The Dictionary of Modern American Philosophers, Volumes 1, 2, 3 and 4

John R. Shook,
Editor

Thoemmes

The Dictionary
of Modern American Philosophers

THE DICTIONARY OF MODERN AMERICAN PHILOSOPHERS

Volume 1

A–C

GENERAL EDITOR

John R. Shook

CONSULTING EDITORS

Richard T. Hull
Bruce Kuklick
Murray G. Murphey
John G. Slater

CONTENTS

This page intentionally left blank

INTRODUCTION

The *Dictionary of Modern American Philosophers*, which contains 1082 entries by over 500 authors, provides an account of philosophical thought in the United States and Canada between 1860 and the present. A dictionary for early American philosophers from the colonial period to the Civil War is in preparation. An envisioned dictionary for Latin America will encompass Mexico to complete the coverage of North America. Even after these dictionaries are all published, scholarship advancement, new information, and error detection will demand updating and enlargement in electronic format. Suggestions for additions, improvements, and corrections are welcome and may be communicated to the general editor.

The chronological boundaries of the *Dictionary* are set by including figures who produced significant philosophical thought in the US or Canada between 1860 and the early 1960s. The birth dates of the *Dictionary*'s thinkers range from 1797 to 1942. The earliest works mentioned in some entries date from around 1820, and the latest are from 2005, so nearly 200 years of philosophy are covered by the *Dictionary*. Figures who died soon after the Civil War, such as some elderly Transcendentalists, are included even though most of their publications appeared in the 1840s or 1850s. The *Dictionary* includes foreign-born philosophers who spent as little as a decade in the US or Canada, provided that they made contributions to philosophy while here, such as the Europeans who fled Nazi persecution and World War II. To select those who were active by the early 1960s, the *Dictionary* editors considered those born by 1935 and who earned their terminal degree by 1962, although a few figures born between 1935 and 1942 who made the greatest impact on late twentieth-century philosophy are also included. The distribution of birth years of figures in the *Dictionary* is as follows: 209 were born between 1797 and 1860, 170 were born between 1861 and 1880, 177 were born between 1881 and 1900, 263 were born between 1901 and 1920, and 263 were born between 1921 and 1942. The philosophers of the generation born after World War II, while not lacking in impact, have not yet concluded their work and some historical distance is still required for proper judgment.

The label of "philosopher" has been broadly applied in this *Dictionary* to intellectuals who have made philosophical contributions regardless of academic career or professional title. The wide scope of philosophical activity across the time-span of this *Dictionary* would now be classed among the various humanities and social sciences which gradually separated from philosophy over the last 150 years. Many figures included were not academic philosophers but did work at the philosophical foundations of such fields as pedagogy, rhetoric, the arts, history, politics, economics, sociology, psychology, linguistics, anthropology, religion, and theology. Philosophy proper is heavily represented, of course, encompassing the traditional areas of metaphysics, ontology, epistemology, logic, ethics, social/political theory, and aesthetics, along with the narrower fields of philosophy of science, philosophy of mind, philosophy of language, philosophy of law, applied ethics, philosophy of religion, and so forth.

It should be remembered, however, that professional philosophers have had no monopoly on these philosophical fields, especially before World War I. There is a large number of entries, for example, about important theologians who made contributions to philosophy of religion and philosophical theology. In nineteenth-century terms, the *Dictionary* includes theologians who practiced "systematic" or "speculative" theology (rather than those who practiced only dogmatic or apologetic theology). Likewise, the *Dictionary* contains major physicists, biologists, anthropologists, linguists, psychologists, cognitive scientists, sociologists, economists, political theorists, cultural critics, literary critics, composers, artists, and architects who philosophized about their field and influenced other philosophers. Social reformers whose writings manifest philosophical concerns in a sophisticated way, such as deliberations on gender or racial equality, social justice, political liberty, and so on, are another significant category of thinkers in this *Dictionary*.

The *Dictionary* entries vary in size from a minimum of around 500 words to a maximum of 4000 words. Entry size should not be construed as resulting from an editorial attempt to measure some intrinsic philosophical value of the figures. The editors planned for roughly one-third of the entries to be more than 1600 words, and those thinkers may indeed be judged among the more significant of their contemporaries. However, many variables, including availability of information, author enthusiasm, attempts to give extra space to figures ignored by other reference works, and many more factors, together yield a great deal of variation. Since the primary purpose of this *Dictionary* is to preserve valuable information about as many thinkers as possible, its virtue lies in its wider historical breadth rather than its analytic depth. By including not only every well-known thinker but also a vast number of lesser-known thinkers surrounding the "great philosophers" with support, criticism, and intellectual context, the story of the evolution of philosophy in the US and Canada becomes visible in broad outlines. Indeed, the number of intellectual disciplines and fields of philosophy in this *Dictionary* is so large, the representation of diverse schools and movements of philosophy is so successful, and the inclusion of so many women and minorities (130) is so pluralistic, that it make a large contribution to the study of modern intellectual life in these two countries.

The editors have sought to ensure that the breadth of significant philosophical activity finds representation in the *Dictionary* in many ways beyond those already mentioned. For example, recognition by one's peers is one useful measure, so nearly all of the presidents of the three divisions of the American Philosophical Association are included, along with many presidents of numerous regional and topical philosophical societies, such as the Southwestern Philosophical Society, the Metaphysical Society of America, and the Philosophy of Science Association. The *Dictionary* also includes philosophers from nearly every geographical section of the US and Canada. Furthermore, nearly every one of the 105 universities that had a doctoral program by 1970 has one or more of their philosophers included here. The *Dictionary* also has many entries on the first philosophers to teach at these major universities, as well as their more recent successors, so that the histories of over one hundred philosophy departments in the US and Canada, along with many smaller college departments, are sketched from the perspective of individual professors.

The story of philosophy in North America comes to life in this *Dictionary* at its most personal level: in the varied careers of the thinkers themselves, from poet, priest, and politician to abolitionist, socialist, and civil rights activist; often alongside their academic position. Public fame and recognized service are not necessarily incompatible with a philosophical life. Among the *Dictionary* figures are an author of an Amendment to the US Constitution (Susan B. Anthony), a Roman Catholic Cardinal (Elzéar-Alexandre Taschereau), two founders of new religious movements (Mary Baker Eddy and Helena Blavatsky), two United States Commissioners of Education (William T. Harris and Sterling McMullin), two martyred African-American leaders (Martin

Luther King, Jr. and Malcolm X), three Presidential Medal of Freedom awardees (Alexander Meiklejohn, Walter Lippmann, and Sidney Hook), four pioneers of environmentalism (Joseph Wood Krutch, Aldo Leopold, Rachel Carson, Holmes Rolston, III), five US Supreme Court Justices (Louis Brandeis, Benjamin Cardozo, William Douglas, Felix Frankfurter, and Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.), eleven Presidential Medal of Freedom awardees (Alexander Meiklejohn, Walter Lippmann, John von Neumann, Will Durant, Lewis Mumford, Rachel Carson, Sidney Hook, Milton Friedman, Friedrich Hayek, Eric Hoffer, John Kenneth Galbraith), and fourteen Nobel prize winners (Jane Addams, Kenneth Arrow, Emily Greene Balch, P. W. Bridgman, James Buchanan, Nicholas Murray Butler, Albert Einstein, T. S. Eliot, Milton Friedman, John Harsanyi, Martin Luther King, Jr., John Nash, Amartya Sen, Elie Wiesel). The mundane realm of technology is here revealed to be thoroughly intertwined with philosophy as well – for example, consider the evolution of the computer, through the work of Charles Peirce (first to recognize the connection between Boolean algebra and electric switch circuits), Allan Marquand (first to design an electro-mechanical digital machine), Arthur Burks (helped build the first general-purpose electronic computer ENIAC), and John Kemeny (wrote the BASIC computer language). More examples of diverse philosophical achievement could be enumerated, too many to list here, but how many philosophers have climbed Mount Everest (Stephen Kleene), have a high mountain peak named after him (Josiah Royce), or inspired the naming of an asteroid (Paul Kurtz)?

Even the less exciting but still rewarding career as a college professor of philosopher could entail very different responsibilities across the timeline of this *Dictionary*. Very few philosophy positions in American academia existed in 1860, and were typically attached to the title of college president and carried clerical qualifications. With very few exceptions, only ministers approved by a college's religious denomination could then teach philosophy, and at almost all colleges save for the largest like Harvard, Princeton, and Columbia, the college president was usually assigned the responsibility for teaching philosophy (meaning moral and social philosophy as the denomination viewed it). Before 1860 only a few colleges, such as Harvard, Princeton, Andover Theological Seminary, and Union Theological Seminary, offered any postgraduate education and the possibility of advanced training in philosophy. In 1866 Yale awarded the first American PhD in philosophy, to Charles Fraser MacLean who became a judge in New York. Yale was soon followed by Harvard (1878 – G. Stanley Hall), Johns Hopkins (1878 – Josiah Royce), and Cornell (1880 – May Preston Slossen, the first American woman to receive a philosophy doctorate). Around half of the philosophers educated between 1870 and 1910 spent some time at German and French universities for additional philosophical study, and this experience contributed to the gradual liberalization and sophistication of religious and speculative thought in North America.

From 1860 to 1880 academic philosophers were scattered across the landscape, found only at the more prestigious colleges and usually working alone as the person holding the one chair of philosophy at their institution. Although the titles of Professor of Moral Philosophy and Professor of Intellectual Philosophy had become more common and independent from the position of college presidency or minister by 1890, advanced philosophical training and skill was possessed only by at most eighty of these professors in the US and Canada. Some of the most important philosophical creativity was still generated by theologians during that era, especially those who creatively struggled with the internal tensions of their faith's doctrines, the challenge of evolution, or the plight of the labor class. Another fertile source of philosophical thinking was coming from the new category of "social scientist" composed of scholars searching for remedies to social problems.

The *Dictionary* recounts in the lives of its figures how philosophy was gradually liberated from denominational creeds as modernizing universities tried to imitate the German model, with a broadly scientific mission and many separate departments of specialists publishing their research.

Introduction

The year 1866–7 was the greatest turning point with three key events: the first American PhD in philosophy in 1866, the founding of America's first philosophy journal, *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, in 1867, and the publication of Charles Peirce's first series of essays on logic in 1867. The next generation of academic philosophers, like Josiah Royce, John Dewey, James Mark Baldwin, and George Santayana, found their positions in the 1880s and 1890s without a theological degree or clerical ordination. Their degrees were from German universities or from the few American universities offering the new PhD degree. The professionalization of philosophy was swiftly achieved in the early 1900s, as enlarged universities divided the various social sciences apart from philosophy, and philosophy departments inflated by hiring the newly minted PhD graduates of Harvard, Princeton, Yale, Cornell, Columbia, Johns Hopkins, and Chicago. These graduates were imbued with a sense of national importance. The closing of the frontier in 1890 signaled the inward shift of America's manifest destiny to its classrooms. It also coincided with the growth and importance of philosophy as the basis from which to craft a new type of intellectual pioneer, one able to comprehend and articulate the unprecedented problems and challenges of the next century. By a conservative estimate the number of academic philosophers tripled from 1880 to 1910, a rate comparable only to the dramatic increase of philosophy positions from 1945 to 1952 and again during the late 1960s.

Academic and intellectual growth is a major theme displayed by the *Dictionary*, but the long-delayed recognition of philosophical talent in women and minorities is evidenced in the *Dictionary* as well. Christine Ladd-Franklin was denied her earned diploma from Johns Hopkins in 1882, as was Mary Whiton Calkins in 1895 when she did not receive her Harvard doctorate. By 1940 only a handful of women had taught as regular philosophy faculty at major universities. The small presence of Native Americans who came to philosophy only through other disciplines, and the prejudice toward the few Jews in philosophy before 1950, is similarly evident in the *Dictionary*, although it should be noted that a large number of Jewish philosophers found refuge in American and Canadian institutions during World War II. Despite Alain Locke's path-breaking achievement as the first African-American PhD in philosophy (from Harvard) in 1918, few have been able to follow him to academic prominence. In the 1940s the only African-American philosopher at an Ivy League university was William Fontaine at Pennsylvania, and little improvement can be seen since. Other religious and ethnic minorities also have suffered neglect and prejudice too extensive to recount here.

However the history of philosophy in the US and Canada may be judged by its treatment of women and minorities, this *Dictionary* was designed to present the lives and careers of a broad and diverse array of philosophical intellectuals. Despite the editors' best efforts, future centuries may yet judge this *Dictionary* and its inclusion choices to be erratic at best or seriously flawed at worst. Charles Hutton's impressive *Mathematical and Philosophical Dictionary* of 1796 omitted John Locke and David Hume, after all – so some true philosophical genius has probably eluded this *Dictionary*'s editors. Still more provoking is the thought that this *Dictionary* contains large entries on figures who will someday be deemed beneath consideration by future historians of philosophy. Still, it is hoped that this *Dictionary* will satisfactorily reveal what this era considered philosophically interesting, stimulate closer attention and research into philosophical thought in the US and Canada, and help make future enlightened judgments possible.

John R. Shook, 2005
University of Oklahoma, Stillwater

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This page intentionally left blank

HOW TO USE THE *DICTIONARY*

The *Dictionary* contains entries on 1082 philosophers. The title of each entry gives the subject's name and dates of birth and death, where known. The names used are those by which a subject was most commonly known; thus Samuel Langhorne Clemens is listed under his famous pseudonym Mark Twain. Further biographical and career details, again where known, are given in the text, usually in the opening paragraphs. The main body of each entry discusses the subject's writings, teaching, and thought. A cross-referencing system refers the reader to other entries. Names which appear in small capitals, such as WHITEHEAD, are themselves the subjects of entries in the *Dictionary*, and the reader may refer to those entries for more information.

The concluding bibliography can contain as many as three sections. The initial section contains the more significant publications by the subject, typically monographs and major articles. Reprintings are only rarely given mention, where the original is particularly obscure or hard to obtain. The second section, "Other Relevant Works," contains additional publications that typically include more articles and book chapters, posthumous editions and collected works, edited books, translations, autobiographies, or non-philosophical works of interest. This section will also locate the figure's archived papers, if known. The third section, "Further Reading," contains citations to standard biographical works that also include the subject, such as *American National Biography*. The Abbreviations for Biographical Reference Works on p. __ explains the citation method for these biographical works. This third section also lists publications about the subject. The reader should be advised that the most comprehensive works on the history of philosophy in America, listed in the General Bibliography on pp. __, are not typically also listed in further reading sections to save space.

The reader should also be advised that for most entries the further reading section is the joint product of the author and general editor's efforts to guide the reader to a judicious and useful selection of secondary writings that may be supportive, neutral, or critical towards the subject. In no case should it be supposed that either the author or the general editor themselves intend to convey a positive evaluation of every item mentioned in the further reading section.

This page intentionally left blank

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Armour, Leslie, and Elizabeth Trott. *The Faces of Reason: An Essay on Philosophy and Culture in English Canada 1850–1950* (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1981).

Biel, Steven. *Independent Intellectuals in the United States, 1910–1945* (New York: New York University Press, 1992).

Blau, Joseph L. *Men and Movements in American Philosophy* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1952).

Blau, Joseph L., ed. *American Philosophic Addresses, 1700–1900* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1946).

Brodbeck, May. "Philosophy in America: 1900–1950," in *American Non-Fiction 1900–1950* (Chicago, 1952), pp. 3–94.

Caws, Peter, ed. *Two Centuries of Philosophy in America* (London: Blackwell, 1980).

Cohen, Morris R. *American Thought: A Critical Sketch* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1954).

Cunningham, G. Watts. *The Idealistic Argument in Recent British and American Thought* (New York: Century, 1933).

Curti, Merle. *The Growth of American Thought* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943).

Curtis, M. M. *An Outline of Philosophy in America* (Cleveland: Western Reserve University, 1896).

Dorrien, Gary. *The Remaking of Evangelical Theology* (Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998).

———. *The Making of American Liberal Theology, vol. 1: Imagining Progressive Religion, 1805–1900* (Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001).

———. *The Making of American Liberal Theology, vol. 2: Idealism, Realism, and Modernity, 1900–1950* (Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003).

Fay, Jay W. *American Psychologies Before William James* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1939).

Flower, Elizabeth, and Murray G. Murphey. *A History of Philosophy in America* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1977).

Gray, James. *Modern Process Thought* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1982.

Hall, G. Stanley. "On the History of American College Textbooks and Teaching in Logic, Ethics, Psychology, and Allied Subjects," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* n.s. 9 (1893–4): 137–94.

Hall, G. Stanley. "Philosophy in the United States," *Mind* 4 (1879): 89–105.

Harlow, Victor. *A Bibliography and Genetic Study of American Realism* (Oklahoma City: Harlow Publishing Co., 1931).

Hofstadter, Richard. *Social Darwinism in American Thought*, 2nd edn (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955).

Hudson, W. D. *A Century of Moral Philosophy* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1980).

Jones, Adam Leroy. *Early American Philosophers* (New York: Macmillan, 1898).

Kuklick, Bruce. *A History of Philosophy in America, 1720–2000* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

———. *Churchmen and Philosophers* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1985).

———. *The Rise of American Philosophy* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1977).

Muirhead, John H. *The Platonic Tradition in Anglo-Saxon Philosophy: Studies in the History of Idealism in England and America* (London: G. Allen & Unwin; New York: Macmillan, 1931).

Nauman, St. Elmo, Jr. *Dictionary of American Philosophy* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1973).

Passmore, John. *A Hundred Years of Philosophy*, 2nd edn (New York: Basic Books, 1966).

Perry, Ralph Barton. *Philosophy of the Recent Past* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926).

———. *Present Philosophical Tendencies* (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1912).

Porter, Noah. "Philosophy in Great Britain and America," in *History of Philosophy from Thales to the Present Time*, by Friedrich Uberweg, trans. George S. Morris (London and New York, 1874), vol. 2, pp. 442–50.

Reck, Andrew. *The New American Philosophers* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1968).

———. *Recent American Philosophy* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1964).

Riley, I. Woodbridge. *American Philosophy: The Early Schools* (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Co., 1907).

———. *American Philosophy from Puritanism to Pragmatism and Beyond* (New York: Henry Holt, 1915).

Roberts, Jon. *Darwinism and the Divine in America* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988).

Rogers, Arthur K. *English and American Philosophy Since 1800: A Critical Survey* (New York: Macmillan, 1922).

Ross, Dorothy. *The Origins of American Social Science* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

Schneider, Herbert W. *A History of American Philosophy*, 2nd. edn. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963).

———. *Sources of Contemporary Philosophical Realism in America* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1964).

Spiegelberg, Herbert. *The Phenomenological Movement: A Historical Introduction*, 3rd edn (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1971).

Thayer, H. Stanley. *Meaning and Action: A Critical History of Pragmatism*, 2nd edn (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1981).

Werkmeister, William H. *A History of Philosophical Ideas in America* (New York: Ronald Press, 1949).

Wiener, Philip. *Evolution and the Founders of Pragmatism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949).

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Ruth Abbey
Senior Lecturer, Department of Politics and IR
University of Kent at Canterbury
Canterbury, Kent, UK

William R. Abbott
Associate Professor Emeritus, Department of
Philosophy
University of Waterloo
Ontario, Canada

Laird Addis
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Michael W. Allen
Philosophy Department
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois

Robert E. Alvis
Saint Meinrad School of Theology
Meinrad, Indiana

Douglas R. Anderson
Associate Professor of Philosophy
Penn State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

Irving H. Anellis
Contributing Editor, Peirce Edition Project
Fort Dodge, Iowa

Edward P. Antonio
Associate Professor of Theology and Social Theory
Iliff School of Theology
Denver, Colorado

Leslie Armour
Research Professor of Philosophy
Dominican College of Philosophy and Theology and
University of Ottawa
Ottawa, Canada

Randall E. Auxier
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
(Oklahoma State University?)

Sidney Axinn
Courtesy Professor
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida

James T. Baker
Professor, Department of History
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

Nicole B. Barenbaum
Professor of Psychology
University of the South
Sewanee, Tennessee

Stephen A. Barnes
Philosophy Instructor
Northwest Vista College
San Antonio, Texas

J. Edward Barrett
Emeritus Professor of Religion and Philosophy,
Muskingum College
Highlands, North Carolina

List of Contributors

Jeffrey A. Barrett
Associate Professor and Chair, Department of Logic
and Philosophy of Science
University of California, Irvine
Irvine, California

Robert Barrett
Washington University
St. Louis, Missouri

Scott Bartlett
Adjunct Professor of Philosophy
Southern Methodist University
Dallas, Texas

John William Bates V
Philosophy Department
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Steven R. Bayne
Writer
Somerville, Massachusetts

Mary Farrell Bednarowski
Professor of Religious Studies
United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities
New Brighton, Minnesota

Jeffrey K. Beemer
Senior Research Associate, Social and Demographic
Research Institute
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

Elizabeth A. Behnke
Coordinator and Senior Research Fellow, Study
Project in Phenomenology of the Body
Ferndale, Washington State

Alyssa R. Bernstein
Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio

Wanda Warren Berry
Professor Emerita of Philosophy
Colgate University
Washington, D.C.

Michael L. Birkel
Professor of Religion, Religion Department
Earlham College
Richmond, Indiana

Larry Lee Blackman
Associate Professor of Philosophy, Department of
Philosophy
State University of New York at Geneseo
Geneseo, New York

Daniel Blair
Visiting Lecturer
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland

Irene Bloom
Ann Whitney Olin Professor Emeritus, Department
of Asian and Middle Eastern Cultures
Barnard College
New York City, New York

Philip Blosser
Professor of Philosophy, School of History,
Philosophy and Religion
Lenoir-Rhyne College
Hickory, North Carolina

Christine M. Bochen
Professor of Religious Studies, Department of
Religious Studies
Nazareth College
Pittsburgh, New York

James W. Boettcher
Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy
Saint Joseph's University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Peter J. Boettke
Department of Economics
George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia

Matthew Bokovoy
Visiting Assistant Professor, Department of History
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

E. J. Bond
Professor Emeritus, Department of Philosophy
Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada

Henry Warner Bowden
Professor, Religion Department
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey

Mary Bowman-Kruhm
Johns Hopkins University
School of Professional Studies in Business and
Education
Rockville, Maryland

Harry McFarland Bracken
Adjunct Professor of Philosophy
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona

Joseph A. Bracken
Retired Professor of Theology
Xavier University
Cincinnati, Ohio

Denny Bradshaw
Associate Professor of Philosophy, Department of
Philosophy and Humanities
University of Texas at Arlington
Arlington, Texas

S. Daniel Breslauer
Professor of Religious Studies, Department of
Religious Studies
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

Terry Brino-Dean
Visiting Assistant Professor of Theatre Studies
Maryville College
Maryville, Tennessee

Kyle Broom
Teaching Assistant
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Urbana, Illinois

Barry F. Brown
Retired Associate Professor, Philosophy
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

B. Ricardo Brown
Assistant Professor of Cultural Studies, Department
of Social Science and Cultural Studies
Pratt Institute
Brooklyn, New York

Donald L. Brown
Assistant Dean, Minority Affairs
Rider University
Lawrenceville, New Jersey

Douglas Browning
Professor Emeritus of Philosophy, Department of
Philosophy
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas

Paul Custodio Bube
W. Lewis McColgan Professor of Religion,
Department of Religion and Philosophy
Lyon College
Batesville, Arkansas

Glenn R. Bucher
Executive Director, The Boyer Center
Grantham, Pennsylvania

Evelyn Burg
Lecturer, La Guardia Community College
City University of New York
Long Island City, New York

Richard W. Burgh
Chair, Department of Philosophy
Rider University
Lawrenceville, New Jersey

Alice Rowe Burks
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Jill Vance Buroker
Professor Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
California State University
San Bernardino, California

Gregory S. Butler
Associate Professor, Department of Government
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico

Thomas A. Byrnes
Professor of Religious Studies
Benedictine University
Lisle, Illinois

Rebecca Bensen Cain
Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Philosophy
Department
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Robert R. Calder
(Formerly) Tutor in Philosophy, CCE
University of Strathclyde
Hamilton, UK

Robert M. Calhoon
Professor of Religion, History Department
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Greensboro, North Carolina

Gary S. Calore
Associate Professor of Philosophy
Penn State University
Abington, Pennsylvania

James Campbell
Distinguished University Professor, Philosophy
Department
University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio

Keith Campbell
Emeritus Professor of Philosophy
University of Sydney
Sydney, Australia

Julie Harms Cannon
Assistant Professor of Sociology, Department of
Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, Texas

Paul E. Capetz
Associate Professor of Historical Theology
United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities
New Brighton, Minnesota

André W. Carus
Open Court Publishing Company
Chicago, Illinois

James O. Castagnera
Associate Provost
Rider University
Lawrenceville, New Jersey

Robert L. Castiglione
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
Rhode Island College
Providence, Rhode Island

John Catalano
Dean
University of South Carolina
Lancaster, South Carolina

Francis J. Catania
Professor Emeritus of Philosophy, Philosophy
Department
Loyola University Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

J. J. Chambliss
Professor of Education, Graduate School of
Education
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey

J. Harley Chapman
Dean, Liberal Arts Division (retired) and Professor
Emeritus, Philosophy and Humanities Department
William Rainey Harper College
Palatine, Illinois

Ananya Chatterjea
Assistant Professor, Department of Theater Arts and
Dance
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Kah Kyung Cho
SUNY Distinguished Teaching Professor,
Department of Philosophy
University at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

James J. Chriss
Associate Professor, Department of Sociology
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio

Lenny Clapp
Associate Professor of Philosophy, Department of
Philosophy
Illinois Wesleyan University
Bloomington, Illinois

David O. Clark
Editorial Assistant for the *Journal of the History of
the Behavioral* Sciences, Department of Psychology
York University
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Catherine L. Coghlan
Assistant Director, Institutional Research
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, Texas

Henry Cohen
Legislative Attorney
Library of Congress
Washington, D.C.

Vincent M. Colapietro
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

E. Paul Colella
Professor of Philosophy
Xavier University
Cincinnati, Ohio

Louis J. Colombo
Adjunct Professor of Philosophy, Philosophy
Department
Rider University
Lawrenceville, New Jersey

Walter H. Conser, Jr.
Professor of Religious Studies and Professor of
History, Department of History
University of North Carolina at Wilmington
Wilmington, North Carolina

Gary A. Cook
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
and Religion
Beloit College
Beloit, Wisconsin

Shelley Wood Cordulack
Associate Professor of Art History, Art Department
Millikin University
Decatur, Illinois

Angela L. Cotten
Assistant Professor of Women's Studies, Women's
Studies Program
State University of New York at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, New York

Mark Cox
PhD Student
University of Glasgow
Glasgow, Scotland

Christopher J. Coyne
Department of Economics
George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia

Kenneth Cracknell
Professor of Theology and Global Studies
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, Texas

John F. Crosby
Professor of Philosophy
Franciscan University
Steubenville, Ohio

Steven Crowell
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
Rice University
Houston, Texas

List of Contributors

Hunter Crowther-Heyck
Assistant Professor of the History of Science,
Department of the History of Science
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma

Garrett Cullity
Associate Professor of Philosophy, Department of
Philosophy
University of Adelaide
Adelaide, Australia

Terence Cuneo
Assistant Professor, Philosophy Department
Calvin College
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Phyllis Curtis-Tweed
Associate Professor and Director, Freshman Year
Program
Medgar Evers College
Brooklyn, New York

Harry F. Dahms
Associate Professor of Sociology and Director of
Graduate Studies
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

Gerard J. Dalcourt
Professor Emeritus
Seton Hall University
South Orange, New Jersey

Joseph W. Dauben
PhD Program in History
City University of New York
New York City, New York

William Davenport
Associate Professor of Philosophy (retired)
Western Illinois University
Macomb, Illinois

Mark Y. A. Davies
Associate Professor of Philosophy
Oklahoma City University
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

David L. Davis
Graduate Student, History Department
Rice University
Houston, Texas

Michael H. DeArmey
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
University of Southern Mississippi
Hattiesburg, Mississippi

Mary Jo Deegan
Department of Sociology
University of Nebraska – Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska

John Deely
University of St Thomas, Houston
Houston, Texas

C. F. Delaney
Professor of Philosophy, Philosophy Department
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana

Lawrence J. Dennis
Professor Emeritus, Educational Administration and
Higher Education
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois

Ione Y. DeOllos
Associate Professor, Department of Sociology
Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana

Claire Detels
Coordinator of the Music History Area and
Professor of Music
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, Arkansas

William D. Dean
Emeritus Professor of Constructive Theology
Iliff School of Theology
Denver, Colorado

Max Deutscher
Emeritus Professor, Division of SCMP
Macquarie University
Sydney, Australia

David C. Devonis
Associate Professor of Psychology, Department of Psychology
Graceland University
Lamoni, Iowa

Cornelis de Waal,
Assistant Editor and Adjunct Professor of Philosophy
Peirce Edition Project
Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis
Indianapolis, Indiana

Randall R. Dipert
C.S. Peirce Professor of American Philosophy
University at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

Brian Domitrovic
Instructor of History, Department of History
Slippery Rock University
Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania

Martin Donougho
Professor, Department of Philosophy
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina

Sarah K. Donovan
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
Wagner College
Staten Island, New York

Mark Dooley
Visiting Research Fellow, Department of Philosophy
University College Dublin
Dublin, Ireland

Gary Dorrien
Parfet Distinguished Professor
Kalamazoo College
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Thomas Drucker
Lecturer, Department of Mathematical and Computer Sciences
University of Wisconsin – Whitewater
Whitewater, Wisconsin

John Drummond
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
Fordham University
Bronx, New York

Stephen D. Dumont
Associate Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana

Elmer H. Duncan
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
Baylor University
Waco, Texas

James Dye
Professor and Chair, Department of Philosophy
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois

Therese Boos Dykeman
Adjunct Professor
Fairfield University
Fairfield, Connecticut

C. Anthony Earls
Residence Life and Dining Services
University of Wyoming
Laramie, Wyoming

Charles Edgley
Professor and Head, Department of Sociology
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Rem B. Edwards
Lindsay Young Professor of Philosophy (Emeritus)
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

Philip Ehrlich
Professor, Department of Philosophy
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio

William D. Eisenhower
Interim Senior Pastor
Faith Presbyterian Church
Minnetonka, Minnesota

List of Contributors

Robin J. Effron
Law Clerk to the Hon. Alvin K. Hellerstein, US
District Court for
the Southern District of New York
New York

Monika Elbert
Professor of English
Montclair State University
West Orange, New Jersey

Michael Eldridge
Lecturer, Department of Philosophy
University of North Carolina at Charlotte
Charlotte, North Carolina

Mark Barger Elliot
Riverside Presbyterian Church
Riverside, Illinois

Robert Ellwood
Emeritus Professor of Religion
University of Southern California
Ojai, California

Reinaldo Elugardo
Full Professor, Department of Philosophy
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma

Lester Embree
William F. Dietrich Eminent Scholar in Philosophy,
Department of Philosophy
Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton, Florida

Greg Eow
Graduate Student, Department of History
Rice University
Houston, Texas

Christopher H. Evans
Associate Professor of Church History
Colgate Rochester Crozer Divinity School
Rochester, New York

Rand B. Evans
Professor of Psychology, Department of Psychology
East Carolina University
Greenville, North Carolina

Chielozona Eze
Assistant Professor of English
Northeastern Illinois University
Chicago, Illinois

Christopher Faille
Reporter for Hedge World
White Plains, New York

Seth A. Farber
Founding Director, www.itim.org.il
Jerusalem, Israel

Richard Feldman
Professor, Department of Philosophy
University of Rochester
Rochester, New York

Steven Fesmire
Philosophy
Green Mountain College
Poultney, Vermont

Thomas W. Flynn
Editor, *Free Inquiry Magazine*, and Director, Robert
Green Ingersoll Birthplace Museum
Amherst, New York

Dagfinn Føllesdal
C. I. Lewis Professor of Philosophy, Department of
Philosophy
Stanford University
Stanford, California

Eugene Fontinell
Professor Emeritus, Department of Philosophy
Queen's College, City University of New York
Bronx, New York

Joan Grassbaugh Forry
Instructor, Department of Philosophy
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Nick Fotion
Professor, Department of Philosophy
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia

Daniel M. Fox
President, Milbank Memorial Fund
New York City, New York

Charles Frederick Frantz
Adjunct Assistant Professor
Westminster Choir College of Rider University
Princeton, New Jersey

Amanda Frisken
Visiting Assistant Professor, Department of
American Studies
SUNY College at Old Westbury
Old Westbury, New York

C. George Fry
Professor, Church History and Theology
Winebrenner Theological Seminary
Findlay, Ohio

Alfred H. Fuchs
Emeritus Professor of Psychology, Department of
Psychology
Bowdoin College
Brunswick, Maine

Robert C. Fuller
Professor of Religious Studies, Department of
Religious Studies
Bradley University
Peoria, Illinois

Steve Fuller
Professor of Sociology, Department of Sociology
University of Warwick
Coventry, Warwickshire, UK

Franklin I. Gamwell
The Divinity School
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Catherine Villanueva Gardner
Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Philosophy
Department
University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth
North Dartmouth, Massachusetts

Don Garrett
Kenan Distinguished Professor for Teaching
Excellence, Department of Philosophy
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Charles Gattone
Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Tamar Szabó Gendler
Associate Professor of Philosophy, Department of
Philosophy
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Uta Gerhardt
Full Professor of Sociology, Soziologie II
Universität Heidelberg
Heidelberg, Germany

Lloyd P. Gerson
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Joseph A. Giacalone
Professor of Economics and Henry George Chair in
Economics, Department of Economics and Finance
St John's University
Queens, New York

Roger F. Gibson
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
Washington University
St. Louis, Missouri

Michaela Giesenkirchen
English Department
Washington University
St. Louis, Missouri

Patrick J. Gilpin
Gilpin Law Firm
Houston, Texas

Lou Goble
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosoph
Willamette University
Salem, Oregon

List of Contributors

Emanuel S. Goldsmith
Professor of Jewish Studies
Queens College of the City University of New York
Flushing, New York

José María Gondra
Full Professor of Basic Psychology, Department of
Basic Psychological Processes
University of the Basque Country
San Sebastián, Spain

James A. Good
Associate Professor of History, Department of
History
North Harris College
Houston, Texas

James M. M. Good
Senior Lecturer, Department of Psychology
University of Durham
Durham, Northumberland, UK

Julia Chenot GoodFox
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

Jacob Lynn Goodson
Garrett Evangelical Theological Seminary
Evaston, Illinois

Nancy M. Gordon
Independent Scholar
Amherst, Massachusetts

Geoffrey Gorham
Assistant Professor of Philosophy
University of Wisconsin
Eau Clair, Wisconsin

Kevin Fox Gotham
Associate Professor, Department of Sociology
Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana

Allan Gotthelf
Visiting Professor of History and Philosophy of
Science
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Carol C. Gould
Professor of Philosophy and Government,
Department of Philosophy
George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia

Daniel W. Graham
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah

Dean Graham
PhD Student and Teaching Assistant (Instructor),
Department of Philosophy
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

John Greco
Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy
Fordham University
Bronx, New York

Christopher D. Green
Professor of Psychology, Department of Psychology
York University
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Judy Green
Professor, Department of Mathematics
Marymount University
Arlington, Virginia

Mitchell S. Green
Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

Larry Greenfield
Chicago, Illinois

Michael F. Gretz
Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science
New School University
New York City, New York

Susan Marie Groppi
Office for History of Science and Technology
University of California
Berkeley, California

Lisa G. Guinn
Visiting Assistant Professor
Ferris State University
Big Rapids, Michigan

Richard B. Gunderman
Associate Professor, Schools of Liberal Arts and
Medicine
Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis
Indianapolis, Indiana

Bina Gupta
Professor of Philosophy and Director, South Asia
Language and Area Program
University of Missouri-Columbia
Columbia, Missouri

William D. Guthrie
Professor, School of Education
Rider University
Lawrenceville, New Jersey

David D. Hall
Professor of History
Harvard Divinity School
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Maurice Hamington
Assistant Professor of Philosophy
University of Southern Indiana
Evansville, Indiana

J. Daniel Hammond
Professor of Economics, Department of Economics
Wake Forest University
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Kathleen M. Haney
Professor of Philosophy
University of Houston, Downtown
Houston, Texas

Barry Hankins
Associate Professor of History and Church-State
Studies
Baylor University
Waco, Texas

Bruce K. Hanson
Professor of Philosophy and Religion
Fullerton College
Fullerton, California

Charley D. Hardwick
Professor of Philosophy and Religious Studies,
Department of Philosophy and Religion
American University
Washington, D.C.

Peter Hewitt Hare
Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus,
Philosophy Department
University at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

Elizabeth Harman
Department of Philosophy
New York University
New York, New York

William Harper
Professor, Philosophy Department
University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada

Leonard Harris
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
Purdue University
West Lafayette, Indiana

Philip E. Harrold
Assistant Professor of History of Christianity
Winebrenner Theological Seminary
Findlay, Ohio

Carl Hausman
Professor Emeritus of Philosophy
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

John Hawthorne
Professor of Philosophy, Philosophy Department
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey

Harry Heft
Professor, Department of Psychology
Denison University
Granville, Ohio

List of Contributors

Marty H. Heitz
Assistant Professor of Philosophy
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Bertrand Helm
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
Southwest Missouri State University
Springfield, Missouri

Harold Henderson
La Porte, Indiana

John R. Hermann
Associate Professor, Department of Political Science
Trinity University
San Antonio, Texas

Albert Hernández
Assistant Professor of the History of Christianity
Iliff School of Theology
Denver, Colorado

Gary L. Herstein
Department of Philosophy
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois

Susannah Heschel
Eli Black Associate Professor of Jewish Studies,
Department of Religion
Dartmouth College
Hanover, New Hampshire

Thomas M. Hibbs
Dean of the Honors College
Baylor University
Waco, Texas

Larry A. Hickman
Director, Center for Dewey Studies and Professor of
Philosophy
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois

David Hildebrand
Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Philosophy
Department
University of Colorado at Denver
Denver, Colorado

Michael R. Hill
Editor, *Sociological Origins*
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska

John W. Hillje
Associate Professor of History, Department of
History
Rider University
Lawrenceville, New Jersey

Jaakko Hintikka
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
Boston University
Boston, Massachusetts

David Justin Hodge
The Extension School
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Brendan Hogan
Faculty, Liberal Studies and Faculty, Design and
Management
New School for Social Research
New York City, New York

Jess Hollenback
Associate Professor of History, History Department
University of Wisconsin – La Crosse
La Crosse, Wisconsin

William G. Holzberger
Professor of English Emeritus, Department of
English
Bucknell University
Lewisburg, Pennsylvania

Jason G. Horn
Associate Professor of English, Humanities Division
Gordon College
Barnesville, Georgia

Nathan Houser
Director, Peirce Edition Project
Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis
Indianapolis, Indiana

R. E. Houser
Professor of Philosophy, Center for Thomistic
Studies
University of St Thomas
Houston, Texas

Daniel Howard-Snyder
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
Western Washington University
Bellingham, Washington State

John Howie
Professor of Philosophy Emeritus, Philosophy
Deparment
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois

Jacob Howland
McFarlice Professor of Philosophy, Department of
Philosophy and Religion
University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma

Jocelyn Hoy
Lecturer in Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
University of California, Santa Cruz
Santa Cruz, California

Richard T. Hull
Emeritus Professor of Philosophy
State University of New York at Buffalo
Clarence, New York

David Hunter
Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy
Buffalo State College
Buffalo, New York

Paul Hurley
Full Professor, Department of Philosophy
Pomona College
Claremont, California

Brian J. Huschle
Assistant Professor
Northwest Technical College
East Grand Forks, Minnesota

Shams Inati
Professor of Theology and Religious Studies,
Department of Theology and Religious Studies
Villanova University
Villanova, Pennsylvania

Tyron Inbody
Professor of Theology
United Theological Seminary
Dayton, Ohio

Nancy K. Innis
Professor, Department of Psychology
University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada

Dominick A. Iorio
Dean and Professor of Philosophy (Emeritus)
Rider University
Lawrenceville, New Jersey

Jason Baird Jackson
Assistant Professor of Folklore, Department of
Folklore and Ethnomusicology
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Jo Ellen Jacobs
Chair and Professor of Philosophy
Millikin University
Decatur, Illinois

Megan Jacobs
Department of Art and Art History
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Dale Jamieson
Henry R. Luce Professor, Department of Philosophy
Carleton College
Northfield, Minnesota

Jennifer G. Jesse
Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Religion
Truman State University
Kirksville, Missouri

List of Contributors

Kenneth Paul Johnson
Director, Halifax County – South Boston Regional
Library
Halifax, Virginia

Kent Johnson
Assistant Professor, Department of Logic and
Philosophy of Science
University of California, Irvine
Irvine, California

Marjorie Jolles
ABD in Philosophy
Temple University
Madison, Wisconsin

Kelly Dean Jolley
Alumni Associate Professor and Chair, Department
of Philosophy
University of Auburn
Auburn, Alabama

David H. Jones
Professor Emeritus, Department of Philosophy
College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia

Susanna Jones
Assistant Professor
Long Island University
Brooklyn, New York

Heather E. Keith
Assistant Professor of Philosophy
Lyndon State College
Lyndonville, Utah

Rosemary Skinner Keller
Academic Dean and Professor of Church History
Union Theological Seminary
New York City, New York

P. C. Kemeny
Associate Professor of Religion and Humanities
Grove City College
Grove City, Pennsylvania

Hendrika Vande Kemp
Clinical Psychologist in Private Practice
Anandale, Virginia

Tim Kenyon
Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Department of
Philosophy
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

Fred Kersten
Frankenthal Professor Emeritus of Philosophy
University of Wisconsin – Green Bay
Green Bay, Wisconsin

Kenneth Laine Ketner
Paul Whitfield Horn Professor, and Director,
Institute for Studies in Pragmaticism
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, Texas

Bockja Kim
Assistant Professor, Hong Kong University of
Science and Technology
Kowloon, Hong Kong, China

Shannon Kincaid
Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Department of
Social Sciences
Queensborough Community College
City University of New York
Brooklyn, New York

William M. King
Professor of Religious Studies
Albright College
Reading, Pennsylvania

Nathan Knobler
Professor of Graduate Studies
The University of the Arts
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Milton R. Konvitz (deceased)
Professor of Law Emeritus and Professor of
Industrial and Labor Relations Emeritus
Cornell University
Oakhurst, New Jersey

Joseph W. Koterski, S.J.
Chair, Department of Philosophy
Fordham University
Bronx, New York

Karen Kovach
Assistant Professor, Biomedical Ethics Program
Mercer University School of Medicine
Macon, Georgia

Dan Krier
Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

Robert Kugelmann
Professor of Psychology, Psychology Department
University of Dallas
Irving, Texas

Bruce Kuklick
Nichols Professor of History, Department of
History
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Elke Kurz-Milcke
Research Scientist
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia

Beth K. Lamont
New York City, New York

Henry A. Landsberger
Professor Emeritus
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Robert Lane
Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Philosophy
Program
State University of West Georgia
Carrollton, Georgia

Simon Langlois
Professor, Département de Sociologie
Université de Laval
Québec, Canada

Estella Lauter
Professor and Chair, Department of English
University of Wisconsin Oshkosh
Oshkosh, Wisconsin

Megan Laverty
Assistant Professor, Department of Educational
Foundations
Montclair State University
Upper Montclair, New Jersey

Thelma Z. Lavine
Clarence J. Robinson Professor of Philosophy and
American Culture
George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia

Nam-In Lee
Full Professor, Department of Philosophy
Seoul National University
Seoul, South Korea

Zosimo E. Lee
Department of Philosophy
University of the Philippines
Quezon City, Philippines

Ernie Lepore
Professor
Rutgers University
Piscataway, New Jersey

Paul J. Levesque
Assistant Professor, Department of Comparative
Religion
California State University, Fullerton
Fullerton, California

Samuel S. Levey
Associate Professor of Philosophy, Department of
Philosophy
Dartmouth College
Hanover, New Hampshire

Albert C. Lewis
Associate Editor, Peirce Edition Project
Indiana University – Purdue University, Indianapolis
Indianapolis, Indiana

Bin Liang
Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology
Oklahoma State University – Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma

List of Contributors

Richard Liebendorfer
Associate Professor, Philosophy Department
Minnesota State University
Mankato, Minnesota

William D. Lindsey
Dean of Instruction
Philander Smith College
Little Rock, Arizona

Bernard Linsky
Professor, Department of Philosophy
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

John Little
Independent Scholar
Bracebridge, Ontario, Canada

D. Stephen Long
Associate Professor of Systematic Theology
Garrett Evangelical Theological Seminary
Evanston, Illinois

Dominic M. Lopes
Associate Professor of Philosophy, Department of
Philosophy
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

Christopher J. Lucas
Professor of Higher Education and Public Policy
Analysis
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, Arizona

George R. Lucas, Jr.
Associate Chair, Department of Leadership, Ethics
and Law
US Naval Academy
Annapolis, Maryland

Kirk Ludwig
Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Sebastian Luft
Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy
Marquette University
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Timothy D. Lyons
Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Department of
Philosophy
Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis
Indianapolis, Indiana

Dana Noelle McDonald
Graduate Student in Philosophy, Philosophy
Department
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois

J. J. MacIntosh
Professor, Department of Philosophy
University of Calgary
Calgary, Alberta, Canada

Melanie McQuitty
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Terrance MacMullan
Assistant Professor, Departments of Philosophy and
Honors
Eastern Washington University
Cheney, Washington

Angela Kristen McWilliams
Graduate Student, History
University of Illinois, Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

E. H. Madden
Professor Emeritus, Department of Philosophy
University at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

Gary B. Madison
Professor Emeritus, Department of Philosophy
McMaster University
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

Krishna Mallick
Chairperson and Full Professor of Philosophy,
Philosophy Department
Salem State College
Salem, Massachusetts

J. Christopher Maloney
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

Jeff Malpas
Professor and Head of School, School of Philosophy
University of Tasmania
Hobart, Tasmania, Australia

James A. Marcum
Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy
Baylor University
Waco, Texas

Nancy Mardas
Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Philosophy
Department
St Joseph College
West Hartford, Connecticut

Andrei S. Markovits
Karl W. Deutsch Collegiate Professor of
Comparative Politics and German Studies. German
Department
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Michele Marsonet
Full Professor and Dean of the Faculty of Arts,
Philosophy Department
University of Genoa
Genoa, Italy

LaDona Martin-Frost
Professor of Ethnomusicology
Millikin University
Decatur, Illinois

Kenneth R. Merrill
Professor, Department of Philosophy
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma

Aaron Meskin
Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, Texas

Ginette Michaud
Professor, Department of French Studies
University of Montréal
Montréal, Québec, Canada

Mark Moller
Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Philosophy
Department
Denison University
Granville, Ohio

Robert E. Money, Jr.
Assistant Professor of Philosophy
Millikin University
Decatur, Illinois

Bradley Monton
Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

Edward F. Mooney
Adjunct Professor of Religion, Department of
Religion
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Ronald Moore
Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

Scott Hunter Moore
Associate Professor of Philosophy and Director of
the Great Books Program
Baylor University
Waco, Texas

Evan Moreno-Davis
Department of Philosophy
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California

Hani Morgan
Associate Professor
Mercer County Community College
Trenton, New Jersey

List of Contributors

Christopher W. Morris
Department of Philosophy
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland

Luise Helene Morton
Senior Lecturer, Department of Philosophy
Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis
Indianapolis, Indiana

James G. Moseley
President
Franklin College
Franklin, Indiana

Danièle Moyal-Sharrock
PhD Student, Department of Philosophy
University of Geneva
Geneva, Switzerland

Mark S. Muldoon
Former Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Algoma
University College, Canada and former Lecturer in
Philosophy at Brock University, Canada
Davison, Michigan

Murray G. Murphey
Professor of American Civilization Emeritus
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Laurence L. Murphy
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

David J. Murray
Emeritus Professor of Psychology, Department of
Psychology
Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada

William T. Myers
Associate Professor of Philosophy
Birmingham-Southern College
Birmingham, Alabama

Paul Nagy
Professor Emeritus of Philosophy, Department of
Philosophy
Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis
Indianapolis, Indiana

Mark Thiessen Nation
Associate Professor of Theology
Eastern Mennonite Seminary
Harrisonburg, Virginia

William Neely
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

L. Jackson Newell
President and Professor
Deep Springs College
Big Pine, California

Ian A. M. Nicholson
Associate Professor of Psychology, Department of
Psychology
St Thomas University
Fredericton, New Brunswick, Canada

Rolf H. Nihilartikel
Professor of Philosophy
Elmira College
Elmira, New York

Ilkka Niiniluoto
Department of Philosophy
University of Helsinki
Helsinki, Finland

Warren A. Nord
Director, Program in the Humanities and Human
Values
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Margaret Nunnelley
Graduate Student, History Department
Rice University
Houston, Texas

Eric Oberheim
Humboldt University of Berlin
Berlin, Germany

Edward W. O'Brien
Assistant Professor (retired)
Delaware Valley College
Doylestown, Pennsylvania

Wesley Mason Olds
Adjunct Professor of Philosophy, English
Department, The Citadel, and Philosophy
Department, College of Charleston
Charleston, South Carolina

Kenneth A. Olliff
Assistant Director, Foundation Relations
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Michael Oppenheim
Professor, Department of Religion
Concordia University
Montréal, Québec, Canada

Brian Orend
Director of International Studies and Associate
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

John C. Orr
Associate Professor of English
University of Portland
Portland, Oregon

Dean Papas
Lecturer, English Department
University of California, Riverside
Riverside, California

Gregory Fernando Pappas
Associate Professor of Philosophy, Department of
Philosophy
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas

Anand C. Paranjpe
Professor Emeritus, Psychology Department
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

Charles Parsons
Edgar Pierce Professor of Philosophy, Department
of Philosophy
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Stanley L. Paulson
William Gardiner Hammond Professor of Law, and
Professor of Philosophy
Washington University
St. Louis, Missouri

W. Creighton Peden
Fuller E. Callaway Professor Emeritus of Philosophy
Augusta State University
Highlands, North Carolina

Stephen M. Perkins
Assistant Professor of Sociology (Anthropology),
Department of Sociology
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Michael L. Peterson
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
Asbury College
Wilmore, Kentucky

Bernard Phillips
Assistant/Associate Professor of Sociology (retired),
Department of Sociology
Boston University
Provincetown, Massachusetts

Sami Pihlström
Department of Philosophy
University of Helsinki
Helsinki, Finland

Anthony B. Pinn
Professor of Religious Studies
Macalester College
St Paul, Minnesota

William C. Placher
Charles D. and Elizabeth S. LaFollette Distinguished
Professor in the Humanities
Wabash College
Crawfordsville, Indiana

List of Contributors

Mary Ellen Poole
Dean
San Francisco Conservatory of Music
San Francisco, California

Jeffrey R. Post
Adjunct Assistant Professor, Department of
Philosophy
Rider University
Lawrenceville, New Jersey

James C. Poteet II
Graduate Student, Department of Philosophy
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Robert E. Prasch
Associate Professor, Economics, Department of
Economics
Middlebury College
Middlebury, Vermont

William H. Pritchard
Henry Clay Folger Professor of English, Department
of English
Amherst College
Amherst, Massachusetts

Meghan Probstfield
Doctoral Student and Teaching Assistant,
Department of Sociology
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Qian Suoqiao
Assistant Professor, Department of Chinese,
Translation, Linguistics
City University of Hong Kong
Kowloon, Hong Kong, China

J. Douglas Rabb
Professor Emeritus
Lakehead University
Thunder Bay, Ontario, Canada

Howard B. Radest
Adjunct Professor, Philosophy
University of South Carolina, Beaufort
Dean Emeritus, The Humanist Institute
Hilton Head Island, South Carolina

Francis B. Randall
Professor Emeritus of Humanities
Sarah Lawrence College
Bronxville, New York

William J. Rappaport
Associate Professor of Computer Science and
Adjunct Professor or Philosophy, Department of
Computer Science and Engineering
University at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

Carl A. Raschke
Professor of Religious Studies, Department of
Religious Studies
University of Denver
Denver, Colorado

Larry L. Rasmussen
Reinhold Niebuhr Professor of Social Ethics
Union Theological Seminary
New York City, New York

Rupert Read
Senior Lecturer, Department of Philosophy
University of East Anglia
Norwich, Norfolk, UK

Todd C. Ream
Assistant Visiting Professor of Educational
Administration
Baylor University
Waco, Texas

Andrew J. Reck
Professor, Department of Philosophy
Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana

Doren A. Recker
Associate Professor of Philosophy, Philosophy
Department
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Harry P. Reeder
Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy and
Humanities
University of Texas at Arlington
Arlington, Texas

George A. Reisch
Independent Scholar
Chicago, Illinois

Eric Reitan
Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Department of
Philosophy
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Bryan S. Rennie
Associate Professor and Visa I. Heinz Professor of
Religion, Department of Religion
Westminster College
New Wilmington, Pennsylvania

Greg Restall
Associate Professor, Philosophy Department
University of Melbourne
Parkville, Australia

Joerg Rieger
Associate Professor of Systematic Theology
Southern Methodist University
Dallas, Texas

Giacomo Rinaldi
Professor of Philosophy, Faculty of Sociology
University of Urbino
Urbino, Italy

Mathias Risse, Yale University
Assistant Professor of Public Policy and Philosophy
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Jon H. Roberts
Professor of History, Department of History
Boston University
Boston, Massachusetts

Robert Campbell Roberts
Distinguished Professor of Ethics, Department of
Philosophy
Baylor University
Waco, Texas

Wesley Roberts
Temporary Instructor
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Indiana, Pennsylvania

James W. Robinson,
Assistant Professor of Sociology, Department of
Sociology and Gerontology
University of Louisiana at Monroe
Monroe, Louisiana

Dorothy Rogers
Assistant Dean, College of Humanities and Social
Sciences
Montclair State University
Upper Montclair, New Jersey

Mark Rollins
Associate Professor and Chair, Department of
Philosophy
Washington University
St. Louis, Missouri

Gideon Rosen
Professor of Philosophy, Philosophy Department
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

Stuart Rosenbaum
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
Baylor University
Waco, Texas

John K. Roth
Edward J. Sexton Professor of Philosophy
Claremont McKenna College
Claremont, California

Richard Rumana
Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy
William Paterson University
Wayne, New Jersey

List of Contributors

Alexandra Rutherford
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology
York University
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Barbara Ryan
Professor of Sociology, Social Science Division
Widener University
Chester, Pennsylvania

Frank X. Ryan
Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Department of
Philosophy
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio

Paul Ryan
New School University
New York, New York

Lyle J. Salmi
Associate Professor of Art, Art Department
Millikin University
Decatur, Illinois

Gregory Salmieri
Graduate Student in Philosophy
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Merrilee H. Salmon
Professor Emerita, Department of History and
Philosophy of Science
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Barbara Sandrisser
Architecture and Environmental Aesthetics
New York City, New York

Paul F. Sands
Assistant Professor of Religion, Department of
Religion
Baylor University
Waco, Texas

Raphael Sassower
Tenured Full Professor, Department of Philosophy
University of Colorado
Colorado Springs, Colorado

Elizabeth Scarborough
Professor Emerita, Psychology Department
Indiana University, South Bend
South Bend, Indiana

Aaron A. Schiller
Graduate Student, Department of Philosophy
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California

Britt-Marie Schiller
Associate Professor and Chair, Department of
Philosophy
Webster University
St. Louis, Missouri

Nancy Hurd Schluter
University Chaplain and Adjunct Professor
Gill Chapel at Rider University
Lwarenceville, New Jersey

Robert F. Schopp
Professor of Law and Psychology, College of Law
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

David E. Schrader
Professor of Philosophy, Philosophy Department
Washington and Jefferson College
Washington, D.C.

Timothy Schroeder
Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Department of
Philosophy
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

Robert Schwartz
Professor, Department of Philosophy
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Darryl Scriven
Associate Professor of Philosophy, Department of
English and Philosophy
Southern University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Fred Seddon
Adjunct Professor of Philosophy, President of the
West Virginia Philosophical Society
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Kenneth Seeskin
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

Jonathan P. Seldin
Associate Professor of Mathematics and Computer
Science
University of Lethbridge
Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada

Evan Selinger
Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy
Rochester Institute of Technology
Rochester, New York

James F. Sennett
Professor of Philosophy and Interdisciplinary
Studies
Lincoln Christian College and Seminary
Lincoln, Illinois

Anthony Serafini
Professor Emeritus
Centenary College
Hackettstown, New Jersey

Patrick Shade
Associate Professor of Philosophy, Philosophy
Department
Rhodes College
Memphis, Tennessee

Seth K. Sharpless
Emeritus Professor of Biological Psychology
University of Colorado at Boulder
Boulder, Colorado

Joshua Shaw
Associate Instructor, Philosophy Department
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Marvin C. Shaw
Emeritus Professor of Religious Studies
Montana State University
Bozeman, Montana

Mark Sherry
Endowed Chair, Disability Studies
University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio

Larry Shiner
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
University of Illinois at Springfield
Springfield, Illinois

Roger A. Shiner
Visiting Professor of Philosophy
Okanagan University College
Kelowna, British Columbia, Canada

John R. Shook
Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Philosophy
Department
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

John Shosky
Adjunct Assistant Professor, University Honors
Program
American University
Washington, D.C.

Philip Siegelman
Professor Emeritus of Political Science
San Francisco State University
Berkeley, California

Beth J. Singer
Professor Emerita of Philosophy
Brooklyn College of the City University of New
York
Lynbrook, New York

Marcus G. Singer
Emeritus Professor of Philosophy, Department of
Philosophy
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Madison, Wisconsin

List of Contributors

David A. Sipfle
William H. Laird Professor of Philosophy and the
Liberal Arts (Emeritus), Department of Philosophy
Carleton College
Northfield, Minnesota

D. W. Skubik
Professor of Philosophy and Humanities, and Dean
of the College of Arts and Sciences
California Baptist University
Riverside, California

John G. Slater
Emeritus Professor of Philosophy, Department of
Philosophy
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Robert O. Slater
Professor
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas

David N. Smith
Associate Professor of Sociology, Department of
Sociology
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

Luther E. Smith, Jr.
Professor of Church and Community
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia

Tara Smith
Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas

David Sobel
Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio

Andrew D. Spear
Graduate Student in Philosophy, Department of
Philosophy
State University of New York at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

Elise Springer
Department of Philosophy
Hartwick College
Oneonta, New York

Gerald Sorin
Director, Jewish Studies Program
State University of New York
New Paltz, New York

Robert J. Stainton
Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy
University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada

Jacqueline Bloom Stanfield
Professor of Sociology, Department of Sociology
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley, Colorado

J. Ron Stanfield
Professor of Economics and Coordinator of
Graduate Studies, Department of Economics
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, Colorado

Glen H. Stassen
Lewis B. Smedes Professor of Christian Ethics
Fuller Theological Seminary
Pasadena, California

James P. Sterba
Philosophy Department
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana

Edward A. Stettner
Ralph Emerson and Alice Freeman Palmer Professor
of Political Science, Department of Political Science
Wellesley College
Wellesley, Massachusetts

Dan R. Stiver
Professor of Theology
Hardin-Simmons University
Abilene, Texas

Daniel Stoljar
Senior Fellow, Philosophy Program
Australian National University
Canberra, Australia

Lucian W. Stone, Jr.
Assistant Professor of Philosophy
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville
Edwardsville, Illinois

Guy W. Stroh
Professor of Philosophy Emeritus, Philosophy
Department
Rider University
Lawrenceville, New Jersey

Philippa Strum
Director, Division of United States Studies
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars
Washington, D.C.

Ellen Kappy Suckiel
Professor of Philosophy
University of California, Santa Cruz
Santa Cruz, California

Ronald Suter
Professor Emeritus, Department of Philosophy
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Brendan Sweetman
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
Rockhurst University
Kansas City, Missouri

Zoltán Gendler Szabó
Associate Professor of Philosophy, The Sage School
of Philosophy
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Michael David Székely
PhD Candidate, Philosophy
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Stephen L. Tanner
Ralph A. Britsch Humanities Professor of English,
English Department
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah

Dirk Tänzler
Fachbereich Geschichte und Soziologie
Universität Konstanz
Konstanz, Germany

Jon Taylor
Associate Professor of Religion
University of Great Falls
Great Falls, Montana

Michael R. Taylor
Associate Professor of Philosophy, Philosophy
Department
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Michael Don Thompson
Associate Professor of Religious Studies, Religion
Department
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Richard L. Tieszen
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
San Jose State University
San Jose, California

John J. Tilley
Associate Professor of Philosophy, Department of
Philosophy
Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis
Indianopolis, Indiana

Lester Tome
Teaching Assistant, Dance Department
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Edgar A. Towne
Honorably Retired Minister, Presbyterian Church
(USA), and Professor of Theology Emeritus,
Christian Theological Seminary
Indianapolis, Indiana

Saul Traiger
Department of Philosophy
Occidental College
Los Angeles, California

List of Contributors

Nick Trakakis
Doctoral Student and Casual Tutor/Lecturer,
Department of Philosophy
Monash University
Clayton, Victoria, Australia

Peter Tramel
Assistant Professor, Department of English and
Philosophy
United States Military Academy
West Point, New York

Daniel Trippett
Philosophy Department
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Elizabeth Trott
Full Professor of Philosophy, Philosophy
Department
Ryerson University
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Jennifer Tsukayama
Assistant Professor, Department of Dance
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona

Matthew Turner
Department of Philosophy
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Cicily Vahadji
Springfield, Massachusetts

Marcia Morgan Vahrmeyer
Postdoctoral Researcher
Technical University of Dresden
Dresden, Germany

Jean Van Delinder
Associate Professor, Department of Sociology
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Eric v. d. Luft
Curator of Historical Collections, Health Sciences
Library
SUNY Upstate Medical University
Syracuse, New York

James Van Evra
Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

Michael Ventimiglia
Assistant Professor of Philosophy
Sacred Heart University
Fairfield, Connecticut

Ian Verstegen
Visiting Assistant Professor, Art Department
Ursinus College
Collegeville, Pennsylvania

Christopher Viger
Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy
University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada

Donald Wayne Viney
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Social
Sciences
Pittsburg State University
Pittsburg, Kansas

Anne K. Vittoria
Associate Professor of Sociology and Gerontology
State University of New York at Cortland
Cortland, New York

Erica Wagner
Graduate Student, Department of Philosophy
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Mary Ellen Waithe
Professor of Philosophy, First College and College
of Arts and Sciences
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio

Kathleen A. Wallace
Professor of Philosophy
Hofstra University
Hempstead, New York

F. Michael Walsh
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Philip Walsh
Assistant Professor of Sociology, Department of
Sociology/Anthropology
State University of New York at Cortland
Cortland, New York

Roger Ward
Associate Professor of Philosophy
Georgetown College
Georgetown, Kentucky

Anne Waters
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Earle Waugh
Professor Emeritus in Religious Studies and Director
of the Dimic Research Institute
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta

Jack Weller
Assistant Professor of Sociology, Department of
Sociology
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

Randy L. Wells
Sociology Graduate Student
New School of Social Research
New York City, New York

Kenneth R. Westphal
Professor of Philosophy, School of Economic and
Social Studies
University of East Anglia
Norwich, Norfolk, UK

Demian Wheeler
Iliff School of Theology
Denver, Colorado

Judy D. Whipps
Associate Professor of Philosophy, and Director,
Liberal Studies Program
Grand Valley State University
Allendale, Michigan

Peter J. Whitehouse
Director Integrative Studies, Department of
Neurology, and Professor, University Memory and
Aging Center
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio

Christopher Wilkes
Vice President of Academic Affairs
Pacific University
Forest Grove, Oregon

Lisa A. Wilkinson
Assistant Professor of Philosophy
Nebraska Wesleyan University
Lincoln, Nebraska

Catherine Wilson
Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

Daniel J. Wilson
Professor of History, Department of History
Muhlenberg College
Allentown, Pennsylvania

Robert Wilson-Black
Vice President
University of St Francis
Joliet, Illinois

Andrew S. Winston
Professor, Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
Guelph, Ontario, Canada

Martin Woessner
Doctoral Candidate in Modern Intellectual History,
Department of History
The Graduate School and University Center
New York City, New York

List of Contributors

Raymond Wolters
Thomas Muncy Keith Professor of History,
Department of History
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware

Richard Wood
Associate Professor, Department of Sociology
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

James A. Woodbridge
Visiting Assistant Professor, Department of
Philosophy
College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia

Mark P. Worrell, University of Kansas
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

Sarah Elizabeth Worth
Department of Philosophy
Furman University
Greenville, South Carolina

Robert H. Wozniak
Professor of Psychology, Department of Psychology
Bryn Mawr College
Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania

Cory Wright
Editorial Assistant, *Philosophical* Psychology,
Department of Philosophy
University of California
La Jolla, California

Keith E. Yandell
Julius R. Weinberg Professor of Philosophy,
Department of Philosophy
University of Wisconsin at Madison
Madison, Wisconsin

Jonathan Young
Director
Center for Story and Symbol
Santa Barbara, California

Charles Yrigoyen, Jr.
General Secretary, General Commission on Archives
and History
United Methodist Church
Madison, New Jersey

Fred G. Zaspel
Senior Pastor, Cornerstone Church of Skippack
Skippack, Pennsylvania

ABBREVIATIONS FOR ACADEMIC DEGREES

BA	Bachelor of Arts	DSc	Doctor of Science
BBA	Bachelor of Business Administration	EdD	Doctor of Education
BD	Bachelor of Divinity	JD	Doctor of Law
BFA	Bachelor of Fine Arts	LLD	Doctor of Laws
BLitt	Bachelor of Literature	LHD	Doctor of Humane Letters
BM	Bachelor of Music	MD	Doctor of Medicine
BS	Bachelor of Science	PhD	Doctor of Philosophy
BSS	Bachelor of Social Science	STD	Doctor of Sacred Theology
LLB	Bachelor of Laws	ThD	Doctor of Theology
PhB	Bachelor of Philosophy		
STB	Bachelor of Sacred Theology		
MA	Master of Arts		
MBA	Master of Business Administration		
MS	Master of Science		
MDiv	Master of Divinity		
STL	Licentiate in Sacred Theology		
DCL	Doctor of Classical Literature		
DD	Doctor of Divinity		
DLitt	Doctor of Literature		
DPhil	Doctor of Philosophy		

This page intentionally left blank

ABBREVIATIONS FOR
BIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCE WORKS

Amer Nat Bio *American National Biography*, ed. John A. Garraty and Mark C. Carnes (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), plus ANB website supplements.

Amer Phils Before 1950 *American Philosophers Before 1950*, *Dictionary of Literary Biography* vol. 270, ed. Philip Dematteis and Leemon McHenry (Detroit: Thomson Gale, 2003).

Amer Phils 1950-2000 *American Philosophers, 1950–2000*, *Dictionary of Literary Biography* vol. 279, ed. Philip Dematteis and Leemon McHenry (Detroit: Thomson Gale, 2003).

Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio *Appleton's Cyclopedia of American Biography* and *Supplements*, 13 vols, ed. James Grant, John Fiske, and James Dearborn (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1888, 1901, 1918).

Bio Dict Psych *Biographical Dictionary of Psychology*, ed. Noel Sheehy, Antony Chapman, and Wendy Conroy (London: Routledge, 1997).

Bio Dict Psych by Zusne *Biographical Dictionary of Psychology*, by Leonard Zusne (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1984).

Bio 20thC Phils *Biographical Dictionary of Twentieth-Century Philosophers*, ed. Stuart Brown, Diané Collinson, and Robert Wilkinson (London and New York: Routledge, 1996).

Blackwell Analytic Phil *Blackwell Companion to Analytic Philosophy*, ed. A. P. Martinich and David Sosa (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2001).

Blackwell Comp Prag *Blackwell Companion to Pragmatism*, ed. John Shook and Joseph Margolis (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2005).

Blackwell Comp Phils *Blackwell Companion to the Philosophers*, ed. Robert Arrington (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 1999).

Blackwell Amer Phil *Blackwell Guide to American Philosophy*, ed. Armen Marsoobian and John Ryder (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2003).

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio *Cambridge Dictionary of American Biography*, ed. John S. Bowman (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Canad Encyc *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, ed. James H. Marsh (Toronto, Ontario: McClelland & Stewart, 2000).

Comp Amer Thought *A Companion to American Thought*, ed. Richard J. Fox and James T. Kloppenberg (Oxford, UK, and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1995).

Dict Amer Bio *Dictionary of American Biography* and *Supplements*, 30 vols

(New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928–95).

Dict Amer Religious Bio *Dictionary of American Religious Biography*, 2nd edn, by Henry Warner Bowden (Westport, Conn., Greenwood Press, 1993).

Dict Canad Bio *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, 14 vols, ed. Francess G. Halpenny et al. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966–98).

Dict Economics *A Dictionary of Economics*, 4 vols, ed. John Eatwell, Murray Milgate, and Peter Newman (London and New York: Macmillan, 1987).

Encyc Amer Bio *Encyclopedia of American Biography*, 2nd edn, ed. John A. Garraty and Jerome L. Sternstein (New York: HarperCollins, 1996).

Encyc Cog Sci *Encyclopedia of Cognitive Science*, 4 vols, ed. Lynn Nadel (London and New York: Nature Publishing Group, 2003).

Encyc Ethics *Encyclopedia of Ethics*, 3 vols, 2nd edn, ed. Lawrence C. Becker and Charlotte B. Becker (New York: Routledge, 2001).

Encyc Psych *Encyclopedia of Psychology*, 8 vols, ed. Alan E. Kazdin (Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Encyc Relig *Encyclopedia of Religion*, 16 vols, ed. Mircea Eliade (New York: Macmillan, 1987).

Encyc Social Behav Sci *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 26 vols, ed. Neil Smerlser and Paul Baltes (Amsterdam and New York: Elsevier, 2001).

Proc of APA in Phil Rev Memorial Minutes in the *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Association* published in *Philosophical Review*, vols 21–58

(1902–49).

Proc of APA Memorial Minutes in the *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Association*, vols 23– (1949–).

Nat Cycl Amer Bio *The National Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, 63 vols (New York: James T. White & Co., 1891–1984).

Oxford Comp Phil *Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, ed. Ted Honderich (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).

Pres Addr of APA *Presidential Addresses of the American Philosophical Association*, vols. 1–10, ed. Richard T. Hull (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1999–2001; Amherst, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 2004–).

Routledge Encycl Phil *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 10 vols, ed. Edward Craig (London and New York: Routledge, 1999), and *Encyclopedia* website supplements.

Who Was Who in Amer *Who Was Who in America*, 14 vols (Chicago and New Providence, N.J.: Marquis Who's Who, 1943–2002).

Who's Who in Phil *Who's Who in Philosophy*, ed. Dagobert D. Runes (New York: Philosophical Library, 1942).

Women Phils *Women Philosophers: A Bio-Critical Source Book*, ed. Ethel M. Kersey (New York: Greenwood, 1989).

A

ABBOT, Francis Ellingwood (1836–1903)

Francis Ellingwood Abbot was born in Boston, Massachusetts on 6 November 1836. Following Boston Latin School, Abbot joined the class of 1859 at Harvard College. He began his studies ranked number one in his class and graduated as a member of Phi Beta Kappa. Harvard provided the foundation for exploring philosophical ideas with associates. These discussions later led to Abbot's participation with Charles Sanders PEIRCE, William JAMES, and others in the Metaphysical Club. Abbot attended Harvard Divinity School and graduated from Meadeville Theological School in 1863.

It was at Meadville that Abbot began a critical examination of William Hamilton's philosophy, which led to the publication in 1864 in the *North American Review* of his "The Philosophy of Space and Time" and "The Conditioned and the Unconditioned." These two articles established Abbot's reputation as a significant American philosopher, with Darwin and Hamilton both responding to Abbot. It was also on the basis of these articles that the philosophy department at Harvard unanimously recommended Abbot for a faculty appointment. However, the administration at Harvard feared that Abbot's open support of evolution would harm fund-raising for the college. Therefore, Abbot was not appointed to the Harvard position and for similar reasons was never able to secure a permanent academic appointment.

With a wife and two sons to support, Abbot became minister at the Unitarian Society in Dover, New Hampshire, in 1864. The next year, the Unitarians held a conference to form a national association, which adopted in the preamble of the constitution the statement that Unitarians "are disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ." Abbot and others objected to this statement on the ground that it violated the Unitarian tradition of free inquiry. At the second conference, in 1866, Abbot led an unsuccessful attempt to remove what he considered a creedal statement in the preamble. Upon returning to Dover, Abbot resigned from the Unitarian ministry.

The retention of this commitment to Jesus in the preamble led many Unitarians, and other liberal religionists, to form the Free Religion Association (FRA) in 1867, with Abbot as a key figure in this movement. In 1869 Abbot became minister of the Unitarian Society of Toledo, Ohio, on the condition that the congregation withdraw from the National Unitarian Conference and abandon the name Unitarian. In 1870 Abbot became the founding editor of *The Index*, which was considered the unofficial publication of the FRA. Abbot published more than 800 articles in *The Index* and other journals.

In 1872 Abbot spoke against the proposals being considered at the first convention of the National Association to Secure the Religious Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. Abbot returned from this convention with a commitment to abolish the political power of American Christianity. In the next issue of *The Index* he called for the formation

of Liberal Leagues across America to fight the proposed religious amendment. By the time Abbot returned to Boston in 1873 there were nine local Liberal Leagues. In 1876 Abbot led a national congress of Liberal Leagues in Philadelphia. At their second congress in 1877 the Leagues nominated Robert INGERSOLL for President of the United States and Abbot for Vice President. Both declined the nomination.

By 1880 Abbot fought his last battles for free religion with *The Index,* turning over the editorial duties to his closest friend, William James POTTER. In the spring of 1880 Abbot enrolled in the doctoral program in philosophy at Harvard, and was awarded the PhD in 1881. However, his radical philosophical and religious views remained roadblocks to academic appointments. His dissertation led to the publication of *Scientific Theism* in 1885. William James was interested in this work and secured from Abbot "advance sheets" to share with his class. Peirce considered Abbot's book as doing honor to American thought and especially praised Abbot's introduction and his view of scientific realism. Peirce also praised Abbot's insights concerning "relations," predicting that these insights would excite fruitful discussion. *Scientific Theism* was translated into German, which served to increase Abbot's international reputation. In 1890 Abbot published *The Way Out of Agnosticism or The Philosophy of Free Religion,* a collection of his essays. The book was heavily criticized by Josiah ROYCE, setting off an ugly public controversy.

In 1893 Abbot's wife, Katharine Fearing Loring, and his best friend, William Potter, both died. The following year he went as a spectator to the National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches. At this gathering Abbot's previous objections to Unitarians being "disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ" were rescinded. Although the Unitarians had essentially accepted Abbot's "free religion" position, he was never able to resume his former fellowship within this religious community. In September 1903 Abbot finished his last work, *The Syllogistic Philosophy.* Less than a month later, on 23 October 1903, the tenth anniversary of his wife's death, Abbot committed suicide on her grave in Beverly, Massachusetts.

In 1864 Abbot published a defense of evolution that appeared in two installments in the *North American Review*. These writings, along with those of Chauncey WRIGHT around the same time, are the first published defenses of Darwinian evolution in America. In the first article, "The Philosophy of Space and Time," Abbot argued that the perceptions of objects as continuous in space and time emerge in the mind as necessary logical conditions of these sensuous perceptions. The mind encounters objects through sensuous perceptions and through its faculty known as sensuous imagination creates a mental representation of these objects and provides, via the "elaborative faculty," a new synthesis of these perceptions. The mind cannot form a conception of pure or empty space since the sensuous imagination can never transcend the data of sensuous perception. Abbot also deduced an important corollary that the sensuous imagination cannot mentally reproduce an object without at the same time reproducing the physical conditions of the perception of that object.

Abbot argued that all knowledge is relative. Consequently, he thought that it is impossible for the mind to create objects of its own cognition, for if that occurred the mind would display a spontaneous activity that would violate the law of the relativity of knowledge. The mind must have all objects presented to it. Therefore, all objects of knowledge are empirical. In developing this position, Abbot refuted en masse all ontological theories. In developing his argument, Abbot especially charged that Kant operated from the false premise that assumed the possibility of pure knowledge a priori. What Abbot championed as common sense was the foundation of all truth. His analysis provided the recognition by philosophy of the absolute and necessary correlation between a priori and a posteriori knowledge. This correlation is important in Abbot's view

because it bridges the chasm between the subjective and the objective. Through this bridging process, thought is brought face to face with existence, thereby throwing light on the fundamental problem of the validity of human knowledge.

In the second paper, "The Conditioned and the Unconditioned," Abbot established a pragmatic criterion for determining the value of intellectual contributions. He realized that the most noted statements of one stage in history had only transitional value for the next stage. The pragmatic test for evaluating intellectual contributions is whether they foster or fetter the free movement of thought. Abbot rejected all systems that hamper the mind with arbitrary restrictions, especially those which postulate a special faculty of faith.

In discussing Hamilton's view of the terms "absolute" and "infinite" Abbot indicated that to say God is infinite is an elliptical use of language. Adequate use of language would be to say that God is infinitely good or wise. What Abbot advances is that the idea of God emerges from the depths of humanity itself and not in the suggestions of outward nature. The only way we can infer God from nature is through our projecting God in nature. For Abbot, the primordial germ of the idea of God lies in the self's consciousness. Thus, human nature is the beginning point in the search for God.

In "Positivism in Theology" (1866, reprinted in 1996) Abbot presented an analysis of the positive method in relation to theology, using the contributions of Comte and Spencer as his points of reference. Although he viewed positivism as the great reform in the scientific method, Abbot realized that only material nature was being studied according to this approach, with human and theological studies yet to be adequately influenced by this approach. The problem with Comte's position is that he arbitrarily rejected the mental sciences and dismissed metaphysics with contempt. Abbot rejected this position on the premise that if one is going to engage in a truly scientific study of nature one may not arbitrarily restrict

the study. He further criticized Comte for failing to include all that is or can be presented to experience, whether internally or externally.

Although Abbot appreciated Herbert Spencer's noted effort to organize all human knowledge, he rejected his universal formula of the law of evolution on the contention that not all phenomena can be reduced to changes of position of atoms and masses. Abbot also argued that it is inadequate to view growth in spirit and character as merely a rearrangement of atoms. For Abbot, if positive science is to be thoroughly scientific, it must extend itself beyond purely physical phenomena and include also the purely spiritual phenomena of thought and feeling. Thus, for science to function properly, it must include all areas of human knowledge, including the religious. The same holds true for religion and theology. They too must employ the scientific method. Abbot postulated that religion and theology must adapt the scientific approach, relinquish the pretense of being "scriptural" or "evangelical," and commit themselves to a scientific systemization of theism as a theological science. This shift for theology and religion is possible if truth is viewed as harmonious and organic in all its ramifications.

Abbot and Spencer continued their discussion in articles and a pamphlet from 1868 through 1870. Abbot applauded Spencer's effort to base his philosophy on the organizing principle of universal evolution because it rests on the unity of the universe, the order of nature, and the absolute universality of law. However, Abbot contended that Spencer's cardinal demerits were his mechanical interpretation of the evolutionary process and his failure to follow boldly the idea of universal evolution to its logical consequences. As a more satisfactory approach to evolution, Abbot offered the vitalist theory, which views the natural evolution of life through the reciprocal play of external and internal forces whose manifestations cannot be classified together. Abbot understood the vitalist theory to be in harmony with the spirit of the development theory,

which necessitates the assumption of spontaneous generation in place of special creation. What Abbot proposed was the reverent study of the ways of nature, using the scientific method, without imposing on nature one's own ways.

In "Theism and Christianity" (1865, reprinted in 1996) Abbot added a new perspective to his developing rational philosophy of religion. He took as axiomatic that law and adaptation underlie all existence, supporting the one great rational postulate of the unity of the universe and the mutual harmony of all facts and truths. He also viewed the individual's nature as having a permanent and universal tendency to worship. From this postulate, he concluded that there must be an object which people are compelled to worship – a prophetic impulse guiding the center of all Being. In other words, if reason is possible, religion is rational. Abbot's position here comes close to Leibniz's principle of sufficient reason.

Based on his postulate of the unity of nature, all personal beings share a common essence or nature. God must also be a person. Certainly differences exist between the transcendent attributes of God and the finite limitations of humanity, but their natures are identical concerning goodness, justice, and love. Abbot thus postulated a Godhead that can be interpreted and apprehended from the perspective of an ideal humanness. Private experience and individual consciousness, coupled with insights of history and science, can serve as the foundation of a theology of worth and value. By taking this position, Abbot rejected individualism because it seeks the universal in the peculiar. To replace it, he postulated a theology that is grounded on the basis of universal human nature.

In summary of the foundation of his philosophy, Abbot presented a view of theism which understands that the ground and origin of all finite existence is One Infinite and Immanent Personality, that all spiritual beings are one in nature with the Infinite Personality, and that religion is the response of spiritual beings to the revelations of love from the Infinite Personality.

The position is theistic because it emphasizes the oneness of the human and the divine, and it is rationalistic because it argues from the human to the divine. Epistemology is essential to Abbot's philosophical views. He postulated that all knowledge is relative and that all objects of knowledge are empirical. This view is presented as a common-sense approach which lies at the bottom of all truth. It was important to Abbot that there is an absolute and necessary correlation between a priori and a posteriori knowledge because it bridges the chasm between subjective and objective knowledge.

During the years Abbot served as editor of *The Index,* his philosophy was focused on the support of Free Religion and against the political power of Christianity in America. Being committed to the scientific approach, he viewed religion as the natural obligation of right and truth without the faintest restrictions upon any human faculty other than this natural obligation. For Abbot, this view of religion fits within the free inquiry obligation of the scientific approach and does not limit religion to pre-scientific views of God or to traditions of supernatural revelation. The mind must be free to search for truth, which is the dictate of religion. However, being religious requires more than being devoted to truth. It requires that one act in harmony with one's highest convictions and noblest sentiments. This devotion to truth and moral action is religious, because it is based on an indestructible instinct, sentiment, or tendency that is common to universal human nature and that is inherent in all great religions. According to Abbot, nature provides the ideal of what one ought to be. Nature also provides the instinct, sentiment, and obligation which impel one to a higher stage of development. It is this pursuit of the moral ideal and the honest endeavor to realize it in character and life that constitute all religion. Thus, religion is the effort by humans to perfect themselves by fulfilling their ideals.

Abbot realized that people differ greatly in strength and clarity of their moral precepts. These differences can only be corrected by

mental enlightenment based on a more adequate understanding of the truth, which is only possible through an application of the scientific method. However, for such enlightenment to occur science must mature and include within its method the great subjective realities of our human conscience and come to understand that the truth of these great eternal verities lies at the core of universal nature. Through the application of the scientific method, education and culture will cleanse from religion the evils of superstition. Abbot asserted that if religion fails to make the necessary adjustment to the scientific method in the search for truth, religion will die and only survive as a part of history.

Abbot relies on the scientific method for the discovery of the facts of nature. These facts are an understanding of the relations of things in nature, which is a system of the universe itself. For Abbot, nature and God are the same. It is no longer necessary to seek God outside or above nature, for modern science has laid the foundation for a natural idea of God in the discovery of the principle of the simple unity of force throughout the universe. Abbot is not saying that this principle of unity constitutes the idea of God; rather, he postulates that the discovery of this unity provides a monotheism based exclusively on scientific grounds. Instead of studying scriptures of pre-scientific religions, one now studies nature for an understanding of God. The theory of evolution also provides an important insight that the history of the universe is a connected whole. However, Abbot rejected the notion that there is a divine center of intelligence in nature, contending that the intelligence of nature cannot be centralized or localized because it is boundless.

Christianity for Abbot is to be studied and evaluated like all other historical religions. All religions are concerned with common universal elements: purity, benevolence, mercy, forgiveness, humility, self-sacrifice, and love. Christianity is distinct from other religions in its claim that God conferred upon Jesus the particular supernatural office of being the Messiah.

Abbot rejected the notion of Jesus's divinity on the basis that there is nothing original in Jesus's conviction of a special divine mission.

Although Christianity and the other religions contributed to human development, Abbot rejected all forms of Christianity because it limits free inquiry and places its followers in mental and spiritual bondage. The net effect is that Christianity has separated religion from real life – dislocated the balance between the spiritual and the practical – by focusing on salvation to another world. The problem is that Christianity remains a system of thought and authority that does not correspond to our growing understanding of the nature of the universe and the whole of human life. Abbot contends that this problem can only be resolved by free inquiry seeking truth. However, for free inquiry to be the guiding principle, Christians must admit that their Confession is not true, Jesus was not the Messiah, and the Christ longed for has never come and never will come.

In place of authoritarian pre-scientific religions, Abbot proposed Free Religion based on free inquiry operating within the bounds of the scientific method. Free Religion is generally defined as the universal religious sentiment running through all special religions. Although each special religion demands obedience to a particular ideal, Free Religion requires obedience to one's own ideal in its natural and unperverted state. This central ideal is faith in humans as progressive beings. Nature has made a part of each person an impulse toward the Better. This impulse is the life of God in each individual. Special or artificial religion has turned humans from the instinctive love of the ideal to repulsive forms of the ideal.

Special religions claim to offer some type of salvation from the reality of this world, but Free Religion seeks the following of instinctive ideals which will move humans toward individual and social perfection. The aim of Free Religion is to develop in the individual character – character for its own sake emancipated from the hope of heaven and the fear of hell. The goal of character is thoroughly sec-

ularized. Abbot was arguing that the aims of the individual and society are really one and the same. Individual character can only be attained when one lives for universal ends – for justice, truth, freedom, progress, and love. In living for others one achieves the noblest character possible for oneself. However, society must function in a way that encourages and supports the development of the character of each individual. Such character development is impossible through special religions because these religions are based on exclusive claims of supremacy. Free Religion provides the foundation for character development because it is based on freedom of thought and expression within the context of the scientific method.

Abbot essentially rejects idealism, especially in the forms presented by Kant and Hegel. In its place, he postulates the position of realistic evolution as providing the concept of the immanent relational constitution of the universe to be viewed as an organism, which is infinitely intelligible and also infinitely intelligent. This relational constitution is immanent in the group as a group but not in the group as a strictly individual thing. Without this relational constitution there would be no system of nature, as Abbot conceived of these eternal relationships as being the self-evolution of nature. Abbot began from the foundation of human experience, employed the scientific method in the study of nature as an organism, and came to the conclusion that God is the All and that the All is God. In rejecting his position as a form of pantheism, Abbot contended that God, according to scientific theism, is both immanent and transcendent. God is immanent in the world of human experience, yet transcendent in the realm that lies beyond human experience. However, he is careful to indicate that God is in no sense transcendent of the infinite universe *per se*. For Abbot, the God of scientific theism satisfies the demands of human intellect and also the need of humans to worship.

As Peirce indicated, Abbot made a significant contribution toward an evolutionary philosophy established on the relational character of nature based on human experience tested by the scientific method. A brief review of Abbot's accomplishments clearly indicates the value of his diverse contributions: as one of the first philosophers publicly supporting the Darwinian revolution; a primary founder of the Free Religious Association; the founding editor of *The Index*; the founding President of the National Liberal League; a key participant in the development of American empirical philosophy; a social philosopher redirecting American ethical thought from individualism to universalism; a major spokesperson for Free Religion and its scientific orientation; and a continual supporter of *freethought* and the other human rights guaranteed in the Constitution of the United States.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Scientific Theism (Boston, 1885).
The Way Out of Agnosticism: Or The Philosophy of Free Religion (Boston, 1890).
The Syllogistic Philosophy: Or Prolegomena to Science, 2 vols (Boston, 1906).

Other Relevant Works
Abbot's papers are at Harvard University.
"The Philosophy of Space and Time," *North American Review* 99 (1864): 64–117.
"The Conditioned and the Unconditioned," *North American Review* 99 (1864): 402–49.
Professor Royce's Libel: A Public Appeal for Redress to the Corporation and Overseers of Harvard University (Boston, 1891).
Is not Harvard Responsible for the Conduct of Her Professors, As Well As of Her Students? A Public Remonstrance Addressed to the Board of Overseers of Harvard University (Boston, 1892).
The Collected Essays of Francis Ellingwood Abbot (1836–1903): American Philosopher and Free Religionist, 4 vols, ed. W. Creighton Peden and Everett J. Tarbox, Jr. (Lewiston, N.Y., 1996).

If Ever Two Were One: A Private Diary of Love Eternal, ed. Brian Sullivan (New York, 2004).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v24*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Ahlstrom, Sydney, and Robert B. Mullin. *The Scientific Theist* (Macon, Georgia, 1987).
Peden, W. Creighton. *The Philosopher of Free Religion: Francis Ellingwood Abbot, 1836–1903* (New York, 1992). Contains a bibliography of Abbot's writings.
Royce, Josiah. "Dr. Abbot's *Way Out of Agnosticism*" *International Journal of Ethics* 1 (1890): 98–113.

W. Creighton Peden

ABBOTT, Lyman (1835–1922)

Abbott Lyman was born on 18 December 1835 in Roxbury, Massachusetts. Lyman graduated from New York University with a BA in 1853. He joined his brother's law firm and passed the bar in 1856, the same year he married Abby Frances Hamlin. Influenced by the preaching of Henry Ward BEECHER, Abbott left the law to study theology in 1859 to prepare for the ministry. In 1860 he was called to pastor a Congregational church in Terre Haute, Indiana. Desiring to influence a stable postwar society, he returned to New York in 1865 to direct the American Freedman's Union Commission. He became disillusioned with the competition among aid societies, resigned his position in 1869, and moved his family of six children to Cornwall on Hudson in New York to become a full-time writer. In 1871 he became the editor of *Illustrated Christian Weekly*, but he chaffed under the denominational limits on editorial freedom.

In 1876 Henry Ward Beecher invited him to become associate editor of the *Christian Union*, in which Abbott's social commentary appeared under the title "Outlook." On Beecher's resignation in 1881, Abbott became full editor, changing the name of the magazine to *Outlook*. Under his editorship circulation grew to 100,000 readers. Abbott also succeeded Beecher as pastor of Plymouth Congregational Church in Brooklyn, where he served from 1888 to 1899.

In the years from 1890 to 1915 Abbott was a national figure speaking against American isolationism and advocating rights for Native Americans and workers. He was a friend of Theodore Roosevelt, who became associate editor of *Outlook* after his presidency. Abbott advocated progressive Protestantism, holding that all increases in knowledge advance the Kingdom of God. Abbott's Christian evolutionism argues that Christendom is the highest culture and that Christianity is the highest religion. *Outlook* became increasingly secular with the profound disillusionment following World War I. With the gradual demise of progressivism, Abbott's influence waned. Ernest Hamlin Abbott assumed editorship of *Outlook* after his father's death. Abbott died on 22 September 1922 in New York City.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Jesus of Nazareth: His Life and Teachings (New York, 1869).
Old Testament Shadows of New Testament Truths (New York, 1870).
A Dictionary of Religious Knowledge (New York, 1872).
Laicus; or, the Experiences of a Layman in a Country Parish (New York, 1872).
Illustrated Commentary on the New Testament in Four Volumes (New York, 1875).
For Family Worship (New York, 1883).
A Study in Human Nature (New York, 1884).

In Aid of Faith (New York, 1886).
Evolution of Christianity (Boston, 1892).
Plymouth Hymnal (New York, 1893).
The Life of Christ (Boston, 1894).
Christianity and Social Problems (Boston, 1896).
The Theology of an Evolutionist (Boston, 1897).
The Life and Letters of the Apostle Paul (Boston, 1898).
The Life and Literature of the Ancient Hebrews (Boston, 1901).
The Rights of Man (Boston, 1901).
The Life of Henry Ward Beecher (Boston, 1903).
The Other Room (New York, 1903).
The Great Companion (New York, 1904).
The Christian Ministry (Boston, 1905).
The Home Builder (Boston, 1908).
The Spirit of Democracy (Boston, 1910).
My Four Anchors: What We Know in the Realm of Religion (Boston, 1911).
America in the Making (New Haven, 1911).
Letters to Unknown Friends (New York, 1913).
The Last Days of Jesus Christ (New York, 1918).

Other Relevant Works
Reminiscences (Boston, 1915).
What Christianity Means to Me: A Spiritual Autobiography (New York, 1921).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v1*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Brown, Ira V. *Lyman Abbott: Christian Evolutionist* (Cambridge, 1953). Contains a bibliography of Abbott's writings.

Roger Ward

ABRAMS, Meyer Howard (1912–)

M. H. Abrams was born on 23 July 1912 in Long Branch, New Jersey. He received his BA degree from Harvard University in 1934. His senior thesis, *The Milk of Paradise*, was published the same year. After studying for a year at the University of Cambridge he returned to Harvard, where he received his MA in 1937 and PhD in 1940. Abrams began a distinguished career at Cornell University's English department in 1945 as assistant professor, rising through the academic ranks to full professor in 1953 and Class of 1916 Professor of English in 1973. He has been emeritus professor since 1983.

Abrams is known for his erudition and for the depth and breadth of his scholarship in Romantic literature, aesthetic theory and criticism, and the history of ideas and cultures. These qualities are all on display in his two best-known works, *The Mirror and the Lamp* (1953) and *Natural Supernaturalism* (1971). Central to both books is his conviction that "Romantic thought and literature represented a decisive turn in Western culture" (1971, p. 14). Abrams depicts this decisive turn in *The Mirror and the Lamp* through the two contrasting metaphors of the book's title. He shows that the image of the mind as a mirror, reflecting an outer world of objects, predominated in both poetry and philosophy from Plato through the eighteenth century. Romantic thought then reconceived the poet's mind and the artist's vocation through the metaphor of the lamp, a "radiant projector which makes a contribution to the objects it perceives" (1953, p. viii).

The Mirror and the Lamp also introduces a well-known and influential conceptual framework for classifying aesthetic theories. Abrams identifies mimetic, pragmatic, expressive, and objective theories of art as respectively highlighting one element – universe, audience, artist, or work – of the art work's total situation. He affirms the importance of theory by pointing out the practical interdependence of the activities of theorizing, criticism, and the production of particular art works. In *Natural Supernaturalism,*

Abrams continues his discussion of English and German Romanticism, showing how Romantic poets and philosophers effectively secularized inherited theological doctrines.

Abrams's writings on contemporary critical theory are collected in *Doing Things with Texts* (1989). A self-described traditionalist, he believes that literature conveys determinable meanings and that we can understand, through shared linguistic and social conventions, what an author intended to communicate. Such understanding is, however, approximate and corrigible; and Abrams allows for the possibility, even inevitability, of multiple valid critical interpretations and literary theories. A theory is valid if it is useful in providing pertinent insights into literary works from its particular vantage point. The innumerable interests, perspectives, and purposes served by theories make hopes for a single, grand theory misplaced.

Abrams's pragmatic pluralism is consonant with Ludwig Wittgenstein's later anti-essentialist philosophy, which holds that linguistic meanings are to an extent fluid and cannot be fixed in isolation from their situation in ever-widening eddies of deeply valuable cultural practices. Looking to the actual practice of theorizing about art, Abrams finds that it is "not a science like physics but an enterprise of discovery" (1989, p. 29). The enterprise of aesthetic theory is in this respect paradigmatic of humanistic discourse, which at its best resembles an ongoing dialogue of mutual discovery and clarification; accordingly, "the search for humanistic truth has no ending" (1989, p. 87).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Milk of Paradise: The Effects of Opium Visions on the Works of De Quincey, Crabbe, Francis Thompson, and Coleridge (Cambridge, Mass., 1934; New York, 1971).

The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition (New York, 1953; 1960; 1971).

Natural Supernaturalism: Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature (New York, 1971).

The Correspondent Breeze: Essays in English Romanticism (New York, 1984).

Doing Things with Texts: Essays in Criticism and Critical Theory (New York, 1989).

Further Reading
Cambridge Dict Amer Bio

Hartman, Geoffrey, et al., *High Romantic Argument: Essays for M.H. Abrams* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1981).

Dean Graham

ADAMS, Elie Maynard (1919–2003)

E. Maynard Adams was born on 29 December 1919 in Clarkton, Virginia. He attended the University of Richmond (BA 1941 and MA 1944, both in philosophy); Colgate-Rochester Divinity School (BD 1944); and Harvard University (MA 1947 and PhD 1948, both in philosophy), where he studied with C. I. Lewis and Ralph Barton Perry. He taught for one year (1947–8) at Ohio University before moving to the University of North Carolina in 1948, where he spent the rest of his career. He served as chair of the philosophy department from 1960 to 1965, and chair of the university faculty from 1976 to 1979. In 1971 he was named Kenan Professor of Philosophy, and held that position until retiring in 1990. Adams was actively engaged in a variety of good causes in civil rights, poverty, peace, and education. He was a highly respected and much-loved member of both the faculty and the community. Adams continued to write until several months before his death on 17 November 2003 in Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Adams's work ranged across the major sub-fields of philosophy. In all, he wrote more than one hundred scholarly articles and he wrote or edited twelve books. His most important book,

The Metaphysics of Self and World (1991), provides a comprehensive account of his philosophy. For Adams, the goal of philosophy is to develop a full and integrated understanding of persons, culture, and the world. His negative agenda was to undermine the *one-dimensional*, purely factual, world of scientific and philosophical naturalism – which he believed to be both incoherent and culturally destructive (because it undercuts the sources of value and meaning in our lives). His positive agenda was to work out the philosophical foundations of a *three-dimensional humanistic* world of factuality, meaning, and value that would intellectually support the human enterprise and nurture the human spirit.

Much of his work in epistemology was directed toward showing that persons cannot be understood in the categories of modern science. Persons are not simply factually constituted, but have an irreducible semantic dimension (which allows them to know their environment) and a normative structure in which reasons, through their semantic presence, are causes; mental causality is normative.

Adams's most striking contribution to philosophy was his claim that emotive experiences are *perceptions* of the normative state of reality. For example, a pain is a perception that some part of our body is not as it ought to be; a desire is the perception that something is normatively required. Of course, our emotive perceptions may be mistaken (just as our sensory perceptions may be). Morality is the reasoned assessment of our often conflicting, sometimes mistaken experiences of normative requiredness in reality.

On a naturalistic view of the world, there is no way to explain how meaning and value come into existence. Adams argued that they must be eternal properties of reality. To say that God exists is to say that reality has a normative structure, that there is purpose built into the universe. This is not an empirical claim, but a presupposition of the fact that we must make sense of the world in terms of meaning and value. Adams's philosophical commitment to the categories of meaning and value led him to be a staunch supporter of the *humanities* as providing our most complete understanding of reality.

Adams was too much out of step with the temper of the times to be influential. He belonged to no school of philosophical thought. Though it is too soon to say, his originality, the sweep of his philosophical work, and the depth of his critique of modern civilization suggest that he will some day be viewed as a prophetic thinker.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Ethical Naturalism and the Modern World-View (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1960).
Philosophy and the Modern Mind (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1975).
The Metaphysics of Self and World (Philadelphia, 1991).
Religion and Cultural Freedom (Philadelphia, 1993).
A Society Fit for Human Beings (Albany, N.Y., 1997).

Other Relevant Works
Adams's papers are at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v77
Weissbord, David, ed. *Mind, Value, and Culture: Essays in Honor of E. M. Adams* (Atascadero, Cal., 1989).

Warren A. Nord

ADAMS, George Plimpton (1882–1961)

George Adams was born on 7 October 1882 in Northboro, Massachusetts, to Edwin A. Adams, a New England minister, and Caroline A. Plimpton Adams. Adams later placed his mother's maiden name as his own middle name. He attended prep school at the prestigious Lewis

Institute in Chicago. He then studied philosophy at Harvard University under William JAMES, Josiah ROYCE, Hugo MÜNSTERBERG, and George SANTAYANA. He received the BA in 1904, followed by the PhD in 1911. His dissertation was titled "An Interpretation and Defense of the Principle of Idealism in Metaphysics." Adams taught psychology and biology at the Lewis Institute from 1906 to 1908.

Adams began teaching philosophy in 1908 at the University of California at Berkeley as an instructor of philosophy, and he was promoted to full professor in 1918. He was Dean of the College of Letters and Science in 1917–18 and again from 1943 to 1947. At Berkeley, Adams furthered faculty participation in academic administration. He also helped organize the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Organization in 1924 and served as President in 1927–8. In 1932 Adams was appointed Mills Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy and Civil Policy. Before accepting emeritus status at Berkeley in 1954, Adams delivered the Faculty Research Lectures at Berkeley in 1932, the Messenger Lectures at Cornell in 1939, and the Woodbridge Lectures at Columbia in 1946. He married Mary Knowles Woodle in 1908, and their son, George Plimpton Adams, Jr., received his PhD in economics from Berkeley and had a prominent career as an economist.

Adams's early publications established him as a respected scholar of Hegel and idealism more generally. He was particularly concerned with the relation of Hegel's idealism to the perennial problems of religion and theology. His later writings focused on the social context of ethics as well as economic and political theory and practice. His philosophical reflections emphasized the broad social context of human experience, the great intellectual traditions of the past, and the trajectory of contemporary metaphysics and epistemology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Mystical Element in Hegel's Early Theological Writings (Berkeley, Cal., 1910).

Idealism and the Modern Age (New Haven, Conn., 1919).

Man and Metaphysics (New York, 1948).

Other Relevant Works

"'Everybody's World' and the Will to Believe," *Journal of Philosophy* 10 (1913): 186–8.

"Mind as Form and as Activity," *Philosophical Review* 22 (1913): 265–83.

"The Mind's Knowledge of Reality," *Journal of Philosophy* 12 (1915): 57–66.

"The Interpretation of Religion in Royce and Durkheim," *Philosophical Review* 25 (1916): 297–304.

"Activity and Objects in Dewey's *Human Nature and Conduct*," *Journal of Philosophy* 20 (1923): 596–603.

"The Basis of Objective Judgments in Ethics," *International Journal of Ethics* 37 (1927): 128–37.

"Immediacy and Meaning," *Philosophical Review* 37 (1928): 109–32.

"Truth, Discourse, and Reality," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 10 (1928): 175–205.

"Naturalism or Idealism," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 1, pp. 65–86.

"Truths of Existence and of Meaning," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 11 (1929): 33–61.

"The Relation between Form and Process," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 13 (1930): 189–217.

"The Range of Mind," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 19 (1936): 143–67.

Knowledge and Society: A Philosophical Approach to Modern Civilization, with W. R. Dennes et al. (New York, 1938).

Ed. with W. R. Dennes et al., *Selected Writings in Philosophy, a Companion Volume to Knowledge and Society* (New York, 1939).

"The Idea of Civilization," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 23 (1942): 49–73.

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, *Pres Addr of APA v3*, *Proc of APA v35*, *Who Was Who in Amer v9*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Cox, George C. "Professor Adams and the Knot of Knowledge," *Journal of Philosophy* 12 (1915): 269–72.
Schneider, Herbert W. "George Adams's *Man and Metaphysics*," *Journal of Philosophy* 45 (1948): 624–8.

David L. Davis

ADAMS, Henry Brooks (1838–1918)

Henry Adams was born on 16 February 1838 in Boston, Massachusetts, and died on 27 March 1918 in Washington, D.C. He was born into the first American political dynasty; the grandson of US President John Quincy Adams, Adams grew up convinced that he would one day serve in a position of influence, but he eventually resigned himself to be a companion to statesmen. He attempted, through a variety of means, to exert influence over the American political landscape, but he is remembered not for those efforts but for his historical writings and his more intimate books, *Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres* (1913) and *The Education of Henry Adams* (1918). The former treated the evolution of medieval French culture seen through the eyes of a student of the arts, while the latter related his sense of loss over the diminished role his family and their class played in American politics and the way that his Enlightenment education ill-suited him for life in the twentieth century. While not a trained philosopher in the sense of disciplinary specialization, Adams possessed one of the last great minds that moved easily among any number of fields, including history, architecture, science, and philosophy. His works and voluminous letters are punctuated by musings on many of the major philosophical issues of his day.

Adams was educated at Harvard, and after graduating with a BA in 1858, he focused his ambition on political journalism, since his familial insider status offered him broad access to American political debates of the 1860s. While serving as the private secretary for his father, Charles Francis Adams, ambassador to England during the American Civil War, Henry privately wrote articles about the British court for the *New York Times*, but the revelation of his identity required that he abandon the project.

While in England, Adams met John Stuart Mill, a man whose works had already highly influenced his thinking. He shared with Mill a belief in the value of universal education, and he readily adopted Mill's precept that the best government is one where the best and brightest govern. Adams believed that his family's removal from positions of power was detrimental to the trajectory of American social and political history. Along with Mill, Alexis de Tocqueville provided the young Adams with a means for understanding the upheavals in American culture that he was witnessing. From de Tocqueville he also received validation for the importance of the New England character, since de Tocqueville argued that American democracy depended on the dominance of that type. Even though Adams lived most of his adult life outside of New England and often railed against his inherited mindset, his works often dealt with the theme of competing types, whether regional or mental, as a means of explaining social transformation.

Returning to the United States following the war, Adams became intent upon exposing the financial scandals surrounding the Grant presidency, and he published several investigative articles revealing official malfeasance. Although the failure of his articles to elicit

reform discouraged him, he continued to distinguish between the personally disinterested and republican motivations of his ancestors and the economic excesses of finance capitalism which were accompanied by politicians enacting policy based on selfish motivations rather than a sense of the public good.

Like many from old fortunes, Adams maintained throughout his life a healthy dislike of modern capitalism and the titanic fortunes it spawned. In his class oration delivered in 1858, he urged his classmates to resist the lure of easy financial gain at the cost of rejecting higher ideals. Likewise, as an older man, he became increasingly concerned with modern finances in the 1890s, partially due to the Panic of 1893 but also because of his increased affiliation with his brother Brooks. Brooks's book, *The Law of Civilization and Decay* (1896), deeply influenced the older brother's thinking, offering him a seemingly scientific explanation for the degeneration of modern society, in part the work of financiers or "gold bugs." Unfortunately, the 1890s also witnessed a virulent anti-Semitism in Adams's private writing, because he associated finance capitalism with Jews.

The second phase of his career began in 1871, when he accepted a position at Harvard to teach medieval history as well as serve as the editor for *The North American Review*. During his short tenure at Harvard from 1871 to 1877, he was instrumental in bringing the Germanic seminar structure to American universities, and he also encouraged his graduate students to publish their research in an era when scholarly publications were not the norm. At the same time, his position as editor of the influential journal gave him a stage for the dissemination of his reformist agenda. The year 1872 also saw him marry Marian Hooper, who like Henry was the descendant of several powerful Boston families.

At this point in his historical research, Adams was a disciple of the Teutonic theory of history, the concept that modern forms of representative democracy derived from the governmental structures of Anglo-Saxon culture. With students from his seminar in medieval institutions, he published a scholarly collection entitled *Essays in Anglo-Saxon Law* in 1876 that explored aspects of the legal rights established by early Anglo-Saxon tribes and their influence on modern democracy. Adams's desire to justify his familial heritage found a ready asset in the Teutonic theory that provided the American system of separation of powers with an ancient ancestry.

Adams's thinking at this time was also highly influenced by Lewis Henry Morgan's *Ancient Society*. Of particular interest was the status of women in early cultures, a theme Adams turned to in his essay "The Primitive Rights of Women," delivered as a Lowell Institute lecture in 1876. His interest in women's issues continued throughout his life. His two novels, *Democracy* (1880), a *roman à clef* on political corruption in American government, and *Esther* (1884), an underrated meditation on religious faith, centered on female protagonists who were intent upon understanding and gently challenging their role in society. Moreover, the culture surrounding medieval reverence for the Virgin Mary that informed *Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres* was a lifelong fascination. Perhaps the hand of Mill was again apparent in Adams's interest in the status of women, though Adams never valued the independent woman of the late nineteenth century; his opinions on women were thoroughly Victorian. The Pre-Raphaelite veneration of women is also apparent in his thinking, since, like them, his female figures of power were idealized possessors of traditional feminine strength. That idealization led him to proclaim, in countless places, the superiority of women over men.

Adams's career as an independent historian and author began after he resigned his position at Harvard to edit the papers and write a biography of Albert Gallatin, Secretary of State under Thomas Jefferson. Leaving Harvard also allowed him to move from Boston to Washington, D.C., where he resided for the

remainder of his life, when not on one of his frequent travels. During the early years in Washington, the Adamses hosted a very fashionable and politically intriguing salon where reform politics were discussed and promoted.

The close proximity to national political debates allowed Adams to function as a confidant and advisor for several politicians. The most significant among these was John Hay, whose friendship with Adams was evident when they built adjoining houses across Lafayette Square from the White House in 1885. Hay's tenure as Secretary of State to Presidents William McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt was a particularly important time in this relationship, since Adams tended to temper the more imperialistic advice that Hay was hearing from other parties, including Henry Cabot Lodge, a former student of Adams. While Adams was excited by the emergence of the United States as a world power following the Spanish-American War of 1898, he was troubled by the imperial direction that American foreign policy was taking. His extended sojourn in the South Seas in 1890 and 1891 had confronted him with the consequences of European colonialism, and while not wholly able to transcend his Euro-centric perspective when confronted with native cultures, he was keenly aware of the destructive powers of colonialism on subaltern peoples.

Residing in Washington also meant easy access to government archives. As a mature historian, Adams was a bridge figure between traditional methodologies that related the story of a people's transformation – a sort of group psychology – to a more modern historical approach built on archival research and focused on powerful individuals as agents of change. Unlike later social historians, though, he was never particularly interested in the lives of commoners. Diplomatic history and behind-the-scenes details of policy-making were his forte. He routinely sought to establish a base-line of concrete data from which to determine the extent of historical progression.

The masterwork of this phase of his life was his multi-volume *History of the United States During the Administrations of Jefferson and Madison*, completed in 1891. Beginning with a base-line for the year 1800, consisting of physical conditions, characteristics of the people, and intellectual issues that he used to calculate the energy of the age, Adams traced the material and political transformation of the early republic at a time of dramatic change, complete with passages from official documents gleaned from his archival research. His predilection for character types recurred here as he distinguished among the intellectual mindsets of New England, the middle states, and the South. As well, he was already seeking a means of translating human mental and physical activity into units of energy or force to be calculated and graphed, a quest he pursued for years to come.

This method of establishing a set of material and intellectual conditions served Adams well in many of his books, since they often related a culture's growth and evolution. However, as an older man, devolution better suited his cosmic dyspepsia, and, like Oswald Spengler, his narratives became more focused on decline rather than progress. Unlike Michel Foucault's attempts almost a century later to unearth an archeology or genealogy of historical movements, Adams's approach, as was true of most nineteenth-century thinkers, was to search for a totalizing theory that would encompass the entirety of historical development, one that could, ideally, anticipate future developments. To the very end of his life, this search for a universal key to history intrigued him, and he repeatedly turned to science as the source for such a master narrative.

The completion of the *History* was little occasion for joy because the work failed to garner significant approbation, thereby deflating Adams's fantasies of being heralded the American Gibbon. But this disappointment paled beside the despair he had been struggling with since the 1885 suicide of his wife, who had suffered for years from depression.

He routinely referred to the years following her death as his "posthumous life." Once the *History* was in print, he abandoned traditional history and focused his energies on travel and the composition of his late works that defy ready categorization.

The first of these was *Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres*, which originated from Adams's yearly retreats to France to escape the summer heat in Washington, D.C. but was not published until 1913. He rediscovered the majesty of Gothic cathedrals in the late 1890s and delighted in taking friends and family members on tours of them. That avuncular approach (his traveling companions were often his nieces) translated into the book as the narrator guided the reader through the history of medieval French culture by reading the iconography of cathedrals and relating them to literature produced during the same era. Early on he reminded his reader that his approach to history was not conventional. To understand the cultural transformation represented by Mont-Saint-Michel and the cathedral at Chartres, we need "not technical knowledge; not accurate information; not correct views either on history, art, or religion; not anything that can possibly be useful or instructive; but only a sense of what those centuries had to say, and a sympathy with their ways of saying it" (1913, p. 66). Facts gave way to sensitivities.

Starting with the dominance of "the church militant," symbolized by the fortress-like Mont-Saint-Michel, Adams traced how a patriarchal hierarchy was overcome by a matriarchal one, identified with the power of the Virgin as a religious force. Her power was evident in the numerous cathedrals dedicated to Our Lady, and the Transition Gothic architecture of Chartres best emblematized her reign. Adams also argued that this historical moment indicated that the masculine Trinity was in some ways supplanted by the feminine mother figure. In the process of relating this transformation from masculine to feminine culture, Adams valorized stereotypical attributes ascribed to women: intuition, irrational-

ity, a forgiving nature, capricious thought process. From this feminine culture arose the great cathedrals, demonstrations of a creative power that is affiliated with women's fecundity and that can occur only in a feminized culture. The Virgin, as idealized by Adams, had little to do with systematic or scientific thinking, nor had she any place for gold bugs.

But the Virgin's moment was short-lived. The moneyed powers that she disdained united to overthrow her, and they were aided by the philosophical program of Thomas Aquinas who effectively demoted the Virgin to a lesser position in the Christian pantheon all the while systematizing theology. The domineering power of masculinity reasserted itself over her loving reign of irrationality, and the High Gothic architecture of the cathedrals at Amiens and Beauvais symbolized that retrenching of power.

Aside from the Church Architectural, Adams constructed his version of the Church Intellectual, particularly as it related to the debate between universalism and nominalism. For each group, Adams assigned a primary figure: William of Champeaux for realism; Abélard for nominalism; Aquinas for moderate realism. In an imaginative connection between the two realms of the book, Adams declared that "Realism was the Roman arch – the only possible foundation for any Church; because it assumed unity, and any other scheme was compelled to prove it, for a starting point" (1913, p. 335). Likewise, conceptualism "was a device, like the false wooden roof, to cover and conceal an inherent weakness of construction" (p. 337).

But the scholastics failed to reason their way to God, opening up the opportunity for another avenue explored by the mystics. Continuing his metaphorical connection between architecture and theology, Adams noted that the "Transition is the equilibrium between the love of God – which is faith – and the logic of god – which is reason; between the round arch and the pointed." (p. 356) The mystical approach of St. Francis of Assisi was

connected to the irrational love of the Virgin, and both stood counter to the reason of the scholastics. It should not be surprising that the intellectual rigor and near empiricism of Aquinas led, in Adams's perspective, to the downfall of the Virgin and the mystics associated with her. Nothing intervened between God and the individual in Aquinas's world, thus fusing the universal with the particular, but also placing the Virgin in an ornamental position. Adams concluded his comparison between architecture and theology with the comment that "the 'Summa Theologiae' and Beauvais Cathedral were excessively modern, scientific, and technical, marking the extreme points reached by Europe on the lines of scholastic science" (p. 419). A part of Adams's research for the book involved reading Spinoza and Pascal, and though the latter offered him a means to unite skepticism with mysticism, he could not solve for the agnostic American thinker the problem of subject/object duality.

The terms most often associated with the mature Adams – unity and multiplicity – resonate throughout both of his late masterpieces, for each relates the story of a once stable and unified culture's descent into instability and multiplicity. But for Adams in the early twentieth century, the split between unity and multiplicity, while always a philosophical problem, had lost the theological dimension only to have it replaced by science, since it too struggled with questions of order or chaos.

The two terms referred, as he suggested in *The Education of Henry Adams*, to a changing world order which his training poorly prepared him to understand. However, the dialectics of unity and multiplicity operated not simply on an historical continuum but also on a synchronic axis for Adams. The crisis represented by the two terms resonated in Adams's thought, as it did for virtually all the great nineteenth-century thinkers, as the dilemma of the subject/object split endemic to Western philosophy, not simply the transmogrification of a culture from one state to its opposite. In *Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres*, Adams iden-

tified that the "attempt to bridge the chasm between multiplicity and unity is the oldest problem of philosophy, religion, and science" (p. 337). Multiplicity represented a state of separation between subject and object. But Adams lacked Hegel's ability to synthesize the two; he could not negotiate a position outside of the subject/object split, despite his desire to do so.

That desire largely accounted for Adams's motivation in valorizing what he conceived of as female consciousness. Unlike most of his contemporaries, Adams found in the epistemic distinction between masculine rationality and feminine irrationality something of a utopian possibility. "The charm of women," he once remarked, "is the Hegelian charm of the identity of opposites. You can assume nothing regarding them, without assuming the contrary to be equally true." (*The Letters of Henry Adams*, vol. 3, p. 231) Even if not finally capable of bridging the split in consciousness engendered by Western rationality, women offered what appeared to be a more unified alternative to it as a consequence of their lack of rationality and their position as object for male subjectivity. Like the Transition arch that united opposites, women offered Adams hope for a unity of thought. For this reason, he deplored the New Woman, for in trying to survive in the arid world of masculine reason, she forfeited her natural female powers and thus her ability to bridge oppositions.

Adams anticipated the direction of *The Education of Henry Adams* when he turned in *Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres* to the image of the modern dynamo as a force of energy for the modern world comparable to the force of the Virgin in her own. In doing so, he connected the lack of human free will underlying Aquinas's theology with the agentless and passionless power of the dynamo, which apparently functioned outside of the pale of human control but was itself a product of masculine reason. This move identified Adams with the naturalistic thinking of his time, a philosophical position he returned to most pointedly in

The Education when he defined man as "the sum of the forces that attract him" (1918, p. 474).

The Education of Henry Adams was not released publicly until after Adams's death in 1918, though he had written the book more than ten years earlier. In the first pages, Adams acknowledged that two of his models in writing the book were St. Augustine and Rousseau. Critics have also noted similarities to Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus*. However, Adams identified his figure to be explored as a manikin upon which different clothing was draped. Far from the transcendent individual of the Romantics, Adams's subject – ostensibly himself – seemed little more than a cipher. Little wonder, then, that he chose to write the book in third-person narrative.

In *The Education of Henry Adams*, Adams recounted the various educational experiences that impacted his development, noting that traditional forms of education were by and large useless. That was particularly the case since his formal education fitted him to live in the eighteenth century, though the world of the late nineteenth and early twentieth had little to do with the Age of Reason. His *History* concluded with questions regarding whether the moral development of the United States would match its economic development; *The Education of Henry Adams* provided a resoundingly negative answer as it traced a movement from American unity of purpose to self-serving multiplicity. Accompanying this transformation was a revolution in science and technology that left Adams puzzling over its meaning.

More instructive than formal education were modern politics, Worlds Fairs, and science. From the one he learned that the New England type had been supplanted by other regional types who were less constrained by eighteenth-century ideals. At the Fairs he came face to face with developments in technology, symbolized most famously in the dynamo. From the last he sought a key to explain the development of human society, to counter "the law of progress" (1918, p. 493) most often promoted by historians.

As he did with his late essay, "A Letter to American Teachers of History" (1910), Adams indicated in several places that his intention in writing what many took to be his autobiography was to reform modern education, a vital necessity since he believed that historians' narratives of progress did not square with the evidence before them. Such a claim is easy to dismiss, though the book did point out how the mental paradigms one inherited lagged behind technological and scientific developments, a theme Lewis MUMFORD returned to decades later. His parallel pursuit was to find a means of charting human capacity for thought in terms of energy, thus drawing on modern physical sciences to interpret human actions. Likewise, as he mentioned in *The Education of Henry Adams*, "Any law of movement must include … some mechanical formula of acceleration." (1918, p. 488) Like a comet flying by the sun, society was accelerating towards its demise.

Like all thinkers in the latter decades of the nineteenth century, Adams was intent upon understanding the ramifications of Darwinian biology. References to Darwin's theory or Spencer's concept of the survival of the fittest appear throughout his work and his private correspondence, and the desire of conservative thinkers to use Darwin as a justification for opposing cultural reforms provided Adams with a methodology for his eventual attempt to derive theories of human history from the physical sciences. He never doubted that science could aid in developing theories in the humanities; it was more a matter of what plots different sciences allowed. A former student of Louis AGASSIZ at Harvard, the pessimistic Adams held his own doubts about the melioristic histories that disciples of Darwin routinely produced. Rather than hope for human progress due to evolution, he found entropy to be a more vital explanation for the devolution of humanity. By the end of *The Education*, Adams hinted at a worldwide breakdown,

based on the same types of data that had served him so well throughout his historical career. Likewise, in "The Rule of Phase Applied to History" (1909), published posthumously by his brother along with "A Letter to American Teachers of History" under the title *The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma*, he furthered his proposition that human history was accelerating in its downward spiral.

Adams served an important function for the Lost Generation writers, since *The Education of Henry Adams* predicted a world torn apart, grinding down to entropic inertia. For those young people whose world was rendered a wasteland in the trenches of World War I, he provided an interpretive framework to understand what they had experienced. *The Education of Henry Adams* continues to be considered among the most important books written by an American.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Democracy: An American Novel (New York, 1880).

Esther: A Novel (under his pseudonym, Frances Snow Compton) (New York, 1884).

History of the United States During the Administrations of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, 9 vols (New York, 1889–91).

Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres (Boston, 1913).

The Education of Henry Adams (Boston, 1918).

Other Relevant Works

Most of Adams's papers are in the Massachusetts Historical Society in Boston.

Ed., *The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma* (New York, 1919).

"The Great Secession Winter of 1860-61" and Other Essays, ed. George Hochfield (New York, 1958).

The Letters of Henry Adams, 6 vols, ed. J. C. Levenson et al. (Cambridge, Mass., 1982–8).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Encyc Amer Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v11, Who Was Who in Amer v1

Chalfant, Edward. *Both Sides of the Ocean: A Biography of Henry Adams. His First Life, 1838–1862* (Hamden, Conn., 1982).

———, *Better in Darkness: A Biography of Henry Adams. His Second Life, 1862–1891* (Hamden, Conn., 1994).

———, *Improvement of the World: A Biography of Henry Adams. His Last Life, 1891–1918* (Hamden, Conn., 2001).

Decker, William Merrill. *The Literary Vocation of Henry Adams* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1990).

Levenson, J. C. *The Mind and Art of Henry Adams* (Boston, 1957).

Samuels, Ernest. *Henry Adams* (Cambridge, Mass., 1989).

John C. Orr

ADAMS, James Luther (1901–94)

James Luther Adams was born on 12 November 1901 in Ritzville, Washington. He received a BA degree from the University of Minnesota in 1924, and an M.Div. degree from Harvard Divinity School in 1927. He was ordained in that year, and continued to study at Harvard as a graduate student in comparative literature (earning an MA) while entering the ministry. Adams served as minister of the Second Church of Salem and the First Unitarian Society of Wellesley Hills, Massachusetts from 1927 to 1935, taught English at Boston

University, and made several visits to Europe. In 1937 Adams joined the faculty of Meadville Theological School, a Unitarian seminary in Chicago. In 1943 he joined the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago. He completed his PhD in philosophy at the University of Chicago in 1945. From 1956 until his retirement in 1968, Adams was Edward Mallinckrodt, Jr. Professor of Divinity at Harvard Divinity School. He occasionally taught at Andover-Newton Theological School and Meadville/Lombard Theological School until 1976. At Harvard's 350th anniversary in 1986, Adams was honored for distinguished service to the university. He died on 26 July 1994 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

A Unitarian, religious social ethicist, and liberal theologian, Adams's intellectual influences and friendships bring together a range of early and mid twentieth-century literary figures, philosophers, and theologians, including Irving BABBITT, T. S. ELIOT, Rudolph Otto, and Baron von Huegel. Adams contributed to the revitalization of interest in Ernst Troeltsch and was strongly influenced by his studies with Alfred North WHITEHEAD. American pragmatism mediated through Charles PEIRCE, John DEWEY, and William JAMES shaped his understanding of the value of theological doctrines to evoke commitment. While teaching in Chicago, Adams was part of the sociohistorical and empirical "Chicago School" of theology, whose members included Shailer MATHEWS, Henry Nelson WIEMAN, and Bernard LOOMER. Paul TILLICH was the subject of Adams's doctoral dissertation and later a close friend. Adams became Tillich's primary interpreter to American audiences and translated many of Tillich's early works into English. Adams also translated works of Erich FROMM and Karl Holl.

Adams's political commitments and theological outlook were shaped by an early encounter with fascism in Hitler's Germany while visiting Europe's leading religious thinkers. His religiously inspired political concern led to involvement in no less than thirty progressive social and voluntary organizations, including serving as chairman of the Independent Voters of Illinois, consultant to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and member of the state board of the Civil Liberties Union. He was among the first American members of the Société Européenne de Culture, an association of intellectuals promoting political responsibility.

Major themes of Adams's thought include the significance of history as the arena for the manifestation of the divine; the relationships among theology, power, and social organization; sources of religious and political authority; theological bases of social action; and contributions of religious ideals to democratic citizenship. Two additional themes, his efforts at reforming religious liberalism and his theory of voluntary association, warrant further explication.

As a Unitarian clergyman and liberal Christian, Adams devoted his talents throughout his career toward reforming and strengthening religious liberalism intellectually and institutionally. Adams's experiences in Germany raised profound questions for him regarding the ability of progressive churches to effectively confront the evils of the modern world. This concern was expressed through his explorations of the historical foundations of modern liberalism in the prophetic biblical tradition and in the radical wing of the Protestant Reformation and through his criticism of liberalism's shortcomings. Adams's contributions to the Unitarian (later Unitarian Universalist) church also took the form of serving as editor of *The Journal of Liberal Religion*, co-founding *The Unitarian Christian* journal, chairing the denomination's social responsibility committee, and establishing ministerial study groups focused on disciplined theological reflection.

Adams's intellectual interests crystallized around the history, theology, and politics of voluntary associations. Adams analyzed the political and sociological meanings and religious and philosophical importance of nongovernmental organizations, not-for-profits, and publicly oriented associations as essential components of democratic life. In explicating a theory of voluntary associations, Adams traces

the historical development of voluntarism in Western religious traditions and emphasizes the importance of human institutions in manifesting the values and beliefs of their members. "By their groups you shall know them," Adams wrote. Although often ambiguous, voluntary associations provide both a window into understanding the associational dimension of human existence and a medium for interpretation and analysis. Adams moved towards a theology of voluntary associations, describing them as the form of organization most conducive to human fulfillment and as a basis for discerning the presence of God.

A master of the essay genre, Adams wrote prolifically on a wide range of topics and interests. In addition to his contributions to the fields of social ethics and theology, Adams influenced American intellectual life through introducing and interpreting European authors (especially Tillich and Troeltsch) to American audiences and training a generation of American social and religious ethicists.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Taking Time Seriously (Glencoe, Ill., 1957).

Paul Tillich's Philosophy of Culture, Science, and Religion (New York, 1965).

On Being Human Religiously: Selected Essays in Religion and Science, ed. Max L. Stackhouse (Boston, 1976).

The Prophethood of All Believers, ed. George K. Beach (Boston, 1986).

An Examined Faith: Social Context and Religious Commitment, ed. George K. Beach (Boston, 1991).

Other Relevant Works

Adams's papers are at Syracuse University, the Essex Institute in Salem, Massachusetts, and Harvard Divinity School.

Trans., *The Protestant Era*, by Paul Tillich (Chicago, 1948).

Ed. with Seward Hiltner, *Pastoral Care in the Liberal Churches* (Nashville, Tenn., 1970).

Ed. with Wilhelm Pauck and Roger Shinn, *The Thought of Paul Tillich* (San Francisco, 1985).

Not Without Dust and Heat: A Memoir (Chicago, 1995).

The Essential James Luther Adams: Selected Essays and Addresses, ed. George K. Beach (Boston, 1998).

Further Reading

Who Was Who in Amer v11

Engel, J. Ronald, ed. "Religious and Political Liberalism: Essays in Honor of James Luther Adams," *American Journal of Theology and Philosophy* 17 (January 1996). Special issue devoted to Adams.

Hunt, James. *James Luther Adams and His Demand for an Effective Religious Liberalism*. PhD dissertation, Syracuse University (Syracuse, N.Y., 1965).

Muelder, Walter. "James Luther Adams as Theological Ethicist," *Andover Newton Quarterly* 17 (1977): 186–94.

Stackhouse, Max. "James Luther Adams: A Biographical and Intellectual Sketch," in *Voluntary Associations: A Study of Groups in Free Societies*, ed. D. B. Robertson (Richmond, Virg., 1966), pp. 333–57, 432–44.

Wilcox, John R. *Taking Time Seriously: James Luther Adams* (Washington, D.C., 1978).

Kenneth Olliff

ADDAMS, Jane (1860–1935)

Jane Addams was born on 6 September 1860 in Cedarville, Illinois to parents Sarah Weber Addams and John Huy Addams. Although she lost her mother very early on, her father, siblings, and later on, her stepmother Anna Hostetter Haldeman all worked to fill the void in the life of this motherless child.

Initially, the Addams family was solidly middle class. However, her father's second marriage increased the family's social class standing and they quickly moved into higher society. Addams had goals to attend Smith College in Massachusetts, but she attended Rockford Female Seminary in Illinois instead, acceding to her father's plans for her future. Jane was disenchanted with the religious foundations of the seminary, but graduated with a BA in 1881.

Suffering from nervous strain, a protracted illness, and the loss of her father, Addams sought to find some meaning for her life. This struggle set her on the path to what was to become a long career. Dissatisfied with the role of a young socialite, she decided to travel to Europe where she began to consider the problems of the poor. It was during her second trip to Europe that she discovered what would give her life meaning and become her life's work, the settlement movement. The settlement movement in England was based on the idea of connecting universities with the poor. This provided impoverished communities with trained leaders who would work and live in the neighborhoods they served. It was hoped that such an arrangement would mitigate social problems in urban areas by increasing education and cultural awareness.

Using the Toynbee Hall model, Adams and her friend Ellen Gates Starr created their own social settlement, Hull-House, in Chicago. After some consideration, the women altered their original conception of their settlement, particularly in terms of religion. Rather than relying solely on the Christian ethic, Hull-House incorporated democratic ideals that would allow for the full participation of all community members. Addams hoped that such a model would serve to facilitate similar changes in the larger society as well. Hull-House gave Addams the opportunity to speak out for herself and on behalf of other oppressed groups. She believed that reasonable individuals would learn from Hull-House and apply its principles on a larger scale. For Addams, Hull-House would function both locally and nationally and, indeed, Addams became the head of the settlement movement in the United States. With the help of women such as Mary Rozet Smith, Mary Keyser, Alice Hamilton, Julia Lathrop, Florence Kelley, and others, Addams put her social philosophy into practice and contributed to the labor movement, educational reform, the international peace movement, and women's rights.

Although not formally trained in sociology, Addams self-identified as a sociologist, and was a member of the American Sociological Society from its inception. She published in the *American Journal of Sociology* and worked closely with the sociology and philosophy faculty at the University of Chicago, who, at least for a time, also recognized her work as sociological. In addition, she toured the United States lecturing at universities and various social settlements. Until 1914 at the beginning of World War I, Addams was a laudable figure in American culture and history. Her settlement work, research, social thought, and efforts in the women's suffrage movement made her an American heroine. However, her ideals necessitated a pacifist position on the war which made her the target of academics, politicians, and the American public. Addams became President of the Women's International League of Peace and Freedom which was ultimately her downfall; she became a social and intellectual pariah. She suffered greatly from this rejection. In *Peace and Bread in Time of War* Addams writes: "Solitude has always had its demons, harder to withstand than the snares of the world, and the unnatural desert into which the pacifist was summarily cast out seemed to be peopled with them." (1922, p. 82) Yet rejection from her colleagues seemed to be even more hurtful: "Every student of our time had become more or less a disciple of pragmatism and its great teachers in the United States had come out for the war

and defended their positions with skill and philosophic acumen. There were moments when one longed desperately for reconciliation with one's friends and fellow citizens …" (1922, p. 82)

Despite the difficult war years, Addams eventually regained her popularity and was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1931. Just prior to receiving this prestigious award, her health began to take a turn for the worse. She suffered from heart problems and, worse, intestinal cancer. Addams died on 21 May 1935 in Chicago, Illinois. The nation mourned for her and seemed to remember only the good. This would not have come as a surprise to Addams, who wrote about this selective tendency in *The Long Road of Women's Memory*. "For many years at Hull-House I have at intervals detected in certain old people, when they spoke of their past experiences, a tendency to an idealization, almost to a romanticism suggestive of the ardent dreams and groundless ambitions we have all observed in the young when they recklessly lay their plans for the future." (1916, p. 3)

Addams's work is premised upon six ideological assumptions: (1) cultural feminism, a belief in the superiority of feminine values such as peace, productivity, and justice; (2) progressivism, a desire to link social activism with social scientific state reform; (3) social reform Darwinism, the advancement of society through social engineering; (4) philosophic pragmatism, the necessity of linking truth claims to social practice; (5) social gospel Christianity, the work of bridging the gap between social class groups and calling congregations into service among the poor; and (6) the social settlement movement, an attempt to bring conscientious reformers into contact with the lives of those they sought to assist, but were separated from due to social class segregation. Although these assumptions are central to an understanding of Addams and her work, it is also important to consider her major intellectual influences.

Cultural feminism is a major component of Addams's work at Hull-House specifically and in terms of her pacifism more generally. At Hull-House she surrounded herself with other well-educated and socially conscious women. She believed women to be more capable of cooperation, nurturing, peacefulness, and capacity to care for others. She saw these as qualities essential to the healthy functioning of any society. Further, she believed that the entry of women into the public sphere would keep the United States from war, alleviate social problems such as poverty and crime, and create a greater sense of community and patriotism.

Another social theorist, Charlotte Perkins GILMAN, was influential concerning Addams's views about women. Gilman spent some time with Addams at Hull-House in 1895. They worked together on a publication addressing the issues of working women and also contributed to the women's peace movement. Although Gilman was somewhat more radical than Addams, both shared the opinion that women's economic dependence upon men limited their social contributions and thus hindered the advancement of the larger society. In addition, Gilman argued that women's isolation in the home limited their exposure to fine art and educational methods. Society stagnates as children are left to the care of socially and culturally ignorant women. It was just this type of ignorance that Addams hoped to ameliorate with her work at Hull-House. She understood the importance of helping oppressed groups to become active participants in the world around them. In *Women at The Hague* Addams writes about the peace movement and the entry of women into the debate as a sign of international social progress: "The recent entrance of women into citizenship coming on so rapidly not only in the nations of Europe and America, but discernable in certain Asiatic nations as well, is doubtless one manifestation of this change, and the so-called radical or progressive element in each nation, whether they like it or not, recognize it as such." (1915, p. 113)

While pragmatism as a branch of philosophy was initially developed by Charles PEIRCE and William JAMES, Addams's "critical pragma-

tism" was primarily informed by the works of her University of Chicago colleagues, John DEWEY, George Herbert MEAD, and W. I. THOMAS. Further, this understanding was built upon the understanding of a more cooperative Marxism, the Russian experience as told by Leo Tolstoy and Peter Kropotkin, and British social thought including that of Charles Booth, Beatrice Potter Webb, and Sydney Webb.

John Dewey was a valued colleague of Addams. The two held very similar ideas regarding the importance of social science, democracy, and education. In fact, before Dewey accepted the job offer at the University of Chicago, he visited Hull-House. He was quite impressed with the settlement and believed in the applied vision of Addams. Dewey was a frequent guest at Hull-House, serving on its Board, giving lectures, participating in debates, and dining with the residents. Additionally, he helped Addams with the Labor Museum, designed with the idea of celebrating the culture and contributions of Chicago's many immigrant groups. It was hoped that the museum would help to bridge the gap between the new society and the old. In this way new immigrants would begin to feel more at home in their new society and also pass down their heritage to second and third generations. Both Dewey and Addams recognized the alienation experienced by immigrant groups. Intellectually, they termed this problem, "social disorganization." However, they recognized the need to ameliorate its consequences and developed social programs to do just that. Theorizing was only one part of the equation for these reformers.

Mead was a close friend of Jane Addams and Hull-House. He supported women's rights, reviewed Addams's scholarly work, worked with her on a number of reform projects, and gave a number of lectures at Hull-House relating to Social Darwinism. Mead brought an understanding of the individual to sociology. He and W. I. Thomas developed what is known as the "symbolic interactionist" paradigm. His work was aimed at explaining the impact of social relations upon individual action. Indeed, for Mead, individuals become human only when they can internalize the larger society in terms of values and roles. However, the individual has the potential to internalize national and international values as well, therefore becoming a good global citizen. This ability coupled with social scientific research and democracy has the ability to transform social relationships. Through vocational education and critical thinking, all individuals, regardless of social class or racial/ethnic background, could become participants in the larger society as workers and reflective citizens. Although Mead and Addams differed on their views of pacifism, with Mead justifying conflict to further democracy, they agreed on the importance of women's rights and higher education.

Like Mead, Thomas also believed individuals to be capable of rational thought and reflexivity, that they are products of social relationships, and further, that they are dynamic agents in the creation of social reality. Additionally, he also identified with a more applied sociology. His studies focused on the more marginal members of society, such as immigrants, deviant women, and African Americans. He advocated complete equality for women and African Americans and argued that education, including vocational education, would enable both groups to enter social life more successfully. For immigrants, Thomas identified the problem as stemming from environmental changes in terms of culture, religion, occupation, and so on. These changes, although at first experienced negatively, could ultimately be opportunities for individual growth and success. However, this could mean the weakening of group ties. Not surprisingly, Thomas was very supportive of the settlement movement and indeed used some of the Hull-House reports in his own studies. He valued Addams as a colleague and friend and even supported her pacifism when others abandoned her.

Although clearly aligned with the pragmatist vision noted above, Addams also owes an intellectual debt to Karl Marx. She agreed with Marx that economic equality was an essential component of a progressive society. However, she believed that commonality and cooperation rather than conflict could be the basis of social change. Stated differently, she argued that groups are more likely to come together over shared interests and that these interests are more likely to foster unity. But she did agree with some of Marx's views about the importance of labor. She argued that work could contribute to the unification of society.

Addams's perspectives on labor were enhanced by her reading of Tolstoy and her 1886 visit with him in Russia. Tolstoy argued for a more simple existence based on individual work on the land. This type of life freed individuals from the alienating impact of capitalism – a life that Tolstoy himself cultivated. Having worked the land himself, Tolstoy expected that Addams would also lead a modest life. He criticized her bourgeois ways at every turn, particularly her dress and her ownership of land that was never worked by Addams herself, but by hired help. Addams understood Tolstoy's position, and respected it. However, she understood the social expectations of the Hull-House neighborhood and knew that they expected her to be a very different type of leader from Tolstoy. She needed to dress well and to be available to meet the needs of her community, which left her unable to fully adopt the peasant lifestyle. While her busy life at Hull-House did not allow her actually to take up the practice of daily bread labor, she did take on the role of an international bread laborer of sorts, traveling to Europe during times of famine and war to assist others in securing both peace and bread. She considered this struggle to be the basic quest of all of humanity, yet that this quest had been perverted by the violence of modern industrial capitalism. But for Addams, it is women who

are likely to fight most strongly for the hungry and oppressed in war-torn countries: "As I had felt the young immigrant conscripts caught up into a great world movement, which sent them out to fight, so it seemed to me the millions of American women might be caught up into a great world purpose, that of conservation of life; there might be found an antidote to war in women's affection and all-embracing pity for helpless children." (1922, p. 48)

British sociology and Fabianism made a lasting impression on Addams. Charles Booth's quantitative study of the poor in London was the inspiration for both Hull-House and *Hull House Maps and Papers* (1895), a sociological investigation of the neighborhoods surrounding Hull-House. The data were collected by the women of Hull-House and utilized by the sociology faculty at the University of Chicago for their studies of urban life. Another follower of Booth, Beatrice Potter Webb, is also linked to Addams and Hull-House. Webb visited Addams in Chicago on two occasions, once in 1893 and again in 1898. Addams also visited Webb and her husband Sydney in 1896, 1915, and again in 1919. The Webbs were active in British political life, particularly regarding the poor.

Scholars of Addams have identified four central themes that are woven throughout the body of her social thought. First, she distrusted formal theory. It was impossible for her to be a dispassionate observer of social life. She felt that academic work and social reform must be carried out within close proximity of its beneficiaries. Stated differently, it is impossible to know what must be done unless one understands the cultural and historical milieu of the people. Furthermore, it is not only the oppressed who benefit from closer contact with the elite. In *Twenty Years at Hull-House* Addams includes her essay, "The Subjective Necessity for Social Settlements." In this essay she argues that to "shut one's self away from that half of the

race life [the poor] is to shut one's self away from the most vital part of it; it is to live out but half the humanity to which we have been born heir and to use but half our faculties." (1919, p. 92) Addams took this quite literally, becoming neighbors with those she served. While her social class location and career set her apart from her neighbors, she worked hard to understand the intricacies of their everyday lives.

This relates to a second theme in Addams's work. Even with the unfortunate relationship with the Progressive Party which supported a platform that denied the rights of both African Americans and women, Addams understood very early on that the goals of the researcher and the researched, the charity worker and her clients might be at odds with one another despite the best intentions of each. This early attempt at multiculturalism is best exemplified in her work, *Democracy and Social Ethics* (1902). For Addams, recognition of cultural diversity is the first step in creating a more progressive and just society. However, Addams believed that all individuals have the capacity to understand differences and work towards the common good. For that reason it is essential that society focus on making morality an active social endeavor. More specifically, democracy while an ideal, must also become an everyday lived reality or lifestyle.

Thirdly, Addams felt that individuals may be limited by their social location, but that each person is motivated by self-interest and the common good. More specifically, individuals need to give and receive kindness from others. While we have come to expect this kindness as functioning on a solely individual level, we can be taught to understand it as part of the collective as well. Addams sees this as essential for charitable workers. As charitable workers represent larger social organizations, they must respond to their clients as ambassadors of social justice. For Addams, this keeps people connected to the larger society and part of a healthy function-

ing democratic process. Charitable workers must be taught to relate to the everyday lives of the individuals they serve. Without this understanding, the charitable worker runs the risk of further alienating the individual from the larger society. As for the rich, the poor already expect indifference. But the stingy charitable worker is baffling: "this lady visitor, who pretends to be good to the poor, and certainly does talk as though she were kind-hearted, what does she come for if she does not intend to give them things which are so plainly needed?" (1902, p. 18)

Finally, society must be assessed to identify the discrepancies between its stated values and ideals and individual and group outcomes. For example, the doctrine of individualism no longer makes sense in a society that has become increasingly stratified in terms of social class. Furthermore, as the gap between the rich and the poor increases, the life chances of each group are in a sense predetermined. There exists only a limited possibility that an individual can, by his or her own effort, lift him or herself out of poverty. As individuals try to get ahead they neglect the collective. Instead, we must teach individuals to relate more as equals and to consider the larger social good, develop new sites for collective consciousness-raising such as trade unions, women's groups, study circles, and finally use this new consciousness to influence the government to act responsibly on behalf of all its citizens, particularly to increase the standard of living for the poor. She argues that this is the more natural state of humanity. This is also true regarding international relations. In *Peace and Bread in Time of War* Addams writes: "We revolted not only against the cruelty and barbarity of war, but even more against the reversal of human relationships which war implied. We protested against the 'curbed intelligence' and the 'thwarted good will,' when both a free mind and unfettered kindliness are so sadly needed in human affairs." (1922, p. 4)

Although much has been written about Addams's life and good works, not enough has been written about her social philosophy or her role in shaping the discipline of sociology. During the war years Chicago sociology separated from the more radical Addams, relegating her and the other Hull-House women to the field of social work. While the men considered Hull-House a social experiment of sorts, Addams argued that it was much more. She put her principles into action and created an institution designed to facilitate both community and democracy. She contributed much to the founding of the discipline and also to the study of the impact of industrialization on the lives of the oppressed. She brought a new level of caring and nurturing to the study of social life and recognized the necessity of women's contributions to such endeavors. Her optimism and stalwart support of peace stands to benefit us as much today as during her own lifetime.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Subjective Necessity of Settlements," in *Philanthropy and Social Progress* (New York, 1893), pp. 1–26.
"Prefatory Note" and "The Settlement as a Factor in the Labor Movement," in *Hull-House Maps and Papers* (Boston, 1895), pp. vii–viii and 183–204.
Democracy and Social Ethics (New York, 1902).
Newer Ideals of Peace (New York, 1907).
The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets (New York, 1909).
Twenty Years at Hull-House (New York, 1910).
A New Conscience and an Ancient Evil (New York, 1912).
"Recreation as a Public Function in Urban Communities," *American Journal of Sociology* 17 (1912): 615–9.
Women at The Hague (New York, 1915).
The Long Road of Women's Memory (New York, 1916).
Peace and Bread in Time of War (New York, 1922).

Other Relevant Works
A major collection of Addams's papers is at Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania.
Why Women Should Vote (New York, 1912).
"A Modern Devil Baby," *American Journal of Sociology* 20 (1914): 117–18.
The Second Twenty Years at Hull-House (New York, 1930).
The Excellent Becomes Permanent (New York, 1932).
My Friend Julia Lathrop (New York, 1932).
Jane Addams: A Centennial Reader, ed. (New York, 1960).
The Social Thought of Jane Addams, ed. Christopher Lasch (Indianapolis, 1965).
The Jane Addams Papers, 1860–1960, 82 microfilm reels (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1984).
Jane Addams on Education, ed. Ellen C. Lagemann (New York, 1985).
The Jane Addams Reader, ed. Jean Bethke Elshtain (New York, 2002).
Jane Addams's Writings on Peace, 4 vols, ed. Marilyn Fischer and Judy D. Whipps (Bristol, UK, 2003).
The Selected Papers of Jane Addams, vol. 1–, ed. Mary Lynn McCree Bryan, Barbara Bair, and Maree de Angury (Urbana, Ill., 2003–).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Blackwell Amer Phil*, *Blackwell Comp Prag*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v27*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Bryan, Mary Lynn. *The Jane Addams Papers: A Comprehensive Guide* (Bloomington, Ind., 1996).
Davis, Allen F. *American Heroine: The Life and Legend of Jane Addams* (New York, 1973).
Deegan, Mary Jo. *Race, Hull-House, and the University of Chicago* (Westport,

Conn., 2002).

———, *Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School, 1892–1918* (New Brunswick, 1988).

Deegan, Mary Jo, and Michael Hill, eds. *Women and Symbolic Interaction* (Boston, 1987).

Elshtain, Jean Bethke. *Jane Addams and the Dream of American Democracy* (New York, 2002).

Fischer, Marilyn. *On Addams* (Belmont, Cal., 2004).

Joslin, Katherine. *Jane Addams: A Writer's Life* (Urbana, Ill., 2004).

Lengermann, Patricia Madoo, and Jill Niebrugge-Brandtley. *The Women Founders: Sociology and Social Theory, 1830–1930* (Boston, 1998).

Stebner, Eleanor J. *The Women of Hull House* (Albany, N.Y., 1997).

Julie Harms Cannon

ADLER, Felix (1851–1933)

Felix Adler was born on 13 August 1851 in Alzey, Germany, the son of Rabbi Samuel and Henrietta Adler. In 1857 the family emigrated to the United States because Samuel, a leader in the nascent Jewish Reform movement, was named to the rabbinate of Temple Emanuel in New York City which was then, as now, one of the most prestigious pulpits in Reform Judaism. Adler was enrolled in Columbia Grammar School (no connection with the University) receiving a rigorous education in Greek, Latin, modern languages, literature, and mathematics. But his schooling was not confined to the classroom. He joined his mother in visiting the sick, the aged, and the poor. As a teenager, he taught – brilliantly, we are told – in the Temple's religion school. On graduating from Columbia Grammar, Felix attended Columbia College (BA 1870) and then went on to the University of Berlin for graduate study. At the same time, he was preparing for the rabbinate at Abraham Geiger's seminary. Leaving both, he transferred to Heidelberg where he earned his PhD in Semitic studies in 1873. While a graduate student, Adler came under the influence of Hermann Cohen. At the same time it was Friedrich Albert Lange's *Die Arbeitefrage* which, he said, "opened for me a wide and tragic prospect." Thus began Adler's lifelong interests in neo-Kantian moral philosophy, in social ethics, and in the "labor" question.

Adler was expected eventually to succeed his father at the Temple. On his return to New York, his first (and last) Emanuel sermon called for "religion not confined to church or synagogue. A religion such as Judaism ever claimed to be, not of the creed but of the deed." Adler recalled later, "Some members [of the congregation] came to me and asked whether I believed in God. I said, 'Yes, but not in your God'" (Obituary, *New York Times*, 25 April 1933).

Adler had been schooled for the rabbinate or the academy. The former was now closed to him and the latter, given the prevailing anti-Semitism, seemed closed as well. However, through the good offices and the substantial generosity of several leading members of Emanuel, a chair in Hebrew and Oriental Literature was established at the newly founded Cornell University. Felix was named to it as non-resident professor and taught from 1873 to 1875.

Some of those who had heard the Temple sermon invited Felix to speak on the "plan of a new organization." On 15 May 1876 at Standard Hall in New York City, Adler called for "Diversity in the creed, unanimity in the deed …. This is the common ground where we may all grasp hands … united in mankind's common cause" (1877). With that address, Ethical Culture was born. Exhibiting formidable powers of organization, Adler in those first years established a pattern of reform for his nascent movement. He founded the district nursing

service (now the Visiting Nurse Service), a model tenement building company, a free kindergarten that grew into the Workingman's School and which is today the Ethical Culture Fieldston School. Societies were established in Philadelphia, Chicago, and St. Louis. The Sunday meetings attracted an ever-growing audience. Newly recruited colleagues joined Adler in leading the Societies and developing, among other projects, the Legal Aid Society and settlement houses.

Adler was creating his own vocation. He was President from 1878 to 1882 of the Free Religious Association, founded in 1866 by Francis Ellingwood ABBOTT and O. B. FROTHINGHAM. Among its members were Ralph Waldo EMERSON, Lucretia Mott, Wendell Phillips, and Julia Ward HOWE. In the 1890s, Adler began to develop Ethical Culture in Europe, Great Britain, and Japan. The International Ethical Union was organized. Among other activities, it sponsored the International Races Congress (1911) and the International Moral Education Congresses (first in 1908 and periodically until the early 1930s). Sadly, the depression, Nazism, and war made international organization impossible and Ethical Culture abroad – except for the British movement led by Stanton Coit and Harold Blackham, and the Vienna Society – ceased to exist.

Adler was active in housing and political reform, joined the movement to oppose American imperialism in the Philippines and Latin America, served as a labor arbitrator, and fostered participatory labor organization among the successful business people who joined the Society. A prolific author and teacher, he founded the *International Journal of Ethics* in 1890. While continuing his Ethical Culture leadership, Adler was appointed professor of political and social ethics at Columbia in 1902, and he held this chair until his death. He was also Theodore Roosevelt Professor at the University of Berlin (1908) and the Hibbert Lecturer at Oxford (1923). He served as President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1928–9. He was busy speaking, teaching, writing, organizing, and raising money for the Societies and for the Schools until the final two years of his life. Adler died on 24 April 1933 in New York City.

Adler was at home in the pulpit, the classroom, the study, and the marketplace. Initially, he preached the relatively simple notion of "deed not creed" inspired by the idea of an "ethical religion" called for by the Unitarian radicals Theodore Parker and William Ellery Channing, by Emerson, and by Jewish Reform. Philosophically, he affirmed Kant's notion of the metaphysical independence and centrality of ethics. Religion was to emerge from ethics rather than the other way around. Institutionally, Adler's Ethical Culture was situated in the nineteenth-century religious and social reform neighborhood that included the social gospel movement, the Quakers, Reform and, later, Reconstructionist Judaism as well as assorted utopians and secular radicals.

As Adler's thought evolved, "deed not creed" turned into "deed before creed." No doubt, Adler's institution building – the Ethical Societies, the Schools, the pioneering social agencies, the international congresses, the politics of reform, the labor and business projects – taught him that the "deed" was not self-evident and that "creed" could not be dispensed with even if dogma could be. In his forties, he was to criticize "mere" reform which seemed to him "mindless" reform. Temperamentally, Adler was both thinker and doer. So, developing the conceptual ground philosophically and religiously rounded out Adler's life-project. Adler also remained committed to the common moral agenda, and to the freedom of an individual to believe differently or not to believe at all. Ethical Culture continued to be pluralistic and inclusive.

Adler grew increasingly critical of Kant's "individualism" and rationalism. He began to develop action, relationship, and organism as the key notions of his mature philosophy. Thus, in reworking Kant's "categorical imperative," he wrote, "Act as a member of the ethical manifold (the infinite spiritual universe)." And, "Act so as

to elicit in another the distinctive unique quality characteristic of him as a fellow member of the infinite whole" (1918, p. 117). He introduced into his thought an abiding sense of the tragic, writing toward the end of his life, of the experience of "spiritual pain." Almost existentialist in mood, he rooted pain ontologically and historically in the "Lilliputian disparity between man and the magnitude of the world … multitudes of our fellow beings … sinking, drowning, and we are powerless to assist them … the intolerable strain of the divided conscience … felt by men who are eagerly desirous to make their life whole … and who do not see how to do it …" (1924, pp. 13, 17–18, 24–5).

Ethics, Adler held, was the "science of right energizing" (1918, p. 221); one's own individuality emerged from the effort to elicit the individuality of the other. No one, in other words, could save him/herself alone! Again, drawing upon Kant, Adler "postulated" the "worth" of every human being. But elaborating the bare bones of a moral geometry was unsuited to Adler's intent and passion. In an interesting turn, he imagined "worth" as emergent in ethical relationships and not as a given of being. Indeed, the ethical character of any relationship was signaled precisely by how it contributed to this emergence. Individuation was thus a relational idea, evolving as relationships evolved. Adler's model was biological, a shift away from the Newtonianism of Kant. Adler's philosophy was organic and not atomistic. Of course, the "ideal" could never be achieved. Moral success, always elusive, remained a permanent goad and goal. The ideal, an infinite democracy of "ends," warranted an ethics of interdependence. Irreplaceability was exhibited in action. The space between ideal and empirical generated moral motivation.

Simultaneously, Adler was developing a critical reconstruction of religion. An ethical religion was not a religion of good works *per se* but of spiritual pedagogy. Good works, whatever their other merits, were the vehicle for personal and interpersonal development. Religion like ethics therefore belonged in the marketplace and in the streets as much as if not more than in the pulpit. Thus, Adler's and Ethical Culture's projects were integral to moral development and expressive of ethical religion, and not mere outcroppings of more basic realities and beliefs.

Behind the institutions and reforms was Adler's guiding question: how is ethics possible in an industrial society? A realist, he did not disdain industry, business, the economics of give and get. Instead, as he said over and over again, industry was to be "ethicized." And Adler both believed and demonstrated in thought and act that it could be done. Adler's philosophic expression of this was his notion of industrial democracy and his reconstruction of the idea of "vocation" in order to replace the dehumanizations of the assembly line and vicious competitiveness. Recognizing the move of American democracy from farm to city, he called for a representative government based in vocational groups – labor unions, professional associations, mothers (the PTA for instance), etc. – in order to assure the power to make changes and the competence to do so. The individual in a "mass" society had neither even if he or she had the vote.

Adler did not set out in 1876 with a grand plan. But he was open to experience, learned from it, and was always looking for a way to put its lessons to work. Adler's was a philosophy of *praxis*. Adler has been difficult to place in the history of American philosophy. Labeling him as "neo-Kantian" doesn't succeed. Using discrete categories like "reformer," "religious leader," "educator," "professor," misleads as often as it instructs. He was, of course, all of these things. But in Adler they came together, were instrumental to each other, and finally served the construction of an interesting turn that philosophic idealism took under the influence of American democracy and the creativity of a realistic idealist.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Creed and Deed: A Series of Discourses
  (New York, 1877; 2nd edn 1886).

The Moral Instruction of Children (New York, 1892).

Life and Destiny, or, Thoughts from the Ethical Lectures of Felix Adler (New York, 1903).

The Essentials of Spirituality (New York, 1905).

The Religion of Duty (New York, 1905).

The World Crisis and its Meaning (New York, 1915).

An Ethical Philosophy of Life (New York, 1918).

Marriage and Divorce (New York, 1923). Reissued as *Incompatibility in Marriage* (New York, 1930).

The Reconstruction of the Spiritual Ideal (New York, 1924).

The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Ethical Movement, 1876–1926 (New York, 1926).

Other Relevant Works

Adler's papers are at Columbia University.

Our Part in this World, ed. Horace L. Friess (New York, 1946).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encyc Ethics*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v23*, *Pres Addr of APA v3*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Bacon, Samuel F. *An Evaluation of the Philosophy and Pedagogy of Ethical Culture* (Washington, D.C., 1933).

Bridges, Horace J., ed. *Aspects of Ethical Religion: Essays in Honor of Felix Adler on the Fiftieth Anniversary of His Founding of the Ethical Movement, 1876* (New York, 1926).

Friess, Horace L. *Felix Adler and Ethical Culture, Memories and Studies*, ed. Fannia Weingartner (New York, 1981).

Guttchen, Robert S. *Felix Adler* (New York, 1974).

Hornback, James F. *The Philosophic Sources and Sanctions of the Founders of Ethical Culture*. PhD dissertation, Columbia University (New York, 1983).

Kraut, Benny. *From Reform Judaism to Ethical Culture: The Religious Evolution of Felix Adler* (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1979).

Radest, Howard B. *Toward Common Ground: The Story of the Ethical Societies in the United States* (New York, 1969; 2nd edn 1987).

———, *Felix Adler, An Ethical Culture* (New York, 1998).

Howard B. Radest

ADLER, Mortimer Jerome (1902–2001)

Mortimer Adler was born on 28 December 1902 in New York City. He began working as a copyboy for the New York *Sun* at age fourteen, while still in public school. Two years later he began to attend Columbia University. He did not earn a bachelor's degree even though he had completed all the coursework, because he refused to take a required physical education course in swimming. Nevertheless, he earned a PhD in psychology from Columbia in 1928. In 1927, Robert Hutchins invited Adler to come to Yale University and discuss how psychological research might be relevant to the study of law. Probably due to his conversations with Hutchins, between 1927 and his appointment to the faculty at the University of Chicago in 1930, Adler switched his interests from experimental social psychology and empirical social science to metaphysical philosophy.

Adler spent his entire academic career at the University of Chicago. He was initially appointed associate professor in philosophy of law in the philosophy department from 1930 to 1931, and then his appointment was reassigned to the Law School, where he

remained at the rank of associate professor until 1942. He was professor in philosophy of law from 1942 to 1952, when he retired. He returned to Chicago as a visiting lecturer from 1963 to 1968. In 1952, Adler became director of the Institute for Philosophical Research, first in San Francisco and then in Chicago after it was moved there in 1963. Along with Hutchins, he co-edited the fifty-two volumes of *The Great Books of the Western World* (1952). Adler was Chairman and co-founder with Max Weismann of the Center for the Study of The Great Ideas and editor-in-chief of its journal *Philosophy Is Everybody's Business*; founder and Director of the Institute for Philosophical Research; Chairman of the Board of Editors of *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Inc.; editor-in-chief of the *Great Books of the Western World* and *Great Ideas: A Syntopicon of Great Books of the Western World* (1952); editor of *The Great Ideas Today* (1961–71; 1978–99; all published by Encyclopaedia Britannica); and co-founder and Honorary Trustee of The Aspen Institute. Ongoing programs started or developed by Adler include: The Great Books Foundation (with Robert Hutchins), the Basic Program of Liberal Education for Adults at the University of Chicago (with Robert Hutchins), the Executive Seminars of The Aspen Institute, the Paideia Project (a plan for major reform of public school education), and The Great Ideas seminars and lectures at the Center for the Study of The Great Ideas. Adler died on 28 June 2001 in San Mateo, California.

Adler is known for advocating a populist approach to general education in seminars using "great books" and "great ideas." He sought to reform all educational curricula in this way, reasoning that all students needed was a thorough understanding of the great works of philosophy, literature, history, science, and religion. Adler thought this approach to knowledge was sufficient for any person, no matter their particular interests. He also wanted to include a single liberal, non-specialized education without electives or voca-

tional classes. Adler's vision for reforming American education was not shared by leading educational theorists such as John DEWEY or Sidney HOOK, with whom he engaged in polemical debates in print.

His first book, *Dialectic* (1927), grew out of his interest in medieval thought and provided an outline of what he thought were the most relevant philosophical and religious ideas of Western civilization. While at Chicago, Adler expanded these ideas into lectures and then as a series of books including *The Higher Learning in America* (1936), *What Man Has Made of Man* (1937), and his well-known *How to Read a Book* (1940), which has gone through several editions and is still in print.

Adler believed that the primary goal of education was to prepare everyone to be lifelong learners. His vision of education was based on the central importance of philosophy and the liberal arts in giving people the necessary tools to solve problems and make decisions in their daily lives, by developing each person's innate ability to live ethically. Adler also thought this included making everyone into responsible citizens who embraced democracy. His hierarchy of knowledge reserved the study of math, science, history, geography, measurement, and other subjects to the lower grades. He set aside the study of works of fiction, poetry, drama, and art to high school and college. He reasoned that students would develop the necessary critical thinking skills and insights in order to understand not only their own minds, but the minds of others as well.

Adler proposed that higher education should adopt "Great Books" programs requiring all students to take core classes in Western philosophy, politics, and religion. Great Books was originally a list of one hundred essential texts in Western civilization, also known as the Western Canon. A book was selected if it met Adler's criteria of its contemporary significance or relevance to the problems and issues of our times; if it could be read again and again with benefit; and if it was relevant to "a

large number of the great ideas and great issues that have occupied the minds of thinking individuals for the last 25 centuries" (1992, p. 142).

Though Adler hoped all public schools in the United States would use classic works of Western civilization to dominate their curriculum, the greatest impact of his ideas has been at the college level. During the 1920s and 1930s, a significant number of American colleges and universities adopted such a curriculum, including Columbia University, his alma mater.

When Adler and Hutchins released *Great Books of the Western World* in 1952, it was met with criticism from several quarters. Since the series appeared at the height of the Cold War their critics attacked them for trying to use the Western Canon to promote American political propaganda abroad. *Great Books* has also been attacked for celebrating only the accomplishments of white, European males while overlooking the voices of women and people of color. Though this list was tentative, many critics considered it presumptuous and laughable to nominate some Great Books to the exclusion of all others. In 1990 a new edition of *Great Books* was published, with six more volumes of material, including works written in the twentieth century.

Adler's multidisciplinary and integrated approach to philosophy, politics, religion, law, and education was aimed at making philosophy's greatest texts accessible to everyone. Throughout his life, he remained devoted to helping those outside academia educate themselves further. As he once wrote, "No one can be fully educated in school, no matter how long the schooling or how good it is." No one, no matter how old, should stop learning, according to Adler, who wrote more than twenty books after he retired.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dialectic (London, 1927).

Art and Prudence: A Study in Practical Philosophy (New York, 1937).

What Man Has Made of Man: A Study of the Consequences of Platonism and Positivism in Psychology (New York, 1937).

How to Read a Book: The Art of Getting a Liberal Education (New York, 1940).

The Philosophy and Science of Man: A Collection of Texts as a Foundation for Ethics and Politics (Chicago, 1940).

A Dialectic of Morals: Towards the Foundations of Political Philosophy (New York, 1941).

How to Think About War and Peace (New York, 1944).

The Idea of Freedom: A Dialectical Examination of the Conceptions of Freedom (Garden City, N.Y., 1958).

The Idea of Freedom: A Dialectical Examination of the Controversies About Freedom (Garden City, N.Y., 1961).

Great Ideas from the Great Books (New York, 1961).

The Conditions of Philosophy: Its Checkered Past, Its Present Disorder, and Its Future Promise (New York, 1965).

The Difference of Man and the Difference It Makes (New York, 1967).

The Time of Our Lives: The Ethics of Common Sense (New York, 1970).

The Common Sense of Politics (New York, 1971).

Some Questions About Language: A Theory of Human Discourse and Its Objects (La Salle, Ill., 1976).

Aristotle for Everybody: Difficult Thought Made Easy (New York, 1978).

How to Think About God: A Guide for the 20th-Century Pagan (New York, 1980).

Six Great Ideas: Truth, Goodness, Beauty, Liberty, Equality, Justice (New York, 1981).

The Angels and Us (New York, 1982).

The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto (New York, 1982).

How to Speak / How to Listen (New York, 1983).

Paideia Problems and Possibilities: A

Consideration of Questions Raised by The Paideia Proposal (New York, 1983).

A Vision of the Future: Twelve Ideas for a Better Life and a Better Society (New York, 1984).

Ten Philosophical Mistakes (New York, 1985).

A Guidebook to Learning: For a Lifelong Pursuit of Wisdom (New York, 1986).

We Hold These Truths: Understanding the Ideas and Ideals of the Constitution (New York, 1987).

Intellect: Mind over Matter (New York, 1990).

Truth in Religion: The Plurality of Religions and the Unity of Truth (New York, 1990).

Desires, Right & Wrong: The Ethics of Enough (New York, 1991).

Haves Without Have-Nots: Essays for the 21st Century on Democracy and Socialism (New York, 1991).

The Great Ideas: A Lexicon of Western Thought (New York, 1992).

The Four Dimensions of Philosophy: Metaphysical, Moral, Objective, Categorical (New York, 1993).

Art, the Arts, and the Great Ideas (New York, 1994).

Adler's Philosophical Dictionary: 125 Key Terms for the Philosopher's Lexicon (New York, 1995).

Other Relevant Works

The Nature of Judicial Proof: An Inquiry into the Logical, Legal, and Empirical Aspects of the Law of Evidence, with Jerome Michael (New York, 1931).

Diagrammatics, with Maude Phelps Hutchins (New York, 1932).

Crime, Law and Social Science, with Jerome Michael (London, 1933).

Trans., *Scholasticism and Politics*, by Jacques Maritain (London, 1940).

The Revolution in Education, with Milton Mayer (Chicago, 1944).

Ed., *Great Books of the Western World*, 52 vols (Chicago, 1952).

Ed., *Great Ideas: A Syntopicon of Great Books of the Western World*, 2 vols (Chicago, 1952).

The Capitalist Manifesto, with Louis O. Kelso (New York, 1958).

The New Capitalists: A Proposal to Free Economic Growth from the Slavery of Savings, with Louis O. Kelso (New York, 1961).

Ed., *The Great Ideas Today*, 17 vols, with Robert Hutchins (Chicago, 1961–77).

Ed., *Gateway to the Great Books*, 10 vols, with Robert Hutchins (Chicago, 1963).

Ed., *The Annals of America*, 21 vols (Chicago, 1968).

The American Testament, with William Gorman (New York, 1975).

Ed., *Propaedia: Outline of Knowledge and Guide to The New Encyclopaedia Britannica 15th Edition* (Chicago, 1975).

Ed., *Great Treasury of Western Thought*, with Charles Van Doren (New York, 1977).

Philosopher at Large: An Intellectual Autobiography (New York, 1977).

Reforming Education: The Schooling of a People and Their Education Beyond Schooling, ed. Geraldine Van Doren (Boulder, Col., 1977).

Ed., *The Great Ideas Today*, 20 vols (Chicago, 1978–99).

The Paideia Program: An Educational Syllabus, with Members of the Paideia Group (New York, 1984).

Reforming Education: The Opening of the American Mind, ed. Geraldine Van Doren (Boulder, Col., 1988).

A Second Look in the Rearview Mirror: Further Autobiographical Reflections of a Philosopher at Large (New York, 1992).

Further Reading

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Who Was Who in Amer v14, Who's Who in Phil

Brameld, Theodore. *Philosophies of Education in Cultural Perspective* (New

York, 1955).

Gilbert, James. *Redeeming Culture: American Religion in an Age of Science* (Chicago, 1997).

Hafner, Arthur W., ed. *Democracy and the Public Library: Essays on Fundamental Issues* (Westport, Conn., 1993).

Shils, Edward. "Robert Maynard Hutchins," *American Scholar* 59 (1990): 211–36.

Torre, Michael D. *Freedom in the Modern World: Jacques Maritain, Yves R. Simon, Mortimer J. Adler* (Mishawaka, Ind., 1989).

Weismann, Max, ed. *How to Think About The Great Ideas: From the Great Books of Western Civilization* (Boulder, Col., 1990).

Jean Van Delinder

ADORNO, Theodor Ludwig Wiesengrund (1903–69)

Theodor Ludwig Wiesengrund was born on 11 September 1903 in Frankfurt, Germany. Theodor replaced his last name with Adorno, his mother's maiden name, in 1938. Adorno's father, a wholesale wine dealer, had converted from Judaism to Protestantism and his mother, who had been a professional singer, was Catholic. In 1919, at age seventeen, he graduated from the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gymnasium at the top of his class. "Teddie," as he was known, led a comfortably sheltered life learning piano and composition from Bernard Sekles at the Hoch Conservatory (later, while in his early twenties, he was also a student of Alban Berg and Eduard Steuermann in Vienna), and philosophy with Siegfried Kracauer (who was a family friend) and Edmund Husserl. From his early days as a student until 1929 Adorno wrote music criticism, championed the Arnold SCHOENBERG circle, and studied to be a professional musician. He received his PhD in philosophy from the University of Frankfurt (now Johann Wolfgang Goethe University) in 1924. An abortive attempt to habilitate under Hans Cornelius in 1927 was overcome when Paul TILLICH assumed a chair of philosophy in 1929 and directed Adorno's work. In 1931 Adorno finished his graduate studies by receiving his Habilitation with a thesis titled "Kierkegaard: The Construction of the Aesthetic," and became a privatdozent at Frankfurt. Also in 1931 Adorno founded the Frankfurt School of critical sociology and philosophy with Max HORKHEIMER. In 1934 Adorno fled Nazi Germany to live in Oxford, England.

Adorno emigrated to the United States in 1938 and joined the faculty of the relocated Frankfurt School, now called the Institute for Social Research, at Columbia University. In 1941 he moved with Horkheimer to Los Angeles, California. After eleven years in the US, with Horkheimer's help he was given a professorship in Frankfurt in 1949, where the Institute of Social Research had been refounded, allowing him to return to Germany and continue his academic career. This culminated in a position as double *Ordinarius* of philosophy and sociology. In the Institute, which was affiliated with the university, Adorno's leadership status became ever more apparent, while Horkheimer, who was eight years older, gradually stepped back, leaving his younger friend the sole directorship in 1958. Adorno died while vacationing on 6 August 1969 in Visp, Switzerland.

Adorno's contributions to philosophy, social science, psychology, and cultural theory can hardly be overestimated. From his first major work on Kierkegaard and aesthetics in 1933 to *Negative Dialectics*, his 1966 masterpiece, Adorno rarely failed to penetrate the dialectical relations between exchange, the formation of alienated and mystified subjectivity, authoritarian political logic, and the contradictory nature of culture in modern society. Though he

sometimes lacked consistency he can nonetheless be credited, both individually and as a member of the celebrated Institute of Social Research, otherwise known since the 1960s as the "Frankfurt School," with arguably the most significant critical extension of Marx's analysis of capitalist society to date.

As early as 1924 Adorno was already connected in significant ways with individuals who would later be his collaborators at the Institute for Social Research. Horkheimer, who would assume the directorship of the Institute in 1931, was an assistant to Cornelius and an examiner of Adorno's dissertation. His relationship with Kracauer also led to an association with Leo Lowenthal, destined to be a long-time member of Horkheimer's inner circle, as well as Walter Benjamin, who, though never officially a full member of the Frankfurt School, was a friend, kindred spirit, and briefly listed as a research associate in 1938 while in Paris during World War II.

Adorno's official entry into the Institute came in February 1938 when he arrived in New York City (he later applied for and achieved US citizenship) to work part-time for both the Institute and Lazarsfeld's Princeton Radio Project. While Adorno proved unsuited for the job with Lazarsfeld, he did gain valuable insight into American empirical methods which would, in modified form, inform the wartime work undertaken by the Institute. As he later said, "For the first time I saw *administrative research* before me; I do not know today whether Lazarsfeld coined this phrase or I in my astonishment at such a type of science, focused directly on praxis, so utterly unfamiliar to me." (1998, p. 219) Adorno remained with the Radio Project until 1941 when he moved to California to assist Horkheimer with the dialectics project and, a few years later, to co-direct the Berkeley study on anti-Semitism and authoritarianism.

The wartime efforts of the Institute revolved around two main intellectual pillars: Horkheimer's dialectics project and the more massive and important "Studies in Antisemitism." Adorno was intimately involved with both streams of research, and this period of research in California was decisive not only for the Institute but for Adorno personally. The most famous study to emerge from the anti-Semitism program was *The Authoritarian Personality* (1950) about authoritarian character structure, written in concert with political psychologists at Berkeley. Adorno contributed four big chapters under the heading of "Qualitative Studies of Ideology," and these chapters were the strong theoretical sections of the book. Generally, Adorno's aim in *The Authoritarian Personality* was to explore the relationship between ideological structures and personality – a phenomenology of authoritarianism from which the meaning behind surface expressions could be interpreted in the light of empirical data.

Like Sartre's classic *Anti-Semite and Jew*, the Berkeley study confirmed that anti-Semitism was not principally a problem of Jews generating hatred, but, rather, a problem of anti-Semites who construct the Jew as a substitute object out of social and psychological elements. An object upon which to project hatred, the necessary material prop or carrier, was not dispensable: the object of hatred "… must have certain characteristics in order to fulfill its role … be tangible enough; and … have sufficient historical backing … . It must be defined in rigid and well-known stereotypes. Finally, the object must possess features, or at least be capable of being perceived and interpreted in terms of features which harmonize with the destructive tendencies of the prejudiced subject." (1950, p. 608) Anti-Semitism was, Adorno stressed, independent from its object – a fantasy construct composed of materials provided by concrete social processes, frustrations, repressions. Rather than focusing on Jewish traits and suggesting ways in which Jews could better assimilate, Adorno insisted that the road to a theory of anti-Semitism amounted to a theory of modern society as a whole.

Where Adorno's empirically rooted theorizing within the Institute's anti-Semitism studies was generally subtle and insightful, his thinking on the dialectics project was perhaps compromised by Horkheimer's impatience toward interpretations that deviated from his growing sense of despair and pessimism. Consequently, *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (first published in 1944 as *Philosophische Fragmente*) co-authored with Horkheimer and generally considered today to be a major publication of the Institute, represents a schizophrenic web of competing philosophical impulses: orthodox Freudianism, bio-reductionism, and pessimism juxtaposed with the occasional use of Hegelian Marxism (see Smith 1992).

One of the central ironies identified by Horkheimer and Adorno was that what appeared to be a gulf between reason, enlightenment, and democratic liberalism, on the one hand, and irrationalism, romantic mysticism, and fascism, was in fact illusory: fascism was incomprehensible outside liberal, bourgeois democracy and the spirit of the Enlightenment. Enlightenment and terror were, in some respects, consubstantial; authoritarian mysticism was the extreme manifestation (or the logical consequence) of sober, bourgeois liberalism itself. As bleak and unforgiving as this interpretation was, the essay on anti-Semitism was even more illustrative of the tensions brewing between Horkheimer's inner circle and the earlier intellectual trajectory of the Institute.

The Institute's labor anti-Semitism study (1944–5), one of the sub-projects in the larger Studies in Anti-Semitism program, was carried out simultaneously with both the Berkeley study and the writing that went into *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Principally authored by Paul Massing and A. R. L. Gurland (Lowenthal and Pollock both contributed sections with Adorno providing general oversight functions), the labor study offered a different set of interpretations and conclusions regarding the working class and the nature of prejudice than those endorsed by Horkheimer. In short,

Massing and Gurland argued that there was good news to be found in the data: if half of the workers in the United States were debilitated to one extent or another by anti-Semitism, then the good news was that education, age, gender, and Americanization, among other factors, all eroded the social bases of anti-Semitic prejudice. The data supported the idea that American labor would, over time, increasingly shed its irrational hatred of Jews. In other words, where Horkheimer saw only a moral, civil, and social abyss enveloping Western civilization, the "Other" Frankfurt School, the empirical and editorial wing, saw things in a very different light. Since the inner circle was in a downsizing mode and since the outer circle was not interpreting society and history in an appropriately abysmal fashion, the labor study was suppressed.

Ironically, *Dialectic of Enlightenment* offered its own kind of totalizing theory of anti-Semitism that failed to take into account national variations or even factors as crucial and elementary as class segmentation and social differentiation – witness such crude assertions as "Anti-Semitism is a deeply imprinted schema, a ritual of civilization." (1972, p. 171) Other Institute researchers (Massing and Gurland in particular) found that Berlin anti-Semitism was only superficially similar to Detroit anti-Semitism. Unlike their German counterparts, so-called white-collar workers in the United States were generally immune to anti-Semitism. They found that education dramatically reduced levels of hostility as well as variables such as gender, age, and long-term exposure to American culture and values. Horkheimer and Adorno countered with notions of hypnotic gaze, blind obedience, mental induction currents, castration fears, mimesis, biological prehistory, blind transference, and so on until they blithely claimed that "contemporary anti-Semitism [has acquired an] impenetrable, meaningless character" (1972, p. 206). Could the Adorno of *Dialectic of Enlightenment* be the same person who helped pen *The Authoritarian*

Personality and who was familiar with the labor study? Was Adorno simply of two minds on the subject or was his intellectual integrity hobbled by his collaboration with Horkheimer?

Upon returning to Germany in 1951, Adorno was a key player in the reformation of the Institute in Frankfurt. Adorno remained hostile to both socialism and capitalism and adamant about publishing what he had written while in exile, though some Institute figures had warmed to bourgeois enlightenment and to a large extent had buried their Marxist past. During the early 1960s Adorno was embroiled in famous disputes with Karl Popper (summed up in *The Positivist Dispute in German Sociology*) and tangled with the existentialists, resulting in a brilliant slim book called *The Jargon of Authenticity* (1973) – a work he described as a "propaedeutic" to *Negative Dialectics*. German existentialism amounted to what Adorno called a cult of authenticity that utilized a standardized jargon of pseudo emotionality systematically to disorganize language, transform the authority of the absolute into absolutized authority and, in so doing, provided a refuge for fascism – "Within this refuge a smoldering evil expresses itself as though it were salvation." (1973, pp. 5, 6) Far from bringing people into contact with concrete, authentic reality, it instead sealed them off inside a shell of mysticism and enabled, in the words of the existentialists, an agreement with existence and a positive relation to the world and life regardless of the dehumanizing and authoritarian nature of existence and the world.

The most significant work of Adorno's post-war life was *Negative Dialectics*. His core conceptual problems centered on the dynamics of alienation and reconciliation. Marx's theory of the commodity was founded upon a theory of alienation such that the social and moral statuses of things and people were dependent upon the objective appearance in the world of a non-identical other to assume the shape and form of this moral substance, for example,

wheat looking over its shoulder at corn to know itself as an exchange value (the relative and equivalent poles of the value form). The Hegelian-Marxist dialectic insisted, metaphysically, that this alienation inherent in social relations (the struggle between alien wills, between subject and other, between agents and history) would work itself out, necessarily, in the direction of freedom and that subjectivity would take care of itself. Reconciliation with society and the world would emerge through education, labor, collective (class) struggle, and the rational transformation of society and nature.

The outbreak of World War I, and totalitarianism following quickly on its heels, finally brought to an end the faith-based optimism that characterized previous generations of radical thinkers. The Frankfurt School, like other branches of neo-Marxist thought, set out to interrogate, among other things, the failure of the working class to become the self-conscious class of world historical change and the dimly understood logic of collective subjectivity and domination. Adorno's final treatise on the problem does not offer an easy answer. In fact, it may offer no answers at all, with some writers likening it to the closing chapter of the Western Marxist tradition. But whatever the case, *Negative Dialectics* does offer a deep exploration and expansion of the logic of subjectivity that Marx had only hinted at in *Capital*. That Adorno could both deepen the tradition of Western Marxism, and also create an intellectual impasse forbidding further development, was a logical conclusion for an individual situated at the crossroads of pessimism and optimism, speculation and empirical inquiry, and orthodoxy and heterodoxy.

With Adorno's death, a form of Critical Theory ended, one which had uniquely centered on the Institute of Social Research and "on an urge for discovery that had its roots in anti-bourgeois sentiment and in a sense of having a mission to criticize society" (1999, p. 654).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Philosophische Fragmente, with Max Horkheimer (New York, 1944). Trans. John Cumming, *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (New York, 1972).

The Authoritarian Personality, with Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Daniel J. Levinson, and R. Nevitt Sanford (New York, 1950).

The Jargon of Authenticity (Evanston, Ill., 1973).

Negative Dialektik (Frankfurt am Main, Germany, 1966). Trans. E. B. Ashton, *Negative Dialectics* (London and New York, 1973).

Philosophy of Modern Music (London and New York, 1973).

Minima Moralia: Reflections of a Damaged Life (London, 1974).

Aesthetic Theory (London and New York, 1984; Minneapolis, 1997).

Critical Models: Interventions and Catchwords (New York, 1998).

Problems of Moral Philosophy, ed. Thomas Schröder, trans. Rodney Livingstone (Stanford, Cal., 2000).

Other Relevant Works

Adorno's papers are at the Theodor W. Adorno Archive in Frankfurt am Main, Germany.

Gesammelte Schriften, 20 vols, ed. Gretel Adorno and Rolf Tiedemann (1970–86).

The Positivist Dispute in German Sociology, with others (London, 1976).

The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture, ed. J. M. Bernstein (London, 1991).

Nachgelassene Schriften, ed. Rolf Tiedemann et al. (Frankfurt am Main, Germany, 1995–).

Adorno: The Stars Down to Earth and Other Essays on the Irrational in Culture, ed. Stephen Crook (London, 1998).

The Complete Correspondence, 1928–1940, with Walter Benjamin, ed. H. Lonitz, trans. N. Walker (Cambridge, Mass., 1999).

The Adorno Reader, ed. Brian O'Connor (Oxford, 2000).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Blackwell Comp Phils*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Buck-Morss, Susan. *The Origin of Negative Dialectics: Theodor W. Adorno, Walter Benjamin and the Frankfurt Institute* (New York, 1977).

Jameson, Fredric. *Late Marxism: Adorno, or, The Persistence of the Dialectic* (London and New York, 1990).

Jay, Martin. *The Dialectical Imagination* (Berkeley, Cal., 1973).

———, *Adorno* (Cambridge, Mass., 1984).

Krakauer, E. L. *The Disposition of the Subject: Reading Adorno's Dialectic of Technology* (Evanston, Ill., 1998).

Menke, Christoph. *The Sovereignty of Art: Aesthetic Negativity in Adorno and Derrida*, trans. N. Solomon (Cambridge, Mass., 1998).

Morris, Martin. *Rethinking the Communicative Turn: Adorno, Habermas, and the Problem of Communicative Freedom* (Albany, N.Y., 2001).

Nordquist, Joan. *Theodor Adorno* (Santa Cruz, Cal., 1988). Bibliography on Adorno.

———, *Theodor Adorno (II)* (Santa Cruz, Cal., 1994). Updated bibliography on Adorno.

Rose, Gillian. *The Melancholy Science: An Introduction to the Thought of Theodor W. Adorno* (London, 1978).

Sherratt, Yvonne. *Adorno's Positive Dialectic* (Cambridge, UK, 2002).

Smith, David N. "The Beloved Dictator: Adorno, Horkheimer, and the Critique of Domination," *Current Perspectives in*

Social Theory 12 (1992): 195–230.

Wiggershaus, Rolf. *The Frankfurt School: Its History, Theories, and Political Significance* (Cambridge, Mass., 1994).

Mark P. Worrell

AGASSI, Joseph (1927–)

Joseph Agassi was born on 7 May 1927 in Jerusalem, Palestine. He received his MS in 1951 at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and his PhD in the field of "science: logic and scientific method" at the University of London in 1956. He was a research associate in the Center for the Study of the Behavioral Sciences in Stanford, California in 1956–7, a lecturer in logic and scientific method at the London School of Economics from 1957 to 1960, and served as lecturer, reader, and head of the department of philosophy at the University of Hong Kong from 1960 to 1963. After two years as associate professor of philosophy at the University of Illinois at Urbana (1963–5), he was professor of philosophy at Boston University from 1965 to 1983. Agassi was also professor of philosophy at Tel-Aviv University in Israel from 1971 to 1996, and professor of philosophy at York University in Toronto from 1982 to 1997. He is currently professor emeritus at both Tel-Aviv University and York University.

Agassi takes it that philosophy is nothing if not rationalist. For over fifty years he has studied the rationality of science, metaphysics, and democratic politics.

Agassi advocates Karl Popper's philosophy, with variations that may be significant. Taking science as a response to the challenge of explaining repeatable facts and testing the few explanations that we have, he ignores many of the problems that concern some philosophers of science, chiefly that of theory choice: he contends that choice depends on ends and that the end of fixing beliefs is not a serious one. The problems of the philosophy of technology do engage him, including the problem of choosing scientific theories and ideas worthy of application and implementation. Such choices are not obligatory but optional; often their implementation requires license (professional or political) and license requires corroboration by legally given standards, which in turn are imperfect and invite modifications. Fake corroboration (of hypotheses), a question that engaged Popper and others, seems to Agassi to be unproblematic in science, as by definition its practitioners engage in the quest for the truth. (Just as fake chess is no chess, so is fake science no science at all and that is all that there is to it. The difference between science and chess is in the serious consequences of the scientific enterprise and in the unproblematic character of the rules of chess.)

In technology, by contrast, there are economic incentives to cheat, but these are matters for the law to deal with, not philosophy. Similarly, ever since science became highly prestigious, some people claim scientific status for their ideas. Those who care for science as a theoretical enterprise can ask themselves why, and see if their characterization of the reasons fits cases that are in doubt. This seems to Agassi to fit very closely with Popper's ideas about keeping the scientific enterprise open to ongoing critical evaluation. The application of technology becomes obligatory in matters of personal responsibility to others, especially to one's charges such as the sick and the young – for example, the duty to administer to them the best possible medication. These cases, too, are subject to the law of the land, and in the modern world this involves only what are publicly recognized (at times quite erroneously) and corroborated factual generalizations, never theories. The status of factual assertions outside science (in their inductive guises) is very interesting and it has changed over the centuries. It is in this vein, too, that Agassi maintains the importance of metaphysical frameworks for the assessment of and choices

made in relation to scientific theories, principles, and foundations.

To the extent that the application of science is a moral duty, it hinges on the theory of morality. Agassi suggests, in line with Popper's political philosophy, that all schools of thought have thus far neglected the one major practical problem of ethics, namely moral brakes: when should one apply them? We know this much: the more decent people are, the sooner they are ready to put their brakes on. For example, the German nation, Agassi observes, lost its moral brakes as soon as its Nazi rulers showed their hand.

Agassi shares with Ernest Gellner (Agassi has edited many of Gellner's works) a view of the original (modern) nationalist movements as progressive. He views as their major characteristic and greatest asset their emancipation of national minority groups and receiving them into the nation as equals. The reactionary tribalist nationalism – the one that Popper rightly attacked and wrongly saw as nationalism in general – is a part of the reaction to the Enlightenment movement that provided the ideology for egalitarian, liberal nationalism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Towards an Historiography of Science (Middletown, Conn., 1963).
The Continuing Revolution: A History of Physics from the Greeks to Einstein (New York, 1968).
Faraday as a Natural Philosopher (Chicago, 1971).
Science in Flux (Dordrecht, 1975).
Paranoia: A Study in Diagnosis, with Yehuda Fried (Dordrecht, 1976).
Towards a Rational Philosophical Anthropology (Dordrecht, 1977).
Science and Society: Studies in the Sociology of Science (Dordrecht, 1981).
Psychiatry as Medicine, with Yehuda Fried (Dordrecht, 1983).
Technology: Philosophical and Social Aspects (Dordrecht, 1985).
The Gentle Art of Philosophical Polemics: Selected Reviews and Comments (La Salle, Ill., 1988).
Diagnosis: Philosophical and Medical Perspectives, with Nathaniel Laor (Dordrecht, 1990).
The Siblinghood of Humanity: Introduction to Philosophy (Delmar, N.Y., 1990).
Radiation Theory and the Quantum Revolution (Basel, 1993).
A Philosopher's Apprentice: In Karl Popper's Workshop (Amsterdam, 1993).
Liberal Nationalism for Israel: Towards an Israeli National Identity (Jerusalem and New York, 1994).
Science and Culture (Dordrecht, 2003).

Other Relevant Works
Ed. with Robert S. Cohen, *Scientific Philosophy Today: Essays in Honor of Mario Bunge* (Dordrecht, 1982).
Ed. with I. C. Jarvie, *Rationality: The Critical View* (Dordrecht, 1987).

Further Reading
Anderson, Gunnar. "Lakatos and Progress and Rationality in Science: A Reply to Agassi," *Philosophia* 16 (1986): 239–43.
Friedman, Jeffrey. "Truth and Liberation: Rejoinder to Brooks, Sassower and Agassi, and Harris," *Critical Review* 8 (1994): 137–57.

Raphael Sassower

AGASSIZ, Jean Louis Rodolphe (1807–73)

Louis Agassiz was born on 26 May 1807 in Motier-en-Vuly in Fribourg canton, Switzerland. His father was a Protestant pastor. Agassiz attended the College of Lusanne in France from 1822 to 1824 and

decided to devote himself to the study of nature. He received training in biology and natural history at the University of Zurich from 1824 to 1826, and at the University of Heidelberg in 1826–7. In 1827 he received his MD from the University of Munich, and then went to the University of Erlangen for his PhD in zoology, which he received in 1829. With assistance from the French naturalist Georges Cuvier and the German scholar Alexander von Humboldt, Agassiz began his career. From 1832 to 1846 Agassiz was professor of natural history at the Collège de Neuchâtel in Switzerland. During this time, he studied glaciers and fossilized fish, developing his theory of divine creation of all organisms. His method of arranging the fossil record to reveal the stages of God's creation was enormously influential on zoology and natural history.

In 1846 the Prussian government sent Agassiz for a two-year study of American animal and plant species. In 1847 Harvard University appointed him to be the professor of zoology and geology for its new Lawrence Scientific School, and he held this post until his death. Agassiz remained in the United States for the rest of his life, except for occasional exploration expeditions, and became a naturalized citizen in 1861. He established the Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard in 1859 and served as a staunch defender of the theory of special creation against Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection. Although his arguments against Darwin and his supporters, such as Asa Gray, did not prevent the next generations of American scientists from gradually adopting evolution, Agassiz was responsible for training many of the great biologists and naturalists of the latter half of the nineteenth century. He was one of the founders of the National Academy of Sciences in 1863, and helped to popularize scientific knowledge for a country that responded with great admiration for his achievements. Agassiz died on 14 December 1873 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Two major American philosophers, Charles PEIRCE and William JAMES, took courses with Agassiz during their educations at Harvard. Although both Peirce and James were quickly convinced by Darwin's theory of natural selection, they nevertheless appreciated and acquired Agassiz's remarkable talent for sensitivity to the empirical evidence presented by any object of the scientist's study. James was especially impressed by Agassiz as a model of a tireless investigator, and went with Agassiz on a collecting expedition to Brazil in 1865–6. James's later devotion to empiricism and pragmatism can partially be traced back to his rejection of Agassiz's use of religion in biology and his affirmation of Agassiz's demand for empirical devotion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Monographies d'échinodermes vivans et fossils, 4 vols (1838–42).

Études sur les glaciers (1840).

Twelve Lectures on Comparative Embryology (1849).

Principles of Zoology, with Augustus A. Gould (Boston, 1851).

Contributions to the Natural History of the United States, 4 vols (Boston and London, 1857–62).

An Essay on Classification (London, 1859; Cambridge, Mass., 1962).

Methods of Study in Natural History (Boston, 1863).

Other Relevant Works

Agassiz's papers are at Houghton Library and the Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard University.

Louis Agassiz: His Life and Correspondence, 2 vols, ed. Elizabeth Cary Agassiz (Boston, 1885).

Life, Letters and Works of Louis Agassiz, 2 vols, ed. Jules Marcou (New York and London, 1895).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio,

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Encyc Amer Bio

Fry, C. George, and John Paul Fry. *Congregationalists and Evolution: Asa Gray and Louis Agassiz* (Lanham, Md., 1989).

Lurie, Edward. *Louis Agassiz: A Life in Science* (Chicago, 1960; 2nd edn, Baltimore, Md., 1988).

Nathan Houser

AIKEN, Henry David (1912–82)

Henry David Aiken was born on 3 July 1912 in Portland, Oregon. He attended Reed College (BA 1935), then went on to graduate study in philosophy at Stanford University (MA 1937) and Harvard University (PhD 1943). After briefly working at Columbia University and the University of Washington, he returned to Harvard, where he taught philosophy from 1946 to 1965. He was awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship in 1960. He left Harvard to teach at Brandeis University, hoping to apply his emerging views on the aim of universities. He became the Charles Goldman Professor of Philosophy and remained at Brandeis until his retirement in 1980. Aiken died on 30 March 1982 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Aiken argued against both the primarily descriptive and emotive character of ethical claims. In "Moral Philosophy and Education" (1955) he stresses the social role such claims play in the regulation of conduct. Because this role is fundamental to the meaning of ethical judgments, these judgments are objective and can be appraised as such, in terms of whether they are consistent with social norms. However, since these norms do not obey the rules of logic, ethical judgments are not reducible to scientific descriptions. Aiken also criticized purely emo-tivist and instrumentalist characterizations of aesthetic value, preferring his pluralistic analysis. He used it to promote the idea that practical or normative claims that may be made about a work of art are independent of that work's empirically verifiable content. He defended the relevance of symbolic cognitive processes to aesthetic judgments.

Aiken edited a number of historical pieces, including two by David Hume, and more notably *The Age of Ideology* (1956), a collection of works by various nineteenth-century philosophers. Here he presents the view that philosophers since Immanuel Kant have increasingly begun to realize that their contributions were not part of science, but instead belong to what Aiken terms "ideology." His fondness for American pragmatism led him to the view that philosophy is thoroughly interconnected with language, morality, and other topics. He was a staunch supporter of ordinary language philosophy, and took a significant interest in the study of education. He advocated several progressive changes to higher education curricula, to accommodate the changing needs of students, and move beyond what he perceived as the stifling rationalist view of education in Western society. He also investigated how education can assist the development of one's aesthetic faculties and speculated on the possible contributions of philosophy to educational reform.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Pluralistic Analysis of Aesthetic Value," *Philosophical Review* 59 (1950): 493–513.

"The Aesthetic Relevance of Belief," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 9 (1951): 301–15.

"The Levels of Moral Discourse," *Ethics* 62 (1952): 235–48.

"Moral Philosophy and Education," *Harvard Educational Review* 25 (1955): 39–59.

"Some Notes Concerning the Aesthetic and the Cognitive," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 13 (1955): 378–94.

Ed., *The Age of Ideology: The Nineteenth*

Century Philosophers (Boston, 1956).

Reason and Conduct: New Bearings in Moral Philosophy (New York, 1962).

Ed. with William Barrett, *Philosophy in the Twentieth Century: An Anthology*, 4 vols (New York, 1962).

"Morality and Ideology," in *Ethics and Society: Original Essays on Contemporary Moral Problems*, ed. Richard T. De George (Garden City, N.Y., 1966).

The Predicament of the University (Bloomington, Ind., 1971).

Further Reading
Who Was Who in Amer v8

Evan Moreno-Davis

ALBEE, Ernest (1865–1927)

Ernest Albee, the son of Solon and Ellen (Eames) Albee, was born on 8 August 1865 in Langdon, New Hampshire. Albee attended the University of Vermont, where he graduated with his BA in 1887. His initial interest was in psychology, leading him to pursue graduate studies at Clark University in 1891. However, his interests soon turned to philosophy; he obtained a fellowship from Cornell University, where he earned his PhD in philosophy in 1894. His doctoral dissertation was titled "The Beginnings of English Utilitarianism" and involved a study of the eighteenth-century origins of utilitarian moral theory. In 1892 Albee was appointed to the faculty at the Sage School of Philosophy at Cornell, where he remained for thirty-five years until his death in 1927. He was instructor of philosophy from 1892 to 1902, assistant professor from 1902 to 1907, and a full professor beginning in 1907. He served twice as editor of the *Philosophical Review*, from 1903 to 1909, and again from 1924 to 1927.

Albee died on 26 May 1927 in Ithaca, New York.

Albee's best-known contribution to philosophy is his work on the history of utilitarianism. Utilitarianism is a moral theory which holds that an action can be regarded as moral if it promotes the greatest happiness for the greatest number of people. Happiness is usually understood by the proponents of the theory as the promotion of pleasure and the avoidance of pain. Actions are also evaluated by their consequences, and not by the intentions of the moral agent. This ethical theory became very influential, even culturally dominant, in Western countries in the twentieth century, and this makes Albee's one major work, *History of English Utilitarianism* (1901), a valuable resource on the history of the movement.

Albee's book was the only one of its kind, because it was the first to treat the history of utilitarianism from a philosophical, rather than a historical, point of view. He provides a critical exposition of all of the major figures involved in the development of utilitarian moral theory, including David Hume, Jeremy Bentham, John Stuart Mill, and Herbert Spencer. He also traces the early origins of the movement in the work of Anthony Ashley Cooper, the first Earl of Shaftesbury, the philosophers Francis Hutcheson, John Gay, and John Brown, and especially in the thought of Richard Cumberland, whom Albee regarded as the first significant thinker in the utilitarian tradition. Albee included thinkers who are not normally associated with the movement of utilitarianism today, and illustrates in insightful ways their importance to any understanding of the main concepts of utilitarianism. He describes John Gay's *Preliminary Dissertation: Concerning the Fundamental Principle of the Virtue of Morality* (1731) as "one of the most interesting and important contributions to the early development of the 'greatest happiness' principle" (1901, p. 69). Hume's *Inquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals* (1751) is, according to

Albee, the classic statement of English utilitarianism, a view which would be resisted by some later scholars. His study of the origins of utilitarianism led him to a rather unenthusiastic view of the influence of Jeremy Bentham, a philosopher who later became closely associated with the theory, but whom Albee held as contributing little that was essentially new to ethical theory.

Albee's study of utilitarianism is a careful, fair, critical contribution to the history of philosophy. Because of the subsequent importance of utilitarian moral theory, it became, and remains, an indispensable resource for the history and development of the movement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Beginnings of English Utilitarianism (Boston, 1897).

A History of English Utilitarianism (London and New York, 1901; 1957).

Other Relevant Works
"An Examination of Professor Sidgwick's Proof of Utilitarianism," *Philosophical Review* 10 (1901): 251–60.
"The Significance of Methodological Principles," *Philosophical Review* 15 (1906): 267–76.
"Descriptive and Normative Sciences," *Philosophical Review* 16 (1907): 40–49.
"The Present Meaning of Idealism," *Philosophical Review* 18 (1909): 299–308.
"Philosophy and Literature," *Philosophical Review* 27 (1918): 343–55.
"Clarke's Ethical Philosophy," *Philosophical Review* 37 (1928): 304–27, 403–32.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Brendan Sweetman

ALBRITTON, Rogers Garland (1923–2002)

Rogers Albritton was born on 15 August 1923 in Columbus, Ohio. He enrolled in Saint John's College in 1940, but with the outbreak of World War II he enlisted in the US Army Air Corps, attaining the rank of sergeant. After the war Albritton returned to Saint John's to complete his BA degree. His senior thesis defended lyric poetry against the implications of logical positivism. He then received his PhD in philosophy at Princeton University in 1955. Albritton taught briefly at Cornell University before joining the philosophy department at Harvard University in 1956. He was department chair from 1963 to 1970. In 1972 Albritton went to the University of California at Los Angeles, and taught philosophy there until his retirement in 1991. He was chair of that department from 1979 to 1981. Albritton served as President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1984/5. After his retirement, he continued to teach courses at UCLA through the mid-1990s, and remained a resident of Los Angeles until his death there on 21 May 2002.

Albritton was an influential and deeply respected philosopher despite publishing only a small number of articles over the course of his career. Yet those articles have had a major impact on several areas of philosophical study. His early articles on Aristotle's metaphysics have been highly influential, and his famous article on Wittgenstein's use of the term 'criterion' remains an important contribution to Wittgenstein scholarship. Albritton's primary philosophical interests lay in ancient Greek philosophy, Descartes, and Wittgenstein, particularly in problems concerning free will, skepticism, philosophy of mind, and metaphysics. On the problem of free will, in particular, Albritton's influence is reflected in a number of scholarly articles by other philosophers written in response to his work.

Albritton was not known primarily as an advocate of any particular philosophical position, but rather as a powerfully careful explorer of philosophical problems. He was greatly prized by his philosophical colleagues

for his ability to clarify ideas and examine philosophical issues in conversation. These conversations with Albritton were legendary among his friends and colleagues, as evening discussions regularly lasted well into the early morning hours. As his UCLA colleague David KAPLAN said at the time of his death, "His high position in philosophy is based on the sheer power of his thought." Albritton's understanding of his role as a philosopher was perhaps best expressed in the now famous words of Ludwig Wittgenstein, "to show the fly the way out of the fly-bottle."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Forms of Particular Substances in Aristotle's 'Metaphysics'," *Journal of Philosophy* 54 (1957): 699–707.
"Present Truth and Future Contingency," *Philosophical Review* 66 (1957): 29–46.
"On Wittgenstein's Use of the Term 'Criterion'," *Journal of Philosophy* 56 (1959): 845–56.
"Comments on Hilary Putnam's 'Robots: Machines or Artificially Created Life'," *Journal of Philosophy* 61 (1964): 691–4.
"Comments on 'Moore's Paradox and Self–Knowledge'," *Philosophical Studies* 77 (1995): 229–39.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v9
Watson, Gary. "Freedom and Strength of Will in Hoffman and Albritton," *Philosophical Studies* 77 (1995): 261–71.

David E. Schrader

ALCOTT, Amos Bronson (1799–1888)

Bronson Alcott was born 29 November 1799, in rural poverty at Spindle Hill near Wolcott, Connecticut. Alcott had little schooling, but became known as one of the major leaders of American Transcendentalism. As O. B. FROTHINGHAM said of Alcott's contribution to Transcendentalism, he represented the mystic, whereas Ralph Waldo EMERSON was the seer, Theodore Parker the preacher, Margaret Fuller the critic, and George Ripley the man of letters. From 1818 until 1823 Alcott was a Yankee peddler in Virginia and the Carolinas where he was struck by the grand manners of the southern planters. He would always embody this gentile sensibility. He then taught schools in small Connecticut towns where, with some help from stray books but mainly out of his own invention, he made such innovations as organized play, the honor system, pleasant rooms, and the abolition of physical punishment.

In 1828 Alcott opened a school in Boston, heard the Boston ministers, and though he was their senior, his lack of formal education enabled him to respond to these new stimulations. In 1830 he married Abigail May and a few years later opened the Temple School in Boston, which would close in 1838 due to Alcott's progressive ideas, including the admission of an African-American girl to the school. From 1859 to 1865 Alcott was superintendent of schools in Concord, Massachusetts.

Throughout the remainder of his life Alcott traveled extensively around America conducting "conversations" on a wide range of topics, especially somewhat convoluted expositions of his own brand of Transcendental Neo-Platonism. The 1868 success of his daughter Louisa May Alcott's *Little Women* provided much needed financial stability to his family. In 1879 Alcott inaugurated his Concord School of Philosophy and Literature at his home, which served as a meeting place for such thinkers as Emerson, Thomas DAVIDSON, William T. HARRIS, William JAMES, Denton

SNIDER, and various other representatives of Hegelian and Transcendental philosophy, until Alcott's death on 4 March 1888 in Boston, Massachusetts.

Alcott's philosophical influences range from Pythagoras, who inspired his commitment to vegetarianism, Plato and Plotinus, who provided his emanation theories of Being and education, to Swedenborg, who offered him a conception of religious faith that relied on personal revelation. Although Alcott was not a great scholar in the usual sense – he was neither a careful reader nor a rigorously systematic thinker – he relied on his streak of genius to pick and choose points of wisdom from others to augment his reliance on intuition and "divination."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Education of Infant Children," *American Journal of Education* 3 (July 1828): 412–15.

"Maternal Instruction," *The Unitarian Advocate* 1 (1828): 304–308.

"Primary Education, Account of the Method of Instruction in the Primary School No.1 of Cheshire, Connecticut," *American Journal of Education* 3 (February 1828): 86–94.

"Pestalozzi's Principles and Methods of Instruction," *American Journal of Education* 4 (March 1829): 97–107.

Observations on the Principles and Methods of Infant Instruction (Boston, 1830).

On the Nature and Means of Early Intellectual Education, as Deduced from Experience (Boston, 1833).

The Doctrine and Discipline of Human Culture (Boston, 1836).

Conversations with Children on the Gospels (Boston, 1836–7).

Concord Days (Philadelphia, 1872).

Record of Mr. Alcott's School (Boston, 1874).

Ralph Waldo Emerson: An Estimate of his Character and Genius (Boston, 1882).

Sonnets and Canzonets (Boston, 1882).

New Connecticut, ed. F. B. Sanborn (Boston, 1887).

Essays on Education, 1830–1862, ed. Walter Harding (Gainesville, Fla., 1960).

Other Relevant Works

Bronson Alcott's papers are at Harvard University.

The Journals of Bronson Alcott, ed. Odell Shepard (Boston, 1938).

The Letters of Bronson Alcott, ed. Richard L. Herrnstadt (Ames, Iowa, 1969).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*

Dahlstrand, Frederick C. *Amos Bronson Alcott: An Intellectual Biography* (Rutherford, N.J., 1982).

Frothingham, O. B. *Transcendentalism in New England* (New York, 1876).

McCuskey, Dorothy. *Bronson Alcott, Teacher* (New York, 1949).

Morrow, Honore Willisie. *The Father of Little Women* (Boston, 1927).

Pochmann, Henry A. *New England Transcendentalism and St. Louis Hegelianism* (Philadelphia, 1948).

Sanborn, F. B. *A. Bronson Alcott: His Life and Philosophy* (Boston, 1893).

Shepard, Odell. *Pedlar's Progress: The Life of Bronson Alcott* (Boston, 1937).

Scott Bartlett

ALDRICH, Virgil Charles (1903–98)

Virgil C. Aldrich was born on 13 September 1903 in Narsinghpur, India. His parents were both missionaries, and he spent his youth living beneath the Himalayas in northern India. As an undergraduate at Ohio Wesleyan he studied

literature, and was known as a writer of short stories. He won a number of literary prizes, but did not take a single course in philosophy. It was after his 1925 graduation with a BA in English that philosophy aroused his exclusive interest. He then pursued his graduate studies at Oxford, the Sorbonne (receiving an MA), and the University of California at Berkeley, where he received his PhD in philosophy in 1931. In addition to visiting appointments at Brown, Harvard, the University of Michigan, Columbia University, and the University of Texas, he held philosophy positions at Mills College, Wells College, Rice University, Kenyon College (1946–65), and the University of North Carolina (1965–72). His influence on the philosophical community, however, extended far beyond his teaching and publishing activities. He served as the President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association (1957–58), the President of the American Society for Aesthetics, and the Director of the Kyoto American Studies Institute. He received an honorary LHD degree from Ohio Wesleyan in 1961. After his retirement from North Carolina he taught one class a year at the University of Utah until 1994. Aldrich died on 28 May 1998 in Salt Lake City, Utah.

Aldrich dedicated the greater part of his life to the study of philosophy, offering two influential books and literally hundreds of articles and reviews to its ends. The scope of his work included significant contributions primarily in the areas of aesthetics and the philosophy of mind and perception, though often crossing over into epistemology and the philosophy of language as well. He was best known for his examinations of artifactuality and for his analysis of experience.

For Aldrich, an account of persons was closely linked to an account of artworks. Works of art are not natural kinds but artifacts, distinguishable from natural objects of aesthetic interest, like flowers or mountains. Aldrich added that persons are not natural kinds either. They were "conventional, inven-tive, and artificial" (1991, p. 246). Unlike pictures, they were natural works of art. Aldrich believed that the analogy was a deep one. Pictures had representational content, they pictured *something*, according to Aldrich, and the "body" of a picture (its physical constitution) manifested that content. Like pictures, what was "in" persons, their attitudes, thoughts, feelings, etc., was in a relevant sense represented in their bodily activities.

Aldrich ultimately developed what might be called a "middle level" account of experience. He argued that the dimensions of thought and experience could neither be reduced to a physicalist account of them, nor contained by a strictly conventionalist account.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"An Ethics of Shame," *Ethics* 50 (1939): 57–77.

"The Spirit of the New Positivism," *Journal of Philosophy* 37 (1940): 431–37.

"John Dewey's Use of Language," *Journal of Philosophy* 41 (1944): 261–70.

"Theory and the Integrity of Experience," *Journal of Philosophy* 43 (1946): 379–82.

"Language, Experience, and Pictorial Meaning," *Journal of Philosophy* 45 (1948): 85–95.

"What Appears?" *Philosophical Review* 63 (1954): 232–40.

"The Informal Logic of the Employment of Expressions," *Philosophical Review* 63 (1954): 380–400.

Philosophy of Art (Englewood, N.J., 1963).

"Reflections on Ayer's 'Concept of a Person'," *Journal of Philosophy* 62 (1965): 111–28.

"An Aspect Theory of Mind," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 26 (1966): 313–26.

"On Seeing Bodily Movements as Actions," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 4 (1967): 222–30.

"Design, Composition, and Symbol," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 27 (1969): 379–88.

"Illocutionary Space," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 22 (1971): 15–28.

"Visual Noticing without Believing," *Mind* 81 (1974): 512–33.

"Pictures and Persons – – An Analogy," *Review of Metaphysics* 28 (1975): 599–610.

"Point of View," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 39 (1979): 498–510.

"Mirrors, Picture, Words, Perceptions," *Philosophy* 55 (1980): 39–56.

The Body of a Person (Lanham, Md., 1988).

"Photographing a Fact," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 26 (1989): 81–4.

"Persons as Natural Works of Art," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 28 (1991): 245–49.

Further Reading
Oxford Comp Phil, *Pres Addr of APA v6*, *Proc of APA v72*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Gustafson, Donald F., and Bangs L. Tapscott. *Body, Mind, and Method: Essays in Honor of Virgil C. Aldrich* (Dordrecht, 1979). Includes a biographical sketch and bibliography of Aldrich.

Erica Wagner

ALEXANDER, Archibald (1855–1917)

Archibald Alexander was born on 30 October 1855 in New York City. His father was Henry Martyn Alexander, a graduate of the College of New Jersey (Princeton) in 1840. His mother was Susan Mary Brown Alexander, the daughter of Reverend Matthew Brown, President of Jefferson College in Pennsylvania from 1822 to 1845. Alexander, like his father, attended the College of New Jersey and received his BA in 1875, his MA in 1877, and his PhD in 1879. His teachers were James McCosh, Charles W. Shields, and Lyman H. Atwater. During 1875–7, he studied philosophy and psychology in Berlin and Vienna.

In 1877 Alexander joined the faculty of Columbia College in New York City as the adjunct professor of moral and intellectual philosophy, assisting Charles Murray Nairne, who had been professor of moral and intellectual philosophy and English literature since 1857. Upon Nairne's retirement, Alexander became professor of philosophy, ethics, and psychology on 7 November 1881, a date that marked the formal inauguration of Columbia's philosophy department. Alexander's only notable philosophy student was Nicholas Murray Butler, who was already assisting in his courses as a senior in 1882. Butler stayed for graduate work with Alexander, and after earning his PhD in 1884 became assistant professor of philosophy in 1885. As Alexander's health declined, Butler took over more of his courses, and filled his position when Alexander retired from Columbia in 1889.

While teaching at Columbia, Alexander completed two books, *Some Problems of Philosophy* (1886) and *A Theory of Conduct* (1890), and wrote articles for theology journals. *Some Problems of Philosophy* discusses a wide variety of issues, including the nature of matter and life, the ego and unconscious mental states, reason and knowledge, the will, immortality, moral knowledge and hedonism, the first cause, the infinite, God and the right, atheism and pantheism, and cause and effect. In *A Theory of Conduct* Alexander argues that the science of ethics concludes that total happiness is the aim and test of morality, and so utilitarianism seems justified. However, he claims, utilitarianism cannot supply the motive to seek the general good, since people tend toward egoism. Only Christianity, with its doctrine that God can regenerate the human character and its provision for immortality, explains how people can be moral.

After leaving Columbia, Alexander continued to live in New York City for some years,

and worked in the editorial department of the *New York Evening Post*. During this time he completed his third book, *Theories of the Will in the History of Philosophy* (1898), which surveys ancient philosophy, Christian theory, British philosophy from Bacon to Reid, continental philosophy from Descartes to Leibniz, and German philosophy from Kant to Lotze. Without developing his own view, Alexander expresses satisfaction with Lotze's defense of free will. He spent most of his later years in Europe, especially Switzerland, traveling and lecturing. Two Swiss universities, Neuchâtel and Geneva, enjoyed his lectures most frequently. Alexander died on 15 February 1917 in Geneva, Switzerland.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Some Problems of Philosophy (New York, 1886).
A Theory of Conduct (New York, 1890).
Theories of the Will in the History of Philosophy (New York, 1898).
"The Paradox of Voluntary Attention," *Journal of Philosophy* 7 (1910): 291–8.

Other Relevant Works
A file on Alexander is kept at Columbia University.
"German Thought and Schopenhauer's Pessimism," *Princeton Review* 3rd ser. 1 (1878): 492–504.
"Thomas Aquinas and the Encyclical Letter," *Princeton Review* 3rd ser. 5 (1880): 245–61.
Trans., *Morituri; Three One-act Plays: Teja – Fritzchen – The Eternal Masculine*, by Hermann Sudermann (New York, 1910).
Trans., *The Latin Church in the Middle Ages*, by André Lagarde (New York, 1915).

Further Reading
Peterson, James B. "Alexander's *Theories of the Will in the History of Philosophy*," *Philosophical Review* 8 (1899): 60–63.
Randall, John H., Jr. "Introduction" and

"The Department of Philosophy," in *A History of the Faculty of Philosophy, Columbia University* (New York, 1957), pp. 3–57 and 102–45.

John R. Shook

ALEXANDER, Hartley Burr (1873–1939)

Hartley Burr Alexander was born on 9 April 1873 in Lincoln, Nebraska. His mother Abby died when he was very young; his father George Sherman Alexander, a Methodist minister, later operated a newspaper in Syracuse, Nebraska, where Hartley was raised. He received his BA from the University of Nebraska in 1897. After some graduate school at the University of Pennsylvania studying with William R. NEWBOLD, Alexander transferred to Columbia University, where he received his PhD in philosophy in 1901. His dissertation was titled "The Problem of Metaphysics and the Meaning of Metaphysical Explanation: An Essay in Definitions." Finding no teaching position, Alexander moved to Boston and was an editor on dictionaries and encyclopedias with the Merriam publishing company from 1903 to 1908. During that time he continued to write, publishing some philosophy articles, his dissertation in 1902, and *Poetry and the Individual* in 1906.

In 1908 Alexander accepted the chair of the philosophy department at the University of Nebraska and held that position until 1927, when he was hired as professor of philosophy to establish the philosophy department at the newly founded Scripps College in Claremont, California. He also occasionally taught at the University of Southern California. Alexander was head of the Scripps philosophy department from 1927 until his death on 27 July 1939 in Claremont, California. His son, Hubert Griggs Alexander, became a professor of

philosophy at the University of New Mexico, and his grandson Thomas M. Alexander is a professor of philosophy at Southern Illinois University.

Alexander was highly respected among his philosophy colleagues in both America and Europe. Along with James H. TUFTS, Alexander has the unusual distinction of being elected to the presidency of all three divisions of the American Philosophical Association: the Western Philosophical Association in 1917–18; the American Philosophical Association (now Eastern Division) in 1918–19; and the Pacific Division in 1929–30. Alexander was invited to lecture at the Sorbonne in Paris in 1905 and again in 1925, when he was awarded with France's Chevalier de la Légion d'Honneur. Alexander also received Columbia University's Butler Medal in 1917, was made an honorary member of the American Institute of Architects, and was an active member of archaeological and art organizations. At the 1939 commencement, the University of Nebraska awarded him the honorary D.Litt. degree.

Alexander was a prolific writer and lecturer, and was said to understand humanity completely. He worked on philosophy, religion and mythology, anthropology, poetry, and the interpretation of symbols. He focused on North American Indian art, lore, mythology, and philosophy. Alexander was the first non-Indian philosopher to seriously study and publish on North American Indian art, mythology, and philosophy. During his university career he also wrote several books and many essays on metaphysics, religion, ethics, social and political theory, and education.

Early in Alexander's career, he decided on the foundations of his philosophy: metaphysics and all fields of knowledge are ultimately grounded in human experience, which must be philosophically ultimate yet mediated by culture. Unlike idealism, which wrongly equates consciousness with experience, Alexander's view sets individual consciousness within the wider setting of human experience of the world, so that reality is always reality-for-us, and the sig-nificance of our intellectual achievements is measured by their ability to satisfy our purposes. In a way similar to John DEWEY's empirical pragmatism, Alexander rejected both absolute idealism and materialism as excessively rationalist, and rescued values from epiphenomenal status by locating them in the experienced world, instead of private consciousness. Alexander's "moral idealism" turns philosophy away from its alliance with the quest of physics to discover the ultimate unchanging quality, towards the dynamic drama of life. In his "Drama as a Cosmic Category" (1930) he asserts the Drama is the ultimate mode of explanation.

Alexander's philosophy was anthropological, ethnological, and symbolic. Alexander explored the multifaceted complexities of reality made manifest in the symbols of our basic belief systems. Therefore, the arts and religions of all cultures connect us to reality just as much as "objective" science, yielding for Alexander a profound ability to deeply sympathize with and understand many other cultures. Alexander's own broadly Christian religious faith, as he describes in "Apologia Pro Fide" (1920), is grounded in a fundamental moral dualism of good and evil, and a promise of salvation. His last two books, *Truth and the Faith: An Interpretation of Christianity* (1929) and *God and Man's Destiny: Inquiries into the Metaphysical Foundations of Faith* (1936), develop a philosophical theology defending basic Christian creeds and values.

Alexander applied his philosophy in his collaboration with the principal architect on the Nebraska State Capitol building. Alexander's philosophical ideals and study of mythology are evident in his choice of decorative schemes and inscriptions. His inscription over the main entrance of the Capitol declares, "The Salvation of the State is Watchfulness of the Citizen." The success of this work brought him commissions to help design other notable structures, including the Joslyn Art Museum in Omaha, the Oregon State Capitol, the Rockefeller Center in New York, and the Los Angeles Public Library.

Alexander explored democracy in several interesting philosophical works. His writings during World War I, collected in *Liberty and Democracy, and Other Essays in War-time* (1918), represent both his support for the war, and his dismay at the downfall of traditional democracy, as America discovered the hollowness of romanticized laissez-faire freedom and Europe reinvented the tyrannical machinery of state-worship. Alexander suggests a conception of freedom as rational control of one's abilities. Such freedom will foster genuine individualism, with only sympathetic understanding to hold individuals together. The solution to the problem of maintaining a spiritual community is art, decided Alexander in "Art and the Democracy" (1918), since it is art's function to energize and sustain the common symbols of both religion and politics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Problem of Metaphysics and the Meaning of Metaphysical Explanation: An Essay in Definitions (New York, 1902).

Poetry and the Individual: An Analysis of the Imaginative Life in relation to the Creative Spirit in Man and Nature (New York, 1906).

Odes on the Generations of Man (New York, 1910).

Liberty and Democracy, and Other Essays in War-time (Boston, 1918).

Letters to Teachers, and Other Papers of the Hour (Chicago, 1919).

Nature and Human Nature: Essays Metaphysical and Historical (Chicago, 1923).

L'Art et la philosophie des Indiens de l'Amérique du Nord (Paris, 1926).

Truth and the Faith: An Interpretation of Christianity (New York, 1929).

God and Man's Destiny: Inquiries into the Metaphysical Foundations of Faith (Oxford, 1936).

Other Relevant Works

"The Spring of Salvation," *International Journal of Ethics* 14 (1904): 209–19.

"The Concept of Consciousness," *Journal of Philosophy* 1 (1904): 118–24.

"The Evolution of Ideals," *International Journal of Ethics* 16 (1906): 311–32.

The Religious Spirit of the American Indian, as shown in the Development of His Religious Rites and Customs (Chicago, 1910).

"The Goodness and Beauty of Truth," *Journal of Philosophy* 8 (1911): 5–21, 29–37.

"The Conception of 'Soul'," *Journal of Philosophy* 9 (1912): 421–30.

"Justice and Progress," *Journal of Philosophy* 12 (1915): 207–12.

North American [Mythology], vol. 10 of *The Mythology of All Races*, ed. Louis Gray (Boston, 1916).

"Liberty and Democracy," *International Journal of Ethics* 27 (1917): 131–49.

"The Fear of Machines," *International Journal of Ethics* 28 (1917): 80–93.

"Metaphysics as a Fine Art," *Journal of Philosophy* 15 (1918): 477–81.

"Art and the Democracy," *International Journal of Ethics* 29 (1918): 63–87.

"Apologia Pro Fide," *Philosophical Review* 29 (1920): 113–34.

Latin American [Mythology], vol. 11 of *The Mythology of All Races*, ed. Louis Gray (Boston, 1920).

"Philosophy in Deliquescence," *Journal of Philosophy* 17 (1920): 617–22.

Odes and Lyrics (Boston, 1922).

Manito Masks: Dramatizations, with Music, of American Indian Spirit Legends (New York, 1925).

God's Drum and Other Cycles from Indian Lore: Poems by Hartley Alexander (New York, 1927).

"Drama as a Cosmic Category," *Philosophical Review* 39 (1930): 105–26.

"Self-discovery and World-discovery," *The Personalist* 30 (1949): 257–69.

The World's Rim: Great Mysteries of the North American Indians (Lincoln, Nebr., 1953; New York, 1999).

Further Reading

Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*,
Dict Amer Bio, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v46*,
Pres Addr of APA v2, *Proc of APA in Phil
Rev v49*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Cailliet, Emile. *Hartley Burr Alexander: A
Biography* (Decorah, Iowa, 1992).

———, "In Memoriam, Hartley Burr
Alexander, 1873–1939," in *Scripps
College Bulletin*, vol. 15, no. 1
(Claremont, Cal., 1940), pp. 1–14.

Masters, Margaret D. *Hartley Burr
Alexander: Writer-in-stone* (Lincoln, Neb.,
1992).

Richard T. Hull
John R. Shook

ALLAIRE, Edwin Bonar, Jr. (1930–)

Edwin Allaire was born on 29 August 1930 in
Bayonne, New Jersey. He received his BA in
1956 from Drew University; and his MA in
1958 and PhD in philosophy in 1960 from the
University of Iowa, working primarily with
Gustav BERGMANN. His dissertation was titled
"A Critical Examination of Wittgenstein's
Tractatus." In 1960 Allaire became instructor of
philosophy at Iowa, and was soon promoted to
full professor. He served as chair of the depart-
ment from 1965 to 1967. He was visiting asso-
ciate professor at the University of Michigan in
1966–7, and visiting professor at Swarthmore
College in Pennsylvania in 1968–9. In 1969
Allaire became professor of philosophy at the
University of Texas, and has remained at Texas
as one of its prominent practitioners in analytic
philosophy and modern philosophy.

Allaire's work on Wittgenstein's *Tractatus*
and later writings has been widely influential.
One important contribution concerns a
problem with seemingly contradictory propo-
sitions such as "a point can be both red and
green at the same time," which results from
logically conjoining two elementary proposi-
tions. Allaire persuasively argued that
Wittgenstein's attempts to account for the
meaningfulness of such propositions substan-
tially shaped his later "meaning as use" con-
ception of language. Allaire's interests in the
phenomenology of basic or "given" experi-
ence helped to inspire his defense of realism:
both a realism about the existence of universals
and a realism toward the perceived existence of
nonmental objects. His realism is designed to
resolve the longstanding problems of individ-
uation and universals.

In "Bare Particulars" (1963) Allaire explains
how two identical spots of color next to each
other are ontologically different and can be
discriminated as such. Each spot, over and
above its color and spatial properties (as rela-
tions cannot individuate), is a bare particular
with which the observer is acquainted through
perception. Allaire's defense of bare particulars
helped to stimulate a robust debate over indi-
viduation, universals, and the realism–nomi-
nalism debate that energized analytic meta-
physics for the rest of the twentieth century.

Allaire's study of the realism–idealism struggle
in modern philosophy has further revealed how
the question of the priority of epistemology or
ontology has shaped the development of the
Anglo-American empiricist tradition. His critical
expositions of Berkeley's idealism have been
particularly influential; a volume titled
*Berkeley's Metaphysics: Structural, Interpretive,
and Critical Essays* (1995), to which he con-
tributed a new essay, celebrates Allaire's con-
tributions to Berkeley studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Tractatus 6:3751," *Analysis* 19 (1959):
100–105.

"Negative Facts and Belief," *Philosophical
Studies* 11 (1960): 1–2.

"Existence, Independence, and Universals,"
Philosophical Review 69 (1960): 485–96.

"Berkeley's Idealism," *Theoria* 29 (1963):
229–44.

"Bare Particulars," *Philosophical Studies* 14 (1963): 1–7.

"The Tractatus: Nominalistic or Realistic?" in *Essays in Ontology*, by Edwin Allaire et al. (Iowa City, Iowa, 1963).

"The Attack on Substance: Descartes to Hume," *Dialogue* 3 (1964): 284–7.

"Another Look at Bare Particulars," *Philosophical Studies* 16 (1965): 16–20.

"The Circle of Ideas and the Circularity of the Meditations," *Dialogue* 5 (1966): 131–53.

"Things, Relations and Identity," *Philosophy of Science* 34 (1967): 260–72.

"Relations and the Problem of Individuation," *Philosophical Studies* 19 (1968): 61–3.

"Wolterstorff and Bradley on Ontology," *Journal of Philosophy* 70 (1973): 727–33.

"Truth," *Metaphilosophy* 6 (1975): 261–76.

"Ontologically Speaking, Things are —," *Theoria* 42 (1976): 93–114.

"Relations: Recreational Remarks," *Philosophical Studies* 34 (1978): 81–9.

"Berkeley's Idealism Revisited," in *Berkeley: Critical and Interpretive Essays*, ed. Colin Turbayne (Minneapolis, 1982), pp. 197–206.

"Berkeley's Idealism: Yet Another Visit," in *Berkeley's Metaphysics: Structural, Interpretive, and Critical Essays*, ed. Robert G. Muehlmann (University Park, Penn., 1995).

Further Reading

Addis, Laird. "Particulars and Acquaintance," *Philosophy of Science* 34 (1967): 251–9.

Chappell, Vere C. "Particulars Re-clothed," *Philosophical Studies* 15 (1964): 60–64.

Meiland, Jack W. "Do Relations Individuate," *Philosophical Studies* 17 (1966): 65–8.

Moreland, James P. *Universals* (Montréal, 2001).

John R. Shook

ALLISON, Henry Edward (1937–)

Henry E. Allison was born on 25 April 1937 in New York City. He received his BA from Yale University in 1959, and his MA in religion from Columbia University's joint program with the Union Theological Seminary. He received his PhD in philosophy from the New School for Social Research in 1964, writing a dissertation on "Lessing and the Environment." His teaching career began as an assistant professor of philosophy at the State University of New York at Potsdam in 1964–5, and at Pennsylvania State University from 1965 to 1968. From 1968 to 1973 Allison was associate professor of philosophy at the University of Florida, and from 1973 to 1996 he was professor of philosophy at the University of California at San Diego. While at San Diego, he served as department chair from 1978 to 1982. In 1996 Allison became professor of philosophy at Boston University, and in 2004 he joined the philosophy faculty of the University of California at Davis in a part-time capacity.

Allison has been a visiting professor at Yale and Princeton, and Findlay Visiting Professor at Boston University. He received a Guggenheim Fellowship in 1986–7, National Endowment for the Humanities Fellowships in 1969–70, 1980, and 1985–6, and many other honors. He was President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1996–7. He serves on several editorial boards, notably those of *Kant-Studien* and *The Monist*, along with service on the advisory boards of *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Philosophy* and the *Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant* in translation.

The breadth of Allison's scholarship extends widely across modern philosophy. He has published on British empiricists, continental rationalism, Kant, Hegel, and post-Hegelian continental philosophy. His outstanding work on the philosophy of Kant, particularly his book *Kant's Transcendental Idealism* (1983), which

examines the *Critique of Pure Reason*, elevated him to the status of one of the most significant interpreters of Kant in the twentieth century. Allison's exposition presents Kant's transcendental idealism as a viable system of thought in its entirety, deviating from the usual effort to salvage only portions of Kant's philosophy. His subsequent books on Kant concern themes from the second and third critiques. Kant scholars rarely have produced such influential commentaries and defenses of Kant's entire system.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Lessing and the Enlightenment (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1966).

The Kant–Eberhard Controversy (Baltimore, 1973).

Benedict de Spinoza (Boston, 1975; New Haven, 1987).

Kant's Transcendental Idealism: An Interpretation and Defense (New Haven, Conn., 1983; 2nd edn, 2004).

Kant's Theory of Freedom (Cambridge, UK, 1990).

Idealism and Freedom: Essays in Kant's Theoretical and Practical Philosophy (Cambridge, UK, 1996).

Kant's Theory of Taste: A Reading of the Critique of Aesthetic Judgment (Cambridge, UK, 2001).

Other Relevant Works

"Locke's Theory of Personal Identity," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 27 (1966): 41–58.

"Christianity and Nonsense," *Review of Metaphysics* 20 (1967): 432–60.

"Bishop Berkeley's Petitio," *The Personalist* 54 (1973): 232–44.

"Kant's Critique of Spinoza," in *The Philosophy of Baruch Spinoza*, ed. Richard Kennington (Washington, D.C., 1980), pp. 199–228.

"Justification and Freedom in the Critique of Practical Reason," in *Kant's Transcendental Deductions*, ed. Eckhart Förster (Stanford, Cal., 1989), pp. 114–30.

"Kant on Freedom: A Reply to My Critics," *Inquiry* 36 (1993): 233–52.

"On Naturalizing Kant's Transcendental Psychology," *Dialectica* 49 (1995): 335–51.

"Personal and Professional," *Harvard Review of Philosophy* 6 (Spring 1996): 31–45.

"We Can Act Only Under the Idea of Freedom," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 71 (November 1997): 39–50.

"Morality and Freedom: Kant's Reciprocity Thesis," in *Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals: Critical Essays*, ed. Paul Guyer (Lanham, Md., 1998), pp. 273–302.

Ed. with Peter Heath, *Theoretical Philosophy after 1781*, by Immanuel Kant (Cambridge, UK, 2002).

"Reply to the Comments of Longuenesse and Ginsborg," *Inquiry* 46 (2003): 182–94.

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v10

Baron, Marcia. "Freedom, Frailty, and Impurity," *Inquiry* 36 (1993): 431–41.

Kitcher, Patricia. "On Interpreting Kant's Thinker as Wittgenstein's 'I'," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 61 (2000): 33–63.

Longuenesse, Beatrice. "Kant's Theory of Judgment, and Judgments of Taste: On Henry Allison's *Kant's Theory of Taste*," *Inquiry* 46 (2003): 143–63.

Westphal, Kenneth. "Freedom and the Distinction between Phenomena and Noumena: Is Allison's View Methodological, Metaphysical, or Equivocal?" *Journal of Philosophical Research* 26 (2001): 593–622.

John R. Shook

ALLPORT, Gordon Willard (1897–1967)

Gordon W. Allport was born on 11 November 1897 in Montezuma, Indiana, and grew up in Cleveland, Ohio. Like his brother, Floyd Henry Allport, who also became a prominent psychologist, Gordon went to Harvard University to study psychology and social ethics. After receiving his BA in 1919, he then earned his PhD in psychology in 1922, working primarily with Herbert Langfeld. His dissertation was titled "An Experimental Study of the Traits of Personality: With Special Reference to the Problem of Social Diagnosis." Two years of study at the German universities of Berlin and Hamburg introduced him to Gestalt, holistic, and structuralist approaches to understanding human behavior.

From 1924 to 1926 Allport was an instructor in Harvard's department of social ethics. He then was an assistant professor of psychology at Dartmouth College from 1926 to 1930, after which he returned to Harvard as professor of psychology. Allport helped establish Harvard's department of social relations in 1946, uniting psychology, sociology, and anthropology, and was appointed the first Richard Clarke Cabot Professor of Social Ethics shortly before his death. From 1937 to 1949 he was the editor of the *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. He was President of the American Psychological Association in 1939, and President of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues in 1944. In 1963 he was awarded the Gold Medal of the American Psychological Foundation, and in 1964 he received the Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award of the American Psychological Association. Allport died on 9 October 1967 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Allport's psychology and philosophy centered around human personality. Rejecting the mechanistic behaviorism of John B. WATSON, he developed a humanistic and value-oriented theory of the person. Although he placed himself in the tradition of William JAMES, and similarly held great respect for religion and mysticism, his approach moved toward a social psychology. The development of unique and individual personality, for Allport, should be studied in its social environment. His greatest contribution to psychological theory was *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation* (1937). A broadly liberal attitude and socially progressive views on the proper work of social psychology resulted in further influential studies, *The Psychology of Rumor* (1947) and *The Nature of Prejudice* (1954). Allport's legacy has been continued by humanistic and positive psychologies that became more respected toward the end of the twentieth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Studies in Expressive Movement, with Philip E. Vernon and Edwin Powers (New York, 1933).

Personality: A Psychological Interpretation (New York, 1937); rev. edn, *Pattern and Growth in Personality* (New York, 1961).

The Psychology of Rumor, with Leo J. Postman (New York, 1947).

The Individual and His Religion: A Psychological Interpretation (New York, 1950).

The Nature of Prejudice (Cambridge, Mass., 1954).

Becoming: Basic Considerations for a Psychology of Personality (New Haven, Conn., 1955).

Personality and Social Encounter: Selected Essays (Boston, 1960).

The Person in Psychology: Selected Essays (Boston, 1968).

Other Relevant Works

Allport's papers are at Harvard University.

"The Historical Background of Modern Social Psychology," in *Handbook of Social Psychology*, ed. Edwin G. Boring and Gardner Lindzey (New York, 1954), vol. 1, pp. 1–46.

"Gordon W. Allport," in *A History of Psychology in Autobiography*, ed. Edwin G. Boring and Gardner Lindzey (New

York, 1967), vol. 5, pp. 1–26.

Waiting for the Lord: Meditations on God and Man, ed. Peter A. Bertocci (1978).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Encyc Psych*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Craik, Kenneth H., Robert Hogan, and Raymond N. Wolfe, eds. *Fifty Years of Personality Psychology* (New York, 1993).

De Carvalho, Roy. *The Founders of Humanistic Psychology* (1991).

Evans, Richard I. *Dialogue with Gordon Allport* (New York, 1981).

Hall, Calvin, and Gardner Lindzey. *Theories of Personality* (1970).

Maddi, Salvatore R., and Paul T. Costa. *Humanism in Personology: Allport, Maslow, and Murray* (Chicago, 1972).

Nicholson, Ian. *Inventing Personality: Gordon Allport and the Science of Selfhood* (Washington, D.C., 2003).

Ruggiero, Karen M., and Herbert C. Kelman, eds. "Prejudice and Intergroup Relations: Papers in Honor of Gordon W. Allport's Centennial," *Journal of Social Issues* 55 (Fall 1999). Special issue about Allport.

John R. Shook

ALSTON, William Payne (1921–)

William P. Alston was born on 29 November 1921 in Shreveport, Louisiana, to Eunice Schoolfield and William Alston. After graduating from high school at age fifteen, he studied music at Centenary College. During World War II, he was stationed in Northern California (1942–6) where he played clarinet and bass drum in an army band and piano in a dance band. A trip to the Berkeley library put him in touch with Jacques MARITAIN's *Introduction to Philosophy* and resulted in his deep and extensive reading in the history of philosophy. Toward the end of the war, Alston's knowledge of philosophy so impressed Charner PERRY, chair of the philosophy department at the University of Chicago, that he was permitted to enter the graduate program without previous study of philosophy.

Alston's education continued at Chicago, aided mainly by Richard MCKEON and Charles HARTSHORNE. He defended a dissertation on the metaphysics of Alfred North WHITEHEAD and received his PhD in philosophy in 1951. His first appointment was at the University of Michigan as a professor of philosophy from 1949 to 1971, where he became familiar with contemporary analytic philosophy. He later held appointments at Rutgers University from 1971 to 1976, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign from 1976 to 1980, and Syracuse University from 1980 to 1992. Alston became professor emeritus at Syracuse in 1992, where he continued to teach until 2000.

During his career, Alston was President of the Western (now Central) Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1978–9, President of the Society for Philosophy and Psychology in 1977, and President of the Society of Christian Philosophers. He is founding editor of *Faith and Philosophy*, the journal of the Society of Christian Philosophers (which he co-founded); the *Journal of Philosophical Research*; and *Cornell Studies in the Philosophy of Religion*. A recipient of numerous honors and fellowships, Alston became a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1990.

Alston is best known for his work in philosophy of language, metaphysics, epistemology, philosophy of religion, and philosophical theology. Early in his career, Alston helped break the stranglehold on philosophy of the verifiability criterion of meaning. His most significant work in philosophy of language focuses on what it is for a sentence to have lin-

guistic meaning. Two themes dominate his answer: illocutionary acts, and the relation of meaning to use and rule-governance. An illocutionary act is uttering a sentence with specific content. To illustrate: if I issue a command under typical circumstances, "Please pick up your toys," the illocutionary act I perform is *commanding my son to pick up his toys*. In issuing this command, I *take responsibility* for certain conditions being satisfied – that he has some toys, that he is able to pick them up, and that I want them to be picked up, and so on – and I open myself to sanctions if these conditions are not satisfied. Generally, performing an illocutionary act by uttering a sentence subjects one's utterance to an *illocutionary rule*, a rule implying that one may perform that act only if certain conditions are satisfied. Alston groups illocutionary acts into five categories: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and exercitives. For each category, and for many types within each category, Alston specifies the conditions speakers take responsibility for in uttering a sentence of that category and type.

To understand the meaning of a sentence is to recognize its relation to use and rule-governance, and illocutionary acts are central to this recognition. A sentence's having a certain meaning is its being usable for a certain role in communication, in the illocutionary acts one uses it to perform. Thus, (1) a sentence's having a certain meaning consists in its being *usable* to perform illocutionary acts of a certain type. Also, a sentence's being usable to perform an illocutionary act of a certain type is its being subject to a certain illocutionary rule; thus, (2) a sentence's having a certain meaning consists in its being subject to a certain illocutionary rule. Illocutionary acts unite meaning with use and rule-governance; (1) and (2) are different ways of saying the same thing. Alston's development of his theory spans nearly fifty years, culminating in *Illocutionary Acts and Sentence Meaning* (2000).

Alston espouses versions of realism about truth and reality. In *A Realist Conception of Truth* (1996), he defends alethic realism, the twin thesis that the truth-value of a proposition depends entirely on whether what it is about is as it purports, and that truth is an important property. The first thesis, the realist conception of truth, is about our ordinary concept of truth; it is not a thesis about the property of truth, although it does presuppose that truth is a property. Thus, Alston's realist conception of truth contrasts with deflationary theories of truth, according to which talk that appears to predicate a truth-value of propositions does not in fact do so, and epistemic conceptions of truth, according to which the truth-value of a proposition, belief or statement depends entirely on whether, or the extent to which, it is justified, warranted, or rational. Alston's realist conception of truth, although compatible with the correspondence theory of truth, does not require it; and it is compatible with global metaphysical antirealism, the view that all of reality is, at least in part, relative to our conceptual choices.

Alston attempts to decide some of these metaphysical issues in *A Sensible Metaphysical Realism* (2001). If global metaphysical antirealism is to avoid absurdities, the sort of dependence posited between reality and conceptualization must be constitutive dependence, not causal dependence. To illustrate the difference: in a nonabsolute space and time, how fast a train is moving is relative to a framework; the framework does not cause the motion of the train – the engine does that – but rather constitutes what it is for the train to be moving at that speed. An alternative to antirealism is global metaphysical realism, the view that no part of reality is in any way relative to conceptualization. Alston does not accept this version of realism but nevertheless regards it as a datum of common sense that should be denied only for excellent reasons. Alston arrives at a *via media* between realism and antirealism, a sensible metaphysical realism: vast stretches of reality are in no way relative to conceptualization, but some aspects of it are.

In epistemology, Alston has contributed work on knowledge and justification. Mere true belief is not knowledge. Traditionally, the difference between true belief and knowledge is said to be justification; knowledge is justified true belief. Many reject the traditional view on the grounds that although justification is necessary for knowledge, it is not sufficient; Alston argues it is not even necessary. What then is justification? Alston distinguishes two families of concepts of justification, each of which has many members. According to the deontological family, beliefs are justified just in case one who holds them violates no duties or obligations relevant to getting at the truth. According to the truth-conducive family, beliefs are justified just in case one who holds them does so on adequate grounds and is unaware of defeaters. Alston opts for the latter family, arguing that the former mistakenly presupposes that we have voluntary control over our believing activity. Furthermore, the adequacy of grounds consists in their making beliefs based on them very likely to be true; and, while the adequacy of the grounds need not be internally accessible to believers in order for their beliefs to be justified, the grounds themselves must be thus accessible.

Alston distinguishes direct justification from indirect justification. An indirectly justified belief owes its justification to other beliefs or their interrelations; a directly justified belief is one that is not indirectly justified. According to Alston, indirectly justified beliefs ultimately owe their justification to directly justified beliefs, and many of our mundane beliefs about the immediate environment are directly justified by experience. This theory is a version of foundationalism. Anti-foundationalists often assume that individuals' beliefs are not justified unless they are justified in believing those beliefs justified, an assumption that precludes directly justified beliefs. In response, Alston distinguishes lower-level beliefs (beliefs not about the justificatory status of other beliefs) from higher-level beliefs (beliefs about the justificatory status of other beliefs). He shows how a viable foundationalism can hold lower-level beliefs justified though their higher-level correlates are not justified. Anti-foundationalists also assume that directly justified beliefs must be immune from doubt or error, an assumption that invites skepticism. Again in response, Alston shows how a viable foundationalism need not require such immunities of its directly justified beliefs.

In *The Reliability of Sense Perception* (1993), Alston argues that all arguments for the reliability of sense perception run afoul of epistemic circularity problems; all require assuming in practice the reliability of sense perception. This feature characterizes every basic source of belief, including memory, reason, and introspection. Nevertheless, Alston argues, it is rational to form beliefs on the basis of sense perceptual experience, and to regard it as reliable, since there is no practical alternative to doing so. As for the nature of perception itself, Alston is primarily concerned to characterize what is distinctive about perceptual experience in contrast with other modes of cognition such as memory and reflection, and he aims to do so in a way that best explains how such experience can be a source of justification and knowledge. Toward that end, he advocates the theory of appearing, the view that what is most fundamental to perceptual experience of physical objects is their appearing to perceivers in specific ways. The view is best understood in contrast with its two main rivals. In contrast with the adverbial theory of Roderick Chisholm, which holds that perceptual experience is merely a way of being conscious, the theory of appearing insists that perception is irreducibly relational; it consists in an object's appearing to a subject, or, equivalently, in an object's presenting itself to a subject. In contrast with the once popular sense-data theory – a theory holding that perceptual experience consists in internal mental objects appearing to the subject – the theory of appearing insists that, typically, physical objects themselves appear to the subject. As for explaining how experience can directly justify

belief, both adverbial and sense-data theories must forge a link external to experience itself in order to account for how it justifies beliefs; according to the theory of appearing, on the contrary, beliefs are directly justified because they register what is present within experience itself.

In his more recent "Epistemic Desiderata" (1993) and *Beyond "Justification": Dimensions of Epistemic Evaluation* (2004), Alston argues that there is no justification understood as a single item over which epistemologists differ. Rather, competing theories of justification express an array of good-making features beliefs might have. Exactly how much of Alston's previous views are compatible with this later expression is unclear.

Alston is best known for his work in philosophy of religion and philosophical theology. He has been at the forefront of the recent trend among Anglo-American Christian philosophers to take more seriously the Augustinian motto, "faith seeking understanding." Living out that motto in his own case resulted in work on the Trinity, the Resurrection, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, prayer, biblical criticism, and the evidential value of the fulfillment of divine promises for spiritual and moral development.

Alston's epistemology of religious experience has been quite influential; as have his contributions to understanding religious discourse and such other matters as whether broadly Freudian explanations of religious belief, and of suffering, defeat the justifications usually offered on behalf of religious belief. Many have assumed that a religious belief can owe its justification to religious experience only indirectly, by being a conclusion in an argument whose premises describe the experience. In contrast with this argumentative model and consonant with his moderate foundationalism, Alston develops a model according to which persons' beliefs about the activities, intentions, and character of God can owe their justification, in no small part, directly to their own religious experience, in much the way that ordinary perceptual beliefs about our immediate environment can owe their justification directly to mundane perceptual experience and not to arguments. What is distinctive about Alston's model is the notion of a doxastic practice, a socially learned, monitored, and reinforced constellation of dispositions and habits, each of which yields a certain belief from certain input.

Two aspects of doxastic practices are fundamental. The most basic doxastic practices are the sole access to a certain stretch of reality; for example, the practice of forming beliefs directly on the basis of sense perception provides our sole access to the physical environment. Second, basic doxastic practices contain an overrider system of beliefs and procedures that its adherents can use to check for reliability in particular cases. Alston applies his doxastic practice epistemology to the practice of forming beliefs about an ultimate religious reality directly on the basis of what its adherents take to be experience of that reality. While this characterization of his project emphasizes the first aspect mentioned above, it does so at the expense of the second, because different religious traditions have divergent doctrinal beliefs about ultimate reality, and their checking procedures likewise vary; and thus their overrider systems vary. Alston pursues more narrowly individuated doxastic practices – the Christian experiential doxastic practice, for example. According to Alston, there is no good reason to think that the Christian practice is unreliable, and significantly, the variety and diversity of doxastic religious practices provide no such reason. Although like any other basic doxastic practice, Christian practice cannot be shown in a noncircular way to be reliable, it does display marks of significant self-support; consequently, those who engage in it may be regarded as practically rational.

Alston rejects the trend in academic theology to treat apparently literal religious assertions as something else. Against theological antirealists of various kinds, he argues that what look like

determinate assertions are genuinely what they seem, and that their truth or falsity is independent of our conceptual choices. Against those who think that thought and talk about God are irreducibly symbolic or metaphorical, he argues that even though such thought derives from our thought about creatures, and even though there is a vast gulf between the nature of God and of creatures, it remains possible to speak of God literally; indeed, if we can metaphorically express truth about God, then it is in principle possible literally to express the same truth about God. Alston is especially concerned to defend the view that personal predicates – predicates that apply distinctively to persons, including predicates ascribing actions – can apply literally to an incorporeal being. Alston suggests two possibilities for how this kind of dual predication is possible. The first is that, even if a personal predicate can apply literally only to embodied persons, that condition of application leaves intact a distinctive conceptual core that may also apply literally to disembodied persons; Alston argues that this is true of most personal predicates ordinary believers apply to God, including such predicates as "making," "commanding," "guiding," and "forgiving." The second is Alston's use of a functionalist account of personal predicates to argue that divine perfection and atemporality are not barriers to their literal application to a divine being.

The scope and depth of Alston's work has significantly affected generations of American students and professional philosophers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Philosophy of Language (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964).
Epistemic Justification: Essays in the Theory of Knowledge (Ithaca, N.Y., 1989).
Divine Nature and Human Language: Essays in Philosophical Theology (Ithaca, N.Y., 1989).
Perceiving God: The Epistemology of Religious Experience (Ithaca, N.Y., 1991).
The Reliability of Sense Perception (Ithaca, N.Y., 1993).
A Realist Conception of Truth (Ithaca, N.Y., 1996).
Illocutionary Acts and Sentence Meaning (Ithaca, N.Y., 2000).
A Sensible Metaphysical Realism (Milwaukee, Wisc., 2001).
Beyond "Justification": Dimensions of Epistemic Evaluation (Ithaca, N.Y., 2004).

Other Relevant Works
"Epistemic Desiderata," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 53 (1993): 527–51.
"A Philosopher's Way Back to Faith," in *God and the Philosophers: The Reconciliation of Faith and Reason*, ed. T. V. Morris (Oxford, 1994), pp. 19–30.
"How to Think About Reliability," *Philosophical Topics* 23 (1995): 1–29.
"Back to the Theory of Appearing," *Philosophical Perspectives* 13 (1999): 181–204.
"Religious Language and Verificationism," in *The Rationality of Theism*, ed. P. Copan and P. K. Moser (London and New York, 2003), pp. 17–34.

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v8*
Lynch, Michael, and Heather Battaly, eds. *Perspectives on the Philosophy of William P. Alston* (Lanham, Md., 2005).
McLeod, Mark S. *Rationality and Theistic Belief: An Essay on Reformed Epistemology* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1993).
Plantinga, Alvin. "Alstonian Justification," in *Warrant: The Current Debate* (Oxford, 1993).
———, *Warranted Christian Belief* (Oxford, 2000).
Senor, T. D., ed. *The Rationality of Belief and the Plurality of Faith: Essays in Honor of William P. Alston* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1995).
"Symposium on Perceiving God,"

Philosophy and Phenomenological Research 54 (1994): 863–99.

Daniel Howard-Snyder

ALTIZER, Thomas Jonathan Jackson (1927–)

Thomas J. J. Altizer was born on 28 September 1927 in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and grew up in Charleston, West Virginia. He is a descendant and namesake of Confederate general Stonewall Jackson. He attended the University of Chicago (BA 1948, MA 1951, PhD 1955) and wrote a dissertation on Greek and Eastern religious philosophy. He taught religion at Wabash College from 1954 to 1956, Emory University from 1956 to 1968, and State University of New York at Stony Brook as professor of religious studies in the English department from 1968 to 1996.

Altizer was the lead spokesperson for, and motivating force behind, the "death of God" movement of the 1960s. He also served as the key theoretician for what came to be known as "radical theology" during the late 1960s and 1970s. Altizer exerted a considerable influence on the early phase of American religious postmodernism, particularly the work of Mark C. Taylor and Charles Winquist.

Unlike his contemporaries, Altizer has consistently written in a self-described "visionary" style, which combines the oracular nature of poetry with a metaphysical grandeur characteristic of those modern authors whom he has repeatedly cited as influences and mentors. Those figures include John Milton, William Blake, G. W. F. Hegel, Friedrich Nietzsche, and James Joyce. Although throughout his career Altizer has considered himself primarily as a Christian theologian, his impact has been almost exclusively on those academic writers who sought in the last quarter of the twentieth century to transform the traditional discipline of theology into the secular academic field of religious studies.

From the outset of his career, Altizer focused on setting a course and developing a rhetoric that diverged dramatically from the school of neo-orthodoxy that dominated American theology and the theological profession. Altizer's earliest work focused on Eastern mysticism and the application to theology of the thought of famed historian of religions, Mircea ELIADE.

In the mid 1960s Altizer became a well-known public figure with the appearance of his book *The Gospel of Christian Atheism* (1966) and his declaration, along with fellow theologian William Hamilton, that "God is dead." Their popularization of Nietzsche's slogan within the seminaries and mainline churches of the day quickly captured national headlines and ignited a storm of controversy that culminated in a cover story by *Time* magazine.

Much of the general public, together with most conservative Christians, to this day have heeded only the shock value of Altizer's message. But, in his proclamation of God's death, Altizer hit upon a startling and original insight that, according to some interpreters, stopped Christian neo-orthodoxy dead in its tracks and paved the way for what a later generation of religious postmodernists would dub "the end of theology" itself. Altizer's subsequent books are rich and subtle variations on this theme.

Altizer elaborated, in the context of late twentieth-century Protestant religious thought, the deeper implications of nineteenth-century German idealism and existential philosophy. Because he continued throughout his career to write in his own unique declamatory style, without citing other contemporary theological writers, his importance as a crucial bridge to postmodernism is frequently overlooked. Altizer built his "radical" or "death-of-God" theology on the notion, first intimated by Luther and later accorded pride of place by

Hegel in his *Phenomenology of Spirit*, that God's incarnation through Christ's sacrifice on the cross inaugurates a new historical era in which divinity can no longer be conceived as transcendent, but must be understood as wholly immanent. Following Paul's assertion that God "emptied" himself by becoming human (Philippians 2:7) through death and suffering, Altizer views the crucifixion as the moment in which the infinite is utterly identified with, and absorbed into, the finite. This divine self-emptying, or *kenosis*, is what is meant by the saying "God is dead," an event not genuinely acknowledged until the dawn of modern consciousness.

The modern era is, at the same time, an "apocalyptic" one, inasmuch as it manifests God's "total presence," a total presence experienced in solitude, loss of individuality, the recovery of a thoroughly "archaic identity," and the realization of "purely immediate speech." Altizer understands modern "atheism" as the fulfillment of all Christian history. Modernity itself is the "total silence and emptiness of an original abyss" that has become "an immediately present chaos" where the "resurrected Christ" is "inseparable and indistinguishable from the crucified Christ" (1985, p. 254).

During the 1990s Altizer's writings dwelt on the theme of apocalypse as a term "indistinguishable" from both crucifixion and creation. In *Genesis and Apocalypse* (1990), Altizer characterizes this moment as "an alien nothingness that is absolutely irreversible" (p. 178). In *The Genesis of God* (1993), he describes apocalypse as "genesis," as an "absolutely new act," which is the "disappearance of the will of the Creator" and the full realization of freedom. Altizer, like the epic authors he repeatedly references, has sought to delineate a new modern mythology under the cover of rewriting Christian theology. This mythology constitutes a "reversal" of the doctrine of incarnate *logos*, where flesh now becomes "word."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Oriental Mysticism and Biblical Eschatology (Philadelphia, 1961).

Mircea Eliade and the Dialectic of the Sacred (Philadelphia, 1963).

The Gospel of Christian Atheism (Philadelphia, 1966).

Radical Theology and the Death of God, with William Hamilton (Indianapolis, 1966).

The New Apocalypse: The Radical Christian Vision of William Blake (East Lansing, Mich., 1967).

The Descent into Hell: A Study of the Radical Reversal of the Christian Consciousness (Philadelphia, 1970).

"The Buddhist Ground of the Whiteheadian God," *Process Studies* 5 (1975): 227–36.

The Self-Embodiment of God (New York, 1977).

Total Presence: The Language of Jesus and the Language of Today (New York, 1980).

Deconstruction and Theology (New York, 1982).

History as Apocalypse (Albany, N.Y., 1985).

Genesis and Apocalypse: A Theological Voyage toward Authentic Christianity (Louisville, Kent., 1990).

The Genesis of God (Louisville, Kent., 1993).

The Contemporary Jesus (Albany, N.Y., 1997).

Godhead and the Nothing (Albany, N.Y., 2003).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Truth, Myth, and Symbol* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1962).

Ed., *Toward a New Christianity: Readings in the Death of God Theology* (New York, 1967).

Ed. with David Ray Griffin, *John Cobb's Theology in Process* (Philadelphia, 1977).

"The Challenge of Nihilism," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 62 (1994): 1013–23.

"The Contemporary Challenge of Radical Catholicism," *Journal of Religion* 74

(1994): 184–91.

"The Otherness of God as an Image of
Satan," in *The Otherness of God*, ed.
Orrin F. Summerell (Charlottesville, Virg.,
1998).

"Self-saving of God," in *The Blackwell
Companion to Postmodern Theology*, ed.
Graham Ward (Oxford, 2001).

Further Reading
Cobb, John B., Jr., ed. *The Theology of
Altizer: Critique and Response*
(Philadelphia, 1970).
Ogletree, Thomas W. *The Death of God
Controversy* (Nashville, Tenn., 1966).

Carl A. Raschke

AMES, Edward Scribner (1870–1958)

Edward S. Ames was born in Eau Claire,
Wisconsin, on 21 April 1870, and died in
Chicago, Illinois, on 29 June 1958. He received
degrees from Drake University (BA 1889, MA
1891), Yale Divinity School (BD 1892), and the
University of Chicago (PhD in philosophy,
1895). A churchman philosopher, Ames was a
participant in what William JAMES called the
"Chicago School of Philosophy," which
included pragmatists George Herbert MEAD,
Addison W. MOORE, and John DEWEY.

Ames chose Yale Divinity School's
Congregational traditionalism for his theolog-
ical studies, rejecting Harvard because of its
Unitarianism. Studying at either school was a
dramatic departure for a Disciples of Christ
Iowan, as East Coast intellectualism was con-
sidered foreign if not dangerous. At Yale, Ames
was inspired by the writings of William James,
Otto Fleiderer, Immanuel Kant, and Arthur
Schopenhauer, and he began investigations into
the religious dimensions of human psychology.
In 1894 the founding President of the
University of Chicago, William Rainey Harper,
offered Ames a fellowship in philosophy. At
Chicago, Ames had a religious awakening, a
realization that the ideas of Alexander
Campbell, imbibed as a youth, mirrored the
compelling ideas of John Locke's reasonable
Christianity. It was then that Ames was able to
identify the American philosophical lineage of
liberalism that he sought to advance: "Locke's
ideas of democracy shaped the political ideas of
Thomas Jefferson; his educational views were
practiced by Horace Mann; and his religious
ideas were basic in American Unitarianism."
Ames brought a pragmatic understanding of
Christianity to his congregation and classroom,
informed by his aesthetic Christian (often
agnostic) understanding of the psychology of
religion (1959, pp. 42–3).

Ames taught religion at the newly formed
Disciples Divinity House at the University of
Chicago from 1895 to 1897, at Butler College
in Indiana from 1897 to 1900, and was pro-
fessor of philosophy at the University of
Chicago from 1900 to 1935. Ames was also the
minister of the Hyde Park Church, Disciples of
Christ, from 1900 to 1940. From 1903 to
1951, he was founder and editor of the theo-
logical journal of the Disciples movement, the
Scroll. Ames also made his mark among fellow
philosophers in developing the Disciples
Divinity House at the University of Chicago, a
non-degree-granting institution closely affili-
ated with the Divinity School, where liberal
and philosophically minded ministers and
scholars of the Disciples movement gathered to
exchange ideas and fellowship.

In 1905 Ames taught the first course at the
University of Chicago in the psychology of
religion, as part of a psychology and education
curriculum recently separated from the philos-
ophy department. For Ames, psychology
offered to religion and the churches a way of
understanding the human desire to associate,
independent of any particular need to speculate
theologically or to follow doctrines. "At the
door of most churches one is met by required
beliefs in a particular conception of God …

definite ideas concerning sin and salvation …. What people are really seeking is access to refreshing fountains of life, sources of strength and guidance." Studying religion (Protestant Christianity primarily) through the lens of early twentieth-century psychological analysis, Ames saw religious rituals and interpersonal relationships as superceding doctrine and orthodoxy for adherents (1959, pp. 92–3).

As a preacher and poet, Ames understood God as a "great spirit of love and comfort … great companion … and giver of life." As a philosopher, his description of God emphasized God as "the reality of a social process … the order of nature" over against a "metaphysical being of the anthropomorphic type" (1929, pp. 176–8). Ames believed strongly in the effectiveness of institutions, religious and educational, to embody the reality of a lived theology or philosophy. The value of an institution to individuals and society was gauged by answering the question: "What is its value for the fullest life of mankind?" (1929, p. 266).

Ames proffered the idea that "religion" in 1929 lacked the "old smoothness and momentum" – largely due to scholars who were at that time unsatisfied with traditional interpretations of Christian theology and scripture. This ensuing crisis of authority provided, for Ames, an important occasion for understanding God not as person but as process. God was not a person or deity somewhere "out there," but the word and concept individuals employed to describe their highest aspirations. For Ames, the real meaning of "God" was in his stature as "that other and larger self in which each little self lives and moves and has its being" (1959, p. 93).

His responses to early twentieth-century crises of interpretation, authority, and the relationship of science and psychology to religion were in direct opposition to an amorphous but influential Christian neo-orthodoxy and its diverse proponents, such as Karl Barth and Reinhold NIEBUHR. Neo-orthodoxy, proffered by "one-time partial 'liberals'," was for Ames a "half-hearted and inconsistent treatment of science and religion" in which one "reverts to acceptance of traditional conceptions of revelation and supernatural grace" despite higher criticism's rejection of this "supernaturalistic theology [which] hangs only by slender threads" (1970, pp. 110–11). Ames also joined social gospel adherents in arguing that the "resurgence of the old theological tradition in Protestantism ha[d] tended to influence church people to feel that … there is something secular and too humanistic in the social emphasis" (1959, p. 117). Ames's dedication to the Christian church as a natural expression of the highest human aspirations (God) was central to his philosophical writings and teaching. His greatest influence was felt by those teachers and ministers who took from his philosophy a greater understanding of the psychological and literary dimensions of religious expression.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Psychology of Religious Experience (New York, 1910).
The Divinity of Christ (Chicago, 1911).
The Higher Individualism (New York, 1915).
The New Orthodoxy (Chicago, 1918; 2nd edn 1925).
Religion (Chicago, 1929).
Letters to God and the Devil (New York, 1933).

Other Relevant Works
Ames's papers are at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, the Disciples of Christ Historical Society in Nashville, Tennessee, and the University of Chicago.
Beyond Theology: The Autobiography of Edward Scribner Ames, ed. Van Meter Ames (Chicago, 1959).
Prayers and Meditations, ed. Van Meter Ames (Chicago, 1970).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Pres Addr of APA v3*, *Proc of APA v32*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Arnold, Charles H. *Near the Edge of Battle: A Short History of the Divinity School and the Chicago School of Theology, 1866–1966* (Chicago, 1966).

"Edward Scribner Ames," *The Scroll* 49 (Spring 1958): 1–30. Special issue devoted to Ames.

Garrison, Winfred E., ed. *Faith of the Free* (Chicago, 1940). Contains a bibliography of Ames's writings.

Peden, Creighton, ed. *The Chicago School: Voices in Liberal Religious Thought* (Bristol, Ind., 1987).

Robert Wilson-Black

AMES, Van Meter (1898–1985)

Van Meter Ames was born in De Soto, Iowa, on 9 July 1898 and died in Cincinnati, Ohio, on 5 November 1985. He was son of Edward Scribner AMES, minister of the University Church of Disciples of Christ, and dean of the Disciples Divinity House of Chicago. His father was also a member of the philosophy department at the University of Chicago with John DEWEY, James TUFTS, and George MEAD. Van Meter Ames was a student at the University of Chicago, where he received a BA in philosophy in 1919 and a PhD in philosophy in 1924. He joined the faculty of the philosophy department at the University of Cincinnati in 1925 and remained there until his retirement in 1966. From 1959 until 1966, he was chair of the department. He received a Rockefeller grant to study French philosophy in France from 1948 to 1949. He became a fellow of the University of Chicago Graduate School in 1959. He was a Fulbright research professor in Japan, where he lectured at Komazawa, a Zen university in Tokyo, where he studied Zen from 1958 to 1959. In 1976 the American Humanist Association designated him Humanist Fellow for Outstanding Contributions to Humanist Thought in Ethics and Aesthetics. He was elected President of the American Philosophical Association in 1959, and also served as President of the American Society of Aesthetics.

Ames's range of interests included aesthetics and history of aesthetics, ethics, American pragmatism, existentialism, literature, poetry, and Zen Buddhism. He wrote on a broad range of topics, such as the history of philosophy, the nature of art, the value of aesthetics, existentialism and the arts, literature, poetry, music, philosophy of religion, Eastern philosophy with an emphasis on Zen thought, George SANTAYANA, John Dewey, Edmund Husserl, Thomas Mann, Marcel Proust, and André Gide. He has written seven books on these topics, over two hundred articles, and several books of poetry.

Ames's aesthetics is characterized by the idea that the aesthetic experience is the pre-reflective contemplation of values for their own sake. In an aesthetic experience the flow of habitual activity is interrupted by a problematic situation. Art facilitates this experience by presenting the data for it – the problematic situation – in which these values are a part and so draws one's attention to them. The response is immediate, disinterested, and pre-reflective. Once reflection sets in, the aesthetic attitude has been interrupted. An aesthetic experience is not an isolated experience, but can occur in any area of life.

In *Aesthetics of the Novel* (1928), Ames explains that the novel offers the aesthetic experience by bringing forth the problematic situations out of which the values the reader contemplates in his or her pre-reflective state arise. The novel typically presents problematic situations characterized through the relation of the self to other selves and to society, "the social self." The novelist's role is to present the values of the social, not to solve them. Any attempt toward resolution requires reflection, which is outside of the aesthetic experience.

This aesthetic attitude is also explained and defended in such writings as *Proust and Santayana: The Aesthetic Way of Life* (1937). The articles contained in this book either discuss the aesthetic way of life or use Proust and Santayana as exemplifying the tradition that values the aesthetic way of life. The aesthetic way of life is defined as an attitude that values detached contemplation over action. Aesthetic insight, or experience, as the prereflective contemplation of values is important because it gives meaning to life and human existence.

Ames's description of the aesthetic experience has affinities with his characterization of enlightenment in Zen thought. "[Enlightenment] is liberation from the uneasy sense of confinement to a little, limited self to be separate from other selves and from the rest of the world" (1962, p. 9). Both enlightenment and the aesthetic attitude bring humankind together through direct, immediate experience.

In *Zen and American Thought* (1962), Ames looks at Zen's influence and compatibility with American values. The book traces the development of American thought from Thomas Jefferson through Ralph Waldo EMERSON, Henry David Thoreau, and Walt WHITMAN, to Charles PEIRCE, Josiah ROYCE, Henry James, Santayana, Dewey, and finally Mead, always keeping in mind Zen teachings. Mead is the pivotal figure of the volume, because in his ideas Ames finds affinities with Zen, as well as recognizing the importance of Mead for current Western thought.

A central notion in Ames's writings on Zen is the "cleavage" of Western culture, which relates to the dualisms between humankind and the world, and Zen's holistic approach. Zen is defined as an entirely naturalistic way of thinking that denies the dualisms associated with traditional Western thought. Mead is also a naturalistic thinker in that he understands one's personality and mentality belong to the same natural process of evolution as his body. "He disposed of dualism by accounting for the human self and mind without relying on any transcendent or supernatural principle" (1962, p. 5). Mead's position, akin to Zen, heals the cleavage in Western culture by making humankind at home in nature.

Ames was a holistic thinker, whose pragmatic yet spiritual attitude permeated every area of his thought. He believed in the unity and solidarity of the peoples of the East and West, as well as the idea that human beings must accept themselves as part of nature. Ames understood art to be fundamental and the aesthetic experience as invaluable. He insisted on the idea that aesthetics, science, and religion are inseparable, because they contain corresponding values. These values are spiritual and social. Understanding these disciplines and the values associated with them is constructive in that it will bring together the peoples of the East and West.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Aesthetics of the Novel (Chicago, 1928).
Introduction to Beauty (New York, 1931).
Proust and Santayana: The Aesthetic Way of Life (Chicago, 1937; 1966).
André Gide (Norfolk, Conn., 1947).
Understanding the World: An Introduction to Philosophy (New York, 1947).
Japan and Zen (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1961).
Zen and American Thought (Honolulu, Hawaii, 1962).

Other Relevant Works
Ames's papers are at the University of Chicago.
"The Function of Aesthetic Experience," *Journal of Philosophy* 23 (1926): 603–609.
"Business and Art," *International Journal of Ethics* 41 (1930): 86–95.
"An Apology for Aesthetes," *International Journal of Ethics* 44 (1933): 56–7.
"Conscience and Calculation," *International Journal of Ethics* 47 (1937): 180–92.
"The Function and Value of Aesthetics," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 1 (1941): 95–105.
"On Empathy," *Philosophical Review* 52

(1943): 490–93.

"Art as Expression," *Ethics* 54 (1944): 283–9.

"Social Esthetic, with Special Reference to Guyau," *Journal of Philosophy* 41 (1944): 91–6.

"Volkelt's Saving Humor," *Philosophical Review* 53 (1944): 295–301.

"Science and the Reconstruction of Value," *Humanist* 5 (1945): 8–16.

"Art and Science Inseparable," *Philosophical Review* 55 (1946): 183–9.

"The Idea of God," *Humanist* 6 (1946): 75–81.

"Expression and Aesthetic Expression," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 6 (1947): 172–9.

"Fetishism in the Existentialism of Sartre," *Journal of Philosophy* 47 (1950): 407–10.

"Theater and Fiction in France," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 8 (1950): 239–44.

"America, Existentialism, and Zen," *Philosophy East and West* 1 (1951): 35–47.

"Existentialism and the Arts," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 9 (1951): 252–6.

"The Humanism of Thomas Mann," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 10 (1952): 247–57.

"The Zenith as Ideal," *Journal of Philosophy* 49 (1952): 201–207.

"John Dewey as Aesthetician," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 12 (1953): 145–68.

"A Philosophy for Today," *Ethics* 64 (1954): 292–301.

"The Archaic Smile," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 13 (1954): 265–6.

"Zen and Pragmatism," *Philosophy East and West* 4 (1954): 19–34.

"Mead and Husserl on the Self," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 15 (1955): 320–31.

"Mead and Sartre on Man," *Journal of Philosophy* 53 (1956): 205–18.

"What Is Form?" *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 15 (1956): 85–93.

"Zen and American Philosophy," *Philosophy East and West* 5 (1956): 305–20.

"Zen and Mead," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 33 (1960): 27–42.

"Aesthetic Values in the East and West," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 19 (1960): 3–16.

"A Humanist at Heaven's Gate," *Humanist* 23 (1963): 175–7.

"The New in the Novel," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 21 (1963): 243–50.

"Butor and the Book," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 23 (1964): 159–65.

"Aesthetics in Recent Japanese Novels," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 24 (1965): 27–36.

"Buber and Mead," *Antioch Review* 27 (1967): 181–91.

"What Is Music?" *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 26 (1967): 241–9.

"The Humanity of Zen," *Humanist* 28 (1968): 17–19.

"Why Naturalistic Humanists Should Use the Term God," *Religious Humanism* 3 (1969): 27–31.

"Is it Art?" *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 30 (1971): 39–48.

"Art for Art's Sake Again?" *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 33 (1975): 303–307.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Pres Addr of APA v6*, *Proc of APA v59*, *Who Was Who in Amer v9*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Duncan, Elmer. "Van Meter Ames: An Examination and Appraisal of His Philosophy of Art," *Journal of Aesthetics Education* 15 (1981): 97–114.

Suzuki, D. T. "Zen: A Reply to Ames," *Philosophy East and West* 5 (1956): 349–52.

Melanie McQuitty

ANDERSON, Alan Ross (1925–73)

Alan Anderson was born on 11 April 1925 in Portland, Oregon, and grew up in Little Rock, Arkansas. His collegiate education was primarily at Yale University, where he earned his BA in 1950 and his PhD in 1955. He also studied at Cambridge University on a Fulbright Fellowship, earning an MLitt in 1952 with a thesis on "Solutions to the Decision Problem for Certain Calculi of Modal Logic." His PhD dissertation at Yale was on "A Finitary System of Logic," written under Frederick B. FITCH. Anderson's first teaching position was as instructor of philosophy at Dartmouth College in 1954–5. He returned to Yale to teach philosophy from 1955 to 1965, becoming full professor in 1963. He was also a Fulbright Lecturer at the University of Manchester in 1964–5, the same year in which he held a Guggenheim Fellowship. In 1965 Anderson moved to the University of Pittsburgh as professor of philosophy, where he remained until his death in 1973. While at Pittsburgh, Anderson also held senior research associate positions with both the Center for the Philosophy of Science and the Knowledge Availability Systems Center. Throughout the 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s he was an active member and officer of the Association for Symbolic Logic and the American Philosophical Association, among other organizations. He also served in editorial capacities with a variety of journals. Anderson died on 5 December 1973 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Anderson was a philosophical logician, whose research lay in three areas now (though not then) commonly called modal logic, deontic logic, and relevance logic. More than that, however, he was a logician who was strongly motivated by philosophical concerns and questions, and above all, he was a philosopher whose thinking was always fully informed by the methods and results of modern formal logic.

Anderson's early work in philosophical logic addressed problems in alethic modal logic, the logic of necessity and possibility. In the early 1950s modal logic was largely studied through syntactical, proof theoretic methods, rather than the semantical methods that have since proved to be so fruitful. In that context, Anderson presented decision procedures and alternative axiomatizations for various modal logics. He is far better known, however, for his contributions to deontic logic.

Deontic logic, or as Anderson preferred to call it, the logic of normative systems, is the logic of normative concepts, such as obligation, permission, and prohibition. Stemming from G. H. von Wright's seminal paper, "Deontic Logic" (1951), this branch of philosophical logic came to be treated as a form of modal logic, in which statements of the form "It ought to be that p" would be formalized as Op, with a monadic modal operator O applied to a proposition p, and similarly for "It is permitted that p," Pp, and "It is forbidden that p", Fp. The deontic modalities then display strong analogies with the alethic modes of necessity, L, possibility, M, and impossibility, I, respectively. The primary difference is that, while necessity implies truth, $Lp \rightarrow p$, obligation, alas, does not; sometimes obligations are not fulfilled. Hence no respectable deontic logic would contain $Op \rightarrow p$, though it should have the weaker principle that obligation entails permission, $Op \rightarrow Pp$. Likewise, it would not contain the converse principle $p \rightarrow Op$, since many truths are not required.

With these measures in mind, Anderson demonstrated that deontic logic could be reduced to alethic modal logic. The leading idea, which Anderson credits to Herbert Bohnert, though it has earlier antecedents, is that a statement of the form "It ought to be that p" is to be analyzed as saying that "if not-p, then S," where S is a propositional constant referring to a bad state of affairs, to a sanction or a violation of the rules. Given such a constant, Op could then be defined as $\neg p \rightarrow S$ (with $\neg$ for negation and $\rightarrow$ for an appropriate "if-then"). This definition of the deontic operator is often called the "Andersonian reduction." If the $\rightarrow$ were classi-

cal material implication, with $p \rightarrow q$ equivalent to $\neg p / q$ (either not-p or q), then Anderson's definition would lead to the collapse of the deontic concept, since both $p \rightarrow Op$ and $Op \rightarrow p$ would be true for every proposition p if there were anything that was permitted, as there surely is. Instead, Anderson proposed that the appropriate sense of "if-then" was that of strict implication, such as formalized in the modal logics T, S4, and S5, etc. With this stipulation, and also the stipulation that the sanction, S, is avoidable, i.e., that it is possible that not-S, $M\neg S$, then all of normal deontic logic can be derived in these modal logics, and nothing can be proved that should not be. In this way deontic logic is reduced to alethic modal logic.

There is another aspect of the Andersonian reduction which is widely overlooked. Anderson showed that even the normative postulate $M\neg S$ is eliminable. Let B be a propositional constant about which *no* assumptions are made, and let S be defined so that $S = B \ \& \ M\neg B$. The requisite proposition $M\neg S$ can then be derived in any of the standard modal logics. (B might be thought of as representing a bad state of affairs which obtains but might not.) See especially Anderson's articles (1956 and 1968) for the full account of the reduction of deontic logic to alethic modal logic, though the central ideas recur in quite a number of his papers.

Anderson was not entirely satisfied with his original analysis of statements "It ought to be that p" as "necessarily, if not-p then S." For, when "necessarily, if-then" is taken as the strict implication of, for example, the modal logic S4, it suffers from the so-called paradoxes of strict implication, including that necessities are strictly implied by anything, since $Lp \rightarrow (q \rightarrow p)$ is a theorem. This would have the consequence that all necessities are obligatory, $Lp \rightarrow Op$. The definition also implies that whatever is obligatory is necessarily obligatory, $Op \rightarrow LOp$, which struck Anderson as a mistake since very many norms seem to depend on contingent states of affairs. In place of strict implication in this sense, Anderson then proposed that the "if-then" of his analysis be taken as *relevant*

implication, a material, but paradox-free, form of implication in the systems of relevance logic that he and Nuel D. BELNAP, Jr. had been developing.

Relevance logics comprise the second area in which Anderson's contributions are most noted. These logics begin with concern about the classic paradoxes of implication. If the implication connective $\rightarrow$ is construed as classical material implication, then any true proposition is implied by every proposition since $p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow p)$ is a theorem of classical logic, a tautology. This does not obtain if $\rightarrow$ is taken as strict implication, but that connective suffers similar problems, for a contradiction would still imply every proposition and a logical necessity would be implied by every proposition. Both $(p \ \& \ \neg p) \rightarrow q$ and $q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow p)$ are theorems of standard modal logics. Against these, Anderson and his collaborator Belnap argue that when a proposition, p, entails another, q, there must be a necessary connection between p and q, which excludes material implication, *and* there must also be a connection of meaning, or relevance, between p and q, lest non sequiturs be licensed as valid. This latter condition excludes both material implication and standard strict implication. The Anderson-Belnap logic E is a formalization of just such an entailment. Their logic R, for relevant implication, relaxes the requirement of necessity while maintaining the requirement of relevance. Relevant implication stands to entailment much as material implication stands to strict implication.

One way to think of the requisite sense of relevance is to consider entailment or implication in terms of inference or derivability. To say that p entails or implies q is thus to say that q can be validly inferred or derived from p. One then expects that in a valid inference or derivation, p must actually be *used* in obtaining q from p. (In other words, one should take the word "from" seriously.) Such use thus reflects a real connection between p and q, and so constitutes relevance. Natural deduction versions of the logics E and R make the sense in which a

proposition is used in deriving another fully rigorous and precise. Another way that relevance is captured in these logics lies in the fact that whenever a formula $A \rightarrow B$ is provable in either system, then A and B share a variable, which thus provides for an element of common meaning in antecedent and consequent. (Notice how both classical logic and standard modal logics fail in this regard.)

Although there were predecessors, such as Alonzo CHURCH, Moh Shaw-Kwei, and especially Wilhelm Ackermann, Anderson and Belnap must be considered the primary founders of the field of relevance logic. Through their work, and that of their students, and now many others, this has become a well-established part of philosophical logic, analogous to modal logic. See (1975) and (1992) for comprehensive expositions of this field, as well as extensive bibliographies.

In addition to his work in philosophical logic, and other aspects of the philosophy of logic and mathematics, where he maintained a robust but irenic Platonism, Anderson was also particularly interested in the philosophy of the social and behavioral sciences and the formal analysis of concepts in those sciences. Here Anderson's work in deontic logic becomes directly applicable since so many social concepts carry a normative component. Much of Anderson's research in this area was in collaboration with the social psychologist Omar Khayyam Moore. Their studies often centered on what they called "autotelic folk models," patterns of behavior that contain their own goals and motivation, rather than serving further personal or social ends. These include especially puzzles, games of chance, games of strategy, and aesthetic endeavors, all of which seem culturally universal. Such activities, they propose, serve as models within a pre-scientific culture by which members of the culture learn and practice the workings of their society. Further, such activities can typify individual personalities according to the tasks they serve to introduce. Anderson also participated in Moore's research program in early education,

where Moore introduced the "talking typewriter" that enabled very young children to learn to read and write. This led to a series of films, *Early Reading and Writing*, for which Anderson composed and performed the incidental music. Anderson also wrote poetry, and loved games.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Improved Decision Procedures for Lewis's Calculus S4 and von Wright's Calculus M," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 19 (1954): 201–14.

The Formal Analysis of Normative Systems (New Haven, Conn., 1956). Reprinted in *The Logic of Decision and Action*, ed. Nicholas Rescher (Pittsburgh, 1968), pp. 147–213.

"The Formal Analysis of Normative Concepts," with Omar K. Moore, *American Sociological Review* 22 (1957): 9–17.

"Reduction of Deontic Logic to Alethic Modal Logic," *Mind* 67 (1958): 100–103.

"The Logic of Norms," *Logique et Analyse* n.s. 1 (1958): 84–91.

Completeness Theorems for the Systems E *of Entailment and* EQ *of Entailment with Quantification* (New Haven, Conn., 1959). Reprinted in *Zeitschrift für mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik* 6 (1960): 201–16.

Autotelic Folk-Models, with Omar K. Moore (New Haven, Conn., 1959). Reprinted in *Sociological Quarterly* 1 (1960): 203–16.

"Modalities in Ackermann's 'Rigorous Implication'," with Nuel D. Belnap, Jr., *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 24 (1959): 107–11.

First-Degree Entailments, with Nuel D. Belnap, Jr. (New Haven, Conn., 1961). Reprinted in *Mathematische Annalen* 149 (1963): 302–19.

"Enthymemes," with Nuel D. Belnap, Jr., *Journal of Philosophy* 58 (1961): 713–23.

"Tautological Entailments," with Nuel D. Belnap, Jr., *Philosophical Studies* 13

(1962): 9–24.

"Logic, Norms and Roles," *Ratio* 4 (1962): 36–49.

"Toward a Formal Analysis of Cultural Objects," with Omar K. Moore, *Synthese* 14 (1962): 144–70. Reprinted in *Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science* (Dordrecht, 1963), pp. 117–43.

"The Structure of Personality," with Omar K. Moore, *Review of Metaphysics* 16 (1962): 212–36.

"Some Puzzling Aspects of Social Interaction," with Omar K. Moore, *Review of Metaphysics* 15 (1962): 409–33.

"The Pure Calculus of Entailment," with Nuel D. Belnap, Jr., *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 27 (1962): 19–52.

"Some Open Problems Concerning the System E of Entailment," *Acta Philosophica Fennica* 16 (1963): 7–18.

"Models and Explanations in the Behavioral Sciences," with Omar K. Moore, in *Concepts, Theory, and Explanation in the Behavioral Sciences*, ed. G. J. Direnzo (New York, 1966), pp. 79–90.

"Some Nasty Problems in the Formal Logic of Ethics," *Noûs* 1 (1967): 345–60.

The Responsive Environments Project, with Omar K. Moore (Pittsburgh, Penn., 1967).

"Some Principles for the Design of Clarifying Educational Environments," with Omar K. Moore, in *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research*, ed. D. Goslin (Chicago, 1968), pp. 571–613.

Entailment: The Logic of Relevance and Necessity, vol. 1, with Nuel D. Belnap, Jr., (Princeton, N.J., 1975).

Entailment: The Logic of Relevance and Necessity, vol. 2, with Nuel D. Belnap, Jr. and J. Michael Dunn (Princeton, N.J., 1992).

Other Relevant Works

Early Reading and Writing, Parts 1–3, with Omar K. Moore (Pittsburgh, Penn., 1960). Three documentary films.

"Platonism," in *Philosophy of Science: The Delaware Seminar*, vol. 1, ed. B. Baumrin (New York, 1963), pp. 137–58.

Ed., *Minds and Machines* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964).

"A New Square of Opposition: Eubouliatic Logic," in *Akten des XIV Internationalen Kongresses für Philosophie* (Vienna, 1968), vol. 2, pp. 271–84.

"St. Paul's Epistle to Titus," in *The Paradox of the Liar*, ed. R. L. Martin (New Haven, Conn., 1970), pp. 1–11.

"An Intensional Interpretation of Truth-Values," *Mind* 81 (1972): 348–71.

"Meaning and Implication," *Idealistic Studies* 4 (1974): 79–88.

"Fitch on Consistency," in *The Logical Enterprise*, ed. A. R. Anderson, R. B. Marcus, and R. M. Martin (New Haven, Conn., 1975), pp. 123–41.

"Logic and Shoulder-Shrugging," in *Issues in the Philosophy of Language*, ed. A. F. MacKay and D. D. Merrill (New Haven, Conn., 1976), pp. 1–10.

"Von Wright on Entailment," in *The Philosophy of Georg Henrik von Wright*, ed. P. A. Schilpp and L. E. Hahn (La Salle, Ill., 1989), pp. 581–601.

Further Reading

Oxford Comp Phil, *Proc of APA v47*, *Who Was Who in Amer v6*.

Avron, Arnon. "Whither Relevance Logic?" *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 21 (1992): 243–81.

Iseminger, Gary. "Is Relevance Necessary for Validity?" *Mind* 89 (1990): 196–213.

Mares, Edwin D. "Andersonian Deontic Logic," *Theoria* 58 (1992): 3–20.

Lou Goble

ANDERSON, Fulton Henry (1895–1968)

Fulton Henry Anderson was born on 23 May 1895 on a farm near Morell, Prince Edward Island, Canada. Anderson attended Dalhousie University in Halifax, Nova Scotia, receiving his BA in 1917. At Dalhousie, under the influence of Herbert Leslie STEWART, he developed an abiding interest in philosophy. Stewart, a graduate of Lincoln College, Oxford, was a gifted teacher who insisted that his honor students acquire a solid grounding in ancient philosophy and British empiricism. Anderson flourished under Stewart and in his final year he was awarded the sole fellowship in philosophy offered by the University of Toronto. There he was supervised by George Sidney BRETT, also an Oxford graduate, in writing a thesis on "The Influence of Contemporary Science on Locke's Method and Results." His third year was spent at Princeton as a Proctor Fellow, Princeton's highest award, where he studied with Archibald Allan BOWMAN, a Scotsman who defended a form of idealism, and Warner FITE, who specialized in ethics. Anderson received his MA in 1918 and was awarded Toronto's fourth PhD in philosophy in 1920.

In the summer of 1920 he was appointed Acting Head of the Philosophy Department in the University of Colorado at Boulder, and his work so pleased his superiors that they appointed him permanent Head when he was only twenty-six years old. But he was not happy living in the United States and watched for an opportunity to return to Canada. When the University of Toronto advertised a junior position in 1924, he applied for it and Brett appointed him, even though it meant a rather severe drop in status, not a trivial matter for Anderson. Brett made the pill easier to swallow by pointing out that two senior men were soon due for retirement, so, if Anderson applied himself, early promotion was assured. He did apply himself and was made a full professor in 1934, with a rise in salary when nearly everyone else was taking a cut.

Anderson's first book, *The Argument of Plato* (1935), is essentially an exposition of Plato's philosophy for undergraduates and it makes no original contribution to Platonic scholarship. His philosophical interests even while he was writing it lay elsewhere, namely, in Lockean studies. He spent every summer in England mining the Lovelace collection of Locke's papers, then in private hands. One of only two scholars allowed access to the papers during this period, he amassed voluminous notes on the manuscripts, but he never wrote his promised book on Locke. The outbreak of war in 1939 meant an increased teaching load for him, since all the younger men were in uniform. To add to the crisis Brett, then departmental Head, was stricken with cancer and died in October 1944. Anderson was immediately appointed to succeed him; he served as Head until he retired in 1963. Anderson died on 11 January 1968 in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, during a lecturing visit to his old secondary school, Prince of Wales College.

Anderson published two books on Francis Bacon, *The Philosophy of Francis Bacon* (1948) and *Francis Bacon: His Career and Thought* (1962), both of which are skillful and well-written syntheses of the immense secondary literature on Bacon. Anderson was not an original philosopher; but he was a committed student of the history of philosophy. Thomas A. GOUDGE, who succeeded him in office, stated on the department's oral history tapes that "I once heard him say in public that he really hadn't the slightest interest in anything that happened after the seventeenth century." This fixation on the past led to considerable friction with his younger colleagues. The curriculum, which remained decidedly historical while he was in charge, was changed quite radically under Goudge. Anderson's enduring legacies were the superior appointments he made and the tenacious way he held the department together during a trying period in the history of the university.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Influence of Contemporary Science on Locke's Method and Results (Toronto, 1920).

The Argument of Plato (London, 1935).

The Philosophy of Francis Bacon (Chicago, 1948).

Francis Bacon: His Career and Thought (Los Angeles, 1962).

Other Relevant Works

"Introduction," in *Philosophy in Canada: A Symposium*, by John A. Irving (Toronto, 1962).

Further Reading

Proc of APA v42

Armour, Leslie, and Elizabeth Trott. *The Faces of Reason: An Essay on Philosophy and Culture in English Canada, 1850–1950* (Waterloo, Ontario, 1981).

Slater, John G. *Minerva's Aviary: Philosophy at Toronto 1843–1943* (Toronto, 2005), chap. 8.

John G. Slater

ANDREWS, Elisha Benjamin (1844–1917)

Benjamin (as he preferred) Andrews was typical of the generation of great educators of his era in the United States. He was born on 10 January 1844 in Hinsdale, New Hampshire, to a Baptist minister and a schoolteacher. He served with distinction in the Civil War, rising from private to second lieutenant and participating in numerous military engagements. Wounds left him without sight in his left eye. Discharged before the war's conclusion, he completed his education at Brown University (BA 1870) and Newton Theological Institution (BD 1874). His major fields of specialization were political economy and history.

Pastoral theology was a third area in which he held an academic post early in his career as university professor and administrator.

Andrews made considerable contributions to the development and expansion of three major American universities. In 1875 he assumed the presidency of Denison University in Granville, Ohio. Like many church-affiliated colleges during the post Civil War epoch of the rising land-grant universities, Denison was in deep financial straits. While simultaneously holding chairs in moral and intellectual philosophy, Andrews constructed a new library and initiated a curriculum of elective coursework. More significantly, he brought John D. Rockefeller onto the board of trustees. A proponent of the emerging "social gospel," Andrews clashed with other trustees and resigned the presidency in 1879. He was professor of homiletics and pastoral theology at the Newton Theological Institution during 1879–82, and studied at German universities in 1882–3.

In 1883 he joined Brown University as professor of political economy and history, and following a brief stint on the Cornell University faculty in 1888–9, returned to become Brown's President in 1889. He founded a graduate school, increased undergraduate enrollment from 176 to around 640, and added more than one hundred graduate students to the rolls as well. Course offerings and faculty were increased proportionately. In 1891 he opened a women's college at Brown University. His somewhat tumultuous tenure as President ended in 1898. His final higher education leadership role was chancellor of the University of Nebraska from 1900 to 1908, where he led the drive for increased enrollments and new campus construction projects. Between the Brown presidency and the Nebraska chancellorship Andrews served as the superintendent of the Chicago public schools. His achievements include the addition of kindergarten, regular health examinations, and special education for the physically challenged.

His scholarship accurately reflects his broad teaching interests and varied faculty appointments. His published works include two historical outlines: *Brief Institutes of Our Constitutional History, English and American* (1886), and *Brief Institutes of General History* (1887). His various works in political economy and moral philosophy were capped by *Wealth and Moral Law* in 1894. His personal philosophy included a deep commitment to academic freedom. His threat to resign the Brown presidency in 1897, rather than accede to the trustees' demand that he foreswear his public commitment to international bimetallism, placed the principle of academic freedom on the national agenda. Andrews died on 30 October 1917 in Interlachen, Florida.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brief Institutes of Our Constitutional History, English and American (Providence, R.I., 1886).
Brief Institutes of General History (Boston, 1887).
An Honest Dollar (Baltimore, Md., 1889).
Institutes of Economics (Boston, 1889).
The Economic Law of Monopoly (Providence, R.I., 1890).
The Duty of a Public Spirit (New York, 1892).
Wealth and Moral Law (Hartford, Conn., 1894).
Eternal Words, and Other Sermons (Hartford, Conn., 1894).

Other Relevant Works
A Private's Reminiscences of the First Year of the War (Providence, R.I., 1886).
History of the United States (New York, 1894).
The Call of the Land: Popular Chapters on Topics of Interest to Farmers (New York, 1913).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v8*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Hansen, James E. *Gallant, Stalwart Bennie: Elisha Benjamin Andrews (1844–1917), an Educator's Odyssey*. PhD dissertation, University of Denver (Denver, 1969).

James O. Castagnera

ANGELL, James Rowland (1869–1949)

James Rowland Angell was born on 8 May 1869 in Burlington, Vermont, and died on 4 March 1949 at Hamden, Connecticut. His mother was Sarah Swope Caswell; his father, James Burrill Angell, was President of the University of Vermont at the time of his son's birth and subsequently served for thirty-eight years as President of the University of Michigan. James Rowland Angell grew up in Ann Arbor and attended school and college there, graduating from Michigan in 1890 with a BA degree. Angell was influenced by his teacher, John DEWEY, and by reading William JAMES's *Principles of Psychology* (1890). He received his MA in 1891 from Michigan with a thesis on imagery. He then studied psychology and philosophy at Harvard University, principally with James and Josiah ROYCE, and received a second MA from Harvard in 1892.

After Harvard, Angell, in keeping with the practice of aspiring academic psychologists of his day, went to study in Germany. A place was not available in the laboratory of Wilhelm Wundt, the acknowledged originator of laboratory psychology, so he went to Berlin to study psychology with Hermann Ebbinghaus and philosophy with Friedrich Paulsen, and then to Halle, where he studied psychology with Benno Erdmann and the philosophy of Kant with Hans Vaihinger. Angell wrote a doctoral thesis that compared the concept of freedom in Kant's critique of pure

reason with the concept of freedom in the critique of practical reason. The thesis was accepted, but the award of the PhD depended upon Angell's revising the thesis to improve its German and his passing a final examination. Angell did not revise the thesis, did not complete the examination, and so did not receive his PhD degree. Instead, in the fall of 1893, he accepted an offer from the University of Minnesota to become an instructor in philosophy at a salary that enabled him, in 1894, to marry Marion Isabel Watrous after a four-year engagement. One year after her death in 1931, Angell married Katharine Cramer Woodman.

In 1894 Angell became an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Chicago where Dewey was the new chair of the department of philosophy, psychology, and pedagogy. Angell was placed in charge of instruction in psychology and given an assistant to help with the laboratory work. He was promoted to the rank of associate professor in 1901 and named full professor and department chair in 1905 when an independent psychology department was established. He served as the editor of the *Psychological Monographs* from 1911 to 1922, served on the council of the American Psychological Association from 1903 to 1906, and was its President in 1906. At Chicago, he also served as Dean of Senior College during 1908–11, Dean of the Faculties during 1911–19, and as Acting President in 1918–19. In 1919 he was appointed President of the Carnegie Corporation.

In 1921 Angell accepted the call to become President of Yale University. Before he retired from Yale in 1937, Angell had greatly strengthened Yale's Graduate School and the professional schools (law and medicine), established the residential quadrangles modeled on the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, enhanced the stature of the faculty and increased the size of the student body, the faculty, expenditures, endowments and the physical facilities. In doing so, "he

made Yale a great university" (Kelley 1974, p. 392). For his contributions as a psychologist and as an educator, he received honors and honorary degrees from many American and European universities. He was elected to the National Academy of Sciences, the American Philosophical Society, and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; and he was awarded the gold medal of the National Institute of Social Science.

Angell's contributions to psychology were made before he assumed the major administrative responsibilities of his later career. His 1896 research with Addison W. MOORE helped to resolve a dispute over the interpretation of experimental results on simple reaction time (Woodworth 1938). Simple reaction time consisted of the time taken to make a motor response (such as pressing a telegraph key) upon the occurrence of a stimulus (e.g., a sound or light). Wilhelm Wundt had asserted that when respondents were instructed to focus attention on the response to be made (motor reactions), reaction times were always shorter than when the same responders were asked to focus attention on the stimulus (sensory reactions).

Wundt interpreted the difference to mean that the longer time for sensory reactions resulted because the stimulus had to be "apperceived" (perceived and attended to) while in the motor reaction the stimulus need only to be perceived. Subtracting the shorter time from the longer was thus considered to measure the time taken to apperceive a stimulus. Results obtained in other laboratories, however, found that for some individuals the motor reaction was longer than the sensory reaction (Baldwin and Shaw 1895; Baldwin 1896). Angell and Moore (1896) argued that the results of their experiments suggested that the observed reaction time differences lay in the role of attention in the coordinated act of responding. For the responder who, by disposition or experience, tends to focus on the response, more time is needed to shift attention to the stimulus,

while the reverse is true for those who are initially more disposed to focus on the stimulus.

In emphasizing reaction time response as a coordinated activity, Angell aligned himself with Dewey (1896), who argued that psychology should not focus on reflexes or responses in isolation, but on integrated activity and the blending of stimulus and response in behavior. Angell and Dewey's psychological functionalism was the foundation of Dewey's pragmatic approach to the mind, knowledge, and truth. Occasionally Angell expressed some measure of agreement with Dewey's pragmatism.

Angell's chief contribution to the new and developing field of scientific psychology consisted of the approach to psychology embodied in his 1904 textbook, *Psychology*, subtitled "An Introductory Study of the Structure and Function of Human Consciousness," and in his later *An Introduction to Psychology* (1918). A more formal statement of his systematic position was contained in his 1906 presidential address to the American Psychological Association, "The Province of Functional Psychology" (1907).

In giving voice to a functional perspective for psychology, Angell was characterizing the research activities of many psychologists while simultaneously challenging the definition of psychology advanced by E. B. TITCHENER, a psychologist at Cornell University. Titchener championed a psychology that focused narrowly on the use of introspection in experiments under laboratory conditions to analyze the structure (mental content) of the generalized normal, adult human mind. Titchener (1898) explicitly dismissed a psychology of function as that which had failed as faculty psychology in the past and had been replaced by the psychology of the structural components of mind, identified in his system as elements of sensation, feeling, and image. Angell's response to Titchener reflected a broader approach taken by American psychologists, an approach that raised to equal status the study of mental activity as manifest in cognition and behavior as part of the adaptation of individuals and species to the environment in which they find themselves.

Functional psychologists recognized the place of introspective analyses of conscious mental content as a significant task for scientific psychology, but believed that limiting psychology to that task narrowed the discipline unnecessarily and restricted its usefulness to the world outside the laboratory. In addition to the introspective observation of the generalized normal, adult, human consciousness, Angell added the objective observation of animal activities (comparative psychology), of developmental patterns of children, of abnormal behavior, of individuals as they differ among themselves and as they exist as part of a social matrix, including comparisons across cultures. This broadening of methodology within and beyond the laboratory to include a wider range of research subjects within psychology emphasized "mind in use" over mind as a static structure. Unlike Titchener, Angell did not accept the view that research on the psychology of animals, children, and abnormal individuals could and should only occur after the psychology of the generalized normal, adult human consciousness had been completed. Angell's aversion to narrow strictures on the subject matter and methods of study in psychology were manifest as well in his criticism of the behaviorism of John B. WATSON. Watson, one of Angell's many prominent PhD graduates from Chicago, advocated the elimination of mind and consciousness from the subject matter of psychology to focus exclusively on the objective study of behavior.

Angell's approach provided a broad umbrella under which many psychologists, whose research covered many different topics using varied methods, could shelter. Another prominent student of Angell's, Harvey CARR, continued and consolidated

Chicago's stature as a center of functionalism, training a second generation of psychologists. Although perceived as a school of thought (for example, Heidbreder 1933), especially in the systematic debates throughout the 1920s, Angell's position was less a firm system of psychology and more an attitude that the advance of psychology might best be served by pursuing a variety of methods and research questions (Carr 1930). This broad approach within a Darwinian framework raised questions about the function of mind and consciousness in several different ways. Mind and consciousness function to serve adaptation; studies of the evolution of intelligence ask comparative questions about mental capacities across the phylogenetic scale. Mental processes can also be studied in their functional relations to physiological processes as in, for example, the dependence of sensation and perception on the nervous system, and as a function of the conditions under which they were initiated, without regard to their dependence on physiology.

Angell's inclusive and multidisciplinary approach to the study of psychology in a Darwinian framework was manifest in the Institute of Psychology that he established at Yale during his presidency. Funded in part by the Laura Spellman Rockefeller Memorial, the institute appointed psychologists to represent the areas of primate biology, physiological psychology, and racial psychology; subsequently, the Child Development Clinic was established. Ultimately, both programs were brought together under the Institute of Human Relations, which also included research in clinical psychiatry and social science that embodied Angell's vision of the most fruitful approach to the study of human behavior. Angell's administrative initiatives continued his influential role in the development of psychology that had begun with the articles and books published early in his career.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Reaction Time," with Addison W. Moore, *Psychological Review* 3 (1896): 245–58.

"The Relations of Structural and Functional Psychology," *Philosophical Review* 12 (1903): 243–71.

Psychology: An Introductory Study of the Structure and Function of Human Consciousness (New York, 1904; 3rd edn 1905).

"The Province of Functional Psychology," *Psychological Review* 14 (1907): 61–91.

"Imageless Thought," *Psychological Review* 18 (1911): 295–323.

Chapters from Modern Psychology (New York, 1912).

"Behavior as a Category of Psychology," *Psychological Review* 20 (1913): 255–70.

An Introduction to Psychology (New York, 1918).

Other Relevant Works
Angell's papers are at Yale University.

"The Evolution of Intelligence," in *The Evolution of Man*, ed. George A. Baitsell (New Haven, Conn., 1922), pp. 103–25.

"James Rowland Angell," in *History of Psychology in Autobiography*, vol. 3, ed. Carl Murchison (Worcester, Mass., 1936), pp. 1–38.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v40*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*

Baldwin, J. Mark. "The 'Type-theory' of Reaction," *Mind* 5 (1896): 81–90.

Baldwin, J. Mark, and W. J. Shaw. "Types of Reaction," *Psychological Review* 2 (1895): 259–73.

Carr, Harvey. "Functionalism," in *Psychologies of 1930*, ed. Carl Murchison (Worcester, Mass., 1930), pp. 59–78.

Dewey, John. "The Reflex Arc Concept in Psychology," *Psychological Review* 3

(1896): 357–70.

Dewsbury, D. A. "James Rowland Angell: Born Administrator," in *Portraits of Pioneers in Psychology*, vol. 4, ed. Gregory A. Kimble and Michael Wertheimer (Washington, D.C., 2003), pp. 57–71.

Heidbreder, Edna. "Functionalism and the University of Chicago," in *Seven Psychologies* (New York, 1932), pp. 201–33.

Hunter, W. S. "James Rowland Angell, 1869–1949," *American Journal of Psychology* 42 (1949): 439–50.

Kelley, Brooks M. *Yale: A History* (New Haven, Conn., 1974).

Shook, John R., ed. *The Chicago School of Functionalism*, 3 vols (Bristol, UK, 2001).

Titchener, E. B. "The Postulates of a Structural Psychology," *Philosophical Review* 7 (1898): 449–65.

Woodworth, Robert S. *Experimental Psychology* (New York, 1938).

Alfred H. Fuchs

ANTHONY, Susan Brownell (1820–1906)

Susan B. Anthony was born on 15 February 1820 in Adams, Massachusetts, and died on 13 March 1906 in Rochester, New York. Her father, Daniel Anthony, was a Quaker who was barred from his meeting because he married Lucy Read, a Baptist. Though raised in a religious household, the absence of regular meeting attendance probably helped shape Susan's fiercely independent nature. The second of eight children, she was a precocious child and learned to read and write at the age of three. In 1826 the family moved from Massachusetts to Battensville, New York where she attended a district school. When the teacher refused to teach Susan long

division, Susan began being educated at home. She later finished her education at a boarding school near Philadelphia. The depression of 1837 forced her to seek work as a teacher to help support her family. The very few employment opportunities for middle-class women made her realize at an early age that economic independence was necessary for women's emancipation and self-sufficiency. Anthony also taught at another female academy, Eunice Kenyon's Quaker boarding school, in upstate New York from 1846 to 1849. She returned to her family home in Rochester, New York where she began her first public crusade on behalf of temperance.

Anthony's introduction to Elizabeth Cady STANTON in 1851 led to their lifelong collaboration on furthering women's civil and political rights. Between 1854 and 1860 Anthony and Stanton worked to obtain legal rights for married women, including entitlements to property, wages, and child custody in divorce settlements. In 1860 the Married Women's Property Act was passed in New York, due in large part to their collaborative efforts. During the Civil War, Anthony and Stanton organized the National Women's Loyal League demanding the abolition of slavery. Expecting women to be given the vote, they were disappointed when the Fifteenth Amendment only granted suffrage to black males. In 1868 they began a newspaper, *The Revolution*, which carried the masthead: "Men their rights, nothing more; Women their rights, nothing less." They reported on anti-lynching, suffrage, racial relations, dress reform, women's property rights, education for blacks and women, an eight-hour work-day, and equal pay for equal work. Anthony called for women's inclusion in unions and the professions, stating there were no differences between the minds of women and men.

Anthony gradually focused her considerable skills in political organizing toward a single goal: women's suffrage. She also realized that this campaign had to be carried out at the federal and not the state level, concentrating her efforts toward a constitutional amend-

ment. In 1872 she was arrested for trying to vote. She refused to pay the fine in order to use her trial as a platform to speak out against the injustice of a democratic society denying women the rights of citizenship. She appeared before every Congress from 1869 to 1906 asking for passage of the suffrage amendment, which came to be named The Susan B. Anthony Amendment. Her unflagging activism is revealed in her motto "Failure is Impossible."

Between 1881 and 1885 Anthony, Stanton, and Matilda Justin Gage published the first *History of Woman Suffrage* in three volumes. The fourth volume was edited by Anthony and Ida Husted Harper soon after, and two more volumes were added by Harper some years later. When the two major suffrage organizations united in 1890 into the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA), Anthony was elected Vice President, becoming President in 1892 and retiring when she was eighty years old. Two years later she presided over the International Council of Women. Stanton would not live to see women's suffrage, which finally was enacted as the Nineteenth Amendment to the US Constitution in 1920.

Anthony spent her life as an activist arguing for women's natural rights, which she contended were formulated on the same basis of logic and reason as men's. The philosophic foundation for her beliefs was a radical feminism and liberalism influenced by John Stuart Mill's writings on the primacy of civil and political rights over religious ones. At the end of her life, she lamented the fact that women everywhere were in chains, their servitude all the more debasing because they did not realize it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
History of Woman Suffrage, 4 vols, with Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Matilda Justin Gage, and Ida Husted Harper (Rochester, N.Y., 1881–9).
"Citizenship Under the Constitution," in *Women at the Podium*, ed. Michele Nix (New York, 2000).
"The Status of Woman: Past, Present and Future," in *The American 1890s*, ed. Susan Harris Smith and Melanie Dawson (Durham, N.C., 2000).
"Suffrage and the Working Woman," in *Ripples of Hope*, ed. Josh Gottheimer (New York, 2003).

Other Relevant Works
Anthony's papers are at the Library of Congress.
Papers of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, 45 microfilm reels, ed. Patricia G. Hildebrand and Ann D. Gordon (Wilmington, Del., 1991).
The Elizabeth Cady Stanton–Susan B. Anthony Reader, 2nd edn, ed. Ellen C. DuBois (Boston, 1992).
The Selected Papers of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, 3 vols to date, ed. Ann D. Gordon (New Brunswick, N.J., 1997–).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v4*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Barry, Kathleen. *Susan B. Anthony, A Biography: The Singular Feminist* (New York, 1988).
Harper, Ida Husted. *The Life and Work of Susan B. Anthony* (Indianapolis, 1908).
Hewitt, Nancy M. *Women's Activism and Social Change: Rochester, New York, 1822–1872* (New York, 1984).
Lutz, Alma. *Susan B. Anthony: Rebel, Crusader, Humanitarian* (Boston, 1959).
Pellauer, Mary D. *Toward a Tradition of Feminist Theology: The Religious Social Thought of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, and Anna Howard Shaw* (New York, 1991).
Sher, Lynn. *Failure is Impossible: Susan B.*

ANTHONY

Anthony in Her Own Words (New York, 1995).

Barbara Ryan

ANTON, John Peter (1920–)

John P. Anton was born on 10 November 1920 in Canton, Ohio. He attended Columbia University, receiving the BS in 1949, the MA in 1950, and the PhD in philosophy in 1954. He was a visiting lecturer at the University of New Mexico in 1954–5; assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Nebraska from 1955 to 1958; and associate professor of philosophy at Ohio Wesleyan University from 1958 to 1962. From 1962 to 1969, he taught at State University of New York at Buffalo, becoming a full professor in 1964 and also serving as Associate Dean of the Graduate School from 1967 to 1969. In 1969 Anton went to Emory University, where he was Callaway Professor of Philosophy from 1969 to 1982, and also chair of the department from 1969 to 1976. In 1982–3, he was professor of philosophy and Provost of the University of South Florida's New College. Since 1983, he has been Distinguished Professor of Greek Philosophy and Culture, Director of the Center for Greek Studies, and Director of the Center for Neoplatonic Research at the University of South Florida, Tampa.

Anton's academic career reflects his continuing interests in the practice and administration of philosophy in terms of excellent teaching, scholarship, and institutional leadership. He was awarded Outstanding Educator of America in 1972. He developed and instituted ongoing philosophic exchange with an international community, for which he was awarded an honorary doctorate of philosophy from the University of Athens in 1992, the Gold Medal Honorary Citizen of Olympia/Zaccharo in 1991, and the Gold Medal Honorary Citizen of the Island of Samos, Greece, in 1988. He has been elected a corresponding member of the Academy of Athens (1983) and an honorary member of the Parnassus Literary Society (1992).

Anton has published extensively in classical Greek philosophy, Hellenistic philosophy, American philosophy, and on topics in metaphysics, ethics, and aesthetics. His dissertation, "The Doctrine of Contrariety in Aristotle's Philosophy of Process," was supervised by John Herman RANDALL, Jr. and provided the material for his first book, *Aristotle's Theory of Contrariety*, first published in 1957 and now in its third and international printing. Anton's groundbreaking scholarship and analyses of classical philosophers served to liberate generations of students and colleagues from the "Analytic" appropriation of ancient texts and thought. Anton restores to the Greeks their vitality and relevance for contemporary ethical and political life.

Anton is one of only a few philosophers to successfully correlate elements of American pragmatism and naturalism with ancient wisdom. This correlation yields profound insight into the principles of democracy, education, and science. Drawing from his extensive knowledge and experience, Anton illustrates an active philosophy, dedicated to transforming life and culture in conjunction with a human desire to know and the rational requirements of thought and action. In all of his writings and teachings, he implicitly or explicitly argues for the accuracy of historical knowledge because accuracy yields true philosophic insight into the perennial questions of human existence. In this way, Anton combines the highest standards of scholarship with the most meaningful philosophic communications.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Aristotle's Theory of Contrariety (New York, 1957; 1987). Reprinted. as vol. 1

of *Routledge Ancient Philosophy in Ten Volumes* (London and New York, 2000).

Philosophical Essays (Athens, 1969).

Critical Humanism as a Philosophy of Culture: The Case of E. P. Papanoutsos (Minneapolis, 1981).

The Poetry and Poetics of Constantine P. Cavafy (London, 1995).

Categories and Experience: Essays on Aristotelian Themes (Oakdale, N.Y., 1996).

Archetypal Principles and Hierarchies: Essays on Neoplatonic Themes (Binghamton, N.Y., 2000).

Essays and Correspondence 1946–1987 with E. P. Papanoutsos (Athens, 2003).

American Naturalism and Greek Philosophy (Amherst, N.Y., 2004).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with G. Kustas, *Essays in Ancient Greek Philosophy*, 5 vols (Albany, N.Y., 1971–92).

Ed., *Naturalism and Historical Understanding: Essays on the Philosophy of John Herman Randall, Jr.* (Albany, N.Y., 1967).

"Studies in Ancient Philosophy: Tragic Vision and Philosophic Theoria in Classical Greece," in *Philosophy and the Civilizing Arts: Essays Presented to Herbert W. Schneider*, ed. John P. Anton and Craig Walton (Athens, Ohio, 1974).

Further Reading

Harris, R. Baine, ed. *The Structure of Being: A Neoplatonic Approach* (Norfolk, Virg., 1982).

Schrenk, Lawrence P., ed. *Aristotle in Late Antiquity* (Washington, D.C., 1994).

Lisa A. Wilkinson

ARENDT, Hannah (1906–75)

Hannah Arendt was born on 14 October 1906 in Hanover, Germany. She grew up in Königsberg in East Prussia but her father died in 1913 and the years of World War I were difficult ones for her and her mother, as they lived near the Eastern Front on the German/Russian border. Through her mother, a German Social Democrat, Arendt was first introduced to the writings of Rosa Luxemburg. She graduated from high school in 1924 and that fall began to study theology with Rudolf Bultmann at the University of Marburg. Also on the faculty was the young philosopher Martin Heidegger, whose lectures, which would form the basis of his 1927 book *Sein und Zeit* (*Being and Time*), were already stirring interest in *Existenzphilosophie*. Arendt had a brief but passionate affair with Heidegger, a married man with children, which ended when she went on to study at the University of Heidelberg with the philosopher Karl Jaspers. Jaspers, initially a psychiatrist, became her mentor. Arendt wrote her dissertation under Jaspers on the concept of love in St. Augustine's thought ("Der Liebesbegriff bei Augustin"). She earned her PhD from Heidelberg in 1929, and her dissertation was published that same year.

As the Nazi party rose to power, Arendt became increasingly involved in Jewish and Zionist politics. In 1930 she married Gunther Stern (who wrote under the pen name of Gunther Anders). From 1933 she worked with the German Zionist Organization and its leader, Kurt Blumenfeld, to publicize the growing Nazi atrocities. She was eventually arrested by the Gestapo but escaped to Paris. From 1935 to 1939 she worked as Secretary General of Youth Aliyah, a Jewish agency for Palestine in Paris, and from 1938 to 1939 she was a special agent for the rescue of Jewish children from Austria and Czechoslovakia.

In 1936 she met Heinrich Blücher, a German political refugee, whom she married on 16 January 1940, having divorced Stern in 1939.

When Germany invaded France, Arendt was separated from her husband and sent to an internment camp in Gurs in southern France. She again escaped and was able to emigrate with her husband and mother to the United States in 1941. Settling in New York City, she worked as a journalist from 1941 to 1945, writing for *Jewish Social Studies, Jewish Frontier*, and *Aufbau*, a German-language newspaper. She directed research for the Commission on European Jewish Cultural Reconstruction from 1944 to 1946, attempting to locate and redistribute the remains of Judaic artifacts and other treasures that had miraculously been salvaged from the ruins of the Third Reich.

In 1944, Arendt began work on what would become her first major political book, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1951). She published "What Is Existenz Philosophy?" in 1946. From 1946 to 1948 she was chief editor of Schocken Books in New York. From 1949 to 1952 she was the Executive Director for Jewish Cultural Reconstruction.

In 1951, Arendt began the first in a sequence of visiting fellowships and professorial positions at American universities. She became an American citizen and was awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship in 1952. In 1953 she delivered the Christian Gauss Lectures at Princeton University, and in 1954 she received a grant from the National Institute of Arts and Letters. She was a visiting professor at several universities: University of California at Berkeley in 1955; Princeton University in 1959 (the first woman to become a full professor at that university); Columbia University in 1960; and Northwestern University in 1961. In 1961–2 she was a fellow at the Center for Advanced Studies at Wesleyan University in Connecticut. From 1963 to 1967 she was a professor on the Committee on Social Thought at the University of Chicago, and from 1967 to 1975 University Professor of Philosophy at the New School for Social Research. From 1969 to 1975 she was also an associate fellow of Calhoun College of Yale University. In 1967,

she received the Sigmund Freud Prize of the German Akademie für Sprache und Dichtung. She was awarded the Emerson-Thoreau Medal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1969. In 1973–4 she delivered the Gifford Lectures at the University of Aberdeen in Scotland. She was awarded the 1975 Sonning Prize by the Danish government for Contributions to European Civilization, which no American and no woman before her had received. Arendt died on 4 December 1975 in New York City.

Arendt was one of America's most prominent intellectuals. She is best known for *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1951), published at the beginning of the Cold War. Examining the idiosyncratic twentieth-century tyrannies of Hitler and Stalin, she argued that their origins lay in imperialism's racist ideologies, which were already flourishing in Central and Western Europe by the end of the nineteenth century. The final section of her book detailed the workings of "radical evil," arguing that the huge number of prisoners in the death camps marked "a horrifying discontinuity in European history itself."

In 1958 she published *The Human Condition* and in 1959 "Reflections on Little Rock," a controversial consideration of the emergent black civil rights movement. *Between Past and Future* was published in 1961 and in that same year Arendt traveled to Jerusalem to cover the trial of Nazi Adolf Eichmann for the *New Yorker*. She later published her reflections on the Eichmann trial in 1963, first in the *New Yorker*, and then as a book, *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*. Eichmann, an S.S. lieutenant colonel who had been responsible for orchestrating the transportation of millions of Jews to death camps, was captured by Israeli forces in 1960. Rather than painting a conventional portrait of Eichmann as the embodiment of "radical evil," Arendt saw him as a "typical" bureaucrat who had dutifully followed orders and was the embodiment of "the banality of evil." Arendt's broader point was that this

type of evil was not necessarily confined to the particularities of the Third Reich, but could be found in many societies.

Arendt used Eichmann's trial to point out that the Jews themselves were also responsible for their systematic murder by being lulled into complacency by the "banality of evil." Many Jews mistook the Nazis for just another wave of anti-Semitism that could be somehow bribed or appeased. Arendt's view, which placed at least some responsibility for the Final Solution on the actions of the Jews themselves, especially the delusion, fear, and selfishness exhibited by many of the Jewish councils (*Judenräte*), was met with harsh criticism; it also prompted investigations and closer scrutiny of the behavior of Jewish communities under Nazi occupation. The resultant scholarship has often reinforced her unpopular view. By pointing out that the victims of the Final Solution were accountable for their own inadequate and ill-conceived political action, Arendt also hoped that other people would realize that these horrors could be repeated under different historical conditions. She thought that modernity and the associated rise of mass society made it difficult for people to listen to their consciences and think clearly through the consequences of their actions. In particular, nationalism was an impediment to reclaiming the possibilities of freedom grounded in the sense of a shared world. According to Arendt, then, Eichmann had done evil not because he was sadistically anti-Semitic, but because he had failed to think through what he was doing (his thoughtlessness).

Her articles in the *New York Review of Books* in the 1960s and early 1970s continued to express her reservations about the new world order by criticizing growing American military intervention in Vietnam. In particular, she singled out the increasing abuses of executive power as further indication of the dangerous imperialism of the presidency.

In 1970 Arendt gave her seminar on Kant's philosophy of judgment at the New School for Social Research, published posthumously as *Lectures on Kant's Political Philosophy* (1982). In her final years, she worked on a projected three-volume work, *The Life of the Mind*. The first two volumes, on "Thinking" and "Willing," were published posthumously, while the third volume on "Judging" remained uncompleted at her death.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Origins of Totalitarianism (New York, 1951).
The Human Condition (Chicago, 1958).
Between Past and Future (London, 1961).
On Revolution (New York, 1962).
Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil (London, 1963).
Men in Dark Times (New York, 1968).
On Violence (New York, 1970).
Crisis of the Republic (New York, 1972).

Other Relevant Works
Arendt's papers are in the Library of Congress and the German Literary Archive in Marbach, Germany.
"What Is Existenz Philosophy?" *Partisan Review* 8 (Winter 1946): 34–56.
Rahel Varnhagen: The Life of a Jewess, trans. Richard Winston and Clara Winston (London, 1957).
The Jew as Pariah (New York, 1978).
The Life of the Mind, 2 vols (London, 1978).
Lectures on Kant's Political Philosophy (Brighton, UK, 1982).
Hannah Arendt/Karl Jaspers Correspondence, 1926–1969, ed. Lotte Kohler and Hans Saner (New York, 1992).
Essays in Understanding, 1930–1954, ed. Jerome Kohn (New York, 1994).
Love and Saint Augustine (Chicago, 1996).
The Portable Hannah Arendt, ed. Peter Baehr (New York, 2000).
Within Four Walls: The Correspondence Between Hannah Arendt and Heinrich Blücher, 1936–1968, trans. Peter

Constantine (New York, 2000).

Letters, 1925–1975, Hannah Arendt and Martin Heidegger, trans. Andrew Shields (Orlando, Fla., 2003).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Bio 20thC Phils, Blackwell Comp Phils, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Dict Amer Bio, Encyc Ethics, Encyc Social Behav Sci, Oxford Comp Phil, Routledge Encycl Phil, Who Was Who in Amer v6, Women Phils

Benhabib, Seyla. *The Reluctant Modernism of Hannah Arendt* (London, 1996).

Bernstein, Richard J. *Philosophical Profiles: Essays in a Pragmatic Mode* (Cambridge, UK, 1986).

Canovan, Margaret. *Hannah Arendt: A Reinterpretation of Her Political Thought* (New York, 1992).

d'Entrèves, Maurizio Passerin. *The Political Philosophy of Hannah Arendt* (London, 1994).

Flynn, Bernard. *Political Philosophy at the Closure of Metaphysics* (London, 1992).

Habermas, Jürgen. "Hannah Arendt: On the Concept of Power," in *Philosophical-Political Profiles* (London, 1983), pp. 171–87.

Hill, Melvyn A., ed. *Hannah Arendt: The Recovery of the Public World* (New York, 1979). Contains a bibliography of Arendt's writings.

Hinchman, Lewis P., and Sandra K. Hinchman. "In Heidegger's Shadow: Hannah Arendt's Phenomenological Humanism," *Review of Politics* 46 (1984): 183–211.

Honig, Bonnie, ed. *Feminist Interpretations of Hannah Arendt* (University Park, Penn., 1995).

Kielmansegg, Peter G., Horst Mewes, and Elisabeth Glaser-Schmidt, eds. *Hannah Arendt and Leo Strauss: German Emigrés and American Political Thought after World War II* (Cambridge, UK, 1995).

Lacoue-Labarthe, Philippe, and Jean-Luc Nancy. *Retreating the Political* (London, 1997).

Parekh, Bhikhu. *Hannah Arendt and the Search for a New Political Philosophy* (London, 1981).

Villa, Dana. *Arendt and Heidegger: The Fate of the Political* (Princeton, N.J., 1996).

———, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Arendt* (Cambridge, UK, 2000).

Wolin, Richard. *Heidegger's Children: Hannah Arendt, Karl Löwith, Hans Jonas, and Herbert Marcuse* (Princeton, N.J., 2001).

Young-Bruehl, Elisabeth. *Hannah Arendt: For Love of the World* (New Haven, 1982).

Jean Van Delinder

ARMOUR, Leslie (1931–)

Leslie Armour was born on 9 March 1931 in New Westminster, British Columbia, Canada. He received his BA from the University of British Columbia in 1952, and his PhD in philosophy from the University of London in 1956. During this time he also worked as a journalist for provincial and city newspapers in both countries. Armour's teaching career began at the University of Montana, from 1957 to 1961. He then taught philosophy at California State University at Northridge in 1961–2; the University of Waterloo from 1962 to 1971; Cleveland State University, where he also served as Dean of Arts, from 1971 to 1977; and finally the University of Ottawa from 1977 to 1996. After retiring from Ottawa he became a research professor at the Dominican College of Philosophy and Theology in Ottawa, occasionally offering courses and continuing his research. Professor

Armour became a fellow of the Royal Society of Canada in 1998.

During his prolific career Armour has published nine books, over 125 articles and book chapters, and many book reviews. He has served on the editorial boards of journals on the history of philosophy, philosophy of religion, philosophy of science, and economics. His publications have concerned all of these topics and more, including metaphysics, theory of knowledge, moral philosophy, social and political philosophy, and the history of Canadian philosophy. He has published in English and French and been an invited speaker (in both languages) at conferences throughout North America, England, and Europe.

Armour is primarily a metaphysician. His early books, *The Rational and The Real* (1962), *The Concept of Truth* (1969), and *Logic and Reality* (1972), were influenced by nineteenth and twentieth-century idealism. However, his work also shows a determination not to imitate the models of the British neo-Hegelians, but instead to develop a consciousness-based metaphysics on his own terms. Armour defends reason as the tool we have for systematizing multiple sensations and reflections which are understood to be so through our use of language. Experience is the result of our capacity to select and express our own particular responses against a background of innumerable possible experiences and responses. The self is a "tendency to actualize possibility…. The explanation of its activity is ultimately logical and there is no duality between it and the world which it 'experiences' since it, too, would be nothing were it not for the experiences which it has. Neither is intelligible without the other" (1962, p. 36).

Armour's focus on multiple possibilities and the need to recognize patterns in and through change, led him to discuss truth as answers that accord with systems of thought that have been established. Truth as a measure of perfection, an absolute, is an idea that fails to recognize the multiplicity of perspectives with which one can interpret experiences. Truth is better understood as the success with which one can judge what data are relevant and will therefore become the bases of available resources to answer one's questions. Armour worked out the conditions for the possibility of truth-claims in *Logic and Reality*. Such conditions were not timeless and universal. His dialectical logic emphasized the need to grasp multiple schemes and frames of reference. Appealing to the law of non-contradiction, a favorite move on the part of logicians, only works in a world where rules and symbols can be separated from experience. Such an appeal does not help us to understand the experienced world that we struggle to express in language.

Armour became interested in his Canadian roots and this led to the publication (with his former doctoral student Elizabeth Trott) of *The Faces of Reason: An Essay on Philosophy and Culture in English-speaking Canada, 1850–1950,* in 1981. This work, which surveys the major philosophers in English-speaking Canada, stands as the definitive resource in the history of Canadian philosophy.

In 1992 Armour published *Being and Idea: Developments of Some Themes in Spinoza and Hegel*, and in 1993 he published *"Infini Rien": Pascal's Wager and the Human Paradox*. *Being and Idea* explored the relation between G. W. F. Hegel and Baruch Spinoza. Hegel found the monism of Spinoza suspect, but he himself also left unsolved problems. Armour extends the idealist metaphysics beyond its subjective ground by seeking the logical properties any possible world requires.

Armour's book on Pascal explores the origins of the "wager," the seemingly incommensurable stand-off between the neo-Platonists and seventeenth-century skeptics over the rational grounds for accepting God as a presence in our lives. Armour argues that Pascal's mission was not to set up the "gamble" but to illustrate with the most prominent issue of the day that what it meant to be human was to face our own limitations.

There will be questions that we cannot answer, but in conceiving of there being answers to them we are conceiving of all possible answers, and God, as the source of those answers, is a good bet. "The best reason to be interested in Pascal's wager, is, surely, that once one understands what is at issue there is something to be said for it – that it helps us to see the options that a reasonable human being ought to consider" (1993, p. 3).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Rational and the Real (The Hague, 1962).

The Concept of Truth (New York, 1969).

Logic and Reality (Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1980).

The Conceptualization of the Inner Life, with E. T. Bartlett, III (Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1980).

The Faces of Reason: An Essay on Philosophy and Culture in English-speaking Canada, 1850–1950, with Elizabeth Trott (Waterloo, Ontario, 1981).

The Idea of Canada and the Crisis of Community (Ottawa, 1981).

Being and Idea: Developments of Some Themes in Spinoza and Hegel (Hildesheim, Germany, 1992).

"Infini-Rien": Pascal's Wager and the Human Paradox (Carbondale, Ill., 1993).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with Elizabeth Trott, *The Industrial Kingdom of God*, by John Clark Murray (Ottawa, 1982).

"The Faces of Reason and Its Critics," with Elizabeth Trott, *Dialogue* 25 (1986): 105–18.

Further Reading

Burns, Steven. "Canadian Philosophy? The Very Idea!" *Dalhousie Review* 61 (Summer 1982): 315–20.

Elder, Bruce. *Image and Identity* (Waterloo, Ontario, 1989)

Goudge, Thomas. "Complex Disguises: Reason in Canadian Philosophy," *Dialogue* 22 (1983): 339–46.

Stevenson, Jack. "Reasonable Canadians," *Canadian Forum* 62 (June–July 1982): 31–2.

Sweet, William, ed. *Idealism, Metaphysics and Community* (Aldershot, UK, 2001). Essays in honor of Armour.

Trott, Elizabeth. "Designing Metaphysics," in *Approaches to Metaphysics*, ed. William Sweet (Dordrecht, 2004), pp. 317–26.

Woodcock, George. "Philosophers, Not Kings," *Canadian Literature* 94 (Autumn 1982): 164–5.

Elizabeth Trott

ARMSTRONG, Andrew Campbell (1860–1935)

Andrew Campbell Armstrong was born on 22 August 1860 in New York City, to Andrew Campbell Armstrong and Isabella Johnston Sinclair Armstrong. In 1881 he completed his BA at Princeton University, and was a fellow of mental science for the subsequent year, during which he trained in psychology with President James McCosh. In 1885 he earned an MA from Princeton Theological Seminary, and he studied at the University of Berlin in 1885–6. He returned to Princeton's Seminary in 1886 as associate professor of ecclesiastical history; in 1887–8 he was an instructor of history at Princeton University. In 1888 he joined the faculty of Wesleyan University in Connecticut as professor of philosophy, and spent the rest of his distinguished career there, retiring in 1930. Armstrong died on 21 February 1935 in Middletown, Connecticut.

An admirable representative of American intellectuals and the profession of philosophy,

Armstrong chaired the Metaphysics Section at the St. Louis International Congress of Arts and Sciences in 1904, served as Honorary Secretary of the Sixth International Congress of Philosophy in 1926, and became a member of the Permanent International Committee for the International Congress. One of the founding members of the American Philosophical Association, he served as its President in 1915–16. He received honorary degrees from Wesleyan University of Connecticut (MA 1894, LHD 1930) and from Princeton (PhD 1896).

Armstrong took a historical approach to the problems of philosophy, as evidenced in his early translation of Richard Falckenberg's *History of Modern Philosophy from Nicolas of Cusa to the Present Time* (1893). In addition to his publications in philosophical journals, he published *Transitional Eras in Thought with Special Reference to the Present* Age (1904). In his memorial to Armstrong, Cornelius F. Krusé wrote, "Historical studies … were not ends in themselves for him, but became primarily means of orientation in the turbulence of modern life."

Armstrong's desire to address life's problems with philosophy was evident in his ambassadorial efforts (especially his postwar chairmanship, from 1916 to 1927, of the American Philosophical Association's Committee on International Cooperation) and in writings that stressed the need to heal the rift between common sense and philosophy. To take one example, in "Philosophy and Common Sense," Armstrong's 1915 presidential address, he said, "When philosophy overlooks the fact that common experience supplies it with primary data for its own activity; when it forgets that its explanatory force with reference to experience forms a principal criterion of its value; and, on the other hand, when common sense denies the metaphysics implicit in its own convictions; that there should be no realization of the contributions which philosophy makes to common sense; above all, that men should lack the knowledge – or reject it – that

common sense is a variable function – such errors are as noteworthy in themselves as they are deplorable because of the results to which they lead" (1916, p. 104).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Transitional Eras in Thought with Special Reference to the Present Age (New York, 1904).
"Individual and Social Ethics," *Journal of Philosophy* 4 (1907): 119–22.
"The Evolution of Pragmatism," *Journal of Philosophy* 5 (1908): 645–50.
"The Idea of Feeling in Rousseau's Religious Philosophy," *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 24 (1911): 242–60.
"The Progress of Evolution," *Journal of Philosophy* 9 (1912): 337–42.
"Bergson, Berkeley, and Philosophical Intuition," *Philosophical Review* 23 (1914): 430–38.
"The Principle of International Ethics," *Journal of Philosophy* 12 (1915): 17–22.
"Philosophy and Common Sense," *Philosophical Review* 25 (1916): 103–20.
"Philosophy and Political Theory," *Journal of Philosophy* 16 (1919): 421–8.
"Kant's Philosophy of Peace and War," *Journal of Philosophy* 28 (1931): 197–204.
"Fichte's Conception of a League of Nations," *Journal of Philosophy* 29 (1932): 153–8.
"Hegel's Attitude on War and Peace," *Journal of Philosophy* 30 (1933): 684–9.

Other Relevant Works
Trans., *History of Modern Philosophy from Nicolas of Cusa to the Present Time*, by Richard Falckenberg (New York, 1893).

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v2, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v45*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

David Hildebrand

ARNHEIM, Rudolf (1904–)

Rudolf Arnheim was born on 15 July 1904 in Berlin, Germany, the son of a piano manufacturer. At the University of Berlin he studied experimental psychology, philosophy, and the history of art and music. While Arnheim attended the lectures on aesthetics of Max Dessoir in Berlin, he was drawn to the newest results of Gestalt psychology and worked closely with Wolfgang KÖHLER and Max WERTHEIMER, the latter being the director of his dissertation (PhD 1928) on the expressiveness of visual form. In spite of his experimental work, Arnheim became a journalist and probably would not have entered academia save for his emigration to Italy in 1933 and then the United States in 1940. In 1943 he became a professor of psychology at Sarah Lawrence College and also taught on the graduate faculty of the New School for Social Research until 1968. He then went to Harvard University as a professor of the psychology of art. Arnheim served twice as the President of the American Society of Aesthetics (1959–60, 1979–80). He retired in 1974 and moved to Ann Arbor, Michigan, where he was visiting professor in the history of art department at the University of Michigan.

Arnheim was an orthodox adherent to Gestalt psychology his entire life and never strayed from its principles and promise. What attracted him was the expectation of a naturalistic scientific theory that could do justice to human values. The image of humanity, demonstrated first by perceptual experiments and then more tangibly in social psychology, suggested that individuals naturally search after meaning, truth, and understanding. People perceive meaningful, value-filled whole entities, called *gestalten*. These make up the basis of experience, and scientific psychology ought not to distort this fact. But more than a phenomenological revision of psychology, the naturalism of Gestalt theory stated that the world itself was formed by the action of structural physical laws that aided the human's interaction with that world. The meeting ground was in the perceiver's brain, where holistic physical principles guided the isomorphic formation of perceptual states. It was an updated Spinozistic view of the world.

The experiments of Wertheimer, Köhler, and Kurt KOFFKA – the three founders of Gestalt psychology – understood perception upon a field metaphor. The percept is formed by the mutual interaction throughout the field. Thus Gestalt psychology was inherently antisensationalist. The doctrine of sense data was never accepted and instead a search was made for an explanation of perceived forms. Arnheim's dissertation extended this analysis into the realm of expressive form. Expression was demonstrated to be radically context dependent, as different forms were embedded in different contexts (a nose on a head, for example) and took on new expressive qualities. This did not discount the intersubjective reality of expression, but instead outlined in a scientific way how it lawfully arose.

Arnheim's early works like *Film as Art* (1932) and *Radio as Art* (1938) emerged from his work as a journalist in Berlin and his fascination with these new media. Still, there is nothing journalistic about these works which can be likened to observing the essence of film and radio in the manner that Roman Ingarden investigated the literary work of art. The language is not philosophically technical, as it is in Ingarden, yet the result is similar. Later, the emergence of talking cinema and Arnheim's profound disappointment with the results caused him to write "A New Laocoön" (1938/1957), an investigation of the mixture of different artistic media according to aesthetic laws. In these early works Arnheim combined the firsthand knowledge of art with deep reflection on theoretical possibilities. Arnheim's stance in these works was that science (psychology) would be the fastest vehicle to understanding this essence rather than the techniques of Husserl's phenomenology, a sentiment much like that in Köhler's *The Place of Value in a World of Facts* (1938).

Scientific results on illusory movement and various effects (induced movement, etc.) pointed to film's limitations and best results. Arnheim's aesthetics was born of a critical attitude that presumed that the aesthetician could only rely so much on analysis or introspection.

It is against this background that Arnheim faced the task of creating a true Gestalt psychology of art after his emigration to America, entry into academia, and the death of his mentor, Wertheimer – all during World War II. While Arnheim and his teachers were from an intensely artistic background, there were no precedents for the young professor as he embarked on his work. Two important papers introduced Arnheim's emerging position against the background of mid-century behaviorism, "Perceptual Abstraction in Art" (1947) and "A Gestalt Theory of Expression" (1949), both collected in *Toward a Psychology of Art* (1966). The first dealt with an imputation of cognitive abstraction to perception, a now-familiar theme, and the second sought a naturalistic explanation of visual expression through the stresses and strains in the optical medium in the act of perceiving.

After World War II Arnheim produced his classic text, *Art and Visual Perception: A Psychology of the Creative Eye* (1954/1974). Now he enunciated a more general psychology of the visual arts, bolstered by the hopeful results of Köhler's latest brain research. Arnheim outlined many different themes in this central book of his, and they may be broken down into a few elementary problems: (1) a critical realist approach to epistemology; (2) belief in the abstracting ability of the senses; and (3) a naturalistic explanation of pictorial expression.

Gestalt naturalism presumed the relevance of neuropsychological work for perceptual and aesthetic problems. However, Arnheim balanced the causal foundation of perception in brain processes against the incorrigibility of the senses in the delicate balancing act that is common to Gestalt theory. This form of

critical realism is partly perplexing but was regarded as the necessary concession to the facts of phenomenal reality and their genetic source in brain processes. While the position was barely represented while Arnheim was writing, it is now quite popular in various brands of emergent materialism.

Visual forms were created by the field-like action of the visual system to produce the simplest visual percept. This had far-reaching consequences for interpretation because these images – representing stable poles of brain activity that could subsume a large number of similar stimulus situations – preserved generality. The ability to subsume particulars under generalities blurs the distinction between seeing and knowing. We perceive what is necessary to survive. There is no problem of solipsism due to the economy of the senses, as there is in other theories, because the world also operates on economic processes. Thus, the world breaks off into holistic forms and it should be no surprise that our percepts register these forms. Art, for that matter, ought to deal in essentials, and so Arnheim removed art's reliance on figures. Just as there is no separation between seeing and knowing, forms can convey the basics of expression without the particulars. Furthermore, this has consequences for interpretation. For example, when a child draws a tadpole, a round circle with lines emerging from it, we cannot impute a particular identity to this circle (head, tail, etc.) because the generality of the form does not allow it.

Arnheim's discussion of expression followed the theory from "A Gestalt Theory of Expression." Arnheim ingeniously saw expression as the other side of the coin of the economy of perceiving. In settling on a stable percept, certain strains and stresses would arise in the discrepancy between the most economical outcome and the stimulus input, and these strains would be the cause of the perceived tension that would ultimately give rise to the expressive content of the percept. Arnheim's solution remains as controversial as the brain doctrine upon which it is based, but it repre-

sented the hope of a naturalistic bridge between ordinary perceiving and the rise of expression.

Arnheim continued to work against the reputation of his teachers (Köhler died in 1967), never content with alternative philosophical views. In the 1950s his essay "The Robin and the Saint" (1966), a brilliant discussion of the ontology of images, was inspired by his reading of Heidegger. Arnheim treated the level of abstraction of images, seeking to show how the generic quality of some abstract images does not support certain particular interpretations, and vice versa, other concrete images do not support generic interpretations. The backyard, stylized statue of St. Francis and the life-like bird decoy Arnheim discussed were quite different. One could not say that Francis appeared angry, in the same way the bird did not represent birdness. The abstract image Arnheim called a *self image*, in the sense that it had reference to the object it represented, but because it was so abstract, possessed a strong objective quality of its own. At the other end of the spectrum were *likenesses*, images which only have meaning by reference to another object in all its individuality and do not stand alone as objects on their own.

While inspired by Heidegger, such talk was actually closer to Roman Ingarden's ontology of aesthetic objects, which holds that works of art possess only the determinacies which the artist has intentionally projected in the work. What for Ingarden is a formal ontological argument is for Arnheim an intuitive point, argued with the problem of interpretation (which Ingarden kept quite separate) never far behind. The demand that abstraction and the generic were positive qualities contained a reaffirmation of Locke's position, against which Berkeley and much of Western philosophy would take issue, a point also made by Arnheim's contemporary Maurice MANDELBAUM.

With his psychological theories fully consolidated, Arnheim's ideas turned in a new direction, around the time that he took his new position at Harvard. If the senses were intelligent in the sense that elementary acts of perceiving contained abstraction, this was a quality inherent to every act of perception. Seeking to represent the dynamic movement of thought in individual creative acts, however, Arnheim sharpened earlier insights (including Wertheimer's own) into the imaginistic elements of productive thinking, and specified the contribution made by vision. These insights began in an early attempt to rehabilitate mental images into psychological study and then Arnheim's next major work, *Visual Thinking* (1969).

Arnheim's basic thesis was that spatial relations are the true language of thought. This was not only a psychological point; in rehabilitating vision, art is placed at the center of cognitive activity as one of the most distinguished examples of thought. The mind, Arnheim reasoned, needs sensuous images in order to make productive strides. To understand a logical rule such as "if all A are contained in B, and if C is contained in A, then C must also be contained in B," we effect a perceptual judgment based on a spatial reconstruction of inclusion. The Euler diagram we construct to aid our reasoning actually shows what is said logically. Although Arnheim never cited the commonality, some of his observations could be discussed in relation to Charles Sanders PEIRCE's existential logic. What this priority to vision presumed was a distrust or qualification of the importance of language. Arnheim traced the opposite tendency of linguistic reductionism back to Humboldt, and had in mind the SAPIR-WHORF theory and behaviorism when he wrote, but his thoughts would mark his position as the "Linguistic Turn" continued throughout the 1970s and 1980s. A school of Gestalt linguistics has lent support to Arnheim's position based on an underlying imaginistic grammar that semantic meaning depends upon underlying spatial grammatical structures.

Arnheim even attempted to reconceptualize the very meaning of symbolism based on

abstraction. In his remarkable definitions (once again recalling Peirce), a sign is an image "which stands for a particular content without reflecting its characteristics visually" (1969, p. 136); images are pictures "to the extent to which they portray things located at a lower level of abstractness than they are themselves" (1969, p. 137); and a symbol "portrays things which are at a higher level of abstractness than is the symbol itself" (1969, p. 138). This is once again a set of distinctions that is wholly perceptual in its foundation, and contra Peirce, denies any Aristotelian taxonomy based on logical (linguistic) principles. It is an open question to which degree Arnheim made visual thinking depend on actual vision. There is some ambiguity about whether or not the salient dimension is vision or spatiality. In the German edition, he translated visual as *Anschauliches*, and this addresses some objections of making thought too much a visual and less a perceptual affair.

Arnheim continued to publish sets of essays until recently. However, his last great work was *The Power of the Center: A Study of Composition in the Visual Arts* (1982/1988). The book was a natural extension of his earlier *Art and Visual Perception* but based on an important new discovery: a basic syntax for pictorial composition based on the relationship of centric systems and the eccentric tensions that derive from their interactions. All works of art, whether representational or not, could be reduced to systems of centers of expanding vectors. The milling centers of a work of art, in addition, always have a balancing center that gives the work legibility and finality, hence the "power of the center." Arnheim's reasoning updated the tendency of Gestalt theorists to work from field metaphors. Vectors, force, and so forth bring to mind the metaphysical monism of Gestaltism and the hope to link all phenomena together under common underlying principles.

Overlaid over freely interacting centers is the anisotropy of gravity. To sketch an example, a standing statue of a man is mostly one vertical vector, but depending on its centricity also a center. The vectoral quality gives it a sharp directionality and the center a quality of a unit. The verticality is counteracted, depending on the style of work, by the slumping concession to gravity of the figure. The head, and any other objects that take on a centric substantiality, become compositional subcenters in their own right and challenge the major center for perceptual (in this case, visual) interest. The relationships between the vertical and centric qualities, their varying emphases, explain the mode of existence the artist is trying to communicate. Part of the plausibility of Arnheim's theory derives from the tendency of viewers to identify with centers of action in works of art as human-like qualities of agency. Therefore, there is no requirement of the theory that recognizable objects be represented.

When *The Power of the Center* appeared in 1982, the title could only be perceived as provocative in the current theoretical climate of postmodernism. Arnheim admitted that "our terms have profound philosophical, mystical, and social connotations" (1998, p. ix). Naturally, Arnheim would have believed that what he argued about the existence of centricity in artistic composition could also be applied to metaphysics of the larger world. But even though Arnheim was not above condemnations of what he perceived as critical irrationalism, the book was more than a reactionary protest against aesthetic nihilism. It argued the common sense point of view that some theory of perceptual composition would have to be articulated, no matter what larger theoretical commitments we might wish to develop. Arnheim regarded as naïve the claim that centricity could be overridden in some sense. It could be argued that certain works of art, like the paintings of Piet Mondrian or the buildings of Giuseppe Terragni, frustrate centered readings and destabilize meanings. However, Arnheim argued that centricity (the formation of a unit) is the very condition of perception, so it is senseless to think we can

cancel it. Whatever else they are, Mondrian's and Terragni's works are units, so their meaning is precisely challenging centricity *within centricity*.

Arnheim's concession to a modicum of foundationalism suggested that art itself might not resist definition. Arnheim called art "the ability of perceptual objects or actions, either natural or man-made, to represent, through their appearance, constellations of forces that reflect relevant aspects of the dynamics of human experience" (1988, p. 225). It seems possible that this open-ended definition can be radicalized even further than Arnheim thought. Arnheim has been accused of an inability to accommodate postretinal art that has moved beyond the canvas into conceptual, minimalist and ironic appropriative directions. But if the constellations of forces are expanded beyond the confines of the picture (or building, etc.) to include the acts of the artists and conceptual information in the human sphere, there is no reason that such a definition of art after postmodernism could not be entertained.

In the case of *The Power of the Center*, Arnheim's theoretical realism is clear but one is left to relate the theory to more contemporary debates. Since the foundational essays of the 1950s and 1960s, there has not been a direct engagement with alternative theoretical perspectives. Even the relationship to theoretical alternatives with which Arnheim sometimes seems to share much – the phenomenology of Ingarden, the analytic theories of Monroe BEARDSLEY – are not really worked out. Arnheim's later works are beautiful essays full of deep aesthetic observations but lacking the parrying and dissection of contemporary analytic aesthetics. This does not diminish them as sources of profound aesthetic observation, but it requires that one be prepared to work along with an acute mind as various ideas embedded in an internal system are discussed.

Arnheim presently has a mixed legacy. An established historical figure in film theory and the most famous proponent of psychological aesthetics, the importance of his theories for aesthetics has not always been possible to assess because of differences in presentation and language. Nevertheless, once the hasty rejection of what is perceived as his naïve or reactionary realism is overcome, his brand of critical and relationalist realism can be appreciated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Experimentell-psychologische Untersuchungen zum Ausdrucksproblem," *Psychologische Forschung* 11 (1928): 2–132.

Film als Kunst (Berlin, 1932). Trans. L. M. Sieveking and Ian Morrow as *Film* (London, 1933); the first half was repr. as *Film as Art* (Berkeley, Cal., 1957).

Rundfunk als Hörkunst (Munich, 1979). Trans. Mary Ludwig and Herbert Read as *Radio* (London, 1936); repr. as *Radio: An Art of Sound* (New York, 1971).

"Nuovo Laocoonte," *Bianco e Nero* (31 August 1938): 3–33. Trans. Rudolf Arnheim as "A New Laocoön: Artistic Composites and the Talking Film," in *Film as Art* (London, 1958), pp. 164–89. The original German manuscript, "Neuer Laokoon: Die Verkoppelung der künstlerischen Mittel," in *Helmut Diederichs Kritiken und Aufsätze zum Film* (Munich, 1977), pp. 81–112.

Art and Visual Perception: A Psychology of the Creative Eye (Berkeley, Cal., 1954; 1974).

Toward a Psychology of Art: Collected Essays (Berkeley, Cal., 1966).

Visual Thinking (Berkeley, Cal., 1969).

Entropy and Art: An Essay on Disorder and Order (Berkeley, Cal., 1971).

The Dynamics of Architectural Form (Berkeley, Cal., 1977).

The Power of the Center: A Study of Composition in the Visual Arts (Berkeley, Cal., 1982; 1988).

New Essays on the Psychology of Art (Berkeley, Cal., 1986).

To the Rescue of Art: Twenty Six Essays (Berkeley, Cal., 1992).

The Split and the Structure: Twenty Eight Essays (Berkeley, Cal., 1996).

Further Reading

Bio Dict Psych, *Cam Dict Amer Bio*

Arnheim, Mary. *Rudolf Arnheim: Bibliography of his Writings, 1928–1982* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1983). The *1983–1990 Supplement* was added in 1991.

Beardsley, Monroe. "The Role of Psychological Explanation in Aesthetics," in *Perceiving Artworks* (Philadelphia, 1980), pp. 185–212.

Carrier, David. "Theoretical Perspectives on the Arts, Sciences and Technology," *Leonardo* 19 (1986): 251–4.

Kleinman, Kent, and Lesley van Duzen, eds. *Rudolf Arnheim: Revealing Vision* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1997).

Sowers, Robert. *Rethinking the Forms of Visual Expression* (Berkeley, Cal., 1990).

Smith, Ralph, ed. "Essays in Honor of Rudolf Arnheim," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 27 (1993): 1–189.

Verstegen, Ian. "The Thought, Life, and Influence of Rudolf Arnheim," *Genetic, Social and General Psychological Monographs* 122 (1996): 197–213.

Ian Verstegen

ARROW, Kenneth Joseph (1921–)

Kenneth Arrow was born on 23 August 1921 in New York City. In 1940 he received a BSS degree from the City College of New York, and in 1941 an MA in mathematics from Columbia University. He served as a weather officer in the US Army from 1942 until 1946, and then continued his graduate work at Columbia, receiving his PhD in economics in 1951. His first faculty position was teaching economics at the University of Chicago in 1948–9. Arrow has since been professor of economics at Stanford University from 1949 to 1968; at Harvard University from 1968 to 1979; and again at Stanford from 1979 until his retirement in 1991. He has won numerous awards, including the John Bates Clark Medal in 1957, the John von Neumann Theory Prize in 1986, and most notably, the Nobel Prize in Economics in 1972.

Arrow's contributions to economics and related fields are many; they concern such topics as social welfare, production and growth, mathematical programming, optimal public policy, and general equilibrium theory. However, his renown among philosophers stems from just one of those contributions: his "impossibility theorem," which he defends in his classic book, *Social Choice and Individual Values* (1951). This theorem has disturbing implications for the feasibility of basing social choices (such as the choice of a government official) on the aggregation of individual preferences; for example, on the aggregation of Ann's, Stan's, and Dan's personal rankings of the candidates, where Ann, Stan, and Dan constitute the relevant social body. Arrow demonstrates that we can find no procedure for doing this: there is no "aggregation device," which meets certain reasonable, weak conditions on such procedures. Those five conditions are the following:

The Ordering condition. For each set of coherent (i.e., transitive and complete) individual preference orderings of a set of alternatives, an acceptable aggregation device yields a unique, coherent social ordering of those alternatives.

The Unrestricted Scope condition. An aggregation device must generate a social ordering no matter how many citizens exist, no matter how many options the citizens are considering, and no matter how each citizen ranks the options.

The Pareto Optimality condition. An aggregation device must respect unanimity. If every individual prefers alternative *A* to *B*, then *A* must rank higher than *B* in the social ordering of the alternatives.

The Nondictatorship condition. An aggregation device must not identify the *social* ordering of any set of alternatives with a particular *individual* ordering. In other words, there is no citizen whose individual ranking of a set of alternatives constitutes the social ordering of those alternatives, regardless of the preferences of the other citizens.

The Independence of Irrelevant Alternatives condition. In ordering two alternatives *A* and *B*, an aggregation device must take into account no individual preference orderings of alternatives other than *A* and *B*. Also, in taking into account the individual preference orderings of *A* and *B*, nothing is to count but the *order* in which *A* and *B* are ranked by the relevant individuals.

Arrow's impossibility theorem can now be stated in this way: if the alternatives considered by a social group are at least three in number, no aggregation device meets all five of the above conditions. Every such device, including majority rule and the Borda Count, violates at least one of these conditions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Social Choice and Individual Values (New York, 1951; 2nd edn 1963).
General Competitive Analysis, with Frank H. Hahn (San Francisco, 1971).
The Limits of Organization (New York, 1974).

Other Relevant Works
Collected Papers of Kenneth J. Arrow, 6 vols (Cambridge, Mass., 1983–5).

Further Reading
Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, *Oxford Comp Phil*
Barry, Brian, and Russell Hardin, eds. *Rational Man and Irrational Society?* (London, 1982).
Chichilnisky, Graciela, ed. *Markets, Information, and Uncertainty: Essays in Economic Theory in Honor of Kenneth J. Arrow* (Cambridge, UK, 1999).
Feiwel, George R., ed. *Arrow and the Ascent of Economic Theory* (New York, 1987).
"Kenneth J. Arrow," in *Lives of the Laureates*, 3rd edn, ed. William Breit and Roger W. Spencer (Cambridge, Mass., 1995).
Mackay, Alfred F. *Arrow's Theorem: The Paradox of Social Choice* (New Haven, Conn., 1980).
Saari, Donald. *Decisions and Elections: Explaining the Unexpected* (Cambridge, UK, 2001).

John J. Tilley

ATWATER, Lyman Hotchkiss (1813–83)

Lyman Hotchkiss Atwater was born on 20 February 1813 in New Haven, Connecticut, the son of Lyman Atwater and Clarissa Hotchkiss. He was influenced early on by the preaching of Nathaniel William Taylor. He entered Yale University at age fourteen, and in 1831 had a profound conversion experience during a revival at the college. Following his graduation with a BA in 1831 he taught for a year at Mount Hope Seminary in Baltimore, and then returned to Yale Divinity School. In 1835 he settled at the First Congregational Church in Fairfield and married Susan Sanford, with whom he had five children. During his tenure as pastor Atwater made explicit his objections to Taylor's New Divinity, especially its embrace of the excesses of revivalism and its rejection of divine power over human will. He published frequently in *Literary and Theological Review*, *The Biblical Repertory*, *The Princeton Review*, and other journals.

Due to his clear articulation of Calvinism he was appointed professor of mental and moral philosophy at Princeton College in 1854,

where he taught courses on the correlation of revealed religion and metaphysics. Atwater served as co-editor of *The Princeton Review* from 1869 to 1878, contributing 110 articles on many subjects including theology, education, ethics, spirituality, economics, philosophy, and politics. During the academic year 1868–9 he served as interim President of Princeton. On the naming of James McCosh as President, Atwater became professor of logic, metaphysics, ethics, economics, and politics in 1869, holding this position until his death. During his tenure at Princeton, in addition to teaching, Atwater served as an effective administrator. He conceived and conducted a campaign in 1862 that raised $140,000 for endowment, and he served on a committee in 1869 to reunite Old School and New School Presbyterians. Atwater also taught philosophy and ethics at Princeton Seminary, and he served on the board of trustees and as Vice President of the seminary from 1877 until his death. Atwater died on 17 February 1883 in Princeton, New Jersey.

Atwater's most enduing contribution was *A Manual of Elementary Logic* (1867), which became a standard text in many colleges. He defended Old School Calvinism vigorously during a period of liberalization in American Protestantism. While at Fairfield he led an unsuccessful effort to bring theological charges against Horace Bushnell. Atwater was a keen observer of the American spiritual landscape, and he argued for the significance of economic issues and for the need for a religious basis for legislation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Power of Contrary Choice," *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review* 12 (October 1840): 532–49.
"The Doctrinal Attitude of Old School Presbyterians," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 21 (January 1864): 81–112.
"Herbert Spencer's Philosophy," *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review* 37 (April 1865): 243–71.
A Manual of Elementary Logic (Philadelphia, 1867).
"The Labor Question in its Economic and Christian Aspects," *Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review* 1 (July 1872): 468–95.
"The Late Commercial Crisis," *Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review* 3 (1874): 106–19.
"Taxation of Churches, Colleges and Charitable Institutions," *Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review* 3 (April 1874): 340–48.
"Calvinism in Doctrine and Life," *Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review* 4 (January 1875): 73–106.
"Morality, Religion, and Education in the State," *Princeton Review* 1 (March 1878): 395–422.
"Religion and Politics," in *Report of Proceedings of the General Council of the Presbyterian Alliance* (Philadelphia, 1880).
"Christian Morality, Expediency, and Liberty," *Princeton Review* 7 (January 1881): 61–82.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v12*
Porter, Noah, James McCosh, and William A. Taylor. *Addresses Delivered at the Funeral of Lyman Hotchkiss Atwater* (New York, 1883).
Smith, Gary Scott. *The Seeds of Secularization: Calvinism, Culture and Pluralism, 1870–1915* (St. Paul, Minn., 1989).

Roger Ward

AUBREY, Edwin Ewart (1896–1956)

Edwin E. Aubrey was born on 19 March 1896 in Glasgow, Scotland. He emigrated to the United States at age seventeen. He became a naturalized citizen in 1918, after having served in World War I with the United States Ambulance Service in France and Italy. Aubrey earned his B.Phil. degree from Bucknell University in 1919, and his MA (1921), BD (1922), and PhD in religious education (1926) from the University of Chicago. Aubrey then taught at Carleton College, Miami University of Ohio, and Vassar College. From 1929 to 1944, he served as professor of Christian theology and ethics at the University of Chicago. He was President of Crozer Theological Seminary in Chester, Pennsylvania from 1944 to 1949. In 1949 he established the Department of Religious Thought at the University of Pennsylvania, where he served as professor and chairman of the department until his death on 10 September 1956 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

At Pennsylvania, Aubrey taught theology and history courses, such as "Theology of Christian Mysticism," "The Christian Conception of Man," "Church and State in Contemporary Thought," and "Christianity and Democracy." His philosophical writings expressed his hope for the renewal of both church and college through the examination of Christian theology and ethics. He primarily addressed issues of secularization, religion, and higher education, specialization, and the necessary decline of Protestant sectarianism. Aubrey was a national Protestant educational leader, consulting with numerous colleges, universities, and churches while on the lecture and preaching circuit. He participated in the influential conferences and foundations of the day, including the Science, Philosophy, and Religion Conference in New York with Mortimer ADLER and Albert EINSTEIN during World War II.

In *Living the Christian Faith* (1939), Aubrey reinforced his attack on the neo-orthodox the-ological renaissance that "handed out musty traditional language meant to warm hearts in place of addressing serious issues that the non-theologian layperson faced." In *Secularism, A Myth* (1954), Aubrey offered an apologetic for a humanistic Christian faith, which he saw as a viable alternative to neo-orthodoxy at mid century. Aubrey insisted on avoiding the polar opposites of rationalism and naturalism, and of dogmatism and supernaturalism, seeking to create and then to embrace a middle way for the church. In making his arguments against the easy attack on secularism, Aubrey stood against many of his theological colleagues.

For Aubrey, an unintended consequence of modernity was the realization that putting too much faith in science was no better than putting too much faith in the Bible or dogmatic theology. A balance among these could help to bridge the gap between science and religion. He contended that knowledge should not become an end in itself, but serve the ends of human improvement. Science and religion needed each other, and he believed theology offered resources that could be particularly helpful in bringing them together. Religion could save science, but not in the way fundamentalist Christians might have imagined. At mid century, he suspected the national "turn toward religion" was superficial and misguided, but understandable given fears about nihilism and communism.

During the Cold War, Aubrey wondered aloud why morals, values, and religious insights were not welcome in the university, noting that astronomy had not been removed from the curriculum just because a large number of people believe in astrology. Aubrey's mediating position was criticized from both sides. To those religious leaders who wanted Protestant Christianity to be powerful once again, Aubrey seemed to be an anti-dogmatist; for those philosophers who refused to give the supernatural realm any foothold in modern life, he appeared too religious or moralistic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Religion and the Next Generation (New York, 1931).

Present Theological Tendencies (New York, 1936).

Living the Christian Faith (New York, 1939).

Man's Search for Himself (Nashville, Tenn., 1940).

Secularism, A Myth: An Examination of the Current Attack on Secularism (New York, 1954).

Humanistic Teaching and the Place of Ethical and Religious Values in Higher Education (Philadelphia, 1959).

Other Relevant Works

Aubrey's papers are at the University of Pennsylvania.

Further Reading

Nat Cycl Amer Bio v42, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Schneider, Herbert W. "Natural Thought and the World of Religion," *Journal of Philosophy* 14 (1951): 66–73.

Robert Wilson-Black

AUDI, Robert Nemir (1941–)

Robert Audi was born on 19 November 1941 in New York City. He earned his BA in 1963 from Colgate University. He then earned his PhD in 1967 from the University of Michigan, where he wrote his dissertation on "The Explanation of Human Action in Common Sense and Psychology" under the direction of William P. ALSTON. From 1967 to 1972 he taught philosophy at the University of Texas. For the next thirty years, from 1973 to 2003, he taught at the University of Nebraska, where he rose from full professor in 1976 to Charles J. Mach Distinguished Professor of Philosophy in 1996, and Charles J. Mach University Professor in 2001. Audi joined the faculty of the University of Notre Dame in 2003 as professor of philosophy and David E. Gallo Professor of Business Ethics. He has received numerous fellowships, lectureships, consultantships, and other honors, in the United States and abroad. In 1987–8 he served as President of the American Philosophical Association Central Division. In 1995 he was awarded an honorary doctorate in social science by the University of Helsinki.

Audi is a leading figure in contemporary epistemology, a major contributor to action theory and political philosophy, and probably the leading ethical intuitionist since W. D. Ross. He has also made important contributions to applied ethics and the philosophies of mind, religion, science, law, and education. A tireless instigator of philosophical dialogue, his influence reaches beyond the world of professional philosophy. He contributes to legal and education journals and, in his capacity as general editor of the *Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*, he has done much to promote philosophical literacy among the interested public.

Perhaps Audi's most important work to date is *The Architecture of Reason* (2001). This brings together his already influential, central work in epistemology, ethics, and action theory to form a unified theory of rationality. He articulates the account by systematically developing parallels between theoretical and practical reason. Although neither sort of reason reduces to the other, they are informatively analogous. Structurally, both have foundations and superstructures. Both are ultimately responsive, and responsible, to experience. At the foundational level the former are capable of evaluations according to their cognitive, the latter according to their conative (understood largely in terms of felt reward and punishment), adequacy to the experiences which causally engender and evidentially ground them. At the inferential level, or within the superstructures, further analogies between

inferential beliefs and intentional actions emerge. Both are grounded in the reasons that sustain them. Rational belief is the "connective tissue" that produces ordered relations between theoretical and practical reason. Reason, then, is no "slave of the passions," as in Humean instrumentalist accounts. The result of successful theoretical reasoning is, like a good map, "true to the territory it represents"; and the result of successful practical reasoning will, like a good itinerary, deliver the rewarding experiences it promises. Global rationality combines mutually interdependent successes of both kinds.

Audi's theory has important normative implications. For instance, it entails that, given certain normal beliefs and desires, altruistic acts are sometimes reasonably, although not rationally, required. He distinguishes many varieties of relativism, and argues that, while his theory is compatible with a wide variety of circumstantially and temperamentally variable ends, it does not entail any strong sort of epistemic or ethical relativism.

Audi's considerable contributions to epistemology, which inform his account of theoretical reason, are most comprehensively articulated and defended in *The Structure of Justification* (1993). Audi develops and defends a moderate foundationalist account of epistemic justification, which concedes the fallibility and defeasibility of justified beliefs at even the foundational level, and affords a strong (but dependent) epistemic significance to coherence. Of particular importance are the distinctions which lead to his highly original accounts of how coherence can affect justification at all levels within a foundationalist structure and how knowledge can have both internalist and externalist features. He is also well known in epistemology for his work on self-evidence and the a priori (he defends a moderate rationalism), sense perception (he defends an adverbial account), testimony, the concept of belief, naturalism, and skepticism.

Audi is a leading moral epistemologist. His moral epistemology combines a neo-Rossian intuitionism with many of the most important epistemic features of moral epistemic "reflectionism." This moral epistemology is the view that (1) one's moral beliefs become more justified as one approaches reflective equilibrium, a state of coherence among one's moral beliefs at all levels of generality, and (2) justification at no level of generality is privileged in such a way as to automatically trump justification at other levels. His more general work on self-evidence and the a priori (and in the philosophy of mind) informs his sophisticated account of the psychological and epistemic nature of moral intuition; and his moderate foundationalism facilitates his synthesis of intuitionism, which, in its most plausible forms, entails foundationalism, and reflectionism, which is often (but wrongly, he argues) thought to entail coherentism.

An important source for Audi's moral epistemology, and his other major contributions to ethical theory, is his *Moral Knowledge and Ethical Character* (1997). In ethics, his experientialism and pluralism are particularly important and basic. Experientialism is the view that experiences, and only experiences, are intrinsically valuable. Apart from experience of them, real, unexperienced things, like beautiful mountain ranges on unvisited planets, have "inherent" value, (roughly) the potential to be constituents in valuable experiences. His pluralism affirms belief in an irreducible variety of kinds of intrinsically valuable experiences, and it provides the grounds for his rejection of hedonism and his rejection of moral theories in which rightness consists in merely optimizing or maximizing what is intrinsically valuable. Audi has also done important work on the analysis of central moral concepts, such as goodness, rightness, and virtue, and their relations.

Audi's *The Good in the Right: A Theory of Intuition and Intrinsic Value* (2004) contains the most developed account of his intuitionism, and provides a sophisticated history and critical taxonomy of intuitionisms. It introduces an original neo-Kantian normative

theory which, despite its Kantian leanings, allows significant relevance to the optimization of reward-realization, and an even more significant place to virtue, as regards moral responsibility and goodness.

So far the most comprehensive source for Audi's work in action theory, which importantly informs many of his views described above (and vice versa), is his *Action, Intention, and Reason* (1993). Drawing on some of his earliest published work, he there develops interdependent accounts of wanting and believing. Wanting and believing, on his view, are two of the most important concepts in action theory. His account of wanting, in particular, is informed by his "nomic and qualifiedly causal" view of the explanation of action. The connection between intending and acting is explainable by appeal to laws – although neither a priori nor scientific laws, but rather laws of ordinary rationality – and the connection is, in a non-trivial way, causally grounded in what explains it. On this basis he develops an account of responsibility for action which is compatible with metaphysical determinism, and he begins to develop the pluralistic, objectivist account of rational action that achieves fruition in his more recent work on the theory of rationality.

Perhaps Audi's three most distinctive contributions to the philosophy of mind are his accounts of the causal power of intentional states, the concept of believing, and mental images as properties. The first two of these are especially seminal in his work in epistemology, ethics, and action theory. In the course of defending the causal power of intentional states, he importantly distinguishes between "reasons as abstract contents" and "reason states," and between "sustaining" and "dynamic" causal relations. In explicating belief, he introduces an influential distinction between dispositional beliefs and dispositions to believe.

Characteristically, Audi's major contributions to the philosophy of religion are informed by his work in the theory of rationality. Especially influential among these are his reli-gious epistemology, particularly his account of rational faith and his work on the permissibility of religious reasons in political and legal contexts. An especially influential feature of his religious epistemology is his account of a fiducial faith, which is "both psychologically strong enough to enable it to play a central part in the cognitive dimension of religious commitment and evidentially modest enough to be rational on the basis of substantially less grounding than is required for the rationality of belief with the same content" (1991, p. 234). In *Religion in the Public Square: The Place of Religious Convictions in Political Debate* (1997), he develops and defends a view according to which someone motivated by religious reasons to advocate a coercive public policy can justifiably do so only if he also has adequate secular reasons.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Intending," *Journal of Philosophy* 70 (1973): 387–403.
"Acting for Reasons," *Philosophical Review* 45 (1986): 511–46.
Practical Reasoning (London, 1989).
"Faith, Belief, and Rationality," *Philosophical Perspectives* 5 (1991): 213–39.
"Mental Causation: Sustaining and Dynamic," in *Mental Causation*, ed. John Heil and Alfred Mele (Oxford, 1992), pp. 53–74.
Action, Intention, and Reason (Ithaca, N.Y., 1993).
The Structure of Justification (Cambridge, UK, 1993).
"Dispositional Beliefs and Dispositions to Believe," *Noûs* 28 (1994): 419–34.
Religion in the Public Square: The Place of Religious Convictions in Political Debate, with Nicholas Wolterstorff (Lanham, Md., 1997).
Moral Knowledge and Ethical Character (Oxford, 1997).
Epistemology: A Contemporary Introduction to the Theory of Knowledge

(London, 1998; 2nd edn 2003).

"Self-Evidence," *Philosophical Perspectives* 13 (1999): 205–28.

The Architecture of Reason: The Structure and Substance of Rationality (Oxford, 2001).

The Good in the Right: A Theory of Intuition and Intrinsic Value (Princeton, N.J., 2004).

Other Relevant Works

"Direct Justification, Evidential Dependence, and Theistic Belief," in *Rationality, Religious Belief, and Moral Commitment*, ed. Robert Audi and William Wainwright (Ithaca, N.Y., 1986), pp. 139–67.

"Scientific Objectivity and the Evaluation of Hypotheses," in *The Philosophy of Logical Mechanism*, ed. Merrilee Salmon (Dordrecht, 1988), pp. 321–45.

"The Separation of Church and State and the Obligations of Citizenship," *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 18 (1989): 259–96.

"Ethical Naturalism and the Explanatory Power of Moral Concepts," in *Naturalism: A Critical Appraisal*, ed. Steven Wagner and Richard Warner (South Bend, Ind., 1993), pp. 95–115.

"The Dimensions of Faith and the Demands of Reason," in *Reasoned Faith*, ed. Eleonore Stump (Ithaca, N.Y., 1993), pp. 70–89.

"Between Faculty and Students: The Ethics of Teaching and the Ideals of Learning," *Academe* 80 (1994): 27–36.

Ed., *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy* (Cambridge, UK, 1995).

"Acting from Virtue," *Mind* 104 (1995): 449–71.

"Religious Experience and the Practice Conception of Justification," in *The Rationality of Belief and the Plurality of Faith*, ed. Thomas D. Senor (Ithaca, N.Y., 1996), pp. 127–49.

"Theism and the Mind-Body Problem," in *Faith, Freedom, and Rationality*, ed. Jeff Jordan and Daniel Howard-Snyder (Ithaca, N.Y., 1996), pp. 155–69.

"The Place of Testimony in the Fabric of Knowledge and Justification," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 34 (1997): 404–22.

"The Axiology of Moral Experience," *Journal of Ethics* 2 (1998): 355–75.

"Philosophical Naturalism at the Turn of the Century," *Journal of Philosophical Research* 25 (2000): 27–45.

"A Kantian Intuitionism," *Mind* 110 (2001): 601–35.

"Epistemic Virtue and Justified Belief," in *Virtue Epistemology*, ed. Abrol Fairweather and Linda Zagzebski (Oxford, 2001), pp. 82–97.

"Prospects for a Naturalization of Practical Reason: Humean Instrumentalism and the Normative Authority of Desire," *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 10 (2002): 235–63.

"An Internalist Theory of Normative Grounds," *Philosophical Topics* 29 (2002): 19–46.

"Theoretical Rationality: Its Sources, Structure, and Scope," in *The Oxford Handbook of Rationality*, ed. Alfred Mele and Piers Rawling (Oxford, 2004).

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v9

Foley, Richard. "Audi on Practical Reasoning," *Behavior and Philosophy* 19 (1991): 59–72.

Kappel, Klemens. "Challenges to Audi's Ethical Intuitionism," *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 5 (2002): 391–413.

Mele, Alfred. "Self-Deception, Action and Will: Comments," *Erkenntnis* 18 (1982): 159–64.

Radcliffe, Dana M. "Nondoxastic Faith: Audi on Religious Commitment," *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 37 (1995): 73–86.

Peter Tramel

AUNE, Bruce Arthur (1933–)

Bruce Aune was born on 7 November 1933 in Minneapolis, Minnesota. He attended the Minneapolis public schools, and received his BA (1955) and MA (1957) at the University of Minnesota. His master's thesis focused on "The Cognitive Content of Literary Art." Aune spent 1957/8 at the University of California at Los Angeles studying logic with Rudolph CARNAP, Richard Montague, and Donald Kalish. He returned to Minnesota with the intent of studying with Wilfrid SELLARS. Discovering that Sellars had moved on to Yale, Aune worked primarily with Alan DONAGAN and Herbert FEIGL, completing his PhD dissertation on "Sensation and Human Behavior" with Feigl in 1960.

After spending two years teaching philosophy at Oberlin College, Aune joined the philosophy department of the University of Pittsburgh in 1963. In 1966 Aune became head of the philosophy department of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, serving until 1971. During that period Aune bore primary responsibility for the recruitment and hiring of a group of young philosophers who transformed the department into a distinguished center of graduate research. He remained professor of philosophy there until his retirement in 2001. Aune has held visiting appointments at the University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, University of California at Riverside, Amherst College, Dartmouth College, Mount Holyoke College, Smith College, and Union College. Aune has also been a Guggenheim Fellow, a Fulbright Fellow, and a resident fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavior Sciences at Stanford University.

Aune's early scholarship focused primarily on issues in epistemology and philosophy of mind. His article, "Hypotheticals and 'Can': Another Look," (1967), and his contribution, "Can," to the *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (1967) have both played major roles in the philosophical literature exploring analyses of "S can do X." In the 1970s, Aune's interests broadened to include Kant, leading to a book,

Kant's Theory of Morals (1980), and a teaching interest that he maintained until his retirement. Aune is also interested in a variety of issues in ontology, in which he maintains a broadly nominalist perspective, reflected in his recently published article, "Universals and Predication" (2002).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Knowledge, Mind, and Nature (New York, 1967).
Rationalism, Empiricism, and Pragmatism (New York, 1970).
Reason and Action (Dordrecht, 1978).
Kant's Theory of Morals (Princeton, N.J., 1980).
Metaphysics: The Elements (Minneapolis, 1985).
Knowledge of the External World (London, 1990).

Other Relevant Works
"The Problem of Other Minds," *Philosophical Review* 70 (1961): 320–39.
"Is There an Analytic A Priori?" *Journal of Philosophy* 60 (1963): 281–91.
"Can," in *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Paul Edwards (New York, 1967), vol. 2, pp. 18–20.
"Hypotheticals and 'Can': Another Look," *Analysis* 27 (1967): 237–43.
"Action and Ontology," *Philosophical Studies* 44 (1988): 195–213.
"Sellars' Two Images of the World," *Journal of Philosophy* 87 (1990): 537–45.
"The Unity of Plato's *Republic*," *Ancient Philosophy* 17 (1997): 1–18.
"Against Moderate Rationalism," *Journal of Philosophical Research* 27 (2002): 1–26.
"Universals and Predication," in *Blackwell Guide to Metaphysics*, ed. Richard M. Gale (Oxford, 2002), pp. 131–50.

Further Reading
Alston, William P. "Aune on Thought and Language," *Noûs* 3 (1969): 169–83.
Fowler, Corbin. "An Alternative to Aune's

Idealized View of Practical Reasoning," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 18 (1980): 23–36.

Hunter, J. F. M. "Aune and Others on Ifs and Cans," *Analysis* 28 (1968): 107–109.

Rappaport, Steven. "Aune's Wittgenstein on the Empiricist Thesis," *Philosophical Studies* 24 (1973): 258–62.

David E. Schrader

AXINN, Sidney (1923–)

Sidney Axinn was born on 30 January 1923 in New York City. After serving in the US Army during World War II from 1943 to 1946, he completed his education at the University of Pennsylvania, where he received his BA in 1947 and his PhD in philosophy in 1955. He was influenced early at Pennsylvania by C. West CHURCHMAN's pragmatism, and wrote his dissertation on "A Study of Kant's Philosophy of History." In 1955 Axinn became an instructor of philosophy at Temple University and was promoted up to full professor by 1964, holding that position until retiring in 1993. He also was an adjunct professor in the psychiatry department of Temple University's Medical School from 1956 to 1993, and was a professor at the Temple University Japan in Tokyo during 1986–8.

For many years during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, Axinn was the senior scholar and leader of Temple University's philosophy department. He served as department chair from 1952 to 1967, and helped to guide the department towards the establishment of its doctoral program. By the 1970s, with the arrival of colleagues Monroe BEARDSLEY, Hugues LEBLANC, and Joseph MARGOLIS, Temple's philosophy department consolidated its strengths in the history of philosophy, analytic philosophy, and aesthetics.

Axinn's own philosophical interests are primarily in Kant, in areas of social, moral, and value theory, and in philosophy of war. He was a member of the board of directors of the *Journal of the History of Ideas* from 1980 to 1994, and the journal's treasurer from 1982 to 1994. He has been active in several philosophical societies, including the American Society for Value Inquiry (serving as President in 1985); the American Philosophical Association; the North American Kant Society; the American Section of the International Society for Law and Social Philosophy; the Aristotelian Society; the International Society for Chinese Philosophy; and Concerned Philosophers for Peace. Axinn has remained active in scholarship during his retirement, and since 2001 he has been a courtesy professor at the University of South Florida.

Axinn's major work on Kant, *The Logic of Hope: Extensions of Kant's View of Religion* (1994), concerns the question posed by Kant, "For what can a human being rationally hope?" Axinn examines Kant's *Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone* in the context of Kant's moral and political theory, and develops a theory for transforming the world community into a Kingdom of Ends of individuals and a peaceful League of Nations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Two Concepts of Optimism," *Philosophy of Science* 21 (1954): 16–24.

"Kant, Logic, and the Concept of Mankind," *Ethics* 68 (1958): 286–91.

"And Yet: A Kantian Analysis of Aesthetic Interest," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 25 (1964): 108–16.

"Ayer on Negation," *Journal of Philosophy* 65 (1964): 74–5.

"Fallacy of the Single Risk," *Philosophy of Science* 33 (1966): 154–62.

"Mathematics as an Experimental Science," *Philosophia Mathematica* 5 (1968): 1–10.

"Kant, Authority, and the French Revolution," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 32 (1971): 423–32.

"Kant and Goodman on Possible Individuals," *The Monist* 61 (1978): 476–82.

"The Collective Sense of Equal Protection of the Laws," in *Social Justice*, ed. Michael Bradie and David Braybrooke (Bowling Green, Ohio, 1982), pp. 44–54.

A Moral Military (Philadelphia, 1989).

"Moral Style," *Journal of Value Inquiry* 24 (1990): 123–33.

The Logic of Hope: Extensions of Kant's View of Religion (Atlanta, Georgia, 1994).

"Kant on Possible Hope: The Critique of Pure Hope," in *The Proceedings of the Twentieth World Congress of Philosophy, vol. 7: Modern Philosophy*, ed. Mark Gedney (Bowling Green, Ohio, 2000), pp. 79–87.

Other Relevant Works

"Autobiographical Sketch," in *A Quarter Century of Value Inquiry: Presidential Addresses of the American Society for Value Inquiry*, ed. Richard T. Hull (Amsterdam, 1994), pp. 293–4.

Ed. with Jane Kneller, *Autonomy and Community: Readings in Contemporary Kantian Social Philosophy* (Albany, N.Y., 1998).

Further Reading

Cavallar, Georg. "Axinn's *The Logic of Hope*," *Kant-Studien* 89 (1998): 230–32.

John R. Shook

AXTELLE, George Edward (1893–1974)

George E. Axtelle was born on 28 November 1893 in Crandall, Texas. He completed his BS degree from the University of Washington in 1923. From 1924 to 1930 he worked as a public school administrator in Hawaii, where he completed an MA degree at the University of Hawaii in 1928. Axtelle served as a Junior High School principal in Oakland, California from 1930 to 1935, and received his EdD degree from the University of California at Berkeley in 1935.

From 1935 to 1942 Axtelle taught education at Northwestern University. During World War II he served at a number of public posts, including labor relations and employee relations. He was appointed to the education faculty of New York University in 1945, and in 1946 became the chair of the history and philosophy of education department, a position that he occupied until 1959. While at New York University, George Axtelle was a visiting faculty member at Yale University in 1956–7 and Fulbright Lecturer in Egypt in 1952–3.

In 1959 Axtelle joined the faculty at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale as a professor of education. At Southern Illinois he taught seminars on pragmatism, John DEWEY, William JAMES, Charles PEIRCE, and George MEAD. Axtelle had a longstanding interest in the philosophy of John Dewey, and was among the founding members of the John Dewey Society. In 1960 he received a grant to edit and publish the complete writings of Dewey, and this project eventually grew into what is today the Center for Dewey Studies. Axtelle retired from Southern Illinois University in 1966, and died on 1 August 1974 in Carbondale.

Axtelle was active in many public service areas. He served as Vice Chairman of the New York Committee to Abolish Capital Punishment, and Vice Chairman of the New York Liberal Party. He was a member of the executive board of the League for Industrial Democracy, Vice President and member of the executive council of the American Federation of

Teachers, and President of the American Humanist Association at various times during his career.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Democracy and the Curriculum, with Harold Rugg, Hollis L. Caswell, and George Count (New York, 1939).

Ed. with William W. Wattenberg, *Teachers for Democracy* (New York, 1940).

"Social Implementation of Democracy and Education," in *Teachers for Democracy*, ed. George E. Axtelle and William W. Wattenberg (New York, 1940).

"Alfred North Whitehead and the Problem of Unity," *Educational Theory* 19 (1969): 129–53.

"Dewey on Education and Schooling," in *Guide to the Works of John Dewey*, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale, Ill., 1970), pp. 257–305.

Other Relevant Works
Axtelle's papers are at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Further Reading
Who Was Who in Amer v6

Michael R. Taylor

AYRES, Clarence Edwin (1891–1972)

Clarence E. Ayres was born on 6 May 1891 in Lowell, Massachusetts. After graduation from Brown University with his BA in 1912, he began graduate work at Harvard, but soon returned to Brown where he completed his MA in economics in 1914. He then went to the University of Chicago to study philosophy and was awarded the PhD in 1917. He taught philosophy at the University of Chicago from 1917 to 1920, before becoming associate professor of economics at Amherst College in 1920. In 1923 Ayres, along with many other faculty, resigned from Amherst to protest the dismissal of President Alexander MEIKLEJOHN. Ayres taught economics at Reed College in 1923–4, and then was an associate editor and author of many articles for the *New Republic* from 1924 to 1927. In 1927 he left academia for ranch life in New Mexico.

During the 1920s, Ayres became increasingly interested in the American institutional economists, especially Thorstein VEBLEN, and in John DEWEY's philosophy of instrumentalism. In 1930 Ayres became a professor of economics at the University of Texas. He remained for the rest of his career, except for occasional leaves for service in government, including terms as a governor of the Federal Reserve Board during the 1960s. Ayres also served on the national committee of the American Civil Liberties Union for twenty years. He retired from Texas in 1968. Ayres died on 24 July 1972 in Alamogordo, New Mexico.

During his nearly forty years at Texas, Ayres established the Texas School of institutional economics, which continues to remind economists of the importance of economic philosophy. His life's work became the integration of institutional economics and instrumental reasoning. Ayres's most influential work is *Theory of Economic Progress* (1944/1962) in which he criticized the ethnocentric commercial economic view of conventional economics, articulated an alternative view of economics, and sketched a program for institutional adjustment to sustain economic progress. He defined progress in terms of finding how to do more and better things. He insisted that progress thus defined is irresistible and everywhere at war with the status preoccupations and habitual sensibilities of propriety. Progress occurs through new combinations of previously unrelated technical artifacts or ideas that bear fruit in their admixture. This includes not only accretion of technical materials or tools but more fundamentally the spread of knowledge about material process. Hence Ayres stressed widening participation as the key to

progress. The more people who have the capacity and opportunity to engage in the material process of inquiry and development, the greater the pool whence new combinations emerge. There is no trade-off between equality and efficiency or growth in a real dynamic economy.

Ayres sketched a strategy for progress to guide the democratic industrial society in taking advantage of the opportunity presented in the immediate period after World War II. The strategy consisted of intensive and extensive development of the New Deal program. Domestically the principles of balancing income flows and revamping the success criteria of corporate America were to be deepened to secure universal participation in socially responsible prosperity. Internationally, Ayres called for application of these principles in a World New Deal intended to promote global economic progress and head off the abysmal deprivation that foments disorder and military conflict.

With respect to corporate governance, Ayres clearly took a "stakeholder" view, rather than a narrow "stockholder" view. He was concerned with harnessing the power of large corporations to the social interest. Ayres advocated the concentration-and-control strategy. In this view, corporate concentration of resources and power is seen to be inevitable and it is therefore necessary to institute a strategy to secure national and international social control to channel corporate behavior toward the public purpose. In order to facilitate democratic control by regulators and public opinion, Ayres advocated opening corporate accounting to public view, as the functional equivalent of a street light in the interest of public safety.

Ayres and other institutionalists also agreed with John Maynard Keynes about the need for an offset policy to counteract the fundamental tendency of finance capitalism toward macroeconomic stagnation. Creation of purchasing power by income transfers and public sector projects counteracts this tendency and rescues the potential output that would otherwise go unproduced and wasted.

Ayres's concern for redistribution went well beyond the macroeconomic concern for aggregate demand; indeed, it went beyond even the humanitarian concern for the underprivileged. Progress for all would be advanced by the widening participation that income redistribution would bring about. Wider participation would magnify the opportunities for creativity and new departures in knowledge and technique. For this reason, Ayres advocated a guaranteed annual income to secure the financing of household livelihoods. Ayres thought that social scientists and philosophers had an ideological responsibility to advocate such bold new departures that would make possible the transition from the Welfare Society to the Creative Society.

Ayres's most philosophical book was *Toward a Reasonable Society* (1961), in which he elaborated his blending of the two most important influences on his economic philosophy. He considered the Veblenian dichotomy, between knowledge, skill, and tools on the one hand and the socially structured personal relations, custom, and sentiments on the other, to be Veblen's principal legacy. Veblen's dichotomy contrasts the invidious and the non-invidious interests. The non-invidious interest refers to the common good of all humanity. To establish that a given use of resources is non-invidious is to establish its service to enhancing human life on the whole. This direct contribution to the fullness of human life on the whole is drawn in contrast to the indirect or secondary utility of goods that derives from competitive emulation and the desire to make an invidious comparison. The invidious interest resides in the individual's desire to make a comparison of relative rank and status to his or her neighbors. Veblenian waste is the expenditure of a scarce resource to satisfy the desire for invidious comparison.

Much of Ayres's work was dedicated to articulation of this dichotomy by weaving into the institutionalist paradigm the instrumental reasoning of John Dewey. For Ayres, instrumental reasoning revealed that there are a handful

of basic values – freedom, abundance, equality, excellence, and security – that are more or less universally held in otherwise very diverse human societies. So also is democracy, the process of collective governance that serves to advance these basic values, revealed to be a universal aspiration. But following Dewey, Ayres conceived democracy differently from the mechanical conception of majority rule. Democracy is not simply or even most importantly voting to monitor preferences and resolve preference conflicts. Democracy is most importantly a process in which preferences are reformed with the enhanced enlightenment that comes from the process of inquiry and reasoned discourse. In effect, this view of the democratic process implies the merger of the social scientist and social reformer.

Ayres derided the tendency of conventional economics to equate price with value and making money with making goods. He insisted that power and inequality as well as limited information and competence led to mistakes in judgment and preferences for unhealthy and destructive products. The central issue is that wants are social habits that result from emotional conditioning. The preferences and capacities of individuals therefore have no more or less validity than the socialization process by which they are formed. For Ayres, the conventional price theory is a metaphysical rationalization of the extant power and distributive configuration. The positivist stance of conventional economics is a sham.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Science: The False Messiah (Indianapolis, 1927).
Holier Than Thou: The Way of the Righteous (Indianapolis, 1929). Reprinted with *Science: The False Messiah* in one volume (New York, 1973).
Huxley (New York, 1929).
The Problem of Economic Order (New York, 1938).
The Theory of Economic Progress (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1944; 2nd edn, New York, 1962).
The Divine Right of Capital (Boston, 1946).
The Industrial Economy: Its Technological Basis and Institutional Destiny (Boston, 1952).
Toward a Reasonable Society: The Values of Industrial Capitalism (Austin, Tex., 1961).

Other Relevant Works
Ayres's papers are at the University of Texas, Austin.
"The Function and Problems of Economic Theory," *Journal of Political Economy* 26 (1918): 69–90.
"The Epistemological Significance of Social Psychology," *Journal of Philosophy* 15 (1918): 35–44.
"The Basis of Economic Statesmanship," *American Economic Review* 23 (1933): 200–16.
"Moral Confusion in Economics," *International Journal of Ethics* 45 (1935): 170–99.
"Dewey and His 'Studies in Logical Theory'," in *Books that Changed Our Minds*, ed. Malcolm Cowley and Bernard Smith (New York, 1939), pp. 111–26.
"The Legacy of Thorstein Veblen," in *Institutional Economics: Veblen, Commons, and Mitchell Reconsidered* (Berkeley, Cal., 1964), pp. 45–62.
"Guaranteed Income: An Institutionalist View," in *The Guaranteed Income,* ed. R. Theobald (Garden City, N.Y., 1966), pp. 169–82.
"Ideological Responsibility," *Journal of Economic Issues* 1 (1967): 3–11.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, Dict Economics
Breit, William, and W. P. Culbertson, Jr., eds. *Science and Ceremony: The Institutional Economics of C. E. Ayres* (Ayres, Tex., 1976).
Phillips, R. J., ed. *Economic Mavericks: The Texas Institutionalists* (Greenwich, Conn., 1995).

Stanfield, J. Ron and Jacqueline B. Stanfield, "The Significance of Clarence Ayres and the Texas School," in *Is Economics an Evolutionary Science?* ed. F. Louca and M. Perlman (Northampton, Mass., 2000), pp. 83–94.

<div align="right">

J. Ron Stanfield
Jacqueline Bloom Stanfield

</div>

B

BABBITT, Irving (1865–1933)

Irving Babbitt was born on 2 August 1865 in Dayton, Ohio. He received the Harvard BA with final honors in classics in 1889 and the MA degree in classical literature in 1893. Disdainful of the novel doctorate degree, he left to teach romance languages at Williams College. He was called back to Harvard in 1894 as instructor of romance languages, and later also taught comparative literature. He was promoted to professor of French literature in 1912 and remained at Harvard until his death on 15 July 1933 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Babbitt was a visiting professor at the Sorbonne in Paris in 1923, and was elected as a corresponding member of the Institute of France. He was also elected to the American Academy of Arts and Letters in 1930.

With fellow Harvard student Paul Elmer MORE, Babbitt led the New Humanism movement, which offered culturally and politically conservative opposition to the growing romanticism and naturalism of America. Among Babbitt's students were T. S. ELIOT and Walter LIPPMANN; many later conservative intellectuals remain indebted to Babbitt's critical views of unrestrained democracy and individualism. Like Lippmann and H. L. MENCKEN, Babbitt was dubious of unrestrained democracy for its own sake. Romanticism's elevation of the liberated personal self abandons the ethical self-control necessary for the universal human rights and

dignity that ground genuine liberalism. Other so-called humanisms, such as the pragmatism of William JAMES and F. C. S. Schiller, only promote chaotic pluralism and relativism, declared Babbitt in *Literature and the American College* (1908). There is a proper mean and balance essential to excellent human life, and the possible paths to moderation are exemplified in the classics of humanistic literature. Their excellence as literature lies in their capacity to display concrete examples of ethical conduct.

Philosophy, ultimately dependent on symbols of life from literature, can only systematize the structure or formal conditions grounding truth, beauty, and goodness. When philosophy turns into history, the past's dead hand of control dissolves creativity and responsibility. If philosophy surrenders its responsibilities to naturalism, on the other hand, then the pragmatic rationality of the sciences completely dissolves human nature into the subhuman and mechanical and thus likewise abandons personal responsibility. Philosophy must respect the free will that permits voluntary commitment to moral standards, and correspondingly must acknowledge the role of personal responsibility in politics. Because human nature is divided between the lower impulses and the higher will to follow the good, philosophy should help seek a middle place between naturalism and supernaturalism. It is too late to expect the world's great religions, in this age of fragmentation and skepticism, to perform their common task of

elevating human nature. Against both the Hegelian absolute of rigid history and the materialistic hedonism of unrestrained desire, the new philosophy of humanism seeks a virtuous aristocracy and a moderate middle class eager to imitate their example. *Democracy and Leadership* (1924) located the foundation of politics in neither a constitution nor the masses, but in the true leader who exemplifies moral character.

Babbitt had little hope of achieving this goal in America, particularly because of the decay of higher education and the arts. His hostility to the transformation of universities in the first decades of the twentieth century was legendary. He decried the elective system that resigned the wisdom of the core humanities to become just another optional major, and he detested the way that the doctoral degree engendered overspecialization. The arts in America were likewise degenerating. Dulled by romanticism or naturalism, they are led down the path of pandering to the lower classes, or alternatively retreating into a sterile and amoral aestheticism divorced from cultural life. Babbitt viewed contemporary humanists like himself as a "saving remnant" ready to rescue civilization in the New World, yet regretfully unappreciated as puritanical defenders of outdated morality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Literature and the American College (Boston, 1908).

The New Laokoön: An Essay on the Confusion of the Arts (Boston, 1910).

The Masters of Modern French Criticism (Boston, 1912).

Rousseau and Romanticism (Boston, 1919).

Democracy and Leadership (Boston, 1924).

On Being Creative and Other Essays (Boston, 1932).

The Spanish Character and Other Essays, ed. Frederick Manchester, Rachel Giese, and William F. Giese (Boston, 1940). Reprinted as *Character and Culture: Essays on East and West*, with a new introduction by Claes G. Ryn (New Brunswick, N.J., 1995). Contains a bibliography of Babbitt's writings.

Other Relevant Works

"Genius and Taste," in *Contemporary American Criticism*, ed. James Bowman (New York, 1924), pp. 95–108.

Trans., *The Dhammapada* (Oxford, 1936). Contains his essay "Buddha and the Occident."

Irving Babbitt: Representative Writings, ed. George A. Panichas (Lincoln, Neb., 1981).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v23*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Brennan, Stephen C., and Stephen R. Yarbrough. *Irving Babbitt* (Boston, 1987).

Hindus, Milton. *Irving Babbitt, Literature, and the Democratic Culture* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1994).

Hoeveler, J. David, Jr. *The New Humanism: A Critique of Modern America, 1900–1940* (Charlottesville, Va., 1976).

Manchester, Frederick, and Odell Shepard, eds. *Irving Babbitt: Man and Teacher* (New York, 1941).

Nevin, Thomas R. *Irving Babbitt: An Intellectual Study* (Chapel Hill., N.C., 1984).

Panichas, George A. *The Critical Legacy of Irving Babbitt* (Wilmington, Del., 1999).

Panichas, George A., and Claes G. Ryn, eds. *Irving Babbitt in Our Time* (Washington, D.C., 1986).

Ryn, Claes G. *Will, Imagination, and Reason: Babbitt, Croce, and the Problem of Reality* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1997).

John R. Shook

BABBITT, Milton Byron (1916–)

Milton Babbitt was born on 10 May 1916 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and grew up in Jackson, Mississippi. At an early age he studied violin, clarinet, and saxophone, and by the age of fifteen, Babbitt had already developed abilities as a jazz musician and pop music composer. He studied mathematics at the University of Pennsylvania starting in 1931. He soon returned to music, studying at New York University (BA 1935), and then at Princeton University (MFA 1942). Babbitt taught on the music faculty at Princeton from 1938 to 1942, and then again from 1948 until his retirement in 1981; he was also on the mathematics faculty from 1943 to 1945. In 1960 he became William Shubael Conant Professor of Music. Since 1973 Babbitt has been on the composition faculty at the Juilliard School. In 1982 Babbitt received a Pulitzer Prize Special Citation for his life's work. Other awards include the Joseph Bearns Prize for Composition, the New York Critics Circle Citation for "Composition for Four Instruments," and Guggenheim and MacArthur fellowships.

An influential American composer and theorist, Babbitt is best known for his contribution to the compositional approach known as twelve-tone serialism, most closely associated with Arnold SCHOENBERG. Babbitt's particular brand of twelve-tone composition emphasizes the more scientific and mathematical principles of music. He clarified what is called combinatoriality, where twelve-tone rows are combined with other rows with identical pitch classes. He also founded the terminology which dominates the theoretical discourse on twelve-tone music, such as "pitch class" and "time point sets" (note values are identified by their position at the point of attack within the bar). Although less known for his contributions to the development of electronic music in America, Babbitt consulted with RCA on their revolutionary Mark II synthesizer and became one of the first major composers to utilize the synthesizer.

Babbitt has made certain well-known theoretical claims, including a recommendation that musical practice take the language of science as its model. He has also defended the need for music to be conceived and received literally, without any consideration of extramusical (such as social or political) factors. In the context of musical aesthetics, Babbitt is a strict formalist, analytic in method and autonomist in preference. Babbitt wrote a controversial article in 1958 entitled "Who Cares if You Listen?" in which he urges composers to withdraw from public life and not allow public and social aspects to hinder their freedom and focus.

Milton Babbitt is still the subject of a variety of criticism. His theoretical and social stance is believed by some to be defeatist and detached, and considered to be elitist by others. Furthermore, his compositional approach is criticized for its inaccessibility. Still, Babbitt has always insisted upon the relationship between theory and practice. He has continued to influence a diverse array of musical practitioners, from those with strictly musical and/or theoretical preoccupations to more interdisciplinary art forms that incorporate music in a variety of ways.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Words About Music, ed. Stephen Dembski and Joseph N. Straus (Madison, Wisc., 1987).

"Who Cares if You Listen?" *High Fidelity* (February 1958): 38–40, 126–7.

The Collected Essays of Milton Babbitt, ed. Stephen Peles (Princeton, N.J., 2003).

Other Relevant Works

Composition for Four Instruments (1947–8).

All Set, for jazz ensemble (1957).

Philomel, for soprano soloist and synthesizer (1963–4).

Reflections, for piano and synthesized tape (1975).

Concerto for Piano and Orchestra (1985).

Further Reading
Cambridge Dict Amer Bio
Kostelanetz, Richard. *On Innovative Music(ian)s* (New York, 1990).
Mead, Andrew W. *An Introduction to the Music of Milton Babbitt* (Princeton, N.J., 1994).
Nichols, Janet. *American Music Makers: An Introduction to American Composers* (New York, 1991).

Michael David Székely

BAHM, Archie John (1907–96)

Archie J. Bahm was born on 21 August 1907 in Imlay, Michigan. He received his BA from Albion College in Michigan in 1929. He then attended the University of Michigan, where he received his MA in 1930 and his PhD in philosophy in 1933. From 1934 to 1946 Bahm taught philosophy at Texas Technological College (now Texas Tech University). He was associate professor of philosophy at the University of Denver from 1946 to 1948, when he became professor of philosophy at the University of New Mexico. He held that position until retiring in 1973. He was a Fulbright Scholar at the University of Rangoon in 1955–6, and at Banaras Hindu University in 1962–3. As emeritus professor he remained very active at New Mexico in research and publishing. A founder of several philosophical societies, including the Southwest Philosophical Society (serving as its President in 1948), the Mountains–Plains Philosophical Society, and the New Mexico–West Texas Philosophical Society, he also founded and edited for three decades the *Directory of American Philosophers*. Bahm died on 12 March 1996 in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Bahm published numerous introductory textbooks and philosophical treatises. The topics of his work include the nature and types of intuition; logic; axiology, which he defined as the science of values; ethics, which he once defined as the science of "oughtness" and previously had defined as a behavioral science; metaphysics; and epistemology. He dealt with the philosophy of history from the standpoint of universal history, calling it "the philosopher's world model."

In 1932 Bahm debated with Henry Bradford SMITH the question of the translatability of Aristotelian syllogistic into algebraic logic and into the language of *Principia Mathematica*. Smith had shown in his *Symbolic Logic* how to deduce the postulates of Aristotle's system directly from the Boole-Schröder calculus, and had proved, in "On the Relation of the Aristotelian Algebra to that of Boole-Schroeder," the consistency of Aristotelian "algebra." He then attempted to prove the invalidity of the equivalent of *Barbara* given in *Principia Mathematica*. In response, Bahm argued, in "Henry Bradford Smith on the Equivalent Form of Barbara" (1932), that Smith had failed to prove this invalidity as he claimed to do by his method of translation.

Bahm worked as well in history and philosophy of logic, with special concern for dialectical logic, the subject of his book *Polarity, Dialectic, and Organicity* (1970). His later work continued to display his special interest in Oriental philosophy. Although he studied Confucian philosophy, he devoted greatest attention to Buddhist philosophy, and undertook comparative studies of Western, Indian, and Chinese philosophies. His preferred philosophical system, which he labeled as "organicism," found all realities to be composed of organic wholes made up of mutually dependent parts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Philosophy: An Introduction (New York, 1953).
What Makes Acts Right? (Boston, 1958).
Philosophy of the Buddha (New York and London, 1959).

Logic for Beginners (Boston, 1960).

Types of Intuition (Albuquerque, N.M., 1961).

The World's Living Religions (New York, 1964).

Yoga for Business Executives and Professional People (New York, 1965).

The Heart of Confucius: Interpretations of Genuine Living and Great Wisdom (New York, 1969).

Polarity, Dialectic, and Organicity (Springfield, Ill., 1970).

Ethics as a Behavioral Science (Springfield, Ill., 1974).

Metaphysics: An Introduction (New York, 1974).

Comparative Philosophy: Western, Indian and Chinese Philosophies Compared (Albuquerque, N.M., 1977).

The Specialist: His Philosophy, His Disease, His Cure (Albuquerque, N.M., 1977).

The Philosopher's World Model (Westport, Conn., 1979).

Ethics, the Science of Oughtness (Albuquerque, N.M., 1980).

Why Be Moral? (New Delhi, India, 1980; 2nd edn, Albuquerque, N.M., 1992).

Axiology: The Science of Values (Amsterdam, 1993).

Epistemology: Theory of Knowledge (Albuquerque, N.M., 1995).

Organicism: Origin and Development; Life and Publications of the Author (Albuquerque, N.M., 1995).

Other Relevant Works

Bahm's papers are at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

"Henry Bradford Smith on the Equivalent Form of Barbara," *The Monist* 42 (1932): 632–3.

"Beauty Defined," *Philosophical Review* 56 (1947): 582–6.

"Existence and Its Polarities," *Journal of Philosophy* 46 (1949): 629–36.

"Aesthetic Experience and Moral Experience," *Journal of Philosophy* 55 (1958): 837–45.

"Matter and Spirit: Implications of the Organicist View," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 20 (1959): 103–108.

"Theories of Conscience," *Ethics* 75 (1965): 128–31.

"The Aesthetics of Organicism," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 26 (1968): 449–59.

"The Logic of Interdependence," *Journal of Thought* 13 (1978): 106–10.

"Improving Applied Ethics," *International Journal of Applied Philosophy* 2 (1984): 61–8.

Further Reading

Who Was Who in Amer v11, *Who's Who in Phil*

Kunstler, Miecyslaw-Jerzy. "To Compare or Not to Compare," *Dialectics and Humanism* 6 (1979): 137–40.

Reinsmith, William A. "Improving Applied Ethics: A Response to Bahm's 'Improving Applied Ethics'," *International Journal of Applied Philosophy* 2 (1985): 81–4.

Smith, Henry Bradford. "On the Relation of the Aristotelian Algebra to That of Boole-Schroeder," *The Monist* 42 (1932): 282–9.

Irving H. Anellis

BAIER, Annette Claire (1929–)

Born Annette Claire Stoop on 11 October 1929 in Queenstown, New Zealand, Annette Baier received her BA (1951) and MA (1952) degrees in philosophy at the University of Otago, and her B.Phil. (1954) at Somerville College, Oxford. In her preface to *Moral Prejudices*, she acknowledges the importance of her inter-action in the all-female academic community of Somerville, where she studied with such famous

philosophers as Philippa FOOT and Elizabeth Anscombe, who made it clear that the philosophical conversation includes women's voices (1994, p. viii). Baier has taught at the universities of Aberdeen, Auckland, Sydney, and Carnegie-Mellon. In 1973 she joined the philosophy department at the University of Pittsburgh where she held the position of Distinguished Service Professor of Philosophy until her retirement in 1995. Baier served as President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1990–91. She is married to philosopher Kurt BAIER, and is currently living in New Zealand.

Annette Baier is chiefly known for her innovative scholarship on Hume and her contributions to ethics inspired both by her interests in Hume and also, crucially, by her feminism. Even her early essays in philosophy of mind, collected in *Postures of the Mind* (1985), demonstrate her naturalist interpretations of mental phenomena, where naturalism for her necessarily includes an emphasis on social, cultural, historical circumstances as well as biological and physical structures and environments. Instead of viewing the mind as the logical representer, or mirror, of the world, she presents minds as formed by culture as well as by nature. Her discussions of memory, intention, and action, for example, locate mind in interactions with others, the world and human conventions, thus insisting on the social nature of the normative practices involved. "To be a thinker at all," she insists, "is to be responsive to criticism, a participant in a practice of mutual criticism and affirmation …" (1985, p. 70). A thinker is essentially a member of a community.

In her essay "Cartesian Persons" as well as in later graduate seminars at the University of Pittsburgh, Baier offers challenging readings of Descartes by paying attention to what he says about passions, practical reasoning and action, and thus about embodiment. Baier's "Cartesian Persons" stands in contrast to the standard view that emphasizes the incorporeal, private, and first-personal nature of mental phenomena.

In her essay, she suggests that Descartes's own philosophical project of ordering and recollecting events in his meditations presupposes an embodied narrator. "Only a seeker of *historical* truth would need recollection and narrative ability, and only one who tired and was capable of relaxation would be a sleeper, one for whom the question 'Awake or asleep?' makes any sense at all" (1985, p. 82). In this essay Baier also presents her influential, oft-quoted notion of "second persons." Although Descartes himself may have missed or at least obscured the point, Baier – along with Donald DAVIDSON, Daniel DENNETT, and others – insists that self-consciousness requires cultural skills, in particular linguistic ones, that we acquire during our extended dependency on other persons. "A person, perhaps, is best seen as one who was long enough dependent upon other persons to acquire the essential arts of personhood. Persons essentially are *second* persons, who grow up with other persons" (1985, p. 84). The importance of childhood for a philosophical conception of persons and minds is a point most philosophers ignore but one Baier makes central in her own philosophical development. Indeed, the developmental story becomes a main feature in all her accounts of minds and morals, including her Carus Lectures, published as *The Commons of the Mind* in 1997. "Gods," she quips, "if denied childhood, cannot be persons" (1985, p. 85).

Baier's influential scholarship on Hume is presented both in her 1991 book *A Progress of Sentiments: Reflections on Hume's Treatise* as well as in her later essays connecting Hume with feminist ethics. While most Hume scholars had ignored or dismissed Hume's treatment of the passions, Baier insists on reading Hume's epistemology in Book One of *The Treatise* as serving his account of the passions and action in Books Two and Three. Baier reads the *Treatise* as a dramatic work whose moods and turns demand careful attention. She focuses especially on the conclusion of Book One, which she reads as Hume's "*reductio ad absurdum* of Cartesian intellect" and his turn

to a new kind of philosophy, a more passionate and social successor to the gloom of the metaphysical skeptic (1991, p. 21). Thus, rather than the strictly epistemological problems elaborated in his famous skeptical analyses of causation, necessity, and personal identity, Hume's main philosophical concerns, on Baier's reading, are practical, social ones.

In her collection of essays on ethics entitled *Moral Prejudices* (1994), she names Hume "the women's moral theorist" and "the women's epistemologist." According to her, Hume transforms the concept of reason not merely in his skeptical questioning of the meaning of metaphysical contentions, but much more importantly in showing us our reasoning capacity as a natural and practical one, essentially shared and developed in language, gesture, and sentiments shaped by intellectual, moral, and aesthetic norms. Her naturalist view of persons takes our biological nature seriously, but includes its playful as well as vulnerable character, conditioned by interdependencies, and marked by cooperation as well as conflict. "[F]antasies of freedom from our own actual history, actual dependency, actual mortality, actual biological limitations, and determinate possibilities, have on the whole been male fantasies," she claims, "and many women philosophers have found them strange" (1995, p. 323).

Harvard psychologist Carol Gilligan explores the influence for ethics of such male fantasies in her 1982 book *In a Different Voice*. Gilligan presents two distinctive, typically gendered approaches to morality that show up in her research on moral development. Gilligan's "different voice," more often spoken by girls and women, articulates the responsibilities and care involved in personal relationships, a kind of caring responsiveness often ignored or denigrated by theorists emphasizing individual autonomy and rights. Gilligan's work profoundly influenced Baier, prompting her to ask "What Do Women Want in a Moral Theory?" (1994, pp. 1–17). Objecting to obligation as the key concept of morality, Baier, with Gilligan and other feminist ethicists, shifts the focus

away from legalistic, contractarian, individualistic theories of justice to an ethics of love, care, and mutual responsibilities. For Baier, the liberal views of persons and rights, underlying Kantian and contractarian ethics – notably John RAWLS's *A Theory of Justice* – cannot account for how real people begin as infants and *learn how* to keep promises, make contracts, respect persons, and property. Her notion of "second persons" figures even more prominently in moral contexts. As she repeatedly insists, infants need to be cared for in loving relationships so that they have even the possibility of growing up to be competent moral agents. But precisely their dependencies, vulnerabilities, and developmental potentialities show that individualistic theories of autonomous moral agents belong among those fantasies she tries to expose. Baier's feminism focuses her discussions of morality precisely on issues of vulnerability, development, cooperation, connection – familial and social relationships and responsibilities frequently not chosen at all, but not on that account less meaningful from a moral perspective.

Baier's most famous contribution to ethics is her sustained discussion of trust as an important, pervasive but philosophically ignored feature of morality and human life. Supplementing theories of both obligation and care, the concept of appropriate trust also mediates between reason and feeling, "those tired old candidates for moral authority": for her, trust is neither a simple belief nor a simple feeling but, rather, an attitude informed by beliefs and influencing actions (1994, p. 10). She defines the attitude of trust as "accepted vulnerability to another person's power over something one cares about, in the confidence that such power will not be used to harm what is entrusted" (1994, p. 341). Trust thus entails risk as well as connection. While it can be rational to trust someone in specific circumstances, trust also presupposes limited control and limited knowledge of all the specifications in the relationship. According to her account, therefore, an omniscient and omnipotent God

would be, paradoxically, unable to trust (1994, p. 187).

While Baier's paradigm of a trusting relationship is the child–parent relationship, obviously not all relations of trust are morally justifiable. She is well aware of the power differentials operative in trust relations, and pays considerable attention to issues about the appropriateness of trust and trustworthiness, and ways of sustaining and enhancing them among the vulnerable. However, a perfectly clear, consistent test for adequate trust, or, more generally, a systematic moral theory with trust as its fundamental principle, is not her goal. She does not think that morality can be presented as a systematic theory; nor does she believe that morality needs first principles. For her it is only a dogma, one of those many moral prejudices she tries to unmask, to suppose moralities should imitate legal systems (1994, p. 214). Discretion, judgment, experience – these are necessary for sustaining trust or escaping from relationships of misplaced trust, but for her these sorts of practical judgments cannot be formulated into rules or principles.

While other contemporary philosophers also propound "anti-theory" and anti-Kantian approaches to morality, Baier's reformulations of ethics intentionally express her own experience as a woman moral philosopher who has traveled widely, worked at diverse universities, and lived on three different continents. Her accounts of trust and distrust, for example, are peppered with anecdotes not only from literature but also, importantly, from her own experiences – in airports, train stations, classrooms, and university committees. She sometimes apologizes for her use of personal anecdote, but her apologies seem more like Socratic invitations to a male-dominated profession to engage with her in confronting real-life moral issues that defy more abstract, systematized treatments. In 1990 she delivered her presidential address to the Eastern Division meeting of the American Philosophical Association, noting she was only the fifth woman president in the eighty-seven-year history of the Eastern Division. In this address she again staunchly advocates a naturalistic view of persons as biological, social, and cultural beings essentially marked by mutual responsiveness and interdependencies. "Self-understanding," she says, "is a shared taste, and cultivating it calls for our full capacities for mutual response" (1994, p. 326). For Baier, responsiveness – not merely to accusations of guilt, as Locke had noted, but to needs, interests, conversations, invitations, conflicts, joys, and sufferings – marks the different voice Gilligan had highlighted and that she herself continually expresses in her philosophical work. To the question of how increasing numbers of women in professional philosophy influence the way philosophy, and especially ethics, gets practiced, she refuses any simple answer. She approves of ethics in many different voices. "Ethics," she concludes, "is a polyphonic art form, in which the echoes of the old voices contribute to the quality of the sound of all the new voices" (1994, p. 312). Her own original readings and reworkings of figures in the history of philosophy as well as her profound insights into the complexities of moral life exhibit that art of shared cultivation constituting genuinely human and humane understanding.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Cartesian Persons," *Philosophia* 10 (1981): 169–88.

Postures of the Mind: Essays on Mind and Morals (Minneapolis, 1985).

"Trust and Anti-Trust," *Ethics* 96 (1986): 231–60.

"The Need for More than Justice," *Science, Morality, and Feminist Theory*, ed. M. Hanan and K. Nielsen (Calgary, Alberta, 1987), pp. 41–56.

A Progress of Sentiments: Reflections on Hume's Treatise (Cambridge, Mass., 1991).

"A Naturalist View of Persons," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 65 (November 1991): 5–17.

Moral Prejudices: Essays on Ethics (Cambridge, Mass., 1994).
Tanner Lectures on Trust (Salt Lake City, Utah, 1994).
The Commons of the Mind (Chicago, 1997).

Other Relevant Works
"Intention, Practical Knowledge and Representation," in *Action Theory: Proceedings*, ed. M. Brand and D. Walton (Dordrecht, 1976), pp. 27–43.
"Natural Virtues and Natural Vices," *Social Philosophy and Policy* 8 (1990): 24–34.
"The Virtues of Resident Alienation," *Nomos* 34 (1992): 291–308.
"How Can Individualists Share Responsibility?" *Political Theory* 25 (1993): 228–48.
"How to Get to Know One's Own Mind: Some Simple Ways," in *Philosophy in Mind*, ed. M. Michael and J. O'Leary-Hawthorne (Dordrecht, 1994), pp. 65–82.
"The Possibility of Sustaining Trust," in *Norms, Values, and Society*, ed. H. Pauer-Studer (Dordrecht, 1994), pp. 245–59.
"Moral Sentiments and the Difference They Make," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* suppl. 69 (1995): 15–30.
"Doing Things with Others," in *Commonality and Particularity in Ethics*, ed. L. Alanen, S. Heinamaa, and T. Wallgren (New York, 1996), pp. 15–44.

Further Reading
Oxford Comp Phil, Pres Addr of APA v10
Alcoff, Linda, and Elizabeth Potter, eds. *Feminist Epistemologies* (New York, 1993).
Friedman, Marilyn. *What Are Friends For? Feminist Perspectives on Relationships and Moral Theory* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1993).
Held, Virginia. *Feminist Morality: Transforming Culture, Society and Politics* (Chicago, 1995).
———, ed. *Justice and Care: Essential Readings in Feminist Ethics* (Boulder, Col., 1995).

Jaggar, Alison and Iris Marion Young, eds. *A Companion to Feminist Philosophy* (Oxford, 1998).
Johnson, Clarence S. "Annette Baier on Reason and Morals in Hume's Philosophy," *Dialogue* 34 (1995): 367–80.
Noddings, Nel. *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education* (Berkeley, Cal., 1986).
Tong, Rosemary. *Feminine and Feminist Ethics* (Belmont, Cal., 1993).

Jocelyn Hoy

BAIER, Kurt Erich Maria (1917–)

Kurt Baier was born on 26 January 1917 in Vienna, Austria. He received his BA in 1944 from the University of Melbourne and his PhD in 1952 from the University of Oxford. Early in his career he taught at both the University of Melbourne and Canberra University. He emigrated to America in 1962 to become professor and later chair of the department of philosophy at the University of Pittsburgh. He was elected President of the Australian Association of Philosophy, President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association (1977–8), and a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Baier retired in 1995 and he currently lives in New Zealand with his wife Annette BAIER.

His writings include *The Moral Point of View* (1958), *Values and the Future: The Impact of Technological Change on American Values* (1969) and his classic essay "Defining Morality Without Prejudice" (1981). Among the more significant of his scholarly publishing activities was his appointment to the editorial board of *Philo*, the official journal of the Society of Humanist Philosophers, published biannually at the Center for Inquiry. As the journal states their mission, "Philo is the only

professional philosophy journal devoted exclusively to criticisms of theism and defenses or developments of naturalism. To facilitate discussion and debate, *Philo* also publishes defenses of theism and criticisms of naturalism. The interest in naturalism extends to the relevant branches of naturalist philosophy, such as naturalist metaphysics, and especially naturalist ethics …"

In his early work *The Moral Point of View* Baier tried to sort out the various ways in which facts contribute to making moral choices. He examines the relationship between self-interest and what he calls "the moral point of view," offering an interesting, albeit qualified, defense of self-interest which will be discussed below. He argues that a valid moral position would consider social as well as individual facts, including special moral obligations, emotional ties to others, and one that would benefit society – drawing support from Thomas Hobbes.

For Baier, there are two aspects of the way we approach a moral problem. We obtain an overview of the facts, and then determine how much weight to give to each fact. But there is no guarantee that fallible human beings will do these things accurately. Our overview of the facts may be faulty, and we may err in determining how much weight to give to a fact. Part of the problem is that the moral principles we use in weighing facts are not all equally important. In any particular case, pleasure may be more important than law, religion may be more significant than self-interest, and so on.

Baier further claims that the exploration of moral issues is constituted by trying to answer the question, "What shall I do?" This might seem like an odd way to frame the question since doing so might not give it any moral aspect at all, as with a so-called Kantian "imperative of skill." If one is interested in stopping a table from wobbling he might ask, "What shall I do?" and an answer like "put a book under the shorter leg" would not strike anyone as an answer to a moral question. However, the context of Baier's discussion makes it clear that he intends this question to have its moral sense. Baier argues that the right answer to the moral question, "What shall I do?" is the action which is buttressed by the clearest and most convincing reasons we can find. An important part of Baier's analysis involves distinguishing among the *quality* of reasons that play a role in our moral decision. In trying to answer the question of what is the best course of action he is thinking, not surprisingly, of *good* reasons. Baier holds that there are good reasons merely as a matter of empirical observation: in our development, we learn that doing one thing rather than another will harm society. It is a matter of observation, and a psychological fact, that people form beliefs that affect their actions.

Another of the critical questions Baier examines is, "Why follow reason?" He says that the question is often absurd, though not so when it has to do with the theoretical role of reason. He argues that it must be recognized that there are other viable interpretations to the question by which it becomes coherent and can be responded to. "Why should I follow reason?" could be a demand for a reason to reflect hypothetically. Following reason comprises two tasks, a practical one and a theoretical one. Baier argues that the purpose of theoretical reasoning is primarily to guide practical decisions, and concludes that the question "Should I follow reason?" is really a question about theory rather than practice. Baier raises the possibility, however, of another perspective entirely, supposing that following the dictates of reason could give way to following inspiration and intuition for the appropriate analyses of ethical questions. However, Baier argues that this really takes us nowhere. Even if we rely on some kind of nonrational insight, authority, etc., the answer we get would have to be checked in a rational, reasoned way. Even if someone were to suggest that his intuitive leadership was superior to reason, we would still have to check his claim by the ordinary methods of reason. His claim to be better than reason can only be supported by the fact that

it tells us precisely the same as reason does. Baier does admit that, as a practical matter, we sometimes trust the judgment of a person without going through a complex series of reasoned analyses, though deciding to trust such a person still involves reason. Hence, reason seems inescapable.

Baier has continued his analyses of theoretical and practical logic in later writings. He has insisted that there are important similarities between both theoretical and practical logic, arguing that practical reasoning is fundamentally a matter of observation. Baier's use of the term "practical reasoning" appears to be in line with classic uses of the term, referring to any logical analysis that deals with some moral issue or other. Thus, in Aristotle's concept of the "practical syllogism," the reasoning involved is not aimed at deriving propositions but at action in daily life. Aristotle develops similar ideas in his concept of "phronesis," or intellectual virtue, as discussed in Book VI of the *Nichomachean Ethics*.

The notion of practical reason has other uses as well. It can be used to refute the notion that actions are prompted only by desire. Reason comes into play, in the best Kantian-like sense, when a person separates himself from his own personal wants and is willing to evaluate his future conduct by principles that any rational person would use. With Kant, a rational moral agent has to ask only if his imagined action could be universalized. In discussions of motivation, furthermore, appeals to practical reason may seek to counter claims that only desire or inclination can ultimately prompt one to action. Yet practical reason encompasses even more than this. If properly used, it involves comparing and contrasting goals, wants and goods, in order to constitute a rational life-map of one's future choices.

Returning to the question of self-interest, while Baier attacks the concept, he surprisingly argues that in valid moral judgments, self-interested reasons can transcend altruistic ones. He maintains that doing something which would be in one's own interest, as well as in someone else's interest, may be decent reasons for doing a thing. He further holds that the reasons which are in one's own interest might, in fact, be better than those in the interest of someone else. In that case – should the interests not contradict one another – both can be satisfied by one's actions. But when interests do collide, it is not unreasonable to choose one's own interests over those of another person. For example, Baier suggests a situation where applying for a job is more in one's own interest than not applying for it, since not doing so would be in some other person's interest. He concludes that society is better off when a person "looks out for Number One first," since each of us is the best judge of what benefits us the most, and because each person knows himself better than anyone else, he is more likely to push his own interests before someone else's.

Baier notes that there are qualifications to this view: this may not apply if there are independent reasons for putting someone else's interests first. It must be remembered that we are considering a case in which there are no special reasons for preferring a particular person's interests to one's own, such as when there are no special moral obligations or emotional ties. Still, it is not hard to imagine cases where one's own interest might not take precedence over those of another. For instance, it may be defensible to take advantage of a very-likely-profitable land investment oneself, rather than tell some stranger about it. However, if that person is someone in desperate financial straits whom one has promised to help out in any way one can, the binding nature of that promise would obligate one to tell the person about the land investment opportunity.

One of Baier's most critical, as well as most interesting, lines of thought has to do with the implausibility of self-interest as a candidate for "the moral point of view." Baier concedes that there is a distinction between what we might call narrow (or selfish) self-interest and enlightened self-interest. He asks if it is possible to salvage the notion that self-interest is the moral point of view. To do so, he distinguishes

between what he calls "short-sighted" and "enlightened" self-interest. As Baier understands it, the essential difference is that the shortsighted person fails to consider how his actions will affect other people, while the enlightened person knows that failing to do so will prevent him from enjoying a satisfying and full life. The enlightened person will not ignore the requirements of others.

Baier argues that no kind of self-interested view, even of the enlightened kind, can work since it can never produce a resolution of any moral conflict. He hypothesizes a situation where two people, B and K, are candidates for political office and points out that, under normal circumstances, although both want to be elected, only one can be elected. Baier says that it could be argued that B ought to remove K and, further, that it would be wrong for B not to do so. As Baier puts it, B would not have "done his duty" otherwise. The same reasoning would of course apply to the second candidate, K. The second candidate, realizing that his elimination would be in the first candidate's interest, should try to stop the first candidate. Indeed, he would not have done his duty if he did not try to do so. But Baier points out that this would lead to a kind of paradox, it would be both right *and* wrong for the second candidate to act in this way. It would be *wrong* because it prevents B from doing what he should do, and wrong for B not to do it; and it would be *not wrong* because it is what K ought to do and it would be wrong for K not to do it. But one and the same act (logically) cannot be *both* morally wrong and not morally wrong. Baier concludes that since one and the same action cannot be *both* right and wrong, in cases like this morality does not apply. Baier claims that all of this is unworkable since it is precisely the purpose of the moral point of view to intervene when interests collide in this way. With only self-interest, no conflict of interests could ever be resolved. Thus, self-interest could not possibly be the same as the moral point of view.

Baier's view involves analyzing other interpretations of how reason figures into moral judgments. For instance, he assaults the now-antiquated, though not necessarily wrong, positivist notion that moral pronouncements are simply commands or orders. Baier claims to the contrary that moral questions like "What shall I do?" are really demands for new moral data. It is worth noting that although Baier speaks generally about positivist approaches to ethics, he reserves a good part of his attack specifically for C. L. STEVENSON's idea that thinking about morality involves holding certain factual positions which, in their turn, lead to action. Baier claims that Stevenson is wrong because his view restrictively holds that it is only desire that leads to action, while fear, ambition, and other mental states can produce action. Baier is a type of ethical philosopher usually called a "prescriptivist." Analyses of moral language, such as those of the logical positivists, interest him less than examining the role of moral judgments, obligations, etc., in reaching moral decisions.

Baier assaults Plato's theory that there is a kind of moral intuition and claims that such a faculty simply does not exist. This is perhaps arguable since people make moral judgments whereas animals do not, and very often human beings will agree on a moral attitude regarding some real or contemplated action. Perhaps what Baier means is that there is no moral intuitive faculty that produces epistemic certainty on any moral question. Neither does Aristotle escape Baier's hard-nosed analysis. He challenges Aristotle's view that moral analysis necessarily requires the determination of how we can best achieve the ultimate good. Baier maintains that what we ought to do morally has to do with the goals we want to, or should, seek and not with the best way of achieving these goals. Hume's restrictive, quasi-quantitative account of moral reasoning, based on working out the consequences, is also attacked.

Even with his exhaustive analysis of the role of reason, the different kinds of reason, and reason versus self-interest, etc., it is a tribute to Baier's skills and thoroughness as a philosopher that he anticipates and analyzes possible objec-

tions to the role of reason which would strike most people as unimpressive. According to Baier, reason has had a "bad press" over the past century, with many intellectuals turning to nonrational approaches, such as instinct, the unconscious, the voice of the blood, inspiration, charisma, and the like, where they advocate that one should not follow reason but instead be guided by these other forces.

Baier continues this assault on opponents of reason, arguing that the question: "Should I follow reason?" is a tautological one, much like asking if a circle is a circle, and that the question "Why should I follow reason?" is as silly as "Why is a circle a circle?" It is by no means obvious, however, that the two are on a par. Some may think something askew here, because clearly there is an entire Eastern tradition, along with aspects of the Western tradition, that rejects the role of reason in favor of intuition, flashes of insight, etc., and these approaches are not nonsensical. Baier is aware of this, qualifies his remarks, and grants that the question "Why follow reason?" is meaningful, though only in its theoretical, rather than its practical, role as suggested above.

However, a word of caution must be noted. One of the things which Baier's approach relies on for its utility is the fact that it does not require any systematic set of moral principles. All we need is to find a plausible principle, one that seems appropriate for the moral choice we are facing. The problem rests in the fact that these principles must be sound, else they would be useless in making ethical decisions. But, unless one is an intuitionist of some kind, or believes that these principles can be derived from some set of theological principles, we have to judge them by their results, thereby landing ourselves in a type of consequentialism.

Baier's interests go beyond ethical theory, as he has written on such things as technology and business ethics. A good example is his essay "Duties to One's Employer" (1983) wherein he discusses – and ultimately dismisses – the view that capitalism can support freedom and the good of all of society only if the duties of employees in a corporation are restricted to those duties they agree to of their own free choice. Another interesting outcome of Baier's work is his insistence that the right to life is not a universal right, since it may collide with the rights of other people. He applied this idea on a more general level as well, insisting that the alleged right to life of certain groups of persons might take precedence over others – an important theme in the abortion issue and other current controversies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Good Reasons," *Philosophical Studies* 4 (1953): 1–15.

"Proving a Moral Judgment," *Philosophical Studies* 4 (1953): 33–44.

The Moral Point of View: A Rational Basis of Ethics (Ithaca, N.Y., 1958; rev. edn New York, 1965).

Ed. with Nicholas Rescher, *Values and the Future: The Impact of Technological Change on American Values* (New York, 1969).

"Rationality and Morality," *Erkenntnis* 11 (August 1977): 197–223.

"Moral Reasons," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 3 (1978): 62–74.

"Defining Morality Without Prejudice," *The Monist* 64 (June 1981): 325–41.

"Duties to One's Employer," in *Just Business: New Introductory Essays in Business Ethics*, ed. Tom Regan (Philadelphia, 1983), pp. 60–99.

The Rational and the Moral Order (Chicago, 1995).

Problems of Life and Death: A Humanist Perspective (Amherst, N.Y., 1997).

Further Reading

Encyc Ethics, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v8*

Frankena, William K. *Ethics* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1963).

Kerner, G. *The Revolution in Ethical Theory* (New York, 1966).

Schneewind, J. B., ed. *Reason, Ethics, and*

Society: Themes from Kurt Baier, with His Responses (Chicago, 1996).

Anthony Serafini

BAKEWELL, Charles Montague
(1867–1957)

Charles M. Bakewell was born on 24 April 1867 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. After brief study at Western University of Pennsylvania (later the University of Pittsburgh), he received the BA and MA from the University of California in 1890 and 1891, where he studied under George H. HOWISON and Joseph Le Conte. Bakewell then received more degrees in philosophy from Harvard University: a second MA in 1892 and a PhD in 1894. He worked with William JAMES, George SANTAYANA, Josiah ROYCE, and George H. PALMER, and wrote a dissertation on "Hegelianism and Man: Or, the Problem of the One and the Many from a Modern Standpoint." Bakewell spent the years 1894 to 1896 studying at the University of Berlin with Friedrich Paulsen and Georg Simmel; the University of Strasbourg with Wilhelm Windelband; and the Sorbonne in Paris with Emile Boutroux.

In 1896 Bakewell returned to Harvard to serve as an instructor of philosophy for a year, and then taught at the University of California at Berkeley in 1897–8. In 1898 he was appointed associate professor of philosophy at Bryn Mawr College in Pennsylvania. He returned to Berkeley in 1900, and became full professor of philosophy in 1903. He resigned a year later to accept a philosophy professorship at Yale University. In 1908 he was appointed Sheldon Clark Professor of Philosophy, succeeding George T. LADD in that chair, and stayed at Yale until his retirement in 1933. He was awarded an honorary MA by Yale in 1905. He served as President of the American Philosophical Association in 1910–11. In 1926 he served on the executive committee of the International Congress of Philosophy. In 1943 he was honored with an LLD from the University of California. Bakewell died on 19 September 1957 in New Haven, Connecticut.

During World War I, Bakewell served as inspector and historian under the Italian Commission of the Red Cross in Italy, with the rank of deputy and commissioner. For this service, he was awarded the silver medal of honor of the Italian Red Cross and was made a Chevalier of the Order of the Crown of Italy. A devoted member of the Republican Party, he also took an active role in American politics, serving in the Connecticut State Senate from 1920 to 1924 and as chairman of the Commission to Revise and Codify Educational Laws of Connecticut from 1921 to 1923. The pinnacle of Bakewell's political career came when he served one term as a Representative in the United States Congress (1933–5), where he vigorously opposed President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal policies.

The two most important influences on Bakewell's mature thought were his close friend Thomas DAVIDSON, a Scottish-American philosopher, and William James. Accordingly, Bakewell's philosophy, which can best be described as a form of personal idealism, was based upon a pluralistic metaphysics and had a radical individualistic emphasis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Philosophy of Emerson," *Philosophical Review* 12 (1903): 525–36.
"Latter-Day Flowing-Philosophy," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 1 (1904): 92–114.
"The Issue between Idealism and Radical Empiricism," *Journal of Philosophy* 2 (1905): 687–91.
"The Ugly Infinite and the Good-for-nothing Absolute," *Philosophical Review* 16 (1907): 136–43.
"On the Meaning of Truth," *Philosophical Review* 17 (1908): 579–91.

"Idealism and Realism," *Philosophical Review* 18 (1909): 505–13.

"The Problem of Transcendence," *Philosophical Review* 20 (1911): 113–36.

"Royce as an Interpreter of American Ideals," *International Journal of Ethics* 27 (1917): 306–16.

"The Continuity of the Idealist Tradition," in *Contemporary Idealism in America*, ed. Clifford Barrett (New York, 1932), pp. 23–42.

Other Relevant Works

Bakewell's papers are at Yale University.

Ed., *The Education of the Wage-earners: A Contribution toward the Solution of the Educational Problem of Democracy*, by Thomas Davidson (Boston, 1904).

Ed., *The Philosophy of Goethe's Faust*, by Thomas Davidson (Boston and New York, 1906).

Ed., *Source Book in Ancient Philosophy* (New York, 1907; 2nd edn 1939).

Ed., *Poems*, by Ralph Waldo Emerson (London and New York, 1915).

Ed., *Selected Papers on Philosophy*, by William James (London and New York, 1917).

The Story of the American Red Cross in Italy (1919).

Ed., *The Republic*, by Plato (New York, 1928).

"The Philosophy of George Herbert Palmer," in *George Herbert Palmer, 1842–1933: Memorial Addresses* (Cambridge, Mass., 1935), pp. 3–43.

"The Personal Idealism of George Holmes Howison," *Philosophical Review* 49 (1940): 623–40.

Further Reading

Nat Cycl Amer Bio v45, *Pres Addr of APA v2*, *Proc of APA v32*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, 1744–1989 (Washington, D.C., 1989).

Dewey, John. "Immediate Empiricism," *Journal of Philosophy* 2 (1905): 597–9.

Strong, Charles A. "Why the Mind has a Body: Reply to Professor Bakewell," *Philosophical Review* 13 (1904): 337–42.

James A. Good

BALANCHINE, George (1904–83)

Georgii Melitonovitch Balanchivadze was born on 22 January 1904 in Saint Petersburg, Russia. He studied dance at the Imperial Theater's Ballet School, and received a strong musical training to become an accomplished pianist. In 1924 he joined Serge Diaghilev's Ballets Russes in Paris and changed his name to George Balanchine. At this company he gained a reputation as a choreographer and started a lifelong artistic relationship with Igor Stravinsky. Their *Apollo* (1928) was the turning point that led ballet to the neoclassic style that persists in this art until today. Balanchine moved to the United States in 1933, and one year later he opened the School of American Ballet, regarded as the most respected ballet conservatory in the USA. In 1948 he founded the New York City Ballet, which he used as a platform for the display of his aesthetic ideas and transformed into one of the leading companies in the international dance scene. Balanchine created over 200 ballets, as well as dances for movies and Broadway productions. *Agon*, *Concerto Barocco*, *The Four Temperaments*, *Serenade*, *Symphony in C*, and *Theme and Variations* are some of his masterpieces. When he died on 30 April 1983 in New York City, he was regarded as the quintessential ballet choreographer of the century.

Balanchine's approach to dance echoes Eduard Hanslick's philosophy of music. As the Viennese aesthetician, the choreographer believed that it is formal structure that makes

artworks enjoyable and dismissed emotional reactions to art as sentimentalism. In his view, the interplay of music and movement is interesting in itself. His choreography visualized musical form or complemented it by means of counterpoint. Rather than paying attention to melody, he was interested in rhythm as architecture of time. He was particularly attracted to the compositions of Stravinsky, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Maurice Ravel, and Pyetoer Ilyich Tchaikovsky. Even if he created some ballets with argument, his typical works are plot-less. Still, he did not subscribe to abstractionism on the ground that human bodies cannot be abstract. In order to highlight choreographic form, he used minimal costumes and scenery. His aesthetics has had a deep impact in the creation and appreciation of dance, earning an important place for formalism in both ballet and modern dance.

Balanchine's formal experimentation stressed the vocabulary of classical dance that he learned in Russia, manipulating it in a dynamic mode, taking it to extreme possibilities, creating new step combinations, and at times using distortion as a choreographic device. The resulting style has been called neoclassic. The American and modern character of Balanchine's pieces is associated with their speed, athleticism, and appetite for space, as well as a certain jazzy and sensual quality. The artist admired jazz and other African-American dance forms and incorporated some of their elements into his choreography.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Notes on Choreography," *Dance Index* 4 (1945): 20–31.
"Marginal Notes on the Dance," in *The Dance Has Many Faces*, ed. Walter Sorrell (Chicago, 1951), pp. 35–43.
"The Dance Element in Stravinky's Music," *Dance Index* 6 (1947): 250–56. Reprinted in *Ballet Review* 10 (1982): 14–18.
Choreography by Goerge Balanchine: A Catalogue of Works (New York, 1984).

Other Relevant Works
101 Stories of the Great Ballets, with F. Mason, 3rd edn (Garden City, N.Y., 1975).
"Work in Progress," with L. Botto, *Intellectual Digest* (June 1992): 6–8.
"An Interview with George Balanchine," *Horizon* 3 (1961): 44–56.
Balanchine's Tchaikovsky: Interviews with George Balanchine, with Solomon Volkov (New York, 1985).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v8*
Buckle, R. *George Balanchine: Ballet Master* (London, 1988).
Denby, Edwin. *Dance Writings and Poetry*, ed. Robert Cornfield (New Haven, Conn., 1998).
Haggin, B. H. *Discovering Balanchine* (New York, 1981).
Jordan, S. *Moving Music: Dialogues with Music and Dance in Twentieth-Century Ballet* (London, 2000).
Scholl, T. *From Petipa to Balanchine: Classical Revival and the Modernization of Ballet* (London, 1984).

Lester Tome

BALCH, Emily Greene (1867–1961)

Emily Greene Balch was born on 8 January 1867 in Boston, Massachusetts, the daughter of Francis V. and Ellen Noyes Balch. She died on 9 January 1961 in Boston. An innovative educator, peace activist, and social reformer, Balch received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1946 for a lifetime of continuous work for the cause of peace and justice. She was only the second American woman to receive this prize; the first was her friend and colleague, Jane ADDAMS.

Balch was a founding member of the Women's International League of Peace and Freedom and worked in an unofficial capacity with both the League of Nations and the United Nations. She demonstrated her commitment to peace through the slow and careful work of cultivating international relationships and researching solutions to international problems. She wrote or edited six books, contributed chapters to half a dozen more, wrote eight important pamphlets, and published over 120 articles. She was trained as a sociologist and an economist, but we see in her work the foundations of classical American pragmatist philosophy, particularly in her support of a social democracy achieved through particular and concrete social action, her reliance on experience as a way of knowing, and in her opposition to class hierarchies and international imperialism.

Balch was a member of the first graduating class of Bryn Mawr College in 1889. After graduation she received a fellowship from Bryn Mawr in 1890–91 to study economics in France under Emile Levasseur. In 1892 Balch was one of the founding members of Denison House, a settlement house in Boston, where she was the "headworker" for the first year. She later returned to academia, believing that this was an area where she could be more useful than in settlement work. She studied sociology with Albion W. SMALL at the University of Chicago for a semester, and took classes at the Harvard Annex (later named Radcliffe College). She returned to Europe to study economics in Berlin in 1895–6. Her two years of study in France and Germany formed the beginnings of many relationships that would become important in her later international work.

In 1896 Balch was appointed to teach economics and social science at Wellesley College. For her, teaching the young women at Wellesley was part of her commitment to progressive social reform, but throughout her teaching career she also continued to work in community and international research, as well as on social activist projects. In her courses, students learned about socialism, labor problems, and immigration issues, often through innovative teaching methods that included experiential field-work. She pioneered service-oriented coursework, asking her students to study poverty through hands-on investigations of slum conditions or by volunteering at places like Denison House.

In the era prior to World War I, Balch considered "the real business of the times" to be "the realization of a more satisfactory economic order." That was the priority that she said she "had given myself unreservedly from my undergraduate days" (1972, p. 77). From a very early stage, Balch publicly identified herself as a socialist, but did not consider herself a Marxist. In February 1909 she and fellow Wellesley faculty member, Vida SCUDDER, organized a three-day conference on "Socialism as a World Movement." She ceased calling herself a socialist after World War II, when she felt the term began to connote Marxism.

During her teaching years, she was a founding member and one-time President of the Women's Trade Union League and was the President of the Massachusetts Minimum Wage Commission (1913), which drafted the first minimum wage law in the country. She took two years off from Wellesley to research Slavic immigration to the United States, traveling throughout the US and Europe. *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens*, the result of this investigation, was published in 1910.

Once the hostilities of World War I started in Europe, Balch became involved in the national peace movement, first through roundtable meetings with a small group of progressive reformers, out of which came her publication "Towards the Peace that Shall Last" and the beginnings of the American Civil Liberties Union. She was also an early member of the Women's Peace Party. She understood that the threat of war interfered with any progress toward improved social or economic systems. Until the threat of war was removed, she said, "no permanent or trustworthy

progress could be made in human relations" (1972, p. 138).

Balch was a delegate to the 1915 International Congress of Women at The Hague, representing the Wellesley branch of the Women's Peace Party and the Women's Trade Union League of Boston. As one of the forty-eight women activists sailing on the *Noordam* to Europe, she developed closer and more collegial relationships with Addams and other influential female anti-war activists. Balch edited the proceedings of this Congress at The Hague in three languages (French, German, and English). At the end of the Congress, she was one of the six delegates asked to visit with the chief statesmen of warring and neutral countries in Europe, asking for their cooperation in proposed mediation measures. Balch visited the mostly neutral northern capitals, as well as Russia. After returning to the US, she consulted with President Woodrow Wilson about possible mediation efforts to end the war. Balch was also one of the co-authors of *Women at The Hague* (1915) with Jane Addams and Alice Hamilton, published just eight months after the Congress.

Although she did not go on the famous "Ford Peace Ship," Balch did play an important role as a member of the unofficial 1916 Neutral Conference for Continuous Mediation in Stockholm from April to July, where she served on the Mediation Committee and prepared proposals for mediation. When she returned to the US, she met with President Wilson and laid out the plans and conclusions of the Stockholm Conference. Later, Balch gathered together various proposals for peace into her 1918 book, *Approaches to the Great Settlement*.

After returning to the US in late 1916, Balch joined the American Neutral Conference Committee, and published the journal *Four Lights: An Adventure in Internationalism*. She also joined the Younger People's Council of America, which was seen as a more radical pacifist organization, and continued to

campaign against the war, visiting members of Congress to argue once again for mediation. When the Congressional vote for the declaration of war was taken, a letter from Balch in opposition to the war was inserted into the Congressional Record.

Although she had taught at Wellesley for over twenty years, and was the chair of the department of economics and sociology, in 1918 the Board of Trustees voted to "postpone" Balch's reappointment, due to her peace activism. Her membership in the People's Council may have been influential in this decision. In 1919, six months after the war ended, the Board voted to terminate her contract. She found herself at the age of fifty-two with no means of support. For a short time in 1918 Balch joined the staff of *The Nation*, before heading back to Europe to participate in what became the founding of the Women's International League of Peace and Freedom (WILPF).

In 1919 the women who had met at The Hague reconvened in Zürich with the goal of influencing the Versailles Peace Treaty negotiations. As a member of the board and of the executive committee of the International Women's Congress, Balch was responsible for planning the agenda and drafting resolutions for discussion. At the Congress she was appointed the first international secretary-treasurer of WILPF; in that role she was responsible for setting up the Geneva headquarters and establishing relations with the League of Nations. She also edited the *Pax et Liberatas* (later titled *Pax International*), the newsletter of the WILPF. She spent much of her time in Geneva building relationships with the members of the new League of Nations and writing proposals for consideration at its various committees. As the Nobel Peace organization says of Balch, "She helped in one way or another with many projects of the League of Nations – among them, disarmament, the internationalization of aviation, drug control, the participation of the United States in the affairs of the League." (*Nobel Lectures, Peace*

1926–1950, 1972) During these early years of WILPF, Balch continued to be involved in educational work for peace because she believed education was a major force for the prevention of war. The first summer school of the WILPF on "Education for Internationalism" was organized and led by both Balch and Addams.

Balch resigned from her post as international secretary-treasurer in 1922, but continued to travel, write, and organize on the WILPF's behalf. At the request of Haitian members of the WILPF, in 1926 Balch headed a six-person multiracial team to Haiti to investigate and report on the American occupation of that nation. The results of this investigation, supplemented by intensive study both before and after the visit, were published in 1927 in *Occupied Haiti*, edited and mostly written by Balch. Reporting on the situation from the Haitian viewpoint, she recounted that Haitians thought the American occupation was an "unmixed curse." She herself came to see the US as an occupying force that robbed Haitians of the responsibility of self-government, regardless of the good that the Americans thought they were bringing to Haiti in the form of bridges, hospitals, and stability. Balch did not advocate leaving smaller dependent countries such as Haiti completely isolated, but instead she advocated self-rule, limiting American intervention to assistance rather than control. As she said, "there are more ways of helping a neighbor who is in trouble than knocking him down and taking possession of his property and family" (1972, p. 147). When she returned from Haiti she met with President Calvin Coolidge and later submitted a *Memorandum* on the situation to the official Hoover Commission. The *Memorandum* was piercing in its criticism of the racism of Americans in Haiti, and she urged the US Commission studying Haiti to respect its heritage and culture. Many of the specific recommendations in this document were eventually adopted by the Hoover Commission.

Balch continued in active leadership in the WILPF, becoming one of its three joint international chairs after Addams stepped down from the position in 1929. She was President of the US section of the WILPF in 1931 and 1932. In 1933–4, when the WILPF was having financial problems, Balch donated eighteen months to work at Geneva again, this time as an honorary international secretary. In 1937 Emily Balch was elected "Honorary International President" of the WILPF for life, as she continued international research, writing position papers, and proposing action plans, many of which were considered by the League of Nations and later the United Nations.

Balch shared with the American pragmatists a fundamental belief that the social environment is capable of transformation through intelligence and action. She certainly looked to Jane Addams for inspiration and guidance, not just in policies, but also in moral sentiment, and in ability to understand diverse sides of an issue. As with most progressive liberals of her era, freedom and liberty were main components of her philosophy, and because of this, she struggled with the post-World War I attitudes. She wrote, in 1934, of fascism as an example of the "powerful current of feeling of the duty and happiness of merging self in the community" (Randall 1964, p. 326). In 1927 Balch warned of the dangers of not thinking critically about nationalism. "How many Americans not only believe, but openly maintain … that *unthinking obedience* is better than action based on individual conscience and thought, that patriotism is synonymous with nationalism, that liberty is dangerous, that peace is a dream, and not even a beautiful dream" (Randall 1964, p. 326).

Balch proposed policies of "internationalism" that urged global thinking and formal, negotiated international agreements. In ways that are consistent with pragmatist philosophy, "internationalism" for her was not an abstract universal principle; rather she saw it as specific and particular efforts to direct international work toward concrete constructive projects in politics and education. These very particular tasks, she thought, would pave the

way to international dialogue and understanding, and would lead not to a type of world government, but rather to "a complex interweaving of functional arrangements for common interests" (Randall 1964, p. 371). She believed that the dialogue resulting from these concrete and functional joint efforts would diminish future threats of war.

For Balch, the key components to developing this philosophy of internationalism are what she called "reason" and "good will." For her, reason did not mean abstract rationality but rather it meant employing careful and clear analysis to understand the problem as well as intentional empathic effort truly to understand other viewpoints. In a 1949 essay she described good will as "a powerful activity of will directed to the good of others" (Randall 1964, p. 185). Later, in the mid 1950s, she acknowledged the "weak spots" or insufficiency of merely good will; she pointed out that prejudices based on differences of color, religion, or of historical background and traditions need to be brought to awareness and addressed more specifically. In addition to reason and good will, she argued that "adequate international organizations" were needed to develop and maintain relationships and laws.

Throughout her international work, Balch opposed colonialism and imperialism in all of its forms, but always urged a nonviolent approach to ending colonialism. "Such tyranny," she said, "is bound to come to an end. May it go, not with violence and explosion, but as the ice goes in the spring through resistless thawing." (Randall 1964, p. 380) In a 1926 article titled "Economic Imperialism with Special Reference to the United States," she warned Americans of economic imperialism – the "free field for profit makers" in less powerful but "nominally independent peoples." She worried that Americans rarely thought critically about international business negotiations and economic imperialism in the beginning of the twentieth century; as Balch said, Americans are "complacently unaware of what is done in our name in inconspicuous but effective ways" particularly in Latin American, Samoa, and the Philippines. To counter economic imperialism, she argued for regulation of trade through international agreements to protect against any one country controlling the assets of another. She also advocated temporary international trusteeship of any country currently considered a colonial possession. As an example of this international trusteeship, she proposed international control of the Arctic and Antarctica, as well as international cooperation in air and ocean transportation.

World War II caused Balch anguish, as she found she could not support an entirely pacifist position, believing that force was necessary to combat Nazism. She believed that the necessity of military action in this war was a tragedy resulting from the hostility and mismanagement of peace processes after World War I. In her seventies, Balch turned her energies toward tireless work to obtain affidavits for individuals at risk in Germany, making it possible for German refugees to escape from Nazi persecution and find asylum in the US. Domestically, she worked toward restraint against "heresy-hunting" or blame on immigrant groups.

Balch was particularly concerned about colonialism resurfacing after World War II, and advocated that all trusteeships that resulted from the peace process must be held internationally through the United Nations. Although the US said it did not claim territories after the war, in her article "America's New and Irresponsible Imperialism" she criticized the growing network of American strategic military bases, particularly on Pacific islands mandated to Japan. In a paper written in 1945, she said that instead of this "strategic imperialism," all military bases should be under United Nations international control, and that local and civilian functions would be coordinated with military functions.

As part of her opposition to imperialism, Balch fought for international standards for human rights. She regretted that the League of

Nations had not adopted a minimum human rights standard. In 1945, as the United Nations was being established, she wrote to the President of the conference urging for a Declaration of Specific International Rights of Individuals and Groups. She advocated non-military forms of pressure, such as embargoes or blockades, but was opposed to all forms of food blockades.

In 1942, at a celebration of her seventy-fifth birthday, Balch gave a short speech, "Towards a Planetary Civilization." She proposed more international administration of matters of common interest, using the airlines and the shipping industries as examples, but did not advocate a "world government" since, as she says, she "see(s) no reason to be sure that a world government would be run by men very different in capacity and moral quality from those that govern national states." She continued, "international unity is not in itself the solution … if it is autocratic and not cooperative in tone, it may indeed be a Frankenstein" (Randall 1964, p. 346–7). She argued instead for an international unity that has a "discipline of moral standards."

After receiving the Nobel Peace Prize in 1946, Balch continued for more than a decade to work for peace, working with the WILPF, writing essays, and meeting with other activists and writers. In the 1940s and 1950s, she became concerned about the cultural and mostly unconscious type of imperialism that the United States was then practicing: the intent to "see to it that the American way of life makes the tour of the globe." Counteracting the seeming naïveté of Americans in the 1950s, so sure of the morals and values of their country, Balch attempted to draw critical attention to US policies of economic imperialism. As she said, "perhaps America is all the more to be feared because our urge to spread our creed is so largely quite unconscious as well as uncritical" (Randall 1964, p. 183).

During the Cold War, she cautioned Americans against fear and cynicism, advocating once again "active good will" and the practice of thinking with others. She was critical of American military preparations during the Cold War for many reasons, not the least because it perpetuated fear internationally and nationally. She understood that this fear and suspicion corroded good will and prevented rational judgment. She urged Americans to continue thinking carefully about national policies during the McCarthy period, saying she was "taken by surprise … most of all by the *hostility to thought* lest it lead to change" (Randall 1964, p. 432). In this period, she continued to emphasize the importance of education and dialogue, asking Americans to look beyond their national boundaries to understand other countries and other positions. She challenged Americans to read papers in foreign languages, including articles that take positions other than their own, asking Americans to think critically about what was fed to them by the media. In her Nobel lecture in Oslo, she reiterated her call to critical and diverse thinking. "We must remember that nothing can be woven out of threads that all run the same way. An *unchallenged* belief or idea is on the way to death and meaninglessness." (Randall 1964, pp. 433–4)

Throughout her long life, Balch worked for both economic and political change which she thought would lead to human progress, working through both political and grassroots efforts. In 1972 Balch's biographer Mercedes Randall said, "Unlike Jane Addams, Emily Balch was not a philosopher. Her mind was realistic and concrete … . She thought in terms of specific problems and solutions; her proposals were not derived from abstract principles." (Randall 1964, p. 164) It may be true that she was not trained as a philosopher in terms of traditional academic philosophy. But part of the work to open up the definition of philosophy and to hear new or excluded voices in the philosophic conversation leads us to understand the wider implications of what it means to be a philosopher in the world. Balch certainly worked within what can be seen as both pragmatist and feminist philosophy,

quietly breaking cultural boundaries for what was considered "women's" work. When she died in 1961, after nearly a century of dedicated international work, she left a political and cultural world dramatically different from the one she was born into in 1867.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Public Assistance of the Poor in France (Baltimore, Md., 1893).
Our Slavic Fellow-Citizens (New York, 1910).
Contributions to Neutral Conference for Continuous Mediation (Stockholm, 1916).
Approaches to the Great Settlement (New York, 1918).
Women at The Hague: The International Congress of Women and Its Results, with Jane Addams and Alice Hamilton (New York, 1915; Urbana, Ill., 2003).
"The Hopes We Inherit," with Jane Addams, in *Building International Good Will* (New York, 1927).
Occupied Haiti (New York, 1927).
The Miracle of Living (New York, 1941).
Beyond Nationalism: Social Thought of Emily Greene Balch, ed. Mercedes M. Randall (New York, 1972).

Other Relevant Works
Balch's papers are in the Peace Collection of Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*
"Emily Greene Balch," in *Nobel Lectures, Peace 1926–1950*, ed. F. W. Haberman (Amsterdam, 1972).
Randall, John Herman, Jr. *Emily Greene Balch of New England: Citizen of the World* (Washington, D.C., 1940).
Randall, Mercedes M. "A Great Internationalist: The Passing of Emily Greene Balch," *Pax et Libertas* 26 (1961): 6–8.
———, *Improper Bostonian: Emily Greene Balch* (New York, 1964).
Shane, Martha P., ed. *Papers of Emily Greene Balch, 1875–1961: Guide to the Scholarly Resources Microfilm Edition* (Wilmington, Del., 1988).

Judy D. Whipps

BALDWIN, James Mark (1861–1934)

James Mark Baldwin was born on 12 January 1861 in Columbia, South Carolina, and died on 9 November 1934 in Paris, France. He was the son of Cyrus Hull Baldwin, businessman and occasional federal official, and Lydia Eunice Ford. After attending a series of private elementary schools and spending two years as a clerk in Columbia, Baldwin traveled north in 1878 to enter the Salem (New Jersey) Collegiate Institute, a private preparatory school. Three years later, in 1881, he enrolled as a sophomore at Princeton. Baldwin's collegiate coursework was focused on language and philosophy. Under the influence of James McCosh, he was introduced to both Scottish mental philosophy and the new experimental psychology of Wilhelm Wundt. The contradictions inherent in this juxtaposition provided the telos for much of his later intellectual development.

After graduating from Princeton with a BA in 1884, Baldwin went to Germany with the support of the Green Fellowship in Mental Science. There he spent a semester at Berlin, studying Spinoza under Friedrich Paulsen and a semester at Leipzig in Wilhelm Wundt's recently established psychological laboratory. By 1885, when he returned to Princeton as an instructor in French and German, he had become a devotee of Spinozan metaphysics and a self-described "enthusiast" for the new

physiological psychology. At Princeton, Baldwin prepared a translation of Théodule Ribot's *German Psychology of To-day* (1886) and published his first significant paper, "The Postulates of a Physiological Psychology" (1887), in which he combined principles of the Scottish mental philosophy, the metaphysics of Spinoza, and Wundtian psychology into what he conceived to be an integrative framework for mental science.

Baldwin moved to Illinois in 1887 to accept the position of professor of philosophy at Lake Forest University. In 1888 he married Helen Hayes Green and completed his PhD in philosophy from Princeton. Although he had initially hoped to do his dissertation on Spinoza, McCosh insisted instead that he produce a refutation of materialism. This he did, publishing the work in part in 1890 as "Recent Discussion in Materialism." While at Lake Forest, Baldwin also completed the first volume of his *Handbook of Psychology* (1889). Subtitled *Senses and Intellect*, it drew heavily on the "old" mental philosophy tradition, albeit leavened with more than a smattering of the "new" psychology. Dividing the intellect into apperceptive and rational functions, Baldwin devoted most of the book to apperception. This he defined as an "activity of synthesis by which mental data of any kind (sensations, percepts, concepts) are constructed into higher forms of relation" (p. 65) and discussed in terms of Presentation (sensation and perception), Representation (memory and recognition), Combination (association, imagination, and illusion), and Elaboration (thought). In a much shorter treatment of the rational function, Baldwin argued, following McCosh, that rational intuition is both constitutive and regulative of mind, mental act and mental product, and that it leads irrevocably to the "ultimate end of knowledge … the comprehension of self in relation to the world and God" (p. 324).

In late 1889 Baldwin accepted the Chair of Logic and Metaphysics at the University of Toronto, where he soon established Canada's first laboratory of experimental psychology (and thus the first in the British Empire) and initiated a groundbreaking series of studies on infant reaching. This work was important not only because it was psychology's first systematic, quantitative, and reasonably controlled experimental research on infant development but also because it marked the beginning of Baldwin's shift toward the evolutionary perspective on mind for which he is now best remembered.

At Toronto, Baldwin also completed the second and final volume of his *Handbook of Psychology, Feeling and Will*, which appeared in 1891. Replacing the global concept of "apperception," around which the first volume had been organized, with a focus on what would now be called "mechanisms of learning," Baldwin argued that this process involves both a consolidation of habit, characterized psychologically by diffusion of attention and automatic action, and an accommodation to new elements, characterized psychologically by concentration of attention and voluntary action. Also apparent in the second volume of the *Handbook* is Baldwin's growing interest in what would come to be called the "sensorimotor principle." When an element of reality is presented to the consciousness of an infant (e.g., when a rattle is shown to a baby), the infant's tendency is to cognize that element through direct and immediate action on it (such as grasping, shaking, or sucking a rattle). Struck by the similarity between this principle and that seemingly involved in hypnotic suggestibility, a phenomenon then very much at the center of psychological interest in France, Baldwin returned to Europe in the summer of 1892 to obtain a deeper understanding of new work on hypnotism and suggestion.

Influenced especially by Hippolyte Bernheim's view of suggestion as the expression of an idiodynamic tendency of mind in which ideas are cognized directly in terms of related actions without the mediation of reflection, Baldwin began to call attention to the

suggestibility of the human infant, in whom the capacity for reflection is as yet undeveloped. Recognizing in addition that many of the actions most readily elicited idiodynamically in infants bear some resemblance to characteristics of the presentations (e.g., smiles, waves, vocalizations) that elicit them, Baldwin became convinced of the importance of imitation in the child's development, particularly with respect to the regulation of habit and accommodation in voluntary action.

In 1893 Baldwin returned to Princeton to assume the Stuart Chair in Psychology. There he founded a new psychological laboratory, co-founded one of psychology's most influential journals, *The Psychological Review*, in 1894, and set out to elaborate his views on habit, accommodation, and imitation into what would become his two most influential contributions to psychology, *Mental Development in the Child and the Race* (1895) and *Social and Ethical Interpretations in Mental Development: A Study in Social Psychology* (1897).

From the opening pages of *Mental Development*, Baldwin made it clear that he no longer subscribed to the mental philosophy view of mind. "The older idea of the soul," he wrote, "was of a fixed substance, with fixed attributes. Knowledge of the soul was immediate in consciousness, and adequate…. The mind was best understood where best or most fully manifested…. If the adult consciousness shows the presence of principles not observable in the child consciousness, we must suppose, nevertheless, that they are really present in the child consciousness beyond the reach of our observation…. The genetic idea reverses all this. Instead of a fixed substance, we have the conception of a growing, developing activity. Functional psychology succeeds faculty psychology … the adult consciousness must, if possible, be interpreted by principles present in the child consciousness." (1895, pp. 2–3)

Mind, Baldwin now recognized, must be construed developmentally, both in the individual and in the species. Adopting a modified recapitulationism, he argued for an analogy between

ontogenesis and phylogenesis. Because this parallelism is only approximate, however, and because stages necessary to phylogenesis are often lacking in ontogenesis, he began to consider the possibility that individual adaptations are somehow linked to the evolutionary history of the species. To lay the groundwork for this perspective, Baldwin developed his earlier view of the relation of habit to accommodation into a biological theory of individual intellectual growth or adaptation.

Children, Baldwin argued, are biologically endowed with the ability to retain and act on that which is worth repeating (i.e., "habit") and to vary their activity within certain constraints in relationship to circumstance (i.e., "accommodation"). Because the environment naturally constrains the child's action, some variations in action lead to more fruitful environmental outcomes than others. Actions that produce better outcomes are more likely to be repeated (i.e., are selected by the environment) and to lead in turn to additional variations that are even more successful. Adaptation, in other words, takes place through a gradual, circular process in which actions (and ultimately thoughts) are repeated with variation and environmental selection. Circular reaction – repetition of action with variation and selection – constitutes an invariant, functional mechanism through which the mind develops toward a more adequate apprehension of reality.

Having laid out a theory of individual adaptation, Baldwin then addressed the problem of the relationship between development in the individual and that in the species. "No theory of development," he suggested, "is complete … which does not account for the transmission in some way, from one generation to another, of the gains of the earlier generations …" (p. 204) In 1895 he was only beginning to articulate the principle that he invoked to serve this function, a principle that he termed "organic selection." In its most developed form (in *Development and Evolution*, 1902), the basic idea was that adaptive behaviors acquired in the course of experience differentially increase the survival

rate of organisms born with hereditary variations that favor those acquisitions. Over evolutionary time, therefore, acquired adaptations can become congenital. Although this idea, later termed the "Baldwin effect," has had relatively little currency in modern evolutionary theory, it has become quite influential in current work on evolutionary algorithms in computer science. Reprinted six times within ten years and translated into at least four languages, *Mental Development* influenced a number of important scholars. Of these, the best known is probably the Swiss genetic epistemologist, Jean Piaget, who made significant use of Baldwin's ideas (Broughton and Freeman-Moir 1982, Cahan 1984).

Baldwin's *Social and Ethical Interpretations in Mental Development: A Study in Social Psychology* was the first book to have "social psychology" in its title. Baldwin extended the principle of circular reaction to the domain of social interaction, developing a theory of social adaptation to complement his theory of individual adaptation. In his view, social adaptation took place through a continuous three-phase, dialectical process in which children acted as others did, experienced themselves in ways that were similar to others, and assumed that the experiences of others were similar to their own. In the first phase, which Baldwin called the *projective* phase, children modeled their behavior imitatively on that of others (e.g., smiling when others smile). In acting as others did, children then naturally experienced themselves in ways that were similar to the experiences of others (e.g., just as others felt themselves smile, so too did the child). This was the second or *subjective* phase. Finally, in struggling at the same time to understand others, children just as naturally assumed that the subjectivity of the other was similar to their own. Baldwin called this the *ejective* phase. In the interplay between shared action, a subjective feeling of self, and understanding of the other, in other words, children's sense of self grew through common action with others and their sense of the other grew in terms of

their sense of self. For Baldwin, the self and the other were fundamentally social and inherently linked. It was this linkage that underlay acculturation, the process by which children became like-minded members of the social groups of which they were a part.

In addition to being awarded the Gold Medal of the Danish Royal Academy, *Social and Ethical Interpretations* served as a fundamental source of ideas for later thinkers. For example, many of the most important concepts of George Herbert MEAD's symbolic interactionism were derived from Baldwin (Holmes 1942); Lev Vygotsky's analysis of the enculturating force of the social system of meanings into which the child is born was influenced by Baldwin's views on social heredity (Valsiner and Van der Veer 1988); and Baldwin stimulated both Piaget and, later, Lawrence KOHLBERG to the study of children's moral development (Broughton and Freeman-Moir 1982).

Elected President of the American Psychological Association in 1897, Baldwin prepared a presidential address titled "On Selective Thinking" (1898), which is foundational for evolutionary epistemology. Conceiving of thinking in terms of variation with selection, he suggested that "the discovery of truth … [is] an adaptation to a given set of data, proceeding by a series of tentative selections from variations of imagery and fragments of hypothetical value… . Truth is what is selected under the control of the system of established thoughts and facts, and assimilated to the body of socially acquired knowledges and beliefs. Truth thus becomes a tentative and slowly-expanding body of data, more or less adequately reflecting the stable whole of thought and action which is accepted as reality, and in turn enlarging and clarifying that whole." (1930, pp. 9–10) Although obviously consistent with early pragmatism, Baldwin's *interactive* instrumentalism was founded on the principle that "knowledge presupposes a *dualism of controls*: the agent, on the one hand, and the recognized world of truth and reality … on the

other" (p. 10). In Baldwin's view, this meant that his approach was immune to the charges of relativism and subjectivism sometimes directed towards pragmatism.

During this same year, Baldwin also began to immerse himself in editorial work on what is arguably his most important contribution to philosophy, the *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology* (1901–1905), widely known as "Baldwin's Dictionary." A collaborative effort that brought together over fifty of the best minds of the day (including William JAMES, John DEWEY, Charles Sanders PEIRCE, Hugo MÜNSTERBERG, and Edward Bradford TITCHENER among others), the *Dictionary* was an attempt to provide systematic definitions for all major philosophical and psychological concepts. As general editor, Baldwin found himself inundated with ideas. Every article received his personal attention; and for a time at least every author became his regular correspondent.

The effect of this remarkable undertaking was immediate. Baldwin's international reputation soared. This led to his receiving Oxford University's first honorary doctorate of science in 1900 and to honorary degrees from the University of Glasgow (1901), the College of South Carolina (1905), and the University of Geneva (1909). For the first time, his writings begin to reflect the influence of G. W. F. Hegel, Hermann Lotze, Alexius Meinong, and others. What had been a nascent interest in logic became a central concern. After 1902 the content and method of Baldwin's work were almost entirely philosophical; and in 1903 he resigned his appointment in psychology at Princeton to become professor of philosophy and psychology at Johns Hopkins University.

Baldwin founded the *Psychological Bulletin* in 1904, and initiated work that would eventually become the three-volume *Thought and Things … or Genetic Logic* (1906–11). In this work he traced the development of cognition and experience from pre-logical thought, imagery, memory, play, and the rise of meaning through discursive thought, reflection, the development

of logical meaning, and implication to higher-order logical operations and aesthetic experience.

Baldwin was, as always, engaged in trying to comprehend the relationship between reason and reality, thought and things. As he put it: "I find that these dualisms are of a certain first-hand and unreflective crudeness in the epochs before the rise of Judgment and Reflection, and that they cannot be finally resolved by the 'practical' methods of that epoch, as is claimed by Instrumentalism or Pragmatism; that they are given refined and characteristic form when melted up and re-cast in the dualism of Reflection, that of Self and Not-self, or Subject and Object. Yet Thought as such, Reflection, cannot resolve its own Dualisms; Rationalism is as helpless before the final problem of the meaning of Reality as is the cruder Pragmatism." (vol. 1, pp. ix–x)

For Baldwin, the final synthesis of subject and object was to be found "… in a form of contemplation, Aesthetic in character … [in which] the immediacy of experience constantly seeks to re-establish itself. In the highest form of such contemplation, a form which comes to itself as genuine and profound Aesthetic Experience, we find a synthesis of motives, a mode in which the strands of the earlier and diverging dualisms are merged and fused. In this experience of a fusion which is not a mixture, but which issues in a meaning of its own sort and kind, an experience whose essential character is just its unity of comprehension, consciousness has its completest and most direct and final apprehension of what reality is and means." (p. x)

Dense, conceptually difficult, encumbered by an unrestrained tendency to neologism, and appearing when psychology was struggling to free itself from philosophy, *Thought and Things* was little read and less appreciated. Yet it represents, in some fundamental sense, the natural culmination of Baldwin's intellectual development. From mental philosopher to evolutionary psychologist to evolutionary epistemologist, he was constantly in search of

an integrative balance between epistemological extremes – biology vs. culture, individual vs. society, thought vs. action, truth vs. value – in the progressive coordination of thought with things. In his final work in this series, a fourth volume separately titled *Genetic Theory of Reality* (1915), Baldwin went on to argue that this coordination leads, in its ultimate outcome, to a kind of aesthetic experience (a "pancalism") in which these dichotomies are overcome. This was the endpoint of Baldwin's own intellectual development, and he considered it to be his most important contribution to human thought.

In 1908, in mid career, Baldwin suffered a personal fiasco. Arrested in a raid on a Baltimore bordello and forced in 1909 to resign from Johns Hopkins, he exiled himself both from America and from American psychology. Between 1908 and 1912 he divided his time between residence in Paris and trips to Mexico, where he served the government as an occasional advisor on higher education and lectured in the School of Higher Studies at the National University.

While in Mexico, Baldwin worked on two of his final contributions to psychology. In *Darwin and the Humanities*, which appeared in 1909 and focused on Darwin's own human studies, he attempted to demonstrate how the natural selectionist account could be related to important issues in psychology, ethics, logic, philosophy, and religion through the application of his own principle of organic selection. In *Individual and Society*, published in 1911, he argued for a psychological (as against a sociological) analysis of the nature of the social bond, the "rules of organization … which characterize the personal development of minds in relation to one another … [and] the *inner development of the social life within the group*" (p. 9).

In 1910, Baldwin was elected to succeed William James as Correspondent of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences, Institute of France. From 1912 until his death, Paris was his primary place of residence. After the outbreak of World War I, he devoted much of his time to lobbying for American entrance into the war on the side of the Allies. In 1916 he wrote a "Message from Americans Abroad to Americans at Home" that was widely circulated by the American Rights League, published a small book critical of Wilsonian neutrality, *American Neutrality, Its Cause and Cure*, and delivered an attack on German political ideology in the Herbert Spencer Lecture at Oxford, "The Super-state and the 'Eternal Values'." In that same year, Baldwin, his wife, and daughter survived a German torpedo attack on the *Sussex*, an unarmed French passenger ship crossing the English Channel. His open telegram to Woodrow Wilson about the affair was embodied in an editorial of 4 April 1916 in the *New York Times* condemning the attack.

Throughout the war, Baldwin contributed to charity and relief efforts organized on behalf of the French, and in 1917 he was awarded the Legion of Honor for his efforts. After the USA's entrance into the war, he helped organize a Paris branch of the American Navy League; and after the Armistice, he maintained informal academic contacts with Pierre Janet, Henri Bergson, and others. His memoirs, with selected letters, were published in 1926 as *Between Two Wars (1861–1921)*.

Baldwin was not only important in the early institutional history of American philosophy and psychology, he was one of the period's most sophisticated thinkers. His biosocial approach introduced a level of complexity in conceptualization of the mind, its evolutionary origins, ontogenetic development, and sociocultural formation that went far beyond the prevailing thought of the period. He addressed topics as varied as the nature of developmental and evolutionary mechanisms, the relationship between reason and reality, the genesis of logic, the value of aesthetic experience, and the nature and development in children of habit, imitation, creative invention, altruism, egoism, morality, social suggestibility, social self, self-awareness, theory of mind, and encul-

turation. His use and in some cases introduction of concepts such as multiplicity of self, ideal self, self-esteem, assimilation, accommodation, primary circular reaction, genetic logic, genetic epistemology, and social heredity exerted a formative influence on later scholars.

When Baldwin left psychology in 1908, however, there were few who would or could follow his intellectual lead. He had few students, and American psychology was committing itself to an experimental empiricism irrelevant to his interests. By 1929 Baldwin could be dismissed with the assertion that his "felicitous literary style, surpassed only by James, gave a transient vitality to his ideas: but his effect was not permanent" (Boring 1929, p. 518). What could not then be foreseen was that many of Baldwin's ideas would one day return to psychology indirectly, through the work of scholars such as Piaget, Mead, and Vygotsky.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Postulates of a Physiological Psychology," *Presbyterian Review* 8 (1887): 427–40.

Handbook of Psychology: Senses and Intellect (New York, 1889).

"Recent Discussion in Materialism," *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* 1 (1890): 357–72.

Handbook of Psychology: Feeling and Will (New York, 1891).

Mental Development in the Child and the Race (New York, 1895).

Social and Ethical Interpretations in Mental Development: A Study in Social Psychology (New York, 1897).

"On Selective Thinking," *Psychological Review* 5 (1898): 1–25.

Thought and Things: A Study of the Development and Meaning of Thought or Genetic Logic, 3 vols (New York, 1906–11).

Darwin and the Humanities (Baltimore, 1909).

The Individual and Society (Boston, 1911).

Genetic Theory of Reality (New York, 1915).

Between Two Wars (1861–1921) (Boston, 1926).

Other Relevant Works

Trans., *German Psychology of Today*, by Théodule Ribot (New York, 1886).

Ed., *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, 3 vols (New York, 1901–1905).

Development and Evolution (New York, 1902).

Fragments in Philosophy and Science (New York, 1902).

History of Psychology (London, 1913).

"James Mark Baldwin," in *A History of Psychology in Autobiography*, vol. 1, ed. C. Murchison (Worcester, Mass., 1930), pp. 1–30.

Selected Works of James Mark Baldwin, 6 vols, ed. Robert W. Wozniak (Bristol, UK, 2001).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v25*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Boring, E. G. *A History of Experimental Psychology* (New York, 1929).

Broughton, J. M., and D. J. Freeman-Moir, eds. *The Cognitive-Developmental Psychology of James Mark Baldwin* (Norwood, N.J., 1982).

Cahan, E. D. "The Genetic Psychologies of James Mark Baldwin and Jean Piaget," *Developmental Psychology* 20 (1984): 128–35.

Holmes, E. C. *Social Philosophy and the Social Mind: A Study of the Genetic Methods of J. M. Baldwin, G. H. Mead, and J. E. Boodin* (New York, 1942).

Valsiner, J., and R. Van der Veer. "On the Social Nature of Human Cognition: An Analysis of the Shared Intellectual Roots of George Herbert Mead and Lev

Vygotsky," *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior* 18 (1988): 117–36.

Wozniak, Robert H. "Thought and Things: James Mark Baldwin and the Biosocial Origins of Mind," in *Psychology: Theoretical-Historical Perspectives*, ed. R. W. Rieber and K. Salzinger (Washington, D.C., 1998), pp. 429–53.

Robert H. Wozniak

BALLARD, Edward Godwin (1910–89)

Edward Ballard was born on 3 January 1910 in Fairfax, Virginia. After receiving his BA in 1931 from the College of William and Mary, Ballard did graduate study in philosophy at the University of Virginia, receiving his MA in 1936. Scott Buchanan, Stringfellow Barr, William Weedon, and Lewis Hammond, all leaders in the interbellum revival of the liberal tradition, taught him that the liberal arts were disciplines that freed the soul from its ancient enemies: ignorance and prejudice. His lifelong interest was in Plato whom he considered the first liberal artist and founder of the liberal arts tradition. Ballard's last published work was a collection of essays in the theory of the liberal arts.

Ballard left Virginia for a brief period of work at Harvard where he studied with the poet, Robert Lowell, and the philosopher, A. N. WHITEHEAD, who encouraged him to complete the PhD in philosophy. Before he did so, Ballard taught English as an instructor at the Virginia Military Academy, thereby becoming a member of Virginia's militia. He served in the United States Navy as an officer in the submarine corps during World War II. He received his PhD in philosophy from the University of Virginia in 1947, writing a dissertation titled "Of Poetic Knowledge: An Inquiry into a Cognitive Aspect of Poetry." He joined the phi-

losophy faculty of Tulane University in 1946, and remained there for the rest of his career. He was promoted to full professor in 1956, and in 1977 he was named W. R. Irby Professor of Philosophy. Ballard was President of the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology in 1967. He served on the board of directors of the Center for Advanced Research in Phenomenology during the 1980s. He retired in 1980, and died on 8 September 1989 in El Cerrito, California.

Ballard was one of the most important of the early readers in the United States of what has come to be called the continental tradition in philosophy. He learned about Maurice Merleau-Ponty in France and first wrote about him in 1957. Ballard next studied Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger. His students include Bernard Dauenhauer, Lester Embree, Kathleen Haney, John Sallis, and Michael Zimmerman.

Ballard's masterwork is a trilogy in which he explores philosophy of history. His view, following Karl Jaspers, is that history proceeds through historical epochs. The task of philosophy is "the interpretation of archaic experience." As he explains in the first volume, *Philosophy at the Crossroads* (1971), modern philosophy broke from the perennial philosophy because, beginning with Descartes, it valorizes intellectual rationality – specifically as expressed mathematically – to the exclusion of the truths of feeling. The Ancients in contrast recognized that a human being was forever in the breach between the two sides of his nature: reason and emotion. Poetic inspiration from beyond must be honored, too. Ballard shows that today we are still faced with the choice between following the Cartesian path or resuming the task of trying to become a whole human being by acknowledging and reintegrating our dual nature.

The second volume, *Man and Technology* (1978), describes technological man, one option of the choice we are being asked to make at this historical crossroad. We can follow along the path of our culture or we can

choose restoration of ourselves as human persons. The third and concluding volume, *Principles of Interpretation* (1983), suggests that the phenomenological *epoche* operates at the successive levels of insight as the hero moves through in a tragedy. The self is a meaning-maker, who points back at being, "the non-being that renders meaning-giving possible." Self-knowledge requires establishing a relation to one's source, for therein lies the key to becoming oneself and realizing one's own meaning.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Art and Analysis: An Essay Toward a Theory in Aesthetics (The Hague, 1957).
Socratic Ignorance: An Essay on Platonic Self-knowledge (The Hague, 1965).
Philosophy at the Crossroads (Baton Rouge, La., 1971).
Man and Technology: Toward the Measurement of a Culture (Pittsburgh, 1978).
Principles of Interpretation (Athens, Ohio, 1983).
Philosophy and the Liberal Arts (Dordrecht, 1989).

Further Reading
Proc of APA v31, *Who Was Who in Amer v10*
Neville, Robert C. "A Critical Study of Edward G. Ballard's Socratic Ignorance: An Essay on Platonic Self-Knowledge," *International Philosophical Quarterly* 7 (1967): 340–56.
Sallis, John, ed. *Philosophy and Archaic Experience: Essays in Honor of Edward G. Ballard* (Pittsburgh, 1982).
Whittemore, Robert C., ed. *Philosophical Perspectives: Essays in Honor of Edward Goodwin Ballard. Tulane Studies in Philosophy*, vol. 29 (New Orleans, 1980). Contains a bibliography of Ballard's writings.

Kathleen M. Haney

BALZ, Albert George Adam (1887–1957)

Albert G. A. Balz was born on 3 January 1887 in Charlottesville, Virginia. He received his BA from the University of Virginia in 1908 and his MA the following year. Balz became a fellow in philosophy at Columbia University for 1912–13, and received his PhD in philosophy in 1916. Balz studied under John DEWEY, and his dissertation, on "Idea and Essence in the Philosophies of Hobbes and Spinoza," was published in 1918. In 1918 he served as Second Lieutenant in the US Army Infantry.

Balz became an instructor of philosophy at the University of Virginia in 1910, and was an adjunct professor from 1911 until 1915. In 1915 he became associate professor, followed in 1919 by promotion to full professor. In 1936 he was appointed Corcoran Professor of Philosophy. He served as chair of the department from 1928 to 1954. He was President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1955–6. Balz retired in 1957, and died on 1 October 1957 in Charlottesville, Virginia.

Balz's philosophical interests centered on early modern philosophy, especially Descartes. Many of his writings are included in *Cartesian Studies* (1951) and *Descartes and the Modern Mind* (1952), which was awarded the Nicholas Murray Butler Medal by Columbia University. Balz was deeply concerned with the state of philosophy and the humanities in the South. In 1952 he published *A Survey of the Humanities in Southern Institutions* and in 1954 *Southern Teachers of Philosophy*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Dualism and Early Modern Philosophy," *Journal of Philosophy* 15 (1918): 197–219, 225–41.
Idea and Essence in the Philosophies of Hobbes and Spinoza (New York, 1918).
The Basis of Social Theory, with W. S. A. Pott (New York, 1924).
The Value Doctrine of Karl Marx (New York, 1943).

"Matter and Scientific Efficiency," *Journal of Philosophy* 41 (1944): 645–64, 673–85.

"Nature, Knowledge, and Myth," *Journal of Philosophy* 43 (1946): 253–66, 288–302.

Cartesian Studies (New York, 1951).

Descartes and the Modern Mind. (New Haven, Conn., 1952).

Other Relevant Works

Balz's papers are at the University of Virginia.

"Music and Emotion," *Journal of Philosophy* 11 (1914): 236–44.

"Dualism in Cartesian Psychology and Epistemology," in *Studies in the History of Ideas* (New York, 1918), pp. 118–57.

"The Use and Misuse of History," *Journal of Philosophy* 16 (1919): 29–41.

"The Characterization of Moral Evolution," *International Journal of Ethics* 37 (1927): 403–18.

"Clauberg and the Development of Occasionalism," *Philosophical Review* 42 (1933): 553–72; 43 (1934): 48–64.

"Whitehead, Descartes, and the Bifurcation of Nature," *Journal of Philosophy* 31 (1934): 281–97.

"The Metaphysical Infidelities of Modern Psychology," *Journal of Philosophy* 33 (1936): 337–51.

"Cartesian Refutations of Spinoza," *Philosophical Review* 46 (1937): 461–84.

Ed., *Benedictus de Spinoza: Writings on Political Philosophy*, trans. R. H. M. Elwes (New York, 1937).

A Survey of the Humanities in Southern Institutions: A Report (Lexington, Kent., 1952).

Southern Teachers of Philosophy (Lexington, Kent., 1954).

Further Reading

Nat Cycl Amer Bio v46, *Pres Addr of APA v6*, *Proc of APA v31*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Cornelis de Waal

BARAKA, Imamu Amiri (1934–)

Amiri Baraka was born LeRoi Jones on 7 October 1934 in Newark, New Jersey, to an ambitious lower-middle-class family. His education included a BA in 1954 from Howard University, and graduate study at the New School for Social Research. He moved to Greenwich Village in 1957, where he met and married Hettie Cohen. Together they edited *Yugen*, a "little magazine" of the literary vanguard, from 1958 to 1963. Their circle in those years included the Beat poets and writers of the Black Mountain School. Jones's 1960 visit to Cuba as a guest of Fidel Castro affected his politics profoundly. He published his first collection of poetry, *Preface to a Twenty Volume Suicide Note*, in 1961.

Jones founded the Black Arts Repertory Theatre School in 1964, and that same year won the Obie for what is still his best-known play, *Dutchman*. In 1965, following the assassination of MALCOLM X, he divorced Hettie Cohen and moved to Harlem. The nascent Black Arts Movement attached great symbolic importance to these actions, and his plays from this period reject assimilation in favor of a militant separatism. In 1967 Jones launched Spirit House in Newark, with the goal of using theater as a weapon in the struggle for black liberation. Later that year he converted to Islam and changed his name to Imamu Amiri Baraka. In 1974 Baraka rejected black nationalism in favor of a Marxist–Leninist ideology, and declared himself a Third World Socialist. He joined the American Academy of Arts and Letters in 2001, and has been the center of controversy as New Jersey's poet laureate.

Even his harshest critics agree that Baraka has made a significant contribution to aesthetics through his writing about music. Beginning in 1959, he published a steady stream of jazz criticism in such magazines as *Down Beat* and *Kulchur*, and in liner notes. *Blues People* (1963) was the first monograph on blues and jazz by a black writer and, some would argue, the first to insist on a historical, sociological, and psy-

chological context in studying the genres. In *Blues People* and *Black Music* (a compendium of his jazz criticism from 1959 to 1967), he asserts that white consumers, critics, and even performers of jazz miss the point. According to Baraka, it is a mistake to study jazz as an art form separate from the history of Africans as they became Americans, to ignore their unique cultural values and aesthetic (of functionalism versus absolutism), or to separate art from life.

Baraka uses jazz as a metaphor for the ultimate failure of blacks to fully assimilate and for the failure of whites to successfully appropriate black art forms. The former leads to a paradox: the adaptation of Africans to America is a principal source of the blues and jazz, but the music's very failure of assimilation is one reason for its survival. White appropriators have misunderstood the context of jazz, applying inappropriate musicological techniques such as transcription as well as European (and in some cases, middlebrow) standards of excellence to its study. His criticism thus supports the Black Arts Movement's insistence on artistic purity via a radical separation from mainstream (white) aesthetics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Blues People (New York, 1963).
Dutchman, and *The Slave* (New York, 1964).
Black Music (New York, 1967; 2nd edn 1980).
The LeRoi Jones—Amiri Baraka Reader, ed. William J. Harris (New York, 1991).
Conversations with Amiri Baraka, ed. Charlie Reilly (Jackson, Miss., 1994).
The Autobiography of LeRoi Jones (Chicago, 1997).

Further Reading
Comp Amer Thought
Benston, Kimberly. W. *Baraka: The Renegade and the Mask* (New Haven, Conn., 1976).
———, ed. *Imamu Amiri Baraka (LeRoi Jones)* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1978).

Harris, William J. *The Poetry and Poetics of Amiri Baraka: The Jazz Aesthetic* (Columbia, Missouri, 1985).
Watts, Jerry. *Amiri Baraka: The Politics and Art of a Black Intellectual* (New York, 2001).
Woodard, Komozi. *A Nation Within a Nation: Amiri Baraka (LeRoi Jones) and Black Power Politics* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1999).

Mary Ellen Poole

BARBOUR, Ian Graeme (1923–)

Ian Barbour was born on 5 October 1923 in Beijing, China, the second of three sons of an American Episcopalian mother and a Scottish Presbyterian father. Both parents taught at Yenching University, he in geology and she in religious education. Barbour's father was a close friend and colleague of the Jesuit paleontologist, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, and was involved with him in the discovery of the hominid skull called *Sinanthropos* or Peking Man. In 1931 the family returned to the United States. Barbour entered Swarthmore College, starting as a major in engineering but switching to physics because its theories and experiments intrigued him. He received his BA in 1944 and MA in 1946 at Swarthmore. As an alternative to military service during World War II, he worked in a mental hospital at Duke University. While enrolled in the PhD program in physics at the University of Chicago, Barbour was a teaching assistant to Enrico Fermi, who contributed to the development of the first atomic bomb.

After graduating with the PhD in 1949, Barbour taught physics at Kalamazoo College in Michigan for four years but then decided to pursue a degree in theology at Yale University, where he took courses from H. Richard

NIEBUHR, Roland Bainton, and Robert Calhoun. In 1956 he earned his divinity degree from Yale and was hired as a professor in the departments of religion and physics at Carleton College in Northfield, Minnesota. With the exception of one year (1973–4) when he was Lilly Visiting Professor of Science, Theology and Human Values at Purdue University, Barbour spent the rest of his teaching career at Carleton College until his retirement in 1986. During that time, he was the first chairperson of a newly created religion department and then Director of the program in Science, Technology and Public Policy. He presently resides in Northfield, Minnesota.

Barbour's first major work was the fruit of a fellowship from the Danforth Foundation in 1963–4 to do research at Harvard. He attended a seminar on the philosophy of Alfred North WHITEHEAD conducted by Gordon KAUFMAN and read extensively in the process theology of Charles HARTSHORNE, John COBB, and David Griffin. After returning to Carleton, he completed *Issues in Science and Religion* (1966). By his own admission, it was an effort to fit together the two halves of his intellectual life. In 1967–8, he was awarded Guggenheim and Fulbright fellowships to explore epistemological questions at Cambridge University, which issued in the publication of *Myths, Models and Paradigms* in 1974. Mary Hesse's writings on models and Thomas KUHN's work on paradigm shifts were influential in that work. *Technology, Environment, and Human Values* (1980) was the result of grants from the National Science Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities to develop a program at Carleton on Science, Technology, and Public Policy. Students and faculty in that program were drawn from the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities.

From 1981 to 1986, Barbour was the first Winifred and Atherton Bean Professor of Science, Technology and Society at Carleton. The invitation to give the Gifford Lectures in Scotland in 1989 and 1990 allowed Barbour the opportunity to write *Religion in an Age of Science* (1990; subsequently expanded to include three introductory historical chapters, and republished in 1997 as *Religion and Science: Historical and Contemporary Issues*) and *Ethics in an Age of Technology* (1993). Both were highly regarded, but the first, above all in the expanded version, enjoyed much wider circulation. Barbour has also published *When Science Meets Religion* (2000) and *Nature, Human Nature, and God* (2002). In 1999 Barbour received the prestigious Templeton Prize for Progress in Religion. He donated most of the prize money (one million dollars) to the Center for Theology and the Natural Sciences (CTNS) in Berkeley, California. CTNS, under the direction of a former colleague at Carleton and close friend Robert J. Russell, has sponsored courses, conferences, and publications on science and religion for many years. Barbour has been involved in working groups on "Divine Action," co-sponsored by CTNS and the Vatican Observatory, and in the program on "Science and the Spiritual Quest" led by Philip Clayton and Mark Richardson under CTNS sponsorship.

Six persistent themes in Barbour's work will be discussed here. The first is his appreciation for the function of models and paradigms in both theology and natural science. This appreciation led him to draw together what had been regarded as totally different worlds of discourse while respecting their inescapable differences in methodology and content. As Barbour notes, models in both natural science and theology "are to be taken seriously but not literally; they are neither literal pictures nor useful fictions but limited and inadequate ways of imagining what is not observable" (1997, p. 117).

A second theme is Barbour's adherence to critical realism in opposition to both classical realism and instrumentalism. That is, in classical realism, theories are taken to be descriptions of nature as it is in itself, apart from the human observer. In instrumentalism, theories are thought to be merely human constructs, calculating devices for making predictions and con-

trolling nature. By way of contrast, critical realism claims that there are entities in the world resembling those postulated in the models, but that the model is a symbolic representation of the reality in question.

A third theme is Barbour's fourfold typology for the relationship between scientists and theologians (or, in any case, religiously oriented individuals): conflict, independence, dialogue, and integration. While many individual scientists or theologians elude description in terms of only one category, the typology nevertheless makes clear that conflict and independence are less than satisfactory approaches to the relationship between science and religion and that relationships either in terms of dialogue or integration are more defensible. In dialogue, one presumes that there are areas of overlap between the two spheres of activity, even as they remain distinct from one another both in content and methodology. Science, for example, raises "limit-questions" (such as "Why is there something rather than nothing?") which cannot be answered from a scientific perspective. Yet believable religious claims must likewise be somehow consonant with what is known about the physical world from a scientific perspective. Integration, to be sure, goes well beyond dialogue in that it presupposes that the data of science and religion can be organized into a single coherent world view.

The fourth theme in Barbour's thought is his preference for theology of nature rather than natural theology. He prefers to ground the theological world view in the scriptures and experiences of a specific religious tradition and then to modify or reinterpret specific beliefs in the light of contemporary natural science (for example, the classical doctrines of creation, divine providence, and eschatology). Natural theology, by comparison, starts with the findings of contemporary science and, from there, tries to "prove" or establish classic religious beliefs, such as the existence of God, life after death, etc., on purely rational grounds. Barbour's thinking is that the models and the findings of science are strictly provisional and revisable so that to base theology on contemporary science is inherently risky.

A fifth prevailing theme in Barbour's work has been his defense of emergence over reductionism in accounting for progressively higher-order levels of activity within nature. Whereas many natural scientists want to reduce all forms of life, even rational life, to ever more complex interactions at the molecular or even atomic level, Barbour is insistent that higher levels of existence and activity within nature function in terms of laws and principles proper to themselves and are not simply reducible to variants of molecular and atomic interactions. At stake here is a metaphysical assumption that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Given the requisite preparation at the lower level, a new self-organizing ontological totality will emerge, which will not only be governed by its own principles of activity, but which will also exert a type of "top-down" causation on the lower-level forms of activity characteristic of its parts or members, taken separately. Barbour avoids classical metaphysical dualism and yet does not endorse a purely materialistic explanation of the emergence of novelty within the cosmic process.

A sixth characteristic of Barbour's thought on religion and science is his consistent espousal of Whitehead's process-relational metaphysics as the philosophy best for the coordination and potential integration of the truth-claims proper to religion and science. In Barbour's view, Whitehead best explains how God can be active in the world without undermining creaturely spontaneity and, above all, human freedom. At the same time, in line with his thinking on the role of models in religion and science, Barbour remains critical of certain weaknesses within process-relational metaphysics, such as how to understand the continuing identity of the human self over and above a simple succession of moments of experience, and how to explain the interplay of diverse levels of existence and activity within nonhuman nature.

Barbour has achieved prominence in the field of religion and science both because of his pioneering work in the 1960s and 1970s on the similarities and differences between these two important spheres of human life and because of his carefully balanced presentation of controversial issues in the religion-and-science debate over the intervening years. He has also summarized his lifelong reflections on the interplay between religion and science in several books which are more accessible to the nonprofessional reader.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Christianity and the Scientist (New York, 1960).

Issues in Science and Religion (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1966).

Science and Secularity: The Ethics of Technology (New York, 1970).

Myths, Models, and Paradigms: A Comparative Study in Science and Religion (New York, 1974).

Technology, Environment, and Human Values (New York, 1980).

Religion in an Age of Science: The Gifford Lectures, 1989–91, vol. 1 (San Francisco, 1990).

Ethics in an Age of Technology: The Gifford Lectures, 1989–91, vol. 2 (San Francisco, 1993).

Religion and Science: Historical and Contemporary Issues (San Francisco, 1997).

When Science Meets Religion (San Francisco, 2000).

Nature, Human Nature, and God (Minneapolis, 2002).

Other Relevant Works

Science and Religion: New Perspectives on the Dialogue (New York, 1968).

Earth Might be Fair: Reflections on Ethics, Religion and Ecology (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1971).

Western Man and Environmental Ethics (Reading, Mass., 1972).

Finite Resources and the Human Future (Minneapolis, 1976).

Energy and American Values, with Harvey Brooks, Sanford Lakoff, and John Opie (New York, 1982).

Further Reading

Polkinghome, John C. *Scientists as Theologians: A Comparison of the Writings of Ian Barbour, Arthur Peacocke and John Polkinghorne* (London, 1996).

Joseph A. Bracken

BARNES, Albert Coombs (1872–1951)

Albert Barnes was born on 2 January 1872 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and died in a car accident on 24 July 1951 in Chester County, Pennsylvania. He attended Central High School, a school for students selected for their potential, graduated from the University of Pennsylvania Medical School in 1892, and in 1900 studied pharmacology, therapeutics, and philosophy at Ruprecht-Karls-Universität in Heidelberg, Germany. Barnes amassed his fortune by promoting the antiseptic Argyrol in 1902. A millionaire by 1907, he began to collect Barbizon School French landscape paintings, but upon the advice of his school acquaintance the painter William C. Glackens in 1912, turned his attention to Impressionists and Post-Impressionists. Today his collection comprises one of the world's greatest collections of those artists. His collection also included paintings by the Old Masters, African sculpture, and decorative work. In 1915 he published his first article, "How to Judge a Painting," in *Arts and Decoration*.

In 1922 Barnes, a champion of the common man in general, and blacks in particular, and a disdainer of art critics and historians, founded the Barnes Foundation in Merion,

Pennsylvania, which formally opened in 1925. This foundation sought to educate predominantly working-class people (from whose origins he himself had arisen) in art and art appreciation. Barnes's prescribed educational method for the school was that of the analysis of the form and expression of the actual works in the collection rather than their iconographical, biographical, or historical context. He maintained that form and content could not be separated and that the aesthetic experience and the appreciation of art was an active process. His first book, *The Art in Painting* (1925), remains the foundation for the art classes taught at the Barnes Foundation today. Barnes's friend, the philosopher John DEWEY, served as the Foundation's education director. Dewey's pragmatism emphasized the validity of experiencing the works of art themselves. For a brief period beginning in 1941 Bertrand Russell was hired as a lecturer. Barnes's teaching philosophy, also influenced by William JAMES and George SANTAYANA, extended to the ahistorical display of the works of art as well; works of art that occupied a single wall were more closely bound by aesthetic effect than style or period, as is common today.

Barnes did not approve of loaning his works, which accounts for the excellent condition of the present-day collection. In 1961 the state mandated that the Barnes Foundation open its doors to the public. Barnes also did not approve of color reproductions. However, the 1993 catalog of the traveling exhibition, organized to fund the refurbishment of the building, presented the first color reproductions of such works as Matisse's *Joie de vivre*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Art in Painting (Merion, Penn., 1925).
The Art of Henri Matisse, with Violette De Mazia (New York, 1933).
The Art of Renoir, with Violette De Mazia (Merion, Penn., 1935).
The Art of Cezanne, with Violette De Mazia (New York, 1939).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*
Cantor, Gilbert M. *The Barnes Foundation: Reality vs Myth* (Philadelphia, 1963).
Decker, Andrew. "Future Shock at the Barnes," *ARTnews* 91 (Summer 1992): 106–11.
De Mazia, Violette. "The Barnes Foundation: The Display of Its Art Collection," *Vistas* 2 (1983): 107–20.
Glass, Newman. "Theory and Practice in the Experience of Art: John Dewey and the Barnes Foundation," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 31 (1997): 91–105.
Great French Paintings from the Barnes Foundation: Impressionist, Post-Impressionist, and Early Modern (New York, 1993).
Greenfield, Howard. *The Devil and Dr. Barnes: Portrait of an American Art Collector* (New York, 1987).
Hart, Henry. *Dr. Barnes of Merion* (New York, 1963).
Hughes, Robert. "Opening the Barnes Door," *Time* (10 May 1993): 61–4.
Schack, William. *Art and Argyrol: The Life and Career of Dr. Albert C. Barnes* (New York, 1963).

Shelley Wood Cordulack

BARNES, Hazel Estella (1915–)

Hazel E. Barnes was born on 16 December 1915 in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania. After attending public schools there, she won the Curran Scholarship which sent her to Wilson College, a women's college in Pennsylvania, for undergraduate study. She majored in classics, a course of study she would continue after earning her BA in 1937 at Yale University. In 1941 she earned her PhD in philosophy with

her dissertation, "Philosophy as Katharsis in the *Enneades* of Plotinus." Barnes spent 1941 to 1945 teaching at two North Carolina colleges for women, the Women's College of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, and Queens College in Charlotte. While at Queens College, she began teaching courses in philosophy in addition to her regular classics courses. In the summer of 1944 she pursued her interest in philosophy by taking graduate courses at Columbia University.

At the conclusion of World War II, Barnes took up a teaching post for three years at Pierce College in Greece, which had fallen into ruin under the German occupation. Upon returning to the United States in 1948, she took a position at the University of Toledo, again teaching classics and philosophy. Barnes began teaching and working extensively on French existentialism in the early 1950s. She was an assistant professor at Ohio State University in 1952–3 and then went to the University of Colorado, where for many years she taught courses in both classics and philosophy. She retired in 1986 and presently resides in Boulder. She was named "Woman of the Year in Philosophy" by the Society for Women in Philosophy in 1989.

It was while she was teaching in Ohio, rather than during her time in Greece or traveling throughout Europe in the postwar years – precisely the years when Jean-Paul Sartre's star was rising – that Barnes was first exposed to existentialism. It all began innocently enough. As she recounted not long ago in her autobiography, *The Story I Tell Myself: A Venture in Existentialist Autobiography* (1997), her lifelong association with existentialism originated in the innocent question of one of her students. "What is this existentialism everybody is talking about?" the student had asked (1997, p. 143). Not having an answer to such a question ready at hand, Barnes embarked on an intense study of Sartre and his cohorts. An intellectual conversion of sorts resulted. Not long after, she began teaching a regular course on existentialism, one of the first of its kind in America.

In the fall of 1951 Barnes began translating Sartre's *L'Être et le néant* (1943), a classic work of French existentialism. With the publication of her translation in 1956, she became an immediate authority on existentialism in America. Barnes was among the first to introduce existentialist works and ideas to American audiences, and she stood alongside such important figures in the translation of postwar European ideas to American contexts as Marjorie GRENE, William BARRETT, J. Glenn Gray, and Walter KAUFMANN. Barnes and Grene were among the first women philosophers to puncture the patriarchal world of postwar American philosophy, which was primarily analytic in orientation at that time.

Unlike some of the other American commentators on existentialism, Barnes did not offer any philosophical genealogy for Sartre's work. She paid little attention to the German existentialists and to Kierkegaard, sometimes to the detriment of her own work. Instead, she focused her energies on the French existentialists almost exclusively, most notably Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, and Albert Camus. Her influential 1959 *The Literature of Possibility: A Study in Humanistic Existentialism* offered an introductory interpretation of the major themes in the works of all three.

Like many others who first introduced existentialism to America, Barnes made a conscious effort to reach out to the broader public beyond academia. *The Literature of Possibility* was written for just such an audience. But she did even more than this. She introduced existentialism over the airwaves on Ohio State's campus radio station and, in the early 1960s, she devised and "starred" in the production of a PBS television series on the subject, which she entitled "Self-Encounter." Barnes was not averse to lecturing for a wide array of audiences, from the most academically rigorous to the most general. Often, she would speak about what she liked to call "applied existentialism"; she would offer existentialist interpretations and perspectives on everything from education to aging.

Even in her more demanding written work, Barnes made every attempt to ground her thinking in the concerns of the day. *An Existentialist Ethics* (1967) was Barnes's most original work. In it she engaged figures as diverse as Ayn RAND, Norman Mailer, and the student radicals of the 1960s – and showed that the question of an existentialist ethics was by no means an academic or abstract one. On the contrary, it was a matter of concrete and immediate experience. In the following years, she would again take up the topic of student radicalism in *The University as the New Church* (1970). Like other American interpreters of existentialism, Barnes realized that there was more than just a superficial relation between the student movement and existentialist philosophy.

Barnes has been more than just a translator and interpreter of Sartre. Her works, *Sartre* (1973) and *Sartre and Flaubert* (1981), have been indispensable. While drawing on the work of Sartre, de Beauvoir, and Camus, she has made her own substantial contribution to American philosophy. *An Existentialist Ethics* was a major contribution to ethical theory. It highlighted the positive qualities of existentialism at a time when the popular conception of existentialism dismissed it as little more than a bleak and pessimistic brand of philosophy. More importantly, it offered a tangible and concrete exploration of existentialism put into ethical action. It stressed the potential relevance of existentialist thought for causes such as feminism and racial equality, causes for which existentialism proved very useful.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Literature of Possibility: A Study in Humanistic Existentialism (Lincoln, Neb., 1959).
An Existentialist Ethics (New York, 1967; Chicago, 1978).
The University as the New Church (London, 1970).
Sartre (Philadelphia, 1973).
The Meddling Gods: Four Essays on Classical Themes (Lincoln, Neb., 1974).
Sartre and Flaubert (Chicago, 1981).
The Story I Tell Myself: A Venture in Existentialist Autobiography (Chicago, 1997).

Other Relevant Works
Trans., *Being and Nothingness: A Phenomenological Essay on Ontology*, by Jean-Paul Sartre (New York, 1956).

Further Reading
Women Phils
Calder, William M., III, Ulrich K. Goldsmith, and Phyllis B. Kenevan, eds. *Hypatia: Essays in Classics, Comparative Literature, and Philosophy* (Boulder, Col., 1985). Presented to Barnes in honor of her seventieth birthday.
Cotkin, George. *Existential America* (Baltimore, Md., 2003).
Fulton, Ann. *Apostles of Sartre: Existentialism in America, 1945–1963* (Evanston, Ill., 1999).

Martin Woessner

BARRETT, William (1913–92)

William Barrett was born on 30 December 1913 on Long Island, New York. After receiving his BA in 1933 from City College, where, like so many other noted American thinkers, he studied under Morris R. COHEN, he went on to do graduate work at Columbia University. At Columbia he studied under F. J. E. WOODBRIDGE, J. H. RANDALL, Ernest NAGEL, and Richard MCKEON. He wrote an MA thesis in 1934 on Duns Scotus. His dissertation, "Aristotle's Theory of Movement," was completed in 1938 under the direction of Woodbridge. He also studied under Rudolph CARNAP at the University of Chicago while a

two-time university fellow from 1936 to 1938. Barrett taught philosophy at the University of Illinois and Brown University, before serving in the US Navy during World War II. At the conclusion of the war, he served with the State Department in Italy. The war, by Barrett's own admission, radically altered his philosophical outlook. No longer interested in the abstract and technical problems of Greek and medieval philosophy, not to mention Carnap's logic, Barrett was drawn to more concrete and immediate matters of experience, which led him to focus his intellectual energies on the works of the European phenomenologists and existentialists. Returning to New York, he moved to Greenwich Village, rekindled friendships from his days at City College and Columbia, and became affiliated with the "New York Intellectuals." He became an editor of *Partisan Review*, a post he held until 1951. He returned to academia to become professor of philosophy at New York University from 1950 until his retirement in 1979. Barrett died on 8 September 1992 in Tarrytown, New York.

While at *Partisan Review* Barrett published a collection of introductory essays in *What is Existentialism?* Along with such philosophers as Marjorie GRENE, Hazel BARNES, and J. Glenn Gray, Barrett helped introduce the themes and ideas of European existentialism – from Søren Kierkegaard to Jean-Paul Sartre – to postwar American audiences. A philosopher with wide-ranging interests and a rare talent for combining philosophical rigor with lively prose, Barrett committed himself early on to writing for the broader public. He wrote extensively on art and literature, frequently contributing essays and reviews to *The New York Times* and the *Atlantic Monthly*, where he was literary editor from 1961 to 1964. His work introducing philosophical subjects to popular audiences was, by all accounts, a success. His classic text from 1958, *Irrational Man: A Study in Existential Philosophy*, has been one of the most widely read and influential introductions to the subject. Barrett stressed the philosophical rigor and historical pedigree of existential-

ism and, in the process, went a long way toward rectifying the common assumption that this new philosophy was merely a fashion or fad – though it certainly was that as well.

Barrett's postwar work was influenced most by Martin Heidegger. Unlike Sartre who, in Barrett's opinion, was too indebted to a Cartesian conception of the subject, Heidegger represented a path of thought that avoided the pitfalls of both Marxism and positivism, while simultaneously calling into question the very foundations of the Western tradition. In the introduction to a selection of writings on Eastern philosophy, *Zen Buddhism: Selected Writings of D. T. Suzuki* (1956), Barrett refers to Heidegger explicitly in this regard. In both *Irrational Man* and the 1964 reissue of *What is Existentialism?* – which included a lengthy new section devoted entirely to Heidegger – the German philosopher emerges as the most profound of all the existentialists. Following Heidegger's later path of thought, Barrett became increasingly interested in technology and rationalism, and their relation to human existence – most notably, the question of freedom. These concerns animated his *The Illusion of Technique: A Search for the Meaning of Life in a Technological Age* (1978), which examined the work of William JAMES and Ludwig Wittgenstein, as well as Heidegger. They also appeared in his *Death of the Soul: From Descartes to the Computer* (1986).

As indebted as he was to Heidegger's work, especially to his critiques of modern science and technology, Barrett was by no means blind to the potential limitations of Heidegger's thought. In *The Illusion of Technique* he turns, in the end, to the pragmatism of William James. In the introduction to a selection of Heidegger's work included in the multivolume *Philosophy in the Twentieth Century* (1962) he at least suggests – at a time when many of the facts remained undisclosed – that there was some connection between Heidegger's support for Nazism and his philosophical development.

Outside of his contributions to the study of existentialism, Barrett is remembered chiefly

for his intellectual memoir, *The Truants: Adventures Among the Intellectuals* (1982), which documented his days among the New York intellectuals before and after World War II. This work was among other things a tribute to his lifelong friend, the poet Delmore Schwartz. But the book's perceptive portraits of such well-known and influential figures as Philip Rahv, Hannah ARENDT, Lionel Trilling, and Mary McCarthy – to name just a few – have made it required reading for anyone interested in the rich world of postwar American letters.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

What is Existentialism? (New York, 1947; rev. edn 1964).

Zen Buddhism: Selected Writings of D. T. Suzuki (New York, 1956).

Irrational Man: A Study in Existential Philosophy (New York, 1958).

Ed. with Henry D. Aiken, *Philosophy in the Twentieth Century: An Anthology*, 4 vols (New York, 1962).

Ego and Instinct: The Psychoanalytic View of Human Nature, with Daniel Yankelovich (New York, 1970).

Time of Need: Forms of Imagination in the Twentieth Century (New York, 1972).

The Illusion of Technique: A Search for the Meaning of Life in a Technological Age (New York, 1978).

The Truants: Adventures Among the Intellectuals (New York, 1982).

Death of the Soul: From Descartes to the Computer (New York, 1986).

Further Reading

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Proc of APA v66

Cotkin, George. *Existential America* (Baltimore, Md., 2003).

Fulton, Ann. *Apostles of Sartre: Existentialism in America, 1945–1963* (Evanston, Ill., 1999).

Martin Woessner

BARTLEY, William Warren, III (1934–90)

William Warren Bartley, III was born on 2 October 1934 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. He received his BA in 1956 and his MA in 1958 from Harvard University. Bartley then attended the London School of Economics and Political Science, where he earned his PhD in logic and scientific method in 1962. From 1960 to 1963 he was a lecturer in logic at the London School of Economics, and from 1961 to 1964 a lecturer on the history of philosophy of science at the Warburg Institute of the University of London. In 1963–4 he was a visiting associate professor of philosophy at the University of California at Berkeley, and from 1964 to 1967 he was associate professor of philosophy at the University of California at San Diego. After a year as the S. A. Cook Bye Fellow at Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, in 1966–7, Bartley returned to the United States permanently.

From 1967 to 1969 Bartley was associate professor of philosophy at the University of Pittsburgh, and from 1969 to 1973 he was professor of philosophy and history and philosophy of science, and associate director of Pittsburgh's Philosophy of Science Center. In 1970 he began an association with California State University at Haywood as professor of philosophy, and he taught there until 1989. From 1985 until his death, he was a senior research fellow at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace at Stanford University. Bartley also was a fellow and adjunct scholar at the Institute for Humane Studies at George Mason University from 1984 until his death. He held a variety of fellowships and visiting lectureships at many universities in the United States and Europe. Bartley died on 5 February 1990 in Oakland, California.

While an undergraduate at Harvard, Bartley became excited by Karl Popper's philosophy of science, and he went to the London School of Economics to study with Popper. Much of his subsequent work developed Popper's theories of science and epistemology, and he soon

became one of the most significant philosophers inspired by Popper, continuing the tradition of critical rationalism and stimulating the evolutionary epistemology movement. Bartley rescued a huge manuscript that Popper had largely composed in the 1950s as a sequel to *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, and brought it to publication in three volumes in the 1980s. Bartley also brought to light some of Lewis Carroll's writings on symbolic logic; edited Friedrich Hayek's last book *The Fatal Conceit: The Errors of Socialism* and began editing Hayek's collected works; and wrote widely read biographies of Ludwig Wittgenstein and Werner Erhard.

Bartley's first book, *The Retreat to Commitment* (1962), applied Popper's anti-foundationalist and anti-authoritarian theory of knowledge to the question of the justification of religious beliefs. Religion often assumes that justification of a belief ultimately consists of a final appeal to an authority, usually a source of that belief. Protestant theology, for example, has fallen into this "justificationist" model, immunizing religion from rational criticism by other systems that do not share the same foundations. Furthermore, much of twentieth-century philosophy has retreated to justificationism, so both rationalists and irrationalists simply disagree on how to locate final epistemological authority. The solution is to abandon justificationism (which modern scientific method already has accomplished), and understand the process of knowledge production as the rational decision procedure for critically evaluating competing beliefs over time in light of the best available evidence. This fallibilist and evolutionary understanding of epistemology offers a solution to the classical problem of the criterion, which threatens a false dilemma of either having to suffer an infinite regress of justification or making a dogmatic appeal to basic foundational beliefs that themselves require no further justification. Bartley's further work on this approach of critical rationalism culminated in his papers published in *Evolutionary Epistemology:*

Theory of Rationality and the Sociology of Knowledge (1987), which he co-edited with Gerard Radnitzky. Critics of Bartley's theory of knowledge have mainly complained that his theory of critical rationalism is itself inconsistent with its own critical standards of justification.

Bartley's last book, *Unfathomed Knowledge, Unmeasured Wealth: On Universities and the Wealth of Nations* (1990), applies critical rationalism to the functioning of universities. According to Bartley, universities are still havens for dogmatism because they are largely insulated from the economic forces of the free market. Following Hayek's view that the economic free market and the free market of competing ideas are mutually interconnected, Bartley concludes that the academic world should be forced to surrender its protected monopoly on knowledge production. The current status quo has been substantially aided by the intellectual world's satisfaction with justificationism, which effectively immunizes both absolutist and relativist philosophies from outside criticism. Bartley's lengthy study of "The Curious Case of Karl Popper" in this book attempts to supply an example of this suppression of criticism, by exposing how professional philosophy has ignored Popper in favor of authoritarian stances inspired by Wittgenstein and Thomas KUHN.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Achilles, the Tortoise, and Explanation in Science and History," *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 13 (1962): 15–33.

The Retreat to Commitment (New York, 1962; 2nd edn, La Salle, Ill., 1984).

"The Critical Approach to Philosophy: Rationality versus the Theory of Rationality," in *The Critical Approach to Science and Philosophy, in Honor of Karl Popper*, ed. Mario Bunge (New York, 1964).

"The Reduction of Morality to Religion,"

Journal of Philosophy 67 (1970): 755–66.

Morality and Religion (London and New York, 1971).

Wittgenstein (Philadelphia, 1973; 2nd edn, La Salle, Ill., 1985).

L. Wittgenstein e K. Popper: maestri di scuola elementare (Rome, 1976).

"The Philosophy of Karl Popper," *Philosophia* 6 (1976): 463–94; 7 (1977): 675–716; 11 (1982): 121–221.

Werner Erhard: The Transformation of a Man, the Founding of est (New York, 1978).

"A Popperian Harvest," in *In Pursuit of Truth*, ed. Paul Levinson (Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1982), pp. 249–89.

"The Challenge of Evolutionary Epistemology," in *Absolute Values and the Creation of the New World* (New York, 1983), vol. 2, pp. 835–80.

"Non-justificationism: Popper versus Wittgenstein," in *Epistemology and Philosophy of Science*, ed. P. Weingartner and J. Czermak (Vienna, 1983).

"Knowledge Is a Product Not Fully Known to Its Producer," in *The Political Economy of Freedom*, ed. K. Leube and A. Zlabinger (Munich, Germany, 1985), pp. 17–45.

Unfathomed Knowledge, Unmeasured Wealth: On Universities and the Wealth of Nations (La Salle, Ill., 1990).

Other Relevant Works

"Goodman's Paradox, a Simple Solution," *Philosophical Studies* 19 (1968): 85–8.

Ed., *Lewis Carroll's Symbolic Logic: Part I, Elementary, 1896, Fifth edition, Part II, Advanced* (New York, 1977; 2nd edn, 1986).

Ed., *The Open Universe: An Argument for Indeterminism* (Totowa, N.J., 1982).

Ed., *Quantum Theory and the Schism in Physics* (Totowa, N.J., 1982).

Ed., *Realism and the Aim of Science*, by Karl Popper (Totowa, N.J., 1983).

"Philosophy of Biology versus Philosophy of Physics," in *Evolutionary Epistemology: Theory of Rationality and the Sociology of Knowledge*, ed. William W. Bartley, III and Gerard Radnitzky (La Salle, Ill., 1987), pp. 7–46.

Ed., *The Fatal Conceit: The Errors of Socialism*, by Friedrich Hayek (1988).

Further Reading

Proc of APA v63

Artigas, Mariano. *The Ethical Nature of Karl Popper's Theory of Knowledge: Including Popper's Unpublished Comments on Bartley and Critical Rationalism* (New York and Bern, Switzerland, 1999).

Derkson, A. A. "The Failure of a Comprehensively Critical Rationalism," *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 10 (1980): 51–66.

Hauptli, Bruce. "Unfathomed Knowledge, Unmeasured Worth and Growth?" *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 23 (1993): 97–102.

Hudson, W. D. "Professor Bartley's Theory of Rationality and Religious Belief," *Religious Studies* 9 (1973): 339–50.

Watkins, John. "Comprehensively Critical Rationalism," *Philosophy* 44 (1969): 57–62.

John R. Shook

BARWISE, Kenneth Jon (1942–2000)

Jon Barwise was born on 29 June 1942 in Independence, Missouri, and he died on 5 March 2000 in Bloomington, Indiana. His precocity was evident from early years, and he achieved distinction in obtaining his BA degree from Yale University in 1963 in philosophy and mathematics. From there he proceeded to

Stanford, where his MA was conferred in 1965 and his PhD in mathematics in 1967, for a dissertation written under the direction of Solomon Feferman. While he was at Stanford, Barwise was also influenced by Georg Kreisel and Dana Scott, reflecting their breadth of interests and concerns about the match or mismatch of logic and language.

After leaving Stanford he spent a year at the University of California at Los Angeles as a National Science Foundation Fellow, and then returned to Yale in 1968 as an assistant professor of mathematics and computer science. The next two years at Yale gave him plenty of opportunity to interact with Abraham Robinson and Paul Eklof, both of whom were involved in the study of the interplay between algebra and logic. In 1970 he went to the University of Wisconsin as an associate professor of mathematics, part of the constellation that gathered there under the leadership of Stephen Cole Kleene.

Barwise's original research interests (as attested to by his dissertation) lay in the area of infinitary logic, the use of expressions with an infinite number of quantifiers. His book *Admissible Sets and Structures* (1975) bore witness to the stamp that he put on the field, both by his research and by his style of exposition. He uses Kripke–Platek set theory for setting out his results (developed by Saul Kripke and Richard Platek), which indicates his willingness to strike out in directions not entirely fashionable. He also provides a recipe in the midst of one of the drier sections of the text in an effort to refresh the reader (although the rock cakes for which he gives directions can sometimes come out more like rocks than cakes). The book was finished during a brief visit at Oxford University.

Perhaps the most visible result of his years at Wisconsin was the *Handbook of Mathematical Logic*. This collection, which appeared in 1977, sought to cover the entire field of logic and included contributions by leading researchers from around the world. The quality of the exposition is unusually high for such a volume,

and, while Barwise paid tribute to the efforts of his collaborators in putting the volume together, it was his editorial direction that made it so exceptionally useful. It is hard to imagine a similar volume being assembled subsequently, both because of the growth of the field and the lack of Barwise's omniscience. He also edited (together with his adviser Feferman) *Model-theoretic Logics* (1985), a collection that tried to draw together some of the strands in generalized model theory that had emerged over the previous decade.

One of the reasons for Barwise's interest in generalized quantifiers was his starting to work on problems in linguistics and its interface with logic. The work on admissible sets had already indicated the advantages of not restricting attention to just finite sequences of "all" and "some." By the late 1970s Barwise was looking at sentences of the form "Most boys and girls like each other" and trying to figure out how to make sense of them. He would solicit the opinions of students and colleagues in an attempt to get a sense of how they ought to be interpreted. He worked a good deal with the linguist Robin Cooper, and their joint paper on interpreting such sentences launched him into a stage of his career in which philosophy of language began to take precedence over mathematical logic.

In 1979 Barwise accepted a mathematics position at Stanford, perhaps for the sake of returning to familiar surroundings, perhaps because it was difficult for Wisconsin to find a way of accommodating his increasingly wide range of interests within its departmental structure. At Stanford he worked intensely with John Perry and started to formulate what has become known as situation semantics. Progress in this field was well documented by a collection of papers which Barwise published at the end of the decade under the punning title *The Situation in Logic* (1989). The concern of situation semantics was to find models on a small scale for languages as used rather than worrying about overly abstract creations that were not needed in practice. This was a contrast

with the work of Richard Montague, which had previously served as the model for mathematical linguistics. As a result, a good deal of Barwise's attention was given to looking at sentences in need of interpretation and to responding to critics who felt that the new approach was either too ambitious or not ambitious enough. The creation of the Center for the Study of Language and Information at Stanford under Barwise's direction helped both to bring scholars together to work on the field of situation semantics and to make sure that their results found a publisher.

In the midst of working on these issues of linguistics, Barwise also looked at questions of paradox in conjunction with the philosopher John Etchemendy. Their joint book *The Liar* (1987)offers a solution to the paradox of the title based on the technical device of hypersets in conjunction with John L. Austin's perspective on semantics (which is defended as an alternative to what they call Russellian semantics). The idea of looking at the ways the liar sentence can be used is connected with Austin's inquiries into speech acts. While the perspective offered by Barwise and Etchemendy has scarcely received universal endorsement as a resolution of the paradox, it has helped to spur interest in the anti-foundation axiom (which, as its name implies, denies the usual "Axiom of Foundation" of Zermelo–Fraenkel set theory). As the authors observe, what made the axiom appealing to them was its emerging from "a coherent, intuitive conception of set, rather than just being a formally consistent axiom."

Another practical occupation for Barwise during the years at Stanford was the design of software for teaching logic. He took the design of the mini-universe for "Tarski's World" as a serious enterprise and worked on it with John Etchemendy. As was typical with items of software, the shelf life of the software itself was not so long as with some of Barwise's other enterprises, but the influence on teaching continued. The design of the software reflects the value Barwise attributed to small models for situations.

In 1990 Barwise went to Indiana University as College Professor of Philosophy, Computer Science, and Mathematics, and contributed to the rise of informatics as a major area of research in Bloomington. Perhaps his own difficulties in getting interdisciplinary support elsewhere led to his enthusiasm for the wide range of the scholarly community that came together around him. If one had to characterize the work of the last decade of his life, it was the extension of the notion of "situation" even further, to visual representations and diagrams. His 1997 volume *Information Flow* (written jointly with Jerry Seligman) presents an overview of how mathematics can be used to describe the titular subject with an undercurrent of philosophical commentary. After his diagnosis with cancer in January 1999, Barwise remained active and continued to work, even if by dictation, up until the last few days of his life.

Barwise received an honorary degree from the University of Pennsylvania in 1992. He was known for his ability to find humor in fairly unlikely situations, which could cheer up students and colleagues alike. His influence in the field of mathematical logic was immense, and some of the technical details of his work will receive philosophical articulation for some years. While the fine points of the application of logic to language are not easy to render entirely convincing, Barwise did not allow the beauty of mathematical generalization to get in the way of seeing how best to use mathematics in the service of communication.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Admissible Sets and Structures (Berlin, 1975).
"Generalized Quantifiers and Natural Language," with Robin Cooper, *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4 (1981): 159–219.
The Liar: An Essay on Truth and Circularity, with John Etchemendy (New York, 1987).
The Situation in Logic (Stanford, Cal., 1989).
Vicious Circles, with Lawrence Moss (Stanford, Cal., 1996).

Information Flow: The Logic of Distributed Systems, with Jerry Seligman (Cambridge, UK, 1997).

Other Relevant Works
"Back and Forth through Infinitary Logic," in *Studies in Model Theory*, ed. M. D. Morley (Buffalo, N.Y., 1973), pp. 5–34.
Ed., *Handbook of Mathematical Logic* (Amsterdam, 1977).
Situations and Attitudes, with John Perry (Cambridge, Mass., 1983).
Ed., with Solomon Feferman, *Model-Theoretic Logics: Perspectives in Mathematical Logic* (Berlin, 1985).
Ed., with Gerard Allwein, *Logical Reasoning with Diagrams* (Oxford, 1996).

Further Reading
Devlin, Keith. "Jon Barwise's Papers on Natural Language Semantics," *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 10 (2004): 54–85.
Feferman, Solomon. "In Memoriam: Kenneth Jon Barwise 1942–2000," *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 6 (2000): 505–508.
Shin, Sun-Joo. "Heterogeneous Reasoning and Its Logic," *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 10 (2004): 86–106.

Thomas Drucker

BASCOM, John (1827–1911)

John Bascom was born on 1 May 1827 in Genoa, New York. His early education took place at Homer Academy followed by Williams College, from which he graduated with a BA in 1849. Bascom spent a year teaching at Ball Seminary in Hoosick Falls, New York. He later studied law in Rochester, New York, but left the law office after less than a year. He entered Auburn Theological Seminary in 1851, but left a year later to tutor rhetoric and oratory at Williams College. That same year he married Abbie Burt who died in 1854. After her death, Bascom attended Andover Theological Seminary, graduating in 1855. That same year he returned to Williams College, this time as professor of rhetoric and oratory. Shortly afterward, he married Emma Curtiss with whom he fathered three children. In addition to rhetoric and oratory, Bascom taught philosophy at Williams. Between 1859 and 1874, he published six books on political economy, aesthetics, rhetoric, psychology, religion, and literature.

In 1874 Bascom was appointed President of the University of Wisconsin. During his thirteen-year tenure, Bascom successfully elevated the University of Wisconsin from an intellectual backwater to a major center of learning. He supported female scholarship and developed an innovative system of administration. At Wisconsin he was the primary professor of philosophy, ardently encouraging students to use their education for the good of society, and publishing eight more volumes on theology, ethics, and sociology. He continually pressed the spiritual element of higher learning and, in his own work, sought to reconcile Christian theology with evolutionary theory. His central philosophical problem was maintaining the efficacy of Christian spirituality in an intellectual climate that was increasingly favorable to empiricism. His avid support of prohibition and a dispute with the regents about operational issues eventually led to his resignation from the University of Wisconsin in 1887. Soon thereafter, he returned to Williams College where he taught sociology and political science until his retirement in 1903. While at Williams College, he published another six books on theology, social theory, evolution, and nationalism. Bascom died on 2 October 1911 in Williamstown, Massachusetts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Political Economy (Andover, Mass., 1859).
Aesthetics; or, The Science of Beauty (New York, 1862).

Philosophy of Rhetoric (New York, 1866).

Principles of Psychology (New York, 1869).

Science, Philosophy, and Religion (New York, 1871).

Philosophy of English Literature (New York, 1874).

A Philosophy of Religion; or, The Rational Grounds of Religious Belief (New York, 1876).

Growth and Grades of Intelligence (New York, 1878).

Ethics; or, Science of Duty (New York, 1879).

Natural Theology (New York, 1880).

The Science of Mind (New York, 1881).

Problems in Philosophy (New York, 1885).

Sociology (New York, 1887).

The New Theology (New York, 1891).

An Historical Interpretation of Philosophy (New York, 1893).

Social Theory: A Grouping of Social Facts and Principles (New York, 1895).

Evolution and Religion; or, Faith as a Part of a Complete Cosmic System (New York, 1897).

God and His Goodness (New York, 1901).

Other Relevant Works

Bascom's papers are at the University of Wisconsin at Madison.

Words of Christ (New York, 1883).

Growth of Nationality in the United States (New York, 1899).

Things Learned by Living (New York, 1913). Contains a bibliography of Bascom's writings.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v8*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Birge, E. A. "In Memoriam: Address Delivered at the Funeral of Dr. John Bascom," *Wisconsin Alumni Magazine* 13 (November 1911): 45–55.

Curti, Merle, and Vernon Carstensen. *The University of Wisconsin, a History:*

1848–1925, vol. 1 (Madison, Wisc., 1949).

Jorgensen, Stan W. *A Passage of Faith: The Thought of John Bascom and His Intellectual Successors*. PhD dissertation, University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1976).

Robinson, Sanford. *John Bascom: Prophet* (New York, 1922).

David L. Davis

BATESON, Gregory (1904–80)

Gregory Bateson was born on 9 May 1904 in Grantchester, Cambridgeshire, England. His father, William Bateson, was an eminent biologist and proponent of Mendelism who sought to understand the patterning of the natural world by examining normal and abnormal variations. Gregory studied at Cambridge University, where he took the Natural Sciences Tripos in 1924 and the Anthropology Tripos in 1926 under A. C. Haddon. In 1930 he was awarded an MA degree from Cambridge in anthropology and subsequently held the position of research fellow at St. John's College, Cambridge, from 1931 to 1937. In his fieldwork among the Iatmul of New Guinea, he analyzed the patterns of interaction between men and women. He distinguished between symmetrical and asymmetrical relationships and showed how the Naven ceremony organized these two kinds of relationship to prevent cumulative tensions between genders from splitting the society apart. Subsequently, with his wife, anthropologist Margaret Mead, he made an extensive photographic analysis of the noncumulative, steady-state patterns of interaction among the Balinese.

After World War II, Bateson participated in the Macy Conferences that spawned cybernetics, initially defined as the science of commu-

nication and control in animals and machines. Bateson considered cybernetics "the biggest bite out of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge that mankind has taken in the last 2000 years" (1972, p. 484). Subsequent to the Macy Conferences, he concerned himself "with building a bridge between the facts of life and behavior and what we know today of the nature of pattern and order" (p. xxvi). Working in various non-academic settings such as the Veterans Administration Hospital in Palo Alto, California, as an ethnologist from 1949 to 1963, and as the associate director of the Oceanic Institute in Waimanalo, Hawaii, from 1965 to 1972, he engaged the "facts of life and behavior" from a cybernetic or systems theory vantage. He articulated the double-bind theory of schizophrenia, offered an explanation of why Alcoholics Anonymous was successful, elaborated a theory of play and fantasy, initiated a systemic approach to both aesthetics and learning theory, analyzed dolphin communication, criticized evolutionary theory, and engaged the ecological crisis. From 1972 to 1978 Bateson was a part-time visiting senior lecturer at the University of California at Santa Cruz, and in 1976 he was appointed to the Board of Regents of the University of California. He was a scholar-in-residence at the Esalen Institute in Big Sur, California, between 1978 and 1980. Bateson died on 4 July 1980 at the Zen Center in San Francisco, California.

Bateson contended that the Darwinian theory of evolution had misidentified the unit of survival as the breeding organism, the family line, or the species. He argued that any species that destroys its environment will destroy itself, and insisted that the unit of survival must be re-identified as a-flexible-species-in-a-flexible-environment. He thought of the unit of evolutionary survival as a unit of mind (1972, pp. 454–71). He specified criteria for what qualifies as a mind, based on cybernetic theory, arguing that any system with the circuit structure necessary for self-correction is a mind, whether that system is a single organism or the larger system of organism in environment. Bateson was distrustful of conscious purpose that disregarded the circuitry of mind. As a corrective to conscious purpose, he looked to aesthetics and to the sacred, even though he was an atheist. William Blake was his favorite artist.

Philosophically, Bateson understood what he was doing as a combination of ontology and epistemology, with the emphasis on epistemology. He argued that mind was immanent, not transcendent. He argued for a necessary unity between mind and nature. In conversation he would describe himself as "practically a logical positivist," yet indebted to Hegel. In sorting out human behavior, he made repeated use of Bertrand Russell's Theory of Logical Types, each time acknowledging the paradoxes. His lucid essays consistently draw on his own skillful observation of patterns rather than the texts of other thinkers. Often his essays include epigrammatic statements of key ideas. For example: "Information is a difference that makes a difference"; "Validity is a function of belief"; "Communication is the creation of a redundancy pattern." To understand communication, he repeatedly insisted on the need to understand context. Toward the end of his life, Bateson revised his thinking to take a fuller account of recursion (Harries-Jones 1995).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Naven: A Survey of the Problems Suggested by a Composite Picture of the Culture of a New Guinea Tribe Drawn from Three Points of View (Cambridge, UK, 1936).

Communication: The Social Matrix of Psychology, with Jurgen Ruesch (New York, 1951).

Steps to an Ecology of Mind: Collected Essays in Anthropology, Psychiatry, Evolution and Epistemology (San Francisco, 1972).

Mind and Nature: A Necessary Unity (New York, 1979).

Angels Fear: Towards an Epistemology of the Sacred, with Mary Catherine Bateson (New York, 1987).

A Sacred Unity: Further Steps to an Ecology of Mind, ed. Rodney E. Donaldson (New York, 1991).

Other Relevant Works
Bateson's papers are at the University of California at Santa Cruz.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, Bio Dict Psych, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio
Harries-Jones, Peter. *A Recursive Vision: Ecological Understanding and Gregory Bateson* (Toronto, 1995).
Lipset, David. *Gregory Bateson: The Legacy of a Scientist* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1980).
Wilder, Carol, and John Weakland, eds. *Rigor and Imagination: Essays from the Legacy of Gregory Bateson* (New York, 1981).

Paul Ryan

BAWDEN, Henry Heath (1871–1950)

H. Heath Bawden was born on 28 September 1871 in Elyria, Ohio. Bawden received his BA at Denison University in 1894 and then studied at Rochester Theological Seminary from 1894 to 1896. He obtained a graduate fellowship in philosophy at the University of Chicago for 1898 to 1900 to study with John DEWEY and George MEAD, receiving the PhD in 1900. His dissertation title was "The Theory of the Criterion." Bawden taught philosophy at Vassar College from 1901 to 1907. In 1904 Bawden became a fellow of the American Academy for the Advancement of Science. He left Vassar for the philosophy chair at the University of Cincinnati, but in 1908 he was dismissed by the university president who disliked Bawden's separation from his wife and his views on marriage and divorce. Bawden never held a teaching position again and lived a farming life near San Diego, California, where he died on 16 May 1950.

Like fellow graduate Addison W. MOORE, Bawden fully absorbed and embraced the Chicago functionalist psychology and its metaphysical stance of empirical naturalism. This naturalism rejects dualism's view that experience is an inner mental representation of the world's features. Bawden used his knowledge of physiology to argue that experience cannot be confined within the individual, and certainly not within the brain. "Consciousness is no more confined to the nervous system than electrical phenomena are confined to the commutators by which the current is deflected. Consciousness is related to the activities of the entire organism … . What we call the single organism is merely a centre of interchange through which the universal energies surge to and fro" (*The Principles of Pragmatism* 1910, pp. 92–3). Experience is fundamentally natural and not mental, since it consists of those situations where natural objects including a human being are interacting. The problem of how the mind and matter relate to each other, left unsolved by the parallelism theory, is thus a psuedo-problem. Bawden further held, with Dewey, James Mark BALDWIN, Lester WARD, and Josiah ROYCE, that the mental aspect of experience is inherently social. Meaningful and goal-directed behaviors are abilities acquired through social interaction in the shared experiences of cooperative activities.

Bawden's biological pragmatism portrays knowledge as produced by the organism's problem-solving thought. If an activity is interrupted by doubt and difficulty, then consciousness in its reflective sense arises, because it is the dynamic tension in experience created by a conflict in motor coordination toward a goal. Reflective thought readjusts the meaning of both things and goals to suggest new courses of successful action. Knowledge accumulates towards objectivity and systematization since it is the ability of things, and not ideas, to be

useful for goals which decides truth. Only from the perspective of an anti-scientific philosophy, which demands that truth have nothing to do with anything human, could pragmatism seem subjective. Furthermore, most human goals are social goals shared and tested by many people, so the judgments that work well for one will typically work for many. Indeed, a culture's technology is grounded on shared working judgments. Since goals, technologies, and hence cultures, are not universal, total agreement does not occur. But this is no reasonable objection against pragmatism. Nor is it reasonable to demand that one theory of the workings of nature should satisfy all intellectual needs. Pragmatism entails a pluralistic and tolerant stance towards the proliferation of successful modes of knowledge.

Bawden also wrote on education, aesthetics, free will, and immortality. Freedom cannot consist in absolute independence from nature, since we are natural beings that have our own energies to create partial control. Immortality of the individual soul or personality is impossible, because such things do not exist. Since one's personality is social, immortality is gained with society's and nature's continued existence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Functional Significance of the Terms 'Sensory' and 'Motor'," *Psychological Review* 7 (1900): 390–400.

"The Psychological Theory of Organic Evolution," *Journal of Comparative Neurology* 11 (1901): 251–76.

A Syllabus of Psychology (Poughkeepsie, N.Y., 1902).

"The Functional View of the Relation between the Psychical and the Physical," *Philosophical Review* 11 (1902): 474–84.

"The Meaning of the Psychical from the Point of View of the Functional Psychology," *Philosophical Review* 13 (1904): 298–319.

"Recent Tendencies in the Theory of the Psychical and the Physical," *Psychological Bulletin* 1 (1904): 102–17.

"What Is Pragmatism?" *Journal of Philosophy* 1 (1904): 421–7.

"The Physical and the Psychical," *Philosophical Review* 13 (1904): 541–6.

"Methodological Implications of the Mind-Matter Controversy," *Psychological Bulletin* 3 (1906): 321–49.

"The New Philosophy Called Pragmatism," *Popular Science Monthly* 73 (1908): 61–72.

The Principles of Pragmatism: A Philosophical Interpretation of Experience (Boston, 1910).

"Mind as a Category of Science," *Psychological Bulletin* 7 (1910): 221–5.

"The Presuppositions of a Behaviorist Psychology," *Psychological Review* 25 (1918): 171–90.

"The Evolution of Behavior," *Psychological Review* 26 (1919): 247–76.

"Psychology and Scientific Method," *Journal of Philosophy* 16 (1919): 603–609.

"Method," *Journal of Philosophy* 41 (1944): 477–94.

"Primary and Secondary Behavior," *Psychological Review* 52 (1945): 150–61.

"The Psychical as a Biological Directive," *Philosophy of Science* 14 (1947): 56–67.

"We Call It Mind," *Journal of Philosophy* 44 (1947): 710–14.

Other Relevant Works

Bawden's papers are at the Pragmatism Archive at Oklahoma State University.

A Study of Lapses, *Psychological Review Monograph Supplements* 3 (April 1900): 1–122.

Theory of Education: An Outline (Poughkeepsie, N.Y., 1904).

"The Social Character of Consciousness and Its Bearing on Education," *Elementary School Teacher* 4 (1904): 366–76.

"Evolution and the Absolute," *Philosophical Review* 15 (1906): 145–56.

"Aesthetic Imagery," *Psychological Review* 16 (1909): 124–41.

"Scientific Wish-thinking," *Review of Religion* 9 (1945): 254–66.

"Religion from the Standpoint of a Naturalistic Philosophy," *Review of Religion* 11 (1947): 381–96.

Further Reading
Shook, John R. "Introduction," to *The Principles of Pragmatism*, by H. Heath Bawden, vol. 1 of *The Early Critics of Pragmatism* (Bristol, UK, 2001), pp. ix–xxv. Contains a bibliography of Bawden's writings.

John R. Shook

BAYLIS, Charles Augustus (1902–75)

Charles A. Baylis was born on 2 April 1902 in Portland, Oregon. He received a BA in 1923 and an MA in 1924 from the University of Washington. He then went to Harvard University for further graduate study, receiving his PhD in philosophy in 1926. He was influenced most by C. I. LEWIS and wrote a dissertation entitled "Creative Synthesis as a Philosophical Concept." After spending the rest of 1926 on a Sheldon Traveling Fellowship at Cambridge University and traveling through France and Germany, he joined the philosophy department of Brown University in 1927. He taught at Brown until 1949, when he became professor and philosophy department chair at the University of Maryland. In 1952 he became professor of philosophy at Duke University, and served as department chair from 1956 until 1968. Baylis retired in 1970 and died on 30 August 1975 in Durham, North Carolina.

Baylis was one of the founders of the Association for Symbolic Logic, and served as secretary-treasurer from 1936 to 1942 and Vice President from 1942 to 1946. He also helped establish the *Journal of Symbolic Logic* in 1936.

He was elected Vice President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1954, and was President of the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology in 1955. He was a Guggenheim Fellow and Fulbright Senior Scholar in 1958–9.

Baylis worked primarily in the areas of logic, philosophy of logic, ethical theory, and metaphysics. In an early article, "Implication and Subsumption" (1931), he argued that neither the definition of material implication in *Principia Mathematica* by Bertrand Russell and A. N. WHITEHEAD nor C. I. Lewis's strict implication can account for cases in which the antecedent (*implicans*) of an implication is irrelevant to the consequent (*implicand*). With mathematician Albert Arnold Bennett, Baylis authored *Formal Logic: A Modern Introduction* in 1939. This popular textbook remained in print for many years. In addition, he held wide interests, leading to a study of metaphysics and another on ethics, in which he treated ethics as a decision-theoretical discipline.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Formal Logic: A Modern Introduction, with Albert Arnold Bennett (New York, 1939; 2nd edn 1946; 3rd edn 1950).
Ethics: The Principles of Wise Choice (New York, 1958).
Metaphysics (New York, 1965).

Other Relevant Works
"Implication and Subsumption," *The Monist* 41 (1931): 392–9.
"How to Make Our Ideas Clearer," *Journal of Philosophy* 37 (1940): 225–32.
"Facts, Propositions, Exemplification, and Truth," *Mind* 57 (1948): 459–79.
"Universals, Communicable Knowledge, and Metaphysics," *Journal of Philosophy* 48 (1951): 636–43.
"The Confirmation of Value Judgments," *Philosophical Review* 61 (1952): 50–58.
"C. I. Lewis's Theory of Value and Ethics," *Journal of Philosophy* 61 (1964): 559–66.
"Foundations for a Presentative Theory of

Perception and Sensation," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 66 (1966): 41–54.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v49, *Who Was Who in Amer v7, Who's Who in Phil*
Peach, Bernard. "The Ethics of C. A. Baylis," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 37 (1976): 1–24.
Welsh, Paul, ed. *Fact, Value, and Perception: Essays in Honor of Charles A. Baylis* (Durham, N.C., 1975).

Irving H. Anellis
John R. Shook

BEARDSLEY, Monroe Curtis (1915–85)

Monroe Beardsley was born on 10 December 1915 in Bridgeport, Connecticut. He was educated at Yale University, receiving his BA in 1936 and PhD in 1939. He was a philosophy instructor at Yale from 1940 to 1944 and an assistant professor from 1946 to 1947. He also taught philosophy at Mount Holyoke College (1944–6). He then was professor of philosophy at Swarthmore College (1947–69) and Temple University (1969–81). Internationally recognized as an aesthetician, Beardsley was also a prominent logician and philosopher of language. He was elected President of the American Society for Aesthetics (1967–8) and President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association (1978–9), and was also a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. For many years he served as an editor of the *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* and as general editor of the Prentice-Hall Foundations in Philosophy series. He died on 18 September 1985 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

In the early part of his career, Beardsley's interests were trained on subjects remote from his later notable achievements. His first book, *Practical Logic* (1950), was a striking contrast to the standard formal logic books of the day. This work dwelt on the elements of reasoning (informal fallacies and similar topics) that non-logicians need to know in order to clarify and make cogent their lines of reasoning. His second book, *Thinking Straight* (1950), developed and refined these same ideas, swiftly becoming the dominant text on informal logic in the mid twentieth century. Even in these early works, however, Beardsley's general philosophical stance is evident. His point in presenting logic to his readers is not a matter of teaching the rules of an arcane game or formal practice but of pulling into focus lines of reasoning that are of genuine practical interest to the intelligent public. "Thinking," he observed, "is effective when it results in true beliefs," and logic is simply "the rules that thinking has to impose upon itself to be effective" (*Thinking Straight*, 1950, pp. xii–xiii). Because logic is instrumentally valuable in producing successful social communication and coordination, it is ultimately valuable as contributing to the good life.

At the same time he was writing his logic texts, Beardsley was beginning to work out his ideas about aesthetics, a field in which he had begun teaching regularly in 1947. The landmark article that inaugurated his entry into this field was "The Intentional Fallacy" (1946), an essay in which he and the distinguished Yale literary critic William Wimsatt stood the prevailing literary theory on its head. The view they advanced was that authorial intent is not the factor to consider in determining the meaning of a text. Instead, they argued, words pronounced by an author have a life of their own, one which must be tied in to the fabric of literary convention and which must anticipate communities of potential future readers. They pointed out that the original intention of the author is generally not available to the reader, so it is pointless to think of it as a standard upon which one might base an evaluation of a work; they reinforced

this point in "The Affective Fallacy" (1949). The audience need not be guided by the author in appreciating a text, and emotive responses are as detached from authorial intention as interpretive responses. Thus it should not matter to our appreciation of a work that its author felt this or that way about it. Together, the two articles took a stand that has been a focus of controversy ever since. The anti-intentionalism they ushered in insists that both cognitive and affective responses appropriate to a literary work are disconnected from whatever thoughts and emotions its author may have had. If certain responses are relevant to our assessment of the aesthetic quality of literary works, it will have to be because the reader is prepared by literary culture to have those responses and not because the reader thinks that they are what the author would have felt.

In 1958 Beardsley published *Aesthetics: Problems in the Philosophy of Criticism*, which immediately became known as a landmark statement of philosophical perspectives on the arts in the twentieth century. Beardsley acknowledged that aesthetics was, at the time, regarded as a feeble stepsister in the philosophical family. But he asserted that this fact alone demanded that we expend more care and effort on it than we would on some other, more robust children. *Aesthetics* was unusual in its day in the degree to which the discussion of its topic was presented in the form of argument, presenting clear-sighted assessments of thinking on all sides of important points of controversy, and advancing theses on these issues. The backbone of Beardsley's line of argument is a perspicuous Deweyanism, wedded to the central importance of aesthetic experience but responsive to the heterogeneous forms that experience can take in the arts. Beardsley found much of what John DEWEY said in describing and defending his notion of aesthetic experience to be vague or cryptic and unsusceptible to empirical demonstration. Nevertheless, he thought that Dewey's notion that experience gets carved into experiences in its submission to various (generally aes-

thetic) strictures is a fruitful way of looking at the distinctive ways art and nature may affect us. The problem, as Beardsley saw it, was to accept this intuition while realizing at the same time that there are so many different ways in which aesthetic elements of our awareness get distributed that the notion of a core concept of aesthetic experience becomes suspect. His response was to build a defensible concept out of general claims that can be distilled from current social practices and common usage.

There are, he reasoned, four points on which nearly everyone will agree. First, we take it to be a distinguishing mark of an aesthetic experience that it involves attention trained on various (but interrelated) elements of a phenomenal field (such as visual and auditory patterns, literary plots, designs of movement in dance). Second, an aesthetic experience is commonly taken to be one of a certain degree of intensity. It involves a bonding of emotion to its object in a way that makes the experience seem concentrated. Third, the experience must hang together, or be coherent, to a high degree. This is a coherence that withstands interruptions, as when we lay down a novel to water the lawn. Fourth, and finally, the experience must be complete in itself. That is, it must not require for its enjoyment elements that are alien to it; and it is vulnerable to the intrusion of extraneous elements. What memory preserves as a single aesthetic experience is cut off from the ordinary run of experience by these factors (1958, pp. 527–8).

The aesthetic theory Beardsley defended in *Aesthetics* and throughout his life revolves around the concept of aesthetic experience. His theory of critical interpretation is an account of conditions and restraints bearing on an artwork's capacity for conducing to such an experience. His general theory of aesthetic value is an account of differential capacities of natural and artifactual objects to occasion and sustain such an experience. And his theory of taste is an account of conditions necessary for a person to make the finest, most discriminating use of sensory input and critical judgment

in the course of aesthetic experience. Although Beardsley's work on these various topics is in this way single-minded, it is not simplistic. By freeing the idea of understanding an art object from the task of understanding the artist and by acknowledging correlative restrictions on understanding that arise out of local and cultural contexts, Beardsley staked his claim to a complex and inherently controversial theoretical domain. Intentionalism and expressionism were off limits in one direction. Institutional theories were off limits in the other. The distinctive approach to the arts he developed between these limits acknowledged that artworks are intentional without making their meaning the captive of their creators' intentions, and that they are institution-related without making every artwork a candidate for appreciation in an institutional setting. Beardsley was modest enough to recognize that there are no certainties in this middle ground, yet bold enough to think that it is possible to find there true and convincing answers to some of the most important questions of criticism.

Among the questions to which he offered novel and insightful answers were: (1) What is the cognitive status of metaphor? He regarded metaphor as a special fact about language whereby properties of objects are transformed into connotations of words. (2) What makes some poetry bad? He offered a purely aesthetic account of poetic badness in contrast to the prevailing account that had conflated aesthetic and moral value. (3) Are simples (like yellowness) ever beautiful? He held that beauty occurs only in complexity. (4) Can interpretation ever be completely free? No, he insisted, it must continually be checked against the text. (5) Is irony a characteristic proper to texts or to social contexts? He held that irony can occur only when there is an internal clue that makes the work ironic and not just social circumstances in which some readers might find it so. (6) And is "art" definable? Silent on this issue for most of his career, he eventually offered a roundabout definition in which an artwork is taken to be an arrangement of conditions typically intended to be capable of affording an experience with a marked aesthetic character. There are, of course, a great many other important questions to which Beardsley offered important answers. He contributed more thought to more issues in a more productive way than any other aesthetician of his time.

Late in his career, in the course of pulling together various of his essays into a collection for posterity, he remarked on the tension philosophers must feel between devotion to their hard-won doctrines and congenial willingness to accede to cogent criticism. He eschewed both the stubbornness of the zealots and the ease of concession. Instead, he mounted a new and invigorated defense of his central doctrine of aesthetic experience, modifying it to fend off criticisms he took to be telling and amplifying the elements he took to lie at its defensible core. He conceded that this is "the concept that has given me the most trouble in aesthetics" despite its centrality in his general aesthetic theory, but insisted that there were two things about which he was sure. First, that there is such a thing as aesthetic value. Second, that is cannot be defined except in terms of aesthetic experience. The key is to make clear what makes an experience aesthetic. In his final exposition of this notion – meant both to take stock of criticisms he accepted and to incorporate ideas he had come to find congenial – he identifies five criteria to be applied as a (Wittgensteinian) family, with the proviso that an experience must have the first and at least three of the rest to count as aesthetic. The criteria are: (1) object directedness – the willingly accepted guidance over one's mental states by properties on which attention is fixed with a feeling that "things are working themselves out fittingly"; (2) felt freedom – a sense of release from concerns about past and future, a sense of harmony with what is presented as if freely chosen; (3) detached affect – a sense that objects of interest are set apart from us at some emotional distance, permitting us to rise above even

dark and disturbing things; (4) active discovery – a sense of the mind's exercising active constructive powers to make things cohere, a sense of intelligibility; and (5) wholeness – a sense of personal integration, a contentment involving both self-acceptance and self-expansion (1982, pp. 288–9).

In this final view of aesthetic experience, Beardsley clarifies and reaffirms the qualities of "being fully alive" he had long maintained to be the inherent values of our encounter with art. Aesthetic experience, he consistently argued, is more than a pleasant feeling. It counteracts violent and destructive impulses, conduces toward the integration of personality, refines perception and discrimination, develops imagination, fosters mutual sympathy and understanding, and "holds before us a clue as to what life can be like in its great richness and joy." Those who knew him affirm that Beardsley's own life reflected these same values and that his love of art and philosophy was matched by his kindness, open-mindedness, and generosity of spirit. In his retirement, Beardsley devoted a great deal of time and effort to the causes of civil rights and civil liberties, serving for a time as an officer in the Pennsylvania National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. As witty as he was wise, Beardsley took up the civil liberties theme to mock his well-known professional modesty in his last essay: "The civil liberties of no reader can be taken away. Each reader retains his or her 'right to reject' my judgment – except in the weak sense that all of us have a duty to be rational, and my judgment is supremely rational" (Fisher 1983, p. 299).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Intentional Fallacy," with W. K. Wimsatt, *Sewanee Review* 54 (1946): 3–23.

"The Affective Fallacy," with W. K. Wimsatt, *Sewanee Review* 57 (1949): 31–55.

Practical Logic (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1950).

Thinking Straight (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1950; 2nd rev. edn 1965; 3rd rev. edn 1966; 4th rev. edn 1975).

"The Concept of Economy in Art," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 14 (1956): 370–75.

Aesthetics: Problems in the Philosophy of Criticism (New York, 1958).

"The Concept of Meter: An Exercise in Abstraction," with W. K. Wimsatt, *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 74 (1959): 585–98.

"The Definitions of the Arts," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 20 (1961): 175–87.

"The Generality of Critical Reasons," *Journal of Philosophy* 50 (1962): 477–86.

"The Discrimination of Aesthetic Enjoyment," *British Journal of Aesthetic*s 3 (1963): 291–300.

Philosophical Thinking: An Introduction, with E. L. Beardsley (New York, 1965).

"The Creation of Art," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 23 (1965): 291–304.

"The Aesthetic Problem of Justification," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 1 (1966): 29.

Aesthetics from Classical Greece to the Present: A Short History (New York, 1966).

"Aesthetic Experience Regained," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 28 (1969): 3–11.

"The Aesthetic Point of View," *Metaphilosophy* 1 (1970): 39–58.

The Possibility of Criticism (Detroit, 1970).

"What is an Aesthetic Quality?" *Theoria* 39 (1973): 50–70.

"Is Art Essentially Institutional?" in *Culture and Art*, ed. Lars Aagaard-Mogensen (Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1976), pp. 194–202.

Writing with Reason: Logic for Composition (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1976).

"Metaphorical Senses," *Noûs* 12 (1978): 3–16.

"The Role of Psychological Explanation in

Aesthetics," in *Perceiving Artworks*, ed. John Fisher (Philadelphia, 1980), pp. 185–212.

The Aesthetic Point of View: Selected Essays, ed. M. Wreen and D. Callen (Ithaca, N.Y., 1982).

"What is Going on in a Dance?" *Dance Research Journal* 15 (1982): 31–6.

"An Aesthetic Definition of Art," in *What is Art?* ed. H. Curtler (New York, 1983), pp. 13–29.

"The Refutation of Relativism," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 41 (1983): 265–70.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Pres Addr of APA v8*, *Proc of APA v59*

Aagaard-Mogensen, Lars, and Luk De Vos, eds. *Text, Literature, and Aesthetics: In Honor of Monroe C. Beardsley* (Amsterdam, 1986).

Davies, Stephen. *Definitions of Art* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1991).

Dickie, George, and Kent Wilson. "The Intentional Fallacy: Defending Beardsley," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 53 (1995): 233–50.

Fisher, John, ed. *Essays on Aesthetics: Perspectives on the Work of Monroe C. Beardsley* (Philadelphia, 1983).

Iseminger, Gary, ed. *Intention and Interpretation* (Philadelphia, 1992).

Kallen, Donald. "Monroe Beardsley," in *A Companion to Aesthetics*, ed. David Cooper (London, 1992), pp. 42–4.

Wreen, Michael J. "Monroe Beardsley," in *The Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, ed. Michael Kelly (New York, 1998), vol. 1, pp. 232–7.

Ronald Moore

BEATTIE, Francis Robert (1848–1906)

Francis R. Beattie was born on 31 March 1848 near Guelph, Ontario, Canada. He was the son of Robert Beattie and Janet McKinley (related to the family of President William McKinley). Beattie received his BA in 1875 and MA in 1876 from the interdenominational University of Toronto. In preparation for the Presbyterian ministry, he attended Knox Theological College in Toronto and was ordained minister upon graduation in 1878. He served churches in Baltimore, Maryland and Cold Spring, Ontario until 1882, and in Brantford, Canada from 1882 to 1888. He was an examiner for Toronto during 1884–8. Based on his advanced study and publications during those years, he received a BD from Knox in 1882, a PhD from Illinois Wesleyan University in 1884. He also received an honorary DD from the Presbyterian College of Montréal in 1887 and an LLD from the Central University in Kentucky.

Deciding to accept an invitation to leave the ministry for academia, in 1888 Beattie joined the faculty of Columbia Theological Seminary in South Carolina as professor of natural science in connection with revelation and Christian apologetics, and he affiliated with the Presbyterian Church South. In 1893 he became professor of apologetics and systematic theology at the Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky, and held that position until his death. He also became the editor of the *Christian Observer* in 1893 and associate editor of the *Presbyterian Quarterly Review* in 1895.

Beattie's *Presbyterian Standards: An Exposition of the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms* (1896) and *Apologetics* (1903) became standard texts for both Presbyterian seminary students and ministers. *The Presbyterian Standards* was the first American commentary expounding all three Westminster Standards: the Shorter Catechism, the Larger Catechism, and the Confession of Faith. Beattie's theological writings were

sophisticated elaborations of conservative Calvinist principles. Largely following the greatest Presbyterian theologian of that time, Princeton's Charles HODGE, Beattie defended the Reformed movement and the federal, or covenant, understanding of grace and salvation. Beattie divided apologetics into three branches: (1) philosophical apologetics which proves God's existence; (2) Christian apologetics which considers the truth of revelation and the Bible; and (3) practical apologetics which demonstrates Christianity's effectiveness in the world. As a powerful member of the executive committee of the Alliance of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches, Beattie worked for a federation of all Presbyterian churches. Later Presbyterian theologians, such as Benjamin WARFIELD who wrote the introduction to *Apologetics*, admired Beattie for his devotion to the Church and to theology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An Examination of the Utilitarian Theory of Morals (Brantford, Ont., 1885).

The Methods of Theism: An Essay (Brantford, Ont., 1887).

Radical Criticism: An Exposition and Examination of the Radical Critical Theory Concerning the Literature and Religious System of the Old Testament Scriptures (New York, 1894; Chicago, 1895).

The Presbyterian Standards: An Exposition of the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms (Richmond, Virg., 1896).

Calvinism and Modern Thought (Philadelphia, 1901).

Apologetics; or, the Rational Vindication of Christianity (Richmond, Virg., 1903).

Other Relevant Works

"Christian Apologetics," *Presbyterian Quarterly* 4 (July 1890): 337–69.

"Primeval Man," *Presbyterian Quarterly* 9 (July 1895): 351–71.

"Some Salient Features of Presbyterian Doctrine" *Presbyterian Quarterly* 13 (October 1899): 653–84.

"The Toronto Council of the Alliance of the Reformed Churches Holding the Presbyterian System," *Presbyterian Quarterly* 7 (January 1893): 108–20.

Ed., *Memorial Volume of the Westminster Assembly, 1647–1897, Containing Eleven Addresses Delivered before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, at Charlotte, N.C. in May, 1897* (Richmond, Virg., 1897).

Further Reading

Dict Amer Bio, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v21*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Webb, Robert A. "Beattie's *Presbyterian Standards*," *Presbyterian Quarterly* 11 (1897): 99–102.

John R. Shook

BEAVEN, James (1801–75)

James Beaven was born on 9 July 1801 in Westbury, Wiltshire, England. Entering Oxford University in 1820, he received the BA in 1824 and was ordained priest in 1826. He took the Oxford MA in 1827, and BD and NN degrees in 1842. He held clerical positions in Staffordshire and Northamptonshire during the 1830s and early 1840s, and displayed remarkable intellectual capacity by publishing several short theological studies. His scholarship, conformist views, and interest in missionary work made him an ideal candidate for a faculty position at a Canadian college. He decided in 1843 to go to the newly opened King's College in Toronto, which was chartered to be a college for the Church of England in Canada. As the professor of divinity, metaphysics, and moral philosophy he guided the small college's affairs, promoted missionary work, and built new

churches, bringing the conservative and royalist High Church Tractarian movement to Ontario. King's College was closed in 1849 so that it could be transformed into the interdenominational University of Toronto. Beaven reluctantly joined the faculty of this new "godless" institution, and in 1851 he became its first professor of philosophy, as the chair of metaphysics and ethics. He retired in 1871 under pressure from students and authorities, giving up his chair to George Paxton YOUNG. Beaven died on 8 November 1875 in Niagara, Ontario.

Beaven is chiefly remembered by the Church of England in Canada as a tireless organizer and worker for the church, and an author of useful catechisms and clerical aids. His *Account of the Life and Writings of S. Irenaeus* (1841) made a notable contribution to church history. His *Recreations of a Long Vacation* was a popular account of a diocesan tour in 1845 through the wilds of western Ontario to Sault St. Marie. But to match his place as one of the first secular professors of philosophy in North America, he also has the distinction of publishing the first philosophical work in English-speaking Canada (Jérôme Demers's 1835 Latin textbook has French Canadian priority). Beaven's *Elements of Natural Theology* (1850) only considers philosophical arguments for religious conclusions, omitting Christian articles of faith dependent on revelation. The immortality of the soul and the existence of God, the two foundations of any religion, can be rationally demonstrated primarily by a variety of arguments from design. Ontological arguments do not appear in his text; traditional cosmological arguments receive only cursory attention; and the moral argument for God's existence and righteousness is mentioned without placing much weight there. Beaven used William Paley's books as course texts, and relied on suitably modified versions of Paley's "watch-maker argument."

Unlike creationists who believe that modern science threatens not just the design argument but the entire faith, Beaven was acquainted with the geology and biology of his day and, like most other Canadian clergy and intellectuals, did not react with extreme hostility to Darwinian evolution when it arrived a short time after his book was published. Beaven was willing to grant the scientific knowledge of his day; the philosophical question was whether natural laws working on matter could fully explain the scale and complexity of organized and living creatures. If matter alone is real, Beaven reasoned, then there could be no explanation why matter would tend to organize lawfully. Matter alone cannot explain the human mind or its growth and achievements. The simple existence of any natural laws demands postulating an intelligent designer of the universe. More significantly, this intelligent designer is the best explanation for the fact that so many laws of nature have to be perfectly and harmoniously aligned to permit the existence of intelligent creatures. Only the unique mind of God could establish this degree of harmony.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An Account of the Life and Writings of S. Irenaeus (London, 1841).

Recreations of a Long Vacation; or A Visit to Indian Missions in Upper Canada (London and Toronto, 1846).

A Catechism on the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England (Oxford and London, 1850; rev. US edn, New York, 1853).

Elements of Natural Theology (London, 1850).

"That they all may be one": A Sermon, Preached before the Synod of the Diocese of Toronto, on the 7th of June, 1859 (Toronto, 1859).

Further Reading
Canad Encyc, *Dict Canad Bio*
Armour, Leslie, and Elizabeth Trott. "Reason and Authority: James Beaven and Natural Theology," in *The Faces of Reason: An Essay on Philosophy and Culture in English Canada 1850–1950* (Waterloo, Ont., 1981), pp. 32–60.

Campbell, John. "The Reverend Professor James Beaven, D.D., M.A.," *University of Toronto Monthly* 3 (December 1902): 69–72.

Rabb, J. Douglas. *Religion and Science in Early Canada* (Kingston, Ont., 1988).

Slater, John G. *Minerva's Aviary: Philosophy at Toronto 1843–1943* (Toronto, 2005), chap. 2.

John R. Shook

BECK, Lewis White (1913–97)

Lewis White Beck was born on 26 September 1913 in Griffin, Georgia. He received his BA at Emory University in 1934, and his MA in 1935 and PhD in 1937 at Duke University. After postdoctoral study at the University of Berlin, he served at Emory University as instructor in philosophy from 1938 to 1941; University of Delaware as assistant and associate professor from 1941 to 1948; and Lehigh University as professor of philosophy during 1948–9. He then was professor of philosophy at the University of Rochester from 1949 to 1979, and he served as Dean of the Graduate School in 1956–7. He was visiting professor at Columbia University, University of Minnesota, and University of California at Berkeley. He was a member of the national council of the National Endowment for the Humanities (1970–75), the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Association of University Professors (member of executive council 1954–6), the American Philosophical Association (President of the Eastern Division 1971–2 and board chairman 1974–7), and Phi Beta Kappa. His awards included: Guggenheim fellow, 1957–8; Edward P. Curtis Prize for undergraduate teaching at the University of Rochester, 1962; American Council of Learned Societies fellow, 1965; D.Litt. Hamilton College, 1974; LHD Emory University, 1977; and D.Phil. Tübingen University, 1977. Beck died on 7 June 1997 in Rochester, New York.

Beck was for many years a leading Kant scholar of world renown. He not only published widely used translations of Kant's works, but also wrote expert introductions and commentaries for these works. Over the years, students and scholars have depended on Beck's translations and helpful commentary. Beck served as editor of *Proceedings of the Third International Kant Congress* in 1970. He also served on several editorial boards, including *Kant-Studien*, and wrote numerous scholarly articles for the journal.

Beck begins one of his studies of Kant with the remark that you can philosophize with Kant or against him, but you can't philosophize without him. For Beck, Kant is important because he set the problems of modern philosophy and also set much of its agenda with his extensive influence. This is especially true in the theory of knowledge and ethics, but it is true in other areas of philosophy as well, including the possibility of metaphysics and the philosophy of religion. In his 1965 *Studies in the Philosophy of Kant*, Beck devotes three of his own essays to Kant's famous analytic synthetic distinction and the so-called synthetic a priori. Kant himself had claimed that mathematical judgments are synthetic a priori in the sense that they must pertain to, or apply to, experience – but they cannot be derived from experience. Kant also claimed that if real metaphysical judgments are possible then they cannot be derived empirically but must be based on pure reason. Also, in his moral philosophy, Kant claimed that any real moral law or principle of morality must be synthetic a priori. Beck was well aware of the central importance of Kant's analytic–synthetic distinction and view of the synthetic a priori for philosophy of mathematics, epistemology, metaphysics, and ethics. Consequently, he tried to clarify Kant's use of these ideas by asking a whole series of important questions, such as whether synthetic judgments be made analytic, whether the episte-

mology of synthesis accounts for the factor of necessity in knowledge, and whether Kant wrongly made things necessary which are in fact contingent. Beck is careful to locate numerous terminological confusions in Kant which have caused much controversy concerning what he meant by critical notions. For example, Beck claims that Kant's use of "synthetic" as having one meaning in his transcendental logic, another in his general logic, and also another in his methodology, is confusing and unfortunate. Beck admits that translating Kant is difficult, since many of the terms that he uses were invented by him and do not have a fixed meaning even in his own writings.

Beck also claimed that Kant's *Critique of Practical Reason* has been neglected in favor of the more popular *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals*. But he contends that an adequate understanding of Kant's moral philosophy cannot be achieved without paying attention to important discussions of freedom, the postulates of pure practical reason, and the notion of practical reason found in the second *Critique*. Beck tried to remedy the neglect of this work with his elaborate *A Commentary on Kant's Critique of Practical Reason*, published in 1961. Beck states that it is only in the second *Critique* that all of the various strands of Kant's thoughts are woven together into the pattern of his practical philosophy. For Kant, ethics is only possible if there is a moral law. But a moral law is a synthetic a priori practical proposition, because its universality and necessity cannot be derived from experience, and must be imposed on it by some causality of the mind. This is a causality of freedom which seems to contradict, or conflict with, the necessary causality operating in nature. While Kant had faced this dilemma in his earlier *Critique of Pure Reason*, it was left to the second *Critique* to resolve this problem in greater detail. For Kant, freedom is the only one of the Transcendent Ideas of pure reason that we can know, while the Ideas of God and Immortality of the Soul are unknowable. But morality depends on freedom and reason; morality cannot simply be a matter of faith, nor can morality be coerced. Consequently, Kant's great problem in his second *Critique* is to try to show how morality can be both rational and free.

Beck was also interested in the question of what exactly is a secular philosophy. In his 1961 book *Six Secular Philosophers*, he examined this question, identifying families of secular philosophers, and giving special attention to Spinoza, Hume, Kant, Nietzsche, William JAMES, and George SANTAYANA. Beck claims that these six philosophers made important contributions to what he calls liberal religion. While we cannot expect a rigid or exact notion of secular philosophy, we can expect that secular philosophy requires independence of thought, and is not simply another theology of a defense of a particular form of religion. A secular philosophy will take religion seriously and try to answer questions concerning its meaning and value.

Beck divides the six secular philosophers he studies into two distinct families. The first group, made up of Spinoza, Hume, and Kant, considered science and philosophy as limiting the scope and validity as well as the content of religious belief. The second family, made up of Nietzsche, James, and Santayana, was most concerned with the relation of religious values to other values in life and culture. Spinoza viewed science, religion, and philosophy as all-rational in requiring reason as their basis. As a monist, Spinoza viewed God, nature, and reality as one, or essentially the same thing in substance. Kant, on the other hand, according to Beck, agreed with Hume that no religious belief can be confirmed by a scientific interpretation of nature. For both, there is no scientific basis of religion. But, Beck alleged, where Hume concluded so much the worse for religion, Kant instead said that there is another basis for religion that is also rational. This, for Kant, is our moral consciousness. True religion can be based on the fact of morality, just as Spinoza thought it could be based on true philosophy and science. Nietzsche, according to

Beck, gave a negative answer to the question whether religion could be justified by reference to moral values. Nietzsche saw the illusions of religion as encumbrances to be cast away, if humans are to become mature and masters of their own destiny.

According to Beck, both James and Santayana found an error in Nietzsche's notion that all actions spring from a natural will to power. Even if men are driven by power, this power can be transformed and made morally useful and valuable, according to James. For James, religion can help humans pragmatically, to set higher goals for themselves and make piecemeal progress, and thus improve their lives. For Santayana, religion was a myth to be taken seriously, but not literally. Taken literally, religion conflicts with fact and cannot be defended. But taken figuratively, it can have great poetic value, moral value, and beauty. For Santayana, religion pursues a life of reason through the imagination. Without imagination human life does not rise above its merely animal nature, and cannot produce the chief embodiments of culture: fine art, morality, literature, philosophy, or even science itself. Beck goes on to state in detail ways in which his six thinkers developed their secular philosophies, which in their different ways sought to show the role of religion in modern life.

In 2001 a group of prominent scholars paid tribute to Beck's numerous scholarly contributions over the years with the publication of *Kant's Legacy: Essays in Honor of Lewis White Beck*. Walter KAUFMANN, a leading scholar of German philosophy and translator of Nietzsche's works, in his 1980 *Goethe, Kant and Hegel*, pays a special tribute to Beck who encouraged his efforts despite Kaufmann's harsh criticisms of Kant's philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Trans., *Immanuel Kant, Critique of Practical Reason and Other Writings on Moral Philosophy* (Chicago, 1949).
Philosophic Inquiry, an Introduction to Philosophy (New York, 1952).
Trans., *Kant, Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals and What is Enlightenment?* (New York, 1959).
A Commentary on Kant's Critique of Practical Reason (Chicago, 1961).
Six Secular Philosophers (New York, 1961).
Trans., *Kant, On History* (Indianapolis, Ind., 1963).
Studies in the Philosophy of Kant (Indianapolis, 1965).
Early German Philosophy: Kant and His Predecessors (Cambridge, Mass., 1969).
The Actor and The Spectator (New Haven, Conn., 1974).
Kant's Latin Writings, Translations, Commentaries, and Notes (New York, 1985).
Essays by Lewis White Beck: Five Decades as a Philosopher (Rochester, N.Y., 1998).

Other Relevant Works

Beck's papers are at the University of Rochester.
Ed., *Macmillan Sources in Philosophy* (New York, 1965).
Ed., *Eighteenth Century Philosophy* (New York, 1966).
Ed., *Kant Studies Today* (LaSalle, Ill., 1969).
Trans., *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals, Immanuel Kant*, ed. R. P. Wolff (Indianapolis, 1969).
Ed., *Kant's Theory of Knowledge: Selected Papers From The Third International Kant Conference* (Dordrecht, 1974).
Ed., *Essays on Kant and Hume* (New Haven, Conn., 1978).

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v8, *Proc of APA v71*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Cicovacki, Predrag, ed. *Kant's Legacy: Essays In Honor of Lewis White Beck* (Rochester, N.Y., 2001).

Guy W. Stroh

BECKER, Carl Lotus (1873–1945)

Carl Becker was born on 7 September 1873 in Black Hawk County, Iowa. After one year at Cornell College in Mt Vernon, Iowa, he went to the University of Wisconsin, where he became a student of the eminent historian Frederick Jackson Turner. He received his BLitt degree with honors in history in 1896, and after some study at Columbia with James Harvey Robinson and a couple of one-year teaching positions, he became assistant professor of history at the University of Kansas in 1902. Under Turner's direction Becker completed his Wisconsin PhD in history in 1907 and was promoted to professor of history in 1909. He went to the University of Minnesota in 1916 but in 1917 he accepted an invitation from Cornell University to be professor of European history, where he stayed until his retirement in 1941. Becker was elected to the Royal Historical Society (1921), to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences (1923), was President of the American Historical Association (1931), and was elected to the National Institute of Arts and Letters (1933). Becker died on 10 April 1945 in Ithaca, New York.

Becker became prominent by interpreting colonial politics and the American Revolution through the lens of the Progressive Era's concern for economic justice, class relations, and power distribution. His work quickly progressed from the history of politics to political theory itself. *The United States: An Experiment in Democracy* (1920) starkly contrasts the original purposes of the Framers with the vastness of modern government, yet Becker approved of the idea that the meaning of the Constitution democratically evolves. His *Declaration of Independence: A Study in the History of Political Ideas* (1922) thoroughly analyzed the document's language in light of the cultural and political context, revealing justifications for democracy and fundamental rights. His later books of the 1940s optimistically discuss the prospects and problems for democracy during its darkest years. Becker's major work in

European history was *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-century Philosophers* (1932), which examines the efforts of the *philosophes* to replace authority with reason.

Becker explored issues in the philosophy of history, especially the possibility of objective historical knowledge, in several essays that were later collected in *Detachment and the Writing of History* (1958). Perhaps of greatest impact was his 1931 presidential address "Everyman His Own Historian," which highlighted the many obstacles preventing neutral impartiality. Both the selection of historical facts and theories to explain them are colored by the historian's own personality, interests, and cultural assumptions. Becker pragmatically doubted whether even the wider community of historians could converge on any truth; the more likely result is that each generation develops a unique approach to history and weaves its own version of past times.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Beginnings of the American People (Boston, 1915).
The United States: An Experiment in Democracy (New York, 1920).
Declaration of Independence: A Study in the History of Political Ideas (New York, 1922).
The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-century Philosophers (New Haven, 1932).
Everyman His Own Historian: Essays on History and Politics (New York, 1935).
Modern Democracy (New Haven, 1941).
New Liberties for Old (New Haven, 1941).
How New Will the Better World Be? A Discussion of Post-war Reconstruction (New York, 1944).
Freedom and Responsibility in the American Way of Life (New York, 1945).
Progress and Power (New York, 1949).

Other Relevant Works
Becker's papers are at Cornell University.

Snyder, Phil L., ed., *Detachment and the Writing of History: Essays and Letters of Carl L. Becker* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1958).

Kammen, Michael, ed., *"What Is the Good of History?" Selected Letters of Carl L. Becker, 1900–1945* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1973).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v33*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*

Brown, Robert E. *Carl Becker on History and the American Revolution* (East Lansing, Mich., 1970).

Smith, Charlotte W. *Carl Becker: On History and the Climate of Opinion* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1956).

Strout, Cushing. *The Pragmatic Revolt in American History: Carl Becker and Charles Beard* (New Haven, Conn., 1958).

Wilkins, Burleigh T. *Carl Becker: A Biographical Study in American Intellectual History* (Cambridge, Mass., 1961).

John R. Shook

BEDAU, Hugo Adam (1926–)

Hugo Bedau became known as a philosopher who lived and acted upon his philosophical convictions. He was born on 23 September 1926 in Portland, Oregon. He earned the BA, summa cum laude, from University of Redlands (1949), and the MA and PhD (1961) degrees from Harvard. When hired by the philosophy department of Tufts University in 1966, from a tenured position at Reed University, he refused to sign the loyalty oath that accompanied his first contract. His appointment was cancelled by the Board of Trustees, and Bedau went to court and won an injunction. His vindication came from the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, which declared the oath unconstitutional. He was a card-carrying member of the American Civil Liberties Union and the American Association of University Professors, and his defense of academic freedom continued in his efforts to protect colleagues engaged in anti-war protests from institutional retribution.

Not surprisingly, his early scholarship focused on academic freedom, justice and equality, and civil disobedience. This focus was aimed in particular upon the philosophy of law and especially the death penalty in the American criminal justice system. His best-known book, *The Death Penalty in America* (1964), has been reprinted, updated, and supplemented numerous times over the past forty years. In the preface to the 1997 edition, Bedau reflected, "In 1964, in my preface to … the grandparent of this book …, I warned the reader that it was not a volume conceived in scholarly neutrality. I was then and still am opposed to the death penalty in all its forms, no matter how awful the crime or how savage the criminal." Colleagues and scholars alike have noted this same passionate partisanship with regard to other issues which have captured Bedau's interest; it seems a fair statement that Bedau the philosopher is inseparable from Bedau the man and citizen.

Upon the occasion of Bedau's retirement from Tufts in 1999, a resolution of the Tufts faculty of arts and sciences observed, "Hugo's contribution to the debate on the death penalty is analytic, normative, and empirical." The resolution adds, "His moral critique of retributive views is fundamental, showing that the only plausible component to such views, a principle of proportionality between crime and punishment, does not imply a life for a life or a rape for a rape." Bedau has argued that the debate over deterrence is not only empirical but also moral. He has provided a philosophic framework for the public debate concerning the death penalty.

Bedau has said that controversial issues are the best things to talk about. His philosophy of pedagogy is grounded in this principle. He

contends that students learn more, and better, by discussing highly controversial topics. There are things to be said on both sides of the issue, and the students are more interested, he claims. Other areas of controversy upon which Bedau has turned his philosopher's mind and his prolific pen are the proper role of human rights in international affairs and US foreign policy, group decision-making processes, and ethics in government.

Despite, or perhaps because of, his lifelong courting of controversies, he has won numerous honors, including the Abolitionist Award of the National Coalition to Abolish the Death Penalty (1989); the August Vollmer Award from the American Society of Criminology (1997); and the Phi Beta Kappa/Romanell Professorship in Philosophy (1994–5), which resulted in a book on casuistry entitled *Making Mortal Choices* (1997). Casuistry is use of the case method for arriving at moral decisions. The case method has been essential for law school education since its introduction at Harvard Law School a century ago. Bedau's *Making Mortal Choices* draws upon the background facts of famous American law cases. For example, he asks his readers to consider the circumstances of the survivors of the sinking of a ship named the *William Brown* in 1841, who were required to determine – in the absence of sufficient boats and provisions – which of them would live and which would die. Described by some reviewers as Bedau's most elegant book, it aims at teaching the art of reasoning in a consistent fashion which shows proper regard for human life.

Still an active philosopher and scholar after his retirement, Bedau co-edited a volume in 2002 on critical thinking and the art of argument. An anthology of essays from ancient times to the present, its goal is to teach the critical reading and reasoned writing of arguments. In true Bedau fashion the volume deals with such contemporary ethical and moral issues as abortion, legalization of drugs, and US immigration policy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"On Civil Disobedience," *Journal of Philosophy* 58 (1961): 653–65.

"Justice and Classical Utilitarianism," *Nomos VI: Justice* (1963): 284–305.

The Death Penalty in America: An Anthology (Garden City, N.Y., 1964).

"Death Sentences in New Jersey, 1907–1960," *Rutgers Law Review* 19 (Fall 1964): 1–64.

"Capital Punishment in Oregon, 1903–1960," *Oregon Law Review* 45 (December 1965): 1–39.

"Egalitarianism and the Idea of Equality," *Nomos IX: Equality* (1967): 3–27.

"Civil Disobedience and Personal Responsibility for Injustice," *Monist* 54 (1970): 517–35.

Victimless Crimes: Two Sides of a Controversy, with Edwin M. Schur (Englewood, N.J., 1974).

The Courts, the Constitution, and Capital Punishment (Lexington, Mass., 1977).

"Retribution and the Theory of Punishment," *Journal of Philosophy* 75 (1978): 601–20.

"Gregg v. Georgia and the 'New' Death Penalty," *Criminal Justice Ethics* 4 (Summer/Fall 1985): 3–17.

"Classification-Based Sentencing: Some Conceptual and Ethical Problems," *Nomos XXVII: Criminal Justice* (1986): 89–118.

Death is Different: Studies in the Morality, Law and Politics of Capital Punishment (Boston, 1987).

"Miscarriages of Justice in Potentially Capital Cases," with Michael L. Radelet, *Stanford Law Review* 40 (November 1987): 21–179.

"Punitive Violence and its Alternatives," in *Justice, Law, and Violence*, ed. James B. Brady and Newton Garver (Philadelphia, 1991), pp. 193–209.

In Spite of Innocence: *Erroneous Convictions in Capital Cases*, with Constance E. Putnam and Michael L. Radelet (Boston, 1992).

"The Eighth Amendment, Human Dignity, and the Death Penalty," in *The Constitution of Rights: Human Dignity and American Values*, ed. Michael J. Meyer and William A. Parent (Ithaca, N.Y., 1992), pp. 145–77.

Thinking and Writing about Philosophy (Boston, 1996; 2nd edn 2002).

Making Mortal Choices: Three Exercises in Moral Casuistry (New York, 1997).

Killing as Punishment: Reflections on the Death Penalty in America (Boston, 2004).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Civil Disobedience: Theory and Practice* (New York, 1969).

Ed., *Justice and Equality* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1971).

Ed. with Chester Peirce, *Capital Punishment in the United States* (New York, 1976).

Ed. with Sylvan Barnet, *Current Issues and Enduring Questions* (New York, 1987).

Ed., *Civil Disobedience in Focus* (New York, 1991).

Ed. with Sylvan Barnet, *Critical Thinking, Reading and Writing: A Brief Guide to Argument* (Boston, 1993).

Ed., *The Death Penalty in America: Current Controversies* (New York, 1997).

Ed. with Paul G. Cassell, *Debating the Death Penalty: Should America have Capital Punishment? The Experts from Both Sides Make Their Best Case* (Oxford, 2004).

Further Reading

Campbell, Jessie. "Striving to Initiate Controversy," *The Tufts Observer* (22 January 1998).

"Resolution on the Retirement of Hugo Adam Bedau," adopted by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of Tufts University (Boston, 17 May 1999).

James O. Castagnera

BEECHER, Catharine Esther (1800–1878)

Catharine Beecher was born 6 September 1800 in East Hampton, Long Island, and died 12 May 1878 in Elmira, New York. She was the daughter of the great Calvinist theologian and preacher Lyman Beecher and his first wife, Roxana Foote, who died of tuberculosis when Catharine was fifteen years old. Raised in Litchfield, Connecticut, Beecher's early education emphasized classical Roman poetry, English poetry, American literature, mathematics, science, and the domestic female arts of maintaining a household. During her early twenties she founded the Hartford Female Seminary in 1823, undertaking the education of young girls including that of her younger sister, Harriet Beecher.

In 1932 Catharine Beecher moved with her father, stepmother, and siblings to Cincinatti, Ohio where Lyman Beecher had been appointed President of Lane Theological Seminary. Shortly thereafter Catharine established the Western Female Institute, but it soon failed financially. Born during the decline of Puritanism to a Puritan theologian, Catharine Beecher lived through the period of the American Civil War. She came from a household in which the power of the spoken word was recognized as a powerful tool for personal moral development and social change. Daughter of one of New England's most famous preachers, sister and half-sister to seven other preachers, Catharine Beecher used her rhethorical skills to champion social reform. Her twenty-nine publications during a forty-five year period, and her numerous public speeches, reflect Beecher's dedication to addressing many of the social and religious concerns of the new republic. These include slavery, war, and the movements for the education and enfranchisement of women and non-whites.

Beecher devoted her life to several causes emerging from her response as an adult to the Puritanism of her father. First, she conceived a more active role for women as equal comple-

ments of their spouses that would require more substantial education of girls. Several of her writings argue for this goal, and several others are didactic works intended for use in the teaching of young girls. In furtherance of this goal she cofounded several schools for girls. In addition, she traveled the eastern United States, especially the New England region, giving speeches to assemblies of women regarding women's education and women's rights. A second goal related to the reconciliation of her developing religious philosophy with secular moral thought, especially that of the Scottish Common Sense movement and Utilitarianism. In furtherance of this goal she wrote a number of philosophical works on philosophy of mind, moral philosophy, and philosophy of religion.

A third goal, also later pursued with her sister Harriet Beecher Stowe, author of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, was emancipation of Americans held in slavery. In furtherance of this goal she traveled the country giving speeches to the largely women-led emancipation movement. At the time there was no unified movement, merely unaffiliated groups with various reasons for desiring emancipation. These groups had dissimilar views regarding the political means through which emancipation should occur, and held varying opinions regarding financial compensation to former slaves or to slaveholders, and regarding the possible enfranchisement of newly-freed slaves. Through a series of lectures and published pamphlets Beecher argued in favor of emancipatory movements and higher education for emancipated slaves, but in ways that minimized social discord.

In addition to writings on religious, moral, and social philosophy, Beecher authored didactic texts that reveal her philosophy of education. Chief among these is her classic, credited as founding the field of home economics, later revised and co-authored with her sister Harriet Beecher Stowe, *Principles of Domestic Science* (1870).

The Elements of Mental and Moral Philosophy, Founded upon Experience, Reason and the Bible (1831) is one of Beecher's two works on philosophy of mind. The other is *Common Sense Applied to Religion, or, The Bible and the People* (1857). Beecher was heavily influenced by the Scottish Common Sense philosophy of Thomas Reid and David Hume, and by Jeremy Bentham's Utilitarianism. She criticizes authors who examine philosophy of mind but stop short of examining the role of the divinity, divine insight, and revelation in the activities of the mind. In her preface to *Elements* Beecher says, "The works of Aristotle, and of other ancient sages, the speculations of more modern writers, the lucubrations of heathens, infidels, and sceptics, are quoted in abundance, but to establish any thing on this subject by an appeal to the Bible, is a phenomenon almost unknown." (1831, p. iv)

Both works contain chapters that analyze the nature of and classify mental phenomena (chapters 1 and 7, respectively), sensation and perception (2 and 9), conception and memory (3 and 10), attention and abstraction (4 and 11), association (5 and 12), and so on. The parallel construction of these two works, written a quarter-century apart, and the fact that the first was privately published and closely circulated, suggests that the latter is the revised, polished version of an earlier draft. *Common Sense Applied to Religion, or, The Bible and the People* goes beyond the earlier *Elements* in its analysis of the application of philosophy of mind to philosophy of religion. In these writings Beecher rather unapologetically and unphilosophically accepts the truth of the Bible as a source of revealed knowledge. Given the times and given her lineage, this is not terribly surprising, yet a little disappointing.

Beecher examines these questions more satisfactorily in *Letters on the Difficulties of Religion,* written in the interim between the composition of *Elements* and *Common Sense*, but Beecher's point of departure for these two works is that of a Christian philosopher who believes that the Bible is an irrefutable source of knowledge about the divine will and divine intention. From her description of the way in

which Common Sense philosophy was modified by Puritan theology, Beecher's *Ethics* examines what we can learn from philosophy of mind about the nature and content of moral knowledge. *Common Sense* has a lesser emphasis on ethics, but, like *Elements*, it too focuses on the consequence of moral action for salvation.

Her *Letters on the Difficulties of Religion* (1836), Beecher assures us, have their foundations in her careful reconstructions of actual correspondence. This volume is valuable in and of itself, if for no other reason than it is an excellent example of the very extensive body of philosophic literature responding to and for the most part adopting and adapting Jeremy Bentham's utilitarianism. Contemporary philosophers who are not historians of nineteenth-century English philosophy sometimes forget that utilitarianism was not merely represented by the great works of Bentham, John Mill, and John Stuart Mill. In *Letters* Beecher sets out her goal, to examine "what is the best method of promoting right intellectual views of truth and duty, and that right state of heart which will lead men to practice what they know to be right?" (1836, pp. v–vi). The next 350 pages answer this question.

Beecher is a utilitarian, seeking to articulate the Christian foundations to follow the Benthamite rule to do that which will produce the most good with the least evil. In Beecher's account, the course of action for an intellectual discussion of this question requires following a set of guidelines that include confining the discussion to the merits of principles rather than personalities, treating one's disputant as sincere and having good motives, avoiding negative comments about those whose views you are attempting to sway, and so on. However, the focus of the letters is an examination of the perceived antipathy of atheism and the Common Sense movement. Beecher takes an opportunity to criticize the then-popular utopist movements that often were associated with atheistic views. Her criticism of the Owenites' New Harmony settlement applies to all utopist

movements including the Fourierists and Saint-Simoneans: they cannot succeed because their goal is to create a society in which evil does not exist. For some utopian movements, organized religion has paradoxically resulted in evils: intolerance, oppression, and (as the Mormons would find out) violence. Beecher rightly notes that even if the atheistic movements banished organized religion from their midst, utopist societies would still be visited by the occasional natural evils: famine, flood, fire, storm, and disease were undoubtedly on Beecher's mind. On Beecher's view, which she acknowledges the atheists do not share, these evils are visited upon humans by God for reasons related either to the moral development of those who suffer, or to their punishment for sin. But, Beecher argues, atheists' lack of religious faith does not protect them from the "natural" evils that God sends. Indeed, we suspect that her view actually is that God sends these evils because of the atheists' infidelity. And although Beecher fondly wishes that atheists would find God, she instead advises the benefits to them of Common Sense philosophy. Common Sense in Beecher's view, augmented with utilitarianism, yields half-a-dozen maxims for philosophical belief:

1. Nothing is to be considered as true, which has no positive evidence in its favor.
2. Whatever has the balance of evidence in its favor is to be considered as true, even when there is some opposing evidence.
3. Men have the control of their belief; that they are to blame for believing wrong; and that their guilt for wrong belief is proportioned to the importance of the interests involved, and to the amount of evidence within reach.
4. [One has a moral duty to seek] for evidence, and to attending to it, when it is in our reach.
5. A man's actions in certain cases, are the proof of what is his belief.
6. Where there are two alternatives and one of them involves danger, and the other is equally promising as to benefit, and is also

perfectly safe, we are obligated to choose the safe course.

Upon these six Common Sense maxims Beecher builds the Pascalian case that it is not merely prudent, but morally obligatory to believe in the God of the Bible. Part of this series of letters examines various claims about the reliability of biblical evidence and the implications for moral action of select biblical exhortations. Without actually saying so, Beecher demonstrates her dissatisfaction with the evangelical Calvinism of her father Lyman Beecher. From her other writings we come to suspect that her dissatisfaction with the Puritan Calvinist view of women and its resulting imposition of religious and social limits on women seeded this dissatisfaction. But Beecher is too much a respectful, dutiful daughter of that tradition to make this point explicit. In the last parts of the *Letters* Beecher turns to an examination of Unitarianism as a moral religion and philosophy. The entire discussion is interesting, nicely argued in most cases, and provides a good glimpse of a philosophical process that occupied much of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries: the development of secular moral philosophy that was respectful of the religious sentiments and the religious foundations of so much of moral thought.

The Duty of American Women to Their Country appeared in 1845 and popularized Catharine Beecher as a speaker in the increasingly popular ladies' clubs that had long existed in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, but whose appeal had spread to smaller towns in upstate New York and the near Midwest. *The Evils Suffered by American Women and American Children: The Cause and the Remedy* is the text of a speech presented at such women's meetings during 1846 and 1847. In *Duty* and in *Evils* Beecher draws on her Puritan beliefs to set out arguments that support the view that women have a special duty to educate children and to be moral exemplars that hopefully shame men into imitation. In *Duty* as well as *Evils* Beecher argues that the American family is the American state writ small. Women, she argues, have a moral duty to fulfill their nature by providing moral leadership on the domestic scene and as voices for moral righteousness in social policy. Moral leadership on the domestic front is best expressed through virtuous childrearing that nurtures moral and physical development of children, through careful secular, moral, and religious education of their own and others' children, and in acting as a moral voice for social reform. In these works and the privately published *Letter to Benevolent Ladies* (1857), Catharine Beecher exhorts women to fulfill their natural leadership roles by example and through generous donations of time, influence, money, and goods.

Beecher's epistolary *True Remedy for the Wrongs of Woman; with a History of an Enterprise Having That for Its Object* appeared in 1851. The series of eighteen letters is affectionately addressed to her sister "Mrs. H. B. Stowe" as "My dear sister." In the early letters Beecher appears willing to discuss the merits of women's suffrage. But in later letters we see her develop arguments against it, favoring instead a national system of liberal education for girls and young women. This is a technique often employed by Beecher: first state what is clear, strong, good about an opinion with which you disagree, then state what is deficient or wrong about it. The letters contain the reflections of a now fifty-year-old woman who is descended from Puritans on the subject of "female manners." She is especially distressed that American women are following European fashions, the most libertine of which are somewhat "manly." While we might not think such observations to merit philosophical discussion, we must grant her underlying point: preoccupation with and slavish obedience to fashion may well go hand-in-hand with a frivolous lack of concern for deeper issues. Until American women on a whole evidence a concern for political and social issues and evidence that they are sufficiently well-educated to think through those issues and reach an

informed opinion, maybe they should not be voting on matters of national policy. She backs up her concerns in letters detailing the state of higher education for American girls and women during the middle of the nineteenth century. In appendices she proposes detailed plans, including physical layout, floor-plans, and fiscal accounting for expenditures to establish a women's Normal Institute (for teacher training) in Milwaukee.

An anti-suffrage petition drafted by Beecher was presented to Congress and published in one of the leading magazines, *Godey's Lady's Book*, in May 1871. But one needs to read almost all of Beecher's works to understand the logic of her reasons for opposing suffrage. They are summarized in the petition itself: "Because we hold that an extension of suffrage would be adverse to the interests of the working women of the country, with whom we heartily sympathize. Because these changes must introduce a fruitful element of discord in the existing marriage relation, which would tend to the infinite detriment of children, and increase the already alarming prevalence of divorce throughout the land."

Beecher's anti-suffrage views are explained at length, but for the most part not philosophically, in her *Woman's Profession as Mother and Educator, with Views in Opposition to Woman Suffrage* (1872). Like many of her writings, this is addressed to a general readership of educated women, at a time when a complete grammar school education was not common for girls in America. *Woman's Profession* is a compilation of two speeches given in opposition to suffrage from the very end of 1870 in Boston and in May 1871 in Hartford. It is difficult to imagine the public listening to oral presentations of one hundred pages and seventy pages respectively. These speeches are followed by an "address" written to sum up and fill in the blanks of the previous pages. And although Beecher *says* that the questions of suffrage are "questions which every woman must settle for herself aided by common sense, the Bible, and the Divine aid

obtained by prayer …" (1872, p. 171), she offers her own answer, bolstered by a lengthy set of anecdotal empirical evidence that each generation of children and each generation of women in particular are becoming less and less healthy. This "fact" counts as evidence that her contemporaries are either impeded by poverty or simply failing (morally) at doing their job of raising healthy families who are then well prepared to succeed in life. Giving women the franchise, Beecher argues, will further distract them from their natural duties of nurturance. Worse, by usurping the natural role of men (to represent the interests of the family in the public arena) suffrage introduces discord into the family unit. Moreover, as an educator of women, Beecher felt that women were not yet educated in sufficient numbers to be capable as a group of exercising the franchise well.

Beecher wrote an early and important pro-emancipation pamphlet *An Essay on Slavery and Abolitionism, with Reference to the Duty of American Females* (1837). Although many of its arguments are incorporated into other later works, it stands alone as an early pre-Civil War argument for emancipation of African slaves held in America. It is addressed to Angelina Grimke, whose abolitionist methods she disagrees with on moral grounds. Beecher argues that the horrific stories of mistreatment of slaves by their masters notwithstanding, the majority of slaveholders are Christians. They therefore accept a set of moral precepts that, Beecher will argue, also have a firm philosophical foundation. Such slaveholders are therefore basically moral people, susceptible to reason and moral persuasion. Reasoning with them, serving as an example to them, and finding economically viable alternatives to slavery that will not require plantation owners to abandon their lives, are methods more likely to succeed in abolishing slavery than the methods commonly used by Northern abolitionists. Beecher urges Grimke to treat slaveholders as reasonable people, as moral people who need guidance, insight, and persuasion to see the error of their ways and to

find methods to abolish the institution of slavery, promote education and training for slaves and freedmen alike, and live as equals with them in new communities.

Beecher participated in the development of American philosophy out of the Scottish Common Sense and English Utilitarian movements in ethics. She made notable contributions to an analysis of the moral foundations of religion, and to the two most powerful social movements of nineteenth-century America: the emancipation of slaves, and the movement for women's educational rights.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Suggestions Respecting Improvements in Education, Presented to the Trustees of the Hartford Female Seminary (Hartford, Conn., 1829).

The Elements of Mental and Moral Philosophy, Founded upon Experience, Reason, and the Bible (Hartford, Conn., 1831).

An Essay on the Education of Female Teachers (New York, 1835).

Letters on the Difficulties of Religion (Hartford, Conn., 1836).

An Essay on Slavery and Abolitionism, with Reference to the Duty of American Females (Philadelphia, 1837).

"An Essay on Cause and Effect in Connection with the Difference of Fatalism and Free Will," *American Biblical Repository and Classical Review* 2 (October 1839): 381–408.

Letters to Persons Who Are Engaged in Domestic Service (New York, 1842).

Treatise on Domestic Economy, for the Use of Young Ladies at Home, and at School (Boston, 1843).

The Duty of American Women to Their Country (New York, 1845).

An Address to the Protestant Clergy of the United States (New York, 1846).

The Evils Suffered by American Women and American Children: The Causes and the Remedy (New York, 1846).

Letter to Benevolent Ladies in the United States (New York, 1849).

Truth Stranger than Fiction (New York, 1850).

The True Remedy for the Wrongs of Woman; with a History of an Enterprise Having That for Its Object (Boston, 1851).

Letters to the People on Health and Happiness (New York, 1855).

Common Sense Applied to Religion, or. The Bible and the People (New York, 1857).

An Appeal to the People on Behalf of Their Rights as Authorized Interpreters of the Bible (New York, 1860).

The American Woman's Home or, Principles of Domestic Science, with Harriet Beecher Stowe (New York, 1869).

Principles of Domestic Science; as Applied to the Duties and Pleasures of the Home. A Text Book for the Use of Young Ladies in Schools, Seminaries, and Colleges, with Harriet Beecher Stowe (New York, 1870).

Woman Suffrage and Woman's Profession (New York, 1871).

Woman's Profession as Mother and Educator, with Views in Opposition to Woman Suffrage (Philadelphia, 1872).

Educational Reminiscences and Suggestions (New York, 1874).

Other Relevant Works

Beecher's papers are at Yale University, Radcliffe College, Mount Holyoke College, the Cincinnati Historical Society, and the Stowe-Day Foundation in Hartford, Connecticut.

Dykeman, Therese, and Dorothy Rogers, eds. *The Social, Political and Philosophical Works of Catharine Beecher*, 6 vols (Bristol, UK, 2003).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought

Boydston, Jeanne, et al., eds. *The Limits of Sisterhood: The Beecher Sisters on Women's Rights and Woman's Sphere* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1988).

Gardner, Catherine Villanueva. "Heaven-Appointed Educators of Mind: Catharine Beecher and the Moral Power of Women," *Hypatia* 19 (2004): 1–16.

Harveson, Mae. *Catharine Esther Beecher, Pioneer Educator* (Philadelphia, 1932).

Sklar, Kathryn Kish. *A Study in American Domesticity* (New York, 1973).

Waithe, Mary Ellen. *Modern Women Philosophers, 1600–1900* (Dordrecht, 1991).

White, Barbara Anne. *The Beecher Sisters* (New Haven, Conn., 2003).

Mary Ellen Waithe

BEECHER, Henry Ward (1813–87)

Henry Ward Beecher was born on 24 June 1813 in Litchfield, Connecticut, and died on 8 March 1887 in New York. He was the eighth child of Lyman and Roxana Beecher. Henry's father was one of the most famous and influential preachers in America during the first half of the nineteenth century, becoming President of Lane Seminary in Cincinnati, Ohio in 1832. Henry's siblings included Harriet Beecher Stowe, author of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*; Edward Beecher, pastor and editor; and educational reformer Catharine BEECHER.

Beecher attended Mount Pleasant Academy, a preparatory school in Amherst, Massachusetts, from 1827 to 1830. He then received his BA from Amherst College in 1834, and studied at Lane Seminary from 1834 until 1837, when he was ordained minister. As a young boy he had a speech impediment that led to his being considered dull-witted, but this changed at Mount Pleasant Academy where he came under the influence of John E. Lovell, who drilled Beecher in oratory. Beecher overcame his difficulties and began to excel at public speaking. After graduating from seminary he spent the first decade of his career as a pastor, first in Lawrenceburg, then in Indianapolis, in Indiana. In 1847 he became pastor of the Plymouth Congregational Church in the Brooklyn Heights area of New York City, where he remained until his death forty years later. The final two decades of his career were marred by a sex scandal in the 1870s when the husband of a woman he was counseling accused the two of adultery. Civil and ecclesiastical courts acquitted Beecher, but his reputation suffered. Nevertheless, to the end of his days he had a large following both at Plymouth Church and across the nation. After Beecher's death in 1887, Lyman ABBOTT succeeded him to Plymouth Church's pulpit.

At Plymouth, Beecher became the most famous American preacher of his era, and his church can be considered the first suburban "mega-church" in American history. In addition to his Sunday sermons, he delivered hundreds of public lectures in the northeastern United States, including the prestigious Lyman Beecher Lectures at Yale University for three straight years (1872–4). He spoke out on a variety of public issues including slavery, women's rights, temperance, and poverty. In a historically famous event in the 1850s his church sent rifles to Kansas to help arm the free-state forces that were fighting for control of the territory. The guns were shipped in a crate stamped "Beecher's Bibles," a term that quickly worked its way into American lore. To this day there is a church on the plains of Kansas called "The Beecher Bible and Rifle Church." While remaining an advocate of some progressive causes like women's rights, Beecher became for the most part a social conservative after the Civil War, usually attributing poverty to sin, for example, and appropriating the Social Darwinism of Herbert Spencer.

Beecher's most important contribution was his articulation of an incipient liberal Protestant theology. He was the first preacher in America with a regional and even national audience who taught that Christian theology must be modified in accordance with modern ways of thinking. Darwinian evolution was one of the two most influential modern movements that reshaped Protestant theology in the late nineteenth century. In the 1880s, as even some conservative Protestants attempted to harmonize evolution (though not natural selection) with the Bible, Beecher went much further. For him, as for most theological modernists (later called liberals), evolution became the model for understanding everything, including theology and even the Bible. He believed that the Christian faith itself had evolved since having been originally outlined in scripture. This put him in direct opposition to evangelical Protestant orthodoxy, which had taught since the Reformation that the faith found in the Bible was the purest and truest form of Christianity, not the most rudimentary and undeveloped. Beecher used a biological analogy, asking why people would want to study acorns when they were standing amidst oak trees. The acorn was the first-century faith with its ancient and outdated supernaturalism and superstition, while the oak tree was a mature, naturalized, and scientifically sophisticated nineteenth-century faith.

The second modern challenge facing Protestantism in the late nineteenth century was higher criticism of scripture. Biblical scholar Julius Wellhausen and others at the leading theological schools in Germany began to subject the Bible to the same historical and archeological criticism as other ancient texts. The result was the rejection of the presumed or stated authorship of several books of the Bible and doubt about the historical accuracy of many biblical stories. Higher criticism of scripture, an attempt to take a scientific and objective approach to the Bible, was a product of the Enlightenment. Beecher, while no theologian, readily adopted the findings of the higher critical method and came to take lightly many claimed historical events as well as doctrinally central biblical passages. For liberals like Beecher, the myths or stories of the Bible had a central point that was true, but the particular facts need not be taken literally. Beecher spoke out forcefully against literalism and verbal inspiration, the doctrine that the actual words of scripture were inspired. Instead, he believed that the biblical authors, not the words, were inspired and in a way quite similar to the inspiration experienced by some of history's great nonbiblical authors. This belief about inspiration was part of liberalism's naturalization of Protestant theology. Inspiration came more from inner experience than from a transcendent God.

Inner experience became central to liberal Protestantism and provided a strong Romantic counter-balance to the "scientific" approach to scripture. Beecher's form of liberal Protestantism, in keeping with the theology of Friedrich Schleiermacher and other German theologians of the time, placed experience over doctrine. Beecher denied the eternal punishment of sinners, and he played down Calvinist doctrines such as the transcendence of God, human sinfulness, predestination, and the need for supernatural salvation. In place of these, Beecher preached God's loving immanence and religion as a natural and world-affirming enterprise. Jesus was less the transcendent Christ who died for the sins of the world than a model of what all humans might become. In contrast to Dwight L. Moody, the most prolific orthodox revivalist of the late nineteenth century, Beecher believed there was great potential for human progress. With Christ as the model for living, the world would become better and better. Beecher once said, "Mr. Moody thinks this is a lost world, and is trying to save as many as possible from the wreck; I think Jesus Christ has come to save the world, and I am trying to help him save it."

Beecher's chief legacy was as a popularizer of the liberal theology that was developing in the most prominent theological schools of

Germany and being exported to American seminaries. He was a transitional figure between the Protestant orthodoxy of the nineteenth century that was based on essential biblical doctrines and supernaturalism, and the mainstream Protestant liberalism of the twentieth century that saw Christianity as a natural and world-affirming experience. He put into practice a liberal theology that emphasized feeling and experience over intellect, the heart over the head, being good and experiencing God over the centrality of a supernatural conversion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Life Thoughts, ed. Edna Dean Proctor (Boston, 1858).
Royal Truths (Boston, 1866).
Yale Lectures on Preaching, 3 vols (New York, 1872–4).
The Life of Jesus, the Christ (New York, 1872).
God Unknowable and How to Know Him (London, 1876).
"Progress of Thought in the Church," *North American Review* 135 (August 1882): 99–117.
Last Sermons (London, 1887).

Other Relevant Works
Beecher's papers are at the Library of Congress, Yale University, and Harvard University.
Bible Studies, ed. John R. Howard (New York, 1893).
Autobiographical Reminiscences of Henry Ward Beecher, ed. T. J. Ellinwood (New York, 1898).
Lectures and Orations by Henry Ward Beecher, ed. Newell Dwight Hillis (New York, 1913).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v3*
Abbot, Lyman. *Life of Henry Ward Beecher* (Philadelphia, 1887).
Clark, Clifford E., Jr. *Henry Ward Beecher* (Urbana, Ill., 1978).
McLoughlin, William G. *The Meaning of Henry Ward Beecher* (New York, 1970).
Ryan, Halford R. *Henry Ward Beecher: Peripatetic Preacher* (Westport, Conn., 1990).
Shaffer, Jane. *Henry Ward Beecher: The Indiana Years, 1837–1847* (Indianapolis, 1973).

Barry Hankins

BELL, Daniel (1919–)

Daniel Bell was born on 10 May 1919 in New York City. The son of Jewish immigrants, he was attracted to socialism early in his life, and never abandoned a commitment to "economic socialism," although this position was modified by his self-described liberalism in politics and cultural conservatism. He attended City College of New York, received a BSS in 1939, and was trained initially as a journalist. In the 1940s and 50s he edited a number of journals and periodicals, and from 1948 to 1958 he worked as the labor editor for *Fortune* magazine. In 1959 Bell accepted an appointment as professor of sociology at Columbia University, and received a PhD in sociology there in 1961 for his book *The End of Ideology: On the Exhaustion of Political Ideas in the Fifties*, which was published in 1960. In 1980 Bell was appointed Henry Ford II Professor of Sociology at Harvard University, and he held that title until retiring in 1990. He served on the board of directors of the American Civil Liberties Union from 1957 to 1961, and is a fellow of the American Sociological Association and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Although Bell saw himself as a sociologist, his work has been acknowledged as important in several fields, including economics, social and political theory, and the philosophy of social science. A series of influential articles and books in the 1950s culminated in *The End of Ideology*. In this work, Bell argued that the historical fractures between the political parties in the advanced industrialized nations, together with their constituencies and ideologies, which had originated in the process of industrialization, had been largely overcome. Modern political parties, bereft of new political ideas, were largely accepting of the political status quo, including the continuing roles of such institutions as the large business enterprise (whether state-owned or private) and the bureaucratic state. Such institutions had become unquestioned as the basis for the maintenance of an industrialized economy and mass consumption lifestyle. Bell refined, revised and extended this argument in two later works, *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society* (1973) and *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism* (1976), which together comprise his main contributions to the theory and practice of the social sciences.

In *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society*, Bell argued that existing social forces, and the processes of social change they engendered, could no longer be understood within the existing paradigms of the social sciences. In particular, the base-superstructure model of classical Marxism could no longer describe either the major changes in the economies of the developed nations, which were undergoing a shift toward the dominance of the tertiary sector, and thus becoming "post-industrial," or the accompanying changes in the political and cultural spheres. Bell instead proposed a multidimensional model, in which social forces should be understood as independently operative within the realms of the social-structural, the cultural and the political realm. Within each sphere, different processes, each obedient to a different set of "axial principles," are the prime agents of social change. In the realm of social structure, which includes the economy, technology, and the occupational hierarchy of society, the axial principle of post-industrial society is the role of theoretical knowledge, which is gradually replacing straightforward capital growth as the key determinant of economic and technological development. This represents the increasing priority of human capital, in the form of skilled technical workers – engineers and scientists – to financial capital, and thus the ascendance of a "knowledge economy." But such an outcome does not have the implications for politics and lifestyle that Marxists and others on the left had argued for previously. This is because the social *milieu* within which post-industrialism develops is also characterized by greater differentiation, and its spheres (politics, social structure, culture) become increasingly independent of each other's axial principles. The axial principle of culture is not knowledge, but increasingly the cult of individualism, expressed paradigmatically in the emergence of the values associated with the 1960s counterculture – self-expression, independence, and hedonism. The axial principle of politics, by contrast, is democratization, understood along the lines of a deliberative model, in which participation in the decision-making processes of shared life takes precedence. These changes in the separate spheres of society do not spell the end of conflict or contradiction, but merely an alteration in the forms social conflict will take.

The theme of the differentiation of spheres was developed further in *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*, arguably Bell's most influential work, in which he sought to show that the cluster of values that had presaged the emergence of capitalist modernity in the United States – Weber's so-called "Protestant ethic" of asceticism, thrift, belief in the inherent value of labor, moral inferiority, and religious sensibility – were being overwhelmed by a culture of acquisitiveness, mass consumption, individualism, and moral vacuity. Bell analyzed the traces of this shift

within the aesthetic of modernism and post-modernism, which he indicted for their reflex antinomianism and moral permissiveness, as they became ascendant in the 1960s and early 70s. While the inner dynamic of the counter-culture, based on the axial principle of individualism, contradicts the rational principles of the economic realm, the differentiation of the two spheres means that a degree of co-existence is possible, although Bell clearly believes that the erosion of traditional values is not functionally sustainable in the long run; hence the "contradictions" between capitalism as an economic and social structural principle, and capitalism as culture. Bell's concern with the potentially corrosive effects of capitalism as culture place him into contact with contemporary theorists such as Jürgen Habermas and Alasdair MACINTYRE.

These positions have also embedded Bell in a set of philosophical presuppositions that can be picked out, though nowhere does Bell commit himself to a systematic presentation of them, or their implications. Philosophy appears, from Bell's own perspective – as it did from Émile Durkheim's – as a kind of supernumerary practice, with which sociology need not be overly concerned.

Epistemologically, Bell espouses a form of post-Kantian perspectivism that is indebted to John DEWEY, and quite similar to recent forms of pragmatism. On Bell's view, society cannot be known as an object in itself; it is best understood from a particular perspective that emphasizes those elements that are useful to the knower. Thus, the distinction between the realms of social structure, politics, and culture is not a reflection of social reality, but a conceptual framework that allows for particular elements to be picked out and described in ways that will be socially useful. Bell therefore denies both the correspondence theory of truth and scientific realism. The description and re-description of events, processes, and things are not "of reality as it is in itself" but of reality as it appears always in the context of human purposes. The notion of "reality" as it is independently of those purposes – what has sometimes been called the "view from nowhere" – is a philosophical fiction that owes its origin to eighteenth-century Enlightenment ideology.

Bell's epistemological perspectivism is embedded in a substantive historicism that occasionally takes on the contours of a full-fledged philosophy of history. This is dominated by a view of the centrality of the role of technology in shaping the course and outcomes of human history. Humanity is distinguished by its tool-wielding and symbol-producing capacity, together with its ability to turn these capacities toward previously conceived ends. These abilities have been united in the modern idea of technology as the active mastery of nature by self-conscious and socially conscious rational agents. The growth of technology is historically linear and accumulative, and the overall trajectory of human history involves increasing rational control over the natural and social order. But process is not teleological; the ends of that process cannot be projected or known in advance, and social and historical change cannot be unified under some overarching ordering principle such as "spirit" (Hegel), "mode of production" (Marx) or "society" (Durkheim).

Bell espouses a kind of cryptic existentialism with respect to the ends of individual life and moral norms. Human culture consists in symbols and representations devoted to production of meaning, including the apprehension of the ethical and the sacred. This is driven not by some nascent quality of human nature, or by the functional needs of society's need for integration, but by a shared human devotion to that which exceeds the self and is apprehended in the mystery of being-with-others. Bell's existentialism should not be taken as an engagement with the tradition of continental philosophy associated with Martin Heidegger and Jean-Paul Sartre, of which he is quite scornful, but perhaps is best understood as evolving out of his interest in and engagement with secularized forms of Judaic ethics.

The projections for the future that Bell extracts from these stances are ambiguous, but in *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism* and elsewhere, he has outlined the possible "return of the sacred" in the form of the restored role for religion in social life. In this, his outlook echoes such mid-century social thinkers as Reinhold NIEBUHR and Robert Lynd. His social forecasts for the increasing importance of the knowledge economy have been widely credited as prescient, although his cultural conservatism has attracted criticism from liberals and socialists. His more general concerns are perhaps best understood as part of the conversation among Anglo-American theorists such as Richard RORTY and Anthony Giddens (who has appropriated the concept of post-industrialism from Bell), regarding the future and fate of modernity from the perspective of liberalism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Marxian Socialism in the United States (New York, 1952; Ithaca, N.Y., 1996).
Work and Its Discontents (Boston, 1956).
The End of Ideology: On the Exhaustion of Political Ideas in the Fifties (Glencoe, Ill., 1960; Cambridge, Mass., 2000).
Reforming of Education: The Columbia College Experience in Its National Setting (New York, 1966).
The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting (New York, 1973; 2nd edn 1999).
The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism (New York, 1976; 2nd edn 1996).
The Winding Passage: Essays and Sociological Journeys (New York, 1980).

Further Reading
Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, *Comp Amer Thought*
Brick, Howard. *Daniel Bell and the Decline of Intellectual Radicalism: Social Theory and Political Reconciliation in the 1940s* (Madison, Wisc., 1986).
Liebowitz, Nathan. *Daniel Bell and the Agony of Modern Liberalism* (Westport, Conn., 1985).
Waters, Malcolm. *Daniel Bell* (London, 1996).

Philip Walsh

BELLAH, Robert Neelly (1927–)

Robert N. Bellah was born on 23 February 1927 in Altus, Oklahoma, where his father was a small-town newspaper publisher, and was raised in Los Angeles, California. He graduated summa cum laude in 1950 from Harvard with a BA degree in social relations and a concentration in social anthropology. His undergraduate honors thesis focused on Southern Athabascan cultural patterns in the American Southwest and was published in 1952 as *Apache Kinship Systems*. He then pursued doctoral studies under the leading social theorist of the period, Talcott PARSONS, earning his PhD in sociology and Far Eastern languages from Harvard in 1955. His dissertation was a Weberian analysis of the role of religion in the modernization of Japan and was published as *Tokugawa Religion* in 1957. This formative period coincided with the systematic effort within American social science to translate into English the works of the European founders of sociology, particularly Max Weber and Émile Durkheim (with their roots in the philosophical work of Hegel), and to incorporate their insights into an overall theory of social relations. Though the resulting school of "structural functionalism" was later rejected by most social scientists – and in some ways transcended in Bellah's own work – this attention to American and European currents of social thought would mark his entire career.

Bellah's undergraduate engagement with Marxist politics and the McCarthy-inspired closure of intellectual freedom in the United

States during the 1950s led to his acceptance of a postdoctoral fellowship at the Institute for Islamic Studies at McGill University in Toronto, where he studied from 1955 to 1957. He returned to Harvard in 1957, and until 1967 he served as a research associate, lecturer, associate professor, and professor of sociology. In 1967 Bellah became the Ford Professor of Sociology at the University of California at Berkeley, where he remained until his retirement as Elliott Professor Emeritus of Sociology in 1997. He was awarded the National Humanities Medal in 2000.

In developing a theoretical framework for interpreting empirical sociological findings, Bellah drew on the classical sociological tradition of Marx, Weber, and Durkheim and on a long tradition of social thought within philosophy, particularly Aristotle, Hegel, and the American pragmatists, as interpreted by such contemporary philosophers as Alasdair MacIntyre and Charles Taylor. Thus, although few of Bellah's works are explicitly philosophical in tone, much of his work carries important philosophical weight through its wide-ranging attention to classical and contemporary social theory, American and European social philosophy, and the philosophy of religion from both Eastern and Western traditions. The important contributions of Bellah's research and teaching include his long focus on an interpretive and humanistic understanding of social analysis (during a period of narrowly positivist emphasis within much of American sociology) and his influence on several generations of scholars in the sociology of religion, the sociology of culture, religious studies, and social theory.

Bellah's most important works fall into three areas. His earliest works focused on applying a Weberian intellectual framework to two important societal systems never systematically analyzed by Max Weber: the tribal societies of the Americas (using Apache societies as the case study), and of Japan during the Tokugawa Period (1600–1868). During this period, and partly under the influence of theologian Paul Tillich (1952), he also intellectually and personally re-engaged with the Christian tradition, ultimately as a member of the Episcopal Church. Bellah's middle period focused on the role of religion and religion-like phenomena as the central cultural systems of society. The core insights of this period are found in three publications: "Religious Evolution" (1964), "Civil Religion in America" (1967; both reprinted in Bellah 1970), and the introduction to *Émile Durkheim on Morality and Society* (1973). This period brought a more profoundly Durkheimian cast to Bellah's analysis, particularly in his attention to the dynamics of collective effervescence and shared mental structures in society. In this vein, Bellah analyzed the ceremonies, symbolism, and concepts of civic and religious currents in American life. Beginning in the 1970s, Bellah's work turned increasingly toward critical engagement with American culture and institutions in a genre he termed "sociology as public philosophy." In two co-authored books (1985, 1991) and myriad magazine articles and public lectures, Bellah emerged as a leading public intellectual, calling for reform within American society, in the tradition of Walter Lippmann, John Dewey, Reinhold Niebuhr, John Courtney Murray, and, before them, Jonathan Edwards, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, and W. E. B. Du Bois.

Sociology, understood as public philosophy, strives to provide a tool for social self-understanding and self-reflection by entering into an ongoing dialogue with the cultural currents that flow within and provide meaning to social life – holding up a mirror to society in a way that allows members to reflect upon and thus critically re-appropriate their own cultural traditions. Such public philosophy is skeptical of attempts in recent decades by the social sciences to emulate the physical or biological sciences, with their focus on accumulating objective knowledge of relatively fixed phenomena. It questions the disciplinary gulf between social sciences and the humanities – particularly philosophy – and seeks to reconnect them by

drawing on social scientific knowledge and social theory for the purpose of better-informed and more democratic public dialogue about society and its direction. Sociology, as public philosophy, thus combines an analytic and a normative intent, simultaneously pursuing firmer knowledge, deeper insight, and a voice in the shaping of a good society. Oriented to the pursuit and promotion of the Aristotelian virtues of *phronesis* (practical reason), public philosophy seeks to deepen democracy through a public dialogue that crosses the boundaries of philosophy and other disciplines in the humanities, the social sciences, and the physical sciences.

In *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life* (1985), Bellah and his co-authors fundamentally criticized the recent dominance of longstanding American cultural currents of "utilitarian individualism" and "expressive individualism." Key philosophical figures in the tradition of utilitarian individualism include Hobbes, Locke, and Bentham, with their emphasis on the self-interested pursuit of particular ends by maximizing one's own share of those ends. Benjamin Franklin represents the paradigmatic American figure in this tradition. Though most at home in the business sphere, utilitarian individualism has become a dominant cultural theme across a great deal of American culture, most clearly wherever economic exchange, self-interest maximization, and cost–benefit analysis explicitly predominate, but also implicitly at work wherever human goods are treated as commodities to be maximized. In the scholarly domain, the dominant versions of utilitarian individualism take the form of rational actor models of human behavior.

Expressive individualism emerged in American life in the nineteenth century, partly in opposition to the rising dominance of utilitarian individualism. It posits an inner core of emotion, intimate experience, and uniqueness to each individual, which must be expressed in pursuit of self-realization. The fountainhead of expressive individualism in American culture was nineteenth-century Romanticism, best exemplified in the poetry of Walt WHITMAN; its contemporary expressions include the influential American culture of psychotherapy, "New Age" spirituality, and the celebration of sexuality devoid of interpersonal commitment.

In criticizing the inability of utilitarian and expressive individualism to ground long-term commitment and provide meaningful orientation to human life, Bellah and his co-authors argued for a cultural re-appropriation of other longstanding cultural currents that relativize individualism, particularly civic republicanism and biblical religion. The American tradition of civic republicanism originated in the city-states of classical Greece and Rome and deeply influenced the founding generation of the American Revolution. The republican tradition emphasizes shared membership in a national community and commitment to work for the common good. Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln represent key figures in this current of American life, though Lincoln also drew deeply from the biblical tradition in framing his understanding of America.

Biblical religion matters enormously in American culture because it provides ethical grounding for trans-individualistic commitment through participation in "communities of memory." Bellah's analysis of biblical religion as a key cultural tradition providing a counterweight to the dark side of American individualism should not be mistaken for a triumphal celebration of mainstream religion. Given their historical centrality in American culture, Christianity and Judaism inevitably serve as the focus of analysis, but they are important because they offer cultural symbols transcending individualism *and* are the locus of widespread commitment within American society. Other religious traditions – particularly others with long historical experience and societal roots – have parallel ethical resources and can play similar roles in contemporary American society. Likewise, Bellah and his co-authors recognize and sharply criticize those ways in which biblical religions themselves have succumbed to the corrosive effects of individu-

alism and therapeutic culture. Thus, some religious traditions some of the time offer vibrant resources in this regard, while others do not.

Implicit in *Habits of the Heart* and explicit in *The Good Society* (1991) – both by the same authors – is the role of institutions in sustaining the cultural possibility of ethical commitment and in providing the settings in which such commitment is exercised. The term "institutions" is used in its social scientific sense, quite different from the everyday sense in which it essentially serves as a synonym for "organization." Rather, "institution" here refers to "patterns of normative, which is to say moral, expectations" (1991, p. 288). Thus, institutions shape interpersonal and societal understandings of how we are to act and what constitutes legitimate ends and means; institutions serve to stabilize interaction by generating mutually shared expectations. Because institutions *mediate* between the self and the wider world (in both its social and natural dimensions), they are crucial to our individuality and to our understanding of others, science, and our place in the world. The focus of attention in *The Good Society* falls on analyzing particular institutional spheres in American life – the market, corporations, and work; government, law, and politics; education; and religion – but the underlying orientation is to the ways we are embedded in institutions and can work to reform them from within. Because institutions in the form of mutual expectations exist within the fabric of interaction, all of us, as social actors, either reify current institutional commitments or reform them by calling institutions back to their ideals and criticizing their basic values. We do the latter typically by seeing a given institutional sphere – for example, the workplace – in light of the values and commitments of another institutional sphere, such as religion, with its call to mutual respect, or politics, with its call to greater equality. In this way, institutional reform depends upon a rich plurality of strong institutional spheres; each strengthens the others by providing cultural resources for critique and reform.

The most consistent objection raised to the line of argument pursued in these works argues that, in their close attention to moral traditions and democratic public dialogue, Bellah and his co-authors fail to take seriously enough the workings of societal power. Though certainly recognizing that more power-centered analyses have their own value, and having pursued in earlier writings those related to race (1975) and in recent public lectures those related to economic polarization in American society, Bellah ultimately emphasizes the ways that cultural patterns shape even the workings of societal power; thus, in the concluding pages of *The Good Society*, he and his co-authors argue, "Such a moral argument cannot alone produce significant institutional change. Power and profit are always involved. But where moral agreement is strong enough, it will find opportunities for breaking through, and power and profit will find it advantageous to go along. Such outcomes cannot occur without conflict, when power is pitted against power. But, without the moral argument, there is no steady pressure to bring economic and political forces to the service of human ends." (1991, p. 306)

A consistent theoretical position termed "symbolic realism" runs throughout Bellah's work. Though only discussed explicitly in a few places, it is central to understanding the philosophical substratum of his work. Best articulated in the essay "Between Religion and Social Science" (in 1970), symbolic realism rejects both the anti-religious bias of Enlightenment rationalism, which sees religion as essentially false, *and* its main alternative in the Western intellectual tradition, termed "symbolic reductionism." The latter accepts that religious insight may hold a kernel of truth but that this kernel must be extracted from the fantastic myths and fabrications of traditional religion; that is, whatever religious truth may exist can and must be *reduced* to its nonreligious core. Bellah argues that symbolic reductionism misses the real import of religion, because it partakes in the mistaken cognitive bias of Western rationalism since the

Enlightenment: "This position has held that the only valid knowledge is in the form of falsifiable scientific hypotheses. The task then with respect to religion has been to discover the falsifiable propositions hidden within it, to discard the unverifiable assertions and those clearly false, and, even with respect to the ones that seem valid, to abandon the symbolic and metaphorical disguise in which they are cloaked." (1970, p. 251)

Bellah's symbolic realism instead strives to understand symbolic statements – including religious symbols, rituals, narratives, etc. – not as cognitive statements about the nature of the self or of external reality, but as evocations of the *real relationship* between the self, others, the wider world, and ultimate reality. Thus, "reality is seen to reside not just in the object but in the subject, and particularly in the relation between subject and object. The canons of empirical science apply primarily to symbols that attempt to express the nature of objects, but there are nonobjective symbols that express the feelings, values, and hopes of subjects, or that organize and regulate the flow of interaction between subjects and objects, or that attempt to sum up the whole subject-object complex or even point to the context or ground of that whole. These symbols, too, express reality and are not reducible to empirical propositions. This is the position of symbolic realism." (1970, p. 252) Thus, though Bellah polemically states, "To put it bluntly, religion is true" (1970, p. 253), the fundamental point is that to make primary the cognitive question about truth is to miss the essential nature of religion and symbolism more generally. They attempt to express what is *real* in the world of human experience rather than what is true in some abstract cognitive sense lying beyond human experience. He notes that "religious symbolization and religious experience are inherent in the structure of human existence … all reductionism must be abandoned. Symbolic realism is the only adequate basis for the social scientific study of religion. When I say religion is a reality *sui generis* I am certainly not supporting the claims of the historical realist

theologians, who are still working with a cognitive conception of religious belief that makes it parallel to objectivist scientific description. But if the theologian comes to his subject with the assumptions of symbolic realism … then we are in a situation where for the first time in centuries theologian and secular intellectual can speak the same language. Their tasks are different but their conceptual framework is shared. What this can mean for the reintegration of our fragmented culture is almost beyond calculation." (1970, p. 253)

Throughout his career Bellah was oriented by this commitment to symbolic realism. This is evident in his analysis of the religious systems of Japanese and Apache societies, his theoretical work on religious phenomena as cultural systems, and his work as a public philosopher. This orientation and Bellah's role in training several generations of scholars at Harvard University, the University of California at Berkeley, and the Graduate Theological Union made Bellah a key figure in the late twentieth-century dialogue between religion and social science, not only in America but in societies around the world. Since his retirement from teaching in 1997, he continued to lecture widely while working on a final major work, an expansion and updating of the seminal work "Religious Evolution" (in 1970) in light of recent scholarly understanding of human origins, prehistoric societies, human history, and genetic and cultural evolution.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apache Kinship Systems (Cambridge, Mass., 1952).

Tokugawa Religion; the Values of Pre-Industrial Japan (Glencoe, Ill., 1957).

Beyond Belief: Essays on Religion in a Post-Traditional World (New York, 1970).

The Broken Covenant: American Civil Religion in a Time of Trial (New York, 1975; 2nd edn Chicago, 1992).

Varieties of Civil Religion, with Phillip E. Hammond (New York, 1980).

Habits of the Heart: Individualism and

Commitment in American Life, with Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven M. Tipton (Berkeley, Cal., 1985).

The Good Society, with Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven M. Tipton (New York, 1991).

Imagining Japan: The Japanese Tradition and Its Modern Interpretation (Berkeley, Cal., 2003).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Religion and Progress in Modern Asia* (New York, 1965).

Ed. with William G. McLoughlin, *Religion in America* (Boston, 1968).

Ed., *Émile Durkheim on Morality and Society: Selected Writings* (Chicago, 1973).

Ed. with Frederick E. Greenspahn, *Uncivil Religion: Interreligious Hostility in America* (New York, 1987).

"Rousseau on Society and the Individual," in *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: The Social Contract and the First and Second Discourses*, ed. S. Dunn (New Haven, Conn., 2002).

"The Ritual Roots of Society and Culture," in *Handbook for the Sociology of Religion*, ed. M. Dillon (New York, 2003).

"Durkheim and Ritual," in *Cambridge Companion to Durkheim*, ed. Jeffrey Alexander and Brian K. Smith (Cambridge, UK, 2004).

Further Reading

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio

Madsen, Richard, et al., eds. *Meaning and Modernity: Religion, Polity, and Self* (Berkeley, Cal., 2001). This festschrift contains Bellah's autobiographical "Epilogue."

Yeaman, Patricia A. *Methodology in the Sociology of Religion: Three Contemporary Sociologists, Peter Berger, Robert Bellah and Thomas O'Dea*. PhD dissertation, Fordham University (New York, 1980).

Richard Wood

BELLAMY, Edward (1850–98)

Edward Bellamy was born on 26 March 1850 in Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts. In 1867 he was rejected for admission to the United States Military Academy at West Point, and instead entered Union College in New York, where he developed his own reading courses in literature, political science, history, and political geography. During his year at Union College he also became interested in socialism and how to use Auguste Comte's ideas of naturalistic science as a way to free mankind from living under the burden of the past. From 1868 to 1869, he and his cousin, William Packer, studied in Dresden, Germany, and traveled in Europe. This European sojourn awakened him to the many social problems created by industrialization, poverty being the most pervasive and acute. He returned to Springfield, Massachusetts, to study law in 1869, passing the bar in 1871. Declining an invitation to join an established law practice, he opened his own office.

In November 1871 Bellamy retired from law after arguing his first case and moved to New York City, where he wrote intermittently for the *New York Post*. He returned to Chicopee Falls in June 1872 as the editorial writer and literary editor and reviewer for the *Springfield Union*. In this year Bellamy gave his first public lecture on socialism at a local school, outlining his faith in a better future deduced from scientific facts rather than the "mystical hyperboles" of religion. He resigned from the *Union* in December 1877 due to ill health and, accompanied by his brother Frederick, spent the next six months traveling to the Sandwich Islands in the South Pacific, as well as the Western frontier in the United States.

In 1878 he published his first novel, *Six to One: A Nantucket Idyll*, followed by *The Duke of Stockbridge*, a story about Shays's Rebellion that was initially serialized in the *Berkshire Courier* and published posthumously as a book in 1900. Another serialized novel, *Dr. Heidenhoff's Process*, was published as a book in 1880; it was an unusual psychological study

of guilt. In 1880 Edward and Charles Bellamy founded the *Springfield Penny News*, which became the *Daily News* in 1881. Edward retired from the *Daily News* in 1884 to devote himself to writing fiction.

In 1888 Bellamy published *Looking Backward, 2000–1887*, a utopian novel about a future in which society has evolved into socialism, where industry is nationalized, there is an equal distribution of wealth, and class divisions have been destroyed. The book was widely read in America and Europe, and was translated into several foreign languages. The first of many Bellamy Nationalist Clubs, advocating the nationalization of industrial production, was formed in Boston in the fall of 1888, and publication of a monthly journal, *The Nationalist*, began. From January 1891 to 1893 Bellamy also published a weekly journal, *The New Nation*. Bellamy's Nationalist philosophy was embodied in the platform of the Peoples' Party of 1892. In 1897 he published *Equality*, a sequel to *Looking Backward*. Bellamy died on 22 May 1898 in Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts.

Bellamy's most famous and influential work, *Looking Backward*, initially dismissed by many as just another utopian fiction, anticipates a future America in the year 2000, when society has been peacefully transformed through enlightened inquiry. Bellamy thought that society was enslaved by moral guilt inherited from past generations, just as he was initially bound into servitude by the Calvinist doctrine of innate depravity. He was able to overcome his sense of sin (or burden of guilt) through critical inquiry, exercising reason and observing his guilt from many different points of view. Gradually he came to the conclusion that this excessive feeling of guilt or nemesis was an unnecessary burden that not only he but the entire human race was forcing itself to live under. Bellamy's struggle with the doctrine of nemesis gradually developed into a vision of society consistent with spiritual freedom: socialism.

Bellamy's primary inspiration for *Looking Backward* was Laurence GRONLUND's 1884 book *The Cooperative Commonwealth: An Exposition of Modern Socialism*. Some critics claim that *Looking Backward* is actually little more than a fictionalized version of Gronlund's work (Shurter 1973, p. 177). Nevertheless, Bellamy's novel gained so much attention after it was published that Gronlund himself eventually endorsed Bellamy's vision as the means to a new socialist society.

Looking Backward was also influential in the thinking of economist Thorstein VEBLEN, who after reading it began working out his own theory, attributing social injustice to economic emulation or the argument that people struggle not only for physical needs but for favorable economic standing as compared to others (Morgan 1944, p. xi). John DEWEY found in Bellamy's utopia the view that society was evolving toward acquiring the technical means for a better, more humane social order (pp. xi–xii).

In the decade after *Looking Backward* was published, scores of other utopian novels emerged in quick succession, praising or condemning Bellamy's nationalistic utopia (for example, see Michaelis 1890, Roberts 1893, Vinton 1890). By late 1888 the first Bellamy Nationalist Club was formed, and the movement quickly spread across the country. The main purpose of these clubs was to institute Bellamy's utopian vision. Members formed coalitions with other reformist political groups, and the Nationalists were represented at the 1891 Populist Party convention. Eugene DEBS also initially advocated some of Bellamy's programs. However, these alliances began to unravel once it was obvious there were fundamental disagreement about how to bring about social change. The Nationalists advocated a gradual or evolutionary transition ushered in by a small group of educated leaders, not a revolution by the masses of laborers or workers, as foreseen by more radical socialists and populists. The breakdown of alliances with these latter groups contributed to the Nationalist movement's marginalization by 1894.

After he began urging immediate nationalization of railroads, telegraphs, and other vital

industries, even Bellamy's most ardent admirers began to lose their enthusiasm for his utopian ideals. The politicization of his ideas through the hundreds of Nationalist Clubs, and his premature death, along with the proliferation of counter-utopias, caused Bellamy's own vision to gradually lose focus. However, the spirit of his social reforms was carried forward into the Progressive Era of the early twentieth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Six to One: A Nantucket Idyll (New York, 1878).
Dr. Heidenhoff's Process (New York, 1880).
Miss Ludington's Sister: A Romance of Immortality (Boston, 1884).
Looking Backward, 2000–1887 (New York, 1888).
Equality (New York, 1897).

Other Relevant Works
Bellamy's papers are at Harvard University.
Blindman's World: And Other Stories (New York, 1898).
The Duke of Stockbridge (New York, 1900).
Talks on Nationalism (Salem, N.H., 1938).
Selected Writings on Religion and Society, ed. Joseph Schiffman (New York, 1955).
Apparitions of Things to Come: Edward Bellamy's Tales of Mystery and Imagination (Chicago, 1988).
Significant Unpublished and Uncollected Writings by and about American Writer Edward Bellamy (1850–1898), ed. Toby Widdicombe and Herman Preiser (Lewiston, N.Y., 2002).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v1*
Aaron, Daniel. *Men of Good Hope: A Story of American Progressives* (New York, 1951).

Bowman, Sylvia E. *The Year 2000: A Critical Biography of Edward Bellamy* (New York, 1958).
———, *Edward Bellamy Abroad: An American Prophet's Influence* (New York, 1962).
———, *Edward Bellamy* (Boston, 1986).
Griffith, Nancy Snell. *Edward Bellamy: A Bibliography* (Metuchen, N.J., 1986).
Kesselman, Stephen. *The Modernization of American Reform: Structures and Perceptions* (New York, 1979).
Lipow, Arthur. *Authoritarian Socialism in America: Edward Bellamy and the Nationalist Movement* (Berkeley, Cal., 1982).
Michaelis, R. C. *Looking Further Forward* (New York, 1890).
Morgan, Arthur Ernest. *Edward Bellamy* (New York, 1944).
Patai, Daphne, ed. *Looking Backward, 1988–1888: Essays on Edward Bellamy* (Amherst, Mass., 1988).
Peyser, Thomas. *Utopia and Cosmopolis: Globalization in the Era of American Literary Realism* (Durham, N.C., 1998).
Rhodes, H. V. *Utopia in American Political Thought* (Tucson, Ariz., 1967).
Roberts, J. W. *Looking Within* (New York, 1893).
Shurter, Robert L. *The Utopian Novel in America, 1865–1900* (New York, 1973).
Spann, E. K. *Brotherly Tomorrows: Movements for a Cooperative Society in America, 1820–1920* (New York, 1989).
Thomas, John L. *Alternative America: Henry George, Edward Bellamy, Henry Demarest Lloyd, and the Adversary Tradition* (Cambridge, Mass., 1983).
Vinton, A. D. *Looking Further Backward* (New York, 1890).
Widdicombe, Toby, and Richard Toby Widdicombe, eds. *Edward Bellamy: An Annotated Bibliography of Secondary Criticism* (New York, 1988).

Jean Van Delinder

BELNAP, Nuel Dinsmore, Jr. (1930–)

Nuel Belnap was born on 1 May 1930 in Evanston, Illinois. He received a BA from the University of Illinois in 1952. He went to Yale for postgraduate study in logic under the supervision of Alan Ross ANDERSON, receiving an MA in 1957 and a PhD in 1960. After graduation, Belnap continued to teach at Yale as assistant professor of philosophy until 1963, when he moved to the philosophy department of the University of Pittsburgh to become an associate professor. He is presently still at Pittsburgh, where he is Alan Ross Anderson Distinguished Professor of Philosophy, in addition to holding positions in sociology, history and philosophy of science, and the intelligent systems program.

Belnap's research covers logic and related fields such as the philosophy of language and metaphysics and philosophy of science. His name is most often associated with his teacher and colleague Alan Anderson and their research program in relevance logic. Belnap's research, with Anderson, and their colleagues and students, first at Yale, and then at Pittsburgh, provided a rigorous formal theory of logical consequence and implication that takes account of *relevance*. The two volumes *Entailment* (1975, 1992) provide a survey of work in this field, which has continued since the 1950s. Belnap's contributions to relevance logic are too numerous to examine, but many have gone on to shape a thriving, if not quite orthodox, research community. A good example of Belnap's contributions is his paper "Display Logic" (1982), which develops a new way of seeing the structure of proof, encompassing classical, intuitionistic, modal, and relevance logic.

Belnap's research is not restricted to relevance logic. He has also written extensively on the logic of questions (1976), arguing against formal logic's near-exclusive focus on declarative forms; on truth, working on both the *prosentential* theory of truth (with Grover and Camp, 1975) according to which "is true"

functions something like a *prosentence* in analogy with pronouns, and on the *revision* theory of truth (with Gupta, 1993), arguing that the circular phenomena exhibited in self-referentially paradoxical sentences (such as the liar: "this sentence is not true") should not be avoided but rather, should be taken to be a defining feature of the concept.

Belnap has published on the philosophy of physics, and the semantics of agency in his work on *branching space–time* (1992) and on the STIT (for "sees to it that") theory of agency, (*Facing the Future*, 2001). This work takes the picture of branching times (or space–time locations, in a relativistic setting) as the grounds of a precise theory. In the context of metaphysics, Belnap provides a theory of indeterminism in branching time that is consistent with general relativity and the absence of a single privileged "present moment." In the context of semantics and agency, STIT theory provides a formal setting for understanding indeterminism, choice, and the open future.

Belnap's work is often collaborative, and he has played a central role in supporting and developing work in philosophical logic in the United States, and elsewhere. At Pittsburgh Belnap taught many graduate students, including Robert K. Meyer, J. Michael Dunn, and Alasdair Urquhart, who have become prominent logicians in their own right. Belnap played a major role in the formation for the Society of Exact Philosophy (Vice President from 1971 to 1974, and President from 1974 to 1976), and the *Journal of Philosophical Logic* (on the editorial board from 1970 to present, as Treasurer from 1970 to 1976, Vice President from 1976 to 1982, and Chairman of the Board of Governors from 1982 to 1988). Both organizations have been crucial to the success of philosophical logic as a discipline in philosophy in North America in the second half of the twentieth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Entailment: The Logic of Relevance and Necessity, vol. 1, with Alan R. Anderson

(Princeton, N.J., 1975).

"A Prosentential Theory of Truth," with D. L. Grover and J. L. Camp, Jr, *Philosophical Studies* 27 (1975): 73–125.

The Logic of Questions and Answers, with T.B. Steel (New Haven, Conn., 1976).

"Display Logic," *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 11 (1982): 103–16.

Entailment: The Logic of Relevance and Necessity, vol. 2, with Alan R. Anderson and J. Michael Dunn (Princeton, N.J., 1992).

"Branching Space-time," *Synthese* 92 (1992): 385–434.

The Revision Theory of Truth, with Anil Gupta (Cambridge, Mass., 1993).

Facing the Future: Agents and Choices in Our Indeterminist World, with Michael Perloff and Ming Xu (Oxford, 2001).

Further Reading

Avron, Arnon. "Whither Relevance Logic?" *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 21 (1992): 243–81.

Cohen, Daniel H. "A New Axiomatization of Belnap's Conditional Assertion," *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 27 (1986): 124–32.

Dunn, J. Michael, and Anil Gupta, eds. *Truth or Consequences: Essays in Honor of Nuel Belnap* (Dordrecht, 1990).

Hart, W. D. "Prior and Belnap," *Theoria* 48 (1982): 127–38.

Greg Restall

BENACERRAF, Paul Joseph Salomon (1931–)

Paul Benacerraf was born on 26 March 1931 in Paris, France, the son of a Moroccan-Venezuelan father and an Algerian mother. The family moved to Caracas in 1939 as World War II threatened, and then to New York in 1940. Benacerraf was educated at Peddie School in Hightstown, New Jersey, and then at Princeton University, receiving his BA in 1953 and his PhD in philosophy in 1960. He wrote his dissertation on "Logicism: Some Considerations" under the supervision of Hilary PUTNAM. He joined the Princeton philosophy department as an instructor in 1960 and he has remained at Princeton ever since. He has also served as chair of the philosophy department during 1975–84 and 1992–9; associate dean of the Graduate School (1965–7); associate provost for special studies (1968–70); and Provost of the University (1988–91). He is currently James S. McDonnell Distinguished University Professor at Princeton.

Benacerraf's early interest in philosophy was galvanized by positivist and post-positivist philosophy of science as represented by his teachers, including Putnam, Carl G. HEMPEL, and John G. KEMENY. His work in philosophy has been devoted almost exclusively to the philosophy of mathematics. He is the author of a number of central papers, among which are two classics, "What Numbers Could Not Be" (1965) and "Mathematical Truth" (1973). Characteristic of Benacerraf's work, both essays are exploratory rather than dogmatic. "What Numbers Could Not Be" argues against the then-prevailing consensus that the natural numbers are to be identified with certain sets. He maintains that since there are many equally adequate ways of representing arithmetic in set theory, no particular identification of numbers with sets can be correct. At the same time, Benacerraf rejects the view that arithmetic is concerned with a domain of *sui generis* mathematical objects. The preferred alternative is that the "objects" of arithmetic are not really objects at all; rather, the truths of arithmetic are truths about *any* sequence of objects satisfying certain structural conditions. The essay is a key work for the view that has since come to be known as *structuralism* in the philosophy of mathematics.

"Mathematical Truth" argued that existing philosophical accounts of mathematical truth

fall to a dilemma. Some accounts (so-called combinatorial accounts) maintain that a mathematical statement is true if and only if it is a theorem of one or another given formal system. Such accounts entail that the semantics for the language of mathematics is radically discontinuous with the semantics for the rest of the language. What is worse, it is generally quite unclear why the combinatorial property in question should be regarded as a species of *truth*. On the other hand, so called Platonist or realist accounts of mathematical truth secure a uniform semantics at the expense of representing mathematical truth as unknowable. If a sentence such as "2 is a prime number" is to count as true only if a certain abstract mathematical object, the number 2, has a certain mathematical property, then it is unclear how we could ever come to know the truth of such a sentence. The objects of mathematics, on the Platonist account, are causally inert and thus altogether inaccessible to us. The argument for the second horn of "Benacerraf's Dilemma" has spawned an enormous literature. The contemporary debate over nominalism in the philosophy of mathematics can be traced directly to this paper.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Tasks, Super-tasks and the Modern Eleatics," *Journal of Philosophy* 59 (1962): 765–84.
"What Numbers Could Not Be," *Philosophical Review* 74 (1965): 47–73.
"God, the Devil and Gödel," *The Monist* 51 (1967): 9–33.
"Mathematical Truth," *Journal of Philosophy* 70 (1973): 661–79.
"Frege: The Last Logicist," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 6 (1981): 17–35.
"Skolem and the Skeptic," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* suppl. 59 (1985): 85–115.

Other Relevant Works
Ed. with Hilary Putnam, *Philosophy of Mathematics* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964; 2nd edn, Cambridge, UK, 1983).

Further Reading
Balaguer, Mark. "A Platonist Epistemology," *Synthese* 103 (1995): 303–25.
Creath, Richard. "Benacerraf and Mathematical Truth," *Philosophical Studies* 37 (1980): 335–40.
Hale, Bob, and Crispin Wright. "Benacerraf's Dilemma Revisited," *European Journal of Philosophy* 10 (2002): 101–29.
Hart, W. D. "Benacerraf's Dilemma," *Critica* 23 (1991): 87–103.
Katz, Jerrold. "What Mathematical Knowledge Could Be," *Mind* 104 (1995): 491–522.
Maddy, Penelope. "Philosophy of Mathematics: Prospects for the 90s," *Synthese* 88 (1991): 155–64.
Morton, Adam, and Stephen P. Stich, eds. *Benacerraf and His Critics* (Oxford, 1996).
Shapiro, Stewart. *Thinking About Mathematics: The Philosophy of Mathematics* (Oxford, 2000).
Wright, Crispin. "Skolem and the Skeptic," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* suppl. 59 (1985): 117–37.

Gideon Rosen

BENEDICT, Ruth Fulton (1887–1948)

Ruth Fulton was born on 5 June 1887 in New York City, the daughter of Frederick and Bertrice Shattuck Fulton. Also a graduate of Vassar, her mother worked as a teacher and a librarian in order to support her daughter after her father's death. Ruth earned a BA degree from Vassar College in 1909, and then traveled to Europe, returning home to teach at a private girls' school from 1910 to 1914. She married Stanley Benedict, a chemist, in 1914, and continued to study independently until 1918 when she enrolled at Columbia University. At Columbia she took courses with John DEWEY

before discovering anthropology, which she studied with Franz BOAS, and she also took courses with anthropologists at the New School for Social Research. After completing her PhD in anthropology in 1923, publishing her dissertation in that year, Benedict taught part-time at Columbia and Barnard College, and studied Native American cultures in the Great Plains and Southwest. By 1930 her marriage had fallen apart, and she had a short-lived relationship with Margaret MEAD, with whom she maintained a lifelong friendship.

In 1931 Benedict was appointed assistant professor of anthropology at Columbia to join Boas. Benedict gradually took greater responsibilities for the anthropology department, continued to research Native American and Japanese culture, and began publishing her most important books. She edited the *Journal of American Folklore* from 1925 to 1940, served as President of the American Anthropological Association in 1947, and was promoted to full professor in early 1948. Benedict died on 27 September 1948 in New York City.

A career anthropologist, Benedict is recognized in philosophy as a cultural relativist who explored ethics and moral theory. She argued that what is defined as morally normal and right is relative to one's cultural traditions and teachings. In her view, all theories that allegedly find a priori or necessary or absolute moral rules are just reflections of one's own deeply imbedded habits acquired from one's culture. She wrote in *Patterns of Culture* (1934) that, "Morality differs in every society, and is a convenient term for socially approved habits." Interestingly, she was unable to endorse relativism when confronted by Germany's Nazi regime. Benedict fought against the racism in academic anthropology that was receding in America but revived in Germany in the 1930s.

In her studies of Native American cultures, Benedict also observed the influences of modernization on these cultures. Her published discussions of these studies served to influence American popular consciousness. They vali-dated a wide range of native cultural practices and emphasized understanding over judgment, and relativity over absolutism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Vision in Plains Culture," (1922) *American Anthropologist* 24: 1–23.
The Concept of the Guardian Spirit in North America (Menasha, Wisc., 1923).
Patterns of Culture (Boston, 1934).
Zuni Mythology (New York, 1935).
Race: Science and Politics (New York, 1940; 2nd edn 1945).
The Races of Mankind, with Gene Weltfish (New York, 1943). Rev. edn, *In Henry's Backyard: The Races of Mankind* (New York, 1947).
The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture (Boston, 1946).
Thai Culture and Behavior: An Unpublished War Time Study (Ithaca, N.Y., 1952).

Other Relevant Works
Benedict's papers are at Vassar College in New York.
Mead, Margaret, ed. *An Anthropologist at Work: Writings of Ruth Benedict* (Boston, 1959).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Encyc Relig*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v36*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Banner, Lois W. *Intertwined Lives: Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict, and Their Circle* (New York, 2003).
Caffrey, Margaret. *Ruth Benedict: Stranger in This Land* (Austin, Tex., 1989).
Lapsley, Hilary. *Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict: The Kinship of Women* (Amherst, Mass., 1999).
Mead, Margaret. *Ruth Benedict* (New York, 1974).

Modell, Judith. *Ruth Benedict: Patterns of a Life* (Philadelphia, 1983).

Dorothy Rogers

BENJAMIN, Abram Cornelius (1897–1968)

Abram Cornelius Benjamin was born on 25 August 1897 in Grand Rapids, Michigan. He received his BA in 1920, his MA in 1921, and his PhD in philosophy in 1924, all from the University of Michigan. His dissertation was entitled "The Logical Atomism of Bertrand Russell." Benjamin was an assistant in mathematics at the University of Michigan in 1920–21, and an assistant in philosophy there in 1922–3. From 1923 to 1924 he was an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Illinois at Urbana, and stayed there until 1932, when he became assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Chicago. In 1945 he was named John Hiram Lathrop Professor of Philosophy and chair of the philosophy department at the University of Missouri. Ill health forced his retirement from the chair in 1956, but he continued to teach (with some interruptions) until retiring in 1966. Benjamin died on 19 October 1968 in Columbia, Missouri.

Benjamin was active in several philosophical organizations. He was a prominent leader of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association, serving as secretary-treasurer in 1934–36, Vice President from 1942 to 1945, and President in 1947–8. He helped organize the Missouri Philosophical Association, and served as its first President. He was a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and a member of Sigma Xi.

In the late 1920s, Benjamin produced a critical exposition of Russell's logical atomism, and throughout his career he authored several works on philosophy of science, including a study of the logical structure of science, an introduction to philosophy of science, a treatment of operationalism (the view that any term used in the exposition or description of a scientific conception or theory which had no operational value or definition ought to be discarded from scientific discourse), and a discussion of human values as they relate to science and technology.

In "Philosophy of the Sciences" (1950), Benjamin considered that philosophy of science deals with three principal kinds of question: (1) those relating directly or indirectly to the methodology of science, for example, the difference between mathematical *proof* and empirical *verification*; (2) clarification of the subject matter and leading concepts of science, such as "force," "matter," and "motion" in physics, and the elimination from scientific discussion and explanation of terms and concepts which have no operational value or substantive explanatory power (following pragmatist John DEWEY and operationalist Percy BRIDGMAN); and (3) a group of miscellaneous problems such as the nature of the relationships among the different sciences.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Logical Atomism of Bertrand Russell (Champaign, Ill., 1927).
The Logical Structure of Science (London, 1936).
An Introduction to Philosophy of Science (New York, 1937).
Syllabus for the Course on Methods, Values, and Concepts (Chicago, 1940).
Operationism (Springfield, Ill., 1955).
Science, Technology, and Human Values (Columbia, Miss., 1965).

Other Relevant Works
"What Is Empirical Philosophy?" *Journal of Philosophy* 36 (1939): 517–25.
"Philosophy, the Cult of Unintelligibility," *Philosophical Review* 57 (1948): 347–62.
"Philosophy of the Sciences," in *A History of Philosophical Systems*, ed. Vergilius Ferm (New York, 1950), pp. 540–51.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v5, *Proc of APA v42*,
  Who's Who in Phil

                                    Irving H. Anellis

—————————————————

BENNETT, John Coleman (1902–95)

John Coleman Bennett was born on 22 July 1902 in Kingston, Ontario, the son of a Presbyterian minister. He was educated at Phillips Exeter Academy, Williams College (BA 1924), the University of Oxford (BA in theology 1926, MA 1930), and Union Theological Seminary in New York City (BD 1927, STM 1929). His STM thesis was on "Schleiermacher's Early Philosophy of Religion." He was ordained in the Congregational Christian Churches in Berkeley, California, in 1939. Bennett's career as a Christian ethicist included theology teaching positions at Auburn (Presbyterian) Seminary from 1930 to 1938; Pacific School of Religion (United Church of Christ) from 1938 to 1943; and Union Theological Seminary in New York City, where he was professor of Christian theology and ethics from 1943 to 1970. From 1961 to 1970 his title was Reinhold Niebuhr Professor of Social Ethics. At Union he also served as dean of the faculty, as acting President, and as President from 1963 to 1970. Bennett was a visiting professor of Christian ethics at the Pacific School of Religion from 1970 to 1977. After his retirement he was an occasional visiting professor at the Claremont School of Theology. He died on 27 April 1995 in Claremont, California.

At his death, the *New York Times* credited him with outspoken views on religion, politics, and social policy that influenced American thinking, ecumenical Christianity, Catholic and Protestant relations, and foreign policy. Bennett was regarded as a precise speaker, a skilled debater, and a prolific writer who, though holding strong opinions, exercised a "hermeneutic of appreciation" (James M. Gustafson's phrase) in seeking common ground among theological and ethical positions. Bennett's significance as a theological ethicist is found at the intersection of the twentieth-century perspectives that shaped his thinking: Social Gospel Christianity, theological liberalism, Christian realism, ecumenical Christianity, and Third World theology. His balancing of social concern with fair judgment, of a passion for justice with a gentle decency (Mark Juergensmeyer's language) is the result of his being more influenced by events than by books. Bennett looked for countervailing tendencies in the positions he criticized. He was not tempted by absolutisms and said he was uncomfortable in secular politics despite his considerable influence on many mid-century politicians.

For forty-three years (1928–71), Bennett was closely associated with his more well-known mentor at Union, Reinhold NIEBUHR. Between *Moral Man and Immoral Society* (1932) and *Man's Nature and His Communities* (1965), Reinhold Niebuhr formulated the religio-political philosophy known as Christian political realism, a philosophy which, especially in the 1940s, provided a public ethic combining a balanced moral assessment of human nature with a pragmatic regard for national self-interest and power. Bennett's significance lies in his capacity to stand squarely in the Niebuhrian tradition and to represent the forces that shaped it: from a movement critical of theological liberalism in the 1930s, to a position on morality and foreign policy in the 1940s, to the social and ethical pragmatic synthesis (words of Ronald H. Stone) it achieved in Niebuhr's later years, and then to its development after Niebuhr's death in the thought of Bennett himself.

Bennett's first book, *Social Salvation*, appeared in 1935. Nearly thirty years later in a paper entitled "What I Believe It Means to Be Saved," he reaffirmed the thesis that, although salvation cannot be social without being

personal, social conditions interfere with personal salvation. In a lecture, "Reflections on Death," he considered at length the subject of nuclear death, thus reiterating the connection between the personal and the social.

When Bennett began his teaching career, he was already a critic of the Social Gospel, though closer to theological liberalism than to any other perspective. An admirer of Walter RAUSCHENBUSCH, Bennett warned in 1939 that the radical shift in theology to a pessimistic view of human nature was to be both acknowledged and resisted. Those who retain continuity with the liberal tradition, he said, are in the proper position to contribute to a fresh theological synthesis.

Rejecting both abstract rationalism and a theology which thrives on the discontinuity between revelation and reason, Bennett acknowledged his shifts in emphasis in the late 1930s and early 1940s but denied that they were radical breaks from his earlier disposition. He identified with Niebuhr's "third position" on war, criticized the neo-isolation and irrelevance of *Christian Century* editorials, and labeled himself a "peace-minded nonpacifist."

In the preface to a 1941 book, *Christian Realism*, Bennett characterized himself as "a liberal who tries to take seriously the contribution of such thinkers as Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, and Reinhold Niebuhr; and as a Congregationalist who believes in the central importance of the ecumenical Church." For him, the contributions of Christian realism included the interdependence of faith and reason, the rejection of natural theology as a point of departure and sole method of knowing, acceptance of Augustinian views on sin, emphasis on forgiveness and justification by faith, and an endless capacity for self-criticism. Bennett also was critical (though not often publicly) of Niebuhr's polemics, of the tendency of realists to offer moral rationalization for self-interested necessity, and of the divorce of strategic answers from moral criticism.

His theological position is best characterized as a redefined theological liberalism. In *Protestant Concepts of Church and State*, Thomas Sanders called it a "reformationized liberalism." Donald Meyer labeled it "neo-liberalism" and Bennett referred to it as a "liberal dilution of Niebuhr." Illustrating a method consistent with these designations in his inaugural address as President of Union Theological Seminary in 1963, Bennett called for a continuing fresh response to the original Christian sources of faith and revelation. What is required, he argued, is a new Protestant theology that makes sense of the relation of God in Christ to the nature and general history of humankind. This theological perspective shaped his approach to ethics.

He delivered the Alexander Graham Bell lecture, "Christian Ethics and the National Conscience," at Boston University in 1964. In the introduction, Bennett asked whether there is "such a thing as a moral consensus or a common ground morality? And, if there is, how do we relate Christian Ethics or the distinctive teaching of the church to it?" Bennett recognized particular Christian implications for ethical thought and action, but his apologetic statement made clear that the Christian faith is an open absolute: there are evidences of the divine spirit outside the Christian community. He recognized the authenticity of non-Christian religious experience, of general revelation, and of common-ground morality, which he sometimes referred to as moral overlap or national or international conscience.

His theological and ethical method reflects the ways in which he merged theological liberalism and Christian political realism. Unlike Niebuhr, whose contrasts between mutual love and pure *agape* led him to be haunted by perfectionism, Bennett was a common sense meliorist whose ethical focus is on available alternatives. Continuity is a key concept in his theological and ethical method. He emphasized the formation of character as well as the process of decision-making, the linking of equality with the need for new social structures, and what he has called 'the humanizing of Christian ethics," a departure from ethical legalism that takes

into account the impact of secularism and the human situation on the nature of ethics.

The impact of Niebuhr and Bennett on the ecumenical movement and thought was significant. Niebuhr's influence was episodic; Karl Barth called him "the man of Amsterdam," an acknowledgment of the impact of Niebuhr's Gifford Lectures. Bennett, on the other hand, has been what might be called the "servant" of ecumenical Christianity. In 1939, Bennett said that "the church is the carrier of the Christian tradition which molds my thought more than any other system or tradition," a comment that led some to conclude that in Bennett, more than in most Niebuhrians, the church emerges as society's conscience. This is a direct result of the influence of Christian realism on his thinking. In *Social Salvation* (1935), *The State of the Church* (which he wrote for the Federal Council of Churches in 1942), and *Christian Ethics and Social Policy* (1946), the independence of the church and the relationship between worship and social action are emphasized. Bennett's role at the first assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1948 in Amsterdam illustrated his interest in ecumenical activity and explains its impact on his thought.

Before Amsterdam, Bennett was in charge of preparations for the Oxford Conference (1937) in the United States in the mid 1930s and secretary of its section on the church and economic life, due in part to the influence of Henry Pitney Van Dusen and William Adams BROWN. After Amsterdam, he edited a volume of the 1966 Geneva Conference, *Christian Social Ethics in a Changing World*, a conference which marked the convergence of ecumenical thinking with Third World issues and the beginnings of liberation theology. In the 1950s, he served on the Federal Council of Church's Dun Commission, which dealt with the moral issues of nuclear weapons and deterrence, and on NCC committees on international affairs and on economics and ethics, which produced ten volumes. In a 1979 article, "The Ecumenical Commitment to a Transforming Justice," Bennett said that this notion, defined as justice that is continually being transformed and that is continually transforming, represents the convergence of ecumenical, World Council, and Roman Catholic thinking.

Bennett's article "After Liberalism, What?" reveals the trend toward continuity in his thought in which historical events and ethical issues led to modifications of liberalism but not full rejection. "In some respects I still think realistically," said Bennett. This is his way of calling attention to the mixed moral character of nations, the case against moralism in international affairs, the role and limitations of pacifism in national discussions, and the critique of idealism and dualism in the role of religion in the national consciousness. Theology, for Bennett, provided a framework and established certain intellectual parameters, but policy cannot be derived from this perspective. Rather, it is necessary to examine the real alternatives and, from them, determine a theologically responsible course of action.

In two 1982 addresses, one at Boston University ("After Liberal Progressivism, Reflections on Human Hope") and the other at the College of Wooster ("Christian Realism and American Responsibility"), Bennett expressed sympathy with both Social Gospel Christianity and Christian political realism. He said that his chastened confidence was the result of being less troubled about the human prospect than those who had only the experience of Christian realism. As early as 1933, he called for a mixed view of humanity, which emphasized not only self-centeredness and hardness of heart but also human love and compassion.

In the Wooster address, Bennett cited and assessed two of Niebuhr's statements as intellectual background for the lecture. The statements, both from *Moral Man and Immoral Society,* dealt with the transmutation of unselfish individualism into national egoism in patriotism and with the hypocrisy of nations. Regarding patriotism, Bennett said he wanted to reclaim "patriotism" as a positive word and regarded the word "hypocrisy" as too extreme. The nation, in World War II and the early Cold War, served good causes, however mixed the

motives; hence, moral claims are not always hypocritical. But he also reaffirmed Niebuhr's criticisms of national messianic illusions and the self-deception of citizens. Bennett reminded his listeners that Niebuhr wanted to emphasize three themes: the creation of human beings in the divine image, the depth and pervasiveness of sin, and human openness to forgiving, healing, changing grace.

Bennett emphasized that Niebuhr himself ("never a dogmatic pessimist, fatalist, or cynic") moved beyond the realist position and that underlying his views on World War II and the early Cold War were strong commitments to social justice, equality, and a consistent critique of national pride. Realism was also a corrective for Bennett. He argued that it had a similar, though more forceful, impact on Niebuhr's development and particularly affected his doctrine of human nature. Though it is more difficult to identify stages of development in Bennett than Niebuhr, Bennett views their respective developments in similar ways. Still, there are differences, but they are explained more by family background, political experience, temperament, travel, and style than by fundamental theological and ethical differences. Bennett was not as negative about liberalism or as caught up in the realist corrective. He also had a considerably longer time to develop the meaning of realism in changed situations, which made him an exponent of an open and changing realism.

In his afterword to the second edition of Charles Kegley's *Reinhold Niebuhr: His Religious, Social, and Political Thought* (1982), Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. criticizes recent characterizations of Niebuhr as the philosopher of the Cold War, the enemy of revolution, and the original neo-conservative, claiming that these views of the Old Left, the New Left, and the neo-conservatives cannot do justice to the essential character of Niebuhr's political and social convictions. Bennett's work, Niebuhrian as it is, corroborates Schlesinger's conclusions and cannot be ignored by those who claim they have found the real Niebuhr. In Bennett (as in

Niebuhr), Christian political realism served not as a dogma, but as a theological and ethical *corrective*, thus maintaining its creative edge.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Social Salvation: A Religious Approach to the Problems of Social Change (New York, 1935).

Christianity and Social Salvation (Philadelphia, 1938).

Christian Realism (New York, 1941).

The State of the Church (New York, 1942).

Christian Ethics and Social Policy (New York, 1946).

Christianity and Communism (New York, 1948). Rev. as *Christianity and Communism Today* (New York, 1960).

The Christian as Citizen (New York, 1955).

Christians and the State (New York, 1958).

When Christians Make Political Decisions (New York, 1964).

Foreign Policy in Christian Perspective (New York, 1966).

The Radical Imperative: From Theology to Social Ethics (Philadelphia, 1975).

U.S. Foreign Policy and Christian Ethics, with Harvey Seifert (Philadelphia, 1977).

Other Relevant Works

Bennett's papers are at Union Theological Seminary.

"The Social Interpretation of Christianity," in *The Church through Half a Century: Essays in Honor of William Adams Brown*, ed. Samuel Cavert and Henry P. Van Dusen (New York, 1936).

"If America is Drawn into the War, Can You, As a Christian, Participate in It or Support It?" *The Christian Century* 57 (1940): 1506.

"The Christian Conception of Man," in *Liberal Theology, An Appraisal: Essays in Honor of Eugene William Lyman*, ed. David Roberts and Henry P. Van Dusen (New York, 1942).

"Reinhold Niebuhr's Social Ethics," in *Reinhold Niebuhr: His Religious, Social*

and Political Thought, ed. Charles W. Kegley and Robert W. Bretall (New York, 1956), pp. 99–141.

Ed., *Nuclear Weapons and the Conflict of Conscience* (New York, 1962).

Ed., *Christian Social Ethics in a Changing World* (New York, 1966).

"The Ecumenical Commitment to a Transforming Social Justice," in *Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History: Essays Presented to George Huntston Williams*, ed. F. Forrester Church and Timothy George (Leiden, 1979).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio

Juergensmeyer, Mark. *Conversations with John Bennett: Reflections on His Life and on the Career of Christian Ethics* (Berkeley, Cal., 1982).

Kegley, Charles, ed. *Reinhold Niebuhr: His Religious, Social and Political Thought* (New York, 1984).

Lee, Robert. *The Promise of Bennett: Christian Realism and Social Responsibility* (Philadelphia, 1969).

Long, Edward, Jr., and Robert Handy, eds. *Theology and Church in Times of Change* (Philadelphia, 1970). Contains a bibliography of Bennett's writings.

Smith, David H. *The Achievement of John C. Bennett* (New York, 1970).

Glenn R. Bucher

BENNETT, Jonathan Francis (1930–)

Jonathan Bennett was born on 17 February 1930 in Greymouth, New Zealand. His father, Francis Oswald Bennett, was a physician and published author of fiction and history; his mother, Pearl Allan Bennett, was a homemaker active in local educational politics. Bennett grew up attending local state schools, before heading to Canterbury University College where he studied philosophy with Arthur N. Prior. Bennett wrote a thesis titled "The Paradoxes of Strict Implication" for his MA in 1953, which was the basis for his first published papers. His studies then took him to the University of Oxford for two years, and in 1955 he earned the BPhil. After one year teaching philosophy at Haverford College in the United States, he returned to England in 1956 to take the post of lecturer in moral science at the University of Cambridge. In 1968 Bennett moved to Simon Fraser University as professor of philosophy, and then two years later he went to the University of British Columbia. In 1979 he came to Syracuse University as professor of philosophy, where he would spend the rest of his academic career. He was President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1987–8. In 1985 he became a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and a corresponding fellow of the British Academy in 1991. He was awarded the LittD from the University of Cambridge in 1991 and was the John Locke Lecturer at Oxford in 1992. Bennett retired in 1997, and lives on Bowen Island near Vancouver.

Bennett has written extensively in philosophy, publishing ten books and more than a hundred articles over a wide range of topics. The majority of his work falls into five areas: early modern philosophy, philosophy of mind and language, theory of events, ethics and action theory, and theory of conditionals. He is an eclectic thinker – eclectic in his subjects, in the resources he brings to his studies, and in his methods – and has been widely noted for his creativity. Still, Bennett's philosophy carries with it not only an instantly recognizable voice and style but also a set of systematic intellectual emphases. He is acclaimed as much for his techniques as for his specific views. Most notable in this regard has been his work in history of philosophy.

With the 1966 publication of *Kant's Analytic*, Bennett helped to launch a wave of research that would bring early modern philosophy back to active interest among philosophers. Its approach to the subject, one Bennett described in part as "fighting Kant tooth and nail" in order to learn from him (p. viii), would also prove influential. The essay is marked by its focus on Kant's arguments and its often critical assessment, and by Bennett's efforts to engage Kant as philosopher with something to contribute to the understanding of ongoing philosophical discussions. "To this end," Bennett notes, "I have freely criticized, clarified, interpolated and revised." *Kant's Analytic* spoke directly to the issues in Kant's philosophy and devoted little space to questions of historical or intellectual context. For Bennett, history of philosophy would be philosophy with a special technique, not history with a special subject matter.

This "philosophical" or "collegial" approach to the history of philosophy sparked controversy. It struck many as an exciting form of inquiry, one casting new light on philosophy and its history and instituting a high standard of active philosophical reflection on the part of the commentator. Others sharply disapproved. Critics characterized Bennett's work as historically insensitive or anachronistic. The philosophical payoff, it was suggested, was coming at the expense of sound scholarship. Bennett's answer was to write three more books in early modern philosophy in the same mode: *Locke, Berkeley, Hume* (1971), *Kant's Dialectic* (1974), *A Study of Spinoza's Ethics* (1984). This did not placate the critics, but it did confirm Bennett's place as a preeminent scholar in the study of early modern philosophy. Yet for all his influence in establishing a rigorous, philosophy-minded approach to the subject, the postmodern turn from history of philosophy to historiography of philosophy – the rise of the study of the commentator – did not itself hold much interest for Bennett. Characteristically, his sights were trained on the philosophy in the texts before him, and for the most part he did not wade into the increasingly baroque and partisan disputes over methodology that had become an academic preoccupation. Only in his fifth and final book in history of philosophy, the two-volume *Learning from Six Philosophers* (2001), did Bennett address the question of method in detail and offer defense of his own approach. But by then the issue was largely resolved at the level of scholarly practice. Methodological pluralism has proved to be the order of the day, and the collegial approach has become an important and entrenched tradition. Bennett's work in this area continues with the provision of freely accessible on-line versions of the early modern classics, revised with the aim of removing stylistic impediments to understanding the texts while leaving the philosophical content intact.

Bennett's philosophical writings – historical and otherwise – belong to the analytic tradition and display the imprint of the "linguistic turn" in philosophy with its signature emphasis on language. He describes his work as conceptual analysis, that is, as the articulation of a body of "analytic truths" about, for example, the concept of meaning, or causation, or moral accountability. Yet his own view of conceptual analysis incorporates a kind of rationalist outlook that separates him sharply from the mid-twentieth-century Oxford analysts. Bennett sees in the human mind deep structures of concepts and meaning that order our thought about the world, and he views them as being expressed in our linguistic practices and in the syntax and grammar of language. Linguistic data do therefore offer a passage to the subject matter of philosophy and so merit close attention. But they serve only as a stepping stone to the principal goal of his philosophical work: to bring the underlying conceptual structures to light where they can be examined in relation to modern canons of argument, inquiry, and explanation.

In his 1988 study *Events and Their Names*, following the lead of work by Zeno VENDLER, Bennett approaches the theory of events with a distinction between two types of sentence nominalizations. A sentence such as "Tenzing

climbed Everest" allows a *perfect* nominal form, "Tenzing's climbing of Everest," as well as an *imperfect* form, "Tenzing's climbing Everest." Both constructions operate as names and each refers to a part of the history of mountaineering. But the distinction here tracks a deeper conceptual division and the two names actually refer to entities of distinct ontological types: the imperfect nominal names a *fact*, the perfect form names an *event*. Nor, Bennett argues, are the two conceptual frameworks equivalent. Facts and events require distinct semantical treatments, and moreover for important theoretical roles – such as the construction of causal explanations – the concept of a fact is superior to that of an event. Bennett contends that a failure to draw the distinction properly has given rise in philosophy to an incorrect semantics for event language and to a mistaken promotion of the category of events for theoretical work. The event concept does manage to pick out a feature of reality: events belong to the broader ontological category of "tropes" or particular instantiations of properties at a place and a time, like the fall of a sparrow or the paleness of Socrates's face. But the fact concept, in virtue of its fineness of grain, is more precise, more informative, and better suited to the purposes of causal explanation. Of our two ways of thinking of the world and its causal superstructure, the one involving the event concept is, in the end, dispensable.

The balance, and perhaps tension, between descriptive and revisionary analyses of human understanding in Bennett's philosophy, as well as his focus on conceptual foundations, also appears prominently in his writings on ethics and action theory. Initially his research in this quarter concentrated on the question of what role the consequences of an act should have in determining the moral status of that act. Yet his strategy soon became to ask after the very concept of an act and whether an act could provide a locus for moral evaluation independently of consequences. In his 1981 Tanner Lectures, he articulated an influential line of argument on the subject, one later refined and deepened in *The Act Itself* (1995).

Consider the distinction between killing someone and letting someone die. It is often thought that there is a morally significant discrimination to be made: killing is worse than letting someone die, despite the fact that death will be the outcome in both cases. An important moral weight apparently attaches to the act itself, independently of its consequences. But what is the ground of the distinction between the act of killing and that of letting die that will support this difference in moral status? Bennett's subtle inquiry into action theory finds no basis in the act itself for drawing this common-sense moral distinction. Killing and letting die are instances of a more general contrast between making things happen and allowing things to happen, and underlying that contrast there is indeed a sharp action-theoretic distinction. But, Bennett argues, it is one devoid of moral significance. Contrary to our common-sense view, the distinction between making and allowing cannot carry any moral weight. Killing is morally no worse than letting die; alternatively, letting die is just as immoral as killing – and likewise for all kinds of harms that one commits or fails to prevent. Bennett's analysis naturally yields a form of consequentialism in ethics and so raises familiar challenges to common sense and faces familiar problems about the prospects of an extraordinarily demanding morality. It is not the consequentialist conclusion that centrally matters, however, but rather the line of inquiry that produced it. For any effective reply will have to come at the level of foundations, where the work consists in patiently, clearly and methodically asking after the most basic concepts around which we frame our understanding of moral and immoral behavior.

There is also a strong empiricist streak tempering Bennett's work that expresses itself in his concern to state empirical conditions under which we would be justified in applying the concepts under study. Bennett routinely seeks to couch his inquiries in terms that can refer

back to experience, keeping the reflective analysis on a tether. This dates to his earliest writings and is most evident in his work on the nature of language and mind, especially *Rationality* (1964) and *Linguistic Behaviour* (1976). The first book addresses the mental states of animals, defining "rationality" to be whatever it is that separates humans, in mentalistic kind, from other terrestrial animals. Bennett poses his question by asking what would have to be added to the language-like *behavior* of honeybees for it to be appropriate to *ascribe* beliefs (and other "contentful" states) to them. He suggests that belief should be understood in relation to wants, needs, and behavior, and that the correct constraint on belief ascription is not that the animal be able to express a belief in language but only that it have the ability to manifest the belief in its behavior. Arguing that beliefs about the past and general beliefs cannot be so manifested by non-linguistic animals, Bennett concludes that rational creatures are distinguished by the ability to escape cognitively from the present into the past and from the particular into the general.

Linguistic Behavior revisits the whole subject of language, belief, and meaning, and features a Gricean analysis of linguistic meaning in terms of intention. Again Bennett develops his case by taking sub-linguistic systems of communication – this time the bees are replaced by imaginary "anthropoid mammals" – and gradually adding complexity to the behaviors of the individuals until the evidence for the attribution of intentions, beliefs, and so on is in place. He also gives clear voice to the empiricist scruple: "statements about minds are based upon facts about behavior, and I shall never introduce any mentalistic concept without first displaying its behavioral credentials, saying what sorts of physical behavior would entitle us to apply it" (1976, p. 3). The project starts with an analysis of the concept of goal-oriented behavior that sets the notion of teleology on firm ground, then builds up an account of intentional behavior, and finally advances to

meaningful behavior, thus keeping the behavioral frame intact at every stage of the analysis of language and meaning.

Bennett has also worked on the theory of conditionals. His earliest publications address the concept of "entailment" or "strict implication" – where a statement *p* strictly implies a statement *q* just in case it is impossible that *p* be true and *q* false – and belong to philosophy of logic. His later writings focus on conditional constructions in natural language that express weaker, more complex forms of connections between statements. A central question concerns taxonomy. Consider three examples. (1) "If Booth didn't shoot Lincoln, someone did." (2) If Booth doesn't shoot Lincoln, someone will." (3) "If Booth hadn't shot Lincoln, someone would have." *Indicative* conditionals like (1) are widely thought to differ in their semantics and functional roles from *subjunctive* or *counterfactual* conditionals like (3). Indicative conditionals (it is thought) are subjective, express links among an agent's system of beliefs, and do not have truth-values, whereas subjunctive conditionals are objective, report principled relations among possibilities, and have truth-values. Whether to classify common future-directed conditionals like (2) with the indicatives or with the subjunctives is unclear. Tradition locates (2) with (3), but there are dissenters. Bennett began as a traditionalist, briefly departed by arguing that most (2)-type conditionals belong with the indicatives like (1), and then recanted, offering an exacting and novel defense of the traditional account.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Rationality (London, 1964).
Kant's Analytic (Cambridge, UK, 1966).
Locke, Berkeley, Hume: Central Themes (Oxford, 1971).
Kant's Dialectic (Cambridge, UK, 1974).
Linguistic Behaviour (Cambridge, UK, 1976).
A Study of Spinoza's Ethics (Indianapolis, 1984).
Events and Their Names (Indianapolis,

1988).

The Act Itself (Oxford, 1995).

Learning from Six Philosophers (Oxford, 2001).

A Philosophical Guide to Conditionals (Oxford, 2003).

Other Relevant Works

"Meaning and Implication," *Mind* 63 (1954): 451–63.

"Analytic-Synthetic," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 59 (1959): 163–88.

"A Myth about Logical Necessity," *Analysis* 21 (1960): 59–63.

"Substance, Reality and Primary Qualities," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 2 (1965): 1–17.

"'Whatever the Consequences'," *Analysis* 26 (1965): 83–102.

"The Age and Size of the World," *Synthese* 23 (1971): 127–46.

"Shooting, Killing, Dying," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 2 (1973): 315–23.

"The Conscience of Huckleberry Finn," *Philosophy* 49 (1974): 123–34.

"Philosophy and Mr Stoppard," *Philosophy* 50 (1975): 5–18.

"Morality and Consequences," in *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, vol. 2, ed. S. McMurrin (Salt Lake City, Utah, 1981), pp. 49–116.

"Counterfactuals and Temporal Direction," *Philosophical Review* 93 (1984): 57–91.

"Thoughtful Brutes," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Association* 62 (September 1988): 197–210.

"Farewell to the Phlogiston Theory of Conditionals," *Mind* 97 (1988): 509–27.

"Truth and Stability in Descartes's *Meditations*," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy Supplementary Volume* 16 (1990): 75–108.

"Negation and Abstention: Two Theories of Allowing," *Ethics* 104 (1993): 75–96.

"Descartes's Theory of Modality," *Philosophical Review* 103 (1994): 639–67.

"Classifying Conditionals: The Traditional Way is Right," *Mind* 104 (1995): 331–54.

"Conditionals and Explanations," in *Fact and Value: Essays on Ethics and Metaphysics for Judith Jarvis Thomson*, ed. A. Byrne, R. Stalnaker, and R. Wedgwood (Cambridge, Mass., 2001), pp. 1–28.

Further Reading

Oxford Comp Phil, Pres Addr of APA v9

Buchanan, Cathy L. *Jonathan Bennett on Language and Belief*. PhD dissertation, University of Chicago (Chicago, 1983).

Cover, J.A., and Mark Kulstad, eds. *Central Themes in Early Modern Philosophy: Essays Presented to Jonathan Bennett* (Indianapolis, 1990).

Scheffler, Samuel. "Deontology and the Agent: A Reply to Jonathan Bennett," *Ethics* 100 (1989): 67–76.

Thomson, Judith J. "Bennett's 'The Act Itself'," *Noûs* 30 (1996): 545–57.

Wood, Allen W. "Kant's Dialectic," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 5 (1975): 595–614.

Samuel S. Levey

BENTLEY, Arthur Fisher (1870–1957)

Arthur Bentley was born on 16 October 1870 in Freeport, Illinois. He briefly attended York College and the University of Denver before going to Johns Hopkins University, where he earned his BA in 1892 and a PhD in sociology in 1895. He also attended the universities of Berlin and Freiburg in 1893–4, hearing lectures by Georg Simmel and Wilhelm Dilthey. In 1895–6 Bentley was a lecturer in sociology at the University of Chicago, and attended a course in the theory of logic by pragmatist John DEWEY. Finding no permanent teaching position, he became a reporter and editor for the Chicago *Times-Herald* and its successor, the

Chicago *Record-Herald*. In 1911 he retired and moved to Paoli, Indiana, to pursue his research and writing. His only return to the classroom was as a visiting professor at Columbia University in 1941–2. Bentley died on 21 May 1957 in Paoli, Indiana.

Bentley's interests ranged across the history of agrarian economics; the sociology of politics, government, and industry; the philosophy of science; logic; and linguistics. *The Process of Government* (1908) was a pioneering work in political science that received close attention when reprinted after World War II. In *Relativity in Man and Society* (1926) Bentley applied Albert EINSTEIN's general theory of relativity to sociology, urging that social events and behaviors should not be abstracted from their temporal and spatial context. He espoused the logicist doctrine of Bertrand Russell and A. N. WHITEHEAD's *Principia Mathematica*, but in "The Linguistic Structure of Mathematical Consistency" (1931) he gave an erroneous proof of the denumerability of the real numbers, which is false. In *The Linguistic Analysis of Mathematics* (1932) he argued against the logistic thesis that mathematics is reducible to logic or can provide a foundation for mathematics. Instead, he explained how mathematics and its foundations are to be understood within a linguistic context, and undertook an analysis of the connection between ordinary language and systems of symbols and notations. He also discussed the mathematical sciences within the context of language, semantics, and semiotics.

In *Behavior, Knowledge, Fact* (1935) Bentley urged an empirical, observational approach to the study of human behavior, in order that sociology can become a fully fledged science to which the scientific method could legitimately be applied. In the 1930s he began a correspondence with Dewey, and they realized the large extent of their common interests and shared pragmatic views. Bentley collaborated with Dewey during the 1940s on a series of articles about the pragmatic theory of inquiry, knowledge, and science which were later collected in their *Knowing and the Known* (1949). Together they developed the philosophy of transactionalism, which reinterprets traditional philosophical dichotomies, such as mind and body or fact and value, as mutually dependent factors within some greater encompassing whole. Applying that theory to persons, they viewed individuals in terms of their social relationships, as a fluctuating part of a group, or community, having shared interests, values, and conceptions of their social and political environment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Condition of the Western Farmer as Illustrated by the Economic History of a Nebraska Township (Baltimore, Md., 1893).

The Process of Government: A Study of Social Processes (Bloomington, Ind., 1908; Cambridge, Mass., 1949).

Relativity in Man and Society (New York, 1926).

The Linguistic Analysis of Mathematics (Bloomington, Ind., 1932).

Behavior, Knowledge, Fact (Bloomington, Ind., 1935).

Knowing and the Known, with John Dewey (Boston, 1949).

Inquiry into Inquiries: Essays in Social Theory, ed. Sidney Ratner (Boston, 1954).

Makers, Users, and Masters, ed. Sidney Ratner (Syracuse, N.Y., 1969).

Other Relevant Works

Bentley's papers are at Indiana University.

"The Units of Investigation in the Social Sciences," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 5* (1895): 915–41.

"The Linguistic Structure of Mathematical Consistency," *Psyche* 12 (1931): 78–91.

John Dewey and Arthur F. Bentley: A Philosophical Correspondence, 1932–1951, ed. Sidney Ratner (New Brunswick, N.J., 1964).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*,

Dict Amer Bio, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*

Black, Max. "Note on Mr. Bentley's Alleged Refutation of Cantor," *Psyche* 12 (1931): 77–9.

Kress, Paul F. *Social Science and the Idea of Progress: The Ambiguous Legacy of Arthur F. Bentley* (Urbana, Ill., 1970).

Ratner, Sidney. "Arthur F. Bentley, 1870–1957," *Journal of Philosophy* 55 (1958): 573–8.

Ryan, Frank X. "The 'Extreme Heresy' of John Dewey and Arthur F. Bentley," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 33 (1997): 774–94, 1003–23.

Taylor, Richard W., ed. *Life, Language, Law: Essays in Honor of Arthur F. Bentley* (Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1957).

Ward, James F. *Language, Form, and Inquiry: Arthur F. Bentley's Philosophy of Social Science* (Amherst, Mass., 1984).

Irving H. Anellis
John Shook

BERENSON, Bernard (1865–1959)

Bernard Berenson was born Bernhard Valvrojenski in Butremancz, Lithuania, on 26 June 1865, and died in Settignano, Italy, on 6 October 1959. Berenson attended Boston's Latin School and studied Greek, Latin, Sanskrit, Hebrew, and German languages at Harvard University after his family immigrated to the United States in 1875. By 1886 he was editor of *The Harvard Monthly*, founded by George SANTAYANA. He received his BA from Harvard in 1887. Although not technically an art historian, his 1887–90 visit to Europe inspired him to live in Italy studying Italian art, helping him to become a connoisseur of the subject. In 1907 Berenson and his wife Mary purchased the Villa I Tatti in Settignano, near Florence.

In his book *The Florentine Painters of the Renaissance*, Berenson applied psychology to aesthetics by suggesting that great painters should be able to visually stimulate the tactile imagination, allowing the viewer to imagine and to experience physiologically volume, weight, and surface texture, as well as movement and space – what he called "tactile values" in art. This idea had already been formulated in Adolf von Hildebrand's 1893 *Das Problem der Form in der bildenden Kunst* and other German writers on "empathy theory" beginning with Robert Vischer's work in 1873, and in the work of Berenson's teacher from 1884 to 1887, William JAMES (*Principles of Psychology*, 1890). Berenson also embraced Friedrich Nietzsche's idea of those things that are "life enhancing" and Arthur Schopenhauer's notion of the oneness of viewer and art during the aesthetic experience.

Berenson's methods, which went beyond Giorgio Vasari's biographical and uncomplicated progression of Italian artistic achievement, were formalism and connoisseurship (attributing paintings to certain artists through measurable form and structure – particularly in details of the painting such as ears, drapery, landscape, etc. – based on the method of Giovanni Morelli and stylistic/quality issues based on the ideas of Walter Pater). These methods were unusual at the time in that Berenson concentrated on the values within the works of art themselves rather than their content. His formalistic approach influenced such later critics as Clive Bell (his concept of "Significant Form") and Roger Fry, as well as the modern art he professed to disdain. In his later career (from 1910) Berenson revised many of his earlier works and published memoirs and diaries. Scholars now look upon his written works on drawing to have best withstood the test of time, although many art historians and critics still refer to his term of "tactile values" in art. For the most part, however, his thought remains grounded in the work of late nineteenth-century German philosophy and William James. Berenson's Villa I Tatti, along with its collections and libraries, was donated to

Harvard University and now serves as the Center for Italian Renaissance Studies – a fitting legacy to Berenson's idea that art exert a humanizing influence upon society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Venetian Painters of the Renaissance (New York, 1894; rev. edn 1895, 1897).

Lorenzo Lotto: An Essay in Constructive Art Criticism (New York, 1895; rev. edn 1901; rev. edn London, 1956).

The Florentine Painters of the Renaissance (New York, 1896; rev. edn 1900; 1909).

The Central Italian Painters of the Renaissance (New York, 1897; rev. edn 1909).

Study and Criticism of Italian Art (1st series New York, 1901; 2nd series 1902; 3rd series 1916).

The Drawings of the Florentine Painters (London, 1903; rev. edn Chicago, 1938).

North Italian Painters of the Renaissance (New York, 1907).

A Sienese Painter of the Franciscan Legend (London, 1909).

Sketch for a Self-Portrait (London, 1919).

Three Essays in Method (Oxford, 1926).

The Italian Painters of the Renaissance (Oxford, 1930; rev. edn London, 1952).

Italian Pictures of the Renaissance (Oxford, 1932; rev. edn London, 1957–68).

Aesthetics and History in the Visual Arts (New York, 1948).

Other Relevant Works

The Berenson Archive: An Inventory of Correspondence, ed. Nicky Mariano (Florence, 1965).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v48*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*

Calo, Mary Ann. *Bernard Berenson and the Twentieth Century* (Philadelphia, 1994).

Mostyn-Owen, William. *Bibliografia di Bernard Berenson* (Milan, 1955).

Samuels, Ernest. *Bernard Berenson: The Making of a Connoisseur* (Cambridge, Mass., 1979).

———, *Bernard Berenson: The Making of a Legend* (Boston, 1987).

Shelley Wood Cordulack

BERGER, Peter Ludwig (1929–)

Peter Berger was born on 17 March 1929 in Vienna, Austria. He immigrated to the United States at the age of seventeen, and earned his BA from Wagner College in 1949. He then studied sociology at the New School for Social Research, receiving the MA in 1950 and PhD in 1954. He spent one year as a student at the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia before deciding that, though he was fully committed to the Christian message, he could not preach this message in its conventional form. Berger then taught sociology at the Women's College of the University of North Carolina (1956–8), was associate professor of social ethics at Hartford Theological Seminary (1958–63), and then professor of sociology at the New School for Social Research. In the 1970s he taught at Rutgers University and Boston College. In 1981 he went to Boston University to become professor of sociology and theology. In 2002 Berger became professor emeritus, continuing to occasionally teach and remaining as Director of the Institute for the Study of Economic Culture and Director of the Institute for Religion and World Affairs at Boston.

Berger's numerous publications cover a wide range of academic areas, including sociological theory, the sociology of knowledge, the sociology of religion, Third World development, and liberal theology. Berger embraced sociology as a tool for personal liberation. The central message of his *Invitation to Sociology* (1963) was that sociology can awaken us to the

profound role that society has in determining our identities and values. This thin volume has sold over a million copies, helping more than two generations of readers understand how a sociological perspective can free us from social masks and enable us to accept personal responsibility for our lives.

In 1966 Berger and Thomas LUCKMANN co-authored *The Social Construction of Reality*, one of the most widely read treatises in the sociology of knowledge. Their argument was that social processes play a pivotal role in a culture's establishment of knowledge. The sociology of knowledge was thus a modern form of philosophical relativism and cast suspicion on human claims to absolute truth. In this book, Berger identified himself with a philosophical tradition that included Karl Marx, Friedrich Nietzsche, Max Weber, and Karl Mannheim. He and Luckmann, like Marx, argued that human consciousness is determined by our social being. And, like Nietzsche, they demonstrated how the "art of mistrust" concerning claims to absolute or transcendental truth can lead to liberation and personal authenticity. It was, however, from Mannheim and Weber that they gleaned a somewhat utopian hope that the sociology of knowledge might enable us to minimize ideologizing influences and thereby inch closer to more reliable and universal forms of knowledge.

Berger then applied the sociology of knowledge to the field of religion in *The Sacred Canopy* (1967). Though this work was written in an abstract and jargon-ridden way, it nonetheless became one of the most important books ever published in the sociology of religion. Berger concentrated almost entirely on religious thought or doctrine, defining religion as "the human enterprise by which a sacred cosmos is established" (1967, p. 25). By this he meant that societies invent religious beliefs as a way of bestowing authority upon their customs, morals, and socioeconomic structures. Basic to his argument was the assumption that religion is human-made, a projection of our own hopes, needs, and desires.

The implication was that religious doctrines do not really contain information about God but are instead the product of humanity's speculative efforts to understand and explain the universe. A further implication was that sociology is itself a component of secularization. That is, by exposing religion as a human projection grounded in specific social settings, sociology was furthering the gradual decline of religion's influence in Western culture. Yet, in the second appendix to this book, Berger voiced his own personal (as opposed to professional) opinion that the sociological perspective does not necessarily have the last word. He countered that it is possible that humans project sacred meanings on to the world because the world really is sacred. Even though sociology is a valuable tool for understanding how social processes give specific shape to our religious beliefs, sociology has nothing to say about the possibility that there really is a transcendent reality toward which our religious beliefs point.

Berger spent much of the 1970s examining the process of modernization in Third World countries and related theoretical debates concerning the connections between economics and democracy (1975, 1977). His overarching interest, however, remained that of the possibility of meaningful religious thought in the modern world. On the one hand, Berger began his life as a staunch theological conservative, influenced by the writings of theologian Karl Barth. Yet, as his career progressed, Berger moved to a decidedly liberal theological viewpoint. He saw in the writings of the classic liberal Protestant theologian, Friedrich Schleiermacher, a model for locating the core of religion in experience rather than doctrine. First in *A Rumor of Angels* (1969) and then in *The Heretical Imperative* (1979), Berger offered one of the most lucid theological strategies of the late twentieth century. In these works Berger sought to demonstrate the superficiality of modern secular thought as well as the intellectual dishonesty of conservative religion's claim to absolute truth. In their place he proposed a liberal theological perspective grounded in

humanity's experiences of a superhuman, supernatural reality. Religious thinking should proceed inductively, based upon empirical accounts of human "consciousness of something beyond itself" rather than deductively from scripture. Berger maintained that "religious truth has nothing to fear from reason … [and that] truth will reassert itself again and again no matter how many sobering questions are addressed to it" (1979, p. 86). He conceded that an empirical approach to religious thought cannot yield absolute truths. He claimed it could, however, establish the empirical fact that humans have recurring experiences of something beyond themselves, and that this might be sufficient for a faith characterized by open-mindedness and toleration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Precarious Vision: A Sociologist Looks at Social Fictions and Christian Faith (Garden City, N.Y., 1961).

Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective (Garden City, N.Y., 1963).

The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge, with Thomas Luckmann (Garden City, N.Y., 1966).

The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion (Garden City, N.Y., 1967).

A Rumor of Angels: Modern Society and the Rediscovery of the Supernatural (Garden City, N.Y., 1969).

Movement and Revolution, with Richard J. Neuhaus (Garden City, N.Y., 1970).

The Homeless Mind: Modernization and Consciousness, with Brigitte Berger and Hansfried Kellner (New York, 1973).

Facing up to Modernity: Excursions in Society, Politics, and Religion (New York, 1977).

The Heretical Imperative: Contemporary Possibilities of Religious Affirmation (Garden City, N.Y., 1979).

The Other Side of God: A Polarity in World Religions (Garden City, N.Y., 1981).

A Far Glory: The Quest For Faith in an Age of Credulity (New York, 1992).

Questions of Faith: A Skeptical Affirmation of Christianity (Oxford, 2003).

Other Relevant Works

The Noise of Solemn Assemblies: Christian Commitment and the Religious Establishment in America (Garden City, N.Y., 1961).

Ed., *Marxism and Sociology: Views from Eastern Europe* (New York, 1969).

Pyramids of Sacrifice: Political Ethics and Social Change (Garden City, N.Y., 1975).

Ed. with Richard J. Neuhaus, *Against the World for the World: The Hartford Appeal and the Future of American Religion* (New York, 1976).

"From Secularity to World Religions: How My Mind Has Changed," *Christian Century* 97 (1980): 41–5.

Sociology Reinterpreted: An Essay on Method and Vocation, with Hansfried Kellner (Garden City, N.Y., 1981).

The War over the Family: Capturing the Middle Ground, with Brigitte Berger (Garden City, N.Y., 1983).

The Capitalist Revolution: Fifty Propositions About Prosperity, Equality, and Liberty (New York, 1986).

Redeeming Laughter: The Comic Dimension of Human Experience (New York, 1997).

Ed., *The Desecularization of the World: Resurgent Religion and World Politics* (Washington, D.C., 1999).

Ed. with Samuel P. Huntington, *Many Globalizations: Cultural Diversity in the Contemporary World* (Oxford, 2002).

Further Reading

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio

Ahern, Annette. *Berger's Dual-citizenship Approach to Religion* (New York, 1999).

Hunter, James D., and Stephen C. Ainlay. *Making Sense of Modern Times: Peter L. Berger and the Vision of Interpretive Sociology* (London and New York, 1986).

Woodhead, Linda, Paul Heelas, and David Martin. *Peter Berger and the Study of Religion* (London and New York, 2001).

Wuthnow, Robert. *Cultural Analysis: The Work of Peter L. Berger, Mary Douglas, Michel Foucault, and Jürgen Habermas* (London, 1984).

Robert C. Fuller

BERGMANN, Gustav (1906–87)

Gustav Bergmann was born on 4 May 1906 in Vienna, Austria. Before going to the university, he attended the same gymnasium as Kurt GÖDEL, with whom he maintained a friendly contact. He attended the University of Vienna, where he studied mathematics and minored in philosophy, working in geometry with Hans Hahn, a member of the Vienna Circle. Through his membership of the Vienna Circle he was especially influenced by GÖDEL, by Moritz Schlick, Friedrich Waismann, and Rudolf CARNAP. He wrote his doctoral thesis under Hahn's direction on the axiomatics of geometry, which subsequently appeared as his first publication, "Zur Axiomatik der Elementargeometrie" in the *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik*. When Bergmann received his PhD in mathematics from Vienna in 1928 at age twenty-two, he was the youngest doctor produced at the university until that time. His most important recollection of his classes was of Hahn telling students that "When you know how a proof goes, you know nothing; when you know why it goes this way rather than that way or some other way, then you know something."

Bergmann taught mathematics at the Neubau *Realschule* in Vienna for an academic year, and then moved to Berlin to join his former professor Walther Mayer, as one of Albert EINSTEIN's assistants. In 1935 he obtained a JD degree from the University of Vienna and then worked as a corporate lawyer in Vienna. As a Jew, with little opportunity to obtain an academic post, especially following the *Anschluss* or annexation of Austria by Germany, Bergmann was obliged to leave Austria, arriving in the United States in October 1938. Soon after his arrival in America, Bergmann was invited to lunch with Gödel, who asked him, "And what brings you to America, Herr Bergmann?" Bergmann also recalled that, ironically, during World War II he was obliged, as a native of an enemy country, to register his ham radio and to report to the local police station every evening. In 1939 he arrived at the University of Iowa, to serve as an assistant to psychologist Kurt Lewin. In 1940 he joined Iowa's philosophy department, and added an appointment to the psychology department in 1943. He became a patron of the arts, donating financially to the Iowa City music scene. Bergmann spent the remainder of his career at the University of Iowa, as professor with a dual appointment in the departments of philosophy and psychology. He was President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1967–8. He retired in 1974, and died on 21 April 1987 in Iowa City, Iowa.

Even before leaving Vienna, Bergmann began developing his "metaphysics of logical positivism," arguing in favor of the ontological commitment behind, and reflected by, the syntax of one's ideal language. The "metaphysics of logical positivism" is philosophizing in an ideal language about what there is. Logic without ontology is merely a calculus (1964, p. 151), whereas "Interpretation makes a calculus into an artificial language." (p. 67) Logical positivists such as Carnap, he held, bring metaphysics in "through the semantical back door" in an implicit ontology (1967, p. 68); whether they knew it or not, they "were all either metaphysical materialists or phenomenalists" (pp. ix, 194).

In *Realism: A Critique of Brentano and Meinong* (1967), Bergmann offered a critique of Austrian realism and used it as a foil to develop his own realistic position, which exploits the syntax of the logic of A. N.

WHITEHEAD and Bertrand Russell's *Principia Mathematica*, in which a higher-order logic built upon set theory with ramified types provides the syntax and logical form for his realist ontology. Victor Kraft explained that "An ontological grounding of logic makes logic unconditionally usable." Entities in Bergmann's world are analyzed as natured particulars, each consisting of a bare particular, a *principium individuationis*, which Bergmann erroneously equated with Aquinas's *materia signata*, but which in fact is akin to Aquinas's *materia prima*, and a collection of universals, or properties. Thus, the constituents of an entity such as a red circle would consist of a bare particular, Redness, and Roundness, with Redness and Roundness bound to the bare particular by an inhomogeneous nexus, called Exemplification, also a universal, with one instantiation of Exemplification to tie each of the other properties to the bare particular. Exemplification is inhomogeneous because, although it is, like Redness and Roundness, a universal, it is not a character of natured particulars. Exemplification may also tie elements (quasi-constituents) of a set to a collective. If Tom, Dick, and Harry are denoted by T, D, H, and the predicate "Man" by M, then $M = \{T, D, H\}$; but M does not consequently become an individual of the same type as T, D, or H, since M is a higher-level type than T, D, and H. "A collection of entities," Bergmann often reiterated, "is not itself an entity." With Exemplification, then, one obtains a complex or natured particular; without it, merely a "cluster."

In opposition to his brand of realism, Bergmann posed Nelson GOODMAN's nominalism as found in *The Structure of Appearance* and its underlying Calculus of Individuals devised by Goodman and W. V. QUINE as a counter-foil. One serious difficulty with Bergmann's analysis, pointed out by Moltke S. Gram, which he failed to solve, is that Exemplification yields a Bradleyan regress, since, as a universal, it in turn requires a nexus to be bound to a bare particular. Yet it was pre-cisely this relational regress that Bergmann found in Goodman's system, in which particulars were to be tied to particulars by "nextness" or overlapping, on the basis upon which he defended his realism.

Because the form of Bergmann's world has ontological status (1964, p. 56), a ramified theory of types is required. The metalanguage M of a language S is interpreted, and therefore Bergmann disagreed with Ludwig Wittgenstein that "logical form is nothing," holding, on the contrary, that "a metalanguage is always interpreted" (p. 254). Natured particulars are individuals, universals that comprise the properties of natured particulars are first-order. The properties or "pseudocharacters" of the metalanguage include Existence, Generality, Particularity, etc.; these are also predicates, being higher-order properties of natured particulars and syncategorematic, while character properties, such as Redness and Roundness are categorematic. Pseudocharacters are second-order predicates, properties of properties, or sets, taken as entities (individuals) in their own right; syncategories include also logical connectives; Generality and Particularity are third-level types; Existence is a fourth-level type.

In addition to developing in detail his metaphysics of logical positivism, Bergmann contributed to philosophy of logic, and to philosophy of psychology and philosophy of mind. He argued in favor of a realism, comprised of a dualism of mind and matter, neither reducible to the other, in which mental acts are intentions that pertain to the external manipulation of matter. Bergmann was influenced by the phenomenalism of Austrian realists Franz Brentano and Alexius Meinong, and the phenomenology of Edmund Husserl.

In his *Philosophy of Science* (1957), in which Bergmann dealt particularly with philosophy of physics and probability theory, he remained close to the original conception of science as presented by the logical positivists. In dealing with intentionality, Bergmann was closer to Husserl insofar as he held that mental acts involved a "fringe" and a "core" in which there

was a representation of the objects perceived by the mind, the latter being a temporal sequence of perceptions of properties (e.g., Redness, Roundness), thought, desire, and that these mental objects are obtained by *acquaintance*, that is, as experienced objects. The mental objects have the same ontological status, then, as experienced entities. Through his theory of acquaintance, Bergmann was also close to the behaviorists, especially B. F. Skinner, insofar as he held that behavior can best be studied by observation and explained in terms of the stimulus–response mechanism.

Bergmann's work fostered an active "school" of metaphysicians of logical positivism, centered around the University of Iowa, but one which had little influence outside the Midwest. Its chief propagator was Elmer David Klemke, who edited anthologies of writings on the philosophies of Frege, Russell, and Bergmann, helping to bring the work of members of the Bergmannian school to wider national and international attention.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Metaphysics of Logical Positivism (New York, 1954; 2nd edn, Madison, Wisc., 1967; 3rd edn, Westport, Conn., 1978).

Philosophy of Science (Madison, Wisc., 1957; 2nd edn, Westport, Conn., 1977).

Logic and Reality (Madison, Wisc., 1964).

Realism: A Critique of Brentano and Meinong (Madison, Wisc., 1967).

Meaning and Existence (Madison, Wisc., 1968).

New Foundations of Ontology, ed. William Heald (Madison, Wisc., 1992).

Other Relevant Works

"Zur Axiomatik der Elementargeometrie," *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik* 36 (1929): 269–84.

"Syntactical Analysis of the Class Calculus," *Philosophy of Science* 9 (1942): 227–32.

"Pure Semantics, Sentences, and Propositions," *Mind* 53 (1944): 238–57.

"Undefined Descriptive Predicates," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 8 (1947): 55–82.

"Logical Positivism," in *A History of Philosophical Systems*, ed. Vergilius Ferm (New York, 1950), pp. 471–82.

"Semantics," in *A History of Philosophical Systems*, ed. Vergilius Ferm (New York, 1950), pp. 483–92.

"The Logic of Quanta," in *Readings in the Philosophy of Science*, ed. Herbert Feigl and May Brodbeck (New York, 1953), pp. 475–508.

"Propositional Functions," *Analysis* 17 (1956): 43–8.

"Diversity," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 41 (1968): 21–34.

"Two Criteria for an Ideal Language," in *The Linguistic Turn: Recent Essays in Philosophical Method*, ed. Richard Rorty (Chicago, 1970), pp. 132–4.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v7*, *Proc of APA v61*

Addis, Laird. "The Philosophy of Gustav Bergmann," *Algemeen Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Wijsbegeerte* 63 (1971): 78–98.

Baker, Robert. "Alice, Bergmann, and the Mad Hatter," *Review of Metaphysics* 24 (1971): 707–36.

Carnap, Rudolf. "Hall and Bergmann on Semantics," *Mind* 54 (1945): 148–55.

Geels, Donald. "Wolterstorff on Bergmann's *Principium Individuum*," *Philosophical Studies* 24 (1973): 257–8.

Gram, Moltke S., and Elmer D. Klemke, eds. *The Ontological Turn: Studies in the Philosophy of Gustav Bergmann* (Iowa City, Iowa, 1974).

Körner, Stephen, "On Bergmann's Ontology," *Philosophy of Science* 35 (1968): 64–71.

Peterson, John. "Bergmann's Hidden Essences," *Review of Metaphysics* 22 (1969): 660–75.

———, "Bergmann's Realism Revisited," *Review of Metaphysics* 25 (1972): 326–36.

Wolterstorff, Nicholas. "Bergmann's Constituent Ontology," *Noûs* 4 (1970): 109–34.

Irving H. Anellis

BERKSON, Isaac Baer (1891–1975)

Isaac Berkson was born on 23 December 1891 in New York City, and died there on 10 March 1975. His main interests were in Jewish philosophy and education. He received his BA from City College of New York in 1912. He then studied with John DEWEY and William H. KILPATRICK, earning a PhD from Teachers College at Columbia University in 1919. His dissertation was published a year later as *Theories of Americanization*.

Berkson began his teaching career at the Central Jewish Institute in New York City in 1911, becoming its Director in 1917. From 1918 to 1927 he worked for the city's Bureau of Jewish Education supervising Jewish schools and extension programs. He taught education courses at the Graduate School for Jewish Social Work, and for a short time at the Jewish Institute of Religion, but left in 1928 to survey schools in Palestine under the auspices of the Jewish Agency. He remained in Palestine until 1935 as superintendent of the Jewish school system.

Beginning in 1938 Berkson lectured on the philosophy of education at the City University of New York and in 1955 was promoted to professor, holding that position until retiring in 1961. By that time, in addition to *Theories of Americanization*, his influential work on cultural pluralism, Berkson had also written *Preface to an Educational Philosophy* (1940) and *Education Faces the Future* (1943). Berkson also taught at Dropsie College

(1945–53) and New York University (1945–9). In 1958 his book *Ideal and the Community* showed that although Berkson was a follower of Dewey's ideas on democracy, cultural pluralism, and progressive education, he had combined the values and ideals of his own Jewish heritage with his mentor's teachings. Rejecting the "melting pot" concept as a form of assimilation, as well as Horace KALLEN's "democracy of nationalities" with its "undue exaltation" (1920, pp. 162–3) of ethnic culture as dangerously isolating, Berkson favored "community theory." He maintained that "cultural groups" can live interspersed with others, engaging in economic, political, and social life as American citizens, while continuing to maintain their particular cultural heritage, mostly through education in the family and the school.

Berkson fiercely opposed parochial schooling of the Catholic mode, but the Jewish afternoon school, as supplement to the public school, he said, was essential to the preservation of a unique culture and ought to be the central agency around which the ethnic group builds its life. In this context, Berkson saw ethnic survival – in this case, Jewish cultural-religious reconstruction and revival – as fully harmonious with Americanization. Indeed, such "double allegiance," he said, "is greater than twice a single allegiance" (1920, p. 120), since knowledge of an additional language and culture makes people more richly complex and prevents the chauvinism which threatens American liberalism and democracy.

One finds democracy, Berkson argued, "where there is a progressive consideration of uniqueness, a multiplicity of diverse possibilities [and] a growing consciousness of man's interdependence" (1920, p. 39). Despite his optimism, Berkson admitted that Dewey's philosophy, even salted with Jewish ideals, would not by itself be able to generate sufficient cultural power to sustain the Jewish group. To support his community theory, then, he also invoked the teachings of Ahad Ha'am

who emphasized Hebrew culture and language as "eternally" part of the Jewish people and who saw Palestine as a spiritual center which would help replenish the spirit of Jewishness in mobile America.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Theories of Americanization: A Critical Study (New York, 1920).

The Zionist School System (Jerusalem, 1930).

Preface to an Educational Philosophy (New York, 1940).

Education Faces the Future: An Appraisal of Contemporary Movements in Education (New York, 1943).

The Ideal and the Community: A Philosophy of Education (New York, 1958).

Ethics, Politics, and Education (Eugene, Oregon, 1968).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio

Goren, Aryeh. "I. B. Berkson," New York Public Library, Oral Histories, Box 6, no. 4, 1965.

Goren, Arthur. *New York Jews and the Quest for Community* (New York, 1970).

Skirball, Henry F. *Isaac Baer Berkson and Jewish Education*. PhD dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College (New York, 1977).

Gerald Sorin

BERLEANT, Arnold Jerome (1932–)

Arnold Berleant was born on 4 March 1932 in Buffalo, New York. Although known primarily as an aesthetician, Arnold Berleant pursued a wide range of interests and became an accomplished musician and composer as well as a philosopher. His first degrees were a BM from Eastman School of Music in 1953 and an MA from Eastman in 1955, with a thesis on "The Fugue in the Orchestral Works of Bartok." For his doctoral work Berleant turned to philosophy and was awarded the PhD in 1962 by the State University of New York at Buffalo with a dissertation on "Logic and Social Doctrine: Dewey's Methodological Approach to Social Philosophy." He was professor of philosophy at the C. W. Post Campus of Long Island University from 1962 until his retirement in 1992. Over the years he has managed to combine a distinguished career as a teacher, lecturer, and writer in philosophy with a parallel career as a composer and performer. He has also been an officer in a variety of international organizations devoted to the study of both theoretical and applied aesthetics, especially groups concerned with environmental issues.

Given the dual focus of his career and his interest in social and environmental philosophy, it is no accident that among the key concepts of his aesthetic theory are "experience" and "engagement," or that he considers "performance" one of the four fundamental factors of the aesthetic field. This general outlook goes hand in hand with a conviction that aesthetic theory must always be conceived in relation to ethics, metaphysics, and political philosophy as well as in relation to the specific practices and experiences of the various arts. Although many philosophers of art and aesthetics try to draw examples from literature and music as well as painting and sculpture, Berleant also gives an important place to dance, film, architecture, and environment. This breadth of outlook is partly a function of Berleant's belief that aesthetic experience is not simply a way of approaching the traditional fine arts, but a dimension of all experience. As a result, Berleant did not follow mainstream analytic philosophy of art during the 1970s and 1980s in its preoccupation with issues surrounding

the definition of art, but pursued a descriptive approach to aesthetic experience itself.

This focus on aesthetic experience was a natural outgrowth of his work on John DEWEY, and Berleant's mature aesthetic theory is clearly in the Deweyan tradition. The subtitle of his first book, *The Aesthetic Field: A Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience* (1970), seems to suggest that existential phenomenology is his primary methodological commitment. Yet the phenomenology Berleant pursues is not the specific eidetic method developed by Edmund Husserl with its peculiar idealist baggage, but a robust empiricism that interprets Husserl's slogan "to the things themselves" in a thoroughly American (and pragmatist) sense. The central theme of *The Aesthetic Field* is the need to base aesthetic theory on a careful description of aesthetic experience rather than try to mold experience according to some "surrogate" model drawn from other modes of knowledge or practice.

Like most theorists of art and the aesthetic, whether analytic or phenomenological, Berleant takes our everyday practice of distinguishing among various areas of experience – social, religious, technical, artistic – as his primary data. Rather than launch immediately into a description of the distinctive characteristics of aesthetic experience, he first offers a sustained critique of traditional theories of art. Each of those theories, whether imitation, expression, communication, form, etc., tends to make a limited feature of experience a surrogate for the richness and complexity of actual aesthetic experience. Berleant seeks to assure the adequacy of his description by starting with the structure of the aesthetic field, the total situation in which experiences of art actually occur. The aesthetic field is made up of the object, the aesthetic perceiver, the artist, and the performer.

Two things are striking about Berleant's detailed account of the aesthetic field. First, his description of the object already includes the role of both the perceiver, who experiences it, and of the artist, who is herself also a per-

ceiver. Berleant depicts the aesthetic field from the beginning as a structure always in movement, a field of dynamic interaction among its four aspects. The second notable characteristic of Berleant's description of the aesthetic is his way of placing the performer on an equal footing with the artist/creator and with the work of art itself. This is not simply a prejudice arising out of his own experience as a composer and performer, but a carefully argued stance in favor of the active role of the perceiver along with the observation that the artist in any medium is at the same time both a performer and a perceiver as well as a creator. Berleant's description of the aesthetic field as a lively transaction among these four elements is a key to understanding both his critique of the mainstream tradition that views the aesthetic as the disinterested contemplation of an autonomous art object, and his counter-position in favor of an aesthetics of engagement and participation.

Berleant devotes the larger part of *The Aesthetic Field* to a description of the characteristics of the aesthetic transaction that knits together the four factors. One will look in vain, however, for a traditional definition of the aesthetic in terms of some property or attribute. The aesthetic is not a separate kind of experience but a mode, phase, or aspect of experience and requires an identification in terms of a set of coordinates; an empirical inquiry into the basic features of what people generally associate with their experience of art. Among the features Berleant comes up with – active/receptive, qualitative, sensuous, immediate, intuitive, noncognitive – his discussion of the last is perhaps the most revealing of his position: "cognition leaves behind the living directness of sensory experience" (1970, p. 119). Here Berleant sees himself in a tradition that embraces aspects of both David Hume and Immanuel Kant, but more particularly John Dewey and Maurice Merleau-Ponty, who provide him with the most telling support for turning our attention to the way that sensory or perceptual experience unites perceiver, object, artist, and performer.

The twenty years between *The Aesthetic Field* and Berleant's next book were among the most productive in his career as a composer and performer even as he continued to publish extensively in aesthetics. Some of the longer compositions include *Theodora*, an eleven-movement ballet for chamber orchestra (1979), *Thirteen Ways of Looking at a Blackbird*, songs for flute, oboe, and voice (1980), *Seven Bagatelles* for piano (1981), *Duo* for violin and viola (1982), *Prelude and Toccata* for piano (1982), and *Adagio* for solo oboe, with flute, clarinet, and strings (1983). Berleant's many articles on aesthetics and ethics during this period explored issues opened up in *The Aesthetic Field* and applied its insights to particular areas of the arts. In a series of essays revisiting the history of aesthetics, Berleant argued ever more forcefully against what he saw and still sees as the fundamental error of traditional aesthetics – the disengaged and distanced spectator, a construct rooted in the more general dualism of subject and object that has plagued Western philosophy. In contrast to this impoverished picture of actual aesthetic experience, Berleant continued to develop his case for an aesthetics of participation. But his most important new work during this period also showed how the themes of the earlier book were able to illuminate problems of the emerging field of environmental aesthetics. The reflections and studies of these years were subsequently incorporated into *Art and Engagement* (1991) and *The Aesthetics of Environment* (1992).

In *Art and Engagement* Berleant argues that the most important movements in the twentieth-century arts have themselves been inviting us to turn away from the contemplative, subject-centered aesthetic of the past toward aesthetic experience as active participation and toward a view of the arts as integrated into life rather than forming a separate realm. Taking up in turn landscape painting, architecture, literature, music, dance, and film, Berleant shows how traditional aesthetics treated each as an object for observation rather than an occasion for an actively integrative experience. Architecture, for example, has too often been treated as an object of visual contemplation, whereas both psychological and phenomenological studies of spatial experience suggest a participatory, kinetic understanding of space that involves the whole body and treats buildings and their sites as total environments.

Here is one of many occasions that Berleant has even taken to task an existential phenomenologist like Merleau-Ponty, remaining too anthropocentric and still treating artworks primarily as objects, rather than as co-constituted in our experience of them. But it is the case of musical composition where Berleant is able to offer the most striking example of how different an aesthetic of engagement would look from traditional approaches. He speaks of musical generation rather than creation to underline that the composer does not stand over against his or her material as a shaper of forms, but enters into the material as a participant in a dynamic process combining intuition and auditory perception. Similarly, the performer and listener also participate in a combined intuitional and auditory perception in reconstituting and interpreting the work. Berleant suggests that music incorporates aesthetic engagement more thoroughly than any other art. He concludes this pivotal book of his career by arguing that a participatory approach can claim for aesthetics and art an equal place within the panoply of regions of experience alongside science, politics, morality, and religion.

Berleant's next two books, *The Aesthetics of Environment* and *Living in the Landscape* (1997), along with the majority of his papers and lectures since 1991, have been devoted to the theme of environmental aesthetics. Berleant was led to environmental issues by his previous emphasis on the dynamic unity of aesthetic participation. His environmental aesthetics is both a natural outgrowth of his aesthetics of engagement and an intensification of many of its most distinctive positions. The environment, for Berleant, is not an aesthetic object,

not even a surround, but an extension of our bodies and as much social and cultural as it is natural.

In order to offer an exemplification of the fusion of multilevel experiences that constitute our integration with the natural, social, and cultural environment, Berleant has experimented with a distinctive literary genre which he calls descriptive aesthetics. In a series of vignettes in *The Aesthetics of Environment* he describes various kinds of aesthetic experiences in their somatic totality – the sights, sounds, smells, textures, and the bodily feel of places, along with the sense of movement and passing time in our experience of them. Some of the places he chooses are in nature, "Paddle on the Bantam River," some in a social/cultural setting, "Stroll through a Small Town," and some combine nature and machine, "A Spring Drive in the Rain." What distinguishes Berleant's combination of narrative and evocation from other nature writing is his way of encouraging the reader's own aesthetic encounters while at the same time articulating related issues for theoretical reflection. Although most of Berleant's descriptions are drawn from the countryside and small towns, his analytic chapters give equal place to issues of urban ecology. The problem of turning the often-negative environment of our cities into a viable habitat by altering the fundamental values that drive city planning (or lack of it) leads Berleant to the useful idea of a negative aesthetics. Central to such aesthetic reflection is Berleant's concept of aesthetic harm, which consists in the various ways our profit and efficiency dominated environments impoverish sensory experience and fill our lives with banality and simulacra. As a result, Berleant argues that the aesthetic appreciation and critique of environment is at the same time a moral critique, something he illustrates with a chapter deconstructing Disneyland (1997, pp. 41–58).

For Berleant, environmental aesthetics is not primarily about the experience of pleasure or beauty in nature, but concerns our total perceptual/sensory experience of the world, an experience in which all values, political, moral, and religious, intersect. As such it is as much about sound, touch, smell, and bodily movement as it is about sight. In Berleant's conception, our bodies are no more an object than is the landscape. Environment is an extension of our bodies and our bodies of the earth. Moreover, the body in question is not that of an isolated individual, but of a member of several interlocking human communities. Berleant also conceives of human community itself in terms of an aesthetics of engagement. He believes that a participatory aesthetics of sensual perception can help us transcend the usual ethical dichotomies of the isolated rational ego versus the dominating organic community in favor of an understanding of community as a unifying experience of mutuality and reciprocity. Berleant's favored term for the series of unities that constitute the total aesthetic experience is continuity. Continuity unites not only the four aspects of aesthetic experience (perceiver, performer, artist, and object), but also more broadly, person and place, body and environment, self and community. Continuity is thus the ontological as well as epistemological heart of Berleant's vision of aesthetics. As a result, Berleant gives aesthetic experience a more exalted role in the life of both the individual and the community than almost anyone since Friedrich Schiller.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Aesthetic Field: A Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience (Springfield, Ill., 1970).

"Toward a Phenomenological Aesthetics of Environment," in *Descriptions*, ed. Hugh Silverman and Don Idhe (Albany, N.Y., 1985), pp. 112–28.

"The Historicity of Aesthetics," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 26 (1986): 101–11, 195–203.

Art and Engagement (Philadelphia, 1991).

The Aesthetics of Environment (Philadelphia, 1992).

"Aesthetics and Community," *Journal of Value Inquiry* 28 (1994): 257–72.

Living in the Landscape: Towards an Aesthetic of Environment (Lawrence, Kansas, 1997).

"Environmental Aesthetics," in *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, ed. Michael Kelly (New York, 1998), vol. 2, pp. 114–20.

"On Getting Along Beautifully: Ideas for a Social Aesthetics," in *Aesthetics in the Human Environment*, ed. Pauline von Bonsdorff and Arto Haapala (Lahti, Finland, 1999), pp. 12–29.

"Embodied Music," in *Environment and the Arts: Perspectives on Art and Environment*, ed. Arnold Berleant (New York, 2002), pp. 143–55.

Other Relevant Works

"Artists and Morality: Toward an Ethics of Art," *Leonardo: The Journal of the Contemporary Artist* 10 (1977): 195–202.

"Subsidization of Art as Social Policy," *Journal of Behavioral Economics* 7 (1979): 23–37.

"Cultivating an Urban Aesthetic," *Diogenes* 136 (1986): 1–18.

"Musical Decomposition," in *What is Music?* ed. Philip Alperson (New York, 1987), pp. 239–54.

"Aesthetic Perception in Environmental Design," in *Environmental Aesthetics: Theory, Research, and Applications*, ed. Jack Nasar (Cambridge, UK, 1988), pp. 84–97.

"Beyond Disinterestedness: Prolegomenon to a Postmodern Aesthetics," in *Primum Philosophari*, ed. Jolanta Brach-Czaina (Warsaw, 1993), pp. 199–213.

"Notes for a Phenomenology of Musical Performance," *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 7 (1999): 73–9.

Ed., *Environment and the Arts; Perspectives on Art and Environment* (Aldershot, UK, 2002).

Further Reading

Carlson, Allen. "Aesthetics and Engagement," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 33 (1993): 220–27.

Larry Shiner

BERNSTEIN, Richard Jacob (1932–)

Richard J. Bernstein was born on 14 May 1932 in New York City. He excelled in school, earning admission to the University of Chicago accelerated program for intellectually advanced high school students. An interdisciplinary course integrating science and philosophy taught by Joseph Schwab had an impact upon him, and he also met Richard RORTY there, which was the beginning of a lifelong friendship and philosophical dialogue. After completing his BA in 1951 with honors in philosophy, he attended Columbia University as a way to solidify his credentials for attending graduate school. He earned a BS in 1953 and began his graduate philosophy at Yale the following year, earning his MA in 1953 and PhD in philosophy in 1958. While at Yale, Bernstein was again in the company of Rorty, and encountered the philosopher who had the greatest influence upon him, Hegel, for the first time. It was also at this time that he began serious study of John DEWEY under professor John E. SMITH. Besides Smith, Paul WEISS and Wilfrid SELLARS were two of his main influences and interlocutors. From Weiss he learned what it meant to be a "real" philosopher, and from Sellars he learned how to combine the tools of analytic philosophy with a deep respect for, and knowledge of, the history of philosophy. The climate at Yale at the time of Bernstein's education was one that fostered a respect for the history of philosophy and had not succumbed to the trends of logical empiricism then sweeping through American

graduate programs in philosophy. The force of this powerful movement was certainly enough of a presence, however, that Bernstein's dissertation on "John Dewey's Metaphysics of Experience" can be read as bold counter-move to the fashionable tendencies and trends in Anglo-American analytic philosophy at the time. Indeed, with such figures as Rorty and Hilary PUTNAM, Bernstein is one of the figures primarily responsible for the resurgence of American pragmatism.

Bernstein considers himself primarily and most importantly a teacher. He has held three main faculty posts. After spending a year as a Fulbright Lecturer at Hebrew University and finishing his dissertation, he returned to Yale as a philosophy professor in 1959, where he remained until 1965, when he was denied tenure in a controversial decision that led to student protest. After returning to Hebrew University for one year as a visiting professor, he was hired as professor and chair of the philosophy department at Haverford College in 1966, where he became the T. Wistar Brown Professor of Philosophy in 1979. He moved to his current position as Vera List Professor of Philosophy at the New School for Social Research in 1989, which is his current position. In addition, Bernstein became Dean of the Graduate Faculty of (the renamed) New School University in 2002. In addition to that at Hebrew University, he held visiting professorships at institutions including Catholic University of America, University of Pennsylvania, and Frankfurt University. From 1977 to 1984 he also served as co-director of an institute for philosophy and social science in Dubrovnik in the former Yugoslavia.

Bernstein has been a fellow at the Institute for Advanced Study in Berlin, the Franz Rosenzweig Research Center in Jerusalem, and recipient of many fellowships including awards from National Endowment for the Humanities and the American Council of Learned Societies. Recognition for his teaching has been widespread, earning him five distinguished teaching awards, including some at a national level. Among many other awards are included the John Dewey Society Award for outstanding achievement; he was also the American Philosophical Association Romanell Lecturer, and the Phi Beta Kappa Visiting Lecturer. He was President of the Metaphysical Society of America, the Charles S. Peirce Society, and the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1988–9. His editorial positions began at Yale when he took up the assistant editorial position of the *Review of Metaphysics*, becoming managing editor in 1964, a post he held until 1971. In addition, he served as editor-in-chief of *Praxis International* (now *Constellations*) from 1980 to 1984. He has served on the editorial boards of numerous journals, including the *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, the *Journal of Value Inquiry*, and the *Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal*.

Bernstein's career includes works in social and political philosophy, hermeneutics, philosophy of natural and social science, pragmatism, continental philosophy, psychoanalysis, and a study on evil. The breadth of his writings is one of the more remarkable features of Bernstein's corpus. Outside of his book-length treatments of these topics, his work includes in-depth articles on such diverse figures as Hannah ARENDT, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Wilfrid Sellars, Charles TAYLOR, Emmanuel Levinas, Michel Foucault, Hans-Georg Gadamer, Jürgen Habermas, Richard Rorty, Jacques Derrida, Alasdair MACINTYRE, Martin Heidegger, John McDowell, and Friedrich Nietzsche. Bernstein has also written articles on the mind–body problem and scientific materialism. The engagement with such a wide range of thinkers is weighted down by a commitment to what could be called immanent reconstructive critique with an ethical purpose.

Bernstein's writing career began by recovering, analyzing, and sharply criticizing American pragmatism, specifically Dewey and Charles PEIRCE. His first book, *John Dewey* (1966), has served as a touchstone for scholars of Dewey since, and his "Introduction" to *John Dewey: On Experience Nature and Freedom* (1960) also remains a classic overview of

Dewey's thought. Bernstein's presentation of Dewey's theory of quality is important, especially as this relates to a pragmatic theory of experience and its consequences for such topics as value theory and philosophy of science. Bernstein's article "John Dewey's Metaphysics of Experience" (1961) has served as more of a lightning rod than a touchstone, as thinkers are still grappling with an unresolved dualism in Dewey's work between the metaphysics of existence and the metaphysics of experience. Bernstein argued that though Dewey did perhaps more than any other American philosopher to work out a philosophy that does justice to the richness and depth of human experience, there still remains a tension in his philosophy. This tension lay in one of his most important concepts, "quality." Dewey's use of this concept in reconstructing philosophy is a pillar of his project. Yet his attempted reconciliation of the seemingly subjective, qualitative dimensions of the phenomenological pole of experience with the real, objective "generic traits of existence" remains unconvincing, separated by a "deep crack." In addition his commentary on the deficits of Peirce's emphasis on community, as that force which ends up determining what is considered reality, is too strong. Regarding Peirce, in "Action, Conduct, and Self-Control" (in 1965) Bernstein argues that Peirce's conception of the individual as the repository of error and ignorance, of the emergence of the individual as the result of error is wrongheaded by overemphasizing the negativity of emergent individuality. While Peirce is right to emphasize the fundamental inextricability, or co-constitutive character of the community and the individual, he does not do justice to the positive dimension of the subjective side of this dialectic.

In his books during the 1970s and 1980s, Bernstein exemplifies this commitment to immanent critique. Hegel's influence is evident in these works, especially in *Praxis and Action* (1971), where the concept of action is traced from Marx in the "Hegelian background" to disputes in existentialism, pragmatism, and analytic philosophy. The influence of Hegel is also in *The Restructuring of Social and Political Theory* (1976) and *Beyond Objectivism and Relativism* (1983), in the Hegelian mode of immanent critique. Bernstein presents the positions of his chosen interlocutors to bring out tensions in their own work that they often remain blind to, resist, or overtly deny. In addition, he brings into conversation widely separated philosophical positions and schools, arguing that they share much more than their respective practitioners think, and that they differ in ways to which they are equally blind.

Praxis and Action offers what Dewey might have called the "criticism of criticisms." Bernstein's goal is the reconstruction and development of the nineteenth and twentieth-centuries' leading conceptions of praxis and action, reorganizing our contemporary reflective position in articulating a theory of action. This is done specifically in light of the fragmentation of philosophical approaches to action in the twentieth century. Bernstein's views of four different approaches to actions are critical, yet retrieve the contribution to understanding human action and the praxis of understanding human action that they make. He argues that there is a solipsism and unavoidable nihilism in Kierkegaard's and Sartre's existentialism, respectively, though they provide a rich account of human subjectivity. The pernicious forms of *a priorism* that run through analytic philosophers' theory of action that presents itself unselfconsciously as "the final solution" to all philosophical problems of action degenerates for Bernstein into ideological posturing at its worst. However, analytic philosophy also provides conceptual clarification at its best, dissolving the pseudo-scientific claims of previous theories and their faulty ontological biases. Marx provides a penetrating understanding of the socially embedded nature of human subjectivity and action, even if he neglects the main strengths that American pragmatism provides: a critical account of the norms of inquiry. Bernstein remarks that each of these strands of philosophical inquiry can be combined to enlighten and deepen the others.

The Restructuring of Social and Political Theory takes a similar approach by presenting the metatheoretical framework of four different schools of social and political theory. Here Bernstein is perhaps most explicitly critical of empirical social science and its confused commitment to a hypostatized version of the fact–value distinction. While acknowledging the work of some of the major empiricist social scientists and philosophers with regard to this thorny problem, clearly the influence of logical empiricism has left mainstream empirical social science blind to the ways in which it behaves ideologically, as opposed to dialogically. The three other schools of social and political theory – ordinary language analysis, phenomenology, and critical theory – criticize it for just this blindness. Bernstein remains staunchly committed to the irreducibly intentional aspect of describing and explaining human actions, against those who would map the methodology of natural science and its categories of observation onto human phenomena in its totality. However, he also claims that his emphasis on intentionality, so well formulated in the phenomenological tradition, is not incompatible with the critical theoretical point that the sources of our intentions are often the products of forces outside of our control and opaque to us, either internally or externally. However, Bernstein does not hold that recent critical theory, exemplified by the work of Habermas, has succeeded in providing the foundations for understanding and describing human action. Habermas's slippage into quasi-transcendental postulates with regard to our knowledge claims does not, nor could it ever, receive the full justificatory grounding it needs without falling into the kind of *a priorism* for which Bernstein criticized analytic philosophy in *Praxis and Action*.

The main argument of *Beyond Objectivism and Relativism: Science, Hermeneutics, and Praxis* concerns the convergence of themes in the investigation of rationality and the consequences of a view of rationality for questions regarding the status of our truth-claims, our intellectual practices, and our ethical commitments. The question of rationality is a main focus in hermeneutics, philosophy of natural and social science, critical theory, Rorty's neopragmatism, and Hannah Arendt's reflections on judgment. Bernstein, in a vein similar to some of the writings of Dewey, reconstructs the seemingly diametrically opposed and irreconcilable concepts of objectivism and relativism by denying the legitimacy of the terms. He casts the former as "the basic conviction that there is or must be some permanent ahistorical matrix or framework to which we can ultimately appeal in determining the nature of rationality, knowledge, truth, reality, goodness or rightness" (1983, p. 8). The objectivist insists on a notion of objectivity that would eliminate from it any trace of human subjectivity, historicity, or sociality. Bernstein takes this objectivist task to be not only impossible, but a distortion of how our concept of objectivity emerges and works. He traces the insistence on this chimerical notion of objectivity, "objectivism," to a certain reading of Descartes. He terms it the "Cartesian Anxiety," an anxiety that produces the false antinomy between an objectivity dependent for its validity on an algorithmic methodology of science and a methodological relativism that Paul FEYERABEND disingenuously characterizes under the dictum "anything goes." Relativism entails that "there can be no higher appeal than to a given conceptual scheme, language game, set of social practices, or historical epoch … there is no substantive overarching framework in which radically different and alternative schemes are commensurable" (1983, p. 12).

Bernstein explores the debate about rationality in its various guises, concluding that there are elements to all inquiry that must be taken into consideration; there are fallibilist, contextualist, practical, and normative dimensions to scientific inquiry understood as a practice making theoretical claims. Bernstein understands the practical dimension to be inflected with the Aristotelian understanding of praxis. The practice of understanding is not

merely a means to an end, but itself contains its own end. This emphasis is crucial for working out the normative character of inquiry, and making knowledge of a scientific character a communal practice that involves the norms of dialogue. His discussion of the philosophy of science of Feyerabend, Imré Lakatos, and Thomas KUHN, alongside Gadamer's hermeneutics, Habermas's theory of communicative rationality, and Arendt's implicit theory of judgment, typifies the reconstructive and dialogical pragmatism as displayed in *Praxis and Action* and *The Restructuring of Social and Political Theory*.

Bernstein's recent work has taken up themes that have traditionally been seen, rightly or wrongly, to suffer great neglect or even myopic oversight in the pragmatic tradition: religious identity and evil. The working out of the psychoanalytic dimensions of community identity as passed down through tradition serves as one of the main focal points of his work on Freud's *Moses and Monotheism*, relating it to Freud's own Jewish identity. His meditations on Hannah Arendt and Judaism exhibit sensitivity to the religious dimensions of the life of a self-proclaimed pariah. His work on religious themes, which includes a reflection on John Paul II's encyclical on the relationship between faith and reason, *Fide et Ratio*, has been widely recognized in circles outside of philosophy by theology scholars and students of religion. The ethical character of philosophy, and of all thinking, is given a grave reading in *Radical Evil* (2002). There he says, in a typically pragmatic fashion, that though evil can never be given a full conceptual articulation and that it is "inscrutable," there nonetheless remains a responsibility to grapple with the problem as best we can, to perform a kind of ongoing *ernst der begriff*: a labor of the concept of "evil." His theses for further reflection on the problem include rethinking the concept of responsibility; evil is a concept with no singular essence and exists in plural forms; evil resists total comprehension even and especially in theodicies that attempt to justify it; and the ultimate ground for choosing between good and evil is inscrutable (2002, pp. 225–35).

While Bernstein's work is committed to an engaged, and open-ended pluralism, it is a pluralism checked by norms of critical self-reflection, committed to getting improved responses regarding the fundamental questions that different theorists disagree upon through a dialogical model or rational inquiry. Bernstein's pluralism does not make the mistakes of what he refers to in his American Philosophical Association Presidential address "Pragmatism, Pluralism, and the Healing of Wounds" as flabby, polemical, or defensive pluralism. Bernstein's philosophy is pragmatic insofar as it is committed to anti-foundationalism and the self-corrective character of inquiry; an irreducibly social understanding of subjectivity; fallibilism with regard to all cognitive, practical, and moral claims; and engaged pluralism in grappling with the varied approaches to philosophical questions and what counts as a philosophical question. Bernstein is committed to a nonskeptical fallibilism with regard to moral and epistemological issues; a critical faith in democratic means and ends; methodological pluralism in intellectual practices; and a deep commitment to interdisciplinary cross-fertilization, to what he has referred to as the "universal discourse" common to intelligent reflection on fundamental questions of our human existence. To deny the connections that exist between different approaches to these questions is not just an intellectual mistake, falling prey to Popper's "myth of the framework" based on a lack of dialogical dexterity. Rather, Bernstein claims that this is primarily an ethical failure as philosophers, and as fellow human beings. We should be engaged, fallibilist pluralists in inquiry understood as a fundamentally communal, ethical, dialogical, and open-ended project.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
John Dewey (New York, 1966).
Praxis and Action (Philadelphia, 1971).
The Restructuring of Social and Political

Theory (New York, 1976).

Beyond Objectivism and Relativism: Science, Hermeneutics and Praxis (Philadelphia, 1983).

Philosophical Profiles: Essays in a Pragmatic Mode (Philadelphia, 1986).

The New Constellation: The Ethical-political Horizons of Modernity/Postmodernity (Cambridge, Mass., 1992).

Hannah Arendt and the Jewish Question (Cambridge, Mass., 1996).

Freud and the Legacy of Moses (Cambridge, UK, 1998).

Radical Evil: A Philosophical Interrogation (Cambridge, UK, 2002).

Other Relevant Works

"Knowledge, Value, and Freedom," in *John Dewey and the Experimental Spirit in Philosophy*, ed. Charles Hendel (New York, 1960).

Ed., *John Dewey: On Experience, Nature, and Freedom* (New York, 1960).

"John Dewey's Metaphysics of Experience," *Journal of Philosophy* 57 (1961): 5–14.

Ed., *Perspectives on Peirce* (New Haven, Conn., 1965).

"Philosophy in the Conversation of Mankind," *Review of Metaphysics* 33 (1980): 745–76.

Ed., *Habermas and Modernity* (Oxford, 1985).

"The Meaning of Public Life," in *Religion and American Public Life*, ed. R. W. Lovin (New York, 1986).

"Structuration as Critical Theory," *Praxis International* 6 (1986): 235–49.

"One Step Forward, Two Steps Backward: Richard Rorty on Liberal Democracy and Philosophy," *Political Theory* 15 (1987): 538–63.

"The Varieties of Pluralism," *American Journal of Education* 95 (1987): 509–25.

"Hermeneutics and Its Anxieties," *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 62 (1988): 58–70.

"Metaphysics, Critique, and Utopia," *Review of Metaphysics* 42 (1988): 255–74.

"Interpretation and Solidarity: An Interview with Richard Bernstein by Dunja Melcic," *Praxis International* 9 (1989): 201–19.

"Pragmatism, Pluralism, and the Healing of Wounds," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 63 (November 1989): 5–18.

"Social Theory as Critique," in *Social Theory of Modern Societies: Anthony Giddens and his Critics*, ed. D. Held and J. B. Thompson (Cambridge, UK, 1990).

"The Lure of the Ideal," in *Peirce and Law*, ed. Roberta Kavelson (New York, 1991).

"The Resurgence of American Pragmatism," *Social Research* 59 (1992): 813–40.

"Richard Rorty's Philosophical Papers," *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 23 (1992): 76–83.

"Hans Jonas: Rethinking Responsibility," *Social Research* 61 (1994): 833–52.

"American Pragmatism: The Conflict of Narratives," in *Rorty and Pragmatism*, ed. Herman J. Saatkamp, Jr. (Nashville, Tenn., 1995), pp. 54–67.

"Whatever Happened to Naturalism?" *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 69 (November 1995): 57–76.

"Are We Beyond the Enlightenment Horizon?" in *Knowledge and Belief in America*, ed. W. M. Shea and P. A. Huff (Cambridge, 1995).

"The Retrieval of the Democratic Ethos," *Cardoza Law Review* 17 (1996): 1127–46.

"Community in the Pragmatic Tradition," in *The Revival of Pragmatism: New Essays on Social Thought, Law, and Culture*, ed. Morris Dickstein (Durham, N.C., 1998), pp. 141–56.

"Faire la part de ce qui sépare Rorty et Habermas et se situer dans l'entre-deux," in *La Modernité en Question: De Rorty à Jürgen Habermas*, ed. Françoise Gaillard, Jacques Poulain, and Richard Schusterman (Paris, 1998).

"Faith and Reason: Response to Pope John Paul II's encyclical letter, *Fides et Ratio*," *Books and Culture: A Christian Review* (July–August 1999).

"Creative Democracy – The Task Still Before Us," *American Journal of Theology and Philosophy* 21 (2000): 215–28.

"Religion and Public Life: Engaged Pluralism," *Modern Schoolman* 78 (2001): 189–98.

"The Constellation of Hermeneutics, Critical Theory, and Deconstruction," in *The Cambridge Companion to Gadamer*, ed. R. J. Dostal (Cambridge, UK, 2002).

"McDowell's Domesticated Hegelianism," in *Reading McDowell on Mind and World*, ed. Nicholas H. Smith (London, 2002).

"Pragmatism's Common Faith," in *Pragmatism and Religion*, ed. Stuart Rosenbaum (Urbana, Ill., 2003).

"Rorty's Inspirational Liberalism," in *Richard Rorty*, ed. Charles Guignon and David Hiley (Cambridge, UK, 2003).

Further Reading
Comp Amer Thought, *Pres Addr of APA v9*
Benhabib, Seyla, and Nancy Fraser, eds. *Pragmatism, Critique, Judgment: Essays for Richard J. Bernstein* (Cambridge, Mass., 2004).

Couture, Tony. "Bernstein, McCarthy and the Evolution of Critical Theory," *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 19 (1993): 59–75.

Margolis, Joseph. "Objectivism and Relativism," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 85 (1985): 171–91.

McCarthy, Thomas. "The Differences That Make a Difference: A Comment on Richard Bernstein," in *Proceedings of the 1982 Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association*, vol. 2, ed. P. D. Asquith and T. Nickles (East Lansing, Mich., 1983).

Rorty, Richard. "Thugs and Theorists: A Reply to Bernstein's 'One Step Forward, Two Steps Backward'," *Political Theory* 15 (1987): 564–80.

"Symposium on *Praxis and Action*," *Philosophy Forum* 14 (December 1974).

Brendan Hogan

BERRY, Wendell Erdman (1934–)

Wendell Berry was born on 5 August 1934 near New Castle in Henry County, Kentucky. He received his degrees in English (BA 1956, MA 1957) from the University of Kentucky. Berry taught English at Georgetown College in Kentucky (1957–8), was a teaching fellow at the Creative Writing Center at Stanford University (1958–60), studied in Europe on a Guggenheim Fellowship (1961–2), and then taught at New York University (1962–4). He became professor of English at the University of Kentucky in 1964, and began reviving the Lanes Landing Farm in Port Royal which has been his family's for five generations. In 1971 Berry became Distinguished Professor of English at Kentucky, and in that year he was awarded the National Institute of Arts and Letters Literary Award, the first of many prestigious awards including the T. S. Eliot Award, the Lannan Literary Award for Nonfiction, the Vachel Lindsay Prize, and honorary degrees. In 1977 Berry resigned to pursue full-time farming and writing. He returned occasionally to offer courses such as "Readings in Agriculture" and "Composition for Teachers" from 1987 until 1993, when he resumed the private life of farming that demonstrates his moral and political commitments.

Berry is the most sophisticated author in the long Southern agrarian tradition. He has developed a comprehensive philosophical defense of the superior value of rural and agricultural culture. This defense includes the development of a holistic environmentalism

of diverse and sustainable agriculture, and an analysis of the economic sustainability of local communities. To accomplish these environmental and economic aims, Berry argues that the welfare of the region must be prioritized over any greater territory such as state or country, even if the advantages of heavy industrialization and mass-market capitalism must be surrendered. Most of these advantages are illusory in Berry's view, in light of the obvious and hidden costs to the individual good in the short run and to the collective good of humanity on this planet in the long run. Berry exposes, as past American socialists and agrarians have emphasized, how the values taught by capitalism – individualism, greed, and competition – have threatened earth's ecosystems, impoverished the human spirit, and devalued democratic power. Berry would not eliminate either technology or industrial production to live like the Old-Order Amish (although he has been inspired by their way of life), but he does insist that only limited and careful use of machines is compatible with agrarianism. Likewise, Berry would not eliminate the capitalist mode of production for profit in favor of the planned or command economies of communism, but he does expect local production to place priority upon local needs.

Berry's philosophy is religiously grounded and politically radical. From the standpoint of religion, people should live in harmonious and cooperative community with both nature and society. From the standpoint of morality, people should place social relationships and group welfare above personal profit. And from the standpoint of politics, people should organize into community blocks with wide powers over local affairs. Berry's vision of decentralized and socialist democracy resembles both Thomas Jefferson's agricultural republicanism that seeks virtuous citizens capable of exercising political power and John DEWEY's socialist democracy that permits legislation over economic affairs by the educated public.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Farming: A Handbook (New York, 1970).
A Continuous Harmony: Essays Cultural and Agricultural (New York, 1972).
The Unsettling of America: Culture and Agriculture (San Francisco, 1977).
The Gift of Good Land: Further Essays Cultural and Agricultural (San Francisco, 1981).
Recollected Essays, 1965–1980 (San Francisco, 1981).
Home Economics: Fourteen Essays (San Francisco, 1987).
What Are People For? (San Francisco, 1990).
Standing on Earth: Selected Essays (Ipswich, UK, 1991).
Sex, Economy, Freedom and Community (New York, 1993).
Another Turn of the Crank: Essays (Washington, D.C., 1995).
A World Lost (Washington, D.C., 1997).
Citizenship Papers: Essays (Washington, D.C., 2003).

Other Relevant Works
Nathan Coulter (Boston, 1960).
November Twenty-six, Nineteen Hundred Sixty-three (New York, 1964).
The Long-legged House (New York, 1969).
The Hidden Wound (Boston, 1970).
Standing by Words: Essays (San Francisco, 1983).
The Collected Poems, 1957–1983 (San Francisco, 1985).
Life Is a Miracle: An Essay Against Modern Superstition (Washington, D.C., 2001).
The Art of the Commonplace: The Agrarian Essays of Wendell Berry, ed. Norman Wirzba (Washington, D.C., 2002).

Further Reading
Cambridge Dict Amer Bio
Angyal, Andrew J. *Wendell Berry* (New York, 1995).
Cornell, Daniel. "A Vision of Stewardship: Wendell Berry's Ecological Ethic,"

Literature and Belief 12 (1992): 13–25.

Freedman, Russell. *Wendell Berry: A Bibliography* (Lexington, Kent., 1998).

Gamble, David E. "Wendell Berry: The Mad Farmer and Wilderness," *Kentucky Review* 8 (Summer 1988): 40–52.

Goodrich, Janet. *The Unforeseen Self in the Works of Wendell Berry* (Columbia, Missouri, 2001).

Merchant, Paul, ed. *Wendell Berry* (Lanham, Md., 1991).

Smith, Kimberly K. *Wendell Berry and the Agrarian Tradition: A Common Grace* (Lawrence, Kent., 2003).

John R. Shook

BERTALANFFY, Karl Ludwig von (1901–72)

Ludwig von Bertalanffy was born on 19 September 1901 in Atzgerdorf near Vienna, Austria. He studied the history of art, philosophy, and biology at the University of Innsbruck and the University of Vienna. At Vienna his teachers included Moritz Schlick and Robert Reininger, and after writing a dissertation about German physicist and philosopher Gustav Theodor Fechner, he received his PhD in philosophy in 1926. Although he attended meetings of the Vienna Circle with Schlick, Bertalanffy rejected positivism, both mechanistic and vitalistic accounts of life, and all forms of reductionism, seeking instead a naturalistic view of life that preserved a special scientific status for living systems. Bertalanffy continued to study biology and philosophy of biology and published *Kritische Theorie der Formbildung* (*Modern Theories of Development*) in 1928, which proposed an organismic system theory. Biological organisms should be studied as self-organizational and openly dynamic systems that cannot be reductively understood as merely the result of the interactions of their physical parts. In 1934 he received his *habilitation* for the first volume of his *Theoretische Biologie*, and became a *Privatdozent* at the University of Vienna. From 1939 to 1948 Bertalanffy was professor of zoology at Vienna, where he conducted pioneering research into cancer growth.

In 1949 Bertalanffy accepted the position of professor of biology at McGill University in Montréal, Canada, and he also was director of research at the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Ottawa until 1952. From 1954 until 1958 he was a professor at the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences in Stanford, California, and co-director of biological research at Mount Sinai Hospital in Los Angeles. From 1958 to 1961 he was Alfred P. Sloan Visiting Professor at the Menninger Foundation in Topeka, Kansas. In 1961 Bertalanffy founded the Center for Advanced Studies in Theoretical Psychology at the University of Alberta in Edmonton, and in 1966 he became professor of theoretical biology at Alberta. From 1969 until his death he was professor of theoretical biology at State University of New York at Buffalo. Bertalanffy was an honorary fellow of the American Psychiatric Association; a member of the Deutsche Akademie der Naturforscher; a fellow of the International Academy of Cytology; and a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Science. Bertalanffy died on 12 June 1972 in Buffalo, New York.

Bertalanffy's most important achievements in biology include his work on the physiology of metabolism and growth and on the laws of biological growth and adaptation. On his theory of biology, living organisms dynamically maintain adaptive structures far from equilibrium. With Ilya Prigogine, who also conjectured on nonequilibrium thermodynamics around the same time, Bertalanffy was among the most important theoretical biologists of his time. He developed a dynamic theory of stationary open systems, designed a General System Theory valid for any theoretical scien-

tific modeling, and made major contributions to the emerging field of cognitive psychology. His holistic and pragmatic epistemology offered a viable alternative to the positivism and neobehaviorism of the mid-twentieth century. Bertalanffy, together with Kenneth Boulding, Jim Miller, Anatol RAPOPORT, and others, founded the Society for General Systems Research (now the International Society for the Systems Sciences) in 1954.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Kritische Theorie der Formbildung (Berlin, 1928). Trans. J. H. Woodger, *Modern Theories of Development: An Introduction to Theoretical Biology* (Oxford, 1933; New York, 1962).

Theoretische Biologie, 2 vols (Berlin, 1932, 1940).

Das Gefüge des Lebens (Leipzig, 1937).

Vom Molekül zur Organismenwelt (Potsdam, 1940).

Das biologische Weltbild (Bern, 1949). Trans. *Problems of Life: An Evaluation of Modern Biological Thought* (New York, 1952; 1960).

Biophysik des Fliessgleichgewichts, with W. Beier and R. Laue (Braunschweig, 1953; 2nd edn 1977).

Robots, Men and Minds: Psychology in the Modern World (New York, 1967).

General System Theory: Foundations, Development, Applications (New York, 1968).

The Organismic Psychology and Systems Theory (Worcester, Mass., 1968).

Perspectives on General Systems Theory: Scientific-philosophical Studies, ed. Edgar Taschdjian (New York, 1975).

A Systems View of Man, ed. Paul A. LaViolette (Boulder, Col., 1981).

Other Relevant Works
"An Outline of General Systems Theory," *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 1 (1950): 139–64.

"Mind and Body Re-examined," *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 6 (1966): 113–38.

"Evolution: Chance or Law," in *Beyond Reductionism*, ed. A. Koestler and J. R. Smithies (London, 1969), pp. 59–84.

Further Reading
Dict Economics, *Who Was Who in Amer v6*

Davidson, Mark. *Uncommon Sense: The Life and Thought of Ludwig von Bertalanffy (1901–1972), Father of General Systems Theory* (Los Angeles, 1983).

Gray, William, and Nicholas D. Rizzo, eds. *Unity Through Diversity: A Festschrift for Ludwig von Bertalanffy*, 2 vols (New York, 1973).

Laszlo, Ervin. *Introduction to Systems Philosophy: Toward a New Paradigm of Contemporary Thought* (New York, 1972).

———, ed. *The Relevance of General Systems Theory: Papers Presented to Ludwig von Bertalanffy on His Seventieth Birthday* (New York, 1972).

John R. Shook

BERTOCCI, Peter Anthony (1910–89)

Peter Anthony Bertocci was born on 13 May 1910 in Gaeta, Italy, and died on 13 October 1989 in Boston, Massachusetts. Soon after his birth, he and his elder brother, Angelo, were brought by their mother to join their father in Somerville, Massachusetts, where Peter and his two brothers and three sisters were raised in abject poverty. He completed his BA degree with honors in philosophy and a minor in psychology at Boston University in 1931, and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. In 1932, he earned his MA in psychology from Harvard

University, working primarily with Gordon ALLPORT and also influenced by Alfred North WHITEHEAD, Ralph Barton PERRY, William Ernest HOCKING, and Clarence Irving LEWIS. In 1935 he completed his PhD in philosophy at Boston University under Edgar Sheffield BRIGHTMAN, with supervision by Frederick R. Tennant at the University of Cambridge. His dissertation was titled "The Empirical Argument for God in Late British Thought" and focused on the place of person and personal values in the understanding of the universe. Harvard University Press published it in 1938 with a foreword by Tennant.

Bertocci began his teaching career with an appointment at Bates College in Maine from 1935 to 1944, where he primarily taught psychology. Bertocci was invited to join the department of philosophy at Boston University in 1944, and taught part-time in psychology as well. Following the death of Brightman in 1953, Bertocci was appointed Borden Parker Bowne Professor of Philosophy at Boston University, the position he held until his retirement in 1975. Bertocci was a Fulbright Research Scholar in Italy in 1950–51, and again in 1960–61 in India. Bertocci was a Guggenheim Fellow in 1968–9. He was President of both the Metaphysical Society of America and the American Theological Association. He was an active member of the American Philosophical Association and the Personalist Discussion Group.

A third-generation Boston personalist, after Borden Parker BOWNE and Brightman, Bertocci's primary philosophical interests included personalistic metaphysics, philosophy of religion, ethics, psychology, and human sexuality. He was attracted to Boston personalism for its focus on living a meaningful life, and a practical application of philosophy to life can be seen in Bertocci's commitment to applying philosophy to individual and social behavior and to questions of human persons' relationship with other persons and with the Cosmic Person, God. For Bertocci, philosophy is about learning how to become a full personality and seeking to live a good life in the world of persons, both human and Divine.

Bertocci's personalistic metaphysics shares many points of contact with the philosophies of Bowne and Brightman. Bertocci agrees with Bowne's and Brightman's criticisms of scientific materialism's mechanical model of the universe. He maintains that the mechanistic materialists do not account adequately for the "appearance, survival, and development of living beings, *and* the appearance and continuance of self-conscious, free, moral persons" (1951, p. 355). In addition, the acceptance of the mechanistic materialistic hypothesis requires more faith than the acceptance of the hypothesis that the universe is the expression of a great Living Agency. Bertocci also finds the personalistic hypothesis of an intelligent cosmic mind to be more empirically coherent than the mechanistic model, given that the personalistic hypothesis accounts more adequately for "the data of the physical, biological, and social sciences … [as well as that] of the moral life" (1951, p. 357).

For Bertocci, reality is not simply the product of blind chance; reality includes purposive elements. Bertocci accepts the evolutionary hypothesis concerning the development of life in nature as being the most empirically coherent explanation of the method by which nature and human beings are created, but evolution explains very little about the cause of creation. Concerning the cause of creation, Bertocci accepts the personalistic hypothesis of a Cosmic Person based on the criterion of empirical coherence. This is not to be confused with a contention that the empirical evidence proves the existence of a personal creator God, rather he maintains that the personalistic hypothesis makes better sense of the empirical data related to creation than any other hypothesis he has considered.

Bertocci hypothesizes that the Cosmic Person, or God, is the unity of change that grounds the dependent order and change of nature. He finds it plausible that the various and changing aspects of the universe are

grounded in the activity of a cosmic Will. The Cosmic Person energizes the inorganic space–time world and interacts with the myriad forms of life that the Cosmic Person creates and sustains. Nonmental nature is part of the activity and expression of the mind of God, but God is not nature alone.

The worlds of values and facts are held together by the Supreme Mind, who is "the ultimate source of values, persons, and nature" (1951, p. 298). The mechanical model provides no coherent account of the interrelationship of these various aspects of reality. Our own consciousness is the only thing we experience that interrelates these various aspects into a unified whole. For Bertocci and the other Boston personalists, it is more plausible to hypothesize that something analogous to our experience of mind, or consciousness, holds the totality of the universe together than to accept the mechanistic hypothesis that the universe is the chance product of matter in motion. Bertocci hypothesizes that the interrelationship of matter, life, mind, and human values is grounded in the activity of a personal God, a Cosmic Consciousness.

As the context in which human persons think and act and realize their ideal values, nature is obviously instrumentally valuable for persons according to Bertocci. What then of the intrinsic value of nature? Here it is important to note Bertocci's distinction between the organic and inorganic (living and nonliving) in nature. Bertocci agrees with Bowne and Brightman that the inorganic world we experience as "the spatial universe is the nonspatial activity of cosmic Will" (1956, p. 223). God's activity in the inorganic world functions as the patterned and purposeful context in which subpersonal selves and persons act with various degrees of autonomy – the more personal the self, the more autonomous the activity.

Unlike Brightman, Bertocci maintains that every conative unity, including living cells, possesses selfhood. We experience the activity of these conative unities as phenomenal reality, but the conative unities themselves are ontologically real. They function as substance-causes, i.e., they are more than mere effects of some other underlying cause. This leaves open the possibility that although we *know* the subpersonal selves as phenomenally spatial, the subpersonal selves may not be merely phenomenal themselves. Thus, unlike Bowne, Bertocci asserts the ontological reality of subpersonal selves, and he extends the notion of selfhood all the way down to, but not including, the inorganic world (1956, p. 225).

Bertocci's organic panpsychism is a significant development in the Boston personalist tradition and has positive implications for understanding the intrinsic value of nature. Whereas the inorganic world may be seen as possessing only instrumental value, Bertocci recognizes the intrinsic value of all organic existence, especially sentient existence. For Bertocci, the seat of value seems to reside in the experience of all life and not solely in the personal experience of human beings or other personal beings in the universe. Bertocci supports Albert Schweitzer's insistence on "reverence for life," and he maintains that "mere existence, be it of animals or of human beings, is not to be taken lightly" (*Personality and the Good*, 1963, p. 333). Bertocci recognizes that we ought not to destroy any sentient being without good reasons to do so.

Although Bertocci recognizes that subpersonal selves possess a degree of autonomy and therefore intrinsic value, the person is, for Bertocci, the key metaphysical principle, and the development of personality and personal values is the key ethical task. Bertocci makes a significant contribution to Boston personalism by moving beyond Bowne's and Brightman's Cartesian views of the person. Bertocci explicitly rejects a mind/body dualism and affirms both consciousness and unconsciousness as belonging to the person. He does not consider the person to be a mental substance, which by definition would entail that it is separate from physical substance. Instead of being two un-relatable substances, mind

and body are viewed as two manifestations of the one person. Bertocci refuses to reify the abstractions of mind and body into substances, and instead he views them as having their unity in personal experience. Not only does Bertocci reject the notion of the person as a mental substance, he rejects the notion of a substantive self altogether. In Bertocci's view, the self does not have, but instead is its experiences. The self is what it is doing; it is not a substance that possesses experiences.

Bertocci affirms both consciousness and unconsciousness as belonging to the person. Both aspects of mentality are part of person's activities as a whole. By affirming unconsciousness as part of the person, Bertocci parts with Brightman's view that the unconscious is no part of the self. Yet by affirming the "will-agency" of the person, that is the ability of the person to choose, Bertocci is in deep disagreement with behaviorism and any other form of reductionistic psychology of the person. Any proposition about the human person or about reality as whole must be based upon the totality of human experience, and the totality of human experience includes both consciousness and unconsciousness, both mind and body.

Bertocci's affirmation of both consciousness and unconsciousness belonging to the *I* allows him to account more readily for the identity of the person through periods of unconsciousness and in various levels of mentality. Bertocci moves away from focusing solely on the cognitive activities of personality and emphasizes the essentially conative activities of feeling–emoting–desiring. Bertocci claims "that telic-conative processes are broader, though still mental, than the cognitive functions that persist in them" (1970, p. 62). The person is a unity of telic processes that may not at all times entail self-conscious awareness. Bertocci suggests a polar nature of the mental life of human beings rather than a clear dichotomy of cognitive and conative activities. He defines "*the essence of mentality at the human level as the range of telic tendency, from minimal purposive striving* (in which 'self'-focus nor

'world'-focus is clear) *to self-conscious, purposeful organization of telic tendency*" (1970, p. 63).

Bertocci's view of personal mentality allows one to view human persons as having much more in common with nonhuman animals than does the thought of Bowne and Brightman. By affirming that the various phases of mentality are part of the total experience of the person, Bertocci rejects equating personhood with self-conscious awareness, thus leaving the door open to speak of nonhuman persons who do not possess self-consciousness, but who may experience other levels of mentality. Bertocci's understanding of the person allows for continuity between human consciousness and nonhuman experience. This is an explicit rejection of Cartesian dualism and its many negative ecological implications. From Bertocci's perspective, human persons are no longer viewed as existing on a completely different plane of reality than nonhuman life. Human persons share some similar experiences with the nonhuman world, and all forms of life share a dependence on the natural environment. In this view of reality, there may be various levels of consciousness and experience and more or less developed personalities, but there need not be any radical ontological separations among various aspects of the community of life.

For Bertocci, the ethical task of the person in the community of life is to balance human values in relation to the values of sentient existence. Each person experiences a symphony of various values of greater and lesser worth and is faced with the challenge of orchestrating this symphony in the most harmonious way possible. Bertocci asserts that harmonious orchestration necessitates achieving optimum quality of value without sacrificing variety. The morally responsible person ought to attempt "to protect a maximum-optimum of value experience in as many value bearers, or persons, as possible" (1970, p. 192). This entails finding the most satisfying values that "also support the maximum of other values and, at the same time, encourage the creation of value" (1970,

p. 192). Persons ought to seek a creative harmony of values in which personal values are maximized while at the same time contributing to value in general. Bertocci claims that persons should seek, "like Whitehead's God, to see that nothing worthwhile is lost" (*Personality and the Good*, 1963, pp. 357–8).

From Bertocci's perspective the ecological context may be seen as the community in which all values are realized, be they human values or values of sentient existents. Bertocci also emphasizes the importance of the ecological context for the experience of rich human value experience. For Bertocci, the values that human persons experience are the "joint products of human nature in commerce with the total environment" (1970, p. 193). The quality of values experienced by human persons is dependent "on the potential for values in human nature as a whole and in the nurturant environment" (*Personality and the Good*, 1963, p. 357). Without a rich and diverse natural environment, the possibility of enjoyable human and nonhuman value experiences is greatly diminished. By affirming that one ought to always consider the consequences on all beings before promoting values for oneself, Bertocci provides an ethical stance that is supportive of an ecological ethic that considers the importance of ecological systems in providing a context for rich value experience, while in no way diminishing the value of human persons.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Empirical Argument for God in Late British Thought (Cambridge, Mass., 1938).

The Human Venture in Sex, Love, and Marriage (New York, 1949).

Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion (New York, 1951).

Free Will, Responsibility, and Grace (New York, 1957).

Religion as Creative Insecurity (New York, 1958).

Personality and the Good, with Richard M. Millard (New York, 1963).

Why Believe in God? (New York, 1963).

Sex, Love, and the Person (New York, 1967).

The Person God Is (London and New York, 1970).

Is God for Real? (New York, 1971).

The Goodness of God (Washington, D.C., 1981).

The Person and Primary Emotions (New York, 1988).

Other Relevant Works

Bertocci's papers are at Boston University.

"The Person as the Key Metaphysical Principle," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 17 (1956): 207–25.

Ed. with Jannette E. Newhall and Robert S. Brightman, *Person and Reality* (New York, 1958).

"Towards a Metaphysics of Creation," *Review of Metaphysics* 17 (1964): 493–510.

Ed., *Mid-Twentieth Century American Philosophy* (New York, 1974).

"Why Personalistic Idealism?" *Idealistic Studies* 10 (1980): 181–98.

"Reflections on the Experience of 'Oughting'," in *The Boston Personalist Tradition of Philosophy, Social Ethics, and Theology*, ed. Paul Deats and Carol Robb (Macon, Georgia, 1986), pp. 209–19.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils 1950–2000*, *Proc of APA v63*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Allport, Gordon W. "Peter Bertocci: Philosopher-Psychologist," *Philosophical Forum* (Boston) 21 (1963–4): 3–7.

Buford, Thomas O., and Harold H. Oliver, eds. *Personalism Revisited* (Amsterdam and New York, 2002).

Burrow, Rufus, Jr. *Personalism: A Critical Introduction* (St. Louis, 1999).

Howie, John, and Thomas O. Buford, eds. *Contemporary Studies in Philosophical Idealism* (Cape Cod, Mass., 1975). Essays in honor of Bertocci, with a bibliography of his

writings.

Knott, T. Garland. "Personhood: F. R. Tennant and Peter Bertocci in the Light of Contemporary Physics," *Personalist Forum* 8 (Fall 1992): 101–14.

"Special Issue in Honor of Peter Anthony Bertocci," *Personalist Forum* 7 (Spring 1991). Contains Bertocci's autobiography and bibliography.

Mark Y. A. Davies

BIRKHOFF, Garrett (1911–96)

Garrett Birkhoff, son of mathematician George David Birkhoff (1884–1944), was born on 10 January 1911 in Princeton, New Jersey. His family moved to Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1912. Entering Harvard in 1928, he passed his entire career there (BA 1932, PhD 1936, mathematics faculty 1936–81), except for one year at Cambridge University (1932–3). Retiring in 1981, he moved to Water Mill, New York, and died there on 22 November 1996.

A. N. WHITEHEAD's *Treatise of Universal Algebra*, treating algebra of logic as a special case of the general concept of an algebra and as the only member of the non-numerical genus of Universal Algebra, provided Birkhoff with the name of the branch of mathematics which he pursued. Birkhoff's paper "On the Structure of Abstract Algebras" has been called the "first real paper on universal algebra" (Mac Lane 1981, pp. 17–18); in it Birkhoff proved the theorem "characterizing varieties of algebras closed under (infinite) products, quotients, and the formation of subalgebras." He was concerned with the structures of algebras and a study of the properties of various types of lattices, his considerations including ordered systems and the application of lattices to describe projective geometry. Of the early 1930s, when he developed lattice theory, Birkhoff wrote (1976, p. 57) that he "had dreamed up lattices … plucking them out of semithin air as a generalization of the Boolean algebra." When he wrote *Lattice Theory*, he did so with the purpose of treating the algebra of logic from the standpoint of algebra rather than of logic.

Birkhoff (1940, p. 9) asserted that lattices can be found in Charles PEIRCE's work, in particular in "On the Algebra of Logic." Birkhoff studied Peirce's proof of the distributivity of lattices, and provided a sketch of the proof for Huntington. Birkhoff's book *Lattice Theory*, which went through three editions, remains a classic to this day, as does his textbook, co-authored with Saunders Mac Lane, *A Survey of Modern Algebra*. Richard Dedekind and Ernst Schröder's *Dualgruppe* presented what became the lattice; Fritz Klein-Barmen provided the first modern treatment of distributive lattices and developed the modern terminology, but in *Lattice Theory*, Birkhoff developed lattice theory as an independent topic of investigation and provided a full and systematic axiomatic presentation for the theory.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Lattice Theory (New York, 1940; 2nd edn 1948, Providence, Rhode Island; 3rd edn 1973).
A Survey of Modern Algebra, with Saunders Mac Lane (New York, 1941).
"The Rise of Modern Algebra to 1936," in *Men and Institutions in American Mathematics*, ed. J. Dalton Tarwater, John T. White, and J. D. Miller (Lubbock, Tex., 1976), pp. 41–63.

Further Reading
Alexanderson, Gerald, and Carroll Wilde. "Interview: Garrett Birkhoff", in *Mathematical People: Profiles and Interviews*, ed. D. J. Albers and G. L. Alexanderson (Boston, Basel, and Stuttgart, 1985), pp. 3–15.

Anellis, Irving H. "In Memoriam. Garrett Birkhoff", *Modern Logic* 7 (1997): 81–2.

Huntington, Edward Vermilye. "Set of Independent Postulates for the Algebra of Logic," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 5 (1904): 288–309.

Mac Lane, Saunders. "Part I, History of Algebra: History of Abstract Algebra: Origin, Rise, and Decline of a Movement", in *American Mathematical Heritage: Algebra and Applied Mathematics*, ed. Dalton Tarwater, John T. White, Carl Hall, and Marion E. Moore (Lubbock, Tex., 1981), pp. 3–35.

Mehrtens, Herbert. *Die Entstehung der Verbandstheorie* (Hildesheim, 1979).

Peirce, Charles S. "On the Algebra of Logic", *American Journal of Mathematics* 3 (1880): 15–57. Reprinted in *Writings of Charles S. Peirce: A Chronological Edition, vol. 4: 1879–1884*, ed. Christian J. W. Kloesel (Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1989), pp. 163–209.

Whitehead, Alfred North. *A Treatise on Universal Algebra* (Cambridge, UK, 1898; repr. New York, 1960).

Irving H. Anellis

BIXBY, James Thompson (1843–1921)

James Thompson Bixby was born on 30 July 1843 in Barre, Massachusetts. After receiving his BA from Harvard College in 1864, he was a private tutor for three years in New York City. He returned to Harvard, received the MA (at that time a more honorary degree), and began study at its Divinity School. Bixby graduated with a BD in 1870 and was ordained minister. He served as pastor of the Unitarian Society of Watertown, Massachusetts from 1870 to 1874, and was pastor of the Independent Congregational (Unitarian) Church in Belfast, Maine, from 1874 to 1878. In 1875 Bixby delivered a course of lectures on "Physical Theories and Religious Truths" at the Lowell Institute in Boston, and in 1883 he returned to give lectures on "Inductive Philosophy of Religion."

From 1878 to 1881, Bixby was professor of religious philosophy and ethnic religions at Meadville Theological School in Pennsylvania. He resigned his position to study religion and philosophy at universities in Heidelberg, Jena, and Leipzig for two years during 1883–5, and earned a PhD in philosophy at Leipzig in 1885. He returned to the United States in 1885, and briefly pastored at the Unitarian Church in Ann Arbor, Michigan. From 1887 until his retirement in 1903 he was pastor of the Unitarian Church in Yonkers, New York. During this period, he was active in New York civic and religious organizations. He served as chair of the Liberal Ministers' Association from 1891 to 1903. In retirement Bixby continued to publish articles on religion despite his blindness. He died on 26 December 1921 in Yonkers, New York.

Bixby combined his liberal Unitarianism with a respect for science, advocating a scientific theology that could accommodate natural evolution. Bixby optimistically saw in evolution a continual progress of both intelligence and morality. His many articles on religion and science in the *Unitarian Review*, *New Englander and Yale Review*, *The New World*, and *Bibliotheca Sacra* encouraged the scientific and comparative study of the world's religions. Against Herbert Spencer's hedonism, Bixby argued in *The Ethics of Evolution* (1900) that moral progress demonstrates the existence of a unifying spiritual trend in humanity. Although morality is a natural product of this evolution, human nature is progressively improving towards a higher perfection planned by God.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Similarities of Physical and Religious Knowledge (Boston, 1876). Reprinted as *Religion and Science as Allies; or, Similarities of Physical and Religious Knowledge* (Chicago, 1889).

The Crisis in Morals: An Examination of Rational Ethics in the Light of Modern Science (Boston, 1891). Reprinted as *The Ethics of Evolution: The Crisis in Morals Occasioned by the Doctrine of Development* (Boston, 1900).

The New World and the New Thought (New York, 1902).

The Open Secret: A Study of Life's Deeper Forces (Boston, 1912).

Other Relevant Works

"From what Faculties does Religion Spring? The Psychology of Religion," *New Englander and Yale Review* 45 (June 1886): 1005–27.

Further Reading

Dict Amer Bio, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v11*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Ryan, Frank X., ed. *Darwinism and Theology in America, 1850–1930*, 3 vols (Bristol, UK, 2000).

John R. Shook

BIXLER, Julius Seelye (1894–1985)

Julius Seelye Bixler was born on 4 April 1894 in New London, Connecticut, and died on 28 March 1985 in Weston, Massachusetts. His father, James Wilson Bixler, was educated at Amherst and Yale, studied in Germany, and then ministered in Congregational churches in Connecticut and Massachusetts. His mother, Elizabeth James, was an alumna of Smith College and the daughter of James H. Seelye,

President of Amherst College. She died shortly after Julius's birth. Bixler received a BA from Amherst in 1916, then taught Latin and English for a year in Madura, India, before entering Union Theological Seminary. He found theology at the seminary limiting and, after a tour in the army during World War I, returned to Amherst where he received his MA degree in 1920. After two years lecturing on philosophy at the American University in Beirut, he continued graduate studies at Yale. He wrote his dissertation on William JAMES and received his PhD in philosophy in 1924. From 1928 to 1929, he attended Martin Heidegger's lectures at the University of Freiburg.

Bixler joined the faculty of Smith College in 1924, where he taught biblical literature until he moved to the Harvard Divinity School in 1933, becoming Bussey Professor of Religion. In 1942, he became President of Colby College in Waterville, Maine. He retired in 1960 to take up lecturing and writing, which he pursued until his death in 1985. The inscription of the LLD degree bestowed on Bixler in 1952 by Bowdoin College summarizes his career: "Inspiring teacher of philosophy and religion, well-known author of books of educational and spiritual value, convincing advocate of liberal education."

Bixler's essays on the place of religious studies in the humanities and in academe merit continued attention. As a philosophical theologian, he makes the strong case for a dualism of knowledge. Perception, grounding the physical sciences, forms one pole. The experience of value, pursued by religion, forms the second pole, which is equally validating if less easily demonstrated. Science is about fact; religion is about value. Both must be reasonable and open. The impartial pursuit of truth requires both.

That the pursuit of knowledge and truth is a social enterprise becomes clear in Bixler's 1963 essay "The Failure of Martin Heidegger." His deep appreciation of Heidegger is apparent. His critique touches, first, on Heidegger's idiosyncratic use of language, but he moves quickly to identify even there the radical individualism

of Heidegger's program. He finds this individualism ultimately destructive of the deepest human values, values constructed in the community of experience.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Religion in the Philosophy of William James (Boston, 1926).

Immortality and the Present Mood (Cambridge, Mass., 1931).

Religion for Free Minds (New York, 1939).

Conversations with an Unrepentant Liberal (New Haven, Conn., 1946).

A Faith that Fulfills (New York, 1951).

Education for Adversity (Cambridge, Mass., 1952).

German Recollections: Some of My Best Friends were Philosophers (Waterville, Maine, 1985).

Other Relevant Works

Bixler's papers are at Smith College.

"A Phenomenological Approach to Religious Realism," in *Religious Realism*, ed. Douglas C. Macintosh and Arthur K. Rogers (New York, 1931), pp. 55–98.

"The Philosophy of Religion," in *The Church Through Half a Century: Essays in Honor of William Adams Brown*, ed. John Coleman and Julius S. Bixler (New York, 1936), pp. 145–62.

"Can Religion Become Empirical?" in *The Nature of Religious Experience*, ed. Eugene G. Bewkes and Julius S. Bixler (New York, 1937), pp. 68–92.

"Whitehead's Philosophy of Religion," in *The Philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (Evanston, Ill., 1941), pp. 487–511.

"William James as Religious Thinker," in *William James, The Man and The Thinker*, ed. Max C. Otto (Madison, Wisc., 1942), pp. 117–41.

"Science, Materialism and the Human Spirit," in *The Social Implications of Scientific Progress*, ed. John Ely (Cambridge, Mass., 1950), pp. 204–13.

"Dr. Schweitzer's One Answer to the Problem of the Many," in *To Albert Schweitzer on His Eightieth Birthday*, ed. Homer A. Jacks (Evanston, Ill., 1955), pp. 3–10.

"The Relevance of Reason," in *In Search of God and Immortality*, ed. Julius S. Bixler (Boston, 1961), pp. 27–45.

"The Failure of Martin Heidegger," *Harvard Theological Review* 56 (1963): 121–43.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Proc of APA v59*, *Who Was Who in Amer v8*, *Who's Who in Phil*

"In Honor of Dr. J. Seelye Bixler," *Colby Library Quarterly* series 5, no. 11 (September 1961): 288–322.

Jon Taylor

BLACK, Max (1909–88)

Max Black was born on 24 February 1909 in Baku, which was then in Russia and is now the capital of Azerbaijan. His father, Lionel Black, was a businessman. Because the Blacks were Jewish and suffered from the anti-Semitism prevalent in Russia at the time, the family left Baku shortly after Max's birth. After a brief stay in Paris, they emigrated to England in 1912. Black received his entire education in England, and grew up thoroughly assimilating English culture instead of the Jewish-Russian culture into which he was born. As a child, Black exhibited great talent in both mathematics and music. He was a gifted violinist and pianist, at one point contemplating a career in music. He decided instead upon a career in mathematics, and entered Queen's College, Cambridge. There, under the influence of Bertrand Russell and Frank Ramsey, and to an even greater degree, G. E. Moore and Ludwig Wittgenstein, his interests turned

increasingly toward philosophy of mathematics first, and then toward philosophy generally. He completed the BA degree in 1930 and was awarded a year-long fellowship to attend the University of Göttingen, where he studied with Hermann WEYL, Paul Bernays, and David Hilbert. Black returned to complete the PhD at the University of London in 1939, writing a dissertation on "Theories of Logical Positivism."

While pursuing his doctoral studies, Black taught at the Royal Grammar School in Newcastle upon Tyne, and then, from 1936 to 1940, at the Teacher Training Institute of Education at London University. In 1940 he moved to the United States to accept a philosophy position at the University of Illinois. He became a United States citizen in 1948. In 1946 he became a professor of philosophy at Cornell University, and in 1954 became the Susan Linn Sage Professor of Philosophy at Cornell, a position he held until his retirement in 1977. In his retirement, Black continued to serve as Director of the Cornell Program in Science, Technology and Society until 1978, and he was a participant in that program until his death on 27 August 1988 in Ithaca, New York.

Black held visiting appointments at Oxford and Cambridge, as well as in Australia, India, Israel, Japan, Scandinavia, and Continental Europe. He also held visiting fellowships at the Princeton and Stanford Institutes of Advanced Study and the National Humanities Center. He served as President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1958–9, and as President of the International Institute of Philosophy in 1981–4, being only the second American to hold the latter position. He was also a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

As a philosopher, Black was not committed to a particular system of philosophy. He understood the primary purpose of philosophy as conceptual clarification, or as he characterized his own work by the end of his career, "the articulation of concepts." In his efforts at clarifying wide ranges of philosophical problems, Black was less concerned with precise formalism than with sensitivity to common language and common sense. This sensitivity was an inheritance from his Cambridge exposure to C. D. Broad, F. P. Ramsey, and G. E. Moore, although the greatest single influence on Black was Wittgenstein. While his philosophical interests ranged widely, mathematics and language provided the central foci around which his work developed.

During his early study at Göttingen, Black wrote his first book, *The Nature of Mathematics* (1933). It was a critical exposition of Bertrand Russell and Alfred North WHITEHEAD's *Principia Mathematica* with supplementary accounts of intuitionist and formalist approaches to mathematics. His exposition of L. E. J. Brower's intuitionism was particularly clear and insightful. Also before the completion of his doctorate, Black wrote "Vagueness: An Exercise in Logical Analysis" (1937). In that paper Black explored the nature of vagueness and, perhaps more importantly, the significance the notion of vagueness might have for logic. It was the first attempt to give a precise analysis of what Black called "vague sets," or what are now called "fuzzy sets."

While Black's list of book publications is long, most of his books are collections of essays, his favored medium of writing. Black wrote of himself that he had "always been interested, like a poet, in minute particulars." This interest in minute particulars manifested itself in the treatment of an exceptionally broad range of philosophical issues, including such topics as the nature of rules, the warrant for induction, reasoning with vague or loose concepts, metaphor, and the shortcomings of the picture theory of language. As Black looked back on his own work only a few years before his death, he divided his writings into three groups, expository, critical, and constructive. Black classified his magisterial *Companion to Wittgenstein's Tractatus* (1964), as well as a number of later essays in which he pursued themes drawn from his work with Wittgenstein, as at the same time both expository and critical. Black also included his important and pioneering logic

text, *Critical Thinking* (1946), among his expository writings, as well as *The Labyrinth of Language* (1968).

Black's critical writings, in addition to the critical elements in his various writings relating to Wittgenstein's work, included the essays, largely on method, in *Language and Philosophy* (1949). They also included essays on Rudolf CARNAP's views on semantics, J. L. Austin's understanding of performative uses of language, Paul GRICE's work on conversational meaning, and Nelson GOODMAN's work on symbol systems. Moving away from issues in the philosophy of language, Black also wrote critically of behaviourist B. F. SKINNER.

Black characterized his constructive work as focusing most importantly on four sets of issues: vagueness, models and metaphors, induction and probability, and rationality. His work on vagueness, as already noted, started with his pioneering essay of 1937. His interest in metaphor, starting with his 1955 paper by that title, extended the importance of Black's work into the area of aesthetics. The basis of probabilistic and inductive reasoning was a long-standing concern in Black's work, starting with his 1947 paper, "Professor Broad on the Limit Theorems of Probability," and his 1949 "The Justification of Induction," and continuing through a number of later papers and exchanges defending a common-sense understanding of induction according to which the very request for a justification of induction is fundamentally misguided. Black's exploration of the notion of rationality was a particularly dominant theme toward the end of his career. In that area of his work he explored traditional problems of rationality such as the prisoner's dilemma, the core question of "Why Should I Be Rational?" and the usefulness of formal decision theory in modeling our rationality. His very last published papers were a critique of Bayesian decision theory, arguing that intelligent human choices are based more on a practical and informal art than on the application of some kind of formal calculus of probability, and an exploration of "Ambiguities of Rationality."

Black's work in the articulation of concepts also carried him deeply into questions of philosophical method and into traditional questions of metaphysics. In the 1940s he wrote several articles on the paradox of analysis and the problem of how analysis of terms can be informative. The influence of Wittgenstein led Black to reject the notion that terms possess meanings that are constituents of the world waiting to be discovered, clarified, and categorized by philosophers. Rather Black recognized that understanding the functioning of human language also involved, to use a title of a 1949 article, "Speaking With the Vulgar." His high regard for ordinary language accordingly led Black, like many philosophers who worked in the tradition of Wittgenstein, to pay less attention to meanings and more to rules. Black devoted a good deal of attention to the analysis of rules, how they are formulated in various kinds of statements, and how they are expressed in various forms of practice.

Black's method was to start with the deliverances of ordinary language. In particular, Black favored starting out by identifying certain paradigm cases of the application of the concepts to be articulated. He believed that through the examination of the range of these paradigm cases the philosopher can move, by an essentially inductive process, to a set of cautious generalizations that will lead to an integrative articulation of the concept. Careful examination of paradigm cases, on Black's view, enables the philosopher to identify the rules and criteria that govern the use of the concepts, and to show their place within various systems of semantically and pragmatically related concepts. Black's understanding of method clearly involved a marriage of the ordinary language analysis of his English philosophical education and the pragmatism of his adopted America.

Black devoted considerable attention, starting with his 1951 "Achilles and the Tortoise," to temporal paradoxes. Black's contributions in this area contributed to a lively debate with Richard TAYLOR and Adolf

GRÜNBAUM in particular. In 1952 Black wrote an article, "The Identity of Indiscernibles," that has been widely reprinted in metaphysics texts and elicited substantial journal response from other philosophers, Black raised his ingenious "twin globe" counter-example to the traditional principle that distinct entities can only be distinct by virtue of some qualitative difference.

Beyond Black's interest in and important contributions to traditional technical problems of philosophy, Black also manifested a career-long concern for what one might call the more human face of philosophy. As early as 1944, Black wrote a paper, "Education as Art and Discipline." This interest in education and in ethics continued throughout Black's career. In the final decade of his life, for example, he wrote a contribution, "Humanistic Education and the Physician's Art," for an anthology on *Changing Values in Medicine*, and authored "The Mount Carmel Declaration," a statement issued by a symposium on ethics and technology.

Black's project of "the articulation of concepts" centered around a concept of method that was rooted in common sense, ordinary language, and a clearly pragmatic understanding of reasonableness that went beyond any kind of formalizable rationality. He rejected any attempt by others to identify him with any particular philosophical "school," characterizing himself as "logician, 'detached empiricist' (J. Passmore), and active skeptic (in the spirit of Goethe's *tätige Sepsis*)." He was concerned with particular problems rather than the construction of some overarching conception of reality. Or perhaps it would be more accurate to say that Black thought that whatever there is of an overarching reality is at bottom nothing more than a collection of particular minutiae. Black was careful to avoid jargon and technical terminology. While he maintained throughout his career his deep and profound love of the mathematical, we might well leave with the impression that he thought that reality was more like a poem than like a mathematical system.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Nature of Mathematics: A Critical Study (London, 1933; 2000).

"Vagueness: An Exercise in Logical Analysis," *Philosophy of Science* 4 (1937): 427–55.

Critical Thinking (New York, 1946).

Language and Philosophy: Studies in Method (Ithaca, N.Y., 1949).

"The Identity of Indiscernibles," *Mind* 61 (1952): 153–64.

The Problems of Analysis: Philosophical Essays (Ithaca, N.Y., 1954).

Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy (Ithaca, N.Y., 1962).

A Companion to Wittgenstein's Tractatus (Ithaca, N.Y., 1964).

The Labyrinth of Language (New York, 1968).

The Margins of Precision: Essays in Logic and Language (Ithaca, N.Y., 1970).

Art, Perception, and Reality, with E. H. Gombrich and Julian Hochberg (Baltimore, Md., 1972).

Caveats and Critiques: Philosophical Essays in Language and Logic (Ithaca, N.Y., 1975).

The Prevalence of Humbug and Other Essays (Ithaca, N.Y., 1983).

Perplexities: Rational Choice, the Prisoner's Dilemma, Metaphor, Poetic Ambiguity, and Other Puzzles (Ithaca, N.Y., 1990).

Other Relevant Works

Max Black's papers are at Cornell University.

"Conventionalism in Geometry and the Interpretation of Necessary Statements," *Philosophy of Science* 9 (1942): 335–49.

"Some Objections to Ogden and Richards' Theory of Interpretation," *Journal of Philosophy* 39 (1942): 281–9.

"Education as Art and Discipline," *Ethics* 54 (1944): 290–94.

"The 'Paradox of Analysis'," *Mind* 53 (1944): 263–7.

"The Limits of a Behavioristic Semiotic," *Philosophical Review* 56 (1947): 258–72.

"Linguistic Method in Philosophy,"

Philosophy and Phenomenological Research 8 (1948): 635–50.

"The Semantic Definition of Truth," *Analysis* 8 (1948): 49–63.

"Carnap's Semantics," *Philosophical Review* 58 (1949): 257–64.

"Achilles and the Tortoise," *Analysis* 11 (1951): 91–101.

"Why Cannot an Effect Precede Its Cause?" *Analysis* 16 (1956): 49–57.

"Necessary Statements and Rules," *Philosophical Review* 67 (1958): 313–41.

"The 'Direction' of Time," *Analysis* 19 (1959): 54–63.

"Can Induction Be Vindicated?" *Philosophical Studies* 10 (1959): 5–16.

"Reasoning With Loose Concepts," *Dialogue* 2 (1963): 1–12.

Ed., *Philosophy in America* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1965).

"The Elusiveness of Sets," *Review of Metaphysics* 24 (1971): 614–36.

"Humanistic Education and the Physician's Art," in *Changing Values in Medicine*, ed. Eric J. Cassell (New York, 1979), pp. 181–95.

"Why Should I Be Rational?" *Dialectica* 36 (1982): 147–68.

"The Radical Ambiguity of a Poem," *Synthese* 59 (1984): 89–108.

"The Articulation of Concepts," in *Philosophers on Their Own Work*, vol. 12, ed. André Mercier and Maja Svilar (Bern, Switzerland, 1985), pp. 9–41.

"Making Intelligent Choices, How Useful is Decision Theory?" *Dialectica* 39 (1985): 19–34.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v6*, *Proc of APA v64*, *Who Was Who in Amer v9*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Bohan, James C. "On Black's 'Loose' Concepts," *Dialogue* 10 (1971): 332–6.

Calistro, Ralph F. "On Discovering Rules: Max Black's Methods," *De Philosophia* 1 (1980): 17–23.

Cross, Charles B. "Max Black on the Identity of Indiscernibles," *Philosophical Quarterly* 45 (1995): 350–60.

Ferraiolo, William. "Black's 'Twin Globe' Counterexample," *Southwest Philosophy Review* 13 (1997): 59–66.

Garver, Newton. "Max Black," in *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (New York, 1967), vol. 1, 318–19.

Grünbaum, Adolf. "Messrs Black and Taylor on Temporal Paradoxes," *Analysis* 12 (1952): 144–8.

Johnson, Bredo C. "Black and the Inductive Justification of Induction," *Analysis* 32 (1972): 110–12.

Marcus, Ruth B. "Max Black (1909–1988)," *Dialectica* 44 (1990): 5–8.

Martinich, A. P. "Meaning and Intention: Black Versus Grice," *Dialectica* 44 (1990): 79–98.

Salmon, Wesley C. "Should We Attempt to Justify Induction?" *Philosophical Studies* 8 (1957): 33–48.

Sanford, David H. "The Inductive Support of Inductive Rules: Themes from Max Black," *Dialectica* 44 (1990): 23–41.

Scherzinger, Martin. "Max Black's 'Interaction View' of Metaphor," *Conference* 6 (1995): 89–97.

Taylor, Richard. "Mr. Black on Temporal Paradoxes," *Analysis* 12 (1951): 38–43.

Warner, Martin. "Black's Metaphors," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 13 (1973): 367–72.

David E. Schrader

BLACK ELK (1863–1950)

Black Elk was born to Black Elk and Mary Leggins Down (also known as White Cow Sees) in December 1863 near the Little Powder River in present-day Campbell county in

northeastern Wyoming. He died on 19 August 1950 in Manderson, South Dakota. Taking the given name Nicholas after his conversion to Catholicism in 1904, Black Elk embodies the complex mix of traditional Native American and Anglo/European experience that has permeated Native American life in America.

Black Elk was a traditional Lakota Sioux medicine man whose first vision at the age of nine foretold not only the conflicts Native Americans would have with white Americans as the US government pursued its policies of westward expansion and Indian removal, but also his own ability to be a spokesman and healer for his people. He began serving as a medicine man in 1881, after his family had been uprooted and resettled on the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota along with other Oglala Lakotas. Black Elk continued to hold the status of a medicine man among his people, but life as he knew it had been disrupted. In 1886 he toured with Buffalo Bill's Wild West Show to parts of Europe. When he returned to South Dakota, he found his people placing their hope in the Ghost Dance, a ritual that called upon the strength of the ancestors to revitalize Native American life and help them regain their sovereignty. This movement was brutally crushed, however, by a US Army massacre at Wounded Knee in 1890.

The most famous account of Black Elk's life, *Black Elk Speaks* (1932), focuses on his thought in the years just after Wounded Knee. His narrative provides a window into Native American thought in this period and the traditions from which they sprung. A deeply religious man, Black Elk had full faith in the Great Spirit which unified all creatures and spoke of human beings as children fully dependent on the earth for their sustenance. He also struggled to make sense of the vision he had as a youth, especially in light of the devastation he and his people experienced at Wounded Knee. With his son Ben Black Elk, who was his interpreter for *Black Elk Speaks*, he recalled the deep sense of despair and loss he and others felt

following this massacre. Perhaps he had misinterpreted the vision or given away its power in sharing it with others, he said, and this was the reason it had not yet come to fruition. The image of Black Elk that seeped into American consciousness as a result of the publication of this book is that of the noble Native American leader yearning for a past that is forever lost: "I, to whom so great a vision was given in my youth, – you see me now a pitiful old man who has done nothing, for the nation's hoop is broken and scattered. There is no center any longer, and the sacred tree is dead." (1932, p. 207)

Black Elk lived another sixty years after Wounded Knee and spent the majority of those years as a Catholic. According to his daughter, Lucy Looks Twice, Black Elk readily accepted the Catholic faith and saw it as transcending the religion of the Lakotas. He had expressed neither anger nor a significant sense of loss to her when recounting the circumstances under which he converted. In 1904 a priest delivering last rites to a dying child implored Black Elk to renounce Satan as he sought to heal the child using traditional Native American methods. Rather than respond with anger, Black Elk simply expressed the sense that he and his religious perspective were ill-guided and mistaken, and he converted to Christianity within two weeks after the priest's confrontation. He became first a devout lay person, then a catechist, and later a missionary to the Oglala and other tribes.

Black Elk's religious conversion points to the complexity of Native American life in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Black Elk, like Charles EASTMAN, Gertrude BONNIN, and Luther STANDING BEAR, all born and/or raised as Sioux in the Dakota Territories in the 1860s and 1870s, tried to preserve and record Indian culture, traditions, and ways of thought. However, while Black Elk continued to participate in Lakota pageants and ceremonies, he also appears to have had a very genuine sense of having discovered a new and fresh religious perspective

that gave him and many of his fellow converts faith in the future. At the heart of his decision to convert, however, was his pragmatic view of the role that this new religion played in reservation life. When asked why he converted, his response was simply, "My children had to live in this world." (Steltenkamp 1993, p. 20)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Neihardt, John G. *Black Elk Speaks: Being the Life Story of a Holy Man of the Oglala Sioux* (New York, 1932; Lincoln, Nebr., 1988).

Brown, Joseph E., ed. *The Sacred Pipe: Black Elk's Account of the Seven Rites of the Oglala Sioux* (Norman, Okla., 1953). Rev. edn, *The Gift of the Sacred Pipe: Based on Black Elk's Account of the Seven Rites of the Oglala Sioux* (Norman, Okla., 1982).

DeMallie, Raymond J., ed. *The Sixth Grandfather: Black Elk's Teachings Given to John G. Neihardt* (Lincoln, Nebr., 1984).

Other Relevant Works

Black Elk's papers are in the Holy Rosary Mission Records at Marquette University in Wisconsin, and in the John G. Neihardt Collection at the University of Missouri, Columbia.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Encyc Relig*

Archambault, Marie Therese. *A Retreat with Black Elk: Living in the Sacred Hoop* (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1998).

Black Elk, Wallace H., and William S. Lyon. *Black Elk: The Sacred Ways of a Lakota* (San Francisco, 1990).

Holler, Clyde. *Black Elk's Religion: The Sun Dance and Lakota Catholicism* (Syracuse, N.Y., 1995).

Holler, Clyde, ed. *The Black Elk Reader* (Syracuse, N.Y., 2000).

Neihardt, Hilda. *Black Elk and Flaming Rainbow* (Lincoln, Nebr., 1995).

Neihardt, Hilda, and Lori Utecht, eds. *Black Elk Lives: Conversations with the Black Elk Family* (Lincoln, Nebr., 2000).

Rice, Julian. *Black Elk's Story: Distinguishing Its Lakota Purpose* (Albuquerque, N.M., 1991).

Steltenkamp, Michael F. *Black Elk: Holy Man of the Oglala* (Norman, Okla., 1993).

Tedlock, Dennis, and Barbara Tedlock, eds. *Teachings from the American Earth: Indian Religion and Philosophy* (New York, 1975).

Dorothy Rogers

BLACKSTONE, William Thomas (1931–77)

William Blackstone was born on 8 December 1931 in Augusta, Georgia. He received a BA degree from Elon College in 1953 and his MA and PhD degrees from Duke University in 1955 and 1957. He was an associate professor of philosophy at Elon College in North Carolina, from 1957 to 1958. He then was an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Florida from 1958 to 1961. The remainder of his academic career was spent at the University of Georgia, first as a professor of philosophy and religion from 1961 to 1963, then as chair of the Division of Social Sciences from 1963 to 1977. He was Vice President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1960–61, and was a member of the executive council for both the Southern Society for Philosophy and Religion and the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology from 1965 to 1968. He was President of the Georgia Philosophical Society in 1966–7 and the Southeastern Philosophy of Education Society in 1969. For three consecutive years, 1959 to 1961, he received the annual award of the Southern

Society for Philosophy and Psychology for the best research paper, and he received the M. G. Michael Award from the University of Georgia in 1965. He was an advisor to US Senator Sam Nunn on energy concerns. In addition, he was a consultant to the National Humanities Foundation and served on the editorial boards of six professional journals. He died in Athens, Georgia, on 14 November 1977. In 1978, *Ethics, Free Enterprise, and Public Policy*, edited by Richard T. DE GEORGE and Joseph A. Pichler, was dedicated to the memory of Blackstone.

Blackstone is credited with organizing the first philosophical conference on environmental ethics, held at the University of Georgia in 1971. The proceedings were published as *Philosophy and Environmental Crisis* in 1974. This collection of essays includes Blackstone's "Ethics and Ecology" and other notable papers such as Pete A. Y. GUNTER's "The Big Thicket" and Eugene P. Odum's "Environmental Ethic and the Attitude Revolution." Blackstone acknowledged an environmental crisis created by overpopulation, abuse of technology, ignorance of interrelationships in nature and, most of all, misguided values. Rather than focusing on factual data, he affirms a human "transvaluation of values" that "require fundamental changes in the social, political, and economic institutions …" 1974, p. 17). These changes are grounded in the notion that a livable environment is a human right and should also be made a legal right. Furthermore, this right overrides any purely economic consideration. The solution is a new economic theory that embodies values that are not present in private enterprise. The formation of a centralized agency would implement this new policy.

Blackstone's concern for the environment, social justice and health care was a development of his earlier research in ethics, religion, and science. His professional life emphasized interdisciplinary exploration, a deep concern for human ethical questions, a comprehensive knowledge of philosophy, and a systematic treatment of important philosophical issues.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Problem of Religious Knowledge (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1963).
Francis Hutcheson and Contemporary Ethical Theory (Athens, Georgia, 1965).
Religious Language and Knowledge (Athens, Georgia, 1972).
Political Philosophy: An Introduction (New York, 1973).

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *The Concept of Equality* (Minneapolis, 1969).
Ed. with George L. Newsome, *Education and Ethics* (Athens, Georgia, 1969).
Ed., *Philosophy and Environmental Crisis* (Athens, Georgia, 1974).
Ed. with Robert D. Heslep, *Social Justice and Preferential Treatment: Women and Racial Minorities in Education and Business* (Athens, Georgia, 1977).
Ed. with Tom L. Beauchamp and Joel Feinberg, *Philosophy and the Human Condition* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1980).

Further Reading
Proc of APA v51

Charles Frederick Frantz

BLACKWELL, Antoinette Louisa Brown (1825–1921)

Antoinette Louisa Brown was born on 20 May 1825 in Henrietta, New York. In 1856 she married Samuel Blackwell, who backed Antoinette wholeheartedly, helping to raise their children so that she could work parttime and write. She died on 5 November 1921 in Elizabeth, New Jersey. Exposed by her family to the Protestant revivals of the age and religiously precocious, she was made a member of her Congregational church at age

nine. She graduated from Oberlin College's non-degree-granting Ladies Department in 1847. She then enrolled as a "resident graduate" in the Theological Seminary, which refused to enroll women officially, and which granted her neither a degree nor a license to preach upon completion of her studies.

For two years Blackwell preached where invited and lectured on women's rights, anti-slavery and temperance. Many a fellow preacher tried to shout her down from the pulpit. Even her own activist friends, including Lucy STONE, Susan B. ANTHONY, and Elizabeth Cady STANTON, discouraged her, as they considered organized religion corrupt and outdated. In 1850 she was a delegate to the first National Women's Rights Convention in Worcester, Massachusetts. In 1853, taking a Congregational pulpit, she became the first woman minister of a recognized denomination in the United States. Ten months later she resigned, her increasingly liberal religious views diverging too radically from Calvinist tenets. Eventually she became a Unitarian.

Blackwell moved to New York City, volunteering in slums and prisons and studying the effects of poverty on mental health and society. At publisher Horace Greeley's suggestion she wrote weekly articles for his *New York Tribune*, collected in her first book, *Shadows of Our Social System* (1856). In the 1870s she returned to the lecture circuit, and in 1878 was recognized as a Unitarian minister. Oberlin granted her honorary degrees in 1878 and 1908. In 1920 she cast her first vote, one of the few women's suffrage pioneers who lived long enough to do so.

In her scientific treatises, Blackwell tries to show the evolution of the universe from the simple to the complex. She brings all of Creation, however, back to "one Mind infinite in executiveness." In *The Sexes Throughout Nature* (1875) she argues against Charles Darwin and Herbert Spencer, disputing that the male is the representative type of the species and the female but a modification of it. She argues that on the subject of the normal powers and functions of woman at least, women are more than the equals of even the wisest men. She sanctioned part-time employment for women, made possible by assistance with household duties from men, and her greatest contribution must be that she modeled this herself by combining marriage, children, social activism, professional work, public speaking, and scholarly writing in a long, productive life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Shadows of Our Social System (New York, 1856).
Studies in General Science (New York, 1869).
The Sexes Throughout Nature (New York, 1875).
The Physical Basis of Immortality (New York, 1876).
The Philosophy of Individuality; or, The One and the Many (New York, 1893).
The Making of the Universe: Evolution the Continuous Process which Derives the Finite from the Infinite (Boston, 1914).
The Social Side of Mind and Action (New York, 1915).

Other Relevant Works
Blackwell's papers are in the Library of Congress and Radcliffe College in Massachusetts.
Soul Mates: the Oberlin Correspondence of Lucy Stone and Antoinette Brown, 1846–1850, ed. Carol Lasser and Marlene Merrill (Oberlin, Ohio, 1983).
Friends and Sisters: Letters between Lucy Stone and Antoinette Brown Blackwell, 1846–93, ed. Carol Lasser and Marlene Merrill (Urbana, Illinois, 1987).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer

Religious Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v29, Who Was Who in Amer v1, Women Phils

Cazden, Elizabeth. *Antoinette Brown Blackwell: A Biography* (New York, 1983).

Cicily Vahadji

BLANSHARD, Brand (1892–1987)

Brand Blanshard was born on 27 August 1892 in Fredericksburg, Ohio, and died on 18 November 1987 in New Haven, Connecticut. Together with a fraternal twin named Paul, later a prominent social critic, he was raised by his grandmother in penurious conditions. Their home, however, was one where learning was encouraged, and the family twice relocated for educational purposes, the second time in 1910, when they moved to Ann Arbor so that the boys could attend the University of Michigan, an affordable public institution. In his junior year Blanshard won a Rhodes scholarship, enrolling at Merton College, Oxford, in the fall of 1913. At Oxford his key influences were F. H. Bradley, Harold Joachim, and H. W. B. Joseph. Bradley's work and presence at Merton cast an inspirational spell on the aspiring philosopher (who met with him twice); Joachim was his tutor and thesis supervisor; and Joseph's conversations and writings had a lifetime impact on specific features of Blanshard's work.

World War I interrupted Blanshard's Oxford education. A pacifist, he signed up with the YMCA, serving in India and Mesopotamia, before returning to the United States in September 1917 to enroll at Columbia University to complete an MA thesis on Hume's theory of judgment. When the United States entered the war, he was drafted and assigned to an educational unit in France to teach the history of philosophy to his fellow soldiers. During this period he dropped his given first name, Percy. Upon leaving the Army, he returned to Merton to write a thesis on John DEWEY's theory of judgment. After receiving his Oxford BSc degree, he went to Harvard University where he completed a PhD thesis on the "Nature of Judgment" under C. I. LEWIS, although Lewis gave only infrequent advice.

In 1921 Blanshard became an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Michigan. He moved to Swarthmore College in 1925, where he eventually became a full professor. In 1945 he moved to Yale University as Sterling Professor of Philosophy, holding that position until his retirement in 1961. He also served as chair of the philosophy department from 1945 to 1950, and 1959 to 1961.

Blanshard gave both the Gifford Lectures and Carus Lectures, an honor shared only by Dewey at that time. His many other lectureships included the Hertz (British Academy), the Howison (California), the Adamson (Manchester), and the Whitehead, Dudleian, and Noble (Harvard). His Adamson Lecture became the delightful classic *On Philosophical Style* (1954). He was a corresponding fellow of the British Academy, an honorary fellow of Merton College, and a Guggenheim Fellow. He received fourteen honorary doctorates; served as President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1942–5; and, despite his avowed agnosticism, was President of the American Theological Society. He published approximately three hundred articles and eight books, the most noteworthy of which are his two-volume *The Nature of Thought* (1939) and the trilogy *Reason and Goodness* (1961), *Reason and Analysis* (1962), and *Reason and Belief* (1974). Critical reaction to his work was highlighted by his selection as the fourth American in the distinguished series *The Library of Living Philosophers*.

Blanshard devoted his long career to a defense of reason and reasonableness, which he believed were threatened, respectively, by

narrow-minded empiricism and prejudice. In doing so, he staunchly defended the tenets of philosophical rationalism and the virtue of reasonableness. His one constant belief was in the primacy of reason, and his paramount goal was to live the life of a reasonable man. Blanshard's most fundamental presupposition was that reality was ultimately intelligible and he believed that the rational life is the most valuable, for the rationalistic temperament is just the actualization of our natural desire to know and is thus productive of good.

Blanshard often referred to his work as neo-Spinozistic and much of it does have close parallels with Spinoza's thought. Late in his career, he summarized his understanding of Rationalism in an *Encyclopaedia Britannica* article as: "the philosophical view that regards reason as the chief source and test of knowledge. Holding that reality itself has an inherently logical structure, the Rationalist asserts that a class of truths exists that the intellect can grasp directly. There are, according to the Rationalists, certain rational principles – especially in logic and mathematics, and even in ethics and metaphysics – that are so fundamental that to deny them is to fall into contradiction." ("Rationalism," 1974, p. 527) In contrast, empiricism holds that all knowledge both comes from and must ultimately be tested by experience, whereas rationalism maintains that "reason is a faculty that can lay hold of truths beyond the reach of sense perception, both in certainty and generality" (p. 527). These truths include universals and their relations, which admit of no exception. Rationalism may also involve epistemological and metaphysical commitments. For instance, the "belief that the world is a rationally ordered whole, the parts of which are linked by logical necessity and the structure of which is thereby intelligible" (p. 528); the belief that "a and not-a cannot coexist" holds not merely for sentences but for the real world; and the belief that facts involve a positive coherence, that "they are so bound up with each other that none could be different without all being dif-

ferent" (p. 528). Blanshard believed in internal relations: relations that cannot be changed or removed without affecting the terms themselves between which those relations hold. Further, he agreed with Spinoza that "the causal relation is really a logical one – that a causal law, if precisely stated, would reveal a connection in which the character of the cause logically necessitates that of its effect; and if this is true … the facts and events of the world must thus compose a single rational and intelligible order" (1974, p. 531).

Cautious about the senses, and seeing reality as an ordered system accessible to the intellect, he was also a strict determinist, maintaining that there were no contingently true propositions – given sufficient knowledge we could deduce an effect from prior knowledge of its cause. (That his mother accidentally burned herself to death when he was an infant perhaps adds poignancy to Blanshard's strict necessitarianism.) Finally, he followed Spinoza, Bradley, Joseph, and others in maintaining that thought was purposive in character: "It was the position of all these men that there is a *conatus* or drive in human nature that demands for its satisfaction an understanding of the world, a vision of the whole, in which the nature and place of each thing is to be understood only by seeing its place in an all-inclusive order. Philosophy is the systematic attempt at the apprehension of that order." (Schilpp 1980, p. 126)

Although blessed with an unusually felicitous style, Blanshard nonetheless wrote long books (*The Nature of Thought* has 1,132 pages), chiefly because his primary method was argument by elimination. His method is something like the following procedure: A problem is posed and initial candidate solutions are carefully enumerated; these are reduced one-by-one by counter-arguments until only one is left standing in the field; the arguments against it are considered and found not to be decisive; however, it is often granted that the arguments in favor of the candidate are not, by themselves, completely compelling

as they do not serve to prove the conclusion drawn; therefore, it is admitted that there are no grounds for a claim to certainty on the question at issue; despite this, it is maintained that it is reasonable to accept this candidate as the best available, even in the face of residual uncertainty, because doing so allows one to make sense of what would otherwise be an inexplicable world (escaping skepticism); furthermore, acceptance makes it possible to continue discussion on this and related matters, thereby enabling us to work towards an ideal goal of understanding reality.

Blanshard is best known for his advocacy of coherence as both the nature and criterion of truth. Coherence has both metaphysical and psychological roots in his thought. As to the latter, he wrote that in reflection we (1) specify a problem, (2) amass data through observation and memory, (3) make a leap of suggestion, (4) deduce the consequences of that suggestion, and then (5) compare these implications with fact. He argued that the last two of these steps are really a single process that establishes the coherence of a suggestion with experience. This reflective process is purposive, aiming at truth and understanding, which are essentially equivalent. "To know the truth about anything is … to apprehend it in a system of relations that makes it intelligible, and this is what we mean by understanding it" (1939, vol. 1, p. 78). It is only when we have such contextual knowledge that we understand why something holds, i.e. grasp its necessity within that context. This concurs with his metaphysical position regarding the fundamentally systematic character of reality. "The upshot of this … was what seemed to me a clear insight that thought from the beginning was a drive toward understanding, and that this drive could in the end be satisfied by one thing only. This was the achievement of a system of thought in which the question Why? had been pressed through to the end in all directions. Such a system would be at once all-comprehensive and so related internally that nothing intelligible remained. In short, thought was a distinctive drive in human nature in which from the very beginning the end of coherent system was immanently at work and became clearer in conception and firmer in its guidance as the development progressed" (Schilpp 1980, p. 591).

But how, one asks, can we be confident that our beliefs conform to the world, and that a coherent system of beliefs offers us a genuine view of reality? In his early work, Blanshard emphasized we can do so because thought and things are related, the first being the partial fulfillment of what the latter fulfills perfectly. Thought, he wrote, "is a half way house on the road to reality" (1939, vol. 1, p. 494). Thought is purposive in that it seeks satisfaction in an explanation that would allow inquiry to come to rest. In the presence of the incoherent this would be impossible. Of course, while we may come closer to an understanding of reality, we never reach our goal, and thus truth must be understood to have degrees, as our explanations never fully satisfy. "Truth is the approximation of thought to reality. It is thought on its way home. Its measure is the distance thought has traveled, under guidance of its inner compass, toward that intelligible system which unites its ultimate object with its ultimate end …. At any given time the degree of truth in our experience as a whole is the degree of system it has achieved. The degree of truth of a particular proposition is to be judged in the first instance by its coherence with experience as a whole, ultimately by its coherence with that further whole, all-comprehensive and fully articulated, in which thought can come to rest." (1939, vol. 2, p. 264) For Blanshard, truth is ideal coherence.

Strictly speaking, a coherent system is a set of propositions in which each stands to the rest such that it is logically necessary that it be true if all the rest are true and such that none is logically independent of the others. Blanshard grants that, in practice, we never attain such an ideal coherent system in which every proposition is entailed by the others jointly and even singly. Nonetheless, such a standard is implicit

in our grading of knowledge as better or worse, more or less adequate, etc. Consequently, we need not be driven to skepticism because our ideal is that judgments be seen to be true in the context of all possible knowledge. For ordinary purposes the coherence we seek is with present knowledge, particularly scientific knowledge, not an inaccessible absolute. Indeed, our attitude to science at any time must recognize its provisional explanatory adequacy – it must be open and critical.

In response to the oft-stated criticism that there might be more than one, indeed an infinite number of consistent and thus coherent systems, Blanshard argued first, that his ideal coherence also required comprehensiveness so that everything real and possible be included; and second, that it is impossible that there could be two such systems. For there to be two they would have to differ either in facts or structure, and if so, either one would not be comprehensive or the structure of each would be a fact not included in the other.

For Blanshard, the problem of truth arises in the context of reflective thinking, where our object is understanding or explaining to ourselves. Judgments can be self-justifying provided they are not considered in isolation from other judgments, but are determined to be fully coherent with those judgments. However, if their coherence is to be truth guaranteeing (or in a weaker sense, warranting), then their truth must itself lie in their coherence. But a high standard of coherence is required – not only must these propositions be tied together necessarily, they must also be as comprehensive as the state of our knowledge at a given time will permit. If pressed, any question calls for an indefinitely inclusive system that links the unexplained fact to its context in such a way as to show that the context requires that fact for its completion. Blanshard grants that the question whether reality is, as a matter of fact, a coherent system, with which coherent thought can accord, is itself not provable but is a postulate of reason. However, it is a postulate that is more rea-

sonable to believe than its negation because it is progressively confirmed by experience. The truth of our present judgment thus lies in a prospective relationship between that thought and reality conceived as what would ultimately satisfy the ideal intellect.

Blanshard shared Spinoza's position that things are either necessary or impossible. For Spinoza, they are necessary because their existence follows necessarily from their essence (i.e. as infinite modes of God) or from a given efficient cause. They are impossible either because their essence or definition involves a contradiction or because there is no external cause which has been determined to produce such a thing. They are never contingent, for "a thing is called contingent only because of a defect of our knowledge" (*Ethics*, I, paragraph 33, section 1). Similarly, it is an important postulate of Blanshard's thought that there are no accidents, no events in the universe that occur outside of a system of necessary causal relationships, and no true inferences that are not impelled by necessity. Necessity, he argues, is characteristic not only of our conceptual systems but also of the object of those systems, reality itself. Indeed, in his view, reasoning is pointless without necessity, for without necessity the world could not be said to be intelligible. Simply put, reason is a drive towards intelligibility (under the guidance of an ideal of system) that can only be satisfied by the apprehension of necessity, that is, when we see that something not only is so, but must be so.

He insisted that there were genuine logical, moral, and natural necessities that are interlinked. For instance, logical necessities involve more than the connection of abstract elements – they involve the real connection of things. Further, natural causation involves logical necessity. Fundamental logical laws record not just an actual or recommended movement of thought in inference but genuine structural characteristics of nature: as Bradley had said, reality does not contradict itself. Moral necessities are revealed in such beliefs as that pleasure is better than pain. They do not just

indicate preferences but are forced upon us by moral realities.

Perhaps Blanshard's most controversial position in this area is his insistence that causation is a necessary relation. He thought that if this were not so we would be trapped in the world of the presently given, unable to move to the realms of the past or future and with no knowledge of actual physical objects. Awareness of causes gives us our ability to predict and control. Again, intelligibility depends on it, for B is truly intelligible only when it is seen to follow necessarily from A. He contends that "the universe itself may be regarded as one gigantic congeries of events linked directly or indirectly by a network of causal laws. And … the strands [the causal relations] that form this network belong to the nature of things no less than the items linked" (1962, p. 445). While he would agree with Hume that this causal process is largely impenetrable to us, Blanshard nonetheless insists, against Hume, that necessity runs through it; otherwise belief in regular succession entails a belief that the world is involved in an outrageous run of luck. The lawfulness we apprehend cries out for an explanation, and this can only be provided by the operation of necessity. "For on the chance hypothesis every successive repetition of a conjunction given in the past is the occurrence of the progressively more improbable, while on the hypothesis of intrinsic connection, it is only a confirmation, more impressive at each recurrence, of what the hypothesis predicted" (1939, vol. 2, p. 506).

In the winters of 1952 and 1953, Blanshard delivered two courses of Gifford Lectures at the University of St. Andrews. The first course of ten lectures had the subject "Reason and Its Critics" and the second course "Reason and Goodness." In December 1959, he delivered the Carus Lectures to the American Philosophical Association meeting in New York City. This latter group of three lectures and the earlier twenty given in Scotland formed the basis of his great trilogy on reason. They "make a sequence in which I have tried to sketch the office of reason in the theory of knowledge, ethics, and religion respectively" (*Reason and Belief*, 1974, p. 10).

In *Reason and Analysis* much more than just the analytic "theory of knowledge" of the post-World War I period is considered. Topics in epistemology, logic, and metaphysics are thoroughly surveyed, and much is found wanting in the theories of the new schools. Blanshard produced what is perhaps our most effective critique of the various analytical schools, and their empiricist ancestors (such as Hume), because he also offered an alternative. He points out the sharp contrasts between the idealistic rationalism that dominated philosophy at the turn of the century and the realism, naturalism, pragmatism, positivism, and linguistic analysis that gained ascendancy after the war. On a range of core issues, Blanshard demonstrates that reason must be the proper foundation of philosophical thought, and that it finds its chief work in the tracing of necessary connections between universals.

Reason and Goodness, the second of the trilogy, is primarily concerned with the question whether moral judgments express knowledge or feeling. Blanshard stands firmly on the side of knowledge, the position which began with Socrates's identification of virtue and knowledge. But the most striking example of a rationalistic ethic is that of the Stoics: "the most remarkable experiment on record in the surrender of life to reason at the expense of feeling and desire" (1961, p. 43). Two aspects of the stoic tradition in ethics are especially important to Blanshard: (1) following the guidance of what Aristotle had said was distinctive or essential in our own nature, i.e. reason; and (2) conforming to that which was essential in outward nature, i.e. intelligible law. In this way, Blanshard arrived at the same position as Spinoza concerning human freedom. How can we be fully determined and yet free? They answered that true freedom consists in acting solely from a necessity of one's nature. It is the nature of a stone to fall

and of a mind to think. Determination by reason is freedom: "For a rational being to act under the influence of seen necessity is to place himself at the farthest possible extreme from the behavior of the puppet. For a moral agent to choose that good which in the light of reflection approves itself as intrinsically greatest is to exercise the only freedom worth having …. To think at its best is to find oneself carried down the current of necessity. To choose most responsibly is to see alternative goods with full clearness and to find the greatest of them tipping the beam. This, in a way, is to be determined. But there is nothing mechanical about it. For it is what the rational man means by freedom" (1962, p. 493).

Reason and Belief considers the respective roles of reason and revelation in forming religious beliefs. Blanshard again argues that we should be guided by reason alone, that to base one's beliefs on revelation or authority is to violate an ethics of belief that should direct all our beliefs, including the religious. As an example, if reality is a coherent whole the law of causality leaves no room for miracles. Where then does God fit in? Once again, he sides with Spinoza: "For us the ultimate reality in the universe is to be found in no part of it, however great, but only in the whole. It is the universe itself, not indeed as a scattered litter of items but as the one comprehensive and necessary order that a full understanding would find in it" (*Reason and Belief*, 1974, pp. 523–4). Such a world is neither morally nor intrinsically good, but indifferent. It is a world governed by logic, not love. However, there are genuine goods we can seek by fulfilling our nature as rational beings. To do so we must recognize reason for what it is. "It will at no stage give [us] finality, but [we] will approach [our] goal by means of it or not at all …. Take reason seriously …. Give it its head. Let it shape belief and conduct freely. It will shape them aright if anything can." (*Reason and Belief*, 1974, p. 572)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Nature of Thought, 2 vols (London, 1939).

"Current Strictures on Reason," *Philosophical Review* 54 (1945): 345–68.

"The Philosophy of Analysis," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 38 (1952): 39–69.

On Philosophical Style (Manchester, UK, 1954).

"The Impasse in Ethics – and a Way Out," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 28 (1955): 93–112.

Reason and Goodness (London, 1961).

Reason and Analysis (London, 1962).

"Internal Relations and Their Importance to Philosophy," *Review of Metaphysics* 21 (1967): 227–36.

The Uses of a Liberal Education: And Other Talks to Students, ed. Eugene Freeman (La Salle, Ill., 1973).

Reason and Belief (London, 1974).

Four Reasonable Men: Marcus Aurelius, John Stuart Mill, Ernest Renan, Henry Sidgwick (Middletown, Conn., 1984).

Other Relevant Works

Blanshard's papers are at Yale University.

"Personal Ethics," in *Preface to Philosophy: Textbook*, ed. W. P. Tolley (New York, 1946), pp. 101–95.

"The Case for Determinism," in *Determinism and Freedom*, ed. Sidney Hook (New York, 1958), pp. 3–15.

"Interrogation of Brand Blanshard," in *Philosophical Interrogations*, ed. S. Rome and B. Rome (New York, 1964), pp. 201–57.

"In Defense of Metaphysics," in *Metaphysics: Readings and Reappraisals*, ed. W. E. Kennick and M. Lazerowitz (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1966), pp. 331–55.

"The Limits of Naturalism," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Second Series*, ed. J. E. Smith (London, 1970), pp. 21–53.

"Rationalism," in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*,

15th edn (London, 1974), vol. 15, pp. 527–32.

"The Philosophic Enterprise," in *The Owl of Minerva: Philosophers on Philosophy*, ed. C. J. Bontempo and S. J. Odell (New York, 1975), pp. 163–77.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils 1950-2000*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v5*, *Proc of APA v64*, *Who Was Who in Amer v9*, *Who's Who in Phil*

"Brand Blanshard," *Review of Metaphysics* 21 (1967): 227–72. Special section of articles on Blanshard with his "Rejoinder to My Critics."

Idealistic Studies 20 (May 1990): 97–170. Special issue devoted to Blanshard.

Reck, Andrew J. *The New American Philosophers: An Exploration of Thought Since World War II* (Baton Rouge, La., 1968), pp. 81–119.

Schilpp, Paul A., ed. *The Philosophy of Brand Blanshard* (La Salle, Ill., 1980). Contains Blanshard's autobiography and bibliography.

"Truth and Reason: Essays Written in Honor of Brand Blanshard's Eightieth Birthday, August 27, 1972," *Idealistic Studies* 4 (1974): 1–105. Blanshard's "A Reply to My Critics" is on pp. 107–30 of the following issue.

F. Michael Walsh

BLAVATSKY, Helena Petrovna (1831–91)

Helena Petrovna Blavatsky was born on 12 August 1831 (31 July in the Russian calendar), in Ekaterinoslav, Ukraine, and died on 8 May 1891 in London, England. She spent her childhood alternating between the estates of her maternal grandparents and a series of military posts in Ukraine and southern Russia. During a year in the Astrakhan region, where her grandfather was administrator, she encountered the Kalmuck tribe, which practiced a form of Tibetan Buddhism. As an adult she reported being strongly influenced by her early contact with the Kalmucks' chief priest. Helena's formal education was limited to a series of governesses, but she came from a literary family; her mother was a successful novelist, her grandmother an amateur naturalist, and her maternal uncle a writer on political and military subjects. After her mother's death in 1842, Helena went to live permanently with her grandparents then residing in Saratov, where she encountered the library of her late great-grandfather, Prince Pavel Dolgorukii, a prominent Rosicrucian Freemason in the years before Catherine II closed the lodges. In 1847 Helena went to live in the new family home in Tbilisi, where she became acquainted with Prince Aleksandr Golitsyn, a Freemason who encouraged her to travel abroad and pursue her growing interest in esotericism.

In 1849 she married Nikifor Blavatsky, vice governor of Yerevan province, but she abandoned her husband within a short time and went to Istanbul and then to Cairo, where she studied with Paolos Metamon, a Coptic magician. In the early 1850s, she met Albert Rawson, an American artist, author, and explorer, with whom she traveled widely in the Middle East, Europe, and America. Rawson, who became a leading figure in the Free Thought movement and several Masonic organizations, later joined the Theosophical Society in New York. Blavatsky spent much of her thirties in the company of Agardi Metrovitch, a Hungarian opera singer and radical leftist. Metrovitch was a disciple of Giuseppe Mazzini, prophet of Italian nationalism, with whom Blavatsky was associated in the 1850s in London. She traveled with Metrovitch in Ukraine, Italy, and Eastern Europe, but returned to her family in Russia for a long visit in 1858. She performed various mediu-

mistic feats during this time according to family memoirs, and alleged psychic phenomena continued in one form or another for the rest of her life.

Although she possibly visited India and neighboring countries around 1856 and again in 1869, her travels and associations during this period remain undocumented. In the early 1870s she went with Metrovitch to Egypt, where he died. There she was reunited with Metamon and became affiliated with a group she would later call the Brotherhood of Luxor. Among her likely associates in this group was Jamal ad-Din "al-Afghani," an Iranian political organizer, religious reformer, and leader of subversive movements throughout the Muslim world, whose travels paralleled hers for thirty years. One of his closest colleagues was James Sanua, an Egyptian playwright and journalist of Italian Jewish background, later exiled to Paris, where he spent most of his life. For many years, Sanua maintained close ties with Lydia Pashkov, a Russian travel writer and friend of Blavatsky, who accompanied her on a long Syrian journey in 1872. An advisor during Blavatsky's later career was Raphael Borg, a British diplomat in Egypt, who had recruited Afghani and Sanua as members of a Cairo Masonic lodge.

After Blavatsky settled in New York City in 1873, she was visited there by Pashkov and also by a Cypriot magician who called himself "Ooton Liatto" and who seems to be the inspiration for her references to "the Master Hilarion." Almost immediately upon her arrival in New York City, Blavatsky set out to make a name for herself among Spiritualists. She met Henry Steel Olcott at a series of seances in Chittenden, Vermont, conducted by William and Horatio Eddy, noted for their materialization of spirits. Olcott, captivated by her talk of distant lands and occult secrets, became her ardent disciple. Soon after meeting Olcott, Blavatsky began to write articles for Spiritualist journals and New York newspapers. Assuring him that she was the agent of a secret brotherhood of initiates, Blavatsky transmitted letters to Olcott alleged to be from various "adepts" beginning in the summer of 1875. The following autumn, Olcott and Blavatsky founded the Theosophical Society, whose other cofounders included Charles Sotheran, an English immigrant to New York who was a noted journalist and Socialist. Sotheran was also a Rosicrucian and Freemason, associated with Rawson in several secret societies.

In 1877, Blavatsky's first book *Isis Unveiled* was published to mixed reviews but impressive sales. It attacked religion and science on behalf of an ancient gnosis allegedly superior to both, traces of which she found preserved by secret societies around the world as well as in scriptures of many religions. Many of its themes were shared by two other authors affiliated with the Theosophical Society – Emma Hardinge Britten and Marie, Countess of Caithness – in books appearing shortly before *Isis*. But Blavatsky's emphasis soon shifted away from Spiritualism and Western esotericism, and all her later writings are unambiguous in support of reincarnation, which was denied in her first book.

Soon after the establishment of the Theosophical Society, Blavatsky and Olcott were visited by James Peebles, an American Spiritualist traveling lecturer who had recently returned from India and Ceylon. He introduced them to leaders of the Indian reform group the Arya Samaj, and of Sinhalese Buddhism, both of which were crucial to the Theosophists' decision to move to Bombay at the end of 1878. Blavatsky and Olcott arrived in India acclaiming the leader and founder of the Arya Samaj, Swami Dayananda Sarasvati, as their guru. The Theosophical Society and the Arya Samaj were amalgamated but the alliance ended in rancor in 1882. In their first year in India, Blavatsky founded *The Theosophist* and began to write for Mikhail Katkov, a Moscow newspaper editor. Katkov was also a political conspirator, who later encouraged a Russian attack on British India and plotted with French sympathizers and

Indian revolutionaries to that end. Olcott and Blavatsky traveled extensively in India establishing their society during 1879 and 1880. In 1880 Olcott and Blavatsky also made an extended tour of Ceylon where they publicly embraced Buddhism.

The central figure in Blavatsky's *Caves and Jungles of Hindostan* (1892), a travel book published serially in two of Katkov's newspapers, is "Gulab-Singh," a Hindu ruler presented as a chief sponsor of the Theosophical leaders' travels. The likely historical basis for this figure is Maharaja Ranbir Singh of Kashmir, who appears under his own name in another series of Russian articles by Blavatsky entitled *The Durbar in Lahore*. Another character in *Caves and Jungles* is "Ram-Ranjit-Das," a Sikh official at the Golden Temple in Amritsar. His most persuasive historical analogue appears to be Sirdar Thakar Singh Sandhanwalia, founder of the Singh Sabha, a Sikh reform organization allied with the Theosophical Society. Beginning in 1880, the Anglo-Indian newspaper editor A. P. Sinnett and government official A. O. Hume were the recipients of a series of "Mahatma letters" alleged to be authored by Morya and Koot Hoomi, mysterious Indians living in Tibet who had chosen Blavatsky as their messenger to the outside world. Morya was another name for Gulab-Singh, according to Blavatsky's letters to a Russian friend. Although Blavatsky herself has been accused of authoring the letters, neither their authorship nor the question of Tibetan sources has been definitely resolved. Handwriting analyses have yielded conflicting results, and while Blavatsky clearly had some role in the letters' production she does not appear to have been their sole author.

The Singh Sabha's co-founder, Bhai Gurmukh Singh, was a leading Sikh intellectual with Theosophical associations, as was his colleague Sirdar Dayal Singh Majithia, a philanthrophist, journalist, and political leader who might be the basis for Blavatsky's references to a "Djual Kul" associated with Morya and Koot Hoomi. The Singh Sabha, Arya Samaj, and Theosophical Society were all involved in the establishment of the Indian National Congress in 1885, an organization that continued to have Theosophical ties well into the twentieth century. In Bengal, many Theosophists were also affiliated with the Brahmo Samaj, another reformist organization that influenced the Freedom Movement. Norendro Nath Sen, a Calcutta newspaper editor, was Theosophy's most influential supporter in Bengal.

In 1885 Blavatsky left India forever, following the investigation of her alleged psychic phenomena by British philosopher Richard Hodgson, sponsored by the Society for Psychical Research. Based largely on the testimony of Emma and Alexis Coulomb, disgruntled staff members who claimed to have assisted Blavatsky in faking psychic phenomena, Hodgson concluded that Blavatsky was an impostor and her Masters nonexistent. His report to the Society for Psychical Research was devastating to Blavatsky's reputation outside the ranks of the Theosophical Society. It has remained controversial to the present day, repeatedly criticized by Theosophists and sympathizers.

After her departure from India, Blavatsky lived briefly in Italy, Germany, and Belgium, before settling in London in 1887. In the four remaining years of her life, Blavatsky completed three books that established her reputation as a leading author of the late Victorian occult revival: *The Secret Doctrine* (1888), *The Key to Theosophy* (1889), and *The Voice of the Silence* (1889). The latter, as well as some material left unpublished at her death, revealed her growing familiarity with Tibetan Buddhism. Olcott's close friendship with the Bengali explorer Sarat Chandra Das, who had penetrated Tibet in the early 1880s and returned with more than two hundred manuscripts, might account for Blavatsky's apparent familiarity with Tibetan source material in her later writings. *The Secret Doctrine* includes commentary on a hitherto unknown text the *Stanzas of Dzyan*, and the *Voice of the Silence* claims to be the

translation of a likewise unknown *Book of Golden Precepts*. Whether these were Blavatskian inventions or genuine texts has been debated ever since their publication.

Although Blavatsky is generally considered as a figure in religious history because she founded a new spiritual movement, her Theosophy claimed to reconcile and synthesize science, religion, and philosophy. *The Secret Doctrine* is the most philosophical of her works, but it usually juxtaposes ancient philosophy with modern science, without reference to modern philosophy. Immanuel Kant and G. W. F. Hegel each receive a mere eight mentions in the text, compared to eighty-seven for Plato and Platonism and fifty-four for Pythagoras and Pythagoreans. Among her contemporaries, the authors most frequently cited are Ernst Haeckl, Thomas Huxley, and Herbert Spencer, all of whom she strongly criticizes as exponents of Darwinism. Blavatsky's Theosophy repudiates scientific materialism and scriptural literalism, attempting to reconcile evolution with religion. She teaches a monadology, frequently citing Gottfried Leibniz, which is combined with Vedantic pantheism, producing an emanationist cosmology in which all monads emerge from divine unity at the beginning of a cosmic cycle and return to the source at its close. Although the cycles of Blavatskian cosmology are Hindu in name, the overwhelming focus on sevenfold cycles of individual, global, and cosmic initiation suggests Isma`ili doctrines. Her emphasis on Advaita Vedanta philosophy reflects the influence of a Brahmin associate T. Subba Row, as well as that of some of her royal sponsors. Nonetheless, she proclaimed herself a Buddhist even before taking formal vows in 1880, and her society was closely allied with leaders of Sinhalese Buddhism thereafter. Her writings recognize no conflicts between Buddhist and Vedanta doctrines, nor for that matter between Indic spiritual traditions and those of Western esotericism. She described Theosophy as a universal solvent and asserted the essential harmony of Eastern and Western religions.

Blavatsky acquired American citizenship in 1878, but spent only five of her sixty years in the United States. Her primary influence on American culture has been as an early promoter of Eastern religious doctrines, particularly reincarnation and karma, which became widely known through Theosophical publications. Some of her doctrines have been adopted in several later occultist groups, as have the names and characters of the Theosophical Mahatmas, mostly in the US. In Europe, Blavatskian Theosophy had an impact on the arts, inspiring painters Wassily Kandinsky and Piet Mondrian and the music of Aleksandr Scriabin. Through her acquaintance with William Butler Yeats and George Russell, Blavatsky had an influence on the Irish literary renaissance. Theosophy had a lasting role in the Indian Freedom Movement, especially during the Theosophical Society presidency of Annie Besant.

Blavatsky is usually portrayed as a marginal figure in American religious history, as well as philosophically. The only philosopher to take note of her was William JAMES, who endorsed Hodgson's report but commented sympathetically on *The Voice of the Silence* in his 1902 *Varieties of Religious Experience*. Despite her marginality she is also frequently regarded as a pivotal figure, an author whose Theosophical writings set the agenda for much of popular occultism of the last century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Isis Unveiled: A Master-key to the Mysteries of Ancient and Modern Science and Theology (New York, 1877).

The Secret Doctrine: The Synthesis of Science, Religion, and Philosophy (London, New York, and Madras, 1888).

The Voice of the Silence (London and New York, 1889).

The Key to Theosophy (London, 1889).

From the Caves and Jungles of Hindostan, trans. Vera Johnston (London and New York, 1892; 2nd edn, Wheaton, Ill., 1975).

Other Relevant Works

Gems from the East (London and New York, 1890).

Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge of the Theosophical Society (London, 1890–91).

Nightmare Tales (London, New York, and Madras, 1892).

The Theosophical Glossary, ed. G. R. S. Mead (London, 1892).

A Modern Panarion (London, 1895).

The Letters of H. P. Blavatsky to A. P. Sinnett (London, 1925).

Some Unpublished Letters of Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, with an Introduction and Commentary by Eugene Rollin Corson (London, 1929).

The People of the Blue Mountains (Wheaton, Ill., 1930).

H. P. B. Speaks, 2 vols, ed. C. Jinarajadasa (Madras, India, 1950–51).

H. P. Blavatsky: Collected Writings, 15 vols, ed. Boris de Zirkoff (Wheaton, Ill., 1966–91).

H. P. Blavatsky to the American Conventions, 1888–1891 (Pasadena, Cal., 1979).

The Inner Group Teachings of H. P. Blavatsky (San Diego, Cal., 1985).

The Letters of H. P. Blavatsky (Wheaton, Ill., 2003).

Helena Blavatsky, ed. Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke (London, 2004).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encyc Relig*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v15*

American Theosophical Society. *The Theosophic Messenger* (San Francisco, 1899–1912). Changed title to *The Theosophical Messenger* and then to *The American Theosophist* (Wheaton, Ill., 1933–96). Changed title to *The Quest* (Wheaton, Ill., 1996–).

Carlson, Maria. *No Religion Higher Than Truth* (Princeton, N.J., 1993).

Cranston, Sylvia. *HPB: The Extraordinary Life and Influence of Helena Blavatsky, Founder of the Modern Theosophical Movement* (Los Angeles, 1993).

Godwin, Joscelyn. *The Theosophical Enlightenment* (Albany, N.Y., 1994).

Gomes, Michael. *The Dawning of the Theosophical Movement* (Wheaton, Ill., 1987).

Harrison, Vernon. *H. P. Blavatsky and the SPR* (Pasadena, Cal., 1997).

Johnson, K. Paul. *The Masters Revealed: Madam Blavatsky and the Myth of the Great White Lodge* (Albany, N.Y., 1994).

The Mahatma Letters to A. P. Sinnett, 2nd edn (London, 1926).

Meade, Marion. *Madame Blavatsky: The Woman behind the Myth* (New York, 1980).

Reigle, David. *Blavatsky's Secret Books* (San Diego, Cal., 1999).

Society for Psychical Research. "Report on Phenomena connected with Theosophy," *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research* 3 (December 1885): 201–400.

Kenneth Paul Johnson

BLAU, Joseph Leon (1909–86)

Joseph Blau was born on 6 May 1909 in Brooklyn, New York, the son of Joel Leon Blau, a rabbi, and Rachel Woolf Blau. He received his BA (1931), MA (1933), and PhD in philosophy (1944) from Columbia University. His dissertation, titled "The Christian Interpretation of the Cabala in the Renaissance," was written under the philosophers James Gutmann and Herbert SCHNEIDER. During the years of his graduate study, Blau taught English in New York City high schools. After earning his doctorate, he was a professor of philosophy at Columbia from 1944 until 1963, when he became a professor of religion.

From 1967 to 1976 he served as chair of the religion department. Blau retired in 1977, and died on 28 December 1986 in New York City.

Blau's scholarship concerned two areas of overlapping interests: (1) historical American philosophy, and (2) the development of Jewish philosophy. For the first of these interests he wrote *Men and Movements in American Philosophy* (1958). This became his best-known book and it was widely studied, discussed, and translated into five languages. It was dedicated to his friend Herbert Schneider, whose pattern of thought it followed. Blau also supplied the extensive bibliographies included in Schneider's 1946 *A History of American Philosophy.*

John DEWEY's influence was evident in Blau's other work. For both Blau and Dewey, God is the relationship between the actual and the ideal. Briefly stated, God must be the realized existence of human beings. Commitment to these "ideals," in their broadest reach, is the religious attitude, and religion is a quality of all human experience. If we proceed analytically we will uncover different but related types of twentieth-century naturalism: (1) the poetic naturalism of George SANTAYANA; (2) the rationalistic naturalism of Morris COHEN; and (3) the experimental naturalism of John Dewey, the category in which Blau's work is best placed.

In the field of Jewish philosophy, Blau attempted to clarify the whole span of Jewish philosophy from the Old Testament to Martin Buber in contemporary time. In his writings, Blau considers creation, freedom, the theories of Philo, the Talmudists, and Kabbalists, Spinoza, Gnosticism, God, individualism, prophesy, Moses, Maimonides and other less well-known figures and groups.

Like his teacher, Salo Wittmayer Baron, Blau stressed the cross-cultural effect on the development of Judaism. Among his works are: *Christian Interpretation of the Cabala in the Renaissance* (1944); *The Story of Jewish Philosophy* (1962), the first single-volume treatment of the entire span of Jewish philos-

ophy for the non-specialist; *The Jews of the United States, 1790–1840* (1963), edited with S. W. Baron; and *Judaism in America* (1976). Blau suggests that, according to one understanding of the Kabbalah, humanity's spiritual and ritual acts of character aid God's own self-reconciliation, making both evil and creative deeds possible.

His colleagues (including Maurice Wohlgelernter and James Martin, Jr.) organized Blau's festschrift volume, *History, Religion, and Spiritual Democracy* (1980).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Christian Interpretation of the Cabala in the Renaissance (Port Washington, N.Y., 1944).

Cornerstones of Religious Freedom in America (Boston, 1949).

Men and Movements in American Philosophy (New York, 1952).

The Spiritual Life of American Jewry, 1654–1954 (New York, 1955).

Essays on Jewish Life and Thought (New York, 1959).

The Story of Jewish Philosophy (New York, 1962).

Ed. with Salo W. Baron, *The Jews of the United States, 1790–1840: A Documentary History* (New York, 1963).

Modern Varieties of Judaism (New York, 1966).

Judaism in America: From Curiosity to Third Faith (Chicago, 1976).

Other Relevant Works

Blau's papers are at Columbia University and in the archives of the Ethical Culture Movement in New York City.

Ed., *American Philosophic Addresses: 1700–1900* (New York, 1946).

Ed., *Nature* (Indianapolis, 1948).

Ed. with Salo W. Baron, *Judaism, Postbiblical and Talmudic Period* (New York, 1954).

Ed., *Social Theories of Jacksonian Democracy: Representative Writings of*

the Period 1825–1850 (New York, 1954).

Ed., *Reform Judaism: A Historical Perspective, Essays from the Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis* (New York, 1973).

"Science and Social Progress," in *Philosophy and the Civilizing Arts: Essays Presented to Herbert W. Schneider*, ed. Craig Walton and John P. Anton (Athens, Ohio, 1974).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio
Hoffman, R. Joseph. *Biblical v. Secular Ethics: The Conflict* (Buffalo, N.Y., 1988).
Wohlgelernter, Maurice, et al., eds. *History, Religion, and Spiritual Democracy: Essays in Honor of Joseph L. Blau* (New York, 1980). Contains a bibliography of Blau's writings.

John Howie

BLEDSOE, Albert Taylor (1809–77)

Albert Taylor Bledsoe was born on 9 November 1809 in Frankfort, Kentucky. After graduating from the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1830, he served at Fort Gibson on the frontier in the Seventh US Infantry, but in 1832 he resigned his commission. He taught mathematics and French at Kenyon College in 1833–4, and then was professor of mathematics at Miami University in 1834–5. During these years he studied law and theology and was ordained in the Episcopal Church in 1835, but growing doctrinal disagreements over baptismal regeneration sent him in the direction of practicing law instead of the ministry. From 1838 to 1848 he maintained a law practice in Springfield,

Illinois. He never lost his primary interest in theology and philosophy, publishing his first book, *An Examination of President Edwards' Inquiry into the Freedom of the Will* in 1845. In 1848 he accepted a position as professor of mathematics and astronomy at the University of Mississippi, and in 1854 became professor of mathematics at the University of Virginia.

With the onset of the Civil War in 1861 he joined the Confederate Army as a colonel. Confederate President Jefferson Davis soon promoted him to assistant secretary of war, and then encouraged him to compose a defense of the constitutional justification for Confederate secession. In 1863 Bledsoe went to London to do legal research, and remained there until 1866, when he returned to Baltimore to publish *Is Davis a Traitor? Or was Secession a Constitutional Right previous to the War of 1861?* The next year he re-founded and edited the *Southern Review*, which promoted a pro-Southern, anti-industrialist, and theological agenda. In 1871 Bledsoe was ordained a minister in the Methodist Church; he occasionally preached, but never settled with a congregation. For some years he ran a girls' school with the assistance of his daughter, Sophia McIlvaine Bledsoe, who also co-edited the *Southern Review* from 1874 to 1878. Bledsoe continued to edit the *Southern Review* and to publish extensively in its pages until his death on 8 December 1877 in Alexandria, Virginia.

Bledsoe's *Philosophy of Mathematics* (1866) was the first advanced textbook on mathematics in America by that title, although its philosophical aspects go little beyond examinations of analytical geometry and the calculus of infinitesimals. His defense of the Confederate secession had a far wider impact, succinctly stating the best case that could be made for voluntary federalism and states' rights, and it perhaps played a helpful role in Davis's trial for treason. His early book on *Liberty and Slavery* (1857) had also advanced this interpretation of the Constitution alongside a virulently racist view of slaves as legiti-

mate property. Bledsoe, like some other Southern pro-slavery intellectuals including Robert Lewis DABNEY, offered biblical interpretations in support of slavery.

Bledsoe's theology in most respects imitates the mainstream Protestant views of providence and salvation, with a particular emphasis on the reality of free will. His rejection of Jonathan Edwards's treatise against libertarianism is grounded on an appeal to the experience of freedom and a denial that volition can be explained in terms of cause and effect. Worse, the false doctrine of predestination leads to unbelief, in Bledsoe's opinion. Another cause of unbelief is a false perspective on the nature and origin of evil. His *Theodicy* (1853) attempts to vindicate God's goodness and righteousness in the face of apparent moral and natural evils. Although it was designed to match John Wesley's position, contemporaries noted that Bledsoe's tactics justifying the fall and sin as necessary for the glory and dominion of God actually proceed in a manner reminiscent of Edwards. Bledsoe also caused controversy within the Southern Methodist Church through his defense of infant baptism by appeal to tradition and near-universal acceptance, although he confessed that he was unable to find biblical evidence for the practice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An Examination of President Edwards' Inquiry into the Freedom of the Will (Philadelphia, 1845).

A Theodicy, or, Vindication of the Divine Glory as Manifested in the Constitution and Government of the Moral World (New York, 1853).

An Essay on Liberty and Slavery (Philadelphia, 1857).

Is Davis a Traitor? Or was Secession a Constitutional Right previous to the War of 1861? (Baltimore, 1866).

Philosophy of Mathematics (Philadelphia, 1866).

Other Relevant Works

Bledsoe's family papers are at Harvard University and some letters are at the University of Virginia.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v8*

Anonymous. *Is Slavery a Blessing? A Reply to Prof. Bledsoe's Essay on Liberty and Slavery; with Remarks on Slavery as it is* (Boston, 1857).

Bennett, John B. "Albert Taylor Bledsoe: Social and Religious Controversialist of the Old South," PhD dissertation, Duke University (Durham, N.C., 1942).

Hays, Willard M. "Polemics and Philosophy: A Biography of Albert Taylor Bledsoe," PhD dissertation, University of Tennessee (Nashville, 1971).

Herrick, Sophia Bledsoe. "Albert Taylor Bledsoe (1809–1877)," in *Library of Southern Literature*, ed. Edwin Alderman and Joel Harris (Atlanta and New Orleans, 1907), vol. 1, pp. 395–9.

McCorkle, William P. "Bledsoe's Theory of Moral Freedom," *Presbyterian Quarterly* 5 (April 1891): 243–61.

Miller, C. W. *The Southern Review and Infant Baptism, or, Methodist Literature Vindicated against the Attacks of Dr. A. T. Bledsoe* (Nashville, Tenn., 1874).

John R. Shook

BLEWETT, George John (1873–1912)

George Blewett was born on 9 December 1873 in Yarmouth Township, Ontario, Canada. He excelled at his college studies in political economy, and received the BA from Methodist Victoria University in Toronto in 1894. Active

in the Methodist Church, he was eventually ordained in 1898 and did some preaching, but his intellectual interests kept him attached to psychology and philosophy. He completed the honors philosophy program at Victoria College in 1897 and also studied theology. He then entered the PhD program in psychology at the University of Toronto with August Kirschmann, who encouraged him to take courses in Germany in 1899 with Oswald Kulpe and Karl Marbe. For his PhD he desired the Harvard degree instead; largely on the basis of his previous work and a dissertation on the metaphysical basis of ethics titled "The Metaphysical Basis of Preceptive Ethics," he earned the PhD in philosophy in 1900. Although his time with psychologist Hugo MÜNSTERBERG and philosophers William JAMES and Josiah ROYCE was brief, their teachings confirmed his commitment to a theological and personal idealism.

After some postgraduate work at Cambridge, Oxford (with A. M. Fairbairn), and Berlin (with George Simmel), Blewett returned to Canada to take the chair of church history and historical theology at Wesley College in Winnipeg, where he taught from 1901 to 1906. In 1906 he assumed the Ryerson chair of ethics and apologetics at Victoria College of the University of Toronto. With the publication of his first book, *The Study of Nature and the Vision of God* (1907), his reputation as one of North America's important thinkers was secured. He patriotically declined invitations to take Borden Parker BOWNE's vacated chair at Boston University, but he did agree to present the Nathaniel William Taylor Lectures at Yale University's Divinity School during the winter of 1910–11, later published as *The Christian View of the World* (1912). In the following year Blewett drowned, on 15 August 1912, while vacationing in Go Home Bay, Ontario.

Blewett's philosophical religion brings God into community with nature and humanity. Unlike some personal idealists who demand that God must be an entirely separate being from human persons, Blewett postulated merged fields of activity whose personal centers are distinct. His idealism emphasized the social relations, including those with God, of cooperation/conflict that sustain human minds. God is the supreme sustainer of all relations, whose role as the knower of nature guarantees nature's existence, because the laws of nature are the laws of experience. In this way scientific conclusions about nature are not only compatible with, but necessary for, human knowledge about God. However, science does not exhaust all knowledge since the logically prior question, how scientific knowledge is possible, must also be answered by philosophy. Following Wilhelm Wundt's and James's voluntaristic psychology, knowledge is intrinsically involved with purposive activity. Materialism is an abstract and lifeless picture of reality that deterministically pre-empts explaining the immaterial foundation and free growth of knowledge. Deism, pantheism, and supernaturalism can fall into the same deterministic error.

Blewett's crucial role for nature, as the field of contact between our energies and God's thoughts, requires that nature itself be in process. "Nature, then, has its being in a process in which God fulfils Himself in the gradual creation of a spiritual society. But, as we have had at every point to notice, we ourselves are active in that process. To have knowledge of nature the human soul must exert energies of its own; although those energies of its own could neither exist, nor have any effect in the way of knowledge, unless similar energies were working on a greater scale through the whole of nature. And if this is true of the knowledge of nature, still more is it true of that practical intercourse with nature – the labour and the wrestle, the steadily growing mastery crossed by occasional and terrible defeat – which has an even greater place than knowledge in the total process in which we at once receive and achieve our spiritual being." (1912, pp. 188–9).

Self-development as persons, which we know through undeniable experience, is the

key to understanding all reality, including God's. At times Blewett willingly embraces a kind of mysticism that unifies our strivings with God's. The ethical dimension to this union is essential; although Absolute, God needs our moral contribution to the universe's progress. Blewett's idealism is based on a processive and ethical metaphysics, where what ought to be grounds what becomes. The great metaphysical difficulty, which Blewett confronts but does not defeat, is how to uphold traditional theistic views of God as a Trinity, as eternally complete, and purely good, while also maintaining that God is essentially involved with the temporal progress (and evils) of the world. Pantheism was not an option for Blewett, any more than was Calvinism: our condition is not one of either natural goodness or natural badness. Blewett took an optimistic view of our opportunities to gradually become more perfect, guided by Christ's example.

Blewett offers a theodicy that explains sin as necessarily resulting from our imperfections as finite and partial creatures. Although Blewett was far less indebted to Hegel than was his fellow Canadian John WATSON, they both agreed that socially progressive action is obligatory for Christians. Salvation is dependent on living in a more righteous community, but faith in creeds cannot ultimately supply the criteria of progress. For Blewett, Christianity itself evolves through humanity's intellectual efforts; this liberal stance does not mean a surrender to secularism but rather opens the entire field of society for Christian reform.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Study of Nature and the Vision of God (Toronto, 1907).
The Christian View of the World (New Haven, 1912).

Further Reading
Canad Encyc, *Dict Canad Bio*
Armour, Leslie, and Elizabeth Trott. *The Faces of Reason: An Essay on Philosophy and Culture in English Canada, 1850–1950* (Waterloo, Ont., 1981).
MacCollum-Paterson, Morton. "George John Blewett: A Forgotten Personalist," *Idealistic Studies* 8 (1978): 179–89.
———, "Blewett's Vision of God," in *Religion and Science in Early Canada*, ed. J. Douglas Rabb (Kingston, Ont., 1988), pp. 233–7.
Paterson, Morton. "Divine Encounter in Blewett," *Studies in Religion* (Waterloo, Ont.) 6 (1976–7): 397–403.
Slater, John G. *Minerva's Aviary: Philosophy at Toronto 1843–1943* (Toronto, 2005), chap. 13.

John R. Shook

BLOOD, Benjamin Paul (1832–1919)

Benjamin Paul Blood was born on 21 November 1832 in Amsterdam, New York. His father, John Blood, was a moderately wealthy landowner of 700 acres, who taught his only son the skills of farming but little else. Although Benjamin had no college education, his own reading and native intelligence made him a local prodigy and a good debater with traveling lecturers or spiritualists visiting the town. Mechanically inclined, he claims in some autobiographical remarks to have patented some "devices" including a swathing reaper. He also admits to his "loose and wandering ways" that included gambling. Blood was married twice: to Mary Sayles and, following her death, to Harriet Lefferts, having a daughter from each marriage. He lived his entire life in Amsterdam and died there on 15 January 1919.

Blood's life would have passed entirely unnoticed by the wider intellectual world, except for his encounter with nitrous oxide at a dentist's office in 1860 and his subsequent

efforts to draw attention to the mystical powers of the gas. Further experiments convinced Blood that all genuine metaphysical knowledge of reality arose from the sort of mystical experiences that also happened to be caused by anesthetic drugs. He wrote and published a thirty-seven-page pamphlet titled *The Anaesthetic Revelation and the Gist of Philosophy* (1874), mailing copies to nearly every prominent philosopher, psychologist, theologian, and literary figure he could think of.

One of the recipients was Harvard philosopher and psychologist William JAMES. Although Blood received more kind replies than he deserved, and began lengthy correspondences with several figures including Ralph Waldo EMERSON and Alfred Tennyson, only James permitted Blood's speculations to significantly influence his own thought. James promptly tried nitrous oxide himself and came to agree with Blood that "normal" consciousness is but a limited and somewhat misleading encounter with reality. James's religious speculations arrived at the same conclusion: that our intellectual methods can distort or obscure the more fundamental features of wider spirit always available at the "fringes" and "margins" of consciousness.

Most of Blood's publications consist of pamphlets on diverse topics, some poetry, and numerous letters to the editors of local newspapers such as the Amsterdam *Gazette and Recorder*, the Utica *Herald*, and the Albany *Times*. James regularly received Blood's latest work, approved of his transition from monism towards pluralistic empiricism, and occasionally quoted his musings. James liked to quote Blood's phrases: "the universe is wild-game flavored as a hawk's wing" (1893, p. 7) and "ever not quite." James's last publication before his death in 1910, "A Pluralist Mystic," described how Blood's efforts "fascinated me so 'weirdly' that I am conscious of its having been one of the stepping-stones of my thinking ever since." James's final words tell us that "[The mystery] remains as something to be met and dealt with by faculties more akin to our activities and heroisms and willingnesses, than to our logical powers. This is the anaesthetic insight, according to our author. Let my last word, then, speaking in the name of intellectual philosophy, be his word: There is no conclusion. What has concluded that we might conclude in regard to it? There are no fortunes to be told, and there is no advice to be given – Farewell!" (1910, pp. 758–9)

Blood's final work, *Pluriverse: An Essay in the Philosophy of Pluralism* (1920), was published because James had urged the responsibilities of literary executor upon his former student Horace M. KALLEN. Two of Blood's poems are in the Library of America volume on *American Poetry: The Nineteenth Century, Volume Two*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Philosophy of Justice between God and Man (New York, 1851).
Optimism: The Lesson of the Ages (Boston, 1860).
The Anaesthetic Revelation and the Gist of Philosophy (Amsterdam, N.Y., 1874).
"What Is Truth?" *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 10 (1875): 89–94.
"Philosophic Reveries," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 20 (1886): 1–53.
Plato! Jesus! Kant! The Flaw in Supremacy (Amsterdam, N.Y., 1893).
Pluriverse: *An Essay in the Philosophy of Pluralism*, ed. Horace M. Kallen (Boston and London, 1920).

Other Relevant Works
Blood's papers are at Harvard University.
The Bride of the Iconoclast, A Poem: Suggestions toward the Mechanical Art of Verse (Boston, 1854).
Napoleon I: A Historical Lecture (Amsterdam, N.Y., 1863).
The Colonnades (Amsterdam, N.Y., 1868).
A Letter to Workingmen: On Hard Times and the Political Situation (Amsterdam, N.Y., 1878).

The Democratic Heart: A Sketch of Conservative Sentiment and Policy (Amsterdam, N.Y., 1882).

A Capitalist's View of Socialism (New York, 1916).

Heirlooms: A Book of Poems, ed. John E. Willoughby (Albany, N.Y., 1924).

Further Reading

Dict Amer Bio

James, William. "Consciousness under Nitrous Oxide," *Psychological Review 5* (1898): 194–6.

———, "A Pluralistic Mystic," *Hibbert Journal* 8 (1910): 739–59.

Kallen, Horace M. "Preface," in *Pluriverse: An Essay in the Philosophy of Pluralism*, ed. Horace M. Kallen (Boston, 1920), pp. xv–xliv.

Perry, Ralph Barton. *The Thought and Character of William James* (Boston, 1935), pp. 552–60.

Wright, A. J. "Benjamin Paul Blood: Anesthesia's Philosopher and Mystic," in *The History of Anesthesia: Third International Symposium Proceedings*, ed. B. R. Fink (Park Ridge, Ill., 1992), pp. 447–56.

John R. Shook

BLOOM, Allan David (1930–92)

Allan Bloom was born on 14 September 1930 in Indianapolis, Indiana. At the age of sixteen he began attending the University of Chicago, where he earned his BA in 1949, his MA in 1953, and his PhD from the Committee of Social Thought in 1954, with a thesis on the political philosophy of Isocrates. Bloom joined the Chicago liberal arts faculty as a lecturer in 1955, and then moved on to Yale University as a professor of political science (1962–3); to Cornell University as a professor of government (1963–70); and to the University of Toronto as a professor of political science (1970–79). He returned to the University of Chicago in 1979 to become a professor of political philosophy and to teach political philosophy and social theory as a member of the Committee of Social Thought, and remained there until his death. Bloom died on 7 October 1992 in Chicago.

Philosopher, political and social theorist, subject of a novel, guest of presidents and prime ministers, Bloom spent most of his sixty-two years as a relatively obscure academic, known mainly for his translations, most notably those of Rousseau's *Emile* (1979) and Plato's *Republic* (1968), the latter being a literal translation and considered, like Bloom himself, to be somewhat eccentric. But obscurity was not in Bloom's destiny.

Late in life, virtually overnight, he found himself famous. He skyrocketed to international attention, becoming, as he himself bemusedly observed, the academic equivalent of a rock star. He was "picked up by the great hydraulic forces of the country," as his friend Saul Bellow describes it in *Ravelstein*, his *roman à clef* on Bloom, a source of valuable insights into both the man himself and his philosophy.

The vehicle that propelled Bloom from obscurity to the television talk-show circuit was a book, *The Closing of the American Mind* (1987), which he wrote at Bellow's urging and hurriedly, apparently in a matter of months, motivated in no small part by his desperate need to pay off the large debts he had accumulated trying to live like an aristocrat on a University of Chicago professor's salary, a lifestyle described in sometimes comic detail in *Ravelstein* (Bellow 2000). Bloom's book, which topped the bestseller lists in both the US and France, generated so much controversy that in the end academics were writing articles about "How Bloom did it" – that is to say, how did he achieve such notoriety with a single work?

"Difficult but popular – a spirited, intelligent, warlike book," to use Bellow's description (Bellow 2000, p. 4), *The Closing of the American Mind* develops most fully ideas that Bloom had sketched out in his lectures and earlier essays, notably the introductions to his translations. *Love and Friendship*, published posthumously, does not supersede but rather complements it. Whereas *The Closing of the American Mind* is about reason (the Enlightenment) and the consequences for Western culture of reason's rise to dominance, particularly in the form of science, *Love and Friendship* is, as the title says, about two of reason's opposites, namely, love and friendship. Accordingly, this last published work of Bloom's can be read as the other half of his general thesis about happiness and the human condition in modern advanced capitalist democracies in general and the United States in particular.

Bloom's main objective in *The Closing of the American Mind* is "to capture modernity in its full complexity and to assess its human costs" (Bellow 2000, p. 14). He pursues this goal by way of analysis of modernity's exemplar, the United States, and views the problematics of modernity through the American window. From this perspective he must perforce discuss America and the American condition. Of particular interest is the condition of democracy in America, especially as he saw it reflected in the beliefs of his undergraduate students (part 1 of the book), in the new language and concepts he felt Americans had adopted to describe themselves and their relationships (part 2), and, finally, in the state of affairs of the contemporary American university (part 3). That the book takes democracy in general and democracy in America in particular as its focus is not always appreciated by its critics, who are quick to seize upon Bloom's critique of higher education, especially its relativism and historicism, intellectual phenomena which – perhaps with the exception of Martha Nussbaum – they rarely if ever link to democracy itself (a connection which Bloom believed

to be of the utmost importance). Perhaps the book's subtitle, *How Higher Education has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today's Students*, is partly to blame for this. The title is at once revealing and deceptively simple. The book is about much more than higher education, though higher education is centrally important to the larger problem it articulates, a problem many of his critics, focused as they are on only the university, fail to see.

Bloom introduces this problem by way of a practical question, a question characteristically his in scope and tone, and one that has preoccupied philosophers both ancient and modern: how can we achieve real happiness and become autonomous? Autonomy, for Bloom, is a necessary and perhaps even a sufficient condition for our being happy. How do you create, especially in the context of modernity, an autonomous human being, morally and intellectually independent, the only kind of human being that can be truly happy? Bloom's work, then, can be viewed as "a plea for authentic liberation" (1987, p. 48), and this central point can be used to help make sense out of the structure of the *Closing of the American Mind*.

The first of the three major parts of the book is "Students." This section can be read as Bloom's attempt to address the question of what an autonomous and happy human being looks like by describing contemporary 1980s young Americans, whom he considered to be neither autonomous nor particularly happy. They are, says Bloom, "homogenized persons" (1987, p. 319) as opposed to persons with truly different goals and motives of action that can be taken seriously, "flat" and "maimed souls" (p. 83) who manifest the individualism and atomism predicted by Tocqueville in his *Democracy in America*. Young Americans, Bloom says, "can be anything they want to be but have no particular reason to be anything in particular" (p. 87).

In the second part of the book, "Nihilism American Style," Bloom tries to show how

Americans have unwittingly adopted a vocabulary (and with it a *Zeitgeist*) from German philosophy, a language which ill suits them, given their empiricist–scientific background and principles. America and Americans, says Bloom, are products of a self-conscious and philosophical project, the Enlightenment. Its general principle is that what is true and good can be discovered through the use of reason, and this general principle informs all modern political regimes founded on freedom and equality, hence on the consent of the governed (1987, p. 158). But through their German connection, brought to them during and after World War II, principally by German émigrés to the faculties and classrooms of America's universities, Americans have unawares adopted a relativist and historicist language. "The new language is that of value relativism and it constitutes a change in our view of things moral and political as great as the one that took place when Christianity replaced Greek and Roman paganism" (p. 141). The "self," "creativity," "culture," "values" – these are terms central in this language, part not of our original Enlightenment vocabulary but of the language of value relativism. The question that has never been raised, says Bloom, is whether this value relativism is harmonious with democracy. He believes it is not.

In the third part of *The Closing of the American Mind*, Bloom addresses the proper role of the university in a democratic society. The university's most important obligation, he argues, is to give students what they need to become autonomous. For Bloom, this means giving them the ability to reflect seriously on the various alternative answers to the most important questions in life. This is an obligation which he feels the American university, suffering from the value relativism which it purveys, is shirking. In so doing, it is putting democracy in America at risk and, given America's superpower status, is possibly putting the world at risk as well.

In the course of his analysis Bloom touches on a great many themes, some of which deserve particular mention. For Bloom, as for Rousseau, politics is decisive for individual development, setting limits on or creating possibilities for what we can be and do as human beings. In *Shakespeare's Politics* (1981) he writes: "Human virtues and vices can be said to be defined primarily in political terms. Civil society and its laws define what is good and bad, and its education forms the citizens. The character of life is decisively influenced by the character of the regime under which a man lives, and it is the regime that encourages or discourages the growth within it of the various human types. Any change in a way of life presupposes a change in the political, and it is by means of the political that the change must be effected. It is in their living together that men develop their human potential, and it is the political regime which determines the goals and the arrangement of the life in common. (pp. 8–9) … various nations encourage various virtues in men; one cannot find every kind of man in any particular time and place. Just the difference between paganism and Christianity has an important effect on the kinds of preoccupations men have." (p. 11)

Concerning virtue and virtue theory, the passage just cited – as well as many others that could also be cited – suggests that Bloom subscribes to some kind of virtue theory. Again, in *Shakespeare's Politics* he writes: "A man is most what he is as a result of what he does; a man is known, not simply by his existence, but by the character of his actions – liberal or greedy, courageous or cowardly, frank or sly, moderate or profligate. Since these qualities produce happiness or misery, they are of enduring interest to human beings … Passions, feelings, and the whole realm of the psychological are secondary. This is because feelings are properly related to certain kinds of action and to the virtues which control such action." (p. 8)

Bloom, who greatly admires Rousseau, does not appear to subscribe to his view that we are by nature moderate and only go to extremes because our experience in society has upset

the equilibrium upon which our moderation depends. Bloom rather seems to take the older view, going back to Aristotle, which holds that our desires are by nature infinite and that they must be checked by our faculty of will, which, guided by reason, can be used to control our desires for the sake of the good. "Virtue was in this older view understood to be natural and the control exercised by it to be productive of at least one part of happiness," Bloom writes (1993, p. 44). "Throughout the whole tradition, religious and philosophic, man had two concerns, the care of the body and the care of his soul, expressed in the opposition between desire and virtue. In principle he was supposed to long to be all virtue, to break free from the chains of bodily desire." (p. 174)

The moderns, says Bloom, broke with the tradition of thought which held that desire was to be tamed and perfected by virtue. The goal, rather, became to discover one's desires and live by them, an objective reflected in our present-day emphasis on *authenticity*. Our unity and wholeness were not to be found, as the ancients believed, in our overcoming of desire but in our recognizing and acknowledging it. Most importantly, for Hobbes and Locke, we were to recognize our most powerful desire of all – our desire for self-preservation or, alternatively, our fear of death. Upon this basic desire nations could be built and maintained. Thus the moderns cut off the higher aspirations of man and our modern nation-states came to be built, as Leo STRAUSS put it, on low but solid ground. For Bloom, however, the modern grounds of the nation-state are not so solid. From this grounding, selves have grown that live according to the opinions of others.

Closely related to Bloom's virtue theory are his ideas about the soul and human nature. Bloom's use of the term "soul" seems to date him and leads one to expect a more religious and spiritual discussion than he actually provides. But on reading him, it becomes clear that he chooses this term quite carefully. Bloom is trying to understand modernity in all of its complexity and assess its consequences, and one of the consequences of modernity is our reluctance to talk about the existence of a "soul," using instead the term "self," which, as he points out in the second part of *The Closing*, is the modern substitute for the soul (1987, p. 173).

Bloom's theory of human nature is scattered throughout his works. We all have common needs, both high and low, which must be satisfied if we are to be happy. We are beings who must take our orientation from visions of our possible perfection. We must play with the "fires of utopia" to know what we can be at our highest as opposed to our lowest. We have souls. Our souls are constituted in part by our reason and our desires, which must be properly balanced if we are to be happy. Our natural disposition or tendency is to go to extremes and we must work to keep ourselves in balance. We are composed of not just one duality but several dualities. We are opposites held together in a tension.

For Bloom, the point of liberal education is to teach us how to be autonomous. Becoming autonomous means, in the first place, recognizing and acknowledging the distinction between nature and convention. "No real teacher," says Bloom, "can doubt that his task is to assist his pupil to fulfill human nature against all the deforming forces of convention and prejudice." (1987, p. 21) Our happiness depends upon our being able to properly balance the conflicting demands of our nature and to reconcile these, in turn, with the obligations with which convention, our society, confronts us. We all want and need to be happy, and freedom or autonomy is one of the major conditions of our really being so. In trying to be free, however, we are faced with a twofold problem, one part having to do with ourselves and the other with the particular society, the set of conventions, culture and political regime into which we are born and that present themselves to us as *the* best ways of thinking and of feeling and of living life. But we can never know whether in fact they are the

best ways (for us) unless we can gain enough distance to examine them critically and then choose for ourselves, perhaps reaffirming them, perhaps not, but nonetheless in the process rendering ourselves autonomous from their original hold over us. The main task of education, particularly a liberal education, the only kind of education that matters for Bloom, is to enable us to achieve autonomy. Education can do this by helping us learn and reflect on the various alternative answers that one can give to the most important questions of life, questions which, as we become more autonomous, we can answer for ourselves or which, if we do not, others will answer for us. American higher education, concerned as it is with specialization, disregards what is in a democracy its most important obligation – to expose students to the major alternatives.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Shakespeare's Politics, with Harry Jaffa (Chicago, 1981).
The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today's Students (New York, 1987).
Giants and Dwarfs (New York, 1990).
Liberal Education and Its Enemies (Colorado Springs, Col., 1991).
Love and Friendship (New York, 1993).
Shakespeare on Love and Friendship (Chicago, 2000).

Other Related Works
Trans., *The Republic of Plato* (1968).
Trans., *Emile, or On Education* by Jean-Jacques Rousseau (New York, 1979).
Ed., *Confronting the Constitution* (Washington, D.C., 1990).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio
Bellow, Saul. *Ravelstein* (New York, 2000).
Nussbaum, Martha. "Undemocratic Vistas," *New York Review of Books* 34 (1987): 20–26.

Palmer, M., and T. Pangle. *Political Philosophy and the Human Soul: Essays in Memory of Allan Bloom* (Lanham, Md., 1995).

Robert O. Slater

BLOOMFIELD, Leonard (1887–1949)

Leonard Bloomfield is perhaps the most important figure in American linguistics in the first half of the twentieth century. In one form or another, 'structural linguistics' as it came to be identified with Bloomfield's name, was the dominant view in linguistics as well as anthropology and a number of other fields. Further, the rise of behaviorism in the 1930s, 40s, and 50s in the study of language and mind owe no small debt to Bloomfield's legacy. It was against the backdrop of Bloomfield's influence and that of his students and disciples that some of the characteristic themes of cognitive science and computational models of the mind were developed, even if many of these later ways of studying language and mind owe Bloomfield a debt by way of his explicit defense of the autonomy of the study of language from other disciplines such as anthropology under which it was often subsumed.

Leonard Bloomfield was born on 1 April 1887 in Chicago, Illinois. He was educated at Harvard (BA in 1906), University of Wisconsin, and the University of Chicago (PhD in linguistics in 1909). He was instructor in German at the University of Cincinnati (1909–10) and the University of Illinois (1910–13), and then studied with leading German linguists at the universities of Leipzig and Göttingen (1913–14). He went back to Illinois to be assistant professor of comparative philology and German (1914–21), and then was professor of German and linguistics at Ohio State University (1921–7). He established himself as the pre-

eminent linguist of his day while he was professor of Germanic philology at the University of Chicago from 1927 to 1940. From 1940 until his death, he was Sterling Professor of Linguistics at Yale University, although his work was disrupted by World War II and health problems. Bloomfield died on 13 April 1949 in New Haven, Connecticut.

Bloomfield made contributions to every branch of linguistics, including grammar, morphology, phonology, and phonetics, as well as semantics and descriptive grammar. He also made significant contributions to the study of Native American languages, compiling detailed descriptions of a number of languages that had not received attention from American and European linguists, including a number of languages from Northern Canada. He also inspired a number of other linguists to do the same. His most important work is his 1933 book *Language*, which represented the received view in linguistics for more than thirty years. His other works include a variety of influential articles on the nature of linguistic entities as well as the scientific status and methodology of psychology and linguistics.

Structuralism, in one form or another, had been around for some time in linguistics and elsewhere before Bloomfield. The idea that one should look at the structure of language as a system of differences and similarities was present in Ferdinand de Saussure's famous work at the turn of the century and the same basic idea can be found in a number of other linguists and anthropologists in the opening decades of the twentieth century, such as Franz BOAS and Edward SAPIR. But it was Bloomfield's detailed defense and articulation of the structuralist theory in his most famous book that made the view into the received view about the nature of language and played no small role in its dominance in American academic life. It is not hard to see why Bloomfield's book came to play this role. Not only does Bloomfield give a detailed defense of the structuralist position, he also shows how to apply the method in detail to linguistic phenomena of almost every variety, from the composition of the basic units of a language's sound pattern to the meanings of its sentences and discourses. The work had the effect of synthesizing a good deal of knowledge about particular aspects of language under one, very general view about the nature of language.

Structural linguistics as practiced by Bloomfield and others can be characterized as the study of language via the description of "distinctive classes." The overriding interests of structural linguists was in the classification of the various ways in which the sounds and structures of a language can be combined and form up different classes of pairings. The goal was to capture the distribution of various linguistic forms. Much of the time, this amounted to saying when two forms were the same or different, depending upon which class the expression belonged to.

Bloomfield's announced goal in *Language* was to construct a fully general theory of language, one that applied to all aspects of language, starting with the structure of the phoneme and applying the same techniques to more and more complex structures within language. The nature of the phoneme was much debated by linguists at this time and earlier. Bloomfield took the phoneme to be the smallest element of a language to be analyzed by the linguist. Below that level we find acoustic data that, while of interest for some areas of psychology and physics, does not form a linguistically significant group of phenomena. The theory of distinctive classes, applied to the case of phonemes, resulted in a description of the basic classes of the phonemes of a language together with a list of how these basic elements can be combined with one another. Bloomfield's view was that one could study the other aspects of linguistic structure in much the same way that one studied the sound pattern of language. Therefore, a description of the formation of morphologically complex verbs would take the form of a distributional analysis of which patterns of affixation and suffixation were attested with which verbs,

together with the various cross-generalizations among these classes. The same method applied to syntactically complex expressions as well. Bloomfield sought to accommodate all of the phenomena of language using the same basic techniques and methods. The structuralist approach to language is sometimes described as one giving "distributional analyses" of various phenomena, by formulating sets of generalizations about which elements co-occur with which other elements and the various exceptions to be found with respect to them.

On the topic of semantics, Bloomfield's views were much less developed. In some places, Bloomfield expresses the idea that the meaning that any individual utterance may have can never be known in its entirety because, in order to do so, one would have to know the entire history of the individual's conditioning and the events which led up to those events and so on. In this way, there is no study of semantics that would not be, at the same time, a study of the history of the world. For this reason, Bloomfield often expressed skepticism about whether there could ever be a realistic semantics for a natural language. It seems impossible that there could ever be such a theory, given all that it would need to encompass in order to capture even the simplest kind of semantic fact, according to Bloomfield. Instead, we would have to make do with various approximations to such a theory, of which he gave us various illustrations. It should be noted that Bloomfield makes no firm distinction between what is now called pragmatics and semantics, nor does he clearly distinguish between sentence meaning and speaker meaning, a distinction of no small importance to later developments in the philosophy of language. It is also notable that on this view, explicit knowledge of the meanings of words is at best approximate.

The prevailing wisdom for several decades was that the study of language is a taxonomic enterprise. For Bloomfield, the fundamental datum about linguistics is that "in every speech community, some utterances are alike in form and meaning," as he put it. The resulting view of language is one of a set of overlapping patterns, phonological, morphological, and so on. This view formed the backdrop against which many of the distinctive claims of generative grammar were first made. The particular way in which Bloomfield applied the method of distinctive features deserves some comment, for it was innovative in its time. The only thing that belongs to a particular phoneme was those ways in which it differed from other related phonemes. The description of a phoneme, for example, should mention only its distinctive features. The similarities among phonemes, the properties that all phonemes of a certain class share with one another, were not to be included in the description of a particular phoneme.

Another prominent part of Bloomfield's view is his behaviorism. Like many others of roughly the same period, he contended that talk of "ideas" and inner processes was not to be admitted into a scientific approach to the structure of language. As he memorably put it, "in the study of language, one can make do with just the noise," by which he meant that one should exclude from consideration such things as speakers' beliefs, their speech intentions, and the ideas and images that are often associated with words in speakers' minds, where these could not be given clear behavioral descriptions. Although much of his early research was conducted in the framework of Wilhelm Wundt's ideational psychology, by the time he came to write *Language*, his views had shifted considerably under the influence of behaviorists. Bloomfield was persuaded by the behaviorists' view that the only admissible data for a theory of language and psychology were observable states and processes. Anything else lay outside the province of serious science.

Bloomfield also followed the traditional way of viewing language as essentially a social phenomenon, related to its use in communication. Assuming that psychology was supposed to be the study of individual personalities and their traits, it seemed to Bloomfield that language must lie outside the study of individual minds. This view had several consequences. Given his

view that the study of meaning would have to involve a detailed inspection of an individual's history of conditioning and the myriad forces which prompted any of his particular utterances, it would appear to follow that the study of meaning also lies outside the study of linguistics, as Bloomfield conceives of it. This is somewhat different from the usual way in which behaviorists of the time sought to eliminate talk of ideas and the like from their psychology. Bloomfield's brand of behaviorism represented a break with the tradition in linguistics of thinking of language and meaning as linked to the psychological states of its users. Thus, unlike his contemporary Edward Sapir, for whom language was a psychological phenomenon, Bloomfield held that language ought to be studied in isolation from these other factors. The eclipse of the psychological view of language within linguistics is largely a product of Bloomfield's influence.

Besides the articulation of structuralist linguistics and his methodological arguments, Bloomfield's major work is famous for a number of other reasons. Most importantly, it also contains the first arguments for distinguishing linguistics as a separate science from such fields as philology, sociology, and anthropology. This was done by showing how the patterns that pertain to the structure of language were law-like, and how linguists can state those laws. The most important examples come from the study of sound change, to which Bloomfield also made important contributions. Bloomfield sought to show how the manner in which the sound patterns of a language change over time was governed by exceptionless laws. The lawfulness of these changes together with other structuralist analyses demonstrated that linguistics was concerned with exceptionless laws, just as other sciences were. Bloomfield's advocacy of linguistics as a separate discipline was not limited to methodological arguments. He was also quite influential in establishing an important scholarly society and journal in addition to an annual summer school in linguistics that continues to this day.

Bloomfield's intellectual legacy lies mostly with his formulation of a theory of language in his major work and the application of a single methodology to a diverse group of phenomena. There are aspects of Bloomfield's linguistic work that set the stage for later developments, especially his investigations of morphology and phonology, and his modifications of earlier views on formulating the laws governing various phenomena. However, the brand of structural linguistics that he practiced and advocated is now largely of historical interest, serving as the backdrop for later development, including the work of generative grammarians in the 1950s and 60s. Nonetheless, many of Bloomfield's descriptions of various linguistic phenomena have retained their usefulness for later writers.

The idea that there could be a single, analytical procedure which could be fruitfully applied to a syntax, morphology, phonology, and semantics no longer compels any widespread acceptance. Workers in these fields today are likely to adopt different analytical and descriptive devices for different phenomena without worrying about whether the same techniques can be deployed elsewhere in linguistics. Although his behaviorism is also out of fashion, there are aspects of his skepticism about the place of meaning and semantics in the explanation of linguistic phenomena that foreshadow W. V. QUINE's skepticism about trying to separate the meaning of an expression from the collateral information that often accompanies its utterance. Given Quine's own behaviorism, this overlap is not surprising.

Besides those aspects of Bloomfield's work that were abandoned by later generations of linguists, however, there is an important sense in which many of the linguistic sciences of today remain in his debt. He was the first significant figure to argue for making the study of language into a separate science, a position that is usually taken for granted today among otherwise quite diverse groups of theoreticians.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An Introduction to the Study of Language (New York, 1914).

"The Menomini Language," in *Proceedings of the Twenty-First International Congress of Americanists* (The Hague, 1924), pp. 336–43.

"A Set of Postulates for the Study of Language," *Language* 2 (1926): 153–64.

"Linguistics as a Science," *Studies in Philology* 27 (1930): 553–7.

Language (New York, 1933).

Plains Cree Texts (New York, 1934).

Linguistic Aspects of Science (Chicago, 1939).

Other Relevant Works

Bloomfield's papers are at the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia, and the National Anthropological Archives at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C.

A Leonard Bloomfield Anthology, ed. C. F. Hockett (Bloomington, Ind., 1970). Contains a bibliography of Bloomfield's writings.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Anderson, Stephen R. *Phonology in the Twentieth Century* (Chicago, 1985).

Esper, Erwin A. *Mentalism and Objectivism in Linguistics: The Sources of Leonard Bloomfield's Psychology of Language* (New York, 1968).

Fought, John G., ed. *Leonard Bloomfield: Critical Assessments of Leading Linguists*, 3 vols (London and New York, 1999).

Hall, Robert A., ed. *Leonard Bloomfield: Essays on His Life and Work* (Amsterdam, 1987).

Hall, Robert A. *A Life for Language: A Biographical Memoir of Leonard Bloomfield* (Amsterdam, 1990).

Matthews, P. H. *Grammatical Theory in the United States from Bloomfield to Chomsky* (Cambridge, UK, 1993).

Daniel Blair

BLOW, Susan Elizabeth (1843–1916)

Susan Blow was born on 7 June 1843 in St. Louis, Missouri, the oldest child of Henry and Minerva Grimsley Blow, and died on 26 March 1916 in New York City. Her education consisted of quality private tutoring until her teenage years, at which time she was sent to a private girls' school in New York. She received no formal higher education, but she continued to read important works of philosophy and literature on her own throughout her life, ultimately rising to prominence as the "mother of the kindergarten" in America.

Blow was from an influential St. Louis family. Her father Henry was first a regional and then a national political figure, who staunchly supported the Union during the Civil War in a sharply divided Missouri. Henry joined her uncle, Taylor Blow, in serving as an advocate for Dred Scott in his legal battle for freedom in the years leading up to the Civil War. When Scott lost his case in the Supreme Court, Taylor Blow had the title to Scott transferred to him in order to give the man his freedom. Henry Blow began traveling as a diplomat in 1861 and took the family with him on several assignments, including an extended stay in Russia in 1870. It was during this assignment that Susan became acquainted with German pedagogical theory.

In 1871 Blow returned to St. Louis and then went to New York to study kindergarten education theory with Baroness Marenholz von Bulow, an expert in the pedagogical methods of Friedrich Froebel. In 1873 in St. Louis, Blow established the first successful public kinder-

garten system in the United States, and soon became a national leader in early childhood education. In 1876 she gained international attention with her kindergarten exhibit at the Paris World's Fair, an exhibit that influenced Kate Wiggins, Elizabeth Harrison, and Jane and Ellen Lloyd Jones, the maternal aunts of Frank Lloyd WRIGHT who believed his childhood play with Froebel's blocks and spheres contributed to his architectural abilities. In 1882 Blow began a kindergarten teacher training program, and in 1884 a series of lectures on child care, philosophy, and literature for mothers of her kindergarten students. After a physical and emotional breakdown caused by Graves' disease in the mid 1880s, Blow again rose to prominence as a writer and lecturer. She headed up the national Kindergarten Union and held a visiting position at Columbia University Teachers College from 1905 to 1909. She wrote numerous articles on kindergarten theory and practice along with several books on the subject.

Blow is best known as a St. Louis idealist and a pedagogical theorist. She was still considered a canonical figure in education schools until the middle of the twentieth century. She saw the works of Froebel as the model for kindergarten teaching, but appended to it her own ideals of childhood, which were based on Hegel's philosophy. Blow saw play as children's natural means of learning and growing, not only physically and cognitively, but morally and spiritually as well. In good Hegelian fashion, she believed that an individual's selfhood would naturally unfold and flourish, if only the appropriate educational tools were used for young children: songs, games, and other forms of play. The world of imagination through story opened up the world and facilitated a level of selfhood for older children and youth.

As Blow developed her theory of early childhood pedagogy, she began to develop a child psychology. The role a child played in a game of make-believe allowed him or her to become estranged from their everyday sense of selfhood and experiment with a new, albeit temporary, self. When the game was over, the child could then return to his or her everyday self. Yet with the new-found knowledge of what it was like to "be" a fish or a bear, a doctor or a teacher, the child gained a new sense of him/her self. This experience while at play helps children to grow.

Blow often embedded discussions of epistemology and metaphysics into her books on childhood education, and these sections of her work make it clear that she was a theist, a personal idealist, and a monist. This is especially true in her final work, *Educational Issues in the Kindergarten* (1908), in which she devotes the final chapter to a discussion of philosophy. Blow firmly believed that a theistic presence animates the world and gives it meaning. She also believed that this theistic presence must be both "person" and "one." In her letters and occasionally in her published works, she criticized thinkers whose ideas she thought were atomistic, pluralistic, and/or atheistic, including John DEWEY, William JAMES, George Holmes HOWISON, and Thomas DAVIDSON.

Blow had a long-time and trusting intellectual friendship with William Torrey HARRIS. She was also close to several minor figures in the St. Louis movement: Susan Beeson, Gertrude Garrigues, and Laura Fisher. But Blow was a strong-willed woman and by some accounts a difficult personality. She had a contentious and competitive relationship with a rival in the kindergarten movement, Mary McCullough. She also had a long-term personal and professional conflict with the Shakespeare scholar, Denton SNIDER. Having herself been an orthodox Presbyterian who nearly converted to Catholicism, she disapproved of the beliefs of the free religionist Davidson and the Unitarian Howison. In addition, she was strongly opposed to feminism as it was developing in her day. She thought women would be irreparably harmed by entering the "industrial realm" and should shun the women's movement. Her counter-

feminist stance no doubt explains why there is no evidence of a close relationship between Blow and some equally prominent women in the American idealist movement – Anna BRACKETT, Grace Bibb, Mary Beedy, Ellen MITCHELL, and Eliza SUNDERLAND – all of whom were committed feminists.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
A Study of Dante (New York, 1886).
Symbolic Education: A Commentary on Froebel's "Mother Play" (New York, 1894).
The Mottoes and Commentaries on Friedrich Froebel's "Mother Play" (New York, 1895; Bristol, UK, 2000).
"The History of the Kindergarten in the United States," *Outlook 55* (1897): 932–8.
"The Kindergarten Ideal," *Outlook 56* (1897): 890–94.
Letters to Mothers on the Philosophy of Froebel (New York, 1898; Bristol, UK, 2000).
Kindergarten Education (Albany, N.Y., 1898).
Educational Issues in the Kindergarten (New York, 1908; Bristol, UK, 2003).

Other Relevant Works
Blow's papers are in the Carandolet Historical Society in St. Louis, Missouri.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*
Harrison, Elizabeth. *Sketches Along Life's Road* (Boston, 1930).
Hill, Patty S. "Personal Reminiscences of Susan Blow," *Kindergarten and First Grade* 1 (1915): 224.
Hilliker, Margaret. "The Life and Work of Susan Blow" (1952), unpublished manuscript archived in the Carandolet Historical Society in St. Louis, Missouri.
———, "The Blow Family" (1955), unpublished manuscript archived in the Carandolet Historical Society in St. Louis, Missouri.
Menius, Joseph M. *Susan Blow* (St. Clair, Missouri, 1993).
Rogers, Dorothy, ed. *Women in the St. Louis Idealist Movement, 1860–1925* (Bristol, UK, 2003).
Snider, Denton J. *The St. Louis Movement in Philosophy* (St. Louis, 1920).

Dorothy Rogers

BLUMER, Herbert George (1900–87)

Herbert Blumer was born on 7 March 1900 in Saint Louis, Missouri, and grew up in nearby Webster Groves, Missouri. He earned his BA in 1921 and MA in 1922 from the University of Missouri. In 1928 he completed the PhD in sociology at the University of Chicago. The sociologist Robert E. PARK and philosopher George Herbert MEAD were notable influences. Blumer stayed at the University of Chicago as a professor of sociology from 1928 until 1952, when he became professor and chair of sociology at the University of California at Berkeley. He retired in 1967 and remained an active scholar at Berkeley as professor emeritus until 1986. Blumer died on 13 April 1987 in Pleasanton, California.

Blumer was a foremost interpreter of the thought of the pragmatist philosopher George Herbert Mead. He studied with Mead and succeeded him as the instructor of his famous seminar in social psychology. Blumer was a leading proponent of "symbolic interactionism," a view of human social life deriving from the pragmatist traditions he encountered at Chicago. He is noted for his incisive critiques of standard sociological methods and conceptual schemes. Blumer also contributed important essays on race relations and other sociological concepts. Original work continues to be edited and published from his manuscripts.

Blumer edited the *American Journal of Sociology* from 1940 to 1952. He served as President of the Society for the Study of Social Problems in 1954, and as President of the American Sociological Association (ASA) in 1956. In 1983 he received the ASA's highest honor, "The Award for a Career of Distinguished Scholarship."

For Blumer, symbolic interactionism is a perspective on human social life that he found in the sociology of the "Chicago School" and the social psychology of Mead. Symbolic interactionism's logical starting point is a view of social life as interdependent of joint social actions. Symbolic interactionism shares with some other action perspectives an emphasis on meanings as prompts, organizers, and guides to social actions. It is distinctive, however, in the prominence given to the role of interaction in constructing and selecting the meanings that predicate actions. Symbolic interactionism highlights a social process of interpretation in which individuals indicate salient features of situations, assess and anticipate others' actions, and construct adjustments in light of those interpretations. This process grounds "joint actions" incorporating a variety of actors. Thus, unlike some other action perspectives, symbolic interactionism focuses analysis on emergent (rather than fixed or established) meanings as predicates of actions. In this view, to understand social life it is crucial to see that the process of interaction is creative and that actors participating in interaction exercise judgment, choice, and agency.

Symbolic interaction occurs in several ways. Interpersonal interaction knits together the responses and coordinates the interdependencies of individuals. Symbolic interaction also takes place between collective actors, as in union-management bargaining. Most distinctively, Blumer attributes deep significance to an intrapersonal level of interaction. "Self interaction" is the process in which one successively indicates objects to one's self and responds to those indications. Through this process, an individual attends to particular objects within a situation and – by building up interpretations and actions – fashions adjustments to the situation. An individual thus selects and fits a line of action to the situation and with the actions of others. At the heart of this view of social life, Blumer placed the human ability to indicate one's own self as an object. The "self" is an interpretive process concerning one's own being. Blumer argued that symbolic interaction and the self are undeniable, inescapable, and central features of human social life, and that concepts and methods to study social life must take them into account. In particular, interaction should be viewed as a contingent and constructive process, not as a neutral conduit merely carrying causal effects. His commitment to the perspectives of symbolic interactionism provided Blumer with a durable standpoint from which to challenge concepts and methods derived from other perspectives.

Blumer emphasized generic concepts as the hallmark of science and as a major goal of research. The defining imagery of a concept, Blumer pointed out, "grasps together" features of an object under study and provides an understanding of the object and how it operates. He saw the creation and use of scientific concepts as instances of the essential human practice of indicating an object and understanding its character in preparation to act toward the object. Science seeks to establish concepts and relationships that characterize the nature of a class of instances. In doing so, scientific research empirically tests and reforms concepts. Improved concepts yield more useful understanding and control of the objects and relationships under study. Blumer thus decentered a standard sociological research emphasis on causal relations among variables. Blumer claimed that variable analysis is not a fit procedure for those vast areas of social life where contingent interpretive processes mediate relationships between conditions and effects. Human society operates through the process by which living people

produce social action. He saw social structures, not as causes of action, but as inferences from observations of action.

Blumer attributed an obdurate character to social life that permits sociological concepts to be tested. But he also maintained that like any reality, social life can only be noted, acted toward, and studied through humanly created concepts. He attributed this position to pragmatist philosophy and claimed it is testable in human experience. The objects we study are always symbolically constructed and indicated. Yet, concepts are not merely free-floating nominations. Experiencing social life's obduracy constitutes an empirical social world which is the central point of concern for sociology. When our examination of social life is direct and close, its obdurate reality can "talk back" against the concepts we have used to approach it. Blumer urged that appropriate concepts could only be worked out by empirical tests. Both the concepts and the methods of any science must be constructed with respect to "the nature of the empirical world under study." In particular, he criticized forming concepts by analogy with schemes imported from other fields of study.

An Appraisal of Thomas and Znaniecki's The Polish Peasant in Europe and America (1939) and Blumer's introduction to its reissue in 1979 are windows onto his thinking regarding methods of research. Blumer praises Thomas and Znaniecki's *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* for the mutual intelligibility that its data and conceptual schemes lend to each other. Yet, Blumer also concludes that *Polish Peasant* illustrates an important dilemma. While it is "absolutely necessary" for sociological analyses to include data on subjective meanings of actors, the means of "getting such subjective elements do not allow us to meet the customary criteria for scientific data" (1979, pp. xii–xiii). The personal documents and life histories used by Thomas and Znaniecki could not be shown to be from a representative sampling of a known population. These data on meanings may be incorrect,

given that respondents may omit and lie. Further, the data do not allow a decisive test that could rule out alternative theoretical interpretations. Blumer argued that methods of social research should be developed to meet these crucial methodological problems. The starting point that he advocates is to respect the interpretive and contingent nature of social life and to form concepts and methods accordingly.

Although Blumer strongly advocated empirical research, the extent and ways in which he engaged in it himself are unclear. His call to study social life directly and closely has been widely cited to justify ethnographic research, but there is no indication that he undertook the type of systematic firsthand observations of ongoing social life that his methodology is usually interpreted as advocating. Some have stated that he did little or no empirical research of any kind. Blumer did, however, publish important essays directed toward improving what he saw as key sociological concepts. Blumer's substantive essays on collective behavior, public opinion, fashion, and race relations remain influential. Robert E. Park developed the concept of "collective behavior" to refer to such temporary, large, dynamic groups as crowds, public factions, and social movements. Blumer's discussion of collective behavior dominated conceptualizations in the field until the 1960s. Then, objections to the weight he gave to emotional and other "nonsymbolic" influences in the dynamics of collective behavior placed his concepts sharply out of favor. Increasingly since the 1980s, after decades of rejection in favor of rational-choice and other cognitive perspectives, elements of Blumer's thought, if not his terminology, have stolen back into the literature. Blumer also followed up Park's interest in the study of publics. Blumer's seminal critique challenged the emerging discipline of public opinion polling with the claim that representative samples painstakingly constructed for public opinion polls fail to capture how public opinion actually works. As he saw it, public

opinion matters when it brings influence to bear on decision-makers. Public opinion is a social process sensitive to power, resources and effort, in which the powerful and the committed have disproportionate effects. These disproportionate effects are not captured by a concept of public opinion that sees each individual's ideas as having an equivalent effect.

Blumer's efforts to conceptualize dynamic processes are also reflected in an essay on fashion. He saw contemporary societies as continually subject to fashion processes. The diversity and impermanence of such societies prompt searches for effective innovations. Fashion processes are continually generated not only to define new standards for dress and other trivialities, but also to define such matters of consequence as how corporations will be managed. Another influential article on social dynamics, reformulating the concept of "social problems," provided a beginning for constructionism. Blumer's essays on race relations treat the color line as produced and modified by symbolic interaction. The relevance of this view of race relations has become more apparent as new definitions of disadvantage, new distinctions of difference, and new rhetoric of anti-racialism emerge. In *Social Order and Public Philosophy* (1988) Lyman and Vidich develop a humanistic, liberal public philosophy from Blumer's essays on race relations and other topics and collect several of his scattered essays.

The posthumous publication of *George Herbert Mead and Human Conduct* (2004) promises to expand Blumer's influence on Mead's legacy. Two additional volumes of Blumer's as yet unpublished work (to be edited by Thomas J. Morrione) are expected.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Science without Concepts," *American Journal of Sociology* 37 (1931): 515–33.

An Appraisal of Thomas and Znaniecki's The Polish Peasant in Europe and America (New York, 1939). 2nd edn, *Critiques of Research in the Social Sciences: An Appraisal of Thomas and Znaniedki's "The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1979).

"Collective Behavior," in *An Outline of the Principles of Sociology*, ed. Robert E. Park (New York, 1939), pp. 219–80.

"The Problem of the Concept in Social Psychology," *American Journal of Sociology* 42 (1940): 707–19.

"What is Wrong with Social Theory?" *American Sociological Review* 14 (1954): 3–10.

"Society as Symbolic Interaction," in *Human Behavior and Social Processes*, ed. Arnold M. Rose (Boston, 1962), pp. 179–92.

"Sociological Implications of the Thought of George Herbert Mead," *American Journal of Sociology* 71 (1966): 535–44.

Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1969).

Industrialization as an Agent of Social Change: A Critical Analysis, ed. David R. Maines and Thomas J. Morrione (New York, 1990).

George Herbert Mead and Human Conduct, ed. Thomas J. Morrione (New York and London, 2004).

Other Relevant Works

"Social Attitudes and Non-Symbolic Interaction," *Journal of Educational Sociology* 42 (1936): 515–23.

"Public Opinion and Public Opinion Polling," *American Sociological Review* 13 (1948): 542–54.

"Psychological Import of the Human Group," in *Group Relations at the Crossroads*, ed. Musafer Sherif and M. O. Wilson (New York, 1953), pp. 185–202.

"Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position," *Pacific Sociological Review* 1 (1958): 3–7.

"Fashion: From Class Differentiation to Collective Selection," *Sociological*

Quarterly 10 (1969): 275–91.

"Social Problems as Collective Behavior,"
Social Problems 18 (1971): 298–306.

"Social Unrest and Collective Protest,"
Studies in Symbolic Interaction 1 (1978):
1–54.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio

Braugh, Kenneth, Jr. *The Methodology of
Herbert Blumer* (Cambridge, UK, 1990).

Hammersley, Martin. *The Dilemma of
Qualitative Method: Herbert Blumer and
the Chicago Tradition* (London, 1989).

"Herbert Blumer's Legacy," *Symbolic
Interaction* 11 (1988): 1–143. Special
issue on Blumer.

Kurtz, Lester R. *Evaluating Chicago
Sociology: A Guide to the Literature with
an Annotated Bibliography* (Chicago,
1984).

Lyman, Sanford M., and Arthur Vidich.
*Social Order and The Public Philosophy:
An Analysis and Interpretation of the
Work of Herbert Blumer* (Fayetteville,
Ark., 1988). Reprints twelve of Blumer's
articles.

Maines, David R. "Herbert Blumer on the
Possibility of Science in the Practice of
Sociology: Further Thoughts," *Journal of
Contemporary Ethnography* 18 (July
1989): 160–77.

Plummer, Ken. "Herbert Blumer," in *Key
Sociological Thinkers*, ed. Rob Stones
(Washington Square, N.Y., 1998), pp.
84–95.

Shalin, D. N. "Pragmatism and Social
Interactionism," *American Sociological
Review* 51 (1986): 9–29.

Shibutani, Tamotsu, ed. *Human Nature
and Collective Behavior: Papers in
Honor of Herbert Blumer* (Englewood-
Cliffs, N.J., 1970).

Jack Weller

BOAS, Franz (1858–1942)

Franz Boas was born on 9 July 1858 in
Minden in Westphalia, Germany, to middle-
class Jewish parents. Boas studied physics and
geography at the universities of Heidelberg,
Bonn, and Kiel. He earned his PhD in physics
from Kiel in 1881 with a dissertation on the
optics of seawater. His professional and
personal journey from physical science through
psychophysics and human geography to
anthropology is symbolized by his year-long
expedition during 1883–4 to Baffin Island in
Canada, where he lived and worked among the
Central Eskimo Inuit. This experience crystal-
lized Boas's thinking about cultural relativism
and revealed to him the professional possibil-
ities and moral urgencies of anthropological
research. Published as *The Central Eskimo*
(1888), the results of this expedition fore-
shadow many of the concerns that would
occupy him throughout his life.

Boas emigrated to the United States in 1887
when he was hired as assistant editor of the
magazine *Science*, and from 1888 to 1892 he
taught anthropology at Clark University. In
1891 he became a US citizen. In 1892 Boas was
named curator of anthropology at the Field
Museum in Chicago, and in 1895 he joined the
staff of the American Museum of Natural
History in New York City, later serving as
curator of ethnology from 1901 to 1905. In
1899 Boas became a professor of anthropology
at Columbia University, where he taught until
1936. He edited the *Journal of American
Folklore* from 1908 to 1925. He was President
of the American Anthropological Society in
1907–1908, and of the New York Academy of
Sciences in 1910. Boas died on 21 December
1942 in New York City.

In the twentieth century Boas was the
dominant figure in North American anthro-
pology, defining the field's scope while pro-
fessionalizing the discipline and orchestrating
its institutionalization in universities and
museums. Having founded American anthro-
pology's first doctoral program at Columbia,

he trained the initial generation of professional anthropologists. These students in turn founded academic departments throughout the United States and shaped the discipline's formative institutions and intellectual concerns. The American anthropology that Boas fashioned integrated the study of archeology, ethnology, linguistics, and human biology and was attuned to several broadly philosophical questions. These included exploring the role of particular languages and cultures in shaping thought, perception, and awareness, the place of the individual in society and history, the nature of culture and the factors shaping cultural change, and the scope and significance of human diversity – biological, cultural, and linguistic.

Like his peers among the American pragmatists, Boas advanced an anti-foundationalist theory of knowledge, a refined understanding of human pluralism and diversity, and a cosmographic and historical approach to science. He favored empirical methods and induction, and resisted premature generalizations. Boas was attentive to contingency and to the role of individuals in human affairs. From his German intellectual heritage, Boas inherited a historicist outlook and an orientation toward culture rooted in the Kantian and Humboldtian traditions. Within social science, his researches buttressed arguments, largely successful, against nineteenth-century social evolutionist perspectives. Politically, Boas and his work contributed to progressive social reform efforts, particularly his opposition to racism, ethnocentrism, and other forms of discrimination.

Following his Eskimo studies, his own field research was dominated by the ethnography and linguistics of the Northwest Coast region of North America, where he conducted studies of American Indian societies. He also authored influential works dealing with general issues, from questions of race and human variation to linguistic structure and variability. An overview of his approach to specific problems within anthropology can be gained in his collection of essays *Race, Language and Culture* (1940). Boas's philosophical perspectives on the nature and study of humanity can be considered in his general works, including *Primitive Art* (1955), *Anthropology and Modern Life* (1928), and *The Mind of Primitive Man* (1911). His pioneering work on the nature of language can be accessed in his *Introduction to the Handbook of American Indian Languages* (1911). Many of his students and collaborators established themselves not only as leaders in their field, but also as prominent public intellectuals. Among the most philosophically oriented of these are Edward SAPIR, Alexander Goldenweiser, Benjamin Lee WHORF, Ruth BENEDICT, Margaret MEAD, and Alfred Kroeber.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Central Eskimo (Washington, D.C., 1888).
Introduction to the Handbook of American Indian Languages (Washington, D.C., 1911).
The Mind of Primitive Man (New York, 1911; 2nd edn 1938).
Anthropology and Modern Life (New York, 1928).
Race, Language and Culture (New York, 1940).
Primitive Art (New York, 1955).

Other Relevant Works
Boas's papers are at the American Philosophical Society and Columbia University.
The Shaping of American Anthropology, 1883–1911: A Franz Boas Reader, ed. George W. Stocking, Jr. (New York, 1974).
A Wealth of Thought: Franz Boas on Native American Art, ed. Aldona Jonaitis (Seattle, 1995).

Further reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer*

Thought, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Encyc Relig*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v12*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*

Cole, Douglas. *Franz Boas: The Early Years, 1858–1906* (Seattle, 1999).

Darnell, Regna. *Invisible Genealogies: A History of Americanist Anthropology* (Lincoln, Neb., 2001).

Goldschmidt, Walter, ed. *The Anthropology of Franz Boas: Essays on the Centennial of His Birth*, American Anthropological Association Memoir no. 89 (Menasha, Wisc., 1959).

Hyatt, Marshall. *Franz Boas, Social Activist: The Dynamics of Ethnicity* (New York, 1990).

Lewis, Herbert. "Boas, Darwin, Science, and Anthropology," *Current Anthropology* 42 (2001): 381–406.

Stocking, George W., ed. *Volksgeist as Method and Ethic: Essays on Boasian Ethnography and the German Anthropological Tradition* (Madison, Wisc., 1996).

Williams, Vernon J. *Rethinking Race: Franz Boas and His Contemporaries* (Lexington, Kent., 1996).

Jason Baird Jackson

BOAS, George (1891–1980)

George Boas was born on 28 August 1891 in Providence, Rhode Island. He attended Brown University, where he received both his BA and MA degrees in 1913. He then earned another MA in philosophy in 1915 from Harvard University, and received his PhD in philosophy in 1917 from the University of California at Berkeley. His dissertation was entitled "An Analysis of Certain Theories of Truth." Boas became an instructor in forensics at Berkeley in 1917, served in the US Army from 1917 to 1919, and then returned to his position at Berkeley. In 1921 he was appointed to the philosophy faculty at Johns Hopkins University by department chair Arthur O. Lovejoy, and was promoted up to full professor by 1933. During World War II, Boas again sought military service and became a Naval Reserve Commander at General Dwight D. Eisenhower's headquarters. After the war, he led an effort to recover Belgian art stolen by the Nazis, and was decorated with the Order of Leopold by the Belgian government. He returned to Johns Hopkins and taught there until he retired in 1957, remaining active for many years as professor emeritus. Boas died on 17 March 1980 in Ruxton, Maryland.

Boas was a trustee of the Baltimore Museum of Art for many years, and was President of the American Society of Aesthetics in 1950. He was a visiting professor at several universities; the Annie Talbot Cole Lecturer at Wheaton College in 1932; the Traux Lecturer at Hamilton College in 1957; the visiting Mellon Professor at the University of Pittsburgh in 1960–61; a fellow at the Center for Advanced Studies at Wesleyan University in Illinois in 1961–2; and the John Danz Lecturer at the University of Washington in 1965. He was Vice President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1948 and President in 1951–2, and was invited by the Association to deliver the Paul Carus Lectures in 1959. These were published as *The Inquiring Mind: An Introduction to Epistemology* (1959).

Boas's primary philosophical interests centered on aesthetics, epistemology, naturalism, and the history of philosophy. His relativism, pluralism, and naturalism were ultimately based on a nominalistic skepticism toward objective classes and categories. This skepticism brought him to the conclusion that aesthetic value is always a matter of an ineffable and emotional personal appreciation of an art work at a particular moment. Because personal aesthetic appreciation is partially conditioned by society, Boas also defended a stance of cultural relativism toward art and aes-

thetic value in *Wingless Pegasus: A Handbook for Critics* (1950) and *The Heaven of Invention* (1963).

Boas followed Lovejoy's methodology of tracing the history of ideas, searching for dominant systems of thought in each historical period, and pondering the causes for transitional phases between them. His best efforts in intellectual history are represented by two books, *Dominant Themes of Modern Philosophy* (1957) and *The History of Ideas: An Introduction* (1969), while the clearest summarization of his "history of ideas" approach is presented in "Some Problems of Intellectual History" (1953). Boas also composed narrower studies of selected historical periods, including Greek thought, medieval philosophy and theology, modern philosophy, and French Romanticism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Critical Analysis of the Philosophy of Emile Meyerson (Baltimore, Md., 1920).

Philosophy and Poetry (Norton, Mass., 1922).

French Philosophies of the Romantic Period (Baltimore, Md., 1925).

The Major Traditions of European Philosophy (New York, 1928).

Our New Ways of Thinking (New York, 1929).

The Happy Beast in French Thought of the Seventeenth Century (Baltimore, Md., 1933).

Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity, with A. O. Lovejoy (Baltimore, 1935). Rev. edn, *Essays on Primitivism and Related Ideas in the Middle Ages* (Baltimore, Md., 1948).

A Primer for Critics (Baltimore, 1937).

Wingless Pegasus: A Handbook for Critics (Cambridge, Mass., 1950).

Dominant Themes of Modern Philosophy: A History (New York, 1957).

The Inquiring Mind: An Introduction to Epistemology (La Salle, Ill., 1959).

Some Assumptions of Aristotle (Philadelphia, 1959).

The Limits of Reason (New York, 1961).

Rationalism in Greek Philosophy (Baltimore, Md., 1961).

The Heaven of Invention (Baltimore, Md., 1963).

The Challenge of Science (Seattle, 1965).

The Cult of Childhood (London, 1966).

The History of Ideas: An Introduction (New York, 1969).

Vox Populi: Essays in the History of an Idea (Baltimore, Md., 1969).

Other Relevant Works

Boas's papers are at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Maryland.

"The Truth of Immediate Knowledge," *Journal of Philosophy* 23 (1926): 5–10.

"The Datum as Essence," *Journal of Philosophy* 24 (1927): 487–97.

Never Go Back: A Novel Without a Plot (New York, 1928).

Ed., *The Greek Tradition* (Baltimore, Md., 1939).

Ed., *Courbet and the Naturalistic Movement* (Baltimore, Md., 1938).

Ed., *Romanticism in America* (Baltimore, Md., 1940).

"The Meeting of Philosophy and Psychology," *Journal of Philosophy* 38 (1941): 466–70.

"Learning from Experience," *Journal of Philosophy* 43 (1946): 466–71.

"The Classification of the Arts and Criticism," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 5 (1947): 268–72.

"The Acceptance of Time," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 16 (1950): 249–69.

"In Defense of the Unintelligible," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 9 (1951): 285–93.

"The Perceptual Element in Cognition," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 12 (1952): 486–94.

"Communication in Dewey's Aesthetics," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 12 (1953): 177–83.

"Some Problems of Intellectual History," in

Studies in Intellectual History by George boas et. al. (Baltimore, Md., 1953).

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v6, Proc of APA v53, Who Was Who in Amer v7, Who's Who in Phil
Wiener, Philip P. "In Memoriam: George Boas (1892–1980)," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 4 (1980): 453–6.

John R. Shook

BODE, Boyd Henry (1873–1953)

Boyd H. Bode was born on 4 October 1873 in Ridott, Illinois, and died on 29 March 1953 in Gainesville, Florida. He was the son of Dutch immigrant parents and grew up in farm communities in South Dakota and Iowa. His father was a minister in the Christian Reformed Church, a branch of the Dutch Reformed Church. Bode attended Yankton College in South Dakota; William Penn College in Iowa (BA 1896); and the University of Michigan (BA 1897). He then went to Cornell's Sage School of Philosophy, where he studied with James CREIGHTON, Ernest ALBEE, Edward MCGILVARY, and Edward TITCHENER. Bode received his PhD in 1900, and in that year he began teaching philosophy at the University of Wisconsin. His first articles in the *Journal of Philosophy* and *Philosophical Review* in 1905 criticized pragmatism and realism from the standpoint of idealism.

By the 1910s, Bode had moved from idealism towards pragmatism, and defended pragmatism on grounds he had found untenable eight years earlier. His pragmatism rejected idealism's "transcendental element" in experience by holding that subject and object do not exist as separate entities in experience, but are functions that arise within experience. Bode rejected the realist notion that objects of knowledge exist prior to particular situations of knowing; instead, that which exists is used in experience to make objects of knowledge. Bode's functional conception of mind held that stimulus and response are not simply fixed in the nervous system since the stimulus does not precede the response in a mechanical way. Instead, they work simultaneously; for example, a baseball player learns to judge a fly ball by seeing its flight in terms of the response needed to catch it. The object – the baseball in flight – is seen in terms of responses already at work in the actions of the player. The objective is catching the baseball in flight, which shows that stimulus and response are not simply "connected" in the nervous system but take on meaning in terms of the behavior needed to realize the objective. Therefore, "mind" is a name for the way the environment functions, and this includes both actor and action taken in relation to one another. Mind is what things do, not a "substance" or a collection of "mental states."

In 1910 Bode became a professor of philosophy at the University of Illinois, where his challenges to the absolutes of established religious sectarianism and entrenched philosophical orthodoxies attracted hundreds of students to his classes. The inclusion of his chapter, "Consciousness and Psychology" in the cooperative volume by pragmatists, *Creative Intelligence* (1917), affirmed his status in American philosophy and openly allied him with John DEWEY. In this chapter Bode's movement away from "transcendental elements" in experience and the search for objects of knowledge existing prior to experience is complete. The question of what is real prior to or transcending experience, he argued, is "absolutely sterile." We must learn how to explain things in terms of facts "that dwell in the light of common day." From this point he never looked back to yearn for certainty in experience, but remained persuaded that we cannot escape the responsibility of working on the problems endemic to everyday experience.

At Illinois, Bode began teaching educational theory in a seminar along with William C. Bagley in the College of Education. Bode's developing interest in the difference that philosophy might make in the practical human affairs made teaching educational theory attractive to him. Bode also taught logic at Wisconsin and Illinois, and his first book was on logic in 1910. He jokingly referred to the study of logic as "horse sense made asinine." When Bagley left Illinois for the Teachers College of Columbia University, Bode continued the seminar in educational theory himself. He sought ways in which thinking could function more meaningfully in human conduct. Thinking as a practical necessity became a priority over logic as an academic study.

In the preface to his first book on education, *Fundamentals of Education* in 1921, Bode wrote that the volume's purpose was "to interpret present-day educational problems from the standpoint of pragmatic philosophy." This purpose Bode sought to realize in moving to Ohio State University in 1921 as a professor of education. Until his retirement in 1944, his presence there made that university a center for the study of educational theory. He excited both colleagues and students to turn philosophical thinking on educational practice, aiming to give practice a sense of rational direction and to test the ideas of pragmatic philosophy in the work of teachers and learners. Three interrelated dimensions in Bode's teaching and writings provide a sense of the ways in which he worked to realize the aims implicit in the purpose of education stated in 1921.

Bode insisted that democracy as a way of life needs to more fully turn its possibilities into actualities. These possibilities must come from the experience of ordinary people, and insofar as they can be actualized, that also must take place in the experience of ordinary people working together. Like other pragmatists, Bode believed that philosophy grows out of genuine conflicts of values in the lives of human beings and, further, that philosophy generates ideas about resolving those conflicts that have to be tested in the lives experiencing the conflicts. Philosophy originates in human problems, and then it returns to those problems and attempts to make differences in striving to solve them. Bode was critical of those who sought guidance from sources external to human experience, whether from an alleged extranatural being, from "pure mind," or from the various claims that reality can be described in a particular way and that children should be educated to fit into it. Reality is not something to be "described" or to be "fit into"; reality is to be made.

Bode called for recognizing democracy as an experiment in which our faith is not placed in something already completed, but in a process by which citizens become creators of the ends they value, rather than working toward ends established by others. Bode liked to quote William JAMES's portrayal of genuine experience as "being on the ragged edge of things." For Bode this meant that the essential value of what exists is not merely in what it is, but in what it might become; we can say this of individuals, of ideas, of whatever is experienced: there is something intangible about what exists, and this character gets to be changed by our very attempts to describe it. Thus to experience something is to move toward a qualitatively different experience; the end of experience is an activity of growing, not the gaining of a fixed end. It is a fallacy to take what allegedly is for what should be. It is suggestive that for Bode, the possibilities of democracy as a way of life, a functional theory of mind, and experience as a way of growing, are all parts of the same reality. We can make distinctions between them, but they are inseparable in the development of experience of the sort that Bode had in mind. A democratic way of life is mind in its functioning while striving to make a difference in our social life by helping individuals to grow.

Another way of considering the fundamental problems faced by schools in our democracy is what Bode called "the cleavage in our culture." One side of the cleavage believes that a reality

exists different from and superior to ordinary experience, one that is necessary to give meaning to ordinary experience. The other side of the cleavage denies the necessity of such a reality and holds that our problems can only be settled in terms of human experience. The cleavage exists, not only in the culture "outside" us; it exists also within each of us because we have grown up in a culture manifesting the cleavage. It is clear on which side of the cleavage Bode stood: his own development from idealism to pragmatism gives us a sense of what it means for citizens in a democracy to overcome the cleavage.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Concept of Pure Experience," *Philosophical Review* 14 (1905): 684–95.
An Outline of Logic (New York, 1910).
"Objective Idealism and Its Critics," *Philosophical Review* 19 (1910): 597–609.
"The Paradoxes of Pragmatism," *The Monist* 23 (1913): 112–22.
"Consciousness and Psychology," in *Creative Intelligence* (New York, 1917), pp. 228–81.
Fundamentals of Education (New York, 1921).
Modern Educational Theories (New York, 1927).
Democracy as a Way of Life (New York, 1927).
Conflicting Psychologies of Learning (Boston, 1929).
Progressive Education at the Crossroads (New York, 1938).
How We Learn (Boston, 1940).

Other Relevant Works
"Objectives in Education," *School and Society* 18 (1923): 546–52.
"The Humanizing of Education," *American Review* 4 (1926): 507–15.
"Education at the Crossroads," *Progressive Education* 8 (1931): 543–9.
"The Confusion in Present-day Education," in *The Educational Frontier*, ed. William H. Kilpatrick (New York, 1933), pp. 3–31.
"Education and Social Reconstruction," *Social Frontier* 1 (1935): 18–22.
"The Great American Dream," in *American Philosophies Today and Tomorrow*, ed. Horace M. Kallen and Sidney Hook (New York, 1935).
"Liberal Education for Today," *Antioch Review* 4 (1944): 112–21.
"Russell's Educational Philosophy," in *The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell*, ed. Paul Schilpp (Evanston, Ill., 1944).
"Harvard Report," *Journal of Higher Education* 17 (1946): 1–8, 201–204.
"Education for Freedom," *Teachers College Record* 49 (1948): 276–85.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Pres Addr of APA v2*, *Proc of APA v26*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Bullough, Robert V. *Democracy in Education: Boyd H. Bode* (Bayside, N.Y., 1981).
Chambliss, J. J. *Boyd H. Bode's Philosophy of Education* (Columbus, Ohio, 1963).
Childs, John L. *American Pragmatism and Education* (New York, 1956), chap. 9.
Seeger, Ruth E. *Writings By and About Boyd H. Bode* (Columbus, Ohio, 1951).
Tanner, Daniel. *Crusade for Democracy: Progressive Education at the Crossroads* (Albany, N.Y., 1991).

J. J. Chambliss

BOHM, David Joseph (1917–92)

David Joseph Bohm was born on 20 December 1917 into a Jewish emigrant family in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania. He studied physics as an undergraduate at Penn State University, receiving his BA in 1939. As a graduate student, he

began studies at the California Institute of Technology, then finished his research under Robert Oppenheimer at the University of California, Berkeley. He was awarded a PhD in physics in 1943 for research on the scattering behavior of fundamental particles. This research was immediately classified due to its relevance to the Manhattan Project. Bohm also became interested in radical politics while in California.

Bohm became assistant professor of physics at Princeton University in 1946, where he worked with Albert EINSTEIN. On 12 April 1949 he was subpoenaed to testify before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in connection with his own interest in Marxism and acquaintances he had made at Berkeley. Bohm refused to cooperate, citing his Fifth Amendment rights. He was arrested for contempt of Congress and suspended from his academic position in 1950. Although later acquitted on all charges, he was not reappointed. In 1951 he accepted a chair in physics at the University of São Paulo in Brazil, and in 1955 he went to Israel to teach at the Technion in Haifa. In 1957 Bohm moved to England and held a research fellowship at the University of Bristol. In 1961 he became a professor of theoretical physics at Birkbeck College, University of London, and he held that position until retiring in 1987. Bohm died on 27 October 1992 in London.

Bohm's most important contributions to philosophy are the result of his reflection on the nature of physical theories generally and quantum mechanics in particular. By 1932 the Copenhagen formulation of quantum mechanics, developed by Niels Bohr and his colleagues, had become the orthodox theory. Though Bohm was always uncomfortable with it, while at Princeton he set out to write a careful textbook explaining the orthodox statistical formulation of quantum mechanics. The result was *Quantum Theory* (1951). This book is remarkable for its clear explanations and arguments and for its honest reflections on the structure of the theory. Einstein, a prominent opponent of the orthodox formulation of quantum mechanics, liked the book as a clear statement of the Copenhagen interpretation but reported to Bohm that he still could not accept the theory. This and his own worries led Bohm to formulate a new theory of quantum mechanics based on explaining the distinctive quantum-mechanical behavior of fundamental particles by their being pushed around by a new "quantum potential." This theory stands as a counter-example to most of the metaphysical conclusions physicists and philosophers had drawn from orthodox quantum mechanics. Bohm's hidden-variable theory makes the same statistical predictions for particle positions as the orthodox theory, but, unlike it, his theory can be written in a form that is fully deterministic. Quantum probabilities result not from a fundamentally random process but from one's ignorance concerning the initial state. On Bohm's theory, the observed nonlocal correlations of quantum-mechanically entangled systems result from the predicted interdependence of the motions of arbitrarily distant particles.

Bohm's thought concerning the nonlocal behavior of quantum-mechanically entangled systems led him to propose a quantum holism where the physical world can only be fully understood as a single indivisible unit. This view is now common among physicists and philosophers of physics, but Bohm saw in it connections to such philosophical traditions as Eastern mysticism and Native American thought. His interests led him to become a student and a close associate of Jiddu Krishnamurti, and he also was a friend of the Dalai Lama. Bohm's investigation into possible relationships between Western and other philosophical traditions, like his research generally, was always characterized by openness to new ideas, intellectual honesty, and a desire for clear understanding.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Quantum Theory (New York, 1951).
Causality and Chance in Modern Physics (Princeton, N.J., and London, 1957).

The Special Theory of Relativity (New York, 1965).

Wholeness and the Implicate Order (London, 1980).

Science, Order, and Creativity (New York, 1987).

The Undivided Universe: An Ontological Interpretation of Quantum Theory, with Basil J. Hiley (London and New York, 1993).

Other Relevant Works

Bohm's papers are at Birkbeck College, University of London.

Truth and Actuality, with Jiddu Krishnamurti (San Francisco, 1978).

The Ending of Time, with Jiddu Krishnamurti (San Francisco, 1985).

Thought as a System (London and New York, 1994).

On Creativity, ed. Lee Nichol (London and New York, 1998).

The Limits of Thought, with Jiddu Krishnamurti (London and New York, 1999).

The Essential David Bohm, ed. Lee Nichol (London and New York, 2003).

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils

Hiley, Basil J., and F. David Peat, eds. *Quantum Implications: Essays in Honour of David Bohm* (London and New York, 1998).

Peat, F. David. *Infinite Potential: The Life and Times of David Bohm* (Reading, Mass., 1996).

Jeffrey A. Barrett

BONNIN, Gertrude Simmons (1876–1938)

Gertrude Simmons was born on 22 February 1876 in the Yankton Reservation in south-eastern South Dakota. Her mother was Ellen Tate'lyohiwin (Reaches for the Wind) Simmons; her father abandoned the family before Gertrude's birth. She was also given the name Zitkala Sa, or "Red Bird," and was raised as a Sioux until the age of eight, when she was sent to White's Manual Labor Institute, a Quaker school, in Indiana. She attended Earlham College in Indiana from 1895 to 1897 and the Boston Conservatory of Music in 1899, and then taught at the Carlisle Indian Training School during 1897–9. She was one of a number of assimilated Native Americans who helped reinforce white domination, while at the same time working to record and honor tribal ritual and tradition.

After studying at Earlham College, Simmons taught at the Carlisle Indian Training School in Pennsylvania, an institution that used rigid military-style discipline to force assimilation of Native American students. Students were forbidden to use their tribal languages, required to do manual labor, and punished severely for failing to conform to the standards set by the training school. Simmons taught at Carlisle for two years before leaving to study violin at the Boston Conservatory of Music, performing at the World Expo the following year in Paris. She returned to the Dakotas in order to help improve reservation life, serving as a clerk at Standing Rock Reservation in North Dakota in 1902, where she met Raymond Bonnin, whom she married in May 1902. Bonnin and her husband, also a Sioux, moved to Utah where she was a clerk and tribal organizer at the Uintah and Ouray reservations from 1902 to 1916.

In 1916, Bonnin moved to Washington, D.C. where she was the editor of *American Indian Magazine*, the journal of the Society of American Indians, an advocacy group that lobbied for Native rights. By 1926 she and her husband had established their own orga-

nization, the National Council of American Indians, to which she dedicated herself for the rest of her life. Bonnin died on 25 January 1938 in Washington, D.C., and is buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

Bonnin's writings focused on reforms in US government policy toward Native Americans, as well as on the recovery of Indian stories and ways of life. She wrote three books, and published several articles in popular publications like *Harper's* and *Atlantic Monthly*. Bonnin, together with Charles EASTMAN, BLACK ELK, and Luther STANDING BEAR, all born and/or raised as Sioux in the Dakota Territories in the 1860s and 1870s, tried to teach their non-Indian readers about Indian culture, traditions, and ways of thought.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Old Indian Legends (Boston, 1901; Lincoln, Nebr., 2004).
"Why I Am a Pagan," *Atlantic Monthly* 90 (December 1902): 801–3.
American Indian Stories (Washington, D.C., 1921; Lincoln, Nebr., 2003).
Oklahoma's Poor Rich Indians; an Orgy of Graft and Exploitation of the Five Civilized Tribes, Legalized Robbery, with Charles H. Fabens and Matthew K. Sniffen (Philadelphia, 1924).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*
"Bonnin, Gertrude Simmons," in *A Biobibliography of Native American Writers, 1772–1924*, ed. D. F. Littlefield and J. W. Parins (Metuchen, N.J., 1981), p. 17. Contains a bibliography of Bonnin's writings.
Fisher, Dexter. "Zitkala Sa: The Evolution of a Writer," *American Indian Quarterly* 5 (August 1979): 229–38.
Johnson, David, and Raymond Wilson. "Gertrude Simmons Bonnin, 1876–1938: 'Americanize the First American'," *American Indian Quarterly* 12 (Winter 1988): 27–40.
Susag, Dorothea M. "Zitkala-Sa (Gertrude Simmons Bonnin), A Power(full) Literary Voice," *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 5 (1993): 3–24.
Tedlock, Dennis, and Barbara Tedlock, eds. *Teachings from the American Earth: Indian Religion and Philosophy* (New York, 1975).
Welch, Deborah. *Zitkala-Sa: An American Indian Leader, 1876–1938*. PhD dissertation, University of Wyoming (Laramie, Wyo., 1985).

Dorothy Rogers

BOODIN, John Elof (1869–1950)

John Elof Boodin was born on 14 September 1869 on the Barsedt homestead in Pjätteryd parish, Småland, Sweden. He was the fifth of ten children and had other half-siblings from his father's previous marriage. Boodin's parents were pious Lutherans and his keen intellect was recognized early by two of the local pastors, who advised that young Elof should receive a university education. Up to the age of sixteen he worked on the family farm and explored the countryside of Småland. From this he gained a firsthand appreciation for nature, both the beautiful and the harsh aspects. Between 1885 and 1887 he attended the respected Fjellstedt Gymnasium in Uppsala. Upon the death of his father in 1887, financial need led Boodin to emigrate to the United States and he settled in Colchester, Illinois. He was following several older siblings already in the US, who planned that he should receive his advanced education there, in spite of his knowing not a word of English.

Thus began a remarkable climb through American academia. Boodin adapted quickly to his new country, attending first Macomb Normal and Commercial College, then

Augustana College, followed by the University of Colorado in 1892, the University of Minnesota in 1893, and finally Brown University, from which he received the BA in 1895 and MA in 1896 in philosophy, studying under James Seth. From there he went to Harvard University in 1897 for doctoral work, where he studied with William JAMES, Josiah ROYCE, and George SANTAYANA, among others. The effort to blend and synthesize these influences provided the impetus for Boodin's thought. He received his PhD in 1899, writing a dissertation on "A Theory of Time."

Boodin served as a lecturer at Harvard in 1899–1900, and then was a professor of philosophy at Iowa College (now Grinnell College) from 1900 to 1904, followed by the University of Kansas from 1904 to 1912. At Kansas, Boodin fought the university's president on a matter of principle, perhaps winning the moral high ground but losing the professional battle. After a year back in Cambridge, Massachusetts, he was professor of philosophy at Carleton College in Minnesota from 1913 to 1927, then at the University of Southern California in 1928–9, and finally at the University of California at Los Angeles from 1929 until his retirement in 1939. Boodin died on 14 November 1950 in Los Angeles, California.

There were travels and visiting lectures in London and Oxford as his reputation grew, but Boodin was always disappointed not to have been called back to Harvard, and at being obliged to create his philosophical works in the spare time he could find between heavy teaching and administrative responsibilities. Nevertheless, he published nine substantial books and close to 100 scholarly articles. During his lifetime Boodin was well respected and often cited and anthologized. A sign of the esteem of his contemporaries came when he was elected early in his career to the presidency of the Western Philosophical Association (today's Central Division of the American Philosophical Association) in 1912–13. Then, at the height of his powers,

Boodin was elected President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1933–4.

Boodin is known for his command of both contemporary science and the history of philosophy, for his creative ideas, his rigorous arguments, and his poetic style of writing. Time has tended to confirm many of his philosophical hypotheses, although he has been rarely read in recent years. Some interpreters read Boodin's philosophy as an effort to temper Royce's absolutism with James's realism. He is often classed with idealists in the philosophical literature. This classification seems to derive largely from Boodin's willingness to embrace and elaborate Royce's social philosophy, especially as set out in *The Problem of Christianity* (1913), and Royce's logic of relations, and also in part because of Boodin's conception of God. Others have seen James as Boodin's primary influence, and his life's work as an effort to work out the theory of energistic fields in pluralistic metaphysics, a project that James was never able to complete to his own satisfaction. Boodin had a greater talent for metaphysics than James, making the task more manageable for him.

Boodin's epistemology was a type of pragmatic realism, very much guided by and connected to the findings of empirical science. But Boodin was critical of aspects of both pragmatism and scientism. Pragmatism was weak in logic and metaphysics, he thought, while science provides at most some good analogies for metaphysics, and he warned against taking those analogies literally. Even a perfected science would not answer some of the most serious philosophical demands, particularly that the universe must be comprehended not just rationally in terms of truth, but also aesthetically and morally in terms of beauty and goodness. Yet Boodin kept up with the best science of his day, especially physics, and strove to conform his philosophical vocabulary and viewpoint to its findings.

Still others see Boodin as a process philosopher, even though he was often critical of

Henri Bergson. Indeed, one of Boodin's principal criticisms of both absolute and empirical idealism was that these philosophies ignore process. And still others see Boodin as a kind of theistic naturalist, on account of his view of the relation between God and nature, a pan-experientialist and panentheist view.

All of these assessments of Boodin, as an idealist, pragmatist, realist, theistic naturalist, and process philosopher, are correct. At a mature stage in his career he described his philosophy as "empirical realism and metaphysical energism with a functional conception of qualities and values" (Nelson 1987, p. 24). Nelson adds to this description that Boodin defends also a "cosmic idealism." Understanding what is meant by these terms is a basis for understanding Boodin's whole philosophy.

Boodin's philosophical thought really began with a theory of time, first published in 1904. Noting that both the Bergsonian qualitative view and the scientific quantitative view of the serial character of time have a number of failings, he argues that our thinking about time may be improved by seeing it as a "real dynamism" in which "truth [is] relative to process, not process to truth... . If process is real, then reality is infinite and truth never can exhaust reality ... it will take an infinite number of truth universes to register or symbolize a universe of process." (1904, p. 80) Time is, for Boodin, "dynamic non-being" that acts within being, as a limit, as a mode of existence without content, as possibility. Identifying process with reality twenty-five years ahead of Alfred North WHITEHEAD, and time with real dynamism following Bergson, prepared Boodin as few others for the philosophical encounter with the theory of relativity and the quantum revolution. Boodin was already able to deal with the idea of energy philosophically before it became the very center of natural philosophy.

Following Royce, Boodin argued that "to be is to be uniquely related to a whole," but he departed from Royce's criticisms of realism.

Royce had defined realism as the conception that "to be is to be independent," and while Boodin granted that there is no such thing as complete metaphysical independence, individuals must be conceived as metaphysically discrete, and hence some metaphysical relations are not internal to any overall totality. The totality is rather a cosmos, an order in process, and the notion of energy "serves as a convenient name, however thin, for the whole world of process" (1911, p. 303). Boodin held that the cosmos consists of "a hierarchy of fields." Such hierarchies of nested and mutually dependent energy fields are found in organisms of all sorts, in our daily experience. For example, in the human organism "there are fields of the lower centers of the nervous system; there are also cerebral fields and psychological fields. The cerebral fields give definiteness and organization to the lower neural fields" (1932, p. 212), and the nested dependence of higher patterns of organization upon lower ones continues to the very top of our intellectual and imaginative capabilities. The universe itself must be conceived by analogy to this organic structure, if any adequate metaphysics is to be offered, since explanations must satisfy not only our logical and empirical demands but also our aesthetic and moral demands. At the height of our imaginative and intellectual life, we find the logical order of thought itself. Arguing that we may be assured of the universal applicability of logical laws, because the mind is fully at home in nature, Boodin reasons that the study of science discovers exemplifications in natural processes of a broader orderliness. "The cosmos must be conceived not merely as a dynamic equilibrium, but as a living dynamic equilibrium of such a structure or 'curvature' that the loss of available energy in one part is compensated for by an equal increase elsewhere, for only a living equilibrium can be self-sustaining." (1932, p. 200) The universe is conceived by Boodin as being alive, as a sophisticated arrangement of interdependent energistic fields, dynamically encountering possibility.

Prior to developing this cosmic idealism, Boodin expended significant effort on issues of method and knowledge to formulate his empirical realism. His realism is grounded in arguing that discrete metaphysical individuals have "reference to an object existing beyond the apperceptive unity of momentary individual consciousness" (1911, p. 251). There is a felt sense of the encompassing whole from any given perspective, but no realistic basis upon which to bind that whole in a single account of "truth." Hence, reality always exceeds truth. Truth concerns relations that make a practical difference in the universe. Thus, one might ask how the nested energistic fields that are organically internal to the metaphysical individuals can have a discoverable relation to the energistic fields from which metaphysical individuals are discrete. This is the way the mind–body problem appears in Boodin's terms. To solve the mind–body problem realistically and empirically, Boodin points out that the concept of energy, as empirically defined, is the capacity to do work in the real universe, a difference that makes a difference in the universe. Whether we have yet learned the details or not, we can safely assume that ideas, consciousness, mind, or whatever term we use for those groups of relations internal to individuals, *do* make a difference in the universe. For all their mysteriousness, it can easily be seen that ideas are a kind of energy, by definition, because they alter the universe. To deny this is to commit oneself to an equivocal definition of energy. Hence it is both empirical and realistic to conceive of energy as existing in fields that possess genuine interdependent but discrete forms. The forms of energy fields are dynamic, contingent, active, and evolving. Time and energy are, then, the two complementary agencies of creative becoming: energy is dynamic being and time is dynamic non-being. This may not be a standard form of metaphysical and empirical realism, but Boodin insists upon its classification as a kind of realism. In the second edition (1931) of his major work, *A Realistic Universe*, Boodin was quick to capitalize on the notion of quantum indeterminacy to argue that realism no longer meant giving one's philosophy to determinate laws of nature as the ground of form. Knowable structure and form in nature are consistent with a process conception of energy within a realist epistemology.

The topic of God and the divine in relation to nature played a large role in Boodin's mature work. Arguing that the first and most basic mistake in human thinking about God is the habit of severing the natural from the super-natural, Boodin argues that these are really two perspectives on all reality: the perspective of the part or individual, and the perspective of the living and developing whole. A human conception of God must be derived empirically from the way in which each and every part is suffused with the meaning of the whole. We know we live in an empirically real "community of minds" that is not wholly rationalizable, but we often fail to recognize that our relation to the divine is analogous. Rejecting "proofs" for the existence of God, Boodin sought an apt way to fill out this relation of part to whole, arguing that "we have an analogy in the human personality. The events in the life of the organism are guided by a whole pattern – the field of the individual soul – which gives a unique quality to the individual… . It is through this soul that energy is directed so as to find its place where it is needed in the life of the whole." (*God: A Cosmic Philosophy of Religion*, 1934, p. 33) Alluding to the first law of thermodynamics, Boodin continues, "nothing is lost which is significant to the life of the whole. The light that goes out here is rekindled yonder… . Only the trivial, insignificant and bad dies, not to rise again to life. This is the second death – the death of the individual – not the loss of energy, but the loss of pattern, the suicide of personality" (p. 33). Thus, Boodin conceives of God as a kind of natural, cosmic personality, "the spiritual field in which everything lives and moves and has its being – the field which guides the cosmic process, though the parts

must adapt themselves to the structure of this field in their own way, according to their own relativity, in their moving finite frames of reference" (p. 34). Boodin conceives of God as the soul of the whole, its center of personal energy.

Although he had been working out his theory of the social mind for many years, Boodin's last major development came to fruition on the eve of World War II. He attempted to set out along democratic lines the notion that "mind" (recalling this is a kind of "energy") is not an idea that can be limited to atomic individuals. In the shadow of both communist collectivism and fascistic nationalism, Boodin sought to articulate a social philosophy that respected individuality while recognizing that there is more to "mind" than "subcranial or solipsistic" individual psychology. Thus he outlines a social ontology on "the analogies between the organism and society" (1939, p. 130). Boodin's analogy is, as always, more careful than the scientistic and reductionistic versions found in communist and fascist ideologies. "The social organism is merely a metaphor, a vague analogy." (p. 131)

Given the intimacy and immediacy of the union of personal selves with the personal divine, it is not easy, Boodin realizes, to explain how the "social" can be anything more than an abstraction. He solves this problem with an account of intersubjective continuity and response that follows Royce and is critical of James while bearing a close resemblance (without explicit reference) to the social ontology of William E. HOCKING. Arguing that the idea of social companionship is a pervasive, intuitive feature of all experience, Boodin reasons that absolute discontinuity among discrete individuals is an abstraction at best. Social continuity of metaphysically discrete individuals is the only warranted idea. The overall thrust of social development is in the direction of creative synthesis, the creation of larger and more complex energistic fields. But our intuitive response that points to intersubjective continuity, although it is prior to the

development of individual personality, is insufficient for "social mind." Boodin says "in order to have a social mind there must be a sense of reciprocal or sympathetic response to the situation. On the lower levels this means the abandon to a common impulse, on the higher levels it means the leading of a common purpose." (p. 157) In proportion as a group can be fused in pursuit of an ideal purpose, there is a social mind in the personal sense. This fusion is not the result of individual personalities choosing rationally, it is what creates individual personalities and provides the measure of their rationality. In terms of forming normative judgments about better and worse purposes, Boodin embraces Royce's notion of loyalty and develops it further.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Time and Reality (New York, 1904).
Truth and Reality: An Introduction to the Theory of Knowledge (New York, 1911).
A Realistic Universe (New York, 1916; 2nd edn 1931).
Cosmic Evolution: Outlines of Cosmic Idealism (New York, 1925).
God: A Cosmic Philosophy of Religion (New York, 1934).
Three Interpretations of the Universe (New York, 1934).
The Social Mind: Foundations of Social Philosophy (New York, 1939).
The Religion of Tomorrow (New York, 1943).
Posthumous Papers of John Elof Boodin, ed. Donald A. Piatt (Los Angeles, 1957).

Other Relevant Works
Boodin's papers are at the University of California at Los Angeles.
"What Pragmatism Is and Is Not," *Journal of Philosophy* 6 (1909): 627–35.
"The Existence of Social Minds," *American Journal of Sociology* 19 (1913): 1–47.
"Biographical" and "Nature and Reason," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, vol. 1, ed. George P.

Adams and William P. Montague (New York, 1930), pp. 136–42, 143–66.

"God and Cosmic Structure," in *Contemporary Idealism in America*, ed. Clifford Barrett (New York, 1932), pp. 197–216.

"Functional Realism," *Philosophical Review* 43 (1934): 147–78.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Pres Addr of APA v2*, *Proc of APA v24*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Auxier, Randall E. "Introduction," to *Truth and Reality*, by John Elof Boodin (Bristol, UK, 2001).

Holmes, Eugene C. *Social Philosophy and the Social Mind: A Study of the Genetic Methods of J. M. Baldwin, G. H. Mead and J. E. Boodin* (New York, 1942).

Nelson, Charles H. *John Elof Boodin: Philosopher Poet* (New York, 1987).

Reck, Andrew. "The Cosmic Philosophy of John Elof Boodin," in *Recent American Philosophy: Studies of Ten Representative Thinkers* (New York, 1964), chap. 4.

Randall E. Auxier

BOOLOS, George Stephen (1940–96)

George Boolos was born on 4 September 1940 in Manhattan, New York. He graduated from Princeton University in 1961 with a BA degree in mathematics. As a Fulbright scholar, he earned a BPhil degree from the University of Oxford in 1963. In 1966 he earned a PhD in philosophy from Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which was the first doctorate in philosophy granted by MIT. Boolos taught philosophy at Columbia University from 1966 until 1969, when he returned to MIT. In 1980 Boolos was promoted to full professor. In 1995 he was elected President of the Association for Symbolic Logic. He also was an editor of the *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, and a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. His wife was the philosopher Sally Sedgwick of Dartmouth College. Just before his death he was appointed Laurance S. Rockefeller Professor of Philosophy at MIT. Boolos died on 27 May 1996 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Boolos's international reputation rests on research in three main areas. First, he is widely recognized as one of the originators of provability logic, where the logic of necessity and possibility is applied to the theory of mathematical proof. He published two books on this topic. Second, Boolos made significant contributions to the philosophy of logic and, in particular, to the understanding of second-order logic. One central insight, now standard in the field, is that second-order variables could be interpreted as making plural reference to the objects in the range of first-order variables, instead of as ranging over sets of such objects. According to many, this semantic insight allowed one to accept second-order logic without being thereby committed to the existence of abstract objects.

Third, Boolos was an international expert on the work of German philosopher and mathematician Gottlob Frege, widely viewed as the grandfather of modern logic. Frege's attempt to ground arithmetic in logic failed when Bertrand Russell showed that one of the set-theoretic axioms Frege employed led to a contradiction. For almost a century, Frege's project was viewed as a grand failure. But, along with Crispin Wright and Richard Heck among others, Boolos showed that a more modest, though still substantial mathematical result could be saved from the project. At the time of his death, Boolos was at work on a book on Frege, funded through a Guggenheim Fellowship. His most important articles on set-theory and Frege's logic were published in a posthumous collection, *Logic, Logic, and Logic* (1998). Boolos's unique mix of humor and

genius was exemplified by his three-page article, "Godel's Second Incompleteness Theorem Explained in Words of One Syllable" (1994).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Computability and Logic, with Richard Jeffrey (Cambridge, UK, 1974).

The Unprovability of Consistency: An Essay in Modal Logic (Cambridge, UK, 1979).

Honor of Richard Cartwright, ed. Judith Jarvis Thomson (Cambridge, Mass., 1987), pp. 3–20.

The Logic of Provability (Cambridge, UK, 1993).

Logic, Logic, and Logic, ed. Richard Jeffrey (Cambridge, Mass., 1998).

Other Relevant Works

"Degrees of Unsolvability of Constructible Sets of Integers," with Hilary Putnam, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 33 (1968): 497–513.

"Effectiveness and Natural Languages," in *Language and Philosophy: A Symposium*, ed. Sidney Hook (New York, 1969).

"The Iterative Conception of Set," *Journal of Philosophy* 68 (1971): 215–32.

"On Second-Order Logic," *Journal of Philosophy* 72 (1975): 509–27.

"Provability, Truth, and Modal Logic," *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 9 (1980): 1–7.

"To Be is to Be the Value of a Variable (or Some Values of Some Variables)," *Journal of Philosophy* 81 (1984): 430–50.

"Nominalist Platonism," *Philosophical Review* 94 (1985): 327–44.

"The Consistency of Frege's *Foundations of Arithmetic*," in *On Being and Saying: Essays for Richard Cartwright*, ed. Judith Jarvis Thomson (Cambridge, Mass., 1987).

Ed., *Meaning and Method: Essays in Honor of Hilary Putnam* (Cambridge, UK, 1990).

"Godel's Second Incompleteness Theorem Explained in Words of One Syllable," *Mind* (1994): 1–3.

"The Hardest Logical Puzzle Ever," *Harvard Review of Philosophy* 6 (1996): 62–5.

Further Reading

Who Was Who in Amer v11

Oliver, Alex. "Logic, Mathematics and Philosophy," *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 51 (2000): 857–73.

Parsons, Charles. "George Boolos," *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 40 (1999): 3–5.

David Hunter

BORING, Edwin Garrigues (1886–1968)

E. G. Boring was born on 23 October 1886 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and died on 1 July 1968 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. From the 1920s to the 1960s, he was one of the most influential figures in academic psychology. In addition to his primary role as a builder of the discipline, Boring published theoretical and systematic works, both psychological and philosophical in content, that may be considered a significant contribution to history of science, philosophy of science, and philosophy of mind.

Boring was raised in a matriarchal Quaker household and attended the George School. While studying electrical engineering at Cornell University, he chose E. B. TITCHENER's psychology course as an elective, and was inspired by Titchener's lectures. After receiving a Masters of Engineering degree from Cornell in 1908, Boring spent a year working at Bethlehem Steel and taught science in a Moravian Church school. Returning to Cornell in 1910 for an MA, with plans to continue teaching, he found himself attracted to psychology. He became a devoted student of Titchener and a member of Titchener's laboratory, one of the most important of its time. For his dissertation, Boring studied sensory

processes in the alimentary tract, a topic assigned by Titchener. After receiving the PhD in psychology in 1914, Boring spent four additional years as an instructor at Cornell. In 1918 he became Chief Psychological Examiner at Camp Upton, Long Island, where he played a major role in World War I army intelligence testing. Working under psychologist Robert M. Yerkes, Boring helped to prepare a massive report on the army testing program. Throughout the rest of his career he remained cautious and was sometimes critical regarding the interpretation of intelligence tests.

In 1919 Boring was invited by G. Stanley HALL to accept appointment as professor of experimental psychology at Clark University. Three years later, during intense administrative controversies and "red scare" issues at Clark, Boring accepted a position as associate professor at Harvard. He served as Director of the Psychological Laboratory from 1924 to 1949, and as de facto chair of psychology, which was not separated from the department of philosophy and psychology until 1934. He was made Edgar Pierce Professor of Psychology at Harvard in 1956 and retired in 1957. His heavy administrative responsibilities at Harvard left him with little time for experimental work, and his limited output caused deep self-criticism and even personal crises during the 1930s. However, Boring and his students did complete a well-known series of experiments on the moon illusion between 1936 and 1941. Using a cleverly designed series of mirrors to create artificial moons, they showed that the illusion depended in part on the position of the eyes in the skull.

Boring is primarily known to psychologists for his 1929 *A History of Experimental Psychology* and its 1950 revision. Although heavily criticized in recent years for presenting a distorted view of Wilhelm Wundt, Boring's *History* was read by nearly all graduate students in psychology through the 1960s, and it shaped the way in which psychologists viewed their emerging science and the aims of experimentation. Boring published on the history of psychology and the history of science throughout his career, interweaving psychological, sociological, and philosophical concepts. These widely read papers dealt with social and cultural factors in scientific development, the history of method, and problems of scientific communication.

Beginning in 1927, Boring attempted to analyze the problems of "founders," creativity, originality, and "greatness" in science. He introduced psychologists to Goethe's concept of *Zeitgeist*, but transformed it into "the total body of knowledge and opinion" at a given time in a specific culture, thus providing a version that positivists could find congenial. Using Robert Merton's concept of "multiples" to explicate scientific discoveries, Boring outlined a view of history of science that reconciled "Great Man" notions with *Zeitgeist* explanations of scientific change. By adding "erudition," love of the unexpected, visualization, alertness, and efficient thinking as psychological attributes, he hoped to explain the mysteries of "scientific genius."

His writings on experimental control, measurement, statistics, and the role of evolutionary theory in psychology provided an analysis of basic methodological and theoretical constructs in historical context. Although Boring's historiography was narrow by contemporary standards, the clarity of his writing and careful argumentation undoubtedly helped to maintain a common discursive framework among experimental psychologists in the face of challenges from Gestalt psychology and phenomenology. Of his concerns with scientific method, his promotion of P. W. BRIDGMAN's operationism was the most significant. Although Boring credited his most noted student, S. S. STEVENS, with introducing the concept to psychology, Boring had hinted at features of operationism in his writings of the 1920s on the stimulus error and intelligence testing. In the mid 1930s, with Stevens and possibly under the influence of Herbert FEIGL, he began active promotion of the concept. Despite the disunity over operationism evident at the famous symposium held

in 1945, Boring continued to argue that operations could converge and provide a foundation for the advancement of knowledge, thus revealing his essentially positivist faith.

Less well recognized by psychologists is Boring's contribution to the mind–body problem. Only after the death of his domineering mentor Titchener, could Boring attempt a reformulation of Titchener's dualism. Boring's 1933 *Physical Dimensions of Consciousness* attempted to transcend the limitations of Titchener's view and bridge structuralism and behaviorism using monistic physicalism as a guiding principle. This physicalism was conceptually related to operationism, but in 1933 Boring had not yet read Bridgman. Retrospectively, Boring described operationism as a modern form of physicalism, in that consciousness was reduced to the operations by which consciousness was known to scientists. He was able to "save" Titchener's work by translating dimensions of consciousness (for example, intensity) into physicalist terms. Boring's position rejected both ontological and epistemological dualism and all parallelisms in favor of monism, but he did not consider himself a behaviorist. For Boring, consciousness had to be understood in terms of neural systems, in a position he called "psychoneural isomorphism" or what later came to be called "identity theory" of mind. In this arena, it is likely that Boring had more influence on the subsequent views of psychologists than of philosophers.

Boring worked tirelessly to organize and promote the discipline of psychology. He served as the President of the American Psychological Association in 1928, Secretary of the IX International Congress of Psychology in 1929, and Honorary President of the XVII International Congress of Psychology in 1963. He was a founder and the first editor of *Contemporary Psychology*. With Herbert Langfeld and Henry Weld he authored a series of widely used introductory textbooks; and, as the 1957 Harvard Lowell Television Lecturer, he was one of the first to present a psychology course on public television. In 1959 the American Psychological Foundation awarded him a Gold Medal for his achievements as an experimentalist, teacher, critic, theorist, administrator, popularizer, and editor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Stimulus Error," *American Journal of Psychology* 32 (1921): 449–71.

"The Problem of Originality in Science," *American Journal of Psychology* 39 (1927): 70–90.

A History of Experimental Psychology (New York, 1929; 2nd edn 1950).

The Physical Dimensions of Consciousness (New York, 1933).

Psychology: A Factual Textbook, with H. Langfeld and H. Weld (New York, 1935).

"A Psychological Function is the Relation of Successive Differentiations of Events in the Organism," *Psychological Review* 44 (1937): 445–61.

Sensation and Perception in the History of Experimental Psychology (New York, 1942).

"The Moon Illusion," *American Journal of Physics* 11 (1943): 55–60.

"The Use of Operational Definitions in Science," *Psychological Review* 52 (1945): 243–5.

"Mind and Mechanism," *American Journal of Psychology* 59 (1946): 173–92.

"Great Men and Scientific Progress," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 94 (1950): 339–51.

"The Nature and History of Experimental Control," *American Journal of Psychology* 67 (1954): 573–89.

"Eponym as Placebo," *Acta Psychologica* 23 (1964): 9–23.

Other Relevant Works

"Edwin Garrigues Boring," in *A History of Psychology in Autobiography*, vol. 4, ed. Edwin G. Boring et al. (Worcester, Mass., 1952), pp. 27–52.

Psychologist at Large: An Autobiography

and Selected Essays (New York, 1961).

History, Psychology, and Science: Selected Papers, ed. D. T. Campbell and R. I. Watson (New York, 1963).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Who Was Who v5*

Cerullo, John. "E. G. Boring: Reflections on a Discipline Builder," *American Journal of Psychology* 101 (1988): 561–75.

Jaynes, Julian. "Edwin Garrigues Boring: 1889–1968," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 5 (1969): 99–112.

Kelly, Barry. "Inventing Psychology's Past: E. G. Boring's Historiography in Relation to the Psychology of His Time," *Journal of Mind and Behavior* 2 (1981): 229–41.

O'Donnell, John. "The Crisis of Experimentalism in the 1920s: E. G. Boring and His Uses of History," *American Psychologist* 34 (1979): 289–95.

Rosenzweig, Saul. "E. G. Boring and the Zeitgeist: *Eruditione gesta beavit*," *Journal of Psychology* 75 (1970): 59–71.

Winston, Andrew S. "'The Defects of His Race …' E. G. Boring and Antisemitism in American Psychology, 1923–1953," *History of Psychology* 1 (1998): 27–51.

Andrew S. Winston

BOROWITZ, Eugene Bernard (1924–)

Eugene B. Borowitz was born on 20 February 1924 in Columbus, Ohio. He received his BA from Ohio State University in 1943. He then attended the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, receiving rabbinic ordination in 1948 and the Doctor of Hebrew Letters in 1952. After becoming Director of the Religious Education Department of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in New York City, he earned an EdD from Columbia University in 1958. In 1962 Borowitz joined the faculty of the Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion in New York, where he presently holds the Sigmund L. Falk Distinguished Professorship of Education and Jewish Religious Thought.

Borowitz's important and programmatic essay, "The Jewish Need for Theology," appeared in *Commentary* in 1962. He recognized in religious existentialism a useful tool for conveying Jewish religious thought to a contemporary audience and developed a familiarity with both Jewish and non-Jewish theological work. This expertise led to his publication in 1965 of *A Layman's Introduction to Religious Existentialism*, a book that bears the hallmark of all his subsequent writings – clarity of expression, an ability to distill difficult ideas into a more easily understood form, and a breadth of interests and subjects. A later book, *Contemporary Christologies* (1980), continues his interest in Christian thought. His many subsequent writings include reflections on Jewish education, theology, interfaith dialogue, ethics, and political thought, balancing commitment to Jewish sources with advocacy of personal autonomy. In 1970 he founded *Sh'ma: A Journal of Jewish Responsibility* and served as its senior editor from 1993 to 1997. This journal provides a forum in which Jews of every persuasion discuss and debate theological, social, cultural, sexual, and political issues. He was instrumental in both the shaping and the explication of the 1976 publication *Reform Judaism: A Centenary Perspective*. He has spoken widely in both academic and non-academic settings and received several honorary degrees.

Borowitz concludes his *Layman's Introduction to Religious Existentialism* by explaining why he finds existentialism a useful tool for expressing a modern religiousness: it sets the modern individual face to face with the biblical God, and it introduces the biblical God into the life of the contemporary individual. His thinking emphasizes the dialogue

between individuals and the divine, a commitment to reading Torah as a way of discerning divine commands, and the problems of mediating between a traditionalism that limits human autonomy and a modernism that overvalues human independence. These criteria establish the standard by which Borowitz judges other thinkers and the motivation that animates his own work. Borowitz's review of modern Jewish thought, *A New Jewish Theology in the Making* (1968), examines the seminal Jewish thinkers from Moses Mendelssohn through the present and concludes by considering a "covenantal" theology that offers an existentialist entry into Jewish belief and thought.

Borowitz's *How Can a Jew Speak of Faith Today?* (1969) is something of a companion piece to the previous volume. It examines particular Jewish issues such as prayer, the celebration of festivals, hope in the divine, and interfaith dialogue from a similar perspective. Characteristically, Borowitz remarks in that book that "the thinker … must slowly find a way to outgrow" his former beliefs. He himself shows that ability. By the 1970s he realized that a new approach was needed. His award-winning volume *The Mask Jews Wear* (1973) took up the same challenge of setting people before God and God before people in a different key, by articulating the hidden theology behind Jewish folkways. By the 1990s Borowitz realized that disillusionment with the promises of the Enlightenment and with liberalism had become widespread. A new, postmodern, Jew was positioned to hear the teachings of Judaism differently from previous generations. His *Renewing the Covenant* (1991) marked a transition to a new approach to Jewish theology that initiated a "decade of fruition" in which postmodernism served as "a cultural language" for interpreting Judaism to the world. The tools of interpretation changed, but Borowitz consistently found existentialist, sociological, or postmodernist ways to convey God's presence to a contemporary audience.

Borowitz's *A New Jewish Theology* went through changes and variations. Its ultimate incarnation as part of the second edition of *Choices in Modern Jewish Thought* (1995) includes a striking recognition of the place of women in Judaism – the language becomes gender neutral, except when referring to the divinity, and a special section on Jewish feminism is added by a Jewish feminist. The evolution of that book reflects Borowitz's concern for applying covenantal theology to ethical questions. Covenantal ethics, itself, responds to an ethical dilemma – the reconciliation of human autonomy and divine authority. Borowitz insists that Judaism preserves the independence of the individual Jew while still demanding obedience to God's commandments. Jewish moral decisions arise from a dialogue between the two covenant members, the divine and the human. He applies this dialogic technique to analyze sexual ethics, to wrestle with economic questions, to mediate interfaith relationships, and to reach a moral stance concerning the modern State of Israel. Borowitz's thinking on these subjects has been consistently dialogical and dynamic – remarkable for including changes and transitions resulting from his covenantal wrestling with religious issues.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Jewish Need for Theology," *Commentary* 33 (August 1962): 138–44.
A Layman's Introduction to Religious Existentialism (Philadelphia, 1965).
A New Jewish Theology in the Making (Philadelphia, 1968).
Choosing a Sex Ethic (New York, 1969).
How Can a Jew Speak of Faith Today? (Philadelphia, 1969).
Reform Judaism Today (New York, 1977–8).
The Mask Jews Wear: The Self-Deceptions of American Jewry (New York, 1973; 2nd edn 1980).
Contemporary Christologies: A Jewish Response (New York, 1980).
Choices in Modern Jewish Thought: A

Partisan Guide (New York, 1983; 2nd edn 1995).

Exploring Jewish Ethics: Papers on Covenant Responsibility (Detroit, 1990).

Renewing the Covenant: A Theology for the Postmodern Jew (Philadelphia, 1991).

Judaism After Modernity: Papers from a Decade of Fruition (Lanham, Md., 1999).

Studies in the Meaning of Judaism (Philadelphia, 2002).

Further Reading

Helfman, Amy W. *A Life in Covenant: The Complete Works of Eugene B. Borowitz, 1944–1999: A Bibliography* (New York, 1999).

Hoffman, Lawrence A., and Arnold J. Wolf, eds. *Jewish Spiritual Journeys: 20 Essays Written to Honor the Occasion of the 70th Birthday of Eugene B. Borowitz* (West Orange, N.J., 1997).

Ochs, Peter, ed. *Reviewing the Covenant: Eugene B. Borowitz and the Postmodern Renewal of Jewish Theology* (Albany, N.Y., 2000).

S. Daniel Breslauer

BOURNE, Randolph Silliman (1886–1918)

Randolph Silliman Bourne was born on 30 May 1886 in Bloomfield, New Jersey, and died on 23 December 1918 in New York City. Bourne was delivered with the use of forceps, which permanently disfigured his face and misshaped his ear. Further, at the age of four, Bourne developed spinal tuberculosis, which hampered his growth and permanently bent his back so he eventually grew to be only five feet tall. His physical challenges were never something he discussed or wrote about in any great detail, and he rarely complained of the illnesses and discomforts he endured.

Despite dying at the young age of thirty-two during an influenza epidemic, Bourne had a profound influence on the pacifist intellectual movement of World War I, worked as an educational theorist and popularizer of the ideas of John DEWEY, and served as an inspiration to generations of young radical thinkers. His writing career was only about eight years long, from 1911 to 1918, but he published three books, edited another, and had two collections of his work published almost immediately after his death. He wrote *Youth and Life* (1913), *The Gary Schools* (1916), and *Education and Living* (1917). He edited *Towards an Enduring Peace* in 1917, and shortly after his death appeared the *History of a Literary Radical* (1919) and *Untimely Papers* (1920). All of these works are in addition to the great many articles he wrote, mostly for *The Atlantic Monthly*, *The New Republic*, *Seven Arts*, and *The Dial*, as well as the public speeches he gave during his short time of intellectual and academic activity.

When he was a child, Bourne's family was comfortably well off, and from a Presbyterian background. Bourne had a pastor, a Civil War colonel, and lawyers among his relatives. After he left high school, however, his family experienced a financial crisis that forced him to work rather than go directly to college. For six years, he worked a variety of jobs, including playing the piano for plays and movie houses, working in a factory, and teaching piano lessons. These jobs, especially a stint involving ever-decreasing piece wages for the production of musical arrangements, gave Bourne a lifelong sympathy for the working class. He remembered these experiences as he started classes at Columbia University at the age of twenty-three.

At the time, Columbia was the largest university in the country, with more than 6000 students. Columbia was also rare in that it had more graduate than undergraduate students – the resulting rich intellectual environment had a powerful influence on young Bourne. He studied under John Dewey,

Charles Beard, James Harvey Robinson, and Franz BOAS, and he read the works of Leo Tolstoy, Thomas Hardy, Maurice Maeterlinck, Friedrich Nietzsche, Henri Bergson, John Dewey, Josiah ROYCE, and William JAMES. By this point in his life, Bourne considered himself a socialist, and became a member of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. By 1912 Bourne was the editor of *The Columbia Monthly* and an active participant in the life of the campus community.

Earlier, in 1908, Ellery Sedgwick had taken over *The Atlantic Monthly* from its previously conservative editors, and turned its focus toward more contemporary problems and concerns. By 1913 Bourne was writing a series of essays for *The Atlantic Monthly*, which were a call to action for the nation's young to revitalize democracy and challenge the traditions of older generations. The essays were then republished as *Youth and Life* (1913). In these early writings, Bourne concentrated on vitality, change, and possibility. In "Youth," Bourne stressed the virtues of youthful experimentation, of fighting against tradition. He argued that planning out one's life and falling into habits of old limit the ability of a person to develop her or his own self and her or his own self-consciousness. In "The Life of Irony," Bourne developed an "ironic" strategy of comparing experiences to bring out inconsistencies. He advocated the production of social goals and ideals based upon acts of revealing present and actual failures through ironic critique: "Irony, the science of comparative experience, compares things not with an established standard but with each other, and the values that slowly emerge from the process, values that emerge from one's own vivid reactions, are constantly revised, corrected, and refined by that same sense of contrast." (1977, p. 136)

In 1913 Bourne had the opportunity to travel to Europe with the support of a fellowship from Columbia. He earned this honor just as he began Master's studies in the then-young study of sociology. From 1913 to 1914 he toured Europe and was heartened by the heady intellectual atmosphere he found in France, especially Paris. There he found the model of activist, scholar, writer, and artist that he tried throughout his life to emulate and import into the United States. Bourne was alarmed, however, by the growing nationalism he saw in Italy and Germany. After much travel was done and many letters, journal notes, and essay ideas were written, Bourne was forced to flee Germany just as it declared war on Russia and France.

Upon returning to the United States, Bourne completed his MA at Columbia and began writing for the new magazine, *The New Republic*. He published a piece in its first issue, and became the editor for education, religion, and urban planning. For the rest of his life, he would have a continuing, though sometimes ebbing and flowing, relationship with *The New Republic*. In his role as education editor, he traveled to Gary, Indiana to profile the new schools being built there by the United States Steel Corporation in an attempt to model and embody the many progressive educational theories of the day. He gathered his writings on these matters in *The Gary Schools* (1916), which praised the attempts to unify learning in and out of the classroom, and other means of implementing the educational theories of John Dewey. Throughout his work at *The New Republic*, as well as in some of his later works, Bourne acted as a great popularizer of previously under-recognized figures. In addition to Dewey, Bourne also worked to bring Henri Bergson, Friedrich Nietzsche, H. G. Wells, and George Bernard Shaw to a new level of familiarity for the American public.

By 1917, however, the relationship between the ever-radical Bourne and the increasingly-moderate *The New Republic* was showing signs of strain. *The New Republic* began to consider itself a voice of intellectuals who supported the Wilson administration and the participation of the United States in the Great War. Many at *The New Republic* aimed to shape the country and the world toward progressive reform, but they thought it best to do so by supporting the war and working to shape

its ends toward democratic and liberal purposes. Bourne vehemently disagreed with these tactics.

In 1917 and 1918 the federal government, under the aegis of the new Espionage and Sedition Acts, arrested 1500 Americans for disloyalty, and 4000 for becoming conscientious objectors to the war. In the heat of these difficulties, Bourne published a series of anti-war articles for the new journal, *The Seven Arts*, a peace-advocating magazine of intellectual artists. In April 1917, the same month as Wilson's war speech to Congress, Bourne published "The Puritan's Will to Power," and from June to October of that year, wrote and published several other anti-war essays for *The Seven Arts*. Throughout, he was especially critical of the cooptation of intellectuals by the government. He believed that through appointments in its administration, Wilson had made many writers and academics, who previously argued against warfare, complicit in its participation in World War I.

In his essays for *The Seven Arts*, Bourne argued that pragmatists, especially Dewey, surrendered their principles for the gains they saw in the Wilson administration and the potential gains they saw in the outcome of the war. Bourne held Dewey to be the exemplar of this betrayal of progressive ideals because Dewey advocated the use of force as an instrument of policy, and claimed that criticisms of the inevitable and unstoppable war were futile and wasteful. Bourne directly attacked Dewey in "Conscience and Intelligence in War" (1917). Here, he wrote: "In wartime, there is literally no other end but war, and the objector, therefore, lives no longer with a choice of alternatives … . The appeal to force removes everything automatically to a nonintelligent sphere of thinking and acting." (1965, pp. 130–31) Bourne, however, launched his most famous series of criticisms of intellectuals' support for the war in a series of essays from 1917 that included "The Puritan's Will to Power," "The War and the Intellectuals," and "Twilight of the Idols." In "The War and

the Intellectuals," he wrote, "The American intellectuals … seem to have forgotten that the real enemy is War rather than Imperial Germany. There is work to be done to prevent this war of ours from passing into popular mythology as a holy crusade." (1965, p. 158) Eventually, however, *The Seven Arts* went out of business, mostly due to a withdrawal of its underwriting support, and Bourne shifted to spending much of his time writing book reviews for *The New Republic* and *The Dial*.

Near the end of his short life, Bourne began work on an autobiographical novel and "The State," a lengthy political essay on the psychology of the state in times of war and peace. Neither was finished. In "The State," we see the repeated appearance of Bourne's famous epigram, "War in the health of the State." The State, according to Bourne, thrives on war, even as the people suffer. War destroys diversity, upon which democracy thrives: "War … unifies all the bourgeois elements and the common people, and outlaws the rest." (1977, p. 367) In peace, according to Bourne, we rarely think about the State – we talk instead about Government, "a legitimate object of criticism and even contempt" (1977, p. 355). In times of war, however, the State rises to power and squelches opposition. Differences among persons disintegrate as the power of the State rises to combat enemies abroad and halt criticism at home. According to Bourne, the "State is essentially a concept of power, of competition; it signifies a group in its aggressive aspects" (1977, p. 358). Bourne's essay unifies many of his earlier anti-war writings and synchronizes his criticisms of the intelligentsia in America and his suspicions of large-scale power, bellicosity, and the desire to submit and surrender to accepted ways of living and thinking.

Throughout his life, Bourne nourished many close friendships, and was sometimes wary of strangers. He was a prolific letter writer, however, and had an especially voluminous correspondence with many young women. Bourne worried throughout his life that he would never find romantic love, and was

thrilled to meet Esther Cornell, a descendent of the founder of Cornell University. They fell in love late in his life, and even talked of marriage. But Bourne took ill with what he thought was simply a bad cold. It was, rather, influenza, from which he never recovered. He reportedly died in his bed with friends and loved ones nearby, dying as he lived, haranguing an adversary.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Youth and Life (Boston, 1913).
The Gary Schools (Boston, 1916).
Education and Living (New York, 1917).
Ed., *Towards an Enduring Peace* (New York, 1917).
Untimely Papers, ed. James Oppenheim (New York, 1919).
History of a Literary Radical, ed. Van Wyck Brooks (New York, 1920).
The Radical Will: Selected Writings 1911–1918, ed. Christopher Lasch (New York, 1977).
The Letters of Randolph Bourne: a Comprehensive Edition, ed. Eric J. Sandeen (New York, 1981).

Other Relevant Works
Bourne's papers are at Columbia University.
"The Handicapped," *The Atlantic Monthly* 108 (September 1911): 320–39.
"Youth," *The Atlantic Monthly* 109 (April 1912): 433–41.
"The Excitement of Friendship," *The Atlantic Monthly* 110 (December 1912): 795–800.
"The Life of Irony," *The Atlantic Monthly* 111 (March 1913): 357–67.
"Impressions of Europe, 1913–1914," *Columbia Quarterly* 17 (March 1915): 109–26.
"American Use For German Ideals," *New Republic* 4 (4 September 1915): 117–19.
"Mental Unpreparedness," *New Republic* 4 (11 September 1915): 143–4.
"A Modern Mind," *The Dial* 62 (22 March 1917): 239–40.
"The Puritan's Will to Power," *Seven Arts* 1 (April 1917): 631–7.
"The War and the Intellectuals," *Seven Arts* 2 (June 1917): 133–46.
"Conscience and Intelligence in War," *The Dial* 63 (13 September 1917): 193–5.
"Twilight of Idols," *Seven Arts* 2 (October 1917): 535–47.
"Denatured Nietzsche," *The Dial* 63 (20 December 1917): 389–91.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Blake, Casey N. *Beloved Community: The Cultural Criticism of Randolph Bourne, Van Wyck Brooks, Waldo Frank & Lewis Mumford* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1990).
Clayton, Bruce. *Forgotten Prophet: The Life of Randolph Bourne* (Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1984).
Lasch, Christopher. *The New Radicalism in America* (New York, 1965).
Moreau, John Adam. *Randolph Bourne: Legend and Reality* (Washington, D.C., 1966).
Mumford, Louis. "The Image of Randolph Bourne," *New Republic* 64 (24 September 1930): 151–2.
Paul, Sherman. *Randolph Bourne* (Minneapolis, 1966).
Rahv, Philip. *The Discovery of Europe* (Boston, 1947).
Resek, Carl, ed. *War and the Intellectuals* (New York, 1968).
Schlissel, Lillian, ed. *The World of Randolph Bourne* (New York, 1965).

Stephen A. Barnes

BOUWSMA, Oets Kolk (1898–1978)

O. K. Bouwsma was born on 22 November 1898 in Muskegon, Michigan. He studied English literature and philosophy at Calvin College from 1916 to 1919, and at the University of Michigan where he earned the BA in 1920, MA in 1921, and PhD in philosophy in 1928. His early philosophical tastes ran in the direction of Hegel and Absolute Idealism; his tastes later ran in a decidedly different direction, first toward G. E. Moore and second toward Ludwig Wittgenstein. Bouwsma was a professor of philosophy at the University of Nebraska from 1928 to 1966. He then was professor of philosophy at the University of Texas from 1966 until his retirement in 1974. Bouwsma was President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1957–8. He died on 1 March 1978 in Austin, Texas.

Bouwsma's work on Moore created his early reputation, which later resulted in his invitation to give the John Locke Lectures at the University of Oxford in 1950–51. But by the time he gave the John Locke Lectures, Bouwsma had immersed himself in Wittgenstein's work, particularly in the *Blue Book*. In the (unpublished) Lectures, titled *The Flux*, Bouwsma disassembled the problems of sense-experience with tools acquired from both Moore and Wittgenstein. Bouwsma anticipated changes in Wittgenstein's work that were revealed only when *Philosophical Investigations* was published.

Bouwsma's reputation later intertwined with Wittgenstein's. Unlike many influenced by Wittgenstein, Bouwsma spent little time writing about Wittgenstein. He instead applied Wittgenstein to other philosophers and to philosophical problems. Bouwsma wooed his reader from latent nonsense to patent nonsense. He led their words, exaggerated, empty and in the empyrean, back to green pastures and still waters, where they shrank and were filled. More than any other Wittgensteinian, Bouwsma internalized Wittgenstein's comment that it is philosophically significant that something makes us laugh, is comical: Bouwsma tickled his reader into philosophically significant laughter. Bouwsma's studies of English literature left their mark on his writing. His prose was dedicated, racy, idiosyncratic, and high-demotic – more of a piece with John Donne than with John Duns Scotus.

During this period, Bouwsma's most significant published essays were "Descartes' Evil Genius," "The Expression Theory of Art," and "The Mystery of Time" (all collected, along with "Moore's Theory of Sense-Data," in *Philosophical Essays*, 1965); and also "Anselm's Argument," "I Think I Am," and "Double-Talk, Jackie Vernon and X" (collected, along with twelve lectures by others, in *The Nature of Philosophical Inquiry*, 1970).

His philosophical influence was as much or more a product of his teaching than of his published writings. Some of the writings Bouwsma did for his classes, along with several unpublished papers, have been collected and edited by J. L. Craft and Ronald Hustwit in *Toward a New Sensibility* and *Without Proof or Evidence*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Moore's Theory of Sense-Data," in *The Philosophy of G. E. Moore*, ed. Paul Schilpp (Evanston, Ill., 1942), pp. 203–21.

"Russell's Argument on Universals," *Philosophical Review* 52 (1943): 193–9.

"Descartes' Skepticism of the Senses," *Mind* 54 (1945): 313–32.

"Naturalism," *Journal of Philosophy* 45 (1948): 12–21.

"Descartes' Evil Genius," *Philosophical Review* 58 (1949): 141–51.

"The Mystery of Time," *Journal of Philosophy* 51 (1954): 341–62.

"Reflections on Moore's Recent Book," *Philosophical Review* 64 (1955): 248–63.

"The *Blue Book*," *Journal of Philosophy* 58 (1961): 141–61.

Philosophical Essays (Lincoln, Neb., 1965).

The Nature of Philosophical Inquiry, ed. Joseph Bobik (Notre Dame, Ind., 1970).

Other Relevant Works

Bouwsma's papers are at the University of Texas.

Toward a New Sensibility, ed. J. L. Craft and Ronald Hustwit (Lincoln, Neb., 1982).

Without Proof or Evidence, ed. J. L. Craft and Ronald Hustwit (Lincoln, Neb., 1984).

Wittgenstein: Conversations, 1949–1951, ed. J. L. Craft and Ronald Hustwit (Indianapolis, 1986).

Bouwsma's Notes on Wittgenstein's Philosophy, 1965–1975, ed. J. L. Craft and Ronald Hustwit (Lewiston, N.Y., 1986).

O. K. Bouwsma's Commonplace Book: Remarks on Philosophy and Education, ed. J. L. Craft and Ronald Hustwit (Lewiston, N.Y., 2001).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Pres Addr of APA v6*, *Proc of APA v52*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Ambrose, Alice, and Morris Lazerowitz. *Essays in the Unknown Wittgenstein* (Buffalo, N.Y., 1984).

Hustwit, Ronald. *Something About O. K. Bouwsma* (Lanham, Md., 1992).

Newman, Jay. "Bouwsma's View of Metaphysics: A Reading of 'Naturalism'," *Philosophical Investigations* 4 (1981): 12–18.

Rollins, C.D. "O. K. Bouwsma, 1937 and Later," *Philosophical Investigations* 8 (1985): 208–16.

Kelly Dean Jolley

BOWEN, Francis (1811–90)

Francis Bowen was born on 8 September 1811 in Charlestown, Massachusetts. He attended Mayhew Grammar School in Boston and worked for several years as a clerk in a Boston publishing house before entering Phillips Exeter Academy in 1829. The following year he enrolled at Harvard from which he graduated with a BA summa cum laude in 1833. While attending college, Bowen worked in various places as a schoolteacher. In 1835, having taught mathematics for two years at Phillips Exeter Academy, he became a tutor in intellectual philosophy and political economy at Harvard. In 1839 he took leave to travel to Europe. While he was in Paris, he met the economist Jean-Charles-Léonard Simonde de Sismondi and the philosopher-statesman Joseph Marie De Gerando. Bowen returned to Cambridge in 1841, having decided to devote himself to literature.

In 1843 Bowen became the editor of *North American Review*, and remained in this position for over a decade. During this time, he wrote close to one-fourth of the articles in the review. He was also for six years editor of the *American Almanac and Repository of Useful Knowledge*. In 1842 Bowen published an edition of Virgil's writings with copious notes and commentary. In the same year Bowen's *Critical Essays on a Few Subjects Connected with the History and Present Condition of Speculative Philosophy* appeared. He also wrote biographies of James Otis (1844) and Benjamin Lincoln (1847). In 1848–9 Bowen delivered the Lowell Lectures, which were published in 1849 as *On the Application of Metaphysical and Ethical Science to the Evidences of Religion*.

During the last part of his tenure at *North American Review* Bowen drew fire by taking an unpopular stance on the popular Hungarian revolution, which also cost him the McLean professorship of history at Harvard College. Bowen had been chosen for this professorship in May 1850 and fulfilled the position's teaching responsibilities for the following fall semester, but the Harvard overseers, who still had to confirm his nomination in January, decided not to confirm it. Bowen lectured again for the Lowell Institute. In 1850 he lectured on political economy and in 1852 he lectured on

the origin and development of the English and American constitutions.

A few years later, however, Bowen did obtain a Harvard professorship. In 1853 he was appointed Alford Professor of Natural Religion, Moral Philosophy, and Civil Polity. The 1783 endowment for this chair required instruction that would demonstrate the existence of God and explain His providence and government, and His Revelation. Whereas Bowen's immediate successor, George Herbert PALMER, called the terms of the bequest into question, Bowen remained faithful to them, even in his 1856 *Principles of Political Economy*. Bowen remained the Alford Professor until his retirement in 1889. He died on 21 January 1890 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

The Alford professorship made Bowen for many years the principal philosophy professor at Harvard. Chauncey WRIGHT, Charles PEIRCE, Oliver Wendell HOLMES, and William JAMES were all his students. Bowen has been identified as an early source of pragmatism in America. A central theme that runs though Bowen's thought is that philosophy should keep in mind the practical application of ideas. Philosophy, for Bowen, should not be an ivory tower discipline. He was a conservative teacher who rejected the lecture system that was being implemented in his time by Harvard President Charles W. Eliot.

Concerned about the British influence on American thought, Bowen advocated the publication of an American treatise on political economy. When no satisfactory treatise was forthcoming, Bowen decided to compose one himself. This resulted in 1856 in the *Principles of Political Economy*. In this treatise Bowen defended capitalism, but as is befitting for a professor in natural religion, he did so by relating it explicitly to God. It is through God and His providence that the acts of self-interested individuals bring about the public good. Notwithstanding his strong leanings toward economic liberalism, Bowen rejected the free-trade doctrine of Adam Smith. In its stead Bowen defended a suspension of free trade on the ground that America was economically much weaker than England, and he repeatedly spoke in favor of high tariffs. In economics, Bowen also opposed Malthus's views on population and Ricardo's views on rent. He remained politically active, serving in 1876 on the US Silver Commission.

During his whole career, Bowen was a strong and orthodox defender of Unitarianism, whose philosophical underpinnings he sought to strengthen. He advocated a non-Calvinistic, freewill-based, evangelical brand of Christianity, developing his views within the context of the Scottish Commonsensism of Thomas Reid and his followers. Bowen was a strong and vocal opponent of the New England Transcendentalists (especially Ralph Waldo EMERSON) and of the many forms of agnosticism and materialism that sprang up in the nineteenth century, especially after the 1859 publication of *The Origin of Species*. In fact, Bowen's outspoken opposition against the theory of evolution made him quickly obsolete. Using his common sense based empiricism Bowen sought to provide an ardent antidote against the flights of fancy of Emerson as well as Darwin.

Philosophically, Bowen remained a strong defender of Hamilton, even after John Stuart Mill's onslaught in *An Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy* (1865), while developing a branch of Scottish Common Sense realism that in his later years he infused with elements taken from German idealism. While Bowen showed a close affinity to Locke in his 1842 *Critical Essays,* the question that remained foremost on his mind was how to avoid skepticism. To address this question, Bowen – rejecting Kant's answer to Hume – allied himself with the Scottish Commonsensists whom he saw as the natural successors to traditional empiricism. According to the common sensists, one should start with introspection and make the dictates of common sense one's first principles. No derivation of these dictates from so-called "more ultimate truths" could produce knowledge that is more secure than the dictates of common sense. For example, the conscious

experience that the will is free is better evidence for free will than any rational argument that seeks to affirm this. Bowen argued along these lines for the existence of God and the goodness of His nature. Though interested mainly in natural theology, Bowen reserved a place for revealed theology as well, and allowed for divine miracles made possible through the suspension of natural laws. Bowen's student, Charles S. Peirce, would later advocate a *critical* commonsensism.

Bowen became an early and vocal opponent of the theory of evolution, beginning with his extensive review of *The Origin of Species,* in *North American Review.* Largely because of his continued and outspoken opposition to Darwin, Bowen became quickly outmoded. Bowen used his common sense philosophy to counter Darwin's claims and to categorize him as a poor empiricist. According to Bowen, Darwin's conclusions were a product of inappropriate extrapolations from empirical data. In fact, Darwin's speculative conclusions went straight against some of the most basic common sense intuitions, such as the design-like quality of the universe, the fixity of species, and the idea that the division between man and animal is one of kind and not of degree. Bowen specifically attacked the idea of a hereditary transmission of variations and the "gemmules" which Darwin had postulated to explain this transmission. The fact that Darwin's most stalwart defenders were often philosophical descendents of Hume only fueled Bowen's disapproval of Darwin's theory, if only because many of them replaced a skepticism-based rejection of religion with a dogmatic embracing of materialism.

During the following two decades Bowen moved away from Locke, as he believed Locke's position would lead to materialism, while getting closer to Berkeley and Kant. Dismissing various forms of mostly German idealism, Bowen argued for a presentational realism which he believed was in line with Hamilton's metaphysics. His later thoughts, however, were never systematically worked out and they remained without influence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Critical Essays on the History and Present Condition of Speculative Philosophy (Boston, 1842).

Lowell Lectures on the Application of Metaphysical and Ethical Science to the Evidences of Religion (Boston, 1849).

Principles of Political Economy: Applied to the Condition, Resources, and Institutions of the American People (Boston, 1856).

Treatise on Logic; or, the Laws of Pure Thought Comprising Both the Aristotelic and Hamiltonian Analyses of Logical Forms and Some Chapters of Applied Logic (Cambridge, 1864).

American Political Economy, With Remarks on the Finances Since the Beginning of the Civil War (New York, 1870).

Modern Philosophy, from Descartes to Schopenhauer and Hartmann (New York, 1877).

Gleanings from a Literary Life, 1838–1880 (New York, 1880).

A Layman's Study of the English Bible, Considered in its Literary and Secular Aspect (New York, 1885).

Other Relevant Works

Bowen's papers are at Harvard University.

Ed., *P. Virgilii Maronis Bucolica, Georgica, et Aeneis* (Boston, 1842).

Ed., *Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind*, by Dugald Stewart (Boston, 1854).

Ed., *Documents of the Constitution of England and America to 1789* (Cambridge, Mass., 1854).

"Review of *The Origin of Species* by Charles Darwin," *North American Review* 90 (1860): 474–506.

The Metaphysics of Sir William Hamilton: Collected, Arranged, and Abridged (Cambridge, Mass., 1861).

Ed., *Democracy in America*, 2 vols, by Alexis de Tocqueville, trans. H. Reeve (Cambridge, Mass., 1862).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*,
    Dict Amer Bio, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v11*
Kuklick, Bruce. *The Rise of American
    Philosophy: Cambridge Massachusetts
    1860–1930* (New Haven, 1977), pp.
    28–45.

Cornelis de Waal

BOWMAN, Archibald Allan (1883–1936)

Archibald Allan Bowman was born on 4
April 1883 in the Congregational Union
manse in Beith, Ayrshire, Scotland, and he
died on 7 June 1936 in the Professors' Square
of Glasgow University in Scotland. He
attended Spier's School in Beith and then
Glasgow University, from which he gradu-
ated with second-class honours in classics
and first-class honours in philosophy in 1905.
A Ferguson Scholarship funded him on the
first of a series of summer vacations which he
spent studying in Germany between 1905
and 1912. In 1906 he was appointed assistant
and lecturer in the department of logic and
metaphysics, and philosophy lecturer to the
women's college at Glasgow University.

In 1912 Bowman was appointed to the
Stuart Chair in Logic at Princeton University,
succeeding John Grier HIBBEN. In 1915 he
secured academic leave to join the British
military. From April 1918 until the end of the
war he was in prisoner-of-war camps. On
release he served some further time in
Germany; he returned to Princeton in 1920.
In 1926 Bowman returned to Glasgow in
1926 as professor of logic, and in 1927 he
transferred to the chair of moral philosophy.
Alarmingly active in public and political life
after his return to Glasgow, he succumbed to
the chest complaint which prevented him
delivering his final class lectures; they had to

be read by a substitute at the end of the
1935–6 academic session.

The notes for Bowman's large ordinary
class lectures, extensively rewritten more than
once, were seriously considered for publica-
tion after his death, but only some extracts
appear in the completion of *A Sacramental
Universe* (1941). Many students of the gen-
eration he taught were deeply interested in
philosophical questions but were unlikely to
develop such concerns in life after university,
and so the examinable basics were presented
within a large-scale systematic presentation.
He "taught an honours course to his ordinary
class." Students who proceeded under the
degree arrangements at the time into tech-
nology or the sciences were as likely as col-
leagues who entered public or pastoral service
to continue to cite him.

The early papers listed in Bowman's full bib-
liography (1989) correct the error of claiming
him a late or perhaps revisionist adherent of
Edward Caird's idealist school. In his writing
on "the stupendous set of ruins that is the
critical philosophy" his citations demonstrate
closeness to such continental contemporaries
and sometime teachers as Georg Simmel, Aloys
Riehl (Vanuxem Lecturer and honorand of
Princeton in 1913), Paul Natorp and Emile
Boutroux. Friedrich Nietzsche, Leo Tolstoy,
and Fyodor Dostoevsky are other important
references. Of a generation influenced by John
Burnet, he was a sufficiently independent active
classicist to raise points of detail in a number
of his citations from Burnet. Unusual in his
generation in having written about Thomas
Reid, he is more unusual in having written of
Reid in relation to the Upanishads, although
Indian thought is discussed in some depth in
the earlier, more massive of Bowman's two
posthumous books.

As Bowman himself later noted with ret-
rospective amazement, his resolve in 1914 to
enlist and fight, despite the recent birth of a
first child, was representative of many of his
generation and culture, regardless of any alle-
giance or otherwise to absolute idealism. On

the front line in April 1918, he surrendered to a German fellow alumnus of Heidelberg. During his ordeal after a failed attempt to escape from a prisoner-of-war camp, Bowman underwent what he described to his friend and later editor J. W. Scott as "experience of spirit." In Scott's report this sounds like one of the "Mystical Experiences of the Prison Camps" discussed by Mihajlo Mihajlov. To Bowman the experience was in effect a scientific discovery crucial to the inspiration of the work which went into his big books – in the event unfinished and posthumously published. On these a very considerable but very localized reputation was founded.

Studies in the Philosophy of Religion (1938) was only ever a provisional title for a work finally some 800 pages long, which Bowman composed during the 1920s and set aside to allow work on the 1934 Charles Eliot Vanuxem Lectures at Princeton, the basis of his other big book. The topic of *Studies* might be termed "mind or consciousness" quite as much as "spirit," if the latter term can be allowed to include both the former. With Baron Charles von Hügel, Bowman treated of "religion" as tradition (without reduction of the former term to a narrowing conception of the latter). He would not venture a preliminary definition of religion, other than by way of extensive description of various religions as processes. Following preliminaries on method which include a severe critique of Bertrand Russell's logic in its pretence to exhaustiveness and a critique of what he called (no "the") Enlightenment, Bowman argued an anthropological account of the historical developments of minds. He engaged in extended debate with Emile Durkheim's *Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* and with Edward B. Tylor's account of "animism," in the latter case to secure the term for his own use.

Tylor and J. G. Frazer are notorious for having projected the viewpoint of the scientific observer on early or primitive man.

Bowman, however, though convinced that very early human beings had much the same psycho-physical equipment as their twentieth-century descendants, argued that scientific observation was a late discovery: a result of the long experience of many, including witness to the emergence of contradictions within tradition – or between traditions which circumstances hitherto had permitted to coexist without awareness of mutual conflict. Religion was another such discovery, as were science or the sciences, morality, and secularity. Each aspired to its own autonomy, and there is no lack of evidence that within the development of each, and certainly within that of religion, there are tendencies toward one-sidedness, and toward an increasing impersonality.

What Bowman termed Enlightenment might be regarded as such a development of one-sidedness and impersonality. "Enlightenment" comes into force from time to time throughout history (as it did, for instance, during what is now called "The Enlightenment") with an oversimplified view of things. It lacks a sense of what Bowman calls "Significant Contrasts," attempting to enshrine a self-sufficient secularism as rational, superior to, and able to dispose of moral and other traditions. Bowman discusses conflicts between traditions in various contexts, Significant Contrasts and "the self-criticism of religion," instructively within the Old Testament. His discussion of the book of Job refers to the coming into being of one entirely new orientation toward life. Scholarly reference to revisions of the text of Job, made long after any "urtext" had been set down, allows Bowman to consider the development of that new orientation, interpreting identifiable accretions within the transmission of the narrative, as evidence of subsequent readings and retrospects on it within Judaic tradition.

Religion, in becoming exclusive as it becomes impersonal, does not merely exclude such other discoveries as secularity and morality. Bowman demonstrates, with refer-

ence to "Eastern religions," that religion, having come into being with the ordering or organization of performances, can become antithetical to what he calls "the desire for life." This "desire for life" is characteristic of animism and is the spring of all the "discoveries" he discusses. If the reader disagrees with Bowman's preference for the desire for life over the exclusivist religious alternative, there is a summary of his case in the light-hearted address read out to students at the end of the 1935–6 lecture course which he was too ill to deliver in person.

The published text of *A Sacramental Universe* was compiled by J. W. Scott, who added to the completed first half of the planned book the platform summaries from which Bowman had delivered his lectures at Princeton and connected scattered passages he had worked up in notebooks. The book was rounded off with the Platonic myth that was the book's intended conclusion, and with what can fairly be called the climax of Bowman's large series of class lectures. Scott's editorial achievement was considerable.

There is some overlap between the later chapters of *Studies* and the book Scott edited, the former book having begun with a focus on anthropology and moved toward issues in the philosophy of science. *A Sacramental Universe* begins with an address to the newer philosophical work which took its start from recent developments within the sciences, not least post-Einsteinian physics.

In *Studies* Bowman moves in the direction of Plato, shifting from consideration of "substance" to the notion of system, a *mathesis universalis*. He does not mention Husserl, but there are plain parallels between the phenomenologist's discussion of the contents of pure consciousness and Bowman's insistent standpoint of consciousness. Bowman's orientation is, however, emphatically the (transcendental) realism of an avowed opponent of phenomenalism. In a parallel with Berkeley which Bowman does not leave obscure, God has not merely provided a divine visual language, but has generated everything, from the conscious and living to the lifeless and unconscious.

Bowman takes on Alfred North WHITEHEAD's notion of "eternal objects" as what is/are stable in the flux of events. Does not this notion merely replace an old mind–body dualism with implications of untenable doctrines of representative perception?

A great deal of attention is paid in both of Bowman's books, first, to an account of the nature of mind, consciousness, and spirit; then, to an account of consciousness in the creatures in whom it might be discerned; and, finally, to the states or conditions of human consciousness as between fading and even a liminal state (external sensitivity in the sleeper) beyond the bracketed consciousness of specialized scientific observation. For spirit, *esse est percipere*.

Bowman takes issue with George SANTAYANA's notion of consciousness as an operative state of the organism, one which comes into being as a rectifying function when normal animal processes are inadequate to any situation. Consciousness can at times be in abeyance or partial suspension or restriction, but it is not episodic. Bowman, for all that Ernst Cassirer praised his "revival of dualism," was not, he himself insisted, a dualist. Dualism is a point of view, whereas, like John Anderson (who was in other respects very different from him), Bowman insists that minds – or, for him, spirits – are existences of a certain character, describable, not entities hypothesized within a dualist doctrine.

The extensive discussion of physics in *A Sacramental Universe* effects full recognition of the work of Albert EINSTEIN, Erwin Schrödinger, and others, but not in supplanting standpoints of mind, consciousness, and perception. Like Bronislaw Malinowski, whose then untranslated Polish work he could not know but of whose opponents Ernst Mach and Richard Avenarius he was not ignorant (he certainly knew his friend Norman Kemp SMITH's critique of Avenarius),

304

Bowman drew on his mathematical training for the notion of function.

Bowman, unlike Malinowski, remained a philosopher, and his notion of function was more complex than that in Malinowski's functionalist anthropology. Function as a relationship between processes is a concept developed extensively in Bowman's second book. He is concerned more with *mathesis* than with mathematics, and with the notion of reality, of the universe – granted the unity of physical theory – as a system of functional relationships. The one-ness of things consists in participation in reciprocal functional relationships. Whatever this might say about mathematical physics – and Bowman has his say against a notion of reality as founded on a projection of competing calculated probabilities – it is not a way of leaving mind or spirit out of things. Mind is a function of brain no more and no less than brain is a function of mind: m and b alike are $f(mb)$.

Bowman's "transcendental realism," a realism never without concern as to how knowledge comes to be, is opposed to what he calls the theoretician's "pragmatism of negations," the abuse of Occam and the phenomenalist fallacy of mistaking the observer's standpoint for awareness itself. A pragmatism of negations is always at the mercy of letting the soundly refuted in again by the back door, whether it is a dualism refuted earlier in the case, or, in Eddington's physical theory, reference to pretty well the operation of such powers as are recognized in pre-religious animistic ideas.

A Sacramental Universe proceeds to a classification of values thorough enough to include discussion of mere matters of taste (choice of wallpaper) to higher aesthetic values (Beethoven, say), and ethical and religious value. These belong to the larger classification, the spiritual, which stands differentiated from the physical, and from nature.

Certainly deeply read in idealist philosophy, in respect of the spiritual, Bowman makes important brief reference to Fichte's project of refuting doctrines of a predestinarian or fatalist character. The spiritual is for one thing to be considered as the spirited, not the passive, while also encompassing the higher values of reverence and religion. The physical is precisely the physicist's exact field of study. It is a value, it is valuable, and where for a strict exclusive phenomenalist theory there is nothing behind phenomena, there are no values in the physical. It is there, but it has had to be looked for. It is there neither for nor to anyone who is not looking for it.

Nature, on the other hand, is the system of things functionally related which has no being without the awareness of a spirit. It is, as it were, the realm of perceptual and other transactions in which human beings are engaged. In the physical there are no human beings, insofar as no human values obtain. Translated into a later idiom, Bowman's distinction between nature and the physical is one whose transgression results in not merely a mixed discourse but confusion.

At the end of *A Sacramental Universe* Bowman does speak the language of speculative metaphysics, that of Samuel Alexander, a personal friend and philosopher whom he regarded highly. It is a language of attempted integration, of functional system, such as that with which Bowman rounded off his large and intensively argued works into a Christian theistic vision. The entire universe is an emanation of God in what are – in sheer physical terms – vibrations, ranging in their respective consciousness of him from the absolutely unconscious to the reverent. Bowman does make clear, however, that this is strictly an extrapolation or transition beyond what he might have hoped to demonstrate philosophically.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Difference as Ultimate and Dimensional," *Mind* 19 (1910): 492–522.

"The Problem of Knowledge from the Standpoint of Validity," *Philosophical Review* 23 (1914): 1–16, 146–58, 299–316.

"Kant's View of Metaphysics," *Mind* 25 (1916): 1–24.

"Kant's Phenomenalism in Its Relation to Subsequent Metaphysics," *Mind* 25 (1916): 461–89.

The Absurdity of Christianity (London, 1931). Reprinted in *The Absurdity of Christianity and Other Essays*, ed. Charles W. Hendel (New York, 1958).

"Spirit-time," *Proceedings of the Aristotelean Society* 33 (1933): 296–332.

Studies in the Philosophy of Religion (London, 1938).

A Sacramental Universe: Being a Study in the Metaphysics of Experience, ed. J. W. Scott (Princeton, N.J., and Oxford, 1941).

Other Relevant Works
Bowman's papers are at Glasgow University.

Sonnets from a Prison Camp (London and New York, 1919).

Further Reading
Proc of APA in Phil Rev v46

Bowman, Ian. "The Philosophy of A. A. Bowman," *Edinburgh Review* 82 (1989): 103–20. With a selection of "Remarks on Education" by Bowman on pp. 100–102, and a bibliography of his writings.

Scott, J. W. "Archibald Alan Bowman," *Hibbert Journal* 35 (1936): 77–83.

Robert R. Calder

BOWNE, Borden Parker (1847–1910)

Borden Parker Bowne was born on 14 January 1847 near Leonardville, New Jersey. He was one of six children of upright parents raised in rural New Jersey, near what is today called Atlantic Highlands. His father, Joseph Bowne, was a farmer, a justice of the peace, a Methodist preacher, and a vocal abolitionist at a time when such a stand was controversial. His mother was of a Quaker family and also an abolitionist. As a youth Bowne was able to observe the example of parents who were unbending on points of moral significance, particularly regarding the dignity of all persons. Later on, he himself was instrumental in supporting integration in higher education, and in 1891 he presided over the dissertation of the first African American to earn a PhD from an American university, John Wesley Edward Bowen (1855–1933). In demeanor and bearing Bowne was very formal, even with his own family members, businesslike and orderly. He followed the manner of personal discipline from which the Methodists originally took their name.

Bowne entered New York University in 1867 amidst the swirling new controversy of Darwin's evolutionary theory, and in that year he was licensed to preach in the Methodist Church. He worked his way through college employed at his uncle's grocery in Brooklyn while preaching and pastoring part-time. He studied the standard curriculum and graduated with a BA degree in 1871. Bowne's formal ordination as a Methodist deacon followed in 1872 and he was assigned a congregation at Whitestone in rural Long Island, New York. In 1873 the opportunity came to continue his studies in Europe. He studied mainly at the universities of Paris, Halle, and Göttingen, being most deeply influenced at the last of these by the empirical strain of Kantian philosophy then prevailing under Rudolf Hermann Lotze. Bowne worked as a journalist in New York City from 1874 until 1876, when he completed an MA at New York University. He accepted a call to the philosophy department at Boston University in 1877, and later refused attractive offers from Yale and the new University of Chicago as his reputation grew. In 1888 he became the first Dean of the Graduate School at Boston University and held that position until

his death. Bowne died on 1 April 1910 in Boston Massachusetts.

Bowne's most lasting contributions came in the philosophy of religion. His religious background is important in this regard. He was a popular guest preacher throughout his career and a volume of his sermons was published posthumously under the title *The Essence of Religion* (1910). His constant stream of contributions to popular religious magazines and newspapers made him one of the foremost theological opinion leaders of his time. These voluminous popular writings were applications of his technical philosophical positions to the social and religious issues of the day. They display an unusual mixture of progressive ideas, the guiding spirit of which is a devotion to clarity of thought and practicality of viewpoint. It will be worthwhile to make note of two theological and biographical points before moving to a summary of Bowne's formal philosophy.

Bowne was able to negotiate a kind of theistic naturalism that enabled him to avoid much of the controversy over evolutionary theory during his career. His basic position was that there was no naturalistic or theological basis for treating nature, its changes, developments, and laws, as something over against God. The idea that a scientific description of nature could contradict the basic principles of theism betrayed a misunderstanding of both nature and theism. Thus, the reductive evolutionist misunderstands nature by assuming that the result of a process ought to be understood through its beginnings or origins, when in fact it is only from the practical survey of the results that the origins can be empirically approached or deduced. This same limiting principle applies to all human understanding and knowledge regardless of whether the question before us is natural, cultural, or historical. In addition, whatever principles and trends may have prevailed regarding an origin, they are undeveloped in their original state and therefore not to be valued except as seen through a later accomplishment, i.e., their having produced a valuable result. There might

be any number of trends and happenings in natural or human history which were dead ends and no one is scandalized by their lack of issue, so why should any theist be scandalized where the issue of natural or historical processes is so immensely and obviously valuable as in the case of evolution? On the other side, the defenders of "special creation" err in assuming that God is something supernatural, something wholly apart from nature.

Bowne argued that unless God is conceived as working immanently within each moment of experience, be it natural or human, the sustaining continuity of natural or human experience is wholly without an explanation. Thus, every event is a special creation in the sense that the complete explanation for its existence cannot be given by science, history, theology, or any other device of human understanding. Scientific explanations are incomplete, just as theological explanations are incomplete. One result of this view is that there is no reason to defend the idea of miracles in the traditional sense of the word, since a serviceable conception of the immanent activity of God in nature renders such traditional tales more suitable for children than for persons of mature faith, according to Bowne. This latter view, in which Bowne denies the traditional view of miracles and argues against the blood atonement, and by implication the resurrection, led him into troubles with the conservative constituency of his church, and also led Harvard philosopher William JAMES to remark, in a letter to Bowne dated 29 December 1903, that he (James) was "a better Methodist than you, in spite of your efforts to persuade me to the contrary. If the ass and the blatherskite succeed in their efforts to weed you out of the body [of the church], I hope they will have the wisdom to get me voted in to fill the vacuum." Bowne's standard answer to such charges was to remind his accusers that there was a difference between matters of knowledge in which human methods could expect some success, however limited, and in matters of faith which take up where investigation will avail nothing.

James's remark about "weeding out" Bowne was a reference to the controversy brewing in 1903 which resulted in Bowne's heresy trial in the spring of 1904 – the only heresy trial in the history of the Methodist Church. In addition to the issues described above, Bowne had defended the teaching of the controversial higher criticism of the Bible at Boston University, where a religion professor had been dismissed for teaching this approach. Having had the example of his own parents, Bowne was unintimidated by those who pointed fingers and threw epithets his way. He calmly defended himself and was acquitted of all charges, unanimously, by a council of Methodist bishops (some of whom were his former students). In many ways this episode served to bring Methodist theology into an influential role, together with other mainline denominations, in the forging of what has since been called the "liberal Protestant consensus," which was so influential in twentieth-century philosophical theology and social ethics. The Bowne heresy trial was one of many turning points in the creation of that important perspective.

Among important philosophical associations in Bowne's environment, James was perhaps the most notable. Bowne was part of a group that met every two weeks for some years in the rooms of Thomas DAVIDSON in Boston. The group also included George H. HOWISON, James E. CABOT, William Torrey HARRIS, and Charles C. EVERETT. A close examination of the philosophies of those who were part of this group suggests that this pleasant fortnightly meeting might have been the birthplace of pluralistic philosophy in America, in the rich exchanges particularly among Howison, James, and Bowne.

Bowne's method was a descriptive (as opposed to prescriptive or formalist or logical) version of Kantian philosophy, similar to Lotze's, but with a greater emphasis upon the empirical roots of our descriptions. In describing experience we are enjoined to remember always the difference between our conceptual suppositions and our genuine evidence. Conceptual clarity is to be sought and self-contradiction to be avoided, not because a clear description is certain to provide access to the structures of the real (be they mental or material), but because conceptual confusion is likely to cloud our judgments about what exists and what we know. Therefore, the primary function of logic is the normative clarification of thought, and the function of clear thinking is to bring to the fore knowledge, understanding, or appreciation of what we value. Abstractions are tools, not principles of the real. The following passage from Bowne's 1899 treatise on method, *Theory of Thought and Knowledge*, exemplifies his outlook: "The root thought of this work is that thought is an organic activity which unfolds from within, and can never be put together mechanically from without... . Knowledge is no longer something originating outside the mind, possibly in the nerves, and passed along ready-made into the mind; it is rather something built up by the mind within itself in accordance with principles immanent in the mental nature. Nothing is nearer to us than thought, and yet nothing is harder to grasp. The reason is that spontaneous thought deals with its objects rather than with itself, and the work of reflection is difficult." (pp. iii–iv) Bowne's approach is a kind of phenomenology that is governed not by an ontologically grounded pure logic, but by a supposition that careful reflection can reveal some portion of its own origins and structures, and can be more clearly described as greater care is given to the refinement of our descriptions. However, ontological knowledge is not the *result* of this process any more than it is the ground; more or less useful guides for action are the most we can expect in our endeavors, and epistemology is the critical treatment of the processes by which valuable knowledge is acquired.

Regarding the limits of description and philosophical knowledge, Bowne warns against the twin pitfalls of epistemology: "I have emphasized two points the knowledge

of which is of great importance, if not absolutely necessary, for our intellectual salvation. The first point is the volitional and practical nature of belief. Persons living on the plane of instinct and hearsay have no intellectual difficulty here, or anywhere else; but persons entering upon the life of reflection without insight into this fact are sure to lose themselves in theoretical impotence and practical impudence. The impotence manifests itself in a paralyzing inability to believe, owing to the fancy that theoretical demonstration must precede belief. The impudence shows itself in ruling out with an airy levity the practical principles by which men and nations live, because they admit of no formal proof. These extremes of unwisdom can be escaped only by an insight into the volitional and practical nature of belief." (pp. iv–v) Hence Bowne embraces what is better known under the aegis of pragmatism as "the will to believe," in James's terminology, or alternatively as "the scientific method of fixing belief," in Charles S. PEIRCE's vocabulary. Whether Bowne ought to be called a pragmatist is a matter of some debate, but that his method can be characterized as pragmatic seems very clear. James did not regard Bowne as a radical empiricist, but a case might be made that he was that as well.

Bowne continues: "The second point … is the almost universal illusion arising from what I have called the structural fallacies of uncritical thought. Spontaneous thought is pretty sure to take itself as the double of reality. Thus arises the fallacy of the universal, the parent of a very large part of popular speculation. And when to this are added the omnipresent imposture and deceit of language, there results a great world of abstract and verbal illusion against which we cannot be too much on our guard, seeing that it is the source both of so much theoretical error and of so much practical menace and aberration." (p. v) Here is a statement of method that is hard to distinguish from pragmatism or from process philosophy. Bowne's consistency in adhering to these methodological principles is exemplary,

and his writing itself is clever, pithy, economical, and insightful. His prose bears up well to the contemporary eye.

In metaphysics, Bowne was an early proponent of process philosophy. In the first edition of his *Metaphysics* (1882), he attacked the traditional notion of "substance" and "being" and suggested that it be replaced with a notion of process. His idea of God as the "world ground" is similar to Alfred North WHITEHEAD's idea of God in the twentieth century. This move rendered "time" and "space" as they had appeared in Kantian and Aristotelian philosophies phenomenal as opposed to either noumenal or ontological. This and other such positions in metaphysics labeled Bowne as an idealist, but he insisted that his brand of pluralistic objective idealism was entirely consistent with the conviction of the reality of an order quite beyond our mental processes, although such a reality cannot be conceived as wholly independent, since nothing is wholly independent of anything else at the level of existence. What was required in order to provide consistent and usable descriptions in metaphysics was a central principle which provided a reliable and fruitful clue to the place we hold in the broader reality. Bowne found this "clue" in the idea of the person. Whatever else we might suppose about the nature of reality, we can be assured that it is compatible with, or not entirely hostile to, the personal mode of existence. In addition, it seems that a pervasive and indeed inevitable feature of all our philosophical descriptions is that they express the perspective and values of personal beings. Thus, person is a mode of relation that we may safely take as a clue to the structure of objective reality and a feature of all philosophical description. Accordingly, Bowne brings his critical acumen to bear against the various "impersonalist" philosophies of his time. Absolute idealism errs by sacrificing the clear empirical plurality of persons in our experience to an impersonal Absolute. Materialism errs in reducing a personal reality to an impersonal principle which can only be abstract.

Impersonalist versions of naturalism and psychologism suffer from similar errors, according to Bowne. Ultimately his claim is that philosophies that eliminate the personal principle fall into the "structural fallacies of uncritical thought" or the fallacy of the universal, what James called "the philosopher's fallacy" and Whitehead called "the fallacy of misplaced concreteness."

This trajectory in metaphysics culminated in the expression of Bowne's mature philosophy in *Personalism* (1908). Although his philosophical system bore several names along the way, including "objective idealism" and "transcendental empiricism," its final label was "personalism." Whether this is a very good label can be questioned, but it has stayed with philosophy in the tradition of Bowne in subsequent generations. Personalism was an important force in mainstream philosophy until the decline of idealistic philosophies in America became a marked phenomenon in the 1930s. In theology and social ethics personalism exerted greater influence through Bowne's student Edgar Sheffield BRIGHTMAN, and Brightman's student Martin Luther KING, Jr., who was perhaps the most important social, political and ethical thinker in the personalist tradition. In the philosophy of religion, personalism continues to exercise some influence in the circles that take philosophical theology seriously. The term "personalism" has gained greater currency in these circles in recent years with the espousal of this view by Pope John Paul II. Due to the importance of this philosopher-pope it is likely that the term "personalism" will be in use for the foreseeable future, and with the same basic meaning that Bowne gave it.

Regarding the mature expression of Bowne's philosophy in *Personalism*, James, upon reading it, remarked in a letter dated 17 August 1908 to Bowne: "It seems to me that you and I are now aiming at exactly the same end… . The common foe of us both is the dogmatist-rationalist-abstractionist. Our common desire is to redeem the concrete personal life which wells up in us from moment to moment, from fastidious (and really preposterous) dialectic contradictions, impossibilities and vetoes." Arguably, then, Bowne's personalism is a kind of pragmatism that insists upon "person" in a way analogous to the way that John DEWEY, for example, insists upon "organism."

The idea that "person" is both a fundamental modality of existence and a reliable descriptive principle in philosophy supplies a needed bridge between metaphysics, method, and ethics. Accordingly, Bowne wrote extensively in moral philosophy, arguably his most important writings, in terms of subsequent impact on the world. His ethical philosophy is characterized by its guarded meliorism: an emphasis on practicality and on learning to be circumspect about human nature and possibilities. Bowne tends to take a fairly dim view of the prospects for improving human behavior, but he is convinced that we may find exemplars of freedom well employed in our midst. He is a progressive, arguing that ethical philosophy ought to learn from its past, but exists for the sake of the present and future and must not be tied down to tradition. Freedom is a given in moral philosophy in the sense that it is implied by the very notion of personal existence. An unfree being cannot be a personal being, and a personal being cannot fail to be free in some sense. Thus, the idea of freedom is not a postulate for Bowne, but an ontological requirement of meaningful existence and a presupposition of all descriptions. The dignity and equality of all persons thus becomes part and parcel of their ontological freedom, and seeking to develop the freedom of persons is an ethical imperative beside which none other can compare. Hence, Bowne favored the equality of women and non-white races at a time when these views were controversial. He did not limit the notion of personal existence to human beings, recognizing as early as 1882 that other beings, including animals, must be described as having a personal form of existence.

While Bowne was an uncompromising apologist of progressive morality, it led him to dis-

parage the ways of life of "savages" and "indians," not because of their race or natural inferiority, but because he saw "primitive" ways of life as morally inferior to the ways of "civilized men." In this regard Bowne was very much a man of his own age. He did not credit the idea of an ascent of man as either naturalized or divinely ordained, but he did hold without apology the idea that not all ways of life have achieved the same level of moral excellence and some ways of life deserved our round condemnation. His model of a morally advanced life was that of city-dwelling Anglo-Europeans, wherever they might be found. While he took a dim view of human nature, Bowne still believed there was reason to hope that we might become less self-destructive, and clarity of thought could only help.

Bowne thought that the mode of relating in the family unit probably holds our best clues to moral progress. While the situation of the family in Bowne's age, as in our own, was nothing to praise, he argued that it was the best set of moral relations we have, and that moral progress will be achieved by the expansion of the sphere of moral concern to include the consideration of wider and wider circles of individuals, a "family of humankind" rather than a "kingdom of ends."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Philosophy of Herbert Spencer (New York, 1874).
Metaphysics: A Study in First Principles (New York, 1882; 2nd edn 1898).
Studies in Theism (New York, 1882).
Introduction to Psychological Theory (New York, 1886).
Philosophy of Theism (New York, 1887; 2nd edn 1902).
The Principles of Ethics (New York, 1892).
Theory of Thought and Knowledge (New York, 1899).
The Christian Revelation (Cincinnati, 1898).
The Christian Life (Cincinnati, 1899).
The Atonement (Cincinnati, 1900).

The Immanence of God (Boston, 1905).
Personalism (Boston, 1908).
Studies in Christianity (Boston, 1909).
The Essence of Religion (Boston, 1910).
A Man's View of Woman Suffrage (Boston, 1910).
Kant and Spencer: A Critical Exposition (Boston, 1912).

Other Relevant Works
Bowne's papers are at Boston University.
Representative Essays of Borden Parker Bowne, ed. Warren E. Steinkraus (Utica, N.Y., 1981).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils Before 1950*, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v11*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Auxier, Randall E., ed. "The Relevance of Borden Parker Bowne," *Personalist Forum* 13 (Spring 1997). Special issue devoted to Bowne.
———, "Bowne on Time, Evolution and History," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 12 (1998): 181–203.
Bowne, Kate Morrison. "An Intimate Portrait of Bowne," *The Personalist* 2 (1921): 5–15.
Burrow, Rufus, Jr. *Personalism: A Critical Introduction* (St. Louis, 1999).
Dearing, Mary H. "Reminiscences of Borden Parker Bowne," *Philosophical Forum* 15 (1957): 51–5.
Deats, Paul, and Carol Robb. *The Boston Personalist Tradition in Philosophy, Social Ethics and Theology* (Macon, Georgia, 1986).
Flewelling, Ralph Tyler, and Rudolf Eucken. *Personalism and the Problems of Philosophy: An Appreciation of the Work of Borden Parker Bowne* (New York, 1915).
Franquiz Ventura, Jose A. *Borden Parker*

Bowne's Treatment of the Problem of Change and Identity (Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico, 1942).

Gacka, Bogumil. *Bibliography of American Personalism* (Lublin, Poland, 1994).

Knudson, Albert C. *The Philosophy of Personalism* (New York, 1927).

———, "Bowne as Teacher and Author," *The Personalist* 1 (1920): 5–14.

Lazarus, Frederick. *The Metaphysics of Ramanuja and Bowne* (Bombay, India, 1962).

McConnell, Francis J. *Borden Parker Bowne: His Life and Philosophy* (New York, 1929).

Pyle, Charles Bertram. *The Philosophy of Borden Parker Bowne and Its Application to the Religious Problem* (Columbus, Ohio, 1910).

Robinson, Daniel S., ed. "Borden Parker Bowne's Letters to William T. Harris," *Philosophical Forum* 13 (1955): 89–95.

Smith, Harmon L. "Borden Parker Bowne: Heresy at Boston," in *American Religious Heretics: Formal and Informal Trials*, ed. George H. Shriver (Nashville, Tenn., 1966), pp. 148–87.

Randall E. Auxier

BRACKETT, Anna Callender (1836–1911)

Anna Callender Brackett was born on 21 May 1836 in Boston, Massachusetts. She was the daughter of a Boston businessman and his wife, Samuel E. and Caroline S. Brackett, and a cousin of social work pioneer, Jeffrey Brackett. She was educated at the Abbott School and the Framingham State Normal School, graduating in 1856. Brackett briefly taught in the Boston area, then accepted a position as the vice principal of a normal school in Charleston, South Carolina.

With the outbreak of the American Civil War, Brackett was forced to return to Boston, by way of St. Louis, where she met other members of the newly developing St. Louis philosophical movement, including William Torrey HARRIS. She returned to St. Louis in 1863 at the invitation of Harris to become principal of the normal school there, reportedly the first woman to head a secondary school in the United States. By 1872 Brackett had returned to New York City, where she opened her own private girls' school with her life partner, Ida Eliot. She and Eliot remained in New York City, vacationing in Vermont and New Hampshire until Brackett's death. Brackett died on 18 March 1911 in Summit, New Jersey.

During all of her professional life, Brackett was a prominent feminist and pedagogical theorist. She wrote, edited, and translated several books. She also wrote articles on education and women's issues for both professional education journals and popular publications. Though Brackett firmly believed that advanced and co-education should be available to women, she worked effectively within her given social and historical context to ensure that the education of her own students was rigorous. Her girls' school was recognized for its excellent college preparatory curriculum, and her students were often admitted to Vassar College with advanced standing.

Brackett was among a number of women who were active in the St. Louis Philosophical Society, despite the fact that its male leaders failed to consider women as full members. Her work represents the early feminist theory that she and other women in the St. Louis circle developed in the last third of the nineteenth century. As a normal school pedagogue and advocate, her feminist ideals and pedagogical theory were intertwined. She wrote and lectured on the need for women's educational equality as well as on their academic and administrative ability to be educational leaders. In her essays "The Education of American Girls" and "Sex in Education" (in *The*

Education of American Girls, 1874), Brackett adhered to a classic liberal understanding of feminism. Women are more similar to than different from men, she declared in these works. Rarely did she make pleas for women's expanded role in public life that were based on their privileged maternal point of view, as did some of her contemporaries, such as Frances Wright and her allies in the Women's Christian Temperance Union.

An accomplished equestrian who complained that games like croquet tired a person out without giving them an adequate amount of exercise, Brackett rejected claims of women's delicacy or special nature outright. In fact, in her paraphrase of the pedagogical theory of Karl Rosenkranz, a disciple of G. W. F. Hegel, she explicitly dismissed a passage in which he said girls needed only dancing lessons, but no real physical education. Such a statement was no more than Rosenkranz's own German traditionalism creeping into the text, according to Brackett.

Brackett's philosophical thought does not extend very far beyond her pedagogical theory and her feminism. Much of her time in St. Louis was spent trying to convince the school board that teaching is a profession worthy of more than a year or two of training in a normal school. In New York she was busy as an educator, administrator, and public lecturer. She failed to go deeply into feminist theory or philosophy, though she did help give shape to early American feminism.

Brackett was well acquainted, both personally and professionally, with fellow St. Louis idealists Harris, Thomas DAVIDSON, Mary Beedy, and Grace Bibb. She was also professionally acquainted with the Michigan idealist and feminist, Eliza SUNDERLAND, who provided a room in her home for Brackett's adopted daughter, Hope, while she attended the University of Michigan. Ralph Waldo EMERSON thought highly of Brackett, whom he saw as something of a latter-day Margaret Fuller, and she knew Oliver Wendell HOLMES, Sr. well enough to offer to write a letter of introduction to him on behalf of Thomas Davidson.

Shortly before her death in 1911, several former students and lifelong colleagues established a scholarship fund with the Association of Collegiate Alumnae in Brackett's name. The fund has now been subsumed under the scholarship and fellowship program of ACA's successor, the American Association of University Women; this is a fitting legacy for one of America's most vocal and active proponents of women's education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Analysis of an Article on Hegel," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 5 (1870): 38–48.

"Woman's Work," *St. Louis Ladies' Magazine* no. 3 (1871): 150.

"The American Normal School," in *Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association*, vol. 15 (Washington, D.C., 1872), pp. 181–9.

"Organization as Related to Civilization," in *Papers Read at the Third Congress of Women, Syracuse, October 13, 14, and 15, 1875* (Chicago, 1875).

The Science of Education: A Paraphrase of Dr. Karl Rosenkranz's Paedagogik als System (St. Louis, 1878).

Other Relevant Works

Some papers and materials about Brackett are in the Memorial Scholarship File with the Educational Foundation Papers in the archives of the American Association of University Women, Washington, D.C. More materials are in the Alumni File at Framingham State College in Massachusetts. Some more correspondence is in the Thomas Davidson Papers at Yale University.

"Margaret Fuller Ossoli," *The Radical* 9 (1871): 354.

Trans., *Pedagogics as a System*, by Karl Rosenkranz (St. Louis, 1872).

Ed., *The Education of American Girls:*

Considered in a Series of Essays (New York, 1874).

Poetry for Home and School, with Ida Elliot (New York, 1876).

Trans., *The Philosophy of Education*, by Karl Rosenkranz (New York, 1893).

Ed., *Woman and Higher Education* (New York, 1893).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v11*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Goetzmann, William H., ed. *The American Hegelians: An Intellectual Episode in the History of Western America* (New York, 1973).

Kendall, Edith. "Anna C. Brackett: In Memoriam," Association of Collegiate Alumnae pamphlet (New York, 1915).

Lundgren, Maria. "Anna C. Brackett: Educator, Essayist, Poet." Master's thesis, Iowa State University (Ames, Iowa, 1989).

Rogers, Dorothy, ed. *Women in the St. Louis Idealist Movement, 1860–1925*, 3 vols (Bristol, UK, 2003).

Weiss, Beverly J. "Footprints in the Sands of Time: A Notable American Woman: Anna C. Brackett," *The Echo* (alumni publication of Framingham State College) 17 (1996): 2.

Dorothy Rogers

BRADWELL, Myra Colby (1831–94)

Myra Colby was born on 12 February 1831 in Manchester, Vermont, and raised in Portage, New York and then Schaumberg, Illinois. She married James B. Bradwell in 1851, with whom she had four children, two surviving beyond early childhood. As a pioneering woman lawyer, Bradwell achieved a series of path-breaking professional accomplishments. She was a political activist and journalist who advocated for women's rights in suffrage, employment, and property, as well as for a variety of social reforms, such as treatment of the insane and reform of the standards for participation in the legal profession.

Like most women of her time, Bradwell had little formal education. She attended a finishing school in Wisconsin and completed her education at the Elgin Female Seminary where she would later teach. Her education probably consisted of a curriculum in the liberal arts as well as the traditional and subordinate role of "true womanhood" expected of nineteenth-century women. Bradwell's legal education primarily consisted of an apprenticeship (then a common and accepted path to the bar) to her husband, a prominent lawyer and judge in Illinois.

Bradwell established the *Chicago Legal News: Journal of Legal Intelligence* in 1868, and was both editor and business manager until 1893. Although she passed the Illinois bar exam with high honors in 1869, she was denied admission to the Illinois bar in 1869 and 1870. These denials led to the famous *Bradwell v. Illinois* case in which the US Supreme Court upheld the decision of the Illinois courts to exclude women from the practice of law. In 1890 Bradwell was finally admitted to the Illinois bar, becoming the first woman lawyer in Illinois. She was allowed to argue cases before the United States Supreme Court in 1892, following in the footsteps of Belva Ann LOCKWOOD who had been the first women so privileged in 1879. After turning her paper over to her daughter Bessie Bradwell Helmer, who had also become a lawyer, Bradwell died on 14 February 1894 in Chicago, Illinois.

Bradwell promulgated her ideas primarily through the *Chicago Legal News*. The paper enjoyed a wide circulation, first locally in Illinois and then nationally. Bradwell engaged courts and legislatures in a series of agree-

ments to allow the paper to report newly enacted statutes and judicial decisions months before their usual official appearance in print, making the *Legal News* an indispensable publication. This secured a large, mainstream, and dedicated audience for views on a variety of issues. Her columns were known for their bold statements of policy and ideology as well as for their wit and humor.

Bradwell's philosophy challenged the traditional understandings of the role of women by advocating for the right to enter any profession or occupation regardless of gender or marital status, and she expended considerable effort, arguing for women's rights to practice law. She further sought to defy the stereotype of the dependent woman, arguing for example that women had equal rights to custody of their children, and that married women had a right to retain their own income. In 1869, together with other women activists, she succeeded in her efforts to secure passage of law that gave married women the right to retain their own wages and protected the rights of widows. In *Chicago Legal News* she published a series of articles entitled "History of Woman Suffrage," edited by Elizabeth Cady STANTON, Susan B. ANTHONY, and Matilda Joslyn Gage.

Other aspects of Bradwell's writings and activism demonstrate a commitment to a more traditional ideology of "true womanhood." For instance, although Bradwell labored tirelessly for the cause of women's suffrage, she stressed that it was the "devoted wives and mothers" who respected their husbands and fathers who would win women the right to vote. Her philosophy stressed the fact that the lives of politically active women would coexist harmoniously with their roles as wives and mothers, and that inclusion of "true women" would improve, not denigrate, the political sphere.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Woman Cannot Practice Law or Hold any Office in Illinois: Full Report of the Proceedings in the Supreme Court of Illinois upon the Application of Myra Bradwell to be admitted to the Bar," *Chicago Legal News* 2 (5 February 1970): 144–55.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v2*
Bradwell v. Illinois, 83 U.S. 130 (1873).
Friedman, Jane M. *America's First Woman Lawyer: The Biography of Myra Bradwell* (Buffalo, N.Y., 1993).
Morello, Karen Berger. *The Invisible Bar: The Woman Lawyer in America, 1638 to the Present* (Boston, 1988).
"Myra Bradwell," in *Album of Genealogy and Biography, Cook County, Illinois with Portraits*, 3rd edn (Chicago, 1895), pp. 135–8.

Robin J. Effron

BRAMELD, Theodore Burghard Hurt (1904–87)

Theodore Brameld was born on 20 January 1904 in Neillsville, Wisconsin. He received his BA from Ripon College in 1926 and his PhD in philosophy at the University of Chicago in 1931. His dissertation was on "The Role of Acquiescence in Leninism." The study of political theory and education under T. V. SMITH at Chicago led him toward a democratic socialism similar to that of John DEWEY. Brameld taught philosophy at Long Island University from 1931 to 1935 and at Adelphi College in 1935–9. He then went to the University of Minnesota for a position in educational philosophy, where he participated in a high school's education reform which was mistakenly branded as communistic, and he was forced out of his job. Brameld left Minnesota in 1947 to become a professor of educational

philosophy at New York University, where he stayed until 1958. Finally, he was a professor at Boston University until his retirement in 1969. He participated in an experimental college at the University of Hawaii in the early 1970s, and continued to actively lecture and publish books. Brameld died on 18 October 1987 in Durham, North Carolina.

Brameld was a powerful force for integrating insights from other social sciences, such as behavioral psychology, sociology, and anthropology, into educational theory. He viewed schooling as embedded in the wider culture. Schools can simply indoctrinate the prevailing culture's values into the young, but they can also be an instrument for gradually changing that culture. Since schools will unavoidably teach ethics and values, the unavoidable pedagogical issue is which values to teach. Brameld was hostile to the relatively unrestrained form of capitalism then existing in the United States, because of its anti-democratic tendencies. His hostility was therefore also directed towards the many ways that capitalist values were infecting public schools, effectively perverting what ought to be the most democratic of institutions.

Brameld departed from the broad Progressive education movement by demanding that schools should not only prepare the young (and adults as well) for democratic participation but should also guide students towards socialist values. Schools that taught the priority of community welfare, social solidarity, group consensus, and working-class needs would produce adults ready for a planned economy instead of the doomed capitalist system. Together with other philosophers of education who agreed with this agenda for schools, such as John L. CHILDS, George S. COUNTS, and Harold Rugg, Brameld expected the Great Depression to cause immense social and political disruption and transformation. Intense debates erupted with fellow progressives and socialists like Dewey, who instead believed that schools must maintain a neutral stance toward whatever democratic solution emerged. After World War II, Brameld's "social reconstructionism" turned toward global perspectives and problems instead of domestic ones. Followers of Brameld, and like-minded reformers around the world who look to schools to lead and transform society, have continued to demand that schools be democratically designed to resist capitalist exploitation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Worker's Education in the United States (New York, 1941).

Minority Problems in the Public Schools (New York, 1946).

Ends and Means in Education: A Mid-century Appraisal (New York, 1950).

Patterns of Educational Philosophy: A Democratic Interpretation (New York, 1950).

Philosophies of Education in Cultural Perspective (New York, 1955).

Toward a Reconstructed Philosophy of Education (New York, 1956).

Cultural Foundations of Education: An Interdisciplinary Exploration (New York, 1957).

The Remaking of a Culture: Life and Education in Puerto Rico (New York, 1959).

Education for the Emerging Age: Newer Ends and Stronger Means (New York, 1961).

Education as Power (New York, 1965).

The Use of Explosive Ideas in Education (Pittsburgh, 1965).

The Climactic Decades: Mandate to Education (New York, 1970).

Patterns of Educational Philosophy: Divergence and Convergence in Culturological Perspective (New York, 1971).

The Teacher as World Citizen: A Scenario of the 21st Century (Palm Springs, Cal., 1976).

Other Relevant Works

Brameld's papers are at the University of Vermont.

Japan: Culture, Education, and Change in

Two Communities (New York, 1968).

Tourism as Cultural Learning: Two Controversial Case Studies in Educational Anthropology, with Midori Matsuyama (Washington, D.C., 1977).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Proc of APA v61, Who's Who in Phil

Brubacher, John S. *Modern Philosophies of Education* (New York, 1962).

Kneller, George F. *Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (New York, 1971).

Thompson, Richard H. *The Educational Theory of Reconstructionism as Viewed by George S. Counts and Theodore Brameld*, PhD dissertation, University of Texas (Austin, Tex., 1985).

John R. Shook

BRANDEIS, Louis Dembitz (1856–1941)

Louis D. Brandeis was born in Louisville, Kentucky on 13 November 1856, and died on 5 October 1941 in Washington, D.C. He was educated in Louisville's public schools and in Germany at Dresden's Annen-Realschule. At age eighteen he enrolled in Harvard Law School, and earned the highest grades ever awarded by that institution, receiving his BA in 1877. He remained at the school for a year of graduate work.

After practicing law for a few months in St. Louis, in 1879 Brandeis joined a Harvard classmate in the new Boston law firm of Warren & Brandeis. Brandeis, the son of a small but prosperous merchant, began his career as the representative of small business. He also started his transformation from a relatively unreflective proponent of laissez-faire capitalism to a proponent and practitioner of social justice and citizen involvement in democratic change. "My early associations were such as to give me greater reverence than I now have for the things that are because they are," Brandeis would say later. "Experience of life has made me democratic." (1934, p. 36) The tale of his life and thought is the story of a developing democratic philosophy that revolved around human possibilities and limitations.

Throughout his life, Brandeis emphasized human dignity and the fulfillment of human potential. He initially believed those goals would be achieved through laissez-faire capitalism but his experiences as a lawyer gradually led him to think that both were threatened by unbalanced power. Called upon in 1902 to explore the reasons for a union's strike against one of his clients, for example, Brandeis discovered that the workers were paid well when they worked but that employment was seasonal and sporadic. He promptly created a system that would enable labor to be spread out during the year to prevent the irregularity of employment that deprived workers of both dignity and financial security. His encounters with union negotiators during that strike, and in subsequent labor disputes he was called upon to mediate, convinced him that unions were necessary to counteract the power of employers.

By 1915 Brandeis had developed a general theory of labor relations based on the concept of "industrial democracy," which he equated with the checks and balances of the political sphere. He urged unions to fight for reasonable hours as well as wages for, as members of a democracy, workers needed leisure "among other reasons, because with us every man is of the ruling class … . Our great beneficent experiment in democracy will fail unless the people, our rulers, are developed in character and intelligence" (*Letters*, vol. 1, p. 407). Education, which meant not only formal instruction but lifetime learning after the classroom, required "freshness of mind … and to the preservation of freshness of mind a short work day is for

most people essential." (p. 407) Informed citizens were the foundation of a democracy, which is the means by which human beings organized society so as to perform the tasks people cannot carry out themselves and to maximize the possibility of human fulfillment. In return for the benefits provided by a democratic government, citizens have the responsibility to participate in the political sphere – and intelligent participation requires the leisure time in which to acquire information.

Workers have a similar right and obligation to participate in economic decision-making. By 1907 Brandeis had come to believe that as the producers of a company's income, workers have a right to share in its profits. His thinking continued to evolve, and by 1912 he was writing about giving each worker management responsibilities as well as profits. In 1915 he declared that "industrial democracy … means that the problems of a trade should be no longer the problems of the employer alone … . The employees must have the opportunity of participating in the decisions as to what shall be their condition and how the business shall be run … . We must insist upon labor sharing the responsibilities for the rest of the business." Worker-participation, he continued, is necessary because "we Americans are committed not only to social justice … but … to democracy … . The end for which we must strive is the attainment of rule by the people, and that involves industrial democracy as well as political democracy." (1934, pp. 73–4) In an updating of Jeffersonian thought, Brandeis argued that if economic independence was no longer possible for the majority of income-producing Americans, they are at least entitled to participation in the economic decision-making that directly affects their lives.

The young Brandeis became involved in public service efforts early in his career, and between 1886 and 1916 he fought against Boston's paper and transportation monopolies, the New England railroad monopoly, and the life insurance monopoly (in response to the last, he created savings bank life insurance). At the turn of the twentieth century the country was caught up in the expansion of sprawling businesses, made possible by the rapidly developing transportation and communication systems. Brandeis, however, found large commercial enterprises to be surprisingly inefficient – a failure he attributed to human limitations. Human beings had to "adjust our institutions to the wee size of man," he counseled (1957, p. 120). He assumed that if an institution was so big that no one person knew what was going on in it, it was out of control. He approved of delegation of power and a degree of specialization, agreeing that "organization can do much to make concerns more efficient [and] larger units possible … . But … organization can never supply the combined judgment, initiative, enterprise and authority which must come from the chief executive officer." (1934, pp. 216–17)

Another reason for his opposition to bigness in business was his belief that concentrated private power inevitably results in public corruption. By 1912 he was convinced that the burgeoning trusts had become so politically potent that even if workers had sufficient leisure to involve themselves in the political process, the trusts prevent the votes of workers and other citizens from having an impact. The 1912 presidential election matched Theodore Roosevelt's platform for governmental control of the trusts against Woodrow Wilson's insistence that government could not control the trusts without becoming so big itself that it would be unwieldy and ultimately unaccountable to the public. Brandeis volunteered to write most of Wilson's trust-busting platform and later helped Wilson as US President design the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Trade Commission.

Nominating him to the Supreme Court in 1916, Wilson gave Brandeis the opportunity

to expound his political philosophy from the nation's highest tribunal. Brandeis remained on the Supreme Court until 1939. The political thought he took to Washington, the result of his experiences in the world of business and his efforts on behalf of the public, was based on an abhorrence of bigness, a distrust of entrenched power, and a belief in the possibilities of citizen action and the need for citizen responsibility. It was therefore unsurprising that the theory of government reflected in his Supreme Court opinions remained Jeffersonian. He did not agree that the government that governed least was necessarily the best, but he did emphasize decentralization of power.

To Brandeis, that meant that the states should be left as free as possible to serve as experimental laboratories in both the economic and the political spheres. If human progress is to be made, experimentation should be encouraged but potentially dangerous large-scale experimentation should not (*New State Ice Co. v. Liebermann*, 1932; *Liggett v. Lee*, 1933). At the federal level, separation of powers should be rigorously enforced (*Myers v. United States*, 1926). The Supreme Court should decline to inject itself into disputes unless the popularly elected branches of government cannot handle them successfully (*Ashwander v. T.V.A.*, 1936). The Supreme Court, however, should ensure that the government does not violate the liberties of the people.

Speech is foremost among those liberties. Brandeis considered free speech crucial to democracy and to the human ability to create a society that enables its citizens to fulfill their potential. The free individual is the goal; democracy, the means by which individual freedom is to be achieved. People have to be able to explore all available ideas if they are to learn, stretch their intellectual horizons, and fulfill their individual capabilities. As it is only within a formal community that individual fulfillment could be attained, each individual is obligated to participate actively in the democratic state, so that it will not lose the democratic nature that makes it responsive to individual needs. The right to hear brings the concomitant duty to speak.

His opinion in *Whitney v. California* (1927), which has become the template of American speech jurisprudence, assumes that human beings are simultaneously "good" in their ability to act intelligently and "bad" in their susceptibility to the pitfalls of power and illogical thinking. In exercising their intelligence, they create a government that will ensure them the liberty necessary to develop individual talents. That government logically must be democratic by being responsive to the expressed will of the people. It must not act arbitrarily or in an illegitimately repressive manner, and mechanisms must be incorporated into its structure to prevent such liberty-threatening behavior.

The imperfect State may threaten liberty, not only because institutions are run by fallible human beings but because it is in the nature of humanity to generate and heed "evil counsels," at least temporarily. For that reason, no government is to be trusted entirely, no matter who its administrators are, and every democratic government must be subjected to constant examination by the people. That is why one of the functions of government is maintenance of the free flow of ideas, through which the people exchange ideas about current and possible government policies and actions.

Brandeis acknowledged that speech could be dangerous, but the danger had to be borne if democratic institutions were to be protected. While his judicial colleagues favored suppression or punishment of speech that might tend to lead to disruption, Brandeis argued that the answer for bad speech was good speech. "If there be time to expose through discussion the falsehood and fallacies, to avert the evil by the processes of education, the remedy to be applied is more speech, not enforced silence," he wrote in *Whitney*. The sole triggering element that

would permit suppression of speech was "the probability of serious injury to the State," and that could occur only if there was an "emergency [that] does not permit reliance upon the slower conquest of error by truth." Harmful *acts* could be punished but, even if the speech behind them resulted in damage to property, it could neither be prohibited nor criminalized as long as the state remained safe.

The right to privacy was closely related to the right to speech as a check upon the government and as a human necessity. The "right to be let alone," which he described in *Olmstead v. United States* (1928) as "the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men," was an important component of human dignity. "The makers of our Constitution," he wrote, "undertook … to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions, and their sensations." It was not only their dignity that would be impaired by governmental violations of their privacy; it would in addition be their ability to exchange their thoughts and engage in the kind of questioning reflection crucial to citizens of a democracy.

The view of law as reflecting the changing needs of a democratic society, implicit in Brandeis's speech jurisprudence, illuminated his approach to all law. His democratic faith, based on the premise that the people know best what is good for them, led logically to the belief that the people's will should be reflected in public policy. Legislators thus have an obligation to produce laws based on what the electorate considered the "felt necessities" of the day. Judges have a concurrent obligation to interpret laws, including the Constitution, according to the same criterion, recognizing societal needs and addressing them in statutes. Yet judges, removed from the popular will as well as the popular whim, might not be familiar with societal realities.

Brandeis the litigator decided that the responsibility for providing courts with the relevant information lay with lawyers. His seminal brief in *Muller v. Oregon* (1908), which contained almost no recitation of legal precedents but instead detailed the societal reasons for upholding a law limiting women's work days, heralded a major change in the function of American constitutional lawyers. Their job was to bridge the gap between the sovereign people and the judges who presided over the people's courtrooms by presenting the judges with factual material. To Brandeis, the twentieth century was the age of science, and science was dependent upon facts. As John DEWEY's instrumentalism was an attempt to adapt the techniques of scientific experimentation to social problems, Brandeis's sociological jurisprudence was meant to bring science into the courtroom, and to do so in the name of democracy. Brandeis the justice followed the path blazed by Brandeis the attorney, and produced fact-laden opinions designed to explain why the people and their legislators chose to enact specific public policies (*Jay Burns Baking Co. v. Bryan*, 1924; *United Railways v. West*, 1939). His approach to the law became the norm during the second half of the twentieth century, as reflected in the fact-laden briefs presented to the Supreme Court and the fact-laden decision handed down by it in *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954).

One of his protégés, Felix FRANKFURTER, wrote that to Brandeis, "democracy is not a political program. It is a religion." (*Mr. Justice Brandeis*, 1932, p. 137) It certainly was as close to a faith as Brandeis came; clearly, it was the guiding principle of his thought.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Right to Privacy," with Samuel D. Warren, Jr., *Harvard Law Review* 4 (1890): 193–220.

Business: A Profession (Boston, 1914).

Other People's Money and How the Bankers Use It (New York, 1914).

Whitney v. California, 274 U.S. 357 (1927) (dissenting).

Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438 (1928) (dissenting).
The Curse of Bigness (New York, 1934).

Other Relevant Works

Brandeis's papers are at the University of Louisville in Kentucky, the Library of Congress, and the Harvard Law School Library.
Mr. Justice Brandeis, ed. Felix Frankfurter (New Haven, Conn., 1932).
The Unpublished Opinions of Mr. Justice Brandeis, ed. Alexander M. Bickel (Cambridge, Mass., 1957).
Letters of Louis D. Brandeis, 5 vols, ed. Melvin I. Urofsky and David W. Levy (Albany, N.Y., 1971–8).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v36*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Konefsky, Samuel J. *The Legacy of Holmes and Brandeis* (New York, 1956).
Lahav, Pnina. "Holmes and Brandeis: Libertarian and Republican Justifications for Free Speech," *Journal of Law and Politics* 4 (1988): 451–82.
Mason, Alpheus T. *Brandeis: A Free Man's Life* (New York, 1946).
Strum, Philippa. *Louis D. Brandeis: Justice for the People* (Cambridge, Mass., 1984).
———, *Brandeis: Beyond Progressivism* (Lawrence, Kan., 1993).
Teitelbaum, Gene. *Justice Louis D. Brandeis: A Bibliography of Writings and Other Materials on the Justice* (Littleton, Col., 1988).

Philippa Strum

BRANDT, Richard Booker (1910–97)

Richard B. Brandt was born on 17 October 1910 in Wilmington, Ohio. He received a BA from Denison University in 1930, majoring in philosophy and classical studies. He went on to study at Trinity College, Cambridge, received another BA from the University of Cambridge in philosophy of religion in 1933, and then studied at Tübingen University in 1934–5. In 1936 he received his PhD in philosophy from Yale University and remained there for a year on fellowship studying logical positivism. Brandt taught philosophy from 1937 to 1964 at Swarthmore College, also serving as chair for nineteen years. In 1964 he became chair of the department of philosophy, and later Roy Wood Sellars Distinguished College Professor of Philosophy, at the University of Michigan. While serving as chair at both institutions he distinguished himself not only as a prominent philosopher, but also as an excellent administrator. Brandt was the John Locke Lecturer at the University of Oxford in 1974, which resulted in his *A Theory of the Good and the Right* (1979). In 1981 Brandt retired and was appointed visiting professor at the Law Center at Georgetown University a year later. Brandt served as fellow for the Guggenheim Foundation in 1945, fellow for the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences in Stanford, California, and for the National Endowment for the Humanities. He was a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, served as President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1969–70, and was President of the American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy. Brandt died on 10 September 1997 in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Noted as one of the most influential moral philosophers from the second half of the twentieth century and as the contemporary utilitarian of his time, Brandt wrote nearly one hundred articles and six books. While at Swarthmore, Brandt developed interests in the philosophy of science, mathematics, physics,

and epistemology. Eventually his attention turned toward ethics, psychology, and anthropology. Although his primary philosophical interests were in ethics and the theory of knowledge, anthropology and psychology were also quite important to him. Wolfgang KÖHLER, a psychologist at Swarthmore during 1935 to 1958, was influential on Brandt's endeavors in the latter field. Brandt defended the concept of Jeremy Bentham's theory that the good follows from the promotion of the greatest amount of happiness for the greatest number of people against the traditional criticisms and dealt with the debate over the relationship between hedonism and utilitarianism. Although most utilitarians have taken up these tasks, Brandt's treatment is quite distinct. He was also one of the first philosophers to ground an ethical theory in anthropology, most clearly found in his *Hopi Ethics* (1954). In addition, he was one of the first utilitarians to bring a clear conception of psychology into utilitarianism, which was common throughout his writings. Perhaps his interest here was due to his rejection of the traditional appeals to intuition to justify morality.

Primarily concerned with the welfare of society, Brandt's philosophy is distinguished from other utilitarians by his type of "rule-utilitarianism" and his conception of practical rationality. He claimed to find the roots of rule-utilitarianism in the philosophies of Epicurus, Thomas Aquinas, and George Berkeley. According to Brandt, this theory is not susceptible to the traditional criticisms that have been brought against utilitarianism and is the most effective practical theory of ethics. His major works deal with the justification of what is good or morally correct, which include detailed analyses of moral psychology. Brandt also professed a need to teach the conception, function, and value of moral codes for the benefit of society. Further, his view that utilitarianism can work toward economic equality has been quite influential on economic theory. His contributions to social ethics include theories on suicide, rules of war, welfare, and the treatment of defective newborns. Although influenced to a great extent by the classic utilitarian theorists Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, as well as John RAWLS, Brandt's views stand in contrast to his predecessors in a number of ways.

Brandt introduced the distinction between "act" and "rule" utilitarianism in his 1959 book *Ethical Theory*, although he paid tribute to Berkeley for being the first to distinguish between the two forms. Brandt maintained that there were other forms of utilitarianism, but that these were the most important. He additionally discussed the connections that cultures have with ethical standards, and provided a clear account of the importance the study of anthropology has on an historical understanding of the development of ethical theories, particularly to critical ethics. Brandt also furnished an analysis of ethical standards in relation to certain schools of psychology, such as the Freudian and Gestalt theories. Some further topics discussed in this work are the Hopi Indians, forms of ethical relativism, moral obligation, distributive justice, and human rights.

According to Brandt, act-utilitarianism identifies the right action as that which carries with it the best possible consequences based on the agent's evidence. He claimed that G. E. Moore, Henry Sidgwick, and Bertrand Russell were proponents of this view. Rule-utilitarianism, however, does not see right action in relation to a certain action, but to the prevalence of a moral code. Brandt's brand of utilitarianism adds the complexity of basing right and wrong action on the "optimal code" for a particular society. What is moral is seen as following certain moral laws, not to promote the most happiness as in most traditional forms of utilitarianism. Moral questions are answered based on the benefits that would result from the acceptance of moral rules by the individuals in a society. Brandt claimed that Mill held a similar view. The optimal code maximizes benefit, or the welfare of society. A moral virtue is one that is beneficial for society, not just an

individual or group. With an injection of an anthropological view, he maintained that all societies have certain standards embedded in their cultures. Each member of a society shares in certain desires and aversions. According to Brandt, these standards provide security for individuals and also help guide them to live in a cooperative manner, as such standards inform the members of a society of their parts in organizational behavior. He additionally illustrated the development of such ethical standards in an evolutionary manner. As they are recognized as better to have for their rewards to society, ethical standards are implemented and refined accordingly.

Brandt further discussed the morality of a society, or moral code of a community, and identified this code as the average person's conscience. He explained this in a general way, and then applied his view to the ethical system of the Hopi Indians; a group referred to in a number of his writings. Brandt's later work on the Hopi Indians, *Hopi Ethics*, resulted from his research conducted in Arizona. This book was a milestone in the examination of philosophical matters through anthropological data. This project began when Brandt sought to test the theory of the absolutism of moral judgments held by the psychologists at Swarthmore with whom he worked. He concluded that evidence shows some moral norms vary among cultures.

His explication in *Ethical Theory* of the relationship that this social conscience has with moral action is also noteworthy. According to Brandt, certain shared aversions of a community are learned dispositions as well that cause guilt in one who acts counter to such aversions or disapproval in one who witnesses such an act. This point illustrates his incorporation of psychological theory into his moral philosophy, as conscience is a central part of his motivational theory of pleasure. Rather than leave the meaning of the term pleasure vague, as is the common criticism of the hedonists, Brandt provided his motivational theory of pleasure. The pleasurable activity, he claimed, was one

that inclined a person to want to repeat the experience. He maintained that this conception of pleasure entails the fact that not only physical sensations give pleasure. Another important issue that Brandt dealt with is the fact that there are various subgroups of society that often have different moral codes. One moral code that is optimal for one group may not be optimal for another. According to Brandt, such issues fall under the subject matter of professional ethics.

Brandt expanded his John Locke Lectures given at Oxford University in the spring of 1974 to become the 1979 *A Theory of the Good and the Right*. He paid tribute in it to John Rawls, for his influence and kindness, and to William FRANKENA, for his friendship and criticism. Some readers see this work as a mere elaboration of Brandt's earlier classic. Although he claimed to be still a rule-utilitarian, Brandt provided a more advanced form than in his earlier *Ethical Theory*. In addition, he noted that some of his views had changed since 1959 and that others had been more developed. The sophistication of his discussion on ethical issues that tie in with psychology is a clear example of the latter. Some of the topics of *A Theory of the Good and the Right* are moral systems of society, welfare, justice, self-interest, and a psychological analysis of desire and pleasure. The focus of the book revolves around the questions over what is worthy of wanting and what is morally right. His favor of utilitarianism remains at the forefront of his discussion in this work and he calls for a moral code that maximizes happiness. Brandt maintained that all people with "rational" desires would benefit by adopting such a moral code for society and then theorizes how this could be accomplished. His conception of rationality is quite distinct, however. The rational desire, according to his theory, is one that meets the criteria of a detailed test of cognitive psychotherapy. Once the desires that fail to meet this test are removed and the individual is aware of all the relevant facts, Brandt claimed that people then are able to choose a common

code to live under. The code he endorses is applicable to moral and legal matters; it includes a list of rules and certain procedures to deal with any conflicts that may arise among the rules. Critics, however, would argue that the idea of expunging the so-called irrational desires from a majority of individuals living in a community is quite utopian.

His essay "Utilitarianism and the Rules of War" provides an insightful application of his rule-utilitarianism to the rules of warfare. This essay, originally published in *Philosophy and Public Affairs* in 1972, was reprinted in 1974 in *War and Moral Responsibility*. Brandt claimed to be working from a "contractual" form of rule-utilitarianism, a term for which he pays tribute to Rawls. According to Brandt, rules pertaining to warfare are morally justifiable as they contribute to the long-range utility of a society through their acceptance and enforcement. He again maintained that all rational and impartial people would accept such rules since they would maximize the future utility for nations at war. Morally justified rules of war, according to Brandt, do not impair either side, as both would benefit from sharing such rules. This point exemplifies the maximization of utility through these rules, as it is better to have moral rules in times of war than to lack them. Brandt further discussed certain types of rules in different areas of warfare, such as the treatment of civilians and prisoners of war, mass bombing, and retaliation. His essay "Moral Philosophy and the Analysis of Language" originated as a lecture given at the University of Kansas and was published as such in *Freedom and Morality* (1976). This work is a collection of ten Lindley Lectures given by prominent philosophers such as Brandt, Frankena, and Paul RICOEUR. In his essay, Brandt attacked the view that moral philosophy must begin with an analysis of the language of morals. He argues that this approach is too simplistic, as it ignores important issues such as context and implicit meaning. His 1992 work, *Morality, Utilitarianism, and Rights*, is a collection of reprinted essays that span a range of

nearly thirty years. Included are a number of his classic essays dealing with critical and normative ethical theory. Other essays explore several applications of utilitarianism to important social issues.

Brandt's final book, *Facts, Values, and Morality* (1996), provides an excellent summary of his views. In this work he again dealt with the justification of value judgments and moral belief. Brandt sought to justify the good through an explanation of moral psychology, rather than by intuition or theories about the meanings of moral words. After pointing out several weaknesses of different ethical systems, for example forms of naturalism, Brandt applied his theory of utilitarianism. A moral belief is justified for society in his system if one can show that the belief is a part of a social code of morals that, if rational and free from error or confusion, he or she would support if expectations were to remain in that society. His presentation includes a detailed psychology and sociology of personal morality, developed through facts of anthropology and a psychological analysis of desire. This latter analysis incorporates his motivational view of morality. Morality, according to Brandt, is not merely a strict cognitive matter. Additionally, in this work, Brandt applied his theory to the view of distributive justice and deals with the relevant issues such as income and taxation. This discussion includes the beginnings of Brandt's tax proposal. Other topics of discussion are criminal law in the United States, the notion of charitable giving as a moral requirement, and the rationality of morality.

Although his major works focus on his version of rule-utilitarianism and the general consequential benefits for society, Brandt also applied his theory to a number of important social issues such as nuclear weapons, the plea of insanity as a legal defense, and abortion. In addition, he has published some other notable works. Brandt's 1941 book *The Philosophy of Schleiermacher* is an explication of the contributions made by F. D. E. Schleiermacher to the fields of epistemology and theology.

Schleiermacher developed a theological view that was based on subjective religious experience and had a great deal of influence on the empirical movement in theology during his time. This book is an edited version of Brandt's doctoral dissertation, and is based on research he began while at Cambridge University. Brandt additionally co-edited two books, both of which would serve as excellent texts in relevant courses in philosophy. His *Meaning and Knowledge: Systematic Readings in Epistemology* (1965), co-edited with Ernest NAGEL, is a collection of readings based on problematic issues in the theory of knowledge, such as meaning, universals, skepticism, empirical knowledge, and justification. This text includes a wide range of figures from the history of philosophy and would be an asset for any introductory course in epistemology. Brandt's 1967 *The Problems of Philosophy: Introductory Readings*, co-edited with William P. ALSTON, is a collection of works from well-known philosophers ranging from Aristotle to J. S. Mill and John HICK. This book would have served as quite useful to any introductory course in philosophy in the latter part of the twentieth century. Some of the issues covered in this text are religious belief, free will and determinism, mind and body, and the foundations of knowledge.

Brandt's 1961 *Value and Obligation: Systematic Readings in Ethics* is a similar work that would have been worthy of any introductory ethics course during its time. In this book, he covers some of the main issues in ethics in a systematic way and prefaces a wide range of readings from a number of noted philosophers such as Plato and C. D. Broad. Brandt's 1962 *Social Justice* includes a collection of essays by Frankena, Gregory VLASTOS, Kenneth Boulding, Paul Freund, and Alan GEWIRTH. These essays, which began as lectures given at Swarthmore College, deal with the problem of justice in relation to society.

In 1978 a collection of essays on Brandt's philosophy by a number of very prominent philosophers was published. The book, entitled *Values and Morals: Essays in Honor of William Frankena, Charles Stevenson, and Richard Brandt*, consists of essays by W. V. O. QUINE, John Rawls, and Roderick CHISHOLM, among others. All three honored in these essays were professors of philosophy at the University of Michigan. *Rationality, Rules, and Utility* (1993) serves as another noteworthy collection of essays about Brandt, with his responses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"On the Possibility of Reference to Inferred Ethics," *Journal of Philosophy* 35 (1938): 393–405.

"The Emotive Theory of Ethics," *Philosophical Review* 59 (1950): 305–18.

Hopi Ethics: A Theoretical Analysis (Chicago, 1954).

"Thinking and Experience," *Review of Metaphysics* 7 (1954): 632–43.

"Blameworthiness and Obligation," in *Essays in Moral Philosophy*, ed. A. I. Melden (Seattle, Wash., 1958), pp. 3–39.

"Determinism and the Justifiability of Moral Blame," in *Determinism and Freedom*, ed. Sidney Hook (New York, 1958), pp. 137–43.

Ethical Theory: The Problems of Normative and Critical Ethics (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1959).

"Toward a Credible Form of Utilitarianism," in *Morality and the Language of Conduct*, ed. H. N. Castaneda and G. Nakhnikian (Detroit, Mich., 1963), pp. 107–43.

"The Concept of Welfare," in *The Structure of Economic Science: Essays on Methodology*, ed. S. R. Krupp (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1966), pp. 257–76.

"Some Merits of One Form of Rule-utilitarianism," *University of Colorado Studies in Philosophy*, Series 3 (1967): 39–65.

"Rational Desires," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 43 (1970): 43–64.

"Utilitarianism and the Rules of War," in *War and Moral Responsibility*, ed. Marshall Cohen, Thomas Nagel, and

Thomas Scanlon (Princeton, N.J., 1974), pp. 25–45.

"Moral Philosophy and the Analysis of Language," in *Freedom and Morality*, ed. John Bricke (Lawrence, Kan., 1976), pp. 1–22.

A Theory of the Good and the Right (Oxford, 1979).

Thinking About Morality (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1980).

"The Concept of a Rational Action," *Social Theory and Practice* 9 (1983): 143–64.

"Problems of Contemporary Utilitarianism: Real And Alleged," in *Ethical Theory in the Last Quarter of the Twentieth Century*, ed. Norman E. Bowie (Indianapolis, 1983), pp. 81–105.

Morality, Utilitarianism, and Rights (Cambridge, UK, 1992).

Facts, Values, and Morality (Cambridge, UK, 1996).

Other Relevant Works

The Philosophy of Schleiermacher: The Development of His Theory of Scientific and Religious Knowledge (New York, 1941).

Ed., *Value and Obligation: Systematic Readings in Ethics* (New York, 1961).

Ed., *Social Justice* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1962).

Ed. with Ernest Nagel, *Meaning and Knowledge: Systematic Readings in Epistemology* (New York, 1965).

Ed. with William P. Alston, *The Problems of Philosophy: Introductory Readings* (Boston, 1967).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, Encyc Ethics, Oxford Comp Phil, Pres Addr of APA v7, Proc of APA v71, Who Was Who in Amer v12, Who's Who in Phil

Goldman, Alvin I., and Jaegwon Kim, eds. *Values and Morals: Essays in Honor of William Frankena, Charles Stevenson, and Richard Brandt* (Dordrecht, 1978).

Contains a bibliography of Brandt's publications.

Hooker, Brad. *Rationality, Rules, and Utility: New Essays on the Moral Philosophy of Richard B. Brandt* (Boulder, Col., 1993).

Lyons, David. *The Forms and Limits of Utilitarianism* (Oxford, 1965).

Narveson, Jan. *Morality and Utility* (Baltimore, Md., 1967).

Postow, B. C. "Criteria for Theories of Practical Rationality: Reflections on Brandt's Theory," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 49 (1989): 69–88.

Smart, J. J. C. *An Outline of Utilitarian Ethics* (Melbourne, 1961).

Velleman, David J. "Brandt's Definition of Good," *Philosophical Review* 97 (1988): 353–71.

Jeffrey R. Post

BRAYBROOKE, David (1924–)

David Braybrooke was born 18 October 1924 in Hackettstown, New Jersey. He received his BA from Harvard in 1948, and his PhD in philosophy from Cornell University in 1953. He was an instructor at Harvard and William Smith Colleges from 1948 to 1950, a teaching fellow at Cornell from 1950 to 1952, instructor in philosophy at the University of Michigan in 1953–4, and at Bowdoin College from 1954 to 1956. He then went to Yale University as assistant professor of philosophy, teaching there from 1956 to 1963. Leaving Yale, he was McCulloch Professor of Philosophy and Politics at Dalhousie University in Nova Scotia from 1963 to 1988. He became a naturalized Canadian citizen during that time. In 1990 he became professor of philosophy and government at the University of Texas.

Braybrooke used the methods of analytic philosophy in their application to and illumination

of the social sciences. From his 1963 work with the economist C. E. Lindblom in *A Strategy of Decision: Policy Evaluation as a Social Process*, to his 1983 *Ethics in the World of Business* and other works, he showed in some detail how philosophy can be applied to ongoing social problems, bringing to the fore the presence of ethical issues in philosophy and in the social sciences. In *Three Tests for Democracy* (1968) he demonstrated the continuing need to evaluate democracy in terms of personal rights, human welfare, and collective preference. Ethical issues cannot be ignored in the area of policy decision.

Braybrooke has contended that both the social sciences and philosophy must evolve their principles and procedures incrementally since both are ongoing activities. Utilitarianism has been practically effective as a philosophy and promises to continue to be, and capitalism is acceptable and even preferable to alternative systems. But Braybrooke insists that both capitalism and utilitarianism must be continually applied and tested if they are to show their benefits. Braybrooke believes that ethics is as much social science as it is philosophy in tracing and deciding all the details of human actions and behaviors. His 1974 work on traffic congestion would seem far removed from philosophy, and his 1965 work on philosophical problems of the social sciences seems far removed from everyday concerns of people. Braybrooke would say this is a mistake. Philosophy only makes progress in addressing *real* social problems, and real social problems are more than meets the eye – they have imbedded in them deeper concerns with values, principles, and concepts that philosophy has always been concerned about. With improved methods in linguistic and conceptual analysis, philosophy can be of use in the enhancement of all the social sciences. By using improved statistical and other quantifying methods, the social sciences can be beneficial to philosophy and ethics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Strategy of Decision: Policy Evaluation as a Social Process, with C. E. Lindblom (New York, 1963).

Philosophical Problems of the Social Sciences (New York, 1965).

Studies in Moral Philosophy: Essays (Oxford, 1968).

Three Tests for Democracy: Personal Rights, Human Welfare, Collective Preference (New York, 1968).

Traffic Congestion Goes Through the Issue-machine (London, 1974).

Ethics in the World of Business (Totowa, N.J., 1983).

Meeting Needs (Princeton, N.J., 1987).

Philosophy of Social Science (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1987).

"Gauthier's Foundations for Ethics Under the Test of Application," in *Contractarianism and Rational Choice: Essays on David Gauthier's Morals by Agreement*, ed. Peter Vallentine (New York, 1991), pp. 56–70.

"No Rules Without Virtues: No Virtues Without Rules," *Social Theory and Practice* 17 (1991): 139–57.

Logic on the Track of Social Change, with Bryson Brown, Peter K. Schotch, and Laura Byrne (Oxford, 1995).

Moral Objectives, Rules, and the Forms of Social Change (Toronto, 1998).

Natural Law Modernized (Toronto, 2001).

Utilitarianism: Restorations, Repairs, Renovations (Toronto, 2004).

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils

Bonevac, Daniel. "Ethical Impressionism: A Response to Braybrooke," *Social Theory and Practice* 17 (1991): 157–73.

Goldman, Alvin. "Reply to Braybrooke," *Philosophical Studies* 30 (1976): 273–6.

Phillips, Griffiths. "The Generalization Argument: A Reply to Mr. Braybrooke's Collective and Distributive Generalization in Ethics," *Analysis* 23 (1963): 113–15.

Guy W. Stroh

BRECKINRIDGE, Sophonisba Preston
(1866–1948)

Sophonisba Preston Breckinridge was born on 1 April 1866 in Lexington, Kentucky, to a prominent Kentucky family. Her father, William C. P. Breckinridge, was a lawyer and US Congressman who supported women's rights, including their access to higher education. "Nisba," as she was called, initially attended Agricultural and Mechanical College in Lexington before enrolling at Wellesley College in Massachusetts, where she studied Latin and mathematics, earning a BS degree in 1888. She taught mathematics at Washington High School in the District of Columbia from 1888 to 1890. She then returned home to Lexington and read law in her father's law office. She passed the bar examination in 1892, and was the first woman to be admitted to the Kentucky bar.

Recognizing the limited opportunities for female attorneys, Breckinridge began graduate studies at the University of Chicago in 1895, earning a MA in political science in 1897 and a PhD magna cum laude in 1901. Her dissertation, which was published in 1903 under the title *Legal Tender*, was a comparison of monetary policy in the United States and England. Breckinridge enrolled in the University of Chicago law school in 1903 and was the first woman to earn a JD degree from Chicago in 1904. She was also the first woman to be admitted to the Order of the Coif, an honorary legal society recognizing outstanding scholarly achievement.

After graduation from law school, Breckinridge was appointed as a part-time instructor in the department of household administration at the University of Chicago, where she also served as Assistant Dean of Women. In 1907, she accepted an appointment at the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, becoming its research director in 1908 and its Dean in 1909, while continuing to hold her part-time faculty position at the University of Chicago. In 1929 she was finally appointed to a professorship at the University of Chicago, the Samuel Deutsch Professor of Public Welfare Administration in the School of Social Services Administration. This appointment came nine years after she had helped to create the Graduate School of Social Service Administration in 1920, the result of a merger between the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy and the University of Chicago. Breckinridge retired in 1942 and died on 30 July 1948 in Chicago, Illinois.

Breckinridge may be best remembered for her contributions to social work. Her texts on the subject introduced innovative methods such as the case study method and she was instrumental in the development of social work as an academic discipline and profession. From 1907, she was involved with the education and formal training of social workers. In 1927 Breckinridge co-founded with Edith Abbott a professional journal titled *Social Service Review*, and she also helped to establish what would become the American Association of Schools of Social Work. She was an officer and committee member of the National Conference of Social Work and served as President of the Illinois Conference on Social Welfare.

As a scholar and reformer, Breckinridge was committed to the idea that social research could be used to create social change. She was interested in understanding the genesis of specific social problems so that something could be done about them. She did not, and probably could not, separate her research from her social action. She was not concerned with developing general principles and theories about how society worked; she wanted to improve society. Breckinridge's scholarly works can be loosely grouped into three categories: empirical studies that examined various social problems, social work texts, and works that examined public policy. She focused her energies on vulnerable groups, particularly women, immigrants, children, juvenile delinquents, and the poor. Her empirical studies are rich with numbers,

details, and descriptions of the social conditions and problems encountered by such groups. These works helped to raise public consciousness of the problems and provided the empirical evidence that she and other reformers needed to press for legislative reforms. Much modern protective legislation for vulnerable groups such as women and children can trace its roots to the research and activism of Breckinridge and her contemporaries. Her works on public policy examined the effects of various policies on the family and other groups such as immigrants.

One of Breckinridge's most important contributions was *The Modern Household* (1912), written with Marion Talbot. This little-known work gives a picture of how Breckinridge and other Progressive Era women helped to transform the role of women from the private sphere of the family and home to one in which they had an increasingly strong voice in public affairs. In *The Modern Household*, Talbot and Breckinridge reinterpreted the nineteenth-century cult of domesticity, which mandated that women's proper place was in the home, by arguing that any woman had a right and an obligation to enter into affairs outside her home if these improved or influenced her family in some way. Because their families consumed prepared food, wore ready-made clothes, lived in neighborhoods, and traveled the city streets, women had not only a right but a responsibility to be engaged in overseeing the inspection of food production, clothing manufacture, sanitation, and street maintenance among other things. In this way, Talbot and Breckinridge challenged the very doctrine that sought to confine women, by using it as a basis from which to liberate them from the household. *The Modern Household* was a revolutionary work, which influenced the redefinition of women's role in society, yet it has gone largely unnoticed until recently.

Like others of her era, Breckinridge was involved in the settlement house movement. She lived at Hull-House at various times,

where she worked with Jane ADDAMS, and belonged to the community of women committed to progressive causes (Fitzpatrick 1990). On the local level, Breckinridge was active in the Progressive Party, and was a founding member of the Chicago chapters of both the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (1911) and the Urban League (1915). She was also involved with the Association of Colored Women and the black Wendell Phillips Settlement. She served on a fact-finding commission on race relations after the 1919 Chicago race riot and had previously tried (unsuccessfully) to integrate women's dormitories at the University of Chicago in 1907. In addition, she served on the board of directors of the Juvenile Protective Association and on the executive committee of the Chicago Consumer League; was a founder and officer of the Immigrants Protective League; was active in the Women's Trade Union League (WTUL); and served as a factory inspector in Chicago in 1906, and for a time as a non-salaried "Tenement Inspector" in the Department of Health. She was also an early President of the Women's City Club of Chicago.

As a feminist, Breckinridge served as Vice President of the National American Woman Suffrage Association in 1911. She participated in three White House conferences on children. As an international activist, she belonged to the Women's Peace Party and the Women's International League of Peace and Freedom, was a delegate to the International Congress of Women in 1915, and was the first woman to represent the United States at an international conference, the Pan-American Conference in 1933.

Much of Breckinridge's legacy is a result of her seemingly tireless activism, informed by her research. As a social activist, she helped to shape contemporary public opinion about the social problems faced by vulnerable groups and what could or should be done to alleviate those problems. Some of her more

notable reform accomplishments include obtaining congressional support for a national study of women and children wage earners which resulted in the study "Investigation of Woman and Child Wage Earners" and helping to draft legislation to regulate women's wages and hours of employment (Abbott 1948). Breckinridge's legal training and background gave her a strong foundation for reform activities, made her the natural author of numerous legislative bills, and laid the foundation for modern legislation on children's and women's rights. Although she never married, she was committed to the improvement of family life and demonstrated through her activism that if a woman was to take care of a family, she must be involved in public life. Breckinridge's actions exemplify what she and Talbot argued in *The Modern Household*, that because a woman's family existed in the larger context of the city, state, country and world, there was nothing that did not belong in the woman's sphere.

Breckinridge was born at just the right time to have opportunities for education and self-development that generations of women before her could barely imagine. As a woman coming of age in the late nineteenth century, she found herself caught between two worlds, one that opened doors of opportunity for her and another that kept them shut. As a member of an upper-middle-class family, she was able to take advantage of those new freedoms, especially the expanding opportunities for women in higher education after the Civil War. As a white southerner growing up in the post-Civil War south, she benefited from the built-in privileges of belonging to the dominant group. She was raised in a family environment that tolerated, but did not fully embrace, free blacks. As she matured, she developed an awareness of her own racial prejudice which challenged her to grow. Confronting her own prejudice, she became a strong advocate for the rights of blacks and other oppressed groups. All of these circumstances, coupled with her family legacy, shaped and molded Breckinridge into a scholar and social reformer.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Legal Tender: A Study in English and American Monetary History (New York, 1903).

The Delinquent Child and the Home, with Edith Abbott (New York, 1912).

The Modern Household, with Marion Talbot (Boston, 1912).

Truancy and Non-Attendance in the Chicago Schools, with Edith Abbott (New York, 1917).

New Homes for Old (New Brunswick, N.J., 1921).

Family Welfare Work in a Metropolitan Community: Selected Case Records (Chicago, 1924).

Public Welfare Administration in the United States (New York, 1927).

Marriage and the Civic Rights of Women (Chicago, 1931).

Women in the Twentieth Century: A Study of Their Political, Social and Economic Activities (New York, 1933).

The Family and the State: Select Documents (New York, 1934).

Social Work and the Courts: Select Statutes and Judicial Decisions (Chicago, 1934).

The Tenements of Chicago 1908–1935, with Edith Abbott (New York, 1936).

The Illinois Poor Law and Its Administration (Chicago, 1939).

Other Relevant Works

Breckinridge's papers are at the University of Chicago.

"Two Decisions Relating to Organized Labor," *Journal of Political Economy* 13 (1905): 593–7.

"Legislative Control of Women's Work," *Journal of Political Economy* 14 (1906): 107–9.

"Employment of Women in Industries: Twelfth Census Statistics," with Edith

Abbott, *Journal of Political Economy* 14 (1906): 14–40.

"Neglected Widowhood in the Juvenile Court," *American Journal of Sociology* 16 (1910): 53–87.

"Women in Industry: The Chicago Stockyards," with Edith Abbott, *Journal of Political Economy* 19 (1911): 632–54.

Ed., *The Child in the City: A Series of Papers Presented at the Conferences Held During the Chicago Child Welfare Exhibit* (New York, 1912).

"A Recent English Case on Women and the Legal Profession," *Journal of Political Economy* 23 (1915): 64–70.

"The Home Responsibilities of Women Workers and the 'Equal Wage'," *Journal of Political Economy* 31 (1923): 521–43.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Economics*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v37*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*

Abbott, Edith. "Sophonisba Preston Breckinridge over the Years," *Social Service Review* 22 (1948): 416–23.

Costin, Lela B. *Two Sisters for Social Action: A Biography of Grace and Edith Abbott* (Urbana, Ill., 1983).

Deegan, Mary Jo. "Sophonisba Breckinridge (1886–1948)," in *Women in Sociology: A Biobibliographical Sourcebook*, ed. Mary Jo Deegan (New York, 1991), pp. 80–89.

Diner, Steven J. "Chicago Social Workers and Blacks in the Progressive Era," *Social Service Review* 44 (1970): 393–410.

———, "Scholarship in the Quest for Social Welfare: A Fifty-Year History of the Social Service Review," *Social Service Review* 51 (1977): 1–66.

Fitzpatrick, Ellen. *Endless Crusade: Women Social Scientists and Progressive Reform* (New York, 1990).

Muncy, Robyn. "Gender and Professionalization in the Origins of the U.S. Welfare State: The Careers of Sophonisba Breckinridge and Edith Abbott, 1890–1935," *Journal of Policy History* 2 (1990): 290–315.

Stehno, Sandra M. "Public Responsibility for Dependent Black Children: The Advocacy of Edith Abbott and Sophonisba Breckinridge," *Social Service Review* 62 (1988): 485–503.

Catherine L. Coghlan

BRETT, George Sidney (1879–1944)

George Sidney Brett was born on 5 August 1879 in Britton Ferry, South Wales, and died on 27 October 1944 in Toronto, Canada. Since his parents were English, Brett always considered himself an Englishman and not a Welshman. As a star pupil at Kingswood in Bath, Brett fell under the influence of its headmaster who was passionately interested in geology. He soon had Brett scouring the land around Bath in search of geological specimens for the school's geological museum. In later years Brett traced his interest in the history of science to those heady outings.

In 1898 Brett won an open exhibition in classics to Christ Church College, Oxford. For his first two years he read Classical Moderations, and then moved into the School of Literae Humaniores, graduating from Oxford with first class honors in 1902. It was during his final two years that he discovered philosophy and was delighted to find that it fitted both his interests and his talents. He had been lucky in his tutors in both parts of his studies. In classics he had John Alexander Stewart, a superb classical scholar with an interest in psychology; his lectures on Aristotle's psychology had a profound influence on Brett and eventually led him to write his greatest

work. In philosophy his tutor was Herbert W. Blunt who took great pride in the fact that he did not have a philosophical position. Instead of spending his time defending a set of doctrines, he took a passionate interest in any new ideas that came his way and sought to determine whether or not there was any truth in them. Blunt advised his pupils to be in no hurry to adopt a particular philosophy, because it would inevitably have a terribly dampening effect on their own thinking. Of all his pupils, Brett probably took this teaching most to heart.

After leaving Oxford in 1902, Brett lived for a year and a half in London, supporting himself by temporary teaching and doing some editing and translating for the Macmillan publishing house. Early in 1904 he took an appointment as professor of philosophy at the Government College in Lahore, India (now in Pakistan), where he proved to be a very popular teacher. His duties extended beyond teaching philosophy to teaching English and serving as librarian; he also coached the school's soccer team. During his four years at Lahore he learned to speak Hindustani and taught himself to read Sanskrit and Arabic. Unfortunately he also contracted malaria, and suffered from recurring bouts of it throughout his life. In 1908, the year that he left for Canada, he published two books: *Representative English Poems*, an edited work, with a long introduction, probably intended to be used as a textbook in Lahore; and *The Philosophy of Gassendi*, the first book-length study of this contemporary of Descartes in English.

Upon arrival in Toronto, Brett took up a position as librarian and lecturer in classics in Trinity College, affiliated with the Anglican Church, which had just become federated with the University of Toronto. The Act of Federation divided the subject of philosophy in this way: the federated colleges were restricted to teaching ethics; the rest of the subject was the responsibility of the University Department of Philosophy. Classics, on the other hand, was taught by the federated colleges and by University College; thus, there were four departments of classics within the University of Toronto. Since classics included the works of the Greek philosophers, Brett was free to teach the whole of ancient philosophy and not just its ethics. It was a cumbersome system, but one forced on the university by the religious affiliations of the federated colleges. Brett made a very favorable impression at Trinity and the following year was promoted to professor of ethics and ancient philosophy.

Brett felt constrained by the restrictions on teaching philosophy at Trinity, and in 1909 he accepted a position as temporary assistant in philosophy and logic in the University Department. He gradually transferred all of his work to the University Department. By 1916 he was appointed professor of philosophy (part-time) and in 1921 his position was made full-time. An additional reason for his move was that the pay was much better in the university than it was at Trinity.

During his early years in Toronto he completed the first volume of his *History of Psychology*. Subtitled *Ancient and Patristic*, it was the culmination of a project that had been hatched while listening to Stewart's lectures as an undergraduate. In the preface to the second volume, published in 1921, he stated his original plan for the book: "As originally planned this history was to record, in their chronological order, the steps by which psychology has reached its present stage of development. At the same time indications would be given of the relation between psychology and those phases of human thought to which it was allied. The complexity of the result is due to the subject-matter." (1921, p. 5) Psychology, it turns out, is intimately connected with just about every sphere of human thought.

Brett's command of languages allowed him to examine critically the relevant literature of both the west and the east and to discuss the complicated role that psychology played in these works. His erudition is extremely impressive. It is important to note that he did not think there was a single definition of "psychology." In the ancient and patristic period it

referred to the study of the soul; in the middle ages, to the study of the mind; in the nineteenth century, to the study of consciousness; and in the early twentieth century, to the study of behavior. In every historical period it was entwined with nearly every area of human thought. In carrying out his plan, he made a thorough examination of each historical period.

First comes an estimate of the condition of those sciences which at the time were clearly important in the eyes of the authors whose work is to be treated: next comes the description of the works upon psychological topics written during the period: to this is added an account of the general influence of psychology and of the applications of the theories during the period in question. (1921, pp. 5–6)

The historian, in Brett's view, must not go beyond his data: "The business of the historian is to record rather than interpret. He should confine himself to giving such interpretations of these phenomena as were actually given by writers contemporary with the events, and so presenting the views of both the believers and skeptics." (1912, p. x) The injunction against interpretation includes anticipating the future development of the subject: "A history of psychology must not anticipate; it must be a record of beliefs about the soul and of the growth of the human mind in and through the development of those beliefs." (1912, p. x) In the second and third volumes, both published in 1921, he brought his account up to the end of the nineteenth century, but, in doing so, he largely ignored the quantitative turn which psychology took in the last quarter of that century. The philosophical attitudes of men like Gustav Fechner and Wilhelm Wundt were discussed, but he offered no treatment of either their experimental methods or their findings.

Brett's interest in the history of science can be traced back to his prep-school studies, and during his years at Kingswood he gradually became aware that the sciences and the human-ities were growing apart, and his Oxford experience served to confirm it. In pondering this unwelcome state of affairs, he came to the conclusion that there was something he could do about it. Brett proposed to humanize the sciences by use of the historical method. Properly written, a history of a science should provide a meeting place for scientists and humanists. What is of crucial importance in such a history is stating fully and clearly the logical process by which science advances, thus removing some of the mystery surrounding scientific discoveries. He found nearly all existing histories of science deficient in this respect. They concentrated their attention on the results of scientific work, and therefore resembled textbooks that record "the established truths without any reference to their genesis or to the men who established them" (1921, p. 6). What has been left out is the involved way in which truths emerge from the errors of the past.

In a lecture entitled "The History of Science as a Factor in Modern Education," read to the assembled Fellows of the Royal Society of Canada in 1925, Brett made the point that special training was required to write a history of science. A great scientist without such training would fail to write an acceptable history of his science, because he would "value all the factors in terms of their ultimate truth, while the complex conditions of success would escape him. But the humanistic element latent in a genuine history of science could only be exposed by the writer who had a power to comprehend the struggle as much as the outcome, the spirit as much as the achievement, the necessity for a suitable environment as well as the need for a genius to whom the truth is revealed." (p. 42) In his opinion, all existing histories of science were deficient: "The chief lack seems to be due to ignoring the actual logical processes by which the results were reached. The results being out of date there is nothing of interest except the method and process, which are usually omitted." (p. 42) In his own historical studies he attempted to meet this standard.

Brett argued that including histories of science in the curriculum would benefit students in both the humanities and science. Humanities students, many of whom have no scientific training, would be able to read well-written histories because all the steps, including the false ones, leading to a particular discovery would be laid out. Students in science would gain in a different way:

> As history tends to become "past sociology" rather than "past politics," scientists will learn that they are not independent of social forces. It is not to be supposed that science has always been the benefactor of society, rescuing it from political strife or religious mania; nor has it been free from superstitions, bigotry, and the kind of narrow-mindedness which thinks to build without proper foundations. A candid history will deal out blame as well as praise, it will show how often scientific work has suffered from the failure to promote its own interests without obscurantism or rivalry; it may also have to show how excessive vulgarization can produce contempt, and excessive organization produce sterility. (1925, pp. 45–6)

This is an important part of what Brett meant by humanizing science.

Brett appeared to have no interest in the emerging field of experimental psychology, but he was prepared to defend it against ignorant critics. In December 1924 he published, in the *Canadian Journal of Religious Thought* (a new periodical he had helped to found), an article entitled, "Some Beliefs About Psychology," in reply to an earlier piece, "Some Doubts about Psychology," published in the same place by Ernest F. Scott, professor of biblical theology in Union Theological Seminary in New York City. Brett's examination of Scott's putative argument was devastating. Scott took the line that the modern vogue for psychology could be likened to that enjoyed by formal logic in the late Middle Ages, which, he claimed, had petered out when its excessive claims proved

groundless. The same fate, he predicted, was in store for experimental psychology. He then proceeded to dredge up every fallacious argument going the rounds, all of which Brett demolished, and, contrary to his usual style, he made no effort to spare Scott's feelings. At the very end of his critique Brett turned Scott's analogy sharply against him: "The great mystics of all time have been psychologists in their degree and would not today be found among the doubters. Nor would the great mediaeval logicians have countenanced the fallacy that because charlatans are often called psychologists, psychologists can be called charlatans." (1924, p. 480)

Brett was hailed by his students as a great teacher, but those who wrote accounts of his teaching were unanimous in stating that they had no very clear idea of his own philosophical position. Thomas A. GOUDGE, in an obituary, stated that Brett made it very clear in his teaching that he rejected monistic idealism, epistemological dualism, and instrumentalism; Goudge thought that his view was "a sort of dynamic pluralism," but he did not specify it further. Brett seemed to follow Blunt's advice throughout his life, for he often mentioned it to his students and he certainly never spent any time defending his own views. In a talk he gave to the philosophy club, Brett told the students that in order to criticize another's position one had to have a basis for one's judgment, and this he thought could fairly be called one's own system. Since he spent much time in the classroom criticizing the views of other philosophers, he was perhaps giving his students a hint as to his own system. All they had to do was to figure out for themselves the basis of his criticisms of others and they would be on their way to ferreting out his position. But by leaving an aura of mystery about himself, he was also encouraging them to think matters through for themselves.

In 1927, the same year in which psychology achieved departmental status at Toronto, Brett was appointed head of the philosophy department and he served in that position until his

death. In 1932 he took on the additional job of Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, and again he held it until his death. In addition to these administrative duties, he continued to teach a full load of courses. It is little wonder then that he did not publish any books during the last fifteen years of his life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A History of Psychology: Ancient and Patristic (London, 1912).

A History of Psychology: Mediaeval and Early Modern Period (London, 1921).

A History of Psychology: Modern Psychology (London, 1921).

"Some Beliefs about Psychology," *Canadian Journal of Religious Thought* 1 (1924): 473–80.

"The History of Science as a Factor in Modern Education," in *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, ser. 3, vol. 19 (1925), pp. 39–46.

Other Relevant Works

The Philosophy of Gassendi (London, 1908).

Representative English Poems (London, 1908).

The Government of Man: An Introduction to Ethics and Politics (London, 1913).

Psychology: Ancient and Modern (New York, 1928).

Introduction to Psychology (Toronto, 1929).

Brett's History of Psychology, ed. R. S. Peters (London, 1953).

Further Reading

Bio Dict Psych by Zusne, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Canad Encyc*, *Encyc Psych*, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v55*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Irving, John A. "The Achievement of George Sidney Brett (1879–1944)," *University of Toronto Quarterly* 14 (1945): 329–65.

Slater, John G. *Minerva's Aviary: Philosophy at Toronto, 1843–1943* (Toronto, 2005), chap. 7.

John G. Slater

BRIDGMAN, Percy Williams (1882–1961)

Percy Williams Bridgman was born on 21 April 1882 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. He received a BA summa cum laude in 1904 from Harvard University, and remained there for his MA in 1905 and PhD in physics in 1908. Bridgman was a research fellow at Harvard from 1908 to 1910, and then became an instructor of physics in 1910. He was promoted to full professor by 1919, and in 1926 he became Hollis Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy. In 1950 he was named Higgins University Professor, and held that position until retiring in 1954. Bridgman died on 10 August 1961 in Randolph, New Hampshire.

Bridgman was a Nobel Prize–winning physicist for his path-breaking work in high-pressure physics. He was also an original and important philosopher of science. He was the proponent of a position in the philosophy of science he called *operationalism* (or operationism), stating that the meaning of a concept consists of "the operations which [are] used by us or our neighbour in applying the concept to any concrete situation" (1952, p. 7). Bridgman's views were well known and frequently cited by philosophers of science in the period from the late 1920s into the 1960s. Bridgman's basic thesis in operationalism dates from *The Logic of Modern Physics* (1927). The operational view has clear similarities with pragmatism, broadly construed, and with the logical positivism or "verificationism" of the Vienna Circle. Nevertheless, Bridgman was apparently completely uninfluenced by pragmatism and by the nascent movement of logical positivism. Treating operationalism as a theory of meaning, or as a demarcation criterion (as Karl Popper sought) between science and non-science, it seems to fit midway between pragmatism and logical positivism. Pragmatism might be defined as declaring the meaning of a concept to consist in all the ways it could guide action (as part of a proposition that is believed), including further investigative efforts. Meaninglessness then arises if a concept or its containing proposition results in no character-

istic actions. Positivism defines meaning to consist of the distinctive possible sense experiences that arise from a concept or the truth of its containing proposition. Meaninglessness arises if a concept makes no difference in actual or possible sense experience. Since sense experiences of all sorts are action-guiding, we might suppose, then, that (logical) positivism is a species of pragmatism, but that there may be some forms of action-guiding concepts or propositions that need not generate sense experiences. Examples include, according to William JAMES, faith or belief in certain values, free will, religion, or other first principles. "Operations," by which Bridgman primarily means measurements of physical features, are actions, but not all actions are measurements. So operationalism is in this respect a narrower theory of meaning than pragmatism: fewer concepts and propositions will be operationally meaningful.

Despite Bridgman's extensive and much-read publications, and some common ground he found with logical positivists such as Moritz Schlick and Rudolf CARNAP especially through the mediation of Herbert FEIGL) and even with pragmatists John DEWEY and Charles PEIRCE (as explained to him by Arthur BENTLEY), positivism and pragmatism seem to have played no role in the development and modification of Bridgman's views. These earlier similar philosophies at best made professional opinion sympathetic to Bridgman's views. The main complaint seems to have always been that his all-important notion of "operation" was crucially vague in ways that the positivistic notion of sense experience and the pragmatic notion of action were not. Noted philosopher of science Mario BUNGE has pronounced the legacy of operationalism to be "ambivalent." Nonetheless, historian of science Gerald Holton has argued that Bridgman was a crucial figure in the 1940s and 1950s, linking positivism and the Vienna Circle with a group of influential thinkers in the Harvard–Cambridge area that included Philipp FRANK, W. V. QUINE, Norbert WIENER, Richard VON MISES, Roman Jacobson, and others. The precise influence of Bridgman and the specific flavor of operationalism in these broad American philosophical movements of pragmatism, positivism (and in the wider European scientific-philosophical diaspora that included Albert EINSTEIN), and naturalism is, however, difficult to discern.

Bridgman's life and his professional work in his main field of physics should be briefly recounted, in order to see some of the sources for his philosophical views. In his lifetime, Bridgman was mainly known for his work in high-pressure physics, and it is for this work that he won his Nobel Prize in 1946. By 1908 he had already become interested in producing and measuring high pressures (of hundreds and thousands of atmospheres), and later in his career he became interested in various unusual behaviors of substances under high pressures and temperatures. This made him valuable in wartime service in World War I and then in experimenting with the impact of projectiles and in the Manhattan Project in World War II, and later still in the development of techniques to produce synthetic diamonds. Bridgman's doctoral dissertation, "Mercury Resistance as a Pressure Gauge," included on its committee Benjamin Osgood Peirce, who was Charles Peirce's third cousin, and upon B. O. Peirce's death in 1914 Bridgman inherited his courses in electrodynamics. In the great divide within physics between experimentalists and theoreticians, it is quite clear that Bridgman worked primarily as an experimentalist. (In fact, much of what Bridgman did would now be considered either engineering or physical chemistry.) Especially early in his career, he was a hands-on experimenter, and an expert in instrumentation, inventing or helping to invent measuring devices, seals (especially the self-tightening seal), and utilizing exotic alloys such as carbide steel with cobalt for pistons and containers. This was sometimes dangerous work, and there was a death and injuries in his laboratory from explosions and projectiles. However, Bridgman also performed extensive experiments on substances under high pressure concerning

liquid–solid transitions and electrical activity. These experiments and his teaching obligations (or opportunities) pushed him into theoretical physics, and he became an expert in some features of relativity, electrical conductivity, quantum mechanics, and, in his last years, in what became solid-state physics. He was thus not just an experimentalist – although that is mainly where his fame within physics lay – and was a general expert in physics in a way that became nearly impossible after World War II.

Operationalism had its origins in two closely related sources. One was Bridgman's interpretation of what he saw as the dominant principle in Einstein's discovery of the Special Theory of Relativity as well as the General Theory. This was that all scientific terms, to be scientifically meaningful, must have "operational" criteria for measuring them. Bridgman was especially concerned to banish from physics Newton's ghost of absolute space; like the logical positivists, Bridgman read and was clearly influenced by the empiricism of Ernst Mach and his rejection of absolute space. However, Einstein himself, who had also been influenced by Mach, argued that it was *not* necessary that each proposition (about forces, phenomena, etc.) be testable, but only that the whole theory "implies empirically testable assertions" (as quoted in Walter 1990, p. 117). Einstein's holistic position on theory confirmation would have been attractive to anyone familiar with the work of nineteenth-century writers Pierre Duhem and Henri Poincaré, who argued that observable consequences only arise with the interaction between a main theory (about fundamental phenomena) and an auxiliary theory, usually about testing and measuring equipment, such as the auxiliary theory of optics that renders observations from telescopes and microscopes relevant to astronomy and microbiology. This view resulted further in an important discussion about conventionalism in the geometric structure of space (for example, it depends on how one defines a straight line, say as the path of a light beam, in the auxiliary theory) that is associated with

Hans REICHENBACH, Ernest NAGEL, and others in the twentieth century. Some sort of holistic principle of verification of an entire theory similar to what Einstein endorses was widely accepted in the twentieth century. Bridgman seems to have stubbornly stuck to a requirement that each term and phenomenon be individually testable or relevant for measurements and operations (as did Mach, rejecting the existence of atoms).

The other source of operationalism in Bridgman's thought, and perhaps ultimately the more important one, is his understanding of the importance of "dimensional analysis" in physics. Dimensional analysis looks not at the numbers involved in equations of physics, but at the units in which they are measured. Thus from the well-known equation $F = ma$, and a study of the units used to measure quantities, we can determine that force itself is to be analyzed as: mass-units times distance-units, all divided by the square of time-units (since $a = s/t^2$). By a similar principle one can vindicate that $E = mc^2$ is, at least in terms of units measured, correct. Dimensional analysis, although it appears to be a purely a priori mode of guessing the basic forms of equations, is counted by Bridgman as operational manipulation of measurable quantities, and therefore operationally acceptable. He seems to have resisted any effort to describe mathematics as unique in either its subject matter or its techniques. He equated (metaphysical) necessity with (epistemic) certainty, a confusion that is common enough, but then rejected any possibility of certainty, and thus necessity. The logical positivists, although less so pragmatists (and notoriously John Stuart Mill), were careful to carve off the a priori realm of logic and mathematics for special consideration. Peirce, for example, sometimes suggested that mathematics was an observational science in light of its construction, manipulation, and observation of diagrams including symbols. This view is similar to, although better motivated than, Bridgman's view that both experimentation and mathematics somehow equally involve

operations. His views about mathematics and operations led him to attack set theory, since the operations of a converging series could never be completed, or infinite sets analyzed. This brought him into conflict with most of the mathematical and logical establishment, but for different and probably less sophisticated reasons than the mathematical Intuitionists.

Various problems beset Bridgman's views and the accumulation of such problems prevented any widespread appreciation for his philosophy of science. No major figure in the natural sciences or philosophy accepted most of Bridgman's ideas. In the social sciences, his influence has been extensive, although he often rejected the way his views were applied to social phenomena. For example, Bridgman's views resulted in Edward C. TOLMAN's interesting efforts to give operational meaning to the meaning of "demand" in economics. However, within economics, the Austrian "individualist" school that included Ludwig von Mises and led to Milton FRIEDMAN's positivist manifesto seems to have arisen independently. One general problem with Bridgman's proposal was the consensus that he was stretching the meaning of operation as primarily measurement when he allowed thought experiments and mathematical or logical operations. Another implication Bridgman drew from the importance of measurement was the ultimate subjectivity of operations (measured size is relative to an observer, as is simultaneity according to the Special Theory of Relativity, for example). He went further to propose that there are not really physical things. There *are* measurable aspects of them. This view anticipates Quine's suggestion in the introduction to *Word and Object* that physical objects are at best "posits" and even accords with Quine's eventually abandoned behaviorist theory of meaning. Finally, Bridgman declared that propositions about the future had no meaning since operations to confirm them could in many cases not be performed now.

Bridgman was one of several important physicists in the mid-twentieth century to be intensely concerned with the role which scientists and science should play in society. He was one of the very few thinkers of his time who developed a coherent and systematic account of the relationship between individual and society. He formulated an attempt to remake the social sciences on the basis of operationalist thinking. Most of these views were first stated in *The Intelligent Individual and Society* (1938) and reemerged at the end of *The Way Things Are* (1959). His writings on social phenomena have in common with his philosophical opinions a lack of reference to all previous work and the opinions of major figures. One of the peculiar implications of his own interpretation of operationalism was that other individuals' consciousness could not be operationally tested; it was meaningless to talk of others' consciousness. This feature was placed at the center of his new understanding of the social sciences. Operational meaning and the primary importance of the individual were to be fundamental principles of the new social sciences. (This brought him into a debate with B. F. SKINNER, who argued that individual consciousness was actually a social product.) Bridgman believed that the recent history of science had shown the importance of sweeping away all previous "absolute" or mythical conceptions. Naturally, the individual was sovereign over the state, and the state was to be conceived as merely a collection of individuals.

This fundamental belief brought with it a hostility to views that held the state to be an entity itself, or more important than the individuals of which it was composed. Bridgman announced his opposition to these "totalitarianisms" (fascist and communist) and went so far as to refuse to work in any way with physicists who maintained such views. His more specific views about the role of the state have been called "libertarian," in the sense that he maintained only a minimal state was permissible. There is some truth in this. However, his central philosophical reality, of the operational meaning of only one's own consciousness, is actually solipsistic and would even seem to

make writing articles and books a bit pointless. He argues against the notion of duty (since it required a notion of others' consciousness) so strongly that one wonders whether moral obligations of any sort were possible. But his libertarianism is idiosyncratic in other ways too. For example, in *The Way Things Are* he argues against the graduated income tax, but his opposition is not to imposing taxes one did not choose to pay (if it was still in fact in your interest as determined by others) but to the fact that for wealthy individuals it violated a quid pro quo principle. They did not get back anything like the taxes they paid.

He seems to have had grand hopes that if only scientifically minded persons would address social problems with all the objectivity and myth-busting energy they could muster, social problems could simply be solved. Working with famous sociologist Talcott PARSONS, he proposed a standing interdisciplinary seminar at Harvard that would systematically provide (where possible) operational definitions for all terms in the social sciences. One unenthusiastic participant was graduate student Henry Kissinger, later a foreign policy advisor to President Richard Nixon.

One of the truly curious aspects of Bridgman's views is that despite their sophistication and clarity, and his important place in American philosophy and intellectual life, he himself seems not to have engaged with or even grasped philosophical literature that was close to his concerns. For example, without stating it clearly, he dismisses the Problem of Induction as a mere issue in the definition of "logic." For this reason, and because of what seem to be many improbable and even unacceptable implications of his theories, philosophers have not fully engaged with Bridgman's philosophical theories. His views in politics have disappeared without a trace, although he has had a continuing influence on the perpetually vexing issue of methodology in the social sciences. Bridgman's impatience with philosophy erupted in *The Way Things Are*, where he declares that the "great philosophical writings that have excited universal admiration from the time of the Greeks" strike him as an "utterly depressing exhibition of human frailty" and in reading them he simply cannot get his mind around them.

Bridgman's operationalism is one of the more systematic and original efforts, stretching from Mill's *System of Logic*, through Mach, logical positivism, Peirce's and possibly Dewey's form of pragmatism, and especially to the dominant naturalism of the late twentieth century, to discover "the" scientific method, and then utilize its methods or conclusions (such as physicalism) in philosophy itself. With relatively few exceptions, few of these writers were themselves empirically minded to the extent that they studied the longer history of science to find what methods had been employed and were successful. For most of them, until Thomas KUHN and the historicist philosophy of science, there was an optimistic view that there *was* a single scientific method and that it could be discovered a priori, or at most by understanding only developments in modern physics. So too Bridgman. Despite having a fine, inquiring mind and a beautifully clear writing and thinking style, Bridgman seems to hold on to the view that somehow all of what philosophy does can be done better and simply by turning to how we do science.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dimensional Analysis (New Haven, Conn., 1922).

The Logic of Modern Physics (New York, 1927).

The Nature of Physical Theory (New York, 1936).

The Intelligent Individual and Society (New York, 1938).

"The Operational Aspect of Meaning," *Synthese* 8 (1951): 251–9.

The Nature of Some of Our Physical Concepts (New York, 1952).

"Some Philosophical Aspects of Science," *Synthese* 10 (1958): 318–26.

The Way Things Are (Cambridge, Mass., 1959).

"The Logic of Modern Physics After Thirty Years," *Daedalus* 88 (1959): 518–26.

Other Relevant Works
Bridgman's papers are at Harvard University. *Reflections of a Physicist* (New York, 1950).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v48*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Benjamin, A. Cornelius. *Operationism* (Springfield, Ill., 1955).
Bunge, Mario. "The Ambivalent Legacy of Operationalism," *Philosophia Naturalis* 25 (1988): 337–45.
Hardcastle, Gary L. "S. S. Stevens and the Origins of Operationism," *Philosophy of Science* 62 (1995): 404–24.
Holton, Gerald. "A Personal View of Percy W. Bridgman, Physicist and Philosopher," *Methodology and Science* 26 (1993): 1–5.
Koch, Sigmund. "Psychology's Bridgman vs. Bridgman's Bridgman," *Theory and Psychology* 2 (1992): 261–90.
Moyer, Albert E. "P. W. Bridgman's Operational Perspective on Physics," *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 22 (1991): 237–58, 373–97.
Schlesinger, George. "P.W. Bridgman's Operational Analysis: The Differential Aspect," *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 9 (1959): 299–306.
Walter, Maila L. *Science and Cultural Crisis: An Intellectual Biography of Percy Williams Bridgman (1882–1961)* (Stanford, Cal., 1990).

Randall R. Dipert

BRIGGS, Charles Augustus (1841–1913)

Charles Augustus Briggs was born on 15 January 1841 in New York City. He briefly studied at the University of Virginia in the late 1850s, and then Union Theological Seminary in New York City from 1861 to 1863. He was licensed to preach by the First (Old School) Presbytery of New York in 1866 and departed for Berlin to study the new critical-historical methods. Briggs returned in 1869 to serve as pastor of a Presbyterian church in Roselle, New Jersey. In 1874 he began teaching languages and theology at Union, and in 1876 he was appointed Davenport Professor of Hebrew and Cognate Languages.

In 1890 Briggs was appointed to the newly founded Edward Robinson Chair of Biblical Theology at Union. His inaugural address, "The Authority of Holy Scripture," was a vigorous attack on the belief in biblical inerrancy represented by the Princeton theology associated with Charles HODGE and Benjamin WARFIELD, then dominant in the Presbyterian Church. At the same time, Briggs made clear that he was in all other matters a theologically conservative evangelical Christian, affirming the conceptual (but not verbal) inspiration of Scripture, its sufficiency in matters of faith and morals, the miracles as special acts of God, the virgin birth of Jesus, and the Chalcedonian incarnationist Christology.

Briggs maintained that belief in verbal inspiration and inerrancy represented recent reactionary innovations in theology rather than the normative church tradition. Verbal inspiration and inerrancy are neither taught in the Bible itself nor found in the creeds. The plain results of modern study show a host of errors and contradictions in the Bible in historical details and other matters not essential to faith, and the interpretation of prophecy as minutely predicting events in the future leads to results that are easily disproved. In addition, Briggs claimed that the dominant theology erroneously insisted on views of the authorship of biblical books that are contrary to the results of modern study.

Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch, and Isaiah is the author of less than half of the Book of Isaiah. Verbal inspiration and inerrancy, Briggs concluded, are dangerous innovations that create a stumbling-block to faith.

Union Seminary was affiliated with the Presbyterian Church, and in 1870 on the reunion of that church's Old School and New School factions, Union's board made a gesture of reconciliation by granting to the church the right of approval of faculty appointments. In response to Briggs's address, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church voted in 1891 to reject the Briggs appointment. Union supported Briggs and maintained that the church had no right to question what was actually only a transfer from one faculty position to another. Briggs was tried by the Presbytery of New York for teaching contrary to the Westminster Confession. He was acquitted, but the prosecution appealed the verdict and the Presbyterian General Assembly suspended Briggs from the ministry in 1893.

Briggs was ordained in 1900 by the Episcopal Bishop of New York, thus becoming the first non-Presbyterian faculty member in the history of Union Seminary. Subsequently Union became an independent, interdenominational school. Until his death on 8 June 1913 in New York City, Briggs continued to teach at Union, expressing a strong interest in the reuniting of the churches, including the Roman Catholic Church. When Catholic modernists were condemned by a papal commission, Briggs supported their use of historical criticism, but not their liberal theological views. Briggs was associate editor of the standard Hebrew lexicon, co-editor of the monumental *International Critical Commentary*, and a founding member of the Society for Biblical Literature.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Biblical Study (New York, 1883).
Messianic Prophecy (New York, 1886).
Whither? A Theological Inquiry for the Times (New York, 1889).
The Authority of Scripture (New York, 1891).
The Bible, the Church, and the Reason (New York, 1892).
The Ethical Teaching of Jesus (New York, 1904).
Church Unity: Studies of Its Most Important Problems (New York, 1909).
Theological Symbolics (New York, 1914).

Other Relevant Works
Briggs's papers are at Union Theological Seminary.
American Presbyterianism, Its Origin and Early History (New York, 1885).
A General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture (New York, 1899).
A History of the Study of Theology, 2 vols (New York, 1916).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v7*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
"Chas. Augustus Briggs," *American Journal of Theology* 17 (1913): 497–508.
Christensen, Richard L. *The Ecumenical Orthodoxy of Charles Augustus Briggs (1841–1913)* (Lewiston, N.Y., 1995).
Essays in Modern Theology and Related Subjects (New York, 1911). Essays in honor of Briggs.
Hatch, Carl E. *The Charles A. Briggs Heresy Trial: Prologue to Twentieth-Century Liberal Protestantism* (New York, 1969).
Massa, Stephen M. *Charles Augustus Briggs and the Crisis of Historical Criticism* (Minneapolis, 1990).
Toy, C. H., ed. *Essays in Modern Theology and Related Subjects* (New York, 1911). Contains a bibliography of Briggs's publications.

Marvin C. Shaw

BRIGHTMAN, Edgar Sheffield (1884–1953)

Edgar Sheffield Brightman was born on 20 September 1884 in Holbrook, Massachusetts, the only child of George Edgar Brightman, a Methodist minister, and Mary Sheffield Brightman. The itinerancy of the Methodist ministry led Brightman to live in various places in New England during his childhood, including Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard. In 1899 Brightman's family moved to Whitman, Massachusetts, where he graduated from high school in 1901. He worked for a year in a grocery and meat market in Provincetown before entering Brown University in 1902, where he studied classics and philosophy. He was the chaplain and member of the Kappa Sigma Fraternity, and in his junior year he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. During his senior year, Brightman experienced an accident that caused him serious burns and made him unable to complete the winter term. His father died in March of that same year. Brightman took extra courses in order to be able to graduate from Brown with his BA in 1906.

Following his graduation, Brightman taught for two years as an assistant in philosophy and Greek at Brown and Pembroke, the women's college, while working on his MA degree in philosophy at Brown, which he received in 1908. He also preached every Sunday at a church in Wickford, Rhode Island, during this time. In the fall of 1908, Brightman entered Boston University School of Theology with concurrent enrollment in the Graduate School. It was here that Brightman came under the intellectual influence of Borden Parker BOWNE, the founder of Boston personalism. Brightman was able to complete his STB degree in 1910, and he received the Jacob Sleeper Fellowship, which enabled him to study for two semesters at the University of Berlin and one semester at the University of Marburg in the areas of philosophy, church history, and Bible.

In 1912 Brightman took a teaching position at Nebraska Wesleyan University where he taught a heavy schedule in religion, philosophy, and psychology. He was able to complete the requirements for his doctorate during that year, and he received his PhD in philosophy from Boston University in 1912. Brightman continued to teach at Nebraska Wesleyan until 1915, when he became associate professor of ethics and religion at Wesleyan University in Middletown, Connecticut, where he remained until 1919. While at Wesleyan, Brightman wrote his first book, *The Sources of the Hexateuch* (1918).

In 1919 Brightman was invited to return to Boston University as professor of philosophy in the Graduate School. In 1925 he became the first Borden Parker Bowne Professor of Philosophy at Boston University, a position he held until his death in 1953. He spent a sabbatical year in 1930–31 in Oxford, Austria, and Berlin. Brightman served as President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1936–7, of the American Theological Society, and of the National Association of Biblical Instructors. In the late 1940s, Brightman's health began to fail to the point that he began to withdraw from responsibilities beyond teaching and scholarly writing. Brightman died on 25 February 1953 in Newton, Massachusetts.

Brightman was the most powerful exponent of Boston personalism of his generation, and he shared many of the same philosophical concerns as his teacher, Bowne. One of their central philosophical concerns was to provide a theistic and personalistic alternative to the mechanistic materialism of philosophic naturalism and its attempts to equate nature with all reality. Brightman understood philosophical naturalism as affirming that only the being of the physical world that is able to be investigated by the natural sciences is real, while denying any ontological status to nonphysical aspects of reality such as personality and ideas. In the language of Bowne, naturalism mistakes phenomenal reality for ontological reality. Brightman attempts to avoid the fallacy of equating "Reality," or "all that is," with the world of sense objects. "Nature is not all that

there is because experience contains more than sensory experience" (1958, p. 247).

Brightman was also wary of equating nature with absolutely everything because this, in effect, reduces God to nature. Consequently, to avoid confusion, not to mention the philosophical and theological problems of pantheism, Brightman opts for defining nature as the "realm of phenomena" (1958, p. 247) or "the world of sense objects" (1945, p. 38). It is "the illuminating absent indicated by the shining present" of personal experience, and it "is the experience of an ordering, creative Mind other than any human mind" (1958, p. 248). Nature, in Brightman's view, is the expression and activity of a unifying force, the Cosmic Consciousness, the Cosmic Person – God. It is not mindless stuff, but rather the activity of a purposive and responsive Mind. The activity of nature is within God as a part of God's experience. Brightman reasons that "any part of God's experience (such as Nature) must be incomplete" (1958, p. 248). Consequently, it makes no sense to equate nature with absolutely everything. "Nature is one area of interaction, cooperation, and communication with God." (1958, p. 251)

Defining nature as the world of sense objects excludes all nonphysical aspects of reality from nature. Brightman admits that our bodies are physical and a part of nature, but maintains that our consciousness, our ideas, values, and beliefs are not part of nature. Brightman argues that although the distinction between personality and nature does imply a duality in our experience, this "definition does not set up two irreconcilable and unrelatable orders of being" (1945, p. 45). Nature and personality represent two realms within one ultimate reality that has its unity in God, and thus there is a possibility of knowledge of the physical world through the reliance on "empirical coherence" as we observe and reason about our sense experiences. According to Brightman, "All other experiences – of memory, emotion, obligation, value, choice, and worship – are supernatural." (1958, p. 249) In Brightman's personalistic per-

spective on the universe, the bodies of human beings are physically in the natural world, but human persons as minds are not a part of nature.

Brightman distinguishes "methodological naturalism" from "metaphysical naturalism" in that "the latter takes the incomplete descriptions and heuristic methods of the former to be either final truth about reality or at least the limits of present human knowledge" (1960, p. 320). He objects to metaphysical naturalism's concept of nature that tends to include "conscious" persons in a "strictly spatio-temporal system" (1960, p. 321). If naturalists insist on speaking of persons as part of nature, Brightman believes the word "nature" must then signify the "metaphysical X," i.e., the metaphysically real that includes but also transcends spatiotemporal systems. Brightman maintains that the presence of persons, experients, telic processes, and value in our universe cannot be understood solely in terms of spatiotemporal relations and materialistic causation. Persons cannot be reduced to the relations of physical objects.

Like Bowne, Brightman maintains that both the Cosmic Person (God) and finite human persons are of an order different from the natural order. Brightman affirms that nature is immanent in God. Nature is not external to God, but God is the source of the natural order, not a part of it. Nature is the activity and expression of God, not God itself. God is also understood as the source of all finite persons, yet persons are also of a supernatural order insofar as mind, or consciousness, is understood to be externally related to the body and the rest of the natural world.

Brightman's reluctance to affirm a naturalism that includes God, persons, and the nonhuman world within one all-inclusive nature is due to his metaphysical conviction of the ontological primacy of persons. For Brightman, persons are not just one ontological reality among others, rather they are the sole ontological reality. Nature is not the ground of personality, rather personality is the ground for nature.

Nature is the expression of consciousness and not vice versa. Persons are in interaction with the natural world, but for Brightman the relations between persons and nature are external, as are the relations between mind and body, consciousness and unconsciousness. Nature, body, and unconsciousness are all external to the person.

Brightman agrees with Bowne that "the universe is a society of persons" and that "all reality is personal reality" (1951, p. 293). Brightman also shares Bowne's bias towards consciousness in his definition of the person. Brightman defines personality (or person, or personal self) as follows: "*A personality is a complex but self-identifying, active, selective, feeling, sensing, developing experience, which remembers its past (in part), plans its future, interacts with its subconscious processes, its bodily organism, and its natural and social environment, and is able to judge and guide itself and its objects by rational and ideal standards.*" (1945, p. 53) Brightman goes on to argue that "this definition does not presuppose that all of the traits mentioned function at all times in any person … . The definition means rather that unless all the experiences described arise or can arise in the course of the development of experience, that experience, although it may still be called a self (or experient), is not a personal self." (1945, p. 53)

Brightman asserts that "personality is the seat of all value" (1944, p. 544). In agreement with British Idealist T. H. Green, Brightman maintains that value "is always 'for, of, or in a person'" (1944, p. 544). In other words, in order for there to be value, there must be a person who is valuing, i.e., experiencing value. Brightman admits that consciousness is not limited to human persons, and therefore value is not limited to human persons. However, Brightman's formal definition of personality, with its emphasis on the ability of persons to guide themselves by rational and ideal standards, is more descriptive of human consciousness than of nonhuman experience. Careful observations indicate that the great majority of nonhuman experiences do not approach the level of complexity and rationality that Brightman ascribes to personal experience. Although Brightman's sentiments lead him to affirm the value of nonhuman life, his metaphysical system makes it difficult for him to express his sentiments in a consistent manner. In Brightman's view of nature and reality, it is difficult to grant nonhuman beings full membership in the society of persons that Brightman equates to reality. This, in turn, makes it difficult for Brightman to affirm the intrinsic value of nonhuman life in nature without falling back on the idea that nonhuman life derives its value from being the activity and expression of God. From this perspective, respect for nature would be grounded in a respect for God's person.

Brightman shares Bowne's view that nature is the activity and the expression of the Cosmic Person. Nature has value by virtue of being part of God's personal activity, and this is an activity that we as human persons ought to respect. Like Bowne, Brightman rejects the mechanistic explanations of the universe, and he understands reality to be infused with value by its Creator. According to Brightman, "The universe of experience could never be understood as the outcome of units such as electrons, protons, positrons, and neutrons; whereas electrons and the like can be understood as aspects or processes of personal experience; not of human experience alone, it is true, but of the objective divine experience." (1951, p. 298)

Similar to Bowne, Cartesian residues also are evident in Brightman's views concerning the relations between human persons and nature and in his understanding of the relations between the mind and the body. Brightman distinguishes between what he calls the "shining present" and the "illuminating absent." According to Brightman, "The shining present is conscious awareness." (1958, p. 47) In other words, the shining present is a person's present consciousness, which includes all the "sensations, memories, beliefs, knowledges, hopes, fears, and vaguenesses" that are a part of

a person's present consciousness (1958, p. 47). The shining present is the person. Everything outside of the shining present, Brightman refers to as the "illuminating absent," and this includes the person's body, other persons, and nature. The illuminating absent is "the object or the cause of the experience," but it is not part of the shining present itself (1958, p. 47). The shining present interacts with the illuminating absent, but the illuminating absent is not part of the person and vice versa. For Brightman, the body is not a part of the person, and the person is not a part of nature, although the person interacts with both the body and nature. Brightman attempts to explain this interaction by rejecting Descartes's "assertion of two … discontinuous and radically different kinds of being [as] a theoretical invention of the mind that causes more trouble than it is worth" (1951, p. 300). For Brightman, the illuminating absent is not composed of extended things, rather it is composed of other selves and persons with whom the person interacts. Thus the world is characterized by interpersonal relations, not by "the Occidental dualism of matter and mind, which [Brightman claims] all personalists reject" (1951, p. 300).

For Brightman, the "person" is "a complex unity of self-consciousness that is able to develop ideal values and to act in itself and to interact with others" (1958, p. 201). Brightman's focus is on consciousness. Without consciousness, there is no person, and, for Brightman, personal consciousness involves a level of self-awareness and reflection that makes it difficult for him to refer to many other life forms on earth as persons. Although Brightman distinguishes between persons and subpersonal selves, at times he speaks of the personality of some more highly developed subhuman selves, and he admits that they possess some level of value. Given his axiological commitment to personality as the seat of all value, Brightman must attribute some form of personality to at least some nonhuman beings if he wants to claim they have intrinsic value. Brightman admits that subhuman persons would possess intrinsic value when he writes, "All human persons, whatever subhuman persons there may be, as well as the Supreme Superhuman Divine Person are seats of intrinsic value." (1944, p. 545) Given that Brightman's definition of person focuses so heavily on self-reflective consciousness, he uses the term person only for those nonhuman beings with complex, more human-like consciousness.

Brightman recognizes that other forms of life besides human persons enjoy a shining present. To emphasize the different manifestations of "shining presents," Brightman distinguishes between selves (experients) and persons (personalities). According to Brightman, "A conscious being – that is, any complex of consciousness that is aware of its complexity and unity – is called a self or an experient. Any self or experient that is able to judge itself rationally and to strive for ideal values is a person or personality or mind." (1951, pp. 294–5) For Brightman, "If any being lacks the power to reason, such a being is a subpersonal self." (1951, p. 297) In contrast to Bowne, however, Brightman sees such subpersonal selves as being a part of reality, and Brightman includes them in his definition of reality. According to Brightman, "The universe is a society of selves and persons with a Supreme Person as its cause and guiding purpose." (1951, p. 300)

Brightman is a personalist, but he is by no means an individualist. He focuses on interpersonal relations and the social forms of personal existence. For Brightman, "The goal of the universe is … the interpersonal development of all persons in the creation and enjoyment of values … . The ultimate category is social; the goal of the universe is inexhaustible, developing love." (1951, p. 303) Persons have a moral obligation to work together, and, although the individual is not lost in the collective, each person "stands in a wide variety of interpersonal relations … [and] when these relations are rightly ordered, they enlarge and enhance the person" (1951, p. 301). According to Brightman, "We belong together in interpersonal community, yet we all have individual existence and personal

rights." (1951, p. 303) Such views contributed to Brightman's support of democratic socialism and pacifism while at Boston University.

As persons living in an interpersonal community, Brightman affirms that we ought to attempt to realize the best possible values. Brightman's value theory is more inclusive than Bowne's in affirming that some higher forms of animal life possess at least rudimentary levels of personality and may even be called persons, thereby granting them at least rudimentary levels of value experience. In addition to expanding the notion of personhood, in Brightman's last book, *Person and Reality* (1958), he includes selves as well as persons as beings capable of value experience. Brightman writes, "Values have their being solely in the shining present of the self or person who experiences them." (1958, p. 291) Perhaps Brightman was beginning to see that other forms of life enjoy a shining present, or some kind of conscious experience, albeit in a different way than human persons do. Following this line of reasoning, to the extent that nonhuman life forms have the experience of a shining present, they would possess intrinsic value. Thus it might be more appropriate for Brightman to claim that value is for, of, or in experients, thereby avoiding the possible interpretation that God and human persons are the only loci of value in the universe.

Brightman was not only concerned about creating plausible hypotheses about persons, reality, and values, he was also concerned about providing some guidance for moral choices by persons in the world. This interest led Brightman to develop a system of moral laws, which was one of his most significant contributions to the Boston personalist tradition and a powerful influence on his most famous student, Martin Luther KING, Jr. All of King's most significant principles for action find expression in Brightman's moral law system. Brightman describes the moral laws as universal principles to which the will ought to conform its choices. These laws are not to be confused with prescriptions for action in specific circumstances, rather they act in a regulatory way as principles according to which one should choose if one is to be moral.

Brightman also showed a career-long concern for speaking meaningfully about the nature of God, God's activity in the world, and God's relation to good and evil. Brightman struggled to reconcile the goodness of God with the power of God, and he was deeply troubled by traditional portrayals of God as infinitely powerful. The presence of so much unaccountable evil in the world led Brightman to the hypothesis that if God is infinitely good, then he must be finite in power. Brightman posits a "Given" in the person of God that limits God's power in the universe, a "Given" with which God must struggle in his activity of realizing values. Brightman's finite–infinite God, finite in power and infinite in goodness, was one of the more controversial and revolutionary hypotheses about the nature of God during the mid twentieth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An Introduction to Philosophy (New York, 1925; 2nd edn 1951; 3rd edn 1963).
Immortality in Post-Kantian Idealism (Cambridge, Mass., 1925).
Religious Values (New York, 1925).
A Philosophy of Ideals (New York, 1928).
The Problem of God (New York, 1930).
The Finding of God (New York, 1931).
Is God a Person? (New York, 1932).
Moral Laws (New York, 1933).
Personality and Religion (New York, 1934).
A Philosophy of Religion (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1940).
The Spiritual Life (Nashville, Tenn., 1942).
Nature and Values (New York, 1945).
Persons and Values (Boston, 1952).
Person and Reality: An Introduction to Metaphysics, ed. Peter A. Bertocci, Jannette A. Newhall, and Robert S. Brightman (New York, 1958).

Other Relevant Works
Brightman's papers are at Boston University.
The Sources of the Hexateuch (New York, 1918).
Ed., *Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress of Philosophy* (New York, 1927).

"The Finite Self," in *Contemporary Idealism in America*, ed. Clifford Barrett (New York, 1932), pp. 169–96.

"An Empirical Approach to God," *Philosophical Review* 46 (1937): 147–69.

The Future of Christianity (New York, 1937).

Ed., *Personalism in Theology: A Symposium in Honor of Albert Cornelius Knudson, by Associates and Former Students* (Boston, 1943).

"Philosophical Ideas and Enduring Peace," in *Approaches to World Peace*, ed. Lyman Bryson et al. (New York, 1944), pp. 542–56.

"Personalistic Metaphysics of the Self: Its Distinctive Features," in *Radhakrishnan: Comparative Studies in Philosophy Presented in Honour of His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. W. R. Inge et al. (London, 1951), pp. 287–304.

Studies in Personalism: Selected Writings of Edgar Sheffield Brightman, Borden Parker Bowne Professor of Philosophy, Boston University, 1924–1953, ed. W. E. Steinkraus and Robert N. Beck (Utica, N.Y., 1984).

Hartshorne and Brightman on God, Process, and Persons: The Correspondence, 1922–1945, ed. Randall E. Auxier and Mark Y. A. Davies (Nashville, Tenn., 2001).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils Before 1950*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v41*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v4*, *Proc of APA v27*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Bertocci, Peter A. "The Personalism of Edgar S. Brightman and Ultimate Reality," *Ultimate Reality and Meaning* 6 (1983): 32–50.

Buford, Thomas O., and Harold H. Oliver, eds. *Personalism Revisited* (Amsterdam and New York, 2002).

Burrow, Rufus, Jr. *Personalism: A Critical Introduction* (St. Louis, 1999).

Lavely, John H. "Edgar Sheffield Brightman: Good-and-Evil and the Finite-Infinite God," in *The Boston Personalist Tradition in Philosophy, Social Ethics, and Theology*, ed. Paul Deats and Carol Robb (Macon, Georgia, 1986), pp. 121–46.

Muelder, Walter G. "Edgar S. Brightman: Person and Moral Philosopher," in *The Boston Personalist Tradition in Philosophy, Social Ethics, and Theology*, ed. Paul Deats and Carol Robb (Macon, Georgia, 1986), pp. 105–20.

Newhall, Jannette E. "Brightman on the Influence of Bowne," *Philosophical Forum* 20 (1962–3): 11–16.

The Personalist 34 (Autumn 1953). Special issue on Brightman.

Philosophical Forum (Boston) 8 (Spring 1950). Special issue on Brightman.

Philosophical Forum (Boston) 12 (1954). Memorial volume dedicated to Brightman.

Reck, Andrew J. "The Personalism of Edgar Sheffield Brightman," in *Recent American Philosophy: Studies of Ten Representative Thinkers* (New York, 1964), chap. 10.

Ross, Floyd H. *Personalism and the Problem of Evil* (New Haven, Conn., 1940).

Mark Y. A. Davies

BRODBECK, May Selznick (1917–83)

May Brodbeck was born on 26 July 1917 in Newark, New Jersey. She received a BA degree in chemistry at New York University in 1941. She then taught high school chemistry, worked in industry, and participated as a physicist in the Manhattan project to build the atomic bomb. Her graduate training was in philosophy at the University of Iowa, earning the MA in 1945 and the PhD in 1947, both under the

supervision of Gustav BERGMANN. Her dissertation was on John DEWEY's *Logic*. For the next twenty-seven years, from 1947 to 1974, Brodbeck was a professor of philosophy at the University of Minnesota. She was chair of the department during 1967–70 and Dean of the Graduate School during 1972–4. In 1974 she returned to the University of Iowa as Carver Professor of Philosophy, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Dean of the Faculties. She retired from her administrative position in 1981 and her faculty position in 1983. Among her honors were a visiting professorship at the University of Cambridge, a Fulbright lecture tour of Europe, membership on various editorial boards, and a fellowship at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University in 1981–2. She was President of the Western (now Central) Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1971–2. Brodbeck died on 1 August 1983 in Menlo Park, California.

Following the publication of a number of technical papers in the philosophy of science and a major essay titled "Philosophy in America: 1900–1950," Brodbeck established her name by co-editing with Herbert FEIGL in 1953 the book that for many years was the leading anthology in the field, *Readings in the Philosophy of Science*. Brodbeck's ambitious introductory essay, "The Nature and Function of the Philosophy of Science," succeeded brilliantly by providing a thorough but reasonably concise statement of the main ideas of the field.

Turning in 1954 to a more specialized domain, the philosophy of the social sciences, Brodbeck produced a number of important papers over the next decade and a half, including the often anthologized essay of 1963, "Meaning and Action," a particularly incisive critique of a Wittgensteinian theory of the relation of mind to behavior. This phase of her labors culminated in 1968 with the publication of another extensive anthology, *Readings in the Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, to which she contributed a general introduction, substantial sectional introductions, and four of the forty-one essays. Like the earlier collection edited with Feigl, this one stood for many years as the leading one in its field, and displayed once again Brodbeck's unusual talent for organizing and making sense of the ideas of others, while at the same time continuing to offer her own technical contributions.

Brodbeck's work in the philosophy of the social sciences led her into the philosophy of mind. Among the papers in this area was her presidential address to the American Philosophical Association, "Mind: From Within And From Without," where Brodbeck renewed and restated her challenge to the dominant materialist theories of mind, disagreeing with most of the philosophers in the analytic tradition of her training.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Coherence Theory Reconsidered: Professor Werkmeister on Semantics and on the Nature of Empirical Laws," *Philosophy of Science* 16 (1949): 75–85.
"The New Rationalism: Dewey's Theory of Induction," *Journal of Philosophy* 46 (1949): 780–90.
"Toward a Naturalistic 'Non-naturalistic' Ethic," *Philosophical Studies* 2 (1951): 7–11.
"An Analytical Principle of Induction?" *Journal of Philosophy* 49 (1952): 747–9.
"Philosophy of the Social Sciences," *Philosophy of Science* 21 (1954): 140–56.
"Methodological Individualisms: Definition and Reduction," *Philosophy of Science* 25 (1958): 1–22.
"Explanation, Prediction, and 'Imperfect' Knowledge," in *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, vol. 3, ed. Herbert Feigl (Minneapolis, 1962), pp. 231–72.
"Logic and Scientific Method in Research on Teaching," in *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, ed. N. L. Gage (Chicago, 1963), pp. 44–93.
"Meaning and Action," *Philosophy of Science* 30 (1963): 309–24.
"The Philosophy of John Dewey," *Indian*

Journal of Philosophy 3 (1963): 69–101.
"Mind: From Within and From Without,"
*Proceedings and Addresses of the
American Philosophical Association* 45
(1972): 42–55.

Other Relevant Works
"Philosophy in America: 1900–1950," in
American Non-Fiction 1900–1950
(Chicago, 1952), pp. 3–94.
Ed. with Herbert Feigl, *Readings in the
Philosophy of Science* (New York, 1953).
Includes her essay "The Nature and
Function of the Philosophy of Science."
Ed., *Readings in the Philosophy of the Social
Sciences* (New York, 1968). Contains four
essays by Brodbeck.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Pres Addr of
APA v8*, *Proc of APA v57*, *Who Was Who
in Amer v8*, *Women Phils*
Margolis, Joseph. "Reply to a Reaction:
Second Remarks on Brodbeck's
Objectivism," *Philosophy of Science* 33
(1966): 293–300.
Mayeroff, Milton. "The Nature of
Propositions in John Dewey's "Logic": A
Reply to Miss Brodbeck," *Journal of
Philosophy* 47 (1950): 353–8.

Laird Addis

BROGAN, Albert Perley (1889–1983)

Albert P. Brogan was born on 22 July 1889 in
Omaha, Nebraska. From 1907 to 1909 he
attended the University of Nebraska, and then
he transferred to Harvard University, where he
received his BA in 1911, his MA in 1912, and
his PhD in philosophy in 1914. He wrote his
dissertation on "The Problem of Intrinsic
Values." Brogan was appointed instructor in

philosophy at the University of Texas in 1914.
When G. Watts CUNNINGHAM arrived as pro-
fessor of philosophy in 1917, Brogan's title
became adjunct professor. In 1923 he was
promoted to associate professor of philoso-
phy, and from 1925 until his retirement in
1963 he was professor of philosophy. Brogan
died on 9 April 1983 in Austin, Texas.

Brogan guided the early growth of the phi-
losophy department at Texas, as Edwin T.
Mitchell arrived in 1923; George Gentry in
1931; and David L. MILLER in 1934 (all three
were graduates of the University of Chicago).
Brogan also held university posts as Assistant
Dean of the Graduate School from 1932 to
1936, and Dean of the Graduate School from
1936 to 1959. He was a visiting professor at
the University of Chicago and Cornell
University in 1931. Brogan was active in
several professional societies. He was a
member of the American Association for the
Advancement of Science, and served as
President of the Conference of Deans of
Southern Graduate Schools, President of the
Philosophical Society of Texas in 1949, and
President of the Western Division of the
American Philosophical Association in
1931–2.

Brogan devoted much of his philosophical
thought to a relational theory of value, in
which value judgments are always a matter of
comparing the intrinsic goodness of one thing
to that of another. Being relational, intrinsic
values are neither subjective nor so objective
that they exist beyond human knowledge. The
moral values of a group, as an example of
comparative values, can be statistically studied
by questionnaire to reveal rankings and pref-
erences, and then groups (such as the genders,
or geographically separated groups) can be
statistically compared against each other. In
"Moral Valuations About Men and Women"
(1925) Brogan also reveals how moral judg-
ments upon a behavior can vary depending
on whether a man or a woman does it.

Brogan's preferred ethical theory is the
pragmatist theory of ethics as moral problem

solving, as explained in "Ethics as Method" (1926). His "objective pluralism" builds on his relational approach to values. Value judgments are both objective (since contradictory judgments cannot both be true) and plural (since there is no greatest good to encompass or judge all others). Monistic theories (such as the *summum bonum* or hedonistic theories) of value wrongly argue that values cannot be intelligently compared unless they are reduced to some single type of value.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Fundamental Value Universal," *Journal of Philosophy* 16 (1919): 96–104.

"Urban's Axiological System," *Journal of Philosophy* 18 (1921): 197–209.

"A Dilemma About Dilemmas," *Journal of Philosophy* 18 (1921): 566–7.

"A Study in Statistical Ethics," *International Journal of Ethics* 33 (1923): 119–34.

"Group Estimates of Frequency of Misconduct," *International Journal of Ethics* 34 (1924): 254–71.

"Moral Valuations About Men and Women," *International Journal of Ethics* 35 (1925): 105–24.

"Ethics as Method," *International Journal of Ethics* 36 (1926): 263–70.

"Objective Pluralism in the Theory of Value," *International Journal of Ethics* 41 (1931): 287–95.

"Philosophy and the Problem of Value," *Philosophical Review* 42 (1933): 105–29.

"John Locke and Utilitarianism," *Ethics* 69 (1959): 79–93.

"A Criticism of Mr. A. J. Ayer's Revised Account of Moral Judgments," *Journal of Philosophy* 56 (1959): 270–80.

"Aristotle's Logic of Statements About Contingency," *Mind* 76 (1967): 49–61.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v57, *Pres Addr of APA v4*, *Who Was Who in Amer v8*, *Who's Who in Phil*

John R. Shook

BROKMEYER, Henry Conrad
(1826–1906)

Henry Conrad Brokmeyer was born to Frederick William and Sophia Brokmeyer in Minden, Westphalia, Prussia, on 12 August 1826. Late in life, he told Denton SNIDER that he left his parents' home because his mother burned his copy of Goethe's poems. At seventeen he arrived in New York City with twenty-five cents in his pocket, as an indentured servant. Hard work earned his release, and he traveled across the United States as far west as the Rockies, learning various trades along the way.

In 1850 Brokmeyer enrolled at Georgetown College in Kentucky, and in 1852 he transferred to Brown University. At Brown he met Frederick Henry HEDGE, who had published some of the first English translations of post-Kantian German philosophy. Through Hedge and Francis Wayland, President of Brown, Brokmeyer was introduced to American Transcendentalism. Under the influence of Henry David Thoreau, in 1854 Brokmeyer retreated from civilization, moving to a hut in the back woods of Warren County, Missouri. His son, E. C. Brokmeyer, eventually published diaries that Brokmeyer kept during this time, as *A Mechanic's Diary* (1910). Soon after he arrived in Missouri, Brokmeyer began translating the works of Hegel and Goethe into English.

At an 1858 meeting of a St. Louis literary group, Brokmeyer met William T. HARRIS. Harris persuaded the reluctant Brokmeyer to

tutor him in philosophy, particularly the writings of Hegel and Goethe. After fighting as a Union officer during the Civil War, Brokmeyer abandoned the solitary life and became an attorney. His law office was soon a regular meeting place for the St. Louis Hegelians. In a brief political career, Brokmeyer was elected to the St. Louis City Council, and then the state legislature, where he was a chief architect of the state of Missouri's new constitution. In 1876 he served as lieutenant governor and, for a while, as acting governor. In the 1880s he spent some time with the Creek Indians near Muskogee in the present-day state of Oklahoma. He devoted his last years to revising his translation of Hegel's *Science of Logic*, which was never published. He died on 26 July 1906 in St. Louis, Missouri.

Brokmeyer was the central figure in the St. Louis Philosophical Movement from its formative years in the late 1850s through the 1870s. His original studies and interpretations of Hegel and Goethe attracted young intellectuals, particularly in the aftermath of the Civil War. Although by all accounts Brokmeyer conveyed ideas best in conversation, his two chief published works provide insight into his philosophy. *A Mechanic's Diary,* which covers only six months in 1856, reveals Brokmeyer's transition from transcendentalism to Hegelianism. The entries contain reflections on Plato, Aristotle, Locke, Kant, and Hegel, alongside entries about woodpeckers, frogs, and squirrels. Throughout the diary Brokmeyer manifests his exuberance for the United States, and proceeds to show how adaptable Hegelian philosophy is to interpreting and assessing American life.

Brokmeyer based his Hegelianism on the German philosopher's concept of self-activity and self-determination. He saw at once the practical value of such a view, and argued that it was particularly suited to America and to the resolution of internal conflicts. God exists as a self-active, self-relating, and self-determining being. Brokmeyer found the locus of self-activity in Hegel's analysis of self-consciousness. Consciousness in its immediacy is vital feeling. In the awareness of an object, mediation begins. Consciousness must negate other objects and set them aside to discriminate one from the others. A human being is aware of itself through the same process, but here one recognizes the object as itself, other than consciousness, and reaches self-consciousness by negation of otherness. Finally, self-consciousness sees the object of consciousness as its own work, its own selection and interpretation.

Brokmeyer systematically tested everything by its universality, in opposition to the specialization of the new universities. More specifically, the ultimate test of every claim was its standing in Hegel's *Logic*. Whereas self-activity is the foundational idea making the movement of the categories possible in the *Logic*, the categories of the logic itself are presupposed in all mental activity. It is a shame, Brokmeyer claimed, that Hegel did not stylize this all-important study for moderns who ride trains and live in a hustle and bustle world.

On the basis of self-activity and the movement within the *Logic*, Brokmeyer criticized Bronson ALCOTT and New England transcendentalism. He claimed that Alcott recognized only diremption (emanation) from the Absolute or God, but not return of the dirempted multiplicity. Transcendentalism not only had a truncated view of God, but also of human life. It greatly underestimated the importance of institutional life, which is all-important for social stability and the enrichment of individuals.

"Letters on Faust," a two-part article that Brokmeyer published in the St. Louis Hegelians' *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* in 1867 and 1868, exemplifies his use of Hegel in interpreting works of art. Hegel saw works of art as manifesting an age's self-awareness, often reflecting conflicts within a person or nation. Brokmeyer organized Goethe's *Faust* from beginning to end according to its self-reflecting ideas, interspersed with analogies and comments of special interest to American

readers. "Letters on Faust" opens with a critique of the idea of literary criticism. Criticism should not be how the work of art affects the critic, for this says more about the critic than the work itself. It should not be founded on the author's biography, nor present the work according to the prevalent standards of literary criticism. Rather, Brokmeyer aimed at understanding the underlying idea of the poem.

According to Brokmeyer, Kant's claim that we cannot know the thing-in-itself destroys Faust's capacity to receive, produce, and aspire for truth and beauty. As Faust's reason is ensnared in a conflict with itself, and the institutions of society, he is led into mysticism and magic. The practical world collapses into a cause and effect relationship centering on personal gratifications. From there, Faust proceeds to destroy Gretchen and the relationships and feelings within her family. The movement of Goethe's *Faust*, which unfolds the deleterious effects of Kant's philosophy, ends in destruction and death.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Letters on Faust," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 1 (1867): 178–87; 2 (1868): 114–20.
A Mechanic's Diary (Washington, 1910).

Other Relevant Works
Brokmeyer's papers are at the Missouri Historical Society in St. Louis, Missouri.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*
DeArmey, Michael H., and James A. Good, eds. *The St. Louis Hegelians*, 3 vols (Bristol, UK, 2001).
Dodgson, G. R. "An Interpretation of the St. Louis Philosophical Movement," *Journal of Philosophy* 6 (1909): 337–45.
Goetzmann, William H., ed. *The American Hegelians: An Intellectual Episode in the History of Western America* (New York, 1973).
Harmon, Francis. *The Social Philosophy of the St. Louis Hegelians* (New York, 1943).
Pochmann, Henry A. *German Culture in America: Philosophical and Literary Influences, 1600–1900* (Madison, Wisc., 1957).
Snider, Denton J. *A Writer of Books in His Genesis* (St. Louis, 1910).
———, *The St. Louis Movement in Philosophy, Literature, Education, Psychology with Chapters of Autobiography* (St. Louis, 1920).

Michael H. DeArmey

BROMBERGER, Sylvain (1924–)

Sylvain Bromberger was born on 7 July 1924 in Antwerp, Belgium, where his parents had moved from Poland. His entire family fled Belgium when the Nazis invaded in 1940. They eventually made it to the United States by way of Portugal, which they were able to reach at the last minute thanks to Aristides de Sousa Mendes, a Portuguese consul in Bordeaux who helped many Jews escape the Holocaust. (Bromberger's only book, described below, is dedicated to the memory of Sousa Mendes.) The family settled in New York City, where Bromberger attended high school and the École Libre des Hautes Etudes, the Free French University staffed by professors who had escaped from France. He enrolled at Columbia University as an undergraduate in 1942, but was drafted into the US Army during his freshman year, and eventually returned to Europe to fight as an infantryman. In 1946, after his discharge, Bromberger returned to Columbia, where he studied physics and philosophy, graduating with his BA in 1948. His earliest philosophical interests were sparked by Hans REICHENBACH (then visiting New York)

and Ernest NAGEL. After a year of graduate studies at Columbia, Bromberger went to Harvard University, where his most influential teachers were W. V. QUINE, Morton WHITE (his thesis supervisor), and Nelson GOODMAN. These exciting days in philosophy were marked by intense discussions about the relative merits of positivism and the new ordinary language philosophy and Wittgenstein. His dissertation was entitled "The Concept of Explanation" and he received his PhD in philosophy in 1961.

Bromberger was an instructor and lecturer in philosophy at Princeton University from 1954 to 1960, and then associate professor of philosophy at the University of Chicago from 1961 to 1966. In 1966 he went to Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he remained for the rest of his career. It is interesting to note, given his eventual interest in the philosophical foundations of phonology, that Bromberger's first appointment at MIT was actually in linguistics, as a visiting scholar. He was invited in 1967 to join the revitalized philosophy program, which already included Jerrold KATZ, Jerry FODOR, Judith Jarvis THOMSON, and James Thompson. Bromberger was professor of philosophy at MIT from 1967 until his retirement in 1993, and he remains active there as professor emeritus. He regularly taught courses on theories of explanation, erotetic logic (i.e., "the logic of questions"), philosophy of language, and philosophy of science (including, in later years, a seminar he co-taught with Thomas KUHN on natural kinds). He taught courses in linguistics as well, and supervised doctoral students in both areas.

Bromberger's most important publication is his book, *On What We Know We Don't Know* (1992). It collects many of his most important early essays, including classics on explanation ("An Approach to Explanation"), the nature of theories ("A Theory About the Theory of Theory and About the Theory of Theories"), and questions, including especially "why"-questions ("Questions"; "Why-Questions"; "What We Don't Know When We Don't Know Why"). In these papers Bromberger

articulates and develops a highly original alternative to the positivistic conception of science. His conclusive "flagpole" type counter-examples to Hempel's deductive model of explanation are now standard refutations of the positivistic model. Bromberger's alternative conception takes our "ability to formulate and to entertain questions whose answers we know we do not know" (1992, p. 2) to be at the core of scientific endeavors. According to Bromberger, "A science, at any moment of its history, consists of a set of accepted (or at least seriously entertained) propositions, a set of unanswered questions to which these propositions give rise, and a set of principles or devices for establishing the answers to such questions. The evolution of a science is a sequence of related changes among these components." (1992, p. 101)

The last two articles in *On What We Know We Don't Know*, "Types and Tokens in Linguistics" and "The Ontology of Phonology" (with the famous MIT phonologist Morris Halle), were written near the end of Bromberger's teaching career. These papers signal a shift in his interests toward providing an interpretation of generative linguistics, especially phonology, that avoids Platonism and instrumentalism. His recent paper, "The Contents of Phonological Signs" (1997), continues to advance this important, but unfortunately neglected, set of issues.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Questions," *Journal of Philosophy* 63 (1966): 597–606.

"Why-Questions," in *Mind and Cosmos: Essays in Contemporary Science and Philosophy*, vol. 3, ed. R. G. Colodny (Pittsburgh, 1966), pp. 86–111.

"Science and the Forms of Ignorance," in *Observation and Theory in Science*, ed. Maurice Mandelbaum (Baltimore, Md., 1971), pp. 45–67.

"On the Relationship between Phonetics and Phonology," with Morris Halle, in *Invariance and Variability in Speech*

Processes, ed. Joseph S. Perkell and Dennis H. Klatt (Mahwah, N.J., 1986), pp. 510–20.

"What We Don't Know When We Don't Know Why," in *Scientific Inquiry in Philosophical Perspective*, ed. Nicholas Rescher (Lanham, Md., 1987), pp. 75–104.

"Rational Ignorance," *Synthese* 74 (1988): 47–64.

"Why Phonology Is Different," with Morris Halle, *Linguistic Inquiry* 20 (1989): 51–70.

On What We Know We Don't Know (Chicago, 1992).

"The Ontology of Phonology," with Morris Halle, in *Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science*, ed. D. Prawitz, B. Skyrms, and D. Westerstahl (Oxford, 1994), pp. 725–43.

"Natural Kinds and Questions," in *Essays on Jaakko Hintikka's Epistemology and Philosophy of Science*, ed. Matti Sintonen (Amsterdam, 1997), pp. 149–63.

"The Contents of Phonological Signs: A Comparison Between Their Use in Derivational Theories and in Optimality Theories," with Morris Halle, in *Derivations and Constraints in Phonology*, ed. Iggy Rocca (Oxford, 1997), pp. 93–123.

Further Reading

Belnap, Nuel D., Jr. "Questions, Answers, and Presuppositions," *Journal of Philosophy* 63 (1966): 609–10.

Teller, Paul. "On Why-Questions," *Noûs* 8 (1974): 371–80.

Leonard Clapp

BROTHERSTON, Bruce Wallace
(1877–1947)

Bruce W. Brotherston was born on 12 August 1877 in Cobourg, Ontario, Canada. When he was still a child he moved with his family to North Adams, Massachusetts. Without a formal high school education, Brotherston worked as a tinsmith while preparing himself for college. He received his BA from Williams College in 1903 and a BST from Andover Newton Seminary in 1906. He remained there for an additional year as a teaching fellow. For the next thirteen years Brotherston held Congregational pastorates in North Conway and Intervale in New Hampshire, and at Gilbertville and Milton in Massachusetts. As a minister (on occasion still acting as a tinsmith – he once personally re-roofed his church), Brotherston preached the social gospel until a growing dissonance between his own liberal ideals and the conservative views of his parishioners made him change his interests towards philosophy.

Brotherston continued his studies at Harvard on an Andover Fellowship, earning his PhD in 1923 with a dissertation entitled "Moral Evil and the Social Conscience." That same year Brotherston became a professor in philosophy at St. Lawrence University. In 1930 he accepted a position at Tufts College, where he became Fletcher Professor of Philosophy. He also held the chair of philosophy and religion in the School of Religion. Brotherston remained at Tufts until his retirement in 1944. After his retirement Brotherston acquired a greenhouse in Holliston, Massachusetts, where he grew flowers commercially until his death there on 17 April 1947.

Influenced by William JAMES and John DEWEY, Brotherston was a pragmatist in philosophy and a liberal in religion. He also took great interest in Charles PEIRCE's form of empiricism and George H. MEAD's social behaviorism. Many of his articles offered searching criticisms of each of the pragmatists, in search of a pragmatic empiricism purified of

any metaphysical presuppositions. Brotherston also wrote philosophical essays on religion and political theory. He authored one book, *A Philosophy for Liberalism* (1934). Work on a second book was interrupted by his death.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Concept of Responsibility," *International Journal of Ethics* 39 (1929): 469–80.
"The Empirical Method in Philosophy," *Journal of Philosophy* 30 (1933): 449–58.
A Philosophy for Liberalism (Boston, 1934).
"The Empirical Spirit," *The Monist* 45 (1935): 186–98.
"The Philosophic Importance of the Determining Tendency," *Journal of Philosophy* 32 (1935): 67–76.
"Firstness," *Journal of Philosophy* 36 (1939): 533–43.
"The Wider Setting of 'Felt Transition'," *Journal of Philosophy* 39 (1942): 97–104.
"The Genius of Pragmatic Empiricism," *Journal of Philosophy* 40 (1943): 14–21, 29–39.
"Sensuous and Non-sensuous Perception in Empirical Philosophy," *Journal of Philosophy* 40 (1943): 589–96.
"The Use of Reason in Morals," *Journal of Philosophy* 43 (1946): 561–72.

Other Relevant Works
A file on Brotherstone is held by the Andover-Harvard Theological Library at Harvard University.
"What Christianity Means to Me," in *Tufts Papers on Religion* (Boston, 1939).

Further Reading
Proc of APA in Phil Rev v58, *Who's Who in Phil*
Ziegler, Albert F. "Bruce Brotherston, John Calvin and Hosea Ballou," manuscript at Andover-Harvard Theological Library.

Cornelis de Waal

BROWN, Harold Chapman (1879–1943)

Harold Chapman Brown was born on 2 April 1879 in Springfield, Massachusetts. He was educated at Williams College, receiving his BA in 1901, and at Harvard University, receiving his MA in 1903 and PhD in philosophy in 1905. He was an instructor in philosophy at Columbia University from 1905 to 1913, and then joined the faculty of Stanford University in 1913, to replace the departing George H. SABINE. He was professor of philosophy at Stanford, and also served as department head, for many years. He was a visiting lecturer at several other universities. A member of Phi Beta Kappa, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the Palo Alto Cooperative Society, in his later years he was active with the American-Russian Institute in San Francisco. Brown was a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1924–5 and in 1932–3. Brown retired in 1943 and died on 19 November 1943 in Stanford, California.

Brown published more than fifty articles on a variety of philosophical topics, ranging from philosophy of mathematics and logic to philosophy of language and social and political philosophy. In "The Logic of Mr. Russell" (1911) he argued that Russellian logistic put what he called a "new face" on old problems. He argued, in particular, that Bertrand Russell's theory of types is merely a rediscovery of universes of discourse, or domains, which John Venn had defined and which specifies and restricts the sets or terms to be taken into consideration. He was an opponent of F. C. S. Schiller's pragmatic and psychologistic logic, and in favor of formal logic as logistic, defending both Russell's logicism and his notion of truth and validity. Brown contributed the essay "A Logician in the Field of Psychology" to *The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell* in the Library of Living Philosophers.

Brown had some sympathies with American naturalism and pragmatism, of the form that John DEWEY defended. William JAMES and E. B.

Holt exerted an early influence on him, and thereafter he opposed scientific reductionism and materialism in favor of a pluralistic and emergent naturalism of infinite levels. Without reducing mind to matter, Brown argued that mental states and abilities are produced by physiological events. He wrote, "The self is then nothing but the organism when its more habitual and characteristic ways of action are abstractly emphasized as the character of a self, and when certain evaluating epithets are applied by the observer." (1933, p. 153)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Logic of Mr. Russell," *Journal of Philosophy* 8 (1911): 85–91.
"Value and Potentiality," *Journal of Philosophy* 11 (1914): 29–37.
"Human Nature and the State," *International Journal of Ethics* 26 (1916): 177–92.
"Intelligence and Mathematics," in *Creative Intelligence: Essays in the Pragmatic Attitude* (New York, 1917), pp. 118–75.
"Social Psychology and the Problem of a Higher Nationality," *International Journal of Ethics* 28 (1917): 19–30.
"The Definition of Logic," *Journal of Philosophy* 16 (1919): 533–41.
"Scientific Thought and Reality," *Journal of Philosophy* 21 (1924): 393–410.
"The Material World – Snark or Boojum?" *Journal of Philosophy* 22 (1925): 197–214.
"Contingency and Necessity in Nature," *Journal of Philosophy* 26 (1929): 393–401.
"Mind – An Event in Physical Nature," *Philosophical Review* 42 (1933): 130–55.
"Ethics from the View Point of Modern Science," *Journal of Philosophy* 34 (1937): 113–21.
"A Logician in the Field of Psychology," in *The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (Evanston, Ill., 1944).

Other Relevant Works
Brown's papers are at Stanford University.
"A Philosophic Mind in the Making," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, vol. 1, ed. George P. Adams and William P. Montague (New York, 1930), pp. 169–95.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v3, Who's Who in Phil

Irving H. Anellis

BROWN, William Adams (1865–1943)

William Adams Brown was born in New York City on 29 December 1865. He received a BA from Yale University in 1886 and an MA in economics in 1888. He then earned a BD from Union Theological Seminary in 1890 and was awarded a graduate fellowship for study in Berlin during 1890–92, where he studied under Adolf von Harnack. He was ordained to the Presbyterian ministry in 1893 by the Presbytery of New York. He earned his PhD in philosophy from Yale University in 1901. Brown spent his entire professional career at Union Theological Seminary, teaching church history (1892–3) and systematic theology (until 1930) and then serving as research professor of applied Christianity (1930–36). He also took a leading role in reorganizing the administration of Yale University, serving as a member of the governing board from 1917 to 1930, and as acting provost of Yale during the 1919–20 academic year. He also served as acting president of Union Theological Seminary in 1925, and held many offices in the Presbyterian Church and ecumenical organizations. He died on 15 December 1943 in New York City.

A champion of the liberal spirit in theology, Brown emphasized an empirical approach to Christianity, asserting that theological doctrines must be reformulated on the basis of a personal experience of Christ and then lived out in social service. Grounded in the theology of Harnack

and Albrecht Ritschl, Brown struggled throughout his career to integrate modern standards of scholarship with the doctrinal positions of the Presbyterian Church. He focused on "the historic personality of Jesus Christ" as the vitalizing essence of faith, through which we directly experience God's self-revelation. On that empirical foundation, he reinterpreted inherited beliefs in light of contemporary scientific and historical approaches to Christian texts and doctrines, and did this in order to communicate effectively what he understood to be the core revealed values of Christianity. His goal was to produce a gospel-centered activism that could transform society.

Brown influenced the development of liberal Protestantism in America mainly as a teacher and church leader rather than as a theological innovator. His first two books, *The Essence of Christianity* (1902) and *Christian Theology in Outline* (1906), set out his theological agenda and were very influential in academic circles. The rest of his publications promoted the progressive ideals of the social gospel movement to a more popular audience. Perhaps his most profound impact resulted from his embodiment of those ideals in ecumenical and social service projects. He was a leading activist in the international ecumenical movements that led to the formation of the World Council of Churches (founded in 1948) and he served on the committee that drafted the constitution for the World Council. He helped organize the Universal Christian Conferences on Life and Work in Stockholm (1925) and Oxford (1937) and the World Conferences on Faith and Order in Lausanne (1927) and Edinburgh (1937). He also assisted the founding of the Union Settlement, a settlement house established in 1895 on the upper East Side of New York City, which provided social outreach to the poor and ministerial training for students of the seminary. Brown served as President of the Union Settlement Association from 1917 to 1919 and he was an active member of the board of directors until 1930.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Essence of Christianity: A Study in the History of Definition (New York and Edinburgh, 1902).

Christian Theology in Outline (New York and Edinburgh, 1906).

The Christian Hope: A Study in the Doctrine of Immortality (New York and London, 1912).

Modern Theology and the Preaching of the Gospel (New York, 1914).

Is Christianity Practicable? (New York, 1916).

New Thoughts on an Old Book (New York, 1920).

The Church in America (New York, 1922).

Imperialistic Religion and the Religion of Democracy: A Study in Social Psychology (New York, 1923).

The Life of Prayer in a World of Science (New York, 1926).

Beliefs That Matter: A Theology for Laymen (New York, 1928).

Pathways to Certainty (New York and London, 1930).

God At Work: A Study of the Supernatural (New York, 1933).

The Education of American Ministers: Ministerial Education in America, vol. 1 (New York, 1934).

The Church: Catholic and Protestant (New York, 1935). Also published as *Your Church and Mine* (London, 1935).

Finding God in a New World (New York, 1935).

The Church and State in Contemporary America (New York, 1936).

The Minister, His World and His Work: A Study of Some Pressing Tasks and Problems of Present-Day Protestantism (Nashville, Tenn., 1937).

The Case for Theology in the University (Chicago, 1938).

A Creed for Free Men: A Study of Loyalties (New York, 1941).

The New Order in the Church (New York, 1943).

How to Think of Christ (New York, 1945).

Other Relevant Works

Brown's papers are at Union Theological Seminary.

Morris Ketchum Jesup: A Character Sketch (New York, 1910).

"Seeking Beliefs that Matter," in *Contemporary American Theology: Theological Autobiographies*, vol. 1, ed. Vergilius Ferm (New York, 1933), pp. 63–102.

A Teacher and His Times: A Story of Two Worlds (New York, 1940).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Cavert, Samuel M., and Henry P. Van Dusen, eds. *The Church Through Half a Century: Essays in Honor of William Adams Brown* (New York, 1936).

Dorrien, Gary. *The Making of American Liberal Theology: Idealism, Realism, and Modernity, 1900–1950*, vol. 2 (Louisville, Kent., 2003).

Kraus, C. Norman. *The Principle of Authority in the Theology of B. B. Warfield, William Adams Brown, and Gerald Birney Smith*. PhD dissertation, Duke University (Durham, N.C., 1961).

Jennifer G. Jesse

BROWNELL, Baker (1887–1965)

Baker Brownell was born on 12 December 1887 in St. Charles, Illinois. Entering the University of Washington in 1906, he transferred to Northwestern in 1907 where he earned his BA in philosophy in 1910 after studying for a year at Harvard. During his time at Harvard, he also began work on his master's degree, taking courses from Josiah ROYCE and George SANTAYANA. He was awarded his MA in philosophy from Harvard in 1911. Harvard also awarded him the James Walker Traveling Fellow in Philosophy in 1912, which he used to travel to Tübingen University in Germany and to Cambridge University, where he studied under Bertrand Russell. He started teaching at the Kansas State Normal College in Emporia in 1913, upon his return from Europe. In 1917, he began his military career, going from enlisted man to officer, and serving in both the Army and the Navy, and finally the National Guard. His service period included the Mexican border campaign and World War I, when he began to write poetry that was published in magazines like *The New Republic*, *Poetry*, and *The Dial*.

Brownell taught English at the University of Idaho in 1919–20, wrote editorials for the *Chicago Daily News* during 1920–21, and in 1921 started teaching at Northwestern University, lecturing in editorial writing. He held an appointment as professor of contemporary thought in Northwestern's School of Journalism from 1925 to 1934, and in the College of Liberal Arts from 1934 to 1947. Brownell was then professor of philosophy at Northwestern from 1947 until his retirement in 1953. He traveled extensively and was a visiting lecturer at the University of Kansas City, University of Chicago, University of Wisconsin, and the Garrett Biblical Institute.

The courses Brownell taught over the years were designed to help students integrate and organize into a unified intellectual understanding the diverse subjects they had studied. His course in Contemporary Thought at Northwestern, the first of its kind in the United States, consisted of weekly lectures by prominent scholars in areas ranging over history, biology, psychology, physics, art, economics, and philosophy. Brownell thought this integration of education would be a key element to prevent the breaking down of the "human community." Preventing or mitigating the effects of the breakdown of the small commu-

nity was his lifelong passion, expressed first in *The New Universe* (1926), and then in 1929 in the twelve-volume series *Man and His World*, a collection of works that he edited, which includes sixty lectures by a variety of professors who taught in his Contemporary Thought courses. In his concern for the preservation of the "grassroots" of society and its importance within the context of the larger human community, he was a prolific writer over many areas ranging from sociology and anthropology to aesthetics and architecture. In 1937 he wrote *Architecture and Modern Life* with Frank Lloyd WRIGHT. In his retirement, Brownell continued to write until his death on 5 April 1965 in Fairhope, Alabama.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The New Universe: An Outline of the Worlds in Which We Live (New York, 1926). Reprinted as *The New Universe: A Biography of the Worlds in Which We Live* (New York, 1929).
A Preface to the Universe, with T. V. Smith, Clarence Darrow, et al. (New York, 1929).
Earth Is Enough: An Essay in Religious Realism (New York, 1933).
Architecture and Modern Life, with Frank Lloyd Wright (New York, 1937).
Art Is Action: A Discussion of Nine Arts in a Modern World (New York, 1939).
The Philosopher in Chaos: An Attempt to Make Head and Tail of the Modern World (New York, 1941).
Economic Order and Religion, with Frank Knight and Thornton Merriam (New York, 1945).
The Human Community: Its Philosophy and Practice in Times of Crisis (New York, 1950).
The College and the Community: A Critical Study of Higher Education (New York, 1952).

Other Relevant Works
Brownell's papers are at Northwestern University.
Ed., *Man and His World: Northwestern University Essays in Contemporary Thought*, 12 vols (Chicago, 1929).
The Other Illinois (New York, 1958).

Further Reading
Nat Cycl Amer Bio v51, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*, *Who's Who in Phil*

James C. Poteet II

BROWNING, Grayson Douglas (1929–)

Douglas Browning was born on 7 March 1929 in Seminole, Oklahoma. He entered the University of Texas in 1946, but joined the Air Force in 1948 and served until 1952. Returning to the University of Texas, he received his MA in English in 1955 and his PhD in philosophy in 1958. Browning's master's thesis was on the poetry of Dylan Thomas, and later in 1964 he published a book of poetry titled *Poems and Visions*. His dissertation in philosophy was on "Judgment and Motivation in Contemporary Intuitionist Ethics." From his teachers he learned analytical skills but he did not abandon his passion for metaphysics and the larger questions of human experience. Browning became interested and influenced by the works of the American pragmatists studying under the direction of David MILLER (scholar and student of George Herbert MEAD), and his thought was also influenced by other nonanalytic philosophers, such as Alfred North WHITEHEAD, Ernst Cassirer, and José Ortega y Gasset.

In 1958 Browning accepted a philosophy position at the University of Miami, and he was promoted up to full professor by 1968. While at Miami he published a number of articles and one book, *Act and Agent* (1964),

and edited another book. In 1969–70 he was a visiting professor at the University of Texas, which became a permanent position as professor of philosophy in 1970. He was chair of the philosophy department from 1972 to 1976. He was President of the Florida Philosophical Association in 1967; the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology in 1972; and the Southwestern Philosophical Society in 1977. Because of the breadth of his philosophical interest and expertise, as well as his wholehearted commitment to his graduate students, he directed nearly thirty dissertations. His influence is felt in the impact he has had on his students, who have become scholars in ethics and pragmatism. Browning's inquiries in metaphilosophy and metaphysics culminated with the publication of *Ontology and the Practical Arena* in 1990. He retired from Texas in 1999.

Browning's numerous articles and books are on a wide range of philosophical subject matters. These methodological commitments stand out. (1) The only legitimate starting and ending point for any philosophical investigation is our own everyday, concrete experience. Experience is nothing more nor less than that which appears, rough and unfinished as it usually is, in our lives from day to day. (2) Any responsible guide to metaphysical speculation must rest upon a careful survey of how things actually make their appearance in our lives. One must learn to be painfully attentive and honest about how the things that we find in our experience show their faces. (3) The practical stance of everyday life, that within which the agent who considers what to do in the particular situation at hand is also an interactive constituent, has been neglected in philosophy when it should be primary for metaphysical and ethical inquiry. (4) The project of proposing criteria for the sorting or classification of all of the things of everyday life, as they actually appear there, is ill founded. It distracts us from the brute autonomy of those things as they make their appearance in their own right.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Act and Agent (Coral Gables, Fla., 1964).
Ed., *Philosophers of Process* (New York, 1965; 2nd edn, New York, 1998).
Poems and Visions (South Miami, Fla., 1968).
Ontology and the Practical Arena (University Park, Penn., 1990).

Other Relevant Works
"Sorting and Grading," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 38 (1960): 234–45.
"The Moral Act," *Philosophical Quarterly* 12 (1962): 97–108.
"The Feeling of Freedom," *Review of Metaphysics* 18 (1964): 123–46.
"Creativity, Correspondence, and Statements About the Future," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 28 (1968): 514–36.
"Quine and the Ontological Enterprise," *Review of Metaphysics* 26 (1973): 492–510.
"Believing in Natural Kinds," *Southwestern Journal of Philosophy* 9 (1978): 135–48.
"Some Meanings of Automobiles," in *Technology and Human Affairs*, ed. Larry Hickman and Azizah Al-Hibri (St. Louis, 1980).
"Sameness Through Change and the Coincidence of Properties," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 49 (1988): 103–21.
"Necessity in Dewey's 'Logic'," in *Frontiers in American Philosophy*, vol. 1, ed. Robert W. Burch and Herman J. Saatkamp, Jr. (College Station, Tex., 1992), pp. 221–9.
"Dewey and Ortega on the Starting Point," *Proceedings of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 34 (1998): 69–92.
"Designation, Characterization, and Theory in Dewey's Logic," in *Dewey's Logical*

Theory: New Studies and Interpretations,
ed. F. Thomas Burke, Robert B. Talisse,
and D. Micah Hester (Nashville, Tenn.,
2002), pp. 160–79.

Further Reading
Harris, George W., and Stephen Leighton,
eds. *The Ontological and the Practical:
Essays in Honor of Douglas Browning*,
Southwest Philosophy Review, vol. 11
suppl. (Fulton, Miss., 1995).

Gregory Fernando Pappas

BROWNSON, Orestes Augustus
(1803–76)

Orestes A. Brownson was born on 16
September 1803 in Stockbridge, Vermont, and
died on 17 April 1876 in Detroit, Michigan.
Brownson was a prolific essayist, theologian,
political philosopher, and literary critic, and
was a well-known figure in the New England
transcendentalist movement. He was largely
self-educated; his only formal schooling was at
the Ballston Academy in New York, where he
was enrolled for only about a year. Important
formative influences included the King James
Bible, Watt's *Psalms and Divine Songs*, *The
Franklin Primer*, Jonathan Edwards's *The
History of Redemption*, and a range of English
classics in literature and poetry. He was par-
ticularly drawn to theology and philosophy,
especially as he encountered these subjects
through the New England Presbyterian,
Universalist, and Unitarian traditions. At the
age of twenty-two Brownson was ordained as
a Universalist minister, and began his literary
career as a frequent contributor of sermons to
*The Gospel Advocate and Impartial
Investigator*.

Brownson's early theological and philo-
sophical convictions were animated by a
curious combination of Christianity and
romantic naturalism. In keeping with much
of the literature of the early nineteenth-century
transcendentalists, his earliest essays were
highly critical of the "otherworldliness" of
orthodox Christianity. Like Ralph Waldo
EMERSON, George Ripley, William Ellery
Channing, and Amos ALCOTT, Brownson
looked inward to the individual conscience for
a knowledge of things divine. The conscience
is akin to the voice of God, indeed a portion of
divine being itself implanted upon the human
soul. In calling into question the traditional
hierarchy of being, Brownson's radical uni-
versalism naturally invited reflection upon the
possibility of progressive advance toward a
more divine-like perfection of the human con-
dition. It was in this way that the religious
views of the late 1820s and 1830s developed
a pronounced political component, for
Brownson felt powerfully drawn toward issues
of social justice as a function of his inner-
worldly spirituality. He was particularly inter-
ested in the utopian speculations of Robert
Owen, Francis Wright, William Ellery
Channing, William Godwin, and Comte de
Saint-Simon. This interest is reflected in
Brownson's first book, *New Views of
Christianity, Society, and the Church* (1836),
a work inspired by the neo-Gnosticism of the
French socialist Comte de Saint-Simon. In this
brief volume Brownson expressed his faith in
the immanent unfolding of a purified civiliza-
tion that would be free of all political and
social antagonisms. Similar expectations of
utopian transformation, driven by profound
religious conviction, are contained in the
proto-Marxist essay "The Laboring Classes"
(1840) and "Church of the Future" (1842),
collected in *The Works of Orestes Brownson*
(1882–7).

During the early 1840s, however, Brownson
began a thorough reconsideration of his theo-
logical and philosophical convictions, and the
politics that stemmed from them. This process
would eventually produce one of the more
compelling American conservative minds of

the nineteenth century. Upon studying the work of fellow transcendentalist Theodore Parker, Brownson began to suspect that the form of revolutionary socialism they shared was built upon a philosophically weak foundation. As retold some years later in his autobiography *The Convert*, Brownson sensed that his religious commitment to the "religion of humanity" would lead not to utopia but, in effect, to the death of God. Like some later critics of modernity, Brownson was disturbed by the nihilistic implications of those who desire "to be as gods" and recreate the world according to a human standard of justice. Spiritual longing, he reasoned, must ultimately identify the divine transcendent as the source of all human progress, both spiritually and socially. In developing his critique of the "religion of humanity" school, Brownson was particularly influenced by Pierre Leroux's philosophy of participatory consciousness, and the correlative doctrine of divine-human communion.

Brownson's acceptance of transcendent divine being as the source of human good meant that revolutionary socialism must lose its appeal, for God's creation contained within it all that was necessary for fulfilling humanity's spiritual longing. This meant a return to orthodox Christianity. Under the influence of Leroux, Brownson began to see the figure of Christ as more than a mere example of the perfect humanitarian. The perfection of Christ became, as it were, a link to God himself, and therefore the very incarnation of the communion principle ("The Mediatorial Life of Jesus," 1842). The idea reestablished for Brownson a more traditional understanding of the hierarchy of being, and the necessity of human dependence upon a transcendent God. Moreover, Brownson concluded that only the Catholic theological and spiritual tradition could uphold this primal distinction between the divine and human. All varieties of Protestantism, insofar as they held to individualistic epistemological assumptions, were bound to degenerate into subjectivism and a concomitant state of moral and ethical nihilism ("Protestantism Ends in Transcendentalism," 1846). Under Protestantism, the human is severed from the divine, and the search for meaning in both personal and social existence is frustrated. It was from such conclusions that Brownson, in a remarkable about-face from his early career, joined the Catholic Church in 1844.

Following his radical change of views, Brownson became a pariah in New England intellectual circles. Even so, he continued his literary career through his own *Brownson's Quarterly Review* and Isaac HECKER's *Catholic World*. In his later work Brownson mainly occupied himself with two tasks: presenting the philosophical and theological case for Catholicism over and against Protestant prejudices and assumptions, and presenting his own unique political philosophy concerning Catholicism and the American regime. He was especially concerned with the familiar charge in his day that a democratic regime is incompatible with the Catholic faith.

Often at odds with the American hierarchy of his day, Brownson was insistent that only a vibrant and highly visible Catholic cultural presence could sustain American democracy. He argued that the success of the American experiment in liberty depended upon an adequate moral foundation, and such can only be supplied by an authoritative (i.e., Catholic) moral teaching regarding the inherent worth and dignity of all human beings. Moreover, according to Brownson, the American Constitutional order is well founded to cultivate this cultural presence because of the freedom guaranteed to Catholics by the principles of toleration and the limited state. In no other nation does the Church find so much freedom to carry out its spiritual and civilizational mission. Brownson develops this argument in one of the seminal works in American Catholic political philosophy, *The American Republic: Its Constitution, Tendencies, and Destiny* (1865).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

New Views of Christianity, Society, and the Church (Boston, 1836).

Essays and Reviews, Chiefly on Theology, Politics, and Socialism (New York, 1852).

The Convert; or, Leaves from My Experience (New York, 1857; 2nd edn 1877).

The American Republic: Its Constitution, Tendencies, and Destiny (New York, 1865).

The Works of Orestes Brownson, 20 vols, ed. Henry F. Brownson (Detroit, 1882–7).

Other Relevant Works

Brownson's papers are at the University of Notre Dame.

Literary, Scientific, and Political Views of Orestes A. Brownson, ed. Henry F. Brownson (New York, 1893).

The Brownson Reader, ed. Alvin S. Ryan (New York, 1955).

Orestes Brownson: Selected Political Essays, ed. Russell Kirk (New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1990).

Selected Writings, ed. Patrick W. Carey (New York, 1991).

The Early Works of Orestes A. Brownson, 4 vols, ed. Patrick Carey (Milwaukee, Wisc., 2000–2003).

Orestes A. Brownson: Works in Political Philosophy, vol. 1, ed. Gregory S. Butler (Wilmington, Del., 2003).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v7*, *Oxford Comp Phil*

Butler, Gregory S. *In Search of the American Spirit: The Political Thought of Orestes Brownson* (Carbondale, Ill., 1992).

Carey, Patrick W. *Orestes A. Brownson: American Religious Weathervane* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 2004).

Gilhooley, Leonard. *Contradiction and Dilemma: Orestes Brownson and the American Idea* (New York, 1972).

Herrera, R. A. *Orestes A. Brownson: Sign of Contradiction* (Wilmington, Del., 1999).

Lapati, Americo D. *Orestes A. Brownson* (New York, 1965).

Marshall, Hugh. *Orestes Brownson and the American Republic* (Washington, D.C., 1971).

Maynard, Theodore. *Orestes Brownson: Yankee, Radical, Catholic* (New York, 1943).

Raemers, Sidney A. *America's Foremost Philosopher* (Washington, D.C., 1931).

Roemer, Lawrence. *Brownson on Democracy and the Trend Toward Socialism* (New York, 1953).

Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr. *Orestes A. Brownson: A Pilgrim's Progress* (Boston, 1939).

Gregory S. Butler

BRUMBAUGH, Robert Sherrick
(1918–92)

Robert S. Brumbaugh was born on 2 December 1918 in Oregon, Illinois. He attended the University of Chicago, receiving his BA in 1938, MA in 1938, and PhD in philosophy in 1942. His dissertation was on "The Role of Mathematics in Plato's Dialectic," working primarily with Richard McKeon. After service in the US Army during World War II from 1943 to 1946, he was assistant professor of philosophy at Bowdoin College from 1946 to 1948, and at the University of Indiana from 1948 to 1950. In 1951 Brumbaugh became assistant professor of phi-

losophy at Yale University. He was promoted up to full professor by 1961 and taught at Yale for the rest of his career, retiring in 1988. Brumbaugh died on 14 July 1992 in North Haven, Connecticut.

Brumbaugh's scholarship interests were concentrated in Greek philosophy, metaphysics, and philosophy of education. He was research fellow at the American School for Classical Studies in Athens in 1962–3, and a Fulbright visiting professor at Hebrew University in Jerusalem in 1967. He also was a Morse Fellow in 1954–5 and a Guggenheim Fellow in 1976–7. He was a member of the Society for Ancient Greek Philosophy; the American Philosophical Association; the Metaphysical Society of America (serving as President in 1965–6); the Association for Process Philosophy of Education (President in 1986–8); the American Association of University Professors (chapter President in 1961–2 and member of national council during 1975–8); the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences; and Phi Beta Kappa.

Besides Brumbaugh's several studies of Plato and Greek philosophy, he attempted in *Plato for the Modern Age* (1962), *Philosophical Themes in Modern Education* (1972), and other writings to reveal how mistaken metaphysical assumptions have shaped modern life and society, not always to our benefit. In the 1970s, he turned his talents from his mathematical explorations of Plato's dialectics toward an attempt to decipher the mysteriously encoded "Voynich manuscript," a challenge that had defeated many others, including philosopher William R. NEWBOLD. Introduced by Charles HARTSHORNE to process philosophy at Chicago, Brumbaugh adopted some of A. N. WHITEHEAD's metaphysical and educational views, and incorporated them into his own metaphysical speculations on time, change, and reality. His *Unreality and Time* (1984) gathers together most of his best efforts on speculative metaphysics. Brumbaugh's study of the entire history of Western philosophy culminated in his theories about the deep interre-

lations among major systems of thought, presented in *Western Philosophic Systems and Their Cyclic Transformations* (1992).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Spirit of Western Philosophy: A Historical Interpretation Including Selections from the Major European Philosophers, with Newton P. Stallknecht (New York, 1950).

The Compass of Philosophy: An Essay in Intellectual Orientation, with Newton P. Stallknecht (New York, 1954).

Plato's Mathematical Imagination: The Mathematical Passages in the Dialogues and Their Interpretation (Bloomington, Ind., 1954).

Plato on the One: The Hypotheses in the Parmenides (New Haven, Conn., 1961).

Plato for the Modern Age (New York, 1962).

The Philosophers of Greece (New York, 1964; Albany, N.Y., 1981).

Ancient Greek Gadgets and Machines (New York, 1966).

Philosophical Themes in Modern Education, with Nathaniel M. Lawrence (Boston, 1972).

The Most Mysterious Manuscript: The Voynich "Roger Bacon" Cipher Manuscript (Carbondale, Ill., 1978).

Whitehead, Process Philosophy, and Education (Albany, N.Y., 1982).

Unreality and Time (Albany, N.Y., 1984).

Platonic Studies of Greek Philosophy: Form, Arts, Gadgets, and Hemlock (Albany, N.Y., 1989).

Western Philosophic Systems and Their Cyclic Transformations (Carbondale, Ill., 1992).

Other Relevant Works

"An Aristotelian Defense of 'Non-Aristotelian' Logics," *Journal of Philosophy* 48 (1951): 582–5.

"Aristotle's Outline of the Problems of First Philosophy," *Review of Metaphysics* 7 (1954): 511–21.

"Kinds of Time: An Excursion in First Philosophy," in *Experience, Existence and*

the Good, ed. Irwin C. Lieb (Carbondale, Ill., 1961), pp. 119–25.

Ed. with Nathaniel M. Lawrence, *Philosophers on Education: Six Essays on the Foundations of Western Thought* (Boston, 1963).

"Logic and Time," *Review of Metaphysics* 18 (1965): 649–56.

"The Trial of Socrates," in *Six Trials*, ed. Robert S. Brumbaugh (New York, 1969), pp. 9–23.

"Applied Metaphysics and Social Unrest," *Metaphilosophy* 1 (1970): 66–70.

"Changes of Value Order and Choices in Time," in *Value and Valuation: Axiological Studies in Honor of Robert S. Hartman*, ed. John W. Davis (Knoxville, Tenn., 1972).

"Cosmography: The Problem of Modern Systems," *Review of Metaphysics* 26 (1973): 511–21.

"Robert Hartman's Formal Axiology: An Extension," *Journal of Value Inquiry* 11 (1977): 259–63.

"Plato's Ideal Curriculum and Contemporary Philosophy of Education," *Educational Theory* 37 (1987): 169–77.

Further Reading

Benson, Garth, and Bryant Griffith, eds. *Process, Epistemology, and Education: Recent Work in Educational Process Philosophy: Essays in Honour of Robert S. Brumbaugh* (Toronto, 1996).

"Brumbaugh, Robert Sherrick 1918–1992," in *Contemporary Authors, New Revision Series*, vol. 70 (Detroit, 1998), pp. 111–12.

Hendley, Brian P. "Robert Brumbaugh: Towards a Process Philosophy of Education," *Process Studies* 17 (1988): 227–31.

———, ed. *Plato, Time, and Education: Essays in Honor of Robert S. Brumbaugh* (Albany, N.Y., 1987). Contains a bibliography of Brumbaugh's writings.

John R. Shook

BRUNSWIK, Egon (1903–55)

Egon Brunswik was born on 17 March 1903 in Budapest, Hungary and died on 7 July 1955 in Berkeley, California. Growing up as a descendent of a well-known family most of whose male family members served the Austro-Hungarian crown as civil servants and engineers, Brunswik was destined for higher education. Before turning to the study of psychology, he spent two years studying engineering. In 1927 he graduated from the University of Vienna with a degree as a teacher of mathematics and physics and a doctorate in psychology. His dissertation title was "Strukturmonismus und Physik." Brunswik's dissertation contained a critical appraisal of the philosophical aspects of modern physics that had found application in the field of Gestalt psychology. The psychologist Karl Bühler and the philosopher Moritz Schlick were on his doctoral advisory committee. While Bühler and Schlick shared the general quest for an overarching perspective on the relationship between the sciences and for the appropriate positioning of psychology as a science, they pursued starkly contrasting programs with regard to this general issue; Bühler's was informed by the study of language, Schlick's by an analysis of the development of physics. One was therefore led to align psychology with a general theory of signs, the other with physiology and even with a vision of a physics of brain mechanisms.

Brunswik similarly sought to identify a conceptual basis for psychology. He felt strongly that psychology as a relatively recent science should be careful about uncritically adopting principles from other sciences to guide its mode of inquiry and the questions it would undertake to study. In its most developed form, his proposal appears in a 1952 paper, "The Conceptual Framework of Psychology," published in the *International Encyclopedia of Unified Science*.

After receiving his doctorate, Brunswik continued his academic career at the Vienna

Psychological Institute, then under the directorship of Karl Bühler (see Benetka 1997). As a main assistant to Bühler he took charge of much of the experimental work in perception, some of it with a developmental focus. He also lectured in this area. In 1931–2 he served as a visiting lecturer at the Gazi Institute, then a college of education in Ankara, Turkey, where he set up a psychological laboratory, probably the country's first. He returned to Vienna and in 1934 was appointed *Privatdozent*. His *Habilitationsschrift* was published in 1934 as *Wahrnehmung und Gegenstandswelt*. From Schlick and the Vienna Circle he took the commitment to a careful scrutinization of scientific language and methodology, in his case of the notion of "object" (*Gegenstand*), and of the assumptions underlying measurement in perceptual research. With Bühler he shared a commitment to the notion of "signs" (which in Brunswik's later work became "cues") and a biological, as distinct from a physiological, orientation towards the study of psychology.

At the University of Vienna, Brunswik made the acquaintance of Edward C. TOLMAN, who was there on sabbatical leave. As a result of their discussions, Tolman and Brunswik coauthored a paper in 1935 conjoining their theoretical perspectives in arguing that intended objects are attained through a process involving local representation or signs. Examples in perception, Brunswik's domain, were cues signaling depth or distance from the observer; examples in learning, Tolman's domain, were means to achieving a goal, such as choosing an action in order to find food. In both cases the relationship between signs and objects (to be achieved) was conceptualized as one of equivocality, and thus required the language of uncertainty, i.e., probability, for its description. In this way, the "uncertainty of knowledge and behavior" became linked to the frequency of couplings of characteristic features of the environment (Tolman and Brunswik 1935, p. 55; see Kurz-Milcke and Innis 2003).

In 1935–6 Brunswik spent the academic year in Berkeley at the University of California,

where a Rockefeller stipend had been obtained for him by Tolman. While the general political atmosphere in Austria had become uncomfortable for many academics after an authoritarian regime had taken power in 1934 (four years prior to the Nazi invasion in 1938), in Brunswik's case the move was equally motivated by career opportunity. In 1937, shortly after the University of Vienna had promoted him to the status of associate professor, Brunswik accepted appointment as assistant professor of psychology at the University of California, Berkeley. In 1938 he married his fiancée, Else Frenkel (PhD with Charlotte Bühler at Vienna in 1930), who also had a significant career in psychology and whose work in personality theory Brunswik considered immediately relevant to his own conception of psychology as a science (1952). Brunswik became an American citizen in 1943. He was promoted to full professor of psychology in 1947 and held this position until his death.

During his years at Berkeley, Brunswik developed a unique integration of: (1) a functionalist approach to the study of psychology; (2) a critique of widely held methodological standards in experimental psychology; coupled with (3) a probabilistic theory of the ecology (see Gigerenzer 1987). This integration came to be known as "probabilistic functionalism" (1955). As Brunswik once put it, in the United States his self-assigned task became, the "bringing to convergence European academic with Anglo-American statistical tradition" (1947, p. 56).

This convergence entailed the introduction of correlational statistics to research on perceptual constancies (see 1940). His new practice was a departure from the approach that he had used in Vienna, which had involved a constancy ratio, also known as "the Brunswik ratio." With this measure, a separate ratio had to be computed for each observed item in an experimental set-up and these were then combined to create indices describing classes of items according to experimental condition. By contrast, the use of the correlation coefficient generated measures that aggregated over items in an

experimental set-up and were therefore no longer geared towards individual items or even experimental conditions.

Along with this new cue-based approach to the study of perception, mediation became a significant research question. Initially, mediation was merely a one-dimensional concept involving, for example, no more than correlating retinal size (the mediating stimulus) with measured size of the items in an experimental set-up and also with perceptual judgments by the observers (1940). Size constancy (the relatively constant perceived size of items placed at varying distances) also remained among Brunswik's favorite working examples for the elaboration of mediation. His elaborate schema for this case contained a hierarchy of mediating distance cues (reprinted in *Perception and the Representative Design of Psychological Experiments*, 1956). This schema for size constancy bears notable resemblance to his subsequently proposed "generalized 'lens-model'," which he intended broadly as a "composite picture of the functional unit of behavior" (1952, p. 678; see Kurz-Milcke and Innis 2003).

From early on Brunswik had the reputation of being an outstanding experimenter. In his later career in the United States he came to push the envelope of experimental psychology, in theory and practice, seeking out a novel methodology for the study of perception and, more generally, of human judgment. This novel approach involved taking research on perceptual constancy outside the psychological laboratory without, however, ever giving up his urge for sophistication in measurement. In this new paradigm he had only a few observers (or participants, one of them the "non-interfering 'experimenter'") making many judgments of various items as they walked about the Berkeley campus. This approach and design, which he characterized as the "laissez-faire policy for the ecology" (1955, p. 198), was utterly predicated upon his focus on "achievement," which in his assessment meant the robustness of perception from grave error "at the expense of the highest

frequency of precision" (*Perception and the Representative Design of Psychological Experiments*, 1956, p. 146). These methodological and theoretical considerations culminated in his proposal and call for "representative design" in psychological research. With this new paradigm, Brunswik was on a path that led him irrevocably away from experimental research conceived in terms of orthogonal variables under the control of an experimenter.

From his days as a doctoral student in Vienna and throughout his career, Brunswik remained in contact with the unity of science movement, and at various times contributed to its conferences and publications. At the time of his death he was a member of the board of trustees of the Institute for the Unity of Science in Boston. As a scholar Brunswik was highly respected; but his approach to the study of psychology was, in its substance, either ignored or openly rejected by his peers (see reactions by Leo Postman, Ernest R. Hilgard, David KRECH, and Herbert FEIGL presented at the *Berkeley Conference for the Unity of Science*, published with Brunswik, 1955). His contribution to the philosophy of science, where he emphasized the thematic differentiation among the sciences, has gone largely unrecognized. Nor has psychology generally responded to his critique of nomothetically oriented experimentation and his proposal of "representative design," both of which challenged convictions deeply held by his colleagues.

Brunswik's intellectual contributions resist easy classification into the better-known schools of thought existing now or during his lifetime. He held relations to logical positivism, but his thought on psychology's standing as a science did not mark him as a logical positivist; his philosophy of science was, in fact, more closely related to that of Karl Bühler. He shared Gestalt psychology's interest in perception, but with an ecological orientation, which is markedly different from the views of well-known Gestalt psychologists, such as Wolfgang KÖHLER. He studied learning (at one time, with

rats) but was not a behaviorist of any known school although he had ties with Tolman's purposive behaviorism, itself not an easily classifiable brand of behaviorism. He studied human cognition and although sympathetic toward cybernetics and information processing theory, which appeared relatively late in the development of his thought, his major intellectual allegiances were with theoretical psychology.

After Brunswik's death, his work maintained a steady influence with a small number of psychologists interested in research on human judgment and decision-making. In recent years there has been something of a reawakening of interest in his ideas. His influence has been felt in a number of areas, not only within psychology (such as cognition, social psychology, and human factors), but also within the medical field and environmental sciences.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Wahrnehmung und Gegenstandswelt – Grundlegung einer Psychologie vom Gegenstand her (Leipzig and Vienna, 1934).

"The Organism and the Causal Texture of the Environment," with Edward C. Tolman, *Psychological Review* 42 (1935): 43–77.

"Psychology as a Science of Objective Relations," *Philosophy of Science* 4 (1937): 227–60.

"Thing Constancy as Measured by Correlation Coefficients," *Psychological Review* 47 (1940): 69–78.

"Distal Focussing of Perception: Size-constancy in a Representative Sample of Situations," *Psychological Monographs* 56 (1944): 1–49.

Systematic and Representative Design of Psychological Experiments: With Results in Physical and Social Perception (Berkeley, Cal., 1947).

"The Conceptual Framework of Psychology," in *International Encyclopedia of Unified Science*, vol. 1, ed. Otto Neurath, Rudolf Carnap, and Charles Morris (Chicago, 1952), pp. 655–750.

"Representative Design and Probabilistic Theory in a Functional Psychology," *Psychological Review* 62 (1955): 193–217.

Perception and the Representative Design of Psychological Experiments (Berkeley, Cal., 1956).

"Historical and Thematic Relations of Psychology to Other Sciences," *Scientific Monthly* 83 (1956): 151–61.

Other Relevant Works

The Psychology of Egon Brunswik, ed. Kenneth R. Hammond (New York, 1966).

Wahrnehmung und Gegenstandswelt: Zum Lebenswerk von Egon Brunswik (1903–1955), ed. Kurt R. Fischer and Friedrich Stadler (Vienna, 1995).

The Essential Brunswik: Beginnings, Explications, Applications, ed. Kenneth R. Hammond and Thomas R. Stewart (New York, 2001).

Further Reading

Bio Dict Psych by Zusne, Encyc Psych

Benetka, G. *Psychologie in Wien: Sozial- und Theoriengeschichte des Wiener Psychologischen Instituts 1922–1938* (Vienna, 1997).

Gigerenzer, G. "Survival of the Fittest Probabilist: Brunswik, Thurstone, and the Two Disciplines of Psychology," in *The Probabilistic Revolution,* vol. 2, ed. L. Krüger, G. Gigerenzer, and M. S. Morgan (Cambridge, Mass., 1987), pp. 49–72.

Hammond, K. "Probabilistic Functionalism and the Clinical Method," *Psychological Review* 62 (1955): 255–62.

Kurz, E. M., and R. D. Tweney. "The Heretical Psychology of Egon Brunswik," in *A Pictorial History of Psychology*, ed. W. G. Bringmann, H. E. Lueck, R. Miller, and C. E. Early (Carol Stream, Ill., 1997), pp. 221–32.

Kurz-Milcke, E., and Nancy Innis. "Egon Brunswik: Student of Achievement," in *Portraits of Pioneers in Psychology*, vol. 5,

ed. G. A. Kimble and M. Wertheimer (Mahwah, N.J., 2003), pp. 209–28.

Kurz-Milcke, E., and L. Martignon. "Modeling Practices and Tradition," in *Model-based Reasoning: Scientific Discovery, Technological Innovation, Values* (New York, 2002), pp. 127–46.

Leary, D. E. "From Act Psychology to Probabilistic Functionalism: The Place of Egon Brunswik in the History of Psychology," in *Psychology in Twentieth-Century Thought*, ed. M. G. Ash and W. R. Woodward (New York, 1987), pp. 115–42.

Scholz, R. W., and O. Tietje. *Embedded Case Study Methods: Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Knowledge* (Thousand Oaks, Cal., 2002).

Tolman, E. C. "*Wahrnehmung und Gegenstandswelt – Grundlegung einer Psychologie vom Gegenstand her,* by Egon Brunswik," *Psychological Bulletin* 32 (1935): 608–13.

———, "Egon Brunswik, Psychologist and Philosopher of Science," *Science* 122 (1955): 910.

———, "Egon Brunswik: 1903–1955," *American Journal of Psychology* 69 (1956): 315–42.

Elke Kurz-Milcke

BRYANT, William McKendree
(1843–1919)

William McKendree Bryant was born on 31 March 1843 in Lake County, Indiana, the son of Eliphalet W. and Esther Eliza (Brown) Bryant. As a child he was taught in a log cabin schoolhouse. On Sundays the family attended a Methodist church where the preacher emphasized the agonies of hell, instilling in Bryant a morbid fear of the infinite. At age twelve he began having a recurrent dream in which he found himself "bound to a huge iron wheel that rolled along without the slightest jar and with tremendous velocity along a thin, perfectly straight line of fire stretched through empty space …" This "struggle with the infinite" occupied him much of his adult life (1898, pp. 408–409).

At the beginning of the Civil War Bryant enlisted as a private in the 3rd Iowa infantry, rising to the rank of adjutant general with special honors by the time of his discharge in 1864. After the war, he attended Ohio Wesleyan University, receiving the BA in 1869 and the MA in 1871. During those years, he also met the woman he married, Sarah Augusta Shade. She would later be known as an accomplished landscape painter and assisted him in writing the *Philosophy of Landscape Painting* (1882).

In 1873 he accepted a position in the St. Louis public schools so that he could study philosophy under the direction of idealist William T. Harris as a member of the St. Louis Philosophical Society. Bryant was an active member from the 1870s until his death. The only published St. Louis philosopher with a background in natural science (geology), Bryant sought to reconstruct and develop Hegel's philosophy of nature and aesthetics. In 1881 Harris placed him in charge of the department of psychology and ethics in the St. Louis High School. Bryant published numerous translations and philosophical articles in *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy* and several philosophical books and pamphlets. For thirty-nine years he taught in the St. Louis Public School System. Retiring in 1912, Bryant moved his family to their summer home in Waynesville, North Carolina, where he died on 28 May 1919.

Bryant's *The World-energy and Its Self-conservation* (1890) is the first installment of a projected two-volume work. The second volume on human nature never appeared, although Bryant worked on it until his death. *The World-Energy* focuses on the question of

what nature is as a prologue to the second volume, which would have addressed the question of man's place in nature. In the preface, Bryant discusses two approaches to the philosophy of nature – the speculative and the scientific. Speculative philosophy of nature involves contextual or relational thinking, aiming at the concrete universal, which is the unity of universality and particularity reached by holding differences or otherness as constitutional to what a thing is.

Bryant agrees with many critics of Hegel's speculative philosophy of nature that it contains astonishing errors. The method of science, he contends, avoids speculation, constructing hypotheses out of known facts. But Bryant asserts that the popular view that science deals exclusively with facts is naïve. Facts must be interpreted, and interpretation involves theorizing and relational thinking. Science proceeds from principles and reflection, anticipating experience and proceeding to the verification process. Reductionism is a byproduct of the naïve avoidance of speculative thinking that robs human life of meaningful orientation and destroys our efforts to harmonize our being with the cosmos. The religious impulse to position oneself in harmony with the cosmos is the most general expression of Darwinian adaptation in human life.

An adequate view of nature would blend the positive features of the speculative and scientific methods, by revealing speculative elements in modern science. This would result in a speculative and dialectical philosophy of nature, in which the identity of thought and being is demonstrated. Along the way, Bryant employees insights from other thinkers, especially Aristotle, Baruch Spinoza, Sir Isaac Newton, Immanuel Kant, Herbert Spencer, Charles Darwin, Hermann von Helmholtz, and Bryant's mentor, William T. Harris.

In *The World-energy* Bryant shows that the objects of scientific study, namely atoms, particles, chemical combinations, and the evolution of life and consciousness, are differentiations of the World Spirit. World Spirit is by nature identical to "World-energy," whose basic physical modulations are the relations of attraction and repulsion. The tensions between attractions and repulsions throughout the cosmos create intensive quantities, the source of qualities, and all objects. All finite entities and processes, including cognition, are relations internal to World Spirit. Bryant's first move is to show that all forms of knowledge, from simple feeling to the World Spirit's return to itself in self-conscious beings, are based upon the unity of sameness and otherness. His second analysis begins with the atom and its particles, and ends with cosmological theory. The third and final analysis starts with the inorganic and traces the evolution of man as the courier of World Spirit's self-consciousness.

Bryant's first analysis shows the relational nature of knowledge, from sensation to logic, and at the same time reveals that at each level their distinctive objects are isomorphic with such relations. The most rudimentary form of cognition is one in which a sensitive subject is related to a spatial object through direct contact. Skin or membrane sensations/feelings are more or less definite, yet there is present an experienced distinction between the act and the object. Even at this basic level there is the double reference of awareness: an intentional object and the sense that this object is for me. In sensation the world enters my body and is reflected in bodily awareness.

Perception involves the use of sensory organs that form definite images of external objects. These images are a function of the structure of both the sensory organs and the object. In perception the conscious subject fixes its attention on an object that it has singled out from a multiplicity of objects. The objects in a multiplicity are similar in that they belong to the same surrounding totality, yet their individuality is founded upon their differences. The act of explicitly recognizing relations of sameness and difference is the beginning of conception.

Conceptions function in making judgments, which are based on the laws of thought, the principles of identity, contradiction, and

excluded middle. The laws of thought provide a fixed point of reference or nonrelativity and show that thought and being are isomorphic. The law of identity says a thing is identical with itself. This means that existence is uniform or changelessly one with itself. The locus of this in modern physics is the principle of the conservation of energy. The totality of energy in the universe neither increases nor decreases. The law of contradiction entails that a thing must be either A or not A depending on a set of conditions. "A" must change as its surrounding conditions change. For example, when a diamond is vaporized and combined with oxygen, plants can absorb it as carbon dioxide. "A" can be both A and not A if not A is potentiality, or liability to changing conditions. Since surrounding conditions are themselves surrounded by yet other conditions, change must be ceaseless. The law of contradiction implies that change can only be serial, and that a self-same substance must exist through these transformations. The third law of thought, excluded middle, entails that the categories of existence or nonexistence exhaust all possibilities. Bryant concludes from his first analysis that World Spirit, as the totality of existence, is the energy system of the world. All change is serial and internal to the World Spirit. The World Spirit as totality is in eternal repose, however. Sensitive creatures know changes relationally as self/other, same/different, polarities that constitute the singleness of sensitive creatures. Thought cannot be wholly distinct from nature, Bryant argues, otherwise the ability of thought to go beyond itself would be wholly inexplicable.

Bryant's second analysis focuses upon the objects of research in physics and chemistry. He rejects the existence of Newtonian space because space has no positive characteristics, for example., no dimensions and no internality. Space only has the negative characteristic of lack of resistance. Real space is a relation between bodies, whole to part, part to part. Likewise, time is a relation between events. There are no special organs to detect space and time, because they are universal features of experience.

The objects of sensory experience are extended in space, which we know by the resistance an object offers to our activity. The attempt to compress an object manifests resistance in the form of the object's parts resisting inclusion. That is to say, the object's parts repel one another. The attempt to divide or split an object also manifests resistance but in the form of attraction of its parts. Repulsion and attraction are two universal modes of universal energy. Objects in space are dispersed or concentrated. Dispersion is due to the basic force of repulsion. If only repulsion existed, dispersion would be total. If only attraction existed, all matter would be concentrated into a single heavy point that would implode upon itself.

Bryant argues that repulsion and attraction, though opposites, are coupled within the logic of essence. To be a force, something must be overcome, some counterforce must resist. Thus neither repulsion nor attraction is thinkable without the other. If we imagine a linear series of five particles (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) the middle particle (3) will be in a state of equilibrium, the recipient of repulsion from each side pair. This repulsion against the middle particle concentrates force in it, which acts as a counterforce of repulsion to each side pair. If we imagine this linear series rotating, thereby forming a disc, there will be different distances from one particle to another, the forces lessening in proportion to the greater distance. The addition of more lines of particles creates a rotating sphere, which constitutes mass. Mass is the number of force centers that constitute a body. The atom itself is a dense core of force spheres.

Bryant rejects the notion of unknowable objects. Reality divorced from appearance leaves appearances unexplained. Following Hegel, he says that appearance is reality manifesting itself. Science too has its shadowy metaphysical posits, one of which is the material atom. Bryant considers and rejects two rival views of the atom, concluding that the material

atom is bad metaphysics. Matter is essentially energy in its two necessarily related modes, attraction and repulsion. Points of matter are centers from which force radiates in all directions, the intensity of the force inversely related to increase in distance from that center. Atoms have no fixed boundary and no simple location, because they are spheres of force with a focus or nuclear density that constitutes each atom's impenetrability. The universe is an indivisible unity, or plenum, of these spheres of force. Gravity is not a kind of matter, but mutual attraction. When an object falls to earth, the earth falls toward that object as well, the latter movement being far too small to measure. There is an indefinite number of dimensions to the universe, but it is not splintered by its indefinite dimensionality.

Bryant's third analysis is of World Spirit itself. The principle of the conservation of energy holds that it cannot be destroyed but only transformed. This totality cannot have been created by something else, because that would presuppose the existence of energy. The totality cannot be destroyed, for that too would require energy. The totality cannot be measured by mathematical calculus. Energy is the one substance, necessarily differentiating itself. The development of the World Spirit is systematic, logical, and universal in its processes. World Spirit exhibits both self-determination and spontaneity, because it is not determined from without, and also exhibits play and sporting because it is a variety-maker, experimenting as it unfolds novelty. World Spirit's manifold differentiations are necessary; otherwise it would be mere abstract identity. All phases of differentiation are forms of coming-forth and returning, emanation and absorption.

To meet the frequent criticism that Hegelianism reduces the individual to a mere moment or phase in the advance of the Absolute, Bryant offers a theory of the development of individuality out of the self-differentiation of World Spirit. There are three grades of individuality. The simplest is "centrality," which characterizes the atom. Centrality is characterized by foci of energy collecting around a center through attractive force. The particles making up centrality have a mere external relation to one another, forming a more or less stable equilibrium. Beyond this is the second type of individual, the chemical compound. Here atoms depend on other atoms for what they lack, i.e., they share particles and manifest affinity or indifference for one another. This affinity/indifference is proto-choice, the first manifestation of the internal nature of centrality. The internal core of centrality in compounds is revealed in proto-spontaneity. New qualities appear throughout the vast array of such compounds. These qualitative features are based upon the tensions between the attractions and repulsions of their parts. The third type of individual is the organism, which incorporates centrality and affinity, but goes beyond it in complication. In the living individual assimilation of parts from an environment on a continuous or rhythmic basis is necessary for the unity, stability, and spontaneity of the unit. Whereas a group of atoms or a compound can be divided without altering the nature of either, the removal of parts of an organism alters the nature of the unit through debilitation or death. A separated part collapses into the merely chemical. With living individuals the World Spirit differentiates itself in the creative environment, which is absorbed by the living thing. It would be just as correct to say that the environment, as energizing World Spirit, creates its species, as it would be to say that the species has an environment. The self-conscious unit is the fullest expression of individuality. The World Spirit objectifies itself into the being that can make itself its own object. Moreover, this unit can contrast or oppose itself to World Spirit. The self-conscious being, as a type, will be repeated with restricted variation throughout the cosmos, where similar environing conditions prevail. Self-conscious beings are true and distinct individuals because they occupy a spatiotemporal nexus, oppose themselves to others, have freedom and self-determination. It is open to each person to progressively approx-

imate the rationality of the world, and at the same time to become a playful or sporting variant of its personality.

Bryant's philosophy of nature provided inspiration for his aesthetics. He saw the advance of science and speculative philosophy increasingly embodied in landscape painting over the centuries. The range in the artist's ability to depict breeze, fog, mist, rocks, the waves of the ocean, forests, etc., and to depict properties like weight, perspective, motion, and light, runs concurrently with the history of science and philosophy. In this vision, the universe is like the radiant interior of a church. The morbid fear of endlessness, the rolling wheel of fire through empty space, is overcome. The task of life is to perfect personality towards the reason, self-determination, and energetic play of the World Spirit. One will undergo physical death, but one's personality will merge into the eternal repose of World Spirit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Philosophy of Landscape Painting (St. Louis, 1882).
The World-energy and Its Self-conservation (Chicago, 1890).
Hegel's Educational Ideas (Chicago, 1896).
Life, Death and Immortality, with Kindred Essays (New York, 1898).

Other Relevant Works
Goethe as a Representative of the Modern Art Spirit (St. Louis, 1889).
Eternity: A Thread in the Weaving of a Life (Chicago, 1892).
A Syllabus of Psychology (Chicago, 1893).
A Syllabus of Ethics (Chicago, 1894).
Ethics and the New Education (Chicago, 1894).

Further Reading
Nat Cycl Amer Bio v5, Who Was Who in Amer v1
DeArmey, Michael H., and James A. Good, eds. *The St. Louis Hegelians*, 3 vols

(Bristol, UK, 2001).
Snider, Denton J. *The St. Louis Movement in Philosophy, Literature, Education, Psychology with Chapters of Autobiography* (St. Louis, 1920).

Michael H. DeArmey

BUCHANAN, James McGill (1919–)

James M. Buchanan was born on 3 October 1919 in Murfreesboro, Tennessee. He was educated at a local public school and then the local college, Middle Tennessee State College, where he earned a BA in 1940. He also earned an MS from the University of Tennessee in 1941. After being drafted into the United States Navy in 1941 and serving through 1945, he returned to school on a GI subsidy, earning a PhD in economics from the University of Chicago in 1948. After graduation he taught economics at the University of Tennessee for three years until he moved to Florida State University where he was professor of economics until 1956. After 1956 Buchanan had three main professional associations with academic institutions in Virginia. He was professor of economics at the University of Virginia from 1956 to 1969, and was University Distinguished Professor of Economics at Virginia Polytechnic Institute from 1969 to 1983, where he established the Center for the Study of Public Choice. In 1983 Buchanan moved, with the Public Choice Center, to George Mason University as Holbert L. Harris University Professor of Economics, which remains his current position. He is also the Advisory General Director of the James Buchanan Center for Political Economy at George Mason University. In 1986 Buchanan was awarded the Nobel Prize in Economics.

A self-described "libertarian socialist," on

his arrival at Chicago Buchanan was "converted" to classical liberalism after six weeks of price theory with Frank KNIGHT. The libertarian values remained, but now Buchanan understood through Knight that the market (not government) was the organizational form most consistent with those values. Knight became Buchanan's intellectual role model.

Also at Chicago, Buchanan discovered Knut Wicksell's principle of just taxation while browsing Harper Library. Buchanan's work to a large extent can be summarized as the persistent and consistent development of the two intellectual influences from Knight and Wicksell. The final intellectual influence on Buchanan was the Italian tradition of public finance that he was exposed to during a Fulbright Fellowship year in 1955–6. This tradition emphasized "real" as opposed to ideal politics, which provided the final piece of the intellectual puzzle that led to Buchanan's development of public choice theory.

From Knight, Buchanan obtained his basic economic theory framework and the idea that economics is not a science in the traditional meaning of that term. From Wicksell, Buchanan learned that politics needs to be understood in an exchange framework. Efficiency in the public sector would be guaranteed only under a rule of unanimity for collective choices. From the Italians, Buchanan learned that public finance theory must necessarily postulate a theory of the state, and that it would be best to reject either Benthamite utilitarianism or Hegelian idealism in postulating such a theory. In retrospect, once these three elements were brought together, the necessary foundational framework for Buchanan's contributions to the economics of the public sector were there. What remained was working out the implications.

By recasting the questions of public finance in light of this Knight/Wicksell/Italian connection, Buchanan was able to challenge the received wisdom of his day on several fronts. For example, the Keynesian theory of functional finance met perhaps its most funda-mental challenge in Buchanan's *Public Principles of Public Debt* (1958). Buchanan challenged the Keynesian doctrine on methodological and analytical grounds. The level of aggregation in Keynesian fiscal theory, for example, strained imagination, violated the political norms of democratic society, and fundamentally misconstrued the nature of the debt burden. By confining their focus to the aggregate unit, fiscal theorists were unable to address the problem of who will have to pay for the creation of public goods and when payment will be made. The problem was an elementary one: the principle of opportunity cost and economic decision-making was forgotten in the Keynesian analysis.

The controversy over the burden of debt issue forced Buchanan to re-examine the conceptual foundations of economic science. This led to his *Cost and Choice* (1969), a slim volume, but broad in implication. The consistent pursuit of the opportunity cost logic of economics would lead to surprising results on a broad range of issues, from the burden of debt to issues concerning the military draft, the problem of externalities, and the choice context of bureaucratic decision-making.

It is *The Calculus of Consent* (1962), Buchanan and Gordon Tullock's comprehensive examination of the political market, that deserves credit for shifting scholarly focus. Before Public Choice, it was commonplace in economic theory to postulate an objective welfare function which "society" sought to maximize, and to assume that political actors were motivated to pursue that objective welfare function. The Buchanan/Tullock critique amounted to simply pointing out that (1) no objective welfare function exists, (2) that even if one existed "societies" do not choose, only individuals do, and (3) that individuals within the political sector, just as in the private sector, base their choices on their private assessment of costs and benefits.

Many of the major insights of modern political economy flow from these three elementary propositions including the vote motive, the

logic of dispersed costs and concentrated benefits, the shortsightedness bias in policy, and the constitutional perspective in policy evaluation. Politics must be endogenous in any reasonable model of economic policy-making, and realistic political processes are not something to be romanticized. But the intellectual spirit of the age (the 1950s and early 1960s) was one of overly zealous optimism about the beneficial nature of politics. The Buchanan warning of democratic folly, and the need for constitutional constraint was one that did not sit well with the intellectual/political idealist of the day. In the wake of the Vietnam War and Watergate, as well as the failed economic policies that have emerged from both Democratic and Republican administrations during the post World War II era, it is now difficult to imagine a non-cynical view of politics. This is not an endorsement of apathy and malcontent with politicians. Nowhere in the Buchanan body of work is it suggested that politicians are any worse than the lot of us. Rather, his work simply stressed that politicians are just like the rest of us – neither sinners nor saints, but a bit of both.

During the 1970s Buchanan's work shifted to social philosophy. *Limits of Liberty* (1975) is his statement of the contractarian perspective in political economy. This was followed by collections of essays in *Freedom in Constitutional Contract* (1977), *Liberty, Market and State* (1986), and *The Economics and the Ethics of Constitutional Order* (1991).

On a methodological front, Buchanan employed the assumption of economic man within politics not as a description of the motivation of any particular political actor, but rather as a modeling strategy in constitutional design. In developing models of public finance, as noted above, Buchanan learned from the Italians (and from Wicksell) that one must postulate a theory of the state. By postulating the revenue-maximizing Leviathan, Buchanan was able to address the political rules of the game, which would constrain the behavior of individuals within politics. In particular, if government officials are revenue maximizing, then the question becomes: what rules of the game are necessary to transform revenue-maximizing behavior into wealth-maximizing behavior? This is a question of constitutional design – one that affects the time preference of rulers and the range of policy choices at their disposal for pursuing their interests. In both of his books written with Geoffrey Brennan, *The Power to Tax* (1980) and *The Reason of Rules* (1985), Buchanan employed the economic man assumption to establish rules, which guard against "worst case" scenarios in politics. Even if rulers were sinners, then it would be an important political theory result to design a constitution that would compel these sinners by constraints to act more like saints.

Throughout Buchanan's career there is a surprising unity in his research purpose and the basic propositions that guide his work. From his early critique of social choice theory and welfare economics to his most recent writings on constitutional design, Buchanan's work persistently stresses the following points. To Buchanan, economics is a "science" but not one like the physical sciences; it is a "philosophical" science and the strictures against scientism offered by Frank Knight and F. A. Hayek should be heeded. Economics is about choice and processes of adjustment, not states of rest. Equilibrium models are only useful when we recognize their limits. Though economics is about exchange, it is not about maximizing. Exchange activity or arbitrage should be the central focus of economic analysis. Most importantly, economics is about individual actors, not collective entities. Only individuals choose. Economics is about a game played within rules and it cannot be studied properly outside of politics. The choices among different rules of the game cannot be ignored. Finally, the most important function of economics as a discipline is its elementary and didactic role in explaining the principle of spontaneous order (1979, pp. 280–82).

Finally, it is important to recognize the basic methodological schema that Buchanan employs to address questions in political economy and how this schema allows him to weave these eight propositions into a coherent framework for social theory. He emphasizes that we must distinguish between pre- and post-constitutional levels of analysis. Pre-constitutional analysis opens up the discourse over the rules of the game, while post-constitutional analysis reflects an examination of the strategies players adopt within the defined rules. Political economy, properly understood, is the tacking back and forth between these two levels of analysis. Successful application of modern political economy to the world of public policy demands that the analyst adopt such a *constitutional* perspective. In this regard, Buchanan introduces the vital distinction for applied political economy of "policy within politics" and the systematic change in the rules of the game. Lasting reform, Buchanan argues, results not from policy changes within the existing rules (or changes in people), but rather from systemic changes in the rules of governance. Thus, far from the "conservative" intellectual that many falsely believe him to be, Buchanan is an intellectual radical seeking to get at the root cause of social/political ills. This final point is apparent upon examination of how Buchanan has refocused the research attention of a generation of scholars.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Prices, Income, and Public Policy, with C. L. Allen and M. R. Colberg (New York, 1954; 2nd edn 1959).

Public Principles of Public Debt (Homewood, Ill., 1958).

Fiscal Theory and Political Economy (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1960).

The Calculus of Consent: Logical Foundations of Constitutional Democracy, with Gordon Tullock (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1962).

Public Finance in Democratic Process: Fiscal Institutions and Individual Choice (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1966).

Demand and Supply of Public Goods (Chicago, 1968).

Cost and Choice: An Inquiry in Economic Theory (Chicago, 1969).

Academia in Anarchy: An Economic Diagnosis, with Nicos Devletoglou (New York, 1970).

The Limits of Liberty: Between Anarchy and Leviathan (Chicago, 1975).

Democracy in Deficit: The Political Legacy of Lord Keynes, with Richard E. Wagner (New York, 1977).

Freedom in Constitutional Contract: Perspectives of a Political Economist (College Station, Tex., 1977).

What Should Economists Do? (Indianapolis, 1979).

The Power to Tax: Analytical Foundations of a Fiscal Constitution, with Geoffrey Brennan (Cambridge, UK, 1980).

The Reason of Rules: Constitutional Political Economy, with Geoffrey Brennan (Cambridge, UK, 1985).

Liberty, Market and State: Political Economy in the 1980s (New York, 1986).

Essays on the Political Economy (Honolulu, 1989).

The Economics and the Ethics of Constitutional Order (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1991).

Better than Plowing: And Other Personal Essays (Chicago, 1992).

Ethics and Economic Progress (Norman, Okla., 1994).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with Robert Tollison, *The Theory of Public Choice – II* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1984).

Ed. with Robert D. Tollison and Viktor J. Vanberg, *Economics: Between Predictive Science and Moral Philosophy* (College Station, Tex., 1987).

The Collected Works of James Buchanan, 20 vols (Indianapolis, 1999–2002).

Further Reading

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio

Brennan, Geoffrey, Hartmut Kliemt, and Robert D. Tollison, eds. *Method and Morals in Constitutional Economics: Essays in Honor of James M. Buchanan* (Berlin, 2002).

Reisman, David. *The Political Economy of James Buchanan* (College Station, Tex., 1990).

Peter J. Boettke
Christopher J. Coyne

BUCHLER, Justus (1914–91)

Justus Buchler was born on 27 March 1914 in New York City, the eldest son of Ida and Samuel Buchler. He earned a BSS in 1934 at the College of the City of New York. He then earned an MA in 1935 and the PhD in philosophy in 1938 at Columbia University, where he studied with Morris R. COHEN, F. J. E. WOODBRIDGE, and Ernest NAGEL. His MA thesis was on Locke; his PhD dissertation was on Charles PEIRCE, which upon publication in 1939 became a well-respected work. Buchler taught part-time at Brooklyn College and Columbia University until he gained a full-time philosophy appointment at Columbia in 1942. He participated in the Contemporary Civilization program of Columbia College, becoming its administrative head in 1950. Buchler was book editor for the *Journal of Philosophy* and Vice Chairman of the National Academic Freedom Committee of American Civil Liberties Union from 1958 to 1965. In 1971 he became Distinguished Professor of Philosophy at the State University of New York at Stony Brook. In 1973 he was awarded the Butler Silver Medal by Columbia University. In the early 1970s Buchler and his wife, philosopher Evelyn Shirk, were founding members of the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy. Buchler later received the society's highest honor, the Herbert W. Schneider Award, in 1989. Buchler retired from Stony Brook in 1981, and died on 19 March 1991 in Chambersburg, Pennsylvania.

While not a pragmatist, Buchler was influenced by Peirce, William JAMES, Josiah ROYCE, and John DEWEY. He was also influenced by George SANTAYANA and Alfred North WHITEHEAD. Buchler's systematic work covers two broad areas: human process and general ontology. He was guided by two principles: (1) ontological parity, which asserts the equal reality of whatever is; and (2) ordinality, which asserts the indefinite complexity of whatever is. Any being – in Buchler's terminology, any "(natural) complex" – is what it is because it is located in orders, that is, is related to other complexes in determinate respects. Each complex "locates" other complexes and therefore, every complex is also an order (a location for other complexes). Since on this view complexity is irreducible, there are no definitive boundaries to a complex or between one complex and another. Buchler's method of exposition resembles Aristotle's by identifying previous well-known concepts (for example, in general ontology, being/becoming; in the theory of human process, experience), showing what is defective about them, and then furnishing his own categories. This method required some neologisms (for example, "proception," "alescence"), but more typically Buchler created a novel signification of familiar concepts. In general ontology, examples are order, relation, possibility, actuality; in the theory of human process, examples include judgment and communication.

Buchler characterized his work as a "metaphysics of natural complexes." Some commentators have noted that this seems to make Buchler's work continuous with American naturalism and have thus characterized it as "ordinal naturalism" or "ordinal ontology" (see Singer 1983). In Buchler's system, "natural complex" is the basic term of identification. A

natural complex conceptualizes the reality of any complex's locations, without insisting that this is the only way of doing this. In a metaphysics of natural complexes, there is no ontological distinction between the real and unreal. Whatever is, is real; the objects we daily experience are as real as the clouds of atomic particles described by physics; fictional objects as real as material objects.

The principle of ontological parity entails that no being or any one kind of being can be singled out as the "really real." The principle of ordinality conceptualizes the determinateness of any being (*complex*) as an interrelation of locations or traits. Actuality and possibility are ordinally defined as traits of natural complexes. For Buchler, three pairs of categories constitute the formal structure of the metaphysics of natural complexes: (1) prevalence and alescence (the technical vocabulary for concepts like being, existence, becoming, changing); (2) ordinality and relation (categories of determinateness); and (3) possibility and actuality (categories of "natural definition," that is, categories that conceptualize the limits of a complex). The term "becoming" is suitable for certain kinds of physical and biological change – an acorn becomes a sapling, a sapling becomes a tree – but does not capture the developing-being of a logical proof or of a conceptual shift in the understanding of a historical event. With the term "alescence" Buchler intends to introduce a concept that does not obscure the insight of ontological parity, namely, that becoming (altering) is just as real as being.

An example of a commonplace object will illustrate some aspects of an ordinal conceptualization. A car, *qua* physical object, prevails in a spatial-temporal set(s) of relations, or orders. The same car, *qua* legal and social entity, is owned, has an assessed value, a market value, and so on; it resides in social, economic, and legal contexts or orders (driving rules, ownership rules, market relations, and so on). Every trait (ordinal location) is real. Physical size is as real as atomic structure, as real as legal status;

color is as real as the possibility-of-being-sold. The car is its complexity of traits, which it acquires by residing in the orders it does. Simultaneously, the car is itself an order; it locates complexes (minimally, its own traits).

According to an ordinal analysis of perception, the human visual order is no less a location of the car than the spatiotemporal, legal, and social orders. Perception is a relational complex, for example, a car-in-perceptual-relation-to-observer or conversely, observer-in-perceptual-relation-to-car. Some traits of the car may prevail in each, the spatiotemporal, the visual and the legal orders; there are other traits that it has only in one respect or the other. Buchler's claim is that ontologically all of its traits are "really" traits of the complex, albeit in different respects. This entails that two different perceptions of the same object are each "really" of the object, in a given respect. For example, in relation to color-blind perception the automobile is gray; in relation to normal human color-sighted perception it is red. A claim that the automobile is "really" red is an affirmation of the priority or greater comprehensiveness of the order of normal-color-sightedness in human experience. A hallucination would have different ordinal locations from, and hence, not be capable of validation as, a perception, however much it may feel like a perception to the hallucinator. Thus, the psychology of perception and mental states is distinguished from their ontological analysis.

The issue of the limit or boundary of any particular complex leads to the modal categories, possibility and actuality. Necessity is defined in terms of possibility. There is a boundary to determinateness, but that boundary is itself indeterminate. Buchler's solution to this apparent paradox is to articulate boundary in terms of actuality and possibility. A boundary of a complex is determinate insofar as it contains actualities and indeterminate because it contains possibilities. This is no less true of logical as it is of empirical possibility; possibility is a matter of ordinal location. Not just anything is a possibility for a complex, because

every possibility is determinate, for example, prevails in an ordinal location. Boundaries, or determinateness, cannot be wholly fixed because actualization is a condition for new possibilities. Buchler argues that according to the principles of ordinality there is no totalizing order of orders, such as "world" or "nature." He also shows that other attempts to argue for the notion of totality fail. His specific targets are Ludwig Wittgenstein, Thomas Hobbes, R. G. Collingwood, and Whitehead.

In the works on the metaphysics of human process, Buchler aims to reconceptualize the notions of experience and judgment. His theory rejects such categories as mind/body, or consciousness/nature by employing a novel category, *proception*, for broadening the conception of experience. While this category may bear some resemblance to Whitehead's prehension, it is restricted to human reality only. However, human process is always relationally located, and thus, for Buchler, experience (proception) breaks down the gap between world and experiencer. Experience (proception) and judgment is each a relation of some kind between the individual and the world.

Judgment is an appraisive relation of the individual to the world, the world as it is in relation to the individual. For Buchler, the individual cannot relate to "the world" indiscriminately for, first, there is no single overarching totality, "the world" and; second, the particular locations constituting an individual contribute to or influence what the individual can appraise. For example, a deaf individual will be limited with respect to judgments about the aural dimensions of the world in ways non-deaf persons are not. Conversely, a deaf person might be capable of judgments, such as tactile or vibratory judgments, of which a non-deaf person is not. An individual not trained in mathematics will be limited (until or unless trained) in ways that mathematicians are not, with respect to judgments about mathematical orders.

Moreover, judgment is always perspectival. It is located. It is always made by an individual in a particular respect. Perspectives are not intrinsically private, but can be communicated and shared. A perspective is the relational context of the judger (or judgers) and the world that is judged. A judgment can be an action or an arranging, or can be propositional. For example, the *act* of purchasing a piece of land is just as much a judgment in the context of real-estate development as the *assertion* "that land is valuable." Similarly, when one *perceives* a piece of land, one perceives *the land*, just as it is the land that one buys, puts in a trust with the Nature Conservancy, or sells to another owner. An object of judgment is a "complex" in relation to a judger, and judgments (such as purchasing, entrusting, selling) articulate something about the judger as well as about the thing judged. Judgments can be assertive (such as propositional assertions), active (or, a purchase of land) or exhibitive (for example, an arrangement of colors or shapes on a canvas). Buchler's view of judgment is thus distinguished by a rejection of the requirement of mentality or language, and by the hierarchy he establishes among the three modes. In a specific context or for a specific purpose, one mode of judgment may be better than another, but, in conformity with the principle of parity, none is intrinsically higher than another.

Buchler's systematic work, while widely known and respected, remained outside the mainstream of analytic Anglo-American thought during his lifetime. More recent developments in feminism, science, and philosophy may prove a more fertile ground for his contributions to take hold.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Charles Peirce's Empiricism (London, 1939).
Toward a General Theory of Human Judgment (New York, 1951; 2nd edn 1979).
Nature and Judgment (New York, 1955).
The Concept of Method (New York, 1961).
Metaphysics of Natural Complexes (New York, 1966; 2nd edn, Albany, N.Y., 1990).
The Main of Light: On the Concept of Poetry

(Oxford, 1974).

"On a Strain of Arbitrariness in Whitehead's System," *Journal of Philosophy* 66 (1969): 589–601.

"On the Concept of the 'World'," *Review of Metaphysics* 31 (1978): 555–79.

"Probing the Idea of Nature," *Process Studies* 8 (1979): 157–68.

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with B. Schwartz, *The Obiter Scripta of George Santayana* (New York, 1936).

"Value Statements," *Analysis* 4 (1937): 49–58.

Ed., *The Philosophy of Peirce: Selected Writings* (London, 1940). Paperback edn, *Philosophical Writings of Peirce* (New York, 1955).

Philosophy: An Introduction, with John H. Randall, Jr. (New York, 1942; 2nd edn 1971).

"Russell and the Principles of Ethics," in *The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell*, ed. Paul Schilpp (Evanston, Ill., 1944).

Ed., *Introduction to Contemporary Civilization in the West*, 2 vol. (New York, 1946).

"Reconstruction in the Liberal Arts," in *A History of Columbia College on Morningside* (New York, 1954).

"Ontological Parity," in *Naturalism and Historical Understanding: Essays on the Philosophy of John Herman Randall, Jr.*, ed. John P. Anton (Albany, N.Y., 1967), pp. 162–75.

Further Reading

Amer Phils 1950-2000, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Blackwell Amer Phil*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Proc of APA v65*, *Who Was Who in Amer v10*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Campbell, James, et al. "The Impact of Justus Buchler: American Philosophy at Stony Brook," *Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy Newsletter* no. 98 (June 2004): 16–37. Symposium of articles about Buchler.

Marsoobian, Armen, Kathleen Wallace, and

Robert S. Corrington, eds. *Nature's Perspectives: Prospects for Ordinal Metaphysics* (Albany, N.Y., 1991). Contains a bibliography of secondary literature.

McGandy, Michael J. "Buchler's Notion of Query," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 11 (1997): 203–24.

Reck, Andrew J. *The New American Philosophers: An Exploration of Thought since World War II* (Baton Rouge, Louis., 1968), chap. 4.

Ross, Stephen D. *Transition to an Ordinal Metaphysics* (Albany, N.Y., 1980).

Singer, Beth J. *Ordinal Naturalism: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Justus Buchler* (Lewisburg, Penn., 1983). Contains a bibliography of Buchler's writings.

Singer Beth J., and Joseph G. Grassi, eds. "Symposium on the Philosophy of Justus Buchler," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 14 (Spring 1976). Includes Buchler's replies to participants.

Wallace, Kathleen. "Ontological Parity and/or Ordinality?" *Metaphilosophy* 30 (1999): 302–18.

———, "Autonomous 'I' of an Intersectional Self," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 17 (2003): 176–91.

Kathleen A. Wallace

BUCKHAM, John Wright (1864–1945)

John Wright Buckham was born on 5 November 1864 in Burlington, Vermont. He was educated at the University of Vermont, where his father Matthew Henry Buckham served as President from 1871 to 1910. At Vermont, Buckham studied philosophy with Henry A. P. TORREY and embraced Kant's critical idealism and moral religion. Graduating with his BA from Vermont in

1885, he entered Andover Theological Seminary at the height of the "Andover Controversy" over future probation and historical criticism. Buckham identified with the controversial "Progressive Orthodoxy" of his teachers, graduated from Andover in 1888, and was ordained a Congregational minister in that year, although conservatives objected to his belief in biblical criticism and universal salvation. From 1890 to 1903 Buckham was minister of the Crombie Street Church in Salem, Massachusetts, and continued to study idealistic philosophy and liberal theology.

In 1903 Buckham was appointed to the chair of Christian theology at Pacific Theological Seminary in Berkeley, California. Buckham taught William Newton CLARKE's liberal theology and forged a key friendship with University of California at Berkeley philosopher George H. HOWISON. Like Howison, Buckham embraced the basic tenets of personalist metaphysical idealism acquired from Harvard philosophers Josiah ROYCE and George Herbert PALMER. In addition, he was influenced by the philosophical writings of Borden Parker BOWNE, Rudolf Hermann Lotze, and James Seth. The American personalist tradition, which came to be centered at Boston University and the University of California, taught that mind is the ultimate reality and that personality is the immediate and univocal key to reality. Following his mentors, Buckham argued that personality is the only reality that is known immediately and directly, that it is the one reality that explains everything, and that it cannot be explained by anything else.

Buckham's writings ranged widely over theology, philosophy of religion, mysticism, social ethics, psychology, and American history, but nearly all of his work was centered on his concern to expound the religious implications of personalism. Buckham was a frequent contributor to the University of California philosophy journal *The Personalist*, edited by Ralph Tyler FLEWELLING. Buckham viewed personal idealism as a source of commonality and unity for the liberal theology movement, admonishing in *Religion as Experience* against "bickering among ourselves over theological and denominational differences" (1922, p. 128). Unlike Howison, he affirmed mystical experience as a valuable dimension of good religion and favored the mystically tinged writings of Friedrich von Hugel and Rufus M. JONES. Unlike Howison, who restricted God's relation to the world to Aristotelian final causality, Buckham also affirmed personal theism. In his 1914 Nathaniel W. Taylor Lectures at Yale University, he argued that God is the supreme person, human beings are developing persons, and Christ is the ideal divine–human person.

Emphasizing social dimensions of personalist thought that were slighted by its founders, Buckham and other liberals of his generation (notably Francis McConnell and Henry Churchill KING) blended personalist philosophy and the social gospel. He argued that salvation is the realization of personality, which is both individual and social, and that personality is the source of all creativity and human flourishing. In *Progressive Religious Thought in America* he enthused that modern Christianity preached "the kinship of God with men as taught by Christ, the presence of the ideal human soul, [and] the conviction that society itself is instituted by God and will respond to the appeal of the social idea" (1919, p. 256).

Buckham retired from the (renamed) Pacific School of Religion in 1937. In 1941 he published his last work, *The Inner World*, which ended where he began. *The Inner World* emphasized "the *religious* aspect of personality," taught that the starting point of all inquiry in religious philosophy is "oneself and his experience," and described the personal starting point as "one who is living the life of the Spirit in the fellowship of God and man" (1941, pp. 3, 282). Buckham died on 30 March 1945 in Berkeley, California.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Christ and the Eternal Order (Boston, 1906).

Personality and the Christian Ideal: A Discussion of Personality in the Light of Christianity (New York, 1909).

Mysticism and Modern Life (New York, 1915).

Progressive Religious Thought in America: A Survey of the Enlarging Pilgrim Faith (Boston, 1919).

Religion as Experience (New York, 1922).

Personality and Psychology: An Analysis for Practical Use (New York, 1924).

The Humanity of God: An Interpretation of the Divine Fatherhood (New York, 1928).

Christianity and Personality (Boston, 1936).

The Inner World: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Christianity (New York, 1941).

Other Relevant Works

"James Marsh and Coleridge," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 41 (April 1904): 305–17.

"The Organization of Truth," *International Journal of Ethics* 20 (1909): 63–72.

"The Principles of Pacifism," *The Biblical World* 48 (1916): 88–90.

"Immanence-transcendence," *Journal of Philosophy* 28 (1931): 204–11.

"From Philosophy to Theology," in *Contemporary American Theology*, ed. Vergilius Ferm (New York, 1932), pp. 85–103.

"God and the Ideal: Professor Dewey Reinterprets Religion," *Journal of Religion* 15 (1935): 1–9.

"Religious Experience and Personality: A Reply to Professor Wieman," *Journal of Religion* 15 (1935): 309–15.

Ed. with George M. Stratton, *George Holmes Howison, Philosopher and Teacher: A Selection from His Writings, with a Biographical Sketch* (Berkeley, Cal., 1934).

"Personal Realism,Åh *Philosophical Review* 45 (1936): 601–609.

"Idealism and Realism: A Suggested Synthesis," *Journal of Philosophy* 39 (1942): 402–14.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Aubrey, Edwin E. "Personal Theism," *Journal of Religion* 9 (1929): 638–40.

Wieman, Henry Nelson. "Dewey and Buckham on Religion," *Journal of Religion* 15 (1935): 10–21.

Williams, Daniel Day. *The Andover Liberals: A Study in American Theology* (New York, 1941).

Gary Dorrien

BUGBEE, Henry Greenwood, Jr.
(1915–99)

Henry Bugbee was born on 19 February 1915 in New York City. He received a BA in philosophy from Princeton University in 1936, submitting "In Demonstration of the Spirit" as an honors thesis in which we find his lifelong philosophical concerns already in focus. In his view, science and technology threaten to suppress a proper view of the distinctively human. A kind of aesthetic appreciation, rather than technical cognitive grip, is the key to meaningful moral or religious life. The Spanish existentialist Miguel de Unamuno is exemplary here. Bugbee's graduate study at the University of California at Berkeley was interrupted by naval service in the Pacific. In 1948 he received his PhD in philosophy, writing on aesthetics under Jacob LOEWENBERG. After briefly teaching at Stanford, he was assistant professor of philosophy at Harvard University from 1948 to 1954. From 1957 to 1977 he was professor of philosophy at the University of Montana,

where he was twice department chair. Bugbee died on 18 December 1999 in Missoula, Montana. W. V. QUINE remembered him as "the ultimate exemplar of the examined life."

Religion scholar Huston SMITH commended Bugbee's *The Inward Morning: A Philosophical Exploration in Journal Form* (1958) as "the most Daoist western book I know." Others call it "a uniquely *American* existentialism," a "lyrical philosophy," or a "philosophy of place." In journal format, Bugbee explores wilderness, art, philosophy, and responsive receptivity in human thought and action. Shakespeare and Melville as well as Plato, Eckhart, and Spinoza appear in a sweep of philosophical interest reminiscent of Bugbee's student, Stanley CAVELL. In the 1950s, Bugbee traveled with D. T. SUZUKI and joined French existentialist Gabriel Marcel in discussions with Martin Heidegger. He participated in colloquia with Hans-Georg Gadamer at Syracuse University in the 1970s. *The Inward Morning* was followed by essays on the book of Job, wilderness, Marcel, the sublime, love, and education. Albert Borgmann, the philosophical environmentalist critic of technology, recalls his colleague as "a humanist *par excellence*" devoted to "the great literature of the West and the East" who "lived with and out of those texts."

The lasting contribution of *The Inward Morning* is its moving evocations of wonder and attentive immersion in one's place, of action and its precedents in responsiveness to a claim or call, of one's personal "intuitive condition" so often abandoned for abstraction and theory, and of mystery underlying meaningful life. These evocations exemplify a unique sense of philosophy and of writing philosophy. Bugbee confides that for him, philosophy is "an approximation to a poem," wedded to the local and individual, a walking "meditation of the place." The place evoked might be a gentle stream or deadly wartime battle; it might be a passage from Melville or Spinoza, or a discussion with C. I. LEWIS. These "experiential reflections" are ineluctably first person. The detached "reportorial" or "spectator's" third-person stance toward the world and others, so characteristic of British empiricism and logical positivism, necessarily derails the quest for meaning that is the calling of philosophy and, in a wider sense, of human life.

In his 1948 dissertation, Bugbee traces a *conception* of being through Aristotle and evokes a *sense* of being peculiar to one's place. In an American idiom, Heideggerian themes are pursued a full decade before Bugbee encountered Heidegger's work. We learn that expressiveness of place is expressiveness of being, focused in a moment of recognition, *Augenblick*, in which both viewer and viewed, actor and ambiance, are transformed. These themes are amplified in *The Inward Morning*. Persons rely on mutual recognition for a sense of being and of *their* being. Such transformative moments can instill an inescapable sense of affirmative mutuality, an attunement to the eloquent reality of others and of place that blocks, for the moment, the shadow of skepticism, indifference, or despair.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Moment of Obligation in Experience," *Journal of Religion* 33 (1953): 1–15.

The Inward Morning: A Philosophical Exploration in Journal Form (State College, Penn., 1958; New York, 1961; Athens, Georgia, 1999).

"Thoughts on Creation," in *Essays in Philosophy*, ed. Penn State University Philosophy Department (University Park, Penn., 1962).

"On Starting with Love," *Humanitas* 2 (1966): 149–64.

"The Philosophical Significance of the Sublime," *Philosophy Today* 11 (1967): 55–9.

"L'Exigence ontologique," in *The Philosophy of Gabriel Marcel*, ed. Paul A. Schlipp (La Salle, Ill., 1968).

"Loneliness, Solitude, and the Twofold Way

in Which Concern May Be Claimed," *Humanitas* 10 (1974): 313–27.

"Wilderness in America," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 42 (1974): 614–20.

Further Reading

Nat Cycl Amer Bio v35, Who Was Who in Amer v2

Conway, Daniel W. "Answering the Call of the Wild: Walking with Bugbee and Thoreau," *Personalist Forum* 14 (1998): 49–64.

———, "The Wilderness of Henry Bugbee," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 17 (2003): 259–69.

Mooney, Edward F. "Two Testimonies in American Philosophy: Stanley Cavell, Henry Bugbee," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 17 (2003): 108–21.

Mooney, Edward F., ed. *Wilderness and the Heart: Henry Bugbee's Philosophy of Place, Presence, and Memory* (Athens, Georgia, 1999).

Rudd, Anthony. *Expressing the World: Skepticism, Wittgenstein, and Heidegger* (Chicago, 2003).

Wilshire, Bruce. "Henry Bugbee," *The Primal Roots of American Philosophy* (University Park, Penn., 2000), chap. 9.

Edward F. Mooney

BUNGE, Mario Augusto (1919–)

Mario Augusto Bunge was born on 21 August 1919 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. He received his PhD in physico-mathematical sciences in 1952 from Universidad de La Plata. From 1956 to 1959 he was a professor of theoretical physics at Universidad de La Plata and Universidad de Buenos Aires, and from 1957 to 1962 he was professor of philosophy at Universidad de Buenos Aires. Unhappy with Argentinian politics, from 1960 onward Bunge held visiting positions at the philosophy departments of the University of Pennsylvania in 1960–61, University of Texas in 1963, Temple University in 1963–4, and University of Delaware in 1964–5. In 1966 he became professor of philosophy at McGill University in Montréal, Canada. Bunge has been awarded honorary degrees from several universities, and became a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1984 and a fellow of The Royal Society of Canada in 1992.

Bunge advocated the rigorous axiomatization of scientific theories, which would help eliminate unnecessary heuristic devices and models and expose the genuine relations between theories. Scientific theories should be interpreted realistically even though they are fallible, replaceable, and do not absorb the postulated entities of their predecessors; Bunge accepts the label of "critical realism" for his stance. His philosophy is comprehensively explained in the eight volumes of his *Treatise on Basic Philosophy* (1974–89), which covers his philosophy of science, ontology, epistemology, technology, and ethics. Against positivism and reductionism, Bunge legitimizes metaphysics (if conducted by the scientific method) and a type of emergent materialism that refuses any demand that one field of science (such as physics) should have an exclusive grasp on the composition of reality.

Bunge refers to his naturalistic ontology as an "integrated pluralism" which holds that science investigates various levels of dynamic systems that together make up the universe. While at any level those existing systems rely on older and underlying systems for their emergence and maintenance, their properties are not reducible to those other systems. Scientific theories can operate relatively autonomously and their scientific laws can be valid independently of any other theories about other levels. Bunge's systems approach to materialism led him to the view that mental systems should be characterized as functions of brain activity.

Uncomfortable with materialistic denials that the qualitative features of consciousness really exist, Bunge locates such qualities in emergent mental systems.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Causality: The Place of the Causal Principle in Modern Science (Cambridge, Mass., 1959). 3rd edn, *Causality and Modern Science* (New York, 1979).

Metascientific Queries (Springfield, Ill., 1959).

Intuition and Science (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1962).

The Myth of Simplicity (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1963).

Problems in Foundations of Physics (Berlin, 1967).

Scientific Research, 2 vols (Berlin, 1967). 2nd edn, *Philosophy of Science* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1998).

Method, Model and Matter (Dordrecht, 1973).

Philosophy of Physics (Dordrecht, 1973).

Treatise on Basic Philosophy, 8 vols (Dordrecht, 1974–89).

Ciencia y desarrollo (Buenos Aires, 1980).

Epistemologia (Barcelona, 1980).

The Mind–Body Problem (Oxford, 1980).

Scientific Materialism (Dordrecht, 1981).

Philosophy of Psychology, with Ruben Ardila (Berlin, 1987).

Finding Philosophy in Social Science (New Haven, 1996).

Foundations of Biophilosophy, with Martin Mahner (Berlin, 1997).

Critical Approaches to Science and Philosophy (New Brunswick, N.J., 1998).

Philosophy of Science, 2 vols (New Brunswick, N.J., 1998).

Social Science Under Debate (Toronto, 1998).

The Sociology–Philosophy Connection (New Brunswick, N.J., 1999).

Philosophy in Crisis: The Need for Reconstruction (Amherst, N.Y., 2001).

Scientific Realism: Selected Essays by Mario Bunge, ed. Martin Mahner (Amherst, N.Y., 2001).

Emergence and Convergence (Toronto, 2003).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *The Critical Approach to Science and Philosophy: Essays in Honor of Karl Popper* (New York, 1964).

Ed., *Exact Philosophy: Problems, Tools and Goals* (Dordrecht, 1973).

Ed., *The Methodological Unity of Science* (Dordrecht, 1973).

Further Reading

Agassi, Joseph, and Robert S. Cohen, eds. *Scientific Philosophy Today: Essays in Honor of Mario Bunge* (Dordrecht, 1982).

Forman, Frank. *The Metaphysics of Liberty* (Dordrecht, 1989).

Freiheit, Heike, and Erwin Rosenthal. "Zur philosophischen position Mario Bunges," *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie* 36 (1988): 233–40.

Schlegel, Richard. "Mario Bunge on Causality," *Philosophy of Science* 28 (1961): 72–82.

Serroni-Copello, Raul. *Encuentros con Mario Bunge* (1989).

"Systems and Mechanisms: A Symposium on Mario Bunge's Philosophy of Social Science," *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 34 (June, September 2004). Special issues about Bunge.

Vacher, Laurent-Michel. *Entretiens avec Mario Bunge* (Montréal, 1993).

Weingartner, Paul, and Georg Dorn, eds. *Studies on Bunge's Treatise* (Amsterdam, 1990). Contains a bibliography of Bunge's writings.

John R. Shook

BURGESS, John William (1844–1931)

John Burgess was born on 26 August 1844 in Cornersville, Tennessee. During the Civil War he eluded impressment into the Confederate army and instead served in the Union army. He graduated with his BA in 1867 from Amherst College, where he took classes with the Hegelian Julius H. SEELYE. Burgess then studied law and was admitted to the Massachusetts bar in 1869. He briefly taught at Knox College before spending over two years studying in German universities. Upon his return in 1873 Burgess found a position teaching history and political science at Amherst College. In 1876 he became professor of history, political science, and international law at Columbia University, and with Nicholas Murray BUTLER he established the first school of political science for graduate study in 1880. Burgess gathered an outstanding faculty at Columbia, including John Bates CLARK and Charles A. Beard. He founded the Academy of Political Science in 1880 and the *Political Science Quarterly* in 1886. Burgess retired in 1912 and died on 13 January 1931 in Brookline, Massachusetts.

Burgess's German education in historical methods of cultural study was thoroughly Hegelian. This produced his conviction that the modern state was the rational destiny of human progress. Modernism for him meant laying down the democratic foundations of governmental authority for the protection of individual liberties. On Burgess's theory, a government serves a nation, which is defined by possession of a common language and culture. Rejecting the "dual sovereignty" theory, which placed a citizen in two relationships with both a state and the federal government, Burgess instead held that the people themselves *are* sovereign and constitute what he generically termed the *state*. Therefore, on this theory, the people (the "state") uses federal, state, and local governments to effect its popular will. Burgess's *Political Science and Comparative Constitutional Law* (1890–91), which defined the state as political science's field of scientific study, shaped conservative political theory until the 1920s.

Burgess wrote influential histories of nineteenth-century America and the Civil War in light of his political theories. Although his early major writings supported immigrant assimilation and the notion that the Anglo-Saxon race had a special leadership position in the world, his later writings repudiated US aggression and regretted its growing imperialism. Looking back on the 1898 Spanish–American War as a watershed event and distressed over World War I, his *Recent Changes in American Constitutional Theory* (1923) called the US government "autocratic" and enumerated many government intrusions into private rights.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Political Science and Comparative Constitutional Law (Boston, 1890–91).
The Middle Period, 1817–1858 (New York, 1897).
The Civil War and the Constitution, 1859–1865 (New York, 1901).
Reconstruction and the Constitution, 1866–1876 (New York, 1902).
The European War of 1914 (Chicago, 1915).
The Reconciliation of Government with Liberty (New York, 1915).
America's Relation to the Great War (Chicago, 1916).
Recent Changes in American Constitutional Theory (New York, 1923).
The Sanctity of the Law: Wherein Does It Consist? (New York, 1928).
The Foundations of Political Science (New York, 1933).

Other Relevant Works
Burgess's papers are at Columbia University.
Reminiscences of an American Scholar (New York, 1934).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v23*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Brown, Bernard E. *American Conservatives: The Political Thought of Francis Lieber and John W. Burgess* (New York, 1951).

Gunnell, John G. *The Descent of Political Theory: The Genealogy of an American Vocation* (Chicago, 1993).

Ross, Dorothy. *The Origins of American Social Science* (Cambridge, UK, 1991).

John R. Shook

BURKE, Kenneth Duva (1897–1993)

Kenneth Burke was born on 5 May 1897 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Announcing in 1917 that he was quitting Columbia College so he could "begin studying," Burke never obtained even a bachelor's degree, much less a doctorate. Nevertheless, he made his mark on American philosophy over the next six decades with a singular determination to reject positivism and to replace it with a philosophical form reminiscent of hermeneutics and which anticipated many of the tenets of postmodernity. Burke supported himself in Greenwich Village by editing and contributing to *The Dial* from 1927 to 1929 and to *The Nation* from 1934 to 1936. In 1943 Bennington College in Vermont appointed him as a lecturer in literary criticism, and he taught literary criticism and literature part-time there until 1961. He also was a visiting professor at other universities, including Princeton University and Kenyon College. Burke was elected to the National Institute of Arts and Letters in 1951 and to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1966. Burke died on 19 November 1993 in Andover, New Jersey.

In an unusually long and productive life, Burke was a literary critic, philosopher of language, poet, and analyst of rhetorical forms. He made substantial contributions to all of these areas as well as formulating a unique philosophy of his own which he called "dramatism." His vast influence can be seen not only in art and literature, but also in qualitative forms of social science including history, political science, and sociology. He is claimed as the founding father of dramaturgical social psychology (Brissett and Edgley 1990).

"Dramatism," which derived from an analysis of literature, took human agency to be the fundamental principle in the study of man. His early work, *Permanence and Change* (1935), subtitled for emphasis "an anatomy of purpose," set a theme which he never compromised: human conduct is in the realm of action rather than motion, therefore the starting point for all analysis is in varieties of conduct rather than knowledge or conditioning. Rejecting Cartesian dualisms, all determinisms, and all forms of reduction, Burke insisted that human beings are symbol-using and motive-invoking creatures who resist all efforts to reduce them to objective forms. "Things move – people act" was his simple starting point that swept away attempts to treat people as mere objects, and to differentiate the human condition with its linguistic dimensions from other forms of nature.

The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action (1941) examines the formal structure of literature and its relation to a literary work's meaning. In the first two parts of an unfinished trilogy, *A Grammar of Motives* (1945) and *A Rhetoric of Motives* (1950), Burke set out the five key terms which constitute a dramatistic analysis. They are Act, Scene, Agent, Agency, and Purpose. Motives are neither levers nor pulleys which make people act the way they do in some deterministic sense, but rather words human beings use to communicate with one another about what they are doing and why they are doing it. In these symbolic interactions each of these prin-

ciples answers a fundamental question. Act names what took place in thought or deed. Scene names the background and situation in which the act occurred, Agent names the person or kind of person who performed the act, Agency names how the act was accomplished, and Purpose says why the act was done.

This *Pentad* applies to all human acts and the ratios between the elements comprise an analysis of what is happening. Whether one is analyzing literature, poetry, a social system, or the interpersonal dynamics of a situation, these five elements are always present. The tendency to reduce all human action to but one of the elements must be avoided, and Burke shows how various disciplines and deterministic theories have fallen into this trap. The recently discovered final work in the trilogy, the manuscript *A Symbolic of Motives*, was to have been a culmination of his dramatistic system (portions are in Henderson and Williams 2001).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Counter-statement (Los Altos, Cal., 1931).
Towards a Better Life, Being a Series of Epistles or Declamations (New York, 1932).
Permanence and Change: An Anatomy of Purpose (New York, 1935).
Attitudes toward History, 2 vols (New York, 1937).
The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action (New York, 1941).
A Grammar of Motives (New York, 1945).
A Rhetoric of Motives (New York, 1950).
The Rhetoric of Religion: Studies in Logology (Boston, 1961).
Terms for Order and Perspectives by Incongruity, ed. Stanley Hyman (Bloomington, Ind., 1964).
Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method (Berkeley, Cal., 1966).

Other Relevant Works
On Human Nature: A Gathering While Everything Flows, 1967–1984, ed.

William Rueckert, Angelo Bonadonna, and William Rueckert (Berkeley, Cal., 2003).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Who Was Who in Amer v11*
Brissett, Dennis and Charles Edgley. *Life as Theater: A Dramaturgical Sourcebook* (New York, 1990).
Crusius, Timothy. *Kenneth Burke and the Conversation After Philosophy* (Carbondale, Ill., 1999).
Duncan, Hugh D. *Communication and Social Order* (New York, 1962).
Frank, Armin. *Kenneth Burke* (New York, 1969).
Henderson, Greig and David Williams, eds. *Unending Conversations: New Writings by and about Kenneth Burke* (Carbondale, Ill., 2001).
Rueckert, William. *Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations* (Minneapolis, 1963).
———, ed. *Critical Responses to Kenneth Burke, 1924–1966* (Minneapolis, 1969).
White, Hayden and Margaret Brose, eds. *Representing Kenneth Burke* (Baltimore, Md., 1982).

Charles Edgley

BURKS, Arthur Walter (1915–)

Arthur Burks was born on 13 October 1915 in Duluth, Minnesota. From age ten through high school, he lived in Batavia, Illinois, west of Chicago, where his father commuted to teach mathematics at Marshall High School. Burks earned his BA in mathematics and physics from DePauw University in 1936. He received his PhD in philosophy at the University of

Michigan in 1941, writing his dissertation on Charles Sanders PEIRCE. After taking a government-sponsored defense-training course in the summer of 1941 at the Moore School of Electrical Engineering at the University of Pennsylvania, Burks stayed on there as a wartime instructor and research engineer. In the fall of 1945, wishing to return to philosophy, he accepted a part-time instructorship at nearby Swarthmore College for the school year 1945–6, but continued to work full-time at the Moore School through mid-February. Shortly thereafter, he began commuting to the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton for three days a week through the balance of the spring term and for five days a week that summer. In the fall of 1946 he commenced his career at the University of Michigan, starting as assistant professor of philosophy and retiring, in 1986, as professor of philosophy in the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts and as professor of electrical engineering and computer science in the College of Engineering. Burks has received many honors, including the Russel Lectureship for 1977–8, the highest honor bestowed on a faculty member by the University of Michigan, nominated by colleagues in both philosophy and computer science. Burks was President of the American Philosophical Association Western Division in 1972–3.

As Burks noted in his "Replies" for *The Philosophy of Logical Mechanism*, the 1990 Festschrift edited by Merilee Salmon, his "long-range philosophical interests have always been in broad questions of epistemology, logic, metaphysics, and value, such as those treated by Plato, Lucretius, Hume, Kant, and Peirce." At Michigan he taught courses in logic, the philosophy of science, and the history of modern philosophy. He has written papers in all of these areas. His major book is *Chance, Cause, Reason: An Inquiry into the Nature of Scientific Evidence* (1977), in which he developed his calculus of probabilistic choice and his logic of causal propositions, together with their applications to traditional philosophical problems.

Burks's work on Peirce took him to Harvard University in 1955, to edit the seventh and eighth volumes of *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce* (1958), completing the series for which Charles HARTSHORNE and Paul WEISS had edited the first six volumes. In recent years, he has been an adjunct professor at Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis, consulting for the Peirce Edition Project as it produces a comprehensive chronological series of Peirce's writings.

Burks's years at the Moore School during World War II had entailed an abrupt shift from his doctoral studies in philosophy to research in electrical engineering. His first assignment was to a mine-sweeping project, with its task of advising the Philadelphia Navy Yard as to the speed and the successive altitudes at which mine-sweeping airplanes should fly over stretches of ocean in order to detonate any possible underwater bombs. Its difficulty lay in the need to explode the mine, whatever its depth, at such a point that the resulting large spout of water would not strike and crash the low-flying plane. The required calculations, in which he joined J. Presper Eckert, John W. Mauchly, and Cornelius Weygandt, were done on desk calculators and on the school's differential analyzer. Burks's adaptation to this and other early projects made clear that his undergraduate studies at DePauw and his graduate work at Michigan, followed by the intensive government course at the Moore School, had provided the foundation he needed for war research.

His main work at the Moore School was as a principal designer, under Eckert and Mauchly, of the ENIAC (Electronic Numerical Integrator and Computer), the world's first general-purpose, or programmable, electronic computer. In this US Army-sponsored project, Burks contributed to the designs of the basic arithmetic unit (the accumulator) and the high-speed multiplier. His chief contribution, though, was the fundamental organization of the computer's master programmer, the component that consolidated all the local programs

of the thirty individual units into a single program, with repetitions and branches. In this regard, he prepared the first electronic computer program – for calculating a shell trajectory, the task for which the ENIAC was originally conceived. When the computer was tentatively finished, Burks worked successively with T. Kite Sharpless and Robert F. Shaw to check the entire electronic system for logical correctness and for adherence to a set of strict design principles devised to ensure reliability in this 18,000-vacuum-tube behemoth.

At the Institute for Advanced Study, where he had been invited by John VON NEUMANN to work on the IAS computer after the ENIAC's dedication in early 1946, he co-authored, with von Neumann and Herman H. Goldstine, the June 1946 *Preliminary Discussion of the Logical Design of an Electronic Computing Instrument*. This work, which provided the paradigmatic form of von Neumann's computer architecture, has been widely regarded as one of the most influential documents in the field. Although he left the Institute for Michigan that fall, Burks returned for the summers of 1947 and 1948.

The wartime move from philosophy to what was to become known as computer science carried over to Burks's postwar years, so that he actually devoted about half his time at Michigan to philosophy and half to computer science, together with efforts to build bridges between two fields that were generally considered distinct. Fortunately, the philosophy department at Michigan took a broad view of its subject matter.

In the fall of 1948, with this strong interest in electronic computers and their basis in logical manipulations, he began consulting for Burroughs Adding Machine Co., in Detroit. A year later he formed the Logic of Computers Group at Michigan, which Burroughs sponsored through 1954, when Burks left for his year at Harvard. That group was re-established upon his return, supported by various government research grants, and continued beyond his retirement in 1986. It did research on pro-

gramming, automata theory, computer modeling, and self-reproducing cellular automata, much of it inspired by von Neumann's original work in those areas.

Burks's Logic of Computer Group led, in 1956, to a doctoral program in computers and then, in 1967, to a new department of computer and communication sciences in the Literary College, with Burks as its first Chair. In 1983 the faculty of that department was shifted to the department of electrical engineering and computer science in the Engineering College. Within this discipline, Burks taught courses in (and wrote papers on) computer architecture, computer logic, the theory of cellular automata, and the history of computing.

His writing on computer history began in the mid 1970s. As early as 1950, he had been asked by several corporations to consult on the ENIAC – as to who did what and when – in anticipation of the issuance of the Eckert-Mauchly patent on that computer. He was especially involved in consulting for Honeywell after the patent was granted in 1964, as Sperry Rand, which had acquired the patent rights, began demanding huge royalties from the entire electronic data processing industry. Honeywell balked and ultimately became the plaintiff in a lawsuit against Sperry Rand. In October 1973 Judge Earl R. Larson, of the US District Court in Minneapolis, handed down his decision rendering the ENIAC patent invalid. A major basis for this invalidation was the finding that the ENIAC had been derived from the work of an obscure physicist/mathematician, John V. Atanasoff, and his prior electronic computer, the ABC, through a visit Mauchly had made to Atanasoff's Iowa State University laboratory in 1941.

This case led Burks to revise his long-held view that the ENIAC was the world's first electronic computer. And he now undertook to write the history, as it became apparent that neither industry nor academia was presenting the unappealed trial outcome with either accuracy or acceptance. He recognized that the

ABC, though a *special-purpose* computer, nevertheless embraced some dozen original concepts that remain basic today, and that the ENIAC, which did go far beyond the ABC and led to the stored-program computers and beyond, was properly seen as the first *general-purpose* electronic computer.

Burks and his wife Alice wrote a lengthy article on the ENIAC for the *Annals of the History of Computing* in 1981, and then a book, *The First Electronic Computer: The Atanasoff Story* in 1988. He continues to write on this history, as now the only remaining survivor of that vacuum-tube era who tries to sort out and explain the relevant issues and their roles in the modern computer revolution.

The question that most often arises with regard to Burks's career concerns a seeming incongruity between philosophy and computer science. Indeed, though the idea that a computer is a *logic machine* is quite well recognized today, this implicit connection between the two disciplines met with considerable resistance for many years, so that Burks found himself living in two separate worlds that were, to him, strongly linked. It so happened that as long ago as the 1880s philosopher Peirce had remarked on the role of logic in computing devices, even suggesting that electromagnetic relays could be basic computing elements. Atanasoff, in designing his binary serial add–subtract mechanisms, realized that he was doing logic, as he devised and followed a truth-table for adding or subtracting two streams of pulses and producing the correct sums or differences, together with their carry or borrow digits. Burks recognized that many circuits of the ENIAC were performing the logical functions of NOT, NOT-OR, NOT-AND, and complexes of these. Other computer designers also understood, to varying degrees, that they were doing logic. Burks carried the relationship forward for the rest of his career.

Burks's philosophy of logical mechanism is itself a combining of philosophy and science, with mathematical logic as a foundation. Further, Peirce brought these same disciplines to bear on his metaphysical system. It is this coincidence that has enabled Burks both to explain Peirce's work and to criticize it in light of later scientific developments. From this perspective, it becomes clear that Burks's philosophy of logical mechanism is generally harmonious with and continuous with Peirce's philosophy. Burks shows how computer simulation can explain the role of probability and the gradual development of complexity in evolution. These two phenomena have their counterparts in the first two stages of Peirce's cosmic theory of evolution: his tychism (probability) and his synechism (gradual development). As a logical mechanist, Burks rejects Peirce's third stage, his agapism (final causation; that is, unlimited progress toward a better and better universe) in favor of a reductive account of evolution. Burks spells out his views by comparison with Peirce's views most succinctly in the conclusion to his 1997 "Logic, Learning, and Creativity in Evolution," an essay in *Studies in the Logic of Charles S. Peirce*. He gives an extended account in the Festschrift cited earlier, *The Philosophy of Logical Mechanism*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Peirce's Conception of Logic as a Normative Science," *Philosophical Review* 52 (1943): 187–93.

"Laws of Nature and Reasonableness of Regret," *Mind* 55 (1946): 170–72.

"Empiricism and Vagueness," *Journal of Philosophy* 42 (1946): 477–86.

Preliminary Discussion of the Logical Design of an Electronic Computing Instrument, with Herman H. Goldstine and John von Neumann (Princeton, N.J., 1946; 2nd edn 1947). Reprinted in Burks and Aspray 1987, pp. 97–142.

"Super Electronic Computing Machine," *Electronic Industries* 5 (1946): 2–67, 96.

"Electronic Computing Circuits of the ENIAC," *Proceedings of the Institute of Radio Engineers* 35 (1947): 756–67. Reprinted in *Proceedings of the Institute of*

Electrical and Electronic Engineers 85 (1997): 1169–82.

"Icon, Index, and Symbol," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 9 (1949): 673–89.

"Logic, Computers, and Men," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 46 (1973): 39–57.

Chance, Cause, Reason: An Inquiry into the Nature of Scientific Evidence (Chicago, 1977).

"An Architectural Theory of Functional Consciousness," in *Current Issues in Teleology*, ed. Nicholas Rescher (New York, 1986), pp. 1–14.

"Peirce's Evolutionary Pragmatic Idealism," *Synthese* 106 (1996): 323–72.

"Logic, Learning, and Creativity in Evolution," *Studies in the Logic of Charles S. Peirce*, ed. Don Roberts, Nathan Houser, and James van Evra (Bloomington, Ind., 1997), pp. 497–535.

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*, vols 7 and 8 (Cambridge, Mass., 1958).

Ed., *Theory of Self-reproducing Automata*, by John von Neumann (Urbana, Ill., 1966).

Ed., *Essays on Cellular Automata* (Urbana, Ill., 1970).

"The ENIAC: First General-Purpose Electronic Computer," with Alice R. Burks, *Annals of the History of Computing* 3 (1981): 310–99.

Ed., with William Aspray, *Papers of John von Neumann on Computing and Computer Theory* (Cambridge, Mass., 1987).

The First Electronic Computer: The Atanasoff Story, with Alice R. Burks (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1988).

"The Invention of the Universal Electronic Computer – How the Electronic Computer Revolution Began," *Future Generation Computer Systems* 18 (2002): 871–92.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v8, Who's Who in Phil
Salmon, Merilee H., ed. *The Philosophy of Logical Mechanism: Essays in Honor of Arthur W. Burks, with His Responses* (Dordrecht, 1990).

Alice Rowe Burks

BURTT, Edwin Arthur (1892–1989)

Edwin A. Burtt was born on 11 October 1892 in Groton, Massachusetts, and died on 6 September 1989 in Ithaca, New York. He was the second son of Edwin Palmer and Harriet Jerome Burtt. His father was a New England Baptist minister, who trusted in God both as healer, by rejecting traditional medicine to treat illness, and as provider, by rejecting a salaried income to support his family. When Burtt was thirteen, his father became a missionary and moved the family to south China. After rebelling against his father's religious fundamentalism, Burtt returned to the United States in 1909 and attended the Mount Herman School in Massachusetts for two years. He then attended Yale University, where he majored in philosophy and was awarded a BA degree in 1915. He next moved to New York City to study for the ministry at the Union Theological Seminary. Although he received a BD degree in 1920 and an STM degree in 1922, Burtt abandoned his plan to become a minister to pursue a career as an academic philosopher. He went to Columbia University as a doctoral student in philosophy, when the department included John DEWEY and F. J. E. WOODBRIDGE. In 1925 he was awarded a PhD in philosophy from Columbia, with Woodbridge supervising the dissertation.

Burtt began his academic career as an instructor at Columbia, where he taught from 1921 to 1923. In 1923, he accepted a position at the University of Chicago as an assistant professor and was promoted to full professor in 1928. During Burtt's tenure at the university, the philosophy department was still a stronghold of pragmatism. Burtt was a visiting professor at Harvard University in 1927–8. In 1931 Burtt resigned from Chicago along with other prominent members of the philosophy department. He then taught at Stanford University in 1931–2.

In 1932 Burtt joined the Sage School of Philosophy at Cornell University, where he was named the Susan Linn Sage Professor of Philosophy in 1941. He retired as emeritus professor from Cornell in 1960 but continued to write and publish actively. Burtt was also a visiting professor at the University of Hawaii in 1941 and 1945 and a lecturer on philosophy and religion in India, Ceylon, and China in 1946–7 and 1953–4. He received several academic awards, including an LHD from the University of Chicago in 1951 and the Nicholas Murray Butler Silver Medal from Columbia University in 1958. He was active in professional societies, serving as President of the American Theological Society in 1949–50 and President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1963–4.

Burtt is best known for *The Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Physical Science*, published first in 1924 as his doctoral dissertation on Isaac Newton's metaphysics and then in 1932 in a revised version. In that book he maps the development of metaphysical presuppositions in the physical sciences from Copernicus and Kepler to Newton. His thesis is that contemporary philosophical issues, particularly those associated with the displacement of humans from the physical and metaphysical center of the cosmos, reflect philosophers' uncritical acceptance of the shift from a medieval worldview to a Newtonian or modern scientific worldview. That shift is particularly evident in the metaphysical categories used to frame the modern perception of cosmology: specifically, the modern categories of space, time, and mass replaced the medieval categories of substance, essence, and form. Moreover, modern reality becomes atoms and their motions, efficient causality, and the identification of mind with the brain. Burtt's demonstration of the importance of metaphysical presuppositions in the development of scientific knowledge ran counter to the then-prevalent logical positivists' view that metaphysics is superfluous in the natural sciences.

Burtt's supporters included Imré Lakatos, who praised Burtt for his critique of positivism's anti-metaphysical view, but some thinkers strongly criticized his main thesis. Bertrand Russell interpreted Burtt's thesis as an attack on the rational foundation of modern science. Another Columbia doctoral student, Edward Strong (1936), whose dissertation was also directed by Woodbridge, argued that metaphysical categories in the natural sciences are methodologically determined so that science is driven by methods or procedures and not by metaphysics. Burtt (1943) responded that certain metaphysical categories, such as "gravity," are methodologically or operationally determined, while other categories, such as the "ether," are conventionally defined. Burtt never felt a need to revise his classic work after further twentieth-century revolutions in physics. Science, however, and especially as it related to religion, remained an important part of Burtt's scholarly activity throughout his career.

During his tenure at Cornell, Burtt taught courses in the history of religions and comparative religion. This experience had a profound impact on the direction of his scholarship, as well as on his personal life. In the late 1920s, Burtt subscribed to religious humanism and signed the "Human Manifesto" in 1933, which was atheistic in intent and also substituted the spirit of humanity for traditional notions of the divine. His conversion to humanism was evident in a series of lectures

that he delivered before the Institute of World Unity at Greene Acre in August 1928; these were published as *Religion in an Age of Science* (1929). Burtt argued that religion must be radically transformed toward consonance with the spirit of science and must come to regard its dogmas as tentative. During World War II, however, he rejected religious humanism because of its inability to account for evil and became a member of Religious Society of Friends until his death. In 1947 while in India, Burtt also took vows as a lay Buddhist to demonstrate publicly the nourishment he received from this religious tradition. Although Quakerism and Buddhism appear to be fundamentally different religious traditions, Burtt found important points of contact between them; he saw the Quaker notion of "inward light" as congenial to principles of Eastern spirituality.

Burtt's dissatisfaction with humanism and his religious conversion initially found their way into his philosophy, in terms of the problem of philosophical method. In a paper on the topic published in 1946, Burtt complained that philosophizing often represents "personal idiosyncrasy" or allegiance to a specific "school of thought." After reviewing the positions of several prominent philosophers on philosophical method, he enumerated several features he considered essential for philosophizing, including relativity of viewpoints, probability of truth, inclusiveness, and contextual evaluation. Burtt called his methodological position "impartial cooperation," for what philosophers "can properly insist upon is that their proposed criteria [for evaluating philosophical arguments] along with ours be rendered intelligible in the sense in which 'intelligible' is identical with 'sharable.' Then all alike become subject to cooperative assessment." (1946, p. 533) Although a variety of philosophers, including John Dewey and Søren Kierkegaard, and different philosophical systems, including pragmatism and existentialism, influenced Burtt's philosophical position, he never completely endorsed any particular philosopher or philosophical system. Rather, after his religious conversions he attempted to forge a philosophical approach or sensitivity that accommodated both Eastern and Western traditions.

Burtt's philosophical method was advanced by a trip to the Far East in the mid 1940s. In a report to the Second Inter-American Congress of Philosophy held at Columbia in 1947, he claimed that his travels had opened new vistas for him and had afforded him "the opportunity to begin exploring a vaster universe than any I had glimpsed before" (1949, p. 387). In a paper contributed to a symposium on Oriental philosophy in a 1948 issue of *Philosophical Review*, Burtt expounded upon a notion of "context" in an attempt at rapprochement between apparently irreconcilable differences separating Eastern and Western philosophical traditions. Although Burtt did not precisely define context, he used the notion operationally to refer to the "linguistic equivalents" between two cultures and to the "point of view" of a culture. He then examined key philosophical concepts in Eastern and Western philosophy and argued that rapprochement between the two traditions is possible only by respecting the culture of other traditions and by continued growth that transcends the limits of a particular tradition. With respect to the outcome of this process, Burtt acknowledged, "No present thinker, Western or Eastern, can anticipate with any assurance what form that notion [of fact and truth] will take, but when it appears it will present itself as a fulfillment of the partial standards which on both sides now obtain." (1948, p. 604)

Burtt's philosophical goal after the mid 1940s was to work toward a "world philosophy," in which the limitations of Eastern and Western philosophical traditions were transcended in an integration of their achievements. To attain that integration, he developed a notion of "expansion of awareness" and introduced it in his final major published work, *In Search of Philosophic Understanding*

(1965). This newer notion eclipsed the earlier notion of context and included three essential components: presuppositions, valuations, and motivations. Presuppositions were the premises that underpin thinking and that compose the scaffolding for constructing a world view. Valuations and motivations represent the emotional dimension of epistemology and are important for adopting specific presuppositions. Another important component of Burtt's drive towards an expanded awareness was psychoanalysis, which Burtt himself had undergone since the mid 1940s. Through psychoanalysis, unconscious motivations that lead to valuing particular presuppositions can be made explicit. Burtt argued that "insight" into the underlying presuppositions is required to transcend unconscious biases towards grasping truth and "ultimate" reality. Besides psychoanalysis, Burtt also recommended Eastern meditation for transcending the biases often inherent in unconscious presuppositions. Importantly, Burtt's intention was not to propose another philosophical system for obtaining truth; rather, "my main aim is to raise questions that cannot be ignored by a seeker for truth, to put them in the most promising form I can, to open vistas ahead by probing in various directions and sketching fertile possibilities, and to entice you to roam farther in whatever way you judge likely to be rewarding" (1965, p. xiii).

When over eighty years of age Burtt summed up his approach to philosophy: "My fundamental maxim now was 'Keep growing!' and this clearly was a process to which there would be no end." (1974, p. 106) Until his death, Burtt continued to search for the philosophical light to grow towards a fuller conscious life. Many have found Burtt's eclectic style disconcerting, but as Francis Moriarty argues, "there is a connecting thread uniting his diverse works, namely, his determination to develop a post-empiricist metaphysics that would receive its political expression in a world community" (1994, pp. 3–4). Burtt spent his academic career trying to bridge two powerful institutions in Western society – science and religion – by developing a "new metaphysics" and attendant categories for a new world understanding, especially with the aid of Eastern philosophical traditions. Not only was he a first-class, influential metaphysician who made significant contributions to twentieth-century philosophical thought, but Burtt's character and integrity were legendary: "He stands for a quality of intellectual and spiritual hospitality that is all the more inspiring because it stems from widespread scholarly analysis and a moral passion for catholicity and civility." (Bertocci 1975, p. 269)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Physical Science: A Historical and Critical Essay (London, 1924; 2nd edn 1932).

Principles and Problems of Right Thinking: A Textbook for Logic, Reflective Thinking, and Orientation Courses (New York, 1928; 2nd edn 1931).

Religion in an Age of Science (New York, 1929).

Types of Religious Philosophy (New York, 1939; 2nd edn 1951).

Right Thinking: A Study in Its Principles and Methods (New York, 1946).

Man Seeks the Divine: A Study of the History and Comparative Religions (New York, 1957; 2nd edn 1964).

In Search of Philosophic Understanding (New York, 1965).

"Toward a Philosophy of Philosophy," in *Mid-Twentieth Century American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. Peter A. Bertocci (New York, 1974), pp. 104–19.

The Human Journey (Calcutta, 1981).

Other Relevant Works

Burtt's papers are at Cornell University, and the University of Adelaide, Australia.

Ed., *The English Philosophers from Bacon to Mill* (New York, 1939).

"Method and Metaphysics in Sir Isaac

Newton," *Philosophy of Science* 10 (1943): 57–66.

"What is Metaphysics?" *Philosophical Review* 54 (1945): 533–57.

"The Problem of Philosophical Method," *Philosophical Review* 55 (1946): 505–33.

"How Can the Philosophies of East and West Meet?" *Philosophical Review* 57 (1948): 590–604.

"Philosophy and Philosophers in the Far East," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 9 (1949): 377–88.

Ed., *The Teachings of the Compassionate Buddha* (New York, 1955).

"The Core of Dewey's Way of Thinking," *Journal of Philosophy* 57 (1960): 401–19.

"Descriptive Metaphysics," *Mind* 72 (1963): 18–39.

"My Path to Philosophy," *Philosophy East and West* 22 (1972): 429–40.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, Pres Addr of APA v7, Proc of APA v64, Who Was Who in Amer v9, Who's Who in Phil

Bertocci, Peter A. "Love and Reality in E. A. Burtt's Philosophy: A Personalistic Critique," *Idealistic Studies* 5 (1975): 269–89.

Daston, L. "History of Science in an Elegiac Mode: E. A. Burtt's *Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Science* Revisited," *Isis* 82 (1991): 522–31.

Lindberg, D. C., and R. S. Westman, eds. *Reappraisals of the Scientific Revolution* (Cambridge, UK, 1990).

Moriarty, F. J. *The Philosophy of E. A. Burtt: The Metaphysical Foundations for a World Community*. PhD dissertation, University of Adelaide (Adelaide, Australia, 1994).

Stainton, E. M. "E. A. Burtt: Bibliography," *Philosophy East and West* 22 (1972): 461–5.

Strong, E. W. *Procedures and Metaphysics: A Study in the Philosophy of Mathematical-physical Science in the Sixteenth and Seventieth Centuries* (Berkeley, Cal., 1936).

Villemaire, D. D. *E. A. Burtt, Historian and Philosopher: A Study of the Author of The Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Physical Science* (Boston, 2002).

James A. Marcum

BUSH, Wendell Ter (1866–1941)

Wendell T. Bush was born on 25 September 1866 in Ridgeway, Michigan, and died on 10 February 1941 in New York City. His father, Rufus T. Bush, belonged to an old and prominent Hudson River Valley family of Dutch origin. Rufus entered the oil-processing business and was one of the founders of the Bush & Denslow Manufacturing Co., which began its operations in 1870. The company merged with Standard Oil, yielding Bush's father a great fortune. After the death of Rufus Bush in 1890, the large estate was incorporated as the Bush Company, with Wendell Bush, his younger brother Irving, and his mother as its officers. The company invested in high-grade New York City and Brooklyn real estate, including the Bush Terminal in South Brooklyn.

Wendell Bush came to New York City early in life and graduated from Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute. In 1896 he married Mary L. Potter, the daughter of a ship captain. They had one adopted daughter, Anna. In 1898 he obtained his MA from Harvard, where he studied with William JAMES and Josiah ROYCE. He continued his education at the University of Berlin in 1900–1901, and in 1905 he received his PhD in philosophy at Columbia University with a dissertation on Swiss philosopher Richard Avenarius. In the same year, Bush began teaching at Columbia, and in 1906 he joined colleague Frederick J. E. WOODBRIDGE as an editor of the *Journal of Philosophy*, then

called the *Journal of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Methods*. He also provided a substantial financial endowment for the *Journal* and contributed many articles. Bush remained at Columbia for his entire career, becoming full professor in 1928 and retiring in 1938. Among other non-academic activities, Bush chaired a committee in 1917 that sponsored a "pilgrimage of patriotism" to Washington, D.C. to urge an immediate declaration of war against Germany.

Bush had a strong leaning toward James's empiricism, and to positivism both in its nineteenth-century French variety and its revival in the works of the logical positivists. Bush was also sympathetic to the American new realists and had a strong appreciation for John DEWEY's logic. In the final decades of his life, Bush developed a strong interest in the cultural and philosophical study of religion, and he founded the program of studies in religion and culture at the Columbia graduate school. Whereas James had sought to capture religious experience by studying diaries and biographies, Bush examined anthropological monographs and religious artifacts. He traveled widely collecting countless artifacts connected to the history of religion, such as fetishes, amulets, and medicine bundles. In 1935 he donated his extensive collection, now called the Bush Collection of Religion and Culture, to Columbia University.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Avenarius and the Standpoint of Pure Experience (New York, 1905).
"An Empirical Definition of Consciousness," *Journal of Philosophy* 2 (1905): 561–8.
"A Factor in the Genesis of Idealism," in *Essays Philosophical and Psychological, in Honor of William James* (New York, 1908), pp. 83–102.
"The Existential Universe of Discourse," *Journal of Philosophy* 6 (1909): 175–82.
"The Emancipation of Intelligence," *Journal of Philosophy* 8 (1911): 169–80.
"The Empiricism of James," *Journal of Philosophy* 10 (1913): 533–41.
"Constructive Intelligence," *Journal of Philosophy* 14 (1917): 505–20.
"An Impression of Greek Political Philosophy," in *Studies in the History of Ideas* (New York, 1918), pp. 43–79.
"The Background of Instrumentalism," *Journal of Philosophy* 20 (1923): 701–14.
"Religion and Art," *Journal of Philosophy* 27 (1930): 5–14.
"The Obvious in Esthetics," *Journal of Philosophy* 30 (1933): 197–212, 225–42.

Other Relevant Works
"Memories and Faith," *Journal of Philosophy* 26 (1929): 505–19.

Further Reading
Proc of APA in Phil Rev v51 & 55, Who Was Who in Amer v1
Friess, Horace L. "Professor Bush and his Collection of Religion and Culture," *Columbia University Quarterly* 33 (April 1941): 159–64.

Cornelis de Waal

BUSHNELL, Horace (1802–76)

Horace Bushnell was born on 14 April 1802 in New Preston, Connecticut, the first of eight children of Ensign Bushnell and Dotha Bishop. He graduated with a BA from Yale College in 1827, taught school, and edited the *Journal of Commerce* in New York during 1828–9. He then entered Yale Law School in 1829 and graduated in 1831. During a revival later in that year he decided to pursue the ministry. At Yale Divinity School he challenged the ideas of theology professor Nathaniel William Taylor. His study of Hebrew developed his appreciation of language, and his reading of Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection* deeply influenced him.

Bushnell left Yale when called to North Congregational Church in Hartford in 1833, and he married Mary Apthorp that same year.

Bushnell's career as preacher and writer developed amid the conflict of free inquiry and conservative Calvinism. His book *Christian Nurture* (1860), an American classic, provoked fellow Congregationalist Bennett Tyler by holding that infant baptism requires religious education to fulfill it. Bushnell had a striking spiritual conversion in 1848. "I was set upon by the personal discovery of Christ, and of God represented in him" (Edwards 1992, p. 96). After this experience, Bushnell entered into a fresh examination of Christian doctrine. In opposition to the economic trinity of Calvinism, Bushnell, following Schleiermacher, argued for an instrumental trinity. He challenged Puritan thought with his argument that play represents the true end of man more than work.

Bushnell also challenged common sense philosophy's claim that imprecision in language can be overcome by careful formulation. Bushnell argued that symbols provide the best way for people to rediscover a dwelling place within Christian faith. Charles HODGE, among others, strongly criticized Bushnell's *God in Christ* (1849); organized opposition among Congregational ministers in 1850, led by Lyman ATWATER, failed in its effort to censure Bushnell.

In 1859 Bushnell resigned his pulpit, although he continued to be intellectually active, publishing his further theological conclusions in a series of books. He also led the city of Hartford to transform a garbage dump into a park. Recalling the words of Job, "There is a spirit in man; and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding," Bushnell sought to shed Christian light on public issues. Bushnell died on 17 February 1876 in Hartford, Connecticut.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Discourses on Christian Nurture (Boston, 1847).

Views of Christian Nurture and of Subjects Adjacent Thereto (Boston, 1847).

God in Christ (Hartford, Conn., 1849).

Christ in Theology (Hartford, Conn., 1849; New York, 1987).

Sermons for the New Life (New York, 1858).

Nature and the Supernatural, as Together Constituting One System of God (New York, 1858).

The Character of Jesus: Forbidding His Possible Classification with Men (New York, 1860; New York, 1973).

Christian Nurture (New York, 1860; New Haven, Conn., 1967).

Work and Play, or Literary Varieties (New York, 1864; 2nd edn 1903).

Christ and His Salvation: In Sermons Related Variously Thereto (New York, 1864).

The Vicarious Sacrifice, Grounded in Principles of Universal Obligation (New York, 1864).

Moral Uses of Dark Things (New York, 1868).

Women's Suffrage: The Reform Against Nature (New York, 1869).

Sermons on Living Subjects (New York, 1872).

Forgiveness and Law, Grounded in Principles Interpreted by Human Analogies (New York, 1874). Reprinted as *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, vol. 2 (New York, 1877).

Building Eras in Religion (New York, 1881).

The Spirit in Man: Sermons and Selections, ed. Henry Learned (New York, 1903). Contains a bibliography of Bushnell's writings.

Other Relevant Works

Bushnell's papers are at Yale University and Harvard University.

Horace Bushnell: Twelve Selections, ed. H. Shelton Smith (Oxford, 1965).

Horace Bushnell: Selected Writings on Language, Religion, and American Culture, ed. David L. Smith (Chico, Cal., 1984).

Horace Bushnell: Sermons, ed. Conrad
  Cherry (New York, 1985).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*,
  Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, *Comp Amer
  Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer
  Religious Bio*, *Encyc Relig*, *Nat Cycl
  Amer Bio v8*

Cheney, Mary Bushnell. *Life and Letters of
  Horace Bushnell* (New York, 1880).

Crosby, Donald A. *Horace Bushnell's
  Theory of Language* (The Hague, 1975).

Cross, Barbara M. *Horace Bushnell:
  Minister to a Changing America* (Chicago,
  1958).

Duke, James O. *Horace Bushnell: On the
  Vitality of Biblical Language* (Chico, Cal.,
  1984). Contains a bibliography of
  Bushnell's writings.

Edwards, Robert L. *Of Singular Genius, of
  Singular Grace: A Biography of Horace
  Bushnell* (Cleveland, 1992).

Mullin, Robert B. *The Puritan as Yankee: A
  Life of Horace Bushnell* (Grand Rapids,
  Mich., 2002).

Munger, Theodore. *Horace Bushnell:
  Preacher and Theologian* (Boston, 1899).

Porter, Noah. "Horace Bushnell," *New
  Englander and Yale Review* 36 (January
  1877): 152–69.

Smith, David L. *Symbolism and Growth:
  The Religious Thought of Horace
  Bushnell* (Chico, Cal., 1981).

Roger Ward

BUSSEY, Gertrude Carman (1888–1961)

Gertrude C. Bussey was born on 13 January
1888 in New York City. Bussey first attended
Barnard College of Columbia, and received her
BA in 1908 from Wellesley College. After
graduate study at Columbia in 1908–1909,
teaching at a private school in Bronxville, and
more study at Oxford University during
1912–14, she went to Northwestern University
to receive her PhD in philosophy in 1915. Her
dissertation was titled "Typical Recent
Definitions of Freedom."

In 1915 Bussey was appointed instructor of
philosophy at Goucher College in Baltimore,
Maryland, and she remained there for the rest of
her career. She was promoted to full professor in
1921, and chaired the philosophy department
from 1924 until her retirement in 1953. Bussey's
early publications analyzed freedom from an
anti-absolutist standpoint, while a couple of later
articles concerned the nature of religion. She
was a member of the American Philosophical
Association, the Southern Society of Philosophy
and Psychology, the American Association of
University Professors, the American Association
of University Women, and Phi Beta Kappa. In
1954 she received an honorary LHD from
Goucher College. Bussey died on 12 March
1961 in New York City.

Bussey was devoted to several progressive
social and political causes, most notably the
Women's International League for Peace and
Freedom (WILPF), which was founded in 1915
by Jane ADDAMS and Emily Greene BALCH.
Bussey was an original member of WILPF's
Baltimore branch from the 1930s. Over the years
she served as Chairperson of the local branch,
National President during 1939–41, and co-
chairperson of WILPF, and wrote much of its
history. Bussey was also a co-founder and leader
of Maryland's Civil Liberties Committee, which
later became a branch of the American Civil
Liberties Union. Other organizations that bene-
fited from her service and leadership were the
Baltimore Open Forum, the Consumers' League
of Maryland, the Baltimore YMCA, and the
Church League for Industrial Democracy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Dr. Bosanquet's Doctrine of Freedom,"
  Philosophical Review 25 (1916): 711–19,
  728–30.

"Anticipations of Kant's Refutation of Sensationalism," *Philosophical Review* 31 (1922): 564–80.

"Croce's Theory of Freedom," *Philosophical Review* 39 (1930): 1–16.

"Religion and Truth," *Journal of Religion* (1932): 80–93.

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1915–1965: A Record of Fifty Years' Work, with Margaret Tims (London, 1965).

Other Relevant Works

Some of Bussey's correspondence is in the Peace Collection at Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania.

Trans., *Man a Machine*, by Julien Offroy de la Mettrie (Chicago, 1912).

Further Reading
Nat Cycl Amer Bio

John R. Shook

BUTCHVAROV, Panayot Krustev (1933–)

Panayot Butchvarov was born on 2 April 1933 in Sofia, Bulgaria. He was educated at the Sofia Gymnasium from 1946 to 1949; Robert College in Istanbul, Turkey (BA 1952); and he received his philosophy degrees at the University of Virginia (MA 1954, PhD 1955). He became a United States citizen in 1959. Butchvarov taught philosophy at the University of Baltimore in 1955–6, the University of South Carolina during 1957–9, and Syracuse University from 1959 to 1968, where he rose to the rank of full professor. In 1968 he moved to the University of Iowa. He served as department chair from 1970 to 1977. Since 1995, he has been University of Iowa Foundation Distinguished Professor of Philosophy. He has served as President of both the American Philosophical Association Central Division in 1992–3, and the Central States Philosophical Association, and also was editor of the *Journal of Philosophical Research*.

Throughout Butchvarov's work, one finds arguments that are simultaneously intricate, subtle, and substantial. Influenced by Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations* and making use of ideas found in continental and analytic sources, his is a systematic philosophical position with a phenomenological ontology at its core and includes interrelated views on ethics, epistemology, the philosophy of language, and the philosophy of mind. For example, the account of universals appearing in *Resemblance and Identity* (1966) and further developed in *Being Qua Being* (1979) supports the ethical realism of *Skepticism in Ethics* (1989). Goodness is seen as a highly generic universal. Among other things, this helps us understand G. E. Moore's claim that goodness is a *nonnatural* property. For Moore, the natural properties of a thing – such as yellow – are parts of it and possibly exist apart from it. One of Butchvarov's points is that, the more generic a property, the less sense it makes to think of it as a Moorean natural property.

In *The Concept of Knowledge* (1970), Butchvarov defends the view that knowledge is the absolute unthinkability of mistake. The view is grounded in the claim that the beliefs constituting primary knowledge may not be states wholly separate from their objects. The identity of a belief is determined in part by its context. This context may include one's *awareness* of the object of the belief, and, in some cases, the awareness may include the object itself. "The headache and the [seen] black marks are constituents of the contexts of my respective beliefs and thus are in a certain sense constituents of the beliefs themselves." (p. 86)

Perhaps most well known is the work on identity, elaborated in *Being Qua Being*. Butchvarov focuses on the problem of accounting for the apparent distinctness of material identicals. Genuine informative identity statements of the form $a = b$, in contrast to mere

instances of the law of identity $(x)(x = x)$, are always about things that are presented as two but, when the statement is true, are in fact one. He understands such identity in terms of two *objects* – in effect, intentional objects, though not necessarily actually intended by anyone – being one *entity*. Alternatively, a thing exists if it is indefinitely identifiable, if there are an indefinite number of objects each identical with it. Yet, identity does not correspond to anything in the world, is not for example a relation, falls under none of the categories. It is in this sense a transcendental concept and forms the basis of the mitigated irrealism, or qualified realism, about the external world that he defends in *Skepticism about the External World* (1998).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Concept Of Possibility," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 20 (1960): 318–37.
Resemblance and Identity: An Examination of the Problem of Universals (Bloomington, Ind., 1966).
The Concept of Knowledge (Evanston, Ill., 1970).
"Identity," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 2 (1977): 70–89.
Being Qua Being: A Theory of Identity, Existence, and Predication (Bloomington, Ind., 1979).
"The Ontology Of Philosophical Analysis," *Noûs* 15 (1981): 3–14.
Skepticism in Ethics (Bloomington, Ind., 1989).
"The Truth and the Untruth of Skepticism," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 67 (January 1994): 41–61.
Skepticism about the External World (Oxford, 1998).

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v10
Dejnozka, Jan. "Butchvarov: Phenomenology, Ontology, Universals, and Goodness," *Philosophia* 28 (2001): 445–54.

Sosa, Ernest. "On the Nature and Objects of Knowledge," *Philosophical Review* 81 (1972): 364–71.
Strawson, P. F. "Reply to Panayot Butchvarov," in *The Philosophy of P. F. Strawson*, ed. Lewis E. Hahn (Chicago, 1998).
Swindler, J. K. "Butchvarov on Existence," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 19 (1981): 229–36.

Denny Bradshaw

BUTLER, Nicholas Murray (1862–1947)

Nicholas Murray Butler was a professor of philosophy, a university president, a national political leader, an advisor to seven US Presidents, and a liaison with dozens of foreign diplomats. He was decorated by fifteen governments, awarded with degrees from thirty-seven colleges and universities, and received the Nobel Peace Prize.

Butler was born on 2 April 1862 in Elizabeth, New Jersey. He absorbed his college education at Columbia University with an amazing ferocity, earning his BA in 1882, his MA in 1883, and PhD in philosophy in 1884, writing a dissertation on "The History of Logical Doctrine." Butler was already helping philosophy professor Archibald ALEXANDER teach his courses by 1881, and became convinced that his future was in education. Alexander and Columbia President Frederick Barnard recognized Butler's extraordinary talents, and sent him to Europe to study at Berlin and Paris. At Berlin, Butler sampled the theology of Adolf von Harnack and the philosophies of Eduard Zeller and Friedrich Paulsen, and returned to America with a determination to elevate Columbia University to the high standards of German scholarship and pedagogy.

Butler was assistant to Alexander in 1885–6, tutor of philosophy from 1886 to 1889, and upon Alexander's retirement in 1889, he became adjunct professor of philosophy, ethics, and pedagogy, and head of the department. Butler engineered the creation of the Faculty of Philosophy (the equivalent of a college of arts and sciences) and became its first Dean in 1890, permanently leaving the classroom. In 1887 Butler also established and led the New York College for the Training of Teachers, which became Columbia's Teachers College in 1901. In 1890 Butler founded the *Educational Review* and during the 1890s he was active on boards of education and curriculum reform organizations. He was President of the National Education Association in 1894–5, and helped to reorganize the New York State Education Department to reduce the power of elected politicians and school boards.

In 1902 Butler became President of Columbia University, and held that position until retiring in 1945. Under Butler's leadership Columbia became a world-class university of 34,000 students. The philosophy faculty naturally prospered under Butler. By the 1920s the philosophy department was one of the largest in America, staffed by prominent figures including John DEWEY, Frederick WOODBRIDGE, Felix ADLER, and William MONTAGUE. Butler never could agree with Dewey's progressive views on education, however.

Besides his political aspirations, which nearly garnered a nomination for the Republican candidate for President, Butler's energies were attracted to fostering international cooperation and peace. From 1925 to 1945 Butler was President of the Carnegie Endowment for Peace; he chaired the Lake Mohonk Conferences on International Arbitration; and he supported the Kellogg–Briand Treaty of 1929 which condemned using the threat of war in international policy. For these efforts Butler shared the 1931 Nobel Peace Prize with Jane ADDAMS. Butler died on 7 December 1947 in New York City.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Meaning of Education, and Other Essays and Addresses (New York, 1898). Enlarged edn, *The Meaning of Education: Contributions to a Philosophy of Education* (New York, 1915).

True and False Democracy (New York, 1907).

The American as He Is (New York, 1908).

The International Mind: An Argument for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes (New York, 1912).

Why Should We Change Our Form of Government? (New York, 1912).

The Building of the Nation (New York, 1916).

The Basis of Durable Peace (New York, 1917).

A World in Ferment: Interpretations of the War for a New World (New York, 1918).

Is America Worth Saving? Addresses on National Problems and Party Policies (New York, 1920).

Scholarship and Service: The Policies and Ideals of a National University in a Modern Democracy (New York, 1921).

Building the American Nation: An Essay of Interpretation (New York, 1923).

The Faith of a Liberal: Essays and Addresses on Political Principles and Public Policies (New York, 1924).

The Path to Peace: Essays and Addresses on Peace and Its Making (New York, 1930).

Looking Forward: What Will the American People Do about It? Essays and Addresses on Matters National and International (New York, 1932).

Between Two Worlds: Interpretations of the Age in Which We Live (New York, 1934).

The Family of Nations: Its Need and Its Problems (New York, 1938).

Why War? Essays and Addresses on War and Peace (New York, 1940).

Liberty, Equality, Fraternity: Essays and

Addresses on the Problems of Today and Tomorrow (New York, 1942).

The World Today: Essays and Addresses (New York, 1946).

Other Relevant Works

Butler's papers are at Columbia University.

Across the Busy Years: Recollections and Reflections, 2 vols (New York, 1939–40). Contains a bibliography of Butler's writings.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v34*, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v57*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2, Who's Who in Phil*

Marrin, Albert. *Nicholas Murray Butler* (Boston, 1976).

Thomas, Milton H. *Bibliography of Nicholas Murray Butler, 1872–1932* (New York, 1934).

Whittemore, Richard. *Nicholas Murray Butler and Public Education* (New York, 1970).

John R. Shook

C

CABOT, Ella Lyman (1866–1934)

A teacher and philosopher of ethics for children, Ella Lyman was born 26 February 1866 in Boston, Massachusetts, the second girl in a family of four daughters and two sons born to Ella (Lowell) and Arthur Theodore Lyman. In 1894 she married Richard Clarke Cabot, a local doctor and later professor of medicine at the Harvard Medical School. Having attended Radcliffe College from 1887 to 1900, she later became a member of the Radcliffe Board of Trustees. From 1900 to 1904 she took courses in logic and metaphysics as a graduate student at Harvard University.

After teaching ethics and psychology in Boston private schools, she taught at the Garland School of Homemaking, Wellesley College, and Pine Manor Junior College. She also became involved with religious education and child welfare. President of the Women's Educational Association, she was elected member of the Massachusetts State Board of Education in 1905. The following year she began publishing books, particularly on ethics for children and young adults, but also on childhood development. Cabot died on 20 September 1934 in Boston, Massachusetts.

Cabot's first book, *Everyday Ethics* (1906), includes an introduction by William Torrey HARRIS, the nationally renowned philosopher and educator. The text explains ethics as a habit not only of the will but also of thinking, for it maintains that the study of ethics is to "think out problems." Thus ethics and episte-mology are closely related for the activities of the soul – memory, imagination, and feeling – to have a moral aspect. For Cabot, ethics should take up "living issues," and to be successful should widen interest in politics, history, and literature.

Cabot wrote *Ethics for Children* (1910) because she believed that no "systematic book on ethics" for children had yet been written. She put faith in ethics as a discipline, for as a discipline, she deemed it capable of determining what facts are relevant, of clearing up self-deceit, and of putting reason in order; hence, she compiled an ethics in a "systematic effort to anticipate and solve recurrent problems." She did not think an ethics for children should be Kantian or concerned with "duty." Instead, Cabot's ethical theory is pragmatic in that it relies on "experience" and integration with childhood. While it draws upon the pragmatic philosophy of Josiah ROYCE and William JAMES, it intermingles such practical arts as "helpfulness" with virtue ethics.

Cabot sought to teach children to see "invisible" ideal virtue, while aiming to show them that "the right act is what [they] truly want." She advances this aim by selecting materials and methods with a view toward the interests of age groups and with the belief that it is better to challenge the talents of the child than not. From grades one through eight, the ethical lessons are taught through legends, poetry, stories, and biographical example. Her pedagogical philosophy asserts that a graphic incident is better than summary. Hence, it is

not a philosophical method of prescriptive maxims, such as those of Anne Bradstreet's *Meditations*. Instead, Cabot's method is one of questioning and of weighing and balancing arguments rather than of authoritarian rule, for she believed that the student has a "rich mine of past experience in which to dig." Cabot's ethics encompasses home, school, and civic arenas of activity, presenting both their common and their unique issues. Perseverance, loyalty, and kindness are virtues that appear frequently in the readings for the younger audience, whereas purpose, truth, self-governance, and sympathy are more often the virtues subject to discussion for the older audience.

The psychology in Cabot's teaching methods is discernible in her descriptive approach to childhood development and consequent parental response. Cabot manifests feminist awareness in her ethics for children as evidenced in her frequent choice of women authors and exemplars. Her feminism is also evident in the formulation of her childhood development theory, in which she points out misconceptions about girls, such as the assumption that girls exhibit little interest in being team players.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Everyday Ethics (New York, 1906).
Ethics for Children: A Guide for Teachers and Parents (Boston, 1910).
Volunteer Help to the Schools (Boston, 1914).
Our Part in the World (Boston, 1918).
Teachers Manual for Our Part of the World (Boston, 1918).
Seven Ages of Childhood (Boston, 1921).
Temptations to Rightdoing (Boston, 1929).

Further Reading
Who Was Who in Amer v1

Therese Boos Dykeman

CABOT, James Elliot (1821–1903)

James Elliot Cabot was born on 18 June 1821 in Boston, Massachusetts. He was the son of Samuel Cabot – who worked for the industrial mill business of T. H. Perkins – and Eliza Perkins, the daughter of Samuel's employer. After graduating from Harvard College with his BA in 1840, Cabot traveled in Europe for three years. While in Berlin, he heard lectures by Friedrich W. J. Schelling; later he translated Shelling's "Essay on Freedom" into English. Also while abroad, he began reading Ralph Waldo EMERSON's *Essays* (1841), and the transcendentalist periodical, *The Dial*. When Cabot published anonymously an essay on "Immanuel Kant" in the last issue of *The Dial* (April 1844), Emerson was presiding as editor (having assumed the role from Margaret Fuller in 1842). In 1845, Cabot and Emerson met. For the next thirty years, the two remained close friends, collaborators, and correspondents.

Cabot collaborated with Emerson and Theodore Parker to edit *The Massachusetts Quarterly Review* (published from 1847 to 1850), which was a more politically oriented and anti-slavery successor to *The Dial*. Cabot also worked with acclaimed Harvard naturalist, Louis AGASSIZ in the 1850s, aiding him with an account of Agassiz's exploration at Lake Superior. Along with James Russell Lowell, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Oliver Wendell HOLMES, Emerson, and a few others, Cabot helped found *The Atlantic Monthly* in 1857. Esteemed by his peers, Cabot was elected as a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

In 1875 Cabot became Emerson's editorial assistant, and later became Emerson's literary executor and official biographer. After Emerson's death in 1882, Cabot published the twelve-volume *Emerson's Complete Works* (1883–93), accompanied by Cabot's *A Memoir of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (1887). This memoir is Cabot's most enduring literary enterprise. The other influential Emerson biog-

raphy at that time was Holmes's *Ralph Waldo Emerson*, which was a much more conventional biographical account. Cabot's memoir might be understood as a pastiche, since he used so many firsthand documentary sources in the creation of a narrative for Emerson's life. Holmes relied more upon his own interpretations of Emerson's work. However, Cabot's memoir served the important purpose, in the years immediately following Emerson's death, of providing scholars with access to many unpublished essays, letters, and journal entries, which are now more widely and easily available in annotated multivolume anthologies and collections. Cabot's memoir stands as a fairly reliable chronologically organized record of biographical data (people, dates, events) that are complemented by extensive use of primary source material.

Cabot died on 16 January in the year of the Emerson centenary of 1903, in Boston, Massachusetts. A marble bust of Cabot by Daniel Chester French is at the Boston Athenaeum. It is to Cabot, in his service as editor and biographer, that we owe the ground upon which the initial inheritance of Emerson's work would take place in the decades immediately following Emerson's death.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Immanuel Kant," *The Dial* 4 (April 1844): 409–15.
"The Philosophy of the Ancient Hindoos," *The Massachusetts Quarterly Review* no. 4 (September 1848): 401–22.
A Memoir of Ralph Waldo Emerson, 2 vols (Boston, 1887).

Other Relevant Works
Cabot's papers are at Harvard University.
Lake Superior: Its Physical Character, Vegetation, and Animals, Compared with Those of Other and Similar Regions, with Louis Agassiz (Boston, 1850).
Letter to the Governor of Massachusetts, on Occasion of his Late Proclamation, of August 20, 1861 (Boston, 1861).

Ed., *Emerson's Complete Works*, 12 vols (Boston, 1883–93).
J. Elliot Cabot: Autobiographical Sketch, Family Reminiscences, Sedge Birds (Boston, 1904).

Further Reading
Higginson, Thomas Wentworth. "James Elliot Cabot," *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 29 (1903–1904): 649–55.
———, *Carlyle's Laugh, and Other Surprises* (Boston, 1909), pp. 233–46.
Simmons, Nancy Craig. *Man Without a Shadow: The Life and Work of James Elliot Cabot*. PhD dissertation, Princeton University (Princeton, N.J., 1980).

David Justin Hodge

CAGE, John Milton (1912–92)

John Cage was born on 5 September 1912 in Los Angeles, California, the son of an inventor. He died on 12 August 1992 in New York City. He was the most important voice of the postwar musical avant-garde, but his influence extends to all the arts. His education included two years at Pomona College, which he left in 1930 to spend eighteen months studying and traveling in Europe. In 1933 he studied non-Western, folk, and contemporary music with Henry Cowell at the New School for Social Research in New York City, where he also joined the composition studio of Adolph Weiss. Returning to Los Angeles in 1934, he took private composition lessons and classes in musical analysis with Arnold SCHOENBERG.

In 1937 Cage took a job at the University of California, Los Angeles, as a dance accompanist and composer. In a similar position in 1938 at the Cornish School for the Arts in

Seattle, Cage began his lifelong collaboration with the dancer and choreographer Merce Cunningham. Their partnership inspired his early works for percussion ensemble and subsequently prepared piano, and his structural use of duration parallels choreographic practice. Cage eventually became musical director for Cunningham's eponymous company, and tours with this group introduced him to artists who would shape his musical and philosophical path: the faculty and students of North Carolina's Black Mountain College in 1947 and, on a 1949 tour of Europe, Pierre Boulez and Pierre Schaeffer.

The years around 1950 were exceptionally fruitful for Cage. In 1946 he met the Indian musician Gita Sarabhai and began work on *Sonatas and Interludes*, a multi-movement work for prepared piano which, following its completion in 1948, earned him recognition from the National Academy of Arts and Letters and the Guggenheim Foundation. Inspired by his encounter with Sarabhai, it aims to portray the eight permanent emotions of Indian aesthetics and their common impulse towards tranquility. In its manipulation of the sound source, the placing of nuts, bolts, washers, etc., on the piano strings, *Sonatas and Interludes* is also an important forerunner of Cage's work in the electronic medium.

The late 1940s also found Cage at Columbia University attending lectures on Zen Buddhism by Daisetz SUZUKI. This would lead him first to experiments with chance (and later indeterminacy) in composition and ultimately toward an aesthetic of silence. In 1950 the third movement of his *Concerto for Prepared Piano and Orchestra* introduced chance operations, and that same year Cage famously pronounced, in a speech at the New York Artists' Club, "I have nothing to say and I am saying it and that is poetry as I need it" (1961, p. 109). Shortly thereafter he began to experiment with using the *I Ching* in the compositional process. This abdication of creative control led Cage naturally to exalt silence as

the negation of intention, and, in 1952, to what would become his best-known and most controversial work, the "silent" piece *4'33"*.

Simultaneously and as part of his search for other kinds of new sounds, Cage experimented with magnetic tape – among the first such efforts by an American – in his *Imaginary Landscape No. 5* (1951–2). In 1958 he taught at Darmstadt, the famed summer school for the European avant-garde, where he developed a technique of indeterminate composition using transparencies. Luciano Berio subsequently invited him to work in Milan at the Studio di Fonologia, where he assembled *Fontana Mix* using the transparency method. In 1969 Cage created *HPSCHD* with LeJaren Hiller, using computerized compositional techniques developed at the University of Illinois.

Cage published his important collection of essays *Silence* in 1961, articulating his contrarian views of art, artists, and the increasingly academic avant-garde. His writing style reflects the influence of Gertrude STEIN in its playful, blatant disregard of standard grammatical and punctuation rules as well as its piercing refusal to submit to standard argumentative models. This only confirmed the prevailing view that he was more of a philosopher than a musician. In a way similar to Schoenberg's claim to continue the long line of Austro-German classicism, Cage came to see himself as perpetuating a tradition. In 1982 he wrote to a young composer that he had "rediscovered the traditional purposes for making music[:] a) to imitate nature in her manner of operation, and b) to sober and quiet the mind thus making it susceptible to divine influences. Thus I was freed from self expression" (Cope 1998, p. xv).

Imitation of nature was of course an old idea made new, but before Cage the composer's practice was to imitate with artifice. He embraced Marshall McLuhan's idea that the invention of electronic instruments had resulted in a dissolving of boundaries between human beings and their envi-

ronment. Cage took this one step further and asserted that electronics render us "technically equipped to transform our contemporary awareness of nature's manner of operation into art" (1961, p. 9). Along with this new tool came permission to use any sound as music. In this Cage followed not only Luigi Russolo's 1913 Futurist manifesto *The Art of Noises* but also his older colleague Edgard Varèse, who had earlier written of composition as the organization of sound masses.

In 1952 Cage participated in multimedia experiments at Black Mountain College along with the pianist David Tudor, abstract expressionist painter Robert Rauschenberg, and Cunningham. Each contributed a prepared (nonrandom) element to a random sequence of events. These collaborations encouraged Cage to view theater, which "takes place all the time wherever one is," as a promising venue for the imitation of nature (1961, p. 174). They were also, of course, direct precursors of 1960s "happenings."

Perhaps the most radical effect of this extroversion of consciousness was the complete destruction of the creator's ego. Cage's goal to be "freed from self expression" subverts one of the accepted purposes of art since the Renaissance. To relinquish control over which sounds happen (and when they happen) during a piece of music calls into question the very definition of art. Cage arrived at this point via his study of Eastern thought. He would allow himself only one pure example of abdication of the creator's will, with *4'33"*. Beyond that he felt compelled to construct systems that resulted in various degrees of indeterminacy.

Cage was quoting Gita Sarabhai when he claimed for music the purpose of sobering and quieting the mind, "thus rendering it susceptible to divine influences." His attraction to this openness was confirmed by the lectures of Daisetz Suzuki, and by the "white paintings" of Robert Rauschenberg, which he saw at Black Mountain in 1952. Canvases empty of all but white paint, their content is determined by the individual viewer. Cage's famous 1952

experiment in an anechoic chamber, where he heard only the high-pitched sound of his nervous system and the low-pitched sound of his circulatory system, brought him to the definitive conclusion that silence does not exist. *4'33"* was the rational extension of such revelations, a surrendering of responsibility by the composer (who has written nothing, even though he knows how to write) and by the performer (who plays nothing, even though he knows how to play). They both collude in placing the entire burden on the audience, who must abandon the old way of listening – with its aggressive pursuit of understanding – for the practice of bare attention. Cage wrote in response to criticism of the piece, "Life goes on very well without me" (Kostelanetz 1970, p. 118).

Such openness risks and even invites chaos. Cage was unfazed by this; he agreed with Charles IVES, that "requiring that many parts be played in a particular togetherness, is not an accurate representation of how things are," and embraced "the coexistence of dissimilars" in his music (1961, pp. 11–12). This led him to embrace indeterminacy as a goal (as opposed to a technique, for he freely admitted never having achieved it), and to develop a number of strategies toward that goal.

In 1949, as Cage was attempting to plot rhythmic structures on charts, he hit upon the idea of chance – tossing coins, for example – as a means of making precompositional decisions and, more importantly, of imitating the operations of nature. With its incorporation of the *I Ching*, *Music of Changes* (1951) was the height of such indeterminate composition leading to highly determined performance. In 1952, while working on his tape piece *Imaginary Landscape No. 5*, Cage became frustrated over the difficulty of precise synchronization. He "began to move away from the whole idea of control, even control by chance operations .... [It was] an omen to go toward the unfixed" (Tomkins 1965, pp. 115–16). At Darmstadt in 1958, he developed a new method using multiple transparencies,

whereby the performer devises his or her own score, making each performance simply one aspect of the total work.

That each successive piece should be something new had long been an axiom for the artistic avant-garde. Cage extended this into the realm of each successive iteration or performance of a given piece. He carried the primacy of the new to an unprecedented extreme: repetition was the great enemy of art, and the past was "used up." Furthermore, Cage made it the listener's responsibility to perceive each musical event with *shoshin* or "beginner's mind." Western harmonic procedures, which he connected to the rise (and, optimistically, to the fall) of materialism in the West, were his special target. His exposure to the *talas* or rhythmic structures of Indian music in the 1940s persuaded him that duration, not vertical sonority, should be the organizing component in music. The postwar invention of magnetic tape for audio recording gave him a new tool with which to measure musical time and led to what James Pritchett calls the "time-length" works of the mid 1950s.

Cage always denied any intention to *épater le bourgeois*, but it is not difficult to find direct lines of influence from his musical hero Erik Satie (1866–1925), who also stood accused of leaving behind ideas weightier than his music. This statement by Cage echoes Satie's deadpan perversity: "Whenever I've found that what I'm doing has become pleasing, even to one person, I have redoubled my efforts to find the next step." (Tomkins 1965, p. 107)

Cage took the final step in a process begun quietly by Satie and more spectacularly by Marcel Duchamp, dethroning in one fell swoop art, the artist, the interpreter, the artifact, and the audience. Like Duchamp in his "ready-mades," he called into question the traditional materials of creation. He relinquished that Promethean dominance vested in the artist by Romantic aestheticians, and demanded that the performer relinquish it as well. He was as indifferent to failure in concert as he was to success. He labeled the score a

posteriori, and asked the listener to approach each event with a fresh pair of ears, empty of historical expectations.

In *Silence*, Cage defined the purpose of writing music as a paradox, "a purposeful purposelessness or purposeless play. This play, however, is an affirmation of life – not an attempt to bring order out of chaos nor to suggest improvements in creation, but simply a way of waking up to the very life we're living, which is so excellent once one gets one's mind and one's desires out of the way and lets it act of its own accord" (1961, p. 12). Cage thus anticipates by more than thirty years the current philosophical interest in the aesthetics of everyday living.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Silence: Lectures and Writings (Middletown, Conn., 1961).

A Year from Monday: New Lectures and Writings (Middletown, Conn., 1967).

M: Writings, 1967–73 (Middletown, Conn., 1973).

Empty Words: Writings, 1973–78 (Middletown, Conn., 1979).

For the Birds, with D. Charles (Boston, 1981).

Another Song, with S. Barron (New York, 1981).

Themes and Variations (Barrytown, N.Y., 1982).

X: Writings, 1979–82 (Middletown, Conn., 1983).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v10*

Cope, David. *New Directions in Music* (Dubuque, Iowa, 1971; Prospect Heights, Ill. 1998).

Fetterman, William. "Merce Cunningham and John Cage: Choreographic Cross-currents," *Contemporary Music Review* 18 (1999): 121–42.

Kostelanetz, Richard, ed. *John Cage* (New York, 1970).

———, *Conversing with Cage* (New York, 1987).

Miller, Leta E. "Cage, Cunningham, and Collaborators: The Odyssey of *Variations V*," *Musical Quarterly* 85 (2001): 545–67.

Nicholls, David, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to John Cage* (Cambridge, UK, 2002).

O'Driscoll, Michael J. "Silent Texts and Empty Words: Structure and Intention in the Writings of John Cage," *Contemporary Literature* 38 (1997): 616–39.

Patterson, David, ed. *John Cage: Music, Philosophy, and Intention, 1933–1950* (New York, 2001).

Perloff, Marjorie, and Charles Junkerman, eds. *John Cage: Composed in America* (Chicago, 1994).

Pritchett, James. *The Music of John Cage* (Cambridge, UK, 1993).

Shultis, Christopher. *Silencing the Sounded Self: John Cage and the American Experimental Tradition* (Boston, 1998).

Tomkins, Calvin. *The Bride and the Bachelors* (New York, 1965).

Mary Ellen Poole

CAILLIET, Emile (1894–1981)

Emile Cailliet was born on 17 December 1894 in Dampierre, France. He studied at the universities of Chalons and Nancy, earning his undergraduate degree. After serving with the French infantry in World War I, he received his PhD from the University of Montpellier in 1926, based on research on the use of primitive religious symbolism which he carried out while in Madagascar. He earned a second postgraduate degree, a doctorate of theology, in 1937 from the University of Strasbourg.

Cailliet was assistant professor of French literature at the University of Pennsylvania from 1927 to 1931 and professor of French literature and civilization at Scripps College and Claremont Graduate School in California from 1931 to 1941. Returning to the University of Pennsylvania in 1941, he was professor of French literature and civilization until 1946. He taught at Wesleyan University as professor of French literature and philosophy from 1946 until 1959. He then became professor of Christian philosophy at Princeton Theological Seminary, where he stayed from 1960 until his death. He held concurrent positions as a fellow in the Academy of Colonial Science in Paris (now the Academy of Overseas Science) and was awarded the Officier d'Academe in 1934 for his work in Madagascar.

Cailliet's work on cultural anthropology and Christian philosophy, especially the use of symbols in primitive religious works, revolved around the usage of "sign" and "symbol" by both pagan and Christian. A "symbol" indicated participation with a community, for example, Jesus Christ was God's symbolic participation with Man. One's Christian faith, conversely, is seen as an active participation with Christ. Cailliet also wrote on the development of Pascal's Christian thinking in *Pascal: The Emergence of Genius* (1961), having earlier translated *Great Shorter Works of Pascal* (1948) and *Pascal's Short Life of Christ* (1950). Cailliet died on 4 June 1981 while travelling in California.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Essai sur la psychologie du Hova (Paris, 1924).

La Foi des ancêtres; essai sur les représentations collectives des vieux Malagaches (Paris, 1930).

La Prohibition de l'occulte (Paris, 1930). Trans. George Cole, *Why We Oppose the Occult* (Philadelphia, 1931).

The Themes of Magic in Nineteenth Century French Fiction, trans. Lorraine

Haven (Paris, 1932).

Symbolisme et âmes primitives (Paris, 1936).

Mysticisme et "mentalité mystique." Etude d'un problème posé par les travaux de m. Lévy-Bruhl sur la mentalité primitive (Paris, 1938).

The Life of the Mind (New York, 1942).

The Clue to Pascal (Philadelphia, 1943; London, 1944).

La Tradition littéraire des idéologues (Philadelphia, 1943).

El Christianismo y la cultura (Buenos Aires, 1944).

Pascal: Genius in Light of Scripture (Philadelphia, 1945).

The Beginning of Wisdom (New York, 1947).

The Christian Approach to Culture (Nashville, 1953).

The Dawn of Personality (Indianapolis, 1955).

The Recovery of Purpose (New York, 1959).

Pascal: The Emergence of Genius (New York, 1961).

Young Life (New York, 1963).

Journey into Light (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1968).

Other Relevant Works

Cailliet's papers are at Princeton Theological Seminary.

Trans., *Great Shorter Works of Pascal* (Philadelphia, 1948).

Trans., *Pascal's Short Life of Christ* (Princeton, N.J., 1950).

Hartley Burr Alexander: A Biography (Decorah, Iowa, 1992).

Alone at High Noon: Reflections on the Solitary Life (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1971).

Further Reading

Gaebelein, Frank E. "Emile Cailliet (1894–1981)," *Theology Today* 40 (1983): 55–7.

Haines, George L. "The Princeton Theological Seminary, 1925–1960," PhD dissertation, New York University (New York, 1966). Contains a bibliography of Cailliet's works.

Lemke, Steve Warner. "The Christian Philosophy of Emile Cailliet," PhD dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary (Fort Worth, Tex., 1985).

James C. Poteet II

CALDWELL, William (1863–1942)

William Caldwell was born on 10 November 1863 in Edinburgh, Scotland. He was educated at Edinburgh University, receiving his MA in 1884 and DSc in 1886. He studied with the professor of logic and metaphysics, Alexander Campbell Fraser, who took that post upon the death of William Hamilton. Fraser was the foremost scholar of Locke and Berkeley, and also taught an early type of personal idealism that greatly impressed Caldwell. Caldwell absorbed continental trends during additional postgraduate work in Germany, France, and Cambridge. He was awarded the Shaw Fellowship in Mental Philosophy, lecturing in 1893 on "Schopenhauer's System in Its Philosophical Significance," later published in 1896. From 1891 to 1903 he taught at Cornell, the University of Chicago (with John DEWEY), and Northwestern University as the Chair of Ethics and Social Philosophy (1895–1903). In 1903 he was called to McGill University in Montréal, Canada, to be Sir William MacDonald Professor of Moral Philosophy. He retired in 1933 and died in Montréal on 14 December 1942.

Caldwell's idealism echoes many of Fraser's arguments for the metaphysical primacy of the mind's self-consciousness, and for the volun-

taristic view that reason and knowledge is an aspect of willful agency. Caldwell avoided solipsism by arguing that mind is essentially social in nature, agreeing with many idealists in the 1880s and 90s, including the Hegelians who incorporated social psychology such as Dewey, Josiah ROYCE, and Bernard Bosanquet. But Caldwell worried that these Hegelian idealists might go too far, beyond the social psychology necessary for replacing subjective Cartesianism, to arrive at a metaphysical theory of an all-absorbing Absolute mind. Caldwell's rejection of the Absolute, elaborated in chapter eight of *Pragmatism and Idealism* (1913), confirms his membership in the smaller company of personal idealists including Andrew Seth Pringle-Pattison, F. C. S. Schiller, Borden Parker BOWNE, and George H. HOWISON. Caldwell, like most idealists of his era, did retain a role for a theistic God. Yet like the other personal idealists, Caldwell ensured that God's role was carefully restricted so that human free will and moral responsibility were preserved, as he moved beyond older idealisms into new territory.

Caldwell was therefore sympathetic with the novel functional psychology and pragmatism inaugurated by William JAMES and Dewey in America. In 1898 Caldwell published "Philosophy and the Activity-Experience," in the same year as James's announcement of pragmatism in "Philosophical Conceptions and Practical Results." Caldwell's article enumerates dozens of philosophers and psychologists, including James, who have defended the six tenets of "practical philosophy" with which his own standpoint agrees: experience is part of natural reality; experience is cognitive aspects in harmony with feeling and volition; consciousness is not primarily knowledge but action; there is no Absolute mind that rationally thinks all possible truths in logical coherence; philosophy must respect the existence of free will and human creative powers; and ethical theory is central to philosophy's systematic comprehension of reality. In "Pragmatism" (1900) Caldwell claims that in reaction against absolute idealism there has arisen a "new" and "ethical" idealism, best exemplified in James's writings. Recent philosophy has taken a "practical turn," trying to "grasp the significance of the world from the standpoint of the moral and social activity of man." This teleological metaphysics refuses to divorce science from morality, and fact from value. Caldwell asserts that "the real object of knowledge is to store up reality or experience in conceptions that may, in the form of motives, influence or determine conduct," and that "the mind itself is a dynamic thing."

Caldwell's *Pragmatism and Idealism* demands additional principles to supplement pragmatism. The most important are an applicable criterion for judging consequences and truth, and a clear statement of the nature of reality and its relation to our experience of reality. Caldwell offers the missing metaphysics: if human experience is necessarily a matter of willful interaction with nature, then those social beliefs which best anticipate successful interactions with nature will naturally be aroused and retained as knowledge. An idealism that includes God would also ground a universal morality by supplying a clear criterion for distinguishing right from wrong. Caldwell's demand for a theistic and moralistic personalism is a representative example of the sort of compromise available to American idealists resisting scientism and materialism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Schopenhauer's Criticism of Kant," *Mind* o.s. 16 (1891): 355–74.

Schopenhauer's System in Its Philosophical Significance (Edinburgh and London, 1896).

"The Epistemology of Ed. V. Hartmann," *Mind* n.s. 2 (1893): 188–207.

"Professor Patten's Theory of Social Forces," *International Journal of Ethics* 7 (1897): 345–53.

"Philosophy and the Activity-Experience," *International Journal of Ethics* 8 (1898): 460–80.

"The Will to Believe and the Duty to Doubt," *International Journal of Ethics* 9 (1899): 373–8.

"Social and Ethical Interpretations of Mental Development," *American Journal of Sociology* 5 (1899): 182–92.

"Von Hartman's Moral and Social Philosophy," *Philosophical Review* 8 (1899): 465–83, 589–603.

"Pragmatism," *Mind* n.s. 9 (1900): 433–56.

Pragmatism and Idealism (London and Toronto, 1913).

Further Reading
Who Was Who in Amer v3

"Caldwell, William," in *The Canadian Who's Who*, ed. C. Roberts and A. L. Tunnell (Toronto, 1936), vol. 2, p. 159.

Shook, John, and Kenneth Westphal. "Introduction," to *Pragmatism and Idealism*, by William Caldwell, vol. 4 of *The Early Critics of Pragmatism* (Bristol, UK, 2001), pp. xii–xix.

Watson, John. "Pragmatism and Idealism," *Queen's Quarterly* 21 (1914): 465–72.

John R. Shook

CALKINS, Mary Whiton (1863–1930)

Mary Whiton Calkins was born on 30 March 1863 in Hartford, Connecticut, and died on 26 February 1930 in Newton, Massachusetts. she was one of five children; her father was Wolcott Calkins, a Protestant clergyman educated at Yale University and Union Theological Seminary, and her mother was Charlotte Whiton, a social activist. She received her early education in local schools in Buffalo, New York, where her father was a minister of the North Presbyterian Church from 1866 to 1880. Her education was supplemented with private lessons in German. In 1880 her father became a clergyman at a Congregational pastorate in Newton, Massachusetts, and Calkins enrolled in Newton High School. Her graduation essay was entitled, "The Apology Which Plato Should Have Written." As a vindication of the character of Xanthippe, this essay displayed Calkins's early commitment to women's struggles.

In 1882 Calkins was admitted to Smith College with an advanced standing as a sophomore. The following year, Calkins's only sister Maud became suddenly ill and died. The emotional impact of the death forced Calkins to take a leave of absence from college. She spent the following academic year of 1883–4 at home studying Greek and tutoring her two younger brothers. She returned to Smith the following year with senior standing, and graduated with her BA in 1885 with a concentration in classics and philosophy. The next year, she actively participated with her mother in the Social Science Club of Newton, a group of local women who studied economic and social problems. Her first book, *Sharing the Profits* (1888), was the culmination of the research undertaken during that year. In 1886 her family embarked on a sixteen-month trip to Europe, during which Calkins met Abby Leach, an instructor in Greek at Vassar who asked Calkins to accompany her on a trip to Greece. Calkins accepted the offer and continued her travels when her family returned to the United States.

Calkins earned her MA from Smith College in 1887. Soon after, she began as a tutor in Greek at Wellesley College, the institution at which she remained for the rest of her career. Soon after Calkins arrived at Smith, Wellesley's philosophy department was planning expansions into new fields of psychology, and they offered Calkins a position in psychology on condition that she undertake a year of training in the discipline. Deliberating over the best institution at which to prepare, she decided upon Harvard University. Though the university refused to admit women formally, pressure from Calkins's father and the President of Wellesley succeeded in securing for Calkins

informal permission to attend graduate seminars. Studying under Josiah ROYCE and William JAMES, Calkins had the privilege of being the sole student in a seminar held by James just after the publication of his *Principles of Psychology*. She also studied psychology under Edmund C. Sanford at Clark University.

She finished her informal study at Harvard and began as an instructor in psychology at Wellesley in 1890. She held the position of instructor in psychology from 1890 to 1894. In addition to teaching, she established a laboratory within Wellesley's psychology department, which was the first established at a woman's university, and one of the first established in the United States. She sought advice from Royce, James, and Sanford about places to undertake formal graduate study in psychology, and seriously considered studying under Hugo MÜNSTERBERG at the University of Freiburg. Further plans were suspended when Münsterberg accepted a position teaching experimental psychology at Harvard in 1892. Petitioning Harvard again, Calkins received permission to continue her informal study under Münsterberg in addition to James and Royce, while she continued her teaching duties at Wellesley. She incorporated the experimental ideas that she learned at Harvard into the curriculum at Wellesley; in turn, her instruction of students and laboratory work at Wellesley aided her further study at Harvard. Her article "Experimental Psychology at Wellesley College" (1892) reflects this process of interchange between teaching and learning.

In 1895 Calkins unofficially presented and defended her dissertation, "An Experimental Research on the Association of Ideas," before the faculty of the philosophy department at Harvard, which included James, Royce, Münsterberg, and George SANTAYANA. She passed her oral defense with distinction. The faculty sent a letter to Harvard's President notifying him that she had fulfilled all of the requirements for her degree. For the next twenty-eight years, various faculty and alumni requested, to no avail, that Harvard confer a

degree upon Calkins. Though Radcliffe College attempted to offer Calkins a PhD in lieu of Harvard's refusal, she turned it down on principle because she did not undertake study at that institution. She received an honorary degree of Litt.D. from Columbia in 1909, and an LLD from Smith College in 1910.

Calkins was promoted from instructor to associate professor of psychology in 1894. She was promoted again in 1896 to the position of associate professor of philosophy and psychology, which she held until 1898. As a professor of both philosophy and psychology, Calkins noticed the different focuses regarding the person within each field. Whereas psychology focused on the determined aspects of the person, philosophy focused on the freedom of the person. Calkins's initial resolution to this dichotomy was derived from Münsterberg's distinction between the objectifying sciences and the subjectifying sciences. From 1901 to 1905, Calkins drew upon this distinction in her recommendation that the study of the person utilize both sciences in a manner that keeps each science in check. She called this process a "double entry" approach. In 1909, Calkins revised her recommendation in favor of a "single entry" approach of the subjectifying sciences. While she did not negate the validity of the objective sciences, she was weary of their atomism.

Calkins's contributions within psychology were significant. In addition to inventing a memory technique of paired associates still employed within memory research today, she published voluminously. Publications in psychology include a monograph supplement in *Psychological Review* entitled "Association: An Essay Analytic and Experimental" (1896), *An Introduction to Psychology* (1901), *Der Doppelte Standpunkt in der Psychologie* (1905), and *A First Book in Psychology* (1909). In addition, she published over fifty articles and reviews in the area of psychology alone.

Calkins was promoted from associate professor to full professor of philosophy and psychology in 1898, a position which she held

until she retired in 1929. Though Calkins maintained an active interest in psychology throughout her career, in 1898 she passed her laboratory work on to a newer colleague, Eleanor Gamble. At this point, Calkins's own metaphysical system of "personalistic absolutism" became a prominent focus. The chief influences of Calkins's metaphysics were G. W. F. Hegel, F. H. Bradley, and Royce. As an idealistic personalism, her metaphysics was idealist insofar as it held that all realities within the universe were comprised of mind; it was personalistic insofar as it held that all realities were a self or aspect of a self. Her metaphysics held that one all-inclusive Absolute Person comprised the lesser mental selves of the universe within it.

In addition to her numerous publications in psychology, Calkins published much in philosophy as well. Her books in philosophy include *The Persistent Problems of Philosophy* (1907), and *The Good Man and The Good: An Introduction to Ethics* (1918). She also edited volumes of Hobbes, Locke, Berkeley, and Hume. Important articles include "The Personalistic Conception of Nature" (1919) and "The Philosophical Credo of an Absolutistic Personalist" (1930).

Calkins received many honors throughout her life in the fields of psychology and philosophy. In *American Men of Science* (1903), James McKeen CATTELL ranked Calkins twelfth among the nation's top fifty psychologists. She was the first woman elected President of both the American Psychological Association in 1905, and the American Philosophical Association in 1918 (and only William James and John DEWEY have also held both presidencies). In addition, she was granted honorary membership in the British Psychological Association in 1927. During that year, Calkins also gave two lectures on conceptions of meaning and value at Bedford College of the University of London. She retired in 1929 from teaching at Wellesley to a research professorship, with the intent of writing more and spending time with her mother, but soon died the next year.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Association: An Essay Analytic and Experimental," *Psychological Review* monograph suppl. no. 2 (February 1896).

An Introduction to Psychology (New York, 1901).

Der Doppelte Standpunkt in der Psychologie (Leipzig, 1905).

The Persistent Problems of Philosophy: An Introduction to Metaphysics through the Study of Modern Systems (New York, 1907; 5th edn 1925).

A First Book in Psychology (New York, 1909; 4th edn 1924).

The Good Man and The Good: An Introduction to Ethics (New York, 1918).

"The Personalistic Conception of Nature," *Philosophical Review* 28 (1919): 115–46.

"The Basis of Objective Judgments in Subjective Ethics," in *Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress of Philosophy*, ed. Edgar S. Brightman (Cambridge, Mass., 1926), pp. 408–14.

"The Philosophical Credo of an Absolutistic Personalist," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 1, pp. 197–218.

Other Relevant Works

Calkins's papers are at Wellesley College.

Sharing the Profits (Boston, 1888).

Ed., *The Metaphysical System of Hobbes* (Chicago and London, 1905).

Ed., Locke's *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (Chicago and London, 1905).

"A Reconciliation Between Structural and Functional Psychology," *Psychological Review* 8 (1906): 61–81.

"Self and Soul," *Philosophical Review* 17 (1908): 272–80.

"Psychology as Science of Self," *Journal of Philosophy* 5 (1908): 12–20, 64–8, 113–22.

"Henri Bergson: Personalist," *Philosophical Review* 21 (1912): 666–75.

Ed. with J. McCormack, *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding, and Selections from A Treatise of Human Nature*, by David Hume (Leipzig, 1913; La Salle, Ill., 1958).

"The Self in Scientific Psychology," *American Journal of Psychology* 26 (1915): 495–524.

"A Personal Idealist's Concern for Psychology," *The Personalist* 5 (1924): 7–11.

"Critical Comments on the 'Gestalt Theorie'," *Psychological Review* 33 (1926): 135–58.

Ed., *Essay, Principles, Dialogues, with Selections from Other Writings*, by George Berkeley (New York, 1929).

"Autobiography of Mary Whiton Calkins," in *History of Psychology in Autobiography*, vol. 1 (Worcester, Mass., 1930), pp. 31–62.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Amer Phils Before 1950, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Bio Dict Psych, Bio 20thC Phils, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Encyc Psych, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v13, Pres Addr of APA v2, Proc of APA in Phil Rev v40, Who Was Who in Amer v1, Women Phils

Furumoto, Laurel. "From Paired Associates to the Self: The Intellectual Odyssey of Mary Whiton Calkins," in *Portraits of Pioneers in Psychology*, ed. G. Kimble, M. Wertheimer, and C. White (Hillsdale, N.J., 1991), pp. 57–72.

In Memoriam: Mary Whiton Calkins, 1863–1930 (Wellesley, Mass., 1931).

Magg, P. "The Personalism of Mary Whiton Calkins," *The Personalist* 28 (1947): 44–53.

Munk, Arthur W. "Samples of the American Feminine Mind: Focus on Mary Whiton Calkins as Philosopher," *Review Journal of Philosophy and Social Science* 2 (1977): 170–82.

Onderdonk, Virginia. "Mary Whiton Calkins," in *Notable American Women 1607–1950*, ed. Edward T. James (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), pp. 278–80.

Dana Noelle McDonald

CALVERT, George Henry (1803–89)

George Henry Calvert was born on 2 January 1803 in Prince George County, Maryland. Calvert came from a distinguished family; he was heir to the lands of Lord Baltimore, the founder of the Colony of Maryland, and his grandfather, Benedict Calvert, was a close personal friend of George Washington. Calvert studied at Harvard from 1819 to 1823 but did not graduate, and then he went to the University of Göttingen in Germany, where he mastered German and became enthralled with German literature. Impressed with the writings of Johann Goethe, Friedrich Schiller, and the German Romantics, Calvert managed to visit Goethe during his stay at Göttingen. He edited the *Baltimore American* upon returning to the United States during the 1830s and eventually made a second tour of Europe in 1840 with his wife, Elizabeth Steuart Calvert. Calvert visited William Wordsworth on this trip and recorded his impressions of Europe in *Scenes and Thoughts in Europe* (1846). He settled in Newport, Rhode Island, in 1843 and was elected the first mayor of Newport, but soon retired from political service to resume his intellectual career. Calvert died on 24 May 1889 in Newport, Rhode Island.

Calvert was not so much a philosopher as a man of letters. His interests were extremely broad. He was a poet, dramatist, travel writer, aesthetician, art critic, translator, and biographer. His wealth of interests can be seen in the numerous prominent literary figures whom he counted among his acquaintances: Johann Goethe, William Wordsworth, Ralph Waldo

EMERSON, Margaret Fuller, Edgar Allen Poe, Thomas Carlyle, and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. Calvert never developed a comprehensive aesthetic theory, but his writings are peppered with philosophical ideas about art, beauty, and poetics drawn from idealist, Romantic, and transcendentalist authors. He argues in "The Beautiful" in his *Essays Aesthetical* (1875), for example, that our experience of beauty consists in the feeling provoked in us by the perception of the ideal or perfect in nature. Calvert sometimes uses the language of divinity to describe this process. Beauty occurs when the spark of divinity in us recognizes the spark of divinity in nature. Elsewhere, in "What is Poetry?," he links this analysis of beauty to the creation of art by associating poetry with imagination, which he defines as an intellectual power for mentally recreating and perfecting perceptual experiences. He defines poetry as the imagination's creations when it is motivated by an emotion longing to uncover the "fair and perfect" in nature.

Calvert's most important contributions lay, however, in his efforts to popularize German literature and ideas from continental Europe. He wrote some of the first English translations and commentaries on Goethe and Schiller and was Goethe's most vocal literary defender in American of his time. He also popularized ideas like hydropathy and Charles Fourier's utopian socialism in his *Scenes and Thoughts in Europe*. Finally, he was a pioneer in the area of biography, writing the first American biographies on literary, rather than political or military, figures. He published biographies of Goethe, Wordsworth, Shakespeare, and Paul Reubens, an ancestor on his mother's side.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Scenes and Thoughts in Europe, by an American (New York, 1846; 2nd edn 1852).
The Gentleman (Boston, 1863).
Goethe: His Life and Works, An Essay (New York, 1872).
Brief Essays and Brevities (Boston, 1873).

Essays Aesthetical (Boston, 1875).
The Life of Rubens (Boston, 1876).
Wordsworth: A Biographic Aesthetic Study (Boston, 1878; Folcroft, Penn., 1970).
Shakespeare: A Biographic Aesthetic Study (Boston, 1879).
Coleridge, Shelley, Goethe: Biographic Aesthetic Studies (Boston, 1880).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v5*
Everson, Ida G. *George Henry Calvert* (New York, 1944).
Tompkins, H. B. *Bibliography of the Works of George Henry Calvert* (Newport, R.I., 1900).

Joshua Shaw

CAMPBELL, Donald Thomas (1916–96)

Donald T. Campbell was born on 20 November 1916 in Grass Lake, Michigan. He attended San Bernadino Junior College and then the University of California at Berkeley, where he received his BA in 1939 and his PhD in psychology in 1947 (after service in the Naval Reserve). He was a student of Egon BRUNSWIK and Edward TOLMAN, and wrote his dissertation on "The Generality of a Social Attitude." Campbell taught psychology at Ohio State University and the University of Chicago before going to Northwestern University in 1953. After retiring from Northwestern in 1979, he was Schweitzer Professor in the Maxwell School at Syracuse University until 1982, when he went to Lehigh University with the title of "university professor" and relationships with the psychology, sociology, anthropology, and education departments. He also held visiting positions at several universities including Yale. Campbell

retired from Lehigh in 1994 and died on 5 May 1996 in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.

Campbell was among the most important social scientists of the twentieth century. He made significant contributions to psychology, sociology, anthropology, education, and epistemology. For the many accomplishments of his career, he received the Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award of the American Psychological Association (he was its President in 1973), and the award for Distinguished Contribution to Research in Education from the American Educational Research Association. He was elected to membership in the National Academy of Sciences in 1973, and became a member of the American Philosophical Society in 1993. Numerous universities awarded him their honorary degrees, including Michigan, Florida, Chicago, and Southern California.

Campbell's training in social psychology led to his pioneering work in the emerging field of cross-cultural psychology in the 1950s, for which he first gained recognition. His next major contribution was to uncover fundamental problems with the standard research methodology of experimentation with human subjects. His article written with Donald W. Fiske on "Convergent and Discriminant Validation by the Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix" (1959) developed the statistical methods of "quasi-experimentation" that approach the genuinely randomized scientific experiments in the natural sciences. It is perhaps the most frequently cited paper in social science. Campbell expanded his theory of research design in later books (1963, 1979) that have long been the standard texts on the subject. He also developed techniques for uncovering the deep and pervasive influences of bias and prejudice on social attitudes, which in turn can entrench "misinformation" and false knowledge. This research produced several studies and a book titled *Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes, and Group Behavior* (1971).

Campbell became interested in the social creation and transmission of knowledge in the 1960s. Mostly inspired by his acquaintance with Karl Popper's philosophy of science, Campbell postulated that all knowledge is created by trial and error. Beginning with his "Blind Variation and Selective Retention in Creative Thought as in Other Knowledge Processes" (1960), he wrote a series of articles applying Popper's view of knowledge as that which survives vigorous testing to various problems in the sociology of knowledge. By the early 1970s, he had selected the label of "evolutionary epistemology" for his theory, and was the first to publish a paper with that title in 1974, joining a new and vibrant interdisciplinary sub-field. Other students of Popper had similarly sought a general theory of knowledge based on Popper, notably William W. BARTLEY. Campbell's inquiries found that basing a theory of knowledge on evolutionary considerations is as old as the theory of evolution itself, and in later writings he discussed the work of such thinkers as Herbert Spencer, William JAMES, James Mark BALDWIN, and Konrad Lorenz.

Campbell's epistemology requires a naturalistic view of intelligence and a realistic attitude toward knowledge's ability to partially represent the external world. As a natural activity of an organism, the intelligent exploration of the environment requires no postulation of non-natural mental states or powers. Because the surrounding environment's features are partially responsible for the success of human experiments, and the refinement of knowledge through further successful trials is best explained by crediting knowledge with gradually approximating those external features, we should believe that scientific knowledge progresses toward some greater realistic accuracy. However, as Campbell stresses, the human organism is imperfectly sensitive only to a small range of relevant environmental features, and heavily reliant on inductive reasoning, and therefore a strong form of the correspondence theory of truth is not justifiable.

Following other thinkers such as general systems theorist Ludwig BERTALANFFY,

Campbell realized that the learning accomplished by living organisms requires "downward causation" in addition to ordinary upward causation. Campbell rejected reductive materialism, which holds that the only causal powers are those of the smallest parts of reality which must in turn be solely responsible for anything "upwards" that is done by larger wholes. He postulated that whole systems can also exert "downward" selective control over the activation of the causal powers of its parts. Campbell was brought to this view by his theory of learning, in which it is impossible to explain what sort of knowledge emerges by considering only the micro-causal causal powers of the brain, since it is the organism–environment interaction which regulates knowledge creation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Perception as Substitute Trial and Error," *Psychological Review* 63 (1956): 331–42.

"Methodological Suggestions from a Comparative Psychology of Knowledge Processes," *Inquiry* 2 (1959): 152–82.

"Blind Variation and Selective Retention in Creative Thought as in Other Knowledge Processes," *Psychological Review* 67 (1960): 380–400.

Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes, and Group Behavior, with Robert A. LeVine (New York, 1971).

"Downward Causation in Hierarchically Organized Biological Systems," in *Studies in the Philosophy of Biology*, ed. Francisco Ayala and Theodosius Dobzhansky (Berkeley, Cal., 1974), pp. 179–86.

"Evolutionary Epistemology," in *The Philosophy of Karl Popper*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (La Salle, Ill., 1974), pp. 412–63.

"On the Conflicts Between Biological and Social Evolution and Between Psychology and Moral Tradition," *American Psychologist* 30 (1975): 1103–26.

"The 'Blind-Variation-and-Selective-Retention' Theme," in *The Cognitive-developmental Psychology of James Mark Baldwin*, ed. John M. Broughton and D. John Freeman-Moir (Norwood, N.J., 1982), pp. 87–97.

"Selection Theory and the Sociology of Scientific Validity," in *Evolutionary Epistemology: A Multiparadigm Program*, ed. W. G. Callebaut and R. Pinxten (Dordrecht, 1987), pp. 139–58.

Methodology and Epistemology for Social Science: Selected Papers, ed. E. Samuel Overman (Chicago, 1988).

"Popper and Selection Theory," *Social Epistemology* 2 (1988): 371–7.

"Epistemological Roles for Selection Theory," in *Evolution, Cognition, and Realism*, ed. Nicholas Rescher (Lanham, Md., 1990), pp. 1–19.

"Levels of Organization, Downward Causation, and the Selection-Theory Approach to Evolutionary Epistemology," in *Theories of the Evolution of Knowing*, ed. Gary Greenberg and Ethel Tobach (Hillsdale, N.J., 1990), pp. 1–17.

"From Evolutionary Epistemology via Selection Theory to a Sociology of Scientific Validity," *Evolution and Cognition* 3 (1997): 5–38.

Social Experimentation, with M. Jean Russo (Thousand Oaks, Cal., 1999).

"Emergence," with Mark H. Bickhard, in *Downward Causation: Minds, Bodies and Matter*, ed. P. B. Andersen, C. Emmeche, N. O. Finnemann, and P. V. Christiansen (Århus, Denmark, 2000), pp. 322–48.

Other Relevant Works

"Convergent and Discriminant Validation by the Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix," with Donald W. Fiske, *Psychological Bulletin* 56 (1959): 81–105.

Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Research, with Julian Stanley (Chicago, 1963).

Quasi-experimentation: Design and

Analysis Issues for Field Settings, with T. D. Cook (Boston, 1979).

A Primer on Regression Artifacts, with David A. Kenny (New York, 1999).

Social Measurement, with M. Jean Russo (Thousand Oaks, Cal., 2001).

Further Reading

Bio Dict Psych, *Encyc Psych*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Who Was Who in Amer v11*

Baum, Joel, and Bill McKelvey, eds. *Variations in Organization Science: In Honor of Donald T. Campbell* (Thousand Oaks, Cal., 1999).

Bickman, Leonard, ed. *Validity and Social Experimentation: Donald Campbell's Legacy* (Thousand Oaks, Cal., 2000).

Brewer, Marilynn B., and Thomas D. Cook. "Donald T. Campbell (1916–1996)," *American Psychologist 52* (1997): 267–8.

———, eds. *Scientific Inquiry and the Social Sciences: A Volume in Honor of Donald T. Campbell* (San Francisco, 1981).

Dunn, William N., ed. *The Experimenting Society: Essays in Honor of Donald T. Campbell* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1998).

Hansen, Forest. "A Critique of the Epistemological Skepticism of Campbell's Phenomenological Behaviorist Psychology," *Behaviorism* 7 (1979): 65–85.

Heyes, Cecilia, and David L. Hull, eds. *Selection Theory and Social Construction: The Evolutionary Naturalistic Epistemology of Donald T. Campbell* (Albany, N.Y., 2001).

Hooker, Cliff A., and Wayne Christensen. "The Organization of Knowledge: Beyond Campbell's Evolutionary Epistemology," *Philosophy of Science* suppl. 66 (1999): 237–49.

Radnitzky, Gerard, and William W. Bartley, III, eds. *Evolutionary Epistemology, Rationality, and the Sociology of Knowledge* (La Salle, Ill., 1987).

Wuketits, Franz M. "The Philosophy of Donald T. Campbell: A Short Review and Critical Appraisal," *Biology and Philosophy* 16 (2001): 171–88.

John R. Shook

CAMPBELL, Joseph (1904–87)

Joseph Campbell was born on 26 March 1904 in White Plains, New York, and died on 30 October 1987 in Honolulu, Hawaii. His childhood was strongly Irish Catholic. This heritage led to an earnest immersion in the rituals and symbols of the church, including becoming an altar boy. His interest in mythology began at age seven when he saw the Indians in Buffalo Bill's Wild West Show in Madison Square Garden. Campbell developed an intense fascination with Native American lore that ultimately led to a life of scholarship. His boyhood he spent studying the Indian exhibits at the American Museum of Natural History and reading all the books he could find on Native Americans, including the reports of the Bureau of American Ethnology.

Campbell graduated from Canterbury School in New Milford, Connecticut, in 1921. On a crossing of the North Atlantic in 1924, he met Jiddu Krishnamurti, who would become a great world teacher of the Theosophists. This friendship led to a deep interest in the traditions of India. Campbell received his BA in English from Columbia University in 1925. He completed his MA in medieval literature in 1926 with a thesis on "The Dolorous Stroke," the origin of the Wasteland symbolism in the Grail legends. His advisor was Roger Loomis, a leading Arthurian scholar. During 1926, Campbell took classes at the New York City Religious Science Church taught by one of the founders

of that movement, Fenwick Holmes. As part of his studies, Campbell read Holmes's *Science of Mind*.

A year in Paris during 1927–8 for dissertation research included other significant learning experiences, such as tutorials in aesthetics with sculptor Antoine Bourdelle. He was impressed with the art of Pablo Picasso, Constantin Brancusi, and Georges Braque. During this time, Campbell read W. B. Yeats, T. S. ELIOT, and James Joyce. Joyce's publisher, Sylvia Beach, befriended him and explained the intricacies of *Ulysses*. At the University of Munich in 1928–9, Campbell studied how Sigmund Freud and Carl Jung used myth in psychology. He also noted mythic dimensions in the novels of Thomas Mann. All these masters of modernity would greatly influence his thinking, leading him later to theorize that mythologies are the artistic expressions of psychological life.

Returning to Columbia University, Campbell wanted to expand the scope of his dissertation topic beyond the Grail myth to include parallels with psychology, literature, and art. His advisors made it clear that such an interdisciplinary perspective would not be acceptable. Choosing not to complete his doctorate, Campbell spent several years in Woodstock, New York, reading extensively. He visited California in 1931–2, where he befriended novelist John Steinbeck and biologist Ed Ricketts. During this time, he first read Oswald Spengler's *Decline of the West*; Campbell's sweeping vision owes much in style to Spengler.

Campbell became professor of literature at Sarah Lawrence College in 1933, and he remained in that position until 1972. He married a former student, Jean Erdman, who became prominent in modern dance as both performer and choreographer. They had no children.

Campbell's principal mentor was Indologist Heinrich Zimmer, a colleague of C. G. Jung. Zimmer died suddenly of pneumonia in 1943. Over the next twelve years, Campbell did the editing and substantial writing of four books based on Zimmer's papers.

Campbell's other early writing included the commentary on a Navajo ceremonial story, *Where the Two Came to Their Father* (1943). He also co-authored with Henry Morton Robinson, *A Skeleton Key to Finnegan's Wake* (1944); this was the first comprehensive analysis of Joyce's complex novel. From Joyce, Campbell drew the concept of the monomyth – the one great mythic story told in all eras and regions that was the initiatory adventure of the hero.

The publication of *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* in 1949 established Campbell as the preeminent comparative mythologist of the twentieth century. Campbell intended the book to be a guide to reading a myth, and he explained how challenging experiences could be seen as initiatory adventures. This connection between ancient stories and the emotional concerns of modern life was distinctive. As Campbell observed, "The latest incarnation of Oedipus, the continued romance of Beauty and the Beast, stand this afternoon on the corner of 42nd Street and Fifth Avenue, waiting for the traffic light to change."

Campbell's description of the hero's journey has been used extensively by generations of artists and scholars. His description shows similarities among the great stories of world mythology, and is a model of initiatory elements in myth, religion, literature, and ritual. Campbell elaborated on a more elementary matrix (departure, transformation, return) developed by Arnold van Gennep in *Rites of Passage* (1912). Campbell used two theories to explain the universality of symbols, myths, and rituals: one theory was the principle of elementary ideas developed by Adolf Bastian; the other was the similar concept of archetypes found in the psychology of Carl Jung.

The hero's journey as described in *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* explains an initiatory sequence. The opening stage includes: the call to adventure, meeting the mentor, and the

threshold passage. Once into the adventure, the challenges involve finding allies and guides, facing ordeals, resisting temptations, braving enemies, enduring the dark night of the soul, surviving the supreme ordeal, and winning the elixir (the boon). The concluding steps are the return threshold passage, resurrection, celebration, acceptance of a role of service (sharing the elixir), and, finally, the merger of two worlds. Campbell shows why societies must have heroes to incarnate values upon which a nation or world-order thrives. The seeker provides a society with the vitality essential for its survival.

The Hero with a Thousand Faces showed the similarities among mythological traditions. Campbell followed this work with a series of writings on the great differences among world myths. The four-volume *Masks of God – Primitive Mythology* (1959), *Oriental Mythology* (1962), *Occidental Mythology* (1964), and *Creative Mythology* (1968) – analyzed the distinctions among the mythologies of various regions and cultures.

Campbell introduced one of his principal theoretical constructs in the *Masks of God* series. In *Occidental Mythology*, Campbell first outlined the four functions of myth. The first function is metaphysical. Myth awakens and supports a sense of awe before the mystery of being; it reconciles consciousness to the preconditions of its own existence. Myth induces a realization that behind the surface phenomenology of the world, there is a transcendent source of mystery. Through this vitalizing mystical function, the universe becomes holy.

The second function is a cosmological one and deals with the image of the world as the focus of science. This function shows the shape of the universe, but in such a way that the metaphysical mystery still comes through. The cosmology corresponds to the actual experience, knowledge, and mentality of the culture. This interpretive function changes radically over time and presents a map or picture of the order of the cosmos and our relationship to it.

The third function is the sociological. Myth supports and validates the specific moral order of the society out of which it arose. Particular life-customs of this social dimension, such as ethical laws and social roles, evolve dramatically. This social function, and the rites by which it is rendered, establishes in members of the relevant group a system of sentiments that link those members spontaneously to the group's ends.

The fourth function of myth is psychological. The myths show how to live a human life under any circumstances. This pedagogical function of mythology carries individuals through the various stages and crises of life: from childhood dependency, to responsibilities of maturity, to the reflection of old age, and finally, to death; it enables people to grasp with integrity the unfolding of their lives. This psychological function of myth initiates individuals into the realities of their own psyches, and guides them toward enrichment and realization.

The psychological function was the principal focus of Campbell's scholarship. He credited his students at Sarah Lawrence College, particularly the women, with making his work accessible. He noted their insistence on hearing how the mythological traditions were relevant to their lives. Partly in response to their perseverance, Campbell put great emphasis on how wisdom literature embodied psychological dynamics. The use of myth as a guide to inner life gained Campbell both a large following and substantial criticism; some of his colleagues believed the original purposes of the mythic texts were primarily sociological.

Campbell edited many books, beginning with *The Portable Arabian Nights* (1952). He was general editor of the series *Man and Myth* (1953–4), which included major works by Maya Deren (*Divine Horsemen: The Living Gods of Haiti*, 1953), Carl Kerenyi (*The Gods of the Greeks*, 1954), and Alan Watts (*Myth and Ritual in Christianity*, 1954). He was editor of *The Portable Jung* (1972), contributing a lengthy introduction on Jung's thought.

Campbell's involvement in the Eranos Conferences (founded by Carl Jung) led to his editing six volumes of papers from the meetings: *Spirit and Nature* (1954), *The Mysteries* (1955), *Man and Time* (1957), *Spiritual Disciplines* (1960), *Man and Transformation* (1964), and *The Mystic Vision* (1969).

Campbell retired from Sarah Lawrence College in 1972 to focus on writing. His interest went beyond the texts to other dimensions of the mythic imagination. He argued that timeless wisdom is approached in three ways. The mythic story is first of all access to the mysteries beyond conscious knowing. The next primary way it offers to approach that wisdom is through ritual; ceremonial practices often accompany major myths and allow participants to enter into personal experience of the story through their own dramatic reenactment of the text. The third way that wisdom is approached is through the image; this image might be a statue or painting of a religious exemplar, or it might be an image from a dream or the imagination. For example, pondering mythic stories brings to mind images that represent beyond themselves; the larger content of their representation is reached through considering metaphors conveyed in the image. Campbell's richly illustrated book, *The Mythic Image* (1974), explains this point.

A new generation discovered Campbell when George Lucas based much of his screenplay for *Star Wars* (1977) on his reading of *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. The most successful film series in history was a retelling of the initiatory adventures that Campbell had so vividly described. Lucas gratefully acknowledged his use of Campbell's work and considered him a mentor.

In his eighties, Campbell launched a multi-volume *Historical Atlas of World Mythology* (1983, 1988) that investigated the major mythological periods and proposed a model of cultural development through stages. The earliest stage, the beginning of symbolic thinking, is that of shaman led hunter-gatherers. The next stage appears in the planters' rituals of birth, death, and rebirth. The third stage involves high civilizations of Goddesses, heroes, and priestly orders. In the final stage, individuals are able to comprehend illumination directly as an internal state. This last stage leads up to the modern era in Western civilization. Not all regions or cultures go through these stages simultaneously; in the contemporary world, cultures appear in each of the four stages.

Campbell's lasting eminence owes much to his gifts as a public speaker. He was able to convey the essence of ancient teachings through vivid storytelling and commentary. A series of public lectures at the Cooper Union in New York City became the accessible book, *Myths to Live By* (1972). He presented annual seminars for seventeen years at the State Department's Foreign Service Institute. For decades, he gave annual workshops at the Esalen Institute in California. He also spoke frequently for C. G. Jung Institutes, University of California Extension in Berkeley, and the Pacifica Graduate Institute in Santa Barbara.

Campbell's prizes and awards include several honorary doctorates. *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* won the National Institute of Arts and Letters Award for Contributions to Creative Literature. In 1985, he received the National Arts Club Medal of Honor for literature for his work on the *Historical Atlas of World Mythology*. At the award ceremony, psychologist James Hillman said, "No one in our century – not Freud, not Thomas Mann, not Lévi-Strauss – has so brought the mythical sense of the world and its eternal figures back into our everyday consciousness." In 1987 Campbell was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Letters.

The most memorable contribution of Campbell's career came through television in the six-part series *Joseph Campbell and The Power of Myth with Bill Moyers*. Most of the interviews were conducted at Skywalker Ranch, the film studio built by George Lucas in California's Marin County. The interviews

for the last episode were done at the American Museum of Natural History where Campbell had pondered Native American artifacts as a boy. Public television stations first broadcast the series in late 1987, and it has been rebroadcast many times since. The 1988 book based on transcripts of the interviews became a bestseller. *The Power of Myth* significantly increased public awareness of the wisdom in mythology. Several books published posthumously are based on his papers and recorded lectures. *An Open Life* (1988) is a book of interviews originally given on a radio series. *A Joseph Campbell Companion: Reflections on the Art of Living* (1991) is based on tapes of a seminar given at Esalen. *Thou Art That* (2001) is a collection of studies of meanings of key metaphors in the Judeo-Christian traditions.

An obituary in *Newsweek* summarized his accomplishments, "Campbell has become one of the rarest of intellectuals in American life: a serious thinker who has been embraced by the popular culture." Campbell continues to stimulate debate among scholars about whether it is appropriate to use mythology to illustrate psychological principles. Meanwhile, an ever-expanding audience is seeing and studying the Moyers interviews. The *Collected Works of Joseph Campbell* will include several additional new books based on lectures and papers. Joseph Campbell's vision of the mythic imagination will have a lasting influence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Skeleton Key to Finnegan's Wake, with Henry Morton Robinson (New York, 1944).

The Hero with a Thousand Faces (Princeton, N.J., 1949).

The Masks of God, vol. 1: Primitive Mythology (New York, 1959).

The Masks of God, vol. 2: Oriental Mythology (New York, 1962).

The Masks of God, vol. 3: Occidental Mythology (New York, 1964).

The Masks of God, vol. 4: Creative Mythology (New York, 1968).

Flight of the Wild Gander: Explorations in the Mythological Dimension (New York, 1969).

Myths to Live By (New York, 1972).

The Mythic Image (Princeton, N.J., 1974).

The Inner Reaches of Outer Space: Metaphor As Myth and As Religion (New York, 1982).

Historical Atlas of World Mythology, 2 vols (New York, 1983, 1988).

Joseph Campbell and The Power of Myth with Bill Moyers, ed. Betty Sue Flowers (New York, 1988).

Mythic Worlds, Modern Words: On the Art of James Joyce, ed. Edmund L. Epstein (New York, 1993).

Thou Art That: Transforming Religious Metaphor, ed. Eugene C. Kennedy (Novato, Cal., 2001).

Pathways to Bliss: Mythology and Personal Transformation, ed. David Kudler (Novato, Cal., 2004).

Other Relevant Works

Campbell's papers are at the Pacifica Graduate Institute in Carpinteria, California.

Ed., *Where the Two Came to Their Father: A Navaho War Ceremonial* (New York, 1943).

Ed., *The Portable Arabian Nights* (New York, 1952).

Ed., *The Portable Jung* (New York, 1972).

An Open Life: Joseph Campbell in Conversation with Michael Toms, eds John M. Maher and Dennie Briggs (New York, 1988).

A Joseph Campbell Companion: Reflections on the Art of Living, ed. Diane K. Osbon (New York, 1991).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Who Was Who in Amer v9

Cousineau, Philip, ed. *The Hero's Journey* (San Francisco, 1990).

Larsen, Stephen, and Robin Larsen. *Joseph*

Campbell: A Fire in the Mind (New York, 1991).

Noel, Daniel C., ed. *Joseph Campbell and the Study of Religion* (New York, 1990).

Segal, Robert A. *Joseph Campbell* (New York, 1987).

Jonathan Young

ČAPEK, Milič (1909–97)

Milič Čapek was born in the village of Trebechovice, Bohemia, Austro-Hungary (now in the Czech Republic), on 26 January 1909. He received a PhD in philosophy in 1935 and a MSc in physics in 1936 from Charles University in Prague. Čapek taught secondary school in his native country from 1937 until 1939, when a scholarship to study at the Sorbonne enabled him to leave what had become German-occupied Czechoslovakia. He soon had to flee Paris as the German army advanced, and found his way, via North Africa, to the United States. During the war, he participated in the Army Specialized Training Program in foreign languages at the University of Iowa and taught physics in the Navy V12 program at Doan College and the Air Corps program at the University of Nebraska.

Returning to Czechoslovakia after the war, Čapek taught briefly at the University of Olomouc before fleeing once again, on the eve of the communist coup d'état in 1948, to take up permanent residence, and citizenship, in the United States. He was a professor of philosophy at Carleton College in Minnesota from 1948 to 1962, and at Boston University from 1962 until his retirement in 1974. Visiting professorships included the University of California at Davis, Emory University, North Texas University, and Yale University. Čapek died on 17 November 1997 in Little Rock, Arkansas.

Čapek published nearly one hundred articles in both English and French-language journals. His doctoral dissertation argued that the philosophy of Henri Bergson anticipated novel elements in contemporary physics. Upon receiving a copy, Bergson wrote, "It would be impossible to better understand what is essential in my views of duration and matter," crediting Čapek with an insight shared only "perhaps, in some measure," by Alfred North WHITEHEAD (Bergson's letter is reproduced in Čapek's *Bergson and Modern Physics*, 1971). Work begun in the dissertation culminated in his two major works, *The Philosophical Impact of Contemporary Physics* (1961) and *Bergson and Modern Physics*.

Čapek devoted his career to developing a metaphysics based both on the revolution created in physics by the theory of relativity and quantum mechanics and on Bergsonian insights into the nature of time and duration. With great erudition and a firm grasp of the history of science and of philosophy, he argued that contemporary physics requires a metaphysics of events, not of enduring substances, and that these events are not the instantaneous events of standard interpretations of relativity theory, but events partaking of the qualities of Bergsonian duration. Following Bergson, Čapek argued that the passage of time requires the emergence of novelty and thus that the determinism of classical physics must be replaced with the indeterminism of quantum mechanics and Bergsonian duration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Philosophical Impact of Contemporary Physics (Princeton, N.J., 1961; 2nd edn 1969).

Bergson and Modern Physics: A Reinterpretation and Re-evaluation (Dordrecht, 1971).

The Concepts of Space and Time: Their Structure and Their Development (Dordrecht, 1976).

The New Aspects of Time, Its Continuity and Novelties: Selected Papers in the Philosophy of Science (Dordrecht, 1991).

Other Relevant Works

"Two Views of Motion: Change of Position and Change of Quality," *Review of Metaphysics*, 33 (1979): 447–56.

Ed. with Karl Hrub, *T. G. Masaryk in Perspective: Comments and Criticism* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1981).

"Eternal Recurrence – Once More," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 19 (1983): 141–54.

"Time-space Rather Than Space-time," *Diogenes* 123 (1983): 30–49.

"The Conflict Between the Absolutist and Relational Theory of Time Before Newton," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 48 (1987): 595–608.

"The Search for an Elusive a priori," *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 22 (1991): 65–74.

Further Reading

Proc of APA v71

Bjelland, Andrew G. "Čapek, Bergson, and Process Proto-mentalism," *Process Studies* 11 (1981): 180–89.

Van Fraassen, Bas C. "Čapek on Eternal Recurrence," *Journal of Philosophy* 59 (1962): 371–5.

David A. Sipfle

CARDOZO, Benjamin Nathan (1870–1938)

Benjamin Nathan Cardozo was born on 24 May 1870 in New York City. The Cardozo family is one of America's oldest and most distinguished Sephardic Jewish families. The family lived a well-mannered upper-class life, which laid a solid basis for Carzodo's education and career. However, the Cardozo family image suffered a major setback when his father, Albert Cardozo, a judge of the New York Supreme Court, resigned his judgeship in 1872, before a legislative committee was about to impeach him for misconduct.

Despite this taint of notoriety, Cardozo chose to enter the law as his career. He entered Columbia College in New York City, at the age of fifteen, and received his BA in 1889 and an LLM from the School of Political Science in 1890. Then he started his law school education but left in 1891 after two years without a degree. However, Columbia University later awarded him an honorary law degree in 1915. Despite not finishing law school, Cardozo was admitted to the bar and joined his father's law firm, practicing law in New York City from 1891 to 1914. In 1913 the political leaders of an anti-Tammany fusion ticket in New York City needed a Jewish candidate to fill a New York Supreme Court vacancy and selected Cardozo, who was elected by a narrow margin. After sitting on the Supreme Court for just a short period of time, he was designated by the Governor, upon recommendation of the Court of Appeals judges, to sit on the Court of Appeals as one of three extra judges named to help clear a backlog. Cardozo subsequently received an appointment to that Court and was elected to a regular fourteen-year term in 1917. It was those years in the Court of Appeals that Cardozo enjoyed most; during this time he worked most productively, delivered his most influential court decisions and intellectual lectures, and as a result, established himself as one of the most outstanding common-law jurists in American judicial history. He became Chief Judge in 1927, declining a part-time assignment as an American member of the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, Netherlands.

In 1932 President Herbert Hoover appointed Cardozo to the Supreme Court of the United States to fill the seat of the legendary Oliver Wendell HOLMES, Jr. Cardozo became the second Jew, after Justice Louis D. BRANDEIS, to serve on the nation's highest court. Unfortunately, Cardozo's judgeship in the Supreme Court did not last long because of

his health condition. After suffering heart attacks and strokes, Cardozo died on 9 July 1938 in Port Chester, New York.

A study of the records of his early years of law practice demonstrates that Cardozo was a first-rate trial and appellate lawyer, and he was much sought after by other lawyers to argue difficult cases. In twenty-three years as a lawyer, he submitted briefs in 197 cases on appeal, 128 of them at the intermediate-court level (he prevailed 89 times) and 69 of them to the Court of Appeals (he prevailed 44 times). Besides his excellent record, he also developed a reputation for the utmost integrity despite the handicap of his father's disgrace. All these made him surpass his peers and built a solid foundation for his future judgeship.

Cardozo never married. Despite his family background, he was not a strong religious believer, and described himself as an agnostic in his later years. However, he never failed to identify himself as a proud Jew and remained a Jewish traditionalist in many aspects. Despite his authority and reputation, he was very modest and friendly to colleagues and professional scholars. He openly appreciated the work being done by academics and was one of the first judges to cite their works (such as legal treatises and law review articles) regularly in his opinions. In return, they applauded him loudly and muted their criticism. Cardozo also knew how to avoid and handle political issues through his personal charisma, and his father's incident might have taught him a lesson: to remain above suspicion, above politics, and even above strong partisan sentiment.

In 1923 Cardozo helped establish the American Law Institute and served as the Vice President of the Institute. Among many efforts, one major work by the Institute was to launch a series of "restatements" of the law. It was an attempt to organize myriad decisions in numerous fields of law into a series of statements of governing principles with examples and commentary. The purpose was to restate the law in those fields for the benefit of the bench, the bar, and the public. Seeing it as consistent with his strong belief in a coherent legal framework, Cardozo gave active sponsorship to this project.

Devoting himself exclusively to his judgeship and legal work, Cardozo to a large extent restrained his own extra-judicial, academic writing. Modest in demeanor, he expounded his philosophy of law and the judicial process in three classics of jurisprudence: *The Nature of the Judicial Process* (1921), *The Growth of the Law* (1924), and *The Paradoxes of Legal Science* (1928). He also wrote *Law and Literature and Other Essays and Addresses* (1931). In his works, Cardozo was primarily concerned with the theory of adjudication, and in particular of common-law adjudication. How do and should common-law judges handle their business of judging? What is the role of the judges' personal values? What are the sources of judicial decisions?

Cardozo specifically identified four methods which judges should consider and utilize when they make decisions. First is the rule of analogy or the method of philosophy. Common-law judges should give primary consideration to previous cases and try to apply principles extracted from those precedents. Second, the rule of history or the method of evolution emphasizes the importance of knowing where a rule/law came from if one is to determine its contemporary scope and relevance. Third, the method of tradition takes into consideration the customs of the community, aimed to close the gap between men's doings and law's sayings. Fourth, the method of sociology (not in its current meaning) emphasizes the notion of justice, morals, and social welfare, the *mores* of the day. Cardozo believed that law ought to be guided by consideration of the effects of its decisions, rules, doctrines, and institutions on social welfare. As a result, Cardozo was sometimes labeled as a "realist" or "pragmatist" in his legal decision-making. However, Cardozo was not specific in explaining when one of his methods should predominate over another, and he did not give a formula that shows how to reach a conclusion when these elements

suggested a variety of possible results. Nevertheless, his effort was the first to explain systematically what good judging was about, and received positive reactions from both the academics and common people.

Cardozo demonstrated a philosophical understanding and analysis in his writings when he queried about issues such as stability and progress, legal form and substance, generalities and specificities, and equality and liberty. For example, Cardozo was very much concerned about the balance between stability and progress (he identified it as one great need along with another need for restatements of law, which he helped to cover through the American Law Institution). On the one hand, he emphasized the importance of extracting principles from previous cases and following precedents; on the other hand, he realized the necessity for legal changes. He refused to treat rules and principles of case law as final truths, but only as working hypotheses, continually retested in the courts of justice. Every new case is an experiment, and if the accepted rule yields a result that is felt to be unjust, the rule should be reconsidered. It is therefore important to reach a delicate balance between stability and progress, in which precedent and formal logic point to stability while the principle of relativity in the adaptation of the law to conduct points to the way to change. As he expressed it: "Law must be stable, and yet it cannot stand stiff."

Moreover, Cardozo strongly proposed a study of philosophy of law, which helps people understand the genesis, the growth, the function, and the end of law. It is these generalities and abstractions in such a study that give direction to legal thinking and determine the outcome of doubtful lawsuits. Through such a study, Cardozo believed that judges and scholars could reach a connection between generalities (in theories) and specificities (in legal cases). Based on his experience in a legal career, Cardozo also found constant conflicts in legal issues. How to reconcile these conflicts and find a middle way to balance conflicting interests within a restrained legal framework is a question faced by all judges. The common-law system, according to Cardozo, is an effective weapon to deal with this problem. He praised the power of judicial lawmaking but warned of the importance of judicial restrictions at the same time. The balance in Cardozo's messages – the justification of judicial lawmaking and the insistence on important restrictions – made for ambiguity sometimes. Judicial theorists with divergent views have both found supporting language in Cardozo's writings. But Cardozo was not ambiguous about his own position, and he had a genius, through powerful rhetoric in his opinions, to make them logical, inevitable, and legally unassailable. His insight was to see the possibility of strengthening judge-made law while respecting various restrictions on judicial discretion required by "the rule of law." As pointed out, Cardozo was therefore an incrementalist working primarily in an incremental medium, the common law.

Cardozo's philosophizing about law made him a self-conscious judge. But he was a judge much more than he was a philosopher. His life experience was that of a practitioner and a judge. He thought like a lawyer and judge, not like a philosopher. His references on philosophy were always to substantiate some point about judging and not to involve himself in any of the eternal questions of philosophy.

Cardozo joined the Supreme Court of the United States during a momentous period of its history, and he chose the theory that gave great deference to legislative choice. Such a choice was in line with his belief that law should, with some qualifications, represent community values. He voted to uphold the constitutionality of most of the major pieces of New Deal legislation. He strongly believed in the democratically elected legislature and his respect was evident in those cases in which he refused to consider reforming a legal doctrine because that decision was the prerogative of the legislature. He also believed in the need for

government regulation to redress economic and social ills, and his judicial philosophy generally found no constitutional bar to such regulation. As a result, he earned himself a label as "progressive and liberal." But there is reservation: as pointed out, Cardozo was hardly liberal in cases involving morality, sexuality, religion, and social order. He indeed held a strong sense of the importance of personal responsibility, duty, and right conduct in life, consistent with his religious heritage. This is why some critics argued that Cardozo's entire career illustrated the importance of personal values in the judicial process, even though he tried never to let his personal identification influence his judicial reasoning.

In the years since his death, many of the doctrines that mattered most to Cardozo have been overturned. Nevertheless, Cardozo's reputation as one of the most outstanding common-law judges has endured, and his major opinions, his theoretical writings, and his approach to judging have remained a subject for study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Nature of the Judicial Process (New Haven, Conn., 1921).
The Growth of the Law (New Haven, Conn., 1924).
The Paradoxes of Legal Science (New York, 1928).
Law and Literature and Other Essays and Addresses (New York, 1931).

Other Relevant Works
Cardozo's papers are at Harvard Law School.
Selected Writings of Benjamin Nathan Cardozo, ed. Margaret E. Hall (New York, 1947).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v27*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Goodhart, Arthur L. *English Contributions to the Philosophy of Law* (Oxford, 1949).
Kaufman, Andrew L. *Cardozo* (Cambridge, Mass., 1998).
Levy, Beryl H. *Cardozo and Frontiers of Legal Thinking* (Cleveland, 1969).
Noonan, John T., Jr. *Persons and Masks of the Law* (New York, 1976).
Polenberg, Richard. *The World of Benjamin Cardozo* (Cambridge, Mass., 1997).
Pollard, Joseph P. *Mr. Justice Cardozo* (Westport, Conn., 1970).
Posner, Richard A. *Cardozo: A Study in Reputation* (Chicago, 1990).

Bin Liang

CARNAP, Rudolf (1891–1970)

Rudolf Carnap was born on 18 May 1891 in Ronsdorf, now part of the industrial town of Wuppertal in the Ruhr area of western Germany. His father died when he was a young child. He was taught at home by his mother until he went to secondary school. In 1908 the family moved to Jena, a small university town in Thüringen, where Carnap finished school and went to university. He attended lectures in many subjects, especially mathematics, physics, psychology, and philosophy of the later neo-Kantian variety. He also attended the lectures of Gottlob Frege, whose logical ideas were fundamental to Carnap's philosophy in all its phases. During his Jena years Carnap participated actively in the German Youth Movement, which left him with the strong conviction that human cognitive and social conventions were under human control, and could be decided on without unreflective conformity to traditional prejudices. This "voluntarism," as it has been

called, was also a central component in his later thought.

Carnap's studies were interrupted by World War I. Like Wittgenstein, he enlisted, participated in some of the bloodiest battles (on the western rather than the eastern front), was wounded and decorated, and was decisively changed by the experience. But this influence was almost diametrically opposite in the two philosophers. Wittgenstein retreated into mystical inwardness and turned his back on the world. Carnap became convinced that it was precisely by withdrawing from public life in this way that German intellectuals had helped to cause the war. He joined the party of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht before they were murdered, distributed clandestine newsletters to soldiers at the front, and wrote articles about world government and socialism for an underground newspaper. His philosophical interests became part of this political project. He conceived of a highest-level "conceptual politics" whose object was the planning and design of conceptual frameworks in which the species could organize its global civic cohabitation. To put the human "form of community" on a rational basis, he thought, an overall system of the sciences was needed, a Leibnizian *calculus philosophicus* or universal characteristic, of which a logic of Frege's kind was evidently to be a central component. He received his PhD in philosophy from Jena in 1921, writing a dissertation entitled *Der Raum: Ein Beitrag zur Wissenschaftslehre* (1922) which concerned the concept of space in physics, mathematics, and philosophy.

Carnap soon became an important member of the Vienna Circle after meeting Hans REICHENBACH at a conference in Erlangen in 1923. In 1926 Carnap became an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Vienna. He became a leading member of the Vienna Circle together with Reichenbach, Moritz Schlick, Hans Hahn, and Otto Neurath. In 1930 he and Reichenbach founded the journal *Erkenntnis*, and in 1931

he became professor of natural philosophy at the German University in Prague, Czechoslovakia. Carnap was forced to emigrate from Central Europe to the United States in 1935 to escape the Nazi threat. He joined the philosophy faculty of the University of Chicago in 1936, at the invitation of Charles W. MORRIS, became a US citizen in 1941, and taught at Chicago until 1952. From 1952 to 1954 he was a fellow at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, New Jersey. After Reichenbach's death, Carnap was invited in 1954 to fill his position as professor of philosophy at the University of California at Los Angeles, and he held that position until his retirement in 1961. Carnap died on 14 September 1970 in Los Angeles, California.

One part of Carnap's early utopian ideal was a "total system of all concepts" in which the whole of knowledge could be traced back to a few basic components. He did not see how to implement this idea until he read Bertrand Russell's *Our Knowledge of the External World* in early 1922, which gave him the tools for constructing his "total system of all concepts." His starting point had been Hans Vaihinger's neo-Kantian "positivist idealism." Vaihinger held that we genuinely *know* only what we have immediate subjective access to in the present "chaos of perception," while the "reality" we construct (whether the scientific reality of forces and fields or the everyday reality of objects and causes) is based on *fictions*, which are useful though we know them to be false. Carnap accepted this broad picture, including its explictly pragmatist orientation. But his goal was to *connect* the "chaos" with the fictive "reality" and to keep the fictions required for the construction of a "reality" to a disciplined minimum. Russell's principle of abstraction gave him the key. Instead of *analyzing* the "chaos of experience," as Mach and other empiricists had tried to do, qualities and physical objects could be *constructed* by taking equivalence classes of "similar"

experiences; these equivalence classes could stand in for the qualities. Furthermore, Carnap used Edmund Husserl's phenomenology to give more structure to the "chaos" than Vaihinger had allowed. Thus Carnap distinguished between "living" and "dead" sectors of the "chaos" (essentially Hume's impressions and ideas, respectively), and he used this distinction as a basis for a temporal ordering of instantaneous time-slices of total experience. Qualities could then be constructed as equivalence classes of aspects (e.g., a color-sensation within a defined range at certain coordinates of the visual field) across these time-slices. So what could be genuinely *known*, within the "chaos," was greatly expanded. Fictions *were* required, though, to get from this fixed primary world (which, phenomenological reflection showed, was two-dimensional) to an optional, fictive "secondary world" of reality (to ascend from two to three or more dimensions). In place of Vaihinger's undisciplined proliferation of fictions, however, Carnap thought the whole of scientific "reality" could be constructed from the primary world with just *two* fictions, corresponding to Kant's categories of cause and substance.

This conception of a "total system of all concepts" was sketched in a document Carnap gave the Vaihinger-reminiscent title "From the Chaos to Reality." Carnap continued to work on the system until 1926, when he moved to Vienna as a junior lecturer at the university and joined the Vienna Circle. The result was published in 1928 as *The Logical Construction of the World* (usually called the *Aufbau* after its German title), and became the Vienna Circle's prime example of a "rational reconstruction." It reconstructed the concept of "empirical content" or "empirical meaning, and thus also provided the Circle with a criterion for distinguishing meaningful sentences (which could be traced back to experience in the style of the *Aufbau*) from meaningless ones (which could not).

The published *Aufbau* of 1928 differed from the 1922 sketch in certain important respects. Following Russell's dictum that "logic gives the method for philosophy, as mathematics does for physics," Carnap gave up the distinction between a fixed "primary world," delineated by phenomenological reflection, and optional "secondary worlds." Logical construction took over from phenomenology. The basic relations were steadily reduced down to a single one, the "recollection of similarity" between time-slices. And Carnap even suggested that this single basic relation could be eliminated, so that the entire system would be purely structural.

The evolution of the *Aufbau* system did not stop with the publication of the *Aufbau*. Important problems remained unsolved, arising mainly out of the Vienna Circle's embrace of Wittgenstein's *Tractatus* as an account of logic and mathematics. On the one hand, the *Tractatus* was indispensable for them, as all previous forms of empiricism had been unable to account plausibly for mathematics. On the other hand, Wittgenstein's picture theory of meaning, taken literally, seemed to consign scientific theories (understood as universal laws), to the realm of nonsense, as well as all meta-linguistic "elucidations," statements *about* language such as the *Aufbau* or the *Tractatus* itself. Neither of these indispensable kinds of statements could be expressed as truth-functional concatenations of atomic sentences. Carnap's task, therefore, was to find a way to express scientific laws and meta-linguistic elucidations *within* the constraints of the picture theory.

His first big project on this front was the attempt to fit axiomatic (implicitly defined) concepts into a Wittgensteinian framework. This was especially important because of the new developments stemming from David Hilbert that used a *meta-mathematics* to prove results about the structural characteristics (the consistency, completeness, categoricity, etc.) of actual (axiomatic) mathematics. It was essential to show that this

meta-mathematics could actually be accommodated, at bottom, within the single, Wittgensteinian language. But after three years of work on this attempt, Carnap was convinced by Alfred TARSKI in early 1930 that his results did not really capture the meta-mathematical concepts intended. He abandoned the axiomatics project. Worse, that summer Kurt GÖDEL showed that there were true arithmetic sentences that could not be proved from the axioms of arithmetic – a result that contradicted the main theorem of Carnap's axiomatics project. And all these results had been arrived at by Hilbert's meta-mathematical method. By the end of 1930, then, the Vienna Circle program was troubled by these developments.

In January 1931 the solution to all these problems came to Carnap in a sleepless night "like a vision." He abandoned Wittgenstein's picture theory, and instead made a sharp distinction between a pure formal calculus, mere marks on a page, and its interpretation. And he restricted interpretation to the scientific *object* language. Philosophy – the "elucidations" – in the meta-language was to remain strictly *un*interpreted. The only reference was to *linguistic* configurations in the object language. The ordinary way of speaking of facts and things, the "material mode of speech" had to be replaced, for all statements that were not straightforwardly factual, by the "formal mode of speech": instead of speaking of extra-linguistic facts and things, we must speak only of linguistic objects – sentences and thing-names. The material mode could still be permitted, in everyday scientific discourse, but only under the proviso that everything said could be translated back into the formal mode. What remained of philosophy became the logic of science ("*Wissenschaftslogik*").

Carnap's first priority, under this new regime, was to develop the canonical language for the formal mode of speech. This "correct" language would be the new criterion to distinguish acceptable from unacceptable sentences, as Carnap demonstrated on a passage from Heidegger (which of course could not be translated into a "correct" language). Using Gödel's trick of arithmetization, Carnap was able to express the meta-language of arithmetic in its own object language. So despite his adoption of Hilbert's meta-language method, he was back to a single language after all! Moreover, this language was strong enough to express all the mathematics needed for physics, and in the Circle's view, all science could be expressed in the language of physics. So Carnap and Otto Neurath proposed the language of physics as a *universal* language for all knowledge, including the logic of science itself (to be expressed in the meta-language as an arithmetized sublanguage). All this reinforced Carnap's conviction that the language he was converging on was genuinely correct or canonical.

One of the essential requirements for this canonical language was a definition of *analyticity* or logical truth, to make it possible to state whether a formal-mode sentence "holds" or is true. Carnap attempted such a definition in 1931–2 (essentially a substitutional definition). But Gödel pointed out that the definition was defective; it fell foul of what we now know as Tarski's theorem on the indefinability of truth. Carnap did eventually produce a new definition of analyticity, in a meta-language, under Gödel's guidance (one quite similar to Tarski's of about the same time), but this no longer had the privileged status that a definition in the *same language*, had it been possible, could have claimed. No particular meta-language for such a definition could claim to be "correct" or "canonical." There are infinite possibilities. And while some meta-languages may seem more "natural" than others, or more useful for certain purposes, there is no "logical reality" for this choice to correspond to. Carnap saw that the disputes among the foundational schools, like the disputes within the Circle about the correct form of evidence

statements or "protocol sentences," revolved around the question of how to set up the *language*, and there was no right or wrong way to settle such questions. One could only try out different ways, and see which ones worked better. This new attitude, which first appeared in Carnap's reply to Neurath about protocol sentences in 1932, was definitively stated as a "principle of tolerance" in the *Logical Syntax of Language* in 1934.

The *Logical Syntax* combined the ideas of January 1931 (a sharp distinction between a formal calculus – specified by explicit rules – and its interpretation) and of late 1932 (the principle of tolerance). These were retained throughout Carnap's later work and became the basis for his mature ideal of explication. But the idea of restricting the philosophical meta-language to the "formal mode of speech" was dropped shortly after the *Syntax* was published, in 1935, when Carnap realized from Tarski's semantic work that the interpretation of a calculus could also be specified by explicit rules.

Carnap's work was interrupted by the Nazi threat and emigration to the US. In wartime and postwar America, Carnap had felt constrained to keep his radical ideas about society and politics well concealed, and thus to focus even more exclusively on purely technical work. Nonetheless, the new American surroundings appear to have reaffirmed and reinforced the pragmatist orientation inspired by Vaihinger.

The three and a half decades of Carnap's American career were largely occupied by a series of not very successful technical language projects. First, he tried, in a series of semantic works, to develop a general definition of "analyticity" that would distinguish analytic from synthetic sentences in a natural and obvious way. The shortcomings of these successive attempts were pointed out by W. V. QUINE, and were often taken to undermine other parts of Carnap's view, such as the principle of tolerance itself. Second, Carnap also tried unsuccessfully to specify a strict logical relation between observation sentences and theoretical sentences. After he abandoned the *Aufbau* effort to construct theories directly from subjective experience, a series of looser definitions of "empirical content" or "empirical reducibility" were given. These attempts were also subjected to searching criticism, above all by Carl Hempel. The lesson derived from this failure has generally been to abandon the question altogether, unfortunately, instead of confining the pessimism to Carnap's particular approach. Third, the last three decades of Carnap's life were largely devoted to the creation of an inductive logic. This was intended as a tool for practicing scientists, to give them a way of measuring the objective probability of a theory with respect to the available evidence. It was intended to make precise the informal usage, in everyday *and* scientific life, by which the evidence is taken to "make" one hypothesis "more likely" than another. Carnap's proposals attained some currency in the 1950s and 1960s, but are no longer in the mainstream of discussion.

Even if these language projects are written off as failures, however, this would not discredit the larger vision or ideal of explication and language engineering that guided Carnap after 1935. At the basis of this ideal is the utopian conception of highest-level "conceptual politics" – the planning and design of our conceptual frameworks and "form of community" – that never left him after 1918. He believed that philosophers have a responsibility to devise conceptual frameworks for the whole of knowledge that will maximize the usefulness of that knowledge for the human species, for all uses to which different humans put knowledge, especially for the purpose of liberation from unreflective tradition and conformity. In devising these frameworks we are constrained by certain obvious human limitations, but we should not allow ourselves to be constrained by the past and the languages handed down to us by our ancestors. Those are a beginning,

certainly, and we could get nowhere without that beginning. But Carnap thought we should not treat the puzzles and contradictions embedded in natural languages, or in historical languages of philosophy, with any undue reverence. In fact, we should liberate ourselves from them as far as possible. Though our habitual ways of thinking and talking are deeply entrenched, in Carnap's view this is no reason to be constrained by them when we envision new ones.

There are three levels of language engineering or language study, in Carnap's mature conception. *Syntax* considers languages in isolation from anything extra-linguistic they might be thought of as representing. *Semantics* considers languages as representing extra-linguistic things, but still in isolation from their concrete uses by humans. *Pragmatics* considers languages in relation to their use contexts and their users (the labels derive from Morris). Each of these three (syntax, semantics, pragmatics) can be considered as *engineering* activities (the creation or discussion of new or improved languages) or as *empirical* studies (the study of existing languages). The engineering activity Carnap called "pure" syntax, semantics, or pragmatics, while the empirical study he called "descriptive" syntax, semantics, or pragmatics. Linguists, as a rule, study the *descriptive* syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of already existing natural languages, while logicians engage in the *pure* syntax and semantics of constructed languages. Epistemology and methodology belong to pragmatics, while whatever remains of metaphysics and ontology belongs to semantics, though this becomes a matter of *deciding* which entities and categories to make fundamental to our language framework, given existing scientific knowledge, rather than *finding out* what those entities are or might be.

This voluntarism also remained fundamental. The notion that something beyond the scope of science might actually *be the case* seemed to Carnap a back door to the readmission of traditional prejudices and conformities of all kinds. Certainly we need to make assumptions, he acknowledged, but we can *decide* on these, and spell them out; they are not "out there" for us to *find*. On these grounds he deprecated Quine's preoccupation with ontology. It makes no sense to talk about "what there is," Carnap said, without specifying the language framework in which this is being asserted; any such claim is relative to a framework. It makes perfectly good sense to ask, *within* a framework that includes, say, the Zermelo–Frankel axioms for set theory, whether there are infinite numbers. Such "internal" questions have determinate answers. But it makes no sense, *outside* such a framework, to ask "just in general" whether "there are" infinite numbers. Not only is there no determinate answer, but there is no way to give such an "external" question itself any clear meaning. What we *can* ask instead is the *practical* question whether it is better (e.g., for use in science) to choose a linguistic framework that has infinite numbers or one that does not. But this is not a question of ontology or semantics; it is a question of pragmatics, a question of *which language* we *want*.

The process by which the human species upgrades its messy and imprecise inherited languages to newly built and more precise ones Carnap called *explication*. He acknowledged that this is a piecemeal, not a revolutionary process. Humanity replaces its concepts a few at a time. Even the people working at the frontier of knowledge have to use a vernacular, a derivative of ordinary language, to discuss the application of the more precise calculi in which they frame their theories. Their vernacular is certainly cleaner and more precise than the vernacular of the society at large. In the scientific vernacular, all concepts used are intended in their scientifically rigorous meanings. Behind a scientist's use of the word "light," for instance, lurks the entire theory of quantum electrodynamics in its present state of development.

But many concepts even in this tidied-up vernacular have no such precise meanings. They may be used for generations before they are made precise. An example Carnap often cited was the replacement of our vague, subjective, intuitive sense of "hot" and "cold" by the precise, quantitative concept of temperature, which we can define intersubjectively by reference to measurement devices. This concept not only takes the place of the former vague concepts, for many purposes, but also gives us many capabilities the vague concepts lacked. It can, for instance, provide an outside, objective framework or standard against which to judge subjective feelings; instead of just saying "I feel hot" or "I feel feverish," I can take my temperature and find out exactly how much higher it is than its ordinary level. So explication also provides a framework of objectivity that enables us to escape from a merely subjective view of the world. But the replacement of the vague, informal world view by a framework of more objective concepts is never complete, and does not proceed uniformly; temperature is not an ultimate constituent of our theory of nature.

Explication, which in Carnap's view is the main task of conceptual engineering, consists in the *replacement* of a vague concept in need of explication, the *explicandum*, by a more precise one, the *explicatum*. The first step is the *clarification* of the explicandum, the establishment of some basic agreement among those using the vague concept as to what they mean by it. The next step is a proposal for its replacement, a proposed explicatum. This explicatum should have most of the important uses that were agreed on in the clarification stage, but need not have all of them. It should, if possible, be expressed in a language framework that makes clear its relation to a wide range of other concepts. The (provisional) acceptance of an explicatum is just its use by the specific community to which it has been proposed, and, ultimately, its wider use by the community of those who use the tidied-up scientific vernacular.

Under the regime of tolerance, there is no single correct language. There is an infinity of possible languages, and the community must decide among them. Explication is therefore *dialectical*. On the one hand, knowledge has obvious and far-reaching effects on our practical life; it can tell us about the likely consequences of various value systems and courses of action, far more than we could have known a few centuries ago. On the other hand, our representation of our knowledge to ourselves is language-relative. We can only know what we know in the form given it by a particular language. The choice *among* languages, though, is not a choice we make *within* a given language framework. It is a practical choice, involving values. So is the choice among explications for some given explicandum. These are *external* questions, in Carnap's terms. So knowledge and values are in a constant feedback relation to each other; knowledge shapes values and values shape knowledge. This would appear to make Carnap as radically "pragmatist" as William JAMES. In Carnap's ideal, reason is not the slave of the passions (or of anything else) but each side informs the other. Reason informs the passions (and the rest of life in the realm of "practice"), and the passions inform reason. Neither is subordinate.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Der Raum: Ein Beitrag zur Wissenschaftslehre (Berlin, 1922).

Physikalische Begriffsbildung (Karlsruhe, Germany, 1926).

Der logische Aufbau der Welt (Berlin, 1928). Trans. Rolf George, *The Logical Structure of the World: Pseudoproblems in Philosophy* (Berkeley, Cal., 1967).

Scheinprobleme in der Philosophie: das fremdpsychische und der readlismusstreit (Berlin, 1928).

Wissenschaftliche Weltauffassung der Wiener Kreis, with Otto Neurath and Hans Hahn (Vienna, 1929).

Logische Syntax der Sprache (Vienna,

1934), Trans. Amethe Smeaton, *The Logical Syntax of Language* (London, 1937).

Philosophy and Logical Syntax (London, 1935).

Foundations of Logic and Mathematics (Chicago, 1939).

Introduction to Semantics (Cambridge, Mass., 1942).

Formalization of Logic (Cambridge, Mass., 1943).

Meaning and Necessity: A Study in Semantics and Formal Logic (Chicago, 1947; 2nd edn 1956).

Logical Foundations of Probability (Chicago, 1950).

The Continuum of Inductive Methods (Chicago, 1952).

Philosophical Foundations of Physics, ed. Martin Gardner (New York, 1966). Rev. edn, *Introduction to the Philosophy of Science* (New York, 1974).

Other Relevant Works

Carnap's papers are in the Archive for Scientific Philosophy in the Twentieth Century at the University of Pittsburgh.

"Testability and Meaning," *Philosophy of Science* 3 (1936): 419–71; 4 (1937): 1–40.

"Meaning Postulates," *Philosophical Studies* 3 (1952): 65–73.

Dear Carnap, Dear Van: The Quine–Carnap Correspondence and Related Work, ed. Richard Creath (Berkeley, Cal., 1990).

Logical Empiricism at Its Peak: Schlick, Carnap, and Neurath, ed. Sahotra Sarkar (New York, 1996).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils Before 1950*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Blackwell Analytic Phil*, *Blackwell Comp Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Proc of APA v44*, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Awodey, Steve, and Carsten Klein, eds. *Carnap Brought Home: The View from Jena* (La Salle, Ill., 2004).

Creath, Richard, and Michael Friedman, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Carnap* (Cambridge, UK, 2005).

Friedman, Michael. *Reconsidering Logical Positivism* (Cambridge, UK, 1999).

———, *A Parting of the Ways: Carnap, Cassirer, Heidegger* (La Salle, Ill., 2000).

Giere, Ronald N., and Alan W. Richardson, eds. *Origins of Logical Empiricism* (Minneapolis, 1996).

Hintikka, Jaakko, ed. *Rudolf Carnap, Logical Empiricist: Materials and Perspectives* (Dordrecht, 1975).

Lepage, François, Michel Paquette, and François Rivenc, eds. *Carnap aujourd'hui* (Paris, 2002).

Ricketts, Thomas. "Carnap's Principle of Tolerance, Empiricism, and Conventionalism," in *Reading Putnam*, ed. Peter Clark and Bob Hale (Oxford, 1994), pp. 176–200.

Schilpp, Paul A., ed. *The Philosophy of Rudolf Carnap* (La Salle, Ill., 1963). Contains Carnap's autobiography and bibliography.

Stadler, Friedrich. *Studien zum Wiener Kreis: Ursprung, Entwicklung und Wirkung des Logischen Empirismus im Kontext* (Frankfurt am Main, 1997).

Stein, Howard. "Was Carnap Entirely Wrong, After All?" *Synthese* 93 (1992): 275–95.

André W. Carus

CARR, Harvey A (1873–1954)

Harvey Carr was born on 30 April 1873 in Morris, Illinois. He later added a middle letter of his own choice. He attended DePauw

College from 1893 to 1895, but illness and lack of money delayed further education until he was twenty-six. He earned a BS in 1901 and MS in 1902 from the University of Colorado, where his interest in psychology began. On a fellowship he went to study psychology with John Dewey, James Angell, and John B. Watson at the University of Chicago, earning his PhD in 1905. After three years of teaching at small schools, he was called back to Chicago as an assistant professor of psychology in 1908 to replace the departed Watson. Carr took charge of animal psychology, and also led research in comparative psychology, learning, and space perception. He was chair of Chicago's psychology department from 1922 until 1938, the year of his retirement. He had a quite large influence on the direction of American psychology. He helped edit the *Journal of Experimental Psychology* and *Journal of General Psychology* for many years. He also advised numerous doctoral graduates (over one hundred). He was President of the American Psychological Association in 1926. Carr died on 21 June 1954 in Culver, Indiana.

Carr's theoretical approach to psychology followed the functionalism of his teachers Dewey and Angell. Behaviorism had risen to challenge functionalism for dominance by the time that Carr's *Psychology* was published in 1925. Carr maintained that behaviorism at best was appropriate only for animal psychology. His presidential address, published in 1927, admitted that establishing the existence of animal consciousness depended on correlating similar human and animal responses. Although Carr expressed dismay and skepticism over psychology's dependence on reified notions of memory, attention, and similarly alleged entities in the mind, he was unwilling to eliminate consciousness from psychology.

The functions of mental activity that Carr investigated were those manifested in the organism's adaptive activities as it manages to survive by learning, though interacting with its environment. Mental operations always come to exist in service of some organic need. By setting any mental activity in its proper context of purposive behavior, Carr left behind the rationalism and introspectionism that prevented psychology from becoming experimental and scientific. This functionalism grants scientific status to teleological explanations, however, which was and remains problematic. The "adaptive act" to which Carr continually appealed has both a reactive and motivated aspect, where the motivation is in reference to some desired goal. This view of intelligence is the foundation of American pragmatism as well.

For Carr, an adaptive act has at least five characteristics: (1) a motive that gives some direction to behavior; (2) a sensory situation that is perceived or cognized; (3) an incentive; (4) a response from the organism that modifies the situation towards satisfying the motive; and (5) an established association formed between the stimuli and the response. In Carr's words, "mental activity is concerned with the acquisition, fixation, retention, organization, and evaluation of experiences, and their subsequent utilization in the guidance of conduct. The type of conduct that reflects mental activity may be termed adaptive or adjustive behavior." (1925)

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Psychology: A Study of Mental Activity (New York, 1925).
An Introduction to Space Perception (New York, 1935).

Other Relevant Works
Carr's papers are at the Archives of the History of American Psychology at the University of Akron, Ohio.
"Interpretation of the Animal Mind," *Psychological Review* 34 (1927): 87–106.
"Functionalism," in *Psychologies of 1930*, ed. Carl Murchinson (Worcester, Mass., 1930), pp. 59–78.
"Harvey A. Carr," in *A History of Psychology in Autobiography*, vol. 3, ed. Carl Murchinson (Worcester, Mass., 1930), pp. 69–82.

Further Reading

Bio Dict Psych by Zusne, Encyc Psych, Who Was Who in Amer v3

Heidbreder, Edna. "Functionalism and the University of Chicago," in *Seven Psychologies* (New York, 1933), pp. 201–33.

Hilgard, E. R. "Harvey Carr and Chicago Functionalism: A Stimulated Interview," in *Portraits of Pioneers in Psychology*, vol. 1, ed. G. A. Kimble, M. Wertheimer, and C. White (Washington, D.C., 1991), pp. 121–36.

Owens, D. A., and M. Wagner, eds. *Progress in Modern Psychology: The Legacy of American Functionalism* (Westport, Conn., 1992).

Pillsbury, W. B. "Harvey A Carr: 1873–1954," *American Journal of Psychology* 68 (1955): 149–51.

John R. Shook

CARR, Herbert Wildon (1857–1931)

Herbert Wildon Carr was born on 16 January 1857 in London, England. He attended Stationer's School in London and then King's College London, but did not complete a degree. From the late 1870s until 1909, Carr operated a financial firm in London. However, he had become interested in philosophy, joined the Aristotelian Society in 1880, and was elected its Vice President in 1884. He also served as secretary and treasurer for several years, helped edit its annual volume of proceedings, and was President from 1915 to 1918. Carr became proficient in metaphysics and philosophical psychology; Durham University awarded him its D.Litt. degree in 1912.

In 1910 Carr encountered the philosophy of French philosopher Henri Bergson, which inspired him to compose two books: *Henri Bergson: The Philosophy of Change* (1911) and *The Philosophy of Change: A Study of the Fundamental Principle of the Philosophy of Bergson* (1914). The success of these works, along with two other books on truth and on Italian philosopher Benedetto Croce, led to his appointment as head of the psychology department of King's College for one year in 1914. Carr then became professor of philosophy at the University of London in 1918, and he held this position for the remainder of his life.

In 1925 Carr began a relationship with the University of Southern California, arriving as visiting professor of philosophy, and in 1926 Southern California honored Carr with an LLD degree. Carr's presence on the philosophy faculty was very welcome, and he taught during most semesters for six years. Several of Carr's colleagues were favorably inclined toward various kinds of idealism, including personal idealists Ralph T. FLEWELLING, F. C. S. Schiller (who arrived from England in 1926), and Wilbur H. Long. He contributed to the school of personalism then flourishing at Southern California, and published five more books. Carr was elected President of the American Philosophical Association Pacific Division for 1928–9. He died on 8 July 1931 in Los Angeles, California.

Before encountering Bergson's philosophy, Carr held an equal suspicion toward absolute idealism, materialism, and interactionist dualism. Both absolute idealism and materialism diminish the significance and power of the human mind and personality, mainly by reducing to illusion our creative freedom. Against the third possibility that mind and brain are distinct and separate realities yet interact through mysterious processes, Carr raised the usual objection that no causal relations can be imagined between such different kinds of things. For him, it is impossible that consciousness could depend on physical processes. His dissatisfaction with the principal schools of philosophy of his day brought him in the early 1900s to a kind of philo-

sophical skepticism, although he always held a faithful commitment to religious theism.

Upon encountering the philosophy of Henri Bergson as elaborated in his *Creative Evolution*, Carr was immediately converted. He was particularly attracted to the theory that life-energy is the most fundamental reality of the universe, and that God should be pantheistically identified with this universal spiritual force. In his books on Bergson, Carr sympathetically explains his conclusion that the evolutionary progress from simpler to more complex organisms is really the process of the supreme world-spirit gradually revealing itself through finite beings. Like the absolute idealists who tried to account for individual limited minds, Carr offered the metaphysical theory that each finite mind has an organic relation to God's whole while still retaining the freedom to exercise its own powers. The organic metaphor, proceeding from our understanding of living creatures composed of cells, suggests by analogy for Carr the notion that each mind is a spiritual cell of God. This evolutionary pantheism properly respects, in Carr's view, the relative independence, real growth, and intellectual freedom of each individual person, although God can still influence the development of the universe toward His ends.

Carr also turned to the philosophy of Leibniz, as did many personal idealists in that era, for designing an antimechanistic and vitalist philosophy and for inspiration on the problem of the relation of persons to the supreme person of God. In two books, *A Theory of Monads: Outlines of a Philosophy of the Principle of Relativity* (1921) and *Leibniz* (1929), and in his 1930 edition of Leibniz's *Monadology*, Carr accepts the solipsistic standpoint that all we ever know is the contents of our private minds and that nothing external to mind could possibly exist to cause ideas within the mind. All thought and action is the internal growth of personal spirit. The new relativistic physics demonstrates that reality only exists in relation to the observer. Having no explanation of how such a solipsistic mind could ever know another, Carr simply proceeds from the existence of one monadic mind to the assertion of a community of monadic minds that cannot communicate. His last book, *Cogitans Cogitata* (1930), gives a terse and compact presentation of his final metaphysical theories. The pantheistic God has evaporated to a mere religious ideal for the community of persons. Our conception of God suggests a path toward moral and spiritual perfection, but as only a human conception, it places no constraints on personal freedom.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Henri Bergson: The Philosophy of Change (London and New York, 1911).
The Problem of Truth (London and New York, 1911).
The Philosophy of Change: A Study of the Fundamental Principle of the Philosophy of Bergson (London, 1914).
The Philosophy of Benedetto Croce: The Problem of Art and History (London and New York, 1917).
The General Principle of Relativity in Its Philosophical and Historical Aspect (London, 1920).
Mind-Energy: Lectures and Essays (London and New York, 1920).
A Theory of Monads: Outlines of a Philosophy of the Principle of Relativity (London, 1921).
The Scientific Approach to Philosophy: Selected Essays and Reviews (London, 1924).
Changing Backgrounds in Religion and Ethics: A Metaphysical Meditation (New York, 1927).
The Freewill Problem (London, 1928).
The Unique Status of Man (New York, 1928).
Leibniz (Boston and London, 1929).
Cogitans Cogitata (Los Angeles and London, 1930).

Other Relevant Works
"On Mr. Shadworth Hodgson's

Metaphysic of Experience," *Mind* 8 (1899): 383–96.

"The Theory of Subjective Activity," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 1 (1901): 191–9.

"The Metaphysical Criterion and Its Implications," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 5 (1905): 117–30.

"Impressions and Ideas – The Problem of Idealism," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 8 (1908): 115–38.

"Life and Logic," *Mind* 22 (1913): 484–92.

"Why the Mind Seems to Be, and Yet Cannot Be, Produced by the Brain," *Philosophical Review* 23 (1914): 257–70.

"The Philosophical Aspect of Freud's Theory of Dream Interpretation," *Mind* 23 (1914): 321–34.

"The Metaphysical Implications of the Principle of Relativity," *Philosophical Review* 24 (1915): 1–16.

"The Moment of Experience," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 16 (1916): 1–31.

"The Problem of Recognition," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 17 (1917): 1–27.

"The Interaction of Mind and Body," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 18 (1918): 1–37.

"The Concept of Mind-Energy," *Mind* 29 (1920): 1–10.

"The Fiftieth Session," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 29 (1929): 359–86.

"Real and Ideal Relations," *Philosophical Review* 38 (1929): 1–22.

Ed., *The Monadology of Leibniz* (Los Angeles, 1930).

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v3, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v41*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Flewelling, Ralph T. "Herbert Wildon Carr – Christian Stoic," *The Personalist* 37 (1956): 117–27.

Schiller, F. C. S. "In Memoriam: Herbert Wildon Carr, January 1, 1857–July 8,

1931," *Mind* 40 (1931): 535–6.

Turner, J. E. "Dr. Wildon Carr's Theory of the Relation between Body and Mind," *Journal of Philosophy* 17 (1920): 268–72.

———, "Dr. Wildon Carr and Lord Haldane on Scientific Relativity," *Mind* 31 (1922): 40–52.

John R. Shook

CARSON, Rachel Louise (1907–64)

Rachel Carson was born on 27 May 1907 in Springdale, Pennsylvania, and died on 14 April 1964 in Silver Spring, Maryland. She received a BA in science (magna cum laude) from the Pennsylvania College for Women (now Chatham College) in 1929. She received an MA in zoology from Johns Hopkins University in 1932. She had a rugged upbringing in a farmhouse outside the river town of Springdale where she acquired a lifelong passion for nature (particularly the ocean) from her mother. Her first publication, "A Battle in the Clouds," appeared in 1918 in *St. Nicholas*, a children's magazine, and three additional stories were published in 1919 and another in 1922 in the same magazine. During the late 1930s Carson supported herself, her mother, her sister and later, her sister's two daughters; and she adopted her grandnephew in 1957.

She began her career as a teaching assistant in biology at Johns Hopkins University during summer sessions from 1930 to 1936. From 1931 to 1933 she was a half-time assistant in zoology at the University of Maryland. In 1935 she wrote a radio program entitled "Romance under the Waters." Carson was the first woman to take and pass the civil service test, and was subsequently hired by the Bureau of Fisheries as a full-time junior biologist in 1937. Her first major publication, "Undersea,"

appeared in *The Atlantic Monthly* in 1941. Her first book, *Under the Sea Wind*, was published in 1949. She became the chief editor for the US Fish and Wildlife Service in 1951. Her next book, *The Sea Around Us*, for which she received the National Book Award and the John Burroughs Medal, appeared in 1951. Carson retired from government service in 1952 and continued to live in Maryland, while spending summers in Maine. Her last two books, *The Edge of the Sea* and *Silent Spring*, were published in 1955 and 1962. Carson received the Conservationist of the Year award from the National Wildlife Federation. To honor her, CBS produced the television special "The Silent Spring of Rachel Carson" in 1964. She was posthumously awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1980.

Rachel Carson was an acclaimed scientist/ecologist who communicated in her writings intricate biological interrelationships in a literary prose style. By her own admission, she could not write about nature, and especially the sea, without the language of poetry. She asserted that nature was intrinsically poetical, and to write about it in any other manner would be to diminish nature's essential quality. Her ability to describe complex concepts in lyrical phrases engaged the educated nonscientific public. Consequently, humankind's perception of the living world has been changed. Rachel Carson has merited the distinction of being called the "mother of the modern environmental movement."

A significant influence on Carson's writing was Henry Beston's 1928 classic of American nature literature, *The Outermost House: A Year of Life on the Great Beach of Cape Cod*. Beston's book is remarkable for its poetic imagery. Consider his painterly description of a flock of turnstones, *Arenaria interpres morinella*, on New Year's Day. The "three dominant colours of this bird [are] … black, white, and glowing chestnut red; and these colours are interestingly displayed in patches and bold stripes seen at their best when the bird is flying. The great dunes behind them and the long vista of the beach were cold silver overlaid with that faint, loveliest violet which is the overtone colour of the coast." (1928, p. 96) Compare this passage with Carson's description of a black skimmer, a bird called *Rynchops*, from *Under the Sea Wind*. "As he neared the shore of the island the skimmer drifted closer to the water, bringing his dark form into strong silhouette against the gray sheet, like the shadow of a great bird that passed unseen above. Yet so quietly did he approach that the sound of his wings, if sound there were, was lost in the whisper song of the water turning over the shells on the wet sand." (1941, p. 5) While the similarity relates only to poetic style, Carson's literary talent – and a vast scientific knowledge – became a means to develop a profound environmental ethic.

Carson's central philosophical principle of ecology was proclaimed in her own words in a speech before the Women's National Book Association on 15 February 1963. "In each of my books I have tried to say that all of the life of the planet is inter-related, that each species has its own ties to others, and that all are related to the earth. This is the theme of *The Sea Around Us* and the other sea books, and it is also the message of *Silent Spring*." For example, she stated that consequential modifications of marine life occur even with slight variations in ocean currents and water temperature. In *The Edge of the Sea*, Carson refers to the living coral coasts as growing in ocean water seventy degrees Fahrenheit and above, since coral animals can secrete their calcareous bone structure only in those temperatures. Moreover, an integral concept in her environmental ethic questions whether changes in any environmental condition are man-made or part of a natural cycle.

Carson's ethic becomes a challenge in the opening pages of her most celebrated book, *Silent Spring*. She develops her ecological perspective by characterizing earth's life history. "The history of life on earth has been a history of interaction between living things and their surroundings. To a large extent, the physical

form and the habits of the earth's vegetation and its animal life have been molded by the environment. Considering the whole span of earthly time, the opposite effect, in which life actually modifies its surroundings, has been relatively slight. Only within the moment of time represented by the present century has one species – man – acquired significant power to alter the nature of his world" (1962, p. 5).

This thoughtful introduction ushers in nothing less than a disclosure of, and an attack on, the widespread use of insecticides and herbicides. Their hazardous effects – meticulously documented with scientific fact – are traced from ground-surface water to soil, to crops, to wildlife, and finally to humans. The targeted chemicals, many of which were an outgrowth of industry developing agents for chemical warfare during World War II, include the chlorinated hydrocarbons (DDT, dieldrin, heptachlor, chlordane, aldrin, endrin), organic phosphates (parathion, malathion), and the herbicides (dinitrophenol, pentachlorophenol). Carson documents the futility and disastrous side-effects of major insecticide programs: spraying for Dutch Elm disease, the Canadian DDT campaign to eliminate the spruce budworm, and the "eradication" of the fire ant in the southern United States.

Carson's ecological principle of interrelationships is clearly demonstrated in her discussion of the Canadian spruce budworm program. In the chapter entitled "Rivers of Death," she refers to the time-immemorial cycle of adult salmon returning to fresh water to spawn their young – in this case, up the Miramichi River on the Canadian coast of New Brunswick. Following the spraying of DDT in 1954, the chemical permeated the balsam forests and reached the soil and streams. Within days, dead and dying fish appeared on the banks of these streams. The rich variety of insect life on which salmon feed also perished. Consequently, the newborn salmon had nothing to eat, and died. Despite the continued spraying, the budworm population became resistant to DDT and, ironically, persisted.

Carson points to two crucial factors that the pesticide control programs mentioned above have ignored: "the … effective control of insects is that applied by nature, not by man," and "the explosive power of a species to reproduce once the resistance of the environment has been weakened" (1962, p. 247). In this spirit, Carson suggests biological solutions as an alternative to the pest problem, that is, approaches that turn a particular insect species against itself. Specifically, she notes Edward Knipling's theory of male sterilization of insects by using X-rays or gamma rays. During the 1950s, the United States Department of Agriculture and the State of Florida funded an effort to eliminate the screw-worm, a major insect enemy of livestock, by using Knipling's sterilization technique. The extinction of this devastating insect pest was achieved in the Southeast by 1959.

The impact of *Silent Spring* has often been compared to Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Responding to Carson's book, President John F. Kennedy's Science Advisory Committee conducted an investigation that ultimately led to the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency in 1970 and the banning of DDT in 1972. Former Vice President Al Gore mentions, in his introduction to the 1994 edition of *Silent Spring*, that a panel of distinguished Americans chose *Silent Spring* as the most influential book within the last fifty years. He suggests that Carson has revealed an essential truth to modern civilization: the interrelationship between human beings and their environment.

Often removed from an urban environment, the remote seacoast was a place where Carson could immerse herself in thoughtful observation of nature. Continual change and fluidity throughout time's passage, as opposed to stasis, characterizes her philosophical view of this world. In many passages throughout *The Edge of the Sea*, Carson ponders her surroundings in a way that reflects Henri Bergson's intuition of duration. She refers to time as continuously and inevitably moving toward a future of unforeseen novelty, and then speaks of a life

force that contains a history of the past in the present. The following excerpt illustrates this idea of evolution. "On all these shores there are echoes of past and future: of the flow of time, obliterating yet containing all that has gone before … . For as the shore configuration changes in the flow of time, the pattern of life changes, never static, never quite the same from year to year." (1955, p. 250)

The language of poetry is manifest in this passage as in all Carson's writing. But, a deeper philosophical truth about nature emerges – one that is grounded in scientific observation. The theme of nature's balances, and man as *part* of that balance, becomes an environmental ethic. The urgency of Carson's message resonated with humanity's anxiety over nuclear weapons of mass destruction during the 1950s and 1960s – a potential threat about which she was deeply concerned. In the present-day world of more complex technology, her voice speaks to our inner beings in an imperative, and yet comforting, manner.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Under the Sea Wind (New York, 1941).

The Sea Around Us (New York, 1951; Oxford, 2003).

The Edge of the Sea (New York, 1955).

Silent Spring (Boston, 1962; 2002).

The Sense of Wonder (New York, 1965; 1998).

Other Relevant Works

Carson's papers are at Yale University. A collection of materials about Carson is at Connecticut College.

Food from the Sea: Fish and Shellfish of New England, Conservation Bulletin #33 (Washington, D.C., 1943).

Food from the Sea: Fishes of the Middle West, Conservation Bulletin #34 (Washington, D.C., 1943).

Food from the Sea: Fish and Shellfish of the South Atlantic and Gulf Coasts, Conservation Bulletin #37 (Washington, D.C., 1944).

Food from the Sea: Fish and Shellfish from Middle Atlantic Coast, Conservation Bulletin #38 (Washington, D.C., 1945).

Always Rachel: The Letters of Rachel Carson and Dorothy Freeman, ed. Martha Freeman (Boston, 1995).

Lost Woods: The Discovered Writing of Rachel Carson, ed. Linda Lear (Boston, 1998).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v51*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*

Brooks, Paul. *The House of Life: Rachel Carson at Work* (Boston, 1972). 2nd rev. edn, *The Writer at Work* (Boston, 1998).

———, *Speaking for Nature: How Literary Naturalists from Henry David Thoreau to Rachel Carson Have Shaped America* (Boston, 1980).

Free, Ann Cottrell. *Since Silent Spring: Our Debt to Albert Schweitzer and Rachel Carson* (Washington, D.C., 1992).

Gartner, Carol B. *Rachel Carson* (New York, 1983).

Graham, Frank, Jr. *Since Silent Spring* (Boston, 1970).

Hynes, Patricia H. *The Recurring Silent Spring* (New York, 1989).

Lear, Linda. "Bombshell in Beltsville: The USDA and the Challenge of 'Silent Spring'," *Agricultural History* 66 (1992): 151–70.

———, "Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*," *Environmental History Review* 17 (1993): 23–48.

———, *Rachel Carson: Witness for Nature* (New York, 1997).

Lutts, Ralph H. "Chemical Fallout: Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*, Radioactive Fallout and the Environmental Movement," *Environmental Review* 9 (1985): 214–25.

Marco, Gino J., Robert M. Hollingworth, and William Durham, eds. *Silent Spring Revisited* (Washington, D.C., 1987).

Waddell, Craig, ed. *And No Birds Sing: Rhetorical Analyses of Rachel Carson's Silent Spring* (Carbondale, Ill., 2000).

Charles Frederick Frantz

CARTWRIGHT, Richard Lee (1925–)

Richard Cartwright was born on 13 December 1925 in Hamilton, Ohio. He began his formal education in philosophy at Oberlin College, where he received a BA in 1945. His doctoral work was done at Brown University, where he worked under Roderick CHISHOLM and Curt DUCASSE. He graduated with a PhD in philosophy in 1954, after taking his first teaching appointment in 1949 at the University of Michigan. He cites William FRANKENA as an important influence (1987, p. xvii) during his time there. While at Michigan, Cartwright also encountered J. O. Urmson and J. L. Austin, and developed an appetite for Oxford philosophy of the period – an appetite that fit well with his longstanding interest in G. E. Moore. In 1961 Cartwright joined the thriving philosophy department at Wayne State University, where he worked closely with Hector CASTAÑEDA, Edmund GETTIER, and Alvin PLANTINGA. Cartwright remained at Wayne State for only six years, moving in 1967 to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he was professor of philosophy and helped to build a new doctoral program. Cartwright remained at MIT until his retirement in 1994. Cartwright is married to Helen Morris Cartwright, also a specialist in analytic metaphysics and philosophy of language, and they presently live in Boston.

Histories sometimes depict twentieth-century philosophy of language as a battle between the Formalists, steeped in mathematical logic and natural science, and the Ordinary Language theorists, exquisitely attuned to colloquial speech and the fine points of usage. Among the Formalist giants, so it is said, were Gottlob Frege, Bertrand Russell, the logical positivists, and W. V. QUINE. Among the giants of the Ordinary Language approach were J. L. Austin, Gilbert Ryle, the later Wittgenstein and his followers (such as Norman MALCOLM), and also G. E. Moore. Whatever the historical merits of dividing things up this way, it is clear that Cartwright cannot be made to fit neatly into either camp. To begin with, the philosophers who most influenced him were Moore and Quine, supposedly combatants on opposing sides. Moreover, Cartwright's published papers exhibit both enormous logical sophistication, like Quine, but also great care about the nuance of wording, like Moore.

A theme that runs throughout Cartwright's philosophical papers – they are few in number as he is too seldom satisfied with his work to publish regularly – are puzzles in metaphysics that emerge from reflection upon linguistic semantics. Does reference to mythical creatures require that there "be" a thing referred to, but one which does not exist? Do we need sentence meanings and propositions, or can propositions simply *be* sentence meanings? If we say that false propositions are those which do not "correspond" to any fact, must we immediately distinguish true propositions from facts – on the grounds that true propositions must merely correspond to, rather than be identical to, facts? If the answer is affirmative, how can true propositions be distinguished from facts? Does failure of substitutivity *salva veritate* at the level of linguistic items really imply failure of identity at the level of their referents? What are the existential commitments of singular propositions, i.e., ones which contain objects "neat", not under any description? In particular, can a proposition about *A* be true (or false for that matter), in a world where *A* does not exist?

Later in his career, Cartwright turned to history of philosophy. During this stage, he had two historical foci: early analytic philosophy, especially Moore, Russell, and the early

Wittgenstein, and late medieval philosophy, especially Aquinas. Here too, his interest was in the broad issue of how facts about what we say relate to facts about what there is.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Negative Existentials," *Journal of Philosophy* 57 (1960): 629–39.
"Propositions," in *Analytical Philosophy*, 1st series, ed. R. J. Butler (Oxford, 1962).
"Propositions Again," *Noûs* 2 (1968): 229–46.
"Identity and Substitutivity," in *Identity and Individuation*, ed. Milton K. Munitz (New York, 1971).
"Indiscernibility Principles," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 4 (1979): 293–306.
Philosophical Essays (Cambridge, Mass., 1987).
"Singular Propositions," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy Supplementary Volume* 23 (1997): 67–84.

Other Relevant Works
"The Second Way," *Medieval Philosophy and Theology* 5 (1996): 189–204.
"Aquinas on What Could Have Been," *Philosophical Perspectives* 10 (1996): 447–58.
"Aquinas on Infinite Multitudes," *Medieval Philosophy and Theology* 6 (1997): 183–201.

Further Reading
Hochberg, Herbert. "Professor Quine, Pegasus, and Dr. Cartright," *Philosophy of Science* 24 (1957): 191–203.
Thomson, Judith J., ed. *On Being and Saying: Essays for Richard Cartwright* (Cambridge, Mass., 1987).

Robert J. Stainton

CARUS, Paul (1852–1919)

Paul Carus was born on 18 July 1852 in Ilsenburg, Germany. He was the son of Gustav and Laura Krueger Carus. Gustav rose to high office in the Lutheran Church in East Prussia, and Paul originally intended to follow him into the clergy. However, "the more I studied the more that sinful tendency to doubt grew." Instead, he obtained a PhD in classical philology at Tübingen in 1876 and a teaching position at the military academy of the Royal Corps of Cadets of Saxony in Dresden. In 1880 he published a pamphlet in which he denied the literal truth of the Bible and described it as a literary work comparable to the *Odyssey*. His employer considered these views "not in harmony with the Christian spirit" and required him to recant or quit. He quit, and emigrated to England in 1881, and then to the United States in 1884. Carus soon came into contact with Edward C. Hegeler, a successful zinc manufacturer in La Salle, Illinois, who had turned to philosophy. Hegeler espoused what he called "the religion of science" in hopes of resolving the nineteenth-century religious dilemma. His world view was conservative in style, retaining such terms as "God" and "immortality" but attaching non-traditional meanings to them.

Hegeler became well known in religious circles such as the Ethical Cultural Society and the Free Religious Association, groups positioned between Unitarianism on one side and outright materialism and agnosticism on the other. In 1887 he hired Benjamin and Sara Underwood to run his new magazine, *The Open Court*, but soon found that he could not abide their agnostic views and replaced them with Carus. Together he and Carus sought with varying degrees of success to promote the religion of science, the transplantation of European and German ideas to the New World, and open philosophical debate generally. There can be little doubt that Carus's gregarious personality, command of idiomatic English, and rhetorical flair enabled the pub-

lishing enterprise to flourish even though it never earned a profit.

Carus married Hegeler's well-educated daughter Mary, and expanded Hegeler's publishing operation to include book publishing (beginning in 1887) and a second, more technical philosophical journal, *The Monist* (beginning in 1890). Both entities survive today in somewhat altered form. (*The Open Court* was a casualty of the Depression.) Carus wrote more than seventy books and one thousand articles on philosophy, religion, history, literature, politics, poetry, mathematics, and other subjects. Working in La Salle and Chicago, he oversaw the publication of 113 issues of *The Monist* and 732 issues of *The Open Court*. Carus was busy with these publishing enterprises until his death on 11 February 1919 in La Salle, Illinois.

Carus's position on the margins of religious dissent enabled him to publish then-familiar mainstays of the movement such as Moncure CONWAY. Of more interest today are other contributors like physicist-philosopher Ernst Mach and Charles S. PEIRCE. Mach wrote that *Open Court*'s English translations of his work were more important to him than the original German editions. *The Monist* published some of Peirce's best-known work, including the classic "The Doctrine of Necessity Examined" in 1892. Carus's publication of these pieces does not imply that he agreed with them or even understood them, however. As late as 1906 he wrote, "I would think that Professor Mach in speaking of the sense-perception of a star, includes with it the star itself and the whole immeasurable depth of celestial space which according to our scientific knowledge the light of the star has to travel. Professor Mach has informed me that such is not his view."

Carus was also well placed to be influenced by the Oriental religious thoughts and personalities that were part of the 1893 World's Parliament of Religions, a conference held with the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago. Carl Jackson describes him as "one of the most important and one of the earliest popularizers of Oriental thought in America." Probably *Open Court*'s best-selling title was Carus's *The Gospel of Buddha*, a compilation drawing on forty-five Buddhist sources. With what he called "due consideration and always in the spirit of a legitimate development," Carus made additions and alterations to his sources, but neglected to alert the reader where his sources ended and he began. The product found favor with Buddhists in various locations, but not with scholarly students of the religion. Carl Jackson says simply that the Buddhism presented in his books "is a Buddhism that owed as much to Carus as it did to Buddha."

Carus encouraged and financially supported Oriental missionaries in the United States, including Anagarika Dharmapala and Shaku Soyen. One of Soyen's young associates, Teitaro SUZUKI, translated *The Gospel of Buddha* and then spent eleven years in the US, mostly working with Carus in La Salle, before returning to Japan and his distinguished later career as a popularizer of Zen Buddhism.

Exposure to non-Westerners made a difference in Carus's own writings. For a time he consciously addressed himself to a diverse audience no longer assumed to be exclusively Western and Christian in background. On one occasion, Carus went so far as to say he was a Buddhist – but he did not mean that he had converted. "You must not forget," he wrote Dharmapala in 1896, "that I am at the same time a Christian in so far as I accept certain teachings of Christ. I am even a Taoist, in so far as I accept certain doctrines of Lautsze. I am an Israelite, in so far as I sympathize with the aspirations of the Israelitic prophets. In one word, I am, as it were, a religious parliament incarnate."

Carus took an active interest in local activities in central Illinois and traveled frequently to Europe. He blamed Britain for the outbreak of World War I, a view that shaped the contents of *The Open Court* magazine, until the United States entered the war against Germany in 1917 and public hostility and government pressure

silenced him on the subject. Open Court staff were interviewed and Carus family homes were searched under various pretexts, but nothing was ever found to suggest that the family had done anything other than hold unpopular opinions. "The worst I can say," Carus wrote in a letter the *New York Tribune* refused to publish, "is that I do not sympathize with our policy in entering into this war, and if that is a crime make the worst of it."

Carus often describes his philosophical views as "monist"; another frequent label is "the philosophy of form." These two slogans may be taken as representing the poles he vacillated between throughout his career. The "monism" derives originally from German monism, whose leading thinker was Ernst Haeckel, a biologist who wrote many popular science books and articles of a free-thinking, anti-establishment tendency. Haeckel, one of Darwin's first champions in Germany, combined a respect for the ethical role of religion with a strong antipathy toward established religion and theoretical theism. His monist view of the world, he claimed, was neither materialistic – despite appearances and frequent accusations – nor spiritualistic, but "neutral," like Spinoza's (or, more relevantly for his audience, Goethe's). What he stressed most vehemently was that the human species was a part of nature.

The "philosophy of form," the other pole of Carus's intellectual life, was Kantian, though Kant was seen by Carus, initially at least, through the eyes of Schopenhauer. (The interest in Eastern thought may well have had its origins in Schopenhauer's writings as well.) In any case, Carus, like other post-Kantians, wrestled with the problem of the "thing in itself" and tried to eliminate it, though his attempts appear, as we will see, to have been based on a misunderstanding. The intersection between Haeckel and Kant, for Carus (as for his patron Hegeler) was the positive role both these thinkers assigned to objective knowledge. As Haeckel had rejected the claim that there were frontiers beyond which human knowledge could not penetrate, so Kant, unwilling to stop at the axioms of geometry and the laws of motion, had provided Newtonian physics with objective metaphysical foundations. From this point of view, Carus also rejected William JAMES's pragmatism, which impugned the objectivity of knowledge, he thought, and made everything depend on mere human whim.

Carus's thought progressed from the "monist" pole, in his early years, to the predominance of the "philosophy of form" after he settled in La Salle. In the early "monist" phase, the emphasis was on monism as a *critical* doctrine, and especially its rejection of traditional theism. From this viewpoint there could be no objection to the skepticism of Spencer or Mill, or a scientific critique of traditional values and social hierarchies. Later, under Hegeler's influence, Carus came to emphasize monism rather as a *positive* doctrine, a substitute religion or "religion of science." This new attitude made positive conviction paramount; the worst sin, now, was not theism but "agnosticism." The main motive for this seems to have been Hegeler's doctrine of the practical efficacy of strong conviction. Carus seems thus to have fallen prey to a pragmatic justification for fundamental principles of precisely the kind he so deprecated in James.

There were many tensions within the "philosophy of form" Carus tried to develop in his later years. Chief among these is ambivalence about what was meant by "form." On the one hand, we have what often sounds like a Kantian conception, or possibly a neo-Kantian conception like that developed by Hermann Cohen in the 1870s, in which "form" consists of the categories of pure reason, prior to all content, that the intellect imposes on the chaotic manifold of experience. Like Cohen and many others, Carus was dissatisfied with Kant's "pure forms of intuition" that forced particular axioms of geometry and arithmetic on us as ineluctable media of apprehending the external world; we humans have no choice, Kant had said, but to perceive the world as spatial and temporal. The great scientist Hermann von Helmholtz (who had played a

key role in reviving Kant's philosophy during the later nineteenth century) had argued persuasively that even if the world ineluctably presents itself to us in spatial and temporal form, as Kant had said, this did not mean that particular axioms of geometry or mathematics are forced on us. Cohen's answer was to assimilate the pure forms of intuition to the categories of the understanding; the axioms of geometry and the whole of mathematics become principles of (objective) reason. Mathematics and the basic principles of science become creatures of the intellect, rather than being forced on us by the organization of our sensibility. This "logical idealism" creates problems of its own, which we need not address here, but it was a much-discussed option among philosophers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Carus took a different approach. Though he accepted Kant's argument for the subjectivity of space and time, he seems not to have understood that it was precisely the fact that our sensibility imposes these forms on nature, for Kant, that guaranteed the objectivity of the principles of science (within the realm of appearance). It is because the constitution of the human mind *puts* them there, Kant had argued, that the axioms of geometry are everywhere valid for us. Where Cohen had sought an alternative guarantee of objectivity, Carus wanted to keep Kant's original one – while also undermining it. Carus fails to see why Kant's arguments should block our access to a "real existence" to which the concepts Kant regards as subjective may *objectively* be applied. Carus discerns an "objective space" as an "inherent quality of things" that "is not, as in subjective space, a construction." While acknowledging that Kant's arguments hold for "subjective" space and time, Carus somehow thought we could also, nonetheless, stand *outside* our sensibility and compare an "objective" space – a thing in itself – with our apprehensions of it.

But even if Carus had adopted a more promising strategy in regard to "form" in this highly abstract and purely intellectual sense,

there seems to have been a more fundamental obstacle to his achievement of a consistent view about it. This is that "form" for him also represented the world of aspirations, ideals, or values more generally. In writing about the poet Friedrich Schiller, for instance, Carus indicates that Schiller's frequent contrast between the transient world and an "ideal world" was precisely that between the chaotic world of our sensibility and the world of "form" – the values or ideals we impose on an otherwise lifeless world. Though they may provide regulative guidance, such "ideals" were not, in Kant's view, anchored in the objective existence of the world we perceive and live in. But Carus did not accept this fundamental trade-off, and thus in effect regressed, without explicitly realizing it, to a kind of Platonic view of "forms" as trans-empirical entities that are in some vague sense "realized" in the empirical world.

Carus shared many of the concerns and preoccupations of his German contemporaries, but was unable to articulate them into a consistent overall view or a compelling argument for any particular ideal. On the other hand, his broad interests, and his awareness of intellectual trends, qualified him as an interlocutor and stimulant for more serious and rigorous minds.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Fundamental Problems: The Method of Philosophy as a Systematic Arrangement of Knowledge (Chicago, 1889).

The Gospel of Buddha According to Old Records (Chicago, 1894).

Kant and Spencer: A Study of the Fallacies of Agnosticism (Chicago, 1899).

The History of the Devil and the Idea of Evil (Chicago, 1900).

The Foundations of Mathematics (Chicago, 1908).

Philosophy as a Science: A Synopsis of the Writings of Dr. Paul Carus (Chicago, 1909).

Truth on Trial: An Exposition of the Nature of Truth Preceded by a Critique of

*Pragmatism and an Appreciation of its
Leader* (Chicago, 1911).
*Goethe, with Special Consideration of His
Philosophy* (Chicago, 1915).

Other Relevant Works

Carus's papers are with the Open Court
Papers at Southern Illinois University,
Carbondale.
"Mr. Charles S. Peirce's Onslaught on the
Doctrine of Necessity," *The Monist* 2
(1892): 560–82.
*The Point of View: An Anthology of Religion
and Philosophy Selected from the Works
of Paul Carus*, ed. Catherine E. Cook
(Chicago, 1927). Contains a bibliography
of Carus's writings.

Further Reading

*Amer Nat Bio, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio,
Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio,
Dict Amer Religious Bio, Nat Cycl Amer
Bio v14, Proc of APA v26, Who Was Who
in Amer v1*
Henderson, Harold. *Catalyst for
Controversy: Paul Carus of Open Court*
(Carbondale, Ill., 1993).
McCoy, R. E. *Open Court: A Centennial
Bibliography, 1887–1987* (La Salle, Ill.,
1987).

Harold Henderson
A. W. Carus

CASE, Shirley Jackson (1872–1947)

Shirley Jackson Case was born on 28
September 1872 at Hatfield Point, New
Brunswick, Canada. He majored in mathe-
matics at Acadia University, receiving his BA in
1893 and MA in 1896. After teaching mathe-
matics in the New Brunswick area from 1893
to 1897, he taught mathematics and Greek at
the New Hampton Library Institute in New
Hampshire. In 1900, while in New Hampshire,
he was ordained and served a part-time pas-
torate in a Baptist church. The next year, he left
his teaching post and began studies at Yale
Divinity School, earning his BD in 1904. For
the next two years, he taught Greek at Yale,
while working toward his PhD in New
Testament, which he completed in 1907. He
also served in church pastorates during his time
at Yale.

After a brief appointment in 1907–8 in the
history and philosophy of religion at Cobb
Divinity School in Lewiston, Maine, Case
accepted a position as assistant professor of
New Testament interpretation at the University
of Chicago Divinity School, which he held until
1925. He also held an appointment in early
church history from 1917 to 1938, served as
chair of the church history department from
1923 to 1938, and as Dean of the Divinity
School from 1933 to 1938. During his tenure
at Chicago, he also revitalized and headed the
American Society of Church History (1920s
and 1930s), which sponsored national and
regional meetings, and published substantial
resources in church history and American reli-
gious history. Case retired in 1938 and contin-
ued teaching and publishing. In 1938, he
lectured in New Testament at Bexley Hall, an
Episcopal seminary in Gambier, Ohio, and in
1940 he became professor of religion at Florida
Southern College and Dean of the Florida
School of Religion. He served in these posi-
tions until he died on 5 December 1947 in
Lakeland, Florida.

Case did not present himself as a philosopher
but as an historian of Christianity. While he
constructed his own thought with ideas
provided through philosophical disciplines –
chiefly philosophy of history and philosophy of
religion – he distrusted speculative philosophy
for its lack of attention to social factors as for-
mative of ideas and institutions. Case asserted
the superiority of "scientific," empirical, and
functional approaches to the historical study of
religion and treated these as normative, without

acknowledging the philosophical assumptions guiding that choice. Case's work may be most adequately assessed within the disciplinary domains of the history of religions and Christian theology.

Raised in the Free Will Baptist tradition, with its Arminian theology, Case found himself drawn to the liberal theological movements of his time. His work shows the influence of Adolf von Harnack, Albrecht Ritschl, German standards for the higher criticism of the Bible, and German history-of-religions approaches to Christianity as practiced by such theologians as Ernst Troeltsch. His work also shows the effects of American pragmatism, with its emphasis on functional approaches to truth-claims, and of the Yale School tradition of applying historical-critical methods to religious studies. Case, however, did not belong strictly to any of these movements, and his thought diverged significantly from each of them.

Case's thought was more directly shaped by the early twentieth-century modernist–fundamentalist controversy in American Protestantism, which revolved around theories of history, evolution, biblical interpretation, and Christian doctrines. His works must be interpreted in that polemical context, as arguments fueling one side of an extremely charged debate with enormous social, political, and theological implications. Along with Shailer MATHEWS, George Burman FOSTER, Edward Scribner AMES, and Gerald Birney SMITH, Case led the "Chicago School of theology," a modernist form of religious progressivism that transformed liberal theology and religious scholarship by applying the scientific method of modern scholarship to the texts, doctrines, and historical records of Christianity. Case and Mathews were the chief architects of the "socio-historical method," which provided the methodology for the entire modernist agenda. While Mathews was the more energetic public figure in the modernist vanguard, Case produced more of the solid scholarship behind the movement, authoring sixteen books, over ninety-five major articles, and nearly 400 book

reviews. He also edited the *American Journal of Theology* (with G. B. Smith, 1912–20) and the *Journal of Religion* (1921–39).

Case's development of the socio-historical method was his most important contribution to the study of religion in America. According to Case, Christian doctrines do not express absolute or normative truths. Rather, they evolve over time, as shaped by the social concerns of particular Christian communities, and their validity should be measured in terms of their functional effects. In his 1932 essay "Education in Liberalism," Case wrote that "every item in Christian belief at any period in history is a product of the experience and conviction of Christian people, and can be regarded as valid only so long as it serves adequately to express the sincerest convictions and deepest experiences of each new generation of Christian persons. This is the inescapable conviction to which we have been driven by the historical study of Christianity." (1932, p. 115) Given his insistence on the evolutionary, empirical, social, and functional nature of all religious beliefs and ecclesiastical forms, Case proposed the socio-historical method as the most appropriate means to analyze and evaluate them. This methodology appeared fully for the first time in *The Evolution of Early Christianity* (1914) and most completely in *The Christian Philosophy of History* (1943).

The socio-historical method is Case's development of higher criticism in New Testament studies extended to the history of Christianity. Because the historical forms and beliefs of any religion are evolutionary and socially conditioned, he concluded that we must interpret them in light of their own social and cultural environments if we are to understand their meaning accurately. This necessitated integrating the studies of other disciplines into religious history; to understand any religious tradition properly, the historical events, social conditions, political systems, cultural forms, and other religions of the environment affecting that tradition must be analyzed rigorously. Case saw these investigations as thoroughly

empirical; if religion is social in nature, we must look to the actual experiences of the real individuals who produced this religion in response to their particular needs in that environment. For Case, this renders metaphysical speculation irrelevant, because one's purpose is to understand the actual meaning and significance of religious beliefs in lived experience.

The single most distinctive feature of Case's socio-historical method is his insistence on the functional view of religion: that the genuine meaning or validity of an image or doctrine must be determined by judging how adequately it expresses the experiences and values of its adherents. Beliefs are validated by the degree to which they serve the needs of their society in a particular time and place. Furthermore, given this functional and evolutionary view of religious forms, Case also rejected the normative use of history. Instead of using past standards to judge or validate current beliefs and practices, he treated the past as a valuable guide to the present, which could be used to recognize the changing needs of contemporary circumstances. In turn, this encourages the revision of past beliefs into new forms in order to preserve the vital functions of those ideas for a new age.

Case used the socio-historical method both in the field of New Testament studies and in the history of Christianity, the two phases of his own career at the University of Chicago. In his first book, *The Historicity of Jesus* (1912), Case discussed the evidences for Jesus's existence. Case held that the historical Jesus, rather than the Christ of faith, was the formative factor for Christianity. In such works as *Jesus: A New Biography* (1927) and *Jesus yhrough the Centuries* (1932), he argued that applying the socio-historical method to historical and New Testament records would make it possible to recover, to some extent, the life and personal religious beliefs of the historical Jesus. This process would provide valuable clues to the vital message of Jesus that continues to animate the Christian religion. However, Case consistently maintained that the main focus of the New Testament texts and Christian theological systems was the theological significance of Jesus for those who followed him. Therefore, he concentrated on analyzing the successive Christologies that evolved over time, each of which sought to translate the meaning of the historical Jesus to communities of believers in very different times and places.

In the second phase of Case's career, reflected in such works as *The Evolution of Early Christianity* (1914) and *The Social Origins of Christianity* (1923), he applied the socio-historical method to the history of Christianity itself, analyzing the documents, institutions, beliefs, and practices of the Christian church through the centuries, interpreting them as products of the social realities and processes they express. He viewed the history of Christianity as animated by an inner vitalism expressed most essentially in the religion of Jesus, which focused on an experiential awareness of unity with God and a life of service to others. This vital spirit was embodied in forms that were adapted continually to meet the changing social needs of Christian believers.

By developing and promoting the socio-historical method, Case set a new standard for writing religious history, which provided exciting new ways to interpret religious literature and to explain intelligibly the changing forms of religious beliefs, practices, and institutions. Case's impact on American religious studies may be best expressed by recognizing how many of his theoretical propositions are taken for granted in contemporary liberal religious scholarship: the view of history as partly the product of *human* responsibility and creativity rather than as simply the playing out of a divinely orchestrated drama; the *empirical*, grassroots view of history as an interpreted record of the actual experiences of individuals and societies rather than of institutions or ideological belief-systems; the thoroughly *social* view of history; the application of these new historical insights to *religious* traditions, including Christianity; the treatment of Christian history, doctrines, and texts in terms of an *evolutionary* process; the *interdisciplinary* nature of

all religious studies; the *instructive* rather than the normative use of history in adjudicating religious controversies; and the recognition that the validity of religious beliefs is due, in part, to how well they *function* in the particular social circumstances of their time. All of these principles are inherent in the socio-historical method pioneered by Case.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Religion of Jesus," *American Journal of Theology* 14 (1910): 234–52.

"The Historicity of Jesus," *American Journal of Theology* 15 (1911): 2–42.

The Historicity of Jesus: A Criticism of the Contention that Jesus Never Lived, a Statement of the Evidence for His Existence, an Estimate of His Relation to Christianity (Chicago, 1912).

The Evolution of Early Christianity: A Genetic Study of First-century Christianity in Relation to Its Religious Environment (Chicago, 1914).

"The Historical Study of Religion," *Journal of Religion* 1 (1921): 1–17. Reprinted, *Journal of Religion* 29 (1949): 5–14.

The Social Origins of Christianity (Chicago, 1923).

"The Religious Meaning of the Past," *Journal of Religion* 4 (1924): 576–91.

Jesus: A New Biography (Chicago, 1927).

Jesus Through the Centuries (Chicago, 1932).

Highways of Christian Doctrine (Chicago, 1936).

Christianity in a Changing World (New York, 1941).

The Christian Philosophy of History (Chicago, 1943).

The Origins of Christian Supernaturalism (Chicago, 1946).

Other Relevant Works

The Book of Revelation: An Outline Bible-Study Course of the American Institute of Sacred Literature (Chicago, 1918).

The Millennial Hope: A Phase of War-Time Thinking (Chicago, 1918).

The Revelation of John: A Historical Interpretation (Chicago, 1919).

Experience with the Supernatural in Early Christian Times (New York and London, 1929).

"Education in Liberalism," in *Contemporary American Theology*, vol. 1, ed. Vergilius Ferm (New York, 1932), pp. 107–21.

Report of the Church History Deputation to the Orient, September, 1931, to March, 1932 (New York, 1932).

The Social Triumph of the Ancient Church (New York, 1933).

Makers of Christianity: From Jesus to Charlemagne (New York, 1934).

Further Reading

Dict Amer Bio, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v36*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*

Hynes, William J. *Shirley Jackson Case and the Chicago School: The Socio-Historical Method* (Chico, Cal., 1981).

Jennings, Louis B. *The Bibliography and Biography of Shirley Jackson Case* (Chicago, 1949).

McNeill, John T., Matthew Spinka, and Harold R. Willoughby, eds. *Environmental Factors in Christian History* (Chicago, 1939). Essays by colleagues and students in Case's honor.

Jennifer G. Jesse

CASTAÑEDA, Hector-Neri (1924–91)

Héctor-Neri Castañeda-Calderón was born on 13 December 1924 in San Vicente Zacapa, Guatemala. He attended the Normal School for Boys in Guatemala City, later called the Military Normal School for Boys, from which he was expelled for refusing to fight a bully; the

dramatic story, worthy of being filmed, is told in the "De Re" section of his autobiographical "Self-Profile" (1986). He then attended a normal school in Costa Rica, followed by studies in philosophy at the University of San Carlos, Guatemala. He won a scholarship to the University of Minnesota, where he received his BA in 1950, MA in 1952, and PhD in 1954, all in philosophy. His dissertation, "The Logical Structure of Moral Reasoning," was written under the direction of Wilfrid SELLARS. Castañeda returned to teach in Guatemala, and then received a scholarship to study at the University of Oxford in 1955–6, after which he took a sabbatical-replacement position in philosophy at Duke University.

Castañeda's first full-time philosophy position was at Wayne State University from 1957 to 1969, where he founded the philosophy journal *Noûs*. In 1969 he moved (along with several of his Wayne State colleagues) to Indiana University, where he eventually became the Mahlon Powell Professor of Philosophy and, later, its first Dean of Latino Affairs during 1978–81. He remained at Indiana until his death. He was also a visiting professor of philosophy at the University of Texas at Austin in 1962–3, and a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences in 1981–2. He received grants and fellowships from the Guggenheim Foundation in 1967–8, the Mellon Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the National Science Foundation. He was President of the American Philosophical Association Central Division in 1979–80, elected a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1990, and received the Presidential Medal of Honor from the Government of Guatemala in 1991. He died on 7 September 1991 in Bloomington, Indiana.

Castañeda's philosophical interests spanned virtually the entire spectrum of philosophy, and his theories form a highly interconnected whole. He was a system-builder, while still remaining firmly in the tradition of Anglo-American analytic philosophy. His work was rigorous and formal where possible, but his preferences lay in developing comprehensive theories that could account for all available data.

Castañeda's theory of the nature of practical thinking arose from his earliest work, on the foundations of morality, for which he developed a theory of deontic logic based on an "ought-to-do" operator. Unlike the more usual "ought-to-be" operator, which applies to propositions (*it ought to be the case that P*, where *P* is a proposition), the "ought-to-do" applies to the proposition-like entity that remains when the "ought" is removed from *John ought to pay his debts*. This is analyzed, not as *it ought to be the case that John pays his debts*, but as *Ought-to-do* (*John to pay his debts*). Consistent with his later theory of guises (see below), there is a special mode of predication that links, for example, *John* with *to pay one's debts* to form the "practition" *John to pay his debts*, expressible in English by a subject noun-phrase followed by an infinitive verb-phrase. The special case of a first-person practition is called an "intention": In *I ought to pay my debts*, the ought-to-do operator is applied to the *I to pay my debts* intention (that is, the intention I have to pay my debts). This theory was explored in great detail in *Thinking and Doing* (1975), in which Castañeda showed how it can provide solutions for the paradoxes of deontic logic (including, especially, the Good Samaritan Paradox). His theories of practical reasoning have found many applications in artificial intelligence, both in the field of planning and acting, and in computational theories of deontic reasoning (especially in the work of the computational legal theorist L. Thorne McCarty). Further relevant works are "On the Semantics of the Ought-to-Do" (1970), "Intentions and the Structure of Intending" (1971), *The Structure of Morality* (1974), *Thinking and Doing* (1975), "The Paradoxes of Deontic Logic" (1981), and *Thinking, Language, and Experience* (1989).

The special role of the *self* occupied much of Castañeda's philosophical career and provided

one of his motivations for doing philosophy, which, he often said, should be done "in the first person, for the first person." He singled it out for special treatment in his theory of intentions (mentioned above), and he investigated what he called the "phenomeno-logic" of "the I." ("Phenomeno-logic" is not phenomenology; rather, it is the study of the logical structure of phenomenal appearance.) One of his major discoveries was the "quasi-indicator" (or "quasi-indexical"): a term that allows a speaker to attribute an indexical reference to another cognitive agent. For example, the speaker of "John believes that he himself is rich" uses the quasi-indicator "he himself" (often written "he*") to express *John's* first-person reference to himself (that is, to John). That sentence is the *speaker's* way of depicting the proposition that *John* would express in the first person by "I am rich." Note that the speaker cannot express it via "John believes that I am rich," since that occurrence of "I" would refer to the speaker. Nor can the speaker express it via "John believes that John is rich," since this allows for an interpretation under which John believes that someone named "John" (and who is not necessarily himself) is rich. Most importantly, John might believe that someone named "John" is rich yet fail to believe that he himself is rich, an observation that was adapted by John Perry for his theory of the "essential indexical." Note that in the expression denoting the practition *John to pay his debts*, "his" is a quasi-indicator. And in "John said that he would read that book there and then," the terms "he", "there", "that", and "then" (and, arguably, "would") are all quasi-indexical, since, presumably, John actually said, "I will read this book here and now." The theory of quasi-indicators is also related to the notion of belief "*de se*" (that is, beliefs about oneself) discussed by David LEWIS, to the linguistic theory of "logophoric" pronouns (quasi-indexical lexical items that are found in some natural languages), and to the literary theory of "free indirect discourse" (used in narrative text directly to represent a charac-

ter's indexical thoughts, by expressing them via quasi-indicators without their antecedents); and it has been used in artificial-intelligence research in knowledge representation. See these articles: "'He': A Study in the Logic of Self-Consciousness" (1966), "Indicators and Quasi-Indicators" (1967), "On Knowing (or Believing) that One Knows (or Believes)" (1970), *Thinking, Language, and Experience*, and *The Phenomeno-Logic of the I* (1999).

Castañeda's *guise theory* is a theory of the mechanisms of reference and of Kantian "phenomena" – of the world as it is presented to us in appearance. The theory arose primarily from two converging sources (among others, such as aspects of his theories about quasi-indicators and practitions). One source was Castañeda's exploration of the consequences of one of the several logically possible responses to Frege's paradox of reference, namely, denying that the copula in sentences such as "The President of the US is the Commander-in-Chief" or "Oedipus's father was the previous King of Thebes" must be strict identity. Castañeda interpreted the copula using a family of weaker relations (including "consubstantiation" and "consociation") that hold among objects of thought (which he called "guises"). The other source was the observation that thinking about truth and reality (such as believing that Plato was a philosopher, or thinking about Plato) is indistinguishable from (i.e., is the same kind of act as) thinking about falsehood and fiction (such as believing that Santa Claus brings presents or that Plato was a computer scientist, thinking about Santa Claus). Instead of saying that such acts of thinking differed in that they had different kinds of objects (true versus false, existing versus non-existing), Castañeda asked what a theory would look like that treated both kinds of objects of thought on a par, and how real objects might be constructed (see below) from objects of thought (guises) that are neutral with respect to reality and non-reality. Roughly, guises are items corresponding to sets of properties; they are both intensional (i.e., non-extensional) and intentional (i.e., objects of thought);

some are perceivable, others only conceivable; they can be incomplete (e.g., the guise *the red square* is constituted by only two properties, whereas a really existing red square would have many more properties); and they can be inconsistent (e.g., the guise *the round square*).

Guise theory is a fully intensional theory with one type of object (guises), one type of property (in contrast to theories, such as that of Terence PARSONS, that distinguish between "nuclear" and "extranuclear" properties), and two modes of predication ("internal" and "external," of which there are several varieties). More precisely, there are (1) properties (e.g., *being round*, *being square*, *being blue*, *existing*, etc.), (2) sets of properties (called "guise cores"; e.g., {*being round*, *being square*}), and (3) an "individuating operator," c, which is an ontic counterpart of the definite article that produces guises from guise cores (e.g., c{*being round*, *being square*} is the guise *the round square*). Guises can be understood, roughly, as things-under-a-description, as "facets" of (physical and non-physical) objects, as "roles" that objects play – in general, as intentional objects of thought. There are "internal" and "external" modes of predication: In general, a guise c{...F...} is-internally F; i.e., a guise whose core contains the property F thereby has F internally predicated of it, and so one can say that an F thing "is" F. For example, the guise c{*being round*, *being square*} – i.e., *the round square* – is-internally only round and square. The two guises *the tallest mountain* and *Mt Everest* (e.g., c{*being a mountain*, *being taller than any other mountain*} and c{*being named 'Mt Everest'*}) are related by an external mode of predication called "consubstantiation" (C^*). Castañeda originally conceived of consubstantiation as an equivalence relation within the domain of actual objects (though he may have weakened this requirement in later writings). He used it to analyze (1) external predication, (2) co-reference, and (3) existence: Let $a = c${...F...} be a guise (i.e., a guise containing in its core, possibly among other properties, the property F), and define $a[G]$ as $c(${...F...}$\cup${G}) (i.e., as the guise whose core consists of all of a's core properties and also property G). Then (1) a is-externally G (in one sense) if $C^*(a,a[G])$ (i.e., G can be predicated externally of a if a and $a[G]$ are consubstantiated). For example, "the morning star is a planet" is true because $C^*(c${*being the last object seen in the morning before the Sun rises*, *being star-like in appearance*}, c{*being the last object seen in the morning before the Sun rises*, *being star-like in appearance*, *being a planet*}); i.e., the two guises, *the morning star* and *the morning star that is a planet*, are consubstantiated. (2) Guise a "is the same as" guise b if and only if C^*ab (i.e., a and b are consubstantiated). For example, "the morning star is the evening star" is true because $C^*(c${*being the last object seen in the morning before the Sun rises*, *being star-like in appearance*}, c{*being the first object seen in the evening after the Sun sets*, *being star-like in appearance*}); i.e., the guise *the morning star* and the guise *the evening star* are consubstantiated. And (3) a ("really") exists if and only if, for some guise b, C^*ab. Moreover, a real object (an infinitely-propertied, multifaceted "Leibnizian individual") was at the "apex" of a semi-lattice of consubstantiated guises. Because of the internal and external modes of predication, it is not a contradiction to say that the guise *the existing round square* both exists and does not exist: It is-internally existing, but it is not consubstantiated with any guise (hence does not "really" – or externally – exist). Another external mode of predication is "consociation" (C^{**}). This is an equivalence relation that holds between guises that a mind has "put together," i.e., between guises in a "belief space." For example, the guise *Hamlet* is consociated with the guise *Prince of Denmark* – $C^{**}(Hamlet, the Prince of Denmark)$ – because "they" are the "same" character in Shakespeare's play. (Perhaps it is better to say that they are two guises of that character.) Other external modes of predication include "transubstantiation" (to handle identity across time) and "transconsociation" (to handle identity across different

works of fiction). Guise theory has had an influence on artificial-intelligence research on intensional knowledge representation. For further reading, see "Thinking and the Structure of the World" (1972), "Identity and Sameness" (1975), "Perception, Belief, and the Structure of Physical Objects and Consciousness" (1977), "Fiction and Reality" (1979), "Reference, Reality, and Perceptual Fields" (1980), and *Thinking, Language, and Experience*.

Also noteworthy are Castañeda's investigations into the history of philosophy – especially his writings on Plato and Leibniz – and his (related) metaphilosophical distinction between "Athenian" and "Darwinian" history of philosophy: On the Athenian approach, one views (or attempts to view) a philosopher's writings as a unitary system, with the inevitable difficulty of trying to reconcile inconsistencies. On the Darwinian approach – which Castañeda favored – a philosopher's writings are viewed as different (possibly inconsistent) theories struggling for survival, each of which must be treated on its own merits. He also developed a more general metaphilosophical stance: Philosophers should consult as much data as possible and construct as many comprehensive philosophical theories as possible. Philosophical analysis should be a helpful endeavor: Philosophers should not attack each other's views but should ask questions and provide more data in order to help others develop their own theories. These theories, then, can be compared and generalized. Examples include "Plato's *Phaedo* Theory of Relations" (1972), "Leibniz's Concepts and Their Coincidence *Salva Veritate*" (1974), "Individuation and Non-Identity" (1975), and *On Philosophical Method* (1980).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"'He': A Study in the Logic of Self-Consciousness," *Ratio* 8 (1966): 130–57.

"Plato's *Phaedo* Theory of Relations," *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 1 (1972): 467–80.

"Thinking and the Structure of the World," *Philosophia* 4 (1974): 3–40.

The Structure of Morality (Springfield, Ill., 1974).

"Leibniz's Concepts and Their Coincidence *Salva Veritate*," *Noûs* 8 (1974): 381–98.

Thinking and Doing: The Philosophical Foundations of Institutions (Dordrecht, 1975).

"Individuation and Non-Identity: A New Look," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 12 (1975): 131–40.

"Fiction and Reality: Their Basic Connections," *Poetics* 8 (1979): 31–62.

On Philosophical Method (Bloomington, Ind., 1980).

"Reference, Reality, and Perceptual Fields," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 53 (August 1980): 763–823.

"The Paradoxes of Deontic Logic: The Simplest Solution to All of Them in One Fell Swoop," in *New Studies in Deontic Logic*, ed. Risto Hilpinen (Dordrecht, 1981), pp. 37–85.

"Self-Profile," in *Hector-Neri Castañeda*, ed. James E. Tomberlin (Dordrecht, 1986), pp. 3–137.

Thinking, Language, and Experience (Minneapolis, 1989).

Intentionality, Modality, and Supervenience, ed. M. Jeroen van den Hoven and Gert-Jan C. Lokhorst (Rotterdam, 1990). Contains a bibliography of Castañeda's writings during 1986–90.

The Phenomeno-Logic of the I: Essays on Self-Consciousness, ed. James G. Hart and Tomis Kapitan (Bloomington, Ind., 1999).

Other Relevant Works

"Imperatives, Decisions, and Oughts," in *Morality and the Language of Conduct*, ed. Hector-Neri Castañeda and George Nakhnikian (Detroit, 1963).

"Consciousness and Behavior: Their Basic Connections," in *Intentionality, Mind, and Perception*, ed. Hector-Neri Castañeda

(Detroit, 1966).

"Private Language Problem," in *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Paul Edwards (New York, 1967), vol. 6, pp. 458–64.

"Omniscience and Indexical Reference," *Journal of Philosophy* 64 (1967): 203–9.

"Indicators and Quasi-indicators," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 4 (1967): 85–100.

"On Knowing (or Believing) that One Knows (or Believes)," *Synthese* 21 (1970): 187–203.

"On the Semantics of the Ought-to-do," *Synthese* 21 (1970): 449–68.

"Intentions and the Structure of Intending," *Journal of Philosophy* 68 (1971): 453–66.

"Identity and Sameness," *Philosophia* 5 (1975): 121–50.

Ed., *Action, Knowledge, and Reality: Critical Studies in Honor of Wilfrid Sellars* (Indianapolis, 1975).

"On the Philosophical Foundations of the Theory of Communication: I. Reference," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 2 (1977): 165–86.

"Perception, Belief, and the Structure of Physical Objects and Consciousness," *Synthese* 35 (1977): 285–351.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v8, *Proc of APA v65*, *Who Was Who in Amer v10*

Jacobi, Klaus, and Helmut Pape, eds. *Thinking and the Structure of the World: Hector-Neri Castañeda's Epistemic Ontology Presented and Criticized* (Berlin, 1990).

Orilia, Francesco, and William J. Rapaport, eds. *Thought, Language, and Ontology: Essays in Memory of Hector-Neri Castañeda* (Dordrecht, 1998). Contains a bibliography of Castañeda's writings during 1991–9.

Shope, Robert. *The Analysis of Knowing: A Decade of Research* (Princeton, N.J., 1983).

Tomberlin, James E., ed. *Agent, Language, and the Structure of the World: Essays Presented to Hector-Neri Castañeda, with His Replies* (Indianapolis, 1983).

Tomberlin, James E., ed. *Hector-Neri Castañeda* (Dordrecht, 1986). Contains a bibliography of Castañeda's writings.

William J. Rapaport

CATTELL, James McKeen (1860–1944)

James McKeen Cattell was born on 25 May 1860 in Easton, Pennsylvania. He was the son of William C. Cattell, a Presbyterian minister and President of Lafayette College. Cattell received his BA from Lafayette in 1880, where he developed an interest in, and adopted with Comtean modifications, the philosophy of Francis Bacon. In 1881–2 Cattell traveled to Europe to study at the universities of Göttingen and Leipzig under Wilhelm Wundt. In 1882–3 he studied at Johns Hopkins University, and then returned to Leipzig to pursue further studies with Wundt. In 1886 Cattell became the first American to earn a PhD in psychology in Wundt's new program for experimental psychology. One of his studies showed that people naturally read whole words, rather than just syllables. To the consternation of Wundt, Cattell's dissertation research, published as *Psychometric Investigation* in 1886, made no use of introspection's internal mental states to explain reaction times, instead relying only on the subject's behaviors.

Cattell took a research and lecturing position in experimental psychology at St. John's College, Cambridge in 1886, where he came into contact with Francis Galton's ideas about individual psychological differences and positive eugenics, of which Cattell approved. In 1888 he married Josephine Owen, with whom he had seven children. In January 1888 Cattell began spending alternate semesters in the United States, lecturing on psychology at Bryn Mawr College in Pennsylvania.

In 1889 Cattell started his appointment as professor of psychology at the University of Pennsylvania, joining George Stuart FULLERTON. His was the first professorship in psychology at any university, since psychologists were usually appointed in philosophy or medical departments. Cattell also founded an experimental psychology laboratory at Pennsylvania in 1889, which was used for both undergraduate and graduate instruction. He continued his experiments measuring the relation between physical sensation and stimulus. Cattell's emphasis upon the study of the subject's behavior promoted a behavioristic approach to psychology soon imitated by many more American psychologists.

In 1891 Cattell moved to Columbia University as professor of psychology and head of his department. In 1895 he hired psychologist and philosopher Charles Augustus STRONG to join him, and in 1899 Edward L. THORNDIKE arrived, making Columbia's psychology department as prominent as its philosophy department, led by John DEWEY. Seeking practical applications for psychology, Cattell developed "mental testing" but was unable to show a positive relationship between educational achievement and reaction times, sensory discrimination, and memory. Intelligence testing in America would wait twenty more years when the Binet-Simon Test arrived. Cattell's career as an editor and publisher started in 1894 when he and James Mark BALDWIN founded the *Psychological Review*, and Cattell served as co-editor until 1904. In 1894 Cattell also took ownership of the weekly *Science*, and in 1900 he made it the official publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, editing it until his death. In 1900 he bought *Popular Science Monthly* and operated it until 1915. In 1907 Cattell took over the journal *American Naturalist*, and in 1915 he founded *School and Society*.

Cattell was President of the American Psychological Association in 1895, and became the first psychologist elected to the National Academy of Sciences in 1901. His strife with Columbia University and its President, Nicholas Murray BUTLER, along with his pacifist stance during World War I, led to his eventual dismissal in 1917. His later years were devoted to his other major academic pursuit of popularizing psychology and science, through journals such as *Science* and *American Naturalist*, and the directory *American Men of Science*. Cattell died on 20 January 1944 in Lancaster, Pennsylvania.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Inertia of the Eye and Brain (London, 1885).

Psychometrische Untersuchungen (Leipzig, 1886).

"The Time Taken up by Cerebral Operations," *Mind* o.s. 11 (1886): 220–42, 377–92, 524–38.

"Experiments on the Association of Ideas," *Mind* o.s. 12 (1887): 68–74.

"Mental Tests and Measurements," with Francis Galton, *Mind* o.s. 15 (1890): 373–81.

On the Perception of Small Differences, with Special Reference to the Extent, Force and Time of Movement, with George Stuart Fullerton (Philadelphia, 1892).

On Reaction-times and the Velocity of the Nervous Impulse, with Charles S. Dolley (Washington, D.C., 1895).

"Mental Measurement," *Philosophical Review* 2 (1893): 316–32.

Physical and Mental Measurements of the Students of Columbia University, with Livingston Farrand (New York, 1896).

"On Relations of Time and Space in Vision," *Psychological Review* 7 (1900): 325–43.

"Reactions and Perceptions," in *Essays Philosophical and Psychological in Honor of William James by his Colleagues at Columbia University* (New York, 1908).

"A Statistical Study of American Men of Science," *Science* n.s. 24 (1910): 537–96.

Other Relevant Works
Cattell's papers are at the Library of

Congress and Columbia University.

Scientific Societies and Associations (Albany, N.Y., 1904).

University Control (New York, 1913).

James McKeen Cattell, 1860–1944: Man of Science, 2 vols, ed. A. T. Poffenberger (Lancaster, Penn., 1948).

An Education in Psychology: James McKeen Cattell's Journal and Letters from Germany and England, 1880–1888, ed. Michael M. Sokal (Cambridge, Mass., 1981).

Seminal Research Papers, ed. Daniel N. Robinson (Washington, D.C, 1977).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Bio Dict Psych by Zusne*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v13*

Sokal, Michael M. "James McKeen Cattell and the Failure of Anthropometric Mental Testing, 1890–1901," in *The Problematic Science: Psychology in Nineteenth-Century Thought*, ed. William R. Woodward and Mitchell G. Ash (New York, 1982), pp. 322–45.

Sokal, Michael M. "James McKeen Cattell and American Psychology in the 1920s," in *Explorations in the History of Psychology in the United States*, ed. Josef Brozek (East Brunswick, N.J., 1984), pp. 273–323.

John R. Shook

CAVELL, Stanley Louis (1926–)

Stanley Cavell was born on 1 September 1926 in Atlanta, Georgia, to Irving H. and Fannie (Segal) Goldstein, and he grew up in both Atlanta and Sacramento, California. His immigrant father was a jeweler whose business went under during the Great Depression, while his mother was an accomplished and well-known pianist for radio, vaudeville, and silent movies. Cavell learned the piano from a young age, and when he began college at the University of California at Berkeley, he decided to pursue a degree in music. His involvement in theater at Berkeley, as well as his coursework in literature and philosophy, started Cavell's interest in a broad range of the arts and humanities. After completing his BA in music in 1947, Cavell moved to New York with plans to further his education in composition at the Juilliard School, but he soon realized that he was no longer interested in a conservatory education.

Cavell moved back to California to study philosophy at the University of California at Los Angeles from 1948 to 1951, and was then invited to join the Harvard University Society of Fellows as a junior fellow from 1953 to 1956. Cavell then moved back to California to accept a position at the University of California at Berkeley as assistant professor of philosophy, while he continued his doctoral work. Cavell completed his dissertation, "The Claim to Rationality: Knowledge and the Basis of Morality," and was awarded his PhD from Harvard in 1961. Cavell served on the faculty at UC Berkeley for six years before departing in 1962 for a yearlong fellowship at the Institute for Advanced Studies in Princeton, New Jersey. In 1963 Cavell accepted a position as professor of philosophy at Harvard University, and in 1965 was named the Walter M. Cabot Professor of Aesthetics and the General Theory of Value. He remained in this position until his retirement in 1997. Cavell's career is notable for his many professional honors and awards, including a MacArthur Fellowship in 1992. He was President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association (1996–7). In addition, his contributions to film studies have been honored with the creation of the Stanley Cavell Curatorship of the Harvard Film Archive. Cavell also won the Morton Dauwen Zabel Award in Criticism from the

American Academy and Institute of Arts and Letters in 1985. He has received honorary degrees from several institutions.

Cavell's work has been most influential in the philosophy of art, particularly in regards to film. He is regarded by many film theorists as a seminal figure in the development and legitimization of film studies as a scholarly discipline. Cavell has also made significant contributions in the philosophies of literature, language, epistemology, politics, ethics, and culture. Throughout his writing, Cavell successfully explores the intersections between the traditions of analytical, continental, and American philosophies, and in so doing he reveals particular debts to such seemingly disparate figures as J. L. Austin (one of Cavell's own teachers), Ludwig Wittgenstein, Friedrich Nietzsche, Martin Heidegger, William Shakespeare, Ralph Waldo EMERSON, and Henry David Thoreau. In addition, Cavell's interest in psychoanalysis helps to shape his approach to a broad range of philosophical problems. As a writer, Cavell is known for a prose style that has a unique stylistic flair; it has sometimes been likened to a form of artistic expression in and of itself. As a result of his diverse interdisciplinary approach and his interest in cultural forms often marginalized as "low culture," Cavell is often perceived to be stretching the boundaries between traditional philosophy and more practical modes of cultural criticism.

Cavell's earliest writings demonstrate the influence of Austin through Cavell's defense of ordinary language philosophy. Cavell links the precepts of ordinary language with late Wittgensteinian thought. His concerns with the problems of modern skepticism appear here, and they continue to figure prominently throughout his philosophy. Cavell sees all forms of skepticism, both ancient and modern, as emerging from the primordial human desire to escape the inevitable tribulations posed by language. He considers efforts to ground communication in foundations considered more rational as being fundamentally skeptical.

Cavell's Wittgenstein places great significance on the necessity of human judgment in regards to language and communication. Cavell sees a way out of the skeptical dilemma of language, for although common ordinary language is untidy and often disruptive, the possibilities of human judgment and interpretation open a space for meaningful communication through ordinary language, as well as through language that is marked by expressiveness and creativity. Cavell is critical of philosophical traditions that repress the value and importance of human expressivity, and he seems to hope that his approach to philosophical questions will help lead to greater theoretical understanding and acceptance of the value of human expression.

Cavell's interest in judgment and expression directly reflect his recurrent preoccupation with aesthetics. Whether the precise target of his analysis is epistemology, morality, political theory, or the philosophy of language, Cavell critiques the skeptical turn time and time again by returning to the matter of expression with aesthetic resonance. In his writings on aesthetic questions themselves, Cavell most often approaches topics from the immediate perspective and concerns of the critic. More often than not, he moves from an analysis of a particular work of art to philosophical issues rather than from theoretical issues to specific examples in the arts.

In Cavell's first book, *Must We Mean What We Say?* (1969), he addresses aesthetic issues in a more overt and exacting way than he does in any of his other publications. In fact, he argues for a more important and central place for aesthetics within the practice of philosophy. Cavell addresses a range of aesthetic topics: he analyzes the relationship between aesthetics and criticism, probes aesthetic questions regarding artistic mediums and genres, and explicates issues surrounding notions of intentions, significance, and pleasure. The book also includes some examples of his dramatic criticism. A later book on Shakespeare, titled *Disowning Knowledge: In Six Plays of*

Shakespeare (1987), solidified Cavell as one of America's leading literary critics. Here Cavell demonstrated the link between Cartesian skepticism and Shakespeare's seeming preoccupation with the volatility of human knowledge and certainty. His criticism also extends to Romantic literature, particularly that of Thoreau and Emerson, which Cavell has sought to connect to the critique and modification of Kant and more recent forms of moral perfectionism. Throughout his philosophy of literature, Cavell addresses the problem of reading, and in so doing, has emphasized that writing is a particularly human exercise, one which meets the human desire for expressive communication.

Cavell's work in film theory and criticism began with philosophical questions about the nature of the medium of film in *The World Viewed: Reflections on the Ontology of Film* (1971). Cavell examines the narrative potential of film given its photographic character. He concludes that the essence of film, as distinguished from other art forms, is the fact that it is photographic. Since films are photographic, the medium allows us to see things that are not present, and in seeing what is not present, we are able to remain unseen. The fact that we are able to see the world that is not present but recreated for us in film while at the same time remaining unseen fulfills a natural human wish to be able to view the world without responsibility. Cavell also interrogates the theories of other influential film critics, such as Andrè Bazin. *The World Viewed* is now regarded as a classic in the philosophy of film.

Cavell focused his analysis on the film genre of comedy by examining seven films of the 1930s and 1940s in *Pursuits of Happiness: The Hollywood Comedy of Remarriage* (1981). Here he argues that this group of comedies, which he calls examples of the comedy of remarriage, are the direct descendants of Shakespearean romantic comedy, and that these movies constitute a unique mode of comic drama unlike those delineated by other comic theorists. More recently, in *Contesting*

Tears: The Hollywood Melodrama of the Unknown Woman (1996), Cavell elucidates another genre from the same period, which he refers to as "the melodrama of the unknown woman." He demonstrates that comedies of remarriage tend to portray a woman's pursuit of a shared partnership in life and love, but that the melodramas instead chronicle a woman's discovery that she is alone and isolated in that pursuit. Both of these books mark a particular moment in film history that Cavell points to as demonstrating an evolving cultural consciousness in women about their role in society, their relationship to men, and their own potential independence.

Psychoanalysis has figured more and more prominently into Cavell's philosophy and criticism over the years. Cavell utilizes psychoanalytic readings in order to understand what causes one to be drawn to a work of art. His approach can be distinguished from other psychoanalytic critics who utilize Sigmund Freud in order to arrive at a deeper and more grounded interpretation of a work. On the surface, Cavell's psychoanalysis seems to be a form of reception theory, but he believes that a more comprehensive psychological understanding of the reasons for one's seduction by a work of art can yield a more intense and unfettered engagement with that art.

The idea of facilitating an intense interaction with a work runs counter to traditional philosophical aesthetics, which has historically encouraged the establishment of a sense of aesthetic distance from which the perceiver of a work of art can come to appreciate an object or event for its intrinsic qualities in a detached fashion. Cavell's emphasis on the importance of human expression, intention, and judgment (in this case on the part of the perceiver of art), as well as his psychoanalytic mode of criticism, have led him to reject the possibility and the desirability of a detached, impartial, universalized perceiver. Modern skepticism, and traditional philosophy, rejects (or is suspicious of) the immediacy of bodily experiences in its haste to ensure that some objective

distance is established; it is through this objective perspective from which it is thought that more accurate and effective analyses of art can occur. On the contrary, Cavell suggests that diving into the depths of human expression is the best way to understand works of art, and to understand each other. There is no better way to examine the significance of art than to submit to the attraction we feel in our experience of a work and to dwell for a while in our fascination and wonder.

Cavell's writing insists that we retain our awareness of ordinary language and the subtle nuances and meanings that it expresses to us. His philosophical investigations into a broad range of topics challenge us to acquiesce to the experiences that intrigue and seduce us in the hopes that we might learn everything we can from those experiences, rather than deny their power over us.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Must We Mean What We Say? (New York, 1969; 2nd edn, Cambridge, UK, 1976; 3rd edn 2002).

The World Viewed: Reflections on the Ontology of Film (New York, 1971; 2nd edn, Cambridge, Mass., 1976).

The Senses of Walden (New York, 1972; 2nd edn, San Francisco, 1981).

The Claim of Reason: Wittgenstein, Skepticism, Morality, and Tragedy (Oxford, 1979).

Pursuits of Happiness: The Hollywood Comedy of Remarriage (Cambridge, Mass., 1981).

Themes Out of School: Effects and Causes (San Francisco, 1984).

Disowning Knowledge: In Six Plays of Shakespeare (Cambridge, UK, 1987; 2nd edn 2003).

In Quest of the Ordinary: Lines of Skepticism and Romanticism (Chicago, 1988).

This New Yet Unapproachable America: Lectures After Emerson After Wittgenstein (Albuquerque, N.M., 1989).

Conditions of Handsome and Unhandsome: The Constitution of Emersonian Perfectionism (Chicago, 1990).

A Pitch of Philosophy: Autobiographical Exercises (Cambridge, Mass., 1994).

Philosophical Passages: Wittgenstein, Emerson, Austin, Derrida (Oxford, UK, 1995).

The Cavell Reader, ed. Stephan Mulhall (Cambridge, Mass., 1996).

Contesting Tears: The Hollywood Melodrama of the Unknown Woman (Chicago, 1996).

Emerson's Transcendental Etudes, ed. David Justin Hodge (Stanford, Cal. 2003).

Cities of Words: Pedogical Letters on a Register of the Moral Life (Cambridge, Mass., 2004).

Philosophy the Day after Tomorrow (Cambridge, Mass., 2005).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v10*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*

Cohen, Ted, Paul Guyer, and Hilary Putnam, eds. *Pursuits of Reason: Essays in Honor of Stanley Cavell* (Lubbock, Tex., 1993).

Dauber, Kenneth, ed. *Ordinary Language Criticism: Literary Thinking after Cavell after Wittgenstein* (Evanston, Ill., 2003).

Eldridge, Richard. *Stanley Cavell* (Cambridge, UK, 2003).

Fischer, Michael. *Stanley Cavell and Literary Skepticism* (Chicago, 1989).

Fleming, Richard. *The State of Philosophy: An Invitation to a Reading in Three Parts of Stanley Cavell's The Claim of Reason* (Lewisburg, Penn., 1993).

Fleming, Richard, and Michael Payne, eds. *The Senses of Stanley Cavell* (Lewisburg, Penn., 1989).

Gould, Timothy. *Hearing Things: Voice and Method in the Writing of Stanley Cavell* (Chicago, 1998).

Hammer, Espen. *Stanley Cavell: Skepticism, Subjectivity, and the Ordinary* (Cambridge, Mass., 2002).

Mulhall, Stephan. *Stanley Cavell: Philosophy's Recounting of the Ordinary* (Oxford, 1994).

Rothman, William, and Marian Keane. *Reading Cavell's World: A Philosophical Perspective on Film* (Detroit, 2000).

Smith, Joseph, and William Kerrigan, eds. *Images in Our Souls: Cavell, Psychoanalysis and Cinema* (Baltimore, Md., 1987).

Terry Brino-Dean

CHAN, Wing-tsit (1901–94)

Wing-tsit Chan (Ch'en Jung-chieh) was born on 18 August 1901 in Kaiping, in the rural Toy-san area of Kwangdong province in south China. After graduating from Lingnan University in Canton in 1924, he came to the United States to enroll in the philosophy department at Harvard University, where he earned an MA in 1927 and a PhD in philosophy in 1929, with a dissertation on the early Daoist philosopher Zhuangzi. Returning to China, he served as Dean of the Faculty and professor of philosophy at Lingnan University from 1929 to 1936. In 1936 he was named professor of Chinese philosophy and institutions at the University of Hawaii, and also served from 1940 to 1942 as the first chair of Hawaii's philosophy department. Chan and colleagues Charles Moore and Gregg Sinclair inaugurated the East-West Philosophers' Conferences in 1939, from which emerged the journal *Philosophy East and West.*

In 1942 Chan was appointed professor of Chinese culture and philosophy at Dartmouth College where he taught until his retirement in 1966. In that year he was named Anna R. D. Gillespie Professor of Philosophy at Chatham College in Pennsylvania, and taught there until retiring in 1982. From the mid 1960s to the late 1980s he also was a visiting professor of Chinese thought at Columbia University. In 1992 he received the Distinguished Service Award from the Association for Asian Studies. Chan died on 12 August 1994 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Chan published more than twenty books and hundreds of articles, in Chinese and in English, on an extraordinary range of topics in Chinese philosophy. For readers of English, the most notable of these are his works of translation, the most important being *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy* (1963), a collection of edited and annotated translations representing philosophical works deriving from the pre-Confucian period down to and including philosophy in Communist China. This volume has been so influential that it was translated from English back into Chinese. Other works of translation include *Instructions for Practical Living and Other Neo-Confucian Writings by Wang Yangming* (1963) and *Reflections on Things at Hand: The Neo-Confucian Anthology by Chu Hsi and Lü Tsu-ch'ien* (1967). These and other studies and translations, particularly in the area of Neo-Confucian thought, have both opened the field and defined it from their publication to the present.

In addition to being a prolific scholar, Chan was a living exemplar of the Chinese philosophical tradition, a participant in and contributor to the ongoing career of Chinese philosophy. Among the leading figures in the field of twentieth-century Chinese philosophy – including T'ang Chün-I, Mou Tsung-san, Fung Yulan, and Ch'ien Mu – Chan was the one who came to the West, making his personal and scholarly life in the United States, but always in active touch with Asia. He served as a link between the culture of China's past and the culture of its future. During a prolonged period when the Confucian tradition was under assault in China, he played a crucial role in transplanting it to the West. In a variety of ways he encouraged its life and growth in the United States and Europe until, with the

thawing of frozen philosophical ground in the 1980s, it became possible to encourage renewed growth in its place of birth. Through correspondence, visits, conferences, and encouragement of younger scholars, Chan carried on the work of this complicated and fascinating transmission and renewal.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy (Princeton, N.J., 1963).

Instructions for Practical Living and Other Neo-Confucian Writings by Wang Yang-ming (New York, 1963).

Reflections on Things at Hand: The Neo-Confucian Anthology by Chu Hsi and Lü Tsu-ch'ien (New York, 1967).

Chu Hsi and Neo-Confucianism (Honolulu, Hawaii, 1986).

Neo-Confucian Terms Explained (The Pei-hsi tzu-i), by Ch'en Ch'un, 1159–1223 (New York, 1986).

Chu His: Life and Thought (Hong Kong, 1987).

Chu His: New Studies (Honolulu, Hawaii, 1989).

Further Reading

Who's Who in Phil

Bloom, Irene. "Remembering Wing-tsit Chan, 1901–1994: Excerpts from an Oral Autobiography," *China Review International* 2 (Fall 1995): 305–44 .

———, "Wing-tsit Chan, 1901–1994: In Memoriam, on the Occasion of the East-West Philosophers' Conference, January 8, 1995, *Philosophy East and West* 45 (1995): 467–71.

Irene Bloom

CHAPPELL, Vere Claiborne (1930–)

Vere Chappell was born on 22 March 1930 in Rochester, New York. He was educated in the Rochester public schools and Yale University, from which he received the BA in 1951, MA in 1953, and PhD in philosophy in 1958. In 1953–4 he received a Fulbright Fellowship to study at the University of Heidelberg. Between 1957 and 1970 Chappell was a professor of philosophy at the University of Chicago, and served as acting chair of the department in 1964–5.

In 1970 Chappell accepted the position of head of the philosophy department at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, serving until 1974; he has also been acting Dean and Associate Provost there. He is presently professor of philosophy at Massachusetts. He has also held visiting appointments at Amherst College, Mount Holyoke College, North Central College, Smith College, Indiana University, Notre Dame University, the University of Illinois at Chicago, the University of Illinois at Urbana, and the University of Southern California.

Chappell's scholarship has focused primarily on the history of early modern philosophy, particularly Descartes and Locke, philosophy of mind, and metaphysics. He has edited many influential collections of work in these areas. His positions on a variety of issues in metaphysics and the philosophy of mind have emerged both through the introductions to his many edited works as well as through his numerous published articles. Issues regarding the concept of person and the concept of matter have been central to Chappell's philosophical work, although he has increasingly come to examine those notions as they are developed in the work of the early modern philosophers, particularly Locke and Descartes. Recently, his editing of *The Cambridge Companion to Locke* has solidified his reputation as one of the pre-eminent Locke scholars of the second half of the twentieth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Whitehead's Theory of Becoming," *Journal of Philosophy* 58 (1961): 516–27.

"The Concept of Dreaming," *Philosophical Quarterly* 13 (1963): 193–213.

"Stuff and Things," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 71 (1970): 61–76.

"The Theory of Ideas," in *Essays on Descartes' Meditation*, ed. A. O. Rorty (Berkeley, Cal., 1987), pp. 177–98.

"Locke and Relative Identity," *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 6 (1989): 69–83.

"The Theory of Sensations," in *The Philosophy of Thomas Reid*, ed. M. Dalgarno and E. Matthews (Dordrecht, 1989), pp. 49–63.

"Locke on the Ontology of Matter, Living Things and Persons," *Philosophical Studies* 46 (1990): 19–32.

"Descartes's Compatibilism," in *Reason, Will and Sensation: Studies in Cartesian Metaphysics*, ed. John Cottingham (Oxford, 1994), pp. 177–90.

"Locke on the Freedom of the Will," in *Locke's Philosophy: Content and Context*, ed. G. A. J. Rogers (Oxford, 1994), pp. 101–21.

"L'homme cartésien," in *Descartes, Objecter et répondre*, ed. Jean-Marie Beyssade and Jean-Luc Marion (Paris, 1994), pp. 403–26.

"Locke on the Intellectual Basis of Sin," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 32 (1994): 197–207.

"Locke's Theory of Ideas," in *The Cambridge Companion to Locke*, ed. Vere Chappell (Cambridge, UK, 1994), pp. 26–55.

"Descartes's Ontology," *Topoi* 16 (1997): 111–27.

"Determinism and Human Freedom," with Robert Sleigh and Michael della Rocca, in *The Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*, ed. Michael Ayers and Daniel Garber (Cambridge, UK, 1997), pp. 1195–270.

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *The Philosophy of Mind* (Englewood-Cliffs, N.J., 1962).

Ed., *The Philosophy of David Hume* (New York, 1963).

Ed., *Ordinary Language* (Englewood-Cliffs, N.J., 1964; rev. edn, New York, 1981).

Ed., *Hume* (New York, 1966).

Twenty-Five Years of Descartes Scholarship, 1960–1984: A Bibliography, with Willis Doney (New York, 1987).

Ed., *Essays on Early Modern Philosophy*, 12 vols (New York, 1992).

Ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Locke* (New York, 1994).

Ed., *Descartes's Meditations* (Lanham, Md., 1997).

Ed., *Locke* (Oxford, 1998).

Ed., *Hobbes and Bramhall on Liberty and Necessity* (New York, 1999).

Further Reading

Allaire, Edwin B. "Another Look at Bare Particulars," *Philosophical Studies* 16 (1965): 16–20.

Cartwright, Helen M. "Chappell on Stuff and Things," *Noûs* 6 (1972): 369–76.

Spiegelberger, Herbert. "Rejoinder to Chappell and Roderick Chisholm," *The Monist* 49 (1965): 38–43.

David E. Schrader

CHENEY, Ednah Dow Littlehale (1824–1904)

Ednah Dow Littlehale was born on 27 June 1824 in Boston, Massachusetts to Ednah Parker Dow and Sargent Smith Littlehale. Littlehale provided well for his family as a wholesale grocer. A Gloucester Universalist, he believed in abolitionism and women's rights, and these causes inspired his daughter's

devotion and great energy. Ednah became a Unitarian, particularly drawn to the transcendentalist Rev. Theodore Parker, in whose study she met her lifelong friend Julia Ward HOWE in 1845. In 1853 she married the celebrated engraver, Seth Cheney, of the Cheney silk manufacturing family from Connecticut, and their marriage was a happy one. Seth was influenced by the example of his own father who, unlike many nineteenth-century men, helped in every aspect with the children. In his memoirs he says, "God forbid that a woman should hold her peace because she is a woman. Methinks the apostle meant no such thing, but meant that they should let their light shine before men." In 1856, before their only child Margaret Swan was a year old, Seth died.

After the death of her husband, Ednah Dow Cheney began her lifelong career of writing and lecturing, making her permanent home in the Jamaica Plain section of Boston. In 1882 Cheney's daughter Margaret died from cholera while a science student at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Had Margaret Swan Cheney lived, she would have been MIT's second woman to receive a degree, and a room for women still exists at MIT in her name. In response to this tragedy, Ednah once again put her energies to profitable works. It was said that, when this formerly dark-haired, attractive, young woman became gray-haired, she presented a "picture of beaming benevolence upon all mankind." Cheney died at eighty years old on 18 November 1904 in Boston. Referring to her funeral ceremony, Alice Stone Blackwell's obituary in *The Woman's Journal* pronounced it to have been "more like a coronation than a funeral." Her career, it was claimed in Cheney's memorial, had been "a link connecting us with that unfinished career of Margaret Fuller." Cheney is buried in Manchester, Connecticut.

Cheney attended the best schools in Boston, the Pembertons' school and the Mt. Vernon school of Joseph Hale Abbott. When her formal schooling ended, she went on to enroll in the Conversations of Margaret Fuller, where at sixteen she was the youngest member. After attending Fuller's classes for three years, Cheney participated in the Conversations of Bronson Alcott, particularly for his lectures on Pythagoras, Plotinus, and Plato in which Alcott claimed Cheney to have been his best student. She claimed that the analysis of language and practice in defining, as drawn from Lindley Murray's grammar, was of great importance to her scholarship. Perhaps that is why her style of writing is clear and systematic.

Fluent in several languages, Cheney read Dante in Italian and Goethe in German. She lists among her reading the ancient philosophers as well as Brown, Stewart, and Reid, whom she admired for their philosophy of Common Sense, Sismondi, Machiavelli and Schiller, and historians Gibbon, Bulwer, and Michelet. Cheney studied art theory and, accompanied by her artist husband, was introduced to a number of European artists. She studied American art as well, becoming a friend of artists Washington Allston and his only student Sarah Freeman Clarke in particular, and came to support contemporary women artists, encouraging them through her writing and speaking.

The tragedies in Cheney's life seem to have inspired her to more rather than less work for social and moral causes, especially the cause of education for women and the unfortunate. Before her marriage, she had been instrumental in founding a school of design in 1851, which she hoped would allow women to become economically self-sufficient. Later she helped found a horticultural school for girls and the Girls' Latin School in Boston. In 1859 through Dr Maria Zakrzewska, Cheney developed an interest in women's medical education, eventually succeeding Lucy Goddard as President of the New England Hospital for women and children in Boston. From the 1870s through the 1890s she wrote books for hospital patients and for children and lectured at the International Council of Women in Washington, D.C. on "Hospitals Managed by and for Women" (27 March 1888). Interest in continuing education for adults led Cheney to become a founding member of the New England Women's Club

where she lectured often during 1868–93 along with a roster of the best minds in the New England area at the time.

An intimate friend of Harriet Jacobs, Harriet Tubman, and Booker T. WASHINGTON, and admirer of the words of Frederick DOUGLASS, Cheney was personally and publicly supportive of African-Americans. She herself went to Readville to teach reading to those in the encampment of the first African-American recruits for the Civil War. Cheney stood beside Lt Shaw's mother when the Black Regiment left for the Civil War, and called the diminished roll when it returned at its close. In England from the women's caged gallery at Parliament she listened to Bostonian abolitionist William Lloyd GARRISON. After the Civil War, she was involved with directing the Freedmen's Schools in the South, as secretary of the teacher's committee of the New England Freedmen's Aid Society for ten years, taking trips to the South to ensure their continuance, sending reports to the Massachusetts House of Representatives. She wrote a *Handbook for American Citizens* in 1866.

By 1860 Cheney was taking part in women's rights conventions. She wrote biographies to honor the many women she felt deserved to be memorialized: Louisa May Alcott, author, 1889; Susan Dimmock, physician, 1875; Abby May, President of the Horticulture School for Women, 1893; Lucretia Mott, chair of the mathematics department at Antioch College, 1893, 1900; Harriet Winslow Sewell, who had in turn collected the letters of Lydia Maria CHILD. Cheney often supported the younger women by writing about them in newspapers, as in her 1875 comments on an Anna C. BRACKETT speech, or writing letters of recommendation, as in the case of Marietta KIES in 1892. Cheney delivered the eulogy for Elizabeth Palmer PEABODY in the Church of the Disciples where women on the pulpit were an anomaly. Cheney believed that the "emancipation of women has especially marked the nineteenth century." In her opinion, it was "the most important and far reaching reform of the world." Often contributing com-

mentaries for the *Woman's Journal*, her own pamphlets on suffrage were considered exceptionally well written. However, she died before she could vote.

As the Honorary Director of the Free Religious Association, newly formed in 1867, Cheney recruited speakers and lectured herself in Boston and at meetings as far away as Chicago. She also occasionally preached at various churches at a time when few women held such privilege. She lectured on religion and individualism at the Radical Club in Boston, and published articles on ethics and other subjects related to religion. She contributed articles to *The Christian Examiner*, and other journals that supported a pluralistic approach to religion, to *The Radical*, and over 100 articles to *The Index* alone. She wrote as well for the philosopher Paul CARUS's philosophical and religious journal *Open Court*. In fact, Cheney's contributions to periodicals besides the ones mentioned were many: *The Atlantic, Chautauquan, Commonwealth, The North American Review, Unitarian Review*. Among her published works are several poems and prayers.

An advocate of education, in 1873 Cheney toured the St. Louis schools presided over by William Torrey HARRIS. A year later, at age fifty, Cheney began ten years of lecturing at the Concord School of Philosophy, on such subjects as History of Art (1879), Color Theory and American Art (1880), Relation of Poetry to Science (1881), Nature, and Reminiscences of Emerson (1882), Study of Nirvana (1883), Emerson and Boston (1884), Goethe (1885), Dante and Michelangelo (1886), Philip Massinger, and John Ford (1887). In her later years, Cheney developed an interest in psychology, and at seventy-nine lectured on the subject at the revival of the Concord School of Philosophy in 1903. Cheney's lectures were often quoted at length and commented upon in the Boston and Concord newspapers.

Friends noted Cheney as a philosopher: Franklin B. Sanborn called her a person of "philosophic character and culture" who "constantly looked at the problems of life in

the genuine philosophic light" and who "put her theories of life in practice" (Sanborn 1905, pp. 6, 11). Julia Ward Howe referred to Cheney as a person "throned in philosophic ease." Cheney's philosophical interests encompassed art, nature, feminism, and ethics. Her notion of being is dualistic; her ethical stance is pluralistic. Her method analytical rather than intuitive seeks to expose the duality and consequently the necessary balance required of it. The Eastern philosophical influences she was exposed to in transcendentalism are evident in her thought, as well as elements of Coleridge whom she admired, Goethe, Hegel, Plato, and the then-forming American pragmatism.

When Cheney was asked by a young girl about what to study, her advice was to encourage her to "learn to record … the processes of reasoning" and to investigate five subject matters: natural science, history ("history is philosophy teaching by examples"), mental philosophy, language, and mathematics (Sanborn 1905, pp. 8–10). She recommended the conservative benefits of reading Locke: his clear and consistent reasoning, his dryness and hardness, and his search into the laws of thought, a good foundation for studying both the idealist and the sensationalist philosophers. Through the years 1840–50, though at first skeptical, Cheney embraced transcendentalism. Later, having been subjected to widely different methods of argument in the company of Fuller, Alcott, Ralph Waldo EMERSON, and Parker among others, and having acknowledged the benefits of each, Cheney adopted a pluralistic philosophy and a liberal point of view. Valuing her independence of thought, she formulated her own dualistic philosophy of God, man, and art.

Cheney's first lecture at the Concord School of Philosophy was on art, the subject to which Cheney chiefly devoted her philosophical writings. With her publication of *Gleanings in the Field of Art* in 1881, she became the first American woman to have written a philosophy of art or aesthetics. She defined art not as

taste or beauty, but as "all that which seeks to express thought in a material form, without reference to its use for any material function." Art is a human activity that subordinates matter to spirit, giving full life to the soul. In "Art and Religion," Cheney saw art's special work as relational, synthetic, harmonious; its truth both conceptual and sensitive, free and disciplined; its unity not one but integrated dualism. Art, for Cheney, serves ethics, and is integral to education. Her contribution to the young discipline of American aesthetics is one that is both theoretical and practical. In the chapter devoted to art in her memoirs, *Reminiscences* (1902), Cheney views American art as wrongly unappreciated. She was deeply involved in its vitality, writing critical reviews of her contemporary women artists, writing the *Life of Christian Daniel Rauch* (1893) to introduce his work to American sculptors, and as well writing memoirs of Seth (1881) and John Cheney (1889) as testaments to their artistic productions. However, in the histories of American aesthetics Ednah Dow Cheney has been completely neglected.

Cheney's philosophy of woman begins with her definition of sex as being essential spirit that is both eternally feminine and masculine, but only in abstract form, and both residing in God. The feminine, meaning "attraction," is the Goethian principle that draws one upward. Hence the feminine principle is the active principle. This principle is blended in every individual. From this definition of woman comes her definition of being as duality. Not only is the duality feminine and masculine, but also form and matter. Duality as center and circumstance is the essence of the nature of both God and man. Not only art but also science in both substance and method is of two-fold nature of thought and expression, imagination and reason. Consequently, the urge comes for harmony and unity. Health is the balance of the dual processes of repair and destruction.

The universe, a "two-fold" tale, is both Empedoclean and Platonic; so too, is society as it tells its "tale" of the individual and the

nation. Cheney writes in her essay "Nature," that "Nature … symbolizes the flow of spirit, the resistance of matter … she is a great artist, teaching us not alone by symbolism, but by her rare power of suffusing the mind with new life … [helping solve the great problems], the greatest of all, the relation of the individual to the universal, the me to the not-me, the one to the many, the changing to the permanent." Hence in nature she sees being as process as well as duality, for nature also offers all "in the great struggle for the survival of the fittest." Cheney developed her pluralistic outlook questioning the pre-eminence of Christianity over all the religions of the world, studying the meaning of nature, and the nature of art. She claimed that pluralism allows one "consciousness of the manifold," and in this disallows fanaticism.

An aspect of all of Cheney's investigations into understanding the universe is inquiry into morality. Nature and art are both teachers that contribute to ethics by awakening and expanding the soul. Ethics is derived from understanding and intuiting the nature of being from the Nature of God, source of all good, wherein originates the eternal principles, the "eternally womanly" and "eternally manly," equality, human dignity, love or attraction which stimulates action. Man's relation to woman is a moral fact as much as is drunkenness that lowers human dignity and injures the brain. Cheney notes the importance of Emersonian intuition in seeing the significance of the feminine in God in being the appeal to ideal good. When that ideal does not become real, imbalance occurs. Moral progress necessitates seeking harmony and balance that is manifest in the ideal to fulfill the function of human life. Cheney lived her own philosophy dualistically balancing inward reflection with outward action and pluralistically embracing many definitions of being.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Women of Boston," in *The Memorial History of Boston* (Boston, 1881), pp.

331–56.
Gleanings in the Fields of Art (Boston, 1881).
"Emerson and Boston," in *The Genius and Character of Emerson: Lectures at the Concord School of Philosophy*, ed. F. B. Sanborn (Boston 1885), pp. 1–35.
"Das ewig-weibliche," in *The Life and Genius of Goethe: Lectures at the Concord School of Philosophy*, ed. F. B. Sanborn (Boston, 1886), pp. 218–50.
Louisa May Alcott: The Children's Friend (Boston, 1886).
Memoir of Margaret Swan Cheney (Boston, 1889).
Life of Christian Daniel Rauch of Berlin, Germany (Boston, 1893).

Other Relevant Works
Papers of Cheney are at the Boston Public Library, the Massachusetts Historical Society in Boston, Radcliffe College, Smith College, and the Concord Memorial Library in Massachusetts.
Ed., *Selected Poems from Michelangelo Buonarroti* (Boston, 1885).
Ed., *Louisa May Alcott: Her Life, Letters, and Journals* (Boston, 1889).
Reminiscences of Ednah Dow Cheney (Boston, 1902).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v9*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Blackwell, Alice Stone. "Ednah Dow Cheney," *Women's Journal* (26 November 1904): 1, 389.
Dykeman, Therese B. *American Women Philosophers 1650–1930, Six Exemplary Thinkers* (Lewiston, N.Y., 1993). Contains a bibliography of Cheney's writings.
———, "Ednah Dow Cheney's American Aesthetics," in *Presenting Women Philosophers*, ed. Cecile T. Tougas and Sara Ebenreck (Philadelphia, 2000), pp.

41–50.

———, "The Philosophy of Halfness and the Philosophy of Duality: Julia Ward Howe and Ednah Dow Cheney," *Hypatia* 19 (2004): 17–34.

Hanaford, Phebe. *Daughters of America; or, Women of the Century* (Boston, 1883).

Howe, Julia Ward. *Reminiscences 1819–1899* (Boston, 1899).

Howe, Julia Ward, ed. *Representative Women of New England* (Boston, 1904).

McFadden, Margaret. "Boston Teenagers Debate the Woman Question, 1837–1838," *Signs* (Summer 1990): 832–47.

Sanborn, Franklin B., et al. *Ednah Dow Cheney, 1824–1904: Memorial Meeting, New England Women's Club, Boston, February 20, 1905* (Boston, 1905).

Shakir, Evelyn. "Ednah Dow Cheney: Jack of All Trades" *American Transcendental Quarterly* 47-48 (Summer–Fall 1980): 95–115.

Sprague, Julia A., ed. *History of New England Women's Club 1868–1893* (Boston, 1894).

Therese B. Dykeman

CHIEF JOSEPH (1840–1904)

Chief Joseph was born In-mut-too-yah-lat-lat (Thunder Rolling in the Mountains) in early 1840 near Joseph Creek in the Wallowa Valley of Oregon Territory (now in Wallowa County in north-eastern Oregon). He was baptized on 12 April 1840 and was raised for the first seven years of his life under the influence of the Presbyterian Mission at Lapwai where he attended day school. In 1847 Joseph moved with his family to their ancestral domain, the Wallowa and Grande Ronde in Oregon, and was taught by his father to live according to the "old ways." When his father died in 1871, Joseph became chief of the Wal-lam-wat-kin band of the Chute-pa-lu (Nez Perce). He buried his father in the Wallowa valley which belonged to his father and, by succession, now belonged to him and his people. The role of chief, in the Nez Perce tradition, meant being a servant-leader, and he brilliantly fulfilled this role by convening and chairing councils, becoming chief negotiator, and a caring administrator. The image of Joseph as the prominent engineer of military strategies in the Nez Perce War is a myth created in the late 1800s by US Army personnel and the media. Chief Joseph's greatness lies in his servant-leadership and his clear oratory in explaining the position of his people. The military successes of the Nez Perce resulted from a combined effort of the people, fired by their determination based on the righteousness of their cause, and facilitated by the leadership of their chiefs such as Chief Joseph.

Chief Joseph's ideas were spoken but not written down by him. His pronouncements were translated into English by others and often edited. This process eliminated the direct expression of his ideas, but their essence remains. His surrender address on 5 October 1877 is one of the most recognized statements in the Western world. In the address Chief Joseph honorably surrenders, reminding everyone of the Army's promise to help the Nez Perce return to their homeland, and proclaiming that the Nez Perce owned the land and never relinquished that ownership. His immediate concern was the welfare of his people. "Hear me my chiefs. I am tired: my heart is sick and sad. From where the sun now stands I will fight no more forever" (1879, p. 429). Chief Joseph died on the Colville reservation in Eastern Washington on 21 September 1904.

On a visit to Washington, D.C. in 1879, Chief Joseph was interviewed by a reporter with Arthur Chapman interpreting. It is believed that his "own story" was probably

highly edited before publication in the *North American Review*. In this story, his sentiments were that all men are created by the same Great Spirit Chief and are, therefore, brothers; the earth is the mother of all people and so people should have equal rights upon it; and that words which do not amount to something do not last. "I know that my race must change. We cannot hold our own with the white men as we are. We only ask an even chance to live as other men live" (1877, p. 630). Chief Joseph expressed a clear call for justice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Chief Joseph's Surrender Speech," in *Report of Secretary of War* (Washington, D.C., 1877), vol. 1, p. 630. Reprinted in Mark H. Brown, *The Flight of the Nez Perce* (Lincoln, Neb., 1967), p. 407.
"An Indian's View of Indian Affairs," with William H. Hare, *North American Review* 128 (April 1879): 412–33. Chief Joseph's statement is on pp. 415–33. Reprinted in *That All the People May Be One People, Send Rain to Wash the Face of the Earth* (Sitka, Alaska, 1995).
"Chief Joseph's Speech on 14 January 1879 at Lincoln Hall, Washington, D.C.," in *The Wisdom of the Great Chiefs: The Classic Speeches of Chief Red Jacket, Chief Joseph, and Chief Seattle*, ed. Kent Nerburn (San Rafael, Cal., 1994).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Encyc Amer Bio
Beal, Merrill D. *"I Will Fight No More Forever": Chief Joseph and the Nez Perce War* (Seattle, Wash., 1963).
Gridley, M. *Kopet: A Documentary Narrative of Chief Joseph's Last Years* (Seattle, Wash., 1981).
Howard, Helen A. *War Chief Joseph* (Caldwell, Idaho, 1941). Reprinted as *Saga of Chief Joseph* (Lincoln, Neb., 1978).
Howard, O. O. *Nez Perce Joseph* (Boston, 1881).
McWhorter, L. V. *Hear Me, My Chiefs! Nez Perce Legend and History* (Caldwell, Ida., 2001).

William D. Guthrie

CHILD, Lydia Maria Francis (1802–80)

Lydia Maria Francis was born on 11 February 1802 in Medford, Massachusetts, and died on 20 October 1880 in Wayland, Massachusetts. The youngest of six children born to Convers Francis, a baker, and Susannah Rand Francis, Lydia inherited from her father the abolitionist zeal that guided her throughout her adult life. Other than a basic grammar school education, she was entirely self-taught. She acquired a strong background in British literature, German philosophy, and American history. She lived for a time in the household of her sister Mary Preston in the Maine Territory where she frequently visited the Abnaki people, who made a lasting impression on her. On 18 October 1828 Lydia married David Lee Child, a lawyer who was a cofounder in 1832 of the New England Anti-Slavery Society. His excessive generosity and poor financial judgment was a source of great stress for Child throughout their married life.

Child quickly became a prolific and persuasive writer, authoring over thirty books and pamphlets. While she is most famous for her uncompromising condemnation of slavery, she was also a pioneer in children's fiction, women's history, early American history, and the history of religion. Child was the editor of *The Juvenile Miscellany,* the first children's periodical in the United States, as well as an editor of *National Anti-Slavery Standard.*

Child participated in virtually every progressive movement of nineteenth-century America. Her first two novels, *Hobomok, a Tale of Early Times* (1824) and *The Rebels or*

Boston Before the Revolution (1825), testify to both her early commitment to correct the racist attitudes of American society and her critical stance towards Calvinism, which grew out of her Unitarian intellectual roots. She was also a prominent figure in New England transcendentalism. Her brother and earliest intellectual influence, Reverend Convers Francis, was a close friend of Ralph Waldo EMERSON and hosted the early meetings of the Transcendentalist Club in his home. At one such meeting Child met Emerson, who later published her poem "What is Beauty?" (1843) in the primary transcendentalist journal, *The Dial*. Henry David Thoreau cited her work *Philothea* (1836) as an early influence.

Child's first commercial success, *The Frugal Housewife* (1830), was one of many domestic manuals that urged women to gain power in the domestic and social spheres by thoughtful control of household finances and resources. While Child's manual was not the first, it was one of the most popular, running through an astounding thirty-three printings by 1855. Finally, she contributed to the historical study of Christianity and religion in her era with her three-volume work titled *The Progress of Religious Ideas Through Successive Ages* (1855).

In 1836 Child published her most complex and misunderstood work, a novel, *Philothea: A Romance*. On its surface, the novel appears to be an unremarkable example of romantic Hellenism: a fictionalized and gauzy account of Athens during its Golden Age. However, the novel's florid language conceals two serious agendas. The first is an expression of Child's abolitionism. While she condemned slavery directly in her political essays, in *Philothea* she accomplishes the same task subtly in the character Eudora. The friend of the protagonist Philothea, Eudora is a slave living in Athens who equals or surpasses the native women of Athens in intellect and character, yet is forbidden from marrying her love because of a xenophobic and unjust law. The second purpose of the novel was to rebut the claims made by Francis Wright in her work of romantic Hellenism, *A Few Days in Athens* (1822). Wright's novel, in which she implicitly advanced her own arguments against organized religion and for women's equality, had offered a favorable account of the unfairly maligned Epicurus and his Garden. While Child agreed with Wright on the need for many religious, social, and political reforms, she disagreed with Wright's agnosticism and views on free love. *Philothea* therefore counters Wright's epicurean critique of religion with a neo-Platonist defense of transcendentalism.

The fame that Child earned through her fiction, children's periodicals, and domestic manual turned to opprobrium with her publication of works advocating social justice for African Americans and Native Americans. Stirred by the recent publication of ardent abolitionist works such as David Walker's *Appeal in Four Articles* (1829) and William Lloyd GARRISON's newspaper *The Liberator* (1831), Child wrote *An Appeal in Favor of That Class of Americans Called Africans* (1833). This work was the first book-length argument in favor of abolition published in the United States. Child documented the cruelty of slavery, using both historical and personal narrative forms to refute the common misconception that slavery was benign or even beneficial for slaves. She eschewed the gradualist approach to the abolition of slavery by condemning the practice as barbaric and calling for immediate emancipation. In her *Appeal*, Child also included biographies of prominent Africans and African Americans to show that people of color were equal to white people. Child then published her *Anti-Slavery Catechism* (1836), in which Child presented the anti-slavery stance in a question-and-answer format. Years later she authored *An Appeal for the Indians* (1868), making the case for the equality of Native Americans on many of the same grounds. Her work on political and social issues stands as an early outstanding example of American humanistic multiculturalism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hobomok, a Tale of Early Times (Boston, 1824).

The Rebels or Boston Before the Revolution (Boston, 1825).

The Frugal Housewife (Boston, 1830).

The Mother's Book (Boston, 1831).

The Coronal: A Collection of Miscellaneous Pieces, Written at Various Times (Boston, 1831).

An Appeal in Favor of That Class of Americans Called Africans (Boston, 1833).

Brief History of the Condition of Women, in Various Ages and Nations, 2 vols (Boston, 1835).

Anti-Slavery Catechism (Newburyport, Mass., 1836).

Philothea: A Romance (Boston, 1836).

"What is Beauty," *The Dial* 3 (April 1843): 490–92.

The Progress of Religious Ideas Through Successive Ages, 3 vols (Boston, 1855).

The Patriarchal Institution, as Described by Members of its Own Family (New York, 1860).

The Duty of Disobedience to the Fugitive Slave Act: An Appeal to the Legislators of Massachusetts (Boston, 1860).

The Freedmen's Book (Boston, 1865).

An Appeal for the Indians (Boston, 1868)

Other Relevant Works

Child's papers are at Cornell University, Harvard University, the Boston Public Library, the Massachusetts Historical Society, the American Antiquarian Society, and the New York Public Library.

Letters of Lydia Maria Child, ed. Harriet Winslow Sewall (Boston, 1882).

The Collected Correspondence of Lydia Maria Child, 1817–1880, 97 microfiche sheets, ed. Milton Meltzer and Patricia G. Holland (Millwood, N.Y., 1979).

The Collected Correspondence of Lydia Maria Child, 1817–1880: Guide and Index to the Microfiche Edition, ed. Milton Meltzer and Patricia G. Holland (Millwood, N.Y., 1980).

Lydia Maria Child, Selected Letters, 1817–1880, ed. Milton Meltzer and Patricia G. Holland (Amherst, Mass., 1982).

A Lydia Maria Child Reader, ed. Carolyn L. Karcher (Durham, N.C., 1997).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v2*

Baer, Helene G. *The Heart Is Like Heaven: The Life of Lydia Maria Child* (Philadelphia, 1964).

Clifford, Deborah Pickman. *Crusader for Freedom: A Life of Lydia Maria Child* (Boston, 1992).

Karcher, Carolyn L. *The First Woman in the Republic: A Cultural Biography of Lydia Maria Child* (Durham, N.C., 1994).

Meltzer, Milton. *Tongue of Flame: The Life of Lydia Maria Child* (New York, 1965).

Osborne, William S. *Lydia Maria Child* (Boston, 1980).

Pratt, Scott L. "Rebuilding Babylon: The Pluralism of Lydia Maria Child," *Hypatia* 19 (2004): 92–104.

Terrance MacMullan

CHILDS, John Lawrence (1889–1985)

John L. Childs was born on 11 January 1889 in Eau Claire, Wisconsin, and died on 31 January 1985 in Rockford, Illinois. The family was devoutly Methodist, and Childs was raised to respect the value of hard work; productive labor was viewed as both a social and a moral

obligation. At the University of Wisconsin, Childs majored in journalism, joining the staff on the *Daily Cardinal* and eventually becoming its editor-in-chief. During his Madison years, while developing his ideas on social matters, he became active in the campus YMCA. Upon graduation with a BA in 1911 he joined the staff of the YMCA, but in 1915, shortly after his marriage to Grace Fowler, he rather abruptly chose to go to China as secretary to the Foreign Department of the International Committee of the YMCA based in Peking.

Childs quickly came to identify with the Chinese as his gospel became increasingly social. In 1922 he took a sabbatical and enrolled at Union Theological Seminary in New York City to pursue his master's degree in religious education. He returned to China in 1924 clearly changed by his experience in New York. Childs wrote that what he once thought was divine revelation actually had a naturalistic explanation. He also publicly questioned the divinity of Christ. Childs returned to New York City in 1927 and continued his studies at Union and Teachers College of Columbia University. Childs became particularly close to William Heard KILPATRICK, and earned his PhD in education in 1930. It was through Kilpatrick's efforts that Childs was appointed assistant professor at Teachers College in 1939 after the publication of his dissertation, *Education and the Philosophy of Experimentalism* (1931). From this point on, the enlightened Methodist became one of the leading New York pragmatists, even after his retirement from teaching in 1954.

During his career at Teachers College, Childs wrote and spoke widely on the educational philosophy of John DEWEY, and drew attention to the implications that an experimentalist philosophy might have for morality in education, culminating in *Education and Morals* (1950). For Childs, morality lay in the making of choices, particularly educational choices. Hence moral interest is engaged when choices have to be made between better and worse in the nurture of the young, when an educator stands for certain things and against others, when selections and rejections are made in the construction of the curriculum and in identifying the purposes of the school. This view went a little beyond Dewey and moved in the direction of the social reconstructionism of George S. COUNTS, Childs's friend and colleague.

Counts and Childs were deeply involved in union activities, in the organizing of the New York Liberal Party, for which Childs served as state Chairman, and in several publications, including the radical *Social Frontier*. Childs also carried on a correspondence with Boyd H. BODE. While agreeing on many points, Bode held that the method of intelligence, so importantly enunciated by Dewey, inevitably led to democratic outcomes. Childs instead took Counts's view that students needed to be indoctrinated into democratic and socialist values.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Education and the Philosophy of Experimentalism (New York, 1931).
America, Russia, and the Communist Party in the Postwar World, with George S. Counts (New York, 1943).
Education and Morals: An Experimentalist Philosophy of Education (New York, 1950).
American Pragmatism and Education: An Interpretation and Criticism (New York, 1956).

Other Relevant Works
Childs's papers are at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.
"The Social-economic Situation and Education," in *The Educational Frontier*, ed. William H. Kilpatrick (New York, 1933), pp. 32–72.
"The Educational Philosophy of John Dewey," in *The Philosophy of John Dewey*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (Evanston, Ill., 1939), pp. 419–43.
"Boyd H. Bode and the Experimentalist," *Teachers College Record* 55 (1953): 1–9.

Further Reading

Who Was Who in Amer v8, *Who's Who in Phil*

Dennis, Lawrence J. *From Prayer to Pragmatism: A Biography of John L. Childs* (Carbondale, Ill., 1992).

Lawrence J. Dennis

CHISHOLM, Roderick Milton (1916–99)

Roderick Chisholm was born on 27 November 1916 in North Attleboro, Massachusetts. Chisholm entered Brown University in 1934 with the intention of becoming a journalist. An introductory course in philosophy led him to switch to philosophy. After his graduation with a BA in 1938, he enrolled in the doctoral program at Harvard University, where he obtained a PhD in philosophy in 1942. He entered the US Army in 1942 and served first as administrator of psychological tests to inductees and later as a clinician in army hospitals. Chisholm was discharged in 1946, and he took a position as a lecturer in philosophy of art at the Barnes Foundation in Pennsylvania. The Foundation was associated with the University of Pennsylvania, and Chisholm's position also included an appointment there. He returned to Brown as an assistant professor of philosophy in 1947 and he spent the next forty years on the philosophy faculty at Brown. He also had numerous visiting positions around the United States, taught regularly at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, and for many years, following the end of Brown's spring semester, he taught a seminar at the University of Graz. From 1972 until his retirement in 1987 he was the Andrew W. Mellon Professor of the Humanities at Brown. Chisholm died on 19 January 1999 in Providence, Rhode Island.

Chisholm was the recipient of numerous awards and honors, including appointments as a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1968–9, President of the Metaphysical Society of America, and Executive Director of the Franz Brentano Foundation. Numerous conferences have been held in his honor and several collections of essays examining his work have been published, including a volume in the *Library of Living Philosophers*.

Chisholm is one of the most influential philosophers of the second half of the twentieth century. In addition to presenting novel philosophical theories in a wide variety of areas, Chisholm wrote and taught in a distinctive style that inspired his readers and students. His characteristic methodology was to begin his discussion of a philosophical issue by identifying a few key questions and citing pre-analytic data that an adequate theory should accommodate. He formulated his theories by first introducing a small number of primitive or unanalyzed terms and then constructing an often elaborate system of definitions and principles all built on these primitives. The final principles and definitions provided answers to the questions with which he began and accommodated the data he had cited. The clarity and elegance of the systems were remarkable. Chisholm encouraged readers and students to criticize his systems by proposing counterexamples and objections. They were eager to do so, and Chisholm took great joy in revising and improving upon his views in the light of their comments.

Chisholm published influential work in many areas of philosophy, most notably in epistemology and in metaphysics. His publications in epistemology include his first book, *Perceiving: A Philosophical Study* (1957), *The Foundations of Knowing* (1982), and three editions of *Theory of Knowledge* (1966, 1977, 1989). Several themes are prominent in these works as well as in Chisholm's other epistemological writings. One of them is his anti-skepticism. In an essay describing his philosophical development,

Chisholm reports that the philosopher who most impressed him during his term as the President of the Harvard Philosophy Club was G. E. Moore. He heard Moore present a lecture that was later published as his well-known essay "Four Forms of Skepticism." Like Moore, Chisholm took it as a starting point for his epistemological theorizing that we do have knowledge of the external world. This was not something he thought he could prove to the satisfaction of a skeptic. This idea can be clarified by means of an epistemological topic that intrigued Chisholm throughout his career, the problem of the criterion.

According to Chisholm, epistemology consisted of Socratic inquiry into the questions "What can we know?" and "What are the criteria of knowledge?" He thought that a puzzle faces anyone who attempts to answer these questions. It appears that to answer the first question, one needs a criterion to distinguish things that are known from things that are not known. That is, one needs an answer to the second question. But to have an answer to the second question, he thought, one needs a list of the things one knows so that one can identify the features that distinguish knowledge from its opposite. That is, one needs an answer to the first question. Lacking such an answer, Chisholm feared, one would not be in a position to be confident that any proposed criterion of knowledge was correct. Chisholm calls those who think that they have an answer to the second question that they can use to answer the first "methodists" and those who think that they have an answer to the first question that they can use to answer the second "particularists." Chisholm himself was a particularist, yet he claimed that he had no argument to offer against methodism or against the view that neither question could be answered without a prior answer to the other. In a number of places he said that the problem of the criterion could be answered only by begging the question.

Chisholm's starting point for epistemology was the particularist thesis that we do know those things that reflective common sense tells us we know. Throughout his career Chisholm repeatedly refined and revised an epistemological system characterizing this knowledge. These systems may be the work for which Chisholm is most well known. One crucial part of the system was a set of precise definitions of terms of epistemic appraisal. Using the primitive and undefined concept – being more reasonable than – Chisholm defined the concepts of certainty, being evident, being beyond reasonable doubt, being acceptable, and so on. Each of these terms implies its successor. Thus, if something is certain, then it is (at least) evident, and if it is evident, then it is (at least) beyond reasonable doubt. A key necessary condition for knowing a proposition, according to Chisholm, was that the proposition be evident.

Chisholm used these terms of epistemic appraisal in formulating principles describing the status various propositions had in various circumstances. These principles were heavily revised over the years, yet the general structure remained constant. His outlook was generally that of a "foundationalist." He held that we have a sort of direct knowledge of some of our own psychological properties. These properties were "self-presenting." An example of such a property is "thinking that it is raining." According to an epistemic principle governing self-presenting properties, if you have a self-presenting property, then it is certain for you that you have it. Other properties describe appearances, or, in Chisholm's terminology, how you are appeared to. For example, in the presence of a ripe tomato, you would be appeared to redly. This might also happen in a dream. According to Chisholm when you are appeared to a certain way, then (provided you have no defeating evidence) it is evident to you that something is appearing that way to you and that something actually is that way. Through a complex set of principles, including principles having to do with concurrence or coherence, Chisholm's system had the implication that much of what we ordinarily take ourselves to

know is evident. What is most distinctive about these principles is that they are not instances of more general logical principles and they are not true in virtue of any facts about causal connections or reliability. They are fundamental epistemological facts.

A final epistemological doctrine for which Chisholm is particularly well known is "internalism." Chisholm characterized internalism in the following way: "The internalist assumes that, merely by reflecting upon his own conscious state, he can formulate a set of epistemic principles that will enable him to find out, with respect to any possible belief he has, whether he is *justified* in having that belief. The epistemic principles that he formulates are principles that one may come upon and apply merely by sitting in one's armchair, so to speak, and without calling for any outside assistance. In a word, one need only consider one's own state of mind." (*Theory of Knowledge*, 1989, p. 76) A crucial implication of this doctrine is that people whose conscious states are alike must be justified in believing the same propositions. Also present in the quoted passage is a related theme concerning the autonomy of epistemology. Chisholm held that epistemologists did not need the assistance of the empirical sciences in answering their purely epistemological questions. In advancing these doctrines, Chisholm took issue with the externalist and naturalistic theories, such as the causal theory and reliabilism, that gained favor with many epistemologists toward the end of Chisholm's career.

Chisholm's work in metaphysics (broadly construed) includes influential work on intentionality, the problem of freedom and determinism, the nature of persons, and ontology generally. Chisholm's work on intentionality was greatly influenced by the Austrian philosopher Franz Brentano. A point that played a central role in Brentano's thinking was that a person can think about things such as unicorns and golden mountains – things that don't exist. Furthermore, a person's thoughts can be directed toward things that do exist, such as horses and ordinary mountains. Among the questions that intrigued Chisholm in this area are questions about how the mind succeeds in making its thoughts be about particular objects in the world. One might think that one can think about a particular object by entertaining a proposition that refers to that object. However, Chisholm rejected this view on the grounds that one can believe propositions such as "the tallest man is tall" without thereby having a thought about the individual who happens to be the tallest man. In developing his views about intentionality, Chisholm always held to "the primacy of the intentional" – the idea that the intentionality (or "aboutness") of the mental is basic and is not to be understood in terms of linguistic behavior or linguistic dispositions. The debate over this issue was a central part of a celebrated exchange with Wilfrid SELLARS. In his later work, a theme that emerged is the idea that the primary sort of intentionality is self-attribution. According to this doctrine, attitudes toward abstract propositions and thoughts about external objects are ultimately to be understood in terms of the attribution of properties to oneself. This is the central theme of his influential book, *The First Person* (1981).

Chisholm rejected determinism, holding that human beings did at times act freely and that free actions could not be the result of prior causes outside the agent. Early in his career he advocated a version of the theory of agency which holds that free actions result from a distinctive kind of agent causation. On this view, a person acts freely when the person, rather than any state of the person or event involving the person, is the ultimate cause of the person's behavior. His later writings less clearly advanced this view, though throughout his career Chisholm advocated indeterminism.

In his work on the nature of persons Chisholm claimed that persons are individual substances that continue to exist through changes in their bodies and minds. He consistently rejected the thesis that a person is to be identified with his or her body. Although at times he seemed to endorse the view that a

person is a non-physical soul, what attracted him during the latter part of his career is the idea that persons are "minute proper parts of our gross material bodies" (1979, p. 52). Chisholm did not explicitly endorse this unusual thesis. Instead, he said that "there is something to be said for it" and he suggested that it is the best of the materialistic views of the self. Questions about the relation of persons and bodies are closely connected to more general metaphysical questions about parts and wholes and about the persistence of objects through time. Chisholm addressed all these issues with his characteristic care and precision, making use of clearly identified primitive terms and explicit definitions of the remaining terms employed in his theory. A comprehensive treatment of these topics appears in his book *Person and Object* (1976).

Chisholm also contributed in other areas of philosophy. He wrote some influential papers in ethics, on the nature of intrinsic value, the metaphysics of time, and the ontological status of events and states of affairs. He was a realist about abstract entities. Chisholm's philosophical influence was enormous. While his views on particular issues were often rejected even by those who most admired him, he identified many of the central philosophical issues to be addressed and the adequacy of proposed solutions was often measured by comparison to his own. His contagious love for philosophy inspired his many colleagues and students.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Perceiving: A Philosophical Study (Ithaca, N.Y., 1957).
Human Freedom and the Self (Lawrence, Kan., 1964).
Theory of Knowledge (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1966; 2nd edn 1977; 3rd edn 1989).
The Problem of the Criterion (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1973).
Person and Object: A Metaphysical Study (London, 1976).
The First Person: An Essay on Reference and Intentionality (Minneapolis, 1981).
The Foundations of Knowing (Minneapolis, 1982).
Brentano and Intrinsic Value (New York, 1986).
On Metaphysics (Minneapolis, 1989).
A Realistic Theory of Categories: An Essay on Ontology (Cambridge, UK, 1996).

Other Relevant Works
"Sextus Empiricus and Modern Empiricism," *Philosophy of Science* 8 (1941): 371–84.
"The Problem of the Speckled Hen," *Mind* 51 (1942): 368–73.
"Law Statements and Counterfactual Inference," *Analysis* 15 (1955): 97–105.
"Sentences about Believing," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 56 (1955): 125–48.
"Chisholm-Sellars Correspondence on Intentionality," *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science* 2 (1957): 521–39.
"He Could Have Done Otherwise," *Journal of Philosophy* 64 (1967): 409–18.
"The Indispensability of Internal Justification," *Synthese* 74 (1988): 285–96.
"The Nature of Epistemic Principles," *Noûs* 24 (1990): 209–16.
"On the Simplicity of the Soul," *Philosophical Perspectives* 5 (1991): 157–81.
"Agents, Causes, and Events: The Problem of Free Will," in *Agents, Causes, and Events: Essays on Indeterminism and Free Will*, ed. Timothy O'Connor (New York, 1995), pp. 95–100.

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, *Blackwell Analytic Phil*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v7*, *Proc of APA v72*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*
Alston, William P. "Some Remarks on Chisholm's Epistemology," *Noûs* 14 (1980): 565–86.
Amico, Robert P. "Roderick Chisholm and the Problem of the Criterion," *Philosophical Papers* 17 (1988): 217–30.
Bogdan, Radu, ed. *Roderick M. Chisholm*

(Dordrecht, 1986).

Hahn, Lewis, E., ed. *The Philosophy of Roderick M. Chisholm* (Chicago, 1997). Contains Chisholm's autobiography and bibliography.

Lehrer, Keith, ed. *Analysis and Metaphysics: Essays in Honor of R. M. Chisholm* (Dordrecht, 1975).

Lewis, C. I. "Professor Chisholm and Empiricism," *Journal of Philosophy* 45 (1948): 517–24.

Noonan, Harold. "Chisholm, Persons and Identity," *Philosophical Studies* 69 (1993): 35–58.

"The Philosophical Legacy of Roderick M. Chisholm," *Metaphilosophy* 34 (October 2003). Special issue on Chisholm.

Plantinga, Alvin. "Chisholmian Internalism," in *Philosophical Analysis*, ed. David Austin (Dordrecht, 1988), pp. 127–51.

Rowe, William L. "Two Criticisms of the Agency Theory," *Philosophical Studies* 42 (1982): 363–78.

Shope, Robert. *The Analysis of Knowing: A Decade of Research* (Princeton, N.J., 1983).

Sosa, Ernest, ed. *Essays in the Philosophy of Roderick M. Chisholm, Grazer philosophische Studien* 7/8 (Amsterdam, 1979).

Richard Feldman

CHO, Kah Kyung (1927–)

Kah Kyung Cho was born on 7 June 1927 in Seoul, Korea as the eldest son of Myo Dong Cho and Kum Ran Shin, who had seven children. After graduating from Seoul National University with a BA in 1952, he studied for four years in Heidelberg and received his PhD in philosophy in 1957 under Karl Löwith with a dissertation entitled "Die Einheit von Natur und Geist." From 1957 until 1969, he taught philosophy at Seoul National University, with appointments in between as Fulbright visiting professor in Yale in 1961–2, Buffalo in 1967–8, and as Alexander von Humboldt Foundation research scholar at the Husserl Archives in Cologne in 1963. In 1970 he moved permanently to Buffalo as successor to Marvin FARBER's chair of phenomenology. He was also visiting professor at the University of Frankfurt in 1976, University of Texas in 1977, and fellow of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science at Osaka in 1990. He was named SUNY Distinguished Professor in 1994.

Cho's contribution to philosophy is most visible in his initiating and maintaining a critical dialogue of intercultural phenomenology. His global vision encompasses both the Western and Eastern tradition, as is indicated by the subtitle "*phänomenologischer West-Ost-Diwan*" of his representative work, *Bewußtsein und Natursein*. In contrast to the genre of phenomenology that correlates the Being of *nature* solely with the domain of objects constituted in consciousness, Cho directs his thought to the otherness of Being that cannot be tallied by means of parsimoniously doled-out intentional act series. "Water let through the controlled sluice gate" is not a lively image of nature that "weaves and strives" and often "takes us by surprise."

What prompted Cho's engagement in an East–West dialogue had little to do with the movement of phenomenology as such. It was rather Heidegger's conception of Being with its underhanded appeal to "decentralize" the human subjectivity that fostered an ambience congenial to explicating it with the language of Taoism. To such language belonged "nothingness," "diminution of self," and "withdrawal." However, Cho addressed this issue not from the usual vantage point of Eastern philosophy so as to prove Heidegger's indebtedness to Lao Tzu. Instead, he held on to the question of internal consistency in Heidegger's conception of Being which could show as much affinity with Taoism as with the older Greek experience of *physis* and Eckehart's notion of Deity.

If Heidegger's relationship to Lao Tzu meant a challenge for Cho to provide a much needed "corrective" to a question floating in speculation, Cho found in Husserl's genetic phenomenology a very specific and systematic aptitude to the problems of comparative and intercultural understanding. For Husserl has gone far beyond the intentional constitution of the alien as "the extension of the familiar" and delved deeper into the dimension of the temporally and culturally Other. Cho, on his part, is committed to an ethnomethodological development of this genetic aspect of phenomenology to render the neglected heritage of the East relevant. The otherness in history, society, and in human mores in general requires the methodical articulation of the ethnic plurality in such indexically essential notions as Self, Time, Language, Community, and World.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Philosophy of Existence (Seoul, 1961; 13th edn 1995).

Ontology, with Myung-no Yun and Myung-kwan Choi (Seoul, 1965).

Bewußtsein und Natursein: Phänomenologischer West-Ost-Diwan (Freiburg, 1987).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Philosophy and Science in Phenomenological Perspective* (Dordrecht, 1984).

Ed. with J. Hahn, *Phänomenologie in Korea* (Freiburg, 2001).

Further Reading

Guignon, Charles B. and Nam In Lee. "A Phenomenological Dialogue between East and West," *American Philosophical Association Newsletter* (Spring 2002): 43–6.

Vetter, Helmuth. "Die Frage nach dem 'Natursein' bei Heidegger aus der Sicht von Kah Kyung Cho," in *Phänomenologie der Natur*, ed. K. Cho and Y. Lee (Freiburg, 1999), pp. 15–29.

Nam-In Lee

CHOMSKY, Noam Avram (1928–)

Noam Chomsky was born on 7 December 1928 to William (Zev) Chomsky and Elsie Simonofsky in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. His father had emigrated to the United States from Russia, and was an eminent scholar on the history and teaching of Hebrew. Noam entered the University of Pennsylvania in 1945. There he came in contact with Zellig HARRIS, a prominent linguist and the founder of Pennsylvania's linguistics department, the first in the United States. In 1947 Chomsky decided to major in linguistics, and in 1949 he began his graduate studies in that field. His BA honors thesis *Morphophonemics of Modern Hebrew* (1949, revised as an MA thesis in 1951) contains several ideas that foreshadow Chomsky's later work in generative grammar. In 1949 he married the linguist Carol Schatz. During the years 1951 to 1955 Chomsky was a junior fellow of the Harvard University Society of Fellows. Pennsylvania awarded Chomsky the PhD in linguistics in 1955; his dissertation was titled "Transformational Analysis" (published as part of *The Logical Structure of Linguistic Theory* in 1975).

Chomsky received a faculty position at MIT in 1955 and he has been teaching there ever since. In 1961 he was appointed full professor in the department of modern languages and linguistics; the graduate program in linguistics began the same year. In 1966 he was appointed Ferrari Ward Professor of Linguistics; in 1976, he became Institute Professor. In the same year, the linguistics and philosophy programs at MIT were merged to form the department of linguistics and philosophy; this has been Chomsky's home department ever since.

Alongside his career as a linguist, Chomsky has been active in left-wing politics. In 1965 he organized a citizen's committee to publicize tax refusal in protest at the war in Vietnam. Four years later he published his first book on politics, *American Power and the New Mandarins.* By the 1980s he had become both the most distinguished figure of American linguistics and one of the most influential left-wing critics of American foreign policy. He has been extremely prolific as a writer: thirty-three books in linguistics (broadly construed), and in excess of forty books on politics. According to a 1992 tabulation of sources from the previous twelve years in the Arts and Humanities Citation Index, Chomsky was the most frequently cited person alive, and one of the eight most frequently cited authors of all time.

Chomsky's intellectual life had been divided between his work in linguistics and his political activism, philosophy coming as a distant third. Nonetheless, his influence among analytic philosophers has been enormous due to three factors. First, Chomsky contributed substantially to a major methodological shift in the human sciences, turning away from the prevailing empiricism of the middle of the twentieth century: behaviorism in psychology, structuralism in linguistics, and positivism in philosophy. Second, his groundbreaking books on syntax (1957, 1965) laid a conceptual foundation for a new, cognitivist approach to linguistics and provided philosophers with a new framework for thinking about human language and the mind. And finally, he has persistently defended his views against all takers, engaging in important debates with many of the major figures in analytic philosophy including Tyler Burge, Donald DAVIDSON, Michael Dummett, Saul KRIPKE, Thomas NAGEL, Hilary PUTNAM, W. V. O. QUINE, and John SEARLE.

Traditional linguistics produced recommendations about socially acceptable forms of speech, guidelines for learning hitherto unknown languages, hypotheses about the origin and development of vernaculars, and a large amount of useful data concerning their current and actual phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics. It is hard to avoid the impression that there is no unified subject matter here. Cognitive linguistics, as Chomsky conceives of it, is the study of the language faculty of individual human minds (and ultimately brains). The key observation is that having a language is a *species property* of *homo sapiens*, both in the sense that linguistic *competence* (what speakers of a language know in virtue of being speakers) is remarkably uniform across members of our species, and in the sense that a similar competence cannot be found among members of other species. The uniformity of linguistic competence among humans had been obscured by excessive focus on the diversity of linguistic *performance* of speakers (facts about their actual linguistic behavior) and on the diversity of languages spoken in the world. But, according to Chomsky, brute observation of speaker behavior is a poor guide in linguistics and underneath the apparent diversity we can discover universal principles of human languages. The lack of linguistic competence among non-human animals is obscured by the fact that some of them (such as bees or dolphins) have the capacity to communicate and by the limited success researchers have had in teaching some of them (like chimpanzees and orangutans) to understand simple verbal instructions. But existing systems of animal communication consist of a finite set of symbols, and there is no evidence that animals can acquire much more than that through instruction. Language, on the other hand, has a recursive grammar capable of generating a potentially infinite set of expressions. Although we humans do employ language for the purpose of communication (as well as for the purposes of self-expression, clarification of thoughts, constructing and strengthening social ties, and so on), Chomsky denies that communication is an inherent function of our language and in general rejects the contention that language should be studied in the context of human interactions.

To characterize what is distinctive in his way of specifying the subject matter of linguistics, Chomsky (1986) introduced the distinction

between *I-language* and *E-language*. He thinks the proper subject of the study of language is the former: a natural object *internal* to the brain of an *individual* whose working is representable as a function-in-*intension* generating structural descriptions of (as opposed to mere strings of) expressions. I-language is to be studied in a way in which we might approach, for example, the visual system. In both cases the systems produce representations employed to facilitate thought and action, but their scientific study must abstract away from the relations these representations bear to objects in the world. (An immediate consequence of this is that semantics, insofar as it is thought to investigate language–world relations, must be an ill-conceived enterprise.) By contrast, E-language is something *external* to individuals, either a social object constituted by norms and conventions, or some abstract object, say, a set of sentences. The traditional notion of a language (like Bulgarian or Swahili) and the traditional notion of a dialect (like the Norfolk or the Yorkshire dialect of British English) are of no scientific use. Variations among competent speakers may be considered significant or insignificant for a variety of purposes and there is nothing systematic to be said about these classifications. Chomsky often mentions the *bon mot* that a language is a dialect with an army and a navy; occasionally he even expresses doubts about the very coherence of the notion of an E-language.

According to Chomsky, the language faculty is part of our biological endowment, and as such it is largely genetically determined. The chief argument for this view comes from facts about language acquisition. According to the *poverty of stimulus argument*, there are many aspects of the linguistic competence of adult speakers that could not have been learned on the basis of the primary linguistic data available for the child during the period of language acquisition (sentences and pseudo-sentences heard along with accompanying gestures and other situational clues). Consequently, these aspects are never learned and must be *innately*

specified. Additional empirical evidence for innateness comes from research showing that language acquisition is remarkably fast, devoid of certain sorts of errors we would *prima facie* expect, and comes in characteristic stages whose order and duration seem independent of environmental factors. Chomsky's hypothesis is that language arises in the mind of the child through a realization in the brain of a language faculty, which begins in an *initial state* (also called *Universal Grammar*), goes through a series of intermediate states, and reaches a *steady state*, which is no longer subject to fundamental changes.

The conceptual framework of Chomsky's early work on syntax has been extremely influential among philosophers, to some extent because his distinction between *deep* and *surface structure* seemed to sit well with the tradition within analytic philosophy (going back to Bertrand Russell's theory of descriptions) that the surface appearance of a sentence often masks its true structure. In Chomsky (1965), grammar is divided into two levels of representation: the deep structure generated by the recursive rules of a context-free phrase structure grammar (this is what makes the grammar *generative*) and the surface structure derived from the deep structure through the application of transformation rules (this is what makes it *transformational*). Much of the subsequent development of the theory in the 1970s can be viewed as a series of attempts to formulate constraints on both the generative and the transformational components. (An example of the former is the development of *X-bar theory*, which specifies a common internal structural skeleton for all phrases; an example of the latter is the proposal to reduce the available movements to the single rule ("*move â*"), whose applicability is then restricted by a few general constraints.) Although the details underwent considerable change by the end of the 1970s, the fundamental framework remained the same.

Starting with Chomsky (1981), however, the familiar framework was abandoned. Chomsky

began to think of Universal Grammar as a system of innate *principles* combined with a certain number of (probably binary) *parameters* whose values are not genetically fixed. Language acquisition is then a process of parameter setting, and the fundamental ways in which human languages differ can be characterized in terms of the values of these parameters. In a complex system with a rich internal structure the change in a single parameter can have a wide variety of consequences proliferating in various parts of the grammar. What is universal – *pace* parametric variation – according to Chomsky, is syntax. The apparent syntactic variety of human languages is the result of variations in idiosyncratic morphological features originating in the lexicon: inflectional morphemes or functional elements, such as tense and case. This picture implies a radical methodological shift in the study of language. If the theory is on the right track, the construction of rule systems for particular languages can no longer be regarded as the central task for linguistics. Instead, the structure of *any* particular human language should be studied through the study of human languages *in general*, through uncovering the principles of Universal Grammar and through the identification of parameters whose setting accounts for linguistic variation.

An example of an innate principle is that all grammatical operation is *structure dependent*; this principle rules out, for example, an operation that would move the second word of a sentence to the front, and thereby accounts for the fact that children tend not to try out sequences such as *"Of glasses water are on the table?" when they seek the interrogative counterpart of "Glasses of water are on the table." An example of an innate parameter is the *head (position) parameter* whose setting determines whether within a phrase the head precedes the complement, as in English, or follows it, as in Korean. Assuming the parameter is binary, the prediction is that there are no intermediate cases: Universal Grammar dictates that in a possible human language that has phrases

where the head must come first there cannot be phrases where the head must come last. There are, however, *polysynthetic* languages, like Mohawk, where there is no fixed order. It has been hypothesized that this is due to another parameter, set one way in Mohawk and another way in English and Korean.

Chomsky (1993, 1995) has initiated a new research program within the boundaries of the principles and parameters framework. The central idea of *the minimalist program* is the hypothesis that the language faculty is, in a sense, a perfect device. Representations and derivations are in fact as minimal as it is conceptually possible, given the constraints put on them by the fact that they have to interact with the *performance systems* (articulatory-perceptual systems and conceptual-intentional systems). The assumption is that the derivation of sentences begins with a set of items drawn from the lexicon and the *computational system* then attempts to derive a pair of representations, one component of which is a *phonetic form* (PF) and the other the *logical form* (LF). Lexical items are supposed to be bundles of *features*, some of which are formal (e.g., tense), some phonological (e.g., that 'know' is pronounced as /nô/), some semantic (e.g., that 'table' is [artifact]). They are *merged* one by one to form successively larger and larger syntactic objects. After a certain point (called *spell-out*) the derivation splits: semantic operations continue without any overt phonological realization to produce LF and phonological operations continue without affecting the meaning of the syntactic object.

The drive behind movement (the reason why a random array of lexical items is typically not grammatical) is the fact that certain *features* are uninterpretable for the conceptual-intentional system, that features can only be erased (the technical term is *checked*) when an appropriate pair of them stand in the right sort of structural relation to one another, and that a well-formed representation must be fully interpreted. This last principle of Universal Grammar is called the *principle of full interpretation*. (For

example, the reason the string *"He not loves her" is ungrammatical is that the third person singular nominative features of the verb cannot be checked by the subject separated from it by "not." So, the relevant features of "loves" move out of their position, carrying with them the phonetic features corresponding to "-s" as well, and attach themselves to the auxiliary "do" appropriately related to the subject resulting in "He does not love her".) Movements are constrained by *economy principles*, which require, in effect, that they occur only as a last resort and in a manner that requires the least effort. If anything counts as surface form in this picture, it must be the phonetic form. Everything else (including the logical form, which is *not* conceived of as a formula of some preferred formal language whose inferential properties match the inferential properties of the derived sentence) counts as "deep". And, as Chomsky has repeatedly emphasized, the surface grammar of philosophical analysis has no status whatsoever.

Given his characterization of language as a system of knowledge – his willingness to downplay the significance of actual performance, to emphasize the creative aspect of language use, to endorse innate principles of grammar, and to postulate structure invisible on the surface – Chomsky is rightly regarded as an heir to the rationalist tradition in the philosophy of language and mind. He himself has often emphasized his indebtedness to such a tradition, especially to the *Port-Royal Grammar* and to Humboldt; see especially Chomsky (1966). But there are important aspects in which Chomsky's views diverge from the rationalist picture. First of all, in speaking about linguistic competence he is willing to consider a kind of knowledge that is (although innate) not based on reason. In fact, the very idea of a justification for a certain aspect of our competence seems out of place. Second, he does not think that Universal Grammar bears any interesting relation to the structure of reality. Moreover, he does not think that Universal Grammar evolved under any particular evolutionary pressure that interaction with our environment may have created. Third, given his radical internalism about language, Chomsky rejects semantic theories that are based on truth and reference and consequently require the study of language–world relations. In doing so, he forfeits a major part of the rationalist enterprise, namely, the justification of logical inference (that is, the justification of the *truth*-preserving character of such inferences) on the basis of the postulation of an underlying logical form.

There is a final, crucial respect in which Chomsky breaks with the rationalist tradition. Rationalism in philosophy knows no fundamental obstacle to the expansion of human knowledge; it is the empiricists who have placed special emphasis on the limits of thought by insisting that experience places severe constraints on concept formation. Being an innatist, Chomsky does not believe in empiricist constraints on thought – he advocates his own conception of limitations instead. He has often spoken of a *science-forming faculty* conceived along the same basic lines as the language faculty. The fundamental principles of the science-forming faculty are genetically encoded and environmental factors permit only minor variations. Just as rats seem genetically incapable of dealing with certain mazes, humans may well be barred from unlocking some of the secrets of nature. He calls questions within the scope of the science-forming faculty *problems*, and distinguishes them sharply from *mysteries* that are outside that scope. The problems of consciousness and free will may well be mysteries, according to Chomsky. Be that as it may, Chomsky advocates the pursuit of fundamental questions – whether or not they turn out to be problems – with uniform scientific vigor without any pre- or post-scientific prejudice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Syntactic Structures (The Hague, 1957).
Current Issues in Linguistic Theory (The Hague, 1964).

Aspects of the Theory of Syntax (Cambridge, Mass., 1965).

Cartesian Linguistics (New York, 1966).

Sound Pattern of English, with Morris Halle (New York, 1968).

American Power and the New Mandarins (New York, 1969).

Problems of Knowledge and Freedom: The Russell Lectures (New York, 1971).

Studies on Semantics in Generative Grammar (The Hague, 1972).

Language and Mind (New York, 1972).

The Logical Structure of Linguistic Theory (Chicago, 1975).

Reflections on Language: The Whidden Lectures (New York, 1975).

Essays on Form and Interpretation (New York, 1977).

Morphophonemics of Modern Hebrew (New York, 1979).

Rules and Representations (New York, 1980).

Lectures on Government and Binding: The Pisa Lectures (Dordrecht, 1981).

Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding (Cambridge, Mass., 1982).

Barriers (Cambridge, Mass., 1986).

Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin, and Use (New York, 1986).

The Chomsky Reader, ed. James Peck (New York, 1987).

Language and Politics, ed. C. P. Otero (Montréal, 1988; 2nd edn, Oakland, Cal., 2004).

Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media, with Edward S. Herman (New York, 1988).

Deterring Democracy (New York, 1991).

Language and Thought (Wakefield, R.I., 1993).

Language and the Problem of Knowledge: The Managua Lectures (Cambridge. Mass., 1994).

World Orders, Old and New (New York, 1994).

The Minimalist Program (Cambridge, Mass., 1995).

New Horizons in the Study of Language and Mind (Cambridge, Mass., 2000).

On Nature and Language (Cambridge, UK, 2002).

Understanding Power: The Indispensable Chomsky, ed. Peter R. Mitchell and John Schoeffel (New York, 2002).

Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for Global Dominance (New York, 2003).

Other Relevant Works

"Skinner's *Verbal Behaviour*," *Language* 35 (1959): 26–58.

"On Certain Formal Properties of Grammars," *Information and Control* 2 (1959): 137–67.

"Recent Contributions to the Theory of Innate Ideas," *Synthese* 17 (1967): 2–11.

"Quine's Empirical Assumptions," in *Words and Objections: Essays on the Work of W. V. Quine*, ed. Donald Davidson and Jaakko Hintikka (Dordrecht, 1969), pp. 53–68.

"Remarks on Nominalization," in *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, ed. R. A. Jacobs and P. S. Rosenbaum (Waltham, Mass., 1970), pp. 184–221.

"Principles and Parameters in Syntactic Theory," in *Explanation in Linguistics: The Logical Problem of Language Acquisition*, ed. N. Hornstein and D. Lightfoot (London, 1981).

"Language and Problems of Knowledge," *Synthesis Philosophica* 5 (1988): 1–25.

"Accessibility 'in Principle'," *Brain and Behavioral Science* 13 (1990): 600–601.

"Explaining Language Use," *Philosophical Topics* 20 (1992): 205–31.

"A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory," in *The View from Building 20*, ed. K. Hale and J. Keyser (Cambridge, Mass., 1993).

"Chomsky, Noam," in *A Companion to the Philosophy of Mind*, ed. Samuel Guttenplan (Oxford, 1994), pp. 153–67.

"Language and Nature," *Mind* 104 (1995): 1–61.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, Blackwell Analytic Phil, Blackwell Comp Phils, Comp Amer Thought, Encyc Amer Bio, Oxford Comp Phil, Routledge Encycl Phil

Baker, Mark. *The Atoms of Language* (New York, 2001).

Barsky, Robert F. *Noam Chomsky: A Life of Dissent* (Cambridge, Mass., 1997).

Cowie, Fiona. *What is Within? Nativism Reconsidered* (Oxford, 1999).

Crain, Stephen, and Rosalind Thornton. *Investigations in Universal Grammar: A Guide to Experiments on the Acquisition of Syntax and Semantics* (Cambridge, Mass., 2000).

D'Agostino, Fred. *Chomsky's System of Ideas* (Oxford, 1986).

Fodor, Jerry. "The Present Status of the Innateness Controversy," in *Representations* (Cambridge, Mass., 1981), pp. 257–316.

George, Alexander, ed. *Reflections on Chomsky* (Oxford, 1989).

Green, Judith. *Psycholinguistics: Chomsky and Psychology* (Harmondsworth, UK, 1972).

Harman, Gilbert, ed. *On Noam Chomsky: Critical Essays* (New York, 1974).

Harris, Randy A. *The Linguistics Wars* (Oxford, 1993).

Hawkins, John A., ed. *Explaining Language Universals* (Oxford, 1988).

Higginbotham, James. "Elucidations of Meaning," *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12 (1989): 465–517.

Hornstein, Norbert, and Louise Anthony, eds. *Chomsky and His Critics* (Oxford, 2003).

Jackendoff, Ray. *Foundations of Language: Brain, Meaning, Grammar, Evolution* (Oxford, 2002).

Kasher, Asa, ed. *The Chomskyan Turn* (Oxford, 1993).

Kayne, Richard. *Parameters and Universals* (Oxford, 2001).

Larson, Richard, and Gabriel Segal. *Knowledge of Meaning* (Cambridge, Mass., 1995).

Leiber, Justin. *Noam Chomsky: A Philosophic Overview* (Boston, 1975).

Lewinton, Richard. "The Evolution of Cognition," in *An Invitation to Cognitive Science*, ed. D. N. Osherson and E. E. Smith (Cambridge, Mass., 1990), vol. 3, pp. 229–46.

Lyons, John. *Noam Chomsky* (New York, 1970).

McGilvray, James, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Chomsky* (Cambridge, UK, 2005).

Nagel, Thomas. "Chomsky: Linguistics and Epistemology," in *Other Minds: Critical Essays, 1969–1994* (Oxford, 1995).

Piatelli-Palmarini, Mario, ed. *Language and Learning: The Debate between Jean Piaget and Noam Chomsky* (Cambridge, Mass., 1980).

Pinker, Stephen. *The Language Instinct: How the Mind Creates Language* (New York, 1994).

Putnam, Hilary. "The 'Innateness Hypothesis' and Explanatory Models in Linguistics," *Synthese* 17 (1967): 12–22.

Quine, W. V. "Reply to Chomsky," in *Words and Objections: Essays on the Work of W. V. Quine*, ed. Donald Davidson and Jaakko Hintikka (Dordrecht, 1969), pp. 302–11.

———, "Methodological Reflections on Current Linguistic Theory," *Synthese* 21 (1970): 386–98.

Robinson, Ian. *The New Grammarians' Funeral: A Critique of Noam Chomsky's Linguistics* (Cambridge, UK, 1975).

Smith, Neil. *Chomsky: Ideas and Ideals* (Cambridge, UK, 1999; 2nd edn, 2004).

Smith, Neil, and Deirdre Wilson. *Modern Linguistics: The Results of Chomsky's Revolution* (Bloomington, Ind., 1979).

Zoltán Gendler Szabó

CHURCH, Alonzo (1903–95)

Alonzo Church was born on 4 June 1903 in Washington, D.C., and died on 11 August 1995 in Hudson, Minnesota. His father, Samuel Robbins Church, was a justice of the municipal court of Washington, D.C., and his grandfather had been librarian of the United States Senate. He was an undergraduate at Princeton University, where he received his BA in mathematics in 1924. He married Mary Julia Kuczinski on 25 August 1925 and the marriage lasted until her death in 1976. Church remained at Princeton for his doctoral work, which he pursued under Oswald VEBLEN. Veblen had written a great deal on logic in the time that he was at Princeton and, with his encouragement, Church followed the path of the study of mathematical logic. He received his PhD in mathematics in 1927, writing a dissertation on the axiom of choice (or, as it was more often called in those days, "Zermelo's Axiom"). The choice of topic was not entirely out of keeping with the style of logic characteristic of Veblen and the era around the beginning of the twentieth century, especially in the United States. Veblen was of the generation called the "Postulate Theorists," who were especially devoted to looking at systems of axioms for deductive systems and identifying basic characteristics. In particular, they were looking at issues of consistency, independency, and completeness. This reflected the influence of David Hilbert's treatment of geometry, which had been rapidly translated from German into English.

After Church's graduation he obtained a fellowship for study at Harvard University and elsewhere. He spent the academic year 1927–8 at Harvard, where there was a good deal of philosophical interest in logic, and then proceeded to the University of Göttingen, where Hilbert and his collaborator Paul Bernays were studying logic and looking at issues of exposition as well. After Göttingen, Church proceeded to Amsterdam, where he spent time with the Dutch mathematician L. E. J. Brouwer. Even though Brouwer and Hilbert disagreed over the fundamental issue of the logical foundation of mathematics, Church seems to have been able to learn from both of them without feeling involved enough to take sides. One of the characteristics of much of Church's writing was a willingness to investigate approaches to mathematics or language without discounting their possible fruitfulness.

On his return from Europe, Veblen was instrumental in procuring for Church an appointment as assistant professor of mathematics at Princeton in 1929. He had supported Church in his application for fellowship support and felt that he had the chance to continue Veblen's efforts to make Princeton one of the centers for research in logic as a part of mathematics. It is clear from Church's recollections of his early years that there were colleagues who did not regard logic as a particularly valuable or intellectually respectable branch of mathematics. If so, Church was one of those who did the most to transform the impression of logic within the mathematical community.

Church's influence on logic took several forms. One was his central role in getting *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* inaugurated. He argued that standard mathematical journals did not have enough room for the important research in logic, basing this both on his experiences as writer and as referee. As a result, the new journal would encourage students to pursue logic and to remain in the field, since their efforts would have an outlet. He was responsible from its inception for the "Reviews" section, recruiting the leaders in the field of logic to contribute evaluations (and not just abstracts) of articles and books in the area. In response to complaints that the reviewers were inclined to do too much evaluation, Church responded that it was important for good work to be distinguished (and, by contrast, for bad work to be chastised). One of his continuing concerns in raising the status of logic within the mathematical community was to point out to his colleagues that even logi-

cians were capable of recognizing nonsense that tried to pass under the guise of logic. In the early days of the *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, Church could be found doing all the tasks from typing to binding the issues, although he did not retain the editorial direction beyond the reviews section for nearly so many years. In addition to his labor, he also was instrumental in making sure that funding was available for supporting the publication, and Princeton University was one of the institutions that provide that support.

One of the most ambitious projects that Church undertook on behalf of the Association for Symbolic Logic was putting together a bibliography of symbolic logic. That involved coming up with criteria for inclusion, which led to his selecting a paper of Leibniz from 1666 as the first entry, and with guidelines for which parts of recent mathematics did not need to be included. Subsequent evolution of the field of logic has led to encompassing a little more territory than Church included, but the bibliography was a kind of programmatic statement about the distinguished history of the field and the increasing rate of recent publication.

Another form of influence was his teaching. Church had perhaps the most distinguished collection of logicians in history as his graduate students at Princeton, and they went forth to spread the gospel of logic to universities throughout the country. Stephen Cole KLEENE and J. Barkley Rosser were two of the first three, and their work, originally together with Church and then subsequently independently, helped to create the discipline of recursive function theory and to clarify consequences of the fundamental work of Kurt GÖDEL on the incompleteness of arithmetic. Alan Turing came from England to obtain a doctorate from Church, a tribute to Church's status at a time when Turing already had impressive academic accomplishments to his name. Other names that appear on the list of Church's students are John KEMENY, Dana SCOTT, Raymond Smullyan, Leon Henkin, Martin Davis, W. W.

Boone, Hartley Rogers, Michael Rabin, and Simon Kochen. The range of work that was undertaken by these students and its influence on the direction of logic attest to what Church's supervision accomplished.

Church's course on logic at Princeton was transformed into a textbook under the title *Introduction to Mathematical Logic*, which appeared in 1944 in the series "Annals of Mathematics," published by Princeton University Press, and then in an expanded form as an independent volume. The introduction to that volume provides one of the most thorough accounts of Church's view of the foundations for logic, and the number of footnotes that he uses to explain his views in greater detail probably detracted from its appearance as a text in 1956. However, those footnotes do attest to the breadth of Church's reading and his readiness to tackle issues in detail that had been raised by contemporaries like Rudolf CARNAP, Alfred TARSKI, and W. V. QUINE. By the time the book came out, it was not the only competitor in the field, and the market for logic texts was distinctly less robust than for other branches of mathematics. Still, the volume had a lasting influence, and served as one of the standard references for many years.

The third line of influence was, of course, his publications, and Church produced in his first decade a couple that altered the face of logic forever. One task that he confronted was coming up with a mathematically precise way of specifying what it means for a function to be "effectively computable." The intuitive notion was sufficient for contemporaries to feel that they could get a handle on the subject, but that was never Church's preferred method of proceeding. As he points out in the introduction to his textbook, formalization was an essential tool for judging the value of any contribution to mathematical thought (and he likely felt that the same criterion was useful in a broader sphere). As a result, he was obliged to come up with a system that would enable the notion of "computability" to be spelled out explicitly.

The system that Church created is known as the "lambda calculus." The name comes from the use of the Greek letter lambda as a kind of operator that identifies what function is being talked about as a prefix for a description of that function. The system was originally introduced as part of a foundation Church wanted to lay for all of mathematics, but his students Kleene and Rosser were able to show that the system as a whole was inconsistent. In addition to this discovery's causing Kleene to have to rewrite his thesis, it also forced Church to look at his system and to try to detach the functional part from the logical part. It was the former which is modeled by the lambda calculus, and Church devoted some attention to proving that it was consistent. He devoted a book to the lambda calculus and used it as a tool for approaching many issues about computability. The approach of the lambda calculus was connected with that of combinatory logic, as developed concurrently by Haskell CURRY.

The lambda calculus was not, however, the only system that was being offered for providing a precise notion of computability. Gödel came up with an approach of "recursive functions," and his definitions had a slightly more intuitive character than those of the lambda calculus. The influence of Gödel on Church and vice versa can be debated, although they were aware of one another's work. As Church was trying fully to understand the notion of "computability," he was pleased to discover that his system and Gödel's were equivalent in that they picked out the same set of functions as computable. This led him to surmise that perhaps all satisfactory definitions of computable led to the same class of functions. This surmise, which starts in tentative fashion in letters, became known as "Church's Thesis" and provided much of the original motivation behind the investigation of different models for computability. It was not clear how far Church himself trusted the thesis that he had propounded and which, by its very nature, could not be given a form in which it could be proved. (There is a contrast here with intu-itionistic mathematics, in which Church's thesis can be explicitly formulated.)

What finally convinced Church of the truth of the thesis was Turing's characterization of computability in terms of machines. The intuitive character of Turing's description of how a computation must proceed was especially attractive to Church, and it did add one more to the list of characterizations that was provably equivalent to the lambda calculus. Once the thesis is accepted, then the specific form of definition for computability begins to lose importance, and one of the consequences was a decrease in attention to the lambda calculus. That ebb was, however, brought to a rapid end with the rise of computer programming languages of the functional variety. The LISP computer language, for example, was inspired by the lambda calculus, and other subsequent languages also took up issues that Church had already considered.

Church was one of the first mathematicians to try to understand exactly the consequences of Gödel's proof that arithmetic was not complete. Originally, he had the hope that Gödel's negative result depended crucially on the features of the system of *Principia Mathematica* which were the basis of his published work. In particular, he thought that perhaps the typed system of the work of Bertrand Russell and Alfred North WHITEHEAD was what laid it open to Gödel's decisive rejoinder. On more careful examination (and perhaps after his conversations with Gödel), he recognized that the argument was more significant than he had suspected. Church turned the argument that Gödel had proposed into a slightly different direction and showed that it could be used to demonstrate that first-order logic was not decidable, that is, that there was no effective procedure for deciding the truth or falsity of every statement in predicate logic. This negative result ran parallel with results indicating that particular branches of predicate logic did have effective decision procedures.

Church rose through the ranks at Princeton, becoming associate professor in 1939 and full

professor in 1947. He seemed destined to remain there, but Princeton did have a mandatory retirement policy and the university indicated that, after Church's retirement, it would no longer be willing to support the secretarial efforts needed to continue to produce the Reviews section of *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*. As a result, Church sought a new home that would provide for the journal as well. He became professor of philosophy and mathematics at the University of California at Los Angeles in 1967. By this time he was sixty-four, and it may have been assumed that his stay in Los Angeles would be a short one. Church's devotion to work, however, kept him at UCLA until 1990, although he gave up editing the Reviews section in 1979. His reason, even then, for giving up that task was not increasing age, but his disagreement with a change in policy forced upon the editor of the Reviews by the editorial board of the journal. Financial exigency led them to cut back on the number of items being reviewed, and Church felt that was a dangerous alteration. Part of his attitude about the importance of not taking bad work for granted may have been due to his recollections of the environment when he first came to Princeton and logic needed to earn its reputation in the eyes of the rest of the mathematical community.

After his retirement from UCLA, Church moved to Hudson, Minnesota, in order to be near his son Alonzo Church, Jr. He continued to remain intellectually active and to respond to inquiries from historians and philosophers about details of controversies and discussions from sixty years before. His first paper had appeared in 1924 and one appeared in the year of his death, as well. That kind of logical longevity is one explanation of his lasting influence. He received honorary degrees from Case Western Reserve University, Princeton, and the State University of New York at Buffalo.

Another explanation was his patient and dogged devotion to making points as carefully as he could. Church was never a gifted stylist like Quine, but many of his off-hand comments, as made in correspondence or in the pages of reviews in *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, have a sharpness all their own. His views on foundations did not crystallize too early, as he was not even aware of the work of Gottlob Frege until after his initial work at Princeton in the early 1930s. His exposure to Frege led to his adopting a certain amount of the Fregean machinery of "sense" and "denotation," as he preferred to translate "Sinn" and "Bedeutung." That machinery he then used to tackle some of the philosophical problems that he saw as fundamental for the formalization of mathematics and ordinary language. Among the notions to which he devoted attention was that of synonymy, where he crossed swords with Carnap. His work on the paradoxes of analysis and of the name relation tackled other proposed solutions head-on. The goal for Church was always a fruitful formal system in which to work. He did not agree with those who felt that logic could be done without a commitment to abstract entities and his efforts at a universal semantics suggest that he felt that Tarski's limitative results could somehow be circumvented. In many cases, his suggestions of philosophical disagreement (expressed perhaps in a footnote) were not worked out in sufficient detail to constitute philosophical arguments but were conducive to elaboration by others.

Perhaps the best example of Church's pragmatic judgment concerned intuitionistic logic and its refusal to accept the law of the excluded middle. In his careful and explicit fashion, Church pointed out that one could work with a logical system which included the law of the excluded middle, or one could work with a logical system which did not make explicit use of the law, or one could work with a logical system which involved the rejection of the law. Any of these was a legitimate target for mathematical investigation, and the value of any of them, he implied, was where it led by way of mathematical content. This pragmatic view of the foundations of logic communicated itself to students of his as well.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Alternatives to Zermelo's Assumption," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 29 (1927): 178–208.

"On the Law of the Excluded Middle," *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 34 (1928): 75–8.

"A Note on the Entscheidungsproblem," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 1 (1936): 101–2.

"An Unsolvable Problem of Elementary Number Theory," *American Journal of Mathematics* 58 (1936): 345–63.

Bibliography of Symbolic Logic (Menasha, Wisc., 1937–9).

The Calculi of Lambda Conversion (Princeton, N.J., 1941).

Introduction to Mathematical Logic (Princeton, N.J., 1956).

"Intensional Isomorphism and Identity of Belief," *Philosophical Studies* 5 (1954): 65–73.

"Intensionality and the Paradox of the Name Relation," in *Themes from Kaplan*, ed. Joseph Almog, John Perry, and Howard Wettstein (New York, 1989), pp. 151–66.

"A Revised Formulation of the Logic of Sense and Denotation," *Noûs* 27 (1993): 141–57.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v8*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v12*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Anderson, C. Anthony. "Alonzo Church's Contributions to Philosophy and Intensional Logic," *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 4 (1998): 129–71.

Anderson, C. Anthony, and Michael Zelëny, eds. *Logic, Meaning, and Computation: Essays in Memory of Alonzo Church* (Dordrecht, 2001).

Aspray, William. "Oswald Veblen and the Origins of Mathematical Logic at Princeton," in *Perspectives on the History of Mathematical Logic*, ed. Thomas Drucker (Boston, 1991), pp. 54–70.

Barendregt, Henk. "The Impact of the Lambda Calculus in Logic and Computer Science," *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 3 (1997): 181–215.

Berlinski, David. *The Advent of the Algorithm* (New York, 2000).

Enderton, H. B. "In Memoriam: Alonzo Church," *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 1 (1995): 486–8.

———, "Alonzo Church and the Reviews," *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 4 (1998): 172–80.

Engel, Pascal. *The Norm of Truth: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Logic* (Toronto, 1991).

Hesseling, Dennis E. *Gnomes in the Fog: The Reception of Brouwer's Intuitionism in the 1920's* (Basel, Switz., 2003).

Kleene, S. C. "Lambda-definability and Recursiveness," *Duke Mathematics Journal* 2 (1936): 340–53.

Manzano, Maria. "Alonzo Church: His Life, His Work, and Some of His Miracles," *History and Philosophy of Logic* 18 (1997): 211–32.

Schulz, Klaus-Dieter. *Die These von Church: zur erkenntnistheoretischen und sprachphilosophischen Bedeutung der Rekursionstheorie* (New York, 1997).

Sieg, Wilfried. "Step by Recursive Step: Church's Analysis of Effective Calculability," *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 3 (1997): 154–80.

Thomas Drucker

CHURCHLAND, Paul Montgomery
(1942–)

Paul Churchland was born on 21 October 1942 in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. He received his BA from the University of British Columbia in 1964 and his PhD in philosophy from the University of Pittsburgh in 1969, writing a dissertation on "Persons and P-predicates." His work at Pittsburgh was under the supervision of Wilfrid SELLARS, whose philosophical outlook greatly influenced Churchland's own. Churchland began academic life before graduation with an appointment at the University of Toronto, and then became assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Manitoba, where he remained from 1969 until 1984. He was promoted to full professor in 1979 and spent a year as a visiting member of the Institute for Advanced Studies in Princeton, New Jersey. In 1984, he and his collaborator (and wife) Patricia Smith Churchland became professors of philosophy at the University of California at San Diego.

Churchland's philosophical work has centered on themes in the philosophy of science, epistemology, and most especially the philosophy of mind. His large-scale vision of these fields, held fairly consistently since the later 1970s, begins with the claim that science gives us a (typically) accurate theoretical picture of reality, one that often departs from the equally theoretical picture of reality provided by common sense and the presuppositions of language. Many accept that science does this when describing the heavens, matter, reproduction, and so on, but Churchland has argued that it can be expected to do the same when describing the mind. Common sense provides a sophisticated but unscientific theory of human and other animal minds, invoking beliefs, desires, intentions, states of consciousness, dreams, and so on to explain behavior. But "folk psychology," Churchland argues, is just as susceptible to replacement by a superior scientific theory as are commonsensical theories of the heavens, matter, and reproduction. In fact, we may confidently expect to see such a replacement, for there is already compelling evidence that our commonsensical or "folk" theory of the mind is not a good enough theory to survive future scientific developments. Epistemology too must be ready to be changed by new understandings of the mind, and in particular to turn away from its traditional focus on rules for the rational revision of sententially structured beliefs, given the likelihood that science will abandon the concept of sententially structured belief as no more useful to psychology than the concept of the superlunary realm was to astrophysics.

All of these themes receive an early treatment in Churchland's first book, *Scientific Realism and the Plasticity of Mind* (1979), and are dealt with in the essays collected in his third, *A Neurocomputational Perspective* (1989). Both books have been particularly influential insofar as they have defended Churchland's view that, while materialism is a correct theory of the mind, folk psychology is profoundly mistaken. This view, known as eliminative materialism, was initially most associated with Paul FEYERABEND and Richard RORTY, but has come to be inextricably linked to the Churchland name. It derives its support from a number of considerations. First, while it is a manifest fact that human beings and other organisms have minds, it is not manifest how that mind is best understood as being organized. Second, there is good reason to think that common-sense psychological thinking is not the best way to understand how the mind is organized. Here Churchland brings up the fact that folk psychology has no adequate way to explain learning, sleep, dreaming, mental disorder, or many other phenomena, and scientific explanations of these phenomena show no sign of making use of concepts such as *belief* and *desire*. Furthermore, scientific explanations of "simpler" things such as language

skills, action, and perception appear to be readily integrated with these other phenomena, but via theoretical constructs (such as activation vectors in multidimensional phase spaces) that bear no substantial relation to familiar beliefs and desires. The third and final piece of support for eliminative materialism is the claim that, if our best explanations of mental phenomena have no substantive relation to folk psychological explanations, then the posits of the superior explanations are probably real, while the posits of folk psychology (beliefs, desires, and the like) are probably not.

Paul Churchland's more recent book, *The Engine of Reason, the Seat of the Soul* (1995), is an unusual philosophical work. Written in an accessible style, it is as much a product of missionary ambitions as scholarly ones. While also making arguments for Churchland's philosophical views, it attempts to teach the reader how to conceive of her own mental life in terms other than those of folk psychology. Readers are introduced in some depth to parallel distributed processing (PDP or "neural network"') models of taste, smell, color vision, facial recognition, learning, categorization, inference, and more. PDP models of mental phenomena, which made their scientific breakthrough in the mid 1980s, have long been championed by Churchland as the source of a more adequate self-understanding than folk psychology; *The Engine of Reason* brings that vision of self-understanding together and attempts to make it the reader's own.

No discussion of Paul Churchland would be complete without some mention of his ongoing collaboration with his wife and colleague, Patricia Smith Churchland. She has been almost as important a contributor to science, especially neuroscience, as to philosophy, and her interests have driven her husband's research program at least as much as the reverse. She was the first of the pair to be introduced to hands-on work in the neurosciences while at the University of Manitoba, and she has remained more connected to the neuroscientific world since then.

In addition to being the leading advocate of eliminative materialism, Paul Churchland has also made important contributions to discussions of the nature of concepts and consciousness, and remains active in most debates that link philosophy and neuroscience.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Scientific Realism and the Plasticity of Mind (Cambridge, UK, 1979).

Matter and Consciousness: A Contemporary Introduction to the Philosophy of Mind (Cambridge, Mass., 1984).

A Neurocomputational Perspective: The Nature of Mind and the Structure of Science (Cambridge, Mass., 1989).

The Engine of Reason, the Seat of the Soul: A Philosophical Journey into the Brain (Cambridge, Mass., 1995).

On the Contrary: Critical Essays, 1987–1997, with Patricia Smith Churchland (Cambridge, Mass., 1998).

Other Relevant Works

"The Logical Character of Action-explanations," *Philosophical Review* 79 (1970): 214–36.

"Eliminative Materialism and Propositional Attitudes," *Journal of Philosophy* 78 (1981): 67–90.

"Perceptual Plasticity and Theoretical Neutrality: A Reply to Jerry Fodor," *Philosophy of Science* 55 (1988): 167–87.

"Theory, Taxonomy, and Methodology," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 93 (1993): 313–9.

"The Rediscovery of Light," *Journal of Philosophy* 93 (1996): 211–28.

"Conceptual Similarity Across Neural Diversity: The Fodor/Lepore Challenge Answered," *Journal of Philosophy* 95 (1998): 5–32.

"Outer Space and Inner Space: The New

Epistemology," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 76 (2002): 25–48.

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, Oxford Comp Phil
Churchland, Patricia Smith. *Neurophilosophy: Toward a Unified Science of the Mind/Brain* (Cambridge, Mass., 1986).
Double, Richard. "More on the Eliminable Intentional: A Reply to Churchland's 'Cognition and Conceptual Change: A Reply to Double'," *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior* 17 (1987): 219–25.
Fodor, Jerry, and Ernest Lepore. "All at Sea in Semantic Space: Churchland on Meaning Similarity," *Journal of Philosophy* 96 (1999): 381–403.
Haldane, John. "Theory, Realism and Common Sense: A Reply to Paul Churchland," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 93 (1993): 321–7.
Hirstein, William. *On the Churchlands* (Belmont, Cal., 2004).
McCauley, Robert N. *The Churchlands and Their Critics* (Cambridge, Mass., 1996).
"Symposium on *The Engine of Reason, the Seat of the Soul*," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 68 (1998): 859–904.

Timothy Schroeder

CHURCHMAN, Charles West
(1913–2004)

C. West Churchman was born on 29 August 1913 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He was educated at the University of Pennsylvania, receiving his BA in 1934, his MA in 1935, and his PhD in philosophy in 1938. He wrote his dissertation on "The Logic of Modality," and his most influential teachers were Edgar A. SINGER, Jr. who had been a student of William JAMES, and Henry Bradford SMITH. Churchman was an instructor and assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania from 1937 to 1948, and also served as department chair from 1945 to 1948. He then was an associate professor of philosophy at Wayne State University from 1948 to 1951. From 1951 to 1957 he was professor of engineering administration at Case Institute of Technology in Cleveland, and from 1957 until 1981 he was professor of business administration at the University of California at Berkeley. In retirement, he occasionally taught at Berkeley as a professor of peace and conflict studies until 1996. Churchman died on 21 March 2004 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Adopting the pragmatism taught by Singer, Churchman contributed to propositional logic, philosophy, and methodology of science, operations research, systems theory, psychology and linguistics, decision theory, metrology, and statistics. Utilizing the mathematical tools developed in the managerial sciences, and especially cybernetics as a mathematical model for organization and application of decision theory to the real world, he applied these methods to planning and management of business operations, environmental protection, and resource allocation, and worked in developing mathematical models for psychology, managerial science, economics, and ecology. For example, *World Modeling* (1976) dealt with mathematical models of economic and social history, and *Challenge to Reason* (1968) studied management science. *Measurement, Definitions and Theories* (1959) dealt both which metrology and mathematical modeling.

Churchman and his student Russell Ackoff attempted to define personality experimentally, turning to psycholiguistics as a means of investigating the psychology of personality, a study which anticipated the structuralist approach of employing language as a key to patterns of

behaviors and beliefs. Churchman wrote an introductory textbook on operations research, and two texts on systems theory, a book dealing with the application of decision theory to industrial management and management values, and another applying and justifying a systems theory approach to social systems. Churchman and his colleagues edited an anthology dealing with the mathematics of consumer behavior, as statistically measured through sampling techniques and opinion polling. He applied the tools of dialectics and philosophy of science in an examination of the impact which researchers and managers have upon one another and the experimental data through their interactions.

In addition to his contribution to the theory of propositions in his doctoral thesis, Churchman wrote an introductory textbook of mathematical logic and scientific method, a treatment of the philosophy and methodology of science, which dealt specifically with the theory of experimental evidence, and a textbook on the use of statistics as a tool for carrying out experimental inferences, which he applied to decision theory.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Elements of Logic and Formal Science (Philadelphia, 1940).

Towards a General Logic of Propositions (Philadelphia, 1942).

Psycholinguistics, with Russell Lincoln Ackoff (Philadelphia, 1946).

Theory of Experimental Inference (New York, 1948).

Methods of Inquiry, with Russell Lincoln Ackoff (St. Louis, 1950).

Introduction to Operations Research, with Russell Lincoln Ackoff and E. Leonard Arnoff (New York, 1957).

Measurement, Definitions and Theories, with Philburn Ratoosh (New York, 1959).

Prediction and Optimal Decision: Philosophical Issues of a Science of Values (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1961).

Challenge to Reason (New York, 1968).

The Systems Approach (New York, 1968; 2nd edn 1979).

The Design of Inquiring Systems: Basic Concepts of Systems and Organization (New York, 1971).

Thinking for Decisions: Deductive Quantitative Methods, with Leonard Auerbach and Simcha Sadan (Chicago, 1975).

The Systems Approach and Its Enemies (New York, 1979).

Thought and Wisdom (Seaside, Cal., 1982).

Natural Resource Management: Introducing a New Methodology for Management Development, with Albert Harold Rosenthal and Spencer H. Smith (Boulder, Col., 1984).

Other Relevant Works

"Statistics, Pragmatics and Induction," *Philosophy of Science* 15 (1948): 249–68.

Ed. with Russell Lincoln Ackoff, *An Experimental Definition of Personality* (Philadelphia, 1948).

"Ethics, Ideals, and Dissatisfaction," *Ethics* 18 (1952): 64–5.

Ed., *Experience and Reflection*, by Edgar A. Singer, Jr. (Philadelphia, 1959).

Ed. with Richard O. Mason, *World Modeling: A Dialogue* (New York, 1976).

Further Reading

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, *Who's Who in Phil*

Britton, G. A., and McCallion, H. "An Overview of the Singer/Churchman/ Ackoff School of Thought," *Systems Practice* 7 (1994): 487–521.

Dean, B. V. "West Churchman and Operations Research: Case Institute of Technology, 1951–1957," *Interfaces* 24 (1994): 5–15.

Ulrich, Werner. *Critical Heuristics of Social Planning: A New Approach to Practical Philosophy* (New York, 1994).

———, ed. "C. West Churchman – 75 Years," *Systems Practice* 1 (December 1988). Special issue about Churchman.

Irving H. Anellis

CLARK, Gordon Haddon (1902–85)

Gordon H. Clark was born on 4 April 1902 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and died on 9 April 1985 in Westcliffe, Colorado. He attended the University of Pennsylvania, earning a BA in French and a PhD in philosophy in 1929. He wrote his dissertation on "Empedocles and Anaxagoras in Aristotle's De Anima" under the direction of William R. NEWBOLD. After graduating, he undertook a period of further graduate study at the Sorbonne in Paris. From 1924 to 1937 Clark was an instructor of philosophy at Pennsylvania, and also was a visiting professor at the Reformed Episcopal Seminary from 1932 to 1936. In 1937 Clark became associate professor of philosophy at Wheaton College in Illinois where he taught until 1943. He went to Butler University in Indiana to become professor of philosophy and chair of the philosophy department in 1945. Clark held these positions for twenty-eight years until retiring in 1973. In retirement he occasionally taught at Covenant College in Pennsylvania and then at Sangre de Cristo Seminary in Colorado until 1984.

Clark was a prominent reformed theologian and philosopher. He was an ordained Presbyterian minister and served as a ruling elder in the Presbyterian Church. Clark protested the liberalizing movement within the Presbyterian Church with his address "The Auburn Heresy" in 1935 (published in 1946). He joined the new Orthodox Presbyterian Church organized by J. Gresham Machen, and in 1944 he was ordained by that church, after the requirement of two years of seminary study was waived. However, Clark was himself driven away from the Orthodox Presbyterian Church soon after by doctrinal disagreements. Clark continued to change affiliations for the rest of his life, having membership in the United Presbyterian Church and the Reformed Presbyterian Church, among others.

Clark's influence in American religious philosophy was notable. He was the mentor of well-known modern theologians such as Ronald Nash, John Carnell and Carl F. H. HENRY. Primarily writing in the field of philosophical theology and philosophy of religion, Clark's philosophy is written from the perspective of Augustinian Calvinism. At the foundation of Clark's philosophy is the sovereign God of the Christian Bible. The triune God as revealed in the Christian scriptures is the starting point of all knowledge. Clark laid heavy emphasis on the law of non-contradiction and the importance of logic as a test for truth. While admitting that no finite system can be expected to give answers to every problem, Clark contended that the preferred system should the one that offers the most solutions, gives more meaning to life, and makes no self-contradictions. For Clark, the Christ of the New Testament is the *logos* (the logic of God). Christianity is true in the final analysis because it is the only system of thought that is free from logical fallacies. All other world views have logically contradictory beliefs in one or more of their central doctrines. It is this belief that served as the impetus for Clark's many writings in the field of apologetics as well.

Following Augustine, Clark's philosophy is characterized by an epistemology in which God must illuminate the human mind if knowledge is to be possible. Apart from this illumination via God-given innate ideas, the mind is not capable of understanding sense experience without a priori innate ideas implanted in man as the image of God. Following from this, the most effective argument for God's existence is the need to

presuppose God and his revelation in the Bible as the only logical starting point (or first principle) in order to make sense of knowledge and experience itself.

Another feature of Clark's philosophy is his rejection of the traditional "proofs" of God's existence – particularly those proofs that are dependent on an empirical theory of knowledge. Clark flatly rejected the epistemology of empiricism, arguing (similar to Hume) that there is no *necessary* connection between ideas and events. At best, we have memories of past experience which we take as indicative of future occurrences. But there is no strictly logical connection between an event and its cause. Hence, argument for God's existence from motion and causality are not logically valid arguments for Clark. Along these lines, Clark rejected Aquinas's "proofs" of the existence of God as purely formal, circular, and indefensible. "The argument for the existence of God, is at best, useless. It proves no more than a finite or physical God. It allows, but does not prove, the existence of a good God, but He need neither be omnipotent nor the cause of all that happens." On the basis of his sharp rejection of an empirical epistemology, the cosmological argument becomes "worse than useless."

Clark contributed much to the field of philosophical theology. His emphasis on the law of non-contradiction as a test for truth is essential for clear thinking in matters of religion and philosophy. Another positive contribution is Clark's stress on objective propositional truth. If truth is simply person-variable, it is hard to see how debates about philosophy and religion are worthwhile. One might question the seeming circularity of Clark's insistence upon God as the requisite starting point in epistemology, or whether his arguments against empiricism still stand in light of contemporary discussion. Nevertheless, Clark contributed greatly to the history of philosophical thought by providing a needed reminder and emphasis on the importance of objective truth and the value of logic in matters of philosophy and religion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Christian Philosophy of Education (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1946).

A Christian View of Men and Things (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1952).

What Presbyterians Believe (Philadelphia, 1956).

Religion, Reason and Revelation (Philadelphia, 1961).

Karl Barth's Theological Method (Philadelphia, 1963).

The Philosophy of Science and Belief in God (Nutley, N.J., 1964).

What Do Presbyterians Believe? The Westminster Confession, Yesterday and Today (Philadelphia, 1965).

Biblical Predestination (Nutley, N.J., 1969).

Historiography: Secular and Religious (Nutley, N.J., 1971).

Language and Theology (Phillipsburg, N.J., 1980).

God's Hammer: The Bible and Its Critics (Jefferson, Md., 1982).

The Biblical Doctrine of Man (Jefferson, Md., 1984).

In Defense of Theology (Milford, Mich., 1984).

Other Relevant Works

Clark's papers are at the Presbyterian Church of America Historical Center in St. Louis, Missouri.

Ed., *Selections from Hellenistic Philosophy* (New York, 1940).

"Apologetics," in *Contemporary Evangelical Thought*, ed. Carl F. H. Henry (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1957).

Thales to Dewey: A History of Philosophy (Boston, 1957).

Dewey (Philadelphia, 1960).

William James (Philadelphia, 1963).

Clark Speaks from the Grave (Jefferson, Md., 1986).

Further Reading

Who's Who in Phil

Geisler, Norman. *Christian Apologetics*

(Grand Rapids, Mich., 1976).

Lewis, Gordon. *Testing Christianity's Truth Claims* (Chicago, 1976).

Longfield, Bradley J. *The Presbyterian Controversy: Fundamentalists, Modernists, and Moderates* (Oxford, 1991).

Nash, Ronald H., ed. *The Philosophy of Gordon Clark* (Philadelphia, 1968).

Robbins, John W. *Gordon H. Clark: Personal Recollections* (Jefferson, Md., 1989). Contains a bibliography of Clark's writings.

Mark Cox

CLARK, John Bates (1847–1938)

John Bates Clark was born on 26 January 1847 in Providence, Rhode Island. He grew up in Minneapolis, Minnesota, but in 1865 he returned east to attend Brown University and later studied economics at Amherst College. He continued his graduate studies in economics in Europe at the University of Heidelberg in 1874 and 1877 under Karl Knies. Clark was professor of economy and history at Carlton College in Minnesota 1877 to 1881, and then was professor of economics at Smith College in Massachusetts from 1881 to 1895. In 1895 he became professor of economics at Columbia University, and taught there until 1923. He also was the Director of the history and economic section of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace from 1911 to 1923. From 1893 to 1895 he served as the third President of the American Economic Association. He died in New York City on 21 March 1938.

Clark's most lasting contribution to theoretical and applied economics was the Marginal Product Theory of distribution, which received its most complete exposition in his *The Distribution of Wealth* (1899). This theory remains at the core of what is today the neoclassical school of economics. Clark's ethical commitments, and his consequent social philosophy, were simultaneously a motivation and consequence of this important theorem. His hope was to uncover a just and politically defensible distribution of income under competitive capitalist conditions.

According to Clark's theory under a regime of "natural competition" (roughly equivalent to our modern conception of "perfect competition") each worker, acre of land, and unit of capital will be paid the dollar value of the additional output that he, she, or it contributes to their firm or industry. "The pay of labor in each industry tends to conform to the marginal product of social labor employed in connection with a fixed amount of social capital, as such." (1899, p. 116) On this theory, the competitive wage is not equal to the average level of production, but rather to the last, or marginal, quantity of production that can be attributed to the last, or marginal, unit of labor (or land, or capital) employed.

To Clark this theory represented more than an answer to a technical problem in economic theory, although this is how it would come to be perceived over the last century. Clark's motivation was to uncover the principles of economic justice, so as to establish the basis of a just distribution under modern economic conditions. If the competitive market process, whether guided by the laws of the state or not, ensured that each laborer were to earn a wage equal to his or her marginal contribution to the output of society then, Clark maintained, the resulting distribution of income could be considered just as each person would earn the monetary equivalent of their contribution. Moreover, and he was most explicit about this, the ethical basis of socialism would be undermined as the latter could no longer plausibly claim that under competitive conditions capitalists expropriate the produce of labor.

Clark concluded that public policy should be directed toward establishing the institutions of

competitive bargaining that would allow the several contributors to the productive process to receive the marginal product of their labor, land, or capital: "If the natural law of wages is an honest and beneficent law, and if it works fairly well and can be made to work better, then we know, at least, at what we should aim in all civil law making. It will remain only to frame the statutes that will accomplish this purpose in view." (1910, p. 452)

Clark's anti-socialist sentiments have led some interpreters to conclude that his primary agenda was to give political legitimacy to laissez-faire capitalism. This is inaccurate. Clark supported neither socialism (which he defined as the state ownership of firms) nor unfettered laissez-faire. He believed that the former would stifle economic progress while denying citizens the benefits of political liberty. He thought the latter, under modern conditions of production, was overly favorable to the formation of private economic power in the form of monopolies. Moreover, laissez-faire under modern conditions could potentially demoralize less skilled and less organized workers through destructive competition. However, as Clark believed that the rising monopolies of his era were the result of progress, he did not favor using the antitrust laws to restore competition. What he did support was the use of regulations to guide or shape the competitive process so that society could reap the benefits associated with the productivity of large consolidated firms while simultaneously neutralizing their monopoly power.

Consistent with his gradualist and conservative approach to addressing economic and social questions, Clark argued that lasting reforms should be built on already existing laws and institutions: "I shall try to show that society is organized on a plan that is essentially sound, and that law may facilitate its development. This special work, which the law has to do, falls within its time-honored function of protecting person and property. Yet, in a sense, it is a new work; for it demands specific things that have never been done." (2002, p. 452)

Clark believed in the essential justice of a competitive market economy based on private property. But he was not an ideologue. He understood that under modern conditions unregulated competition could generate an unjust distribution, widespread harm, and a political demand for radical reform along socialist lines. Since he believed that "natural" competition would be unlikely to reestablish itself in light of trends in modern technology and business methods, Clark concluded that enlightened laws would have to intervene to restore a distribution of income consistent with private property and economic justice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Philosophy of Wealth: Economic Principles Newly Formulated (Boston, 1885).

The Distribution of Wealth: A Theory of Wages, Interest and Profit (New York, 1899).

The Essentials of Economic Theory, as Applied to Modern Problems of Industry and Public Policy (New York, 1907).

Social Justice Without Socialism (Boston, 1914).

A Tender of Peace: The Terms on Which Civilized Nations Can, If They Will, Avoid Warfare (New York, 1935).

Other Relevant Works

Clark's papers are at Columbia University.

"Is Authoritative Arbitration Inevitable?" *Political Science Quarterly* 17 (1902): 553–67.

The Control of Trusts, with John Maurice Clark (New York, 1912).

"The Minimum Wage," *The Atlantic Monthly* 112 (September 1913): 289–97.

"Anarchism, Socialism and Social Reform" (c. 1910), ed. Robert E. Prasch, *Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 24 (2002): 443–62.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Economics*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v13*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Everett, John R. *Religion in Economics: A Study of John Bates Clark, Richard Ely and Simon Patten* (New York, 1946).

Henry, John F. "John Bates Clark and the Marginal Product: An Historical Inquiry into the Origins of Value-Free Economic Theory," *History of Political Economy* 15 (1983): 375–89.

———, *John Bates Clark: The Making of a Neoclassical Economist* (New York, 1995).

Hollander, J. H., ed. *Economic Essays Contributed in Honor of John Bates Clark* (New York, 1927). Contains a bibliography of Clark's writings.

Prasch, Robert E. "John Bates Clark's Defense of Mandatory Arbitration and Minimum Wage Legislation," *Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 22 (2000): 251–63.

Robert E. Prasch

CLARK, Romane Lewis (1925–)

Romane L. Clark was born on 3 December 1925 in Waverly, Iowa. He served in the US Air Force during 1943–4. He then attended the University of Iowa, where he earned the BA in 1949, MA in 1950, and PhD in philosophy in 1952. Clark's initial faculty appointment was as a lecturer at the University of Iowa in 1952–3. The following year he became assistant professor of philosophy at Duke University, where he was promoted through the ranks to full professor and remained for seventeen years (except 1968–9, when he was visiting professor at the University of Western Ontario). Clark moved to Indiana University in 1970 as professor of philosophy and adjunct professor of the history and philosophy of science. He was department chair for two years, and retired in 1990.

Clark's primary writings are about perception, language, and reasoning. He wrote brilliantly and elegantly about the relation of sensation to perception, seamlessly merging his original ideas here with his signature study of predication. His papers on the semantics of abductive reasoning wrestle with some of Charles PEIRCE's most difficult problems. As a metaphysical minimalist, Clark sharpened Occam's razor in a series of devastating critiques of unrepentant ontologies that extravagantly posit entities answering to every thought thereof.

Clark is a direct realist within the philosophy of perception. Perception, he argues, connects the mind to its environment directly rather than through inferential processes that exploit phenomenally evident sense data or impressions. With Wilfrid SELLARS, Clark holds that sense impressions are theoretical posits hidden from immediate awareness. These impressions secure the distinctively sensuous character of perception. However, unlike Sellars, Clark maintains that sense impressions are conceptual elements in perceptual judgments. According to Clark, *basic* perceptual judgments are best modeled by natural language. Sense impressions are to basic perceptual judgments as predicates are to their containing simple declarative sentences. Sense impressions *attribute* selected properties of objects in the subject's environment while the sheer occurrences of these impressions *demonstratively refer* to these same objects. This is why the content of perceptual judgments – as opposed to judgments generally – is essentially limited to depiction of the ambient array. Basic perception is the direct, immediate awareness of what is distally, but sensuously, available. It does *not* trade on *(unconscious) inference* from knowledge of occurrent sense impressions as premises to conclusions regarding the external

milieu. According to Clark, sensuously to judge an object's color, for example, is simply to suffer the occurrence of a sense impression within a mental state. This state functions like a simple declarative sentence, with the occurrent impression acting the part of a *contextually sensitive predicate* representing the color of the object to which the impression's occurrence demonstratively refers.

Clark departs from classical empiricists by further insisting that perception is not restricted to the familiar Aristotelian proper and common sensibles. Rather, Clark concurs with J. J. GIBSON and N. R. HANSON that, within certain but unspecified limits, perception offers direct, noninferential, sensuous, cognitive access to some of the *kinds*, *natures*, and even the *dispositions* of the things sensed. For Clark, *sequences* of sense impressions constitute nonbasic perceptual judgments or ascriptions of abstract properties that transcend the conceptual limits foundationalists typically suppose. Glancing at the hunting tiger about to spring, one might literally see it *as a tiger*, *as a predator* and *as poised to pounce* – no inference required – depending on the sequence of sense impressions one happens to have. A contextualist, Clark allows that the *content* of a sense impression or sequence of such impressions is determined by various fluctuating factors including the subject's background knowledge and perceptual perspective in ways that defy precise specification. Contextually sensitive features of indexicals and demonstratives allow two scuffling boys each to threaten the other by saying, "I'll punch you in the nose!" So too, different perceivers might simultaneously deploy similar sense impressions to achieve perceptual judgments with different content. The child and adult both see the coin obliquely from similar perspectives. Their sense impressions are similar. Nevertheless and context providing, the naïve child sees it as elliptical, but the seasoned adult sees it as circular. Dissimilar but contextually determined sense impressions might engender congruent perceptual judgments. In staring at each other, the boys collect different sense impressions but, context playing its part in establishing the impressions' contents, each sees the other as a boy.

Clark cautioned against drawing ontological conclusions from patterns of natural language or logical formalisms. He endorsed modal logics for the propositional attitudes generally and perception in particular but eschewed semantical interpretations for these systems requiring more than the mundane objects of the external world of common and scientific sense. Similarly, Clark's logic of predicate modifiers – while important in its own right – offers an alternative to Donald DAVIDSON's reification of events embedded in his account of the implications of complex predicates.

Russell refuted naïve set theory by pointing to the paradoxical character of sets having as members only those sets that are not members of themselves. There is not always a set corresponding to each predicate we might use or every concept we might deploy. The creative powers of the mind are thus limited in ways that Meinong, Frege, and their followers did not anticipate. In a series of acute papers, Clark – with an eye on Russell – demonstrates that Hector-Neri CASTAÑEDA errs by proliferating (mental) entities – propositions, senses, or guises – answering to every thought.

Clark's metaphysical minimalism has several aspects. Perception is a direct mode of thought. It does not require sense data implicated in a proliferation of inferences to the world beyond. Thought too is direct. Neither does it require entities like propositions, senses, or guises to tie the mind to the world. Rather, according to Clark, the bare minimum suffices. The mind; the world. That's all; that's enough.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Comments on Professor Hintikka's 'The Logic of Perception'," in *Perception and Personal Identity,* ed. N. S. Care and R. H. Grimm (Cleveland, 1969), pp. 174–87.

"Concerning the Logic of Predicate Modifiers," *Noûs* 4 (1970): 311–35.

"Sensuous Judgments," *Noûs* 7 (1973):

45–56.

"Adverbial Modifiers," in *Ontological Commitment*, ed. R. Severens (Athens, Georgia, 1974), pp. 22–36.

"The Sensuous Content of Perception," in *Action, Knowledge and Reality*, ed. Hector-Neri Castañeda (Indianapolis, 1975), pp. 4–17.

"Old Foundations for a Logic of Perception," *Synthese* 33 (1976): 75–99.

"Not Every Object of Thought Has Being: A Paradox in Naive Prediction Theory," *Noûs* 12 (1978): 181–8.

"Considerations for a Logic for Naive Realism," in *Studies in Perception*, ed. P. Machamer and R. Turnbull (Columbus, Ohio, 1978), pp. 525–56.

"Sensing, Perceiving, Thinking," *Grazer Philosophische Studien* 12 (1981): 273–95.

"Not Every Act of Thought Has a Matching Proposition," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 5 (1980): 509–23.

"When Is a Fallacy Valid? Reflections on Backward Reasoning," *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 23 (1982): 1–13.

"Sensibility and Understanding: The Given of Wilfrid Sellars," *The Monist* 65 (1982): 350–64.

"Predication Theory: Guised and Disguised," in *Agent, Language, and Structure in the World*, ed. J. E. Tomberlin (Indianapolis, 1983), pp. 111–29.

"What is a Perceptually Well-Defined Individual? Hintikka's Views on Perception," in *Jaakko Hintikka*, ed. Radu Bogdan (Dordrecht, 1987).

"Predication and Paronymous Modifiers," *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 27 (1986): 376–92.

"Objects of Consciousness: The Non-relational Theory of Sensing," *Philosophical Perspectives* 1 (1987): 481–500.

"A Categorical Analysis of Predication: The Moral of Bradley's Regress," in *Mind, Value, and Culture: Essays in Honor of E. M. Adams*, ed. David Weissbord (Atascadero, Cal., 1989).

"Deeds, Doings and What is Done: The Non-extensionality of Modifiers," *Noûs* 23 (1989): 199–210.

"Seeing and Inferring," *Philosophical Papers* 22 (1993): 81–96.

Further Reading

Aquila, Richard E. "Perceptions and Perceptual Judgments," *Philosophical Studies* 28 (1975): 17–31.

Castañeda, Hector-Neri. "Philosophical Method and the Theory of Predication and Identity," *Noûs* 12 (1978): 189–210.

Heidelberger, Herbert. "Beliefs and Propositions: Comments on Clark," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 5 (1980): 525–31.

Landini, Gregory. "Salvaging 'The F-er is F': The Lesson of Clark's Paradox," *Philosophical Studies* 48 (1985): 129–36.

J. Christopher Maloney

CLARKE, William Newton (1841–1912)

William Newton Clarke was born on 2 December 1841 in Cazenovia, New York, and, as the son of a Baptist minister, lived in several small towns in northern parts of his native state where strict Calvinist principles still exerted considerable influence. In 1861 he graduated with a BA degree from Madison College (now Colgate University) and in 1863 received a BD from Hamilton Theological Seminary, located on the same campus. Thereafter he served in pulpits at Keene, New Hampshire (1863–9), Newton Center, Massachusetts (1869–80), and Montréal, Canada (1880–83). Clarke severely injured an elbow and knee after slipping on ice in 1883 and this accident caused him to seek less vigorous occupations than those required in an active ministry. From 1883 to 1887 he tried

academia as professor of New Testament interpretation at Toronto Baptist College, and then served once again as minister of a Baptist church. In 1890 he assumed the position in which he became nationally famous: professor of Christian theology at the now renamed Colgate Seminary in New York. Teaching for eighteen years in that capacity, and then for another four years from 1908 to 1912 as lecturer in ethics, Clarke rounded out a long career as a seminal thinker who shaped the contours of Protestant liberalism.

Clarke's religious ideas and values were derived from his practical experience in pastorates over a period of more than two decades. Biblical studies in the original Greek, pastoral counseling, and sermon composition provided a solid background for the ideas he began to systematize for classroom use. Drawing to some extent on the ideas promulgated by Adolf von Harnack in Germany and Horace BUSHNELL in the US, Clarke perceived the world of past and present as part of an extended evolutionary process. He held religious ideas or theology to be natural expressions of the human spirit; as cultural conditions changed over time, so did human experiences and, in like manner, people's religious understanding as they tried to make religion relevant in specific contexts.

On the premise that all ideas and practices have developed over time, Clarke argued that people in each age should formulate a theology relative to the cultural circumstances of their own setting. This contradicted traditionalist approaches, which regarded certain doctrines as perennially true. Such approaches, for Clarke, were arbitrarily forced on varied cultural contexts instead of being derived from them. This insight made his work compatible within the larger intellectual atmosphere affected by biblical criticism, historical relativism, and scientific knowledge of the natural world.

After a few years of teaching, Clarke put his lecture notes into a more organized system. His *Outline of Christian Theology* (1898) was an immediate success, running to twenty editions in almost that many years. It also stands as the first systematic American treatment of religious ideas derived from biblical criticism and a scientific knowledge of the natural world. Such widespread popularity indicates that a significant number of liberal-minded Protestants had been looking for someone who could articulate their general feelings. Clarke showed how one could break with outmoded doctrinal statements and yet adhere to the basics of earlier confessional patterns without sacrificing rational integrity or relevance to modern life. Many regarded his work as the most influential Protestant theological publication issued in America at the dawn of the twentieth century.

In Clarke's view, the beginning point for everything else in theology was a proper understanding of Jesus of Nazareth. He thought of Jesus as a human being whom God's spirit had permeated to such an extent that his teachings about divine presence and proper ethics were normative for all others. Jesus' religious experience thus became a universal pattern wherein people were to discern two salient categories: (1) revering God as a loving parent to all humanity; and (2) treating other mortals as spiritual kinsfolk and neighbors. Religion in everyday life, patterned after Jesus as the example par excellence, was essentially moral endeavor. The proper response to God's spiritual guidance, Clarke held, was a life of service and sacrifice, a striving for moral excellence with love as its greatest expression.

There was little room in this liberal religious perspective for a divine Christ, a sacrificially atoning death, or sacramental rituals in a gathered church. There was even little emphasis on human sin, aside from recognizing the presence of recurrent selfishness in both private and communal experience. Clarke was convinced that God's beneficial purposes guided people as they moved toward greater realizations of their potential. Human progress was the primary achievement of evolutionary processes, and all of God's influence con-

tributed to the supreme purpose of redemption. Clarke's optimistic, progressivist viewpoint defined salvation as human effort toward moral improvement, and he was confident that cooperation with divine wisdom and power would eventually triumph over every failing. As one who pioneered such liberal emphases, Clarke greatly influenced the next generation of such thinkers. Perhaps his most noted student and exponent of this genre in modern Protestantism was Harry Emerson Fosdick, who perpetuated Clarke's ideas for more than fifty years in New York City. Owing to his wife's and his own poor health, they wintered in a warmer climate, and Clarke died on 14 January 1912 in Deland, Florida.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Commentary on the Gospel of Mark (Philadelphia, 1881).

An Outline of Christian Theology (New York, 1898).

What Shall We Think of Christianity? (New York, 1899).

The Use of Scripture in Theology (New York, 1905).

The Christian Doctrine of God (New York, 1909).

Sixty Years with the Bible (New York, 1912).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v22*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Clarke, Emily S. *William Newton Clarke: A Biography* (New York, 1916).

Howe, Claude L. *The Theology of William Newton Clarke* (New York, 1980).

Henry Warner Bowden

CLARKE, William Norris (1915–)

W. Norris Clarke was born on 1 June 1915 in New York City. Upon graduation from the Loyola School in New York, he spent several years at Georgetown University before entering the Society of Jesus in 1933. During his early Jesuit training during 1936–9 on the Isle of Jersey in the English Channel he studied such thinkers as Joseph Maréchal and Maurice Blondel. He then received an MA in philosophy in 1940 at Fordham University, studying with the Thomist Anton PEGIS. From 1940 to 1942 he taught philosophy at Loyola College in Baltimore, Maryland, and then studied theology at Woodstock College in Maryland prior to priestly ordination in 1945. In 1950 he received his PhD in philosophy from the Université Catholique de Louvain, where he had studied with Fernand van Steenberghen and Louis De Raeymaeker. His dissertation, "The Limitation of Act by Potency: Aristotelianism or Neoplatonism?" has been widely recognized as a seminal work in contemporary Neothomism. During this period he also read broadly in existentialist phenomenology, and especially the personalism of Emmanuel Mounier, Martin Buber, and Gabriel Marcel.

After teaching at Woodstock College from 1949 to 1952 and at Bellarmine College in Kentucky from 1952 to 1955, Clarke joined the philosophy department at Fordham University, where he taught from 1955 until his retirement in 1985. Since then he has been a visiting professor at many Jesuit colleges, including Xavier University, the University of San Francisco, Canisius College, John Carroll University, and Wheeling Jesuit University, as well as a lecturer in the Philippines and Ireland. The author of more than sixty articles, Father Clarke has produced five books, including *The One and the Many: A Contemporary Thomistic Metaphysics* (2000). In 1961 he co-founded the *International Philosophical Quarterly*, which he edited until 1985. Clarke was

President of the Jesuit Philosophical Association of North America in 1960–61, President of the Metaphysical Society of America in 1968, President of the American Catholic Philosophical Association in 1969, and the elected President of the International St. Thomas Society in 1996. He was honored with the Aquinas Medal from the American Catholic Philosophical Association for distinguished contributions to philosophy in 1980.

As a Thomist deeply committed to dialogue with other traditions, Father Clarke has made a point of engaging proponents of various philosophical schools, including Oriental metaphysicians about the question of the self, American process philosophers about the metaphysics of substance and relation, and analytic philosophers about the nature and validity of analogical language in the quest for knowledge of God.

Within contemporary Thomism he is well known for his "creative retrievals" of certain aspects of Aquinas's thought as a way to promote Thomism as a living philosophy and not just an interesting historical position. In Neothomist circles he has been prominent for further developing Etienne GILSON's concentration on *esse* as the concrete act of existence and Maréchal's interpretation of Rousselot's theory of the subject. Of special significance in his recent work has been the elaboration of a Thomistic philosophy of the person-in-relation. Reflecting upon the evidence provided by mutual self-communication as illuminative of the nature of the human subject, he has elaborated a philosophy of the human person that is as deeply faithful to the Thomistic metaphysics of substance, act, and potency as it is open to phenomenological and process insights about receptivity and relation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Philosophical Approach to God: A Neo-Thomist Perspective (Winston-Salem, N.C., 1979.)

The Universe as Journey: Conversations with W. Norris Clarke, S.J., ed. Gerald A. McCool (New York, 1988).
Explorations in Metaphysics: Being-God-Person (Notre Dame, Ind., 1994).
Person and Being (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1993).
The One and the Many: A Contemporary Thomistic Metaphysics (Notre Dame, Ind., 2000).

Further Reading
"A Festschrift in Honor of W. Norris Clarke, S.J.," *International Philosophical Quarterly* 40 (June 2000). Special issue about Clarke.
Ford, Lewis S. "The Immutable God and Father Clarke," *New Scholasticism* 49 (1975): 189–99.

Joseph W. Koterski, S.J.

COBB, John Boswell, Jr. (1925–)

John Cobb was born on 9 February 1925 in Kobe, Japan. His parents, John B. Cobb and Theodora Atkinson Cobb, were Methodist missionaries, originally from Georgia. He attended Emory junior college at Oxford, Georgia, from 1941 to 1943 before entering the United States Army, where he underwent training to be a Japanese translator. After World War II, without having earned a bachelor's degree, he entered the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, where he earned his MA (1949) and PhD (1952). At the Divinity School he studied under philosophers Richard McKEON and Charles HARTSHORNE. McKeon, who has been characterized variously as a "neo-Aristotelian" and "systematic pluralist," was notorious among his students as a proponent of intellectual rigor and engagement with a wide range of philosophical perspectives. Hartshorne, who

viewed his philosophy as "neoclassical" metaphysics, was a major proponent of process philosophy. Cobb wrote his master's thesis on the theological method of the empirical theologian Henry Nelson WIEMAN, and wrote his doctoral dissertation, "The Independence of Faith from Speculative Beliefs," under another process theologian Bernard LOOMER.

Cobb taught religion at Young Harris College in Georgia from 1950 to 1953 while serving as a Methodist pastor to several small rural churches. From 1953 to 1958, Cobb taught theology at the Candler School of Theology at Emory University. He moved to Claremont School of Theology in 1958, becoming the Ingraham Professor of Theology. In 1960 he took a joint appointment at the Claremont Graduate School, serving as the Avery Professor until his retirement in 1990. He is now emeritus Professor at both the Claremont School of Theology and Claremont Graduate School.

In 1973 Cobb co-founded the Center for Process Studies at Claremont with David Griffin. The center is dedicated to promoting and applying process thought, broadly conceived, (including the ideas of Alfred North WHITEHEAD, Charles Hartshorne, and Pierre Teilhard de Chardin) across traditional disciplinary boundaries. Cobb's work has been recognized with numerous awards and honors, including co-winner of the 1992 Grawemeyer Award for Ideas Improving World Order (for his book with Herman Daly, *For the Common Good*, 1989) and honorary doctorates at the University of Mainz, Emory University, Linfield College, DePauw University, and the University of Victoria.

Since his years of graduate study, Cobb has had a strong interest in the question of how religious faith can be integrated with scientific thought. He finds in Whitehead a cosmology that is amenable to both a Christian vision of the world and a post-Newtonian scientific world view. Cobb *chooses* Whitehead's cosmology as a means of systematically elaborating and consistently relating faith experience to wider experience and knowledge, especially scientific knowledge. Cobb views cosmology as necessary to, but not sufficient for, theology. Hence, he uses the phrase *Christian* natural theology to describe his thought. The choice of a cosmology is warranted by its coherence with empirical knowledge (consistency with faith experience) and philosophical excellence (internal consistency and explanatory power). In Cobb's writings since the late 1970s, he adds to these criteria the pragmatic ability of the cosmology to promote a just, participatory, and sustainable society. To that end, Cobb takes a decidedly postmodern approach to systematic theology by not grounding his theology in Whitehead's cosmology, but rather by using that cosmology to articulate and explore the theological significance of the preconscious experience of Christian faith or the Christian vision of the world.

Cobb believes employing Whitehead's cosmology to articulate a Christian natural theology is vindicated by its ability to illuminate several key issues confronting contemporary Christian theology: the nature of God, the problem of evil, the relationship of Jesus Christ to God, the challenge of liberation movements, the challenge of the ecological crisis, global economic justice, and the relationship of Christianity to other religions. At the same time, in his engagement with these issues, Cobb has not hesitated to extend and/or revise many elements of Whitehead's cosmology that fail to address coherence with faith experience, philosophical consistency, or promotion of a just, participatory, and sustainable society.

Cobb became convinced early in his career that the traditional philosophical view of God is problematic both to a modern scientific understanding of the world and to biblical Christianity. The substance ontology presupposed by traditional philosophical views of God (and ultimately based upon ancient Greek categories) has been untenable at least since the time of Hume and is difficult to defend in light of modern physics, which understands the world in terms of interactions among

quanta of energy. Moreover, the "God of the philosophers" bears little resemblance to the Bible's depiction of a personal God who is deeply affected by relations to creation and is understood in terms of love.

In Whitehead and Hartshorne, Cobb finds an understanding of the world and God that he believes is more amenable to both science and Christian faith experience. Cobb takes over Whitehead's basic analysis of reality as made up of actual occasions of experience. All actual occasions, whether those that make up a water molecule or those that make up our immediate experience, are "events" which are "internally related" to other events. Put differently, an actual occasion's prehension (unconscious experience or feeling) of past entities are constitutive of what that actual occasion is and is the basis of causal efficacy.

However, the present does not merely repeat the past. Change and novelty also characterize reality. Novelty is affected by God's primordial nature. As primordial, God is the eternal ground of all possibilities for actualization. These formal possibilities for actualization are "eternal objects" that represent "every possible state of the actual world" entertained by God (1965, pp. 155–6). The eternal objects relevant to an actual occasion are a "lure for feeling" that both gives direction to actualization and allows freedom for how each actual occasion constitutes itself. This direction and freedom compose the "subjective aim" of each occasion of experience and affect all actual occasions from those that constitute atoms to those that constitute human consciousness. The capacity for freedom is diminished by the determination provided by past actual occasions and increased by the eternal objects (the novel possibilities provided by God). Conscious experience represents a highly developed capacity for entertaining novelty and thus freedom, whereas unconscious experience tends to have little capacity to do more than repeat the past.

Cobb follows Whitehead's contention that God is not merely an eternal ground of possibilities. If God were merely primordial, not only would Whitehead's categoreal scheme be violated, so too would the Christian experience of God as personal. The primordial nature of God (God's mental pole) is complemented by the consequent nature of God (God's physical pole); that is, God's reception of the actualized world into God's own experience. Put differently, while the primordial nature of God includes all possibilities for actualization, the consequent nature of God includes God's feelings of all actualizations. Just as other actual occasions of experience prehend the past world, God prehends all that has come into being, experiencing all that is experienced. This is God as "the great companion – the fellow sufferer who understands" (Whitehead 1978, p. 351). Moreover, since God is both the basis of all things coming to be as well as the one that experiences all things in a unity of divine experience, God aims at ever-increasing richness of experience, or what Whitehead calls Beauty: the integration of diverse experience into intense harmonies. Hence, all existence is suffused with value for each actual occasion and for God.

The interrelatedness of all actual occasions and the dipolar view of God are fundamental to Cobb's theology. To understand God's relationship to the world as one who lures the world into novel actualization or "creative advance" points to an understanding of creation that is amenable to contemporary scientific theories of the origin of the universe as well as the origin and evolution of life. In process terms, God's creativity is characterized by acting as a lure for all occasions of experience toward increasing complexity, or richer forms of existence. Yet, precisely because God's relationship to the world is that of a lure toward being that makes possible and promotes freedom, the creative advance of the world allows for chance and change in a way that is compatible with evolutionary theory.

Perhaps more important for Cobb's theological interest is the advantage of a process view of reality for illuminating the problem of evil. The traditional theological view that God is an absolute, immutable, omnipotent, omni-

scient being has always presented difficulties for theodicy. If God is all-powerful and all-good, why is it that the innocent suffer? The *Shoah* (Holocaust) raised that question in its most radical form. The ecological crisis has raised it for all life on our planet (see 1972 and 1981). For Cobb, the power of God is necessarily persuasive rather than coercive. As the lure toward freedom and richness of experience in a relational world, God *cannot* override the freedom of actual occasions. The greater capacity for achievement of value corresponds to the greater capacity for freedom, which in turn allows for greater possibility for evil. God is, however, both the one who suffers with those who suffer and who always and everywhere acts as the creative, redeeming lure to bring about new value, even out of suffering. Here, Cobb and other process theologians have been strongly criticized as saying that God is deficient in power. Cobb responds that we can redefine omnipotence in terms of persuasive power, instead of attributing to God a monopoly of power. Put differently, divine omnipotence is God's life-giving, creative, and liberating persuasion: perfect power expressed as perfect love.

Cobb finds in process thought a way to understand the philosophically problematic notion of the doctrine of the incarnation. Indeed, Whitehead viewed the Christian idea of the incarnation as the key to his notion of internal relatedness of actual occasions to one another and thus "the only fundamental improvement on Plato's metaphysics" (Whitehead 1933, p. 167). God is internally related to every actual occasion and every actual occasion is internally related to God. For Cobb, that relation was uniquely realized in Jesus of Nazareth. On the one hand, God's initial aim for Jesus emphasized God's own feelings of the world (God's consequent nature) as its main content and, on the other, Jesus fully incorporated God's ideal aim into his subjective aim (1966, p. 146). Put in traditional theological language, the fullness of God was fully present in Jesus's being and action.

Cobb develops his Christology more fully in *Christ in a Pluralistic Age* (1975), where he connects the biblical idea of Christ as the Logos of God to the Whiteheadian notion of creative transformation. God's creative transformative activity in the world, luring the world into novel and richer forms of actualization, captures the central meaning of the Logos, by which and through which all things that have come to be have their being (John 1:3). As such, Christ is present and effective in the world even if Christ is not consciously acknowledged (although conscious acknowledgment of Christ can promote and further God's creative activity). Moreover, for the Christian to recognize Christ as God's creative transformative activity allows the Christian to find common cause with others in participating in God's aim to bring about greater achievements of value in all creation.

As Cobb came to be challenged by liberation (especially feminist) theologies on the one side and the environmental crisis on the other, he expanded his characterization of the Logos in terms of other biblical images, particularly the Sophia of God (1988) and Life (Birch and Cobb 1981). The feminine image of Sophia is not only closely connected to the biblical notion of Logos, but it also acts as a creative lure for feeling, challenging Christians to embrace a richer, more inclusive understanding and experience of God and all of God's people, female as well as male.

The image of Life also acts as a creative lure for feeling that calls both Christians and non-Christians to widen their appreciation of and commitment to all of God's creation, recognizing both God's presence in all things and God's love for all things. Cobb finds Whitehead's thought particularly congenial to environmental ethics. The Whiteheadian view that every actual occasion is an achievement of value in response to God's lure for it, and the recognition that all experience is experienced by God, lifts up the largely neglected biblical idea in Genesis 1 that all things that are created are good in themselves and are good to God.

Moreover, the fundamental interrelatedness of all entities to one another and to God recalls that what is done to the least is done to God, and to all. To ally oneself with Life is to reject anthropocentrism in favor of promoting the liberation, and thus the greater richness of experience, of the entire ecosystem.

The relationship of human liberation and ecological liberation is often viewed as problematic in ethics. Many philosophers analyze the relationship in terms of trade-offs or compromises between the well-being of humans on the one side and the well-being of the rest of creation on the other. Cobb's theological approach is to view these two goals from the perspective of creative transformation, both ethically and methodologically. To that end, Cobb has devoted several years of study and writing (particularly during the 1990s) to economic theory. Working with economists like Herman Daly, as well as sustainable agriculturalists like Wes Jackson, Cobb has authored or co-authored a number of articles and books that treat the goals of human liberation and ecological liberation as fundamentally interrelated with the ethical values of justice, participation, and sustainability. This work has been as much practical as theoretical and has included concrete alternatives to current economic measures, such as proposing a measurable Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare to replace the measure of Gross National Product (Daly and Cobb 1989).

Cobb has long had an interest in inter-religious relations, especially between Christianity and Japanese forms of Buddhism, such as Pure Land. The model of creative transformation provides the method and framework for engaging the insights of diverse traditions (see 1982 and 1990). Cobb's aim is not to eliminate or ignore fundamental differences between religious experiences but to explore what those differences might tell adherents about their own traditions even as his aim challenges them to incorporate insights from others. Cobb rejects efforts to reduce diverse religious traditions to an underlying perennial philosophy or even to

the sharing of a common goal. Rather, he believes that greater learning and growth occurs when we recognize that diverse traditions may have different sources and different aims that ought to be appreciated and respected.

Sensitive to criticisms that the Whiteheadian conceptuality that informs most of his theology is too esoteric for the average lay person, Cobb has devoted much of his writing in the last twenty years to communicating the insights of process theology in nontechnical language and even in narrative form (see 1985 and 1990). One reason Cobb has been able to succeed in this endeavor is that his method is ultimately pragmatic. Although Cobb describes himself as a Whiteheadian, his methodology reflects the pragmatic roots of Whitehead's own cosmology (see Whitehead 1978, pp. xii–xiii), as well as the pragmatic influences mediated by Hartshorne's Peircean interests and McKeon's systematic pluralism. Indeed, Cobb places the development of process theology squarely in the pragmatic, pluralistic, relativistic, holistic, and naturalistic tendencies of William JAMES, John DEWEY, and Charles PEIRCE. His application of creative transformation in his engagement with ethics and inter-religious relations carries a dialogical and fallibilist approach to philosophy of religion and theology into the twenty-first century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Varieties of Protestantism (Philadelphia, 1960).

Living Options in Protestant Theology: A Survey of Methods (Philadelphia, 1962).

A Christian Natural Theology: Based on the Thought of Alfred North Whitehead (Philadelphia, 1965).

"The Finality of Christ in a Whiteheadian Perspective," in *The Finality of Christ*, ed. Dow Kirkpatrick (Nashville, Tenn., 1966), pp. 122–54.

The Structure of Christian Existence (New York, 1967).

God and the World (Philadelphia, 1969).

Is It Too Late? A Theology of Ecology

(Beverly Hills, Cal., 1972).

Christ in a Pluralistic Age (Philadelphia, 1975).

Process Theology: An Introductory Exposition, with David R. Griffin (Philadelphia, 1976).

Theology and Pastoral Care (Philadelphia, 1977).

The Liberation of Life: From the Cell to the Community, with Charles Birch (London, 1981).

Beyond Dialogue: Toward a Mutual Transformation of Christianity and Buddhism (Philadelphia, 1982).

Process Theology as Political Theology (Philadelphia, 1982).

Talking About God, with David Tracy (New York, 1983).

"Christ Beyond Creative Transformation," in *Encountering Jesus*, ed. Stephen J. Davis (Philadelphia, 1988).

For the Common Good: Redirecting the Economy Toward Community, Environment, and a Sustainable Future, with Herman Daly (Boston, 1989; rev. edn 1994).

Sustainability: Economics, Ecology, and Justice (New York, 1992).

Founders of Constructive Postmodern Philosophy: Peirce, James, Bergson, Whitehead, and Hartshorne, with David R. Griffin, Peter Ochs, Marcus P. Ford, and Pete A. Y. Gunter (Albany, N.Y., 1993).

Sustaining the Common Good (Cleveland, 1994).

The Earthist Challenge to Economism: A Theological Critique of the World Bank (New York, 1999).

Postmodernism and Public Policy: Reframing Religion, Culture, Education, Sexuality, Class, Race, Politics, and the Economy (Albany, N.Y., 2001).

Other Relevant Works

"A Critical View of Inherited Theology," in *Theologians in Transition*, ed. J. M. Wall (New York, 1981), pp. 74–81.

Ed. with W. W. Schroeder, *Process Philosophy and Social Thought* (Chicago, 1981).

Praying for Jennifer (Nashville, Tenn., 1985).

Ed. with Christopher Ives, *The Emptying God: A Buddhist-Jewish-Christian Conversation* (New York, 1990).

Ed. with Clifford Cobb, *The Green National Product: A Proposed Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare* (Lanham, Md., 1994).

Ed. with Clark H. Pinnock, *Searching for an Adequate God: A Dialogue Between Process and Free Will Theists* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 2000).

Ed., *Speaking of Religion and Politics: The Progressive Church Tackles Hot Topics* (Louisville, Kent., 2003).

Further Reading

Bube, Paul Custodio. *Ethics in John Cobb's Process Theology* (Atlanta, 1988).

Davaney, Sheila, ed. *Feminism and Process Thought* (New York, 1981).

Griffin, David Ray, and Thomas J. J. Altizer, eds. *John Cobb's Theology in Process* (Philadelphia, 1977).

Griffin, David Ray, and Joseph C. Hough, Jr., eds. *Theology and the University: Essays in Honor of John B. Cobb, Jr.*, (Albany, N.Y., 1991). Includes a bibliography of Cobb's writings.

Whitehead, Alfred North. *Process and Reality* (New York, 1929; corrected edn, ed. D. R. Griffin and D. W. Sherburne, 1978).

———, *Adventures of Ideas* (New York, 1933).

Paul Custodio Bube

COE, George Albert (1862–1951)

George Albert Coe was born on 26 March 1862 in Mendon, New York, the son of Methodist minister George W. Coe and Harriet Van Voorhis. He received his BA in 1884 from the University of Rochester, and his STB in 1887 and MA in philosophy and world religions in 1888 from the Boston University School of Theology. From 1888 to 1890 he was professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California. He then studied religion at the University of Berlin in 1890–91. Upon returning to Boston University and presenting his dissertation on "The Problem of Knowledge," Coe received his PhD in philosophy in 1891. His mentor at Boston was Borden Parker BOWNE, who introduced Coe to his type of idealism called personalism.

In 1891 Coe was appointed acting professor of intellectual and moral philosophy at Northwestern University, and in 1893 he was named the John Evans Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy, holding that position until 1909. During much of this period, his philosophy colleague was the professor of ethics and social philosophy, William CALDWELL. From 1909 to 1922 Coe was Skinner and McAlpin Professor of Practical Theology and taught religious education and psychology of religion at Union Theological Seminary in New York City, where he established the department of religious education and psychology. From 1922 until retiring in 1927, he was professor of religious education at Columbia University Teachers College. In retirement Coe remained active in lecturing and publishing into his eighties. Coe died on 9 November 1951 in Claremont, California.

With William JAMES and Edwin D. STARBUCK, Coe was one of the three leading pioneers in psychology of religion. Using experimental psychology, he investigated the physiological and temperamental traits underlying the susceptibility to having mystical or conversion experiences. His books *The Spiritual Life: Studies in the Science of Religion* (1900) and *The Psychology of Religion* (1916) also developed his functionalist and somewhat pragmatist theory of religion. Rather than emphasizing the personal and private experience of religion, like James, Coe discussed the effects of religious belief on the realization of personality under social conditions. Coe argued that special religious experiences cannot be the proper foundation for religious conviction, which instead must rest more on the wisdom of intellectual reflection.

Coe also was the leading figure of the field of religious education for many decades. In 1903 he was a co-founder of the Religious Education Association and served as its President in 1909. At Union Theological Seminary, he helped to maintain the prevailing spirit of the Social Gospel movement and the ideas of Walter RAUSCHENBUSCH. His liberal theory of religious education, elaborated in *Social Theory of Religious Education* (1917) and *What is Christian Education?* (1929), was very influential for two generations of Protestant educators. Coe was active in settlement work, local political reform, and led efforts to reduce the military's presence at high schools and colleges. In later years Coe became convinced of Marxism's superiority over capitalism for proper spiritual and personality formation. He faulted American churches for abandoning the pursuit of social justice and capitulating to capitalism in his last book, *What Is Religion Doing to Our Consciences?* (1943).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Spiritual Life: Studies in the Science of Religion (New York, 1900).
The Religion of a Mature Mind (Chicago, 1902).
Education in Religion and Morals (Chicago, 1904).
The Psychology of Religion (Chicago, 1916).
Social Theory of Religious Education (New York, 1917).
The Motives of Men (New York, 1928).

What is Christian Education? (New York, 1929).

What Is Religion Doing to Our Consciences? (New York, 1943).

Other Relevant Works
Coe's papers are at Yale University and Northwestern University.
"The Philosophy of the Movement for Religious Education," *American Journal of Theology* 8 (1904): 225–39.
"Religious Value," *Journal of Philosophy* 5 (1908): 253–6.
"The Mystical as a Psychological Concept," *Journal of Philosophy* 6 (1909): 197–202.
"On Having Friends: A Study of Social Values," *Journal of Philosophy* 12 (1915): 155–61.
"Borden Parker Bowne," *Journal of Philosophy* 7 (1910): 281–2.
"What Constitutes a Scientific Interpretation of Religion?" *Journal of Religion* 6 (1926): 225–35.
"My Own Little Theater," in *Religion in Transition*, ed. Vergilius Ferm (New York, 1937).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*
Archibald, Helen A. *George Albert Coe: Theorist for Religious Education in the Twentieth Century*. PhD dissertation, University of Illinois (Urbana, Ill., 1975).
Bremer, David H. *George Albert Coe's Contribution to the Psychology of Religion*. PhD dissertation, Boston University (Boston, 1949).
Campbell, Eldrich C. *George Albert Coe and Religious Education* (New York, 1974).
"In Memoriam, George Albert Coe, 1862–1951," *Religious Education* 32 (March–April 1952). Special issue devoted to Coe, and includes a bibliography of Coe's writings.

Nicholson, Ian. "Academic Professionalization and Protestant Reconstruction, 1890–1902: George Albert Coe's Psychology of Religion," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 30 (1994): 348–68.

John R. Shook

COFFIN, Henry Sloane (1877–1954)

Born on 5 January 1877 in New York City, Henry Sloane Coffin came to appreciate "order" through his father Edmund, an attorney, and his mother Euphemia, a devout Presbyterian. Coffin once said, "God is to me that creative force, behind and in the universe, who manifests Himself as energy, as life, as order, as beauty, as thought, as conscience, as love." Coffin's parents provided Henry with the best education, including the Cutler School for Boys in New York City; Yale University (BA 1897), where he became a member of Phi Beta Kappa and Skull and Bones; New College of the University of Edinburgh (1897–9); and the University of Marburg in Germany (1899), where he was taught the higher criticism approach to biblical studies. Returning to the United States, Coffin sensed God, the "creative force," calling him into ministry and entered Union Theological Seminary where he received his BD in 1900.

In 1900 Coffin was ordained as a Presbyterian minister and served the Bedford Park Presbyterian Church in New York City. In 1904 he was given a part-time appointment on the faculty of Union Theological Seminary, and taught as an associate professor of practical theology until 1926. In 1905 Coffin was presented with what would prove to be a pivotal opportunity in his life, accepting a call to serve as senior pastor of Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church. Coffin led this historic

church for twenty-one years, growing its membership from 500 to 2,500. At the time Coffin arrived at Madison Avenue, the church sat in the midst of the Upper East Side, one of the more affluent neighborhoods in the city which was also separated by the Third Avenue train tracks from tenement buildings that housed many recent immigrants. Following his "conscience," Coffin led outreach efforts to these "East Siders" and intentionally invited them into the life of the congregation.

Later, as a theological chasm emerged in the Presbyterian Church between fundamentalists and modernists, Coffin became an articulate voice for diversity of opinion in regards to church doctrine. In 1915, Coffin delivered an address at Union Seminary which eventually led to the Auburn Affirmation. This document argued for what was then called "Liberal Evangelicalism," a name for non-Calvinistic doctrines that maintained the authority of Jesus while at the same time sought to appeal in a persuasive manner to individuals who were thoughtful yet uncommitted in regards to their religious convictions. At the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in 1927, Coffin's leadership enabled that body to declare no individual or church body had the authority to define a particular interpretation of scripture as "essential and necessary."

Coffin left Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church in 1926 to serve as President of Union Theological Seminary, a post he held for nineteen years. During his tenure the seminary moved forward in many areas, in particular offering full rights and privileges to women, and attracting Reinhold NIEBUHR and Paul TILLICH to the seminary faculty. In 1929, Coffin participated in the reunion of the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church of Scotland, which underscored in his mind the necessity of church unity in the United States. In 1943, Coffin was elected moderator of the General Assembly and saw this as his opportunity to facilitate a similar reunion between the Northern and Southern branches of the Presbyterian Church, but his efforts were unsuccessful. After his retirement from Union Theological Seminary in 1945, Coffin was a well-sought lecturer and preacher and often referred to affectionately as "Uncle Coffin." Coffin died on 25 November 1954 in New York City.

Coffin's contribution to the canon of philosophical and religious thought is grounded in his unique voice as a preacher, writer, and educator. Perceived by many as eloquent, persuasive, and passionate, Coffin added to the national and religious debate with his zest for social reform and church unity in the face of factionalism. He believed the church must faithfully live out Jesus's example of reaching out to the poor, and that there must always be room for thoughtful reflection and even disagreement in regards to church doctrine and beliefs concerning the person of Jesus Christ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Creed of Jesus (New York, 1907).

Social Aspects of the Cross (New York, 1911).

Some Christian Convictions: A Practical Restatement in Terms of Present-day Thinking (New Haven, Conn., 1915).

In a Day of Social Rebuilding: Lectures on the Ministry of the Church (New Haven, Conn., 1918).

What is There in Religion? (New York, 1922).

The Meaning of the Cross (New York, 1931).

What Men are Asking: Some Current Questions in Religion (Nashville, Tenn., 1933).

God's Turn (New York, 1934).

Religion Yesterday and Today (New York, 1940).

The Public Worship of God (Philadelphia, 1946).

God Confronts Man in History (New York, 1947).

Other Relevant Works

Coffin's papers are at Union Theological

Seminary in New York City.

University Sermons (New York, 1914).

"Why I Am a Presbyterian," in *Twelve Modern Apostles and Their Creeds*, eds G. K. Chesterton et al. (New York, 1926).

Communion Through Preaching (New York, 1952).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v55*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Longfield, Bradley J. *The Presbyterian Controversy: Fundamentalists, Modernists, and Moderates* (Oxford, 1991).

Niebuhr, Reinhold, ed. *This Ministry: The Contribution of Henry Sloane Coffin* (New York, 1945).

Noyes, Morgan P. *Henry Sloane Coffin: The Man and His Ministry* (New York, 1964).

Mark Barger Elliot

COHEN, Isidor Bernard (1914–2003)

I. Bernard Cohen was born on 1 March 1914 in Far Rockaway, Long Island (now in Queens, New York City). Cohen spent virtually his entire academic career at Harvard, where he earned his BS in mathematics in 1937 and joined Phi Beta Kappa. He then went on to graduate study under the guidance of George Sarton, began teaching at Harvard as an instructor in physics in 1942, and earned the first PhD in history of science in 1947. He was an instructor in the physics department teaching the history of science until 1947, when he joined the history of science program as an instructor of the history of science. He was promoted up to full professor by 1959,

and established the department of the history of science in 1966. He also was among the founding members of the Kennedy School of Government's seminar on science and public policy. In 1977 he was named the Victor S. Thomas Professor of the History of Science. He retired in 1984, but occasionally offered courses until 2000. Cohen died on 20 June 2003 in Waltham, Massachusetts.

Cohen was an advocate of the case study method in teaching, and his introductory natural sciences course at Harvard, "The Nature and Growth of the Physical Sciences," was a perennial favorite with students. His philosophy of science education was reflected in a volume edited early in his career, the result of a "Workshop in Science in General Education" held at Harvard in 1950. Cohen was a natural teacher, and in the course of his career also lectured and taught at Boston College; Brandeis University; University College, London; Queen's University, Belfast; and Tel Aviv University, among others. He was also a founding visiting fellow of Clare Hall and a visiting overseas fellow at Churchill College of Cambridge University.

Cohen played a substantial role in the professionalization of the history of science as an academic discipline, both in the United States and internationally. He served as President of the US History of Science Society in 1961–2 and edited the Society's journal *Isis* from 1953 to 1958. In 1974 he was awarded the George Sarton Medal, the highest award conferred by the History of Science Society. He also served as Vice President of both the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He was an honorary life member of the New York Academy of Sciences, a member of the American Philosophical Society, a Benjamin Franklin Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts, a fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society, a corresponding fellow of the British Academy, and a member of the International Academy of the History of Science. He served as Chairman of the US National Committee

for the History and Philosophy of Science, and as President of the International Union of the History and Philosophy of Science. Among his many honors were a Guggenheim Fellowship in 1956 and honorary doctoral degrees from Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, George Washington University, and the University of Bologna. In 1998 he was awarded the Centennial Medal from Harvard's Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

As a scholar, Cohen was as prolific as an editor as he was as an author. Best-known for his scholarship on Isaac Newton, he was also interested in history of science in America, the history of scientific instruments and computing, and the role of quantification in the social sciences. His greatest impact in philosophy is the result not only of the meticulous variorum edition of the *Principia Mathematica* he edited with Alexandre KOYRÉ, but of his own detailed *Introduction to Newton's "Principia"* published as a companion to the variorum edition (1971), and the first English translation of Newton's *Principia Mathematica* since 1729 that he and Anne Whitman published in 1999. Cohen's most philosophically reflective work is his comprehensive analysis of the nature of science and the scientific enterprise in *Revolution in Science* (1985), which won the Pfizer Award from the History of Science Society the following year.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Benjamin Franklin: His Contribution to the American Tradition (Indianapolis, 1953).

Franklin and Newton: An Inquiry into Speculative Newtonian Experimental Science and Franklin's Work in Electricity (Philadelphia, 1956).

Introduction to Newton's "Principia" (Cambridge, Mass., 1971).

From Leonardo to Lavoisier, 1450–1800 (New York, 1980).

The Newtonian Revolution: With Illustrations of the Transformation of Scientific Ideas (Cambridge, UK, 1980).

The Birth of a New Physics (Garden City, N.Y., 1960; 2nd edn 1985).

Revolution in Science (Cambridge, Mass., 1985).

Benjamin Franklin's Science (Cambridge, Mass., 1990).

Interactions: Some Contacts between the Natural Sciences and the Social Sciences (Cambridge, Mass., 1994).

The Natural Sciences and the Social Sciences: Some Critical and Historical Perspectives (Dordrecht, 1994).

Science and the Founding Fathers: Science in the Political Thought of Jefferson, Franklin, Adams, and Madison (New York, 1995).

Howard Aiken: Portrait of a Computer Pioneer (Cambridge, Mass., 2000).

The Triumph of Numbers: How They Shaped Modern Life (New York, 2005).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Benjamin Franklin's Experiments: A New Edition of Franklin's Experiments and Observations on Electricity* (Cambridge, Mass., 1941).

Ed. with Fletcher G. Watson, *General Education in Science* (Cambridge, Mass., 1952).

Ed., *Opticks*, by Isaac Newton (New York, 1952).

Ed., *Isaac Newton's Papers and Letters on Natural Philosophy and Related Documents* (Cambridge, Mass., 1978).

Ed., *Puritanism and the Rise of Modern Science: The Merton Thesis* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1990).

Ed. with Richard S. Westfall, *Newton: Texts, Backgrounds, Commentaries* (New York and London, 1995).

Ed. with Robert V. Campbell and Gregory W. Welch, *Makin' Numbers: Howard Aiken and the Computer* (Cambridge, Mass., 1999).

Trans. with Anne Whitman, *The Principia. Preceded by a Guide to Newton's Principia* (Berkeley, Cal., 1999).

Ed. with Jed Z. Buchwald, *Isaac Newton's*

Natural Philosophy (Cambridge, Mass., 2001).

Ed. with George E. Smith, *The Cambridge Companion to Newton* (Cambridge, UK, 2002).

Further Reading

Haigh, T. "I. Bernard Cohen (1 March 1914–20 June 2003)," *Annals of the History of Computing, IEEE* 25 (October–December 2003): 89–92.

Mendelsohn, Everett, ed. *Transformation and Tradition in the Sciences: Essays in Honor of I. Bernard Cohen* (Cambridge, UK, 1984).

Joseph W. Dauben

COHEN, Morris Raphael (1880–1947)

Morris R. Cohen was born on 25 July 1880 in Minsk, Russia. Raised in an orthodox Jewish community, he was imbued with the spirit and the letter of the Bible and the Talmud. In 1892 the Cohens emigrated to America and settled in New York City. After attending public school Morris matriculated at the City College of New York from which he was graduated in 1900 with a BS. His intellectual interests had turned from religious orthodoxy to science and socialism and he became seriously involved in the social problems of his New York community. Science and socialism combined to spark an interest in philosophy which he pursued first at Columbia, where he was a student of Wilmon SHELDON, Felix ADLER, and F. J. E. WOODBRIDGE, and then at Harvard where he received his PhD in philosophy in 1906. While at Harvard he roomed with Felix FRANKFURTER and he studied under Josiah ROYCE, William JAMES, and Hugo MÜNSTERBERG, among others. He wrote his dissertation on Immanuel Kant. With superla-

tive recommendations from the faculty and a recent bride he set off in search of an academic appointment.

After teaching mathematics at the City College of New York for five years, he finally received an appointment in the philosophy department there in 1912. Philosophy professor Harry Allen OVERSTREET fought to have Cohen join him on the philosophy faculty, and Cohen was likely the first Jew in America to attain a regular philosophy position. Cohen quickly established himself as one of the most powerful personalities on the faculty and he became a pivotal figure not only in that institution but in the American Philosophical Association. Among his many students who had philosophy careers were Ernest NAGEL, Sidney HOOK, Paul WEISS, Herbert SCHNEIDER, and Philip WIENER. He was visiting professor at Stanford, the New School for Social Research, and Harvard. After retiring from City College in 1938, he taught philosophy at the University of Chicago until 1942. Cohen died on 28 January 1947 in Washington, D.C.

Inspired by one of his philosophical models, Charles S. PEIRCE (of whose papers he was appointed the first editor), Cohen thought of himself primarily as a logician and philosopher of science standing firmly but moderately in the "rationalist" tradition. Against the current of the time his project was to argue that reason was an objective feature of the world and his philosophical targets were empiricism, nominalism, and atomism. Like Peirce, he started with the conviction that we have an effective method for attaining knowledge, namely, scientific method, and then conceived of the metaphysical project as the effort to construct a general description of nature consistent with the success of that method.

For Cohen, scientific method is neither empiricist induction nor a priori deduction, but a sophisticated integration of reasoning and confrontations with the experience which fallibly delivers a real grasp of the structure of the world. The obvious success of this way of knowing has metaphysical presuppositions

about the relation of mind and nature. He felt that this realistic view of science would make little sense on either an empiricist dualism of mental universals and physical particulars, or on a Kantian dualism of a creative mind and an unknowable thing-in-itself. Empiricists like Mach and Pearson were driven to construe laws and theories as mere conventions while Kantians saw them as mental constructions. Both accounts were inadequate.

Cohen proposed to overcome these dualisms and restore a robust view of nature that would make sense out of the realistic reach of science. He located the problem in their failure to appreciate the real nature of mathematics, logic, and reason in general. These were not merely mental manipulations but truly indicative of the structure of the natural world. He defended a version of logical realism construing the enterprise of logic as the exploration of the realm of possibility and hence as the basic chapter in ontology. The rules of logic, while independent of any specific content, have reference to all possible content and the relations of compatibility and incompatibility were as real as any other relations in the world.

The natural world is neither unknown nor a mere collection of particulars, but a complex of things-in-relation whose structure can be discerned by monitored reasoning. For Cohen, nature is a relational system and the intelligible nature of any actual existent is constituted by its logical relations, its place in the system. Its nature is the group of invariant characters it involves and these characters can involve several different levels. The object can have one relational properly at one level of analysis and the opposite property at another without contradiction. This invokes Cohen's famous but elusive "principle of polarity" which was central to his metaphysical vision.

Balancing this emphasis on the rationality of nature and the ability of science to discern it, Cohen was not a thoroughgoing rationalist. Although the "nature" of everything is thoroughly rational, there is more to any given being than rationality. There is a brute facticity to the individual that transcends its abstract relations and universal connections. This duality of rational nature and brute existence mirrors the dual dimensions of the scientific method that enables us to discern the nature of our world. Just as scientific method is neither purely deductive nor purely experiential, so nature is neither a rational "one" nor an irrational "plurality." Nature is rational in the sense that its phenomena do conform to rational laws at many different levels, but it also transcends rationality since it cannot be reduced to laws alone. While deeply suspicious of all forms of irrational mysticism and maintaining that everything intelligible can be expressed in logical form, Cohen maintained that the essence of all expression is to point beyond itself.

This having been said, it would be a clear mistake to think of Cohen as merely a speculative philosopher. This was far from the case. As said, from early adulthood his two passions were science and socialism, and on the latter front he was among the most active of public intellectuals in the early part of the twentieth century. From its inception in 1914, *The New Republic* recruited Cohen and he became a frequent contributor and editorialist, as he was a contributor to many other journals of social opinion. In addition, he was extremely active in social organizations in New York and was a frequent speaker at all sorts of public forums.

This activism also flowed into his academic work in practical philosophy. He wrote a substantial treatment of the philosophy of history and even a history of philosophy in America, but his principal contribution beyond philosophy of science and metaphysics was as one of the major figures in the development of philosophy of law in America. The same temper that informed his philosophy of science informed his philosophy of law. Law was both a principle of stability and a principle of dynamism, a bridge between tradition and the emerging demands of society. As such it had to be informed by reason and the various norms reason dictated, but it also had to be grounded in the facts of human nature historically under-

stood. Like Kant and Peirce before him, Cohen's mantra was that experience without reason is blind and reason without experience empty.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Preface to Logic (New York, 1914).

Reason and Nature: An Essay on the Meaning of Scientific Method (New York, 1931; 2nd edn, Glencoe, Ill., 1959).

Law and the Social Order: Essays in Legal Philosophy (New York, 1933).

An Introduction to Logic and Scientific Method, with Ernest Nagel (New York, 1934).

The Faith of a Liberal (New York, 1946).

The Meaning of Human History (LaSalle, Penn., 1947).

Studies in the Philosophy of Science (New York, 1949).

Reason and Law: Studies in Juristic Philosophy (Glencoe, Ill., 1950).

American Thought: A Critical Sketch (New York, 1961).

Other Relevant Works

Cohen's papers are at the University of Chicago.

"The Faith of a Logician," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 1, pp. 221–47.

A Dreamer's Journey: The Autobiography of Morris Raphael Cohen (Glencoe, Ill. 1949). Contains a bibliography of Cohen's writings.

Reflections of a Wondering Jew (Boston, 1950).

King Saul's Daughter (Glencoe, Ill., 1952).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils Before 1950*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v40*, *Pres Addr of APA v3*, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v57*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Delaney, C. F. *Mind and Nature: A Study of the Naturalistic Philosophies of Cohen, Woodbridge and Sellars* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1969).

Freedom and Reason: Studies in the Philosophy of Jewish Culture in Memory of Morris Raphael Cohen, ed. Salo W. Baron (Glencoe, Ill., 1952).

Hollinger, David. *Morris R. Cohen and the Scientific Ideal* (Cambridge, Mass., 1975).

Rosenfield, Leonora. *Portrait of a Philosopher: Morris Raphael Cohen in Life and Letters* (New York, 1962).

Singer, Marcus G. "Two American Philosophers: Morris Cohen and Arthur Murphy," in *American Philosophy* (Cambridge, UK, 1985), pp. 295–329.

C. F. Delaney

COHEN, Selma Jeanne (1920–)

Selma Jeanne Cohen was born on 18 September 1920 in Chicago, Illinois. Her parents sent her to the primary and secondary laboratory school at the University of Chicago, founded by John DEWEY, and she graduated in 1937. However, her true passion was for dance. At age thirteen, she began ballet lessons under Edna McRae and fell in love with it, although Cohen herself admits she was at best a mediocre dancer. Her dancing ability was also hampered by her poor three-dimensional vision. McRae kept books on dance and the arts in her studio and Cohen borrowed all of them. She discovered that, other than the occasional biography, few books existed on dance history or theory. Since she was not destined to dance professionally, she vowed to write about dance. No degree programs in dance history or theory existed at that time. Dance instruction was either concealed within physical education departments, or students received private

lessons. Cohen instead pursued her second love for books.

In 1939 she completed an associate's degree at Stephen's College, which prepared her for a library career. She then returned to the University of Chicago to study English with a minor in philosophy while continuing to read anything available on dance. Cohen particularly admired Plato because he recognized the importance of dance and also because he articulated the notion that an ideal definition gives us the essence of a thing. This became Cohen's life's work: defining dance so that we understand its essential qualities. Cohen completed her BA in 1941, her MA in 1942, and while teaching in the English department, her PhD in English in 1946. Her dissertation on Gerard Manley Hopkins (1844–1889) focused on the relationship between his poetry and his religious thought. His poetry, oftentimes profoundly intense, used a technique called "sprung rhythm" to recreate the cadence of everyday speech. The notion of the movement of words within a time frame related to her interest in dance.

Cohen began teaching English at the University of California at Los Angeles in 1946. In 1949 she attended the annual meeting of the American Society of Aesthetics, exchanging ideas with philosopher Rudolf ARNHEIM and later Francis SPARSHOTT, Hilde HEIN, Julie van Camp, Arnold BERLEANT, and Peter Kivy. Arnheim encouraged her to submit a paper on dance to their scholarly journal, *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism.* Following his suggestion, "Some Theories of Dance in Contemporary Society" was published in 1950. Since then Cohen has written more than 200 scholarly articles, book and dance reviews, introductions and prefaces, critiques, informed biographies, obituaries, and essays on dance aesthetics. Her goal was to turn dance history, theory, and aesthetics into academic disciplines. She was one of the first to note that dance becomes history the moment the performance ends, since no two dance performances are exactly alike.

Approaching dance through aesthetics and philosophy of art, Cohen strives to create a partnership between theory and the actual works of art. She believes that throughout history, dance served three functions worldwide: (1) ritual – such as dancing for spirits and gods; (2) social – such as dancing with another person; and (3) theatrical – dancing for an audience. By exploring disciplines such as anthropology, art history, music, folklore, and philosophy, Cohen attempts to make us understand why people dance and why it is important that they dance. She asks the following questions: (1) What is the difference between body movement and dance? (2) How does one apply aesthetic standards to dance that are applicable worldwide and historically? (3) Indeed, is this possible? (4) Finally, how do we apply aesthetic standards to different kinds of dance and choreography found within the same time and place?

In 1952 Cohen moved to New York City where ballet, modern dance, and other forms of dance were already established and thriving. Initially she taught dance history at the High School of Performing Arts, then at a number of colleges and universities in New England such as Connecticut College for Women. In the late 1950s she became the deputy assistant to arts critic John Martin of the *New York Times*, and later wrote her own dance reviews. She was one of the first female critics hired by the *New York Times*. One of her colleagues, art critic Clive Barnes, called her dance reviews exemplary. In 1959, she co-founded *Dance Perspectives*. Extensively illustrated, each issue concentrated on a specific aspect of dance written by an expert. She remained its editor until it closed in 1976.

In 1974 at the Dance Critics Association meeting, the idea to create an encyclopedia of dance encompassing the entire world emerged from a discussion between Cohen and Arlene Croce. Cohen was drafted as editor; and so began twenty-four years of intensive, exhilarating, and occasionally frustrating work. In 1976 the National Endowment for the

Humanitites awarded a planning grant to get the project underway. An editorial board was created, headed by Cohen. Although the project received numerous grants, it was shuttled from publisher to publisher until 1991, when Oxford University Press agreed to publish it. By then, much of the material was outdated, needing extensive revisions and additions. New articles were added, new photos, and an elaborate cross-referencing system so that dance genres from, for example, Armed Dances to Trance Dance to Wayang could relate to different parts of the world, dance types, and performing groups. Entries also included biographies of choreographers and performers, lighting, makeup, costume and stage design, circus performers, Ainu dances, the hula – creating for the first time comprehensive, worldwide approaches to dance. Her wish to bring together scholars and performers resulted in endorsements from Rudolf Arnheim and choreographer Jerome Robbins. In her preface to the six-volume encyclopedia, finally published in 1998, Cohen explains that the significance of dance is that it promotes intercultural understanding that transcends language. She notes that the evolution of dance throughout the world reflected different cultural forms. Understanding the diversity of dance movement enables us to "comprehend the message conveyed by the moving body" (1998, p. xviii) better than by using rigid standards that cannot possibly apply to all dance. Understanding the aesthetic value of dance enables scholars, creators, and performers to think, observe, and share ideas with one another and with audiences.

Cohen was a charter member of the National Endowment for the Arts dance panel, serving from 1966 to 1971. In 1976 she received a Fulbright Grant to travel to Russia to conduct research on dance performance and choreography, and to interview dance historians and dance critics. In 1980 she received a Guggenheim Fellowship, which enabled her to begin work on a new book, *Next Week, Swan Lake: Reflections on Dance and Dances* (1982), that explored questions of identity using *Swan Lake* as her primary example. Cohen reminds us that dance theory must be combined with experiencing dance performance, that we must see dance, not only think about it. "Dance," she wrote, "does not take place in the mind (though I admit I have choreographed some magnificent ballets there), but on the stage." (1982, p. ix) Her gentle wit, notwithstanding, reinforces the notion that separation of the physical and the emotional from the mental is not particularly constructive. There is a need to relate to the dancer as a person, just as the dancer asserts her personality to the audience. This is one reason we return to see *Swan Lake* yet again, even if we have seen it the week before.

From 1983 to 1989 Cohen taught dance history and theory at the University of California, Riverside, while continuing to work on the encyclopedia; in 1990 she became a Distinguished Scholar. In a concerted effort to encourage future dance scholars, the Society of Dance History Scholars inaugurated the Selma Jeanne Cohen Awards in 1996. In 2000 Cohen's wish to internationalize dance scholarship and make scholarly papers available to a multidisciplinary forum resulted in the Selma Jeanne Cohen Fund for International Scholarship on Dance, administered by the Fulbright Association. After more than fifty years of steadfast commitment, her determination to give dance intellectual respectability and philosophical significance seems successful. Past and future generations will remember her for her considerable scholarly contributions, her respect for dancers, choreographers, critics, and scholars, and for her levity, never taking herself or her accomplishments too seriously. Cohen realizes the difficulty choreographers, dancers, and audiences have with this seemingly trivial subject; still she looks forward to seeing nice old lady characters dancing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Some Theories of Dance in Contemporary Society," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art*

Criticism 9 (1950): 111–18.

"Dance as an Art of Imitation," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 12 (1953): 232–6.

Ed. with Francis Gadan-Pamard and Robert Maillard, *Dictionary of Modern Ballet* (New York, 1959).

"A Prolegomenon to an Aesthetics of Dance," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 21 (1962): 19–26.

Ed., *The Modern Dance: Seven Statements of Belief* (Middletown, Conn., 1966).

Next Week, Swan Lake: Reflections on Dance and Dances (Middletown, Conn., 1982).

"Problems of Definition," in *What is Dance?* ed. Roger Copeland and Marshall Cohen (Oxford, 1983), pp. 339–54.

Ed., *Dance as Theatre Art: Source Readings in Dance History from 1581 to the Present* (Hightstown, N.J., 1992).

Ed., *International Encyclopedia of Dance* (Oxford, 1998).

Other Relevant Works

"Woman as Artistic Innovator: The Case of Choreographer," in *A Sampler of Women's Studies,* ed. Dorothy G. McGuigan (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1973), pp. 5–16.

"What Does Sugar Plum Fairy 'Mean'?" *Dance Chronicle* 4 (1981): 279–96.

"Virtuosity and the Aesthetic Ideals of Japanese Dance and Western Classical Dance," with Gunji Masakatsu, *Dance Research Annual* 14 (1983): 88–95.

"Beyond Performance: Dance Scholarship Today," with A. J. Faro, S. D. Lokko, Ou Jian-Ping, J. Robinson, and E. Souritz, *Ballet Review* 17 (1989): 2–2F.

Further Reading

Dorris, George E., and Barbara G. Palfry. "Selma Jeanne Cohen," *Dance Chronicle* 18 (1995): 143–152, 319–332. Contains a bibliography of Cohen's publications.

Dorris, George E., et al. "Tributes to Selma Jeanne Cohen," *Dance Research Journal* 32 (Summer 2000): 34–8.

Barbara Sandrisser

COHON, Samuel Solomon (1888–1959)

Samuel S. Cohon was born on 22 March 1888 in Lohi, Minsk, Russia. In his youth he was given a Jewish education in rabbinic texts and traditional learning. He immigrated to the United States in 1904. His studies in the United States included earning a high school diploma in New Jersey, seminars at the University of Chicago, and a BA degree from the University of Cincinnati in 1911. He was ordained as a Reform rabbi at the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1912, studying with Kaufmann KOHLER, the architect of American Reform Judaism's theological stance. After ordination, he served several Reform Jewish congregations.

In 1923, Cohon was appointed as professor of Jewish theology at Hebrew Union College upon Kohler's retirement. During the next two decades, the Reform movement in Judaism was undergoing considerable change and development. Cohon was one of the leaders shaping this change. Until his retirement in 1956, he influenced the growing trend toward infusing Reform Judaism with greater emotionalism and respect for tradition. Notable publications during this time include his 1923 revision of the Reform *Union Haggadah*, a text for home use on the holiday of Passover; his editing of the Reform prayer book *Rabbi's Manual* in 1928; and, most strikingly, in the coup by which his statement of Reform principles became the basis for the creedal formulation of the so-called Columbus Platform, which in 1937 replaced and radically altered the earlier statement of Reform ideals in the Pittsburg Platform of 1885 established under the influence of Kohler.

Cohon published scholarly books and articles on the nature of religion, the significance of specific Jewish practices, the key ideas of Jewish thought, and the relationship between Judaism and other religious traditions, in particular the relationship to Christianity. By the time of his retirement he had authored over 300 publications. Upon retiring he went to Los Angeles, California, where he nurtured that branch of the Hebrew Union College until his death there on 22 August 1959.

Cohon's thought took as its foundation a pragmatist's view of religion: religion proves its truth through its usefulness. To argue for such usefulness he turned to psychology and social anthropology. Drawing on Rudolf Otto and William JAMES, he emphasized the "phenomenon" of the "Holy" and the individual's response to it. Cohon sought to correct the "rationalism" of previous Reform Jewish thinkers. Reason provides an important complement and corrective to emotional experience, but religion essentially arises as a living response to a personal deity. Religion transcends both politics and ethics in its concern for the personal. Even during times of national crisis, such as World War II, Cohon proclaimed that the most pressing question was that of keeping "the divine alive in man." This emphasis on personal religiousness led Cohon to attack the emphasis on Jewish peoplehood in Mordecai KAPLAN's Reconstructionist Judaism.

Cohon, however, also criticized Jewish existentialists for ignoring the social dimensions of Jewish religion. He learned from Émile Durkhiem and Max Müller that religion often functions to bring social solidarity. All individuals exist as parts of a greater whole: a family, a nation, the human race. Religion is functional, and that function has a communal aspect as in clear in Judaism. Jews are part of a social body, not just a creedal community. The language of the Jewish people, Hebrew, and the experience of Jewish history were part of the complete complex that made up Jewish religiosity. Judaism combines a personal experience of the divine with a communal identity derived from history. Judaism, however, has transformed the social into a transcendent value. Judaism balances loyalty to the Jewish people with personal faith such that national aspirations are tied to spiritual goals. The maligned idea of the chosen people subordinates national existence to the effort of attaining higher values.

Cohon integrated his ideas into a double meaning attributed to the belief in immortality. Immortality implies the belief that within each person exists a spirit that extends beyond the confines of the body. Immortality in the highest sense, however, is attained by insuring the continuation of one's ideals and values through the continuation of civilization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
What We Jews Believe (1931).
Judaism: A Way of Life (Cincinnati, 1948).
Jewish Theology: A Historical and Systematic Interpretation of Judaism and Its Foundations (Assen, The Netherlands, 1971).
Religious Affirmations (Los Angeles, 1983).
Essays in Jewish Theology, ed. Walter Jacob, Stanley Dreyfus, and Sidney Brooks (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1987).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v47*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Wiener, Theodore. "The Writings of Samuel S. Cohon," *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore* 2 (1956): 160–78.

S. Daniel Breslauer

COMMONS, John Rogers (1862–1945)

John R. Commons was born on 13 October 1862 in Hollandsburg, Ohio. He earned his BA degree from Oberlin College in 1888 and that same year enrolled for graduate study at Johns Hopkins University. He studied under Richard T. ELY, which furthered his commitment to Christian social reform, awakening a lifelong interest in social research. Though he was a gifted student, his academic record was uneven, which was probably related to a series of nervous collapses. He failed his history examinations and never finished his doctorate. He was appointed as an instructor at Wesleyan University in Middletown, Connecticut in 1890, and after Oberlin awarded him an honorary master of arts degree he spent one year there as assistant professor of sociology in 1891. He went on to teach sociology at Indiana University from 1892 to 1895 and at Syracuse University from 1895 to 1899. After he was dismissed from Syracuse, he spent five years without an academic appointment before Ely hired him at the University of Wisconsin as professor of economics in 1904. Commons served as President of the American Economic Association in 1917. He remained at Wisconsin until his retirement in 1932. He died on 11 May 1945 in Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

Although Commons is most frequently associated with the "Institutionalist" school of economic thought and wrote a book entitled *Institutional Economics* (1934), he is most noted for his successes in the development of public policy legislation for the state of Wisconsin, especially in the area of industrial relations. An expert in labor history and labor economics, he was closely involved with Robert LaFollette's Progressive Party and was instrumental in developing legislation in areas such as workplace safety, workman's compensation, unemployment compensation, and public utility regulation. He helped develop Wisconsin's Legislative Reference Service, the first of its kind, to provide resources and data for the rational and objective creation of legislation. Throughout his long career, he was actively involved with various government agencies and private advocacy groups, largely in connection with labor-related causes. His concern for and activity with respect to public policy issues took precedence over the development of a systematic body of economic theories.

Although Commons never developed a totally acceptable explanation of institutional economics, he clearly distanced himself from the prevailing neoclassical school of thought. A survey of his writings shows the diversity of his search for an understanding of economic behavior. This work includes research on the role of religion, political arrangements, legal foundations, race, immigration, and trade unionism among others. His multidisciplinary approach, which focused very heavily on actual human behavior, was in sharp contrast with the mainstream, neoclassical approach which, in Commons's view, was too mechanistic and treated economics like a physical science. Moreover, Commons argued that the neoclassical emphasis on individual behavior was incorrect. He believed the focus should be on collective action.

It was in his studies of the labor movement in the United States and the legal roots of capitalist society where Commons was most effective and influential. Many of the labor reforms he pioneered in the state of Wisconsin were ultimately extended to the federal level. Indeed, in 1989 John Commons was among the first four persons to be inducted into the Labor Hall of Fame created by the United States Department of Labor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Distribution of Wealth (New York, 1893).
Social Reform and the Church (New York, 1894).
Proportional Representation (New York, 1896; 2nd edn 1907).
Trade Unionism and Labor Problems

(Boston, 1905).

Races and Immigrants in America (New York, 1907).

Labor and Administration (New York, 1913).

Principles of Labor Legislation, with J. B. Andrews (New York, 1916).

History of Labor in the United States, 4 vols (New York, 1918–35).

Industrial Goodwill (New York, 1919).

Legal Foundations of Capitalism (New York, 1924).

Institutional Economics: Its Place in Political Economy (New York, 1934).

Other Relevant Works

Commons's papers are in the State Historical Society Library in Madison, Wisconsin.

A Documentary History of American Industrial Society, 10 vols, with others (New York, 1910–11).

Myself (New York, 1934).

The Economics of Collective Action, ed. Kenneth Parson (New York, 1950). Contains a bibliography of Commons's writings.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Economics*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*

Barbash, Jack. "John R. Commons: Pioneer of Labor Economics," *Monthly Labor Review* 112 (May 1989): 44–9.

Blaug, Mark. *Wesley Mitchell (1874–1948), John Commons (1862–1945), Clarence Ayres (1891–1972)* (Aldershot, UK, 1992).

Dorfman, Joseph. *The Economic Mind in America, 1918–1933* (New York, 1959).

Gonce, Richard A. *The Development of John R. Commons' System of Thought*. PhD dissertation, University of Wisconsin (Madison, Wisc., 1967).

Harter, Lafayette. *John R. Commons: His Assault on Laissez-faire* (Corvallis, Oregon, 1962).

Somers, Gerald, ed. *Labor, Management, and Social Policy: Essays in the John R. Commons Tradition* (Madison, Wisc., 1963).

Joseph A. Giacalone

COMMONS

COMPTON, John Joseph (1928–)

John J. Compton was born on 17 May 1928 in Chicago Illinois. He studied mathematics at the College of Wooster in Ohio, where he received a BA in mathematics and music in 1949. From there he continued his education at Yale University, majoring in philosophy, and earned his MA in 1951 and his PhD in 1953. Compton became an assistant professor of philosophy at Vanderbilt University in 1952, and was promoted up to full professor by 1968. He served as chair of the philosophy department from 1963 to 1973. He was a visiting professor of philosophy at Colorado College in 1977 and a visiting professor at Wesleyan University in 1984. He retired in 1998, and remains active at Vanderbilt.

Compton has received numerous awards for his contributions to the discipline of philosophy. He was a Phi Beta Kappa member and received a Kent fellowship in 1951. In 1956–7 he earned funding through a fellowship from the Belgian-American Education Foundation. He won the Danforth Foundation award for distinguished teaching in 1966, and received both the Madison Sarratt Prize for distinguished teaching and the Chancellor's Cup of the Nashville Vanderbilt Club for Student–Faculty Relations in 1967. He held a visiting fellowship at Princeton University in 1968, and a National Endowment for the Humanities Senior Fellowship in 1974–5. The Center for Humanities of Wesleyan University awarded him an associate fellowship in 1974. In 1979 he received the Distinguished Alumni

Award from Wooster College; in 1982 the Alumni Professor Award of the Vanderbilt Alumni Association; and in 1990 the Distinguished Teaching Award from Peabody College.

Along with these prestigious awards, Compton is also a member of the American Philosophical Association (serving as Secretary of the Eastern Division during 1970–73 and as Vice President in 1974), the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and the American Association of University Professors. He was elected President of the Metaphysical Society of America in 1979. He has memberships in the Society for Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy, Merleau-Ponty Circle, Philosophy of Science Association, American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Association of University Professors, Society for Values in Higher Education, and Society of Christian Philosophy, and he was an honorary faculty member of Omicron Delta Kappa.

Compton's main areas of research involve metaphysics, philosophy of science, phenomenology, philosophy of mind, and philosophy of nature. He has also written extensively on Maurice Merleau-Ponty's philosophy and existential phenomenology. In his study of the philosophy of science, Compton has recognized that scientists have become agents of social change, that is, our lives are drastically affected by technological advances. While he admits that we are, in a sense, "better off" by these advances, on the other hand, ever-growing scientific progress brings us face to face with new questions concerning religion, politics, ethics, human nature, and, perhaps most significantly, the definition of nature itself.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Toward an Ontology of Value," *Philosophical Quarterly* 8 (1958): 157–70.
"Natural Science and the Experience of Nature," in *Phenomenological America*, ed. James Edie (Chicago, 1967).
"Science and God's Action in Nature," in *Earth Might Be Fair: Reflections on Ethics, Religion, and Ecology*, ed. Ian Barbour (New York, 1972), pp. 33–47.
"Responsibility and Agency," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 11 (1973): 83–9.
"Hare, Husserl and Philosophical Discovery," in *Analytic Philosophy and Phenomenology*, ed. Harold Durfee (Boston, 1976).
"Reinventing the Philosophy of Nature," *Review of Metaphysics* 33 (1979): 3–28.
"Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, and Human Freedom," *Journal of Philosophy* 79 (1982): 577–88.
"On the Sense of There Being a Moral Sense of Nature," *Personalist Forum* 2 (1986): 38–55.
"Phenomenology and the Philosophy of Nature," *Man and World* 21 (1988): 65–89.
"Some Contributions of Existential Phenomenology to the Philosophy of Natural Science," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 25 (1988): 99–113.
"Phenomenological Reflections and the Human Meaning of Science," in *American Phenomenology: Origins and Developments*, ed. Eugene Kalelin and Calvin Schrag (Dordrecht, 1989).
"Merleau-Ponty's Thesis of the Primacy of Perception and the Meaning of Scientific Objectivity," in *Merleau-Ponty: Critical Essays*, ed. Henry Pietersma (Washington, D.C., 1990).
"The Persistence of the Problem of Freedom," *Review of Metaphysics* 60 (2001): 95–115.

Further Reading
Kohak, Erazim. "Reply to Compton's 'On the Sense of There Being a Moral Sense of Nature'," *Personalist Forum* 2 (1986): 56–60.
McMullin, Ernan. "Compton on the Philosophy of Nature," *Review of Metaphysics* 33 (1979): 29–58.

Daniel Trippett

CONE, James Hal (1938–)

James Cone, the son of Charlie and Lucy Cone, was born on 3 August 1938 in Fordyce, Arkansas, and grew up in Bearden, Arkansas. Cone argues in his writings that life in Bearden provided him with the two principles that would guide his academic work and his sense of praxis: confrontation with the nature of racism and the life-affirming nature of the black Christian faith.

Beginning his college career at Shorter College, Cone transferred to Philander Smith College in Arkansas and graduated with his BA in 1958. Having accepted a "call" to preach at the age of sixteen, he nurtured his interest in church ministry as a college student by serving, at various times, as pastor of several African Methodist Episcopal (AME) churches, including Allen Chapel AME Church. In addition to practical experience as a minister, Cone secured professional training by earning the BD degree from Garrett Theological Seminary in 1961. Overcoming numerous obstacles, including both explicit and implicit racism, he then entered the PhD program at Garrett. While a graduate student, Cone wrestled with the challenges of the civil rights movement, debating whether he could be of greater service to the struggle by leaving school and becoming involved full time or by using his educational process and faith commitment as tools for the destruction of racism. Cone decided to remain in graduate school, receiving the MA in 1963 and a PhD in theology in 1965 from Garrett Theological Seminary, writing his dissertation on Karl Barth.

With no real prospects for pastoring an AME church or working at one of the AMEC colleges, Cone accepted a teaching appointment as an assistant professor at Philander Smith College. However, due to the conservative leanings of the administration, he left Philander Smith and began teaching as an assistant professor at Adrian College in Michigan in 1966. Cone's eventual prominence in theological circles resulted in various tempting job offers, and in 1969 he left Adrian College and accepted a position at Union Theological Seminary. He believed Union's strong history of theological creativity and its location within the heart of black America – Harlem – would provide the best opportunity for him to continue the development of a black theology of liberation.

For a short period of time, Cone considered returning to graduate school to pursue advanced work in literature. He saw this as a way of working through some of his sociopolitical and intellectual concerns. However, the growing intensity of the civil rights struggle disrupted these plans and strengthened his determination to apply his training and faith to the movement against injustice. Although he wrestled with the sociopolitical ramifications of Christianity for the destruction of racism during much of his schooling, it was at Adrian College that he began discussing publicly this attempt to reconcile black power and the Gospel of Christ. The intellectual pieces began falling in place when Ronald Goetz invited him to give a lecture in February 1968 at Elmhurst College. In this lecture, "Christianity and Black Power," Cone verbalized his rejection of theological paradigms offered by white thinkers as universally applicable, and he began to formulate a theological interpretation of the Christ event that spoke more directly to the existential condition of African Americans, through an equating of black power and the Gospel of Christ. In this sense, unlike most other theologians at that time, he saw no contradiction between black power and the Christian faith. In fact, he attempted to show a necessary synergy between the two. Cone would come to understand his theological work as a way of holding the Church accountable for praxis related to the radical gospel of Christ.

While rejected by some, this essay received positive attention from leading scholars such as C. Eric Lincoln, whom Cone credits with his receiving other invitations to lecture (as well as job offers). During the next year, 1969,

through the encouragement of Lincoln and the invitation from Metz Rollins, Executive Director of the National Conference of Black Churchmen (NCBC), to become a member of the group's theological commission (charged with writing a black theology statement), Cone gave more focused attention to his growing theological sensibilities, often arguing that the NCBC afforded him the necessary organizational and political platform on which to base his theological concerns. It was also during this year that Cone published his first book, *Black Theology and Black Power*, in which he began to outline the contours of what he would call Black Theology of Liberation. One year after the publication of this book, Cone provided the first systematic discussion of black theology in *Black Theology of Liberation* (1970). Here he offered a new grounding or foundational principle for theological discourse, one that would mark his work from that time to the present: liberation as the focus of the Christ event.

What Cone provided in these books was a turn in theological discourse, one that took seriously the reality of oppressed African Americans and used this historical lens to interpret the Christ event. In addition to scripture as a theological resource, as this shift might suggest, Cone gave attention to African-American culture, the African-American experience, and African-American history as resources for the doing of theology. And he argued that using these various resources to read scripture pushed to the fore God's intense commitment to the oppressed. According to Cone, and this was one of the major theological shifts his work marked, God's connection to the oppressed is so strong that God is ontologically black – with blacks representing for him the paradigm of oppression in the United States. Within these works, he also provided a theological analysis of violence that argued for the oppressed as the shapers of theological language and the nature of praxis. According to Cone, physical violence could be a legitimate tool of struggle against injustice.

As one might expect, many theologians objected to Cone's radical reworking of theology. While some African-American scholars were in this camp, others argued that his theological system remained, although rhetorically black, too indebted to the European theological tradition, as evidenced by his strong use of Karl Barth and Paul TILLICH. These critics, who included Gayraud Wilmore and Cone's brother Cecil, called for a theological discourse that made more use of African-American cultural resources. In a response tied to this critique, Charles Long raised questions concerning the usability of theology as a proper method for exploring African-American religion and the struggle for liberation when it is a product of the world view African Americans are attempting to escape. In addition William R. Jones questioned the theodical underpinning of black theology, suggesting that a humanocentric theism might provide a better response to the disproportionate suffering encountered by African Americans.

Cone addressed his critics in several texts, beginning with *Spirituals and the Blues* (1972), which focused attention on African-American musical culture as a theological resource for the development of a more appropriate language and grammar for the doing of theology. Other works, including *God of the Oppressed* (1975) and *Martin and Malcolm and America* (1992), which more concretely outlined the norm, sources, and structure of black theology, followed this book. He has also extended his writing and teaching to include issues related to the global impact of liberation theology. In all, Cone has published some eleven books, more than 150 articles, and he has lectured on black theology and black religion at more than one thousand colleges, universities, divinity schools, and community organizations in the United States, Europe, Africa, Asia, and Latin America. At Union Theological Seminary, where he is the Charles A. Briggs Distinguished Professor of Systematic Theology and has taught for roughly three decades, he has

trained a significant number of scholars who have continued to work in various forms of liberation theology. His impressive contributions to theological studies have been noted through various honorary degrees, as well as awards such as the American Black Achievement Award (in religion) from *Ebony Magazine* (1992), and the Theological Scholarship and Research Award from the Association of Theological Schools (1994).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Black Theology and Black Power (New York, 1969; Maryknoll, N.Y., 1990).

Black Theology of Liberation (Philadelphia, 1970; Maryknoll, N.Y., 1990).

Spirituals and the Blues: An Interpretation (New York, 1972; Maryknoll, N.Y., 1991).

God of the Oppressed (New York, 1975; Maryknoll, N.Y., 1997).

For My People: Black Theology and the Black Church (Maryknoll, N.Y., 1984).

My Soul Looks Back (Nashville, Tenn., 1986).

Speaking the Truth: Ecumenism, Liberation, and Black Theology (Maryknoll, N.Y., 1986; 1999).

Martin and Malcolm and America: A Dream or a Nightmare (Maryknoll, N.Y., 1992).

Ed. with Gayraud Wilmore, *Black Theology: A Documentary History* (Maryknoll, N.Y., 1993).

Risks of Faith: The Emergence of a Black Theology of Liberation, 1968–1998 (Boston, 1999).

Further Reading

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio

Burrow, Rufus, Jr. *James H. Cone and Black Liberation Theology* (Jefferson, N.C., 2001).

Hopkins, Dwight N., ed. *Black Faith and Public Talk: Critical Essays on James Cone's Black Theology and Black Power* (Maryknoll, N.Y., 1999).

Singleton, Harry H., III. *Black Theology and Black Ideology: Deideological Dimensions in the Theology of James H. Cone* (Collegeville, Minn., 2002).

Anthony B. Pinn

CONWAY, Moncure Daniel (1832–1907)

Moncure Daniel Conway was born on 17 March 1832 to Walker Peyton Conway and Margaret (Daniel) Conway in Stafford County, Virginia, where the Conways were one of the most prominent and wealthy slaveholding families. In 1849 Conway graduated with his BA from Dickinson College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, where the seed of abolitionist thought was planted in his mind. He began to study law for the bar in 1850 and simultaneously began to study progressive thinkers such as Horace Greeley and Horace Mann. Inspired by Mann, Conway lobbied the Virginia legislature for compulsory public education. This effort bore no fruit, but the conservatism of the Virginia legislature convinced him that slavery had stultified the thinking of the Virginia establishment, which seemed to cling to the status quo against all reason. Conway's private pursuit of knowledge drove his intellectual development and, a month after he began to study the law, his life was transformed by an encounter with the writings of Ralph Waldo EMERSON. Emerson's celebration of the individual led Conway in new intellectual paths and germinated the seed of abolitionist thought.

Early in 1851 Conway abandoned his legal studies, choosing to become a Methodist minister instead. The Methodist Church's emphasis on the equality of all believers before God and its earlier prohibition against slave ownership by church members were consistent with his budding abolitionism. He became a circuit-riding Methodist minister on his nine-

teenth birthday and continued to read Emerson and other radical authors. Conway's sermons began to alarm the faithful as he emphasized the fulfillment of a person's life on this earth rather than preparation for the afterlife. During this period, he decided that his interest in educational reform, his opposition to the conservatism of the slaveholding aristocracy in Virginia, and his attraction to Emerson and other radical writers were all expressions of a desire for autonomy, not only for himself, but for all men and women. Conway embarked on the quest of a freethinker, seeking to expose and root out arbitrary authority wherever he encountered it.

In 1852 Conway left his Methodist ministry to attend Harvard Divinity School. In the Boston area he befriended several local luminaries, particularly Henry Wadsworth Longfellow and Jared Sparks. Although initially repelled by the radical transcendentalism of Theodore Parker, he ultimately went beyond Parker's radical theology. Conway also made the short pilgrimage to Concord to meet Emerson, who introduced him to other prominent transcendentalists. Conway graduated from Harvard with his BD in 1854 and accepted the prestigious Unitarian pulpit in Washington, D.C. He increasingly found himself torn between his opposition to slavery and his allegiance to the South. Although he abhorred slavery, he disapproved of radical abolitionists' blanket condemnations of all southerners, arguing that northerners had been complicit in the growth of southern slavery. Nonetheless, northern abolitionists, including radicals like William Lloyd GARRISON and Wendell PHILLIPS, welcomed Conway to their cause, recognizing the power of an eloquent abolitionist from an influential, slave-owning Virginia family.

During the first year of his Washington ministry, Conway was cautious about expressing his abolitionist views before a congregation that included wealthy slave owners. As Americans became increasingly polarized over the issue of slavery, however, he was swept up by events beyond his control. In the summer of 1856 he resolutely denounced slavery in a sermon; within three months he was ousted from his position, accused of using the pulpit as a political forum. In his defense Conway maintained that slavery was a moral, and hence, religious issue. By December of 1856 he accepted an appointment to the First Congregational Church of Cincinnati, Ohio, where the members were more tolerant of his abolitionism.

Initially, Conway flourished in the heavily Germanized city of Cincinnati, marrying Ellen Dana, the well-educated daughter of a prominent businessman in 1858. He was particularly impressed with German intellectuals in Cincinnati, especially John B. STALLO and August WILLICH, the latter of whom sharpened his sensitivity to labor problems in the industrializing city. Conway's theology moved further left as he studied David Friedrich Strauss's *Das Leben Jesu* and questioned the veracity of biblical accounts of miracles, the divinity of Jesus, and the authority of the Bible. In 1859 Conway's church split over his theology, but he retained a following sufficient to remain in the pulpit. He finally left the Unitarian Church in 1862 and, after leading the Conway family slaves to safety in Ohio, he moved to Boston to serve as co-editor with Franklin B. Sanborn of an antislavery weekly, *The Commonwealth*.

Conway's reasons for leaving Cincinnati went beyond theology, however. As the escalating sectional crisis turned to war in April of 1861, he was thrust into the most difficult period of his tumultuous life. While his abolitionist allies abandoned their pacifism to support the Union cause, he nearly succumbed to the psychological pressures created by his commitment to abolitionism and his compassion for southerners. He argued that immediate emancipation of slaves and opposition to the war should be linked as one overriding goal, because emancipation would undermine the South's ability to prosecute the war as inspired slaves rebelled against their owners. Although

he felt the horror of war more profoundly than many Americans, Conway's commitment to the abolitionist cause never wavered, and he lectured at numerous venues on the subject throughout the war. In 1863 he managed to convince skeptical abolitionist colleagues that he should travel to England to promote their cause. Conway apparently felt compelled to leave the United States because he could not tolerate the emotional whirlpool into which he had been drawn.

In the summer of 1863 Conway sent a letter to James Murray Mason, the Confederate envoy in London, in which he proposed that if the Confederacy would liberate its slaves, American abolitionists would advocate an end to the war that would allow the South to secede from the Union. A controversy immediately arose because he had presented himself as a representative of American abolitionists, knowing that the proposal was not acceptable to that group. Mason used the opportunity to discredit American abolitionist leaders as duplicitous to their supporters, publishing his correspondence with Conway in the pro-Confederate London *Times*. Conway became the bane of American abolitionists who rushed to repudiate his position. Feeling alienated, he sent for his wife and sons, having unintentionally severed his ties to the United States.

Despite this episode, Conway enjoyed the spiritual and intellectual freedom he found in London. In 1864 he was appointed minister of London's most radical religious institution, South Place Chapel, a freethought church that still meets at Conway Hall in Red Lion Square. In 1884, having regained credibility with his former abolitionist colleagues, he returned to the United States for a brief triumphal visit. After the death of his wife Ellen in 1897, he returned to the United States once more, where he denounced American imperialism and promoted free religion. In 1898 he moved to Paris where he devoted himself to the peace movement and writing. He died on 15 November 1907 in Paris, France.

Throughout the course of his life, in addition to innumerable pamphlets and articles, Conway authored over seventy books.

Probably his most important literary accomplishment was his revival of the reputation of Thomas Paine, who had been condemned by Americans for decades as an atheistic Jacobin. Conway's publications, as well as his life, provide invaluable insight into American transcendentalism, the abolitionist movement, pacifist thought, and liberal religious thought during the late nineteenth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Tracts for Today (Cincinnati, 1857).
The Golden Hour (Boston, 1862).
Idols and Ideals, with an Essay on Christianity (New York, 1867).
The Earthward Pilgrimage (London, 1870).
Republican Superstitions as Illustrated in the Political History of America (London, 1872).
Demonology and Devil Lore, 2 vols (New York, 1879).
Thomas Carlyle (London and New York, 1881).
Emerson at Home and Abroad (Boston, 1882).
Omitted Chapters of History Disclosed in the Life and Papers of Edmund Randolph (New York, 1888).
Life of Nathaniel Hawthorne (New York, 1890).
Prisons of Air (New York, 1891).
The Life of Thomas Paine (New York, 1892).
My Pilgrimage to the Wise Men of the East (Boston, 1906).

Other Relevant Works
Conway's papers are at Columbia University and Dickinson College.
The Rejected Stone; or, Insurrection vs. Resurrection in America (Boston, 1861; 3rd edn 1862).
Testimonies Concerning Slavery (London, 1864).
Ed., *The Sacred Anthology: A Book of Ethnical Scriptures* (London and New York, 1874).

Barons of the Potomack and the Rappahannock (New York, 1892).

Ed., *The Writings of Thomas Paine*, 4 vols (New York, 1894–6).

Solomon and Solomonic Literature (Chicago and London, 1899).

Autobiography, Memories and Experiences of Moncure Daniel Conway, 2 vols (Boston, New York, and London, 1904).

Addresses and Reprints, 1850–1907: Published and Unpublished Work Representing the Literary and Philosophical Life of the Author (Boston, 1909).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v1*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Budd, Susan. *Varieties of Unbelief* (London, 1977).

Burtis, Mary Elizabeth. *Moncure Conway, 1832–1907* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1952).

D'Entremont, John. *Southern Emancipator: Moncure Conway, the American Years, 1832–1865* (New York, 1987).

Easton, Loyd D. *Hegel's First American Followers: The Ohio Hegelians: J. B. Stallo, Peter Kaufmann, Moncure Conway, August Willich* (Athens, Ohio, 1966).

Fredrickson, George M. *The Inner Civil War: Northern Intellectuals and the Crisis of the Union* (Urbana, Ill., 1965; 1993).

Good, James A. "Introduction," to *Moncure Daniel Conway: Autobiography and Miscellaneous Writings*, 3 vols (Bristol, UK, 2003), vol. 1, pp. v–x.

Ratcliffe, S. K. *The Story of South Place* (London, 1955).

Smith, Warren S. *The London Heretics* (New York, 1968).

Walker, Peter. *Moral Choices: Memory, Desire and Imagination in Nineteenth-Century American Abolitionism* (Baton Rouge, La., 1978), pp. 3–86.

James A. Good

COOLEY, Charles Horton (1864–1929)

Charles H. Cooley was born on 17 August 1864 in Ann Arbor, Michigan. His father, Thomas McIntyre Cooley, was on the faculty of the University of Michigan Law School, published several influential works on law and legal theory, and was also a judge at the Supreme Court of Michigan. In 1880 Charles Cooley entered the University of Michigan to study mechanical engineering. His studies were interrupted several times due to chronic ill health and a sojourn in Europe. After receiving the Michigan BA in 1887, Cooley went to Washington, D.C. to work for the Commerce Commission and then on to the Census Bureau. His search for a life career led him back to graduate work at the University of Michigan where he was offered a part-time instructorship in the department of political economy. He completed his dissertation, "The Theory of Transportation," and earned his PhD in political economy with a minor in sociology in 1894. During his graduate work Cooley associated with Lester WARD, Franklin Giddings, and James ANGELL, then President of the University of Michigan. In 1892 Cooley accepted a teaching position as instructor of sociology at the University of Michigan where he remained for the duration of his career. He was promoted to the rank of assistant professor in 1899 and attained full professorship in 1907, holding that position until his death. He was chair of the sociology department and twice President of the American Sociological Society, which he helped found in 1905. Cooley died on 7 May 1929 in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Cooley was a seminal thinker who defies categorization. Endowed with a brilliant intellect and having cultivated an especially rich imagination, he had interests in a variety of fields including sociology, philosophy, social psychology, political economy, and political science. He was influenced significantly throughout his life and in all of his writings by his study of philosophy and the organic view

modified from the work of Herbert Spencer. The writings of Ralph Waldo EMERSON, J. W. Goethe, Henry David Thoreau, and Thomas à Kempis were an abiding source of nurture for Cooley's work from his early years onward. His trilogy, *Human Nature and the Social Order* (1902), *Social Organization* (1909), and *Social Process* (1918), which he planned over the course of almost thirty years, represents the heart of his scholarly work and the mark of a highly original mind. These works made valuable contributions to social psychology, sociology, and philosophy. Cooley became an important social theorist during the early twentieth century in the company of William JAMES, James Mark BALDWIN, and George H. MEAD.

Cooley was linked with the schools of objective idealism and pragmatism. As an idealist, Cooley was interested in social problems as well as problems associated with the self. He wrote eloquently of the evolution of the self, which he verified empirically through observation of and introspection about his own family. His ideas on the social origins of both the mind and the self built on James's work and surpassed it with the concept of the reflected or "looking glass self." His family observations gave rise to a foundational concept in the social sciences, "the primary group" and its role in nurturing human and moral development. Cooley believed in the inextricable link and mutual dependency between the individual and society which he helped make a core concept in sociology. His theory of values and his examination of social institutions have made lasting contributions to the discipline of sociology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Human Nature and the Social Order (New York, 1902; New Brunswick, N.J., 1983).

Social Organization (New York, 1909).

Social Process (New York, 1918).

Sociological Theory and Social Research: Being Selected Papers of Charles Horton Cooley, ed. Robert C. Angell (New York, 1930). Contains a bibliography of Cooley's writings.

On Self and Social Organization, ed. Hans-Joachim Schubert (Chicago, 1998).

Other Relevant Works

Cooley's papers are at the Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

"Reflections upon the Sociology of Herbert Spencer," *American Journal of Sociology* 26 (1920): 129–45.

"Heredity or Environment," *Journal of Applied Sociology* 10 (1926): 303–307.

"The Roots of Social Knowledge," *American Journal of Sociology* 32 (1926): 59–79.

"Sumner and Methodology," *Sociology and Social Research* 12 (1928): 303–306.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych by Zusne*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Angell, Robert C. "Charles Horton Cooley," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (New York, 1968), vol. 3, pp. 378–82.

Cohen, Marshall J. *Charles Horton Cooley and the Social Self in American Thought* (New York, 1982).

Coser, Lewis A. "Charles Horton Cooley," in *Masters of Sociological Thought: Ideas in Historical and Social Context* (New York, 1971), pp. 305–30.

Jandy, Edward C. *Charles Horton Cooley: His Life and His Social Theory* (New York, 1942).

Schubert, Hans-Joachim. *Demokratische Identität: der soziologische Pragmatismus von Charles Horton Cooley* (Frankfurt am Main, 1995).

Anne K. Vittoria

COOLIDGE, Mary Lowell (1891–1958)

Mary Lowell Coolidge was born on 9 December 1891 in Lagrange, Illinois, and died on 8 October 1958. She attended public and private schools in Concord and Brookline, Massachusetts, and graduated from Bryn Mawr College with a BA in 1914. She earned a Master of Education from Harvard University in 1926, and an MA and a PhD in philosophy from Radcliffe College in 1930. Her dissertation was titled "Subjectivity and Objectivity in Contemporary Aesthetic Theory." In 1929 she was appointed for one year at Vassar College as an instructor of philosophy. In 1931 she joined the faculty of Wellesley College where she remained until her retirement in 1957, also serving as Dean from 1931 to 1938. Coolidge was an active member of the American Philosophical Association but not a prolific writer, publishing only five philosophy articles in her lifetime in the *Journal of Philosophy* and *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*.

Although each of Coolidge's articles deals with a separate philosophical issue, together they are characterized by thematic and methodological continuities. Coolidge was committed to pragmatism, as the best available philosophy for the people. For Coolidge, pragmatism is not naïvely optimistic as is often assumed, and it is has much in common with the esteemed European philosophies of phenomenology and existentialism. Methodologically speaking, Coolidge liked to work with established ideas or distinctions in philosophy (Nietzsche's use of the Apollonian and Dionysian distinction, William JAMES's distinction between the once-born and twice-born outlook as well as Kant's category of "purposiveness without purpose") and apply them to particular developments in the history of ideas, like the logical positivist critique of ethics, for example, so as to develop a more fruitful understanding and ways to proceed.

Coolidge's first article, "Today's Philosophy and Tomorrow's," published in the *Journal of Philosophy* in 1940, distinguishes between critical and speculative philosophy. She argues that American pragmatism, as a form of critical philosophy, is closer to being a philosophy for the people. Insofar as professional philosophy informs popular consciousness, critical philosophy is an important improvement upon speculative philosophy, according to Coolidge, because it resists the ready appropriation by political ideology, as illustrated by the case of dialectical materialism in Soviet Russia and that of totalitarian nationalism in Nazi Germany. A citizen inspired by critical philosophy analyzes the theories of her day with the view to developing a set of nondogmatic opinions that (1) are tentatively held; (2) are "forward looking and melioristic"; (3) presuppose "social interrelatedness and mutual responsibility"; and (4) are open to change (p. 623). She concludes that although professional philosophers will continue to engage in speculative philosophy, the emergence of critical philosophy ensures the subjection of these theories to ongoing, piecemeal, and relevant criticism, preventing them from becoming totalizing – something she thinks is imperative for the engagement in philosophical reflection to be possible.

"Ethics – Apollonian and Dionysian" was published in 1941, also in the *Journal of Philosophy*. It uses Nietzsche's analysis of classic and romantic art in terms of our Apollonian and Dionysian impulses to defend normative ethics against the assertion of logical positivism that ethical judgments and theories do nothing more than express and excite emotion. Apollonian art, according to Nietzsche, depicts a dream or image that is persuasive in terms of its beauty and "measured limitation." Dionysian art, by way of contrast, is wild and internally contradictory; it is an art of drunkenness, self-forgetfulness, ecstatic revelry, and exuberant vitality. Coolidge defends the thesis that Apollonian treatments of the good are found in the utopian writings of Plato, Bacon, and Marx. She argues that Dionysian treatments of the good are found in the Old Testament with the great variety of its teaching and the contradictions between them; in the writings of Nietzsche with his simultaneous affirma-

tion and rejection of rationalism; and in psychoanalysis. She recognizes that philosophy tends to emphasize Apollonian rather than Dionysian interpretations of the good life and identifies the ethical philosophies of Lucretius, Hobbes, Rousseau, and Schopenhauer as representing an uneasy compromise between the two. Coolidge concludes that the viability of the Apollonian and Dionysian distinction in ethics establishes that ethical theories do more than show and excite emotion: they attempt to answer the question of what the morally good life consists in.

In "Purposiveness without Purpose in a New Context," published in 1943 in *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, Coolidge draws on Kant's *Critique of Judgment* to defend A. N. WHITEHEAD against the criticism that he has two accounts of the Good which he fails to reconcile. In some places, critics charged, Whitehead's Good is a pattern found in the world, and in other places Good is a feeling within us. Coolidge argues that the point of Whitehead's account is to demonstrate that our appreciation of goodness is equivalent to an appreciation of "purposiveness without purpose," interpreting this phrase as Kant intended it, namely as a recognition of a form or order *in the world*, by way of a *feeling*. It is not surprising therefore that Kant used "purposiveness without purpose" to distinguish our experience of artistic and natural beauty. Coolidge argues that, by way of analogy, Whitehead's analysis of the Good as both a pattern found in the world and a feeling, need not be read as internally contradictory. Whitehead conceives of beauty (and creativity) as one of the ultimate categories of the universe, making aesthetic judgment original and final.

Coolidge's most sophisticated article, "Some Vicissitudes of the Once-born and of the Twice-born Man," appeared in *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* in 1950. She uses James's distinction between the once-born and the twice-born person to analyze recent developments in European and American philoso-

phy, and also to reveal their limitations. In *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, James distinguishes between the once-born outlook – a healthy tendency to look on all things as having the values that they appear to have – and the twice-born outlook – an unhealthy tendency to be suspicious of ordinary value as mere appearance that needs to be renounced in order to move in the direction of genuine value. Coolidge uses James's distinction to represent John DEWEY's empirical naturalism as characteristic of the first-born outlook. Dewey's empirical naturalism is optimistic in the sense that it represents the given world as capable of yielding the satisfactory experiences constitutive of the good life – no rebirth into another environment is necessary. She draws on C. I. LEWIS's book, *An Analysis of Knowledge and Valuation*, to show Dewey's empirical naturalism is more complex. Lewis accepts that human beings aspire to a good life, but emphasizes that we therefore necessarily conceive and live life *as a unity*. It follows then that good living cannot be a matter of quantitatively maximizing good experiences, but rather must involve a *relation* of experiences in a "temporal *Gestalt*" – the whole of experience takes precedence over the distinguishable experiences they include. Lewis makes two points about this. First, it follows that "whole" experiences have a transcendental quality, in that they may be taken as evidence for a life or even all life, suggestive of an alternative existence. Second, this "whole experience" will make reference to a context, incorporating reference to the lives of others and to the circumstances of those lives: social, economic, geographic, and so on. The implication of Lewis's argument is, as Coolidge suggests, either that the once-born position is more complex than James represents it as being, or that American philosophy does not fall within the once-born outlook – it is not as optimistic or natural as it might initially appear.

Coolidge's final article, "The Experimental Temper in Contemporary European Thought," was published in 1955 in the *Journal of Philosophy*. For Coolidge, pragmatism takes the middle ground between empiricism and ratio-

nalism, while European experimentalism takes the middle ground between logical positivism on the one hand and idealism and dialectical materialism on the other. Pragmatism begins from the position that thinking is a psychological process carried on by a biological animal whose nature is to be forward-looking. In order to evaluate thought, therefore, we evaluate its consequences for individuals and communities of individuals, for these are never wholly separable in pragmatism. Pragmatic tendencies begin to find expression in the writings of Nietzsche and Kierkegaard as well as the schools of phenomenology and existentialism. All involve a direct appeal to experience and constitute a revolt against traditional orthodoxies. They share with pragmatism a refusal to treat fact and value as separate, an emphasis on the temporality of human existence, and a concept of consciousness as always situational.

Distinguishing Coolidge's defense of pragmatism is its novel and insightful use of other philosophical developments, refusing to use philosophical caricatures whether of pragmatism or Nietzsche or Kant. Her work stands as a model of the philosophical enterprise: take all criticism seriously even if you suspect that it contains undisclosed biases; defend your view by testing it; make use of sound philosophical distinctions and ideas already available to you; consider the implications of your philosophical endeavors for the broader community; and always be mindful of the history of ideas into which your work falls.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Today's Philosophy and Tomorrow's," *Journal of Philosophy* 37 (1940): 617–26.
"Ethics – Apollonian and Dionysian," *Journal of Philosophy* 38 (1941): 449–65.
"Purposiveness without Purpose in a New Context," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 4 (1943): 85–93.
"Some Vicissitudes of the Once-born and of the Twice-Born Man," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 11 (1950): 75–87.
"The Experimental Temper in Contemporary European Philosophy," *Journal of Philosophy* 52 (1955): 477–92.

Further Reading
Who's Who in Phil, *Women Phils*

Megan Laverty

COOMARASWAMY, Ananda Kentish (1877–1947)

Ananda Coomaraswamy was born on 22 August 1877 in Colombo, Sri Lanka, and died on 9 September 1947 in Needham, Massachusetts. He was the son of Sir Mutu Coomaraswamy, a respected Sri Lankan Tamil scholar, and his wife Elizabeth Clay Beeby from Kent, England. His father passed away when he was only two years old, and he was raised by his mother in England. After graduating from Wycliff College, he went to University College London in 1897 and earned a PhD in geology in 1906. He is credited with discovering the mineral thorianite.

He accepted a position as the Director of the Mineralogical Survey of Sri Lanka and continued the research that he had embarked upon as part of his doctoral studies in Sri Lanka. These years were pivotal: they offered him scope to familiarize himself with the effects of British colonization of Sri Lanka and spurred the development of his political and philosophical ideas. In 1905 he published "An Open Letter to the Kandyan Chiefs," in an independent newspaper, *The Ceylon Observer*, where he bemoaned the degeneration and neglect that had fallen upon the traditional Kandyan architecture and crafts in the face of slavish imitations of Western artistic

and literary traditions. In the same year, he was instrumental, along with some other thinkers, in establishing the Ceylon Social Reform Society, which encouraged reform in social and cultural practices among Sri Lankans, and critiqued thoughtless and superficial imitations of European customs. This emphasis on cultural revivalism continued to be an important strain in his work. His exhortations to revive the past artistic glory of these South Asian countries, combined with his abhorrence for the "impoverished reality" of the modern world, have caused some to label him as an Orientalist.

A Renaissance man, he applied his training in scientific investigative methodologies to artistic analysis and published his first major book, *Mediaeval Sinhalese Art* (1908), in England. Working through a sociological reading of Kandyan social organization at that time, and aesthetic processes and practices in place, this book located artists and craftsmen in a specific sociocultural context. It also marked the beginning of Coomaraswamy's theorizing of ideas of tradition and the spiritual core of arts in South Asian cultures, a predominant idea in his later books such as *The Dance of Shiva* (1918). Through these ideas he located continuities among diverse artistic practices in South Asia, as well as among the high arts and those practiced as crafts, and established the cornerstone of his theory regarding much artistic practice in India and Sri Lanka: the integral connection between the aesthetic and functional aspects of art in these cultural contexts.

Coomaraswamy began to travel in India, picking up an intimate knowledge of the artistic traditions there with particular reference to the visual arts and collecting art objects. By 1911 he published several essays on Indian arts and crafts, and was well known among other theoreticians and philosophers as a historian and researcher of Indian art. It was soon thereafter that he arrived at what was to become a long-term research area for him: Rajput paintings. In 1912 he added another volume to his previously published *Indian Drawings* (1910), the latter subtitled *Chiefly Rajput*, noting that his subsequent travels had enabled him to better distinguish the Rajput and Mughal artistic styles. Like his other writings in this field, he worked painstakingly to historicize the development of these traditions, though according to a modernist linear model of historiography. He also continued to situate the artistic practice in a richly layered cultural context, and to identify patterns and themes running through them. All of this research contributed to his later, more mature writings on aesthetic theories of Indian art.

As he traveled through India, Coomaraswamy witnessed gathering unrest against colonial rule and met leaders of the nationalist movement, who were advocating the boycott of British manufactured goods and the adoption of Swadeshi, the goods manufactured in one's own country. This fired his imagination and strengthened his enthusiasm for the revival and nurturing of older indigenous cultural practices. In essays and papers written at this time, such as *Art and Swadeshi* (1912), he critiqued the colonized mindset that sought after Western imports and styles. While Coomaraswamy indubitably romanticized the artistic legacy that contemporary India had allegedly inherited from the past, his colonial critique had become sharper. Abhorring both the crass consumerism of Western mechanical production as well as the Anglicized tastes and habits of many leaders of the nationalist movement, he reframed Swadeshi as an aesthetic–religious, as well as political, practice. He urged reform in the areas of artistic practice and educational policy, which could provide vital tools to prevent the kinds of intellectual and creative poverty he saw as inevitable in the colonial experience. He also repeatedly challenged the political leaders of the community to pay attention to the indigenous imaginative and cultural resources in shaping the national movement.

While these writings seem conservative and problematic to contemporary readers, Coomaraswamy's ideas were by no means

narrow and conformist. By the time he returned to England in 1912, he was deeply invested in researching Western thinkers and artists such as William Blake and Friedrich Nietzsche, whose rebellious ideas he was drawn to. Woven into his writings on art history and religion – primarily the tenets of Hinduism and Buddhism – are questions about contemporary problems and challenges to the socio-political order. Inspired by some ideas of these thinkers, Coomaraswamy imagined a world- order that defied the constraints of any organized religion, but was deeply embedded in ethical, moral, and artistic considerations – an ideology he described as "idealistic individualism." The leaders in this new order would be artists, who alone could intuit the moral and aesthetic ideals that characterized it.

By the late 1910s, both his writings and collections had made for him a name as an art historian in international circles. In 1917 he was invited to join the Asiatic Section of the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, Massachusetts, and he was appointed Curator of the recently created Indian section, the first of its kind in the United States. As Keeper of Indian and Mohammedan Art of the Museum, Coomaraswamy continued his scholarly and research work. Through his work of cataloguing the art collections at the Museum, to which he added his own, his own knowledge of Indian art became literally encyclopedic. This is reflected in the level of detail in his later works, such as *History of Indian and Indonesian Art* (1927), as well as in the several catalogues and essays published under the auspices of the Museum. Adept at presenting his scholarship in lectures, he was quickly welcomed into the academic circuit and traveled intensively to universities.

Charged with the mission of explaining and interpreting South Asian arts for Western audiences in his position at the Museum, Coomaraswamy worked to develop a sophisticated and philosophical writing style that positioned him uniquely as translator of East to West. His deep knowledge of the paradigms of artistic excellence and ethics and values in both worlds enabled him to move between them,

and to draw parallels, compare, and contrast, as is obvious, in his *Christian and Oriental Philosophy of Art* (1956). His seminal essays at this time reveal the depth of his thought regarding the ways in which artistic and cultural difference are contextualized. For instance, in his address *Why Exhibit Works of Art?* before the American Association of Museums in 1941, he upheld the symbolic and educational value of art. Critiquing the curio-cabinet nature of many museum collections, he argued that such works must not be exhibited in ways that spectacularize them, but rather, must be related to the conditions in which they were created, to the aesthetic values from which they emerged, and their place in the world view from which they emerge.

In the last few years of his life, he worked indefatigably to recover and systematically research traditional knowledge in fields ranging from art, dance, and aesthetics to religion, philosophy, metaphysics, education, and government. Besides being a prolific scholar, he was also a poet, a photographer, and painter. And while he evolved no new system of thought, the philosophical ideals that suffused all of his work made him an excellent expositor of the systems of thought and aesthetics he loved and knew intimately. His critics have charged him with falling into the modernist trap of dichotomizing nature and culture, exoticizing Indian traditions, and creating master narratives of culture. And while all of these mediate the value of his work, his erudition and his work in systematizing and in recovering knowledge that might otherwise have remained obscure remain the bases for much current scholarship in the arts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Deeper Meaning of the Struggle (Broad Campden, UK, 1907).

Mediaeval Sinhalese Art (Broad Campden, UK, 1908).

The Aims of Indian Art (Broad Campden, UK, 1908).

Essays in National Idealism (Colombo, Sri

Lanka, 1909).

The Indian Craftsman (London, 1909).

Indian Drawings (London, 1910).

The Oriental View of Woman (Broad Campden, UK, 1910).

Selected Examples of Indian Art (Broad Campden, UK, 1910).

Indian Drawings: Chiefly Rajput (London, 1912).

Art and Swadeshi (Madras, India, 1912).

Visvakarma: Examples of Indian Architecture, Sculpture, Painting, Handicraft (London, 1912).

The Arts and Crafts of India and Ceylon (London, 1913; 2nd edn 1964; 3rd edn 1971).

Buddha and the Gospel of Buddhism (New York, 1916).

Rajput Painting (London, 1916).

The Mirror of Gesture: Being the Abhinaya Darpana of Nandikesvara (Cambridge, Mass., 1917).

Myths of the Hindus and Buddhists, with Sister Nivedita (London, 1918).

The Dance of Shiva: Fourteen Indian Essays (New York, 1918; 2nd edn 1924; 3rd edn 1959).

Introduction to Indian Art (Madras, India, 1923; 2nd edn Delhi, 1969).

Yaksas: Essays in the Water Cosmology (Washington, D.C., 1923–31; 2nd edn 1971; 3rd rev. edn 1993).

History of Indian and Indonesian Art (New York, 1927).

A New Approach to the Vedas (London, 1933).

The Transformation of Nature in Art (Cambridge, Mass., 1934).

The Darker Side of Dawn (Washington, D.C., 1935).

Elements of Buddhist Iconography (Cambridge, Mass., 1935).

Spiritual Authority and Temporal Power in the Indian Theory of Government (New Haven, Conn., 1942; 2nd edn 1978; 3rd edn 1993).

Hinduism and Buddhism (New York, 1943).

Why Exhibit Works of Art? (London, 1943).

Figures of Speech, or, Figures of Thought: Collected Essays on the Traditional, or, "Normal" View of Art (London, 1946).

Am I My Brother's Keeper? (New York, 1947).

The Bugbear of Literacy (London, 1947).

Time and Eternity (Ascona, Switzerland, 1947).

Other Relevant Works

Portfolio of Indian Art (Boston, 1923).

Catalogue of the Indian Collections in the Museum of Fine Arts (Boston, 1923).

Bibliographies of Indian Art (Boston, 1925).

Writings and Speeches, ed. S. D. Raja Singam (Singapore, 1960).

The Sacred and the Secular in India's Performing Arts: Ananda K. Coomaraswamy Centenary Essays, ed. V. Subramaniam (Delhi, 1980).

Sources of Wisdom (Colombo, Sri Lanka, 1981).

Ananda Coomaraswamy Centenary Essays, ed. C. D. Narasimhaiah (Mysore, India, 1982).

Paroksa: Coomaraswamy Centenary Seminar Papers, ed. Gulam Mohammed Sheikh, K. G. Subramanyan, and Kapila Vatsyayan (New Delhi, India, 1984).

Fundamentals of Indian Art (Jaipur, India, 1985).

Selected Letters of Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, ed. Alvin Moore, Jr. and Rama P. Coomaraswamy (Delhi, India, 1988).

Essays in Early Indian Architecture, ed. Michael Meister (New Delhi, 1992).

Essays in Architectural Theory, ed. Michael Meister (Delhi, 1995).

The Door in the Sky: Coomaraswamy on Myth and Meaning, ed. Rama P. Coomaraswamy (Princeton, N.J., 1997).

Perception of the Vedas, ed. Vidya Misra (New Delhi, 2000).

The Essential Ananda K. Coomaraswamy,
   ed. Rama P. Coomaraswamy
   (Bloomington, Ind., 2004).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was
   Who in Amer v2*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Bagchee, Moni. *Ananda Coomaraswamy: A
   Study* (Varanasi, India, 1977).
Bharatha Iyer, K., ed. *Art and Thought:
   Issued in Honour of Dr. Ananda K.
   Coomaraswamy on the Occasion of His
   70th Birthday* (London, 1947).
Crouch, James S. *A Bibliography of Ananda
   Kentish Coomaraswamy* (Delhi, 2002).
Fernando, Ranjit, ed. *The Unanimous
   Tradition: Essays in Honor of Ananda
   Kentish Coomaraswamy* (Colombo, Sri
   Lanka, 1991).
Kamaliah, K. C. *Ananda Coomaraswamy,
   Wise Man from the East* (Madras,
   India, 1977).
Lipsey, Roger. *Daedalus: Lectures
   Commemorating the Birth Centenary of
   A.K. Coomaraswamy* (Dharwad, India,
   1980).
Raja Singam, S. Durai. *A Garland of
   Tributes: Homage to Ananda K.
   Coomaraswamy* (Kuala Lumpur,
   Malaysia, 1948).
———, *Ananda Coomaraswamy:
   Remembering and Remembering Again
   and Again* (Petaling Jaya, Malaysia, 1974).
Rao, C. V. Ramachandra. *A.K.
   Coomaraswamy: An Inspirer of Indian
   Renaissance and Other Cultural Causerie*
   (Nellore, India, 1980).
Roebuck, Valerie. *Meaning and Symbolism
   in the Work of Ananda Coomaraswamy*
   (London, 1990).
Rowland, Benjamin. *The Wall-paintings of
   India, Central Asia and Ceylon* (Delhi,
   India, 1985).
Sastri, P. S. *Ananda K. Coomaraswamy*
   (Delhi, India, 1974).

Ananya Chatterjea

COOPER, Anna Julia Haywood
(1858–1964)

Anna Julia Haywood was born into slavery on 10 August 1858 in Raleigh, North Carolina. She was the daughter of slave Hannah Stanley and, by Anna's own convictions, the man who held Hannah as a slave, George Washington Haywood. Cooper felt a deep sense of love and gratitude toward her mother who worked to ensure that Anna's life would be better than her own. Like Frederick DOUGLASS, Cooper expressed nothing but disdain for her white father, from whom her mother escaped as soon as slavery was abolished. Anna is believed to have learned to read and write at the home of Charles Busbee, for whom her mother was hired out as a nursemaid.

Anna studied at St. Augustine's Normal School from 1867 to 1877, and soon after graduating she married Reverend George C. Cooper, a teacher at St. Augustine's, at the age of nineteen. George Cooper, also a former slave, was fourteen years her senior; he died in 1879, just two years after they were married. Faced with the need to earn her own living, Cooper returned to St. Augustine's to teach from 1879 to 1881, and committed herself to a life as an educator. Though she never remarried, she did adopt five nieces and nephews later in life, and was devoted to nurturing the intellectual and personal growth of young people.

After receiving her BA from Oberlin College in 1884, she taught at Wilberforce College from 1885 to 1887, and at the M Street High School in Washington, D.C. from 1887 to 1902, where she also was the school's principal from 1902 to 1906. After teaching for four years at the Lincoln Institute in Jefferson City, Missouri, she returned to the M Street High School to teach under a new administration, and remained on its faculty until retiring in 1930. During this time she pursued a doctorate, studying modern languages and literature in France and at Columbia University in the mid 1910s. The Sorbonne in Paris finally

accepted transfer credits and her dissertation on the role of slavery in the French Revolution, granting Cooper the PhD in history in 1925. In 1930 Cooper became President of Frelinghuysen University in Washington, D.C. This university for adult education benefited from her energies for much of the rest of her life. She served as President until 1937, and continued to be involved afterwards.

Cooper was the first woman elected to membership in the exclusive American Negro Academy in 1897. She was the fourth African-American woman in the US to earn a doctoral degree. She was also one of only two women to lecture at the first Pan-African Conference in London in 1900. Cooper did not fully retire from teaching until she reached the age of eighty-four. She died on 27 February 1964 in Washington, D.C., at the age of 105.

Cooper became an educator largely because she saw education as a way of lifting African Americans out of the state of poverty and degradation slavery had left them in. She also saw women as playing an especially important role within African-American culture. A maternal feminist, Cooper believed that women were inherently nurturing and caring, which meant that African-American women were able to ennoble and purify their race as mothers and educators. Her views on this subject are outlined in her major work, *A Voice from the South*.

Cooper also expressed her views on race relations in *A Voice*. In fact, she was not afraid to call white women to account for their racism. She facetiously suggested that the name of the organization "Wimodausis," which stood for "wives, mothers, daughters, and sisters" be changed to "Whimodausis" – *white* mothers, daughters, and sisters – because it was not open to women of color. She was also among several African-American women to insist on being given a chance to speak at the women's sessions of the Chicago World's Fair in 1893. She lectured, along with Fanny Jackson Coppin and Fannie Barrier WILLIAMS, about the status and progress of African-American women at this famous event, thereby educating her white contemporaries and inspiring her black colleagues and followers.

Like so many women in this era, Cooper saw education as the key to true emancipation for both women and minorities. She agreed with W. E. B. DU BOIS and Alexander CRUMMELL, whose family she was close to, that a classic liberal education was more valuable to African Americans than vocational training. She also believed that quality education would improve the social and political standing of African-American women and enrich both their personal and their professional lives.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
A Voice from the South, by a Black Woman of the South (Xenia, Ohio, 1892; Oxford, 1988).
Attitude de la France à l'égard de l'esclavage pendant la revolution (Paris, 1925). Trans. Frances Richardson Keller, *Slavery and the French Revolutionists (1788–1805)* (Lewiston, N.Y., 1988).
The Voice of Anna Julia Cooper: Including A Voice from the South and Other Important Essays, Papers, and Letters, ed. Charles Lemert and Esme Bhan (Lanham, Md., 1998).

Other Relevant Works
Cooper's papers are at Howard University.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio
Bailey, Catherine. "Anna Julia Cooper: 'Dedicated in the Name of My Slave Mother to the Education of Colored Working People'," *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy* 19 (2004): 56–73.
Baker-Fletcher, Karen. *A Singing Something: Womanist Reflections on Anna Julia Cooper* (New York, 1994).
Gable, Leona C. *From Slavery to the Sorbonne and Beyond: The Life and Writings of Anna J. Cooper* (Northampton, Mass., 1982).

Hutchinson, Louise Daniel. *Anna J. Cooper: A Voice from the South* (Washington, D.C., 1981).

Johnson, Karen A. *Uplifting the Women and the Race: The Educational Philosophies, and Social Activism of Anna Julia Cooper and Nannie Helen Burroughs* (New York, 2000).

May, Vivian. "Thinking from the Margins, Acting at the Intersections: Anna Julia Cooper's *A Voice from the South*," *Hypatia* 19 (2004): 74–91.

Dorothy Rogers

COPE, Edward Drinker (1840–97)

Edward Cope was born on 28 July 1840 in Philadelphia. He attended a private academy and the University of Pennsylvania, followed by further study at the Philadelphia Academy of Sciences and the Smithsonian Institution. He then attended the University of Heidelberg in 1863–4, receiving a PhD. He was professor of natural sciences at Haverford College from 1864 to 1867, and from 1865 to 1873 he was curator of the Academy of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia. He specialized in reptile, amphibian, and fish paleontology, exploring first the eastern regions of the United States and then several western states, assembling and classifying vast collections of thousands of fossils. Cope was also a chief paleontologist for the United States Geological Survey during the late 1870s and 1880s. In 1889 he was appointed professor of geology and paleontology at the University of Pennsylvania, and was professor of zoology and comparative anatomy from 1896 until his death. He was an honorary member of several international scientific societies, and in 1896 he was elected President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Cope died on 12 April 1897 in Philadelphia.

Cope was America's first major theoretician and philosopher on evolution, and a prominent and influential neo-Lamarckian. He postulated that most of the higher organisms arose from "unspecialized ancestors" of relatively small body sizes, whose larger descendants are much more specialized. Therefore, most current species are highly susceptible to degeneracy and extinction, and further evolution will proceed from the few remaining small and unspecialized mammals now alive. This theory is still debated today, although his idea that evolution proceeds in a relatively cumulative and linear manner has lost credibility. Cope made little advance with his theory of "acceleration and retardation" over Lamarck's own position that the learned habits of adults correspondingly modify their reproductive cells so that offspring will be more likely to display the same habit. Interestingly, according to Cope, this modification did not happen by a chemical mechanism,

In his more speculative discussions of biology, Cope could not credit chance mutation with creating fitter variations over time. The initial origin of fitter organic structures cannot be explained by selection and survival. He thus argued that biology cannot rest on materialism and Darwin's theory of natural selection, but instead must appeal to spiritual or mental forces to explain sustained growth and progress. Unlike his contemporary Chauncey WRIGHT, who was America's most sophisticated defender of Darwin's theory of natural selection, Cope insisted that higher animals and humanity could not have resulted from fortuitous chance. Entropy prevails over matter, so that there must be an organizing force to compensate against mechanical energy's tendency to dissipate. In his early writings Cope was willing to see God's own guiding hand in all stages of evolution, following many other zoologists such as Louis AGASSIZ. Furthermore, Cope accepted and taught the racist notion that the "lower" (dark-skinned) races display the immature characteristics of the fully evolved "higher" (white) race.

His later writings move away from explicit theism towards a kind of vitalism. Cope's theory of evolution required an initial supply of basic mental energy which permitted primitive life to make discriminations and form successful habits that are inheritable and improvable. It was supposed to be this form of nonmaterial energy that modified the adult's reproductive cells. Intelligence will develop in step with the increasing specialization, sensitivity, and usefulness of the organism's parts. This empiricist theory of intelligence was designed by Cope to compromise with the dominant psychological theory of psychophysical parallelism. Parallelism had no provision for evolutionary mental development, rested on a rationalistic view of mind, and was notoriously unable to explain mind–body interaction. Like Charles PEIRCE at about the same time, Cope was unable to find in physics or chemistry the sort of energy that could explain intelligence and evolutionary progress, and so both thinkers postulated a higher form of dynamic and purposive causality and identified it with mind. Cope held that his evolutionary theory of mind eliminates the need to postulate an indeterministic free will.

Cope's theory of inherited habits resulted in his view that humanity's moral habits will permanently rest in a delicate balance between altruism and selfishness. Excessive altruism cannot long survive in a population, although some individuals will have a preponderance of social qualities. Our destiny as a species is a perpetual struggle between justice and injustice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

On the Origin of Genera (Philadelphia, 1869).

On the Hypothesis of Evolution: Physical and Metaphysical (New Haven, Conn., 1870).

On the Method of Creation of Organic Types (Philadelphia, 1871).

Consciousness in Evolution (Philadelphia, 1875).

The Theory of Evolution (Philadelphia, 1876).

The Origin of the Fittest: Essays on Evolution (New York, 1886).

Theology of Evolution (Philadelphia, 1887).

The Primary Factors of Organic Evolution (Chicago, 1896).

Other Relevant Works

Most of Cope's papers are at the American Museum of Natural History in New York City and at Haverford College.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v23*

Jaffe, Mark. *The Gilded Dinosaur: The Fossil War between E. D. Cope and O. C. Marsh and the Rise of American Science* (New York, 2000).

Osborn, Henry F. *Cope*: *Master Naturalist. The Life and Writings of Edward Drinker Cope* (Princeton, N.J., 1931). Contains a bibliography of Cope's publications.

John R. Shook

COPI, Irving Marmer (1917–2002)

Irving Copi was born on 28 July 1917 in Duluth, Minnesota, to Samuel Bernard Copilowish and Rose Marmer Copilowish. He received his BA in 1938 and MS in 1940 from the University of Michigan. After working in Detroit automobile factories and participating in union politics during World War II, he returned to Michigan for his MA in 1947 and PhD in philosophy in 1948. He immediately joined the Michigan philosophy faculty, where he taught until 1969, when he became professor of philosophy at the University of Hawaii. Copi retired in 1991, and died on 19 August

2002 in Honolulu, Hawaii.

Relying on Charles PEIRCE's 1870 "Description of a Notation for the Logic of Relatives" while employing the *Principia Mathematic* notation developed by its authors Bertrand Russell and A. N. WHITEHEAD, Copi developed a modern matrix logic for the algebra of relations. He noted that Peirce sought to introduce matrices "partly as an aid in his classification of relations, and partly for the sake of illustrations or examples" (1984, pp. 193–6).

Copi's *Symbolic Logic* was one of the most widely used and controversial textbooks of the mid twentieth century. The quantifier rules in its first and second editions were shown to be erroneous by numerous authors. In its third edition, Copi borrowed quantifier rules provided by Hugues LEBLANC.

In "Artificial Languages" (1958), Copi defined an "ideal language" in terms of material, but not formal, adequacy. He then rejected the concept of an ideal language on the basis of the vicious circle principle, arguing that a knowledge of the structure of the world is a prerequisite to definition of the structure of a logically correct language, so that the language cannot be known to be "ideal" except by comparison of the structure of the language with the structure of the world. An "ideal" language must thus be constructed in order to examine the logical and ontological structure of the world, and to determine what exists. Copi thought he saw an early variant of Russell's simple theory of types in the theory of categories as found in Plato's *Sophist* (1971, p. 26), and argued that Ludwig Wittgenstein's *Tractatus* is nominalistic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Matrix Development of the Calculus of Relations," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 13 (1948): 193–203.

"The Inconsistency or Redundancy of Principia Mathematica," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 11 (1950): 190–99.

Introduction to Logic (New York, 1953; 9th edn 1994).

Symbolic Logic (New York, 1954; 10th edn 1998).

"Another Variant of Natural Deduction," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 21 (1956): 52–5.

"Artificial Languages," in *Language, Thought and Culture*, ed. Paul Henle (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1958), pp. 96–102.

"The Burali–Forti Paradox," *Philosophy of Science* 25 (1958): 281–6.

The Theory of Logical Types (London, 1971).

"Objects, Properties, and Relations in the *Tractatus*," in *Essays on Wittgenstein's Tractatus*, ed. Irving M. Copi and Robert W. Beard (New York, 1966), pp. 167–86.

"Logic versus Illogic," *International Logic Review* 19–20 (December 1979): 111–13.

Informal Logic (New York, 1986).

Other Relevant Works
Ed. with James A. Gould, *Contemporary Readings in Logical Theory* (New York, 1967).

Ed. with James A. Gould, *Contemporary Philosophical Logic* (New York, 1967).

Further Reading
Proc of APA v76

Anellis, Irving H., "Forty Years of 'Unnatural' Natural Deduction and Quantification: A History of First-order Systems of Natural Deduction, from Gentzen to Copi," *Modern Logic* 2 (1991): 113–52.

Bradley, M. C. "Copi's Method of Deduction Again," *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 12 (1971): 454–8.

Fang, Joong, "The 'User-hostile' Logic: 'Logic' versus 'Illogic'," *Philosophia Mathematica* 2 (1987): 77–109.

Johnson, Frederick A. "Copi's Method of Induction," *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 20 (1979): 295–300.

Leblanc, Hughes. "Minding Ones *X*'s and

Y's," *Logique et Analyse* 8 (1965): 207–8.

Peirce, Charles S. "Description of a Notation for the Logic of Relatives, Resulting from an Amplification of the Conceptions of Boole's Calculus of Logic," *Memoirs of the American Academy* 9 (1870): 317–78. Reprinted in *Writings of Charles S. Peirce: A Chronological Edition*, vol. 2: *1867–1871*, ed. Edward C. Moore (Bloomington, Ind., 1984), pp. 359–429.

Irving H. Anellis

CORNMAN, James Welton (1929–78)

James Cornman was born on 16 August 1929 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He first studied philosophy at Dartmouth, receiving the BA in 1956. He then undertook graduate studies at Brown University. Cornman received the MA from Brown in 1957, supervised by Roderick CHISHOLM, and completed the PhD in philosophy in 1960, working with John Lenz. Cornman was an assistant professor of philosophy at Ohio State University from 1960 to 1963, associate professor at the University of Rochester from 1963 to 1967, and professor of philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania from 1967 to 1978. Cornman had a Mellon postdoctoral fellowship at Pittsburgh in 1964–5, where he worked intensely with Wilfrid SELLARS. He was killed in a car accident on 31 May 1978 in Norristown, Pennsylvania.

Cornman published four books and more than forty articles during his lifetime. These works presented his views on metaphilosophy, reference, the mind–body problem (issues involving sensations in particular), and philosophy of science. A fifth book, *Skepticism, Justification and Explanation*, was nearly complete at the time of his death, and was published posthumously.

Cornman may be best known for his adverbial theory of sensations, and for his metaphilosophical reflections on the place of linguistic analysis in philosophy. With respect to the former, Cornman denied that there are sensa or phenomenal objects; thus there can be no issue of such objects exhibiting non-material properties. Sensory experiences are, for him, objectless events, which are identical to brain events. For example, it is philosophically misleading to talk about having *a pain* (phenomenal object) which *is intense* (mental property thereof). Instead, what really occurs is that someone suffers painfully, and intensely so. Cornman's central argument for adverbial materialism was its superiority over its two rivals: the utter elimination of sensation, as in Richard RORTY and W. V. QUINE, and the (to Cornman implausible) reduction of sense data to physical *entities*, as in his reading of Sellars.

As for metaphilosophy, Cornman endorsed "the linguistic turn." However, there were three familiar varieties of linguistic philosophy that he resisted. He rejected the reform of language, as in Russell and CARNAP, seeking instead a description of the actual workings of ordinary language. He insisted, against Wittgensteinians who favored linguistic therapy, that traditional philosophical problems are perfectly sensible. He equally insisted that philosophy is not *about* language: philosophers want to know about God, sensations, physical objects, the will, etc., not merely about "God," "sensations," "physical objects," or "the will." But if one rejects not just reform and therapy, but also the idea that philosophy is about language, how can linguistic analysis make positive contributions to traditional metaphysics, understood as being about extra-linguistic entities? The evidence-base (facts internal to language) does not seem to fit with the stated topic (facts external to language). Cornman's suggestion involved a kind of coherentist bootstrapping. Carried out in practice across several books,

the method involved careful study of particular philosophical problems – mind–body relations, sense data, skepticism – each providing evidence, along the way, about which theory of reference was on the right track. Those findings about reference then provide a sort of bridge from language-internal evidence to language-external ontological results. These, in turn, would yield further results about reference, and so on. Cornman cautioned, however, that such investigations could never be conclusive or ultimate, precisely because the various philosophical positions – about reference and otherwise – all support one another.

Cornman believed that philosophical theories generally, not just those which are more or less directly about language, have implications for the correct account of reference, and vice versa. He had hoped to write two further books, on ethics and aesthetics, thereby affording a fairly complete philosophical system against which to check his prior accounts of reference, mind, sensation, evidence, and so on.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Metaphysics, Reference, and Language (New Haven, Conn., 1966).

Philosophical Problems and Arguments: An Introduction, with Keith Lehrer (New York, 1968).

Materialism and Sensations (New Haven, Conn., 1971).

Perception, Common Sense, and Science (New Haven, Conn., 1975).

Skepticism, Justification and Explanation (Dordrecht, 1980). Contains a bibliography of Cornman's writings.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Who Was Who in Amer v7*

Choy, Victoria. "The Philosophy of James W. Cornman," *Philosophical Studies* 41 (1982): 7–29.

Domotor, Zoltan, and Michael Friedman. "Cornman and Philosophy of Science," *Philosophical Studies* 41 (1982): 115–28.

Duran, Jane. "A Contextualist Modification of Cornman," *Philosophia* 16 (1986): 377–88.

Elugardo, Reinaldo. "Cornman, Adverbial Materialism and Phenomenal Properties," *Philosophical Studies* 41 (1982): 33–49.

Pitcher, George. "Sensations and Information: A Reply to Cornman," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 56 (1978): 65–7.

Sellars, Wilfrid. "Science, Sense Impressions and Sensa: A Reply to Cornman," *Review of Metaphysics* 24 (1971): 391–447.

Swain, Michael. "Cornman's Theory of Justification," *Philosophical Studies* 41 (1982): 129–50.

Robert J. Stainton

COSTELLO, Harry Todd (1885–1960)

Harry Todd Costello, nicknamed "Butch," was born on 1 November 1885 in Richmond, Indiana, and died on 25 January 1960 in Hartford, Connecticut. In 1908 Costello graduated with a BA from Earlham College, where Edwin D. STARBUCK was his first philosophy teacher. Next he went to Harvard on a university scholarship where he received his MA in 1910. Costello studied symbolic logic under Josiah ROYCE by taking his Philosophy 20C seminar in 1909–10 and 1910–11. Pleased with his work, Royce appointed him as "recording secretary" for this seminar for the year 1913–14. Costello's "secretarial notes" have been preserved, and they were published posthumously in 1963. In 1911 Costello received his PhD in philosophy with a dissertation on economic organization entitled "The Fundamental Characteristics of Organization: Especially as Illustrated by those Organizations Through which the Results of Science are Applied in the Arts and Industries." Royce, R. B. PERRY, and E. B. HOLT were on his dissertation committee.

After his graduation Costello spent one year in Paris on a Sheldon Fellowship to attend Bergson's lectures at the Sorbonne. On his return he taught philosophy at Harvard from 1912 to 1914. In the spring of 1914 Costello was also assistant lecturer in an advanced logic course that was taught by visiting professor Bertrand Russell.

Costello left Harvard in 1914, teaching at Yale University in 1914–15, and Barnard College of Columbia University from 1915 to 1920. In 1920 he became the Brownell Professor of Philosophy at Trinity College in Hartford, Connecticut, succeeding Wilbur M. URBAN. Costello remained at Trinity College until his retirement in 1956. He was a visiting lecturer at the University of California, at Berkeley in 1922 and Harvard in 1930. In 1952 he gave the Woodbridge Lectures at Columbia, which were published in 1954 as *A Philosophy of the Real and the Possible*. His only other book is his annotated *A List of Books for a College Student's Reading* (1925), which went through five editions. Indifferent to social life, Costello secluded himself to the point of eccentricity, devoting all his time to reading. He died suddenly in 1960, having lived for thirty-nine years in a cluttered suite of two rooms on the Trinity College campus.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"A Neo-Realistic Theory of Analysis," *Journal of Philosophy* 10 (1911): 494–8.
"Hypotheses and Instrumental Logicians," *Journal of Philosophy* 15 (1918): 57–64.
A List of Books for A College Student's Reading (Hartford, Conn., 1925).
"Logic and Reality," *Journal of Philosophy* 43 (1946): 169–90.
A Philosophy of the Real and the Possible (New York, 1954).
"Logic in 1914 and Now," *Journal of Philosophy* 54 (1957): 245–64.

Other Relevant Works
Josiah Royce's Seminar, 1913–1914: As Recorded in the Notebooks of Harry T. Costello, ed. Grover Smith (New Brunswick, Canada, 1963). Contains a bibliography of Costello's writings.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v34, Who Was Who in Amer v4, Who's Who in Phil

Cornelis de Waal

COUNTS, George Sylvester (1889–1974)

George S. Counts was born on 9 December 1889 near Baldwin City, Kansas. He received his BA in 1911 at Baker University and taught in high schools for two years. He then earned a PhD in education and social sciences from the University of Chicago in 1916, studying with Charles Hubbard Judd and Albion W. SMALL. He embarked on a busy career, teaching at the University of Delaware, Harris College, the University of Washington, Yale University, the University of Chicago, and finally Columbia University Teachers College from 1927 to 1955. After his retirement from Columbia, he held visiting teaching positions at the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Colorado, Michigan State University, Northwestern University, and finally Southern Illinois University at Carbondale (1962–74). Counts died on 10 November 1974 in Belleville, Illinois.

Counts was a leading philosopher of education and a powerful force in the later years of the progressive education movement. He served on educational commissions and committees for many American educational societies, including the National Education Association, and was President of the American Federation of Teachers from 1939 to 1942. He was active in international education, studying several countries including the Soviet Union and Japan. His energies were

also devoted to a variety of political organizations. He was the New York State chairman of the American Labor Party (1942–4). He then established the Liberal Party in New York, unsuccessfully ran for the US Senate in 1952, and chaired the party for four years (1955–9). He served for many years on the national committee of the American Civil Liberties Union (1940–73).

Counts agreed with other liberal educational leaders such as John Dewey that schools should prepare students for social usefulness and democratic participation. Also like Dewey, Counts was politically aligned with socialism and its judgment that unrestrained capitalism is both unjust and unsustainable. The Great Depression confirmed these views for Counts, but he went farther than many progressive educators including Dewey by demanding that schools teach the values of socialism. With the other philosophers of education Theodore Brameld, John L. Childs, and Harold Rugg, Counts expected that schools could quickly become forces for social change and produce citizens ready for social democracy and the inevitable planned economy. A fierce dispute arose among liberal educators, with Dewey replying that schools should remain neutral with respect to any economic solution that emerges.

Counts could not see how schools, as firmly embedded in the broader culture, could ever remain neutral; they always teach some values. He anticipates Dewey's objection: "You will say, no doubt, that I am flirting with the idea of indoctrination. And my answer is again in the affirmative. Or, at least, I should say that the word does not frighten me. We may all rest assured that the younger generation in any society will be thoroughly imposed upon by its elders and by the culture into which it is born. For the school to work in a somewhat different direction with all the power at its disposal could do no great harm. At the most, unless the superiority of its outlook is unquestioned, it can serve as a counterpoise to check and challenge the power of less enlightened or more selfish purposes." (1932, p. 263)

When Counts looked at schools realistically, he saw another social institution designed to make students conform to the values and expectations consistent with the form of capitalism then existing. The necessary question for philosophers of education is which values shall be taught, and Counts believed that progressive education tended to avoid this question. Ironically, as Counts's admiration for the Soviet Union diminished after World War II, he attacked that country for using its schools to indoctrinate children into communism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
School and Society in Chicago (New York, 1928).
The American Road to Culture: A Social Interpretation of Education in the United States (New York, 1930).
The Soviet Challenge to America (New York, 1931).
"Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive?" *Progressive Education* 9 (1932): 257–63.
Dare the School Build a New Social Order? (New York, 1932).
The Social Foundations of Education (New York, 1934).
The Prospects of American Democracy (New York, 1938).
The Country of the Blind: The Soviet System of Mind Control, with Nucia Lodge (Boston, 1949).
Education and American Civilization (New York, 1952).
The Challenge of Soviet Education (New York, 1957).
Education and the Foundations of Human Freedom (Pittsburgh, 1963).

Other Relevant Works
Count's papers are at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.
George S. Counts: Educator for a New Age, ed. Lawrence Dennis and William Eaton (Carbondale, Ill., 1980).

COUNTS

Further Reading
Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, *Who Was Who in Amer v6*
Dennis, Lawrence J. *George S. Counts and Charles A. Beard: Collaborators for Change* (Albany, N.Y., 1989).
Gutek, Gerald L. *The Educational Theory of George S. Counts* (Columbus, Ohio, 1970).

John R. Shook

CRAIG, William Lane (1918–)

William Craig was born on 13 November 1918 in Nuremberg, Bavaria, Germany. He emigrated to the United States for his education and earned a BA in 1940 from Cornell University. He then received his PhD in philosophy in 1950 from Harvard University under W. V. QUINE's supervision. Craig was assistant professor of mathematics at Pennsylvania State University from 1951 to 1960, and professor of philosophy at the University of California at Berkeley from 1960 until his retirement in 1989. Craig was President of the Association for Symbolic Logic during 1965–8, and President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1978–9.

Craig's research concerned algebraic logic, a model theory, and connections between proof theory and model theory. His Interpolation Lemma, or Interpolation Theorem, first presented for classical first-order logic in "Linear Reasoning," is his best-known contribution. Craig's lemma says that if a sentence S with vocabulary V logically follows from a sentence T with vocabulary W, then there is a third interpolating sentence X written using symbols from the intersection of W and V such that there is a logical proof of S from T via X. X is called the *interpolation formula*. Another way of stating Craig's Theorem is as follows: let R be a recursively enumerable theory. Supposing that there exists an effective procedure for dividing the theorems of R into two sets, S and its complement, then there is a recursively axiomatizable subtheory of R theory whose theorems are S.

Jaakko HINTIKKA, aware of connections between the complexity of proofs in tableaux and arboricity proofs and interpolation, correctly suggested that with proper caution one could consider the interpolation formula X to be an index of the complexity of the tree proof of S…T. Craig's lemma may in turn be used to give tree proofs of Beth's Definability Theorem and Robinson's Consistency Theorem. These connections have been presented by Craig in his paper "Three Uses of the Herbrand-Gentzen Theorem" (1957). The Craig–Vaught Theorem asserted that every class of infinite models defined by an R-system of axioms of the system Σ_1 of first-order axioms is defined by a projective second-order axiom.

Craig's Theorem was involved in debates during the 1970s and 1980s between scientific realists and anti-realist empiricists. Anti-realist empiricists generally try to argue that scientific theories should not be interpreted realistically because their theoretical statements about nonobservable entities actually fail to make ontological claims. Some of these anti-realists claimed that theoretical statements are logically related to observational statements, supposedly by applying Craig's Theorem, to reveal how all theoretical statements can be effectively "eliminated" or reduced to sets of observational statements.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Linear Reasoning: A New Form of the Herbrand–Gentzen Theorem," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 22 (1957): 250–68.
"Three Uses of the Herbrand–Gentzen Theorem in Relating Model Theory and Proof Theory," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 22 (1957): 269–85.
"Finite Axiomatizability Using Additional

548

Predicates," with Robert Vaught, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 23 (1958): 289–308.

Combinatory Logic, vol. 1, with Haskell B. Curry and Robert Feys (Amsterdam, 1958).

Logic in Algebraic Form: Three Languages and Theories (Amsterdam, 1974).

"Unification and Abstraction in Algebraic Logic," in *Studies in Algebraic Logic*, ed. Aubert Daigenault (Washington, D.C., 1974), pp. 91–104.

"Boolean Logic and the Everyday Physical World," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 52 (1979): 751–78.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v8
English, Jane. "Underdetermination: Craig and Ramsey," *Journal of Philosophy* 70 (1973): 453–62.
Hooker, C. A. "Craigian Transcriptionism," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 5 (1968): 152–63.
Putnam, Hilary. "Craig's Theorem," *Journal of Philosophy* 62 (1965): 251–9.

Irving H. Anellis
John R. Shook

CREIGHTON, James Edwin (1861–1923)

James Edwin Creighton was born on 8 April 1861 in Pictou, Nova Scotia, Canada. He grew up on his parents' farm and taught grade school in Nova Scotia until the age of twenty-two. Creighton entered Dalhousie College in 1883 and studied philosophy with Jacob Gould SCHURMAN, who became his lifelong friend and patron. Creighton followed Schurman to Cornell University in 1887, and received the PhD in philosophy in 1892. As was customary in that age, he spent 1889–90 studying in Germany at the universities of Leipzig and Berlin, returning to Cornell to defend his thesis. He became an instructor in philosophy at Cornell in 1889, was promoted to assistant professor of modern philosophy in 1892, and then was named the Sage Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in 1895, holding that position until his death. He also was Dean of the Graduate School from 1914 to 1923. Creighton died on 8 October 1924 in Ithaca, New York.

More than his written work, it was Creighton's ideas concerning how to live the philosophical life, and his manner of implementing those ideas, that has left a lasting mark on philosophy in North America. This contribution is marked by paradoxes, however. There was probably not another single individual as important as Creighton in establishing the form and expectations of the modern "profession" of philosophy, its role in contemporary universities, its characteristic curriculum, its professional organizations, and its form and style of publication. The professionalization of philosophy bears the mark of Creighton's vision at every turn. Yet, one could hardly find a philosopher who conceived of the philosophical life in *less* professional terms. The philosophical life was for Creighton the life of leisure – disciplined and properly employed – for the development of the mind and of character, for the formation of small groups of excellent minds who press themselves and one another for the genuine attainment of ideals. This idea is something close to Aristotle's notion of the "divine life," apolitical and contemplative, and nearly the opposite of the "engaged professional." For both better and worse, Creighton thus defined not only the *role* of the engaged professional philosopher for the twentieth century, but also the *image* of the philosopher as unengaged and contemplative. While his philosophical ideas were widely influential, it was his professional influence over his fellow philosophers, and its further consequences, that marks his major contribution to American philosophy.

Creighton's conception of the philosophical life was that of the humanistic scholar who uses leisure for the improvement of the mind. An excellent mind was marked by its clarity, measured by its capacity for rigorous argumentation. The best way to attain this clarity and skill is through the study of the history of philosophy, Creighton thought. Broad questions and questions of principle are the philosopher's province, he believed. An ethos of intellectual honesty, forthrightness, and sharp criticism of oneself and one's fellows was to be cultivated in this "society of minds." Creighton urged that apprentices to the philosophical life trust their intuitions and discipline those intuitions by means of logic. Agreement upon a final set of ideas or a system was not the aim of the philosophical life, rather the end was the cultivation of excellent and clear thinking about philosophical issues among individuals committed to the life of the mind. Philosophical excellence was as much to be measured by one's capacity to carry on conversation, dialectic in the Platonic sense, as by one's capacity to write. Creighton advocated high academic standards throughout his life. Originality in philosophical ideas was neither especially to be sought nor likely to be attained, in Creighton's view. As a result of this idea of the philosophical life, Creighton published comparatively little himself. However, he actually lived the life he envisioned, and by living it concretized the ideal of the philosophical life he advocated. As a colleague described him, "he rarely left Ithaca, took little exercise, and spent most of his life in the library" (Hammond 1925, p. 254).

Understanding Creighton's ideas about the philosophical life and his ability to realize them requires some grasp of the animating ideals and resources of Cornell University. Cornell was the brainchild of the controversial academician Andrew Dickson White and the wealthy Ezra Cornell. It started as an experimental way to take advantage of the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862. The public and private colleges of the US had been torn by sectarian strife and Cornell and White set out to show that a non-sectarian Christian institution, promoting both the liberal arts and the natural and applied sciences, especially at the graduate level, was the idea of the future. Cornell opened in 1868 and in many ways was the epicenter of the cultural forces that developed the liberal Protestant consensus in the US in the twentieth century, the tacit agreement among mainline denominations to strive for public unity by emphasizing points of agreement while privatizing points of sectarian difference. In this space grew the secular pluralistic American ideal in both higher education and the nation. Cornell was progressive from the beginning, becoming co-educational by 1872, awarding degrees in new fields such as journalism and veterinary medicine, pioneering the ideas of the lending library and the university press. The available resources were marvelous. Among the many experiments tried at Cornell was the Sage School of Philosophy. Creighton's teacher at Dalhousie and lifelong friend Schurman was made President of Cornell University in 1892, and immediately appointed Creighton to the chair in logic and metaphysics. Together they established the Sage School, and quickly began to create the institutional structures required to realize their ideal of the philosophical life. The idea of the Sage School was to be a center for all sorts of philosophical activities, but most of all for the formation of a society of minds devoted to the pursuit of philosophy both for its own intrinsic worth and for the betterment of their own character. The Sage School included, in addition to graduate and undergraduate education in the history of philosophy, colloquia and gatherings at which ideas were to be presented and debated, a published journal, a philosophy club, and formal and informal ties to other centers of philosophy in the US and abroad. In effect, the pursuit of graduate education at Cornell in the 1890s set the pattern easily recognized in most every American graduate school of philosophy today.

Among the first institutions created in the Sage School were Schurman's *Philosophical Review* (founded 1892), of which Creighton became co-editor in 1896, and editor-in-chief in 1902, a position he held until his death. Creighton also served as American editor of *Kant-Studien* from 1896 until his death. These roles not only established the form in which professional philosophy would be published, but made Creighton the principal gatekeeper and the setter of standards. It also placed him in the role of the American philosopher who presented ideas to the German-speaking academies. Naturally the publication of professional philosophy followed the European forms in most ways, but it should be recalled that earlier American journals, such as William T. HARRIS's *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* had conceived of philosophy as something that can and should be published and discussed at a high level beyond the academies. *The Philosophical Review* published academic philosophers and tacitly (and perhaps unconsciously) advocated an exclusively academic idea of philosophical rigor, form, and scholarship. The great success of *The Philosophical Review*, along with the advent of *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Methods* in 1903, squeezed out high-level philosophical discussion among thinkers beyond the academy. The paradox involved is that Creighton's high standards also functioned as barriers to those who had not been enculturated to academic styles and forms of philosophical discourse. To participate in the important discussions, one would have to adopt its rules, and to adopt the rules one would need to study philosophy formally in the academy. As a result it was not easy, subsequently, for academics to distinguish between worthy ideas that were in nonstandard forms and poor thinking. So while Creighton was a great champion of free expression, especially open criticism, his philosophical style contributed much to the segregation of public and academic philosophical discourse, both in the US and abroad.

Apart from the two journals, a third way in which Creighton played a significant role in creating the public face of professional philosophy was through his contribution of twenty-six articles to the new *Encyclopedia Americana*, insuring that students around America would be consulting Creighton's interpretations of major figures and movements in philosophy. The list of his contributions is telling. He wrote articles on Aristotle, Descartes, Kant, Schopenhauer, and Spinoza, among the figures, and Bergsonism, Cartesianism, determinism, empiricism, idealism, materialism, pluralism, pragmatism, rationalism, realism, and other movements. Creighton was sharply critical of many of these perspectives and movements and to have him defining their basic principles and arguments for students everywhere placed him in a position of enormous authority. In these and other writings Creighton was the consummate commentator on the philosophical developments of his time, a sort of journalist of the highest stripe.

Creighton exerted great influence over how philosophy came to contribute to the overall curriculum of American universities. Prior to the development of Cornell's school of philosophy, and before Harvard University, Boston University, and Johns Hopkins University tried other models, moral philosophy was usually taught by the college president (often an ordained minister), to seniors before they graduated. The old idea was to impart to them a sense of the responsibility to God (and perhaps country) of the educated class. Commonly "natural philosophy" was taught by a practicing physicist, and particularly was dominated by the study of optics and electricity. Mental philosophy was often associated with rhetoric and elocution. The coming of the modern non-sectarian university, exemplified by Cornell, signaled an opportunity for philosophy to separate itself from religious commitments, sectarian and non-sectarian, and to redefine its role in the academy. The idea of a "philosophy department" was in the

551

air, but the form it eventually took was greatly shaped by the Sage School under Schurman and Creighton. Such a department would teach the history of philosophy and rational psychology, but not rhetoric and elocution; it would teach logic but not grammar; it would teach foundations of the objective world in metaphysics and epistemology, but not the natural sciences. Creighton held that it was the job of philosophy to "interpret" the sciences and to examine their assumptions critically. The centerpiece of philosophy's contribution to the university or college would be logic on Creighton's model. In 1898 there were plenty of logic texts available for colleges, such as the famous texts of William Whewell, Stanley Jevons, and even Josiah ROYCE's 1881 *Primer of Logical Analysis* (which still integrated logic with grammar and writing). But it was Creighton's textbook, *An Introductory Logic* (1898), and its many reprintings, that established the subject of logic as philosophy's contribution to the curriculum. This textbook was still in print as late as 1947, giving it a half-century of influence during the formative period of the modern American university. The paradox arising here is that Creighton's ideas about logic were not even close to the formal discipline logic became during the revolt against idealism in between 1910 and 1930. Creighton conceived of logic in humanistic terms, with little formalization. Defining the role of logic in philosophy was something closely akin to defining what philosophy itself is, grasping what it can and cannot do. Logic was the tool philosophers use to do philosophy, and not much more than that. The effect of Creighton's view of the role of logic in the university became far more influential than his conception of logic itself. As logic became formalized and mathematical during Creighton's lifetime, it nevertheless held fast to the idea that the teaching and development of logic is the contribution philosophy makes to the advancement, interpretation, and clarification of knowledge. If universities were founded for the creation and advancement of

knowledge, as they were claiming to be, then philosophy must have a role in this project, Creighton believed. He thus created the institutional space for formal logic to become the center of attention, but he did not contribute to the creation of formal logic itself; nor would Creighton have approved of the complete formalization of logic. However, he should be recognized as a visionary in seeing that philosophy would have to redefine itself in light of the way universities were evolving. As he observed, "in many colleges and universities the place of philosophy is only grudgingly conceded. It is regarded as a more or less useful handmaid to theology, or perhaps education, but its scientific status as a real and independent subject of investigation is tacitly or explicitly denied." He saw how this problem could be overcome by allying philosophy to the sciences. The plan was successful. Without Creighton's foresight philosophy as a discipline might have met the same fate in the university as elocution and rhetoric, since, as Creighton noted:

> It does not seem too much to say that philosophy does not enjoy the general recognition, even among educated men, that is accorded to many of the other sciences, nor is the philosophical teacher and writer universally conceded to be a specially trained scholar whose opinions in his own field are as much entitled to respect as those of the physicist or biologist in his special domain.

Creighton was among a small group of philosophy professors who founded the American Philosophical Association and he was elected its first President in 1901. While the APA was preceded by the Western Philosophical Association by a year, the idea was much circulated during the progressive era that respectable disciplines should form professional organizations for education, intellectual exchange, and for setting the standards of their disciplines. While the first president of the Western Association, Frank THILLY of

Missouri, used his presidential address to discuss the theory of interaction, Creighton used his address to present a manifesto on the purposes of the association, subsequently published in *Philosophical Review*. The connection of the APA with *Philosophical Review* was one factor that led to the gradual dominance of Creighton's association over the Western Association. The American Philosophical Association today very much still bears the forms and self-concept that Creighton espoused in his presidential address, making that piece perhaps his most influential and important writing. The address makes clear that philosophers themselves are not altogether certain why an association is needed or what it should try to do. Eschewing the idea that the association should gather for the edification of its members, and rejecting the idea that the association could solve every problem philosophers face, Creighton sought to define the scope and purposes of the APA by noting that "all modern scientific work" has the "striking characteristic" of "conscious co-operation among a number of individuals." The old notion of the philosopher as a "man of leisure," eccentric, alone in his contemplations and scriblings, was not to be perpetuated in the coming age. The philosopher was, for Creighton, a kind of cooperative scientist. The term "science" was meant in the broad Germanic sense of *Wissenschaft*, an ordered and systematic kind of study leading to knowledge, in the broadest sense, and not limited by the narrow definition of "natural science" such as is common today. The advantage of having allied philosophy with science at the beginning became clear as the growing prestige of the sciences pressed hard against the humanities in the twentieth century. In spite of Creighton's broad sense of "science," ideas about what renders a discipline scientific narrowed and formalized with the increasing success of quantitative methods. The paradox of the American Philosophical Association is that its initial vision as "scientific" and devoted to "research" was articulated by a thorough-going humanist who would not recognize the largely anti-humanist association it eventually became. Second, in spite of his own devotion to the history of philosophy, and the role he gave it in graduate study at Cornell (and Cornell remains a historically oriented program), Creighton did not project the study or discussion of the history of philosophy as being of central importance to the association. "The history of philosophy is only intelligible when read in light of present day problems," he said, and the activity of the association "is likely to be centered in the actual problems of the present time." The APA has taken Creighton at his word in this regard. The promotion of scholarship and research was the sole purpose of the association. Third, although Creighton was a legendary and influential teacher himself, he insisted "it would be a mistake to make the discussion of methods of teaching philosophy a co-ordinate purpose" of the APA. He argued that papers on teaching ought not be presented on the program and the matter of teaching should not even be discussed, since such discussion was "a rather stupid way of wasting time." And in this context Creighton made the case, oft-repeated in later years, that the best teacher is a good researcher who attacks the problems firsthand, and so we should "actually discover by our own efforts what we teach students, that is the one thing needful." The APA's ambivalence regarding teaching and promoting the teaching of philosophy takes its impetus from Creighton's vision.

All of Creighton's experiments and ideas, along with their paradoxes, might have failed to take hold were it not for the number and subsequent influence of his students. Cornell was among only a few institutions producing doctorates in philosophy at a time when the modern university was forming. These students carried out Creighton's legacy and ideals in numerous places around the country, implementing versions of his ideal in schools everywhere. Twelve of Creighton's students became presidents of the APA, the Western

Philosophical Association, or one of the three divisions of the APA after the merger. This presidential number included two women, Grace Andrus DE LAGUNA and Katherine Everett GILBERT, during the days when the professional barriers for women were enormous. It would have been anathema to Creighton's style or thinking to expect his students to follow his ideals. As a teacher he insisted only upon clear thinking and expression and never sought disciples. But his vision of the philosophy profession and the philosophical life was freely and eagerly propagated by his students. The Creighton model spread, although largely without being credited to its visionary founder. Ironically Creighton's own philosophy did not meet with similar influence, which attests to the autonomy of thinking he encouraged in his students. None of Creighton's students distinguished themselves as philosophers in any lasting way, but many were prominent as leaders of the profession and many lived fulfilling philosophical lives.

Creighton defended a version of personal idealism he called "speculative idealism." There were three basic touchstones of his view: (1) that philosophy is a social activity; (2) that the history of philosophy is central to philosophy itself; and (3) that speculative idealism defines *the* philosophical attitude. Since we have seen above how the first two of these views played out, grasping the third is all that remains. The term "speculative" does not imply, as Katherine Gilbert puts it, "the roaming fancy or any character that conflicts with strict logical procedure." The speculative and idealist posture meant taking a certain approach to any and every objective and changing problem in the world, a commitment to reflective and critical engagement with any subject matter at all. Idealism could not be subjective because the world itself, objectively existing, changing and rational, was the reference point without which thought itself is impossible. The philosophical attitude does not possess a peculiar subject matter. Rather, as Gilbert summarizes it, "the business of the

philosopher is not to do some one thing coordinate with the work of the natural scientist or of the man of practice, but sympathetically and intelligently to penetrate the work of all classes of men and to help them become intellectually self-conscious and mutually respectful." This is, of course, a Socratic conception of the place of the philosopher in the *agora*. Many readers have commented on how much Creighton's idealism resembles the very pragmatism of which he was so critical, but one might say the same for Socrates, and it was Socrates of whom Creighton was fondest. In the end it seems that the Socratic ideal is the notion that relieves some of the tensions in Creighton's simultaneous professionalization of philosophy and his humanistic concept of the philosophical life. These motions together may have been a practical way of convincing the public to award the heirs of Socrates the pension he claimed to deserve in the *Apology*, and to insure that the marketplace would always have an ample supply of gadflies. If that was Creighton's aim, he succeeded beyond his fondest imaginings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Modern Psychology and Theories of Knowledge," *Philosophical Review* 3 (1894): 196–200.

"The Nature of Intellectual Synthesis," *Philosophical Review* 5 (1896): 135–56.

An Introductory Logic (New York, 1898; 2nd edn 1900; 3rd edn 1909; 4th edn 1920; 5th edn rev. by Harold Smart, 1932).

"The Purposes of a Philosophical Association," *Philosophical Review* 11 (1902): 219–37.

"The Standpoint of Experience," *Philosophical Review* 12 (1903): 593–610.

"Purpose as Logical Category," *Philosophical Review* 13 (1904): 284–97.

"Experience and Thought," *Philosophical Review* 15 (1906): 482–93.

"The Nature and Criterion of Truth,"

Philosophical Review 17 (1908): 592–605.

"Knowledge and Practice," *International Journal of Ethics* 20 (1909): 29–48.

"The Copernican Revolution in Philosophy," *Philosophical Review* 22 (1913): 133–50.

"Two Types of Idealism," *Philosophical Review* 26 (1917): 514–36.

"The Social Nature of Thinking," *Philosophical Review* 27 (1918): 274–95.

"The Form of Philosophical Objectivity," *Philosophical Review* 32 (1923): 247–62.

Studies in Speculative Philosophy, ed. Harold R. Smart (New York, 1925).

Other Relevant Works

Creighton's papers are at Cornell University.

Trans. with E. B. Titchener, *Lectures on Human and Animal Psychology*, by Wilhelm Wundt (London, 1894).

Trans. with A. Lefevre, *Immanuel Kant: His Life and Doctrine*, by Friedrich Paulsen (New York, 1902).

Other Relevant Works

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v23*, *Pres Addr of APA v1*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Cunningham, G. Watts. "In Memoriam: James Edwin Creighton," *International Journal of Ethics* 35 (1925): 214–16.

———, *The Idealist Argument in Recent British and American Philosophy* (New York, 1933).

Gilbert, Katherine. "James E. Creighton as Writer and Editor," *Journal of Philosophy* 22 (1925): 256–64.

Hammond, William A. "James Edwin Creighton," *Journal of Philosophy* 22 (1925): 253–6.

Sabine, George H. "The Philosophy of James Edwin Creighton," *Philosophical Review* 34 (1925): 230–61.

———, ed. *Philosophical Essays in Honor of James Edwin Creighton by Former Students in the Sage School of Philosophy* (New York, 1917).

Randall, John Herman, Jr. "Josiah Royce and American Idealism," in *Philosophy after Darwin: Chapters for The Career of Philosophy, Volume III, and Other Essays*, ed. Beth Singer (New York, 1977).

Thilly, Frank. "The Philosophy of James Edwin Creighton," *Philosophical Review* 34 (1925): 211–29.

Werkmeister, William H. "Creighton's Speculative Idealism," in *A History of Philosophical Ideas in America* (New York, 1949), pp. 289–93.

Randall E. Auxier

CROLY, Herbert David (1869–1930)

Herbert Croly was born 23 January 1869 in New York City, and died on 17 May 1930 in Santa Barbara, California. Croly studied philosophy at Harvard University from 1886 to 1888, and part-time until 1899, with Josiah ROYCE, William JAMES, and George SANTAYANA among others. He also took courses in economics, history, and politics, but never earned a degree. Abandoning his plans for a philosophy career, he became one of America's leading cultural critics and political theorists.

Croly began work as an architectural critic. Concerns about American culture led him to a broader interest in American thought and politics, and in 1909 he published *The Promise of American Life*. Croly argued that Americans needed to construct a stronger sense of national purpose, proposing a combination of Hamiltonian nationalism and Jeffersonian democracy for American "reconstruction." His argument led him to a re-examination of the

philosophic foundations of American democracy, emphasizing in particular that equality needed to be combined with an emphasis on individual excellence. Croly also explored the meaning of liberty, endorsing the traditional notion of individual freedom against government, thus placing himself in the tradition of liberal theory, but also developing what has come to be called "positive freedom," the idea that an individual may sometimes be made more free with government assistance. Croly also argued strongly for the reform of the American political system and for extensive government regulation of the economy and particularly of large corporations.

After the publication of *The Promise of American Life*, Croly became politically involved in the developing Progressive Movement, especially as an advisor to Theodore Roosevelt in 1912. He rethought his political philosophy in *Progressive Democracy* (1914), where he was clearly influenced by pluralist arguments, and where his thought is more obviously democratic than in the earlier work.

In these years, Croly and Walter LIPPMANN obtained financial support to begin a weekly "journal of opinion," and in November 1914 the first issue of *The New Republic* appeared. He had intended that the "paper" would emphasize domestic political and cultural reform, but the reality of World War I forced him to focus on international affairs as well. Croly continued as editor-in-chief of *The New Republic* from 1914 to 1928. In hundreds of articles, Croly treated a wide range of issues. Perhaps most notable was his support of President Wilson's decision to enter the war, and his subsequent rejection of the Versailles Treaty as a betrayal of Wilson's earlier positions. Croly also strongly opposed the "Red Scare" of 1918 to 1920, coming to realize anew and to restate the arguments for individual liberties. His efforts were particularly important in stating the importance of freedom of speech and of the press.

Croly was disillusioned by postwar America. He sought to recast his political theory in the 1920s, in articles in *The New Republic* and also in a proposed book, *The Breach in Civilization*, which he withdrew before publication. Here, Croly tried to develop a fuller understanding of human nature, particularly in its religious dimension, but he failed to state the argument to his own satisfaction.

Croly's achievements are his two important books and *The New Republic*, which in his years attracted a most distinguished collection of writers, providing a superb commentary on a wide range of political and cultural issues. His thought is important in the development of a modern American liberal political theory.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Promise of American Life (New York, 1909; Cambridge, Mass., 1965).
Marcus Alonzo Hanna: His Life and Work (New York, 1912).
Progressive Democracy (New York, 1914).
Willard Straight (New York, 1924).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Forcey, Charles. *The Crossroads of Liberalism: Croly, Weyl, Lippmann, and the Progressive Era, 1900–1925* (Oxford, 1961).

Levy, David W. *Herbert Croly of the New Republic: The Life and Thought of an American Progressive* (Princeton, N.J., 1985).

Neuchterlein, James A. "The Dream of Scientific Liberalism: *The New Republic* and American Progressive Thought, 1914–1920," *Review of Politics* 42 (1980): 167–90.

Stettner, Edward A. *Shaping Modern Liberalism: Herbert Croly and Progressive Thought* (Lawrence, Kan., 1993).

Edward A. Stettner

CROOKS, Ezra Breckenridge (1874–1941)

Ezra Breckenridge Crooks was born on 6 October 1874 in Clinton, Kentucky. His parents were James David and Elizabeth Bugg Crooks. He received his BA from Central College in Fayette, Missouri, in 1899 and his MA from Vanderbilt University in 1901. Ordained a Methodist minister, from 1902 to 1906 Crooks was an educational missionary in Brazil. Upon his return he attended Harvard University, where he received his STB in 1908, his MA in 1909, and PhD in philosophy in 1910. Crooks studied with William JAMES and Josiah ROYCE, and wrote a dissertation titled "Religion as Experience."

Crooks was an assistant professor in philosophy and history at Harvard in 1910–11, and assistant professor of philosophy at Northwestern University from 1911 to 1913. From 1913 to 1922 he was professor of philosophy and head of the department of philosophy and education at Randolph-Macon Woman's College in Lynchburg, Virginia. During World War I he interrupted his academic career to go into government service. In 1917–18 he was the Director of Publicity for the US Food Administration. He then went to France as a liaison officer on behalf of the YMCA with the Portuguese troops serving under the British 5th Army, and was decorated with the Military Order of Christ by the Portuguese government.

In 1922 Crooks became professor and head of the department of philosophy and social sciences at the University of Delaware, which had just reorganized its academic departments during a period of growth. The faculty publication, *Delaware Notes*, was edited by Crooks after its founding in 1923. He also continued to participate in public administration and education, serving on several state commissions. When he retired in 1940, Lewis White BECK was hired to replace him. Crooks died on 8 March 1941 in Newark, New Jersey.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Is It Must or Ought?" *International Journal of Ethics* 23 (1913): 323–39.
"Professor James and the Psychology of Religion," *The Monist* 23 (1913): 122–30.

Further Reading
Proc of APA in Phil Rev v51, Who Was Who in Amer v2

John R. Shook

CRUMMELL, Alexander (1819–98)

Alexander Crummell was born 3 March 1819 in New York City, and died on 10 September 1898 in Point Pleasant, New Jersey. His father, Boston Crummell, was born in Sierra Leone and worked as an oysterman. His mother, Charity Hicks, was a free-born black American from Jericho, Long Island. Since blacks of the period inherited the slave status of their mothers, Crummell was likewise born free. However, he and his family were deeply committed to the abolitionist cause. *Freedman's Journal*, the first black American newspaper, was founded in the Crummells' home. The newspaper was committed to promoting black self-reliance and correcting politically motivated misconceptions about Africa and Africans. From an early age, Crummell was taught the value of education, academic and religious, as well as social service. He attended the African Free School in Manhattan and, in 1831 at age twelve, attended the Canal Street High School. During his four years there, Crummell was able to interact with the Canal Street's directors, Peter Williams and Theodore Wright, who were two of the leading black clergy of the period. In 1835 Crummell, along with Henry Highland Garnet, attended the Noyes Academy in Canaan, New Hampshire.

The school had only been open a few months before local white residents dragged it into a swamp, forcing it to close.

The next year, Crummell entered Oneida Institute in Whitesboro, New York and graduated in 1839. He also attended Yale Divinity School for a time but, for financial reasons, did not finish the Masters of Divinity program. Crummell nevertheless decided on a career as a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church. He spent the next four years studying with leading clergy in Boston and Providence, as well as battling rejection of his ministry on the basis of race. Crummell was finally ordained a priest in 1844 and returned to New York to pastor a small, poor black congregation. During this time, his great oratorical talent was utilized for the abolitionist cause as well as the cause of general black uplift. Yet he always subordinated these efforts to his religious duties, seeing them, at the time, somewhat separately. Because of strained finances and the need of the congregation for a church building, Crummell ventured to England to raise funds for this endeavor.

Crummell lived in England from 1848 to 1853 preaching, lecturing, and studying at Queen's College, Cambridge from which he graduated with his BA in 1853. Instead of returning to the United States, he went to Liberia as a missionary. He came to believe that American blacks would have greater opportunities in Liberia and that their skills would be more appreciated. He also became committed to the general cause of African liberation and, consequently, became a citizen of Liberia and an advocate of emigration to Liberia. During the American Civil War, Crummell made three visits to the United States to promote this idea and came to work closely with the American Colonization Society. Shortly before this time (1858), Crummell was appointed to the faculty of Liberia College in Monrovia along with his associate Edward Blyden. This afforded Crummell an opportunity to speak publicly on behalf of Liberian nationalism and its con-

nectedness to African Diasporic redemption. He would later be dismissed from his teaching post in 1866 because of frequent clashes with school administrators. As a result, Crummell went on to establish his own school modeled after his alma mater, Oneida Institute. However, a color caste civil war erupted in Liberia before the school could be built.

Crummell returned to the United States in 1873, settled in Washington, D.C., and eventually established St. Luke's Episcopal Church there. Much of the next twenty years would be spent in ministry and encouraging the black intelligentsia to produce scholarship and to resist anti-black racism. In 1897 Crummell founded the American Negro Academy, promoting the African race through independent scholarly achievement. He also taught at Howard University from 1895 until 1897, and died the next year from heart disease. Throughout his life Crummell battled sickness; nevertheless, he published several books of sermons and speeches.

Crummell's thought blended philosophy, sociology, religion, psychology, and history and stressed the development of the black scholar-philanthropist who, while educated as a matter of principle, would build and support institutions that improved the conditions of black life. In this way, he anticipated and conceptually embodied the later social theories of W. E. B. Du Bois and Booker T. Washington.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Relations and Duties of Free Colored Men in America to Africa (Hartford, Conn., 1861).

The Future of Africa; Being Addresses, Sermons, etc., etc., Delivered in the Republic of Liberia (New York, 1862).

The Greatness of Christ, and Other Sermons (New York, 1882).

Africa and America: Addresses and Discourses (1891; Miami, Fla., 1969).

Other Relevant Works

Crummell's papers are at the New York

Public Library, the Library of Congress, and Columbia University.

Alexander Crummell, 1844–1894: The Shades and Lights of a Fifty Years' Ministry: A Sermon by Alex. Crummell, Rector, and a Presentation Address by Mrs. A. J. Cooper (Washington, D.C., 1894).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v5*

Du Bois, W. E. B. "Of Alexander Crummell," in *The Souls of Black Folk* (New York, 1903), chap. 12.

Moses, Wilson Jeremiah. *Alexander Crummell: A Study of Civilization and Discontent* (New York, 1989).

Oldfield, J. R. *Alexander Crummell, 1819–1898 and the Creation of an African/American Church in Liberia* (Lewiston, N.Y., 1990).

Rigsby, Gregory U. *Alexander Crummell: Pioneer in Nineteenth-Century Pan African Thought* (New York, 1987).

Darryl Scriven

CUMMING, Robert Denoon (1916–2004)

Robert Denoon Cumming was born on 27 October 1916 in the town of Sydney on Cape Breton Island in Nova Scotia, Canada. He grew up in Bangor, Maine, where his father, Charles G. Cumming, was a professor of theology at Bangor Theological Seminary. He attended Philips Exeter Academy in New Hampshire, and after graduating in 1934 he became a classics major at Harvard University (where his roommate was Donald DAVIDSON). He earned his BA from Harvard in 1938, and went to Oxford on a Rhodes Scholarship

during 1938–40. Cumming served in the US Army during World War II, participated in the liberation of Paris, and received the Croix de Guerre and the Legion of Merit. He studied at the Sorbonne after the war in 1945–6, and upon returning to the USA went to the University of Chicago for graduate studies in philosophy. He wrote a dissertation on "The Psychological Structure of Descartes' Moral Philosophy" and received his PhD in philosophy in 1950.

Cumming was appointed as an instructor of philosophy at Columbia in 1948, and was soon promoted up to full professor. He was the philosophy department chair from 1959 to 1964, also taught courses in the department of public law and government, and was named Frederick J. Woodbridge Professor of Philosophy in 1976. From 1957 to 1964 he was the editor of the *Journal of Philosophy*. He held fellowships from the American Council of Learned Societies, the Fulbright Foundation, the Guggenheim Foundation, and the National Endowment for the Humanities. After retiring in 1985, he completed several more books that were published before his death, and he also finished his war memoirs and a manuscript about the novels of Henry James. Cumming died on 25 August 2004 in New York City.

For many years Cumming worked in both the history of political theory and twentieth-century continental philosophy. His early major book, *Human Nature and History: A Study of the Development of Liberal Political Thought* (1969), was a very successful and widely read examination of over two hundred years of political philosophy. Cumming edited the first English-language collection of Sartre's philosophical writings, published in 1965, and the efforts of his later career were directed towards the existentialist, phenomenology, and deconstruction movements.

The four volumes of his *Phenomenology and Deconstruction* (1991–2001) examine and contrast the philosophies of the movement's major figures starting with Edmund Husserl. *The Dream Is Over* (1991) has the broadest

scope, presenting a survey of the phenomenological movement from Husserl to its conclusion with Derrida. *Method and Imagination* (1992) exposes the major divergences between Husserl and Heidegger on the one hand and Sartre on the other. *Breakdown in Communication* (2001) centers on Husserl's rejection of Heidegger's *Being and Time*. Their disagreement concerned more than just differences between conceptions of phenomenological method, according to Cumming, because Heidegger had decided to criticize not only the wider philosophical tradition but Husserl's own philosophy as well. *Solitude* (2001) magnifies Cumming's own interest in the role of "the personal" in phenomenology, as he explores the significance of Heidegger's Nazi sympathies and further compares Heidegger with Karl Jaspers and Sartre.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Human Nature and History: A Study of the Development of Liberal Political Thought, 2 vols (Chicago, 1969).

Starting Point: An Introduction to the Dialectics of Existence (Chicago, 1979).

Phenomenology and Deconstruction, Volume One: The Dream Is Over (Chicago, 1991).

Phenomenology and Deconstruction, Volume Two: Method and Imagination (Chicago, 1992).

Phenomenology and Deconstruction, Volume Three: Breakdown in Communication (Chicago, 2001).

Phenomenology and Deconstruction, Volume Four: Solitude (Chicago, 2001).

Other Relevant Works

"Descartes' Provisional Morality," *Review of Metaphysics* 9 (1955): 207–35.

"Existence and Communication," *Ethics* 65 (1955): 79–101.

"Mill's History of His Ideas," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 25 (1964): 235–56.

Ed., *The Philosophy of Jean-Paul Sartre* (New York, 1965).

"This Place of Violence, Obscurity and Witchcraft," *Political Theory* 7 (1979): 181–200.

"To Understand a Man," in *The Philosophy of Jean-Paul Sartre*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (La Salle, Ill., 1981), pp. 55–85.

"Role-playing: Sartre's Transformation of Husserl's Phenomenology," in *Cambridge Companion to Sartre*, ed. Christina Howells (Cambridge, UK, 1992).

Further Reading

Glendinning, Simon. "Submerged Initiative," *Times Literary Supplement* (29 August 2003): 7.

Holland, Nancy J. "Two as an Odd Number: On Cumming on Derrida on Schapiro on Heidegger on Van Gogh," *Philosophy Research Archives* 8 (1982): 383–92.

Shapiro, Gary. "Cumming's *Starting Point*," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 22 (1984): 131–3.

John R. Shook

CUNNINGHAM, Gustavus Watts
(1881–1968)

Gustavus Watts Cunningham was born on 14 November 1881 in Laurens, South Carolina. In 1902 Cunningham received an MA from Furman College in South Carolina. His first teaching job was in English at Howard College in Birmingham, Alabama, where he taught from 1902 to 1905. He then studied at Cornell University under the idealist James Edwin CREIGHTON and received his PhD in philosophy in 1908. His dissertation on "Thought and Reality in Hegel's System" became his first book, published in 1910.

In 1908 Cunningham became an instructor of philosophy at Middlebury College in Vermont, where he was promoted to full professor in 1915. In 1917 he went to the University of Texas, where he remained until 1927, when he returned to Cornell as professor of philosophy. He served as chair of the school of philosophy, and also as Dean of the Graduate School from 1944 to 1949. Cunningham was President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1930–31, and President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1937–8. Cunningham retired in 1949, and died on 1 April 1968 in Laurens, South Carolina.

Cunningham was a central figure in the Cornell school of idealists that included Jacob Gould SCHURMAN as well as Creighton, and followed them as an editor of *Philosophical Review*. However, he struggled with many of the central ideas in the idealist tradition. The problem of time especially bothered him, and he turned to Henri Bergson for guidance. His *Study in the Philosophy of Bergson* (1916) suggests an organic and teleological universe.

Cunningham also responded to some of the American "new realist" critiques of idealism. In their correspondence, he and Viscount Richard Burdon Haldane remark favorably on some of the work of Roy Wood SELLARS. In particular, Cunningham insisted that meaning requires two dimensions. One of them is, indeed, "intrinsic" and mental, but there is also an extrinsic dimension that requires a contrast with the knowing subject. Still, he maintained that knowledge of every kind is tightly bound up with the objects of knowledge. Knowledge is impossible if what we know is wholly distinct from our knowledge. In this sense Cunningham remained an idealist.

In *The Idealistic Argument in Recent British and American Philosophy* (1933) Cunningham dismisses many of the common idealist arguments outright and only accepts one. The one that he accepts gives more precision to his claims about knowledge and the objects of knowledge.

He says that any conception of nature without mind becomes unintelligible because it ignores the presupposition that nature is conceivable. To conceive of nature as unknowable is ultimately unintelligible. Cunningham does not reject the Absolute, but he quotes with approval Bernard Bosanquet's "metaphor of the tide" that the Absolute is only "the high water mark" of "fluctuations" of ordinary "experience" (1933, pp. 136–7).

In the section of *The Idealistic Argument* about the Absolute (pp. 534–42), Cunningham's aversion to most kinds of reductionism asserts itself strongly. The "Absolutists" generally wanted to "sublate" individuals into the Absolute. Cunningham called this the "weakest point" in systems of absolute idealism (1933, p. 534). The necessity of this "sublating" does not seem to follow from the nature of things themselves but from the decision to make the Absolute the principle of explanation. The timelessness of more conventional views of the Absolute continued to trouble him. He and Viscount Haldane exchanged notes of agreement throughout their long correspondence. They could agree that process is real, as Bergson, Samuel Alexander, Alfred North WHITEHEAD, and others were saying. But Cunningham and Haldane insisted that this does not deflect from the truth of idealism.

Cunningham shared the concerns of the growing analytic movement and the American realists about meaning and objectivity. He was also deeply skeptical of the personalists who adopted what he called "spiritual pluralism" and who saw nature as a collection of spirits. He could see no evidence that the "lower orders of nature are to be conceived as 'spiritual' centers," and he feared "unbridled anthropomorphism" (1933, p. 511).

Cunningham was a voluminous correspondent. In addition to forty-seven letters from Viscount Haldane and several from Creighton, there are letters in the Cornell archives from Herbert Wildon CARR, Andrew Seth Pringle-Pattison, and George H. SABINE. Those from Creighton about the Absolute are particularly

interesting. Much of his discussion with Haldane is about relativity and the ways in which Albert EINSTEIN's relativity theory connects the subject and the object while at the same time permitting objectivity in science. The result, they believed, is an "idealism" of the sort Cunningham and Haldane favored.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Thought and Reality in Hegel's System (New York, 1910).
A Study in the Philosophy of Bergson (New York, 1916).
Five Lectures on the Problem of Mind (Austin, Tex., 1925).
Problems of Philosophy, an Introductory Survey (New York, 1924; 2nd edn, London, 1925).
The Idealistic Argument in Recent British and American Philosophy (New York, 1933).

Other Relevant Works
Cunningham's papers are at Cornell University.
"Coherence and Organization," in *Philosophical Essays in Honor of James Edwin Creighton*, ed. George H. Sabine (New York, 1917), pp. 133–50.
"Emergence and Intelligibility," *International Journal of Ethics* 39 (1929): 148–66.
"On the Second Copernican Revolution in Philosophy," *Philosophical Review* 41 (1932): 107–29.
"A Search for System," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 1, 251–74.
"On the Meaning Situation," in *Contemporary Idealism in America*, ed. Clifford Barrett (New York, 1932), pp. 67–100.
"Perspective and Context in the Meaning-Situation," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 16 (1935): 29–52.

"Meaning, Reference, and Significance," *Philosophical Review* 47 (1938): 155–75.
"On the Linguistic Meaning-Situation," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 4 (1943): 251–66.
"Must We All Be Thomists?" *Philosophical Review* 57 (1948): 493–504.

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, *Pres Addr of APA v4*, *Proc of APA v44*, *Who Was Who in Amer v6*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Aldrich, Virgil C. "Meaning without Mind," *Philosophical Review* 43 (1934): 607–19.
Brother Benignus. "Professor Cunningham and Thomism," *Philosophical Review* 58 (1949): 585–98.
Howie, John, and Thomas O. Buford, eds. *Contemporary Studies in Philosophical Idealism* (Cape Cod, Mass., 1975).
Pratt, James B. "What is Speculative Idealism?" *Journal of Philosophy* 30 (1933): 673–83.

Leslie Armour

CURRY, Haskell Brooks (1900–82)

Haskell Brooks Curry was born on 12 September 1900 in Millis, Massachusetts. His parents were Samuel Silas Curry and Anna Baright Curry, founders of the School for Expression in Boston, now known as Curry College. He graduated from high school in 1916 and entered Harvard College with the intention of going into medicine. When the US entered World War I in 1917, he changed his major to mathematics because he thought it might be useful for military purposes in the artillery. He also joined the Student Army Training Corps on 18 October 1918, but the war ended before he saw action. He received his BA in mathematics from Harvard University in

1920. From 1920 until 1922 he studied electrical engineering at Massachusetts Institute of Technology in a program that involved working half-time at the General Electric Company. From 1922 until 1924 he studied physics at Harvard; during the first of those two years he was a half-time research assistant to P. W. BRIDGMAN, and in 1924 he received an MA in physics. He then studied mathematics at Harvard until 1927; during the first semester of 1926–7 he was a half-time instructor. During 1927–8 he was an instructor at Princeton University. During 1928–9, he studied at the University of Göttingen, where he wrote his doctoral dissertation; his oral defense under David Hilbert was on 24 July 1929, although the published version carries the date of 1930 and his PhD was awarded by Göttingen in 1930.

In the fall of 1929 Curry joined the mathematics faculty of Pennsylvania State College (now Pennsylvania State University), where he spent most of the rest of his career. He also held visiting fellowships and appointments. In 1931–2 he was at the University of Chicago as a National Research Council Fellow; in 1938–9 he was in residence at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton; during 1942–6 he worked for the United States government doing applied mathematics for the war effort at the Frankford Arsenal (1942–4) and the Applied Physics Laboratory at Johns Hopkins University (1944–5); in 1945–6 he did research at the Ballistic Research Laboratories at the Aberdeen Proving Ground, where he worked on the ENIAC project; in 1950–51 he was at the University of Louvain in Belgium on a Fulbright grant. During this time Curry became one of America's foremost mathematical logicians and philosophers of logic. He was one of the founders of the Association for Symbolic Logic in 1936, and he served as its President from 1938 to 1940.

In 1960 Curry became Evan Pugh Research Professor of Mathematics at Pennsylvania State University, and this enabled him to devote most of his time to his research. It also enabled him to take a trip around the world in 1962, visiting a number of universities and giving talks. He retired in 1966 and accepted the position of professor of logic, history of logic, and philosophy of science at the University of Amsterdam in The Netherlands, where he stayed until 1970. After a visit to the University of Pittsburgh in 1971–2, he returned to live in State College, Pennsylvania, where he died on 1 September 1982.

Curry's main work was in the field of mathematical logic. In 1922 he read the first chapter of A. N. WHITEHEAD and Bertrand Russell's *Principia Mathematica*, and he noticed that the system was based on two rules: *modus ponens* and substitution of well-formed formulas for propositional variables. He also noticed immediately that this rule of substitution was significantly more complicated than *modus ponens*, more complicated to describe and use, and also more complicated in the sense of computer implementation (although this was long before there were either computers or computer implementations of logical systems). He wanted to break the rule of substitution down into simpler rules, and his work on this led him to what he called "combinatory logic," which became the main part of his life's work. Since he was working on a new foundation for logic, he had to begin with a discussion of the nature of these foundations, and his early ideas on this appear in his first two papers: "An Analysis of Logic Substitution" (1929) and "Grundlagen der Kombinatorischen Logik" (1930). Here Curry first defines what he means by a formal system (which he originally called an "abstract theory"). Stating clearly that such a theory does not involve meaningless symbols, he indicates that such a theory is based on a "primitive frame," which is to specify the formal objects considered by the theory, what it means to say that a formal object is asserted, and which assertions are true. Thus, for Curry, what was proved in an abstract theory were not formal objects, but statements, which were of the form "X is asserted" where X is a formal object; these statements are formed from the formal objects by the

predicate "is asserted." The formal objects and the true assertions are inductively defined sets, and although he does not emphasize the point at this stage, the formal objects need not be words on an alphabet. In "Grundlagen der Kombinatorischen Logik," he makes the point that he wants to have in his system formal objects which represent the paradoxes, for example, if F is the property of properties p for which $F(p)$ = not $p(p)$, then $F(F)$ = not $F(F)$, and so $F(F)$ represents the liar paradox. Curry proposes here to avoid the paradox by denying that $F(F)$ is a proposition, but he wants this fact about $F(F)$ not being a proposition to be a theorem of his logic and not to have the formal object involved excluded from the theory by the rules of formation.

Following "Grundlagen der Kombinatorischen Logik," Curry published a series of technical papers continuing the development of combinatory logic. In one of them, "First Properties of Functionality in Combinatory Logic" (1936, but written in 1932), he introduced into combinatory logic machinery for treating grammatical or logical categories, such as "proposition," and showed how certain paradoxes could be avoided by the postulates adopted for these formal objects. In a footnote in this paper, he stated the view that a proof of absolute consistency is a secondary matter for the acceptability of a theory. He concluded that a theory of logic should be judged as a whole, and should be treated as a hypothesis, which can be accepted as long as it remains useful. Clearly the discovery of a contradiction would make a theory useless, but in the absence of a contradiction, a proof of consistency is not really needed.

In 1932–3, Alonzo CHURCH published "A Set of Postulates for the Foundation of Logic," which contained a system with a basis very similar to Curry's combinatory logic. Then, Church's students, Stephen C. KLEENE and John B. Rosser, in "The Inconsistency of Certain Formal Logics" (1935), proved the inconsistency of Church's original system and the extension of Curry's original system that appeared in

"Some Properties of Equality and Implication in Combinatory Logic" (1934). Church and his students responded by abandoning the idea of basing logic and mathematics on this kind of system, and they abstracted from Church's system the l-calculus, which is equivalent to basic combinatory logic (without any logical connectives and quantifiers). For Curry, however, who had already considered the possibility of a contradiction developing as he extended his system, the contradiction discovered by Kleene and Rosser only meant that a contradiction could be derived from weaker assumptions than he had realized; his ideas about the prelogic and the category of propositions gave him a means of searching for a system that would be consistent, but now he felt he needed a consistency proof. As part of this work, he discovered, in "The Inconsistency of Certain Formal Logics" (1942), a much simpler contradiction than that of Kleene and Rosser which would follow from the same assumptions as theirs.

Meanwhile, in response to a request to present a paper on the subject to a meeting of the International Congress for the Unity of Science, which was held at Cambridge, Massachusetts in 1939, he began to write independently on his philosophical ideas. His first manuscript was too long for the meeting, and was eventually published with only minor revisions in 1951 as *Outlines of a Formalist Philosophy of Mathematics*. But the manuscript served as the basis for the paper he did present at the meeting, "Remarks on the Definition and Nature of Mathematics" (1939). In these works, Curry proposed that mathematics be defined as the science of formal systems. He intended this to be an alternative to (naïve) realism, which holds that mathematics is about objects that exist in the physical world, and idealism, which holds that mathematics is about mental objects. His examples of idealism in mathematics were Platonism and intuitionism. In order to explain this definition of mathematics, Curry devoted a considerable amount of space, especially in *Outlines of a Formalist Philosophy of*

Mathematics, to an exposition of his idea of formal systems, with many examples. This was essentially the definition he had given of an abstract theory in "An Analysis of Logical Substitution" and "Grundlagen der Kombinatorischen Logik," except that in addition to the one-place predicate assertion he allowed for other predicates with other arities, so that the statements of a formal system could, for example, be equations. In addition to this definition, Curry pointed out that a study of formal systems is not limited to deriving one formal theorem after another, but also involves proving metatheorems, or general theorems about the system. In *Outlines of a Formalist Philosophy of Mathematics*, he suggests that this metatheory itself might be formalized. Indeed, he had already started a project of justifying the rules of standard logical systems in natural deduction formulations by taking the systems as formalizing the elementary metatheory of an elementary formal system. He did this first in an unfinished manuscript "Some Properties of Formal Deducibility" (1937). This project was eventually finished and published as *A Theory of Formal Deducibility* (1950), where Gentzen-style L-formulations were also considered, and this was all expanded in *Foundations of Mathematical Logic* (1963).

Curry also made a point of distinguishing between truth within a system or theory, which depends on the definition of the system or theory, and the acceptability of the system or theory for some purpose, which depends on the purpose. Curry called this philosophy of mathematics "formalism." Curry felt the need to use the label "formalism" for his views, probably because he studied at Göttingen under Hilbert, but his philosophy actually appears to be a form of structuralism (Shapiro 2000, chap. 10). Curry elaborated his philosophy of mathematics in the paper "Some Aspects of the Problem of Mathematical Rigor" (1941). He emphasized the distinction between the formal objects and their representations; these representations may be strings of letters, but they may also be entirely different things. In addition, he contrasted a formal system to a calculus, which is a class of symbols of a language, the object language, together with rules for their manipulation. Curry indicated how to convert mechanically a formal system into a calculus and a calculus into a formal system. He also coined the word "contensive" to refer to realist or idealist philosophies of mathematics (intending it as a translation for the German word "inhaltlich"). In his view, mathematics is not contensive, because it does not have any essential subject matter, and the only subject matter of mathematical propositions is other mathematics.

In a series of further papers, Curry elaborated these ideas and related them to the ideas of others, including Rudolf CARNAP and Lorenzen. The ideas were further elaborated into the introductions to his books *A Theory of Formal Deducibility*, *Leçons de logique algébrique* (1952), *Combinatory Logic*, vol. 1 (1958), *Foundations of Mathematical Logic*, and *Combinatory Logic*, vol. 2 (1972). Curry refined his notion of formal system so that it would include some versions of calculi. As part of this process, he revised his terminology as others criticized his use of some terms. Thus, for example, his original term for formal object in the 1920s and early 1930s was "entity" in English and "Etwas" (used as a noun) in German. When a philosopher told him that his use of the English word "entity" involved some philosophical assumptions that he did not wish to make, he stopped using it, and in *Outlines of a Formalist Philosophy of Mathematics* used the English word "term." However, his use of the word "term" for the formal object was in conflict with the use of that word in systems of predicate logic, and so starting about 1950 he substituted for it a word of his own: "ob." (See the preface to the second edition of *A Theory of Formal Deducibility*, 1957.) But not all formal objects are obs in this sense; obs are formal objects with the property that each one has a unique construction from the atomic formal objects. In a system in which the formal objects are words on an alphabet, not every word has a unique construction, since the word "abc"

can be constructed by adding "c" to the right of "ab" or by adding "a" to the left of "bc." Curry thus distinguished two kinds of formal systems: *ob systems*, in which every formal object has a unique construction from the atomic formal objects, and *syntactical systems*, in which the formal objects are words on an alphabet. The standard systems of propositional and predicate logic are both, since the formal objects are, indeed, words on an alphabet, but in all the standard definitions, the "well-formed formulas" all have a unique construction from the atomic formulas.

Another example is an objection raised by Kleene to Curry's use of the prefix "meta-," which Kleene felt should apply only to symbols and languages. So, starting about 1951, Curry began systematically using the prefix "epi-" instead of "meta-." (See the preface of *Outlines of a Formalist Philosophy of Mathematics*.) This idiosyncratic use of words has made some of Curry's works difficult to read, and has caused some misunderstanding of some of his ideas. For more on Curry's notion of formal system see Seldin (1975), and the history of Curry's terminology is described in *Foundations of Mathematical Logic* (pp. 85–6).

By the early 1960s Curry was no longer saying that mathematics is the science of formal *systems*, but that it is the science of formal *methods* (1963, p. 14). This revised definition can be used to answer a criticism made on several occasions that under Curry's earlier definition there could have been no mathematics before there were formal systems. In "The Purposes of Logical Formalization" (1968), Curry compares the process that led from the nineteenth-century arithmetization of analysis to twentieth-century formal logic to the process that led from the informal seventeenth and eighteenth-century deductions in calculus to the more formal ε–δ proofs of nineteenth-century analysis. This indicates that Curry considered the introduction of ε–δ proofs to be a kind of formalization, and that therefore, for Curry, formal methods go far beyond formal systems.

Curry believed strongly that mathematics is like language, a creation of human beings. He also thought that what was thus created had objective existence after it was created. Thus, for Curry, mathematics belonged to what Karl Popper called the "third world." In fact, when Popper presented his ideas on this in his paper "Epistemology without a Knowing Subject" at the Third International Congress for Logic, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science in 1967, it was at a session which Curry chaired. Curry's immediate reaction to Popper's paper was that it only elaborated upon what is trivially true.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"An Analysis of Logical Substitution," *American Journal of Mathematics* 51 (1929): 363–84.

"Grundlagen der Kombinatorischen Logik," *American Journal of Mathematics* 52 (1930): 509–36, 789–834.

"Some Properties of Equality and Implication in Combinatory Logic," *Annals of Mathematics* 35 (1934): 849–60.

"First Properties of Functionality in Combinatory Logic," *Tôhoku Mathematical Journal* 41 (1936): 371–401.

"Some Properties of Formal Deducibility," *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 43 (1937): 615.

"Remarks on the Definition and Nature of Mathematics," *Journal of Unified Science* 9 (1939): 164–9.

"Some Aspects of the Problem of Mathematical Rigor," *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 47 (1941): 221–41.

"The Inconsistency of Certain Formal Logics," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 7 (1942): 115–17.

A Theory of Formal Deducibility (Notre Dame, Ind., 1950; 2nd edn 1957).

Outlines of a Formalist Philosophy of

Mathematics (Amsterdam, 1951).

Leçons de logique algébrique (Paris and Louvain, 1952).

Combinatory Logic, vol. 1, with Robert Feys and William Craig (Amsterdam, 1958).

Foundations of Mathematical Logic (New York, 1963).

Combinatory Logic, vol. 2, with J. R. Hindley and J. P. Seldin (Amsterdam, 1972).

"The Purposes of Logical Formalization," *Logique et analyse* 11 (1968): 357–66.

Other Relevant Works

"Language, Metalanguage, and Formal System," *Philosophical Review* 59 (1950): 346–53.

"L-semantics as a Formal System," in *Congrès International de Philosophie des Sciences, Paris 1949, II Logique, Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles* (Paris, 1951), pp. 19–29.

"Philosophische Bemerkungen zu Einigen Problemen der Mathematischen Logik," *Archiv für Philosophie* 4 (1951): 147–56.

"On the Definition of Substitution, Replacement, and Allied Notions in an Abstract Formal System," *Revue Philosophique de Louvain* 50 (1952): 251–69.

"Mathematics, Syntactics, and Logic," *Mind* 62 (1953): 172–83.

"Theory and Experience," *Dialectica (Neuchatel)* 7 (1953): 176–8.

"Calculuses and Formal Systems," *Dialectica* 12 (1958): 249–73.

"Logic as a Mathematical Science," *Annals of the Japan Association for the Philosophy of Science* 2 (1963): 131–43.

"The Relation of Logic to Science," in *Information and Prediction in Science*, ed. S. Dockx and P. Bernays (New York, 1965), pp. 79–96.

"The Equivalence of Two Definitions of Elementary Formal System," *Compositio Mathematicae* 20 (1968): 13–20.

"Some Philosophical Aspects of Combinatory Logic," in *The Kleene Symposium: A Collection of Papers on Recursion Theory and Intuitionism*, ed. Jon Barwise, H. Jerome Keisler, and Kenneth Kunen (Amsterdam, 1980), pp. 85–101.

Further Reading

Who Was Who in Amer v8, *Who's Who in Phil*

Church, Alonzo. "A Set of Postulates for the Foundation of Logic," *Annals of Mathematics* 33 (1932): 346–66; 34 (1933): 839–64.

Hindley, J. R., and J. P. Seldin, eds. *To H. B. Curry: Essays on Combinatory Logic, Lambda Calculus and Formalism* (London and New York, 1980).

Kleene, Stephen C., and John B. Rosser, "The Inconsistency of Certain Formal Logics," *Annals of Mathematics* 36 (1935): 630–36.

Seldin, J. P. "Arithmetic as a Study of Formal Systems," *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 16 (1975): 449–64.

Shapiro, Stewart. *Thinking about Mathematics: The Philosophy of Mathematics* (Oxford, 2000).

Jonathan P. Seldin

CURTI, Merle Eugene (1897–1996)

Merle Eugene Curti was born on 15 September 1897 in Papillion, Nebraska. He received his BA in 1920 and PhD in 1927 from Harvard University, studying with Frederick Jackson Turner. Curti became a pioneer in American intellectual and social history, and was influenced by Progressive historians like his close friend Charles Beard and Carl BECKER, and also by John DEWEY's pragmatism. Curti

taught history at Beloit College, Smith College (1925–37), and Columbia University Teachers College (1937–42). In 1942 he became professor of history at the University of Wisconsin, and from 1947 until his retirement in 1968 he held the Frederick Jackson Turner professorship in Wisconsin's history department. Richard Hofstadter and John Higham were two of his many outstanding students. In 1952 Curti was President of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association (renamed the Organization of American Historians in 1964) and President of the American Historical Association in 1954. He died on 9 March 1996 in Madison, Wisconsin.

Curti helped establish peace studies as a field of scholarship with publication of his dissertation *The American Peace Crusade* (1929). In 1943 he received the Pulitzer Prize in history for *The Growth of American Thought* (1943), a sweeping overview of the social history of ideas, and the relationship of ideas to society in American history. It became an indispensable guide to American studies scholars after World War II, a field Curti helped influence as an Americanist.

Throughout his career, Curti strongly supported academic freedom and grassroots social democracy. He embraced the idea that empirical evidence and local study would stimulate social intelligence to improve the human condition. In the 1930s he completed two additional books on the peace movement, *Bryan and World Peace* (1931) and *Peace or War: The American Struggle* (1936). This marked him as somewhat of a "radical" in a very conservative historical profession. He considered himself a socialist with a "small s." In 1934 Curti was "very blue and discouraged" with ideological conflicts while at Smith, a place that had "a whole crew of young people … that are reactionary and fascist." During the Cold War, he was often attacked for his political convictions. As President of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association and the American Historical Association, he used his presidential addresses to denounce loyalty oaths, anti-intellectualism, and McCarthyism. In 1959 Curti and his research assistants at the University of Wisconsin published *The Making of an American Community,* a detailed study of Trempealeau County in Wisconsin. The team pioneered use of the federal manuscript census to shed further light on Turner's concept of frontier democracy assessing ethnic assimilation and mobility through longitudinal historical study. The use of quantitative data to study historically inarticulate "common people" in American history is the distinguishing feature of New Left social history to this day.

With his senior colleagues Merrill Jensen and Howard Beale at Wisconsin, Curti led a historiographic revival in the late 1950s that provided inspiration for the historical politics of New Left historians like Warren Susman, George Rawick, William Appleman Williams, William Preston, Herbert Gutman, and Gar Alperovitz. Although there is no "Curti School" of history, his eighty-six doctoral students wrote on dozens of topics. He was legendary for the openness of his classroom and his eclectic and wide-ranging intellect. He had immense bibliographic knowledge of all fields of history. He never forced specific interpretations or methods on his students, but rather encouraged them to explore approaches to the study of the human condition and the American scene. During the 1950s Cold War, eminent social historian Herbert Gutman remembered his Madison years as a time of intellectual awakening. He called Curti "that gentle and thoughtful man." Curti encouraged George Rawick, the prominent historian of slavery, to continue his academic career. Although a Marxist, Rawick respected his mentor for "his deep-seated commitment to American grass-roots democracy" as "'mankind's last best hope.'"

In retirement, Curti remained engaged in the profession through publication, participation, and correspondence until his death. Allen F. Davis, the biographer of Jane ADDAMS, recalled receiving letters from his former

advisor that "praised or criticized books that I had never heard of or had not got around to read." Merle Curti established intellectual history and American studies as fields to learn and teach about American culture.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The American Peace Crusade (Durham, N.C., 1929).
The Social Ideals of American Educators (New York, 1935).
The Growth of American Thought (New York, 1943).
The Roots of American Loyalty (New York, 1946).
The Making of an American Community: A Case Study of Democracy in a Frontier County (Stanford, Cal., 1959).

Other Relevant Works
Curti's papers are at the University of Wisconsin, Madison.
"The Dramatic Theme in American Historical Literature," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 39 (1952): 3–28.
"Intellectuals and Other People," *American Historical Review* 60 (1955): 259–82.
"American Philanthropy and the American Character," *American Quarterly* 10 (1958): 420–37.

Further Reading
Who Was Who in Amer v11
Breisach, Ernst. *American Progressive History: An Experiment in Modernization* (Chicago, 1993).
Buhle, Paul, ed. *History and the New Left: Madison, Wisconsin, 1950–1970* (Philadelphia, 1990).
Cronon, E. David. "Merle Curti: An Appraisal and Bibliography of His Writings," *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 54 (Winter 1970–71): 119–35.
Novick, Peter. *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge, UK, 1988).
Pettegrew, John. "A Tribute: Merle Curti, Pragmatist Historian," *Intellectual History Newsletter* 18 (1996): 70–75.

Matthew Bokovoy

CURTIS, Olin Alfred (1850–1918)

Olin Alfred Curtis was born on 10 December 1850 in Frankfort, Maine. While working in business in Chicago, he was greatly influenced by the preaching of Dwight Moody and began religious work. He was twenty-seven when he graduated with a BA from Lawrence University. He then attended Boston University Theological School, graduating three years later in 1880. After serving in the ministry for several years at Methodist Episcopal churches in Wisconsin and Chicago and studying for two years at Leipzig, he became professor of systematic theology at Boston University Theological School in 1889. He spent six years in this position, traveling several times for study in Europe: to Erlangen in 1890, Marburg in 1893, and Edinburgh in 1894. In 1896 he took the chair of systematic theology at Drew Theological Seminary, where he stayed until his retirement in 1914. Curtis died on 8 January 1918 in Leonia, New Jersey.

Curtis proved to be an effective teacher of theology as a result of his diverse education and experience. He had served as a ship's chaplain in the Spanish-American War, leading him to espouse a patriotic stance. Curtis studied intensely the subjects within theology, mastering the history of Christian doctrine and contemporary religious thought. In addition to theological material, he was well read in literature and American history. Widely respected as a theologian, his book entitled *The Christian Faith: Personally Given in a System of Doctrine* (1905) was a staple in Methodist theological circles and was required reading for

most young Methodist ministers. Curtis was admired as a professor and had great influence on his student Edwin Lewis, who succeeded to his chair of systematic theology.

In *The Christian Faith*, Curtis set out to show that in Christ "alone our Lord opens his mind, his heart, his personal consciousness to the whole inflow of the horror of sin, the endless history of it, from the first choice of selfishness on, on to the eternity of hell, the boundless ocean of desolation, he allows wave upon wave to overwhelm his soul" (p. 1). He thus sets out to give a psychological theory of God's relationship to the world. Curtis clearly thinks that the sin of humanity changes the psyche of God. Because sin negatively impacts God, he does not think that predestination is a possibility, because God can change God's mind and does so based upon the actions of humanity. Against the Calvinist doctrine of predestination, then, Curtis develops and defends an Arminianism that posits how human perfection is possible through one's free will. This Arminianism is definitive of Curtis's Methodist evangelicalism. Not only did he defend Arminianism, but he also defended a sort of personalism. He thought that this was the best way to defend spiritualism against the theory of evolution that was starting to gain popularity in his day.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Christian Faith: Personally Given in a System of Doctrine (New York, 1905).
"The Catechism of Sir Oliver Lodge," *Methodist Review* 89 (1907): 681–92.
"Professor Denney's Irenic Attempt," *Methodist Review* 91 (1909): 694–707.
"A New Estimate of the Theological Situation," *Methodist Quarterly Review* 60 (1911): 627–40, 758–60.
"Personal Creed," *Methodist Review* 109 (1926): 274–9.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Dalton, Charles B. "The Theology of Olin Alfred Curtis," *Methodist Review* 104 (1921): 891–903.
Hough, Lynn H. "Making Theology Live," *Methodist Review* 101 (1918): 686–95.
Limpscomb, Thomas H. "The Christian Faith," *Methodist Quarterly Review* 55 (1906): 419–31.
Ryan, Michael D. "The Theology of Olin Curtis," *Drew Gateway* 33 (Winter 1963): 82–90.
Terry, Milton S. "A Worthy Creed," *Methodist Review* 92 (1910): 131–2.

Angela Kristen McWilliams

The Dictionary
of Modern American Philosophers

THE DICTIONARY
OF MODERN AMERICAN
PHILOSOPHERS

Volume 2

D–J

GENERAL EDITOR

John R. Shook

CONSULTING EDITORS

Richard T. Hull
Bruce Kuklick
Murray G. Murphey
John G. Slater

thoemmes

D

DABNEY, Robert Lewis (1820–98)

Robert Lewis Dabney was born on 5 March 1820 in Louisa County, Virginia, an area where loyalty to conservative religious and social principles was natural and considered to be a point of honor. This attitude may also have become part of his personality at the age of thirteen, when the death of his father caused him to assume oversight of the family farm. He studied for a short while in 1836–7 at Hampden-Sydney College but resumed farming again while also teaching at a local school. In 1842 he obtained an MA degree from the University of Virginia and four years later a BD degree from Union Theological Seminary in the same state. After ordination within a few months Dabney traveled as a missionary in several counties and then served from 1846 to 1853 as minister of the Tinkling Springs Presbyterian church in Augusta County. Many agreed that he had reached the apex of his career when he joined the faculty of Union Theological Seminary, the most influential Presbyterian institution in the South. During his tenure there from 1853 to 1883, Dabney molded generations of ministerial students in ecclesiastical history, polity, and, most importantly, in systematic theology.

While a social conservative on most issues, Dabney opposed the groundswell of support for secession in the 1850s. When war broke out, however, he volunteered to serve as a chaplain in the Confederate army. His emphasis on discipline and duty brought him to the attention of a like-minded officer, and in 1862 he briefly filled the position of chief of staff to General "Stonewall" Jackson. After the war he became more entrenched in defending ideas about the antebellum South and its presumed social refinements. Arguing that slavery had been a moral social arrangement, he defended the "peculiar institution" as a beneficial step in the annals of human progress. Dabney idealized many myths that buttressed the "lost cause" mentality and declaimed at length about the purity of Southern life which had been overwhelmed by greater numbers and material strength, not by superior virtues. His postwar reactionary views portrayed a genteel culture facing dire threats from Reconstruction policies and suffrage extended to freedmen. Dabney supported various schemes to salvage Southern achievements through possible immigration to Brazil and Australia, but most of his embittered focus remained at home where an American South was beleaguered by unwanted changes forced on it by alien invaders.

War and its aftermath did little to make Dabney adopt more conservative positions regarding doctrine, moral standards, or polity. He had made a name for himself as a staunch supporter of Old School Presbyterianism in his early years, and he continued to sustain those convictions for the rest of his life. Because he tempered rigidities in the system with gentleness and expressing a positive appreciation of revivals, Dabney appealed to Presbyterians at many different levels of con-

viction and consequently was deemed to be one of the most influential theologians of his generation. As a defender of doctrinal and biblical orthodoxy, he held that strict adherence to creed and discipline was a virtue in and of itself. Beyond that, he chose the category of epistemology as a proper ground on which to defend conservative creedalism. Standing with the Scottish Common Sense perception of reality, he became particularly antagonistic toward Darwinists and beyond that to all who relied on positivistic and naturalistic criteria in the physical sciences. Limiting viable knowledge to such criteria would, he held, eviscerate metaphysical truths and lead to the eventual destruction of religious sensitivity. Accepting the hypotheses of evolution would lure the unwary deeper into the materialism and sensuality that had always been earmarks of original sin.

While battling the threats of intellectual error, Dabney moved to Texas in 1883, hoping to enjoy better health in a warmer climate. He soon became the professor of mental and moral philosophy at the University of Texas in Austin in 1883 and taught there until 1894, and he was also instrumental in founding what became Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary in 1884. But physical transition did not produce any softening of attitudes. Dabney had long opposed reunion with northern branches of the Presbyterian denomination, and his activities stiffened Southern resistance to any such overtures. He also tried to thwart all attempts by churchwomen to form their own auxiliary or management committees in education or missions. On a third controversial issue he denounced the ordination of African Americans because it might possibly place a black official over white congregants in some local presbytery. By 1890 Dabney was blind and suffered from a number of infirmities. In 1894 he announced his retirement but continued to speak out vehemently in ways that showed how much he was still at war with most changes in the world around him. Always a defiant old romantic, Dabney died on 3 January 1898 in Victoria, Texas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Life and Campaigns of Lieutenant-general Thomas J. Jackson (New York, 1866).

Defence of Virginia and the South (New York, 1867).

Treatise on Sacred Rhetoric (Richmond, Virg., 1870).

Syllabus and Notes on the Course of Systematic and Polemic Theology (Richmond, Virg., 1871).

Sensualistic Philosophy of the Nineteenth Century Examined (New York, 1875).

Practical Philosophy (Kansas City, Missouri, 1897).

Other Relevant Works

Dabney's papers are at Union Theological Seminary in Richmond, Virginia.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v2*

Dabney, W. H. *Sketch of the Dabneys of Virginia* (Chicago, 1888).

Johnson, Thomas Cary. *Life and Letters of Robt. Lewis Dabney* (Richmond, Virg., 1903).

Henry Warner Bowden

DAHL, Robert Alan (1915–)

Robert Alan Dahl was born on 17 December 1915 in Inwood, Iowa. He received his BA from the University of Washington in 1936, and a PhD in political science from Yale University in 1940. He served in the federal government, first in the Office of Price Administration and later in the War Production Board, and in 1943 enlisted in the US Army. After the war, Dahl joined the faculty of Yale University as an instructor of

political science in 1946, and was promoted up to full professor. He became Eugene Meyer Professor of Political Science in 1955 and the chair of the political science department two years later. He was the Sterling Professor of Political Science from 1964 until his retirement in 1986. Dahl is presently a senior research scientist in sociology at Yale. He is a member of the National Academy of Sciences, the American Philosophical Society, and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, a corresponding member of the British Academy, and was President of the American Political Science Association in 1966–7.

In the 1950s and 60s Dahl's name became closely associated with a controversial theory in American studies known as pluralism. This view denied the contention of such scholars as C. Wright MILLS that there is a single dominant "power elite" in the United States. Dahl instead asserted that public policy at all levels is the result of both conflict and cooperation among several overlapping but competing elites, any one of which has an effective veto over those issues that concern it most deeply. These elites are accommodated by what Dahl dubbed a "decentralized bargaining bureaucracy."

Dahl set out this theory on a theoretical level in 1956, and he offered a supporting empirical study of the politics of the city of New Haven, Connecticut in 1961. There has always been some ambiguity, though, as to whether Dahl's pluralism was a descriptive or a normative theory. In general, Dahl himself believed in this period both that a plurality of elites is an accurate description of the American scene *and* that this is on the whole good news. The specifically normative component of the theory he called "polyarchy."

Through the 1970s and 80s Dahl became convinced that the concentration of wealth is a great threat to democracy in any normative sense. "A desirable economic order would disperse power, not concentrate it," he wrote in 1985. In more recent writings, Dahl has largely abandoned polyarchy for a more populist conception of democracy, one that he sometimes discusses in almost wistful terms, writing for example that "looking back on the rise and decline of democracy, it is clear that we cannot count on historical forces to insure that democracy will always advance – or even survive, as the long intervals in which popular governments vanished from the earth remind us" (1998, p. 25).

Dahl's influence has been enormous, both in the United States and abroad, touching scholars as different from one another as conservative Harvard criminologist James Q. Wilson, idiosyncratic Berkeley economist Oliver Williamson, and Edward P. Weber, author of a fine study of the politics of environmental regulation which bears the Dahl-inspired title, *Pluralism by the Rules*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Congress and Foreign Policy (New York, 1950).
Politics, Economics, and Welfare: Planning and Politico-economic Systems resolved into Basic Social Processes, with Charles E. Lindblom (New York, 1953).
A Preface to Democratic Theory (Chicago, 1956).
Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City (New Haven, Conn., 1961).
Modern Political Analysis (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1963).
Pluralist Democracy in the United States: Conflict and Consent (Chicago, 1967). Rev. edn, *Democracy in the United States: Promise and Performance* (Chicago, 1972).
After the Revolution? Authority in a Good Society (New Haven, Conn., 1970).
Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition (New Haven, Conn., 1971).
Size and Democracy, with Edward R. Tufte (Stanford, Cal., 1973).
Dilemmas of Pluralist Democracy: Autonomy vs. Control (New Haven, Conn., 1982).

A Preface to Economic Democracy (Berkeley, Cal., 1985).

Controlling Nuclear Weapons: Democracy versus Guardianship (Syracuse, N.Y., 1985).

Democracy and Its Critics (New Haven, Conn., 1989).

On Democracy (New Haven, Conn., 1998).

How Democratic is the American Constitution? (New Haven, Conn., 2001).

Other Relevant Works

"Marxism and Free Parties," *Journal of Politics* 10 (1948): 787–813.

"A Critique of the Ruling Elite Model," *American Political Science Review* 52 (1958): 462–9.

"Democracy in the Workplace," *Dissent* (Winter 1984): 54–60.

Further Reading

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio

Domhoff, G. William. *Who Really Rules? New Haven and Community Power Reexamined* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1978).

Hoffman, Tom. "The Quiet Desperation of Robert Dahl's (Quiet) Radicalism," *Critical Review* 15 (2003): 87–122.

Lee, Donald J. *Polyarchy: The Political Theory of Robert A. Dahl* (New York, 1991).

Shapiro, Ian, ed. *Power, Inequality, and Democratic Politics: Essays in Honor of Robert A. Dahl* (Boulder, Col., 1988).

Weber, Edward P. *Pluralism by the Rules: Conflict and Cooperation in Environmental Regulation* (Washington D.C., 1998).

Williamson, Oliver E. *Markets and Hierarchies: A Study in the Economics of Internal Organization* (New York, 1975).

Wilson, James Q. *Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It* (New York, 1989).

Christopher Faille

DALY, Mary (1928–)

Mary Daly was born on 16 October 1928 in Schenectady, New York, to Irish Catholic working-class parents and was educated in Roman Catholic schools. She received a BA in English from the College of St. Rose in Albany, New York, and an MA in English from the Catholic University of America. Her desire to study Catholic philosophy and theology was frustrated by the fact that women were not accepted in the authorized programs. She completed the new doctoral program in religion at St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, but found that it did not open teaching opportunities in challenging programs in Catholic thought. The only opportunities seemed to be in Europe and she decided to go to the University of Fribourg, Switzerland, where state support prevented the exclusion of women. Supporting both herself and her mother by loans and by teaching in study abroad programs, she earned a baccalaureate, licentiate, and in 1963 a doctorate in sacred theology (the first granted to a woman). After completing her sacred theology dissertation on "The Problem of Speculative Theology: A Study in Saint Thomas," in 1965 she obtained a third doctorate, in philosophy, also from Fribourg, with a dissertation on "Natural Knowledge of God in the Philosophy of Jacques Maritain."

Visiting the Second Vatican Council in 1965 helped to motivate Daly's first articles criticizing the church's policies toward women. These led to an invitation to write *The Church and the Second Sex* (1968), much of which was completed before she returned to the USA to take a position in the theology department at Boston College in 1966. Although during subsequent years she lectured extensively both internationally and nationally, this Jesuit institution remained her professional location until she retired as an associate professor in 1999 after thirty-three years. These years were marked by several widely publicized controversies over her candidacies for tenure and promotion and over her pedagogical strate-

gies. Her courses centered on feminist ethics, enrolled both graduate and undergraduate students, and were available to students at nine other universities and schools of theology in the Boston area.

The Church and the Second Sex calls upon the Catholic Church to reform its policies toward women and defends Christianity in dialogue with Simone de Beauvoir. However, by the time Daly was asked to prepare a second edition, she no longer hoped for reform of the religious traditions and had become a radical feminist philosopher and theologian. She then began her policy of authorizing "new editions" of her works that were unchanged texts but with additional introductions that revealed the subsequent transformations of her thought.

Daly's radical feminism considers all inherited languages, symbolic traditions, and institutions as so profoundly shaped by systems of male domination that women must refuse to grant authority to them in order to claim their own creativity, intellectual powers, and spirituality. Recognizing the power of language, her method calls for wordplay that jolts consciousness so that it reveals patriarchal hegemonies and embraces women's agency. While her first books were shaped by somewhat traditional frameworks, later books reject standard philosophical and theological formulations. At the same time, however, she regularly uses classical thinkers (for example, Aristotle and Aquinas) as "springboards" for her own analyses.

The internationally influential *Beyond God the Father* (1973) is a philosophy of religion developed as a feminist challenge to patriarchal religion, specifically to Christian doctrines. It gave impetus to several different feminist movements that have transformed much contemporary theology as well as some religious institutions. While many feminists disagree with aspects of Daly's radical feminism, certain themes of her thought regularly recur throughout feminist theology and she is universally recognized as the field's pioneer. Identifying

human existence with the power of "self-naming," she calls women "to name the self, the world and God," in other words, to articulate meaning in terms of their own becoming, rather than simply to conform to inherited doctrines. Later, she calls herself a "pirate" who steals resources from the intellectual traditions (for example, Thomism) in order to transform them for the sake of women's becoming. An early example is her appropriation of the ontologies of Thomas Aquinas, Alfred North WHITEHEAD, and Paul TILLICH in terms of her metaphor of Ultimate/Intimate Reality as "Verb." Daly is convinced that the women's movement has a spiritual dimension and needs to be grounded in an image of ultimate reality as dynamic interconnected process. At first she speaks metaphorically of "God the Verb." Later, she decides that the word "God" cannot be liberated from its associations with the reified Father God and she speaks simply of "the Verb." This is developed in terms of Aristotle's emphasis on final causality and, eventually, is called "Quintessence."

By the time of her third book, *Gyn/Ecology* (1978), Daly had not only formulated her radical feminism and her rhetorical methods, she had come to a personal realization of lesbianism. This, however, did not restrict her audience, since she addresses all who affirm women's becoming and are open to criticizing societal systems that have perpetuated both psychological and physical atrocities against women and "other biophilic creatures." She introduces here her unremitting analysis of the "Sado-Ritual Syndrome" that is played out in "necrophilic" patriarchal phenomena such as witch burnings, genital mutilation, footbinding, and psychoanalysis.

From the time of *Beyond God the Father,* Daly has aimed to reveal the connections between sexism, violence, and ecological devastation. In *Pure Lust* (1984) she calls for the ecstatic recovery of "elemental" passionate participation in Ultimate/Intimate Reality as opposed to the "plastic and potted" emotions encouraged by contemporary economic

systems. The *Wickedary* (1987), with ironic humor, uses a dictionary format to present the current results of the etymological experimentation that marks her writing. *Outercourse* (1992) blends autobiography with philosophy as it analyzes her own intellectual as well as personal development in terms of radical feminism's need to criticize "foreground" patriarchally conditioned realities by invoking the "Background," women's original potentialities. *Quintessence* (1998) imagines the future in critical dialogue with present ecological and social violence, with particular attention to the threats posed by religious fundamentalisms and genetic engineering.

Some feminist theorists criticize Daly as an essentialist who does not adequately recognize the diversity of women's experiences. Others think she successfully maintains an existentialist and ontological critique of essentialism. Her emphasis on the power of language and on the self as process resonates with postmodernism. However, she criticizes the relativism and social determinism sometimes associated with postmodernism and continues to advocate the ontological powers of intuitive reason existentially appropriated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Problem of Speculative Theology (Washington, D.C., 1965).
Natural Knowledge of God in the Philosophy of Jacques Maritain (Rome, 1966).
The Church and the Second Sex (Boston, 1968; 1975; 1985).
Beyond God the Father: Toward a Philosophy of Women's Liberation (Boston, 1973; 1985).
Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism (Boston, 1978; 1990).
Pure Lust: Elemental Feminist Philosophy (Boston, 1984; San Francisco, 1992).
Websters' First New Intergalactic Wickedary of the English Language, with Jane Caputi (Boston, 1987; San Francisco, 1993).
Outercourse: The Be-Dazzling Voyage (San Francisco, 1992).
Quintessence … Realizing the Archaic Future: A Radical Elemental Feminist Manifesto (Boston, 1998).

Further Reading
Cambridge Dict Amer Bio
Hoagland, Sarah Lucia, and Marilyn Frye, eds. *Feminist Interpretations of Mary Daly* (University Park, Penn., 2000).
Ratcliffe, Krista. *Anglo-American Feminist Challenges to the Rhetorical Traditions: Virginia Woolf, Mary Daly, Adrienne Rich* (Carbondale, Ill., 1996).

Wanda Warren Berry

DANTO, Arthur Coleman (1924–)

Arthur Danto was born on 1 January 1924 in Ann Arbor, Michigan. He received his BA degree from Wayne State University in 1948, and his MA in 1949 and PhD in philosophy in 1952 from Columbia University. He began teaching philosophy at Columbia in 1951, became full professor in 1966, and is now Johnsonian Professor Emeritus of Philosophy. Initially an artist before he turned to philosophy, Danto is best known for his work in aesthetics. He is married to Barbara Westman, an artist and noted creator of covers and illustrations for *The New Yorker* magazine. Danto has received two Guggenheim Fellowships, an ACLS Fellowship, and a Fulbright Grant, as well as the National Book Critics Circle Prize in 1990 for *Encounters and Reflections*. He was a longtime editor of *The Journal of Philosophy* and has been President of both the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association (1983–4) and the American Society of Aesthetics. Since his retirement he has continued to publish in philosophy and

has received considerable acclaim as the art critic for *The Nation*.

For Danto, philosophy studies ways of making connections to the world. These connections take two forms: knowledge and action. They may be manifested in various ways, notably in historical events and scientific or philosophical theories, as well as in individual actions and expressions of belief. Of particular importance in Danto's later work are the connections made in the production and perception of art. Both knowledge and action are grounded on two fundamental relations: causation and representation. However, the two relations are intertwined in ways that make *representation* the central concept in all of the areas in which Danto works. The centrality of representation is displayed in Danto's analysis of knowledge and action; representation constitutes knowledge if it is caused by the state of affairs that makes it true. Something is an action when it is caused by a representation that it makes true.

Danto's construal of knowledge and action applies to both internal and external representations; beliefs or intentions, as psychological entities, but also spoken or written sentences, and visible pictures as well. The common account of internal and external representations is underwritten in Danto's theory partly by the view that beliefs are psychologically real sentential states. These are encoded much in the manner of what Jerry FODOR calls a language of thought. We are "constructed sententially," Danto says; in fact, "we are sentential beings" (*The Body/Body Problem*, p. 87) and so his account of knowledge applies to representations that occur both inside and outside of the head. His theory of action also applies to internal as much as to external events, and not just because bodily movements become actions when they are caused by the appropriate mental states. Beyond that causal relation, Danto sometimes says, ideas are themselves actions, only of a mental sort. That point is revealing, and can be understood by mapping his theory of action onto his philosophy of mind.

According to Danto, actions have two components: a representation and a behavior. The capacity for the behavior, he argues, is usually produced through operant conditioning. However, it becomes an action when a representation of a desired outcome is what causes the relevant movement to occur. I raise my hand (the behavior), because I intend to vote (the representation). The behavior is not simply a reflexive response or disposition realized upon the presentation of a stimulus of a non-representational sort. If we apply that analysis to ideas-as-actions, the implication would seem to be that the behavior in question need not involve bodily movement, outside the perimeters of the skull. There may be, instead, habitual patterns of thought (call them ideational behaviors) that antecedent ideas sometimes activate. But conditioned behaviors are physical phenomena, the results of rewards and punishments administered through physical pleasure or pain. How can patterns of thought be construed in that way? Moreover, ideas or beliefs have "wide" or extensional content: they refer to objects and events in the world. In that case, how can ideational behaviors be identified with physical movements inside the skull? Both questions call for an account of the relation of the mind to the brain.

On Danto's conception, patterns of thought are vested in patterns of neural activity. That is part of what it means to say that beliefs are sentential states: the relevant sentences are encoded in brain tissue and neurochemicals, more or less as sentences are inscribed in paper and ink. This allows patterns of thought and belief systems to be conditioned through whatever literal pleasures are provided through connections to the brain's limbic system and the subpersonal delights that neurotransmitters such as serotonin can supply. However, it does not follow that the contents of beliefs or the meanings of sentential states can be identified with, or reduced to, their neurological underpinnings – the electrochemical encoding by which they are internally expressed. Danto

advocates a materialist conception of the mind, but it is a nonreductionist and broadly functionalist type. Beliefs supervene on brain states, but there is more to belief than neurology can ever describe. Danto is a realist about beliefs and other mental representations, and a semantic realist as well. There are psychologically real beliefs, and there are facts of the matter that can be used to determine what beliefs are about. He rejects arguments for either the elimination of propositional attitudes from cognitive science and philosophy, or their identification with brain events.

Danto's functionalist view of the psychological reality of mental representations includes a commitment to a *modularity thesis* about how the mind and brain are organized. At the level of basic perceptual abilities, at least, mental representations – perceptual ideas, we might call them – are impervious to the effects of learning and full background knowledge. They are cognitively impenetrable in the sense that Fodor has described. This provides a foundation for perceptual knowledge that plays an important part in Danto's theories of action, knowledge, and art.

The most straightforward argument for the need for foundations can be seen in Danto's analysis of *basic actions*, which has changed in certain ways over the years. A basic action is one that is not caused by another action, although of course it might have antecedent causes of other kinds. The argument for such actions is simply that, without them, an account of action faces an infinite regress: each action would be caused by another action, and so on without end. Although such actions are, as we might put it, done directly, Danto no longer believes that they must be known directly and consciously. However, basic actions can be identified by subtracting away from nonbasic actions until a description is reached from which no further subtractions can be made.

The appeal to subtraction and infinite regress can then be extended to argue for basic elements of other kinds. It follows from the analysis of basic action and ideas-as-actions that there must also be basic mental representations that cause basic actions to occur. Moreover, the view that there are such representations is consistent with the language of thought hypothesis, according to which some capacity to conceptualize and form hypotheses must be innate, to explain how we learn natural language at all. This view also fits well with the appeal to the modularity of perception, which requires that basic perceptual categories not be affected or acquired through learning. Whether basic representations in these particular forms are the causes of basic actions or not, the foundationalist argument is the same. There are discoverable basic actions that are embedded in nonbasic actions, Danto argues, "and parallel claims, I am certain, can be vindicated for basic and non basic cognition" (*The Body/Body Problem*, 1999, p. 60). However, the question arises of what larger philosophical significance basic elements might have, apart from stopping logical regressions. Danto now acknowledges that basic actions need not be the objects of direct awareness and so do not have the importance he once thought they had. What does it matter if the representations produced in early visual processing, for instance, are everywhere and at all times exactly similar, whenever perceivers are confronted with the same sort of stimuli? Danto's answer has two parts: basic elements matter a lot to philosophical methodology, he thinks; but they do not matter much to an account of what representations mean. The appeal to constant, noncomplex factors sets the stage for philosophical analysis. However, once we acknowledge them, we realize how little they contribute to our understanding of words and pictures, ideas, and beliefs.

The methodological significance of basic perceptual abilities derives from Danto's well-known *method of indiscernibles*, his central philosophical technique to distinguish action from mere behavior, knowledge from mere belief, and artworks from mere real things. Take two texts, two pictures, two arm-raising

events, two statements or propositions, two physical objects, or two sentences inscribed in the brain. The two items in each pair may be visually identical, yet they may have a very different ontological status or be as different in meaning as night and day. This presupposes that such items *can* be visually indistinguishable, even if we know that they were intended to be, or to represent, different things. That possibility is grounded on the existence of basic perceptual abilities, basic representations, which such knowledge supposedly cannot affect. However, it then follows that we must account for the differences between the two items in terms of something other than the basic representations on which the perception of them depends. This reveals the limited semantic significance of basic elements where the difference is one of meaning or content. To capture that difference, some account of their different causal histories is required, as well as a theory of how beliefs about those histories are brought to bear through interpretations by which meaning is ascribed.

This brings us to the second way in which Danto's conception of the mind is important for his philosophy overall. His functionalist form of semantic realism raises the question of how broadly to construe the representational functions that brain states can implement. This is a question about the scope of beliefs and intentions, a matter of how we determine what they are about. A central concern in all of Danto's philosophy has to do with the relation of meaning and history, where the meaning in question belongs to representations of all kinds. In his philosophy of mind, the issue is how world history informs the contents of beliefs and desires. A similar question can be asked about the contents of art; for art and mind are reflections of each other where meaning and content are concerned. As Danto asks rhetorically, "if a bit of mere paint can be *of* the Passion of the Lord, why on earth cannot a state of our brain?" (*The Body/Body Problem*, 1999, p. 30).

As the emphasis on history makes clear, Danto's theory of representational content is quite broad. In the identification of meaning of both beliefs and paintings, extended causal relations to the world play an important role. In the case of mental representations, causal relations do more than transform belief into knowledge, behavior into action. To some extent, they determine which beliefs are so transformed and which intentions have the transforming effect. As we have seen, truth conditions are critical for Danto's theories of knowledge and action. Recall, for instance, that a belief becomes knowledge when it is caused by the state of affairs that makes the belief true. But, of course, it can only be made true by the state of affairs that causes it, so long as those affairs are what it represents. Danto says that we cannot even say what an idea is an idea of without knowing its truth conditions. Moreover, those conditions are, on his view, only satisfied when the representation is caused in the right way. This means that some appeal to causal history is required in order to identify the conditions that would make the representation true. It follows that a certain type of causal relation must be what makes an idea or a picture the idea or picture it is. When the actual cause of a token sentence or picture does not match the type with which its content is identified, there is misrepresentation. The same is true for neural encoding of sentential or (if there are such things) pictorial states of mind.

The appeal to causal history can be more or less restricted in scope. In the more restricted application, it establishes denotation or reference; the extensional sense of what a belief or artwork represents. For example, *The Polish Rider* depicts a man on a horse, but this can be only a small part of the story according to Danto's method of indiscernibles. What would be recognized as the same in two identical pictures is just what the representations happen to denote. Two images may denote a man on an incline in exactly the same way, yet represent (indeed, depict) him as walking uphill or downhill, as the case may be. Equally different meanings could be attributed to exactly similar

paintings of a man on a horse. Visually identical pictures can denote the same objects, yet have essentially incompatible contents and not just be variations on a theme. The same is true for thoughts and beliefs. Two of those may be inscriptionally identical and refer to the same state of affairs, yet be quite different in meaning for all of that. Apprehending the referential relation is not enough to give us a full understanding of what the thoughts and beliefs are about. Moreover, in the case of fictional representations, there is an intentional sense of aboutness, a kind of content, that clearly remains, even when they refer to nothing at all. Winged angels and one-eyed monsters may have never existed, but pictures and stories about them abound nonetheless. Some explanation of this fact is required. The question then is, in what, beyond denotation, does the meaning of a representation consist?

In philosophy of mind, it is tempting to think that, beyond the level of denotation, the meaning of a mental sentence or belief becomes a matter of interconnected conceptual or functional roles, the inferential and causal relations into which the sentences and beliefs can enter. These are typically viewed as defined just by parameters of the local systems in which they are housed; individual brains, in the case of the human mind. Danto suggests this in holding that the identity of a (mental) sentence depends on the other sentences with which it co-occurs. Moreover, he says, in taking account of systems of sentential attitudes, we are effectively treating the mind as if it were a text. This is a challenge, because individual systems of beliefs and intentions can be "pretty eccentric"; mental texts can vary considerably from one person to the next (*The Body/Body Problem*, 1999, p. 97). Danto's fundamental commitment to the essential bearing of history on meaning implies that the relevant relations among beliefs and other representations can only be understood by way of their historical connections; conceptual roles that are long-armed enough to reach into the distant past.

For Danto's philosophy of art, his theory of knowledge and action applies to public – novels and paintings – as well as private representations. Artworks convey knowledge by virtue of the same sort of causal and representational relations that constrain true beliefs. They are also the products of actions – indeed, they are actions – insofar as they are caused by and express the artist's intentions and ideas. In these respects, Danto holds a cognitivist and symbolic expressionist theory of art. The point of calling the locus of representations a text (even where it is a painting) is to bring out the importance of interpretation for the identification of content or meaning in representations of any kind. Interpreting such texts requires understanding a complex system of beliefs and intentions; in particular, the beliefs and intentions of the person who produced them. In that case, the maker's intentions are a particularly salient factor in the causal history of the representation and, of course, those intentions have causal histories of their own. The maker's beliefs and intentions provide a standard of correctness for the attribution of meaning to his representations, the truth conditions that make interpretation into knowledge when they play a central role in bringing the interpretation about. But then, the artist's or agent's beliefs also have truth conditions, and his intentions may or may not result in an action (a painting, a gesture) that makes them true. Interpretations must take both of these causal relations into account. Danto can say that the artist's intentions provide a standard of correctness for interpretations and at the same time hold that interpretations that acknowledge those intentions are constitutive of what a representation means. Interpretations that bring more to the meaning than the artist could have intended may be illuminating, but they are not constitutive of meaning in Danto's sense. Constitutive interpretations must place the artist's intentions in a larger context, that of the historical context from which they have arisen and in which they may succeed or fail. In that case, historical relations constrain both the

meanings of paintings and their maker's intentions. To that extent, Danto holds a historicist view, although he believes that philosophy discovers the concepts and ideas in terms of which representations are interpreted and meanings attributed. He has therefore been called an essentialist, a neo-Hegelian whose historicism consists in the following fact: ideas may be discovered, but not all ideas, and not all actions or artworks, are possible at all times. There is a kind of logic to their emergence as history unfolds. What a thing essentially is depends on what has preceded it; the types of things that can follow it depend on what sort of thing it is. There are contingencies, to be sure. The world might have been one way rather than another, but it is constrained by logical relations among actual and possible objects, actions, and events. For example, if O is a snow shovel, it cannot be made into art (by Marcel Duchamp, perhaps) before it is an ordinary object. If E is a hand-raising, it cannot be an act of voting before the relevant political institutions exist. If O is a representation in putative pictures or descriptions, or E is a simulation or performance of some kind, even if the representations are fictions (there being no Os to denote), the type of fictions they are, and the kinds of attitudes they can express, will depend on the nature of fictive representation, that have gone before. One work can be a parody of another, but only after the first piece has been made. To return to mental representations, this implies that the content of a belief or intention will depend on the sequence of concepts, beliefs, and ideas that have preceded it, not so much in the individual believer as in the world. It is in this sense that that the attribution of belief contents, in interpretations of actions and utterances, must be conceptually and causally long-armed. Danto argues that although actions and representations in the present have to be interpreted in terms of a prior causal sequence of actions and representations, the description of that sequence often takes a quasi-teleological tone. Antecedent causes are singled out after the fact by reference to later events that make

them salient, "in terms that later events make available but that generally cannot have been know about when the earlier events took place" (*The Body/Body Problem*, 1999, p. 6).

The watershed moment for the development of Danto's thinking was provided by the infamous American artist, Andy Warhol. The artistic actions of Warhol were for Danto's analysis what Napoleon's conquests were for Hegel's thought. They transformed the world, including the world of ideas, making theories possible that had not been possible before. By placing ordinary Brillo boxes in a museum, turning them into *Brillo Boxes*, as a work of art, Warhol crystallized for Danto the idea of an art world, under the auspices of which things can come to be works of art. This is a type of institutional theory. However, it should be distinguished from other institutional theories like that of George DICKIE in certain important respects. On Danto's view, the art world is a world that is circumscribed by the discourse of available reasons and theories about art. Art is not defined by canons simply laid down by a de facto academy; that is, strictures with canonical status because they are espoused by philosophers, artists, curators, and critics who happen to be influential at the time.

Warhol's work, and other related developments in this period, also signaled what Danto describes as the *end of art*. His claim is not that we have reached the end of art-making, but that art history can be understood as a series of developments in the project of self-definition, in which various conceptions and attitudes about representation emerged. This project reached a culmination when ordinary objects were presented and accepted as artworks, raising and attempting to answer a philosophical question of how to distinguish art from nonart things. In so doing, art converges with philosophy, and there art's project of self-definition reached an end.

Danto believes the question "what is art?" can be answered: art expresses ideas and is the subject of interpretation that takes account of its history, in which it is treated essentially

as metaphor. "What a work expresses is what it is a metaphor for …" (1981, p. 194). The Brillo boxes in *Brillo Boxes* are like Brillo boxes in the real world, but transformed into meaningful objects by the artist's actions (intentions) in ways constrained by the art historical context. The work is therefore a metaphor for art as Warhol construes it. This conception is not limited to one artistic movement in New York in the 1960s, of course. For example, the *Portrait of Madame Cézanne* denotes Madame Cézanne, but it is about painting and expresses the view that painting should reveal geometrical forms, serving as a metaphor for what Cézanne believes painting to be.

Danto's career comprises a philosophical system in which an extended causal–historical theory of representation is the basis for his accounts of knowledge and action, which provide for connections to the world that perhaps are best understood through the lens of his influential theory of art.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Artworld," *Journal of Philosophy* 61 (1964): 571–84.
Analytical Philosophy of History (Cambridge, UK, 1968).
Analytical Philosophy of Knowledge (Cambridge, UK, 1968).
Analytical Philosophy of Action (Cambridge, UK, 1973).
The Transfiguration of The Commonplace (Cambridge, Mass., 1981).
Narration and Knowledge (New York, 1986).
The Philosophical Disenfranchisement of Art (New York, 1986).
The State of the Art (New York, 1987).
Connections to the World (New York, 1989).
Encounters and Reflections: Art in the Historical Present (New York, 1990).
Beyond the Brillo Box: The Visual Arts in Post-historical Perspective (New York, 1992).

Playing with the Edge: The Photographic Achievement of Robert Mapplethorpe (Los Angeles, 1996).
The Body/Body Problem: Selected Essays (Los Angeles, 1999).
Philosophizing Art (Los Angeles, 1999).
The Madonna of the Future: Essays in a Pluralistic Art World (New York, 2000).
The Abuse of Beauty: Aesthetics and the Concept of Art (Chicago, 2003).

Other Relevant Works
"Anselm Kiefer," *The Nation* (2 January 1989): 26–8.
"Andy Warhol," *The Nation* (3 April 1989): 458–61.
"Narrative and Style," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 49 (1992): 201–209.
"Seeing and Showing," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 59 (2001): 1–9.
"The Pigeon within Us All: A Reply to Three Critics," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 59 (2001): 39–44.

Further Reading
Amer Phils 1950–2000, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v9*
Carrier, David, ed. "Danto and His Critics: Art History, Historiography and After the End of Art," *History and Theory* 37 (December 1998). Special issue devoted to Danto.
Carroll, Noel. "Modernity and the Plasticity of Perception," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 59 (2001): 11–19.
Davis, Whitney. "When Pictures Are Present: Arthur Danto and the Historicity of the Eye," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 59 (2001): 29–38.
Rollins, Mark, ed. *Arthur Danto and His Critics* (Cambridge, UK, 1993).
———, "The Invisible Content of Visual Art," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 59 (2001): 19–27.

Mark Rollins

DAVIDSON, Donald Herbert (1917–2003)

Donald Davidson was born on 6 March 1917 in Springfield, Massachusetts. He entered Harvard University in the fall of 1935, was influenced by a course with A. N. WHITEHEAD, and graduated with a BA in philosophy and classics in the spring of 1939. He received a graduate scholarship from Harvard to further pursue these interests, studying primarily with W. V. QUINE. He left graduate school in 1942 to enlist in the US Navy. He was discharged in 1945, returned to Harvard, and also began teaching as a philosophy instructor at Queens College in New York City, starting in 1946. He received his PhD in philosophy in 1949, writing his dissertation on Plato's *Philebus*. In 1951 Davidson joined the philosophy department at Stanford University, teaching there until 1967. He then was professor of philosophy at Princeton University from 1967 to 1970, Rockefeller University from 1970 to 1976, and the University of Chicago from 1976 to 1981. From 1981 until his death, Davidson was professor of philosophy at the University of California at Berkeley. He was President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1973–4, and President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1985–6. Davidson died on 30 August 2003 in Berkeley, California.

Until Davidson's "Actions, Reasons, and Causes" (1963), something close to a consensus had formed in philosophy that whatever the relationship between reasons and actions might be, it could not be causal. It was believed that an alleged *logical connection* between reasons and actions excluded any causal relation between them. Much of Davidson's essay is devoted to refuting various arguments, then popular, that purported to show that reasons could not cause the actions they rationalize. According to each, a necessary condition for causal interaction cannot be satisfied by reasons and actions. Though these arguments are too many to be properly treated here, it suffices to say that Davidson replied to all of them by showing either that reasons and actions satisfy the necessary condition in question, or that the would-be necessary condition for causal interaction is not one at all.

After "Actions, Reasons, and Causes" Davidson became interested in practical reasoning, which led him to the nature of events. In 1968 he went to Australia to give the David Gavin Lectures at the University of Adelaide. These lectures gave rise to his first volume of collected papers *Essays on Action and Events* (1980). Davidson's chief claim about actions and events is that like tables and chairs they are concrete, dated particulars that can be described in various non-logically equivalent and non-synonymous ways. What distinguishes them from other sorts of concrete, dated particulars is their potential for causal interaction, and so it is part of the nature of being an event that it can stand in a causal relationship. Since Davidson treats causation as a relation between events, and takes action to be but a species of event, events comprise the very subject matter of action theory, as well as science and ethics.

In the mid 1960s Davidson discovered the logician Alfred TARSKI's paper, the *Wahrheitsbegriff*, on the concept of truth. Davidson's own contributions to this area are best exemplified in his papers "Theories of Meaning and Learnable Languages" (1965) and "Truth and Meaning" (1967). Though natural languages are spoken by finite speakers, they still have an infinity of meaningful (non-synonymous) sentences, each of which, at least potentially, a speaker could understand. For any (indicative) sentence S of English, a new one can be formed by prefacing it with "It is believed that." For any two (indicative) sentences, S and S', a new one can be formed by disjoining them with the word "or"; and so on for other productive mechanisms of our language. The novel sentences which these productive mechanisms give rise to are intelligible to normal speakers if their components are. This capacity seems to require that speakers have learned (a finite number of) rules that determine from a finite set of *semantic primitives* what counts as mean-

ingful compositions, where an expression is semantically primitive if the "rules which give the meaning for the sentences in which it does not appear do not suffice to determine the meaning of the sentences in which it does appear" (1965, p. 9). Based on such considerations, Davidson requires of a theory of meaning that it specify what every sentence means by exhibiting its meaning as a function of the meaning of its significant parts (based, presumably, on their arrangement in the sentence). Let us call any such theory for a language "a compositional meaning theory" for that language.

Davidson was the first philosopher to bring to prominence the importance of the requirement that a theory of meaning of our language exhibit it as compositional (1965, p. 23). The requirement focuses attention on the need to uncover structure in natural languages. Davidson's positive suggestion for a compositional meaning theory for a language L, surprisingly, utilizes no concept of *meaning* that goes beyond truth. To wit, his theory of meaning takes the form of a (finite) theory *of truth* that, for each sentence S of L, entails what we shall call a T-sentence of form

(T) S is true in L if, and only if, p.

where 'p' specifies (in a metalanguage) conditions under which S is true in L. So, for example, an adequate compositional meaning theory for German should issue in a theorem like (S):

(S) 'Schnee ist weiss' is true in German if, and only if, snow is white.

A compositional theory of meaning for a language L that issues in interpretive T-sentences like (S) is such that anyone who knows it is positioned to understand every sentence of L. The observation that natural languages are compositional is the foundation upon which Davidson builds his program in the theory of meaning.

Davidson argues that an adequate compositional meaning theory must be empirically warranted under the practice of *radical interpretation*. What this means is that certain specific empirical considerations must be respected in choosing between distinct but true compositional meaning theories; namely, in opting for a compositional meaning theory for German that issues in (S) over one that issues in (W).

(W) "Schnee ist weiss" is true in German if, and only if, grass is green.

(W) is, as a matter of fact, true, but, unlike (S), it fails to *interpret* 'Schnee ist weiss', and so no compositional meaning theory for German that issues in (W) can be adequate. But for languages we do not already understand, a compositional meaning theory must be selected on the basis of "evidence plausibly available to an interpreter," that is, "someone who does not already know how to interpret utterances the theory is designed to cover" (1973, p. 128).

Is it not possible that different people, communities, cultures or periods view, conceptualize, or make the world (or their worlds) in different ways? Could not another thinker have concepts or beliefs radically different from our own? Davidson identifies conceptual schemes with sets of intertranslatable languages (1974, p. 185). He thereby transforms the question about alternative conceptual schemes into one about whether there could be non-intertranslatable languages. Pressures from the nature of radical interpretation together with the fact that "all understanding of the speech of another involves radical interpretation" (1973, p. 125) force him to draw his critical conclusions.

Davidson's views about the nature of events and their relation to laws brought him to a stunning conclusion about the relationship between minds and bodies, namely, his thesis of *anomalous monism*. Much can and has been said in favor of each of the following three claims:

1. The mental and the physical are distinct.
2. The mental and the physical causally interact.
3. The physical is causally closed.

The problem, though, is they seem inconsistent. Consider their application to events. (1) Says that no mental event is a physical event; (2) says that some mental events cause physical events, and vice versa; a loud noise reaching Tom's ear may cause him a desire to turn down his radio; and his desire to turn down his radio may cause his arm to move in such a way to result in the volume of his radio being lowered. (3) Says that all the causes of physical events are themselves physical events. The dilemma posed by the plausibility of each of these claims and by their apparent incompatibility is the traditional mind–body problem. Davidson's resolution, as articulated in "Mental Events" (1970) consists of theses (4)–(6), which taken together comprise his thesis of *anomalous monism*:

4. There are no exceptionless psychological or psychophysical laws, and in fact all exceptionless laws can be expressed in a purely physical vocabulary (1970, p. 214–5).
5. Mental events causally interact with physical events (1970, p. 208).
6. Event c causes event e only if an exceptionless causal law subsumes c and e (1970, p. 208).

The thesis is monistic, since it assumes there is but one kind of stuff in the world, physical stuff, but it is anomalous, since although its monism commits it to physical and mental stuff being the same stuff, it denies that there is a strict reduction of the one to other.

Of the many consequences of radical interpretation one quite striking one is anti-skepticism, the impossibility of massive error. In a number of articles, including "Empirical Content" (1986) and "A Coherence Theory of Truth and Knowledge" (1986), Davidson argues, on the basis of a principle of charity, that an interpreter cannot find speakers to have largely false beliefs, even if she herself has no opinion as to the general truth and falsity of these beliefs. Given what beliefs are, and how their contents are determined on this story, Davidson is committed to the impossibility that "all our beliefs about the world might be false" ("Three Varieties of Knowledge," 1991, p. 193). A radical interpreter must have beliefs about the world in order to succeed in ascribing to others beliefs about the world. But, as radical interpretation is conceived, she also must find others largely in agreement with her in those beliefs.

Davidson's anti-skeptical argument from radical interpretation rests on two assumptions: that to be a speaker is to be interpretable by others, and that to be interpretable by others requires being largely right, not only in one's general beliefs, but in beliefs about the local environment. On the assumption that radical interpretation is possible, the proper way to state the requirement on a speaker is that her beliefs about her environment be mostly true. The crucial aspect of radical interpretation is the importance of *causality* in determining what someone means or believes. We cannot "in general fix what someone means independently of what he believes and independently of what caused the belief …. The causality plays an indispensable role in determining the content of what we say and believe." ("A Coherence Theory," 1986, p. 435) So, it is the central role of causation in fixing the contents of beliefs that ensures that the truth of everything we believe is not in general "logically independent" of having those beliefs; and that others cannot differ too much from us in what they believe.

A central feature of the Cartesian tradition in modern philosophy is that at the foundation of the structure of our justified beliefs about the world are our beliefs about our own mental states, our attitudes, experiences, and sensations. As we have seen, Davidson's approach both to meaning and interpretation, and to central issues in epistemology, is *anti-Cartesian*

inasmuch as he rejects this assumption. A radical interpreter is restricted to behavioral evidence in interpreting another. From this standpoint, Davidson treats the central concepts employed in interpreting another as theoretical concepts introduced to keep track of behavior. Viewed from his perspective, the role of a theory of interpretation is to identify and systematize patterns in the behavior of speakers in relation to their environment. If this is right, we do not first have access to facts about speakers' meanings and attitudes, including our own.

Another consequence of Davidson's taking what we might call a third-person perspective of the radical interpreter as methodologically fundamental is the rejection of all forms of traditional empiricism. Essential to traditional empiricism is its attempt to account for our knowledge of the world exclusively by appeal to sensory experience. What is distinctive about empiricism is not the thought that sensory experience can play a role in justifying our beliefs about the world around us, but that it plays the role of a foundation for our empirical knowledge. This in turn entails that the first-person point of view is fundamental, since each person's experience is treated as being his own foundation for his empirical knowledge. In adopting the third-person point of view as fundamental, Davidson rejects a central tenet of all forms of empiricism, and the traditional project associated with it of explaining our empirical knowledge by appeal to experience. Rather, in Davidson's view, our knowledge of the world around us, of other minds, and of our own minds, has a unified source in our nature as rational beings capable of communicating with one another.

Davidson argues that language, mind, and action are inseparable. To account for language, he advances the radical idea that a theory of meaning can be satisfactory only if it discovers a finite basic vocabulary and rules of composition in the language to be interpreted. The aim to provide a comprehensive understanding of natural languages led him to a treatment of the theory of truth for a language as an empirical theory, and to the adoption of the stance of the radical interpreter as the standpoint for confirmation, linking the structure of a rich theory with its basic evidence, and placing the theory of meaning in the context of a theory of rational agency. Adopting this stance as fundamental is tantamount to the rejection of Cartesianism and empiricism, and so the abandonment, among other philosophical mainstays, of conceptual relativism, global skepticism, and representationalism. Theories frequently yield insight into problems that they were not specifically designed to solve. As with other significant philosophers, a careful reading of Davidson's writings bears out both how broad in scope his philosophical accomplishments are and, more importantly, how well they cohere.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Decision Making: An Experimental Approach, with Patrick Suppes (Stanford, Cal., 1957).

"Actions, Reasons and Causes," *Journal of Philosophy* 60 (1963): 685–99.

"Theories of Meaning and Learnable Languages" (1965). Reprinted in *Inquiries into Truth and Interpretation* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 3–16.

"Truth and Meaning," *Synthese* 17 (1967): 304–23.

"Mental Events," in *Experience and Theory*, ed. Lawrence Foster and J. W. Swanson (London, 1970), pp. 79–101.

"On the Very Idea of a Conceptual Scheme," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Association* 47 (1974): 5–20.

Essays on Actions and Events (Oxford, 1980; 2nd edn 2001).

Inquiries into Truth and Interpretation (Oxford, 1984; 2nd edn 2001).

"Rational Animals," in *Actions and Events: Perspectives on the Philosophy of Donald Davidson*, ed. Ernest Lepore and Brian McLaughlin (Oxford, 1985), pp. 473–80.

"A Coherence Theory of Truth and

Knowledge," in *Truth and Interpretation: Perspectives on the Philosophy of Donald Davidson*, ed. Ernest Lepore (Oxford, 1986), pp. 307–19.

Plato's Philebus (New York, 1990).

"The Structure and Content of Truth," *Journal of Philosophy* 87 (1990): 279–328.

"Three Varieties of Knowledge," in *A. J. Ayer Memorial Essays*, ed. A. Phillips Griffiths, *Philosophy* suppl. 30 (1991): 153–66.

"Thinking Causes," in *Mental Causation*, ed. John Heil (Oxford, 1993), pp. 3–18.

Subjective, Intersubjective, Objective (Oxford, 2001).

Problems of Rationality (Oxford, 2004).

Other Relevant Works

"On Saying That," *Synthese* 19 (1968): 130–46.

Ed. with Jaakko Hintikka, *Words and Objections: Essays on the Work of W. V. O. Quine* (Dordrecht, 1969; rev. edn 1975).

Ed. with Gilbert Harman, *Semantics of Natural Language* (Boston, 1972; 2nd edn 1977).

"Radical Interpretation," *Dialectica* 27 (1973): 314–28.

"Belief and the Basis of Meaning," *Synthese* 27 (1974): 309–23.

"The Method of Truth in Metaphysics," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 2 (1977): 244–54.

"Empirical Content," in *Truth and Interpretation: Perspectives on the Philosophy of Donald Davidson*, ed. Ernest Lepore (Oxford, 1986), pp. 320–32.

"A Nice Derangement of Epitaphs," in *Truth and Interpretation: Perspectives on the Philosophy of Donald Davidson*, ed. Ernest Lepore (Oxford, 1986), pp. 433–46.

"Knowing One's Own Mind," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Association*

60 (January 1987): 441–58.

"The Myth of the Subjective," in *Relativism: Interpretation and Confrontation*, ed. Michael Krausz (Notre Dame, Ind., 1989), pp. 159–72.

"Davidson, Donald," in *A Companion to the Philosophy of Mind*, ed. Samuel Guttenplan (Oxford, 1994), pp. 231–6.

"On Quine's Philosophy," *Theoria* 60 (1994): 184–92.

"Radical Interpretation Interpreted," in *Philosophical Perspectives: Logic and Language*, ed. James Tomberlin (Atascadero, Cal., 1994).

"Could There Be a Science of Rationality?" *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 3 (1995): 1–16.

"Laws and Cause," *Dialectica* 49 (1995): 263–79.

"The Folly of Trying to Define Truth," *Journal of Philosophy* 93 (1996): 263–78.

"Seeing through Language," in *Thought and Language*, ed. J. Preston (Cambridge, UK, 1997), pp. 15–28.

In Conversation: Donald Davidson, discussions with other philosophers on 19 videocassettes, filmed by Philosophy International (London, 1997).

"Replies to My Critics," *Critica* 30 (1998): 97–112.

"The Emergence of Thought," *Erkenntnis* 51 (1999): 7–17.

"Truth Rehabilitated," in *Rorty and His Critics*, ed. Robert Brandom (Oxford, 2000), pp. 65–74.

"What Thought Requires," in *The Foundations of Cognitive Science*, ed. Joao Branquinho (Oxford, 2001), pp. 121–32.

Further Reading

Amer Phils 1950–2000, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Blackwell Analytic Phil*, *Blackwell Comp Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v8*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*

Brandl, Johannes, and Wolfgang L. Gombocz, eds. *The Mind of Donald*

Davidson, *Grazer Philosophische Studien* 36 (Amsterdam, 1989).

Dasenbrock, Reed Way, ed. *Literary Theory After Davidson* (University Park, Penn., 1993).

De Caro, Mario, ed. *Interpretations and Causes: New Perspectives on Donald Davidson's Philosophy* (Dordrecht, 1999).

Engel, Pascal. *Davidson et la philosophie du langage* (Paris, 1994).

Envine, Simon. *Donald Davidson* (Stanford, Cal., 1991).

Fodor, Jerry, and Ernest Lepore. *Holism: A Shopper's Guide* (Oxford, 1992).

Glock, Hans-Johann. *Quine and Davidson on Language, Thought, and Reality* (Cambridge, UK, 2003).

Hahn, Lewis E., ed. *The Philosophy of Donald Davidson* (Chicago, 1999). Contains Davidson's autobiography and bibliography.

Köhler, Wolfgang R., ed. *Davidsons Philosophie des Mentalen* (Paderborn, Germany, 1997).

Kotátko, Petr, Peter Pagin, and Gabriel Segal, eds. *Interpreting Davidson* (Stanford, Cal., 2001).

Lepore, Ernest, ed. *Truth and Interpretation: Perspectives on the Philosophy of Donald Davidson* (Oxford, 1986).

Lepore, Ernest, and McLaughlin, Brian, eds. *Actions and Events: Perspectives on the Philosophy of Donald Davidson* (Oxford, 1986).

Letson, Ben H. *Davidson's Theory of Truth and Its Implications for Rorty's Pragmatism* (New York, 1997).

Ludwig, Kirk, ed. *Donald Davidson* (Cambridge, UK, 2003).

Malpas, Jeff. *Donald Davidson and the Mirror of Meaning: Holism, Truth, Interpretation* (Cambridge, UK, 1992).

Preyer, G., F. Siebelt, and A. Ulfig, eds. *Language, Mind, and Epistemology: On Donald Davidson's Philosophy* (Dordrecht, 1994).

Ramberg, Bjørn. *Donald Davidson's Philosophy of Language: An Introduction* (Oxford, 1989).

Stoecker, Ralf, ed. *Reflecting Davidson: Donald Davidson Responding to an International Forum of Philosophers* (Berlin, 1993).

Stüber, Karsten. *Donald Davidsons Theorie sprachlichen Verstehens* (Frankfurt am Main, 1993).

Vermazen, Bruce, and Merrill B. Hintikka, eds. *Essays on Davidson: Actions and Events* (Oxford, 1985).

Wheeler, Darrell. *On Davidson* (Belmont, Cal., 2003).

Zeglen, Urszula, ed. *Donald Davidson: Truth, Meaning and Knowledge* (London and New York, 1999).

Ernie Lepore

DAVIDSON, Thomas (1840–1900)

Thomas Davidson was born into poverty on 25 October 1840, on a small farm in the parish of Old Deer, Scotland. His mother, Mary Warrender, moved a year later to the nearby village of Fetterangus. Neither Davidson nor his brother, John Morrison Davidson, knew who their father was, but church records in the parish indicate that he was Thomas Davidson, a nearby farmer. As a boy Davidson displayed a natural vivacity and joy for living, a passion for reading, and an exceptional memory. As a young boy he attended the library auction of a deceased preacher, where the books were being sold in lots. Unable to compete in the bidding, when the auction was over, the auctioneer gave all of the remaining books to the delighted boy. When Davidson spread the books out in his attic room, his joy was abated, for the books were all in foreign languages – French, German, and Dutch. The studious boy began

an intense study of foreign languages; by the end of his life he had mastered thirteen, including Sanskrit, Icelandic, and Arabic.

In 1856 Davidson won a bursary prize to King's College, Aberdeen, from which he graduated in 1860, first in his class in Greek and second in the humanities. He taught Latin and Greek for six years and then made his way to Boston in 1867 where he befriended Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Ralph Waldo EMERSON, and Bronson ALCOTT. In November 1867 he left for St. Louis where he accepted a teaching position in the St. Louis Public School system, under the direction of Superintendent William Torrey HARRIS. He joined the St. Louis Philosophical Society, led by Henry C. BROKMEYER and Harris, both committed Hegelians. Although he regularly attended meetings of the Philosophical Society, Davidson rejected Hegel's philosophy and formed a competing Aristotle Club.

In 1875 Davidson moved to Boston where he revived Charles S. PEIRCE's Metaphysical Club. The new club, which took up the study of Hume's *Treatise of Human Nature*, included William JAMES, Joseph Bangs Warner, Nicholas St. John GREEN, Oliver Wendell HOLMES Jr., John FISKE, George Holmes HOWISON, Francis BOWEN, Charles Carroll EVERETT, and James Elliot CABOT. The group's discussions revolved around the problem of relations and Kant's distinction between analytic and synthetic truths. Davidson read a paper to the club on 7 December 1878, in which he denied the validity of the distinction, and seemed to defend empiricism. Although Davidson's paper is lost, another paper from the same time, "Individuality" (from 22 October 1878), together with comments in his letters, indicates his position: universals do not exist. Universality lies in how predicates are applied. Following Aristotle and Leibniz, only individuals exist. The self is always subject, never predicate. The self is therefore a simple, eternal entity. Its object is the world, a plurality, in which actions and events take place in temporal and spatial form. The self holds this

plurality together in a continuous act of "world-building." Feeling is the paradigm for understanding the self, because it provides for the many-within-one out of which increasing discrimination, individuality, and world-building grow. Davidson eventually related these ideas to a Leibnizian monadology that was also indebted to Giordano Bruno and Maxmillian Drossbach.

Davidson traveled to London in June 1877, where he apparently met Heinrich Schliemann, the eminent archaeologist. From London, Davidson traveled to Greece for a walking tour of historic sites and, with Schliemann, surveys of archaeological sites. One result of this trip was Davidson's *The Parthenon Frieze, and Other Essays* (1882), which offered a new explanation of the meaning and purpose of the frieze. According to Davidson, the Parthenon frieze represents Pericles's dream of a league or confederation of Greek cities with Athens as its leader. The building itself and its chryselephantine statue represent Athens's triumph over Persia and its new ascendancy. Like a ribbon that ties or binds, the girdling frieze, he claims, represents the hope for unity in the Greek world. The probable date for the completion of the Parthenon (445 BCE) matches the time at which the ambassadors were sent out, calling for conventions and a confederacy. To encourage the Spartans to join, the frieze represents two sets of gods: Ionic and Dorian, or Athenian and Spartan.

Davidson returned to Boston in the summer of 1878 and lectured at Alcott's Concord Summer School of Philosophy in its founding year of 1879. Despite frequent trips to Europe, he was a frequent lecturer at the Concord School until its close in 1888, lecturing on a wide range of topics: Plato, Aristotle, Sappho, Dante, Goethe, immortality, education, Emerson, irony, Émile Zola, and ontology.

At the urging of his close friend Princess Katherine Sayn-Wittgenstein, in January 1880 Davidson journeyed to Rome where he met Vatican scholars, and had at least one meeting

with the Pope to discuss the philosophy of Aquinas. He then traveled to the Rosminian monastery in Domodosolla in the Italian Alps where he studied the philosophy of Antonio Rosmini-Serbati for two years. Inspired by Rosmini and Dante, he became enamored with the idea of a *vita nuova*, a new life of moral and spiritual regeneration. He combined the Rosminian emphasis on feeling, sympathy, and devotion to others with the Faustian urge to assimilate all cultural possibilities in his conception of the new life.

In 1883 Davidson formed a "Fellowship for the New Life" in London that counted among its members Edward Carpenter, Havelock Ellis, Ramsay McDonald, Edward Pease, and George Bernard Shaw. According to Davidson's scheme, the group held that moral regeneration must precede social regeneration; they must live in proximity, in the same building or same neighborhood, and share tasks and material goods; they must disseminate high culture to the poor; they must repudiate competition and selfishness, the culture of acquisition, replacing it with the simple life of satisfaction in arts and crafts.

Although the Fellowship lasted through the 1890s, from its inception a rift among its members plagued the group. Some members wanted a commitment to activism and socialist ideas written into the constitution. Others saw the goal of the New Life as first and foremost spiritual rebirth and moral reconstruction. Unable to reconcile these aims, the members agreed to create a sister society to accommodate the activists. Thus, although he detested socialism, "The Fabian Society" is perhaps the most enduring outcome of Davidson's initiative.

In 1888 Davidson established his own summer school, after the fashion of Concord, first in Orange, New Jersey, and then Farmington, Connecticut. With the financial assistance of an old St. Louis friend, Joseph Pulitzer, in 1889 he purchased 167 acre tract of land on Mt. Hurricane, in Keene, New York. Davidson built a cottage for himself, a dining hall, and cottages for guests. For ten years the "Glenmore Summer School for the Culture Sciences" brought together some of the greatest figures in American philosophy. James, John DEWEY, Josiah ROYCE, Morris COHEN, and many others exchanged and debated ideas. Young people, especially from the Lower East Side of New York City, studied at the feet of these men in a well-ordered daily routine.

Beginning in 1890 Davidson divided his year into two parts. From October through March he resided in New York City, but in early April he returned to Glenmore. After opening the buildings, he arranged the lectures for that summer's course of study. The 1892 summer course was typical: Dewey lectured on nineteenth-century English philosophy, especially conservatism and liberalism; Harris spoke on New England transcendentalism; Royce on ethics; Ibn Abi Suleiman on Islam; Max Margolis on Judaism; and Davidson on Greek philosophy in Christendom to the seventh century.

In 1898 Davidson was invited to lecture to a large group of young Jewish immigrants at the Educational Alliance, a settlement house on the Lower East Side. After his lecture, which emphasized high culture, he was challenged by the audience to state how its acquisition was possible for poor laborers. Davidson met the challenge by establishing a "Breadwinner's College" at an available building, the People's Institute, and proceeded to design a curriculum that included remedial English, foreign languages, health and hygiene, natural science, and great works in the humanities. Although Davidson died on 14 September 1900 in Montréal, Canada, his students were inspired by his example to continue the Breadwinner's College for many more years. Elizabeth FLOWER and Murray G. MURPHEY aptly explain that "Students grew into professionals and teachers, and the list of those associated with the college reads like a *Who's Who* of the next generation's intelligentsia and reformers" (Flower and Murphey 1997, vol. 2, p. 486).

Anyone wishing to peer deeper into the thought of Davidson must grapple with the fact that several of his key essays were never published and are now missing. The remaining pieces reveal Davidson's embrace of Aristotle's God as a self-replicator, Davidson's assertion of the ontological irreducibility of selves and the monadic nature of the self, and a fervent belief in the immortality of the soul as the appropriation of a succession of lives.

In his journal Davidson defends a view he calls "apeirotheism," which he defines as "a theory of Gods infinite in number." There is a primary or archetypal individual, self, or God. This primary individual is Aristotle's unmoved mover as reworked by Davidson. The primary Individual is thinking or *Nous*. God thinks only of himself, but there must be some content to this self, otherwise God would be mere abstract identity (A = A). Therefore God must include the world as part of himself. This world consists of secondary individuals, selves, or Gods, which have unfolded from the primary individual. Davidson claims that Aristotle's God can be fully actual yet contain at the same time unenergized reserves, reserves that are not potentials. He derives this from Aristotle's distinction between having knowledge and exercising it, the metaphysical distinction between first and second actualities. Secondary individuals emerge from the primary individual like droplets of moisture that appear on a glass of water. The primary individual is not static perfection but "ever-advancing activity." Although we use God as a uniquely referring name, Davidson explains, it is in fact an essence. Secondary individuals or selves are therefore essentially monadic Gods. Through cooperation, love, and the Faustian drive for all possibilities, the secondary self approaches the perfection of the primary self.

One can speculate about Davidson's view of immortality from evidence contained in William James's 1898 Ingersoll Lectures, *Human Immortality*. A Glenmore participant and devoted friend of Davidson's, James was well aware of his radical individualism and passion for eternity. He probably had Davidson in mind when he wrote that there are "people known to me" for whom "a life hereafter is … an obsession" (James 1956, pp. 3–4). James suggested that the brain might serve either a permissive or transmissive function and, after the dissolution of one's biology, experiences might remain in a higher self, a "mother-sea" of consciousness. Although Davidson criticized James's theory of the absorbing "mother-sea" as pantheistic, in regard to the mechanism of immortality, something like James's doctrine is the direction of Davidson's apeirotheism.

A perusal of memorials to Davidson reveal that his most enduring influence was that of a loving friend, a passionate educator, and a sterling example of the philosophical life. James captures this aspect of Davidson particularly well: "the *value* of Thomas Davidson … lay in the example he set to us all, of how – even in the midst of this intensely worldly social system of ours, in which every interest is organized collectively and commercially – a single man may still be a knight-errant of the intellectual life, and preserve freedom in the midst of sociability" (James 1911, p. 118).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Parthenon Frieze, and Other Essays (London, 1882).
The Philosophical System Of Antonio Rosmini-Serbati (London, 1882).
Prolegomena to In Memoriam, with an Index to the Poem (Boston and New York, 1889).
Aristotle and Ancient Educational Ideals (New York, 1892).
The Education of the Greek People and Its Influence on Civilization (New York, 1894).
Rousseau and Education According to Nature (New York, 1898).
A History of Education (New York, 1900).
The Education of the Wage-earners, ed. Charles M. Bakewell (Boston, 1904).
The Philosophy of Goethe's Faust, ed. Charles M. Bakewell (Boston, 1906).

Other Relevant Works

Davidson's papers are housed in the Sterling Memorial Library at Yale University.

Journal, 1884–1898. Thomas Davidson Papers, Yale University.

"Discussion with A. Vera Concerning *L'Ancienne et la Nouvelle Foi*," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 8 (1874): 281–2; 9 (1875): 434–7.

"Education," *Atlantic Monthly* 39 (January 1877): 231.

"Antonio Rosmini," *The Fortnightly Review* 36 (1881): 583.

"A Solitude in the Italian Alps," *Pall Mall Gazette* (28 May 1882). Repr. in *Memorials of Thomas Davidson: A Wandering Scholar*, ed. William Angus Knight (Boston, 1907), pp. 231–4.

"The Concord Philosophical School," *Town Topics* (22 August 1885): 7.

"Goethe's Titanism," in *The Life And Genius of Goethe; Lectures at the Concord School of Philosophy*, ed. F. B. Sanborn (Boston, 1886), pp. 68–106.

Thomas Davidson, "Noism," *The Index* (April 1886): 525.

"Cooperation," *The Freethinker's Magazine* (February 1887): 50–61.

"Bruno's Thought," *The Freethinker's Magazine* (September 1889): 288–9.

"When the 'Higher Criticism' Has Done Its Work," *International Journal of Ethics* 7 (1897): 435–48.

"American Democracy as a Religion," *International Journal of Ethics* 8 (1898): 21–41.

"Autobiographical Sketch," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 8 (1957): 531–6.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v23*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

DeArmey, Michael H. "Thomas Davidson's Apeirotheism and Its Influence on William James and John Dewey," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 48 (1987): 691–708.

Flower, Elizabeth, and Murray G. Murphy. *A History of Philosophy in America*, 2 vols (New York, 1977).

Good, James A. "The Value of Thomas Davidson," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 40 (2004): 289–318.

James, William. "Thomas Davidson: A Knight-Errant of the Intellectual Life," in *Memories and Studies* (New York, 1911).

———, *Human Immortality* (New York, 1956).

Knight, William Angus, ed. *Memorials of Thomas Davidson: The Wandering Scholar* (Boston, 1907).

Snider, Denton J. *A Tour of Europe* (St. Louis, 1907).

———, *The St. Louis Movement in Philosophy, Literature, Education, Psychology, with Chapters of Autobiography* (St. Louis, 1920).

Michael H. DeArmey

DAVIS, Noah Knowles (1830–1910)

Noah Davis was born on 15 May 1830 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and died on 4 May 1910 in Charlottesville, Virginia. He received several degrees including a BA in chemistry from Mercer University in 1849, the MA, PhD, and the LLD His father, Noah Davis, was a minister for the Baptist Tract Society. Shortly after his birth Noah's father died, and his mother Mary married the Southern Baptist theologian John L. Dagg. After graduating from Mercer, Davis went to Philadelphia to study chemistry. He edited two books, *The Model Architect* and *The Carpenter's Guide*, and worked in an architect's office. From 1852 to 1865 he worked in Alabama, first as a teacher of natural science for seven years at Howard College and, later, as the head of the Judson Female Institute. During his presidency

at Judson, Davis succeeded in increasing student attendance to its highest annual rate.

Davis became President of Bethel College in Russelville, Kentucky in 1868 where he made major changes. He not only raised the standards of the college to make it more competitive with other colleges, but also increased the course offerings. In 1873 the University of Virginia appointed him as chair of moral philosophy, a position he held for twenty years. Educators of his time described him as a stimulating and intellectual teacher who made his institutions rise among the leading colleges in America.

As a writer, Davis was described as profound, clear, and original. He made contributions to *The Forum*, *Christian Thought*, and *The North American Review*. In 1880 he published *The Theory of Thought* which was at the time a very comprehensive work on logic. *Elements of Psychology* (1892) was recognized by a large number of colleges as a leading book in the field. In *Elements of Ethics* (1900), Davis discusses his theory of morals. According to Davis, every person has moral worth, but while some people are respected when their conduct conforms with moral law, others do not earn this respect, because they disregard it. Davis also contends that ethics is the study of *real truth*. He goes on to discuss duty, virtue, selfishness, charity, the family, and the community. Davis had strong religious beliefs which were reflected in his Sunday lectures to students on biblical passages. He began giving these religious discourses every Sunday during the early 1880s. The lectures were popular with students, and their main ideas were made available to the wider community in three religious volumes published from 1895 to 1903.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Theory of Thought (New York, 1880).
Elements of Psychology (New York, 1892).
Elements of Deductive Logic (New York, 1893).
Elements of Inductive Logic (New York, 1895).

Elements of Ethics (Boston and New York, 1900). Abridged version, *Elementary Ethics* (Boston and New York, 1900).

Other Relevant Works
Juda's Jewels, A Study of the Hebrew Lyrics (Nashville, Tenn., 1896).
Synopsis of Events in the Life of Jesus of Nazareth (Charlottesville, Virg., 1900).
The Story of the Nazarene in Annotated Paraphrase (New York, 1903).

Further Reading
Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v4*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Denny, Collins. *Analysis of Noah K. Davis's Elements of Deductive Logic and of his Elements of Psychology* (Nashville, Tenn., 1916).

Hani Morgan

DAY, Henry Noble (1808–90)

Henry Noble Day was born on 4 August 1808 in New Preston, Connecticut. Before graduating from Yale College with a BA in 1828, he lived with Jeremiah Day, his uncle and President of Yale at the time. After college, Day taught in a seminary for a year, studied law, returned to Yale to serve as a tutor, and then spent fifteen months traveling in Europe. In 1836 he was appointed pastor of the First Congregational Church of Waterbury, Connecticut. In 1840 he became professor of theology at Western Reserve College in Hudson, Ohio. During his time there, he worked to make the college resemble Yale in various ways. Day also edited the *Ohio Observer*, and managed various railroads. In 1852 the theology department was eliminated when the college underwent a financial crisis

brought about by low enrollment. His affiliation with Western Reserve remained merely nominal until 1858, when he became President of Ohio Female College at College Hill (on the outskirts of Cincinnati). After his resignation in 1864, he returned to New Haven where he spent the rest of his life. Day died on 12 January 1890 in New Haven, Connecticut.

His life in New Haven was Day's most prolific period; he was a full-time writer and produced most of his twenty textbooks. Whereas his earlier works had been mostly about rhetoric and bookkeeping, his later writings explored such diverse topics as logic, ethics, epistemology, aesthetics, and education. His investigation of these themes represented one of the two overarching intellectual projects that one may discern within his writing: aesthetics and logic. The former project was the more ambitious, and, in his eyes, the more all-encompassing, since it was from psychology that one could derive the associated laws of many subordinate disciplines. For instance, in his *Elements of Psychology*, a textbook "for beginners in metaphysical studies" (1876, p. iii), he mentions William Hamilton's taxonomy of the phenomena of the mind into the three mental sciences of aesthetics, logic, and ethics. In light of their derivation from mental facts, Hamilton calls these the three nomological sciences. However, it was not until after Day had separately written on each of these three sciences that he began to delve thoroughly into the topic that evidently unified them, an undertaking that completely occupied his final years. In this book Day also described the classification of mental phenomena as falling under intelligence, sensibility, and will. This was a common demarcation; the novel contribution of Day's approach was his treatment of sensibility as prior to intelligence, which would prevent confusion and error that arises from attempts to treat imagination and memory as part of intelligence. He also studied sensibility in greater detail than previous authors, and noted that the other two faculties, intelligence and will, cannot properly be understood independently of it.

Many of Day's books were written as introductions to a particular subject. His style was highly structured; consistent with his view that the disciplines under study were sciences, he attempted to systematically break them down into their major constituents for examination. Another technique he used, figuring prominently in *The Science of Aesthetics* (1872), was one in which he proceeded from an analysis of the essential aesthetic elements or properties, to a classification of these properties into kinds, and the derivation of laws regarding these kinds, and their practical applications.

Day's work on aesthetics was the culmination of one of his two major projects, which began with his writings on rhetoric. He described rhetoric as comprising three parts: thought, form (words), and the process of applying the thought to an appropriate form. This stance led to his interest in aesthetics, which he described as "the philosophy of form." *The Art of Rhetoric*, published in 1850 and revised in 1867 under the name *The Art of Discourse*, was an attempt to remedy a problem with earlier texts by, for instance, Richard Whately and Hugh Blair. Day noted that the former regards rhetoric as a purely logical endeavor, and emphasizes the formulation of arguments, whereas the latter treated it as entirely a matter of taste. Day, in contrast, stressed the equal importance of logic and aesthetics, as well as ethics.

In his characteristic manner, he began with the division of rhetoric into two component processes, based on logic and grammar. He labeled these elements invention and style respectively. However, rhetoric consists of more than the sum of these interdependent parts; as mentioned above, a third critical factor was the ability to combine them, putting logical thought into grammatical form. This skill, "the great art of the writer and speaker" (1872, p. iv) was, like others in the arts, one that could only be acquired by practice. This fact induced Day to write *Rhetorical Praxis* ten years later (1860), to help students become accustomed to thinking about abstract rhetorical concepts.

He defined invention as "the art of supplying the requisite thought in kind and form for discourse" (1867, p. 42), and observes it to be founded on logic. He reduced the process to several steps: explanation, confirmation, excitation, and persuasion. Style, on the other hand, is "that part of rhetoric which treats of the expression of thought in language" (1867, p. 208). Day divided style's properties into absolute and relative, and further characterized relative properties as either relative-subjective (that is, relative to the thoughts of the speaker; this includes significance, consciousness, and naturalness) or relative-objective (or relative to the listener; in descending order of importance, these are clearness, energy, and beauty). The absolute properties of style include the oral, suggestive, and grammatical properties. Day was unique among rhetoricians in recognizing the relative nature of energy and beauty. He was also the one of the few of his time to invoke classical authors, including Cicero and Aristotle.

Day found that the problems of embodying a thought in an external form were not unique to rhetoric, but instead pervaded other artistic disciplines. In *The Science of Aesthetics* he used countless examples in an effort to reveal common features among these varied expressions of beauty. He maintained that beauty exists independently of the observer, arguing that both idea and matter were essential to beauty, and since they had an objective reality, so must their union. The kinds of beauty that he identified were material, ideal, and formal, which unite in varying degrees. For example, in rhetoric, material beauty is to be found in the grammar, ideal in the logic, and formal in the application of the one to the other. Day also delineated elaborate interconnections between beauty, truth, and good, and logic, ethics, and aesthetics, and then proceeded to discuss the implications of this position. The majority of the book, however, is spent on the derivation of laws and very specific applications of aesthetic principles to the "six leading arts": architecture, landscape, sculpture, painting, music, and discourse. Here, as elsewhere, he demonstrated his meticulousness and exhaustive attention to detail.

Well before finishing the study in rhetoric, Day wrote *Elements of Logic* (1867), partly to improve upon the logic texts that were available at the time. However, the book also made original contributions, such as the grounding of induction on relationships of parts and their complements, and accordingly, a new classification of reasoning, and a new logical methodology. Day also asserted that thought, and all its products (notably concepts, and language – the latter of which is produced by the application of reasoning to these concepts), are entirely reducible to identity relations. Here Day departed from Hamilton, although he acknowledged his indebtedness to Hamilton's work.

Day's book on the third of the mental sciences, ethics, was published immediately after *Elements of Psychology*.. His approach was explicitly deontological; he attempted to study "the essential principles of duty" to determine what actions are moral. He maintained that unlike rhetoric, ethics was not an art, because one could uncover objective ethical truths regardless of one's method. Indeed, he took the results of his analysis to be so self-evident that he openly presented his procedure as didactic, rather than argumentative. Unfortunately, many of his assertions reflect his theological commitments, and are hardly uncontroversial to modern readers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Elements of the Art of Rhetoric (Hudson, Ohio, 1850). Revised. as *The Art of Discourse: A System of Rhetoric* (New York, 1867).
Rhetorical Praxis (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1860).
Elements of Logic (New York, 1867).
The Science of Aesthetics; or, The Nature, Kinds, Laws, and Uses of Beauty (New Haven, Conn., 1872).
Elements of Psychology (New York, 1876).
The Science of Ethics: An Elementary System of Theoretical and Practical Morality (New York, 1876).

Other Relevant Works
The Art of Bookkeeping (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1861).
The Logic of Sir William Hamilton (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1863).
Grammatical Synthesis: The Art of English Composition (New York, 1867).
Introduction to the Study of English Literature: Comprising Representative Masterpieces in Poetry and Prose (New York, 1869).
Outlines of Ontological Science, or a Philosophy of Knowledge and of Being (New York, 1878).
The Elements of Mental Science (New York, 1886).
The Science of Education (New York, 1889).

Further Reading
Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v22*
Henry Noble Day (New Haven, Conn., 1890). A collection of tributes.
Wohl, R. Richard. "Henry Noble Day: A Study in Good Works, 1808--1890," in *Men in Business*, ed. W. Miller (Cambridge, Mass., 1952), pp. 153–92.

Evan Moreno-Davis

DEBS, Eugene Victor (1855–1926)

Eugene Debs was born on 5 November 1855 in Terre Haute, Indiana, where his parents, Jean Daniel and Marguerite Marie Bettrich (recent immigrants from the Alsace region of the Franco-German borderlands), owned a grocery store. His formal education ended when he completed the ninth grade at age fourteen and went to work for the Terre Haute and Vandalia Railroad. His experiences as a railroad worker forged Debs's commitment to socialism and the workers' movement. It is in his capacities as a partisan of democratic socialism, a labor activist and a five-times presidential candidate that Debs is best remembered. He had a long career as a socialist politician and labor organizer but has suffered a somewhat undeserved reputation for simplicity and lack of philosophical sophistication. Debs died on 20 October 1926 in East Elmhurst, Illinois.

Debs is known more as a great orator, whose gift was to make the simplest of ideas seem eloquent and grandiose. Most of his collected writings are comprised of correspondence and the voluminous transcriptions of his impassioned speeches. In his entire career, Debs composed only one book, the posthumously published *Walls and Bars* (1927), written mostly during his imprisonment from 1918 to 1921 for violating the World War I era Espionage Acts. This book was mostly a description of prison conditions, from which his publisher downplayed his political commentary. Despite Debs's failure to produce any profound theoretical treatises, throughout his career he made many unique contributions to political philosophy and enriched an American political culture that has long suffered an inability to consider alternatives to Lockean liberalism and laissez-faire capitalism. Debs also made important contributions to the theory of the American labor movement. Moreover, when considered in the global context of the period, his thought stands out within socialist theory itself, as a unique and important alternative to both Second International socialism and Bolshevism.

After leaving home in 1870 to join the ranks of the expanding railroad proletariat, Debs quickly moved up the ranks from laborer to painter and eventually became a railroad fireman, a skilled occupation. In 1874 he briefly left the railroad to work as a billing clerk, but the next year he joined the newly organized Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen (BLF) and became its secretary. Over the next two decades, Debs devoted his life to union work, most notably as editor of the BLF

magazine. In this period his approach to labor issues was not very radical and in fact even appears conservative when compared to his later years. Initially, Debs abhorred strikes and criticized the anarchists for what today might be called "class war rhetoric." For the early Debs, capital and labor were not mutually opposed, but rather dependent on one another. The goal of union organizing was to prevent certain capitalists from abusing the reciprocal relationship that bound the two main classes of modern society in a kind of organic unity. Debs initially did not consider socialism as the answer to working people's oppression. Rather, he seemed to envision a future society where the division of labor continued to exist, but in which workers would enjoy the full fruits of their labor. In this early period, Debs formulated philosophical commitments that would follow him throughout his career: a certain humanist approach to social transformation, coupled with a moralist view of justice and the good life. Nevertheless, his early hostility to radical labor militancy consistently eroded as the last two decades of the nineteenth century brought some of the United States' most intense moments of class conflict. Debs's editorials from the period evidence an increasing willingness to endorse strikes and other militant actions.

Nevertheless, Debs entered party politics for the first time not as a socialist, but as a member of the Democratic Party. In 1879 and 1881 he was elected to two-year terms as the city clerk of Terre Haute and in 1884 he was elected to the Indiana House of Representatives. While Debs would later turn on the Democratic Party, his experience in local office during the 1880s foreshadowed his later conceptualization of socialism, in which the role of electoral politics in bringing about the social transformation was paramount.

In the 1890s Debs's approach to the labor movement developed dramatically. Already antagonistic to the craft unionism of Samuel Gompers's American Federation of Labor, he became President of the American Railway Union in 1893, a new industrial union in which membership was open to all railroad employees regardless of craft. For Debs, craft unionism had become a weapon of the employers to divide the proletariat against itself based on differing skill level. His initial somewhat abstract humanism toward the labor question did not suffer any defined change until the 1894 Pullman Strike, an event that served to redefine his world view and bring the failures of the labor movement of the day into sharp relief. Now in a position of national importance, Debs was arrested for defying a court injunction to stop directing the strike, and was sentenced to six months in jail. During his incarceration by the Sheriff of McHenry County, Illinois, Debs corresponded and visited with socialists, who introduced him to Marx's *Das Kapital*. Although it is clear that Debs was rapidly moving toward socialism at the time, upon his release from jail in 1895 he supported William Jennings Bryan's Populist Party in the election of 1896. The subsequent defeat of the Populists in the election of 1897 ended any faith Debs might have had in the parties of capitalist reformism, and in early 1897 he announced that he was now a socialist.

In June of the same year, Debs convinced the American Railway Union to disband and reorganize as the Social Democracy of America. Immediately, he found himself immersed in the theoretical and tactical debates of the socialist movement. Although Debs initially flirted with a somewhat far-flung utopian plan to colonize a Western territory with socialists and then apply for statehood as a socialist commonwealth, he was dissuaded from this course by colleagues and finally endorsed the political road to socialism through party-building, labor organizing, and electoral politics. The SDA's platform included positions common to most European socialist parties of the era, calling for state ownership of important industries; shorter working hours; unemployment compensation; as well as specifically American demands for increased

democracy through initiatives, referendums, the direct election of US Senators, and proportional representation. In the main, this is the political program that Debs would defend his entire life, with only minor modification.

In 1898 the SDA split, leading to the formation of the Social Democratic Party, which ran Debs as its candidate for President in 1900, 1904, 1908, and in 1912 when he won six percent of the popular vote, the most for any socialist candidate in American history. He ran for President again on the SPA ticket in 1920, while an inmate at the Atlanta Federal penitentiary. It is somewhat unclear if Debs ever believed he had a chance to win any of these elections. However, he considered victory a secondary goal to the opportunity to educate the working class about socialism and the class struggle.

In all of these presidential campaigns, as well as an unsuccessful bid for the US House of Representatives from Indiana in 1916, Debs's political message to the American working class remained consistent. He preached that capitalism was both a morally and historically bankrupt system in which the producers of wealth saw their labor expropriated by a parasitic class of capitalists. Debs spread the word to the workers that the Republican and Democratic parties, or the "Too Old Parties" as he called them, were equally useless, reform was a dead-end and only a revolution would sweep away the debris of class society and provide the fresh start needed to build a new human society of cooperation and mutual association.

Nevertheless, despite the consistency of his message there were several important tensions in Debs's conceptualization of socialism. While he was capable of parroting some of the bland ideas of economic determinism that dominated much of socialist theory at the time – i.e., the idea that socialism is an almost inevitable phase of historical development that is on the imminent horizon and as such is invincible – Debs was also committed to a more humanist explanation as to why socialism was not simply inevitable but also necessary and just. He saw it as the only just way of ordering society. Debs championed socialism more out of what he perceived to be its subjective potential to allow the workers, and eventually the entire human species, a better life, rather than out of a simple acknowledgment of objective scientific laws governing the evolutionary succession of modes of production.

Debs's humanist interpretation of socialism is also evident in his attitude towards religion. Like Marx, he abhorred the church as an institution, but he did not despise church leaders, many of whom he recognized as having a similar concern with the betterment of mankind. In this sense, Debs anticipated Ernst Bloch's reconciliation of Marxism and Christianity after the rediscovery of Marx's earlier writings on the subjective life of man. Another tension in Debs's thought concerned the question of violence and its relationship to the process of social transformation. While professing to be a revolutionary and a presidential candidate at the same time is not necessarily contradictory, Debs's rhetoric on the subject was often confusing. Though he acknowledged the inevitability of violent class conflict in his speeches, he withdrew his membership from the Industrial Workers of the World for using sabotage rather than electoral politics to resolve class differences. Debs worked towards the election of a new socialist government, though he saw this event as likely to be preceded by a period of potentially violent class conflict, brought on by the capitalists' lack of concern for the workers' welfare.

Debs also rejected the philosophy of "boring within," the idea that the old conservative craft unions of the AFL could be transformed into revolutionary organs through a patient policy of internal penetration and education by socialists. Instead, he favored the creation of new industrial unions, a trajectory that the American labor movement would assume in the decades following his death.

Debs's most important contribution to socialist thought concerned the relationship between capitalism and war. Debs frequently addressed this subject in his speeches, seeing the two as inextricably linked. When World War I began in 1914, Debs felt his approach

had been vindicated. While most of the European socialist parties had supported their nation's war efforts after 1914, Debs and the SPA stood firm against participation. On 16 June 1918 in Canton, Ohio, he delivered a famous speech attacking the war. For this, he was charged with violating the World War I Espionage Acts and sentenced to ten years in prison. Though he was released by President Warren Harding less than three years later, his imprisonment illuminates the latent anti-liberalist tendencies of American political culture.

After his release from prison in December 1921, Debs emerged to find a socialist movement in disarray. The success of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia in 1917 had led to several splits in the old SPA, and a new communist movement beckoned Debs to be its leader, which he refused. Though a critic of Lenin, Debs refused to reject totally the Russian Revolution, considering the Bolsheviks as potential allies in the global struggle against capitalism. Debs's stay in prison worsened his persistent bad health and the years that followed his release were punctuated by frequent visits to sanitariums and hospitals.

Scholars disagree about Debs's legacy. Some characterize him as a utopian radical whose socialist philosophy was alien to America's liberal tradition making it unsurprising that the socialist movement in the United States went into sharp decline following his death. On the other hand, Debs's opposition to war and his early attempts to reshape American democracy to include the powerless came to fruition with such programs as the New Deal, the Civil Rights Movement, the War on Poverty, and the Anti-Vietnam War Movement of the 1960s and 70s.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Debs: His Life, Writings and Speeches (Girard, Kan., 1908).

Walls and Bars: Prison Life in the "Land of the Free" (Chicago, 1927).

Eugene V. Debs Speaks, ed. Jean Y. Tussey (New York, 1970).

Other Relevant Works

Debs's papers are primarily at Indiana State University. Other collections are at New York University, Duke University, and Indiana University.

Letters of Eugene V. Debs, 3 vols, ed. Robert J. Constantine (Urbana, Ill., 1990).

The Eugene V. Debs Reader: Socialism and the Class Struggle, ed. William A. Pelz (Chicago, 2000).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v12*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Brommel, Bernard J. *Eugene V. Debs: Spokesman for Labor and Socialism* (Chicago, 1978).

Currie, Harold W. *Eugene V. Debs* (Boston, 1976).

Ginger, Ray. *The Bending Cross: A Biography of Eugene Victor Debs* (New Brunswick, N.J. 1949).

Kann, Mark E. "Challenging Lockean Liberalism in America: The Case of Debs and Hillquit," *Political Theory* 8 (1980): 203–22.

Morgan, H. Wayne. "The Utopia of Eugene Debs," *American Quarterly* 11 (Summer 1959): 120–35.

———, *Eugene V. Debs: Socialist for President* (Syracuse, N.Y., 1962).

Salvatore, Nick. *Eugene V. Debs: Citizen and Socialist* (Urbana, Ill., 1982).

Young, Marguerite. *Harp Song for a Radical: The Life and Time of Eugene Victor Debs* (New York, 1999).

Michael F. Gretz

DE GEORGE, Richard Thomas (1933–)

Richard T. De George was born on 29 January 1933 in New York City. He attended the University of Paris in 1952–3 before receiving his BA (egregia cum laude) in 1954 from Fordham College. He earned a PhB with great distinction in 1955 from the Université de Louvain, Belgium. This was followed by an MA (1958) and PhD (1959) in philosophy from Yale University. After serving as an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Kansas, De George did postdoctoral study at the University of Freiburg, where he was associated with the Institute of East European Studies. This early exposure to Eastern European thought and culture, particularly in terms of the Soviet form of Marxism practiced at the time, was to have lasting influence on De George's approach to ethical studies especially in terms of international economic considerations.

From 1962 to 1964 De George served as an associate professor of philosophy at the University of Kansas, then was professor of philosophy from 1964 to 1972. During this time he was a senior research fellow at Columbia University in 1965–6, where he also lectured in philosophy, and in 1969–70 he was a research fellow at Yale University. He served as chair of the philosophy department at the University of Kansas from 1966 to 1972. In 1972 the University of Kansas honored De George by naming him University Distinguished Professor. Over the course of his career, De George's attention evolved steadily toward an interest in value-based administrative and applied ethics. He put this interest into practice as co-director of the Center for Humanistic Studies at the University of Kansas from 1977 to 1982. As the Center's Director in 1982–3, he set a model for applied ethics as a catalyst for advanced inquiry and scholarship in the humanities. In 1985 De George was visiting professor for the Graduate School of Business at the University of St. Gallen, Switzerland, and in 1986 he was visiting professor at Santa Clara University. He is presently University Distinguished Professor of Philosophy, of Russian and East European Studies, and of Business Administration, and co-director of the International Center for Ethics in Business at the University of Kansas.

De George's administrative positions have influenced some of the most influential institutions in higher education. He has served as president of prestigious academic organizations including the American Philosophical Association Central Division (1989–90), the Metaphysical Society of America, the Society for Business Ethics, and the International Society for Business, Economics and Ethics. De George's administrative experience has been complimented by his influence upon advanced scholarship and academic publishing. He has served on editorial boards for numerous philosophy journals. He is the author of more than 160 articles and the author, or editor, of twenty books, including *The Ethics of Information Technology and Business* (2003), *Academic Freedom and Tenure: Ethical Issues* (1997), and *Business Ethics* (1982) – a text now in its fifth edition (1999) which has been translated into Japanese, Chinese, and Russian. *Competing with Integrity in International Business* (1993) was also translated into Chinese. In 1996, in recognition of his pioneering work in applied ethics, De George received an honorary doctorate from Nijenrode University in The Netherlands along with Bill Gates and Nelson Mandela.

De George showed an early inclination that has been sustained throughout his professional career of attention to political and international issues, and their relevance to theoretical ethics. This interest was to take a pragmatic and innovative turn towards business, and applied ethics in particular; and in doing so, was predictive of ethical issues latent both in the advent of the information age and the interrelationship of economic growth beyond the strict boundaries of the nation-state. Thus De

George's career was marked by what had traditionally been referred to as an "interdisciplinary" approach to ethics. This approach, however, particularly in the twenty-first century, has proven to be prescient of the pragmatic turn ethics was to take in the later stages of, and soon after, the Cold War.

Early in his career, De George had the foresight to incorporate political and economic theory into ethical inquiry by employing ethical criteria as a foundation for the validity, and viability, of social and political systems. Rather than analyzing history on the basis of economic and political considerations alone, De George subjected historical and social analysis to ethical criticism. With an underlying pragmatic emphasis, De George's turn toward applied ethics revealed that often political and theoretical constructs have an ethical underpinning in the form of foundational values which inevitably must align and define the feasibility of sustaining these values systemically. De George uses this insight as a platform from which to raise the level of contemporary ethical discourse, while simultaneously challenging systemic dogma. Rather than instituting arguments of justification for applied ethics, De George opens a continuing critical discourse that addresses ethical concerns as a means of self-examination, using intent, purpose, and consistency as a critical apparatus for re-examining the basis of foundational values. This secular and pragmatic turn in De George's applied ethics has led to the examination of existing social and political structures, while anticipating ethical dilemmas and the means of addressing them, as they are bound to occur with advances in technology and the realignment of political and economic order.

De George's approach to ethics has advanced from an original interdisciplinary and international scope to the advent of the age of globalization and the resulting problems of forming universal axiological premises as the foundation for value consensus. As a result, political science, economics, and cultural anthropology are brought into critical thought, with ethics as the underlying basis for the examination of constructs. With ethics as the foundation, strictly theoretical ethics as well comes under scrutiny. De George uses ethical considerations in their applied sense as the guidelines for an ever-evolving social and economic secular reality. Consequently, De George's critical use of ethical criteria anticipates emerging transitions in both technological advances and global politics.

As the author of foundational texts in business ethics, De George has had great influence on the contemporary approach to the study of the subject, using not only case studies and existing ethical issues as premises, but examining potential issues and hypothetical considerations in the form of thought experiments. Under De George's guidelines, business ethics (which, by his own admission, was not taken seriously until the 1960s) becomes fundamental to a future that demands criteria of value in order to address ethical dilemmas emerging out of the rapid development and proliferation of technology, medical advances, and global economic development. With a pragmatic orientation, De George has applied this approach as an academic leader and administrator, and as a professor. In bringing ethics into a new venue of address outside the academic community, he has advised such organizations as Motorola, Hallmark, Kansas City Power and Light, Koch Industries, and General Motors, among others. His special area of interest continues to be ethical issues in international business. He has been a leader in innovative ethical thought, lecturing throughout the world and, in the process, has become a well-known American philosopher with great influence beyond the borders of the United States.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Patterns of Soviet Thought: The Origins and Development of Dialectical and Historical Materialism (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1966).

Soviet Ethics and Morality (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1969).

A Guide to Philosophical Bibliography and Research (New York, 1971).

The Philosopher's Guide to Sources, Research Tools, Professional Life and Related Fields (Lawrence, Kan., 1980).

Business Ethics (New York and London, 1982; 5th edn 1999).

The Nature and Limits of Authority (Lawrence, Kan., 1985).

Competing with Integrity in International Business (Oxford, 1993).

Academic Freedom and Tenure: Ethical Issues (Lanham, Md., 1997).

The Ethics of Information Technology and Business (Oxford, 2003).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Classical and Contemporary Metaphysics: A Source Book* (New York, 1962).

Ed., *Ethics and Society: Original Essays on Contemporary Moral Problems* (New York, 1966).

Science and Ideology in Soviet Society (New York, 1967).

The New Marxism (New York, 1968).

Ed., *The Structuralists, From Marx to Levi-Strauss* (New York, 1972).

Ed. with James Scanlan, *Marxism and Religion in Eastern Europe* (Dordrecht, 1976).

Ed. with Joseph Pichler, *Ethics, Free Enterprise and Public Policy* (Oxford, 1978).

Ed., *Semiotic Themes* (Lawrence, Kan., 1981).

"Ethics and Coherence," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 64 (November 1990): 39–52.

"Law and Ethics in the Information Age," *Business and Professional Ethics Journal* 20 (2001): 5–18.

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v9

Bowie, Norman, ed. *Blackwell Guide to Business Ethics* (Oxford, 2002).

Graybosch, Anthony, and Joel Rudinow. *Ethics and Values in the Information Age* (Belmont, Cal., 2002).

Laurence L. Murphy

DE KONINCK, Charles (1906–65)

Charles De Koninck was born 20 July 1906 in Thourout, West Flanders, Belgium. He received the PhD from Louvain University in 1934, writing a dissertation on "Eddington's Philosophy of Science." De Koninck was a Dominican novice, but preferred an academic career, and was professor of philosophy of nature and scientific methodology at the Université de Laval in Québec, Canada, from 1934 until his death. He served as the Director of Laval's philosophy faculty from 1939 to 1956. De Koninck died on 13 February 1965 in Rome, Italy.

De Koninck formulated a philosophy of science compatible with Thomistic theology and a Christian world view. He produced stimulating and influential writings in metaphysics, natural and doctrinal theology, and philosophy of religion. His work was widely read in both French-speaking Canada and in English-speaking Canada and the United States. In 1945 he co-founded with Alphonse-Marie Parent the journal *Laval Théologique et Philosophique*. A prominent intellectual Catholic, De Koninck was involved in the Vatican II debates in the early 1960s. Université de Laval awarded him the STD degree, and the American Catholic Philosophical Association awarded him the Aquinas Medal in 1964. De Koninck lectured widely across Canada and the United States.

Perhaps his most popular book was *The Hollow Universe* (1960), which offers a reconciliation of science, philosophy, and religion. De Koninck argued that modern science does not deserve to decide the nature of reality

because the abstractions of scientific theories have no meaning apart from the ordinary yet concrete experience of nature. In his natural theology, De Koninck considerably departed from traditional arguments. Nature displays design, but design is not incompatible with chance and indeterminism, because intelligence will take advantage of randomness to still achieve its intended results. Evolution by random mutation and divine guidance towards more perfect forms are therefore quite compatible. De Koninck argued, in an interpretation of Aquinas, that spiritual causes are necessary to explain fully the emergence of the form as the perfection of matter, and that forms are evident even in the infinitely diverse partial perfections of matter.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

De la primauté du bien commun contre les personnalistes: le principe de l'ordre nouveau (Québec and Montréal, 1943).

The Hollow Universe (London and Québec, 1960).

Tout homme est mon prochain (Québec, 1964).

Other Relevant Works

De Koninck's papers are at the Jacques Maritain Center at the University of Notre Dame.

"Le problème de l'indéterminisme," in *L'Académie Canadienne Saint-Thomas d'Aquin* (Québec, 1937), pp. 65–159.

"Thomism and Scientific Indeterminism," *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 13 (1937): 58–76.

"Concept, Process, and Reality," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 9 (1949): 440–47.

"The Moral Responsibilities of the Scientist," *Laval Théologique et Philosophique* 6 (1950): 352–6.

"Abstraction from Matter," *Laval Théologique et Philosophique* 13 (1957): 133–96.

Further Reading

Canad Encyc, Who's Who in Phil

Armour, Leslie. "Science and Religion in the Work of Charles De Koninck," *Laval Théologique et Philosophique* 47 (1991): 387–400.

George, Richard. "Traditional Wisdom of Charles De Koninck," *American Benedictine Review* 16 (1965): 586–97.

McInerny, Ralph M. "Charles De Koninck: A Philosopher of Order," *New Scholasticism* 39 (1965): 491–516.

Mélanges à la mémoire de Charles De Koninck (Québec, 1968). Contains a bibliography of De Koninck's writings.

John R. Shook

DE LAGUNA, Grace Mead Andrus (1878–1978)

Grace Mead Andrus was born on 28 September 1878 in East Berlin, Connecticut, the daughter of Wallace R. and Annis Mead Andrus. She received her BA from Cornell University in 1903, where she was Phi Beta Kappa, and her PhD in philosophy from Cornell in 1906. The title of her dissertation was "The Mechanical Theory in Pre-Kantian Rationalism." In 1905 she married Theodore DE LAGUNA, with whom she collaborated on philosophical works. She taught at Bryn Mawr College in Pennsylvania her entire career; as an assistant professor of philosophy from 1912 to 1916, associate professor from 1922 to 1929, and as full professor from 1929 to 1944. De Laguna became department chair when her husband died in 1930. She was Vice President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1938–9, and President in 1941–2. In her retirement she continued to write, and published her third book in 1963. De Laguna died on 17 February 1978 in Devon, Pennsylvania.

De Laguna's early work was concerned with interpreting the philosophical significance of the transition from pre-Darwinian to post-Darwinian thought. Central to her analysis is the distinction between *dogmatic* (classical and modern rationalism and empiricism) and *evolutionary* thought (absolute idealism, critical, particularly neo-Kantian, philosophy and pragmatism). For De Laguna, the common postulate of both rationalism and empiricism is the dogma of the possibility of an ultimate analysis or terminus of inquiry, located by rationalists in the discovery of logical presuppositions and by empiricists in the discovery of psychological structure. Consistent with early pragmatist critiques of modernist epistemology, De Laguna maintained that all such foundational assumptions are undermined by (Darwinian) evolutionary logic. In *Dogmatism and Evolution* (1910) she adopted a position broadly sympathetic with John DEWEY's functionalist psychology and instrumentalism while rejecting the doctrine of immediatism, as expressed in Dewey's "postulate of immediate empiricism" and William JAMES's notion of "pure experience." These concepts she viewed as dogmatic vestiges of pre-evolutionary foundationalism that serve only to weaken the force of pragmatic methodology.

In "The Practical Character of Reality," reprinted in *Dogmatism and Evolution*, De Laguna argued that Dewey's immediatism functions as a surrogate for ontology and leads to intolerable contradictions. The pragmatist's attempt to describe the reality of all things in terms of what they are experienced as runs afoul of the requirement of an instrumentalist epistemology to maintain a distinction between the *what* and the *that* of experience. Immediatism, in her view, involves an unwelcome (and unnecessary) reduction of meaning to existence. For Dewey, it is the *experience as knowledge* which is said to effect a resolution of the *experience as problematic*; it is in this sense that reality can be said to change as the result of successful inquiry. Yet, the doubt, vagueness, or uncertainty that is said to insti-gate reflection becomes just the thing immediately felt and cannot, as such, refer beyond itself and become a doubt as to the nature of the thing experienced, so as to evoke the function of thought and thereby lead to the reconstruction of experience that settles the problematic situation. As a result, according to De Laguna, a robust pragmatism incorporates "the real," not as what is immediately experienced, but as that which is "good for something else in experience." In a departure from Dewey, she identified "the real" as the known, which she considered the continuously changing product of an unavoidably fallible and self-correcting scientific method. Understood in its historical context, immediatism can be seen as pragmatism's reaction against the ontological framework of absolute idealism, the doctrine that reality is the object of an absolute knowledge in which every element is what it is by reason of its relation to and determination by every other. For the pragmatist, the standard of absolutely completed knowledge, in relation to which actual thought and judgment is to found true or false, is a chimera. Yet, according to De Laguna, a thoroughgoing and consistent instrumentalism finds value in the ontological and epistemological ideals of absolute idealism as *limiting conceptions* only, which like the limiting conceptions of mathematics and the physical sciences, are subject to criticism both in terms of their logical consistency and their efficacy in the analysis of the facts of actual experience. It is in this sense as an *ideal limit* that we should approach the pragmatist conception of immediate experience as well; not as that which is the fundamental datum of existence/experience prior to all interpretation, but as that tendency in or character of the experiential/existential context which resists the wholesale reduction of the qualitatively felt *that* to the cognitively refined *what*.

De Laguna's mature work, in many respects an outgrowth of the themes first sketched in *Dogmatism and Evolution*, took a bold speculative turn. Rooted in the

American grain, her philosophical development bears the influences of other traditions as well, notably continental phenomenology and existentialism, and process metaphysics. These diverse strains were woven by De Laguna's original philosophical temperament with the naturalistically and scientifically oriented elements of the classical American tradition into an intellectual fabric of remarkable texture and strength. She embraced the primacy of scientific method, as inseparably bound up with the actual facts of the existence of human inquiry and human inquirers, as a path to knowledge of reality. Her substantial psychological and anthropological writings, significant in their own right, embody a commitment to pragmatist methodology in its insistence upon the continuity between epistemology and a philosophical anthropology grounded in the empirical theory of human beings in their social and cultural contexts.

De Laguna's later work continued to explore the philosophical implications of Darwinian biology, providing a point of departure for her most important work, *On Existence and the Human World* (1963), a summation of nearly forty years of intellectual labor. She formulates what might be called a speculative naturalism, in which she situates human and nonhuman (including inorganic) reality along an evolutionary continuum, whose unifying element is the conception of "teleonomy," or "end-directedness." "Selection" is thus a universal datum of nature: inorganic and organic evolution can be distinguished by their teleonomic differences. What is selected in the former are structures suited to the maintenance of individual entities; what is selected in the latter is organization directed to the replication of its own structure in other entities, that is, biological reproduction. In fact, the task imposed upon philosophy by biology is that of making sense of the notion – in the absence of rejected conceptions of classical teleology – that there are ends in nature that do not derive from human valuation. With the emergence of humanity, however, selection becomes self-directed and the end becomes the control of evolutionary change itself. So, for De Laguna, a corollary task of philosophy is to satisfy the "anthropic principle" by conceptualizing nature in terms that allow for the existence of human reality as a product of evolutionary processes.

While philosophical concerns must remain grounded in empirical science, philosophical inquiry, on De Laguna's terms, is necessarily speculative. For De Laguna, speculative philosophy is the search for being, which generic traits manifest themselves both in the wider world of nature and in the human life-world. A philosopher must make the world of nature intelligible as including within it human reality as lived. At the same time, in order to understand ourselves and our world as lived, she must uncover the very nature to which we belong as human beings. De Laguna's project constitutes an attempt to reconcile the modern opposition between philosophies of nature and philosophies of the human life-world through the so-called *lebenswelt*. To this end she found Heidegger's ontological inquiry, as the search for being through an analysis of *Dasein*, or human reality, to be highly significant, but flawed. Heidegger's failure, in her view, consisted in refusing to see that an existential analysis of entities other than man is possible and by maintaining an ontological dualism "as dogmatic as Descartes," by not pursuing such an analysis of the "ontic" world, the world of non-human nature. For De Laguna, to *be* is to exist as an *individual*; moreover, the being of what exists is intrinsically temporal. This means that being must include both actuality and potentiality. No being is passive, rejecting with A. N. WHITEHEAD classical mechanics with its insistence upon the inertial character of all physical entities, instead holding that to exist is to be active. Every individual makes present the future by actualizing the potentialities inherent in its being. To do so, every existent must endure and thus must act so as to maintain itself as potential, as capable of acting in the ways which are con-

stitutive of its being (which is mutually dependent upon the actualities and potentialities of other beings). She wrote, "The ontological self-relatedness that Heidegger found to be a distinctive characteristic of *Dasein* we thus find to be an essential condition for all temporal existence. There is a sense – an ontological sense – in which the being of every existent individual is 'at stake' and is 'an issue for it'." (1963, p. 96)

Even as De Laguna rejected Heidegger's interpretive phenomenology as incompletely naturalistic, so it is not, ultimately, a *lebensweltsphilosophie*, but the science of cultural anthropology that shapes her thought concerning human nature and the cultural world. Her approach is informed by deep understanding of ethnographical method and practice, with which she was intimately familiar through her daughter and colleague, the distinguished anthropologist Frederica De Laguna. Culture, for the elder De Laguna, constitutes the environment of humanity. The human world is a cultural one and cultures are fundamentally normative systems, which make available ideals for the integration of personality and, moreover, individuals' attainment of personhood. The premise of anthropological theory and practice is the recognition that belief systems and values are relative to culture, which is defined as a functional whole. Yet, the anthropologist, as a scientist, assumes the objectivity and validity of scientific method. As such, she must also affirm the truth of particular beliefs and note the falsity of contradictory beliefs that are to be found in the alien culture she studies. No one would fault the anthropologist for passing judgment upon those beliefs of a culture that obviously ran counter to established scientific truth. In fact, recognition of such beliefs as false often plays a significant role in the understanding of what makes the culture function.

According to De Laguna, the ethnographer's predicament is not dissimilar when it comes to another culture's moral norms. Not only is it unreasonable for the anthropologist to suspend moral judgment when confronted with cultural practices, such value judgment on his part is an essential part of understanding the peculiar pattern of the "value-economy" through which the culture is maintained. The value-economy of a culture is that system of normative preferences which selects the positive-values or "goods" to be attained at the cost of negative values or "evils." Such valuation is to be regarded to a certain extent culturally relative, but not entirely. Anthropology, on her view, necessarily assumes a core of common goods that all cultures value and a core of common evils to be avoided. Certain norms appear to be universal across cultures, the injunction against murder and the obligation to care for the young, for example. In fact, the anthropologist's understanding of the particular value-economy of a culture presupposes universal and objective standards of value in accordance with which such an economy can be judged as "sound," that is, to the extent that the balance of benefits and costs – assuming the above-mentioned "psychic unity of mankind" – results in a structure that is "stable" rather than "precarious."

De Laguna argued that while anthropology is justified in regarding the specific and varying moral standards of different cultures as relative to these cultures, its own scientific procedure, itself the outgrowth of a particular culture, involves the acceptance of universal and objective standards. What is true of anthropology is true of every science: scientific method is one and presupposes belief in a fully intelligible order of being. To be sure, this belief is a regulative ideal, for in practice the sciences' realization of it is incomplete and limited. Yet, the very transcendence of scientific method lies in its inherent fallibility. As self-critical and self-correcting, science must deal not only with nature and with human beings as living organisms, but with the human achievement of culture: it must include itself as a form of being. As such, it must be critically self-engaged in relation to those actualities and potentialities of culture

through which it can sustain itself. One of the potentialities, according to De Laguna, upon which the pursuit of science rests, is the ideal of universal moral standards, including the respect for human rights. With the sought-for affirmation of the unity of truth-seeking and truth-knowing, no less than that of being and the good, does the remarkable speculative project of this noteworthy American philosopher find closure.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dogmatism and Evolution: Studies in Modern Philosophy, with Theodore De Laguna (New York, 1910).

Speech: Its Function and Evolution (New Haven, Conn., 1927).

On Existence and the Human World (New Haven, Conn., 1963).

Other Relevant Works

De Laguna's papers, along with Brand Blanshard's manuscript "Memories and Reflections in Honor of Grace De Laguna" and a bibliography of her writings, are at Bryn Mawr College in Pennsylvania.

"The Practical Character of Reality," *Philosophical Review* 18 (1909): 396–415.

"Sensation and Perception," *Journal of Philosophy* 13 (1916): 533–47, 617–30.

"The Empirical Correlation of Mental and Bodily Phenomena," *Journal of Philosophy* 15 (1916): 617–30.

"The Limits of the Physical," in *Philosophical Essays in Honor of James Edwin Creighton*, ed. George H. Sabine (New York, 1917), pp. 175–83.

"Emotion and Perception from the Behaviorist Standpoint," *Psychological Review* 26 (1919): 409–27.

"The Psychological Element," *Philosophical Review* 24 (1924): 371–89.

"Dualism and Gestalt Psychology," *Psychological Review* 37 (1930): 187–213.

"Knowing and Being: A Dialectical Study," *Philosophical Review* 45 (1936): 435–56.

"Cultural Relativism and Science," *Philosophical Review* 51 (1942): 141–66.

"Communication, the Act and the Object with Reference to Mead," *Journal of Philosophy* 43 (1946): 225–38.

"Democratic Equality and Individuality," *Philosophical Review* 55 (1946): 111–31.

"Existence and Potentiality," *Philosophical Review* 60 (1951): 155–76.

"The Lebenswelt and the Cultural World," *Journal of Philosophy* 57 (1960): 777–90.

"The Role of Teleonomy in Evolution," *Philosophy of Science* 29 (1962): 117–31.

"The Person," *Review of Metaphysics* 17 (1963): 171–86.

"Speculative Philosophy," in *Transparencies: Philosophical Essays in Honor of J. Ferrater Mora*, ed. Priscilla Cohn (Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1981).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Pres Addr of APA v5*, *Proc of APA v50*, *Who's Who in Phil*, *Women Phils*

Lovejoy, Arthur O. "Dogmatism and Evolution," *Philosophical Review* 20 (1911): 535–45.

Natanson, Maurice. "Nature, Value, and Action," *Man and World* 1 (1968): 293–302.

Gary S. Calore

DE LAGUNA, Theodore de Leo
(1876–1930)

Theodore De Laguna was born on 22 July 1876 in Oakland, California. He received his BA in philosophy from the University of California at Berkeley in 1896, and stayed at Berkeley for his MA in philosophy and English literature in 1899. He received his PhD in philosophy from Cornell University in 1901, writing a dissertation on "The Relation of Ethics to Evolution." De Laguna taught English in the Philippines from 1901 to 1903. He then was assistant in philosophy at Cornell University from 1903 to 1905, and assistant professor of education at the University of Michigan from 1905 to 1907. He became assistant professor of philosophy at Bryn Mawr College in Pennsylvania in 1907, and was promoted up to full professor by 1910. He also became department chair, and held these positions until his death. De Laguna died on 22 September 1930 while vacationing in Hardwick, Vermont.

De Laguna worked primarily in philosophy of logic and philosophy of science, and he was expert on Greek philosophy, especially Plato. Early in his career, he published articles on the square of opposition and the syllogism, at a time when there was considerable debate in both British and American philosophical journals on the relationship between and comparative merits of traditional syllogistic logic and mathematical logic (whether the older algebraic logic of George Boole, Charles PEIRCE, and Ernst Schröder, or the more recent logistic). He also worked on the related question of the validity of propositions according to the traditional square of opposition on the one hand and the Boolean or existential square of opposition on the other, and on the logical paradoxes. He reviewed Josiah ROYCE's article "The Relation of the Principles of Logic to the Foundations of Geometry," in which the principles of logic and set theory were employed axiomatically to develop geometry,

asserting that Royce's title promised much more than it delivered. De Laguna nevertheless asserted his preference for Royce's system to that of Alfred Bray Kempe in "On the Relation between the Logical Theory of Classes and the Geometrical Theory of Points," upon which Royce's work was based, while C. I. LEWIS reworked Royce's system in terms of ordered elements rather than Royce's O-collections or multisets, and using strict implication rather than material implication or an ordering relation.

De Laguna's major works were *Dogmatism and Evolution* (1910), co-authored with his wife and Bryn Mawr philosophy colleague Grace Mead Andrus DE LAGUNA; *Introduction to the Science of Ethics* (1914); and *The Factors of Social Evolution* (1926). These works exhibited his close interest in the social and ethical implications of science, especially of the biological sciences. He had early been influenced by neo-Kantian George Holmes HOWISON, one of his teachers at Berkeley, who taught logic, methodology, and philosophy of science and whose course "Propaedeutic to Philosophy" treated "empirical psychology, including formal logic, deductive and inductive," as well as by the pragmatism of William JAMES. De Laguna rejected both pragmatism and the new realism, holding that pragmatism is too anti-intellectual and new realism is too dependent on the ontological priority of external relations. He developed a radical skepticism that held inductive reasoning to be impossible and stated that there can be no general theory of truth. A systematic scientific philosophy is therefore impossible because there is no sound basis for distinguishing between knowledge and belief.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Dogmatism and Evolution: Studies in Modern Philosophy, with Grace Mead Andrus De Laguna (New York, 1910).
Introduction to the Science of Ethics (New York, 1914).

The Factors of Social Evolution (New York, 1926).

Other Relevant Works

De Laguna's papers are at Bryn Mawr College in Pennsylvania.

"Stages of the Discussion of Evolutionary Ethics," *Philosophical Review* 14 (1905): 576–89.

"Review of Josiah Royce, 'The Relation of the Principles of Logic to the Foundations of Geometry'," *Journal of Philosophy* 3 (1906): 357–61.

"The Externality of Relations," *Philosophical Review* 20 (1911): 610–21.

"Opposition and the Syllogism," *Journal of Philosophy* 9 (1912): 393–400.

"The Logical-analytic Method in Philosophy," *Journal of Philosophy* 12 (1915): 449–62.

"On Certain Logical Paradoxes," *Philosophical Review* 25 (1916): 16–27.

"The Sociological Method of Durkheim," *Philosophical Review* 29 (1920): 213–25.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v40*

Kempe, Alfred Bray. "On the Relation between the Logical Theory of Classes and the Geometrical Theory of Points," *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* 21 (1889): 147–82.

Lewis, Clarence Irving. "The Calculus of Strict Implication," *Mind* 23 (1913): 240–47.

Royce, Josiah. "The Relation of the Principles of Logic to the Foundations of Geometry," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 24 (1905): 353–414.

Irving H. Anellis

DELANY, Martin Robison (1812–85)

Martin Robison Delany was born in Charles Town, Virginia (now West Virginia) on 6 May 1812, and died on 24 January 1885 in Wilberforce, Ohio. His father, Samuel, was a slave but his mother, Pati Peace, was a free black woman. His mother moved the family to Chambersburg, Pennsylvania in 1822 after it was discovered that she had taught her children how to read and write in violation of state law. His father joined them a year later after purchasing his freedom. Delany moved to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania in 1831 and enrolled as a student of Revd Lewis Woodson in the cellar of Pittsburgh's Bethel African Methodist Church on Wylie Street. In 1832 he studied classics, Latin, and Greek at Jefferson College (now Washington and Jefferson College) in Washington, Pennsylvania. Throughout this period he supported himself working as a barber and laborer.

During the 1833 cholera epidemic, Delany apprenticed himself to Andrew N. McDowell, a white doctor who taught him the skills of a physician's assistant as a cupper and leecher. He set up his own practice as a physician in 1836. In addition to his medical practice, he worked with a covert organization that provided safe passage and transport for runaway slaves as they passed through Pittsburg. Delany also agitated against other types of slavery, such as the moral degradation of alcohol addiction. In 1837 he founded a temperance organization called "Young Men's Literary and Moral Reform Society of Pittsburgh."

In 1843 Delany introduced the *Mystery*, an abolitionist periodical in Pittsburgh. He was an agent of Frederick DOUGLASS's newspaper *North Star* during 1847–8. In 1850 Delany was accepted at Harvard Medical School in Cambridge, Massachusetts, along with two black Bostonians sponsored by the American Colonization Society, Isaac H. Snowden and Daniel Laing, Jr. A minority of white students protested their presence, and the Dean along

with Professor Oliver Wendell HOLMES, Delany's preceptor in anatomy and physiology, approved their dismissal in March 1851. Delany was allowed to complete only one of two four-month terms. In 1856 he moved his family to Chatham, Ontario in Canada, and from there began to organize emigration to Africa for ex-slaves. In 1859 he explored the Niger River Valley in West Africa, hoping to find a suitable location to produce enough cotton to compete with the slave South. This scheme failed to materialize and he returned to the United States just as the Civil War was starting in 1861.

During the war, Delany worked to recruit black troops and was later commissioned a major in the 104th United States Colored Troops in 1865. After the war, Delany served with the Freedmen's Bureau at Hilton Head, South Carolina, and became involved in South Carolina Republication Party politics. He worked to acquire land for ex-slaves so they could be economically self-supporting. But, the political corruption of the Radical Reconstruction eventually drove him to favor southern home rule and even to support ex-confederate, white supremacist Wade Hampton as the Democratic candidate for governor of South Carolina. He edited the *Charleston Independent* in the late 1870s and published a volume on the contributions of African civilization in 1879. He pursued another unsuccessful Africa emigration scheme that was short-lived in Liberia. In 1880 Delany returned to the black community of Xenia, Ohio, where his family had settled, and there he died in 1885.

Delany was one of the first black abolitionists to formulate and articulate an ideology of Black Nationalism. He thought the only way black Americans could break free of white domination was to emigrate to Africa, a view he first published in *The Condition, Elevation, Emigration and Destiny of the Colored People of the United States* (1852). Delany argued that going back to Africa would provide the necessary physical and emotional space to be free of the fetters created by white economic and religious hegemony. He thought that some of the most important ideo-logical obstacles to black self-liberation were the ones erected by white supremacy: the economic dependence created by slave labor and the spiritual complacency espoused by religion. His views met with a chilly reception by white abolitionists and caused Frederick Douglass to remark: "I thank God for making me a man, but Delany thanks him for making him a *black* man" (italics in original). Embittered and discouraged over how to overcome the badge of inferiority inherited from slavery and racism in American society, Delany thought the only viable solution was to relocate in Africa. After his death, he remained relatively unknown until his critique of white domination was rediscovered by black nationalists in the 1960s.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Condition, Elevation, Emigration and Destiny of the Colored People of the United States (Philadelphia, 1852).

The Origin and Objects of Ancient Freemasonry; Its Introduction into the United States and Legitimacy Among Colored Men (Pittsburgh, 1853).

Blake: Or the Huts of America (Boston, 1859).

Official Report of the Niger Valley Exploring Party (New York, 1861).

Homes for the Freedman (Charleston, S.C., 1871).

Principia of Ethnology: The Origin of Races and Color with an Archaeological Compendium and Egyptian Civilization from Years of Careful Examination and Enquiry (Philadelphia, 1879).

Other Relevant Works

"Political Destiny of the Colored Race on the American Continent," in *Index of the Report of the Select Committee on House Resolution No. 576* (Washington, D.C., 1862).

Martin R. Delany: A Documentary Reader, ed. Martin Levine (Chapel Hill, N.C., 2003).

Further Reading

Encyc Amer Bio

Adeleke, Tunde. *Without Regard to Race: The Other Martin Robison Delany* (Jackson, Miss., 2003).

Bell, Howard H., ed. *Minutes and Proceedings of National Negro Conventions 1830–1864* (Manchester, N.H., 1969).

Griffith, Cyril E. *The African Dream: Martin R. Delany and the Emergence of Pan-African Thought* (University Park, Penn., 1975).

Kahn, Robert M. "The Political Ideology of Martin Delany," *Journal of Black Studies* 4 (1984): 415–40.

Levine, Robert S. *Martin Delany, Frederick Douglass and the Politics of Representative Identity* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1997).

Painter, Nell Irvin. "Martin R. Delany: Elitism and Black Nationalism," in *Black Leaders of the Nineteenth Century*, ed. Leon Litwack and August Meier (Urbana, Ill., 1988), pp. 149–71.

Rollin, Frank A. *Life and Public Service of Martin R. Delany* (Boston, 1883).

Sterling, Dorothy. *The Making of an Afro-American: Martin Robison Delany* (Garden City, N.Y., 1971).

Ullman, Victor. *Martin Delany: The Beginnings of Black Nationalism* (Boston, 1971).

Jean Van Delinder

DE MAN, Paul (1919–83)

Paul de Man was born on 6 December 1919 in Antwerp, Belgium. He studied chemistry at the University of Brussels from 1939 to 1942, and then earned a living writing and translating for Belgian and French publishers. After emigrating to the United States in 1947, he taught French literature at Bard College in New York from 1949 to 1951. He then lived in Boston and took classes at Harvard; in 1954 he joined Harvard's Society of Fellows and studied comparative literature and literary criticism with Harry Levin and Reuben Brower. He received his MA in 1958 and PhD in comparative literature in 1960. He taught comparative literature at Cornell University from 1960 to 1966, the University of Zurich in 1966–67, and at Johns Hopkins University from 1967 to 1970. In 1970 de Man became professor of French and comparative literature at Yale University, and he held that position until his death on 21 December 1983 in New Haven, Connecticut.

In 1966 de Man met French philosopher Jacques Derrida, who was using the term "deconstruction" to refer to the view that literary criticism can reveal multiple meanings of any text, and none is more correct or more accurate than any other. They realized their common standpoint and aims, and collaborated for many years. In 1967 de Man published *Blindness and Insight*, which quickly established him as one of America's foremost literary theorists and soon brought deconstruction and postmodernism to the forefront of both critical theory and philosophy. Further books kept de Man and deconstruction in the spotlight in both academia and the wider culture that appreciated the anti-authoritarian implications of the deconstruction methodology. *Allegories of Reading* (1979) and three posthumously published books, *The Rhetoric of Romanticism* (1984), *The Resistance to Theory* (1986), and *Aesthetic Ideology* (1992), were widely acclaimed as major contributions.

De Man's reputation was destined to fall as quickly as it rose. Within four years of his death, allegations arose that he had written pro-Nazi propaganda and anti-Semitic articles during World War II. Besides throwing his own career into obscurity, attacks on deconstruction itself were raised to a new intensity, as some critics wondered whether deconstruction had some deep connection with a character such as de Man's.

Refusing to assign primary meaning to the literal understanding of a text, de Man argued that the text's performative functions through rhetoric, allegory, and metaphor (and other categories) supply equally valid readings. By contrasting the grammatical and rhetorical features of a text, the critic can "deconstruct" the text, uncovering and challenging its supposedly intended message (and thus challenge the reader's understanding as well). Of special importance for de Man are occasions when a text's grammatical and rhetorical features contradict each other, making it "undecidable" or "unreadable." Furthermore, the rhetorical meanings of a text are all culturally and historically relative. Therefore, the reader (and the critic) should not try to discern what the text's author intended to mean; whatever the author believes the text to mean is just another possible reading having no more authority than any other. No text can indicate, by itself, what its exact meaning is; since meaning is relational and not intrinsic, readings are actually productions of new texts. All readings are commentaries; none is more true than the rest. Similar views on the relational nature of language can be found in the semiotics of Charles PEIRCE and Ferdinand de Saussure.

Further philosophical implications of deconstruction were indicated by de Man and Derrida, which helped to inspire much of postmodernism's standpoint. By deposing the semantic relation between a text and the reality it purports to mirror, deconstruction replaced the correspondence theory of truth with relativism and pluralism. Like Derrida, de Man aims to subvert Western philosophy's logocentrism and its supporting metaphysics of privileged categories such as being over becoming, permanence over change, and intrinsic over relational properties. Since there really are no fixed and universal structures of meaning, postmodernism's alternative is to gain reflective control of the ideologies, or systems of thought which determine reference to reality, by contrasting them with each other and by revealing their own internal complexities. Although postmodernism has been allied with politically liberal efforts to criticize traditional power relationships supported by ideologies, de Man regarded deconstruction as applying equally to all discourse regardless of political motivation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blindness and Insight: Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism (Oxford, 1971; 2nd edn 1983).

Allegories of Reading: Figural Language in Rousseau, Nietzsche, Rilke, and Proust (New Haven, Conn., 1979).

The Rhetoric of Romanticism (New York, 1984).

The Resistance to Theory (Minneapolis, 1986)

Critical Writings, 1953–1978, ed. Lindsay Waters (Minneapolis, 1989).

Aesthetic Ideology, ed. Andrzej Warminski (Minneapolis, 1992).

Romanticism and Contemporary Criticism: The Gauss Seminar and Other Papers, ed. E. S. Burt, Kevin Newmark, and Andrzej Warminski (Baltimore, Md., 1992).

Other Relevant Works

De Man's papers are at the University of California at Irvine.

Wartime Journalism, 1939–43, ed. Werner Hamacher, Neil Hertz, and Tom Keenan (Lincoln, Neb., 1988).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio

Cohen, Tom, Barbara Cohen, J. Hillis Miller, and Andrzej Warminski, eds. *Material Events: Paul de Man and the Afterlife of Theory* (Minneapolis, 2001).

Derrida, Jacques. *Mémoires: For Paul de Man*, 2nd edn (New York, 1986).

Hamacher, Werner, Neil Hertz, and Thomas Keenan, eds. *Responses: On Paul de Man's Wartime Journalism* (Lincoln, Nebr., 1989).

Herman, Luc, Kris Humbeeck, and Geert Lernout, eds. *(Dis)continuities: Essays on Paul de Man* (Amsterdam, 1989).

Lehman, David. *Signs of the Times: Deconstruction and the Fall of Paul de Man* (New York, 1991).

Morrison, Paul. *The Poetics of Fascism: Ezra Pound, T. S. Eliot, Paul de Man* (Oxford, 1996).

Norris, Christopher. *Paul de Man: Deconstruction and the Critique of Aesthetic Ideology* (London and New York, 1988).

Waters, Lindsay, and Wlad Godzich, eds. *Reading de Man Reading* (Minneapolis, 1989).

John R. Shook

DEMOS, Raphael (1892–1968)

Raphael Demos was born on 23 January 1892 in Smyrna, in the Ottoman Empire (now Turkey). In 1910 he received his BA from Anatolia College in Marsovan. He emigrated to the United States in 1913 (becoming a naturalized citizen in 1921) and earned his PhD from Harvard in 1916. He pursued postgraduate work at Cambridge in 1918–19, and later studied at the University of Paris in 1928–9. Demos taught at Harvard University for his entire career, beginning in 1919. He was named the Alford Professor of Natural Religion, Moral Philosophy, and Civil Polity in 1945 (succeeding William E. HOCKING) and held that position until retiring in 1962.

Demos also traveled and taught in many places throughout the world; as visiting professor he taught at Vanderbilt University (1962–7) as well as McGill University (1963–4); he was the Director of the College Year in Athens program, of which he was an influential founding member in 1967–8. To honor his con-

tributions to the program, a scholarship was established in his name. His scholarship earned him many grants and awards during his lifetime: a Guggenheim Fellowship to Paris (1928–9), an award from the Rockefeller Foundation (1956), another one from the American Philosophy Association (1959), and a grant from the Littauer Foundation (1960).

During his tenure at Harvard, he became known as America's leading Plato scholar, beginning with his studies under A. N. WHITEHEAD, who once said that all philosophy is but a footnote to Plato. Demos went on to publish many articles on Plato and served as the editor for two volumes dedicated to Plato's philosophy: *Plato: Selections* (1927) and *Complete Works of Plato* (1936). Raphael called himself a Christian Platonist, and grounded his philosophy within the common ground that both realms share: the idea that there is a better world that is the root cause of this one, and that the idea of Good (or God) is the ultimate ground of all being, not only within this world of shadows and illusions, but also within the more real realm of Ideas. His works on Plato were focused on the difficult areas of metaphysics and epistemology, and making these problems understandable for modern readers of Plato. He was hailed in his day as one of Harvard's favorite philosophy professors by the many students who enrolled in his classes. Demos retired to his homeland of Greece and died there on 8 August 1968 in Kifissia near Athens.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"A Discussion of a Certain Type of Negative Proposition," *Mind* 26 (1917): 188–96.

"A Discussion of Modal Propositions and Propositions of Practice," *Mind* 27 (1918): 77–85.

"Romanticism vs. the Worship of Fact," *Journal of Philosophy* 19 (1922): 197–200.

"Legal Fictions," *International Journal of Ethics* 34 (1923): 37–58.

"Possibility and Becoming," *Journal of Philosophy* 23 (1926): 234–40.

"On Persuasion," *Journal of Philosophy* 29

(1932): 225–32.

"Non-being," *Journal of Philosophy* 30 (1933): 85–102.

"Eros," *Journal of Philosophy* 31 (1934): 337–45.

"The Fundamental Conceptions of Plato's Metaphysics," *Journal of Philosophy* 32 (1935): 561–78.

"Plato's Idea of the Good," *Philosophical Review* 46 (1937): 245–75.

The Philosophy of Plato (New York, 1939).

"The State and the Law," *Journal of Philosophy* 41 (1944): 589–98.

"Society and the Ethics of Individualism," *Philosophical Review* 54 (1945): 97–114.

"The Meaningfulness of Religious Language," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 18 (1957): 96–106.

"Paradoxes in Plato's Doctrine of the Ideal State," *Classical Quarterly* 7 ns (1957): 164–74.

"Is Moral Reasoning Deductive?" *Journal of Philosophy* 55 (1958): 153–9.

"A Fallacy in Plato's Republic?" *Philosophical Review* 73 (1964): 395–8.

"Plato's Philosophy of Language," *Journal of Philosophy* 61 (1964): 595–610.

"Plato's Doctrine of the Psyche as a Self-moving Motion," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 6 (1968): 133–46.

"Spinoza's Doctrine of Privation," in *Studies in Spinoza: Critical and Interpretive Essays*, ed. S. Paul Kashap (Berkeley, Cal., 1972).

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *Plato: Selections* (New York and Chicago, 1927).

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v44, Who Was Who in Amer v5, Who's Who in Phil

James C. Poteet II

DENNES, William Ray (1898–1982)

William Dennes was born on 10 April 1898 in Healdsburg, California, and died on 2 May 1982 in Berkeley, California. He earned his BA in 1919 and MA in 1920 from the University of California, Berkeley, along the way receiving the University Medal as the outstanding scholar in his undergraduate class, and holding the Mills Fellowship as an MA candidate. He attended Oxford University as a Rhodes Scholar, receiving his PhD in philosophy there in 1923.

Dennes was a longtime member, and three times the chair, of the philosophy department at Berkeley. He began there as an instructor in 1923 and, after advancing to assistant professor in 1924 and associate professor in 1927, became a full professor in 1936. From 1958 until his retirement in 1965 he was Mills Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy and of Civil Polity. He also was Dean of the Graduate Division from 1948 to 1955, and served on many campus and state committees. He held several visiting positions, including posts at Harvard in 1935 and Stanford in 1941 and 1943.

Dennes won many honors, including a Guggenheim fellowship in 1929, and an honorary Doctor of Laws from NYU in 1951. Dennes was much admired for his professional and public service. He served on an impressive number of university committees and on many statewide and national organizations. He was President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1945–6, and President of the Graduate Council of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities in 1952. In 1943 he briefly served as an assistant director of the Los Alamos Project.

Dennes's best-known writings concern two themes: the resolution of conflict and the problems of philosophical naturalism. The first theme is reflected in "Conflict" (1946), which defends "the ancient faith in reason as the resolver of conflicts" in the face of "the current

eclipse of reason's reputation." (1946, p. 346) The second is reflected in *Some Dilemmas of Naturalism* (1960), the published version of his 1958 Woodbridge Lectures. The book explores dilemmas of that perspective which, on the one hand, construes "the cognitive meaning of explanatory beliefs … in such a way that we may become progressively clearer about what empirical evidence would confirm them," and, on the other, contends that "we are seriously justified in holding only those beliefs which are thus confirmed". (1960). By "dilemmas" Dennes means "predicaments in which what appear to be justified opinions, or justified ways of analyzing or interpreting beliefs and evaluations, seem nevertheless to require us to accept sets of beliefs that are either irreconcilable with one another or otherwise unsatisfactory". (1960). For example, if naturalism is true "must we … concede that universal statements … are meaningless? Must we deny cognitive meaning to statements about so-called 'unobservable entities' … ?" (1960) In discussing these and other dilemmas Dennes addresses many topics, including analyticity, meaning and use, and the naturalistic fallacy. Perhaps the best-known chapters are the last two, in which Dennes construes moral judgments as nondescriptive expressions of approval yet argues that in a significant sense they can be tested empirically.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Method of Metaphysics," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 5 (1924): 49–77.

"Practice as the Test of Truth," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 10 (1928): 87–116.

"Truth and Perception," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 11 (1929): 139–66.

"The Meaning of Individuality," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 20 (1937): 53–78.

"The Categories of Naturalism," in *Naturalism and the Human Spirit*, ed. Yervant Krikorian (New York, 1944), pp. 270–94.

"Conflict," *Philosophical Review* 55 (1946): 343–76.

"Knowledge of Values," in *Symbols and Values*, ed. Lyman Bryson et al. (New York, 1954), pp. 603–18.

Some Dilemmas of Naturalism (New York, 1960).

Other Relevant Works
"Santayana's Materialism," in *The Philosophy of George Santayana* (Evanston, Ill., 1940).

"Lewis on the Morally Imperative," in *The Philosophy of C. I. Lewis*, ed. Lewis Hahn (La Salle, Ill., 1968).

Philosophy and the University since 1915, interview with J. D. Ariff (Berkeley, Cal., 1970). Unique copy at the Regional Oral History Office, Bancroft Library, University of California at Berkeley. Contains a bibliography of Dennes's writings.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v5, *Who Was Who in Amer v8*, *Who's Who in Phil*

John J. Tilley

DENNETT, Daniel Clement, III (1942–)

Daniel Dennett was born on 28 March 1942 in Boston, Massachusetts. His parents met in Lebanon, where his mother, Ruth Leck Dennett, was teaching English at the American Community School in Beirut and his father, Daniel C. Dennett, Jr., was working on his PhD in Islamic history from Harvard University while teaching at the American University of Beirut. Daniel C. Dennett, Jr. began his academic career at Clark University. Because of

his expertise on the Middle East and his fluency in Arabic, he was recruited by the OSS to be a secret agent based in Beirut during World War II; his cover was as cultural attaché at the American Legation. Thus the philosopher Daniel Dennett's early years were spent living a diplomatic lifestyle – he spoke Arabic and French at nursery school and had a pet gazelle when he was four years old. In 1947 his father was offered a job at Harvard University, but was killed in an airplane crash in the mountains of Ethiopia while on a mission. Dennett, who was only five, his mother, and two sisters returned to Winchester, Massachusetts near Boston, where his paternal grandparents lived. His mother, having an MA degree in English from the University of Minnesota, was able to get a job as an editor of history and social science textbooks with Ginn & Company, a Boston textbook publisher. Because his mother was away in Boston working during the days, the children had a housekeeper who played a significant role in raising them. A boyhood friend of his father, Sherman Russell, was the father figure in Dennett's childhood. There were many books and magazines in the Dennett household, and so young Dennett became a voracious reader, but he also loved to build things in his basement workshop. Despite his fascination with the workings of machinery, Dennett grew up under his father's legacy, so that it was assumed and expected that he would attend Harvard and become a professor in one of the humanities.

Dennett began high school in Winchester at which time he realized that he wanted to be a teacher. He completed his last two years of high school at Phillips Exeter Academy in New Hampshire. The school was an excellent match for Dennett, as it was intellectually intense, with a significant emphasis on writing. Contrary to expectations, after he graduated in 1959, he went to Wesleyan University rather than Harvard. Because he had advanced placement in mathematics and English, he ended up in an advanced math course being taught by the logician Henry KYBURG. With the only other

student in the class being a graduate student, Dennett soon found the course difficult, so he spent many hours in the math library. There by chance he found W. V. QUINE's *From a Logical Point of View*. By morning he had finished it, and had decided to transfer to Harvard. That experience together with a reading of Descartes's *Meditations* in his first philosophy course set Dennett on the path of philosophy of mind and language.

The next year Dennett transferred to Harvard and enrolled in Quine's philosophy of language course. With the main text being *Word and Object*, fresh off the press, several graduate students were in the class, including David LEWIS, Saul KRIPKE, Thomas NAGEL, and Gilbert HARMAN. The course inspired Dennett to the point that he began working on a senior thesis on "Quine and Ordinary Language" in his second year; his objective was to refute Quine, whom he thought to be "very, very interesting but wrong." In order not to be pre-empted by Quine before he had a chance to work through the project, Dennett decided against Quine as a supervisor, opting instead for Dagfinn FØLLESDAL, the teaching assistant for the course on *Word and Object*. However, Quine did examine the thesis together with Charles PARSONS. Dennett came away from the defense with a new confidence about being a philosopher; and he also had promise as a sculptor and had shown pieces in Boston. Dennett's senior year included another life-shaping event: in the summer of 1962 he was married to Susan Bell; the Dennetts have had two children.

Because one of the few contemporary books in philosophy that Dennett really liked was Gilbert Ryle's *The Concept of Mind*, Dennett thought that the logical next step after obtaining his Harvard BA degree in 1963 was to study with Ryle at the University of Oxford. He applied to three colleges, Balliol, University, and Ryle's Magdalen College but was rejected by all three since they were popular choices among the Rhodes and Marshall scholars and therefore had a full quota of Americans.

Disappointed at not being able to study with Ryle, Dennett was preparing to accept a graduate position at the University of California at Berkeley, when he received an acceptance to Hertford College, Oxford, to read for the B.Phil. in philosophy. What was strange about this acceptance was that Dennett had not applied to Hertford; as he was to learn years later from Ryle, Ryle had seen his application to Magdalen, with Quine's recommendation, and forwarded it with a note of his own to a friend at Hertford.

Study for the B.Phil. degree in philosophy allowed Dennett to have Ryle as his supervisor (regardless of college the supervisor was one of the professors) but it was also notoriously difficult, requiring a thesis and three tough examinations within a few weeks of each other at the end of the second year. As he became absorbed in writing the thesis, which was later published as his first book, *Content and Consciousness* (1969), his motivation to prepare for the examinations diminished and he became certain that he would not successfully complete the B.Phil. requirements. He consulted Ryle on this, with the suggestion that he switch his degree to the B.Litt., which required only a thesis. Instead, Ryle recommended Dennett for the D.Phil. degree. The examiners were A. J. Ayer and the neuroanatomist J. Z. Young from London, chosen because of Dennett's forays out of strictly philosophical issues into speculations about the brain sciences. The thesis was accepted in 1965, so, suddenly at the age of twenty-three, Dennett had to turn from more graduate study and towards applying for faculty positions. On the strength of a letter alone he was hired by A.I. MELDEN as an assistant professor in the newly formed department of philosophy at the University of California at Irvine. Dennett was the only appointment Melden made that year, so with the exception of ethics, which Melden taught, Dennett taught the entire undergraduate curriculum.

While at Irvine, Dennett was drawn into discussions with a small group of artificial intelligence researchers. That, together with an influential meeting with Allen NEWELL, and Dennett had found his niche in the philosophical community. Dennett's interests throughout his career have been with the conceptual issues arising from the scientific investigation of the mind, including artificial intelligence (AI) research and robotics, psychology, neuroscience, and evolutionary biology. On the strength of *Content and Consciousness*, refereed by Quine, he was promoted to associate professor in 1970.

In 1971 Dennett moved to the philosophy department at Tufts University in Massachusetts, where, apart from various visiting positions, he has been teaching ever since. One of his visiting positions was at Harvard in 1973 during which time Georges Rey, then a graduate student, introduced him to Jerry FODOR, with whom he formed a reading group. In 1975 Dennett was promoted to full professor. The next year he was made chair of the philosophy department at Tufts, a position he held until 1982. In 1978–9 he was a Fulbright Fellow with Steven Stich in Andrew Woodfield's philosophy and psychology research group at the University of Bristol. The following year, he worked on problems in philosophy and AI with John McCarthy, Patrick Hayes, Zenon PYLYSHYN, Robert Moore, and John Haugeland at the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences at Palo Alta, California. It was there that he met Douglas Hofstadter. At Hofstadter's suggestion they worked together to produce an anthology: *The Mind's I*. This experience pushed Dennett further toward the sciences and away from more traditional philosophical perspectives. Hofstadter also introduced Dennett to Stephen Jay Gould and Richard Dawkins, opening up the area of evolutionary theory to Dennett.

In 1985 Dennett became the Director of the Center for Cognitive Studies at Tufts University, a position he still holds. The Center was established by Tufts in order to retain Dennett when the University of Pittsburgh offered him the chair vacated by Wilfrid SELLARS's retirement. Also in 1985, Dennett

was named Distinguished Professor of Arts and Sciences. It was around this time that he began collaborating with the neuropsychologist Marcel Kinsbourne, going on hospital rounds with him to witness for himself the pathologies that were informing his views about consciousness. Together with psychologist Nick Humphrey and linguist Ray Jackendoff, they started a discussion group. The group has continued with notable additions of MIT roboticist Rodney Brooks and Harvard psychologists Marc Hauser, Steve Pinker, Elizabeth Spelke, and Susan Carey. In 2000, with a unanimous nomination from his department, Dennett was honored with the title University Professor at Tufts University. He is also the Austin B. Fletcher Professor of Philosophy at Tufts University.

Dennett has been awarded more than one dozen fellowships during his career, including the Santayana Fellowship at Harvard in 1974; a Fulbright Fellowship at the University of Bristol in 1978; a visiting fellowship at All Souls College, Oxford in 1979; an NEH senior fellowship in 1979; a fellowship at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences in 1979–80; and a Guggenheim Fellowship in 1986–7. He has given nearly two dozen special lectureships, including the Herbert Spencer Lecture at Oxford in 1979; the John Locke Lectures at Oxford in 1983; the John Dewey Lecture at the University of Vermont in 1986; and the Jean Nicod Lectures at the Institut Nicod in Paris in 2001. Dennett sits on the editorial board of sixteen journals and is the associate editor of the *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*. He is a member of several learned societies including the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Association for Artificial Intelligence, and the American Philosophical Association. Dennett was President of the Society for Philosophy and Psychology in 1980–81, and the President of the Eastern Division of the APA in 2000–2001.

Dennett's philosophy centers on conceptual issues arising from scientific investigations of the mind. His main position is a kind of interpretationism in which *having* mental states is behaving in a way that is predictable with the *ascription* of mental states, such as beliefs and desires. Ascription of mental states is part of a predictive strategy, the intentional strategy, according to which an entity is ascribed the beliefs and desires it *ought* to have given its history and niche in the world. The entity is ascribed mental states under the assumption of idealized rationality in which it acts based on its beliefs to satisfy its desires. "*All there is* to being a true believer is being a system whose behavior is reliably predictable via the intentional strategy, and hence *all there is* to really and truly believing that *p* (for any proposition *p*) is being an intentional system for which *p* occurs as a belief in the best (most predictive) interpretation." (1987, p. 29)

Dennett is often taken to be an instrumentalist, speaking *as if* there are mental states is predictively useful, though in fact there are no such things. "You could take an *instrumentalist* view of intentional explanation. You could hold that though there are, *strictly speaking*, no such things as beliefs and desires, still talking as though there were some often leads to confirmed behavioral predictions …. The most extensively worked-out version of instrumentalism about the attitudes in the recent literature is surely owing to D. C. Dennett." (Fodor 1990, pp. 6–8). However, Dennett insists that propositional attitudes are real because they explain genuine detectable patterns in behavior. What is crucial to understanding Dennett's view is that the real patterns which license the ascription of propositional attitudes are only detectable from a particular point of view: the intentional stance. The intentional stance can best be understood by contrasting it with two other explanatory stances we adopt: the physical stance and the design stance. The physical stance is the point of view we adopt in explaining the constituent make-up and basic properties something possesses. From this point of view we can learn, for example, that something is made of 250 grams of steel, but not that

something is a corkscrew or a kidney, which would instead require the adoption of the design stance, focusing on the function something plays in its environment. Something is just as truly a corkscrew as it is 250 grams of steel, but these different regularities are perceivable only from different perspectives. Similarly, something is an intentional system if there are regularities noticeable only from the perspective of it having beliefs and desires. Something is as truly a believer as it is a corkscrew or 250 grams of steel, but they are very different kinds of things, as the differing points of view required to identify them make clear.

On Dennett's view, a belief is real in the same way that a center of gravity is real. Physical systems have centers of gravity, though to search for them as a constituent part of an object would be to misunderstand their nature. Similarly, some physical systems are intentional systems, though again to search for a belief as if it were some proper component of a system, in the way that circuits or gears are components, is to misunderstand the nature of belief. The subject of intentional ascriptions is an entire system considered at what Dennett coins a *personal level*. Personal-level intentional ascriptions, such as having pains, are those by which we understand ourselves and others as persons in daily life. Importantly, it is not necessary to know the inner workings of a system to make personal-level intentional ascriptions, just as it is not necessary to know anything of the microstructure of a magnet to recognize its magnetic properties and treat it as a magnet. Of course, there are microphysical properties in virtue of which something is a magnet just as there are underlying sub-personal processes in virtue of which something is an intentional system. Sub-personal cognitive psychology is in the business of explaining those inner workings of intentional systems but Dennett does not expect the personal-level regularities to reduce to regularities at the sub-personal level, particularly if we consider intentionality extending beyond human cognition. The variety and inner complexity of intentional systems virtually guarantees that the sub-personal realizations of intentional states will have no common explanation below personal-level ascriptions. The personal/sub-personal distinction should not be conflated with the distinction between the intentional stance and other stances, however, for it is possible to adopt the intentional stance towards sub-personal processes. The personal/sub-personal distinction is that the content ascribed at the personal level likely will not map on to the content ascribed at the sub-personal level.

One of the personal level attributes that Dennett has made considerable efforts to explain is consciousness. By considering the constraints imposed on a theory of consciousness from our expanding understanding of sub-personal processes of brain activity, Dennett has challenged the very coherence of a pervasive [mis]conception about the nature of consciousness. The misconception is that there is some place and moment where experiences come together for the inner self, dubbed the "Cartesian Theater" by Dennett for its roots in the philosophy of René Descartes. The flaw in this picture is that it presupposes some inner homunculus to view the screen in the Theater, where viewing by the homunculus constitutes consciousness. But what of the consciousness of the homunculus? This picture leads to an infinite regress that explains nothing.

Dennett insists that we take seriously the idea that the processing in virtue of which we are conscious is smeared across the brain both spatially and temporally; there is no place or time at which it all comes together. The new picture of consciousness that emerges is very different from our standard conception. Our brains are constantly processing distinct (and sometimes contradictory) contents as our state of information changes. Subsystems processing different streams of content compete with each other for behavioral control of the system, the winner becoming for a short time a *virtual captain* of the system; thus Dennett compares consciousness to fame. The competition, *pan-*

demonium as Dennett refers to it, is more like transactions in the stock exchange than in the courtroom. There is no central executive, just local interactions of competing interpretations of experience, *multiple drafts* of the information we receive. The winning content constitutes *our* take on the world. The ascribed subject of all the winning contents is the self, for which reason Dennett likens the self to a center of narrative gravity; it is the common element in our competing narrative fragments of content around which contents are selected to be coherent with our personal history and current beliefs. The conscious self is the story the dynamic interactions of our subsystems write in virtue of how they determine our behavior. The stable unity of the self is a feature of the world and our dispositions to interact with it, not an intrinsic feature of an inner mind.

The explanation of consciousness in terms of order arising from local processes is a special case of another major theme in Dennett's thinking, evolutionary theory. For Dennett, perhaps the single greatest idea anyone has ever had is Darwin's idea that random local processes can result in highly structured systems because of naturally occurring selective pressures. Characteristics of members in a population can be quite diverse but when environmental conditions favor a particular characteristic in the sense that those possessing it are more likely to reproduce, the characteristic will increase its proportion within the population. Just which characteristics confer reproductive advantages within a population can change depending on the ever-changing environment. This simple-sounding process has resulted in the staggering variety of species on our planet.

Dennett's emphasis in discussing evolutionary theory is that we had to get here from there, where "there" refers to an earlier time on our planet when it was devoid of life and minds. The processes of evolution are natural processes, "cranes" as Dennett refers to them, in contrast to the fictitious "skyhook" that we can hang on the clouds to lift ourselves whenever needed. Whether from creationists or evolutionary biologists, Dennett rejects any line of reasoning that is tantamount to positing a skyhook. However miraculous some process or structure might seem, from the complexity of the cell to the complexity of the mind, it should have a scientific explanation that essentially includes its selective history. Dennett argues that processes can build on each other, cranes lifting other cranes, speeding up selection processes to the point of genetic engineering. All of this is natural selection explicable using Darwinian reasoning.

Free will, like everything else on this planet, had to evolve. Dennett has argued against libertarians and determinists that determinism and free will are compatible. Both of these views are based on the reasoning that if determinism is true, i.e., if the course of future events follows necessarily from past events, then there is no free will. Determinists use this reasoning to reject free will, while libertarians use it to reject determinism, sometimes invoking quantum indeterminacy in arguing for free will. Dennett rejects the supposition by distinguishing determinism from inevitability. The outcome of some event is whatever it turns out to be, regardless of whether it is brought about deterministically, randomly, or some other way. We imagine freedom to be the power to change the outcome of an event, but since there is no outcome until things play themselves out there is no changing of outcomes. Determinism or not, the particulars of a situation lead creatures to act in certain ways. Whether their actions are inevitable depends on whether they can act based on information about their situation to alter an *anticipated* outcome, typically to their benefit. Creatures that are not hardwired to respond in every situation can learn how to use information to guide their actions; therefore, they have distinct possible futures, which is to say that other creatures of that type could have acted differently in those circumstances. The notion of possibility based on an intentional characterization of circumstances provides a naturalistic account of freedom, since possibilities arise as creatures evolve infor-

mation-processing capacities. It is the only kind of freedom worth wanting, according to Dennett, since other notions introduce freedom at the expense of willing. Interestingly, as technology gives us access to more information we become freer, perhaps freer than we want or are ready to be.

Dennett has never shied away from new fields of inquiry and he has introduced philosophers to many fascinating and philosophically relevant scientific research programs. This has provided him with a novel perspective on philosophical questions, enabling him to challenge philosophers' presuppositions with unnerving poignancy through thought experiments, intuition pumps as he calls them, that confound the philosophical community. Dennett is a major influence on philosophy, psychology, artificial intelligence research, and cognitive science.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Content and Consciousness (London and New York, 1969).

Brainstorms: Philosophical Essays on Mind and Psychology (Cambridge, Mass., 1978).

Elbow Room: The Varieties of Free Will Worth Wanting (Cambridge, Mass., 1984).

The Intentional Stance (Cambridge, Mass., 1987).

Consciousness Explained (Boston, 1991).

Darwin's Dangerous Idea: Evolution and the Meanings of Life (New York, 1995).

Kinds of Minds: Towards an Understanding of Consciousness (New York, 1996).

Brainchildren: Essays on Designing Minds (Cambridge, Mass., 1998).

Freedom Evolves (New York, 2003).

Sweet Dreams: Philosophical Obstacles to a Science of Consciousness (Cambridge, Mass., 2005).

Other Relevant Works

"Machine Traces and Protocol Statements," *Behavioral Science* 13 (1968): 155–61.

"Intentional Systems," *Journal of Philosophy* 68 (1971): 87–106.

"Why the Law of Effect Will Not Go Away," *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 5 (1975): 169–87.

"True Believers: the Intentional Strategy and Why it Works," in *Scientific Explanation*, ed. A. F. Heath (Oxford, 1981).

"Three Kinds of Intentional Psychology," in *Reduction, Time and Reality*, ed. Richard Healey (Cambridge, 1981).

Ed. with Douglas Hofstadter, *The Mind's I: Fantasies and Reflections on Self and Soul* (New York, 1981).

"Beyond Belief," in *Thought and Object: Essays on Intentionality*, ed. A. Woodfield (Oxford, 1982), pp. 1–96.

"Intentional Systems in Cognitive Ethology: the 'Panglossian Paradigm' Defended," with commentaries, *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 6 (1983): 343–90.

"Quining Qualia," in *Consciousness in Modern Science*, ed. A. Marcel and E. Bisiach (Oxford, 1988), pp. 42–77.

"Real Patterns," *Journal of Philosophy* 88 (1991): 27–51.

"Time and the Observer: The Where and When of Consciousness in the Brain," with M. Kinsbourne, followed by commentaries, *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 15 (1992): 183–247.

"Artificial Life as Philosophy," *Artificial Life* 1 (1994): 291–2.

"Dennett, Daniel C.," in *A Companion to the Philosophy of Mind*, ed. Samuel Guttenplan (Oxford, 1994), pp. 236–44.

"The Virtues of Virtual Machines," with Shannon Densmore, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 59 (1999): 747–67.

"Making Tools for Thinking," in *Metarepresentations: A Multidisciplinary Perspective*, ed. D. Sperber (New York, 2000): 17–29.

"Who's Afraid of Determinism? Rethinking Causes and Possibilities," with Christopher Taylor, in *The Oxford Handbook of Free Will*, ed. Robert Kane (Oxford, 2002), pp. 257–77.

"In Darwin's Wake, Where Am I?" in *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 75 (November 2001): 13–30.

"Who's On First? Heterophenomenology Explained," *Journal of Consciousness Studies* 10 (2003): 19–30.

Further Reading

Bio Dict Psych, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*

Brook, Andrew, and Don Ross, eds. *Daniel Dennett* (Cambridge, UK, 2002).

Churchland, Paul M. "Densmore and Dennett on Virtual Machines and Consciousness," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 59 (1999): 763–7.

Dahlbom, Bo, ed. *Dennett and His Critics: Demystifying Mind* (Oxford, 1993).

Elton, Matthew. *Daniel Dennett: Reconciling Science and Our Self-conception* (Malden, Mass., 2003).

Fodor, Jerry. *A Theory of Content and Other Essays* (Cambridge, Mass., 1990).

———, "Deconstructing Dennett's Darwin," *Mind and Language* 11 (1996): 246–62.

Hill, Christopher, ed. "The Philosophy of Daniel Dennett," *Philosophical Topics* 22 (Spring–Fall 1995). Special issue on Dennett.

Hornsby, Jennifer. "Dennett's Naturalism," in *Simple Mindedness: In Defense of Naïve Naturalism in the Philosophy of Mind* (Cambridge, Mass., 1997), pp. 168–84.

McLaughlin, Brian P. "Why Intentional Systems Theory Cannot Reconcile Physicalism with Realism about Belief and Desire," *Protosociology* 14 (2000): 145–57.

Ramberg, Bjørn. "Dennett's Pragmatism," *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 53 (1999): 61–86.

Rorty, Richard. "Dennett on Awareness," *Philosophical Studies* 23 (1972): 153–62.

Rosenthal, David M. "Multiple Drafts and Higher-order Thoughts," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 53 (1993): 911–8.

Ross, Don, Andrew Brook, and David Thompson, eds. *Dennett's Philosophy: A Comprehensive Assessment* (Cambridge, Mass., 2000).

Stich, Stephen. "Dennett on Intentional Systems," *Philosophical Topics* 12 (1981): 39–62.

Symons, John. *On Dennett* (Blemont, Cal., 2002).

Christopher Viger

DEUTSCH, Eliot (1931–)

Eliot Deutsch was born on 8 January 1931 in Gary, Indiana. After the death of his father, who was a successful building contractor and developer, he and his mother moved to Chicago. His mother, while trained as a librarian, was a devoted housewife and volunteer worker. Deutsch received his BS degree from the University of Wisconsin in 1952, then went on to do graduate study briefly at the University of Chicago (concentrating on art history and philosophy) before going to Harvard for one year of graduate work in architecture. After being drafted and serving time in the army he attended Columbia University, where in 1960 he received his PhD degree in philosophy. His dissertation focused on the modern Indian philosopher Sri Aurobindo, whose demonstration of the inseparable relationships between philosophical and spiritual imperatives strongly attracted Deutsch's interest.

Deutsch's academic career began at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in 1960 and flourished when he moved to the University of Hawaii in 1967 as professor of philosophy and successor to Charles A. Moore as editor

of *Philosophy East and West* (a position that he held from 1967 until 1987). During Deutsch's tenure as editor, this became the major academic journal in the field of Asian and comparative philosophy. He also directed the East–West Philosopher's Conference program from 1970 through the Sixth Conference held in 1989 on the theme "Culture and Modernity." The Conference drew 130 scholars from over thirty-three countries. Deutsch has chaired the Hawaii philosophy department from 1997 to the present. In addition to being invited to speak at over thirty-four colleges and universities in Europe, Asia and the Americas, he has been a visiting professor at the University of Chicago and at Harvard University, and a visiting fellow at Clare Hall, Cambridge, to which he was elected a life member in 1999.

Deutsch has been a pioneering leader in the field of comparative philosophy, carrying on the work of Charles A. Moore and Wing-Tsit CHAN and standing shoulder to shoulder with such allies as Roger T. Ames and David L. Hall, Tu Wei-Ming, Henry Rosemont, Jr., Herbert FINGARETTE, and J. N. MOHANTY. Deutsch has contributed to this field not simply through critical commentary on specific texts of Eastern philosophies, but by his creative reworking of themes and concepts from a broad range of philosophical sources, as much from the West as the East. There are many voices present in each of his works, not so much vying with each other as offering ingredients conducive toward his own unique style of thought and expression. His latest published major work, *Persons and Valuable Worlds: A Global Philosophy* (2001), shows clearly his philosophical career as one devoted to exploring philosophies from around the globe and appropriating them in his own creative enterprise. But it also speaks of the philosopher himself as well, for it takes a truly "global philosopher" to harmonize these many voices and compose such a philosophy.

Multivalenced as it may be, Deutsch's thinking is pre-eminently colored by the meta-physical non-dualism of the Indian school Advaita Vedānta (literally, the "non-dual" school of thought based upon the "end" or "culmination" of the *Vedas*, that is, the *Upaniśads*). As Deutsch himself "reconstructs" this philosophy (in *Advaita Vedānta: A Philosophical Reconstruction*, 1969), following the commentary of its chief exponent, åankara (788–820 CE), "reality" is unitary, timeless, spaceless, and totally transcends human conceptual knowledge and language. While this level of reality (or alternatively, Brahman) transcends the grasp of the human mind, it is the essence of our being, one and the same with the innermost reality of the Self (or, Atman). Hence the famous expression of the *Upaniśads*, *tat tvam asi*, "thou art that," meaning that the ground of the self, the Atman, *is* in fact one with the ground of all being, Brahman. Since reality is, in fact, unitary and beyond determination, the world as it appears (dualistic and bounded) is not reality, but *māyā* the play of illusion. As the title of this school of thought indicates, however, the realm of *māyā* is not separate from reality, nor is it truly other than reality: reality, in essence, is *non-dual*. It is only our ignorance (*avidyā*) which, by mistaking what is of reality for illusion and what is illusion for reality, mistakes the world for what it is – the free, purposeless creative play of Tśvara, or Brahman in the determinate guise of creator. That is, lacking knowledge of reality, of oneness, we accept the world of appearance, with all its inherent conflict and impermanence, as all that is, and so are caught in its ensnaring webs. We take the world seriously, and so find ourselves seriously at odds with it, with others, and with ourselves. The wise, rather, having an enlightened knowledge of reality, become "liberated" from the world (*mokśa*), and are free to enjoy the play, free to join in creation and partake of its beauty, without taking it all that seriously, without, that is, needing an answer to "why?"

Deutsch's philosophy likewise enjoins us to appreciate the inherent beauty of existence

through the free creative play of our own personhood, such personhood understood as an achievement, a work ever in progress, and as the central task in the cultivation of our humanity. "A person," he writes in *Persons and Valuable Worlds*, "is a creative articulation, in varying degrees of rightness, of his or her individuality within the matrix of social community and within the enduring reality of the Self" (2001, p. 3). One's individuality is largely the matrix of personal and environmental conditions that particularize oneself and distinguish one from others, while the "Self" is that which is one with all reality, itself unconditioned, and what inherently links us with all that is. Persons, then, are more than their individuality, but less than totally real, or the Self. To achieve personhood does not mean, for Deutsch, to realize your "true self," to be true to your inner (introspectively known) self, but demands a certain, though appropriate, "masking." To be as a person is to continually reappropriate one's individuality in the given context, to tend toward possibilities that are uniquely revealed and "right" for oneself. Persons understand and accept this fluid and changing condition of their personhood, and lovingly relinquish attachments to ego. Thus maturing as a person "is a matter not of discovering who I am but of creating the socially informed sensitive person that is right for me. A person who is right is like a work of art; he or she is a simplification that is richly constituted," and there can be no one, single "right" articulation (2001, p. 27). This is the freedom opened and necessary for creativity, and is the space within which one "plays" one's humanity, such play being an integration of meaning and form that is spontaneous yet stable.

Since reality is cognitively unknowable, nothing of this conditioned world, or what we may say of it, or even do in it, is ultimately real, or true. Largely following åankara, truth (or, for Deutsch, "rightness") is never ultimate and always open to revision, since whatever is said to be true is so if and only if there is no "correct alternative to [it] within the matrix of its presentation" (*On Truth: An Ontological Theory*, 1979, p. 93). What is remarkable about his definition of truth is that it is formulated with an eye first to truth as displayed by works of art and truth as evinced by religious language, and only then does it seek to account for propositional truth. In each case, Deutsch argues, we must understand the degree to which a work, textual or artistic, appropriately realizes its own "intentionality," such intentionality being the "direction" toward which a work moves, which we recognize by understanding the field of possibilities open to it, and indeed, opened *by* the work (or proposition) itself. But inherent in this "universal" theory of truth (since it can be applied equally to aesthetic, religious, and epistemic contexts) is a lack of ultimacy: ultimate, or final, perfect truth is not available to us on the conditioned level (or to what he also terms our "bounded consciousness"). Only enlightened realization of unity, of reality, can be said to be ultimate. Yet far from making skeptics or cynics of us, this opens up and greatly expands the realm of creativity, even and especially in philosophy, for at root all discourse and human work is a kind of fiction: not ultimately true or real, yet inherently open to the possibility of beauty and valuable, loving achievement.

This lack of ultimate verifiability which constitutes a more fertile ground for creativity and freedom is likewise seen in Deutsch's musings on aesthetics (especially as expressed in *Essays on the Nature of Art*, 1996). What makes a particular art work beautiful, or even what "art" itself is, is not a question that can be answered without considering *how* the work is seen, how it in fact expresses itself in a play of imagination, a play enacted by *both* the seeing and the work itself. As imitative, a work of art "acts out" its meaning or aesthetic content, such acting out rooted in a natural yet spiritual ground of being, such that an aspect of reality itself comes to expres-

sion in the art work, yet always in a mode appropriate to its particular form and context. When such expression is "right" or appropriate for a particular work we notice such rightness as beauty, and see the fulfillment of the work's intentionality as an integral part of its aesthetic accomplishment. In summarizing his view of the art work Deutsch says: "A work of art, even though culturally embedded, thus has its own intentionality, which is precisely its aiming to be aesthetically forceful, meaningful, and beautiful." (1996, p. 33) But like creative personhood, it is still play, a play that can reveal a truth of being (wherein it carries a certain "authenticity") – and so fall within the realm of the meaningful – but is just as likely to reveal the inherent "no-meaning" of existence, or what he terms the absurd. To accomplish this means that the work reveals something of the radical "discontinuity" of being, the radical difference between the world perceived as real through *avidyā* and the infinite unity of being realized through enlightenment. There is thus a profound alliance between art and religion, as both may point to, though never embody fully, spiritual reality. Yet the work of art, through a certain aesthetic content, enables one to realize something of the nature of the self, and so of Reality.

This non-reducibility of Reality to human comprehension, which is seen precisely in the light of enlightened realization, likewise leads to his playful ruminations on the nature of religion. In *Religion and Spirituality* (1995) Deutsch explores the nature of, and the relationships between, religion and spirituality, sometimes in directly "authorial" discourse and sometimes more metaphorically through the use of a wide variety of linguistic forms. The text includes philosophical commentary and analysis, plays, aphorisms, dialogues, monologues, stories, prose-poems, definitions, meditations, and discussions, a panoply of forms that Deutsch himself muses may well be a kind of "postmodern" discourse,

"but only if this writer's voice is allowed as well to have something essentially to do with the meaning that is inscribed" (1995, p. x). Perhaps Deutsch is hinting that we would do well to read this text as an "appropriate" expression of Deutsch's own creativity, and listen for its "rightness" within the context of its own intentionality. Such an intentionality can only be discerned by the individual reader, but perhaps Deutsch furnishes us with another clue of sorts. In Part 1, entitled "A Phenomenology of Spirituality," he writes of solitude, spiritual passivity, divine love, and wisdom; speaking of wisdom he says, "Wisdom, in short, does not deliver knowledge; it tells us what is worth knowing – and especially not-knowing." (1995, p. 10) This is perhaps indicative of the work itself, as the text teaches by pointing us toward that "radical discontinuity of being," in its own discontinuous modes of discourse.

Thus mirroring the Vedāntic "non-dual dichotomy" of reality and *māyā* and its discourse on ignorance (*avidyā*), Eliot Deutsch's lifelong pursuit has been, on one portrayal, to deeply understand and joyfully exhibit the *Spielraum* that opens up between an ineffable reality and our relatively absurd human condition. "The ontologist's dilemma: in being one loses the power of speech; with beings there is nothing truthful to say. Silence becomes the place for listening." (1992, p. 97) From silence and spontaneous being come creativity, egoless love, and the source of all beauty, and into silence all that is created, loved, and beautiful will return. Deutsch's profound understanding of this spiritual dimension of all existence not only informs his own creative ventures, but challenges all of us, qua persons, to give ear to this silence, and so discover the sources of our own creative and aesthetically meaningful play.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Bhagavad Gita: An English Translation from the Sanskrit with Introductory Essays and Philosophical

Analyses (New York, 1968).

Advaita Vedānta: A Philosophical Reconstruction (Honolulu, 1969).

Humanity and Divinity: An Essay in Comparative Metaphysics (Honolulu, 1970).

Studies in Comparative Aesthetics (Honolulu, 1975).

On Truth: An Ontological Theory (Honolulu, 1979).

Creative Being: The Crafting of Person and World (Honolulu, 1992).

Religion and Spirituality (Albany, N.Y., 1995).

Essays on the Nature of Art (Albany, N.Y., 1996).

Persons and Valuable Worlds: A Global Philosophy (Lanham, Md., 2001).

Other Relevant Works

"Sri Aurobindo's Interpretation of Spiritual Experience: A Critique," *International Philosophical Quarterly* 4 (1964): 581–94.

"Karma as a 'Convenient Fiction' in Advaita Vedānta," *Philosophy East and West* 15 (1965): 3–12.

"On the Concept of Art," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 3 (1976): 373–98.

"Causality and Creativity," *International Philosophical Quarterly* 18 (1978): 19–32.

"The Ontological Power of Speech," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 12 (1985): 117–30.

Ed. with Gerald Larson, *Interpreting Across Boundaries: New Essays in Comparative Philosophy* (Princeton, N.J., 1988).

"Community as Ritual Participation," in *On Community*, ed. Leroy S. Rouner (Notre Dame, Ind., 1991), pp. 15–26.

"Creative Friendship," in *The Changing Face of Friendship*, ed. Leroy S. Rouner (Notre Dame, Ind., 1994).

Ed., *Introduction to World Philosophies* (New York, 1996).

"Loneliness and Solitude," in *Loneliness*, ed. Leroy S. Rouner (Notre Dame, Ind., 1998).

"Rationality and Tradition(s)," in *The Empirical and the Transcendental: A Fusion of Horizons*, ed. Bina Gupta (Lanham, Md., 2000).

Further Reading

Ames, Roger, ed. *The Aesthetic Turn: Reading Eliot Deutsch on Comparative Philosophy* (Chicago, 2000).

Levine, Michael. "No-self, Real Self, Ignorance and Self-deception: Does Self-deception Require a Self?" *Asian Philosophy* 8 (1998): 103–10.

Puligandla, R. "Professor Deutsch on Karma," *Darshana International* 10 (1970): 27–33.

Marty H. Heitz

DEUTSCH, Karl Wolfgang (1912–92)

Karl Wolfgang Deutsch was born on 21 July 1912 in Prague, Austro-Hungary, to German-speaking parents. His father Martin was an optician and his mother Maria Scharf was one of the first female parliamentarians of the newly established Czechoslovakia following World War I. Deutsch graduated from the German Staatsrealgymnasium in Prague with high honors in 1931. He received his first university degree from the Deutsche Universität, also in Prague, in 1934. Deutsch's outspoken leadership of anti-Nazi groups forced him to interrupt his studies and seek refuge in England where he studied optics and mathematics. Though he never pursued a career in optics, his sojourn in England helped him develop an interest in quantitative political science both as a fundamentally new epistemology as well as an innovative methodology.

Deutsch returned to Prague to obtain his JD law degree from Czech national Charles University in 1938, graduating with high honors in seven fields. This was a signal honor for a German-ethnic Czech in this time of bitter antagonism between ethnic Czechs and Germans. In 1939 he was awarded a fellowship to study at Harvard University, from which he received the PhD in political science in 1951. America's entry into World War II led Deutsch to offer his services to the United States government as an analyst of authoritarian and totalitarian political systems. It was through this involvement that Deutsch became one of the main contributors to the famous "Blue Book" on Juan Domingo Peron's efforts to extinguish democracy in Argentina. Deutsch also participated in the International Secretariat of the San Francisco Conference of 1945 which created the United Nations.

Deutsch taught political science at Massachusetts Institute of Technology from 1945 to 1956 and then at Yale University until 1967, when Deutsch moved to Harvard University as professor of government. He was named Stanfield Professor of International Peace at Harvard in 1971, a post he held until he retired in 1983. He was President of the New England Political Science Association in 1964–5, the American Political Science Association in 1969–70, and the International Political Science Association during 1976–9. Deutsch was also a member of the National Academy of Science and of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Deutsch died on 1 November 1992 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Deutsch was part of the trans-Atlantic migration of European intellectuals who sought refuge in America from the Nazi regime. Though he never returned to live in his homeland, Deutsch frequently toured the United States to speak on behalf of the Free Czechoslovak movement. In his adopted country, Deutsch dedicated himself to work on behalf of a general improvement of the human condition. He made it his life's purpose to study politics in order to help people overcome the dangers of large wars, hunger, poverty, and population growth. Deutsch never surrendered his immense talents to the sole pursuit of an academic career and always perceived his scholarship as part of a larger commitment to improve the human condition. Ever the optimist until his dying day, he was convinced that more knowledge, better education, and improved channels of communication will inevitably lead to better understanding among peoples and thus to a much-improved world of reduced conflict, if not everlasting peace.

Even before he finished his dissertation, Deutsch began publishing articles on the complex interactions among intolerance, religion, territoriality, freedom, and economic development. His early work showed both the promise of his mature scholarship and, more significantly, discernment in his view of society and politics. His dissertation, "Nationalism and Social Communication," was a path-breaking study of modern nationalism's dual oppositions of cohesiveness and integration as well as its destructive-alienating dimensions. Deutsch's dissertation also broke new methodological grounds by using sophisticated quantitative analyses to illustrate the relationship between politics and society both in a diachronic as well as synchronic dimension. Deutsch's dissertation was published as a book with the same title in 1953; it has remained a classic in the literature of political science and the study of nationalism to this day.

While teaching at MIT, Deutsch became interested in the ideas of Norbert WIENER, one of the inventors of cybernetics and its application to the social sciences. While he was at the Center for Research on World Political Institutions at Princeton University in 1953–4, Deutsch and his colleagues applied these ideas into a theoretical analysis of large-scale political integration, *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area* (1957). In 1956–7, while a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences in Palo Alto,

California, he laid the basis for another book that used an innovative application of cybernetics to the study of politics. This book, *The Nerves of Government* (1963), revolutionized the discipline of political science. Once again using concepts derived from cybernetics, Deutsch made a nuanced analysis of essential political mechanisms such as power, authority, governance, cohesion, conflict, guidance, and breakdown. It was also at this time that Deutsch held a visiting professorship at the University of Chicago in 1954 and received his first Guggenheim Fellowship in 1955.

In *Germany Rejoins the Powers*, with Lewis J. Edinger (1959), Deutsch used data on public opinion, the background of elites, and economics to analyze West Germany's postwar progress. Another highly original study of politics and society is his seminal article "Social Mobilization and Political Development" (1961). While at Yale during the 1960s, Deutsch established the Yale Political Data Program, to develop quantitative indicators for testing significant theories and propositions in social science. He organized a multi-university research team, sometimes called the Yale Arms Control Project, to investigate the prospects for arms control, disarmament, and steps toward unification in Western and Central Europe. This project also assumed an increasingly prominent role in the development of an international social science network. During his Yale years, Deutsch also held visiting professorships at Heidelberg University in Germany and at Nuffield College of Oxford University.

Deutsch was also a great teacher, supervising the doctoral work of an unusually large number of students, all of whom became major political scientists in their own right and assumed prestigious posts at the world's leading research universities where they continued to uphold Karl Deutsch's intellectual legacy. It was at Yale that an informal but certainly palpable "Deutsch school of political science" emerged. Moreover, it was during this period that Deutsch became far and away the most frequently cited scholar of international relations in the leading academic

journals of this field. On the undergraduate level, Deutsch attained legendary status on campus by giving countless lectures on the most varied topics, always to packed venues. Virtually without exception, each lecture was followed by an ovation, rewarding Deutsch's unique style of combining a breathtaking array of empirical examples culled from all over the world from antiquity to the present with a breezy delivery full of wit and humor. The Yale Political Union awarded Deutsch with the prestigious William Benton Prize in 1965 for having done the most among the Yale faculty to stimulate and maintain political interest on campus.

Deutsch was also invested with the directorship of the International Institute for Comparative Social Research of the Science Center in Berlin where he and his team of international scholars pioneered and refined the study of global modeling in political science.

Deutsch's scholarly legacy to the various subfields comprising the discipline of political science, as well as to the social sciences in general, includes the introduction of quantitative methodology requiring rigorous statistical analyses and measurements. He also conceptualized empirically grounded theories of such crucial issues as nation-building, state-building, social mobilization, national and international integration, center-periphery relations, and the distribution of power between, within, and among states. He contributed to communication theory, particularly cybernetics, using in Wiener's work that Deutsch introduced some aspects of John VON NEUMANN's influential breakthroughs in game theory that later become a mainstay of political science by the 1980s.

Deutsch's work was profoundly interdisciplinary and he freely used concepts borrowed from anthropology, sociology, economics, statistics, mathematics, biology, and physics. His work always had a strong empirical dimension, remaining firmly anchored in history and geography. He feared that political science, like any social science, ran the risk of becoming vacuous if it drifted too far away from studying empirical reality in favor of abstract theoreti-

cal models. Throughout his life, Deutsch remained an avid reader of history and his work reflects his deep commitment to historical knowledge.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Nationalism and Social Communication: An Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality (Cambridge, Mass., 1953).

Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience, with S. A. Burrell, R. A. Kann, M. Lee, Jr., et al. (Princeton, N.J., 1957).

Germany Rejoins the Powers: Mass Opinion, Interest Groups, and Elites in Contemporary German Foreign Policy, with L. J. Edinger (Stanford, Cal., 1959).

"Social Mobilization and Political Development," *American Political Science Review* 55 (1961): 493–514.

The Nerves of Government: Models of Political Communication and Control (New York, 1963).

Arms Control and the Atlantic Alliance: Europe Faces Coming Policy Decisions (New York, 1967).

The Analysis of International Relations (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1968).

Nationalism and Its Alternatives (New York, 1969).

Politics and Government: How People Decide Their Fate (Boston, 1970).

Other Relevant Works

Arms Control and the Atlantic Alliance: Europe Faces Coming Policy Decisions (New York, 1967).

France, Germany and the Western Alliance: A Study of Elite Attitudes on European Integration and World Politics, with L. J. Edinger, R. C. Macridis, and R. L. Merritt (New York, 1967).

Further Reading

Encyc Social Behav Sci, Who Was Who in Amer v11

Merritt, Richard L., and B. M. Russett, eds. *From National Development to Global Community: Essays in Honor of Karl W. Deutsch* (London, 1981).

Vickers, Jill McCalla. *An Examination of the Scientific Mode of Enquiry in Politics with Special Reference to Systems Theory in the Works of Easton, Almond, Kaplan and Deutsch* (New York, 1991).

Andrei S. Markovits

DEWEY, John (1859–1952)

John Dewey was born on 20 October 1859 in Burlington, Vermont, and died on 1 June 1952 in New York City. The son of a grocer, Archibald, who served as a quartermaster in the Union Army during the civil war, Dewey spent his youth and college years in Burlington. His mother, Lucina, was an evangelical Christian who encouraged her sons to have a personal relationship with Jesus, but she also insisted that they be educated. Dewey was increasingly uneasy with the first expectation but readily embraced the second. While at the University of Vermont Dewey was introduced to a traditional form of philosophy, but he also read widely on his own in intellectual and literary journals. Upon graduation with his BA in 1879, he taught high school in Pennsylvania and Vermont for three years, and continued his philosophical reading with his college teacher, H. A. P. TORREY, upon his return to Vermont. He then entered the newly established Johns Hopkins University in 1882 to pursue graduate work in philosophy. There he encountered Charles S. PEIRCE, who was teaching logic, and G. Stanley HALL, the experimental psychologist. Peirce was inventing pragmatism, and Hall had been a student of William JAMES, who publicly introduced the term "pragmatism" and developed an alternative version to Peirce's. But the

philosopher who influenced Dewey the most during his graduate study was the historically oriented neo-Hegelian George S. Morris. Upon completing the PhD in philosophy in 1884, Dewey joined Morris as an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Michigan. In 1888 Dewey accepted the position of head of the philosophy department at the University of Minnesota.

In 1889 Morris suddenly died, and Dewey returned to Michigan as the chair of the philosophy department. In 1894 he moved to the recently founded University of Chicago as the head of the department of philosophy, psychology and pedagogy. It was during these years that Dewey was drifting away from Hegelianism, as he later described it, and began to formulate his instrumentalist version of pragmatism. The process was mostly complete by the time he resigned from Chicago in 1904. In later reminiscences Dewey said that a "Hegelian deposit" remained with him throughout his career, but thought that he had contributed to the development of a pragmatism, or instrumentalism, as he came to regard his version of pragmatism, that had moved beyond Hegelian idealism. The years at Chicago were productive, and two of his colleagues, George H. Mead and James H. Tufts, who had also been at Michigan, became lifelong friends and collaborators. Unfortunately, Dewey and Chicago's President, William Rainey Harper, had an unpleasant disagreement over Harper's handling of an institutional restructuring of the experimental "Dewey" school which Dewey had founded, that had dismissed Dewey's wife, Alice, as its Principal.

Dewey was invited by Columbia University to be a central member of their philosophical department, and he began teaching there as professor of philosophy in 1905. This began a long association that saw him become a world-renowned figure and America's best-known philosopher in the first half of the twentieth century. It was during the almost fifty years that he lived in New York City that he published his major books and was in heavy demand as a teacher, lecturer, writer, and public figure.

Dewey had long been involved in public affairs – he was on the first board of Jane Addams's Hull House in Chicago – and was an advocate for various liberal causes, writing for the *New Republic* and other intellectual journals. In 1909 he played a minor role in the founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. He was more involved in the founding of the American Association of University Professors, serving as its first President in 1915. Dewey was initially opposed to American involvement in World War I, but finally decided on pragmatic grounds to support Woodrow Wilson's war policy. This strained his relationship with Jane Addams and other pacifists, notably the passionate and articulate young writer, Randolph Bourne. Dewey was disappointed in his support of Wilson but later said he would have made the same decision again, given what he knew at the time. Nevertheless, he became the principal intellectual supporter of the Outlawry of War movement in the 1920s, and did not support entering World War II, fearful of the harm to American civil liberties. Dewey was convinced that social intelligence was possible even with regard to the momentous and emotionally charged issues of war and peace.

In the 1930s Dewey became even more involved in public affairs. He was active in the League for Independent Political Action's efforts to form a third political party. This placed him in opposition to Franklin D. Roosevelt's Democratic Party and the New Deal, which he considered too much of a blind trial-and-error effort. He favored a more explicitly experimental and socialist approach. He also chaired the commission that examined the charges brought against Leon Trotsky in the Moscow Trials. In the highly charged ideological battles of the time, this was no small or casually assumed task. Still another fray, which he entered with a calm but passionate commitment to cooperative intelligence, was one involving the grievances of the Communist

Party insurgents within the New York City Teachers Union. Dewey patiently chaired the grievance committee, providing a working example of his faith in democracy and inquiry. Any understanding of Dewey as a philosopher must take into account this devotion to intelligent inquiry and practice.

Dewey retired from Columbia in 1929, shortly after the death of Alice, but remained at the university until 1939 as an emeritus professor and an advisor to doctoral students. Dewey remarried in 1946, and continued to publish on philosophy and social issues until his death in 1952.

Dewey was a prolific writer. The critical edition published by Southern Illinois University Press contains thirty-seven volumes. One major early and very influential article is "The Reflex Arc Concept in Psychology" (1896), in which Dewey provided an integrated understanding of psycho-physical action that overcomes mind–body dualism. Dewey moved easily between philosophy, psychology, and education. Philosophy and psychology were just separating into distinct disciplines at the end of the nineteenth century, so it was not unusual for one to be engaged in what are now considered distinct fields. What distinguished Dewey, particularly in the Chicago years, was his interest in education and his intellectual leadership of the "Dewey School." This experience provided the basis for his *School and Society* (1899), bringing him to the attention not only of philosophers but also the educated public. Dewey was also interested in epistemology and logic, publishing with his colleagues at Chicago a volume of essays, *Studies in Logical Theory* (1903). Dewey's four essays were revised and joined with more on knowledge and truth for *Essays in Experimental Logic* (1916).

Another collaborative volume was the widely used *Ethics* textbook, jointly authored by Dewey and Tufts (1908). A book concerned with both logic and education, reflecting Dewey's interest in promoting a critical and experimental intelligence, was *How We Think* (1910). But the book that Dewey himself thought for many years best captured his whole thought was *Democracy and Education* (1916). Dewey understood the desired form of schooling (and education generally) to be a democratic practice. It was not just that education reflected society, but a democratic society was enhanced by schools (and other educational activities) that were democratic in character. This continuity of means and ends, as we shall see below, is one of the most distinctive features of Dewey's thinking.

Perhaps the book that best serves as a programmatic statement for his later work is *Reconstruction in Philosophy* (1920). Originally delivered as lectures at the Imperial University in Tokyo in 1919, *Reconstruction* anticipates many of his major books of the 1920s and 30s. The first of these is *Human Nature and Conduct* (1922), which develops a social psychology. Through his naturalistic approach to ethics, it provides the intellectual understanding of human conduct that makes his ethical proposals feasible, working out his understanding of the social individual who engages in the moral life.

The one book that many point to as Dewey's major work is *Experience and Nature* (1925). A comprehensive treatment of the way in which we interact with one another and with and within nature, *Experience and Nature* is read by many as being Dewey's metaphysics, despite the fact that he was often sharply critical of metaphysics. At best it is a new sort of metaphysics, a naturalistic one, one that describes the "generic features" of our existence without any recourse to the supernatural or a reality behind the appearances. A book review by George Santayana accused Dewey of a "half-hearted naturalism" because it allowed the foreground of human experience to dominate the rest of existence. Hence it was no true naturalism, for "in nature there is no foreground or background, no here, no now, no moral cathedra, no centre so really central as to reduce all other things to mere margins and mere perspectives" (1925). Dewey denied that he had

compromised his naturalism by privileging human experience, instead giving an accurate account of the place of experience within nature.

Experience and Nature was followed by *The Quest for Certainty* (1929), which deals with another core concern of philosophy: epistemology or the theory of knowledge. He subtitled the book, *A Study of the Relation of Knowledge and Action*, thus connecting it to his ongoing concern with intelligent action, and much of the book is an attack on traditional essentialist and foundationalist theories of knowledge. Some have quipped that a better title would be *The Quest Against Certainty*; it is an account of how we can live (and know) without certainty because it is a profound mistake to seek security in certainty. Security is to be found in a fallibilist, probabilistic way of knowing–acting.

The Public and Its Problems (1927) reacted to Walter LIPPMANN, the well-regarded public intellectual and Dewey's fellow contributor to the *New Republic*, who had published two books that called into question the feasibility of democracy. In Lippmann's view the public was not competent to govern; at best it can choose between competing groups of insiders to serve as their elected representatives. Dewey took up the challenge in *The Public and Its Problems*, describing how a mass society could be a democratic one. This book is not his entire political philosophy, only taking up the task of showing how the changing society of the 1920s could be a richly democratic one by becoming more adept at exercising social intelligence.

Dewey continued to speak to political, educational, and ethical issues in the 1930s in *Individualism, Old and New* (1930), *Liberalism and Social Action* (1935), *Freedom and Culture* (1939), *Experience and Education* (1938), and *Theory of Valuation* (1939). But the more remarkable books, in terms of the reaction they received, were *A Common Faith* (1934), *Art as Experience* (1934), and *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry* (1938). *A Common Faith* is interesting because Dewey was perceived as a secular humanist with little or no interest in religion, but here he recast his pragmatic naturalism as a religious way of life. Making a distinction between "religion" and "the religious," he proposed that one could, without reference to or dependence upon the supernatural, develop a meaningful life of passionate intelligence. Also catching some by surprise were his Harvard University William James Lectures on art and aesthetic experience. Building on what he had written in *Experience and Nature*, Dewey put forward an original contribution to the philosophy of art. He was concerned to show that a work of art originates in experience – hence the title, *Art as Experience* – but also that experience, the interaction of an organism with its environment, can be something other than routine or desultory. It can be artfully done. Dewey showed how we can intelligently transform our lives, making them more satisfactory than they would otherwise be.

Less well received was Dewey's *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry*, the culmination of his efforts to devise intellectual tools for dealing with human problems. However, mainstream philosophy was not interested in this approach, finding promise instead in the developments in formal logic and its promise of an ideal language that could accurately represent reality. The reception of Dewey's *Logic* was not helped by Bertrand Russell's highly negative reaction (reprinted in Schilpp 1939) and Dewey's efforts to reply (see Burke 1994).

Most interpreters of Dewey have chosen to understand his work from a particular vantage point, such as politics, art, ethics, or religion. It is difficult to hold together all of his philosophical goals over his long career, but some pervasive themes can be identified. One way to start is with a story he told in *The School and Society*, about his search for appropriate desks for the University of Chicago Elementary School. Dewey recalled his troubles "trying to find desks and chairs … suitable … to the needs of the children." One dealer, whom Dewey significantly describes as being "more intelligent than the rest," finally put his finger on the problem: "I am afraid we have not what you

want. You want something at which the children may work; these are all for listening" (1899). In traditional education, students were regarded as passive absorbers of information from a teacher or a textbook. In Dewey's school, students were to be active learners, pursuing their interests within the limits established by the teacher and curriculum. As he observed a few years later, in traditional education "the tendency is to reduce the activity of mind to a docile or passive taking in of the material presented – in short to memorizing, with simply incidental use of judgment and of active research. As is frequently stated, acquiring takes the place of inquiring" (*Democracy and Education*, 1916). As children developed into adults, he hoped that they would become active learners and inquirers, intelligently capable of modern experimental science.

Intelligence for Dewey is the use of indirect action (or means) to accomplish that (an end) which cannot be seized directly. Science, or directed experimental inquiry, is an intensification of the natural process of experimental learning. He wrote: "The organism is a part of the natural world; its interactions with it are genuine additive phenomena. When, with the development of symbols, also a natural occurrence, these interactions are directed towards anticipated consequences, they gain the quality of intelligence … " (1929). Dewey was not just a pragmatist; he was a pragmatic naturalist. His instrumentalism was set within a naturalistic (as opposed to supernaturalistic) context. He valued science not only for what it could teach us about inquiry but also for its results. The world described by science, both physical and social, was world enough for the secular Dewey, where "secular" means "having to do with this world" and not "anti-religious."

This understanding of learning and orientation toward science led Dewey not only into conflicts with traditionalists generally but with philosophy as traditionally understood. It was no longer philosophy's task to describe reality and to access that reality by reason. Philosophy should become "a method, cultivated by philoso-phers for dealing with" human problems. The story that best captures this shift is the one told by Charles FRANKEL, who as a graduate student at Columbia attended the 1939 American Philosophical Association dinner that honored Dewey's eightieth birthday:

> When Dewey was eighty, he engaged in a debate, at a meeting of the American Philosophical Association, with his old friend and Columbia colleague, William Pepperell MONTAGUE, in the course of which Montague complimented him for his life-long effort to practicalize intelligence. Dewey replied quietly but firmly that Montague was taking a narrow, inbred view – a philosopher's trade-union view, he implied – of what he, Dewey had tried to accomplish. His effort had not been to practicalize intelligence but to intellectualize practice. (quoted in Eldridge 1998, p. 5)

To understand intelligent practice, begin with our engagement in practices, our ongoing activities. These activities, what Dewey elsewhere terms "habits," came about to meet some need, but over time they cease to be appropriate to our changing needs. Thus we need to rethink what we are doing, to make sure that there is a match between means and ends. The method whereby we make our practices more intelligent is inquiry. The philosopher's task is not to take reason and try to figure out how to apply it – the practicalizing intelligence approach rejected by Dewey. Rather, the philosopher's job is to identify the significant disjunctions between our needs, habits, and objectives and to help us rethink what we are doing. She can assist in the intellectualizing of practice.

This is no easy task, for the cultural deposits in our thinking are deeply buried and not easily recovered, examined, or changed. Often they are firmly embedded in our moralities and religions and imbued with an absoluteness and sacredness that elicits a do-not-touch attitude. But Dewey thought that nothing was beyond a possibly transforming investigation. The task of

philosophy is to identify these tensions in society where a no longer fully effective practice needs a transformation. Such tensions exemplify the tension between ideal and actual that Dewey took to be central to philosophy. But "ideal" did not mean for Dewey something that was perfect or timeless. Rather, something was ideal if it was a "generalized end-in-view." It arises naturally and is cultivated by us. It is our making-desirable that which naturally occurs.

A third Deweyan ideal, in addition to science and intelligence, is democracy. He sought the sort of social structure that enables individuals to flourish, not just for the sake of the individuals but for the group as well. He was willing to consider many different procedures as "democratic," provided they were inclusive of people's interests and they enabled the group and its members to flourish. He did think that open and free communication was important, as was the explicit embrace of the method of experimental inquiry that he championed. Democracy for Dewey was a social instantiation of intelligence, for an ideally democratic group would be engaged in resolving its tensions through the deliberate reconstruction of its experience.

Although Dewey's ideas have enjoyed interest in recent decades, thanks in no small part to Richard RORTY, they continue to be questioned, not least of all by Rorty. What Rorty finds valuable is Dewey's anti-essentialism, anti-foundationalism, and frank constructivism. Dewey's "pragmatism," writes Rorty, "was, as Hilary PUTNAM [another prominent neo-pragmatist] has said, an 'insistence on the supremacy of the agent point of view'" (Rorty 1999, p. 88). Rorty also has said that pragmatism is "a doctrine of the relativity of normative judgments to purposes served," standing with Dewey against the traditionalist critics. But Rorty thinks that Dewey's idea of method is "vacuous," and that the linking of naturalism with pragmatism makes the mistake of doing metaphysics by trying to describe reality as such. In "Dewey's Metaphysics"

Rorty concludes, "Dewey's mistake … was the notion that criticism of culture had to take the form of a redescription of 'nature' or 'experience' or both" (Rorty 1982, p. 85). For Rorty, such descriptions are attempts to speak from a neutral vantage point about what is, whereas pragmatism requires that one speak from a particular perspective.

More damaging to Dewey's effort to transform experience is the charge that a Deweyan democracy requires citizens who are more capable of critical thinking than Dewey's critics think is possible. One does not have to subscribe to the doctrine of original sin or be cynical about human potential to be skeptical about the possibilities of social intelligence, for we have much evidence of people every day not matching up ends and means and suffering as a result. But Dewey was not the optimist that he is sometimes portrayed to be. It is true that he was hopeful that we could improve our practices, as his continuing attention to education and science suggests. But his hope was one that recognized the stupidity of which we are capable.

To conclude his 1930 autobiographical essay, "From Absolutism to Experimentalism," Dewey said, "I do not expect to see in my day a genuine, as distinct from a forced and artificial, integration of thought. But a mind that is not too egotistically impatient can have faith that this unification will issue in its season. Meantime a chief task of those who call themselves philosophers is to help get rid of the useless lumber that blocks our highways of thought, and strive to make straight and open the paths that lead to the future. Forty years spent in wandering in a wilderness like that of the present is not a sad fate – unless one attempts to make himself believe that the wilderness is after all itself the promised land." (1930, pp. 26–7) Dewey found life full of possibilities as well as perils. He chose to overcome some difficulties and exploit the possibilities, and recommended that we do the same.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Leibniz's New Essays Concerning the Human Understanding (Chicago, 1886).

Psychology (New York, 1887; 2nd edn 1889; 3rd edn 1891).

"The Reflex Arc Concept in Psychology," *Psychological Review* 3 (1896): 357–70.

The School and Society (Chicago, 1899).

Ethics, with James H. Tufts (New York, 1908; 2nd edn 1932).

How We Think (Chicago, 1910; 2nd edn 1933).

The Influence of Darwin on Philosophy and Other Essays (New York, 1910).

Democracy and Education (New York, 1916).

Essays in Experimental Logic (Chicago, 1916).

Reconstruction in Philosophy (New York, 1920).

Human Nature and Conduct: An Introduction to Social Psychology (New York, 1922; 1930).

Experience and Nature (La Salle, Ill., 1925; 2nd edn 1929).

The Public and Its Problems (New York, 1927).

The Quest for Certainty: A Study of the Relation of Knowledge and Action (New York, 1929).

Individualism, Old and New (New York, 1930).

Philosophy and Civilization (New York, 1931).

Art as Experience (New York, 1934).

A Common Faith (New Haven, Conn., 1934).

Liberalism and Social Action (New York, 1935).

Experience and Education (New York, 1938).

Logic: The Theory of Inquiry (New York, 1938).

Freedom and Culture (New York, 1939).

Theory of Valuation (Chicago, 1939).

Knowing and the Known, with Arthur F. Bentley (Boston, 1949).

Other Relevant Works

Dewey's papers are at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale. Collections of writings about Dewey are at the Center for Dewey Studies in Carbondale.

"From Absolutism to Experimentalism," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 2, pp. 13–27.

Intelligence in the Modern World: John Dewey's Philosophy, ed. Joseph Ratner (New York, 1939).

The Early Works, *1882–1898*, 5 vols (Carbondale, Ill., 1967–72).

The Middle Works, 1899–1924, 15 vols (Carbondale, Ill., 1976–83).

The Later Works, 1925–1953, 17 vols (Carbondale, Ill., 1981–90).

Lectures on Ethics, 1900–1901, ed. Donald F. Koch (Carbondale, Ill., 1991).

The Essential Dewey, 2 vols (Bloomington, Ind., 1998).

Principles of Instrumental Logic: John Dewey's Lectures in Ethics and Political Ethics, 1895–1896, ed. Donald F. Koch (Carbondale, Ill., 1998).

The Correspondence of John Dewey, 3 CD-ROM discs, ed. Larry A. Hickman (Charlottesville, Virg., 1999–2005).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Amer Phils Before 1950, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Bio Dict Psych, Bio 20thC Phils, Blackwell Amer Phil, Blackwell Comp Phils, Blackwell Comp Prag, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Dict Amer Bio, Encyc Amer Bio, Encyc Ethics, Encyc Psych, Encyc Social Behav Sci, Oxford Comp Phil, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v40, Pres Addr of APA v1, Proc of APA v26, Routledge Encycl Phil, Who Was Who in Amer v3, Who's Who in Phil

Alexander, Thomas M. *John Dewey's Theory of Art, Experience, and Nature: The Horizons of Feeling* (Albany, N.Y., 1987).

Boydston, Jo Ann, ed. *Guide to the Works of John Dewey* (Carbondale, Ill., 1970).

Burke, Tom. *Dewey's New Logic: A Reply to Russell* (Chicago, 1994).

Campbell, James. *Understanding John Dewey* (Chicago, 1995).

Coss, John J., ed. *Essays in Honor of John Dewey* (New York, 1929).

Dykhuizen, George. *The Life and Mind of John Dewey* (Carbondale, Ill., 1973).

Edel, Abraham. *Ethical Theory and Social Change: The Evolution of John Dewey's Ethics, 1908–1932* (New Brunswick, N.J., 2001).

Eldridge, Michael. *Transforming Experience: John Dewey's Cultural Instrumentalism* (Nashville, Tenn., 1998).

Garrison, James. *Dewey and Eros: Wisdom and Desire in the Art of Teaching* (New York, 1997).

Hickman, Larry A. *John Dewey's Pragmatic Technology* (Bloomington, Ind., 1990).

Hook, Sidney. *John Dewey: An Intellectual Portrait* (New York, 1939).

———, ed. *John Dewey: Philosopher of Science and Freedom* (New York, 1950).

Levine, Barbara, ed. *Works about John Dewey, 1886–1995* (Carbondale, Ill., 1996).

Martin, Jay. *The Education of John Dewey: A Biography* (New York, 2002).

Morgenbesser, Sidney, ed. *Dewey and His Critics: Essays from the Journal of Philosophy* (New York, 1977).

Rockefeller, Steven C. *John Dewey: Religious Faith and Democratic Humanism* (New York, 1991).

Rorty, Richard. *Consequences of Pragmatism* (Minneapolis, 1982).

———, *Philosophy and Social Hope* (London, 1999).

Ryan, Alan. *John Dewey and the High Tide of American Liberalism* (New York, 1995).

Santayana, George. "Dewey's Naturalistic Metaphysics," *Journal of Philosophy* 22 (1925): 673–88.

Schilpp, Paul A., ed. *The Philosophy of John Dewey* (Evanston, Ill., 1939; 3rd edn, La Salle, Ill., 1989). Contains Dewey's autobiography and a bibliography of his writings.

Shook, John R. *Dewey's Empirical Theory of Knowledge and Reality* (Nashville, Tenn., 2000).

Sleeper, R. W. *The Necessity of Pragmatism: John Dewey's Conception of Philosophy* (New Haven, Conn., 1986; Urbana, Ill., 2001).

Tiles, J. E. *Dewey* (London, 1988).

Welchman, Jennifer. *Dewey's Ethical Thought* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1995).

Westbrook, Robert B. *John Dewey and American Democracy* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1991).

Michael Eldridge

DeWOLF, Lotan Harold (1905–86)

L. Harold DeWolf was born on 31 January 1905 in Columbus, Nebraska. DeWolf followed the path of his father, Rev. Dr. Lotan R. DeWolf, to become a pastor in the Methodist Episcopal Church. DeWolf earned his BA degree from Nebraska Wesleyan University in 1924. DeWolf pursued theological studies at Boston University where he received his STB in 1926. He received the Borden Parker Bowne Fellowship in Philosophy at Boston University in 1933–4, and received his PhD in philosophy in 1935 studying under Edgar Sheffield BRIGHTMAN. His dissertation was titled "Premises of the Arguments Concerning Immortality in Thirty Ingersoll Lectures (1896–1934)." After graduating, DeWolf served as a Methodist minister in Nebraska and Massachusetts from 1926 to 1936.

DeWolf's teaching career began in 1934 in the philosophy department at Boston University where he taught until 1944, when he joined the faculty of Boston University School of Theology as professor of systematic theology. DeWolf taught twice in Central and East Africa, in 1955–6 and 1962–3. His most well-known student at Boston University was Martin Luther KING, Jr. DeWolf was King's primary teacher and mentor at Boston University. King remained in contact with DeWolf throughout his life (their letters are in King's *Papers*), and DeWolf spoke at King's funeral. In 1965 DeWolf became Dean of Wesley Theological Seminary in Washington, D.C., where he served until his retirement in 1972.

A third-generation Boston personalist, DeWolf accepted the personalistic principle that all human persons, regardless of their differences, are of sacred worth, created and loved by the Supreme Person, God. DeWolf found in Boston personalism a network of reason within which to express his Christian faith. DeWolf viewed reason and faith, not as contradictory, but as mutually reinforcing and challenging one another.

Along with Walter MUELDER, DeWolf helped Boston personalism to become more communitarian in its focus. DeWolf emphasized the connection of individual persons with their communities. He recognized that human individuals are involved in reciprocal relations in communities and that respect for the sacred worth of individual persons requires careful attention to social health and social justice in human communities. This insight led DeWolf to formulate three principles of community that have been incorporated into the moral law tradition of Boston personalism. These principles focus on the values of cooperation, social devotion, and promoting ideal community.

Although he was critically engaged with numerous social justice issues, DeWolf was especially interested in applying the communitarian personalist ideals of mutual caring and support to issues related to the criminal justice system in the United States. DeWolf believed that the focus of the criminal justice system should be on social defense and restoration rather than on punishment and retribution. He was particularly concerned with reforming socioeconomic structures that made crime more likely in society. DeWolf argued that compensation of victims and rehabilitation of offenders were keys to restorative justice and reconciliation, with the general goal of contributing to a mutually caring community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Religious Revolt Against Reason (New York, 1949).

A Theology of the Living Church (New York, 1953).

Trends and Frontiers of Religious Thought (Nashville, Tenn., 1955).

The Case for Theology in Liberal Perspective (Philadelphia, 1959).

The Enduring Message of the Bible (New York, 1960).

Present Trends in Christian Thought (New York, 1960).

Teaching Our Faith in God (New York, 1963).

Responsible Freedom: Guidelines to Christian Action (New York, 1971).

Crime and Justice in America: A Paradox of Conscience (New York, 1975). Abridged edn, *What Americans Should Do About Crime* (New York, 1976).

Eternal Life: Why We Believe (Philadelphia, 1980).

Other Relevant Works

DeWolf's papers are at Boston University and Wesley Theological Seminary.

"The Influence of Prayer on God and Man," in *Healing: Human and Divine*, ed. Simon Doniger (New York, 1957), pp. 144–61.

"How My Mind Has Changed," in *How My Mind Has Changed*, ed. Harold Fay (Cleveland and New York, 1961), pp. 133–47.

"Public and Private Dimensions of Ethical Responsibility," in *Toward a Discipline of Social Ethics: Essays in Honor of Walter George Muelder*, ed. Paul Deats, Jr. (Boston, 1972), pp. 275–94.

"Martin Luther King, Jr. as Theologian," *Journal of the Interdenominational Theological Center* 4 (Spring 1977): 1–11.

"Ethical Implications for Criminal Justice," in *The Boston Personalist Tradition on Philosophy, Social Ethics, and Theology*, ed. Paul Deats and Carol Robb (Macon, Georgia, 1986), pp. 221–36.

Further Reading

Who's Who in Phil

Burrow, Rufus, Jr. *Personalism: A Critical Introduction* (St. Louis, 1999).

Neufer, P. Dale. *A Critical Analysis of the Systematic Theology of Lotan Harold DeWolf*. ThD dissertation, Iliff School of Theology (Denver, 1972).

Mark Y. A. Davies

DIAMOND, Cora Ann (1937–)

Cora A. Diamond was born on 30 October 1937 in New York City. She attended Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania and graduated with a BA in 1957. She was a Woodrow Wilson fellow in 1957–8, and then went to England where she studied at Oxford University, earning a BPhil in 1961. Her professional career began in 1961, when she taught for a year as an assistant lecturer in philosophy at the University of Wales, Swansea. In 1962–3 she held a position as assistant lecturer in philosophy at the University of Sussex in England. From 1962 to 1971, she was lecturer in moral philosophy at the University of Aberdeen in Scotland. Diamond returned to the United States to

take up the position of associate professor in philosophy at the University of Virginia in 1971. She was promoted to full professor of philosophy in 1982, and currently is the William R. Kenan Jr. Professor of Philosophy and Professor of Law. During her time at the University of Virginia, Diamond has also been a visiting professor at Princeton University and the Alfred North Whitehead lecturer at Harvard University.

Diamond is recognized for her work on Wittgenstein, Frege, the philosophy of language, moral philosophy, and philosophy and literature. Her reputation as a Wittgenstein scholar, in particular, has established the University of Virginia as an important location for graduate students and researchers wishing to study his philosophy. In writing about her early philosophical influences in "On Wittgenstein" (2001), Diamond claims that even though she had some acquaintance with Wittgenstein's philosophy during her years at university, she could make little sense of it at that time. Her proper introduction to his philosophy came when she spent the summers of 1965 and 1966 in a hut in Norway reading his work. Diamond credits the work of three philosophers in particular – G. E. M. Anscombe, Stanley Cavell, and Rush Rhees – with helping her understand Wittgenstein's approach to philosophy in her early days of studying his work.

In the late 1960s Diamond was asked by Rush Rhees to edit notes taken by students who attended Wittgenstein's lectures in 1939. These notes were subsequently published in 1976 as *Wittgenstein's Lectures on the Foundations of Mathematics, Cambridge, 1939*. During the 1970s and 1980s, Diamond published a series of articles which were collected for *The Realistic Spirit* (1991). Even though the essays in this collection were written at different times and are on a range of subjects in language, epistemology, and ethics, *The Realistic Spirit* needs to be read as an organic whole. There is a way of thinking, "the realistic spirit," that underlies and

connects each essay. In essence, the realistic spirit is a resistance to the metaphysical mythology that postulates that there is some thing beyond what we perceive as real, whether it be matter, our own inner states, or some such thing. Furthermore, this thing is required to explain what we perceive as real.

Diamond's claim that this way of thinking is mistaken is not because it is overinvolved or unnecessary as an explanation. Instead, she is saying that the mistake is a loss of attention to the way things are. In trying to look beyond the way things are, we not only miss the details but fail to recognize them as important. Diamond offers instead a different philosophical "attitude" of the realistic spirit to the world. This realistic spirit is not an alternative or competing theory of reality. It does not provide an answer in this way, as this would be to keep the same metaphysical question or requirement that demands something that philosophically we cannot have.

For Diamond, to take on this philosophical attitude is to commit ourselves to paying attention, specifically to focusing our attention both on what we say and on our practices within this world. Describing this world and the particulars of this world, especially the features of our moral life, is a task of getting it right. But, for Diamond, getting it right is not about seeing the truth beyond the real, or capturing and simplifying the world through explanatory theories. Getting it right is an ethical task in itself requiring integrity, honesty, commitment to truth, and courage. It is also, in a sense, an aesthetic task. Indeed, one of the distinct characteristics of Diamond's work is her use of novels and poetry to express attitudes that are relevant to or part of her philosophical thinking about a particular issue.

The influence of Wittgenstein's philosophy on Diamond's thinking in *The Realistic Spirit* is clear. For both Diamond and Wittgenstein, the philosopher must pay attention to our ways of thinking and acting: what we actually do. Not only must we be wary of laying down rules for what must be the case prior to an examination of what we actually do, but we must also be wary of making what we see fit a single paradigm. This attention is also central to ethical thinking. Someone is not necessarily persuaded of the problems in their thinking through the force or completeness of an argument, but rather they are shown something about their way of thinking: something new or some already present aspect of it is brought to their attention.

However, there are differences between Diamond's philosophical interests and approach and those of Wittgenstein. Unlike Wittgenstein, Diamond holds that philosophy cannot be done without the context of the history of the discipline, and she is also more involved in philosophical conversations with her contemporaries. Diamond also demonstrates a greater interest than Wittgenstein in "applied" issues, in particular in her essays that consider our treatment of animals. While her approach to these "applied" issues is not aimed at conversion through argument, it is clear that in bringing to our attention our attitudes to animals she is providing a practical critique of our current way of life.

Since the publication of *The Realistic Spirit*, many of Diamond's publications have been on Wittgenstein or early analytic philosophy. This is in part a reflection of the fact that much of her work in the 1990s has been for invited conferences and collections of articles. However, this does not indicate the full spectrum of her current philosophical interests. For example, in an interview in 1999 with *The Harvard Review of Philosophy*, she expressed a desire to do some work on the subject of truth, including moral truth. This interest can be seen to inform some of her more recent work, including two of her newest publications: "Truth Before Tarski" (2002) and "Unfolding Truth and Reading Wittgenstein" (2003).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Mr Goodman on Relevant Conditions and the Counterfactual," *Philosophical Studies* 10 (1959): 42–4.

"Secondary Sense," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 67 (1967): 189–208.

"Eating Meat and Eating People," *Philosophy* 53 (1978): 465–79.

"Hommage ou Dommage?" *Philosophy* 58 (1983): 73–88.

"Rights, Justice and the Retarded," in *Ethics and Mental Retardation*, ed. Loretta Kopelman (Dordrecht, 1984), pp. 57–64.

"The Dog That Gave Himself the Moral Law," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 13 (1988): 161–79.

"Losing Your Concepts," *Ethics* 98 (1988): 255–77.

"Rules: Looking in the Right Place," in *Wittgenstein: Attention to Particulars*, ed. D. Z. Phillips and P. Winch (Basingstoke, UK, 1989), pp. 12–34.

The Realistic Spirit: Wittgenstein, Philosophy, and the Mind (Cambridge, Mass., 1991).

"Ethics, Imagination and the Method of Wittgenstein's *Tractatus*," in *Bilder der Philosophie, Wiener Reihe 5*, ed. R. Heinrich and H. Vetter (Vienna, 1991).

"Martha Nussbaum and the Need for Novels," *Philosophical Investigations* 16 (1993): 128–53.

"Truth: Defenders, Debunkers, Despisers," in *Commitment to Reflection*, ed. Leona Toker (New York, 1993), pp. 195–221.

"Wittgenstein, Mathematics, and Ethics: Resisting the Attractions of Realism," in *The Cambridge Companion to Wittgenstein*, ed. Hans Sluga (Cambridge, UK, 1996), pp. 226–60.

"Consequentialism in Modern Moral Philosophy and in 'Modern Moral Philosophy'," in *Human Lives: Critical Essays on Consequentialist Bioethics*, ed. David Oderberg (New York, 1997).

"Realism and Resolution: Reply to Warren Goldfarb and Sabina Lovibond," *Journal of Philosophical Research* 22 (1997): 75–86.

"How Old Are Those Bones? Putnam, Wittgenstein and Verification," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* suppl. 73 (1999): 99–134.

"How Long Is the Standard Meter in Paris?" in *Wittgenstein in America*, ed. Timothy McCarthy (Oxford, 2001), pp. 104–39.

"On Wittgenstein," *Philosophical Investigations* 24 (2001): 108–15.

"Truth Before Tarski," in *From Frege to Wittgenstein: Perspectives on Early Analytic Philosophy*, ed. Erich Reck (Oxford, 2002), pp. 252–79.

"What If X Isn't the Number of Sheep? Wittgenstein and Thought-experiments in Ethics," *Philosophical Papers* 31 (2002): 227–50.

"What Time Is It on the Sun?" in *Philosophers in Conversation: Interviews from the Harvard Review of Philosophy*, ed. S. Phineas Upham (London and New York, 2002).

"The Difficulty of Reality and the Difficulty of Philosophy," *Partial Answers* 1 (June 2003): 1–26.

"Unfolding Truth and Reading Wittgenstein," *Sats* 4 (2003): 24–58.

"Finding One's Way into the Tractatus," *Sats* 4 (2003): 165–82.

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Wittgenstein's Lectures on the Foundations of Mathematics, Cambridge, 1939: From the Notes of R. G. Bosanquet, Norman Malcolm, Rush Rhees, and Yorick Smythies* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1976).

Ed. with Jenny Teichman, *Intention and Intentionality: Essays in Honour of G. E. M. Anscombe* (London, 1979).

Further Reading

Goldfarb, Warren. "Metaphysics and

Nonsense: On Cora Diamond's 'The Realistic Spirit'," *Journal of Philosophical Research* 22 (1997): 57–73.

Lovibond, Sabina. "The 'Late Seriousness' of Cora Diamond," *Journal of Philosophical Research* 22 (1997): 43–55.

Vilhauer, Ben. "On a Tension in Diamond's Account of Tractarian Nonsense," *Philosophical Investigations* 26 (2002): 230–38.

Catherine Villanueva Gardner

DICKIE, George Thomas (1926–)

George Dickie was born 12 August 1926 in Palmetto, Florida. Prior to his college education, he served in the Marine Corps from 1944 to 1946. He received his BA from Florida State University in 1949 and his PhD in philosophy from the University of California at Los Angeles in 1959. He began teaching in 1956 at Washington State University, and after a brief stay at the University of Houston, went to the University of Illinois at Chicago in 1965, where he taught for thirty years. After a long and distinguished career he became professor emeritus in 1995 and returned to Florida for his retirement.

Dickie is the dominant advocate of two lines of argument central to the development of modern aesthetics. First is his adamant opposition to the claim, prominent in some early twentieth-century views, that aesthetic experience is predicated on a special state of mind, the so-called "aesthetic attitude," and that lacking that state of mind, a proper appreciation of an aesthetic object could not be had. Second is his defense of the institutional theory, a definitional account of the nature of art. These are by no means his only important con-

tributions to aesthetics, however. In 1988 he proposed and defended a novel account of aesthetic evaluation, and in 1996 he presented an analysis of eighteenth-century British aesthetic theory as the basis for his own Humean theory of taste. He has been a frequent commentator on developments in the field of aesthetics, and has occupied various leadership roles in the American Society for Aesthetics, culminating in his Presidency (1993–4).

Dickie's attack on the aesthetic attitude theory was driven by skepticism about its cognitive claims. He came to believe that there was no singular, identifiable state of mind involved in the aesthetic engagement of this or that person with this or that object. As he saw it, attention could be trained on objects for an endless variety of reasons. No common quality can be shown to run through all forms of attention properly trained on objects of aesthetic interest. For this reason, it would be pointless or misleading to say that aesthetic experience was predicated on the maintenance of a certain state of mind. Lapses of aesthetic attention, taken by aesthetic attitude theorists to indicate a failure to engage the right attitude, can be equally well explained as inattention or misdirected attention.

Some versions of the aesthetic attitude theory (such as Jerome STOLNITZ's) required that successful aesthetic attention be disinterested, and that disinterestedness implied a detachment from both cognitive and critical claims regarding the object in question. Dickie rejected this view, claiming both that there was no conceptual incompatibility among aesthetic, critical, and cognitive claims in appreciation of a given object and that empirical evidence (for example, the experience of watching a movie and writing down critical notes) runs counter to the claims of detachment. In arguing that there is no one kind of experience that people have in engaging art works or natural objects of aesthetic interest, Dickie did not deny that there are such things as aesthetic experiences, nor that they are set off from other experiences in their valuable

qualities. Rather, he denied that one's access to these qualities is predicated on disinterestedness or any other special state of mind distinguishable from all other states of mind as the aesthetic attitude. He concluded that the aesthetic attitude is a myth.

In his landmark exposition of the Institutional Theory in *Art and the Aesthetic* (1974), earlier found in "Defining Art" (1969), Dickie developed a definition of "art" meant to respond to (while taking into account the salient virtues of) the anti-definist tendency in aesthetic theory that had been advanced by Morris WEITZ and Paul ZIFF among others, following the lead of Ludwig Wittgenstein. His proposed definition aimed to avoid the traditional mistake of identifying qualities common and peculiar to all objects worthy of the title "art." The by-now obvious problem with all such efforts is that the term "art" is essentially contested and importantly elastic in its conceptual range. But the process by which things come to be understood as artworks is not itself indefinite in the way art content is indefinite. Instead, as Dickie observed, it is a product of complex institutions in which there are rules and roles, expectations and responsibilities, all of which make up a context of recognition and appraisal.

In 1964 Arthur DANTO published "The Artworld," laying out the idea that there is "something the eye cannot decry – an atmosphere of artistic theory, a knowledge of this history of art" that is involved in taking things to be artworks in the peculiar setting of our social understandings. Dickie refined this idea in making it a central element in his own institutional theory of art. As he formulated it in *Art and the Aesthetic*, a candidate object is a work of art if, and only if, it is "an artifact a set of the aspects of which has had conferred upon it the status of candidate for appreciation by some person or person acting on behalf of a certain social institution (the artworld)" (1974, p. 34). Dickie's version of the artworld element incorporated personnel and a host of institutional roles and modes of interaction in addition to history and theory. People playing important roles in social institutions involving art were thereby members of the artworld. Dickie also allowed that anyone who took himself to be a member of the artworld was thereby made a member. The status of something as an artwork or not was a function of the deeming behavior of an art-involved, informed populace, rather than anything explicitly presented in the work itself.

The great virtue of Dickie's theory was that it made it possible to settle questions of art-candidacy without reliance on any dubious criterion of recognition based on content. It acknowledged that art in a social setting is one of those grand institutions that make us even as we make them and that requires a coordination of parts and a cooperation among participants to succeed. To some of its critics, however, the theory seemed either vague (on the issues of what makes conferral successful and what acting on behalf of consists in) or overly dependent on formal-sounding actions (status conferral might seem akin to christening) alien to artistic practice. Responding to these criticisms, Dickie devised a second, improved version of the Institutional Theory in which the definition of art is reduced to a simpler phrase: "A work of art is an artifact of a kind created to be presented to an artworld public." In this version of the theory, the artist is taken to be a person making works with understanding, the public is taken to be a set of persons who are prepared in turn to understand the artworks made, and the artworld is taken to be the totality of all artworld systems, including frameworks peculiar to the presentation of drama, painting, dance, etc. (1984, pp. 80–82).

The chief advantage of the new formulation over its predecessor is that it makes art status something achieved, rather than bestowed. The business of status achievement is viewed as something more like the basis of recognition given new meanings in the modern-style dictionary than like the acknowledgment of masterworks by medieval art guilds. There is no

longer any hint of formal acts of status-bestowal, and yet status decidedly comes to be acknowledged within the social setting. The social setting of art is something Dickie now speaks of as the "art circle," an interactive, mutually reinforcing relation between artists, audiences, and all the ancillary participants in the process of artistic production and performance. Moreover, the theory itself involves a kind of circularity, in that the terms art and artworld and the understanding required of artists and audiences cannot be defined independently of each other. But Dickie argues that this circularity is not vicious, in that it simply reflects the way in which the practices of artistic production, presentation, and performance are inflected, or deeply interdependent, in our culture and unintelligible without reference to their mutual reliance.

Dickie's theory of art evaluation is presented as disconnected from his institutional theory of art. This reflects his acceptance of Weitz's claim that maintaining the distinction between criteria of recognition and criteria of evaluation is a central obligation of modern aesthetic theory. Dickie's approach is to identify the seven most plausible accounts of artistic value (ranging from David Hume's to J. O. Urmson's) and glean from them the acceptable elements while discarding the flaws. The account that results from this distillation turns out to be a view closer to Hume's than to any of the more recent rivals. He distinguishes between positive and negative criteria of aesthetic value on the basis of detachment: a property of a work of art is positive if in isolation from other properties it is valuable, and otherwise negative. Among the properties that Dickie takes to be positive counters are unity, complexity, and elegance. Negative counters are such qualities as garishness, disharmony, and incoherence. Identifying positive and negative properties is only the first step, however, in reckoning comparative valuations of aesthetic objects. In addition, it is necessary to assign number values, or something very much like them, to combinations of properties in their complex interactions. On this point, Dickie pursues a comparison-matrix approach pioneered by Bruce Vermazen, but construes all the value-weights in strictly instrumental terms. In his view, the key determining factor in assigning weight is the capacity of properties involved to produce an experience valuable to the person experiencing it, either intrinsically or as a means to other valuable experiences. He denies that there is any further basis on which strong evaluations such as "X is good" or "X is bad" are justified. In this approach, some qualities are acknowledged to have greater weight than others (e.g., Monroe BEARDSLEY'S central aesthetic values of unity and complexity are taken to have particularly great weight). But the weights of these and all other values may vary from instance to instance, individual to individual. It is in this sense that Dickie's theory is true to its Humean roots in combining instrumentalism, relativism, and common sense while remaining open to the prospect of the calculative comparative measurement of values.

Dickie's allegiance to Hume is further expressed in *The Century of Taste* (1996), an historical survey and critical commentary on the philosophical shift from objective to subjective standards of taste in the eighteenth century. After examining the accounts of aesthetic judgment proposed by Francis Hutcheson, Alexander Gerard, Archibald Alison, Immanuel Kant, and Hume, he argues that Hume's theory of taste is far superior to the others. Hutcheson's and Kant's theories fail because they attend exclusively to a single property (uniformity in variety for Hutcheson, purposiveness without purpose for Kant) as contributing to beauty. Gerard's and Alison's theories fail in the opposite way, by deploying association in a way that makes any object you please beautiful, or sublime, and so on, rendering these ascriptions meaningless. As Dickie sees it, the unique appeal of Hume's approach lies in its willingness to recognize a variety (but not an infinite variety) of factors as beauty-making characteristics, together with

the admission that a given object can have some of these objects – even several of them – without necessarily thereby becoming beautiful. Here, the position which Dickie applauds in Hume parallels a popular line of analysis in modern ethics. The qualities that make a person a morally good man or woman are various but not endlessly various; they are commonsensically recognizable; and they may be present in a given person without adding up in such a way as to entail moral approbation.

Throughout his career, Dickie has elaborated his own position by carefully examining positions previously advanced by prominent philosophers and spelling out the basis of his differences from their views, as well as the implications of these differences. This technique might lead the casual reader to conclude that Dickie is the philosophical opponent of those from which he distances himself. But this is not the case. Dickie is always careful to credit the thinkers he criticizes for their good ideas and for advancing philosophical reflection to the point where subsequent reflection can lead to further progress. Several recent essays make it abundantly clear that this is especially true of Dickie's response to the work of Monroe Beardsley, many of whose views he is at pains to reject, but to whom he also acknowledges a substantial philosophical indebtedness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Is Psychology Relevant to Aesthetics?" *Philosophical Review* 71 (1962): 285–302.

"The Myth of the Aesthetic Attitude," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 1 (1964): 56–65.

"Defining Art," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 6 (1969): 252–8.

Aesthetics: An Introduction (Indianapolis, 1971). Revised as *Introduction to Aesthetics: An Analytic Approach* (Oxford, 1997).

"Psychical Distance: In a Fog at Sea," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 13 (1973): 17–29.

"Taste and Attitude: The Origin of the Aesthetic," *Theoria* 39 (1973): 153–70.

Art and the Aesthetic (Ithaca, N.Y., 1974).

"Art and the Romantic Artist," in *Essays on Aesthetics: Perspectives on the Work of Monroe C. Beardsley*, ed. J. Fisher (Philadelphia, 1983), pp. 99–108.

The Art Circle: A Theory of Art (New York, 1984).

"The New Institutional Theory of Art," in *Proceedings of the 8th International Wittgenstein Symposium* (Vienna, 1984), pp. 57–64.

"Beardsley, Sibley, and Critical Principles," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 41 (1987): 229–37.

Evaluating Art (Philadelphia, 1988).

"A Tale of Two Artworlds," in *Danto and His Critics*, ed. Mark Rollins (London, 1993), pp. 73–8.

"The Intentional Fallacy: Defending Beardsley," with Kent Wilson, *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 53 (1995): 233–50.

The Century of Taste: The Philosophical Odyssey of Taste in the Eighteenth Century (Oxford, 1996).

"Art and Value," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 40 (2000): 228–41.

"The Institutional Theory of Art," in *Theories of Art Today*, ed. Noël Carroll (Madison, Wisc., 2000), pp. 93–108.

Art and Value (Oxford, 2001).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils

Beardsley, Monroe. "Is Art Essentially Institutional?" in *The Aesthetic Point of View*, ed. Michael Wreen and Donald Callen (Ithaca, N.Y., 1982), pp. 125–43.

Carroll, Noël. *Beyond Aesthetics: Philosophical Essays* (Cambridge, UK, 2001).

Danto, Arthur. "The Artworld," *Journal of Philosophy* 61 (1964): 571–84.

Davies, Stephen. *Definitions of Art* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1991).

Yanal, Robert, ed. *Institutions of Art:*

Reconsiderations of George Dickie's Philosophy (University Park, Penn., 1994).

Ronald Moore

DIETRICH, John Hassler (1878–1957)

John H. Dietrich was born on 14 January 1878, in a farmhouse near Chambersburg, in Franklin County, Pennsylvania. His parents were German-Swiss whose ancestors had immigrated to that isolated part of the state in 1710. They were members of the Reformed Church, which originated from the efforts of the Swiss reformer, Ulrich Zwingli. Dietrich was named after the local minister, Jacob Hassler, who later encouraged him to become a minister. At age fifteen, he entered Mercersburg Academy, which was four miles from his home. Because his family did not have the money for room and board so he could live on campus, he had to walk the round trip to the Academy each day. He also had to compensate his parents for his tuition fees by performing odd jobs around the farm. Even with these hardships, he completed the four-year course in three years and graduated valedictorian of his class in 1896.

In the fall of 1896 Dietrich entered Franklin and Marshall College in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. During his freshman year, he was exposed to Darwin's theory of evolution, which he accepted immediately, and he read essays of Emerson, which he did not immediately care for but enjoyed in later life. His favorite subjects were Greek and Latin, and he graduated in 1900 with a BA degree. Not having the resources to continue his education, he taught one semester at Mercersburg Academy, unsuccessfully sought employment in Philadelphia, sold encyclopedias in New York, and worked in a fresh air camp north of the city. During the school year 1901–02

he taught at Nyack Military Academy. In the summer, he secured a position as private secretary to Jonathan Thorne of New York, who was a multimillionaire.

In the fall of 1902 he had his finances in order and was able to resume his graduate education. He entered the Eastern Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, located down the street from his college. With the exception of his professor of church history, who exposed him to the German theories of historical criticism, he did not find his seminary courses challenging. After three years, he was the head of his class, and as such was invited to write a paper on "The Significance of the Death of Christ" to be read at the graduation exercises. Apparently he stated rather clearly in his paper that Jesus had died the death of a martyr, but he was not a god dying for the sins of the world, and the obligation of the Christian was to emulate Jesus' moral and spiritual example. When the paper was finished, he had his favorite professor read it. The professor acknowledged that it was an excellent paper and he was in general agreement with the conclusions; but he requested that Dietrich tone the paper down because a number of older clergymen would be present at the reading, and would be greatly disturbed by it. The paper was revised, but Dietrich lost respect for his professor.

Immediately after graduation from Eastern Theological Seminary in 1905, Dietrich became the minister of St. Mark's Memorial Church in Pittsburgh. For the first couple of years the church experienced steady growth and things went smoothly. However, in time a number of factors coalesced and their combined effect forced Dietrich to leave the ministry of the Reformed Church. Most were petty issues, but the more serious one was concern in the Allegheny Classis about Dietrich's unorthodox doctrine. In fact, he had become a theistic Protestant liberal. In his sermons, he often set orthodox doctrine off and compared it with liberal thinking, so that

his growing congregation could see clearly the issues involved. The Allegheny Classis set up a committee to determine whether Dietrich should be tried for heresy. The conclusions reached by the committee were that he did not believe in the infallibility of the Bible, nor in the virgin birth and the deity of Jesus, nor in the traditional understanding of the atonement. In addition, he accepted the theory of evolution and even revised the worship service so that the Apostles' Creed was deleted and secular readings were incorporated. The recommendation of the committee was that he be indicted for heresy. A trial date was set for 10 July 1911. Under the circumstances Dietrich refused to defend himself and resigned from the church before an actual trial was held.

In looking back on this period, Dietrich said, "I started out as an orthodox Christian minister, teaching the doctrines which center about the Apostles' Creed. I gradually went through the stage known as Modernism, or liberal orthodoxy, during which period I resorted to reading new meanings into the old phrases, trying to make them fit the new knowledge."

Dr Walter L. Mason, minister of the First Unitarian Church in Pittsburgh, was favorably impressed with Dietrich's intelligence and leadership qualities, and persuaded him to apply for ministerial fellowship in the American Unitarian Association.

In 1911 Dietrich became the minister of the First Unitarian Society of Spokane. In 1913–14 he gave lectures to his rapidly growing congregation on comparative religions. As a result, he began to question his liberal view of Jesus as the greatest spiritual leader of all history. He came to believe that the world owed a great debt to such figures as Buddha, Confucius, the Hebrew prophets, and the ancient Greek philosophers. He also embraced the "scientific method" as the most effective means for arriving at truth. He began to refer to prayer as "aspiration" and once again employed secular readings in his services. In a sense, he saw the church as a kind of continuing educational center for adults, and his sermons became well-prepared hour-long lectures. Crowds came in 1914 to hear him lecture on the various nations involved in World War I, and in 1915 he came out strongly for family planning in a sermon entitled, "The Right to Be Well Born." More and more, he moved away from liberal theism to a kind of "naturalistic humanism." He later said of this change in his thinking, "Then I came out into Unitarianism, but at first a fairly conservative and theistic Unitarian. And finally I reached a point where my mind was satisfied only by a wholehearted acceptance of Naturalism and what has come to be known as Humanism."

As Dietrich developed his religious humanism, it became a "religion without God" and without a doctrine of personal immortality. He viewed the universe as an eternally contained system that was indifferent to the human enterprise. Humans created most of their problems, and it was they who must solve them. He therefore shifted the emphasis of religion from theological speculation to moral responsibility and moral living.

After a very successful ministry in Spokane, on 1 November 1918 Dietrich became the minister of the First Unitarian Society of Minneapolis, a church which Professor Zuebun of the University of Chicago would later describe as "an organization in whose nest had been hatched most of the liberal and reform legislation of the state of Minnesota."

As a Unitarian minister Dietrich became one of the principal leaders of the humanist movement within the American Unitarian Association. He met Curtis W. REESE, the minister of the Des Moines Church, in 1917 when the Western Unitarian Conference was held there. They discovered that Reese had been preaching a type of religion that was similar to Dietrich's humanism. However, Reese called his point of view "the religion of democracy." It was out of this chance

meeting that the religious humanist movement within Unitarianism was born. Later Reese became Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference, promoting humanism from his administrative position, whereas Dietrich was a leader and preacher of humanism from his pulpit in Minneapolis. By 1921 they had precipitated the humanist–theist controversy in the American Unitarian Association. It took over a decade and a half for Unitarians to decide that they could tolerate humanists, not only in their church pews, but in their pulpits as well.

In 1925 Minnesota, like many states, experienced repercussions from the Scopes Trial about the teaching of evolution. Dr William B. Riley was minister of the First Baptist Church in Minneapolis and National President of the Christian Fundamentalist Association. He attempted in the fall of 1925 to have legislation passed which would prevent the teaching of evolution in public institutions in the state. Dietrich organized a committee of the more progressive ministers, and they defeated the legislation.

As Dietrich's congregation grew, in December 1925 the First Unitarian Society moved to the Garrick Theater in order to accommodate the larger numbers. The following year his services began to be broadcast over radio. Through the years his sermons were published and mailed to those who subscribed to them. In 1927 a collection of sermons given to combat the movement to ban the teaching of evolution in the public schools was published under the title *The Fathers of Evolution*. From that same year, *The Humanist Pulpit* came out every month, containing a single address. At the end of each church year these twelve to fifteen sermons were published in book form under the same title, *The Humanist Pulpit*.

There was not only success but also tragedy for Dietrich. His wife, Louise, who had borne him a son while they were in Spokane and another in Minneapolis, died of cancer on 22 February 1931. In time he overcame his loss, and on 30 January 1933 he married a young widow, Margaret Winston, a writer and a poet. Later in the same year, he was awarded a Doctor of Divinity degree by Meadville Theological School.

In 1935 Dietrich announced to his congregation that the time had arrived for him to resign from his pulpit and active ministry, and this became effective in 1938. He thought that too many ministers held on to their positions after they lost their effectiveness, and he did not want this to happen to him or his congregation. In 1941, he and his wife moved to Berkeley, California, where Dietrich died on 22 July 1957.

Perhaps Dietrich's greatest contribution to American religious thought was that he was the "father of religious humanism," and from his thought have sprung directly or indirectly a number of institutions, such as the American Humanist Association, Friends of Religious Humanism, and the Humanist Institute. Dietrich once said, "So far as I know, I was the first minister in the Unitarian Church, if not in America, not who has acknowledged the truth of Humanism, but who has frankly and publicly accepted it, making it the basis of my regular pulpit teaching as well as for the arrangement of our devotional service, and who has attempted something like a reconstruction of religion in harmony with it."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Present Crisis in Religion (Minneapolis, 1922).

The Fathers of Evolution (Minneapolis, 1927).

Unitarianism and Humanism? Humanist Sermons (Chicago, 1927).

The Significance of the Unitarian Movement (Boston, 1927).

The Humanist Pulpit, 7 vols (Minneapolis, 1927–37).

Humanism (Boston, 1934).

The Humanist Pulpit, vol. 8 (Minneapolis, 1936).

"Humanism," in *Varieties of American Religion*, ed. Charles S. Braden (Chicago, 1936).

"The Inevitability of Humanism," *University Review* 3 (Summer 1937): 243–4.

Ten Sermons: What If the World Went Humanist? ed. Mason Olds (Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1989).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Who Was Who in Amer v6*

Dakin, Arthur Hazard. *Man the Measure: An Essay in Humanism as Religion* (Princeton, N.J., 1939).

Lamont, Corliss. *The Philosophy of Humanism*, 5th edn (New York, 1967).

Olds, Mason. *American Religious Humanism* (Minneapolis, 1996).

Winston, Charleton. *This Circle of Earth: The Story of John H. Dietrich* (New York, 1942).

Wesley Mason Olds

DIETZGEN, Peter Joseph (1828–88)

Joseph Dietzgen was born on 9 December 1828 in Blankenberg, Prussia. After high school in nearby Cologne, his continued reading of philosophy and economics, including Karl Marx, converted him to socialism. After the 1848 revolution he spent almost three years traveling across the United States, and returned to join his father's tannery. Still reading philosophy and seeking better financial opportunities, he moved his growing family to Montgomery, Alabama in 1859. Frightened by mob violence on the eve of the Civil War, he again returned to Germany to run his father's tannery. In 1864 he accepted a position managing a tannery in St. Petersburg, Russia. There he published *The Nature of Human Brain Work: A Renewed Critique of Pure and Practical Reason by a Manual Worker* (1869), and articles about economics and communism that attracted Marx's attention. After returning to Germany, Dietzgen was a delegate to The Hague International Congress in 1872, and was later imprisoned for defending socialism in Cologne. Continued persecution sent him back to the US permanently in 1884, and by 1886 he arrived in Chicago to take advantage of a more liberal atmosphere and exciting labor politics. He sided with the more anarchist elements of American socialism, publishing in the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* and other short-lived newspapers. He wrote his final books and essays in Chicago, where he died on 15 April 1888. He was buried next to the martyrs of the 1886 Haymarket riot.

Dietzgen's early writings followed the same course as Marx's empiricism and materialism, and they agreed with Ludwig Feuerbach that science should replace speculative metaphysics. His democratic politics resulted in a similarly democratic epistemology, by holding that no privileged class held a monopoly on rationality or thought. Everyone begins from their own experiences of the world and by induction forms general ideas for reasoning. Moral thought proceeds by the same logic, determining the value of ends in light of wider consequences. Akin to utilitarianism's concern for the common good, and approaching John DEWEY's moral theory which rejects final ends, Dietzgen postulated a genuine science of morals that could critique all social norms and laws in light of the larger needs of human welfare.

Dietzgen's late writings abandon materialism for a kind of organic pantheism that would transcend the materialist-idealist dispute. Inspired by Spinoza, German mysticism, and Hegel's rationalism, Dietzgen refined several a priori arguments for an absolute god in dialectical process with the world. These metaphysical speculations gained no lasting readership. His writings on

social theory and politics, many gathered together in volumes that remained in print for decades, were treasured by many later American and European socialists.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Das Wesen der menschlichen Kopfarbeit (*The Nature of Human Brain Work: A Renewed Critique of Pure and Practical Reason by a Manual Worker*) (Hamburg, Germany, 1869).

Streifzüge eines sozialisten in das gebiet der erkenntnisstheorie (*Excursions of a Socialist into the Domains of Epistemology*) (Zürich, 1887).

Other Relevant Works

The Nature of Human Brain Work was translated and published with translations of *The Positive Outcome of Philosophy* (1887) and *Letters on Logic* (1890–93) in a single volume titled *The Positive Outcome of Philosophy*, ed. Eugene Dietzgen and Joseph Dietzgen, Jr. (Chicago, Ill., 1906).

Dietzgen, Eugene, and Joseph Dietzgen, Jr., eds. *Some of the Philosophical Essays on Socialism and Science, Religion, Ethics, Critique-of-reason and the World-at-large* (Chicago, Ill., 1906).

Dietzgen, Eugene, ed. *Joseph Dietzgens Sämtliche Schriften*, 3 vols (Weisbaden, Germany, 1911).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio

Dietzgen, Eugene. "Joseph Dietzgen: A Sketch of His Life," in *Some of the Philosophical Essays on Socialism and Science, Religion, Ethics, Critique-of-reason and the World-at-large* (Chicago, Ill., 1906).

Huck, Gerhard. *Joseph Dietzgen, (1828–1888): ein Beitrag zur Ideengeschichte des Sozialismus im 19. Jh.* (Stuttgart, 1979).

Rée, Jonathan. *Proletarian Philosophers* (Oxford, 1984).

Strüning, Horst-Dieter, ed. *"Unser Philosoph" Josef Dietzgen* (Frankfurt am Main, 1980).

Thomas, Viktor. *Das Erkenntnisproblem* (Stuttgart, 1921).

John R. Shook

DONAGAN, Alan Harry (1925–91)

Alan Donagan was born on 10 February 1925 in Melbourne, Australia. He completed his MA degree at the University of Melbourne in 1951 and his B.Phil. at Exeter College, Oxford in 1953, under the supervision of William Neale and Gilbert Ryle. Although Donagan taught philosophy during the late 1940s and early 1950s at the University of Western Australia and Canberra University College, most of his academic life was spent in the United States, teaching philosophy first at the University of Minnesota from 1953 to 1961, then Indiana University from 1961 to 1966, the University of Illinois at Urbana from 1966 to 1970, the University of Chicago from 1970 to 1984, and California University of Technology from 1984 until his death. Donagan died on 29 May 1991 in Pasadena, California.

Donagan's early work was in the philosophy of history. His first book was on the later philosophy of R. G. Collingwood, and he was a prominent contributor to the debate that arose in the late 1950s and the 1960s concerning the nature of historical explanation and the role of the deductive–nomological model associated with Karl Popper and Carl HEMPEL. Donagan also published extensively on topics in the history of philosophy, particularly rationalist thought and the philosophy of Baruch Spinoza. He also wrote about Ludwig Wittgenstein, Bertrand Russell, John Stuart Mill, and others.

It was in moral philosophy, however, that Donagan's main energies were concentrated and in which he had his major influence. In *The Theory of Morality* (1977), Donagan aimed to provide a rational underpinning for the "common morality" that is to be found in Judaeo-Christian moral thinking. This project was continued in a number of essays, a number of which focus on Kant's moral philosophy. Donagan held that morality can be deduced from a single principle that is best expressed in terms of the Kantian injunction to treat all rational creatures as ends rather than means (an injunction that Donagan argued was not equivalent, Kant's own claims to the contrary, to that which follows from the requirement that moral judgments be universalizable). On this basis, Donagan denied the existence of moral dilemmas, arguing for the rational consistency of all moral judgments, and arguing that such judgments are objectively true in the same fashion as are judgments relating to matters of fact.

Committed to a view of philosophy as a practical, rather than narrowly theoretical activity, Donagan had a strong interest in issues at the intersection of ethics and the public sphere, making significant contributions to topics in medical and legal ethics. In addition, Donagan's work in moral philosophy gave rise to a theory of action based around the idea of action as essentially an intervention or abstention from intervention in the natural course of events that is itself causally based in the agent's capacity to choose – a theory that owed much to Aristotle as well as to contemporary theorists such as Donald DAVIDSON and Roderick CHISHOLM. Donagan's work in moral philosophy and action, which drew heavily on traditional Christian thought, extended naturally into theology and the philosophy of religion. Donagan published a number of essays in these areas, including the philosophy of Aquinas, whose ideas provided an important additional source for Donagan's thinking on morality and action.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Later Philosophy of R. G. Collingwood (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1962; 2nd edn, Chicago, 1985).

The Theory of Morality (Chicago, 1977; 2nd edn 1979).

Human Ends and Human Actions: An Exploration in St. Thomas's Treatment (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1985).

Choice: The Essential Element in Human Action (London and New York, 1987).

Spinoza (Chicago, 1989).

The Philosophical Papers of Alan Donagan, 2 vols, ed. Jeff E. Malpas (Chicago, 1994).

Reflections on Philosophy and Religion, ed. Anthony N. Perovich (Oxford, 1999).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Essays in the Philosophy of Art*, by R. G. Collingwood (Bloomington, Ind., 1964).

Ed. with Barbara Donagan, *Philosophy of History* (New York, 1965).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Encyc Ethics*, *Pres Addr of APA v9*, *Who Was Who in Amer v10*

"A Memorial Symposium in Honor of Alan Donagan," *Ethics* 104 (October 1993). Essays on Donagan including memorials and a bibliography of his writings.

Boyle, Joseph M., Jr. "Aquinas, Kant, and Donagan on Moral Principles," *New Scholasticism* 58 (1984): 391–408.

Curley, Edwin. "Donagan's Spinoza," *Ethics* 104 (1993): 114–34.

Davenport, John. "Deontology and Alan Donagan's Problem of Exception-Rules," *Analysis* 55 (1995): 261–71.

Leach, James J. "The Logic of the Situation," *Philosophy of Science* 35 (1968): 258–73.

Levine, Susan. *A Critical Analysis of Some of the Limitations on the Scope of Moral Prohibitions Suggested by Two Quasi-absolutist Moral Theorists*. PhD dissertation, Brown University (Providence, R.I., 1982).

Sellars, Wilfrid. "Reply to Alan Donagan on

'My Views on "Determinism and Freedom"'," *Philosophical Studies* 27 (1975): 149–84.

Stout, Jeffrey. "The Philosophical Interest of the Hebrew-Christian Moral Tradition," *Thomist* 47 (1983): 165–96.

Tollefsen, Christopher. "Donagan, Abortion, and Civil Rebellion," *Public Affairs Quarterly* 11 (1997): 303–12.

Westphal, Merold. "Donagan's Critique of 'Sittlichkeit'," *Idealistic Studies* 15 (1985): 1–17.

Jeff Malpas

DONNELLAN, Keith Sedgwick (1931–)

Keith Donnellan was born on 25 June 1931 in Washington, D.C. He began his studies at the University of Maryland, then transferred to Cornell University where he earned his BA in 1953, MA in 1954, and PhD in philosophy in 1961. His dissertation was on "C.I. Lewis and the Foundations of Necessary Truth." Donnellan taught philosophy at Cornell from 1958 to 1970, becoming full professor in 1967. In 1970 he joined the philosophy department at the University of California at Los Angeles, and taught there until becoming professor emeritus in 1994.

Donnellan's work is mainly in the philosophy of language, with an emphasis on the connections between semantics and pragmatics. His most influential work was his 1966 paper "Reference and Definite Descriptions." He challenges the canonical view, due to Bertrand Russell, about definite descriptions. Russell had argued that the proper semantic treatment of a definite description such as "the present king of France" was quantificational. Thus, a sentence like "the present king of France is bald" should be analyzed as "There exists one and only one entity x that is the present king of France, and x is bald." Donnellan argues that in natural languages, there are actually two different kinds of uses of definite descriptions. Russell's analysis picks out the "attributive" use of definite descriptions. When we use a definite description ("the F") this way, we mean to make statements about the unique entity x that is F. However, Donnellan notes that we also sometimes use definite descriptions "referentially" to pick out a given entity and say something about it. To see this, imagine you are at a party where virtually everyone is drinking beer. However, you and your friend are observing a man in a corner of the room holding a martini glass. Unbeknownst to you, the man's glass is filled with water. You turn to your friend and ask, "Who is the man drinking a martini?" Suppose further that your friend knows that the man in question is Fred and that Fred's glass is filled with water. According to the Russellian attributive analysis, such a question would amount to asking for the identity of the one and only one man drinking a martini. But the presupposition that there is a man drinking a martini is false, and so there should be no answer to the question. But your friend can, and in normal circumstances will, answer your question. Donnellan concludes that even though there is no unique thing that satisfies the definite description, there is nothing defective about the use of the phrase "the man drinking a martini." This referential use of the phrase enables your friend to answer your question.

Donnellan's position on definite descriptions provoked a long and lively debate about the distinction between semantics and pragmatics, where the theory of meaning ends and the theory of how we use language in practical circumstances begins. Much of Donnellan's later work was devoted to this broad issue, along with other issues concerning the foundations of language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Necessity and Criteria," *Journal of Philosophy* 59 (1962): 647–57.
"Knowing What I Am Doing," *Journal of*

Philosophy 60 (1963): 401–9.

"Reference and Definite Descriptions," *Philosophical Review* 75 (1966): 281–304.

"Putting Humpty Dumpty Together Again," *Philosophical Review* 77 (1968): 203–15.

"Proper Names and Identifying Descriptions," *Synthese* 12 (1970): 335–58.

"Speaking of Nothing," *Philosophical Review* 74 (1974): 3–31.

"The Contingent A Priori and Rigid Designation," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 2 (1977): 12–27. Expanded version in *Contemporary Perspectives on the Philosophy of Language*, ed. Peter French et al. (Minneapolis, 1979), pp. 45–60.

"Speaker Reference, Descriptions and Anaphora," in *Syntax and Semantics, vol. 9: Pragmatics*, ed. Peter Cole (New York, 1978), pp. 47–68.

"Intuitions and Presuppositions," in *Radical Pragmatics*, ed. Peter Cole (New York, 1978), pp. 129–42.

"Kripke and Putnam on Natural Kind Terms," in *Knowledge and Mind*, ed. Carl Ginet and Sidney Shoemaker (Oxford, 1983), pp. 84–104.

"Belief and the Identity of Reference," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 14 (1989): 275–88.

"Genuine Names and Knowledge by Acquaintance," *Dialectica* 44 (1990): 99–112.

"There Is a Word for That Kind of Thing: An Investigation of Two Thought Experiments," in *Philosophical Perspectives* 7 (1993): 155–71.

"Burge Thought Experiments," in *Reflections and Replies: Essays on the Philosophy of Tyler Burge*, ed. Martin Hahn and Bjørn Ramberg (Cambridge, Mass., 2003).

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils
Devitt, Michael. "Donnellan's Distinction," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 6 (1981): 511–24.

Jeshion, Robin. "Donnellan on Neptune," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 63 (2001): 111–35.

Kripke, Saul. "Speaker's Reference and Semantic Reference," in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 2 (1977): 6–27.

Searle, John. "Referential and Attributive," *The Monist* 62 (1979): 190–208.

Soames, Scott. "Donnellan's Referential/Attributive Distinction," *Philosophical Studies* 73 (1994): 149–68.

Kent Johnson

DOUGHERTY, Jude Patrick (1930–)

Jude P. Dougherty was born on 21 July 1930 in Chicago, Illinois. He received his education from Catholic University of America, earning his BA in 1954, his MA in 1955, and his PhD in 1960. While completing his dissertation on "Recent American Naturalism: A Critique" with professor Charles A. Hart, he taught as an instructor of philosophy at Marquette University in 1957–8 and at Bellarmine College in Kentucky starting in 1958. In 1966 Dougherty was appointed associate professor of philosophy at Catholic University of America, and the next year he became Dean of the School of Philosophy there, the first layman to hold that office. He was promoted to full professor of philosophy in 1976, and continued to serve as Dean until his retirement in 1999. As Dean Emeritus, he remains very active in scholarship and the profession.

Dougherty has long been one of the most prominent American Catholic philosophers. He has published several books and over one hundred articles in the areas of theology, metaphysics, ethics, social and political philosophy, the philosophy of law, the philosophy of science, and the history of American philosophy. He has

been editor of the *Review of Metaphysics* since 1971. He has been President of the Metaphysical Society and the American Catholic Philosophical Association. He has received many honors, including the title Knight of the Order of St. Gregory and the Benemerenti Medal bestowed by Pope John Paul II; the Cardinal Wright Award from the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars; and the Aquinas Medal from the American Catholic Philosophical Association. He is one of the two North American fellows of the Pontifical Academy of St. Thomas Aquinas.

The essays collected in Dougherty's *Western Creed, Western Identity: Essays in Legal and Social Philosophy* (2000) are organized into three parts. The first part contrasts the views of Karl Marx and John DEWEY with those of Jacques MARITAIN and John Courtney MURRAY concerning the role of religion in society. The second part discusses the nature of the law and the relation between civil law and natural law, on topics in responsibility and punishment. The third part contains essays on faith and reason, in relation to such figures as Edith Stein, Maritain, and John Paul II. *Jacques Maritain: An Intellectual Profile* (2003) is a thorough introduction, providing an understanding and evaluation of many important aspects of Maritain's philosophy from metaphysics and epistemology to social and political theory. Dougherty's most recent book, *The Logic of Religion* (2003), surveys selected classical, medieval, and modern thinkers, including some Eastern representatives, on the nature of religion and its relationship with reason.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Recent American Naturalism: A Critique (Washington, D.C., 1960).

Western Creed, Western Identity: Essays in Legal and Social Philosophy (Washington, D.C., 2000).

Jacques Maritain: An Intellectual Profile (Washington, D.C., 2003).

The Logic of Religion (Washington, D.C., 2003).

Other Relevant Works

"Lessons from the History and Science of Technology," *Studies in Philosophy and the History of Philosophy* 4 (1967): 34–50.

"Dewey and the Value of Religion," *New Scholasticism* 51 (1977): 303–27.

"Potentiality from Aristotle to Rescher and Back," in *The Philosophy of Nicholas Rescher*, ed. Ernest Sosa (Dordrecht, 1979), pp. 109–22.

Ed., *The Good Life and Its Pursuit* (New York, 1984).

"The Thomistic Element in the Social Philosophy of John Paul II," *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 60 (1986): 156–65.

"Christian Philosophy: Sociological Category or Oxymoron?" *The Monist* 75 (1993): 283–90.

"The Failure of Positivism and the Enduring Legacy of Comte," in *Recovering Nature: Essays in Natural Philosophy, Ethics, and Metaphysics in Honor of Ralph McInerny*, ed. Thomas Hibbs and John O'Callaghan (Notre Dame, Ind., 1999), pp. 25–36.

"Moral Aspects of Immigration Policy," in *Immigration und Integration*, ed. Anton Rauscher (Berlin, 2003), pp. 41–8.

Further Reading

"Dougherty, Jude Patrick," in *Directory of American Scholars*, 10th edn (Detroit, 2002), vol. 4, p. 101.

John R. Shook

DOUGLAS, William Orville (1898–1980)

William O. Douglas was born on 16 October 1898 in Maine, Minnesota. The family moved early in his life to Cleveland in eastern Washington, and his father, a missionary for the Presbyterian Church, died when Douglas

was six. Struck by abject poverty and temporary infantile paralysis from polio, his childhood was a series of arduous challenges. Douglas attended Whitman College, which was interrupted by uneventful military service, and graduated with a BA in 1920. He taught school for two years and then attended Columbia University Law School. After graduating second in his class with his JD in 1925, Douglas worked for two years at a prominent Wall Street Law Firm, Cravath, de Gersdoff, Swaine, and Wood. In 1927 he became a full-time law professor at Columbia University, and then from 1928 to 1939 he was Sterling Professor of Law at Yale University, specializing in the field of corporate law.

Like many of his generation, Douglas supported President Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal policies, which aroused his interest in working for the Securities and Exchange Commission. In 1936 he became a member of the SEC and later served as Chairman. Rewarding his loyalty toward the New Deal, in 1939 President Roosevelt selected Douglas to replace Associate Justice Louis BRANDEIS on the Supreme Court of the United States.

Drawing on his experiences as a law professor and on the SEC, Douglas's early New Deal decisions in business regulation struck a fair balance between the company and consumer, as evidenced by *Federal Power Commission v. Hope Natural Gas Company* (1944). Douglas, however, is best known for his strong libertarian views protecting the powerless and downtrodden. Regarding free speech in *Dennis v. United States* (1951), for example, Douglas dissented against the majority that upheld the conviction of several Communist Party members' actions under the Smith Act (1940). He, in contrast, believed that free speech should be tested in a free market and mused that the most valued ideas would flourish. Although not expressly mentioned in the Constitution, he also was a strong advocate for the right to privacy. In *Griswold v. Connecticut* (1965), Douglas, speaking on behalf of the Court, held that the right to privacy encompassed a married couple's

right to use contraceptives because penumbras emanate from certain explicit constitutional provisions. During the tumultuous 1960s he wanted to ensure that those groups not afforded protection by other governmental agents could turn to the courts to redress their grievances. In *Adderly v. Florida* (1966), for instance, Douglas dissented against the majority's decision upholding a conviction of student protestors who gathered at a local jail to express their discontent with segregation policies and related arrests. He declared that the Constitution, not a government official, must be the ultimate arbiter of the time and place of the gathering if the protest was peaceful.

After serving for thirty-six years and seven months on the Supreme Court, Douglas had to retire in 1975 because of a stroke. He died on 19 January 1980 in Washington, D.C. He not only had strong philosophical predilections as a justice, but also was an author of numerous manuscripts, ranging on topics from his experiences traveling in central Asia and Russia to conservation and the environment to democracy. He will be most remembered, however, as a constitutional guardian of civil rights and liberties.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Stare Decisis (New York, 1949).
Strange Lands and Friendly People (New York, 1951).
An Almanac of Liberty (New York, 1954).
Russian Journey (New York, 1956).
The Rights of the People (Garden City, N.Y., 1958).
America Challenged (Princeton, N.J., 1960).
A Living Bill of Rights (Garden City, N.Y., 1961).
Democracy's Manifesto (New York, 1962).
The Anatomy of Liberty: The Rights of Man without Force (New York, 1963).
Mr. Lincoln & the Negroes: The Long Road to Equality (New York, 1963).
A Wilderness Bill of Rights (Boston, 1965).
Points of Rebellion (New York, 1970).

International Dissent: Six Steps to World Peace (New York, 1971).

Go East, Young Man: The Early Years, the Autobiography of William O. Douglas (New York, 1972).

The Three-hundred Year War: A Chronicle of Ecological Disaster (New York, 1972).

The Court Years, 1939–1975: The Autobiography of William O. Douglas (New York, 1980).

Other Relevant Works

Douglas's papers are in the Library of Congress.

The Douglas Opinions, ed. Vern Countryman (New York, 1977).

The Douglas Letters: Selections from the Private Letters of Justice William O. Douglas, ed. Melvin Urofsky and Philip E. Urofsky (Bethesda, Md., 1987).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v7*

Ball, Howard, and Phillip J. Cooper. *Of Power and Right: Hugo Black, William O. Douglas, and America's Constitutional Revolution* (Oxford, 1992).

Epstein, Leon D. "Justice Douglas and Civil Liberties," *Wisconsin Law Review* (January 1951): 125–57.

Murphy, Bruce A. *Wild Bill: The Legend and Life of William O. Douglas* (New York, 2003).

Wasby, Steven L., ed. *"He Shall Not Pass This Way Again:" The Legacy of Justice William O. Douglas* (Pittsburgh, 1990). Contains a bibliography of Douglas's writings.

Simon, James. *Independent Journey: The Life of William O. Douglas* (New York, 1980).

John R. Hermann

DOUGLASS, Frederick (1818–95)

Frederick Douglass was born Frederick Augustus Washington Bailey in February 1818 near Easton, Maryland. Douglass escaped from slavery in 1838, settled in New Bedford, Massachusetts, and changed his surname to Douglass. William Lloyd GARRISON, the outspoken leader of the Anti-Slavery Society, hired him in August 1841 as a lecturer to speak in northern states and sell subscriptions to Garrison's newspaper *The Liberator*. Douglass published *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave* in 1845. To avoid being seized as a fugitive, he agreed to purchase his freedom from slavery in 1846. He began publication of his own newspaper, the *North Star*, in 1847. He addressed the first women's rights convention in 1848, supporting women's right to vote as an essential part of their movement.

Before 1850 Douglas was a pacifist. The Fugitive Slave law of 1850 changed him. Douglass, with a number of other Boston abolitionists, provided money for John Brown's raid on Harper's Ferry in 1859. He maintained that the way to prevent the taking of fugitives is to make a few dead fugitive catchers. As an unofficial advisor to President Abraham Lincoln during the US Civil War, Douglass persuaded Lincoln to make emancipation a major war goal and to allow black enlistment in the Union Army. Douglass believed that military service would allow black men to demonstrate their patriotism and manhood, winning equality as well as ending slavery. After the Civil War, Douglass was appointed to administrative posts, including US Marshal for the District of Columbia (1877–81) and US Minister to Haiti (1889–91). Douglass died on 20 February 1895 in Washington, D.C.

Many consider Frederick Douglass the most influential African American of the nineteenth century. Douglass understood that the struggle for emancipation and equality demanded forceful, persistent, and unyielding agitation. And he recognized that the African American

must play a conspicuous role in that struggle. Douglass was an ardent advocate of American individualism, as seen in his often-repeated lecture "Self-Made Men." He considered the very idea of prejudice utterly revolting. He deplored it in all of its manifestations, whether based on religion, class, color, race, or sex, considering it a "moral disorder" and "consequence of a diseased imagination." Prejudice was irrational, evil, unnatural, and unjust. Douglass made a career of agitating the American conscience. He devoted most of his time to the cause of equal rights for African Americans.

Douglass also spoke and wrote on behalf of a variety of reform causes: women's rights, temperance, peace, land reform, free public education, and the abolition of capital punishment. Douglass's importance as a thinker derives from his insight into the complex interrelationship between the African American and the European American. For example he battled against white southern attempts to deport blacks to Africa. His central intellectual struggle was to resolve the dynamic tension between his identities as a black man and as an American. Douglass's positions were the foundation of "Negro" middle-class identity and conceptions of community responsibility, symbolized by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Urban League.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave (New York, 1845; New Haven, Conn., 1999).
My Bondage and My Freedom (New York, 1855; New Haven, Conn., 2003).
Life and Times of Frederick Douglass (Hartford, Conn., 1881).

Other Relevant Works
Douglass's papers are at the Library of Congress.
Life and Writings of Frederick Douglass, 5 vols, ed. Phillip S. Foner (New York, 1950–75).

The Frederick Douglass Papers: Speeches, Debates, and Interviews, 5 vols, ed. John W. Blassingame (New Haven, Conn., 1979–92).
Autobiographies (New York, 1994).
The Oxford Frederick Douglass Reader, ed. William L. Andrews (Oxford, 1996).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v2*
Davis, Reginald F. *A Critical Analysis of Selected Theories of the Philosophical and Theological Development of Frederick Douglass*. PhD dissertation, Florida State University (Tallahassee, Fla., 1997).
Duberman, Martin. *The Antislavery Vanguard: New Essays on the Abolitionist* (Princeton, N.J., 1965).
McFeely, William S. *Frederick Douglass* (New York, 1991).
Quarles, Benjamin. *Frederick Douglass* (Washington, D.C., 1948).

Donald L. Brown

DRAKE, Durant (1878–1933)

Durant Drake was born on 18 December 1878 in Hartford, Connecticut. Drake was educated at Harvard, where he received his BA degree in 1900 and his MA degree in 1902. At Harvard, Drake was influenced by William JAMES, George SANTAYANA, Josiah ROYCE, George PALMER, and Dickinson MILLER, while his religious bent also led him to the Divinity School. He pursued his doctoral studies at Columbia University, where he received his PhD in philosophy in 1911, writing his dissertation on "The Problem of Things in Themselves." At Columbia he was introduced to John DEWEY,

F. J. E. WOODBRIDGE, and William MONTAGUE, whose philosophical theories, although alien to his earlier thinking, "eventually penetrated" his consciousness, which was especially impressed also by the writings of Charles A. STRONG. In 1911–12 Drake taught philosophy at the University of Illinois. In 1912 he was appointed professor of philosophy and religion at Wesleyan University in Connecticut; the Bible was among the subjects he taught. In 1915 he was appointed professor of philosophy at Vassar College, a position he held until his death on 15 November 1933 in Poughkeepsie, New York.

In epistemology and metaphysics Drake was a critical realist, and in ethics and philosophy of religion he was a meliorist. Critical realism followed new realism as the second major movement in American realism in the twentieth century, and Drake played a major role. Although in his *Problems of Things in Themselves* (1911) he took the position of epistemological dualism, separating the cognitive state in mind from the object for knowledge external to the mind, he was persuaded by the new realists that what we are aware of or perceive when our perception is accurate are the real things themselves.

In 1916 Drake conceived the idea of a cooperative volume to present a more accurate realistic epistemology than that advanced by the new realism. Six other American philosophers joined him – Santayana, Strong, A. O. LOVEJOY, J. B. PRATT, A. K. ROGERS, and R. W. SELLARS. The volume *Essays in Critical Realism* appeared in 1920, with Drake's contribution as the lead essay.

Because, unlike the new realist, the critical realist acknowledges that some cognitive states are susceptible to error, he maintains that the cognitive situation is a triadic relation between a knower, an independent object of knowledge, and the datum of experience, that of which we are aware. While the datum may be identical with the independent object of knowledge, there is no guarantee that it is. Drake, along with Santayana, Strong, and Rogers,

adopted the term "essence" to designate the datum, also called the "describable somewhat."

The unity of purpose which underlay Drake's epistemological and metaphysical enterprise was his meliorism. He sought to articulate and diffuse a method of intelligence and experience among humans so that they could escape unnecessary unhappiness and instead attain, by the art of living, the rich and adventurous happiness of which they are capable. His was a naturalistic, utilitarian morality. Drake had great sympathy for the definition of value as any object of interest or desire, with the proviso that it is necessary to learn what to desire. Experience or experiment confirms some objects worthy, others worthier, and still others worthless. Intelligence joins experiment as the method for constructing the art of living. Religion, too, falls within the art of living. Rejecting the supernatural and skeptical of traditional religions, Drake nonetheless embraced a humanistic religion, believing in God as a transcendent essence, the Ideal Good, and as an immanent power in each of us to make for righteousness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Problems of Things in Themselves (Boston, 1911).
Problems of Conduct: An Introductory Survey of Ethics (Boston, 1914).
Problems of Religion: An Introductory Survey (Boston, 1916).
Shall We Stand by the Church? A Dispassionate Inquiry (Boston, 1920).
"The Approach to Critical Realism," in *Essays in Critical Realism: A Co-operative Study of the Problem of Knowledge* (London, 1920), pp. 3–34.
America Faces the Future (New York, 1922).
Mind and Its Place in Nature (New York, 1925).
New Morality (New York, 1928).
Invitation to Philosophy (Boston, 1933).

Other Relevant Works
"The Philosophy of a Meliorist," in

Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 1, pp. 277–97.

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Blanshard, Brand, *The Nature of Thought* (New York, 1939), vol. 1, pp. 416–44.
Harlow, Victor E. *Bibliography and Genetic Study of American Realism* (Oklahoma City, Okla., 1931).
Klausner, Neal W. "Three Decades of the Epistemological Dialectic," *Philosophy of Science* 14 (1947): 20–43.
Laird, John, *A Study of Realism* (Cambridge, UK, 1920).
Sellars, Roy Wood. *Reflections on American Philosophy from Within* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1969).
Schneider, Herbert W. *Sources of Contemporary Philosophical Realism in America* (Indianapolis, 1964).

Andrew J. Reck

DRAY, William Herbert (1921–)

William H. Dray was born on 23 June 1921 in Montréal, Canada. He received his BA from the University of Toronto in 1949. He then attended the University of Oxford where he received another BA in philosophy, politics, and economics in 1951, an MA in 1955 and a D.Phil. in philosophy in 1956. At Oxford he studied with W. H. Walsh, whose views were a continuing influence on his work. In 1956 Dray became an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Toronto, and was promoted up to full professor. In 1968 he became chair of the philosophy department at Trent University in Ontario, serving until 1973, and teaching at Trent until 1976. From 1976 until retiring in 1985, Dray was professor of philosophy at the University of Ottawa.

Dray's doctoral thesis provided the basic themes for much of the rest of his published work. Carl HEMPEL and Karl Popper had insisted that historical explanations, like scientific explanations elsewhere, proceed by showing that one could deduce the *explanandum* from a description of circumstances and a universal law of nature. Dray argued that many historical explanations do not need laws, some are based on showing how actions are rational, and others explain by showing "what" happened, or "why." His concern, he states, is to examine the logic of historical explanation, not engage in epistemology or philosophy of science. R. G. Collingwood's theories about history as reenactment were also in the background, but worked out in ways that did not appeal to inner working of thought that made historical writing seem arbitrary or subjective. Dray was arguing for a middle ground between positivistic theories and those accused of philosophical idealism.

In general, Dray does not begin from general normative principles about what history should be like, but rather from an examination of actual writings of historians to find the conceptual structures of their explanations and of their accounts of what happened. Dray's studies of particular examples yield a variety of explanatory patterns. Some use causal concepts, some collect events together to show "what" happened, some show how an event was "possible," and so on. In his later writings, Dray moves on from explanation to see what can be said about the role of values in history, about objectivity and subjectivity, human freedom and determinism. In each case his interest is in the particular way in which these matters affect the specific piece of historical writing. For that reason, Dray's detailed analysis of ways of explaining, influenced by H. L. A. Hart and A. M. Honoré's *Causation and the Law,* resists simple summary. Dray thinks that there are legitimate, nondeductive forms of causal explanation, that history is

not an autonomous discipline with its own independent logic, and that narrative structure and identification of matters as valuable do not impugn a reasonable objectivity. His influence can be felt in the way in which philosophy of history is disinclined to tackle huge epistemological issues.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Laws and Explanation in History (London, 1957).
Philosophy of History (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964; 2nd edn 1993).
Perspectives on History (London, 1980).
On History and Philosophers of History (Leiden, 1989).
History as Re-enactment: R. G. Collingwood's Idea of History (Oxford, 1995).

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *Philosophical Analysis and History* (New York, 1966).
Ed. with L. Pompa, *Substance and Form in History: A Collection of Essays in Philosophy of History* (Edinburgh, 1981).
Ed. with W. J. van der Dussen, *The Principles of History, and Other Writings in Philosophy of History*, by R. G. Collingwood (Oxford, 1999).

Further Reading
Canad Encyc
Van der Dussen, W. J., and Lionel Rubinoff, eds. *Objectivity, Method, and Point of View: Essays in the Philosophy of History* (Leiden, 1991). Volume in honor of Dray, containing a bibliography of his writings.

William R. Abbott

DREBEN, Burton Spencer (1927–99)

Burton Dreben was born on 26 September 1927 in Boston, Massachusetts. He graduated from Boston Latin School in 1945. He attended Harvard, receiving his BA in 1949 and MA in philosophy in 1955. Dreben was a professor of philosophy at the University of Chicago in 1955–6, at Harvard University from 1956 to 1990, and at Boston University from 1991 until his death on 11 July 1999 in Boston, Massachusetts. He was a member of Harvard's Society of Fellows from 1952 to 1955, a Fulbright Fellow at Magdalen College, Oxford in 1950–51, a Guggenheim Fellow in 1957–8, and in 1963 was elected to membership in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He was Harvard's Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences from 1973 to 1976. Dreben was an editor of *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* from 1967 to 1976.

Dreben's main philosophical interests were mathematical logic, the history of analytic philosophy, and especially the philosophy of W. V. Quine. Quine used Dreben unceasingly as a sounding board for his philosophical ideas. In grateful acknowledgement of this, Quine dedicated his 1990 book, *Pursuit of Truth*, as follows: "TO BURT DREBEN, *firm friend and constructive critic down the decades*."

Though Dreben was an expert on the history of analytic philosophy and on Quine's philosophy, he published very little. Much of what he knew regarding analytic philosophy and Quine is lost with his passing. Luckily, all is not lost, for he produced several excellent and faithful students, including Richard Creath, Michael Friedman, Warren Goldfarb, W. D. Hart, Peter Hylton, Daniel Isaacson, Miriam Solomon, Alan Richardson, and Thomas Ricketts. It is probably close to the mark to say that Dreben's students represent his greatest philosophical legacy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"On the Completeness of Quantification Theory," *Proceedings of the National*

Academy of Science of the United States of America 38 (1952): 1047–52.

"False Lemmas in Herbrand," with S. O. Aanderaa and P. B. Andrews, *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 69 (1962): 699–706.

"The Craig Interpolation Lemma," with Hilary Putnam, *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 8 (1967): 229–33.

"Herbrand-Style Consistency Proofs," with J. S. Denton, Jr., in *Intuitionism and Proof Theory*, ed. A. Kino, J. Myhill, and R. E. Vesley (Amsterdam, 1970), pp. 419–33.

The Decision Problem: Solvable Classes of Quantificational Formulas, with Warren D. Goldfarb (Reading, Mass., 1979).

"Quine," in *Perspectives on Quine*, ed. Robert Barrett and Roger Gibson (Oxford, 1990), pp. 81–95.

"Tautology: How Not to Use a Word," with Juliet Floyd, *Synthese* 87 (1991): 23–49.

"Putnam, Quine – and the Facts," *Philosophical Topics* 20 (1992): 293–315.

"*In Mediis Rebus*," *Inquiry* 37 (1994): 441–7.

"Cohen's Carnap, or Subjectivity Is in the Eye of the Beholder," in *Science, Politics and Social Practice: Essays on Marxism and Science, Philosophy of Culture and the Social Sciences in Honor of Robert S. Cohen*, ed. K. Gavroglu, J. Stachel, and M. W. Wartofsky (Dordrecht, 1995), pp. 27–42.

"Quine and Wittgenstein: The Odd Couple," in *Wittgenstein and Quine*, ed. R. Arrington and H. Glock (London and New York, 1996), pp. 39–61.

"Hilbert and Set Theory," with A. Kanamori, *Synthese* 110 (1997): 77–125.

"On Rawls and Political Liberalism," in *The Cambridge Companion to Rawls*, ed. Samuel Freeman (Cambridge, UK, 2003), pp. 316–46.

"Quine on Quine," in *The Cambridge Companion to Quine*, ed. Roger Gibson (Cambridge, UK, 2004), pp. 287–93.

Further Reading

Putnam, Hilary. "Reply to Burton Dreben," *Philosophical Topics* 20 (1992): 393–9.

Rawls, John. "Afterward: A Reminiscence," in *Future Pasts: The Analytic Tradition in Twentieth-century Philosophy*, ed. Juliet Floyd (Oxford, 2001), pp. 417–30.

Roger F. Gibson

DRETSKE, Frederick Irwin (1932–)

Fred Dretske was born on 9 December 1932 in Waukegan, Illinois. In 1954 he received a BA in electrical engineering from Purdue University. He then received his MA in 1958 and PhD in philosophy in 1960 from the University of Minnesota, writing a dissertation on the philosophy of time under May BRODBECK. Dretske's first academic appointment was teaching philosophy at the University of Wisconsin beginning in 1960, where he rose to the rank of full professor. At Wisconsin he was particularly close to fellow philosophers Berent Enç, Elliott Sober, and Denis Stampe, and they made Wisconsin a center for philosophical naturalism, theories of biological function, and causal/functional theories of the mind. Dretske was President of the American Philosophical Association Western Division in 1984–5. In 1988 he went to Stanford University, where he was the Bella and Eloise Mabury Knapp Professor of Philosophy and also served for a time as chair of the department. He became professor emeritus in 1998, and in 1999 he became a senior research scholar at Duke University.

Dretske's first book, *Seeing and Knowing* (1969), deals with the question of what is required to know that something is the case on the basis of what is seen. He rejected the widely held view of the time that knowledge is some variant on the theme of justified true belief.

Knowledge requires true belief, but inner justifications are not typically used in gaining knowledge from the senses, nor are they necessary for gaining such knowledge, according to Dretske. He was in the forefront of what came to be known as the "naturalized epistemology" movement. The theory of knowledge presented in *Seeing and Knowing* held that for a subject *S* to be able to see that an object *b* has property *P* is (i) for *b* to be *P*, (ii) for *S* to see *b*, (iii) for the conditions under which *S* sees *b* to be such that *b* would not look the way it now looks to *S* unless it were *P*, and (iv) for *S*, believing that conditions are as described in (iii), to take *b* to be *P* (1969, pp. 78–93). For example, for a person to see that your shirt is torn – to know, by seeing, that it is torn – is for that person to see your shirt under conditions such that it would not look the way it does if your shirt were not torn, and for that person to believe that your shirt is torn on that basis.

Dretske's principal innovation occurs in condition (iii), which requires, not that it be *impossible* for your shirt to look torn when it is not, but that it be *impossible in the given circumstances*. Dretske has in mind something like the following idea: if you are standing in such odd shadows that one such shadow might well have looked just like a tear to me, then even though I see a tear in your shirt I cannot come to have knowledge that you have a tear in your shirt. At most, I am lucky to be right. But if you are not standing in odd shadows (and are not the owner of shirts painted with imitation tears, and so on), then I *can* see that your shirt is torn, so long as I notice how your shirt looks and form appropriate beliefs as a result. The problem for the philosopher who would hold such a view is to specify which unrealized possibilities are relevant for determining whether or not your shirt could have looked that way to me under those circumstances without being torn. Now known as the problem of specifying the *relevant alternatives*, an active literature in epistemology has grown up around this idea that to know something requires, not that one be able to rule out all possible sources of error, but only some subset of these. An important consequence of this approach is that it allows one to know that P, and that P entails Q, without being able to know that Q – for to know that Q might require being able to rule out relevant alternatives that are not relevant to knowing P. For instance, I can see that your shirt has a tear, and know that, if your shirt has a tear, then existence is not merely a dream, without seeing that existence is not merely a dream, since seeing *that* requires existence to look some way that it would not, under the circumstances, if it were merely dreamt, and of course there is no such appearance for existence to have.

In addition to its interest as a contribution to the theory of knowledge, *Seeing and Knowing* is also interesting for the way in which it prefigures the themes which dominate Dretske's other philosophical projects. In its disinterest in epistemic justification and the norms surrounding belief, it prefigures Dretske's naturalism: not so much a specific doctrine as a commitment to providing philosophical theories which wear on their sleeves their continuity with the natural sciences. *Seeing and Knowing* also prefigures Dretske's work in the philosophy of mind. Both consciousness and belief would go on to receive book-length treatments from Dretske (discussed below). Likewise, the task of distinguishing consciousness and belief, and arguing for their distinctness, would continue to occupy Dretske into the 1990s. Perhaps most importantly, Dretske's condition (iii) on knowledge is the first appearance in his writings of any gesture at natural information, though as yet only in obscure form.

Dretske's next book, *Knowledge and the Flow of Information* (1981), returns to the topic of knowledge gained via perception, but does so with new ambitions. Dretske had become convinced that the concept of natural information was central to his understanding of knowledge, but that, once understood, it also opened the way to a naturalistic theory of belief. Information, understood in Dretske's

sense, is something that exists as an objective and mind-independent feature of the natural world. It is even something that can be quantified, following Claude Shannon and Warren Weaver. Dretske offers the following theory of information: A signal r carries the information that s is F = The conditional probability of s's being F, given r (and k), is 1 (but, given k alone, less than 1) (1981, p. 65). Thus, for the fact that a given maple leaf is red (r) to carry the information that fall (s) has arrived (is F) is for the probability that fall has arrived, given that the maple leaf is red (and given my background knowledge of the world, k), to be one (but less than one given just my background knowledge). A difficulty with Dretske's characterization of information is that, given his naturalistic ambitions for the notion of information, no appeal to background knowledge should appear in the theory of information, since information is meant to be prior to knowers. But this difficulty is fairly readily resolved by the excision of k from the theory, and later treatments of information (or "indication" or "natural meaning") by Dretske do not rely on background knowledge.

From his theory of information, Dretske develops a theory of knowledge and a theory of belief. His theory of knowledge is fundamentally quite similar to that of *Seeing and Knowing*, but now instead of appealing to the specific fact that an object would not look the way it does were it not F, Dretske has the resources to appeal to the idea that the visual state of the observer *carries the information* that the object is F. Conscious "looks" are thus put aside in favor of information-bearing, a less mysterious relation, but one which plays the same role in the theory of knowledge. The reformulated theory holds that knowledge is belief supported by information that certifies the truth of the belief. As before, such certification is not guaranteeing absolutely as such, but in the sense of guaranteeing absolutely *among relevant alternatives*, with context determining which alternatives are relevant.

Dretske's work on belief begins in the last third of *Knowledge and the Flow of Information*, but takes on its mature form in the book that followed, *Explaining Behavior* (1988), where it meets up with theories of desire, action, and reason-based explanation. Against such philosophers as Donald DAVIDSON, Dretske holds that actions are the causing of movements by mental states, rather than the movements themselves. Action is thus a partly mental process itself, not a mere product of a mental process. For the meaning (the content) of a belief to explain an action, on this view, is for the content of the belief to explain why it is that the mental state is part of a process that leads to the movement it does. Here Dretske's interest in information makes its appearance in the theory: a belief that P is a brain state that has been recruited (through operant conditioning) to be part of movement-causing processes because of the fact that it did, when recruited, carry the information that P. Being recruited because of carrying information is sufficient for having the function of carrying that information, on Dretske's view, and having the function of carrying information is sufficient for representation. Beliefs are thus mental representations that contribute to movement production *because* of their contents (saying P is *why* the brain state is recruited to cause movement), and so form components of the process known as *acting for a reason*.

An important feature of Dretske's account of belief is that, although brain states are recruited to control action because they carry information, there is no guarantee that they will continue to do so. Yet, once they have been recruited for carrying information, they have the function of carrying information, and continue to have that function even if they no longer carry information. This is how *misrepresentation* enters the world, on Dretske's view. A state that carries information cannot be wrong so long as it carries information: having information that P guarantees (within relevant possibilities) that P. But Dretske recognizes that an important fact about genuine representations is that they are capable of misrepresentation, and so he stresses that although

brain states can carry information, they may cease to, and then brain states with the function of carrying specific information will fail to perform their functions, and so misrepresent.

Dretske next turned to the nature of consciousness, defending a representational theory in *Naturalizing the Mind* (1995). Between the representational theory of belief, desire, and action in *Explaining Behavior* and the representational theory of consciousness found in *Naturalizing the Mind*, Dretske aims to give full support to what he calls the "Representational Thesis." This is the claim that (1) all mental facts are representational facts, and (2) all representational facts are facts about informational functions (1995, p. xiii). In seeking to extend representationalism to encompass consciousness, Dretske does not give up on his view, first expressed in *Seeing and Knowing*, that there is a fundamental difference between seeing something and seeing that something is the case, i.e., between seeing and believing. He nonetheless attempts to describe a deep underlying unity between consciousness and belief in representational terms. In *Explaining Behavior*, Dretske holds that when a brain state acquires, through learning, the function of carrying information, then it becomes a mental representation suited to being a belief. In *Naturalizing the Mind* he extends his taxonomy of representational types and holds that when a brain state acquires, *through natural selection*, the function of carrying information, then it is also a mental representation, but one suited (with certain provisos) to being a state of consciousness.

The very idea that representations might explain consciousness may seem obscure. It is true that our senses tell us about the world, and so might be said to represent it to us, but it has seemed obvious to many that the *way* in which they represent the world, via qualities such as experienced redness, saltiness, or roughness, go beyond what they represent. Many would say that the redness that appears in consciousness is just the mind's way of presenting a physical property that is not red in the same sense. In *Naturalizing the Mind*, Dretske rejects this sort

of thinking. Experienced redness is redness, a purely physical property of certain objects, which is experienced. Roughly, to experience something as a precise shade of red is to have an experience that "says" the object is that very shade of red. "Saying," in this case, is simply a matter of the experience being a mental representation, the content of which is that the object is the precise shade of red in question. A little more is required, of course: not every mental representation in one's head is an experience. But this little more is not the "hard" part of consciousness. The mental representations that are our experiences are those whose functions come from natural selection and whose connections to the rest of the brain allow their information to be taken up into belief. When these conditions are met, then the contents of these mental representations *are* the contents of consciousness. What it is like to experience a fine French chocolate is to represent that one's mouth contains a sweet (in a specific way, to a specific degree), bitter (likewise specific) substance, giving off specific odors and presenting a specific sticky smooth surface to the tongue and palate, and so on.

Dretske is also a leading proponent, along with David Armstrong and Michael Tooley, of the view that laws of nature are relations among universals, and he has contributed to discussions of explanation and events. He has recently returned to active work in epistemology, working on a puzzle about knowledge of one's own consciousness. If perceptual knowledge is belief that is sustained by information-bearing perceptual states, then do we have perceptual knowledge of our own states of consciousness? Since we do not see or hear our mental representations (they are what we see and hear *with*, on Dretske's view), it seems that we have no perceptual knowledge of our own consciousness. But surely we do not only know that we are conscious by careful reasoning and argument! This puzzle's resolution would bring Dretske full circle, completing the naturalistic program for knowledge with which he launched his career.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Seeing and Knowing (Chicago and London, 1969).

Knowledge and the Flow of Information (Cambridge, Mass., 1981; Stanford, Cal., 1999).

Explaining Behavior: Reasons in a World of Causes (Cambridge, Mass., 1988).

Naturalizing the Mind (Cambridge, Mass., 1995).

Perception, Knowledge, and Belief: Selected Essays (Cambridge, UK, 2000).

Other Relevant Works

"Observational Terms," *Philosophical Review* 73 (1964): 25–42.

"Perception from an Epistemological Point of View," *Journal of Philosophy* 68 (1971): 584–90.

"Laws of Nature," *Philosophy of Science* 44 (1977): 248–68.

"Chisholm on Perceptual Knowledge," *Grazer Philosophische Studien* 7/8 (1979): 253–69.

"The Intentionality of Cognitive States," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 5 (1980): 281–94.

"Machines and the Mental," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 59 (September 1985): 23–33.

"Misrepresentation," in *Belief*, ed. Radu Bogdan (Oxford, 1986), pp. 17–36.

"Can Intelligence Be Artificial?" *Philosophical Studies* 71 (1993): 201–16.

"Dretske, Fred," in *A Companion to the Philosophy of Mind*, ed. Samuel Guttenplan (Oxford, 1994), pp. 259–65.

"Dretske's Awful Answer," *Philosophia* 24 (1995): 459–64.

"Phenomenal Externalism," *Philosophical Issues* 7 (1996): 143–58.

"Machines, Plants and Animals: The Origins of Agency," *Erkenntnis* 51 (1999): 19–31.

"Entitlement: Epistemic Rights without Epistemic Duties?" *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 60 (2000): 591–606.

"Norms, History and the Mental," *Philosophy* suppl. 49 (2001): 87–104.

"Externalism and Self-knowledge," in *New Essays on Semantic Externalism and Self-knowledge*, ed. Susana Nuccetelli (Cambridge, Mass., 2003), pp. 131–42.

"Skepticism: What Perception Teaches," in *The Skeptics: Contemporary Essays*, ed. Steven Luper (Aldershot, UK, 2003), pp. 105–18.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v9*

Fodor, Jerry. "Semantics: Wisconsin Style," *Synthese* 59 (1984): 231–50.

Foley, Richard. "Dretske's 'Information-theoretic' Account of Knowledge," *Synthese* 70 (1987): 159–84.

Kim, Jaegwon. "Causation, Emphasis, and Events," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 2 (1977): 100–103.

Lycan, William G. "Dretske on the Mind's Awareness of Itself," *Philosophical Studies* 95 (1999): 125–33.

McLaughlin, Brian, ed. *Dretske and His Critics* (Cambridge, Mass., 1991). Contains a bibliography of Dretske's publications.

Mele, Alfred. "Dretske's Intricate Behavior," *Philosophical Papers* 20 (1991): 1–10.

Niiniluoto, Ilkka. "Dretske on Laws of Nature," *Philosophy of Science* 45 (1978): 431–9.

Shope, Robert. *The Analysis of Knowing: A Decade of Research* (Princeton, N.J., 1983).

"Symposium on *Explaining Behavior: Reasons in a World of Causes*," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 50 (1990): 783–839.

Williams, Michael. "Dretske on Epistemic Entitlement," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 60 (2000): 607–12.

<div align="right">Reinaldo Elugardo</div>

DREYFUS, Hubert Lederer (1929–)

Hubert L. Dreyfus was born on 15 October 1929 in Terre Haute, Indiana. He received his education at Harvard University, earning the BA with highest honors in philosophy in 1951, and joined Phi Beta Kappa. Dreyfus then earned his MA in 1952, and a PhD in philosophy in 1964. His dissertation was titled "Husserl's Phenomenology of Perception." Dreyfus studied at the University of Freiburg on a Harvard Sheldon traveling fellowship in 1953–4; traveled to the Husserl Archives at the University of Louvain on a Fullbright Fellowship in 1956–7; and went to the Ecole Normale Supérieure in Paris on a French government grant in 1959–60.

Dreyfus began his teaching career at Brandeis University as instructor in philosophy from 1957 to 1959, and then was assistant and associate professor of philosophy at Massachusetts Institute of Technology from 1960 to 1968. In 1968 he became associate professor of philosophy at the University of California at Berkeley, and was promoted to full professor in 1972. Since 1994 Dreyfus has been professor of philosophy in the Graduate School at Berkeley, and added a joint appointment in the rhetoric department in 1999. He has directed several NEH summer institutes, received grants and fellowships from the NSF, ACLS, the Guggenheim fund, and taught as a visiting professor at many universities. In 2003 he was the Spinoza Lecturer at the University of Amsterdam. He became a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 2001, and served as President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association in 2004–5.

The phenomenologies of Husserl, Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty, and other continental philosophers have dominated Dreyfus's scholarly attention. Of particular interest to him is how phenomenological explorations of learning, understanding, and intelligence contrast favorably with the excessively rationalistic traditions of modern philosophy. Both empiricism and idealism have elevated the notion of "representation" far above its proper role in learning. Expertise arrives when neither representations of one's goal, or of means to achieve it, occupy one's attention. The ordinary knowledge of common sense is grounded on accumulated living that provides for a meaningful environment, in which the agent can immediately assess the relevance of contextual features of novel situations. The representational theory, for which the mind is a logical calculator of symbols representing external matters, is entirely false to the nature of lived experience.

During the mid 1960s Dreyfus witnessed the beginnings of Artificial Intelligence at the Rand Corporation, in the pioneering work of Allen NEWELL and Herbert SIMON. Dreyfus immediately launched a thorough attack on AI's basic principle that the brain's intelligence is similar to the computer's logical manipulation of discrete symbols. According to Dreyfus, AI is the newest mechanical manifestation of the rationalist tradition in philosophy, because they both view the mind as essentially rational, representational, and rule-governed. In his earlier writings he suggested that the brain's analog operations could never be duplicated by the computer's digital processes. In more recent writings, he has suggested that neural networks may have some potential for modeling actual human learning. However, like his Berkeley colleague John SEARLE, Dreyfus takes the very limited success of AI as confirmation that it has contributed very little to the understanding of consciousness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

What Computers Still Can't Do: A Critique of Artificial Reason (Cambridge, Mass., 1972; 2nd edn 1979).

Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics, with Paul Rabinow (Brighton, UK, 1982; 2nd edn, Chicago, 1983).

Mind Over Machine: The Power of Human Intuition and Expertise in the Era of the

Computer (New York, 1986).

Being-in-the-world: A Commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time (Cambridge, Mass., 1991)

Thinking in Action: On the Internet (London and New York, 2001).

Other Relevant Works

"Alchemy and Artificial Intelligence," Rand Corporation paper P3244 (Santa Monica, Cal., 1966).

"Phenomenology and Artificial Intelligence," in *Phenomenology in America*, ed. James Edie (Chicago, 1967), pp. 31–47.

"Phenomenology and Mechanism," *Noûs* 5 (1971): 81–96.

"Holism and Hermeneutics," *Review of Metaphysics* 34 (1980): 3–24.

Ed., *Husserl, Intentionality and Cognitive Science* (Cambridge, Mass., 1982).

"Husserl's Epiphenomenology," in *Perspectives on Mind*, ed. Herbert Otto and James Tuedio (Dordrecht, 1988), pp. 85–106.

"Towards a Reconciliation of Phenomenology and A.I.," with Stuart Dreyfus, in *The Foundations of Artificial Intelligence: A Sourcebook*, ed. Derek Partridge and Yorick Wilks (Cambridge, UK, 1990).

"Action and the First Person," with Jerome Wakefield, in *John Searle and His Critics*, ed. Ernest Lepore and Robert Van Gulick (Oxford, 1990).

"Searle's Freudian Slip," *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 13 (1990): 603–604.

"Heidegger's Hermeneutic Realism," in *The Interpretive Turn: Philosophy, Science, Culture*, ed. David R. Hiley, James F. Bohman, and Richard Shusterman (Ithaca, N.Y., 1991).

Ed. with Harrison Hall, *Heidegger: A Critical Reader* (Oxford, 1992).

"Coping with Things in Themselves: A Practice-based Phenomenological Basis of Robust Realism," with Charles Spinosa,

Inquiry 42 (1999): 49–78.

"A Merleau-Pontyian Critique of Husserl's and Searle's Representationalist Accounts of Action," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 100 (2000): 287–302.

Ed. with Mark Wrathall, *Heidegger Reexamined*, 4 vols (London and New York, 2002).

"Intelligence without Representation: Merleau-Ponty's Critique of Mental Representation," *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 1 (2002): 367–83.

"Taylor's (Anti-)Epistemology," in *Charles Taylor*, ed. Ruth Abbey (Cambridge, UK, 2004), pp. 52–83.

Further Reading

Cooper, David E. "Inverting the Image: Dreyfus's Commentary on Heidegger," *Inquiry* 35 (1992): 233–48.

Malpas, Jeff, and Mark A. Wrathall, eds. *Essays in Honor of Hubert L. Dreyfus*, 2 vols (Cambridge, Mass., 2000).

Pylyshyn, Zenon. "Minds, Machines, and Phenomenology: Some Reflections on Dreyfus' 'What Computers Can't Do'," *Cognition* 3 (1974–5): 57–77.

Rorty, Richard. "Not All 'That' Strange: A Response to Dreyfus and Spinosa," *Inquiry* 42 (1992): 125–8.

John R. Shook

DU BOIS, William Edward Burghardt (1868–1963)

W. E. B. Du Bois was born on 23 February 1868 in Great Barrington, Massachusetts. He graduated valedictorian from his high school in 1884 and then attended Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee from 1885 to 1888, earning his BA in 1888, and spending summers

teaching in African-American schools in Nashville's rural areas. It was at Fisk where he first experienced black higher education and the indignities of legalized racial segregation of the American South. The social practices of segregation were commonly referred to as "Jim Crow" and were present in segregated, separate institutions such as education, housing, transportation, restaurants, and medicine. Fisk provided Du Bois with a life-changing experience of his people, their shared fate, problems, and strengths. He began a lifelong defense of the leaders of the black community, whom he called "the talented tenth."

In 1888 Du Bois entered Harvard University, earning a second BA in 1890 majoring in history and graduating cum laude. He was introduced to pragmatism by William JAMES in psychology. Du Bois recounts that in many ways he was an outsider at Harvard and he made few friends there. In 1891 he earned an MA and from 1892 to 1894 he pursued graduate studies in history and economics at the University of Berlin on a Slater Fund Fellowship. He worked with Max Weber, the great interpretive sociologist, and became one of his few American students. Upon his return to the United States, he taught Greek and Latin at Wilberforce University in Ohio for two years during 1894–6 while he finished his doctoral dissertation on "The Suppression of the African Slave Trade in the United States of America, 1638–1870," which was published in 1896. He received his PhD in history from Harvard in 1895, becoming the first black to receive Harvard's doctorate. His dissertation signaled the pattern of many of his interests: the African diaspora, history, economics, and American race relations.

Du Bois was first a professor of classics and modern languages for two years at Wilberforce University in Ohio, and then an assistant instructor in sociology at the University of Pennsylvania in 1896–7. He accepted a position as professor of economics and history at Atlanta University where he taught from 1898 to 1910, before leaving academia to work for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) from 1910 to 1934. In 1934 he resigned from the NAACP and returned to his academic position at Atlanta University, where he taught from 1934 to 1944. He returned to the NAACP in 1944 as head of research on the African disapora in a concerted effort to legitimize the status of former colonies in the new postwar world order. He was dismissed from his duties at the NAACP in 1948 over ideological disputes. He eventually became the target of anti-communist witch-hunters and in 1951 he was tried and acquitted of a federal charge of failing to register as an agent of a foreign government. Although Du Bois was cleared of all charges, the trial cost him his savings, his reputation, and his fundamental faith in American institutions. This disillusionment with the United States, however, gave way to an optimistic and hopeful view of African life and culture. In 1960 he moved to Ghana, on the west coast of Africa, where he was a major intellectual and political symbol for the new state. Du Bois died on 27 August 1963 in Accra, Ghana, on the eve of the important civil rights milestone: the March on Washington led by Martin Luther KING, Jr.

In 1903 Du Bois observed that "the problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line" (p. 7), and this problem was the center of his ideas and lifework. He became one of the greatest intellectuals of the twentieth century, embracing the worldwide experience of Africans and their descendants, especially those kidnapped and sold into slavery in the New World. Du Bois was conscious of his racial and ethnic lineage, tracing it back to free Negroes who had settled in Great Barrington, Massachusetts in the early 1700s. Throughout his life he meticulously studied his ancestry from both its African and European (primarily Dutch) roots and was thankful that he was not descended from Anglo-Saxons. He was ambivalent toward whites most of his life.

Du Bois's experience at Wilberforce University helped to prepare him for a profes-

sional role in mainstream academic sociology. Though this institution had been established in 1852 for the education of African Americans, Du Bois felt he was never admitted as a full colleague by the white male establishment. Finding the religious mission of the Methodist college restrictive and unsatisfactory, he accepted a position at the University of Pennsylvania, where he used his sociological skills to survey economic and social conditions in the black community. He lived in a social settlement and his book was modeled on that of *Hull-House Maps and Papers* (*Residents of Hull-House*, 1895) and initiated a lifelong alliance with many of the white female sociologists who worked in community settings. Du Bois and Isabel Eaton, a Quaker, former Hull-House resident, and contributor to *Hull-House Maps and Papers*, produced the monumental study of *The Philadelphia Negro* (1899), which set the standard for urban studies of black communities in the United States. Du Bois did not enjoy life in a social settlement and he soon moved on to Atlanta University in 1898.

While at Atlanta he sponsored studies on a series of institutions, such as business, art, the church, and communities, which generated social networks and extensive scholarship on the black community. They established the ideal model for investigations in each of these topics for many decades. Between 1898 and 1904 the US Department of Labor sponsored four demographic studies of the black South conducted by Du Bois. These inquiries also established precedents to document the patterns of settlement, income, and distribution which dramatically shaped the lives of African Americans.

Du Bois's first autobiography was *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903). It is the passionate and eloquent story of an individual, W. E. B. Du Bois, and a group, African Americans. Du Bois could not separate himself from his world that was divided by a color line: one part was privileged and white, and it exploited the other part that was black. As an African American, Du Bois both studied this dilemma and lived it,

and as he (1903, p. 7) wryly wrote: "being a problem is a strange experience." Du Bois calls the experience generated by the color line "the Veil" and allowed his readers to walk with him within it. He did this symbolically through the sorrow songs that introduce each chapter.

One way to address these concerns was to work for gradual change, like Booker T. WASHINGTON, but Du Bois rejected this path. His unflinching criticism of Washington created a public debate about how to fight discrimination that continues to this day. Du Bois reflected on entering Fisk University, the Jim Crow world of the South, and teaching children who must endure its cruelty. He described his travels through the Black Belt, Jim Crow railway cars, and the plantations that dotted the landscape and continued the peculiar legacy of slavery through tenant farming.

Du Bois revealed how the "faith of our fathers" was a communal heritage. Music and lyrics created a heritage from the past that lives in the present. This faith was tested by the death of Du Bois's first (and only) son, Burghardt, who was refused medical care because of the color line. Du Bois's keening cry against the evil that killed his baby is a heart-wrenching paean to lost hope and love. Men survived and triumphed behind the Veil, nonetheless, and the African-American leader was the key to ending the color line. Ordinary people could be extraordinary, too. Their path may be hard, but their triumphs cause joy and celebration.

This book and succeeding books employ a number of pragmatist assumptions including an emphasis on education for the community and not just for the elite; the genesis of the self; intellectual activity that is problem-oriented and processual; a belief that social science is useful in a democracy; and a perspective stressing the union of opposites (as opposed to dichotomizations). Du Bois particularly drew on the pragmatism of James and his concept of "the self" as a divided, doubled, sense of "twoness." James's pragmatist understanding of "consciousness" with its corollary divisions

is also intellectually important. In addition, Du Bois supported Fabian socialism during this era, with a focus on state programs to provide minimal resources for health, housing, employment, and education. Although Du Bois later claimed he was not a socialist until the 1930s, this is not entirely true.

The Souls of Black Folk is a literary masterpiece that articulates the cost of hatred and the power to resist it. Although it has never been out of print, it was especially important in the 1960s when it helped inspire the American civil rights struggle. Du Bois continued to tell his life story and the story of a people during the rest of his long, productive life. *The Souls of Black Folk* is unique in its passion and eloquence, however.

While at Atlanta University he founded two journals: *The Moon Illustrated Weekly* (1905) and *The Horizon: A Journal of the Color Line* (1907). In 1905 he also helped to establish the Niagara Movement, comprised of black men who were part of the talented tenth and demanding full equality. This group opposed Booker T. Washington's gradual approach and political machine, and they built an alternative network of militant "race men."

In 1908 Du Bois's life was altered by a race riot in Springfield, Illinois. This event sparked a "Call" for a national organization to fight for civil rights for African Americans. Over forty leaders signed the Call, including Du Bois, which led to a conference in 1909 and the founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. This organization changed Du Bois's life and career.

By the end of this first phase of his life and work, Du Bois had established his interests in the "talented tenth." He had studied the structure of the slum in Philadelphia, the history of slavery, the Reconstruction era, and emancipation. He had used sophisticated methodologies ranging from demographic data, interviews, mapping techniques, and theoretical analyses. He had pioneered his autobiographical, experiential style of analysis, adapting the strengths of Weber's interpretive sociology with the feminist pragmatism of the women of Hull House.

From the inception of the NAACP, Du Bois was one of its leaders and became the founding editor of its journal *The Crisis*. This new job necessitated his resignation from Atlanta University and a turn from the academy to a national, multi-dimensional public role as an intellectual, leader, and journalist in New York City. In this position he built a national perspective on events affecting the lives of blacks throughout the United States. In a Herculean achievement, Du Bois produced a monthly journal filled with the latest news, editorial critiques of it, and essays written by national leaders. Literary figures submitted fiction and poetry on the black experience. *The Crisis* shaped the lives of blacks throughout the country, giving them news, hope, and cogent analyses. Du Bois maintained the journal with little overview or restraint from the NAACP despite continual efforts by the organization's directors to do so. The great popularity of the magazine and its financial success mitigated against their firing the independent Du Bois.

Du Bois published his second autobiographical book *Darkwater* in 1920. His most important concepts here revolve around his discussion of "white folks" and the study of white racism. He also analyzed "the damnation of women" and the mythic "Great Mother" in a major feminist statement about black women. Du Bois included fiction in this book, preceding the development of the Harlem Renaissance which occurred a few years later and in which Du Bois played an important, often critical role.

Du Bois expanded his dramatic interests with his production of the mammoth pageant, *The Star of Ethiopia*. This three-hour play required a cast of hundreds and was performed three times beginning in 1916. Du Bois also wrote novels during this period and explored numerous themes of love and romance outside his usual non-fictional "news-reporting" and comment. His leadership of a worldwide, pan-African movement also emerged during these

busy and fruitful years and continued throughout the rest of his life.

With the Great Depression, beginning in 1929, the economic fate of African Americans became direr and Du Bois increasingly despaired of achieving social justice and equality. After many years of conflict over who controlled *The Crisis*, its policies, content, and editorials, in 1934 Du Bois left the NAACP and returned to Atlanta University and the teaching of sociology. Du Bois quickly reentered the academic world and a Marxist, conflict perspective characterized this next major era in his life. Bitterness and discouragement over American capitalism and race relations permeated much of his work.

Two of Du Bois's most important books during this period are *Black Reconstruction* (1935) and his autobiographical *Dusk of Dawn* (1940). In *Black Reconstruction*, Du Bois analyzed the blunders of Reconstruction and the scholarly literature that distorted that history. He examined the failure of democracy and the bankrupt economy that prevented the attainment of full citizenship for black people. His new autobiography continued these themes and sharply criticized "white folk" and their corrupt "white world." In contrast to the strengths of the "gifts of black folk" which he praises, white racism delayed the coming of morning and the "dusk of dawn." American class structure echoed and reinforced racial segregation similar to a feudal pattern of class and interpersonal relations. This angry and disillusioned analysis is often used in conjunction with contemporary social movements based on interracial conflict. To his deep sorrow, he assessed the American people, including blacks, to be too corrupt and cowardly to come to his aid. This precipitated another major change in his life and ideas.

Du Bois published his final self-reflection in 1963, *The Autobiography of W. E. B. Du Bois*. The first five chapters related his travels to Europe, the Soviet Union, and China after 1958. After he observed the accomplishments of socialist nations, he finally converted to communism. The rest of this autobiography explained how and why he made this decision so late in life and in opposition to the training and pressures of American capitalism. This narrative portrayed his life as an inevitable advance toward communist ideals and praxis.

The most gripping portion of the *Autobiography* is Du Bois's clear description of his trumped-up indictment and persecution by the US Government during the McCarthy era. Du Bois's *Autobiography* reflects not only his disillusionment with the United States, however: it is an optimistic and hopeful view of African life and culture. Du Bois subtitles this autobiography "a soliloquy," to speak to the generations that follow him. One sign of his estrangement from America is the fact that this volume was published first in Russian in Moscow. The first English edition, posthumously published in 1968, was by International Publishers, a well-known voice for Marxist and Soviet-oriented books written in English. The *Autobiography* has been reprinted many times, but it remains his least popular autobiography. This relative obscurity is at least partially due to his despair over all Americans, black and white, and total rejection of capitalism which contrasts dramatically with his other autobiographies and popular role as an antagonist of white racism and unflinching supporter of the black community and its institutions. This last autobiography, like the three that preceded it, is a heroic narrative presenting Du Bois as an often lonely and embattled warrior with few friends and fewer resources other than his mind and pen. This makes for a gripping drama, but not necessarily an accurate portrayal of his life, allies, institutional power, or accomplishments. The veracity of Du Bois's recollections concerning both his enemies and friends cannot be decided on the selected, carefully crafted images of himself and his intellectual journeys.

Du Bois's second wife, Shirley Graham Du Bois, wrote a book (published in 1971) about the events covered in *The Autobiography*, but her account is of their shared lives, her view of Du Bois, and these events from her perspective.

Although her prose lacks the power of Du Bois's, her narrative is more romantic, popularly written, and accessible to the general reading public.

Herbert Aptheker, a Marxist scholar and loyal friend of Du Bois, edited a large number of books that radically increase the availability of Du Bois's more obscure writings. Aptheker edited and annotated volumes on Du Bois's correspondence, book reviews, short essays, and organizational documents (1973, 1976, 1978).

Most studies of Du Bois adopt his autobiographical view of himself, with an emphasis on that found in *Dusk of Dawn*. Eliot M. Rudrick's books (1960, 1968) represent this important literature that inspires many community activists and scholars. Adolph L. Reed, Jr. (1997) analyzes Du Bois's relation to Fabianism and the color line, but this book lacks a critical understanding of the subject, topic, and historical context. David Levering Lewis (1993, 2000) has written a lengthy, two-volume biography of Du Bois that draws on the archival documents of Du Bois, many of which are found in the Du Bois microfilm from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, as well as from interviews of many of Du Bois's friends, family, and colleagues. Although Lewis provides a much-needed corrective of the scholarship that unquestioningly accepts much of Du Bois's self-reflections, his biography is not a strong intellectual analysis of the overwhelming and massive literature created by Du Bois. Cornel West (1989), in contrast, brings Du Bois into significant contemporary debates on pragmatism and religion. Some editors (Clarke et al. 1970) of *Freedomways* compiled an important set of articles, essays, and memoirs that reflected on Du Bois's life and his impact upon the authors, including Martin Luther King, Jr.

The failure of sociologists adequately to acknowledge the significance of Du Bois is discussed by Dan S. Green and Edwin D. Driver (1978). Du Bois was particularly ostracized by Robert E. Park, the leader of the major group studying African Americans in sociology called the Chicago School of race relations, because Park was a follower of the ideas of Washington. This is part of the "Veil of sociology" which continues to support a complex pattern of hiding the discipline's elaboration, defense, and maintenance of racism and sexism which is analyzed in depth by Mary Jo Deegan (2002). In 1971 the American Sociological Association gave its first Du Bois-Johnson-Frazier award, officially honoring Du Bois's work for the first time.

The women of Du Bois's family socialized him into his African and American world views and he wrote often about them in his four autobiographies and other essays. He was a feminist, which allowed him to work successfully with both white and black women on a number of important issues. He failed to acknowledge these alliances in his writings, however, as Nellie McKay (in Andress 1985) documents for black women and Deegan (2002) documents for white women. Lewis (2000), in his second volume on Du Bois's life from 1919 until 1963, provides considerable evidence for his interpretation of Du Bois as a womanizer. But this information is disconnected often from Du Bois as a colleague to and intellectual influence on women, so this important area of ideas and professional patterns is yet to be explored.

The deep animosity between Du Bois and Washington has been replicated in dichotomized positions and scholarship on the two men. Their work is debated and analyzed in a huge literature on the "Washington–Du Bois Controversy," Miller's (1994) annotated twenty-three-page bibliography on this vast scholarship which largely accepts Du Bois's view of Washington as cowardly, cruel, power-hungry, and an agent of white racism. In 1961 Du Bois discussed his life and ideas in an interview with Moses Asch, which covers several of the major topics detailed in Du Bois's *Autobiography*, but more succinctly and conversationally than that found in the lengthy volume.

Because of the national and international significance of Du Bois's role as a black leader, his work as a creative writer and powerful editor,

and his centrality to initiating the Du Bois–Washington debate, it is important to stress that Du Bois developed and executed a series of brilliant, systematic sociological investigations of African-American life. Du Bois's unrelenting drive to live an intellectual life, to teach the "talented tenth" of Black America, and to destroy white myths and misapprehensions about African Americans by means of careful research gives coherence and meaning to his accomplishments.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Suppression of the African Slave-Trade to the United States of America, 1638–1860 (New York, 1896).

The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study. Together with a Special Report on Domestic Service by Isabel Eaton (Philadelphia, 1899).

The Souls of Black Folk (Chicago, 1903).

Darkwater: Voices from Within the Veil (New York, 1920).

Black Reconstruction in America: An Essay Toward a History of the Part Which Black Folk Played in the Attempt to Reconstruct Democracy in America, 1860–1880 (New York, 1935).

Dusk of Dawn: An Essay Toward an Autobiography of a Race Concept (New York, 1940).

World and Africa: An Inquiry into the Part Which Africa Has Played in World History (New York, 1947).

The Autobiography of W. E. B. Du Bois: A Soliloquy on Viewing My Life from the Last Decades of Its First Century (New York, 1968).

Other Relevant Works
Du Bois's papers are at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.

W. E. B. Du Bois: A Recorded Autobiography, interview by Moses Asch (New York, 1961).

The Seventh Son, Vol. 1, ed. Julius Lester (New York, 1970).

W. E. B. Du Bois Speaks: Speeches and Addresses, 2 vols, ed. Philip Foner (New York, 1970).

W. E. B. Du Bois: A Reader, ed. Meyer Weinberg (New York, 1970).

The Correspondence of W. E. B. Du Bois, 3 vols, ed. Herbert Aptheker (Amherst, Mass., 1973–8).

The Oxford W. E. B. Du Bois Reader, ed. Eric J. Sundquist (Oxford, 1996).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, Blackwell Amer Phil, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Dict Amer Bio, Encyc Amer Bio, Encyc Social Behav Sci, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v13, Who Was Who in Amer v4

Andress, Lillian, ed. *Critical Essays on W. E. B. Du Bois* (Boston, 1985).

Aptheker, Herbert. *W. E. B. Du Bois and the Struggle Against Racism in the World* (New York, 1983).

Clarke, John Henri, et al., eds. *Black Titan, W. E. B. Du Bois: An Anthology by the Editors of Freedomways* (Boston, 1970).

Deegan, Mary Jo. *Race, Hull-House, and the University of Chicago: A New Conscience Against Ancient Evils* (Westport, Conn., 2002).

Du Bois, Shirley Graham. *His Day is Marching On* (Philadelphia, 1971).

Green, Dan S., and Edwin D. Driver, *W. E. B. Du Bois on sociology and the Black Community* (Chicago, 1978).

Lewis, David Levering. *W. E. B. Du Bois: Biography of a Race, 1868–1919* (New York, 1993).

———, *W. E. B. Du Bois: The Fight for Equality and the American Century* (New York, 2000).

Miller, Jan. "Annotated Bibliography of the Washington–Du Bois Controversy," *Journal of Black Studies* 25 (1994): 250–72.

Reed, Adolph L., Jr. *W. E. B. Du Bois and American Political Thought* (New York, 1997).

Rudwick, Eliot M. *W. E. B. Du Bois: A Study in Minority Group Leadership* (Philadelphia, 1960).

———, *W. E. B. Du Bois: Propagandist of the Negro Protest* (New York, 1968).

West, Cornel. *The American Evasion of Philosophy* (Madison, Wisc., 1989).

Mary Jo Deegan

DuBOSE, William Porcher (1836–1918)

DuBose was born into the southern gentry on 11 April 1836 on a plantation near Winnsboro, South Carolina. He attended local schools and in 1855 graduated as ranking cadet officer from the state's military academy, better known as "The Citadel." He then obtained an MA degree from the University of Virginia in 1859 and began classes at a newly established Episcopal seminary located at Camden in his native state. When the Civil War began in April of 1861, he temporarily abandoned theological studies and joined the Confederate army. Serving first as adjutant to his former college commandant and after being exchanged as a prisoner with several wounds, he was ordained a deacon in 1863 and spent the rest of the war as a chaplain. Upon returning home to Winnsboro, DuBose worked at St. John's Episcopal Church for two years. During those same years he volunteered to help at a nearby mission called St. Stephen's Chapel. It is unclear whether DuBose functioned in the capacity of deacon or priest during those years, but by 1868 he had definitely been ordained into the priesthood when he became rector of Trinity Church in Abbeville, South Carolina.

In 1871 DuBose moved to Tennessee and began an association with the University of the South at Sewanee that lasted for more than forty-five years. Over the course of those decades he was chaplain from 1871 to 1883, professor of moral science from 1871 to 1894, and professor of New Testament language and interpretation from 1894 to 1908. He also was Dean of the university's theology department while lecturing on biblical exegesis. Generations of students called DuBose the "Sage of Sewanee," because he was a father figure to them and earned their affection by showing kindly interest in them while demanding their respect as well by challenging their minds through stimulating lectures and seminars. He became a fixture in Episcopalian thought and education throughout the South as well as the rest of the nation.

In trying to assimilate Christian doctrine to contemporary thought, DuBose has been described as a "liberal catholic modernist." His emphasis on changing conceptions within traditional categories placed him in the forefront of those seeking to revitalize orthodoxy. Concentrating on soteriology as his specialty, DuBose spoke of God's movement humanward through incarnation in Christ. Human efforts Godward were aided by the Church, in the sacraments, and in ethical endeavor. Christian living was a process in which human beings could realize in their lives the reality of how divine life was actualized in Christ. Thus life was a process, a personal transformation that followed evolutionary lines of progress. God's activity in the world was not obscured by the process of evolution, and His redemptive power was not impaired by the fact that it was visible mainly through human life, an imperfect reflection of divine purpose.

Still speaking of salvation, DuBose did not subscribe to a vicarious death as a substitute for sinners' failings. He held to a more modern interpretation of human nature that required people to pay for their own misdeeds and thus actualize the redemptive reconciliation that God had made possible in Christ's resurrection. Largely through studying St. Paul, he stressed the universal, humanistic qualities of Christianity rather than the rigid formalism so often found in creedalist, fundamentalist orientations. Christian progress toward salva-

tion for him was part of a single scheme where natural, rational, and divine truth formed an organic whole. His appreciation of New Testament authority and the catholic witness of ecumenical churches, from Apostolic times forward, came from recognizing that truth is a corporate possession, part of a never-ending process wherein no single person comprehends it entirely. As teacher and author DuBose urged thoughtful believers to determine their private faiths within ecclesiastical and sacramental contexts. He continuously pursued greater understanding of God's revelation and sought to understand more perfectly that portion of the truth that was in his grasp. Though professor emeritus after 1908, he continued to be active until his death on 18 August 1918 in Sewanee, Tennessee.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Soteriology of the New Testament (New York, 1892).
The Ecumenical Councils (New York, 1897).
The Gospel in the Gospels (New York, 1906).
The Gospel According to St. Paul (New York, 1907).
High Priesthood and Sacrifice: An Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews (New York, 1908).
The Reason of Life (New York, 1911).
Turning Points in My Life (New York, 1912).

Other Relevant Works
DuBose's papers are at the University of the South in Sewanee, Tennessee.
A DuBose Reader, ed. Donald S. Armentrout (Sewanee, Tenn., 1984).
William Porcher DuBose: Selected Writings, ed. John Alexander (New York, 1988).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v18*,

Who Was Who in Amer v1
Bratton, Theodore D. *The Life and Thought of the Reverend William Porcher DuBose* (New York, 1936).
Murray, John O. F. *DuBose as a Prophet* (London, 1942).

Henry Warner Bowden

DUCASSE, Curt John (1881–1969)

Curt Ducasse was born on 7 July 1881 in Angoulême, France. He emigrated to Mexico in 1900 and eventually moved to the United States as a young man in pursuit of business. He discovered philosophy at the age of twenty-four when he acquired a book on George Berkeley, David Hume, and Immanuel Kant. His interest in philosophy led him to the University of Washington where he received his BA in 1908 and then to Harvard, where he studied under Josiah ROYCE and received his PhD in 1912. He taught at the University of Washington from 1912 to 1926. During this time he met Mable Lisle, a noted Seattle artist, whom he married in 1921. Ducasse became professor of philosophy at Brown University in 1926 and remained there until his retirement in 1958. He served as chair of the department of philosophy from 1930 to 1951 and served as acting dean of the Graduate School from 1947 to 1949. Ducasse died on 3 September 1969 in Providence, Rhode Island.

Ducasse is perhaps best known today for being one of the first champions of analytic method before it came to dominate English-speaking universities. Roderick CHISHOLM was one of Ducasse's more famous students. His essays typically begin by carefully reviewing and clarifying the definitions of terms like "cause," "art," and "mental." Ducasse then shows how philosophical debates over these terms arise out of misunderstandings of their

definitions. Ducasse's interests were remarkably broad, and he influenced virtually every area of philosophy. His most noteworthy publications were in the areas of causation, free will, mind–body dualism, and philosophy of art and aesthetics. He served as chair of the founding committee for the Association for Symbolic Logic and as President of such diverse organizations as the American Society for Aesthetics, the Philosophy of Science Association, and the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association (1939–40). Ducasse also maintained a lifelong interest in parapsychology and paranormal activity, a somewhat surprising interest given his work in the philosophy of science and commitment to analytic method.

Some of Ducasse's most important publications were on causation. Ducasse argued against Humean critiques of causality. Ducasse held that Humeans were wrong to hold that causal relations are unobservable and to insist that causality is simply the constant conjunction of a pair of events in nature. He felt that a correct definition of "cause," one that adhered to its actual linguistic use, would show that causal relations are observable. He tried to show that we typically use the word "cause" in English to identify a relationship between a pair of changes, call them P and R, in which P ends at the same time and environment as R and no other changes occur in this environment during this time. Roughly, we typically say that P causes R when P only occurs immediately before R in the immediate environment of R. Ducasse argued on the basis of this definition that causal relations are observable. Hume was right to note that they are not observable in the same way as sensations like color or odor, but we observe them whenever we perceive a change take place immediately before and in the immediate environment of another change. He also noted on the basis of this definition that Humeans were wrong to treat causality as a matter of recurrent pairs of events in nature. Our typical English usage of "cause" refers to single cases of change sequences.

Ducasse also opposed Gilbert Ryle in upholding a dualist–interactionist concept of mind–body relations. He argued that there is a fundamental difference between the things described by mental or psychical terms and physical or material terms. Physical terms refer to properties that are perceptually public, whereas mental terms denote properties that are inherently private. I can inform you, for example, that I am currently remembering a dream I had last night by using perceptually public words, be they spoken or written. But my memory of this dream itself cannot, in principle, be shared. Ducasse held that there was an irreducible difference between mental and physical language.

Ducasse's most lasting contributions were in the areas of aesthetics and the philosophy of art. Ducasse brought his interest in analytic method to his discussions of art and aesthetics. He felt that the main task of the philosopher of art is not to propose theories of art or to comment on what qualities make one artwork superior to another, but simply to analyze, define, and disambiguate the terms we use in discussing art. Ducasse believed in the importance of prefacing any philosophic discussion of art by developing rigorous definitions for terms like "art," "aesthetic," and "aesthetics."

Ducasse defined art neither as a particular class of objects nor as a property of objects but as a type of activity. He defined art in a 1946 address to the American Society for Aesthetics as all activity that aims to create objects intended for aesthetic contemplation. He identified aesthetic contemplation with a psychological attitude in which one takes up a stance of receptivity to the sensible qualities of some object and in which one's interest is devoid of all scientific, theoretical, or practical concerns. He first elaborated this view of art as an activity in his 1929 book, *The Philosophy of Art*. Ducasse spent the early chapters of his book taking stock of several views of art, such as Leo Tolstoy's expressivism, Freudian views of art as wish fulfillment, and the general equation of art with the creation of beauty. He drew from some of these perspectives but ulti-

mately found them all to be unsatisfactory. He defined art as creative activity that aims at the self-objectification of an artist's feelings. An object is a work of art when it results from an activity in which an artist seeks to create something that is capable of being contemplated by herself or others that will yield back to her the feeling of which is the attempted expression.

Ducasse's view of art occasionally sounds similar to ideas in Immanuel Kant and other formalist aesthetic theories, but he was quite critical of Clive Bell's formalism. He felt that Bell's notion of significant form was unhelpful. Bell held that all art combines things like line, color, and so on, together so as to produce aesthetically moving forms, referring to this distinguishing characteristic of art as "significant form." Ducasse argued that Bell could not advance beyond simply applying this label to the combinations of lines, color, and so on, found in art, so significant form is just whatever it is about these combinations that leads us to call them artistic. Ducasse's analysis of art also led him to construe the class of art objects more broadly than other authors. He was willing to include decorative arts, fashion, personal style, and cosmetics in the category of art since they result from activities that aim at creating objects of aesthetic contemplation.

Ducasse was an extremely well-rounded philosopher. He made significant contributions to virtually every area of philosophy: metaphysics, epistemology, aesthetics, philosophy of language, and philosophy of science. He also struggled to ensure that his writings were lucid and accessible. In his first book Ducasse summarized the values he prized in his work: "there is at least one article of my methodological creed which has obsessed me so constantly that I feel that I must have come somewhere near living up to it, namely, that every assertion made is to be sufficiently clear and precise to be capable of being definitely disproved if false" (1924, p. 72).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Causation and the Types of Necessity (Seattle, Wash., 1924).

The Philosophy of Art (New York, 1929).
Philosophy as a Science: Its Matter and Its Method (New York, 1941).
Art, the Critics, and You (New York, 1944).
Nature, Mind, and Death (La Salle, Ill., 1951).
A Philosophical Scrutiny of Religion (New York, 1953).
A Critical Examination of the Belief in a Life after Death (Springfield, Ill., 1961).
Truth, Knowledge and Causation (New York, 1968).

Other Relevant Works

Ducasse's papers are at Brown University.
"On the Nature and Observability of the Causal Relation," *Journal of Philosophy* 23 (1926): 57–68.
"Aesthetics and Aesthetic Activities," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 5 (1947): 165–76.
"In Defense of Dualism," in *Dimensions of Mind*, ed. Sidney Hook (New York, 1960), pp. 85–9.
"Minds, Matter and Bodies," in *Brain and Mind*, ed. J. R. Smythies (London, 1965), pp. 81–109.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v55*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v4*, *Proc of APA v42*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Dommeyer, F. C., ed. *Current Philosophical Issues: Essays in Honor of Curt John Ducasse* (Springfield, Ill., 1966). Contains a bibliography of Ducasse's writings.
Hare, Peter H., and Edward H. Madden. *Causing, Perceiving and Believing: An Examination of the Philosophy of C. J. Ducasse* (Dordrecht, 1975).

Joshua Shaw

DUMONT, Fernand (1927–97)

Fernand Dumont was a philosopher deeply inspired by sociology, a discipline he taught all his life at Université de Laval in Québec, Canada, and above all, he was a great intellectual in the French tradition and a recognized master for generations of students. He was French Canada's foremost intellectual for over forty years.

Fernand Dumont was born on 24 June 1927 in Montmorency, a small working-class town near Québec City, and he died on 1 May 1997 in Québec City. He received his education at Petit Séminaire de Québec (receiving a BA), and at Université de Laval where he studied social sciences. He later went to Paris and registered at La Sorbonne to study sociology, psychology, epistemology, and philosophy with Georges Gurvitch, Lucien Goldman (his doctoral thesis supervisor), and Gaston Bachelard. He received the *certificat d'études supérieures en psychologie générale et psychologie sociale*, and a PhD in sociology from the University of Paris in 1967. In 1955 Dumont was appointed professor of sociology at Université de Laval, and he held this position until his death. He became the Director of the department of sociology and anthropology in 1963, and Director of the Institut supérieur des sciences humaines in 1967.

Over the years Dumont achieved international recognition for his works on culture, religion, and epistemology of science. He occasionally taught at École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales in Paris and served as President of the International Association of French-speaking Sociologists. Dumont received many prestigious awards: the Molson and the Governor General awards in Canada, the Leon Gérin and the Prix David awards in Québec, to mention a few.

Dumont authored sixteen books; it is difficult to classify his works in precise terms or areas. He contributed to epistemology of science; more precisely of economics (1970), sociology (1973), and theology (1988). He proposed an original theory of culture (1968, 1981, 1987) written in philosophical rather than in strict sociological terms, and he wrote strong works in sociology as well as inspired by philosophy (1974, *L'Avenir de la mémoire*, 1995). He also edited (alone or with colleagues) seventeen other books on ideologies, youth, religion, culture, including a handbook on medical anthropology and another on social problems. All these books are related to his personal perspective which consists of interpreting the contemporary world; many of them are case studies that illustrate the fruitfulness of his thoughts. He founded a research institute on culture (Institut Québécois de Recherche sur la Culture), and a multidisciplinary scholarly review *Recherches Sociographiques* (with Y. Martin and J.-C. Falardeau) on Québec studies.

The son of a textile worker, he experienced in his life the distance between social classes, and between high and popular cultures, as revealed by the title of his autobiography (1997). He wrote that he has been unable to leave school. "The real function of the school, from the primary level to University, is to put apart, to transplant the child in another world, far from pretending to initiate someone in life. Such a distance generates self consciousness." (p. 186) Distance is a key word that helps us to understand Dumont's conception of culture as *horizon* and *milieu*, developed in his master book *Le Lieu de l'homme* (1968).

Dumont distinguishes between primary culture and secondary culture (*culture première* and *culture seconde*), not to be confused with popular and high cultures. The primary culture is a milieu, a set of models that orient daily life. Men and women are closely embedded in complex social networks, they make things, they build villages and cities, and they raise a family. But they are not confined to their milieu, because they are able to take some distance, to interpret the world,

to build a secondary culture. Individuals develop a historical consciousness, they adhere to ideologies, they create knowledge, they develop cultural works that incarnate a significant world, they communicate with others, and build shared values. Ideologies, artists' productions, and learned works are different modes of production of culture. Dumont proposed the concept of *dédoublement*, a French word which characterizes the construction process by creating a distance.

Dumont (1981) distinguishes three modes of thought: that of operation, of action, and of interpretation. Dumont's writings belong to the interpretation mode of thought where the subject recognizing his own singularity brings to the world a meaning inscribed in rituals and production. For Dumont, society is not like an inert material because we have an experience of it. "La société n'est pas analogue de la matière inerte. Nous ne la percevons pas, nous en avons l'expérience." Society is not a system, but a set of practices of interpretation (often in conflicts) that are working toward its own integration. This perspective leads Dumont (1974) to the study of ideologies. Ideologies are different definitions of a situation and are oriented toward social action. In that sense, ideologies are symbolic productions different from myths; myths mix up two different temporalities (past and present) but ideologies, on the contrary, separate them. This separation characterizes also history as discipline, where each new generation feels the obligation to rewrite national history. For Dumont, social conditions are open to diverse readings, but ideologies bring out different meaning because of the different situations or viewpoints of their producers. This is a major aspect to Dumont's contribution to the analysis of the ideological phenomena. He speaks of a plurality of definitions but also of a plurality of *définiteurs* (which may be translated as defining subject) often in conflict. In this perspective, one cannot speak of *the end of ideology* and he takes issue with the notion

of ideology as deformed image of reality or as *fausse conscience*. The purpose of an ideology is not to develop knowledge about the world but to provide meaning to collective action.

In his works, Dumont distinguishes truth and relevance, a distinction that allows him to separate science from ideology. Truth refers to scientific knowledge, thoughts, operationalization, objectivity. Relevance refers to what makes sense for individuals, and Dumont also believes that knowledge should have some sense for individuals. In this respect, one can speak of the relevance of science and knowledge, an aspect important for him in social sciences and philosophy.

Dumont contributes in his works to the study of social change in French Canada, and especially the emergence of Québec as a global society inside Canada. He proposed important conceptual tools for the study of all global societies, a classic concept of the French school of sociology. All societies must develop political institutions: modes of political and economic regulation that define a political community. But societies are also structured as people grouping by common reference (not to be confused with a reference group). This approach is illustrated in his theory of the nation. Instead of defining the nation by referring to properties or objective traits (in the tradition of beginning twentieth century, as illustrated by André Siegfried), he suggested to characterize it *as a constructed reference*, based on social mechanisms like ideologies, historiography, literature. "A nation is above all the social construction of its members." (*Raisons communes,* 1995, p. 94–5) For Dumont, social classes, defined as a community of situations in society, are also an important grouping by common reference. Frontiers, more than internal characteristics, are structuring social classes. But these frontiers are not mainly given by objective criteria like occupation or income. These criteria must be transformed into signs – must be interpreted – and social classes are in this perspective cultural form. "Language, rituals,

all kinds of discourses contribute to integrate us in a nation, a cultural group, a political community, a class, a generation. They offer tools to develop our behaviour and thoughts, but also to develop a reference that locates us in history that gives a shared identity." (p. 100)

Dumont wrote a scholarly masterpiece on the transformation of the French Canadian nation and the development of the Québec society, a book not only on the emergence of a new and original society in North America, but also a study which will help to understand and interpret national identity in the contemporary world (1993). Dumont states that, from time to time, all societies have to rebuild their own foundations in order to recognize the emergence of new realities. The process is clearly at work in contemporary Europe, for example. French Canada offers an exemplar case of this process of *refoundation*. The result is emergence of different new national entities in New England's former *petits Canadas*, fragmented French Canadian communities and contemporary *nation québécoise*. Many of his writings help to distinguish often confused concepts: nationalism, national sentiment, patriotism, civic culture.

In the last years of his life, Dumont wrote a fascinating and very personal book, both a sociological analysis of religion in contemporary societies and an essay on faith (*Une foi partagée*, 1996). He also prepared the final edition of all the poems he wrote during his life (*La Part de l'ombre. Poèmes 1952–1995*, 1996) and he had time to complete the writing of his memoirs (1997). Philosopher and sociologist, Dumont was an unclassifiable great writer.

As few publications of Dumont are available in English, Weinstein's *Culture Critique: Fernand Dumont and New Quebec Sociology* (1985) will help to introduce readers to his thought.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
L'Analyse des structures sociales régionales, with Yves Martin (Québec, 1963).
Pour la conversion de la pensée chrétienne (Montréal, 1964).
Le Lieu de l'homme. La culture comme distance et mémoire (Montréal, 1968).
La Dialectique de l'objet économique (Paris, 1970).
La Vigile du Québec (Montréal, 1971). Trans., *The Vigil of Quebec* (Toronto, 1974).
Chantiers. Essais sur la pratique des sciences de l'homme (Montréal, 1973).
Les Idéologies (Paris, 1974).
L'Anthropologie en l'absence de l'homme (Paris, 1981).
Le Sort de la culture (Montréal, 1987).
L'Institution de la théologie (Paris, 1988).
Genèse de la société québécoise (Montréal, 1993).
Raisons communes (Montréal, 1995).
L'Avenir de la mémoire (Québec, 1995).
Une foi partagée (Montréal, 1996).
La Part de l'ombre. Poèmes 1952–1995 (Montréal, 1996).
Récit d'une émigration (Montréal, 1997).
Un Témoin de l'homme. Entretiens colligés et présentés par Serge Cantin (Montréal, 2000).

Further Reading
Dumais, Alfred. "Fernand Dumont, sociologue," *Laval Théologique et Philosophique* 55 (1999): 3–18.
"Fernand Dumont," *Voix et images* 27 (Autumn 2001). Issue devoted to Dumont.
Gagnon, Nicole. "Fernand Dumont et la conscience historique," *Possibles* 18 (1994): 126–36.
Langlois, Simon, and Yves Martin, eds. *L'Horizon de la culture. Hommage à Fernand Dumont* (Québec, 1995). Contains a bibliography of Dumont's writings.
Lucier, Pierre. *La Foi comme héritage et projet dans l'œuvre de Fernand Dumont* (Québec, 1999).

"Mémoire de Fernand Dumont," *Recherches sociographiques* 42, 2 (2001). Issue devoted to Dumont.

"Présence de Fernand Dumont," *Carrefour* 21, 1 (1999). Issue devoted to Dumont.

"Présence et pertinence de Fernand Dumont," *Bulletin d'histoire politique* 9 (Autumn 2000). Special issue devoted to Dumont.

Warren, Jean-Philippe. *Un Supplément d'âme. Les intentions primordiales de Fernand Dumont (1947–1970)* (Québec, 1998).

Weinstein, Michael A. *Culture Critique: Fernand Dumont and New Québec Sociology* (New York, 1985).

Simon Langlois

DUNCAN, Isadora (1878–1927)

Isadora Duncan, credited as being the "mother of modern dance," consistently broke from the social, political, and artistic conventions of her time. Her birth name and date are in question. It is documented that her given name was either Dora Angela Duncan or Angela Isadora Duncan, born on either 27 May 1878 or 26 May 1877 in San Francisco, California. She died tragically on 14 September 1927 in Nice, France, in a freak automobile accident in which her own shawl became entangled in the tires of her convertible, strangling her. Her father Joseph Charles, an unsuccessful banker, connoisseur of the arts, and poet, abandoned the family leaving them penniless and constantly eluding creditors. Her mother, Dora Gray, a music teacher and pianist, educated her four children and introduced them to the arts. Duncan was an avid reader, and particularly influenced by Greek art and the works of Walt WHITMAN and Friedrich Nietzsche.

Duncan is recognized as the first American dancer to develop a philosophy of dance, though her formal dance training was as sporadic as her education. She had a limited exposure to the Delsarte Method, burlesque forms, social dances, and ballet. She believed the body was a vital, kinetic energy, not to be confined or limited to a codified movement vocabulary. The body was the tool through which the sentiments and thoughts of the soul were expressed. She believed the solar plexus was the driving force of movement.

Duncan joined the Augustin Daly Company in Chicago in 1895 to 1898, and performed in Chicago, New York City, and London. After leaving Daly, she began performing primarily as a solo artist throughout the United States, Europe, Russia, and Egypt. She was inspired by the music of such composers as Ludwig van Beethoven, Richard Strauss, and Richard Wagner and moved to their scores with abandon. She performed barefooted, with loose hair, and dressed in revealing free-flowing Greek-style tunics. In Grunewald, a suburb of Berlin, she began to develop her theories of dance education and in 1904 she assembled her famous dance group, now known as the Isadorables. Duncan encouraged her students to run and skip, to study the movement quality of nature and to respond to its rhythms.

Duncan's tours to Russia (1905–1907) were revolutionary in the art scene. A country steeped in the ballet tradition was greatly swayed by her spiritual and pure movement aesthetic. Before long, master choreographers and performers like Mikhail Fokine, Nadezhda Pavlova, and Vaslav Nijinsky began to show evidence of Duncan's conventions in their own works. In 1921 her relationship with Russia ended badly, when the government failed to fulfill a promise to support her and her school. Her final years were spent in Berlin and Paris.

Duncan was motivated by love and art. She was an outspoken feminist adamantly opposed to marriage, critical of social conventions and a political radical. She thought nothing of bringing her political speeches to the stage

before her performances. Her lifestyle and free-spoken approach to politics resulted in a pendulum effect in her career and financial status. Duncan created many works in her lifetime, most notably *Blue Danube*, *Funeral March*, and *Symphonie Pathetique*. She authored *The Dance* (1909), and *My Life* (1927), and a collection of her writings, *The Art of the Dance*, was published posthumously in 1928.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Dance of the Future (New York, 1908).
The Dance (New York, 1909).
My Life (New York, 1927).
The Art of the Dance, ed. Sheldon Cheney
    (New York, 1928).

Other Relevant Works
*Isadora Speaks: Writings and Speeches of
    Isadora Duncan*, ed. Franklin Rosemont
    (San Francisco, 1981; Chicago, 1994).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*,
    Dict Amer Bio, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl
    Amer Bio v22*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*
Blair, Fredrika. *Isadora*: *Portrait of the Artist
    as a Woman* (New York, 1986).
Dillan, Millicent. *After Egypt: Isadora
    Duncan and Mary Cassatt* (New York,
    1990).
Kurth, Peter. *Isadora: A Sensational Life*
    (Boston, 2001).
MacDougall, Allan R. *Isadora: A
    Revolutionary in Art and Love*
    (Edinburgh, 1960).
Terry, Walter. *Isadora Duncan: Her Life,
    Her Art, Her Legacy* (New York, 1963).

Jennifer Tsukayama

DUNLAP, Knight (1875–1949)

Knight Dunlap was born on 21 November 1875 in Diamond Spring, California. He studied psychology at the University of California at Berkeley with George M. STRATTON, receiving his PhB in 1899 and LM in 1900. Dunlap then studied with Hugo MÜNSTERBERG at Harvard University, obtaining the MA in 1901 and PhD in psychology in 1903. From 1904 to 1906 Dunlap was an instructor of psychology. In 1906 he followed Stratton to the psychology department at Johns Hopkins University, and remained there for thirty years as professor of experimental psychology, serving as department chair for much of that time. His more famous colleague at Johns Hopkins was John B. WATSON. In 1936 Dunlap became a professor of psychology at the University of California at Los Angeles, from which he retired in 1946. Dunlap was President of the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology in 1920, and the American Psychological Association in 1929. He died on 14 August 1949 in Columbia, South Carolina.

Dunlap was a skeptical, iconoclastic psychologist who worked hard to divorce philosophy from psychology during the first two decades of the twentieth century. Though one of his first publications was a theory of the syllogism, he did not continue as a philosopher. Instead, he used his philosophical knowledge to discredit and discard those views at variance with his version of functionalism. Among his choices for pruning was psychology's Cartesian heritage, which for Dunlap led to much of what was impeding the growth of scientific psychology: introspection, images, and mental-content psychology. To replace this, Dunlap urged a theory based on responses instantiated in the brain as "transit patterns," in which connections between external reality and internal mental activity were developed through learning. This can be seen now as anticipatory of many later developments in psychology, but in his day Dunlap was just one of many psy-

chologists proposing similar systems which had to wait for more sophisticated neurology and learning theory for their support.

Dunlap was an enthusiastic proselytizer for scientific psychology and an equally enthusiastic debunker of what he perceived as its enemies. Chief among these was mysticism, which he defined as knowledge beyond intellect and perception. He had no interest in the possibility of mental states beyond the ordinary, and had a special animosity toward Freud and Freudians, equating the scientific value of their views and practices with that of telepathy. A person of few nuances, Dunlap was public, opinionated, and outspoken about subjects ranging from clothing styles to discourteous driving. But he was not notably consistent: for instance, though a confirmed foe of mysticism, he wrote a creditable survey of the psychology of religion which commended a personal survival view of immortality. Dunlap allowed more eugenic views into his published writings than many psychologists of his era, but even that had ambiguous effects. On the one hand, in 1940, he announced that studies of familial heredity such as those of H. H. Goddard are dead. On the other, reaction against the eugenic theory of beauty and reproductive success contained in Dunlap's *Personal Beauty and Racial Betterment* (1920) was among the factors that led Evelyn Hooker, a 1932 Johns Hopkins graduate, to become a proponent of an inclusive gay and lesbian psychology. Dunlap's contradictions illustrate the tensions inherent in the development of psychology of that period.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A System of Psychology (New York, 1912).

On Outline of Psychobiology (Baltimore, Md., 1914).

Mysticism, Freudianism, and Scientific Psychology (St. Louis, 1920).

Personal Beauty and Racial Betterment (St. Louis, 1920).

The Elements of Scientific Psychology (St. Louis, 1922).

Old and New Viewpoints in Psychology (St. Louis, 1925).

Social Psychology (Baltimore, Md., 1925).

Habits: Their Making and Unmaking (New York, 1932).

The Dramatic Personality of Jesus (Baltimore, Md., 1933).

Civilized Life: The Principles and Application of Social Psychology (Baltimore, Md., 1934).

Personal Adjustment (New York, 1946).

Religion, Its Functions in Human Life: A Study of Religion from the Point of View of Psychology (New York, 1946).

Other Relevant Works

Dunlap's papers are at the Archives of the History of American Psychology, University of Akron.

"A Theory of the Syllogism," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 1 (1904): 227–36.

"The Case against Introspection," *Psychological Review* 19 (1912): 404–13.

"The Theoretical Aspect of Psychology," in *Psychologies of 1925*, ed. Carl Murchison (Worcester, Mass., 1926), pp. 309–29.

"Response Psychology," in *Psychologies of 1930*, ed. Carl Murchison (Worcester, Mass., 1930).

"Knight Dunlap," in *A History of Psychology in Autobiography*, vol. 2, ed. Carl Murchison (Worcester, Mass., 1932), pp. 35–61.

"Antidotes for Superstitions Concerning Human Heredity," *Scientific Monthly* 51 (1940): 221–5.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych by Zusne*, *Encyc Psych*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v39*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*

Boxer, Andrew M., and Joseph M. Carrier. "Evelyn Hooker: A Life Remembered," *Journal of Homosexuality* 36 (1998): 1–17.

Dorcus, Roy M. "Knight Dunlap: 1875–1949," *American Journal of*

Psychology 63 (1950): 114–19.

Kornfeld, Alfred D. "Contributions to the History of Psychology: Achievement, Eminence, and Histories of Psychology: The Case of Knight Dunlap," *Psychological Reports* 68 (1991): 368–70.

Moore, Kate Gordon. "Knight Dunlap: 1875–1949," *Psychological Review* 50 (1949): 309–10.

Zenderland, Leila. *Measuring Minds: Henry Herbert Goddard and the Origins of American Intelligence Testing* (New York, 1998).

David C. Devonis

DUPRÉ, Louis Karel (1925–)

Louis Dupré was born on 16 April 1925 in Veerle, Belgium. He received a PhD in philosophy from the Catholic University of Louvain in 1952. His doctoral dissertation on the starting point of Marxist philosophy was published two years later under a government grant. In 1958, he emigrated to the United States and later became a naturalized citizen in 1966. He taught philosophy at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., from 1958 to 1972, rising through the ranks from an instructor to full professor. In 1973 he became the T. Lawrason Riggs Professor in Philosophy of Religion at Yale University, remaining until his retirement in 1998.

Dupré has lectured at universities in the United States, Belgium, The Netherlands, Ireland, and Italy. He was President of the American Catholic Philosophical Association in 1971 and President of the Hegel Society of America in 1972–3. His many national and international honors include Yale's Phi Beta Kappa Award as Teacher of the Year in 1996, and the Aquinas Medal from the American Catholic Philosophical Association in 1997.

He is a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a foreign member of the Royal Belgian Academy of Arts, Sciences, and Letters. He was honored with honorary doctorates from several universities.

Dupré has written over a dozen books and has edited another five. He has published over 200 articles in a variety of scholarly journals and books, illustrating the breadth of his knowledge and the expanse of his scholarship. Some of his books have been translated into Dutch, French, German, Polish, Spanish, Chinese, and Korean.

The main subjects of his writing have been social ethics (especially concerning Marxism), philosophy of religion, and philosophy of culture. His early work shows a strong influence of G. W. F. Hegel and Karl Marx. After 1972, Ernst Cassirer's influence became more pronounced, as he moved toward a symbolic analysis of the religious act and of the development of cultural processes. Early and late, Dupré's method shows the strong impact of Edmund Husserl's phenomenology undergone during his philosophical formation. Increasingly his cultural analysis has moved in an ontological direction. The crucial transition for him is that from Immanuel Kant to the great German idealists Johann Fichte, Friedrich Schelling, and Hegel.

Dupré has also written a number of shorter works on spiritual life and mysticism, analyzing the modern problematic of regaining a sense of transcendence in a secularized world. He argues that modern believers have no choice but to embrace an inward spiritual turn, similar to the one the mystics took, as they find themselves in the desert of modern atheism.

In his trilogy on the evolution of modern culture – *Passage to Modernity* (1993), *The Enlightenment and the Intellectual Foundations of Modern Culture* (2004), and a third volume on Romanticism (not completed at the time of this writing) – Dupré discusses how the classical synthesis of cosmos, gods, and humans, expanded yet basically maintained through the Middle Ages, began to be

subverted in nominalist thought. It still survived, though heavily transformed, in the modern stages of the early Italian Humanism, Renaissance, and Baroque periods. Here the human individual moved to the foreground, yet the synthesis remained solidly anchored in a transcendent basis. In the post-Cartesian period it collapsed, when human reason became the sole source of meaning and value. The postmodern reaction against Enlightenment rationalism still remains grounded in Enlightenment principles. These three works combine theology, history, and the arts in a philosophical analysis of the problems of modern culture.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Het vertrekpunt der marxistische wijsbegeerte: De kritiek op Hegels staatsrecht (Antwerp, Belgium, 1954).

Kierkegaard As Theologian: The Dialectic of Christian Existence (New York, 1963).

Contraception and Catholics: A New Appraisal (Baltimore, Md., 1964).

The Philosophical Foundations of Marxism (New York, 1966).

The Other Dimension: A Search for the Meaning of Religious Attitudes (New York, 1972).

Transcendent Selfhood: The Loss and Rediscovery of the Inner Life (New York, 1976).

A Dubious Heritage: Studies in the Philosophy of Religion after Kant (New York, 1977).

The Deeper Life: An Introduction to Christian Mysticism (New York, 1981).

Marx's Social Critique of Culture (New Haven, Conn., 1983).

The Common Life: The Origins of Trinitarian Mysticism and Its Development by Jan Ruusbroec (New York, 1984).

Passage to Modernity: An Essay in the Hermeneutics of Nature and Culture (New Haven, Conn., 1993).

Metaphysics and Culture (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1994).

Religious Mystery and Rational Reflection: Excursions in the Phenomenology and Philosophy of Religion (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1998).

Symbols of the Sacred (Grand Rapids, Mich., 2000). Contains selections from *The Other Dimension* and *Transcendent Selfhood*.

The Enlightenment and the Intellectual Foundations of Modern Culture (New Haven, Conn., 2004).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with Francis Eterovich et al., *Approaches to Morality: Readings in Ethics from Classical Philosophy to Existentialism* (New York, 1966).

Ed., *Faith and Reflection* by Henry Duméry, trans. S. McNiernery and M. B. Murphy (New York, 1968).

"Mysticism," in *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, ed. Mircea Eliade (New York, 1987), vol. 10, pp. 245–61.

Ed. with James Wiseman, *Light from Light: An Anthology of Christian Mysticism* (New York, 1988).

Ed. with Don Saliers, *Christian Spirituality III: Post-Reformation and Modern* (New York, 1989).

Ed., *Nicholas of Cusa. Special Issue: American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 64 (1990).

"Postmodernity or Late Modernity? Ambiguities in Richard Rorty's Thought," *Review of Metaphysics* 47 (1993): 277–95.

"Cultural Variety and Metaphysical Unity," in *The Practice of Cultural Analysis*, ed. Mieke Bal (Stanford, Cal., 1999), pp. 255–67.

Further Reading

Casarella, Peter, and George Schner, eds. *Christian Spirituality and the Culture of Modernity: The Thought of Louis Dupré* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1998).

Levesque, Paul J. *Symbols of Transcendence:*

Religious Expression in the Thought of Louis Dupré (Louvain, Belgium, 1997). Contains a bibliography of Dupré's writings.

Paul J. Levesque

DURANT, William James (1885–1981)

Will Durant was born on 5 November 1885 in North Adams, Massachusetts. His early education was by Catholic nuns and priests in parochial schools and later in the Jesuit college of St. Peter's in Jersey City, where he received the BA in 1907. He entered the seminary at Seton Hall in 1909, but withdrew in 1911 after reading Spinoza's *Ethics* and losing his faith in organized religion. He agreed to continue for two years further at Seton Hall as professor of Latin, French, English, and geometry. After Durant passed from this quiet seminary, he traveled in the most radical circles in New York, and from 1911 to 1913 he was employed as the sole teacher of the Ferrer Modern School, an experiment in libertarian education. Durant resigned his post when he fell in love and married one of his pupils, Ariel, in 1913. From 1913 to 1917, he took graduate work at Columbia University, specializing in philosophy under F. J. E. WOODBRIDGE and John DEWEY. Durant's dissertation, "Philosophy and the Social Problem," expanded on Dewey's pragmatic view that philosophy should concern itself with social utility, rather than with issues of epistemology. He received the PhD in 1917, and taught philosophy at Columbia University for half a year.

During his graduate studies, Durant had begun lecturing on history, literature, biology, psychology, and philosophy at Labor Temple on Second Avenue in New York. Durant prepared and delivered these lectures twice a week for thirteen years, and founded there the Labor Temple School. A publisher attending Durant's lecture on Plato was so impressed that he asked Durant to write it out for publication. Out of this and subsequent lectures and essays grew *The Story of Philosophy* (1926). This survey of the history of philosophy quickly and unexpectedly became an extraordinary best-seller, passing two million copies in just a few years (and it is still in print in many languages), enabling Durant to retire from teaching in 1927. Durant's next book, *Transition: A Sentimental Story of One Mind and One Era*, was published in 1927, in which he detailed his intellectual evolution, from Catholicism and socialism, to Spinoza and Darwin and the problems that can attend the loss of one's religious faith. In 1929, Durant's *The Mansions of Philosophy* was published, in which his views on logic and epistemology, metaphysics, ethics, politics, aesthetics, religion, and history were presented.

From 1930 to 1975, Durant devoted himself to the concept of history as a form of philosophy, resulting in the creation of the eleven-volume *Story of Civilization*, for which he was awarded the Pulitzer Prize (1968) and Medal of Freedom (1977). Durant died on 7 November 1981 in Los Angeles, California. His last book, *Heroes of History*, published posthumously in 2001, represented his final attempt to present history as "philosophy teaching by examples."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Philosophy and the Social Problem (New York, 1917).

The Story of Philosophy: The Lives and Opinions of the Greater Philosophers (New York, 1926).

Transition: A Sentimental Story of One Mind and One Era (New York, 1927).

The Mansions of Philosophy: A Survey of Human Life and Destiny (New York, 1929). Revised as *The Pleasures of Philosophy* (New York, 1953).

"An Amateur's Philosophy," in *American Philosophies Today and Tomorrow*, ed.

Horace M. Kallen and Sidney Hook (New York, 1935).

The Story of Civilization, with Ariel Durant, 11 vols (New York, 1935–75).

The Lessons of History (New York, 1968).

A Dual Autobiography, with Ariel Durant (New York, 1977).

Heroes of History (New York, 2001).

The Greatest Minds and Ideas of All Time, ed. John Little (New York, 2002).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Who Was Who in Amer v7*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Frey, Raymond. *William James Durant: An Intellectual Biography* (Lewiston, N.Y., 1991).

John Little

DWORKIN, Ronald Myles (1931–)

Ronald M. Dworkin was born on 11 December 1931 in Worcester, Massachusetts. He received a BA degree from Harvard University in 1953, another BA and an MA from the University of Oxford in 1955 and the LL.B. from Harvard in 1957. For the next year he served as Harvard Law School clerk for Judge Learned HAND at the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in Manhattan. Dworkin then became an associate at the Sullivan & Cromwell law firm in New York in 1958 and was admitted to the bar in 1959.

Dworkin's academic career started as assistant professor of law at Yale University in 1962. He was promoted to professor in 1965, and was Wesley N. Hohfeld Professor of Jurisprudence in 1968–9. In addition, he was visiting professor of philosophy at Princeton University in 1963, Gauss seminarian in 1965–6, visiting professor of law at Stanford University in 1967, and Case lecturer at Case Western Reserve University in 1967. In 1969 Dworkin went to England as Chair of Jurisprudence at the University of Oxford, succeeding H. L. A. Hart, and he held this chair until 1998. He was also Fellow of University College, Oxford, during this time.

Dworkin returned to America to teach at Princeton University in 1974, and then became professor of law at New York University in 1975, while continuing to hold his chair at Oxford. Dworkin has also served as Rosenthal lecturer at Northwestern University in 1975, academic freedom lecturer at the University of Witwatersrand in South Africa in 1976, professor-at-large at Cornell University during 1976–82, visiting professor of philosophy and law in 1977 and visiting professor of philosophy during 1979–82 at Harvard University, and as Roscoe Pound Lecturer at the University of Nebraska in 1979. At present he holds joint appointments as Frank Henry Sommer Professor of Law and professor of philosophy at New York University, as well as Quain Professor of Jurisprudence at University College London (since 1998), and he works with philosophers and lawyers at both institutions. Additionally, Dworkin served as a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1972 and 1976. He is a member of Democrats Abroad, serving as Chair during 1972–4, the Democratic Charter Commission, the Programme Committee of the Ditchley Foundation, and is a consultant on human rights to the Ford Foundation. He has received honorary degrees from Yale University, Williams College, and John Jay College of Criminal Justice, and is a fellow of the British Academy and the American Academy of Arts and Letters.

Dworkin's groundbreaking work in the philosophy of law and in legal theory will be a major influence for years to come in the United States as well as the United Kingdom. Lauded by liberals and respected by conservatives for his expertise in and contributions to jurisprudence, as well as for the originality of his liberal views, Dworkin has gone from "the Yank at

Oxford" to a world-renowned figure in contemporary legal theory and political philosophy. Honored by philosophers, political scientists, and legal experts, he has published a number of books and numerous articles in various journals and law reviews. Dworkin's scope crosses a number of different disciplines; he weaves together sophisticated legal, political, and philosophical theories and inquiries with a great deal of clarity. His extensive work in the *New York Review of Books* is also notable – he published eighty articles there between 1968 and the spring of 2003 – as is his work for the United States Congress on legal aspects of Alzheimer's disease. His debates with H. L. A. Hart and Catherine MacKinnon, and his commentary on the 2000 US presidential election have also garnered interest toward his work.

Dworkin's major writings bring together the views of influential judges, philosophers, and politicians in sophisticated analyses, which generally deal with important contemporary issues such as constitutional law. His observations often include a detailed account of the political and social implications of defective past and present practices, as well as advice on the improvement of our present conditions. Dworkin's account of law is directly connected to a view of moral principles, to an ethics. In holding onto the democratic ideal of equality as a fundamental virtue, he advances a theory of interpretation of law that rests on a moral base. His addition of integrity as a means for interpreting law is as admirable as it is inspirational. After pointing out the shortcomings of more traditional and present ruling methods of interpretation, Dworkin builds a theory rooted in the foundation of morality with integrity and equality at its core. Additionally, he hopes to promote a system that would increase the consistency and fairness of verdicts made by judges by rooting their decisions in a moral framework. Dworkin always stands up for the rights of the individual, but never in a blind or unqualified fashion.

Rather than leave the ideal of equality as vague and undefined, Dworkin expresses a connection with one's ability to share in the national prosperity. His theory also entails a certain perspective on life, as one is responsible toward society to assist the maintenance of the legal system by following the laws set forth. Within this illustration, Dworkin exemplifies an important overlap between law and ethics. Equality is also defined in terms of the equal concern for the interests and well-being of all citizens within a community. Further, he identifies constitutional law as the greatest current concern in judicial affairs. This concern, according to Dworkin, lies in two parts. The first deals with the topic of the liberty a citizen holds in a democracy. He claims that we must find the line that separates the majority's rights to determination and the rights of the individual that the majority may not determine. Second, Dworkin claims that constitutional law must also deal with a clear conception of equality that can be set as a reachable goal. A major issue in this debate from Dworkin's perspective is found in the distribution of wealth and opportunity.

The greater portion of his major works contributes additions of a moral perspective to various aspects of the American legal system. However, his distinction between the "inside-out" and "outside-in" relationships between theory and practice may also prove to be quite influential to the more general philosophical world. In explaining his methods of approach in *Sovereign Virtue* (2000), Dworkin may have uncovered the solution to the contemporary philosophical debate over theory and practice. According to Dworkin, one manner of inquiry, which he labels the inside-out approach, begins with a controversial issue and works toward a structure of theory. On the other hand, one may begin with theory and seek to apply it by some practical means later. This is his illustration of the outside-in approach. This distinction drawn by Dworkin certainly will have American pragmatists scratching their heads over their blur of any concrete distinction between theory and practice at all.

Dworkin's first book, *Taking Rights Seriously* (1977), was both highly acclaimed

and controversial. In it, he deems the "ruling theory" of law as defective. According to Dworkin, this ruling theory is made up of two distinct parts: legal positivism and utilitarianism. Both of these parts fail in their treatment of individual rights. He argues that the phenomenological failure of legal positivism is found in its view that individuals have rights, but only to the extent that they have been created by law or social practice in some explicit manner. On the other hand, the utilitarianism of Jeremy Bentham completely denies the existence of natural rights altogether. In response to the inadequacies of their combined effect, Dworkin provides his own "liberal theory of law," by which individual rights are not distinguished by or demanded in relation to liberty, but are determined in relation to equality. The impact of this step is tremendous, as it defuses the longtime conflict between liberty and other important values. Rights, according to Dworkin, are not always had merely because of explicit legislation; they exist prior to such action and the justification for these rights is found in equality. He identifies an ethical basis as the fundamental purpose of all law, which is the equal treatment of all citizens within a community. In addition, Dworkin applies his theory to several important court cases and deals with social issues such as civil disobedience, reverse discrimination, and the controversial aspects of rights.

His defense of liberalism in his 1983 "Neutrality, Equality, and Liberalism" advances his view that certain important ideals are not in conflict with each other. In this case, he deals with the importance of the neutrality of government regarding affairs of personal morality and the responsibility of the government to reduce economic inequality. In this essay, Dworkin provides his argument against the conception of a moral majority, as made famous by the Reverend Jerry Falwell, for example, and the economic views of the "New Right." In addition, he clarifies the meaning of the term "liberalism" by explicating its principles noted above, and raises important ques-

tions regarding the distribution of wealth in a society of equal individuals.

Dworkin's *A Matter of Principle* (1985) includes the roots of much of the work that would follow it. For example, here we find an illustration of the practice of adjudication as primarily an issue not of policy, but of principle. Additionally, Dworkin includes a good deal of discussion on and explanation of his conception of liberalism. Each essay in this work deals with important issues of political philosophy and legal theory. In this book, Dworkin claims to combine practical problems with philosophical theory. The collection demonstrates a number of contexts in which he advances the relationship between moral principle and law. Other topics in these essays deal with discrimination (both academic and employment), methods of adjudication, censorship, and the freedom of the press.

Dworkin's 1986 book *Law's Empire* provides a further point of view on law with a heavy philosophical slant as well as a detailed analysis on interpretation of law. The primary topic of his discussion revolves around his answer to the question over the ability of law to rule based on the silence, lack of clarity, and ambiguity of law books. Judges, according to Dworkin, do not merely apply past legal decisions to present cases – they must also interpret these past decisions as well. After dismissing the contemporary conventionalist and pragmatist points of view on the interpretation of law based on their shortcomings, Dworkin provides his alternative view of "law as integrity." The conventionalist method is too rooted in tradition and the established authority for Dworkin's taste, while the pragmatist perspective is so disconnected that one may interpret the law in a manner that suits the individual's advantage. In constructing a method by which the past may be read into the future regarding legal decisions, Dworkin illustrates a further injection of morality into the legal system.

In *Life's Dominion* (1993), Dworkin channels his attention on the issues of abortion and euthanasia. Regarding the 1973 case of

Roe v. Wade, Dworkin maintains that by deciding the Texas law against abortion was unconstitutional, the Supreme Court, which he notes is an appointed and unelected branch of government, in effect made law. In this work, Dworkin sifts through the rhetoric of both sides of the issue of abortion, provides an analysis that is both philosophic and scientific, and relates this all to constitutional law. From his perspective, abortion is not a matter that rests on the rights of the fetus, but on the intrinsic value of human life. Not only does Dworkin shed new light on this issue that includes important constitutional and political implications, he also defuses the religious controversy that has dominated the debate over abortion and replaced it with philosophic debate. Dworkin further compares the question of abortion with that of euthanasia and again provides a detailed philosophical discussion on human life, highlighting the social and political implications of euthanasia. According to his view, the debate over euthanasia must include recognition for respect for the choice of the patient, his or her best interests, and the intrinsic value of human life. In addition, Dworkin echoes his perspective of ethical individualism, i.e., the view that humans have a moral responsibility to actualize their potential to the fullest and make something good out of life.

His 1996 work *Freedom's Law* provides additional suggestions for a stronger bond between ethics and the legal system in order to enhance the latter. In this book, Dworkin advances his perspective of the American Constitution and the interpretation of this document by Supreme Court Judges in the United States. Claiming that Americans are confused over the meaning of the Constitution and the procedures for its interpretation, Dworkin analyzes different methods. The moral reading of the Constitution that he recommends preserves the ideals that he deems are found in any real democracy, by which certain types of constitutional clauses are seen as "moral principles." In his observations on representative government, Dworkin provides a

detailed view of how collective action relates to the decisions made based on interpretations of the Constitution. It is clear that his influence in the future of legal interpretation will be monumental. This work also deals with important social issues such as abortion, euthanasia, affirmative action, race, homosexuality, and free speech, while analyzing major decisions such as *Roe v. Wade*, the *Cruzan* case, and the *New York Times v. Sullivan*. The inclusion of his debate with Catherine MacKinnon over the legality of pornography also is noteworthy, as is his discussion of the defeat of Judge Robert Bork and the nomination of Judge Clarence Thomas.

Dworkin ends *Freedom's Law* on a personal note, with a tribute to Judge Learned Hand. In the 1890s, Hand studied philosophy with George SANTAYANA, Josiah ROYCE, and William JAMES at Harvard. Hand, a liberal who would turn off the lights in his own and other judges' chambers before leaving for the day in order to save the taxpayers' money, was a great influence on Dworkin and deeply respected by him. This is evident from chapter 17, "Learned Hand." Further, Dworkin identifies Hand as one of the best judges the United States has ever had in *Law's Empire*. In addition to Hand, Dworkin also often refers to Isaiah Berlin and John RAWLS in his writings, and he has been influenced by the hermeneutics of Hans-Georg Gadamer.

His 1996 essay "We Need a New Interpretation of Academic Freedom" exposes the depth and scope of Dworkin's work. Not only has he contributed a great deal to political philosophy and jurisprudence, he also has provided an insightful analysis of academic freedom with important suggestions as to how this liberty ought to be interpreted. In this essay, he maintains a strong connection between ethical individualism and academic freedom. This connection gives rise to certain duties to be upheld by the citizens of a community. According to Dworkin, citizens have direct responsibilities to speak out for that which they believe to be true, and to not declare what they

believe false. His view of ethical individualism demands that each person live life in a thoughtful manner. Academic freedom, he claims, relates to the responsibility to preserve independence in our culture. However, he admits that this freedom may be compromised only when another value of greater importance or urgency must be protected, and illustrates lines that academic freedom must not cross in regards to free speech. His "DeFunis v. Sweatt," which includes discussion on equal treatment of citizens by institutions of higher education, is also an important contribution to the academic world.

Dworkin's *Sovereign Virtue* (2000) provides a further inquiry into the subject of equality among citizens. In it he returns to a number of themes from his previous writings. The expansion of his view of equality presented in his first book *Taking Rights Seriously* is quite notable. Dworkin identifies equality as the fundamental virtue to any democracy and as key for the legitimacy of any form of government. In this work, he explores different models of equality, such as that of welfare and resources, and illustrates equality of resources as the more desirable model. Equality is properly defined in terms of the equality of concern over the citizens of a community according to Dworkin. Since "indiscriminate equality" is never an acceptable practice, he maintains that society should set out as a goal the equal concern for all and notes the implications this view would have on the making and enactment of law. He also returns to an examination of the relationship between equality and liberty, again rejecting the traditional view that these two ideals are exclusive of one another and in direct conflict with each other. In addition, Dworkin includes another primary message from his prior works: his theory of ethical individualism. The responsibility each person holds for the success of their life and the choices they make is an integral acknowledgment for the advancement of society. Dworkin further treats current social issues such as campaign finance reform, health care, genetic experimentation, and affirmative action, among others, in this work.

His latest offering to the American legal system is found in *A Badly Flawed Election* (2002), a collection of essays Dworkin edited, with contributions by him, Judge Richard POSNER, Arthur SCHLESINGER, Jr., and Lawrence Tribe, among others. Dworkin claims that the situation was completely mishandled and refers to the Supreme Court's decision as "pragmatic adjudication." However, he not only critically analyzes the results of the 2000 election and the fallout from the decision, but also provides suggestions for election reform to insure that such an unprecedented fiat and national fiasco will never happen again.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Taking Rights Seriously (Cambridge, Mass., 1977).

The Philosophy of Law (Oxford, 1977).

A Matter of Principle (Cambridge, Mass., 1985).

Law's Empire (Cambridge, Mass., 1986).

A Bill of Rights for Britain (London, 1990).

Foundations of a Liberal Equality (Salt Lake City, Utah, 1990).

Life's Dominion: An Argument about Abortion, Euthanasia, and Individual Freedom (New York, 1993).

Freedom's Law: The Moral Reading of the American Constitution (Cambridge, Mass., 1996).

Sovereign Virtue: The Theory and Practice of Equality (Cambridge, Mass., 2000).

Other Relevant Works

"On Not Prosecuting Civil Disobedience," *New York Review of Books* (6 June 1968): 14–21.

"DeFunis v. Sweatt," in *Equality and Preferential Treatment*, ed. Marshall Cohen, Thomas Nagel, and Thomas Scanlon (Princeton, N.J., 1977), pp. 63–83.

"The *Bakke* Decision: Did it Decide Anything?" *The New York Review of Books* (17 August 1978): 20–25.

"Neutrality, Equality, and Liberalism," in

Liberalism Reconsidered, ed. Douglas MacLean and Claudia Mills (Totawa, N.J., 1983), pp. 1–11.

"Pragmatism, Right Answers, and True Banality," in *Pragmatism in Law and Society*, ed. Michael Brint and William Weaver (Boulder, Col., 1991), pp. 359–88.

"We Need a New Interpretation of Academic Freedom," in *The Future of Academic Freedom*, ed. Louis Menard (Chicago, 1996), pp. 181–98.

Ed., *A Badly Flawed Election: Debating Bush v. Gore, the Supreme Court, and American Democracy* (New York, 2002).

Ed. with Mark Lilla and Robert Silvers, *The Legacy of Isaiah Berlin* (New York, 2002).

"The Court and the University," *New York Review of Books* (15 May 2003): 8–11.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Ethics*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*

Burley, Justine, ed. Dworkin and His Critics (Malden, Mass., 2004).

Cohen, Marshall. *Ronald Dworkin and Contemporary Jurisprudence* (Totawa, N.J., 1984).

Forsyth, Murray G., H. M. A. Keens-Soper, and Maurice Keens-Soper, eds. *Political Classics: Green to Dworkin* (Oxford, 1996).

George, Robert P. *Making Men Moral: Civil Liberties and Public Morality* (Oxford, 1993).

Gordon, Richard, and Richard Wilmot-Smith, eds. *Human Rights in the United Kingdom* (Oxford, 1997).

Guest, Stephen. *Ronald Dworkin* (Stanford, Cal., 1991).

Honeyball, Simon, and James Walter. *Integrity, Community and Interpretation: A Critical Analysis of Ronald Dworkin's Theory of Law* (Aldershot, UK, 1998).

Hunt, Alan and Andrew Altman, eds. *Reading Dworkin Critically* (New York, 1992).

Posner, Richard. *Overcoming Law* (Cambridge, Mass., 1995).

Scalia, Antonin. *A Matter of Interpretation: Federal Courts and the Law* (Princeton, N.J., 1997).

Jeffrey R. Post

E

EARLE, William Alexander, Jr. (1919–88)

William Earle was born on 18 February 1919 in Saginaw, Michigan. In 1941 he received his BA from the University of Chicago. In 1948, after having served in the army during World War II, he received a PhD from the University of Aix-Marseilles where he had studied on a Rockefeller Fellowship. In 1953, under the direction of Charles HARTSHORNE, he received a PhD in philosophy from the University of Chicago, writing a dissertation titled "Thought and Its Object." In 1948, Earle joined the philosophy department at Northwestern University, where he stayed until his retirement. During this period, he was a visiting professor at Yale, Harvard, and Stanford. He received an ACLS Fellowship in 1959 and a Carnegie Foundation Grand for research in the Far East in 1965. Earle died on 16 October 1988 in Evanston, Illinois.

Earle was one of the first proponents of existentialism and phenomenology in the United States. He was one of the founders of the Society for Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy, and general editor of *Studies in Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy*. Together with John D. Wild and James M. Edie, Earle played a key role in the Northwestern graduate program in philosophy, which became a stronghold of continental philosophy in the United States.

Earle sought to reconnect contemporary continental thought with its roots, especially the rationalism of Descartes and Spinoza, and the transcendental philosophy of Kant and Hegel. The core of Earle's thought is laid out in four books. In *Objectivity* (1955) Earle presents a phenomenological account of objectivity. Seventeen years later, in *The Autobiographical Consciousness* (1972), he gives an existentialist account of subjectivity. In his next two books, *Mystical Reason* (1980) and *Evanescence* (1984), Earle returns to the transcendental ego, which had been abandoned by phenomenologists and existentialists alike, treating it as indispensable for the understanding of both objectivity and subjectivity. In *Mystical Reason*, Earle moreover paired the transcendental ego with the ontological argument, claiming that the transcendental ego is "God thinking Himself, the self-awareness of absolute reality." (1980)

An accomplished filmmaker and photographer, Earle was deeply interested in the philosophy of film, resulting in 1987 in *A Surrealism of the Movies*, a book on the aesthetics of film. In this book Earle sides with the running critique of surrealist filmmakers against what he considered the ineffable boredom of cinematographic realism. *Imaginary Memoirs* (privately published) is Earle's autobiography. The first volume, covering the years 1919 to 1960, details much of Earle's student life at Chicago and his professional career, whereas the last two volumes contain travel logs from 1965 to 1978.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Objectivity: An Essay in Phenomenological Ontology (Chicago, 1955).
The Autobiographical Consciousness (Chicago, 1972).
Public Sorrows and Private Pleasures

(Bloomington, Ind., 1976).

Mystical Reason (Chicago, Ill., 1980).

A Surrealism of the Movies (Chicago, Ill., 1987).

Evanescence: Peri-phenomenological Essays (Chicago, Ill., 1984).

Other Relevant Works

"The Paradox and Death of God," in *Christianity and Existentialism*, with James M. Edie and John D. Wild (Evanston, Ill., 1963).

The Autobiographical Conciousness (Evanston, Ill., 1982).

Imaginary Memoirs, 3 vols, with drawings by Corban LePell (Evanston, Ill., 1986).

Further Reading

Proc of APA v63, *Who Was Who in Amer v9*

The Life of the Transcendental Ego: Essays in Honor of William Earle, ed. Edward S. Casey and Donald V. Morano (Albany, N.Y., 1986). Contains a bibliography of Earle's writings.

Cornelis de Waal

EASTMAN, Charles Alexander
(1858–1939)

Charles A. Eastman was born on 19 February 1858 in the Santee Reservation near Redwood Falls, Minnesota. His father was Ite Wakanhdi Ota "Many Lightnings" (Jacob) Eastman, a Wahpeton Sioux, and his mother was Wakantan Kanwin "the Goddess" (Mary Nancy) Eastman. In 1862 Charles received the name "Ohiyesa," meaning "the Winner." Eastman was educated at Dartmouth College where he received his BS in 1887, and then he graduated from Boston University School of Medicine in 1890. As the most educated American Indian at the start of the twentieth century, Eastman became a leading voice for tribal rights. Like BLACK ELK, Gertrude BONNIN, and Luther STANDING BEAR, who were all born and/or raised as Sioux in the Dakota Territories in the 1860s and 1870s, Eastman tried to preserve and record his Indian culture, traditions, and ways of thought.

Eastman's mother died when he was an infant, and he was separated from his father at the age of four when the Minnesota Uprising of 1862–3 forced several members of his family into exile. His uncle and grandmother escaped US troops by going to North Dakota and Manitoba, taking young Charles with them, while his father stayed behind. By the time the family was reunited eleven years later, his father had converted to Christianity and encouraged Charles and his brother John to be educated at white schools.

After graduating from medical school, Eastman was a US government physician at Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota from 1890 to 1893, where he witnessed the Wounded Knee massacre and treated those who survived this horrific event. He served the government in other capacities as well. He was the physician at the Crow Creek Reservation, an analyzer of the allotment of tribal lands, and an inspector of reservations.

Eastman taught for a short time at the Carlisle Indian Training School, an institution known for its rigid military style of discipline and forced assimilation policies. After teaching at the school, Eastman became a proponent of partial assimilation, allowing individual Native American people to pick and choose which customs and practices of white culture they wished to adopt. Years later, he was among the founders of the Society of American Indians in 1911, through which he lobbied for Indian citizenship and decried the poor living conditions on Indian reservations. In 1933 he was recognized with the first Indian Council Fire achievement award in 1933 for his efforts to encourage understanding between Indians and non-Indians. He wrote a number of works on

Native American issues, some with his wife Elaine Goodale, a poet whom he married in 1891. Eastman died on 8 January 1939 in Detroit, Michigan.

Eastman was part folklorist, retelling traditional tales and shedding light on their meaning. He was also part apologist, explaining to his white audience where the roots of traditional beliefs and practices lie, and encouraging respect of Native American world views. In his most theoretical work, *The Soul of the Indian* (1911), Eastman describes common practices in Native American life and explains their rationale. The sweatlodge and vision quest, for example, are similar to Christian rites, like confession and communion. They prepare the seeker for spiritual renewal and enlightenment. Native Americans are silent about these and other spiritual practices, because they believe them to be deeply personal experiences in which the Great Spirit communicates to each person individually. A vision quest is shared only when the seeker considers it to be of importance to the larger community.

In *The Soul of the Indian* Eastman makes insightful observations about the ways in which Native American life and belief systems are in some ways vastly different from and in others surprisingly similar to those of Christian Euro America. But it is also clear that as a well-educated and assimilated person, his observations were made through a Euro-American lens, and perhaps even through early American philosophical idealism. He maintains, for instance, that there is a sharp divide between the spiritual and the physical realms in Native American thought. While on a vision quest, an individual subdues the flesh by fasting so that he can gain access to and strengthen the soul. The soul is "pure spirit" for Eastman, and is concerned "only with the essence of things." All of the ceremonies and charms that Native Americans employ are completely symbolic for them, serving in a sense as a "material or physical prayer."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Indian Boyhood (New York, 1902; Lincoln, Nebr., 1991).

Red Hunters and the Animal People (New York, 1904; New York, 1976).

Old Indian Days (New York, 1907; Lincoln, Nebr., 1991).

The Soul of the Indian (Boston, 1911; Lincoln, Nebr., 1980).

The Indian To-day: The Past and Future of the First American (Garden City, N.Y., 1915; New York, 1975).

From the Deep Woods to Civilization: Chapters in the Autobiography of an Indian (Boston, 1916; Mineola, N.Y., 2003).

Indian Heroes and Great Chieftains (Boston, 1918; Mineola, N.Y., 1997).

Light on the Indian World: The Essential Writings of Charles Eastman (Ohiyesa), ed. Michael Fitzgerald (Bloomington, Ind., 2002).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*

Hertzberg, Hazel W. *The Search for an American Indian Identity* (Syracuse, N.Y., 1971).

Miller, David R. "Eastman, Charles (Ohiyesa)," in *Encyclopedia of North American Indians*, ed. Frederick Hoxie (Boston, 1996).

Tedlock, Dennis, and Barbara Tedlock, eds. *Teachings from the American Earth: Indian Religion and Philosophy* (New York, 1975).

Wilson, Raymond. *Ohiyesa: Charles Eastman, Santee Sioux* (Urbana, Ill., 1983).

Dorothy Rogers

EDDY, Mary Baker (1821–1910)

Mary Baker Eddy, founder of the First Church of Christ Scientist, popularly known as Christian Science, was born on 16 July 1821 in Bow, New Hampshire, and died on 3 December 1910 in Pleasant View, near Concord, New Hampshire. The Baker family was Congregationalist, and Eddy reflected in later years about the dual influence of her father's stern Calvinism and the more love-oriented piety of her mother. Her formal education – minimal, but not unusual for a child of her time, gender, class, and rural location – began in one-room district schools, was interrupted frequently by illness, and concluded after a year or two of "academy." Her learning was occasionally supplemented by tutoring from her brother Albert, home from Dartmouth College. She married in 1843 and was widowed eighteen months later before her son was born. During the years between 1844 and 1866, Eddy lived in a variety of places and depended largely on the charity of relatives and friends. She gave up custody of her son, entered a lengthy, unhappy marriage with an itinerant dentist and sought treatment - hydropathy, homeopathy, mesmerism - for persisting physical and emotional ills. In 1862 she entered treatment with Phineas Parkhurst Quimby – a Portland, Maine, mesmerist healer – which association furthered her already developing conviction that disease was related to thought.

In February 1866, two weeks after Quimby's death, Eddy experienced healing from the injuries of a fall on the ice in Lynn, Massachusetts, while reading a gospel story about one of Jesus's healings. With physical healing came a "glimpse" of the metaphysical/theological claim on which Christian Science is based, a glimpse Eddy describes in *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures* (1875): "When apparently near the confines of mortal existence, standing already within the shadow of the death-valley, I learned these truths in divine Science: that all real being is in God, the divine Mind, and that Life, Truth, and Love are all-powerful and ever-present; that the opposite of Truth – called error, sin, sickness, disease, death – is the false testimony of false material sense, of mind in matter."

Between 1866 and 1875 Eddy moved from household to household, setting up classes and relationships with students and writing *Science and Health*. All the while she was working out the implications for Christianity of her basic claim that matter is ultimately illusion. She published the results in 1875 in the first edition of *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*, the primary text, along with the Bible, of Christian Science. By 1879 it was clear to Eddy that her original hope of reforming Christianity in light of her teachings would not be realized due to hostility from the established churches, and she founded a church of her own. The *Manual of the Mother Church* (1895) – the small book that to this day prescribes the structure, governance, and order of worship of Christian Science – quotes Eddy's motion at the 12 April 1879 meeting of the Christian Science Association: "To organize a church designed to commemorate the word and works of our Master, which should reinstate Christianity and its lost element of healing." The *Manual* specified that the Bible and *Science and Health*, rather than human persons, would be the pastors of the Church.

Over the next thirty years, Eddy continued to revise and issue more than fifty new editions of *Science and Health*; to publish other books, among them *Unity of Good and Unreality of Evil* (1887) and *Christian Science: No and Yes* (1891); and to institutionalize Christian Science through a series of organizations, de-organizations, and reorganizations. She chartered the Massachusetts Metaphysical College in 1881 (and dissolved it in 1890), established the *Journal of Christian Science* in 1883, and formed the National Christian Scientist Association in 1886 (adjourned for three years in 1890). The Church was formally de-organized in 1890 and reorganized in 1892. The

edifice of the Mother Church in Boston was built in 1894, and Eddy founded the *Christian Science Monitor* in 1908.

By the time of her death in 1910, through her leadership, her publications and the governance structure she had put in place, Eddy had assured her ongoing doctrinal authority over the Church of Christ, Scientist, and its persistence after her death, in contrast with the fate of many new religions upon the death of their founders. A bare facts rendition of the institutionalization process of Christian Science, while accurate, does not indicate the conflict-ridden nature of that history: law suits, fallings-out with former students and rivals, and ridicule by both religious and cultural critics (most popularly known among critics is Mark TWAIN's *Christian Science*, published in 1907). Suffice it to say that some of the more tumultuous aspects of Mary Baker Eddy's history had the functional effect of solidifying her authority and of clarifying the distinctiveness of Christian Science healing in comparison with various other "mind cure" movements.

The church Eddy founded, the convictions about the nature of God and of the reality upon which its world view is constructed, and the spiritual healing method at its core, all derive from her claim that "there is no reality in matter." At one level this is a philosophical claim, and because of her insistence on matter as ultimately illusory and reality as Spirit or Mind, she has often been labeled a philosophical idealist. In a broad sense, that label is accurate; but only up to a point, because it obscures the dual fact that this category was likely not part of Eddy's self-understanding and that her philosophical claim about the nature of reality functioned primarily as a bridge to her theological world view. She was not, for example, indebted to Hegel or Berkeley, as some of her critics have claimed. At bottom, no matter the extent to which she focused on the nature of reality, Mary Baker Eddy was plagued not so much by philosophical questions but by the issue of theodicy – the part of theology that focuses on questions about evil and suffering and what, if anything, God has to do with creating or permitting it. The philosophical claim that matter does not participate in reality provided the theoretical bridge to what Eddy called a "new departure" in Christianity. At the same time, it imposed on her the very large task of reinterpreting the traditional categories of Christian theology such as God, human nature, creation, Jesus, atonement, sin, and prayer. She needed, as well, to point out the significance of these reinterpretations for the spiritual healing method she was developing.

Denying the reality of matter and claiming that Spirit is All made it possible for Eddy to dissociate God from the creation of the material world and thus to relieve God of responsibility for sin and suffering. Repudiating the doctrine of original sin as key to understanding the human condition and replacing it with the interpretation of humankind as the perfect reflection of Spirit/God narrowed the obligation of Christians from doing to knowing. Knowing the spiritual fact that humankind is already perfect brought about physical and spiritual healing, though this healing was not the primary goal of Christian Science but a by-product. Healing, in turn, offered a demonstration of the truth of Christian Science and reinforced Eddy's understanding of science as a method of testifying to the universality of divine law and to the absolute certainty with which Christian Science claims it can be applied.

Placing Mary Baker Eddy and Christian Science within American philosophical history and thought is a challenge. The thinkers and practitioners who influenced her and whom she likewise influenced are a combination of mainstream and non-mainstream thinkers. She was a creative but eclectic grassroots thinker who drew over a period of many years from multiple sources in order to construct her world view. Eddy was not part of the lineage of male academic and ministerial philosophers who have shaped the outlines and insights of

mainstream American philosophical thought. Concepts like philosophical idealism were not available to her by means of traditional, academic, mentor trajectories but found their way into her thought more indirectly, often filtered through the medium of popular culture. A further difficulty in thinking about her contributions to American philosophy lies in the fact that scholarly response to her has been more polarized than dispassionate. The phenomenon of "dueling biographies" persists to the present.

Neither an academic nor a cleric, Eddy was a primary participant in the alternative philosophical and religious thought and religious movements described variously as "mind cure," "positive thinking," and New Thought. These groups are often referred to as making up the metaphysical tradition in American religion, although "metaphysical" takes on a particular meaning among them, and there is no direct and certainly no sustained connection with the Metaphysical Club of Cambridge, whose mostly Harvard-educated members were characterized by William JAMES as "none but the very topmost cream of Boston manhood." In *Science and Health*, Eddy asserts that "Metaphysics is above physics, and matter does not enter into metaphysical premises or conclusions. The categories of metaphysics rest on one basis, the Divine Mind. Metaphysics resolves things into thoughts and exchanges the objects of sense for the ideas of Soul."

A useful strategy for placing her within the framework of American philosophy is to take one of two different tactics. One tactic is to stand apart from her and point to those philosophical and theological thinkers and worl views from whom she drew, directly or indirectly, or which she rejected. The other tactic is to portray Eddy's self-perception. From the outside vantage point, one could say that she belongs within the general classification of philosophical idealism and that she drew from both Calvinism and Emersonian transcendentalism. By implication, at least, she rejected

Scottish common sense realism and thus the evidence of the senses, but embraced nonetheless her own understanding of a scientific method that spoke of spiritual facts and insisted upon the need for a demonstration of truth. She shared the conviction of American theological and philosophical pragmatists that ideas have consequences. She was indebted to Quimbian mesmerism, although the extent of that indebtedness is a source of ongoing and often acrimonious debate. She had experience with a variety of alternative healing methods and religious groups such as Spiritualism and Theosophy, but she eventually rejected them vehemently, along with "animal magnetism" (another term for mesmerism) as being too materialistic. She understood evil as error, rather than as a kind of substantive entity. In *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, William James – who calls Christian Science "the most radical branch of mind cure" – considers this stance "a bad speculative omission." As Stephen Gottschalk – a Christian Scientist and one of her most sophisticated interpreters – points out, Eddy was not a systematic thinker either philosophically or theologically. On the other hand, although she denied the ultimate reality of evil and sin, there is no lack of reference to the tragic elements of life in her writings.

From Eddy's own perspective she was a lifelong Christian who had "discovered" (a term that is important to Eddy) through revelation and experience the true nature of reality, of Jesus's ministry as a healer, and of Christianity as a healing religion. No matter the extent to which religious critics labeled Christian Science heretical, Eddy described herself in *Science and Health* as grounded in Scripture and dependent "unreservedly on the teachings of Jesus. Other foundations there are none." And, whatever the convergence of vocabularies between Christian Science and other mind-cure movements, Eddy insisted that Christian Science did not hold that sin or sickness were actual conditions that needed to be healed through the application of thought

but, rather, erroneous belief about the nature of reality.

Finally, it is not insignificant that Mary Baker Eddy was a woman. She offers an historical example of a person who had no access to positions of leadership in either academy or church and therefore no public forum other than what she eventually constructed for herself. She was consumed, nonetheless, with the kinds of theoretical and existential questions that are addressed in these institutions but outside them as well in more popular ways. With resources available in her nineteenth-century American culture, she put together a world view that was sufficiently coherent to support a new denomination and to inspire the formation of a number of other groups, among them Religious Science, Divine Science, and the Unity School of Christianity. Taken together, the two facts of her isolation from the major meaning-granting institutions of her culture and her founding of a new religious movement that persists to the present are a compelling example of the theological and philosophical creativity that has flourished in American culture and history.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures (Boston, 1875; 2nd edn 1891; 3rd edn 1910).

Unity of Good and Unreality of Evil (Boston, 1887).

Christian Science: No and Yes (Boston, 1891).

Retrospection and Introspection (Boston, 1892).

Manual of the Mother Church (Boston, 1895).

Miscellaneous Writings, 1883–1896 (Boston, 1897).

The First Church of Christ, Scientist, and Miscellany (Boston, 1913).

Other Relevant Works

Eddy's papers are at the First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston.

Poems (Boston, 1910).

Prose Works Other than Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures (Boston, 1925).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Encyc Relig*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v3*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Gill, Gillian. *Mary Baker Eddy* (Reading, Mass., 1998).

Gottschalk, Stephen. *The Emergence of Christian Science in American Religious Life* (Berkeley, Cal., 1973).

Judah, J. Stillson. *The History and Philosophy of the Metaphysical Movements in America* (Philadelphia, 1967).

Peel, Robert. *Mary Baker Eddy: The Years of Discovery* (New York, 1966).

———, *Mary Baker Eddy: The Years of Authority* (New York, 1971).

———, *Mary Baker Eddy: The Years of Trial* (New York, 1977).

Mary Farrell Bednarowski

EDEL, Abraham (1908–)

Abraham Edel was born on 6 December 1908 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. He received his BA in 1927 and his MA in 1928 from McGill University, a BA from the University of Oxford in 1930, and a PhD from Columbia University in 1934, where he came under the strong influence of John DEWEY's pragmatism and naturalism. He was a member of the philosophy department of City College of New York from 1931 to 1973, and a distinguished professor of the CUNY Graduate School during 1970–73. Since his retirement he has been a research pro-

fessor of philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania. He has held visiting appointments at Columbia University, University of California at Berkeley, Swarthmore College, and Case Western Reserve University among others. Edel was an associate at the National Humanities Center (1978–9); senior fellow at the Center for Dewey Studies (1981–2); recipient of the Butler Silver Medal from Columbia University (1959); and a Guggenheim Fellow (1944–5). He has been Vice President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association (1972–3); President of the American Society of Value Inquiry (1984); and President of the American Section of the International Association of Philosophy of Law and Social Philosophy (1973–5). In 1995 Edel received the Herbert W. Schneider Award for contributions to the understanding and development of American philosophy from the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy.

For well over fifty years Abraham Edel has explored ethical theory and moral practice in his extensive writings. He is the author of numerous works in moral philosophy and collaborated with Yervant H. KRIKORIAN, his wife May M. Edel, and Elizabeth FLOWER in works on philosophy and ethics. In all his works he shows a commitment to empirical and scientific methods which he believes are fruitful toward the illumination of ethics. In his 1944 essay on "Naturalism and Ethical Theory" he tries to show the superiority of empirical and scientific methods for ethics to otherwise unempirical methods of intuition and introspection or what he calls the apprehension of "essences." The value of empirical and scientific methodologies for ethics is that they can be tested, corrected, and therefore improved. In answer to the question whether there are any unique or distinctively ethical statements, he alleges that there are *not*. Ethical assertions always have a direct or implied reference to actions or events of the natural world. There are no ethical "essences" as separated or isolated from natural qualities and situations of empirical or natural facts. He also claims that, in theory, the problem of verification or proof in ethics is no different than the problem of proof in any other field. There are no special or peculiar methods of verification for ethics as compared with other factual claims. Naturalism in ethics, which Edel favors, does not imply that the problems of ethics are simple or easy. It certainly does not imply that a naturalistic moral philosophy can reach a finality or completeness by laying down fixed principles. A naturalistic moral philosophy must remain *open* and cannot stop short of fashioning a whole conception of good individuals functioning well in a good society.

In his first large-scale work *Ethical Judgment: The Use of Science in Ethics* (1955), Edel discusses at length the problem of ethical relativity. This, he finds, is not a simple problem. It has what he terms many strands or elements, that morality is a human product, that everything changes, that cultural diversity exists, that ethics depends on variable attitudes or emotions, etc. If everything in life is contingent and temporal, does this mean that ethical judgments must be arbitrary or even indeterminate? Does this mean that ethics reduces to expediency where there can be no solid or rational answers or results that can be counted on? Edel with his naturalism is willing to forgo absolute, final or a priori conclusions for ethics. If ethics is to truly apply to the world then its theories must somehow be tested by experience. Ethics, he claims, must make use of science and like science be willing to modify its methods and correct its mistakes. This implies that ethical judgments are not simply arbitrary but, like those of science, they are or can be made careful and rational. Carefulness is itself a scientific and a moral virtue, testable by its usefulness. Likewise honesty is a value not merely in a moral sense, but also in an intellectual sense. This agrees with Edel's basic point that moral values are not special or peculiar. Moral values permeate and are relevant to all human endeavors.

Edel's 1963 *Method in Ethical Theory* carries further his earlier studies to work out, as he

says, a methodological approach for ethical theory that attempts to be both critical and comprehensive, one that will attempt to do justice to the factual as well as the normative functions of ethics. That ethics must be both descriptive and prescriptive, empirical and valuational or normative, raises the so-called fact–value or is–ought questions. Is there a gap between fact and value or between what is the case and what ought to be the case? Like the problem of relativity in ethics the fact–value or is–ought problem has many different strands or dimensions. Edel does not believe that we can either evade this problem or simply solve it once and for all. His own extensive work is a demonstration of the need to face anew the problem of how suitable methods can be devised which can make piecemeal but not wholesale progress toward both better theories and better applications. Here Edel shows the great influence of Dewey's experimental naturalism, in his attempt to solve the problems of ethical methodology. Edel, along with his strong interest in ethics, also kept up an abiding interest in Aristotle. His dissertation at Columbia was on Aristotle's theory of the infinite. Subsequently, he published two books on Aristotle's philosophy in 1967 and 1982.

Edel also continued his interest in Dewey. In 2001 he published *Ethical Theory and Social Change: The Evolution of John Dewey's Ethics*. In his presidential address to the American Society for Value Inquiry in 1984, Edel takes up the question of the relation between ethical theory and moral practice. Like Dewey, he insists that false separations or false dualisms, between what might be considered true or valid in theory and false or unworkable in practice, must be seen as impediments and not as final positions. Theories must be kept open to examine new opportunities of inquiry. Practices must be also kept open to do better justice to the actual situations to which they apply. As Edel says at the end of his address, the full work of a more mature moral philosophy remains to be done.

In 1987 Edel was honored with book called *Ethics, Science, and Democracy: The Philosophy of Abraham Edel*. Many recognized scholars including H. S. THAYER, Ralph W. Sleeper, Elizabeth Flower, and Edmund PINCOFFS offered discussions of central ideas in Edel's philosophy over the years.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Logical Structure of Moore's Ethical Theory," in *The Philosophy of G. E. Moore*, ed. Paul Schilpp (New York, 1942), pp. 137–76.

"Naturalism and Ethical Theory," in *Naturalism and the Human Spirit*, ed. Y. H. Krikorian (New York, 1944), pp. 65–95.

The Theory and Practice of Philosophy (New York, 1946).

Ethical Judgment: The Use of Science in Ethics (Glencoe, Ill., 1955).

Anthropology and Ethics, with May Edel (Springfield, Ill., 1959).

Contemporary Philosophic Problems, with Y. H. Krikorian (New York, 1959).

Science and the Structure of Ethics (Chicago, 1961).

Method in Ethical Theory (Indianapolis, 1963).

Aristotle (New York, 1967).

Analyzing Concepts in Social Science (New Brunswick, N.J., 1979).

Exploring Fact and Value (New Brunswick, N.J., 1980).

Aristotle and his Philosophy (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1982).

"Ethical Theory and Moral Practice: On the Terms of Their Relation," in *New Directions in Ethics: The Challenge of Applied Ethics*, ed. J. P. DeMarco and R. M. Fox (New York, 1986), pp. 317–35.

Ed. with Elizabeth Flower and Finbarr O'Connor, *Morality, Philosophy, and Practice: Historical and Contemporary Readings and Studies* (Philadelphia, 1989).

Relating Humanities and Social Thought (New Brunswick, N.J., 1990).

The Struggle For Academic Democracy:

Lessons from the 1938 "Revolution" in New York's City Colleges (Philadelphia, 1990).

In Search of the Ethical: Moral Theory in Twentieth-century America (New Brunswick, N.J., 1993).

Critique of Applied Ethics: Reflections and Recommendations, with Elizabeth Flower and Finbarr W. O'Connor (Philadelphia, 1994).

Ethical Theory and Social Change: The Evolution of John Dewey's Ethics, 1908–1932 (New Brunswick, N.J., 2001).

Further Reading
Who's Who in Phil
Horowitz, H. L., and H. S. Thayer, eds. *Ethics, Science, and Democracy: The Philosophy of Abraham Edel* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1987).

Guy W. Stroh

EDELMAN, Gerald Maurice (1929–)

Gerald Edelman was born on 1 July 1929 in New York City. In 1950 he earned his BSc degree, magna cum laude, in chemistry from Ursinus College in Pennsylvania. He then studied at the Medical School of the University of Pennsylvania, receiving his MD degree and the University's Spencer Morris Award in 1954. For the next year he was a Medical House Officer at the Massachusetts General Hospital. From 1955 to 1957 he practiced general medicine as a Captain in the US Army Medical Corps. He then pursued graduate studies at the Rockefeller Institute under Henry Kunkel, receiving his PhD in biochemistry and immunology in 1960. Edelman remained at the Rockefeller Institute as a professor of biochemistry, and also serving as Assistant Dean (1960–63) and Associate Dean (1963–6) of Graduate Studies. In 1972 Edelman shared the Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine with British biochemist Rodney Porter for their discoveries concerning the chemical structure of antibodies, an important consequence of which is being able to prevent the body from rejecting transplanted organs. Edelman left Rockefeller University in 1992 to become chair of neurobiology at the Scripps Research Institute in La Jolla, California. Over his distinguished career, he has written and co-authored over 300 journal articles and holds memberships in many learned societies.

Edelman's more recent interest in neurobiology makes his work philosophically important. Edelman rejects several central tenets of contemporary cognitive science, particularly "functionalism," the view that the mind can be studied at a level that abstracts away from the brain, as a physical symbol system, independent of its physical instantiation. On Edelman's view, functionalism is not biologically plausible. According to his Theory of Neuronal Group Selection, or Neural Darwinism, during development neurons cluster into groups through selective competition under biological constraints. The groups further develop through biochemical changes resulting from environmental interactions, which alter the strength of connections between the neurons within the groups. The parallel activities of distinct groups of neurons are coordinated through re-entrant pathways – channels of communication – between the groups. Re-entry makes possible coherent responses to diverse inputs, resulting in our psychological categorizations of the world. Given the high degree of variability among individual brains even among genetically identical twins, and Edelman's metaphysical view that the world does not come labeled for categorization, he concludes that our representations are not symbols with the same fixed content for all individuals, as the physical symbol system hypothesis requires. Rather, our representations share a kind of Wittgensteinian family resemblance.

Edelman also uses the notion of "re-entry" to explain consciousness. The limbic-brain stem

system, which controls bodily functions, is a kind of value system for a creature; the thalamocortical system is responsible for categorization. The evolution of re-entrant paths between these systems makes new events significant or meaningful to a creature by relating them to its past events. Conscious experience is a kind of "remembered present" in which perceptual signals are conceptually categorized by value-laden memories. Uniquely human consciousness arises from the evolution of a symbol memory that makes it possible to categorize conscious experiences themselves in relation to an enduring self, developed through social and linguistic interactions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Mindful Brain: Cortical Organization and the Group-selective Theory of Higher Brain Function, with Vernon B. Mountcastle (Cambridge, Mass., 1978).

Neural Darwinism: The Theory of Neuronal Group Selection (New York, 1987).

Topobiology: An Introduction to Molecular Embryology (New York, 1988).

The Remembered Present: A Biological Theory of Consciousness (New York, 1989).

Bright Air, Brilliant Fire: On the Matter of the Mind (New York, 1992).

A Universe of Consciousness: How Matter Becomes Imagination, with Giulio Tononi (New York, 2000).

Wider than the Sky: The Phenomenal Gift of Consciousness (New Haven, Conn., 2004).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with W. Einar Gall and W. Maxwell Cowan, *Signal and Sense: Local and Global Order in Perceptual Maps* (New York, 1990).

"Building a Picture of the Brain," *Daedalus* 127 (Spring 1998): 37–69.

Ed. with Jean-Pierre Changeux, *The Brain* (New Brunswick, N.J., 2001).

Further Reading

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio

"Gerald M. Edelman – Biography," *Les Prix Nobel en 1972* (Stockholm, 1973).

Franzwa, Gregg E. "Ontological Assumptions: Descartes, Searle, and Edelman," *Philosophy in the Contemporary World* 4 (1997): 14–18.

Christopher Viger

EDIE, James Murphy (1927–98)

James Edie was born on 3 November 1927 in Grand Forks, North Dakota. He received his BA from Saint John's University in Minnesota, studying philosophy and classics. He then received his STB and STL degrees at Athenaeum Anselmianum in Rome, and the PhB, PhL, and PhD (1958) degrees from the University of Louvain in Belgium. From 1958 to 1960 Edie taught philosophy at Hobart and William Smith Colleges. From 1961 until his retirement in 1993 he taught philosophy at Northwestern University, and served as chair from 1970 to 1977. Edie died on 21 February 1998 in Sarasota, Florida.

Fluent in six languages, Edie taught courses in phenomenology, ancient and medieval philosophy, the philosophy of theater, the philosophy of William JAMES, and Russian philosophy. Edie was a founding member and guiding spirit of the Society for Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy. In addition to publishing many articles, books, and translations, he helped inaugurate and edit *Studies in Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy* published by Northwestern University Press, a book series that continues to set high standards of scholarly work.

Strongly influenced by Etienne GILSON while studying ancient and medieval philoso-

phy at Louvain, Edie also studied Edmund Husserl, especially his *Logical Investigations*. This study was responsible for focusing his philosophical interests in epistemology and the philosophy of language. He was attracted to Gilson's idea that the history of philosophy is a "laboratory" in which the consequences of ideas are tested for confirmation or disconfirmation. Edie's "laboratory" experimented critically with the backbone of his philosophical interests that ranged from Plato and Aristotle to Augustine and Aquinas, from Descartes and Leibniz to Hume and Kant, and from Husserl to Sartre. In the light of Husserl, Edie finally added William James, in whose *Varieties of Religious Experience* he discovered "the first and really the only phenomenology of religious experience" (1989).

Edie's interests found their critically unifying expression in a phenomenology of language. Here he was influenced by Maurice Merleau-Ponty's structuralism which influenced him to see language as an instrument for turning away from perceptual experience, and towards the meant and meaning, to words and sentences, to the linguistic a priori and linguistic truth in relation to experience, then to the universal eidetics of language, and finally to the outfittings of prelinguistic experience and the transcendental field of the lifeworld. Edie made equally significant excursions into metaphysics and theories of perception, science, and history that bridged and integrated phenomenology with numerous other kinds of philosophical and scientific inquiry.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Speaking and Meaning: The Phenomenology of Language (Bloomington, Ind., 1976).
Edmund Husserl's Phenomenology. A Critical Commentary (Bloomington, Ind., 1987).
William James and Phenomenology (Bloomington, Ind., 1987).
Merleau-Ponty's Philosophy of Language: Structuralism and Dialectics (Washington, D.C., 1987).

Other Relevant Works
"Faith as Existential Choice," and "The Absence of God," in *Christianity and Existentialism* (Evanston, Ill., 1963), pp. 2–39, 113–48.
"Notes on the Philosophical Anthropology of William James," in *An Invitation to Phenomenology: Studies in the Philosophy of Experience*, ed. James M. Edie (Chicago, 1965), pp. 7–16, 110–32.
Ed., *Phenomenology in America: Studies in the Philosophy of Experience* (Chicago, 1967).
"William James and Phenomenology," *Review of Metaphysics* 23 (1970): 481–526.
"The Genesis of a Phenomenological Theory of the Experience of Personal Identity: William James on Consciousness and the Self," *Man and World* 6 (1973): 322–40.
"Self-Presentation," in *Analecta Husserliana, vol. 26: American Phenomenology: Origins and Developments*, ed. E. F. Kaelin and C. O. Schrag (Dordrecht, 1989), pp. 207–11.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v72
Wachterhauser, Brice R., ed. *Phenomenology and Skepticism: Essays in Honor of James M. Edie* (Evanston, Ill., 1996). Contains a bibliography of Edie's writings.
Wilshire, Bruce. *Fashionable Nihilism: A Critique of Analytic Philosophy* (Albany, N.Y., 2002), pp. 73–81.

Fred Kersten

EDMAN, Irwin (1896–1954)

Irwin Edman was born on 28 November 1896 in New York City. His academic training took place entirely at Columbia University; he received his BA in 1917 and his PhD in philosophy in 1920. Edman was exposed to American pragmatism and naturalism during

his education at Columbia, studying with John DEWEY and befriending George SANTAYANA. He was then invited to join the faculty at Columbia, and was professor of philosophy from 1920 until his death on 4 September 1954 in New York City.

Edman was especially renowned for his ability to give unusually clear, accessible formulations of complex philosophic ideas. Edman used this gift to great effect in his more popular writings for magazines like *Harpers*, where he sought to communicate philosophical ideas to lay audiences, and in the introductions he contributed to translations of Plato, Epicurus, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, and Schopenhauer. Edman loved teaching, and was remembered after his death for his skills as a teacher. "Such was his extraordinary skill and zest and charm in expounding ancient wisdom illuminated by modern insights and tasteful wit," a 1954 memorial remarked, "that he had become a living symbol of the ideal teacher of the humanities."

Edman retained a measure of independence from pragmatism, and never developed a comprehensive philosophic system. He tended to focus instead on showcasing his essayist's wit in shorter occasional pieces. His philosophical interests were also quite diverse, ranging from history of philosophy to philosophy of religion (*The Mind of Paul*, 1935), to political philosophy (*Candle in the Dark*, 1939; *Fountainheads of Freedom*, 1941) to pedagogy and the goals of philosophic inquiry (*Four Ways of Philosophy*, 1937; *Philosopher's Quest*, 1947). His great love, however, was aesthetics.

Edman saw the fine arts as a manifestation of a greater human impulse to interpret experience. He sometimes cited William JAMES's characterization of experience as a "big blooming buzzing confusion" to explain his view of art. Art is the name for the human longing to clarify the "buzzing confusion" of experience by intensifying certain aspects of it. Edman saw the fine arts as a vivid expression of this impulse. The artist uses color, sound, spatial form, movement, or literary language to focus her audience's attention on different aspects of experience. This analysis of art led Edman to place art on par with philosophy as a means for reaching knowledge of the world. The philosopher constructs theories on the basis of definitions and demonstrations that supply us with a useful "vision of life." Edman held that the artist accomplishes a similar "commentary on life" through the performances and objects she creates. The artist and philosopher both try to clarify the "mystery" of experience by bringing experience into sharper attention for us, and simply use different media to achieve this result.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Human Traits and Their Social Significance (New York, 1920).

The World, the Arts and the Artist (New York, 1928).

Adam, the Baby, and the Man from Mars (Boston, 1928).

The Contemporary and His Soul (New York, 1931).

The Mind of Paul (New York, 1935).

Four Ways of Philosophy (New York, 1937).

Philosopher's Holiday (New York, 1938).

Arts and the Man: A Short Introduction to Aesthetics (New York, 1939).

Candle in the Dark: A Postscript to Despair (New York, 1939).

Fountainheads of Freedom: The Growth of the Democratic Idea (New York, 1941).

Landmarks for Beginners in Philosophy (New York, 1941).

Philosopher's Quest (New York, 1947).

Under Whatever Sky (New York, 1951).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with Sidney Hook, *American Philosophy Today and Tomorrow* (New York, 1935).

Ed., *The Philosophy of Santayana: Selections from the Works of George Santayana* (New York, 1936).

Ed., *John Dewey: His Contribution to the*

American Tradition (Indianapolis, 1955).

The Uses of Philosophy: An Irwin Edman Reader, ed. Charles Frankel (New York, 1955).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Proc of APA v28*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v44*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who's Who in Phil*

In Memoriam: Irwin Edman, 1896–1954 (New York, 1954). Collection of memorials to Edman.

Joshua Shaw

EDWARDS, Paul (1923–)

Paul Edwards was born 2 September 1923, in Vienna, Austria, and later became a naturalized United States citizen. Edwards received his education at the University of Melbourne (BA 1944, MA 1947), and at Columbia University (PhD in philosophy 1951). He held appointments at the University of Melbourne (1945–7) and New York University (1949–66). Since 1966 he has been a professor of philosophy at Brooklyn College of the City University of New York, where he is presently professor emeritus. He has held visiting positions at Columbia University, the University of California, Berkeley, and the New School of Social Research. In 1964–5 he was a Guggenheim Fellow.

In his 1955 book, *The Logic of Moral Discourse*, Edwards developed a metaethical analysis that combines naturalism with emotivism, theories ordinarily regarded as incompatible, claiming they can, and need to be, combined. Edwards's book was dedicated to Ernest NAGEL and contained an introduction by Sidney HOOK. Both Nagel and Hook were proponents of philosophical naturalism. Rejecting intuitionism and all forms of subjectivism,

Edwards attempted to combine objective or scientific naturalism, as in John DEWEY, and emotivism, as in Charles STEVENSON and others. When we claim that a person or action is good, according to Edwards, our approval of certain objective qualities of that person or action is what determines our moral judgment. But when we judge that the person or action is good we are referring to the qualities of each and not to our *approval* of them. This, Edwards claims, is the most important point of his theory. His agreement with emotivism is that the referent of a moral judgment is determined by the judger's attitude, but his agreement with naturalism is his claim that the referent of a moral judgment is not the judger's attitude but the natural facts or qualities of the action or situation that is presented for approval. This distinction, Edwards admits, is a fine one but, nevertheless, important. It allows him to agree with Dewey and naturalism in claiming that moral judgments are cognitively significant since they must contain a reference to empirical facts that can be, and need to be, verified.

At the same time, this distinction allows him to agree with Stevenson and the emotive theory in claiming that an act of approval or evaluation must be made or determined by some individual, otherwise no moral or value judgment would be involved. Edwards also goes *beyond* Stevenson's emotive theory on a number of other points. For one, he argues that it is possible to give reasons for moral judgments that surpass mere causal factors. Stevenson could only allow giving reasons or presenting evidence for moral judgments to have the effect of having an influence, or persuading people to agree, not in proving or validating the moral judgment. Edwards's view, by contrast, is a form of cognitivism and can allow us to speak of confirming reasons or evidence for moral judgments which depend on not how well they persuade individuals, but which themselves can be tested logically and empirically to determine their validity or cogency. Also, Edwards argued that moral disputes can be settled in a number

of ways, not simply if both parties arrive at the same view, whether that view has been proven or not. Edwards claimed that moral judgments do have emotive or expressive meaning, but that factual or referential meaning is not incidental to the character of the judgment. He gives the example of judging that someone is a good person. This judgment is moral not only because it expresses the feeling or emotion of approval, but equally because it refers to such morally relevant and observable qualities as kindness, gentleness, lack of envy, etc., and not to such morally irrelevant qualities as the person's income or physical appearance.

As Sidney Hook mentions in his introduction to Edwards's book, it is noteworthy that Edwards confronts directly important criticisms or objections to his own position. Edwards responds to the so-called "naturalistic fallacy" which G. E. Moore had made famous in his objections to any naturalistic ethics in *Principia Ethica* (1903). This is a hurdle, as Hook says, which must be cleared by any cogent analysis of ethics which claims to be naturalistic. Moore had claimed that the concept *good* is the most fundamental or important in ethics, and further that this concept is indefinable. Moore also alleged that while the notion of yellow is indefinable and natural, the quality of good is indefinable and nonnatural. Good, unlike yellow, does not occur in time and is not a natural property or quality. To suppose that good means pleasure, interest, desired, etc., is a fallacy since good is indefinable, and cannot be identified with natural or psychological qualities or feelings which occur in time. For Moore, we cannot give factual reasons why anything is morally good. We cannot say that honesty is good because it is desired, approved, preferred, or is useful in promoting happiness. This is a source of the famous is–ought problem in modern ethics. If good is what ought to be, or what ought to be done – then to give any factual reasons for this will be inappropriate, since factual reasons are conditional, while good, as independent of time, is unconditional.

Edwards responds directly to Moore's challenge by showing that there is a clear sense in which moral ought-statements may be based on statement of facts. To say that it is morally good to be honest, or that we ought to be honest because honesty is useful in promoting well-being, makes perfectly good sense. As a naturalist in ethics, Edwards cannot allow that good is nonnatural, nontemporal, or unconditional. Anything good in ethics, or anything good at all, will have conditions that are subject to time and change. For Edwards, the so-called naturalistic fallacy is a fallacy in name only. Emotions, desires, interests, etc., are all *relevant* to ethics since without them there would not be ethics or value judgments at all.

Edwards served as editor-in-chief of the eight-volume *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* published in 1967. Over the years this reference work has perhaps been more widely used than any other reference work in philosophy. As editor, Edwards was quite candid about his preference for the empirical and analytic tradition of Anglo-Saxon philosophy which controlled his chosen topics and space allotments of the work. Edwards also served as general editor for the Library of Philosophical Movements.

In his other writings, on Martin Buber and Martin Heidegger, Edwards is extremely critical of what he considers a lack of clarity and a tendency to provoke mystery by obscure and invented terminology. For Edwards, clarity is always a virtue in philosophy, and so is honesty. He is always in favor of trying to judge a philosophy on moral grounds. This he believes is consistent with his metaethical view that moral judgments are fundamentally factual and emotive.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Bertrand Russell's Doubts about Induction," *Mind* 58 (1949): 141–63.
"Necessary Propositions and the Future," *Journal of Philosophy* 46 (1949): 155–7.
The Logic of Moral Discourse (Glencoe, Ill., 1955).

Buber and Buberism: A Critical Evaluation
  (Lawrence, Kan., 1969).
Heidegger and Death: A Critical Evaluation
  (La Salle, Ill., 1979).
Voltaire: Selections (New York, 1989).
Reincarnation: A Critical Examination
  (Amherst, Mass., 1996).

Other Relevant Works
Ed. with Arthur Pap, *Modern Introduction to
  Philosophy: Readings from Classical and
  Contemporary Sources* (Glencoe, Ill.,
  1957).
Ed., *Bertrand Russell: Why I Am Not a
  Christian, and Other Essays on Religion
  and Related Subjects* (London, 1957).
"Hard and Soft Determinism," in
  *Determinism and Freedom in the Age of
  Modern Science*, ed. Sidney Hook (New
  York, 1958), pp. 117–25.
Ed., *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 8 vols
  (New York, 1967).
Ed., *Immortality* (Amherst, Mass., 1997).

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, *Oxford Comp Phil*
Stroh, Guy W. *American Ethical Thought*
  (Chicago, 1979), chap. 7.
Urmson, J. O. *The Emotive Theory of Ethics*
  (New York, 1968).
Wellman, Carl. *The Language of Ethics*
  (Cambridge, Mass., 1961).

Guy W. Stroh

EINHORN, David (1809–79)

David Einhorn was born on 10 November
1809 in the town of Dispeck in the Bavarian
area of Germany. He proved to be an excep-
tional student in the traditional Jewish educa-
tional programs of his village and at the
Talmudic Academy in Fürth where he attained

a rabbinical diploma at the age of seventeen in
1826. Things took a sharply different turn
after that, however, when he began espousing
liberal ideas studying philosophy at secular
universities in Erlangen, Würzburg, and
Munich. Controversial views delayed for ten
years his appointment as a rabbi, but he served
several congregations in Germany and
Hungary between 1842 and 1855. During that
time he had formulated theological and philo-
sophical bases for a "scientific study" of
Judaism and thus the means for advocating
adjustments in Jewish life to modern cultural
conditions.

In 1855 Einhorn emigrated to the United
States in search of greater freedom to express
himself. As rabbi of Har Sinai synagogue in
Baltimore, Maryland, he helped bring Reform
Judaism to America and provided the
movement with vigorous leadership for two
decades. His outspoken attacks on slavery
aroused local opposition, and he left Baltimore
in 1861 to escape mob violence. The rest of his
career was with noted congregations in
Philadelphia from 1861 to 1866, and New
York City from 1866 until 1879.

Einhorn was convinced that Judaism was
essentially a moral law, stemming from the
days of Moses but unfolding progressively up
to contemporary times. Scientific study of such
ideas that became refined over time could
determine which aspects were still valid and
which outdated, simultaneously avoiding the
unthinking naïveté of traditionalists as well as
the dismissive scorn of rationalists. For
Einhorn, Judaism was a living, growing faith,
one that evolved beyond old patterns because
it sought always to embody the spirit rather
than the letter of divine revelation. His hope
was that modernizing reforms would recapture
the essence of perennial truths and move
beyond unquestioning conformity to an
orthodox cultus, much as one distinguishes
kernels of grain from the husks that no longer
serve any valuable purpose.

Taking a more radical stance within Judaism
than many of his liberal colleagues, Einhorn

urged that several traditional practices be abandoned. He refused, for instance, to accept the Talmud as containing the authoritative interpretation of Scripture. He also sought to cease relying on Hebrew as the proper language for religious understanding, arguing instead that German was preferable by far as the best vehicle for Reform Judaism. To that end in 1856 he produced the *Olat Tamid*, a shortened and modified version of the traditional Hebrew prayer book, translated into German with all references to sacrifices eliminated and many new prayers added. This popular volume was expanded several years later and became the basis for the *Union Prayer Book* (1892 and 1895), a compromise volume which served as a common denominator for Reform congregations throughout the country,

Because Einhorn wanted to reinvigorate the believing heart of Judaism rather than bolster any behavioral particulars, he found ceremonial laws to be outdated. He ignored dietary restrictions derived from bygone ages, and he regarded the old categories that forbade work on the Sabbath with similar indifference. Many of these ideas reached a wider audience between 1856 and 1862 when he published his most important sermons and topical views, especially those regarding abolitionism, in *Sinai*, a German-language monthly which he had established.

Probably the most controversial aspect of Einhorn's thought, and that of Reform Judaism in general, pertained to Messianism and the restoration of Israel. In 1869 he was instrumental in having a rabbinical conference in Philadelphia declare messianic hope to be a universalistic expectation rather than a nationalistic prerogative. Israel's dispersion around the globe was declared a fulfillment of the chosen people's mission, not a frustration of it. This position of regarding the Diaspora as opportunity instead of tragedy laid the groundwork for another landmark manifesto of Reform Judaism. In 1885 the "Pittsburgh Platform," a comprehensive statement issued by the Rabbinical Conference that convened there, rejected all concern for restoring Jews to Palestine or for establishing an independent state there. Einhorn's attempts to align Jewish allegiance with contemporary times departed significantly from what many with more Orthodox opinions regarded as essentials of their faith. But the reforming advocate pursued his convictions with zeal and eloquence, not retiring from an active ministry until a few months before his death. Einhorn died on 2 November 1879 in New York City. His son-in-law, Kaufmann KOHLER, continued Einhorn's work as President of Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Princip des Mosaismus und dessen Verhältnis zum Heidenthum und Rabbinischen Judenthum (Leipzig, 1854).
Ausgewählte Predigten und Reden, ed. Kaufmann Kohler (New York, 1880).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v12*
Cohen, Bernard N. "David Einhorn, Some Aspects of His Thinking," in *Essays in American Jewish History* (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1958).
Kandel, Martin. "David Einhorn," in *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* (New York, 1939–43), vol. 4, pp. 27–8.
Kohler, Kaufmann, ed. *David Einhorn Memorial Volume: Selected Sermons and Addresses* (New York, 1911).
Temkin, Sefton D. "Einhorn, David," *Encyclopedia Judaica* (New York, 1971), vol. 6, p. 531.

Henry Warner Bowden

EINSTEIN, Albert (1879–1955)

Albert Einstein was born on 14 March 1879 in Ulm, Württemberg, Germany, and died on 18 April 1955 in Princeton, New Jersey. Though educated in Judaism, initially at home and later at the Luitpold Gymnasium, Einstein's ethnic and religious heritage was not the centerpiece of his personal or family life. He spent his childhood in Munich, and remained there even after his family moved to Milan in 1894. In 1895 he failed an entrance examination that would have permitted him to enter into a course of study in electrical engineering at the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule (the Swiss Federal Polytechnic School, "ETH") in Zürich. Not willing to give up on ETH, he entered secondary school in Arrau, Switzerland as a route into ETH. In 1896 he did gain entrance to ETH, in a course of studies directed toward his becoming a teacher of mathematics and physics. That same year, he renounced his German citizenship and remained stateless for several years. He received his diploma from ETH in 1901, the same year he also accepted Swiss citizenship. Unable to find anything better than temporary and short-term teaching positions, Einstein was eventually able to secure a job as a "technical expert third class" in the Swiss patent office in Berne. But even that job came about only because of the help of the father of his close friend from ETH, Marcel Grossmann.

Einstein worked in the patent office from 1902 until 1909, all the while continuing his own studies. In 1905 he received his doctorate in physics from the University of Zürich, after writing a thesis (dedicated to Marcel Grossmann) on the determination of molecular dimensions. This was a year of singular importance for Einstein's thought and development, often called his *annus mirabilis* because he published a series of papers on physics any one of which would have been revolutionary, including the introductions of special relativity, work on Brownian motion, and his paper on the photoelectric effect, which demonstrated the particulate nature of light.

Einstein's reputation within the scientific community was well established by 1909, when Hermann Minkowski put the ideas of special relativity in a more geometrical format, thus making Einstein's theory more intuitive to other physicists. Einstein resigned from the patent office in 1909 and took up a post at the University of Zürich as a "professor extraordinary." By 1914 he had moved on to become a professor of physics at the University of Berlin as well as the Director of the Kaiser Wilhelm Physical Institute. He was awarded the Nobel Prize in physics in 1921, "for his services to Theoretical Physics, and especially for his discovery of the law of the photoelectric effect" (Nobel Prize Organization 1967, p. 477). When he returned to Berlin in 1914, he also resumed his German citizenship. However, he renounced this for a second time in 1933 as a response to the political situation in Germany, and moved to the United States. He became a professor of theoretical physics at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, New Jersey in 1933, and was associated with Princeton University until the end of his life. He added US citizenship in 1940 to his Swiss citizenship. Even after his retirement from Princeton in 1945, Einstein continued to work on the unification of physics, focusing his attention on geometrical solutions until his death in 1955. But the problems proved largely intractable, and he made few additional contributions to physics in his later years.

Evaluating Einstein's philosophical contributions is an oddly difficult task. Einstein, of course, was not trained in philosophy, and much of the philosophical content of his thought is either expressed in fairly superficial forms or must be teased out of the physical researches that dominated his thought. But of even greater difficulty here are the many layers of public perception of Einstein and his work, layers to which he was himself a very conscious contributor. Einstein the icon stands in the way of uncovering Einstein the thinker. There is, on the one hand, a kind of adoration of him that scarcely brooks any manner of criticism. As recently as 3

January 2000, *Time* magazine named him its "Man of the Century"; this was his fourth *Time* cover. On the other hand, there are those who would demonize him as a man of relatively little originality who often plagiarized those ideas for which he became most famous.

It is true that many people helped Einstein, while seldom receiving explicit credit in his publications. Thus, Marcel Grossmann and perhaps Mileva Maric (Einstein's first wife) provided considerable assistance in the development of special relativity, while Michele Besso (another friend from ETH) worked extensively on the mathematics of general relativity. None of these persons received any sort of acknowledgment in the relevant papers, which were published in Einstein's name. Yet none of them ever challenged Einstein's originality or asserted any role for themselves in the development of his physical theories. Given Einstein's later prominence as a public figure, they and others certainly had the opportunity to do so had they felt themselves wronged. So, although this is a matter which might require rethinking in light of future scholarship, there seems little reason at this time to challenge the genuineness of Einstein's contributions.

Something of the nature of his originality can be seen in his development of special relativity. His article "On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies" (in 1952, pp. 37–65) is one of the series of extraordinary pieces that he wrote within a few weeks of each other and published in 1905. Many of the basic ideas in this paper had appeared in the works of earlier thinkers, though Einstein was not aware of the most recent developments by people such as H. A. Lorentz. Nevertheless, what was most important in Einstein's contribution was his synthesis of these disparate ideas. In this paper, he united into a coherent whole the ideas of ordinary mechanics and James Clerk Maxwell's electromagnetic theory, something which had not been done before.

To what extent did the experimental findings of Einstein's day contribute to the development of the special theory of relativity?

In particular, what role did the (now) famous "Michelson–Morley" experiment (the so-called "ether drift" experiment which attempted, but failed, to measure the difference in the speed of light due to the earth's movement through the theoretically postulated ether) have on Einstein's thought? Einstein himself was not consistent on this matter. At different times and in different places, his answer ranged from the centrally important to the inconsequential. However, a more substantial clue can be found in his 1905 "Electrodynamics" essay itself.

The opening paragraph of this article makes no mention of the experimental situation of the day. Rather, the entire focus is on the breakdown in the *symmetry* of how the older, Newtonian style of mechanics described electromagnetic phenomena versus that of Maxwell's more recent theory. In the second paragraph, Einstein makes a passing reference to "the unsuccessful attempts to discover any motion of the earth relative to the 'light medium'" (1952, p. 37). But Einstein gives absolutely no specifics regarding which experiments he is referring to, nor does he ever return to the subject in that paper. Rather, his focus remains exclusively on this issue of symmetry breakdown within the older theory, and ways of correcting it. Gerald Holton observes that Einstein could easily have had in mind "any two or more of at least seven experiments" (Holton 1973, p. 302). And this, of course, is predicated upon the less than convincing assumption that Einstein had any particular experiments in mind at all, rather than just a commonly known fact that such experiments had failed.

This is an example of the powerful inclination toward a kind of rationalism found throughout Einstein's work. Although it is certainly the case that he never denied the importance of empirical adequacy, what stands out in Einstein's scientific work is his commitment to such things as the unification of ideas, logical coherence, aesthetic matters such as the symmetry of the internal relations of a sci-

entific theory, and so on. All of these factors stand out in his 1905 paper on special relativity. We see it again, for instance, in a letter from 1914 to his friend Michele Besso, who provided Einstein with extensive assistance in the work leading up to the 1916 paper that introduced general relativity, "The Foundation of the General Theory of Relativity" (1952, pp. 111–64). Referring to the gravitational field equations that had been developed in his paper from 1911, "On the Influence of Gravitation on the Propagation of Light" (1952, pp. 99–108), Einstein told Besso that he was entirely satisfied with the correctness of the whole system, and did not care whether the observations of the solar eclipse succeeded or not. "The logic of the thing is too evident," Einstein stated (1987, vol. 5, 1993 p. 604). Additional examples are readily multiplied throughout Einstein's work; his confidence rarely resulted in failure. The observation of the solar eclipse which Einstein specifically mentions in his letter was originally scheduled to take place in August 1914. It finally occurred in 1919, when Arthur Eddington led an expedition to the Atlantic Ocean near Africa to take measurements of the deflection of starlight around the limb of the sun during a solar eclipse visible there. Eddington's announcement that his observations provide a spectacular confirmation of general relativity secured Einstein's scientific and popular fame.

Throughout his later work Einstein took a robustly geometrical approach to problems of physics, which again exemplifies the rationalism of his approach. For him, that solution was most likely to be true which could be elegantly couched in geometrical terms. This is certainly manifest in his development of general relativity, which in turn came to be viewed as one of his central contributions to philosophy. In general relativity, contingent relations of physics and formal relations of geometry are effectively merged into one another, so that the geometrical structures of physical space have no a priori characteristics. This meant that the traditional privileging of Euclidean geometry, which Kantian thought went so far as to declare to be the absolutely necessary form of physical or intuitive space, came to be challenged on empirical and scientific grounds.

Another major aspect of Einstein's philosophical contributions is the challenge to a priorism. This is a line of thought that was developed less by Einstein than by other philosophers such as Hans REICHENBACH. Reichenbach argued against any form of a priorism, and took Einstein's theories as demonstrating the untenability of any such position (Reichenbach 1957, p. 37ff). However, other readings of Einstein's theories came to different conclusions. Ernst Cassirer, for example, in a text that Einstein himself read and commented on prior to publication, saw in Einstein's work the confirmation of a deeper principle of relationalism that served as a kind of validation of a neo-Kantian reading of relativity (Cassirer 1953, p. 349f). Einstein himself came to insist on a kind of relational interpretation of space as necessitated by relativity. "[S]pace-time is not something to which one can ascribe a separate existence, independently of the actual objects of physical reality. Physical objects are not *in space*, but these objects are *spatially extended*." (1961, p. vii, original emphasis) But this raises other problems with Einstein's approach.

Alfred North WHITEHEAD identified part of the problem as one of confusing a general principle with its particular application (Whitehead 1922, p. 3f). The special and general theories of relativity represent particular applications of relational philosophy, but they are not themselves the enunciation of that general principle. In attempting to ground the relational structure of space and time in that of objects, Einstein creates more problems than he solves. If the objects are changeless, then time cannot be distilled from any set of relations between them; if they do undergo change, then time does not emerge as a relational property from them because it is presupposed in their very definition. Hence, Whitehead argued, a deeper

principle is needed to make sense of these relational structures.

Another problem Whitehead identified was peculiar to general relativity. Because this theory collapses the geometry of space into the contingent physical arrangements of matter and energy, there is no way of knowing in advance the logical relations of spatial congruence needed to give meaning to spatial measurements. But the only way one can know these contingent physical facts is by making careful and precise measurements, measurements which presuppose the prior knowledge of the relevant congruence relations of space which permit such measurements to be meaningfully conducted. One is thus left with a situation of having to know everything before one can know anything (Whitehead 1922, p. 29f). This "measurement problem of cosmology" (not Whitehead's phrase) has not been addressed by science, and is rarely attended to within philosophy.

Although earlier in his life Einstein expressed some interest in Ernst Mach's positivistic methodology in interpreting science, by the time he was working on general relativity Einstein had abandoned this philosophical approach (Holton 1973, p. 223f). Aside from his explicit statements on the subject, his larger theory of nature emerges on its own. Einstein is essentially a realist about the mathematical structures of which his formal theories are composed. Space is not the space of experience, but a direct correlate of the idealized mathematical forms used to represent it in physical theories. This view is also quite prevalent in the physical sciences today. But it is certainly problematic. The idealized structures of mathematics are quite alien with respect to human experience. Unextended points of space and durationless instants of time are not to be found there. Yet these are the kinds of mathematical entities to which nature is presumed to correspond directly. No clear path is indicated in Einstein's thought as to how experience on the one hand, and the mathematical idealizations which describe the real on the other, are to be brought together.

Making sense of human experience within the context of his scientific rationalism and realism was a problem that troubled Einstein. He was an enormously humane individual. Although he was never an adherent of any religious orthodoxy, he was a firm believer in a creative, loving, and intelligent God. A lifelong pacifist, he was also a firm believer in the essential roles of passion and imagination, both in life in general and in the development of scientific thought in particular. But it is difficult to reconcile a meaningfully creative role for passion and imagination with the rigidly mathematical determinism of Einstein's scientific theories. Nature within an Einsteinian universe is a Parmenidean block in which all change is an illusion due to the limitations of human perception. For nature itself, all of reality is already there in the four-dimensional mathematical manifold of space–time. Passion and imagination are simply effluvia of existence, incapable of making any real contributions to the world, because that which is real is already determined. In addition, there does not appear to be much room for God in such a scheme of things.

Einstein's philosophical legacy is a great deal more problematic than his scientific reputation might indicate. His philosophy of nature is all but irreconcilable with his belief in the vital reality of human passion and imagination. This philosophy of nature has been rigidified into a largely unchallenged dogma throughout much of the scientific community, with the enormous successes of Einstein's physical theories contributing to this ossification. Yet the success of these theories within the physical sciences neither necessitates nor validates any specific philosophical interpretation of nature. Other approaches are arguably at least possible which do no violence to empirical science, but which do not simply equate nature with the mathematical formalisms used to represent it, and thus do not leave the connection between human experience and nature as problematic as happens with Einstein's philosophical ideas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Über einen die Erzeugung und Verwandlung des Lichtes betreffenden heuristischen Gesichtspunkt," *Annalen der Physik* 17 (1905): 132–48.

"Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper," *Annalen der Physik* 17 (1905): 891–921.

"Über den Einfluss der Schwekraft auf die Ausbreitung des Lichtes," *Annalen der Physik* 35 (1911): 898–908.

"Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie," *Annalen der Physik* 49 (1916): 769–822.

The World As I See It, trans. Alan Harris (New York, 1934).

The Evolution of Physics: The Growth of Ideas from Early Concepts to Relativity and Quanta, with Leopold Infeld (New York, 1938).

The Principle of Relativity, trans. W. Perrett and G. B. Jeffrey (Mineola, N.Y., 1952).

Ideas and Opinions, ed. Carl Seelig (New York, 1954).

The Meaning of Relativity, 5th edn, trans E. P. Adams et al. (Princeton, N.J., 1956).

Einstein on Peace, ed. Otto Nathan and Heinz Norden (New York, 1960).

Relativity: The Special and the General Theory, trans. R. W. Lawson (New York, 1961).

Other Relevant Works

Einstein's papers are at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

Out of My Later Years (Totowa, N.J., 1950).

The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein, 25 vols planned, ed. John Stachel et al. (Princeton, N.J., 1987–).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Bio 20thC Phils, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Encyc Amer Bio, Routledge Encycl Phil, Who Was Who in Amer v3

Cassirer, Ernst. *Substance and Function and Einstein's Theory of Relativity* (New York, 1953).

Clark, Ronald W. *Einstein: The Life and Times* (New York, 1971).

Holton, Gerald. *Thematic Origins of Scientific Thought: Kepler to Einstein* (Cambridge, Mass., 1973).

Reichenbach, Hans. *The Philosophy of Space and Time*, trans. Maria Reichenbach and John Freund (New York, 1957).

Nobel Prize Organization. *Nobel Lectures: Physics* (New York, 1967).

Schilpp, Paul A., ed. *Albert Einstein: Philosopher–Scientist* (Evanston, Ill., 1949; 3rd edn, La Salle, Ill., 1970). Contains Einstein's autobiography and bibliography.

Whitehead, Alfred North. *The Principle of Relativity with Applications to Physical Science* (Cambridge, UK, 1922).

Gary L. Herstein

EISELE, Carolyn (1902–2000)

Carolyn Eisele was born on 13 June 1902 in the Bronx, New York, and died on 15 January 2000 in New York City. The only daughter of Rudolph and Caroline Wüst Eisele, she attended Hunter College High School in New York City before entering Hunter College in 1919. Although hoping to specialize in physics, she found the offerings at Hunter limited, and opted instead for mathematics while taking courses in physics and chemistry as well. She graduated with a BA and honors, Phi Beta Kappa, in 1923. Eisele then began her graduate studies in mathematics at Columbia University, where she later counted it as her good fortune to have taken David Eugene Smith's famous course on the history of mathematics, in addition to other courses with Cassius J.

KEYSER. After receiving her MA in mathematics and education in 1923 (with an emphasis on history of mathematics), she continued her graduate study, spending several summers at the University of Chicago and later at the University of Southern California. Unfortunately, due to illness and increasing responsibilities for her parents at home, she never completed a doctorate.

Eisele was offered a position teaching mathematics at Hunter College immediately upon her graduation. Her teaching career in the department of mathematics and statistics spanned nearly fifty years, from 1923 until her retirement in 1972, with a promotion to full professor in 1965. Her early interest in differential geometry (which she studied at Chicago) would later prove both prophetic and useful when she turned to study similar aspects of the mathematics of pragmatist Charles S. PEIRCE several decades later. Just after World War II, she was asked to teach the mathematics department's course on history of mathematics. In order to prepare, she obtained a semester's sabbatical from Hunter in 1947 to gather primary sources in Columbia's archives for the history of mathematics, including many rare works that had been amassed by George Plimpton. Plimpton, a publisher, was the head of Ginn and Company, and his magnificent collection now forms, with the D. E. Smith library, an important repository of works on history of mathematics in New York City. It was during her examination of the materials at Columbia that Eisele happened by chance to find a book that Peirce had been asked to evaluate for Plimpton. Peirce's handwritten comments on the *Liber Abaci* fell into her hands as she opened the volume for careful inspection. Peirce had thought the manuscript so important that he even made a special presentation on the subject to members of the American Mathematical Society at its annual meeting in 1894. His letter made such an impression on Eisele that she wrote an account of her discovery, "The *Liber Abaci*" (1951), and decided that Peirce was worthy of more

serious research. Eisele then received a letter from the science editor of Princeton University Press suggesting she write a book for the Press on Peirce, whereupon she then wrote to W. V. QUINE of Harvard's philosophy department, asking about the availability of Peirce manuscripts there. Not only was the response from Harvard positive, but in 1952 she received a grant from the American Philosophical Society to support her research on Peirce in both Cambridge and Washington. Among Peirce's works that particularly attracted Eisele's attention were the many studies he presented to the American Academy of Sciences, in particular one entitled "On Two Map-Projections of the Lobatschewskian Plane," which Peirce had never printed, but which Eisele wrote up as a separate article, "The Quincuncial Map-Projection of Charles S. Peirce" (1963). She also realized that serious study of Peirce's original contributions to American science while a member of the Coast Survey had yet to be undertaken.

Eisele's edition of Peirce's *New Elements of Mathematics*, comprised of volumes devoted to "Arithmetic," "Algebra and Geometry," "Mathematical Miscellanea" (which required two books), and "Mathematical Philosophy," was published with a subvention from the Dewey Foundation in 1976. This was also the year in which the Peirce Bicentennial International Congress was held. Eisele committed herself to the congress with great energy to insure its success as the first international meeting to be devoted entirely to Peirce. In addition to securing the cooperation of the Dutch academic community and negotiating approval of the Congress as an official international event of the US bicentennial celebrations that year, she also engaged the help of the cultural attaché at the American Embassy. Not only did the Peirce Congress result in a volume of proceedings that appeared in 1981, but in the meantime, a volume of Eisele's own papers appeared in 1979.

Eisele was concerned that most readers would not appreciate the role mathematics

had played in Peirce's life and works, and therefore she was determined to produce a new work, to make clear how his mathematical stance is essential to an understanding of his philosophy. This effort would lead to Eisele's last major contribution to Peirce studies, her two volumes devoted to *Historical Perspectives on Peirce's Logic of Science: A History of Science* (1985).

When Eiesle retired from Hunter College in 1972, she was elected to the Hunter Hall of Fame in recognition of her outstanding achievements. By then, she had made many contributions, not just to the field of Peirce studies, but to the professionalization of the history of science as a discipline. Eisele was President of the Charles S. Peirce Society from 1973 to 1975. She was a founding member of the Metropolitan New York Section of the History of Science Society, which she served for nearly a decade as treasurer. From 1959 to 1962, Eiesle served as an elected member of the national Council of the History of Science Society, and also served on the board of directors of the George Sarton Memorial Foundation. In 1988 she was made an honorary life member of the Metropolitan New York Section of the History of Science Society. Later, this group consolidated in the early 1990s with the History and Philosophy of Science Section of the New York Academy of Sciences. A fellow of the Academy, in 1985 she was the recipient of its Behavioral Sciences, History and Philosophy of Sciences award. In 1972 she was made a consulting member of the Centro Superiore di Logica e Scienze Comparate at the University of Bologna. Other honors included the award of a Doctor of Humanities degree honoris causa in 1980 by Texas Tech University, where she was also a member of the University's Institute for Studies in Pragmatism. In 1982 she received another Doctor of Science degree honoris causa from Lehigh University.

It was due to Eisele's scholarship devoted primarily to Peirce's mathematics that its importance for a satisfactory understanding of the origins of pragmatism came to the attention of the scholarly world in a new way. Eisele was almost single-handedly responsible for setting the record straight in sofaras the extent and importance of Peirce's thinking in mathematics and logic were essential to the formulation and development of his ideas concerning pragmatism. For the philosophy of science generally, Eisele's writings offer much in the way of insight thanks to Peirce's own interest in this subject. Especially noteworthy in this respect is the volume of her own essays on Peirce and history of science, *Studies in the Scientific and Mathematical Philosophy of Charles S. Peirce* (1979), for it was through examples from the history of science that Peirce sought to illuminate the ways in which science progresses, and the nature of the knowledge that science can achieve.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ed., *The New Elements of Mathematics by Charles S. Peirce*, 5 vols (The Hague, 1976).

Studies in the Scientific and Mathematical Philosophy of Charles S. Peirce, ed. Richard M. Martin (The Hague, 1979).

Historical Perspectives on Peirce's Logic of Science: A History of Science (Berlin, 1985).

Other Relevant Works

Eisele's papers are at the Institute for American Thought at Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis.

"The *Liber Abaci*," *Scripta Mathematica* 17 (1951): 236–59.

"Peirce and the History of Science," *Year Book of the American Philosophical Society* (1954): 353–8.

"A Nineteenth Century Man of Science," *Scripta Mathematica* 24 (1959): 305–24.

"The Quincuncial Map-Projection of Charles S. Peirce," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 107 (1963): 299–307.

"The Influence of Galileo on Peirce," in

Atti del Simposio su "Galileo Galilei nella storia e nella filosofia della scienze" (Firenze-Pisa, 14–16 Settembre 1964) (Florence, Italy, 1964), pp. 321–4.

"Peirce's Philosophy of Mathematical Education," in *Studies in the Philosophy of Charles Sanders Peirce*, ed. Edward C. Moore and Richard S. Robin (Amherst, Mass., 1964), pp. 51–75.

"The Search for a Method," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 11 (1975): 149–58.

Further Reading

Proc of APA v74, Who Was Who in Amer v14

Ketner, Kenneth L. "Carolyn Eisele's Place in Peirce Studies," *Historia Mathematica* 9 (1982): 326–32.

Joseph W. Dauben

ELIADE, Mircea (1907–86)

Mircea Eliade was born in Bucharest, Romania, on 13 March 1907. Although Romanian records give his date of birth as 28 February, this is according to the Julian calendar, since the Gregorian calendar was not adopted in Romania until 1924. Eliade's Orthodox Christian family celebrated his birthday on the Day of the Forty Martyrs, which is 9 March by the Julian calendar, and Eliade himself gave that date as his birthday. Eliade died on 22 April 1986 in Chicago, Illinois.

Eliade's family, including an elder brother and younger sister, was city dwelling and middle class, separated from their peasant roots by two generations. His father had changed his own surname from Iremia (Jeremiah) to Eliade in 1899. Mircea attended the Strada Mântuleasa primary school and the Spiru Haret high school where he developed an interest in the natural sciences, particularly entomology and botany, but where he also failed courses in Romanian, French, and German. This failure seems to have impelled him to greater effort and he became a voracious reader. Eliade began to write imaginative fiction at the age of twelve, although his first publication, at the age of fourteen, was a natural science piece concerning a wasp predatory upon the Chinese silkworm. That same year, in the same *Journal of Popular Science and Travels*, he published his first autobiographical fragments, one of which consisted largely of the narration of a peasant legend told by a local guide. His first published work of imaginative fiction, "How I Found the Philosopher's Stone," came later in 1921. By the end of high school his interests had moved from natural science to literature and philosophy and he determined to study philology and philosophy at university. His autobiographical fiction indicates a youth of a modernist, scientific bent, convinced of the importance of both traditional religions and folk traditions but unable to accept mysteries or dogmas surpassing rational explanation. His American biographer, M. L. Ricketts, suggests that "Perhaps Eliade's real 'religion' at this time could be said to have been faith in the unlimited power of the disciplined will …. Although he has denied being influenced at this time by Nietzsche … Eliade nourished a deep, secret wish to become a kind of 'superman,' to control his own will" (Ricketts 1988, p. 72).

This passion for self-discipline must have been active when Eliade read the five-volume *Geschichte des Altertums* by Edward Meyer (despite his high school difficulty with German), and again during his seventeenth or eighteenth year when he encountered the historians of religions, Raffaele Pettazzoni and James Frazer (he taught himself both Italian and English so as to read them in the original). In 1925 Eliade enrolled in the department of philosophy of the University of Bucharest.

There he was greatly influenced by Nae Ionescu, an assistant professor of logic and metaphysics and an active journalist with a keen interest in both science and religion. One of Ionescu's principle tenets was the "separation of planes" in which the theological, metaphysical, and scientific planes were seen, not as hierarchical as by Auguste Comte, but as mutually exclusive and irreducible one to another. Ionescu's tenet may well be the source of Eliade's celebrated "irreducibility of the sacred," but the latter may also be related to Immanuel Kant's nonreductionistic philosophy of pure reason, practical reason, and aesthetic judgment.

Eliade's thesis of 1928 examined "Contributions to Renaissance Philosophy" including Marsilio Ficino, Pico della Mirandola, and Giordano Bruno, and the influence of Renaissance humanism seems to have been at work in his turn to India to "universalize" the "provincial" philosophy of Western Europe. Having earned his licentiate degree and being awarded a grant from the Maharaja of Kassimbazar to study in India, Eliade sailed east that same year. He studied Sanskrit and philosophy at the University of Calcutta under Surendranath Dasgupta, a Cambridge-educated Bengali, author of the five-volume *History of Indian Philosophy* (Calcutta, 1922–55). In 1930, however, Eliade was expelled from Dasgupta's home under suspicion of some romantic liaison with Dasgupta's daughter, Maitreyi. He traveled around India, visiting sites of religious interest, participating in the famous Kumbh-Mela festival at Allahabad, and staying for three months at the Svarga ashram at Rishikesh, at the time headed by swami Shivananda.

Eliade returned to Bucharest in 1932 and the publication of his novel, *Maitreyi*, in 1933 assured his status as a best-selling novelist in his native land. An apparently realistic account (including the actual street address and telephone number of the house in Calcutta) of his supposed liaison with Maitreyi, this novel later occasioned a response from Maitreyi Devi

herself, in the form of her own novel refuting Eliade's claim to sexual intimacy (*It Does not Die*, 1976). *Maitreyi* was Eliade's third novel and he was to publish a total of ten novels by 1940. He also successfully submitted his analysis of Yoga as his doctoral thesis at the Bucharest philosophy department in 1933. Published in French as *Yoga: Essai sur les origines de la mystique Indienne* (Paris, 1936) this was revised and became one of his major works, *Yoga, Immortality, and Freedom* (1954). Also in 1933 he began living with Nina Mareş, a single mother and secretary at the telephone company, and they married in October 1934. As Nae Ionescu's assistant at the university of Bucharest, Eliade lectured, among other things, on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* and Nicholas of Cusa's *Docta Ignorantia*. Ionescu was a significant influence on Eliade and on other young Romanian intellectuals in their support for the ultra-rightist movement, the Legion of the Archangel Michael, founded by Corneliu Zelea Codreanu in 1927. Between 1936 and 1938 Eliade wrote journalistic articles in support of this group and claims have been made that he ran for public office with the legionary party, but decisive evidence is still lacking. He was imprisoned as a result of his support, but he was released without charges after four months. After 1938 Eliade no longer gave any public support to the Legion. His legionary connections have led to accusations of fascism and anti-Semitism, but the evidence is contradictory.

In 1940 Eliade was appointed to the Romanian Legation in London by the incumbent fascist-royalist government. When Romania entered the war as a German ally he was sent to Portugal where he served the Romanian office of Press and Propaganda. His wife, Nina, died of cancer in Portugal in 1944. After the cessation of hostilities, in 1945, Eliade moved to Paris where Georges Dumézil, a scholar of comparative mythology, found him a part-time post at the Sorbonne teaching comparative religion. From this time on most of Eliade's scholarly work was composed in

French. In Paris Eliade met his second wife, Christinel, also a Romanian, whom he married in 1950. His second marriage, like his first, remained childless.

At the prompting of Joachim WACH, a scholar of religion at the University of Chicago, Eliade was invited to give the 1956 Haskell Lectures at that institution on "Patterns of Initiation." These were published as *Birth and Rebirth* (1958). On Wach's death in 1958, Eliade was invited to assume the chair of the history of religions department in Chicago. There he stayed until his own death in 1986, publishing extensively on the history of religions and continuing to write fiction in Romanian. Although his fiction remained largely unpublished in English there are some significant exceptions, including the novel he regarded as his *chef d'oeuvre*, *The Forbidden Forest* (1978). From the time of his early novels and short stories in Romania, Eliade's fiction utilized a dialectic of realism and fantasy comparable to "magic realism." He commonly wrote in a realist style into which he gradually introduced fantastic elements until the world of the commonplace became transformed into some mythic realm. Some of his work, however, was more directly fantastic. *Un Om Mare* ("A Great Man," in *Fantastic Tales*, 1969), for example, had its protagonist grow to enormous size. Another, *Domnişoara Christina* ("Mistress Christina," in *Mystic Stories*, 1992) was a vampire story. Other novels are apparently realistic, as is his *Forbidden Forest*. One novel, *Nuntā în cer* (*Marriage in Heaven*, 1938) was translated into Italian and won the Elba-Brignetti prize for the best foreign language novel in Italian in 1983. His *Maitreyi* became a French language film starring Hugh Grant.

Although translation into English has been partial at best, most of his fiction is available in French. Concerning the Scottish historian of religions, Andrew Lang, Eliade wrote that "he had the misfortune to be an excellent and versatile writer, and author, among other works, of a volume of poetry. And literary gifts usually arouse the scholar's suspicions." (1969, p. 45) On similar grounds Eliade seems to have thought it best not to advertise his own literary accomplishments to the Anglophone readership of his history of religions work, and such dissimulation about his past is apparent at several junctures. Particularly in the case of his political sympathies of the late 1930s Eliade's dissimulation has made his past difficult to reconstruct and the object of considerable contention.

Whatever his stature as a novelist or the truth about his earlier life, at the University of Chicago, Eliade was a member of the committee on social thought; he led the journals *History of Religions* and *The Journal of Religion*; and he was editor-in-chief of Macmillan's *Encyclopedia of Religion* (1987). Through these activities as well as his continued publication in the history of religions and his tuition of a generation of successful scholars of religion, he was, from the early 1960s through the mid 1970s, the most influential single figure in establishing the history of religions as an academic discipline in the United States.

Despite this focus on the history of religions, Eliade maintained a philosophical agenda, although he never explicitly systematized his position. There has been considerable disagreement over the value of his thought, some seeing it as a crucial contribution to our understanding of religion, and some seeing him as an obscurantist proposing unacceptable normative assumptions. In *Cosmos and History: The Myth of the Eternal Return* (1954) – a book he considered subtitling *Introduction to a Philosophy of History* – Eliade differentiated between religious and nonreligious humanity by applying Henri Bergson's distinction between perceptions of time (*Essai sur les données immédiates de la conscience*, 1889). Eliade contended that the perception of time as a homogeneous, linear, and unrepeatable medium is a peculiarity of "modern," nonreligious humanity. "Archaic" or religious humanity (*homo religiosus*), in comparison,

apprehends time as heterogeneous, divided between linear, profane time and cyclical and reactualizable, sacred time, called by Eliade, *illud tempus* (Latin for "that time"). Myths and rituals give repeated access to this sacred time ("the eternal return") and thus protect religious humanity against the "terror of history," a form of existential anxiety in which the absolute "givenness" of historical time causes helplessness. Eliade undermined his own distinction, however, insisting that non-religious humanity in any pure sense is nonexistent and that religiousness, understood in this way, is ubiquitous. Myth and *illud tempus*, the temporal continuum of mythic event, still exist, although concealed, in the world of "non-religious" humanity and there is no "solution of continuity between the archaic mind and scientific ideologies of the nineteenth century" (*The Quest*, 1969, p. 41). Eliade set himself against "the historicistic position, in all its varieties and shapes – from Nietzsche's 'destiny' to Heidegger's 'temporality'" (*Cosmos and History*, 1954, p. 152). He regarded the attempt to restrict "real" time to historical time alone as an unacceptable reduction and he considered, for example, the atheistic existentialism of Jean-Paul Sartre to be arid and hopeless.

Eliade defined religion in terms of humanity's relation to the "sacred," and the precise nature of his concept of the sacred has also been the subject of contention. Some see it as corresponding to a conventional concept of deity, or to Rudolf Otto's *ganz andere* ("wholly other") – an ontologically independent reality. Others have detected a closer resemblance to Émile Durkheim's social sacred. Eliade identifies the sacred and the real, yet states repeatedly, "the sacred is a structure of human consciousness" (*The Quest*, 1969, p. i; *History of Religious Ideas*, 1978, p. xiii). This combination seems to support the latter interpretation – both the sacred and the real are social constructions – and is reminiscent of Kant's identification of reality as a category of the understanding. Thus the sacred

can be identified as simultaneously a structure of consciousness and the source of significance, meaning, power, and Being. Its manifestations can be seen as appearances of the holy, of power, or of Being (hierophanies, cratophanies, or ontophanies), just as, for Kant, space and time are irreducibly perceived as external continua, although they are identified as the a priori postulates of the understanding. It is surely no coincidence that the title of Eliade's major work, *Yoga, Immortality, and Freedom*, echoes the ideas of pure reason that for Kant become the postulates of practical reason: God, Immortality, and Freedom.

Eliade's identification of the sacred and the real places individual human apprehension of the sacred and of the real on equal footing, rather than privileging either sort of apprehension. Eliadean history of religions does not begin with the presumption of exhaustive knowledge of what "the real" actually is, and is thus consonant with much recent critical theory and encourages openness to alternative belief systems. Insofar as mythical entities and events have a real effect on the existential situation of believers they are real and sacred entities and events.

The philosophical influences on Eliade from Kant through Otto and others are yet to be traced with real precision. Eliade's *The Sacred and the Profane* (1959) – first published in German as *Das Heilige und das Profane* in 1957 – was explicitly written in response to Otto's *Das Heilige* (1918), but Eliade goes beyond Otto in describing the dialectic of the sacred and the profane. He insists that believers are prepared by their lived experience and religious background to experience hierophany, the apprehension of the real/sacred in the historical/profane. In Eliade's analysis any historical entity could be apprehended as such a hierophany with appropriate preparation, and all hierophany must be mediated by historical realities. His conclusion is that all beings reveal, but at the same time conceal, the nature of Being.

In Eliade's quest to recover the meanings of hierophanies for those who apprehend them he

attempts to analyze and understand religious data by applying concepts from the German hermeneutical tradition going back to Schleiermacher and Dilthey and continued by Wach and Gerardus van der Leeuw. Eliade agrees with them that religious data are intelligible because, as human expressions, they are in accord with our own experience. Although he is most often identified as a phenomenologist of religion he frequently insisted that he was a phenomenologist only insofar as he sought to discover the meanings of religious data. His hermeneutical phenomenology is most evident in his morphological approach in *Patterns in Comparative Religion* (1958), where he groups religious phenomena ahistorically by structural themes such as water symbolism or the symbolism of the center. Later, he attempted to complement that methodology with the chronological organization of his *History of Religious Ideas* (1978–85). However, in considering Eliade's sources and influences, one should bear in mind that he considered, to give just one example, the first/second-century Indian Buddhist, Nagarjuna, to have produced "one of the most original ontological creations known to the history of thought" (*History of Religious Ideas*, 1982, p. 225). Eliade's openness to the influence of Asian philosophy should not be ignored, nor should his origins in an Eastern Orthodox Christian environment, which also clearly influences his understanding. Eliade's greatest contribution to the contemporary understanding of religions may be his combining all of these influences in a pluralistic philosophy of religion that manages to take all religious traditions seriously as genuine expressions of real existential situations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Le Mythe de l'éternel retour (Paris, 1949). Trans. W. Trask as *Cosmos and History: The Myth of the Eternal Return* (Princeton, N.J., 1954).

Traité d'histoire des religions (Paris, 1949). Trans. R. Sheed as *Patterns in Comparative Religion* (London, 1958).

Le Chamanisme et les techniques archaïques de l'extase (Paris, 1951). Trans. W. Trask as *Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy* (London, 1964).

Images et symboles: essays sur le symbolisme magico-religieux (Paris, 1952). Trans. P. Mairet as *Images and Symbols: Studies in Religious Symbolism* (London, 1961).

Yoga immortalité et liberté (Paris, 1954). Trans. W. Trask as *Yoga, Immortality and Freedom* (London, 1958).

Forgerons et alchimistes (Paris, 1956). Trans. Stephen Corrin as *The Forge and the Crucible* (London, 1962).

Mythes, rêves, et mystères (Paris, 1957). Trans. P. Mairet as *Myths, Dreams and Mysteries: The Encounter between Contemporary Faiths and Archaic Realities* (London, 1960).

Naissances mystiques (Paris, 1959). Trans. W. Trask as *Birth and Rebirth: The Religious Meanings of Initiation in Human Culture* (London, 1958); also published as *Rites and Symbols of Initiation: The Mysteries of Birth and Rebirth* (New York, 1975).

Méphistophélès et l'androgyne (Paris, 1962). Trans. J. M. Cohen as *The Two and the One* (Chicago, 1965).

Aspects du mythe (Paris, 1963). Trans. W. Trask as *Myth and Reality* (New York, 1963).

"Yoga and Modern Philosophy," *Journal of General Education* 2 (1963): 124–37.

Le Sacré et le profane (Paris, 1965). Trans. Eva Moldenhauer as *Das Heilige und das Profane* (Hamburg, 1957); trans. W. Trask as *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion* (London, 1959).

"Historical Events and Structural Meaning in Tension," *Criterion* 6 (1967): 29–31.

The Quest: History and Meaning in Religion (Chicago, 1969).

"The Sacred in the Secular World," *Cultural Hermeneutics* 1 (1973): 101–13.

Histoire des croyances et des idées religieuses I: de l'âge de la pierre aux mystères

d'Éleusis (Paris, 1976). Trans. W. Trask as
*A History of Religious Ideas, vol. I: From
the Stone Age to the Eleusinian Mysteries*
(Chicago, 1978).

*Histoire des croyances et des idées religieuses
II: de Gautama Bouddha au triomphe du
christianisme* (Paris, 1978). Trans. W.
Trask as *A History of Religious Ideas, vol.
II: From Gautama Buddha to the
Triumph of Christianity* (Chicago, 1982).

*Histoire des croyances et des idées religieuses
III: de Mahomet à l'âge des reformes*
(Paris, 1983). Trans. A. Hiltebeitel and D.
Apostolos-Cappadona as *The History of
Religious Ideas, vol. III: From
Muhammad to the Age of the Reforms*
(Chicago, 1985).

Editor-in-chief, *The Encyclopedia of
Religion* (New York and London, 1987).

Other Relevant Works

Maitreyi (Bucharest, Romania, 1933). Trans.
Alain Guillermou as *La Nuit Bengali*
(Lausanne, Switzerland, 1950); trans.
Catherine Spencer as *Bengal Nights*
(Chicago, 1994).

Domnişoara Christina (Bucharest, Romania,
1936). Trans. Ana Cartianu as *Mistress
Christina* (Boulder, Col., 1992).

Pe Strada Mântuleasa (Paris, 1968). Trans.
M. P. Stevenson as *The Old Man and The
Bureaucrats* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1979).

Fantastic Tales (London, 1969).

Noaptea de Sânziene (Paris, 1971). Trans. A.
Guillermou as *Forêt interdite* (Paris,
1955); trans. M. L. Ricketts and M. P.
Stevenson as *The Forbidden Forest* (Notre
Dame, Ind., 1978).

Tales of the Sacred and Supernatural
(Philadelphia, 1981).

Two Strange Tales (London, 1986).

*Youth without Youth: Three Fantastic
Novellas* (Columbus, Ohio, 1988).

Mystic Stories: The Sacred and the Profane
(New York, 1992).

*L'histoire des religions a-t-elle un sens?:
Correspondance 1926–1959*, with

Raffaele Pettazzoni (Paris, 1994).

"The Unpublished Correspondence between
Mircea Eliade and Stig Wikander
(1948–1977): Parts I–III," ed. Mihaela
Timuş and Eugen Ciurtin, *Archaeus:
Études d'histoire des religions* 4 (2000):
157–85; 4 (2000): 179–211; 5 (2001):
75–119.

Mircea Eliade: A Critical Reader, ed. Bryan
Rennie (London, 2005).

Further Reading

*Amer Nat Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio,
Encyc Social Behav Sci, Encyc Relig, Who
Was Who in Amer v9*

Allen, Douglas. *Structure and Creativity in
Religion: Hermeneutics in Mircea Eliade's
Phenomenology and New Directions* (The
Hague, 1978).

———, *Myth and Religion in Mircea Eliade*
(New York, 1988).

Allen, Douglas, and Denis Doeing. *Mircea
Eliade: An Annotated Bibliography* (New
York, 1980).

Baird, Robert D. "Phenomenological
Understanding: Mircea Eliade," in
*Category Formation and the History of
Religion* (The Hague, 1971).

Cave, John D. *Mircea Eliade's Vision for a
New Humanism* (Oxford, 1992).

Devi, Maitreyi. *It Does Not Die. A Romance*
(Calcutta, 1976; Chicago, 1994).

Dudley, Guilford, III. *Religion on Trial:
Mircea Eliade and His Critics*
(Philadelphia, 1977).

Handoca, Mircea. *Mircea Eliade:
Biobibliografie* (Bucharest, Romania,
1997).

Laignel-Lavanstine, Alexandra. *Cioran,
Eliade, Ionescu: L'oubli du fascisme*
(Paris, 2002).

Olson, Carl. *The Theology and Philosophy
of Eliade* (New York, 1992).

Paden, William. "Before the Sacred became
Theological: Rereading the Durkheimian
Legacy," in *Religion and Reductionism:
Essays on Eliade, Segal, and the Challenge*

of the Social Sciences for the Study of Religion*, ed. T. A. Idinopulos and E. Yonan (Leiden, 1994), pp. 198–209.

Rennie, Bryan. *Reconstructing Eliade: Making Sense of Religion* (Albany, N.Y., 1996).

———, ed. *Changing Religious Worlds: The Meaning and End of Mircea Eliade* (Albany, N.Y., 2000).

Ricketts, Mac L. *Mircea Eliade: the Romanian Roots*, 2 vols (New York, 1988).

Webster, A. F. C. "Orthodox Mystical Tradition and the Comparative Study of Religion: An Experimental Synthesis," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 23 (1986): 621–49.

Bryan S. Rennie

ELIOT, Thomas Stearns (1888–1965)

T. S. Eliot was born on 26 September 1888 in St. Louis, Missouri. He was educated at Harvard (BA in 1909 and MA in English in 1910), the Sorbonne, Marburg (briefly), and Oxford. After establishing residence in England in 1914, he completed a Harvard dissertation in philosophy under the direction of Josiah ROYCE titled "Experience and the Objects of Knowledge in the Philosophy of F. H. Bradley," but he never received the PhD because he could not return to America in 1916 to defend the dissertation. After working as a bank clerk, he held a series of positions in publishing, as assistant editor of the *Egoist*, as editor of the *Criterion*, and as editor and eventually a Director at Faber & Faber publishing house. His major works of poetry are "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock," *The Waste Land*, *Ash Wednesday*, and *Four Quartets*. Eliot was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1948. He died on 4 January 1965 in London, England.

As a critic and a philosopher of literature, Eliot's work reflects his early study of Bradley, though it is not constrained by that study. His early and perhaps most influential critical work on the nature of poetry and the project of criticism shows the influence of Bradleyan idealism, while at the same time it shows marks of a resurgent empiricism inspired by Eliot's interactions with Bertrand Russell. Essays of this vintage were collected in *The Sacred Wood* (1920), the most prominent of which is "Tradition and the Individual Talent." In that essay, Eliot proposes a program for understanding poetry, the central motivation of which is the historical contextuality of all poetry of high merit. In order to write poetry responsibly, a poet must incorporate knowledge of the past and the tradition of poetry of the past in such a way as to reflect awareness of the presence of the past in the present. This allows the poet to become part of the tradition without merely copying what has gone before. Just as mere copying cannot be a viable program for creating genuine art, neither can innovation, Eliot maintains, irrespective of tradition. This rejection may rely on something like a view of the general contextuality of all linguistic utterance (and thus the impossibility of genuine isolation from tradition). The imperative is to cultivate what Eliot calls the historical sense, so that the poet can write impersonally, allowing tradition to work itself out through the individual talent.

All of Eliot's critical work in literature is directed along these lines, viewing literature as indicative of culture more broadly. In his early work, however, the criterion of impersonality was thought to extend not only to the poet but also to the critic, whose sole responsibility it was to provide historical information relevant to particular pieces of literature, enabling the audience to access the poet's historical sense. Later, in *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism* (1933), he revised his view of criticism to regard the variation of needs for criticism across various eras. Where he had once regarded the historical sense relevant in litera-

ture as importantly objective, he began later to regard it as something liable to reinterpretation according to the specific needs of varying cultures.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Sacred Wood (London, 1920).
For Lancelot Andrewes (London, 1928).
Selected Essays 1917–1932 (London, 1932).
The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism (London, 1933).
Essays Ancient and Modern (London, 1936).
The Idea of a Christian Society (London, 1939).
Notes Towards the Definition of Culture (London, 1948).
On Poetry and Poets (London, 1957).

Other Relevant Works
Collections of Eliot's papers are at Harvard University, the New York Public Library, and Cambridge University.
Prufrock and Other Observations (London, 1917).
The Waste Land (London, 1922).
Poems 1909–1925 (London, 1925).
Ash Wednesday (London, 1930).
Murder in the Cathedral (London, 1935).
Collected Poems 1909–1935 (London, 1936).
East Coker (London, 1940).
The Dry Salvages (London, 1941).
Little Gidding (London, 1942).
Complete Poems and Plays (New York, 1952).
To Criticize the Critic, and Other Writings (New York, 1965).
The Waste Land and Other Writings (New York, 2002).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who v4*
Ackroyd, Peter. *T. S. Eliot: A Life* (New York, 1984).
Chinitz, David E. *T. S. Eliot and the Cultural Divide* (Chicago, 2003).
Gallup, Donald. *T. S. Eliot: A Bibliography* (New York, 1947; rev. edn 1969).
Schusterman, Richard. "Eliot as Philosopher," in *The Cambridge Companion to T. S. Eliot* (Cambridge, UK, 1994), pp. 31–47.

Kyle Broom

ELY, Richard Theodore (1854–1943)

Richard T. Ely was born on 13 April 1854 in Ripley, New York, and died on 4 October 1943 in Old Lyme, Connecticut. He grew up in Fredonia in western New York, where his mother, a regional artist, taught at Fredonia Normal School. He first attended Dartmouth College and then Columbia University where he received his BA in 1876 and his MA in 1879. He held a fellowship at Columbia during 1876–9, which enabled him to study in Germany at Halle and Heidelberg universities. Although he originally intended to study philosophy in Germany, he soon switched to economics, earning his PhD degree at Heidelberg under Karl Knies. He also worked for a year at the Royal Statistical Bureau in Berlin during 1879–80.

Ely was one of the earliest professors appointed to the faculty at the new Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, founded on the German model in 1876, and designed primarily to train academic professionals. He was appointed professor of political economy in 1881, imbued with a passion for developing specialists in the emerging branches of economics. He taught many of the men who went on to teach at the new public universities created by the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862. Among his graduate students was Woodrow Wilson, later President of the United States. More of his students include sociologist

Albion W. SMALL, economists John R. COMMONS and Edward A. ROSS, and historian Frederick Jackson Turner.

Although a dedicated professional economist, Ely was also a great believer in reaching the public. While at Johns Hopkins he brought out a succession of books in the emerging branches of economics that were also intended to be read by the educated citizen. His first book, *French and German Socialism*, appeared in 1883 and described the many thinkers of the preceding century who had contributed ideas to European socialism. *The Labor Movement in America* (1886) was in a sense an extension of the earlier work, describing various labor organizations in the United States. *Taxation in American States and Cities* (1889) described in detail different methods of taxation used in the United States since its creation. Although his *An Introduction to Political Economy* (1889) was by no means the first general account of the operation of the economy, it was intended as much as a popular account as a professional textbook, and was the basis of his widely disseminated *Outlines of Economics* (first edition, 1893), which went through six editions and sold over 300,000 copies. It was used as a textbook in economics courses in many colleges and universities for over three decades.

Ely was one of a cadre of young, mostly German-trained economists, who disputed the reigning economic orthodoxy stemming from the English classical economists, Adam Smith, David Ricardo, James Mill and his son, John Stuart Mill. The central principle of classical economics was the idea that the market determined values and that it worked best when unencumbered: the doctrine of laissez-faire. By the late nineteenth century, however, it became clear that unencumbered markets gave too much power to capital and the men who controlled it, *vis-à-vis* labor and those who had only their labor to sell. Besides, the Germans who had taught the young economists held that circumstances, as embodied in history, played a major role in determining economic development: this was known as the historical school. Of all the young, German-trained economists, Ely was the most radical, believing that laissez-faire had to be constrained, in the interests of fairness and the public good.

In 1885 the young economists, prominent among them Ely, John Bates CLARK and Henry Carter Adams, came together at Saratoga to found their own professional organization, the American Economic Association. Several organizational plans were proposed, but the most structured was that prepared by Ely, and his was the plan adopted, with one important exception. Ely had prepared a statement of principles, which specifically attacked the doctrine of laissez-faire; the other young economists, less radical in their thinking than Ely, tabled his statement of principles. Although other parts of the statement were adopted by the AEA, the rejection of laissez-faire was omitted. Notwithstanding, Ely became the secretary of the new AEA, a post he occupied until 1892 and which gave him considerable control of the operations of the AEA, particularly its vigorous publications program.

Concurrently with teaching at Hopkins, Ely pursued his campaign to bring economics to the larger population. His primary vehicle, aside from his books, was the Chautauqua Institution, a religious summer school founded by Methodist Bishop John H. Vincent in 1876, in Chautauqua, New York, not far from Ely's childhood home. Ely was a regular lecturer at the summer school and his *Introduction to Political Economy*, published in 1889 by the Chautauqua Press, was intended to be a kind of textbook for the lectures he gave. Chautauqua enabled him to link the doctrines of economics with the principles of Christianity, most notably the second commandment, "do unto others …" But Ely was not in harmony with the other young academic economists, who wished to restrict their work to academia; and Ely's action, in scheduling the 1892 meeting of the AEA at Chautauqua, led to a split with his fellow AEA members and to his resignation as the secretary of the AEA.

In 1892 Ely left the Johns Hopkins University to become a professor of economics at the University of Wisconsin. Wisconsin, one of the many growing land-grant state universities, gave him the opportunity to develop the program in economics at a time when the progressive movement, especially in Wisconsin, created an unusually congenial climate for his anti-laissez-faire views. For most of his career at Wisconsin, he enjoyed the support of the administration of the university and the political climate of the state. Although he continued to develop his views as a professional economist, a good deal of his time was devoted to building up the program in the social sciences. Because those who shared his anti-laissez-faire views often encountered opposition at more conservative institutions, Ely was able to bring Wisconsin a group of young economists and sociologists who had been dismissed from the faculty elsewhere. Two of the most notable of these men were his former student, Edward A. Ross (spectacularly fired from the faculty at Stanford in 1901), who established sociology as an integral part of the economics program, and John R. Commons, who became the preeminent specialist in labor issues. Ely devoted much time to raising money for the assortment of special lectures and fellowships that were an integral part of the program at Wisconsin.

One of Ely's important departures from classical economists was his belief that a full understanding of economics had to arise from detailed factual studies of actual conditions. He referred to this idea as "look and see," although he was always ready to acknowledge that he got the idea from an earlier, little-known American economist, Richard Jones, author of *The Distribution of Wealth and the Sources of Taxation*, which had appeared around 1830. "Look and See" as a methodology also owed much to the emergence of statistics in the mid-nineteenth century, and the collection of statistics on social and economic developments by many states, most notably Massachusetts. Ely himself began this approach to economics while he was still at Hopkins, with his appointment to, first, the Baltimore, and then the Maryland Tax Commissions. He gathered data not just from Maryland but from many other states and communities, and this information formed the basis for his book on *Taxation in American States and Cities*, replete with data comparing the systems of taxation used in many parts of the United States. Although he himself added much new information to his works on economics, Ely complained throughout his life that information remained inadequate for really sound judgments.

Ely's radicalism was early challenged at the University of Wisconsin. One Oliver E. Wells, a relatively unknown politician who had won election to the post of Superintendent of Public Instruction, in 1894 accused Ely of propagating socialist ideas at the university, and of taking direct part in some strike action at a local printing plant in Madison, the state capital. Wells made his accusation public in a letter published in *The Nation*, subsequently reprinted in the *New York Post* in July 1894, while Ely was out of town lecturing at Chautauqua. The accusations received national notice, at a moment of significant labor unrest throughout the country. The officials at the university determined that the only recourse was a formal trial to be conducted by the Board of Regents of the University. Ely's friends at Wisconsin rallied around him, and his lawyer was able to refute all the accusations in detail. Ely was exonerated by the Regents, and in their decision they issued that famous defense of academic freedom: "Whatever may be the limitations which trammel inquiry elsewhere we believe the great state University of Wisconsin should ever encourage that continual and fearless sifting and winnowing by which alone the truth can be found."

Despite the public defense, the trial had a sobering effect on Ely. He gave up appearing at Chautauqua, and his work focused more than ever on investigating actual conditions in the operation of the economic system. He

dug into the details of monopolies and trusts, publishing a book on the subject in 1900. But a major effort appears to have been devoted to studying the interrelationship between property and contract, on the one hand, and the distribution of wealth on the other. He carried out an exhaustive search of court judgments, especially those of the United States Supreme Court, and showed in his two-volume work, *Property and Contract in Their Relation to the Distribution of Wealth* (1914) the importance of the law in defining economic relationships. He resumed his close relations with other professional economists, and he was elected President of the American Economic Association in 1900.

Ely was also instrumental in developing land economics as a branch of the discipline. Agricultural economics was first taught at Wisconsin in 1902, when Henry C. Taylor offered a course on the subject. But land economics in a larger sense became the focus of Ely's later career. In 1920 he founded Wisconsin's Institute for Research in Land Economics, and was successful in getting funding for it from outside the university. The Institute developed a special course for real estate agents, which helped professionalize those working in this field. In 1923 the Institute was rechristened the Institute for Research in Land Economics and Public Utilities. In 1925 the Institute began publication of the *Journal of Land and Public Utility Economics*.

This new focus led to Ely's last career change, when he left Wisconsin in July 1925 to move himself and the Institute to Northwestern University. Although relations with the regular economics department were cordial, difficulties arose over financing – the private sources Ely solicited either wanted to give their financial aid directly to Northwestern, or suggested that it was Northwestern's responsibility to cover the costs of the Institute. When the great depression began in 1929, and especially in the 1930s, private financing became even more difficult. Ely moved part of the Institute to New York City in 1932, and formally resigned from Northwestern in 1933; that part of the Institute remaining at Northwestern gradually dwindled over the next few years. Ely lived in New York City for the rest of his life, continuing his independent research and publishing. He was made an honorary professor at Columbia University in 1937.

Ely's career was in part a reflection of his own background and native abilities, but in large measure he was a product of his times. Reaching maturity in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, his career responded to the first great wave of industrialization, with its creation of great corporate entities and masses of workers. The times also saw the prolonged depression of 1873–93, with the resulting unrest among working classes, who lacked, any social safety net. Ely's own fervent Christian beliefs, combined with his "look and see" approach to existing conditions, sparked his sympathy for the problems of labor. At the same time his own analysis of economic forces led him to recognize that the economy relied on input from a variety of factors, capital, labor, and land being the primary ones. He came to realize that distribution of wealth was to a large extent the basis for human well-being, and that through the distribution of wealth, man, to him the measure of all things, could be best served.

In rejecting laissez-faire as the best way of achieving the well-being of all members of society, Ely also rejected the deductive reasoning that was essential to classical economics. His "look and see" policy led him inevitably to inductive approaches, developing the "law" from the data on actual conditions. In this he was merely reflecting the scientific and professional bias of his times: the belief, since Darwin, that intensive investigation of the facts could reveal the rules by which the system worked. This approach, which came to be called "institutional" economics, has since become just a part of the methods used by the professionals who form the discipline of economics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

French and German Socialism in Modern Times (New York, 1883).

The Labor Movement in America (New York, 1886).

Taxation in American States and Cities (New York, 1888).

An Introduction to Political Economy (New York, 1889).

Outlines of Economics (New York, 1893).

Socialism: An Examination of Its Nature, Its Strength and Its Weakness, with Suggestions for Social Reform (New York, 1894).

Monopolies and Trusts (New York, 1900).

Property and Contract in Their Relation to the Distribution of Wealth, 2 vols (New York, 1914).

Elements of Land Economics, with Edward W. Morehouse (New York, 1924).

Hard Times – The Way In and the Way Out (New York, 1931).

Other Relevant Works

Ely's papers are at the University of Wisconsin.

Ground Under Our Feet: An Autobiography (New York, 1938).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Dict Economics*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v9*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*

Everett, John R. *Religion in Economics: A Study of John Bates Clark, Richard Ely and Simon Patten* (New York, 1946).

Furner, Mary O. *Advocacy & Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science* (Lexington, Kent., 1975).

Miller, Harold L., ed. *The Richard T. Ely Papers: Guide to a Microfilm Edition* (Madison, Wisc., 1986).

Rader, Benjamin G. *The Academic Mind and Reform: The Influence of Richard T. Ely in American Life* (Lexington, Kent., 1966).

Nancy M. Gordon

EMERSON, Ralph Waldo (1803–82)

Ralph Waldo Emerson was born on 25 May 1803 in Boston, Massachusetts, to William and Ruth Haskins Emerson. Emerson's father, a well-respected Federalist and Unitarian minister, died in 1811, so the young Emerson lived with his mother and four brothers. Emerson's aunt, Mary Moody Emerson, who was deeply mystical and rather morose, became an early intellectual influence on him. She introduced her nephew to literature that incited and inspired him for the rest of his life, including Plato, Plotinus, Marcus Aurelius, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, William Ellery Channing, John Locke, Lord Byron, John Milton, and William Shakespeare. After attending Boston Latin School from 1812 to 1817, Emerson entered Harvard College at the age of fourteen, where he studied German philosophy with Edward Everett and George Ticknor. Levi Frisbie and Levi Hedge introduced Emerson to Scottish Common Sense philosophy. While at Harvard, Emerson began a journal, which he named "Wide World." In retrospect, this marked the birth of a project that would last for half a century. In time, the journal entries would serve as the first site of intellectual investigation and a repository from which he could extract prose to serve more public and published forms.

After graduating from Harvard with his BA in 1821, Emerson taught elementary school with his brother William. By 1825, however, he resumed his own studies with training for the Unitarian ministry at the recently founded Harvard Divinity School. He was approbated to preach, and in 1827 he began to do so in

Boston and nearby towns. On a visit to Concord, New Hampshire, he met Ellen Louisa Tucker, whom he married in 1829, the same year he was invited to fill the pulpit of the Second Church in Boston. In his preaching, Emerson addressed the still urgent conflicts between orthodox Calvinists and liberal Unitarians. The debate centered on the degree to which an individual is responsible for his own salvation. Emerson gave sermons that emphasized the role of ethical conduct in lieu of reliance on saving grace. He denied the Calvinist theology of human depravity, and affirmed Jesus as a moral exemplar fit to guide human life. The purpose of scripture, therefore, is practical; it helps one respond to the question Emerson recurrently asked of himself: "How shall I live?"

Ellen died of tuberculosis in early 1831. In addition to coping with this loss, Emerson continued to doubt his adaptability to the ministry. In the summer of 1832, he confessed, "I have sometimes thought that in order to be a good minister it was necessary to leave the ministry." Later the same year, Emerson asked the leaders of his congregation if he could refrain from administering the Eucharist, and wrote "The Lord's Supper" to explain his objection to the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Emerson resigned from the Church when his request was denied. In December 1832, he boarded a ship to Europe, where he met Coleridge and William Wordsworth, and, by way of John Stuart Mill, he was introduced to Thomas Carlyle, who became a lifelong friend and correspondent.

Upon returning to Boston, Emerson embarked on a career of public lecturing. Soon after, he married Lydia Jackson, with whom he had two daughters and a son who lived to maturity. Emerson bought a house in Concord, Massachusetts, and lived there with his family for the rest of his life. The year 1836 proved tumultuous for Emerson; his beloved brother Charles died, his first book *Nature* was published, and his first son Waldo was born.

In *Nature*, Emerson blends his interest in Plato and Stoic philosophy with reconceptions of divinity, history, and individual identity. He employs Kantian terminology, which came to him by way of Coleridge, with a rigor, compactness, and innovation that lead many to cite this short book as a founding document of transcendentalist thinking. Emerson moved away from overtly Christian language, and toward ideas that are more generic and conceptually fluid, but also more concretely philosophical. For example, where he had a keen interest in the life of Jesus as an exemplar, he now broadens his interest to include human conduct widely construed. In *Nature*, he takes this to an extreme, since he argues that nature provides a "discipline" for the moral life, and that its lessons are coextensive with the deepest wisdom of human performance and perfectibility: "Nature, in its ministry, is not only the material, but is also the process and the result." (1983, p. 12) The source of this instruction provides a moral foundation for the network of criticisms and commentaries Emerson will develop in the coming years, since it reinforces the idea that human life should not remain beholden to the past or bounded by custom and dogma. Rather, the infinitude of nature entails the scope of human possibility in thought and action. For Emerson, this meant revelation is based on private insight, and redemption is a matter of human imagination and will.

In August 1837, Emerson delivered "The American Scholar," an oration to the Phi Beta Kappa Society at Harvard. Invited to speak before a class of graduating seniors, and the academic community that supported them, Emerson used the occasion to assess the current state of American thinking. Part of the query involved speculation on whether there was such thinking to speak of. The scholar, as "Man Thinking," should be dedicated to thinking his own thoughts, and in that process aware of three primary influences on his thinking: nature, the past in the form of books, and the future in the prospect of action (1983, p. 12). The first influence is familiar to readers of *Nature*, the second deals with the stultifying

effects of inheriting stale opinions from others, and the third outlines a vision for a kind of thinking that achieves itself only through action. Action is predicated on "self-trust," the abiding inner quality that sustains and converts these influences to the benefit of thinking (1983, p. 63).

The next summer, the seniors at the Divinity School in Cambridge, Massachusetts, invited Emerson to offer a graduation address. Where, in "The American Scholar," he critiques habits of thinking in general terms, in the "Address" he advances a more specialized version of the earlier appraisal. In particular, he raises doubts about orthodox Christian faith and the implications of believing in miracles. Christianity errs by making truth seem an established fact of prior history, and thereby making God seem distant, "as if God were dead" (1983, p. 83). Emerson contends that God is an immanent fact of human life, and that such presence is only perceptible when each person draws from "the religious sentiment" that abides within (1983, p. 76). He told an audience saturated with years of theological training, and on the cusp of entering the Christian ministry: "Let me admonish you, first of all, to go alone; to refuse the good models, even those which are sacred in the imagination of men, and dare to love God without mediator or veil." (1983, p. 88) There is no reason to love God through something else, since he is already fully present in every heart. The reaction from the Address at the Divinity School was severely negative. Already separated from the Church, Emerson was now effectively banned from the academy; he wouldn't be invited back to Harvard until 1866, when he was old and famous. Surviving partly on an inheritance from his first wife, he continued to lecture publicly to make up the difference. A lecture circuit was developing to meet the demand of this forum, and Emerson kept pace by writing during the winter and giving speeches during the summer.

In 1841, *Essays* was published in Boston. In the tradition of great essayists from Seneca to Montaigne to Bacon, Emerson wrote on a variety of themes and problems, many of which developed thoughts already present in earlier work, including a fair portion of material written in his extensive journals. "Self-Reliance" remains a striking and enduringly vital essay, perhaps because it stages so effectively the debate between interior inspiration and external influence. Does living with others necessitate that my integrity and identity will be compromised? Can I learn from others how to be who I am, and yet be myself? Emerson mediates the apparent paradox of education by arguing for trust in the "aboriginal Self," which he cites as the principal guide for negotiating attempted coercion by others (1983, p. 268). "Insist on yourself; never imitate." (1983, p. 278) Similar to a stoic handbook, this essay comprises a set of reflections on what it means to retain individual integrity in the midst of society, and recommendations for how to preserve it. Importantly, however, and in keeping with the romantic thinking that had influenced him, he does not present nature as an antagonistic external force. On the contrary, nature is an outer means for perceiving one's most privileged and pristine interior character. Emerson's conceptual sympathies lie with a blend of physics and ethics. Meanwhile, the social context remains under suspicion as a force of potentially hazardous manipulation.

Early in 1842, Emerson was devastated by the loss of his first son, Waldo, who died of scarlet fever at age five. He conveyed his grief in letters to family and friends, among them Margaret Fuller, who later the same year handed over the editorship of the transcendentalist journal, *The Dial*, to Emerson. While editing the periodical, Emerson worked on his second series of essays, which was published in 1844.

Essays: Second Series continues the format of the first set of essays. Like the first collection, the topics, however varied, hang together along dominant conceptual lines. Emerson focused perspicuous attention on the nature of human interiority: what makes us who we are,

and how we express that nature. In the second series, there is an enhanced appreciation of external facts and circumstances, among them the challenges that emerge in human engagement (such as with manners and politics), and that bear down upon us without consultation or negotiation (such as with somatic finitude and mortality). In the earlier *Essays*, Emerson dwelled on the benevolence of nature. Now he gives nature a more sober assessment; its gifts are not bestowed without a demand for recompense. Before, Emerson had emphasized the analogical quality of the natural and human relation. In these essays, the analogical relation is depicted as a trade that can have severe costs. In "Experience," Emerson sets the terms of his revaluation, specifically the link between fate and freedom, skepticism and belief.

In 1846 Emerson published his *Poems*. "The Sphinx," which leads the compilation, returns to ideas of unity and identity found in *Nature* and the first series essays "History," "Spiritual Laws," and "The Over-Soul." Other important poems include "The Rhodora," "The Humble Bee," "Blight," and "Threnody," the last of which is a meditation on young Waldo in the wake of his death.

Emerson returned to England in 1847, this time accepting an invitation to lecture. His experiences on this trip, along with those from his first voyage, became the basis for *English Traits*, published nearly a decade later in 1856. In the course of his travels, Emerson spent time with Dickens, Wordsworth, Tennyson, and Harriet Martineau, and refreshed his communion with Carlyle. In Paris, he met Alexis de Tocqueville. Upon returning to America, Emerson continued to lecture widely, including a series entitled "Mind and Manners in the Nineteenth Century," in which he reflected on his recent time abroad.

Following up on the idea that Jesus is a fitting moral exemplar, but not the only one, Emerson published *Representative Men* in 1850. The book stands as a report on the character of individual men who, in their talent for self-representation in their creative works, reveal the promise latent in each of us. In the "Address," Emerson said that "Truly speaking, it is not instruction, but provocation, that I can receive from another soul." (1983, p. 79) In the opening essay of this book, "Uses of Great Men," Emerson reaffirms the notion that when we heed the fantastic productions of the imagination, we learn the lesson of self-trust even as we see it confirmed in another: when his imagination wakes, "a man seems to multiply ten times or a thousand times his force. It opens the delicious sense of indeterminate size, and inspires an audacious mental habit. We are as elastic as the gas of gunpowder, and a sentence in a book, or a word dropped in conversation, sets free our fancy, and instantly our heads are bathed with galaxies, and our feet tread the floor of the Pit." (1983, p. 622) Thus, these representative men – Plato, Swedenborg, Montaigne, Shakespeare, Napoleon, and Goethe – are not exemplars for us to imitate, but examples of what resistance to imitation may produce. Their genius was not in copying others, but in being themselves. Likewise, the only version of imitation we should allow ourselves is that which supports us in the pursuit of our own projects and positions. To seek, accept, or sustain more than provocation from another may lead to one's peril.

Emerson was crestfallen by Daniel Webster's support of the Fugitive Slave Law in 1851, and publicly denounced him for it. By the mid 1850s, Emerson spoke more explicitly and widely on anti-slavery issues. Though he was slow to voice his derision, and doubted his authority to relate it to the public, he made an unambiguous bid toward reform. In his "Lecture on Slavery" in 1854, he writes that the institution is an evil equal to cholera or typhus that has resulted from Americans' superficial grasp of their own values. Emerson's capacity for culture critique, and his contribution to social reform movements began with his protest against the Jacksonian plan to relocate the Cherokee Indians. By

1855, Emerson was adapting the same principles he used to reprimand slavery and the mistreatment of Native Americans to the purpose of establishing the rights of women. In a speech before a Women's Rights Convention, he declared his support that women be given "one half of the world" through equal rights.

In 1860 Emerson published *The Conduct of Life*, which joins issues from the first two series of *Essays* with his more developed political writings from the 1850s. "Fate" is among the finest illustrations of such work, in which Emerson comments on the nature of human freedom. The triumvirate of players that date to his earliest essays – nature, society, and the individual – receive a fresh review, if with a familiar sense of disquiet. The question placed at the book's outset – "How shall I live?" – exposes the high stakes of one's conception of freedom. In "Fate," Emerson posits freedom as the signature antagonism of human conduct: "And though nothing is more disgusting than the crowing about liberty by slaves, as most men are, and by the flippant mistaking for freedom of some paper preamble like a 'Declaration of Independence,' or the statute right to vote, by those who have never dared to think or to act, yet it is wholesome to man to look not at Fate, but the other way." (1983, pp. 953–4)

While lecturing on "American Civilization" in Washington, D.C., in 1862, Emerson met with President Abraham Lincoln, and thought well of him. Later the same year, Emerson gave a generous speech, "The President's Proclamation," in which he declared that Lincoln "has been permitted to do more for America than any other American man." Also in 1862, Emerson mourned the loss of his friend, Henry David Thoreau: "The country knows not yet, or in the least part, how great a son it has lost." (1983, p. 1133) Emerson's second book of poetry, *May-Day and Other Pieces*, was published in 1867, the same year he delivered a second Phi Beta Kappa oration at Harvard, "The Progress of Culture," thus closing the circle on his twenty-nine year

absence. There were only a few highlights among the poems, and the address was more a ceremony for Harvard's reclamation of an exile than an occasion for Emerson to brand a new revolution.

In 1870 Emerson published *Society and Solitude*, a collection of essays that were given as lectures in 1858 and 1859. That same year, he was chosen as an Overseer of Harvard College, and invited to deliver a series of lectures on philosophy. Emerson's course of sixteen lectures, "The Natural History of Intellect," was sparsely attended in the first year, and retracted the second. Despite this, James Elliot CABOT, Emerson's biographer, attested that Emerson judged this work the most important of his life. This assessment seems fitting given that his ambition for the course was a rigorous summary and systematic outline of ideas in development for nearly forty years. In 1871, Emerson traveled to California by train and met with naturalist John Muir. In 1872, the family home in Concord was damaged by fire, but Emerson's original manuscripts were spared from destruction. By the generous support of friends, Emerson traveled to Europe for the third time, and to Egypt in the company of his daughter, Ellen, while his house was repaired at their expense. Emerson spent time with Henry James, Jr. in Paris, and, in England he saw his friend Carlyle for the last time.

In 1875 Emerson's *Letters and Social Aims* was published. It contains, among other things, his 1867 Harvard oration, "Quotation and Originality," "Persian Poetry," and "Immortality." Though much of the material was written in the 1860s and later revised, some of the pieces in this collection possess material from as early as 1839. A third book of poetry, *Selected Poems*, was published in 1876. And in 1878, Emerson delivered a eulogy on Carlyle, which turned out to be his final public presentation. Emerson died on 27 April 1882 in Concord, Massachusetts.

Emerson's work has received appreciable, if varied and inconsistent, attention from the

academy. Early biographies by Cabot and Oliver Wendell HOLMES emphasized Emerson's presence in a genteel tradition of thinking, but this sentiment was soon lampooned by George SANTAYANA. William JAMES and John DEWEY were steadfast in their praise of Emerson's contribution to philosophy. James said there was never such a "fastidious lover of significance and distinction," and Dewey avowed that he had never known a writer "whose movement of thought is more compact and unified" (Konvitz and Whicher 1962, pp. 22, 24). Emerson also had the admiration of Europeans, among them Friedrich Nietzsche, who wrote his first essays with Emerson's nearby, and kept them as his companion throughout his life. Robert Musil and Maurice Maeterlinck also registered their affection for Emerson.

In recent decades, Emerson's work has received more attention from within academic departments of philosophy, and English, among others. New biographies have offered revised portraits, thereby complicating the polished, sometimes simplified sketches from earlier years. Coupled with extensive contributions from a diverse range of scholars, Emerson's work has become more fundamental and essential to humanistic approaches to nineteenth-century thought, and its implications for present-day scholarship. Work by Cornel West and Stanley CAVELL, for instance, has contributed to a philosophical understanding of Emerson's role in founding American thinking. This has involved overcoming the repression of Emerson, and the exposition of a brand of value theory known as moral perfectionism. Cavell, along with an expanding contingent of scholars, continues to explore this habilitation and its many fecund implications. At the time of Emerson's bicentenary, conferences were held in departments of philosophy, among other venues, leading one to speculate with some confidence that Emerson's third century may witness the continued proliferation of critical philosophical inheritance of his work.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Nature (Boston, 1836).

An Address Delivered Before the Senior Class in Divinity College, Cambridge Sunday Evening, 15 July 1838 (Boston, 1838).

Essays (Boston, 1841; 1884).

Essays, Second Series (Boston and London, 1844; 1884).

Orations, Lectures, and Addresses (London, 1844).

Poems (Boston and London, 1847). Enlarged edn, *Selected Poems* (Boston, 1876). Enlarged edn, *Poems* (Boston, 1884).

Nature, Addresses, and Lectures (Boston, 1849; 1884).

Representative Men: Seven Lectures (Boston and London, 1850; 1884).

English Traits (Boston and London, 1856; 1884).

The Conduct of Life (Boston and London, 1860; 1884).

May-Day and Other Pieces (Boston and London, 1867).

Society and Solitude: Twelve Chapters (Boston and London, 1870; 1884).

Letters and Social Aims (Boston and London, 1876; 1884).

Lectures and Biographical Sketches (Boston and London, 1884).

Miscellanies (Boston and London, 1884).

Complete Works, "The Riverside Edition," 12 vols, ed. James Elliot Cabot (Boston and London, 1884, 1893). The twelve volumes are listed by title above.

Natural History of Intellect and Other Papers (Boston, 1893).

The Complete Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson, "The Centenary Edition," 12 vols, ed. Edward Waldo Emerson (Boston, 1903–1904).

Other Relevant Works

Emerson's papers are at Harvard University.

The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson, 10 vols, ed. Ralph L. Rusk and Eleanor M.

Tilton (New York, 1939–95).

The Journals and Miscellaneous Notebooks of Ralph Waldo Emerson, ed. William H. Gilman et al. (Cambridge, Mass., 1960–82).

The Correspondence of Emerson and Carlyle, ed. Joseph Slater (New York, 1964).

The Collected Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson, ed. Robert E. Spiller et al. (Cambridge, Mass., 1971–).

Emerson in His Journals, ed. Joel Porte (Cambridge, Mass., 1982).

Ralph Waldo Emerson: Essays and Lectures, ed. Joel Porte (New York, 1983).

The Complete Sermons of Ralph Waldo Emerson, ed. Albert von Frank et al. (Columbia, Miss., 1989–92).

Ralph Waldo Emerson: Collected Poems and Translations, ed. Harold Bloom and Paul Kane (New York, 1994).

Emerson's Antislavery Writings, ed. Len Gougeon and Joel Myerson (New Haven, Conn., 1995).

The Selected Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson, ed. Joel Myerson (New York, 1997).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils Before 1950*, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Blackwell Comp Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Encyc Ethics*, *Encyc Relig*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v3*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*

Allen, Gay Wilson. *Waldo Emerson: A Biography* (New York, 1981).

Baker, Carlos. *Emerson Among the Eccentrics: A Group Portrait* (New York, 1996).

Bloom, Harold. *Ralph Waldo Emerson* (New York, 1985).

Buell, Lawrence. *Emerson* (Cambridge, Mass., 2003).

Burkholder, Robert E., and Joel Myerson, eds. *Critical Essays on Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Boston, 1983).

Cabot, James Elliot. *A Memoir of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, 2 vols (Boston and New York, 1888).

Carpenter, Frederick I. *Emerson and Asia* (Cambridge, Mass., 1930).

Cavell, Stanley. *Conditions Handsome and Unhandsome: The Constitution of Emersonian Perfectionism* (Chicago, 1990).

———, *Philosophical Passages: Wittgenstein, Emerson, Austin, Derrida* (Oxford, 1995).

———, *Emerson's Transcendental Etudes*, ed. David Justin Hodge (Stanford, Cal., 2003).

Goodman, Russell B. *American Philosophy and the Romantic Tradition* (New York, 1985).

Gougeon, Len. *Virtue's Hero: Emerson, Antislavery, and Reform* (Athens, Georgia, 1990).

Hodder, Alan D. *Emerson's Rhetoric of Revelation: Nature, the Reader, and the Apocalypse Within* (University Park, Penn., 1989).

Hodge, David Justin. *On Emerson* (Belmont, Cal., 2002).

Holmes, Oliver Wendell. *Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Boston, 1885).

Kateb, George. *Emerson and Self-reliance* (Thousand Oaks, Cal., 1995).

Konvitz, Milton R., ed. *The Recognition of Ralph Waldo Emerson: Selected Criticism Since 1837* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1972).

Konvitz, Milton R., and Stephen E. Whicher, eds. *Emerson: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1962).

Myerson, Joel. *Ralph Waldo Emerson: A Descriptive Bibliography* (Pittsburgh, Penn., 1982).

Myerson, Joel, and Robert E. Burkholder. *Emerson: An Annotated Secondary Bibliography* (Pittsburgh, Penn., 1985).

Poirier, Richard. *The Renewal of Literature: Emersonian Reflections* (New York, 1987).

Porte, Joel. *Emerson and Thoreau: Transcendentalists in Conflict* (Middletown, Conn., 1966).

———, *Representative Man: Emerson in His Time* (Oxford, 1979).

Porte, Joel, and Saundra Morris, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Emerson* (Cambridge, UK, 1999).

Richardson, Robert D. *Emerson: The Mind on Fire* (Berkeley, Cal., 1995).

Robinson, David. *Emerson and the Conduct of Life: Pragmatism and Ethical Purpose in the Later Work* (New York, 1993).

Santayana, George. *George Santayana's America: Essays on Literature and Culture*, ed. James Ballowe (Urbana, Ill., 1967).

Stack, George. *Nietzsche and Emerson: An Elective Affinity* (Athens, Ohio, 1992).

Van Leer, David. *Emerson's Epistemology: The Argument of the Essays* (Cambridge, UK, 1986).

West, Cornel. *The American Evasion of Philosophy: A Genealogy of Pragmatism* (Madison, Wisc., 1989).

David Justin Hodge

ERIKSON, Erik Homburger (1902–94)

Erik Erikson was born as Erik Abrahamsen on 15 June 1902 near Frankfurt, Germany. His father (name unknown) abandoned his mother, Karla Abrahamsen (a Danish Jew), before his birth. He grew up in Karlsruhe, Germany, in the home of his stepfather, Dr. Theodore Homburger, and Erik's last name became Homberger. He was trained as a psychoanalyst under the guidance of Anna Freud, and was awarded full membership of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society in 1933. After emigrating to the United States with his wife Joan in 1933, he set up practice in Boston as a child analyst. There he came into close association with the psychologist Henry MURRAY and his Harvard Psychological Clinic, and was deeply influenced by the ideas of William JAMES. From 1934 to 1935 he held various minor staff appointments in Boston, including some connected with Harvard University. He worked at the School of Medicine and the Institute of Human Relations at Yale University from 1936 to 1939.

Moving to California in 1939, he adopted the last name Erikson, keeping the middle initial of 'H' for Homburger. He remained in Berkeley until 1951, serving for a few years as a research associate at the Institute for Child Welfare and from 1949 to 1951 as a member of the psychology faculty at the University of California at Berkeley. From 1951 to 1960 his primary appointment was on the senior staff of the Austen Riggs Center in Stockbridge, Massachusetts. From 1960 to 1970 he was professor of human development and lecturer on psychiatry at Harvard. Erikson died on 12 May 1994 in Harwich, Massachusetts.

Childhood and Society (1950) was Erikson's first well-known book, in which he presents a basic conceptual framework for human development. His system was deeply influenced by the ego psychology of Anna Freud, Heinz Hartmann, and others who viewed the ego as more autonomous than did Sigmund Freud. Erikson also included diverse cultural influences on human development under the influence of anthropologists, particularly Margaret MEAD, Ruth BENEDICT, and H. Scudder Mekeel. The central idea of his view of human development is that, by analogy to the principle of *epigenesis* according to which the human embryo develops stage by stage, adding new organs according to a pre-established sequence, the human being also develops in eight successive stages. Each stage unfolds as the successive maturation of physical, cognitive, and social capacities prompts the individual to interact with a widening social sphere. Under the joint impact of growing inner needs and capacities on the one hand, and differing stage-specific

social opportunities and challenges shaped by the culture on the other, the individual negotiates a series of developmental tasks. While the successful completion of stage-specific tasks contributes to the health and vitality of the individual, the lack of success results in a deficiency.

Erikson's model of development is described in terms of dialectical pairs of positive and negative outcomes typical of each stage: (1) trust versus mistrust, (2) autonomy versus shame, (3) initiative versus guilt, (4) industry versus inferiority, (5) identity versus role confusion, (6) intimacy versus isolation, (7) generativity versus stagnation, and (8) integrity versus despair. Each stage is considered to be critical for the development of a senses of trust versus mistrust and the like. The sense of trust, autonomy, and so on involve largely preconscious and pervasive attitudes, which manifest themselves in experience and in behavior. The outcome of each stage is not an either/or affair; nor is the negative side totally undesirable. A sense of mistrust, for instance, is desirable, for its total lack would make a person vulnerable to potentially dangerous encounters. The stages are not fixed chronological segments of the life cycle, nor does a person miss the mark if a stage-specific task is not mastered during an appropriate period; a person could compensate for a deficiency at a later time.

Erikson continued to articulate, elaborate, and revise his developmental model throughout his career. In an essay called "The Problem of Ego-identity" (1956), he provided a detailed account of late adolescent development of the sense of identity and of difficulties encountered in the process of identity formation. Erikson coined the term "identity crisis" to describe such difficulties, and suggested that these were normative rather than pathological. His graphic and convincing portrayal of the difficulties in the process of identity formation led to the popularization of the term "identity crisis." Its companion term "moratorium" – meaning time taken to complete identity formation without the burden of common responsibilities

of adulthood – became almost equally popular. Erikson always opted for elaborate description, rather than precise definition, of the crucial term "identity." Deriving insights from clinical experience, observations of normal and competent youth in longitudinal research, and in-depth studies of exceptional individuals, Erikson presented a rich image of challenges and triumphs in the process of the growth of personality. A detailed account of this process is offered in *Identity, Youth and Crisis* (1968), and a revised version of his theory of development is presented in *The Life Cycle Completed* (1982). His last major work, called *Vital Involvement in Old Age* (1986), was based on longitudinal studies of persons followed through the decades into their eighties.

An additional and significant aspect of Erikson's work involves in-depth studies of great historical figures such as Martin Luther (*Young Man Luther*, 1958), Mahatma Gandhi (*Gandhi's Truth*, 1969), and Thomas Jefferson (*Dimensions of a New Identity*, 1974). While his analysis depends heavily on the use of psychoanalytic insights, throughout this series of studies Erikson develops his idea of the "complementarity of history and life history." He spells out this idea in *Life History and the Historical Moment* (1975), and mentions the work of the historian and philosopher R. G. Collingwood in this context. This type of work has often been called "psychohistory." As a person and a scholar he inspired two biographical works, one written by a psychologist and the other by a historian (Coles 1970, Friedman 1999).

Erikson's book on Gandhi won a Pulitzer Prize and a National Book Award. Mainstream academic psychology in America has recognized Erikson's contributions in two main areas: developmental psychology and theories of personality. Yet even sympathetic critics like Hall and Lindzey spoke guardedly about the validity of his theory, admitting only that it "appears to have face validity, that is, it seems to ring true to the average reader" (1978, p. 108). More recently, a group of psychologists

have marshalled empirical evidence supporting various propositions based on Erikson's theory of ego-identity formation (Marcia et al. 1993). In the seventies his ideas about womanhood were strongly criticized by several feminist authors (such as Millett 1970, Janeway 1971).

In an atmosphere of academic psychology dominated by the natural science model with a focus on minute stimulus-response units of analysis, Erikson developed a distinctive approach grounded in the humanities and focused on the human being throughout the entire life history viewed as a single unit. His conceptual framework is deceptively simple as it focuses on lived experience of people, and uses common words often endowed with deep, technical meanings. A central issue of his inquiry into human nature is the age-old philosophical problem of identity: what, if anything, remains the same in a sea of change, in the myriad aspects of human life? His initial answer to this issue was distinctly Kantian. Thus, in *Identity, Youth and Crisis*, he speaks of "an 'I,' an observing center of awareness and of volition, which can transcend and must survive the *psychosocial identity*" (1968, p. 135). Later, in *Vital Involvement*, he describes the "I" as a "center of awareness in the center of the universe" that allows all humans to experience a "'We' on a universal level" (1986, p. 52). In one of his last essays, "Galilean Sayings and the Sense of 'I'," (1981) he turns to religion and mysticism alluding to God's answer to Moses's question to Him as to who He was: "I AM THAT I AM." Erikson refers in this context to the biblical expression "Kingdom of God in everyone's heart," and also to the mystical experience of Meister Eckhart. According to Paranjpe (1998), these ideas are parallel to the concept "Atman" in Indian philosophy as a center of experience disclosed in transcendental states of awareness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Childhood and Society (New York, 1950; 2nd edn 1963).

"The Problem of Ego-identity," *Journal of the American Psychoanalytical Association* 4 (1956): 56–121.
Young Man Luther (New York, 1958).
Identity, Youth and Crisis (New York, 1968).
Gandhi's Truth: On the Origins of Militant Nonviolence (New York, 1969).
Dimensions of a New Identity: The Jefferson Lectures in the Humanities (New York, 1974).
Life History and the Historical Moment (New York, 1975).
"Galilean Sayings and the Sense of 'I'," *Yale Review* 70 (1981): 321–62.
The Life Cycle Completed (New York, 1982).
Vital Involvement in Old Age: The Experience of Old Age in Our Time, with Joan M. Erikson and Helen Q. Kivnick (New York, 1986).

Other Relevant Works
Erikson's papers are at Harvard University.
Ed., *Adulthood: Essays* (New York, 1978).
Erik H. Erikson: A Way of Looking at Things: Selected Papers from 1930 to 1980, ed. Stephen Schlein (New York, 1987). Contains a bibliography of Erikson's writings.
The Erik Erikson Reader, ed. Robert Coles (New York, 2000).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Who Was Who in Amer v11*
Coles, Robert. *Erik H. Erikson: The Growth of His Work* (Boston, 1970).
Friedman, Lawrence J. *Identity's Architect: A Biography of Erik H. Erikson* (New York, 1999).
Hall, C. S., and G. Lindzey. *Theories of Personality*, 3rd edn (New York, 1978).
Janeway, E. *Man's World, Woman's Place: A*

Study of Social Mythology (New York, 1971).

Marcia, J. E., A. S. Waterman, D. R. Matteson, et al., eds. *Ego Identity: A Handbook for Psychosocial Research* (New York, 1993).

Millett, K. *Sexual Politics* (New York, 1970).

Paranjpe, A. C. *Self and Identity in Modern Psychology and Indian Thought* (New York, 1998).

Roazen, Paul. *Erik H. Erikson: The Power and Limits of a Vision* (New York, 1976)

Zock, Hetty. *A Psychology of Ultimate Concern: Erik H. Erikson's Contribution to the Psychology of Religion* (Amsterdam, 1990).

Anand C. Paranjpe

ETZIONI, Amitai Werner (1929–)

Amitai Etzioni was born as Werner Falk on 4 January 1929 in Köln, Germany. He later selected his Hebrew name. In 1935 he and his family escaped Germany to live in Palestine (later Israel). He received his BA in 1954 and MA in 1958 from Hebrew University in Jerusalem. He emigrated to the United States, where he received his PhD in sociology from the University of California at Berkeley in 1958. He was appointed instructor of sociology at Columbia University in 1958 and was soon promoted up to full professor by 1967. He was chair of the sociology department from 1969 to 1971. Since 1980 Etzioni has been University Professor at George Washington University in Washington, D.C., and he is also the Director of the Institute for Communitarian Policy Studies.

Etzioni was a guest scholar at the Brookings Institution in 1978; a senior advisor to the Carter Administration during 1979–80; the Thomas Henry Carroll Ford Foundation Professor at the Harvard Business School during 1987–9; and has been a visiting lecturer at many universities. Etzioni was the founding President of the International Society for the Advancement of Socio-economics in 1989–90, and he was President of the American Sociological Association in 1994–5. In 1990 Etzioni founded the Communitarian Network, and edited its journal, *The Responsive Community: Rights and Responsibilities*, from 1991 to 2004. In 2001 Etzioni was awarded the John P. McGovern Award in Behavioral Sciences, and the Officer's Cross of the Order of Merit by the German government.

Etzioni has published over twenty books on a variety of social, economic, and political topics and problems. His general political position has received the label of "communitarianism," and is allied with the theories of such social theorists as Robert BELLAH and Charles TAYLOR, along with the similar views of Philip SELZNICK, Michael WALZER, and Michael Sandel. Against what is perceived as excessive individualism in modern social and political theory, communitarians stress how membership in communities are the primary basis for life and politics. By reversing individualism's priorities, the communitarian emphasizes responsibilities over rights and social order over freedom of choice. In Etzioni's model of communitarianism, people should respect each other's dignity and autonomy, to be sure, but the classical liberal theory of rights is insufficient to provide for strong communities because it encourages selfishness over communal bonds and mere rights do not generate shared moral values. Multiple kinds of overlapping communities should simultaneously exist with society, permitting the kind of cultural diversity which encourages people to share in, and change allegiance to, more than one social group.

The Communitarian Platform, designed and endorsed by Etzioni, summarizes his political aims and perspective. The Platform's Preamble begins as follows: "American men, women, and children are members of many communi-

ties – families; neighborhoods; innumerable social, religious, ethnic, work place, and professional associations; and the body politic itself. Neither human existence nor individual liberty can be sustained for long outside the interdependent and overlapping communities to which all of us belong. Nor can any community long survive unless its members dedicate some of their attention, energy, and resources to shared projects. The exclusive pursuit of private interest erodes the network of social environments on which we all depend, and is destructive to our shared experiment in democratic self-government. For these reasons, we hold that the rights of individuals cannot long be preserved without a communitarian perspective. A communitarian perspective recognizes both individual human dignity and the social dimension of human existence. A communitarian perspective recognizes that the preservation of individual liberty depends on the active maintenance of the institutions of civil society where citizens learn respect for others as well as self-respect; where we acquire a lively sense of our personal and civic responsibilities, along with an appreciation of our own rights and the rights of others; where we develop the skills of self-government as well as the habit of governing ourselves, and learn to serve others – not just self."

For Etzioni, democracy is the best form of government provided that the government is empowered to aid the formation and maintenance of healthy communities of shared values and ways of life. Unlike majoritarians (or assimilationists), communitarians do not recommend social uniformity and conformity to achieve greater social order and cohesion. Like the social pragmatists, such as John Dewey, communitarians expect that public institutions, such as schools, should teach the fundamental moral values needed in a pluralistic democracy: respect for the dignity of all, toleration of ethnic and religious diversity, and the citizenship skills needed for civic and political life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Hard Way to Peace: A New Strategy (New York, 1962).

Winning Without War (Garden City, N.Y., 1964).

Modern Organizations (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964).

Political Unification: A Comparative Study of Leaders and Forces (New York, 1965).

Studies in Social Change (New York, 1966).

The Active Society: A Theory of Societal and Political Processes (New York, 1968).

Demonstration Democracy (New York, 1971).

Genetic Fix: The Next Technological Revolution (New York, 1973).

Social Problems (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1976).

An Immodest Agenda: Rebuilding America before the 21st Century (New York, 1983).

Capital Corruption: The New Attack on American Democracy (New York, 1984).

The Moral Dimension: Toward a New Economics (New York, 1988).

A Responsive Society: Collected Essays on Guiding Deliberate Social Change (San Francisco, 1991).

The Spirit of Community (New York, 1993).

The New Golden Rule: Community and Morality in a Democratic Society (New York, 1996).

The Limits of Privacy (New York, 1999).

The Monochrome Society (Princeton, N.J., 2001).

My Brother's Keeper: A Memoir and a Message (Lanham, Md., 2003).

From Empire to Community: A New Approach to International Relations (New York, 2004).

Further Reading
Cambridge Dict Amer Bio

Antonides, Gerrit, Wil Arts, and W. Fred van Raaij, eds. *The Consumption of Time and the Timing of Consumption, Toward a New Behavioral and Socio-economics: Contributions in Honor of Amitai Etzioni* (Amsterdam, 1991).

Delaney, C. F., ed. *The Liberalism–Communitarianism Debate: Liberty and Community Values* (Lanham, Md., 1994).

Drummond, Helga. *Power and Involvement in Organizations: An Empirical Examination of Etzioni's Compliance Theory* (Aldershot, UK, 1993).

Frohnen, Bruce. *The New Communitarians and the Crisis of Modern Liberalism* (Lawrence, Kan., 1996).

Bell, Daniel. *Communitarianism and Its Critics* (Oxford, 1993).

Phillips, Derek. *Looking Backward: A Critical Appraisal of Communitarian Thought* (Princeton, N.J., 1993).

John R. Shook

EVANS, Daniel Luther (1895–1979)

D. Luther Evans was born on 2 April 1895 in Columbus, Ohio. He was educated at Ohio State University, where he received his BA in 1917, MA in 1920, and PhD in philosophy in 1923. His dissertation was titled "The Status of Values in New Realism." In 1922 he joined his professor Joseph A. LEIGHTON on the philosophy faculty at Ohio State. From 1925 to 1928 he was a professor of philosophy at Ohio Wesleyan University, and then he was Compton Professor of Philosophy and department chair at the College of Wooster in Ohio from 1928 to 1938.

In 1938 Evans returned to Ohio State as professor of philosophy and also was Junior Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences from 1938 to 1943. During World War II, he was Commanding Officer of a US Naval V-12 unit at Hobart and William Smith Colleges from 1943 to 1945. During his long career Evans was visiting professor at Boston University, the University of Wisconsin, and other colleges. He was Secretary-Treasurer of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association during 1940–42. He retired from teaching in 1965, and died on 12 March 1979 in Columbus, Ohio.

Evans's first book, *New Realism and Old Reality* (1928), criticizes the new realism movement and its doctrine of the externality of relations for falling into the same philosophical errors of formalism, equivocation, and dogmatism that new realism accuses older systems of harboring. New realism's naturalism and evolutionism falls short of supporting an adequate conception of both the person and of God. Evans's preferred standpoint is personal idealism combined with a transcendental supernaturalism. In "Current Epistemology and Contemporary Ethics" (1928), he argues that both moral objectivity and human freedom require the existence of God, the supreme spirit, who supplies absolute moral ideals for free human reason to obey.

A Free Man's Faith (1949) reveals that Evans is not interested in returning to stern Calvinism and Puritanism, but rather a liberal religion that places personal revelatory experiences as central to faith. Evans goes so far as to claim that this kind of religious experience, our "communion with God," supplies not only faith and moral motivation but also gives the only evidence for God's existence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

New Realism and Old Reality: A Critical Introduction to the Philosophy of the Realists (Princeton, N.J., 1928).

Fundamentals of Philosophy, with Walter S. Gamertsfelder (New York, 1930).

Logic: Theoretical and Applied (Garden City, N.Y., 1937).

Essentials of Liberal Education (Boston, 1942).

A Free Man's Faith (Oxford, 1949).
Elements of Logic (Dubuque, Iowa, 1957).

Other Relevant Works
"The Reactions of a Religionist to
  Behaviorism," *Journal of Religion* 4
  (1924): 347–60.
"Current Epistemology and Contemporary
  Ethics," *Philosophical Review* 37 (1928):
  353–9.
"The Persistent Claims of Humanism,"
  Journal of Religion 17 (1937): 263–72.
"Two Intellectually Respectable
  Conceptions of God," *Philosophy and
  Phenomenological Research* 10 (1950):
  572–7.
"The Difference Between Getting Truth and
  Getting Wise," *Philosophy and
  Phenomenological Research* 22 (1962):
  360–65.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v53, Who's Who in Phil
Bertocci, Peter. "Evans's *A Free Man's
  Faith*," *Philosophy and
  Phenomenological Research* 11 (1950):
  124–6.

John R. Shook

EVERETT, Charles Carroll (1829–1900)

Charles Carroll Everett was born on 19 June
1829 in Brunswick, Maine. He was cousin to
the statesman and orator Edward Everett, with
whom he carried on an extensive correspon-
dence. He graduated with his BA from
Bowdoin College in 1850, where he studied
medicine. From 1851 to 1852, he studied in
Berlin under Hegel's successor, Georg Andreas
Gabler. He earned his divinity degree at
Harvard in 1859. Everett taught languages
and was librarian at Bowdoin College from

1853 to 1857 but was denied tenure because
he was a Unitarian. Bowdoin later made
amends by granting their notable alumnus the
DD and LLD degrees. He ministered at the
Independent Congregational Church in
Bangor, Maine, from 1859 to 1869. His
writings of this period, particularly *The Science
of Thought* (1869), led to his call to the Bussey
Professorship of Theology, New Testament
Criticism, and Interpretation at Harvard in
1869. In 1878 he also became Dean of the
Divinity Faculty at Harvard, and he held these
positions until his death on 16 October 1900
in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Hegelian logic was, as Everett acknowl-
edged, a formative and lasting influence on
his thought. Yet Everett's own thought was
anchored to roots in the real, empirical world;
the "outer world" is often his term, where the
most intense of human experience must origi-
nate. His outlook finds expression in his essay
"The Philosophy of the Sublime" (in the col-
lection *Immortality and Other Essays*, 1902),
where he contrasts Kant and Hegel: "It is a
little singular that Kant, who experienced so
intensely the character of the sublime, should
have failed to perceive its real nature, while
Hegel, who stated somewhat more truly the
relation in which this sense stands to the outer
world, should appear to have been utterly
devoid of the actual experience of it, so far, at
least, as anything but intellectual and spiritual
realities are concerned."

His intellectual strength was not in philo-
sophical originality, but in exposition, applica-
tion, and effective teaching. He was nonetheless
an innovator in comparative religions. In 1872
he offered the first course on Asian religions at
Harvard and, evidently, the first in the United
States. His twenty-one years of service as Dean
put his stamp on the Harvard Divinity School
into the early twentieth century. Unitarian
thought and life benefited greatly from his
lectures, pamphlets, and courses.

Everett was an early contributor to the
dialogue between science and religion. He
addresses the outlook of those who find the

two in opposition and mutual exclusion and he seeks to allay the anticipation or fear of those who see science diminishing the place of faith. He proposes that science and religion represent complementary and necessary aspects of the same knowledge. Religion and its faith promote ethical goodness; while science pursues the rule and order of the natural world. He develops his argument in "The Faith of Science and the Science of Faith," in which he concludes with the image, "[They are]…like an elder and younger brother approaching together the home they love. One walks with quiet and sober tread; the other leaps and dances along the way." In his critical essay, "Spencer's Reconciliation of Science and Religion," he finds the fallacies in Spencer's system in the "points of germination" from which a perfect theology will grow through contact with the insights of empirical science. Everett stands on the religious side of the debate; but his appreciation for the scientific side is evident.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Science of Thought: A System of Logic (Boston, 1869; 2nd edn 1882). Reprinted in *The Early American Reception of German Idealism*, vol. 5, ed. James A. Good (Bristol, UK, 2002).

Fichte's Science of Knowledge: A Critical Exposition (Chicago, 1884).

Poetry, Comedy and Duty (New York, 1888).

Ethics for Young People (Boston, 1891).

The Gospel of Paul (Boston, 1893).

Essays, Theological and Literary (Boston, 1901).

The Psychological Elements of Religious Faith, ed. Edward Hale (New York, 1902).

Immortality and Other Essays (Boston, 1902).

Theism and the Christian Faith, ed. Edward Hale (New York, 1909).

Further Reading

Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v9, Who Was Who in Amer v1

Gilman, Nicholas P. "Charles Carroll Everett," *The New World* 9 (1900): 724–6.

Good, James A. "Introduction to Charles Carroll Everett's *The Science of Thought*," in *The Early American Reception of German Idealism*, vol. 5 (Bristol, UK, 2002), pp. v–xvi.

Peabody, Francis G. *Reminiscences of Present-day Saints* (New York, 1927).

Toy, Crawford H. "Charles Carroll Everett," *The New World* 9 (1900): 714–24.

Jon Taylor

EVERETT, Walter Goodnow (1860–1937)

Walter Goodnow Everett was born 21 August 1860 in Rowe, Massachusetts, to Samuel P. and Aleesta Goodnow Everett. He studied at Brown University where he received the BA in 1885. In that year he was appointed tutor in Latin and Greek, and in 1889 he was promoted to instructor. He earned his MA in 1888, and the PhD in philosophy in 1895, dividing his time between studying, tutoring, and lecturing.

In 1894 Everett became associate professor of philosophy at Brown, succeeding James Seth who had returned to his native Scotland. After a year of postgraduate studies in Strasburg and Berlin, in 1896 he became chair of Brown's philosophy department, and in 1899 he was named professor of philosophy and natural theology. Shortly afterward, he was promoted to Romeo Elton Professor of Natural Theology, a position he held until his retirement in 1930, having been department chair for thirty-four years. Curt John

DUCASSE assumed both the chair and the Elton Professorship (more recently held by Ernest SOSA), and Ducasse would lead the department for another twenty-one years, accumulating perhaps an unmatched duration of philosophy department leadership for over half a century by only two philosophers.

Everett also served as Acting President of Brown University during 1912–13. In 1921 he was sent to the Allied Congress of Philosophy in Paris as a delegate of the American Philosophical Association. He was President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1922–3. In retirement he lectured at numerous universities, including the University of California at Berkeley where he gave the 1931 Howison Lecture on "The Uniqueness of Man," and the 1934 Foerster Lecture on the Immortality of the Soul, titled "The Life of the Spirit." In his final years he stayed close to the Berkeley campus. Warmly remembered by his students as a dedicated and caring teacher, Everett died on 29 July 1937 in Berkeley, California.

In 1918 Everett published *Moral Values*, a widely read book on ethics that was reprinted in Japanese translation in 1930. In that work he sought to develop a science of ethics that was relevant and applicable to all of life. Everett classified values into only eight categories: (1) economic values, (2) bodily values, (3) value of recreation, (4) value of association, (5) character values, (6) aesthetic values, (7) intellectual values, and (8) religious values. He also made numerous contributions to journals, dictionaries, and encyclopedias of philosophy. Everett took a liberal and humanistic approach to the relation between religion and morality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Evaluation of Life," *Philosophical Review* 7 (1898): 382–93.
"The Concept of the Good," *Philosophical Review* 7 (1898): 505–17.
"The Relation of Ethics to Religion," *International Journal of Ethics* 10 (1900): 479–93.

Moral Values: A Study of the Principles of Conduct (New York, 1918).
"The Problem of Progress," *Philosophical Review* 32 (1923): 125–53.
"The Uniqueness of Man," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 16 (1932): 1–27.

Other Relevant Works
"In *vestigiis veritatis*," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 1, pp. 329–53.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v3, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Barry, Jay. *Gentlemen Under the Elms* (Providence, R.I., 1982).
Bronson, Walter C. *The History of Brown University* (Providence, R.I., 1914).
Tsanoff, Radoslav A. *Ethics*, rev. edn (New York, 1955).

David L. Davis

EZORSKY, Gertrude (1926–)

Gertrude Ezorsky was born on 5 July 1926 in Brooklyn, New York. She attended Brooklyn College, where she earned her BA degree in 1947. Ezorsky received the MA (1955) and PhD (1961) degrees in philosophy from New York University, as well as an additional MA (1969) from Wolfson College, Oxford. She taught philosophy at Brooklyn College for her entire career, from 1964 to 1995. She also jointly served on the faculty of the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. Her substantial publication record dates from the mid 1960s and extends into the 1990s. she is presently professor emerita of philosophy.

In the late 1960s she contributed to a number of works edited by Sidney HOOK. These contributions tended to be on such mainstream philosophical themes as pragmatic philosophy, theories of knowledge and science, and the relationship of language to philosophy. By the early 1970s she was debating Hook and others in the popular press over the role of women in university life. In a 1974 contribution to the *New York Review of Books*, replying to an earlier piece by Hook, she advocated for the sex discrimination complaint filed by the Women's Equity Action League, which asked that the 1968 Executive Order banning sex discrimination by federal contractors be enforced against universities. At about the same time her scholarly focus turned to the philosophy of the law. There followed, in quick succession, works on rights and punishment; bioethics and human rights; crime; and the American criminal justice system.

In 1991 Ezorsky turned her prolific pen to a defense of affirmative action. In *Racism and Justice* she argued that, from the post-Reconstruction period to the present, racist practices have continued to transmit and reinforce the consequences of slavery. While the slim volume uses recent studies and legal opinions, old and new, its primary focus is on the ethics and morality of affirmative action as against the statistical data pro and con the practice.

Another work that is emblematic of what might be termed this third period in her scholarly career (the first being contributions to traditional topics in philosophy, the second being significant contributions to the philosophy of law and justice) is her 1987 *Moral Rights in the Workplace*. Her approach is set forth with typical clarity, arguing that it would be convenient if we could begin a paper on privacy rights in employment by citing a commonly accepted definition of privacy and then proceeding to apply that definition to employment situations. She then takes as her jumping-off point the seminal 1890 law review article co-authored by Louis Brandeis and the US Supreme Court's landmark 1965 decision, *Griswold v. Connecticut*. On this foundation she builds an erudite discussion of privacy rights and invasions of privacy in the modern American workplace.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Wishing Won't – But Wanting Will," in *Dimensions of Mind*, ed. Sidney Hook (New York, 1960), pp. 252–8.
"The Performative Theory of Truth," in *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Paul Edwards (New York, 1967), pp. 88–90.
"A Note on Metaphysics and Language," *Language and Philosophy*, ed. Sidney Hook (New York, 1969), pp. 291–2.
"Retributive Justice," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 1 (1972): 365–8.
"The Fight over University Women," *New York Review of Books* (16 May 1974): 32–9.
"It's Mine," *Philosophy of Public Affairs* 3 (1974): 321–30.
"Hiring Women Faculty," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 7 (1977): 82–91.
"The Right to Punish," in *Bioethics and Human Rights: A Reader for Health Professionals*, ed. Elsie Bandman and Bertram Bandman (Boston, 1978), pp. 251–2.
"War and Innocence," *Public Affairs Quarterly* 1 (1987): 111–16.
Racism and Justice: The Case for Affirmative Action (Ithaca, N.Y., 1991).

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *Philosophical Perspectives on Punishment* (Albany, N.Y., 1972).
Ed. with James Nickle, *Moral Rights in the Workplace* (Albany, N.Y., 1987).

Further Reading
Parent, W. A. "The Whole Life View of Criminal Desert," *Ethics* 86 (1976): 350–54.

James O. Castagnera

F

FACKENHEIM, Emil Ludwig (1916–2003)

Emil L. Fackenheim was born on 22 June 1916 in Halle, Germany, and died on 19 September 2003 in Jerusalem, Israel. In 1935, two years after the seizure of power by Hitler, Fackenheim decided to protest the growing hatred of Jews by going to Berlin to study Judaism. He studied for his rabbinical ordination at the Hochschule fur die Wissenschaft des Judentums. His study was interrupted with his arrest the day after *Kristallnacht*, the brutal attack by the Nazis on Jewish persons and property in November 1938. Since the government's policy was still at that time the expulsion of Jews, rather than their physical extermination, Fackenheim was sent to the proto-concentration camp at Sachsenhausen. Upon the guarantee of his intention and ability to leave Germany, he was released from Sachsenhausen in February 1939. Passing his rabbinic exams that year, he left for Scotland and was admitted to the doctoral program at the University of Aberdeen. With the outbreak of the war, he was interned as an enemy alien for a total of twenty months, first in Britain and then in Canada. Released from the internment camp outside of Montréal in December 1941, he attended the University of Toronto and received his PhD in philosophy in 1945. He was a professor of philosophy at the University of Toronto from 1948 to 1981. In 1983, Fackenheim went to Israel and taught at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem until his death.

Fackenheim's first essays, starting from the mid 1950s, explored the nature and viability of Judaism in the modern world. He was greatly influenced by the two twentieth-century German-Jewish philosophers, Franz Rosenzweig and Martin Buber, as well as the nineteenth-century Danish Christian philosopher, Søren Kierkegaard. Fackenheim saw all three of these figures as powerfully arguing for the importance and philosophical legitimacy of a commitment to God's revelation as a foundation for the religious life of individuals and communities as well as for formulating a critique of modernity. Agreeing with Rosenzweig and Buber, Fackenheim argued against the then dominant view of many liberal Jewish thinkers that the concept of revelation was both antiquated and irrelevant. He insisted that a Judaism without a belief in God's past revelations was meaningless, and that the experience of revelation was still open to Jews in the present.

In the early 1960s the topic of the Holocaust took on more and more importance in his essays. He began to suspect that the unprecedented challenge of the Holocaust to the possibility of revelation in the present undermined Rosenzweig's view that no event in history could deeply affect Jewish faith. He also saw Buber's anguishing notion of God's "eclipse" during the Holocaust as an inadequate response.

Two books of 1968, *The Religious Dimension in Hegel's Thought*, and *Quest for Past and Future*, marked the end of the first period of Fackenheim's work. While publishing essays on Jewish thought during this time, he had also

been concerned with the issues of reason, revelation, and authority in medieval and modern philosophy. He was particularly interested in the philosophy of G. W. F. Hegel. While never a Hegelian, Fackenheim admired Hegel's attempt to bring together, through the concept of Absolute Spirit, reason and revelation, the universal and the particular, eternity and history, and the religious and the secular. The Hegel book concluded that "the Hegelian middle" could not succeed, but that the effort to understand the dialectical relationships between the different features of human existence should not be abandoned. *Quest for Past and Future* brought together Fackenheim's early essays on Jewish faith and Judaism. Fackenheim's own introduction to the collection, "These Twenty Years: A Reappraisal," chronicled the development of his thought but also critiqued it in two areas. First, he now found that the Jewish thinker could only address problems of contemporary life based on a prior commitment to "the singled-out condition" of the Jew, that is, to both the covenant between God and the Jewish people and to the particularities of Jewish existence in history. Second, he recognized that he had not fully faced the "scandal" of Auschwitz, even though Jews throughout the world had answered the threat of Jewish extinction by continuing to live as Jews and to have Jewish children.

God's Presence in History (1970) showed a major advance in Fackenheim's effort, which had started in 1967, to seriously respond to the Holocaust. He saw the challenge of the Holocaust to Jewish faith as unprecedented, in his words: "the God of Israel cannot be God of either past or future unless He is still God of the present" (1973, p. 137). He meant that faith in God's direction of history, or in history's meaningfulness, cannot restrict itself to the past – the world of the Bible, or to the future – the Messianic Age. If God cannot be connected in some way to this most momentous event of Jewish history, then the God of history is totally lost. While Fackenheim insisted that no clear, direct meaning for the event could be identified, a fragmentary response which followed that of the Jewish people must be formulated. Fackenheim's most famous statement, the formulation of a new "614th commandment" added to Sinai's traditional commandments, was that "Jews are forbidden to hand Hitler posthumous victories. They are commanded to survive as Jews, lest the Jewish people perish." (1970, p. 84) Through this Fackenheim responded by way of *midrash*, that rabbinic form of interpretative story, suggesting that God's commanding presence has been felt by Jews through their conscious and unconscious recognition that Jewish survival is a sacred duty. Fackenheim's collection of essays, *The Jewish Return Into History* (1978), extended his "vulnerability to history" to include the establishment of the State of Israel. He held that although there was no causal link between the Holocaust and Israel, it is only because of the latter that Jews can face the former, through a dual tale of destruction and fragmentary redemption.

The parallel studies of Jewish philosophy and general philosophy were first integrated in *Encounters Between Judaism and Modern Philosophy* (1973), in which Fackenheim brought them together through the critical encounter between such modern philosophers as Kant, Hegel, and Heidegger with Jewish philosophy and faith. His self-described "magnum opus" of 1982, *To Mend the World*, continued this mutual engagement as well as adding to the resources that Fackenheim brought to the struggle with the meaning of the Holocaust. He insisted that the Holocaust demonstrated the vulnerability to history not only of Jewish faith but also of philosophy. Following Theodor ADORNO's notion that where the Holocaust is, thought is paralyzed, Fackenheim explained that this "unique" event was so radically evil and extreme, beyond all earlier comprehension of the nature of humans, that it could not be explained or assimilated. Further, according to Fackenheim, since one of modern philosophy's greatest figures, Martin Heidegger, not only failed to contest the Nazi's world of terror, but initially supported it, the viability of not just reli-

gious faith but philosophic reason had been put into question. Fackenheim found that Judaism, Christianity, and philosophy could be sustained today because the seeds for their mending were already planted at that time. Some acts of resistance in the name of philosophy and also of Christianity that testified to the sacredness of all human life, showed that they could sustain themselves then and had the right to continue now. In terms of Judaism, Fackenheim offered a new *midrash* that saw valiant acts of resistance as a *tikkun* or partial mending, directly or indirectly testifying to God's saving Presence even at that time.

Fackenheim once defined Jewish philosophy as "a disciplined, systematic encounter between the Jewish heritage and relevant philosophy" (1996, p. 186). At first he pursued the study of Jewish philosophy and general philosophy separately, but soon brought them into critical engagements with each other. It was the exposure of both to the nova of twentieth-century history, the Holocaust and the establishment of the state of Israel, that represents Fackenheim's most important contribution to both disciplines.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Religious Dimension in Hegel's Thought (Bloomington, Ind., 1968).

Quest for Past and Future: Essays in Jewish Theology (Bloomington, Ind., 1968).

God's Presence in History: Jewish Affirmation and Philosophical Reflections (New York, 1970).

Encounters Between Judaism and Modern Philosophy: A Preface to Future Jewish Thought (New York, 1973).

The Jewish Return Into History: Reflections in the Age of Auschwitz and a New Jerusalem (New York, 1978).

To Mend the World: Foundations of Future Jewish Thought (New York, 1982).

An Epitaph for German Judaism: From Halle to Jerusalem (Madison, Wisc., 2004).

Other Relevant Works

Metaphysics and Historicity (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1961).

What is Judaism: An Interpretation for the Present Ages (New York, 1987).

The Jewish Bible After the Holocaust: A Re-Reading (Bloomington, Ind., 1990).

Jewish Philosophers and Jewish Philosophy (Bloomington, Ind., 1996).

The God Within: Kant, Schelling, and Historicity (Toronto, 1996).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Canad Encyc*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*

Morgan, Michael. *The Jewish Thought of Emil Fackenheim: A Reader* (Detroit, 1987).

Oppenheim, Michael. *What Does Revelation Mean for the Modern Jew?* (Lewiston, N.Y., 1985).

Seeskin, Kenneth. "Emil Fackenheim," in *Interpreters of Judaism in the Late Twentieth Century*, ed. Steven Katz (Washington, 1993).

Michael Oppenheim

FAIRCHILD, James Harris (1817–1902)

James Harris Fairchild was born on 25 November 1817 in Stockbridge, Massachusetts. Shortly after his birth his family moved to Ohio and settled on a farm near the present site of Oberlin College. In 1834 Fairchild entered the freshman class at Oberlin, supporting himself by working for five cents an hour in a sawmill. He received his BA in 1838, served as tutor of Greek, Latin, and Hebrew at Oberlin from 1839 to 1842, was professor of languages from 1842 to 1847, and became chair of mathematics and natural philosophy in 1847. In 1858 he was named professor of systematic theology and

moral philosophy. Fairchild acquired a reputation as an able teacher and was admired by many. He was a trustee, faculty Chairman, and upon President Charles Finney's resignation, he was elected President in 1866. Oberlin was having financial problems and had only nine professors. In 1889 when he stepped down from the presidency, the college had twenty-three professors, a property value of one million dollars, and a reputation as a leading college. Fairchild traveled to Palestine, Egypt, and Europe in 1871, and in 1884 to Hawaii. He continued to teach as professor of theology until 1898 and as professor emeritus until his death. Fairchild died on 19 March 1902 in Oberlin, Ohio.

Fairchild published *Moral Philosophy, or the Science of Obligation* (1869), *Oberlin, the Colony and the College* (1883), *Elements of Theology, Natural and Revealed* (1892), as well as numerous religious and historical sermons, monographs, and reviews. He was a leader in the promotion of coeducation and corresponded with Susan B. ANTHONY and Lucy STONE.

In *Moral Philosophy*, Fairchild discusses many topics including virtuous action, sinful action, particular vices and virtues, conscience, duty, government, and rights. According to Fairchild, a virtuous action is reasonable and is also one we normally approve of. A sinful action is one which we normally condemn, for example, a failure to meet one's obligation or a refusal to be benevolent. When discussing government, Fairchild discusses divine government and civil government. The head of the divine government is God. God is the absolute monarch and receives no counsel. The law, which God enforces in the divine government, is the moral law of nature and reason. Governments that are led by human beings can be legitimate or corrupt. Fairchild emphasized the religious unity of the universe.

Fairchild was described as a man who enjoyed being with young people, related well to their questions, and comprehended their difficulties. He had a reputation for being candid and tolerant and was known to have skill in inspiring students.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Educational Arrangements and College Life at Oberlin (New York, 1866).
Moral Philosophy, or the Science of Obligation (New York, 1869).
Woman's Right to the Ballot (Oberlin, Ohio, 1870).
Needed Phases of Christianity (Oberlin, Ohio, 1874).
The Doctrine of Sanctification at Oberlin (Boston, 1876).
Oberlin, the Colony and the College, 1833–1883 (Oberlin, Ohio, 1883).
Elements of Theology, Natural and Revealed (Oberlin, Ohio, 1892).

Other Relevant Works
Fairchild's papers are at Oberlin College, Ohio.
"The Duty of Religion as Known to Every Man." A sermon delivered before the Young Men's Christian Association of the University of Michigan (Cleveland, Ohio, nd).
"Coeducation of the Sexes," *American Journal of Education* 17 (1868): 385.
Ed., *Finney's Lectures on Systematic Theology* (Oberlin, Ohio, 1878).
"Grandfather's Story": An Autobiography (Oberlin, Ohio, 1906). Reprinted as *Country Boy: Growing Up in Northern Ohio in the 1820s*, ed. Geoffrey Blodgett (Elyria, Ohio, 1993).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v2*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Swing, Albert T. *James Harris Fairchild; or, Sixty-Eight Years with a Christian College* (New York, 1907).

Hani Morgan

FALK, Werner David (1906–91)

W. David Falk was born on 25 April 1906 in Berlin, Germany. His Jewish parents were Dr. Fritz Falk and Charlotte Betty Cassirer, a cousin of philosopher Ernst Cassirer. Falk received a PhD summa cum laude in political economy at the University of Heidelberg in 1932, but he soon moved to England to escape the growing Nazi oppression. He was a research scholar at the London School of Economics from 1933 to 1936, and then earned an MA in philosophy from Oxford University in 1938. From 1938 to 1946 he was a lecturer in philosophy at New College, Oxford, and was acting head of the moral philosophy department at the University of Aberdeen, Scotland in 1946–7. He then returned to Oxford as a research fellow at Nuffield College from 1947 to 1950. In 1950 Falk became reader in philosophy at the University of Melbourne, Australia, and also received an MA from Melbourne in that year.

In 1957–8 Falk was a visiting professor at the University of Michigan, and decided to remain in the United States. He was visiting professor at Brown University in 1958 and at the University of Illinois in 1959; professor of philosophy at Wayne State University from 1959 to 1962; and professor of philosophy at Syracuse University in 1962–3. In 1963–4 he was a visiting professor at the University of North Carolina, brought by department chair E. Maynard ADAMS who was seeking international representation in the department. In 1964 Falk was named the first James Gordon Hanes Professor of Philosophy. In 1965 he became chair of the philosophy department, serving until his retirement in 1975. During his tenure as chair, he brought North Carolina's philosophy department to national prominence and inaugurated the annual Chapel Hill Philosophy Colloquium. In his retirement he was a fellow at the National Humanities Center in Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, and continued to be an active presence in the philosophy department, writing and occasionally teaching. Falk died on 11 October 1991 in Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Falk's contributions to philosophy centered on ethical theory, especially concerning the analysis of moral language, the functioning of practical reason, the nature of value, and the "is-ought" problem. Falk opposed the view, attributed to G. E. Moore, that the property of goodness is objectively external to people, arguing instead for a relational view in which goodness is the capacity of a thing to arouse a favorable judgment by a person who has full and dispassionate knowledge of what that thing is like.

For Falk, a judgment of moral obligation is, ideally, the result of one's further evaluation of what one must do, after a situation has been considered from all possible perspectives. As Falk claimed to have found in David Hume, and as John DEWEY urged as well, morality is not simply a matter of instrumental reasoning since alternative means to ends, as well as alternative ends, must be hypothetically and imaginatively considered. This "internalist" theory of a categorical practical necessity supplies the needed rational motivation to act. Moral disagreement arises from the failure of everyone fully to undergo this process of reflection. Against excessive rationalism in ethics, Falk cannot agree that there could be moral truths apart from our best efforts to know them. He also opposed another ethical theory influential in the mid-twentieth century, R. M. Hare's prescriptivism, because a moral judgment cannot be merely a matter of recommending that a certain action be performed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Morals without Faith," *Philosophy* 19 (1944): 3–18.
"Obligation and Rightness," *Philosophy* 20 (1945): 129–47.
"'Ought' and Motivation," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 48 (1948): 111–38.
"Moral Complexity," *Ethics* 66 (1956): 123–31.

"Morality and Convention," *Journal of Philosophy* 57 (1960): 675–84.

"Action-guiding Reasons," *Journal of Philosophy* 60 (1963): 702–18.

"Hume on Practical Reason," *Philosophical Studies* 27 (1975): 1–18.

"Hume on Is and Ought," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 6 (1976): 359–78.

Ought, Reasons, and Morality: The Collected Papers of W. D. Falk (Ithaca, N.Y., 1986).

"Humanism," *Personalist Forum* 5 (1989): 69–81.

Further Reading

Proc of APA v66

Baier, Kurt. "Reasons for Doing Something," *Journal of Philosophy* 61 (1964): 198–202.

Falk, Jeanette L. "'Carolina' Vignettes: W. David Falk, Philosopher," in *They Fled Hitler's Germany and Found Refuge in North Carolina*, ed. H. A. Landsberger and C. E. Schweitzer (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1996), pp. 69–74.

Piker, Anthony. "W. D. Falk's Alternative to Moral Realism and Anti-Realism," *Auslegung* 20 (1995): 100–105.

John R. Shook

FARBER, Marvin (1901–80)

Marvin Farber was born on 14 December 1901 in Buffalo, New York. He was the eldest son of Simon and Matilda Goldstein Farber who had fourteen children, five of whom were eventually listed in *Who's Who in America*. After receiving his BS at Harvard in 1922, Farber studied for two years in Freiburg and Heidelberg. He visited Edmund Husserl twice in 1923, was accepted as a PhD candidate by Husserl, and also studied with other prominent German philosophers including Martin Heidegger, Ernst Zermelo, and Karl Jaspers. However, Farber returned to Harvard to complete his desired PhD in 1925 with a dissertation on "Phenomenology as a Method and as a Philosophical Discipline." The readers were Alfred North WHITEHEAD, Raphael DEMOS, and Ralph B. PERRY. Before his second visit to Germany in 1926 he taught a year at Ohio State University. From 1927 to 1974, Farber spent forty-seven years of his distinguished career as professor of philosophy at State University of New York at Buffalo. For a three-year span from 1961 to 1964 he also was chair of the philosophy department at the University of Pennsylvania. He was President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1963–4. Farber died on 24 November 1980 in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Farber's reputation as a leading contributor to phenomenology rests in part on his early work, *The Foundation of Phenomenology* (1943), an extensive commentary on Husserl's *Logical Investigations* which many in the English-speaking world regarded as the centerpiece of Husserl's philosophy. But the public perception of Faber's role for phenomenology was shaped largely through his lifelong editorship of the journal *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, the organ of the International Phenomenological Society that Farber founded in 1940. He was its only elected President until his death.

Philosophy and Phenomenological Research provided, especially during World War II and following years, a vital professional outlet for numerous refugee scholars from Europe. However, practical considerations of the time and Farber's own advocacy of pluralism in philosophical method obliged the journal to accommodate more and more articles unrelated to phenomenology. Farber, on his part, grew increasingly critical of the hybrid character of the "phenomenological movement." He abhorred the popular but "unscientific" existentialist phenomenology of Scheler and Heidegger and eventually distanced himself

from what he called the "subjective idealism" of Husserl himself.

In a conscious opposition to Husserl's critique of "natural attitude," Farber often characterized his own position as "naturalism," intending the materialism of Karl Marx, which remained Farber's philosophical ideal throughout his life. But there was in him an almost equally strong streak of enthusiasm for logical and mathematical sciences. If he was drawn to phenomenology for some time, it was mainly because he admired the descriptive rigor in Husserl's logical analysis of conscious experience. Farber realized soon enough that there was no bridge leading from the recess of subjectivity to a socially and materially beneficial praxis. Thus what the title of his posthumously published book, *The Search for an Alternative* (1984), implied was not a promise of a new beginning, but rather a retrospective account of an outcome long since decided in favor of Marxism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Phenomenology as a Method and as a Philosophical Discipline (Buffalo, N.Y., 1928).
The Foundation of Phenomenology: Edmund Husserl and the Quest for a Rigorous Science of Philosophy (Cambridge, Mass., 1943; 3rd edn, Albany, N.Y., 1967).
Naturalism and Subjectivism (Springfield, Ill., 1959; 2nd edn, Albany, N.Y., 1968).
The Aims of Phenomenology: The Motives, Methods, and Impact of Husserl's Thought (New York, 1966).
Phenomenology and Existence: Toward a Philosophy within Nature (New York, 1967).
Basic Issues of Philosophy: Experience, Reality and Human Values (New York, 1967).
The Search for an Alternative: Philosophical Perspectives of Subjectivism and Marxism (Philadelphia, 1984).

Other Relevant Works
Farber's papers are at State University of New York at Buffalo, New York.
Ed., *Philosophic Thought in France and the United States* (Albany, N.Y., 1968).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Pres Addr of APA v7*, *Proc of APA v55*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Cho, Kah Kyung, ed. *Philosophy and Science in Phenomenological Perspective* (Dordrecht, 1984).
Cho, Kah Kyung. "Marvin Farber in memoriam: Sein Leben und Wirken für die Phänomenologie in USA," *Phänomenologische Forschungen* 12 (1984): 145–72.
Riepe, Dale, ed. *Phenomenology and Naturalism: Essays in Honor of Marvin Farber* (Albany, N.Y., 1973). Contains a bibliography of Farber's writings.

Kah Kyung Cho

FARIS, Ellsworth (1874–1953)

Ellsworth Faris was born 30 September 1974 in Salem, Tennessee. He received both his BA in 1894 and his MA in 1896 from Add-Ran University in Waco, Texas (now Texas Christian University). He spent seven years as a missionary in the Belgian Congo for the Foreign Christian Missionary Society of the Disciples of Christ. He spent one year studying at the University of Chicago in 1901–1902 before going back to the Congo until ill health forced him to return home in 1904. He taught philosophy, sacred history, and psychology at Texas Christian University from 1904 to 1911, before pursing graduate studies in psychology at the University of Chicago, where he received the PhD in psychology in 1914. He was hired by Iowa State University but returned to the University of Chicago in 1915. A year later he

joined Iowa's faculty teaching in the psychology department and serving as Director of the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station during 1916–19.

Faris returned to Chicago in 1919 when he accepted a sociology appointment in the sociology department, and was promoted up to full professor. He served as chair of the sociology and anthropology department from 1925 to 1939, taking over duties from Albion SMALL and maintaining Chicago's preeminence in the field as sociology became an independent department. He was editor of the *American Journal of Sociology* from 1926 to 1936 and was elected President of the American Sociological Society, later called the American Sociological Association, in 1937. Faris retired in 1939 but continued to remain active teaching, researching, and publishing. He was involved in two international research projects, the first in Central America and Mexico in 1947 and the second in the Belgian Congo and Uganda in 1949. He was distinguished professor of sociology at Texas Christian University from 1949 to 1950, and at the University of Utah in 1951. Faris died on 19 December 1953 in Lake Forest, Illinois.

Faris's scholarship includes a book of his lectures titled *The Nature of Human Nature* (1937), and chapters in Burgess's *Personality and the Social Group* (1929), Smith's *Essays in Philosophy* (1929), and Young's *Social Attitudes* (1930). He authored over forty articles contributing to the emerging sociological field of social psychology. During his tenure as chair of sociology at the University of Chicago, Faris was responsible for creating a separate anthropology department in 1929, and for hiring several prominent Chicago graduates such as Louis Wirth and Herbert BLUMER.

Writing on social evolution, Faris advocated the term "preliterate societies" to replace the older label of "primitive societies," which was an important step in making social science terminology more value-free and less ethnocentric. He also is credited with refining the attitude-value concept and for interpreting the social psychology of George Herbert MEAD, as well as the writings of Charles H. COOLEY, W. I. THOMAS, and Vilfredo Pareto. At Chicago, Faris developed a multidisciplinary approach to sociological inquiry and was an important bridge between the established qualitative, ethnographical approach used by Robert PARK and the emerging quantitative, statistical approach favored by William F. Ogburn.

Among his other philosophical interests evident in his social psychology notable is his contribution to the study of the nature of human values. In his two essays "The Concept of Social Attitudes" (1925) and "Social Attitudes" (1931), Faris follows up suggestions in Mead's work to offer an alternative to instinct and desire theories of value, which were the lingering remnants of individualistic psychology and philosophy. A value is essentially an attitude, which is defined as "an acquired predisposition to ways or modes of response, not to particular acts except as, under special conditions, these express a way of behaving." Faris argues that values are irreducibly social and have two dimensions: an objective dimension and an attitudinal dimension. Values are objectively oriented judgments about external things, and not reports of internal states, although they also serve to express positive or negative feelings about those things. Values are primarily social, however, because their existence and modification is entirely conditioned by social situations of learning.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Mental Capacity of Savages," *American Journal of Sociology* 23 (1918): 603–19.

"Ethnological Light on Psychological Problems," *Publications of the American Sociological Society* 16 (1921): 113–20.

"Social Evolution," in *Contributions of Science to Religion*, ed. Shailer Mathews (New York, 1924).

"Pre-literate Peoples: Proposing a New Term," *American Journal of Sociology* 30 (1925): 710–12.

"The Concept of Social Attitudes," *Journal of Applied Sociology* 9 (1925): 404–9.

"The Sect and the Sectarian," *Publications of the American Sociological Society* 22 (1927): 144–59.

"Attitudes and Behavior," *American Journal of Sociology* 34 (1928): 271–81.

"Current Trends in Social Psychology," in *Essays in Philosophy by Seventeen Doctors of Philosophy of the University of Chicago*, ed. Thomas V. Smith and William K. Wright (Chicago, 1929), pp. 119–33.

"Social Attitudes," in *Social Attitudes*, ed. Kimball Young (New York, 1931).

"The Primary Group: Essence and Accident," *American Journal of Sociology* 38 (1932): 41–50.

The Nature of Human Nature, and Other Essays in Social Psychology (New York, 1937).

Other Relevant Works

Faris's papers were lost, but some lecture notes are the Philip Morris Hauser Papers at the University of Chicago. Some Faris correspondence is in the Frank H. Hankins Papers at Smith College in Massachusetts.

Intelligent Philanthropy, with Ferris F. Laune and Arthur J. Todd (Chicago, 1930).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Who Was Who in Amer v3

Faris, Robert E. L. *Chicago Sociology, 1920–1932* (Chicago, 1970).

Hinkle, Roscoe. *Developments in American Sociological Theory, 1915–1950* (Albany, N.Y., 1994).

Odum, Howard W. *American Sociology: The Story of Sociology in the United States through 1950* (London, 1951).

———, "Ellsworth Faris 1874–1953," *Social Forces* 33 (1954): 101–103.

Jean Van Delinder

FEFERMAN, Solomon (1928–)

Solomon Feferman was born on 13 December 1928 in New York City. He was educated at the California Institute of Technology from which he received his BS in mathematics in 1948, and the University of California at Berkeley from which he received his PhD in mathmatics in 1957. His doctoral advisor was Alfred TARSKI. Ferferman has taught mathematics and philosophy at Stanford University since 1956. He was promoted to full professor in 1968, and was chair of the mathematics department from 1985 to 1992. He retired in 2004.

He has worked primarily in proof theory and foundations of mathematics, and in model theory, especially to first-order arithmetic and fragments and second-order and higher-order arithmetic and fragments, and recursion-theoretic model theory, becoming increasingly interested in philosophy and history of logic in later years.

In "Systems of Predicative Analysis" (1964), Feferman made use of his technique, developed in his "Transfinite Recursive Progressions of Axiomatic Theories" (1962) of building up a set-theoretic hierarchy Z^* in stages, where at each stage one could assume the consistency of earlier stages. For example, he could "define" a sequence of theories:

$$Z^0 = ZF$$
$$Z^{\alpha+1} = Z^\alpha \cup \{Con(Z^\alpha)\}$$
$$Z^\beta = \cup Z^\alpha, (\forall\alpha)\,(\alpha{<}\beta)$$
$$Z^* = \cup Z^\beta$$

Feferman treated impredicative definitions within this hierarchy of theories, rather than within a Russellian hierarchy of types for a single system.

As editor-in-chief of the *Collected Works of Kurt Gödel*, Feferman became a close associate and friend of Jean VAN HEIJENOORT and developed his own interest in the history of mathematical logic and foundations of mathematics. To the biography by his wife, Anita Burdman

752

Feferman, of van Heijenoort, he contributed an appendix on van Heijenoort's scholarly work, and later collaborated with her on a study of Tarski's life and work. In discussing the contributions of Jean van Heijenoort, Feferman (1993, p. 383) had noted the particular value which van Heijenoort placed on Herbrand's Fundamental Theorem as one of the "deepest results in logic," even in light of its known defects and despite the more subdued assessments of other logicians. At the same time, Feferman noted that the Fundamental Theorem has had a crucial impact on further developments, and it is presumably at least in part to John Alan Robinson's resolution method that he refers in stating (1993, p. 383) that Herbrand's Fundamental Theorem has "been used in recent years as the basis for one approach to automated deduction." This connection dates back to at least the late 1950s, in the work of Hao WANG.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Arithmetization of Metamathematics in a General Setting," *Fundamenta Mathematicae* 49 (1960): 35–92.

"Transfinite Recursive Progressions of Axiomatic Theories," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 27 (1962): 259–316.

The Number Systems: Foundations of Algebra and Analysis (Reading, Mass., 1964; 2nd edn, New York, 1989).

"Systems of Predicative Analysis," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 29 (1964): 1–30; 33 (1968): 193–220.

"Lectures on Proof Theory," in *Proceedings of the Summer School in Logic, Leeds, 1967*, ed. M. H. Löb (Berlin and New York, 1968), pp. 1–107.

"Proof Theory: A Personal Report," in *Proof Theory*, ed. Gaisi Takeuti (Amsterdam, 1987), pp. 447–85.

In the Light of Logic (Oxford, 1998).

Truth and Consequences: The Life and Logic of Alfred Tarski, with Anita Burdman Feferman (Cambridge, UK, 2005).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with K. Jon Barwise, *Model-theoretic Logics* (Berlin and New York, 1985).

Ed., *Collected Works*, 5 vols, by Kurt Gödel (Oxford, 1986–2003).

"Jean van Heijenoort (1912–1986)," with Anita B. Feferman, in *Logic Colloquium '85*, ed. Paris Logic Group (Amsterdam, 1987), pp. 1–7.

"Jean van Heijenoort's Scholarly Work, 1948–1986," in *Politics, Logic, and Love: The Life of Jean van Heijenoort*, by Anita B. Feferman (Boston and Wellesely, Mass., 1993), pp. 371–90.

Ed., *The Collected Works of Julia Robinson* (Providence, R.I., 1996).

Further Reading

Sieg, Wilfried, Richard Sommer, and Carolyn Talcott, eds. *Reflections on the Foundations of Mathematics: Essays in Honor of Solomon Feferman* (Urbana, Ill. and Natick, Mass., 2002).

Irving H. Anellis

FEIBLEMAN, James Kern (1904–87)

James K. Feibleman was born 13 July 1904 in New Orleans, Louisiana, and died on 14 September 1987 in Houston, Texas. He grew up in New Orleans, where his father was a successful businessman. His parents were Reformed Jews, although in his family religion "was not a highly organized affair." At age nineteen, he spent his last year of preparatory education at the Horace Mann School in New York City. He then attended the University of Virginia, but dropped out after less than six months due to illness and returned to New Orleans to learn the family business, motivated by an obligation Feibleman felt to his family. Business led him to philosophy; with a close

associate, Julius Friend, he sought a better understanding of the culture of business in Depression-era America. Their concern with technology led them to study contemporary physics, then the history of physics, and then the history of philosophy. They began collaborating on a number of books and articles. In the first, *Science and the Spirit of Man* (1933), they argued that "everything that physics regarded detachedly really belong[s] to the human being as an attribute." Moving away from that initial, less realist view to a more realist position, they wrote *The Unlimited Community* (1936) and *What Science Really Means* (1937).

In 1943, despite the fact that Feibleman had no college degree, Tulane University offered him his first academic position as acting assistant professor of English, hired to teach naval officers in training. In 1945 he transferred to the philosophy department. In 1951 he became head of the philosophy department in the College of Arts and Sciences. In 1957 he became chair of the university department of philosophy. Upon his retirement from that position in 1969, he was named to the W. R. Irby Chair in Philosophy. From 1958 to 1967 he was also special lecturer in the Louisiana State University Medical School department of psychiatry. In 1974 Feibleman became the first A. W. Mellon Professor in the Humanities at Tulane, and retired in 1975. In spring 1976 he served as Barry Bingham Professor in the Humanities and Philosophy at the University of Louisville.

In 1952 Feibleman co-founded *Tulane Studies in Philosophy*, an annual publication which he edited for nearly two decades. He was President of the Charles S. Peirce Society in 1948–9, President of the New Orleans Academy of Sciences in 1958–9, and President of the Southwestern Philosophical Society in 1980–81. He was an honorary member of Phi Beta Kappa and received honorary doctoral degrees from Rider College, Tulane University, and the University of Louisville.

Like his contemporary Charles HARTSHORNE, Feibleman was deeply influenced by Charles PEIRCE and A. N. WHITEHEAD. Among his many

contributions to the study of the history of philosophy was an early book in which he set forth Peirce's philosophical ideas as a unified system of thought. Like Peirce and Whitehead, Feibleman was a system-builder. He published a staggering number of articles and books, and he viewed at least twenty-one of his book-length works of philosophy – of which there are more than thirty – as components of a single, comprehensive system. Those books range across many different areas, including metaphysics, epistemology, philosophical logic, ethics, aesthetics, political philosophy, philosophical psychology, sociology and anthropology, and others.

Feibleman's system reflects his belief that "the purpose of a philosophy … is to find the nature of the universe of all universes while at the same time saving the facts, to account for every type of detail in the world as well as to seek out reasons for the very existence of such detail. A philosophy is a scale-model of all that we can describe from our experience or imagine, a model based on an ontological system." (1951) He viewed ontology as "the most important branch of philosophy" (1952), and his own ontology as the foundation of his system. Feibleman set forth his ontological theory, which he called axiologic realism, in his near 800-page magnum opus *Ontology* (1951). That work culminates in a list of 599 "postulates" of axiologic realism, systematically arranged in a way that recalls Spinoza's *Ethics* and Wittgenstein's *Tractatus*. Only the barest sketch of that system can be given here.

The central claim of axiologic realism is that there are only three fundamental categories or ontological universes: (1) essence or possibility, (2) existence or actuality, and (3) destiny or teleology. Feibleman describes essence or possibility along the lines of Plato's *Sophist*, as "the power to affect or be affected." The universe of essence thus consists of "the total of all items having the power to affect or to be affected taken together." It is "a universe of pure being … governed by *determination* and *law*" (1951). It is also the realm of both universals and values; thus, Feibleman's ontology commits him to realism

about universals (in other words, a "realism" in the sense in which it is opposed to nominalism) and to realism about values (hence the name "axiologic realism").

Individual "exemplars" of values and universals belong to the second universe, that of existence or actuality. These terms describe that which "exercises the power of affecting or being affected," so this second universe "include[s] the total of all items exercising the power to affect or to be affected taken together"; further, "it is a universe of mutual interaction [and] is governed by the conditions laid down by the universe of essence" (1951). But it not completely governed, since "*chance* or *accident*" influences actual goings-on. The universe of existence is "simply nature," the natural universe. It is spatiotemporal, but is nonetheless not limited to the physical (nor is the physical limited to actuality): "Much is physical that is not actual: meteors which have disintegrated in the past, planets which will be formed in the future. And much is actual that is not physical: Plato's fame, the beauty of Cézanne's paintings." Unlike the "persistent," unchanging realm of possibility, the realm of actuality is "transient," ever-changing. But despite this, it is no less real than the realm of possibility. Feibleman's ontology commits him to a form of modal realism according to which the universes of the actual and the possible are equally real and constitute a "two-story world."

As that phrase suggests, Feibleman's third universe is not on a par with the others. Destiny or teleology is "an interim universe" constituted by "the direction and movement of existence toward essence, or … of actuality toward possibility." The universe of actuality is "incomplete," in that it is not wholly systematic. It contains "internal contradictions, chance occurrences, disvalues." But possibility is "a complete system" toward which actuality is continually moving, and destiny is just this tendency of actuality to move in such a way. It is "the active principle weaving together" of the primary universes of possibility and actuality.

Feibleman intended his system, especially his ontology, to be compatible with both empiricism and the discoveries of modern natural science. He believed that in denying the possibility of metaphysics, logical empiricism had gone too far, holding that it is possible to construct an elaborate speculative metaphysics consistent with the spirit and methods of science and empiricism. He was careful to deny that there was anything mystical about his concept of destiny, and he held that "[t]he test of which universals are real is the business of the logical and empirical sciences." Indeed, he described his own ontology as an empirical metaphysics. He saw himself as engaged in the Peircean project of developing a "prope-positivism" which would broaden traditional positivism by reconciling the natural, empirical sciences with metaphysics. He was inspired by Peirce's attempt to develop what Peirce called a "scientific" metaphysics. Near the end of his life, Feibleman urged philosophers to allow their work to be influenced by science, rather than merely commenting on, or attempting to elucidate, the findings of science as logical positivism did. He felt that if philosophers were to look at philosophy from the standpoint of science, then new, and perhaps radically different, philosophical ideas might be brought forth.

In addition to numerous books and articles aimed at academic readers, Feibleman published a number of philosophy books for a wider audience. One of these, *Understanding Philosophy: A Popular History of Ideas* (1973), was serialized in the *New York Post*. His interests and skills as a writer extended well beyond philosophy. While in high school, he began contributing poems and stories to the *Double Dealer*, a New Orleans literary magazine cofounded by Julius Friend that also published works by William Faulkner (of whom Feibleman was an acquaintance) and Sherwood Anderson (with whom Feibleman was friends). He published a number of novels and many collections of poetry, and his *Collected Poems* were published in 1974. His literary talents

were shared by his son, Peter S. Feibleman, a successful novelist and playwright, and his second wife, Shirley Ann Grau, a writer of short stories and novels and winner of the Pulitzer Prize for *The Keepers of the House* in 1964.

Perhaps because he entered the profession of philosophy without a college degree, during most of his academic career Feibleman was relatively isolated from the community of professional philosophers. This sometimes resulted in his ignorance of others' work on the very problems with which he was concerned. It also resulted in other philosophers being ignorant of Feibleman's work, despite the remarkable quantity of his published work, much of which appeared in first-rank philosophy journals. In his introduction to *The Two-Story World* (1966), a collection of Feibleman's philosophical writings, Huntington Cairns wrote that Feibleman's work "has been unduly neglected, almost, in fact, to a scandalous degree. No other philosopher who has written so widely and with the insight of Professor Feibleman has been given such scant attention." (1966) Contemporary philosophers working in the myriad areas spanned by his system seem not to be influenced by, concerned with, or even aware of his work. This is surprising, given his prolificacy, the length of his career in academe, his many professional honors and achievements, and the unusual depth and breadth of his philosophical system.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

In Praise of Comedy: A Study in Its Theory and Practice (New York, 1939).

An Introduction to Peirce's Philosophy Interpreted as a System (New York, 1946).

The Revival of Realism: Critical Studies in Contemporary Philosophy (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1946).

The Theory of Human Culture (New York, 1946).

Aesthetics: A Study of the Fine Arts in Theory and Practice (New York, 1949).

Ontology (Baltimore, Md., 1951).

The Institutions of Society (London, 1956).

Inside the Great Mirror: A Critical Examination of the Philosophy of Russell, Wittgenstein, and Their Followers (The Hague, 1958).

The Pious Scientist: Nature, God, and Man in Religion (New York, 1958).

Religious Platonism: The Influence of Religion on Plato and the Influence of Plato on Religion (New York, 1959).

Foundations of Empiricism (New York, 1962).

Mankind Behaving: Human Needs and Material Culture (Springfield, Ill., 1963).

Moral Strategy: An Introduction to the Ethics of Confrontation (The Hague, 1967).

The Reach of Politics: A New Look at Government (New York, 1969).

The New Materialism (The Hague, 1970).

The Quiet Rebellion: The Making and Meaning of the Arts (New York, 1972).

Scientific Method: The Hypothetico-Experimental Laboratory Procedure of the Physical Sciences (The Hague, 1972).

The Stages of Human Life: A Biography of Entire Man (The Hague, 1975).

Adaptive Knowing: Epistemology from a Realistic Standpoint (The Hague, 1976).

Assumptions of Grand Logics (Boston, 1979).

Technology and Reality (Boston, 1982).

From Hegel to Terrorism, and Other Essays on the Dynamic Nature of Philosophy (Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1985).

Justice, Law, and Culture (Boston, 1985).

Education and Civilization (Boston, 1987).

Other Relevant Works

Feibleman's papers are at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.

Science and the Spirit of Man: A New Ordering of Experience, with Julius Friend (London, 1933).

The Unlimited Community: A Study of the Possibility of Social Science, with Julius Friend (London, 1936).

Christianity, Communism and the Ideal

Society: A Philosophical Approach to Modern Politics, with Julius Friend (London, 1937).

What Science Really Means: An Explanation of the History and Empirical Method of General Science (London, 1937).

Positive Democracy (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1940).

The Long Habit: A Novel (New York, 1948).

Philosophers Lead Sheltered Lives: A First Volume of Memoirs (London, 1952).

Biosocial Factors in Mental Illness (Springfield, Ill., 1962).

The Two-Story World: Selected Writings of James K. Feibleman, ed. Huntington Cairns (New York, 1966).

The Way of a Man: An Autobiography of James K. Feibleman (New York, 1969).

Great April (New York, 1971).

Understanding Philosophy: A Popular History of Ideas (New York, 1973).

Collected Poems (New York, 1974).

Understanding Civilizations: The Shape of History (New York, 1975).

Understanding Oriental Philosophy: A Popular Account for the Western World (New York, 1976).

Understanding Human Nature: A Popular Guide to the Effects of Technology on Man and His Behavior (New York, 1977).

Ironies of History: Leaders and Misleaders of Humankind (New York, 1980).

Conversations: A Kind of Fiction (New York, 1982).

"Presidential Address: The Third Sophistic," *Philosophical Topics* 13 (1985): 7–18.

The Destroyers: The Underside of Human Nature (New York, 1987).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Proc of APA v61*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Reck, Andrew J. "James Kern Feibleman: Axiological Realism and Ontological Positivism," in *The New American Philosophers: An Exploration of Thought since World War II* (Baton Rouge, Louis.,

1968), chap. 7.

"The Systematic Philosophy of James K. Feibleman," *Studium Generale* 24 (July 1971). Issue on Feibleman, including his replies to participants.

Whittemore, Robert C., ed. "The Reach of Philosophy: Essays in Honor of James K. Feibleman," *Tulane Studies in Philosophy* 25 (1977). Contains a bibliography of Feibleman's works.

Robert Lane

FEIGL, Herbert (1902–88)

Herbert Feigl was the founder and Director of the Minnesota Center for the Philosophy of Science at the University of Minnesota. The Minnesota Center was the first successful American institution maintained by public and private funding which was dedicated to the philosophy of science. Along with Feigl's own writing and teaching, he published the monographic series *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, and the journal *Philosophical Studies* which Feigl established with Wilfred SELLARS. The Minnesota Center strongly contributed in the 1950s and 1960s to the establishment of philosophy of science as a subdiscipline of academic philosophy and profession within American intellectual life.

Feigl was born on 14 December 1902 in Reichenberg, Austria. His youthful interests in science and philosophy (Albert EINSTEIN and Moritz Schlick were strong influences) led him to study at the University of Vienna, where he became a student of Schlick. Through Schlick, Feigl became acquainted with the Vienna Circle of philosophers and scientists who helped articulate a positivistic scientific philosophy, or "logical empiricism," in the early twentieth century. After completing his dissertation in probability theory, titled "Zufall

and Gesetz" (or "Chance and Law"), Feigl received his PhD in philosophy and physics from Vienna in 1927.

Feigl emigrated to the United States in 1930. He arrived a few years before Rudolf CARNAP, Hans REICHENBACH, Philipp FRANK, and other members and associates of Schlick's Vienna Circle began arriving in the mid 1930s. After spending a year at Harvard in 1930–31 as a Rockefeller research scholar, he took a permanent position in philosophy at the University of Iowa in 1931. There Feigl helped introduce scientific philosophy to American philosophers both by hosting colleagues from the Vienna Circle (such as Otto Neurath) as they toured the Midwest, and by co-authoring with American Albert Blumberg (a fellow student of Schlick) the famous paper "Logical Positivism: A New Movement in European Philosophy." In this paper, Feigl and Blumberg gave the new movement its first widely accepted name. However, "logical positivism" with its foundationalist and phenomenalist overtones was soon rejected by many in favor of "logical empiricism." Feigl helped introduce the work of the Vienna Circle and its Wittgensteinian connections to American philosophers. Within a few years, young American philosophers such as W. V. QUINE, Charles W. MORRIS, and Ernest NAGEL traveled to Europe to meet firsthand the philosophers introduced by Feigl and Blumberg.

Feigl moved to Minnesota in 1940 to become professor of philosophy, and he continued to build and stabilize the field of philosophy of science. Besides founding *Philosophical Studies* in 1950 and the Minnesota Center in 1953, he edited several texts and anthologies that soon became standard reading for students of philosophy of science (Feigl and Sellars 1949; Feigl and Brodbeck 1953; Feigl and Maxwell 1959). Some of these anthologies were proceedings of conferences and workshops that he organized at the Minnesota Center or within national meetings sponsored by organizations such as the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Feigl also was on the editorial board of *Philosophy of Science* and served as President of the American Philosophical Association Western Division in 1962–3. He was a visiting professor at many universities and was elected to membership in the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Feigl's success in building the profession of philosophy of science in the United States can be usefully compared to the efforts of his senior colleague from Vienna, Philipp Frank, who similarly was a devotee of Einstein and began his philosophical career studying problems surrounding causation and scientific law. While Feigl was establishing the Minnesota Center, Frank received funds from the Rockefeller Foundation to establish his Institute for the Unity of Science in Boston within the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. In the early 1950s Frank and Feigl undertook parallel projects as they pioneered the current practice of organizing professional conferences and publishing books and collections of essays resulting from them (see, for example, Frank 1957). Unlike Feigl, however, Frank aimed to establish scientific philosophy not as a branch of academic philosophy but rather as a branch of science. While Feigl's series of publications was called *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, for example, Frank adopted Otto Neurath's crusade against the word "philosophy" and gave his short-lived series the title "Contributions to the Analysis and Synthesis of Knowledge." As a devotee of the unity of science, Frank envisioned scientific philosophy as a project diffused among – and thus helping to connect – existing areas of science, philosophy, and humanities and also as a project capable of engaging and influencing public debates about science and values in science and society. Tensions between these different styles of leadership in philosophy of science are evident in Frank's and Feigl's correspondence at the time (Reisch 2005).

The cold war years of the 1950s were more favorable to a professionalism such as Feigl's than to interdisciplinary projects like Frank's. Those projects that reached back to the early Vienna Circle's efforts to reign in the metaphysical excesses of traditional philosophy and to promote science and scientific thinking as part of a broadly modern and socialist approach to life and society were too political for the anti-communist atmosphere on most campuses in the 1950s and 60s. While Feigl's Minnesota Center grew in influence, Frank's Institute declined. Rumors about Frank's interests in Soviet philosophy and politics circulated in the profession, and by 1952 he was investigated by the FBI as a possible subversive. After Frank's death in 1966, Feigl succeeded him as President of the Institute for the Unity of Science in 1967, which was soon dissolved in 1970 and absorbed into the Philosophy of Science Association. Feigl retired from his philosophy position and from the directorship of the Minnesota Center in 1971. He died on 1 June 1988 in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

In his retirement, Feigl continued to publish essays concerning physicalism and the mind–body problem and published a collection of his essays in 1980. This collection reflects Feigl's body of research divided mainly among four problem areas: induction and probability, realism, empiricism, and the mind–body problem. Feigl is perhaps best remembered for the last two areas. In the debates surrounding empiricism in the 1950s and 1960s, he defended a logical empiricist model of scientific theory as an axiomatic system and built upon some workable distinction between statements true by virtue of meaning (or analytically true) and those whose truth depends on empirical circumstances (synthetic truths). Feigl thus retained, against influential protests from Quine (1951), an analytic-synthetic distinction. Feigl also retained, against the counsel of Carl HEMPEL (1950), the viability of a criterion of empirical meaningfulness.

Feigl's work on the mind–body problem featured an identification of mind with brain, albeit one that took inspiration from better-known identities within scientific theory, such as thermal temperature and specification of the average kinetic energy of molecules in a gas (1958). In the influential 1963 volume *The Philosophy of Rudolf Carnap*, Feigl and Carnap further articulated the parameters of mind–body identity theory and different versions of the thesis of physicalism and the reducibility of mental phenomena to physical phenomena that continue to organize debate and research in philosophy of psychology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Logical Positivism: A New Movement in European Philosophy," with Albert Blumberg, *Journal of Philosophy* 28 (1931): 281–96.

"The 'Mental' and the 'Physical'," *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science* 2 (1958): 370–497.

"Empiricism at Bay?" in *Methodological and Historical Essays in the Natural and Social Sciences, Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, vol. 14, ed. Robert S. Cohen and Marx W. Wartofsky (Dordrecht, 1974), pp. 1–20.

"No Pot of Message," in *Mid-twentieth Century Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. Peter A. Bertocci (New York, 1974), pp. 120–39.

Inquiries and Provocations: *Selected Writings, 1929–1974*, ed. Robert S. Cohen (Dordecht, 1980).

Other Relevant Works

Feigl's papers are at the University of Minnesota and in the Archives of Scientific Philosophy at the University of Pittsburgh.

Ed. with Wilfrid Sellars, *Readings in Philosophical Analysis* (New York, 1949).

Ed. with May Brodbeck, *Readings in the Philosophy of Science* (New York, 1953).

Ed. with Grover Maxwell, *Current Issues in the Philosophy of Science* (New York, 1959).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Pres Addr of APA v7*, *Proc of APA v62*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Hempel, Carl. "Problems and Changes in the Empiricist Criterion of Meaning," *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 11 (1950): 41–63.

Quine, W. V. "Two Dogmas of Empiricism," *Philosophical Review* 60 (1951): 20–43.

Reisch, George. *How the Cold War Transformed Philosophy of Science* (Cambridge, UK, 2005).

Savage, Wade. "Herbert Feigl: 1902–1988," *Proceedings of the 1988 Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association*, vol. 2 (East Lansing, Mich., 1988), pp. 15–22.

Sturma, Dieter. "Reductionism in Exile? Herbert Feigl's Identity Theory and the Mind–Body Problem," *Grazer Philosophische Studien* 54 (1998): 71–87.

George A. Reisch

FEINBERG, Joel (1926–2004)

Joel Feinberg was born on 19 October 1926 in Detroit, Michigan. He graduated from high school in 1944, briefly attended the University of Illinois and then joined the army, where he served in an officer training program in Chicago. At the end of World War II, he left the army in 1946 and went on to earn three degrees in philosophy from the University of Michigan: a BA in 1949, an MA in 1951, and a PhD in 1957. In 1955 he began teaching at Brown University as an assistant professor of philosophy. Feinberg moved to Princeton University in 1957 as associate professor of philosophy, teaching there until 1966. In 1960–61 he was a fellow of the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences in California. He also spent one year as a liberal arts fellow at Harvard University Law School in 1963–4. Feinberg left Princeton in 1966 and taught at the University of California at Los Angeles before he was appointed professor of philosophy at Rockefeller University from 1967 to 1977. In 1975–6 he was the Walter E. Meyer Visiting Professor, New York University School of Law. Feinberg joined the University of Arizona in 1978 as professor of philosophy and law. In 1981–2 Feinberg served as President of the American Philosophical Association Pacific Division. He was named Regents, Professor of Philosophy at Arizona in 1988 and held that position until retiring in 1994. Feinberg died on 29 March 2004 in Tucson, Arizona.

Feinberg engaged in an extended philosophical inquiry that continued for four decades. This scholarship applies rigorous analytic method to conceptual and normative questions arising in the philosophy of law as well as in the broader range of moral philosophy. Most of the central works in this evolving body of scholarship are collected in eight volumes. Four of these eight volumes contain collections of essays published during each of the four decades of the extended inquiry. The other four volumes comprise the highly integrated analysis that constitutes *The Moral Limits of the Criminal Law* (1984–8).

Doing and Deserving (1970) contains a series of essays originally published during the first decade of Feinberg's career. These essays emphasize the application of the analytic method to a series of problematic concepts that are central to law and to morality. These include, for example, desert, responsibility, justice, punishment, and causation. These chapters provide penetrating conceptual analyses and normative arguments that clarify the meaning and legitimate functions of these concepts in law. Some chapters in this volume draw attention to the relationship between the legal applications of these morally relevant concepts and the corresponding moral appli-

cations to non-legal individual lives and relationships. These essays advance our understanding of the significance of these concepts and related principles for the extra-legal moral lives of individuals and of communities.

Rights, Justice, and the Bounds of Liberty (1980) continues the application of analytic method to questions arising in legal and moral philosophy. Its emphasis shifts from explicitly legal concepts and applications to the concepts and principles of political philosophy that provide the normative foundation for legal institutions. One chapter addresses, for example, the idea of a free person as one who possesses independent standing in a society and as one who manifests certain virtues of character. Other essays examine the meaning and significance of central concepts of political philosophy including liberty, harm, duty, rights, and justice. Some of these chapters critically examine the application of these concepts to difficult moral and legal questions such as those addressing euthanasia, abortion, and the attribution of rights to animals or to unborn generations. Others address the defensible relationship between the individual and the state by exploring purported justifications for the state exercise of coercive force through criminal punishment. Collectively, these essays contribute to a developing conceptual and moral foundation for legal institutions that embody liberal principles of political morality.

Freedom and Fulfillment (1992) continues this process of integrating philosophy of law with political philosophy. As compared to those written in the previous decade, however, the essays in this volume reveal a greater emphasis on the application of conceptual analysis and moral argument to specific legal institutions and practices. The explicit emphasis shifts from clarifying the central principles of political philosophy to articulating the form and boundaries of legal institutions consistent with these principles. Some chapters carry over projects begun in the prior decade by applying the previous analyses of general concepts and principles to more specific legal

issues and institutions. The essay addressing wrongful life, for example, applies the conceptual analysis of harm and the liberal harm principle to the evaluation of various types of civil or criminal liability for prenatal harming. Similarly, a three-chapter sequence confronts a series of analytic and normative challenges to the recognition of moral rights, and the final essay in this sequence applies a conception of moral rights to the process of constitutional interpretation.

Other chapters apply the liberal harm principle to legal doctrines that raise difficult questions regarding the interpretation and application of that principle. These include, for example, legal doctrines that place limits on freedom of expression or establish a legal duty to rescue. Two essays examine a series of arguments that have been advanced as justifications for the legal prohibition of voluntary euthanasia. These chapters also pursue a more general project, however, in that they provide a critical analysis of the reasoning that purports to justify reliance upon categorical rules rather than evaluating the merits of each case because these rules are expected to provide an institutional means to avoiding more severe or frequent errors.

The essays in this collection reveal a pattern of reciprocal enrichment between legal and political philosophy. Careful analysis of concepts and arguments from political philosophy is brought to bear on questions regarding the most defensible formulation and application of legal institutions. In a complimentary fashion, addressing difficult legal applications of underlying principles of political morality promotes more precise formulation and defense of those principles. The final two chapters of this volume depart from this pattern, however, in that they redirect attention away from legal and political philosophy and toward the meaning of individual human lives. These essays address the significance of the absurd in the struggle to understand the meaning of a human life from the perspective of the individual human being who defines

and pursues that life. These chapters remind the reader that legal institutions and philosophical analysis draw their significance from the role they can play in the human lives of those who pursue them and are affected by them.

Problems at the Roots of Law (2003) continues the extended integration of legal and political philosophy contained in the first three volumes. Some of these essays provide conceptual analysis of abstract concepts of political philosophy, including moral rights and intrinsic value. Other chapters reflect the shift in emphasis toward the perspective of the individual suggested in the last two chapters in *Freedom and Fulfillment*. One essay, for example, addresses the ongoing debate regarding natural law and positivism by directing attention toward the obligations of judges and jurors who must discharge their responsibilities in the context of the German experience of Nazism or of the American experience of slavery. Similarly, chapter six presents an extended analysis of evil, including literary and philosophical conceptions of evil. This analysis addresses evil as a property of crimes and as a property of the evil-doer's character. It includes discussion of certain crimes and criminals that apparently blur the distinction between "mad" and "bad" in that they tend to elicit judgments that they are both wicked and "sick."

Other essays examine problematic aspects of the law of criminal attempts and of entrapment in a manner that addresses ongoing debate regarding the most defensible formulation and justification for provisions of these types. These chapters advance our understanding of these ongoing doctrinal questions, but they also draw attention to the interpretations of criminal responsibility revealed by these doctrines. They include discussion of the relationship between circumstances and individual dispositions contemplated by the law of entrapment as well as exploration of the defensible measure of criminal culpability revealed by sentencing practices associated with the law

of attempt. Thus, these essays focus attention on the complex interaction among legal institutions, the principles of political philosophy underlying these institutions, and the moral lives of the individuals who participate in them.

Collectively, these four volumes represent an emerging approach to legal and moral philosophy that applies the analytic method to enhance our understanding of morally defensible legal institutions, the underlying principles of political philosophy, and the meaning and experience of individual human lives. Two characteristics permeate this developing body of work. First, this scholarship examines philosophical questions relevant to law in a manner that accurately represents and clarifies the legal rules, principles, and institutions at issue and simultaneously informs the broader questions of political and individual morality raised by these legal practices. Thus, it addresses important moral questions arising in the individual, collective, and institutional strands of human life, and it clarifies the relationships among these strands. Second, it applies rigorous analytic method while maintaining unusual sensitivity to the personal experience of individual human lives and of human relationships. Thus, it maintains penetrating analytic rigor without sacrificing cogent relevance to the human experience. The four volumes that comprise *The Moral Limits of the Criminal Law* provide an exemplar of scholarship manifesting these characteristics.

The Moral Limits of the Criminal Law consists of *Harm to Others* (1984), *Offense to Others* (1985), *Harm to Self* (1986), and *Harmless Wrongdoing* (1988). These four volumes contain an extensive analysis of the legitimate bases for the state's exercise of coercive force against the individual through criminal prohibition and punishment. Feinberg advances a moderate version of the classic liberal thesis that justifies criminal prohibition and punishment of conduct that causes or threatens harm or serious offense to others. He rejects as unjustifiable criminal prohibition or punishment of individual conduct that causes

only minor offense to others or harm to self. He also rejects the state's authority to criminally prohibit or punish harmless wrongdoing, understood as immoral conduct that does not cause harm or serious offense to others.

The argument contained in these four volumes presents an extended philosophical analysis that integrates the individual, political, and legal components of the comprehensive moral experience. It is useful to think of this analysis as progressing through successive two-volume stages. *Harm to Others* and *Offense to Others* present the positive thesis in that they articulate and defend the argument for the legitimacy of criminal prohibition and punishment by the state of conduct that harms or causes wrongful offense to others. *Harm to Self* and *Harmless Wrongdoing* then confront and reject paternalism and legal moralism as two credible challenges to the liberal thesis advanced in the first two volumes.

Harm to Others exemplifies the precise, subtle application of conceptual analysis that characterizes Feinberg's scholarship. This volume distinguishes various senses of harm and limits the harm principle to those harms that constitute wrongful setbacks to interests. In clarifying the most defensible interpretation of harm for the purpose of the harm principle, this volume confronts borderline cases that present difficult questions regarding the defensible boundaries between individual liberty and justifiable state coercion through the application of the criminal law. These include, for example, questions regarding the possibilities that persons can be harmed by their own death or by events that occur after their death. The discussion of these difficult questions exemplifies the integration of conceptual and normative analysis that permeates the entire work.

Offense to Others provides the second part of the positive liberal thesis in that it articulates and defends a conception of wrongful offenses that justifies state prohibition and punishment through the criminal law. This volume also represents a transition to the negative part of the argument contained in the third and fourth volumes, however, in that it rejects a broad interpretation of the offense principle that threatens to undermine any substantial constraints on the state's authority to criminalize and punish. The two chapters that discuss various bases for the application of the criminal law to pornography, for example, carefully differentiate arguments for the criminal prohibition of pornography based on the harm, offense, paternalistic, and moralistic principles. These chapters demonstrate the reciprocal pattern of analysis revealed in much of Feinberg's scholarship in that they provide careful examination of law that clarifies and defends the broader normative framework contained in *The Moral Limits of the Criminal Law*, and they make use of that analysis to advocate a defensible position regarding the legal response to pornography.

Harm to Self shifts the emphasis from the defense of the positive thesis to the rejection of the paternalistic justification for criminal prohibition and punishment. It also draws attention to more general questions about the defensible relationship between the individual and the state. The core of this volume involves a precise analysis of individual autonomy with particular attention to autonomy as personal sovereignty. This conceptual analysis provides the foundation for inquiry into the limits of state authority to exercise coercive force through the criminal law. Thus, it integrates the individual and institutional domains of moral philosophy. It applies this integrated analysis to some particularly troubling questions for the liberal thesis, such as those involving slavery contracts and voluntary euthanasia.

Harmless Wrongdoing completes the negative component of the argument in that it rejects legal moralism as a challenge to the liberal position. It also continues the integration of the individual and institutional domains of moral philosophy in that the argument for the rejection of legal moralism does not purport to establish a boundary between law and morality. Rather, it recognizes that the criminal process constitutes a "great moral

machine" (1988, p. 155) that enforces criminal prohibition through the application of punishment with the expression of condemnation inherent in punishment. As presented here, the liberal position does not separate law and morality. Rather, it defines public and non-public domains of morality and limits the legitimate jurisdiction of the criminal law to the public domain. This interpretation recognizes that complete human lives extend across the individual and institutional domains, and it seeks to preserve the significance of each while allowing the integration of the two. Thus, it reflects the central characteristics of Feinberg's extended body of scholarship in that it represents a rigorous yet sensitive approach to the study of ethics as characterized by Socrates as "no small matter, but how we ought to live."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Doing and Deserving: Essays in the Theory of Responsibility (Princeton, N.J., 1970).
Social Philosophy (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1973).
Rights, Justice, and the Bounds of Liberty: Essays in Social Philosophy (Princeton, N.J., 1980).
The Moral Limits of the Criminal Law: *Harm to Others* (Oxford, 1984).
The Moral Limits of the Criminal Law: *Offense to Others* (Oxford, 1985).
The Moral Limits of the Criminal Law: *Harm to Self* (Oxford, 1986).
The Moral Limits of the Criminal Law: *Harmless Wrongdoing* (Oxford,1988).
Freedom and Fulfillment: Philosophical Essays (Princeton, N.J., 1992).
Problems at the Roots of Law: Essays in Political and Legal Theory (Oxford, 2003).

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *Moral Concepts* (Oxford, 1969).
Ed., *The Problem of Abortion* (Belmont, Cal., 1973; 3rd edn 1997).
Ed., with Hyman Gross, *Philosophy of Law* (Encino, Cal., 1975; 7th edn 2003).

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v9*
Coleman, Jules L. and Allen Buchanan, eds. *In Harm's Way: Essays in Honor of Joel Feinberg* (New York, 1994). Contains a bibliography of Feinberg's writings.
Martin, Rex. "The Development of Feinberg's Conception of Rights," *Journal of Value Inquiry* 16 (1982): 29–45.

Robert F. Schopp

FERM, Vergilius Ture Anselm (1896–1974)

Vergilius Ferm was born on 6 January 1896 in Sioux City, Iowa. His parents, Olof Wilhelm Ferm and Augusta Mathilda Slattengren, had emigrated separately, he by himself and she with her kin, to the United States from the provinces of Nerike and Småland in Sweden, respectively. After the death of his father, who was a minister of the Lutheran Church's Swedish Augustana Synod, the family moved to Chicago, where Vergilius graduated from Lake View High School in 1913. He earned the BA (1916) and BD (1919) degrees from Augustana College and Seminary in Rock Island, Illinois. During this period, he learned to play the trumpet and the piano, enjoying his skill at improvisational jazz. During a Lutheran pastorate in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, he studied with G. T. W. PATRICK and Edwin STARBUCK at the University of Iowa, where he discovered his "calling" to philosophy, religious inquiry, and teaching, though he continued preaching throughout his life. Supporting his family by pastorates at Ansonia and West Haven, Connecticut, he received the MA (1923) and PhD (1925) in philosophy from Yale University, the latter under his mentor and advisor Douglas Clyde MACINTOSH, whom he

described as "one of my best professors without the embroidery of an outgoing personality" (1971, p. 108).

In 1926–7 Ferm taught at Albright College in Reading, Pennsylvania. His career in teaching, however, was spent almost entirely at the College of Wooster in Ohio, where he was associate professor of philosophy (1927–8), professor of philosophy (1928–38), and then Compton Professor of Philosophy and head of the department (1938–64). Many yearlong sabbatical leaves were spent at the family's beloved summer home at Mercer Lake, Wisconsin, where he studied, corresponded, and wrote and edited books (thirty in all). After his retirement in 1964, Ferm was a visiting professor at Sweet Briar College (1964–5), Heidelberg College (1966), Wake Forest University (1965–8), where he was also acting chair of the philosophy department, and Ashland College (1968–72).

Of Ferm, W. E. Garrison wrote, "there is no more competent man to [update the churches] than Vergilius Ferm, who besides being the author of thoughtful books of his own, is an experienced editor of symposiums and encyclopedias …" (Garrison 1953, p. 448). Ferm's *Memoirs of a College Professor* (1971) reviewed his career as an editor, his voluminous correspondence with prominent world authorities, his theological views, the "shenanigans" of college officialdom, and his "bad boy" status in ecclesiastical and theological circles. He described his impressions of the latter in his presidential address in 1945 to the American Theological Society Eastern Division titled "Oceanic Christianity." *Philosophy Beyond the Classroom* (1974) brought together seventeen sermons and twenty-two published articles and addresses. These books, along with *First Chapters in Religious Philosophy* (1937), *What Can We Believe?* (1948), and *Toward An Expansive Christian Theology* (1964), provide access to Ferm's constructive theistic naturalism, his careful attention to theological method as an aspect of philosophy, and his belief in the everlasting spiritual life of persons. His wide contact with those of other faiths enabled him to write presciently, "We in our time, are faced to exchange experiences with other religions of whatsoever the name and capitulate on the long-standing platform that religious truths are the copyrights of only one religion – there being a Divinity that casts its influence among all the sons of men." (1971, p. 171)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Crisis in American Lutheran Theology (New York, 1927).

First Adventures in Philosophy (New York, 1936).

First Chapters in Religious Philosophy (New York and London, 1937).

"Theology and Religious Experience," in *The Nature of Religious Experience*, ed. Julius Bixler, Robert Calhoun, and H. Richard Niebuhr (New York, 1937).

What Can We Believe? (New York, 1948).

Toward An Expansive Christian Theology (New York, 1964).

Cross-Currents in the Personality of Martin Luther: A Study in the Psychology of Religious Genius (North Quincy, Mass., 1972).

Philosophy Beyond the Classroom (North Quincy, Mass., 1974).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *What Is Lutheranism? A Symposium in Interpretation* (New York, 1930).

Ed., *Contemporary American Theology: Theological Autobiographies*, 2 vols (New York, 1932–3).

Ed., *Religion in Transition* (London, 1937).

Ed., *An Encyclopedia of Religion* (New York, 1945).

Ed., *Religion in the Twentieth Century* (New York, 1948).

Ed., *A History of Philosophical Systems* (New York, 1950).

Ed., *Forgotten Religions: Including Some Primitive Living Religions* (New York, 1950).

Ed., *The American Church of the Protestant*

Heritage (New York, 1953).

Ed., *The Protestant Credo* (New York, 1953).

Their Day Was Yesterday (New York, 1954).

Ed., *An Encyclopedia of Morals* (New York, 1956).

Inside Ivy Walls: Observations from a College Professor's Notebook (New York, 1964).

Memoirs of a College Professor: Telling It Like It Was (North Quincy, Mass., 1971).

Further Reading

Proc of APA v48, Who Was Who in Amer v6, Who's Who in Phil

Garrison, W. E. "Bird's Eye View," *Christian Century* 70 (1953): 448–9.

Edgar A. Towne

FERRATER MORA, José María (1912–91)

José (or Josep) Ferrater Mora was the most important Catalan philosopher since Ramon Llull in the thirteenth century. He was born on 30 October 1912 in Barcelona, Spain. Along with José Ortega y Gasset, Miguel de Unamuno, Xavier Zubiri, and George SANTAYANA, Ferrater was one of the most influential Spanish philosophers of the twentieth century. He achieved success not only in all areas of philosophy, especially symbolic logic, speculative thinking, philosophy of language, and history of philosophy, but also as a journalist, encyclopedist, photographer, film maker, novelist, short story writer, social critic, and litterateur. He was a familiar television and newspaper personality throughout the Spanish-speaking world, much more a household name there than any American philosopher has ever been in the English-speaking world.

After secondary education at the Colegio de Santa Maria del Collell, Ferrater supported himself with odd jobs then entered the University of Barcelona, receiving his BA in 1932 and his Licenciado en Filosofía in 1936. He enlisted in the Loyalist army for the Spanish Civil War, served as an intelligence clerk, and escaped across the Pyrenees in 1939. During his exile he lived three months in Paris, then from 1939 to 1941 in Havana, Cuba, and from 1941 to 1947 in Santiago, Chile, where he was Professor of Philosophy at the University of Chile.

A Guggenheim Fellowship from 1947 to 1949 brought Ferrater to the United States, where he lived in New York City, Princeton, and Baltimore. Bryn Mawr College hired him to teach both philosophy and Spanish literature in 1949, and promoted him to associate professor of philosophy in 1951, professor of philosophy in 1955, and Fairbank Professor in the Humanities in 1974. He retired in 1981. A naturalized American citizen since 1960, he lived in southeastern Pennsylvania the rest of his life, but traveled widely. He died on 30 January 1991 while visiting Barcelona, Spain.

Always modest, gracious, charming, and sophisticated, Ferrater was a popular teacher, careful thinker, attentive listener, and witty conversationalist. His subtle humor was legendary. His graduate students at Bryn Mawr considered him nearly omniscient. At the first session of his graduate seminar on Immanuel Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*, Ferrater would take the class to Canaday Library and, without notes, expound upon every monograph in the secondary literature on Kant that could be found on those shelves. Paul EDWARDS's *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (1967) and Robert AUDI's *Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy* (1995) are valuable reference works, but what Edwards and Audi accomplished as editors with all-star teams of scholars, Ferrater accomplished single-handedly as author. His *Diccionario de filosofia* first appeared in 1941 and went through six editions during his lifetime. Abridged versions have been translated into English and several other languages.

Although Ferrater wrote hundreds of articles, he confined his speculative writing mostly to books because he believed that the purpose of articles, being too short to support examining nuances in sufficient depth and interrelation, is to convey facts. He judged that only five of his works were essential to understand his thought: *El ser y la muerte* (Being and Death, 1962); *El ser y el sentido* (Being and Meaning, 1967), revised and retitled as *Fundamentos de filosofía* (Fundamentals of Philosophy); *Cambio de marcha en filosofía* (Shifting Gears in Philosophy, 1974); *Indagaciones sobre el lenguaje* (Investigations on Language, 1970); and *El hombre en la encrucijada* (Man at the Crossroads, 1952), revised and retitled as *Las crisis humanas* (Human Crises).

Ferrater called his philosophy "integrationism." It is neither a system nor an ideology, but a method of overcoming dualisms and disagreements through philosophical comprehension of the opposing positions and with a healthy dose of irony. It is universally critical, even self-critical, self-sustaining, and almost dogmatically non-systematic. Ferrater's absolute rejection of dogmatism was the closest that he ever came to either absolutism or dogmatism. This rejection does not make integrationism an unprincipled relativism; rather, it is grounded in the fundamental belief that every careful thinker has something important to say and is worth an honest hearing. Above all, integrationism is characterized by its openness, tolerance, and synthesizing potential. Given Aristotle's veneration of the middle way, Ferrater's thought might be described as an ironic Aristotelianism.

Integrationism involves an ontology for which the problem of death is central. Death means that all thought is transitory and must constantly be revised as thinkers come and go. Moreover, following Martin Heidegger, Ferrater asserts that death is the defining element of a life and the most intensely private experience. Thus all thought is colored by the fact of each thinker's mortality, and at the same time hidden from others by the particularity of that experience. Despite this and several other debts to Heidegger, integrationism is not a form of existentialism, since, if it were, it would be just one doctrine among others. Integrationism intends to be overarching, beyond and comprising all doctrines. If this sounds like Hegelianism, then one need only remember that G. W. F. Hegel tried to accomplish systematically what Ferrater tried to accomplish non-systematically, namely, the dynamic unity of all thought.

Ferrater enjoyed speculating on the future of philosophy. Citing the provocative nature of their thought, the extensiveness of their perception, and especially the open-endedness of their inquiry, Ferrater predicted in the 1980s that the twentieth-century philosophers who would most likely still be read one hundred years hence were Heidegger and Ludwig Wittgenstein. While Ferrater's appreciation of Heidegger is evident throughout his works, his admiration for Wittgenstein is best demonstrated in his article, "Wittgenstein: A Symbol of Troubled Times," in *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* (1953).

Beginning with films in 1967, short stories in 1979, and novels in 1982, Ferrater often expressed his philosophy as fiction. He claimed that these works were just non-philosophical tales, yet they are much deeper than that. He published five novels and a collection of short stories and made dozens of films. Three of his novels are set in the fictional island of Corona off the east coast of the United States. Several of his short stories evolved from his films. Five of his films were original stories that used Bryn Mawr and Haverford students and faculty, including himself, as actors. *Everydayness* (1970) took its cue from Heidegger's concept of *Alltäglichkeit* and won an award in 1973 at the International Film Festival in Rochester, New York. *The Heartache and the Thousand Natural Shocks* (1978), arguably his best film, explored the tension between love and academia. Other titles include *A Hero of Our Time* (1969), *Back to the Firing Squad* (1971), and *The Call* (1973). Playing a cameo role in

one of these films, Ferrater found himself sitting under a sign that read, "Positively No Smoking," to which he replied as he lit up, "Negatively, some smoking."

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Cóctel de verdad (Madrid, 1935).
Diccionario de filosofia (México City, 1941; 7th edn, Barcelona, 1994).
Unamuno: Bosquejo de una filosofía (Buenos Aires, 1944).
Cuatro visiones de la historia universal (Buenos Aires, 1945).
La ironía, la muerte y la admiración (Santiago, Chile, 1946).
El sentido de la muerte (Buenos Aires, 1947).
Helenismo y Cristianismo (Santiago, Chile, 1949).
El hombre en la encrucijada (Buenos Aires, 1952).
Lógica matemática, with Hugues Leblanc (Mexico City, 1955)
Ortega y Gasset: An Outline of His Philosophy (London, 1956).
Man at the Crossroads (Boston, 1957).
La filosofía en el mundo de hoy (Madrid, 1959).
Philosophy Today: Conflicting Tendencies in Contemporary Thought (New York, 1960).
The Idea of Man: An Outline of Philosophical Anthropology (Lawrence, Kan., 1961).
On Miguel de Unamuno's Idea of Reality (Groningen, 1961).
El ser y la muerte: Bosquejo de filosofía integracionista (Madrid, 1962).
Unamuno: A Philosophy of Tragedy (Berkeley, Cal., 1962).
Being and Death: An Outline of Integrationist Philosophy (Berkeley, Cal., 1965).
El ser y el sentido (Madrid, 1967).
La filosofía actual (Madrid, 1969).
Indagaciones sobre el lenguaje (Madrid, 1970).
Las palabras y los hombres (Barcelona, 1971).
Las crisis humanas (Estella, 1972).
Cambio de marcha en filosofía (Madrid, 1974).
Cine sin filosofías (Madrid, 1974).
De la materia a la razón (Madrid, 1979).
Ética aplicada: Del aborto a la violencia, with Priscilla Cohn (Madrid, 1981).
El mundo del escritor (Barcelona, 1983).
Modos de hacer filosofía (Barcelona, 1985).
Voltaire en Nueva York (Madrid, 1985).
Hecho en Corona (Madrid, 1986).
Ventana al mundo (Barcelona, 1986).
El juego de la verdad (Barcelona, 1988).
Regreso del infierno (Barcelona, 1989).

Other Relevant Works
Ferrater Mora's papers are at the University of Girona, Spain.
"Wittgenstein: A Symbol of Troubled Times," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 14 (1953): 89–96.

Further Reading
Oxford Comp Phil, *Proc of APA v64*
Cohn, Priscilla, ed. *Transparencies: Philosophical Essays in Honor of José Ferrater Mora* (Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1981). Contains a bibliography of Ferrater Mora's writings.
Giner, Salvador, and Esperanza Guisán, eds. *José Ferrater Mora: el hombre y su obra* (Santiago, Chile, 1994).
Nieto, Carlos. *La filosofía en la encrucijada: perfiles del pensamiento de José Ferrater Mora* (Barcelona, 1985).
Terricabras, Josep-Maria. "Josep Ferrater Mora: An Integrationist Philosopher," *Man and World* 26 (1993): 209–18.
Terricabras, Josep-Maria, ed. *Three Spanish Philosophers: Unamuno, Ortega, Ferrater Mora* (Albany, N.Y., 2003).

Eric v. d. Luft

FERRÉ, Frederick Pond (1933–)

Frederick Ferré was born on 23 March 1933 in Boston, Massachusetts, to Nels F. S. Ferré and Katharine Pond Ferré. He grew up in Newton, Massachusetts where his father was professor of Christian theology at Andover-Newton Theological Seminary. He attended Oberlin College in 1950–51 and then went to Boston University where he received his BA in history summa cum laude in 1954. He received an MA in philosophy of history from Vanderbilt University in 1955, and did theological studies in 1955–6 at Vanderbilt University Divinity School. He then received a Fulbright Fellowship for 1956–8 for further graduate study in Scotland. He earned his PhD in philosophy in 1959 from the University of St. Andrews, writing a dissertation on "The Linguistic Feasibility of Theistic Proofs in British Discussion 1945–1955."

In 1958–9 Ferré was visiting assistant professor of philosophy at Vanderbilt University. From 1959 to 1962, he was assistant professor of religion at Mount Holyoke College in Massachusetts. In 1962 he became associate professor of philosophy at Dickinson College in Pennsylvania, was promoted to full professor in 1967, and held the title of Charles A. Dana Professor of Philosophy at Dickinson from 1970 to 1980. From 1980 until retiring in 1998, Ferré was professor of philosophy at the University of Georgia. He served as head of the department of philosophy and religion from 1980 to 1984 (taking over leadership in the aftermath of William T. BLACKSTONE's death in 1977), and then was head of the newly independent philosophy department from 1984 to 1988. Ferré was also the chair of the faculty of environmental ethics from 1984 to 1991. He was active in the American Association of University Professors and served on its National Council from 1973 to 1976. He was President of the American Theological Society in 1976–7, President of the Society for Philosophy of Religion in 1985–6, and President of the Metaphysical Society of America in 2003–4.

Ferré combines his concerns for personalism, religion, and environmental ethics through what he calls the "postmodern science of ecology." Unlike the reductionist and mechanist values of modern science's world model, ecology emphasizes the natural features of interrelatedness and purposiveness necessary for explanations of life. Philosophy of science and technology must follow the lead of ecological thinking, as Ferré has explored in many writings. Religion must likewise follow the postmodern path of scientific knowledge to satisfy the intellect, and there is no necessary conflict between much of Christian doctrine, including the Trinity, and the new science. However, Ferré admits that while anthropomorphic conceptions of God should not be eliminated, it may be that the divine is not theistic.

Like his philosophy professor at Boston, personalist Peter BERTOCCI, Ferré has sought a community-oriented type of personalism that would overcome the human-centered view of value. He has appealed to the process philosophy of A. N. WHITEHEAD for inspiration, to formulate a "personalistic organicism" that offers a non-reductive and pluralistic naturalism that explains the emergence and preservation of consciousness. This personalistic organicism would overcome value subjectivism by placing partial responsibility for objective value on environing conditions. Ferré proposes to overcome the divide between intrinsic value and instrumental value by taking the wider ecological perspective of all of life's evolving and growing interdependent values. Placing supreme value in neither human persons alone (resulting in environmental devastation), nor in the environment as a whole (excessively devaluing human ends), Ferré overcomes such dichotomies by emphasizing each organism's pursuit of value in harmony with all others. From this wider, more inclusive cosmological perspective, Ferré suggests that metaphysics returns to its axiological roots by using ecological categories of creativity, homeostasis, and holism. These categories in turn suggest a

supreme aesthetic perspective. This organismic cosmology, he suggests, therefore should be labeled "kalogenic" (beauty-creating).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Language, Logic, and God (New York, 1961).

Exploring the Logic of Faith: A Dialogue on the Relation of Modern Philosophy to Christian Faith, with Kent Bendall (New York, 1962).

Basic Modern Philosophy of Religion (New York, 1967; London, 1968).

Shaping the Future: Resources for the Post-Modern World (New York, 1976).

Philosophy of Technology (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1988; 2nd edn, Athens, Georgia, 1995).

Hellfire and Lightning Rods: Liberating Science, Technology and Religion (Maryknoll, N.Y., 1993).

Being and Value: Toward a Constructive Postmodern Metaphysics (Albany, N.Y., 1996).

Knowing and Value: Toward a Constructive Postmodern Epistemology (Albany, N.Y., 1998).

Living and Value: Toward a Constructive Postmodern Ethics (Albany, N.Y., 2001).

Other Relevant Works

"The Definition of Religion," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 38 (1970): 3–16.

"Toward Transformational Theology: A Dialogue with My Father," *Religion in Life* 47 (1978): 6–22.

"Brand Blanshard on Reason and Religious Belief," in *The Philosophy of Brand Blanshard*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (La Salle, Ill., 1980), pp. 908–43.

"Science, Religion and Experience," in *Experience, Reason and God*, ed. Eugene Long (Washington, D.C., 1980), pp. 97–111.

Ed. with Joseph Kockelmans and John E. Smith, *The Challenge of Religion Today* (New York, 1982).

Ed. with Rita Mataragnon, *God and Global Justice* (New York, 1985).

"Moderation, Morals, and Meat," *Inquiry* 29 (1986): 391–406.

"Nels F. S. Ferré on Ultimate Reality and the Meaning of Human Life," *Ultimate Reality and Meaning* 9 (1986): 103–16.

"Theodicy and the Status of Animals," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 23 (1986): 23–34.

Ed. with Carl Mitcham, *Ethics and Technology* (Greenwich, Conn., 1989).

Ed. with Peter Hartel, *Ethics and Environmental Policy: Theory Meets Practice* (Athens, Georgia, 1994).

"Personalistic Organicism: Paradox or Paradigm?" *Philosophy* 36 suppl. (1994): 59–73.

"Value, Time, and Nature," *Environmental Ethics* 17 (1995): 417–31.

"Keeping it Together: Holistic Reflections from a 'Natural Analyst'," in *Religious Experience and Ecological Responsibility*, ed. Donald Crosby and Charley Hardwick (New York, 1996), pp. 3–22.

"Persons in Nature: Toward an Applicable and Unified Environmental Ethics," *Ethics and the Environment* 1 (1996): 15–25.

"Theism and Technology," in *A Companion to Philosophy of Religion*, ed. Philip Quinn and Charles Taliaferro (Oxford, 1997), pp. 442–9.

"Personalism and the Dignity of Nature," in *Personalism Revisited: Its Proponents and Critics*, ed. Thomas O. Buford and Harold H. Oliver (Amsterdam, 2002), pp. 104–22.

"Value Judgments, God, and Ecological Ecumenism," in *Philosophy of Religion for a New Century: Essays in Honor of Eugene Thomas Long*, ed. Jeremiah Hackett and Jerald Wallulis (Dordrecht, 2004), pp. 105–32.

Further Reading

Cheney, Jim. "Naturalizing the Problem of Evil," *Environmental Ethics* 19 (1997): 299–313.

"Reflections on Frederick Ferré's *Living and Value*," *American Journal for Theology and Philosophy* 23 (January 2002). Special issue about Ferré, including his responses.

John R. Shook

FEUER, Louis Samuel (1912–2002)

Lewis Samuel Feuer was a philosopher with interests in Spinoza, the sociology and history of science, and the psychological roots of ideology and ideological conflict. He was born on 7 December 1912 in Manhattan and raised on the Lower East Side of New York City. He was a student of Morris COHEN at City College of New York, where he earned a BS in 1931. He then attended Harvard, where he earned an MA in 1932 and a PhD in philosophy in 1935. After serving in the US Army during World War II, he became an instructor of philosophy at Vassar College in New York in 1946 and was soon promoted up to associate professor. In 1951 he became assistant professor of philosophy and sociology at the University of Vermont, and he taught there until 1957 when he accepted an appointment as professor of philosophy and social science at the University of California at Berkeley. From 1966 to 1976 Feuer was professor of sociology at the University of Toronto, and from 1976 until 1988 he was University Professor of Sociology and Humanities at the University of Virginia. He died on 24 November 2002 in Newton, Massachusetts.

At Berkeley, Feuer made his reputation as a controversial intellectual. Though he supported the early free speech movement and had edited a standard edition of Marxist writings in 1959, he offended many leftists and radicals of the 1960s with his book *The Conflict of Generations* (1969), which analyzed student movements around the world as examples of Freudian and Oedipal rebellions against authority. Feuer's break with the New Left in the 1960s was itself perhaps one instance of a rebellious pattern in his career and anticipated by his own break with the socialism of his youth. Though as late as 1942 he was writing spirited essays about class struggle and ideology in the Marxist journal *Science & Society*, he later followed the ideological trajectory of other former leftist philosophers (such as John DEWEY, Sidney HOOK, and Horace KALLEN) and emphatically rejected philosophical or broadly intellectual views sympathetic to socialism or the Soviet Union.

By the end of the 1950s, however, Feuer was not content with the widespread depoliticization of professional philosophy. In 1959, presaging his growing work as a sociologist and historian of science, he wrote to a sympathetic Kallen: "I find myself rather bored by the verbal exercises which constitute modern academic philosophy. More and more, I find myself writing about problems in the social sciences with a mixture of empirical and philosophical concern." (Feuer to Kallen, 23 March 1959)

In the second half of his career, Feuer's concerns led him to write books about the history of science and scientific creativity and psychoanalysis and ethics. He continued to write about political history and philosophy, but with an explicitly anti-Soviet, anti-socialist emphasis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Spinoza and the Rise of Liberalism (Boston, 1958).

The Scientific Intellectual: *The Psychological and Social Origins of Modern Science* (New York, 1963; 2nd edn 1992).

The Conflict of Generations: *The Character and Significance of Student Movements* (New York, 1969).

Marx and the Intellectuals: A Set of Post-Ideological Essays (Garden City, N.Y., 1969).

Psychoanalysis and Ethics (Westport, Conn., 1970).

Einstein and the Generations of Science (New York, 1974).

Ideology and the Ideologists (New York and Oxford, 1975).

The Case of the Revolutionist's Daughter: Sherlock Holmes Meets Karl Marx (Buffalo, N.Y., 1983).

Imperialism and the Anti-imperialist Mind (Buffalo, N.Y., 1986).

Varieties of Scientific Experience: *Emotive Aims in Scientific Hypotheses* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1995).

Other Relevant Works

Feuer's papers are at Brandeis University in Massachusetts.

Ed., *Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels: Basic Writings on Politics and Philosophy* (New York, 1959).

"Ethics and Historical Materialism," *Science & Society* 6 (1942): 242–72.

"Materialism, Idealism and Science," *Philosophy of Science* 15 (1948): 71–5.

"What is Philosophy of History?" *Journal of Philosophy* 49 (1952): 329–40.

"Political Myths and Metaphysics," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 15 (1955): 332–50.

"Letter from Lewis S. Feuer to Horace Kallen, 23 March, 1959," in the Horace Kallen Papers, quoted courtesy of the Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives, Hebrew Union College, Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, Ohio.

"The Genetic Fallacy Re-examined," in *Sidney Hook: Philosopher of Democracy and Humanism*, ed. Paul W. Kurtz (Buffalo, N.Y., 1983).

Further Reading

Agassi, Joseph. "The Zeitgeist and Professor Feuer," *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 7 (1977): 251–3.

Hook, Sidney, William L. O'Neill, and Roger O'Toole, eds. *Philosophy, History, and Social Action: Essays in Honor of Lewis Feuer* (Dordrecht, 1988). Contains Feuer's autobiography and bibliography of writings.

George Reisch

FEYERABEND, Paul Karl (1924–94)

Paul K. Feyerabend was born on 13 January 1924 in Vienna, Austria, and died on 11 February 1994 in Genolier, near Geneva, Switzerland. As the only child in a middle-class family, he grew up in the aftermath of World War I in Vienna under difficult economic conditions. Feyerabend was an excellent student who loved to read. He had many diverse interests including mathematics, physics, and astronomy, as well as the arts, theater, and music. He learned to play the accordion and the violin, and took singing lessons. He enjoyed opera and fostered a lifelong love for music and theater. In 1942 he was drafted into the labor service, and then into the German army. In an attempt to avoid combat, he volunteered for officer's school. However, he was sent to the Russian front as a sergeant in 1943. In that year his mother committed suicide – an event that haunted him in his later life. In 1944 he was promoted to lieutenant and was put in command of a company of soldiers, and received the Iron Cross for leadership in battle. In January of 1945 he was shot in the spine by a machine gun and was paralyzed from the waist down for the rest of his life, able to walk only with crutches. Because he periodically suffered from intense pain, he took ever-

increasing amounts of painkillers. Decades later many of his lectures were given under the influence of heavy doses of drugs. In his autobiography, he says that the events that happened to him during and before the war always seemed strange, distant, and difficult to recall.

After the war, Feyerabend was able to secure a fellowship (as he had never been a member of the Nazi party) that he used to study theater science and take singing lessons at the Weimar Music Academy. In 1946 he began studying history and sociology at the University of Vienna. He then transferred to mathematics, physics, and astronomy, and eventually earned an MA in astronomy. He also attended philosophy and theology lectures. His general attitude was positivistic: the empirical sciences were the basis of all knowledge, and non-empirical enterprises were either logic or nonsense. As an active participant at both academic and cultural events, he quickly earned the reputation of being wherever interesting things were going on.

In 1948, in what Feyerabend described in his autobiography as the most decisive step of his life, he accepted an invitation to work for the Austrian College Society. As a result he traveled for the first time to the Alpbach Forum where he met Karl Popper (and his first wife Edeltrud). Popper was an immense influence on his intellectual development. In light of the Duhemian argument, appropriated by Popper, that general theories cannot be induced from empirical laws because empirical laws logically contradict general theories, Feyerabend fell for Popper's falsificationism: the scientific method relies on deductive, not inductive, reasoning. Sometime in the mid to late 1960s Feyerabend began to become increasingly critical of Popper and his ideas, to the point where he even eventually published severe professional and sometimes even personal criticisms of him.

In 1949 Feyerabend became the leader of a student philosophy club called the "Kraft Circle" after his PhD supervisor Viktor Kraft, who had been a member of the Vienna Circle. Feyerabend invited Ludwig Wittgenstein to a club meeting. They discussed the reality of the external world – a subject that fascinated and occupied Feyerabend throughout his carrier. In the same year Feyerabend met Bertolt Brecht and was offered the opportunity to become a production assistant. He declined. Later, he described this as one of the greatest mistakes of his life. In 1951 Feyerabend received his PhD in philosophy at Vienna for a thesis on the theory of basic statements. The thesis criticizes the neutral foundation observation reports supposedly play in supporting knowledge according to logical positivism. He then applied and received a British Council scholarship to study under Ludwig Wittgenstein at Cambridge. Wittgenstein died before Feyerabend arrived, so Feyerabend went to the London School of Economics to study under Popper instead. In 1953 Feyerabend declined Popper's offer to become his assistant, and instead returned to Vienna, where he became Arthur Pap's assistant. In 1955 he began teaching philosophy as a lecturer at the University of Bristol. In 1958 Feyerabend began as a guest professor at the University of California at Berkeley, and in 1959 he accepted the offer of a permanent position. He also became a US citizen. Although he had a remarkable number of other visiting teaching positions over the course of his unusually dynamic career (for example at Auckland, Berlin, Brighton, Hamburg, Kassel, London, Yale, and Zurich), he remained a professor of philosophy at Berkeley until he retired in 1990. He then lived in Austria and Switzerland during the remainder of his life.

Feyerabend's intellectual development can be roughly divided into five phases. In the 1950s he worked on Wittgenstein's philosophy and made a name for himself primarily in the philosophy of quantum mechanics. In the 1960s he mainly argued against various aspects of logical empiricism. His most influential idea from this period is the incommensurability thesis, according to which successive scientific theories have no logical relations. Because he often used *ad hominem* arguments, or immanent criticisms, which temporarily adopt

the positions under attack in order to make effective criticisms, his ideas have often been misunderstood. In the 1970s Feyerabend began to challenge the idea of universally valid methodological rules, arguing for "epistemological anarchism." In 1976 Feyerabend began to endorse relativism and address cultural and political issues related to science. In this phase, in a reversal from his earlier views, Feyerabend began to challenge the assumption that scientific knowledge and the culture it supports is superior to other forms of life. In the 1990s Feyerabend retracted his relativist views and his work adopted a humanist tone. Throughout his career, many of his main arguments were aimed at promoting pluralism in the pursuit of knowledge.

In the 1950s, in addition to Popper, Feyerabend was heavily influenced by Niels Bohr and David BOHM. His early work on quantum mechanics, specifically on Bohr's thesis of complementarity, helped to shape his views on man's relationship to the external world. Feyerabend developed a kind of neo-Kantian metaphysical view according to which the world we experience is shaped by the theories that we use to interpret it. He argued that as science advances, we should correct more our primitive ideas that are based on the misleading perspective of "common sense." In particular, Feyerabend argued that the idea of an objective, independent reality should be given up as a metaphysical mistake. In discussions with Bohm, Feyerabend discovered the case of Brownian motion, which he used to illustrate his main argument for pluralism. Feyerabend argued that an investigation of the observational consequences of the phenomenological theory of thermodynamics by itself could not have led to the discovery that Brownian motion refutes the second law of thermodynamics. *Direct* measurements are physically impossible. Instead, measurements based on an alternative theory, statistical thermodynamics, were needed to prove the anomaly. More generally, he argued that some facts exist which cannot be discovered without

developing alternatives to established points of view. Accordingly, Feyerabend rejected both the logical empiricist and Popperian models of theory testing according to which theories are tested against neutral facts. Feyerabend argued for a pluralistic test-model according to which theories compete against each other and the facts as interpreted from some theoretical perspective.

In a 1962 landmark essay, "Explanation, Reduction and Empiricism," Feyerabend introduced the term "incommensurability" which would become the focal point of debates concerning realism and rationality. The term incommensurability was intended to capture an idea that he had been developing for about a decade. The basic idea is that scientific advance is not a steady accumulation of more and more facts, or a steady improvement of existing theories. Instead, scientific advance involves dramatic theoretical breaks in which older theories are *replaced* by new ones. Old "facts" are also reinterpreted according to the new theories. Feyerabend introduced the term "incommensurable concepts" in the context of criticizing Ernest NAGEL's theory of reduction and the HEMPEL-OPPENHEIM theory of explanation. Feyerabend argued that in the course of major theoretical advances, the meanings of the main descriptive terms change, and thus consecutive scientific theories have no logical relations. Exemplifying an often-repeated two-prong argumentative strategy, Feyerabend argued that these theories of reduction and explanation fail as accurate descriptions of actual scientific advance, and they are also undesirable as norms governing scientific practice because if enforced, they would stifle progress.

Feyerabend met Thomas KUHN in Berkeley around 1960. The two worked together closely in 1960 and 1961. Kuhn's influential *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* was also published in 1962, and it introduced the term incommensurability (although with a somewhat different emphasis). The two worked together to help transform the professional phi-

losophy of science from a discipline preoccupied with logic to what is now known as the historical philosophy of science.

Many of Feyerabend's views up until the 1970s share a distinctive characteristic. His pragmatic theory of observation, contextual theory of meaning, and views on realism all invert the standard empiricist creed. Instead of a bottom-up model according to which we begin with common-sense observations and experience and then build up theoretical systems about them, Feyerabend argued for a top-down view according to which our theoretical ideas shape our observations, our concepts, and our interpretation of the nature of the world. Scientific theories do not merely systematize our common-sense views, but also correct them.

Events of the late 1960s had several dramatic effects on Feyerabend's intellectual development. As increasing numbers of minorities attended Berkeley, Feyerabend came to see his assigned role as that of a cultural imperialist teacher whose job it was to spread Western rationality. Consequently, he began to question the supposed superiority of science over other more traditional cultures, and he began to investigate the rise of rationality in ancient Greece. These two themes play out in his major publications in the 1970s and 80s.

In 1975 Feyerabend published *Against Method*. This book propelled his fame far outside of philosophy. The book was originally planned as half of a book, *For and Against Method*, co-authored by his best friend Imré Lakatos. However, in 1974 Lakatos unexpectedly died. Feyerabend's contribution was published by itself. The main thesis of the book (which was developed in a long essay published already in 1970) challenges the traditional idea of the Scientific Method as a set of universally binding methodological rules that delineate how to do science properly. Feyerabend argued that there are no such universal rules in science. Instead, methodological rules have only a limited validity. He claimed that for any possible candidate of a universal methodolog-ical rule, for example avoid ad hoc hypotheses, there exist episodes in the history of science in which the rule was broken *for the sake of progress*. He tried to capture his ideas by developing a position he called "epistemological anarchism" which has been associated with the slogan "Anything goes." For these reasons, he has often been misinterpreted as arguing that science is entirely irrational, and has become widely known as the "anything goes" philosopher. However, "anything goes" was a sarcastic jibe at those keen to save the idea of universally binding methodological rules. If there is such a universal rule in science, then it is that "anything goes."

Although Feyerabend tried to correct many such misinterpretations of his ideas in a series of sometimes scathing responses to reviews, he continues to be perceived as a champion of postmodernist rejections of the notion of rationality. *Against Method* concludes with a brief development of some political consequences of his main thesis. The book provoked extremely mixed reactions. By some it has been dismissed as a terrible book, while by others it is celebrated as one of the best books ever written in the philosophy of science. It was extensively reworked and republished twice in English, and there are also several German editions, which differ significantly both from each other, as well as from the three English editions. Feyerabend called *Against Method* a "collage," more like a personal letter to his friend Imré Lakatos than a proper book.

In 1976 Feyerabend first began explicitly to endorse relativism. In 1978 he published *Science in a Free Society*, which further develops the political consequences of his "epistemological anarchism," and contains several responses to reviews of *Against Method*. This period marks a major transition in his philosophical outlook. In the first half of his career, Feyerabend always assumed the superiority of the empirical sciences in producing knowledge. But now he began to ask, "What's so good about science?" His publications take on an increasing political character, leaving behind

the often more technical and abstract considerations of his earlier career. In 1981 Feyerabend published the first two volumes of his collected papers. In addition to some new material, almost all of the extensive praise and acknowledgments to Popper in the original versions were systematically removed. They were mostly replaced with acknowledgments to Pierre Duhem and John Stuart Mill. In 1984 Feyerabend set out the view that in science, like in art, there is no progress, only change. Feyerabend repeatedly reflected on the arts and their relation to science throughout his career. He even argued that the theater, and not essays, is the better medium to treat philosophical issues. *Farewell to Reason* (1987) collects many of Feyerabend's publications that appeared between 1981 and 1987 in which he repeatedly argues for relativism.

As his career progressed, Feyerabend was increasingly critical of professional philosophy of science, especially its inclination toward abstraction. In 1970 he published a paper entitled "Philosophy of Science: A Subject with a Great Past," pointedly implying that it had no future. At a conference in 1972, Feyerabend delivered a paper entitled "Philosophy of Science – A Thus Far Unknown Form of Insanity?" which argued that professional philosophy of science had completely lost touch with actual scientific practice. By the end of the 1980s Feyerabend contemptuously asked, "Who Needs the Philosophy of Science?" and in the 1990s, in "Concerning an Appeal for Philosophy," he publicly rejected a call for money for education in philosophy, arguing it would be better spent elsewhere.

Feyerabend demonstrated a remarkable ability to adapt to changing interests and attitudes over half a century: the positivism of the 1950s, the historization of the philosophy of science beginning in the early 1960s, the radical student movements in Berkeley in the late 1960s, the relativism boom in the late 1970s and 1980s, and his more compassionate, humanitarian outlook in the 1990s. In *Against Method* Feyerabend argued that to systematic

philosophers, great scientists must appear to be unscrupulous opportunists willing to disregard the rules. This characterization fits Feyerabend himself in many respects. For example, he never set out a single, coherent philosophical theory of his own, but instead practiced the pluralistic approach that he preached. Furthermore, by drawing from his extensive reading, he broke with tradition and brought a wide range of otherwise esoteric subjects, such as the history of witchcraft, voodoo, and the arts, to bear on issues in the philosophy of science.

In 1989 Feyerabend married Grazia Borrini, who was a great inspiration to him. After he retired, Feyerabend attempted a last philosophical book that he had promised Grazia to write. The *Conquest of Abundance* investigates how we create an "objective" reality out of the richness of being. Although the book was never finished, several reworked copies of the first few chapters were compiled and published posthumously together with a collection of pieces he wrote towards the end of his career. In these latter works, Feyerabend retracted his views on relativism and cultural incommensurability arguing that "potentially every culture is all cultures." Instead of viewing cultures as closed units which can only be evaluated on their own standards, Feyerabend argued that they can benefit from interaction, and they can indeed be evaluated from an outside, humanitarian perspective. Before he died in 1994, he finished his autobiography, *Killing Time*, on his deathbed. This poignant tale of an extraordinary life has been an inspiration outside the bounds of academia.

Feyerabend will be remembered as an influential critic of positivism and empiricism, and as a co-founder of the notion of incommensurability. He will continue to be revered as champion of pluralism, who reshaped widely held views on the scientific method, and who argued that scientific progress needs to be protected from dogmatism through the proliferation of a plurality of competing views. His challenges to the objectivity of science continue to be fertile as a founding force for the mounting

postmodernist movement in the philosophy of science and in the newer discipline of science studies. Together with Popper, Kuhn, and Lakatos, he was one of "The Big Four" philosophers of science of the second half of the twentieth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Explanation, Reduction and Empiricism," in *Scientific Explanation, Space and Time*, ed. Herbert Feigl and Grover Maxwell (Minneapolis, 1962), pp. 28–97.

"Problems of Empiricism," in *Beyond the Edge of Certainty: Essays in Contemporary Science and Philosophy*, ed. R. G. Colodny (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1965), pp. 145–260.

"Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge," in *Analysis of Theories and Methods of Physics and Psychology*, ed. M. Radner and S. Winokur (Minneapolis, 1970), pp. 17–130.

Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge (London, 1975; 2nd edn 1988; 3rd edn 1993).

Science in a Free Society (London, 1978).

Realism, Rationalism and Scientific Method. Philosophical Papers Volume 1 (Cambridge, UK, 1981).

Problems of Empiricism: Philosophical Papers Volume 2 (Cambridge, UK, 1981).

Farewell to Reason (London, 1987).

Three Dialogues on Knowledge (Oxford, 1991).

Killing Time: The Autobiography of Paul Feyerabend (Chicago, 1995).

Conquest of Abundance: A Tale of Abstraction versus the Richness of Being, ed. Bert Terpstra (Chicago, 1999).

For and Against Method: Including Lakatos's Lectures on Scientific Method and the Lakatos–Feyerabend Correspondence, ed. Matteo Motterlini (Chicago, 1999).

Knowledge, Science and Relativism. Philosophical Papers Volume 3, ed. J. Preston (Cambridge, UK, 1999). Contains a bibliography of Feyerabend's writings.

Other Relevant Works

Feyerabend's papers are at the University of Konstanz, Germany.

"An Attempt at a Realistic Interpretation of Experience," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 58 (1958): 143–70.

"Complementarity," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume* 32 (1958): 75–104.

"How to be a Good Empiricist: A Plea for Tolerance in Matters Epistemological," in *Philosophy of Science. The Delaware Seminar Vol. 2*, ed. B. Baumrin (New York, 1963), pp. 3–39.

"Problems of Empiricism, Part II," in *The Nature and Function of Scientific Theories*, ed. R. G. Colodny (Pittsburgh, 1970), pp. 275–353.

"Philosophy of Science: A Subject with a Great Past," in *Historical and Philosophical Perspectives of Science*, ed. R. Stuewer (Minneapolis, 1970), pp. 172–83.

"Die Wissenschaftstheorie – eine bisher unbekannte Form des Irrsinns?" (Philosophy of Science – A Thus Far Unknown Form of Insanity) in *Natur und Geschichte. X. Kongress für Philosophie*, ed. K. Hübner and A. Menne (Hamburg, 1973), pp. 88–124.

"Progress and Reality in the Arts and in the Sciences," in *Progress in Science and Its Social Conditions*, ed. T. Ganelius (Oxford, 1986), pp. 223–33.

"Art as a Product of Nature as a Work of Art," *World Futures* 40 (1994): 87–100.

"Concerning an Appeal for Philosophy," in *Common Knowledge*, ed. J. M. Perl (Oxford, 1994), pp. 10–13.

"Two Letters of Paul Feyerabend to Thomas S. Kuhn on a Draft of *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*," ed. P. Hoyningen-Huene, *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 26 (1995): 353–87.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*

Achinstein, Peter. "On the Meaning of Scientific Terms," *Journal of Philosophy* 61 (1964): 497–509.

Andersson, Gunnar. *Kritik und Wissenschaftsgeschichte: Kuhns, Lakatos' und Feyerabends Kritik des kritischen Rationalismus* (Tübingen, Germany, 1988).

Couvalis, George. *Feyerabend's Critique of Foundationalism* (Aldershot, UK, 1989).

Farrell, Robert P. *Feyerabend and Scientific Values* (Dordrecht, 2003).

Gellner, Ernest. "Beyond Truth and Falsehood," *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 26 (1975): 331–42.

Koertge, N. "For and Against Method," *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 23 (1972): 274–90.

Lamb, D., G. Munévar, and J. Preston, eds. *The Worst Enemy of Science? Essays in Memory of Paul Feyerabend* (New York, 2000).

Laudan, Larry. "For Method; or, Against Feyerabend," in *An Intimate Relation: Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, ed. J. Brown et al. (Dordrecht, 1989), pp. 299–318.

Maia Neto, J. "Feyerabend on the Authority of Science," *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 24 (1993): 687–94.

Munévar, G., ed. *Beyond Reason: Essays on the Philosophy of Paul Feyerabend* (Dordrecht, 1991).

Oberheim, E., and P. Hoyningen-Huene. "Incommensurability, Realism and Metaincommensurability," *Theoria* 12 (1997): 447–65.

———, "Feyerabend's Early Philosophy," *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science* 31 (2000): 363–75.

Preston, John. *Feyerabend: Philosophy, Science and Society* (Cambridge, UK, 1997).

Sankey, H. *The Incommensurability Thesis* (Aldershot, UK, 1994).

van Fraassen, Bas C. "Sola Experientia? Feyerabend's Refutation of Classical Empiricism," *Philosophy of Science Supplement* 64 (1997): 385–95.

Zahar, E. "Feyerabend on Observation and Empirical Content," *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 33 (1982): 397–409.

Eric Oberheim

FINDLAY, John Niemeyer (1903–87)

John N. Findlay was born on 25 November 1903 in Pretoria, South Africa, to John Hudson Lamb Findlay, an attorney, and Elizabeth Aletta (Niemeyer) Findlay. He was educated at home by a governess and at a primary school in Pretoria, mastering Dutch, French, and German at a young age. By the age of seven, Findlay became a dedicated vegetarian out of a sense of compassion for and identity with all living things; this decision became fundamental to his mature philosophical reflections. At age twelve he began attending Boy's High School in Pretoria, where he excelled in his studies, learning Latin and Greek and developing a love of literature, poetry and acting. In 1919, as he began undergraduate studies at Transvaal University College, he became fascinated with the Theosophical Society's blend of Oriental religious beliefs, which developed into a serious study of Hindu, Buddhist, and Neoplatonist writings. Findlay earned a BA at Transvaal in 1922 and an MA in 1924. He was awarded a Rhodes Scholarship and went to Balliol College, Oxford, in the middle of 1924. At Balliol he earned another BA with first class honors in *Literae Humaniores* (classics, ancient history, and philosophy) in 1926 and an MA in 1930. From there Findlay went to the University of Graz, where he earned a PhD in philosophy in 1933.

Findlay had a long and distinguished academic career. He was professor of philosophy at the University of Otago in New Zealand from 1933 to 1944. During those years, he befriended Karl Popper, "then a refugee teacher of philosophy," and married Aileen May Davidson in 1941, with whom he had a son and a daughter. Findlay taught at Rhodes University in South Africa in 1945; the University of Natal in South Africa from 1946 to 1948; King's College, University of Durham in England from 1948 to 1951; and King's College, University of London from 1951 to 1966. Findlay then emigrated to the United States where he lived for the rest of his life. He was Clark Professor of Metaphysics at Yale University from 1967 to 1972, and University Professor of Philosophy at Boston University from 1972 to 1987. He also held numerous visiting appointments. He was a visiting professor at Carleton College in Minnesota in 1961; the University of Texas at Austin from 1962 to 1963; the University of Kyoto in 1964; and again at the University of Texas at Austin from 1966 to 1967. Additionally, he was the Gifford Lecturer at the University of St. Andrews in Scotland during 1964–6. Findlay died on 27 September 1987 in Boston, Massachusetts.

Findlay's intellectual development was unusual for the time in which he lived and provides ample evidence of the independence of his mind. Under the influence of Hegel's *Logic*, Bergson's *Creative Evolution*, Neoplatonism, Hinduism, and Buddhism, Findlay developed a "philosophical cosmology" during his college years that he never abandoned. As he explained, "this is the view that this dirempted, vanishing, particularized zone of sensuous being … is only the outermost surface of a series of sectors leading from the sensuous and particularized to a central point of absolute simplicity, where all things 'come together' in unity and are contained, not in separate existence, but in an eminent concentration of pure power" ("My Life," 1985, p. 10). Findlay also never abandoned his

love of Eastern thought, Neoplatonism, and Hegel. He claimed that he was unimpressed by "the last breathings of Oxford idealism," largely because he had already developed a philosophical position of his own by the time he arrived at Balliol ("My Life," 1985, p. 16). During his doctoral studies in Germany, he thoroughly immersed himself in the philosophies of Meinong, Husserl, and Hegel. This research led to the publication of his first book, *Meinong's Theory of Objects and Values* (1933). He met Ludwig Wittgenstein in February 1930, and reminisced "that his words, remote from philosophical cliché, seemed to instill wisdom itself into the soul" ("My Life," 1985, p. 21). While on sabbatical leave in 1939, he was able to attend Wittgenstein's seminar on memory and to spend more time in one-on-one conversation with him. Although Wittgenstein's power over his students and peers is well known, Findlay managed to maintain critical distance and, in later years, commented on the "amateur introspection … of Wittgenstein and Ryle" ("My Life," 1985, p. 12).

Although much of Findlay's early work was shaped by Wittgensteinian assumptions, even then continental philosophers who were neglected in British universities influenced Findlay's thought. He eventually turned away from Wittgenstein's anti-metaphysical, linguistic approach, arguing that philosophical problems are more than linguistic confusions. Under the influence of Plato and Hegel, Findlay believed that philosophical problems "are deep and irremovable difficulties which have their roots in the articulation of being, and not primarily in that of human language, and which point … to completions of reality and experience which go far beyond what we ordinarily perceive or conceive" ("My Encounters with Wittgenstein," 1985, pp. 68–9).

Although Findlay applauded Wittgenstein's efforts to place strictures on what can be said meaningfully because of the framework within which discourse operates, he also believed

Wittgenstein indicated that metaphysics has a proper role. As he explains, "Wittgenstein had provided the germ of a true analysis of metaphysics as the search for a new notation that would remove the cramps produced in ordinary diction and would satisfy a variety of deep conceptual and linguistic needs. He investigated the values which might lead metaphysicians to diverge from ordinary ways and which were not, on his view, at all pathological or demanding therapy." (p. 175) Findlay sought a unifying, mystical vision that gives meaning to human existence. In *Hegel: A Reexamination* (1958) he argued for significant commonalities between Wittgenstein and Hegel, both of whom emphasize the social and historical nature of language. Findlay also maintained that rather than a transcendent metaphysics, Hegel offers an innovative perspective on everyday experience by way of a "dialectical study of Categories" according to which we see the world and according to the way the world essentially is. Findlay believed this was the proper role of philosophy; it must reorient everyday experience by articulating a speculative vision of the whole of reality that gives meaning to our lives.

In 1961 Findlay published *Values and Intentions* in which he elaborated in great detail the interrelatedness of the cosmos and human moral orders. Findlay believed that Kant's thing-in-itself is the transcendental source of the relations among things as they appear to the senses. This phenomenological insight should not lead us to disdain phenomenal knowledge as false or illusory, Findlay maintained, but to truly discover how things regularly appear to us. Findlay believed that there must be an inner law of the mind that translates its affections, according to the thing-in-itself, into instances of sensible qualities spatially and temporally arranged. Despite his conviction that we are epistemologically removed from the thing-in-itself, making this world a "cave," Findlay stressed the meaningfulness of the phenomenal world. Although we cannot expect the Kantian transcendental illusion to disappear, he argued, we should not dismiss our life in the cave as meaningless.

Findlay's belief in this epistemological distance between our minds and the thing-in-itself was inspired by Brentano, Meinong, and Husserl, all of whom emphasized intentionality. Rather than a passive recipient of objects, consciousness modifies and shapes what it encounters, rearranging and redirecting experience in the light of our specific goals. We are conscious of contents, but also conscious that contents are real. Nonetheless, our intentionality shapes our understanding of reality and creates distance between our minds and the thing-in-itself. Findlay's acceptance of this emphasis on intentionality led to what he called speleology, the delineation of the cave that is the human condition.

In his ethical writings, Findlay sought to articulate the basis of a positive moral philosophy focused upon axiology, and to foster a well-rounded philosophical approach that is neither dogmatic nor myopic. The ultimate goal of philosophy, for Findlay, was the integration of metaphysics and ethics. The foundation of Findlay's moral philosophy lies in mystical, transcendental Platonism in which being and value are inseparable. It is this Platonic inseparability of ontology from axiology that furnishes the ground for his repudiation of radical skepticism and nihilism. Findlay believed that moral philosophy should not identify or enhance human anxiety and guilt as existentialism had done. Rather, moral philosophy should point to the light of Platonic goodness that beams from beyond the cave of the human condition, to the benefit of all people. The light of goodness, for Findlay, is the source of human life and the unity of all existence. Despite his reliance on transcendent Platonism, Findlay argues in *The Discipline of the Cave* (1966) and *The Transcendence of the Cave* (1967) that it finds its highest fulfillment in an immanent Hegelian method and Husserlian phenomenology.

Findlay argues that philosophers should play the role of speleologists, utilizing Husserl's phenomenological method to describe our life within the cave. Husserl's phenomenology is limited, however, because it only describes things as they are presented to us and does not provide us with a methodology that can transform our cave life. By contrast, Hegel's dialectic not only shows how things are in the cave, but also how they undergo perpetual revisions and how we can flee from the cave to the world beyond it. The primary merit of Hegel's dialectical thinking is that things are seen as dynamic rather than static. Findlay argues that as we go through the perpetual, dialectical revision of things we perceive in the cave, we are led beyond it. Findlay argued that there is a dynamic spirit of goodness at work in the world, and that there is also a timeless pattern of goodness, the absolute, that is the source and origin of all things. He spoke of this absolute as the Platonic good that illuminates the world beyond the cave, but that also lends some illumination within the cave. He argued that knowledge of values is the highest knowledge, so knowledge of the absolute, the unity of all values, is the pinnacle of all knowledge because it is comprehensive knowledge of the good. On Findlay's reading, Hegel maintains that the contingencies of the cave should not be dismissed in favor of the absolute because they are a necessary foil that propels us beyond the cave. Although the absolute is that to which we ultimately look beyond the cave, without the contingencies of the cave, the absolute would lose its meaning. Efforts to do away with the life of the cave will not lead us out of it, because we must go through it.

Findlay's speleology is at once both otherworldly and this-worldly. But the otherworldly realm in which the absolute resides can be known only speculatively or mystically. He argues that there can be no rationale for morality apart from mysticism. Morality without mysticism is inevitably one-sided because the meaning of the dilemmas and absurdities of practical, moral life can be understood only within a mystical vision of the whole. The Hegelian absolute, the Platonic transcendent good, has value only if it is worked out in the contingent terms of practical philosophy, which involves the welfare of the community as well as of the individual. Findlay confesses that, rather than being a Hegelian, he is ultimately a Platonist. Findlay used Hegel's immanent method only to establish the Platonic otherworldliness that Hegel dissolved.

Findlay was a noble lover of Socratic wisdom and an ecumenical philosopher of religion, committed both intellectually and experientially to the transcendence of universal truth. He was a remarkably comprehensive philosopher in an age of narrow specialization. Findlay studied major works throughout the history of Western and Eastern thought, as well as contemporary Anglo-American and continental thought, and perceptively injected insights he gleaned from them into contemporary philosophical debates, writing with exceptional literary skill.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Meinong's Theory of Objects and Values (London, 1933; 1963).

Hegel: A Re-examination (New York, 1958).

Values and Intentions: A Study in Value-theory and Philosophy of Mind (London and New York, 1961).

Language, Mind and Value: Philosophical Essays (London, 1963).

The Discipline of the Cave (London and New York, 1966).

The Transcendence of the Cave (London, 1967).

The Systematic Unity of Value (Lawrence, Kan., 1968).

Ascent to the Absolute: Metaphysical Papers and Lectures (London, 1970).

Axiological Ethics (London, 1970).

Psyche and Cerebrum (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1972).

Plato: The Written and Unwritten Doctrines (New York, 1974).

Plato and Platonism: An Introduction (New York, 1978).

Kant and the Transcendental Object: A Hermeneutic Study (Oxford, 1981).

Wittgenstein: A Critique (London, 1984).

Other Relevant Works

"Morality by Convention," *Mind* 53 (1944): 142–69.

"Can God's Existence be Disproved?" *Mind* 57 (1948): 176–83.

"Recommendations Regarding the Language of Introspection," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 9 (1948): 212–36.

"Probability Without Nonsense," *Philosophical Quarterly* 2 (1952): 218–39.

"The Justification of Attitudes," *Mind* 63 (1954): 145–61.

"The Logic of *Bewusstseinslagen*," *Philosophical Quarterly* 5 (1955): 57–68.

"The Methodology of Normative Ethics," *Journal of Philosophy* 58 (1961): 757–64.

"The Logic of Ultimates," *Journal of Philosophy* 64 (1967): 571–83.

"Hegel and the Philosophy of Physics," in *The Legacy of Hegel: Proceedings of the Marquette Hegel Symposium, 1970*, ed. J. J. O'Malley et al. (The Hague, 1970), pp. 72–89.

Trans., *Logical Investigations*, by Edmund Husserl (London and New York, 1970).

"Thoughts on the Gnosis of St. John," *Religious Studies* 17 (1982): 441–50.

"An Ontology of Senses," *Journal of Philosophy* 79 (1982): 545–51.

"My Life," in *Studies in The Philosophy of J. N. Findlay*, ed. Robert S. Cohen, Richard M. Martin, and Merold Westphal (Albany, N.Y., 1985), pp. 1–51.

"My Encounters with Wittgenstein," in *Studies in The Philosophy of J. N. Findlay,* ed. Robert S. Cohen, Richard M. Martin, and Merold Westphal (Albany, NY, 1985), pp. 52–69.

Further Reading

Who Was Who in Amer v9, Who's Who in Phil

Bockja, Kim. *Morality as the End of Philosophy: The Teleological Dialectic of the Good in the Moral Philosophy of J. N. Findlay* (Lanham, Md., 1999).

Cohen, Robert S., Richard M. Martin, and Merold Westphal, eds. *Studies in The Philosophy of J. N. Findlay* (Albany, N.Y., 1985). Contains Findlay's autobiography, bibliography, and comments on the essays.

Harris, Errol E. "John Niemeyer Findlay (1903–1987)," *Owl of Minerva* 19 (1988): 252–3.

Macintyre, Alasdair. "John Niemeyer Findlay," *Bulletin of the Hegel Society of Great Britain* 16 (1987): 4–7.

Marchetto, Michele. *Impersonal Ethics: John Niemeyer Findlay's Value-theory* (Aldershot, UK, 1996).

Werkmeister, W. H. "Volition, Intention, and Values," in *Historical Spectrum of Value Theories, vol. 2: Anglo/American Group* (Lincoln, Neb., 1973), pp. 198–225.

Bockja Kim

FINE, Arthur Isadore (1937–)

Arthur Fine was born on 11 November 1937 in Lowell, Massachusetts. He left high school after his junior year to take advantage of the early entrance program at the University of Chicago where he studied physics, philosophy, and mathematics, graduating in 1958 with a BS degree in mathematics. He subsequently earned the MS degree in mathematics from Illinois Institute of Technology in 1960 with a thesis on generalized covering theorems, results he later extended to a new equivalent to the axiom of choice. His supervisor was Karl

Menger, of Vienna Circle fame, who introduced him to the mathematics and conceptual mysteries of the quantum theory. Fine returned to the University of Chicago for graduate study in philosophy, earning the PhD in 1963. He worked with Henry Mehlberg and Dudley Shapere in philosophy and Gregor Wentzel in physics, writing a thesis on realism and the quantum theory of measurement. During 1966–7 he was a postdoctoral fellow at the University of Cambridge, supervised by Mary Hesse.

Fine was assistant professor of mathematics and philosophy at the University of Illinois at Chicago from 1961 to 1963, and assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Illinois at Urbana 1963 to 1965. In 1966–7 he was a National Science Foundation Fellow. From 1967 to 1972 he was associate and full professor of philosophy at Cornell University. In 1972 he returned to University of Illinois at Chicago where he taught philosophy from 1972 to 1982. He then became professor of philosophy at Northwestern University, and from 1985 to 2001 he held the title of John Evans Professor of Philosophy at Northwestern. In 2001 he became professor of philosophy at the University of Washington. Fine also held visiting appointments at several universities including University of London, Stanford, University of California at Los Angeles, and the University of Chicago. He was President of the Philosophy of Science Association during 1987–9, and President of the Central Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1997–8.

Early in his career Fine divided his research between technical issues that arise concretely in scientific practice and general issues related to the traditional problems of philosophy and philosophy of science. These agendas were always connected since, from the beginning, he has tried to show how important aspects of science can profitably be seen as engaged with philosophy, and vice versa. He conceives of science as a reflective enterprise that integrates recognizably philosophical elements with technical ones. Conversely, he regards philosophy as engaged with aspects of practical living, and suggests as a rule of thumb that good philosophy of science always connects with ongoing scientific practice. As generations of his graduate students have learned, he rejects the two cultures picture, with its neat division of labor into humanistic versus scientific inquiries. He also rejects the reductionism associated with W. V. QUINE's philosophy according to which, when science has had its say, there will be nothing left over for philosophy, or at any rate nothing very important. In rejecting grand dualisms, Fine's thinking is broadly pragmatic.

In the 1970s to early 1980s, Fine wrote a series of papers on the foundations of physics, concentrating mostly on conceptual problems of the quantum theory. These include important papers on the quantum measurement problem, where he extended the theory of measurement to prove a general "no-go" theorem (the "insolubility theorem"). He then turned to the use of probability in quantum theory and to its connection with hidden variables, beginning an examination of the no-hidden-variables theorems of John Bell, Simon Kochen, and Ernst Specker. Fine's analysis uncovered a probability structure underlying these theorems whose modification allows for hidden variables (including his "prism models"). This analysis led him to examine the locality conditions behind the Bell theorem, and to disentangle plausible physical constraints involving local causality from more arbitrary constraints employed in the proof. A central issue here is the question of whether outcomes that are physically independent need also be stochastically independent. Fine challenged that connection by introducing the notion of random events that (nevertheless) occur in harmony. These issues remain controversial. One issue, however, was settled by his work which demonstrated that the Bell inequalities are both necessary and sufficient for the existence of certain joint probabilities.

In tandem with this work in foundations, Fine also produced a series of articles respon-

sive to the issues concerning scientific change raised by the work of Thomas KUHN and Stephen TOULMIN. He argued that "commensurability" was not attainable from the Saul KRIPKE and Hilary PUTNAM treatment of general terms without a background assumption of scientific progress. But this is question-begging, since the comparison of successive theories was supposed itself to provide a demonstration of scientific progress. Instead Fine argued for a local notion of reference, one that is coarse-grained (or approximate in a sense that he spelled out), contextual, and good enough for certain purposes. This leads to a context-relative conception of referential stability that allows for theory comparison within limited domains. Fine's crucial idea is that of concepts from disparate discourses having context-relative extensions that locally "overlap." These are similar to the "shared concepts" in Putnam's later pluralism and to concepts negotiated in the "trading zones" described in the work of historian Peter Galison.

In the 1980s and 90s Fine's research took a historical turn. He began investigations into the later thought of Albert EINSTEIN, especially Einstein's ideas concerning the quantum theory. This occurred just as the Einstein papers were being collected for eventual publication. Fine was among the first to read through the unpublished correspondence. Among his discoveries here was a remarkable correspondence between Einstein and Erwin Schrödinger in the summer of 1935. Stimulated by the publication in 1935 of the later famous paper by Einstein, Boris Podolsky, and Nathan Rosen ("EPR"), Einstein and Schrödinger discussed their respective views on the quantum theory. Fine pointed out that early in the exchange Einstein noted that Podolsky actually wrote the EPR paper and that Podolsky's text obscured what Einstein regarded as the central points. Later in the correspondence Einstein produced an example similar to the famous "cat paradox" of Schrödinger, which Schrödinger then devel-

oped in the very next letter. These issues, and others, are discussed in Fine's *The Shaky Game* (1992). Fine examines Einstein's attitude toward the quantum theory and Einstein's philosophy of science more generally. He argues that the realism espoused by Einstein was not the sort of doctrine that philosophers would call by that name, but was rather of an essentially motivational sort.

Fine's integration of original historical research with philosophical reflection was taken up by other philosophers of science and is now a standard part of the discipline. At the same time, he rejected the reigning realist orthodoxy in philosophy of science, not turning toward anti-realism but toward a deflationary stance he calls "the natural ontological attitude" (NOA), and which he likes to describe in Zen-like language as "a third way." He emphasizes that NOA is not a philosophical position, like realism or constructive empiricism, but rather an attitude one can take toward ongoing scientific practice and its results. Roughly, the idea is not to bring a pre-formed philosophical agenda to understanding (or "interpreting") science, but to approach science and the significance of its results from the perspective of a participant and in terms that would arise naturally within that perspective. Fine understands this as a way of looking at science in its particularity, rather than imposing global interpretations. To the frustration of some critics, Fine does not argue for the adoption of NOA. He thinks any such argument would presuppose an essentialist conception of science, which NOA itself rejects. (The "natural" in NOA is not essentialist but, as Fine likes to quip, it is the California natural; no additives, please). In support of NOA, Fine deploys two strategies. One promotes the legitimacy of inductive argument in philosophy, and then points to the history of failures of the grand-theory agenda that philosophy inherited from neopositivism (theories of explanation, confirmation, causality, reference, and even theories of theories). The second way involves examining critically

the best-looking arguments brought in support of NOA's rivals to show why they are not compelling. Fine suggests that the best way to appreciate the virtues of NOA, as for any attitude, is to try it out.

Fine's critical examination of support for realism begins with an examination of the explanationist defense, inherited from the J. C. C. Smart and Hilary Putnam claim that unless realism is correct, science's ability to produce good explanations would be miraculous. Fine points out that a central disagreement between realism and anti-realism concerns whether good explanations need to be true. Anti-realists challenge the legitimacy of an inference to the truth of the best explanation, and therefore to infer realism as the best explanation for the success of science would simply beg the question against anti-realism. Further, he notes that if there actually were a good realist explanation for why science is successful (assuming it is), it would be based on a realist conception according to which science tells us the truth about an external world. But Fine argues that any such explanation could be trumped by an instrumentalist who replaces the correspondence notion of truth with the pragmatic notion of general reliability. Thus if there were a good argument for realism, along these lines, there would be an equally good (perhaps better) instrumentalist argument. The converse is also true. Indeed Fine claims a metatheorem according to which any argument drawn from scientific practice that appears to support one side in the realism/instrumentalism debate can be converted to one that appears to support the other side as well. He concludes that the realism–anti-realism issue is a pseudo-question, in something like the sense that Rudolf CARNAP and Otto Neurath suggested, and that we should move beyond it.

One of the most interesting aspects of NOA, and one that distinguishes it from similar post-positivist and postmodern proposals, is its insistence that truth-talk is not eliminable. While Fine takes a deflationary attitude toward truth, he rejects any general account of truth, even a deflationist one. Instead he regards truth as a semantic primitive in a way that aligns him with Donald DAVIDSON or, after they moved away from idealized consensus pictures, with Putnam and Richard RORTY.

Fine's recent work continues on NOA-related themes with a study of objectivity. Distinguishing what is objective from what is real (or true), in his hands objectivity is trust-making, not real-making, and becomes "that in the process of inquiry which makes for trust in the outcome of inquiry." This pragmatic conception allows objectivity to apply as well to the study of the mind and human affairs as it does to the natural sciences. He has also taken a critical look at social constructivism and at relativism, where he winnows out a positive agenda related to NOA. In the constructivist case the diachronic perspective of the participant (the scientist as agent) provides connections to NOA and in the case of relativism he focuses on its anti-foundationalism. Fine also finds NOA-like themes in the free will debate, where he argues that if determinism is incompatible with free will then so is indeterminism; and in the nature–nurture controversy, where NOA suggests a perspective on causal modeling that undermines the dichotomy between nature and nurture. Notable among his recent work in philosophy of physics is a proposal for solving the quantum measurement problem. His proposal introduces "selective interactions" that become available in a pragmatic approach to the interaction formalism. He has also carried out investigations into Bohmian mechanics (showing it open to pluralism and not just a simple realism), quantum separability (he shows it to be compatible with entanglement), and the emergence of classicality via decoherence. Fine's work continues to range over the formal sciences, the natural sciences, and the human sciences where, to adapt a famous remark of William JAMES, it leaves the trail of a philosopher over all.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Consistency, Derivability, and Scientific Change," *Journal of Philosophy* 64 (1967): 231–40.

"On the General Quantum Theory of Measurement," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 65 (1969): 111–22.

"Insolubility of the Quantum Measurement Problem," *Physical Review D* 2 (1970): 2783–7.

"On the Completeness of Quantum Theory," *Synthese* 29 (1974): 257–89.

"How to Compare Theories: Reference and Change," *Noûs* 9 (1975): 17–32.

"Interpreting Science," in *Proceedings of the 1988 Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association*, vol. 2 (East Lansing, Mich., 1988), pp. 3–14.

"Correlations and Physical Locality," in *Proceedings of the 1988 Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association*, vol. 2 (East Lansing, Mich., 1988), pp. 535–56.

"Hidden Variables, Joint Probability and the Bell Inequalities," *Physical Review Letters* 48 (1982): 291–5.

"Joint Distributions, Quantum Correlations and Commuting Observables," *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 23 (1982): 1306–10.

The Shaky Game: Einstein, Realism and The Quantum Theory (Chicago, 1986; 2nd edn 1996).

"Unnatural Attitudes: Realist and Instrumentalist Attachments to Science," *Mind* 95 (1986): 149–79.

"With Complacency or Concern: Solving the Quantum Measurement Problem," in *Kelvin's Baltimore Lectures and Modern Theoretical Physics: Historical and Philosophical Perspectives*, ed. Robert Kargon and Peter Achinstein (Cambridge, Mass., 1987), pp. 491–506.

"Causes of Variation: Disentangling Nature and Nurture," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 15 (1990): 94–113.

"Measurement and Quantum Silence," in *Correspondence, Invariance and Heuristics*, ed. Steven French and Harmke Kamminga (Dordrecht, 1993), pp. 279–94.

"The Viewpoint of No-one in Particular," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 72 (1998): 9–20.

"The Scientific Image Twenty Years Later," *Philosophical Studies* 106 (2001): 107–22.

Other Relevant Works

"Explaining the Behavior of Entities," *Philosophical Review* 75 (1966): 496–509.

"Covering Theorems and the Axiom of Choice," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 19 (1968): 787–8.

"Some Conceptual Problems of Quantum Theory," in *Paradoxes and Paradigms: The Philosophical Challenge of the Quantum Domain*, ed. R. G. Colodny (Pittsburgh, 1972), pp. 3–31.

"Do Correlations Need to be Explained?" in *Philosophical Consequences of Quantum Theory*, ed. James Cushing and Ernan McMullin (Notre Dame, Ind., 1989), pp. 175–94.

"Piecemeal Realism," *Philosophical Studies* 61 (1991): 79–96.

"Indeterminism and the Freedom of the Will," in *Philosophical Problems of the Internal and External Worlds: Essays on the Philosophy of Adolf Grünbaum*, ed. John Earman et al. (Pittsburgh, 1993), pp. 551–72.

"Bohr's Response to EPR," with Mara Beller, in *Niels Bohr and Contemporary Philosophy*, ed. J. Faye and H. Folse (Dordrecht, 1993), pp. 1–31.

Ed. with James Cushing and Sheldon Goldstein, *Bohmian Mechanics and Quantum Theory: An Appraisal* (Dordrecht, 1996).

"Quantum Life: Interaction, Entanglement,

and Separation," with Eric Winsberg, *Journal of Philosophy* 100 (2003): 80–97.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v10
Blackburn, Simon. "Realism: Deconstructing the Debate," *Ratio* 15 (2002): 111–33.
Ehrlich, Phillip, and Roger Jones, eds. *The Natural Ontological Attitude Refined* (Oxford, 2005).
Kukla, André. *Studies in Scientific Realism* (Oxford, 1998).
Muller, Thomas, and Tomasz Placek. "Against a Minimalist Reading of Bell's Theorem: Lessons from Fine," *Synthese* 128 (2001): 343–79.
Rorty, Richard. "A Pragmatist View of Contemporary Analytic Philosophy," in *The Pragmatic Turn in Philosophy: Contemporary Engagements Between Analytic and Continental Thought*, ed. William Egginton and Mike Sandbothe (Albany, N.Y., 2004).
Saurez, M. "Quantum Selections, Propensities and the Problem of Measurement," *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 55 (2004): 219–55.
Szabó, L. E. "On Fine's Resolution of the EPR-Bell Problem," *Foundations of Physics* 30 (2000): 1891–1909.
Van Fraassen, Bas C. "Constructive Empiricism Now," *Philosophical Studies* 106 (2001): 151–70.

Philip Ehrlich

FINGARETTE, Herbert (1921–)

Herbert Fingarette was born on 20 January 1921 in Brooklyn, New York. While still in high school his family moved to Los Angeles where he entered the University of California at Los Angeles. He left before graduating to serve in the United States Army, earning the rank of lieutenant and working in the Pentagon for the Army General Staff in the Information-Education group. Early in 1945, and still in the Army, he married Leslie Swabacker. Fingarette returned to UCLA in 1946, completing his BA in 1947 and PhD in 1949 in philosophy. His daughter, Ann Fingarette Hasse, was born in 1947 and trained as a lawyer, later co-authoring with her father *Mental Disabilities and Criminal Responsibility* (1979). Fingarette began teaching at the University of California at Santa Barbara in 1948, where he remained until his retirement in 1990. Among many other honors he was the first American philosopher to be Romanell–Phi Beta Kappa Professor of Philosophy; a William James Lecturer in Religion at Harvard University; and a Lewis Law Scholar at Washington and Lee University. In 1976–7 he served as President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association.

Fingarette's work is centrally concerned with the notion of responsibility. He thinks responsibility "a root constitutive element of our idea of humanity and what it is to be a person" (1967, p. 14). Rejecting emotivist and analytic fashions of mid-twentieth-century moral philosophy, Fingarette found an interest in psychoanalytic theory and the idea that self-knowledge could transform a life – an interest which led to existentialist literature and the ideas of karma and enlightenment in Eastern philosophy. Psychoanalytic theory holds that "the patient *must* accept responsibility for traits and actions of his which are the inevitable results of events over which he had no control and of actions which he did not consciously control" (1963, p. 163). This concern with responsibility is iterated throughout Fingarette's work. According to his original account, self-deception results from a person's failure to spell out "some features of his engagements in the world" (2000, p. 46), a failure for which the person is responsible. In *Confucius: The Secular as Sacred* (1972) he recounts the Confucian idea that accepting responsibility imposed by

engagement in a culture's practices promotes power to create deep meaning. Such acceptance Confucius describes as "holy ritual" and "sacred ceremony." Fingarette finds that Confucian concerns with acceptance and commitment tread common ground with themes in the work of John Austin and Ludwig Wittgenstein. His books *The Meaning of Criminal Insanity* (1972) and *Mental Disabilities and Criminal Responsibility* explore legal and moral complexities with attributions of responsibility to the insane and mentally disabled. One such mental disability is alcoholism. In *Heavy Drinking* (1988) Fingarette argues that heavy drinkers must accept responsibility for their addiction and that this may require reconstruction of their way of life. Themes in *Death: Philosophical Soundings* (1996) both extend and depart from Fingarette's earlier work, wherein he provides, along with thoughts on death by Tolstoy, Hume and Freud, an original meditation on the meaning of life and death. He claims that acceptance of the multiplicity of meanings is a "wonderfully distinctive feature of human nature" (1996, p. 87).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Self in Transformation (New York, 1963).
On Responsibility (New York, 1967).
Self-deception (London, 1969; rev. edn Berkeley, Cal., 2000).
Confucius: The Secular as Sacred (New York, 1972).
The Meaning of Criminal Insanity (Berkeley, Cal., 1972).
Mental Disabilities and Criminal Responsibility, with Ann Fingarette Hasse (Berkeley, Cal., 1979).
Heavy Drinking (Berkeley, Cal., 1988).
Death: Philosophical Soundings (Chicago, 1996).
Mapping Responsibility (Chicago, 2004).

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v8

Bockover, Mary, ed. *Rules, Rituals and Responsibility: Essays Dedicated to Herbert Fingarette* (Chicago, 1991).

Richard Liebendorfer

FIRTH, Roderick (1917–87)

Roderick Firth was born on 30 January 1917 in Orange, New Jersey. He attended Haverford College and earned his BA in 1938. He then completed his PhD in philosophy at Harvard in 1943. Firth's dissertation, written under C. I. LEWIS, was titled "Sense-Data and the Principle of Reduction." From his growing Quaker convictions he asked for conscientious objector status; he was eventually classified as unable to serve in the US Army because of a heart murmur. Firth was instructor of psychology and philosophy at the College of William and Mary from 1943 to 1945 (the college resisted calls for dismissing Firth due to religious convictions against war), and then was a professor of philosophy at Swarthmore College from 1945 to 1953. He joined the philosophy faculty at Harvard in 1953, where he was professor of philosophy until his death. He was awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship in 1952–3; an American Council of Learned Societies Fellowship in 1959–60; and two fellowships at the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University in 1964–5 and 1967–8. He was President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1980–81. Firth died on 22 December 1987 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Firth made a variety of contributions to philosophy, mostly in epistemology but also in ethics. Some of his work in both these fields anticipates later developments. Without question, Firth's most significant contribution lies with his subtle and complex defense of "phenomenalism" and epistemic foundation-

alism against various objections, a defense which often featured innovative and complex responses to pressing objections. Although both phenomenalism and foundationalism eventually fell out of favor with the majority of epistemologists and philosophers of mind in the years following his presentation of these positions, Firth's articulation and defense of the positions retains some interest.

Although Firth's defense can be found in many of his papers, his most extended exposition of phenomenalism comes from his 1949 *Mind* articles on "Sense Data and the Percept Theory." In those articles, Firth responds to many of the traditional objections to sense data, such as the objection that a sense datum epistemology involves a false phenomenology. One of the most important objections was that the phenomenalist view of experience implies that experiences, constituted as they are on the phenomenalist view by the occurrence of sets of sense data, are only indirectly related to whatever it is those sense data can be said to represent. But experience itself seems to be of *objects*; the sense data themselves seem to be invisible or transparent, in a sense. The phenomenalist description of experience appears to obscure this and also appears unable to explain why experience ought to be this way.

Firth's own exposition of the objections against phenomenalism and his detailed discussion of how to formulate the phenomenalist position are particularly noteworthy, distinguishing different ways in which phrases like "directly perceive" and "direct awareness" are used and with what implications. Indeed, the article is as notable for its detailed exposition of the objection as well as its defense of the phenomenalist position.

Although these criticisms had been around a while, they had, when Firth was writing, been revived by a group of philosophers and psychologists who were developing new theories of perception and exploring their epistemic consequences. Most of these theories sought to do away with sense data as unnecessary go-betweens between the mind and the objects of

knowledge and perception, and sought, in one way or another, to make perception more "direct" than traditional epistemological views had made it seem. Doing away with sense data was one alternative and the phenomenalism was thought to be vulnerable precisely because it seemed to give a false picture of experience. Besides these tasks, the philosophers and psychologists who were constructing new theories of perception also faced the problem of dealing with the many arguments *for* sense data, such as the argument from illusion, in terms that did not end up positing something very much like sense data.

Firth believed that even though the criticisms directed at the implied phenomenology of the phenomenalist position were significant, it was not clear how the newer theories of perception – like that of the Gestalt psychologists and the phenomenology of Edmund Husserl and William JAMES – represented any real epistemological advance over the kinds of epistemological facts that sense data theories were designed to address. Indeed, given Firth's own view that a sense data epistemology was more or less the basic epistemology of traditional philosophy, the failure of the newer theories of perception to provide adequate responses to the kinds of arguments that motivated talk of sense data in the first place rendered their usefulness for philosophical purposes questionable. Once these theories were adjusted so as to accommodate the phenomena that originally motivated sense data epistemologies, Firth thought that their proponents would arrive at more or less the same place as sense data theories.

In another important paper, "Radical Empiricism and Perceptual Relativity" (1950), Firth takes up an argument of Roderick CHISHOLM directed against C. I. Lewis's version of phenomenalism. Lewis had argued that, on the phenomenalist position, statements about physical objects entail certain complex conditional statements about sense data. The antecedent of such a conditional would be given using the vocabulary of physical objects

and the consequent would be a description of experience in sense data terms. Chisholm notes that one could conjoin to any such physical object statement in the antecedent of such a conditional another statement about physical objects that would entail the falsity of the alleged entailed statement about sense data without contradiction.

Firth's response to Chisholm involves a discussion of how a phenomenalist ought to deal with the meaning and pragmatics of conditionals like the ones that Lewis deployed, arguing, in effect, that given the complexity of the relation between sets of experiences and physical object statements and how physical object statements are vastly outnumbered by statements about experiences, the least misleading that *could* be said by the phenomenalist in the situation Chisholm describes would be that the kinds of conditionals the arguments attacks are false. Given the complexity of the relation between descriptions of experience in terms and sense data and descriptions of physical objects, the phenomenalist position actually predicts how our intuitions about certain conditionals ought to fall, together with certain views about the pragmatics and meanings of physical object statements.

Firth's defense of phenomenalism made several crucial distinctions that were picked up by other writers. Most importantly, Firth argued that phenomenalist claims need not be voiced as *replacing* material object statements with statements about sense data. Rather, the phenomenalist could make his claims using the vocabulary of "looks as if." One thus need not try to replace claims about material objects using only terms denoting sense data in order to state the phenomenalist view.

Besides his work in epistemology, Firth also made important contributions to debates about the relationship between epistemic and ethical notions of justification and the extent to which they overlap. For example, in response to Chisholm's view that ethical and epistemic notions of justification are the same, Firth pointed out several ways in which they

appeared to differ. Chisholm's view was that epistemic terms and phrases like "adequate evidence" and "reasonable belief" are to be analyzed in terms of an ethical notion of worthiness to believe. Thus, to say that I have adequate evidence for some proposition p is equivalent to saying that p is more worthy of my belief than not-p.

Firth described a number of subtle ambiguities between ethical and epistemic terms that make Chisholm's claims more compelling than they perhaps should appear. In addition, Firth observes that identifying epistemic and ethical terms would render explanations of the sort "p is more worthy of my belief that not-p because my evidence for p is adequate" as vacuous, given Chisholm's analysis of the phrase "adequate evidence". For Firth this did not mean that there was no relationship at all between the notions of justification as they figure in ethical and epistemic contexts. In some of his later papers, Firth explored how ethical and epistemic notions are related, describing the different sorts of merits that a belief could have, such as whether a false belief could have instrumental value in motivating beneficial actions and the acquisition of true beliefs and so on.

Firth also wrote a well-known defense of the Ideal Observer theory of the meaning of ethical statements. The point of these theories was to give an analysis of the meaning of ethical statements in terms of the reactions of either certain real or imagined creatures. Thus, one might analyze the meaning of a statement like "action x is good" in terms of how God might react to it. The Ideal Observer theory of the meaning of ethical statements proceeds by analyzing statements like x is P – where P is an ethical predicate – as meaning something like "Any Ideal Observer would react to x in such and such a way under such and such conditions." This analysis needs, among other things, to spell out what the relevant characteristics of an ideal observer are. Firth gives the following list: he must be omniscient with respect to the nonmoral facts, have unlimited powers of imaginative projection, be disinterested, dispassion-

ate, and consistent, and be otherwise, a "normal person." One objection is that it is not clear how any creature meeting a majority of these criteria could be a "normal person," and hence it is not clear what relation their judgments would have to the moral judgments of human beings or even whether they would be moral agents at all. Firth's position was thus criticized as being too divorced from anything resembling a human being. In particular, it is hard to see what the relevant relations are between such a disinterested observer and human agents with their large and often complex set of interests, a complaint made by, among others, Richard BRANDT.

Firth's importance to contemporary American philosophy lies largely with his formulation and defense of phenomenalism, a position that can be traced back to George Berkeley's views and which played a significant role in twentieth-century American philosophy through the influence of such philosophers as C. I. Lewis. Although many aspects of phenomenalism and foundationalism have been abandoned in contemporary discussions, the tools that Firth used to formulate and defend the position retain interest for contemporary discussion. Many of his other papers, particularly those concerning the relations between ethics and epistemology, contain valuable discussions that anticipate later developments in epistemology, such as virtue epistemology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Sense Data and the Percept Theory," *Mind* 58 (1949): 434–65; 59 (1950): 35–56.

"Radical Empiricism and Perceptual Relativity," *Philosophical Review* 59 (1950): 164–83, 319–31.

"Ethical Absolutism and the Ideal Observer,' *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 12 (1952): 317–45.

"Reply to Professor Brandt's 'The Definition of an "Ideal Observer" Theory in Ethics'," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 15 (1955): 414–21.

"Ultimate Evidence," *Journal of Philosophy* 53 (1956): 732–8.

"Chisholm and the Ethics of Belief," *Philosophical Review* 68 (1959): 493–506.

"Austin and the Argument from Illusion," *Philosophical Review* 73 (1964): 372–82.

"Coherence, Certainty and Epistemic Priority," *Journal of Philosophy* 61 (1964): 545–56.

"The Anatomy of Certainty," *Philosophical Review* 76 (1967): 3–27.

"The Men Themselves: Or the Role of Causation in Our Concept of Seeing," in *Intentionality, Minds, and Perception: A Symposium*, ed. Hector-Neri Castañeda (Detroit, 1967), pp. 357–82.

"Lewis on the Given," in *The Philosophy of C.I. Lewis*, ed. P.A. Schilpp (La Salle, Ill., 1968).

"On Being in the Mind," *Philosophic Exchange* 1 (Summer 1971): 45–50.

"Sense Experience," in *Handbook of Perception*, ed. E. C. Carterette and M. P. Friedman (New York, 1974), vol. 1, chap. 1.

"Are Epistemic Concepts Reducible to Ethical Concepts," in *Values and Morals: Essays in Honor of William Frankena, Charles Stevenson, and Richard Brandt*, ed. Alvin Goldman and Jaegwon Kim (Dordrecht, 1978).

"Epistemic Merit, Intrinsic and Instrumental," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 55 (September 1981): 5–23.

"A Reply to Lectures by Wilfrid Sellars," *The Monist* 64 (1981): 91–101.

Radical Empiricism: Essays and Lectures, ed. John Troyer (Lanham, Md., 1999). Contains almost all of Firth's publications and some other writings.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Pres Addr of APA v9*, *Who Was Who in Amer v9*

Heil, John. "Reliability and Epistemic Merit," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 62 (1984): 327–38.

"Roderick Firth: His Life and Work," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 51 (1991): 109–47. Contains essays by John Rawls, Roderick Chisholm, Robert Shope, Richard Brandt, Hilary Putnam, and a bibliography of Firth's publications.

Sellars, Wilfrid. "Givenness and Explanatory Coherence," *Journal of Philosophy* 70 (1973): 612–24.

Taliaferro, Charles. "Relativising the Ideal Observer Theory," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 49 (1988): 123–38.

Daniel Blair

FISCH, Max Harold (1900–1995)

Max H. Fisch was born on 21 December 1900 in Elma, Washington, and died on 6 January 1995 in Los Angeles, California. A leading historian of philosophy and science, he studied Greek and Latin in high school in San Francisco, and earned a BA in philosophy at Butler College in 1924 and a PhD in philosophy at Cornell University in 1930. In 1928 he married Ruth Bales, who became his invaluable collaborator in his scholarly researches until her death in 1974. He taught philosophy at Western Reserve College from 1928 to 1943, when he became curator of the Rare Books Collection of the US Army Medical Library, where he produced a book and articles on the history of medicine in the Renaissance. Fisch joined the philosophy department of the University of Illinois at Urbana in 1946, serving until his age-mandated retirement in 1969. There he directed the graduate theses of dozens of students in the fields of social philosophy, American philosophy, and ancient philosophy; many of his students have achieved scholarly distinction. After several visiting distinguished professorships, including two years at Texas Tech University, Fisch collaborated with Edward Moore in establishing the Peirce Edition Project at Indiana University–Purdue University in Indianapolis in 1975. He served the Peirce Project for another sixteen years, for most of that time as General Editor.

Fisch traveled abroad for research and teaching in Italy (1939, 1950–51), India (1958), and Japan (1958–9), with support of Fulbright fellowships and the State Department. He represented the University of Illinois at the first meeting of the International Association of Universities in 1950 and served on its administrative board until 1955. He was President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1955–6, and he chaired the executive board of the APA from 1956 to 1958.

Fisch considered his greatest service to philosophy to be his introduction to the English-speaking world of the great eighteenth-century Italian philosopher Giambattista Vico, through his translations with Thomas Bergin of Vico's *Autobiography* and *New Science*, which included lengthy and masterful introductions by Fisch. For this work he was accorded knighthood by the government of Italy in 1976. Vico's great insight was that philosophy had originated as an internalization of the discussions and debates in the marketplaces, public assemblies, and law courts of ancient Greece. Fisch's interest in Vico was an outgrowth of his doctoral work on the influence of Stoicism on Roman law, which he published as "Alexander and the Stoics" in 1937.

Fisch's teaching of American philosophy led to his first textbook in 1939. He became much better known for the influential essay in which he described the "classic period" of American philosophy: his introduction to *Classic American Philosophers* (1951), which was a standard textbook in the field for several decades. Fisch identified the two most central problems of American philosophy as the nature of human community and the nature of science, and he offered a brilliant exposition of the

American approach to their solution (see also 1986).

Fisch is most renowned for his scholarship on one of the "classic" American philosophers, Charles S. PEIRCE. His work intensified in 1959 when the Harvard philosophy department invited him to write an intellectual biography of Peirce. Fisch soon realized that the 60,000 pages of Peirce's manuscripts, if arranged chronologically, would present the opportunity for an understanding of the *development* of the most original and most versatile intellect that the Americas have so far produced. The preparations for and production of a new chronological and more comprehensive edition of Peirce's writings accompanied the biographical work, much of which he published as introductions to the first three volumes of the *Writings of Charles S. Peirce* (1982–6). Other important results of Fisch's developmental approach were published in more than two dozen other essays, most reprinted in *Peirce, Semeiotic, and Pragmatism* (1986).

Fisch brought to his study of Peirce the same methods and perspectives he had used in his other studies – emphasis on historical context and chronology, meticulous attention to detail, extensive use of unpublished sources, and tracing intellectual development and multiple connections with other thinkers and the broader sweep of human civilization. He argued that Peirce followed the logical principle of first adopting nominalism and then accepting a realistic position only when compelled to do so by the inadequacy of nominalism. Peirce advanced step by step from his initial nominalism toward a complete realism, accepting real possibility and eventually real continuity. Fisch concluded that Peirce stopped short of complete realism, and he planned an essay entitled "Peirce's Lifelong Nominalism" (1986, p. 355n47). Fisch showed the probable influence of Epicurus's "swerve" of atoms on Peirce's introduction of absolute chance to explain the origin of laws of nature in habit-taking. He emphasized that Peirce's experiences as a working scientist influenced his con-

ception of truth as the long-run consensus of the community of inquirers. Fisch interpreted Peirce's pragmatism as the lesson in logic taught by Darwin's work, and he also described it as Peirce's recipe for making our ideas scientifically testable. His explanations of Peirce's later arguments for pragmatism are particularly illuminating. The single most characteristic trait of Peirce's thought, Fisch eventually concluded, was his lifelong reliance on a general theory of signs as its framework. The process of sign interpretation was for Peirce irreducibly social, triadic, and continuous (1986, p. 279). All of Fisch's essays emphasized the need for the full context of Peirce's work as mathematician, scientist, and historian of science, in order to understand the development of his philosophy.

Fisch has also made important but somewhat neglected contributions to social philosophy. Reflecting the influence of his mentor Elijah JORDAN and also John DEWEY, Fisch proposed that *institutions*, rather than abstractions, as A. N. WHITEHEAD had said, are the proper objects of critical evaluation for philosophers. Fisch intended this definition of philosophy to include all the work that was currently considered philosophy, but he wished to broaden the horizon of the profession, in order to establish closer connections with the social sciences, and he proposed concrete measures for doing so. Fisch predicted that if professional philosophers were unwilling or unable to supply the value theories needed by the social sciences, others would step in to do so (1956). In the autobiographical dialogue "The Philosophy of History" (in Tursman 1970), Fisch explored the nature of historical objectivity, finding its basis in the network of institutions and practices which allow fellow inquirers to verify or correct one another's work.

One of Fisch's most remarkable theses was that Aristotle never conceived of any science or discipline of ethics. Aristotle himself considered his writings now called "ethics" to be part of politics or political science, better translated as "poliscraft," by analogy with "statecraft." Poliscraft focused solely on the politically inde-

pendent city-state as the necessary condition for human flourishing, and encompassed all of the institutions and practices of the polis. To extract an "ethics" from the writings of Plato and Aristotle is to attempt to understand human goodness without due consideration for the institutional means of its realization, and this is bound to fail. Fisch defended this claim and broached some of its far-reaching implications in "The Poliscraft" (1974) and in unpublished papers.

Fisch's scholarship was remarkable for its combination of breadth of vision with depth of historical detail, of sympathetic understanding and clear analysis with critical acumen based on his strong commitment to social values.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Alexander and the Stoics," *American Journal of Philology* 58 (1937): 59–82, 129–51.

"Vico on Roman Law," in *Essays in Political Theory Presented to George H. Sabine*, ed. Milton Konvitz and Arthur Murphy (Ithaca, N.Y., 1948), pp. 62–88.

"The Academy of the Investigators," in *Science, Medicine, and History: Essays on the Evolution of Scientific Thought and Medical Practice Written in Honour of Charles Singer*, ed. E. A. Underwood (Oxford, 1953), vol. 1, pp. 521–63.

"The Critic of Institutions," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 29 (1956): 42–56.

"The Idea of Institution in the Major Religions," *Proceedings of the IXth International Congress for the History of Religions* (Tokyo, 1960), pp. 513–18.

"Was There a Metaphysical Club in Cambridge?" in *Studies in the Philosophy of Charles Sanders Peirce, Second Series*, ed. Edward C. Moore and Richard S. Robin (Amherst, Mass., 1964), pp. 3–32.

"Dewey's Critical and Historical Studies," in *Guide to the Works of John Dewey*, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale, Ill., 1970), pp. 306–38.

"The Poliscraft," in *Philosophy and the Civilizing Arts: Essays Presented to Herbert Schneider*, ed. J. P. Anton and C. Walton (Athens, Ohio, 1974).

"Croce and Vico," in *Thought, Action and Intuition*, ed. L. M. Palmer and H. S. Harris (Hildesheim and New York, 1975), pp. 184–233.

"What has Vico to Say to Philosophers of Today?" *Social Research* 43 (1976): 399–409.

Peirce, Semeiotic, and Pragmatism: *Essays by Max H. Fisch*, ed. Kenneth Ketner and Christian Kloesel (Bloomington, Ind., 1986). Includes a biographical sketch and bibliography of Fisch's publications.

Other Relevant Works

Fisch's papers are at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and the Peirce Edition Project at Indiana University–Purdue University at Indianapolis.

Ed. with P. R. Anderson, *Philosophy in America: From the Puritans to James* (New York, 1939).

Trans. with Thomas Bergin, *The Autobiography of Giambattista Vico*, with introduction (pp. 1–107) by Fisch (Ithaca, N.Y., 1944; rev. edn 1963).

Trans. with Thomas Bergin, *The New Science of Giambattista Vico* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1948; rev. edn 1961).

Ed., *Classic American Philosophers* (New York, 1951; 2nd edn 1966; 3rd edn 1996).

Ed., *Writings of Charles S. Peirce: A Chronological Edition*, vols 1–3 (Bloomington, Ind., 1982–6).

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v6, Who Was Who in Amer v12, Who's Who in Phil

Madden, Edward H. "Max H. Fisch: Rigorous Humanist," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 22 (1986): 375–96.

Roberts, Don D. "The Well-Tempered Critic

of Institutions," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 22 (1986): 397–415.

Tursman, Richard, ed. *Studies in Philosophy and in the History of Science: Essays in Honor of Max Fisch* (Lawrence, Kan., 1970).

William Davenport

FISKE, John (1842–1901)

Edmund Fisk Green was born on 30 March 1842 in Hartford, Connecticut. At his grandmother's request, he changed his name to John Fiske in 1855 after his mother remarried. He died on 4 July 1901 in East Gloucester, Massachusetts, where he had gone to escape the heat and humidity of the Cambridge summer. He was an historian, philosopher, and popularizer of science, delivering lectures on history and on Darwinism to large audiences of laymen. His fame led to the naming of Mt. Fiske, a 13,500-foot mountain in California, by T. S. Solomons in 1895.

Fiske attended Harvard College, enrolling in 1860 as a sophomore, and graduating with his BA in 1863. At first planning to work in philology, he studied the basics of twelve languages, but soon turned to history and philosophy, reading in these subjects on his own while taking classes. His study of languages bore fruition in his publication of "The Evolution of Language," in the *North American Review*. Fiske argued that the classificatory scheme which philologists had constructed on the family relationships of the world's languages as known in the nineteenth century also indicated the gradual evolution of those languages, from the more primitive, such as Chinese, to the Indo-European languages, as more civilized, complex, and

sophisticated. These insights, and Fiske's application of evolution to the study of linguistics, history, religion, and philosophy was stimulated by his accidental discovery in a Boston bookstore of the writings of Herbert Spencer. He became an enthusiastic adherent to the Spencerian conception of evolution as a means of explaining all the multifarious phenomena of the natural, social, spiritual, and intellectual phenomena and developments of the universe.

Fiske entered Harvard Law School, and was awarded his LL.B. degree in 1865. In Boston, he passed the Suffolk bar examination and very briefly established himself as an attorney. Before long, however, his intellectual interests predominated and he turned to philosophy and theology, making his career as an educator, lecturer, and writer. His interests in philosophy were exhibited while still a student, and when caught reading a volume of the work of Auguste Comte during services in the Harvard Chapel, he was subjected to disciplinary action by the Harvard faculty. He became an enthusiastic adherent of Comte's positivism, finding in it a rational, scientific, and systematic conception of the universe. His earliest efforts were aimed at a reconciliation of the science of his era, including especially the theory of evolution, with the tenets of the Congregationalist theology, which he practiced. Having little success in achieving that goal, he came to reject Christianity.

Fiske was an early adherent of Darwinism, and deeply influenced in particular by Spencer's philosophical generalization of Darwin's theory of evolution. His first writings on Spencer's adaptation of Darwin's theory of evolution date from 1860, making him one of the earliest American defenders of Darwin with Chauncey WRIGHT. In considering the philosophical and theological implications of natural science, Fiske declared himself to be an "infidel," by which he meant a non-Christian. Literary historian Van Wyck Brooks went so far as to say of Fiske that

"Evolution was for him a new religion" (Brooks and Bettmann 1956, p. 157).

Because of his reputation as an agnostic or atheist, Fiske was denied an academic chair at Harvard, although he served on the Harvard faculty and in various other capacities. From 1869 to 1871 he served as university lecturer on philosophy at Harvard, and in 1870 he was appointed instructor in history. In 1869–70, at the invitation of Charles William Eliot, Harvard's new President, Fiske delivered a series of lectures at Harvard on Comte's positivism. In 1872 he became assistant librarian, and served in that capacity at the Harvard library until 1879, when he resigned his position. While working at the library, he continued his research and writing; much of his writing in these years consisted of rewriting his earlier works, and his Harvard lectures, to eliminate the Comtian positivism and replace it with Spencerian evolutionism.

In 1873 Fiske traveled in England for a year, conversing about evolution and his own philosophy of evolutionism with Spencer, Charles Darwin, geologist Charles Lyell, and biologist Thomas Henry Huxley. It was on the basis of the revisions of his previous works, in which positivism was replaced by evolutionism, and from the criticisms and comments of these men, that Fiske's *Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy Based on the Doctrine of Evolution, with Criticisms on the Positive Philosophy* (1874) emerged. In 1879 he was elected to a six-year term on Harvard's Board of Overseers, and was reelected to a second six-year term in 1885. He was also strongly influenced by Charles PEIRCE and pragmatism. Fiske was among those added to the Harvard faculty by Eliot upon his appointment as President in 1869 with the goal, as described in "A History of Harvard College," to "transform the relatively small provincial College into a modern university."

Fiske was an enthusiastic advocate of Darwin's theory of biological evolution and especially of Spencer's philosophical applications and development of a general theory of evolution. His most important philosophical work, *Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy*, was based upon his Harvard lectures, delivered from 1869 to 1871. In the *Outlines*, the posthumously published 1902 edition of which included an "Introduction" by Josiah ROYCE, Fiske expressed the opinion that in time Spencer's law of evolution would come to be recognized as having greater importance even than Newton's theory of gravity, arguing that Spencer's law was of ultimately greater import because it was the "first generalization concerning the concrete universe as a whole." Like Spencer, Fiske sought to apply the theory of evolution to all spheres, not merely to the biological, but to every aspect of the universe and existence. Science, Fiske held, had been little more than a disconnected collection of facts and rules, devoid of a coherent and unifying system of governing truths. Spencer's positivism, based upon the doctrine of evolution, had, finally, provided a conception of the unity of nature with causality as its unifying principle and a web of causation binding together all of these facts.

Fiske argued that the human brain continued to evolve long after the human body reached its finished state of growth, and that that was the reason why a considerably more prolonged infancy was required for humans than for other species. These evolutionary views on the significance of the prolonged dependency of humans were expressed in the posthumously published *The Meaning of Infancy* (1909). He held that the human brain would continue to evolve and that, therefore, human progress would continue.

Besides lecturing on Darwinism at Harvard, Fiske lectured on positivism. He was noted for his ability to simplify and make readily comprehensible the most complex, obscure, and abstruse ideas, yet doing so without sacrificing the intellectual substance of the theories he was discussing, which were presented in a methodical, orderly train of thought. In his popular lectures on science

across the country, he was noted for his ebullient, entertaining style. It was said of him that he was a "master-performer" and that his popular lectures on science, labeled the "Fiske season," "rivaled the feats of Barnum" (Brooks and Bettmann 1956, p. 157).

Fiske was a close friend of both Chauncey Wright and Charles Peirce, and in *Darwinism and Other Essays* (1879), he showed himself to be a pragmatist. This work included an appreciation of Wright (1879, pp. 78–109). Along with Peirce, Wright, Francis Ellingwood ABBOT, and several others, Fiske was a member of the "Metaphysical Club" that met at various Cambridge homes for philosophical discussions during the early and mid 1870s. It was at the Metaphysical Club that Peirce first formulated his conception of pragmatism (Wiener 1949). Although corroboration of Peirce's assertion is scant, the group was important in establishing Darwinism in American intellectual life, and as both a crucial component of pragmatism and a crucial influence on its development.

Fiske's interests also included history and philosophy of history. Beginning in 1881 Fiske lectured annually on American history at Washington University in St. Louis, and beginning in 1884 he was professor of American history at Washington University for several years, visiting for two months each year while living in Cambridge the rest of the year. He also lectured at many other universities and gave popular lectures in history across the country, and was renowned in his day for his delivery. He sought to understand political history against the backdrop of intellectual history, and saw the evolution of ideas as driving factors in the evolution of political culture: for example, in *American Political Ideas Viewed from the Standpoint of Universal History* (1885) and *Civil Government in the United States Considered with Some Reference to Its Origins* (1890). The best of his works combined political and intellectual history with the theme of evolution connecting them. An example in which

political and religious culture were combined in this manner through a study of history was found in *The Beginnings of New England, or, The Puritan Theocracy in Its Relation to Civil and Religious Liberty* (1889). His many books on American history dealt primarily with the colonial, revolutionary, early republic, and Civil War periods. Fiske's approach throughout was that of the intellectual and cultural historian, in search of the leading ideas and ideals that provided the motivation, justification, or expression of political evolution. Intellectual and cultural history led him to study the lives of such leaders as George Washington, seeking through political biography to examine the leading ideas of the men and the times. He also wrote a biography of chemist, publisher and popular science writer Edward L. Youmans (1894).

The best example of Fiske's approach to history through its leading ideas and ideals is found in his essays on the history of science and of those men who contributed to the development of science. This can be seen in *A Century of Science* (1899), in which Fiske discussed the developments of the nineteenth century. It also appears in *Essays, Historical and Literary* (1902), which, in addition to containing his musings on history, philosophy of history, and historiography in the essay "Old and New Ways of Treating History," includes essays on "John Milton," "Herbert Spencer's Service to Religion," and "Evolution in the Present Age."

In the essays collected in *Excursions of an Evolutionist* (1883) and *The Miscellaneous Writings* (1902), Fiske applied evolutionary theory and his pragmatic conception of religion to social and anthropological themes, including mythology, psychology, and linguistics, examining social evolution, religion, and the nature, origin, and growth of language. In his historical writings, Fiske undertook to demonstrate that American civilization was the most developed, arguing that, while English historians of the era pointed to the British institution of

parliamentary government as evidence that the Anglo-Saxon was the most evolutionarily advanced of civilizations, America had gone even beyond Britain in developing its democracy.

For Fiske, the interest in political and intellectual history was an outgrowth of his interest in, and an effort to understand, human development and civilization in evolutionary terms. In *The Unseen World and Other Essays* (1876), *The Destiny of Man, Viewed in the Light of His Origin* (1884), in *Through Nature to God* (1899), and in *Life Everlasting* (1901), he sought for the religious or spiritual meaning of human existence, as elucidated and unfolded in the biological world as driven by evolution. The concern in these works is spiritual values, such as the immortality of man and, especially, *The Destiny of Man* and *Life Everlasting*. This theme is also treated in *Through Nature to God*, which treats the themes of good and evil, the nature and significance of love and self-sacrifice, and the reality of religion, in an effort to understand which universal truths and values religion presents. In *The Idea of God as Affected by Modern Knowledge* (1886), Fiske examines the conception of God and attempts to preserve from a rationalistic and scientific perspective the spiritual substance of religiosity and its values, thus developing a rational theology that would justify and preserve the human value and ethical core of religion while defending Darwinian evolution.

Psychologist and philosopher G. Stanley HALL, who became acquainted with Charles Peirce when both were on the faculty of the Johns Hopkins University, wrote in his autobiography that "Charles Peirce had been for years at the Hopkins occupying a tentative position, one of the ablest and most original philosophic minds this country has ever produced, and I think at one time an intimate friend of Chauncey Wright (1830–1875) and John Fiske, two of the most brilliant men in the Harvard circle though not on the faculty." (Hall 1923, p. 226)

Fiske can best be described as a philosopher of history and of human existence who exploited the Spencerian conception of evolution, applied well beyond the biological sphere, to seek the purpose of human existence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Myths and Mythmakers: Old Tales and Superstitions Interpreted by Comparative Mythology (Boston, 1872).

Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy Based on the Doctrine of Evolution, with Criticisms on the Positive Philosophy, 2 vols (Boston and London, 1874).

The Unseen World and Other Essays (Boston, 1876; 2nd edn 1902).

Darwinism and Other Essays (New York, 1879; 2nd edn 1885).

The Destiny of Man, Viewed in the Light of His Origin (Boston, 1884).

Excursions of an Evolutionist (Boston, 1883).

Darwinism and Other Essays (New York, 1879; 2nd edn 1885).

American Political Ideas Viewed from the Standpoint of Universal History (New York, 1885).

The Idea of God as Affected by Modern Knowledge (Boston, 1886).

The Critical Period of American History, 1783–1789 (Boston, 1888).

The Beginnings of New England, or, The Puritan Theocracy in Its Relation to Civil and Religious Liberty (Boston, 1889).

Civil Government in the United States, Considered with Some Reference to Its Origins (Boston, 1890; 2nd edn 1898; 3rd edn 1902).

The American Revolution, 2 vols (Boston and New York, 1891).

The Discovery of America, with Some Account of Ancient America and the Spanish Conquest (Cambridge, Mass., 1892). 2nd edn, *The Discovery and Colonization of North America* (Boston, 1905).

A Century of Science, and Other Essays

(Boston, 1899).

Through Nature to God (Boston, 1899).

The Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America (Boston, 1900; 2nd edn 1903).

The Mississippi Valley in the Civil War (Boston, 1900).

Life Everlasting (Boston, 1901).

Colonization of the New World, ed. John Henry Wright (Philadelphia and New York, 1902).

Essays, Historical and Literary (New York, 1902).

New France and New England (Boston, 1902).

Other Relevant Work

Fiske's papers are at Huntington Library in San Marion, California, the Library of Congress, and Harvard University.

Ed. with James Grant Wilson, *Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, 6 vols (New York, 1886–9).

Edward Livingston Youmans, Interpreter of Science for the People, A Sketch of His Life with Selections from His Published Writings (New York, 1894).

The Historical Writings of John Fiske, 12 vols (Boston, 1902).

The Miscellaneous Writings of John Fiske, with Many Portraits of Illustrious Philosophers, Scientists, and Other Men of Note, 12 vols (Boston, 1902).

The Meaning of Infancy (Boston, 1909).

The Life and Letters of John Fiske, 2 vols, ed. Joseph Spencer Clark (Boston and New York, 1917).

The Letters of John Fiske, ed. Ethel Fisk (New York, 1940).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Dict Amer Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v3, Who Was Who in Amer v1

Berman, Milton. *John Fiske: The Evolution of a Popularizer* (Cambridge, Mass., 1961).

Brooks, Van Wyck, and Otto L. Bettmann. *Our Literary Heritage: A Pictorial History of the Writer in America* (New York, 1956).

Davis, Andrew M. *John Fiske* (Boston, 1902).

Hall, G. Stanley. *Life and Confessions of a Psychologist* (New York and London, 1923).

Pannill, H. Burnell. *The Religious Faith of John Fiske* (Durham, N.C., 1957).

Perry, Thomas S. *John Fiske* (Boston, 1906).

Powell, Lawrence Clark. *John Fiske: Bookman* (New York, 1941).

Roberts, Jon H. *Darwinism and the Divine in America* (Notre Dame, Ind., 2001).

Saum, Lewis O. "John Fiske and the West," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 48 (1985): 47–58.

Saunders, Jennings B. "John Fiske," in *The Marcus W. Jernegan Essays in American Historioghraphy*, ed. William Hutchinson (Chicago, 1937), pp. 144–70.

Wiener, Philip P. *Evolution and the Founders of Pragmatism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1949).

Winston, George P. *John Fiske* (New York, 1972).

Irving H. Anellis

FITCH, Frederic Brenton (1908–87)

Frederic B. Fitch was born on 9 September 1908 in Greenwich, Connecticut. He attended Yale University, from which he earned his BA in 1931 and his PhD in philosophy in 1934. From 1934 to 1937 he did postdoctoral study on a fellowship and a research assistantship at the University of Virginia. He returned to Yale in 1937 to join the philosophy faculty, where he taught for

the rest of his career. He was an active member of the Association for Symbolic Logic, serving as its Vice President from 1956 to 1959 and President from 1959 to 1962. From 1974 until his retirement in 1977, he held Yale's title of Sterling Professor of Philosophy. Fitch died on 18 September 1987 in New Haven, Connecticut.

Fitch worked primarily in combinatory logic, authoring an undergraduate-level textbook on the subject (1974), but he also made significant contributions to intuitionism and modal logic. He was interested in the problem of the consistency, completeness, categoricity, and constructivity of logical theories, especially of nonclassical logics, and contributed to the foundations of mathematics and to inductive probability. He dealt with the theory of reference in "The Problem of the Morning Star and the Evening Star" (1949).

Fitch was an early advocate of combinatory logic, developed in America by Haskell CURRY, Robert Feys, Dana SCOTT, J. Roger Hindley, and Jonathan P. Seldin. Combinatory logic is constructed as an extension of the concept of the Sheffer stroke to first-order functional calculus. In 1924 Moses Schönfinkel presented a universal connective U of mutual exclusivity which reduces all functions to single-valued functions and treats the values of these functions as truth-values. Thus, for a binary relation $F(x, y)$, we construct the single-valued function $fX(y)$; and for classes F and G of this system, we rewrite UFG as $(UF)G$, which is to be translated as "F and G are mutually exclusive (classes)." Moreover, we define the usual logical connectives of propositional calculus in terms of U, and eliminate the variables of first-order, and even higher-order, functional calculi, by adjoining the constancy function C, defined as $(Cx)y$, and the fusion function S, defined as $((Sx)y)z) = (xz)(y, z)$, and identity. We thus obtain a string of concatenated terms, given by J, where $S = JJ$, $C = JS$, and $U = JC$. The problem of the consistency of combinatory logic arises because of the appearance of a paradox similar in structure to the Russell paradox (and which we know as the Curry paradox), which is, after all, derivable in the Curry–Hindley–Seldin system of combinatory logic. This accounts for Fitch's interest in issues of the properties of logical systems, in particular such properties as consistency.

In his work on modal logic, Fitch pioneered the use of tree proofs, the analytic tableaux of Raymond M. SMULLYAN. Smullyan's doctoral student Melvin Chris Fitting in his paper "Tableau Methods of Proof for Modal Logics" (1972) borrowed Saul KRIPKE's work in two 1963 papers that present a semantic model-theoretic approach to modal logics, as adapted by Fitch in his 1966 abstract on "Tree Proofs in Modal Logic," and applied it to Smullyan trees. Fitting's 1983 book *Proof Methods for Modal and Intuitionistic Logics* is a textbook for applying semantic tableaux to modal and intuitionistic logic. Fitch also contributed to deontic logic.

Fitch continued through the years to question the consistency of the calculus of the second edition of Bertrand Russell and A. N. WHITEHEAD's *Principia Mathematica* (in 1974), just as, at the outset of his career, he defended that of the ramified *Principia* system without the Axiom of Reducibility, but with the Axioms of Infinity, Extensionality, and Choice, of the first edition (in 1938). Fitch's textbook *Symbolic Logic* (1952) uses a variant of the popular natural deduction technique; in common with the natural deductive system used by W. V. QUINE and others, it was a deductive zero-order system, based upon rules of substitution and without any rules specifying axioms. Proofs are begun with assumptions and the consequences of these assumptions are obtained by discharging the assumptions by conditionalization.

In 1969 Fitch and Robert Feys prepared a dictionary of symbols of mathematical logic, in an effort to standardize notation, but they did not provide a history of the notation in their dictionary. Later, Fitch joined with other logicians of the Yale University philosophy

department, including in particular Allan Ross ANDERSON, Ruth Barcan MARCUS, and Richard Milton MARTIN, to produce the *Logical Enterprise* (1975), which describes a full range of logical systems and philosophical applications of logic.

One of Fitch's few direct contributions to epistemology concerns the debate between verificationism and realism. Verificationism holds that all truths are knowable, but in a 1963 article Fitch offered a proof that from the proposition that all truths are knowable it can be concluded that all truths are known. Unless it is possible that some truths are both known and not known, his proof would be a reason to reject verificationism since we obviously do not know all truths. The validity and implications of his "paradox of knowability" continue to be a matter of debate in epistemology.

Fitch also contributed to philosophy of logic and language, working in natural deduction and formulating rules of inference using natural deduction for natural languages, for example in "Universal Metalanguages for Philosophy" (1964) and "Natural Deduction Rules for English" (1973). Among his unpublished manuscripts are "A Correlation Between Modal Reduction and Properties of Relations" and "The Relation Between Natural Languages and Formal Languages," which are in his papers at Yale University.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Consistency of the Ramified Principia," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 3 (1938): 140–49.
"The Problem of the Morning Star and the Evening Star," *Philosophy of Science* 6 (1949): 137–41.
Symbolic Logic: An Introduction (New York, 1952).
"Definition of Negation in Extended Basic Logic," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 19 (1954): 29–36.
"A Logical Analysis of Some Value Concepts," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 28 (1963): 135–42.
"Universal Metalanguages for Philosophy," *Review of Metaphysics* 17 (1964): 396–402.
"Tree Proofs in Modal Logic," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 31 (1966): 152.
"Natural Deduction Rules for Obligation," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 3 (1966): 1–12.
"A Theory of Logical Essences," *The Monist* 5 (1967): 104–9.
"A Complete and Consistent Modal Set Theory," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 32 (1967): 93–103.
"A Revision of Hohfeld's Theory of Legal Concepts," *Logique et Analyse* 10 (1967): 269–76.
"Natural Deduction Rules for English," *Philosophical Studies* 2 (1973): 89–104.
Elements of Combinatory Logic (New Haven, Conn., 1974).
"Combinatory Logic and Negative Numbers," in *Logical Enterprise*, with Allan Ross Anderson et al. (New Haven, Conn., 1975), pp. 265–77.
"Toward Proving the Consistency of *Principia Mathematica*," in *Bertrand Russell's Philosophy*, ed. George Nakhnikian (London, 1974), pp. 19–27.

Other Relevant Works
Fitch's papers are at Yale University.
Ed. with Robert Feys, *Dictionary of Symbols of Mathematical Logic* (Amsterdam, 1969).

Further Reading
Proc of APA v61, Who's Who in Phil
Beall, J. C. "Fitch's Proof, Verificationism, and the Knower Paradox," *Australian Journal of Philosophy* 78 (2000): 241–7.
Berry, George D. W. "On Quine's Axioms of Quantification," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 6 (1941): 23–7.
Curry, Haskell B. "Grundlagen der Kombinatorischen Logik," *American Journal of Mathematics* 52 (1930):

509–36, 789–834.

Curry, Haskell B., and Robert Feys. *Combinatory Logic* (Amsterdam, 1958).

Fitting, Melvin C. "Tableau Methods of Proof for Modal Logics," *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 13 (1972): 237–47.

Kripke, Saul A. "Semantical Analysis of Modal Logic I, Normal Modal Propositional Calculi," *Zeitschrift für mathematische Logik und die Grundlagen der Mathematik* 9 (1963): 67–96.

———, "Semantical Considerations on Modal Logic," *Acta Philosophica Fennica* 16 (1963): 83–94.

Quine, W. V. *Mathematical Logic* (New York, 1940).

Schönfinkel, Moses. "Über die Bausteine der mathematischen Logik," ed. Heinrich Behmann, *Mathematische Annalen* 94 (1924): 305–16.

Siemans, David F., Jr. "Fitch-style Rules for Many Modal Logics," *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 18 (1977): 631–6.

Irving H. Anellis

FITE, Warner (1867–1955)

Warner Fite was born 5 March 1867 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He graduated with a BA from Haverford College in 1889 and received his PhD in philosophy from the University of Pennsylvania in 1894. He taught at Williams College where he also served as Dean of the faculty during 1895–7. He was an instructor at the University of Chicago from 1897 to 1901, and then did postgraduate study in philosophy at the universities of Berlin and Munich for two years. Fite was an instructor at the University of Texas (1903–1906), Indiana University (1906–1908), and Harvard

(1911–12). In 1915 he joined the philosophy department at Princeton University, where he was a colleague of Charles HENDEL, Jr. He held the chair of Stuart Professor of Ethics from 1917 until his retirement in 1935. He was President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1934–5. Fite died on 23 June 1955 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

From his earliest writings Fite espoused a strong form of individualism in his basic approach to philosophy and life. This became a recurrent theme which he developed in his *Individualism* (1911) and in *Moral Philosophy: The Critical View of Life* (1925). He used the term "morality" to cover all that is important in human character and personality. He claimed each of us stands for something than which nothing can be assumed by him to be better. That something, that most important thing in life, is the true meaning of morality. The examination of your own life – the examined life – is not only necessary for individuality and morality, it is also, according to Fite, sufficient.

Fite distinguishes two broad classes of ethical theories: absolutistic or authoritarian, and humanistic or libertarian, in which morality is derived from human nature and human choice. He describes his own view as humanistic. This view does not ground ethics or the moral life on some external law or principle of rightness or duty, but rather insists that any genuine ethics or moral life can only be grounded in the critical thinking of the individual who lives by and stands by that life. Fite does not see how any moral philosophy can be both moral and also a matter of obedience or obligation. Here, he insists, we are faced with an antinomy or paradox which defines the orthodox view of morality, as well as the longstanding view of Kantian morality. To break this antinomy or conflict, we do not have to vacate morality, we only have to reject the view that morality is externally imposed and thereby adopt the view of individualism: that morality is individually developed by each person doing his or her own

critical thinking or reflection.

Warner Fite was a personal friend of the Spanish philosopher Miguel de Unamuno, whose novel *Mist* he translated in 1928. In his last published work *Jesus, The Man* (1946), Fite characterizes Jesus as a human personality, a superior preacher, but not authoritarian or supernatural in his moral insights.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An Introductory Study of Ethics (New York, 1903).

Individualism: Four Lectures on the Significance of Consciousness for Social Relations (New York, 1911).

"Pragmatism and Truth," *Philosophical Review* 23 (1914): 506–24.

Birth-Control and Biological Ethics, National Birth Control League pamphlet (New York, 1916).

Moral Philosophy: The Critical View of Life (New York, 1925). Republished as *The Examined Life: An Adventure in Moral Philosophy* (Bloomington, Ind., 1957).

The Living Mind: Essays on the Significance of Consciousness (New York, 1930).

The Platonic Legend (New York, 1934).

"The Philosopher and His Words," *Philosophical Review* 44 (1935): 120–37.

Jesus, the Man: A Critical Essay (Cambridge, Mass., 1946).

Other Relevant Works

Fite's papers are at Princeton University.

Trans., *Mist (Niebla): A Tragicomic Novel*, by Miguel de Unamuno (New York, 1928).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Pres Addr of APA v4*, *Proc of APA v29*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Burr, John R. *Three Dimensions of Philosophic Intelligence; Private, Public, and Visional, in the Philosophies of Warner Fite, John Dewey, and George Santayana*. PhD dissertation, Columbia University (New York, 1959).

Guy W. Stroh

FLETCHER, Joseph Francis, III (1905–91)

Joseph Fletcher was born on 10 April 1905 in Newark, New Jersey, and died on 28 October 1991 in Charlottesville, Virginia. Minister, educator, and author, he was ordained as an Episcopal priest in 1929. He taught Christian ethics and pastoral theology at the Episcopal Theological School from 1944 to 1970 and medical ethics at the University of Virginia from 1970 to 1977. His 1954 book *Morals and Medicine* provoked considerable scholarly debate about euthanasia, sterilization, and artificial insemination. His 1966 book *Situation Ethics: The New Morality* caused much controversy in the academic world and also in the popular press. In 1974 he was named Humanist of the Year by the Southern Medical Association. He was a founding member of numerous societies including the Planned Parenthood Foundation, the Society for the Right to Die, and the Soviet American Friendship Society.

Fletcher's *Situation Ethics* was an unusual book, becoming a best-seller and widely discussed in the mass media by *Time*, *Newsweek*, and other venues. It opened up a series of popular and academic debates on the whole topic of the proper methods for ethics. In this work, and in others, Fletcher focused attention on many topics in medical and sexual ethics: euthanasia, birth control, abortion, genetic control, etc. His main purpose was to remove ethics from purely abstract and general discussion, and to focus attention on the specific and variable situations of life where ethics really goes on. There were antecedents for this. In Germany, Eberhard Grisebach's book *Gegenwart: eine kritische Ethik* (1928)

called attention to the importance of concrete situations for any religious ethics, where each moral problem is actually unique and can be solved only by one who is concretely confronted with the problem. Earlier than this, the American pragmatist, John DEWEY, in his 1920 work *Reconstruction in Philosophy*, clearly emphasized the need for a truly situational approach to any moral life. Dewey argued that we cannot seek or attain health, wealth, education, or justice in *general*. Action he claimed is always specific, individualized, unique, or situational.

Fletcher was aware of the efforts of Dewey and others which emphasized the need for a truly situational ethics. Fletcher claims that his own situation ethics is able to accommodate several important other perspectives including relativism, pragmatism, and utilitarianism. Moral situations are always relative to change, time, and place, and must be judged in terms of their practical consequences for the greatest good or happiness of the greatest number of people. Fletcher sets out to show that situation ethics is a kind of middle position between mere rule following or moral legalism on the one hand, and antinomianism, or a purely spontaneous view where rules are abandoned entirely on the other. Situation ethics, he claims, is superior to both. It can accept rules or laws for ethics, but only insofar as they are treated as flexible, capable of being modified as needed, for every specific situation.

Fletcher believes that moral legalism is wrong because it sets rules above people and the specific situations in which they have to act. Fletcher is critical of all major Western religious traditions as being too legalistic by relying on strict or absolute rules. Fletcher does, however, allow one absolute in ethics. Love, he claims, is always absolutely good; but love is not a law or abstract principle. Love, in a truly moral or religious sense, involves a personal concern or caring about people and their needs. Here, he distinguishes love as *agape* from love as mere eros or desire. *Agape* involves a deep caring and respect for persons as ends in them-

selves. *Agape*, he alleges, is not a matter of mere interest or a means to something else. It is intrinsically good. But he also claims that *agape* is compatible with reason or calculating consequences. It is not the same as impulsiveness, dogmatism, or pure subjective feeling.

Fletcher claims his situation ethics is superior to all forms of antinomianism, including the existentialism of the French philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre. Fletcher believes that moral decisions can be justified, and in fact need to be justified, by appealing to anticipated consequences. Ethical rules or principles are acceptable as long as they are pragmatically and relatively used. No principle of *agape* tells anyone how to use this love in each and every situation. Christian love, as Fletcher sees it, is not opposed to prudence or justice. Prudence and careful calculation, he claims, give love the carefulness it needs.

Fletcher is fond of giving examples of what he means by careful calculation and decision-making. His examples often involve rather extreme situations. He offers the following example: if we can only carry one person from a burning building, where the choice is between saving one's father or a scientist who has discovered a cure for a widespread fatal disease, Fletcher says that we should save the scientist since, according to the agapeic calculus, this choice involves the greater good. By saving the scientist, who is able with his knowledge to save many other people, we serve the greater good. This example and other cases Fletcher cites have produced much controversy and criticism of his views. No doubt, by using such extreme cases as he does, Fletcher has succeeded in getting his many readers to think seriously about the problems of ethics. His influence has been both positive and negative. On the positive side, he has contributed to the growing concern in recent ethics with all the problems of applied social ethics, medical ethics, abortion, euthanasia, capital punishment, etc. On the negative side, his critics have been quick to call attention to what seem like simplistic or premature solutions to otherwise

complex problems. By provoking as much controversy as he has, Fletcher's work is clearly a stimulus for more and better thought about what ethics can do and what it cannot do. Situation ethics, as he conceives it, offers only a method for approaching the ongoing choices or decisions of the moral life; it does not pretend to offer a fixed and final solution. Absolute security, fixity, or complacency are not to be found, or expected, in any real or concrete moral life, or theory about life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Church and Industry, with Spencer Miller (New York, 1930).
Christianity and Property (Philadelphia, 1947).
Morals and Medicine (Princeton, N.J., 1954).
William Temple: Twentieth-Century Christian (New York, 1963).
Situation Ethics: The New Morality (Philadelphia, 1966).
Moral Responsibility: Situation Ethics at Work (Philadelphia, 1967).
Hello Lovers: An Introduction to Situation Ethics, with Thomas Wassmer, ed. W. E. May (New York, 1970).
Situation Ethics – True or False, with John W. Montgomery (Minneapolis, Minn., 1972).
The Ethics of Genetic Control: Ending Reproductive Roulette (New York, 1974).
Humanhood: Essays in Biomedical Ethics (Buffalo, N.Y., 1979).

Other Relevant Works
"Medicine and Criteria of Human Nature," in *Science, Medicine and Man* 1 (1973): 93–102.
"Situation Ethics and Watergate," *Theology Today* 31 (1975): 343–5.
"Fetal Research: Pragmatists and Doctrinaires," *Hastings Center Report 5* (1975): 11–46.
"Feeding the Hungry: An Ethical Appraisal," *Soundings* 59 (1976): 52–69.
"Medical Resistance to the Right to Die," *Journal of the American Geriatric Society* 35 (1987): 676–82.
"Humanism and Theism in Biomedical Ethics," *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 31 (1987): 106–16.
"Euthanasia in the Courts," *Euthanasia Review* 2 (Fall 1987): 15–22.

Further Reading
Bennett, John C., et al. *Storm over Ethics* (Philadelphia, 1968).
Cox, Harvey, ed. *The Situation Ethics Debate* (Philadelphia, 1968).
Cunningham, Robert L., ed. *Situationism and the New Morality* (New York, 1970).
Davitt, Thomas E. *Ethics in the Situation* (New York, 1970).
Ramsey, Paul. *Deeds and Rules in Christian Ethics* (New York, 1967).
Robinson, John. *Honest to God* (Philadelphia, 1963).
Stroh, Guy W. *American Ethical Thought* (Chicago, 1979), chap. 7.
Vaux, Kenneth, ed. *Joseph Fletcher: Memoir of an Ex-Radical, Reminiscence and Reappraisal* (Louisville, Kent., 1993).

Guy W. Stroh

FLEW, Antony Garrard Newton (1923–)

Antony Flew was born on 11 February 1923 in Ealing, London, England. He attended St. Faith's Preparatory School, Kingswood School, and St. John's College, Oxford, where he earned a BA in 1947 and an MA in 1949. He won Oxford's annual university prize in philosophy – the John Locke Scholarship in Mental Philosophy – in 1948. He later earned a D.Litt. from the University of Keele in 1974. Flew was lecturer in philosophy at Christ Church, Oxford, in 1949–50, and a lecturer in moral philosophy at King's College, University

of Aberdeen, from 1950 to 1954. Flew then went to the University of Keele, where he was professor of philosophy from 1954 to 1974. Flew's next appointment was professor of philosophy at the University of Reading, from 1973 to 1982. After taking early retirement from Reading in 1982, Flew had a half-time position as professor of philosophy at York University in Toronto, teaching there during the spring semesters from 1983 to 1985.

During the period from the mid 1950s to the early 1990s, Flew spent many semesters as a visiting professor in the United States and Canada, totaling about ten cumulative years that made a considerable impact on the course of North American philosophy and graduate education. Among the universities he visited are Minnesota, New York University, Swarthmore, Pittsburgh, Maryland, Buffalo, Southern California, Calgary, University of California at San Diego, and Bowling Green. Flew also was Gifford Lecturer at the University of St. Andrews in 1986–7.

For more than fifty years, Flew has made contributions in linguistic, historical, political, sociological, moral, and theological scholarship. His strident libertarianism, championship of free markets, atheistic humanism, and advocacy of the right to assisted suicide have been influential on matters of public policy. His large output in a variety of fields has made him a well-known, accessible, and controversial philosopher.

Flew pursued linguistic philosophy, following in the tradition of Bertrand Russell, Ludwig Wittgenstein, and Friedrich Waismann. He was deeply influenced by his Oxford mentors, Gilbert Ryle and John Austin. The advantages of linguistic philosophy were documented and disseminated in his three great methodological collections: *Logic and Language*, first and second series (1951 and 1953), and *Essays in Conceptual Analysis* (1956). These were among the first and most influential collections of contemporary essays around a central methodological theme. In "Philosophy and Language" (1955), a powerful *mea culpa*, he

shows that linguistic philosophy is as old as philosophy itself, with pride of place for Aristotle, and significant contributions by Hume, Kant, and J. S. Mill, among others. Attention to ordinary language helps clarify philosophical disputes and may suggest means of resolution, as in the famous Argument of the Paradigm Case, which shows that indicating a paradigm case eliminates arguments that no such case is possible.

For Flew, linguistic philosophy demands consistency and good reasoning in all intellectual work (*Thinking About Thinking*, 1975). The meaning of a word may evolve over time, but at any point in time meaningful discourse requires the possibility of inclusion and exclusion. To the notion of contradiction Flew adds Karl Popper's methodology of falsification, the view that one falsifying instance disproves a theory though confirming instances do not prove it. Contradiction and falsification harmoniously complement Flew's ordinary language analysis.

A good example of this methodology in action is Flew's short essay, "Theology and Falsification" (1950), where he demonstrates that claims about the nature and existence of God change in the face of criticism through the addition of qualifications to the original claims. A fair application of the falsification challenge – an account of what would constitute clear disproof of any claim – would limit such qualifications and show that theological claims are not provable. Thus, theological disputes are not factual disputes. The argumentative lesson is that progress in philosophy comes only through the assertion and defense of potentially falsifiable claims. Flew's linguistic philosophy is argumentative and empirical, falling well within the tradition of British philosophy from Thomas Hobbes to A. J. Ayer.

As Flew argues, the burden of proof in the matter of God's existence is on the theist, so disbelief has argumentative presumption. In *The Logic of Mortality*, his 1986 Gifford Lectures (1987), Flew shows that "personal survival of death" and "personal immortal-

ity" are self-contradictory expressions. As we understand those expressions, personal survival of death is impossible, since personhood, as we understand it, requires our physical and social being. Memory can reveal but cannot constitute personal identity. People are creatures of flesh and blood. The usual indices of death demonstrate that a person is unequivocally dead, and thus lacks continuous mental properties. The very meaning of personhood relies on this notion. Arguments about personal survival of death equivocate at the very least, but also are self-defeating. Although never tempted by traditional Christianity or theism, recently Flew has become more comfortable with the idea of a divinely intelligent creator responsible for the universe and for the first life on earth. In the third edition of his book *God and Philosophy* (2005), Flew expresses greater respect for teleological arguments for God, such as the intelligent design argument.

Flew believes democratic principles and personal autonomy offer the best environment for free inquiry. For Flew, this fact leads to libertarianism and to arguments against enforced political equality, unjustified governmental regulation, and centralized economies. Flew's libertarianism attempts to maximize political freedom, personal choices that do no harm, and free markets. For Flew, justice comes from eliminating barriers to personal and economic freedom, not from reverse discrimination or other unequal attempts to establish commonality. The state violates its social contract when it places barriers, however well intentioned, in the way of intellectual or economic attainment. The marketplace of ideas must always be unregulated, and the commercial marketplace must be unregulated except for the most extreme contingencies.

Investigations of human nature risk violating Hume's is/ought, fact/value distinction, described by G. E. Moore as "the naturalistic fallacy." Flew discusses this problem in *Thinking About Social Thinking* (1985), where he warns that the search for truth in the social sciences is often compromised by illicit assumptions or poor reasoning. The social sciences suffer from all of the justification problems of the natural sciences, and more, including covert political agendas and question-begging readings of evidence. The antidote to these maladies, Flew urges, is uncompromising honesty and integrity in social science research.

Flew believes our greatest moral responsibility is to each other, now and in our embodied future, and not in some theoretical eternity. This responsibility requires that we work to make this world just, safe, rational, free, and secure; we must not sacrifice our human future for the hope of a better immaterial future. With attention to language, to cogent reasoning, to freedom of inquiry, and to empirical evidence, progress is possible in philosophy. Ordinary language, logic, and empiricism yield a powerful methodological approach to issues in philosophy, theology, and the social sciences.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A New Approach to Psychical Research (London, 1953).

Hume's Philosophy of Belief: A Study of His First Inquiry (London, 1961).

God and Philosophy (New York and London, 1966). 2nd edn, *God: A Critical Enquiry* (La Salle, Ill., 1984). 3rd edn, *God and Philosophy* (Amherst, N.Y., 2005).

Evolutionary Ethics (London, 1967).

Crime or Disease? (London, 1973). Reprinted as *Crime, Punishment and Disease* (New Brunswick, N.J., 2002).

Thinking About Thinking (London, 1975). Also published as *Thinking Straight* (Buffalo, N.Y., 1977); rev. edn, *How to Think Straight* (Buffalo, N.Y., 1998).

The Presumption of Atheism and Other Philosophical Essays on God, Freedom, and Immortality (London, 1976).

Sociology, Equality and Education: Philosophical Essays in Defense of a

Variety of Differences (London, 1976).

A Rational Animal and Other Philosophical Essays on the Nature of Man (Oxford, 1978).

Politics of Procrustes: Contradictions of Enforced Equality (Buffalo, N.Y., 1981).

Darwinian Evolution (London, 1984; 2nd edn, New Brunswick, N.J., 1997).

Thinking About Social Thinking (Oxford, 1985; 2nd edn, London, 1991).

David Hume: Philosopher of Moral Science (Oxford, 1986).

The Logic of Mortality (Oxford, 1987). Rev. edn, *Merely Mortal? Could You Survive Your Own Death?* (Buffalo, N.Y., 2000).

Agency and Necessity, with Godfrey Vesey (Oxford, 1987).

Power to the Parents: Reversing Educational Decline (London, 1987).

Equality in Liberty and Justice (London, 1989; New Brunswick, N.J., 2001).

Atheistic Humanism: The Prometheus Lectures (Buffalo, N.Y., 1993).

Shephard's Warning: Putting Education Back on Course (London, 1994).

Philosophical Essays, ed. John Shosky (Oxford, 1998). Contains Flew's autobiographical "Philosopher's Apology," pp. 183–208.

Social Life and Moral Judgment (New Brunswick, N.J., 2003).

Ethics and Public Policy, ed. John Shosky (Oxford, 2003).

Does God Exist? The Craig–Flew Debate, with William L. Craig (Aldershot, UK, 2004).

Resurrected? An Atheist and Theist Dialogue, with Gary Habermas (Lanham, Md., 2005).

Other Relevant Works

"Locke and the Problem of Personal Identity," *Philosophy* 26 (1951): 53–68.

Ed., *Logic and Language, First Series* (Oxford, 1951).

Ed., *Logic and Language, Second Series* (Oxford, 1953).

"Can an Effect Precede Its Cause," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* suppl. 28 (1954): 45–62.

Ed. with Alasdair MacIntyre, *New Essays in Philosophical Theology* (London, 1955).

Ed., *Essays in Conceptual Analysis* (London, 1956).

Ed., *Body, Mind, and Death* (London, 1964).

Ed., *A Dictionary of Philosophy* (New York, 1979; 2nd edn 1999).

Ed., *Readings in the Philosophical Problems of Parapsychology* (Buffalo, N.Y., 1987).

"The Legitimation of Factual Necessity," in *Faith, Scepticism and Personal Identity: A Festschrift for Terence Penelhum*, ed. J. J. MacIntosh and H. A. Meynell (Calgary, Alberta, 1994), pp. 101–17.

"Social Democracy and the Myth of Social Justice," in *Libertarians and Liberalism: Essays in Honor of Gerard Radnitzky*, ed. Hardy Bouillon (Aldershot, UK, 1996), pp. 170–83.

"Russell, Wittgenstein, and *Cogito ergo sum*," in *Bertrand Russell on Nuclear War, Peace, and Language*, ed. A. Schwerin (London, 2002), pp. 59–71.

Further Reading

Allen, R. T. "Flew, Marx and Gnosticism," *Philosophy* 68 (1993): 94–8.

Colwell, Gary. "The Flew-Nielsen Challenge: A Critical Exposition of Its Methodology," *Religious Studies* 17 (1981): 323–42.

Evans, C. Stephen. *Philosophy of Religion: Thinking About Faith* (Downers Grove, Ill., 1985).

Kurtz, Paul W. "Has Mr Flew Abandoned 'The Logic of Ordinary Use'?" *Philosophical Studies* 9 (1958): 73–7.

Lycan, William G. "Flew on Mind/Brain Identity and the Cartesian Framework," *Journal of Critical Analysis* 5 (1974): 56–64.

Purtill, Richard L. "Flew and the Free Will Defence," *Religious Studies* 13 (1977):

477–83.

Wallace, R. C. "Hume, Flew, and the Miraculous," *Philosophical Quarterly* 20 (1970): 230–43.

John Shosky

FLEWELLING, Ralph Tyler (1871–1960)

Ralph Tyler Flewelling was born on 23 November 1871 near DeWitt, Michigan, and died on 31 March 1960 in Glendale, California. His parents, Francis Tyler and Mary Flewelling were devout Methodists, but they named their son after Ralph Waldo EMERSON. His father had been a school teacher before deciding to become a farmer. Flewelling married Jennie Carlin in 1893 and raised a son and a daughter. He was educated at the University of Michigan (1890–92), Alma College in Michigan (BA 1895), Garrett Biblical Institute at Northwestern University (1895), and finally Boston University (STB 1902, PhD in philosophy 1909). At Boston Flewelling studied under Borden Parker BOWNE whose personalist philosophy provided the foundation for Flewelling's thought and philosophical projects throughout his career. During his theological and philosophical training Flewelling served as pastor of several Methodist churches. His series of sermons in Osterville on Cape Cod became his first published book, *Christ and the Dramas of Doubt: Studies in the Problem of Evil* (1913), and established his reputation, receiving favorable attention from Nobel Laureate Rudolf Eucken. Flewelling was eventually appointed to the historic Harvard Street Church in Cambridge, and from there accepted the call in 1917 from the University of Southern California to come to build its philosophy program as professor of philosophy and Director of the School of Philosophy. Flewelling was forty-five years old and already successful, but this new charge offered a second career as an educator. Apart from time spent teaching for the US Army in France (1918–19) and several visiting appointments and extended trips abroad, Flewelling remained at USC as Director until his retirement in 1945, and continued his editing work and other duties until the year before his death.

Flewelling's importance to American philosophy resides in several different domains, but his philosophical ideas and writings rank perhaps lower on the list than his amazingly successful endeavors in building the School of Philosophy of USC, with its world-class faculty, and its impressive Hoose Library of Philosophy. Notable also was Flewelling's service to the American Philosophical Association and other professional and learned societies, but perhaps most important of all was his founding and editing work with the journal *The Personalist* (the name became *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* in 1980).

The University of Southern California was a young Methodist institution at the time Flewelling arrived. Philosophy courses had been taught up to that time by the honored and venerable James Harmon Hoose. When Hoose retired, the trustees and President Bovard saw an opportunity in the area of philosophy in the West, especially at the graduate level, and was seeking an appropriate Methodist to create it. Flewelling's pedigree and achievements fit the need, but the resources of the university were slim. A fortuitous event led to the resources needed. In 1919 Flewelling offered a seminar in personalism that was attended by Seely Greenleaf Mudd, who was interested in philosophy but had been disappointed in the courses he attended at Stanford and other institutions. He became excited about Flewelling's personalism and work at USC and encouraged his father, Colonel Seely Wintersmith Mudd, to attend with him. The Mudds had become enormously wealthy in copper mines and were of a philanthropic nature. Over the years the Mudd family would provide Flewelling with the principal gifts that created

the School of Philosophy, the Hoose Library, the journal *The Personalist*, and finally the Mudd Memorial Hall of Philosophy. Flewelling had a talent for fundraising and never failed to build upon what the Mudd's provided, bringing credit to the family, the university, and himself. Flewelling set about building a world-class faculty, attracting Heinrich Gomperz from Vienna, Herbert Wildon CARR from the University of London, and F. C. S. Schiller from Oxford, J. H. Muirhead from the University of Birmingham, and R. F. Hoernlé of South Africa, among others. He established fellowships to attract the most able graduate students, and provided a broad and humanistic vision for the school. The generations of PhDs who graduated under Flewelling's directorship became successful and influential in American philosophy, such as Philip P. WIENER and William Henry WERKMEISTER. The vision of the school Flewelling provided was of pluralistic personalism, religiously liberal, humane and literate, interdisciplinary, and engaged with the latest science. The USC School of Philosophy retained that character until shortly after Flewelling's death when the university's efforts to break with the Methodist Church upset the delicate balance, resulting in the creation of the Claremont School of Theology.

Flewelling was responsible for establishing the Hoose Library of Philosophy. Among the first efforts he undertook at USC was to provide a library suitable for the graduate study of philosophy. The initial idea had been to raise money from subscriptions by the former students of James Harmon Hoose. Some subscriptions did come in and the collection began. It was, however, an initial gift by the Mudd family in 1922 of $10,000, as part of an effort to raise $40–60,000, that really enabled the collection to become a serious endeavor. Flewelling was shrewd and astute in his acquisitions, gaining not only those titles that were needed for up-to-date studies, but also rare and antique editions and titles that he knew would give the library a reputation. He

was no antiquarian in his approach to philosophy, but he did believe a command of the history of philosophy was essential to its proper progress in the present. However, his efforts to acquire an antiquarian collection for the Hoose Library, particularly manuscripts, incunabula and European philosophy 1700–1850, indicates a sense that the scholarly reputation of a library is something apart from the reputation of its faculty and students. Flewelling was assiduous and perhaps even a little opportunistic in acquiring rare treasures for the library, especially from Europe when economic conditions there made it possible to obtain items that in better times would have been prohibitively expensive. Over the decades he built the finest philosophy library in the American West and became himself a legendary collector and a living force in the antiquarian book world. Interestingly, he seems not to have had any great love of books, just an acute eye for them.

An integral part of the plan for building the School of Philosophy at USC was its journal, *The Personalist*, a quarterly journal of philosophy, theology, and literature. Each issue contained Flewelling's own editor's pages, called "The Lantern of Diogenes" after 1931, and was often humorous. In the pages of the journal, philosophers and other humanistic scholars discussed contemporary events, serious technical philosophy, and fed their souls on excellent contemporary poetry. Few publications have ever attempted such a range at such a high level of discourse. Flewelling's idea was to create a publication that was above the level of discourse of any popular magazine, but was no less edifying to the readers who wanted to remain abreast of the best creative thinking that was occurring in their time. The idea was to bridge the gap between the academy and the public, and many contributors were therefore not academicians. The philosophical center of the journal was personalism, which Flewelling promoted tirelessly. The journal first appeared in April 1920 and continued more or less in its original format

810

until 1979. Flewelling remained chief editor until 1959. After the troubles between USC and the Methodist Church, which efffectively removed the bridge between philosophy and theology historically present in the university, *The Personalist* began to narrow its scope and to publish academic philosophy only, gradually only in the analytic methodology, which was effectively its only mission when it changed its name to *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* in 1980. Therefore, Flewelling's journal is a matter for the history of philosophy at this point, not a part of his ongoing legacy.

The philosophical perspective that informed all of this activity was the Boston University strain of American personalism. Flewelling was always quick to point out that philosophical personalism was not something peculiar to Boston University or the United States, commonly citing lists not of Bostonians but of French, German, and even historical thinkers who held the general viewpoint (sometimes without the name "personalism"). Together with George Holmes HOWISON at the University of California at Berkeley, Flewelling is generally credited as a key founder of the "California School of Personalism," although Howison's and Flewelling's philosophies were really very different. Howison really represented a modified Kantian philosophy of an earlier generation, while Flewelling's really incorporated a sense of the new turn in the sciences toward temporalism. Flewelling's own personalism was expounded in voluminous writings. Apart from his quarterly contributions in articles, editor's pages and book reviews to *The Personalist*, between 1920 and 1959, literally hundreds of articles and reviews which would fill several volumes, he authored fifteen books, another fifty or so articles, especially for *The Science of Mind* and *The Methodist Review*, and contributed to several encyclopedias. Flewelling's personalism is briefly stated as follows: "As a metaphysical theory it is the conception of reality as a world of persons with a supreme person at the head. Personality is in effect the primary idea, and nature is a derivative idea." (1926, p. 12) Like Bowne and other personalists, Flewelling embraces an objective view of knowledge and the universe, but unlike them, Flewelling did not deny the existence of the impersonal. His encounter with the philosophy of Henri Bergson when he was in France with the US Expeditionary Forces left a permanent mark. The lasting imprint of Bergson's thought was to lead Flewelling to embrace temporalism in a way that Bowne had not. In some ways, therefore, Flewelling's modification of Bowne's personalism parallels that of Edgar S. BRIGHTMAN, another student of Bowne in the same generation, but where Brightman acquired his temporalist turn from his study of Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger and, after 1929, Alfred North WHITEHEAD, Flewelling's temporalism was Bergsonian. Since Brightman was interested in method and system, his took a metaphysical and epistemological turn in seeking a ground for his temporalism. Flewelling was less enamored of method and more concerned with character; hence his thought took a moral, religious, cultural, and humanistic turn. Flewelling was, then, a moral idealist who held that the sciences do not provide the best clues to the character of ultimate reality, rather, the structure of the real was more reliably available in the most complex and the highest developments of individuality, and these are to be found in moral and religious exemplars. Thus, Flewelling's orientation on the possibility of knowledge is that the person best able to "know" is the one who is most morally developed. As science advances, it moves towards better understanding of the Cosmic Person whose activities are the data available for study by any science. There is in Flewelling's philosophy great emphasis given to creativity, and the development of creative personality is the normative task set upon each individual. Purposive intelligence, individual and cosmic, is the proper guide to creative activity. Flewelling opposed

scientism with all his strength, believing that the worship of scientific knowledge bereft of moral insight was a great menace to the future. The final test of the value of science was its service to the moral improvement of persons, and it must be vigilantly held to account by this ideal, in each generation, lest science fall into disvalue through serving itself in disservice of humanity. Science could produce no morally worthy ends of its own. Truth for Flewelling is a kind of value, inseparable from a broader faith in the capacity of persons to improve their moral and spiritual condition.

Flewelling lived out his own philosophical creed in a life of continuous service. He traveled the world, published and spoke in several languages, lent his name and voice to humanitarian causes, and while he was very much a realist about human faults and tendency to misuse freedom, he continually promoted hope and optimism about the prospects of persons. Flewelling was in many ways a goodwill ambassador of the University of Southern California, the United States, and American philosophy. He was a tireless, wise and visionary administrator. Among the many organizations he served were the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association, of which he was President in 1938–9, the British Institute of Philosophical Studies, the American Scientific Association, Phi Beta Kappa, and Phi Kappa Phi.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Christ and the Dramas of Doubt: Studies in the Problem of Evil (New York, 1913).

Personalism and the Problems of Philosophy (New York, 1915).

Philosophy and the War (New York, 1918).

Bergson and Personal Realism (New York, 1920).

The Reason in Faith (New York, 1924).

Creative Personality: A Study in Philosophical Reconciliation (New York, 1926).

The Uses of a School of Philosophy (Los Angeles, 1928).

Reflections on the Basic Ideas of East and West: A Study in Cultural Contrasts (Peiping, China, 1935).

The Survival of Western Culture: An Inquiry into the Problem of Its Decline and Resurgence (New York, 1943).

El Sentido Cristiano del la Vida (Buenos Aires, 1944).

The Things that Matter Most: An Approach to the Problems of Human Values (New York, 1946).

Winds of Hiroshima (New York, 1946).

Conflict and Conciliation of Cultures (Stockton, Cal., 1951).

The Person; or, the Significance of Man (Los Angeles, 1952).

Other Relevant Works

Flewelling's papers are at the University of Southern California.

The Forest of Yggdrasil (Los Angeles, 1962). Flewelling's autobiography.

Further Reading

Nat Cycl Amer Bio v51, *Pres Addr of APA v4*, *Proc of APA v35*, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Gacka, Bogumi. *Bibliography of American Personalism* (Lublin, 1994), pp. 87–184.

Nethery, Wallace. *Dr. Flewelling and the Hoose Library: Life and Letters of a Man and an Institution* (Los Angeles, 1976).

Porter, Jenny Lind. "Yours Faithfully, Ralph Tyler Flewelling," *The Personalist* 42 (1961): 293–302.

Werkmeister, William H. "Ralph Tyler Flewelling," in *A History of Philosophical Ideas in America* (New York, 1949), pp. 318–24.

Randall E. Auxier

FLOWER, Elizabeth Farquhar (1914–95)

Elizabeth Flower was born on 28 April 1914 in Atlantic City, New Jersey, and died on 26 June 1995 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. One of the pioneering women in philosophy in the United States, Flower spent most of her career writing and teaching on ethics and American philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania. After receiving a BS in chemistry from Wilson College in Pennsylvania, she studied philosophy at Pennsylvania with Edgar A. SINGER and became an instructor in 1937. Upon completing her PhD in philosophy in 1939, she received a regular appointment in the philosophy department and became one of the first women in the United States on the philosophy faculty of a major university. In 1956 she became the first tenured woman in the philosophy department at Pennsylvania, and taught there until retiring in 1985. She was also Truax Professor at Hamilton College, and was a visiting professor at Barnard College, San Marcos in Peru, and the National Universities of Colombia, Chile, and Guatemala. She joined work camps and met with Spanish Republican intellectuals and philosophers while working with the American Friends Service Committee early in her career. Flower was a fellow of the National Humanities Center in 1978–9 and a senior fellow at the Center for Dewey Studies in 1981–2. She was named Woman of the Year by the Society for Women in Philosophy in 1987, and with her husband Abraham EDEL she received the Herbert W. Schneider Award of the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy in 1995.

Flower was well known for her leadership role in resurgent interests in ethics in contemporary American critical thought. Refocusing disciplinary interests in ethics was no easy task, since much of twentieth-century philosophy had turned away from moral philosophy and aesthetics to other subjects like language, science, knowledge, and logic.

A distinct characteristic of Flower's thought was her integrationist or holistic approach to philosophical and social problems. The tendency to view concepts, theories, and discourses as more co-constitutive than mutually exclusive permeates every dimension of her work. In both her approach to the development of critical thought in North America and in her critique of applied ethics, Flower gave a laudable attempt to synthesize knowledge and concepts from varying disciplines and discourses. This resulted, in part, from her appreciation of Scottish realism, which had developed a unique epistemology composed of both physiology and psychology. She also maintained an appreciation for psychology and sociology in approaches to ethical questions. Crossing disciplines and analyzing concepts and phenomena from multiple discursive locations reflect not only her professional training, but also her commitment to scholarly excellence.

Flower's best-known work is *A History of Philosophy in America* (1977), co-written with Murray MURPHEY. Considered a standard in the field now, its two volumes outline the history of American critical thought in a different framework from the one that had been conventionally employed. Rather than offering the well-worn narrative of science and philosophy struggling triumphantly against the bane of dogma and faith, the work emphasized the discursive influences and exchanges, as well as the conflicts, between religion, science, and philosophy. In their account, contemporary pragmatism has its deepest roots in thinkers who, influenced by Scottish realism, sought to synthesize theology, empiricism, and evolutionary theory. Much of the Puritans' thought was compatible with the discoveries of Newton and Darwin, for they conceived the scientific method as a tool for understanding and appreciating God's ingenuity. The ideas of the transcendentalist Ralph Waldo EMERSON and his successors in the idealist tradition, such as Josiah ROYCE, mediated

between science and religion in an effort to present a unified world view. Flower viewed the development of critical thought in America as a discourse that synthesized (and reconciled) scientific discoveries and religious concerns.

A phenomenon that is hardly mentioned in other chronicles of American philosophy but was explored extensively by Flower and Murphey is the infusion of Scottish ideas into American critical thought. The Scottish tradition helped rescue ethics from Puritan dogma and legitimate it as a secular field of study called moral science. American philosophers found the realists' emphasis on the empirical sciences insightful and refreshing, for they were more interested in how knowledge is acquired than the continental concerns with the validity of knowledge. John Dewey and C. I. Lewis figured prominently in their portraiture of American philosophy, as they went on to develop full-scale theories of valuation and to treat ethics like an empirical discipline governed by scientific methods and models. Their detailed portrait of the St. Louis Hegelians' appropriation of Schelling and Hegel, moreover, also demonstrates appreciation for the infusion of continental ideas into American critical thought, which other accounts until then had left largely unexplored.

Flower supplemented discussions of noteworthy figures with details of the social contexts (institutions, ideologies, and networks of influence) in which knowledge and truth are produced. Her approach chronicles a culture's history of ideas with the concrete textures of human choice, random chance, and politics, and was used again in discussing the influences of scholasticism, positivism, realism, and idealism in Mexico and Latin America in the *Principales Tendencias de La Filosofia Norteamericana* (1963), co-authored with Murphey, and other studies of philosophy in the Americas. The development and reception of critical thought in Mexico and Latin America were

effected by centuries of civil strife and political struggles, which Flower chronicled with erudition and style. Consequently, the portraitures of philosophy in the US, Mexico, and Latin America that emerge chart the complex relations among discursive practices, political interests, institution building, and transcultural influence. Flower's studies of philosophy in these cultures were among the earliest attempts by an American philosopher to chronicle the development of critical thought south of the border in a systematic study of regional figures and politics.

Flower was particularly concerned with science's relationship to ethics, of the descriptive to the normative, of theory to practice, and the possibility of a moral agenda for ethical theory. The integrationist tendency of her approach to philosophical problems continues in this area as well, as she thought that the fact/value and theory/practice dichotomies had been exaggerated, and that many more points of overlap exist between them. Normative judgments are inescapably grounded in scientific concepts while scientific knowledge is value-laden. In bridging the gap between fact and value, Flower demonstrates her roots in American pragmatism, which was born out of her conviction that professional philosophers should engage problems of the larger world outside the university. She was known for her quiet social activism and for integrating it into her coursework in ethics and social policy. In this way, she maintained the importance of examining historical context during a period when many American philosophers considered history irrelevant. While working with the American Friends Service Committee in Mexico, for example, Flower staged a production of Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, which helped settle a decades-long dispute between two local villages.

Flower's work is not easily categorized into the rights/duty, goods/means, or character/virtue schools of moral thought of Kant, Bentham, or Plato. Yet, her concern with specific problems in ethics yielded

unique contributions to the field. Her reversal of approaches and suspicion of dichotomies formed part of her skepticism toward the disciplinary tendency to debate the universal sovereignty of ethical models, for none, she believed, could cover every facet of civilization. Rather than debate the merits of a rights, utilitarian, or virtue model, she thought it was more productive to allow the situation to determine which moral theories and concepts are most fitting for deliberation. She preferred reversing conventional approaches to moral problems by diagnosing the problem first and then drawing from ethical theories rather than applying theories to problems. This allowed her to displace the theory–practice dichotomy so pervasive in Western moral philosophy and to recast the investigation of ethical theories in terms of their "stable" and "problematic" elements: "It introduces the theory–practice relation at the outset and it opens the door to issues that are too infrequently attended to, especially the socio-historical dimension of moral quandaries … . They point beyond the question of the truth of theories to questions of the adequacy of the theory in solving particular problems, practical as well as theoretical." (1994, p. 62)

Flower saw merit in an interdisciplinary approach to problems of value and method in relation to law, education, and social theory. She believed that ethics benefited from the social and psychological sciences for increased knowledge of a rapidly changing and increasingly complex world. The continuing drive of disciplinary specialization, including the concomitant dispersion and fracturing of knowledge, constitutes a problem for moral philosophy whose contours and objects of analysis are no longer as easily distinguishable from other spheres of life as classic moral philosophy had defined. Flower explores issues in a variety of professions, public policies, and personal experience to illustrate the strengths and drawbacks of the application of ethics in modern life. Artificial life support and euthanasia raise questions that require consideration of issues of human psychology, religious faith, and patient/family rights and duty. Knowledge produced outside the field is indispensable to ethical deliberation, according to Flower. Further, moral issues are more complex than they had been a century earlier, due to the rapid development of technology. At the turn of the last century, ethicists concerned themselves with questions about whether a doctor should disclose terminal illness to patients. Today, ethicists struggle with different problems, such as genetic cloning, organ transplant, the manufacture of biochemical weapons, and the use of fetal tissue for medical research. Flower thought that we have yet to adapt to the rapidity of change that is characteristic of contemporary life, and that new moral methods need to be developed to deal with these increasingly complex problems in our world.

Flower believed that ethical theory should not only detail the dimensions of its framework, but also investigate the "emphases, commitments, and choices" into which it invests (1987, p. 28). Following the work of Edel, she argued for the use of discourse analysis as a critical tool in evaluating the cultural assumptions, investments, and reflections embedded in moral lexicons. For her, the language used in moral discourse was not transparent, but rather was socially and historically specific, reflecting the crises, concerns, and power relations of a society. Metaphors of moral theories were thus a rich source of information about their structure and value for ethicists (1987, p. 49).

In *Critique of Applied Ethics* (1994), co-authored with Edel and Finbarr W. O'Connor, Flower evaluated ethical theories formulated since the Enlightenment in order to suggest which might serve as tools of applied ethics and how knowledge and personal experience figure in moral deliberation. She explored the moral lexicons of utilitarian, ontological, and virtue theories, for

example, and their implication for solving moral problems today. Flower had a keen interest in the underlying influences on the practice of ethics, especially the ways in which moral problems are diagnosed and their contexts established. To this end, she analyzed a number of elements that factored into deliberation. She was especially interested in the constitutive power or "instrumental characterization" of language: that is, by the ways in which words effected the human cognitive apparatus's comprehension of moralities and moral dilemmas (1994, p. 104). For word choices help determine which paths of ethical inquiry are pursued, rather than others, and hence influence the outcome of ethical deliberation (1994, p. 102). "We need, therefore, to attend to how we identify, classify, and recognize a problem, and *how we come to see that it is a problem*, as a necessary preliminary to the search for solution, resolution, or answer." (1994, p. 102) Here, Flower relied heavily on William JAMES's psychology of perception: all conception is structured by purpose and interest, and thus is perspectival. This means that there are alternative ways of structuring experience in regard to other purposes and interests (1994, pp. 94, 105).

For Flower, all ethical concepts are potentially useful in formulating ethical problems. Flower saw no reason why we should privilege one term like the *good* or *character* over another such as *right* (or vice versa) in a quest for a unified system that could then be applied to all life situations. Rather, she thought it was more effective for moral deliberation to build up "an inventory of resources from the theoretical reservoir," and to attend to the different ways that each family of concepts structures moral problems and paves the way for ethical judgment.

Flower's critique of the terms also led her to suggest alternatives for several. She displaced the sharp distinction of Kant's right/wrong binary with the concept of moral guidance, and presented a broader heuristic framework of conceptual possibilities in ethical inquiry. The relations and attitudes of situations involving normative judgments are more varied and nuanced than the analytical capacity of Kant's binary. Flower opted for Edel's phenomenology of types of moral rules – must-rules, always-rules, break-only-with-regret-rules, and for-the-most-part-rules – over categorical imperatives. These allow for the gleaning of more information about moral dilemmas, for more is at stake than simply doing one's duty. Flower did not want to dispense with the universal altogether, however, for she believed it is applicable in certain situations.

Flower's suspicion of dichotomies extended to her analysis of social policies on education, organizational and institutional structures, and pedagogical and instructional practices. She criticized the culture wars of the late 1970s for obfuscating the more fundamental issues at stake. Democratizing funding for arts and humanities education through institutions like the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Endowment for the Arts makes art and culture accessible to the broader public. Her discourse analysis is notable again as an effective strategy in engaging problems of valuation and social policy, allowing her to unpack rhetorical slippages and conceptual sophistries and reformulate the issues at hand. In clarifying the categories of interests, objectives, costs, and potential gains of democratizing funding, she broadened the horizon of the critical issues involved beyond the binary structure onto a plethora of issues that had been obscured.

Flower's thought spanned a range of diverse topics, treating concerns in ethics, education, and the history of ideas. She wrote and taught on as many social issues concerning the general public as she did on the theoretical matters appealing to professional philosophers. Influenced by Dewey and Royce, as well as the Scottish realists, Flower played an important role in refocusing attention on ethics in contemporary American phi-

losophy. Her work on Mexican and Latin American philosophy is some of the earliest exploration of critical thought in these cultures by a philosopher in the United States.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Principales Tendencias de La Filosofia Norteamericana, with Murray Murphey (Washington, D.C., 1963)

A History of Philosophy in America, with Murray Murphey (New York, 1977).

Critique of Applied Ethics, with Abraham Edel and Finbarr W. O'Connor (Philadelphia, 1994).

Other Relevant Works

"Two Applications of Logic to Biology," in *Philosophical Essays in Honor of Edgar A. Singer*, ed. Francis P. Clarke, and Milton C. Nahm (Philadelphia, 1942).

"The Mexican Revolt against Positivism," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 10 (1949): 115–29.

"Philosophies of History," in *A History of Philosophical Systems*, ed. Vergilius Ferm (New York, 1950).

"Comments on the Ethical Theory of Edgar A. Singer," *Philosophy of Science* 21 (1954): 1–8.

"Commitment, Bias, and Tolerance," in *Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea*, ed. Horace M. Kallen (Philadelphia, 1956).

"Edgar J. Singer, Jr., on Contentment," *Journal of Philosophy* 54 (1957): 576–84.

"Some Present Day Disagreements in Moral Philosophy," in *Aspects of Value*, ed. Frederick C. Gruber (Philadelphia, 1959).

"The Unity of Knowledge and Purpose in James' View of Action," in *The Philosophy of William James*, ed. Walter Corti (Hamburg, Germany, 1976).

"Some Interesting Connections between the Common Sense Realists and the Pragmatists, especially James," in *Two*

Centuries of Philosophy in America, ed. Peter Caws (London, 1980).

"A Moral Agenda for Ethical Theory," in *Value, Science and Democracy: The Philosophy of Abraham Edel*, ed. Irving L. Harowitz and H. Stanley Thayer (New Brunswick, N.J., 1987).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Proc of APA v69*, *Who's Who in Phil*, *Women Phils*

Murphey, Murray G., and Ivar Berg, eds. *Values and Value Theory in Twentieth Century America: Essays in Honor of Elizabeth Flower* (Philadelphia, 1988). Contains a bibliography of Flower's writings.

Angela L. Cotten

FODOR, Jerry Alan (1935–)

Jerry Fodor was born on 22 April 1935 in New York City. He earned his BA summa cum laude from Columbia University in 1956. He then attended Princeton University and received his PhD in philosophy in 1960, working with Hilary PUTNAM. During 1959–60 Fodor was a philosophy instructor in the humanities department at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). In 1960–61 he attended the University of Oxford as a Fulbright Fellow. Fodor returned to MIT in 1961 as an assistant professor in the humanities department, where Noam CHOMSKY was an influential colleague. In 1963 he became an associate professor in the departments of philosophy and psychology at MIT, and was promoted to full professor in those departments in 1969. Fodor left MIT in 1986 to become Distinguished Professor at the City University of New York Graduate Center. In 1988 he became the State of New Jersey Professor of Philosophy at Rutgers University,

a position he still holds. From 1988 to 1994 he remained with the CUNY Graduate Center as an adjunct professor, where his wife, Janet Dean Fodor, with whom he has collaborated, is a professor of linguistics. Fodor was a New York State Regents' Fellow; a Woodrow Wilson Fellow; a Chancellor Greene Fellow; a Fulbright Fellow; a Guggenheim Fellow, and a Fellow of the Center for the Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. He is also a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He has written over one hundred articles and over a dozen books, many of which are short, penetrating analyses of specific issues.

Fodor's views in philosophy of mind, philosophy of language, philosophical psychology, and cognitive science have profoundly influenced the course of research in these areas. With remarkable clarity and consistency over the years, Fodor has offered one of the most elaborate accounts of the mind: how it is structured and how it works. He has also vigorously challenged positions he deems to be explanatorily inadequate, including behaviorism, connectionism, and cognitive neuroscience. The clarity of his critiques has helped set the agenda in much of the subsequent debate.

The cornerstone of Fodor's philosophy is the language of thought hypothesis (LOT). LOT itself is tied to two other views Fodor espouses, namely the representational theory of mind (RTM) and the computational theory of mind (CTM). According to RTM, thinking is a sequence of activating or "tokening" mental representations having meaning or content. For example, we think about dogs by tokening a representation whose content is *the property of being a dog*. What we think about dogs will depend on what other representations are tokened.

Providing an account of the mind consistent with the dominant materialist world view is known as the "naturalization" of the mind. Though they need not be, Fodor takes mental representations to be material entities, so for him RTM is a materialist theory. His particular version of materialism is called token physicalism, meaning that every instance or tokening of a mental event is identical with an instance or tokening of a physical event, but the mental event type is not identical with any physical event type. An advantage of token physicalism over type physicalism, the view that mental types *are* identical with physical types, is that mental types can be multiply realized. Since the physical instantiations of mental types in humans are undoubtedly neurological, anything that does not have a human central nervous system cannot have mental states, according to type physicalism. Token physicalism allows for any number of physical realizations of minds; what makes something a mental state is its relations, nomic and computational in this case, regardless of its physical realization.

The argument from multiple realizability is an instance of how Fodor sees the special sciences, such as geology, biology, and psychology, generally. Suppose it is a law of a particular special science that P causes Q, ceteris paribus. The unity of science requires that the implementing mechanism for every law is a physical regularity (assuming some kind of idealized physics as the basic science). In that case, physical events that are tokenings of P cause other physical events that are tokenings of Q. However, types in the special sciences do not reduce to physical types. The distinct tokenings of P or Q are a disparate disjunction of physical events having nothing in common except that they are tokenings of the same special science event. Thus every instance of P causing Q is an instance of some basic science law, but different laws in different instances. Then assuming that laws relate types, taken together the different implementing laws do not form a new law of the basic science, guaranteeing the autonomy of the special science. Furthermore, it need not be the case that *every* tokening of P causes a tokening of Q. These cases constitute the exceptions to the special science law, in virtue of which they are ceteris paribus laws. The laws of the basic science, on the other hand, are exceptionless (1974).

According to RTM, thinking is a sequence of tokening mental representations. Of course,

tokening arbitrary mental representations is not thinking. There must be some principle making the sequence coherent. The computational theory of mind (CTM) specifies the kinds of sequences that constitute thinking, following Alan Turing's insight that representations with logical structure can be mechanically transformed in such a way that if the initial representation is true then the transformed representation is also true. This is possible because representations have two key features: content, what they are representations of, and syntax, their physical characteristics by which they can be identified. Turing's insight was that transformations sensitive only to the syntax of representations can be truth preserving when the representations are semantically interpreted. For example, we can transform "R & S" to "R." Regardless of the content of 'R & S', if it is true, then the resulting representation, "R," must be true. While the transformations are sensitive to only the local syntax of the representation being transformed, the sequence of transformations is semantically coherent because each follows logically from the previous one. Such transformations are called computations. CTM is the theory that the admissible sequences of mental representations constituting thinking are computations. In the overall project of naturalizing the mind, CTM is invoked to explain how thinking can be purely mechanistic.

Fodor uses language as a window to the mind. Since we use language to express our thoughts, Fodor infers that certain universal characteristics of natural languages, those languages we speak such as English or Spanish, are also characteristic of our thoughts. Systematicity is the property of a representational system that if two things can be represented as being related, then they can be represented as changing roles in the same relation; i.e., if "a" can be represented as being related to "b" (aRb) then "b" can be represented as being related to "a" (bRa). Systematicity is a property of what can be represented regardless of the truth of those representations. Minds

that can think that Daniel is taller than George can also think that George is taller than Daniel, irrespective of which thought, if either, happens to be true. In addition to being systematic our minds are representational systems enabling us to think an indefinite number of thoughts, just as we can understand and produce arbitrarily many novel sentences of a language we speak, limited only by cognitive resources such as memory.

The systematicity and productivity of natural languages are explained by their compositionality. There are rules for combining words into sentences and simple sentences into more complex ones. The meaning of a sentence is determined by the meaning of the words and how they are put together. Since some of the rules are recursive, we finite human beings can produce an indefinite number of sentences, explaining productivity. Also since complex expressions are made from their parts and rules for combining them, if we can state a relation we must be able to state it with the relata interchanged. If we can combine "a," "R," and "b" to form "aRb," we must be able to combine them to form "bRa," since both expressions use the same parts and the same rules for combining those parts. Fodor reasons that since compositionality is the only explanation we have for how we finite beings can have languages that are systematic and productive, therefore the medium of thought must also be compositional, thereby explaining the systematicity and productivity of thought, and thus the medium of thought must be a language. Fodor takes systematicity and productivity as the benchmarks for an adequate theory of mind. His main challenge to connectionists is that they are unable to account for the systematicity of human thought because their representations do not have constituent structure (1988; Macdonald and Macdonald 1995).

Fodor's LOT hypothesis includes two more claims. First, the language of thought is innate and distinct from any of our natural languages. Fodor's reasoning for this claim follows from considerations of how first languages are

acquired. He argues that we cannot learn a predicate such as "is a dog" unless we can already think about dogs. Roughly, what we learn is that the English term expresses our thoughts about dogs, which on RTM means that a natural language representation applies when and only when some mental representation coextensive with it is tokened. Since we must use mental representations to learn our first language, we must already know them and they cannot be natural language representations. Parallel reasoning suggests that the innate representational system must be at least as rich as any language we could learn, since if there were some predicate not expressible in the mental language we could not learn it. Again, to learn any predicate we must be able to use a term that is coextensive with it. If the predicate is not among the first we are learning in our natural language we might learn it in terms of other coextensive natural language predicates we have already learned. But these too must have been learned and the chain traces back eventually to the first terms we learn. Since we learn them via innate coextensive predicates, there is an innate mental representation for any term of the natural language we can learn (1975). The language of thought for which Fodor argues has come to be known as "mentalese."

Many theorists feel that Fodor's strong nativism does not account for the cognitive advantages we enjoy over other creatures in virtue of being language users. Not only does Fodor not deny such cognitive advantages, he explicitly argues how they might come about on his view (1975, p. 82–6). Formally, mentalese and natural languages might be equivalent in that what can be computed in one system can be computed in the other. However, which computations we can perform with each system need not be the same. In particular, if we were able to perform more computations in a natural language than in mentalese, learning a natural language would have cognitive advantages. Just as in formal systems we introduce new terms as mnemonics so that we do not

have to derive every result from first principles, natural language terms could serve as mnemonics for mentalese expressions. In this case, learning a natural language would allow us to learn other natural language terms we could not otherwise learn, and it would allow us to think thoughts we could not otherwise think.

An important challenge for materialism and naturalizing the mind is known as Brentano's Problem, which asks for an account of how we can think of abstract, absent, or fictitious things. It is fairly plausible that when we are in sensory contact with something we can have thoughts about that thing. However, by the very nature of abstract, absent, or fictitious things, we cannot sense them or be related to them in a way permitted by materialism that would plausibly make them the content of our thoughts. For example, the weak gravitational forces between someone and say the CN Tower in Toronto, are not enough to make it the content of her thoughts, since they are relatively stable whether she is thinking of the CN Tower or not.

Fodor's materialist version of RTM provides a solution to Brentano's Problem by having representations stand in for the things they represent. Our thoughts about something are not under the direct influence of that thing. We need not experience it to think about it since its representation can be tokened by something else in the world or by another mental representation. All that is required for us to think about something, according to RTM, is that we token a mental representation of it, however that comes about. Since mental representations are material things and thinking is just transformations of representations, the process is admitted by materialism. We need only token a representation with the appropriate content to think about the abstract, absent, fictitious, or anything else for that matter. So how does a representation have the appropriate content? How is it that any material thing has meaning and in virtue of what does it have that meaning? A complete materialist solution to

Brentano's Problem requires a materialist account of content. Fodor's naturalistic account of content is a nomic-informational theory. It has changed over the years, but the changes are mostly additions. He initially argued for narrow content, in which meaning is entirely in the head. Fodor reasoned from CTM that representations can be individuated according to their computational role. The narrow content of a mental representation is given by that computational role, much as distinct signs in a formal system can be given an interpretation according to their role in derivations within the system.

The notion of narrow content runs into certain difficulties, most notably Hilary Putnam's Twin Earth thought experiment. In his 1975 essay "The Meaning of 'Meaning'," Putnam argues that "meaning ain't in the head" by considering a Twin Earth, identical to ours in every respect except that twin water is made of XYZ, which is chemically distinct from H_2O. You and your twin are in exactly the same internal state when you think about water and your twin thinks about twin water, but your thoughts are about different things. As a result, the internal state cannot be all there is to content. Fodor addresses Putnam cases by taking an externalist stance. Representations continue to have a computational role by which they are individuated as syntactic types; however, their nomic connections to the world determine their content. If it is a law that instances of a particular property cause tokenings of a syntactic type, then the semantic content of that syntactic type is that property. Roughly, instances of *the property of being a dog* reliably cause "dog" tokens (1987, 1990). The earlier account of narrow content determined by computational relations has become an account of individuation augmented by an externalist semantics in terms of nomic relations. A problem for causal theories of content, known as the disjunction problem, is that several properties can reliably token the same syntactic type. For example, *foxhood* might reliably token the same syntactic type as

doghood. What makes it a "dog" representation, on Fodor's view, is an asymmetric dependence between the nomic connections. If the nomic connection of the syntactic type with *foxhood* depends on its connection with *doghood* in the sense that if the latter were broken the former would be also, but not vice versa, the representation is a "dog" representation (1990).

It is important to emphasize that asymmetric dependence is a condition on nomic connections and not actual causal histories. Many adherents of RTM take it to be the fact that you interact with H_2O whereas your twin interacts with XYZ, which explains the difference in the content of your thoughts. Fodor explains the difference in terms of counterfactuals. In all nearby possible worlds, water, i.e., H_2O and not XYZ *would* cause your "water" tokens, so your thoughts are about water. Thus it is how the world is built, and how we are built, in particular how we are disposed to interact with that world, that explains the contents of our thoughts (*The Elm and the Expert*, 1994, and other writings). Appealing to nomic connections gives Fodor the added benefit of having a ready response to Brentano's Problem, which requires of RTM a materialist theory of content to account for the very things we are not, and in some cases cannot be, causally related to. Since actual causal histories are not relevant for determining the content of our representations on Fodor's view, we can have representations about absent, abstract, or even fictitious entities. To have a "unicorn" representation, for example, one merely requires a syntactic structure that would be reliably tokened by unicorns if there were any. That there are not any unicorns does not change the story. Simply by tokening your "unicorn" representation you can have thoughts about unicorns.

The various aspects of Fodor's philosophy come together in his theory of concepts. Concepts are the constituents of thoughts for Fodor; they are mental representations that compose, explaining systematicity and productivity. They are mental particulars with a

syntax that allows them to be mental causes and effects, so mental causation is unproblematically physical on this view. They are also categories for things in the world. The things that fall under a concept are those that instantiate the property to which it is nomically related by the asymmetric dependence condition. Most concepts are complex; we learn them by learning to compose their constituents. Primitive concepts, however, the basic symbols in the language of thought, are unlearned. Furthermore, lexical concepts have no internal structure. "Informational semantics is atomistic; it denies that the grasp of *any* interconceptual relations is constitutive of concept possession" (*Concepts*, 1998, p. 71, emphasis in original). Having the concept BACHELOR is constituted by having a syntactic structure that is nomically connected to bachelors. Though there is clearly a relation between the concept BACHELOR and the concept UNMARRIED, grasping it is not constitutive of possessing either concept.

Fodor's reason for being an atomist is that it allows concepts to be public. If concepts are conceived holistically, then each person will have different concepts and even a single individual will have different concepts at different times, because our grasp of interconceptual relations is always changing with our experience. But if we all have different concepts, there are no generalizations about us concerning the contents of our thoughts, precluding much of cognitive psychology. With eliminativism as the alternative, atomism is not negotiable for Fodor.

Fodor explains concept possession in terms of "locking on" to properties. We are locked on to a property when we have tokened a mental representation with that property as its content. The usual way of locking on to some property is to experience stereotypical instances of it, but this is not the only way. Possessing some concepts may help us acquire others, such as abstract concepts or concepts of fictitious things. Note that this does not contradict atomism because Fodor distinguishes what it is

to have a concept from how we come to have the concept. He allows that getting some concepts may require having others. But having the concept consists only in having a tokened mental representation with the right nomic relations.

Fodor's nativism has been severely criticized. DOG might be innate but what about CARBURETOR? On Fodor's latest view, concepts are not innate. Though this may seem to be a radical departure from his earlier views, little has changed. Syntactic structures that stand in nomic relations to properties in the world are innate. When these structures are activated we acquire the concept. Activation can result from learning or it can be triggered, as must be the case for primitive concepts. So while CARBURETOR is not innate, our minds are such that causally interacting with a carburetor could make it salient – i.e., represented – hence the content of our thoughts. Slugs likely do not have such minds.

Different syntactic structures can stand in the same nomic relations to properties in the world; they can have the same extensional content. However, differences between the syntactic structures give them different computational roles. They are different modes of presentation of extensional content, reflecting the heterogeneity of human thought that does result from our actual causal histories. We all have the same concepts because our syntactic structures are nomically related to the same properties, but we have our concepts differently; we are disposed to make different inferences, because syntactic differences in our concepts determine novel causal relations between them.

RTM, CTM, and LOT attempt a complete account of the mind and its structure. This is only part of the story, however, and perhaps a small part at that, according to Fodor. Fodor distinguishes highly specialized functional units of the mind, called modules, from central processing. Modules are extremely fast because they are informationally encapsulated: the information they process is domainly specific.

Central cognition, on the other hand, is where in the mind any information can influence the processing of any other information. Examples of modules are sensory systems and language processing. Evidence for the modularity of early vision, for example, is given by the fact that, despite recognizing a visual illusion and knowing how it is produced, we still see the effect; we cannot use our knowledge to see through the illusion (Pylyshyn 2003). Fodor's view is that he has given an account of modular thinking only (1983, 2000). His reasoning is that computations are sensitive only to the *local* syntax of a representation. But then to determine, say, the simplicity of a statement, a typical central process, requires computing its local syntactic relations to every other representation. We would have to perform computations over all of our representations in just a few hundred milliseconds, which even with massively parallel processing is utterly implausible. Understanding central cognition is simply beyond our conceptual resources at present, according to Fodor.

Fodor's views have shaped the landscape of research on the mind. Theorists define and better understand their own views by contrasting them with Fodor's. His profound influence in philosophy of mind and the mind sciences is likely to be a lasting one.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Psychological Explanation (New York, 1968).
The Language of Thought (Cambridge, Mass., 1975).
"Methodological Solipsism Considered as a Research Strategy in Cognitive Science," *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 3 (1980): 63–109.
Representations: Philosophical Essays on the Foundations of Cognitive Science (Cambridge, Mass., 1981).
The Modularity of Mind (Cambridge, Mass., 1983).
Psychosemantics: The Problem of Meaning in the Philosophy of Mind (Cambridge, Mass., 1987).
A Theory of Content and Other Essays (Cambridge, Mass., 1990).
Holism: A Shopper's Guide, with Ernest Lepore (Oxford, 1992).
The Elm and the Expert: Mentalese and Its Semantics (Cambridge, Mass., 1994).
Concepts: Where Cognitive Science Went Wrong (New York, 1998).
In Critical Condition: Polemical Essays on Cognitive Science and the Philosophy of Mind (Cambridge, Mass., 1998).
The Mind Doesn't Work that Way: The Scope and Limits of Computational Psychology (Cambridge, Mass., 2000).
The Compositionality Papers, with Ernest Lepore (Oxford, 2002).
Hume Variations (Oxford, 2003).

Other Relevant Works
"What Do You Mean?" *Journal of Philosophy* 57 (1960): 499–506.
Ed. with Jerrold Katz, *The Structure of Language: Readings in the Philosophy of Language* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964).
"Three Reasons not to Derive 'Kill' from 'Cause to Die'," *Linguistic Inquiry* 1 (1970): 429–38.
"Special Sciences," *Synthese* 28 (1974): 97–115.
"Propositional Attitudes," *The Monist* 61 (1978): 501–23.
"Fodor's Guide to Mental Representation," *Mind* 94 (1985): 76–100.
"Connectionism and Cognitive Architecture: A Critical Analysis," with Zenon Pylyshyn, *Cognition* 28 (1988): 3–71.
"Making Mind Matter More," *Philosophical Topics* 67 (1989): 59–79.
"Fodor, Jerry A.," in *A Companion to the Philosophy of Mind*, ed. Samuel Guttenplan (Oxford, 1994), pp. 292–300.
"Deconstructing Dennett's Darwin," *Mind and Language* 11 (1996): 246–62.
"The Red Herring and the Pet Fish," with Ernest Lepore, *Cognition* 58 (1996): 253–70.

"All at Sea in Semantic Space: Churchland on Meaning Similarity," *Journal of Philosophy* 96 (1999): 381–403.

"Language, Thought and Compositionality," *Philosophy* suppl. 48 (2001): 227–42.

Further Reading

Bio Dict Psych, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Blackwell Analytic Phil*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*

Cain, M. J. *Fodor: Language, Mind, and Philosophy* (Cambridge, UK, 2002).

Chalmers, David J. "Connectionism and Compositionality: Why Fodor and Pylyshyn were Wrong," *Philosophical Psychology* 6 (1993): 305–19.

Chomsky, Noam. *Rules and Representations* (New York, 1980).

Churchland, Paul M. "Conceptual Similarity across Sensory and Neural Diversity: The Fodor/Lepore Challenge Answered," *Journal of Philosophy* 95 (1998): 5–32.

Davidson, Donald. "Radical Interpretation Interpreted," *Philosophical Perspectives* 8 (1994): 121–8.

Dennett, Daniel C. "Granny Versus Mother Nature – No Contest," *Mind and Language* 11 (1996): 263–9.

Loewer, Barry, and Georges Rey, eds. *Meaning in Mind: Fodor and His Critics* (Oxford, 1991).

Macdonald, Cynthia, and Graham Macdonald, eds. *Connectionism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1995).

Preti, Consuelo, and Victor Velarde-Mayol. *On Fodor* (Belmont, Cal., 2001).

Pylyshyn, Zenon. *Seeing and Visualizing: It's Not What You Think* (Cambridge, Mass., 2003).

"Review Essays of *Concepts: Where Cognitive Science Went Wrong*," *Mind and Language* 15 (2000): 299–349. Followed by Fodor's "Replies to Critics," pp. 350–74.

Searle, John R. "The Connection Principle and the Ontology of the Unconscious: A Reply to Fodor and Lepore," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Review* 54 (1994): 847–55.

Christopher Viger

FOGELIN, Robert John (1932–)

Robert J. Fogelin was born on 24 June 1932 in Congers, New York. His father, Carl Fogelin, was a sheet metal worker and musician; his mother, Florence Sandberg, a homemaker and, after the death of her husband, a civil servant whose sharp mind carried her rapidly up through the ranks. Fogelin received his BA in philosophy at the University of Rochester in 1955. His graduate studies took him to Yale, and there he received his MA in 1957 and his PhD in philosophy in 1960, writing his dissertation under the supervision of Brand BLANSHARD and the unofficial guidance of Alan Ross ANDERSON. He was an assistant and associate professor of philosophy at Pomona College from 1958 to 1966. In 1966 Fogelin returned to Yale as associate professor, and in 1970 was promoted to full professor of philosophy. In 1980 he left Yale to join Dartmouth College where he became the Sherman Fairchild Professor in the Humanities. He retired in 2001, and presently lives in White River Junction, Vermont, with Florence Clay Fogelin, a published poet and his wife for more than forty years.

Fogelin is best known for his work on Wittgenstein's philosophy and for his studies of skepticism. From the two he fashions a contemporary view amounting to a revival of the Pyrrhonian skeptical philosophy. But he was not always such a skeptic. Fogelin's Yale dissertation, "The Definition of Ethical Terms," defends a theory of ethical statements on which such statements are often "cognitive" or genuine assertions because they put forward truth-claims. This theory opposed powerful

trends of noncognitivism about ethical statements then being advanced by such philosophers as A. J. Ayer, R. M. Hare, and P. H. Nowell-Smith, who had argued that ethical statements make no factual claims and cannot be true or false.

Soon after his arrival at Pomona College, Fogelin met Richard POPKIN, who was teaching at nearby Claremont Graduate School. Popkin introduced Fogelin to the ideas of Sextus Empiricus and the Pyrrhonian philosophy that Sextus records in *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*. At about the same time Fogelin had also found his way, through the works of J. L. Austin, to the writings of Ludwig Wittgenstein. Thus Fogelin's education in classical skepticism began alongside his first reading of Wittgenstein. This first exposure to Wittgenstein was already unusual, as it was received not from the hands of initiates but rather from a relatively isolated study of Wittgenstein's writings. Such independence from the tradition allowed Fogelin the freedom of perspective to see Wittgenstein not only as a philosopher deeply skeptical of philosophy itself but also as a skeptical philosopher of a particular, identifiable sort: a Pyrrhonian skeptic.

But that view of Wittgenstein was not to blossom immediately, and Fogelin's first book, *Evidence and Meaning* (1967), is still mostly innocent of the Pyrrhonism yet to come. The book draws upon the earlier dissertation's analysis of ethical statements, according to which the function of a value judgment is to indicate the evidential backing or "warrant" for some further statement, action, or decision. This allows an instructive analysis of ethical statements. For example, "X is good" becomes "There are adequate grounds for choosing X." "S ought not to do A" is analyzed as "There are adequate grounds for saying to S, 'Don't do A!'." Ethical statements can support prescriptions or imperatives, not by being equivalent to them but by noting the grounds one has for making them. Normally, the relevant grounds indicated by the statement will involve an appeal to facts. An ethical statement therefore has factual content, although it is context that determines just what the relevant facts are in a given case. The statement itself says only whether there are such facts. Still, the dependence of ethical statements upon the facts makes them subject to evaluation for truth or falsity.

Fogelin calls statements that function in this way "warrant statements" and proposes an account of warrant statements that can be modified to fit a range of types of expression, including epistemic terms, perception terms, modal terms, and value terms. The analysis divides warrant statements into two parts, a warrant component (that makes a claim about evidential backing) and a material component (a particular statement, action or choice). For instance, the statement "X knows that the king is in check" is broken down into the warrant-carrying operator "X knows that" and the statement "The king is in check." The warrant component then can be given precise analysis, to be determined by the particular subject matter. On the account of "knows that" which Fogelin offers, the full analysis in this case yields "X commands adequate grounds for the statement: 'The king is in check'." The knowledge claim is true or false depending on whether X in fact has such grounds for the statement. Similar analyses can be provided for "X sees that p," "It is possible that p," "It is permitted that p," and so on.

Fogelin suggests that some traditional disputes in philosophy are encouraged by the failure of the disputants to recognize that certain statements are warrant statements. For instance, when the error theorist about ethics squares off against the moral intuitionist, both agree that the term "good" in typical ethical statements is used to ascribe an alleged moral property – say, Goodness – to something. Their dispute concerns whether in fact there is any such property. Fogelin's warrant-statement analysis forestalls this dispute. Ethical statements do not attempt to ascribe a property of Goodness at all. Instead, they indicate the degree of factual backing one has for, say,

choosing something or praising it. Thus the opposing sides of the traditional debate both suffer from a misunderstanding of the actual function of ethical language. Once the misunderstanding is cleared away, the dispute is dissolved. Traces of Fogelin's Austinian youth are visible here as well as in the book's discussion of the language of argument. Fogelin provides a sensitive analysis of some of the informal rules governing conversation, including one he calls the rule of strength: Make the strongest claim you can reasonably defend! In the same year in which *Evidence and Meaning* appeared, Paul GRICE would give his celebrated William James Lectures, in which he outlines a detailed analysis of the informal rules governing conversation. The rule doing the most work in Grice's theory is the rule of quantity, and it corresponds exactly to Fogelin's rule of strength. Although he did not continue to publish directly on the topic, Fogelin's interest in conversational rules would be an abiding element in his thought.

In his return to Yale, Fogelin's teaching duties brought him to the study of David Hume and continued his education in skepticism. On a trip to London, Fogelin was recruited by Ted Honderich to author a volume for the new Routledge and Kegan Paul series *The Arguments of the Philosophers*. His *Wittgenstein* (1976) was lauded for its clarity and insight and became hugely influential for its interpretation of the private-language argument as a "skeptical paradox" for which Wittgenstein proposes a "skeptical solution." Still, it was not without its critics. In particular, Fogelin's portrayal of Wittgenstein's later philosophy as being involved in an attempt to develop a constructivist semantics for language, and as hostile to science and to causal explanations of various natural phenomena, struck some as a misreading. Nor was Fogelin's willingness to state the private-language argument in detail and to call its cogency into question popular with all readers. What Fogelin saw in Wittgenstein, however, was a series of partially submerged, competing conceptions of how to

proceed in philosophy; for example, whether to propose nontraditional theories of meaning to replace failed traditional ones or whether simply to loosen the grip of the desire to formulate unified theories of meaning. He highlighted the therapeutic orientation of Wittgenstein's philosophy, calling attention to Wittgenstein's attempts to allay the impulse towards nonsensical metaphysics as a response to philosophical puzzlement by uncovering the source of the puzzlement and showing it to be an illusion. It was a view of philosophy Fogelin found illuminating and persuasive.

The watershed in Fogelin's own philosophical development was to be reached just a few years later, when he identified an ancient tradition in philosophy to which Wittgenstein belongs, a tradition that Fogelin would find worth defending himself. In "Wittgenstein and Classical Skepticism" (1981), and later in the second edition of *Wittgenstein* (1987), Fogelin connected Wittgenstein and the Pyrrhonian skeptical tradition. Pyrrhonian skepticism, as Fogelin interprets it, is aimed at philosophy itself and especially at philosophical theories that parade as new forms of knowledge. Beliefs and claims belonging to common life are left untouched by the Pyrrhonist, but philosophical theories that purport to "ground" them, or perhaps to replace them, are subjected to a distinctive style of criticism. The theories are criticized from within: the very sorts of arguments marshaled in the campaign to establish some philosophical theory are turned against that philosophy itself. The Pyrrhonist advances no positive philosophical doctrine but only borrows the instruments of philosophy as a temporary measure, discarding them along with the dogmatic philosophy they are used to destroy. Not even skepticism remains in the wake of the Pyrrhonian critique, for it destroys itself as well, which is its purpose. What the Pyrrhonist seeks is escape from philosophy and the *aporia* it provokes. The aim of Pyrrhonian inquiry is the peace of mind that comes with escape. And here the link with Wittgenstein's conception of his own approach in philosophy

is clear: "The real discovery is the one that makes me capable of stopping doing philosophy when I want to. The one that gives philosophy peace, so that it is no longer tormented by questions which bring *itself* into question." (*Philosophical Investigations*, §133)

The new chapter of Pyrrhonism that Fogelin finds in Wittgenstein – the neo-Pyrrhonian philosophy – is one that adds substantially to the ancient tradition. The traditional Pyrrhonist ambition was simply to produce suspension of belief with respect to philosophical theories by undermining them with their own arguments. The new Wittgensteinian Pyrrhonist seeks further to quiet philosophical torment by exposing its original sources and making clear how philosophical perplexity arises in the first place. And it is this neo-Pyrrhonian programme that Fogelin puts into action. In *Pyrrhonian Reflections on Knowledge and Justification* (1994), Fogelin carries out a neo-Pyrrhonian critique of contemporary epistemologies and their various attempts to formulate an analysis of knowledge and a theory of epistemic justification. Contemporary epistemology, he argues, is still grappling with a Pyrrhonian challenge codified in Agrippa's modes: to show how one's beliefs are justified without either falling into a vicious infinite regress, moving in a circle to presuppose the justification of the beliefs in question, or coming to rest at some arbitrary point with beliefs that are themselves not shown to be justified. The challenge is raised by the very philosophical theories that attempt to meet it – foundationalism, internalist and externalist coherentism, subjunctive analyses, and so on – but it is in fact unanswered by them, and so those theories fail on their own terms. The totality of the strength of each particular theory of epistemic justification, Fogelin suggests, is exhausted in the weaknesses of its rivals. No dogmatic epistemology can claim good credentials of its own, and none is a match for skepticism. He concludes that in epistemology "things are now largely as Sextus Empiricus left them almost two thousand years ago" (1994, p. 11).

In contrast to such dogmatic epistemologies, his neo-Pyrrhonian approach attempts only to *describe* our actual practices of making and assessing knowledge claims, and seeks to understand what it is about those practices that gives rise to the specter of skeptical refutation of ordinary knowledge claims. An analysis of knowledge, taken in this merely descriptive way, is readily proposed. "X knows that *p*" means that X justifiably believes that *p* on grounds that establish the truth of *p*. Of the tendency for knowledge claims to be undercut at the hands of epistemology, Fogelin offers a diagnosis. He suggests that the rules governing the ordinary practice of epistemic appraisal allow one to raise the level of scrutiny to which various knowledge claims might be subjected. At higher levels, more stringent demands are made on one's evidence in order to be able to claim to know a particular fact. One must be able to rule out ever more potential defeaters to one's claim to know. But virtually no claim can meet these demands if the level of scrutiny is raised indefinitely. What philosophical theories mistakenly aim for is a form justification that will shield some of our ordinary knowledge claims no matter how high the level of scrutiny should be raised. No proposed form of justification seems close to achieving this, however. In ordinary life the rules of epistemic appraisal are not pushed to such extremes and so do not yield the skeptic's verdict that almost nothing is known. Yet reflection alone can raise the level of scrutiny, and if pursued to the limit, such reflection drives one into skepticism, against which dogmatic epistemology offers no relief. And it is precisely this sort of unrestricted reflection that is distinctive of philosophy. By contrast, ordinary cases of epistemic appraisal are motivated by specific ordinary concerns and come to rest once those concerns have been addressed. Kept in check by life's actual concerns, and unbothered by philosophy, the impulse to engage in theorizing about idealized forms of justification is allowed to sleep and the philosophical problem of epistemic justification no longer intrudes upon us. With this

understanding, Fogelin's neo-Pyrrhonian reaches peace of mind.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Evidence and Meaning: Studies in Analytic Philosophy (London, 1967).

Wittgenstein (London, 1976; 2nd edn 1987).

Hume's Skepticism (London, 1985).

Figuratively Speaking (New Haven, Conn., 1988).

Philosophical Interpretations (Oxford, 1992).

Pyrrhonian Reflections on Knowledge and Justification (Oxford, 1994).

Berkeley and the Principles of Human Knowledge (London, 2001).

Walking the Tightrope of Reason: The Precarious Life of a Rational Animal (New York, 2003).

A Defense of Hume On Miracles (Princeton, N.J., 2003).

Other Relevant Works

"Blanchard's Reasons and Goodness," *Review of Metaphysics* 17 (1963): 91–7.

"Wittgenstein and Intuitionism," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 5 (1968): 267–74.

"Three Platonic Analogies," *Philosophical Review* 80 (1971): 371–82.

Understanding Arguments: An Introduction to Informal Logic (New York, 1978).

"When I Look at a Tomato there is much I cannot See," *The Monist* 64 (1981): 100–123.

"Wittgenstein and Classical Skepticism," *International Philosophical Quarterly* 21 (1981): 3–15.

"The Tendency of Hume's Scepticism," in *The Skeptical Tradition*, ed. Miles Burnyeat (Berkeley, Cal., 1983), pp. 397–412.

"Wittgenstein on Identity," *Synthese* 56 (1983): 141–54.

"Hume and Berkeley on the Proofs of Infinite Divisibility," *Philosophical Review* 97 (1988): 47–69.

"Hume's Skepticism," in *The Cambridge Companion to Hume*, ed. David F. Norton (Cambridge, UK, 1993).

"Wittgenstein's Critique of Philosophy," in *The Cambridge Companion to Wittgenstein*, ed. Hans Sluga and David Stern (Cambridge, UK, 1996).

"Quine's Limited Naturalism," *Journal of Philosophy* 94 (1997): 543–63.

"David Lewis on Indicative and Subjunctive Conditionals," *Analysis* 58 (1998): 286–9.

"The Sceptic's Burden," *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 7 (1999): 159–72.

"Contextualism and Externalism: Trading in One Form of Skepticism for Another," *Skepticism*, *Philosophical Issues* 10 (2000): 43–57. Fogelin's replies, pp. 86–93.

"Why Obey the Laws of Logic?" *Philosophical Exchange* 32 (2002): 19–29.

"Two Diagnoses of Skepticism," in *The Skeptics: Contemporary Essays*, ed. Steven Luper (Aldershot, UK, 2003), pp. 137–47.

"The Skeptics are Coming! The Skeptics are Coming!" in *Pyrrhonian Skepticism*, ed. Walter Sinnott-Armstrong (Oxford, 2004).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Oxford Comp Phil*

"Symposium on *Pyrrhonian Reflections on Knowledge and Justification*," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 57 (1997): 395–425.

Rosenberg, Jay F. "Scrutinizing a Trade," *Philosophical Issues* 10 (2000): 58–66.

Villanueva, Enrique. "What Has Contextualism to Do with Skepticism?" *Philosophical Issues* 10 (2000): 67–71.

Williams, Michael. "Fogelin's Neo-Pyrrhonism," *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 7 (1999): 141–58.

Samuel S. Levey

FØLLESDAL, Dagfinn Kaare (1932–)

Dagfinn Føllesdal was born on 22 June 1932 in Asxiu, Norway. He studied mathematics, mechanics, and astronomy at the University of Oslo where he received the Cand.mag. degree in 1953, and mathematics at the University of Göttingen. He spent two years studying ionospheric physics before entering Harvard University's graduate program in philosophy. He completed his PhD there in 1961, and taught philosophy and logic at Harvard until his return to Oslo in 1967. Since 1967 he has been professor of philosophy at the University of Oslo, and since 1968 has also been professor of philosophy at Stanford University. In 1976 he became C. I. Lewis Professor of Philosophy at Stanford.

Among the lectures Føllesdal has given are: the Hägerström Lectures (University of Uppsala), the Wolfson College Lecture (Oxford University), the Gurwitsch Lecture (New School for Social Research), and the Alfred Schutz Lecture (American Philosophical Association). Føllesdal is a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and a member of Academia Europea and the academies of science in Norway, Finland, Denmark, and Sweden. He was President of the Norwegian Academy of Science, 1993, 1995, and 1997. In addition, Føllesdal was a Guggenheim Fellow, a Santayana Fellow, a fellow of the American Council of Learned Societies, a member of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford, a Wissenschaftskolleg fellow, and a fellow at the Center for Advanced Studies, Oslo.

Føllesdal's primary research interests include philosophy of language and phenomenology, while his secondary interests include philosophy of science, philosophy of action, and ethics. He has been influenced by W. V. QUINE's philosophy on the one hand and by Edmund Husserl's on the other. Føllesdal has made important contribution to major issues in recent analytic philosophy, including the functions of mind, the indeterminacy of translation, the social nature of language, and the externalist view of meaning. He has argued against causal theories of reference, and for the significance of the intentionality and normativity of consciousness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Quantification into Causal Contexts," in *Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science* (Dordrecht, 1965), pp. 263–74.

"Knowledge, Identity and Existence," *Theoria* 33 (1967): 1–27.

"Interpretation of Quantifiers," in *Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science*, ed. B. van Rootsellar and J. F. Stall (Amsterdam, 1968), pp. 271–81.

"Quine on Modality," in *Words and Objections: Essays on the Work of W. V. Quine*, ed. Donald Davidson and Jaakko Hintikka (Dordrecht, 1968), pp. 175–85.

"Husserl's Notion of Noema," *Journal of Philosophy* 66 (1969): 680–87.

"Indeterminacy of Translation and Under-determination of the Theory of Nature," *Dialectica* 27 (1973): 289–301.

"Meaning and Experience," in *Mind and Language: Wolfson College Lectures 1974*, ed. S. Guttenplan (Oxford, 1975), pp. 25–44.

"Hermeneutics and the Hypothetico-deductive Method," *Dialectica* 33 (1979): 319–36.

"The Status of Rationality Assumptions in Interpretations and in the Explanation of Action," *Dialectica* 36 (1982): 301–16.

"Essentialism and Reference," in *The Philosophy of W. V. Quine,* ed. Paul Schilpp and Lewis Hahn (La Salle, Ill., 1986), pp. 97–113.

"Indeterminacy and Mental States," in *Perspectives on Quine*, ed. Robert Barrett and Roger Gibson (Oxford, 1990), pp. 98–109.

"In What Sense is Language Public?" in *On Quine: New Essays*, ed. P. Leonardi and

M. Santambroglio (Cambridge, UK, 1995), pp. 427–46.

"Mind and Meaning," *Philosophical Studies* 94 (1999): 139–49.

Referential Opacity and Modal Logic (London and New York, 2004).

Other Relevant Works

"Phenomenology," in *Handbook of Perception*, ed. E. C. Carterette and M. P. Friedman (New York, 1974), vol. 1, pp. 377–86.

"Brentano and Husserl on Intentional Objects and Perception," *Grazer Philosophische Studien* 5 (1978): 83–94.

"Sartre on Freedom," in *The Philosophy of Jean Paul Sartre*, ed. Paul Schilpp and Lewis Hahn (La Salle, Ill., 1981), pp. 392–407.

"Causation and Explanation: A Problem in Davidson's View on Action and Mind," in *Actions and Events: Perspectives on the Philosophy of Donald Davidson*, ed. Ernest Lepore and Brian McLaughlin (Oxford, 1985), pp. 311–23.

"Von Wright's Modal Logic," in *The Philosophy of Georg Henrik von Wright*, ed. Paul Schilpp and Lewis Hahn (La Salle, Ill., 1989), pp. 539–56.

"Gödel and Husserl," in *From Dedekind to Gödel: Essays on the Development of the Foundations of Mathematics*, ed. Jaakko Hintikka (Dordrecht, 1995), pp. 427–46.

Ed., *The Philosophy of Quine*, 5 vols (New York, 2000–2001).

"Quine on Modality," in *The Cambridge Companion to Quine*, ed. Roger Gibson (Cambridge, UK, 2004), pp. 200–213.

Further Reading
Oxford Comp Phil

Banchetti, Marina-Paola. "Føllesdal on the Notion of the Noema: A Critique," *Husserl Studies* 10 (1993–4): 81–95.

Hintikka, Jaakko. "Existence and Identity in Epistemic Contexts: A Comment on Føllesdal's Paper," *Theoria* 33 (1967): 138–47.

Langsdorf, Lenore. "The Noema as Intentional Entity: A Critique of Føllesdal," *Review of Metaphysics* 37 (1984): 757–84.

Roger F. Gibson

FOLLETT, Mary Parker (1868–1933)

Mary Parker Follett was born on 3 September 1868 in Quincy, Massachusetts. She was educated first at Thayer Academy, where she developed an interest in philosophy. Four years after graduating in 1888, she entered Harvard's Annex, soon to become Radcliffe College. There she studied English, political economy, and history. She also studied abroad at Cambridge (Newnham) from 1890 to 1891. Follett received her BA summa cum laude from Radcliffe in 1898, having already published her first book, *The Speaker of the House of Representatives* (1896). She was a social worker and political activist in Boston for many years. She lived in England during the last five years of her life. Follett died on 18 December 1933 in Boston, Massachusetts.

Follett read Latin, Greek, French, and German and her early philosophical interests and training were in the idealist tradition. Yet she also admired William JAMES's pluralism, and her own writings merged both views. Her holistic vision of society as a complex interactive unity, and her assertion that the individual found an identity only within group activities had similarities with ideas of the American pragmatist George Herbert MEAD, a contemporary sociologist/philosopher.

Follett spearheaded community centers in Boston's poorer neighborhoods and developed evening educational and recreational programs and departments of vocational guidance in the local schools. This extended use of school build-

ings became a social movement and a national example. We might see Follett as a typical example of a progressive social thinker in that she favored social planning and "control," and used her time and inheritance to pursue social projects. However, she was also often critical of American progressivism's reliance on an expansion of the suffrage to improve society, dismissing "ballot-box democracy" as feeble since it left power relations unchanged.

Her second book, *The New State* (1918), began as a report on her community activities, but developed into a more theoretical work exploring group dynamics. Follett maintained that the state was the highest expression of human endeavor, and that creativity and freedom were generated from organized social interaction of individuals not merely persuasion of the masses. Her next book, *Creative Experience* (1924), examined sociopolitical behavior in terms of the "wholes" of Gestalt psychology. Friendly with industrialists and perceiving industrial management as a central modern concern, she also lectured extensively on that topic.

One of Follett's most distinctive notions was that of "integration," and she applied it to both her political theories and to business management. Conflict is inevitable, yet it might serve as a forum for imaginative solutions and human progress. Three possible approaches to conflict are domination, compromise, or integration. Domination leaves one party dissatisfied; compromise often leaves all parties dissatisfied. Neither effect a qualitative change in actors' views. Integration involves reexamining motives. Often disputants do not want mutually exclusive ends. Therefore it is possible for a solution to deliver desired ends to all. To give an example: someone wishes to close an open and drafty library window; another wants fresh air. Follett's "integration" would shut the first window while opening another in a different room, permitting air to circulate. Follett saw this as a new sort of solution which introduces a new, non-traditional leadership style. Arguing that a more natural authority derives from func-

tional expertise than from hierarchical position, she believed that labor could participate in corporate decisions. Many of her ideas were adopted by those considering new non-coercive forms of management and social relations in both the United States and Great Britain, thus extending her influence well beyond the halls of academe.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Speaker of the House of Representatives (New York, 1896).

The New State: Group Organization, the Solution of Popular Government (New York, 1918).

Creative Experience (New York, 1924).

Freedom and Co-ordination: Lectures in Business Organization, ed. L. Urwick (London, 1949).

Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett, ed. Henry C. Metcalf and L. Urwick (New York, 1941).

Mary Parker Follett, Prophet of Management: A Celebration of Writings from the 1920s, ed. Pauline Graham (Boston, 1995).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*

Fry, Brian R. *Mastering Public Administration: From Max Weber to Dwight Waldo* (Chatham, N.J., 1989).

Graham, Pauline, ed. *Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of Management* (Cambridge, Mass., 1995).

Tonn, Joan C. *Mary Parker Follett: Creating Democracy, Transforming Management* (New Haven, Conn., 2003).

Wren, Daniel A., and Ronald G. Greenwood. *Management Innovators: The People and Ideas that Have Shaped Modern Business* (New York, 1998).

Evelyn Burg

FOLTZ, Clara Shortridge (1849–1934)

Clara Shortridge Foltz was one of the first women to study and practice law in the United States. In both her practical and her written work, she focused on legal reform and women's rights. She was born on 16 July 1849 in Lafayette, Indiana to Talitha Cumi Harwood and Elias Willets Shortridge, a minister who later became a lawyer. Her brother, Samuel M. Shortridge, became a United States senator in California. She was educated by private tutors as a child, and attended Mt Pleasant Seminary in Iowa. She then became a teacher herself in Illinois before eloping, at the age of fifteen, with Jeremiah Foltz. During hard years on an Iowa farm, she bore four children.

Foltz's career came only after her early marriage took her to California and then ended in divorce. Clara began pursuing a legal apprenticeship with lawyers in San Jose, California. She succeeded in getting a placement with C. C. Stephens and immediately began to work to change the California statute that barred women from practicing law. Foltz worked as a lawyer for several years before she was actually able to attend law school, however. Foltz was admitted to the California bar in 1878, joining Myra BRADWELL as one of the first women lawyers. When Hastings College refused to admit her to its law school in the mid 1880s, she took her case to court and won access to the school in a decision ordering Hastings to admit women on the same terms as men (54 Calif. 28).

After studying at Hastings from 1888 to 1890, she was granted the right to argue before the US Supreme Court in 1890. As a lawyer, Foltz initiated the legal reforms she advocated in her written work. She was the author of one of California's first prison parole laws in 1893, and in 1921 she wrote California's statute to authorize the appointment of public defenders for those who could not afford legal representation.

A feminist all of her professional life, Foltz was involved in many women's organizations, including the Votes for Women Club in Los Angeles. Many of her initiatives benefited women, such as laws that allowed them to act as executors and administrators of estates and to serve as notaries. She also successfully argued for the appointment of a jail matron for female prisoners in San Francisco. Foltz contributed to the *Chicago Legal News*, a periodical edited by Bradwell. From 1916 to 1918, Foltz published a periodical devoted to women's issues, *The New American Woman*, and wrote a monthly column for its pages entitled "The Struggles and Triumphs of a Woman Lawyer." She also edited the *San Diego Daily Bee* in the late 1880s and early 1890s. Foltz died on 2 September 1934 in Los Angeles, California.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Matter of Goodell," *Wisconsin Law Journal* 39 (1875): 232, 245–6.

"Public Defenders – Rights of Persons Accused of Crime – Abuses Now Existing," *Albany Law Journal* 48 (1893): 248.

"Public Defenders," *Chicago Legal News* 25 (1893): 431.

"The Evolution of Law," *Chicago Legal News* 25 (12 August 1893).

"Duties of District Attorneys in Prosecutions," *Criminal Law Magazine* 18 (1896): 415.

"Public Defenders for Criminals," *American Law Review* 31 (1897): 393.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*

Avey, Sharon. *The Lady Lawyer: Clara Shortridge Foltz* (Fullerton, Cal., 2001).

Babcock, Barbara Allen. "Reconstructing the Person: The Case of Clara Shortridge Foltz," *Biography: An Interdisciplinary Quarterly* 12 (1989): 5–16.

———, "Clara Shortridge Foltz: Constitution Maker," *Indiana Law Journal* 66 (1991): 849–940.

———, "Clara Shortridge Foltz: 'First

Woman'," *Valparaiso University Law Review* 28 (Summer 1994): 1231–85.

King, Deborah. "Clara Shortridge Foltz: Angel and Revolutionary," *Hastings Women's Law Journal* 11 (Summer 2000): 179–219.

Morello, Karen Berger. *The Invisible Bar: The Woman Lawyer in America, 1638 to the Present* (New York, 1986).

Shuck, Oscar T. *History of the Bench and Bar of California* (San Francisco, 1901).

Dorothy Rogers

FONTAINE, William Thomas Valeria (1909–68)

William Thomas Fontaine was born on 2 December 1909 in Chester, Pennsylvania, an industrial town on the Delaware River, south of Philadelphia. He received a BA from Lincoln University in 1930, and an MA in 1932 and PhD in philosophy in 1936 from the University of Pennsylvania, respectively. At Pennsylvania he worked with Edgar A. SINGER and Francis Clarke, and wrote a dissertation on Boethius and Bruno. He maintained an interest in ancient, medieval, and early modern philosophy, but in the summer of 1933 he had also studied at Harvard, where he was introduced to the ideas of the conceptual pragmatism of C. I. LEWIS, and pragmatic orientations thereafter dominated his outlook.

Fontaine taught a variety of courses part-time at Lincoln while earning his doctorate, including an innovative one on black history, but in 1936 he accepted a position at Southern University in Scotlandville, Louisiana, and during his six years there he wrote a series of essays on racial issues. These articles combined a relativist approach to cultural knowledge indebted to the pragmatists with an understanding of how cultural views were a product of social position, in the manner of European sociologists of knowledge like Karl Mannheim.

Fontaine left Southern in 1942, in the middle of World War II. He briefly worked in the Chester shipyards as part of a work force challenging segregated employment but soon enlisted in the US Army where he did vocational counseling and, more important, became acquainted with Nelson GOODMAN, who began teaching philosophy at Pennsylvania in 1946. At the same time, Morgan State College in Baltimore, Maryland, called Fontaine to chair its department of philosophy and psychology, but a year later he was asked to replace Goodman, who went on leave in 1947–8. Pennsylvania repeated the arrangement in 1948–9, and in 1949 he was appointed assistant professor of philosophy. He was tenured in 1958, and promoted to associate professor in 1963, holding that position until his death. He was the first African American to teach philosophy at any Ivy League university, and for a long time he was the only one.

Fontaine had begun to work on problems of counterfactuals, which had made Goodman famous, but his writing was interrupted by a long fight with active tuberculosis, which eventually killed him. But from 1955 through the mid 1960s, when the disease was in remission, he returned to issues of race, writing on the ethics of segregation. Pragmatism and Fontaine's color had sensitized him to the subjectivity of social knowledge, and to the social locus of the knower. But in the context of the analytic philosophy that dominated the profession, his concerns were barely recognized as being philosophical. By the 1960s he was a reflective observer of the movement for African colonial independence, the black Diaspora, and Pan Africanism. Some of these interests congealed in *Reflections on Segregation, Desegregation, Power, and Morals*, his book written in 1967, the year before his death. Fontaine died on 29 December 1968 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Fortune, Matter and Providence: A Study of Ancius Severinus Boethius and Giordano Bruno (Scotlandville, La., 1939).
"The Mind and Thought of the Negro of

the United States as Revealed in Imaginative Literature, 1876–1940," *Southern University Bulletin* 28 (March 1942): 5–50.

"Social Determination in the Writings of American Negro Scholars," *American Journal of Sociology* 49 (1944): 302–13.

"Segregation and Desegregation in the United States: A Philosophical Analysis," *Présence Africaine* 8–10 (1956): 154–73.

"The Means End Relation and its Significance for Cross-cultural Ethical Agreement," *Philosophy of Science* 25 (1958): 157–62.

Reflections on Segregation, Desegregation, Power, and Morals (Springfield, Ill., 1967).

Further Reading
Proc of APA v43

Bruce Kuklick

FONTINELL, Eugene (1924–)

Eugene Fontinell was born on 22 May 1924 in Scranton, Pennsylvania. He received his BA in 1948 from the University of Scranton. He received his MA in 1950 and his PhD in philosophy in 1957 from Fordham University. Fontinell began teaching philosophy at Iona College (1951–4) and then moved to the College of New Rochelle. In 1961 he took his third and final position in the philosophy department of Queens College of City University of New York. His colleagues at Queens included John J. McDermott, Peter Manicas, and Ralph W. Sleeper, also important contributors to the study of American thought. Fontinell had known McDermott from his time at Fordham, where both studied with Robert Pollock, a gifted teacher who possessed a deep familiarity with American thought. Pollock

inspired countless students to undertake a creative engagement with American philosophy. He opened Fontinell to nothing less than the open universe of radical possibility so vividly depicted and vigorously defended by Ralph Waldo Emerson, William James, and John Dewey, a universe in which religion can become once again a "live option" even for the empirically oriented philosopher.

Fontinell served as chair of his department at both New Rochelle (1958–61) and at Queens (1966–72). Fontinell also served as an associate editor for *Cross Currents*. After his retirement in 1991, he has continued a life of reading and reflection.

The titles of Fontinell's two books indicate his main concerns. The subtitles are, in a different way, equally significant. The first, published in 1970, is titled *Toward a Reconstruction of Religion: A Philosophical Probe*. The second, published in 1986 and reissued in 2000, is titled *Self, God, and Immortality: A Jamesian Investigation*. These two works add up to a significant contribution to the advancement of American philosophy, for several distinct reasons. In these works, Fontinell offers an insightful reading of central figures in the pragmatic tradition (most notably James and Dewey), but also draws upon such thinkers as Susanne K. Langer and John H. Randall, Jr. As an interpreter of American texts, thinkers, and traditions, Fontinell makes a notable contribution to American thought. But his interpretations are put forth as aids to probing, from a novel angle, perennial philosophical questions.

Toward a Reconstruction of Religion is truly what its subtitle promises. It opens with a parable about isolated islanders who are thrust beyond their cultural insularity by encounters with individuals who exemplify other ways of living. The spirit of Jamesian pluralism pervades this work of pragmatic reconstruction, just as the demand defining pragmatic empiricism informs this reconstruction at every turn. This is the demand, in the first instance, to frame our questions in explicitly experiential

terms and, subsequently, to formulate our answers only on the basis of what experience discloses. In *Toward a Reconstruction of Religion* the investigation moves from the opening parable to a detailed sketch of how contemporary experience bids us to envision the world as a scene of open-ended processes. Fontinell probes into the pragmatic meaning of religious truth, morality, and finally religion. Drawing heavily upon James and Dewey, he offers pragmatic reconstructions of what is vital and viable in traditional Christianity, but is unhesitant in noting what is, at this historical juncture, stultifying and untenable. After carefully interpreting their texts, he imaginatively uses their insights for his own purposes, including a defense of religion in which the *ecclesia* or church (conceived as a community of worshippers rooted in a history and embodied in institutions) plays a much more central and prominent role than in the accounts offered by James and Dewey.

Self, God, and Immortality is also a philosophical probe deeply indebted to the singular genius of James, as its subtitle makes clear. But, in a manner decidedly influenced by Dewey, emphasis is placed by Fontinell on the self as a being at once constituted by its relationships to others, and yet irreducibly unique as a center of action and innovation. Fontinell uses James's metaphor of overlapping, processive "fields" as one of his principal ways of giving expression to this conception of the self. The field-self "participates in and is constituted by a range of fields, some of which can be designated 'wider' in relation to the identifying 'center' of the individual self" (1986, p. 132). This *Jamesian Investigation* is, more than anything else, an attempt to probe two possibilities. The first is that the finite, mortal human self might be constituted in a transformative manner by a relationship to a transcendent yet finite God. The second is that that the longing for personal immortality might be other than what Nietzsche, Freud, and a host of other contemporary thinkers have claimed this longing to be (a thoroughgoing betrayal of human life – a

destructive bid for illusory happiness entailing the complete forfeiture of any possibility of genuine happiness; moreover, an ignoble withdrawal from the actual world of transient affairs).

Fontinell was vital to the recovery of American pragmatism at a time when James, Dewey, and other pragmatists were being eclipsed by positivists, analysts, existentialists, and others. Furthermore, he developed insights derived from James and Dewey into a philosophy of religion principally addressed to religious persons, above all ones reluctant to abandon their traditional faith but unwilling to maintain their religious convictions by appeals to anything but their lived experience. After John E. Smith, no one has done more than Fontinell to bring into sharp focus the abiding relevance of American pragmatism to religious questions. These questions pertain to how the self can most authentically relate to itself as well as to ones concerning how to envision the nature of divinity (with James, Fontinell opts for a finite God) and how to assess the prospects for personal immortality. Fontinell's works are deeply rooted in the American pragmatism tradition, animated by the experiential revelations and inextinguishable doubts so evident in James's *Varieties of Religious Experience* and *A Pluralistic Universe*, as well as Dewey's *A Common Faith* and *Experience and Nature*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Toward a Reconstruction of Religion: A Philosophical Probe (Garden City, N.Y., 1970).

Self, God, and Immortality: A Jamesian Investigation (Philadelphia, 1986; New York, 2000).

Other Relevant Works

"James's Pragmatic Personalism," in *Frontiers in American Philosophy*, vol. 2, ed. Robert Burch (College Station, Tex., 1996), pp. 356–64.

"Theistic Religion; Energizing or

Deenergizing?" *Contemporary Philosophy*
19 (January–April 1997): 26–32.
"James: Religion and Individuality," in
*Classical American Pragmatism: Its
Contemporary Vitality*, ed. Douglas
Anderson, Carl Hausman, and Sandra
Rosenthal (Urbana, Ill., 1999).

Further Reading

Colapietro, Vincent. "Beyond Doubt:
Tradition, Narrative, and Processive
Faith," *Cross Currents* 39 (1989): 83–90.
Lauder, Robert E. "Fontinell's *Self, God, and
Immortality*," *Contemporary Philosophy*
24 (May–August 2002): 26–32.

Vincent M. Colapietro

FOOT, Philippa Ruth (1920–)

Throughout a philosophical career spanning
more than half a century, Philippa Foot has
been acclaimed for her rigorous, original, and
inspirational scholarship and teaching. She was
born Philippa Ruth Bence on 3 October 1920
in Owston Ferry, England, to William Sydney
Bence and Esther Cleveland Bosanquet
(daughter of US President Grover Cleveland).
She received her BA (1942) and MA (1946)
from Somerville College, Oxford, where G. E.
M. Anscombe was a major influence on her.
She married Michael Foot in 1945. She stayed
at Somerville to teach philosophy for many
years in various positions: lecturer in philoso-
phy (1947–50), tutorial fellow (1950–69), vice-
principal (1967–9), and then became a senior
research fellow (1970–88). Beginning in the
1960s, Foot also held visiting professorships at
American universities, including Cornell,
University of California at Los Angeles,
University of California at Berkeley,
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, New
York University, and Princeton. In 1976 Foot
became full professor at UCLA, where she was
appointed the first holder of the Gloria and
Paul Griffin Chair in Philosophy in 1988. In
1982–3 she was President of the Pacific
Division of the American Philosophical
Association. She has the rare distinction of
being a fellow of both the British Academy and
the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.
Best known for her essays collected in *Virtues
and Vices* (1978) and numerous other articles
in professional journals and literary reviews, she
has lectured widely in the United States and
Great Britain, as well as in other major cities of
the world. Although she retired from UCLA in
1991, she continues to be a productive writer
and active participant in philosophical discus-
sions of ethics. Her recent books include
Natural Goodness (2001) and *Moral
Dilemmas* (2002).

In a collection of essays in her honor,
Rosalind Hursthouse declares Foot the most
distinguished modern exponent of virtue ethics
(Hursthouse et al. 1995, p. 74). Following in
the tradition of Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas,
Foot herself insists that a sound moral philos-
ophy should start from a theory of the virtues
and vices. Accordingly, her important collection
entitled *Virtues and Vices* begins with an
analysis of the concept of virtue: how virtues
benefit and whom; how they differ from talents
and skills in being tied to the human will; and
how virtues as correctives are linked to the
peculiar features and deficiencies of human
nature. For example, if human beings were
never fearful in the face of danger, courage
would not be seen as a virtue at all. Insofar as
Foot claims that what counts as virtues and
vices depends on what human nature is like, her
virtue ethics can be labeled naturalistic.
According to Foot, "Virtues are in general ben-
eficial characteristics, and indeed ones that a
human being needs to have, for his own sake
and that of his fellows." (1978, p. 3) While the
cardinal virtues of courage, temperance, and
wisdom benefit both the agent and others,
charity and justice may sometimes require that
agents sacrifice their own happiness for the

sake of others. How the virtue of justice relates to self-interest is a recurrent problem for Foot insofar as it raises the question of why one should act morally if one's self-interest is at odds with the requirements of justice.

Besides analyzing the concept of virtue in a general way, Foot is known for her work on specific moral issues, notably abortion and euthanasia. Her 1967 essay on "The Problem of Abortion and the Doctrine of Double Effect" does not come to any general conclusions about the moral permissibility of abortion. However, in this essay she challenges the doctrine of double effect as a theory for resolving the competing interests in cases of abortion. Is it morally permissible to inflict injury, even death, on an innocent to save another, perhaps even many others? What shall we say of the judge who under pressure from rioters frames an innocent person to save the lives of five hostages? Or the trolley driver who steers his runaway engine away from a track where five men are standing onto a track where there is only one? Despite its initial appeal, Foot argues that the doctrine of double effect is not the most useful theory for dealing with such dilemmas. While the doctrine of double effect invokes a distinction between intention in a direct or strict sense and what is foreseen as a result of the intended action, Foot thinks that a distinction between positive and negative rights, with correlative positive and negative duties, is better suited to handling these conflicts without having to invoke any utilitarian principle of greater good. The judge who considers framing an innocent person weighs the negative duty of avoiding harm against the positive duty of providing aid. In this case, killing the innocent to save others abuses the negative duty to avoid inflicting injury. The driver of the runaway trolley, on the other hand, weighs two negative duties – not harming the five and not harming the one – and so may reasonably abide by that duty which causes the least injury possible.

In her 1977 essay "Euthanasia," she defines euthanasia as an act "of inducing or otherwise opting for death for the sake of the one who is to die" (1978, p. 34). Claiming that human life itself is a good but leaving open the possibility that it is not always so, Foot carefully examines the various distinctions brought up in connection with euthanasia: active versus passive, voluntary versus involuntary, and killing versus letting die. Whether an act of euthanasia is justified will depend on its relation to the virtues of charity and justice. If an act is uncharitable, and hence not good for the person who dies, then the act is unjustified. Foot offers an interesting discussion of the complicated relation between a subject's own view of her life and what makes a life good or bad. She also points out that while one always has a right not to be killed, one does not always have a right to life-prolonging or life-ending procedures. She offers a nuanced discussion of when such rights obtain that shows moral judgments demand careful inspection of the details and circumstances involved in each case.

The connection between facts and values is a major theme in Foot's persistent opposition to emotivism and prescriptivism in ethics. She herself characterizes this opposition as "a painfully slow journey … away from theories that located the special character of evaluations in each speaker's attitudes, feelings, or recognition of reasons for acting" (1978, p. xiv). Her early essays "Moral Arguments" (1958) and "Moral Beliefs" (1958) attack the alleged fact/value split, the claim that there is no logical connection between statements of fact and statements of value, and thus that arguments about moral issues can always break down even when disputants agree about matters of fact. The fact/value dichotomy with its serious implications for moral reasoning was made famous by David Hume, endorsed by G. E. Moore, and developed by other twentieth-century critics of naturalistic ethics such as Charles STEVENSON, A. J. Ayer, and R. M. Hare. Following Ludwig Wittgenstein, Foot's tactic in opposing these forms of ethical noncognitivism is to look at how evaluative terms are used in ordinary circumstances to

see if the evaluative terms can be separated from descriptive factual content. For example, consider the term "rude." To call someone rude, she claims, there must be some reference to disrespect or offense against norms of behavior that can be pointed to as evidence for the person's rudeness. One cannot simply call someone rude for walking slowly up to an English front door, she says, or for behaving totally conventionally. There are criteria of correct usage of concepts, and a failure to follow those criteria is a failure to use the concept at all. To the claim that calling a piece of behavior rude is simply expressing one's attitude, Foot responds that one's attitude in this case presupposes beliefs about certain conditions being fulfilled (1978, p. 103). Consider another example. The claim "this is dangerous" has a warning function, similar to how "this is good" allegedly has a commending function, at least according to the emotivists and prescriptivists. But not anything at all can be called dangerous, she notes, or have this warning function: it is logically impossible to warn about something not thought of as threatening evil, while the assertion of danger requires some evidence. Her general point is that one "who uses moral terms at all, whether to assert or deny a moral proposition, must abide by the rules for their use, including the rules about what shall count as evidence for or against the moral judgment concerned" (1978, p. 105). For her, the use of evaluative terms like "good" is internally related to their objects, and thus not merely to the feelings or attitudes of the speaker.

Her essay on "Goodness and Choice" (1961) continues to pry apart the alleged connection between the use of value terms and the feelings, attitudes, and choices of speakers or agents. She considers how the term good is internally related or connected to such things as knives, cars, horse-riders, and farmers. The ascription of the term good in these cases depends on fulfilling certain objective criteria, whether in terms of function or purpose, as for cars and knives, or social practices, as for riders and farmers. An object is not good because it is chosen but rather because of what it is chosen for. Choosing is not like pointing at something but more like a "picking out for a role, which has a ground" (1978, p. 143). If the point of an activity has to do with common interests, needs, and desires of those who engage in it, reasons for the choice can be offered and discussed. However, the fact that something is good does not mean one necessarily has a reason to choose it. A knife may be a good knife, but if one has no use for cutting, one will not have reason to choose it. The choices of the speaker, she concludes, are neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for the use of the term good. But if this is so, she admits, it may be the case that particular speakers or agents not only have no reason to choose good things like good cars or good knives but also have no reason to choose good actions and good character traits. Without sharing the standard needs, desires, and interests of others in one's social group, one may have no apparent reason to act morally at all.

Foot develops this latter point in her famous essay on "Morality as a System of Hypothetical Imperatives" (1972). For morality as for etiquette, she claims, certain behavior may be required, not merely recommended, but that it is required still leaves open the question, why should I do what I am required to do? For her, Kant's famous categorical imperative is an empty slot; all imperatives depend for their efficacy or bindingness on people's interests or desires. In her "Reply to Professor William Frankena" (1975), she reiterates: "Moral judgments are, I say, hypothetical imperatives in the sense that they give reasons for acting only in conjunction with interests and desires. We cannot change that though we could keep up the pretence that it is otherwise." (1978, p. 177) To the charge that her position undermines morality, Foot retorts that "a morality of hypothetical imperatives is not a morality of inclination; resolution and self-discipline being at least as necessary to achieve moral ends as to achieve anything else" (1978, p. 170). On this

view, then, morality is still very much connected with the practice of virtues, though the rationality of acting virtuously is, according to Foot at this stage in her thinking, quite contingent.

If reasons for acting morally cannot be located in some universal, binding for each and every person, nevertheless Foot's investigations consistently show that moral judgments and evaluations must be located in a social dimension. Recall that her early essays argued that the use of evaluative terms depends on social norms entailing descriptive evidence. Contrary to the prevailing doctrines of contemporary analytic ethics, her essay on "Approval and Disapproval" (1977) again highlights the social in contrast to the individualistic character of morality. Just as concepts of voting and banking require social institutions and conventions for their use, so too "it is no more possible for a single individual, without a special social setting, to approve or disapprove than it is for him to vote" (1978, p. 191). For example, while I may hold an opinion about the proposed marriage or move of my next-door neighbor, I am in no position, in the role of being merely a neighbor, to approve or disapprove these actions. "I approve" is a performative requiring specific social settings and conventions. To the ethical noncognitivist's objection that approval and disapproval are merely attitudes that anyone can have about anything, Foot replies that "the attitudes of approval and disapproval would not be what they are without the existence of tacit agreement on the question of who listens to whom and about what. On this view where we have approval or disapproval we necessarily have such agreements …." (1978, p. 198) Summing up her argument, she claims that if the expression of approval and disapproval is part of the complex phenomenon we call morality, and if approval and disapproval are essentially social in presupposing determinate social practices and backgrounds, then morality itself is essentially social (1978, p. 207).

To take account of her philosophical development, scholars now writing on Foot's philosophical career divide her work into early, middle, and recent (for example Gavin Lawrence, in Hursthouse et al. 1995). Early Foot attacked the fact/value dichotomy, but still held that moral considerations provide reasons for acting for each and every person. Middle Foot – regarding morality as a system of hypothetical imperatives – argued against the necessary rationality of moral action. In her 2001 book *Natural Goodness*, Foot herself labels this view of morality "indigestible" (p. 59). Recent Foot now claims that acting morally is acting rationally, and practical rationality itself is necessarily tied to human goodness. "I want to say, baldly, that there is no criterion for practical rationality that is not *derived from* that of goodness of the will" (2001, p. 11). But her view here is decidedly not Kantian. Influenced by her philosophical mentors – Aquinas, Wittgenstein, and Elizabeth Anscombe – but also by contemporary philosophers and colleagues such as Warren Quinn, Rosalind Hursthouse, Michael Thompson, and Gavin Lawrence, Foot articulates a thoroughgoing naturalistic ethics grounded in facts about human life. "To determine what is goodness and what defect of character, disposition and choice, we must consider what human good is and how human beings live: in other words, what kind of a living thing a human being is." (2001, p. 51) Returning to the vexing question of why a person should follow the dictates of justice even when they conflict with self-interest or desires, Foot can now say that the just person recognizes certain considerations, such as the fact of a promise or a neighbor's need, as powerful and even compelling reasons for acting. Recent Foot, then, has freed herself from the dominant philosophical prejudice that only desires or self-interest can motivate or serve as reasons for acting. But in the face of the fantastic diversity of human lives, can one argue persuasively for a common human good? In her 1978 Lindley Lecture on "Moral Relativism" Foot had already pointed in the direction of her recent work on *Natural Goodness*: "Granted

that it is wrong to assume identity of aim between peoples of different cultures; nevertheless there is a great deal that all men have in common. All need affection, the cooperation of others, a place in a community, and help in trouble. It isn't true to suppose that human beings can flourish without these things …." (1979, p. 16) Understanding the conditions of being human is essential to understanding human goodness and thus the dictates of morality and the ideals of virtue, or what Foot now calls "natural normativity." To the objection that practical rationality is simply the pursuit of happiness, she responds with a nuanced analysis of happiness as a protean concept that cannot be simply identified as the human good. Too many examples of those willing to sacrifice happiness for justice, honor, or some other virtue tell against the claim that happiness is to be identified with the human good and thus with the goal of a practically rational agent. To the claim that genuine happiness consists in a life of virtue, Foot demurs, for that view allows too little room for the genuine tragedy that may lie in a moral choice.

Reviewing Philippa Foot's philosophical work as whole, one is struck not only by the brilliance of her analyses and examples but also by the fact that she is forever willing to change or modify her position in response to sound argument. She does not flinch from the challenge of opposing views, nor does she hesitate to expose recalcitrant philosophical prejudices. The feisty character of her work is further demonstrated by the fact that for many decades she was among the very few Anglo-American analytic ethicists to engage seriously and critically with the writings of Friedrich Nietzsche, the self-proclaimed immoralist. Foot admires Nietzsche's "daring, his readiness to query everything … his special nose for vanity, for pretense, for timid evasion," yet in the end it is his psychology she finds unconvincing. While she grants Nietzsche's genius in exposing hidden motivations, foreshadowing the depth psychology elaborated later on by Freud, some of his observations, she claims, are overblown

and unfounded. For example, she does not believe that most instances of human sympathy or compassion are motivated by malice, jealousy, or resentment against the more powerful, so she cannot accept his overall attack on the ethics of compassion. Furthermore, she says, "those who take Nietzsche's attack on morality as an edifying call to authenticity and self-fulfillment are deluding themselves": for her Nietzsche's refusal to call actions of rape, torture, or cruelty intrinsically wrong or evil cannot be tolerated in the name of individual inspiration or cultural playfulness. In the end, she claims, "Nietzsche fell into the philosophers' trap of inventing a generalizing theory [of will to power] largely unsupported by observation. It is common to think of him as a wonderful psychologist, but at this point I think that he was not." (2001, p. 113)

Summing up a philosophical career as brilliant and subtle as Philippa Foot's is extremely difficult. Nevertheless, in terms of her own metaphor of the journey, certain markers appear constant: her opposition to emotivism, prescriptivism, utilitarianism, and Kantianism; her advocacy of naturalism and virtue ethics; and her use of distinctions from Aquinas and tactics from Wittgenstein. Her preoccupation with the rationality of moral judgment and action stretches across the other concerns, and takes various turns during her career, as we have seen. In addition to the substantive contributions Philippa Foot has made to ethics, the imaginative vitality and rigor of her philosophical voice will continue to influence her readers, colleagues, and students: she has shown that philosophy in its most genuine sense is indeed a dialogue in search of truth.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Moral Arguments," *Mind* 67 (1958): 502–13.
"Moral Beliefs," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 59 (1958): 83–104.
"Goodness and Choice," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society Supplement* 35 (1961): 45–60.
"The Problem of Abortion and the Doctrine

of Double Effect," *Oxford Review* 5 (1967): 5–15.

"Morality as a System of Hypothetical Imperatives," *Philosophical Review* 81 (1972): 305–16.

"Nietzsche: The Revaluation of Values," in *Nietzsche: A Critical Collection of Essays*, ed. R. Solomon (New York, 1973), pp. 156–68.

"Approval and Disapproval," in *Law, Morality and Society: Essays in Honour of H. L. A. Hart*, ed. P. M. S. Hacker and J. J. Raz (Oxford, 1977), pp. 229–46.

"Euthanasia," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 6 (1977): 85–112.

Virtues and Vices, and Other Essays in Moral Philosophy (Berkeley, Cal., 1978; Oxford, 2002).

"Utilitarianism and the Virtues," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 57 (November 1983): 273–83.

Natural Goodness (Oxford, 2001).

Moral Dilemmas and Other Topics in Moral Philosophy (Oxford, 2002).

Other Relevant Works

"When Is a Principle a Moral Principle?" *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 28 (1954): 95–111.

Ed., *Theories of Ethics* (Oxford, 1967).

"Morality and Art," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 56 (1970): 131–44.

"Moral Realism and Moral Dilemma," *Journal of Philosophy* 80 (1983): 379–98.

"Nietzsche's Immoralism," *New York Review of Books* 38 (13 June 1991): 18–22.

Ed., *Morality and Action: Collected Papers of Warren Quinn* (Cambridge, UK, 1993).

"Rationality and Virtue," in *Norms, Values, and Society*, ed. H. Pauer-Studer (Dordrecht, 1994), vol. 2, pp. 205–16.

"Does Moral Subjectivism Rest on a Mistake?" *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 15 (1995): 1–14.

Further Reading

Blackwell Analytic Phil, *Encyc Ethics*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v9*

Hursthouse, Rosalind. *On Virtue Ethics* (Oxford, 1999).

Hursthouse, Rosalind, Gavin Lawrence, and Warren Quinn, eds. *Virtues and Reasons: Philippa Foot and Moral Theory: Essays in Honour of Philippa Foot* (Oxford, 1995).

Korsgaard, Christine. "Skepticism about Practical Reason," *Journal of Philosophy* 83 (1986): 5–25.

MacIntyre, Alasdair. "Virtues in Foot and Geach," *Philosophical Quarterly* 52 (2002): 621–31.

McDowell, John. "Are Moral Requirements Hypothetical Imperatives?" *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 52 (1978): 13–29.

Williams, Bernard. *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy* (London, 1985).

Jocelyn Hoy

FOSTER, George Burman (1857–1918)

George Burman Foster was born on 2 April 1857 in Alderson, Monroe County, in Virginia (now West Virginia). Foster attended Shelton College in West Virginia, and was ordained to the Baptist ministry in 1879 when he graduated. He received the BA and MA degrees at West Virginia University in 1883 and 1884. In 1884 he married Mary Lyon, whose father, Franklin Smith Lyon, was professor of English, Vice President, and later Acting President at West Virginia. After graduating with a divinity degree from Rochester Theological Seminary in 1887, Foster became pastor of the First Baptist Church of Saratoga Springs, New York. Reputed as he was among Baptists as a skillful preacher and intellectual prodigy, two new Baptist universities sought him for their faculties. McMaster University in Toronto financed

his study in Germany at Göttingen and Berlin during 1891–2, after which he joined its faculty to teach philosophy, psychology, and logic. Denison University also conferred the PhD degree on Foster. At the same time, William Rainey Harper, President of the University of Chicago, sought him for the faculty of its Divinity School. Foster did move to Chicago to join the Chicago Divinity School in 1895 and rose to the position of professor of systematic theology. He was made professor of philosophy of religion in 1905, and he held this position until his death on 22 December 1918 in Chicago, Illinois.

The University of Chicago was committed to keeping ties to its Baptist constituency and to disseminating to churches the new knowledge of the sciences and the historical and textual criticism of the Bible. Foster participated in the annual Baptist Congresses and regional "Ministers' Meetings" and corresponded with regional and national Baptist newspapers. In doing so, he drew himself into controversy over his liberal theological views. To quell the uproar, in 1905 he agreed to be transferred from the Divinity School to the department of comparative religion, as professor of the philosophy of religion. He preached regularly in Baptist and Unitarian churches, including the congregation which he and his wife joined in 1896, the Hyde Park Baptist Church, now the Hyde Park Union Church, in Chicago. At the time of his death he was preaching regularly in the Unitarian Church in Madison, Wisconsin. Despite the storms of controversy that engulfed Foster, at his death he remained a member in good standing of his own congregation and a minister in good standing in the Northern Baptist Convention. Memorial services were held in Mandel Hall at the University of Chicago and downtown at the Garrick Theatre, where Foster's friend and public debater, Clarence Darrow, addressed the mourners.

Foster relentlessly pursued intellectual integrity for faith as a dynamic, living process. Faith, he said, is a task and an achievement as well as a gift. He "would rather have a minimum that was sure than a maximum that was not" (1909, p. xi). As a Baptist believer in the soul's liberty, he rejected the coercion of creeds, yet he insisted on "the personal need of intellectual convictions with reference to religious realities" (Nash 1923, p. 38). He saw the need for "the synthesis of the stability of doctrine sufficient for church work, and the movement of science sufficient in that field …" ("Religious Teaching," 1897, p. 109). All who knew Foster, friends and foes alike, testified that he was a man of integrity, great intelligence, and a kind spirit. These were the qualities that energized his passionate and unconsummated search for the meaning of "the God-idea." In their passion, self and faith contribute to the certainty and realization of God as an inner spiritual reality. Foster says, in a way recognizably contemporary to persons who are inquiring into the meaning of God today, "in this new world [of modern science] the opposition of human and divine is overcome, and all is human and all is divine at one and the same time" (1906, p. 147). Foster's contemporaries recognized that his struggle for a new and credible theism was an authentic, inner, spiritual one. His most recent interpreters, however, debate whether he was an orthodox Christian theist, a theist at all, a humanist, a religious humanist, or a religious naturalist. Foster's primary aim was investigating the plausibility of faith in a theology of culture.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Theological Training for the Times," *Biblical World* 9 (1897): 23–5.

"Religious Teaching and the Denomination," *Proceedings of the Baptist Congress at Chicago, Ill.* 15 (1897): 107–109.

"The Influence of the Life and Teaching of Jesus on the Doctrine of God," *Biblical World* 11 (1898): 306–18.

"Kaftan's Dogmatik," *American Journal of Theology* 2 (1898): 802–27.

The Finality of the Christian Religion (Chicago, 1906).

"Pragmatism and Knowledge," *American*

Journal of Theology 11 (1907): 591–6.

The Function of Religion in Man's Struggle for Existence (Chicago, 1909).

"Concerning the Religious Basis of Ethics," *American Journal of Theology* 12 (1908): 211–30.

"What is a Baptist Church?" *Proceedings of the Baptist Congress at Chicago, Ill.* 30 (1912): 66–8.

"The Philosophy of Feminism," *The Forum* 52 (1914): 10–22.

"The Contribution of Critical Scholarship to Ministerial Efficiency," *American Journal of Theology* 20 (1916): 161–78.

The Function of Death in Human Experience (Chicago, 1919).

Christianity in Its Modern Expression, ed. Douglas Clyde Macintosh (New York, 1921).

Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. Curtis W. Reese (New York, 1931).

Other Relevant Works

Foster's papers are at the University of Chicago, the American Baptist Historical Society in Rochester, N.Y., and the Canadian Baptist Archives in Hamilton, Ontario.

"Nietzsche and the Great War," *Sewanee Review* 28 (1920): 139–51.

"An Unpublished Interview with the Late Dr. George Burman Foster on the Future of Religion," with J. V. Nash, *Open Court* 37 (1923): 37–9.

"Nietzsche and Wagner," *Sewanee Review* 32 (1924): 15–29.

"Maeterlinck and the Spirit of Romanticism," ed. J. V. Nash, *Open Court* 38 (1924): 65–75.

"Ibsen's Philosophy of Religion," ed. J. V. Nash, *Open Court* 38 (1924): 193–205.

"The Message of Bjornson," ed. J. V. Nash, *Open Court* 38 (1924): 321–31.

"The Ethics of the Wage," *Sewanee Review* 29 (1931): 39–43.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v18*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Arnold, C. Harvey. "The Death of God – '06: George Burman Foster and the Impact of Modernity," *Foundations: A Baptist Journal of History and Theology* 10 (1967): 331–53.

———, *God Before You and Behind You: The Hyde Park Union Church Through a Century* (Chicago, 1974), pp. 145–232.

Axel, Larry E. *God or Man at Chicago: The 'Chicago School' of Theology with Special Reference to the Issue of Antecedents and to the Roles of G. B. Foster, E. S. Ames, and H. N. Wieman*. PhD dissertation, Temple University (Philadelphia, 1976), pp. 152–76.

———, "Conflict and Censure: The Religious Odyssey of George Burman Foster," in *Alone Together: Studies in the History of Liberal Religion*, ed. Peter Kaufman and Spencer Lavan (Boston, 1978), pp. 91–101.

Dorrien, Gary. *The Making of American Liberal Theology: Idealism, Realism, and Modernity 1900–1950*, vol. 2 (Louisville, Kent., 2003), pp. 151–81.

Gragg, Alan. *George Burman Foster: Religious Humanist* (Danville, Virg., 1978).

Nash, J. V. "A Twentieth Century Emancipator," *Open Court* 36 (1922): 321–31.

Peden, W. Creighton. *The Chicago School: Voices in Liberal Religious Thought* (Bristol, Ind., 1987), pp. 24–43.

Peden, W. Creighton, and Jerome A. Stone, eds. *The Chicago School of Theology: Pioneers in Religious Inquiry*, vol. 1 (Lewiston, N.Y., 1996), pp. 1–59.

Smith, Gerald Birney. "George Burman Foster," *Biblical World* 53 (1919): 181–3.

Stone, Jerome A. "The Line Between Religious Naturalism and Humanism: G. B. Foster and A. E. Haydon," *American Journal of Theology and Philosophy* 20

(1999): 217–40.

Towne, Edgar A. "A 'Singleminded' Theologian: George Burman Foster at Chicago," *Foundations: A Baptist Journal of History and Theology* 20 (1977): 36–59, 163–80.

Edgar A. Towne

FRANK, Jerome New (1889–1957)

Jerome Frank was born on 10 September 1889 in New York City. He graduated from high school at sixteen; after three years at the University of Chicago he received the BA in 1909, and by 1912 he earned the JD degree, having earned the highest grades ever achieved at the University of Chicago Law School. He had a law practice in Chicago from 1912 to 1929 and then he moved to New York City. He joined the Roosevelt administration's New Deal, serving on agricultural and finance commissions. He was Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission from 1939 to 1941. He was appointed to the US Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in 1941, and he served until his death on 13 January 1957 in New Haven, Connecticut.

Frank's many influential opinions helped to shape subsequent Supreme Court decisions, expanding the protection of civil rights and liberties against infringements of government power. He justified his understanding of the Constitution in light of his rejection of the simplistic notion that the legislature designs laws while judges apply them. This legal philosophy came to be called "legal realism" which was a small but formidable movement against legal formalism throughout the twentieth century. Frank drew upon the pragmatism of William JAMES, John DEWEY, and Oliver Wendell HOLMES, Jr. to argue that judges can and should justify their desired results by selectively choosing among diverse relevant laws and prior interpretations. His 1930 *Law and the Modern Mind* undermines the immature notion that the law is fixed and stable and that judges aim at rigidly predictable decisions based on facts alone. Although we may want to believe that justice is paternalistically infallible, Frank detailed the many ways that judges not only may, but must, go well beyond applicable laws and facts to reach any decision. He embraced the necessary conclusion that most complex judicial decisions are quite unpredictable because the judge's personal convictions and social viewpoints play a large role. Frank encouraged the study of the social sciences as potentially relevant to a better understanding of the complex relations between the judicial process and wider society.

The wider implications of Frank's legal philosophy seriously challenge another widespread conviction that the judiciary is largely immune from political or economic influence. Some critics have argued that Frank's exposure of the lack of judicial independence underestimates the primacy of law and hence undermines democracy itself. However, by exposing the susceptibility of the judicial system to manipulation by deep social struggles over wealth and power, Frank hoped for a deeper and stronger democracy. His legal realism helped to prepare the way for the Critical Legal Studies movement of the 1970s.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Law and the Modern Mind (New York, 1930).

Save America First: How to Make Our Democracy Work (New York, 1938).

If Men Were Angels: Some Aspects of Government in a Democracy (New York, 1942).

Fate and Freedom: A Philosophy for Free Americans (New York, 1945).

Courts on Trial: Myth and Reality in American Justice (Princeton, N.J., 1949).

Other Relevant Works

Most of Frank's papers are at Yale University.

"A Conflict With Oblivion: Some Observations on the Founders of Legal Pragmatism," *Rutgers Law Review* 9 (1954): 425–63.

Kristein, Barbara F., ed. *A Man's Reach: The Philosophy of Judge Jerome Frank* (New York, 1965).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*

Glennon, Robert J. *The Iconoclast as Reformer: Jerome Frank's Impact on American Law* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1985).

Rosenberg, J. Mitchell. *Jerome Frank: Jurist and Philosopher* (New York, 1970).

Volkomer, Walter E. *The Passionate Liberal: The Political and Legal Ideas of Jerome Frank* (The Hague, 1970).

John R. Shook

FRANK, Philipp (1884–1966)

Philipp Frank was born on 20 March 1884 in Vienna, Austria. He studied physics and mathematics at the universities of Göttingen and Vienna. At Vienna, he studied with Ludwig Boltzmann and received his PhD in theoretical physics in 1907. While lecturing in physics at Vienna from 1910 to 1912, he was a regular member of the so-called First Vienna Circle with Richard VON MISES, Hans Hahn, and Otto Neurath. During the remainder of his career, he remained linked to Neurath in several ways. He shared Neurath's activist conception of scientific philosophy, which shunned excessive formalism, emphasized the instrumental and conventional aspects of science and scientific theory, and encouraged practical engagements with science and the public. Frank was active, for example, in Viennese adult education, while his brother, architect Josef Frank, was a central member of Josef Hoffman's Austrian Werkbund and architect of Neurath's Social and Economic Museum in Vienna.

In 1912 Frank left Vienna for Prague, where he succeeded Albert EINSTEIN (at Einstein's invitation) as professor of theoretical physics at the German University. While Frank's official work in Prague was in physics, he remained connected to logical empiricism as it was developing in the Vienna Circle around Moritz Schlick in the 1920s. Frank remained in close contact with the Circle's members, especially Rudolf CARNAP who came to the German University in 1931. In 1929 Frank organized within a meeting of the German Physical Society a conference on the "Epistemology of the Exact Sciences" at which Frank, Carnap, Hahn, Neurath, Hans REICHENBACH, and Herbert FEIGL gave talks that first introduced the new scientific philosophy of the Vienna Circle (and Reichenbach's Berlin-based Society for Empirical Philosophy) to established scientists. The reception, Frank later recalled, was less than warm, since the physicists and mathematicians assembled "did not particularly like the idea of combining this serious scientific meeting with such a foolish thing as philosophy" (1949, p. 40).

Frank continued to promote logical empiricism to working scientists, the educated public, and scholars in the humanities after his emigration to the United States in 1938. In 1939 he began teaching for one semester each year at Harvard University as a lecturer in physics and mathematics, and lectured at many other universities on alternate semesters. He retired from teaching at Harvard in 1954 and took various visiting positions, as he continued to promote the unity of science and the cultural and social roles philosophy of science should play. He died on 21 July 1966 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Beginning in 1940 Frank regularly attended the annual Conferences on Science, Philosophy and Religion in New York City where he defended science and scientific philosophy to the many intellectuals who regarded science as disconnected from, if not dangerous to, human culture (see 1950). After World War II and Neurath's death in 1945, Frank joined Rudolf Carnap and Charles MORRIS, who had edited the *International Encyclopedia of Unified Science* with Neurath, as a leader of the Unity of Science Movement. With Rockefeller funding arranged by Warren Weaver, Frank established a new Institute for the Unity of Science in 1936 within the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in Boston, serving as its President until 1965. At the same time, he succeeded William Malisoff as President of the Philosophy of Science Association. The institute sponsored colloquia and conferences but lost its funding from the Rockefeller Foundation in the mid 1950s. In this respect, Frank's organizational efforts were less successful than those of others, such as Herbert Feigl, whose Minnesota Center for the Philosophy of Science has survived Frank's institute to the present day.

Frank's specialty in mathematics was differential equations. In philosophy of science, he contributed to several areas. His first was theory of causality. His early paper "*Kausalgesetz und Erfahrung*" ("Experience and the Law of Causality", 1949) offered a conventionalist interpretation of physical causality (following Henri Poincaré). Causal laws do not so much govern our experience of the world, Frank argued, as guide us in selecting those successions of events that we choose to regard as paradigms of causation. Einstein took notice of Frank's paper and it led to Frank's invitation to Prague, their subsequent friendship, and Frank's later role as a biographer of Einstein (1947).

Vladimir Lenin also took notice and dismissed Frank in his *Materializm i empiriokrititsizm* (*Materialism and Empirio-criticism*, 1909), a polemic against Marxists seeking a synthesis of Machism and empiricism. Though not specifically because of Lenin's attack, one theme of Frank's subsequent career was his defense of Ernst Mach against the common misinterpretation that Mach's phenomenalism entailed an ontological claim (usually that the world somehow consists in sensations). Frank also championed Mach as an important precursor to the Unity of Science Movement: "If we demand of science an economical representation of our experiences, that is, a representation by a unified system of concepts, we must admit only propositions that are reducible to propositions containing only perception terms as predicates. This is the real meaning of Mach's doctrine that all propositions of science deal with perceptions." (1949, p. 84) On this view, Mach's phenomenalism was not a metaphysical theory of the world but instead an attempt to explicate the unity of the sciences by way of eliminating spurious, unscientific metaphysical statements.

Frank also defended Mach as a guiding spirit behind logical empiricism's critique of metaphysics and pseudoscience. In writings to a variety of audiences, including scientists, philosophers and theologians and humanists prominent in the CSPR, Frank championed logical empiricism as a universally valuable project seeking to understand how experience and theory – those of science, theology, ethics, or other areas – relate to and interact with each other. In the same spirit, Frank aggressively criticized misinformed popularizations that sought to marshal developments in science (usually in quantum theory or relativity theory) as justification for politically manipulative claims about freedom of the will, biological vitalism, or "spiritualism" in modern science (see 1941 and 1950, p. 74).

Frank's interest in conventionalism connected to his interest in sociology and the dynamics of theory choice. He promoted the view (associated usually with Pierre Duhem, Neurath, and W. V. QUINE) that evidence logically constrains choices of scientific theories only to families of theories, each of which are

consistent with specific evidence but which can be in other respects quite different from each other. In such cases, Frank argued, different kinds of values held consciously or unconsciously by a scientist or prominent in his or her culture can and often do influence theory choice and, in turn, the direction of scientific research. This insight served as his justification for promoting research in sociology of science within the Institute for the Unity of Science. "To understand that the observed facts do not determine scientific doctrines unambiguously is the most important prerequisite for understanding the role played by sociological factors in the acceptance of scientific doctrines." (1951, p. 19) This interest clearly informs the title of the popular volume, edited by Frank, titled *The Validation of Scientific Theories* (1957), which remains one of his best-remembered contributions to philosophy of science.

Recent interest in Frank concerns the disparity between his prominence in the 1940s and early 50s and the subsequent obscurity of his project and writings (Uebel 1998; Reisch 2005). Frank is now understood as remaining committed to early Vienna Circle ideals of public "enlightenment" during a time when they were tarnished by their past political associations with socialism and Marxism. His contributions were also eclipsed by the growing institutional dominance of analytic and natural language styles of philosophy that aimed less to explicate and popularize scientific theory and more to clarify ordinary usages and meanings of concepts. The philosophers of the Frankfurt School who sought to continue social and cultural engagements during and after the Cold War also helped obscure Frank's project. In perhaps its most famous form, this critique held that logical empiricism was anti-progressive and anti-humanistic for promoting a conception of human thought and existence as technical and "one dimensional" (see Marcuse 1964). Given that Frank desired to promote the study of science's social and cultural connections and mutual influences,

and to oppose the view that no such influences existed, this misunderstanding was ironic. It is also ironic (though for different reasons) that as a leader in Boston-area science studies, Frank was succeeded by Thomas KUHN with whom he shared the view that science's history is punctuated by revolutionary periods and that any valid philosophy of science must accept these as data. "The history of science," Frank wrote, "is the workshop of the philosophy of science." (1949, p. 278) Yet, in Kuhn's influential *Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1970), the history of science counsels against unity of science and instead emphasizes the natural specialization of scientific knowledge and terminology within individual paradigms. Paradigms are divided typically by (alleged) incommensurabilities of language and meaning that tend to isolate scientists from their revolutionary predecessors, from contemporaries in competing research programs, and from the general public.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Das kausalgesetz und seine grenzen (Vienna, 1932). Trans., *The Law of Causality and its Limits*, ed. Robert S. Cohen (Dordrecht, 1998).

Between Physics and Philosophy (Cambridge, Mass., 1941). 2nd edn, *Modern Science and Its Philosophy* (Cambridge, Mass., 1949).

Foundations of Physics (Chicago, 1946).

Einstein: His Life and Times (New York, 1947).

Relativity: A Richer Truth (Boston, 1950).

Philosophy of Science: The Link between Science and Philosophy (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1957).

Other Relevant Works

Frank's papers are at Harvard University.

Ed. with Richard von Mises, *Die Differential- und Integralgleichungen der Mechanik und Physik*, (Braunschweig, Germany, 1925).

Ed., *The Validation of Scientific Theories*

(Boston, 1957).

"The Logical and Sociological Aspects of Science," *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 80 (1951): 16–30.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v7*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Cohen, Robert S., and Marx W. Wartofsky, eds. *Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science, vol. 3: In Memory of Philipp Frank* (New York, 1965).

"Frank, Phillip," in *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, vol. 5 (New York, 1972), pp. 122–3. Contains a bibliography of Frank's writings.

Holton, Gerald. "Ernst Mach and the Fortunes of Positivism in America," *Isis* 83 (1992): 27–60.

Holton, Gerald, et al. "In Memory of Philipp Frank," *Philosophy of Science* 35 (1968): 1–5.

Kegley, Charles W. "Reflections on Philipp Frank's Philosophy of Science," *Philosophy of Science* 26 (1959): 35–40.

Kuhn, Thomas. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago, 1962).

Lenin, Vladimir I. *Materializm i empiriokrititsizm* (Moscow, 1909). Trans., *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* (New York, 1927).

Marcuse, Herbert. *One Dimensional Man* (Boston, 1964).

Parrini, Paolo, ed. *Logical Empiricism: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives* (Pittsburgh, 2003).

Reisch, George A. *How the Cold War Transformed Philosophy of Science* (Cambridge, UK, 2005).

Uebel, Thomas E. "Enlightenment and the Vienna Circle's Scientific World-Conception," in *Philosophers on Education: Historical Perspectives*, ed. Amelie Rorty (London 1998), pp. 418–38.

George Reisch

FRANKEL, Charles (1917–79)

Charles Frankel was born on 13 December 1917 in New York City. He received his BA in 1937 from Columbia University. From 1942 to 1946, he served in the US Navy during World War II. Returning to Columbia, he received his PhD in philosophy in 1946. From the position of assistant professor in Columbia's philosophy department beginning in 1947, Frankel advanced to full professor in 1956 and then to Old Dominion Professor of Policy and Public Affairs in 1970, and he held this position until his death. Frankel died on 10 May 1979 in Bedford Hills, New York.

Although Frankel's consistent focus as a scholar was upon political philosophy, he moved beyond scholarship to the domain of public affairs in which he held a succession of significant public positions, among them: Director of the New York State Civil Liberties Union (1960–65); Co-chairman of the National Assembly for Teaching Principles of the Bill of Rights (1962–5); Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs (1965–7); a founder of the International Council on the Future of the University (1970); and the first President and Director of the National Humanities Center (1978).

Throughout his career in philosophy and public affairs, there is reflected Frankel's pervasive liberal optimism. Frankel advocated a staunch liberalism in which rational, democratic problem-solving and scientific testing of the consequences combine with goodwill to overcome bias and greed and lead to an increasingly benevolent society and continuous historical progress. In place of "an official canon" of liberalism, Frankel offers only "the working principles of practical liberalism." For liberalism, he argues, religious and political beliefs are "private affairs," but "without political significance" (2002, pp. 29–30). As for liberalism itself, it "stands for a general predisposition in favor of reform," Frankel claims, and it achieves this goal by distributing power by parliamentary institutions and civil liberties and recently by the

reform of subjecting group membership to the individual's choice. Despite the absence of an "official liberal ideology," liberals accept "intellectual aspects of reform: objectivity, scientific method, relativism and intellectual progress. Truth is not denied, here, but is viewed as dubitable, and subject to scientific testing." (2002, p. 41)

With the development of science and the power of technology, liberalism perceives human beings as making their own history and controlling their destiny, and provides an image of America as the "most modern, technological, and democratic of countries in the total design of world history" (2002, p. 47).

Beyond the defense of a specific version of American liberalism, Frankel's scholarly and political contributions are continuous with historical attempts to achieve an articulation of an American public philosophy. His defense, however, of optimistic liberalism from the perspective of a narrow, reduced naturalistic pragmatism of piecemeal problem-solving and his dismissal of political and religious beliefs as private affairs lead him to four deliberate and controversial decisions. First is the deletion of the inalienable rights and constitutional structure of government of the American Founders. With this deletion, the public philosophy of America loses its identity. Second, the erasure of theory in favor of pragmatic problem-solving fails to see the revolutions of modernity itself and the liberalism arising within it; and to the failure to mention the liberalism of America's own philosophic pragmatism (PEIRCE, ROYCE, JAMES, DEWEY); and discredits its philosophy, along with religion, as mere matters of personal choice. With this erasure, an American liberal public philosophy loses its philosophic grounding. Third, the dismissal of religious conceptions for failing to meet the narrow tests of empirical verifiability and effective consequences deletes the persistent role of religious beliefs in personal needs and a variety of religious organizations. Fourth, in 1955 the Nuremberg Trials of Holocaust perpetrators had ended less than a decade earlier, and the Gulag was still in full

operation, yet Frankel persists in failing to make any recognition or denunciation of the greatest evils of modernity.

How was this undaunted, exuberant liberal optimism possible for Frankel together with his stern deliberate silence on the evils of his time? How was this optimism possible for Frankel, growing up in New York City's mean streets; or in the aftermath of his experience of the devastation of war as a navy lieutenant in World War II; or after the Holocaust and the Gulag had evolved into unbearable atrocities; or in the face of the violence of the Vietnam War; or of the student uprising of 1968 and in 1970; and of the onset of the Cold War?

But in 1979 it was with happiness and a sense of fulfillment that Frankel saw his plan for a National Humanities Center become a reality. The dedication of the Center was a moving tribute to its goal of connecting the worlds of scholarship and politics, the model for which can be found in the life of Charles Frankel. Back at Columbia the week following the dedication, Frankel's buoyant optimism asked Quentin Anderson whether he really believed in evil. Anderson replied in the affirmative. Before the week ended, Charles Frankel and his wife Helen were brutally murdered in their home in Bedford Hills, New York. How, for such liberal optimism, was such evil possible? Have we not learned that a liberalism focused upon the pragmatic management of piecemeal problems lacks the conceptual and moral capability to identify as evil the gross violations of human life in the Holocaust and the Gulag?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Faith of Reason (New York, 1948).
The Case for Modern Man (New York, 1956). 2nd edn, *The Case for Modern Liberalism* (New Brunswick, N.J., 2002).
The Golden Age of American Philosophy (New York, 1960).
The Democratic Prospect (New York, 1962).
The Love of Anxiety, and Other Essays (New York, 1965).
Pleasures of Philosophy (New York, 1972).

Human Rights and Foreign Policy (New York, 1978).

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *The Golden Age of American Philosophy* (New York, 1960).
The Neglected Aspect of Foreign Affairs: American Educational and Cultural Policy Abroad (Washington, D.C., 1966).
Education and the Barricades (New York, 1968).
High on Foggy Bottom: An Outsider's Inside View of the Government (New York, 1969).
Ed., *Controversies and Decisions: The Social Sciences and Public Policy* (New York, 1976).
"John Dewey's Social Philosophy," in *New Studies in the Philosophy of John Dewey*, ed. Steven M. Cahn (Hanover, N.H., 1977).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Proc of APA v52*, *Who Was Who in Amer v7*
Agresto, John, and Peter Riesenberg, eds. *The Humanist as Citizen* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1981). A memorial volume to Frankel.
Blanshard, Brand. "The Case for Modern Man," *Saturday Review* (17 March 1956): 12.

Thelma Z. Lavine

FRANKENA, William Klaas (1908–94)

William Frankena was born Wibe Klaas Frankena on 21 June 1908 in Manhattan, Montana, and died 22 October 1994 in Ann Arbor, Michigan. He grew up in a Dutch Reformed community in western Michigan, and received his BA from Calvin College in 1930. He then became a graduate student at the University of Michigan, where he studied with Roy Wood SELLARS and C. H. Langford, and received his MA in philosophy in 1931. For a few years he was a doctoral candidate at the University of Michigan but, after passing his required exams, he went to Harvard, attracted by such luminaries as Ralph Barton PERRY, Alfred North WHITEHEAD, and C. I. LEWIS. He received the Harvard MA in 1935, spent the 1935–6 academic year at the University of Cambridge working with G. E. Moore, and returned for a PhD in 1937 from Harvard.

Frankena joined the University of Michigan faculty as an instructor in 1937 and attained the rank of assistant professor (1940), associate professor (1946), professor (1947–78), chair of the department (1947–61), and was professor emeritus (1978–94). He also held visiting positions at Columbia, Princeton, Harvard, and Tokyo Universities. A member of Phi Beta Kappa and Phi Kappa Phi, he was a trustee of Chatham College (1961–94), Cairns Lecturer for the American Philosophical Association (1974), and received the University of Michigan Distinguished Faculty Achievement Award (1965), and the Warner G. Rice Humanities Award from the University of Michigan (1978). He served as chair of the Council for Philosophical Studies; was President of the American Philosophical Association Western Division (1965–6), chaired its board of directors (1963–5), and delivered the 1974 Carus Lectures to the APA. He was a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the National Academy of Education. Additionally, he held fellowships from the Center for Advanced Study of Behavioral Science, the Guggenheim Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Frankena's first published essay, "The Naturalistic Fallacy" (1939), was a powerful assault on G. E. Moore's treatment of the naturalistic fallacy. By his 1976 "Concluding More or Less Philosophical Postscript," in *Perspectives on Morality*, he considered

himself a "cognitivist," taking a naturalistic attitude about good, and an intuitionist stance about ought. In his 1939 essay Frankena held that Moore begs the question in his claim that naturalists commit a fallacy in defining good in terms of such natural properties as desire, pleasure, interest, etc. Frankena claims the so-called naturalistic fallacy is not a logical fallacy, since Moore simply *assumes* and does not *prove* that good is both nonnatural and indefinable.

Frankena's interests then broadened to emotivism, the philosophy of education, ethics and religion, and other areas. In 1963 he authored a noteworthy introductory text, *Ethics*. Later he considered the importance of virtue ethics, a topic of great debate in recent decades. Perhaps the resurgence of interest in virtue ethics can be traced to a debate between Frederick Carney, Stanley HAUERWAS, and Frankena in the *Journal of Religious Ethics* in 1973. Carney held that ethics having to do with actual behavior, i.e. normative ethics, was far more important than what is today called "virtue" ethics, with its emphasis on the moral attributes of individuals. Frankena did not deny the importance of character traits in ethics, but alone they do not generate standards of ethical behavior. With norms and virtues together, he says, we are able to act in a morally correct way. Attempting to pin down his conception of morality even further he suggests, like Kurt BAIER and Stephen TOULMIN, that moral judgments are based on reasons of different kinds. In some cases the basis for a moral judgment may be consequentialist in nature, while others base moral decisions on the wishes, desires, etc., of the agent. In this more specific concept of morality, decisions about goodness, actions, people's qualities, etc., come into play because we believe these will affect human beings in various ways. How our actions affect others has to be considered for its own sake and not, for example, for its utility in bringing about some end. This is so because morality, almost by definition, has to do with the effects of our actions, judgments, decisions, etc., on other people.

According to some moralities such as utilitarianism, what we do will be rightly judged by how much good or harm we bring to others. In Frankena's view ethical systems, at least some of them, are teleological or, perhaps better, consequentialist in that we judge them by the good or harm that they are designed to either forestall or cause. As Frankena says, the ethics of some moral philosophers are teleological. On the other hand, he rightly notes that other moral systems are deontological, in that consequences do not figure in. For example, a person has at least a prima facie obligation to keep a promise regardless of the consequences. Similar remarks would apply to our verdict of the rightness of actions when they involve truth-telling, the promotion of fairness, etc. Frankena called his theory a "mixed deontological ethics," precisely because he believed it merged virtues with moral obligations – a kind of synthesis of Aristotle and Kant. This concern with deontological and consequentialist conceptions of ethics reappears in his concept of "Gens," as discussed below.

In subsequent writings Frankena continued to work for some kind of *definition* of morality. His comments are plausible and in line with our ordinary intuitions about morality. He calls morality a kind of "action-guide" which, along with facts about the world, ourselves, etc., can lead us to certain actions and not others. There are numerous other action-guides which usually have little or no connection with morality, though they can overlap on occasion. An example of one of the nonmoral life-guides might be etiquette. It is certainly a violation of etiquette, in some quarters, to belch in public, but that is not the sort of thing one normally considers unethical or immoral. Frankena points out that having a "morality" has more than one usage, some of them quite broad. We can refer to a person's morality even if the code he goes by is wholly at variance with what civilized people would call moral behavior. Thus, even if a person's morality

includes stealing, cheating, etc., there remains a use of morality where we say, "that is that person's morality." There is also a sense of morality where we say of a person or a society that it is "amoral," although they might well have a set of rules for guiding their behavior. This could be the case if the rules were entirely oriented towards survival, and the interest of others in the society played no role whatsoever, as in the African mountain people studied by anthropologist Colin Turnbull. To have a morality, even in the widest sense of the term, it is essential to have some values, meaning that the person or society does hold some beliefs about what is right or wrong, even if they are wildly askew of what we would ordinarily call moral values.

An important step in Frankena's conception of morality is what he calls "Gens" – or general ethical statements – which include both justice and beneficence. As he asks: What is, or should be, the content of morality? What Gens should it recognize? What Gens should we live by and teach to the young? What is right and who is good? He goes on to explain that issues regarding the nature of morality are metamoral, regardless of whether they involve normative questions or not. Still, queries about content must be considered first-order. As for the evidential status of Gens, Frankena maintains that they are neither self-evident nor a priori. How are we to determine what the basic Gens (principles) of morality are or should be? We are to do so by taking the moral point of view, and getting as clear as we can about all relevant facts. He continues by saying that any Gens that might emerge from such an analysis cannot be self-evident or a priori. Part of determining the basic Gens of morality involves trying to elucidate a personal morality and then determining which Gens we should try to inculcate in society (as in the rearing of children). Frankena takes pains to argue that a purely utilitarian or consequentialist approach is not sufficient, though it is *part* of the answer. Also needed, however, is a principle of justice which is at the core of deontological theories of ethics,

insofar as deontological theories, such as Kant's, demand respect for the intrinsic worth of all individuals and treating them equally. He admits that these principles are not universal or absolute and that in any given moral choice it may be difficult to determine which principle takes precedence. He further argues that personal ethics and correct analysis show that there are only two fundamental Gens. The first is what he calls a principle of beneficence that he thinks grounds nonegoistic consequentialist theories such as utilitarianism which base moral judgments on doing no harm and acting for the good. But there is also a principle of justice which he thinks underlies deontological theories of morality. Such theories urge us to recognize the intrinsic value of all persons and to treat all equally. Frankena adds that these principles are not absolute, since they may come into conflict in some situations, and there is no formula for determining which take precedence.

Some of the above remarks might suggest that Frankena does not believe that any real certainty is possible in morality. Some scholars believe, however, that Frankena very much believes that moral certainty is possible. Part of his view of ethics is the idea that morality is independent of religion, as well as other areas of human inquiry, such as science. Frankena seems to defend this idea in his 1973 essay "Is Morality Logically Dependent on Religion?" According to Frankena, morality is an autonomous inquiry. But Frankena also objects to the notion that religion plays any role in morality because religion would rule out certainty in moral judgments. Some critics say Frankena is unrealistic in demanding moral certainty in ethics because, in the real world, the conditions needed for making "absolutely certain" moral judgments do not exist. The issue of moral certainty is important in Frankena's work and is important in and of itself.

Beyond such epistemic questions, Frankena also asks, "Why is it that one should be moral?" This question is important because acting morally could involve some sacrifice on

one's part, and be against one's interests. Frankena takes issue with the simplistic way this question is usually meant, i.e., what reasons might exist for acting morally in a particular case. According to him, the question could involve more than this; it might be asking for a rational basis for acting morally. And this is the sense of the question that Frankena focuses on. He points out that "should" doesn't always have a moral sense. One could say that at a dinner party you should not wipe your mouth with your sleeve, where the "should" could hardly be said to have a moral meaning but is only a matter of etiquette. It would be decidedly odd to say that wiping your mouth with your sleeve is an immoral act. Similarly, "should" is not being used in a moral sense if I say you should flatter your boss because he likes flattery and doing so might help you get a raise.

Frankena suggests that there is a sense of "should" that is beyond morality, taking precedence over the ordinary moral use of "should," which implies being reasonable. He explains that what we need is a "should" that is not only nonmoral but also an important way beyond morality, one that puts us in a position to say that we should or should not be moral, one that takes priority over any moral "should" in cases of conflict. In his view, there is a sense of "should" which means being "rational." Therefore, "Why should I be moral?" equates to "Is it rational to be moral?"

Frankena tries to further clarify such questions by analyzing what it means to act rationally. He surmises that a traditional answer to this question is that to act rationally means to act self-interestedly, or for one's own welfare or benefit. His counter-argument is that this is not what morality involves and could not possibly equate to self-interest. The problem is that morality often requires actions counter to one's own best interest. Frankena points out that the common notion that acting morally is rational only when it is for our own happiness is not necessarily true, because it is a fact that people are capable of acting for the good of others, and not just selfishly.

By way of further clarification, Frankena asks what a person might do from the viewpoint of the "ideal observer," if he had full knowledge of all the factors involved in a decision and was completely in control of his faculties. A choice made under such conditions, he argues, would be a paradigm case of acting rationally and is in fact what being rational means. Frankena considers the case where someone is faced with a choice, and asks himself what the rational course of action could be, taking into account such things as morality, prudence, etc. This person is asking what would be the right choice, assuming he was in possession of his faculties and knew himself very well. Frankena contends that something is rational for one to choose if one would choose it under those conditions.

Frankena was among the most thoughtful and insightful philosophers of our age. A significant testimony to his importance as a philosopher is that several of his essays appeared in the July 1981 issue of *The Monist*. This distinguished journal has only twice focused an entire issue on the ideas of a living thinker, the other being Wilfrid SELLARS. Frankena was a man of broad interests; he was an enthusiastic amateur ornithologist, as well as an enthusiast for environmental issues and a lover of nature.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Naturalistic Fallacy," *Mind* 48 (1939): 464–77.

"Obligation and Value in the Ethics of G. E. Moore," in *The Philosophy of G. E. Moore*, ed. Paul Schilpp (La Salle, Ill., 1942), pp. 91–110.

Ethics (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1963).

Three Historical Philosophies of Education: Aristotle, Kant, Dewey (Chicago, 1965).

The Concept of Morality (Boulder, Col., 1967).

Three Questions about Morality (La Salle, Ill., 1974).

Perspectives on Morality: Essays by William K. Frankena, ed. K. E. Goodpaster (Notre

Dame, Ind., 1976).

Thinking about Morality (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1980).

"The Ethics of Right Reason," *The Monist* 66 (1983): 3–25.

"Moral-Point-of-View Theories," in *Ethical Theory in the Last Quarter of the Twentieth Century*, ed. Norman E. Bowie (Indianapolis, Ind., 1983), pp. 39–79.

Other Relevant Works

Frankena's papers are at the Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Ed., *Philosophy of Education* (New York, 1965).

"G. H. von Wright on the Theory of Morals, Legislation and Value," *Ethics* 76 (1966): 131–6.

Some Beliefs about Justice (Lawrence, Kan., 1966).

"Education," in *Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, vol. 2, ed. P. P. Weiner (New York, 1973).

"Is Morality Logically Dependent on Religion?" in *Religion and Morality*, ed. G. Outka and J. P. Reeder (Garden City, N.Y., 1973), pp. 195–317.

"The Ethics of Love Conceived as an Ethics of Virtue," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 1 (1973): 21–36.

Ed. with John T. Granrose, *Introductory Readings in Ethics* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1974).

"Moral Philosophy and World Hunger," in *World Hunger and Moral Obligation*, ed. W. Aiken and H. La Follete (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1977), pp. 66–84.

Ed., *The Philosophy and Future of Graduate Education* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1980).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Encyc Ethics*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v7*, *Proc of APA v68*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Brandt, Richard. "William Frankena and the Ethics of Virtue," *The Monist* 64 (1981):

271–92.

Foot, Philippa. "William Frankena's Carus Lectures," *The Monist* 64 (1981): 305–12.

Goldman, Alvin I., and Jaegwon Kim, eds. *Values and Morals: Essays in Honor of William Frankena, Charles Stevenson and Richard Brandt* (Dordrecht, 1978). Contains a bibliography of Frankena's writings.

Warnock, G. J. "Comments on Frankena's Three Questions," *The Monist* 63 (1985): 85–92.

Anthony Serafini

FRANKFURT, Harry Gordon (1929–)

Harry Frankfurt was born in Langhorne, Pennsylvania, on 29 May 1929, and while he was still an infant his family relocated to Brooklyn, New York. The family remained in Brooklyn for ten years before moving again, this time to Baltimore, Maryland, where Frankfurt finished high school and enrolled in Johns Hopkins University. He obtained his BA from Johns Hopkins in 1949, and spent the next two years doing graduate work at Cornell University before returning to Johns Hopkins, receiving his MA in 1953 and PhD in philosophy in 1954.

From 1954 to 1956 Frankfurt served in the US Army. From 1956 to 1962, Frankfurt taught at Ohio State University, first as instructor, then as assistant professor. He taught at State University of New York at Binghamton for a year before moving to Rockefeller University in 1963. Frankfurt remained at Rockefeller University for eleven years, becoming chair of the philosophy department in 1965. Frankfurt also taught at Yale University, both in the School of Law as a lecturer from 1981 to 1989, and in the philosophy department as a professor from 1976 to

1989, where he served as chair of the department from 1978 to 1987. From 1990 to 2002 he was professor of philosophy at Princeton University, where he is now emeritus professor. He has also held visiting appointments at the University of California at Los Angeles, the University of Pittsburgh, Vassar College, and All Souls College, Oxford. In addition to his teaching, Frankfurt has been President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division (1991–2). He has twice received the National Endowment for the Humanities Fellowship (1981–2 and 1994) and in 1993 he was awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship. He is a fellow in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and was awarded a Romanell–Phi Beta Kappa Professorship in Philosophy (1999–2000).

Although Frankfurt's philosophical output covers a wide range, including essays on topics as seemingly diverse as the rigorous analysis of the concept "bullshit" to speculations concerning God's creation of the world, we may indicate three consistent areas of interest in Frankfurt's work. In all of these areas we find Frankfurt's insight that the will, more than reason, is the essential feature of human nature and our understanding of ourselves. The early period of Frankfurt's philosophical investigations centers on questions concerning objectivity, skepticism, and the foundations of knowledge. Frankfurt's dissertation, entitled "The Essential Objectivity of What is Known," and his work on Descartes reflect these concerns.

The second area of inquiry which arises in Frankfurt's work focuses on questions relating to morality, notably such problems as free will and responsibility. In this area Frankfurt attempts to elaborate adequate notions of freedom and personal ideals, not to provide a theory of moral obligations and rights. While beginning with questions of morality, Frankfurt's thought moves into areas of metaphysics and philosophy of mind. Taking volition as central to an understanding of what it means to be human, Frankfurt's second area of inquiry focuses primarily on questions of

freedom and responsibility. While his interest in the will and the volitional structure of human beings remains central to his thinking, Frankfurt's most recent work attempts to deal with those constraints upon the will which make autonomy possible.

Thirdly, in his work on Descartes, Frankfurt advocates the controversial position that Descartes gives up his quest to find an unshakable foundation of knowledge in the external world, and instead finds satisfaction in his ability to offer a rational description of the world, even if it is impossible to know whether or not such a description corresponds to the world. As Frankfurt writes, "Descartes's theory of knowledge is grounded in his recognition that we simply cannot help believing what we clearly and distinctly perceive. For him, the mode of necessity that is most fundamental to the enterprise of reason is not logical but volitional – a necessitation of the will." (1999, p. ix)

Classical debates on the question of free will and moral responsibility often begin with the assumption that an agent cannot be held responsible in situations where he could not have done otherwise. This assumption is referred to as the "principle of alternate possibilities." Situations wherein the agent performs an action due to coercion are thought to provide examples of this assumption. Against this seemingly obvious assumption, Frankfurt argues that in certain situations the fact that an agent could not have acted otherwise may be perfectly compatible with his moral responsibility. In some situations, the fact that the agent could not have done otherwise may have no bearing on why the agent chose to act as he did. What is important in assigning moral responsibility, according to Frankfurt, is the formation of the agent's will. An agent may be held morally responsible, even if he could not have acted otherwise, insofar as he identifies with the action. In situations wherein an agent forms his will with respect to a specific action, and undertakes the action he wants to undertake, the fact that he could not have done otherwise would play no constitutive role in the formation

of the agent's will. Indeed, the agent may never be made aware that he could not have acted otherwise. What is motivating the agent to act is not the fact that he could not have done otherwise, but his identification with the action, that is, the action is being motivated by a will which the agent recognizes as his own. In these situations, although he could not have acted otherwise, the agent is morally responsible for his actions. Thus, Frankfurt agues that determinism need not be incompatible with moral responsibility. This underscores a deeper point that Frankfurt makes about freedom of the will. Freedom of the will is not simply a matter of doing what we want to do. To assume that having a free will simply means having the ability to do what we want to do is to conflate freedom of the will with freedom of action. But as Frankfurt points out, although an animal may be free to run in any direction it wants, we would not assign a free will to the animal. Freedom of the will, according to Frankfurt, is a question of having the will that one wants to have. One's will is free insofar as it is the will that one wants to have. Thus, a free will is one whose structural organization displays a coherence between one's second-order volitions and one's first-order desires. While one may be ambivalent about one's second-order volitions, the "wanton" lacks these second-order volitions entirely and is moved solely by first-order desires.

Frankfurt's recent writings address the concept of autonomy. Common sense seems to suggest that one cannot be autonomous if there are constraints placed upon the will. Not only does Frankfurt reject this position, but he goes further, arguing that certain constraints not only do not limit one's autonomy, but may in fact facilitate it. This is true in those cases where the constraints placed on a person's will are grounded in the person's own nature. An example of this is when we act out of love. To love something, or to have an ideal, is to recognize a limit to one's will – one's love or ideal is that which it would be unthinkable to violate. Thus one's love or ideal places a constraint upon the will. But the opposite situation, loving nothing, or having no ideals is not an indication of freedom according to Frankfurt. Far from being free, the person who loves nothing or has no ideals lacks personal identity. These people are "amorphous." If autonomy means being "self-regulating," it follows that only a being which has a personal identity, which is a self, is capable of autonomy. Constraints then, when grounded in a person's own nature, are the necessary prerequisite of autonomy.

The value of Frankfurt's work lies not only in his penetrating insights into the structure of the will, but also in his sustained effort to bring a rigorous style of analysis to bear on problems which one "can recognize and appreciate as a professional philosopher but also – and particularly – as a human being trying to cope in a modestly systematic manner with the ordinary difficulties of a thoughtful life" (1999, p. x).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Demons, Dreamers, and Madmen: The Defense of Reason in Descartes's "Meditations" (Indianapolis, 1970).
Leibniz: A Collection of Critical Essays (Notre Dame, Ind., 1976).
The Importance of What We Care About (Cambridge, UK, 1988).
Necessity, Volition, and Love (Cambridge, UK, 1999).

Other Relevant Works
"Realism and the Objectivity of Knowledge," *Philosophical Quarterly* 7 (1957): 353–8.
"The Dependence of Mind," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 19 (1958): 16–26.
"Memory and the Cartesian Circle," *Philosophical Review* 71 (1958): 504–11.
"Peirce's Account of Inquiry," *Journal of Philosophy* 55 (1958): 588–92.
"Peirce's Notion of Abduction," *Journal of*

Philosophy 55 (1958): 593–7.

"Meaning, Truth, and Pragmatism," *Philosophical Quarterly* 10 (1960): 171–6.

"Philosophical Certainty," *Philosophical Review* 71 (1962): 303–27.

"Descartes's Validation of Reason," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 2 (1965): 149–56.

"Functional Analyses in Biology," with Brian Poole, *British Journal of Philosophy of Science* 17 (1966): 69–72.

"The Anarchism of Robert Paul Wolff," *Political Theory* 1 (1973): 405–14.

"Les Desordres du Rationalisme," in *Le Discourse et sa Methode*, ed. N. Grimaldi and J. L. Marion (Paris, 1987), pp. 395–411.

"Duty and Love," *Philosophical Explorations* 1 (1998): 4–9.

"Gleichheit und Achtung," *Deutsche Zeitschrift fur Philosophie* 47 (1999): 3–11.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v10*

Blum, Alex. "The Kantian versus Frankfurt," *Analysis* 60 (2000): 287–8.

Buss, Sara, and Lee Overton, eds. *Contours of Agency: Essays on Themes from Harry Frankfurt* (Cambridge, UK, 2002).

Della Rocca, Michael. "Frankfurt, Fischer and Flickers," *Noûs* 32 (1998): 99–105.

Fischer, John Martin. "Frankfurt-type Examples and Semi-compatibilism," in *The Oxford Handbook of Free Will*, ed. Robert Kane (Oxford, 2002), pp. 281–308.

Mele, Alfred R., and David Robb. "Rescuing Frankfurt-style Cases," *Philosophical Review* 107 (1998): 97–112.

Schnall, Ira M. "The Principle of Alternate Possibilities and 'Ought' Implies 'Can'," *Analysis* 61 (2001): 333–40.

Widerker, David. "Frankfurt's Attack on the Principle of Alternative Possibilities: A Further Look," *Philosophical Perspectives* 14 (2000): 181–201.

Widerker, David, and Michael McKenna, eds. *Moral Responsibility and Alternative Possibilities* (Aldershot, UK, 2003).

Louis J. Colombo

FRANKFURTER, Felix (1882–1965)

Felix Frankfurter was born on 15 November 1882 in Vienna, Austria. In 1894, when he was twelve, his family emigrated to the United States and settled in New York City's Lower East Side. He combined the high school and college degrees in a single set of courses and graduated with a BA from the College of the City of New York in 1902. He spent one year working in New York's tenement house commission before he entered Harvard Law School, graduating with a law degree in 1906. He became the first Jewish lawyer hired by the prominent New York firm of Hornblower, Byrne, Miller, and Potter in 1906, but when he was advised that his advancement in the firm would be contingent upon changing his name, Frankfurter decided to go into public service.

From 1906 to 1911 Frankfurter worked as an Assistant US Attorney for the Southern District of New York under Henry Lewis Stimson, who had been named US Attorney by President Theodore Roosevelt. In 1911 Stimson was appointed Secretary of War by President Taft and took Frankfurter with him to Washington, D.C. as his special assistant. Frankfurter was put in charge of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, which had jurisdiction over the nation's foreign territories. Stimson also worked to find the funds for Harvard to hire Frankfurter as an assistant professor of law. Frankfurter was hired in 1914, becoming the first Jew on its law faculty. While at Harvard,

he helped to found *The New Republic* in 1914 with Herbert CROLY, Walter LIPPMANN, and Learned HAND. Frankfurter remained at Harvard until 1917, when he returned to Washington as a special assistant to the new Secretary of War, Newton D. Baker.

After the American declaration of war against Germany in 1917, Frankfurter became secretary and legal counsel to the Mediation Commission, a combined labor–management–government effort to mend the growing rift between key defense workers and employers. In the 1917 strike at the copper mine in Brisbee, Arizona, Frankfurter was more sympathetic to the employees' grievances than management, earning the lasting enmity of conservatives. While serving as the Chairman of the War Labor Policies Board, Frankfurter became acquainted with Franklin D. Roosevelt, then the Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

After the war, Frankfurter returned to his law position at Harvard. When Roosevelt became US President in 1932, Frankfurter turned down an invitation to be Solicitor General of the United States, preferring to remain at Harvard training the next generation of lawyers. Frankfurter helped to found the American Civil Liberties Union in 1920. He also immersed himself in controversial cases such as trying to save the lives of Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, two Italian-born anarchists sentenced to death on charges of robbery and murder.

President Roosevelt nominated Frankfurter to the Supreme Court of the United States on 5 January 1939, and the Senate confirmed the appointment twelve days later. After twenty-three years of service, he retired on 28 August 1962. Frankfurter died on 22 February 1965 in Washington, D.C.

Frankfurter was influenced by his mentor, Oliver Wendell HOLMES, Jr., who, like Justice Louis BRANDEIS, was known for dissenting against the orthodoxies of their time. Before being appointed to the Supreme Court, Frankfurter published an analysis of the commerce clause decisions of the United States Supreme Court under three nineteenth-century chief justices (*The Commerce Clause under Marshall, Taney and Waite*, 1937). The general tone of the work, derived from controversies contemporary to its composition, was one of opposition to any restricted reading of the commerce clause that might create arbitrary formalist boundaries to federal regulation of the economy. Frankfurter was a jurisprudential realist: he believed that judges and justices inevitably make law; they do not simply discover and apply it. He was also an advocate of judicial restraint: the view that courts should not interpret the fundamental law, the constitution, in such a way as to impose sharp limits upon the authority of the legislative and executive branches. On the bench this meant that he was in general willing to uphold the actions of those branches against constitutional challenges so long as they do not "shock the conscience."

Despite his outspoken opposition that distinguished between some constitutional clauses and others – and, even in the construction of specific clauses, distinguished between some rights and others – a hierarchy of rights position emerged while he was on the Supreme Court. This position put rights on different "tiers," leaving the court very likely to find legislation or executive action unconstitutional if it infringes on higher-tier rights (such as the freedom of political dissent), yet very unlikely to do so if the action merely infringes on lower-tier rights, (such as freedom of contract or commercial speech). In a concurring opinion in 1949, Frankfurter complained that such a ranking of rights "expresses a complicated process of constitutional adjudication by a deceptive formula … . Such a formula makes for mechanical jurisprudence."

Frankfurter is also known for helping Chief Justice Earl Warren build a unanimous decision to strike down racial segregation in public schools in *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954. He had a strong belief in cultural assimilation for all Americans, and thought that talent and intelligence counted more than race or religion. Among scholars, he has especially

influenced Alexander Bickel, Raul Berger and Louis Luskey; while among Supreme Court justices, John Paul Stevens in many respects adopted his mantle.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Case of Sacco and Vanzetti: A Critical Analysis for Lawyers and Laymen (Boston, 1927).

The Business of the Supreme Court: A Study in the Federal Judicial System, with James Landis (New York, 1927).

The Labor Injunction, with Nathan Greene (New York, 1930).

The Public and Its Government (New Haven, Conn., 1932).

The Commerce Clause under Marshall, Taney and Waite (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1937).

Mr. Justice Holmes and the Supreme Court (Cambridge, Mass., 1938).

Other Relevant Works

Frankfurter's papers are at the Library of Congress and Harvard Law School.

The Constitutional World of Mr. Justice Frankfurter: Some Representative Opinions, ed. Samuel J. Konefsky (New York, 1949).

Felix Frankfurter Reminisces (New York, 1960).

Of Law and Life and Other Things that Matter: Papers and Addresses of Felix Frankfurter, 1956–1963, ed. Philip B. Kurland (Cambridge, Mass., 1965).

Felix Frankfurter on the Supreme Court: Extrajudicial Essays on the Court and the Constitution, ed. Philip B. Kurland (Cambridge, Mass. 1970).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Dict Amer Bio, Who Was Who in Amer v4

Baker, Liva. *Felix Frankfurter* (New York, 1969).

Parrish, Michael. *Felix Frankfurter and His Times: The Reform Years* (New York, 1982).

Silverstein, Mark. *Constitutional Faiths: Felix Frankfurter, Hugo Black, and the Process of Judicial Decision Making* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1984).

Urofsky, Melvin I. *Felix Frankfurter: Judicial Restraint and Individual Liberties* (Boston, 1991).

Christopher Faille

FREI, Hans Wilhelm (1922–88)

Hans W. Frei was born on 29 April 1922 in Breslau, Germany. Both his parents were physicians: his father, Wilhelm Siegmund, was a venereologist who invented the "Frei test" for certain venereal diseases, and his mother, Magda (née Frankfurther) was a pediatrician. They were thoroughly secularized Jews, but, in a practice common at the time, they had their children baptized as Lutherans in hopes of avoiding problems with anti-Semitism. In later years, Frei used to remark with a smile, "And in my case the baptism took!"

When the Nazis came to power, Frei was sent to a Quaker school in England, and then in 1938 the whole family fled to the United States. They had little money, and his father endured a long period of serious illness. The only college scholarship Frei could find was, improbably, to study textile engineering at North Carolina State University. He took what he could get, and graduated with his BS in 1942, the year before his father died.

It is not clear when Frei became a believing Christian. On several occasions much later in life, he remarked on a childhood experience of seeing a picture or statue of Jesus on the cross and suddenly "knowing that it was true." In any event, by his college years he was involved in the Baptist Church and active in a Christian

student group. He was deeply impressed when he attended a lecture at North Carolina State by H. Richard NIEBUHR, and subsequent correspondence led to an invitation from Niebuhr to come to Yale Divinity School. Frei completed his BD degree there in 1945 and then spent two years as minister of a Baptist church in the small town of North Conway, New Hampshire.

He came to admire the greater doctrinal freedom of the Episcopal Church and to think that his own calling might be academic rather than pastoral, so he returned to Yale in 1947 as an Episcopal doctoral student. He married Geraldine Frost Nye in 1948, and they had three children. Frei was ordained an Episcopal priest in 1952, and took teaching jobs at Wabash College from 1950 to 1953 and at the Episcopal Seminary of the Southwest from 1953 to 1956. During these years he completed his very long dissertation on "The Doctrine of Revelation in the Thought of Karl Barth, 1909–1922: The Nature of Barth's Break with Liberalism," and received his PhD in theology in 1956. In that year Frei joined Yale Divinity School as a faculty member, and he was a professor of theology at Yale until his death. Publications came slowly, but early on he established himself as a popular teacher. His influence around the university grew steadily, and he served an important term as chair of the Yale religious studies department from 1981 to 1984. Frei died on 12 September 1988 in New Haven, Connecticut.

Long reflection on hermeneutics led in 1974 to the publication of Frei's greatest book, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*, a study of biblical interpretation in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Until the late seventeenth century, he argued, most Christian writers took the biblical narratives to define the shape of the world "in which we live and move and have our being." Our lives had meaning to the extent that they fit into that biblical framework. Then the pattern began to reverse – it was increasingly the world of our experience, our getting and spending, that defined "reality," and the

biblical narratives could be true only if *they* somehow fit into *that* world. Theologians accomplished the fit in two ways. Some argued that at least parts of the Bible were true because the investigations of critical historians could establish their truth – a project that continues down to, in extreme form, the work of the Jesus Seminar today. Others thought the Bible true in that it presented valuable moral lessons – again a view with supporters still today.

Either way of establishing biblical *truth*, Frei argued, distorted the *meaning* of the Gospel texts in particular. After all, perhaps their most obvious feature is that they are narratives. Frei recognized that the Bible contains non-narrative texts as well, but narrative seemed to him its dominant genre. As in a realistic novel, we learn about characters through a series of incidents – their identities are narrated. As Frei learned from New Critics, and especially from Erich Auerbach's remarkable book *Mimesis*, this is simply how realistic narratives express their meaning. But, if the truth of the Gospels lies in the eternal moral lessons they teach, then their meaning is not about characters at all. Similarly, if their truth lies in the historical kernels we can retrieve, then the shape of the narratives is not part of their meaning.

Starting with apologetic worries about the truth of these texts thus inevitably distorts their meaning. If we want to avoid misinterpreting them, Frei argued, then we should start with meaning. More than anything else, in these narratives we learn who Jesus is by reading stories about him (and, since Jesus is God's self-revelation, we thereby learn about God). The truth of the stories lies, not in the historical accuracy of particular details, but in the way the stories capture Jesus' identity – just as a telling anecdote, even if exaggerated, can capture the identity of the person it presents. (This does not rule out the possibility that *some* particular historical claims may be so central to the picture the stories render that we would have to claim truth for them.) As Karl Barth did, particularly in the later volumes of the

Church Dogmatics, Frei claimed that Christian theology functions best when it tells the biblical stories and opens them up to include as much of the world as it can manage.

In *The Identity of Jesus Christ*, published first as a series of articles in 1967 and then in book form in 1975, Frei put his hermeneutical theory into practice, showing how the Gospels present Jesus as an unsubstitutable individual in a way that literary treatments of Jesus or "Christ figures" or Gnostic Gospels fail to do. He was influenced by Gilbert Ryle's *The Concept of Mind*, arguing that a person's identity is not essentially some mysterious inner entity, forever hidden to one degree or another from the outside world, but much more centrally defined by the words and deeds and sufferings that make up the pattern of one's life.

Frei's work in hermeneutics and Christology served as a paradigm for what his Yale colleague George LINDBECK later christened "post-liberal theology." Frei emphasized reading the Bible as primarily a narrative text that presented the identity of Jesus and of God. And he thought that Christians should seek to understand the world by beginning with those biblical narratives and trying to fit as much as possible within their framework rather than beginning with some other framework derived from philosophy, contemporary culture, or one's own experience, and trying to fit the biblical narratives into it.

In lectures delivered in the 1980s at Yale, Birmingham, and Princeton, and published after his death as *Types of Christian Theology* (1992), Frei located his theological approach within an original typology of Christian theology, laying out options along a scale between two extremes. At one end (type 1: Immanuel Kant, Gordon KAUFMAN) were those who thought of theology purely in an academic context, as a subdiscipline of the grand intellectual project of philosophy. Human beings try to understand the world; theologians are assigned to understand the aspects of the world related to God and religion; Christian theology is one case among others. At the other extreme (type 5: D. Z. Phillips and others influenced by a certain

reading of Wittgenstein), theology is purely a sort of exercise in descriptive ethnography: Christians act and speak in particular ways, and theology describes the rules of their acting and speaking. Type 2 theologians (Rudolf Bultmann, Wolfhart Pannenberg, David Tracy, and other theological liberals, but also conservatives like Carl F. H. HENRY) start with general philosophical questions but include more Christian particularity than type 1. Type 3 (Friedrich Schleiermacher, Paul TILLICH) seeks a balance between internal Christian description and philosophical presuppositions. Type 4 (Karl Barth, Frei himself) gives a priority to Christian self-description, but is willing to engage in ad hoc apologetics, making connections as they arise with non-theological conversations.

The typology made at least three interesting points. First, both most liberals and many conservative apologists turn out to fit in the same group: they are beginning with philosophy and trying to make arguments for Christianity. Second, Barth and Schleiermacher, often thought of as polar opposites, turn out to be near neighbors. Third, in one sense the extremes come round to touch each other, for the type 5 theologians, paradoxically, base their refusal to engage in any philosophical argument on a philosophical argument, Wittgenstein's supposed claim that a language game cannot be criticized from outside the form of life with which it is associated. (Like Frei, I am noting the appeal these theologians make to Wittgenstein without claiming that they interpret Wittgenstein correctly.) It is thus type 4 that best preserves the integrity of Christian theological discourse – and Barth's *Church Dogmatics* and Frei's own work offer examples of how it can also most faithfully interpret scriptural narrative texts.

Near the end of his life, Frei was rethinking some of his conclusions. Partly because of the influence of Auerbach and the New Critics, he had earlier maintained that treating the Bible as centrally realistic narrative was the way of reading it most faithful to the character of the texts themselves. In an important later article, "The 'Literal Reading' of Biblical Narrative

in the Christian Tradition: Does It Stretch or Will It Break?" (delivered as a lecture in 1983, first published in 1986, and reprinted in *Theology and Narrative*, 1993), he backed off from insisting that the texts themselves imply one best reading and defended his argument for realistic narrative on the grounds that this was the way the primary community that has used the text, the Christian churches, has characteristically read it. One sees the influence of deconstructionism and reader response theories at work here, as well as the ideas of Frei's colleague David Kelsey.

Frei was always nervous about being identified as the founder of a "school," though he was an amazingly gracious and immensely influential teacher. In particular, while he wanted to maintain that, whether because of the character of the texts themselves or of the community that has principally read them, narrative provided the best category to use in interpreting many biblical texts, he resisted broader claims about narrative as the key category for interpreting any text, any religious text, or human experience generally. Thus the term "narrative theology" (which has the added problem that it leaves open the question of whether theology should start with the *biblical* narratives or the narratives of *our experience*) particularly unnerved him.

Frei's work certainly opened up new study of Karl Barth, particularly encouraging approaches to Barth that engaged with the wider postmodern context, from anthropology to literary criticism – "ad hoc apologetics" at its best. Postmodern critiques opened up new possibilities for sympathy with a theological approach like Frei's and Barth's that does not subsume theology under a larger philosophical project. Pushed further, however, postmodern critiques undercut beliefs about an overall Christian meta-narrative and a single best way of interpreting it that was central to both their theologies. Frei's work thus presupposes an ability to go part way on the postmodern project without going all the way.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Niebuhr's Theological Background," and "The Theology of H. Richard Niebuhr," in *Faith and Ethics: The Theology of H. Richard Niebuhr*, ed. Paul Ramsey (New York, 1957), pp. 9–116.

The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics (New Haven, Conn., 1974).

The Identity of Jesus Christ: The Hermeneutical Basis of Dogmatic Theology (Philadelphia, 1975).

Types of Christian Theology (New Haven, Conn., 1992).

Theology and Narrative: Selected Essays (New York, 1993).

Other Relevant Works

Frei's papers are at Yale University.

"David Friedrich Strauss," in *Nineteenth Century Religious Thought in the West*, vol. 1, ed. Ninian Smart et al. (Cambridge, UK, 1985), pp. 215–60.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*

Campbell, Charles L. *Preaching Jesus: New Directions for Homiletics in Hans Frei's Postliberal Theology* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1997).

Demson, David E. *Hans Frei and Karl Barth: Different Ways of Reading Scripture* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1997).

Green, Garrett, ed. *Scriptural Authority and Narrative Interpretation* (Philadelphia, 1987).

Lee, David. *Luke's Story of Jesus: Theological Reading of Gospel Narrative and the Legacy of Hans Frei* (Sheffield, UK, 1999).

Lindbeck, George A. *The Nature of Doctrine: Religion and Theology in a Postliberal Age* (Philadelphia, 1984).

Loughlin, Gerard. *Telling God's Story:*

Bible, Church, and Narrative Theology (Cambridge, UK, 1996).

William C. Placher

FRIEDMAN, Milton (1912–)

Milton Friedman was born on 31 July 1912 in Brooklyn, New York. He studied economics and mathematics at Rutgers University, graduating with a BA in economics in 1932. He then earned an MA in economics from the University of Chicago in 1933 and a PhD in economics from Columbia University in 1946. His graduate studies included mathematics and theoretical statistics in addition to economics. Between 1935 and 1946 Friedman worked as an economist and statistician for several government agencies. He also worked for the National Bureau of Economic Research from 1937 to 1981, and taught at Columbia University, the University of Wisconsin and the University of Minnesota. He was professor of economics at the University of Chicago from 1946 to 1976, and he currently is the Paul Snowden Russell Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus of Economics.

Friedman was awarded the Nobel Prize in Economics in 1976. He served as President of the American Economic Association, the Western Economic Association, and the Mont Pelerin Society. Friedman is a member of the American Philosophical Society and the National Academy of Sciences. Other honors include the Presidential Medal of Freedom and the National Medal of Science, both awarded in 1988. He has served as economic advisor to several Republican presidential candidates: Barry Goldwater (1964), Richard Nixon (1968, 1972), and Ronald Reagan (1980). President Reagan named him to his Economic Policy Advisory Board in 1981.

Friedman has been a senior research fellow at the Hoover Institution in Stanford, California since 1977.

Friedman was a leading figure of the second "Chicago School" of economics, favoring free market libertarianism over existing Keynesian economic policies. He argued for the importance of controlling the money supply as not only an instrument of government policy but also as a determinant of business cycles and inflation. Friedman's most influential teachers were Arthur F. Burns at Rutgers, Henry Schultz at Chicago, and Harold Hotelling and Wesley C. Mitchell at Columbia. From Burns and Mitchell, Friedman learned techniques of business cycle analysis which he later used in work for the National Bureau of Economic Research. They also influenced his belief in the importance of measurement in the social sciences. From Schultz and Hotelling, Friedman was trained in bringing mathematical and statistical reasoning to economic data.

Friedman's philosophical contributions are in economic methodology and political philosophy. His most important publications in these areas are "The Methodology of Positive Economics" and *Capitalism and Freedom* (with Rose D. Friedman, 1962). Methodologically, Friedman emphasized the importance of testing economic theory empirically, and doing so with data other than those from which the theory is derived. His ideas were developed in reaction to a trend in the 1940s toward growing mathematical abstraction in economics. Friedman developed positivist sensibilities from his teachers and from his work experience in economics and applied statistics for the National Bureau of Economic Research and the National Research Defense Council.

In "The Methodology of Positive Economics" Friedman criticized two attempts to circumvent the difficulties of testing theory in a field such as economics, where laboratory controls are not practicable. These are to rely solely on standards of logic and mathematics and forgoing testing altogether, or to test empirically by evaluating how realistic a

theory's premises are rather than testing by its predictions. Friedman argued that reliance on mathematical reasoning and formal logic leaves economics arid, disconnected from the everyday world of economic problems such as business cycles and taxes, and that attempts to test theory empirically by realistic premises are futile. Theories provide simplifying generalizations from a mass of facts, and as such necessarily abstract from reality. Useful theories therefore cannot be fully descriptive representations of the facts. However, theories yield predictions about facts that are not yet observed. So the only valid test of a theory is the consilience of its predictions with observed evidence.

Friedman's interest in political philosophy was kindled at the 1947 meeting of European and American liberals at Mont Pelerin, Switzerland. Until that time Friedman's interests were mostly in economic and statistical analysis. There is no evidence that he had an articulated ideology. At Mont Pelerin Friedman met F. A. HAYEK, who had gained notoriety as author of *The Road to Serfdom*, and Karl Popper, to whose philosophy of science Friedman's ideas on testing theory bore a resemblance. Friedman soon became active as an apologist for capitalism. Following the Great Depression and World War II, with intellectuals enamored of socialism, support for economic liberties waned. However, faith in democracy with its requirements of political and civic liberties remained strong. Friedman made the case for capitalism and economic liberty in terms intended to appeal to those who placed little value on economic liberty itself, arguing that ownership rights to property and to the income from one's labor and property are necessary for maintaining political and civic liberties.

Friedman is most widely known for his influence over and participation in the late twentieth-century restructuring of the American economy. Friedman's work clarified "monetarism" as an approach to the management of the American (and later global)

economy through control of the money supply and interest rates. Friedman's best-known book, *A Monetary History of the United States, 1867–1960,* developed a theory of the Great Depression that emphasized the importance of money supplies and real interest rates, arguing that ill-timed and poorly considered government intervention in the free market deepened the depression and delayed the recovery. Friedman, along with a number of affiliated economists, consistently criticized New Deal and Great Society programs aimed at managing the economy, viewing them as uneconomic hindrances to free market adjustments.

Friedman was a highly influential and consistent critic of government spending who doubted the efficacy of social programs. He was also an architect of and apologist for late twentieth-century downsizing of government and the dismantling of the welfare state. While Friedman served as an economic advisor to the Reagan administration, he maintained close ties to business leaders and politicians interested in the deregulation of the American economy. Monetarism became an important policy weapon to criticize and substantially discredit Keynesian management of the American economy through spending and tax policy. Friedman's monetarism led to a heightened focus upon the office of the Federal Reserve Chairman, the primary person responsible for changes in monetary policy and hence the growth rate of the economy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Essays in Positive Economics (Chicago, 1953).

A Theory of the Consumption Function: A Study by the National Bureau of Economic Research, New York (Princeton, N.J., 1957).

Capitalism and Freedom, with rose D. Friedman (Chicago, 1962).

A Monetary History of the United States, 1867–1960 (Princeton, N.J., 1963).

The Optimum Quantity of Money and

Other Essays (Chicago, 1969).

Monetary Statistics of the United States: Estimates, Sources, Methods, with Anna J. Schwartz (New York, 1970).

Monetary Trends in the United States and the United Kingdom, their Relation to Income, Prices, and Interest Rates, 1867–1975, with Anna J. Schwartz (Chicago, 1982).

Monetarist Economics (Oxford, 1991).

Other Relevant Works

Free to Choose, with Rose D. Friedman (New York, 1980).

Tyranny of the Status Quo, with Rose D. Friedman (New York, 1984).

Two Lucky People: Memoirs, with Rose D. Friedman (Chicago, 1998).

Further Reading

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Economics*, *Encyc Amer Bio*

Selden, Richard T., ed. *Capitalism and Freedom, Problems and Prospects: Proceedings of a Conference in Honor of Milton Friedman* (Charlottesville, Virg., 1975).

Trebach, Arnold S. and Kevin B. Zeese, eds. *Friedman & Szasz on Liberty and Drugs: Essays on the Free Market and Prohibition* (Washington, D.C., 1992).

Wood, John C. and Ronald N. Woods, eds. *Milton Friedman: Critical Assessments*, 4 vols (London, 1990).

J. Daniel Hammond

FRIES, Horace Snyder (1902–51)

Horace Fries was born on 22 October 1902 in Richland Center, Wisconsin. He attended the University of Wisconsin, receiving a PhB in 1925 and a PhM in 1927. He taught chemistry at Wisconsin in 1925–7, and English at New Mexico Military Institute in 1927–8. Returning to Wisconsin, he was Assistant Dean in the College of Letters and Science in 1929–30 while studying philosophy. He received his PhD in philosophy in 1934, writing a dissertation on "The Development of Dewey's Utilitarianism." From 1930 to 1937 Fries taught philosophy and psychology at Lawrence College. In 1937 he joined Wisconsin's philosophy department as a lecturer. He was tenured in 1947 and appointed professor of philosophy in 1948, teaching until his death on 21 September 1951 in Madison, Wisconsin.

Besides various academic leadership positions, in 1938–9 he supervised the "In-Service Training Program" of the State Bureau of Personnel, an apprenticeship program for the State's civil service. The experience acquired in these administrative appointments fitted well into his abiding interest in public administration, management, and the philosophy of social planning, and for some years prior to his premature death from cancer he was investigating the relationship of perception to social inquiry. In 2001 Leo Molinaro, a former student of Fries, received Fries's book manuscript on "Foundations of Experimental Planning," from Fries's daughter. The topic of this unpublished book is central to two of Fries's most significant essays, "Varieties of Social Planning" (1947) and "Social Planning" (1952).

Fries was a pragmatist, in the tradition developed by John DEWEY and Max OTTO. He worked, in his own individual way, on topics closely connected with what Otto called Scientific Humanism. Fries published some fifty essays and fourteen reviews. Although his early work was on problems of metaphysics and perception, he was always interested in philosophy of science. He also developed an abiding interest in social philosophy, with an emphasis on experimental social planning – on which he was an acute innovator – and on bridging the gap between science and value. These topics are central to his "Foundations of Experimental

Planning," in which his views are keenly and thoroughly worked out.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Some Attitudes and Considerations and a Biological Argument for Epiphenomenalism," *Journal of Philosophy* 26 (1929): 626–34.

"On the Spatial Location of Sensa," *Philosophical Review* 44 (1935): 345–53.

"The Appeal of Communism," *New Humanist* 9 (Summer 1936): 97–102.

"On an Empirical Criterion of Meaning," *Philosophy of Science* 3 (1936): 143–51.

"The Functions of Whitehead's God," *The Monist* 46 (1936): 25–58.

"The Method of Proving Ethical Realism," *Philosophical Review* 46 (1937): 485–502.

"Method in Social Philosophy," *Journal of Social Philosophy* 3 (1938): 325–41.

"Physics: A Vicious Abstraction," *Philosophy of Science* 6 (1939): 301–8.

"Science, Ethics and Democracy," *Journal of Social Philosophy* 6 (1941): 302–25.

"Virtue is Knowledge," *Philosophy of Science* 8 (1941): 89–99.

"On the Unity and Ethical Neutrality of Science," *Journal of Philosophy* 39 (1942): 225–34.

"Science and the Individual," *Antioch Review* 2 (1943): 591–611.

"Ethical Objectivity Through Science," *Philosophical Review* 52 (1943): 553–65.

"Science and the Foundations of Freedom," *Journal of Philosophy* 41 (1944): 113–26.

"A Methodological Consideration," *Journal of General Psychology* 33 (1945): 11–20.

"Varieties of Social Planning: An Effort Toward Orchestration," in *Freedom and Experience*, ed. Sidney Hook and Milton Konvitz (Ithaca, N.Y., 1947), pp. 3–24.

"Logical Simplicity," *Philosophy of Science* 17 (1950): 207–28.

"Social Planning," in *The Cleavage in Our Culture*, ed. Frederick Burkhardt (Boston, 1952), pp. 81–104.

Other Relevant Works
"Foundations of Experimental Planning," unpublished manuscript (1951?).

Further Reading
Proc of APA v25, Who's Who in Phil

Marcus G. Singer

FRINGS, Manfred Servatius (1925–)

Manfred Frings was born on 27 February 1925 in Cologne-Lindenthal, Germany, the third son of Gottfried and Maria Frings. He attended a Catholic elementary school and lived near a Jewish community among whom he formed significant friendships that shaped his later antipathy towards Nazism. The intense bombing of Cologne during World War II destroyed both his school and home, and at one point he had to rescue his mother from under the rubble of their house. Drafted near the end of the war, he was captured by American forces and did office work outside POW camps near Rouen, France, where he made the first of many lifelong friendships with Americans.

After World War II, Frings attended the University of Cologne, where he studied philosophy, English, and French philology. He earned his doctorate in philosophy in 1953. In 1958 he received a teaching position in philosophy at the University of Detroit, realizing his ambition to emigrate to the United States. In 1962 he accepted an appointment at Duquesne University. Then, from 1966 until his retirement in 1992, he taught at DePaul University. After his retirement he continued to teach in a part-time position at the University of New Mexico. He has served as a visiting professor and lecturer at the universities of Cologne, Freiburg, Oxford, and the Sorbonne. He has been widely respected for his work, personal integrity, and thoughtfulness towards others.

At DePaul in 1966, Frings initiated the annual International Heidegger Conference. He was one of six scholars chosen by Martin Heidegger to be the initial editors of Heidegger's collected works. He edited Heidegger's 1942–4 lectures on Parmenides and Heraclitus (volumes 54 and 55 of that collection), and was honored by him in personal meetings in Freiburg. From 1970 Frings served as editor of the *Gesammelte Werke* of Max Scheler, a task completed with the publication of volume 15 in 1997. He also was President of the International Max Scheler Society.

The primary focus of Frings's career was Scheler's phenomenology of values, ethics, sociology of knowledge, political theory, and philosophy of time. Among his major contributions are his legitimation of Scheler's phenomenology as a credible and illuminating alternative to Edmund Husserl's, most notably in his *The Mind of Max Scheler* (1997), and his clarification of the relationship between Scheler and Heidegger in *Person und Dasein* (1969). In the latter work, Frings endeavored to go beyond the limited role given to the experience of values in Heidegger's ontological preoccupations, and beyond Scheler's own unfinished metaphysics by using Scheler's phenomenology of repentance (*Reue*) to explicate the ontological foundations of ethics. Also notable is Frings's contribution to the phenomenology of absolute time in *Life Time: Max Scheler's Philosophy of Time* (2003). He has published well over a hundred articles, edited twenty-four books, and his publications have been translated into Chinese, French, Japanese, and German. He was granted a private audience with Pope John Paul II, himself an accomplished Scheler scholar.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Person und Dasein: Zur Frage der Ontologie des Wertseins (The Hague, 1969).

Zur Phänomenologie der Lebensgemeinschaft: Ein Versuch mit Max Scheler (Meisenheim, Germany, 1971).

Philosophy of Prediction and Capitalism (Dordrecht, 1987).

"Existence through Resistance between Man, World, and God," in *American Phenomenology: Origins and Developments*, ed. Eugene F. Kaelin and Calvin O. Schrag (Dordrecht, 1989), pp. 212–15.

Max Scheler: A Concise Introduction into the World of a Great Thinker (Pittsburgh, 1965; 2nd edn, Milwaukee, Wisc., 1996).

The Mind of Max Scheler: The First Comprehensive Guide Based on the Complete Works (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1997).

Life Time: Max Scheler's Philosophy of Time, A First Inquiry and Presentation (Dordrecht, 2003).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Heidegger and the Quest for Truth* (Chicago, 1968).

Ed., *Max Scheler (1874–1928): Centennial Essays* (The Hague, 1974).

"Nothingness and Being: A Schelerian Comment," in *Radical Phenomenology: Essays in Honor of Martin Heidegger* (Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1978).

"Social Temporality in George Herbert Mead and Scheler," *Philosophy Today* 27 (1983): 281–9.

"The Structure of Social Communality," in *Philosophy and Science in Phenomenological Perspective*, ed. Kah Kyung Cho (Dordrecht, 1984).

"Max Scheler: The Human Person in Action and in the Cosmos," in *Phenomenology World Wide*, ed. Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka (Dordrecht, 2002).

Further Reading

Nota, John H. "Fring's *Max Scheler*," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 27 (1966): 119–20.

Smith, F. J. "Fring's *Person und Dasein*," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 33 (1972): 292–3.

Philip Blosser

FROMM, Erich Pinchas (1900–1980)

Erich Fromm was born on 23 March 1900 in Frankfurt, Germany, and died on 18 March 1980 in Muralto, Switzerland. Fromm's parents, Naphtali and Rosa Fromm, had a troubled relationship, and the unhappy marriage resulted in Fromm becoming a distressed, highly anxious child. Growing up, Fromm spent time with a beautiful female artist, who was a friend of the family. When Fromm was twelve, the woman's father died, and she, grief-stricken by the event, committed suicide immediately following his death. This traumatic episode, along with World War I, became the impetus for Fromm's obsession with questions concerning the apparent irrationality of human behavior, an irrational nature that, to Fromm, seemed extremely pervasive in the behavior of the masses.

Fromm began studying jurisprudence at the University of Frankfurt am Main, but in 1919 he attended the University of Heidelberg, where he changed his major to sociology. In 1922, under the supervision of Alfred Weber, Fromm received his PhD in sociology from Heidelberg. Following the completion of his doctorate, Fromm began focusing on psychology and studied psychoanalysis at the University of Munich in 1923 and 1924. In 1925 he started his own clinical practice, and in 1927 he helped organize the Frankfurt Psychoanalytic Institute. By 1930 he had finished his psychoanalytical training in Berlin at the Psychoanalytical Institute and joined the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt.

During the rise of Hitler's Nazi regime, Fromm emigrated from Germany and arrived in New York City in 1934. He taught at the Institute for Social Research, the relocated Frankfurt Institute affiliated with Columbia University, from 1934 to 1939. Fromm was a guest lecturer at Columbia during 1939–42; he lectured at New School for Social Research beginning in 1941; and he was a part-time professor at Bennington College in Vermont in 1942. In 1943 he helped to found the William Alanson White Institute, the New York branch of the Washington School of Psychiatry, and worked with Harry Stack SULLIVAN. From 1945 to 1947 he taught psychology at the University of Michigan, and was the Terry Lecturer at Yale in 1948–9. In 1950 Fromm moved to Mexico City, where he joined the Medical Faculty of the National Autonomous University, teaching there until 1965. He founded the Mexican Institute of Psychoanalysis in 1963. In addition to his work in Mexico, Fromm was an occasional visiting professor at Michigan State University from 1957 to 1961, and became an adjunct professor of psychology at New York University in 1962. During the 1960s and 1970s Fromm traveled and lectured across the US and Europe, and also spent much time in Switzerland, where he died in 1980.

After becoming interested in Karl Marx's social philosophy, Fromm began to feel that Freud was incorrect in placing so much emphasis on the repression of sexual desires and that socioeconomic factors played a more crucial role in the origin of modern-day neurosis. Thus, Fromm's psychological and philosophical system developed into a synthesis of aspects of Marxism and Freud's psychoanalysis. Fromm's original ideas about the human mind and human behavior began to flourish during the 1920s, when he was appointed as leader of the Frankfurt Institute of Social Research's social psychological division.

The Frankfurt Institute was comprised of leftist intellectuals, including Max HORKHEIMER, Theodor ADORNO, and Herbert MARCUSE. They sought to construct a "critical theory" of society which would revise and update Marxism in a manner that would provide guidance for potential future revolutions. During his time at the Frankfurt Institute (which became known as the Frankfurt School), Fromm surveyed blue-collar Germans, in an attempt to catalogue authoritarian or protofascist traits. The results of the survey led Fromm to believe that workers' allegiance to the left was hindered by conformist and sado-

masochistic attributes which made them more likely to support a dictatorship.

The findings of Fromm's survey proved to be prophetic as Hitler's dictatorship began to take form in the 1930s, and subsequently, the Frankfurt Institute and Fromm, who was a Jew, moved to Columbia University in New York City. In 1933 Fromm worked briefly at the Chicago Psychoanalytic Institute, where he met renowned psychologist Karen Horney. Horney's ideas about sexuality impressed Fromm, while he influenced her thoughts concerning social influences on behavior. After leaving Columbia, Fromm also left the Frankfurt Institute, apparently over a dispute caused by conflicting ideas about the importance of Freud. He became a citizen of the United States in 1940, and one year later, published the book that would bring him national acclaim.

Escape from Freedom (1941) was Fromm's seminal work which delineated his ideas about society's role in shaping the masses into conformists. While most of Fromm's colleagues from Frankfurt wrote in a jargon-filled prose inaccessible to the lay reader, Fromm possessed a talent for writing with lucidity and clarity, which helped make the book a success, with over twenty-five printings to date. As a proponent of Marx's philosophy, Fromm felt that the workers of his time, especially those living in a capitalist system, had become alienated from their jobs, as well their communities. As the influence and purpose provided by culture and religion fade in a democratic society, man is left in a state of psychological dissonance and struggles to find personal identity and meaning for his life. To ameliorate these feelings, modern man seeks out the approval of his society by conforming to the rules and values established by it. Slowly, almost all traces of genuine individualism are lost as he feigns respect for things he does not truly believe, for the sake of emotional and financial protection.

According to Fromm, if a democratic political system is thought of as a sadist, then those who submit to it, despite their true feelings, become the masochists. As the masochists receive the pain afflicted by the sadist, feelings of powerlessness grow as personal autonomy atrophies. Fromm hypothesized that social conditions, such as those seen in a capitalist society, rob individuals of psychological needs, a robbery that becomes perversely manifested through acts of violence toward others.

Believing that modern culture was to blame for the violence witnessed around him and with the fear of nuclear war spreading, Fromm aided in starting a peace group called SANE (National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy) in 1957. He became a political advocate, meeting with US leaders to discuss the Cold War, visiting Europe to talk about US foreign policy, writing election platforms for the American Socialist Party, marching for civil rights, and so on. All the while he continued to be a prolific writer, publishing several books that added to the themes presented in *Escape*, and his popularity grew throughout the 1960s and 1970s.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Escape from Freedom (New York, 1941).

Man For Himself: An Inquiry into the Psychology of Ethics (New York, 1947).

Psychoanalysis and Religion (New Haven, 1950).

The Forgotten Language: An Introduction to the Understanding of Dreams, Fairy Tales and Myths (New York, 1951).

The Sane Society (New York, 1955).

The Art of Loving (New York, 1956).

Sigmund Freud's Mission: An Analysis of His Personality and Influence (New York, 1959).

Beyond the Chains of Illusion: My Encounter with Marx and Freud (New York, 1962).

The Dogma of Christ and Other Essays on Religion, Psychology and Culture (New York, 1963).

The Heart of Man: Its Genius for Good and Evil (New York, 1964).

The Crisis of Psychoanalysis (New York, 1970).

The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness
(New York, 1973).
To Have or to Be? (New York, 1976).

Other Relevant Works
The Erich Fromm Archives are in Tübingen,
Germany.
Erich Fromm Gesamtausgabe, 12 vols, ed.
Rainer Funk (Munich, 1999). Vol. 10
contains a bibliography of Fromm's
writings.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Comp Amer
Thought*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*
Burston, Daniel. *The Legacy of Erich Fromm*
(Cambridge, Mass., 1991).
Funk, Rainer. *Erich Fromm: The Courage to
be Human* (New York, 1982).
Jay, Martin. *The Dialectical Imagination: A
History of the Frankfurt School and the
Institute of Social Research, 1923–1950*
(Berkeley, Cal., 1973).
Landis, Bernard, and Edward S. Tauber, eds.
*In the Name of Life: Essays in Honor of
Erich Fromm* (New York, 1971).
Schaar, John H. *Escape from Authority: The
Perspectives of Erich Fromm* (New York,
1961).

Daniel Trippett

FRONDIZI, Risieri (1910–83)

Risieri Frondizi was born on 20 November
1910 in Posadas, the capital of the Province of
Misiones, Argentina. His brother, Arturo
Frondizi, became President of Argentina,
serving from 1958 to 1962. Frondizi studied
philosophy and law at the Instituto Nacional
del Profesorado in Buenos Aires, where his
teachers were Angel Vassallo, Luis Juan
Guerrero, and Francisco Romero. The latter,

a prominent figure in the history of Latin
American philosophy, had a great influence
on him. Romero's concern to provide a richer
and non-reductionistic view of human beings
is a concern that is implicit in all of Frondizi's
work. But Frondizi's relation with North
American philosophers was also key to his
philosophical development. He won a schol-
arship for advanced studies at Columbia
University in New York, making him the first
Argentine to study philosophy in the United
States. Although his scholarship was for
Columbia he wanted to study at Harvard and his
wishes were granted. Frondizi entered Harvard
and studied with A. N. WHITEHEAD, C. I. LEWIS,
R. B. PERRY, W. KÖHLER, and William HOCKING.
From Whitehead he learned the view of reality
as process and organic unity. From Köhler he
became acquainted with the concept of *Gestalt*,
which was useful in the development of his own
original philosophy. Throughout his life Frondizi
remained in a constant dialogue with philoso-
phers from all the Americas. This contributes to
the richness of his philosophy and makes him
one of the first philosophers to become truly
Pan-American.

In 1937 Frondizi returned to Argentina to
become one of the founding members of the
College of Humanities in the Universidad
Nacional de Tucuman. He remained there
until 1946, with a one-year interruption in
1943–4, when he won a scholarship for post-
graduate work at the University of Michigan
in Ann Arbor. There he worked closely with
Roy Wood SELLARS and De Witt H. PARKER. In
Tucuman and in Michigan Frondizi wrote his
first book, *El punto de partida del filosofar*
(1945). In that essay he defended a thesis that
he never abandoned and that is at the heart of
his philosophy: experience is the necessary
point of departure and permanent reference of
all genuine philosophizing. Verbal adherence
to experience by a theory is not enough to
make it empirical. To avoid the mistakes of
modern philosophy we must aspire for a
"total" and "integral" empiricism that is able
to put aside our theories and describe experi-

ence as it is actually lived. It is necessary to determine clearly what is meant by experience and to develop a general view of experience. Experience is a process constituted by my self, my activity, and the objects that this activity is concerned with. A general philosophy of experience must proceed to study each of these elements without making the mistake of forgetting that they are given as part of an indivisible totality. Frondizi embarked upon this project and culminated in books about the self, value, and education.

As an academic Frondizi was admired for his integrity and stance against threats to freedom of thought. In 1946 he was illegally dismissed from his teaching post in Argentina and then imprisoned when he rightfully protested. After regaining his freedom he was invited by writer Mario Picon to found another college of humanities at Venezuela's Universidad Central. In 1948 he accepted an invitation to spend a semester at the University of Pennsylvania. Because of a military coup in Venezuela, instead of returning to the Universidad Central he accepted in 1949 a post offered to him by Brand BLANSHARD at Yale University. At Yale, he wrote *Substancia y funcion en el Problema del yo* (1952), and a year later it was published in English. This book was well received. Frondizi provides a critical evaluation of the modern philosopher's attempt to provide an adequate theory of the self. Modern philosophy seems to force us to choose between a substantial self and no self at all. The quarrel between atomism and substantialism is due to a non-empirical starting point where each concentrates on one aspect of the self to the exclusion of the other. The changing aspect of the self is not incompatible with its unity and continuity. The self is a complex unity undergoing a constant process. It is not something that can be divided in pieces but an organic unity that is dynamic and structural. This unity is not one that transcends the empirical world. The relation between the self and the elements that constitute it is the same sort of relation that contemporary psychology refers to as a *Gestalt*.

From Yale, Frondizi went to the University of Puerto Rico, where he offered seminars and began to work on his philosophy of values and education. In 1952 he worked at the Institute of Philosophy of the University of Rome. In 1955 he returned to Argentina, where he was appointed as Chairman of the Institute of Philosophy at the University of La Plata. In 1957 he published *¿Que son los Valores?*, a book that would be translated, revised, and expanded in subsequent editions. In this book the main objectivist and subjectivist doctrines are presented and analyzed. The way to overcome the antithesis between these two doctrines is to question their shared starting point and the way the problem is posed. They both start with an abstraction and not with value as it is experienced. Value is better conceived as a *Gestalt* quality. This means that it is a quality that depends on, but cannot be reduced to the empirical qualities. This is how Frondizi takes care of G. E. Moore's concern about the relation of good to natural qualities. A value is a synthesis of objective and subjective contributions that emerges and has meaning in concrete human situations.

In 1957 Frondizi was elected Dean and later President of the Universidad de Buenos Aires. He made substantial educational reforms, including the establishment of the University Press of Buenos Aires, which by the end of his administration in 1962 had published eight million volumes. He played an important role in establishing the first journals, classes, and organizations dedicated exclusively to philosophical inquiry in many places in Latin America.

In 1964 Frondizi was invited to the Institute of Advanced Studies in Princeton, New Jersey. In 1965, because of a military coup in Argentina, he resigned from all his posts in the Universidad de Buenos Aires. He was then offered several positions abroad. He taught philosophy at the University of California at Los Angeles from 1966 to 1968, the University of Texas in 1969–70, and Southern Illinois

University at Carbondale from 1970 to 1979. He was later appointed to a visiting position in Baylor University in Texas. He died on 23 February 1983 in Waco, Texas.

Frondizi was a prolific writer and contributed to numerous philosophic journals in both Europe and America. He was concerned about the inadequacy of communication of philosophical ideas between North America and Latin America. He wrote articles about the state of philosophy in Latin America and about the need for these two American philosophies to complement each other.

Frondizi acquired an international reputation. He was an honorary professor of several Latin American Universities. He was a philosopher with a rich diverse philosophical background and a broad outlook or scope. His philosophy resists the ordinary classifications in part because his influences are so diverse. He acquired from his North American education the type of clarity and rigor that we know today as analytic philosophy. But he was critical of how often philosophical analysis can get in the way of adequacy or faithfulness to concrete everyday experience. He criticized the scientistic approach to philosophy as much as the poetic-religious conception for being one-sided and narrow. The constant reference to experience is the only way to avoid the reductionism and single-mindedness that have plagued philosophy. Philosophy must be faithful to the richness and variety present in human experience. This was an underlying goal that pervaded all of Frondizi's work.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

El Punto de Partida del Filosofar (Buenos Aires, 1945; 2nd edn 1957).

Substancia y función en el problema del yo (Buenos Aires, 1952).

The Nature of the Self: A Functional Interpretation (New Haven, Conn., 1953; Carbondale, Ill., 1971).

¿Que son los Valores? Introducción a la Axiología (Mexico City, 1958; 2nd edn 1962; 3rd edn 1968; 4th edn 1972).

Trans., Solomon Lipp, *What is Value? An Introduction to Axiology* (La Salle, Ill., 1962; 2nd edn 1971).

La Universidad en un Mundo de Tensiones: Misión de las Universidades en America Latina (Buenos Aires, 1971).

Introducción a los problemas fundamentales del hombre (Mexico City, 1977).

Ensayos filosóficos (Mexico City, 1986).

Other Relevant Works

"Contemporary Argentine Philosophy," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 4 (1943): 180–85.

"On the Unity of the Philosophies of the two Americas," *Review of Metaphysics* 4 (June 1951): 617–24.

"Value as a Gestalt Quality," *Journal of Value Inquiry* 6 (1972): 163–84.

"Sartre's Early Ethics: A Critique," in *The Philosophy of Jean-Paul Sartre*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (La Salle, Ill., 1981), pp. 371–91.

Further Reading

Proc of APA v56

Gracia, Jorge J. E. "Frondizi's Theory of the Self as a Dynamic Gestalt," *The Personalist* 57 (1976): 64–71.

Gracia, Jorge J. E., ed. *Man and His Conduct: Essays in Honor of Risieri Frondizi* (San Juan, Puerto Rico, 1980).

Hartman, Robert S. "Risieri Frondizi on the Nature of Value," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 22 (1961): 223–32.

Gregory Fernando Pappas

FROTHINGHAM, Octavius Brooks
(1822–95)

Octavian Frothingham was born on 26 November 1822 in Boston, Massachusetts, at a time when Unitarianism was still young enough to affect the rest of New England as a vibrant theological movement. Since his father was a Unitarian minister, it seemed natural enough for Octavius to receive his BA from Harvard College (1843) and a BD from its Divinity School (1846) in preparation for a pastoral career. This training inculcated commonplace Unitarian ideas in him, and for the first thirty years of his life one finds little more than placid acceptance of his denomination's central emphases. The first sign of real change came with the issue of slavery, specifically the Fugitive Slave Law. Frothingham had been pastor of North Church in Salem, Massachusetts, since 1847, but in 1854 he drew a great deal of attention to himself by preaching against northern compliance with pro-slavery legislation. He denounced in ringing terms any form of Christianity that acquiesced in abetting slavery in any form. Many in his congregation remained unmoved by his ardent advocacy, or they took umbrage at it, so much so that he decided to leave that church a few months thereafter. During those latter days Frothingham refused to serve communion to anyone lest he imply that he cooperated with the morally inert portion of his flock. He never served communion again throughout his career, judging it to be too divisive an issue.

Frothingham moved to other pastorates on the strength of his reputation as zealous reformer and eloquent speaker. For a time in Jersey City (1855–9) and then at the Third Unitarian Society in New York City (1859–79), he rose to eminence within the more liberal wing of his denomination. His congregation represented his own mental and spiritual prerogatives, composed as it was of cosmopolitan minds with varied tastes and freethinkers who went beyond comfortable traditions in search of truth wherever it could be found in the world around them. His engaging, challenging sermons were printed in newspapers, periodicals, and pamphlets. In his mental ventures that ranged widely through literature, politics, and different religious systems Frothingham's beliefs moved increasingly beyond the generally accepted bounds of Unitarianism. He made little distinction, for example, between such categories as nature and the supernatural. Many nineteenth-century liberal thinkers shared this perspective, and Frothingham represented that widespread group when he saw little difference between divinity and humanity. Human beings existed as a combination of infinite and finite, or animal, influences. Problems occurred when animal instincts prevailed, and salvation from this sin was in the pursuit of high ideals that were still present in people, a striving for moral improvement that would enhance both personal growth and community welfare. Guidelines for identifying ideals and examples of moral effort could be found in all cultures around the globe.

By 1865 denominational conservatives had become concerned enough about doctrinal erosion to form the National Conference of Unitarian Churches, an organization with enough authority to compose a written creed for use as a standard among constituent congregations. Frothingham balked at such attempts to control free inquiry in search of truth wherever it could be found. He opposed all forms of religious dogmatism, any claim from a centralized power that it had determined final truths and had the right to impose them on an individual's beliefs. Thus he was acknowledged as a pioneer and leader among radicals in the Unitarianism of his day because he championed open inquiry into spiritual matters. In 1867 he helped establish the Free Religious Association and served until 1878 as its first President. The group stood on principles of free search for truth, not on any set of specific tenets as requisite beliefs. Members of this association avowed that they did not intend to form a new religious sect, but they eventually broke with Unitarianism altogether.

For ten years, from 1870 to 1880, Frothingham edited *The Index*, an official organ

of the association, wherein he continually denounced all attempts to impose creedal restrictions on free minds. In 1879 poor health forced him to retire from vigorous activities. After a year's convalescent tour of Europe he settled in Boston again and continued a modest literary output for another fifteen years. In his later writings he affirmed that all forms of truth should be honored when attained through serious, honest effort, and that pure religion could result from untrammeled search for divine wisdom found to some extent in all viewpoints. He died on 27 November 1895 in Boston, Massachusetts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Story of the Patriarchs (Boston, 1864).
The Religion of Humanity (New York, 1873).
Transcendentalism in New England: A History (New York, 1876).
The Cradle of Christ: A Study of Primitive Christianity (New York, 1877).
Boston Unitarianism, 1820–1850: Study of the Life and Work of Nathaniel Langdon Frothingham (New York, 1890).
Recollections and Impressions, 1822–1891 (New York, 1891).

Other Relevant Works
Frothingham's papers are at the Library of Congress, the Massachusetts Historical Society, Harvard University, and Princeton University.
Life of Theodore Parker (New York, 1874).
Gerrit Smith: A Biography (New York, 1878).
George Ripley (Boston, 1882).
Memoir of William Henry Channing (Boston, 1886).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v2*
Caruthers, J. Wade. *Octavius Brooks Frothingham: Gentle Radical* (Tuscaloosa, Ala., 1977).
Stedman, Edmund C. *Octavius Brooks Frothingham and the New Faith* (New York, 1876).

Henry Warner Bowden

FRYE, Herman Northrop (1912–91)

Northrop Frye was born on 14 July 1912 in Sherbrooke, Québec, Canada. He graduated from Victoria College of the University of Toronto, receiving the BA with honors in philosophy and English in 1933. He attended Merton College, Oxford, receiving his MA in English in 1940. In 1939 he joined the English department at Victoria College, University of Toronto, and remained there for the rest of his life. Frye published twenty-eight books and edited fifteen; he published over 150 essays, chapters and articles. He received many prizes and honors from Canadian academia in the humanities, and held thirty-eight honorary doctorates from universities around the world. He died in Toronto, Ontario, on 23 January 1991.

Frye achieved distinction primarily as one of the foremost literary critics of the twentieth century, and his more philosophical work involved his reflections on criticism as a discipline. Frye's major theoretical work, *Anatomy of Criticism* (1957), came relatively early in his career as the second book he wrote. He was thereafter, in A. C. Hamilton's words, "remarkably stubborn in preserving his critical principles unchanged" (1990, p. xi).

Frye presented his theory of criticism in the waning days of the so-called New Criticism, a method of intensely close reading of individual literary texts. Frye aimed to make literary criticism "scientific"; not that criticism should adapt the methods of the natural or social sciences, but that criticism must be based on knowledge and reasoning. Criticism should become an organized body of knowledge though the organizing principles must be drawn from literature itself,

and not imported from theology, or philosophy, or politics, or science (1957, pp. 6–11).

In order to achieve this goal of being scientific, Frye believed that criticism needs a conceptual framework which it alone possesses. Criticism seems to be badly in need of a coordinating principle, a central hypothesis which will see the phenomena it deals with as parts of a whole. The critic must assume there is an order in literature which criticism properly organized reveals. The organizing scheme which Frye proposed involved four elements, a theory of each of modes, symbols, myths, and genres. Of these, the theory of myth is the most important, because it is the "most abstract and conventionalized of all literary modes" (1957, p. 134). Symbol, Frye interprets narrowly as any unit of any literary structure that can be isolated for critical attention (1957, p. 71). The polysemous character of meaning implies that the organizing principle of criticism cannot be at the level of symbol. Only myth has the required generality and abstractness. Frye takes the myths of the Judaeo-Christian Bible and of classical mythology to form the core of the conceptual framework or organizing principle for literature. The structural principles of literature are as closely related to mythology and comparative religion as those of painting are to geometry (1957, pp. 15–17, 71, 134–5). The title of *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature* (1982) is deliberate: Frye is not presenting the Bible as literature, but the Bible and literature. He is concerned with how the mythology of the Bible taken as a conceptual framework for criticism structures, and so permits, the understanding and appreciation of literature.

Frye might seem an easy target in diverse and multicultural times, but that would be a mistake. There is ample testimony that he interpreted myth inclusively; that his political sensibilities were social-democratic; and that he was, although certainly in the academy, not of it. He did not hesitate to write for a non-academic audience, and he once said that his true academic home was the undergraduate lecture hall, not the graduate supervision.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Anatomy of Criticism (Princeton, N.J., 1957).
The Educated Imagination (Toronto, 1963).
The Great Code: The Bible and Literature (New York, 1982).
Northrop Frye on Shakespeare (Markham, Ont., 1986).
Words with Power: Being a Second Study of "The Bible and Literature" (New York, 1990).
The Collected Works, ed. Alvin A. Lee (Toronto, 1996).

Further Reading
Who Was Who in Amer v10
Ayre, John. *Northrop Frye: A Biography* (Toronto, 1989).
Cook, David. *Northrop Frye: A Vision of the New World* (Montréal, 1985).
Denham, Robert D. *Northrop Frye: An Annotated Bibliography of Primary and Secondary Sources* (Toronto, 1987).
Gorak, Jan. *The Making of the Modern Canon: Genesis and Crisis of a Literary Idea* (London, 1991).
Hamilton, A. C. *Northrop Frye: Anatomy of His Criticism* (Toronto, 1990).
Lee, Alvin A., and Robert D. Denham, eds. *The Legacy of Northrop Frye* (Toronto, 1994).

Roger A. Shiner

FULLER, Lon Luvois (1902–78)

Lon Fuller was born on 15 June 1902 in Hereford, Texas. He earned his BA (1924) and JD (1926) at Stanford University. He was instructor of law at University of Oregon Law School (1926–8), instructor of law at University of Illinois College of Law (1929–31), and professor of law at Duke University (1931–40). He then went to Harvard Law School where he

was visiting professor of law (1939–40), professor of law (1940–48), and Carter Professor of Jurisprudence (1948–72). He died on 8 April 1978 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

At a time when legal positivism was dominant, which demanded the separation of morality from law, Fuller championed the seemingly antiquated notions of natural law theory. His assault began in 1964 with his famous and controversial work, *The Morality of Law*, which argued that law and morality were intimately intertwined. He claimed that the positivist sees law as a one-way projection of authority, emanating from an authorized source and imposing itself on the citizen. It does not discern as an essential element in the creation of a legal system any tacit cooperation between lawgiver and citizen – morally or immorally, justly or unjustly.

For Fuller, the Supreme Court 1973 abortion-rights decision *Roe v. Wade* was a perfect example of the limitations of the positivist school of legal thought. A classic example of the positivist approach, the Court's opinion focuses almost exclusively upon the issue of "who decides" whether a woman may have an abortion. It ignores the issue of whether or not a human life is destroyed, much less the subsidiary question of who, if anyone, has a moral obligation to protect such a life.

If Fuller is a champion of natural law, it is most definitely natural law in a secularized and updated form. His approach emphasizes customary law, by which he means rules which have evolved spontaneously from the adjudication and arbitration of legal disputes. Consequently, he endorsed the thinking of the Italian philosopher Bruno Leoni that, "Individuals make the law, insofar as they make successful claims." The law is a dynamic enterprise that is at home in the American market economy. A society of economic traders is the social order most likely to foster the conditions that make a duty most understandable and most palatable to the man who owes it.

For Fuller the law also provides a chart or roadmap with which the individual can orient his plans and proposed actions and rationally evaluate and predict how they will be received by and impact the activities of his fellows. His examples are drawn from the law of contract, quasi-contract, and tort, the acceptance of which in American society today represents the fruit of a centuries-old struggle to reduce the role of the irrational in human affairs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Law in Quest of Itself (Chicago, 1940; Boston, 1966).
The Problems of Jurisprudence (Brooklyn, N.Y., 1949).
"Positivism and Fidelity to the Law – A Reply to Professor Hart," *Harvard Law Review* 71 (1958): 630–72.
The Morality of Law (New Haven, Conn., 1964).
Legal Fictions (Stanford, Cal., 1967).
Anatomy of the Law (New York, 1968).

Other Relevant Works
Fuller's papers are at Harvard University Law School.
Basic Contract Law (St. Paul, Minn., 1947; 7th edn 2001).
Winston, Kenneth I., ed. *The Principles of Social Order: Selected Essays of Lon L. Fuller* (Durham, N.C., 1981). Contains a bibliography of Fuller's publications.

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, *Encyc Ethics*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v7*
Bechtler, Thomas W., ed. *Law in a Social Context: Liber Amicorum Honouring Professor Lon L. Fuller* (Deventer, The Netherlands, 1978).
MacLeod-Cullinane, Barry. "Lon L. Fuller and the Enterprise of Law," *Legal Notes No. 22* (London, 1995).
Strahan, Thomas W. "The Natural Law Philosophy of Lon L. Fuller in Contrast to Roe v. Wade and Its Progeny," in *Association for Interdisciplinary Research in Values and Social Change*, vol. 15, no. 4

(Washington, D.C., 2000).

Summers, Robert S. *Lon L. Fuller* (Stanford, Cal., 1984).

Witteveen, W. J., and W. van der Burg, eds. *Rediscovering Fuller: Essays on Implicit Law and Institutional Design* (Amsterdam, 1999).

James O. Castagnera

FULLERTON, George Stuart (1859–1925)

George Stuart Fullerton was born on 18 August 1859 in Futteghur, India, to the Reverend Robert Stewart Fullerton and Martha White Fullerton, who lived there as missionaries. In 1875 he entered the University of Pennsylvania, earning his BA in 1879 and his MA in philosophy in 1882. He subsequently studied in the divinity schools at Princeton in 1879 and Yale from 1880 to 1883, receiving his divinity degree from Yale in 1883. Later he was ordained in the Episcopal Church. In 1892 Muhlenberg College conferred the honorary PhD degree upon him, and in 1900 he received a Doctor of Laws degree from the same institution.

In 1883 Fullerton became an instructor of philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania, replacing the recently deceased Charles Porterfield Krauth who had been the professor of moral and intellectual philosophy since 1868. Fullerton became an adjunct professor in 1885 and the Adam Seybert Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy in 1887. The Seybert chair had just been established through the estate of Henry Seybert with the condition that its holder investigate claims of psychic phenomena. Fullerton was secretary of the commission that was appointed to review the relevant literature and to examine self-proclaimed psychics. Having found no evidence of psychic phenomena, the university trustees determined that the investigation had satisfied

the terms of the gift and gave the chair to the philosophy department. Fullerton later served as Dean of the Philosophy Department in 1889–90, Dean of the College from 1894 to 1896, and Vice Provost of the University from 1894 to 1898. In 1904 Fullerton became professor of philosophy at Columbia University. Students of his include Warner FITE and Edgar Arthur SINGER. Fullerton was President of the American Psychological Association in 1896.

In 1913 Fullerton went on leave from Columbia to lecture as an exchange professor at the universities of Vienna, Graz, Innsbruck, Cracow, and Lemberg. The following year, Emperor Franz Joseph appointed him as an honorary professor at the University of Vienna. When World War I began, Fullerton was detained in Austrian and German prison camps for four years. His position with Columbia officially ended in 1917. A frail man who was partially paralyzed after an attack of inflammatory rheumatism in his boyhood, Fullerton never recovered from the hardship and starvation he suffered in the camps. After returning to the US, he was a part-time lecturer in philosophy at Vassar College. With his health deteriorating, Fullerton committed suicide on 23 March 1925 in Poughkeepsie, New York.

Fullerton was a prominent early defender of realism against the dominant idealism in American philosophy. The central purpose of *On Spinozistic Immortality* (1899) is to examine the eternity Spinoza ascribed to the human mind. Fullerton gives Spinoza a realistic reading, which carries through in his own philosophy. Since he rejected the notion of substance, he can be properly called a phenomenalistic realist: all real objects are as they appear. *A System of Metaphysics* (1904) explains his established views. For Fullerton, objects are perceived *directly* but they are always perceived under particular conditions so that one never perceives the object *as such*. Observers who give conflicting accounts see the object under different conditions. For Fullerton these conditions are objective, which

allows him to deny that his views commit him to subjectivism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Conception of the Infinite and the Solution of the Mathematical Antinomies: A Study in Psychological Analysis (Philadelphia, 1887).

A Plain Argument for God (Philadelphia, 1889).

On Sameness and Identity: A Psychological Study Being a Contribution to the Foundations of a Theory of Knowledge (Philadelphia, 1890).

On the Perception of Small Differences: With Special Reference to the Extent, Force and Time of Movement, with James McKeen Cattell (Philadelphia, 1892).

On Spinozistic Immortality (Philadelphia, 1899).

A System of Metaphysics (New York, 1904).

An Introduction to Philosophy (New York, 1906).

The World We Live In: Or, Philosophy and Life in the Light of Modern Thought (New York, 1912).

Germany of Today (Indianapolis, 1915).

A Handbook of Ethical Theory (New York, 1922).

Further Reading

Bio Dict Psych by Zusne, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v12*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Miller, Dickinson S. "Fullerton and Philosophy," *The New Republic* (13 May 1925): 310–12.

Singer, Edgar A., Jr. "George Stuart Fullerton," *Journal of Philosophy* 22 (1925): 589–96.

Cornelis de Waal

FULTON, James Street (1904–97)

James Street Fulton was born on 29 August 1904 in Columbia, Tennessee. After earning his BA from Vanderbilt University in 1925, he studied for a year in Germany at Göttingen University, and then returned to Vanderbilt for his MA in 1929. He earned his PhD in philosophy from Cornell University in 1934, writing a dissertation on "Five Theories of Truth." After graduation, he taught philosophy at McGill University in Montréal from 1934 to 1943, and served in the Canadian Navy during World War II from 1943 to 1945. Fulton's association with Rice University in Texas began in 1946, when he was hired as assistant professor of philosophy by Radoslav TSANOFF. Fulton was promoted to full professor in 1952, and served as chair of Rice's philosophy department from 1956 to 1968. He retired in 1974, and died on 31 March 1997 in Bellaire, Texas.

Fulton was an important and widely respected teacher, scholar, and leader at Rice. During his chairing of Rice's philosophy department, graduate studies and a doctoral program began. Under his leadership as the first Master of Will Rice College, the college system began and evolved at Rice University during the 1950s and 1960s. He was a member of several academic societies; he participated in the University of New Mexico Taos Aesthetics Institute for several years, and served as President of the Southwestern Philosophical Society in 1957.

Fulton's philosophical orientation tended towards idealism, defending the superior reality of lived values by each person, against the anti-personalist "objective" science and naturalism. His book *Science and Man's Hope* (1954) attempts to show the limitations of science for both understanding reality and justifying itself. Value-neutral science is blind to the existence of values and the human hope that life is good, and science cannot explain why its pursuit of truths should be valuable. Science is embedded in

the cultural environment, and both its methods and knowledge production is determined by culture. Science is therefore so dependent on its wider culture that it cannot be expected to help lead that culture's evolution. The task of rationally considering value is philosophy's responsibility, and science's value lies in its expansion of creative personality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Cartesianism of Phenomenology," *Philosophical Review* 49 (1940): 285–308.

"Our Knowledge of One Another," *Philosophical Review* 51 (1942): 456–75.

"Science and the Naturalization of Man," *The Personalist* 30 (1949): 376–84.

Science and Man's Hope (New York, 1954).

"Computing Machines and Minds," *Philosophy Today* 1 (1957): 207–13.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v72

Gurwitsch, Aron. "James Street Fulton's 'The Cartesianism of Phenonemology'," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 2 (1942): 551–7.

Kolenda, Konstantin, ed. *Creativity and Openness: Essays in Honor of James Street Fulton* (Houston, Tex., 1975).

"Symposium Honoring James Street Fulton," *Southwestern Journal of Philosophy* 6 (Winter 1975): 7–30.

John R. Shook

G

GALBRAITH, John Kenneth (1908–)

John Kenneth Galbraith was born on 15 October 1908 in the Scottish farming community of Iona Station, Ontario, Canada. He received a BS from the Ontario Agricultural College (now the University of Guelph) in 1931. He received an MS in 1933 and a PhD in agricultural economics in 1934 from the University of California at Berkeley. Galbraith accepted a position teaching economics at Harvard University, and taught there from 1934 to 1939. In 1937 he traveled to the University of Cambridge to study with John Maynard Keynes, and became a strong supporter of the principles of Keynesian economics. He returned to the US in 1939, and taught economics at Princeton University in 1939–40. In 1941 he entered government service working as Deputy Head of the Office of Price Administration, which set price controls during World War II. In 1945 he was asked to carry out a survey of allied and United States strategic bombing during World War II, and he concluded that the US bombing of Germany did not help to shorten the war. He also served as an editor of *Fortune Magazine* from 1943 to 1948. Galbraith was appointed professor of economics at Harvard in 1949, where he remained until 1961 when he was appointed Ambassador to India, serving until 1963. He rejoined the Harvard faculty in 1963 and remained there until his retirement in 1975, when he was named Paul M. Warburg Professor Emeritus of Economics.

Galbraith served as Chair of Americans for Democratic Action from 1967 to 1969. He has received over forty-five honorary degrees from universities around the world, including the University of Oxford, Moscow University, and the University of Paris. He was elected President of the American Economic Association in 1972. In 1997 he was inducted into the Order of Canada, and received the Robert F. Kennedy Book Award for Lifetime Achievement. He was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom from the US Government in 2000. Galbraith currently lives with his wife, Catherine, in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

As a Keynesian economist, Galbraith favored government spending to reduce unemployment and stressed using more of the nation's wealth for public services, and less for private consumption. As a modern "American Institutionalist," he worked within the tradition of Thorstein VEBLEN and John R. COMMONS in emphasizing the contingency of historical, social, and institutional factors over absolute "laws" comprising "economic behavior." Galbraith continues to provoke criticism from mainstream economists, like Milton FRIEDMAN, for challenging the hegemonic ideology of the "free market." Beginning with *American Capitalism* (1952), he attributed American postwar success to the low inflation provided by price controls as benefiting not the average consumer but rather aiding in the growth of large, industrial firms and their ability to wield oligopolistic power. Like Veblen and Frank KNIGHT, Galbraith attacked the myth of "consumer sovereignty" by focusing more

closely on the qualitative rather than the quantitative aspects of economic progress. Many of his critics were quick to accuse him of challenging core American values of individual freedom and choice.

In *The Affluent Society* (1958), Gailbraith highlighted the sharp contrast between the paucity of services in the public sector, and the abundance of private wealth. He attributed this gap to the lack of any "countervailing" institutions strong enough to check the growth and potential abuse of these large corporations. Galbraith argued for the need of a "countervailing power" to be built from government regulation and a coalition of private-sector interests among trade unions, supplier and consumer organizations. Further, the large-scale, high-tech nature of corporate activity demands a close-knit relationship between business and government, which works to consolidate power in the hands of the corporate bureaucracy by means of "political capture" (1967). He saw a way to check this growing menace through public education, the political process and stressing the provision of public goods over private gain.

In *The Good Society: The Humane Agenda* (1996), Galbraith made the case for a more equitable distribution of resources to lessen the atrocities associated with poverty, arguing that the absence of money denies a person liberty. In his most recent work, *The Economics of Innocent Fraud: Truth for Our Time* (2004), he examines the underlying dynamics behind the growing tendency among institutional authorities to misrepresent the truth in subtle but pervasive ways. Gailbraith's influence among economists has been tacitly acknowledged in James M. BUCHANAN's work on political capture and "public choice" economics; in Herbert A. SIMON and the "new" institutionalist critique of the objectives and conduct of the firm; and the renewed interest in the failure of consumer sovereignty by people like Tibor de Scitovsky.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
American Capitalism, *the Concept of Countervailing Power* (Boston, 1952).
The Great Crash (Boston, 1955).
Economics and the Art of Controversy (New Brunswick, N.J., 1955).
The Affluent Society (Boston, 1958).
The Liberal Hour (Boston, 1960).
The New Industrial State (Boston, 1967).
Money: Whence It Came, Where It Went (Boston, 1975).
The Age of Uncertainty (Boston, 1977).
The Nature of Mass Poverty (Cambridge, Mass., 1979).
The Voice of the Poor: Essays in Economic and Political Persuasion (Cambridge, Mass., 1983).
The Anatomy of Power (Boston, 1983).
Economics in Perspective: A Critical History (Boston, 1987).
The Culture of Contentment (Boston, 1992).
The Good Society: The Humane Agenda (Boston, 1996).
The Economics of Innocent Fraud: Truth for Our Time (Boston, 2004).

Other Relevant Works
The Triumph: A Novel of Modern Diplomacy (Boston, 1968).
Ambassador's Journal (Boston, 1969).
A China Passage (Boston, 1973).
A Life in Our Times (Boston, 1981).
Capitalism, Communism and Coexistence: *From the Bitter Past to a Better Prospect*, with Stanislav Menshikov (Boston, 1988).
A Tenured Professor (Boston, 1990).
A Journey Through Economic Time: A Firsthand View (Boston, 1994).
Letters to Kennedy (Cambridge, Mass., 1998).
Name-dropping: From F. D. R. On (Boston, 1999).

Further Reading
Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, *Comp Amer*

Thought, *Dict Economics*, *Encyc Amer Bio*

Bowles, Samuel, Richard Edwards, and William G. Shepherd, eds. *Unconventional Wisdom: Essays on Economics in Honor of John Kenneth Galbraith* (Boston, 1989).

Hession, Charles H. *John Kenneth Galbraith and His Critics* (New York, 1972).

Keaney, Michael, ed. *Economist with a Public Purpose: Essays in Honour of John Kenneth Galbraith* (London, 2001).

Scitovsky, Tibor de. *Human Desire and Economic Satisfaction: Essays on the Frontiers of Economics* (New York, 1986).

Sharpe, Myron E. *John Kenneth Galbraith and the Lower Economics* (White Plains, N.Y., 1974).

Simon, Herbert A. *An Empirically Based Microeconomics* (Cambridge, UK, 1997).

Stanfield, James Ronald and Jacqueline Bloom Stanfield, eds. *Interviews with John Kenneth Galbraith* (Jackson, Miss., 2004).

Charles Gattone

GARDINER, Harry Norman (1855–1927)

Harry Norman Gardiner was born on 6 November 1855 in Norwich, England. After completing grammar school, Gardiner went into business in England for four years. He emigrated to the United States in 1874 to attend Amherst College and graduated with a BA and high honors in 1878. After graduating, he taught for one year at an academy in Glens Fall, New York. Gardiner went on to study at Union Theological Seminary from 1879 to 1882. He then studied in Germany; while studying theology at the University of Göttingen in 1882 he was a student of Paul Haupt, and in 1883 he studied psychology with Wilhelm Wundt at the University of Leipzig. While at the University of Heidelberg in 1884 he studied with Kuno Fischer but did not receive a PhD. He did receive an MA from Amherst College in 1885.

Gardiner joined the faculty of Smith College in Massachusetts in 1884 as instructor in mental and moral philosophy, replacing professor Moses Stuart Phelps. Except for one year of teaching in 1891–2 at Amherst College as an instructor of psychology, Gardiner spent his entire career as professor of philosophy at Smith College. Upon his retirement in 1924, he was given an honorary doctorate. He was working on writing a history of Smith College at the time of his death. The work was never completed because Gardiner was stuck by a car and died shortly afterwards on 29 December 1927 in Northampton, Massachusetts.

Gardiner was involved in many highly respected institutions. He was Vice President of the Nonotuck Savings Bank, and succeeded Calvin Coolidge as Secretary of the Board of Trustees of the People's Institute. He was also a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and one of the founding members of the American Philosophical Association of which he served as President from 1907 to 1908, as well as being the first secretary and treasurer of the association. In addition to his ties to philosophical institutions, Gardiner was an early member of the American Psychological Association, he was an advisory editor of the *Psychological Review*, and he regularly contributed evaluations and reviews concerning emotion to the *Psychological Bulletin*. Two of his significant articles concerned the psychology and emotions found in ancient philosophy. He wrote extensively about the works of Jonathan EDWARDS, and contributed articles to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* and James Mark BALDWIN's *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*.

Gardiner's writings, teaching style, and beliefs avoided strict dogmatism. He encouraged his students to discover their own meaning in the philosophical works they read, rather than impose his own views upon them. Gardiner was heavily influenced by ancient philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle but also had affinities for the idealists Josiah ROYCE, F. H. Bradley, and Bernard Bosanquet, but it could not be said that he was a disciple of any one of these thinkers. His studies in Germany and America gave him a unique philosophical standpoint; while his work in Germany may have swayed him towards accepting idealism, he rejected typical idealist denials of the reality of time and space, and rejected any reduction of the world to private consciousness. Concerning the meaning of "truth," Gardiner agreed with the pragmatists that we can only gauge or test the truth by examining its serviceableness in use. However, he still accepted the notion of universal and objective truths that cannot be defined merely by relative usefulness. Gardiner believed that truth was not just something that "works" in reality, but rather that truth is an indispensable component of a harmonious working of a world ordered by rationality and social communion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Early Idealism of Jonathan Edwards (New York, 1900).

Ed., *Jonathan Edwards: A Retrospect* (New York, 1902).

Ed., *Selected Sermons of Jonathan Edwards* (New York, 1904).

Feeling and Emotion: A History of Theories, with Ruth Metcalf and John Beebe-Center (New York, 1937).

Other Relevant Works

Gardiner's papers are at Smith College in Northampton, Massachusetts.

"The Problem of Truth," *Philosophical Review* 17 (1908): 113–37.

"The Psychology of the Affections in Plato and Aristotle," *Philosophical Review* 27 (1918): 469–88; 28 (1919): 1–26.

"Affective Psychology in Ancient Writers after Aristotle," *Psychological Review* 26 (1919): 204–29.

"The First Twenty-Five Years of the American Philosophical Association," *Philosophical Review* 35 (1926): 145–58.

Further Readings

Dict Amer Bio, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v21*, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v38*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Cutler, Anna A. "Professor Harry Norman Gardiner as Teacher and College Officer," *Journal of Philosophy* 25 (1928): 79–80.

Bakewell, Charles M. "Harry Norman Gardiner," *Philosophical Review* 37 (1928): 203–209.

"Tributes Given at a Memorial Service, 19 February 1928," *The Smith Alumnae Quarterly* 19 (May 1928): 262–9.

Daniel Trippett

GARMAN, Charles Edward (1850–1907)

Charles Garman was born on 18 December 1850 in Limington, Maine, to Reverend John H. Garman and Elizabeth Bullard Garman. He received a BA degree with honors from Amherst College in 1872. He was a high school principal in Ware, Massachusetts, before going to Yale Divinity School, where he earned a BD degree in 1879. Garman returned to Amherst to take over some of the responsibilities for teaching philosophy from President Julius H. SEELYE. Garman was Walker instructor in mathematics (1880–81); instructor in philosophy (1881–2); associate professor of moral philosophy and metaphysics (1882–9); professor of mental philosophy (1889–92);

and professor of moral philosophy and metaphysics from 1892 until his death. In 1896 Amherst awarded him the honorary DD degree. Garman died on 9 February 1907 in Amherst, Massachusetts.

Beloved as a professor at Amherst, Garman did not publish any books or articles, but he did produce a series of almost one hundred study pamphlets for use by his students. Some members of the Amherst community criticized Garman for his allegedly subversive teaching style because he rejected rote memorization, instead encouraging his students to think through philosophical issues for themselves and reach their own conclusions. Many of his students went on to graduate study and had prominent careers in philosophy.

Profoundly influenced by British neo-Hegelianism, Garman consistently emphasized a religious perspective on all philosophical issues, the world, and values. In addition to philosophy, Garman was also very interested in the latest developments in psychology, which he incorporated into his courses at every opportunity. He even managed to persuade the Amherst trustees to provide funding for a psychological laboratory. Garman's interest in developmental psychology was reflected in his teaching methods, because he sought to instill in students an ability to continually learn and think for themselves and to become future teachers.

During his tenure at Amherst, Garman's courses were always amongst the most popular at Amherst. His students respected his teaching and character so much that he exercised a strong, and often lifelong, influence on them. In 1906, and again in 1909, some of Garman's students compiled books of essays, reminiscences, and unpublished writings dedicated to their philosophy teacher.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Letters, Lectures and Address of Charles Edward Garman: A Memorial Volume, Prepared, with the Coöperation of the Class of 1884, Amherst College (Boston, 1909).

Other Relevant Works
Garman's papers are at Amherst College, Massachusetts.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v23*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Dyer, Walter A. "Garman of Amherst: Charles Edward Garman," in *Great Teachers, Portrayed by Those Who Studied Under Them*, ed. Houston Peterson (New Brunswick, N.J., 1946).
Tufts, James H., et al., eds. *Studies in Philosophy and Psychology, by Former Students of Charles Edward Garman, in Commemoration of Twenty-Five Years of Service as Teacher of Philosophy in Amherst College* (Amherst, Mass., 1906).
Waterhouse, J. A. *Calvin Coolidge Meets Charles Edward Garman* (Rutland, Vermont, 1984).

James A. Good

GARNETT, Arthur Campbell (1894–1970)

Arthur C. Garnett was born on 20 October 1894 in Port Victoria, South Australia, on an aboriginal reservation. Garnett attended the College of the Bible in Melbourne, and then entered the University of Melbourne where he received his BA in 1920 and his MA in 1922. Through the YMCA he taught English at a school in Yumanfu, China, in 1921. After his graduation Garnett was ordained into the ministry of the Disciples of Christ. He served churches in South Australia and was briefly a missionary in China. In 1924 Garnett joined the University of Adelaide, South Australia, as a lecturer in philosophy. The following year he received his LittD from the University of Melbourne with the thesis "The Problem of Personality in the Light of Recent Psychology."

In 1928 Garnett published *Instinct and Personality,* based partly on research he conducted while he was at the University of London. In the same year he moved to the United States where he became professor of philosophy at Butler University in Indianapolis. He stayed at Butler until 1935. After a brief return to Adelaide, Garnett joined the Transylvania University in Kentucky as visiting professor. He became professor of philosophy at the University of Wisconsin in 1937, remaining there until his retirement in 1965. He was chair of the philosophy department from 1950 to 1953. He was President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1960–61. After his retirement he taught at Texas Christian University until 1969. Garnett died on 19 September 1970 in Fort Worth, Texas.

At Wisconsin, Garnett developed a liberalistic theism not unlike that of William JAMES, which he expressed in *A Realistic Philosophy of Religion* (1942) and *God in Us* (1945). In 1949 he published *Freedom and Planning in Australia.* Garnett developed his ethical views in *Reality and Value* (1937) and *The Moral Nature of Man* (1952). His views on religion and morality culminate in *Religion and the Moral Life* (1955). Garnett maintained that although our ethical insights do not depend on religion, only a theistic faith can give us the energy needed to lead the moral life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Instinct and Personality (New York, 1928).

The Mind in Action: A Study of Motives and Values (London, 1931).

Reality and Value: An Introduction to Metaphysics and an Essay on the Theory of Value (New Haven, Conn., 1937).

A Realistic Philosophy of Religion (Chicago, 1942).

God in Us: A Liberal Christian Philosophy of Religion for the General Reader (Chicago, 1945).

Freedom and Planning in Australia (Madison, Wisc., 1949).

The Moral Nature of Man: A Critical Evaluation of Ethical Principles (New York, 1952).

Can Ideals and Norms be Justified? (Stockton, N.J., 1955).

Religion and Moral Life (New York, 1955).

Contemporary Thought and the Return to Religion (Lexington, Kent., 1960).

Ethics: A Critical Introduction (New York, 1960).

The Perceptual Process (Madison, Wisc., 1965).

Other Relevant Works

"Freedom and Responsibility in Moore's Ethics," in *The Philosophy of G. E. Moore,* ed. Paul Schilpp (Evanston, Ill., 1942).

"Naturalism and the Concept of Matter," *Journal of Philosophy* 45 (1948): 477–89.

"A Naturalistic Interpretation of Mind," *Journal of Philosophy* 45 (1948): 589–603.

"Freedom and Creativity," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 34 (1961): 25–39.

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v7, Proc of APA v44, Who's Who in Phil

Damer, Thomas E. *Value in the Thought of Peter A. Bertocci and A. Campbell Garnett: A Comparison of Two Theistic Theories.* PhD dissertation, Boston University (Boston, 1970).

Walhout, Donald. "Garnett's New Analysis of Ethical Concepts," *Ethics* 75 (1965): 132–40.

Werkmeister, W. H. "Volition, Intention, and Values," in *Historical Spectrum of Value Theories, vol. 2: Anglo/American Group* (Lincoln, Neb., 1973), pp. 198–225.

Cornelis de Waal

GARNETT, Christopher Browne, Jr.
(1906–75)

Christopher B. Garnett, Jr. was born on 23 December 1906 in Richmond, Virginia. He received his BS from Princeton University in 1927, and then did graduate study at Stanford University during the summers of 1927 and 1928, and at the University of Göttingen in Germany during the summers of 1930 and 1931. He received a PhD in philosophy in 1932, and also a Litt.D. in 1936, from the University of Edinburgh. In 1931 Garnett was hired as an instructor in philosophy at George Washington University in Washington, D.C. He was rapidly promoted, reaching full professor in 1936. From 1942 to 1944 he also was acting Dean of the Liberal Arts College, and Dean of the Junior College in 1944–5. He also taught philosophy during the summers of those years at City College of New York, and lectured on citizenship and philosophy at Mt Vernon Seminary in Washington during 1937–45.

At the end of World War II in 1945, Garnett left teaching to join the administration of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in Shanghai, China. He made a brief return to the United States in 1947–8 to teach at Wesleyan University in Connecticut. In 1948 he became a cultural affairs officer of the American Military Government in Berlin, Germany, and from 1949 to 1952 he was chief of the education and cultural relations branch of the Office of the US High Commissioner for Germany in Berlin. In this capacity Garnett helped to secure the establishment of the American Memorial Library and the Free University of Berlin. In 1952–3 Garnett was a cultural officer in the US Foreign Service in Saigon, Vietnam.

Returning to academia, Garnett accepted the positions of professor of philosophy and chair of the newly established philosophy department at Gallaudet College in Washington, D.C. in 1954, and he held these positions until his death. In addition, he lectured at the American University from 1957 to 1969, and at the University of Maryland from 1960 to 1964. Based upon his extensive experience teaching the deaf at Gallaudet, he published books about deaf teaching methods and lectured on teaching philosophical concepts to the deaf. Garnett's books *Wisdom in Conduct: An Introduction to Ethics* (1940) and *The Quest for Wisdom: An Introduction to Philosophy* (1942) were widely used philosophy texts. Garnett died on 21 November 1975 in Washington, D.C.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Kant's Theory of Intuitus Intellectualis in the Inaugural Dissertation of 1770," *Philosophical Review* 46 (1937): 424–32.

"Negativity and Ethicism in Ethics," *Journal of Philosophy* 35 (1938): 263–9.

The Kantian Philosophy of Space (New York, 1939).

"Philosophy and the Social Tendencies of the Present," *Social Science* 16 (1941): 327–31.

Socrates: An Essay in Contemporary Political Thought (New York, 1968).

Taste: An Essay in Critical Imagination (New York, 1968).

Other Relevant Works

Wisdom in Conduct: An Introduction to Ethics (New York, 1940).

The Quest for Wisdom: An Introduction to Philosophy (1942).

Ed., *The Exchange of Letters between Samuel Heinicke and Abbé Charles Michel de l'Epée: A Monograph on the Oralist and Manualist Methods of Instructing the Deaf in the Eighteenth Century* (New York, 1968).

Ed., *So You Find Your Child Is Deaf: The Art of Instructing the Infant Deaf and Dumb*, by John Pauncefort Arrowsmith (Washington, D.C., 1968).

Further Reading

Nat Cycl Amer Bio v62, Proc of APA v49

John R. Shook

GARRISON, William Lloyd (1805–79)

William Lloyd Garrison was born on 10 December 1805 in Newburyport, Massachusetts, and he died on 24 May 1879 in New York City. Raised in a Baptist household, he was largely self-educated and held several apprenticeships, including one in 1818 to a printer, and in the 1820s he edited a series of newspapers in Massachusetts and Vermont. During 1829–30 he came to reject the idea of the colonization of blacks outside the United States – which he had previously supported – and demanded the immediate, uncompensated abolition of slavery, equality for blacks, and the creation of a biracial society. These were policies which he championed in his famed, weekly abolitionist newspaper *The Liberator* which he began in Boston on 1 January 1831 and continued until 29 December 1865, after the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment which formally abolished slavery throughout the United States. Garrison stressed that slavery was a sin and a moral issue. A pacifist, he condemned violence and appeals to threats of violence, seeking to use moral suasion to persuade Americans to support emancipation.

In 1832 Garrison helped to found the New England Anti-Slavery Society. In December 1833 in Philadelphia, he participated in the creation of the American Anti-Slavery Society (AASS), which included blacks and women and used peaceful moral suasion to win support for immediatism – the immediate uncompensated abolition of slavery. In 1840 the Society split over several issues, including whether to engage in political action, which Garrison opposed, and the role of women in the movement, which Garrison strongly supported (he campaigned for various reforms, including temperance and women's rights). Thereafter Garrison controlled the small organization (he was President from 1843 to 1865) but the Society was a distinct minority within the larger abolitionist movement. In the 1840s and 1850s he vigorously opposed racial segregation in various campaigns.

Despite his pacifism, he supported the Union in the Civil War and strongly defended Lincoln's policies abolishing slavery, particularly after 1862 when the president issued his preliminary Emancipation Proclamation. When the Civil War ended, Garrison urged the AASS to disband, which it voted against doing until 1870 when he resigned his membership. This action and the closing of *The Liberator* in December 1865 ended the major part of his career.

Historians differ on Garrison's influence. He was the greatest publicist of immediatism and radical abolition, but other abolitionists may have been more successful in persuading Americans to support emancipation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Thoughts on African Colonization (Boston, 1832; New York, 1968).
Selections from the Writings and Speeches of William Lloyd Garrison (Boston, 1852; New York, 1968).

Other Relevant Works
Garrison's papers are located at the Boston Public Library, Smith College Library, and the American Antiquarian Society in Worcester, Massachusetts.
Documents of Upheaval: Selections from William Lloyd Garrison's The Liberator, 1831–1865, ed. Truman Nelson, (New York, 1966).
William Lloyd Garrison, ed. George M. Frederickson (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1968).
The Letters of William Lloyd Garrison, 6 vols, ed. Walter M. Merrill (Cambridge, Mass., 1971–81).
William Lloyd Garrison and the Fight Against Slavery: Selections from The Liberator, ed. William E. Cain (Boston, 1995).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer*

Thought, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v2*

Kraditor, Aileen S. *Means and Ends in American Abolitionism: Garrison and His Critics on Strategy and Tactics, 1834–1850* (New York, 1969).

Mayer, Henry. *All on Fire: William Lloyd Garrison and the Abolition of Slavery* (New York, 1998).

Merrill, Walter M. *Against Wind and Tide: A Biography of William Lloyd Garrison* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963).

Rogers, William B. *We Are All Together Now: Frederick Douglass, William Lloyd Garrison and the Prophetic Tradition* (New York, 1995).

Stewart, James B. *William Lloyd Garrison and the Challenge of Emancipation* (Arlington Heights, Ill., 1992).

Thomas, John L. *The Liberator, William Lloyd Garrison: A Biography* (Boston, 1963).

John W. Hillje

GARVER, Newton (1928–)

Newton Garver was born on 24 April 1928 in Buffalo, New York. He began his education at Deep Springs College and earned degrees from Swarthmore College (BA 1951), the University of Oxford (BPhil 1953), and Cornell University (PhD 1965) with a dissertation supervised by Max Black. He taught at the National College of Choueifat (Lebanon), at Cornell, and at Minnesota, before joining the philosophy faculty at the State University of New York at Buffalo in 1961. He was promoted to full professor in 1971, became SUNY Distinguished Service Professor in 1991, and retired in 1995. He has had visiting appointments at Michigan, Friends World College, Rochester, Northwestern, San Diego State, and Pendle Hill.

His achievements include four books, some seventy articles and two dozen reviews. The focus of his writing has been on the work of Kant, Wittgenstein, and Derrida, and on problems about violence, philosophy of language, social and political philosophy, and ethics. Garver has, among other views, insisted that proper limits have to be recognized so that the error, for example, of making constitutive use of regulative ideas is not made. This recognition of proper limits is a critical element in his evaluation of Derrida. The latter does not recognize the distinction between constitutive and regulative rules, an important lesson from Kant, and exemplified by Wittgenstein.

His work in ethics and political theory has been informed by his many scholarly and public activities. Interdisciplinary activities have included organizations on modern German studies, human rights law and policy, and cooperation and conflict studies, the last of which he founded. Outside the academy, Garver has been active with the Quakers. He has been in prison for draft refusal, and taken a case to the Supreme Court (385 US 589) for refusing to sign a New York State anti-Communist certificate, the so-called Feinberg Certificate. He has long been active with Buffalo Friends Meeting, Alternatives to Violence Project, Friends World Committee, Quaker Bolivia Link, and with Friends in Bolivia. He is sought after in Quaker gatherings for the clarity and precision of his comments, which help the reflections move along firmer paths.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"On the Rationality of Persuading," *Mind* 69 (1960): 389–96.

"Varieties of Use and Mention," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 26 (1965): 230–38.

"Die Lebensform in Wittgensteins 'Philosophischen Untersuchungen'," *Grazer Philosophische Studien* 21 (1984): 33–54.

"Neither Knowing Nor Not Knowing," *Philosophical Investigations* 7 (1984):

206–24.

"Structuralism and the Challenge of a Metaphor," *The Monist* 69 (1986): 68–86.

"Wittgenstein and the Critical Tradition," *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 7 (1990): 227–40.

This Complicated Form of Life: Essays on Wittgenstein (Chicago, 1994).

Derrida and Wittgenstein, with Seung-chong Lee (Philadelphia, 1994).

"Naturalism and Transcendentality: The Case of Form of Life," in *Wittgenstein and Contemporary Philosophy*, ed. Souren Teghrarian (Bristol, UK, 1994).

"Philosophy as Grammar," in *The Cambridge Companion to Wittgenstein*, ed. Hans Sluga and David Stern (Cambridge, UK, 1996), pp. 139–70.

"Politics, Politics, Politics," *International Studies in Philosophy* 29 (1997): 19–33.

"Vagueness and Analysis," *Journal of Philosophical Research* 24 (1999): 1–19.

"Wittgenstein and George Fox," in *Wittgenstein and the Future of Philosophy, a Reassessment after 50 Years: Proceedings of the 24th International Wittgenstein Symposium* (Vienna, 2002).

Other Relevant Works

"What Violence Is," *The Nation* 206 (24 June 1968): 819–22.

Ed. with Peter Hare, *Naturalism and Rationality* (Buffalo, 1986).

Ed. with James Brady, *Justice, Law and Violence* (Philadelphia, 1991).

"Pugnacity and Pacifism," *The Acorn* 6 (1991): 7–19.

Jesus, Jefferson and the Task of Friends, Pendle Hill Pamphlet no. 250 (Wallingford, Penn., 1983).

Nonviolence and Community, with Eric Reitan, Pendle Hill Pamphlet no. 322 (Wallingford, Penn., 1995).

Further Reading

Betz, Joseph. "Violence: Garver's Definition and a Deweyan Correction," *Ethics* 87 (1977): 339–51.

Canfield, John V. "Criteria and Method," *Metaphilosophy* 5 (1974): 298–315.

Haller, Rudolf. "Lebensform oder Lebensformen: eine Bemerkung zu Newton Garvers Interpretation von 'Lebensform'," *Grazer Philosophische Studien* 21 (1984): 55–64.

Zosimo E. Lee

GARVEY, Marcus Mosiah (1887–1940)

Marcus Mosiah Garvey was born on 17 August 1887 in Saint Ann's Bay, Saint Ann, Jamaica. Marcus received the entirety of his formal education at a local elementary school. In 1901, at age fourteen, Garvey was forced to leave the school and was apprenticed by his godfather, Mr. Burrowes, in the craft of printing. Like Garvey's father, Mr. Burrowes was well read and had an extensive personal library to which Garvey had constant access for three years. In 1904, having been sufficiently trained, Garvey went to Kingston, Jamaica's capital, to work as a printer.

Garvey's ascension as a printer was so rapid that, three years after arriving in Kingston, he had become a foreman and master printer. Yet, in the same year of his promotion to foreman, he was involved in a labor strike called by the printer's union. Although the management offered to raise Garvey's pay, he elected to go on strike alongside his fellow workers. At age twenty, he began to see the oppression of laborers, particularly black laborers, in the workplace and came to the conclusion that only organized activity and economic power could effectively improve their situation. Garvey used his printing skill to develop periodicals such as *Garvey's Watchman, La Nationale,* and *La Prensa*, to speak on issues regarding organized labor and

the mistreatment of black workers in Jamaica and South America. In 1912 Garvey went to London to learn more and to strategize concerning the amelioration of blacks throughout the British Empire. There he met Duse Mohammed and was introduced to Pan-Africanism. As a result of this meeting, he read extensively on Africa, and began to reflect deeply on the colonialization of Africa and the African Diaspora.

Garvey's reflection on the African Diaspora led Garvey to consider the racial problem in the United States and the autobiography of Booker T. WASHINGTON, *Up From Slavery*. Garvey left London in 1914 for Jamaica and established the Universal Negro Improvement Association and African Communities League (UNIA). He tried to establish trade schools in Kingston along the lines of the Tuskegee Institute in Alabama but his efforts were successfully opposed by the local black population who saw such schools as stigmatizing and separating. Garvey wrote Booker T. Washington regarding the matter and Washington encouraged Garvey to visit Tuskegee to obtain firsthand knowledge. When Garvey arrived in the United States in 1916, however, Washington had recently died. Yet Garvey, as a distant pupil of Washington, was in a good position to promote his vision with a Washingtonian backdrop. Thus, in 1917 he established a branch of the UNIA in Harlem, New York. In five years, it is estimated that the organization had as many as six million members in North and South America, the West Indies, and Africa.

Garvey taught Pan-Africanism, and his main agenda included building an economic base to promote worldwide African emancipation. He established the Black Star Steamship Company and the Negro Factory Corporation as well as a weekly publication, *The Negro World*. While he inherited much of the prestige of the Washington era, Garvey also inherited the criticism of the black intelligentsia, led by W. E. B. DU BOIS. Garvey was personally resented by Du Bois and others as an oppor-

tunist, a foreigner, and, because he had little formal education, as anti-intellectual.

Garvey was convinced that some UNIA professionals needed to settle in Africa to assist with an African rebirth that would create the conditions for the possibility of worldwide African flourishing. This ideology was wrongly criticized by his opponents who charged that Garvey was simply advocating a mass exodus of New World blacks "back to Africa." Garvey's dream, while widely heralded, nevertheless did not materialize. In January 1922 he and three associates were arrested for mail fraud in relation to the stock sold to purchase the Black Star Line. In 1923 the jury acquitted the other defendants but sentenced Garvey to five years in prison. In 1925 Garvey's second wife, Amy Jacques Garvey, published a second edition of his *Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey*, having edited and published the first edition in 1923. In 1927 President Coolidge commuted Garvey's sentence and he was deported back to Jamaica. He later traveled to London, England and established another UNIA headquarters, but the movement never regained its momentum. Garvey died on 10 June 1940 in London England.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey, 2 vols, ed. Amy Jacques-Garvey (New York, 1923–5; 2nd edn 1926).
Marcus Garvey: Life and Lessons, ed. Robert A. Hill and Barbara Bair (Berkeley, Cal., 1987).

Other Relevant Works
"The Negro's Greatest Enemy," *Current History* 18 (September 1923): 951–7. Garvey's autobiography.
The Poetical Works of Marcus Garvey, ed. Tony Martin (Dover, Mass., 1983).
The Marcus Garvey and Universal Negro Improvement Association Papers, 9 vols, ed. Robert A. Hill (Berkeley, Cal., 1983–95).

Selected Writings and Speeches of Marcus Garvey, ed. Bob Blaisdell (Mineola, N.Y., 2005).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*

Clarke, John Henrik, ed. *Marcus Garvey and the Vision of Africa* (New York, 1974).

Cronon, E. David. *Black Moses: The Story of Marcus Garvey and the United Negro Improvement Association* (Madison, Wisc., 1955).

Davis, Lenwood G. and Janet L. Sims. *Marcus Garvey: An Annotated Bibliography* (Westport, Conn., 1980).

Garvey, Amy Jacques. *Garvey and Garveyism* (New York, 1978).

Lewis, Rupert and Maureen Warner-Lewis, eds. *Garvey: Africa, Europe, the Americas* (Trenton, N.J., 1994).

Martin, Tony. *Race First: The Ideological and Organizational Struggles of Marcus Garvey and the United Negro Improvement Association* (Dover, Mass., 1986).

Stein, Judith. *The World of Marcus Garvey: Race and Class in Modern Society* (Baton Rouge, Louis., 1986).

Darryl Scriven

GASS, William Howard (1924–)

William Howard Gass was born on 30 July 1924 in Fargo, North Dakota. He received his BA degree in philosophy in 1947 from Kenyon College and his PhD in philosophy from Cornell University in 1953. He studied philosophy of language and wrote his dissertation, "A Philosophical Investigation of Metaphor," with Max BLACK. Ludwig Wittgenstein visited Cornell in 1949, attending a meeting of the Cornell Philosophy Club, and meeting twice with the graduate students in philosophy. Gass calls this "the most important intellectual experience of my life" (1970, p. 248). The influence of Wittgenstein, especially his *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, manifests itself in Gass's emphasis on and celebration of the forms and structures of language in literature and poetry. From 1954 to 1969 Gass taught philosophy at Purdue University. He then was professor of philosophy at Washington University in St. Louis from 1969 to 1999, and appointed David May Distinguished University Professor in Humanities in 1979. He founded and also directed the International Writers Center in St. Louis from 1990 until 2001. Gass has received the Lannan Foundation Lifetime Achievement Award (1997), the National Book Critics Circle Award for Criticism (1985 and 1996), and the Pushcart Prize (1976, 1983, 1987, and 1992).

Gass calls himself a Methodologist, by which he means that he reformulates the traditional aesthetic problems of fiction, such as point of view, character, and theme, as problems of language. A Methodologist thinks of character as "the establishment of linguistic centers to which and from which meanings flow" (1996, p. 51). He or she holds that "thought is constructed out of concepts and interconnections," that "imagination involves the management of metaphor," and that "form is found in the logic of the language" (1996, p. 51). Gass's view of art is formalist: the language of art is not functional or representational, but purely formal. Influenced by the symbolists, especially Paul Valéery, Gass holds that in art, language is transformed from its common use, its instrumental nature in representing thought, to something inherently valuable. A sentence viewed this way is valued for its shape, its sound, and its relationship to other sentences in the rhetorical space of a paragraph. Gass rejects realism in his critical essays and in his fictions. He refers to his stories as anti-narrative and his

essays as anti-expository. In his view a poet is a maker who constructs an aesthetic object and adds it to the world in order for it to become part of someone else's consciousness. Following Immanuel Kant's notion of disinterested interest, Gass views the work of art as having no purpose beyond itself, but instead to be an object for contemplation.

In *Finding a Form* (1996) and elsewhere, Gass develops an aesthetic theory of language. He takes as his departure point the view that a word is a token, an instance of a pure Platonic type. This means that the word the writer uses is a token, a stand-in for the pure word, which is held to be context-invariant. In this view of language, meanings are assigned to type-words and type-sentences, and any two tokens of an unambiguous type-sentence are in turn guaranteed to have the same meaning. Gass seems to reject the type/token doctrine of meaning, claiming that words do not have any such independent life. Instead, they are to be looked upon as foci for relations. Words take on meaning within their contexts, and meanings are also altered by history and use. It is not clear that Gass has rejected the type/token view of language altogether. He returns to it in order to capture the transformations of language from the pure meanings of Platonic forms to the unmistakable imprint of a distinct artistic voice, which he calls "Personalized Token Types" (2002, p. 303). Gass's philosophical interest then, lies not in justifying or rejecting theories of language, but in articulating an aesthetics of poetic language by drawing on theories of the nature of meaning.

The uniqueness of a text, in which the use of language embodies the writer's mind, is for Gass, the ideal of great writing. In works that stand the test of time, words lose their generality, and the tokens are non-synonymous and "cemented in their sentential place" (1996, p. 337). The unmistakable materiality of the token displays an individuality of style in the written language that embodies a uniquely creative imagination. Gass captures the process of making word-tokens non-synonymous or irre-

placeable as the descent from generality of meaning to the specific style of the writer.

For Gass, a book is a "bodied mind" (1996, p. 339). It is a container of consciousness. Gass examines the elements that are combined to create and construct a fictional work, like one would the elements of a building. In the essay "Transformations" (2002) he develops the idea that a book is like a building, both materially, with covers like massive doors, illuminations like windows, and in the case of poetry, containing stanzas or rooms, and experientially. Like a building, a text exists all at once for Gass: ontologically he sees a book as a single conceptual level, where times are collapsed. In order to experience the text, a reader must let herself be taken on a guided tour by the author. Then the poetic consciousness of the writer, who has transformed the "matter" of experience not into an object but into a quality of consciousness, and ordinary language into poetic language, can inhabit the awareness of the reader.

Rainer Maria Rilke influenced Gass's writing about transformations. The cycle of poetic transformations begins in the poet's "inwarding" of matter into mind. Inwarding is not just a process of change; it is specifically a change in the quality of consciousness, an ability to be fully open to experiencing the world. The second transformation takes place in the poet's transforming ordinary, utilitarian language into poetic language. After the transformation of poetic language into a verbal object, which is inserted into the world, there is sometimes another transformation – the translation of a poem into another language, such as Gass's translation of Rilke's poems from German into English.

In *Reading Rilke: Reflections on the Problems of Translation* (1999), Gass formulates a theory of translation embedded in his translations of Rilke's poetry. Translation is not for Gass a form of betrayal, because it has nothing to do with the poet's intentions. Translation is instead a "transreading," a reading of a poem with a recognition of patterns of creative choices, as opposed to mere understanding of what the poem is about. In transreading the translator

realizes why the poet made the formal choices that create the relations between the elements, the verbal movement, the emotions, the meaning, and the music that Gass finds to be at the heart of any art.

Gass has little interest in discussing philosophical views found within a fictional world. His focus is instead on the fundamental structure of the work of art, on a recognition of the formal construction of a fictional world. Reading works that have stood the test of time reveals the structural elements of those works, a "rightness of relations" (2002, p. 115), at the same time as it reveals the experience of a world wherein the heart is also to be found. Gass's philosophical commitment is to an authentic existence of both art and artist, but especially of the work of art.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Fiction and the Figures of Life (Boston, 1970).
On Being Blue (Boston, 1976).
The World within the Word (New York, 1978).
The Habitations of the Word (New York, 1985).
Finding a Form (New York, 1996).
Reading Rilke: Reflections on the Problems of Translation (New York, 1999).
Tests of Time (New York, 2002).

Other Relevant Works
Gass's papers are at Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.
Omensetter's Luck (New York, 1966).
In the Heart of the Heart of the Country (New York, 1968).
Willie Masters' Lonesome Wife (Evanston, Ill., 1968).
The Tunnel (New York, 1995).
Cartesian Sonata (New York, 1998).

Further Reading
Cambridge Dict Amer Bio
Hix, H. L. *Understanding William H. Gass* (Columbia, S.C., 2002).

Holloway, Watson. *William Gass* (Boston, 1990).
Kellman, Steven and Irving Malin. *Into The Tunnel* (Newark, N.J., 1998).
Saltzman, Arthur. *The Fiction of William Gass: The Consolation of Language* (Carbondale, Ill., 1986).

Britt-Marie Schiller

GAUTHIER, David Peter (1932–)

David Gauthier was born on 10 September 1932 in Toronto, Ontario. He received his BA at the University of Toronto in 1954. He then studied at Harvard University, where he received the MA in 1955, and at the University of Oxford where he received the B.Phil. in 1957 and the D.Phil. in 1961, the latter under the supervision of John L. Austin. His main academic positions as professor of philosophy have been at the University of Toronto from 1958 to 1980, and the University of Pittsburgh from 1980 to 2001, where he became Distinguished Service Professor of Philosophy. He also held visiting professorships and research appointments at a number of institutions including University of California at Los Angeles; University of California at Berkeley; Princeton University; Australian National University; All Souls College, Oxford; and École Polytechnique in Paris. Gauthier became a fellow of the Royal Society of Canada in 1979.

Gauthier's career has for the most part been confined to the academic world, but he has also had a keen interest in politics, in which he was active early in his career. He was executive member of various political and pressure groups including: the Toronto Committee for Disarmament; the Committee of Concern for South Africa; the Canadian Civil Liberties Association; and the Committee for an

Independent Canada. In 1962 he was a candidate for election to the Canadian House of Commons.

Gauthier's main contributions to philosophy have been in ethics and moral theory, the theory of practical rationality and the formal theory of rational choice, political philosophy, and the interpretation of early modern moral and political philosophy, especially Hobbes and Rousseau. He was one of the principal theorists – with the philosopher John RAWLS and economist James BUCHANAN – responsible for the revival of contractarian theory, and was one of the first philosophers to introduce decision and game theory to moral theory. He has written widely in political theory and on a number of topics in politics, including secession, nuclear deterrence, democracy, and public reason. He is also the author of a number of important essays on the work of contemporary philosophers, such as Rawls, Kurt BAIER, George GRANT, Amartya SEN, John HARSANYI, and T. M. Scanlon.

Gauthier's writings on these diverse topics are, for the most part, connected. From his earliest work he has been preoccupied by the question of the rationality of morality – what reasons do we have to be moral? – and his interest in this question frames his conception of ethics. Gauthier's identification of morality with principles and constraints, his conception of them as conditional on the compliance of others, and his account of their specific content are all shaped by his concern with the rationality of morals. Over several decades he developed a contractarian account of morality which sought to establish both the principles of morality and the rationality of acting in accordance with them. Teaching seventeenth and eighteenth-century moral and political philosophy in the late 1950s and early 1960s, Gauthier came to appreciate Hobbes's thought, and the first of his many writings on Hobbes, *The Logic of Leviathan*, appeared in 1969. In the late 1960s, while a visiting professor at UCLA, he was introduced by Howard Sobel to game theory and to the Prisoner's Dilemma.

Hobbesian moral and political theory and contemporary game theory have been important influences on Gauthier's thought, even if he has, in recent decades, moved away from many aspects associated with both traditions.

The most complete statement of his moral theory is given in *Morals by Agreement* (1986). He has modified his views in a number of respects since writing this book. Some of his earlier essays, collected in *Moral Dealing* (1990), provide an easier and more accessible entry into his thought, and some modifications of his theory are introduced in later essays. The questions taken up in many of his writings on Hobbes and Hume are relevant to understanding his moral theory. Gauthier's interest in Rousseau, especially his psychological and biographical writings, are not necessarily those one would expect from the creator of *Morals by Agreement*. Several of his essays on Rousseau, along with some early essays, may be seen as exploratory self-critiques.

Gauthier's *Morals by Agreement* is a theory about the nature and rationality of morality. We may usefully think of the theory as having several parts or elements. The first is an account of the human condition, giving the aim of practical reason, the natural condition of humankind, the function of constraints on action. Next is an account of the principles of conduct that rational agents would hypothetically agree to: a kind of social contract. The third element is a revisionist account of practical rationality essential to the argument aiming to show that virtually everyone, under normal circumstances, has reason to accept and to abide by the constraints imposed by these principles. Last, Gauthier argues that the principles in question are principles of morality. Much of the interest of the theory turns on the details of the account – most of which are innovative and original. But it is important not to lose sight of the aim and general structure of the theory. Gauthier aims to understand morality and to ascertain our reasons to be moral, and this he proposes to do by an argument which takes us from a particular account of the

human condition to a conception of moral principles, emerging from hypothetical agreement to a conception of rationality, according to which we have reason to be moral in the conditions in which we typically find ourselves. The structures of the overall argument, as well as its ambitions, are important in order to avoid some common misunderstandings of the theory.

Gauthier follows Hobbes, Hume, and many others in thinking that humans characteristically find themselves in "the circumstances of justice." The phrase is from Rawls – who borrows from Hume and H. L. A. Hart, a summary account of the conditions in which humans typically benefit from cooperation. These circumstances consist principally in scarcity, relative to our needs and wants, our self-bias, and our tendency to favor ourselves and those close to us over others. Cooperation in these circumstances is mutually beneficial, and it is made possible by our capacity to constrain our self-seeking behavior by adhering to just principles of action. In *Morals by Agreement* Gauthier uses the neoclassical economic theory of perfectly competitive markets to illustrate his conception of the rationale for moral constraints. In a perfectly competitive market – the highly idealized markets of certain branches of neoclassical theory – all agents are rational and self-interested, and all exchanges are mutually beneficial (or Pareto-improving). In these markets, there is no way of rearranging things so as to improve the situation of some without making others worse off. The outcome of perfect competition is a Nash equilibrium, Pareto-efficient, and in the core. In such a world there is no place, no need, for mutually beneficial principles of action; individual rational choice, through trade, secures all of the benefits available. In real markets, of course, there are public goods and externalities, for example, clean air, congestion, and many opportunities for mutually beneficial cooperation. But Gauthier's purpose in referring to perfectly competitive markets is first to give an example of a world, even if largely hypothetical, where there would be no need for a rational morality, and secondly to have us think of moral principles as designed to resolve externalities and other "market failures." Given that markets typically presuppose the existence of a number of constraints on self-seeking behavior – for instance, a regime of property rights – it is not clear what are, if any, the policy implications of Gauthier's account of a perfectly competitive interaction. The book seems to illustrate the theoretical possibility of a "morally free zone," one in which the constraints of morality would have no place, a kind of "moral anarchy."

In *Morals by Agreement* Gauthier defends a subjectivist and instrumentalist conception of practical rationality, according to which we are rational to the extent that our acts maximize the satisfaction of our considered preferences. Rationality, in this view, is purely instrumental; no particular ends are rationally required. In his more recent thinking Gauthier has moved away from the subjectivism of this account. It is not necessary for the conclusions that he wishes to defend about morals; the assumption he needs is that human reasons for action are characteristically agent-relative, in that something being a reason for one person does not entail it being a reason for others. Gauthier's early subjectivist account entails this agent-relativity, but it is not *necessary* for it. The presentation of the theory also presupposes that agents considering the terms of interaction with others reason from the perspective of their own interests – the assumption of "non-tuism." But this assumption is not essential to the theory either, and Gauthier has moved away from it.

Gauthier argues that agents in the circumstances of justice have reason to constrain their behavior by accepting and adhering to mutually advantageous and fair principles of action conditional on the compliance of others. To determine what they are, he considers the principles that suitably characterized rational agents would choose were they to consider the question. Unlike Rawls and others, he imposes

no "veil of ignorance," and does not deprive his hypothetical contractors of knowledge of who they are and where they find themselves. And, again unlike Rawls and others, he represents the hypothetical choice situation as a collective bargain. The principles selected represent a compromise, each person making a concession from their maximal claim. The principles selected govern the distribution of benefits and burdens amongst a set of cooperators; they determine the distribution of the cooperative or social surplus, the gains that cooperation make possible. So the talents and assets that are prior to, or independent of, social cooperation – our natural assets – are not subject to redistribution as they are in Rawls's theory. The fact that some bring more, as it were, to the bargaining table than others – they are more talented or fortunate – does not imply that others must be compensated for their lesser natural assets. Distributive justice is concerned with the cooperative or social surplus.

Gauthier relies on bargaining theory, part of the theory of games, to determine the principle of distribution that rational agents would select. He defends a principle of minimax-relative concession, which says that the maximum relative concession that anyone must make should be minimal, where relative concession is measured by an individual's maximal and minimal claims to the cooperative surplus. The principle says that no one may receive a relative benefit smaller than necessary. Under certain conditions, it requires equal relative concessions. The principle does not require interpersonal comparisons of utility; rather, it would have us look at an interpersonal comparison of the proportion of each person's potential gain from cooperation that must be conceded. Gauthier's principle is similar to the solution to the two-person bargaining problem, axiomatized by Ehud Kalai and Meir Smorodinsky. Most game theorists find the traditional solution developed by John NASH more plausible, and Gauthier himself has come to favor it over his earlier position. This change of mind undercuts the argument offered in *Morals by Agreement*

for the principle of minimax-relative concession, and it is unclear whether an argument for it can still be made.

Gauthier's principle of minimax-relative concessions is, in fact, only one part of what can be identified as the second element of his contractarian theory. He also develops an account of the initial bargaining position, one which is highly original and which makes it clear that his theory is, only in part, a Hobbesian one. Gauthier argues that rational agents interacting in a pre-moral state would come to accept certain principles that and, these constrain the baseline or status quo point for the application of the distributive minimax-relative concession principle. His account here is "Lockean" in appearance and has features similar to Robert NOZICK's conception of basic rights. But Gauthier, inspired by Buchanan's two-stage contractarian political theory, developed in the latter's *Limits of Liberty*, constructs a conventionalist argument different from the natural law foundation of Lockean theorists. Gauthier argues that rational agents, in a pre-moral state, would constrain their interactions by "a Lockean proviso" which prohibits bettering one's situation through interactions which worsen the situation of another. Imagine that you come to a river and find a bridge which you may cross provided you pay the builder a small fee. Imagine, also, coming to a mountain pass which someone prohibits you from crossing without paying a small fee. Consider the options you would have faced had neither the bridge-builder nor the mountain pass toll-collector existed; in the first case, there would be no bridge for you to use, but, in the second, the pass would still exist. These simple examples illustrate the counterfactual test offered by the proviso; the mountain pass toll-collector violates the proviso in charging you a fee, but the bridge-builder does not.

Gauthier uses the proviso to develop an argument for the emergence of limited rights, or semi-natural rights, which protect each person's exercise of their own powers. Individuals, prior to agreeing to be governed by a minimax-

relative concession or other principle, acquire a right to their natural assets and the fruits of their labor. These rights are limited, in certain respects, but they constrain the application of minimax-relative concession. The latter is applied to an initial bargaining situation in which agents have these rights. Gauthier's account and argument is remarkable in that he provides, in effect, a prospective, conventionalist case for rights and duties that many have thought presupposes a natural law framework.

Gauthier's moral theory presented thus far offers an account of the nature and the content of morality – what morality asks of us and why. It does not yet establish that we have reason to comply with the demands of morality. Justice often requires that we act in ways contrary to our interests or aims – we may not steal, cheat or break our word, when this would prove advantageous to us or to the causes we defend. As many thinkers from Plato to Philippa FOOT have noted, it often pays to be unjust. Gauthier's response to this fact, and the problems it poses for the kind of account he develops, is to argue that we misconceive practical rationality, even instrumental rationality, if we think the aim of rationality determines, in any straightforward way, the manner in which we should reason or deliberate. The aim of rationality is to do as well as possible, but it does not necessarily determine our principle of decision; for instance, to choose the best alternative at each moment of choice. In terms of the utility-maximizing conception of rationality, which he has accepted until recently, Gauthier argues that the aim of maximizing utility does not mean that we should, *at each decision point*, maximize utility. Instead we should reason in ways which are utility-maximizing. Just as it is sometimes the case that we do best, or at least well, by not aiming to do best or well, so it may sometimes be that the utility-maximizing course of action is not to maximize utility at each decision point. The point can be expressed and developed without presupposing a utility-maximizing or any particular account of rationality. Given that our mode of reasoning, or deliberation itself, affects our prospects, our aims or purposes are sometimes best served by our not seeking to do best at every decision point.

Gauthier's discussion in *Morals by Agreement* is conducted in terms of "dispositions to choose" and, specifically, of "constrained maximization," the disposition to cooperate with other cooperators even in circumstances where defecting is more advantageous. In his later work Gauthier develops his revisionist account of practical rationality, in terms of rational plans and intentions and of modes of deliberation. If we grant that agents may do better, in any number of circumstances, by acting in ways that are not straightforwardly maximizing, the problem is to determine how acting as a constrained maximizer is rational. In *Morals by Agreement*, Gauthier assumes that if our dispositions to choose are rational, then our choices determined by these dispositions are also rational. A number of theorists have followed Thomas Schelling in arguing that it is often rational to do things that are irrational, but they argue that the latter do not, in some circumstances, cease being irrational. Gauthier thinks that if a course of action is better than any other in its effects, then it may, under certain conditions, be rational to adopt it, and to intend to carry it out even if some of its effects are not, from the standpoint of the moment of execution, the best thing to do in terms of one's aims or purposes. He seeks, therefore, to establish that if a mode of deliberation, or a plan of action, is rational, then acting according to it can be rational, even if so acting requires doing things that are not optimal, considered from the standpoint of the moment of action.

Principled action constrains one's action, and it is rational to be so constrained. Thus, if Gauthier is right, it can be rational to abide by certain norms or principles, even when they require acting in ways that are not best from the standpoint of the time of action. Much of Gauthier's work since *Morals by Agreement*

has sought to develop, and to defend, his revisionist account of practical rationality. Some of his later essays compare his account to those of Edward McClennen and Michael Bratman and address the arguments of critics. If all Gauthier were to establish – and it would be no small feat – was that we have reason to accept and to abide by certain principles of cooperation, then he would not have shown that we have reason to be moral. The last element of his theory is an argument, interspersed throughout *Morals by Agreement*, identifying various principles and dispositions as moral. His argument is, in effect, a functional one: the principles and dispositions in question resemble familiar moral ones in important respects. Impartiality seems, to him, to be a defining feature of morality, and it is central to the argument he makes for identifying the principles derived from rational interaction and bargaining, with those of morality.

From an account of the human condition and the circumstances of justice, Gauthier develops a theory of the principles that rational agents would hypothetically agree to, and a revisionist account of practical rationality which would establish the rationality of "principled" behavior. Lastly, he argues that these principles and dispositions to choose should be identified as moral. His theory has been the object of intense critical examination, and each part of the account has been criticized. Many contemporary moralists reject his starting point, the account of the circumstances of justice. They think that justice speaks, even outside of the context of potential cooperation. In Gauthier's view, there is no room for moral constraint outside of the context of mutual benefit. Even if one relaxes the assumption of mutual disinterest or non-tuism, there may be some apparent moral obligations that have no place in a Hobbesian or Humean framework, for example duties to the infirm or unproductive, to nonhuman animals. And left-leaning egalitarians will remain dissatisfied with the restricted scope of distributive justice on Gauthier's account. Many philosophers and decision theorists have quarreled with aspects of Gauthier's contractarian derivation of principles, some favoring other principles, others the alternative Rawlsian conception of a hypothetical social contract. Gauthier's revisionist account of practical reason is widely viewed as implausible, both by thinkers influenced by decision-theoretic or economic conceptions of rational choice and by traditional philosophers. Lastly, some have quarreled with Gauthier's identification of principles of rational cooperation as moral. Some of these criticisms may rest on misunderstandings of the theory. But others do not. There are many details of the account that may not be right, as Gauthier himself has argued in later essays. The widespread rejection of the revisionist account of rationality is striking. It is also puzzling, as one might think that any moral theorist hoping to establish the rationality of moral action would need an account of reasons like Gauthier's that would allow for counter-preferential or principled choice. In this regard, it is odd that neo-Kantianism, now dominant in contemporary American thought, has abandoned the attempt to establish the rationality of morals, seeking only to secure the accord of "reasonable" people.

Gauthier's other writings, especially those on important early modern thinkers such as Hobbes, Locke, Hume, Rousseau, and Kant, are important contributions to philosophy, independent of the merits of his moral theory. They establish that his concerns, his aims and, to some extent, his style, while contemporary in many respects, are also similar to past thinkers. He writes, in the opening page of *Morals by Agreement*, "What theory of morals … can ever serve any useful purpose, unless it can show that all the duties it recommends are also truly endorsed in each individual's reason?" This is a thought that, presumably, would elicit not only Hobbes's assent, but also that of Plato, Kant, and many others.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Practical Reasoning: The Structure and Foundations of Prudential and Moral Arguments and Their Exemplification in Discourse (Oxford, 1963).

The Logic of Leviathan: The Moral and Political Theory of Thomas Hobbes (Oxford, 1969).

Morals by Agreement (Oxford, 1986).

Moral Dealing: Contract, Ethics, and Reason (Ithaca, N.Y., 1990).

The Social and the Solitary (Cambridge, UK, 2004).

Other Relevant Works

"Morality and Advantage," *Philosophical Review* 76 (1967): 460–75.

Ed., *Morality and Rational Self-Interest* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1970).

Ed. with Robert Sugden, *Rationality, Justice, and the Social Contract: Themes from Morals by Agreement* (New York and London, 1993).

"Assure and Threaten," *Ethics* 104 (1994): 690–721.

"Public Reason," *Social Philosophy and Policy* 12 (1994): 19–42.

"Commitment and Choice: An Essay on the Rationality of Plans," in *Ethics, Rationality, and Economic Behaviour*, ed. F. Farina, F. Hahn, and S. Vannucci (Oxford, 1996), pp. 217–43.

"Political Contractarianism," *Journal of Political Philosophy* 5 (1997): 132–48.

"Intention and Deliberation," in *Modeling Rationality, Morality, and Evolution*, ed. P. Danielson (Oxford, 1998), pp. 41–54.

"Rethinking the Toxin Puzzle," in *Rational Commitment and Social Justice: Essays for Gregory Kavka*, ed. J. Coleman and C. Morris (Cambridge, UK, 1998), pp. 47–58.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Oxford Comp Phil*

Boucher, David, and Paul Kelly, eds. *The Social Contract from Hobbes to Rawls* (London and New York, 1994).

Danielson, Peter. *Modeling Rationality, Morality, and Evolution* (Oxford, 1998).

Kraus, Jody S. *The Limits of Hobbesian Contractarianism* (Cambridge, UK, 1993).

Lessnoff, Michael, ed. *Social Contract Theory* (New York, 1990).

Morris, Christopher W. "A Contractarian Account of Moral Justification," in *Moral Knowledge? New Readings in Moral Epistemology*, ed. W. Sinnott-Armstrong and M. Timmons (Oxford, 1996), pp. 215–42.

Morris, Christopher W., and Arthur Ripstein, eds. *Practical Rationality and Preference: Essays for David Gauthier* (Cambridge, UK, 2001).

Paul, Ellen, et al., eds. *The New Social Contract: Essays on Gauthier* (Oxford, 1988).

Ridge, Michael. "Hobbesian Public Reason," *Ethics* 108 (1998): 538–68.

Vallentyne, Peter, ed. *Contractarianism and Rational Choice* (Cambridge, UK, 1991).

Christopher W. Morris

GAYLEY, Charles Mills (1858–1932)

Charles Mills Gayley was born in Shanghai, China, on 22 February 1858. The son of Irish-American missionaries, he was educated in London and Ireland, and moved to Ann Arbor, Michigan with his great-uncle in 1875, where he attended the University of Michigan (BA 1878). Two years after graduating he returned to his alma mater to teach Latin. He subsequently took a leave of absence to pursue postgraduate study for a year at German universities, where he acquired an affinity for the *kulturhistorische* method that was becoming increasingly popular in Germany at the time. His training culminated in an interest in applying an understanding of historical and cultural trends to literary analysis. Upon his return to Michigan, Gayley was charged with improving the university's ailing freshman and sophomore English classes. His success at this task prompted an offer in 1889 from the

University of California at Berkeley to become the head of its English department. Under his guidance, Berkeley had one of the leading English departments in the country. Gayley retired in 1923, and died on 25 July 1932 in Berkeley, California.

Gayley's first major work was his most successful. *The Classic Myths in English Literature* (1893) began as an adaptation of Bulfinch's *Age of Fable*. He wrote this textbook to accord with his view that an appreciation of English poetry required familiarity with Norse and other Germanic myths, in addition to those of Greek and Roman origin. Six years later he published *An Introduction to the Methods and Materials of Literary Criticism* (1899), which was widely adopted as an introductory text, in part because of its systematic treatment not only of materials and methods, but also of aesthetics and comparative literature. Gayley agreed with H. M. Posnett, Ludwig Jacobowski, and C. J. Letourneau in the view that aesthetic theory must be substantiated by scientific investigation, and in advocating a more systematic comparative approach to the study of literature, including an analysis of the earlier and less well-documented stages of its evolution. Though this position initially met with sharp criticism, it was soon vindicated by the work of Francis Gummere, J. A. Macculloch, and Ezra POUND, among others.

The work that Gayley considered his greatest contribution was *Representative English Comedies*, a four-volume set of which he was chief editor. The project, which spanned nearly forty years, was an attempt to document the history of English comedy by means of illustrative examples. The significance of this publication lay not merely in the unearthing and systematization of many previously obscure writings, but also in Gayley's general introductions to each volume, which together amount to almost three hundred pages.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Classic Myths in English Literature and in Art (Boston, 1893; 2nd edn 1911).

An Introduction to the Methods and Materials of Literary Criticism, vol. 1: The Bases in Aesthetics and Poetics, with Fred Newton Scott (Boston, 1899).
"What is Comparative Literature?" *Atlantic Monthly* 92 (1903): 56–68.
"The Development of Literary Studies during the Nineteenth Century," in *Congress of Arts and Science*, vol. 3, ed. Howard J. Rogers (Boston, 1906), pp. 323–53.
Plays of Our Forefathers, and Some of the Traditions Upon Which They Were Founded (New York, 1907; 2nd edn 1968).

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *Representative English Comedies, with Introductory Essays and Notes: An Historical View of Our Earlier Comedy, and Other Monographs by Various Writers*, 4 vols (New York, 1903–36).

Further Reading
Nat Cycl Amer Bio v23, Who Was Who in Amer v1
Hart, Walter M., et al., eds. *The Charles Mills Gayley Anniversary Papers: Contributed by Former Students of Professor Gayley* (Berkeley, Cal., 1922).
Kurtz, Benjamin P. *Charles Mills Gayley* (Berkeley, Cal., 1943).

Evan Moreno-Davis

GEERTZ, Clifford James (1926–)

Clifford Geertz was born on 23 August 1926 in San Francisco, California. After moving to a small town in northern California, his formal education began in a rural two-room schoolhouse. At the age of seventeen he enlisted in the US Navy. With the end of World War II, he attended Antioch College in Ohio, where he

initially majored in English before graduating in 1950 with a BA in philosophy. On the advice of an esteemed philosophy professor, Geertz and his new wife Hildred turned to cultural anthropology and graduate studies in the social relations department at Harvard University. This newly founded interdisciplinary department included such important scholars as anthropologists Clyde Kluckhohn, David Schneider, and George Homans, and sociologist Talcott PARSONS. He completed ethnographic fieldwork in Indonesia and received his PhD in social relations in 1956. Geertz was a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences in Stanford, California in 1958–9.

From 1958 to 1960 Geertz was assistant professor of anthropology at the University of California at Berkeley. In 1960 he went to the University of Chicago, rising to full professor of anthropology by 1964. In 1970 he was invited to become professor of social science and establish a new social science program at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, New Jersey. At about the same time he authored *The Interpretation of Cultures* (1973), a seminal collection of essays that established Geertz as a founder, along with Schneider and Victor Turner, of "symbolic" or "interpretive" anthropology. In 1982 Geertz was named Harold F. Linder Professor of Social Science, and he held that title until retiring in 2000. Geertz also was a Senior Research Career Fellow of the National Institute of Mental Health from 1964 to 1970; a visiting professor of history at Princeton University from 1975 to 2000, and the Eastman Professor at Oxford University in 1978–9. He has received numerous honorary doctorates and scholarly awards, and is a fellow of both the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the British Academy.

Geertz is regarded as one of the preeminent anthropological theoreticians of the twentieth century. His influence extends well beyond anthropology to disciplines such as philosophy, sociology, and history. His elegantly written essays also appeal to lay readers on a scale not seen in anthropology since the days of Margaret MEAD.

Interpretive anthropology focuses on the symbolic component of human interaction. Inspired by Ludwig Wittgenstein, Geertz argued that symbols are not enigmas housed in the private mind, but instead are clearly observable in human societies. Even daily interaction in normal public settings contains metaphoric content potentially expressive of a people's world view and ethos. Quoting Gilbert Ryle, Geertz identified the anthropologist's goal as "thick description," whereby the underlying significance of social interaction and behavior is sorted out, and its deeper symbolic meanings elucidated. He famously illustrated the approach in his essay "Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight" (1971). Here he used an apparently mundane competition – highly valued by villagers but outlawed by the Indonesian state – to explore local Balinese conceptualizations of self, sociality, and social status. In this and other studies, Geertz deserves credit for introducing a generation of anthropologists to the views of Ryle, Wittgenstein, Kenneth BURKE, and other little-appreciated philosophers.

Critics cite Geertz's prescribed method of "reading" culture as a "text" to argue that his conception of culture is overly reified, too bounded, and not sufficiently dynamic. His approach, they add, neglects social stratification or how inequality influences cultural production. Proponents counter by pointing to Geertz's use of ideology rather than culture, to explain the impact of stratification on colonized societies.

Geertz influenced to varying degrees a later generation of postmodern scholars, although for Geertz, culture always remained more real than most postmodernists would concede. His task was to identify and describe culture, even if we could never objectively know it. In doing so, he reinvigorated the study of culture as meaning.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Ritual and Social Change: A Javanese Example," *American Anthropologist* 59 (1957): 32–54.

"Form and Variation in Balinese Village Structure," *American Anthropologist* 61 (1959): 991–1012.

The Religion of Java (Glencoe, Ill., 1960).

"The Javanese Kijaji: The Changing Role of a Cultural Broker," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 2 (1960): 228–49.

Agricultural Involution, the Processes of Ecological Change in Indonesia (Berkeley, Cal., 1963).

Peddlers and Princes (Chicago, 1963).

"Ideology as a Cultural System," in *Ideology and Discontent*, ed. D. Apter (New York, 1964), pp. 47–76.

The Social History of an Indonesian Town (Cambridge, Mass., 1965).

Islam Observed: Religious Development in Morocco and Indonesia (New Haven, Conn., 1968).

"Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight," *Daedalus* 101 (Winter 1971): 1–38.

The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays (New York, 1973).

Kinship in Bali, with Hildred Geertz (Chicago, 1975).

Meaning and Order in Moroccan Society, with Hildred Geertz and Lawrence Rosen (New York, 1979).

Negara: The Theatre State in Nineteenth-Century Bali (Princeton, N.J., 1980).

Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology (New York, 1983).

"Anti Anti-Relativism," *American Anthropologist* 86 (1984): 263–78.

Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author (Stanford, Cal., 1988).

After the Fact: Two Countries, Four Decades, One Anthropologist (Cambridge, Mass., 1995).

Available Light: Anthropological Reflections on Philosophical Topics (Princeton, N.J., 2000).

Other Relevant Works

"On the Nature of Anthropological Understanding," *American Scientist* 63 (1975): 47–53.

"The Way We Think Now: Toward an Ethnography of Modern Thought," *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 35 (1982): 14–34.

"History and Anthropology," *New Literary History* 21 (1990): 321–35.

"Blurred Genres: The Refiguration of Social Thought," *The American Scholar* 49 (1980): 165–79.

"The Social Scientist as Author: Clifford Geertz on Ethnography and Social Construction," interview with Gary Olson, *Journal of Advanced Composition* 11 (1991): 245–68.

"An Interview with Clifford Geertz," interview with Richard Handler, *Current Anthropology* 32 (1991): 603–13.

Further Reading

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, *Comp Amer Thought*

Inglis, Fred. *Clifford Geertz: Culture, Custom and Ethics* (Malden, Mass., 2000).

Ortner, Sherry B. "Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26 (1984): 126–66.

Ortner, Sherry B., ed. *The Fate of "Culture": Geertz and Beyond* (Berkeley, Cal., 1999).

Stephen M. Perkins

GENDLIN, Eugene T (1926–)

Born on 25 December 1926 in Vienna, Austria, Eugene Gendlin emigrated to the United States with his family in 1939, and later added the 'T' to his name for style. He attended the University of Chicago, working with psychologist Carl Rogers, and after passing exams went directly

into the graduate program. He received his MA in 1950 and PhD in philosophy in 1958 from the University of Chicago. The title of his dissertation was "The Function of Experiencing in Symbolization." Gendlin was a professor of both philosophy and psychology at the University of Chicago, where he taught from 1963 until his retirement in 1995. He is also a practicing psychotherapist. Gendlin has been honored several times by the American Psychological Association for his development of Experiential Psychotherapy, including being presented with the first Distinguished Professional Psychologist of the Year award. He was a founder and editor of the journal *Psychotherapy: Theory Research and Practice.*

Gendlin's work is influenced by the lingering pragmatism of the Chicago school, transmitted through his teacher Richard MCKEON, and also by the philosophy of Wilhelm Dilthey. Gendlin's approach is akin to phenomenology in directly accessing lived experience, which he characterizes as an open-ended felt intricacy rather than a primarily cognitive–perceptual representation of a determinate world. He proposes a non-dual ontology featuring intricate pre-thematic life-interactions, irreducible to static patterns, within a non-arbitrarily "responsive" reality, irreducible to any single account. He develops a radically embodied epistemology, explicates many types of relationships between language and experiential intricacy, and suggests an intrinsic experiential social ethics.

Gendlin's leading notion of a situational body-sense refers not merely to an anatomical body, but to a self-sentient body from which language emerges as a power of meaning-making (rather than a repertory of pre-packaged meanings). This power can interact with the implicit intricacy of a felt situation in such a way as to let words come that work freshly to carry the situation forward – not replacing, exhausting, or freezing its intricacy, but transforming it and readying it for further shifts. This non-arbitrary carrying-forward is crucial in psychotherapy, creative process, and especially philoso-

phy. It allows us to transcend available assumptions and models and study each new step of formulation in the act, noticing how it lifts out exactly this or that from the greater experiential intricacy. Dipping into the initially inchoate bodily felt sense of a complex situation and "speaking-*from*" it rather than from known schemata can allow genuinely new steps forward, especially where routine forms fail (be they concepts, theories, social behaviors, etc.).

Gendlin emphasizes that what is new in his philosophy cannot be said unless the words change their meaning as they work newly in their sentences. Indeed, the notion of words "working newly" is not only one of his basic themes, but "is an example of itself" (to cite another key formulation): studying how words work requires understanding both "words" and "working" in a particular way. His writings accordingly resist summary because they shift the tradition itself. His work is a major original philosophy; his *Process Model* provides many specific concepts in science and psychotherapy; and the practical applications of his philosophy in *Focusing* are recognized worldwide. However, the ethical–political import of his insistence on the integrity of felt, situational bodily experiencing, in its articulable intricacy, uncancelable concreteness, and precisely textured implying, has yet to be fully appreciated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Experiencing and the Creation of Meaning (New York, 1962; Evanston, Ill., 1997).
Focusing (New York, 1978; 2nd edn 1981).
Focusing-Oriented Psychotherapy: A Manual of the Experiential Method (New York, 1996).

Other Relevant Works
"Experiential Phenomenology," in *Phenomenology and the Social Sciences,* vol. 1, ed. Maurice Natanson (Evanston, Ill., 1973), pp. 281–319.
"*Befindlichkeit*: Heidegger and the Philosophy of Psychology," *Review of*

Existential Psychology and Psychiatry 16 (1978–9): 43–71.

"A Philosophical Critique of the Concept of Narcissism," in *Pathologies of the Modern Self,* ed. David M. Levin (New York, 1987), pp. 251–304.

"Phenomenology as Non-logical Steps," in *America Phenomenology: Origins and Developments*, ed. Eugene F. Kaelin and Calvin O. Schrag (Dordrecht, 1989), pp. 212–15.

"Thinking Beyond Patterns: Body, Language, and Situations," in *The Presence of Feeling in Thought,* ed. B. den Ouden and M. Moen (New York, 1991), pp. 21–151.

"The Responsive Order: A New Empiricism," *Man and World* 30 (1997): 383–411.

Further Reading

Depestele, Frans. "Primary Bibliography of Eugene Gendlin," *Gesprächspsychotherapie und personzentrierte Beratung* 31 (2000): 104–14.

Levin, David M., ed. *Language Beyond Postmodernism: Saying and Thinking in Gendlin's Philosophy* (Evanston, Ill., 1997). Contains Gendlin's replies.

Shea, John J. *Religious Experiencing: William James and Eugene Gendlin* (Lanham, Md., 1987).

Elizabeth A. Behnke

GEORGE, Henry (1839–97)

Henry George was born on 2 September 1839 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and died on 29 October 1897 in New York City. The relatively short distance between these two cities hides the fact that George traveled extensively, having shipped out as a cabin boy at the age of sixteen for a voyage around the world. From a subsequent voyage around Cape Horn, he disembarked in San Francisco and, after failing to strike it rich in the gold fields of the Frazier River in Canada, he spent considerable time in the new state of California. Between his two voyages, George learned the printing trade in Philadelphia and, in California, worked as a printer and newspaper reporter. George's California experiences had a profound effect in shaping his ideas on land and its role in the economy.

These travels provided the foundation for George's self-education and led him to his major thesis that land was the critical resource in causing income inequality and should provide the basis for alleviating the resulting poverty. This self-education, so crucial to the development of George's ideas, was also the source of his rejection by the traditional academic community that challenged his credentials as an economist and social philosopher. George received heavy criticism from a leading American economist, Francis Amasa Walker, and the legendary British economist, Alfred Marshall. However, for the most part, he was ignored by the academic economists. With a formal education that stopped at seventh grade, George hardly qualified for a university faculty appointment. In his biography of his father, his son Henry George Jr. reported that the title of "Professor" was the only title his father would have cherished. At the time of an 1877 lecture at the University of California at Berkeley there was speculation that the university would establish a chair in political economy and George would be named to it. To his great disappointment, however, that did not occur.

In his travels, George observed a contradiction between the enormous wealth created by industrialization and growing levels of poverty among the working classes. But it was the land use and land policies of California that spurred George to find an answer as to the cause of this contradiction. His observations crystallized in 1871 with the publication of a pamphlet entitled "Our Land and Land Policy, National and State" in which he closely examined

California's land and railroad monopolies. In this pamphlet, George proposed the single tax on land as the fiscal remedy for poverty. Further refinement of his thinking on the subject ultimately led to his masterwork, *Progress and Poverty*. The latter volume was originally self-published in 1879 but shortly thereafter found a major New York City publisher, Appleton & Co.

The observations from his extensive travels stimulated George to read and comprehend the classical literature of economics which provided the context for *Progress and Poverty*. This, however, was not enough for his critics in the academy who always considered him an outsider despite the fact that *Progress and Poverty* was an international best-seller that was estimated to have sold over two million copies in George's lifetime. *Progress and Poverty* as well as all George's other books remains in print through the efforts of the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation. The Foundation was formed in 1925 and expressly created "to teach, expound and propagate" the ideas of Henry George.

In seeking to explain the poverty of the working classes, George addressed the distribution of income among labor, land, and capital. George found the wages-fund theory of the classical economists totally inadequate as an explanation for the share of income going to labor. To George, it was the monopolization of land ownership and land speculation in industrial societies that were the root causes of poverty and the economic fluctuations that tormented the lives of the impoverished working classes. The poor were precluded from access to productive land and relegated to low-paying jobs in the urban centers of industrializing nations. They were also subjected to the deleterious effects of the business cycle which, in George's view, was precipitated by the periodic collapse of speculative land values. This situation subsequently led to the working classes living in substandard conditions that were the breeding ground for the many social problems of the urban ghettos. The poor were

denied the means by which they could benefit from the wealth creation of the industrial age. This, he reasoned, led to the coexistence of great poverty in the midst of great wealth.

In the tradition of the physiocrats and David Ricardo, George argued that the high returns resulting from monopoly land ownership and its accompanying speculation was an "unearned increment." The increasing value of land was due, not to the efforts of the owners, but to progress of society. Though earlier theories had focused on the rent of farmland, George generalized his theory to urban land as well. He saw this unearned increment as the source of municipal revenues that could and should be used for the betterment of the poor when directed to services such as education, health care, transportation and other aspects of the urban infrastructure. Thus was the origin of the "single tax" theory of municipal finance associated with Henry George. George and his followers argued that all taxes on the productive efforts of labor and capital ought to be eliminated as both inefficient and unjust. The elimination of these taxes would remove a major obstacle to work and investment. A tax on land value, which was socially determined, could not be evaded and the revenues could be dedicated to providing services that would benefit the poor. The supply of land, which is determined by nature, would not be changed by such a tax. George defined land very broadly to encompass not only the surface of the earth but "all natural materials, forces, and opportunities."

The ideas introduced in *Progress and Poverty* were further developed and advocated in several books, newspaper articles, pamphlets, and speeches. He produced subsequent volumes on the land question, social issues, and free trade as well as a text that integrated his thinking on economics. However, George was not content to leave his positions on the printed page and actively promoted them on both sides of the Atlantic. He was a very popular speaker, especially among the working classes, and he took his mission for economic

justice to all corners of the globe. In the British Isles, he visited Ireland and addressed the Irish land question, a highly sensitive political issue. George subsequently visited England and served as an advisor to the British government on land reform issues. As a teen, George had stopped in Australia on his first voyage around the world. In 1889, at the height of his popularity, an invitation to return led to an Australian trip in the following year. To this day, there is a well-established Georgist movement in Australia. In the United States, he made two runs for mayor of New York City. His second-place finish, ahead of Theodore Roosevelt, in the campaign of 1886 is a well-documented political story. George died near the end of the 1897 mayoral campaign.

The single tax policy advocated by George had some very famous supporters in the early part of the twentieth century such as Leo Tolstoy, John DEWEY, Sun Yat Sen, and George Bernard Shaw. It also faced serious criticisms from mainstream economists such as Alfred Marshall and Francis Walker. George's position on land was labeled as socialist, communist, and Marxist by some. Those who accused George of socialism failed to grasp the distinction between the private ownership of land, which George unequivocally supported, and the public appropriation of socially determined land rent through the single tax. George and some of his supporters, most notably the Reverend Edward McGlynn, even ran afoul of the Roman Catholic Church which misinterpreted George's position as a socialist attack on private property. McGlynn was even excommunicated, though that sanction was rescinded a few years later. George, in *The Condition of Labor*, was openly critical of Pope Leo XIII's encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*, which he believed was a veiled attack on his ideas on land and taxation.

Other critics argued that George's fiscal remedy for poverty, the single tax, was incapable of providing adequate public revenue. This became a much more significant criticism in the twentieth century when the govern-ment's role in the economy expanded at all levels. Increasingly, governments became committed to income and sales taxes as their major revenue sources despite the disincentives inherent in such an approach.

Though the Georgist movement has continued for more than a century after George's death, it has faced monumental political and economic hurdles which have resulted in limited adoption of its tax program. The land lobby in particular has been staunch in its opposition. Yet, there have been small political victories for the Georgist movement which has morphed into a tax program that would place increased, if not exclusive, emphasis on land value taxation at the municipal level. In the US, several Pennsylvania cities and Arden Township in Delaware have implemented tax programs based on George's recommendations. Other examples can be found in scattered locations around the world.

The literature on Henry George, *Progress and Poverty*, and the single tax is huge and shows little sign of abating. George's position has been positively acknowledged by many major economists, including several Nobel laureates, as providing both efficiency and equity. From the standpoint of public finance, the equity of a tax that was highly progressive and could not be avoided as well as the relative simplicity of its administration and collection were appealing. So too were the improved efficiency and incentive benefits of removing taxes on labor and capital.

In the latter part of the twentieth century, the theory has resurfaced as the Henry George Theorem and is recognized as having a much greater degree of theoretical robustness, under certain conditions, than had been previously thought. The Georgist tax program is also seeing increased interest in the former Soviet states and other emerging economies where the land situation is much less encumbered by past arrangements. Furthermore, a line of inquiry into the role of George's ideas relative to the physical environment has developed a "green" movement that encompasses sustain-

able development, natural resource use and conservation, and energy issues. The elimination of urban sprawl has been added to George's original concern for urban ghettos. Moreover, contemporary Georgists have further broadened the concept of land use to include such things as the airwaves, telecommunication spectrums, and the market for pollution "rights."

The Georgist movement is sustained in the contemporary world through a variety of means. The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation in New York was created in 1925 to promote George's social and economic ideas through an extensive publication and research program. All of George's writings, as listed in the following bibliography, are still in print by the Foundation in English and other languages. The Henry George Schools, with locations around the world, teach the essence of Georgist thought to anyone who is interested. There is also the Council of Georgist Organizations, encompassing dozens of entities around the world. These entities espouse all aspects of George's intellectual and policy legacy and cut a wide swathe across the political spectrum.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Progress and Poverty: An Inquiry into the Cause of Industrial Depressions and of Increase of Want with Increase of Wealth (New York, 1879).

The Irish Land Question: What it Involves, and How Alone it Can Be Settled (New York, 1881). 2nd edn, *The Land Question: Viewpoint and Counterpoint on the Need for Land Reform* (New York, 1884; 3rd edn 1893).

Social Problems (New York, 1883).

Protection or Free Trade: An Examination of the Tariff Question, with Especial Regard to the Interests of Labor (New York, 1886).

A Perplexed Philosopher: An Examination of Herbert Spencer's Utterances on the Land Question (New York, 1892).

The Science of Political Economy: A Reconstruction of Its Principles in Clear and Systematic Form (New York, 1898).

Other Relevant Works

George's papers are in the New York Public Library.

The Complete Works of Henry George, 10 vols (New York, 1904).

Henry George: Collected Journalistic Writings, 4 vols, ed. Kenneth Wenzer (New York, 2003).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Economics*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v4*

Andelson, Robert V. *Critics of Henry George: A Centenary Appraisal of Their Strictures on Progress and Poverty* (Rutherford, N.J., 1979).

Barker, Charles A. *Henry George* (Oxford, 1955).

Gaffney, Mason, and Fred Harrison. *The Corruption of Economics* (London, 1994).

Geiger, George Raymond. *The Philosophy of Henry George* (New York, 1933).

George, Henry, Jr. *The Life of Henry George* (New York, 1900).

Giacalone, Joseph, and Clifford Cobb, eds. *The Path to Justice: Following in the Footsteps of Henry George* (Malden, Mass., 2001).

Hudson, Michael, G. J. Miller, and Kris Feder. *A Philosophy for a Fair Society* (London, 1994).

Rose, Edward J. *Henry George* (New York, 1968).

Thomas, John L. *Alternative America: Henry George, Edward Bellamy, Henry Demarest Lloyd, and the Adversary Tradition* (Cambridge, Mass., 1983).

Wenzer, Kenneth, ed. *Land Value Taxation: The Equitable and Efficient Source of Public Finance* (New York and

London, 1999).

Whittaker, John. "Enemies or Allies? Henry George and Francis Amasa Walker One Century Later," *Journal of Economic Literature* 35 (1997): 1897–1915.

Joseph A. Giacalone

GERT, Bernard (1934–)

Bernard Gert was born on 16 October 1934 in Cincinnati, Ohio. He was the only son of Max Gert and Celia Yarnovsky Gert, both of whom had immigrated separately to the United States as children with their parents from Lithuania, then under imperial Russian rule. Bernard and his younger sister were raised at their parents' home in Cincinnati. He attended Walnut Hills High School in Cincinnati, a college preparatory school, graduating in 1952. He then entered the University of Cincinnati and received his BA in 1956. In 1956 he entered Cornell University's Sage School of Philosophy where he received his PhD in 1962, studying with John RAWLS, Max BLACK, and Norman MALCOLM. Gert's dissertation was on the philosophy of Thomas Hobbes and this has remained a lifelong interest, resulting in such works as *Man and Citizen* (1972) and several articles and reference entries on Hobbes. Gert joined the philosophy department at Dartmouth College in 1959 and he has remained there ever since, becoming professor of philosophy in 1970. He is currently Stone Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy with a cross-appointment as Adjunct Professor of Psychiatry in the Dartmouth Medical School. Interestingly, both his daughter Heather Gert and his son Joshua Gert are published professional philosophers, and they have both had an influence on his work – perhaps a unique situation in the annals of American philosophy!

Gert's major work has been in the field of moral theory. His four books on morality, *The Moral Rules* (1970), *Morality: A New Justification of the Moral Rules* (1988), *Morality: Its Nature and Justification* (1998), and *Common Morality* (2004), are tightly related, as each of the later ones is a revised development of the earlier books. They constitute for Gert a lifework in respect of which he can be said to be one of the most original and important ethical theorists of the twentieth century. In contrast to most other philosophers with the notable exception of Hobbes, Gert sees morality, or what he now calls "the moral system" or "common morality," as being entirely concerned with not causing, but rather preventing, alleviating, or eliminating evils or harms (these terms are used synonymously), of which there are five: death, pain, disablement, deprivation of freedom, and deprivation of pleasure. Morality, or the moral system, in Gert's view, has nothing whatever to do with the production or increase of positive goods.

Each of the five evils or harms is recognized as such by all rational persons, and each is something that it would be irrational to wish upon oneself. Every rational person therefore desires that no one cause any of these harms to him or her or to those within his or her circle of concern. The moral rules, of which there are ten, are those that one would on pain of irrationality have others obey because disobedience would either cause or be likely to cause evil to oneself or those within one's circle of concern. The first five rules are rules directly forbidding the infliction on anyone of one of the five evils. Thus they are: (1) do not kill, (2) do not cause pain, (3) do not disable, (4) do not deprive of freedom, (5) do not deprive of pleasure. The second five rules are those such that if they were not obeyed by others, the likelihood of oneself or someone within one's circle of concern suffering one or more of the evils would be greatly increased. These are: (6) do not deceive, (7) keep your promises, (8) do not cheat, (9) obey the law, (10) do your duty (duties here being understood as those attached to one's social roles and also to certain special

circumstances in which one may find oneself).

The public attitude of any rational person, i.e., the attitude that calls for and anticipates general agreement, even if that attitude is not expressed or even considered, could only be that these rules are to be obeyed by everyone toward everyone, i.e., impartially, taking into account only the beliefs that all rational persons must hold, regardless of their religion, ethnicity, age, sex, or anything else that distinguishes them, i.e., regardless of everything but their common humanity. While it is not rationally *required* to be moral – the only thing rationally required is not to bring evil on oneself without an adequate reason – it is rationally *allowed*. What this means is that the question "Why should I be moral?" requires an answer, of which Gert offers several.

The moral attitude towards the moral rules is that they are to be obeyed by every person (oneself included) towards all other persons unless a fully informed rational person could have an exception publicly allowed, and this could only be on the grounds that he or she would suffer or be more likely to suffer one or more of the evils if the rule were obeyed in cases of this kind than if it were violated. Importantly, violations are divided into those that are *strongly* justified and those that are *weakly* justified. When all fully informed rational persons would favor a violation, then that violation is strongly justified; when fully informed rational persons disagree on whether they would publicly allow a violation, that violation is weakly justified. That some violations may be only weakly justified explains why, although there can be no disagreement among fully informed rational persons in the vast majority of cases, there remain unresolvable moral differences on certain issues. These disagreements may result (1) from differences in the ranking of the evils; (2) differences in beliefs about the consequences of everyone understanding such violations to be allowed, such differences being based on different views about human nature or the nature of human societies; (3) differences as to whether only moral agents are impartially protected by the moral rules or whether this protection extends to the higher mammals or to potential moral agents (such as fetuses); and (4) disagreement on the interpretation of the moral rules.

Whereas obedience to the rules must be understood as a moral requirement, *except* where a violation can be justified on the grounds that more evil would result from obedience in a certain set of circumstances than from violations in these circumstances being publicly allowed, there are also moral *ideals*. These have to do with acting so as to prevent, remove, or alleviate evils, and are encouraged rather than required. Finally there are *multiple* moral virtues, which one possesses if one justifiably follows a moral ideal or a moral rule beyond the norm. Thus the five harms or evils are architectonic of the whole moral system, and everything in it is in some way related to them.

An important spin-off from his work in ethical theory is his work on the application of the moral system to medical practice. He has become deeply and usefully involved in medical ethics, and he has published considerably in this area, usually with collaborators, especially Charles M. Culver, K. Danner Clouser, and James L. Bernat.

Among the contributions of Gert and his collaborators to medical ethics are the following. (1) The definition of malady (disease, injury, headache, etc.) as involving one of the five evils mentioned above, or a significantly increased risk of suffering one of them. (2) Because of the differences noted above, some moral disagreements on medical matters are unavoidable allowing greater tolerance of the views of others. (3) The account of death as the permanent loss of function of the organism as a whole, and the total loss of all brain function as the criterion of death. (4) The claim that, except in special circumstances (where there may be allowable disagreement), paternalism violates at least one of the moral rules. (5) The suggestion of refusal of food and fluids as an alternative to physician-assisted suicide. Gert

has argued persuasively that the same moral system that applies to all other areas of life applies to medicine while, because of allowable disagreements, it does not seek to impose answers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Moral Rules: A New Rational Foundation for Morality (New York, 1970; rev. edn 1973).

Philosophy in Medicine: Conceptual and Ethical Issues in Medicine and Psychiatry, with Charles M. Culver (New York, 1982).

"Defining Death in Theory and Practice," with James L. Bernat and Charles M. Culver, *Hastings Center Report* 12 (February 1982): 5–9.

"Moral Theory and Applied Ethics," *The Monist* 67 (1984): 532–48.

"Rationality in Medicine: An Explication," with K. Danner Clouser, *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy* 11 (1986): 185–205.

Morality: A New Justification of the Moral Rules (Oxford, 1988).

"Morality, Moral Theory, and Applied and Professional Ethics," *Professional Ethics* 1 (1992): 5–24.

"Moral Impartiality," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 20 (1996): 102–28.

Bioethics: A Return to Fundamentals, with Charles M. Culver and K. Danner Clouser (New York and London, 1997).

Morality: Its Nature and Justification (Oxford, 1998).

Common Morality: Deciding What To Do (Oxford, 2004).

Other Relevant Works

"Hobbes and Psychological Egoism," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 28 (1967): 503–20.

"Justifying Violence," *Journal of Philosophy* 66 (1969): 616–28.

Ed., *Man and Citizen. Thomas Hobbes's De Homine* (Garden City, N.Y., 1972).

"The Justification of Paternalism," *Ethics* 89 (1979): 199–210.

"Free Will as the Ability to Will," with Timothy Duggan, *Noûs* 13 (1979): 197–217.

"Malady: A New Treatment of Disease," with K. Danner Clouser and Charles M. Culver, *Hastings Center Report* 11 (June 1981): 29–37.

"Ethical Issues in Oncology," with Charles M. Culver, *Psychiatric Medicine* 5 (1987): 389–404.

"The Law of Nature as the Moral Law," *Hobbes Studies* 1 (1988): 26–44.

"Irrationality and the DSM-III-R Definition of Mental Disorder," *Analyse und Kritik* 12 (1990): 34–46.

"Moral Theory," in *Medical Ethics: A Reader*, ed. A. Zucker, D. Borchert, and D. Stewart (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1992), pp. 15–22.

"Moral Theory and the Human Genome Project," in *Morality and the New Genetics: A Guide for Students and Health Care Providers* (Boston, 1996).

"An Alternative to Physician-assisted Suicide: A Conceptual and Moral Analysis," with Charles M. Culver and K. Danner Clouser, in *Physician Assisted Suicide: Expanding the Debate*, ed. M. Battin, R. Rhodes, and A. Silvers (New York and London, 1998), pp. 182–202.

"Morally Relevant Features," *Metaphilosophy* 30 (1999): 13–24.

"Morality and Its Applications," with K. Danner Clouser, in *Building Bioethics: Conversations with Clouser and Friends on Medical Ethics*, ed. L. Kopelman (Dordrecht, 1999), pp. 147–82.

"Hobbes on Language, Metaphysics, and Epistemology," *Hobbes Studies* 14 (2001): 40–58.

Further Reading

Encyc Ethics

Baier, Kurt, et al. "Symposium on *Morality: Its Nature and Justification*," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 62

(2001): 421–81.

Bond, E. J. "Bernard Gert's Moral System," *Metaphilosophy* 31 (2000): 427–45.

Sinnott-Armstrong, Walter, and Robert Audi, eds. *Rationality, Rules, and Ideals: Critical Essays on Bernard Gert's Moral Theory* (Lanham, Md., 2002).

Sterba, James P., et al. "Symposium on *Morality: Its Nature and Justification*," *Journal of Value Inquiry* 35 (2001): 427–76.

Wellman, Carl. "Gert's Contribution to Moral Philosophy," *Metaphilosophy* 10 (1979): 315–29.

E. J. Bond

GETTIER, Edmund Lee, III (1927–)

Edmund Gettier was born on 31 October 1927 in Baltimore, Maryland. He received his BA from Johns Hopkins in 1949 and his PhD in philosophy from Cornell in 1961. His dissertation title was "Bertrand Russell's Theories of Belief." Gettier taught philosophy at Wayne State University from 1957 until 1967. Then he became professor of philosophy at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, teaching there until his retirement in 2001.

Gettier spent many years teaching philosophy of language, modality, and formal semantics. He will be remembered in the history of philosophy, however, for his three-page paper "Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?" That 1963 paper changed the course of epistemology in the English-speaking world, provoking countless articles, books, and dissertations on the nature of knowledge and epistemic justification. Perhaps no three pages in the history of philosophy have attracted so much attention.

Gettier's paper challenged a widely held account of knowledge. As Gettier notes, the account goes at least as far back as Plato, where it is considered in the *Theaetetus* and perhaps accepted in the *Meno*. The account of knowledge in question may be stated as follows. (A) *S* knows that *p* if and only if (i) *p* is true, (ii) *S* believes that *p*, and (iii) *S* is justified in believing that *p*. Alternatively, we may state the third clause (with Roderick CHISHOLM) as "*S* has adequate evidence for *p*," or (with A. J. Ayer) as "*S* has the right to be sure that *p* is true." Gettier claims that his argument counts against all of these versions.

The argument proceeds by way of two counter-examples, each of which purports to show that the conditions stated in (A) are not sufficient for knowledge. Each counter-example purports to show that a person *S* can satisfy all of the three conditions stated with respect to *p*, and yet fail to know that *p*. The first counter-example is as follows:

> Suppose that Smith and Jones have applied for a certain job. And suppose that Smith has strong evidence for the following conjunctive proposition: (d) Jones is the man who will get the job, and Jones has ten coins in his pocket. Smith's evidence for (d) might be that the president of the company assured him that Jones would in the end be selected, and that he, Smith, has counted the coins in Jones's pocket ten minutes ago. Proposition (d) entails: (e) The man who will get the job has ten coins in his pocket. Let us suppose that Smith sees the entailment from (d) to (e) and accepts (e) on the grounds of (d), for which he has strong evidence. In this case, Smith is clearly justified in believing that (e) is true. But, imagine further, that unknown to Smith, he himself, not Jones, will get the job. And, also, unknown to Smith, he himself has ten coins in his pocket. (1963, p. 122)

The problem is revealed when we substitute (e) for *p* and Smith for *S*, then all of the clauses of (A) are satisfied. Yet it is clear that Smith does not know that (e) is true. Smith has no idea that he himself will get the job, or that he himself has ten coins in his pocket. Hence the

example shows that the conditions stated in (A) are not sufficient for knowledge. Philosophers have generally agreed, and after 1963 there has been an explosion of literature on the analysis of knowledge and justification. Responses in the literature range from minor adjustments to radical revisions of (A); doubts about the viability of epistemology; and doubts about the nature and viability of philosophical analysis. There is no consensus regarding how to respond to Gettier's paper.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?" *Analysis* 23 (1963): 121–3.

Other Relevant Works
"Comments on A. J. Ayer's 'The Concept of a Person'," in *Intentionality, Minds, and Perception: Discussions on Contemporary Philosophy*, ed. Hector-Neri Castañeda (Detroit, 1967). Ayer's rejoinder follows.

Further Reading
Oxford Comp Phil
Austin, David F., ed. *Philosophical Analysis: A Defense by Example* (Dordrecht, 1987). Essays in honor of Gettier.
Chisholm, Roderick. "Knowledge as Justified True Belief," in *Empirical Knowledge*, ed. Paul Moser (Totowa, N.J., 1986).
Dretske, Fred. "Conclusive Reasons," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 49 (1971): 1–22.
Feldman, Richard. "An Alleged Defect in Gettier Counterexamples," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 52 (1974): 68–9.
Fogelin, Robert. *Pyrrhonian Reflections on Knowledge and Justification* (New York, 1993).
Goldman, Alvin. "A Causal Theory of Knowledge," *Journal of Philosophy* 64 (1967): 355–72.
Goldman, Alvin, "Discrimination and Perceptual Knowledge," *Journal of Philosophy* 73 (1976): 771–91.
Klein, Peter. "A Proposed Definition of Propositional Knowledge," *Journal of Philosophy* 68 (1971): 471–82.
Lehrer, Keith, and Thomas Paxson. "Knowledge: Undefeated Justified True Belief," *Journal of Philosophy* 66 (1969): 225–37.
Nozick, Robert. *Philosophical Explanations* (Oxford, 1981).
Shope, Robert. *The Analysis of Knowing: A Decade of Research* (Princeton, N.J., 1983).
Skyrms, Brian, "The Explication of 'X Knows that p'," *Journal of Philosophy* 64 (1967): 373–89.
Sosa, Ernest. *Knowledge in Perspective* (Cambridge, UK, 1991).
Swain, Marshall. "Epistemic Defeasibility," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 11 (1974): 15–25.
Zagzebski, Linda. "What is Knowledge?" in *The Blackwell Guide to Epistemology*, ed. John Greco and Ernest Sosa (Oxford, 1999).

John Greco

GEWIRTH, Alan (1912–2004)

Isidore Gewirth was born on 28 November 1912 in Union City, New Jersey. He changed his name to Alan when he was eleven because he was tired of being called "dizzy Izzy" at school. Gewirth graduated valedictorian of his class from Memorial High School in West New York in January 1930. He then attended Columbia University, where he received his BA in 1934, and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa in his junior year. He spent the next two years doing graduate study at Columbia before accepting a Sage Fellowship at Cornell University in 1936–7. He was then invited to the University of Chicago as an assistant to Richard MCKEON, who had been brought

there the year before by Robert Maynard Hutchins. In June 1942 Gewirth was drafted into the army, moving up the ranks from private to captain in four years. After his military service in World War II, he spent the academic year 1946–7 at Columbia on the GI Bill, receiving his PhD in philosophy in 1948. Starting in 1947 he was a member of the philosophy faculty at the University of Chicago. He served as President of the Central Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1973–4, and President of the American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy during 1981–3. In 1975 he was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and was named the Edward Carson Waller Distinguished Service Professor of Philosophy. He retired in 1982, and remained active in writing and occasional teaching. Gewirth died on 9 May 2004 in Chicago Illinois.

Gewirth has published works on a range of topics, but is best known for his work in moral theory. In this area, his most important work is *Reason and Morality* (1978), in which he seeks to provide a foundation for human rights in the demands of rational consistency. What distinguishes Gewirth's approach is his belief that human action has what might be called a "normative structure." He argues that, because freedom and well-being are the indispensable conditions for the possibility of action, agents implicitly assert the right to freedom and well-being whenever they act. Furthermore, in asserting these rights agents implicitly regard the fact that they are prospective purposive agents (that is, beings capable of goal-directed action) as the *sufficient* condition for the ascription of these rights-claims to themselves. Hence, rational consistency demands that these rights be extended to every prospective purposive agent. Gewirth thus derives what he calls the Principle of Generic Consistency: "Act in accord with the generic rights (to freedom and well-being) of your recipient as well as yourself."

In two recent works Gewirth applies the ideas seminally expressed in *Reason and Morality*. In *The Community of Rights* (1996) he makes use of his theory of rights to attack both libertarianism and communitarianism, and to defend communities organized around respect for an array of economic, social, and political rights. In *Self-Fulfillment* (1998), he argues that self-fulfillment requires actualizing our rational capacities, which includes adherence to the Principle of Generic Consistency. Hence, personal flourishing cannot be achieved at the expense of violating the rights of others.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Marsilius of Padua and Medieval Political Philosophy (New York, 1951).
"The Generalization Principle," *Philosophical Review* 78 (1964): 229–42.
"Categorical Consistency in Ethics," *Philosophical Quarterly* 17 (1967): 289–99.
"The Normative Structure of Action," *Review of Metaphysics* 25 (1971): 238–61.
"The 'Is-Ought' Problem Resolved," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 47 (1974): 34–61.
Reason and Morality (Chicago, 1978).
"The Basis and Content of Human Rights," *Georgia Law Review* 13 (1979): 1143–70.
Human Rights: Essays on Justification and Applications (Chicago, 1982).
"The Epistemology of Human Rights," *Social Philosophy and Public Policy* 1 (1984): 1–24.
"Economic Rights," *Philosophical Topics* 14 (1986): 169–93.
The Community of Rights (Chicago, 1996).
Self-Fulfillment (Princeton, N.J., 1998).

Other Relevant Works
"The Cartesian Circle," *Philosophical Review* 50 (1941): 369–95.

"Clearness and Distinctness in Descartes," *Philosophy* 18 (1943): 19–38.

Ed., *Political Philosophy* (New York, 1965).

"Ethics," in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 15th edn (London, 1974), vol. 6, pp. 967–98.

"Why Agents Must Claim Rights: A Reply," *Journal of Philosophy* 79 (1982): 403–10.

"Action and Rights: A Reply," *Ethics* 86 (1976): 288–93.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v77

Bio 20thC Phils, *Encyc Ethics*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v8*

Beyleveld, Deryck. *The Dialectical Necessity of Morality: An Analysis and Defense of Alan Gewirth's Argument to the Principle of Generic Consistency* (Chicago, 1991).

Boylan, Michael, ed. *Gewirth: Critical Essays on Action, Rationality, and Community* (Lanham, Md., 1999).

Regis, Edward, ed. *Gewirth's Ethical Rationalism: Critical Essays with a Reply by Alan Gewirth* (Chicago, 1984).

Steigleder, Klaus. *Grundlegung der normativen Anblick: der Ansatz von Alan Gewirth* (Freiburg, Germany, 1999).

Eric Reitan

GIBSON, James Jerome (1904–79)

James J. Gibson was born on 27 January 1904 in McConnelsville, Ohio, and died on 11 December 1979 in Ithaca, New York. He was an experimental psychologist and perceptual theorist whose innovative research and conceptual contributions opened possibilities for a direct realist epistemology. Gibson developed an ecological approach to perceiving that attempted to explain how everyday features of the world – from ground surfaces and objects to pictures – are perceived. Gibson received a BS from Princeton University in 1925. He took his first course in experimental psychology in his senior year from H. S. Langfeld, who had studied with the experimental phenomenologist Carl Stumpf in Berlin.

After graduating, Gibson remained at Princeton as one of Langfeld's graduate assistants, and received his MA in 1926 and PhD in psychology in 1929. Although Gibson completed his dissertation attacking the Gestalt theory of perception under Langfeld's direction, the strongest intellectual influence during his graduate studies was that of the philosophical behaviorist E. B. HOLT. Holt was a student of William JAMES and a central figure among the New Realist philosophers. Holt's psychological writings fused the non-dualistic metaphysics of James's philosophy of radical empiricism with a behavioristic focus on action. Holt's distinctive brand of behaviorism was *molar* in level of analysis, *purposive* in motivational character, and *distal* in identification of the effective stimulus.

Gibson's first teaching appointment was in the psychology department at Smith College in 1928. Over the ensuing fifteen years, Gibson taught courses in experimental psychology and social psychology, and published numerous research papers with his students. His most significant experimental work during this period concerned perceptual adaptation. Gibson discovered that prolonged visual inspection of a curved line results in experiencing the line as straight; and subsequent examination of a different straight line reveals an after-effect of apparent curvature in the opposite direction. What is most significant about these findings is that a line might be expected to function as a visual primitive, that is, an elementary sensation, on which perceiving processes operate. Instead, these results suggest that even such a seemingly basic stimulus attribute as linearity/curvilinearity is a property of a dynamic perceiver–environment relation. More broadly,

this discovery questions a clear-cut objective-subjective distinction in visual perception. This theme recurs throughout Gibson's writings.

A significant intellectual influence on Gibson at Smith was his colleague, the Gestalt psychologist Kurt KOFFKA, whose focus on organization in perceptual experience heightened Gibson's sensitivity to higher-order relations in patterns of sensory stimulation. Moreover, at this time Gibson married Eleanor Jack, who was to become a highly distinguished psychologist working primarily in the area of perceptual development. Although they rarely collaborated in a formal manner in their writing or research, the Gibsons were lifelong intellectual partners, and their programs were mutually supportive and mutually influential.

During the years of World War II, Gibson worked in the psychological research unit of the US Air Force, and this period of time was an extraordinarily rich one in the development of his thinking. Gibson's primary responsibility was developing selection procedures for prospective pilots. An innovative feature of this work was the use of motion pictures in presenting test materials. Utilization of this medium was instrumental in shaping Gibson's ideas about the nature of perceiving because it highlighted for him several qualities of visual stimulation regularly obscured by the dominance of static displays (such as pictures) in investigations of visual perception.

One important consequence in this regard was Gibson's exploration of the role of optical flow in the visual field as information for self-motion. Perception of one's own movement has long been treated as based solely on motor feedback (kinesthesis) from the limbs – a claim that is in keeping with the assumption that the proximal stimulus for vision is a stationary retinal image (the so-called "picture theory of vision"). Gibson's use of dynamic displays demonstrated in compelling fashion that moving through the environment generates an optical streaming as the world appears to flow around the perceiver, and that movement of the self through the world is specified by this optical flow. Not only does this finding enrich a consideration of the available visual stimulation, but it also confounds the received picture theory of vision.

Similarly, in the process of designing training films for developing skills in aircraft identification, Gibson became sensitized to the critical and often overlooked differences between *form* perception (which involves two-dimensional displays) and *object* perception (which involves solid objects that typically can be identified from any orientation). This work ultimately led to Gibson's later hypothesis that objects are specified by invariant structure under transformation. In the case of both perceiving self-motion through optical flow and perceiving objects through the detection of unchanging structure in the context of change, Gibson began to formulate an account of sensory stimulation that was far richer than any previously offered. The results of this research initially appeared in *Motion Picture Testing and Research* (1948).

After returning to Smith College after the war, Gibson began writing a book describing this work and its implications. Gibson joined the psychology faculty of Cornell University in 1949, where he remained until his death. The following year Gibson published *The Perception of the Visual World*, which became his most broadly influential book among perceptual psychologists, even though Gibson abandoned many of its central assumptions over the ensuing decades. The most frequently cited contribution of this book is the role of surface texture gradients in distance and object perception. Traditionally, the question of perceived object size has been approached without considering characteristics of the background, as if objects are located in an empty space. One of several difficulties created by this conceptualization is that of explaining the perception of object size, because against a background of empty space, perceived object size and perceived distance are confounded. For example, how does one distinguish between, on the one hand, two objects of different sizes located at the same distance from an observation point, as

compared to, on the other hand, two objects of equal size located at different distances from the perceiver such that they project sizes equal to the first pair? In order to make such relative size estimates, the perceiver must know how far away each object is. But because distance is visually indeterminate in empty space, analytically one must either draw upon non-visual sensory sources of knowing (as Berkeley famously argued), or invoke some innate rational processes (as did Descartes) in order to make such a judgment. In either case, visual experience of size/distance would be derived from supplementing visual input in some fashion. The apparent necessity of this move is but one reason why theorists have long assumed that perceivers' experience of the environment must be indirect. This commonplace assumption has been the source of innumerable now familiar epistemological puzzles.

Gibson reconceptualized this problem by demonstrating that distance perception is not typically a matter of judging extent in an empty space; rather it is based on perceiving a continuous, textured surface (for example, the ground) as it extends away from a point of observation. Consequently, the existence of a higher-order psychophysical correspondence between texture gradients and retinal stimulation raises the novel possibility that distance is directly perceived, because the corresponding pattern of stimulation itself specifies distance. As for relative object size, because surface textures tend to be stochastically regular, and because objects in a terrestrial environment tend to rest on surfaces, objects that are the same size even when located at different distances from the perceiver will occlude equal amounts of ground texture. In short, relative object sizes are specified by object/surface relations in the visual field. The epistemological significance of this analysis is that it points to a way of avoiding the forced move to indirect realism, at least in this particular case, because the perceptual phenomena in question can be accounted for without going beyond the pattern of available stimulation.

In the 1950s Gibson engaged in a program of research concerning the perception of various properties of surfaces, and this experimental work deepened his theoretical analysis of visual perception. But three critical advances during this period will be mentioned. First, based on Eleanor J. Gibson's earlier work, Gibson and Gibson offered an original account of perceptual learning, which refers to the commonplace process of developing improved perceptual skills in some domain with experience. Perceptual learning usually has been viewed as a process of supplementing intrinsically limited stimulus input (for example, through associative learning). Such a step is in keeping with the viewpoint of indirect realism. The Gibsons proposed instead that perceptual learning is the differentiation of structure already present in the stimulus array. In the course of discovering heretofore unrealized structure in available sensory stimulation, perceivers engage in a process of learning more about the world in a direct (that is, unmediated) fashion.

Second, Gibson elaborated his earlier analyses of optical flow by examining its role in animal locomotion. In a paper entitled "Visually Controlled Locomotion in … Animals and Men" (1958), Gibson argued that the information in the optical flow field specifies speed and direction of movement and can be utilized by perceivers in guiding locomotion.

A third notable advance in Gibson's program during this period was the empirical investigation of meaningful, perceivable properties of the environment. The clearest expression of this work appeared in E. J. Gibson and R. D. Walk's classic 1960 studies using the visual cliff apparatus, which demonstrated that crawling babies experience the edge of a surface of support as affording falling-off. These findings run counter to the long-held view that information for depth/distance is not immediately available, in which case inexperienced perceivers would be unable reliably to detect depth at an edge. Indeed, this demonstration of awareness of such functionally meaningful

properties of the environment at an early age necessitates a re-evaluation of the stimulus information available to perceivers. Similarly, with W. Schiff and J. Caviness, Gibson (1962) demonstrated that an expanding form in the visual field is perceived as a looming surface that affords impending collision. Both of these studies demonstrate that features of the environment with functional significance are readily perceived.

In the early 1960s these threads fused into two significant and interrelated concepts – "ecological optics" and "perceptual systems" – that together mark an important shift in Gibson's thinking. Gibson replaced his earlier higher-order psychophysics, which carries with it an assumption that stimulation is imposed on receptor surfaces, with a consideration of how the interaction of light and the surface features of an econiche gives rise to potential stimulus information available for an active perceiver to detect. Ecological optics is a program of analysis that examines how reflected light can be structured such that it carries information about environmental layout. The concept of a perceptual system reciprocally supports ecological optics by taking perceiving to be an embodied activity of an animal. Vision, for example, is properly considered an action system that encompasses exploratory movements of the whole organism because these actions play an essential role in the detection of stimulus information. To be more specific, structure in the array of reflected light can serve as information specifying stable environmental properties; and the isolation of this invariant structure is facilitated by changes conferred on the stimulus array from the point of view of an active perceiver. Hence, the concepts of ecological optics and perceptual systems are complementary facets of a dynamic system of animal-environment reciprocity, and jointly reflect the adaptation of species' perceptual capacities within an econiche.

These innovations are presented in *The Senses Considered as Perceptual Systems* (1966), which as the title indicates emphasizes Gibson's ground-breaking conceptualization

of perceiving. Gibson's analysis of stimulus information is more fully elaborated, and his treatment of perceiving is further refined, in *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception* (1979). Among the many notable features of this book is Gibson's explication of the concept of "affordances," an idea that was anticipated in his earlier writings.

Gibson proposed that what is perceived by individuals are the affordances of the environment. Affordances are functionally significant properties of the environment taken with reference to an individual, and as such, they are mutually constituted by properties of both the environment and the perceiver. For example, an object resting on a ground surface affords "sitting-on" for an individual if the object's height falls within a certain range relative to the perceiver's leg length. An object that meets this relational criterion (among others) not only could function as a seat for this individual, but it would be perceived as such. In short, affordances are properties of the environment considered relationally, and they are specified by information that is scaled relative to a perceiver.

With this concept Gibson addresses most fully his sustained interest in perceived meaning. For Gibson, meaning is an intrinsic quality of perceptual experience, and those views claiming that meaning must be added to perceptual experience fail to recognize the richness of the stimulus information available to be perceived. Meaning is a ubiquitous property of the environment from an ecological perspective. Further, the relational ontology of affordances brings to fruition a project that runs through Gibson's writings and connects his work back to his intellectual predecessors James and Holt; and that project is to develop a realist account of knowing that overcomes the deeply problematic assumption of objective–subjective dualism. The concept of affordances, and Gibson's functional analysis of perceiver–environment reciprocity more generally, reflect this effort, and in his estimation offer grounds for a direct realist epistemology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Adaptation, After-Effect and Contrast in the Perception of Curved Lines," *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 16 (1933): 1–31.

Motion Picture Testing and Research. Aviation Psychology Research Reports, No. 7 (Washington, D.C., 1948).

The Perception of the Visual World (Boston, 1950).

"Parallax and Perspective during Airplane Landing," with P. Olum and F. Rosenblatt, *American Journal of Psychology* 68 (1955): 372–85.

"Perceptual Learning: Differentiation or Enrichment?" with E. J. Gibson, *Psychological Review* 62 (1955): 32–41.

"Visually Controlled Locomotion and Visual Orientation in Animals and Men," *British Journal of Psychology* 49 (1958): 182–94.

"Persistent Fear Responses in Rhesus Monkeys to the Optical Stimulus of 'Looming'," with W. Schiff and J. Caviness, *Science* 136 (1962): 982–3.

The Senses Considered as Perceptual Systems (Boston, 1966).

"New Reasons for Realism," *Synthese* 17 (1967): 162–72.

"The Change from Visible to Invisible: A Study of Optical Transitions," with G. Kaplan, H. Reynolds, and K. Wheeler, *Perception & Psychophysics* 5 (1969): 113–16.

The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception (Boston, 1979).

Other Relevant Works
Gibson's papers are at Cornell University.
"The Concept of the Stimulus in Psychology," *American Psychologist* 16 (1960): 694–703.

"James J. Gibson," in *A History of Psychology in Autobiography*, vol. 5, ed. E. G. Boring and G. Lindzey (New York, 1967), pp. 127–43.

"The Information Available in Pictures," *Leonardo* 4 (1971): 27–35.

Reasons for Realism: Selected Essays of James J. Gibson, ed. Edward S. Reed and Rebecca Jones (Hillsdale, N.J., 1982).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Encyc Psych*, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*

Gibson, Eleanor J. *Principles of Perceptual Learning and Development* (New York, 1969).

———, *Perceiving the Affordances: A Portrait of Two Psychologists* (Mahwah, N.J., 2002).

Gibson, Eleanor J., and Anne D. Pick. *An Ecological Approach to Perceptual Learning and Development* (New York, 2000).

Gibson, Eleanor J., and Richard D. Walk. "The Visual Cliff," *Scientific American* 202 (1960): 64–71.

Heft, Harry. *Ecological Psychology in Context: James Gibson, Roger Barker, and the Legacy of William James's Radical Empiricism* (Mahwah, N.J., 2001).

MacLeod, Robert B., and Herbert L. Pick, Jr. *Perception: Essays in Honor of J. J. Gibson* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1974).

Michaels, Claire, and Claudia Carello. *Direct Perception* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1981).

Reed, Edward S. *James J. Gibson and the Psychology of Perception* (New Haven, Conn., 1988). Contains a bibliography of Gibson's publications.

———, *Encountering the World: Toward an Ecological Psychology* (New York, 1996).

Warren, William H. "Perceiving Affordances: Visual Guidance of Stair-Climbing," *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance* 10 (1987): 683–703.

Harry Heft

GILBERT, Katharine Everett (1886–1952)

Katharine Everett Gilbert was born on 29 July 1886 in Newport, Rhode Island to a Methodist minister, Thomas Jefferson Everett, and Sue Florence Morrison Everett. She studied philosophy at Brown University under Walter Goodnow EVERETT and Alexander MEIKLEJOHN, where she received a BA in philosophy in 1908. She then attended Cornell University where she received a PhD in philosophy in 1912. She married English professor Allan H. Gilbert in 1913. At the University of North Carolina she taught philosophy as a research fellow from 1922 to 1930, acting professor in 1928, then lecturer in philosophy in 1929. She was professor of philosophy at Duke University from 1930 to 1951, and she was chair of the department of aesthetics from 1947 to 1948. She served as President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1946–7, and of the American Society of Aesthetics in 1947–8. She retired from Duke University in 1951, and died on 25 April 1952 in Durham, North Carolina.

The body of Gilbert's work is centered in the field of aesthetics, spanning such topics as poetry, architecture, history of aesthetics, and dance. She wrote numerous articles on these topics, as well as several books. Gilbert's first book, *History of Esthetics* (1939), co-written with Helmut Kuhn, followed inquiries and debates on art and beauty from Plato to Croce. It offered an understanding of the questions at the center of the history of aesthetic thought as well as the answers to these questions. It has been regarded as one of the most important books written on the topic of the history of aesthetics. Gilbert's final work, *Aesthetic Studies: Architecture and Poetry* (1952), collects her most influential articles, elaborating her views on the language used to describe architectural design, the relation between poetry and philosophy, and the difference between the art critic and the philosopher of art.

Gilbert's approach to aesthetics saw the philosophy of art as imbedded between the practice and experience of art. It was not simply an abstract metalanguage that lay beyond works of art, but closely related to its object.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Hardy and the Weak Spectator," *The Reviewer* 5 (1925): 9–25.

"The One and the Many in Croce's Aesthetic," *Philosophical Review* 34 (1925): 21–33.

"Santayana's Doctrine of Aesthetic Expression," *Philosophical Review* 35 (1926): 221–35.

Studies in Recent Aesthetics, with Helmut Kuhn (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1927).

"The Relation of the Moral to the Aesthetic Standard in Plato," *Philosophical Review* 43 (1934): 279–94.

"Aesthetic Imitation and Imitators in Aristotle," *Philosophical Review* 45 (1936): 558–73.

"The Relation between Aesthetics and Art Criticism," *Journal of Philosophy* 35 (1938): 289–95.

A History of Esthetics , with Helmut Kuhn (New York, 1939).

"Art between the Distinct Idea and the Obscure Soul," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 6 (1947): 21–6.

"Recent Poets on Man and His Place," *Philosophical Review* 56 (1947): 469–90.

"Seven Senses of a Room," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 8 (1949): 1–11.

"Two Levels of Aesthetic Definition," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 9 (1950): 119–23.

Aesthetic Studies: Architecture and Poetry (Durham, N.C., 1952).

Other Relevant Works

"Ruskin's Relation to Aristotle," *Philosophical Review* 49 (1940): 52–62.

"Mind and Medium in Modern Dance," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 1 (1941): 106–29.

"Recent Catholic Views on Art and Poetry," *Journal of Philosophy* 39 (1942): 654–61.

"The Intent and Tone of Mr. I. A. Richards," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 3 (1945): 29–48.

"A Spatial Configuration of Five Recent Poets," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 44 (1945): 422–31.

"Architecture and the Poet," *Journal of the American Institute of Architects* 13 (1950): 99–102.

"Clean and Organic: A Study in Architectural Semantics," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 10 (1951): 3–7.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v49*, *Pres Addr of APA v5*, *Proc of APA v26*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Boas, George. "Katharine Everett Gilbert's Writings on Aesthetics: A Selective Bibliography," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 11 (1952): 76–7.

Nahm, Milton C. "The Relations of Aesthetics and Criticism," *The Personalist* 45 (1964): 362–84.

Melanie McQuitty

GILKEY, Langdon Brown (1919–)

Langdon Gilkey was born on 9 February 1919 in Chicago, Illinois. His father, Charles Gilkey, was a theological liberal and the first Dean of the Chapel at the University of Chicago. His mother, Geraldine Gilkey, was a feminist and national leader of the YWCA. As a youth, Gilkey absorbed the social gospel values and fervent piety of his parents. Upon entering Harvard College as an undergraduate in 1936, however, he relinquished the religious part of his idealism. Gilkey reasoned that ethical humanism retained the best parts of his parents' world view while discarding its religious mythology. He changed again in 1939, upon hearing Reinhold NIEBUHR sermonize on the crisis of Western civilization and the dialectical realism of biblical faith. Gilkey later recalled: "Suddenly, as the torrent of insight poured from the pulpit, my world in disarray spun completely around, steadied, and then settled into a new and quite firm and intelligible structure. I thought to myself, 'Now I am in touch with *reality* and not with the illusions of humanistic idealism'" (Musser and Price. 1988, p. 7). Gilkey studied Niebuhr's writings and converted to his style of Christian realism.

After receiving his BA from Harvard in 1940, he sailed to China to teach English at Yenching University in Peking, an American/British university for Chinese students. At that time, the British were holding on against Hitler, the American war with Japan was more than a year away, and the Japanese occupation of eastern China was in its fourth year. A year later, after the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, all enemy nationals in China were placed under house arrest by the Japanese occupiers. Gilkey passed the time reading theology until March 1943, when he was sent to an internment camp in Shantung province with nearly 2,000 others.

Gilkey's wartime imprisonment was a formative personal and intellectual experience. He expected his relatively well-educated fellow detainees to be reasonable and cooperative in working out fair accommodations for families, adolescents, and people with special needs. Instead, he found that nearly everyone in the camp was much less rational and more selfish than he had anticipated. Gilkey's reflections on this phenomenon drove him to think more profoundly through Niebuhr's perspective. The character of humankind's instinctive will to live is transformed by human consciousness, he reasoned. Only the human mind calculates far-off dangers to human existence and protects the self and its loved ones from a wide variety of negative contingencies. Self-consciousness transforms the human agent's instinctive will to live into the aggressive, dynamic, and possessive will to power. Human beings are distinctively

grasping, alienated, and destructive because the demands of instinct in human beings are accelerated by humankind's distinctive capacities of mind or spirit. Beneath and within the complex interactions of mind, will, and instinct is a unified self that determines whether the "higher powers" of mind and moral will are to be used creatively or destructively. This intuition of a unifying spiritual dimension in human life became a foundational principle of Gilkey's later theology, as did his closely related insight that ordinary "secular" experience cannot be adequately accounted for on secular grounds.

After the war ended in 1945, Gilkey entered Union Theological Seminary in New York City to study under Niebuhr and Paul TILLICH. He knew Niebuhr's writings thoroughly before he entered seminary, and Tillich's theology of ultimate concern gave him a language for his conviction that each person possesses a distinctive, meaning-conferring, unifying spiritual center. He received his PhD in religion from Union Theological Seminary in 1954 and began teaching theology at Vanderbilt Divinity School.

Twentieth-century American theology was predominantly liberal from 1900 to 1935, predominantly neo-orthodox/neo-liberal from 1935 to 1965, and predominantly pluralistic and postmodern from 1965 to 2000. As much as any twentieth-century American theologian, Gilkey absorbed and reflected the century's chief theological currents. He was raised in theological liberalism, identified with Niebuhrian "neo-orthodoxy" in his early career, developed a powerful critique of neo-orthodoxy in the early 1960s, and spent most of his career fashioning a new kind of theological liberalism that appropriated postmodern elements.

In his early career Gilkey embraced Niebuhr's crusade against a fading liberal establishment in American theology. Though he shunned Karl Barth as impossibly scholastic, long-winded, and conservative, Gilkey described himself as a "neo-orthodox" theologian in the style of Niebuhr and Tillich. His first book, *Maker of Heaven and Earth* (1959), argued that the Christian doctrine of creation is true as true myth and that the paradoxes of Christian creation mythology must be affirmed against all religious and secular criticism. Christianity teaches that, before all time, God created time out of nothing; that God is eternal yet creates and rules time; that God is infinite and unconditioned yet becomes finite and conditioned in Christ; and that God is immanent in the world yet transcends creation. Gilkey argued that Christian theology must sustain the full force of these paradoxes and that myth is a form of religious language that unites the concepts of analogy, revelation, and paradox into a single mode of God-language.

He allowed that Christianity requires more than a symbolic knowledge of its subject but puzzled over the relationship between the historical foundation of Christianity and its mythical or symbolic interpretation. Gilkey's early work invoked the neo-orthodox phrase, "the mighty acts of God in scripture," but in the early 1960s he judged that the neo-orthodox conflation of liberalism and orthodoxy was incoherent. Gilkey taught at the University of Chicago Divinity School from 1963 until his retirement in 1989, where he developed his views on modern theology. Neo-orthodox theology used the language of the Bible but did not share the biblical understanding of God as an intervening, miracle-making divine agent. It spoke of God as "acting" in biblical history but assumed the causal continuum of space/time experience. Though it appealed to the priority of revelation over experience and the activity of God in history, and thus claimed to represent a third way in theology, Gilkey concluded that neo-orthodoxy was actually an incoherent version of liberalism.

Modern theology needed to reestablish the basis of its claims; Gilkey was finished with neo-orthodox appeals to a revelationist starting point. Still drawing heavily on the insights of Niebuhr and Tillich, he argued that theology must adopt some version of Schleiermacher's starting point in human experience. His own thesis was that religious language is meaningful because human beings cannot escape the essentially religious character of their humanity.

Gilkey observed in *Naming the Whirlwind: The Renewal of God-Language* (1969) that human beings often find that they can affirm life in spite of its ambiguities and afflictions; thus, he argued, on the basis of ordinary experience, theology is justified in claiming a referent. Religious language is a valid form of symbolic discourse about the mystery of life, not merely a function of human nature. If theological language is to be made intelligible to the modern secular mind, it must look for the basis of its discourse in secular experience. Theology must discern and explicate the dimension of ultimacy in human experience, which is the ground and limit of human existence. Gilkey explained that the dimension of ultimacy is not what is seen, "but the basis of seeing; not what is known as an object so much as the basis of knowing; not an object of value, but the ground of valuing; not the thing before us, but the source of things; not the particular meanings that generate our life in the world, but the ultimate context within which these meanings necessarily subsist" (*Naming the Whirlwind*, 1969, p. 296). The dimension of ultimacy manifests itself as the ground of being and bridges the gap between Christian faith and modern secular experience.

Naming the Whirlwind uncovered dimensions of ultimacy in personal, existential experience; *Religion and the Scientific Future* (1970) and *Nature, Reality, and the Sacred* (1993) looked for dimensions of ultimacy in cognitive experience, especially scientific inquiry; *Shantung Compound* (1966) and *Reaping the Whirlwind* (1976) found dimensions of ultimacy in social and historical existence; *Catholicism Confronts Modernity* (1975) and *Message and Existence* (1979) used the disclosure of ultimacy method to explicate Gilkey's constructive position; and *Society and the Sacred* (1981) and *Through the Tempest* (1991) looked for sacral dimensions in various aspects of modern culture. Gilkey explained in *Catholicism Confronts Modernity* that his work sought to synthesize the myths, stories, and symbols of Christian experience with modern scientific and philosophical reason.

His major work, *Reaping the Whirlwind*, argued that an adequate interpretation of history must include not only the methods and factors privileged by secular reason, but also a theological interpretation of the ultimate dimensions of historical existence. Appropriating Alfred North WHITEHEAD's dialectic of freedom and destiny, Gilkey proposed that the primary ontological structure of historical existence is actuality and possibility, not self and world. History moves and is experienced in the interplay of freedom and destiny, bringing together the historical given with the actualization of new possibilities. God is the source of being, Gilkey maintained, but God's being should be conceptualized in terms of the Whiteheadian dialectic of achieved actuality and future possibility. Whitehead conceived divine reality as distinct from the more basic reality of creativity; Gilkey countered that creativity must be understood as constitutive in the power of being that is God's being. With Whitehead, he affirmed that God is in dynamic process, but against Whitehead, he insisted that God is not subject to process, for process implies the passing out of existence of what has been. God is the ground of the possibility of process and the creative power of being through which the reality of each occasion comes to be; God's power transcends the finite temporality of destiny and freedom; and God "acts" in and through the secondary causes of destiny and freedom.

In addition to the influences of Niebuhr and Tillich, which pervade all his work, and Schleiermacher and Whitehead, his thinking has been strongly influenced by Mircea ELIADE's history of religions comparativism, especially Eliade's analyses of myth. In his later career, Gilkey has written almost exclusively in the essay form, addressing a wide variety of topics in culture, science, liberation theology, postmodern criticism, and inter-religious dialogue. Often he cautions about the return of the repressed. To the extent that modern secular culture has de-legitimized or repressed its yearnings for the sacred, Gilkey observes, it has created the conditions under which irrational

and sometimes malevolent forms of religious expression have erupted. Tillich taught that the substance of culture is always religious in some form; in the spirit of his teacher, Gilkey warns that modern life is not as secular as modern intellectuals want to believe and that religion-suppressing societies are bound to unleash backlashes of unassimilated religious forms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Maker of Heaven and Earth: A Study of the Christian Doctrine of Creation (Garden City, N.Y., 1959).

How the Church Can Minister to the World without Losing Itself (New York, 1964).

Naming the Whirlwind: The Renewal of God-Language (Indianapolis, 1969).

Religion and the Scientific Future: Reflections on Myth, Science, and Theology (New York, 1970).

Catholicism Confronts Modernity: A Protestant View (New York, 1975).

The Contemporary Explosion of Theology: Ecumenical Studies in Theology, ed. Michael D. Ryan (Metuchen, N.J., 1975).

Reaping the Whirlwind: A Christian Interpretation of History (New York, 1976).

Message and Existence: An Introduction to Christian Theology (New York, 1979).

Society and the Sacred: Toward a Theology of Culture in Decline (New York, 1981).

Gilkey on Tillich (New York, 1990).

Through the Tempest: Theological Voyages in a Pluralistic Culture (Minneapolis, 1991).

Nature, Reality, and the Sacred: The Nexus of Science and Religion (Minneapolis, 1993).

Blue Twilight: Nature, Creationism, and American Religion (Minneapolis, 2001).

On Niebuhr: A Theological Study (Chicago, 2001).

Other Relevant Works

Shantung Compound: The Story of Men and Women under Pressure (New York, 1966).

"Unbelief and the Secular Spirit," in *The Presence and Absence of God*, ed. Christopher F. Mooney (New York, 1969).

Creationism on Trial: Evolution and God at Little Rock (Minneapolis, 1985).

Further Reading

Dorrien, Gary. *The Word as True Myth: Interpreting Modern Theology* (Louisville, Kent., 1997), pp. 128–86.

Musser, Donald W., and Joseph L. Price, eds. *The Whirlwind in Culture, Frontiers in Theology: Essays in Honor of Langdon Gilkey* (Bloomington, Ind., 1988).

Pasewark, Kyle A., and Jeff B. Pool, eds. *The Theology of Langdon B. Gilkey: Systematic and Critical Studies* (Macon, Georgia, 1999).

Walsh, Brian J. *Langdon Gilkey: Theologian for a Culture in Decline* (Lanham, Md., 1991).

Gary Dorrien

GILLIGAN, Carol Friedman (1936–)

Carol Gilligan was born on 28 November 1936 in New York City. She received her BA in literature summa cum laude from Swarthmore College in 1958. Becoming interested in psychology, she pursued advanced studies at Radcliffe College and received her MA in clinical psychology in 1961. She then earned her PhD in social psychology from Harvard University in 1964, writing a dissertation on "Responses to Tempation: An Analysis of Motives." Gilligan became a lecturer at the University of Chicago, and then returned to become a lecturer at Harvard in 1967. During this time she worked closely with the renowned psychologist Erik ERIKSON. In the spring of 1969 Gilligan met Lawrence

KOHLBERG and she joined him in his research on adolescent moral behavior. The following year she also taught one of Kohlberg's course sections on moral and political choice.

In 1971 Gilligan became an assistant professor in the Harvard Graduate School of Education, advancing to associate professor in 1979 and full professor in 1986. She spent 1992–3 teaching at the University of Cambridge as Pitt Professor of American History and Institutions. In 1997 she was appointed to the Patricia Albejerg Graham Chair in Gender Studies in Harvard's Graduate School of Education. She has been an integral part of the Harvard Project on Women's Psychology and Girls' Development that she created. She began teaching as a visiting professor at New York University School of Law in 1999. She teaches seminars on law and culture and works with the first-year law students to enrich their sense of the responsibilities that are involved in practicing law. In 2002 Gilligan joined the faculty of New York University as a University Professor with the Graduate School of Education and the School of Law.

Gilligan is best known in philosophy for her criticism of Kohlberg's stage theory of moral development. She felt that his theory was biased against females as Kohlberg's studies seemed to privilege the moral decision-making of males. This was shown by the fact that women typically scored no higher than stage three, on Kohlberg's stage theory of moral development, while men scored consistently at stage four or higher. Gilligan argued that the theory viewed individual rights and fair treatment as superior to a theory which valued caring and human relationships. In Gilligan's terms, this is a difference between a theory of justice and a theory of care. In her most famous work, *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*, she emphasizes the gender differences associated with the two modes of moral thought. A morality of care emphasizes the relationships formed with others and is often dependent on the context of the situation, while a theory of justice tries to find principles that are discovered outside of social interaction. Her involvement in this criticism is why she is known as the founder of "different voice feminism" or "difference feminism," which supports the idea that men and women tend to develop in two distinct and different manners. On this view, men tend to do moral reasoning according to laws and justice, while women predominantly reason according to caring and relationships. Both, she argues, should be equally valued within society.

Gilligan has met much criticism from some feminists, who believe that arguing from difference creates more problems and may justify oppressive actions, and from some psychologists, who worry that Gilligan has used anecdotal evidence that is seldom successfully duplicated. Nevertheless, Gilligan's criticisms of prior developmental theories have proven important to moral philosophy, developmental psychology, and feminist thought.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"In a Different Voice: Women's Conceptions of Self and of Morality," *Harvard Educational Review* 47 (1977): 481–517.

"Justice and Responsibility: Thinking about Real Dilemmas of Moral Conflict and Choice," in *Toward Moral and Religious Maturity*, ed. Christiane Brusselmans et al. (Morristown, N.J., 1980), pp. 223–49.

In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development (Cambridge, Mass., 1982; 1993).

Between Voice and Silence: Women and Girls, Race and Relationships, with Jill Taylor and Amy Sullivan (Cambridge, Mass., 1995).

The Birth of Pleasure: A New Map of Love (New York, 2002).

Further Reading
Hekman, Susan. *Moral Voices, Moral*

Selves: Carol Gilligan and Feminist Moral Theory (University Park, Penn., 1995).

"In a Different Voice," *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy* 23 (April 1998). Special issue about Gilligan.

Larrabee, Mary Jeanne, ed. *An Ethic of Care: Feminist and Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (London and New York, 1993).

John William Bates V

GILMAN, Charlotte Anna Perkins
(1860–1935)

Charlotte Anna Perkins was born on 3 July 1860 in Hartford, Connecticut, to parents Frederick Beecher Perkins and Mary A. Fitch Westcott. Although part of the wealthy Beecher family, when her parents divorced, Gilman and her older brother were left to be raised by their mother in relative poverty. She married twice during her lifetime. Her first marriage to Charles Walter Stetson in 1884 was dissolved amicably in 1887 after the birth of her only child Katherine Beecher Stetson and consequent emotional collapse, leading to a nervous condition that was to plague her for her entire working life. Although she attempted to raise her daughter on her own for several years, Gilman ultimately decided to give Stetson primary custody of her only child. Her second marriage to her cousin Houghton Gilman in 1900 proved to be much more compatible and lasted until Houghton's death in 1934. Gilman was diagnosed with breast cancer in 1932 and committed suicide by chloroform on 17 August 1935 in Pasadena, California.

Gilman attended the Rhode Island School of Design, yet this facet of her education was largely utilitarian. She did not have any formal academic training in either sociology or phi-losophy, although she self-identified as a sociologist and published in the *American Journal of Sociology*. Her father, a librarian, supplied Gilman with book lists (if not money) in order to advance her education. Self-taught, Gilman read many of the classic works of social philosophy so as to make a contribution to the progress of humanity, a goal she viewed as her ultimate calling.

Without the credentials to obtain a formal academic position, Gilman took her sociology on the road lecturing to the public on topics such as the equality of men and women, child-rearing, religion, and the home. Gilman's social thought was infused with (1) cultural feminism, the belief in the uniqueness or superiority of feminine cultural values; (2) social reform Darwinism, the application of Darwinian principles of biological evolution to the social world; and (3) Fabian socialism, the conviction that social ills such as poverty and crime can be resolved through the systematic application of social scientific laws and democratic ideals. Gilman sought to create a more pragmatic sociology that would change society from the bottom up. Additionally, she worked with the settlement movement in Chicago, including a brief stint at Jane ADDAMS's Hull-House.

Although she is intellectually linked to Addams and other sociologists including Lester WARD, Luther L. Bernard, Edward A. ROSS, and Patrick Geddes, Gilman's ideas remain largely unrecognized. She attempted to negate the sexism advocated by functionalists such as Emile Durkheim and to raise the status of women. Furthermore, she worked to undermine the ideas of theorists such as Karl Marx who viewed social change in terms of conflict. Rather, Gilman argued that society would only progress with the contributions and cooperation of both men and women.

Despite her lack of formal education, Gilman was a prolific writer and theorist. She wrote, edited, and published her monthly journal *The Forerunner* for seven years from 1909 to 1917. Her best-known works on "the

woman question" are *The Yellow Wallpaper* (1892), a fictional account of her first nervous breakdown and consequent therapy, and *Women and Economics* (1898), a treatise on the unnatural state of women's economic dependence on men. Today these works are widely read in the academic areas of women's studies and feminist theory. *The Man-made World* (1911) and *His Religion and Hers* (1923) are institutional accounts of gender relations in the Western world. More specifically, she discusses male domination within the legal system, education, religion, the family and so on. *The Home* (1903) and *Concerning Children* (1901) lament the subordination of women and children in the home and its consequent impact on men specifically and society in general, and how home life, childrearing, and education can be improved for the good of society. Gilman identified *Human Work* (1904), a discussion of the importance of specialization and human interdependence, as her most important contribution.

Gilman's work was revolutionary for its time and even today. Her belief in the scientific progression of humanity through democracy and the equality of men and women is laudable. However it must be noted that Gilman's work was severely limited by her racism. While hints of racism and eugenics are present throughout the body of her works, her "A Suggestion on the Negro Problem" (1908) outlines a specific plan of institutionalized racism aimed at African Americans. Although this racism does not discredit the entirety of her work, it is indicative of the social Darwinist thought common during Gilman's lifetime.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Women and Economics (Boston, 1898).
The Yellow Wallpaper (Boston, 1899).
Concerning Children (Boston, 1901).
The Home: Its Work and Influences (New York, 1903).
Human Work (New York, 1904)
The Man-Made World (New York, 1911; 3rd edn 1914).
"Herland," in *The Forerunner* 7 (January–December 1915). Published separately as *Herland* (New York, 1979).
His Religion and Hers: A Study of the Faith of Our Fathers and the Work of Our Mothers (New York, 1923).

Other Relevant Works
Gilman's papers are at Radcliffe College in Massachusetts.
"A Suggestion on the Negro Problem," *American Journal of Sociology* 14 (1908): 78–85.
"How Home Conditions React upon the Family" *American Journal of Sociology* 14 (1909): 592–605.
"The Waste of Private Housekeeping," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 48 (1913): 91–5.
"The Housekeeper and the Food Problem," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 74 (1917): 123–30.
The Living of Charlotte Perkins Gilman (New York, 1935).
The Charlotte Perkins Gilman Reader, ed. Ann J. Lane (New York, 1980).
Charlotte Perkins Gilman: A Nonfiction Reader, ed. Larry Ceplair (New York, 1991).
The Diaries of Charlotte Perkins Gilman, 2 vols, ed. Denise D. Knight (Charlottesville, Virg., 1994).
With Her in Ourland: Sequel to Herland, ed. Michael R. Hill and Mary Jo Deegan (Westport, Conn., 1997).
Social Ethics: Sociology and the Future of Society, ed. Michael R. Hill and Mary Jo Deegan (Westport, Conn., 2004).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Economics*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v13*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Allen, Polly Wynn. *Building Domestic Liberty: Charlotte Perkins Gilman's*

Architectural Feminism (Amherst, Mass., 1988).

Cannon, Julie Harms, and Adrian De La Rosa. "Utopian Feminism and Feminist Pedagogy: Charlotte Perkins Gilman and the Everyday Classroom," *Quarterly Journal of Ideology* 24 (2001): 1–41.

Hill, Mary A. *Charlotte Perkins Gilman: The Making of a Radical Feminist, 1860–1896* (Philadelphia, 1980).

Kessler, Carol Farley. *Charlotte Perkins Gilman: Her Progress toward Utopia with Selected Writings* (Syracuse, N.Y., 1995).

Lane, Ann J. *To "Herland" and Beyond: The Life and Work of Charlotte Perkins Gilman* (New York, 1990).

Lengermann, Patricia Madoo, and Jill Niebrugge-Brandtley. *The Women Founders* (Boston, 1998).

Meyering, Sheryl L., ed. *Charlotte Perkins Gilman: The Woman and Her Work* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1989).

Scharnhorst, Gary. *Charlotte Perkins Gilman* (Boston, 1985).

Julie Harms Cannon

GILSON, Etienne Henry (1884–1978)

Etienne Gilson was born on 13 June 1884 in Paris, France, and he died on 19 September 1978 in Auxerre, France. Gilson was the third of five sons of Paul Anthelme Gilson and Caroline Juliette Rainaud. Both families were *petit bourgeois*, Paul's were Parisian shopkeepers and Caroline's innkeepers in Burgundy. After Paul suffered a stroke in 1901, "Maman" turned over the shop to her second son and ran the family until her death in 1937. She passed on her religiosity, energy, and ambition to her three younger sons: Etienne; André, a physician; and Maurice, a priest.

Gilson attended the Catholic Notre-Dame-des-Champs from 1895 to 1902, but finished at the public Lycée Henri IV during 1902–1903, attending that year the public lectures of the Sorbonne's Lucien Lévy-Bruhl, who presented Hume's philosophy in its full historical context. Gilson later said that he aspired to do for medieval philosophy what Lévy-Bruhl had done for Hume. Gilson then studied philosophy under Emile Durkheim, Victor Delbos, and Henri Bergson at the Sorbonne from 1904 to 1907 during the high tide of positivism. For a thesis, "I asked Lévy-Bruhl to direct me in philosophy. He told me that I must undertake something positive, that speculative philosophy just wouldn't do. 'All right,' I replied, 'I will do history of philosophy. That's positive enough, isn't it?'" (Shook 1984, p. 18). Lévy-Bruhl suggested a thesis on the medieval sources of Descartes, and what resulted was nothing short of a revolution. "In 1905 Octave Hamelin was still writing that Descartes came after the ancients almost as though nothing had taken place between them and himself." In 1960 Gilson wrote: "I distinctly remember the feeling of fear I experienced on the day when, after holding back my pen for a long time, I finally wrote this simple sentence: On all these points the thought of Descartes, in comparison with the sources from which it derives, marks much less a gain than a loss" (*The Philosopher and Theology* 1962, pp. 87–9). So emerged a life's work: Gilson had found the undiscovered country of medieval philosophy and would be its explorer.

Gilson married Thérèse Ravisé in 1908; they had three children. He taught in lycées while writing his two theses during the period from 1907 to 1913. Gilson received his doctorate from the Sorbonne in 1913. His university career beginning at Lille in 1913–14, where he delivered the lectures on Aquinas that would become *Le Thomisme* (1919). In World War I he served in the army, was captured, and used the time to learn Russian and study Bonaventure. The peace settlement gave the

German University of Strasbourg to the French, who decided to make it a showcase with promising young professors, including Gilson. The German practice of organizing the Faculty of Letters around institutes rather than disciplines was retained, which led to an inter-disciplinary atmosphere Gilson embraced. While at Strasbourg from 1919 to 1921, he wrote three books, each arguing in its own way for medieval philosophy.

Gilson was promoted from Strasbourg to the Sorbonne in 1921. In 1926 he was appointed professor of medieval philosophy, launched the journal *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, and visited North America for the first time. In 1929 classes began in the Institute of Medieval Studies in Toronto, Canada, co-founded by Gilson and the Basilian Fathers. Awarded Pontifical status in 1939, Gilson's Institute was dedicated to following his interdisciplinary approach to medieval philosophy. In 1932 he joined the Collège de France as the chair of medieval philosophy. With the exception of the years of World War II, Gilson split his teaching between Paris and Toronto from 1929 to 1951. In 1946 Gilson was elected to the Académie Française. Resigning his chair at the Sorbonne in 1951, Gilson spent most of his time in Canada at the Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies until 1968. His last visit to North America was in 1972.

Gilson's first book was *Le Thomisme* (1919), which he thought was the least successful of his early books. A doctrinal study covering the full range of Aquinas's thought, it came directly from lectures Gilson always wrote out fully and ahead of time. To set out Aquinas's philosophical "system," Gilson followed the "theological order" of his *Summa theologiae* – God, creation, human nature, and a morality that returned to God – but its content and argument were fully rational and philosophical. Its six editions trace Gilson's interpretation of Thomism. But he also moved outward to other medieval thinkers, using the same theological order as the proper template

for presenting the philosophies of Bonaventure, Augustine, Bernard of Clairvaux, Dante, and Duns Scotus. Gilson's goal was a clear and systematic presentation of the doctrine of an author, based on his own words and arguments. Letting medieval philosophers speak for themselves made Gilson a master of the lucid and insightful summary, which makes his books still vivid portraits, even if each chapter began life as that most ephemeral of scholarly productions, the lecture.

Gilson's second use of history consisted in a synthetic view of a whole historical period. In *La Philosophie au moyen âge* (1922) he painted a panorama of the age. To show that there was such a thing as philosophy throughout the Middle Ages, he chose central philosophical questions – such as the existence of God, human nature, and the sources of morality – and then he traced the origin, development, frequent distortion, and sometimes death of philosophical doctrines produced as answers. If his studies of individuals show philosophical depth, his histories were designed to show the breadth of philosophy in the period. Two complete revisions followed, one in French (1944), the other in English (1955), after which Gilson turned to the history of modern philosophy.

Gilson's third and most distinctive use of history is found in *Etudes de philosophie médiévale* (1921), modeled on the music he loved. Each of the eight studies focuses on a single theme, prominent among them: the meaning of Christian rationalism, theology's servant, and Thomism's historical significance. This work exhibited the power of Gilson's prose and led to a series of memorable books. In each, Gilson used the history of philosophy as a sort of laboratory in which he leads the reader through "metaphysical experiments" where "the proof that [abstract principle] *x* by right implies *a, b, c, d* is that in fact, in the course of time, and sometimes after an interval of centuries, *a, b, c, d* have finally emerged from it" (quoted in Maurer, "Gilson's Use of History in Philosophy," 1990, p. 43). Each

book contains an overarching thesis proven with historical evidence, an exercise Gilson thought not the task of the history of philosophy but of philosophy proper. His Gifford Lectures on *The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy* (1932) were designed to prove historically his thesis of a Christian philosophy in the Middle Ages, the first of several books on this subject. In *Methodical Realism* (1936) and *Thomist Realism* (1939) Gilson took aim at neo-scholastic philosophers who tried to join the "critical method" with Thomistic realism. Such a philosophical accomodation with modernity produced an incoherent Cartesian Thomism, Cartesian in using the method of the *cogito*, but Thomistic in arriving at unsound conclusions. In 1938 Gilson gave the William James Lectures at Harvard, *The Unity of Philosophical Experience*. Taking aim at the positivism of his teachers, Gilson attempted to show that "metaphysics always buries its undertakers," by resorting to three "experiments" – medieval, Cartesian, and modern – that had failed to accomplish the attempted internment. Gilson's appreciation of existence (*esse*) as a distinctive feature of Aquinas's metaphysics led to another series of books, beginning with *L'Etre et l'essence* (1948) and *Being and Some Philosophers* (1949), where he espoused an existential Thomism.

Three of Gilson's philosophical doctrines are especially worthy of mention: Christian philosophy, epistemological realism, and existential Thomism. In all three cases Gilson found himself disputing on two fronts: against the modern philosophy represented for him by the Sorbonne, and against neo-scholastic philosophy whose emblem was Louvain.

On 21 March 1931 the Société Française de Philosophie met to debate "The Notion of Christian Philosophy," with Gilson and Jacques MARITAIN arguing in favor, and Emile Bréhier and Léon Brunschvicg against. The dispute was inevitable once Gilson claimed to have found in the Middle Ages a philosophy created by Christians. Bréhier argued historically that when Augustine grafted Greek philosophy onto Christianity he produced theology, so that after the Greek period there was no philosophy until the moderns separated it from theology in the sixteenth century. Both Bréhier and Brunschvicg conceived of philosophy in the modern way, as an abstract, demonstrative system standing on its own. Maritain and Gilson, for their part, viewed philosophy in more Aristotelian terms, as a habit existing in a concrete subject, the philosopher. Gilson argued from historical fact, pointing out that Christians like Justin the martyr, Augustine, and Anselm had turned to "the Bible and the Gospel as sources of *philosophic* inspiration," especially in metaphysics and above all about the name of God – *Ego sum qui sum* – positions he would never abandon. Maritain took a "doctrinal" approach, distinguishing between the "order of specification" that shows philosophy in itself is separate from theology, and the order of exercise, "its state within the human subject at the historical period of its making," where Christian philosophy is found.

The meeting had a great impact and others entered the dispute. Pierre Mandonnet, in agreement with the positivists, had already said that the Middle Ages produced theology, not philosophy, with the possible exception of Aquinas. The most stringent criticism, however, came from those seemingly closest to Gilson's position. In 1893, Desiré Mercier had created the Institut Supérieur de Philosophie at Louvain in order to espouse a new scholasticism in which the purely philosophical thought of Aquinas would be mastered in order for neo-scholastic philosophers to engage as equals with contemporary philosophers, who had no use for religion. The historian Maurice de Wulf then discovered in the Middle Ages a common scholastic synthesis where, among other advantages, philosophy already stood clearly demarcated from theology. F. Van Steenberghen said "there are Christian *philosophers* but there is no Christian *philosophy*," any more than there can be Christian geometry, because if "Christian" is taken as a

specific difference limiting the genus philosophy, this difference turns philosophy into theology. Gilson's response lasted for the rest of his career and began with *The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy*. There he defined Christian philosophy as "every philosophy which, although keeping the two orders [of faith and reason] formally distinct, nevertheless considers Christian revelation as an *indispensable auxiliary* to reason" (1936, p. 37). Gilson thought the positivists at the Sorbonne and the neo-scholastics at Louvain shared a common conception of philosophy: to be rational it had to be pure, unaffected by faith. Gilson's definition of Christian philosophy is designed precisely to challenge this presupposition. Considered as an abstract system, it is true that philosophy cannot argue from faith premises; but when looked at historically and in the individual philosopher, Christian philosophy exists as one habit side by side with the habits of faith and theology, in a kind of symbiotic relationship. In the 1930s Gilson thought that even while present in the mind of one knower, theology and Christian philosophy move down such separate tracks that Aquinas "exclud[ed] from theology all necessary demonstrations of purely rational nature" (*Reason and Revelation*, 1938, p. 78). The problem is that this view pushes the "five ways" demonstrating God's existence, for example, out of theology proper, even though they occur in a book called by its author *Summa theologiae*. Consequently, Gilson later called this view "a very widespread delusion" (*The Philosopher and Theology*, 1962, p. 97), and concluded that the Christian philosophy of Aquinas was an integral part of theology: "his theology by its very nature *includes* not only in fact but necessarily a *strictly rational philosophy*" (*Thomism*, 2002, xiii).

The dispute over Christian philosophy led Gilson to a conflict over epistemology, again waged on two fronts. Here his immediate target was neo-scholastic philosophy, but behind it stood modern philosophy itself. Neo-scholastics like Cardinal Mercier of Louvain

thought that through clever argument they could beat modern philosophy at its own game, because they assumed the critical method was neutral about results. But his studies of history showed Gilson that the method of critique was not neutral, because it was merely the other side of the idealistic conclusions that Descartes's successors from Berkeley to Hegel had drawn. Gilson proposed an alternative: "I maintain, therefore, that just as there is in Cartesianism a *methodical idealism*, the kind that starts with *thinking*, there can be a *methodical realism*, the kind that starts with *being*" (*Methodical Realism*, 1990, p. 118). The *cogito* cannot transcend the self because it is an artificial thought experiment. Real knowledge always begins in real experience and real experience is always from the beginning experience of the real world. Gilson's job was simply to remind neo-scholasticism and modern philosophy alike of this fact: "When, therefore, [the idealist] asks the realist how, starting from thought, one can rejoin the object, the latter should instantly reply that it is impossible, and also that this is the principal reason for not being an idealist. Since realism starts with knowledge, that is, with an act of the intellect which consists essentially in grasping an object, for the realist the question does not present an insoluble problem, but a pseudo-problem, which is something quite different." (*Methodical Realism*, 1990, p. 128) Gilson's defense of a direct but far from naïve realism was one part of an early twentieth-century critique that now appears to have closed down the era of modern philosophy that ran from Descartes to Nietzsche – a critique that included Husserl's use of intentionality to overcome the subjective error of beginning philosophy with a solitary Cartesian ego ultimately trapped within itself, and Heidegger's "ontologizing the phenomenological method" in order to point out the equally pernicious error on the objective side, that of the "eclipse of being."

Isolated in Paris during World War II, Gilson re-edited his major works and reevalu-

ated his understanding of Aquinas. Inspired by the sixteenth-century Spanish commentator Domingo Bañez and the current philosophy of existentialism, he perfected his existential interpretation of Aquinas. "As a metaphysics of the act of existing, Thomism is not *another* existential philosophy, it is *the only one*." (*Thomism*, 2002, p. 417) Gilson offered a twofold argument for this extraordinary claim, first looking at Aquinas's metaphysics, then comparing it with the metaphysics of other historical figures.

To understand each of the individual things that constitute the universe, Socrates had asked "what is it?" – a question designed to uncover essence. Plato had recognized hierarchies of essences and Aristotle had said his categories, the most general essences of all, are surpassed only by being and unity, the broadest of all notions. Aristotle thus laid down a "charter for metaphysics" by distinguishing it as a general science of "being as being" different from other sciences that cut off a part of being to study. Though Aristotle had recognized that prior to "what is it?" comes the question "is it?" he passed over this point too quickly. Aquinas saw that each individual being in the world (Aquinas in Latin: *ens*, Gilson in French: *étant*, and in English: *a being*) is composed of two distinct principles: essence (*essentia*) and a second principle Aquinas called *esse* (translated by Gilson as *étre* in French, but variously as *being* or *existence* in English). Existence and essence are real principles corresponding respectively to Aristotle's two questions. But there is a priority between them. Aquinas thought *esse* to be "the act of all acts and the perfection of all perfections." We come to understand essence through the first act of the mind – apprehending concepts; but we attain knowledge of existence only in the second act of the mind – the judgments that produce propositions; a fact that makes our concept of existence difficult and obscure. These two principles provided Aquinas with a sharp distinction between God and creatures, for in God essence and existence are identical, whereas in all creatures they are two distinct principles, as different as substance and accident or matter and form. Consequently, God is the efficient cause bestowing existence on all creatures, a properly philosophical notion of creation that complements the religious notion of creation at a first moment in time. Gilson wrestled for many years with the question whether the distinction between essence and *esse* is a demonstrated conclusion or a fundamental principle of metaphysics and finally concluded it is a principle. All arguments for this distinction are dialectical and the principle can come to any Christian philosopher by reflecting on Exodus 3:14, where God told Moses his name was "I am" (*Christian Philosophy*, 1993, pp. 30–31). Gilson was well aware of the temptation to oversell existence: "There would be no advantage in making a great to-do about the act of existing to the point of forgetting about the reality of essence, or even to thinking that this justifies us to belittle its importance. Essences are the intelligible stuff of the world. That is why ever since Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, philosophy has been a hunt for essences. The great question is whether we will try to take them alive, or if our philosophy will be only a herbarium of dead essences." (*Thomism*, 2002, p. 419)

In *L'Etre et l'essence* and *Being and Some Philosophers* Gilson took his readers on a tour of that herbarium, whose specimens were labeled with the names of the great metaphysicians of the West. Aquinas's transcendentals provide a ready scheme for cataloguing their errors. "Being (*ens*), which first falls into the mind, as Avicenna said" (*De veritate* 1.1), has two sorts of attributes subordinate to it: transcendental attributes present in all beings (essence, unity, truth, and goodness); and special modes not present in all beings (substance and Aristotle's nine accidents). Metaphysicians have committed four kinds of error: (1) Parmenides and Platonists throughout history have reversed the priority being should have over its transcendental attributes, trying to make "one" or "good" ontologically

prior to being. (2) Aristotle and his medieval followers Averroes and Siger of Brabant reduced the wider notion of being to one of its parts – namely, substance, for Aristotelian metaphysics is always a metaphysics of substance, not of being in its universality. And there have been two ways that essence has eclipsed being. (3) Medieval essentialists like Avicenna, Scotus, and Suarez recognized the composition of essence and existence in beings, but they misunderstand existence, taking it for a kind of essence. (4) And modern essentialists from Descartes to Hegel, by beginning in the mind, reduced being (*ens*) to essence, thereby producing gossamer metaphysical systems completely free of the weight of real existence. Only Aquinas escapes Gilson's critique, for Aquinas had the good sense to fight the temptation to reduce being to something less real than it actually is. Though he is never mentioned, this survey seems to be Gilson's reply to Heidegger's critique of Western metaphysics: Aquinas at least had not forgotten being, and Gilson was determined that Heidegger's century would not forget Aquinas.

Gilson's impact on philosophy was worldwide – by no means limited to North America. Of special importance to the New World, however, were his success in transplanting the skills of high European scholarship and the way he made philosophy's history respectable – especially its medieval history, and most particularly the thought of Thomas Aquinas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Le Thomisme: Introduction au système de saint Thomas d'Aquin (Strasbourg, 1919; 2nd edn, Paris, 1922; 3rd edn 1927; 4th edn, *Le thomisme: Introduction à la philosophie de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, 1942; 5th edn 1944; 6th edn 1965). The 4th edn was translated by E. Bullough as *The Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Cambridge, UK, 1924); the 5th edn was translated by L. K. Shook as *The Christian Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas* (New York, 1956); and the 6th edn was translated by L. K. Shook and A. A. Maurer as *Thomism: The Philosophy of Thomas Aquinas* (Toronto, 2002).

La Philosophie au moyen âge (Paris, 1922; 2nd edn 1944).

Saint Thomas d'Aquin (Paris, 1925). Trans. Leo Ward as *Moral Values and the Moral Life* (London, 1931).

Introduction à l'étude de saint Augustin (Paris, 1929; 2nd edn 1943). Trans. L. E. M. Lynch as *The Christian Philosophy of Saint Augustine* (New York, 1960).

Etudes sur le rôle de la pensée médiévale dans la formation du système cartésien (Paris, 1930).

L'Esprit de la philosophie mediévale (Paris, 1932). Trans. A. H. C. Downes as *The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy* (London, 1936; 2nd edn 1944).

Christianisme et philosophie (Paris, 1936). Trans. R. MacDonald as *Christianity and Philosophy* (London, 1939).

Le Réalisme méthodique (Paris, 1936). Trans. Philip Trower as *Methodical Realism* (Front Royal, Virg., 1990).

The Unity of Philosophical Experience (New York, 1938).

Reason and Revelation in the Middle Ages (New York, 1938).

Réalisme thomiste et critique de la connaisance (Paris, 1939). Trans. M. A. Wauck as *Thomist Realism and the Critique of Knowledge* (San Francisco, 1986).

God and Philosophy (New Haven, Conn., 1941).

L'Etre et l'essence (Paris, 1948; 2nd edn 1962).

Being and Some Philosophers (Toronto, 1949; 2nd edn 1952).

Les Métamorphoses de la cité de Dieu (Louvain, 1952).

The History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages (New York, 1955).

Painting and Reality (New York, 1957).

Elements of Christian Philosophy (New York, 1960).

Le philosophe et la théologie (Paris, 1960).
Trans. C. Gilson as *The Philosopher and Theology* (New York, 1962).

Introduction à la philosophie chrétienne (Paris, 1960). Trans. A. A. Maurer as *Christian Philosophy: An Introduction* (Toronto, 1993).

Introduction aux arts du beau (Paris, 1963). Translated as *The Arts of the Beautiful* (New York, 1965).

Modern Philosophy: Descartes to Kant, with T. Langan (New York, 1963).

The Spirit of Thomism (New York, 1964).

Recent Philosophy: Hegel to the Present, with T. Langan and A. A. Maurer (New York, 1966).

Les Tribulations de Sophie (Paris, 1967).

Linguistique et philosophie (Paris, 1969).

D'Aristote à Darwin et retour (Paris, 1971). Trans. J. Lyon as *From Aristotle to Darwin and Back Again* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1984).

Other Relevant Works

Gilson's papers are at the Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies in Toronto, Canada.

La Liberté chez Descartes et la théologie (Paris, 1913).

Index scolastico-cartésien (Paris, 1913).

Etudes de philosophie médiévale (Strasbourg, 1921).

La philosophie de saint Bonaventure (Paris, 1924). Trans. I. Trethowan and F. J. Sheed as *The Philosophy of St. Bonaventure* (Paterson, N.J., 1938; 2nd edn 1943).

La Théologie mystique de Saint Bernard (Paris, 1934). Trans. A. H. C. Downes as *The Mystical Theology of Saint Bernard* (London, 1940).

Pour un ordre catholique (Paris, 1934).

Héloïse et Abélard (Paris, 1938). Trans. L. K. Shook as *Heloise and Abelard* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1960).

Dante et la philosophie (Paris, 1939). Trans. D. Moore as *Dante the Philosopher* (London, 1948).

Jean Duns Scot: Introduction à ses positions fondamentales (Paris, 1952).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Encyc Relig*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v7*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Couratier, M., ed. *Etienne Gilson et nous: La philosophie et son histoire* (Paris, 1980).

Dewan, L. "Etienne Gilson and the *Actus Essendi*," *Maritain-Studies* 15 (1999): 70–96.

FitzGerald, D. "Maritain and Gilson on the Challenge of Political Democracy," in *Reassessing the Liberal State: Reading Maritain's Man and the State*, ed. T. Fuller (Washington, D.C., 2001), pp. 61–9.

Houser, R. E. "Trans-Forming Philosophical Water into Theological Wine: Gilson and Aquinas," *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 69 (1996): 103–16.

Maritain, Jacques. *Etienne Gilson: philosophe de la chrétienté* (Paris, 1949).

Maurer, A. A. "Etienne Gilson," *Christliche Philosophie im katholischen Denken des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, ed. E. Coreth (Salzburg, 1989), vol. 2, pp. 519–45.

———, "Gilson's Use of History in Philosophy," in *Thomistic Papers V* (Houston, 1990), pp. 25–48.

———, "Medieval Philosophy and its Historians," in *Being and Knowing* (Toronto, 1990), pp. 461–79.

McCool, Gerald. *From Unity to Pluralism: the Internal Evolution of Thomism* (New York, 1992).

McCorkell, Edmund J., et al. *Mélanges offerts à Etienne Gilson* (Toronto and Paris, 1959).

McGrath, Margaret. *Etienne Gilson: A Bibliography* (Toronto, 1982).

O'Neil, C. J. *An Etienne Gilson Tribute* (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1959).

Quinn, J. M. *The Thomism of Etienne Gilson* (Villanova, Penn., 1971).

Shook, Laurence K. *Etienne Gilson* (Toronto, 1984).

West, J. "Gilson, Maritain and Garrigou-Lagrange on the Possibility of Critical Realism," *Maritain-Studies* 17 (2001): 49–69.

R. E. Houser

GINET, Carl Allen (1932–)

Carl Ginet was born on 11 July 1932 in Casper, Wyoming. He received his BA from Occidental College in 1954 and his PhD in philosophy from Cornell in 1960. He taught philosophy at Ohio State University, University of Michigan, and University of Rochester, before returning to Cornell in 1971 to be professor of philosophy until his retirement in 1999. He served as an editor of *The Philosophical Review* during the 1980s and 90s.

Ginet has written on various topics in metaphysics, the philosophy of language, and Wittgenstein. His most important contributions, however, have been in epistemology and in action theory. In epistemology, he has defended an internalist account of justification and an indefeasibility account of knowledge. In action theory, he has been an important critic of compatibilism, the view that free action is compatible with the doctrine that all events have natural causes. In contrast to this view, Ginet has defended an incompatibilist account of free action, along with a distinctive account of "acting for a reason."

In the theory of knowledge, Ginet has been a leading proponent of internalism, the view that epistemic evaluation is a function of factors that are (in some appropriate sense) "internal" to the knower. Ginet argues that epistemic justification, or the kind of justification required for knowledge, is entirely a function of facts that are "directly recognizable" to the knower. A fact *f* is directly recognizable to a person *S* just in case *S* can know that *f* obtains on the basis of reflection alone. Such facts, Ginet argues, will be facts about *S*'s current mental states; for example, facts of the form "*S* is confident that *p*," or "*S* seems to remember that *q*," or "*S* seems to see that *r*."

Ginet argues that a consequence of his position is the following: if a person *S* is justified in believing that *p*, then *S* is justified in claiming to know that *p*. For consider: any reason that *S* has in favor of believing *p*, and that thereby justifies *S* in believing that *p*, is also a reason in favor of the claim that *S* knows that *p*. Likewise, if I know that *p*, and hence facts that are directly recognizable to me justify me in claiming that I know that *p*, then I need only reflect on this in order to know that I know that *p*. With a few qualifications aside, we can say that justification and knowledge are transparent in the following sense: if one is justified in believing, then one is justified in believing that one is justified in believing. And if one knows, then one can (by reflection alone) know that one knows.

According to Ginet, internalism is supported by the following reflections about epistemic justification. First, *S* ought to believe that *p* (or not believe that *p*) according to whether *S* has appropriate justification. Put another way, *S* ought to regulate her belief according to her justification. But if this is what *S* *ought* to do, then it must be something that *S* *can* do. In other words, it must be that *S* can tell whether *S* has justification in a given case. But this, Ginet argues, requires that justification be entirely a function of what is directly recognizable to *S*. That is the only way that *S* could fulfill the relevant obligation.

True justified belief is not sufficient for knowledge, however, since one's justification might be false or misleading. Ginet argues that there must be a "fourth condition" on knowledge, and he proposed that a person *S* knows *p* if and only if (1) *p* is true, (2) *S* believes *p* with confidence, (3) *S*'s confidence is supported by adequate justification, and (4) there is no truth *r* such that, if *r* were added to *S*'s justification, then *S* would no longer be justified in being con-

fident that *p*. This sort of account has come to be known as an "indefeasibility" account of knowledge, since it says, in effect, that knowledge is true justified belief, where *S*'s justification cannot be defeated or undermined in any relevant way.

In action theory, the orthodox position has long been compatibilism: an action can be free even if all events, including human actions, are determined by antecedent natural causes. Typically, compatibilists hold that an action is free just in case it is caused in the right sort of way – that is, by the actor's own beliefs and desires, as opposed to some external force or some external manipulation. Against this orthodox view, Ginet has argued that no sort of cause is compatible with free action. The usual contrast to compatibilism invokes the notion of agent causation, or the idea that free actions are caused by the actor herself, as opposed to some desire, belief, or other state of the actor. Ginet's version of incompatibilism is distinctive by avoiding the notion of agent causation, which he thinks is less than fully coherent. According to Ginet, free actions are not caused at all, either by the agent or by states of the agent. Ginet argues that compatibilism is false by proposing that freedom of action requires that more than one alternative is open to the person acting. But determinism, Ginet argues, does not allow for such alternatives. If everything that happens is determined by antecedent sufficient causes, then whatever happens has to happen, given those causes. Once the causes are in place, no alternatives are open.

This general argument can be explained in greater detail. First, determinism implies the following: for any true description of the world *a*, there is a true description of the world *b*, entirely about the past, such that, given the laws of nature, if *b* then *a*. This follows straightforwardly from the definition of determinism, which says that everything that happens is determined by antecedent sufficient causes. Second, we may affirm "the inescapability of the laws." That is, if it follows from a law of nature that if *b* then *a*, then it is not open to

anyone to make it the case that *b* but not-*a*. Finally, we can affirm "the fixity of the given past": once something happens in the past, it is not open to anyone to change what happened. Ginet argues that the three principles together entail the following: that no alternative action is open to anyone at any time. His argument begins by noting that determinism entails that for any person *S* who performs any action *a*, there will be a truth of the form "If *b* then *a*," where *a* describes *S*'s action and *b* describes a state of the world before *S* was even born. Moreover, determinism guarantees that the truth in question follows from the laws of nature. But given "the inescapability of the laws," it is not open to *S* to change this truth, and given "the fixity of the given past," it is not open to *S* to change *b*. But then it is not open to *S* to change *a*. Since the argument is completely general regarding *b, a,* and *S*, it follows that it is never open to anyone to perform an alternative action. Assuming that free action requires that one can perform an alternative, it follows that there is no free action. Of course, Ginet does not accept this conclusion. The point, rather, is that the three principles are incompatible with free action. But since "the inescapability of the laws" and "the fixity of the given past" can be taken as givens, it follows that determinism is incompatible with free action.

Incompatibilism faces problems of its own, however. Most importantly, if an action is not caused then it is not caused by the actor's own beliefs and desires, or the actor's own reasons. But this too seems incompatible with freedom. At the very least, it would seem that at least *some* free actions are done for reasons, but incompatibilism threatens to make even this impossible. To address this problem, Ginet defends an a-deterministic account of "acting for a reason." It is "a-deterministic" in the sense that it is compatible with both determinism and indeterminism. Roughly, the idea is this: A person *S* performs an action *a* for a reason just in case, by performing *a*, *S* intends to accomplish some purpose or fulfill

some desire. For example, *S* flips the switch in order to turn on the light just in case, by flipping the switch, *S* intended to turn on the light. Alternatively, *S* opened the window because she wanted to get some fresh air just in case, by opening the window, *S* intended to fulfill her desire to get some fresh air. On this account, to act for a reason is to act with the right sort of intention. Relatedly, to give a "reasons explanation" for an action is to point out that the action is done with a particular intention, and with the belief that it will fulfill that intention. This is consistent with the action being caused by the intention in question or by something else. But it does not require that the action is caused. *S* performs an action for a reason just in case *S* performs the action *with* the right sort of intention, whether there are casual antecedents to the intention and action or not.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Knowledge, Perception, and Memory (Dordrecht, 1975).

"Knowing Less by Knowing More," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 5 (1980): 151–61.

"Contra Reliabilism," *The Monist* 68 (1985): 175–87.

"The Fourth Condition," in *Philosophical Analysis,* ed. D. F. Austin (Dordrecht, 1988), pp. 105–19.

On Action (Cambridge, UK, 1990).

"In Defense of the Principle of Alternative Possibilities: Why I Don't Find Frankfurt's Argument Convincing," *Philosophical Perspectives* 10 (1996): 403–17.

"Deciding to Believe," *Knowledge, Truth and Duty*, ed. M. Steup (Oxford, 2001), pp. 63–76.

"Reasons Explanations of Action: Causalist versus Noncausalist Accounts," in *The Oxford Handbook of Free Will*, ed. Robert Kane (Oxford, 2001), pp. 386–405.

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with Sidney Shoemaker, *Knowledge and Mind: Philosophical Essays* (Oxford, 1983).

Further Reading

Alston, William. "Internalism and Externalism in Epistemology," *Philosophical Topics* 14 (1986): 179–221.

Greco, John. "Internalism and Epistemically Responsible Belief," *Synthese* 85 (1990): 245–77.

Hinton, Beverly K. "A Critique of Carl Ginet's Intrinsic Theory of Volition," *Behavior and Philosophy* 29 (2001): 101–20.

Lemos, Noah. "High Accessibility and Justification," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 49 (1989): 463–76.

Marks, Charles E. "Ginet on Wittgenstein's Argument against Private Rules," *Philosophical Studies* 25 (1974): 261–71.

Mele, Alfred. "Is there a Place for Intention in the Analysis of Intentional Action?" *Philosophia* 27 (1999): 419–32.

O'Connor, Timothy. "Indeterminism and Free Agency: Three Recent Views," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 53 (1993): 499–526.

Sorensen, Roy. "Uncaused Decisions and Pre-decisional Blindspots," *Philosophical Studies* 45 (1984): 51–6.

John Greco

GLADDEN, Solomon Washington (1836–1918)

Washington Gladden was born on 11 February 1836 in Pottsgrove, Pennsylvania. Gladden proudly claimed descent from the Gladding family, part of the Puritan migra-

tion to Plymouth, Massachusetts, in the 1630s. In honor of one of his forebears who had served at Valley Forge, he was given the name "Washington." His father, an impoverished village schoolmaster, died when Washington (or "Wash" as he was known) was only five. Upon the remarriage of his mother, "Wash" was sent to live on an uncle's farm near Owego, New York. Noticing his nephew's literary ability, the uncle released him from his obligation to serve until he was twenty-one, and allowed him at age sixteen to be apprenticed to the editor of the Owego *Gazette*.

His training in the print shop, plus some occasional hours in a one-room school and the local "preparatory academy," proved sufficient for Gladden to be accepted as a sophomore at Williams College in rural Massachusetts in 1856. The collegiate curriculum was largely limited to the "Five R's" – or "reading, recitation, 'rithmetic, rhetoric, and religion." A redemptive influence was provided by the presence of Mark HOPKINS, regarded as "one of the four or five great teachers that America has produced." He received his BA in 1859, and for a while he attended lectures at the Union Theological Seminary in New York City, where he was influenced by Professors Roswell D. Hitchcock and Henry B. SMITH. Gladden profited from his wide reading, both in his own personal library (which came to include many thousand volumes) and in public collections (such as the famed Astor Library). His broad erudition and extensive public service led to his being recognized with honorary doctorates from three institutions: a Doctor of Laws degree from the University of Wisconsin in 1881; a Doctor of Divinity degree from a small Lutheran liberal arts college in Roanoke, Virginia, in 1882; and the Doctor of Laws degree from the University of Notre Dame in 1905.

For nearly sixty years following his graduation from Williams, Gladden won recognition both as a parish minister and a widely-read journalist. Asked to identify himself, he could

have said Congregational pastor or editor of the *Independent* magazine, but, instead, he simply answered "interpreter." In addition to literally thousands of essays in journals as varied as *Scribner's*, *The Congregationalist*, *Century*, the *New York Times*, and the *Ohio State Journal*, Gladden also found time to write more than forty books as varied as fiction (*Christian League of Connecticut*, 1886), poetry (*Ultima Veritas*), sermons (*Where Does the Sky Begin?*, 1904), and social criticism (*Working People and Their Employers*, 1885).

Most of his "interpreting" occurred from the pulpits of Congregational churches in Brooklyn and Morristown, New York, but especially at the First Church in Springfield, Massachusetts, from 1875 to 1882; and the First Church of Columbus, Ohio, from 1882 to 1918. Though offered academic posts, and though no stranger to the university podium and the seminary pulpit, Gladden was convinced that he served best as a "communicator of ideas" in the context of the local church. His congregations, especially in Columbus, were composed of professionals and intellectuals who supported his free and wide-ranging spirit. Gladden even served on the Columbus City Council.

Both a thinker and a doer, Gladden was best remembered as an advocate of liberal Christianity, and as a champion of the Social Gospel. Gladden did not come easily to his position as America's major exponent of Liberal Protestantism in the Gilded Age. While he was an heir of the Puritan tradition, with its threefold emphasis on faith, reason, and justice, he had been raised in the revivalism and Calvinism that permeated antebellum America. Against both he was to revolt, painfully, instead seeking a "broader faith," and "a free mind" focused on "justice for all."

Revivalism dominated evangelical Christianity in the United States from George Whitfield to Billy Sunday. As a child, Gladden had been told to "get saved." As a five-year-old he heard the evangelist describe "the burning pit, with sinners trying to crawl up it sides out

of the flames" while "the devils, with pitch-forks, stood by to fling them back again." Gladden recalled "it made me angry" but, when he simply could not have the "right experience," he fell into deep despair. Ready to embrace atheism as a more humane alternative than revivalism, Gladden happened to come upon the writings of Horace BUSHNELL, who argued that faith was not "a sudden new nature" born in a "momentary experience" but, instead, was the result of *Christian Nurture* (1847). Reading that book convinced Gladden that Christianity was rational, not emotional; gradual and incremental, not instantaneous; and that it was graceful, not wrathful in nature.

Calvinism, since colonial times, had been the prevailing influence in all the major American denominations. A classical Christian model, it involved "faith seeking understanding" on the basis of Scripture and Nature to create a synthesis of understanding. Gladden was persuaded that this Calvinism had to be reexamined in light of seven major changes in the cultural climate: (1) geology now indicated a far greater age for the earth than the traditional 6,000 years based on genealogies in Genesis; (2) evolutionary biology convinced Gladden that any literal reading of the scriptural account of human origins was irrational; (3) the German "higher criticism" of the Bible suggested that Scripture had emerged from multiple strands of thought, rather than being "miraculously dictated"; (4) the new psychology, expounded by William JAMES, proposed more complex models of human behavior than "simple sinfulness"; (5) the new economics, articulated by scholars like Richard ELY, revealed the interdependence of humans in society as well as the need for "Corporate Salvation"; (6) the comparative religion movement, identified with Max Müller and displayed at the World Parliament of Religions in 1893 (in which Gladden participated), pointed to cooperation and not competition between faith traditions; (7) and the new history of the origins of Christianity by Adolf von Harnack invited a new look at the "religion of Jesus," rather than the one "about" him. To reconcile these new findings with faith, on the basis of reason, became Gladden's task – as he inquired, "how much is left of the old doctrines?"

For Gladden, the nineteenth century was a time as exciting for new religious options as the Reformation era had been. Clearing a way the "cluttered landscape of a collapsed Calvinism," in works as *Present Day Theology* (1913), Gladden proposed the new synthesis of liberalism. It was to be anchored in three affirmations. (1) The imminence of God in Nature, not his transcendence in Space. Gladden contended that "God has been abiding in the world and manifesting himself … ever since the morning of the creation." There could be no "Warfare of Science and Religion" since the God who spoke in apostles and prophets now talked in poets and physicists. (2) The organic character of human life and nature was a second confession, for "if … God be imminent in the creation, it is evident that the sign of his presence must be most clear in humanity." Human evolution was a divine revelation, starting, not with the "fall" of Adam and Eve but their rise, from the Stone Age to Jesus. In the Man of Nazareth, one "pre-eminently the Teacher," the self-impartation of God to the species became eminently evident. (3) The Christian hope was not "eschatological chaos" but the trust that God's Kingdom would come through intelligence, benevolence, and reverence. A "Good Society" could result as the values of friendship were used to usher in a realm of right relationships.

These three commitments led to Gladden's articulation of the Social Gospel. As the spiritual component of the progressive movement in the 1890s and early 1900s, it longed to see "the promise of American life" actualized in four ways. First, the genesis of a broader democracy was desired, giving more power to the people; the masses, not the classes, were to be trusted and empowered. Second, the birth of an industrial democracy was to be hastened,

with a concern for the fair distribution of the goods resulting from mechanized mass production. Third, the dawn of a cooperative, not a competitive, culture was to be welcomed. For Gladden the future was communitarian, not ruggedly individualistic. Fourth, as a Christian Socialist, Gladden also came to embrace pacifism, the nonviolent resistance to oppression and exploitation. An opponent of American entry into World War I, Gladden asked, along with fellow Social Gospel thinker Walter RAUSCHENBUSCH, that America become a "sanctuary of civilization" in a world "embracing holocaust."

At the time of his death on 2 July 1918 in Columbus, Ohio, Gladden was perhaps America's best-known minister, its most ardent "apostle of Liberal Christianity," and its most respected "project of Social Justice." As both a popularizer and a seminal thinker, Gladden not only hastened the triumph of liberalism in American Protestantism, he also foreshadowed the radical theology of the mid twentieth century with its emphasis on a revisioning of the faith and a restructuring of society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Working People and Their Employers (New York, 1885).

Applied Christianity: Moral Aspects of Social Questions (Boston, 1887).

Who Wrote the Bible? A Book for the People (Boston, 1891).

Burning Questions (New York, 1892).

Tools and the Man: Property and Industry under the Christian Law (Boston, 1893).

The Church and the Kingdom (New York, 1894).

Ruling Ideas of the Present Age (Boston, 1895).

Social Facts and Forces: The Factory, the Labor Union, the Corporation, the Railway, the City, the Church (New York, 1897).

How Much is Left of the Old Doctrines? A Book for the People (Boston, 1899).

Social Salvation (Boston, 1902).

Where Does the Sky Begin? (Boston, 1904).

Christianity and Socialism (New York and Cincinnati, 1905).

The New Idolatry, and Other Discussions (New York, 1905).

The Church and Modern Life (Boston, 1908).

The Futility of Force (Columbus, Ohio, 1908).

The Labor Question (Boston, 1911).

Present Day Theology (Columbus, Ohio, 1913).

The Forks of the Road (New York, 1916).

Other Relevant Works

Gladden's papers are in the Ohio Historical Society in Columbus, Ohio.

The Christian League of Connecticut (New York, 1886).

The Cosmopolis City Club (New York, 1893).

Recollections (Boston, 1909).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Dict Amer Religious Bio, Encyc Amer Bio

Dorn, Jacob H. *Washington Gladden: Prophet of the Social Gospel* (Columbus, Ohio, 1967). Contains a bibliography of Gladden's writings.

Fry, C. George. "The Social Gospel at the Crossroads of Middle America: Solomon Washington Gladden and the First Congregational Church of Columbus, Ohio, 1892–1918," in *Perspectives on the Social Gospel* (Lewiston, N.Y., 1999), pp. 51–80.

Fry, C. George, and Jon P. Fry. *Pioneering a Theology of Evolution: Washington Gladden and Pierre Teilhard de Chardin* (Lanham, Md., 1989).

Fry, C. George, and Joel R. Kurz. *Washington Gladden as a Preacher of the Social Gospel, 1882–1918* (Lewiston, N.Y., 2003).

Knudten, Richard D. *The Systematic Thought of Washington Gladden* (New York, 1968).

Weisenburger, Francis P. *Ordeal of Faith, The Crisis of Church-Going America, 1865–1900* (New York, 1959).

C. George Fry

GÖDEL, Kurt Friedrich (1906–78)

Kurt Gödel was born on 28 April 1906 in Brünn, Moravia, then part of Austria and now Brno, Czech Republic. In 1924 he entered the University of Vienna, initially to study physics but eventually studying mathematics with Hans Hahn. He also attended lectures in philosophy and sessions of the Vienna Circle of logical positivists including Rudolf CARNAP. Gödel completed the PhD in mathematics in 1929 and qualified as a *Privatdozent* (unsalaried lecturer) in 1933. He retained that position until it was abolished after the Nazi annexation of Austria in 1938, but lectured only intermittently, in part because of health problems and in part because of visits to the United States. He was a visiting member of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, New Jersey in 1933–4, the fall of 1935 (when he had to return early), and the fall of 1938, after which he taught for a semester at the University of Notre Dame and then returned to Vienna.

In January 1940, in the face of concerns about the war and uncertainty about his academic position, Gödel left Vienna with his wife and took up a position at the Institute for Advanced Study, where he remained for the rest of his life. He became a permanent member in 1946 and professor of mathematics in 1953. He retired in 1976. During that time he traveled little and never returned to Europe. He had many health problems, both physical and mental, and his health declined seriously after 1976. Gödel died on 14 January 1978 in Princeton, New Jersey.

Gödel's most significant work was mostly in logic, mathematical logic, and mathematics. Although he was interested in philosophy throughout his life and it became a major pre-occupation from about 1942 on, he published little philosophy. His impact on philosophy rests more on his mathematical work, especially the incompleteness theorems of 1931, than on his philosophical writing, even when his publications are augmented by posthumous materials.

Gödel's enduring fame rests primarily on four contributions. First, in his dissertation he proved the completeness of first-order quantificational logic, that is, that if a formula of this logic is not formally refutable then there is a model in which it is true, in fact a model where the domain of the quantifiers is the natural numbers. Gödel generalized his result to prove that the same holds for denumerable sets of formulae and along the way proved the compactness theorem: if every finite subset of a set of formulae has a model, so does the whole set. These theorems, published in 1930, are the fundamental theorems of model theory.

Second, in his epoch-making paper in 1931, Gödel proved his two incompleteness theorems. First, he described for a system of arithmetic based on the simple theory of types a formula F that "says of itself that it is unprovable" and proved that if the system is consistent, then F *is* unprovable. If in addition the system is w-consistent (cannot prove there is a number satisfying some condition while refuting it for each individual number), then $\neg F$ is also unprovable, and thus the system is incomplete. The method was that of arithmetization of syntax, coding symbols of the system by natural numbers so that formulae and proofs could be coded as sequences and so also as numbers, so that properties such as being a proof of a given formula could be represented by predicates expressible in the system. Gödel showed that this could be

carried out for first-order arithmetic, so that the incompleteness result applies to it as well. Second, if the system satisfies some further conditions, then if it is consistent the formula expressing the consistency of the system is unprovable. In this sense the consistency of the system cannot be proved in the system itself.

Gödel's third major contribution came in the mid 1930s, as he turned his attention to set theory. Between 1935 and 1937 he proved of the standard systems of set theory, such as that of Zermelo-Fraenkel (ZF), that if they are consistent, they remain so after the addition of the axiom of choice and the generalized continuum hypothesis, a generalization of Cantor's early conjecture that the power of the continuum is the least uncountable cardinal. Thus the latter cannot be refuted by standard set-theoretic principles. The proof proceeded by constructing an inner model of "constructible sets," essentially an extension of Russell's ramified hierarchy to allow levels of sets indexed by all the ordinals. He proved that it is consistent with ZF that all sets are constructible and that this hypothesis implies the axiom of choice and the generalized continuum hypothesis. Gödel's methods proved fundamental to later research in set theory.

Gödel's fourth major contribution came in the late 1940s, prompted by reflection on Kant's conception of the transcendental ideality of time. Gödel discovered solutions of the field equations of general relativity in which the matter of the universe is in a state of uniform rigid rotation and in which there are closed time-like curves. The latter raised the theoretical possibility of time travel, but what interested Gödel philosophically were solutions in which one could not define an objective global time. He published his results in two papers, as well as a philosophical comment (1949), all reprinted in volume 2 of the *Collected Works* (abbreviated as CW). His initial models appear not to be physically realistic, but the later ones may be. The work was influential in the development of general rela-

tivity and cosmology. The connection with Kant is explored in some manuscripts on relativity theory and Kantian philosophy, probably earlier drafts of 1949 (two are in CW 3).

In the 1930s Gödel obtained other significant results in mathematical logic. Several papers concern intuitionistic logic and its relation to classical logic and modal logic. Most foundationally significant is the translation of classical logic into intuitionistic, which implies that if intuitionistic first-order arithmetic HA is consistent, then so is classical (PA). His interpretation of HA by primitive recursive functionals of finite type, discovered in 1941 but only published in 1958, introduced a method widely used in postwar work in proof theory.

Gödel's first two major results are pillars on which later mathematical logic rests. One major step remained to be taken in the 1930s for mathematical logic to reach maturity: the analysis of computability and the proof of undecidability results, in particular the undecidability of first-order logic. Gödel participated in this development. For example, in his 1934 Princeton lectures, "On Undecidable Propositions of Formal Mathematical Systems" (in Davis 1965 and CW 1), he presented the concept of general recursive function, one of the equivalent notions that came to be identified with that of computable total function on the natural numbers. However, the decisive steps and results were obtained by others, particularly Alonzo CHURCH and A. M. Turing. Gödel recognized the importance of Turing's analysis. In particular, it enabled him to state his own first incompleteness theorem in what he regarded as full generality, since it enabled a general definition of formal system (CW 1, p. 369).

The philosophical impact of Gödel's logical work can be further discussed here largely in connection with his own philosophical thought. One immediate impact must be mentioned, however. In the 1920s David Hilbert founded proof theory, a branch of mathemat-

ical logic, and proposed to resolve epistemological questions about mathematics by formalizing fundamental mathematical theories and giving a proof of their consistency by a syntactic analysis of formal proofs. Proofs of consistency were to be carried out by the finitary method, which corresponded to the most elementary constructive methods in arithmetic. Hilbert's own statements and the actual methods of proof-theoretic work in his school encouraged the conclusion that finitary methods could be captured within a restricted part of PA. However, Gödel's second incompleteness theorem implied that such methods were not sufficient even to prove the consistency of PA. This was a very serious blow to Hilbert's program, and although work in the type of proof theory it inaugurated has continued to this day, its philosophical ambitions have had to become more modest.

Gödel's own philosophical work reflected his highly rationalistic temperament as well as his training in mathematics and physics. Although the Vienna Circle, especially Carnap, stimulated his interest in logic and foundations, he reacted against their views. During most of his career positive influence came more from historical figures, especially Leibniz and Kant, than from the philosophical movements of his own day (apart from programs in the foundations of mathematics). He was aloof from the philosophical debates of the postwar period and indeed sought to avoid controversy of any kind.

Gödel is widely known for defending a Platonist view and a philosophical conception of mathematical intuition. On the first point, he could be described as a realist; in an unsent reply to a questionnaire in 1975 he described himself as a "conceptual realist" even since 1925 (see CW 4, p. 447). In letters during 1967–8 to Hao WANG (Wang 1974, pp. 8–11; CW 5, pp. 396–9, 403–5), he argued that his realist view contributed significantly to his principal discoveries in logic. With respect to the incompleteness theorem, what he thought important was the heuristic role of the concept of objective truth, independent of provability. Remarks from the 1930s suggest that it was only over time that he came to the complete Platonism he avowed in 1944 and later writings (see Parsons 1995 and Davis 1998).

Gödel nonetheless showed sympathy for idealism, and sometimes described his philosophy as idealistic. Although Kant was an important influence on him, he criticized Kant's transcendental idealism as too subjectivist. But he was able to combine ringing expressions of realist conviction with idealist sympathies (see for example the letter to Gotthard Günther of 30 June 1954 in CW 4). Concern to reconcile these tendencies was probably a factor leading him to embark in 1959 on a study of Edmund Husserl's works and to be favorable thereafter to Husserl's views. Evidence of this influence from Husserl is in a shorthand draft of an undelivered lecture, c. 1961, titled "The Modern Development of the Foundations of Mathematics in the Light of Philosophy" (CW 3, pp. 374–87). See also Tieszen (1998) and van Atten and Kennedy (2003).

Gödel's Platonism has several elements. One element, which may underlie his reaction to the Vienna Circle, is the insistence that mathematical statements have a "real content" as opposed to being tautologies or reflections of convention or the use of language. Such a view need not be realism in a strong sense, and Gödel admits that it is compatible with intuitionism. A second element is the conviction of the inexhaustibility of mathematics, in the sense that any formal system or even definite conceptual framework can in principle be expanded to yield new statements and theorems. This was one of Gödel's reasons for insisting on the generality that the Church–Turing thesis gave to the first incompleteness theorem. However, he already observed in 1931 that his undecidable sentence becomes provable by ascending to higher types. In a 1933 lecture on "The Present Situation in the Foundations of Mathematics" to the Mathematical Association of America (CW 3, pp. 45–53) he describes in very clear

terms what is now called the iterative conception of set. He argues that any procedure for generating sets in this way leads, once clearly understood, to a procedure that generates more sets. In the usage of Michael Dummett, the concept of set is "indefinitely extensible."

A third element of Gödel's Platonism, which emerges only in 1944 and 1947, is his robust defense of set theory, taking its language at face value and thus accepting its ontology of sets. He wrote that the iterative conception captures Cantor's set theory "in its whole original extent and meaning" and that it "has never led to any antinomy whatsoever." In 1947 he already conjectures that the continuum hypothesis (CH) is independent (as Paul Cohen proved in 1963) but holds that set theory, however incomplete, describes a "well-determined reality"; independence of CH would not make idle the question of its truth. Gödel was already then interested in strong axioms of infinity (also called large cardinal axioms) and hoped that axioms of that type might settle CH. Such axioms have subsequently played an important role in set theory, but the independence results have extended to those proposed so far, so that it is only in conjunction with axioms of another kind that they might settle CH. Even the question whether CH has a determinate truth-value remains open.

The fourth and most problematic aspect of Gödel's Platonism is that his realism extends to concepts as well as mathematical objects. Concepts are objects associated with predicates. One might expect a rationalist like Gödel to be a realist about properties and relations. But he had more specific reasons. Concepts are important to his epistemology as objects of intuition. Set theory avoids paradox by allowing that some predicates do not have sets as extensions, so that concepts are not reducible to sets or objects too much like sets. Finally, he took examples of conceptual analysis in mathematics, yielding sharp and essentially unique concepts (such as that of computability), to indicate that such concepts are not man-made.

Although Gödel believed that the iterative conception of set is free of antinomies, he did regard the antinomies as a serious problem for the foundations of logic. Late in life he maintained that the "intensional paradoxes" (which presumably concerned the notion of concept and related notions) remained unsolved. He seems to have hoped for a type-free theory of concepts, and the problem of devising such a theory that is both strong and consistent remains difficult. But it is not clear how much effort he himself put into devising a formal theory of concepts, or how high a priority it was for him. He was, however, undoubtedly dissatisfied with his own thought about concepts.

Gödel's epistemological views on mathematics have two distinctive features. First, already in 1944 he proposed that axioms in mathematics might be accepted not on the ground of intrinsic evidence but on the basis of their consequences. As he later put it, "There might exist axioms so abundant in their verifiable consequences, shedding so much light on a whole field, and yielding such powerful methods of solving problems that, no matter whether or not they are intrinsically necessary, they would have to be accepted at least in the same sense as any well-established physical theory." (1964, CW 2, p. 261) In 1944 this was a bold proposal (though with a precedent in Bertrand Russell), but in time it has come to be widely accepted that mathematical evidence is to some degree a posteriori in this way. That it is to some degree empirical is a further thesis, which Gödel did not embrace.

Second, Gödel held that what he calls mathematical intuition is an essential source of evidence in mathematics. He famously wrote that "we do have something like a perception of the objects of set theory, as is seen from the fact that the axioms force themselves upon us as being true" (CW 2, p. 268). In his earlier philosophical publications there are only tenuous indications of this view, but it is fully avowed in 1964 and developed earlier during 1953–9 in the six drafts titled "Is Mathematics

Syntax of Language?" (the second and third versions are in CW 3, pp. 334–62). Intuition, as Gödel understands it, is rational evidence. A proposition is a deliverance of intuition if it is rationally evident by itself (i.e., not inferred). The conception is not Kantian; intuition in the relevant sense is not spatiotemporal and does not have the limits of application to mathematics drawn by Kant and later Kantian conceptions of intuition. It probably derives from conceptions of rational evidence in early modern philosophers such as Descartes and Leibniz. Gödel argues that mathematical intuition has to be admitted by someone who does not hold a reductionist view such as he attributed to Carnap, although his rather expansive view of its scope could not be shared by someone who does not accept higher set theory. Gödel does not consider an empiricist view such as W. V. QUINE's.

The above quotation speaks of something like a perception of the *objects* of set theory. Distinctive of Gödel's view is that he thought rational evidence of this kind analogous to perception. One argument is from the inexhaustibility of mathematics, so that in the development of mathematics new intuitions will continue to arise. Another is that we can "perceive" concepts more or less clearly. He thought the concept of computability was perceived much more clearly after Turing's analysis. It follows that there is no reason to think mathematical intuition infallible. When axioms of set theory "force themselves on us as being true," the objects in question are primarily *concepts*, in particular the concept of set itself, and of course the concept of membership. It is doubtful that intuition of particular sets plays any significant role in the evidence of the axioms.

Gödel saw a parallel both ontologically and epistemologically between mathematics and physical theory, and like Quine, one that allowed him to find a place for a posteriori evidence in mathematics. But Gödel insisted that mathematics has no implications for physical reality and argued that basic mathematical principles are analytic. However, he meant by this that they follow from the concepts in them, so that the claim is quite compatible with realism. It is probable that intuition as described above amounts to seeing how a proposition is made true by the concepts constituting it. Of certain strong axioms of infinity Gödel thought this had not yet been made out, so that whatever plausibility they might have, we do not know them by intuition.

One idealistic aspect of Gödel's philosophy is his rejection of materialism and mechanism. In his 1951 Gibbs lecture to the American Mathematical Society on "Some Basic Theorems of the Foundations of Mathematics and their Philosophical Implications" (CW 3, pp. 304–23), Gödel considered the implication of his incompleteness theorem for a mechanist view of the mind. Unlike J. R. Lucas, who argued (1961) that the theorem itself implied the falsity of mechanism, Gödel argued for a disjunction: "Either … the human mind infinitely surpasses the powers of any finite machine, or else there exist absolutely unsolvable diophantine problems," i.e., problems expressible as whether a Gödel sentence is true or false (CW 3, p. 310). But his view of the power of reason made him favor the first disjunct. Some of his thoughts on this subject appeared in his lifetime (Wang 1974, pp. 324–6, in a section revised by Gödel).

Gödel's work in general relativity originated in reflections on Kant's view of time. In 1949 he expresses the view that general relativity implies that change is "an illusion or appearance due to our special mode of perception" (CW 2, p. 202). Although he admits that in some models an objective global time can be defined, he took his own models to imply that whether this is true depends on the mean motion of matter, and he seems to have thought that too contingent. But the issue concerned the place of time in the overall scheme of things. Gödel's overall view of physical knowledge was cautious but otherwise not more anti-realistic than his view of mathematical knowledge. Without going into the

matter, he rejects drawing such conclusions from quantum mechanics. In discussing Kant's idealism in the light of relativity, he suggests that the former should be modified: "it should be assumed that it is possible for scientific knowledge, at least partially and step by step, to go beyond the appearances and approach the world of things" (CW 3, p. 244).

Gödel held a wide spectrum of philosophical views and aspired to general system in philosophy. The outstanding characteristic of his world view is rationalistic optimism, evident in fourteen theses with which he once summarized his philosophy in a manuscript (Wang 1996, p. 316). He described his philosophy as "rationalistic, idealistic, optimistic, and theological" and as "a monadology with a central monad" (p. 290). The kinship of this general outlook with Leibniz's is obvious. Gödel thought it should be possible to found metaphysics scientifically, with the help of the axiomatic method, and later phenomenology as well. Gödel's more general philosophical reflections are almost entirely recorded in shorthand notebooks and in his conversations with Wang. He himself thought he had not worked out his philosophy enough for a more systematic exposition. One concrete result, however, was a modal-logical version of the ontological proof in an unpublished paper of 1970 titled "Ontological Proof" (CW 3, pp. 403–4), related to Leibniz's version of the argument.

What is Gödel's significance as a philosopher? Although his views are and will remain controversial, he is a major philosopher of mathematics, where his Platonist and rationalist views were developed in the context of reflection on his own mathematical work, and the data he appeals to, particularly the incompleteness theorems and the nature of higher set theory, are a challenge for any view. Outside this area, the views in the philosophy of time developed along with his cosmological models, his views on minds and machines, and his version of the ontological argument, have excited interest and will probably continue to

do so. Gödel's general world view seems to be of interest mainly as an expression of a genius of a very particular temperament. Whether others sympathetic with that temperament will find his sketches promising remains to be seen.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Collected Works, vol. 1: Publications 1929–1936, ed. Solomon Feferman et al. (Oxford, 1986). In all five volumes, Gödel's German writings have facing English translations.

Collected Works, vol. 2: Publications 1938–1974, ed. Solomon Feferman et al. (Oxford, 1990).

Collected Works, vol. 3: Unpublished Essays and Lectures, ed. Solomon Feferman et al. (Oxford, 1995).

Collected Works, vol. 4: Correspondence A–G, ed. Solomon Feferman et al. (Oxford, 2003).

Collected Works, vol. 5: Correspondence H–Z, ed. Solomon Feferman et al. (Oxford, 2003).

Other Relevant Works

Gödel's papers are at Princeton University.

"Die Vollständigkeit der Axiome des logischen Funktionenkalküls," *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik* 37 (1930): 349–60.

"Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der *Principia Mathematica* und verwandter Systeme I," *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik* 38 (1931): 173–98.

"Zur intuitionistischen Arithmetik und Zahlentheorie," *Ergebnisse eines mathematischen Kolloquiums* 4 (1933): 34–8.

The Consistency of the Axiom of Choice and of the Generalized Continuum Hypothesis with the Axioms of Set Theory (Princeton, N.J., 1940).

"Russell's Mathematical Logic," in *The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (Evanston, Ill., 1944), pp. 123–54.

"What is Cantor's Continuum Problem?" *American Mathematical Monthly* 54 (1947): 515–25. Rev. version in *Philosophy of Mathematics: Selected Readings*, ed. Paul Benacerraf and Hilary Putnam (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964), pp. 258–73.

"A Remark about the Relationship between Relativity Theory and Idealistic Philosophy," in *Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (Evanston, Ill., 1949), pp. 557–62.

"Über eine bisher noch nicht benützte Erweiterung des finiten Standpunktes," *Dialectica* 12 (1958): 280–87.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*

Davis, Martin, ed. *The Undecidable* (Hewlett, N.Y., 1965).

Davis, Martin. "Why Gödel Didn't Have Church's Thesis," *Information and Control* 54 (1982): 3–24.

———, "Review of John Dawson, *Logical Dilemmas*," *Philosophia Mathematica* 6 (1998): 116–28.

Dawson, John W., Jr. *Logical Dilemmas. The Life and Work of Kurt Gödel* (Wellesley, Mass., 1997).

Ellis, G. F. R. "Contributions of K. Gödel to Relativity and Cosmology," in *Gödel '96*, ed. Peter Hájek (Berlin, 1996), pp. 34–49.

Goldstein, Rebecca. *Incompleteness: The Proof and Paradox of Kurt Gödel* (New York, 2005).

Hintikka, Jaakko. *On Gödel* (Belmont, Cal., 2000).

Hofstadter, Douglas. *Gödel Escher Bach: An Eternal Golden Braid*, 2nd edn (New York, 1999).

Köhler, Eckehart, et al., eds. *Kurt Gödel: Wahrheit & Beweisbarkeit*, 2 vols (Vienna, 2002).

Lucas, J. R. "Minds, Machines, and

Gödel," *Philosophy* 36 (1961): 112–27.

Malament, David. "'Time Travel' in the Gödel Universe," in *Proceedings of the Philosophy of Science Association*, ed. Peter Asquith and Philip Kitcher (East Lansing, Mich., 1985), vol. 2, pp. 91–100.

Nagel, Ernest, and James R. Newman. *Gödel's Proof*, 2nd edn (New York, 2001).

Parsons, Charles. "Platonism and Mathematical Intuition in Kurt Gödel's Thought," *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 1 (1995): 44–74.

Smullyan, Raymond M. *Gödel's Incompleteness Theorems* (Oxford, 1992).

Tieszen, Richard. "Kurt Gödel's Path from the Incompleteness Theorems (1931) to Phenomenology (1961)," *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 4 (1998): 181–203.

van Atten, Mark, and Juliette Kennedy. "The Philosophical Development of Kurt Gödel," *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 9 (2003): 425–76.

Wang, Hao. *From Mathematics to Philosophy* (London, 1974).

———, *Reflections on Kurt Gödel* (Cambridge, Mass., 1987).

———, *A Logical Journey: From Gödel to Philosophy* (Cambridge, Mass. 1996).

Yourgrau, Palle. *The Disappearance of Time: Kurt Gödel and the Idealistic Tradition in Philosophy* (Cambridge, UK, 1991).

Charles Parsons

GOFFMAN, Erving Manual (1922–82)

Erving Manual Goffman was born on 11 June 1922 in Mannville, Alberta, Canada. He received his high school degree from St. John's Technical High School in Winnipeg, Canada, which he attended from 1936 to 1939. Goffman enrolled in the University of Manitoba in 1939 and considered a career in chemistry. In 1942 he left school and went to work for the National Film Board of Canada in Ottawa. He enrolled at the University of Toronto in 1944 where he began taking sociology classes. He left Canada for the United States shortly after receiving his BA from the University of Toronto in 1945. The remainder of his formal academic training was at the University of Chicago, where he received an MA degree in 1949 and a PhD in sociology in 1953. Although he owed a debt to Everett C. Hughes, perhaps the greatest influence on Goffman was the anthropologist W. Lloyd Warner with whom Goffman studied at Chicago. Goffman worked as an assistant in the Division of Social Sciences from 1952 to 1953. After Goffman defended his dissertation, he remained at Chicago, working as a research associate for Edward Shils in 1953–4. From 1954 to 1957, he was at the National Institute of Mental Health in Bethesda, Maryland as a visiting scientist. In 1957 Goffman was appointed assistant professor of sociology at the University of California at Berkeley. He became an associate professor in 1959, and was full professor of sociology from 1962 to 1968. Goffman then went to the University of Pennsylvania, where he was Benjamin Franklin Professor of Anthropology and Sociology from 1968 until his death. He was President of the American Sociological Association in 1981–2. Goffman died on 20 November 1982 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Goffman's earliest and still best-known work was based in part on research he conducted for his dissertation at Chicago in 1953. "Communications Conduct in an Island Community," a study based on field research in the Shetland Islands, a crofting community off the coast of Scotland, was later revised and elaborated into *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, published in 1956. This book, quickly regarded as a classic, became one of the most widely known works by a living sociologist. In this small, relatively isolated rural community, Goffman discovered what he believed was the foundation of all social order: the expressions given and given off by the actor which were designed suitably to impress others about an entire range of matters. Thus, self, identity, and motive all arose, not from the culture at large, not from any kind of bequeath from nature, but from and within a dramatic encounter which was evanescent and transitory. External and micro-level issues were always subordinate to Goffman whose dramaturgical vision was located in face-to-face encounters, the study of which he regarded as fundamental.

A prolific writer and influential teacher, Goffman influenced a generation of interactionist sociologists, and made the study of micro-level encounters a respected tradition within sociology. In doing so he also reinvigorated the field tradition of qualitative study in which the researcher engaged in "participant observation," a method requiring the investigator to go directly to the scene in which human beings are conducting their affairs in order to see the most miniscule features of that life as closely as possible. His own field ethnologies echoed this theme. *Asylums* (1961) was based on extensive field work at St. Elizabeth's Hospital in Washington, D.C., where he served as an assistant recreation director while observing and collecting data on how persons come to be regarded as mentally ill and what happens to them after they do. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity* (1963) was a chilling and detailed portrait of the close ritual connection of "normals" to those with visible stigmas. An essay entitled "Where the

Action is" was based on field work in casinos in Las Vegas where Goffman had trained to become a blackjack dealer. Beyond these occasions where he was literally "in the field," there was also a sense in which Goffman was always in the field, no matter what he was studying.

In his memorial tribute to Goffman, Pierre Bourdieu hailed him as the "discoverer of the infinitely small." If not its discoverer, Goffman at the very least made legitimate the close observational study of human interaction with all of its flaws, failures, and intrigues. Fascinated by what his teacher Everett C. Hughes had called "mistakes at work," Goffman carried the study of interactional breakdowns to new dimensions. He was adept at studying what he called "remedial interchanges," those situations in which pro-offered selves were discredited and thus repaired through the dramaturgical techniques of accounts, apologies, and requests. He was also intrigued by embarrassment, those situations in which it becomes clear to the actor that he or she can no longer sustain a presented self. These meltdowns in which a pro-offered self goes awry revealed to Goffman the basic underlying communicative assumptions on which social life is based.

Because the self was not, for Goffman, a thing, but a dramatic effect arising diffusely from the entire scene in which an act occurs, Goffman was led to a lifelong interest in how persons present themselves to others. These presentations of self are moral acts requiring both *demeanor*, the obligation to "come off" to others, and *deference*, the obligation to protect the coming off of others. Therefore the study of selfhood was not, as generations of scholars caught in Cartesian dualisms believed, the study of the inside of human agents, but rather the way in which these agents interact with the external world around them. Similarly to the pragmatic philosophy of George Herbert MEAD, for Goffman the self is not a product but a process, not a subjective essence, but an objective social construction.

Individuality is not a personal matter to Goffman, but rather a meaning which emerges in relationships with others. To use Harry Stack SULLIVAN's terminology, a person's self emerges, is maintained, and is lost only through a process of "consensual validation." Following the social behaviorism of Mead, the self is the meaning of the organism, and this meaning, like all others, is established by the action of that organism and the actions of others with respect to it (Brissett and Edgley 1990). Here Goffman shows his pragmatic roots.

At the turn of the century, Mead articulated the foundations for a nondualistic, dramaturgical view of self when he wrestled with the question of how to account for two of the most obvious features of selfhood: continuity and novelty. Previous views of the agency which had seen the self as a kind of "ghost in the machine" that started the process of action, presumed what the theory sought to explain: the process of human action. Mead resolved the question in an ingenious way. He simply spoke of the self as a meaning as opposed to a thing, and as John DEWEY proposed, noted that it always arose as part of a social process. Goffman continues this strand of thought.

Goffman's work is also at times profoundly existential, though devoid of all acknowledgments save for a few solitary references to Sartre. Goffman is fascinated in documenting closely those situations in which people experience "close brushes with life," and the view he promulgates is that life is a desperate and problematic business in which the precariousness of interaction makes it difficult for the individual to come out of an interaction better than when he or she went in. Human beings fashion a self out of what society makes available to them, and the imperatives of communication cannot be avoided. Just as for Sartre, human beings are "condemned

to freedom, Goffman's man is "condemned to expressiveness."

A controversial figure – as much for his attitude and style as for his writings – Goffman often ridiculed those intellectual traditions which studied social life from afar. In the preface to *Relations in Public*, Goffman criticized those who emphasize hypotheses-and-evidence (1971, p. xvi). Instead, Goffman urged his students to get as close to their subject matter as possible. Social life was to be studied directly in social situations, and nothing substituted for a close association with the subject of one's research investigations. It is this emphasis on direct methods, coupled with a preoccupation with the ritual nature of social life which most closely connects Goffman to his Warnerian anthropological roots developed at Chicago during his graduate training.

Locating Goffman within a philosophical tradition is made difficult by the fact that he was, as Randall Collins (1986) has suggested, adept at concealing his intellectual tracks and disassociating himself from any particular philosophical tradition. Anthony Giddens states that "Goffman was by no stretch of the imagination a philosopher," though there is within the confines of his interests a systematic theory of co-presence. Nevertheless, Goffman is subject to multiple philosophical readings. His work shows elements of pragmatism and his symbolic interactionist roots seem fairly well established, especially his links to Mead and Charles H. Cooley. His writings "resonate strongly with some of the emphases of hermeneutic phenomenology and with the philosophy of the later Wittgenstein." Many scholars have noted the similarity between the neo-Kantian Formalism of Georg Simmel and Goffman's approach. Such a case can easily be made.

As Gerhardt has shown, Goffman was familiar with Simmel's formalism, there are numerous reciprocities between them, their intellectual passage from earlier to later work is surprisingly similar, and "their contribution to sociological theory was in their analysis of the basic forms of social order, while methodologically they were oriented toward a systematic, empirically grounded *verstehen*." Also like Simmel, Goffman's work was trivialized and dismissed by many of his macro-oriented colleagues.

There are ethnomethodological and phenomenological readings of Goffman as well, especially for *Frame Analysis* (1974) where he asks the question inspired by William James, "under what conditions do we assume of a certain content of our thinking that it represents reality?" Important for reality as experienced by the individual actor is a feeling of reality in contrast to another feeling or experience of which we know that it is a dream or a fantasy and therefore not real (1974, p. 2). By the same token, there are many affinities between Goffman's contention that selves are multiple with the phenomenology of Alfred Schutz's conception of "The Life World" and its "multiple realities."

Goffman himself, though he seemed to ignore all efforts to locate his work within any theoretical camp, sometimes talked of his oeuvre as within the tradition of Durkheimian functionalism. But at other times he claimed affinities to symbolic interactionism. In *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, he acknowledges an obvious debt to Kenneth Burke's dramatism, and throughout his writings Burke's "perspective by incongruity" is in evidence. His epistemological connection to Durkheim seems clear as when he distances himself from the popular social construction of reality paradigm by suggesting that while reality is always socially constructed, "I don't think the individual does much of the constructing." But he seemed to talk of philosophical and theoretical matters only when forced to by circumstances, and was more often atheoretical, using insights and understandings from a variety of theoretical perspectives that suited his purpose at the time. So for all his theoretical acumen, Goffman was not essen-

tially a theorist nor was he interested in theoretical things – particularly "theory talk," a form of intellectual aggrandizement which he particularly despised. He was primarily an empiricist, an observer, a producer of insights, and a conceptual iconoclast who rarely strayed from what was in front of his eyes (1961, p. xii–xiv).

Seemingly immune to criticism and fundamentally aloof from philosophical debates, Goffman's body of work succeeds, as Robin Williams has argued, *because* of its vulnerabilities. Such a pragmatic stance toward epistemological concerns is quintessentially Goffman and has also been argued by such contemporary pragmatists as Richard RORTY. According to Tom Burns's account, based on personal conversations, Goffman also took solace from J. L. Austin's and Ludwig Wittgenstein's view of philosophy as legitimating his own exploratory rather than system-building approach (Burns 1992, p. 354).

In the intellectual world of the 1950s, filled with those who held the Parsonian and Mertonian conception of order which emphasized shared moral values, Goffman was a polarity player, showing the other side of every theoretical assertion. His connection to postmodernity can be seen in his attitude, which is best expressed as a combination of irony and absurdity (Trevino 2003). But even there, Goffman's absence of a central epistemology rebels against the postmodernist's non-epistemological stance. For as he shows in his last work *Forms of Talk* (1981), as long as human beings are forced by social circumstances to relate to one another through the vehicle of communication, there will always be some kind of underlying structured "truth" in the social interactions and relationships we all share.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (Edinburgh, 1956).

Asylums: Notes on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates (New York, 1961).

Encounters: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction (Indianapolis, 1961).

Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity (New York, 1963).

Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings (New York, 1963).

Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior (New York, 1967).

Strategic Interaction (Philadelphia, 1969).

Relations in Public: Micro-Studies of the Public Order (New York, 1971).

Frame Analysis: Essays on the Organization of Experience (New York, 1974).

Gender Advertisements (Cambridge, Mass., 1979).

Forms of Talk (Philadelphia, 1981).

Other Relevant Works

Goffman's papers are in the possession of his family.

"The Interaction Order: American Sociological Association" *American Sociological Review* 48 (1983): 1–17.

The Goffman Reader, ed. Charles Lemert and Ann Branaman (Malden, Mass., 1997).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Who Was Who in Amer v8*

Burns, Tom. *Erving Goffman* (London, 1992).

Brissett, Dennis, and Charles Edgley, eds. *Life as Theater: A Dramaturgical Sourcebook*, 2nd edn (New York, 1990).

Collins, Randall. "The Passing of Intellectual Generations: Reflections on the Death of Erving Goffman," *Sociological Theory* 4 (1986): 106–13.

Ditton, Jason, ed. *The View from Goffman* (New York, 1980).

Drew, Paul, and Anthony Wooton, eds.

Erving Goffman: Exploring the Interaction Order (Boston, 1988).

Fine, Gary Alan, and Gregory W. H. Smith, eds. *Erving Goffman*, 4 vols (London, 2000).

Riggins, Stephen, ed. *Beyond Goffman* (Bloomington, Ind., 1989).

Trevino, A. Javier, ed. *Goffman's Legacy* (New York, 2003).

Charles Edgley

GOLDMAN, Alvin Ira (1938–)

Alvin I. Goldman was born on 1 October 1938 in New York City. He received his BA from Columbia University in 1960. He then received his graduate degrees from Princeton University: his MA in 1962 and PhD in philosophy in 1965. His teaching career began at the University of Michigan as assistant professor of philosophy in 1963. After rising to full professor, he left Michigan in 1980 to become professor of philosophy at the University of Illinois at Chicago, where he taught until 1983. From 1983 to 2002 Goldman was Regents Professor of Philosophy at the University of Arizona. He was President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1991–2. Since 2002 Goldman has been Board of Governors Professor of Philosophy at Rutgers University.

Goldman has published books and articles primarily on epistemology, philosophy of mind, and cognitive science. Like many analytic philosophers of his generation, his first efforts in epistemology were directed towards formulating a solution to the severe problems for the "justified true belief" theory of knowledge posed by Edmund GETTIER in 1963. In "A Causal Theory of Knowing" (1967) Goldman proposed a view of justification that some type of causal relation holds between a person's belief and the fact known by that person, such that this relation tends to produce more true beliefs. Since the existence of that causal relation need not also be known to the knower, Goldman rejects such an internalist requirement and instead upholds the naturalization of epistemology and epistemic externalism. This type of externalism came to be labeled as "reliabilism" and most reliabilists have been inspired by Goldman, including a few major ones such as D. M. Armstrong, Robert NOZICK, and Fred DRETSKE.

In Goldman's reliabilism, elaborated in "What is Justified Belief?" (1979), *Epistemology and Cognition* (1986), and later books, formulates a kind of foundationalism by distinguishing higher belief-dependent processes (such as reasoning) from lower belief-independent processes such as perception. Perception causes the formation of beliefs but can result in knowledge only if a perception results from the most reliable process available to the knower. Goldman attempts to forestall the sort of skepticism that attacks reliabilism (such as brain-in-a-vat scenarios) by requiring that the reliable processes needed for knowledge are reliable in the sort of "normal worlds" that are consistent with our general beliefs about the actual world.

Causal processes are also applied to understanding agency in Goldman's *A Theory of Human Action* (1970). Against Elizabeth Anscombe and Donald DAVIDSON, Goldman argues that only some descriptions of an agent's behavior can be identified as the same intentional action. On his theory, an agent's behavior is a "basic" intentional act only if it was caused in the appropriate way by the agent's knowledge of, and action upon, her wants and beliefs.

Placing his confidence in neurological and cognitive science to help discover the physiological and psychological processes responsible for reliable cognition, Goldman has advocated a close alliance between epistemology and the cognitive sciences. Like Fred Dretske and some other philosophers, Goldman has depicted

information as resulting from the functioning of a mechanical device complex and as sensitive enough to discriminate and register changes in its environment. The new epistemologist (now doing "epistemics" according to Goldman) will proceed from the knowledge provided by the cognitive sciences and investigate how reliable a process must be to qualify for knowledge. Especially useful would be cognitive science's understanding of the more basic or native processes of perception that produce foundational knowledge.

From Goldman's own examples, displayed in *Epistemology and Cognition* and *Philosophical Applications of Cognitive Science* (1993), the new epistemologist will continue to be concerned with erecting a theory of knowledge and justification immune from any Gettier-type counterexamples. There are several tensions in this combination of traditional epistemology with cognitive science but three examples must suffice: (1) reliabilism is satisfied with the production of beliefs which are more than likely true or close to truth, while "knowledge" has usually required completely true belief; (2) reliabilism has difficulty by itself deciding which kinds of knowledge and learning processes are more relevant and valuable to human beings in this actual world, while traditional epistemology takes full advantage of our social institutions of knowledge production (what Goldman calls our "epistemic folkways"); and (3) reliabilism is grounded on the descriptive conclusions of cognitive science while epistemology typically has a normative dimension. Goldman has creatively engaged these tensions, producing a highly original theory of knowledge.

In *Liaisons: Philosophy Meets the Cognitive and Social Sciences* (1992) and *Knowledge in a Social World* (1999) Goldman's combination of epistemology and cognitive science requires a division of labor between individual and social epistemology. Individual epistemology considers the lone knower, while social epistemology for Goldman considers how knowers come to possess and use knowledge in groups. Knowledge itself for Goldman remains an indi-

vidual matter, like belief; when a person knows something, that knowledge is not dependent on anyone else knowing it. Other social epistemologies are grounded on some types of beliefs and knowledge which are never possessed individually, but Goldman only acknowledges this possibility without dealing with beliefs had by groups.

Goldman's social epistemology considers how true beliefs may be maximized over groups or balanced against other social values. "Veritism" should be social epistemology's focus, as the goal of truth is essential to intellectual pursuits. There are five standards for a veritistic social practice (1992, p. 195): (1) the reliability of a practice, measured by the proportion of truths over errors in all beliefs produced by the practice; (2) the power of a practice, in its ability to guide knowers to truths that interest them; (3) the fecundity of a practice, its ability to bring large numbers of true beliefs to many people; (4) the speed of a practice, how quickly it produces true beliefs; and (5) the efficiency of a practice, how well it economically provides true beliefs. *Knowledge in a Social World* applies these standards to four knowledge practices: science, law, democracy, and education.

Pathways to Knowledge: Private and Public (2002), consisting of essays published from 1997 to 2001, continues the exploration of social epistemology informed by cognitive science. Goldman suggests that epistemic internalism is incompatible with the scientific naturalizing of epistemology, while also suggesting that suitably reformed understandings of the a priori, intuitions, and introspection will remain useful for cognitive science and epistemology. Richard Dawkins's theory of memes is incorporated in Goldman's social epistemology, along with a concern for the social pressures and technological limitations that direct and constrain scientific research. Here, Goldman's work intersects that of Philip Kitcher, who urges a more pragmatist view of knowledge, and Nicholas RESCHER, who has applied pragmatism to the economics of science.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Theory of Human Action (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1970).

Epistemology and Cognition (Cambridge, Mass., 1986).

Liaisons: Philosophy Meets the Cognitive and Social Sciences (Cambridge, Mass., 1992).

Philosophical Applications of Cognitive Science (Boulder, Col., 1993).

Knowledge in a Social World (Oxford, 1999).

Pathways to Knowledge: Private and Public (Oxford, 2002).

Other Relevant Works

"A Causal Theory of Knowing," *Journal of Philosophy* 64 (1967): 357–72.

"Discrimination and Perceptual Knowledge," *Journal of Philosophy* 73 (1976): 771–91.

Ed. with Jaegwon Kim, *Values and Morals: Essays in Honor of William Frankena, Charles Stevenson, and Richard Brandt* (Dordrecht, 1978).

"What is Justified Belief?" in *Justification and Knowledge*, ed. George Pappas (Dordrecht, 1979), pp. 1–23.

"Interpretation Psychologized," *Mind and Language* 4 (1989): 161–85.

"Empathy, Mind and Morals," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 66 (1992): 17–41.

Ed., *Readings in Philosophy and Cognitive Science* (Cambridge, Mass., 1993).

"Naturalistic Epistemology and Reliabilism," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 19 (1994): 301–20.

"Speech, Truth, and the Free Market for Ideas," with James Cox, *Legal Theory* 2 (1996): 1–32.

"Games Lawyers Play: Legal Discovery and Social Epistemology," with William Talbott, *Legal Theory* 4 (1998): 93–163.

"The Mentalizing Folk," *Protosociology* 16 (2002): 7–34.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils

Beardsley, Monroe C. "Actions and Events: The Problem of Individuation," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 12 (1975): 263–76.

Corlett, J. Angelo. "Epistemology, Psychology, and Goldman," *Social Epistemology* 5 (1991): 91–100.

Markie, Peter J. "Goldman's New Reliabilism," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 56 (1996): 799–817.

Philosophia 19, no. 2–3 (1989). Special issue devoted to *Epistemology and Cognition*.

Shope, Robert. *The Analysis of Knowing: A Decade of Research* (Princeton, N.J., 1983).

"Symposium on *Knowledge in a Social World*," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 64 (2002): 185–227.

Thagard, Paul. "Collaborative Knowledge," *Noûs* 31 (1997): 242–61.

Vermazen, Bruce. "Actions in the Causal Series," *Philosophical Studies* 33 (1978): 287–99.

John R. Shook

GOLDMAN, Emma (1869–1940)

Emma Goldman was born on 27 June 1869 in Kovno, Lithuania, and died 14 May 1940 in Toronto, Canada. At the age of thirteen Goldman moved with her family to St. Petersburg, where she attended school for six months before economic hardship forced her to begin working in the city's factories. When Goldman was sixteen her father arranged for her to emigrate to the United States and live in Rochester, New York. Upon arriving in

Rochester Goldman worked in textile factories there for two years before moving to New York City in 1889. It was there that Goldman's adherence to the political philosophy of anarchism fully developed, and her life as a full-time revolutionary emerged.

Goldman's early years spent largely in poverty were crucial to the later maturation of her anarchist vision. As a young girl working in the factories of St. Petersburg, Goldman was introduced to a novel that had a significant impact on numerous nineteenth and twentieth-century Russian revolutionaries, including V. I. Lenin and Josef Stalin. That novel was Nikolai Chernyshevsky's *What is to Be Done?* This influential work introduced Goldman to revolutionary thought and practice, and also to the idea of equality between the sexes. It was certainly the first stimulus for Goldman's revolutionary philosophizing. Later in Rochester, the second catalyst in the development of Goldman's political philosophy came with the deaths of the "Haymarket Martyrs" of Chicago in 1887. The Martyrs were four self-proclaimed anarchists accused of throwing a bomb into a group of policemen during a workers' rally that had become riotous. Though there was no evidence to convict the Martyrs on this charge, they were all hanged because of their affiliation with anarchism. Upon hearing of this event, Goldman pronounced herself a revolutionary, and her interest in anarchism began to grow.

Goldman's eventual move to New York City introduced her to a flourishing anarchist movement. Here she met German anarchist Johann Most, who nurtured Goldman's anarchist thinking and helped establish her as a writer and orator. Goldman's most important relationship formed in New York City, however, was with fellow Russian anarchist Alexander Berkman. Goldman and Berkman's friendship was lifelong, but was tormented with the trials associated with being a revolutionary. The worst of these trials occurred in 1892 when Goldman and Berkman aspired to put their revolutionary ideals into practice by utilizing "propaganda by the deed," a term that refers to using violent acts as the best means to espousing one's political aims. At this time, steelworkers in Homestead, Pennsylvania were immersed in a fierce labor struggle with industrialist Henry Clay Frick. Goldman and Berkman believed that the assassination of Frick would free the steelworkers and rid the world of a despot. Berkman made an attempt on Frick's life, but failed. The failed attempt cost Berkman a sentence of twenty-two years in prison. Goldman continued to support Berkman after his assassination attempt and imprisonment, much to the disdain of fellow revolutionaries and state authorities. This incident would continue to haunt Goldman and the anarchist movement more generally throughout the rest of her revolutionary career. At the same time, it acted as another catalyst in the maturation of Goldman's anarchist philosophy, as she would continue to struggle with her views on violence and revolutionary deeds. For instance, in her "The Political Psychology of Violence," an early essay in which she defends Berkman, Goldman explains political violence as a kind of natural retaliation against the violence of government. However, her viewpoint would later change upon witnessing the violence of the Russian Revolution of 1917, and she later renounced terroristic violence as a means to a revolutionary end.

During the next decades Goldman concentrated on propaganda by way of the written and spoken word. It is in the essays and speeches of this time that we can perceive the fundamentals of Goldman's anarchist thought. Goldman's essential task was to remove from the masses the idea that anarchism merely means chaos. To the contrary, she argued, anarchism is a clearly defined theory that is based on societal order. Though the most basic premise of anarchism is the abolition of the state, it does not imply disorder and barbarism. In fact, anarchists

recognize the need for governance in society. However, the anarchists envision direct governance by free individuals rather than state governance from above. One of the most accessible works that delineates Goldman's own conception of anarchism is found in an early collection of writings entitled *Anarchism and Other Essays* (1910).

In her essay "Anarchism," Goldman clearly defines the philosophy: "The philosophy of a new social order based on liberty unrestricted by man-made law; the theory that all forms of government rest on violence, and are therefore wrong and harmful, as well as unnecessary" (1910, p. 50). Based on Goldman's writings, one could also add that the new social order would be based on the absence of religion and private property (an institution of capitalism, which would also necessarily be abolished). Indeed, government, religion, and property were for Goldman the "shackles" of humanity, and only after these were removed could humanity be truly free. The only way to remove the shackles, of course, was through a social revolution. Once the revolution took place, an anarchist society could fully develop. It is important to note that the new anarchist society was not necessarily considered a new stage of social evolution. Rather, according to Goldman, the basic possibilities of anarchism already exist in human nature and human society; a social revolution is merely a means of removing the despotic institutions of government, religion, and property so that an anarchist society may develop naturally.

What would Goldman's anarchist society look like? There is some contentiousness among scholars concerning the exact philosophical perspective of anarchism Goldman maintained. It is safe to conclude that it was complex, blending together ideas taken from several modes of anarchist thought known as anarcho-communism, syndicalism, and individualism. However, considering the timeframe of Goldman's thought it is likely that anarcho-communism was her biggest

inspiration. Indeed, her lifelong comrade Berkman was primarily an anarcho-communist, and Goldman was heavily influenced by the famous Russian anarchist Prince Peter Kropotkin, also an anarcho-communist. In the anarcho-communist vision, social and economic equality would be achieved through the abolition of private property. Economic production would take place in decentralized communes. The idea of decentralization in the economic production process is an important distinction from Marxian communism. In a Marxian communist society economic production is centralized in the state. An anarcho-communist society would abolish state power, and therefore all economic production would be maintained by free individuals and the communal institutions they establish. Moreover, the anarcho-communist vision is just as concerned with the development of the individual as it is the development of the society, and so no subjugation of the individual would occur. The distinctions between Marxian and anarcho-communism would put Goldman at odds with the leaders and supporters of the Russian Revolution of 1917, as we shall see momentarily.

Goldman was responsible for another breed of anarchist thought known as anarcho-feminism. Indeed, much of what Goldman has written pertains to the emancipation of women. Goldman believed this end could be wholly achieved only through women's sexual lives. Accordingly, Goldman wrote and spoke a great deal on birth control, love and marriage, motherhood, and, of course, the place of women in an anarchist society. It is important to understand Goldman's distinction between the economic emancipation of women versus the sexual emancipation. For Goldman, a woman's economic emancipation was important, but it did not represent complete freedom. Instead, it merely allowed women to take a larger part in private property, which was an inhibitor of true freedom. Similarly, the right to vote was not the key to fully freeing women. All it did

was allow women to take place in state institutions and corrupt political processes. The full emancipation of woman, Goldman argued, could only emerge when she freed within herself her true womanly nature, which is largely related to her sexual identity. That is, every woman must first recognize herself to be a self-sufficient individual endowed with strong tendencies to love, nurture, and mother. Contrary to the view that loving another or desiring to be a mother is subordination, Goldman believed these to be qualities necessary for a woman's full happiness, and society must be structured so these qualities may be free to emerge. She further argued that men and women are not opposing forces, but rather equal beings that must unite as free individuals to create an anarchist society. Goldman's feminism is an interesting break from contemporary mainstream feminism that focuses so heavily on women's economic emancipation and political power. In fact, it is certain that the modern mainstream feminist movement could learn something from Goldman's ideal.

Through her ceaseless writing and lecturing, Goldman earned a name for herself as a propagandist and revolutionary. However, this fame and her prior history with Berkman in the attempted assassination of Frick also earned Goldman special attention from United States authorities. Consequently, she was frequently referred to as "Red Emma" and seen as a threat to the "American way of life." In 1917 Goldman launched a particularly fierce attack against the draft and World War I. This finally gave United States authorities a significant reason for her arrest. She was imprisoned for two years for obstructing the war effort. At the end of her sentence in 1919, she was deported to Russia with other political dissidents and her old friend Berkman. At this time J. Edgar Hoover dubbed Goldman "one of the most dangerous women in America." The deportation had a deep impact on Goldman, as the United States had become her home. It was an event that she wrote about in *Deportation: Its Meaning and Menace* (1919) and *A Woman Without a Country* (1979), in which she denounces government for its attack on true democracy. Goldman would partake in one last lecture tour throughout the United States before her death, but she would never again live within the country's borders.

While living in Russia, Goldman and Berkman participated in the unfolding Revolution of 1917. However, Goldman was deeply disappointed by its results. Her detailed reaction can be read in such works as *My Disillusionment in Russia* (1923), *My Further Disillusionment in Russia* (1924), and *The Bolshevik Myth* (1925). Goldman's disillusionment was a result of the brutal suppression of anarchist workers by the Bolsheviks. In one particularly important incident, the Kronstadt Rebellion, thousands of anarchist workers were killed and imprisoned as they took economic production into their own hands. Whereas the anarchists sought decentralized economic production in the traditions of anarcho-communism and syndicalism, the newly emerging Marxist/Leninist regime was focused on centralizing economic production in the hands of the state. Goldman instantly recognized the horrors this new state would produce, and attacked it through her writing and speeches. She also attacked the use of terroristic violence to achieve the ends of a social revolution, recognizing its failure from her own experience with Berkman and his attempted assassination of Frick. Goldman was one of the few revolutionaries of her time who recognized the many misdeeds of the Russian Revolution, and she often found herself shunned by fellow revolutionaries who felt the revolution was a great success. Given what we now know about the failures of the Soviet regime, it appears that Goldman was correct. Indeed, Goldman's criticism of the Russian Revolution should act as an important reminder of the horror highly centralized forms of power can produce.

After her disappointment with the Russian Revolution, Goldman went abroad. She lived in numerous European countries but never considered any her true home. During this time she wrote a significant piece of work called *Living My Life* (1931), an autobiography detailing her life as a revolutionary. Goldman's last significant political work was done during the Spanish Civil War between the years 1936 and 1939. The Spanish Civil War was a unique event in history because it is the largest social uprising that had anarchists at the fore. During this time Spain was a great bastion of anarchist thought and practice, and many anarchist groups arose to defend their country against the fascist regimes growing throughout Europe. The anarchists were able to establish many towns and agricultural centers that were communally organized. This was the anarchist revolution for which Goldman waited her entire life, and she traveled to Spain to participate in the anarchist activity. Afterward Goldman returned to North America and lived in Toronto. Upon her death in 1940, the United States allowed Goldman's body to be brought into the country for burial. She was buried in Chicago's Waldheim Cemetery near the Haymarket Martyrs that inspired her earlier in her life.

Perhaps the most important feature of Goldman's life and work is her unswerving allegiance to the necessity of human liberty. Though we may fairly speculate about the possibilities of an anarchist society in the modern world, it is, as Goldman called it, "a beautiful ideal." We will likely never see this ideal come to fruition, but we can use it, and Goldman's life, as a reminder that human liberty must often be fought for, and it should never be taken for granted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Beautiful Ideal (Chicago, 1908).
What I Believe (New York, 1908).
Anarchism and Other Essays (New York, 1910).
The Social Significance of the Modern Drama (Boston, 1914).
"The Philosophy of Atheism," *Mother Earth* 10 (1916): 410–16.
Deportation: Its Meaning and Menace (New York, 1919).
My Disillusionment in Russia (London, 1923).
My Further Disillusionment in Russia (Garden City, N.Y., 1924).
The Bolshevik Myth (New York, 1925).
Living My Life (New York, 1931).
The Place for the Individual in Society (Chicago, 1940).

Other Relevant Works
Goldman's papers are at the University of California at Berkeley.
The Traffic in Women and Other Essays on Feminism, ed. Alix Kates Shulman (New York, 1971).
A Woman Without a Country (Sanday, Scotland, 1979).
Red Emma Speaks: An Emma Goldman Reader, ed. Alix Kates Shulman (New York, 1983).
Vision on Fire: Emma Goldman on the Spanish Revolution, ed. D. Porter (New Paltz, N.Y., 1983.)
The Emma Goldman Papers: A Microfilm Edition, 69 microfilm reels (Alexandria, Virg., 1991).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*
Drinnon, Richard. *Rebel in Paradise: A Biography of Emma Goldman* (Chicago, 1961).
Falk, Candace, ed. *Emma Goldman: A Guide to Her Life and Documentary Sources* (Alexandria, Virg., 1995).
Glassgold, Peter, ed. *Anarchy! An Anthology of Emma Goldman's Mother Earth* (Washington, D.C., 2001).

Madison, Charles A. *Emma Goldman: A Biographical Sketch* (New York, 1947).

Moritz, Theresa, and Albert Moritz. *The World's Most Dangerous Woman: A New Biography of Emma Goldman* (Vancouver, 2001).

Morton, Marian. *Emma Goldman and the American Left* (New York, 1992).

Waldstreicher, David. *Emma Goldman* (New York, 1990).

Watson, Martha. *Emma Goldman* (Boston, 1987).

Wenzer, Kenneth C. *Anarchists Adrift: Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman* (St James, NY, 1996).

Wexler, Alice. *Emma Goldman: An Intimate Life* (New York, 1984).

Wesley Roberts

GOODMAN, Henry Nelson (1906–98)

Nelson Goodman was born on 7 August 1906 in Somerville, Massachusetts, and died on 25 November 1998 in Needham, Massachusetts. He attended Harvard University, receiving the BS magna cum laude in 1928 and the PhD in philosophy in 1941 under the direction of C. I. LEWIS. The title of his dissertation was "A Study of Qualities." He served in the US Army from 1942 until 1945. Goodman held philosophy positions at Tufts University in 1945–6, and the University of Pennsylvania from 1946 to 1964. He then was Harry Austryn Wolfson Professor of Philosophy at Brandeis University from 1964 to 1967, before returning to Harvard University as professor of philosophy from 1968 to 1977.

Goodman published eight books, over one hundred articles, and many reviews. Goodman's major philosophical writings have appeared in several editions and are translated into several languages. He was a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a corresponding fellow of the British Academy. He was a Guggenheim Fellow in 1945–6. He gave the Sherman Lecture at University of London, 1953; the Alfred North Whitehead Lecture at Harvard University, 1962; the John Locke Lectures at University of Oxford, 1962; the Miller Lectures at the University of Illinois, 1974; the Immanuel Kant Lectures at Stanford University, 1976; and the Howison Lecture at University of California, Berkeley, 1985.

Goodman was also an art dealer and collector. He directed the Walker-Goodman art gallery from 1929 to 1940, where he met his wife, the late artist Katherine Sturgis. He founded the Project Zero Center in 1967, a Harvard Graduate School of Education research program in arts education that has done pioneering work in how children use language, symbols, and narrative to express themselves. Besides his philosophical writings, Goodman authored several scripts, including "Hockey Seen," a multimedia production, and "Rabbit Run," a dance version of John Updike's novel. Goodman served as Vice President of the Association of Symbolic Logic from 1950 to 1952, and as President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1967–8.

Goodman is well known for his contributions in aesthetics, epistemology, metaphysics, philosophy of science, and philosophy of language. He challenged traditional understandings of central issues in each of these areas. Goodman's work displays the influence of William JAMES, Ernst Cassirer, and Rudolf CARNAP. In *Reconceptions in Philosophy* (1988) Goodman outlines a three-phased approach to systematically "reconceiving" philosophy that is motivated by problems for traditional views of truth, certainty, and knowledge. The first phase is the recognition that symbols do not merely describe the world, but enter into the very constitution of what is described or referred to. The second phase confronts the consequences of this recognition. The third phase examines the deficiency of traditional philosophic positions in addressing

fields of cognition that include the arts as well as the sciences (since all fields of cognition rely on use of symbols). Given a revised understanding of the role of symbols, Goodman urges the replacement of the notions of truth, certainty, and knowledge with those of rightness, adoption, and understanding, respectively.

In *Ways of Worldmaking* (1978), and other later work, Goodman develops a non-reductive metaphysical position he terms "irrealism." Irrealism holds that objects, properties, and relations result from the active process of fitting a representational system and world together. Irrealism investigates what it means to take seriously the recognition that symbols enter into the very constitution of what they describe or refer to. The second of the three stages outlined above, irrealism is the result of rejecting the analytic-synthetic distinction and related doctrines. It is in this context that Goodman claims there are many worlds "made" or constructed by us. Irrealism can also be viewed, in a somewhat different context, as an attempt to offer an alternative that lies mid-way between anti-realism (or idealism) and realism. In this regard, Goodman's work shares an affinity with much of the work of Hilary PUTNAM.

Like W. V. QUINE, Goodman rejects the existence of a fixed or unique distinction between analytic and synthetic expressions. Quine, Goodman, and Morton WHITE developed challenges to this distinction through a three-way exchange during the 1940s. Goodman, in "On Likeness of Meaning," maintains that no non-repetitive statements are analytic. A repetitive statement is one of the form '*p* is *p*' (e.g., 'bachelors are bachelors'). However, he allows that we can speak of two distinct terms being more or less similar in meaning. As a result, a non-repetitive statement may be more or less analytic. While no non-repetitive statement is ever fully analytic, two terms may have a high degree of likeness of meaning, and so may be "analytic," in a given context. For example, "bachelors are unmarried males" may be analytic in the context of a specific conversation about eligible men.

With the analytic–synthetic distinction gone, Goodman holds that there can be more than one version (or, we might say, conceptual scheme) of the world, and these versions cannot be reduced. In this, Goodman and Quine (in his ecumenical mood) agree. They further agree that, since there is no neutral description of the world in such cases, the best one can do is recognize both versions. The chief difference lies in the fact that Quine privileges physical (scientific) descriptions of the world. In contrast, Goodman holds that world descriptions from the arts are on an equal footing with those from the sciences. The version given by a painting by Pablo Picasso informs our understanding of a world as much as that of a scientific theory by Albert EINSTEIN.

To suggest that this is the only difference between Quine and Goodman is to oversimplify the matter. Goodman rejects the notion of a neutral world that grounds all versions (or conceptual schemes). This, and his commitment to the claim that we cannot hold that conflicting versions are true of the same world (since conflicting versions commit one to logical contradictions), lead Goodman to conclude that there are many actual worlds. That there are many actual worlds, and the further claim that we make or construct such worlds when we make versions, has led to some notoriety for Goodman, at least among those philosophers who share his analytic roots and view such claims as, at best, tenuous metaphors.

Truth, Goodman maintains, is a suitable notion in certain linguistic contexts, but should be reconceived as rightness since truth is but an "occasional ingredient" in rightness. The rightness of a version is a matter of fit and working. This conception should not, Goodman maintains, be viewed as simply "pragmatist." *Fit,* on Goodman's view, is a fitting of a version *into* a world. This contrasts the conception of truth as correspondence, whereby versions are said by Goodman to be fitted *onto* an independently existing world. In fitting a version *into* a world we work within that world and make adjustments to both the version and world. In

this sense we "construct" worlds. But the world (particularly the well-entrenched elements of a world) has primacy in this process. This latter characteristic, in Goodman's view, allows irrealism to avoid becoming an anything-goes relativism. Nonetheless, irrealism is commonly criticized as falling into an anything-goes relativism. The burden is on Goodman to show that rightness, as he conceives of it, is capable of allowing for a plurality of right versions while not permitting just any version whatsoever – a difficult task when one rejects any objective or neutral world to do the work. While Goodman's attempt to replace the notion of correspondence with that of fit is commendable, it is not clear that the latter is any less problematic in the end.

Irrealism – described by Goodman as "a radical relativism under rigorous restraints" – is perhaps best seen as the working out of his earlier book, *The Structure of Appearance* (1951) and as a continuation of his work in *Languages of Art* (1968). In *The Structure of Appearance* Goodman defends nominalism. According to Goodman, the nominalist, while recognizing only individuals, can take anything as an individual. Physical particles, phenomenal elements, or ordinary things may all serve as the nominalist's base. Nominalism, as Goodman sees it, permits a variety of systems (or versions) under rigorous restraints. As Goodman quips, the book would be better titled *Structures of Appearance*.

Goodman's aesthetics does not approach the arts through questions of value or appreciation, but rather through epistemology. He examines the various symbol systems of the arts as means of representation. Semantic and syntactic characteristics of the various symbol systems of the arts – rather than causal features – are the focus of his aesthetics. Goodman's nominalism informs and infuses his aesthetics. While his nominalist views of art have been criticized and are not widely accepted today, they have been highly influential.

In *Languages of Art* Goodman distinguishes between autographic and allographic art works. Identification of the autographic depends upon the history of the production of the piece; the allographic does not. A painting, for example, is autographic. Even though one may paint a perfect forgery, the work loses its value because of the history of the painting's production. In contrast, an allographic work of art, like a piece of music, does not lose its value when produced by someone other than the composer, provided the performance of it includes all of the elements required by the score.

In shifting the study of aesthetics to an examination of symbol systems, we can see much of his work in aesthetics as an examination of the consequences of the recognition of the fact that symbols enter into the constitution of what is described (the second phase). Goodman sees reference as describing the relation between symbol and object. In addition to language, symbols (such as graphs, pictures, or sculptures) may *denote* or *exemplify* an object, albeit metaphorically. When a symbol denotes an object, the direction of fit is from symbol system to object. In contrast, when a symbol is an exemplar of an object the direction of fit is from object to symbol. Since the conditions that apply to symbols (syntactic conditions) and the object (semantic conditions) lie on a continuum (as there is no fixed analytic–synthetic distinction), therefore the construction or making of a symbol system (version) is the construction or making of a realm (world). In this sense, the symbol enters the very constitution of the object since fit with the object goes both ways.

Goodman is also well known for his "reworking" of Hume's problem of induction in *Fact, Fiction, and Forecast* (1954). The "old problem of induction" – as Goodman sees it – is the problem of "justifying induction" or of demonstrating universal rules of inductive inference given that there is no guarantee that the future will resemble the past. Goodman suggests that the problem of induction, so understood, is not *Hume's* problem of induction. Like many problems of modern philosophy, Goodman sees this problem as the cause

of "much fruitless discussion." A fruitful discussion of induction must not separate how induction is to be justified from how induction takes place. Goodman suggests that Hume offered "habit" as a passable answer to the legitimate question of why we should make one prediction rather than another – the question Goodman sees Hume as having raised. Hume's answer, while perhaps incomplete or wrong, is according to Goodman on the right track insofar as it pertains to the source, and not the legitimacy, of predictions about the future. What Hume's answer misses, writes Goodman, is that while some regularities do establish habits others do not; so some predictions based on regularities are legitimate while others are not.

Having dissolved the traditional problem of induction, Goodman at once raises "the new riddle of induction" – the problem of distinguishing those predictions or hypotheses that are law-like and can thus be projected into the future from those that are not. The riddle is raised as follows. Suppose that all emeralds examined before time *t* are green. The hypothesis that all emeralds are green, then, seems well confirmed. Goodman notices, however, that by introducing a new predicate, *grue*, which applies to things before *t* that are green but which are blue if examined after *t*, our evidence for the hypothesis that emeralds are grue is just as good as for the hypothesis that emeralds are green. The point of the example, and the point of the new riddle of induction, is that we have no way of saying which hypothesis is law-like and which is accidental. To favor the hypothesis that all emeralds are green over that which states all emeralds are grue seems to accept certain regularities with no good grounds.

Rather than focus on the "old problem of induction" – that of justifying inference from the past (observed) to the future (unobserved) – Goodman focuses on how we decide which inductive inferences are good inferences. As with deductive inference, justification stems from conformity to rules of inference. Both deductive and inductive rules are amended if they yield results we do not wish to accept; inferences are rejected if they violate rules we are unwilling to amend. Goodman's own exploration of the riddle introduces the notion of "entrenchment" – the idea that we can use the extension of a predicate to determine which hypotheses are confirmed.

There is in all of Goodman's work a certain spirit of challenging the traditional understanding of philosophical issues while expanding our own understanding of these issues. While Goodman may be seen as similar to a philosopher like Richard RORTY, since he rejects traditional problems of philosophy and the existence of an independent reality, there is a sharp contrast in that Goodman sees this as the beginning of philosophy, and not as the end. What is left to do, according to Goodman, is the difficult work of constructing standards and constructing right worlds.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Structure of Appearance (Cambridge, Mass., 1951; 2nd edn, Indianapolis, 1966; 3rd edn, Dordrecht, 1977).
Fact, Fiction, and Forecast (London, 1954; Cambridge, Mass., 1955; 2nd edn, Indianapolis, 1965; 3rd edn 1973; 4th edn, Cambridge, Mass., 1983).
Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols (Indianapolis, 1968; 2nd edn 1976).
Problems and Projects (Indianapolis, 1972).
Ways of Worldmaking (Indianapolis, 1978).
Of Mind and Other Matters (Cambridge, Mass., 1984).
Reconceptions in Philosophy and Other Arts and Sciences, with Catherine Z. Elgin (Indianapolis, 1988).
A Study of Qualities (New York, 1990).

Other Relevant Works
Goodman's papers are at Harvard University.
"Steps toward a Constructive Nominalism," with W. V. Quine, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 12 (1947): 105–22.

"On Likeness of Meaning," *Analysis* 10 (1949): 1–7.

"A World of Individuals," in *The Problem of Universals* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1956), pp. 13–31.

"About," *Mind* 70 (1961): 1–24.

"The Significance of Der logische Aufbau der Welt," in *The Philosophy of Rudolf Carnap*, ed. Paul Schilpp (La Salle, Ill., 1963), pp. 545–58.

"Art and Inquiry," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 41 (1968): 5–19.

"When Is Art?" in *The Arts and Cognition*, ed. David Perkins and Barbara Leondar (Baltimore, Md., 1977), pp. 11–19.

"Statements and Pictures," *Erkenntnis* 22 (1985): 265–70.

"Nominalisms," in *The Philosophy of W. V. Quine*, ed. Lewis Hahn (La Salle, Ill., 1986), pp. 159–63.

"Just the Facts, Ma'am," in *Relativism*, ed. Michael Krausz (Notre Dame, Ind., 1989), pp. 80–85.

"Status and System," *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 46 (1993): 99–139.

"Some Reflections on My Philosophies," *Philosophia Scientiae* 2 (1997): 15–20.

Further Reading

Amer Phils 1950–2000, Bio 20thC Phils, Blackwell Analytic Phil, Blackwell Comp Phils, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Oxford Comp Phil, Pres Addr of APA v7, Proc of APA v72, Routledge Encycl Phil

"Aesthetics and Worldmaking: An Exchange with Nelson Goodman," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 39 (1981): 249–80. Symposium of essays about Goodman.

D'Orey, Carmo. *A exemplificação na arte: um estudo sobre Nelson Goodman* (Lisbon, 1999).

Douglas, Mary, and David Hull. *How Classification Works: Nelson Goodman among the Social Sciences* (Edinburgh, 1992).

Elgin, Catherine Z. *With Reference to Reference* (Indianapolis, 1983).

———, *The Philosophy of Nelson Goodman: Selected Essays*, 4 vols (New York, 1997).

Fischer, H. R., and S. J. Schmidt, eds. *Wirklichkeit und Welterzeugung: In memoriam Nelson Goodman* (Heidelberg, Germany, 2000).

Gardner, Howard. "A Psychological Investigation of Nelson Goodman's Theory of Symbols." *The Monist* 58 (1974): 319–26.

Gosselin, Mia. *Nominalism and Contemporary Nominalism: Ontological and Epistemological Implications of the Work of W. V. O. Quine and of N. Goodman* (Dordrecht, 1990).

Handjaras, Luciano. *Problemi e progetti del costruzionismo: saggio sulla filosofia di Nelson Goodman* (Milan, 1991).

Hausman, Alan, and Fred Wilson. *Carnap and Goodman: Two Formalists* (Iowa City, 1967).

"The Legacy of Nelson Goodman," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 58 (Summer 2000). Special issue on Goodman.

McCormick, Peter J., ed. *Starmaking: Realism, Anti-Realism, and Irrealism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1996).

"More Ways of Worldmaking," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 25 (Spring 1991). Special issue devoted to Goodman, with a bibliography of his publications.

Morizot, Jacques. *La philosophie de l'art de Nelson Goodman* (Nîmes, France, 1996).

"The Philosophy of Nelson Goodman," in *Erkenntnis* 12 (1978): 3–179, 181–291. Special issues of essays on Goodman.

"Probing into Reconceptions," *Synthese* 95 (1993): 1–128. Special issue on Goodman.

Putnam, Hilary. "Reflections on Goodman's Ways of Worldmaking," *Journal of Philosophy* 76 (1979): 603–17.

Quine, W. V. "Goodman's Ways of

Worldmaking," in *Theories and Things* (Cambridge, Mass., 1981), pp. 96–9.

Rudner, Richard S., and Israel Scheffler, eds. *Essays in Honor of Nelson Goodman* (Indianapolis, 1972).

Scheffler, Israel. "A Plea For Plurealism," *Erkenntnis* 52 (2000): 161–73.

Sparshott, F. E. "Goodman on Expression," *The Monist* 58 (1974): 187–202.

"Special Section on Nelson Goodman," *Erkenntnis* 52 (2000): 149–212.

Stalker, Douglas, ed. *Grue! The New Riddle of Induction* (Chicago, 1994).

Thomson, Judith Jarvis. "Grue," *Journal of Philosophy* 63 (1966): 289–309.

Thürnau, Donatus. *Gedichtete Versionen der Welt: Nelson Goodmans Semantik fiktionaler Literatur* (Paderborn, Germany, 1994).

Wolterstorff, Nicholas. "Are Concept-users World-makers?" *Philosophical Perspectives* 1 (1987): 233–67.

Brian J. Huschle

GOTSHALK, Dilman Walter (1901–73)

D. Walter Gotshalk was born on 11 September 1901 in Trenton, New Jersey. In 1922 he received his BA from Princeton, where Warner FITE introduced him to philosophy. Before going to graduate school, Gotshalk became an instructor in English literature at Mohegan Lake School in New York. After two years teaching he resumed his education at Cornell University in 1924, where he wanted to study with James Edwin CREIGHTON. However, due to Creighton's declining health, Gotshalk took a year-long course on Kant's first and third critiques with Ernest ALBEE, making a profound impact on him. In 1927 Gotshalk received his PhD in philosophy with a dissertation on "The Problem of Mind and Objects in the Philosophies of Samuel Alexander and Ernst Cassirer," mentored by Harold SMART.

In 1927 Gotshalk became a professor of philosophy at the University of Illinois, where he taught until his early retirement in 1965. He was chair of the department from 1951 to 1961. Gotshalk was President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1950–51, and chaired the National Board of Officers of the APA in 1951–2. He also was President of the American Society for Aesthetics in 1957–9. Gotshalk died on 19 February 1973 in Olney, Illinois.

Gotshalk specialized in metaphysics, philosophy of art, and value theory. In *Structure and Reality* (1937), he advocates that philosophy is first and foremost a study of first principles and focuses on the three elements that in his view exhaust the real: the continuant, the event, and the relation. Continuants are energy systems in process, whereas events are substantives of sorts, and all relations are internal. In *Art and the Social Order* (1947), Gotshalk seeks to integrate the wide variety of theories that interpret art. In *The Promise of Modern Life* (1958), he gives a historical account of the value principles that are operative in the modern period. In its sequel, *Human Aims in Modern Perspective* (1966), Gotshalk returned to these principles, arguing that the highest art is political. Gotshalk was highly concerned with the present and future of intellectual life. In *The Structure of Awareness* (1969), he developed a situational epistemology.

At his death Gotshalk left behind four book-length manuscripts, including his autobiography *A Philosopher in America*. In a letter to his lifelong friend Max FISCH, Gotshalk said about his biography: "It should be an interesting volume, for while it is an autobiography of an only slightly interesting life, it is an autobiography with a purpose – to illustrate the role the philosopher has in 20th century America (None) and the consequences thereof." Gotshalk's son Richard followed his father to become also a professor of philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Structure and Reality: A Study of First Principles (New York, 1937).

Metaphysics in Modern Times: A Present-day Perspective (Chicago, 1940).

Art and the Social Order (Chicago, 1947).

The Promise of Modern Life (Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1958).

Patterns of Good and Evil (Urbana, Ill., 1963).

Human Aims in Modern Perspective: Outlines of a General Theory of Value with Special References to Contemporary Social Life and Politics (Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1966).

The Structure of Awareness: Introduction to a Situational Theory of Truth and Knowledge (Urbana, Ill., 1969).

Twentieth Century Theme: A Philosophical Study (Lawrence, Kan., 1971).

Other Relevant Works

Gotshalk's papers are at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

"Qualities, Relations, and a Paradox of Judgment," *Journal of Philosophy* 26 (1929): 645–57.

"Twentieth Century Theme," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 24 (1951): 19–30.

"C. I. Lewis on Esthetic Experience and Esthetic Value," in *The Philosophy of C. I. Lewis*, ed. Lewis Hahn (La Salle, Ill., 1968).

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v6, Proc of APA v46, Who Was Who in Amer v6, Who's Who in Phil

Petock, Stuart Jay. "Dewey and Gotshalk on Criticism," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 25 (1967): 387–94.

Cornelis de Waal

GOUDGE, Thomas Anderson (1910–99)

Thomas A. Goudge was born on 19 January 1910 in Halifax, Nova Scotia, and died on 20 June 1999 in Toronto, Ontario. After earning his BA (1931) and MA (1932) at Dalhousie University, he was admitted to the Graduate School of the University of Toronto on a scholarship in 1932. At Dalhousie his principal teacher had been Herbert Leslie STEWART who insisted that his students write well and acquire a solid grounding in ancient philosophy and British empiricism. Goudge responded very well to this regimen and he published several articles in student magazines. At Toronto Goudge came under the influence of George Sidney BRETT, then head of the department. Brett attempted to interest Goudge in the idealistic tradition by urging him to read J. H. Muirhead's *The Platonic Tradition in Anglo-Saxon Thought*, but with unexpected results. Muirhead included views of philosophers opposed to the Hegelian tradition, one of which was Charles S. PEIRCE. Muirhead emphasized the seminal nature of Peirce's philosophy, noted that realists, idealists, and pragmatists had all found support in it, and stressed how it did not form a neat system. Goudge was intrigued by both Peirce's ideas and his failure to develop them into a system. He decided to make a careful study of Peirce's writings to decide whether they formed a system. During a year at Harvard he read the Peirce *Collected Papers*, edited by Charles HARTSHORNE and Paul WEISS, and was given access to those not included in their edition. The results of his study were presented in his dissertation, "The Theory of Knowledge in Charles S. Peirce."

After receiving his PhD in 1937 and starting his philosophy teaching career at Toronto the next year, Goudge continued to work on Peirce until 1950 when he published *The Thought of C. S. Peirce*. In this book he argued that there were two distinct strands to Peirce's philosophy: a naturalistic strand deriving from the British tradition, and a transcendentalist strand stemming from the German idealists by way of

the New England transcendentalists. Goudge showed that the two strands were present in Peirce's work in logic, metaphysics, and the methods of science. His book was widely discussed and helped to fuel the expanding interest in Peirce's thought.

Goudge's next large project, on which he spent nearly a decade, was a study of the philosophical problems of biology, published as *The Ascent of Life* (1961). Goudge made a careful study of the nature of explanation and theory in biology, and came to the conclusion that biology was a science in its own right and was not reducible to physics. This book did much to establish the philosophy of biology as a subdiscipline.

Goudge taught at the University of Toronto from 1938 until his retirement in 1975, except for two years of service in the Royal Canadian Navy during World War II. In 1963 he was appointed chair of the department and served until 1969. Those were the years of great expansion in institutions of higher learning in North America, and Goudge made thirty-four tenure-stream and tenured appointments during those six years, surely a record among philosophy departments. At the same time he presided over the transition of an autocratic structure of governance to a democratic one, which included student representatives. His early reforms gave the department immunity to the student unrest that swept the campus during that decade. Goudge was a founding member of the Canadian Philosophical Association and served as its President. In 1957 he was elected President of the Charles Sanders Peirce Society, and in 1955 he was elected a fellow of the Royal Society of Canada.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Thought of C. S. Peirce (Toronto, 1950).
The Ascent of Life: A Philosophical Study of the Theory of Evolution (Toronto, 1961).

Other Relevant Works
"Peirce's Theory of Abstraction," in *Studies in the Philosophy of Charles Sanders*

Peirce, ed. Philip P. Wiener and Frederic H. Young (Cambridge, Mass., 1951).

Further Reading
Canad Encyc, *Proc of APA v73*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Slater, John G. *Minerva's Aviary: Philosophy at Toronto 1843–1943* (Toronto, 2005), chap. 10.
Sumner, L. W., John G. Slater, and Fred Wilson, eds. *Pragmatism and Purpose: Essays Presented to Thomas A. Goudge* (Toronto, 1981). Contains a bibliography of Goudge's writings.

John G. Slater

GOULDNER, Alvin Ward (1920–80)

Alvin Ward Gouldner was born on 29 July 1920 in New York City. He received a BA degree from City College of New York in 1941, and then did graduate study in sociology at Columbia University, earning an MA in 1945 and a PhD in 1953. While working on his dissertation under the direction of Robert Merton, he worked as resident sociologist on the American Jewish Committee from 1945 to 1947, and then was an assistant professor in sociology at the University of Buffalo from 1947 to 1951. In 1951 and 1952 he worked as a consulting sociologist at Standard Oil Company in New Jersey, before becoming associate professor of sociology at Antioch College from 1952 to 1954. During these years some of Gouldner's first scholarly articles were published in such journals as *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *American Journal of Sociology*, and *American Sociological Review*. He studied mathematics, factor analysis, and computers at the University of Illinois starting in 1954. In 1959 he became professor and chair of sociology

and anthropology at Washington University in St. Louis. He was named Max Weber Research Professor in Social Theory in 1967, holding that position until his death. He served as President of the Society for the Study of Social Problems in 1962, and in 1963 he founded and edited the journal *Transaction*. He also taught at the University of Amsterdam from 1972 to 1976, and founded the journal *Theory and Society* in 1974. He died on 15 December 1980 in Madrid, Spain.

While still in graduate school, Gouldner briefly worked on the transplanted Frankfurt School's "Studies in Prejudice" project headed by Max HORKHEIMER and Theodor ADORNO. This experience introduced Gouldner to the European critical tradition, influencing his later scholarship and work encompassing an international focus in sociological theory, particularly in his founding of the journal *Theory and Society*. Under Merton's mentoring, Gouldner launched his academic career by publishing his dissertation simultaneously in two volumes: *Wildcat Strike* and *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*, both published in 1954. Gouldner, who had already made a name for himself as a result of his edited volume *Studies in Leadership* (1950) as well as a chapter on red tape he had written for Merton's edited volume on bureaucracy, established his position among the intellectual leadership of the field of industrial sociology.

Gouldner's *Enter Plato* (1965) traces the social origins of social theory to Plato's scientific philosophy. Before the appearance of Plato, ancient Greek thought was characterized by the tragic form, where protagonists in dramatic plays worked their way through a hostile and difficult world in an attempt to arrive at truths. Owing much to Friedrich Nietzsche on this point, Gouldner argues that with the appearance of Plato, Greek thought moves away from psychologism and egoism to a more collectivist and social form. Science requires agreement among a group of like-minded thinkers (forged through the Greek dialectic) in determining the truths of the world.

Gouldner is best known for his provocative book *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology* (1970), a stinging critique of the Harvard tradition of American sociology and aimed at Talcott PARSONS. Gouldner questioned the overall value of sociology and its future as a discipline. He also argued that the relentless pursuit of objectivity had taken sociology away from its European roots, thus making sociological theory irrelevant. This was a theme he would take up and refine later in the pages of *Theory and Society*, that only by practicing "reflexivity" could sociologists really understand the world as it now exists. In his final work, *Two Marxisms* (1980), Gouldner analyzed the conflict between scientific and critical Marxism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy (Glencoe, Ill., 1954).

Wildcat Strike (Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1954).

"The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement," *American Sociological Review* 25 (1960): 161–78.

Notes on Technology and the Moral Order, with Richard Peterson (Indianapolis, 1962).

Modern Sociology: An Introduction to the Study of Human Action, with Helen P. Gouldner and Joseph Gusfield (New York, 1963).

Enter Plato: Classical Greece and the Origins of Social Theory (New York, 1965).

The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology (New York, 1970).

For Sociology: Renewal and Critique in Sociology Today (New York, 1973).

The Dialectic of Ideology and Technology: The Origins, Grammar, and Future of Ideology (New York, 1976).

The Future of Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Class (New York, 1979).

The Two Marxisms: The Ambiguous Legacy (New York, 1980).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Studies in Leadership: Leadership and Democratic Action* (New York, 1950).

Trans., *Socialism and Saint-Simon (Le socialisme)*, by Emile Durkheim (Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1958).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Who Was Who in Amer v7*

Chriss, James J. *Alvin W. Gouldner: Sociologist and Outlaw Marxist* (Aldershot, UK, 1999).

Eldridge, J. "Gouldner, Alvin W. (1920–1980)," in *The IEBM Handbook of Human Resource Management*, ed. M. Poole and M. Warner (London, 1998), pp. 887–91.

Fuhrman, Ellsworth R. "Alvin Gouldner and the Sociology of Knowledge: Three Significant Problem Shifts," *Sociological Quarterly* 25 (1984): 287–300.

Giddens, Anthony. "Alvin Gouldner and the Intellectuals," in *Social Theory and Modern Sociology* (Cambridge, UK, 1987), pp. 253–74.

Merton, Robert K. "Alvin W. Gouldner: Genesis and Growth of a Friendship," *Theory and Society* 11 (1982): 915–38.

"A Symposium on the Legacy of Alvin Gouldner," *Sociological Quarterly* 43 (Winter 2002). A special issue about Gouldner.

James J. Chriss

GRAHAM, Martha (1894–1991)

One of the pioneers of American modern dance, Martha Graham was born on 11 May 1894 in Allegheny, Pennsylvania, and died on 1 April 1991 in New York City. Before beginning her first formal dance training with the Denishawn Company, she graduated from Cumnock junior college in 1916. An intensely reflective and innovative artist, Graham created a movement vocabulary and danced philosophical statements that revolutionized concert dance traditions at the time. Deeply influenced by Asian movement forms, she drew on principles of yoga to make the floor a partner with the moving body and work in different ways with the spine. Her articulation of the "contraction," based on an elongation of the spine and a tense, curving, energy line, when combined with her characteristic "cupped" hand positions, became a trope of modernist angst. The strength of her women dancers was also obvious, both in their technical training and the characters they portrayed. She created an aesthetic characterized by angular and sharp lines, steep falls, and pitch turns, that several critics have described as "difficult beauty."

After a short period of touring with the Denishawn Company, Graham first presented her choreography on 18 April 1926 at the 48th Street Theater in New York City. Her early work comprised of group works for her all-female company such as *Heretic* (1929), which dramatizes the conflict between a rebel and society, and solos such as *Lamentation* (1930), which abstracts the state of being in the title. The rich metaphorical imagination and minimalist design that Graham came to be celebrated for was already evident in these works.

Her later and major works can be categorized into two major groups: her Americana, comprising works like *Frontier* and *Appalachian Spring*, that perform the pioneering spirit of early American settlers, and *Primitive Mysteries*, which draws on rituals practiced by American Indians in the Southwest and in Mexico; and her reinterpretations of Greek myths, such as *Night Journey*, based on the story of Oedipus and Jocasta. Deeply influenced by philosophers such as Carl Jung and Joseph CAMPBELL, these works reveal Graham's fascination with the relationship of the mythic and the subconscious, and her exploration of movement to invoke archetypal

figures. They are also unique in their articulation of an "interior landscape," most often of the psychic processes of the strong central female character with whom she identified strongly.

Martha Graham's work, in establishing a clearly articulated technique and training methodology, and evolving a movement aesthetic permeated with philosophical depth, deeply impacted diverse audiences. Many dancers who trained with her and danced in her pieces came to be celebrated artists and choreographers in their own right. Among them are Erick Hawkins, her partner and husband till 1950, Merce Cunningham, Anna Sokolow, Jane Dudley, Bessie Schoenberg, and others. By the time of her death in 1991, she was recognized as a seminal figure in American modern dance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Seeking an American Art of the Dance," in *Revolt in the Arts*, ed. O. Sayler (New York, 1930), pp. 249–55.

"A Modern Dancer's Primer for Action," in *Dance: A Basic Educational Technique*, ed. F. R. Rodgers (New York, 1941), pp. 178–87.

The Notebooks of Martha Graham (New York, 1973).

"I am a Dancer," in *The Routledge Dance Studies Reader*, ed. A. Carter (New York, 1998), pp. 66–71.

"Platform for the American Dance" and "American Document," in *I see America Dancing: Selected Readings*, ed. M. Needham (Urbana, Ill., 2002), pp. 203–204, 206–15.

Other Relevant Works
Blood Memory: An Autobiography (New York, 1991).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v10*

Jackson, Graham. "The Roots of Heaven: Sexuality in the Work of Martha Graham," in *Dance Spectrum: Critical and Philosophical Enquiry*, ed. D. T. Taplin (Waterloo, Ont., 1983), pp. 50–60.

Mille, Agnes de. *Martha: The Life and Work of Martha Graham* (New York, 1991).

Polcari, Stephen. "Martha Graham and Abstract Expressionism," *Smithsonian Studies in American Art* 4 (1990): 3–27.

Siegel, Marcia. "The Harsh and Splendid Heroines of Martha Graham," in *Moving History / Dancing Cultures: A Dance History Reader*, ed. A. Dils and A. C. Albright (Middletown, Conn., 2001), pp. 307–14.

Stodelle, Ernestine. *Deep Song: The Dance Story of Martha Graham* (New York, 1984).

Ananya Chatterjea

GRAMLICH, Francis William (1911–73)

Francis W. Gramlich was born on 12 October 1911 in Buffalo, New York. He was educated at Princeton University, earning his BA summa cum laude in 1933, his MA in 1934, and his PhD in philosophy in 1936. His dissertation was titled "Symbolism and Meaning." In 1936 Gramlich was a clinical psychologist with the University of Buffalo, and from 1937 to 1940 he was an instructor of mental science and clinical psychology at Canisius College in Buffalo, and also a psychologist for the Buffalo public schools.

In 1940 Gramlich was appointed assistant professor of philosophy at Dartmouth College. During World War II he served in the US Navy as a psychologist in Idaho, California, and Oregon from 1942 to 1946. In 1946 he returned to Dartmouth, where he was promoted to full professor in 1948. He was

later named Stone Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy in 1960, and held this position until his death. He was chair of the philosophy department for a total of sixteen years, serving various terms from 1947 to 1971, and was responsible for rebuilding the department after a series of retirements. He died on 4 June 1973 in Hanover, New Hampshire.

Gramlich's courses on "philosophy of human nature" and "philosophy of mind" were among the most popular on campus. He also played a very active role in administration and in a variety of educational programs. His publications were few, mainly about psychological topics during the beginning of his career; he was among the last of that generation of philosophers who could have successful careers at prestigious institutions without getting into print.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Functions of the Psychologist in the Neuropsychiatric Unit," with G. Stouffer, Jr., *Journal of Consulting Psychology* 7 (1943): 211–15.

"Psychological Studies in Semantics: I. Free Association Reactions to Words, Drawings, and Objects," with T. Karwoski and F. Arnott, *Journal of Social Psychology* 20 (1944): 233–47.

"A Psychological Study of Stress in Service," *Journal of General Psychology* 41 (1949): 273–96.

Ed. with Maurice Mandelbaum and Alan Ross Anderson, *Philosophic Problems: An Introductory Book of Readings* (New York, 1957).

Ed. with Robert E. Dewey and Donald Loftsgordon, *Problems of Ethics: A Book of Readings* (New York, 1961).

Further Reading
Proc of APA v46, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v58

John R. Shook

GRANT, George Parkin (1918–88)

George Grant was born on 13 November 1918 in Toronto, Canada. He was the son of William Lawson Grant, the principal of Upper Canada College, and the grandson of two more prominent leaders of education: George Monro Grant, the principal of Queen's University, and Sir George Parkin, the founding secretary of the Rhodes scholarships. He concentrated on history at Queen's, earning the BA in 1939. With a Rhodes Scholarship he went to Oxford to study law. He was in England at the start of World War II and experienced the Blitz bombing attacks of 1940–41. His encounters with C. S. Lewis at Oxford's Socratic Club were also memorable. Grant returned to Canada in 1942 to recover his health and ponder the intense religious conversion he had in England. From 1943 to 1945, he was the national secretary of the Canadian Association for Adult Education. He turned his academic interest to religion, and eventually completed his doctoral thesis, "The Concept of Nature and Supernature in the Theology of John Oman," and received his D.Phil. from Oxford in 1950.

Grant taught philosophy at Dalhousie University from 1947 to 1960. He then helped to found the department of religion and served as professor of religion at McMaster University. Disappointed by his department's inability to lead a humanistic challenge to science's dominance, he returned to Dalhousie in 1980 as a professor of political science, classics, and religion, and remained there until his death. He received numerous honors and awards, including an honorary LLD from Queen's in 1976 and the Order of Canada from the Canadian government. Grant died on 27 September 1988 in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.

Grant was Canada's most important and influential philosopher since John WATSON. Like Watson, Grant applied a religious understanding of the human condition in order to make critical social and political commentary

on Canada's destiny. In contrast with Watson's creatively metaphysical efforts to improve idealism, Grant never tried substantially to modify his Christian Platonism and mysticism. His philosophy presumed the necessity of grounding all thought upon the eternal and absolute foundation of divinely revealed truths. Raised in a Presbyterian family, he joined the Anglican Church in Canada, and despite sharp disagreements, he remained a member his entire life. As a public philosopher, he revealed his power in his moral mission that was simultaneously conservative and radical. The conservative effort was directed towards preserving Canada's unique culture from the sweeping changes brought by capitalism's technocratic culture and political liberalism. His radical effort was aimed at holding even his own culture responsible for violating Christian principles in the pursuit of technology's temptations. He forcefully exposed as delusional the notion that morality could be unaffected by alleged neutral technological advancements. Repulsed by social scientists who supposed that the solution is reformulation of morality and law to fit the new technocratic culture, Grant in his early writings instead attacked technology and liberalism in the hope of preserving something of Canada's traditions.

In 1959 Grant published *Philosophy in the Mass Age*, which expressed his conviction that the moral flexibility offered by liberalism is incompatible with the divine moral truths. Grant's pivotal work was his 1965 *Lament for a Nation: The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism*, in which his hopes for Canada's future were now missing. Sparked by Canada's acceptance of nuclear weapons and his rising fury at the United States's growing hegemony over North America, Grant predicted Canada's demise and absorption into American culture. He argued that modern civilization cannot tolerate any moral or social structure outside of its own technological functioning. Like Martin Heidegger, Grant viewed scientific technology as a cultural solvent and reactive agent that first dissolves the social bonds of local tradi-tional cultures and then restructures them to serve its own needs for mass production and consumption. This "empire of technology" cannot be successfully resisted by Canada, Grant concluded, since its own cultural roots and history are too fragmented and shallow. When confronted by an all-powerful "empire of technology" in imperial America, which had early and easily overcome its own internal conservative forces, Canada could only surrender and link its fate with the United States.

Grant never found a welcoming political home, always remaining outside organized political parties and movements. Other Canadian conservatives were dismayed by his seeming approval of returning to the monarchy, by his anti-capitalism, and anti-Americanism. Liberal nationalists welcomed his Canadian nationalism but Grant rejected secularism and joined the pro-life movement. He was not interested in the compromise with technology offered by unionism and socialism, and socialists did not appreciate his traditional Christianity. His lecturing and writing did strongly impact the nationalist movement of the late 1960s and 1970s, but by the mid 1970s Grant had already moved on to even larger issues and themes.

Grant's collection of essays *Technology and Empire* (1969) and his Massey Lectures *Time as History* (1969), more closely examined the grave faults and fate of modernism and Western civilization. Protestantism itself cannot be exempted from responsibility, Grant decided, in *English-Speaking Justice* (1974). The right of personal autonomy over matters of conscience that Protestants sought has come full circle to its contradiction, because Protestantism became the sort of liberalism of rights for adults that cannot understand the duty to treat other human beings justly. For Grant, after individuals are given the right to make their own moral laws and design their own churches to match, Christianity becomes impossible. Grant's particular concern here is abortion, after the US Supreme Court decreed the right to abortion. Liberal justice can only

mean maximizing rights for political citizens and must be blind to the more fundamental justice for the powerless and helpless who lack political standing. He wrote, "Obviously the justice of a society is well defined in terms of how it treats the weak. And there is nothing human which is weaker than the foetus." The inevitable decay and destruction of Western civilization, already evident in its taste for ever-increasing war and brutality, was nowhere more obvious than in its disregard for the unborn. This "culture of violence," as it has been called elsewhere, will doom the very freedom that liberalism promised. He wrote, "If tyranny is to come in North America, it will come cosily and on cat's feet. It will come with the denial of the rights of the unborn and of the aged, the denial of the rights of the mentally retarded, the insane and the economically less privileged. In fact, it will come with the denial of rights to all those who cannot defend themselves. It will come in the name of the cost-benefit analysis of human life." (1974)

Grant had few philosophical or theological peers who shared his concerns. Of special interest is the relationship with Charles TAYLOR's similar call to return to the pre-liberal vision of medieval virtues. Also relevant is Stanley HAUERWAS's Christian criticism of modernism's embrace of injustice and violence. Grant's last book, *Technology and Justice* (1986), was his deepest meditation on the meaning of Christ and Christianity for today. This book was in part inspired by his matured understanding of the significance of the Cross and his reading of the French philosopher Simone Weil on suffering. Since Christianity and modernism are fundamentally opposed, modernism's moral and spiritual decay cannot be repaired and would cause its collapse. Grant's Christian faith kept alive his hope that modernism's replacement would be an improvement. One of his biographers relates how, after being asked why he is so pessimistic, Grant replied: "I'm not being pessimistic at all. I think God will eventually destroy this technological civilization. I'm very optimistic about

that." On Grant's tomb the inscription quotes St. Augustine: "Out of the Shadows and Imaginings into the Truth."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Philosophy in the Mass Age (Vancouver, 1959; New York, 1960; Toronto, 1995).

Lament for a Nation: The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism (Princeton, N.J., 1965).

Technology and Empire (Toronto, 1969).

Time as History (Toronto, 1969; 2nd edn 1995).

George Grant in Process: Essays and Conversations, ed. Larry Schmidt (Toronto, 1978).

English-speaking Justice (Sackville, New Brunswick, 1974; Notre Dame, Ind., 1985).

The Dispossessed: Homelessness in America (Fort Worth, Tex., 1986).

Technology and Justice (Toronto, 1986).

Other Relevant Works

George Grant: Selected Letters, ed. Christian William (Toronto, 1997).

The George Grant Reader, ed. William Christian and Sheila Grant (Toronto, 1997).

Collected Works of George Grant, ed. Arthur Davis and Peter Emberley (Toronto, 2000–).

Further Reading

Canad Encyc

Athanasiadis, Harris. *George Grant and the Theology of the Cross: The Christian Foundations of His Thought* (Toronto, 2001).

Christian, William. *George Grant: A Biography* (Toronto, 1993).

Combs, Eugene, ed. *Modernity and Responsibility: Essays for George Grant* (Toronto, 1983). Contains a bibliography of Grant's writings.

Davis, Arthur, ed. *George Grant and the Subversion of Modernity: Art, Philosophy,*

Politics, Religion, and Education (Toronto, 1996).

Emberley, Peter C., ed. *By Loving Our Own: George Grant and the Legacy of Lament for a Nation* (Ottawa, 1990).

Kroker, Arthur. *Technology and the Canadian Mind: Innis, McLuhan, Grant* (Montréal, 1984; New York, 1985).

O'Donovan, Joan E. *George Grant and the Twilight of Justice* (Toronto, 1984).

Taylor, Charles. *Radical Tories: The Conservative Tradition in Canada* (Toronto, 1982).

Whillier, Wayne, ed. *Two Theological Languages* (Lewiston, N.Y., 1990). Festschrift for Grant, contains a bibliography of Grant's writings.

John R. Shook

GRAY, John Chipman (1839–1915)

John Chipman Gray was born on 14 July 1839 in Brighton, Massachusetts. The half-brother of Horace Gray, who became a US Supreme Court justice, John also received his BA from Harvard in 1859, an LL.B. in 1861, and an MA in 1862. After service in the Union Army during the Civil War, Gray practiced law in Boston, helped to found the *American Law Review* in 1866, and began lecturing at Harvard Law School in 1869. In 1875 Gray was named to the first Story Professorship, and in 1883 became the Royall Professor of Law, a position that he held until retiring in 1913. Gray died on 25 February 1915 in Boston, Massachusetts.

Gray's specific area of legal expertise was property law, and his deep insights into the tradition and democratic nature of property rights were widely influential. His first book, *Restraints on the Alienation of Property* (1883), attacked the innovation of "spendthrift trusts" which protect estates from the debts of heirs. The legal principle at stake is whether the concentration of wealth into immense multi-generational estates (a heritage from England) is compatible with the interests of democracy. Gray's second book, *The Rule against Perpetuities* (1886), dealt with this problem at the most general level. He proposed a clearly defined limitation upon control over property, which was widely adopted with various modifications by courts and legislators. Gray's *Select Cases and Other Authorities on the Law of Property* (1888–92) applied the quickly spreading case method to the teaching of property law.

Gray is also remembered as one of the earliest proponents of what came to be known as "legal realism," which rebelled against the legal formalism dominant during most of the 1800s in America and England. With Oliver Wendell HOLMES, Jr., Gray took into account the methods by which judges must modify and create law from the bench. He was a part of a small circle of friends in Boston that included Holmes, lawyer Nicholas St. John GREEN, and pragmatists William JAMES and Charles S. PEIRCE.

Gray's last book, *The Nature and Sources of Law* (1909), based on the Carpentier Lectures at Columbia Law School in 1908, argued systematically that all law is judge-made law. Legislative statutes should be regarded as only one type of source of law, along with other sources that include previous judicial decisions, social expectations and moral opinions, and views of the public good. Gray also argued that rights are neither intrinsic nor natural; for him, rights are not to be identified directly with our interests, because they are only means that need to be properly adjusted to our ends. His vision of political power was historicist, pluralistic, and diffused; neither constitution, the people, the legislature, nor judges could be assigned supreme political authority. Besides Holmes, heirs to Gray's legal realism include Wesley HOHFELD, Karl LLEWELLYN, and Jerome FRANK.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Restraints on the Alienation of Property (Boston, 1883; 2nd edn 1895).

The Rule against Perpetuities (Boston, 1886; 2nd edn 1906, 3rd edn 1915, 4th edn 1942).
Select Cases and Other Authorities on the Law of Property, 6 vols (Cambridge, Mass., 1888–92).
The Nature and Sources of Law (New York, 1909; 2nd edn 1921).

Other Relevant Works
Gray's papers are at Harvard University.
"The Methods of Legal Education," *Yale Law Journal* 1 (1892): 159–61.
War Letters, 1862-65, of John Chipman Gray and John Codman Ropes, ed. Worthington Chauncey Ford (Boston, 1927).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v16*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Alexander, Gregory S. "The Dead Hand and the Law of Trusts in the Nineteenth Century," *Stanford Law Review* 37 (1985): 1189–266.
Fisch, Max H. "Justice Holmes, the Prediction Theory of Law, and Pragmatism," *Journal of Philosophy* 39 (1942): 85–97.
Gray, Roland. *John Chipman Gray* (Boston, 1917). Contains a bibliography of Gray's writings.

John R. Shook

GREEN, Nicholas St. John (1830–76)

Nicholas St. John Green was born on 30 March 1830 in Dover, New Hampshire. His father, James D. Green, was in the 1817 class of Harvard graduates, and became a Unitarian minister of the East Cambridge church, and later was mayor of Cambridge. Green received his Harvard BA in 1851. He then studied law with Harvard law professor Joseph Story and became junior partner to Boston lawyer Benjamin Franklin Butler. He earned his law degree from Harvard in 1861. With the outbreak of the Civil War, he enlisted and served as a paymaster. After the war, he opened his own practice and was appointed as an instructor in mental philosophy at Harvard, where he taught logic, metaphysics, psychology, and political economy. The publication of noteworthy articles in the *American Law Review* led Harvard to appoint Green as lecturer in the Law School in 1870. In 1873 he accepted a professorship of law in Boston University's new law school, and he also served as its Acting Dean during 1874–6. He died on 8 September 1876 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Green is remembered today by legal historians for his acute legal mind and key contributions to advancing legal theory in the areas of tort law, negligence, and liability. He is also remembered for his central role in the creation of a new American philosophy, because he was credited by Charles PEIRCE as being the "grandfather" of pragmatism. Peirce recalls how Green, at meetings of the "Metaphysical Club" in Cambridge during the early 1870s, urged the definition of a belief as "that upon which a man is prepared to act." This view is traceable to Green's acquaintance, by way of fellow club member Chauncey WRIGHT, with the psychology of Alexander Bain, and with the legal theory of James Stephen which was also familiar to another member, Oliver Wendell HOLMES, Jr. Against the logical formalism of that era, Green and Holmes pragmatically viewed law positively and historically, as a social institution that has evolved irregularly through the many struggles of human experience. They were both social utilitarians as well. From this perspective, outdated notions of negligence are difficult to apply in judicial practice, and so Green proposed that "causing" a harm by an act should be replaced with failing rea-

sonably to anticipate possible harmful consequences of an act. He also proposed reforms for handling slander and libel, insanity, the legal status of minors, and the equal rights of women. He described the inferior status of women as "the last vestige of slavery."

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Proximate and Remote Cause," *American Law Review* 4 (January 1870): 201–16.
"Contributory Negligence on the Part of an Infant," *American Law Review* 4 (1870): 405–16.
"Insanity in Criminal Law," *American Law Review* 5 (1871): 704–9.
"Married Women," *American Law Review* 6 (1872): 57–74.
"Slander and Libel," *American Law Review* 6 (1872): 593–613.
"The Three Degrees of Negligence," *American Law Review* 8 (1874): 649–68.
Ed., *Commentaries on the Law of Agency as a Branch of Commercial and Maritime Jurisprudence*, by Joseph Story, 8th edn rev. with additions by Nicholas St. John Green (Boston, 1874).
Ed., *Criminal Law Reports*, 2 vols (New York, 1874–5).

Other Relevant Works
A file for Green is in the biographical folders (HUG 300) at Harvard University Archives.
Essays and Notes on the Law of Tort and Crime, ed. Frederick Green (Menasha, Wisc., 1933).

Further Reading
Nat Cycl Amer Bio v11
Fisch, Max. "Was There a Metaphysical Club in Cambridge?" in *Studies in the Philosophy of Charles Sanders Peirce*, ed. Edward C. Moore and Richard S. Robin (Amherst, Mass., 1964), pp. 3–32.
Hackney, James. "The Intellectual Origins of American Strict Products Liability: A Case Study in American Pragmatic Instrumentalism," *American Journal of Legal History* 39 (1995): 443–509.
Menand, Louis. *The Metaphysical Club: A Story of Ideas in America* (New York, 2001).
Peirce, Charles S. "Nicholas St. John Green." *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* n.s. 4 (1877): 289–91. Reprinted in *Writings of Charles S. Peirce, vol. 3, 1872–1878* (Bloomington, Ind., 1986), pp. 208–10.
Wiener, Philip P. "The Pragmatic Legal Philosophy of Nicholas St. John Green," in *Evolution and the Founders of Pragmatism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1949), pp. 152–71. See also "Biographical Notes on Nicholas St. John Green (1835–1876)," pp. 231–4.

John R. Shook

GREENBERG, Clement (1909–94)

Clement Greenberg was born on 16 January 1909 in Bronx, New York, and died in New York City on 4 May 1994. Educated in the public schools of New York City and Norfolk, Virginia, he entered Syracuse University in 1926 and graduated Phi Beta Kappa in 1930 with a BA in English. After graduating Greenberg located a full-time position in 1936 in the Manhattan office of the United States Civil Service Commission, then the Veterans Administration, and finally in 1937 in the Appraiser's Division of the Customs Service in the Port of New York. These positions allowed Greenberg to devote himself to his calling as a writer and a critic of literature and theater. Greenberg was considered by many to be the foremost American art critic of the twentieth century. In 1939 he became a contributor to *Partisan Review*, a liberal journal devoted to cultural, social, and political commentary. The following year he was appointed an editor of

the magazine. In 1941 he began writing for *The Nation* and became its regular art critic from 1944 to 1949. Though he continued to write the regular critical articles for *The Nation*, Greenberg accepted the position of managing editor of the *Contemporary Jewish Record*, which later was replaced by *Commentary*. He remained with this magazine as associate editor until 1957. His major book *Art and Culture* was published in 1961.

From the end of the 1950s through the 1960s Greenberg was a major figure in the burgeoning New York art scene. He was a champion of the abstract expressionist movement and had close personal relations with the artists who were identified with it. His influence extended far beyond the Hudson River or the shores of the Atlantic. Writing essays for the major art journals in the United States, he lectured throughout the country at universities and museums. His advice was sought on exhibitions and acquisitions by those museums, important galleries, and collectors. Lionized as a taste-maker and included in many lists of the foremost intellectuals in the country, he was also feared because of his power to affect the careers of the artists he championed and those he neglected. Frequently criticized as he was for wielding too much influence on the artists he supported, rumors were circulated that he not only directed the completion of some works but even edited and altered some of them. His critical essays in support of abstract expressionism, and especially Jackson Pollack, in the late 1940s and 1950s, and his later encouragement in the 1960s of those producing color field paintings, including Morris Louis, Kenneth Noland, and Jules Olitski, significantly affected their success. With the rise of pop art and the work of other postmodernist image-makers in the 1970s, Greenberg's influence waned. He continued to write, lecture, and publish in important magazines and journals, but the power he once exercised diminished.

Greenberg's primary critical interest was directed toward literature and drama. His first article for the *Partisan Review* was devoted to Bertold Brecht. In 1939 his essay in the *Partisan Review* titled "Avant-Garde and Kitsch" (in 1961) attracted attention in both the United States and England; it started his extraordinary career as a major art critic. Greenberg asked the question: Is it possible for the work of a major poet like T. S. ELIOT, a popular song, a Baroque painting, and a popular magazine cover to be understood as having some meaningful relationship to each other? He argued that no universal aesthetic principles could provide an answer. It is necessary to place that question and others that touched on the extraordinarily varied forms of cultural expression in the response of "the specific – not generalized – individual, and the social and historical contexts in which that experience takes place" (1961, p. 5). Greenberg began his argument with the premise that a healthy society and its artists were tied together by the unique forms and cultural concepts that are shaped by common social, moral, political, and economic factors. He believed that this shared culture encouraged the vital communication between the creative producers of the arts and their audiences: these ties were eroded when a society's values seemed arbitrary and unjustifiable. Instead of having the intellectual, moral, and emotional support that encourages them to explore difficult, controversial ideas and aesthetic forms, artist and writers working in this cultural milieu fell back on previously acquired skills and demonstrations of academic virtuosity based on historic precedent.

Greenberg believed that the contemporary culture was corrosive, eviscerating the vitality and inventive potential of the best of the arts. Yet, he argued, there are those who resist this apparently inevitable decay. He identified these artists and writers as members of an "avant-garde" culture that had its historical roots in the development of the bourgeois society of the 1850s and 1860s in Europe. This new social class, and the economic capitalist system that accompanied it, encouraged the emergence of creative individuals who no longer found support and inspiration in the decaying power

and culture of the aristocracy. But neither could they accept the demonstrated values of bourgeois capitalism. According to Greenberg, the so-called Bohemians were isolated from the Bourgeoisie, but yet they were a product of the revolution that produced this new social and economic force. The avant-garde (Bohemians) "retiring from public altogether … (seeking) to maintain the high level of their art by both narrowing and raising it to the expression of an absolute … . 'Art for art sake' and 'pure poetry' appear, and subject matter or content becomes something to be avoided like a plague" (1961, p. 3). This statement was written two years before the Museum of Modern Art Exhibition titled *Americans 1942* when eighteen artists, from nine states, showed paintings and sculpture. All but two of the artists represented produced representational images.

For the avant-garde artist, Greenberg insisted, the aesthetic concerns and images were to be found in the medium of the work in progress. Painting was about painting, sculpture about the making of sculpture. But he warned that though this revolutionary art should by its very elitist qualities be an art that was supported by the economic and intellectual ruling class, it was in danger of being disowned by them. He wrote, "Where there is an avant-garde, generally we also find a rearguard. True enough – simultaneously with the entrance of the avant-garde, a second new cultural phenomenon appeared in the industrial West: that thing to which the Germans give the wonderful name of *Kitsch*: popular, commercial art and literature with their chromeotypes, magazine covers, illustrations, ads, slick and pulp fiction, comics, Tin Pan Alley music, tap dancing, Hollywood movies, etc. For some reason this gigantic apparition has been taken for granted." (1961, p. 9)

Greenberg, from an elitist's position, saw kitsch as false "ersatz" culture that satisfied the needs of the middle class which had little preparation for an appreciation of the truly fine arts. He believed that there was a historic, general agreement as to the nature of the real cultural legacy "among the cultivated of mankind, over the ages, as to what was good art and what a developed taste" (1961, p. 13). Kitsch debased genuine culture by producing watered down, undemanding versions of the avant-garde visual and literary arts whose appreciation was limited to those who had developed the knowledge and taste required for true aesthetic experiences.

The distinction between Kitsch and the avant-garde was projected into the coeval political conflicts that were erupting throughout the Western world in 1939. Greenberg argued that the support of kitsch in the totalitarian regimes of Germany, Italy, and Russia was due to the fact that kitsch was the culture of their masses. He ends his essay with a "jaundiced" assessment of the capitalist countries: they were in decline, but still capable of producing avant-garde art which paradoxically threatens their own existence.

When Greenberg wrote "Avant-Garde and Kitsch" he was thirty years old. Though he was extraordinarily well read, his letters to his friend Harold Lazarus do not suggest that he was reading extensively in the areas of art history, or aesthetics. There is evidence, however, that he had taken two courses in art history while a student at Syracuse. He referred repeatedly in his letters to his art history teacher, Professor Irene Sargent, and it is clear that she had made a lasting impression on him. Professor Sargent became the editor of *The Craftsman* and in its first issue Sargent wrote an article in praise and support of William Morris and his aesthetic and social theories. The essays and speeches by both Morris and Gustav Stickley, who was thought to depend on Sargent's intellectual and literary strengths, can be felt within Greenberg's ideas about the relationships between the arts and the social and economic divisions that characterized the culture of the burgeoning industrial revolution. Both Morris and Stickley emphasized the need to develop designs that honored the materials, structures and the processes of their manufacture. Their belief in the ideals of socialism, their abhorrence of applied design and cheap imitations of authentic works, are strikingly

similar to Greenberg's comments about kitsch, and his insistence on a nonreferential aesthetic that derives its formal values from the exploitation of the artist's materials. There are also obvious similarities between Greenberg's formalist emphasis on the work of art as a self-referential entity and the earlier aesthetic concepts of Roger Fry and Clive Bell.

In his second major article, "Towards a Newer Laocoon" (1940, in 2000), Greenberg sought to legitimize abstract (non-representational) art by establishing its historic precedents. He argued that by the middle of the nineteenth century, out of a need of "self preservation" the visual arts moved away from what had been its primary functions, the representation of the perceived visual world, and communication of ideas and feelings. Painting and sculpture had become a form of visual literature which was "infecting the arts with the ideological struggles of society" (2000, p. 63). The avant-garde artists shifted their interests from subject matter to a concern for the formal relationships in the work itself. Greenberg saw music and its pure non-representational abstract methodology as a central influence on the artists who were moving toward an art of pure form. Emphasizing the primacy of the medium in avant-garde imagery, Greenberg went on to stipulate that paintings and sculptures were physical objects and that it was the ordered relationships of the physical elements in these visual arts that affected the viewer. To use his phrase: "Painting and sculpture … look what they do. The picture or statue exhausts itself in the visual sensation it produces." (2000, p. 67) For the painter, this meant that the two-dimensional flat surface of the canvas and the manipulation of the painting medium on that flat surface, were the essential primary concerns of the avant-garde artist. Painting as a referential medium, one that directed a viewer's concern to something outside itself, including the illusion of three-dimensional form and space, was no longer a legitimate aim of image-making. The exploitation and importance of the picture surface was a central issue for Greenberg throughout his entire career. In one way or another it remained a cardinal precept in much of his critical writing.

Another question that rises repeatedly in Greenberg's aesthetic is the nature and value of taste. Referring back to Immanuel Kant's *Critique of Aesthetic Judgment*, Greenberg argued that an individual's taste was intuited and subjective. In a 1978 seminar at Bennington College he defined taste as a directed and developed attention. He insisted that it could be stated but not defended because it was intuited, and the basis of intuition, in any individual, was beyond knowing. Taste could not be learned, but could be improved as a result of one's experience. Following Kant, Greenberg also insisted that though taste was a personal basis for aesthetic judgment, ultimately it was also "intersubjective," that over time, a consensus could be reached about the relative merit of unique works of art.

In his late comments on the nature of the arts, Greenberg came to conclusions that suggested that many of the aesthetic concepts he espoused at the beginning of his critical career had developed and been revised. Four decades after his initial essay in the *Partisan Review*, responding to the works of Marcel Duchamp, he was prepared to state that "All reality, all possibility is virtually art." (1999, p. 158) He insisted, however, that though anything we choose to call art is art, there were still distinctions to be drawn between good art and the mediocre; distinctions that depended upon taste and an observer's ability to assume an act of distancing, perceiving an object or event for its own sake as opposed to any reference it might make to objects or event external to it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Henri Matisse (New York, 1953).
Art and Culture: Critical Essays (Boston, 1961).
The Collected Essays and Criticism, vol. 1: Perceptions and Judgments, 1939–1945 (Chicago, 1986).
The Collected Essays and Criticism, vol. 2:

Arrogant Purpose, 1945–1949 (Chicago, 1986).

The Collected Essays and Criticism, vol. 3: Affirmations and Refusals, 1950–1956 (Chicago, 1993).

The Collected Essays and Criticism, vol. 4: Modernism with a Vengeance, 1957–1969 (Chicago, 1993).

Homemade Esthetics (New York, 1999).

The Harold Letters, 1928–1943, The Making of an American Intellectual (Washington, D.C., 2000).

"Towards a New Laocoon," in *Pollack and After: The Critical Debate*, ed. Francis Franscina (New York, 2000), pp. 60–70.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Encyc Amer Bio*

de Duver, Thiery de. *Clement Greenberg entre les lignes* (Paris, 1996).

Kuspit, Donald B. *Clement Greenberg: Art Critic* (Madison, Wisc., 1979).

Rubenfeld, Florence. *Clement Greenberg: A Life* (New York, 1997).

Wilken, Karen, and Bruce Guenther. *Clement Greenberg: A Critic's Collection* (Princeton, N.J., 2001).

Nathan Knobler

GREENE, Theodore Meyer (1897–1969)

Theodore Meyer Greene was born on 25 January 1897 in Constantinople, Turkey (now Istanbul). He earned his BA from Amherst College in 1918. After teaching at the Forman Teaching College of the University of Punjab in India from 1919 to 1921, he went to the University of Edinburgh to study philosophy with Norman Kemp Smith. He wrote a dissertation on "Kant's Religious Theory and Its Relation to English Deism," and received his PhD in philosophy in 1924. He began teaching at Princeton University in 1923 as an instructor, and was promoted up to associate professor in 1928 and full professor in 1938. Following the death of colleague Edward G. SPAULDING, Greene was named McCosh Professor of Philosophy in 1941. In 1946 he went to Yale University as professor of philosophy, teaching there until 1954 when he went to Scripps College in California as its first professor in the humanities. In 1966 he became visiting professor of philosophy at Bowdoin College in Maine. Over the years he was awarded honorary degrees by seven colleges, and he was made an honorary member of Bowdoin's Class of 1968 and an honorary graduate of Bowdoin. Greene died on 13 August 1969 in Christmas Cove, Maine.

Much of Greene's dissertation on Kant, religion, and deism was used for his introduction to his 1934 translation of Kant's *Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone*. Greene also studied Kant's aesthetics and developed his own Kantian aesthetic theory for changing standards of taste. *The Arts and the Art of Criticism* (1940) was his first book on aesthetics. For Greene, "beauty" is the indefinable object of subjective judgments of taste. While indefinable, the quality of beauty does have characteristic powers to arouse disinterested yet satisfyingly engrossing responses from human beings. The beauty of an artifact or natural thing lies in its formal structure and thus is manifest in a great many things besides "works of art." The work of art must be both beautiful and express an aesthetic content beyond its own existence. This artistic beauty must be the consideration of any judgment of taste, and has an objective existence so that judgments of taste may have cognitive and truth value. Greene suggests four criteria of artistic criticism: quality, perfection, truth, and greatness.

Greene's later work on aesthetics is marked by its treatment, rare in twentieth-century American philosophy, of the aesthetics and philosophy of music. His neo-Kantian philosophy is summarized in his article "Life, Value, Happiness" (1956) and his book *Moral,*

Aesthetic, and Religious Insight (1957). Sense perception requires rational interpretation, but science is only one means of rationally organizing experience. Others are morality, art, and religion, which cannot be replaced by science.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Arts and the Art of Criticism (Princeton, N.J., 1940).
Liberal Education Reconsidered (Cambridge, Mass., 1953).
Our Cultural Heritage (Houston, Tex., 1956).
Moral, Aesthetic, and Religious Insight (New Brunswick, N.J., 1957).
Liberalism: Its Theory and Practice (Austin, Tex., 1957).

Other Relevant Works
Greene's papers are at Bowdoin College in Maine.
Trans., *Kant: Selections* (New York, 1929).
Trans. with Hoyt Hudson, *Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone*, by Immanuel Kant (Chicago, 1934).
"A Critical Examination of Mr. Stace's Solipsism," *Journal of Philosophy* 32 (1935): 197–216.
"The Problem of Meaning in Music and the Other Arts," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 5 (1947): 308–13.
"Life, Value, Happiness," *Journal of Philosophy* 53 (1956): 317–30.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v44, Who's Who in Phil
Edman, Irwin. "Professor Greene's 'Critique of Art'," *Journal of Philosophy* 37 (1940): 449–59.
Squire, Russel N. *The Philosophy of Music of George Santayana, Helen Huss Parkhurst and Theodore Meyer Greene.* PhD dissertation, New York University (New York, 1942).

John R. Shook

GRENE, Marjorie Glicksman (1910–)

Marjorie Glicksman was born on 13 December 1910 in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Her parents were Harry and Edna Kerngood Glicksman. She entered Wellesley College in 1927 and majored not in philosophy but in zoology. Although interested in philosophy as a teenager, it was not until 1931, after she had graduated with her BA from Wellesley, that her philosophical studies truly began. In 1931 she traveled to Germany as an exchange student, ending up in Freiburg im Breisgau. There, she learned her philosophy "at the feet of Martin Heidegger" (Auxier and Lewis 2002, p. 4). She read Heidegger's *Sein und Zeit* that summer – partly while at sea, heading home to Madison for the summer recess – and returned to Germany in the fall of 1932. During the 1932–3 school year she studied with Karl Jaspers in Heidelberg while Heidegger was on leave. The spring semester of her studies in Heidelberg were cut short by Hitler's rise to power, and she returned to the United States, where she undertook graduate study in philosophy at Radcliffe, "as close as females got in those days to Harvard" (1995, p. 5).

Glicksman earned an MA and a PhD in philosophy in 1935 from Radcliffe, writing a dissertation on *Existenzphilosophie*. She then traveled to Europe again, this time to Denmark on a postdoctoral fellowship, where she did work on Kierkegaard. She faced a bleak job market when she returned, as a woman in a profession dominated by men and suffering the effects of the Depression. She became Director of Residence at a junior college in southern Illinois. After the start of World War II she went to the University of Chicago, where she worked as an assistant and instructor of philosophy until 1944 when the men began returning from the war. She got the job, she said, as part of "a noble experiment," for she was the first woman the department had ever hired (1995, p. 5). While at Chicago, she took part in Rudolf CARNAP's seminar, discovering that she had major misgivings about logical positivism.

From 1944 until 1957 she was out of academia, but by no means exiled from philosophy. She had married David Grene in 1939 and lived as a wife, mother, and farmer in rural Illinois until 1952, when the family moved to Ireland. Although not affiliated with any academic institution during this period, Marjorie Grene continued to do important work during this time, most of it related to existentialism. It was also during this time that she met Michael POLANYI, with whom she would work closely for many years to come. In 1957 she went to Manchester, England, to work as Polanyi's assistant, helping him to compose his book *Personal Knowledge* (1958).

In 1959 Grene held a lectureship at the University of Leeds in England. A year later she took up a similar position at Queen's University Belfast, Northern Ireland. Having divorced David, in 1965 she moved back to the United States, becoming a professor of philosophy at the University of California at Davis, a position she held until retiring in 1978. Since 1988 she has been honorary distinguished professor and adjunct professor of philosophy and science studies at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Among many honors, Grene was named a fellow in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1976.

In the years after World War II, Grene was among the first thinkers to introduce American audiences to existentialism. Along with such notable figures as Hazel BARNES, William BARRETT, J. Glenn Gray, and Walter KAUFMANN, she played an important role in the postwar American reception of European ideas, a process which intellectual historians have only recently begun to explore in detail. Grene's writings on Heidegger, for example, were some of the earliest interpretations of his work available in English.

Despite having begun her philosophical career "at Heidegger's feet," Grene's relation to existentialism in general, and Heidegger in particular, has been largely antagonistic. The second essay she ever published, in 1938, found Heidegger's philosophy original yet prone to mystification and dogmatism. She concluded a later essay on the Freiburg philosopher, an essay first published in 1958, with these words: "Behind the cheap rhetoric, what is there? The ghost of the Quest for Being fencing with the ghost of Aristotle. Something, but by no means enough." (1976, p. 70) The same sort of appraisal can be found in her 1957 book *Heidegger*. More recently, emphasizing more than ever Heidegger's political misdeeds (Grene was in attendance when Heidegger presented a version of his notorious *Rektoratsrede* at the University of Heidelberg in 1933), she finds Heidegger "a worthy successor to Hegel as a master of German philosophical fraud" (Auxier and Lewis 2002, p. 549).

Her skeptical view of existentialism was not limited to Heidegger. In *Dreadful Freedom: A Critique of Existentialism* (1948) she criticized the other existentialists as well, so in vogue in the postwar years. At least when he was held up to figures such as Sartre, Grene could find in Heidegger something of value, namely his anti-Cartesian philosophical perspective. At least Heidegger, like Jaspers, refused the existentialist moniker. Though she wrote about them extensively in the 1940s and 1950s, it was obvious that Grene was no existentialist.

When she returned to academic life, Grene's work changed direction. Working closely with Polanyi, perhaps the most recognized scientist-turned-philosopher of the time, Grene became interested in evolutionary theory, which would culminate in her work on the philosophy of biology. It was also during this time that she began working extensively on Aristotle, work which led to the publication of *A Portrait of Aristotle* in 1963. The final component of her intellectual development during this time was the work of French philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty.

Reading Merleau-Ponty's *Phenomenology of Perception* in 1960 was, in her own estimation, a kind of "revelation" (Auxier and Lewis 2002, p. 20). The work clarified many

of the anti-Cartesian elements she had absorbed, but not fully appreciated, in her earlier studies of existentialism. Placing Polanyi and Merleau-Ponty alongside evolutionary theory and biology, Grene tried to go beyond the Cartesian *cogito*. In *The Knower and the Known* (1966), for example, she pointed toward a naturalist, contextualist approach to understanding, one which would not try to deny or surpass the embedded character of existence and knowing. Her work up to the present has continued, for the most part, these themes.

Grene has balanced her interests in the history of philosophy and the philosophy of biology, a field of inquiry which hardly existed when she began writing on the subject. She pursued both interests in opposition to the dominance of the Anglo-American tradition of analytic philosophy, so prominent in the American academy. In the philosophy of biology she has written on everything from Darwinist theories of evolution to the ecological psychology of J. J. GIBSON. Without in any way reducing philosophy to the study of genes and molecules, without in any way reducing it to the realm of cognitive science – indeed, in direct opposition to these "reductionist" temptations – she has opened up fruitful paths in the philosophy of biology. In the 1960s and early 1970s she was preoccupied with the threat of reductionism. Grene has always been careful to protect philosophy from the encroachment of science (especially so-called "pure sciences" like physics), while simultaneously highlighting the links between the two. Much of her philosophical work has been devoted to such themes in the philosophy of science, including *Approaches to a Philosophical Biology* (1969) and *The Understanding of Nature* (1974), as well as numerous important essays and edited volumes.

Grene has combated a different kind of reductionism in her work on the history of philosophy. By attempting to place thinkers in their historical contexts without simply reducing them to these historical moments, she has helped to make the history of philosophy more than a mere refuge for antiquarianism. Her work on Descartes, including *Descartes* (1985) and *Descartes Among the Scholastics* (1991), has shown how research into the history of philosophy can explore historical themes without denying contemporary contexts.

Throughout her career, Grene has helped broaden the horizons of American philosophy. In this regard, collections such as her 1976 *Philosophy In and Out of Europe* reveal how important a role she has played in the development of American thought during the latter half of the twentieth century. Although some might argue that her wit has sometimes gotten the best of her philosophical judgment, her work displays, like that of the best minds in the American tradition, a common-sense skepticism toward the flights of fancy endemic to so much philosophical writing. Her thinking is often a welcome, though far from uncontroversial, rejoinder to the jargon-laden and often inconsequential musings of much contemporary philosophical work. A good example of this no-nonsense approach to philosophy is her most recent book, *A Philosophical Testament* (1995).

If there is any thread that unites all of Grene's work, from her early writings on existentialism to the more recent work in the philosophy of biology, it is her consistent anti-Cartesianism. It is in this sense, perhaps, that she never fully escaped Heidegger's shadow, ending up where she began, still in search, like Heidegger, of a philosophical starting point other than the Cartesian subject. Although she has explored many areas of inquiry along these lines, including existentialism, evolutionary theory, the work of Merleau-Ponty, and the philosophy of science, specifically the philosophy of biology, Grene has focused on the *cogito*'s ever-elusive context. Her path of thought was thus shaped, almost against her will it seems, by her early studies in Freiburg.

In a long and distinguished career, Grene

has been a pioneer. Barred for many years from the comfort of academic security available to men, she persevered to become one of this country's most important philosophers. The first woman to be the subject of a *Library of Living Philosophers* volume, Grene has opened up numerous philosophical pathways with her work. With her keen philosophical presence and her acerbic wit (which has spared few philosophers, both past and present), she has left a lasting impact on continental philosophy, on research in the history of philosophy, and on the philosophy of biology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dreadful Freedom: A Critique of Existentialism (Chicago, 1948). Reissued as *Introduction to Existentialism* (Chicago, 1948).

Heidegger (New York, 1957).

A Portrait of Aristotle (Chicago, 1963).

The Knower and the Known (New York, 1966).

Approaches to a Philosophical Biology (New York, 1968).

Sartre (New York, 1973).

The Understanding of Nature: Essays in the Philosophy of Biology (Dordrecht, 1974).

Philosophy In and Out of Europe (Berkeley, Cal., 1976).

Descartes (Minneapolis, 1985).

Interactions: The Biological Context of Social Systems, with Niles Eldredge (New York, 1992).

A Philosophical Testament (Chicago, 1995).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with Thomas V. Smith, *From Descartes to Kant: Readings in the Philosophy of the Renaissance and Enlightenment* (Chicago, 1940).

Ed., *Knowing and Being: Essays*, by Michael Polanyi (Chicago, 1969).

Ed., *Toward a Unity of Knowledge* (New York, 1969).

Ed., *Interpretations of Life and Mind: Essays Around the Problem of Reduction* (New York, 1971).

Ed., *Spinoza: A Collection of Critical Essays* (New York, 1973).

Ed. with Everett Mendelsohn, *Topics in the Philosophy of Biology* (Dordrecht, 1976).

Ed. with Debra Nails, *Spinoza and the Sciences* (Dordrecht, 1986).

Ed., *Dimensions of Darwinism* (New York, 1983).

Ed. with Roger Ariew, *Descartes and His Contemporaries: Meditations, Objections, and Replies* (Chicago, 1995).

Ed. with David Depew, *Philosophy of Biology* (Cambridge, UK, 2004).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Pres Addr of APA v8*, *Women Phils*

Auxier, Randall E. and Lewis E. Hahn, eds. *The Philosophy of Marjorie Grene* (Chicago, 2002). Contains Grene's autobiography and bibliography.

Burian, R. M., and J. C. Pitt, eds. "The Thought of Marjorie Grene," *Synthese* 92 (July 1992). Special issue on Grene.

Cotkin, George. *Existential America* (Baltimore, Md., 2003).

Donagan, Alan, A. N. Perovich, Jr., and M. V. Wedin, eds. *Human Nature and Natural Knowledge: Essays Presented to Marjorie Grene on the Occasion of her Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (Dordrecht, 1986).

Fulton, Ann. *Apostles of Sartre: Existentialism in America, 1945–1963* (Evanston, Ill., 1999).

Martin Woessner

GRICE, Herbert Paul (1913–88)

H. P. Grice was born on 15 March 1913 in Birmingham, England. He was educated at Clifton College in Bristol, and then at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. He read "Greats" at Oxford, the BA degree that combined classics with philosophy, graduating with first class honors in 1936. Between 1939 and 1967, Grice taught philosophy as lecturer, tutor, fellow and then University Lecturer at St. John's College, Oxford. His teaching at Oxford was interrupted by World War II, when he served for five years in the British Royal Navy with active service first in the North Atlantic, and then from 1942 in Admiralty Intelligence. Following the war, Grice's fame within philosophy spread both in England and the United States. In 1967 he gave the prestigious William James Lectures at Harvard, later published in *Studies in the Way of Words*, and in that same year he became a professor of philosophy at University of California at Berkeley. He was promoted to full professor in 1975. Grice was President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1974–5. In 1980 he retired, although he continued to teach occasionally until 1986. Grice also held visiting positions at Harvard, Brandeis, Stanford, Cornell, and the University of Washington. Grice died on 28 August 1988 in Berkeley, California.

Grice is perhaps best known for two papers, "Meaning" of 1957 and "Logic and Conversation" of 1975, both reprinted in his *Studies in the Way of Words* (1989). The article "Meaning" drew attention to two quite different senses of the word "mean." On the one hand, there is the evidential relationship between, say, a cause and its effect. An example of this sense is "Those spots mean measles." In this sense of "mean," "*x* means *y*" is related to "*x* shows that *y*," "*x* is a symptom of *y*" and "*x* lawfully correlates with *y*"; more than that, a particular claim that "*x* means *y*" on this first sense of "mean" can only be true if, when the *x* in question occurred, so did *y*. Thus those

spots on little Jimmy *do not* really mean measles, in this first sense of "mean," if Jimmy does not have measles, even if the spots typically correlate with measles. Grice called this first sense of the word "natural meaning." On the other hand, there is the sense of "mean" that pertains to language and communication. On this second sense, it is words and speakers which mean. To give a couple of examples, take "The Spanish word 'rojo' means red" (word meaning) and "What he meant by saying he was thirsty was that you should bring more whisky" (speaker meaning). And on this sense of "mean," "*x* means *y*" is closer to "*x* says/asserts that *y*," "*x* expresses *y*," and so forth. And when "*x* means *y*" is the case, it will usually be true that someone, or some group, means something by *x*. (Compare: the spots on Jimmy do not express anything, and no one meant anything by them.) In this second sense of "mean," it can be true that "*x* means *y*" even though *x* obtains when *y* is not the case. Thus our speaker might indeed have meant that you should bring more whisky, when in reality you should not: his meaning it, in this second sense, does not make it so.

In "Meaning," Grice went on to analyze in more detail this second sense of "mean," which he called "nonnatural meaning." His fundamental idea was that for a person to mean something, in this nonnatural sense, was for her to intend to induce some belief in her hearer. More than that, it was to induce the belief by getting the addressee to recognize the intention to induce a belief: in meaning something, the speaker does not merely cause the hearer to have a belief, she overtly gives him a reason to believe, the reason being that she wants him to believe. To take the "I'm thirsty" example, the idea would be that *the speaker meant in the nonnatural sense that you should bring more whisky* amounts to *the speaker intended to induce in you the belief that you should bring more whisky, and he intended you to come to have this belief on the basis of recognizing his intention to induce it*. Thus what a person means, in the nonnatural sense, comes down to

complex mental states of hers, especially intentions. As for what words and sentences in the language mean, Grice thought that this could emerge from what beliefs those expressions were standardly used to induce. If some sentence *S* is standardly used by speakers to induce the belief that Howard wants ice cream, then *S* will conventionally mean, in the nonnatural sense of "mean," that Howard wants ice cream. Grice held that linguistic meaning emerged, at bottom, from human psychology.

Grice's "Logic and Conversation" (in *Studies in the Way of Words*) discusses the divergence between speaker meaning and word meaning, as these will not always coincide. A speaker might mean something that the words she utters don't mean. The whisky example is a case in point: the speaker meant that you should bring more whisky, but his words conventionally mean only that he, the user of the sentence, is thirsty – a mere point of information, and one which does not even say what one is thirsty for. One of the key lessons of this pioneering work was that there are several kinds of "content" attaching to speech episodes. There is the content that derives from what the sentence used conventionally means in the language, and there is the content that the speaker manages to convey nonconventionally. Most strikingly, Grice explained how the latter could happen – namely, because talk exchanges are a rational, cooperative endeavor. By making use of the audience's expectation that she will cooperate – she will say the most helpful thing she can in the most helpful way – a speaker can get across something more than, or something different from, what she has said.

Grice is most famous for drawing attention to a certain kind of merely conveyed content, which he called conversational implicatures. These come in two kinds. There are implicatures which only attach in very special circumstances, and there are those which *usually* attach to the use of these words. To give examples of each, in saying "Jones has beautiful handwriting and his English is grammatical" one would not normally implicate that Jones was a poor student. But this implicature would arise if this sentence were the only thing said in a letter of reference supporting Jones's application to graduate school! In contrast, one would usually implicate that *one's own* finger was broken in saying "I broke a finger," and one would usually implicate that one had *exactly* one sister in saying "I have one sister." These are generalized conversational implicatures.

Important as Grice's papers on meaning are, they are not genuinely the core of his philosophy. The real core is conceptual-linguistic analysis. There are two facets of conceptual–linguistic analysis, and both were crucial for Grice. First, there is the process of analyzing concepts through careful study of language, which for Grice, is a philosophical method. Second, there is the product of that process, these being various particular *analyses*. These are the results of applying the philosophical method. Grice reformed the analyzing method borrowed from the "ordinary language" school of his Oxford peers J. L. Austin and P. F. Strawson. According to Grice, to discover what is genuinely revealed by careful linguistic description requires a general theory of language and communication, not just piecemeal observation. As he puts the point, "Before we rush ahead to exploit the linguistic nuances which we have detected, we should make sure that we are reasonably clear what sort of nuances they are." (1989, p. 237) His variation on the process/method of conceptual-linguistic analysis is one half of the "core" of his philosophy. The other half consists in the particular products of conceptual–linguistic analysis. These products were not mere exercises in lexical semantics, because the aim was to uncover metaphysical *reductive emergences* of various kinds: the reduction of meaning, as we have seen, but also of perception, reason, and value. Crucially, the kind of reductive emergence Grice investigated was conceptual: very roughly, in "Meaning," meaning was claimed to be conceptually related to intentions to induce beliefs and actions; in "The Causal Theory of Perception," perception was held to be conceptually related to the causation

of sensations; in *Aspects of Reason* (2001), reasoning was held to be conceptually related to (good) transitions between goal-directed states; and in *The Conception of Value* (1991), value was said to be conceptually related to an evaluation of whether something carried out its function well. In every case, the philosophically charged kind is shown to emerge *by linguistic–conceptual equivalence*, as it were, from something else – possibly but not inevitably something more basic. What connects these two facets of "the core of Grice's philosophy" is that one arrives at these conceptual–linguistic analyses not via natural science, but by applying the aforementioned method/process. As a result, "conceptual reductive emergence" contrasts with the kind of physical emergence that scientists discover a posteriori, for example, that getting hotter emerges from greater molecular motion.

Consider an example. In Grice's 1961 paper "The Causal Theory of Perception" (in *Studies in the Way of Words*) he provides an analysis of the ordinary notion of perceiving a material object. What he was aiming for was neither a scientific hypothesis about how perception actually occurs, nor a philosophically perspicuous amendment to ordinary talk. To the contrary, he was aiming for an analysis of our existing notion. Simplifying for the purposes of illustration, Grice maintained that (1) An ordinary claim that a person X perceives some material object M says that X has a sense datum that was caused by M. Thesis (1) could use some clarification since it can be misleading by suggesting two objections which are not actually apposite. First, there is a familiar complaint about this kind of appeal to sense data: we need to say what a sense datum is; and they seem, at first glance, to be either peculiar philosophical constructs, or postulated entities of the kind scientists introduce. But, continues the objection, for Grice they can be neither, because (1) is meant to be an account of what ordinary people mean, when they say things like "Joan saw a green leaf," and ordinary folks do not mean to talk about philosophical constructs or

postulated entities of psychology. To address this first misleading feature of (1), Grice thinks we should allow that a phrase like "X has a red sense-datum," as used in the analysis, is really just shorthand for ordinary locutions like "That looks red to X," or "It feels to X as if there is a red thing." The second non-apposite objection is that it is not enough for perceiving M that M be *a* cause of a sense datum; for, as is obvious, when one has a red sense datum due to a ripe tomato, the retina of the eye also plays a causal role in giving rise to it, as does the sun; but neither of these things is perceived whenever a ripe tomato is. To address this, Grice notes that what is meant is that the sense datum is caused *in the right way* by M, namely in the way that ripe tomatoes cause red sensations. Put more carefully, then, Grice's view is (2) An ordinary claim that a person X perceives some material object M says that (a) some present-tense sense-datum statement is true of X, (b) this statement reports a state of affairs for which the material object M is appropriately causally responsible. Thesis (2) illustrates the product of conceptual–linguistic analysis, i.e., reductive emergence. But "The Causal Theory of Perception" also illustrates Grice's process of analysis, as a method of careful inspection not only of linguistic nuances, but of what they derive from. In particular, we discover that perception emerges from causation and statements about "looks," "appears," and "seems" by looking below the surface of ordinary talk, to see what is responsible for the nuances we find. Grice insists that when I utter "It looks to me __," what I strictly and literally *say* can very well be true, even if both doubt and denial are absent. To speak this way may be odd, when there is no doubt-or-denial, but only because it is misleading: it somehow suggests, incorrectly, that there is doubt-or-denial. More precisely, to employ the term introduced above, there is a generalized conversational implicature of doubt-or-denial that attaches to "It looks to me __" claims. But to conversationally implicate something misleading is not to assert what is false, let alone to

speak nonsense. Grice makes similar points about "cause." It may be that speakers conversationally implicate that the situation is unusual, when they describe the cause. But one does not *say* that the situation is unusual. One's description of the cause of the sense datum thus is not false, but at most peculiar and misleading, if the perception is perfectly normal.

Grice's conceptual–linguistic analysis might be threatened by W. V. QUINE's rejection of the analytic–synthetic distinction. Grice's approach is to proceed by analysis of meaning, setting aside as irrelevant "factual knowledge" that clouds our intuitions about meaning – which amounts, in effect, to seeking out analytic truths. The metaphysical emergences he purports to uncover – of meaning, perception, reason, and value – are meant to be different from what I called above "physical emergence" (for example, that lightning involves a massive flow of electrons), because only the latter involves finding synthetic truths by means of scientific investigation. But how can this approach even make sense, or its products be correct, if there is no analytic–synthetic distinction?

Grice responded to Quine's threat in "In Defense of a Dogma," co-authored with his student Peter Strawson (also reprinted in *Studies in the Way of Words*). Grice and Strawson read Quine as complaining that one cannot give a definition of "analytic" and "synthetic" except by appeal to expressions that belong in the same family-circle, such as "necessary," "logical truth," and "synonymous." In light of this, the first premise of Grice and Strawson's reply is that if there is independent reason for thinking that the analytic–synthetic distinction is real, then it is not a problem if one cannot give noncircular necessary and sufficient conditions for its application. They defend this first premise by highlighting an absurd consequence if one rejects it. They note, first, that if this premise were false of the analytic–synthetic distinction, it would have to be false when generalized: the analytic–synthetic distinction could not be the only one which is threatened if it "cannot be clarified."

Thus Grice and Strawson's first premise is denied, then for any distinction there would be a serious problem if one could not give noncircular necessary and sufficient conditions for its application. The distinction would have to be abandoned, even if there was independent reason to accept that distinction. To cite one example, the only way adequately to explain the distinction between "true" and "false" is to invoke other words in their family-circle – words like "correct," "statement," "entails" and so forth. So if the analytic–synthetic distinction is suspect on these sorts of grounds, so too is the true–false distinction. But, note Grice and Strawson, one can hardly ever provide such an exhaustive noncircular definition. Given this, if their first premise were false, very few distinctions would be safe. But this is absurd. So, since the denial of their first premise leads to absurdity, their premise must be accepted. The second premise is that *there is independent reason for thinking that the analytic–synthetic distinction is real*. In support of this, Grice and Strawson note that one can give an informal explanation of the distinction without difficulty. Indeed, precisely because this is possible, philosophers have traditionally used these words without any problem, applying "analytic" to roughly the same cases and "synthetic" to roughly the same cases. More than that, a lay person can easily be trained to make the distinction, and to apply "analytic" versus "synthetic" to new cases. Nor is it just that these technical terms can be informally explained, and have a use within philosophy. Rather, these technical words are, as Quine also notes, connected to ordinary ones like "means the same as." Thus there is a pattern of *ordinary* usage at play, which equally supports the presumption that the distinction is real. The conclusion of the two-premise argument, obviously, is that it simply is not a problem that the distinction has not been "adequately clarified."

The theoretical motivation for the two premises relates to Grice's larger philosophy. Grice takes words to mean what they do

because of how they are standardly used. But then any expression which has a standard use among a population must equally have a meaning. Now, "analytic" and "means the same as" have reliable uses, projecting even to novel cases. So, say Grice and Strawson, they surely have a meaning. What is more, insofar as the relevant community contrasts the use of "analytic" and "synthetic," there is a *contrasting* meaning. Thus there is good reason to think the distinction real. They grant that Quine's writings about the analytic–synthetic divide may show that the distinction cannot bear all of the weight that certain philosophers have tried to hoist upon it, if it cannot be clarified in the way Quine sought. However, Grice's larger project does not require that "analytic" and "synthetic" be immune to criticisms of blurriness or unclassifiability. All it requires is that there *be* a distinction. Now, it might be that the analytic–synthetic divide is supposed to be "a distinction without a difference," comparable to the "distinction" between suns and stars, or between the brontosaurus and the apatosaurus. In such cases, one has two different terms, but they actually pick out the very same thing. Or perhaps there really is only a pseudo-distinction here, with expressions that end up not having any genuine sense at all, comparable to the "distinction" between people with healthy auras versus people with auras afflicted by the evil eye. But has Quine given us good reason to assimilate "analytic" either to "sun"/"star" or to "healthy aura"/"afflicted aura"? Such assimilation is not supported by the points Quine makes about how hard it is, while eschewing concepts within their family circle, to give necessary and sufficient conditions for being analytic versus synthetic. After all, providing such a definition is something we can hardly ever do, as was noted while supporting the first premise of Grice and Strawson's argument, that where there is independent reason to take the distinction seriously, it does not matter whether a noncircular definition can be given.

Grice is making an important point about his larger project. He is, in effect, conceding that complete reductive analyses, ones that specify all necessary and sufficient conditions while breaking us out of a circle of related concepts, are simply not to be expected. If the product of conceptual–linguistic analysis was supposed to be reductive analyses of that sort, Grice would be in trouble, but he never intended such results. Conceptual–linguistic analysis involves careful reflection upon the nuances of language use, in light of a theoretical understanding of the contribution of standing meaning to such nuances, and its product is a statement of relationships between concepts. Despite Quine's famous attack upon the analytic–synthetic distinction, the two parts of the "core" of Grice's philosophy remain intact.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Studies in the Way of Words (Cambridge, Mass., 1989).
The Conception of Value (Oxford, 1991).
Aspects of Reason (Oxford, 2001).

Other Relevant Works
Grice's papers are at University of California, Berkeley.
"Personal Identity," *Mind* 50 (1941): 330–50.
"Vacuous Names," in *Words and Objections: Essays on the work of W. V. Quine*, ed. Donald Davidson and Jaakko Hintikka (Dordrecht, 1969), pp. 118–45.
"Davidson on Weakness of the Will," with Judith Baker, in *Essays on Davidson: Actions and Events*, ed. Bruce Vermazen and Merrill Hintikka (Oxford, 1985), pp. 27–49.
"Actions and Events," *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 67 (1986): 1–35.

Further Reading
Amer Phils 1950–2000, *Blackwell Analytic Phil*, *Blackwell Comp Phils*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v8*
Avramids, Anita. *Meaning and Mind: An*

Examination of a Gricean Account of Language (Cambridge, Mass., 1989).

Bach, Kent, and R. Michael Harnish. *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts* (Cambridge, Mass., 1979).

Cosenza, Giovanna, ed. *Paul Grice's Heritage* (Turnhout, Belgium, 2001).

Grandy, Richard, and Richard Warner, eds. *Philosophical Grounds of Rationality: Intentions, Categories, Ends* (Oxford, 1986). Contains a bibliography of Grice's writings.

Levinson, Stephen C. *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicatures* (Cambridge, Mass., 2000).

Mackay, Alfred F. "Professor Grice's Theory of Meaning," *Mind* 81 (1972): 57–66.

Martinich, A. P. "Conversational Maxims and some Philosophical Problems," *Philosophical Quarterly* 30 (1980): 215–28.

Neale, Stephen. "Paul Grice and the Philosophy of Language," *Linguistics and Philosophy* 15 (1992): 509–59.

O'Rourke, Michael. "The Scope Argument," *Journal of Philosophy* 100 (2003): 136–57.

Pigden, Charles. "Two Dogmatists," *Inquiry* 30 (1987): 173–93.

Rolf, Eckard. *Sagen und Meinen: Paul Grices Theorie der Konversations-Implikaturen* (Opladen, Germany, 1994).

Ross, Peter W. "Qualia and the Senses," *Philosophical Quarterly* 51 (2001): 495–511.

Saul, Jennifer. "What Is Said and Psychological Reality; Grice's Project and Relevance Theorists' Criticisms," *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25 (2002): 347–72.

Schiffer, Stephen. *Meaning* (Oxford, 1972).

Sperber, Dan, and Deirdre Wilson. *Relevance* (Cambridge, Mass., 1986).

Strawson, Peter F. "Intention and Convention in Speech Acts," *Philosophical Review* 73 (1964): 439–60.

Robert J. Stainton

GRONLUND, Laurence (1846–99)

Laurence Gronlund was born on 13 July 1846 in Copenhagen, Denmark. He attended the University of Copenhagen, graduating with an MA in 1865 and afterwards studied law. He emigrated to the United States in 1867, settling in Chicago. He was admitted to the Chicago Bar in 1869 but soon gave up practicing law in favor of journalism and radical socialist politics. He published several pamphlets advocating socialism and then produced his first major book, *The Cooperative Commonwealth in Its Outlines: An Exposition of Modern Socialism*, in 1884. As a socialist he disagreed with Henry GEORGE's single tax reform but nevertheless supported his 1886 campaign for Mayor of New York. After Edward BELLAMY's widely read book *Looking Backward* (1888) incorporated many of his ideas, Gronlund began supporting the Nationalist movement, though he was still active in the Socialist Labor Party. By 1891 he was working as a statistician in the office of Commissioner of Labor Statistics in Washington, D.C. In 1898 he moved to New York City and worked as an editorial writer for the *New York Journal*. Gronlund died on 15 October 1899 in New York City.

Gronlund was a radical socialist who, unlike Karl Marx, favored socialist reform rather than the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism. In *The Cooperative Commonwealth* he articulated his utopian vision about the dissolution of all government and the natural ascension of the "State," in the form of a cooperative commonwealth governed by a National Board of Administrators democratically selected by the masses. These governors would somehow administrate "the State" so judiciously that there would no longer be any need for laws, litigation, or lawyers. His book was influential in the United States and England. It strongly influenced Edward Bellamy's novel *Looking Backward* (1888) which popularized Gronlund's ideas and brought him so much attention that Gronlund eventually came publicly to endorse Bellamy's Nationalist

movement as the means to a new socialist society.

Gronlund and Bellamy's works also inspired a practical experiment in socialist utopia called the Equality Colony in 1897. Located on 600 acres near Puget Sound in Washington State it was founded by the political order known as the Brotherhood of the Cooperative Commonwealth. By the fall of 1898 there were over 300 people living at Equality, eager to put Gronlund's social philosophy into action. The colony was governed by a General Assembly – a group headed by a president and a board of directors who were the elected representatives of various colony "departments" such as lumbering, milling, and education. Everyone (both men and women) over eighteen were allowed to participate in the weekly town meetings and to vote on issues affecting colony life. The colony also incorporated Gronlund's philosophy of non-competition into its educational curriculum.

Gronlund's socialist utopia also included sexual equality with the hope that women would be able to pursue intellectual interests the same way that men could. Today he is mainly known for his influence on other contemporary social critics, including Bellamy and socialist union organizer Eugene DEBS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Cooperative Commonwealth in Its Outlines: An Exposition of Modern Socialism (Boston and New York, 1884). Reprinted as *The Cooperative Commonwealth* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965).

Our Destiny: The Influence of Socialism on Morals and Religion, an Essay in Ethics (London, 1891)

The New Economy: A Peaceable Solution of the Social Problem (Chicago, 1898).

Other Relevant Works

Socialism vs. Tax-Reform: An Answer to Henry George (New York, 1887).

Three in One: A Trinity of Arguments in Favor of Social Democracy, with G. C. Clemens and G. A. Hoehn (Chicago, 1898).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v11*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Gemorah, Solomon. "Laurence Gronlund – Utopian or Reformer?" *Science and Society* 33 (1969): 446–58.

Pittenger, Mark. *American Socialists and Evolutionary Thought, 1870–1920* (Madison, Wisc., 1993).

Quint, Howard H. *The Forging of American Socialism: Origins of the Modern Movement* (Columbia, S.C., 1953).

Jean Van Delinder

GRÜNBAUM, Adolf (1923–)

Adolf Grünbaum was born on 15 May 1923 in Cologne, Germany. He emigrated to the United States in 1938 and entered Wesleyan University in Connecticut, where he received his BA in 1943. He then earned an MS in physics from Yale University in 1948, and stayed at Yale for his PhD in philosophy in 1951, writing a dissertation on "The Philosophy of Continuity." From 1950 to 1960 Grünbaum taught at Lehigh University, becoming professor of philosophy in 1955. In 1960 he was appointed Andrew Mellon Professor of Philosophy at the University of Pittsburgh, and named the Director of the new Center for Philosophy of Science. Grünbaum wanted to develop a premier research institute like Herbert FEIGL's older Minnesota Center for Philosophy of Science. In 1961 Nicholas RESCHER was appointed associate director, and Grünbaum and Rescher remain the current leaders of the Center for

Philosophy of Science as Chair and Vice Chair. Grünbaum has also been a research professor of psychiatry since 1979. In 2003 Grünbaum resigned from the philosophy department, although he retained his position as Andrew Mellon Professor of Philosophy of Science.

Grünbaum has received numerous honors and awards. Among them are the Senior US Scientist Award from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation in 1985; Italy's Fregene Prize for Science in 1989; the University of Pittsburgh's first Master Scholar and Professor Award in 1989; Yale University's Wilbur Lucius Cross Medal in 1990; the University of Konstanz's honorary doctorate in philosophy of science in 1995; and the University of Parma's Silver Medal in 1998. In 1985 he gave the Gifford Lectures in Scotland and the Werner Heisenberg Lecture at the Bavarian Academy of Sciences, and in 2003 he gave the Leibniz Lectures at the University of Hannover. He is a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Académie internationale de philosophie des sciences, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and a Laureate of the international Academy of Humanism. His achievements have also been recognized by his election to two terms as President of the Philosophy of Science Association from 1965 to 1970, and his election as President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1982–3. He has recently been elected President of the Division of Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science of the International Union of History and Philosophy of Science for 2004–2005, and President of the International Union for the History and Philosophy of Science for 2006–2007.

Grünbaum's first book, *Philosophical Problems of Space and Time* (1963), elaborates his views that neither space nor time, being continuous, have intrinsic metrics, and therefore that the foundations of physical science involving the measurement of time and space are conventional. Grünbaum's conventionalism is not aiming to show the arbitrariness of theories; rather, he shows how it is an objective fact about nature that many metrics will permit scientific knowledge. As Hans REICHENBACH also argued, following Albert EINSTEIN, there is no way to determine whether events distant from one another are simultaneous, and Grünbaum points out that there is no way to determine whether the movement of a measuring rod changes its length. Therefore, measurable time relations, including the direction of time and even the speed of light, must be conventionally stipulated, leading toward what has been called a "causal theory of time." Grünbaum shows, however, that Einstein's theory of general relativity required the concept of absolute space–time. *Geometry and Chronometry in Philosophical Perspective* (1968) and the second edition of *Philosophical Problems of Space and Time* (1973) expand and modify several of his key arguments for his type of conventionalism. Some younger philosophers of science, including Wesley SALMON and Bas VAN FRAASSEN, were influenced by aspects of Grünbaum's conventionalist program.

A corollary to Grünbaum's treatment of time and energy is that there is no reason to believe that the universe had a beginning (despite the Big Bang hypothesis), and in later writings he has criticized cosmological arguments that presume an origin for the universe and a need to explain such an origin by appeal to a supernatural cause. His article "The Pseudo-Problem of Creation in Physical Cosmology" (1989) set out his main complaints, and more recent articles have developed his anti-theistic cosmology.

Grünbaum was not satisfied with Karl Popper's criterion of falsifiability, holding that theory choice was far more complicated than merely making more experiments that might show a theory to be false. He argued against Popper in *The Foundations of Psychoanalysis: A Philosophical Critique* (1984) that Sigmund Freud's theory of psychoanalysis is indeed falsifiable. Of perhaps greater significance is that Freud, according to Grünbaum, violated many

fundamental principles of scientific reasoning in his defenses of psychoanalysis. In addition, Grünbaum claims, Freud unreasonably argued that since his type of therapy by analysis is uniquely effective, his theory of the development of personality is superior.

Grünbaum did not want to move too far in the opposite direction from Popper's falsifiability toward the sort of relativism that cannot find any sufficient reason to prefer one theory over another. For example, Grünbaum argued against what he took to be the thesis of Pierre Duhem and W. V. QUINE that a theory may always be suitably modified to avoid falsification. Grünbaum's own philosophy of theory choice has largely stayed with the limits of the empiricism of probabalistic inductivism, seeking theories whose ability to explain observed phenomena can best be extended to explain new phenomena.

Grünbaum has been a staunch defender of naturalism against phenomenalism on the one hand and supernaturalism on the other. In "Causality and the Science of Human Behavior" (1952) and some other writings he defends compatibilism. This compatibilism holds that all human behavior is open to scientific explanation regardless of whether the explanation uses deterministic or statistical scientific laws, and that our feelings of freedom are irrelevant to the explanatory success of those theories. In addition to criticizing cosmological arguments for God, Grünbaum has criticized theism on various other grounds, including arguments that morality grounded on divine authority is monstrous and that belief in God may be a delusion caused by irrational psychological motives. Grünbaum's preferred stance is secular humanism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Philosophical Problems of Space and Time (New York, 1963; 2nd edn, Dordrecht, 1973).

Modern Science and Zeno's Paradoxes (Middletown, Conn., 1967; 2nd edn, London, 1968).

Geometry and Chronometry in Philosophical Perspective (Minneapolis, 1968).

Observation and Theory in Science, with Ernest Nagel and Sylvain Bromberger (Baltimore, Md., 1971).

The Foundations of Psychoanalysis: A Philosophical Critique (Berkeley, Cal., 1984).

Validation in the Clinical Theory of Psychoanalysis: A Study in the Philosophy of Psychoanalysis (Madison, Conn., 1993).

Philosophy of Science in Action: Collected Papers, 2 vols (Oxford, 2005).

Other Relevant Works
"Causality and the Science of Human Behavior," *American Scientist* 40 (1952): 665–76.

"Logical and Philosophical Foundations of the Special Theory of Relativity," *American Journal of Physics* 23 (1955): 450–64.

"Law and Convention in Physical Theory," *Current Issues in the Philosophy of Science*, ed. Herbert Feigl and Grover Maxwell (New York, 1961), pp. 140–55.

"Carnap's Views on the Foundations of Geometry," *The Philosophy of Rudolf Carnap*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (La Salle, Ill., 1963), pp. 599–684.

"Can We Ascertain the Falsity of a Scientific Hypothesis?" *Studium Generale* 22 (1969): 1061–93.

"The Meaning of Time," in *Essays in Honor of Carl G. Hempel: A Tribute on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday*, ed. Nicholas Rescher (Dordrecht, 1969), pp. 147–77.

"Popper's Views on the Arrow of Time," in *The Philosophy of Karl Popper*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (La Salle, Ill., 1974), pp. 775–97.

"Is the Method of Bold Conjectures and Attempted Refutations *Justifiably* the Method of Science?" *British Journal for*

the *Philosophy of Science* 27 (1976): 105–36.

"Freud's Theory: The Perspective of a Philosopher of Science," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 57 (1983): 5–31.

"Psychoanalysis and Theism," *The Monist* 70 (1987): 152–92.

Ed. with Wesley C. Salmon, *The Limitations of Deductivism* (Berkeley, Cal., 1988).

"The Pseudo-Problem of Creation in Physical Cosmology," *Philosophy of Science* 56 (1989): 373–94.

"In Defense of Secular Humanism," *Free Inquiry* 12 (Fall 1992): 30–39.

"The Hermeneutic Versus the Scientific Conception of Psychoanalysis: An Unsuccessful Effort to Chart a *via media* for the Human Sciences," in *Einstein Meets Magritte*, ed. D. Aerts, J. Broekaert, and E. Mathijs (Dordrecht, 1999), pp. 219–39.

"A New Critique of Theological Interpretations of Physical Cosmology," *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 51 (2000): 1–43.

"The Poverty of Theistic Cosmology," *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 55 (2004): 561–614.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v9*

Barrett, William, et al. "A Panel Discussion of Grünbaum's Philosophy of Science," *Philosophy of Science* 36 (1969): 331–99.

Cohen, Robert S., and Larry Laudan, eds. *Physics, Philosophy and Psychoanalysis: Essays in Honor of Adolf Grünbaum* (Dordrecht, 1983).

Craig, William Lane. "Professor Grünbaum on Creation," *Erkenntnis* 40 (1994): 325–41.

Garvey, Brian. "Adolf Grünbaum on Religious Delusions," *Religious Studies* 35 (1999): 19–35.

Earman, John et al., eds. *Philosophical Problems of the Internal and External Worlds: Essays on the Philosophy of Adolf Grünbaum* (Pittsburgh, 1993).

Horwich, Paul. "Grünbaum on the Metric of Space and Time," *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 26 (1975): 199–211.

Jokic, Aleksandar, ed. *Philosophy of Physics and Psychology: Essays in Honor of Adolf Grünbaum* (Amherst, N.Y., 2005).

Moreland, J. P. "Libertarian Agency and the Craig/Grünbaum Debate about Theistic Explanation of the Initial Singularity," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 71 (1997): 539–54.

Robinson, Paul. "Adolf Grünbaum: The Philosophical Critique of Freud," in *Freud and His Critics* (Berkeley, Cal., 1993), pp. 179–266.

Swinburne, Richard. "Reply to Grünbaum," *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 51 (2000): 481–5.

Von Eckardt, Barbara. "Adolf Grünbaum: Psychoanalytic Epistemology," in *Beyond Freud: A Study of Modern Psychoanalytic Theorists*, ed. J. Reppen (Hillsdale, N.J., 1985), pp. 353–403.

John R. Shook

GULLIVER, Julia Henrietta (1856–1940)

Gulliver was born on 30 July 1856 in Norwich, Connecticut, to Frances Curtis Gulliver and John Putnam Gulliver, a minister, theologian, and later President of Knox College in Illinois. Gulliver was one of the first professional academic women philosophers. She was part of the first class of Smith College

in Massachusetts, and earned a BA in 1879. After further study with her father she received a PhD in philosophy from Smith College in 1888. Her dissertation was titled "The Substitutes for Christianity Proposed by Comte and Spencer." Gulliver was the second woman to receive a PhD in philosophy in America, preceded by May Preston Slosson in 1880, and followed by Eliza RITCHIE in 1889. Gulliver also had a year of study with Wilhem Wundt at the University of Leipzig during 1892–3. In 1910 her alma mater awarded her the honorary LLD

Gulliver taught at Rockford Seminary in Illinois as head of the department of philosophy and biblical literature from 1890 to 1919, and also was its President from 1902 to 1919. She published several articles in academic and quasi-academic journals and published two books, a translation of Wundt's ethics (1894) and a discussion of political philosophy, *Studies in Democracy* (1917). She was one of the first fifteen women to join the American Philosophical Association, founded just after the turn of the century. Gulliver died on 25 July 1940 in Eustis, Florida.

Gulliver's 1894 response to an article by Ritchie on free will in the journal *Philosophical Review* marks the first public debate between two of America's first academic women philosophers. Both influenced by early American idealism, Gulliver and Ritchie nevertheless disagreed strongly on the nature of human will and its freedom to choose within a world that is at least partly fixed and determined. Ritchie took the Spinozist point of view, that the human will is free, but only within a deterministic framework. Gulliver did not wholly disagree with Ritchie, but believed that her arguments were flawed and that she represented the views of thinkers like Gulliver incorrectly. She had two main criticisms of Ritchie. First, the "libertarians" that Ritchie criticizes do not misunderstand the nature of causation. They simply object to a simple definition that makes no distinction between physical causation and "psychical" causation.

Libertarians deny that "the physical law of causation is applicable to volitions" (p. 64). Second, Ritchie espoused sociological determinism, believing "that it is no more possible that a man … should act otherwise than he does than that a lily should produce rosebuds" (p. 65). Gulliver maintained that Ritchie's approach makes God responsible for all human acts, good and evil. A libertarian point of view allows for at least the possibility that humans are responsible for their own moral decisions.

Gulliver lived on the cusp of two eras, and her political philosophy illustrates ways in which she sought to balance these two eras and ways of thinking, the conservative neo-Hegelian idealism of the nineteenth century, and the progressivism of the early twentieth century. In her most significant work, *Studies in Democracy*, she applauds the American ideal of equality. At the same time, she cautions that equality is not that the interests and ideals of all should be identical, but there should be a "vital idea of diversity, wealth of varying opportunity" (p. 27). It is naïve to believe that persons of different races and social classes are meant to be economically and socially equal in Gulliver's view, only that they are meant to have an equal chance to progress. She also approves of women's increased participation in social and political life, but for classically conservative and maternalistic reasons: women are the conservators in society (while men are the initiators for Gulliver). If given the opportunity to influence political life, they will help maintain peace and harmony. Because they are nurturers and community builders, women will also help bring unity and altruism to an egoistic and atomistic world.

The most difficult matter that Gulliver addresses in *Studies in Democracy* is that of how to reconcile "the two ideals of welfare and freedom." Here she compares the efficiency of autocratic socialism in Germany to the relative inefficiency of democratic capitalism in America, and notes that the German system has many merits. It is an incredibly productive and orderly society, with each individual contributing to the greater good of the whole.

Even so, the sacrifice of individual liberty is not worth the efficiency manifested in the European nation. America simply needs to take a few lessons in the development of character and cooperation that emanate from Germany's tightly controlled social, economic, and political environment. This can be done by educating and inspiring individuals to aim for the higher good – the good of the community – not simply of each individual self. An American, she maintains, can "attain the full stature of a man through a big-visioned self-direction and self-expression in the larger self of the business or the community of which he forms a part" (p. 97).

Gulliver did not specialize in a particular area, but instead wrote several articles on a range of philosophical subjects: the subconscious, the nature of dreams, religion, and literature. While her contributions to philosophic discourse were limited, her contribution to philosophy as a profession was considerable. Gulliver was among the first women in America to study philosophy at the doctoral level, one of the first female members of the APA, an early woman academic administrator, and an advocate of higher education for women. She helped break barriers to the professional philosophical world that were based purely on gender, not ability.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Psychology of Dreams," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 14 (1888): 204–18.

"The Substitutions for Christianity Proposed by Comte and Spencer," *New Englander and Yale Review* 43 (March 1884): 246–61.

"Shelley – The Poet," *New Englander and Yale Review* 52 (February 1890): 138–47.

"What Value has Goethe's Thought of God for Us?" *Andover Review* 9 (August 1891): 133–45.

"Reply to Eliza Ritchie's 'The Ethical Implications of Determinism'," *Philosophical Review* 3 (1894): 62–7.

"Tito Melema," *New World* 4 (December 1895): 687–96.

"The Temptation of Mr. Bulstrode: A Study of the Subconscious Self," *New World* 9 (September 1900): 503–16.

"Modern Educational Ideals," *Smith College Monthly* (December 1903): 178–80.

"A Basic Principle of Growth," *Kindergarten Magazine* 18 (1905): 133–40.

Studies in Democracy (New York, 1917).

Other Relevant Works

Gulliver's papers are at Rockford College, Illinois.

Trans. with Margaret F. Washburn and Edward B. Titchener, *Ethics: An Investigation of the Facts and Laws of Moral Life*, by Wilhelm Wundt (New York, 1897).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*, *Women Phils*

Walhout, Donald. "Julia Gulliver as Philosopher," *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy* 16 (2001): 72–89.

Dorothy Rogers

GUNTER, Pete Addison Yancy, III (1936–)

Pete A. Y. Gunter was born on 20 October 1936 in Hammond, Indiana. After a nine-year residence in New York, the family moved to Texas. Gunter holds BA degrees in philosophy and literature from the University of Texas (1958), a BA in philosophy from the University of Cambridge (1960), and a PhD from Yale University (1963). He taught at Auburn University (1962–5) and the University of

Tennessee (1965–9). He then moved to North Texas University in 1969, and he has been Regents's University Professor there since 1987. His honors include membership in Phi Beta Kappa (1957), Marshall Scholar (1958–60), membership in the Texas Institute of Letters (1973), and the San Antonio Conservation Society Book Award (1998).

Gunter is best known for his work in environmental ethics. His academic and environmental specialties are woven into a complex unity in his teaching, writing, and lobbying for more progressive environmental and ecological stances. His is a major North American voice in these fields. Gunter's initiatives have contributed the passage of significant national and state legislation protecting green spaces and ecological enclaves. He became Chairman of the Big Thicket Task Force of the Texas Committee on Natural Resources in 1992. He linked organizing efforts in several environmental fields with a philosophy of creativity when he alleged in *The Big Thicket* (1993) that working to set up biological and environmental sanctuaries "allows man and nature, economics and ecology, to coexist … . In a world where good causes often die and honest hopes lose themselves in sheer futility, something lasting and living has been actually achieved. People tried, and it mattered." (1993, pp. 167, 189)

Gunter has cultivated the philosophy of science, metaphysics, philosophy of literature, and ecological ethics, with the philosophy of Henri Bergson serving as a departure point for richly diverse studies in the work of a score of leading American and European philosophical personages of the twentieth century. Gunter's literary studies, coupled with his insider's knowledge of those figures, enable him to configure their complex philosophical positions with singular brevity and clear effect. Gunter has done major service to remove the anti-intellectual label which the Anglo-American analytic tradition often associates with Bergson and his work. Gunter's efforts have been the first steps in showing that Bergson's philosophy can contribute to a life-centered environmentalist view-

point. He reinterprets Bergson for contemporary American philosophy in arguing for connectivity between Bergson's stress on intuition and his modifications of simplistic, mechanistic science. Gunter shows how these views can be synthesized in an account of sound, reflective life sciences. Some Mexican and South American philosophies, where Bergson is a major influence, have room for this revitalized Bergson. Such emphases allow for a future-oriented blend of environmental and economic concerns within a workable land ethic for all the Americas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Big Thicket: A Challenge for Conservation (Austin, Tex., 1972).
Henri Bergson: A Bibliography (Bowling Green, Ohio, 1974).
The Big Thicket: An Ecological Reevaluation (Denton, Tex., 1993).
Texas Land Ethics, with Max Oelschlaeger (Austin, Tex., 1997).
"Bergson and The War Against Nature" in *The New Bergson*, ed. J. Mallarkey (Manchester, UK, 1999), pp. 168–82.

Other Relevant Works

Ed. and trans., *Bergson and the Evolution of Physics* (Knoxville, Tenn., 1969).
Ed. with Andrew C. Papanicolaou, *Bergson and Modern Thought: Towards a Unified Science* (Chur, Switzerland, 1987).
Ed., *Creativity in George Herbert Mead* (Lanham, Md., 1990).

Further Reading

Davis, Harold E. *Latin American Thought* (Baton Rouge, La., 1972).
Grogin, R. C. *The Bergsonian Controversy in France* (Calgary, 1988).
Leopold, Aldo. *A Sand County Almanac* (Oxford, 1989).
Stewart, Sharon. *Toxic Tour of Texas* (Houston, Tex., 1992).

Bertrand Helm

GURWITSCH, Aron (1901–73)

Aron Gurwitsch was born on 17 January 1901 in Vilnius, Lithuania, which was then part of Imperial Russia. He was descended from rabbinical scholars on both sides of his family; his Westernizing father owned forests in Ukraine and exported timber to Germany before World War I, when the family fortune was lost. The family moved to Danzig in 1907, where Gurwitsch attended the classical Gymnasium for twelve years. Gurwitsch entered the University of Berlin in 1919, where he became a student of Carl Stumpf, who, like Edmund Husserl, was a student of Franz Brentano. Under Stumpf's guidance, he studied mathematics and theoretical physics as well as philosophy. After two years, Stumpf sent him to Husserl at Freiburg University, where he could only stay a semester for bureaucratic reasons, but he heard the lectures on *Natur und Geist* and considered himself a constitutive phenomenologist thereafter. Stumpf next advised study with the psychiatrist Kurt Goldstein and the Gestalt psychologist Adhémar Gelb at the institute at Frankfurt for the investigation of the after-effects of brain injuries.

Goldstein's influence on Gurwitsch is extensive, but it was in a lecture by Gelb that he had the insight that the Gestaltist abandonment of the constancy hypothesis was an incipient phenomenological reduction. The constancy hypothesis assumes a one-to-one correlation between local stimulations of sense organs, on the one hand, and experiential sensations, on the other. When the predicted sensations are not found in perception, "unnoticed sensations" were posited along with a dualism with higher factors responsible for the distortion of the supposedly true situation with the sensations.

The constancy hypothesis is neither self-evident nor experimentally demonstrable, since it is assumed in any experiment designed to prove it. But with the constancy hypothesis dismissed, there is no need to introduce unnoticed sensations and higher factors; one can describe what is perceived just and precisely as it is perceived. This integral percept can then be explained by internal factors, especially attitude and past experience, combined with external stimulation of the sense organs. Like William JAMES's "object of thought," the perceived-as-perceived is very like what Husserl called the "noema," and as we shall see, Gurwitsch's phenomenology is noematically oriented.

Gurwitsch's dissertation, "Phänomenologie der Thematik und des reinen Ich," was first accepted by Max Scheler, who died before the thesis could be defended, and then by Moritz Geiger. It was published in the organ of the Gestalt school, *Psychologische Forschung*, in 1929 and translated in Gurwitsch's *Studies in Phenomenology and Psychology* (1966). Husserl was quite impressed by it and they met regularly until 1933.

After a year as Geiger's personal assistant at Göttingen, Gurwitsch married Alice Stern and became a research fellow at the Prussian Ministry of Science, Art, and Public Education in Berlin, where he essentially completed *Die mitmenschlichen Begegnungen in der Milieuwelt* (although this was only published and translated into English posthumously). When the National Socialist Party came to power in January 1933, Gurwitsch's fellowship was canceled because he was a Jew. (Some years later Gurwitsch's mother was killed at Auschwitz.)

On 1 April 1933, the day of the boycott of Jewish shops, Gurwitsch and his wife left Germany without visas for Paris, where he knew only Alexandre KOYRÉ and Lucien Lévy-Bruhl, but he had spoken French since childhood and had a deep appreciation of French culture from his father. Alice was soon working alongside Hannah ARENDT in helping Jewish orphans emigrate to Palestine. In 1933–4 Gurwitsch began teaching at L'Institut d'Histoire des Sciences at the Sorbonne in Paris with a series of lectures on Gestalt theory attended by Maurice Merleau-Ponty, who had already read Gurwitsch's dissertation, and Gurwitsch subsequently lectured on intentional

psychology, the phenomenology of eideation, and constitutive phenomenology. His posthumously published *Esquisse de la phénoménologie constitutive* is chiefly based on the last of these lectures. It is difficult to doubt that Jean-Paul Sartre heard of Gurwitsch's non-egological conception of consciousness from Merleau-Ponty.

Gurwitsch and Alfred SCHUTZ had been recommended to each other by Husserl; they finally met in 1937, and their twenty-year correspondence documents their friendship and complementary thinking. Schutz helped Gurwitsch evade the Nazis a second time by facilitating his emigration to the United States in 1940. He lived on grants and temporary instructorships at Johns Hopkins University and elsewhere (Alice worked in a purse factory) until he became an assistant professor of mathematics at the new Brandeis University in 1948. He moved to the philosophy department in 1951.

Schutz tried twice unsuccessfully to bring Gurwitsch to the New School for Social Research. But upon Schutz's death in 1959, Gurwitsch became his successor at the New School. Working alongside Dorion Cairns, he taught during a time when phenomenology was attracting much attention in the US and the New School was a major center. During this period he composed *Leibniz: Philosophie des Panlogismus* and was preparing to write a book entitled *Reality and Logic*. He retired in 1972 with an additional pension awarded by the German government to compensate for the career denied him by the Nazis. He died on 6 June 1973 in New York City. His wife survived until 1996 and facilitated the editing and/or translating of four posthumous volumes of his writings. There was a Festschrift for Gurwitsch in 1972 and there have been two memorial volumes; a six-volume set of his works in English is currently in preparation.

During World War II Gurwitsch began work on his magnum opus, *The Field of Consciousness* (appearing first in French in 1957, then the English original in 1964).

Herbert SPIEGELBERG pronounced it the most substantial original work produced by a European phenomenologist in the United States. Excised from the manuscript was a segment of 150 pages posthumously published as *Marginal Consciousness* (1985). Unfortunately, this text was never expanded to include an *Auseinandersetzung* with Merleau-Ponty and Sartre, whom Gurwitsch considered his peers in the creative development of phenomenology. These two works are the chief sources for the following exposition of his philosophy.

"Consciousness" has the broad signification for Gurwitsch that it has for Husserl, and thus includes valuing and willing, but the emphasis for both is on cognition. They also share the project of a theory of the formal, cultural, and natural sciences that distinguishes constitutive phenomenology from much subsequent concern with human existence and metaphysical themes. Gurwitsch's phenomenology is called constitutive because it is focused on how all objects indicate the intentional consciousness for which they are identical or different, animate or inanimate, experienced in various ways, posited in various ways, and so on, but while Husserl emphasized the noetic side of the noetico-noematic correlation whereby all consciousness is consciousness-of, Gurwitsch, as mentioned, emphasized all objects as-objects-of-consciousness.

Again like Husserl and also like Schutz, Gurwitsch recognized two versions of constitutive phenomenology, transcendental and mundane. But like Husserl, he emphasized the transcendental version, while Schutz found the mundane version, phenomenological psychology, sufficient for his purposes. Gurwitsch rejected phenomenologically the sensuous hyletic data of Husserl and, in addition, he returned to the early James and the early Husserl by denying that there are egos or I's who engage in consciousness and bestow meaning on sense data. He was as unable to observe reflectively such an alleged subject of consciousness just as he was unable to observe

reflectively any dualism of sensations and supervenient factors in objects-as-perceived.

Drawing on Wolfgang KöHLER's work on chimpanzees, and later Heidegger's *Sein und Zeit,* Gurwitsch emphasizes how objects can have functions or uses in relation to actions, explains in Gestaltist terms how such uses arise and can change, and holds that objects are cultural by virtue of having such uses. This not only implies that chimpanzees have basic culture, but defines the subject matter of the cultural sciences, the subject matter of the natural sciences being derived through abstraction from such functions or uses that objects always already have. He thus accepted that the cultural sciences have priority over the natural sciences, which was also accepted by Husserl, Schutz, John DEWEY, and others.

To approach Gurwitsch's description of the structure of the field of consciousness into theme, context, and margin, it is best to determine what a noematic core is for him. This core is also called the "what" of consciousness or the noematic *Sinn.* Since the word "what" does not have an adjectival form and since the German *Sinn* can be misleading even when translated as "sense," the third noun, "core," which can be used as an adjective, is preferable. The following multi-step approach to the noematic core is derived from Husserl's *Ideen I* (1913), but the example – seeing a building – is from Gurwitsch: one might remember seeing or expect to see a building, or one might imagine or feign seeing it; in addition, one might touch, smell, taste, or even hear it, for example, when the door is knocked on. But his analysis focuses on a building-as-seriously-looked-at.

What one sees in looking at a building is the whole building – its back and inside vaguely included – as it appears from a particular side. A side does not present itself as something separate, but as a member of a system of noemata that is what it is in relation to other appearances in the system. If one walks around, approaches, and draws away from the building, there is a succession of appearances, all of which are perceptual presentations of the whole building. This also holds for looking at it from within. In this case, the areas of the room behind one's back and also other rooms and the outside of the building are vague, just like the other side of the building is when it is seen from any one side. While there is thus a multiplicity of perceptual appearances of the object-as-seen over against an identical object seen, there is also a multiplicity of mental acts or experiences over against each identical appearance, which one can verify by remaining in one standpoint while shutting and opening one's eyes repeatedly; the visual appearance is then the same, but there are manifold correlative seeings. In the technical terminology of phenomenology, the seeings are noeses while the appearances are noemata.

More than seeing, however, is involved when one looks at a building. For one thing, it is beautiful, plain, or ugly, and thus has value, and it is used for some purpose that is referred to with such words as "school," "home," or "church." The expressions, "as-looked-at" and "as-seen" emphasize what Husserlians call "manners of givenness" (*Gegebenheitsweise*), which in this case is serious rather than fictive and perceptual rather than memorial or expectational. Manners of givenness discernable reflectively in noemata include perceivedness, rememberedness, expectedness, clarity, obscurity, etc. While Gurwitsch emphasizes the building as-looked-at, what is seen is seen as able to be touched, heard, smelled, and tasted; for example, an orange looks tasty. However, the full or concrete noema includes not only manners of givenness, but also values and uses that correlate with components of valuing and willing in the correlative noeses. Like Husserl, Gurwitsch mentions these non-cognitive components of noemata and noeses, but emphasizes the perceived-as-perceived.

Reflection is required to recognize what has been described. It contrasts with straightforward encountering in which not only the noeses but also the noemata are, as it were, overlooked in dealing simply with things, for example,

going into the house, sitting down at one's desk, and writing a letter. For a noematically-oriented constitutive phenomenologist such as Gurwitsch, it is the object-as-encountered that is reflected upon.

Noematic characteristics of both the positional and experiential kinds can be abstracted from; performing that abstraction yields the "noematic core," the core of the noema (which, as already mentioned, is also called the "what" or "sense"). And a core can be recognized as identical while the manner of givenness changes from expectedness through perceivedness to rememberedness (or a value goes from positive to negative or the object from having a means-use to having an end-use). Finally, noematic cores can be described in what Husserl calls "material-ontological" terms such as "thing," "shape," "cause," "rough," "hard," and "colored," as well as "formal-ontological" terms such as "object," "property," and "state of affairs." The core of the noema of the looking at a building might then be described by saying it is oblong, thirty feet tall, green on the smooth vertical sides, and yellow on top, with nine separate spaces with oblong openings between them inside, and so on, and is of such a description whether expected, perceived, or remembered and when believed, valued, and willed in whatever ways.

Phenomenology can thus clarify much that is usually taken for granted. Yet since Gurwitsch rejected some of Husserl's terms and concepts – for example, hyletic data and noetic *morph,* as well as sense "bestowed" by an ego or I – he was obliged to develop alternative descriptions. This he did with Gestaltist terms. This can be further illustrated with the building-as-looked-at. The building is a Gestalt, an ensemble of items that mutually support and determine one another. Each detail exists only at the place at which it plays the role assigned to it by the whole of which it is a part. This is fairly obvious for doors, windows, walls, floors, ceilings, and so on, but those terms refer to architectural components identified in terms of their use. If uses are abstracted from, the same components can be described in terms of shapes and colors in relation to one another, so that the central square opening on a vertical surface appears as it does in relation to the lateral openings beside it, and the oblong opening at one end with the moveable part that can fit it. The same goes for the surface areas between them: some parts are terminals and others intervals, one can also speak of similarity, equidistantiality, boundaries, and so on. But throughout, the side from which this object is looked at refers to the other sides, including the inside and the top and bottom sides, so that there is a whole in which the front is what it is in relation to the back, top, etc. This is a different account of a seen object than is found in Husserl.

The general structure of the field of consciousness is also a matter of objects of consciousness reflectively observed and analyzed and it culminates Gurwitsch's distinctive position. Every total field of objects-as-encountered has three domains. At the center is the focus of attention that he calls the "theme." This could be the building looked at. Then there is a context of items simultaneously intended-to that is relevant to the theme and forms the background against which it stands out as the center. Gurwitsch calls this relevant context the "thematic field." This could be the surrounding neighborhood, but it might also be a set of past buildings composing the tradition to which an architectural type belongs. And then there are other simultaneously intended-to items that have no relevancy to the theme and thus make up what he calls the "margin." In Gestaltist terms, when items are marginal they have merely "and-connections" with the theme. Yet they are potential themes and items of relevancy; for example, a barking dog, can become thematic instead of the building that thereupon becomes marginal within one's total theme or as relevant to where the dog is heard to be located. If an item can cease to be marginal with a change of the perceiver's perspective, it belongs to the "halo" within the margin; otherwise, it is in the "horizon" there.

Gurwitsch identifies three constants within reality, at least two of which are marginal at a given time. These are one's own body; the inner time of one's stream of consciousness; and the real world as a whole. All three are marginal when one thematizes non-real or ideal objects such as theorems when one is thinking mathematically. But when one of these three is thematized, the others will be marginal or relevant. But for Gurwitsch, what unifies one's whole field with the possible changes exemplified is the stream of consciousness within which the consciousnesses of the various and varying items are "co-present," in other words, occurring together, a position that could be expected of a constitutive phenomenologist. The three constancies of body, inner time, and real world are "orders of existence" (there are ideal orders as well). An order of existence is made up of items and data referred to through the consciousness of indefinite continuation of context – as in the context as continuing beyond items of immediate relevancy to a given theme, a sharp line between a thematic field and the rest of the order of existence being difficult to draw. For example, other buildings in the neighborhood can be relevant to the building thematized, but the context of the real world to which the building belongs extends indefinitely in space, time, and causality, as noematic reflection shows.

Finally, orders of existence have "relevancy principles." For reality in general the relevancy principle is temporality, with both spatiotemporal and purely temporal orders being parts of reality. Streams of consciousness also belong to reality in general and make up the intersubjectivities correlative to which there is objectivity. But when consciousness as a temporal order presents itself as a purely temporal and intentional order, and thus not as part of the spatiotemporal world, it can be called "transcendental" and be reflectively seen to ground the world and the sciences of its aspects, which is a constitutive phenomenological position in philosophy.

Gurwitsch developed objections to some of Husserl's positions; offered alternatives for them; and carried transcendental phenomenology further through the creative use of Gestaltist notions (notions devised as well as borrowed). And indeed he does this to such an extent that his philosophy can be called "Gestalt phenomenology."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Théorie du champ de la conscience, trans. Michel Butor (Paris, 1957).

The Field of Consciousness (Pittsburgh, 1964).

Studies in Phenomenology and Psychology (Evanston, Ill., 1966).

Phenomenology and the Theory of Science, ed. Lester Embree (Evanston, Ill., 1974).

Die mitmenschlichen Begegnungen in der Milieuwelt, ed. Alexandre Métraux (Berlin, 1977). Trans. Fred Kersten, *Human Encounters in the Social World* (Pittsburgh, 1979).

Marginal Consciousness, ed. Lester Embree (Athens, Ohio, 1985).

Esquisse de la phénoménologie constitutive, ed. José Huertas-Jourda (Paris, 2002).

Other Relevant Works

Gurwitsch's papers are at Duquesne University, Pittsburgh. Copies are at the Center for Advanced Research in Phenomenology at the University of Memphis, Tennessee, and at the Sozialwissenschaftliches Archiv at the University of Konstanz, Germany.

Alfred Schutz and Aron Gurwitsch: Briefwechsel 1939–1959, ed. Richard Grathoff (Munich, Germany, 1985). Trans. J. Claude Evans, *Philosophers in Exile: The Correspondence of Alfred Schutz and Aron Gurwitsch, 1939–1959* (Bloomington, Ind., 1989).

Further Reading

Who Was Who in Amer v6, Who's Who in Phil

Embree, Lester, ed. *Life-World and*

Consciousness: Essays for Aron Gurwitsch (Evanston, Ill., 1972).

———, "The Phenomenology of Gurwitsch," *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 12 (May 1981). Special issue on Gurwitsch with a secondary bibliography.

———, *Essays in Memory of Aron Gurwitsch* (Lanham, Md., 1984).

Evans, J. Claude, and Robert S. Stufflebeam, eds. *To Work at the Foundations: Essays in Memory of Aron Gurwitsch* (Dordrecht, 1997). Contains a secondary bibliography.

Lester Embree

GUTHRIE, Edwin Ray, Jr. (1886–1959)

E. R. Guthrie was born on 9 January 1886 in Lincoln, Nebraska, and died on 23 April 1959 in Seattle, Washington. He is best known for his parsimonious one-trial theory of learning. In its broadest sense, however, Guthrie's theory was an explanation of mind in terms of the observed plasticity of behavior as adjustment or adaptation.

The oldest of five children born to Edwin Ray Guthrie, a merchant, and Harriet Louise Pickett, a school teacher, Guthrie graduated from Lincoln High School in 1902. He entered the University of Nebraska in 1903, graduating with his BA and membership in Phi Beta Kappa in 1907. In 1910 he received the MA in philosophy while teaching high school mathematics. With a strong background in classical languages as well as mathematics and philosophy, Guthrie moved from Nebraska to the University of Pennsylvania as a Harrison Fellow, receiving his PhD in philosophy in 1912 with a dissertation on the paradoxes of Bertrand Russell.

In 1914, after teaching high school in Philadelphia, Guthrie became instructor of philosophy at the University of Washington. In 1919 he transferred to the new department of psychology where he remained for the rest of his academic career, becoming emeritus professor in 1951 and retiring from teaching completely in 1956. Guthrie also served as Dean of Graduate Studies for several years and was an administrator in charge of academic personnel. In 1945 he was elected President of the American Psychological Association.

Guthrie's theory was the tip of an intellectual iceberg supported by a set of attitudes and beliefs concerning human communication and language, the nature of facts and explanations, and the nature of scientific truth. His dissertation critiqued Russell's Theory of Types, and this sojourn into symbolic logic left Guthrie with the belief that there was no rigorous deduction or ultimate validity possible. The laws of logic are conventions; they are not the laws of thought.

Like Karl Popper, Guthrie objected to naïve belief in inductive science. While he respected mathematics as a scientific tool, he was critical of approaches in which the need for quantification was allowed to dictate research procedure and believed that just as nature does not count, human purposes and motives create the social constructs known as "facts."

Since science for Guthrie is social discourse, one critical test of truth is acceptability, and to be acceptable theories must meet the conditions of general understanding, chief among which is observability. Science is the search for a body of rules which will serve society by allowing prediction and control and by facilitating the education of the following generation. Nature is not simple, but simple rules are desirable for education.

Guthrie's simplified formulation of learning as a change resulting from a single experience was based on the principle of association. Contiguity, the temporal proximity of stimulus and response, rather than reinforcement, is the critical factor in habit formation. This was an elegant explanation of diverse but converging research. Guthrie attributed the theory's genesis

to Stevenson Smith, his mentor in psychology. Smith drew Guthrie's attention to associative learning during their collaboration on *General Psychology in Terms of Behaviour* (1921). Smith's theory of habit formation provided Guthrie with basic principles that he went on to develop in his best-known work, *The Psychology of Learning*, published in 1935.

While Guthrie had hoped for a general scientific theory of psychology, he is best remembered for his calculus of habit formation and for making learning theory widely accessible through his deft use of homely illustrations and his popular textbooks. When learning theory was eclipsed in the 1950s and 60s, Guthrie became simplistically stereotyped as a behaviorist/logical positivist; but by then much of his influence had already been absorbed into the received body of general psychological understanding.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

General Psychology in Terms of Behavior, with Stevenson Smith (New York, 1921).
The Psychology of Learning (New York, 1935; 2nd edn 1952).

Other Relevant Works
Guthrie's papers are at the University of Washington in Seattle.
The Psychology of Human Conflict: The Clash of Motives within the Individual (New York, 1938).

Cats in a Puzzle Box, with George P. Horton (New York, 1946).
Educational Psychology, with Francis F. Powers (New York, 1950).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Encyc Psych*
Mueller, Conrad G., Jr., and William N. Schoenfeld. "Edwin R. Guthrie," in *Modern Learning Theory*, ed. W. K. Estes et al. (New York, 1954), pp. 345–79.
Prenzel-Guthrie, P. "Edwin Ray Guthrie: Pioneer Learning Theorist," in *Portraits of Pioneers in Psychology*, vol. 2, ed. G. A. Kimble, C. A. Bonaeau, and M. Wertheimer (Washington, D.C., 1996), pp. 137–49.
Sheffield, Fred. "Edwin Ray Guthrie, Jr.," *American Journal of Psychology* 72 (1959): 642–50. Contains a bibliography of Guthrie's writings.

David O. Clark

H

HACKING, Ian MacDougall (1936–)

Ian Hacking was born on 18 February 1936 in Vancouver, Canada, the son of Harold E. and Margaret MacDougall Hacking. After receiving a BA from the University of British Columbia in 1956, he went to the University of Cambridge, from which he received both another BA in 1958 and a PhD in philosophy in 1962. He remained at Peterhouse College, Cambridge as a fellow for two years. From 1964 to 1969 Hacking was associate professor of philosophy at British Columbia, and from 1969 to 1975 he was a university lecturer in philosophy at Cambridge. In 1975 he joined the philosophy faculty at Stanford University, and then in 1982 he was appointed to the faculty of the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology at the University of Toronto, perhaps the most distinguished philosopher in the history of the Institute. In 2000 he also accepted the Chair of Philosophy and of the History of Scientific Concepts at the Collège de France in Paris. He won the Canada Council for the Arts Molson Prize in 2001, and he became a Companion of the Order of Canada in 2004.

It is not surprising that Hacking received a position at the Collège de France in view of his long attachment to the work and influence of the French philosopher Michel Foucault. That influence has taken many forms, and Hacking has never claimed that his work exhausts the possible variety of interpretations of Foucault's work. On the other hand, it is arguable that Hacking has been a more effective ambassador for Foucault's intellectual approach than those who have been more explicitly trying to interpret him for the English-language community precisely because he is addressing issues in a more analytic way.

One of the threads of Foucault's work that runs consistently through Hacking's writing is the "archeology of ideas." This appears strongly in his *The Emergence of Probability* (1975), which gives an account of how probability came to play so prominent a role in European thought in the seventeenth century and after. The subject remains central to Hacking's work, as witnessed by his later volumes *The Taming of Chance* (1990) and *An Introduction to Probability and Inductive Logic* (2001). What distinguishes Hacking's history of probability from other accounts is his determination to embed the discussion in, not just the intellectual but the political context of the period in which Blaise Pascal and G. W. Leibniz were applying mathematical ideas to the solution of problems in the sphere of uncertainty. In his later writings on probability, Hacking tries to look at the questions being asked in the subject rather than concentrating on the answers. In particular, his treatment of figures like David Hume and Karl Popper argues that their treatments of the problem of induction are not just counters in an abstract game of mathematics or philosophy.

Hacking's discussions of logic are informed by a historical sense that sometimes takes precedence over what more exclusively ana-

lytical philosophers might regard as crucial theoretical issues. When he writes about Bertrand Russell and deduction, his analysis takes into account the purposes for which Russell approached deduction. In looking at the philosophy of science, his starting point is the way in which the scientist makes a difference in the discussions and activity about him rather than contemplating the abstract edifice of "Science."

Hacking has been assigned a position among the relativist philosophers of science who discount the pretensions of the discipline to any commanding position above the dispute. As he demonstrates in his *The Social Construction of What?* (1999), this is rather too simple a picture of someone well aware of the furor being created in the name of science and antiscience. Hacking argues that different settings can require different sorts of orientation toward social construction and that a universal dissolution of theoretical questions via social construction is inappropriate. It is true that his views of the role that social construction can play are unlikely to find a warm welcome among the scientists best known for taking social construction to task, but among his points is that the context of the scientist performing an experiment is different from the critic and the philosopher standing outside observing.

One way of characterizing Hacking's approach to issues of philosophy of science and philosophy of language together is not just that he is interested in history but that he is interested in prehistory. This has sometimes led to claims that he is inclined to tell a story that would serve as a plausible explanation for what happened rather than to produce a full-fledged account on the basis of the sources available. While such an approach may be problematic for those approaching the period as historians of science, it certainly produces a philosophy that is historically literate. If, for example, Hacking examines a theoretical claim such as the possibility of radical mistranslation and does not see examples of that in the his-torical record, he argues that this is prima facie evidence against that theoretical claim. On the strength of his published writings, Hacking has managed to bridge gaps between a continental philosopher like Foucault and the analytical tradition in which he was brought up and between philosophy and history of science. While some of his work has been specifically devoted to the subjects in which Foucault was interested, like mental illness, he has generally brought Foucault's slant to settings in which its influence in the English-speaking world had previously been slight.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Logic of Statistical Inference (Cambridge, UK, 1965).
The Emergence of Probability: A Philosophical Study of Early Ideas about Probability, Induction and Statistical Inference (Cambridge, UK, 1975).
Why Does Language Matter to Philosophy? (Cambridge, UK, 1975).
Representing and Intervening: Introductory Topics in the Philosophy of Natural Science (Cambridge, UK, 1983).
The Taming of Chance (Cambridge, UK, 1990).
Rewriting the Soul: Multiple Personality and the Sciences of Memory (Princeton, N.J., 1995).
Mad Travelers: Reflections on the Reality of Transient Mental Illnesses (Charlottesville, Virg., 1998).
The Social Construction of What? (Cambridge, Mass., 1999).
Historical Ontology (Cambridge, Mass., 2002).

Other Relevant Works
"On the Foundations of Statistics," *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 15 (1964): 1–26.
"The Leibniz–Carnap Program for Inductive Logic," *Journal of Philosophy* 68 (1971): 597–610.
A Concise Introduction to Logic (New

York, 1972).

"Michel Foucault's Immature Science," *Noûs* 13 (1979): 39–51.

Ed., *Scientific Revolutions* (Oxford, 1981).

"Is the End in Sight for Epistemology?" *Journal of Philosophy* 77 (1980): 579–87.

"Do We See Through a Microscope?" *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 62 (1981): 305–22.

"The Parody of Conversation," in *Truth and Interpretation: Perspectives on the Philosophy of Donald Davidson*, ed. Ernest Lepore (Oxford, 1986).

"Self-improvement," in *Foucault: A Critical Reader*, ed. David C. Hoy (Oxford, 1986), pp. 235–40.

"Natural Kinds," in *Perspectives on Quine*, ed. Robert Barrett and Roger Gibson (Oxford, 1993), pp. 129–43.

"On Kripke's and Goodman's Uses of Grue," *Philosophy* 68 (1993): 269–95.

"Searle, Reality and the Social," *History of the Human Sciences* 10 (1997): 83–92.

"How Inevitable Are the Results of Successful Science?" *Philosophy of Science* suppl. 67 (2000): 58–71.

An Introduction to Probability and Inductive Logic (Cambridge, UK, 2001).

"How 'Natural' Are 'Kinds' of Sexual Orientation?" *Law and Philosophy* 21 (2002): 95–107.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Oxford Comp Phil*

Holcomb, Harmon R., III. "Hacking's Experimental Argument for Realism," *Journal of Critical Analysis* 9 (1988): 1–12.

Kusch, Martin. "Metaphysical deja vu: Hacking and Latour on Science Studies and Metaphysics," *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* Part A 33 (2002): 639–47.

Reiner, Richard, and Robert Pierson, "Hacking's Experimental Realism: An Untenable Middle Ground," *Philosophy of Science* 62 (1995): 60–69.

Resnik, David B. "Hacking's Experimental Realism," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 24 (1994): 395–411.

Seager, William. "Ground Truth and Virtual Reality: Hacking vs van Fraassen," *Philosophy of Science* 62 (1995): 459–78.

Slater, John G. *Minerva's Aviary: Philosophy at Toronto 1843–1943* (Toronto, 2005), chap. 12.

Thomas Drucker

HAHN, Lewis Edwin (1908–)

Lewis Hahn was born on 26 September 1908 in Swenson, Texas. He received both his BA and MA from the University of Texas at Austin in 1929, and his PhD in philosophy from the University of California at Berkeley in 1939. At Berkeley Hahn studied the *Tractatus* with Moritz Schlick of the Vienna Circle and aesthetics with Stephen C. PEPPER, for whom he also assisted for two years. Hahn's dissertation was "A Contextualistic Theory of Perception." Hahn taught philosophy at the University of Missouri, Columbia from 1936 to 1949, and at Washington University, St. Louis, from 1949 to 1963, where he also served as department chair during that time. He served as Associate Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences in 1953–4 and as Dean from 1954 to 1963. From 1963 to 1977 Hahn was a research professor of philosophy at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, where he is now professor emeritus. From 1977 to 1981, he was distinguished visiting professor at Baylor University. Hahn traveled widely, to China, Japan, Taiwan, Russia, and other countries. He was a member of the US National Commission for UNESCO from 1965 to 1967. Hahn edited *The Proceedings and Addresses of*

the APA from 1960 to 1965 and served as co-editor for the first two volumes of *The Early Works of John Dewey*. Hahn also edited or co-edited volumes for *The Library of Living Philosophers* from 1981 to 2000.

Hahn describes his position of contextualism, which is heavily influenced by Pepper and John DEWEY, as a "pragmatic naturalistic world view which treats time and change seriously and takes as its root metaphor patterned events, things in process, or historical events … the self-sufficient substances of the older substance-attribute metaphysics are replaced by textures" (Allen and Handy 2001, p. 129). He distinguishes between "practical drive perception," which is used in reflective inquiry to solve problems, and "aesthetic drives" which enable us to take in the "quality of a situation or a texture," adding that the latter is a "good part of what makes life worth living" (p. 130). Hahn's contextualism emphasizes pluralism, world dialogue, fallibilism, evolution, and education. Most of his numerous essays are contained within *Enhancing Cultural Interflow* (1998) and *A Contextualistic Worldview* (2001).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Contextualistic Theory of Perception (Berkeley, Cal., 1942).

"Psychological Data and Philosophical Theory of Perception," *Journal of Philosophy* 39 (1942): 296–300.

The Elements of Logic, with Cecil H. Miller (Columbia, Missouri, 1946).

"A Contextualist Looks at Values," in *Value: A Cooperative Inquiry* (New York, 1949).

"Dewey's Philosophy and Philosophic Method," in *Guide to the Works of John Dewey*, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale, Ill., 1970), pp. 15–60.

Enhancing Cultural Interflow between East and West: Collected Essays in Comparative Philosophy and Culture, ed. George C. H. Sun (Mobile, Ala., 1998).

A Contextualistic Worldview: Essays by Lewis E. Hahn (Carbondale, Ill., 2001).

Other Relevant Works

Hahn's papers are at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.

"Metaphysical Interpretation," *Philosophical Review* 61 (1952): 176–87.

"What is the Starting Point of Metaphysics?" *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 18 (1958): 293–311.

"Of Shoes and Ships and Sealing Wax, and Cabbages and Kings," *Journal of Philosophy* 55 (1958): 45–57.

"Contextualism and Cosmic Evolution-Revolution," *Philosophy Forum* 11 (1972): 3–39.

"Piping Pragmatically," introduction to vol. 4 of *The Middle Works of John Dewey* (Carbondale, Ill., 1977).

"Brand Blanshard's World View," in *The Philosophy of Brand Blanshard*, ed. Lewis Hahn (La Salle, Ill., 1980).

"Introduction," to vol. 10 of *The Middle Works of John Dewey* (Carbondale, Ill., 1980).

Ed., *Perspectives on Habermas* (Chicago, 2000).

Further Reading

Allen, Michael W. "Instrumental, Aesthetic, and Pedagogical Aspects of Lewis Hahn's Contextualist Vision," *Comprehensive Harmony: International Journal for Comparative Philosophy and Culture* 1 (2001): 145–52.

Allen, Michael W., and Janet E. Handy. "The Living Philosopher: An Interview with Lewis Edwin Hahn on the Occasion of His Ninetieth Birthday," *Comprehensive Harmony: International Journal for Comparative Philosophy and Culture* 1 (2001): 121–44.

Michael W. Allen

HALL, Everett Wesley (1901–60)

Everett W. Hall was born on 24 April 1901 in Janesville, Wisconsin, to Reverend Walter A. Hall and his wife Mathilda Hall. In 1923 he graduated with a BA summa cum laude from Lawrence College in Wisconsin, and received his MA in 1925. In 1924 he married Charlotte Louise Braatz, whom he met while a student; their son Richard also became a philosopher. During 1924–5 he was pastor at a Methodist church in northern Wisconsin, but refused ordination. For two summers in 1927 and 1928 he studied philosophy at the University of Chicago. Hall obtained his PhD in philosophy in 1929 from Cornell University and was twice Sage Fellow in Philosophy at Cornell.

Hall was a philosophy instructor at Chicago during 1929–31. After leaving Chicago, he taught at Ohio State University in 1931–3, and then became associate professor of philosophy at Stanford University from 1933 to 1941. He then left for the University of Iowa where he became chair of the philosophy department. Gustav BERGMANN was then hired; while there are conflicting reports, initially Hall supported Bergmann to the point of approaching the university provost, citing Bergmann's accomplishments and talent at philosophy.

While at Iowa, Hall and Bergmann experienced a tempestuous relationship which was charged in some measure by Bergmann's incendiary personality, matched only by his genius. Their relationship has become somewhat legendary, but the facts are largely unclear. In an oral history interview now archived at the University of Iowa Libraries, Bergmann credits Herbert FEIGL for enabling his hiring at Iowa, but also speaks highly of Hall, mentioning their numerous discussions together with Wilfrid SELLARS, who was also at the University of Iowa at that time. Hall's relationship with Bergmann was complex; they did read each other's work. Hall's understanding of the method of "ideal language" came straight from Bergmann, and there can be little doubt that Hall's trenchant comments on

Brentano in *What is Value?* excited Bergmann, who later devoted a book to Meinong and Brentano. However, Hall's relationship with Bergmann worsened, and in 1952 Hall left Iowa for the University of North Carolina to become Kenan Professor of Philosophy and chair of the philosophy department, positions he held until his death on 17 June 1960 in Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

After arriving at North Carolina, Hall became one of the most beloved members of its philosophy department. He continued to pursue interests outside of philosophy and earned a reputation singing the bass solo from Mozart's *Requiem* and parts of Handel's *Messiah*. He was an accomplished sailor and was commodore of the Ephrim Yacht Club while living in Wisconsin. In addition to his permanent position at North Carolina, Hall held a number of visiting positions, including a Fulbright to lecture in philosophy at Kyoto University in Japan in 1958–9.

While Hall was an admirer of G. E. Moore with whom he had entered into a correspondence, he took exception to Moore's claim that "good" was an unanalyzable descriptive term. More generally, Hall urges that value be regarded as neither a property of facts nor of things, but rather as a semantical notion resembling truth. Value is a concept of *legitimacy* based on the "fittingness" of the assertion of a value statement. Although intended as a semantical analogue of truth, Hall's conception derives ultimately from Brentano. Just as we might say, following Alfred TARSKI, that "A is red" is true if and only if A is red, Hall suggests that we might with equal propriety say "'A is good' is legitimate if and only if A is good." This is Hall's most important contribution to the discussion of ethical notions. Second in importance is his claim that value statements can be reduced to normative ("ought") statements. Where "A" refers to some universal, "A is good" reduces to "For any x, if x exemplifies A, then x ought to exemplify A." Normatives cannot be reduced to value statements because value statements fail to capture

the "requiredness to be exemplified" of normative statements.

Hall rejected the idea of a presuppositionless philosophy and held firmly to the belief that all philosophy relied on a categorical framework in some form. Central to his thinking was that "There are no categorically self-sufficient and self-justifying philosophical systems." All categorial statements are indexed to a philosophical system, leading to what he called the "category-centric predicament." This provided the basis for his criticisms of, among others, Gilbert Ryle, whose work on "category mistakes," he felt, betrayed a lack of awareness that being such a mistake is relative to a categorial framework.

While admitting that "ideal language" philosophy was methodologically "the best we have," he faulted it on three counts. First, it is devoid of value statements; second, it is everyday language and not ideal language that provides the puzzles that drive philosophy; and third, while the ideal language shows its categorial commitments this is all it can do. There was a further problem, one he dubbed the "lingua-centric predicament." The predicament is that there is no escaping language in order to talk about the world. The problem is persuasively illustrated by designation rules for individual constants of the "ideal" language. Consider the second occurrence of "a" in "'a' designates a." How are we to know what it designates? The only way is to simply restate the semantical rule in which it occurs. To solve the problem we would have to substitute for the second occurrence of "a" the very object to which it refers, a very awkward procedure to say the least. According to Hall, the most immediate access to the world via semantics is not through ideal languages but experience itself. It was this proposal that distinguished him from other philosophers of the period and caught the attention of Wilfrid Sellars with whom he shared an interest in ontology.

Perceptions, Hall maintained, are in fact sentences, sentences in the natural language of the mind. What makes the language natural is that unlike English, for example, it does not rely on conventions of any sort. It possesses, however, the semantical feature of reference and refers to "the very entities symbolized." The color we see refers to the color exemplified by the object itself. This was a novel view, one that Sellars found so philosophically interesting that he devoted an entire paper to the subject.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

What is Value? (London, 1952).

Philosophical Systems (Chicago, 1960).

Our Knowledge of Fact and Value (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1961).

Categorial Analysis: Selected Essays of Everett W. Hall on Philosophy, Values, Knowledge and the Mind, ed. E. Maynard Adams (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1964).

Other Relevant Works

"Some Dangers in the Use of Symbolic Logic in Psychology," *Psychological Review* 49 (1942): 142–69.

"The Extra-Linguistic Reference of Language," *Mind* 52 (1943): 230–46; 53 (1944): 25–47.

"The Philosophy of G. E. Moore," *Philosophical Review* 53 (1944): 62–8.

"Justice as Fairness: A Modernized Version of the Social Contract," *Journal of Philosophy* 22 (1957): 662–70.

Further Reading

Proc of APA v34, Who Was Who in Amer v4

Adams, E. Maynard, ed. "Commonsense Realism: Critical Essays on the Philosophy of Everett W. Hall," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 4 (Fall 1966).

Carnap, Rudolf. "Hall and Bergmann on Semantics," *Mind* 54 (1945): 148–55.

Sellars, Wilfrid. "The Intentional Realism of Everett Hall," in *Philosophical Perspectives* (Springfield, Ill., 1967), pp. 209–28.

Werkmeister, W. H. "Everett W. Hall and the Linguistic Approach," in *Historical Spectrum of Value Theories, Vol. II: The*

Anglo-American Group (Lincoln, Neb., 1973), pp. 307–31.

Steven Bayne

HALL, Granville Stanley (1844–1924)

G. Stanley Hall was born on 1 February 1844 in Ashfield, Massachusetts, and died on 24 April 1924 in Worcester, Massachusetts. His parents were teachers and conservative Congregational Christians. He attended Williams College, from which he graduated with a BA in 1867 with the intention of becoming a minister. After a year at Union Theological Seminary in New York City, where he gradually lost interest in orthodox religion, he spent three years studying in Germany. There he heard lectures by Emil DuBois-Reymond in physiology and Friedrich Trendelenburg in philosophy. He returned to America thinking of teaching school, but finding no position, he returned to Union to finish his BD degree, which he obtained in 1871.

Hall soon found that being a pastor, particularly after the liberating experience of study in Germany, was less than congenial. After tutoring for a year in New York City, he received an appointment to teach English at Antioch College in Ohio where he remained until 1875. Intending to return to Germany, he first went to Harvard University where he taught English. While at Harvard he met William JAMES and saw his small physiological demonstration laboratory. Hall's position at Harvard allowed him to take courses in philosophy and to pursue a doctoral thesis, which he did under the supervision of James while working in the laboratory of the physiologist Henry P. Bowditch. In 1878 Hall received Harvard's first PhD degree with a thesis on the muscular perception of space. This was a topic that fit closely not only with James's interests but also with those of Wilhelm Wundt at Leipzig.

With no teaching position available, Hall returned to Germany, remaining there until 1880. Working in Carl Ludwig's laboratory of physiology, he published research with Johannes von Kries and Hugo Kronecker. Although he did no research with Wundt, he took courses in Leipzig during the time when Wundt's laboratory was first opened for student research and thereby Hall became Wundt's first American student.

Hall returned to America in 1881 and first received notoriety not for his psychology but for his lectures comparing German and American education. These lectures were sufficiently well received that they led in 1882 to a call to Johns Hopkins University, where he rose to professor of psychology in 1884. At Hopkins, Hall lectured and published on education and child study, but his passion was for the psychology laboratory, which he established unofficially in 1883. His laboratory was the first *research* laboratory in psychology in America, since James's 1875 founding of his laboratory at Harvard was for demonstrations in physiology. At Hopkins, Hall also came into contact with many who would become the leaders of American experimental psychology. He supervised the first doctorate in psychology in America, that of Joseph JASTROW. Among his students were John DEWEY and James McKeen Cattell. Together with William James, George Trumbull LADD, John Dewey, and James Mark BALDWIN, Hall was a leader in the transition from philosophical to scientific psychology in the 1870s and 80s.

In 1887 Hall made the first of his great contributions to the establishment of psychology as an independent discipline in America, by founding and editing *The American Journal of Psychology*. He promoted the "new" experimental psychology by providing publishing outlets and by employing book and topical reviews to condemn the literature of philosophical psychology that still existed in the

late 1880s and 90s. Of the early figures in the transition from philosophical to scientific psychology in America, he was the most strident in his emphasis on scientific psychology and the need to break with the methods of traditional "armchair" philosophy.

In 1888 Hall accepted the presidency of the newly founded Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts. Clark, based directly on the German model, was initially conceived as a graduate school devoted to research and scholarship without an undergraduate college, and this design greatly appealed to Hall. In 1892, while at Clark, he made another significant contribution to the professionalization of American psychology, founding the American Psychological Association. He was its first President in 1892.

At Clark, the laboratory in psychology and the department of psychology were handed over to the charge of E. C. Sanford, one of Hall's students from Johns Hopkins. Although Hall worked with many graduate students over his career, the laboratory for which he had striven so intensely at Hopkins became of less interest to him as time went on; he found himself deeply disappointed by events in the development of the new experimental psychology in America, events that left him largely isolated from the mainstream. He remained at Clark for the remainder of his career, stepping down as President in 1922, two years before his death.

Intellectually Hall was exceptionally expansive. His interests in children, sex, psychopathology and education led him far from physiology, psychophysics, and introspective psychology. He had begun publishing in child studies in 1883 with an article in the *Princeton Review* entitled "The Contents of Children's Minds on Entering School." In succeeding years he became a well-known figure in the child study movement and developed a form of questionnaire that became widely used in child research. In 1891 he founded the *Pedagogical Seminary*, which later became the *Journal of Genetic Psychology*. His book, *Adolescence* (1904), was widely read and very influential in the field. Late

in life he would come full circle with a book entitled *Senescence* (1922).

Hall also had a lifelong interest in the study of sex and taught what may have been the first class on sexuality in America. He was a champion of evolutionary theory, a view that cut through virtually all his work on development and education. He was an early supporter of Sigmund Freud; it was Hall who arranged in 1909 for Freud to make his only visit to the United States, to lecture at a meeting in celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the founding of Clark University. Freud's lectures, published by Hall in English translation in the *American Journal of Psychology*, introduced most Americans, and even most Europeans, to Freud's psychoanalysis.

Hall's interest in education continued throughout his career, even during his experimental interlude, and late in life his interest in religion was revived. He founded the *American Journal of Religious Psychology and Education* in 1904 and published, among others, *Jesus the Christ, in the Light of Psychology* (1917).

It is difficult to know where to place Hall in the history of philosophy and psychology. He had an early interest in philosophy, but quite publicly turned his back on it during his period of experimental psychology. While his early work in this field was of some importance, he abandoned it too quickly for it to achieve long-term significance. His work on developmental psychology, while important in its day, seems not to have carried over after his death. Perhaps his primary legacy is institutional. The two major journals he founded still exist and are highly respected. The society he founded is still the primary American psychological organization. Hall was a promoter, of himself and of his ideas. However he was mercurial in his interests, and perhaps because of this few of his studies or publications still exert influence today. Nonetheless it is probably not an overstatement to say that an understanding of the historical transition from philosophical to scientific psychology in America is impossible without an understanding of Hall's role.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Muscular Perception of Space," *Mind* 3 (1878): 433–50.

"American and German Methods of Teaching," *Harvard Register* 3 (1881): 319–21.

"The Contents of Children's Minds," *Princeton Review* 11 (1883): 249–72.

"Child Study: The Basis of Exact Education." *Forum* 16 (1893): 429–41.

Adolescence: Its Psychology and Its Relations to Physiology, Anthropology, Sociology, Sex, Crime, Religion and Education, 2 vols (New York, 1904).

Youth, Its Education, Regimen and Hygiene (New York, 1906).

Educational Problems, 2 vols (New York, 1911).

Founders of Modern Psychology (New York, 1912).

Jesus the Christ, in the Light of Psychology, 2 vols (New York, 1917).

Morale, the Supreme Standard of Life and Conduct (New York, 1920).

Senescence: The Last Half of Life (New York, 1922).

Other Relevant Works

Hall's papers are at Clark University.

"Philosophy in the United States," *Mind* 4 (1879): 89–105.

Life and Confessions of a Psychologist (New York, 1923).

Health, Growth, and Heredity, ed. Charles E. Strickland and Charles Burgess (New York, 1965).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Encyc Relig*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v39*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Fisher, Sara Carolyn. "The Psychological and Educational Work of G. Stanley Hall," *American Journal of Psychology* 36 (1925): 1–52.

Hogan, John D. "G. Stanley Hall: Educator, Organizer, and Pioneer Developmental Psychologist," in *Portraits of Pioneers in Psychology*, vol. 5, ed. G. A. Kimble and M. Wertheimer (Washington, D.C., 2003).

Hulse, Stewart H., and Bert F. Green, Jr., eds. *One Hundred Years of Psychological Research in America: G. Stanley Hall and the Johns Hopkins Tradition* (Baltimore, Md., 1986).

Rosenzweig, Saul. *Freud, Jung, and Hall the King-maker: The Historic Expedition to America (1909), with G. Stanley Hall as Host and William James as Guest* (St. Louis, 1992).

Ross, Dorothy. *G. Stanley Hall: The Psychologist as Prophet* (Chicago, 1972). Contains a bibliography of Hall's writings.

Sanford, Edmund C. "G. Stanley Hall, 1846–1924," *American Journal of Psychology* 35 (1924): 313–21.

Rand B. Evans

HALPRIN, Anna Schuman (1920–)

Anna Halprin was born Anna Schuman on 13 July 1920 in Winnetka, Illinois. A graduate (BA 1942) and an honorary PhD of the University of Wisconsin, she studied under Margaret H'Doubler, the first to establish a dance major at a university. Halprin's work as a choreographer, dancer, and educator has made her a pioneer of postmodern dance. In 1940 she married architect Lawrence Halprin (who won the 2002 National Medal of Arts). In Boston during 1942 and 1943, Halprin taught children of both the wealthy and impoverished, observing how the environment impacts movement, socialization, and childhood development (1955, p. 25), which later influenced her work and method of teaching other artists.

Halprin moved to California in 1945, where she established the Marin County Dance Co-Operative (1947–72), the San Francisco Dancer's Workshop (1955–78), and the Tamalpa Institute (1973–present). She founded the Reach Out Program in 1967, the first multicultural dance company, and also created *Earth Run* in 1981, an annual movement ritual performed in thirty-six different countries. The work created in the Dancer's Workshop most informed her philosophies of movement and forged a new approach to modern dance.

The events at Dancer's Workshop rejected the academic idea of dance that her contemporaries Martha GRAHAM, José Limón, Pearl Lang, and Anna Sokolow were using as the foundation for their work. Instead, she combined ideas from anatomy and psychology to dissolve the boundaries between the person and the artist to allow access to a myriad of emotions. Halprin used anatomy and kinesiology to create new methods of "specific, objective, individual movements" (Wolf 2000, p. 25). She developed new forms of dance bringing the physical, spiritual, emotional, and mental functions together in an interdependent relationship. She used untrained dancers, broke the proscenium, performed outside, integrated nudity, collaborated with people of many disciplines, and incorporated task-oriented movement into dance. These forms led to revolutionary uses of dance, specifically, in the healing and transformational process, the development of community, self-realization, communication, and choreographic motivation. These practices, along with the RSVP Cycles (developed by her husband), Movement Ritual, Psychokinetic Imagery, and the Five Stages of Healing are the primary theoretical foundations for what is now known as the Halprin Life/Art Process.

Halprin believes the primary role of the educator is to generate creativity in others, to be an objective guide who tells students what to do, not how to do it. Halprin's students are credited with starting the New York City avant-garde dance movement and founding the Judson Church Theater. They have received numerous national and international awards including three MacArthur "Genius" Awards: Yvonne Rainer (1990), Trisha Brown (1991), and Meredith Monk (1995). Halprin's work continues to shape the direction of dance and dance education.

Halprin is the recipient of a Guggenheim Fellowship (1970), an American Guild Award (1980), the Samuel H. Scripps/American Dance Festival Award for Lifetime Achievement (1997), and a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts (2001).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Moving Toward Life: Five Decades of Transformational Dance (Hanover, N.H., 1955).

Moving Rituals (San Francisco, 1979).

Circle the Earth Manual: A Guide for Dancing Peace with the Planet (Kentfield, Cal., 1984).

Dance as a Healing Art: Returning to Health Through Movement and Imagery (Mendecino, Cal., 2000).

Moving Toward Life: Five Decades of Transformational Dance, ed. Rachel Kaplan (Hanover, N.H., 1995).

Further Reading

"Halprin, Anna." *International Encyclopedia of Dance*, ed. Selma J. Cohen (Oxford, 1998).

Halprin, Lawrence. *The RSVP Cycles: Creative Processes in the Human Environment* (New York, 1969).

Ross, Janice. "Anna Halprin: From Dance Art to Healing Art," *Dance Magazine* 78 (2004): 74–7.

Wolf, Marina. "Dancing Solo," *Northern California Bohemian* (14–20 December 2000): 25.

Jennifer Tsukayama

HAMILTON, Edward John (1834–1918)

Edward J. Hamilton was born on 29 November 1834 in Belfast, Ireland. He emigrated to the United States where he attended Hanover College in Indiana. Excelling at religion, mathematics, and philosophy, he received a BA in 1853, and an MA in 1856. He briefly went to McCormick Theological Seminary in Indiana (which shortly after became New Albany Theological Seminary), and Union Theological Seminary in New York City, before attending Princeton Theological Seminary where he graduated in 1858. After being ordained in the Presbyterian Church, Hamilton became a pastor at Oyster Bay in Long Island, New York. He remained there until 1861, after which he returned for a year to Ireland to lead a congregation in the town of Dromore.

During the American Civil War, Hamilton was chaplain and bookkeeper for the 7th New Jersey Infantry of Volunteers in the US Army from 1862 to 1865. Besides performing religious services, he kept track of payroll and wrote correspondence for soldiers who could not write themselves. After the war Hamilton spent three years as a pastor in Hamilton, Ohio. From 1868 to 1879 he was Holliday Professor of Logic and Mental Philosophy at Hanover College. He received a DD degree from Monmouth College in 1877. In 1882–3, Hamilton was acting professor of logic, ethics, and politics at Princeton College.

From 1883 to 1891 he was professor of intellectual philosophy at Hamilton College. He taught a course titled "The Radical Principles of Mental Science" using his own text, *The Human Mind* (1882). He unsuccessfully applied for the chair of logic and metaphysics at the University of Toronto in 1889. From 1891 to 1893 he served on the staff of Funk's *Standard Dictionary*. In 1894–5 he was professor of philosophy at Whitworth College, and then he went to Washington State University where he remained until his retirement in 1900. He continued to publish philos-

ophy in retirement. Hamilton died on 29 November 1918 in Berlin, Germany.

Throughout his professional career, Hamilton published a series of pamphlets in response to fundamental philosophical questions about God and mankind's role in the universe. Most of his articles appeared in journals such as *American Presbyterian Review* and *Christian Thought*. He also kept a diary of his thoughts and sermons that he used as notebooks for his research and future publications. Hamilton is best known for his work in logic and mental philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
A New Analysis in Fundamental Morals (New York, 1870).
The Human Mind: A Treatise in Mental Philosophy (New York, 1882).
Mental Science: A Text-Book for Schools and Colleges (New York, 1886).
Christian Thought. Perceptionalism: A System of Philosophy (New York, 1891).
The Modalist, or the Laws of Rational Conviction: A Textbook in Formal or General Logic (Boston, 1891).
The Perceptionalist, or Mental Science: A University Text-Book (New York, 1899).
The Moral Law, or the Theory and Practice of Duty: An Ethical Text-Book (New York, 1902).
Münsterberg's Theory of Immortality (New York, 1905).
Perzeptionalismus und Modalismus: eine Erkenntnistheorie (New York, 1911).
Erkennen und Schlieszen: eine theoretische Logik auf der Grundlage des Perzeptionalismus und Modalismus (New York, 1912).
Rational Orthodoxy: Essays on Mooted Questions (New York, 1917).

Other Relevant Works
Hamilton's papers are at Hanover College.

Further Reading
Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*,

Who Was Who in Amer v1
Testimonials of the Rev. Edward John Hamilton, D.D., S.T.D. (Toronto, 1889).

Cornelis de Waal

HAMPSHIRE, Stuart Newton (1914–2004)

Stuart Hampshire was born on 10 October 1914 in Lincolnshire, England. He was educated at Repton School and Balliol College, Oxford, which he attended from 1933 to 1936, receiving the BA. In 1936 he was appointed fellow of All Souls College, Oxford, a post he held until 1940 and then held again from 1955 until 1960. For four years during World War II he served as an intelligence officer in the British government, and he remained in government service until 1947. During the war he studied the espionage and counter-espionage operations of Himmler's Central Command, and at the end of the war he interrogated some leading Nazis in captivity. In the summer of 1947, in Paris, he was involved in the preparation of the European response to the Marshall Plan.

Hampshire returned to university life in 1947 by taking up the post of lecturer at University College London, which he held until 1950. For the next five years he was a fellow of New College, Oxford, and then he returned to All Souls College. In 1960 he succeeded A. J. Ayer as Grote Professor at University College London. He taught there until 1963, when he became professor of philosophy at Princeton University. In 1964 he became chair of Princeton's philosophy department. After seven years at Princeton, Hampshire moved back to Oxford to be Warden of Wadham College in 1970. Fourteen years later he again taught in the United States as Bonsall Professor of Philosophy at Stanford University from 1984 to 1990. His first marriage in 1961 was with Renee Ayer, the former wife of the Oxford philosopher A. J. Ayer. Some years after her death Hampshire married British philosopher Nancy Cartwright. Hampshire died on 13 June 2004 in Oxford, England.

Hampshire received numerous high honors in both the United Kingdom and the United States of America. He served as President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1969–70, and as President of the American Philosophical Association Pacific Division in 1990–91. He was a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the British Academy. He was knighted in 1979. In 1960 he gave the British Academy's Dawes Hicks Lecture as well as the Ernest Jones Lecture before the British Psychoanalytic Society. In 1964 he gave the De Carle Lectures at the University of Otago at Dunedin, New Zealand. In 1965 he gave the Lindley Lecture at the University of Kansas. In 1967 he gave the Howison Lecture at the University of California, Berkeley. In 1972 he gave the Leslie Stephen Lecture at Cambridge University. In 1976 he gave the Thank-Offering to Britain Fund Lectures. In 1996 he gave the Tanner Lecture at Harvard University. In 1997 he took part in UNESCO's Universal Ethics Project at the Instituto Italiano per gli Studi Filosofici.

Hampshire's philosophical publications spanned six decades and range across many sub-fields of philosophy, including philosophy of language, philosophy of mind, aesthetics, ethics, political philosophy, and the history of philosophy, in particular Spinoza's rationalism. In addition to books and articles in academic journals he published a large number of essays in literary reviews and elsewhere. In *The New York Review of Books* alone he published some fifty-five essays from 1964 to 2002, on topics ranging from Freud and Sade through Virginia Woolf and Iris Murdoch to John Rawls and T. M. Scanlon. He was widely admired for his cultured, humanistic approach to analytic philosophy as well as for his elegant writing style.

In *Spinoza* (1951) Hampshire provides an economically written and very readable expo-

sition of Spinoza's metaphysical determinism and theory of the mind–body relationship, and draws an analogy between Spinoza's theory of natural knowledge and modern programs of unified science. Hampshire notes in his introduction to the 1987 edition that it was first published "in the aftermath of logical positivism and in the first high enthusiasm of the new analytical philosophy." In retrospect he sees that he had read Spinoza's theory of knowledge "in a too contemporary spirit" and made some errors of emphasis and balance, including underestimating "the peculiarity of Spinoza's claims for mathematical knowledge and the metaphysical implications of these claims" (1987, pp. 67).

Thought and Action (1959) is widely regarded as Hampshire's most important book. In it he argues that the self is a necessarily embodied agent that manipulates and interacts with elements of its environment and is free in virtue of its capacities for reasoning and knowledge, including self-knowledge. Since human beings are capable of articulate, discursive reasoning, they are necessarily capable of identifying and categorizing objects. Unlike automata or even some complex organisms, human beings are not passive observers of their surroundings or of their own mental life, but have the capacity to form intentions and make decisions, as distinct from predictions. One can stand back from a prediction about one's own future actions; by doing so one changes the situation. And increased self-knowledge can increase one's freedom, Hampshire argues.

Hampshire criticized behaviorist accounts of psychological concepts in a 1950 review of Gilbert Ryle's *The Concept of Mind*. Other early writings on mind include: "The Analogy of Feeling" (1952); in which he argues that interaction with other physical things and communication with other persons are necessary to a subject's sense of identity and to self-knowledge; "Self-knowledge and the Will" (1953) and "On Referring and Intending" (1956); in which he argues that statements about one's intentions and other introspection-based state-

ments can be incorrigible; and "Dispositions" (1953); in which he offers an account of human dispositions as differing from dispositional properties of material things in that a thing can have a dispositional property without having manifested it.

In *Thought and Action* as well as subsequent works, Hampshire examines the relations among knowing, intending, and deciding, and inquires into what is and what is not contingent in human thought and experience. In his essay "A Kind of Materialism" (1970), he asks how a materialist can believe that his thoughts and feelings are physical and determined, and also, consistently with that belief, try to change them for the better and advocate that others do likewise. He offers an answer drawn from Spinoza. The articles in *Freedom of Mind and Other Essays* (1971), which were published over a period of twenty years, converge upon a common topic: "What are the peculiarities of the concepts that we use to describe and to criticize the mental states and the performances of human beings, as contrasted with the states and performances of things of other kinds? What are the peculiarities of knowledge that we may possess of our own mental states and attitudes and of the mental states and attitudes of other persons?" (1971, p. vii) In *Freedom of the Individual* (1975) Hampshire contrasts noninductive knowledge of the future, which one has in virtue of having formed intentions to act, with inductive knowledge of the future.

Both Hampshire's approach to the explanation of human dispositions and his approach to ethics are aspects of his more general view that human activities must be understood historically. The grounds for ascribing dispositions to people are to be found in their past behavior. Understanding a person's dispositions requires knowing how these developed, via generalization, from responses to specific situations in early childhood, and how the unconscious memories of those original situations continue to play a role in the person's life. Understanding one's own dispositions by way of psychoanalysis can increase one's control over them,

and hence can increase one's freedom. More generally, understanding human activities requires seeing them historically. It also requires recognizing that the conception of human nature employed in any explanations or moral evaluations of human activities is itself a changeable product of history.

In a widely reprinted essay on aesthetics, "Logic and Appreciation" (1952), Hampshire argues that the difference between art and other human activities is such that there can be no general rules of critical appraisal. To appreciate works of art one must freely explore them. Works of art are unique, and aesthetic judgments are concerned with what is unique, whereas moral judgments, which consider whether actions conform to rules and principles, focus on what actions have in common. Since aesthetic judgments and moral judgments have different purposes, he concludes that there are no problems of aesthetics comparable with the problems of ethics. Critics Marcia Cavell and Mary MOTHERSILL contend that he overstates the case.

For a full understanding of Hampshire's views about aesthetics and ethics one must read not only his books but also his literary reviews, including those collected in *Modern Writers and Other Essays* (1969). In the introduction Hampshire says he is not one of the philosophers who turn to logic and mathematics for the full satisfaction of their intellectual needs, but instead one of those who "have suspected that in philosophy, and particularly in moral philosophy and in the philosophy of psychology, strict argument is interesting only if it is also a working out of an imaginative vision" (1969, p. x). From his earliest writings through his latest, Hampshire argues that issues in the philosophy of language have significant implications for ethics. He also argues, in his books about ethics, that in reflecting on conduct and character we need to consider vividly presented cases such as those found in history and in fiction, in addition to abstract arguments.

Aristotle's and Spinoza's accounts of morality were the two classical accounts that always seemed to Hampshire "the most plausible and the least shallow in the literature," as he says in his introduction to *Morality and Conflict* (1983, p. 1). In 1949 he published "Fallacies in Moral Philosophy," which supported Aristotle's conception of moral and political judgment. In 1977 he published *Two Theories of Morality*, a study of the moral theories of Aristotle and Spinoza. Both of these theories base morality principally on typically human powers of mind, distinguish reason from passion and desire, and regard reasoning as the way to make human life better. Hampshire agreed with these views at that time, but his conception of reason underwent change, as did his conception of morality. The stages of these changes are presented in the chapters of *Morality and Conflict*.

Hampshire came to believe that morality is inseparable from conflict. He developed this view further in *Innocence and Experience* (1989) and *Justice Is Conflict* (2000). In these books he also argues that the core of a thin notion of minimum procedural justice is derivable from the need faced by all societies to establish institutions for deliberation and decision-making. In the latter book he argues that within a single society there can be conflicting moral traditions and at the same time a shared political culture within shared institutions. Hampshire's conception of value is a form of pluralism. Some critics see his conception of morality and justice as a form of relativism, a charge he denies. Judith DeCew's arguments provide some support for his denial.

The main value of Hampshire's rich body of published contributions to the field of philosophy lies not in conclusive arguments for or against particular doctrines but in his philosophical style and in the many insights yielded by his intelligent, independent-minded approach to each of his topics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Spinoza (Harmondsworth, UK, 1951; rev. edn 1987).
Thought and Action: A New Approach to

Moral Philosophy and to the Problem of Freedom of the Will (London, 1959; New York, 1960; rev. edn, Notre Dame, Ind., 1982).

Freedom of the Individual (London, 1965; rev. edn, Princeton, N.J., 1975).

Modern Writers and Other Essays (London, 1969).

Freedom of Mind and Other Essays (Princeton, N.J., 1971).

Two Theories of Morality (Oxford, 1977).

Public and Private Morality (Cambridge, UK, 1978).

Morality and Conflict (Cambridge, Mass., 1983).

Innocence and Experience (Cambridge, Mass., 1989).

Justice Is Conflict (Princeton, N.J., 2000).

Other Relevant Works

"Logical Form," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 48 (1947): 37–58.

"Subjunctive Conditionals," *Analysis* 9 (1949): 9–14.

"Fallacies in Moral Philosophy," *Mind* 58 (1949): 466–82.

"Ryle's *Concept of Mind*," *Mind* 59 (1950): 237–55.

"Multiply General Sentences," *Analysis* 10 (1950): 73–6.

"Freedom of the Will," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* suppl. 25 (1951): 161–215.

"The Analogy of Feeling," *Mind* 61 (1952): 1–12.

"Self-Knowledge and the Will," *Revue internationale de philosophie* 7 (1953): 230–45.

"Dispositions," *Analysis* 14 (1953): 5–11.

Ed., *The Age of Reason: the Seventeenth Century Philosophers* (New York, 1956).

"Identification and Existence," in *Contemporary British Philosophy, Third Series*, ed. H. D. Lewis (London, 1956), pp. 189–208.

"On Referring and Intending," *Philosophical Review* 65 (1956): 1–13.

Ed., *Philosophy of Mind* (New York and London, 1966).

"Decision, Intention, and Certainty," with H. L. A. Hart, *Mind* 67 (1958): 1–12.

"Spinoza and the Idea of Freedom," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 46 (1960): 195–215.

"J. L. Austin," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* suppl. 34 (1960): 1–14.

"Disposition and Memory," *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 43 (1962): 59–68.

"Commitment and Imagination," in *The Morality of Scholarship*, ed. Max Black (Ithaca, N.Y., 1967).

"A Kind of Materialism," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 43 (1970): 5–23.

"The Social Spirit of Mankind," in *Kant's Transcendental Deductions*, ed. Eckart Forster (Stanford, Cal., 1989), pp. 145–56.

"World Governance: A Philosophical View," in *Global Governance: Ethics and Economics of the World Order*, ed. M. Desai and P. Redfern (London, 1995).

Further Reading

Oxford Comp Phil, Pres Addr of APA v7

Bratman, Michael E. *Intention, Plans, and Practical Reason* (Cambridge, Mass., 1987), chap. 7.

Cavell, Marcia. "Taste and the Moral Sense," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 34 (1975): 29–33.

DeCew, Judith W. "Moral Conflicts and Ethical Relativism," *Ethics* 101 (1990): 27–41.

Delahunty, R. J. *Spinoza* (London, 1985).

Dennett, Daniel. "Mechanism and Responsibility," in *Essays on Freedom of Action*, ed. Ted Honderich (London, 1973).

Honderich, Ted. *How Free Are You?* (Oxford, 2002), chap. 7.

Hudson, W. D. *A Century of Moral Philosophy* (New York, 1980), chap. 8.

Lovibond, Sabina. *Realism and Imagination*

in Ethics (Minneapolis, 1983).

Magee, Bryan. *Modern British Philosophy* (London, 1971), chap. 1.

Mothersill, Mary. "'Unique' as an Aesthetic Predicate," *Journal of Philosophy* 58 (1961): 421–37.

Murdoch, Iris. "The Idea of Perfection," *Yale Review* 53 (1964): 342–80.

Smilansky, Saul. *Free Will and Illusion* (Oxford, 2000), chap. 11.

Alyssa R. Bernstein

HAND, Billings Learned (1872–1961)

Learned Hand was born on 27 January 1872 in Albany, New York. His father Samuel, along with two uncles, a grandfather, and his cousin Augustus Hand, were lawyers. Hand entered Harvard College in 1889 and took advantage of its new elective system, selecting economics and philosophy. Courses with Harvard philosophers Josiah ROYCE, William JAMES, and George SANTAYANA confirmed Hand's agnosticism and his belief that absolute truth is unattainable. He received the Harvard AB and MA degrees in 1893. Following his family's preference for law school over philosophy, he graduated from Harvard Law School in 1896. He practiced law in Albany until 1902 when he moved his practice to New York City, where he wrote for law reviews, advocated social reforms, and supported progressive political parties. He continued these pursuits after his judicial appointment to the US District Court for New York's Southern District (1909–24), but soon after World War I he restrained his political engagement. In 1923 he helped to found the American Law Institute. In 1924 President Coolidge appointed Hand to the federal Second Circuit Court of Appeals, and he became its chief judge in 1939. He retired from the bench in 1951 but continued to assist the Court, write on legal theory, and give lectures. He died on 18 August 1961 in New York City.

His friends and Supreme Court justices Oliver Wendell HOLMES, Jr., Louis BRANDEIS, and Benjamin CARDOZO regarded Hand as the finest jurist never to have joined them on the nation's highest court. Although most of his decisions (over 4000) concerned the typical lower court's problems with contract law, tort law, and statutory interpretation, occasionally Hand could deliver an influential decision on the nation's urgent constitutional issues. His moderate stance on judicial powers and powerfully analytic mind provided a standard of excellence for writing reasoned and persuasive opinions. He stood between legal formalism's focus on strictly following the plain wording of laws, and legal pragmatism's emphasis on the power of the judge to create new law. For statutory interpretation he stressed the guiding role of determining the purpose behind a law to assess its meaning for application by a judge to a particular case. In the realm of common law Hand formulated useful rules for determining negligence. He regularly condemned judicial activism where he believed judges imported their own social, economic, or political views into a decision. His 1958 *The Bill of Rights* most completely expresses his arguments against judicial activism.

Hand's preference for judicial restraint brought him into conflict with both conservative and liberal readings of the Constitution. He occasionally objected to what he viewed as illegitimate expansions of the meaning of the Bill of Rights, for example, unconvinced that these fundamental rights must always change with the times. However, his own conviction that no individual, organization, religion, or government has possession of secure truths made him a passionate advocate for freedom of speech. His decision in *Masses Publishing Co. v. Patten* (1917) protected the free speech rights of a pacifist and socialist magazine, ruling against the widespread notion that protecting the nation's ability to fight a war overrides anyone's right to object to the war or to how the nation conducts the war. He applied his own creation,

the "incitement test," which permits punishment only of speech that directly causes criminal behavior. Although influenced by Hand, later Supreme Court decisions guided by Justice Holmes used a weaker "clear and present danger" test that instead permitted prior restraint of speech that is judged to have potential dangerous consequences. Contemporary free speech law is much closer to Hand's original incitement standard.

While his stance on free speech limited the ability of popular opinion to silence minority views, Hand saw constitutional and representative democracy as the best form of government. Like Walter LIPPMANN, Hand rejected romanticizing democratic individualism, fearing an anarchy of unrestrained desires that only threatens genuine liberty for all. If citizens must carry the burden of self-government, they must take the responsibility of humbly seeking the welfare of all. In May 1944 he gave a now famous speech before reciting the Pledge of Allegiance with 150,000 new citizens in New York City's Central Park. After warning that not legislatures and courts but the people are the sources and guarantors of liberty, he offers a tentative vision of liberty:

> What then is the spirit of liberty? I cannot define it; I can only tell you my own faith. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the mind of other men and women; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias; the spirit of liberty remembers that not even a sparrow falls to earth unheeded; the spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, near two thousand years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never learned but never quite forgotten; that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest. (*The Spirit of Liberty*, p. 190)

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Spirit of Liberty: Papers and Addresses of Learned Hand, ed. Irving Dilliard (New York, 1952; 3rd edn 1960).
The Bill of Rights (Cambridge, Mass., 1958).
The Art and Craft of Judging: The Decisions of Judge Learned Hand, ed. Hershel Shanks (New York, 1968).

Other Relevant Works
Hand's papers are at Harvard Law School.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*
Breuer, Ernest H. *Learned Hand, January 27, 1872–August 18, 1961: Bibliography* (Albany, N.Y., 1964).
Griffith, Kathryn P. *Judge Learned Hand and the Role of the Federal Judiciary* (Norman, Okla., 1973)
Gunther, Gerald. *Learned Hand: The Man and the Judge* (New York, 1994)
Schick, Marvin. *Learned Hand's Court* (Baltimore, Md., 1970).

John R. Shook

HANSON, Norwood Russell (1924–67)

Norwood Russell Hanson was an Oxford-educated philosopher and physicist who helped transform professional philosophy of science in the late 1950s and 60s. Over the course of a career in which he taught at Cambridge, Indiana, and Yale, Hanson popularized one of the defining ideas of post-positivist philosophy of science, the notion that scientific observations are "theory-laden," and promoted the intellectual union of history of science and philosophy of science.

Hanson was born on 17 August 1924 in New York City. After service in the US Navy

during World War II as a decorated fighter pilot, he attended the University of Chicago where he earned a BA in 1946. He then did further study in physics at the University of Columbia, receiving his BS in 1948 and MA in 1949. As a Fulbright Scholar during 1950–52, Hanson studied philosophy at the universities of both Oxford and Cambridge. He was a lecturer in philosophy of science at Cambridge from 1952 to 1957 while he completed his doctorate there, and he received his PhD in philosophy in 1956. In 1957 he accepted an appointment from Newton P. STALLKNECHT, then chair of Indiana University's philosophy department. After helping to establish the Department of History and Philosophy of Science, Hanson went to Yale University as professor of philosophy in 1963. He is remembered as a flamboyant character. He regularly traveled in his personal vintage Grumman Bearcat and became known on Yale's campus as "the flying professor." He died while piloting his airplane on 18 April 1967 near Cortland, New York.

Though credit is usually given to Thomas KUHN for the idea that scientific perceptions are influenced or shaped by paradigmatic commitments, it was Hanson who brought late Wittgensteinian notions of "seeing" and "seeing as" into mainstream philosophy of science as a tool to help explain disagreement among scientific observers. "Perhaps," Hanson wrote in the beginning of his most famous book, *Patterns of Discovery*, "there is a sense in which two such observers do not see the same thing, do not begin from the same data, though their eyesight is normal and they are visually aware of the same object" (1958, p. 4). Appealing to both gestalt optical illusions and episodes in the history of astronomy, Hanson argued that "seeing is a 'theory-laden' undertaking. Observation of x is shaped by prior knowledge of x" (1958, p. 19).

Because a strict division between observational and theoretical languages was a standard feature of then-dominant logical empiricist conceptions of science, Hanson's

view can be seen as an early revision of what came to be seen as logical empiricist dogma. His appeals to perception and optical illusions were designed to suggest that observations and beliefs (and, hence, observational and theoretical languages) were more connected and mutually influencing than previously supposed. This debate was revived in the 1980s by Jerry FODOR (Fodor 1984) in ways suggesting that logical empiricism models were not so naïve as Hanson and his followers came to believe.

This was not Hanson's only point of attack on logical empiricist orthodoxy. He also sought to counteract the profession's tendency to study completed, more or less justified scientific theories. The title of his *Patterns of Discovery* was itself a reply to Hans REICHENBACH's famous distinction between contexts of discovery and justification, only the last of which Reichenbach took to be the proper domain of scientific philosophy. Many believed that scientific discovery and creativity were phenomena to be studied by psychologists and sociologists, not philosophers. Hanson appealed to Charles Sanders PEIRCE's conception of abduction to explain scientific creativity and hypothesis formation as he argued instead that there were patterns in the development and discovery of scientific theories (1958). In both history and contemporary sciences such as particle physics (1963), Hanson urged philosophers to examine these patterns in order to understand science better.

Hanson's reliance on pre-Galilean physics in developing his account of Galileo's work in physics suggests the influence and proximity of his Indiana history colleague Edward Grant, whose *Source Book in Medieval Science* (Grant 1974) helped facilitate the growth of history and philosophy of science (HPS) as a unified discipline in the 1960s and 70s. Hanson and Grant established Indiana's Department of History and Philosophy of Science in 1960. This department established a model for HPS programs in other universities and continues to uphold Hanson's adaptation of Kant: history of science without philosophy of science is

blind; philosophy of science without history of science is empty.

Hanson was colorful and intellectually brazen inside and outside philosophy of science. In the late 1950s and early 1960s he joined other prominent intellectuals who wrote for popular audiences in magazines such as *The Nation*. Excerpts from *Patterns of Discovery* appeared in the *Saturday Review*. Outside of his technical contributions, Hanson also applied philosophy of science to perennial debates about theism and, in particular, for his burden-of-proof argument holding that theists (and not atheists) need to supply positive evidence for (rather than against) the existence of God (*What I Do Not Believe and Other Essays*, 1971, pp. 309–31). While credited with helping to overthrow logical empiricism, Hanson energetically maintained the public crusade undertaken by early logical empiricists against scientifically unsound metaphysical beliefs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Patterns of Discovery: An Inquiry into the Conceptual Foundations of Science (Cambridge, UK, 1958).

The Concept of the Positron: *A Philosophical Analysis* (Cambridge, UK, 1963).

Perception and Discovery: *An Introduction to Scientific Inquiry* (San Francisco, 1969).

What I Do Not Believe and Other Essays, ed. Stephen Toulmin and Harry Woolf (Dordrecht, 1971).

Observation and Explanation: *A Guide to Philosophy of Science* (New York, 1971).

Constellations and Conjectures, ed. Willard C. Humphreys (Dordrecht, 1973).

Other Relevant Works
"Uncertainty," *Philosophical Review* 63 (1954): 65–73.

"On the Impossibility of any Future Metaphysics," *Philosophical Studies* 11 (1960): 86–96.

"Is There a Logic of Scientific Discovery?" in *Current Issues in the Philosophy of Science*, ed. Herbert Feigl and Grover Maxwell (New York, 1961), pp. 20–35.

"The Irrelevance of History of Science to the Philosophy of Science," *Journal of Philosophy* 59 (1962): 574–85.

"An Anatomy of Discovery," *Journal of Philosophy* 64 (1967): 321–52.

"The Genetic Fallacy Revisted," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 4 (1967): 101–13.

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*

Cohen, Robert S., and Marx W. Wartofsky, eds. *Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science, vol. 3: In Memory of Norwood Russell Hanson* (Dordrecht, 1967).

Feyerabend, Paul K. "Patterns of Discovery," *Philosophical Review* 69 (1960): 247–52.

Fodor, Jerry. "Observation Reconsidered," *Philosophy of Science* 51 (1984): 23–43.

Grant, Edward, ed. *A Source Book in Medieval Science* (Cambridge, Mass., 1974).

Grau, Kevin T. "Force and Nature: The Department of History and Philosophy of Science at Indiana University, 1960–1998," *Isis* suppl. 90 (1999): 295–318.

Putnam, Ruth Anna. "Seeing and Observing," *Mind* 78 (1969): 493–500.

Tibbetts, Paul. "Hanson and Kuhn on Observation Reports and Knowledge Claims," *Dialectica* 29 (1975): 145–55.

George A. Reisch

HARDIN, Garrett James (1915–2003)

Garrett Hardin was born on 21 April 1915 in Dallas, Texas. He spent much of his youth moving form town to town, but found stability in the summers he spent at the family farm in Missouri, where he would discover many "life lessons" that shaped his later ethical beliefs. At the age of fifteen he won a city-wide contest run by the *Chicago Daily News* with an essay on the importance of Thomas Edison, and was awarded a trip east to visit the aging inventor. In 1932 Hardin won both a University of Chicago academic scholarship and a dramatic arts scholarship at the Chicago College of Music. A month's attendance convinced him that he could not follow both paths simultaneously, and so he abandoned the dramatic scholarship. In 1936 he graduated from the University of Chicago with a BA in zoology, studying under the ecologist W. C. Allee. He then transferred to Stanford University, where he obtained his PhD in microbial ecology in 1941. His most influential mentors were the microbiologist C. B. van Niel and the geneticist George W. Beadle, who was later awarded a Nobel Prize. Shortly after graduation Hardin began work at the Carnegie Institution of Washington's Division of Plant Biology, which had a laboratory on the Stanford campus. For four years he was part of a team investigating antibiotics produced by algae, as well as the future possibility of using cultured algae as animal food.

In 1946 Hardin resigned his research position at the Carnegie Institution to accept an associate professorship at the University of California's campus in Santa Barbara. During the next two decades he devoted much of his time to developing an ecologically oriented course in biology for the general citizen, which he adapted to closed-circuit television. He was appointed full professor of human ecology in 1963, holding that position until he retired in 1978. His work on population control and immigration reduction was supported by grants from the Pioneer Fund from 1988 through 1992.

Hardin is best known for his 1968 essay, "The Tragedy of the Commons," and his later work, "Living on a Lifeboat" (1974); which critically examines the long-term consequences of foreign aid, immigration, and other seemingly ethical activities. Concerned for the environmental sustainability of the planet, he argued against policies and ethical views that would increase population and reduce natural resources. Through all of his work he discusses "tough love ethics." His analogy of the lifeboat is used to argue against sharing resources with those in poverty by implying that such sharing will only threaten disaster for all in the long run. In his 1985 *Filter's against Folly* he expands on his ethical position in distinguishing three filters that must be used in the practical use of ethics: literacy, concerned with correct use of language; numeracy, an appreciation of quantities; and ecolacy, the study of relationships over time.

Hardin has received many honors. In 1973 he was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and in 1974 to the American Philosophical Society. In 1979 he was awarded the Margaret Sanger Award for his support for the wider provision of birth control and population limitation. In 1993 he was one of the recipients of the Phi Beta Kappa annual book prizes for his book *Living Within Limits: Ecology, Economics, and Population Taboos.* Hardin and his wife were members of the Hemlock Society and felt very strongly that they wanted to choose their own time to die, which they accomplished on 14 September 2003 in Santa Barbara, California.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Nature and Man's Fate (New York, 1958).
"The Tragedy of the Commons," *Science* 162 (1968): 1243–8.
Birth Control (New York, 1970).
Exploring New Ethics for Survival: The Voyage of the Spaceship Beagle (New York, 1972).
Stalking the Wild Taboo (Los Altos, Cal., 1973).

Mandatory Motherhood: The True Meaning of "Right to Life" (Boston, 1974).

"Living on a Lifeboat," *BioScience* 24 (October 1974): 561–8.

The Limits of Altruism: An Ecologist's View of Survival (Bloomington, Ind., 1977).

Promethean Ethics: Living with Death, Competition, and Triage (Seattle, 1980).

Naked Emperors: Essays of a Taboo-stalker (Los Altos, Cal., 1982).

Filters against Folly, How to Survive Despite Economists, Ecologists, and the Merely Eloquent (New York, 1985).

Living Within Limits: Ecology, Economics, and Population Taboos (Oxford, 1993).

The Immigration Dilemma: Avoiding the Tragedy of the Commons (Washington, D.C., 1995).

The Ostrich Factor: Our Population Myopia (Oxford, 1998).

Further Reading

"Tragedy of the Commons?" *Science* 302 (12 December 2003). Special issue about Hardin.

Callahan, Daniel. "Garrett Hardin's 'Lifeboat Ethic'," *Hastings Center Report* 4 (December 1974): 1–4.

Coburn, Robert. "On Feeding the Hungry," *Journal of Social Philosophy* 7 (1976): 11–16.

Gardiner, Stephen M. "The Real Tragedy of the Commons," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 30 (2001): 387–416.

John William Bates V

HARING, Ellen Stone (1921–)

Ellen Stone was born on 5 December 1921 in Los Angeles, California. Her father was a naval officer, and as a child, she experienced a nomadic-style life, moving several times between the west and east coast. She received her BA from Bryn Mawr College in 1942. She married Philip S. Haring in 1942 and they later divorced in 1951. Haring received her MA in 1943 and PhD in philosophy in 1959 from Radcliffe College. She began teaching as an instructor at Wheaton College in 1944–5, and then taught philosophy at Wellesley College beginning in 1945 where she progressed from instructor to full professor. She was department chair during 1962–5, 1966–7, and 1971–2. In 1972 Haring became professor of philosophy and chair of the department at the University of Florida, being the first woman to chair a department in Florida's College of Arts and Sciences. She served as chair until 1979, and was a visiting professor at Fordham University in the fall of 1979. She remained at the University of Florida until 1999, continuing to teach there part-time after retirement in 1993. She is currently living in Washington, D.C.

Haring's professional awards include two fellowship prizes from Bryn Mawr as an undergraduate: the Hinchman Prize Fellowship (1941–2) and the European Fellowship (1942–3). Also in 1942–3 she was awarded a Josiah Royce Scholarship by Radcliffe. She received the Penelope McDuffie Fellowship from the American Association of University Women in 1958–9. With regard to her professional activities, at Wellesley College she was the Director of the Medieval Studies Honors Major (1952–5) and Chair of the College Curriculum Revision Committee (1962–4). She served as President for the Association of Realistic Philosophy (1961–3), and as Secretary for the Metaphysical Society of America (1951–2 and 1968–71). She was the President of the Florida Philosophical Association in 1975. She was active as a member on several national committees during her career: the Committee for the International Exchange of Persons (Fulbright Committee) in 1964–8; the Council of Secretaries, American Council of Learned Societies in 1968–71; the Executive Committee, Council of

Secretaries, of the American Council of Learned Societies (1970–71); and the Executive Committee of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association (1972–4).

Haring's major areas of interest are ancient philosophy and metaphysics. She has published a series of three articles on Aristotle in the *Review of Metaphysics*, entitled "Substantial Form in Aristotle's *Metaphysics Z*." She has been acknowledged in the prefaces of three of Paul Weiss's books: *Modes of Being* (1958), *The World of Art* (1960), and *History: Written and Lived* (1962). She is an Aristotelian rather than a Platonist; and, for that reason, has been drawn into some contemporary sciences, particularly those concerned with perception and action.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Substantial Form in Aristotle's *Metaphysics Z*" *Review of Metaphysics* 10 (1956): 308–32; 10 (1957): 482–501; 10 (1957): 698–713.
"A Twentieth Century Aristotle," *Review of Metaphysics* 14 (1960): 292–9.
"Aristotle's Physical Philosophy," *Review of Metaphysics* 15 (1961): 271–7.
"The Ontological Principle," *Review of Metaphysics*, 16 (1962): 3–13.
"Interrogation of Paul Weiss," in *Philosophical Interrogations*, ed. Sydney Rome and Beatrice Rome (New York, 1964), pp. 259–317.
"Actualities as Private and Public," *Review of Metaphysics* 25 (1972): 131–43.
"The *Theaetetus* Ends Well," *Review of Metaphysics* 35 (1982): 509–28.
"Socratic Duplicity: 'Theaetetus' 154b1–156a3," *Review of Metaphysics* 45 (1992): 525–42.

Further Reading
"Haring, Ellen Stone," in *Who's Who in America*, 58th edn (New Providence, N.J., 2004), pp. 2155.

Rebecca Bensen Cain

HARKNESS, Georgia Elma (1891–1974)

Georgia Harkness was the first female theologian to teach in Protestant seminaries in the United States, at Garrett Biblical Institute and Pacific School of Religion. She was a social activist, challenging churches and society to overcome sexism, racism, and militarism. Harkness was trained in and taught philosophy, became a Boston personalist and a philosophical idealist, and then turned to theology in the second half of her career.

Harkness was born on 21 April 1891 in the tiny hamlet of Harkness in the Lake Champlain area of upstate New York. The town was named after her grandfather. The substantial farm on which she grew up had been in her father's family since her Scotch-Irish ancestors migrated to the area in 1801. Harkness's father, J. Warren, and her mother, Lillie (Merrill) Harkness, were leading citizens of the town and church. She and her siblings attended the town's one-room elementary school, which was located in the same building as their church. Raised in a conservative evangelical Methodist Episcopal congregation, Georgia joined the church after what she described as her definitive conversion at age fourteen and maintained her membership there throughout her life.

Harkness graduated from the nearby Keeseville High School at fifteen and received a Regents' scholarship to attend a university or college in New York State. She chose Cornell University, the state's leading institution of higher education, which had opened its doors to women in 1872. Harkness became active in the Student Volunteer Movement, a second home to her, and took its pledge that, God willing, she would become a foreign missionary. Over the next several years, her vocational direction changed from missionary service to director of religious education in a local church, to college and seminary teaching in philosophy of religion, religious education, and practical theology.

During her years at Cornell, Harkness's strongest academic influence was James Edwin

CREIGHTON, a distinguished philosopher in American academic circles who had been elected President of the American Philosophical Association at its founding in 1902. Creighton believed that philosophy should bring deeper meaning to everyday life and address present-day problems in the home, school, and work settings, an approach that Harkness embraced. He advanced his own system of speculative idealism, which held that the mind can overcome its one-sidedness and correct and complete ideas and experiences. To Creighton, the free spirit of critical inquiry was the ideal of philosophical experience. He was not a philosopher of religion and was not concerned with an understanding of divinity from a Christian perspective. Belief in a sane world in which individuals, other selves, social systems, and the natural order functioned harmoniously furnished the only basis for rationality. His speculative idealism provided Harkness a subsequent natural entry into Boston personalism. The two philosophical systems shared common optimistic liberal tenets: the centrality of the individual and personality, the ability of the mind to bring truth and freedom to any given situation, and confidence in a steady and dependable natural and social world. Creighton's philosophical map enabled Harkness to venture forth on her academic journey and, in time, to move in her own distinct direction.

After graduation with a BA from Cornell in 1912, and before beginning work on her advanced degrees at Boston University, Harkness taught high school in small upstate New York towns until 1918. She then earned one of the first MRE degrees from Boston University's School of Religious Education in 1920, and a MA in philosophy in that year. While in her master's programs, she began taking classes under Edgar S. BRIGHTMAN, professor of philosophy at Boston University, who became her foremost academic mentor. Brightman had earned his PhD under Borden Parker BOWNE, the founder of Boston Personalism, one of the first comprehensive

systems of philosophy of lasting influence developed in the United States. Brightman followed in his footsteps as a second-generation exponent of Personalism; Harkness was among its third-generation representatives.

The essence of this philosophical position lay in its interpretation of personality. The person is the ultimate reality and personality the fundamental explanatory principle and value of all of life, both human and divine. Harkness gained from Brightman the notion that to be practical, in the philosophical sense, necessitates ideals that provide a more convincing interpretation of the ends, meaning, and values of life than the desires, instincts, and habits that motivate a superficial existence. Personalism found inexhaustible meaning in life in the relation of human and divine wills. Brightman taught that God is a being of perfect goodness and purpose and that humans live out of an ideal obligation to live by the highest values. Though suffering and tragedy are facts of life, the Personalist believed that finding a deeper meaning can transform tragedy. Because the universe is a friendly place, the hope of transformation is possible. Brightman taught Harkness that religion is a person's total attitude toward what the self considers to be superhuman and worthy of worship or devotion. All religious experience aims to express a person's attitude toward what is regarded as the chief value of all values in life. Religion, like philosophy, is practical because it leads people to deeper meaning and purpose in life. Serving God is the only purpose inclusive enough both to sustain the individual and to benefit the larger community and world.

Taking the advice of Brightman, Harkness wrote her dissertation on "The Relationships between Philosophy of Religion and Ethics in the Thought of T. H. Green." Green, an Oxford professor in the late nineteenth century, conceived of God in the same way that the Boston personalists did, through the concept of self-consciousness. He saw God as a "completed self-consciousness, a being of perfect understanding and perfect love, whose life is an

eternal act of self-realization through self-sacrifice". God's eternal self-consciousness reproduces itself in human beings and becomes the foundation for their intellectual and moral lives, leading persons to live more purposefully. Green defined religion as a "God-seeking morality" and moral activity as the "reproduction of God." The thought of T. H. Green did not attract wide interest; Harkness's dissertation was not published, and only two short articles were published from it. However, her dissertation brought together the work she had done on philosophical idealism and personalism in her undergraduate and graduate training and defined the philosophy that became the basis of her life as well as her teaching throughout the 1920s and 1930s.

After receiving her PhD at Boston in 1923, Harkness gained her first college teaching position as assistant professor of religious education at Elmira College in upstate New York, and taught there in the philosophy department until 1937. Founded in 1855, it claimed the distinction of being the first women's college in the United States. Harkness moved to Mount Holyoke College as associate professor in the department of history and literature of religion in 1937, remaining there for only two years. Her self-understanding as a teacher and a scholar was strongest during the years from 1922 to 1939. By 1939, she had begun to strongly question the adequacy of her philosophical position and to define herself as a theologian rather than as a philosopher of religion.

Harkness's philosophy was grounded in the tenets of triumphant religion or triumphant idealism. The language of triumphant religion gave expression to the quest for an ideal of philosophical objectivity to enable a person to live religiously, a position which underlay her writing until she was almost fifty. Harkness's commitment to triumphant religion is presented definitively in four of her books: *Conflicts in Religious Thought* (1929), *The Resources of Religion* (1936), *The Recovery of Ideals* (1937), and *Religious Living* (1937). She stated in these writings that her basic religious concern was to

discover the "true grounds upon which one may believe in and live by moral and spiritual ideals." An ideal, Harkness wrote, is "a conviction that something ought to be held before the mind with sufficient power to motivate effort to bring it to pass" (*Recovery of Ideals*, 1937, pp. viii, 49). Most people settle for "prudential adjustment"; they aspire to do nothing to excess and to maintain a socially respectable character. The Christian, however, should aspire to the highest ideal of triumphant religion, the level of active saintliness, demonstrating the dynamic union of social action and social passion, sympathy for all persons, and courage to serve the needy. Harkness contended that "It is through ideals that we discover direction and power both to resist temptation and to overcome limitation. If our ideals are as inclusive as they ought to be, we find through them not only personal mastery but the impetus toward the creation of a society where none need be inhibited by artificial barriers from living at his best. The function of the ideals is both individual and social. In the power to live by ideals, whether directed against sin or chaos, lies salvation." (*Recovery of Ideals*, 1937, p. 46)

To live out of the highest ideals of triumphant religion is "both a quest and an achievement" (*Religious Living*, 1937, p. 1), she continued. As a person's life is turned outward to seek the good of others, his or her inner life is enriched and deepened. The most important thing a person can do is to find a way to live religiously. One may at times be confronted with the inability to do the good that he or she wills to do. However, God delivers persons from evil to the paradoxical assurance of victory in Christ. The person who feels bound by evil should know that one can do all things through Christ. The definitive statement of her faith in 1937 is summarized in these words from *The Recovery of Ideals*: "Living in Christ, one could look the world in the face, do a mighty work, and know that nothing could daunt the soul." (1937, p. 190)

By 1937, Georgia Harkness had reached a crest of professional success that could be credited to her personal experience of triumphant religion. She wrote to Brightman in January that she had experienced a great burst of energy that enabled her to do a prodigious amount of fruitful writing and lecturing. However, her words in the last sentence of the letter were crucial: she stated that she felt she had found a reason for living during this period. This statement provides the first indication of her inward questioning, the earliest sign of the onset of a spiritual depression that would strike to the heart of her life's goal of triumphant living, leading her from her philosophical commitment to triumphant religion to a theological stance as an evangelical liberal. Immediately after her surge of energy and purposefulness, the crucial turning point occurred in Harkness's spiritual journey. Her work came to a sudden halt when her father became seriously ill. On 1 April 1937, on his deathbed, his last words to her were that he knew she had written good books; wise men said they were. But he wished she would write more about Jesus Christ. Warren Harkness was asking Georgia at that fateful hour to recover the roots of her Christian faith as an evangelical Christian and to embrace a more Christ-centered approach to religious truth. The death of her father began to release the hold of triumphant religion over her. In his prodigious activity for the good of others in his church and community, Georgia's father was her model of triumphant living. She had sought to emulate, on the national and international level, his example on the local scene. A life of service to God, the church, and other persons had always shaped her Christian commitment; however, his death initiated a lengthy process of change in her vocational motivations. In her late forties, suffering from her father's death and the strains of work, Harkness entered a dark night of the soul that lasted for almost eight years, from 1937 to 1945. Over the next decade, clinical depression manifested itself physically, mentally, emotionally, and spiritually. She developed serious back problems, could not concentrate to work effec-

tively, and felt bereft of the presence of God in her life. Her healing, which occurred gradually over several years, came from physical treatment, psychological counseling, personal companionship, and theological redirection.

Harkness became professor of applied theology at Garrett Biblical Institute, a Methodist seminary in Evanston, Illinois, in 1939. She was the first woman in the United States to obtain a theological professorship. She remained there until she moved to the Pacific School of Religion in Berkeley, California, in 1950. Her years at Garrett provided personal support and professional direction as a theologian. In 1945, when Harkness had come out of her depression, she wrote *The Dark Night of the Soul*, which grew out of her understanding of the inseparable connection between one's emotional and physical condition and one's spiritual pilgrimage.

In her maturing theology, she wrote that the problem of evil, from the standpoint of Christian faith, is resolved in an acceptance of God's grace, in a belief that God's grace is sufficient for all circumstances. She interpreted her former spiritual goal to live triumphantly as the pride of doing good works for God, which constituted a deep level of self-centeredness in which a person quested "for spiritual blessings through communion with Him not for the love of God but for one's own satisfaction" (1945, p. 339). In her former commitment to triumphal religion, Harkness had believed that human beings gained their own spiritual victory, that salvation came by the living out of high ideals. Through the redemptive experience at the heart of her dark night of the soul, she now knew that the victory was in God's grace and human acceptance. The Christian's rightful faith, she wrote in 1945, is that, however dark the night, God's love surrounds us. The good news is that "there is a way forward out of the dark. Such assurance comes through the God revealed in Jesus Christ. It is the ultimate conviction of Christian faith that there is no situation in life where spiritual defeat is final. We may be defeated but God cannot be." Harkness's evangelical faith was based on the ultimate promise of Christianity, given at Easter

in the cross and resurrection: "sin can be forgiven, pain overcome, by the victory of God, a victory that is both within and beyond this earthly scene" (1945, pp. 170–71, 10–12, 178).

Of her evangelical liberalism, Harkness said: "Open always to more truth from whatever source it comes, suspending judgment when necessary till relative certainty emerges, resolved to live by the truth one has and to let others differ if their insights lead in another direction, one combines tolerance with decisiveness, open-mindedness with Christian conviction … . The greatest word ever spoken about the pursuit of truth" was Jesus's: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." (1947, p. 49)

After retiring from Pacific School of Religion in 1961, she lived in Claremont, California with her companion of thirty years, Verna Miller, whom she had met in Evanston while on the faculty of Garrett Biblical Institute. Harkness died on 21 August 1974 in Claremont, California.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Church and the Immigrant (New York, 1921).
Conflicts in Religious Thought (New York, 1929).
John Calvin: The Man and His Ethics (New York, 1931).
Holy Flame (Boston, 1935).
The Resources of Religion (New York, 1936).
The Recovery of Ideals (New York, 1937).
Religious Living (New York, 1937).
The Faith by Which the Church Lives (Nashville, Tenn., 1940).
The Glory of God (Nashville, Tenn., 1943).
The Dark Night of the Soul (New York, 1945).
Understanding the Christian Faith (New York, 1947).
Prayer and the Common Life (New York, 1948).
The Gospel and Our World (New York, 1949).
Through Christ Our Lord: A Devotional Manual Based on the Recorded Words of Jesus (New York, 1950).
The Modern Rival of Christian Faith (New York, 1952).
O Worship the Lord (New York, 1952).
Be Still and Know (Nashville, Tenn., 1953).
The Religious Life (New York, 1953).
The Sources of Western Morality (New York, 1954).
Toward Understanding the Bible (New York, 1954).
Foundations of Christian Knowledge (Nashville, Tenn., 1955).
Christian Ethics (New York, 1957).
The Providence of God (New York, 1960).
Beliefs That Count (New York, 1961).
The Church and Its Laity (New York, 1962).
The Methodist Church in Social Thought and Action (New York, 1964).
Our Christian Hope (New York, 1964).
What Christians Believe (Nashville, Tenn., 1965).
The Fellowship of the Holy Spirit (Nashville, Tenn., 1966).
Coming of Life: A Study of the Gospel of John, Guide (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1968).
Stability and Change (Nashville, Tenn., 1969)
The Ministry of Reconciliation (Nashville, Tenn., 1971).
Women in Church and Society: A Historical and Theological Inquiry (Nashville, Tenn., 1971).
Mysticism: Its Meaning and Message (Nashville, Tenn., 1973).
Understanding the Kingdom of God (Nashville, Tenn., 1974).
Biblical Backgrounds of the Middle East Conflict, with Charles F. Kraft (Nashville, Tenn., 1976).

Other Relevant Works
Harkness's papers are at Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary and the Claremont School of Theology, and many letters to E. S. Brightman are at Boston University.
"A Spiritual Pilgrimage: Ninth Article in the Series 'How My Mind Has Changed in This Decade'," *The Christian Century* 56 (1939):

348–51.

"If I Make My Bed in Hell," *The Christian Century* 59 (1942): 45–8.

Grace Abounding (Nashville, Tenn., 1969). Harkness's autobiography.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Religious Bio, Proc of APA v48, Who Was Who in Amer v6, Who's Who in Phil

Bass, Dorothy C. "Georgia Harkness," in *Notable American Women: The Modern Period* (Cambridge, Mass., 1980), pp. 312–14.

Carpenter, Dianne E. *Georgia Harkness's Distinctive Personalistic Synthesis.* PhD dissertation, Boston University (Boston, 1988).

Deats, Paul, and Carol Rubb, eds. *The Boston Personalist Tradition in Philosophy, Social Ethics, and Theology* (Macon, Georgia, 1988).

Hogue, Harland E. *Christian Seed in Western Soil: A History of Pacific School of Religion* (Berkeley, Cal., 1965).

Keller, Rosemary S. *Georgia Harkness: For Such a Time as This* (Nashville, Tenn., 1992). Contains a bibliography of Harkness's writings.

Leiffer, Murray, and Dorothy Leiffer. *Enter the Old Portals, Reminiscences: Fifty Years on a Seminary Campus, Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary* (Evanston, Ill., 1987).

Scott, Martha L. *The Theology and Social Thought of Georgia Harkness.* PhD dissertation, Northwestern University (Evanston, Ill., 1984).

Rosemary Skinner Keller

HARMAN, Gilbert Helms (1938–)

Gilbert Harman was born on 26 May 1938 in East Orange, New Jersey. He received a BA at Swarthmore in 1960, and a PhD at Harvard in 1964. The title of his dissertation was "Skepticism and the Definition of Knowledge." Harman has taught philosophy at Princeton University since 1963, where he presently is professor of philosophy. He has earned several honors and awards, including a Guggenheim Fellowship and fellowships from the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the James D. McDowell Foundation.

Significant early influences were Richard Brandt, Noam Chomsky, John Rawls, W. V. Quine, H. P. Grice, Wilfrid Sellars, and Donald Davidson. In early work Harman argued against Chomsky's reasons for introducing transformations into generative grammar and against Chomsky's position for an innate language faculty. But he soon changed his mind on both topics.

In semantics Harman rejects any identification of meaning with truth conditions while agreeing that accounts of truth conditions can shed light on the meanings of logical constants. His view is that other apparently conflicting theories of meaning are really theories about different topics: the content of psychological states, the intended meanings of utterances, and the significance of speech acts.

Some of Harman's work discusses the possibility of uncovering the logical form of sentences in ordinary language. He argues that, if logical principles hold by virtue of form, then modus ponens is not a principle of logic, because "if" is a sentence complementizer rather than a sentential connective. He takes a stand against nontrivial notions of analyticity and a priori knowledge but rejects Quine's thesis of the indeterminacy of radical translation. He defends a nonsolipsistic version of conceptual role semantics and a related functionalist account of psychological states.

Harman also defends the existence of a "language of thought" that includes (but is not limited to) one's natural language. He argues that propositions should be construed as semantic types instantiated, for example, by various attitudes. He rejects the claim that perceptual states have an intrinsic qualitative character of which one is aware.

In epistemology, Harman favors a distinction between logic as a theory of implication and consistency and the theory of reasoning and inference: reasoning consists in change in view by addition and subtraction of beliefs. He emphasizes the role of explanatory considerations in reasoning, discusses what kinds of simplicity considerations are relevant, and discusses pragmatic aspects of theoretical reasoning.

Concerning practical reasoning, Harman argues that intentions are self-referential. He distinguishes positive, negative, and conditional intentions, holding that it is inconsistent to have intentions that cannot all be carried out given one's beliefs, in the way that it is inconsistent to have desires that cannot all come true. Since intentions involve acceptance of a more or less determinate plan, he explains doing something intentionally in terms of carrying out that plan.

In ethics, Harman defends a form of moral relativism that allows for moral bargaining as an important part of moral reasoning. He argues that the "fundamental attribution error" shows that people do not differ in respect of character traits in the way envisioned by virtue ethics. He offers an analysis of intrinsic value and argues against philosophical appeals to second or higher order desires in order to explain value or freedom. He also finds an analogy between linguistics and moral philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Knowledge, Reasons, And Causes," *Journal of Philosophy* 67 (1970): 841–55.

"Logical Form," *Foundations of Language* 9 (1972): 38–65.

Thought (Princeton, N.J., 1973).

The Nature of Morality: An Introduction to Ethics (Oxford, 1977).

Change in View: Principles of Reasoning (Cambridge, Mass., 1986).

Skepticism and the Definition of Knowledge (New York, 1990).

Moral Relativism and Moral Objectivity, with Judith Jarvis Thomson (Oxford, 1996).

Reasoning, Meaning, and Mind (Oxford, 1999).

Explaining Value and Other Essays in Moral Philosophy (Oxford, 2000).

Other Relevant Works

"The Inference to the Best Explanation," *Philosophical Review* 74 (1965): 88–95.

"Toward a Theory of Intrinsic Value," *Journal of Philosophy* 64 (1967): 792–804.

"Substitutional Quantification and Quotation," *Noûs* 5 (1971): 213–14.

Ed. with Donald Davidson, *Semantics of Natural Language* (Dordrecht, 1972; 2nd edn 1977).

Ed., *On Noam Chomsky: Critical Essays* (Garden City, N.Y., 1974).

Ed. with Donald Davidson, *The Logic of Grammar* (Encino, Cal., 1975).

"Moral Relativism Defended," *Philosophical Review* 84 (1975): 3–22.

"Metaphysical Realism and Moral Relativism," *Journal of Philosophy* 79 (1982): 568–75.

"Positive versus Negative Undermining in Belief Revision," *Noûs* 18 (1984): 39–49.

Ed., *Conceptions of the Human Mind: Essays in Honor of George A. Miller* (Hillsdale, N.J., 1993).

"Stringency of Rights and 'Ought'," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 53 (1993): 181–5.

"Analyticity Regained?" *Noûs* 30 (1996): 392–400.

"General Foundations versus Rational Insight," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 63 (2001): 657–63.

"The Future of the A Priori," in *Philosophy in America at the Turn of the Century* (Charlottesville, Virg., 2003), pp. 23–34.

"Skepticism and Foundations," in *The Skeptics: Contemporary Essays*, ed. Steven Luper (Aldershot, UK, 2003), pp. 1–11.

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, *Oxford Comp Phil*
Copp, David. "Harman on Internalism, Relativism, and Logical Form," *Ethics* 92 (1982): 227–42.
Harding, Sandra. "Harman's Thoughts," *Metaphilosophy* 8 (1977): 62–71.
Kupperman, Joel. "The Indispensability of Character," *Philosophy* 76 (2001): 239–50.
Lehrer, Keith. "How Reasons Give Us Knowledge, or the Case of the Gypsy Lawyer," *Journal of Philosophy* 68 (1971): 311–3.
Millgram, Elijah. "Harman's Hardness Arguments," *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 72 (1991): 181–202.
Pojman, Louis. "Gilbert Harman's Internalist Moral Relativism," *Modern Schoolman* 68 (1990): 19–39.
Robinson, William S. "Intrinsic Qualities of Experience: Surviving Harman's Critique," *Erkenntnis* 47 (1997): 285–309.
Shope, Robert. *The Analysis of Knowing: A Decade of Research* (Princeton, N.J., 1983).
Sorell, Tom. "Harman's Paradox," *Mind* 90 (1981): 557–75.
Sosa, Ernest. "Is Color Psychological or Biological? Or Both?" *Philosophical Issues* 7 (1996): 67–74.
Steinbock, Bonnie. "Moral Reasons and Relativism," *Journal of Value Inquiry* 15 (1981): 157–68.
"Symposium on *Moral Relativism and Moral Objectivity*," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 58 (1998): 161–222.

Elizabeth Harman

HARPER, Frances Ellen Watkins
(1825–1911)

Frances Harper lived in total dedication to social causes, feminist issues, and the general advancement of her race. She was born Frances Ellen Watkins on 24 September 1825 in Baltimore, Maryland to free parents but she was orphaned at an early age. She received a formal education in a Baltimore school for free blacks, which was founded and run by her uncle. She took interest in literature at an early age. She was fortunate to be a maid to the Armstrongs, a liberal white Baltimore family, who owned a bookshop and granted her access to the family library.

In 1850 she became the first woman to teach at Union Seminary in Wilberforce, Ohio, and then she taught in Pennsylvania where she was involved in the Underground Railroad. In 1859 she published "The Two Offers" in an Anglo-African magazine, becoming the first African American to publish a short story. She married Fenton Harper in 1860, who died in 1864 after the birth of their daughter. She rededicated herself solely to the advancement of social causes, which she pursued in both her writing and her many speeches throughout her long life. She was a speaker at the 1866 National Women's Rights Convention, and involved in the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the American Association of Education of Colored Youth, and the National Association of Colored Women, serving as its Vice President in 1897. Harper died on 22 February 1911 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Even though Harper established her reputation in her poetry and fiction (publishing many commercially successful volumes), the depth and complexity of her philosophy guiding those works gives her prominence as an African-American philosopher. Prominent is the ethical role of aesthetics and race as a social construct. Maryemma Graham sees Harper's poems as "social protest poetry" (*Complete Poems*, 1988, p. lii). Graham

situates her at a "critical juncture in the development of Afro-American poetry" and as prefiguring Harlem Renaissance writers like Paul Laurence Dunbar, Langston Hughes, Sterling Brown, and also the entire generation of Black Arts Movement poets in the 1960s, artists who renounced "art for art's sake" (p. liii). Harper's concern both for her race and the ethical role of literature is shown in her 1869 poem, "Moses, a Story of the Nile" crafted in the form of a dialogue between Moses and the Egyptian Princess: "I go to join/The Fortunes of my race, and to put aside/All other bright advantages, save/The approval of my conscience and the meed/Of rightly doing."

In her 1892 novel, *Iola Leroy*, Harper explored further the ethical role of literature in fighting stereotypes and enhancing positive self-image. According to Frances Smith Foster, Harper was "a black woman who advocated social reform and used her literature to argue controversial issues" (*Iola Leroy*, 1988, p. xxxiii). In the same vein, Harper uses *Iola Leroy* to explore the issue of race as a social construct. "Passing" as white, as Iola Leroy does, is seen as a metaphor for the negotiability of race. Iola declares, "It is the public opinion which assigns me a place with the colored people" (p. 417). Due to the power and money Iola's father had amassed, she was assigned a place in the white person's world.

Though Harper herself focused on her fiction and poetry, she also wrote a number of essays on racial equality and women's rights. She did not deny the reality of phenotypic difference between persons of African and European descents. Her argument was simply that this difference is not essentially given. According to Leonard Harris, "she envisions a community of self-respecting persons that were not confined to living out lives as racial kinds." (Harris 2000, p. 53) In this way, she set the tone for Alain LOCKE, the prominent African-American philosopher of the Harlem Renaissance, who gave these issues deeper attention.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Poems on Miscellaneous Subjects (Boston, 1854; 2nd edn, Philadelphia, 1857).

Moses: A Story of the Nile (Philadelphia, 1869).

Iola Leroy, or Shadows Uplifted (Philadelphia and Boston, 1892; 2nd edn 1893; Oxford, 1988).

Idylls of the Bible (New York, 1975).

Sketches of Southern Life (Philadelphia, 1893).

Complete Poems of Frances E. W. Harper, ed. Maryemma Graham (New York, 1988).

A Brighter Coming Day: A Frances Ellen Watkins Harper Reader, ed. Frances Smith Foster (New York, 1990).

Minnie's Sacrifice; Sowing and Reaping; Trial and Triumph: Three Rediscovered Novels (Boston, 1994).

Other Relevant Works

"Education and the Elevation of the Colored Race," a pamphlet (Philadelphia, 1854).

"Enlightenend Motherhood: An Address by Mrs. Frances E. W. Harper, before the Brooklyn Literary Society," a pamphlet (Brooklyn, N.Y., 1892).

"Woman's Political Future," in *Worlds Congress of Representative Women*, ed. May Wright Sewall (Chicago, 1894), pp. 433–8.

"The Afro-American Mother," in *Work and Words of the National Congress of Mothers (First Annual Session)* (New York, 1897), pp. 67–71.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*

Boyd, Melba Joyce. *Discarded Legacy: Politics and Poetics in the Life of Frances E. W. Harper, 1825–1911* (Detroit, 1994).

Harris, Leonard, ed. *Philosophy Born of Struggle: Anthology of Afro-American*

Philosophy from 1917 (Dubuque, Iowa, 2000).

Filler, Louis. "Harper, Frances Ellen Watkins," in *Notable American Women 1607–1950: A Biographical Dictionary* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), pp. 137–9.

Young, Elizabeth. "Warring Fictions: Iola Leroy and the Color of Gender," *American Literature* 64 (1992): 273–97.

Chielozona Eze

HARRIES, Karsten (1937–)

Karsten Harries was born on 25 January 1937 in Jena, Germany. He was educated at Yale University, receiving his BA in 1958 and PhD in philosophy in 1962. From 1961 to 1963 he was an instructor of philosophy at Yale, and then he was an assistant professor from 1963 to 1965 at the University of Texas. Harries returned to Yale as associate professor of philosophy in 1966 and was promoted to full professor in 1970. He was visiting professor at the University of Bonn in 1965–6 and 1968–9. He was awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship in 1971–2. During 1987–91 He held the position of Mellon Professor at Yale. He has also served as department chair from 1973 to 1978 and in 1987–8.

Harries has published primarily on continental philosophy, aesthetics, and metaphysics. His first book, *The Meaning of Modern Art: A Philosophical Interpretation* (1968), maintains that art expresses human ideals, and that understanding a work of art requires understanding the ideal image involved. Each historical period of art expresses the ideals (religious and moral) of the age. Harries's next book, *The Bavarian Rococo Church: Between Faith and Aestheticism* (1983), applies this theory to a specific place and time period. The ornamentation characteristic of rococo is hard to justify by modern standards, but is explicable in terms of underlying ideals animating the use of space and design.

In the culmination of his thought on aesthetics, *The Ethical Function of Architecture* (1997), Harries argues against the modern tendency to divorce aesthetic quality from reason and morality. His extensive work on German philosophy, especially Hegel and Heidegger, is applied to the aesthetics problems of the relation between architecture and ongoing human life. The ethical responsibility of the architect to exemplify human values should be matched by the community's responsibility to experience buildings as centers of their social lives. "The ethical function of Architecture is inevitably also a public function. Sacred and public architecture provides the community with a center or centers. Individuals gain their sense of place in a history, in a community, by relating their dwellings to that center." (1997, p. 287) *The Ethical Function of Architecture* won the American Institute of Architects 8th Annual International Architecture Book Award for Criticism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Meaning of Modern Art: A Philosophical Interpretation (Evanston, Ill., 1968).
The Bavarian Rococo Church: Between Faith and Aestheticism (New Haven, Conn., 1983).
The Broken Frame: Three Lectures (Washington, D.C., 1990).
The Ethical Function of Architecture (Cambridge, Mass., 1997).
Infinity of Perspective (Cambridge, Mass., 2001).

Other Relevant Works
"Heidegger and Holderlin: The Limits of Language," *The Personalist* 44 (1963): 5–23.
"Two Conflicting Interpretations of Language in Wittgenstein's

'Investigations'," *Kant Studien* 59 (1968): 397–409.

"Meta-criticism and Meta-poetry," *Research in Phenomenology* 9 (1979): 54–73.

"Copernican Reflections and the Tasks of Metaphysics," *International Philosophical Quarterly* 23 (1983): 235–50.

"Architecture and Ontology," in *Creativity and Common Sense: Essays in Honor of Paul Weiss*, ed. Thomas Krettek (Albany, N.Y., 1987), pp. 145–61.

"Poetry as Response: Heidegger's Step Beyond Aestheticism," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 16 (1991): 73–88.

"Questioning the Question of the Worth of Life," *Journal of Philosophy* 88 (1991): 684–90.

"Beauty, Language and Re-Presentation," in *Transformations in Personhood and Culture after Theory*, ed. Christie McDonald and Gary Wihl (University Park, Penn., 1994), pp. 61–77.

Ed. with Christoph Jamme, *Martin Heidegger: Politics, Art, and Technology* (New York, 1994).

"Herkunft als Zukunft," in *Annäherungen an Martin Heidegger: Festschrift für Hugo Ott zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Hermann Schäfer (Frankfurt am Main, Germany, 1996), pp. 41–64.

"Descartes and the Labyrinth of the World," *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 6 (1998): 307–30.

"The Epochal Threshold and the Classical Ideal: Hölderlin contra Hegel," in *The Emergence of German Idealism*, ed. Michael Baur and Daniel Dahlstrom (Washington, D.C., 1999), pp. 147–75.

"Nietzsche's Labyrinths, Variations on an Ancient Theme," in *Nietzsche and "An Architecture of Our Minds,"* ed. Alexandre Kostka and Irving Wohlfarth (Los Angeles, 1999), pp. 35–52.

"Philosophy in Search of Itself," in *What is Philosophy?*, ed. C. P. Ragland and Sarah Heidt (New Haven, Conn., 2001), pp. 47–73.

Further Reading

Olivier, Bert. "Why a Philosophy of Architecture? The Importance of Harries's Contribution," *South African Journal of Philosophy* 13 (1994): 167–74.

Spector, Tom. *The Ethical Architect: The Dilemma of Contemporary Practice* (Princeton, N.J., 2001).

Wild, John. "Being and Time: A Reply," *Review of Metaphysics* 17 (1964): 610–16.

John R. Shook

HARRINGTON, Edward Michael, Jr. (1928–89)

Michael Harrington was born on 24 February 1928 in St. Louis, Missouri, and died on 31 July 1989 in Larchmont, New York. A lifelong Catholic, he attended parochial schools, receiving the BA from Holy Cross College in 1947, and after attending Yale Law School for one year, earned the MA in English literature from the University of Chicago in 1949. While an undergraduate at Holy Cross, he discovered the writings of G. K. Chesterton, a British novelist adept at paradox. Returning home to St. Louis, he took a temporary job as a social worker which started his journey as social critic and reformer.

After moving to New York, he became an editor and contributing writer for *Catholic Worker*, joining the Catholic Worker Movement in 1951. The next year he became a Marxist, and helped to found the Young Socialist League in 1954, becoming its national chairman in 1955. Harrington worked tirelessly to spread the organization's Marxist

message by visiting university campuses and contributing widely to the organization's publication, *Young Socialist Challenge*. His leadership roles in American socialism included serving as editor and chief of *New America*, the journal of the Socialist Party. He served as chairman of the League for Industrial Democracy, the education component of the American socialist movement. He also served as chairman of the American Socialist Party and was co-founder of the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee in 1973. In 1972 he became a professor of political science at Queens College of the City University of New York and in 1988 was named Distinguished Professor of Political Science, holding that position until his death.

Harrington's widely read work, *The Other America* (1962), raised awareness about the hidden problem of poverty in the face of America's rising affluence. He argued that poverty was created by the hidden workings of American capitalism, which served the economic interests of its wealthy elites. Harrington's influential indictment of how America's prosperity was responsible for perpetuating poverty caught the attention of both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, inspiring many social welfare programs of the 1960s. He served as a consultant to Johnson's War on Poverty, helping to create numerous social agencies and programs aimed at ending the persistence of poverty (Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Social Security Disabilities programs, Food Stamp and Head Start programs).

Harrington disagreed with the New Left's condemnation of American liberalism and later failed to unite the old socialist party with Students for a Democratic Society. He argued that socialists should work within a re-aligned Democratic party by encouraging the southern conservative faction to leave in order to bring about necessary reforms related to civil rights and the war on poverty. Though anti-communist, he vehemently opposed the Vietnam War as encouraging colonialism, further distancing himself from the Socialist Party's leadership. In 1973 he formed the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee, which played an important role in uniting the interests of labor, liberals, civil rights and feminist groups within the Democratic Party during the 1970s.

As a leader of the American socialist movement, Harrington sought to use a Marxist critique to strengthen democracy by pointing out its political and economic deficiencies. A prolific writer of political theory, he wrote for *Dissent* magazine and authored many books on the importance of Marxism in trying to understand the dynamics of change in contemporary capitalist societies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Other America (New York, 1962).

Accidental Century (New York, 1965).

Toward a Democratic Left: A Radical Program for a New Majority (New York, 1968).

Socialism (New York, 1972).

Twilight of Capitalism (New York, 1976).

Fragments of the Century (New York, 1977).

The Vast Majority (New York, 1977).

Decade of Decision: The Crisis of the American System (New York, 1980).

The Next America: The Decline and Rise of the United States (New York, 1981).

The Politics at God's Funeral: The Spiritual Crisis of Western Civilization (New York, 1983).

The New American Poverty (New York, 1984).

Taking Sides: The Education of a Militant Mind (New York, 1985).

Who Rules Boston?: A Citizen's Guide to Reclaiming the City, 3rd edn (Cambridge, Mass., 1986).

The Next Left: The History of a Future (New York, 1986).

Socialism Past and Future (New York, 1989).

Other Relevant Works
Harrington's papers are at New York University.

Fragments of the Century (New York, 1973).

The Long-Distance Runner: An Autobiography (New York, 1988).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v10*

Isserman, Maurice. *The Other American: The Life of Michael Harrington* (New York, 2000).

Okroi, Loren J. *Galbraith, Harrington, Heilbroner: Economics and Dissent in an Age of Optimism* (Princeton, N.J., 1988).

James W. Robinson

HARRIS, Errol Eustace (1908–)

Errol E. Harris was born on 19 February 1908 in Kimberley, South Africa, from a family immigrated from England. Harris studied philosophy at Rhodes University College in South Africa and at the University of Oxford, where he obtained a B.Litt. degree with a thesis on Samuel Alexander and A. N. WHITEHEAD. After serving as an education officer for the British Colonial Service and in the British Army during World War II, he received his PhD in philosophy from the University of the Witwatersrand in 1950, where he became a full professor in 1953. His first important philosophical work, *Nature, Mind and Modern Science*, appeared in 1954. In 1956 Harris was appointed professor of philosophy at Connecticut College and moved to the United States, where his philosophical activity could prosper unimpeded, gaining growing recognition in the subsequent years. In 1962 Harris became Roy Roberts Distinguished Professor of Philosophy at the University of Kansas. In 1966 he became professor of philosophy at Northwestern University, and was later named the John Evans Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy, teaching there until his retirement in 1976. At present Harris is an honorary research fellow at the Center for Philosophy and History of Science at Boston University. Harris was President of the Metaphysical Society of America in 1968–9 and President of the Hegel Society of America in 1977–8.

The most conspicuous achievement of Harris's research activities at Kansas and Northwestern was the publication of two significant works: *The Foundations of Metaphysics in Science* (1965) and *Hypothesis and Perception: The Roots of Scientific Method* (1970). Over the years, along with his original and prevailing theoretical interests he also developed a historiographic concern for the thought of the two most prominent representatives of modern metaphysics, Baruch Spinoza and G. W. F. Hegel. Spinoza's philosophy is reconstructed, interpreted and appropriated by Harris in *Salvation from Despair. A Reappraisal of Spinoza's Philosophy* (1973). He convincingly argued for the thorough cogency, truth and up-to-dateness of Hegel's speculative logic in *An Interpretation of the Logic of Hegel* (1983). In retirement his philosophical activity went on uninterrupted, giving rise to numerous articles and volumes, the most original and important of which is *Formal, Transcendental, and Dialectical Thinking: Logic and Reality* (1987).

Harris's crucial epistemological insight is his lucid awareness of the insuperable inconsistency of philosophical empiricism in all its versions worked out by European thought from Locke to the twentieth-century analytic philosophers (1954, pp. 117–86, 274–351). The verification principle, upon which empiricism is grounded, is held by Harris to be intrinsically false because sense-perception is devoid of immediate self-evidence, depending on an interpretative context that is a product of thinking's discursive activity. Furthermore, the verification principle is also unable to account for the empiricist epistemologist's claim to truth for his own doctrine. Empiricism's

"fallacy" is that "of propounding a theory of knowledge from which, if it is true, the theorist himself must be exempt, and which, if it applies to the theorist himself, must be false" (1979, p. 49). Nor is empiricism able successfully to overcome the logical antinomies infecting the inductive method, by which it usually tries to explain and justify the genesis and validity of the universal form of scientific theories. Finally, the hypothetico-deductive method, to which some epistemologists such as Karl Popper resort in order to integrate the plain shortcomings of the inductive one, is in truth epistemologically unfruitful, owing to its merely analytic and conjectural nature.

The peculiar character and interest of Harris's critique of philosophical empiricism, however, lies in the fact that he does not confine himself to refuting it in a purely logico-immanent way, but also effectively shows that a careful examination of the theoretical results achieved by contemporary physics, biology, and experimental psychology, as well as of the peculiar procedures of scientific inquiry and discovery, concordantly proves that it is not even in harmony with the specific orientation of contemporary science. Science supports a world view that is relativistic, holistic, organicistic, teleological, and hierarchical in character, and therefore flatly contradicts the (unconfessed) atomistic, mechanical, and pluralistic metaphysical presuppositions of formal and mathematical logic, wrongly privileged by philosophical empiricism.

Harris's critique of the naïve realism of positivistic epistemology, however – unlike those of other well-known contemporary epistemologists such as Popper, Norwood HANSON, Thomas KUHN, and Paul FEYERABEND – successfully avoids ending up in a more or less radical form of relativistic or historicistic subjectivism (1954, pp. 29–42) or even scepticism. On the contrary, Harris pursues the real possibility of the knowledge of objective truth. This, however, would not reveal itself in a static, immediate intuition, but rather at the apex of a teleological process, whose more abstract

and elementary forms are the theoretical perspectives worked out by the natural and human sciences, whereas its most concrete, fully blown phase coincides with the self-reflective activity of metaphysical thought. The fundamentals of the metaphysics outlined by Harris (see 1965, pp. 451–93) appear to be strongly influenced by Spinoza's rationalistic monism, Hegel's absolute idealism, R. G. Collingwood's philosophical logic (especially by his insightful doctrine of a hierarchically ordered ontological "scale of forms"), as well as by H. H. Joachim's coherence theory of truth. In an enlightening passage in *Nature, Mind and Modern Science* he tersely summarizes its fundamental tenets as follows:

> The philosophical theory demanded by the modern outlook must, accordingly, maintain five main theses: (i) that mind is immanent in all things; (ii) that reality is a whole, self-sufficient and self-maintaining, and that coherence is the test of truth of any theory about it; (iii) that the subject and object of knowledge are ultimately one – the same thing viewed from opposite (and mutually complementary) standpoints; (iv) that events and phenomena can adequately be explained only teleologically, and (v) that the ultimate principle of interpretation is, in consequence, the principle of value. (1954, p. 206)

The third tenet also involves the thesis that absolute truth and reality, which is as such the peculiar object of *metaphysical* thought, is identical with *logical* reason, in other words the self-conscious act of systematic thought that thinks of it. However, neither formal logic (be it Aristotelian or mathematical logic, see 1963, pp. 26–47) nor the transcendental logic worked out by Immanuel Kant, J. G. Fichte, and Edmund Husserl (1987, pp. 89ff) can consistently grasp the intrinsic essence of such an identity. This theoretical task can be accomplished only by dialectical logic. For by sublating into the absolute Idea the very negativity of finitude, appearance, and error, it alone

can do full justice to the concrete, dynamic nature of (the identity of) thought and reality, and consequently unfold a logical universe that is not simply an aggregate of "bloodless categories," but is rather a fully actual, self-sufficient and self-conscious Whole. As a consequence, just as was the case with Hegel, Harris's metaphysics finally turns into a speculative "logic of construction" and a panentheistic theology.

Harris's philosophical historiography starts from the assumption that the temporal alternation of different metaphysical doctrines and systems cannot be regarded – as is instead the case with historicism – as a discontinuous sequel of subjective opinions, whose validity, at best, is confined to the particular epoch in which they were originally stated. On the contrary, he asserts the existence of "eternal problems in philosophy" (1954, pp. 3), and conceives of their historical development as a unique, logically necessary, and teleological process, in and through which they progressively achieve a more and more coherent and adequate formulation and solution. Philosophical historiography, therefore, is by no means a discipline which should confine itself to registering the external philological shape of the doctrines taken into consideration, without stating a judgment of value about them. Its peculiar task is rather that of discerning in them the true from the false. The most original and significant achievements of his historiographic activity are certainly those concerning Spinoza's and Hegel's metaphysics. By stressing the crucial relevance of Spinoza's doctrines of the infinity of the attribute of the *cogitatio*, of the *idea ideae* and of the *intellectus infinitus dei* as an "infinite mode" of Substance (1973, pp. 57, 87ff), Harris undermines the plausibility of the one-sided empiricist and materialistic interpretations of Spinoza's naturalism. Spinoza's polemic against the final causes ought to be understood as referring only to the standpoint of external teleology, and consequently it would not exclude the possibility of a valid explana-

tion of natural processes in the light of the different category of inner teleology (1973, pp. 126–32). But on the other hand, Harris also rejects (1973, pp. 49ff) the opposite, mystical or rather "acosmistic" interpretations of the relationship between substance and its attributes, according to which the former would be in itself undifferentiated, while the latter would be nothing more than a contingent product of man's finite intellect. Harris on the contrary maintains that Spinoza's theory of the *scientia intuitiva* clearly shows that Spinoza consistently conceives of substance's self-identity as intrinsically differentiated into a rational system of "individual essences," and moreover that Spinoza's geometric method is nothing other than the outward dress of an inferential procedure that in truth is far more similar to the circularity of dialectical method than Hegel himself had believed.

Harris's interpretation of Hegel's philosophy – unlike that of most of his interpreters and followers in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries – emphasizes the crucial theoretical role played in Hegel's metaphysical system by the *Naturphilosophie* (1954, pp. 241–6). After the crisis of the epistemological presuppositions of the positivistic world view at the end of the nineteenth century, the natural sciences, from whose results the philosophy of nature draws its matter, would have taken a new theoretical orientation that was radically different from that of the "Renaissance sciences" (with which alone, if only for chronological reasons, Hegel and his immediate followers could be acquainted), and that would even allow us today to discover in them the very "foundations of metaphysics." As a consequence, Harris outlines something like a "reform" of Hegel's *Naturphilosophie* that rejects as obsolete at least three of its main contentions: (1) that the natural sciences are nothing more than the product of the finite intellect's analytic activity; (2) that owing to the peculiar externality and contingency of their theoretical perspective on nature, it is impossible cogently to prove the coming to be in it of a unitary

process of *real* biological evolution; and (3) that the "bad infinity" of the spatiotemporal form of inorganic nature is clear evidence of its insuperable self-contradictoriness. According to Harris, in fact, Einstein's theories of special and general relativity (1965, pp. 41–63), as well as the contemporary cosmological theories of the "expanding universe" (1965, pp. 85–108), involve a plausible conception of the physical universe as a "finite but unbounded Whole," so that it can be safely regarded as an objective embodiment of that very category of the *infinitum actu*, or "true infinity," which Hegel had instead confined to the subjectivity of life and spirit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Survival of Political Man: A Study in the Principles of International Order (Johannesburg, 1950).

"White" Civilization: How It Is Threatened and How It Can Be Preserved in South Africa (Johannesburg, 1952).

Nature, Mind and Modern Science (London and New York, 1954).

Objectivity and Reason: Inaugural Lecture (Johannesburg, 1955).

Revelation through Reason: Reason in the Light of Science and Philosophy (New Haven, Conn., 1958).

The Foundations of Metaphysics in Science (London and New York, 1965).

Annihilation and Utopia: The Principles of International Politics (London, 1966).

Fundamentals of Philosophy: A Study of Classical Texts (New York, 1969). Reprinted as *Fundamentals of Philosophy* (London, 1969).

Hypothesis and Perception: The Roots of Scientific Method (London and New York, 1970).

Salvation from Despair: A Reappraisal of Spinoza's Philosophy (The Hague, 1973).

Perceptual Assurance and the Reality of the World (Worcester, Mass., 1974).

Atheism and Theism (New Orleans, La., 1977).

The Problem of Evil (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1977).

An Interpretation of the Logic of Hegel (Lanham, Md., 1983).

Formal, Transcendental, and Dialectical Thinking: Logic and Reality (Albany, N.Y., 1987).

The Reality of Time (Albany, N.Y., 1988).

Cosmos and Anthropos: A Philosophical Interpretation of the Anthropic Cosmological Principle (Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1991).

Cosmos and Theos: Ethical and Theological Implications of the Anthropic Cosmological Principle (Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1992).

Spinoza's Philosophy: An Outline (Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1992).

One World or None: Prescription for Survival (Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1993).

The Spirit of Hegel (Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1995).

The Substance of Spinoza (Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1995).

The Restitution of Metaphysics (Amherst, N.Y., 2000).

Apocalypse and Paradigm: Science and Everyday Thinking (Westport, Conn., 2000).

Other Relevant Works

"The Philosophy of Nature in Hegel's System," *Review of Metaphysics* 3 (1949): 213–28.

"Objectivity and Reason," *Philosophy* 31 (1956): 55–73.

"Coherence and Its Critics," *Idealistic Studies* 5 (1975): 208–30.

"Time and Eternity," *Review of Metaphysics* 29 (1976): 464–82.

"The Problem of Self-Constitution for Idealism and Phenomenology," *Idealistic Studies* 7 (1977): 1–27.

"Reason and Rationalism," *Idealistic Studies* 9 (1979): 93–114.

"Testament of a Philosophical Dissenter," *The Carleton Miscellany* 17 (Spring

1979): 48–73.

"Natural Law and Naturalism," *International Philosophical Quarterly* 23 (1983): 115–24.

"Darwinism and God," *International Philosophical Quarterly* 39 (1999): 277–90.

Further Reading

Amer Phils 1950-2000

Blanshard, Brand. "On Rationalism: A Reply to Professor Harris," *Idealistic Studies* 10 (1980): 95–106.

Christensen, D. E. "Der universelle Systemgedanke bei Errol Harris," *Wiener Jahrbuch für Philosophie* 8 (1975): 195–211.

George, Marie I., and Warren Murray. "New Look at the Anthropic Principle," *Reason Papers* 19 (1994): 132–45.

Grier, Philip T. ed. *Dialectic and Contemporary Science: Essays in Honor of Errol E. Harris* (Lanham, Md., 1989). Contains Harris's replies and a bibliography of Harris's writings.

Rinaldi, Giacomo. *Saggio sulla metafisica di Harris* (Bologna, Italy, 1984).

Giacomo Rinaldi

HARRIS, George (1844–1922)

George Harris was born on 1 April 1844 in Machias, Maine, and died on 1 March 1922 in New York City. He was the son of George Harris, a lumber manufacturer, and Mary Ann Palmer. Robinson Palmer, his grandfather, was a Maine senator. He studied at Washington Academy, a preparatory school in East Machias. In 1866 he graduated from Amherst College with a BA, and then enrolled at Andover Theological Seminary, graduating with his BD in 1869. After finishing his studies,

Harris became an educator and a clergyman. From 1869 to 1872 he was minister of the High Street Congregational Church in Auburn, Maine. He was described as a preacher with strong influence and high standards. He then became pastor of the Central Congregational Church in Providence, Rhode Island.

In 1883 Harris became a professor of Christian theology at Andover Seminary. At the time of his appointment the faculty was being largely replaced. In 1884 Harris and four of his colleagues, including William J. TUCKER, established and edited a monthly periodical, the *Andover Review*. Although the periodical continued to be published until 1894, during 1886 the editors were charged with heresy, and they were not acquitted until 1892. Harris wrote articles and unsigned editorials, and some of his writings appeared in two volumes entitled *Progressive Orthodoxy* (1886) and *The Divinity of Jesus Christ* (1893).

In 1896 Harris described his ethical views in *Moral Evolution* and followed this, in 1897, with *Inequality and Progress*. The latter book offers a more practical perspective based on his interest in social theory. Although Harris praised the importance of equality, he wrote that inequality among people will always exist as a result of individual differences. Although people differ in social class and can have more opportunities based on the class they belong to, even persons who have the same circumstances differ from one another. According to Harris, a Christian and democratic state has to secure each individual his worth so that each person can be part of the whole. As a citizen each person is equal and a child of God. Although men differ in the skills they have, they share experiences of sympathy, sorrow, and affection; and, in this respect, they are alike. Other topics discussed in *Inequality and Progress* include variety and progress. According to Harris, progress produces variety, as can be observed when comparing savage groups to civilized groups.

Harris preached at Dartmouth College from 1894 to 1899, and at Harvard University from

1897 to 1899. In 1899 he was elected President of Amherst College, where he showed skill in his administrative ability and gained the support of faculty, staff, and students. He made good choices when selecting faculty members and was praised for the changes he made to the curriculum. When Harris retired from the presidency in 1912, he was succeeded by Alexander MEIKLEJOHN. He received four honorary degrees: DD from Amherst, 1883; DD from Harvard, 1899; LLD from Dartmouth, 1899; DD from Yale, 1901. He published *A Century's Change in Religion* in 1914 after he retired, which displays his sense of humor and describes aspects of his youth.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Philosophical Treatise on the Nature and Constitution of Man (London, 1876).
Moral Evolution (Boston, 1896).
Inequality and Progress (Boston, 1897).
A Century's Change in Religion (Boston, 1914).

Other Relevant Works
How Much Shall I Give (Boston, 1879).
Sermons by George Harris (Providence, R.I., 1883).
The Rational and Spiritual Verification of Christian Doctrine (Andover, Mass., 1883).
A Bible Study: Christ's Teaching Concerning Heredity (Boston, 1887).

Further Reading
Dict Amer Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v10, Who Was Who in Amer v1
The Andover Heresy. In the Matter of the Complaint against Egbert C. Smyth and Others, Professors of the Theological Institution in Phillips Academy, Andover. Professor Smyth's Argument, Together with the Statements of Professors Tucker, Harris, Hincks, and Churchill (Boston, 1887).

Hani Morgan

HARRIS, Marjorie Silliman (1890–1976)

Marjorie Harris was born on 6 June 1890 in Wethersfield, Connecticut, the daughter of George Wells and Elizabeth Mills Harris. She received her BA from Mount Holyoke College in 1913, where she was Phi Beta Kappa. From 1913 until 1917 she was an instructor in philosophy at the University of Colorado in Boulder. She then earned a PhD in philosophy from Cornell University in 1921. Her dissertation was titled "The Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte." In 1921, Harris became an assistant professor of philosophy at Randolph Macon Woman's College in Lynchburg, Virginia. She was promoted to associate professor in 1925 and full professor in 1930. She also served as department chair until her retirement in 1958. Among numerous other professional affiliations, she was a member of the American Philosophical Association, the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology (President, 1940), and the Virginia Philosophical Association (President, 1946). She died on 27 March 1976 in Rocky Hill, Connecticut.

A recurring, if not the dominant, theme in Harris's writing is the vital role of philosophy in penetrating the significance of life and in the adequate adjustment to it. Though she does not explicitly use instrumentalist language to describe this function, her debt to the pragmatists John DEWEY and George Herbert MEAD is clear. There is also a profound influence from Henri Bergson, whose notion of "life" powerfully informs her reflections. Philosophy thus is "the art of life," which consists in adopting the attitude summarized by the phrase, *sub specie aeternitatis*, "from the viewpoint of eternity."

In her book *Sub Specie Aeternitatis* (1937), which consists of two chapters on "The Function of Philosophy" and "Bergson and the Art of Life," Harris identifies this attitude with taking an objective stance upon the data of experience. Such a perspective is morally inclusive and cognitively generous; it involves

a transcendence of the ego. To the extent that it involves detachment from the push and pull of our narrow and narrowing self-interest, it does so not to be free from life but to be free for life and to attain a more satisfactory adjustment to experience. Likewise, philosophy functions by reminding us that we are better able to achieve that sought-for equilibrium of life by discerning what is implicit *in* experience rather than imposing our subjective categories – our "selective emphases," as Dewey would say, *upon* experience. These biases, or rigid constructs for understanding, impoverish our capacity to make sense of the unpredictable flux of the world. These biases also cripple our appreciation of that novelty that would nourish and sustain creative responses to living.

Philosophy functions as well, according to Harris, when it disposes us to think experimentally, to regard all our beliefs as hypotheses until confirmed – and then never completely – by actual experience. Finally, philosophy provides us, in a word, consolation, in enjoining us to accept the inevitable in a positive manner.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Function of Philosophy (Lynchburg, Virg., 1927).
Sub Specie Aeternitatis (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1937).
Francisco Romero on Problems of Philosophy (New York, 1960).

Other Relevant Works
"Comte and James," *Philosophical Review* 34 (1925): 154–64.
"The Aesthetic Theory of Auguste Comte," *Philosophical Review* 36 (1927): 226–36.
"If We Have Life, Do We Need Philosophy?" *Journal of Philosophy* 15 (1927): 522–5.
"The Dilemma of an Experiential Esthetician," *Journal of Philosophy* 26 (1929): 692–5.
"Beauty and the Good," *Philosophical Review* 39 (1930): 479–90.
"Bergson's Conception of Freedom," *Philosophical Review* 42 (1933): 511–20.
"Symbolic Logic and Esthetics," *Journal of Philosophy* 37 (1940): 533–46.
"A Transcendent Approach to Philosophy," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 15 (1955): 394–401.
"Philosophy for Tomorrow," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 24 (1964): 573–9.
"For Such a Time as This," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 27 (1967): 517–26.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v50, *Who's Who in Phil*, *Women Phils*

Gary S. Calore

HARRIS, Samuel (1814–99)

Samuel Harris was born on 14 June 1814 in East Machias, Maine, and in a fashion typical for youths of his day entered Bowdoin College at the age of fifteen. There, under the tutelage of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, he acquired a lifelong appreciation of learning, especially a love for literature and modern languages such as German and French. He graduated with a BA in 1833 and served the following year as Principal of an academy in Limerick, Maine. Returning to his home town in 1834 he taught at the Washington Academy for one year, and then studied at Andover Theological Seminary from 1835 to 1838 to acquire a BD degree, resuming thereafter a period of teaching at Washington Academy for another three years. In 1841 Harris was ordained a Congregationalist minister and occupied pulpits in Conway (1841–51) and Pittsfield (1851–5) in Massachusetts. Academic pursuits opened new opportunities in 1855

when he began lecturing on theology at Bangor Seminary in his native state. In 1867 he was elected the fifth President of Bowdoin College, and also took the position of lecturer in mental and moral philosophy. Teaching was invigorating, but administration was onerous, so it was with no little relief that Harris accepted the Dwight Professorship of Systematic Theology at Yale Divinity School in 1871, taking over primary theology responsibilities duties at Yale from Theodore Dwight WOOLSEY, and he held that prestigious chair until his retirement in 1895. During his retirement, he continued to work on the second part of his systematic theology until his death on 25 June 1899 in Litchfield, Connecticut.

Most of Harris's early written work took the form of reviews, sermons, addresses, and lectures on current issues like temperance and anti-slavery. A few of these were printed in pamphlets that circulated widely. He also published articles in the *New Englander* and *Bibliotheca Sacra*. But it was not until he was sixty-nine years old that he began publishing serious, lengthy treatises on basic theological issues. At that point a wider readership began to appreciate the insights and emphases that had been apparent to students in classrooms during prior decades. His ornamental style and penchant for literary allusions often enriched the rather arid treatment of theological propositions that had come to characterize much of Congregationalist pedagogy. Beyond that, pulpit experience and interest in evangelical outreach caused him to value communicating essentials truths which would affect human life more than articulating a series of terms that fit together nicely into a system. In retrospect it is fair to say that Harris occupied a transitional position between Enlightenment categories and those of more liberal Protestant views becoming more prevalent in his own day.

In laying down a philosophical basis for theology, Harris began with the idea that God is Absolute Reason, progressively revealing Himself in nature and in humanity. Thus reason is the ground of faith because it discerns meaning and purpose in the created world. So too was human experience in historical contexts another avenue to understanding the divine. People as the divine archetype of rationality could know God through observing their own actions. But Harris went beyond such eighteenth-century notions by also claiming that a personal God, not just an aloof clockmaker, revealed Himself in Christ and in the Bible. The ultimate purpose of this revelation was the salvation of humanity, culminating in the Kingdom of Christ. Following classic philosophical convictions, he affirmed that to know the good was to will it. Proper use of reason kindled understanding, and this mental achievement moved the will to emulation. Christian living led ultimately to perfection.

Human reason could grasp the ends for which God had created different entities in the world. In light of this knowledge people could decide whether to satisfy demands made by the self or to be primarily concerned with serving God and fellow human beings. Self-centeredness was Harris's definition of sin, and salvation consisted of acts that showed a desire to serve God and neighbor by rising above egocentric selfishness. Using both rational analysis and intuitive apprehension a person could gain an increasingly deeper grasp of truth and goodness, and this deeper knowledge helped the individual to make proper moral choices. Harris labeled actions of this latter sort as examples of Christian love, the ultimate objective of both theistic and biblical religious ideals.

Harris echoed Enlightenment thought by defining human beings as self-determined individuals who could understand God and themselves by rational observation of the created order. But he also posited the divinity of Christ and the primacy of scriptural revelation. He was respectful of Congregationalist theological tradition. But he emphasized human freedom, the capacity of making choices in light of rational understanding, further than other thinkers of his denomination. Harris also stood on the edge of liberalism by remaining open to

modern scientific findings and by accepting, warily, at least some tenets of contemporary biblical criticism. His most recurrent ideas affirmed that God influenced human experience in historical contexts and that rational reflection on that experience led to understanding, thence to doctrinal formulation. Such a basis for proper action made humans capable of living effective lives by loving God and others. These emphases in Harris's teaching and writing blended eighteenth-century theism and nineteenth-century Christian moralism in ways that stimulated thought within Congregationalist circles and beyond.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Kingdom of Christ on Earth (Andover, Mass., 1874).

The Philosophical Basis of Theism (New York, 1883).

The Self-Revelation of God (New York, 1887).

God: The Creator and Lord of All, 2 vols (New York, 1896).

Other Relevant Works

Harris's papers are in the Yale Divinity School Library.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v1*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Brastow, Lewis O. *A Memorial Address Commemorative of the Life and Services of Samuel Harris* (New Haven, Conn., 1899).

Whittaker, Frederick W. *Samuel Harris: American Theologian* (New York, 1982).

Henry Warner Bowden

HARRIS, William Torrey (1835–1909)

William Torrey Harris, son of Zilpah Davison Harris and William Harris, was born on 10 September 1835 in Killingly, Connecticut. As a farm boy he developed a strong interest in deep subjects, an interest that was almost brought to an end by an accident with a firecracker, which left him with only one eye. Harris studied at Phillips Andover Academy in Andover, Massachusetts. In 1854 he enrolled at Yale College, where his philosophical interests ripened. Restless at Yale, he left in the middle of his junior year, traveling to St. Louis in 1857 to buy farmland for his father and to seek his fortune. He was hired as instructor at Franklin Grammar School in 1858. Also in that year he married Sarah Bugbee, his childhood sweetheart. An omnivorous reader, Harris always carried books in his pockets. By 1858 he owned over 400 books, for which he developed a classification system foreshadowing that of Melvin Dewey. His penchant for foreign languages led him to develop skills in German, French, Sanskrit, Hebrew, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese.

In 1858 Harris met Henry C. Brokmeyer, a German immigrant, at a meeting of a literary club at the St. Louis Mercantile Library. The fiery Brokmeyer persuaded Harris that he must study the philosophy of Hegel, and the two men became lifelong friends. Along with a couple of associates, Harris commissioned Brokmeyer to translate Hegel's *Wissenschaft der Logik* into English. Brokmeyer's disdain for the grammatical and spelling conventions of the English language doomed to failure all efforts to publish his translation, but his intellectual influence on Harris was profound. Although Brokmeyer and Harris were intense students of Hegel's logic, Brokmeyer convinced his pupil that he must study the entire Hegelian corpus in the original language, including works that were generally neglected by English-speaking Hegel scholars at the time, such as the *Phänomenoligie des Geistes* and the *Philosophie Propädeutik*. Brokmeyer

taught Harris to read Hegel in the context of the German neo-humanist tradition initiated by Goethe and to interpret his political philosophy as a mean between the extremes of the revolutionary left-wing Hegelians and reactionary Prussian conservatism. Brokmeyer emphasized Hegel's notion of *Bildung*, education that incorporates but also transcends book learning with the goal of promoting *Selbsttätigkeit*, self-activity, self-development, and self-direction. Within the context of well-formed social institutions, the individual must discover and develop his own unique talents and abilities. Finally, although American transcendentalism had shaped the thought of both men, their study of the German neo-humanists and Hegel led them to criticize the transcendentalists' individualism as destructive of the social institutions that make individual freedom possible.

The philosophical work of Brokmeyer and Harris was disrupted by the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861. A staunch unionist, Harris was exempted from military service by his eye injury and remained in St. Louis as principle of Clay School. During the war he worked on a translation of Hegel's *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte*, which helped him formulate an Hegelian interpretation of the conflict. Surrounded by the most appalling and lawless guerilla combat of the war, it is perhaps unsurprising that Harris concluded that the violent conflict was the result of Americans' disregard for social institutions, such as the Constitution, and blind faith in a rather shallow conception of individualism.

In January 1866 Brokmeyer and Harris resumed their philosophical plans by founding the St. Louis Philosophical Society with Brokmeyer as President and oracle, and Harris as Secretary and organizing engine. The Philosophical Society was part of a larger "St. Louis Movement," which included an art club, an Aristotle club, a Shakespeare society, the St. Louis Academy of Science, the St. Louis Philharmonic Society, and the Academy of Useful Science. All of these organizations were primarily composed of local professionals: public school teachers and administrators, judges and attorneys. The most important achievement of the Philosophical Society was the publication of a quarterly journal, *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, and Harris edited its twenty-two volumes from 1867 to 1893. *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy* was the first philosophical journal in the English language without a theological or denominational agenda. Initially, Harris and his colleagues sought to use the journal to promote the healing and development of American culture, by publishing translations and scholarly studies of the writings of post-Kantian German philosophers, German neo-humanist literature, as well as Dante, Shakespeare, and other literary artists. The journal was a cultural endeavor that would counter the "brittle individualism" of American thought and culture ("To the Reader," 1867, p. 1). Throughout its brief history, *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy* evolved beyond its initial purpose, serving as a vehicle for the innovative philosophical reflections of Charles S. PEIRCE, William JAMES, John DEWEY, Josiah ROYCE, and many other prominent American and European thinkers.

By 1868 Harris had risen to the position of superintendent of the St. Louis public school system. Under Harris's leadership, the St. Louis public schools rose to national and international prominence. He drew upon insights he gained from the writings of Hegel, Karl Rosenkranz, and Friedrich Froebel to reorganize both the school's curriculum and its management. In partnership with Susan BLOW, in 1873 Harris oversaw the organization of the first successful public kindergarten program in the United States and a normal school for teacher training in 1874.

Harris's work in the public schools was driven by his conviction that they should reconcile post-Civil War Americans by uniting oppositions. More concretely, public schools should educate newly freed slaves, augment the self-esteem of poor whites, and poise in

equilibrium the opposing behavioral proclivities of boys and girls, requiring of both the same curriculum. Harris proclaimed that the idea that boys or girls are unfit for various subjects is "a vanishing element" in a progressive world (quoted in Leidecker 1946, p. 266). Harris also rejected a school curriculum that emphasized quantitative matters, or that approached education as rote memorization. He argued that education should elevate the pupil's individual style, foster high aspirations, and help students absorb mankind's literary and artistic treasures. In short, Harris sought to promote *Bildung*, or what he called "qualitative culture," in the school system: "To describe points of law, statesmanship, morality and other essential interests, we must have qualitative culture … [that] cultivates comprehensiveness in the pupil." (quoted in Leidecker 1946, p. 182) Despite his emphasis on qualitative culture, Harris was also one of the first educators to require science courses as part of the curriculum, emphasizing their practical benefits. As author of the *Appleton's School Readers* from 1878 to 1889, Harris's views on education were particularly influential in the national public school curriculum.

Harris was able to convince the Missouri legislature to establish a library school board, and from there he launched into the acquisition, directly or through wills, of important private library holdings from scientists, professors, lawyers, businessmen, and various organizations. Often he traded lifetime use of public school rooms as meeting places in exchange for library donations. Concerts and lecture series were held to raise funds. Ultimately, the St. Louis Public School Library became the St. Louis Public Library, a world-class institution.

In his effort to promote *Bildung*, Harris also brought the arts to the children of St. Louis. He regarded music as a moral force, claiming that singing together bonded students to one another, and inculcated virtues such as civic pride, and the love of nature, home, and family. He also required that one day a week be devoted to the study of the great composers and their music. Through the Art Society of St. Louis, Harris began to acquire autotypes, models, casts, and other reproductions of great art for the city. In 1873 the Art Society acquired huge plaster casts of the "Niobe Group," "Venus of Milo," and other classic sculpture. Harris also acquired original paintings and decorative art from wealthy families.

In 1879 Harris moved to Concord, Massachusetts, at the invitation of Bronson ALCOTT who had launched the "Concord Summer School of Philosophy." Harris offered sophisticated lectures on philosophy, art, and literature at the school each summer until it shut its doors in 1888. The school drew over 2,000 people in its ten-year existence and, according to Denton Snider, Harris "… of all the lecturers, had personally the most devoted band of listeners" (Snider 1920, p. 365). During his Concord years Harris considered himself retired, declining offers for the presidency of several major universities. But in 1889 he accepted President Benjamin Harrison's appointment to the position of United States Commissioner of Education, a post he held until 1906. Commissioner Harris pressed for national kindergartens, equality of education for the sexes, the standardization of exams for teachers, elevated requirements for medical and dental degrees, and the creation of open-door colleges for all Americans, regardless of their means.

From 1890 to 1908 Harris spent his summers at Thomas DAVIDSON's "Glenmore" resort in the Adirondack Mountains at Keene, New York. Davidson's "Summer School for the Culture Sciences" brought young immigrants from the Lower East Side of New York City to study and discuss philosophy, literature, language, history, and the social sciences. With Dewey, Royce, James, and many other thinkers as their mentors, the group enjoyed discussion and the exchange of ideas combined with camping, hiking, and outdoor camaraderie. But by 1908 Harris's health had deteriorated. He and his wife moved to Providence,

Rhode Island, next door to his brother, who was a physician. Harris died in Providence on 5 November 1909.

The most prominent feature of Harris's thought can be identified by noting that he devoted his life to the promotion of both individual and cultural *Bildung* through what he called "speculative philosophy." Contrary to current parlance, for Harris, speculative philosophy is concrete philosophy because it is contextual thinking. Speculative philosophy assumes that in order to understand anything we must comprehend it in all of its relations. For Harris, empiricism and "the mathematical method" are both abstract thinking because they divorce their subject matter from its context in an effort to isolate and analyze problems. Although speculative philosophy must always begin with analysis, it is a preliminary moment in the dialectical movement toward an inclusive vision of the "genetic development" of the problem within the larger context in which it arose ("The Speculative," 1867, p. 3). Harris argued that speculative philosophy is systematically inclusive of the richness of human culture, and that it alone can understand the levels of human achievement: art, religion, and philosophy. Only speculative philosophy, Harris claimed, can furnish a rational basis for an understanding of human problems, from the seemingly mundane to the ethereal. Harris believed speculative philosophy was needed more than ever in American culture because pre-Civil War individualism had been found wanting and Americans, like other Westerners, were faced with bewildering advancements in the sciences, such as Darwinian biology and thermodynamics, that required a new world view. Speculative philosophy, he argued, could provide a basis for the continuing development of American thought and put new scientific theories into systematic and logical form, thereby relating them to all aspects of human existence.

Harris's Hegelian speculative philosophy is not as foreign as one might think to the pragmatic modes of thought that soon arose in the United States. Reflecting back on Brokmeyer's tutelage and *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, Harris wrote that Brokmeyer "impressed us with the practicality of philosophy, inasmuch as he could flash into the questions of the day, or even into the questions of the moment, the highest insights of philosophy and solve their problems." Harris continued, "Philosophy came to mean with us … the most practical of all species of knowledge. We used it to solve all problems connected with school-teaching and school management. We studied the 'dialectic' of politics and political parties…But our chief application was to literature and art" (*Hegel's Logic* 1890, p. xiii). In addition to his intense study of literature and art, Harris's wide-ranging publications and his work in education were acts of self-development that expressed his and Brokmeyer's reading of Hegel's speculative thought as a philosophy of action. Nonetheless, Harris also took seriously abstract philosophical issues.

In "'The Fates' by Michael Angelo," which Harris published in 1877, he addresses a trio of philosophical problems that animated much of his thought, the existence of evil, frailty, and finitude. These three problems follow from one metaphysical and ethical question. If the world springs from some one principle, a metaphysical absolute, that is unaffected by anything else, why would it allow or cause itself to suffer finitude and imperfection as it manifests itself in the particulars of the world? That this issue persistently troubled Harris is evidenced by the fact that he revisited it in 1890 in *Hegel's Logic*, where he writes, "The enigma of the world is the existence of evil or imperfection … this world is one and is obviously under the sway of one principle … how can it originate or suffer to exist that which does not correspond to its perfection?" (1890, pp. 4–5)

In "'The Fates' by Michael Angelo" Harris considers a solution from Eastern philosophy, which is to hold that all imperfection is mere illusion or Maya. On this view, the apparent imperfection of the world is due to the frailty

of human faculties. But Harris asserts that this simply shifts the problem to another locus. Why is there imperfection in human thought? Thus Harris considers a second solution from Eastern philosophy. The *Sankhya Karika*, which contains the philosophy of Kapila whom Harris calls the "profoundest of East Indian thinkers," holds that relief from pain is the object of philosophical inquiry (1877, p. 265). As physical beings we are fated to suffer internal bodily pain, pain caused by the inter-action of our bodies with other bodies, and pain from the unfolding of the world's history. We are fated to suffer from our bodily exis-tence as much as the earth is fated to change seasons. For Kapila, the only relief from torment and fate is the pure intellect, the retreat into the pure thought of the timeless. The counterpart to the Asian doctrine of fate is the physicalism and determinism of Western science, in which each body is what it is because of surrounding bodies, whether it be cells surrounding cells, bodies pervaded by gravitation, gases, electricity, etc. "The totality of surrounding conditions," Harris writes, "necessitates each and every body to be what it is … and … naught else" (1877, p. 267). Common to both traditions is the contradic-tion of physical existence. A body is finite and dependent, yet is also independent in exclud-ing other bodies. The answer to the enigma of finitude, argues Harris, is to see the totality of existence in the most comprehensive and rigorous manner. The growth and dissipation of bodies in space and time are the result of the interaction of forces. Electricity, heat, light, cohesion, and gravitation are transformed into one another in nature. But underlying these transformation of forces is one force or energy.

The totality is therefore self-active, self-deter-mining, and free of all imposition and con-straint. Finite bodies arise with various grades of unity in the womb of this totality. The process moves towards increasing complexity and is therefore systematic and methodical. The totality differentiates itself into countless particulars other than itself, and in so doing, concretizes itself in its differentiations. In this process the totality gains its own self-realiza-tion.

A high grade of physical complexity is one in which the bodily parts are interdependent, internally related. Concomitant with this enhanced complexity is feeling, as the expres-sion of the concern for preservation of bodily unity. The affective/desiderative will to live is the first sign of the conflict between freedom and fate, which Harris saw as the attempt to subordinate the external to the internal. In the physical complexity of human beings, thinking frees us from the here and now. We choose over the span of past, present, and future, thus gaining our individuality in a way similar to the totality's self-activity and self-realization. But we are frail physical beings, subject to the pains noted by Kapila. But Kapila errs, accord-ing to Harris, because he forgets that human beings can choose associations and prevent or lessen the powers of nature that produce indi-vidual suffering. Human communities form vast protective shields against that which the individual is powerless. The absolute or totality differentiates itself into finite forms to achieve concrete identity and self-realization. As finite beings, humans must learn to live together in the array of institutions that protect them from the vicissitudes of fate and pain. In our shielded, institutionalized lives the absolute returns to itself.

In *Hegel's Logic*, which Harris dedicated to Brokmeyer, he attempted to do for Hegelian philosophy what James had done for psychol-ogy, namely, to present his subject matter to the educated public. Harris maintains that *Hegel's Logic* marks his transition from faith in Hegel's system to a critical reworking of it. His first modification is to advance Brokmeyer's suggestion that Hegel's germinal thought is the idea of a self-active, self-deter-mining, self-conscious first principle. Harris delineates three approaches to Hegel's system. The first, the phenomenological path, proceeds from sense-certainty through various stadia to the first principle, spirit as self-determining.

The second path is the ontology of logic, which moves from the abstract notions of being and nothing to the self-determining idea. The third way, that of Brokmeyer and Harris, is to begin with self-determination itself.

Harris defended Hegel's logic from the criticism raised by Friedrich Adolf Trendelenburg that his conception of pure thought purports to be a priori, but in fact smuggles in content from experience by invoking categories, such as being, nothing, and becoming, that we find in experience. Harris perceptively argues that "there is a line of *à priori* thinking and a line of *à posteriori* thinking combined in one, in [Hegel's] logic" (*Hegel's Logic*, 1890, p. 132). Because Hegel successfully overcomes Cartesian mind/world dualism, a priori and a posteriori are moments or stages of the dialectic rather than markers of pre- and post-experiential realities. Pure thought is not thought that is devoid of experiential presuppositions; rather it is thought that recognizes its presuppositions. Rather than a science of the categories of being, Hegel's logic is a science of the categories according to which we think being. The fact that Harris preceded his discussion of Hegel's logic with five chapters on his Voyage of Discovery, the *Phänomenologie des Geistes*, clarifies his reading of Hegel's logic. For Harris, Hegel's logic begins after a thorough examination of consciousness in which thought's experiential presuppositions are identified.

However, Harris was critical of Hegel's doctrine of the Christian trinity which identified the absolute with God the Father, nature with God the Son, and spirit with God the Holy Ghost. Harris objects that Hegel "had not deduced the logical consequences of his system in the matter of the relation of Nature to the Absolute Idea … . His doctrine of the Trinity makes the Second Person, or Logos, to be Nature, whereas it should make the Logos to be eternally a Person like the First, and Nature should be the Procession of the Holy Spirit." (*Hegel's Logic*, 1890, pp. xiv–xv) Hegel went astray, Harris claims, by making

the absolute real "only in the process of Nature, and his personality actual only in historical persons" (*Hegel's Logic*, 1890, p. xv). This theory is not only pantheistic, but lends itself to appropriation by Hegel's atheistic and anthropological left wing.

Harris sought a centrist position in his religious philosophy, much as he had done in his political thought, by avoiding extreme left and right-wing interpretations of Hegel's thought. Whereas right-wing Hegelians claimed that Hegel preserved and upheld the entire gospel story, Harris was concerned only to preserve the doctrine of the trinity. Whereas left-wing Hegelians read Hegel as a pantheist or as reducing God to the human race in its historical development, Harris sought to preserve the notion of a transcendent God that manifests himself in the world.

Harris's impact on American thought and culture was immense. In addition to his leadership in public education, as a driving force behind *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy* and the "Concord Summer School," Harris significantly elevated both philological and philosophical research in the United States. At the same time, he promoted a vision of philosophy as an endeavor that should change people's lives and transform their culture.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Spiritual Sense of Dante's "Divina Commedia" (New York, 1889).

Hegel's Logic: A Book on the Genesis of the Categories of the Mind: A Critical Exposition (Chicago, 1890).

Introduction to the Study of Philosophy, ed. Marietta Kies (New York, 1890).

Psychologic Foundations of Education: An Attempt to Show the Genesis of the Higher Faculties of the Mind (New York, 1898).

Other Relevant Works

Primary collections of Harris's papers are at the Missouri Historical Society in St. Louis, the National Education Society in

Washington, D.C., and the Concord Public Library, Massachusetts.

"Philosophy of History," *Missouri Republican* (8 October 1861).

"To the Reader," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 1 (January 1867): 1.

"The Speculative," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 1 (January 1867): 2–6.

"What Shall We Study?" *Journal of Education* 2 (September 1869): 1–3.

"The Concrete and the Abstract," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 5 (1871): 1–5.

"Theism and Pantheism," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 5 (January 1871): 86–94.

Ed., *A Statement of the Theory of Education in the United States by Many Leading Educators* (Washington, D.C., 1874).

"Trendelenburg and Hegel," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 9 (1875): 70–80.

"Defense of Hegel against the Charge of Pantheism as Made in Hickok's Logic of Reason," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 9 (1876): 328–34.

"'The Fates' by Michael Angelo," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 11 (1877): 265–77.

Appleton's School Readers (New York, 1878–89).

"The Definition of Social Science and the Classification of the Topics Belonging to its Several Provinces," *Journal of Social Science* 22 (June 1887): 1–7.

"The Philosophic Aspects of History," *Papers of the American Historical Association* 5 (1890): 247–54.

The Aesthetic Element in Education (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1897).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Amer Phils Before 1950, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Bio 20thC Phils, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Dict Amer Bio, Encyc Amer Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v11, Proc of APA in Phil Rev v46, Who Was Who in Amer v1

DeArmey, Michael H., and James A. Good, eds. *The St. Louis Hegelians*, 3 vols (Bristol, UK, 2001).

Dodgson, G. R. "An Interpretation of the St. Louis Philosophical Movement," *Journal of Philosophy* 6 (1909): 337–45.

Evans, Henry Ridgley, ed. "A List of the Writings of William Torrey Harris," *Report of the Commissioner of Education for 1907* (Washington, D.C., 1908), pp. 37–72.

Fisch, Max H. *Peirce, Semeiotic, and Pragmatism* (Bloomington, Ind., 1986).

Goetzmann, William H., ed. *The American Hegelians: An Intellectual Episode in the History of Western America* (New York, 1973).

Good, James A. "A 'World-Historical Idea': The St. Louis Hegelians and the Civil War," *Journal of American Studies* 34 (2000): 447–64.

———, "Introduction," in *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy, 1867–1893*, vol. 1 (Bristol, UK, 2002), pp. v–xx.

Harmon, Francis. *The Social Philosophy of the St. Louis Hegelians* (New York, 1943).

Harris, D. H. *A Brief Report of the Meeting Commemorative of the Early St. Louis Movement in Philosophy, Psychology, Literature, Art and Education* (St. Louis, 1922).

Leidecker, Kurt. *Yankee Teacher: The Life of William Torrey Harris* (New York, 1946; 1971).

Pochman, Henry A. *New England Transcendentalism and St. Louis Hegelianism: Phases in the History of American Idealism* (Philadelphia, 1948).

———, *German Culture in America: Philosophical and Literary Influences, 1600–1900* (Madison, Wisc., 1957).

Schuyler, William. "German Philosophy in St. Louis," *Bulletin of the Washington University Association* no. 2 (23 April 1904): 72–3.

Snider, Denton J. *A Writer of Books in His Genesis* (St. Louis, 1910).

———, *The St. Louis Movement in Philosophy, Literature, Education, Psychology with Chapters of Autobiography* (St. Louis, 1920).

Michael H. DeArmey

HARRIS, Zellig Sabbettai (1909–92)

Zellig Sabbettai Harris was born on 23 October 1909 in Balta, Ukraine, and died on 21 May 1992 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. His birth name is not known; when his family emigrated to the United States in 1913, his name for his American life was created at the entry point. He received his BA (1930), MA (1932), and PhD (1934) from the Oriental studies department at the University of Pennsylvania. He began teaching linguistics at Pennsylvania in 1931, and there in 1946 he founded the first linguistics department in the United States. Among his students who had prominent careers was Noam CHOMSKY. He retired in 1979 but occasionally lectured at Columbia University for some years. He served as President of the Linguistic Society of America in 1955.

Harris's large body of writings spans a diverse range of areas in linguistics, from books detailing various properties of obscure languages, to books developing the mathematical aspects of his method of "distributional analysis." Perhaps his most noteworthy philosophical position was that, like Rudolf CARNAP and the members of the Vienna Circle, Harris was opposed to the semantic theories of the time. But whereas Carnap and others opposed semantic theories on the grounds that intensional entities were too mysterious, Harris's opposition to the use of straightforwardly semantic notions in linguistic theory was driven by a kind of a priori methodological concern.

Linguistics, Harris argued, was unlike any other science in that there is no "external" metalanguage in which a linguistic theory may be stated. In astronomy, for instance, the fundamental entities and relations of the theory may (at least in principle) be characterized without using the very astronomical phenomena in question. That is, a theory about black holes can explain how the term "black hole" is to be used without using either the phenomena themselves (black holes) or simply assuming a prior grasp of the relevant terms (for example, "black hole"). Logically speaking, this would be done by using a "metalanguage," in which the terms of the theory of astronomy are themselves discussed. In this way the astronomer can step outside of her theory and ground its crucial terms in other terms. Not so with language, Harris argues. Like any other scientific theory, a linguistic theory must explain its crucial terms in a metalanguage. But when a linguistic theory uses a metalanguage, it is using a language, and is therefore employing the very phenomena that constitute the object of study. Moreover, the theory is also assuming a prior understanding of the metalanguage and the terms it uses. Since the goal of a linguistic theory is to understand all natural languages, it will not do to theorize about one natural language using another natural language. Moreover, using an artificial language (such as a formal language of logic or arithmetic) will not do, either, since the terms and structural relations of an artificial language must be defined. Although these terms and relations might themselves be defined in yet a further artificial language (a "meta-metalanguage"), eventually the last of this finite hierarchy of metalanguages must itself be explained in a natural language metalanguage, thus returning us to the original epistemological problem.

Harris's own view about language was based on the distributional properties of phonemes. He argued at great length that these properties could form an adequate theoretical basis for linguistic notions. For instance, the notion of a sentence was defined as a string of phonemes, where the end of that string was a point where every phoneme was equally likely to follow

next in the discourse as any other. This can be contrasted with, for example, the word *bake*, which is far more likely to be followed by the phonemes corresponding to *–ed* or *–ing* than by those corresponding to *cat*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Grammar of the Phoenician Language (New Haven, Conn., 1936).

Development of the Canaanite Dialects: An Investigation in Linguistic History (New Haven, Conn., 1939).

"The Scope of Linguistics," *American Anthropologist* 49 (1947): 588–600.

Methods in Structural Linguistics (Chicago, 1951).

"Discourse Analysis," *Language* 28 (1952): 1–30.

String Analysis of Sentence Structure (The Hague, 1962).

Mathematical Structures of Language (New York, 1968).

Papers in Structural and Transformational Linguistics, ed. Henry Hiz (Dordrecht, 1970).

"A Theory of Language Structure," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 13 (1976): 237–55.

Papers on Syntax, ed. Henry Hiz (Dordrecht, 1981).

A Grammar of English on Mathematical Principles (New York, 1982).

Language and Information (New York, 1988).

The Form of Information in Science: Analysis of an Immunology Sublanguage (Dordrecht, 1989).

A Theory of Language and Information (Oxford, 1991).

The Transformation of Capitalist Society (Lanham, Md., 1997).

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils
Chomsky, Noam. "Logical Syntax and Semantics, their Linguistic Relevance," *Language* 31 (1955): 136–45.

Hymes, Dell, and John Fought. *American Structuralism* (The Hague, 1981).

Matthews, Peter. *Grammatical Theory in the United States from Bloomfield to Chomsky* (Cambridge, UK, 1986).

———, "Zellig Sabbettai Harris," *Language* 75 (1999): 112–9.

Nevin, Bruce, ed. *The Legacy of Zellig Harris: Language and Information into the 21st Century*, 2 vols (Philadelphia, 2002). Contains a bibliography of Harris's writings.

Kent Johnson

HARSANYI, John Charles (1920–2000)

John Harsanyi was born on 29 May 1920 in Budapest, Hungary. He shared the Nobel Prize in Economics of 1994 with John NASH and Reinhard Selten for his work in game theory. Harsanyi was educated in Budapest (at the same high school John VON NEUMANN attended) under fairly favorable circumstances until Germany's occupation of Hungary. He was forced to work in a labor unit in 1944, because he was of Jewish origin. The Nazis transferred his unit to an Austrian concentration camp, where, Harsanyi notes, "most of my comrades eventually perished," but he escaped before the trip to Austria. He hid in a Jesuit monastery for some time, and after the war he switched his study from pharmacy, which was the avocation of his parents, to his true love of philosophy. He earned a PhD in philosophy from the University of Budapest in 1947. He left Hungary, which he feared was becoming increasingly Stalinist, in 1950.

Since his doctorate went unrecognized in Australia and his English was poor, Harsanyi worked in a factory for a time. It was here that he started his formal training in economics, earning his MA degree in economics at the

University of Sydney in 1953, and a lecturership at Brisbane. A Rockefeller Fellowship at Stanford gave him time to earn a PhD in economics in 1959 with Kenneth ARROW as his supervisor. Arrow returned to Australia to take up an attractive research post at the Australian National University in Canberra where he worked on game theory from 1958 to 1961. Harsanyi then was a professor of economics at Wayne State University from 1961 to 1963. In 1964 he went to the University of California at Berkeley as a visiting professor, and soon became a professor at the Business School. Later on, his appointment was extended to include a position in the economics department at Berkeley as well, and he held these positions until his death on 9 August 2000 in Berkeley.

Harsanyi did some of the most important work in economics in the second half of the twentieth century. His work on games with incomplete information played against other agents earned him a Nobel Prize. However, he was also keenly interested in philosophical topics and his work was nearly as influential in the utilitarianism literature as it was in game theory and economics proper.

In the preface to the collection of essays *Utilitarianism and Beyond*, Amartya SEN and Bernard WILLIAMS write that they included only two previously published papers. One of these papers was Harsanyi's "Morality and the Theory of Rational Behavior" (1977). Several of Harsanyi's key themes in his work on utilitarianism are sounded in this paper. First, it reiterated his "equiprobability model" argument for utilitarianism that he initially put forward in the mid 1950s. This is the "fictitious assumption of having the same probability of occupying any possible social position." Harsanyi mentions that John RAWLS's use of a very similar idea, apparently independently derived, to different ends was called by Rawls "the veil of ignorance." Harsanyi had largely prefigured the Rawlsian argumentative strategy, but holds that such an argument justifies a version of utilitarian-

ism. He claims a rational individual will maximize his expected utility and the way to do this, given the morally mandated equiprobability model, is to press for maximizing the group's utility. This is just the result that Rawls was so famously to deny later in his 1972 *A Theory of Justice*.

In "Morality and the Theory of Rational Behavior" Harsanyi also reiterated his articulate defense of subjectivism about well-being. He writes that

> … in deciding what is good and what is bad for a given individual, the ultimate criterion can only be his own wants and his own preferences. To be sure … a person may irrationally want something which is very bad for him. But, it seems to me, the only way we can make sense of such a statement is to interpret it as a claim to the effect that, in some appropriate sense, his own preferences at some deeper level are inconsistent with what he is now trying to achieve. (1982, p. 55)

In contrast to most writers on utilitarianism coming from a background in economics, Harsanyi held that the true version of utilitarianism should recommend the promotion of people's true (as opposed to actual) preferences. It was a position of this sort that was to become, partially through Harsanyi's influence, predominant in philosophy. Harsanyi's work to some extent was an early version of the "full information" desire-based account of a person's good that has taken hold in philosophy.

Harsanyi held that the best version of utilitarianism would exclude anti-social preferences such as malice, envy, and resentment (even if these represent true preferences of the individual) from being counted in generating the social utility function that deserves moral promotion. In a sense then, he did not hold that the "good," or that which deserves moral promotion, is prior to and independent of the "right." Harsanyi's view has been influential and highlights his undogmatic utilitarian

approach. This paper also reiterates his famous solution for the problem of interpersonal comparisons of utility. He holds that the best solution rests with the "similarity postulate." The view is that if we adequately can imagine ourselves into the shoes of another, with her tastes, background, education, and such, then it is reasonable to assume that the preferences I would myself have are and their intensity would be the same. This would give us a point of comparison between the utility scale of myself and another.

Harsanyi's work in philosophy will be long remembered as precise, compelling, and nuanced. His vision of utilitarianism was complete, influential, and undogmatic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Essays on Ethics, Social Behavior, and Scientific Explanation (Dordrecht, 1976).
"Morality and the Theory of Rational Behavior," *Social Research* 44 (1977): 623–56. Reprinted in *Utilitarianism and Beyond*, ed. Amartya Sen and Bernard Williams (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), pp. 39–62.
Rational Behavior and Bargaining Equilibrium in Games and Social Situations (Cambridge, UK, 1977).
Papers in Game Theory (Dordrecht, 1982).
A General Theory of Equilibrium Selection, with Reinhard Selten (Cambridge, Mass., 1988).

Other Relevant Works
"Cardinal Welfare, Individualistic Ethics and Interpersonal Comparisons of Utility," *Journal of Political Economy* 63 (1955): 309–21.
"Bargaining in Ignorance of the Opponent's Utility Function" *Journal of Conflict Resolution* (1962): 29–38.
"Bayesian Decision Theory and Utilitarian Ethics," *American Economic Review* 48 (1978): 223–8.
"Games with Incomplete Information," *American Economic Review* 85 (1995):

291–303.
"Utilities, Preferences, and Substantive Goods," *Social Choice and Welfare* 14 (1996): 129–45.

Further Reading
Cambridge Dict Amer Bio
Leinfellner, Werner, and Eckehart Köhler, eds. *Game Theory, Experience, Rationality: Foundations of Social Sciences, Economics and Ethics in Honour of John C. Harsanyi* (Dordrecht, 1998).
Selton, Reinhard, ed. *Rational Interaction: Essays in Honor of John C. Harsanyi* (Berlin, 1992).

David Sobel

HARTMAN, Robert Schirokauer
(1910–73)

Robert Schirokauer was born on 27 January 1910 in Berlin, Germany. He was educated first as a lawyer, and was a judge in Berlin when Hitler came to power. He openly criticized Hitler, had a Jewish father, and escaped Germany in 1932 using a fake passport issued to "Robert Hartman." Thereafter, he took the name. After working in England and Mexico, Hartman entered the United States in 1941. He received his PhD in philosophy from Northwestern University in 1946. He was a professor of philosophy at the College of Wooster in Ohio from 1945 to 1948 and Ohio State University from 1948 to 1956. He was a visiting professor at Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1955–6, and at Yale University in 1966. He was Smith Mundt State Department Research Fellow and Exchange Professor at the National University of Mexico in 1956–7, and from 1957 until his death he was a research professor of philosophy at the National

University of Mexico. From 1968 until his death Hartman also held an appointment as professor of philosophy at the University of Tennessee. He also held more than fifty lectureships in the United States, Canada, Latin America, and Europe. Hartman died on 20 September 1973 in Cuernavaca, Mexico.

Hartman turned to philosophy to understand good and evil, especially why evil people promote evil so efficiently while good people are so poorly organized for goodness. He published over one hundred articles on value theory in English, German, and Spanish, plus his most significant book, *The Structure of Value* (1965). Several of his books have been published posthumously by members of the Robert S. Hartman Institute for Formal and Applied Axiology in Tennessee.

G. E. Moore convinced Hartman that "good" cannot be defined "naturally" or empirically. However, Hartman discerned that it can be defined formally as "concept (or standard) fulfillment." Value standards consist of sets of good-making predicates; something is good if its properties exist in one-to-one correspondence with the elements of its measuring standard. To the degree that it fulfills fewer and fewer of these good-making predicates, it is "fair," "average," "poor," or "no good." Hartman aspired to create a formal science of value.

Hartman recognized three kinds of goodness: intrinsic, extrinsic, and systemic. In application, intrinsically good things – valuable for their own sakes – are unique persons or centers of conscious thinking, feeling, choosing, and valuing. Extrinsically good things are useful things in public space–time, such as physical objects and processes, and social roles and actions. Systemically good things – ideas or conceptual constructs – are principles, laws, rules, logical and mathematical systems, definitions, and other formalities. Hartman proffered a rudimentary formal calculus of value for resolving value problems, further developed by Frank G. Forrest in *Valuemetrics*.

According to Hartman, "better" means "having more good-making properties." This yields a "hierarchy of value" according to which people (intrinsic values) are more valuable than things (extrinsic values), and things are more valuable than mere ideas (systemic values) of things or people. Applying this hierarchy, he developed a personality profile, the Hartman Value Profile, consisting of nine positive and nine negative value combination items from the three value dimensions, to be ranked from best to worst. The Hartman Value Profile is now widely used by business consultants, counselors, psychotherapists, and religious professionals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Structure of Value (Carbondale, Ill., 1965).
The Knowledge of Good (Amsterdam, 2002).

Other Relevant Works
Hartman's papers are at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
Freedom to Live: The Robert Hartman Story (Amsterdam, 1994).

Further Reading
Proc of APA v47, Who Was Who in Amer v6
Dicken, Thomas M., and Rem B. Edwards. *Dialogues on Values and Centers of Value* (Amsterdam, 2001).
Edwards, Rem B., ed. *Formal Axiology and Its Critics* (Amsterdam, 1995).
Edwards, Rem B. *Religious Values and Valuations* (Chattanooga, Tenn., 2000).
Edwards, Rem B., and Davis, John W., eds. *Forms of Value and Valuation: Theory and Applications* (Lanham, Md., 1991).
Forrest, Frank G. *Valuemetrics* (Amsterdam, 1994).

Rem B. Edwards

HARTSHORNE, Charles (1897–2000)

Charles Hartshorne (pronounced "hart's horn") was born on 5 June 1897 in Kittanning, Pennsylvania. He was educated at Yeates Boarding School and Haverford College where he received his BA in 1917. During World War I he was a volunteer in the Army Medical Corps in France. After the war he went to Harvard University where he received his PhD in philosophy in 1923. He then studied for two years in Europe as a Sheldon Traveling Fellow, and for the next three years he was an instructor and research fellow at Harvard. He was A. N. WHITEHEAD's assistant and put in charge of editing the papers of Charles S. PEIRCE. He was joined by Paul WEISS in 1927, and their six-volume edition of the Peirce papers was published in 1931–5.

Hartshorne was a professor of philosophy at the University of Chicago from 1928 to 1955, and he also held a joint appointment in the Meadville Theological School from 1933 to 1955. He then taught at Emory University from 1955 to 1962, and University of Texas from 1962 to 2000. Hartshorne was President of the American Philosophical Association Western Division in 1948–9, President of the Charles S. Peirce Society in 1950–51, and was also president of numerous other scholarly organizations. Throughout his career he made frequent travels domestically and abroad, and he was an internationally recognized ornithologist specializing in oscines; his main research was published in *Born to Sing* (1973). He always enjoyed good health and he remained productive into his final years. He died on 9 October 2000 in Austin, Texas.

Hartshorne was foremost a metaphysician. His dissertation on "The Unity of Being" presents an unrefined version of his metaphysics. Although he never published the work, it anticipated the themes of his mature thinking. Hartshorne viewed Peirce and Whitehead as giving him finer conceptual tools for expressing ideas to which he had already arrived. Their example, along with those of William JAMES and Henri Bergson, buoyed Hartshorne's thinking by providing him with a philosophical tradition that represented a fresh start in the pursuit of metaphysical wisdom. This new tradition, which Hartshorne labeled neoclassical metaphysics, takes account of the failures of past metaphysical systems without despairing of the project of metaphysics.

For Hartshorne, metaphysics is the enterprise of discovering a priori truths about existence. His method, however, is not the traditional one of deducing metaphysical theorems from self-evident axioms. On the contrary, Hartshorne's final appeal is to experience. This is not to say that metaphysical propositions are empirical in the sense that Karl Popper gives the term (in other words, falsifiable by some conceivable experience). For Hartshorne, metaphysical propositions are true, if at all, of every conceivable experience. His method can be characterized as a reflective equilibrium between experience, in its widest sense, and hypotheses about the necessary features of existence.

Hartshorne insisted that experience not be understood too narrowly; otherwise a metaphysical statement could be mistaken for an empirical one. He was critical of traditional empiricism, for it privileged sensory experience and compartmentalized sensation and affect. In his first book Hartshorne argued that sensations exist along an "'affective continuum' of aesthetically meaningful, socially expressive, organically adaptive and evolving experience functions." The twin axes of the theory are (1) sensory modalities are not isolated from each other and (2) every sensation is a feeling, but not every feeling is a sensation. According to (1), the comparison of qualities from different senses has a biological basis. On Hartshorne's view, to speak of tones as bright, dark, sharp, soft, or sweet is not merely a question of analogy. According to (2), there are no sensations devoid of affect. This is most evident in the sense of touch. The flame's heat, directly on the skin, is felt *as* painful. Hartshorne noted that, from an evolutionary standpoint, a bare

sensation would be an anomaly, for it would have no adaptive utility. Hartshorne's theory has the most difficulty accommodating the sense of sight. Even here, however, it is evident that too much brightness is felt *as* sharply painful; more diffuse light is felt *as* soft. Emotional sensitivity to light also varies, as the phenomenon of seasonal affective disorder attests.

Hartshorne's critique of empiricism is complemented by his suspicion of anthropomorphism. He denied that "experience" is synonymous with "human experience." Descartes bifurcated the world into the human and the nonhuman and he put *all* experience on the human side. Cartesian misgivings aside, we routinely attribute experience to a variety of nonhuman creatures. Hartshorne observed that a dog need not become a man in order to suffer. His ornithological studies convinced him that songbirds have a primitive aesthetic sense that is manifested in the variety of their songs and the frequencies with which they sing them. How far down the evolutionary scale sentience extends is a fair question. Hartshorne rejected as a temporal form of dualism the idea that mind emerges from mere insentient matter. In this, he was fond of remarking, he could enlist the support of his friend, Sewall Wright, the great geneticist. Hartshorne followed Leibniz in understanding experience as a variable that can take an infinite number of values, from the daylight of self-awareness to the dim recesses of a stupor.

The relevance of these ideas makes Hartshorne's version of panpsychism, which he called psychicalism, attractive as a metaphysical hypothesis. Hartshorne maintained that the world is a theatre of interactions among "active singulars" of varying levels of complexity held together by affective bonds. Thus, the most universal values are aesthetic, in the root meaning of the term, "feeling" (*aesthesis*). The most concrete relation among active singulars is "feeling of feeling," an expression he borrowed from Whitehead. For both philosophers, memory provides the model

of experience. Two things are evident in memory. First, the object of a memory is another experience. Thus, if memories and experiences are forms of feeling, then memory is a feeling of feeling. Second, memory has a temporal structure, for one remembers only what is past. The most concrete way in which the past continues into the present is in memory; for instance, a memory can be so vivid that one relives the original experience.

Hartshorne held that perception also has a temporal structure, although the temporal dimension becomes apparent only as a function of distance and speed. For instance, the delay between the lightning flash and the thunder increases the further removed one is from the lightning strike. According to Hartshorne, an experience never has itself as an object. As Bergson insisted, this is true even in dreams. So-called "external" events are part of the fabric of dreams, for example, an alarm clock is heard in a dream as a fire alarm. For Hartshorne, the object of an experience is always a past event – most concretely, a past experience. If the event is in the immediately preceding moment then there is an illusion of simultaneity of experience and its objects. For this reason, Hartshorne spoke of perception as impersonal memory.

Psychicalism may seem to be false, for not every object of experience is an experiencing object. Hartshorne argued, however, that naïve sense experience can no more settle this issue for metaphysics than it could reveal the atomic structure of matter for science. He appropriated Leibniz's distinction between singulars and composites. For Hartshorne, only active singulars have experiences, and every active singular is a composite, but not every composite is an active singular. In this way, for Hartshorne, feeling can be everywhere even though not everything feels, somewhat as vibration can be everywhere even though not everything vibrates – for example, rocks. With sufficient complexity, a composite may become an active singular; a multi-celled zygote is not a center of feeling, but the baby it becomes is.

Individual cells may nevertheless have feeling. Hartshorne believed that each of us has confused perceptions of the feelings of our cells. As he was fond of saying, hurt my cells and you hurt me. He doubted that plants are active singulars, although their cells may have cell-like experiences. The inorganic realm is entirely devoid of psychic qualities, but its micro-constituents need not be. Here, the "variable" of experience must be near its limits.

Hartshorne's talk of the "singulars" that form the substratum of existence as "active" highlights another feature of his metaphysics. The activity in question is a *creative activity* that is conditioned, but not wholly determined, by the causal nexus from which it is born. In Hartshorne's view, at the metaphysically basic level of active singulars, the chain of cause and effect can be read backwards but not forwards. Hartshorne used the relation between adult and child as illustration; the woman includes the girl she once was, but the girl does not include the woman. Put differently, the woman is internally related to the girl but the girl is externally related to the woman.

Determinists claim that the woman's genetics, her environment, and every detail of her prior experience and behavior dictate that she could not have been other than she is. Following Peirce, Hartshorne argued that the strict law-like regularity that determinism implies is nowhere to be found, nor is it required by the practice of science. On the contrary, effects outrun their causes. From the earliest moments for which there is any evidence, the universe has been the womb of a cumulative evolutionary process, staggering in the variety and diversity of its products. The degree of novelty can be negligible, as in the nearly exact repetition of pattern in chemical processes, or it can be dramatic, as in the flowering of human genius. Hartshorne noted that his indeterminism is the mean between the contrary extremes of unqualified determinism (where causes uniquely determine effects) and chaoticism (where causal relations are nonexistent).

The relation of cause to effect is mirrored in temporal asymmetry. With Whitehead, but against Peirce, Hartshorne accepted the atomicity of becoming. Active singulars are discrete momentary processes. With Peirce, but against Whitehead, he held that possibilities form a continuum. For Hartshorne, time is "objective modality." The past is fully determinate; the future is a partially indeterminate field of possibility; the present is the process of adding onto the determinateness of the past. Hartshorne also held that modal distinctions are grounded in temporal becoming. Necessity is the common element of all temporal alternatives; something is not logically possible unless it was always possible or becomes possible in the fullness of time.

Hartshorne argued that psychicalism, indeterminism, and temporal becoming satisfy his criteria of a sound metaphysical theory. A simpler example of a metaphysical truth is "Something exists." It too is verified by every experience and falsified by none (for the experience itself would have to exist). For this reason, Hartshorne calls it a metaphysical confusion to ask why there is something rather than nothing. Of course, the question is most often shorthand for asking why there is a universe rather than none at all. Hartshorne also questions this question. May it not be that *this* universe is contingent but that it is not contingent that a universe exists? This was indeed Hartshorne's view. He concluded by denying that there are merely negative facts. What makes a negative existential statement true is something positive (for example, "no ants in the room" means that every part of the room is occupied by something other than ants).

If it is necessary that something exists, it is a further question whether it is necessary that something contingent exists. Many philosophers affirm a wholly non-contingent divine reality that freely created a contingent universe. A hallmark of Hartshorne's metaphysics, and arguably his signal contribution to philosophical theology, is that deity necessarily has con-

tingent aspects. Hartshorne argued that God's decision to create is part of God, yet it must be contingent if it is to be free. Hartshorne also argued as follows. Consider the conditional, "God knows W entails W" where W is a statement about a contingent occurrence. If the antecedent, God knows W, is necessary then W must also be necessary, for only a necessary truth can follow from a necessary truth. But W is a statement about a contingency and hence is contingent. Thus, it must be contingent that God knows that W.

The traditional objection to God's having contingent aspects is premised on God's simplicity (or, having no parts); any contingency in God would function as a kind of metaphysical virus infecting the whole of God, so God's very existence would be contingent. Hartshorne denies divine simplicity. His antidote for the "virus" is to distinguish the fact that something exists and the manner or state in which it exists. He calls this the difference between *existence* and *actuality*. Hartshorne observed that my existing tomorrow is one question; while my existing tomorrow hearing a blue jay call at noon is another. Existence and actuality are related asymmetrically – in effect it is a logical type difference. From "X hears a blue jay call at noon" one may infer "X exists"; but from "X exists" one may not infer "X hears a blue jay call at noon."

Hartshorne draws the further consequence that the *modalities* of existence and actuality are logically distinct. To be sure, in the case of the creatures, both actuality and existence are contingent. My hearing a blue jay at noon and my existence are such that they can fail to be. Nevertheless, it is possible to conceive of a being whose actual states are contingent but whose existence is necessary. Medieval philosophers came close to this idea in speaking of the *æviternity* of angels, but they did not apply it to God. Hartshorne says that God is both necessary and contingent, but in different respects: God's existence is necessary (it cannot not be), but God's actual states are contingent (each could have been different than it is). To revert

to Hartshorne's example: whether or not I hear a blue jay, God knows it and God's knowledge is as contingent as my experience; but, God's existence and the abstract quality of God knowing whatever occurs are unaffected by this contingency.

A theme running throughout Hartshorne's work is that philosophers have been largely inattentive to the logically possible varieties of theism. The regnant assumption has been that God and the world fall on opposite sides of ultimate contrasts. According to this "monopolar theism," God is necessary, infinite, eternal, etc.; the world is contingent, finite, temporal, etc. Hartshorne argues that the possibilities are more numerous than this. Consider the necessary/contingent contrast. It may be the case that God is necessary in all respects (N), contingent in all respects (C), necessary and contingent in different respects (NC), or neither necessary nor contingent (O). Likewise, the world (n, c, cn, o). The eight possibilities for God and the world combine to make an exhaustive list of sixteen mutually exclusive options ($N.n, N.c, N.cn, N.o; C.n, C.c, C.cn, C.o; NC.n, NC.c, NC.cn, NC.o; O.n, O.c, O.cn, O.o$). Well-known philosophies can be mapped onto the sixteenfold matrix: $N.n$ is classical pantheism; $N.cn$ is Aristotle's view; $O.c$ is Russell's atheism; $N.c$ is monopolar theism. The formal possibilities jump to 256 (16 times 16) if two contrasts are used (for example, necessity and contingency, eternity and temporality). If x equals the number of contrasts, then the formally possible doctrines about God and the world equal 16^x. Not all formal combinations are logically consistent. Nevertheless, the matrices are a useful tool for exploring ignored alternatives.

Hartshorne's matrix clearly expresses his own view ($NC.cn$), called *dipolar theism*. God is *in different respects* necessary and contingent, infinite and finite, eternal and temporal, and so on. The qualification "in different respects" saves Hartshorne from inconsistency. God's *existence* is necessary, infinite, and eternal, whereas God's *actual states* are con-

tingent, finite, and temporal. By conceiving God as inclusive of the world, Hartshorne preserved the contrast between them, establishing a view he calls *panentheism* (in other words, all-in-God). Hartshorne appropriated and updated Plato's doctrine of the world-soul. God's relation to the world is analogous to the relation of a person to the cells of his or her body. God is the whole; each creature is a fragment of the whole. For Hartshorne, the aim of religion is the acceptance of our fragmentariness.

Another dimension of dipolar theism is the distinction between *A* (absolute)-perfection and *R* (relative)-perfection. To be *A*-perfect is to be unsurpassable by all others including self; to be *R*-perfect is to be unsurpassable by all others excluding self. For monopolar theism, God is *A*-perfect in all respects. For dipolar theism, God is *A*-perfect in some respects and *R*-perfect in others. For instance, God has the *A*-perfect quality of omniscience (God knows all that is knowable) and the *R*-perfect quality of being responsive to all changes and all values in the universe. Thus, Hartshorne speaks of God as "the self-surpassing surpasser of all" – a view he calls *surrelativism*. The values of the jay's song, both for the jay and for me, are also values for God (for in knowing those values God possesses them). God continues to know those values long after the jay and I are gone. Hartshorne adopted Whitehead's expression in saying that the values of the world are objectively immortal in God. This is the only form of immortality Hartshorne considered thinkable or desirable.

The scholastic philosophers used Aristotle's expression "unmoved mover" to describe God. Hartshorne, inspired by Abraham HESCHEL, calls God "the most and best moved mover." To say that God is a moved mover is to imply that God is affected by creaturely decisions. Put somewhat differently, what happens in the universe is not a unilateral decision of God. Hartshorne goes further: God cannot decide not to be affected by creaturely decisions. God's creativity sets the boundaries within which the creativity of the creatures can exist. Hartshorne develops in considerable detail three consequences of these ideas. First, what happens in the universe is the product of the joint decisions of God and the creatures. Second, divine power cannot guarantee that creaturely decisions coordinate to bring about the best possible result. Thus, to ask why God causes or allows bad things to happen is metaphysical confusion. Third, because creaturely decisions come to be in time, God's knowledge of them comes to be in time. Hartshorne insists that this does not mean that God is not omniscient. God knows all that is possible to know, but decisions that have yet to come to be cannot be known as already accomplished.

Hartshorne's most widely recognized work is his revival of the ontological argument for God's existence. He was the first to identify two forms of the argument in Anselm's *Proslogion*. He was also the first to present the argument using the formalism of modal logic. According to Hartshorne, "Anselm's discovery" is that the divine existence must be "modally coincident" with possibility as such. If God exists, then God exists necessarily. The ontological argument may be expressed as follows: God's existence is either necessary, impossible, or one possibility among others. Anselm's discovery eliminates the third alternative. If we assume that God's existence is not impossible then God's existence is necessary. If God's existence is necessary, then God exists.

Hartshorne denied that Anselm proved God's existence. The problem is that Anselm did not show that God's existence is not impossible. Indeed, we have seen that Hartshorne considers Anselm's type of "monopolar theism" impossible. Hartshorne's dipolar theism is designed to address the doubt that the concept of deity has consistent meaning. In the final analysis, Hartshorne's argument for the existence of God is a cumulative case of which the ontological argument is one element. In *Creative Synthesis*, he presented the ontological proof as one of six strands in a "global argument" for God's existence – the other

"proofs" are non-empirical versions of the cosmological, design, epistemic, moral, and aesthetic arguments. After *Creative Synthesis*, Hartshorne stressed the eliminations of options in the sixteenfold matrix as a way of arguing for dipolar theism.

Because aesthetic values are, for Hartshorne, the most universal, he conceived the cosmos, at any stage of its evolution, as permeated by divine beauty. There is a dynamic beauty of the universe that God appreciates and to which God contributes. This is not to deny the tragedies and horrific evils that disfigure existence. God too feels these, but is not defeated by them. In Hartshorne's view, the objective measure of aesthetic value is a mean between the double extremes of unity and diversity and simplicity and complexity. God is guided by these ideals in an everlasting effort to bring what is best from both the triumph and wreckage of our lives.

John B. COBB, Jr. called Hartshorne "a strange and alien greatness." Hartshorne's vigorous defense of metaphysics may have seemed quixotic in the days when logical positivism labeled metaphysical statements nonsensical. In retrospect, it seems almost prophetic. Like the greatest metaphysicians he found time for empirical studies. Above all, Hartshorne sought, without claiming to have fully achieved, a comprehensive wisdom that satisfies our rational and emotional demands.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Philosophy and Psychology of Sensation (Chicago, 1934).

Man's Vision of God and the Logic of Theism (Chicago, 1941).

The Divine Relativity: A Social Conception of God (New Haven, Conn., 1948).

The Logic of Perfection (La Salle, Ill., 1962).

Creative Synthesis and Philosophic Method (La Salle, Ill., 1970).

Insights and Oversights of Great Thinkers: An Evaluation of Western Philosophy (Albany, N.Y., 1983).

Omnipotence and Other Theological Mistakes (Albany, N.Y., 1984).

Creativity in American Philosophy (Albany, N.Y., 1984).

The Zero Fallacy and Other Essays in Neoclassical Philosophy, ed. Mohammad Valady (Peru, Ill., 1997).

Other Relevant Works

Hartshorne's papers are at the Center for Process Studies, Claremont School of Theology, California.

Beyond Humanism: Essays in the Philosophy of Nature (Chicago, 1937).

Reality as Social Process: Studies in Metaphysics and Religion (Boston, 1953).

Philosophers Speak of God, with William L. Reese (Chicago, 1953).

Anselm's Discovery: A Re-examination of the Ontological Proof for God's Existence (La Salle, Ill., 1965).

A Natural Theology for Our Time (La Salle, Ill., 1967).

Whitehead's Philosophy: Selected Essays, 1935–1970 (Lincoln, Neb., 1972).

Born to Sing: An Interpretation and World Survey of Bird Song (Bloomington, Ind., 1973).

Aquinas to Whitehead: Seven Centuries of Metaphysics of Religion (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1976).

Whitehead's View of Reality, with Creighton Peden (New York, 1981).

Wisdom as Moderation: A Philosophy of the Middle Way (Albany, N.Y., 1987).

The Darkness and the Light: A Philosopher Reflects on His Fortunate Career and Those Who Made It Possible (Albany, N.Y., 1990).

Hartshorne and Brightman on God, Process, and Persons: The Correspondence, 1922–1945, ed. Randall E. Auxier and Mark Y. A. Davies (Nashville, Tenn., 2001).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Amer Phils Before 1950, Bio 20thC Phils, Oxford Comp Phil, Pres

Addr of APA v5, Proc of APA v74, Routledge Encycl Phil, Who Was Who in Amer v14, Who's Who in Phil

Hartshorne, Dorothy C., Donald W. Viney and Randy Ramal. "Charles Hartshorne: Primary Bibliography of Philosophical Works," *Process Studies* 30 (2001): 375–409.

Cobb, John B., Jr., and Franklin L. Gamwell, eds. *Existence and Actuality: Conversations with Charles Hartshorne* (Chicago, Ill., 1984).

Dombrowksi, Daniel A. *Hartshorne and the Metaphysics of Animal Rights* (Albany, N.Y., 1988).

———, *Analytic Theism, Hartshorne, and the Concept of God* (Albany, N.Y., 1996).

———, *Divine Beauty: The Aesthetics of Charles Hartshorne* (Nashville, Tenn., 2003).

Ford, Lewis S., ed. *Two Process Philosophers: Hartshorne's Encounter with Whitehead* (Tallahassee, Fla., 1973).

Goodwin, George L. *The Ontological Argument of Charles Hartshorne* (Missoula, Mont., 1978).

Hahn, Lewis E., ed. *The Philosophy of Charles Hartshorne* (La Salle, Penn., 1991). Contains Hartshorne's autobiography and bibliography.

Kane, Robert, and Stephen H. Phillips, eds. *Hartshorne, Process Philosophy and Theology* (Albany, N.Y., 1989).

Peter, Eugene. *Hartshorne and Neoclassical Metaphysics* (Lincoln, Neb., 1970).

Reck, Andrew J. *The New American Philosophers: An Exploration of Thought since World War II* (Baton Rouge, Louis., 1968), chap. 9.

Shields, George W., ed. *Process and Analysis: Whitehead, Hartshorne, and the Analytic Tradition* (Albany, N.Y., 2003).

Sia, Santiago. *God in Process Thought: A Study in Charles Hartshorne's Concept of God* (Dordrecht, 1985).

Sia, Santiago, ed. *Charles Hartshorne's Concept of God: Philosophical and Theological Responses* (Dordrecht, 1990).

Viney, Donald W. *Charles Hartshorne and the Existence of God* (Albany, N.Y., 1985).

Whitney, Barry L. *Evil and the Process God* (Toronto, 1985).

Donald Wayne Viney

HARVEY, Van Austin (1926–)

Van A. Harvey was born on 23 April 1926 in Hankow, China. After serving in the United States Navy in World War II, he received his BA in philosophy from Occidental College in 1948. He attended Princeton Theological Seminary in 1948–9, and then received his BD from Yale Divinity School in 1951 and his PhD in religion from Yale University in 1957, having studied post-Enlightenment religious thought. While at Yale he was profoundly influenced by H. Richard NIEBUHR, from whom he gained an appreciation for the impact the rise of modern historical consciousness had on theology. This influence led to his dissertation, "Myth, Faith, and History," and to his lifelong interest in the implications of the historical-critical method for theological formulation. Harvey taught religion at Yale (1952–4), Princeton University (1954–8), Perkins School of Theology at Southern Methodist University (1958–68), the University of Pennsylvania (1968–78), and Stanford University (1978–96). He served as chair of the graduate program in religion at Southern Methodist University and chair of his departments at both the University of Pennsylvania and Stanford. At Stanford, from 1985 until his retirement in 1996, he was the George Edwin Burnell Professor of Religious Studies.

Harvey's first book, *A Handbook of Theological Terms* (1964), relates traditional theological terms to their reconceptualization in

light of issues that have arisen only in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. His much-celebrated second book, *The Historian and the Believer* (1966), reflects his lifelong concern with the integrity of religious belief. After a nuanced analysis of the nature of historical reason, he shows how the "morality of judgment" associated with historical reason has created enormous ethical and theological problems still unresolved by theologians trying to reconcile traditional Christian belief with biblical research. These problems have principally to do with the relationship between historical investigation of the historical Jesus and theologically significant claims about him that Christianity has traditionally wanted to make. Harvey continued to engage these issues in many essays throughout his career. The third printing (1996) of *The Historian and the Believer* contains an important new introduction that relates this early book to Harvey's mature position.

A common theme in many of Harvey's works through about 1980 – including *The Historian and the Believer*, and especially to be seen in "A Christology for Barabbases" (1976) – is his conception of faith based on the biblical picture of Jesus that is free from explicit historical claims which would make faith dependent on the results of historical research. Related to Rudolf Bultmann's notion of justification by faith and to Richard Niebuhr's "radical monotheism," this effort is the most theologically significant aspect of Harvey's work, but he never developed it beyond suggestive hints.

In the later stages of his career, this theme disappeared and the critical side of his work came to prominence. Harvey transformed himself from theologian into a skeptical student of religion, evident in "Nietzsche and the Kantian Paradigm of Religious Faith" (1989) and in his third book, *Feuerbach and the Interpretation of Religion* (1995), which won a prize from the American Academy of Religion. The latter work traces Feuerbach's intellectual development after his famous *The Essence of Christianity* and argues that Feuerbach dropped many of the Hegelian elements of that early work and created a much more powerful "naturalist-existentialist" paradigm for the interpretation of religion, which has important parallels in the contemporary study of religion. The result is a more critical interpretation of religion. Harvey shows how Feuerbach's later conception of the nature of religion itself requires rejecting efforts by liberal theologians and others to save religious meaning while avoiding literalistic constructions. As reflected in his writings over the last twenty years of his career, this Feuerbachian position represents Harvey's own final views as a critical student of religion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"On Believing What is Difficult to Understand," *Journal of Religion* 39 (1959): 219–31.
"D. F. Strauss' Life of Jesus Revisited," *Church History* 30 (1961): 191–211.
"Wie Neu ist die 'Neue Frage nach dem historischen Jesus'?" with S. M. Ogden, *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 59 (1962): 46–87.
"How New is the 'New Quest …'?," with S. M. Ogden, in *The Historical Jesus and the Kergymatic Christ*, ed. C. E. Braaten and R. A. Harrisville (New York, 1964), pp. 197–242.
A Handbook of Theological Terms (New York, 1964).
"The Historical Jesus, the Kerygma, and the Christian Faith," *Religion in Life* 43 (1964): 430–50.
The Historian and the Believer (New York, 1966; Philadelphia, 1981; Urbana, Ill., 1996).
"Is There an Ethics of Belief?" *Journal of Religion* 49 (1969): 41–58.
"A Christology for Barabbases," *Perkins School of Theology Journal* 29 (1976): 1–13.
"The Ethics of Belief Reconsidered," *Journal of Religion* 59 (1979): 406–20.

"The Dilemma of the Unbelieving Theologian," *American Journal of Theology and Philosophy* 2 (1981): 46–54.

"Nietzsche and the Kantian Paradigm of Religious Faith," in *Witness and Existence*, ed. P. E. Devenish and L. Goodwin (Chicago, 1989), pp. 140–61.

Feuerbach and the Interpretation of Religion (Cambridge, UK, 1995).

"Feuerbach on Luther's Doctrine of Revelation," *Journal of Religion* 78 (1997): 3–17.

Further Reading

Anderson, Tyson. "Resurrection and Radical Faith," *Religious Studies* 9 (1973): 171–80.

Evans, C. Stephen. "Critical Historical Judgment and Biblical Faith," *Faith and Philosophy* 11 (1994): 184–206.

Ferre, Nels F. S. "This Is My Point of Viewing," *Theology Today* 18 (1962): 506–12.

Hardwick, Charles D. "Rejoinder to Van Harvey," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 66 (1998): 883–6.

Charley D. Hardwick

HAUERWAS, Stanley Martin (1940–)

Stanley Martin Hauerwas was born on 24 July 1940 in Pleasant Grove, Texas. His father Coffee Martin Hauerwas was a bricklayer, which is important in understanding Hauerwas's philosophical development. After receiving his BA in philosophy from Southwestern University in Texas in 1962, he went on to Yale Divinity School and received a BD in 1965. He did his graduate work at Yale University and received an MA in theology, an MA in philosophy, and a PhD in theology all in 1968. He was assistant professor of theology at Augustana College in Illinois from 1968 to 1970, and a professor of theology at the University of Notre Dame from 1970 to 1984. Since 1984 Hauerwas has taught at Duke University, and is currently Gilbert T. Rowe Professor of Theological Ethics at Duke Divinity School and the School of Law.

Hauerwas has published over twenty-five books, including *A Community of Character* (1981), which was named among the one hundred most important books on religion in the twentieth century, and *With the Grain of the Universe: The Church's Witness and Natural Theology*, which were his Gifford Lectures given at the University of St. Andrews in 2001. In that same year, Hauerwas was named "America's Best Theologian" by *Time* magazine, which is an ironic honor since Hauerwas claims that "best" is not a theological category but "faithfulness" is. Anyone interested in the work of Hauerwas should begin by reading William Cavanaugh's "Stan the Man: A Thoroughly Biased Account of a Completely Unobjective Person" and Michael Cartwright's "A Reader's Guide" in *The Hauerwas Reader*. Both Cavanaugh and Cartwright note that Hauerwas's "ethics" are inseparable from his theology; this includes his recovery of the tradition of virtue and his philosophy of human action.

A consistent theme throughout Hauerwas's work is the inadequacy of much of modern philosophy because it makes human action primarily a matter of choice rather than vision. His dissertation, published as *Character and the Christian Life: A Study in Theological Ethics* (1975), in many ways is a theological version of G. E. M. Anscombe's *Intention*. In 1974 Hauerwas wrote that modern moral philosophers "see all moral agents as inhabiting the same world of facts; thus they discriminate between the different types of morality only in terms of acts and choices. But differences of moral vision or perspective may also exist." Then, drawing on Iris Murdoch, he argued "our morality is more than adherence to universalizable rules; it also encompasses

our experiences, fables, beliefs, images, concepts, and inner monologues" (*Vision and Virtue*, 1981, p. 34). He felt no compunction for using philosophy to make theological claims even when philosophers felt such compunction. Thus Hauerwas reads philosophers theologically, exposing their strengths and weaknesses. He also reads theologians philosophically. In *Wilderness Wanderings* (1997), his response to the theologian John B. COBB, JR. in an essay entitled "Knowing How to Go On When You Do Not Know Where You Are" asks where would someone have to stand to know how to use the words Cobb uses? Hauerwas admits that this essay is unintelligible without some familiarity with Ludwig Wittgenstein. Wittgenstein is always present in Hauerwas's work. A philosopher like Wittgenstein who begins philosophy with "Slab!" is compelling to the son of a bricklayer who apprenticed with his father. If philosophy helps us situate the language game within our knowledge of how to go on when someone says "Slab!" as well as the life-form within which such a language game is rendered intelligible, then Hauerwas's work is a fascinating exemplification of one of the most interesting philosophical movements in the twentieth century, for it shows how this philosophical movement cannot finally discriminate philosophy from theology if it is to be faithful to its own best insights.

Note for instance Hauerwas's "retrospective assessment" of his development of an ethics of character: "Back in the days when I made an honest living laying brick I learned a great deal from the colorful ways bricklayers and laborers described their work. For example, when laying the last brick, tile, or stone in a particularly difficult job a bricklayer often says, 'Man I wish I had started with that one'." (*Hauerwas Reader*, p. 75). Of course, the "point" here is that one cannot start with the last brick; laying the final brick presumes a timeful activity of bricklaying that has now come to an end, and bricklayers know they are at the end. If we asked them

how they knew they were at the end, they would point to the brick and say, "Because I've laid the last brick." If we asked, "On what grounds do you know you have laid the last brick?" the bricklayer rightly would not find us worthy of conversation. He can only say what he says when a building is finished and he can *see* it. *When* he says these words is as important as *that* he says them. Getting to the place where he can say them is what allows him to say them. In fact, for us to *explain* this is for us to say what the bricklayer *showed*. Some things can only be shown, even when they are done so through language. But they can be shown through language because there is something to see. As Hauerwas often puts the point, "you can only act in a world you can see; you can only see a world you can say." Hauerwas is a realist, and this is why he *knows* that thinking begins and ends in a local particular context. But this does not make him an empiricist or a positivist. The bricklayer does not know the last brick is laid because a sense impression in his mind matches some external reality. For instance, an observer could wrongly apperceive that the last brick was laid, thinking the building finished when it was not. He wrongly sensed a finished building, but it was an illusion. No such single criterion or set of criteria, as empiricism or positivism suggests, allows a bricklayer to know the last brick is laid. He knows it is laid because he laid it, which is a shorthand narrative that tells us he was part of a timeful activity of constructing a building, which is what is meant by the term "narrative."

Hauerwas's philosophy fits what Charles TAYLOR describes as *ad hominem* practical reasoning. *Ad hominem* practical reasoning does not seek neutral or universal criteria to adjudicate among competing positions; for it argues that such criteria cannot and do not exist. They can only be dangerous illusions where someone's "form of life" is no longer recognized as such. All reasoning is, at some level, *ad hominem* practical reasoning. That is

a universal claim, but it is neither self-refuting nor does it entail relativism. Simply because Hauerwas acknowledges, as did all the above-mentioned philosophers, that all knowledge begins in local, language-laden contexts, does not entail that truth is confined to those contexts. The argument that Hauerwas, any more than Wittgenstein, assumes fideist communities where people live in sectarian cultures is absurd. It says more about the fixation with foundationalist or mediationial epistemology of those who say it than it conveys any knowledge of Wittgenstein or Hauerwas's position. That someone speaks English with a Texas twang does not entail that they cannot communicate with Midwestern or Northeastern English-speakers, let alone French, Spanish, or German-speakers as well. Yet communication among these groups will require different practices, and they may vary according to time and place. Nevertheless communication is possible. We know this because we communicate. But to require a priori a theory as to how it is or is not possible is to forgo the very practices that make it possible in the first place. Inevitably such a theory privileges as neutral and universal a local practice, which now has no need to give an account of its privileged status. The desire for a universal and neutral criterion is akin to those new voice technologies that anchors for news programs undergo in order to disguise the region from which they came. Hauerwas's voice could never be that domesticated.

Hauerwas does not teach, publish, or present philosophy itself as worthy of our lives. He requires graduate students to read Aristotle's *Nichomachean Ethics*, and often does so before urging them to read Holy Scripture, but nevertheless Hauerwas's "philosophy" has little to no stake in philosophy for its own sake. Philosophy is the handmaiden of theology; for only theology can give us a telos worthy of our lives: friendship with God. Hauerwas begins and ends with his Christian faith and thinks philosophy departments ought to consider such a conviction "reasonable."

Imagine philosophy departments that offered Christian, Jewish, and Islamic studies taught by practitioners of those traditions. Hauerwas often notes, though, that Aquinas, Maimonides and Ibn Sinai would not be able to be hired or tenured in philosophy departments today (let alone religion and theology departments), which clearly shows how unreasonable they have become. As long as such persons are not hireable in philosophy departments, philosophers betray their pursuit of wisdom.

Hauerwas's work begins with an unapologetic commitment to the Christian faith. As he states in his *Sanctify Them in the Truth* (1998) and elsewhere, he seeks to show "what difference being a Christian might make." Is truth, then, "what works" for Hauerwas? No, because truth is finally a gift that calls us toward it rather than being a secure possession we can identify in us. Truth is Christologically determined. It is discovered in the truthfulness of faithful discipleship. It is an eschatological goal that is not "clearly known prior to the undertaking of the journey." Instead, "we learn better the nature of the end by being slowly transformed by the means necessary to pursue it."

Hauerwas says that he hopes his work exhibits that to be a faithful witness is to be a living mystery. "It means to live in such a way that one's life would not make sense if God did not exist" (*Hauerwas Reader*, p. 5). This is why Hauerwas's work is best understood as an exercise in practical reasoning. Hauerwas depends less on Aristotle for his account of practical reasoning than he does on the Mennonite theologian John Howard YODER. Hauerwas's explication of Yoder's theology has in part to do with the role practical reasoning must play in a good performance of Mennonite church life. This is not to romanticize the Mennonites; they are as corrupt as other modern church formations. (Hauerwas is no triumphalist when it comes to the contemporary church.) But it is to show how their life together makes best sense when it is a life

that risks practical moral reasoning. He explains this:

> Practical moral reasoning is a conversation of a community that can risk judgment because of its willingness to forgive. Moral judgments are not deductive applications of universally valid rules, but the confrontation of one person by another on matters that matter for the whole community. Private wrongs in fact are public matters, since the very nature of the community and its moral discourse depends on calling sin, sin, with the hope of reconciliation. (1988, p. 73)

Note that practical reasoning is inseparable from the practices of specific, local communities. It does not mean that those communities do not also have theories, doctrines, and universal claims. They could not be communities without them. But it means that those theories, doctrines, and universal claims matter in everyday life. They cannot be abstracted from everyday practices. Practice and theory, therefore, meet in the context of concrete local communities.

Further key themes in Hauerwas's thought include vision, virtue, character, narrative, tradition, telos, witness, and church. Vision is a central theme for Hauerwas. Although he moved away from some terms found in his early work, such as "experience," "central metaphor," and "inner monologues," the importance of vision remains. Vision has to do with the take on the world one's language makes possible. Language allows us to "see" such that what we see also allows us to act. Following the work of Alasdair MacIntyre, Hauerwas recognizes that the most basic form of action is not action per se but "intelligible action," which is related to telos.

A telos is the end for which one acts. Hauerwas follows Aristotle and Aquinas in assuming that the will is not a discrete faculty separate from the intellect, but the will is "rational appetite." Therefore, the will acts based on what the intellect envisions. The intellect sees the good that elicits the will's desire. If the good is mere human preference, moral human action would not exist. All human action, since it is always associated with desire, takes place under some quest for the good. The good is inescapable; all action assumes a teleological ordering, but not every pursuit done in the name of the good is a good pursuit. What constitutes goodness still needs further specification. Christian moral actions assume friendship with God in and through Christ as the end that should render our actions intelligible. Such intelligible actions, properly ordered to that end, are virtues.

Hauerwas recovered the importance of the virtues for doing theological ethics. He uses the virtues to argue against the Protestant doctrine that strictly distinguishes faith from works. For Hauerwas, the virtues provide what is needed to show that faith and works are interrelated and dependent upon one another. In order to be faithful one must be formed virtuously within the context of the church. Much of his work is an explication of the virtues and the ecclesial context that makes them possible. Hauerwas has an abiding interest in the importance of "character," (Greek, "hexis," Latin "habitus") which results from our virtuous formation. This is his Christian anthropology, which is intimately related to the doctrine of sanctification. We have "character" because God seeks for us to be holy.

Hauerwas uses Aristotle, Aquinas, and Anscombe to develop his "ethics of character." It is determined by a notion of practical reason that forms the beliefs, desires, and intentions of the acting agent. "Character," he notes, "is the qualification or determination of our self-agency, formed by having certain intentions (and beliefs) rather than others" (1975, p. 115). In *A Community of Character*, he explicitly moves beyond this definition of character and develops the importance of narrative for the purpose of showing how character is acquired and the necessary conditions for such acquisitions. To understand rightly the

character of a particular agent is to understand the narratives that form the particular agent.

As character assumes virtue which assumes a telos which assumes virtue and character, all these essential themes assume narrative. Although "narrative" could suggest a systematic ordering of beginning, middle, and end, this is not how it functions for Hauerwas's ethics. A good story can begin anywhere; what makes it a good story is the development of characters and a plot such that the "events" of the story find their place in a well-told story. Hauerwas's ethics does not begin at a single place. His work is more like a well-told story. He uses MacIntyre to argue that human action is unintelligible separate from its "narrative" wholeness. However, as the term "narrative" became increasingly popular and used to legitimate a kind of relativism that verged on solipsism, Hauerwas became wary of the term's use in contemporary theological ethics and decided that narrative theology had to take into account specific traditions.

Narratives do not exist separate from the institutions and traditions that make them possible. Institutions are necessary, but their purpose is to provide the space and time for traditional communal discourses where knowledge and wisdom are presented as goods to be embodied. Far from any sectarian leanings, Hauerwas remains deeply committed to specific institutions such as the university with its practices of appointment, promotion, and tenure. However, this commitment to and advocacy for institutions is not for the institution per se. It is so that space and time can be made in which traditional discourse can be pursued. If an institution does not provide space and time for such pursuits, if it becomes an end in itself, then Hauerwas finds it incapable of producing virtue and thus not worthy of our lives. The modern nation–state has become such an institution, which is why Hauerwas finds participation in the Church – especially the Eucharist – to be the most significant political act one can perform.

Hauerwas's ecclesiology is in the terms of American pragmatism, whether it is using William JAMES to develop his use of truth as truthfulness or arguing with Richard RORTY about what constitutes politics. Like the pragmatists, Hauerwas makes the community – not the individual – the place that Christian convictions are justifiable. Hauerwas is perhaps a better pragmatist than most pragmatists because he always speaks to a particular community – a practice that pragmatists talk about doing but do not do very often. The Church thus is not merely an institution, for Hauerwas, but God's expression of a story-formed community where God's politics slowly but decisively take form. This does not mean that God only works in and through the Church. Hauerwas is open to other religious traditions making similar claims for how God works in their communities. Christians, Jews, and Muslims might find common ground through some common practices and convictions, but we do not know this until we converse with each other firmly grounded in our own traditions. Thus Hauerwas works with Rabbi Peter Ochs in the "radical tradition" book series. But Hauerwas will not countenance the liberal move that assumes one's church location is ornamental to a more fundamental religious a priori all "religions" share in common. One must be located ecclesially to be part of the conversation. For Christians, the social location that allows them to speak well about God is the Church. It is the time in which people "out of every tribe, nation, tongue and people" (Revelation 5) come together to inhabit a new time, a liturgical time. When it is faithful to its story it will be a nonviolent school of virtue. Hauerwas fears that this story-formed community has been policed by the democratic institutions that claim to give us freedom. Thus he writes, "Christians have learned to police their convictions in the name of sustaining such [democratic] social orders. They cannot appear in public using explicit Christian language since that would offend other actors in our alleged

pluralist polity. But if this is genuinely a pluralist society, why should Christians not be able to express their most cherished convictions in public?" (1994, p. 93) To refuse this policing through faithful witness is the heart of Hauerwas's work.

For Hauerwas, witness describes the way that the church relates to the world. As the body of Christ, the Church serves the world by being a witness to the peace that is only found in Christ. Hauerwas uses this conception of witness to show how the Church is a common life against those who think that politics is constituted outside of the Church. This is most fully developed in his 2001 Gifford Lectures, *With the Grain of the Universe: The Church's Witness and Natural Theology*. The irony involved in these lectures should not be lost on the reader. The Gifford Lectures were intended to advance the cause of "natural theology," which is the very kind of theology that Hauerwas works against. Natural theology normally assumes a universal account of religion separate from any specific, particular teachings of the faith. Most persons assumed Hauerwas would attack "natural theology" in his Gifford lectures, but he did just the opposite. He even drew favorably on James, but he did so based on a statement of Yoder that "people who bear crosses" work "with the grain of the universe." In other words, what is "natural" is not self-evident based on observation, but depends upon being able to see well what God did in the life, crucifixion, resurrection and ascension of Christ. Christians owe it to their non-Christian brother and sisters to show them the difference it makes that "the cross of Christ" is not "incidental to God's being" (2001, p. 17). Hauerwas makes his argument for the centrality of witnessing to the cross and resurrection as the most "natural" way of being in the world. If we ever had Hauerwas's vision, the world would not be the same. We would find ourselves spinning in the most natural of all directions, a direction we often fight against but one in which reason, faith, grace, nature, philosophy, and theology all naturally lead; we would spin with the grain of the universe.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Character and the Christian Life: A Study in Theological Ethics (San Antonio, Tex., 1975).

Truthfulness and Tragedy: Further Investigations in Christian Ethics (Notre Dame, Ind., 1977).

Vision and Virtue: Essays in Christian Ethical Reflection (Notre Dame, Ind., 1981).

A Community of Character: Toward a Constructive Christian Social Ethic (Notre Dame, Ind., 1981).

The Peaceable Kingdom: A Primer in Christian Ethics (Notre Dame, Ind., 1983).

Should War Be Eliminated? Philosophical and Theological Explorations (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1984).

Against the Nations: War and Survival in a Liberal Society (Minneapolis, 1985).

Suffering Presence: Theological Reflections on Medicine, the Mentally Handicapped, and the Church (Notre Dame, Ind., 1985).

Christian Existence Today: Essays on Church, World, and Living in Between (Durham, N.C., 1988).

Naming the Silences: God, Medicine, and the Problem of Suffering (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1990).

Unleashing the Scriptures: Freeing the Bible from Captivity to America (Nashville, Tenn., 1993).

Dispatches from the Front: Theological Engagements with the Secular (Durham, N.C., 1994).

In Good Company: The Church as Polis (Notre Dame, Ind., 1995).

Christians Among the Virtues: Theological Conversations with Ancient and Modern Ethics (Notre Dame, Ind., 1997).

Wilderness Wanderings: Probing Twentieth-century Theology and

Philosophy (Boulder, Col., 1997).

Sanctify Them in the Truth: Holiness Exemplified (Nashville, Tenn., 1998).

After Christendom?: How the Church Is to Behave If Freedom, Justice, and a Christian Nation Are Bad Ideas (Nashville, Tenn., 1999).

A Better Hope: Resources for a Church Confronting Capitalism, Democracy, and Post-modernity (Grand Rapids, Mich., 2000).

With the Grain of the Universe: The Church's Witness and Natural Theology (Grand Rapids, Mich., 2001).

Performing the Faith: Bonhoeffer and the Practice of Nonviolence (Grand Rapids, Mich., 2004).

Cross-shattered Christ: Meditations on the Seven Last Words (Grand Rapids, Mich., 2005).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with L. Gregory Jones, *Why Narrative? Readings in Narrative Theology* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1989).

Ed. with John Westerhoff, *Schooling Christians: "Holy Experiments" in American Education* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1992).

The Hauerwas Reader, ed. John Berkman and Michael Cartwright (Durham, N.C., 2001).

Further Reading

Kallenberg, Brad. *Ethics as Grammar: Changing the Postmodern Subject* (Notre Dame, Ind., 2001).

Katongole, Emmanuel. *Beyond Universal Reason: The Relation between Religion and Ethics in the Work of Stanley Hauerwas* (Notre Dame, Ind., 2000).

Nation, Mark Thiessen, and Samuel Wells, eds. *Faithfulness and Fortitude: In Conversation with the Theological Ethics of Stanley Hauerwas* (Edinburgh, 2000).

Rasmusson, Arne. *The Church as Polis: From Political Theology to Theological Politics as Exemplified by Jurgen Moltmann and Stanley Hauerwas* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1995).

Wells, Samuel. *Transforming Fate into Destiny: The Theological Ethics of Stanley Hauerwas* (Waynesboro, Georgia, 1998).

Jacob Lynn Goodson
D. Stephen Long

HAUSMAN, Carl Ransdell (1924–)

Carl Hausman was born on 7 December 1924 in St. Louis, Missouri. He received his BA from the University of Louisville in 1949, his MA from Duke University in 1951, and his PhD in philosophy from Northwestern University in 1960. His dissertation on "Creativity and Art" was supervised by Eliseo VIVAS and revised as *The Existence of Novelty*, published in 1966. Hausman also minored in art history, and his lifelong study of creativity has been informed by his personal experience as a painter. Hausman spent the majority of his professional career at the Pennsylvania State University, where he was a professor of philosophy from 1967 to 1993. He was Executive Director of the Foundation for the Philosophy of Creativity in the early 1980s, President of the Charles S. Peirce Society in 1992, and he was a founding editor of the *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* in 1987. In 1991 Hausman was elected as a fellow to the Pennsylvania State University Institute for Arts and Humanistic Studies. He remains active as both a teacher and a scholar.

Hausman is best known for his contributions to creativity studies and to Charles PEIRCE scholarship. In *A Discourse on Novelty and Creation*, Hausman argued that the phenomenon of creativity could be rendered intelligible without being reduced to antecedent con-

ditions. To this end Hausman sketched a theory of metaphor that provided a framework for explaining the creation of new meaning in both the verbal and nonverbal arts. Five years later, in *Metaphor and Art*, Hausman expanded upon this theory by offering a new rendition of the influential interaction theory of metaphor, arguing that novel metaphors create not only new meanings but also new referents of meanings. *Metaphor and Art* won a *Choice* Book of the Year Award in 1989.

Hausman is explicit about his affinity with and indebtedness to Peirce. In *Charles S. Peirce's Evolutionary Philosophy* (1993), Hausman offered a systematic introduction to Peirce which emphasized Peirce's commitment to an evolutionary realism, a realism in which teleological generality evolves in a process of cosmic creativity. Hausman gave special care to explaining why Peirce understood this cosmic evolution and creation, in its most general features, to be consistent with the general features of *agape* or Christian love. Hausman has also stressed the significance of Peirce's semiotic notion of the "dynamical object" for appreciating how the Peircean real places resistance on perception and interpretation. Hausman saw the various ways that these Peircean themes could be fruitfully applied to creativity studies, and he successfully integrated each of these notions – developmental teleology, *agape*, and the dynamical object – into his study of creativity and metaphor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Art and Symbol," *Review of Metaphysics* 25 (1961): 256–70.
A Discourse on Novelty and Creation (The Hague, 1975; 2nd edn, Albany, N.Y., 1984).
Charles S. Peirce's Evolutionary Philosophy (Cambridge, UK, 1993; 2nd edn 1997).
"Charles Peirce and the Origin of Interpretation," in *The Rule of Reason: The Philosophy of Charles Sanders Peirce*, ed. Jacqueline Brunning and Paul Forster (Toronto, 1997).
"The Paradox of Creative Interpretation in the Arts," in *A Companion to Art Theory*, ed. Paul Smith and Carolyn Wilde (Oxford, 2002).

Other Relevant Works
"Eros and Agape in Creative Evolution: A Peircean Insight," *Process Studies* 4 (1975): 11–25.
Metaphor and Art (Cambridge, UK, 1989).
"Value and the Peircean Categories," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 15 (1979): 203–23.
"In and Out of Peirce's Percepts," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 26 (1990): 271–308.
"Figurative Language in Art History," in *The Language of Art History*, ed. Salim Kemal and Ivan Gaskell (Cambridge, UK, 1991).

Further Reading
Ridely, Aaron. "Collingwood's Commitments: A Reply to Hausman and Dilworth," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 56 (1998): 396–8.

Michael Ventimiglia

HAVEN, Joseph (1816–74)

Joseph Haven was born on 4 January 1816 in Dennis, Massachusetts. He received his BA in 1835 and MA in 1838 from Amherst College. Haven then studied at Union Theological Seminary in New York City in 1836–7 and at Andover Theological Seminary from 1837 to 1839. He was ordained a minister in 1839 at Ashland, Massachusetts, and served the church there until 1846. In 1840 he married Mary Emerson, the daughter of Ralph Waldo

EMERSON, with whom he had ten children. From 1846 to 1850 he was minister of the Harvard Church in Brookline, Massachusetts. During this period Haven was the editor of *The Congregationalist*.

In 1850 Haven became professor of mental and moral philosophy at Amherst College, succeeding Henry Boynton SMITH. He remained at Amherst until 1858, when he was appointed professor of systematic theology at the Chicago Theological Seminary. Haven retired in 1870, but after several years of occasional teaching, lecturing, and traveling, he returned briefly to university service in 1873–4 as acting professor of mental and moral philosophy at the first University of Chicago (which closed in 1885). He received a DD from Marietta College in 1859, a DD from Amherst College in 1862, and an LLD from Kenyon College in 1862. Haven died on 23 May 1874 in Chicago, Illinois.

Haven wrote the book for which he is best known, *Mental Philosophy* (1857), as a text for use by his students. A second textbook, *Moral Philosophy* (1859), was also written at Amherst for student use as a sequel and supplement to his *Mental Philosophy*. A collection of previously published essays, *Studies in Philosophy and Theology* (1869), and a *History of Philosophy* (1876) were published later in his career.

Mental Philosophy dealt with a natural science of mind "resting on experience, observation, and induction – a science of facts, phenomena, and laws" for which "the word Psychology is now coming into use …" (1857, p. 16). The unitary mind expressed itself through faculties, primarily the tripartite categories of Intellect, Sensibilities, and Will. Haven's intellectual debt, like that of most of the authors of such texts in this period, was primarily to John Locke and the Scottish School of Common Sense. In 1889, Haven's *Mental Philosophy* became the first Western psychology textbook translated into Chinese; it had been previously translated into Japanese in 1875 (Kodama 1991).

For Haven, the understanding of moral science depended upon an understanding of mental philosophy; moral conduct depended upon the action of mind. The moral faculty was subsumed under the intellect and was part of the mind's capacity for reasoning. Haven rejected theories that attributed moral judgments to the sensibilities (feelings). Haven's moral philosophy was, nonetheless, a science separate from mental philosophy that focused on the laws of conduct and duty. Haven stressed especially the moral guides appropriate to the political responsibilities of citizens.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Mental Philosophy (New York, 1857).
Moral Philosophy: Including Theoretical and Practical Ethics (Boston, 1859).
Systematic Divinity (Boston, 1875).

Other Relevant Works
A History of Philosophy Ancient and Modern (New York, 1876).
Studies in Philosophy and Theology (Andover, Mass., 1869).

Further Reading
Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v2*
Kodama, Seiji. "Life and Work of Y. K. Yen, the First Person to Introduce Western Psychology to China," *Psychologia: An International Journal of Psychology in the Orient* 34 (1991): 213–26.

Alfred H. Fuchs

HAYDON, Albert Eustace (1880–1975)

Albert E. Haydon was born on 17 January 1880 in Brampton, Ontario, Canada. He received degrees from McMaster University:

the BA (1901), B.Th. (1903), BD (1906), and MA (1907). The University of Saskatchewan awarded him the MA (1912) *ad eundem gradum*. Haydon was ordained to the Baptist ministry and served Baptist churches in Dresden and Fort Williams, Ontario (1903–18). While still serving as a Baptist minister, he became a doctoral student at the University of Chicago under George B. FOSTER. He received his PhD in theology in 1918 from the University of Chicago; his dissertation was "The Conception of God in the Pragmatic Philosophy." Haydon succeeded Foster in 1918 as professor and chair of the department of comparative religion. During his years at Chicago, he aligned himself with both the Unitarian and Ethical Culture traditions. Haydon ministered to the First Unitarian Society of Madison, Wisconsin from 1918 to 1923. Haydon retired in 1945, and then served as Leader of the Chicago Ethical Society from 1945 to 1955. In 1956 he was awarded the American Humanist Association's Humanist of the Year award, and McMaster University awarded him an honorary LLD in 1964. Haydon died on 1 April 1975 in Santa Monica, California.

Haydon's contributions to the field of comparative religion are evident in numerous books and articles. He participated in a new era in the study of religions, which sought objectivity and made an attempt to escape the limitations of apologetics. He offered some "warning canons" for those engaged in such study: the necessity of (1) escaping all bias, (2) being scientific, (3) rigidly excluding all a priori ideas, (4) considering every idea and institution within its total situational context, and (5) avoiding the use of all jargon, often ending in "-ism." Haydon stressed the need to give specific individual significance to every element of religious study, keeping in mind that no single science can provide a descriptive interpretation of the materials of religion.

Haydon argued that the new study of religion was hampered by an idea of religion dictated by the patterns of Christianity: (1) the idea of a personal relationship with God and the spiritual world, (2) the belief about God and the supernatural being accepted as embodiments of truth, and (3) the idea that humans are universally endowed by nature with a capacity to apprehend God. He argued that the result in the first phase of the scientific study of religion was inappropriately to judge all "culture religions" by these dominant ideas of Christianity.

From Haydon's perspective, the key mistake in past studies was to approach religion as if the gods or beliefs were the central focus of religion. This approach considers primitive people to hold inferior beliefs and those who project gods as supernatural beings to hold a superior belief.

Haydon proposed that religion be approached as a social matter concerning the life interests of the group, taking into account the social, intellectual, emotional, and physical components of the religious complex. Haydon defined religion as a way of living in which a group functions to acquire a complete and fully satisfying life. Such a life requires a socially accepted set of practical and ideal values, a social technique for realizing them, and an understanding of a social relationship with the extrahuman powers impacting life. In essence, religion, for Haydon, is a functional cooperative or shared quest of the "good life" or ideally satisfying life.

When a religion moves beyond a focus on the human struggle to survive, it becomes, according to Haydon, a "culture religion." When religion adopts values that go beyond material survival, its gods cease being nature gods and become gods who help in the realization of these values. Religion changes from the search for a good life in this world to the quest for a good life in a future world. With this radical transformation, the goals and characteristics of religion change. Instead of reinforcing the value of human effort in solving problems, emphasis is given to inherent human weakness and the tragedy of human effort overwhelmed by the forces of evil. Individual immortality emerges as a new theme, and religion became the way of achieving it. Haydon postulates the

demise of supernatural religion in modern cultures, because the historic deities are no longer at home in the intellectual climate of science and technology and because modern changes in social organization no longer require the help of the gods to establish justice and to order society. He pointed out that these cultural changes undermine the traditions and institutions related to supernatural gods, with the result that these gods will die.

Haydon viewed it as a cruel irony that, as humans are increasingly able to satisfy their material wants, they lack a religion that can give direction to their quest. What is needed is a synthesis of the religious vision, a unifying goal, to give direction to modern society. The role of religion is to summon the intelligence and good will available for developing a social order in which creative efforts will support spiritual or ideal values – values that provide a more satisfying life for all persons and a way of living to enable the hopes and ideals of the modern age to be fulfilled.

For Haydon, a religion for the modern age will make it obvious that the human task is here on this little planet, because it is here that a cosmic, value-increasing process has reached a level of consciousness and personality. He argued that such a religion is possible if humans will apply scientific analysis to the problems that hinder the quest for a good life for all. Haydon believed that the scientific method is not a cure-all for the ailments of our individual–social–economic organism. Nor does this living religion offer the absolute assurance and dogma of supernatural religion. However, he contended that applying the scientific method could foster the development of piecemeal solutions based on an intelligent ordering of human affairs in light of common ideals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Quest of the Ages (New York, 1929).

Modern Trends in World Religions (Chicago, 1934).

Man's Search for the Good Life: An Inquiry into the Nature of Religions (New York, 1937).

Biography of the Gods (New York, 1941).

Other Relevant Works

Materials by and about Haydon are at the University of Chicago, the First Unitarian Society in Madison, Wisconsin, and the Chicago Ethical Humanist Society.

"What Constitutes A Scientific Interpretation of Religion?" *Journal of Religion* 6 (1926): 243–9.

"The Definition of Religion," *Journal of Religion* 7 (1927): 125–35.

"History of Religions," in *Religious Thought in the Last Quarter-Century,* ed. Gerald B. Smith (Chicago, 1927).

Ed., *Modern Trends in World-Religions* (Chicago, 1934).

"The Interpretation of Religion in the Western Tradition," *Journal of Religion* 16 (1936): 153–74.

"Christianity and Humanism," *Journal of Religion* 21 (1941): 177–9.

"Is Scientific Humanism Religious?" *Religious Humanism* 2 (1968): 49–51.

"Prolegomena to Method in the Study of Religion," *Religious Humanism* 3 (1969): 158–60.

Further Reading

Encyc Relig, Who Was Who in Amer v6, Who's Who in Phil

Peden, Creighton W. "Albert Eustace Haydon," in *The Chicago School: Voices in Liberal Religious Thought* (Bristol, Ind., 1987), pp. 72–83.

Wilson, Edwin. "A. Eustace Haydon: Notes by a Former Student," *Religious Humanism* 16 (1982): 79–83.

W. Creighton Peden

HAYEK, Friedrich August von
(1899–1992)

Friedrich August von Hayek was born on 8 May 1899 in Vienna, Austro-Hungary, and died on 23 March 1992 in Freiburg, Germany. Hayek was born into a family of intellectuals; he was the oldest of three boys all of whom became professors. His earliest education was in the field of biology. One can see the connection between the evolutionary view of the world in biology and Hayek's later work in economics, political science, and philosophy. From 1918 to 1921 he studied at the University of Vienna under Friedrick Weiser. Hayek, although enrolled as a law student, focused on economics, earning doctorates in 1921 and 1923 respectively. After doing post-graduate work studying economics at New York University in 1923–4, he was the Director of the Austrian Institute of Economic Research from 1927 to 1931. In 1931 he accepted the Tooke Chair in Economics and Statistics at the University of London (London School of Economics and Political Science). He remained in this position until 1950, becoming a naturalized British citizen in 1938. From 1950 to 1962 he was professor of social and moral science at the University of Chicago. Upon reaching mandatory retirement age at Chicago, he accepted an economics chair at the University of Freiburg. He remained at Freiburg after retiring in 1968 as professor emeritus. In 1974 he shared the Nobel Prize for Economics with the Swedish economic liberal Gunnar Myrdal. Hayek was awarded the Companion of Honour in Britain in 1984 and the Medal of Freedom by the United States in 1991.

In the 1920s Hayek worked for the Austrian government, later accepting a position as the Director of the Institute for Business Cycle Research in Vienna. At this time Hayek came under the influence of the Austrian economist, Ludwig von Mises. Mises's work on the socialist calculation and the impossibility of socialism shifted Hayek away from the Fabian socialist ideals acquired as a youth. Early in his career, Hayek distinguished himself with his *Prices and Production* (1931) and *Monetary Theory and the Trade Cycle* (1933), in which he developed the Austrian Business Cycle theory. This theory postulated that business cycles were not the result of structural problems inherent in the market economy but rather were a result of credit expansion by central banks. In the 1930s the Austrian Business Cycle Theory became the main rival to Cambridge economist John Maynard Keynes's theory that business cycles were the result of inherent flaws in the unhampered market. It was through his work on business cycles and capital theory that Hayek first gained his reputation as a prominent economist.

Hayek also made key contributions to the famous socialist calculation debate, building on the work of his teacher Ludwig von Mises. Mises had argued that socialism was impossible because of inability of the socialist planners to engage in economic calculation. Without private property, Mises contended, there could be no markets. With no markets there could be no prices and with no prices there could be no economic calculation. Hayek further developed this argument, claiming that socialism would ultimately fail because central planners could not possess the essential economic information – the tacit knowledge of time and place – which was dispersed throughout the economy and was continually changing. Prices served to economize on this dispersed information. Following Mises, Hayek argued that this communication mechanism would be missing in the absence of private property and hence, markets. Hayek's work on dispersed knowledge culminated in a series of essays in the 1940s, which are collected in *Individualism and Economic Order* (1948). In addition to the aforementioned contributions to the socialist calculation debate, his focus on the importance of dispersed knowledge was the foundation of Hayek's later work in political philosophy.

While the general intellectual climate in the 1930s and 1940s was not overly receptive to Hayek's work on business cycles and the socialist calculation debate, this was not the case in the context of the general public. In 1944 Hayek published *The Road to Serfdom*, which was widely recognized throughout the United States and appeared in an abridged version in *Reader's Digest*. Hayek's argument was that socialism, rising in popularity among the educated class, had the same essential features as fascism.

In addition to his scholarly work, Hayek also worked to organize intellectuals in the classical liberal tradition to reinvigorate the movement in support of a free society. He founded the Mount Pelerin Society in 1946 which had a large influence on economic policy in the second half of the twentieth century. Active members include such Nobel Prize winners in economics as Milton FRIEDMAN, George Stigler, Ronald Coase, Gary Becker, and James BUCHANAN.

Hayek pursued research in areas other than technical economics. For example, in 1952 he published *The Sensory Order*, a study of psychology and the philosophy of the mind, and *The Counter-Revolution of Science* on the philosophy of science. In his later career, he published his political treatise, *The Constitution of Liberty* (1960) and his three-volume legal study, *Law Legislation and Liberty* in the years spanning 1973 through 1979. In 1988 Hayek published *The Fatal Conceit*, a summary of his life's work focusing on the evolution of society and the errors of "socialists of all parties."

In 1974 Hayek was awarded the Nobel Prize in Economics for his work in the theory of money and economic fluctuations and his interdisciplinary analysis of economic, social, and institutional phenomena. Many view his work as the dominant influence on the Reagan revolution in the US and the Thatcher administration in Great Britain.

Hayek's career drew from the multiple disciplines of economics, political science and philosophy, and was dedicated to the study of spontaneous orders. Spontaneous orders are institutions, economic orders or norms that serve a social purpose but which are not the result of intentional human planning. The Scottish philosopher, Adam Ferguson, characterized spontaneous orders as "the product of human action but not human design." Hayek spent his career criticizing the notion of rational constructivism. He emphasized the ability and need for societies to develop institutions that reflect the experience of past generations. In contrast, proponents of government planning attempted to destroy these orders and replace them with "rational" orders. For Hayek, the information and knowledge necessary for a successful and well-functioning society is not in the mind of one individual, but rather is distributed across millions of individual agents. Planning will ultimately fail because no single mind or group of minds can possess, let alone process, the underlying knowledge and experience of an entire society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Prices and Production (London, 1931).
Monetary Theory and the Trade Cycle (London, 1933).
The Pure Theory of Capital (Chicago, 1941).
The Road to Serfdom (Chicago, 1944).
Individualism and Economic Order (Chicago, 1948).
The Sensory Order (Chicago, 1952).
The Counter-Revolution of Science (Chicago, 1952).
The Constitution of Liberty (Chicago, 1960).
Law Legislation and Liberty, 3 vols (Chicago, 1973–9).
The Fatal Conceit (Chicago, 1988).

Other Relevant Works
Hayek's papers are at the Hoover Institution Library and Archives at Stanford University, California.

The Collected Works of F. A. Hayek, 10 vols, ed. William W. Bartley, III, Peter Klein, and Bruce Caldwell (Chicago, 1989–).

Hayek on Hayek: An Autobiographical Dialogue, ed. Stephen Kresge and Leif Wenar (Chicago, 1994).

Further Reading

Comp Amer Thought, *Dict Economics*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Who Was Who in Amer v10*

Barry, Norman P. *Hayek's Social and Economic Philosophy* (London, 1979).

Boettke, Peter J., ed. *The Legacy of F. A. Hayek: Politics, Philosophy and Economics*, 3 vols (Cheltenham, UK, 1999).

Buckley, William F., Jr., ed. *Essays on Hayek* (New York, 1976).

Caldwell, Bruce J. *Hayek's Challenge: An Intellectual Biography of F. A. Hayek* (Chicago, 2004).

Ebenstein, Alan O. *Friedrich Hayek: A Biography* (New York, 2001).

Gray, John. *Hayek on Liberty* (Oxford, 1984).

Kley, Roland. *Hayek's Social and Political Thought* (Oxford, 1994).

Sciabarra, Chris M. *Marx, Hayek, and Utopia* (Albany, N.Y., 1995).

Walker, Graham. *The Ethics of F. A. Hayek* (Lanham, Md., 1986).

Peter J. Boettke
Christopher J. Coyne

HEBB, Donald Olding (1904–85)

Donald O. Hebb was born on 22 July 1904 in Chester, Nova Scotia, Canada, and died on 20 August 1985 in Halifax, Nova Scotia. He graduated with the BA from Dalhousie University in 1925 and worked as a primary and secondary school teacher and principal for several years. A persistent interest in psychology led him to part-time graduate study at McGill University, where he attained the MA in 1932. Finally deciding in 1934 on a full-time career as a psychologist, he chose to study with Karl Lashley at Chicago, moving with him to Harvard the following year and receiving the PhD in psychology there in 1936.

Hebb was a research assistant to Wilder Penfield at the Montreal Neurological Institute from 1937 to 1939 and an instructor at Queens University until 1942, when he rejoined Lashley as a research fellow at the Yerkes Laboratories for Primate Biology in Florida. In 1947 he returned to a professorship in psychology at McGill, became department chair the following year, and served a term as University Chancellor from 1970 to 1972. He retired in 1977, accepting an honorary professorship at Dalhousie and continuing to write until his death.

In his apprenticeship as a psychologist, Hebb came into contact with three of the most significant neuropsychological theorists of the first half of the twentieth century: Ivan Pavlov (represented by his McGill teachers Boris Babkin and Leonid Andreyev), Karl Lashley, and Wilder Penfield. In the context of their research programs he confronted several problems, among which were the formation of concepts, the localization of memory in the brain, and the emotional and behavioral effects of the perception of novelty. His response to these was his most important achievement, the neuropsychological theory synthesized in his 1949 book *The Organization of Behavior* and elaborated over the next three decades. Hebb posited that neurons become linked together via changes in synaptic activity, forming what he termed "cell assemblies." While experience is necessary for the creation of these groupings, once formed they can function autonomously as ideas or memories, and can interact with other cell assemblies, creating what he termed

"phase sequences." A brain organized in this way not only perceives, recognizes, and reacts to external stimuli, but can also recognize environmental novelty and, through internal recombination of assemblies, think novel thoughts. In short, cell assemblies create the mind.

Hebb's theory has been one of the most fruitful in psychology. Several of its conjectures, especially those regarding synaptic change, have been corroborated by later research. From a philosophical standpoint, it provides a plausible mechanism for associationism, and it has been taken as a point of departure for much subsequent theorizing in cognitive science and neurophilosophy.

Hebb claimed to be only a "stickit philosopher," but he was adamant about the need for psychology to be grounded in philosophy, an unpopular view in his behaviorist times. He held to monism, determinism, and mind–brain identity, insisted that every psychologist take a position on the mind–body problem, and advocated belief in free choice between entirely determined courses of action. Hebb saw the mind as a useful product of evolution and the source of specifically human creativity, much as did William JAMES, whom Hebb acknowledged many times as an influence on his thought.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Organization of Behavior: A Neuropsychological Theory (New York, 1949).

"What Psychology is About," *American Psychologist* 81 (1974): 71–9.

Essay on Mind (Hillsdale, N.J., 1980).

Other Relevant Works

Hebb's papers are at McGill University.

"D. O. Hebb," in *A History of Psychology in Autobiography*, vol. 7, ed. Gardner Lindzey (San Francisco, 1980), pp. 273–303.

The Conceptual Nervous System, ed. Warren Buchtel (New York, 1982).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Encyc Cog Sci*, *Encyc Psych*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Who Was Who in Amer v9*

Glickman, S. "Donald Olding Hebb: Returning the Nervous System to Psychology," in *Portraits of Pioneers in Psychology*, vol. 2, eds G. A. Kimble, C. A. Bonaeau, and M. Wertheimer (Washington, D.C., 1996), pp. 227–44.

Klein, Raymond M., and Peter W. Jusczyk, eds. *The Nature of Thought: Essays in Honor of D. O. Hebb* (Hillsdale, N.J., 1980).

Milner, Peter. "Donald O. Hebb and the Mind," in *Foundations of Cognitive Psychology: Core Readings*, ed. Daniel Levitin (Cambridge, Mass., 2002), pp. 831–9.

David C. Devonis

HECKER, Isaac Thomas (1819–88)

Isaac Hecker was born on 18 December 1819 in New York City. A Catholic priest, he was the founder of the Society of Missionary Priests of St. Paul the Apostle (Paulists). As a philosopher Hecker was primarily interested in demonstrating the compatibility of Christianity and the culture of the nineteenth century in America, departing from the orthodox Catholic theology based upon Rome's authority.

Hecker only had a few years of public schooling in New York City and was raised as a Methodist. His brothers were involved in the 1830s with the Locofoco movement, inviting Boston Unitarian minister Orestes BROWNSON to New York to address factory workers on economics and political reform. Hecker and Brownson became friends; Brownson introduced him to transcendentalism and Henry David Thoreau.

In 1844, Hecker became a Roman Catholic, joining the congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer and receiving an education in Belgium and Holland for the priesthood. He was ordained in London in 1849 and returned in 1851 to the United States as a missionary focused on preaching and writing.

Hecker's philosophical reflections were influenced by German Romanticism and Kantian idealism. He made theological arguments that confession and absolution were simply sacramental expressions of human striving and culture, causing some church leaders to fear Hecker's American pragmatic approach to theology. Although Hecker was not initially given permission to found the Paulists because he lacked the support of his own superior, in 1858 Pope Pius IX allowed Hecker and four Americans to found the Society of Missionary Priests of St. Paul the Apostle, in New York City. The original purpose of the order was to convert American Protestants in particular. Hecker became the leader of the Paulists and held the position of superior until he died.

The Paulists never attracted a numerically significant membership, but Hecker's order did produce several important leaders in American Catholicism during the twentieth century. Hecker's life and philosophy came to fruition in Paulist Press, which later became an important publisher of materials on liturgy, New and Old Testament studies, and other critical issues in the Church. Hecker established *Catholic World*, a Catholic opinion journal, in 1865. In 1866 he established Paulist Press and in 1869 he attended the First Vatican Council as the theologian of the Baltimore archbishop. He was a theological reformer ahead of his time, as many of his ideas came to fruition as church doctrine during the Second Vatican Council of the early 1960s.

Hecker died on 22 December 1888 in New York City. Hecker's views became the subject of a controversy, which finally ended when Pope Leo XIII's encyclical *Testem Benevolentiae* (1899) condemned Americanism as the source of heretical ideas that some churchmen, especially European priests, had attributed to Hecker.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Questions of the Soul (New York, 1855).
Aspirations of Nature (New York, 1857).
The Church and the Age (New York, 1887).

Other Relevant Works
Hecker's papers are at the Paulist Archives in Washington, D.C.
The Brownson–Hecker Correspondence, ed. J. F. Gower and R. M. Leliaert (Notre Dame, Ind., 1979).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v9*
Farina, John. *An American Experience of God: The Spirituality of Isaac Hecker* (New York, 1981). Contains a bibliography of Hecker's writings.
Holden, Vincent F. *The Early Years of Isaac Thomas Hecker, 1819–1844* (Washington, D.C., 1939).
O'Brien, David J. *Isaac Hecker: An American Catholic* (New York, 1992).

Robert Wilson-Black

HEDGE, Frederic Henry (1805–90)

Frederick Henry Hedge was born on 12 December 1805 in Cambridge, Massachusetts to Levi Hedge and Mary Kneeland Hedge. His father, Harvard's first professor of philosophy, and a series of Harvard graduate students privately tutored the rather shy and bookish boy throughout his childhood. He demonstrated a talent for languages at an

early age, reading Greek and Latin by age ten. Hedge passed Harvard's entrance exam at age twelve, but his father sent him to Germany for a more complete education before he entered Harvard. In Germany he began to develop a mastery of the German language and literature, including Goethe and the German idealists. He returned to the United States in 1822 and entered Harvard as a junior in 1823.

Upon graduation with his Harvard BA in 1825, Hedge entered the Harvard Divinity School where he studied the German higher criticism of the Bible with George Ticknor. At the Divinity School, he developed a friendship with Ralph Waldo EMERSON that was immensely important to both men for the rest of their lives. Within a few years, Hedge was Emerson's closest advisor on German thought and, among the American transcendentalists, his knowledge of the German language, literature, and philosophy earned him the nickname "Germanicus Hedge."

Hedge graduated from the Divinity School in 1828, received an MA there in 1929, and in that year he was ordained and installed at the Congregational Church and Society in West Cambridge, Massachusetts. The following year he married Lucy L. Pierce. His publishing career began in 1833 with "Coleridge's Literary Character," which appeared in the *Christian Examiner*. The essay was a review of the American editions of Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria* (1817), James Marsh's edition of Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection* (1829), and *The Friend* (1831), as well as the three-volume London edition of Coleridge's *Poetical Works* (1829). After a brief discussion of Coleridge's speculative powers, Hedge noted his lack of clarity about German idealism and displayed a thorough understanding of the philosophies of Kant, Fichte, and Schelling. Although Kant revolutionized philosophy, he explained, his successors rightly moved beyond his analytic method and narrow focus on epistemological problems. Hedge then criticized Fichte's sub-

jectivism and tendency toward skepticism, favoring Schelling's system of objective idealism. Yet he never identified himself, in this essay or any other publication, with a particular school of thought. First and foremost, he was a preacher primarily interested in ethics rather than philosophy or theology, but his principle debt to German idealism was its opposition to Lockean sensationalism and its vision of man and his relationship to the world. The impact of his article on American transcendentalism cannot be overstated. During the next two years, he published highly regarded articles on Emmanuel Swedenborg and on the pretensions of phrenology. These articles are generally regarded as the originating statements of the American transcendentalist movement.

In 1835 Hedge moved to Bangor, Maine where he filled the pulpit of the Independent Congregational Church. After a protracted salary dispute, he settled into the position and was well received. In 1836 he joined with Emerson, Convers Francis, James Freeman Clarke, and Amos Bronson ALCOTT in the first meeting of the informal "Transcendental Club" at the Boston home of George Ripley. Theodore Parker, Margaret Fuller, Orestes A. BROWNSON, Henry David Thoreau, Nathaniel Hawthorne, William Ellery Channing, and others, attended subsequent meetings. Among the initiated, the group was known as "Hedge's Club" because it usually met when he was in town, and his mind was the most philosophically trained. The group founded its literary organ, *The Dial*, at his urging, but by the 1840s he was increasingly critical of the calls for prompt ecclesiastical and theological revolution expressed in it. Although he was among the few ministers sympathetic to the views of the transcendentalists, his thought remained moderate enough for him to continue his ministerial career.

Hedge published his first major volume in 1847, *Prose Writers of Germany*. Much like Fuller's writings on Goethe in *The Dial* and

Ripley's translations of German and French writers in *Specimens of Foreign Standard Literature,* Hedge's *Prose Writers of Germany* is part of the transcendentalists' effort to bring foreign masterpieces to the attention of the American people in order to stimulate original expression by native artists and intellectuals. The book is an anthology of excerpts from the writings of German writers presented, most for the first time, in English translation. Hedge sought to select "the Classics" of German prose in the sense of "writers of the first class" (*Prose Writers of Germany*, p. iii). Altogether, the book, which went through five editions, included twenty-eight selections and involved eight translators besides Hedge.

In 1849 Hedge accepted an offer for the pulpit of the Westminster Congregational Society in Providence, Rhode Island. Over the course of his seven years in Providence, he received an honorary Doctor of Divinity degree from Harvard and published *Christian Liturgy, for the Use of the Church* (1853) and, with the assistance of Frederick D. Huntington, *Hymns for the Church of Christ* (1853). He left Providence in 1857 to accept the more prestigious pulpit of the First Parish of Brookline, Massachusetts. Within a year, he was appointed lecturer on ecclesiastical history at the Harvard Divinity School and editor of the *Christian Examiner,* a position he held until 1861. During his tenure as President of the American Unitarian Association from 1859 to 1862, Hedge was widely regarded as an effective leader during a period of serious internal discord. He displayed an uncanny ability to remain bold and daring in his religious writings while rising above the squabbles of theological factions within the association.

In 1860 Hedge published *Recent Inquiries in Theology,* a collection of essays and reviews by English religious thinkers on contemporary theological issues. Consistent with his liberal religion, all of the essays opposed the agnostic implications of Lockean episte-mology. In 1865 he published *Reason in Religion,* which established him as the intellectual leader of liberal Unitarianism. Throughout these years, he also managed to publish journal articles too numerous to list and maintained an increasingly busy speaking schedule. He resigned his position in Brookline in 1872, devoting himself to his academic career at Harvard where he was appointed professor of German, a position he held until his retirement in 1881.

Hedge remained active after his retirement, lecturing regularly at Alcott's Concord School of Philosophy until 1887, speaking on many important occasions, including a notable eulogy on the death of Emerson in 1882, and receiving an honorary LLD from Harvard in 1876. In his last philosophical monograph, *Atheism in Philosophy* (1884), Hedge argued that excessive philosophical speculation dangerously undermines belief in the existence of God. He died on 21 August 1890 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Although the more radical transcendentalists have overshadowed him, Hedge's reputation for meticulous scholarship and sober presentation of original ideas remains untarnished.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Prose Writers of Germany (Philadelphia, 1847).

Recent Inquiries in Theology, by Eminent English Churchmen; Being "Essays and Reviews" (Boston, 1860).

The Primeval World of Hebrew Tradition (Boston, 1870).

Hours with German Classics (Boston, 1876).

Ways of the Spirit and Other Essays (Boston, 1877).

Atheism in Philosophy (Boston, 1884).

Martin Luther and Other Essays (Boston, 1888).

Other Relevant Works

Collections of Hedge's correspondence and papers are at Harvard University,

Radcliffe College, the Massachusetts Historical Society in Boston, and the Maine Historical Society.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v8*

Good, James A. "Introduction," to *Prose Writers of Germany*, vol. 3 of *The Early American Reception of German Idealism* (Bristol, UK, 2002), pp. v–xvi.

LeBeau, Bryan F. *Frederic Henry Hedge: Nineteenth Century American Transcendentalist: Intellectually Radical, Ecclesiastically Conservative* (Allison Park, Penn., 1985).

Pochmann, Henry A. *German Culture in America: Philosophical and Literary Influences: 1600–1900* (Madison, Wisc., 1957).

Wells, Ronald Vale. *Three Christian Transcendentalists: James Marsh, Caleb Sprague Henry, Frederic Henry Hedge* (New York, 1972).

Williams, George Huntston. *Rethinking the Unitarian Relationship with Protestantism: An Examination of the Thought of Frederic Henry Hedge* (Boston, 1949).

James A. Good

HEIN, Hilde Stern (1932–)

Hilde Hein was born on 24 April 1932 in Cologne, Germany. She received her PhD in philosophy from the University of Michigan in 1961 with a dissertation on theories of creativity. She subsequently taught at the University of Michigan, Los Angeles State College, Tufts University, and at College of the Holy Cross in Massachusetts (1971–2000) where she was the first woman to receive tenure. Her philosophical work has spanned the fields of philosophy of science, philosophy of art, and feminist theory.

Her 1971 book, *On the Nature and Origin of Life*, examined the competing versions of vitalism and mechanism as they were developed historically by both scientists and philosophers. The book concludes with a perspicacious analysis of the basic philosophical issues at stake in the debate over the nature of life. In the field of aesthetics she is known for her contributions to feminist aesthetics and for her studies on the nature and purpose of the museum.

Given her background in both science and aesthetics, Hein was a natural choice to write a history and discussion of the Exploratorium, the pioneering interactive science museum in San Francisco that included in its mission the integration of science and art. In *The Exploratorium: The Museum as Laboratory* (1990), Hein described the various ways science and aesthetics have intersected in the San Francisco museum, from the attention given to the aesthetic quality of exhibitions to the scientific and technological dimensions of the visual and auditory exhibits designed by professional artists.

Hein's next book, *The Museum in Transition* (2000), was an analytical and critical outgrowth of her study of the Exploratorium, and deals with museums dedicated to all types of subject matter, art, science, history, and technology. She examines the recent transition from the traditional idea of the museum as a repository of rare and/or exemplary objects, to a more interactive institution dedicated to generating expansive forms of cultural experience. The book not only contains insightful discussions of the current conflicts over the purposes of the art museum, but an important chapter on the role of the aesthetic in all types of museums.

In addition to editing a major collection of essays on feminist aesthetics, she has written several essays on feminist issues in science and aesthetics. Several essays explore the implica-

tions of feminist aesthetics for feminist theory in general.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
On the Nature and Origin of Life (New York, 1971).
The Exploratorium: The Museum as Laboratory (Washington, D.C., 1990).
"Institutional Blessing: The Museum as Canon-maker," *Monist* 76 (1993): 556–73.
"Refining Feminist Theory: Lessons from Aesthetics," in *Aesthetics in Feminist Perspective*, ed. Hilde Hein and Carolyn Korsmeyer (Bloomington, Ind., 1993), pp. 3–18.
"The Role of Feminist Aesthetics in Feminist Theory," in *Feminism and Tradition in Aesthetics*, ed. Peggy Brand and Carolyn Korsmeyer (University Park, Penn., 1995), pp. 446–63.
"What is Public Art? Place, Time, and Meaning," *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 54 (1996): 1–7.
The Museum in Transition: A Philosophical Perspective (Washington, D.C., 2000).

Further Reading
Mullin, Amy. "Adorno, Art Theory, and Feminist Practice," *Philosophy Today* 44 (2000): 16–30.

Larry Shiner

HELD, Virginia Potter (1929–)

Virginia Held was born on 28 October 1929 in Mendham, New Jersey. She received her BA from Barnard College in 1950 and attended the University of Strasbourg and the University of Paris before beginning her "first career" as a reporter. Held was on the staff of the *Reporter* from 1954 to 1965 and made contributions to such publications as the *New Leader*, the *Public Interest*, and the *Nation*. Her first book was a reporter's account of contemporary attitudes toward morality. In 1968 Held received her PhD in philosophy from Columbia University. She was a professor of philosophy at Hunter College of the City University of New York from 1969 until retiring in 2001, and also was on the faculty of the Graduate School of the City University of New York after 1977. Held was President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 2001–2002.

Held's work in moral, political, and social philosophy has its roots in and is always inextricably linked to a commitment to achieving moral clarity about actual decision-making contexts. Throughout her career, Held has defended the usefulness of theory for practice and the objectivity of moral judgment. She has argued that moral theory is more like scientific theory than is typically acknowledged but has resisted ethical naturalism. She has argued that just as scientific theories must withstand the tests of observational experience, so must moral theories withstand the "tests" of moral experience. This claim is a challenge to such methods as John RAWLS's reflective equilibrium, in which the theorist looks back and forth between theoretical claims and particular judgments about *hypothetical* decision-making contexts.

Moral philosophy has long been substantially immersed in a debate between consequentialist and deontological moral theorists, both sides assuming that a single moral theory should be adequate for all moral questions. Held has argued for a "division of moral labor," in which independent moral inquiry proceeds in distinct moral realms – the political, the legal, the economic, the familial. She has also argued that in all realms of moral inquiry, attention to the perspectives of women is called for to redress its historical absence.

Held has joined other feminist philosophers in rejecting the dominant contractual model

of society defended by such heirs to the tradition of Locke, Hobbes, and Kant as John Rawls and the rational choice theorists, because it presupposes that persons are essentially independent and motivated predominantly by rational self-interest. Held points out that persons are actually typically dependent on others and typically they are significantly engaged in relationships with others. Having rejected the traditional conception of "economic man" as a model for an array of social relations, Held has explored alternative models, most extensively, the relationship between a "mothering person" and a child.

A *mothering person*, for Held, is a woman or a man who has primary responsibility for the care and development of a child. Rejecting the traditional idea that mothering is essentially a "natural," and so less fully human, activity, Held describes it as the very human activity of creating new persons – persons who will speak a language, share a culture, and engage in morally significant activity, thought, and feeling. The moral duties involved in being a mother or a child are not exhausted by negative duties to "leave others alone." On this model, theory begins not with uninvolved individuals who must be brought together in society but with very involved individuals. A morality based on this model would be "the morality of being responsive to the needs of actual, particular others in relations with us" ("Non-contractual Society: A Feminist View," 1987, p. 133). A political theory based on this model would acknowledge that contractual thinking, while possibly appropriate to some domains, is insufficient to establish the mutual concern, trust, and cooperativeness necessary to hold a society together. Held came to believe that while the concept of justice is not dispensable in moral and political theory, the concept of care is more widely applicable and conceptually prior.

The idea that moral thinking is always the thinking of individuals who are related to others in morally significant ways is central to Held's work. Held has argued that moral responsibility may be borne by corporations, nations, and ethnic groups, as well as by "collectivities" defined strictly in terms of the relation in which their members stand to particular events or opportunities for action. She has also argued that a satisfactory account of the moral person requires attention to the individual's social location – to her social relationships and to the nature of the social roles she occupies.

According to Held, cultural structures and norms are as much in need of philosophical attention and moral scrutiny as political or legal structures and norms. Recognizing the social power of the mass media and the way commercial interests guide and limit the issues and images presented within them has led Held to call for greater economic independence in the production and distribution of cultural products.

Held has played a substantial role in a number of contemporary philosophical debates, arguing, for instance, that in addition to political and civil rights, individuals in a sufficiently prosperous society have social and economic rights to "a decent life, adequate self-development, and equal liberty" (1984, p. 184); that *the public good* is a concept with significant content and that at least some decisions concerning a society's economic activities should be guided by an interest in it; that terrorism may be justified in circumstances of profound injustice, when it would be reasonable to believe that rejecting available uses of violence would allow the continuation of serious human rights violations for longer than it would be reasonable to ask the victims of those violations to wait for relief. Held has argued that it is the responsibility of those with power to strengthen or create alternative means of addressing injustice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Bewildered Age: A Report on Ethical Attitudes in the U.S. (New York, 1962).
The Public Interest and Individual Interests (New York, 1970).

Rights and Goods: Justifying Social Action (New York, 1984).

Feminist Morality: Transforming Culture, Society and Politics (Chicago, 1993).

Other Relevant Works

"Rationality and Social Value in Game-Theoretical Analyses," *Ethics* 76 (1966): 215–20.

"Can a Random Collection of Individuals Be Morally Responsible?" *Journal of Philosophy* 67 (1970): 471–81.

"Violence, Terrorism, and Moral Inquiry," *The Monist* 67 (1984): 605–26.

"Corporations, Persons, and Responsibility," in *Shame, Responsibility, and the Corporation*, ed. Hugh Curtler (New York, 1987), pp 159–81.

"Non-contractual Society: A Feminist View," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* suppl. 13 (1987): 111–37.

"Terrorism, Rights, and Political Goals," in *Violence, Terrorism, and Justice*, ed. R. G. Frey and Christopher Morris (Cambridge, UK, 1991), pp. 59–85.

Ed., *Justice and Care: Essential Readings in Feminist Ethics* (Boulder, Col., 1995).

"The Media and Political Violence," *Journal of Ethics* 1 (1997): 187–202.

"Group Responsibility for Ethnic Conflict," *Journal of Ethics* 6 (2002): 157–78.

"Moral Subjects: The Natural and the Normative," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 76 (2002): 7–24.

"Taking Care: Care as Practice and Value," in *Setting the Moral Compass: Essays by Women Philosophers*, ed. Cheshire Calhoun (Oxford, 2004), pp. 59–71.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils

Haber, Joram G., and Mark S. Halfon. *Norms and Values: Essays on the Work of Virginia Held* (Lanham, Md., 1998).

Moody-Adams, Michele M. "Feminist Inquiry and the Transformation of the 'Public' Sphere in Virginia Held's 'Feminist Morality'," *Hypatia* 11 (1996): 155–67.

Karen Kovach

HEMPEL, Carl Gustav (1905–97)

Carl Hempel, known as "Peter" by his friends, was one of the youngest of the scientific philosophers who brought logical empiricism from Vienna and Germany to North America in the 1930s. As a student of Hans REICHENBACH, Rudolf CARNAP, Moritz Schlick, and Friedrich Waismann, Hempel was a broad-minded representative of logical empiricism during the 1930s and 1940s. Yet he was also young enough to have survived logical empiricism. He articulated some of its shortcomings in the 1950s, helping to prepare for the later growth of alternative historicist approaches in science studies.

Hempel was born on 8 January 1905 in Oranienburg near Berlin, Germany. He studied mathematics and logic at the University of Göttingen with David Hilbert in 1923–4. After briefly studying at the University of Heidelberg, he moved to Berlin in 1924, where he encountered Reichenbach and his Berlin Circle of scientific philosophers. He also studied physics with Max Planck and logic with John VON NEUMANN until 1928. While accompanying Reichenbach to the 1929 conference on the Epistemology of the Exact Sciences in Prague organized by Philipp FRANK, Hempel made connections with his future colleagues in the Vienna Circle with whom he would later bring scientific philosophy from a war-torn Europe to the more stable United States.

In 1934 Hempel completed his Berlin PhD in philosophy, writing a dissertation titled

"Beiträge zur logischen Analyse des Wahrheitsbegriff." In that year he emigrated to Belgium where he co-authored his first major work in logic with Paul Oppenheim in 1936. He emigrated to the United States in 1937 to be Carnap's postdoctoral student at the University of Chicago. In 1939–40 he taught philosophy at City College of New York. From 1940 to 1948 he was professor of philosophy at Queens College in New York, and from 1948 to 1955 he was professor of philosophy at Yale University. In 1955 he joined the philosophy faculty of Princeton University, and was named Stuart Professor of Philosophy in 1956, holding that title until becoming professor emeritus in 1973. After holding visiting positions at Hebrew University in Jerusalem in 1974, the University of California at Berkeley in 1975, and the University of Pittsburgh in 1976, he became University Professor of Philosophy at the University of Pittsburgh in 1977 and held that position until 1985. Hempel died on 9 November 1997 in Princeton Township, New Jersey.

Hempel was a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Académie Internationale de Philosophie des Sciences, the American Philosophical Society, and a corresponding fellow of the British Academy. He was President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1961–2.

Hempel contributed to the central debates and themes of philosophy of science: probability theory, logic, scientific explanation, induction, semantics, and theory structure. He is perhaps best known for articulating the "Deductive-Nomological" (D-N) model of scientific explanation in the late 1940s (see 1965, pp. 331–496). On this model, explanation consists in the logical deduction of descriptions of particular facts we wish to explain from generalizations or laws taken to hold over those instances. Such laws and appropriate background conditions together constitute the "explanans," Hempel proposed, from which "explananda" can be logically derived. Understood as a schema to focus

attention on the problem of explanation, Hempel's work in explanation was successful and influential. Like any idealization, it failed to capture aspects of scientific practice and required modifications to treat cases involving statistical generalizations and cases where scientific laws remain unknown. Still, the simplicity and clarity of the model and some of its consequences (such as the logical symmetry between explanation of observed facts and prediction of future facts) made it compelling for a growing profession.

Hempel's model also popularized the unity of science and fueled debates about relations between the sciences and humanities. In "The Function of General Laws in History" (1942) Hempel presented his D-N model as a model for historical explanation by arguing that historians tacitly appeal to law-like generalizations in their accounts of historical events. With this "covering law" model of historical explanation, he suggested that the logical force of proper scientific and historical explanations came from the same, logical source. And because such historical generalizations were ultimately empirical, as are laws in natural science, he could count his essay as a contribution to substantiating the "methodological unity of empirical science" (1942, p. 243) in which history and historical sciences could claim membership. His essay was equally provocative in fields such as philosophy of biology and philosophy of social science and remains a classic contribution to philosophy of history. Hempel indirectly provided a clear voice to often heated debates, arising especially after World War II and the invention of nuclear weapons, about the role of scientific thinking in society and anti-scientific claims about alleged fundamental differences between science and the humanities – differences that Hempel and other logical empiricists usually denied.

Other topics in philosophy of science that Hempel gave canonical treatment include the Theoretician's Dilemma (why posit abstract theoretical concepts at all if the point of

science is to help us navigate among empirical phenomena?); the paradoxes of confirmation (in which a proposition such as "all ravens are black" finds confirmation in any observation at all); and the logic of functional explanation in biology and social science (see, for example, 1945; 1958; 1959). While Hempel's work on these topics generally promoted and sustained logical empiricism, his classic work on the criterion of cognitive significance (1950, 1951, 1965) took stock of the increasingly difficult task of formally and adequately specifying the basic idea of logical empiricism: that properly scientific propositions were cognitively significant whereas those of metaphysics and pseudoscience were not. Though Hempel never dismissed the purposes such criteria were designed to meet, he helped solidify opinion (perhaps partly because of his logical empiricist credentials) that finding such a criterion was at least a matter for "further constructive work" in philosophy of science, if not a quest that should be abandoned or reconceived. W. V. QUINE shortly afterward published his influential essay "Two Dogmas of Empiricism" in 1951, questioning the possibility of formally distinguishing analytic and synthetic sentences, a result that Hempel took to corroborate his own and similarly ominous verdict about cognitive significance.

While contributing both to the rise and the fall of logical empiricism, Hempel's career nonetheless captures the spirit of that movement and, in particular, its ability (indeed, its ambition) to avoid scholastic dogmatism and, like science, to abandon or modify beliefs or hypotheses when relevant evidence from science, logic, or history mounts against them. Though the legacy of logical empiricism is still in question, and is being reinterpreted if not resuscitated by some contemporary philosophers (such as Friedman 1991), Hempel's work and especially the careful, empiricist attitude it illustrates continue to be respected and emulated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Beitrage zur logischen analyse des wahrscheinlichkeitsbegriffs" (Jena, 1934).

Der Typusbegriff im Lichte der neuen Logik: Wissenschaftstheoretische Untersuchengen zur Konstitutions forschung und Psychologie, with Paul Oppenheim (Leiden, 1936).

"The Function of General Laws in History," *Journal of Philosophy* 39 (1942): 35–48.

"A Purely Syntactical Definition of Confirmation," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 8 (1943): 122–43.

"Studies in the Logic of Confirmation," *Mind* 54 (1945): 1–26, 97–121.

"Studies in the Logic of Explanation," with Paul Oppenheim, *Philosophy of Science* 15 (1948): 135–75.

"Problems and Changes in the Empiricist Criterion of Meaning," *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 11 (1950): 41–63.

"The Concept of Cognitive Significance: A Reconsideration," *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 80 (1951): 61–77.

Fundamentals of Concept Formation in Empirical Science (Chicago, 1952).

"The Theoretician's Dilemma: A Study in the Logic of Theory Construction," *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science* 2 (1958): 37–98.

"The Logic of Functional Analysis," in *Symposium on Sociological Theory*, ed. Llewellyn Gross (New York, 1959), pp. 271–307.

"Deductive-Nomological vs. Statistical Explanation," *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science* 3 (1962): 98–169.

"Rational Action," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 35 (1962): 5–24.

Aspects of Scientific Explanation and Other Essays in the Philosophy of Science (New York, 1965).

Philosophy of Natural Science (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1966).

"Maximal Specificity and Lawlikeness in Probabilistic Explanation," *Philosophy of Science* 35 (1968): 116–33.

"Comments on Goodman's 'Ways of Worldmaking'," *Synthese* 45 (1980): 193–200.

"Turns in the Evolution of the Problem of Induction," *Synthese* 46 (1981): 389–404.

"Valuation and Objectivity in Science," in *Physics, Philosophy and Psychoanalysis*, ed. Robert S. Cohen (Dordrecht, 1983), pp. 73–100.

Other Relevant Works

Hempel's papers are in the Archives of Scientific Philosophy at the University of Pittsburgh.

Ed. with R. G. Colodny, *Frontiers of Science and Philosophy* (Pittsburgh, 1963).

Ed. with Wolfgang Stegmüller and Wilhelm K. Essler, *The Philosophy of Nelson Goodman* (Hamburg, 1978).

Selected Philosophical Essays, ed. Richard Jeffrey (Oxford, 2000).

The Philosophy of Carl G. Hempel: Studies in Science, Explanation, and Rationality, ed. James H. Fetzer (Oxford, 2001).

Further Reading

Amer Phils 1950–2000, Bio 20thC Phils, Blackwell Analytic Phil, Blackwell Comp Phils, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Encyc Social Behav Sci, Oxford Comp Phil, Pres Addr of APA v7, Proc of APA v71, Routledge Encycl Phil, Who's Who in Phil

Davidson, Donald. "Hempel on Explaining Action," *Erkenntnis* 10 (1976): 239–53.

Dray, William H. *Laws and Explanation in History* (Oxford, 1957).

Fetzer, James H., ed. *Science, Explanation, and Rationality: Aspects of the Philosophy of Carl G. Hempel* (Oxford, 2000).

Friedman, Michael. "The Re-Evaluation of Logical Empiricism," *Journal of Philosophy* 88 (1991): 505–19.

Jeffrey, Richard. The Works of Carl Gustav Hempel," *Erkenntnis* 45 (1995): 9–14.

Kim, Jaegwon. "Hempel, Explanation, Metaphysics," *Philosophical Studies* 94 (1999): 1–20.

Lennox, James. "In Memoriam: Carl G. (Peter) Hempel, 1905–1997," *Biology and Philosophy* 14 (1999): 477–80.

Nagel, Ernest, and Henry Kyburg, Jr., eds. *Induction: Some Current Issues* (Middletown, Conn., 1963).

Parrini, Paolo, ed. *Logical Empiricism: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives* (Pittsburgh, 2003).

Pitt, Joseph C. "Hempel versus Sellars on Explanation," *Dialectica* 34 (1980): 95–120.

Putnam, Hilary, Wilhelm K. Essler, and Wolfgang Stegmüller, eds. *Epistemology, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science: Essays in Honour of Carl G. Hempel on the Occasion of his 80th Birthday* (Dordrecht, 1985).

Quine, W. V. "Two Dogmas of Empiricism," *Philosophical Review* 60 (1951): 20–43.

Rescher, Nicholas, ed. *Essays in Honor of Carl G. Hempel: A Tribute on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday* (Dordrecht, 1969).

Salmon, Wesley C. *Four Decades of Scientific Explanation* (Minneapolis, 1989).

———, "The Spirit of Logical Empiricism: Carl G Hempel's Role in Twentieth-century Philosophy of Science," *Philosophy of Science* 66 (1999): 333–50.

George A. Reisch

HENDEL, Charles William, Jr. (1890–1982)

Charles W. Hendel was born on 16 December 1890 in Reading, Pennsylvania, and died on 12 November 1982 in Salt Lake City, Utah. He attended Princeton University (B.Litt. 1913); Marburg University in Germany (1913–14); Collège de France (1914); and returned to Princeton (PhD in philosophy 1917). He served in the United States Army Infantry as second lieutenant in 1917–18. His first academic positions were at Princeton Preparatory School (1919), and as instructor in philosophy at Williams College (1919–20). Hendel then was assistant professor (1920–26) and associate professor (1926–9) at Princeton University. He went to McGill University to become MacDonald Professor of Moral Philosophy and chair in 1929, and also was dean of the faculty of arts and sciences during 1937–40. He moved to Yale University to be professor of moral philosophy and metaphysics in 1940 and chaired the department from 1940 to 1945. His title at Yale was Clarke Professor of Moral Philosophy and Metaphysics from 1943 until his retirement in 1959. Among his honors were the Gifford Lectureship in natural theology at University of Glasgow in 1962–3, President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1940–41, and President of the American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy in 1959–61. He was awarded the William C. DeVane medal, Yale Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa; and an honorary MA from Yale in 1940.

Charles Hendel was a leading Hume scholar. Not only did he edit widely used editions of Hume's major works, but he also made valuable contributions to Hume scholarship. In his major work, *Studies in the Philosophy of David Hume* (1925/1963), he integrated the different facets of Hume's thought and developed criticisms of Hume that went further than anyone before. Hendel was one of the first scholars to demonstrate that Hume's major philosophical works were motivated by theological concerns. He argues that Hume investi-gated the principle of causation because he wanted to explain the world order without an appeal to God. Hendel convincingly showed that Hume's claim that we can logically think of something existing without a cause was founded on his desire to show that the existence of the world does not entail God as its cause.

Hendel established an important point in Hume's theory of knowledge that was rarely appreciated by other scholars. From the fact that Hume ascribed the idea of cause and effect to the imagination, most critics supposed that Hume denied the idea of causation. Hendel showed this supposition to be false by arguing that though the causal inference is nonrational, it does not follow that it is arbitrary, because it *may* be natural. Habits of thought may faithfully represent facts about the world because mental habits sometimes arise out of human nature working with the nature that is independent of us. In other words, ideas of the imagination may lead to truth if they are corroborated by further experience. According to Hendel, Hume's discovery of the nonrational character of the causal inference is not skepticism in the sense of total doubt, but skepticism in the sense that one should never be secure in having knowledge because one should always be looking for further verification. Hendel also corrects a view of mind often attributed to Hume. Critics regularly conclude that Hume denied the reality of self. Hendel points out that Hume was only rejecting a scholastic conception of the self as a soul or simple substance. In its place, Hume offered an analysis of self as a system of different perceptions, which are linked together by the relation of cause and effect. It is nothing more than an organization of different perceptions, habits, and customs acquired through experience.

Hendel additionally advanced some interesting ideas concerning Hume's religious position, which many scholars now accept. Readers of Hume often concluded that he was an atheist without faith. In his *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*, they see Philo, the religious skeptic, as his spokesman who

argues against Cleanthes, the religious dogmatist, who thinks reason can establish religious beliefs. Hendel denies this and argues that both characters express Hume's thinking because both represent valid ways of looking at the matter. Philo, the skeptic, is right in showing the defects of our reasoning in proving the existence of God. Cleanthes is right in insisting that the theist position, given our nature, is the one we must accept. Hendel concludes that Hume is Pampilus who listens to the arguments on both sides. He is not a participant in the debate. Rather, for the sake of truth that all views represent, he is detached from any personal interest in one character or the other. Rational proof for or against God is impossible. Nevertheless, religious belief is natural in the sense that it is the outcome of human nature.

In his discussion of Hume's theory of causality Hendel presented a provocative analysis of Hume's theory of belief, which implies that Hume was an idealist. He argues that Hume held the position that things are believed to exist only when they are conceived in relation to other objects of perception. Though this is certainly true of ideas, Hendel goes further and asserts that it is also true of impressions – thus suggesting the idealist position that no content of experience can be real unless it is part of a coherent system of other experience. However, for many scholars this misconstrues Hume's conception of belief. For Hume, the only difference between impressions, ideas and beliefs is their respective force and vivacity. An idea is a pale copy of an impression. It becomes a belief when it stands in such a relation to an impression that the impression communicates its vivacity to the idea. In this sense, impressions are not believed, rather, they are non-inferentially taken to be true because of their initial force and vivacity. Thus, it would seem that impressions are real even if they bear no relation to any other content of experience.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Studies in the Philosophy of David Hume (Princeton, N.J., 1925; rev. edn New York, 1963).
Jean Jacques Rousseau: Moralist, 2 vols (Oxford, 1934; rev. edn New York, 1963).
Jean Jacques Rousseau, Citizen of Geneva (Oxford, 1937).
Philosophy in American Education, with Brand Blanshard et al. (New York, 1946).
Preface to Philosophy (New York, 1946).
Civilization and Religion: An Argument about Values in Human Life (New Haven, Conn., 1948).
The Philosophy of Kant and Our Modern World: Four Lectures Delivered at Yale University Commemorating the 150th Anniversary of the Death of Immanuel Kant (Indianapolis, 1957).

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *Selections*, by David Hume (New York, 1927).
Ed., *The Myth of the State*, by Ernst Cassirer (New Haven, Conn., 1946).
Trans. with W. H. Woglom, *The Problem of Knowledge: Philosophy, Science, and History Since Hegel*, by Ernst Cassirer (New Haven, Conn., 1950).
"Introduction," to *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, by Ernst Cassirer (New Haven, Conn., 1953).
Ed., *David Hume's Political Essays* (New York, 1953).
Ed., *An Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding: An Abstract of a Treatise of Human Nature*, by David Hume (New York, 1955).
Ed., *Inquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*, by David Hume (Indianapolis, 1957).
Ed., *John Dewey and the Experimental Spirit in Philosophy* (New York, 1959).

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v5, *Who Was Who in Amer v8*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Currie, Cecil. "Hendel on Hume's Atomism," *Dialogue* 3 (1964): 199–307.

Richard W. Burgh

HENLE, Paul (1908–62)

Paul Henle was born on 12 September 1908 in New York City, and was raised in Cleveland, Ohio. Receiving his BA magna cum laude from Harvard University in 1929, Henle then attended Harvard Law School for a semester before returning to philosophy, earning his MA in 1931 and his PhD in 1933. He studied Kant with C. I. LEWIS and wrote his dissertation on implication in abstract logical systems. Henle was an assistant in philosophy at Harvard until 1934, and then taught at Smith College from 1934 to 1937. From 1937 until 1942 he was a professor of philosophy at the University of Michigan.

Henle then served in the US Army from 1942 until 1945, working as a crypotogist in Europe, carrying onto the beaches of Normandy an Enigma machine for decoding German messages. He returned to the University of Michigan after the war for one year in 1945–6 before going on to Northwestern University from 1946 to 1950, and then he returned to the University of Michigan in 1950 as professor of philosophy, holding that position until his death. He had a Guggenheim Fellowship in 1948–9 and a Fulbright Fellowship in France in 1954–5. He was President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1953–4. He died during a sabbatical leave on 27 January 1962 in Paris, France.

Henle co-authored a logic textbook with Frank Miller Chapman in 1933. He contested the efforts of H. B. SMITH to demonstrate the equivalence of Aristotelian syllogistic and the classical Boole-Schröder algebra of logic. He argued in "A Note on the Validity of Aristotelian Logic" that it is "difficult to see" Smith's system as equivalent to Aristotelian logic. In another work on logic, "On the Fourth Figure of the Syllogism" (1949), he argued that Aristotle's arrangement of valid syllogism was motivated by purely logical considerations, and not by any effort to follow the path of actual reasoning.

Henle also wrote on the applications of logic, semantics, scientific method, ethics, and religion. His influence on students was pivotal, leading many, such as Arthur BURKS, to undertake studies of pragmatist Charles PEIRCE. Henle also played a pivotal role in the democratization of the American Philosophical Association while it was undergoing reorganization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Fundamentals of Logic, with Frank Miller Chapman (New York and Chicago, 1933).
"A Definition of Abstract Systems," *Mind* 44 (1935): 341–6.
"A Note on the Validity of Aristotelian Logic," *Philosophy of Science* 2 (1935): 111–13.
"The Status of Emergence," *Journal of Philosophy* 39 (1942): 486–93.
"Method in Ethics," *Ethics* 54 (1943): 29–40.
"On the Certainty of Empirical Statements," *Journal of Philosophy* 44 (1947): 625–32.
"Mysticism and Semantics," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 9 (1949): 416–22.
"On the Fourth Figure of the Syllogism," *Philosophy of Science* 16 (1949): 94–104.
"Uses of the Ontological Argument" *Philosophical Review* 70 (1961): 102–9.
"The Critique of Pure Reason Today," *Journal of Philosophy* 59 (1962): 225–34.

Other Relevant Works
Ed. with Horace M. Kallen and Suzanne K. Langer, *Structure, Method, and Meaning: Essays in Honor of Henry M. Sheffer* (New York, 1951).
Ed., *Language, Thought and Culture* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1958).

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v6, Proc of APA v35

Irving H. Anellis

HENLE, Robert John (1909–2000)

Robert J. Henle was born on 12 September 1909 in Muscatine, Iowa. He joined the Jesuit order in 1927 and then attended St. Louis University, earning his BA in 1931, MA in 1932, licentiate in philosophy in 1935, and his STL degree in 1941. He was ordained priest in 1940, and then attended the University of Toronto during the 1940s, receiving his PhD in philosophy in 1954. In 1947 Henle became an assistant professor of philosophy at St. Louis University, and was promoted up to full professor in 1958. He also served in various administrative capacities, and was a trustee from 1949 to 1969. In 1969 Henle became President of Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., and held that office until 1976. He returned to St. Louis, and from 1976 until his retirement in 1982 he was McDonnell Professor of Justice in American Society, teaching in the philosophy and law departments. He died on 20 January 2000 in St. Louis, Missouri.

Henle was an important figure in the revival of Thomistic theology and philosophy in the mid twentieth century. He was the author of more than 200 articles and many books, including a series of Latin grammar books that were widely used. Henle was an editor of the *Modern Schoolman* from 1945 to 1950. He was an active member of the American Catholic Philosophical Association, the American Philosophical Association, the Philosophy of Education Society, and was elected to membership in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Henle made major contributions to the understanding of medieval theology. His book *Saint Thomas and Platonism: A Study of the Plato and Platonici Texts in the Writings of Saint Thomas* (1956) largely established the parameters of Thomas Aquinas's relationships to Plato and the neo-Platonists. His *Method in Metaphysics* (1951) describes how metaphysical method, quite distinctly from scientific method, offers an independent science of being. This science must proceed by the epistemological realism of Thomism. His later works, *A Meditation about Knowing* (1966) and *Theory of Knowledge* (1983), expound this Thomistic epistemology. Henle also studied Thomistic value theory, ethics, and legal theory, and applied the Catholic standpoint to issues in political theory and applied ethics. Many of his important articles are gathered together in *The American Thomistic Revival in the Philosophical Papers of R. J. Henle, S.J.* (1999).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Method in Metaphysics (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1951).
Saint Thomas and Platonism: A Study of the Plato and Platonici Texts in the Writings of Saint Thomas (The Hague, 1956).
A Meditation about Knowing (Columbus, Ohio, 1966).
Theory of Knowledge: A Textbook and Substantive Theory of Epistemology (Chicago, 1983).
The American Thomistic Revival in the Philosophical Papers of R. J. Henle, S.J. (St. Louis, 1999).

Other Relevant Works
Ed. and trans. with Vernon J. Bourke, *De principiis naturae*, by Thomas Aquinas (St. Louis, 1947).
"A Thomist on 'An Experimentalist on Being'," *Modern Schoolman* 35 (1958): 133–41.
Ed., *Systems for Measuring and Reporting the Resources and Activities of Colleges and Universities* (Washington, D.C., 1967).
"A Catholic View of Human Rights: A Thomistic Reflection," in *The Philosophy of Human Rights*, ed. A. Rosenbaum (Westport, Conn., 1980), pp. 87–93.
"Transcendental Thomism, A Critical Assessment," in *One Hundred Years of Thomism*, ed. Victor Brezik (Houston,

Tex., 1981), pp. 90–116.

"St. Thomas and the Definition of Intelligence," *Modern Schoolman* 53 (1976): 335–46.

"The Basis of Philosophical Realism Re-examined," *New Scholasticism* 56 (1982): 1–29.

"Reflections on Current Reductionism," *New Scholasticism* 59 (1985): 131–55.

Ed. and trans., *Saint Thomas Aquinas, the Treatise on Law* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1993).

Further Reading

Romanell, Patrick. "Henle's *Method in Metaphysics*," *Journal of Philosophy* 49 (1952): 485–6.

Van Cleve, Morris. "Rejoinder to Father Henle," *Modern Schoolman* 36 (1958): 57–60.

John R. Shook

HENRY, Caleb Sprague (1804–84)

Caleb Sprague Henry was born on 2 August 1804 in Rutland, Massachusetts, to Silas Henry and Dorothy Pierce Henry. He received the BA from Dartmouth College in 1825, studied theology at Andover and at Yale, and was ordained as a Congregational minister on 21 January 1829. He held Congregational pulpits at Greenfield, Massachusetts (1829–31) and West Hartford, Connecticut (1833–5). An avid proponent of the peace movement, in 1834 Henry published *Principles and Prospects of the Friends of Peace* and established the *American Advocate of Peace*, the literary arm of the American Peace Society. For unknown reasons, he decided to change denominations when he took deacon's orders in the Protestant Episcopal Church and was ordained priest in 1836. In the same year he was appointed professor of intellectual and moral philosophy at Bristol College in Pennsylvania, where he taught for one year.

In 1837 Henry was appointed one of the first four professors at the University of the City of New York (later New York University), holding the position of professor of history, belles-lettres, and philosophy, and he taught there until 1852. Also in 1837, Henry founded the *New York Review* with Francis L. Hawks, which he edited until 1840. From 1847 to 1850, he edited the *Churchman*, a publication of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and served a brief stint as political editor of the *New York Times*. During three of his years at the University of the City of New York, Henry served as rector of St. Clement's Church, New York (1847–50). As the University's financial condition declined, Henry left the institution in 1852. Except for serving as rector at St. Michael's Church in Litchfield, Connecticut (1870–73), for the rest of his life Henry focused on his literary projects. Hobart College awarded him the degree of DD in 1838 and the University of the City of New York awarded him the LLD in 1879. Henry died on 9 March 1884 in Newburg, New York.

In addition to his ministry, educational, and editorial work, in his writings Henry sought to blend traditional Protestant theology with the latest philosophical trends, particularly American transcendentalism. To a significant degree, his Christian transcendentalism was a precursor to the Social Gospel of the late nineteenth century. Henry sought to preserve and bolster orthodox Protestant thought, while urging the churches to embrace an active social ethic. Specifically, he argued that the churches must take a leading role in many of the social and political reform movements of his time, including the abolition of slavery, prison reform, and workers' rights. Henry was a passionate champion of freedom of thought in higher education in opposition to what he saw as the doctrinal indoctrination of students that had been the norm in American colleges. He

also advocated greatly expanded public education to foster free and critical thought among all Americans.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Principles and Prospects of the Friends of Peace. A Discourse Pronounced before the Hartford County Peace Society, December 25, 1833 (Hartford, Conn., 1834).

The Importance of Exalting the Intellectual Spirit of the Nation, and Need of a Learned Class; a Discourse Pronounced before the Phi Sigma Nu Society of the University of Vermont, August 3, 1836 (Burlington, N.J., 1836).

Moral and Philosophical Essays (New York, 1839).

The Position and Duties of the Educated Men of the Country (New York, 1840).

The True Idea of the University, and Its Relation to a Complete System of Public Instruction. An Address before the Association of the Alumni of the University of the City of New York, June 28, 1852 (New York, 1853).

Plain Reasons for the Great Republican Movement (New York, 1856).

Considerations on Some of the Elements and Conditions of Social Welfare and Human Progress. Being Academic and Occasional Discourses and Other Pieces (New York, 1861).

Doctor Oldham at Greystones, and his Talk There (New York, 1860; 3rd edn 1872).

About Men and Things (New York, 1873).

Christian Truth and Modern Opinion (New York, 1874).

Satan as a Moral Philosopher (New York, 1877).

The Endless Future of the Human Race (New York, 1879).

Other Relevant Works
Henry's papers are at New York University.
Trans., *Elements of Psychology*, by Victor Cousin (New York, 1834).
Ed., *Contemplations*, by Matthew Hale (Hartford, Connecticut, 1835).
Trans., *An Epitome of the History of Philosophy*, by Louis Bautain (New York, 1841–2).
Ed., *General History of Civilization in Europe, from the Fall of the Roman Empire to the French Revolution*, by François Guizot, trans. William Hazlitt (New York, 1842).
Ed., *A Manual of Ancient and Modern History*, by William Cooke Taylor (New York, 1855).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v11*
Duyckinck, Evert A., and George L. Duyckinck. "Professor Henry's Writings," *North American Review* 94 (1862): 525–40.
Frothingham, O. B. *Transcendentalism in New England* (New York, 1959).
Jones, Theodore F. *New York University 1832–1932* (New York, 1933).
Wells, Ronald Vale. *Three Christian Transcendentalists: James Marsh, Caleb Sprague Henry, Frederic Henry Hedge* (New York, 1972).

James A. Good

HENRY, Carl Ferdinand Howard (1913–2003)

Carl F. H. Henry was born on 22 January 1913 in Manhattan, New York, to Karl F. and Joanna Vathroder Heinrich, a German immigrant couple who changed the family name to Henry during the upsurge in anti-German sentiment during World War I. As a young man, Carl Henry worked as a newspaper reporter and soon became editor of *The Smithtown Star*, a weekly newspaper in Long

Island. He underwent a religious conversion in 1933, and with a new sense of divine vocation he enrolled in Wheaton College in Illinois, an interdenominational liberal arts college regarded by many conservative Christians as the "evangelical Harvard." While there, Henry met many of the future leaders of the neo-evangelical movement (notably, Billy Graham) in which he played a crucial role. Henry also came under the influence of professor Gordon H. CLARK, a conservative Presbyterian philosopher whose thoroughgoing rationalism left a lasting impression on the younger man's thought.

Henry earned a BA in 1938 and an MA in theology in 1941 from Wheaton. While working on the latter degree, Henry enrolled as a student at Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, a school established amid the modernist–fundamentalist controversy as a conservative alternative to the theologically liberal University of Chicago Divinity School. Henry completed a BD in 1941 and a ThD in 1942 from Northern. In 1942 Henry joined Northern's faculty to teach philosophy of religion, and also served as chair of the department of philosophy and religion.

In 1947, Henry was invited to join the founding faculty of Fuller Theological Seminary in Pasadena, California, as a professor of theology and Christian philosophy. Although occupied with teaching and administrative duties, Henry managed to complete a PhD in philosophy under personalist philosopher Edgar BRIGHTMAN of Boston University in 1949, write nine books and numerous articles, and actively participate in the fledgling neo-evangelical movement.

Henry left Fuller after nine years to become the founding editor of the journal *Christianity Today* in 1956. Although he was forced out after a sometimes stormy twelve years at the journal, Henry had become the leading theological commentator among conservative Protestant Christians. In the decades following his editorship at *Christianity Today*, Henry taught on the faculty of Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Philadelphia from 1969 to 1974; served as lecturer at large first for the Christian relief organization, World Vision, and later for Prison Fellowship; held several visiting professorships; wrote voluminously; and lectured at seminaries, colleges, and universities throughout the world. In his later years Henry was a member of Capitol Hill Baptist Church in Washington, D.C. In 1977 Henry was named as the leading theologian of American evangelicalism by *Time* magazine. He was President of the Evangelical Theological Society during 1967–70, and President of the American Theological Society during 1979–80. In 1989, he delivered the Rutherford Lectures in Edinburgh, Scotland. Henry died on 7 December 2003 in Watertown, Wisconsin.

In his influential book, *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism* (1947), Henry helped launch the neo-evangelical movement by calling on fellow conservatives to leave behind the excesses of fundamentalism. In particular, Henry criticized fundamentalism's "hyper-separatism," anti-intellectualism, dogmatic intolerance, and withdrawal from cultural and social involvement. He did not call for doctrinal reform since he remained theologically fundamentalist, but he challenged conservatives to adopt an irenic spirit and to demonstrate greater intellectual honesty and rigor.

Henry's *magum opus* is his six-volume *God, Revelation and Authority* (1976–83). In that work, he attempts to establish the epistemological and metaphysical foundations of the conservative evangelical theology he favors. The first volume deals with theological prolegomena; the next three volumes deal with the doctrine of revelation; and the final two focus on the doctrine of God. In the course of his wide-ranging discussion, Henry touches on most traditional topics of systematic theology, probes key concepts set forth by ancient and modern philosophers, skirmishes with non-evangelical Christian scholars, and comments on an array of contemporary intellectual trends. No work produced within twentieth-

century evangelicalism matches the breadth of learning and intellectual rigor of *God, Revelation and Authority*.

Noting that all human inquiry must begin with unproven assumptions, Henry argues that Christian theology should begin with the assumption that the Christian Bible is a written deposit of divine revelation. The task of theology is to systematize the contents of this revelation, producing an orderly set of propositions into which extra-biblical knowledge can be integrated. The resulting system indirectly verifies the assumption on which it is based by its internal consistency and coherence. Non-evangelical systems, on the other hand, always "shelter some marked internal lack of consistency and contradiction" (vol. 1, p. 243) and thereby refute themselves.

According to Henry, God's revelation "is rational communication conveyed in intelligible ideas and meaningful words, that is, in conceptual-verbal form" (vol. 3, p. 248). By this claim, Henry intends to counter the neo-orthodox contention that revelation is a nonpropositional, perspective-altering encounter between God and humans. Henry does not deny the validity of the neo-orthodox claim as far as it goes, but he insists that the personal encounter between the divine and the human also conveys information and doctrine. Were revelation nonpropositional, he argues, it would be impossible on the basis of revelation to distinguish good from evil or truth from error.

Because revelation is communicated in rational propositions, no special spiritual illumination is required in order to grasp its contents. Even after the fall of Adam, human beings retain their rational faculties; thus, believers and nonbelievers alike can understand God's revealed truth. This universal accessibility of divine revelation establishes humanity's moral accountability. Henry notes, however, that although God has revealed himself truly, he has not done so exhaustively. Even in his revelation, God remains mysterious, for "the Revealer transcends his own revelation" (vol. 2, p. 47).

Non-evangelical theologies and philosophies have gone wrong, Henry judges, because they have all in one way or another rejected biblical authority. Although God is revealed in nature, history, the human mind and conscience, and Jesus Christ, Henry emphasizes that the Bible is "the authoritative written record and exposition of God's nature and will" (vol. 4, p. 7). Without the light cast by the biblical text, revelation mediated through other channels would be overlooked or misinterpreted. The Bible derives its authority from God, who inspired the human authors to record the divine revelation. Henry takes pains to deny that God dictated the words of scripture to human amanuenses. God superintended the writing of scripture so that the human authors, expressing their own thoughts in their distinctive styles, set down precisely those words God wanted written.

An important corollary of biblical inspiration, Henry maintains, is "biblical inerrancy." By this term, he means that the Bible is without error in everything it teaches, even when its teachings impinge on historical and scientific matters. Henry qualifies inerrancy in important ways. He insists that inerrancy is consistent with the fact that the Bible is written in common language and lacks modern precision when reporting such things as measurements, statistics, genealogies, and cosmology. He also concedes that, strictly speaking, inerrancy can be predicated only of the non-extant "autographs" of scripture, though he is confident that the errors found in copies are minor and do not compromise the overall reliability of the Bible. In response to critics, Henry defends his inerrancy doctrine by proposing ways of harmonizing contradictory biblical passages, attacking the anti-supernaturalist bias of critical biblical scholars, and recommending flexibility in biblical interpretation when ordinary readings of the text contradict well-established results of contemporary science.

Henry's doctrine of God stands within the mainstream of orthodox Protestant theology.

God is triune, infinite, timelessly eternal, immutable, omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent. God created the world *ex nihilo* by divine fiat and rules providently with perfect love and justice. Henry regards each of the divine attributes as involved in every other; hence, he refuses to posit a hierarchy in which some attributes are subordinated to others. Moreover, Henry refuses to distinguish God's attributes from his being. "I reject the realistic view," he says, "that being is a substratum in which the attributes inhere, an underlying substance that supports its qualities or predicates" (vol. 5, p. 119). According to Henry, the doctrine of God is properly derived from the Bible, either directly or by rational inference. He rejects traditional but extra-biblical approaches to defining divine attributes, namely, the ways of negation, eminence, and causation, because they fail to provide definite, reliable knowledge of God. True knowledge of God is univocal, not simply analogical.

Henry's influence among the most conservative wing of Protestant evangelicalism remains strong. More progressive evangelicals have in recent years criticized Henry's theological rationalism, his views on the nature of divine revelation, and his defense of biblical inerrancy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1947).

Notes on the Doctrine of God (Boston, 1948).

Remaking of the Modern Mind (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1948).

Giving a Reason for Our Hope (Boston, 1949).

Christian Personal Ethics (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1957).

Aspects of Christian Social Ethics (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1964).

A Plea for Evangelical Demonstration (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1971).

God, Revelation and Authority, 6 vols (Waco, Tex., 1976–83).

The Christian Mindset in a Secular Society (Portland, Oregon, 1984).

Twilight of a Great Civilization: The Drift toward Neo-paganism (Westchester, Ill., 1988).

Toward a Recovery of Christian Belief: The Rutherford Lectures (Wheaton, Ill., 1990).

Other Relevant Works
Confessions of a Theologian: An Autobiography (Waco, Tex., 1986).

Further Reading
Patterson, Bob E. *Carl F. H. Henry* (Waco, Tex., 1983).

Paul F. Sands

HERBERG, Will (1901–77)

Philosopher, political activist, and Jewish thinker, Will Herberg was born on 30 June 1901 in Liachovitzi, Russia, and died on 26 March 1977 in Chatham, New Jersey. Herberg emigrated with his family to the United States in 1904, and he grew up in Brooklyn, New York. He attended the College of the City of New York from 1918 to 1920, but he did not complete an academic degree and was suspended in part due to conflict with a professor in military studies. Active in communist causes in the 1920s, Herberg broke with the American Communist party, as did many of his fellow travelers, over Stalin's repressive treatment of dissidents.

Herberg formed the Independent Labor League of America in the late 1920s, arguing that worker rights were central to a successful American experiment. Herbert was editor of the journal *Revolutionary Age* (*Workers' Age*), working until 1948 for various groups within the larger Marxist–Leninist movement,

although he remained disillusioned with Trotsky and Stalin. His reading of Reinhold NIEBUHR's *Moral Man and Immoral Society* (1932) in the late 1940s moved Herberg to join like-minded political realists and the so-called "Atheists for Niebuhr" in proclaiming the dangers of absolutist thinking within political ideologies. If sin consists in outreaching one's grasp, according to Herberg and Niebuhr, then many communist practitioners had done just that with the practical implementation of Marxist philosophy.

Herberg's "neo-orthodox" turn toward an appreciation of the theological implications of his political idealism meant a renewed appreciation for his own Jewish tradition, studying at the Jewish Theological Seminary, affiliated with Columbia University, in the early 1940s. In 1955 he became professor of Judaic studies and social philosophy at Drew University in New Jersey, and held that position until his death.

Herberg's most lasting influence was his analysis of American religious life at mid century, articulated in *Protestant – Catholic – Jew: An Essay in American Religious Sociology* (1955). He explained how the assimilation of religious life into American culture broadly construed was dangerous as it elevated an American civic faith above the traditional faiths anchored in biblical literature and traditional religious community. In 1961 he accepted the editorship of the *National Review*, founded by the young conservative Catholic Yale thinker William F. Buckley. Herberg taught, lectured, and published widely, contributing to a body of literature and thought that represented a renewal of religious belief among intellectual leaders in America's northeast.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Judaism and Modern Man: An Interpretation of Jewish Religion (New York, 1951).
Protestant – Catholic – Jew: An Essay in American Religious Sociology (Garden City, N.Y., 1955).

Faith Enacted as History: Essays in Biblical Theology (Philadelphia, 1976).
From Marxism to Judaism: The Collected Essays of Will Herberg, ed. David G. Dalin (New York, 1989).

Other Relevant Works
Herberg's papers are at Drew University in New Jersey.
"From Marxism to Judaism …," *Commentary* 3 (January 1947): 25–32.
Ed., *The Writings of Martin Buber* (New York, 1956).
Ed., *Four Existentialist Theologians: A Reader from the Works of Jacques Maritain, Nicolas Berdyaev, Martin Buber, and Paul Tillich* (Garden City, N.Y., 1958).
Ed., *Community, State and Church*, by Martin Buber (Garden City, N.Y., 1960).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*
Ausmus, Harry J. *Will Herberg: From Right to Right* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1987).
Gnall, Janet M. *Will Herberg, Jewish Theologian: A Biblical-existentialist Approach to Religion*. PhD dissertation, Drew University (Madison, N.J., 1983).

Robert Wilson-Black

HERZOG, Frederick (1925–95)

Frederick Herzog was born on 29 November 1925 in Ashley, North Dakota. Many of his formative years were spent in Germany. His father, a German pastor sent by his church to the Dakotas, took the family back to Germany in 1935, and Herzog later studied theology in Wuppertal and Bonn, Germany, and in Basel, Switzerland, where he became assistant to the-

ologian Karl Barth and lived in Barth's house. Herzog earned his ThD at Princeton Theological Seminary with Paul Lehmann in 1953. From 1953 to 1960 he taught systematic theology at Mission House Theological Seminary in Plymouth, Wisconsin. From 1960 until his death, Herzog was a professor of systematic theology at Duke University. Herzog died on 9 October 1995 in Durham, North Carolina.

Herzog was one of the originators of liberation theology, a way of thinking about God and the world that takes into account the margins of society and the underside of history. True to this basic orientation, liberation theology did not develop out of one center, or from the top down. It emerged in specific settings, from the bottom up, where theology began to encounter the suffering and hope of specific groups of people on the margins. Even the term of "liberation" theology itself emerged in this way, as it was coined simultaneously but independently by at least three very different thinkers: Gustavo Gutiérrez, writing from the Latin American context of Peru; James CONE, writing from the African-American context in the United States; and Herzog, writing from the civil rights struggle in North Carolina. The different approaches would only meet years later, at the Theology in the Americas Conference in Detroit in 1976, together with representatives of feminist theology, Hispanic theology, and Native American theology.

Trained in the theology centers of Germany, Switzerland, and the United States, and teaching and writing as a white male theologian in the South of the United States for most of his life, Herzog was a most unlikely participant in the liberation theology project. His work is a witness to the broader relevance of liberation theology, with wide-reaching implications for mainline academic sensitivities. Herzog published the first essay in English that used the term "theology of liberation" in 1970, a few months before James Cone's book *A Black Theology of Liberation* appeared.

Herzog's 1972 book *Liberation Theology* is one of the first major publications on this topic. In this book he develops a unique approach to questions of liberation through a critique of liberalism, individualism, and the intellectual presuppositions of racial segregation. Transgressing the boundaries of traditional theological genres, Herzog rethinks the state of the art of theology in both Germany and the United States in conversation with the suffering of African Americans through an interpretation of the ancient texts of the Gospel of John.

Herzog's work is best characterized by his ongoing concern for the embodiment of academic insight in the midst of his broadening analysis of the most severe tensions and pressures of life. Instead of focusing on a few select symptoms at the center of the debate in his field – like the crisis of interpretation, or the sometimes lamented, sometimes celebrated, loss of philosophical foundations – Herzog's work picks up a wider set of problems. One of his central concerns has to do with reflections on power. In his book *Justice Church* (1980) he treads new ground by offering an analysis of power in relation to reflections on Jesus and by reconsidering key figures in theology (particularly Friedrich Schleiermacher, one of the most influential theologians and philosophers of the nineteenth century). While in his earlier work the question of power relates more closely to the realm of politics, later on Herzog is one of the first theologians to reflect on power in relation to economics. The basic problem that poses itself for the academy regarding politics and economics is not that academic thought would need to be politicized, but that thought itself is shaped by, and drawn into, the force-fields of politics and economics.

Within the parameters of his own field, Herzog's work takes up one of the basic challenges of early twentieth-century dialectical theology and develops it further. In settings where theology and the church are adapting to the dominant powers, the reminder of the dif-

ference between humanity and God, or between God and world, can make a significant difference. This is exemplified, for instance, in the work of his teacher Barth in his resistance to the German Third Reich. Going beyond Barth, Herzog senses early on that in the North American context the struggle to acknowledge God's otherness and sovereignty needs to go deeper. It makes sense only in the context of real-life confrontations between black and white, rich and poor, center and margin. If those in power are unable to respect to the concerns of the marginalized, if whites are unable to listen to blacks, if the rich do not care about the poor, how can they propose truly to respect and listen to God? In one of his last essays, "Athens, Berlin, and Lima" (1994), Herzog formulates the challenge in new ways: "What the theologian needs most is to see God. Yet God will not be seen where the divine can be controlled. The poor, as such, do not demonstrate God, and yet they are the place for us to 'see' God. How can this be?" No doubt, this is a description of one of the least understood dynamics at work in liberation theology. Rather than giving an exhaustive explanation, Herzog invites new thought by answering his own question with the observation that "the poor cannot be controlled." If our approach to other people is determined by relationships of power and control (even if well-intentioned), how can we assume that our approach to the divine other would be any different?

According to a common misconception, liberation theologies represent special interests, at best relevant only to limited groups of people, at worst just another outgrowth of postmodern pluralism. Yet liberation theology as developed by Herzog and others understands that, rather than addressing the special interests of one group, the concern for people on the margins deals with important parts of reality which, even though mostly repressed and made invisible, affect all of humanity. The reality of the margins is not independent from the reality of the center, and vice versa. Here a curious

reversal takes place that has not yet fully reached the level of consciousness of mainline academic thought. Despite their claims to universality, intellectual approaches developed in the centers of power shape up as special interest thinking if they pay no attention to the most severe pressures of life which affect everyone, those in the center and those on the margins alike. In addition, the different fault lines of marginalization along the lines of class, gender, and race, are connected in subtle ways. In this context, new alliances and connections need be forged without disregarding vital differences.

Herzog's work pulls together various strands of theological reflection on the margins not in order to imitate or supersede them but – as exemplified by his last book *God-Walk* (1988) – in order to apply them to the reform of mainline theology and the academy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Understanding God: The Key Issue in Present-Day Protestant Thought (New York, 1966).

"Theology of Liberation," *Continuum* 7 (1970): 515–24.

Liberation Theology: Liberation in the Light of the Fourth Gospel (New York, 1972).

Justice Church: The New Function of the Church in North American Christianity (Maryknoll, N.Y., 1980).

God-Walk: Liberation Shaping Dogmatics (Maryknoll, N.Y., 1988).

"Athens, Berlin, and Lima," *Theology Today* 51 (1994): 270–76.

European Pietism Reviewed (San Jose, Cal., 2003).

Other Relevant Works

"Political Theology," *Christian Century* 86 (1969): 975–8.

"God: Black or White? The Upshot of the Debate About God in the Sixties," *Review and Expositor* 67 (1970): 299–313.

"Pre-Bicentennial U.S.A. in the Liberation Process," in *Theology in the Americas*, ed.

S. Torres and J. Eagleson (Maryknoll, N.Y., 1976).

"New Birth of Conscience," *Theology Today* 53 (1997): 477–84.

"Methodism, Missions, and Money," in *Doctrines and Discipline*, ed. D. Campbell, W. Lawrence and R. Richey (Nashville, Tenn., 1999).

Theology from the Belly of the Whale: A Frederick Herzog Reader, ed. Joerg Rieger (Harrisburg, Penn., 1999). Contains a bibliography of Herzog's writings.

Further Reading

Meeks, M. Douglas, Jürgen Moltmann, and Frederick Trost, eds. *Theology and Corporate Conscience: Essays in Honor of Frederick Herzog* (Minneapolis, 1999).

Rieger, Joerg. *Remember the Poor: The Challenge to Theology in the Twenty-First Century* (Harrisburg, Penn., 1998).

Joerg Rieger

HESCHEL, Abraham Joshua (1907–72)

Abraham Heschel was born on 11 January 1907 in Warsaw, Poland, and died on 23 December 1972 in New York City. The foremost Jewish theologian of the post-World War II era, he also carried out important scholarship on biblical, rabbinic, medieval, and Hasidic Jewish sources. He was the scion of a distinguished lineage of Hasidic leaders of Hasidism, a pietistic movement that developed in Eastern Europe during the late eighteenth century, and as a young man he received a thorough education in classical Jewish texts. While studying at the University of Berlin for a PhD in philosophy, which he completed in 1933, Heschel also attended the Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums (School for the Study of Judaism), Berlin's liberal seminary

that trained its students in the techniques of modern Jewish scientific scholarship.

During the first years of the Third Reich, Heschel sought an academic position outside Europe. Among the Polish Jews deported by the Nazis in October 1938, he was rescued from Warsaw just weeks before Germany's invasion of Poland in September 1939. He was brought to the United States by the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati in March 1940, where he taught Jewish philosophy for five years. Most of his family remained trapped in Nazi-occupied Europe and perished. In 1945 he joined the faculty of Conservative Judaism's Jewish Theological Seminary in New York, where he served as the Ralph Simon Professor of Jewish Ethics and Mysticism until his death. Active in a variety of political movements during the last decade of his life, he achieved recognition as one of America's foremost religious leaders and as a unique, if sometimes controversial, voice within the Jewish community.

Heschel's earliest scholarship in the 1930s centered on medieval Jewish philosophy and on biblical scholarship. His books on *Maimonides* (1935) and *Don Jizchak Abravanel* (1937) were published in Germany to great acclaim. His doctoral dissertation, "Das prophetische Bewusstsein" (1936), was as much a critique of Protestant biblical scholarship as an analysis of the "prophetic consciousness" and presents a phenomenological analysis of religious experience based on the writings of the classical prophets. His primary criticism was that scholars treat the prophets in a reductionist fashion, analyzing their experiences of divine revelation as examples of psychological disorders or social conflicts and viewing their message as condemnations of Israelite religion in a proto-Christian fashion. They ignored the subjective experience of the prophets themselves, as well as the moral challenge they presented, in God's name, to their communities. Prophetic experience differs essentially from religious experience, Heschel argues, because of the public nature of its proclamation of justice.

The divine pathos, which he held to be the central biblical teaching about the nature of God, found its correspondence in prophetic sympathy, the prophet's ability to give voice to the "silent agony" of the poor and disenfranchised, while simultaneously speaking in the name of God. The prophets, according to Heschel, proclaimed that justice was not merely a political category but the supreme manifestation of God's presence and a tool for human redemption.

Heschel marked his difference from other philosophers of religion by emphasizing that the starting point of religious faith was neither proofs for the existence of God nor a human psychological need for religion. Rather, he writes that faith begins with questions, not certainty, and is reached by cultivating human sensibilities, such as awe, wonder, and radical amazement, that lead to an awareness of God's presence: "When the soul is not aflame, no light of speculation will illumine the darkness of indifference. No masterly logical demonstration of God's existence or any analysis of the intricacies of the traditional God concepts will succeed in dispersing that darkness … . Proofs may aid in protecting, but not in initiating certainty; essentially they are explications of what is already intuitively clear to us." (*Man is Not Alone*, 1951, p. 84)

With language that was deliberately poetic, Heschel recreated what he claimed was central to religious language, namely, its allusiveness and openness to multiple meanings, particularly the intimation, by words, of higher meanings in the realm of the divine. Literal-mindedness, by contrast, was an obstacle to faith, he argued. Literal readings of Scripture and rigid adherence to religious practice led to what Heschel decried as "religious behaviorism." Religion, he insisted, must continually evolve in practice and interpretation: "A vibrant society does not dwell in the shadows of old ideas and viewpoints; in the realm of the spirit, only a pioneer can be a true heir. The wages of spiritual plagiarism are the loss of integrity; self-aggrandizement is self-betrayal.

Authentic faith is more than an echo of a tradition. It is a creative situation, an event." (*Man is Not Alone*, 1951, p. 164)

Heschel similarly rejected the development within orthodoxy of an expansionist Zionism that demanded a "Greater Israel." In his book, *Israel: An Echo of Eternity* (1969), Heschel studied the spiritual meaning of the land of Israel for Jews, Christians, and Muslims, and insisted that Israel is not sacred in itself – "We do not worship the soil" – but is "endowed with the power to inspire" Jews to greater awareness of God's presence. Political might, he warned, can become "demonic when detached from moral meaning, from moral commitment."

In his phenomenological approach, Heschel brought to the fore aspects of Judaism that had been neglected by modern Jewish philosophy, which tended toward rationalist interpretations that identified Judaism as ethical monotheism. Heschel's phenomenological study *The Sabbath* (1951) speaks of Judaism as a religion concerned with the sanctification of time rather than space. "Six days a week we live under the tyranny of things of space; on the Sabbath we try to become attuned to holiness in time. It is a day on which we are called upon to share in what is eternal in time, to turn from the results of creation to the mystery of creation, from the world of creation to the creation of the world." While technology is essential to civilization, he writes that humanity might perish, not for want of information but for lack of appreciation. Cultivation of the inner life remained primary to him: Judaism teaches "not to flee from the realm of space; to work with things of space, but to be in love with eternity."

Toward the end of his life, Heschel completed a two-volume Yiddish book on a Hasidic rebbe, Menachem Mendel of Kotzk, a figure known for his insistence on radical self-awareness, honesty, and sincerity in religious commitment, comparing him with the Danish theologian Søren Kierkegaard. Heschel's attention to the Kotzker rebbe was a major contribution to scholarship on Hasidism and also reflected

his political engagement during the late 1960s, particularly his opposition to the war in Vietnam and his condemnation of the mendacity and hypocrisy of contemporary society.

Heschel, who wrote that he was a "brand plucked from the fire" of the Holocaust, died before public discussion of the Holocaust reached its height of popularity in the 1970s and 80s, and he has been criticized for not developing a formal theological response to it. He alludes to the Holocaust frequently and draws theological conclusions from it, particularly in his book *Who is Man?* (1965), which discusses the degradation of the human in the scientific racism leading up to the Nazi era. Not only survivors, he writes, but all human beings have to recognize that the primary challenge of Nazism is anthropodicy, how to justify continued faith in humanity in light of the evil committed by human beings: "We have once lived in a civilized world, rich in trust and expectation. Then we all died, were condemned to dwell in hell. Now we are living in hell. Our present life is our afterlife." For Jews, he writes, "Auschwitz is in our veins," and to attempt a theological explanation, "is to commit a supreme blasphemy."

Heschel's most important and original theological category, divine pathos, was first developed in his doctoral dissertation on prophetic consciousness and became central to all of his later theological writings. Heschel argued that the central feature of prophetic religiosity was the teaching that God responds to human deeds, gaining strength or experiencing injury in response to the ways human beings treat one another. His formulation is drawn from classical rabbinic and Kabbalistic understandings of *Zoreh Gavoha* (divine need), according to which God voluntarily went into exile with the Jewish people and requires redemption along with them. Each mitzvah, the Kabbalists emphasized, when performed with the proper intention, can bring about a reunification within God and the redemption of the world, both human and divine. Heschel expands the classical understanding, as Arthur Green points

out, making God responsive not only to private acts of religious observance, but also to public acts of social justice.

Tracing his theme of divine pathos in postbiblical literature, Heschel argued in his three-volume scholarly study of rabbinic theology, *Torah min HaShamayim* (1962, 1965, 1990), that many categories of classical Kabbalah are already anticipated in the Talmud and Midrash. In contrast to other studies of rabbinic theology that portray a unified viewpoint, Heschel dissected the conflicting viewpoints of the rabbis on central questions of *halakha*, revelation, and God. Heschel's synthetic theological writings, including *God in Search of Man* (1955), *Man Is Not Alone*, and *Man's Quest for God* (1954), develop the motif of divine pathos further. He argues that God is in need of human beings and that, properly understood, the Bible revealed itself as God's book about humanity, rather than a humanly authored book about God. Prayer, Heschel wrote, is not human petition of God, but an opportunity to achieve awareness of being challenged by God; indeed, he wrote that prayer must be "subversive."

Heschel's study of the prophets linked the political with the spiritual. Religiosity, he wrote, was the opposite of callousness. He described "prophetic sympathy" as the ability to hold God and humanity in one thought and at one time, resulting in an intense, passionate concern for justice: "prophecy is the voice that God has lent to the silent agony, a voice to the plundered poor, to the profaned riches of the world." Making the marginalized of society the center of their concern, the prophets, Heschel writes, are "intent on intensifying responsibility"; their goal is to abolish indifference. Rather than preaching a God of wrath, as some have charged, the prophets, according to Heschel, present God as profoundly emotional and resonant to humanity, whether in anger, love, or forgiveness; the prophetic God is characterized above all as compassionate.

While publication of Heschel's dissertation in 1935 had brought him to the attention of some

Bible scholars in America, his work on religion first received widespread notice in the United States following a glowing review of his first major English-language book, *Man Is Not Alone*, by the distinguished Protestant theologian Reinhold NIEBUHR. Heschel's book, which was primarily concerned with articulating the nature of religious experience, demonstrated, Niebuhr wrote, that he was "one of the treasures of mind and spirit by which the persecutions, unloosed in Europe, inadvertently enriched our American culture … . It is a safe guess that he will become a commanding and authoritative voice not only in the Jewish community but in the religious life of America." (1951) Like Niebuhr, Heschel became a theologian with deep commitments to social activism. Based on his conviction that the prophets of Israel form models for Jewish behavior today, Heschel came to be best known for his work in the civil rights movement, where he worked closely with Martin Luther KING, Jr., and as founder of an anti-Vietnam War organization, Clergy and Laity Concerned about Vietnam. He understood his political work religiously, writing that silence in face of the deaths in Vietnam was "blasphemy" and that "in a free society, some are guilty, but all are responsible."

Heschel also served as the Jewish representative to the Second Vatican Council during its deliberations on Catholic–Jewish relations, meeting frequently with Vatican officials, including Augustin Cardinal Bea and Pope Paul VI. His approach to interfaith dialogue insisted that the focus should be on matters of faith, stressing common problems faced by all religious persons, rather than matters of doctrine on which religions differ. His work has been widely read by Christian as well as Jewish theologians, shaping, for example, Jürgen Moltmann's influential discussion of divine suffering. In 1964–5 he served as Harry Emerson Fosdick Visiting Professor at Union Theological Seminary in New York City. A frequent and popular lecturer at American universities and synagogues, as well as in Israel and Europe, he received numerous awards and honorary degrees and was often consulted by inter-religious organizations and peace groups, as well as policy organizations concerned with topics such as aging, education, and medical care.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Maimonides: Eine Biographie (Berlin, 1935).
Die Prophetie (Krakow, 1936).
Don Jizchak Abravanel (Berlin, 1937).
The Earth Is the Lord's (New York, 1950).
Man is Not Alone: A Philosophy of Religion (New York, 1951).
The Sabbath: Its Meaning for Modern Man (New York, 1951).
Man's Quest for God: Studies in Prayer and Symbolism (New York, 1954).
God in Search of Man (New York, 1955).
The Prophets (New York, 1962).
Torah min HaShamayim be-Aspaklaryah shel ha-Dorot, 3 vols (vol. 1, London, 1962; vol. 2, London, 1965; vol. 3, New York, 1990).
Who is Man? (Palo Alto, Cal., 1965).
The Insecurity of Freedom (New York, 1966).
Israel: An Echo of Eternity (New York, 1969).
A Passion for Truth (New York, 1973).
Kotzk, 2 vols (Tel-Aviv, 1973).
The Circle of the Baal Shem Tov: Studies in Hasidism by Abraham J. Heschel, ed. Samuel H. Dresner (Chicago, 1985).
Moral Grandeur and Spiritual Audacity: Essays of Abraham Joshua Heschel, ed. Susannah Heschel (New York, 1996).
Prophetic Inspiration after the Prophets: Maimonides and Other Medieval Authorities, by Abraham J. Heschel, ed. Morris M. Faierstein (Hoboken, N.J., 1996).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encyc Relig*, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*

"Abraham Joshua Heschel: A twenty-fifth Yahrzeit Tribute," *Conservative Judaism* 50 (Winter/Spring 1998). Special issue on Heschel.

Green, Arthur. "Three Warsaw Mystics," in *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought*, vol. 13 (Jerusalem, 1996), pp. 1–58.

Heschel, Susannah. "Introduction," in *Moral Grandeur and Spiritual Audacity: Essays of Abraham Joshua Heschel* (New York, 1996).

Kaplan, Edward K. *Holiness in Words: Abraham Joshua Heschel's Poetics of Piety* (Albany, N.Y., 1996).

Kaplan, Edward K., and Samuel H. Dresner. *Abraham Joshua Heschel: Prophetic Witness* (New Haven, Conn., 1998).

Merkle, John C. *The Genesis of Faith: The Depth Theology of Abraham Joshua Heschel* (New York and London, 1985).

———, ed. *Abraham Joshua Heschel: Exploring His Life and Thought* (New York, 1985).

Moore, Donald J. *The Human and the Holy: the Spirituality of Abraham Joshua Heschel* (New York, 1989).

Niebuhr, Reinhold. "Masterly Analysis of Faith," *New York Herald Tribune Book Review* 27 (1 April 1951): 12.

Perlman, Lawrence. *Abraham Heschel's Idea of Revelation* (Atlanta, 1989).

Rothschild, Fritz. "Introduction," in *Between God and Man: An Interpretation of Judaism from the Writings of Abraham J. Heschel* (New York, 1965).

Susannah Heschel

HIBBEN, John Grier (1861–1933)

John Grier Hibben was born on 19 April 1861 in Peoria, Illinois. His father Samuel was a Presbyterian minister, who volunteered for service in the Union Army during the Civil War and died of a fever in 1862. His mother, Elizabeth Grier, emphasized education in Hibben's childhood, and in 1882 he graduated with his BA from Princeton University as the class president and class valedictorian. Hibben then studied philosophy at the University of Berlin for one year, after which he returned to Princeton to earn the MA at the Princeton Theological Seminary in 1885. For six years he was an ordained Presbyterian minister in St. Louis and Chambersburg, Pennsylvania.

In 1891 Hibben returned to Princeton as an instructor of logic in 1891. He was awarded the PhD in philosophy in 1893 for his dissertation "The Relation of Ethics to Jurisprudence." Hibben proceeded to climb the academic hierarchy, becoming an assistant professor of logic at Princeton in 1894, associate professor of logic in 1897, and Stuart Professor of Logic in 1907. Hibben served as the President of the American Philosophical Association in 1909–10, and in 1912 he became the fourteenth President of Princeton, succeeding Woodrow Wilson.

Hibben inherited the presidency of Princeton at a time of controversy. Like other universities in this period, Princeton was undergoing a shift from a provincial institution dedicated to theological and social pursuits to an internationally recognized research center. While Hibben furthered Wilson's introduction of the preceptorial system, which supplemented lectures with discussion groups, he disagreed with Wilson's proposal to divide the campus into quadrangles, a plan that would have eliminated the eating clubs that dominated Princeton student life. Although Hibben refused to eliminate the eating clubs, he oversaw great changes at Princeton, including increased faculty participation in university governance, a doubling of the size of the faculty, an expansion of the departments of the natural and social sciences, and the creation of professional schools of architecture, engineering, and public affairs. During his tenure, the endowment of the university increased by nearly four hundred percent. Hibben retired

from the presidency in 1932. Hibben and his wife died in an automobile accident on 16 May 1933 while traveling from Elizabeth to Princeton, New Jersey.

Though not known for groundbreaking work in philosophy, Hibben was respected for his knowledge of both the Kantian and Hegelian systems. Hibben published several works, including the popular textbooks *Inductive Logic* (1896) and *Logic: Deductive and Inductive* (1905). His *Hegel's Logic* (1902) was among a very small number of book-length studies on Hegel in the English language available before 1940. Hibben also published a book on political philosophy, *The Higher Patriotism* (1915), which made a case both for American military preparedness and America's entry into World War I. In philosophical matters, Hibben was opposed to historicist trends, asserting in one essay, "There are certain ideas which in the history of the race experience have become established for all time, for all places, and for all persons and things." (1911, pp. 146–7)

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Inductive Logic (New York, 1896).
The Problems of Philosophy: An Introduction to the Study of Philosophy (New York, 1898).
Hegel's Logic: An Essay in Interpretation (New York, 1902).
Logic, Deductive and Inductive (New York, 1905).
The Philosophy of the Enlightenment (New York and London, 1910).
A Defense of Prejudice, and Other Essays (New York, 1911).
The Higher Patriotism (New York, 1915).
Self-legislated Obligations: The Godkin Lectures, 1927 (Cambridge, Mass., 1927).

Other Relevant Works
Hibben's papers are at Princeton University and the University of New Hampshire.
"The Relation of Ethics to Jurisprudence," *International Journal of Ethics* 4 (1894):

133–60.
"The Test of Pragmatism," *Philosophical Review* 17 (1908): 365–82.
"The Philosophical Aspects of Evolution," *Philosophical Review* 19 (1910): 113–36.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v33, Pres Addr of APA v1, Who Was Who in Amer v1
McGilvary, Evander B. "John Grier Hibben, *Hegel's Logic*," *Philosophical Review* 12 (1903): 353–7.

Greg Eow

HICK, John Harwood (1922–)

John Hick was born on 20 January 1922 in Scarborough, England, and grew up in the Anglican tradition. At age eighteen, while studying law and in a skeptical stance toward religion, he experienced an evangelical conversion. He turned towards ordination in the Presbyterian church and the study of philosophy and theology. Before receiving an MA in philosophy at the University of Edinburgh in 1948, he served as a conscientious objector in the Friends' Ambulance Unit from 1942 to 1945 during World War II. In 1950, he received a D.Phil. from the University of Oxford. His dissertation was the basis of his first book, *Faith and Knowledge* (1957). He then studied theology at Westminster Theological College, Cambridge, in 1953. Also in 1953, he married and was ordained in the Presbyterian Church of England.

From 1956 to 1959, Hick was assistant professor of philosophy at Cornell. From 1959 to 1964 he was professor of Christian philosophy at Princeton Theological Seminary. While at Princeton, the Presbyterian Synod of New

Jersey denied his membership application, thereby threatening his teaching appointment, because Hick refused to affirm the doctrine of the virgin birth. The dispute became bitter and public but was defused in 1962 when the General Assembly ordered his acceptance. Hick then was lecturer in divinity at the University of Cambridge from 1964 to 1967. In 1967 he became professor of theology at the University of Birmingham, in whose pluralistic atmosphere he began to develop his distinctive views on world religions. In 1972 he became Governor of Queens College, Birmingham. In 1979 he became Danforth Professor of Philosophy of Religion at Claremont Graduate School in California, from which he retired as emeritus professor in 1992. He gave the Gifford Lectures in 1986–7, which were the basis for his *An Interpretation of Religion* (1989). He received the Grawemeyer Award in 1991.

Early in his career, in *Faith and Knowledge*, Hick gave a vigorous defense of a realist, cognitive approach to the experience of a transcendent reality, a reality that can nonetheless be experienced or interpreted in a variety of ways. He rejected the reductionist claim, common in that period, that experiences of the transcendent could be explained in naturalistic terms. His later thought followed a Kantian direction where the actual experience of the transcendent is understood to be experienced in metaphorical ways as a phenomenon shaped by various religions and traditions, even though all point to one and the same noumenal reality.

When he was defending a more traditional account of Christian faith against the noted falsification challenge of Antony FLEW in the 1950s, he argued that eschatological claims could be verified, and thus be cognitively meaningful, even though they might not be capable of falsification (in the case that no one survives death at all). The University Discussion in the 1950s, as it came to be known, dominated philosophy of religion for a quarter of a century. Three parables were given at the original discussion, and Hick added a fourth, the Parable of the Celestial City, calling for eschatological verification, which usually has been seen as integral to that significant discussion. In light of his later well-known pluralist approach to religion, it is noteworthy that in that early parable, closer to his evangelical roots, he tended to consider only two outcomes: naturalistic death or encounter with the risen Christ in the Celestial City.

In *Evil and the God of Love* (1966), Hick propounded a major alternative to the Augustinian free-will defense in theodicy; this, too, involved a major emphasis on eschatology. Drawing especially on the early church father Irenaeus and the modern theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher, he delineated a free-will defense that did not presuppose perfection in the beginning of creation but in the future. Creation thus offers a "soul-making" potential that has to be realized by each individual. Besides being more compatible with the Hebrew story of creation, it offered the advantage, as compared to Augustine's perfectionist notion, of being more compatible with evolution and modern science. While many across the theological spectrum have moved to this Irenaean account in its broad outlines, Hick's particular view required universalism because of his sensitivity to the magnitude of human suffering; if anyone were to be denied the consummation, Hick believed that creation would be unjustified.

Yet another eschatological dimension was added to his theodicy in *Death and Eternal Life* (1976), a book devoted entirely to the issue of the afterlife. Hick here further developed his desire to draw on all major world religions and offered a remarkable synthesis. Still working within an Irenaean person-making framework, he argued that since people are usually not very developed at the end of this life, they go on to become reincarnated in other worlds many times until they are perfected enough to get off the wheel of life. Drawing on the *Tibetan Book of the Dead*, he suggested that between lives, people may experience ther-

apeutic reflection enabling them to take a further step in their next life. The final consummation of person-making occurs when everyone has become one with God. Hick also offered significant arguments for the coherence of the idea of an afterlife in his "replica theory" of identity. Although he did not regard theistic proofs as necessary for faith, he also made contributions to the discussion of arguments for the existence of God.

Hick further pursued his pluralistic concern for all world religions in his "Copernican revolution" in religion, for which he is perhaps most well-known. These ideas were launched in *God and the Universe of Faiths* (1973) and in a book he edited, *The Myth of God Incarnate* (1977). In 1986, Hick and Paul Knitter organized a conference at Claremont that resulted in a book arguing for a theistic rather than Christocentric approach to religious pluralism, *The Myth of Christian Uniqueness: Towards a Pluralistic Theology of Religions* (1987). In the same year, his Gifford Lectures drew all of these themes together into what is perhaps his *magnum opus*, *An Interpretation of Religion* (1989). Particular religions, he argued, have tended to see themselves as central and absolute and others as peripheral, yet all major religions have produced their full share of saints and sinners. The claim of moral and religious superiority, he concluded, is arrogant and unfair to other religions. He changed this strategy by placing the noumenal Real at the center and having all religions revolving around it. Concerning Christianity, he argued that historical criticism has shown that Jesus did not consider himself to be divine in the strong Chalcedonian sense and that religious language is largely metaphorical, as is the language of religion in general. Jesus Christ can be seen as the way to God for Christians but not as an exclusive way that is unique from all other religions. The great world religions thus represent different perspectives on the Real and on the central religious emphasis of sacrificial love. Individuals may affirm their own way of worship while recognizing legitimacy in other ways. Hick's views have been widely celebrated, although he has been criticized for offering a synthesis that in effect proposes another religion, for not doing justice to the unique claims of religions, and for taking a Christian slant, emphasizing love, on the essence of religion.

Beyond his distinctive ideas, Hick conveyed complex ideas clearly and defended them effectively. His introductions to the philosophy of religion, to theodicy, to world religions, and to eschatological issues have been staples for teaching these subjects even for those who do not agree with his conclusions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Faith and Knowledge: A Modern Introduction to the Problem of Religious Knowledge (Ithaca, N.Y., 1957; 2nd edn 1966).

Philosophy of Religion (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1963; 2nd edn 1973; 3rd edn 1983; 4th edn 1990).

Christianity at the Centre (London, 1968). 2nd edn, *The Center of Christianity* (San Francisco, 1978). 3rd edn, *The Second Christianity* (London, 1983).

Arguments for the Existence of God (London, 1970; New York, 1971).

God and the Universe of Faiths: Essays in the Philosophy of Religion (London and New York, 1973; 2nd edn, Basingstoke, UK, 1987).

Evil and the God of Love (New York, 1966; 2nd edn 1978).

Death and Eternal Life (London and New York, 1976; Louisville, Kent., 1994).

God Has Many Names: Britain's New Religious Pluralism (London, 1980).

God Has Many Names (Philadelphia, 1982).

Problems of Religious Pluralism (London and New York, 1985).

An Interpretation of Religion: Human Responses to the Transcendent (New Haven, Conn., 1989; 2nd edn, Basingstoke, UK, 2004).

*The Metaphor of God Incarnate:
Christology in a Pluralistic Age*
(Louisville, Kent., 1993).

*The Fifth Dimension: An Exploration of the
Spiritual Realm* (Oxford, 1999).

Dialogues in the Philosophy of Religion
(Basingstoke, UK, 2001).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Faith and the Philosophers* (New York,
1964).

Ed., *The Myth of God Incarnate*
(Philadelphia, 1977).

Ed. with Paul F. Knitter, *The Myth of
Christian Uniqueness: Towards a
Pluralistic Theology of Religions*
(Maryknoll, N.Y., 1987).

Ed. with Edmund S. Meltzer, *Three Faiths –
One God: A Jewish, Christian, Muslim
Encounter* (Albany, N.Y., 1989).

A John Hick Reader, ed. Paul Badham
(Philadelphia, 1990).

John Hick: An Autobiography (Oxford,
2003).

Further Reading
Oxford Comp Phil

Cheetham, David. *John Hick: A Critical
Introduction and Reflection* (Aldershot,
UK, 2003).

Davis, Stephen T., ed. *Encountering Jesus: A
Debate on Christology* (Atlanta, 1988).

———, ed. *Evil and the God of Love: Live
Options in Theodicy*, 2nd edn (Louisville,
Kent., 2000).

Eddy, Paul R. *John Hick's Pluralist
Philosophy of World Religions* (Aldershot,
UK, 2002).

Geivett, R. Douglas. *Evil and the Evidence
for God: The Challenge of John Hick's
Theodicy* (Philadelphia, 1993).

Gillis, Chester. *A Question of Final Belief:
John Hick's Pluralistic Theory of
Salvation* (New York, 1989).

Goulder, Michael, ed. *Incarnation and
Myth: The Debate Continued* (Grand
Rapids, Mich., 1979).

Hartshorne, Charles. "John Hick on Logical
and Ontological Necessity," *Religious
Studies* 13 (1977): 155–65.

Hewitt, Harold, ed. *Problems in the
Philosophy of Religion: Critical Studies of
the Work of John Hick* (New York,
1991).

Mathis, Terry R. *Against John Hick: An
Examination of His Philosophy of
Religion* (Lanham, Md., 1985).

Plantinga, Alvin. "Ad Hick," *Faith and
Philosophy* 14 (1997): 295–8.

Rose, Kenneth. *Knowing the Real: John
Hick on the Cognitivity of Religions and
Religious Pluralism* (New York, 1996).

Rowe, William L. "Religious Pluralism,"
Religious Studies 35 (1999): 139–50.

Sharma, Arvind, ed. *God, Truth, and
Reality: Essays in Honour of John Hick*
(New York, 1993).

Dan R. Stiver

HICKOK, Laurens Perseus (1798–1888)

Laurens Perseus Hickok was born on 29
December 1798 in Bethel, Connecticut, and
died on 7 May 1888 in Amherst,
Massachusetts. While still in high school, he
opened and taught at a private school in Bethel.
In 1818 he entered the junior class of Union
College, graduating with a BA in 1820. He
studied theology with mentors William
Andrews of Danbury and Bennet Tyler of South
Britain, Connecticut. Tyler was an "old school"
Calvinist who later became the President of
Dartmouth College. In 1822 Hickok married
Elizabeth Taylor; they had no children. Hickok
was ordained in 1824 at the church in Kent,
Connecticut, where he served as pastor until
1829, when he was called to succeed Lyman
Beecher in the pulpit of the Congregational
church in Litchfield, Connecticut.

Hickok's self-education in theology and philosophy led in 1836 to his appointment as professor of theology at Western Reserve College in Ohio. In 1844 he became professor of theology at Auburn Theological Seminary. At Auburn, he published his first book, *Rational Psychology; or, The Subjective Idea and the Objective Law of All Intelligence* (1849). In 1852 he became professor of mental and moral philosophy and Vice President of Union College. At Union he published a number of important works. These included *A System of Moral Science* (1853); *Empirical Psychology; or, The Human Mind as Given in Consciousness* (1854); *Rational Cosmology; or, The Eternal Principles and the Necessary Laws of the Universe* (1858); and "Psychology and Skepticism" (1862) which was written in response to a critical review of his revised *Rational Psychology*.

Hickok served as Acting President of Union College for several years before being confirmed as President in March 1866. He resigned from the presidency and his professorship in 1868, and moved to Amherst, Massachusetts, where he continued to write and publish on theological subjects. With the collaboration of his nephew, Julius Hawley SEELYE, President of Amherst College, Hickok revised his books until his death in 1888.

The priority that Hickok assigned to rational over empirical psychology is evident in the order in which his books were written. The first, *Rational Psychology*, argued that an empirical psychology cannot go beyond a description of the facts of conscious experience and therefore needs a metaphysical, transcendental grounding to meet the criterion of a true science. Hickok recognized the domination of British empiricism in American thought, developed in Locke's system as well in the philosophies of Berkeley, Hartley, and Hume (and, in opposition to Hume's skepticism, the Scottish School of Common Sense). However, he believed Locke's system to be only a partial philosophy of mind because Locke rejected a priori knowledge. Hickok welcomed Kant's investigations into the origin and validity of all knowledge and his spur

to the search for the general and universal a priori principles that govern what must be the facts of experience. The method for discovering these principles was the exercise of pure reason.

For Hickok, science entails identifying the correlation between the idea (subjective fact of experience) and the universal necessary law, identified through reason independent of experience. He devoted book 2 (around 600 pages) of his *Rational Psychology* to determining the a priori principles consistent with the facts of experience for Sense, Understanding, and Reason, the three faculties of the Intellect, where Intellect was in turn conceived as one of three modes in which the mind operates (the others being Sensibility, or Susceptibility, and Will). Intellect encompasses the mind's capacity for knowing and is the source of all cognition.

A System of Moral Science, Hickok's second book, followed the pattern set by the *Rational Psychology*. Rather than being concerned with detailing examples of moral conduct for students, Hickok concentrated instead on the delineation of the ultimate rational principle ("the intrinsic excellency of spiritual being" and a "spirit to act worthily of its spirituality") that governs moral conduct within the spheres of personal duties to mankind in general and to civil, divine, and family government in particular. Civil government, he argued, exerts its authority through rewards and punishments, divine government through love and loyalty, and family government through a mixture of the two. All three constitute objective moral powers. In this text, Hickok demonstrated "his independence of current opinion by his outspoken treatment of the theory of the state, which was conceived in a Hegelian manner".

Hickok's *Empirical Psychology* elaborated the facts of mind as given in experience, tested by individual consciousness and the manifestations of collective consciousness in social and cultural phenomena such as language. Although Hickok gave pride of place to his *Rational Psychology*, it was his *Empirical Psychology* that had wide circulation as a textbook. Written in a style and with content

accessible to students, it attained considerable popularity for use in courses in mental philosophy in the antebellum period and, in revised form, continued in use until the textbooks of the "new psychology" replaced the authors of the pre-Civil War era. A chapter on anthropology, in which Hickok discussed the mind–body relation and the influence of race, gender, and temperament on mind, distinguished the *Empirical Psychology* from other texts of the pre-Darwinian era.

The description of mind and its processes provided by Hickok in the *Empirical Psychology* was generally consistent with that then being taught in American colleges under the influence of the Scottish Common Sense School despite differences between Hickok and the Scottish School in their respective metaphysics. For Hickok, the Intellect, the Sensibility or Susceptibility, and the Will are categories of mind that encompass the cognitive, conative, and volitional mental processes respectively. The Intellect operates through the three faculties of Sense, Understanding, and Reason, the primary subjects of his *Rational Psychology*. The Sense derives cognitions from the senses, identifying the quality and quantity of sensory experience. The Understanding connects the qualities and quantities provided by the senses into a conception (e.g., the smell and color that stimulate the senses may be understood as a flower); memories, concepts, associations, and other cognitive processes such as judgment are also considered part of the Understanding. Reason provided the mind with the capacity to determine how it perceives and thinks and is thus the means to arrive at a rational psychology.

The Susceptibility was considered in two aspects; animal susceptibility included irrational, emotional aspects of mind, feelings and desires, serving survival needs of the individual as well as social relationships, while rational susceptibility included a higher order of feelings or emotion related to aesthetics, ethics, science, and theism. Finally, the Will represents the mind's capacity for making choices

among alternatives, in the knowledge that an individual is held responsible for the choice that is made. Thus, for Hickok, the will is free.

In a concluding chapter of *Rational Psychology* entitled "The Competency of the Human Mind to Attain the End of Its Being," Hickok addressed the end or purpose of the human mind, which he believed to conform to the highest good of humanity. While the animal portion of mind seeks happiness, the spiritual portion seeks self-approval. The difficulty of achieving the higher spiritual ends lies in the hedonistic animal nature of mind; achieving spiritual fulfillment rested, Hickok concluded, with the coming of a savior. A contemporary reviewer of Hickok's first three volumes (*Rational Psychology*, *A System of Moral Science*, and *Empirical Psychology*) believed them collectively to "represent the highest attainments in speculative thought which the American mind has yet reached" (Anonymous 1859).

Hickok's conviction that rational principles provide meaning for empirical facts was not restricted to his psychology. In his *Rational Cosmology*, he relied on reason as the instrumental human faculty to identify those general and universal principles for all sciences. As a philosopher-theologian, Hickok's rational principles were consistent with the notion of a rational Author in which all facts of experience can be grounded. This was a position that he defended against attacks arguing that his philosophy was pantheistic, skeptical, and much too heavily influenced by German transcendental philosophy.

Hickok's psychology was a serious attempt to provide a theory of mind that rested on a solid metaphysical foundation. His approach offered an alternative to the empirical psychologies that constituted the British tradition in American mental philosophy, and foreshadowed the tension within later scientific psychology between an emphasis on empirical fact-gathering and the pursuit of theoretical principles within which the facts may be understood.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Rational Psychology; or, The Subjective Idea and the Objective Law of All Intelligence (Auburn, N.Y., 1849; 2nd edn, New York and Chicago, 1861).

A System of Moral Science (Schenectady, N.Y., 1853).

Empirical Psychology; or, The Human Mind as Given in Consciousness (Schenectady, N.Y., 1854).

Rational Cosmology; or, The Eternal Principles and the Necessary Laws of the Universe (New York, 1858).

Creator and Creation; or, The Knowledge in the Reason of God and His Work (Boston, 1872).

Humanity Immortal; or, Man Tried, Fallen and Redeemed (Boston, 1872; 2nd edn 1876).

The Logic of Reason, Universal and Eternal (Boston, 1875).

Other Relevant Works

Hickok's papers are at Amherst College.

"Psychology and Scepticism," *American Theological Review* 15 (1862): 391–414.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v7*

Anonymous. "Dr. Hickok's Philosophy," *The Bibliotheca Sacra and Biblical Repository* 16 (1859): 253–78.

Bare, John K. "Laurens Perseus Hickok: Philosopher, Theologian, and Psychologist," in *Portraits of Pioneers in Psychology*, vol. 3, ed. G. A. Kimble and M. Wertheimer (Washington, D.C., 1998), pp. 1–15.

Fay, Jay Wharton. *American Psychology before William James* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1939).

Good, James A. "Introduction," to *Rational Psychology*, by Laurens Perseus Hickok, vol. 4 of *The Early American Reception of German Idealism*, ed. James A. Good (Bristol, UK, 2002), pp. v–xviii.

Roback, A. A. *History of American Psychology* (New York, 1952).

Alfred H. Fuchs

HIGGINSON, Thomas Wentworth Storrow (1823–1911)

Thomas Wentworth Higginson was born on 22 December 1823 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. He received the Harvard College BA in 1841. After graduating from Harvard Divinity School in 1847, he was soon ordained and became the minister of the Unitarian church in Newburyport, Massachusetts. His liberal theology and socially progressive views on abolition, temperance, and rights of laborers caused his dismissal in 1849. After some teaching and writing, he was called to the Free Church in Worcester, Massachusetts, where he served from 1852 to 1857. He then organized abolition societies and wrote anti-slavery tracts until he found an opportunity in 1862 to command the First Carolina Volunteers, the first federally authorized African-American regiment composed of freed slaves. Higginson was wounded in battle and left the army in 1864. He devoted the rest of his life to writing fiction, histories of the US, literary criticism, and biographies. He continued to support diverse causes including free immigration and civil rights for women and African Americans. He served two terms as a Republican in the Massachusetts legislature from 1879 to 1881, and for many years was President of the Free Religious Association of Boston. Higginson died on 9 May 1911 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Higginson was an important theological ally of Ralph Waldo EMERSON, William Ellery Channing, and Theodore Parker. His consistent defense of religious pluralism and toler-

ance did not extend to fundamental issues of human dignity and worth. After the Compromise of 1850 he spoke out against the Fugitive Slave Act and helped the Underground Railroad. He supported the more radical and violent resistance efforts against extending slavery in the territories. He led the 1854 mob attacking the Boston Court House to try to free fugitive slave Anthony Burns, and he was one of the "Secret Six" who funded John Brown's unsuccessful raid in 1859 on the military compound at Harpers Ferry, Virginia. Higginson also joined feminists Lucy STONE and Susan B. ANTHONY in their efforts for temperance and women's suffrage. He encouraged aspiring women writers, notably poet Emily Dickinson whose works he edited and published after her death, and wrote a useful biography of Margaret Fuller.

Higginson was one of the most important thinkers to have bridged the transcendentalist and progressive eras, leading Protestantism away from fundamentalism towards the social gospel. In 1852 he stated his often-quoted principles directing this march:

We do not, I trust, undervalue the debt of mankind to the Scriptures. We only claim, with the most eminent of modern Orthodox critics, the learned and pious Neander, that the time is come "to distinguish between the divine and human in the sacred writings".… It is not possible that any collection of various books by various writers at various times can be assumed as a whole and so consulted, without introducing the utmost confusion into all moral questions. It has almost come to be a proverb, "You can prove anything out of Scripture." There are, all told, not less than fifty different sects in this country, each claiming to sustain itself by the Bible, to the exclusion of all others. And in all great moral questions, as War, Slavery, Temperance, Capital Punishment, it is unquestionably far easier to decide what is or is not right, than to ascertain what is or is not Scriptural … . There are certain prac-

tical tests provided in every generation, difficult works to be done, crosses to be borne – which are "the only true relics of the true cross of Christ, let the Romanists say what they will." By their fruits ye shall know them. I do not see positive marks of any apostolical in churches whose members buy and sell their fellow-members; but I see a zeal that looks quite apostolical in several reformatory societies, and even if they do reprove rather sharply at times, so did Peter and Paul. In times when doctors of divinity openly offer to sell their brothers in the cause of slavery, we need not wonder if irregular practitioners go so far as to scold their brothers in the cause of liberty. (1852, pp. 18–20)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Things New And Old: An Installation Sermon (Worcester, Mass., 1852).
Out-door Papers (Boston, 1863).
Common Sense about Women (Boston, 1882).
Margaret Fuller Ossoli (Boston, 1884).
Concerning All of Us (New York, 1892).
Cheerful Yesterdays (Boston, 1898).
Contemporaries (Boston, 1899).
Women and the Alphabet: A Series of Essays (Boston, 1900).
John Greenleaf Whittier (New York, 1902).
Henry Wadsworth Longfellow (Boston, 1902).
Part of a Man's Life (Boston, 1905).
Carlyle's Laugh and Other Surprises (Boston, 1909).

Other Relevant Works
Higginson's papers are at Harvard University.
The Writings of Thomas Wentworth Higginson, 7 vols (Boston, 1900).
Letters and Journals of Thomas Wentworth Higginson, 1846–1906, ed. Mary Thacher Higginson (Boston, 1921).
The Complete Civil War Journal and Selected Letters of Thomas Wentworth

Higginson, ed. Christopher Looby (Chicago, 2000).

The Magnificent Activist: The Writings of Thomas Wentworth Higginson (1823–1911), ed. Howard N. Meyer (Cambridge, Mass., 2000).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v1*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Edelstein, Tilden G. *Strange Enthusiasm: A Life of Thomas Wentworth Higginson* (New Haven, Conn., 1968).

Higginson, Mary Thacher. *Thomas Wentworth Higginson, The Story of His Life* (Boston, 1914).

Mather, Winifred. *A Bibliography of Thomas Wentworth Higginson* (Cambridge, Mass., 1906).

Meyer, Howard N. *Colonel of a Black Regiment: The Life of Thomas Wentworth Higginson* (New York, 1967).

Tuttleton, James W. *Thomas Wentworth Higginson* (Boston, 1978).

John R. Shook

HILDEBRAND, Dietrich von (1889–1977)

Dietrich von Hildebrand was born on 12 October 1889 in Florence, Italy, the son of the great German sculptor, Adolf von Hildebrand. He grew up in an extraordinarily rich aesthetic culture and was educated by tutors at home until he began his university studies in Munich in 1906. It was in Munich that he met philosopher Max Scheler and began the very close friendship with him that lasted some fifteen years. Between 1909 and 1911 he spent several semesters studying with Edmund Husserl at the University of Göttingen. He was deeply influenced by Husserl's *Logische Untersuchungen*, which gave him a fundamental philosophical orientation that he never lost. In Göttingen he also studied with Husserl's assistant, Adolf Reinach, whom he always venerated as a master pedagogue and an exemplary phenomenologist. Scheler lived in Göttingen at this time and shared an apartment with von Hildebrand, who acknowledged receiving much inspiration for his moral philosophy from his close association with Scheler.

In 1912 von Hildebrand received his PhD in philosophy from Göttingen, writing a dissertation under Husserl entitled "Die Idee der sittlichen Handlung" (The Idea of Moral Action). Husserl wrote in his evaluation of it: "I almost want to say that the genius of Adolf von Hildebrand has been inherited by his son, the author, as a philosophical genius." He also said that von Hildebrand "astonishes the reader by an incomparably intimate knowledge of the various formations of affective consciousness and their objective correlates." Recent research at the Husserl archive in Louvain has shown that Husserl made repeated use of von Hildebrand's dissertation in his own research.

In 1914 von Hildebrand, who had received no religious education as a child, converted to Catholicism under the influence of Scheler, who had directed von Hildebrand's attention to the exemplary Christian existence of the saints. But von Hildebrand differed from other Catholic converts of the time, such as Jacques MARITAIN, because he felt no obligation to remake himself philosophically into a Thomist. Von Hildebrand always kept a critical distance to Thomism, developing some of his own phenomenological positions in debate with the followers of Thomas Aquinas. But this philosophical distance did not involve any distance from Catholic faith and morals, which von Hildebrand ardently embraced.

If von Hildebrand was critical of some Thomistic teachings, he was much more critical

of the transcendental phenomenology that Husserl first expressed in his *Ideen* in 1913. Most of the early phenomenologists who studied with Husserl in Göttingen – such as Edith Stein, Roman Ingarden, Hedwig Martius, and Adolf Reinach – understood the genius of phenomenology to consist in a certain recovery of philosophical realism; they were deeply disappointed with Husserl's turning away from realism and they could not follow him in that direction.

Von Hildebrand returned to Munich for his *Habilitation*, which he completed in 1918 with another ethical study, this one entitled "Sittlichkeit und ethische Werterkenntnis" (Morality and Ethical Value Knowledge). In 1924 von Hildebrand became associate professor of philosophy at Munich, where he taught until 1933. In the 1920s von Hildebrand, in addition to his properly philosophical work, began lecturing in Catholic circles on the nature of marriage and of the marital intimacy of man and woman. He was one of the first Catholic voices to affirm strongly that there is more to marital intimacy than procreation; he insisted that in their one-flesh union a man and a woman also enact their love in an incomparable way. In this way he helped to set in motion the development of Catholic thought on marriage that culminated in the teaching of Vatican II concerning the twofold meaning of the marital act, the procreative and the unitive meaning. Just before leaving Munich he published his *Metaphysik der Gemeinschaft: Untersuchungen über Wesen und Wert der Gemeinschaft* (Metaphysics of Community: Investigations into the Essence and Value of Community, 1930), a work in which he defends an authentically personalist philosophy of community against the collectivism that was rising in Germany.

It was the coming to power of Hitler that drove von Hildebrand from Germany. Even before Hitler's 1923 *Putsch* in Munich, von Hildebrand had been a vociferous critic of National Socialism. In 1933 he had to leave Germany and went to Vienna, where he tried to rally the intellectual resistance to Nazism. With the help of the Austrian chancellor, Dollfuss, he founded a review, *Der christliche Ständestaat*, where he brought his philosophy to bear on the European crisis of the time. His years in Vienna were tumultuous, living as he did in constant danger of assassination. But he continued his work in philosophy, becoming professor of philosophy at the University of Vienna in 1935. He completed his important work in epistemology, *Der Sinn philosophischen Fragens und Erkennens* (On the Meaning of Philosophical Questioning and Knowing, 1950), which appeared in an expanded form in English in 1960 under the title, *What is Philosophy?* It was also in Vienna that he wrote his main religious work, *Die umgestaltung in Christus: über christliche grundhaltung* (Transformation in Christ: on the Fundamental Attitude of the Christian, 1940). Works by von Hildebrand like this one have on occasion given some people the impression that he is first of all a religious writer and only secondarily a phenomenologist. But von Hildebrand himself distinguished sharply between these writings and his properly philosophical writings, and he insisted that in these latter works he fully acknowledges the rightly understood autonomy of philosophy.

Von Hildebrand barely escaped Vienna in 1938 when Germany annexed Austria. He spent the next years as a refugee moving through Switzerland, France, Spain, Portugal, and Brazil, until he arrived in New York City in 1941, aided along the way by the Rockefeller Foundation. He was offered professorships both at the New School for Social Research and at Fordham University. Von Hildebrand chose Fordham, where he taught philosophy from 1941 until his retirement in 1960. While at Fordham, he became one of the world's most prominent Christian philosophers, and Pope Pius XII called him "the 20th Century Doctor of the Church."

In 1953 von Hildebrand published his major work in moral philosophy, *Christian Ethics*, which in the next years was followed by his *Morality and Situation Ethics* (1972) and his

Graven Images: Substitutes for True Morality (1976). In 1968, Professor von Hildebrand founded the Roman Forum to help advance the Roman Catholic Church in the United States. In his last years he published *Das Wesen der Liebe* (The Essence of Love, 1971), a book that he had been working towards all his life. He lived in New York until his death on 26 January 1977 in New Rochelle, New York. His widow, the philosopher Alice Jourdain von Hildebrand, posthumously published his *Moralia* (1980) and the two volumes of his *Ästhetik* (1977), a work in which he as master phenomenologist draws on the deep artistic sensibility that he had developed growing up in Florence in the house of a great artist.

Von Hildebrand's greatest contributions to philosophy lie in his ethics and his concepts of value and value-response. The value of a being is for him the intrinsic dignity or nobility or splendor of the being, such as the dignity of a human person. Value expresses for him something that is not relative to a valuing person but rather belongs intrinsically or absolutely to the valuable being. Value differs from the traditional *bonum*, which means "beneficial for" or "perfective of" someone: for something to have value means that it is worthy in itself, important in its own right. Of course von Hildebrand finds a place for *bonum* in his ethics, but he lays particular stress on value and on our response to value. He is fascinated with the way in which certain responses are "due" in justice to certain values. For example, admiration is due to a person of great moral stature, like a Socrates. Adoration is due to God, who is worthy of being adored. Veneration is due to a great saint, who "ought" to be venerated. The point is not that veneration benefits the saint, or perfects him or her, but that it is due in justice to the saint, that it is only fitting and right to venerate the saint. Von Hildebrand was particularly taken by the way in which persons transcend themselves in responding to value; they do not appropriate the valuable being, or bend it to their needs, but they affirm it according to its own intrinsic dignity or splendor. The phenom-

enologists had already tried to capture the "ecstatic," outward-thrusting nature of consciousness with their concept of the intentionality of consciousness; von Hildebrand thought that this capacity of persons for self-transcendence was raised to an altogether higher power in value-response.

Von Hildebrand did not just recognize a great plurality of values but also an ordered whole, a cosmos of value. He gave particular attention to the hierarchical relations obtaining among values and also to the relation between values and God. Nor did he just recognize a plurality of possible value-responses; he distinguished between more and less foundational value-responses, and held that the value-response of reverence is the most fundamental of them all, being the one in which persons open themselves to the world of value and declare their readiness to follow the call of value.

Von Hildebrand held that value-response was the heart and soul of every moral virtue as well as of most morally worthy actions. As a result he was critical of the Aristotelian and the Thomistic eudaemonism, which he thought stressed the pursuit of happiness at the expense of the full self-transcendence of value-response. But he was close to the Aristotelian–Thomistic tradition in stressing the centrality of moral virtue in the moral existence of human persons. Von Hildebrand felt a certain kinship with Kant. He entirely agreed with the teaching of Kant that moral obligation binds not just hypothetically but categorically, a teaching that coheres very well with his own teaching on value-response. But he broke sharply with the formalism of Kant's ethics; he held that most moral obligation issues from value and is grounded in value.

On the basis of his philosophy of value, von Hildebrand also made an important contribution to the understanding of human freedom, and in particular to the ancient question how it is possible knowingly to do wrong. To see this we must first realize that he did not follow Scheler in thinking that we are always only motivated by value; not only can we be motivated by *bonum*, as already noted, but we can also be motivated

by what he called the importance of the merely subjectively satisfying. We can be in a state of mind the very opposite of reverence, so that we do not care what has value and calls for an appropriate response from us, and also do not care what is really beneficial or harmful for us: we can be interested instead in what is merely subjectively satisfying for us. Now von Hildebrand teaches that we can find an action to be subjectively satisfying which we know to be wrong, and that we can choose that action in spite of acknowledging its wrongness. We do not perform the action under the aspect of *bonum*, or of value, as has so often been said, but we perform it under the entirely different aspect of it being subjectively satisfying for us. In this way he exorcizes once and for all the old idea that wrongdoing is based on some defect in the intellect and he makes understandable how its defect is a defect precisely in the will.

But value not only has a central place in von Hildebrand's moral philosophy; it is also central to his philosophy of community, his aesthetics, his metaphysics, his philosophy of love. Value and value-response form the axis of almost all of his philosophical thought.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Die Idee der sittlichen Handlung," in *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung*, vol. 3 (Halle, Germany, 1916), pp. 126–251.

"Sittlichkeit und ethische Werterkenntnis," in *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung*, vol. 5 (Halle, Germany, 1922), pp. 463–602.

Reinheit und Jungfräulichkeit (Munich, Germany, 1927). Trans., *In Defense of Purity: An Analysis of the Catholic Ideals of Purity and Virginity* (New York, 1931).

Metaphysik der Genmeinschaft: Untersuchungen über Wesen u. Wert d. Gemeinschaft (Augsburg, Germany, 1930).

Zeitliches im Lichte des Ewigen: gesammelte Abhandlungen und Vorträge (Regensburg, Germany, 1932).

Liturgie und Persoenlichkeit (Salzburg, Austria, 1933). Trans., *Liturgy and Personality* (New York, 1943).

Sittliche grundhatungen (Mainz, Germany, 1933).

Die umgestaltung in Christus: über christliche grundhaltung (under pseudonym Peter Ott) (Einsiedeln, Switzerland, 1940; 3rd edn 1955). Trans., *Transformation in Christ: On the Christian Attitude of Mind* (New York, 1948).

Der Sinn Philosophischen Fragens und Erkennens (Bonn, Germany, 1950).

Fundamental Moral Attitudes (New York, 1950).

Christian Ethics (New York and London, 1953). Repr., *Ethics* (Chicago, 1972).

Die Menschheit am Scheideweg (Regensburg, Germany, 1955).

What is Philosophy? (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1960).

Das Wesen der Liebe, in *Gesammelte Werke*, vol. 3 (Stuttgart, Germany, 1971).

Morality and Situation Ethics (Chicago, 1972).

Metaphysik der Gemeinschaft in *Gesammelte Werke*, vol. 4 (Stuttgart, Germany, 1975).

Graven Images: Substitutes for True Morality (Chicago, 1976).

Ästhetik I, in *Gesammelte Werke*, vol. 5 (Stuttgart, Germany, 1977).

Äesthetik II, in *Gesammelte Werke*, vol. 6 (Stuttgart, Germany, 1977).

Moralia, in *Gesammelte Werke*, vol. 9 (Stuttgart, Germany, 1980).

Other Relevant Works
Hildebrand's papers are at the International Academy of Philosophy in Triesenberg, Liechtenstein.

Gesammelten Werke, 10 vols (Regensburg and Stuttgart, Germany, 1971–84).

Further Reading
Crosby, John F, ed. *Truth and Value: The*

Philosophy of Dietrich von Hildebrand (New York, 1992). Contains a bibliography of von Hildebrand's writings.

———, "Dietrich von Hildebrand: Master of Phenomenological Value-Ethics," in *Phenomenological Approaches to Moral Philosophy*, ed. John Drummond and Lester Embree (Dordrecht, 2002), pp. 475–96.

Schwarz, Balduin, ed. *The Human Person and the World of Values: A Tribute to Dietrich Von Hildebrand by His Friends in Philosophy* (New York, 1960).

Von Hildebrand, Alice, ed. *The Soul of a Lion: Dietrich von Hildebrand, a Biography* (San Francisco, 2000).

John F. Crosby

HINMAN, Edgar Lenderson (1872–1965)

Edgar L. Hinman was born on 5 September 1872 in the town of Afton in Chenango County, New York. He attended Cornell University, receiving his BA in 1892 and PhD in philosophy in 1895. His dissertation on "The Physics of Idealism" was written under the direction of James E. CREIGHTON and other idealists. In 1895–6 Hinman was a teaching fellow at the University of California at Berkeley. In 1896 he was appointed instructor of philosophy at the University of Nebraska, joining psychologist Harry Kirke Wolfe. Wolfe had founded the philosophy and psychology department at Nebraska in 1886, but was fired shortly after Hinman's arrival in 1897 over an administration dispute.

Hinman had briefly to teach psychology until Wolfe's replacement, Cornell graduate Albert Ross Hill, had arrived, but he was soon responsible for most philosophy courses from the history of philosophy to metaphysics and philosophy of religion. When Hill went to Missouri in 1903, F. C. French arrived to continue the psychology duties and more psychology instructors were added, and Hinman was promoted up to full professor of philosophy by 1906. By 1908 Wolfe had returned and another philosophy professor, Hartley Burr ALEXANDER, was added to the department. More colleagues arrived during the 1920s and 30s: William H. WERKMEISTER and O. K. BOUWSMA, and the philosophy department became independent from psychology. When Alexander left in 1927, Hinman became chair of the department and served in that position until his retirement in 1943. The Nebraska faculty were all leaders of the Western Philosophical Association from its inception in 1900. Hinman served in various offices and eventually was President in 1920–21 after the organization had become the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association. He was also active in the American Association of University Professors. Hinman died on 18 June 1965 in Lincoln, Nebraska.

Hinman was carefully trained in absolute idealism during his education at Cornell, and idealism remained his basic philosophical standpoint for the rest of his career. The greater part of his mature studies were directed towards philosophy of religion and Eastern philosophy, especially Hinduism. In several writings, including his presidential address published in 1921, Hinman elaborated careful contrasts between Western philosophical rationalism and idealism with the Eastern counterparts of monistic idealism and mysticism. Of special concern for Hinman were the various ways that these pantheistic systems could attempt to account for the relations between finite growing personalities and God's perfection.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Physics of Idealism (Lincoln, Nebr., 1906).
"Hegelianism and the Vendanta," in *Philosophical Essays in Honor of James*

Edwin Creighton, ed. George H. Sabine (New York, 1917), pp. 112–32.

"Modern Idealism and the Logos Teaching," *Philosophical Review* 30 (1921): 333–51.

"Kant's Philosophy of Law," in *Immanuel Kant: Papers Read at Northwestern University on the Bicentenary of Kant's Birth*, ed. Edward L. Schaub (Chicago, 1925), pp. 137–54.

"Radhakrishnan and the Sung Confucianism," in *The Philosophy of Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (New York, 1952).

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v3, Proc of APA v39

John R. Shook

HINTIKKA, Kaarlo Jaakko Juhani (1929–)

Jaakko Hintikka was born on 12 January 1929 in Vantaa, Finland. His father Toivo had a PhD in botany and plant pathology, and his mother Lempi was an elementary school teacher. After finishing high school in Kerava in 1947, Hintikka went to the University of Helsinki. His major subject was first mathematics, where the most impressive teacher was professor Rolf Nevanlinna. During that time, influenced by the charismatic philosopher Eino Kaila, Hintikka started to study theoretical philosophy as a second major. Already in 1947–8 he followed the lectures on logic by the young professor Georg Henrik von Wright, who soon became Ludwig Wittgenstein's successor at Cambridge. Hintikka spent the year 1948–9 as an undergraduate at Williams College in Massachusetts. He received the degrees of Cand. Phil. in 1952, and Lic. Phil. in 1952 from Helsinki. In his doctoral dissertation, which he defended with von Wright as the faculty opponent, Hintikka extended to full first-order logic the so-called distributive normal forms that von Wright had developed for monadic predicate logic. Hintikka received his PhD in philosophy from Helsinki in 1953.

Hintikka taught philosophy for one semester in 1954 at Harvard University. He returned to Harvard as a junior fellow from 1956 to 1959, working in the new field of modal logic. His friends during this period included many later colleagues like Burton DREBEN, Dagfinn FÖLLESDAL, and Julius Moravcsik. In 1959 Hintikka was appointed professor of practical philosophy (moral and social philosophy) at the University of Helsinki. In 1964 he also became professor of philosophy at Stanford University, where Patrick SUPPES and Föllesdal taught, making it one of the leading centers of philosophical logic. Hintikka's new interests included inductive logic and semantic information. In 1965 Hintikka started his work with D. Reidel's Publishing Company (later Kluwer Academic Publishers) in Holland as the editor-in-chief of the journal *Synthese* and the book series *Synthese Library*. This activity, which has continued until 2002, has placed Hintikka among the most influential editors of philosophical works in the English-speaking world. He shared his time between Stanford and Helsinki until 1978.

In 1970 Hintikka was appointed to a research professorship in the Academy of Finland which allowed him to establish a research group of younger Finnish scholars working mainly in logic, philosophy of science, philosophy of language, and history of philosophy. As a teacher and supervisor, Hintikka has been highly influential through the richness of his new ideas and research initiatives. Many of the former students of Hintikka have been appointed to chairs in philosophy, including Risto Hilpinen, Raimo Tuomela, Juhani Pietarinen, Ilkka Niiniluoto, Simo Knuuttila, Veikko Rantala, Juha Manninen, Lauri Carlson, Esa Saarinen, and Gabriel Sandu.

In 1978 Hintikka divorced his first wife Soili and married American philosopher Merrill

Bristow Provence. In that year, Jaakko and Merrill HINTIKKA were appointed to philosophy positions at the Florida State University. Hintikka resigned from his research position in Finland in 1981, but maintained close cooperation with Finnish logicians and philosophers. After Merrill's death in 1987 Hintikka married Finnish philosopher Ghita Holmström. In 1990 Hintikka became professor of philosophy at Boston University.

Besides his activities in research, teaching, and publication, Hintikka has served in many important positions in international organizations. He was Vice President of the Association for Symbolic Logic from 1968 to 1971; President of American Philosophical Association Pacific Division in 1975–6; Vice President of the Division of Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science of the International Union of History and Philosophy of Science during 1971–5 and President in 1975; Vice President of the International Federation of Philosophical Societies from 1993 to 1998; President of the Charles S. Peirce Society in 1997, the chair of the organizing committee of the Twentieth World Congress of Philosophy in 1998, and the President of the International Institute of Philosophy from 1999 to 2002. Hintikka has been awarded honorary doctorates in many universities: Liège, Kracow, Uppsala, Oulu, and Turku.

Hintikka's publications cover an exceptionally wide range of topics. During the fifty years from 1953 to 2004 he has published thirty-seven books or monographs, edited seventeen books, and authored more than three hundred scholarly articles in international journals or collections. His works can be classified in seven main areas: mathematical logic, intensional logic, philosophy of logic and mathematics, philosophy of language, philosophy of science, epistemology, and the history of philosophy.

In mathematical logic, Hintikka's dissertation *Distributive Normal Forms in the Calculus of Predicates* (1953) showed that each formula in first-order logic can be transformed to a disjunction of constituents. This normal form is relative to the chosen quantificational depth d of the relevant formulas: a depth-d constituent is a systematic description of all kinds of sequences of d individuals which can be drawn from a universe. Hintikka designed these notions for the study of logical proofs, but he soon found many applications in several fields of philosophy. In 1955 Hintikka defined model sets as a new tool in logical semantics, and constructed a new proof of the completeness of first-order logic. In the 1970s he developed (with Veikko Rantala) a new system of infinitary logic which allows infinitely deep formulas. Hintikka's interest in partially ordered quantifiers led in the 1980s to a new system of logic. This "independence friendly logic," or IF-logic, is still first-order in the sense that quantifiers range over individuals, but it is much more powerful than the traditional Fregean first-order logic, as it allows quantifiers to be informationally independent of each other. In *The Principles of Mathematics Revisited* (1996), and in several papers with Gabriel Sandu, Hintikka has argued that the IF-logic constitutes a genuine revolution in logic. Among other things, it puts the incompleteness results of Kurt GÖDEL and Alfred TARSKI in a new light, as it is possible to construct a truth definition for the sentences of IF-logic within the same language.

In the area of intensional logic, in 1957 Hintikka – independently of a slightly earlier proposal by Stig Kanger and a later one by Saul KRIPKE – presented the basic idea of the possible-worlds semantics for modal logic. In *Knowledge and Belief* (1962), he applied the technique of model sets to lay the foundations of epistemic and doxastic logic. Later he applied these semantical methods to deontic logic. In treating knowledge and perception as propositional attitudes, Hintikka had to face philosophical issues concerning quantification into modal contexts and the cross-identification of individuals in different possible worlds. These topics, which led him into debates with W. V. QUINE, Föllesdal, and David LEWIS, are discussed in *Models for Modalities* (1969) and

The Intentions of Intentionality (1975). Starting with *The Semantics of Questions and the Questions of Semantics* (1976), Hintikka has also applied his system of epistemic logic to give an account of the logic of questions and dialogues.

On philosophy of logic and mathematics, Hintikka realized that his distributive normal forms, due to the undecidability of first-order logic, vindicate "Kantian" themes in the philosophy of logic: constituents provide a tool in defending Kant's thesis that mathematical truths are synthetic a priori. In his John Locke Lectures given at Oxford University in 1964, Hintikka argued that logical inferences may be nontrivial or nontautological by increasing "surface information" when they require the introduction of new individuals into consideration. Mathematical statements are synthetic in Kant's sense when they contain surface information. Hintikka has also shown that this idea has interesting connections to the traditional discussions about analysis and synthesis in geometry (*The Method of Analysis*, 1974).

Hintikka's interest in formal semantics led him to look at Wittgenstein's notion of a language-game from a new perspective in philosophy of language. According to Hintikka's program of "logical pragmatics," semantical relations between language and world are man-made and thus dependent on pragmatics. Game-theoretical semantics, which can be applied in a fruitful way in infinitary logic and IF-logic, has been developed by Hintikka (with several collaborators, among them Saarinen, Carlson, Sandu, and Jack Kulas) into a comprehensive framework for the study of natural language. Important topics to which this method has been applied include quantifiers (every, some, any), pronouns, anaphora, questions, and metaphor. Hintikka has generalized his semantical work into the conception that language is a "calculus" which can be interpreted and reinterpreted in various ways. This view (which can be found in George Boole, Charles S. PEIRCE, David Hilbert, and the later Rudolf CARNAP) is contrasted by Hintikka with the thesis that language is a "universal medium" whose relations to extralinguistic reality cannot be expressed in language. Hintikka regards this distinction as the "ultimate presupposition" of twentieth-century philosophy. The universal medium view, which leads to the thesis that semantics is ineffable, he finds in Gottlob Frege, Bertrand Russell, Wittgenstein, and Quine. Martin Kusch (1989) has argued that Edmund Husserl shared the calculus view, but Martin Heidegger and Hans-Georg Gadamer the universal medium view.

Hintikka has applied his distributive normal forms to many problems in philosophy of science, among them the definability and identifiability of concepts with respect to theories, the deductive–nomological model of explanation, and the problem of incommensurability. Starting from the observation that constituents can be regarded as descriptions of possible worlds (relative to the expressive power of a given linguistic framework), Hintikka constructed in 1964 a new system of inductive logic. Unlike Carnap's system, Hintikka's method allows the assignment of non-zero inductive probabilities to genuinely universal statements. He also showed how these probability measures lead to a natural definition of semantic information – or depth information in contrast to surface information – and systematic power. Hintikka's ideas have been further developed by, among others, Hilpinen, Tuomela, Pietarinen, Niiniluoto, and Theo Kuipers.

Hintikka employed his theory of propositional attitudes (knowledge, perception) in epistemological studies. For example, these applications have generated new perspectives on Kant's notion of things in themselves, Russell's distinction between knowledge by acquaintance and knowledge by description, Husserl's phenomenology, and pictorial representation in art. Hintikka's pioneering studies in epistemic logic have also recently made a strong impact in artificial intelligence and cognitive science.

Hintikka has combined his systematic interests with historical studies which reconstruct

and re-evaluate important philosophical doctrines. His discussions have included Plato's notion of *episteme* and the tradition of "maker's knowledge," Aristotle's theory of modality, Descartes's *cogito* argument, Leibniz's view on plenitude, Kant's notion of intuition, Peirce's theory of reasoning, Wittgenstein's account of language-games, and Arthur Lovejoy's thesis about unit ideas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Distributive Normal Forms in the Calculus of Predicates (Helsinki, 1953).

Two Papers on Symbolic Logic (Helsinki, 1955).

Knowledge and Belief: An Introduction to the Logic of the Two Notions (Ithaca, N.Y., 1962).

Models for Modalities: Selected Essays (Dordrecht, 1969).

Logic, Language-games, and Information: Kantian Themes in the Philosophy of Logic (Oxford, 1973).

Time and Necessity: Studies in Aristotle's Theory of Modality (Oxford, 1973).

Knowledge and the Known: Historical Perspectives in Epistemology (Dordrecht, 1974).

The Method of Analysis: Its Geometrical Origin and Its General Significance, with Unto Remes (Dordrecht, 1974).

The Intentions of Intentionality and Other New Models for Modalities (Dordrecht, 1975).

The Semantics of Questions and the Questions of Semantics (Helsinki, 1976).

The Game of Language: Studies in Game-theoretical Semantics and Its Applications, with Jack Kulas (Dordrecht, 1983).

Anaphora and Definite Descriptions: Two Applications of Game-Theoretical Semantics, with Jack Kulas (Dordrecht, 1985).

Investigating Wittgenstein, with Merrill B. Hintikka (Oxford, 1986).

The Logic of Epistemology and the Epistemology of Logic, with Merrill Hintikka (Dordrecht, 1989).

What If…? Toward Excellence in Reasoning, with James Bachman (Mountain View, Cal., 1991).

On the Methodology of Linguistics: A Case Study, with Gabriel Sandu (Oxford, 1991).

The Principles of Mathematics Revisited (Cambridge, UK, 1996).

Ludwig Wittgenstein: Half-truths and One-and-a-half Truths, Selected Papers, vol. 1 (Dordrecht, 1996).

Lingua Universalis vs. Calculus Ratiocinator: An Ultimate Presupposition of Twentieth-century Philosophy, Selected Papers, vol. 2 (Dordrecht, 1997).

Language, Truth and Logic in Mathematics, Selected Papers, vol. 3 (Dordrecht, 1997).

Paradigms for Language Theory and Other Essays, Selected Papers, vol. 4 (Dordrecht, 1997).

Inquiry as Inquiry: A Logic for Scientific Discovery, Selected Papers, vol. 5 (Dordrecht, 1999).

Analyses of Aristotle, Selected Papers, vol. 6 (Dordrecht, 2004).

Other Relevant Works

"Modality as Referential Multiplicity," *Ajatus* 20 (1957): 49–64.

"'Cogito, ergo sum': Inference or Performance?" *Philosophical Review* 72 (1961): 3–32.

"Toward a Theory of Inductive Generalization," in *Proceedings of the 1964 International Congress for Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science*, ed. Yehoshua Bar-Hillel (Amsterdam, 1965), pp. 274–88.

Ed. with Patrick Suppes, *Aspects of Inductive Logic* (Amsterdam, 1965).

"The Varieties of Information and Scientific Explanation," in *Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science*, vol. 3, ed. B. van Rootselaar and J. F. Staal (Amsterdam, 1968), pp. 151–71.

"Language-Games for Quantifiers," in *Studies in Logical Theory*, ed. Nicholas

Rescher (Oxford, 1968), pp. 46–72.

Ed., *Philosophy of Mathematics* (Oxford, 1969).

Ed. with Donald Davidson, *Words and Objections: Essays on the Work of W. V. Quine* (Dordrecht, 1969).

Ed. with Patrick Suppes, *Information and Inference* (Dordrecht, 1970).

Ed., *Rudolf Carnap, The Logical Empiricist: Materials and Perspectives* (Dordrecht, 1975).

"Gaps in the Great Chain of Being: An Exercise in the Methodology of the History of Ideas," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 49 (1976): 22–38.

Ed. with Simo Knuuttila, *The Logic of Being: Historical Studies* (Dordrecht, 1986).

Ed., *Aspects of Metaphor* (Dordrecht, 1994).

"Husserl: The Phenomenological Dimension," in *The Cambridge Companion to Husserl*, ed. David Smith and Barry Smith (Cambridge, UK, 1995), pp. 78–105.

Further Reading

Oxford Comp Phil, Pres Addr of APA v8

Auxier, Randall E., and Lewis E. Hahn, eds. *The Philosophy of Jaakko Hintikka* (Chicago, 2004). Contains Hintikka's autobiography and bibliography.

Bogdan, Radu J., ed. *Jaakko Hintikka* (Dordrecht, 1987).

Haaparanta, Leila, Martin Kusch, and Ilkka Niiniluoto, eds. *Language, Knowledge, and Intentionality: Perspectives on the Philosophy of Jaakko Hintikka* (Helsinki, 1990).

Haller, Rudolf, ed. *Investigating Hintikka* (Amsterdam, 1995).

Kolak, Daniel. *On Hintikka* (Belmont, Cal., 2001).

Kusch, Martin. *Language as Calculus vs. Language as Universal Medium: A Study in Husserl, Heidegger and Gadamer* (Dordrecht, 1989).

Niiniluoto, Ilkka. *Truthlikeness* (Dordrecht, 1987).

Rigal, Elisabeth, ed. *Jaakko Hintikka: Questions de logique et de phenomenology* (Paris, 1998).

Saarinen, Esa, Risto Hilpinen, Ilkka Niiniluoto, and Merrill Hintikka, eds. *Essays in Honour of Jaakko Hintikka on the Occasion of His Fiftieth Birthday* (Dordrecht, 1979).

Sintonen, Matti, ed. *Knowledge and Inquiry: Essays on Jaakko Hintikka's Epistemology and Philosophy of Science* (Amsterdam, 1997).

Ilkka Niiniluoto

HINTIKKA, Merrill Bristow (1939–87)

Merrill Hintikka was born Jane Merrill Bristow on 10 March 1939 in Alameda, California. Her parents were John and Margaret Reynolds Bristow. John Bristow was trained in electrical engineering but by virtue of his gifts of persuasion and reconciliation became a professional labor arbitrator. His daughter not only inherited these gifts but also took active interest in his line of business, at one point helping the dealers in Las Vegas casinos to start their trade union and at another point advising one of the first professional baseball players who managed to become a free agent. Jane Bristow, later Merrill Sumners, received her undergraduate education at Mills College in California, graduating with her BA in 1961 with top honors. She received her graduate training at Stanford University, where she was awarded a PhD in philosophy in 1982. After two earlier marriages, she married a fellow philosopher, Jaakko HINTIKKA, in 1978.

Merrill Sumners (later Provence) taught philosophy at Mills College from 1964 to 1975, and then taught (as Merrill Hintikka) at

Florida State University from 1979 until her death. At Florida State she took an active part in the governance of the institution. When she died on 1 January 1987 in Tallahassee, Florida, she was in her second term as the President of the Florida State faculty senate. After her death, the distinguished administrator Dr Werner Baum testified that he had never had as close a working relation with any other faculty member as he had had with her.

While still in graduate school at Stanford, Hintikka – then Merrill Provence – put together with three fellow students a guide-book to analytic philosophy entitled *Philosophical Analysis: An Introduction to its Language and Techniques*, which she updated with Samuel Gorowitz in 1979. With Bruce Vermazen, Merrill Hintikka edited *Essays on Davidson: Actions and Events* (1985). In 1983 she edited with Sandra Harding the pioneering volume *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science*. In 1986 she published a major study of Ludwig Wittgenstein's philosophy entitled *Investigating Wittgenstein* with her husband Jaakko, after having collaborated with him on a number of joint articles on Wittgenstein. She also co-authored with him a number of papers on other topics, most of which appear in their volume *The Logic of Epistemology and the Epistemology of Logic* (1989).

Hintikka had an intellectual and moral sensitivity that made her an excellent interpreter of other philosophers' thoughts. Her book written jointly with Jaakko on Wittgenstein offers several new perspectives on the philosophy of this enigmatic thinker. They include the interpretation of the simple objects that Wittgenstein postulated in his *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* as being essentially Russellian objects of acquaintance (although their logical forms are not). Another well-documented interpretational idea in the book concerns Wittgenstein's transition from his earlier to his later thought. The Hintikkas found that a crucial step in this transition was Wittgenstein's rejection of phenomenological languages as the underlying forms of our actual discourse in favor of physicalistic ones.

Not all of Hintikka's philosophical ideas were historical, however, even apart from feminism. While a graduate student at Stanford, she took a seminar on metaphysics with Donald DAVIDSON, who at that time was still defending the primacy of physical objects as basic particulars. In her term paper, Merrill took all arguments Davidson had used for his primary claim and modified them so as to become arguments for the primacy of events. Davidson's only comment was, "You seem to have discovered a skeleton in my cupboard." Later Davidson himself came to defend the primacy of events.

Her mother's long-time debilitating illness had thrust on the young Jane Bristow family and social responsibilities when she was barely a teenager. She had quickly come to distrust the rules of behavior that her parents and the society around her were trying to impose on her, and instead to rely on her own decisions. Although her main philosophical training under her Stanford professors like Davidson was primarily analytic, Hintikka found a philosophical articulation and justification of what her personal experiences had taught her in the thought of Jean-Paul Sartre, prominently including its emphasis on free decisions. She gave a number of lectures on Sartre's thought, especially on his theory of personal identity, but she never published any of them. She was especially interested in Sartre's idea that personal identity is constituted by one's "projects" rather than one's "essences." However, she did not find this idea (rightly understood) to be Sartre's monopoly. Once, she gave a talk to a philosophical audience on Sartre's theory of personal identity using copious quotations to illustrate her points. Only afterwards did she confess that none of the cited passages were from Sartre; they were all from Stuart HAMPSHIRE.

Hintikka also realized keenly both on the philosophical level and on the personal one

that a decision-centered ethic is viable only when combined with an ethic of self-honesty. She had seen a frightening example of *mauvaise foi* in her mother's denial of her condition. As a consequence, she displayed an unusual degree of self-awareness, including both an awareness of the limitations that her situation imposed on her and a recognition of her own ends and aims. As Jaakko Hintikka has written, if Merrill had been the person in Sartre's memorable example of a young woman who does not admit to herself the reality of her companion's advances, she would have decided how she wanted the scene to develop before the man had a chance to decide what he wanted. She was often able to conceptualize her own personal decisions in philosophical terms. For one telling example, she cast her relationship with Jaakko as concretely answering in Sartrean terms the question of the possibility of a genuine we-subject which Sartre himself had left in doubt.

Hintikka's Sartrean ethic was also related to her feminism. What she criticized was not merely de facto male domination, but the personal values that served as its cover story. She attacked what she called the John Wayne syndrome. This syndrome did not only include the idea of a strong dominating male, but first and foremost a refusal to acknowledge the falsity of the image of a strong man that excludes all inevitable human self-doubts, fears, and emotions. A "John Wayne" is morally objectionable, not because he is a bully, but because he is in bad faith. The paradigm case in Merrill's own experience was probably John F. Kennedy, who, according to her, "could only be fully himself with his brother Bobby and then after a couple of stiff whiskies."

Hintikka had an exceptionally broad range of interests and talents beyond philosophy. She was both a professional-level chef and a top-level blackjack player. Severe medical problems prevented her in her later life from participating actively in sports, but she remained an active fan. At Florida State University, she surprised local sports writers by playing a key role in the selection of a new basketball coach. Earlier in her life she was briefly involved in competitive sports car racing. She was a well-informed money manager. In fact, she was one of the earliest private investors in California to write systematically covered options.

Hintikka's greatest achievement nevertheless was the integration of her personal experiences and the decisions she was led to by them with a fully articulated philosophical position. In many ways her life was determined to an unusual degree by her being a highly intelligent and strong woman in a male-dominated field and society. This affected deeply her personal relations, including even her relation to her parents. One of the most remarkable things she ever said to her third husband was, "Jaakko, you are the only man in my life who is not afraid of me." What made her personal status especially poignant is that she did not excel in virtue of some androgynous special talent but because of qualities that are usually considered characteristically feminine, such as keen emotional and intellectual empathy, psychological insight and skills in communication and self-expression. Her experiences prompted her to examine philosophically the whole spectrum of feminist issues. While at Mills College, she taught or co-taught courses on the status of women in western society – the first such courses offered in the state of California. She was one of the original members of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession of the American Philosophical Association. She gave lectures to different kinds of audiences on women's issues, and through her teaching she provided a role model to hundreds of young women.

Hintikka's gifts of empathy and communication resulted in circles of friends and acquaintances that were extraordinarily wide and varied. She came to know – often through her students and sometimes through her father's connections – major political figures, labor and business leaders, including a couple of famous families like the Hesses and the Guinnesses, athletes and other sports figures, at least one major movie star, a leading composer and lots of remarkable but less

famous people. A small episode perhaps epitomizes her relationships. Once at San Francisco International Airport Merrill literally ran into a black gentleman who apologized and treated Merrill to a cup of coffee. He was the famous San Francisco Giants baseball star Willie McCovey. The relationship so started culminated, not in a romance, but in Merrill's teaching McCovey writing, reasoning, and argumentation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Wittgenstein on Privacy and Publicity," with Jaakko Hintikka, in *Wittgenstein and His Impact on Contemporary Thought, Proceedings of the Second International Wittgenstein Symposium*, ed. W. Leinfellner et al. (Vienna, 1978), pp. 351–62.
"The Objects of Wittgenstein's *Tractatus*," in *Language and Ontology, Proceedings of the Sixth International Wittgenstein Symposium*, ed. W. Leinfellner et al. (Vienna, 1982), pp. 429–34.
"Some Remarks on (Wittgensteinian) Logical Form," with Jaakko Hintikka, *Synthese* 56 (1983): 155–70.
"How Can Language Be Sexist," with Jaakko Hintikka, in *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science*, ed. Sandra Harding and Merrill Hintikka (Dordrecht, 1983), pp. 139–48.
Investigating Wittgenstein, with Jaakko Hintikka (Oxford, 1986).
The Logic of Epistemology and the Epistemology of Logic: Selected Essays, with Jaakko Hintikka (Dordrecht, 1989).

Other Relevant Works
Philosophical Analysis: An Introduction to Its Language and Techniques, with S. Gorowitz, D. Provence, and R. G. Williams (New York, 1965; 3rd edn 1979).
Ed. with E. Saarinen, R. Hilpinen, and I. Niiniluoto, *Essays in Honour of Jaakko Hintikka* (Dordrecht, 1979).
Ed. with Sandra Harding, *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science* (Dordrecht, 1983; 2nd edn, Dordrecht, 2003).
Ed. with Bruce Vermazen, *Essays on Davidson: Actions and Events* (Oxford, 1985).

Further Reading
Proc of APA v60

Jaakko Hintikka

HOCHBERG, Herbert Irving (1929–)

Herbert Hochberg was born on 13 July 1929 in Detroit, Michigan, the son of George and Lillian Hochberg. The family moved to New York City, where his father became the managing editor of the left-wing Yiddish newspaper *Morning Freiheit*. Hochberg earned his BA in 1950 and MA in 1951 from Wayne State University. He then received his PhD in philosophy in 1954 from the University of Iowa, writing his dissertation under Gustav BERGMANN on the philosophy of W. V. QUINE. He has been a professor of philosophy at Northwestern University from 1954 to 1961; Indiana University from 1961 to 1965; Gothenburg University in Sweden in 1965–6; Ohio State University from 1966 to 1968; and the University of Minnesota from 1968 to 1978. Since 1978 Hochberg has been professor of philosophy at the University of Texas. Hochberg has received Guggenheim and Fulbright fellowships. To date, he has published six books and over one hundred articles.

Hochberg's main contributions have been in ontology, philosophy of language and mind, and the history of analytic philosophy. He was

strongly influenced by the early twentieth-century writings of Bertrand Russell, G. E. Moore, and Ludwig Wittgenstein. Bergmann, who in the 1940s broke from positivism and affirmed the meaningfulness of metaphysics, was another strong influence. In this tradition, Hochberg has defended realism about facts and universals and the existence of mental states against the dominant contemporary trends of nominalism, idealism, holism, and materialism.

Taking qualities as universals, he criticizes trope (quality-instance) theories, arguing they are absurdly forced to take exactly similar tropes as grounds for logically independent truths expressing their diversity and similarity, to take complexes as simples, and cannot, without circularity, specify needed similarity classes. Universals are not Platonic entities but are "in" facts that are presented in experience. Objects are facts with universal monadic qualities as terms standing in a Russell-type compresence relation. Having long rejected Bergmann's bare particulars as merely postulated objects not found in experience, he points out that one can trivially add mere individuators as terms, if one construes the problem of individuation as requiring individuating items. His adherence to the Principle of Acquaintance reflects an empiricist bias.

Hochberg agrees with Wittgenstein's claim in the *Tractatus* that the world is a collection of facts, not things. Facts enable him to secure realism and truth as correspondence in opposition to idealism and coherence accounts of truth. The paradox championed by F. H. Bradley is resolved by acknowledging that facts are complex but, having logical form, cannot be analyzed into constituents. Employing definite descriptions in an innovative version of a correspondence theory of truth, he acknowledges a basic intentional relation holding between primitive terms (thought items) and their referents but not between thoughts and facts. This avoids possible facts.

Hochberg philosophizes by means of an "improved language" of the sort developed in *Principia Mathematica*. To that extent he accepts what Bergmann dubbed the "linguistic turn" and would find it particularly illuminating to discover categorial features and the referents of the primitive signs of the most adequate calculus. He defends Russell's theory of descriptions and Russell's view that logically proper names and primitive predicates are labels (tags); the sense of "meaning" relevant to ontology is reference.

Besides being a highly original philosopher, Hochberg is perhaps the leading commentator on Russell, Moore, and the early Wittgenstein. He has also written extensively, often critically, on Bergmann, Quine, Rudolf CARNAP, Wilfrid SELLARS, Peter Strawson, Nelson GOODMAN, Saul KRIPKE, Donald DAVIDSON, D. M. Armstrong, Ivar Segelberg, and others.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Thought, Fact, and Reference: The Origins and Ontology of Logical Atomism (Minneapolis, 1978).

Logic, Ontology, and Language: Essays on Truth and Reality (Munich, 1984).

Complexes and Consciousness (Stockholm, 1999).

"Propositions, Truth and Belief: The Wittgenstein-Russell Dispute," *Theoria* 66 (2000): 3–40.

Russell, Moore, and Wittgenstein: The Revival of Realism (Egelsbach, Germany, 2001).

The Positivist and the Ontologist: Bergmann, Carnap and Logical Realism (Amsterdam, 2001).

Introducing Analytic Philosophy: Its Sense and Its Nonsense, 1879–2002 (Frankfurt am Main, 2003).

Further Reading

Sellars, Wilfrid. "Hochberg on Mapping, Meaning, and Metaphysics," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 2 (1977): 214–24.

Larry Lee Blackman

HOCKING, Richard Boyle O'Reilly
(1906–2001)

Richard Hocking was born on 26 August 1906 in Berkeley, California. His father, William E. HOCKING, was professor of philosophy at the University of California at Berkeley at that time. His mother, Agnes Boyle O'Reilly Hocking, founded Shady Hill School in Cambridge in 1915, after his father became a professor at Harvard University. Richard went to his mother's school and then Phillips Academy in Andover, Massachusetts. He earned his BS cum laude in mathematics and science at Harvard in 1928, and an MA in 1930. He was a laboratory assistant at California Institute of Technology in 1930–31, but decided to pursue philosophy. In 1935 Hocking received his PhD in philosophy from Yale University, and he also had a year of study at the University of Berlin in 1933–4.

Hocking was instructor of philosophy at the University of Minnesota from 1935 to 1937, and assistant professor at Williams College from 1937 to 1940. From 1940 to 1946 he taught at the University of California, Los Angeles, and from 1946 to 1949 he taught at the University of Chicago. In 1949 Hocking became professor of philosophy at Emory University, at the invitation of Leroy LOEMKER to join him in establishing a philosophy graduate program. Hocking taught at Emory for twenty-one years, retiring in 1970. He was chair of the department during 1962–6. In 1971 he and his wife, Katherine Ewing Hocking, who was the Director of the Federal Theatre in Chicago from 1936 to 1939, decided to move to a family home and manage a farm in New Hampshire. During his many remaining years Hocking continued to write and participate in philosophical societies, community organizations, and the Republican Party. He died on 11 March 2001 in Madison, New Hampshire.

Hocking shared his father's interests in idealism, Josiah ROYCE, and process thought, and became an accomplished Royce scholar himself. With Frank OPPENHEIM he helped to complete the editing of Royce's lectures on metaphysics that his father had started decades earlier. Hocking's broad interests also encompassed the history of philosophy, especially Augustine and Hegel, Asian religion and philosophy, and continental thought. He was a member of many professional societies. He was President of the Society for Philosophy of Religion in 1954 and President of the Metaphysical Society of America in 1969. He also was a member of the American Philosophical Association, the Academy of Political Science, the Hegel Society of America, the Society for Asian and Comparative Philosophy, and the Society for Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Influence of Mathematics on Royce's Metaphysics," *Journal of Philosophy* 53 (1956): 77–91.
"Royce, Forty Years Later," *Review of Metaphysics* 10 (1956): 64–72.
Types of Philosophy, 3rd edn, with William E. Hocking (New York, 1959).
"Introduction," in *Josiah Royce's Seminar, 1913–1914, as Recorded in the Notebooks of Harry T. Costello*, ed. Grover Smith (New Brunswick, N.J., 1963).
"Event, Act, and Presence," *Review of Metaphysics* 24 (1970): 39–56.
"Emergence and Embodiment: A Dialectic within Process," in *The Recovery of Philosophy in America: Essays in Honor of John Edwin Smith*, ed. Thomas P. Kasulis (Albany, N.Y., 1997).
Other Relevant Works
Ed. with William E. Hocking and Frank Oppenheim, *Metaphysics*, by Josiah Royce (Albany, N.Y., 1998).

Further Reading
Proc of APA v76

John R. Shook

HOCKING, William Ernest (1873–1966)

William Ernest Hocking was born on 10 August 1873 in Cleveland, Ohio, and died on 12 June 1966 at his farm near Madison, New Hampshire. Hocking was the only son and the oldest of five children born to William Francis Hocking, a physician, and Julia Carpenter Pratt Hocking, a schoolteacher. The family moved west to Joliet, Illinois in 1881. Hocking was raised in a devout Methodist family with daily prayer, Bible reading and recitation. Later, the stated purpose of his most influential work, *The Meaning of God in Human Experience*, was devoted to probing "the nature and worth of religion – what it consists of in the way of experience, belief, and action; what comes of it in the way of support, outlook, and actual productiveness." (p. 3) Confronting an agnostic age with the aim of restoring some meaning to worship, prayer, and religious practices that were coming to be seen as superstitious or pointless was one of the early goals of Hocking's philosophical efforts. He did not seek to restore the place of these traditional practices, but rather to reinterpret them in ways that would make them both intellectually respectable and practically efficacious. He also reported a conversion experience at the age of twelve, including a mystical vision in which he saw his own soul in the company of a historical procession of such souls. His later engagement with and defense of philosophical mysticism should be understood as an extension of this experience.

Hocking finished high school at age fifteen and worked at various trades to earn money for college, such as surveying, printing, and mapmaking. His family moved to Newton, Iowa in 1893, and from 1894 to 1896 Hocking attended Iowa State College, studying primarily civil engineering. There he read William JAMES's *Principles of Psychology* (1890), which made a great impression on him. He moved in 1896 to Davenport, Iowa, where he taught mathematics at Duncan Business College, and later was made Principal of the Davenport Public School, holding that position for four years while he earned enough money to continue his education. Hocking chose to attend Harvard University to study with James, although when he enrolled in 1899 James was away delivering the Gifford Lectures, which became *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (1902).

At Harvard, Hocking was exposed to a remarkable collection of philosophers, including Josiah ROYCE, George SANTAYANA, and eventually James. Hocking received his BA in 1901 and his MA in 1902. He traveled to Germany in 1902–3, studying with Wilhelm Windelband and Edmund Husserl, becoming fast and lifelong friends with the latter. He returned to Harvard in 1903 and completed the PhD in philosophy in 1904, writing his dissertation on "The Elementary Experience of Other Conscious Beings in Relation to the Elementary Experiences of Physical and Reflexive Objects." Royce directed the doctoral thesis and its completion corresponded with the publication of Royce's own *Outlines of Psychology*. Hocking, like so many other distinguished Harvard products of that generation, such as George Herbert MEAD, John Elof BOODIN, W. E. B. DU BOIS, and Alain LOCKE, was caught in a battle of giants, among James, Royce and Santayana. In the case of Hocking, Royce was the victor for his philosophical soul, but no student of the three great philosophers ever wholly shed the influence of any of them. That Hocking should have written on philosophical psychology indicates a culmination in his earlier fascination with James's psychology. Hocking remained convinced throughout his life that the social sciences could act as a solid guide to responsible philosophical reflection, so long as both strove to be ever more scientific, in the broad sense of German *Wissenschaft*, rather than the narrower, reductionist ideas of natural science that were gaining in popularity throughout Hocking's career. This optimism about the possibilities for human knowledge was not only a characteristic of Hocking's thought, but of his personality, which is often described as tena-

cious in its optimism. Hocking was the product of a progressive and relatively peaceful age, and his optimism should be seen in that light.

Hocking's initial appointment after graduation was teaching philosophy at Andover Theological Seminary from 1904 to 1906, followed by two years at the University of California at Berkeley, where he had been invited by Royce's and James's old friend and philosophical sparring partner, George Holmes HOWISON. Howison was an idealist, like Royce, and Hocking's idealist leanings were reinforced during his years in California. Howison's commitment to personalism was more explicit than Royce's and Hocking's own later insistence upon person may have been reinforced by Howison's views. In 1908 Hocking was called to Yale University where he taught philosophy for six years while finishing *The Meaning of God in Human Experience*, which appeared in 1912. This well-received and widely reviewed work resulted in Hocking's call back to Harvard as professor of philosophy in 1914 where he remained until his retirement in 1943.

Hocking's service at Harvard was interrupted by service in World War I, for which he volunteered in spite of his age (he turned forty-three in 1916), and was assigned initially to use his engineering background in France. He was soon reassigned to teach recruits in New England moral issues courses related to soldiering. This endeavor resulted in a book, *Morale and Its Enemies* (1918), and marked the beginning of a lifelong interest in national and international affairs, regarding which he wrote several later books.

Hocking's life was remarkable for tireless public service. He traveled widely and was sought all over the world as a speaker, served on countless committees and commissions and very much allowed his writing (some 17 books and around 270 articles, chapters and reviews) to be guided by these public concerns. His pragmatism is evinced in his willingness to expend his best energies upon the social, moral, political and religious issues of his day. This habit of serving the common good prevented him from

completing the long expected technical metaphysics he always intended to write. However, the practical application of personal idealism was perhaps the legacy he was best able to bring forward from the combined influences of James and Royce, and indeed, Hocking well exceeded his teachers in this effort.

Three other aspects of Hocking's life deserve to be mentioned. Biographical writings about Hocking commonly place great emphasis on the powerful influence and strong personality of his wife, Agnes Boyle O'Reilly, to whom Hocking was married from 1905 until her death in 1955. Agnes was the daughter of an Irish nationalist revolutionary and poet, and she was a staunch Roman Catholic while he was a devout Methodist. The couple negotiated religion as they negotiated everything and attended the Episcopal Church. In many ways the partnership in life was also a collaboration in Hocking's work. Second, Hocking was responsible for luring Alfred North WHITEHEAD to Harvard in 1925, a move that changed American philosophy and the history of philosophy. Whitehead's philosophical aspirations had not been nurtured in his appointments at Cambridge and London, and had Hocking not drawn Whitehead to Harvard, it is doubtful whether Whitehead would have written his most important philosophical work. Hocking's conviction that Whitehead ought to write philosophy was an important moment of vision, supported by the ability to see the plan through, all greatly to Hocking's credit. Third, Hocking's lifelong friendship with Gabriel Marcel proved to be important in terms of keeping European phenomenology and existentialism in dialogue with American philosophy. Through Hocking, Marcel introduced Royce's theory of interpretation and community to European thinkers in 1913, and Royce's and Hocking's ideas (more than their names) have continued to play an important role in the years since.

Hocking's philosophical contributions begin with a perspective on the psychology of perception and range outwards into every branch of philosophy. The psychological insight with

so many epistemological consequences is that "feeling is cognitive." Depending upon what is meant by "feeling" and "cognitive," Hocking's position may also be understood as similar to the central insights of Whitehead and Charles HARTSHORNE, and it is a view fundamental to all process philosophy, which stresses that the ground of all experience is the feeling of feeling. Events experience each other, feel each other. This is a place where Hocking certainly intersects with that tradition. Indeed, a case can be made that Hocking is properly understood as a process philosopher, since he argued that "idealism fails to work … chiefly because it is unfinished." He continues: "Unfinishedness is not in itself a blemish … but there are tolerable and intolerable kinds of unfinishedness." (1912, pp. x–xi) He argues that until idealism finds a path from the abstract to the concrete, its unfinishedness will be intolerable, but when idealism becomes sufficiently concrete as to inform everyday life, it will be unfinished in the tolerable sense. Arguably, this is the move that distinguishes process philosophy from idealism.

Whether or not Hocking is regarded as a process philosopher, it is clear that his move in the direction of the concrete is one he attributes to the role of pragmatism in his thinking. Feeling in Hocking's view is social before it can be individual, and its immediacy just is the originally undifferentiated orientation of a particular perspective upon a broader reality. Individuality develops later, sociality being its basis. Hence, we are with others before we have selves. And it is others we understand first and foremost in the act of experiencing. Our self-understanding, when it comes and such as it is, is a reflection upon what we understand about others. This is not first or foremost a cognitive process for Hocking, it is a process of feeling, a natural process, with psychological results. To this extent he follows Royce's notions about the "community of interpretation." Yet Hocking seeks to make Royce's account of community and interpretation empirical by means of a theory of feeling.

Hocking's empiricism is a version of James's radical empiricism which requires an attitude of openness not only to what is particular in experience, but also what is broadly indicated in its outlines. It is natural to alternate between specificities and particularities in experience, and the generalities to which they point. This "principle of alternation" provides the natural processes by which feeling is refined into ideas. Pragmatism plays a more cautionary than constructive role in Hocking's thought at this point. We are enabled by pragmatic criticism to learn when a generalization has failed to issue in practical consequences. As a check on the generalization phase of our natural alternation between part and whole, pragmatism is invaluable. But pragmatism, according to Hocking, does not contribute much to the construction of a positive philosophy. Although we can never have full understanding of the whole, constructive philosophy requires ideals, and pragmatism is ill-equipped to deal with the role of ideals in philosophical speculation, although it generally tries to make a place for them in moral life. Where Royce understood how partial experience opened out onto a whole, he was more optimistic about the capacity of human intelligence to grasp that whole than Hocking's type of radical empiricism allows. Hocking believed that some a priori knowledge was genuine, but not generalizations extending to the whole of reality. James, on the other hand, was ruling out any role for a priori knowledge, and Hocking believed we could achieve more than he allowed by reasoning upon the particulars of concrete experience and generalizing responsibly. This is, methodologically speaking, the middle path Hocking was able to negotiate using his insight into the cognitive value of feeling. Feeling is not a dead end, it is an opening outward onto what is genuinely and immediately there, and taking its natural course it develops into ideas, which are generalizations from a unique perspective of what is felt.

Hocking came to believe his insight about the cognitive value of feeling was an advance on

Royce. He also believed this view about feeling can be maintained within an idealistic framework. His case turns upon a view of immediacy that links psychology to metaphysics through epistemology and attributes to mystical experience an unusually significant role in knowing, significant because exemplary. The notion of immediacy that Hocking defends depends in a crucial way upon his conception of the person, individual existence and the role of communication in constituting relations among persons. These topics inform, in turn, Hocking's ethical and political philosophies.

What sort of "idealism" issues from the claim that "feeling has cognitive value"? This view of feeling has many implications. Hocking always took for granted the need for a metaphysics of individuality that preserved personhood and freedom, but he departed from the logic-driven versions of idealism that were dominant in his formative years. Rather, he took his direction from a more intuitive, concrete, and pragmatic sense of human experience that first affirms the validity of interpersonal experience and only then seeks a conceptual understanding that will be maximally consistent with experience and true of it, insofar as language and abstract expression permit. This account sees logic as the best articulation of the ordering activity of the mind, but refuses to give any logic the status of the necessary lawgiver of the mind, and even less would logic be binding upon the structures of existence. Logic is rather a result of the efforts of finite minds to grasp what they are already doing, and any account of the logic of mental activity would need to be revisable in light of a better understanding of the powers and limitations of finite minds, with the best understanding being provided by the progress of the social sciences. Thus, as the project of self-knowledge proceeds in history and cumulative experience, we should expect to have to revise our understanding of logic. Hocking's view involves relinquishing the claim that any given logic is the foundation of all mental activity, and it also turns away from idealistic and philosophical psychologies, in preference for empirical ones. Consequently, Hocking sees the necessity we seem to discover in logical relations as a necessity strictly internal to the accounts of logic and reason we have offered, highly mediated accounts based on our reflection upon experience, understood historically, culturally, and symbolically.

The basis for this view of the mediated character of knowledge is again the cognitive value of feeling. Hocking argues that feeling always strains to produce ideas: all feelings strive toward a sort of self-clarification, and the resulting ideas cannot exist alone but depend for their very being upon these prior feelings. The sociality of feelings then requires articulation along both a subjective and objective side. On the subjective side, immediate social feelings develop according to an immanent dynamism that is the community of interpretation. Subsequent mediated experience, including knowledge, draws both its content and existence from this immediate social feeling. Among the basic characteristics of immediate feeling, apart from its sociality, are that it is personal, plural, communicative, and presupposes freedom. On the objective side, this view of immediacy requires, in turn, a broader account of the existing order in which finite human beings exist, and a creative role for them. For this science reason is useful, but reason is only one among many principles that mind employs in understanding and describing its reality. In attempting to show how ideas are always already present in every feeling, and lead inexorably to thoughts, Hocking is obliged, therefore, to explain what the being of feeling could be, apart from the immediate experience of it. The ensuing metaphysical issues run as follows: Granting that feeling and desire are social, intentional in structure and issue in thought, why does feeling exist rather than nothing? Granting that no one can honestly doubt that he or she experiences feeling, what creates it? Is feeling one or many, ultimately? Is its knowledge-content meaningful apart from each particular occurrence of

each feeling? If so, what validity supports the claim that it is either one or many? These are the sorts of questions Hocking would have addressed in the complete metaphysics he promised but never published. He wrote much of what was needed to address these questions for his Gifford Lectures in 1938–9, but his revision of them was interrupted by World War II, and no revision ever brought these writings to a form that satisfied Hocking. His subsequent writings develop more thoroughly the personal, ethical, and political aspects of his basic stance.

Hocking addresses with some thoroughness the intersubjective basis for inferring some aspects of the existential order. His account of communication and response exemplifies this aspect of his thought. We find our own immediate experience fragmentary and incomplete; Hocking says:

> To anything that appears in our life with the character of a response, we instinctively attribute outer personality … . God is most real, undoubtedly, to that person who finds his prayers responded to; for, to paraphrase Royce's criterion, response is our best ground for believing the social object is real. Upon this way of reaching the Other Mind … we are still left with only an inference of that Other; a faith and not a knowledge of experience. Even though we say, with Royce, that reality is nothing else than response (or fulfilling of meaning), we have not so far as this criterion goes, found that reality personal save by probability of high order. We can still speak only of 'the source of our belief in the reality of our fellow men', not of an experience of that reality itself. (1912, pp. 248–9)

Hocking was not satisfied with a merely inferential knowledge regarding the personal character of reality and therefore finds Royce's response theory inadequate phenomenologically, and his logical solution to the problem in his proofs for the existence of God from the reality of error (1885) and ignorance (1895)

overly abstract. It is here that Hocking turns to mystical experience for assistance. In what types of experience may we find the ground of an inferential knowledge of the personal reality of the other?

According to Hocking, the "immediate experience of the Real is regarded by the mystics as a somewhat unusual or privileged state of being … a sort of initiation, after which one is no longer an *outsider* in the world." (1939, p. 453) More importantly, "the mystic is a radical, without caution, trimming, or compromise, in his assertion of the essential value of life." (1939, p. 455) The essential value of life is not asserted first as a theoretical principle or a universal law, but as a practical condition of the transformed will of the mystic.

> There is a transition in the will that cannot be effected by will – for will operates only on something outside itself – by which one passes into identity with the One which is also the Good. It is as if one who has been saying 'You' to another person, now begins to say 'We': in this transition from the second person to the first, there is a new element of identification, without change in the objective facts of the world. The ineffable reality has to be adequately discerned by an ineffable will-attitude. (1939, pp. 464–5)

In this Hocking sees the "essential difference" between his view and previous forms of idealism, since "the idealist believes the world is a Self," while "the mystic holds that this knowledge is accurate without being adequate, or quite deserving the name of knowledge" (1939, pp. 465). This philosophical stance places great importance upon the "will," and this idea is what connects Hocking's metaphysics, method, and theory of knowledge to his ethical and political philosophy.

One point in which both of Hocking's teachers, James and Royce, concurred was the centrality of "will" to philosophical understanding. Both defended the practical character of all volitional activity, and this is a mark of

the move to pragmatism in this generation. Hocking followed James and Royce, but he recognized more clearly than either of them that the genuine problems with pragmatic voluntarism are the ones Friedrich Nietzsche raised in his accounts of the will to power. Hence, from his earliest ethical writings Hocking sought to reinterpret Nietzsche's "will to power" in light of a different metaphysic. Where Nietzsche had seen in nature a violent play of primal forces which resulted in nature's being "dismembered into individuals," Hocking saw the individual as a union of opposites that is the product and creative center of the development of a quality of will that finds its apex in virtuous life and democratic community. The push and pull of individuals against one another is preserved and turned in a creative direction by democratic social organization, wherein the individuality of each will is preserved and allowed a creative place in the overall growth of community. Hocking provides an agapic revision of the will to power, in which "seeking power" and "loving mankind" are not separable, insofar as we seek to be providential to one another, or ultimately, to stand in God's place in service to each other. Power, therefore, exercised in its most creative form, is a kind of service to the other through which I gain myself by losing it for the other. Love without power "is not fit to survive," Hockings says, placing the truth Nietzsche had gleaned about historical Christian reality in a different light. But there is nothing slavish in the creative and transformed will to power which is power for another rather than mere self-assertion. In the individualist form "the will to power cannot be satisfied in its generality: it must be satisfied in changing conditions." (1918, p. 97) Hence, in seeking to become what we are, we are obliged to change our communities. Hocking therefore holds the individual person to be the creative node that communities produce in their evolution and histories, and which in turn transforms those communities, either for better or for worse. Our "vital circuits" become in ethical life "will-circuits" by way of the transformation of immediate feeling into cognitively elaborated values. We consciously pursue our own moral evolution, and we do so in community. A "passion for righteousness" becomes the creative impetus in creating a preservative, "a world faith" in which the permanent moral gains of humankind are built upon indefinitely.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Union for Ethical Action (Cambridge, Mass., 1904).

The Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Human Happiness (Palo Alto, Cal., 1907).

The Meaning of God in Human Experience (New Haven, Conn., 1912).

Human Nature and Its Remaking (New Haven, Conn., 1918; 2nd edn 1923, 3rd edn 1929).

Morale and Its Enemies (New Haven, Conn., 1918).

The Present Status of the Philosophy of Law and of Rights (New Haven, Conn., 1926).

Man and the State (New Haven, Conn., 1926).

The Self, Its Body, and Freedom (New Haven, Conn., 1928).

Types of Philosophy (New York, 1929; 2nd edn 1939; 3rd edn 1959).

The Spirit of World Politics: With Special Studies of the Near East (New York, 1932).

Evangelism: An Address on Permanence and Change in Church and Mission (Chicago, 1935).

Thoughts on Death and Life (New York, 1937).

The Lasting Elements of Individualism (New Haven, Conn., 1937).

Living Religions and a World Faith (New York, 1940).

What Man Can Make of Man (New York, 1942).

Arab Nationalism and Political Zionism (Flint, Mich., 1944).

The Church and the New World Mind, with others (St. Louis, 1944).

Science and the Idea of God (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1944).

The Immortality of Man (Lancaster, Penn., 1945).

The Coming World Civilization (New York, 1956).

The Meaning of Immortality in Human Experience, including Thoughts on Death and Life (New York, 1957).

Strength of Men and Nations: A Message to the U.S. vis-á-vis the U.S.S.R. (New York, 1959).

Other Relevant Works
Preface to Philosophy, with others (New York, 1946).

Freedom of the Press in America (Leiden, 1947).

Experiment in Education: What We Can Learn from Teaching Germany (Chicago, 1954).

A William Ernest Hocking Reader, ed. John Lachs and D. Micah Hester (Nashville, Tenn., 2004).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils Before 1950*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Relig*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v54*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v3*, *Proc of APA v40*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Howie, John, and LeRoy H. Rouner. *The Wisdom of William Ernest Hocking* (Washington, D.C., 1978).

Luther, A. R. *Existence as Dialectical Tension: A Study of the First Philosophy of W. E. Hocking* (The Hague, 1968).

Robinson, Daniel S. *Royce and Hocking, American Idealists: An Introduction to Their Philosophy, with Selected Letters* (Boston, 1968).

Rouner, LeRoy H. *Within Human Experience: The Philosophy of William Ernest Hocking* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969).

Rouner, LeRoy H., ed. *Philosophy, Religion, and the Coming World Civilization: Essays in Honor of William Ernest Hocking* (The Hague, 1966). Contains a bibliography of Hocking's writings.

Thigpen, Robert B. *Liberty and Community: The Political Philosophy of William Ernest Hocking* (The Hague, 1972).

Randall E. Auxier

HODGE, Charles (1797–1878)

North America's most articulate exponent of Calvinism in the Victorian Age, Charles Hodge was born on 27 December 1797 in Philadelphia. Descended from Scotch-Irish immigrants who had arrived in the New World in 1730, his father, Hugh Hodge, was a surgeon, who served in the Continental Army during the American Revolution. His mother, Mary Blanchard, of Huguenot descent, had the task of raising her son alone, as her husband, while practicing medicine in Philadelphia, died of the yellow fever the very year of his son's birth. When Hodge was fourteen, his mother moved him to Princeton, New Jersey, which was his home for the next sixty-eight years. While in Princeton College Hodge was converted, and following his graduation in 1815, he attended Princeton Seminary, finishing his studies in 1819. Hodge embraced the theology and philosophy of Archibald ALEXANDER, the first professor of Princeton Theological Seminary and the founder of the famed and influential "Princeton Theology," a view dominant in Presbyterianism until the 1920s. Coming to Princeton Seminary at its founding in 1812, Alexander had stressed a High Calvinism that combined the "head religion" of seventeenth-century Reformed Scholasticism and the "heart religion" of eighteenth-century Pietism. Charles Hodge built on his mentor's ideas, but he never passed beyond them. Called in 1822

to teach at Princeton Seminary, and, later, becoming Alexander's successor as professor of theology, Hodge allegedly boasted that "a new idea never originated in this seminary." Hodge was professor of Oriental and biblical literature from 1820 to 1840, professor of exegetical and didactic theology from 1840 to 1852, and professor of exegetical, didactic, and polemical theology from 1852 until 1877. Hodge died on 19 June 1878 in Princeton, New Jersey.

Besides the dominant role of Alexander in Hodge's intellectual growth, European intellectual influences also had a role. After four years of teaching scripture at Princeton, Hodge enjoyed two years (1826–8) of travel and study in Europe. Time in Paris among the French Reformed reinforced his devotion to that seventeenth-century Calvinist scholastic, François Turretin of Geneva. Hodge was indebted to Turretin for his views on the inerrancy and infallibility of Scripture. While in Berlin he encountered the spirituality and theology of the greatest Reformed theologian of the day, Friedrich Schleiermacher. Though he found Schleiermacher fascinating (he was a compelling preacher), Hodge felt that the Berlin professor had "inverted" the "coin" of Calvin's theology by making human dependency central, instead of divine sovereignty. There is some indication, however, that Hodge was influenced by Schleiermacher's concern for empirical theology. From that concern Hodge developed his notion of the Systematician as a "scientist" culling out "facts" from the Bible for "organization" and "interpretation."

The most profound impact of Hodge's European sojourn came not from Reformed, but from Lutheran theologians. In Halle, where the "afterglow of Pietism" was still evident, Hodge formed a lifelong friend with the German exegete, Friedrich August Tholuck. Tholuck was profoundly committed to a supernatural understanding of Christianity, to a recovery of Pauline theology (especially the doctrine of justification), and to a re-appreciation of the though of Martin Luther. Faith for

Tholuck is not simply trust in Christ as Savior and Scripture as a fully reliable revelation; faith is also a transforming energy that won him immortality as a teacher who truly had a pastor's heart for his students. This model profoundly influenced Hodge, who replicated Tholuck's virtues in his own Princeton classroom. Exposed to the idealism of Immanuel Kant, Hodge rejected it for the Scottish or Common Sense Realism of his own upbringing – which philosophy was articulated at Princeton University by President James McCosh, the last, and perhaps greatest exponent of Scottish Realism in America.

While at Princeton, Hodge taught more than three thousand ministers, some three generations of Presbyterian pastors. Part of his power was his very appearance, with his curly hair, high forehead, and wire-rimmed spectacles, making him the archetype of the Victorian seminary instructor. Another component of his personality, noted one biographer, was his "solid learning," his thorough "familiarity with contemporary thought," his "strong certainty," his "power for clear analytical statement" and, above all, the teacher's art par excellence, "skill in awakening minds." For a man of "fixed opinions," Hodge was noteworthy for his "irenic spirit" and "impeccable civility."

Hodge's thought had four major sources: (1) the Reformed Scholasticism of the seventeenth century, with its primary authority as Scripture (the magisterial principle), and its secondary norms as reason, experience, conscience, and tradition (the ministerial principle); (2) the empirical method of the nineteenth century, with its passion for gathering "facts," suggested to Hodge that the Bible was the source of the data to be garnered and synthesized by the systematician; (3) the Scottish Common Sense realism of the time, with its emphasis on accepting appearances at face value; and (4) and the motivating passion of Christian experience, as evidenced in America's "Great Awakenings."

The content of Hodge's theology was classical Calvinism. He accepted the absolute

authority of Scripture, with a doctrine of plenary inspiration ("Inspiration extends to everything which any sacred writer teaches as important, as e.g., that Satan tempted our first parents in the form of a serpent"). He relied on the supreme sovereignty of God, who "rules and over-rules" all things; while God "permitted" the fall of man, he did not "cause" it. He believed that humanity, created good, is now in a "ruined" state, for each soul, created directly by God, "inherits" from Adam, the "Federal Head" of the species, the "original sin" resulting in alienation from God. Apart from a saving relationship with Jesus Christ (both assent to his intellectual truths and emotional trust in his grace), humans are eternally lost. He viewed the new Community, or the Church, as composed of those elected by God for salvation, although Hodge allowed for the salvation of unbaptized infants, and he mused, "we have reason to believe … that the number of the finally lost in comparison with the whole number of the saved will be very inconsiderable." Finally, Hodge held a belief in "futurity," or the ultimate uncontested reign of God on earth and in heaven, following the return of Christ, to usher in "a new and eternal age."

The teachings of Hodge were at odds with six other main streams of American religious thought. First, Unitarianism, which had captured a sizeable part of the Congregationalist tradition, including Harvard; for Hodge, the full divinity of Jesus was a "non-negotiable" part of Christianity. Second, Arminianism and Methodism, then rapidly replacing Calvinism as the majority movement in American Protestantism. For Hodge, their views were flawed in two major respects: the volitional and the soteriological. The freedom of the human will to decide "for" or "against" faith in Christ (an anthropological problem) was anathema to Hodge. The cooperation of human and divine wills in salvation, or synergism, to Hodge undermined the doctrine of justification. Third, the "new measures" of Charles Finney and the Oberlin theology, which, to Hodge, placed far too much emphasis on emotion, neglecting the vital role of reason in faith. Fourth, the New Haven theology of Nathaniel Taylor, who contended for human initiative and responsibility and denied "providential decrees," arguing that man "not only can if he will, but he can if he won't." Fifth, Edwards Amasa Park and Andover New England Theology, a modified Calvinism. Sixth, the Mercersburg theology of Philip SCHAFF and John W. Nevin, who were much in sympathy with theological, liturgical, and philosophical movements in the German United (Lutheran/Reformed) Church, and envisioned the complementary nature of Roman Catholic and Protestant theology (Evangelical Catholic). To Hodge this was a compromise of the Reformation's emphasis on Word Alone (*Sola Scriptura*), Faith Alone (*Sola Fide*), and Grace Alone (*Sola Gratia*).

Hodge advocated his "Princeton Theology" not only in the classroom but in his biblical commentaries on Romans (1835), Ephesians (1856), and 1 and 2 Corinthians (1857). Hodge's greatest work was his famed three-volume *Systematic Theology* (1872–3), still in print and in use in the twenty-first century. Hodge also wrote a popular study of doctrine for laypeople (*The Way of Life*, 1841) as well as a "repudiation" of Darwin (*What is Darwinism?*, 1874). Hodge also edited, after 1825, the *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*. He wrote more than a hundred and fifty articles for it during his forty-six years as editor. Besides teaching and writing, Hodge served as Moderator of the "Old School" Presbyterian Church in 1846.

It is almost impossible to overestimate the impact of Charles Hodge on American thought. He took the Princeton Theology introduced by Alexander and gave it a form and direction that was continued by his successor – his son, Archibald Alexander Hodge – and by Benjamin Breckinridge WARFIELD. As developed by J. Gresham Machen, Princeton Theology survived the liberal–fundamentalist controversy of the 1920s, finding a new home

in Westminister Theological Seminary. Within the Reformed tradition, the heritage of Hodge continued among conservative evangelicals in a variety of denominations. Because of his articulation of a "high view of Scripture" Hodge won a permanent place of honor among American evangelicals (as varied as Missouri Synod Lutherans and Southern Baptists). Within the Protestant world, Hodge's theology offered a major alternative to the religious liberalism that came to dominate American religion by the 1920s. Within the intellectual community, Hodge showed how Calvinism, even for the twentieth century, could still be a valid and vital intellectual option.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (Philadelphia, 1835).

The Way of Life (Philadelphia, 1841).

A Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians (New York, 1856).

An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians (New York, 1857).

An Exposition of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (New York, 1857).

Systematic Theology, 3 vols (New York, 1872–3).

What is Darwinism? (New York, 1874).

Other Relevant Works

Hodge's papers are at Princeton University.

The Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (Philadelphia, 1840).

Essays and Reviews: Selected from the Princeton Review (New York, 1857).

Noll, Mark A., ed. *Charles Hodge: The Way of Life and Selected Writings* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1987).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Religious Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v10

Barker, William S. "The Social Views of Charles Hodge (1797–1878): A Study in 19th-Century Calvinism and Conservatism," *Covenant Seminary Review* 1 (1975): 1–22.

Danhol, Ralph J. *Charles Hodge as Dogmatician* (Goes, The Netherlands, 1929).

Hodge, Archibald Alexander. *The Life of Charles Hodge* (New York, 1880).

Hoffecker, W. A. *Piety and the Princeton Theologians: Archibald Alexander, Charles Hodge, and Benjamin Warfield* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1981).

Noll, Mark A. "The Founding of Princeton Seminary," *Westminister Theological Journal* 42 (1979): 72–110.

———, ed. *The Princeton Theology, 1812–1921* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1983).

Salmond, C. A. *Princetonians: Charles and A. A. Hodge: With Class and Table Talk of Hodge the Younger* (Edinburgh, 1888).

Sandeen, Ernest R. "The Princeton Theology: One Source of Biblical Literalism in American Protestantism," *Church History* 31 (1962): 307–21.

Wells, David F., ed. *Reformed Theology in America: A History of Its Modern Development* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1985).

Wells, Jonathan. *Charles Hodge's Critique of Darwinism* (Lewiston, N.Y. 1988).

C. George Fry

HOFMANN, Hans (1880–1966)

Johann Georg Albert (Hans) Hofmann was born on 21 March 1880 in Weissenburg, Germany. His formal training in art began in 1898, when he enrolled in Moritz Heymann's Munich Art School. In 1903 he befriended department store owner and art collector

Phillip Freudenberg, who sponsored Hofmann's art studies in Paris. While in Paris, Hofmann attended classes at the Académie de la Grande Chaumière, where he met fellow artists Henri Matisse, Pablo Picasso, Fernand Leger, and Georges Braque. In 1910 Hofmann held his first one-man exhibition of paintings at the Paul Cassirier Gallery in Berlin. In 1915 Hofmann opened the Hans Hofmann Schule für Bildende Kunst in Munich; among his students were Louise Nevelson, Alfred Jensen, and Ludwig Sander.

Hofmann was invited to teach at the University of California at Berkeley in the summer of 1930. In 1931 Hofmann returned to Berkeley for a second term, where he wrote *Creation in Form and Color: A Textbook for Instruction in Art*, which was a major unpublished treatise on his philosophy and teaching methods concerning art. Hofmann permanently moved to New York City in 1932, where he opened the Hans Hofmann School of Fine Arts two years later. As a teacher, Hofmann was highly repected; he taught such students as George McNeil, Burgoyne Diller, and Lee Krasner. Hofmann had his first one-man exhibition in New York City at Peggy Guggenheim's Gallery in 1944 and was included in the "Contemporary American Painting Exhibition" at the Whitney Museum of American Art in New York City in 1945. In 1960 Hofmann was included in the XXX Venice Biennale. Hofmann died on 17 February 1966 in New York City.

In 1948 Hofmann published a collection of writings entitled *The Search for the Real*. Hofmann's ideas had an immediate impact on abstract art during this time, particularly influencing the "New York School" of abstract expressionist painters. Hofmann explored the plastic relations that give rise to a vitality that becomes spiritual. He quoted Spinoza while urging artists to abandon the banality of the material (1948, p. 62). His statement that "the aim of art is to vitalize form" echoes Susanne Langer's definition of art as presentational form or forms of feeling.

In both his capacities as painter and teacher, Hofmann's contributions continue to remain influential to the philosophical foundations of abstract art being done today. Of particular importance are Hofmann's ideas concerning the issues of color and form as primary elements in painting that allow for the creation of pictorial space and the illusion of depth through the tensions of form and color. Equally important are Hofmann's ideas regarding the relationship of positive to negative space in conjunction with form and color, resulting in a sense of "push and pull" on a two-dimensional surface.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Creation in Form and Color: A Textbook for Instruction in Art, trans. Glenn Wessels (1931, unpublished). Rewritten as *Das Malerbuch: Form und Farbe in der Gestaltung*. Manuscript is at the University of California, Berkeley.

The Search For The Real And Other Essays, ed. Sara T. Weeks and Bartlett H. Hayes, Jr. (Andover, Mass., 1948).

Hans Hofmann: New Paintings, catalog for exhibition of 7–25 January 1958 (New York, 1958).

"Hans Hofmann on Art," *Art Journal* 22 (1963): 180, 182.

Other Relevant Works

"Art in America," *Art Digest* 4 (August 1930): 27.

"Painting and Culture," *Fortnightly* 1 (11 September 1931), pp. 5–7.

"On the Aims of Art," trans. Ernst Stolz and Glenn Wessels, *Fortnightly* 1 (26 February 1932): 7–11.

Further Reading

Goodman, Cynthia. *Hans Hofmann* (New York, 1986).

Greenberg, Clement. *Hans Hofmann* (Paris, 1961).

Lyle J. Salmi

HOFFER, Eric (1902–83)

Eric Hoffer was born on 25 July 1902 in Bronx, New York. He died on 20 May 1983 in San Francisco, California. Hoffer's parents were immigrants from Alsatian Germany. By the time he was five, Hoffer could both speak and read German and English. At the age of seven, perhaps due to a fall down stairs, he went blind; this was also about the time his mother died. For the next eight years he lived under the care of a Martha Bauer, a woman who had accompanied his parents to America. He recovered his sight when he was fifteen, but he never attended school. His father died when he was eighteen; Hoffer bought a one-way train ticket to California with his inheritance.

From 1920 to 1930 he worked at odd jobs and lived in Los Angeles's skid row. Throughout the 1930s he worked as a migrant worker, following the crops up and down California. Whenever he could, he read books from lending libraries along the rail lines. In 1942, with the war's job boom, he became a longshoreman on the San Francisco waterfront and worked there until his retirement in 1967.

In the late 1940s Hoffer began writing a manuscript based on his wide reading and observations of world events. Amazingly, the handwritten work was bought and published by Harper & Row in 1951 under the title *The True Believer*. It made an immediate stir as the seminal work of a day laborer who never attended school; Hoffer was proclaimed "the American Rousseau." The book analyzed both the nature and character of mass movements and the people who lead them.

In *The True Believer*, Hoffer recognized the central importance of self-esteem to psychological well-being, especially its lack. He saw a connection between the negative consequences of low self-esteem to the rise of totalitarian regimes in his own time, such as Nazism and Stalinism. Hoffer noticed how such governments had been able to secure power by capitalizing on individual self-hatred, self-doubt, and insecurity. He concluded that the absence of a positive self-esteem caused people to search for meaning in their own life by becoming obsessed with the mundane details of other people's lives. In so doing, they became unwitting puppets, blind to how they were controlled by the malevolent machinations of "true believers."

In 1955, responding to calls for more of his historical-philosophical commentary, he produced *The Passionate State of Mind*. In 1963 came the book that many consider his greatest achievement, *The Ordeal of Change*. In 1964 the University of California at Berkeley made Hoffer a special guest lecturer. In 1967, after the appearance of *The Temper of Our Time* that year, he was interviewed by Eric Severeid on national television, adding to his fame. President Lyndon Johnson was so impressed by his working-class persona and philosophy that he invited Hoffer for a visit to the White House and then named him to the Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence.

In retirement Hoffer produced *Working and Thinking on the Waterfront* (1969), taken from the journal he kept while a longshoreman; *First Things, Last Things* (1971); *Reflections on the Human Condition* (1973); *In Our Time* (1976); and *Before the Sabbath* (1979). These works, like all of his books after *The True Believer*, were collections of essays. The essays were brief, as were the books, the result of long periods of reflective thought, honed to literary perfection by a critical and thirsty mind. He once claimed that every essay had one original thought, which could not be said of many entire books. His last book, *Between the Devil and the Dragon* (1982), was an ensemble of the greatest passages from his long writing career. In 1983 he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom, and when he died later that year, it was pinned to the longshoreman's jacket during the public viewing of his remains. Later that year, his memoirs, *Truth Imagined*, were published, which Hoffer finished just before he died.

Hoffer's work is concerned with twentieth-century world events and the evolution of American democracy. He focused on human nature, especially the particular breed of human being produced by living in the United States. He strongly believed in the ability of men to be productive without the support of governments and especially without leaders. He believed that most charismatic leaders were "true believers" living in a perpetually passionate state of mind, driven by the desire to manipulate their fellow men eventually to their own ruin and many times to that of the very society they believed they were sent to save. He believed that even greedy American businessmen were less dangerous than the "political saviors" of the twentieth century because all businessmen wanted was to make money, while true believers wanted to control man's destiny.

Hoffer was one of the most intelligent of twentieth-century American writers. Whether a formal education would have strengthened his grasp and interpretation of history and psychology or diminished his creative response to the events and people he studied so avidly through personal observation and reading we can never know. What remains unchallenged is that Hoffer was a monumentally gifted observer and interpreter of the human condition, with an original thought in every essay and in every chapter of every book he wrote.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The True Believer: Thoughts on the Nature of Mass Movements (New York, 1951).
The Passionate State of Mind (New York, 1955).
The Ordeal of Change (New York, 1963).
The Temper of Our Time (New York, 1967).
Working and Thinking on the Waterfront (New York, 1969).
First Things, Last Things (New York, 1971).
Reflections on the Human Condition (New York, 1973).

In Our Time (New York, 1976).
Before the Sabbath (New York, 1979).
Between the Devil and the Dragon: The Best Essays and Aphorisms of Eric Hoffer (New York, 1982).

Other Relevant Works

Hoffer's papers are at the Hoover Institution Library and Archives at Stanford University, California.
"How Natural is Human Nature?" *Saturday Evening Post* (13 January 1962): 26–7.
"Whose Country is America?" *New York Times Magazine* (22 November 1970): 30–31.
"Beware the Intellectual," *Harper's Magazine* (October 1979): 10–11.
Truth Imagined (New York, 1983).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v8*
Baker, James T. *Eric Hoffer* (Boston, 1982).
Koerner, James D. *Hoffer's America* (La Salle, Ill., 1973).
Tomkins, Calvin. *Eric Hoffer: An American Odyssey* (New York, 1968).

James T. Baker

HOHFELD, Wesley Newcomb (1879–1918)

Wesley N. Hohfeld was born on 8 August 1879 in Oakland, California. He received his BA from the University of California at Berkeley in 1901, winning the gold medal for highest possible grades. Hohfeld then went to Harvard, earning his LL.B. cum laude in 1904, where he assisted law professor John Chipman GRAY. Returning to California, he was a professor of law at Stanford University from 1905

until he left in 1914 to join the faculty of Yale Law School. Hohfeld was later named Southmayd Professor of Law, the position that he held at Yale until his unexpected death on 21 October 1918 in New Haven, Connecticut.

Hohfeld was a conduit of transmission for legal realism from his teacher Gray to the next generation of legal scholars that includes Karl LLEWELLYN. Deeply suspicious of legal traditions and formalisms that vaguely use and confuse fundamental legal concepts such as "right" and "duty," Hohfeld demonstrated how an analytical and philosophical jurisprudence can clarify and disentangle such concepts. As presented in perhaps his most important essay, the two-part article "Fundamental Legal Conceptions as Applied in Judicial Reasoning" (1913, 1917), he argued that a legal "right" of a person has four basic and separable meanings that refer to a claim, a privilege, a power, or an immunity in relation to a second person. A claim is an expectation that some other person(s) will fulfill a certain duty; a privilege (or liberty) is lacking a certain duty to another; a power is granted by an authority or statute; and an immunity is having an exemption from another's power. Together with their counterparts as viewed from the perspective of the second person, namely having a duty, a no-right, a liability, and a disability, these eight concepts can serve as the most basic components of any more complex legal relationship or situation. Hofheld deftly categorized seemingly dissimilar legal terms together as exemplifying one or another basic legal concept, and revealed where legal argumentation had too often become unnecessarily contorted and confused by failing to recognize such commonalities.

By defining the basic legal concepts exclusively as relations that one person has with another, Hohfeld set himself against any and all notions of corporate or group or social rights. Depending on the context, this individualistic stance on rights and duties can be either a problem for corporations when the state finds business misconduct, or a useful way to defend corporate interests when workers petition for organized labor rights. In addition, by grounding legal rights on personal relations, the traditional category of rights that people have toward things (like property) has been radically reconstructed. Following Hohfeld, a property right can be conceived as a bundle of various rights concerning the owned property, which can be enlarged or diminished by the owner.

Both Hohfeld's judicial methodology and his conclusions about legal rights have been very influential legal theory and philosophy of law. Besides invigorating the movement of legal realism, his theories have influenced some economists, especially John R. COMMONS, and several important philosophers including H. L. A Hart, Jeremy Waldron, Joseph Raz, and Judith Jarvis THOMSON. The course of debates over the nature of legal and moral rights during the twentieth century would have been very different without Hohfeld's contributions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Individual Liability of Stockholders and the Conflict of Laws," *Columbia Law Review* 9 (1909): 492–522; 10 (1910): 283–326, 520–49.

"The Relations between Equity and Law," *Michigan Law Review* 11 (1913): 537–71.

"Fundamental Legal Conceptions as Applied in Judicial Reasoning," *Yale Law Journal* 23 (1913): 16–59; 26 (1917): 710–70.

Fundamental Legal Conceptions and Other Legal Essays, ed. Walter Wheeler Cook (New Haven, Conn., 1919; enlarged edn 1923).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v27*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*

Anderson, Alan R. "The Logic of Hohfeldian Propositions," *Logique et Analyse* 13 (1970): 231–44.

Brady, James B. "Law, Language, and Logic: The Legal Philosophy of Wesley Newcomb Hohfeld," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 8 (1972): 246–63.

Cook, Walter Wheeler. "Hohfeld's Contributions to the Science of Law," *Yale Law Journal* 28 (1919): 721–38.

Corbin Arthur L. "Jural Relations and Their Classification," *Yale Law Journal* 30 (1921): 226–38.

Hart, H. L. A. *The Concept of Law*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1994).

Horwitz, Morton J. *The Transformation of American Law 1870–1960: The Crisis of Legal Orthodoxy* (Oxford, 1992).

Perry, Thomas D. "A Paradigm of Philosophy: Hohfeld on Legal Rights," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 14 (1977): 41–50.

Pound, Roscoe. "Legal Rights," *International Journal of Ethics* 26 (1915): 92–116.

"Wesley Newcomb Hohfeld," *Yale Law Review* 28 (1918): 166–8.

John R. Shook

HOLLANDS, Edmund Howard
(1879–1967)

Edmund H. Hollands was born on 11 January 1879 in Watervliet, near Albany, New York. He received his education at Cornell University, where he was awarded a PhB in 1899, an MA in 1901, and a PhD in philosophy in 1905. His dissertation was entitled "The System of Schleiermacher as a Philosophy of Subjective Consciousness." He was an instructor of philosophy at Cornell in 1905 and 1907 to 1909, and also at Princeton in 1906. In 1909–10 he taught at Hamilton College in New York, and then he was professor of philosophy at Butler University in Indiana from 1910 to 1913.

In 1913 Hollands became professor of philosophy and chair of the department of philosophy and psychology at the University of Kansas. He replaced John E. BOODIN, who had been Kansas's philosopher since 1904. Hollands remained chair of the philosophy department after its separation from psychology, and continued in that position until 1946. He served as President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1924–5. He was a visiting professor at the University of Missouri during the summer of 1924, and at the University of Southern California in 1929–30. He retired from teaching in 1949, and died on 5 December 1967 in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Hollands absorbed much of the idealistic philosophy taught at Cornell during his education there. Arguing that science's abstractions of measurable quantities and natural laws give only a partial perspective on nature, Hollands held that human experience could not be rendered false or non-existent by naturalism. A complete philosophy must take into full account the qualitative feelings and aesthetic values of ordinary experience. The direct apprehension of nature, in which spirit has its home, takes a wide variety of forms, including the religiously mystical experience. Holland declares in "Nature and Spirit" that "experiences of the mystical type are absolutely fundamental and prior to all developed intelligence" (1925, p. 344).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Wundt and the Doctrine of Psychical Analysis," *American Journal of Psychology* 16 (1905): 499–518; 17 (1906): 206–26.

"Schleiermacher's Development of Subjective Consciousness," *Philosophical Review* 15 (1906): 293–306.

"The Relation of Science to Concrete Experience," *Philosophical Review* 15 (1906): 614–26.

"Possibility and Reality," *Philosophical Review* 16 (1907): 604–15.

"Neo-Realism and Idealism," *Philosophical Review* 17 (1908): 507–17.

"The Externality of Relations," *Journal of Philosophy* 11 (1914): 463–70.

"Nature, Reason and the Limits of State Authority," *Philosophical Review* 25 (1916): 645–61.

"Some Comments on Instrumentalism," in *Philosophical Essays in Honor of James Edwin Creighton*, ed. George H. Sabine (New York, 1917), pp. 214–28.

"Nature and Spirit," *International Journal of Ethics* 35 (1925): 329–45.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v3, *Proc of APA v41*, *Who Was Who in Amer v6*, *Who's Who in Phil*

John R. Shook

HOLMER, Paul LeRoy (1916–2004)

Paul L. Holmer was born on 14 November 1916 in Minneapolis, Minnesota, the son of Swedish Lutheran immigrants. He earned his BA and MA from the University of Minnesota and a PhD in philosophy from Yale University in 1942. His dissertation was on "Kierkegaard and the Truth." Holmer taught philosophy at Gustavus Adolphus College in 1944, and taught at the University of Minnesota from 1946 to 1958. In 1960 he accepted a full-time appointment to the faculty of Yale Divinity School, where he became Noah Porter Professor of Philosophical Theology. After retiring in 1987, Holmer was succeeded to the Noah Porter chair by Nicholas WOLTERSTORFF. Holmer died on 29 June 2004 in St. Paul, Minnesota.

Holmer was influenced early and late by the writings of Søren Kierkegaard, whom he inter-preted not as a precursor of twentieth-century existentialism but as a Christian thinker exploring human subjectivity in the interest of reviving, reforming, and deepening the life of the church. In the 1960s Holmer came under the influence of Ludwig Wittgenstein, whom he read in a distinctive way that saw Wittgenstein's affinities with Kierkegaard. He also felt considerable kinship with C. S. Lewis, and wrote a book about him.

Holmer's work shows a preoccupation with the nature of theology, its relation to the ground-level language of Christian faith, and the relation of both to the emotions and virtues of the faithful. He did not much like academic theology because of its tendency either to turn Christianity into a big theory or to exploit it in the interest of some current social movement. Examples of what he took to be real theology were the New Testament, the ancient creeds, the sermons of John Wesley, and the prayers of Samuel Johnson. He thought Christianity to be a highly responsible way of understanding the world, one that was less a world view or theory about the world than a formation of character that embedded understanding in passion and action. A major effort of his work was to encourage pastors and theologians to aim at this primitive character-forming use of the traditional language of Christian faith, a use he found surprisingly little practiced in churches.

In addition to courses centered on Kierkegaard and Wittgenstein, Holmer taught courses in philosophical theology that employed little of the traditional literature on that topic but instead nonreligious papers by J. L. Austin, Gilbert Ryle, Peter Strawson, and other analytic philosophers of the period. In the 1960s, well before the current rage of virtue ethics and the explosion of philosophical literature on the emotions, Holmer taught courses with titles like "Emotions, Passions, and Feelings," and "Virtues and Vices," at Yale.

Holmer exercised his influence more through teaching and lecturing than through publication. From 1960 to his retirement

Holmer exercised extensive influence on the minds of students and faculty alike at Yale Divinity School, though not always in ways he himself approved. Among theologians whose work cannot be explained apart from Holmer's influence were Brevard Childs, Hans FREI, Stanley HAUERWAS, George LINDBECK, and Don Saliers. Ralph McINERNY attests to having come under Holmer's influence at the University of Minnesota.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Theology and the Scientific Study of Religion (Minneapolis, 1961).

C. S. Lewis: The Shape of His Faith and Thought (New York, 1976).

The Grammar of Faith (San Francisco, 1978).

Making Christian Sense (Philadelphia, 1984).

Further Reading

Bell, Richard H., ed. *The Grammar of the Heart: New Essays in Moral Philosophy and Theology* (San Francisco, 1988).

Horst, Mark. "Disciplined by Theology: A Profile of Paul Holmer," *Christian Century* 115 (12 October 1998): 891–5.

Rollefson, Richard G. *Thinking with Kierkegaard and Wittgenstein: The Philosophical Theology of Paul L. Holmer*. PhD dissertation, Graduate Theological Union (Berkeley, Cal., 1995).

Robert Campbell Roberts

HOLMES, Oliver Wendell, Jr. (1841–1935)

Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. (he dropped the "Jr." when his father died) was born on 8 March 1841 in Boston, Massachusetts. Holmes was born into a prominent intellectual family and was named for his famous father, the writer, physician, and Harvard professor Oliver Wendell HOLMES. Holmes Sr.'s intellectual pursuits earned him membership in the Saturday Club, which included Ralph Waldo EMERSON, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, James Russell Lowell, John Greenleaf Whittier, and Henry JAMES, Sr. Holmes Jr. was a childhood friend of William JAMES and his brother Henry, and also of Henry ADAMS. Holmes entered Harvard College in 1858. He became an editor of *Harvard Magazine* in July 1860, and in October published essays on Plato and Albrecht Dürer. During his senior year, he enlisted as a private in the Union Army, but was able to return to Harvard to graduate with his BA in 1861. Holmes was official class poet, sharing the prize for excellence in Greek prose composition. In July 1861 Holmes received a commission as first lieutenant in the Massachusetts 20th Volunteer Infantry and served three years from 1861 to 1864. He was profoundly affected by his wartime experience, intellectually and physically. He was seriously wounded three times, causing him later to adopt an unsentimental view of life, arguing it was an unending and futile struggle against the capricious dictates of fate or chance. He was mustered out in July 1864 with the rank of captain.

Holmes entered Harvard Law School in 1864, earning the LL.B. in 1866. He was admitted to the Massachusetts Bar in 1867 and practiced law in Boston. During 1870–71, he was an Instructor in Constitutional Law, Harvard College. From 1879 to 1873 he was the editor of *American Law Review*, and he also edited the twelfth edition (1873) of Kent's *Commentaries*. Holmes was a member of the Boston law firm of Shattuck, Holmes & Munroe from 1873 to 1882. In 1880 Holmes delivered a series of lectures on common law at the Lowell Institute, which became the basis of his famous work *The Common Law*, published in 1881. This publication earned him an international reputation. He was named professor of law at Harvard Law School in 1882, but left after one semester when he was appointed to

the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court. Holmes sat on that court for twenty years from 1882 to 1899 as Associate Justice, and was Chief Justice from 1899 to 1902. In 1902, when Holmes was sixty-one, President Theodore Roosevelt appointed him Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of United States, where he sat for almost thirty years, from 4 December 1902 to 12 January 1932. Holmes died on 6 March 1935 in Washington, D.C.

Though Holmes was a member of the Metaphysical Club, a small discussion group founded by pragmatists William James and Charles Sanders PEIRCE in 1871, he was not a regular member. However, Holmes had much in common with pragmatism in his rejection of universal laws or general propositions being used to decide empirical, concrete cases. Some scholars also see Holmes as a utilitarian, but to Holmes, having sympathies with Social Darwinism, the good was not what served the greatest number, but what emerged from the struggles in the social arena.

In his two important treatises, *The Common Law* and "The Path of the Law" (1897), Holmes attacked prevailing views of jurisprudence and proposed new conceptions of the origin and nature of law. He maintained that the law could be understood only as a response to the needs of the society that it regulated, and that it was useless to consider it merely as a body of rules developed logically by legal theorists. Holmes also embraced the doctrine of Social Darwinism, once writing to Felix FRANKFURTER that law should reflect the brute forces or dominant will of the community. For example, Holmes believed that even though juries are not especially inspired for the discovery of the truth, they were desirable because they reflected the wishes and feelings of the community. As a justice, Holmes thought it more important to sustain the constitutionality of laws even if the laws were bad.

Holmes scholars have called his scholarship in *The Common Law* both a landmark work of legal theory and history as well as difficult, confusing, and "turgid." The book's opening paragraph contains perhaps the most famous line ever written about law: "The life of the law has not been logic: it has been experience."

Remarks like these led legal realists, such as Karl LLEWELLYN and Jerome FRANK, to embrace Holmes in the 1920s and 30s. Legal realism argues that legal concepts are not a substantially constraining force in law – regardless of what reasons judges offer for their opinions, law is determined largely by their personal predilections. This cynicism was taken to even greater lengths in the 1970s and 80s with the critical legal studies school, or legal deconstructionism, which saw no practical dividing line between law and politics.

Some scholars, however, find it a misreading to view Holmes as a proto-realist in *The Common Law*, as he did, after all, offer a general theory of liability civil and criminal by stating that though the law uses the language of morality, it necessarily ends in external standards not dependent on the consciousness of the individual or on his moral culpability. Similarly, tort liability was imposed when circumstances were such as would have led a prudent man to perceive danger, although not necessarily to foresee the specific harm. If a man makes a representation, knowing facts which by the average standard of the community are sufficient to give him warning that it is probably untrue, and it is untrue, he is guilty of fraud in theory of law whether he believes his statement or not. Likewise, the formation of a contract did not depend upon a meeting of the minds, but on the parties' conduct. Holmes's attack on moralism and subjective standards in the law was based in part on his desire for order, stability, and predictability in the law.

Consistent with this desire, Holmes was a legal positivist, viewing law and morality as distinct, and he rejected the concept of natural rights. Holmes's legal doctrine was austere, causing him to advocate "judicial restraint" in the firm belief that popular majorities through their elected representatives should have their will sustained. He vigorously objected to the nullification of social legislation, such as

minimum wage and hour laws, as unconstitutional. From his eloquent opinions in these cases he came to be regarded as the Great Dissenter. In cases dealing with free speech, however, Holmes exerted judicial authority. For example, in defense of the First Amendment, he developed the "clear and present danger" rule, to protect the public interest from an immediate threat.

Holmes's legal realism is also reflected in his insistence that the court look at the facts in a changing society, instead of clinging to worn-out slogans and formulas. Holmes convinced people that the law should develop along with the society it serves. He exercised a deep influence on the law through his support of the doctrine of "judicial restraint" which urged judges to avoid letting their personal opinions affect their decisions.

During Holmes's twenty years on the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, one case brought him brief national notoriety. In his dissenting opinion in *Vegelahn v. Guntner* (1896) that upheld an injunction against labor picketing, Holmes argued that employees may combine to support their interests by lawful means, even if doing so constitutes intentional harm to their employer. Holmes's dissent in *Vegelahn v. Guntner* reflected the influences of Social Darwinism on his thinking, but it also furthered his unwarranted reputation as a friend of labor – a reputation that, along with "The Soldier's Faith" speech, influenced Roosevelt to appoint him to the Supreme Court in 1902.

While on the Supreme Court, Holmes again supported labor, though again not out of sympathy for workers. In *Lochner v. New York* (1905), the Court struck down a New York statute that prohibited employees from being required or permitted to work in a bakery more than sixty hours a week. The majority found that the statute interfered with the right of contract between employer and employees and that the right of contract, though not explicit in the Constitution, is protected by the Fourteenth Amendment under the "due process" clause. Because the statute violated

no *procedure* due the employees, the majority's ruling is said to have been based on a violation of the oxymoronic concept of "substantive due process." Holmes, in his brief dissent, said that the majority had reached its decision on the basis of the economic theory of *laissez faire*, though Supreme Court decisions had settled that the Constitution does not prevent the states from interfering with the liberty to contract. In another pithy statement, Holmes stated that "the Fourteenth Amendment does not enact Mr. Herbert Spencer's *Social Statics*."

The post-World War I "red scare" saw several important free-speech cases reach the Supreme Court. In *Schenck v. United States* (1919), the defendant had been convicted of circulating to military draftees a "document" calculated to cause "insubordination." Holmes wrote the majority opinion affirming the conviction, uttering the pithy aphorism: "The most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting fire in a theatre and causing a panic." But he also strengthened the First Amendment by adding that speech may be punished only when it creates a "clear and present danger."

In *Abrams v. United States* (1919), a defendant had been convicted of publishing leaflets intended to encourage resistance to the US war effort. The Supreme Court again affirmed, but this time Holmes dissented, writing that "the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas … competition of the market." Holmes's marketplace theory of truth may be contrasted with a defense of freedom of speech based on individual rights. In *Buck v. Bell* (1927), his most notorious opinion, Holmes upheld a Virginia statute that allowed the sterilization of persons deemed mentally deficient. Holmes did not even consider any arguments for a constitutional right to procreation (a right the Court upheld in 1942), saying it gave him "pleasure" to uphold the Virginia statute.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Common Law (Boston, 1881).
Speeches (Boston, 1891; 2nd edn 1913).

"The Path of the Law," *Harvard Law Review* 10 (1897): 457–78.

Collected Legal Papers, ed. Harold J. Laski (New York, 1920).

Other Relevant Works

Holmes' papers are at Harvard Law School and the Library of Congress.

The Dissenting Opinions of Mr. Justice Holmes, ed. Alfred List (New York, 1931).

Representative Opinions of Mr. Justice Holmes, ed. Alfred List (New York, 1931).

The Mind and Faith of Justice Holmes: His Speeches, Essays, Letters, and Judicial Opinions, ed. Max Lerner (Boston, 1943).

The Formative Essays of Justice Holmes: The Making of and American Legal Philosophy, ed. Frederic Rogers Kellogg (Westport, Conn., 1984).

The Essential Holmes: Selections from the Letters, Speeches, Judicial Opinions, and Other Writings of Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., ed. Richard A. Posner (Chicago, 1992).

The Collected Works of Justice Holmes: Complete Public Writings and Selected Judicial Opinions of Oliver Wendell Holmes, 3 vols, ed. Sheldon M. Novick (Chicago, 1995).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Dict Amer Bio, Encyc Amer Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v27, Routledge Encycl Phil, Who Was Who in Amer v1

Alschuler, Albert W. *Law Without Values: The Life, Work, and Legacy of Justice Holmes* (Chicago, 2000).

Baker, Liva. *The Justice from Beacon Hill: The Life and Times of Oliver Wendell Holmes* (New York, 1991).

Biddle, Francis, *Mr. Justice Holmes* (New York, 1942).

Bowen, Catherine Drinker. *Yankee from Olympus: Justice Holmes and His Family* (Boston, 1944).

Brent, Silas. *Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. A Biography* (New York, 1932).

Frankfurter, Felix. *Mr. Justice Holmes and the Supreme Court* (Cambridge, Mass., 1938).

Gordon, Robert W., ed. *The Legacy of Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.* (Stanford, Cal., 1992).

Grey, Thomas C. "Holmes and Legal Pragmatism," *Stanford Law Review* 41 (1989): 787–854.

Howe, Mark DeWolfe. *Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes: The Shaping Years, 1841–1870* (Cambridge, Mass., 1957).

———, *Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes: The Proving Years, 1870–1882* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963).

Konefsky, Samuel J. *The Legacy of Holmes and Brandeis*: *A Study in the Influence of Ideas* (New York, 1956).

Menand, Louis. *The Metaphysical Club* (New York, 2001).

Novick, Sheldon M. *Honorable Justice: The Life of Oliver Wendell Holmes* (Boston, 1989).

White, G. Edward. *Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes: Law and the Inner Self* (Oxford, 1993).

Henry Cohen

HOLMES, Oliver Wendell, Sr. (1809–94)

Oliver Wendell Holmes was born on 29 August 1809 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. His father, Reverend Abiel Holmes, was minister of the First Congregational Church in Cambridge for nearly four decades. Holmes attended Phillips Andover Academy and then Harvard, receiving the BA in 1829.

He first tried law school and then medical school, and after study in Paris he returned to Harvard Medical School for his degree in 1836. His private practice and occasional teaching could not compete with his growing love for writing poetry and public lecturing, both encouraged by Ralph Waldo EMERSON. Thereafter Holmes lived a double life, making many important medical contributions (he is credited with discovering the contagiousness of puerperal fever before Pasteur) while publishing and lecturing on science and literature. Despite his frequent travel on the lecturing circuits he found time to raise a family; his son, the future Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell HOLMES, JR., was born in 1941. In 1847 Holmes was appointed Parkman Professor of Anatomy and Physiology at Harvard Medical School, where he taught until his retirement in 1882, and he also served as the school's Dean from 1847 to 1853. He was awarded many honors in his later years, including Harvard University's Doctor of Laws, Cambridge University's Doctor of Letters, Edinburgh University's Doctor of Laws, and Oxford University's Doctor of Civil Law. Holmes died on 7 October 1894 in Boston, Massachusetts.

An aristocratic version of Benjamin Franklin, another native Bostonian, Holmes was renowned for his deft satires of many Puritan doctrines and moral habits. Across his poems, stories, and novels there are many undercurrents criticizing the narrow conservatism and parochial Calvinism of his New England society. As a prominent free-thinker in religious matters, liberal even for a Unitarian, Holmes aroused controversy but always clothed his own views with entertaining and epigrammatic wit that remains as quotable as Franklin or Mark TWAIN.

His primary theological targets for scorn were predestination and innate depravity. From his own vast medical knowledge he appreciated the numerous ills, both physiological and psychological, that can limit or remove a person's control over his conduct. The influence of Holmes's scientific stature, blended with his persuasive prose, was an important component of the growing trend in the mid 1800s to react to unstable or aberrant behavior with the healing compassion of the doctor instead of the criminal punishment of a judge or the spiritual damnation of a minister. Holmes educated two generations of Harvard medical students including William JAMES (who became his assistant as instructor in anatomy and physiology in 1872) and he anticipated many themes of modern psychology. Like James, Holmes looked forward to the day when medical psychology would influence the progress of religion. "Medical science, and especially the study of mental disease, is destined, I believe, to react to much greater advantage on the theology of the future than theology has acted on medicine in the past. The liberal spirit very generally prevailing in both professions, and the good understanding between their most enlightened members, promise well for the future of both in a community which holds every point of human belief, every institution in human hands, and every word written in a human dialect, open to free discussion today, tomorrow, and to the end of time." (1883)

Holmes's explorations of the hereditary and social causes of character (or lack of character) cast a new light on the "Brahmin caste" of Bostonian elites as well. Although it was he who invented the famous description of Boston as "the hub of the universe," and his home served as a salon to center its intellectual life, Holmes was in a sense the last Puritan who excelled in celebrating his culture's mental superiority while simultaneously undercutting its moral right to guide the religious destiny of America. His absorption of much of the spirit of transcendentalism resulted in an optimistic view of humanity and a demand that religion serve the heart rather the head.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Poems (Boston, 1836).
Homeopathy and Its Kindred Delusions

(Boston, 1842).

The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table (Boston, 1858).

Medical Essays, 1842–1882 (Boston, 1883).

Ralph Waldo Emerson (Boston, 1884).

Other Relevant Works

The Writings of Oliver Wendell Holmes, 13 vols (Boston, 1891–2).

The Complete Poetical Works of Oliver Wendell Holmes, ed. Horace Scudder (Boston, 1908).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v2*

Gibian, Peter. *Oliver Wendell Holmes and the Culture of Conversation* (Cambridge, UK, 2001).

Hoyt, Edwin P. *Improper Bostonian: Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes* (New York, 1979).

Moore, John T. *Life and Letters of Oliver Wendell Holmes*, 2 vols (Boston, 1896).

Oberndorf, Clarence P. *The Psychiatric Novels of Oliver Wendell Holmes* (New York, 1903).

Small, Miriam R. *Oliver Wendell Holmes* (New York, 1962).

John R. Shook

HOLT, Edwin Bissell (1873–1946)

Edwin B. Holt was born on 21 August 1873 in Winchester, Massachusetts. He attended Amherst College in 1892, and subsequently enrolled at Harvard University, receiving a BA degree in 1896. Holt's most influential teachers at Harvard were William JAMES, Josiah ROYCE, and Hugo MÜNSTERBERG. Holt began graduate studies at Harvard in 1897, but left for a year of military service in 1898 during the Spanish–American War. Holt studied medicine at the University of Freiburg in 1899, and then psychology at Columbia University with James McKeen CATTELL, receiving his MA degree in 1900. Holt returned to Harvard for further graduate study. After receiving the PhD in psychology in 1901, Holt was appointed instructor at Harvard, and subsequently promoted to assistant professor in 1905. He resigned his position in 1918, but was persuaded to return to teaching as visiting professor of psychology at Princeton University from 1926 to 1936. Holt died on 25 January 1946 in Tenants Harbor, Maine.

Holt's earliest publications concerned experimental investigations of visual phenomena, particularly relationships between visual sensations and eye movements. Also during this period he translated Münsterberg's historical and cultural survey of American life, *The Americans* (1904) for English-speaking audiences. Holt's major work of this period was *The Concept of Consciousness*, which was completed in 1908 (although not published until 1914). The primary aim of this work was to articulate a metaphysical framework for psychological theory, which in turn would afford some novel ways of conceptualizing psychological processes. These new formulations were intended to resolve some longstanding epistemological problems connected to the received views. Toward this end, Holt adapted the conceptual structure of Royce's idealism to meet the metaphysical commitments of James's radical empiricism. The latter was James's project of developing an alternative to the matter–mind dualism of the British empiricists, on the one hand, and the mentalism of neo-Kantian varieties of idealism on the other, *both* of which placed reality beyond the knower's immediate grasp. Through radical empiricism, James sought to develop the groundwork for a realist epistemology. Holt felt that Royce provided a logical system for deriving a suc-

cession of hierarchically structured domains of experience, or "universes of discourse," that included mathematics, geometry, physics, chemistry, and psychology. The differences that exist among these orders of discourse were seen as differences in the functional *properties* existing at successive structured levels of a common substance, rather than differences in *substance* as found in a dualistic metaphysics. Departing from Royce, however, who envisioned this common substance to be mind, Holt argued that these domains were all ultimately composed of a common ontologically neutral "stuff," along the lines of James's notion of "pure experience." Further, Holt proposed that these manifolds of structure are externally related, each logically connected but operating independently according to different specifiable principles. This framework permitted Holt to make a case for consciousness as but one of many *irreducible* domains within a pluralistic universe of ontologically neutral stuff.

The most significant concept in *The Concept of Consciousness* is that of a "cross-section," which was inspired by James's treatment of consciousness in his classic essay "Does Consciousness Exist?" A cross-section is defined as any portion of one manifold that is articulated by operations specific to a different manifold. For example, perceiving is an operation specific to the manifold that is consciousness, and at any particular moment perceiving selectively articulates a portion of the manifold that is the so-called material world. Just as a searchlight from a boat at night illuminates features of a shoreline that exist independently of the boat, so consciousness selectively discriminates some features of the domain that is the material world existing independently of the psychological order. As the landscape example illustrates, that which is illuminated by the searchlight at any moment is neither dependent on the light for its existence nor exists within the light; rather, it is *a function of the relationship* between the two. Likewise, the environment that is perceived is neither dependent on the perceiver for its existence,

nor exists within the knowing mind; it involves an awareness of properties that are a function of the operations of the knower. That is, what is experienced resides in the relationship between the knower and the known. Significantly, from this perspective, perceiving is a direct relation between knower and known, rather than being mediated by a mental representation. The commitment to indirect realism that mental representations require is invariably tainted with the specter of solipsism. Finally, because consciousness as a cross-section of the material world is always selective and partial, with further transactions more can be discovered about the universe of discourse that is the material world.

In 1910 Holt collaborated with five other philosophers, including R. B. PERRY at Harvard and W. P. MONTAGUE at Columbia, to produce a program for a new philosophical approach they called "The New Realism." Their initial platform offered an explication and extension of James's radical empiricist philosophy and a defense of it in the face of criticisms principally from idealist quarters. In spite of acknowledged differences among this group, what they took as common ground was their objection to the epistemological claim that a mind can only have direct knowledge of its own mental states. They opposed not only Royce's idealism, but also any account of knowing that takes mental representation as its epistemic starting point. This essay was followed two years later by the book, *The New Realism: Cooperative Studies in Philosophy* (1912). In addition to a joint introductory chapter by the group, each philosopher contributed an individual chapter. The aim of Holt's chapter was to address what is commonly identified as the fatal challenge to any direct realist proposal, namely, the occurrence of perceptual illusions. If the world is experienced directly, how can one account for errors in perceptual experience, illusions being the most dramatic sort? Holt's reply involved a detailed discussion of illusions from the point of view he developed earlier in *The Concept of Consciousness* (though published after *The*

New Realism). The core of his argument is as follows: the realist position is "as things are perceived *so they are*," which must be distinguished from the claim "as things are *so they really are* … . Because while all perceived things are things, *not* all perceived things are *real* things." (1912, p. 358) The realist's position is that while the knower–known relation is direct, that does mean that it is free of error; directness is to be distinguished from veridicality. Holt illustrates this point with reference to the left-right reversal in a mirror reflection, which while producing error is fully explainable within the conditions of the mirror–perceiver relation.

Holt attended the 1909 Clark University lectures given by Sigmund Freud and was deeply impressed by Freud's psychodynamic view, principally because it made a compelling case for the active and purposive nature of mind. In perhaps his most widely read book, *The Freudian Wish and its Place in Ethics* (1915), Holt argued that the everyday phenomena Freud studied, such as slips of the tongue, forgetting, and humor, starkly revealed that mind was fundamentally comprised of "wishes" for courses of action. As a result, Freud dramatically demonstrated that the appropriate analytical unit for psychology was a mental function, rather than a static element of mind (such as a sensation). Psychological functions are directed rather than random; they are "specific responses" which the body is prepared to execute with regard to some feature of the environment. Freud was especially helpful in showing that everyday actions are often best understood as arising from conflicting desires, or from Holt's perspective, in terms of the joint action of several specific responses innervated concurrently.

Holt saw Freud's approach as offering a more adequate way of capturing the complex and dynamic character of organismic functioning than the simpler, structural models erected on an image of the reflex arc which were coming into favor. A naturalistic ethics follows from this analysis: the development of character hinges on coordinating often conflicting, sometimes repressed motives, as well as replacing broad, generalized responses to the environment with more finely-tuned discriminative ones. Thus, he also saw in Freud's framework the germ of an ethics of self-realization, the kind of self-improvement that was also to be found in some of James's writings, but which for Holt rested on a motor theory of consciousness. Finally, the doubt that Freud cast on the veracity of conscious expression reinforced Holt's conviction that human action was best understood by observing behavior in its full complexity. Holt can be seen as joining the growing behaviorist temper of the times, although adopting a decidedly more complex and dynamic perspective. Moreover, Holt can be seen here as anticipating efforts decades later, notably by J. Dollard and N. Miller in the 1950s, to find a compromise between behaviorist and psychodynamic approaches.

Holt's behaviorism is distinctive, being both molar and purposive rather than reductionistic and mechanistic. Holt's purposive behaviorism resembles John B. WATSON's approach and that of his successors only in a shared positivistic outlook. His psychological perspective is most fully developed in the "Response and Cognition" essays that are appended to *The Freudian Wish*. Three *interrelated* ideas run through the two essays. First, the appropriate unit of analysis for psychology is the functional relationship between the behaving organism and some feature of the environment. Holt rejected the notion that psychological phenomena are reducible to underlying biological states of the organism because the psychological domain consists of properties of the organism–environment *relation*, and as such there are distinctive natural properties manifested only at that level of analysis. Holt's student Edward C. TOLMAN became the most visible exponent of this view within twentieth-century psychology. Second, psychology like any natural science was to look for lawful functional relationships between variables within its domain of analysis. In its failure to do so, psychology has been prone to invent fictitious,

hidden causes of non-natural character, namely, those due to mind in the sense of an extended, Cartesian entity. Such mentalistic fictions can be overcome, and psychology can fully embrace a natural science perspective, by looking beyond immediate, antecedent "causes" of behavior, for example, proximal stimuli at receptor surfaces. Third, behavior is to be viewed as a "specific, integrated response" to increasingly distal features of the environment. That is, as behavior becomes progressively integrated, the effective stimulus is to be found at more distal and molar levels of the environment. This is Holt's claim of the "recession of the stimulus," which would find its most complete development in the ecological psychology of Holt's student James J. GIBSON.

Holt resigned from Harvard in 1918, citing as his reason disenchantment with the growing professionalization of academia. In Holt's view, academia was to be an enclave for seekers of knowledge and for educating students, unsullied by personal motives of faculty for career advancement and prestige. He despaired at seeing the ascendancy of the latter motives at the expense of academia's proper mission, and for this reason, he chose to sever ties with the academic world and live on a family inheritance. Holt never re-established a full-time affiliation with academic psychology, although he was lured back to the part-time teaching at Princeton University by its chair and Holt's former Harvard colleague, Herbert S. Langfeld. From 1926 until 1936 Holt taught psychology courses each spring semester at Princeton, while spending the rest of the year at his home in Tenants Harbor, in Rockland County, Maine. At Princeton, Holt was appreciated as a supportive and committed teacher who challenged his students to examine critically conventional psychological frameworks. His clarity of thought and deep understanding of the philosophical foundations of psychology contributed to the distinctive character of his teaching.

During this period, Holt brought to conclusion the first volume of a projected two-volume work, *Animal Drive and the Learning Process: An Essay Towards Radical Empiricism* (1931). This work can be seen, in part, as an attempt to provide the biological underpinnings of the philosophical and psychological perspective Holt had been developing throughout his career. He argued as far back as *The Concept of Consciousness* that psychological phenomena are emergent functional properties derived from material constituents of organism and world. However, whereas in the earlier work these constituents were described as being ontologically neutral, here Holt explicitly committed himself to physicalism. The advances made in biological analysis of organism and behavior led him to claim that "conscious phenomena are to be explained entirely, without reserve or residue, in *physical* terms, and specially of course in terms of physiology" (1931, p. v). In making this claim, Holt was not retreating from his initial position. He found in the burgeoning neurobiological literature evidence consistent with the integrated, purposive complexity he had long championed as the hallmark of behavior.

Holt reviewed in considerable detail the physiological bases for his purposive behaviorism. Thus, although this book, steeped as it is in the biological research of the day, is in many respects far different from Holt's earlier philosophical and psychological writings, in fact it complements them. A core concept in the book is the "reflex circle," which because of its dynamic quality is better suited to an account of purposive action than the reflex arc, the reductive and static cornerstone of classical behaviorism and its offshoots. The "reflex circle" was later adapted by Gordon ALLPORT in developing his influential idea of the "functional autonomy" of action. One pervasive feature of *Animal Drive and the Learning Process* can be viewed as an attempt to redress the most notable shortcoming of the earlier *The Concept of Consciousness*, which failed to preserve the dynamic quality of natural processes and of James's psychology. The Roycean logic that undergirds the earlier work

was far too static to support a dynamic psychology, and Holt attempted to rectify that limitation in this later book with an emphasis on *processes* of learning and development.

According to Holt, the psychological development of the organism is at every moment an *interaction* of a history of organismic processes and present environmental conditions. The contribution on the side of the organism to development and learning is *activity*; and most basically what the environment contributes of psychological significance is *resistance*. The primary behavioral motive of an organism is to experience more of an eliciting stimulus, a response tendency that Holt calls "adience." When encountering resistance from the stimulus object, the organism continues to engage it, and in so doing, the structure of the action becomes modified to take into account properties of the stimulus object. This circular activity is "the reflex circle," which over successive iterations eventuates in integrated, goal-directed action that is progressively structured in relation to the stimulus object. Thus, as an organism engages its surroundings, its ensuing accommodation follows a course of increasing differentiation of actions and, concomitantly, finer discriminations. In turn, the range of directed responses in each instance becomes narrowed and fine-tuned, establishing a "locus of freedom" for that action. This locus of activity provides action constraints, on the one hand, and freedom of exploration within those constraints, on the other, making systematic and yet spontaneous exploration intelligible.

With the concept of "the locus of freedom" for complex, integrated actions, Holt offers a way of reconciling the apparently competing tendencies of conservative and exploratory actions. Further, with on-going engagement of the environment, action becomes increasingly integrated, thereby taking as its referent increasingly distal features – in other words, the effective stimulus recedes. Holt here returns to a significant theme of the "Response and Cognition" essays. Finally, consistent with his inclination toward a motor theory of con-sciousness, Holt proposes that awareness is an intrinsic quality of engaging environmental features, or in many cases, anticipating doing so. The latter potential for action would have likely become the foundation for an account of cognition to be developed in the projected second volume of this book.

Holt's prominence in psychology declined by the middle of the twentieth century, but his legacy was conveyed to post-1950s psychology by his two most prominent students. Tolman's cognitive behaviorism work served as a critical bridge between behaviorism and the re-emergence of cognitive psychology. Gibson's ecological approach to perception proposes a functional analysis of psychology based on person–environment reciprocity, and in so doing offers grounds for the direct realist epistemology that James initially sought in his radical empiricism and that Holt attempted to advance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Concept of Consciousness (New York, 1914).

The Freudian Wish and Its Place in Ethics (New York, 1915).

Animal Drive and the Learning Process: An Essay Toward Radical Empiricism (New York, 1931).

Other Relevant Works

Trans., *The Americans*, by Hugo Münsterberg (New York, 1904; London, 1905).

"Visual Sensation and Eye Movement," *Psychological Bulletin* 2 (1905): 388–91.

"The Program and First Platform of Six Realists," with M. Marvin, W. Montague, W. Pepperell, et al., *Journal of Philosophy* 7 (1910): 393–403.

"The Place of Illusory Experience in a Realistic World," in *The New Realism: Cooperative Studies in Philosophy* (New York, 1912), pp. 303–73.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych by Zusne*, *Bio*

20thC Phils, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Carmichael, L. "Edwin Bissell Holt, 1873–1946," *American Journal of Psychology* 59 (1946): 478–80.

de Waal, Cornelis, ed. *American New Realism*, 3 vols (Bristol, UK, 2001).

Heft, Harry. *Ecological Psychology in Context: James Gibson, Roger Barker, and the Legacy of William James's Radical Empiricism* (Mahwah, N.J., 2001).

Langfeld, H. "Edwin Bissell Holt, 1873–1946," *Psychological Review* 53 (1946): 251–8.

Harry Heft

HOOK, Sidney (1902–89)

Sidney Hook was born on 20 December 1902 in Brooklyn, New York. He earned his BA from City College of New York in 1923, and was influenced by philosopher Morris R. COHEN. Like many of Cohen's students, Hook was drawn towards naturalism and pragmatic empiricism, and sent on to graduate study at Columbia University under John DEWEY. After receiving his PhD in philosophy in 1927, writing a dissertation on "The Metaphysics of Pragmatism" (published that year), Hook was appointed instructor of philosophy at New York University in 1927. He was rapidly promoted and became department head in 1934, holding this position until his retirement in 1969. He was President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1959–60. In 1973 he became a senior research fellow at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University. He was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1985. Hook died on 12 July 1989 in Stanford, California.

Hook was the most prominent defender of the legacy of John Dewey's pragmatism during the middle and late twentieth century. This legacy of naturalistic humanism and pragmatic liberalism fell upon Hook's shoulders early in his career, as Dewey quickly recognized Hook's commitment to the main principles of his own pragmatism. Among those principles was democratic socialism, which advocated the public control of industry for the general welfare. Hook's early work attempted to synthesize Dewey's theory of democratic inquiry with Karl Marx's justification of socialism. He found sufficient overlap between them, concerning the preeminent role of science and the priority of action over pure reason, to describe how democracy and socialism are compatible. As a proponent of democracy, however, Hook rejected both historical materialism and determinism, and any violent means of revolution. He was happy to describe himself as a Marxist as well as a pragmatist, because a friend of democracy, in Hook's view, would not prefer the tyranny of the capitalist class. As Marxism and communism became close synonyms during the 1940s, Hook stopped referring to himself as a Marxist since a well-managed capitalism should not be confused with the totalitarian form of communism.

While sympathetic to the economic and democratic side of Marx, Hook held communist ideology and political tactics in contempt. Watchful towards the Soviet Union in the 1930s, he soon recognized that the Soviet experiment was turning against basic human rights and the civil rights of political liberty and freedom of speech. Hw remained a staunch defender of freedom of political inquiry first and foremost; whether he should be categorized as a liberal or conservative can obscure his radical commitment to the experimental method of democratic deliberation. Hook and Dewey organized a commission that refuted Stalin's accusations against Leon Trotsky in Mexico City in 1938, and took the then-unpopular position before and during World War II that Stalinism was just as dangerous as

Nazism. During the Cold War, Hook argued that communists should not be allowed to teach, on the grounds that those who cannot respect freedom of thought and speech do not deserve to have their own speech protected. Most of his ideas about justifying and protecting democracy are collected in *Political Power and Personal Freedom* (1959).

For Hook, democratic inquiry should be responsible for morality as well as law. His pragmatism accepted the reality of value pluralism, and paralleling a denial of absolute truths in epistemology and science, he rejected absolute values in morality. Religion should no longer control morality, and indeed Hook was philosophically opposed to religion, preferring atheism. His naturalism restricted reasonable belief to empirical grounds and scientifically justifiable theories. His mature conclusions about empiricism, science, and metaphysics can be found in the essays collected in *The Quest for Being, and Other Studies in Naturalism and Humanism* (1961). Calling himself a "secular humanist," he advocated both freedom of religion and strict boundaries to keep religion from controlling politics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Metaphysics of Pragmatism (Chicago, 1927).

Toward an Understanding of Karl Marx: A Revolutionary Interpretation (New York, 1933; Amherst, N.Y., 2002).

From Hegel to Marx: Studies in the Intellectual Development of Karl Marx (New York, 1936).

John Dewey, an Intellectual Portrait (New York, 1939).

Reason, Social Myths, and Democracy (New York, 1940).

The Hero in History: A Study in Limitation and Possibility (New York, 1943).

Education for Modern Man (New York, 1946; 2nd edn, Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1973).

Heresy, Yes – Conspiracy, No (New York, 1952).

Marx and the Marxists: The Ambiguous Legacy (Princeton, N.J., 1955).

Common Sense and the Fifth Amendment (New York, 1957).

John Dewey: His Philosophy of Education and Its Critics (New York, 1959).

Political Power and Personal Freedom: Critical Studies in Democracy, Communism and Civil Rights (New York, 1959).

The Quest for Being, and Other Studies in Naturalism and Humanism (New York, 1961).

The Paradoxes of Freedom (Berkeley, Cal., 1962).

Education for Modern Man: A New Perspective (New York, 1963).

The Place of Religion in a Free Society (Lincoln, Nebr., 1968).

Academic Freedom and Academic Anarchy (New York, 1970).

Education and the Taming of Power (La Salle, Ill., 1973).

Pragmatism and the Tragic Sense of Life (New York, 1974).

Revolution, Reform and Social Justice: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Marxism (New York, 1975).

Philosophy and Public Policy (Carbondale, Ill., 1980).

Marxism and Beyond (Totowa, N.J., 1983).

Other Relevant Works

Hook's papers are at the Hoover Institution in Stanford, California.

Ed., *The Meaning of Marx* (New York, 1934).

Ed. with Milton R. Konvitz, *Freedom and Experience: Essays Presented to Horace M. Kallen* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1947).

Ed., *John Dewey: Philosopher of Science and Freedom* (New York, 1950).

Ed., *American Philosophers at Work* (New York, 1956).

Ed., *In Defense of Academic Freedom* (New York, 1971).

Out of Step: An Unquiet Life in the Twentieth Century (New York, 1987).

Letters of Sidney Hook: Democracy, Communism, and the Cold War, ed. Edward S. Shapiro (Armonk, N.Y., 1995).

Sidney Hook on Pragmatism, Democracy, and Freedom: The Essential Essays, ed. Robert B. Talisse and Robert Tempio (Amherst, N.Y., 2002).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils 1950-2000*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Blackwell Comp Prag*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v6*, *Who Was Who in Amer v10*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Cotter, Matthew J., ed. *Sidney Hook Reconsidered* (Amherst, N.Y., 2004. Contains a bibliography of Hook's writings.

Kurtz, Paul, ed. *Sidney Hook and the Contemporary World: Essays on the Pragmatic Intelligence* (New York, 1968).

Kurtz, Paul, ed. *Sidney Hook, Philosopher of Democracy and Humanism* (Buffalo, N.Y., 1983).

Phelps, Christopher. *Young Sidney Hook: Marxist and Pragmatist* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1997).

John R. Shook

HOPKINS, Mark (1802–87)

Mark Hopkins was born on 4 February 1802 in Stockbridge, Massachusetts. The grandnephew of theologian Samuel Hopkins, he was educated at private academies. In 1820 he went to Mecklenburg, Virginia to teach. He then entered Williams College as a sophomore and graduated with his BA in 1824, giving the valedictory oration. He then began the study of medicine in Pittsfield, Massachusetts. In 1825 he was appointed tutor to the junior class at Williams, but he resumed medical studies, and in 1829 received his MD. After practicing medicine in New York, he was appointed in 1830 as professor of rhetoric and moral philosophy at Williams. Hopkins was also licensed to preach by the Berkshire Association of Congregational Ministers in 1833. Elected President of Williams College in 1836, Hopkins was the youngest man ever to hold office as college president in the United States, and in this same year he was also made professor of moral and intellectual philosophy and ordained a Congregational minister. The following year he received a DD degree from Dartmouth, and in 1841 Harvard College conferred on him that same degree. In 1868 he was elected President of the Academy of Metaphysical and Ethical Sciences. Hopkins retired from the presidency of Williams College in 1872. Hopkins died on 17 June 1887 in Williamstown, Massachusetts.

An 1856 alumnus of Williams, future US President James A. Garfield is reported to have said in 1871 that "The ideal college is Mark Hopkins on one end of a log and a student on the other." This famous statement defines the true small college: a group of professors and students working together in a friendly, often informal way, to make higher education a reality. The essence of Garfield's image is dedicated and inspired teaching; it also implies two additional points – the irrelevance of expensive material surroundings, and the need for undergraduate energy, vision, and initiative. Under the leadership of Hopkins, enough of these elements were present to elevate Williams College to excellence. When the US government issued a series of postage stamps honoring American educators in 1940, it selected Hopkins to represent the small liberal arts college. Hopkins is rightly considered as a great educator, lecturer, and administrator.

As a philosopher, the essential work of Mark Hopkins lay in stimulating thought rather than in creative contributions to philosophy, bridging the gap between the old Calvinistic system and contemporary thinking in his time. Hopkins had a genius for selecting ideas of lasting value from the confusing arguments of his day. Upon these values, the character and stamp of a new age would be erected. Hopkins, in his evangelical cast of mind, thought more highly of developing moral and spiritual character than of imparting knowledge alone. Though aware of the weak points of Unitarianism, he came under the influence of the Unitarian William E. Channing and turned away from the system of Jonathan Edwards. Hopkins was a moderate Calvinist, but he held that Edwards, though a careful and logical writer, provided a system that was somewhat unreal and backward-looking. He also rejected the intuitionism of Ralph Waldo EMERSON, considering it relativistic and chaotic, and leading to moral anarchy. We need more than a refined Emersonian appreciation of nature, he implied; we need an informed conscience.

Hopkins held modern and liberal ideas for his time. During his tenure as President of Williams, science was promoted, while the older theology of strict Calvinism was voted out of the curriculum by the trustees. Instead, astronomy, chemistry, physics, world affairs, mathematics, landscape gardening, languages, and ethics were taught. The aim of Williams, under Hopkins, was not to turn out eminent specialists or moneymaking industrialists searching for social prestige, but men of culture and high morality. The purpose of a college is to form right character in students while giving them a liberal education. Hopkins believed that he should open the minds of students to modern thought, while breaking down restrictive walls of older theology. That would be true liberation – to free one from old extremist errors while preserving the inspiration and strength of a timeless Christianity. A small college could achieve this goal better than a large university could. At the head of this idealistic enterprise stood Hopkins, a tall figure of dignity and charm, a figure of formidable moral force and integrity who held the attention of his students. He loved to ask a student in class, "What do you think about this?" In time, he became a lecturer of impressive power and popularity with the public. He possessed an unusual blend of pedagogic majesty and a disarming geniality. With Hopkins, the pertinent qualities in a teacher were weight of character, power of inspiration, and unselfish devotion. Money cannot buy these qualities, but they are worth more than great knowledge and scholarship; so held the President of Williams.

Hopkins presented a Christian conception of ethics. He approved of the Scottish Common Sense School of philosophy which provided refutations of skepticism about God's existence, the truths of revelation, and the authority of natural law. James McCOSH at Princeton University held that Hopkins was a utilitarian because for him an act was right if it tended to the good and happiness of all. Yet, Hopkins rejected as *too* utilitarian the widely used text *The Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy* (1785) by William Paley. He also held that a fair and nonsectarian presentation of evidence would create a rational conviction of the truth of Christianity. Hopkins was likely unaware of the so-called higher criticism of the Bible and he rejected Darwinism.

Hopkins's course in moral philosophy at Williams was a spiritual yet practical guide to the conduct of one's life. He was committed to allaying doubts about public and private duty caused by Enlightenment thinkers and the French Revolution. For him, every system of thought had to be based on the truths of the Bible. Life has a meaning, and one must turn one's back on all skepticism which doubted the validity of perception. One must trust human consciousness or fall back into the despair of universal doubt. Thought is based more on feeling than on intellect. Yet, nothing is right unless there is a reason for it or unless it brings, or can bring, ultimate happiness to all. The supreme good or happiness is found in a

right relationship to God and man and, therefore, the chief end of man is to glorify God. The glory of the creator is found in the beauties of nature and in the power and progress of the human mind. The natural creation "whispers" sublime truths into the ear of philosophy while science is a "hymn" to the creator. Religion ideally stimulates scientific exploration and all human progress. For Hopkins, Christianity was the path to progress and happiness. In *The Law of Love* (1869), he expounded the idea that behind duty stands love, which is the supreme motive and law of life.

Hopkins's major contribution to ethics is *Lectures on Moral Science* (1862/1872). In this treatise he is very much the Congregational minister, the rational man of the cloth. His ethics is teleological; the duties of man to himself and to God are determined in the light of his end as a creature of God. Our moral nature is made up of these powers of the mind: the moral reason, moral affections, conscience, and free will. These faculties constitute the *person*; they are the manifestations of personality, of a responsible moral being. Here is found the possibility of complete virtue (holiness) as well as the origin of our moral ideas, actions, and judgments. A person endowed with these powers is capable of rational love, the highest form of activity, which is also the highest good. Hopkins sees this doctrine of man's moral being as identified with the revealed law of God as found in Christian faith. The good for man, his end, is what he calls holy happiness, or blessedness, which all should seek. Blessedness is perfection.

To determine the morality of a specific act, one must observe first the outward act, then go to the source, the agent, the one who performed the act in question, and find an immediate recognition of the moral quality of the act as good or evil. Here one discovers the motive which bears on the moral quality. Then, one goes to the outward act and determines its consequences, using the principle of utility to discover the rightness and wrongness of the act. If an act is separated from its origin in a person it has no moral quality yet the social consequences of an act may be beneficial or injurious and, thus, in ordinary speech, right or wrong.

Hopkins tried to reconcile reason with faith. Reason is the basis of ethics, while faith is the distinctive principle of religion. He said that one may be rational when acting from instinct or from faith, that there is mutual support between moral philosophy and religion, whether natural or revealed. Yet the moral sphere is the highest of all spheres, because herein we find our true selves. A person is rational and free, with a moral sense, and is held accountable for his actions. Reason is a power by which man is especially made in the image of God; without free will there would be no obligation or responsibility, and no praise or blame could be earned by anyone. Morality, then, presupposes human freedom and reason; the power of doing good or bad actions depends upon these two faculties. We approve or disapprove the self-conscious, thinking, choosing person. What a wolf or lion does is amoral and cannot be praised or blamed. But, it is of the very essence of the human being to have a moral character; no one can avoid being moral, no one can avoid doing good and evil acts.

It must be noted that *Lectures on Moral Science* is a carefully written treatise. Its style is severely abstract, yet agreeably analytic. Hopkins sometimes writes in a persuasively high tone. For example, in alluding to the early utilitarians, he says that some hold that the enjoyment of the glutton and the saint (or angel) are the same. Not so, answers Hopkins. Between them lies a great gulf. Animal pleasures and those of intellectual beings vary greatly in dignity and worth. Poetry is more, far more, than silly games, which is a good response to Jeremy Bentham, the utilitarian philosopher, who said poetry and the simple game of push-pin have equal value.

Our moral powers are our highest powers; therefore, man's highest enjoyments must be

contained in the activity which virtue consists in. In connection to these ideas, Hopkins claims that in our power to resist all temptations and all violence, in our allegiance to virtue and to God, are found man's true greatness. Moral sublimity is attained when a person of integrity resists unto death all solicitation to evil, the will remaining firm. Such a successful struggle against evil will ensure the winning of the victor's crown, ultimately in salvation, if not in earthly honor. Love is the highest form of activity. Self-love is one's right and duty to seek the highest good; this is not selfishness. "Thou shalt love they neighbor as thyself"; hence, self-love involves and implies benevolence, or love of others. When we promote our own good, we promote the good of others, and vice versa. The highest good of each person is conducive to the highest good of all.

The more moral goodness there is in any person, the more will others approve of him as a source of light and joy, as a new star brightens all the other stars in its vicinity. Moral good, or holiness, is the highest good. The world can neither give nor take away moral goodness from anyone. The approval which accompanies moral goodness, Hopkins affirms, may be seen as the voice of God urging us to seek this good. Finally, the attainment of moral good in one's heart assures the enhancement and establishment of the general good: the interest of the individual and the community become one. In Hopkins's system, if one promotes the blessedness of self and society, the divine being will be glorified. The true end of man is blessedness or what he calls *holy happiness*.

The mere possession of a conscience does not have anything to do with one's moral character, for everyone has a conscience since it is a natural part of human nature; it is simply the mind when it analyzes a moral problem and makes a judgment. If the conscience is unperverted and if the subject it judges is seen as it is, the conscience will be a reliable guide. The terms ought and ought-not express the idea of obligation; thus, conscience has a power of great authority. Conscience proclaims the moral law within us, and to deny this is to deny that man has a moral nature and that there is a science of morality.

How then, do we account for the diversity of moral judgments? Hopkins does allow for a limited diversity in moral judgment, but the conscience is liable to be disregarded or misled. Furthermore, many supposed cases of diversity are not really that at all. Because of the complexity of many cases, as well as the limitations of the human mind, people understand imperfectly, and therefore differently, and from differences in intellectual judgments come differing moral judgments. Yet this implies no lack of uniformity in the actions of our moral nature. Men are sometimes weak and dishonest with themselves and defend their actions by an appeal to relativism. The office of conscience is to affirm the obligation to choose in a particular way. Because man is liable to choose wrongly, he needs conscience to affirm the obligation to choose primarily the good, and secondarily the right. The virtue of prudence, a form of practical reasoning valued by the Greeks, is transcended in the Hopkinsonian system of ethics. Prudence is transcended the moment we come to Christian faith and are made to confront suffering and martyrdom. This is the crucial moment for adherence to principle at all hazards. Neither the hero nor the martyr is prudent; they are brought to a position where the rules of prudence are out of place and do not apply. In this position it becomes necessary to vindicate the supremacy of the spiritual nature and the majesty of virtue by an unconditional trust in goodness and in God.

All moral speculation leads to God as the fountain of being and excellence, to the one who is the governor of the universe. All that is ultimate in moral distinctions is found in the character and will of the divine being. Without the revelation found in the scriptures there could be no philosophy of man, no satisfactory comprehension of human beings; without divine revelation, we would not know our true end, our purpose on this earth. This divine

being is known, approached, and obeyed through religious faith. For Hopkins, faith always has a personal element. Human faith is having confidence in another person. If we believe what someone says solely because a person says it, that is human faith. Religious faith, on the other hand, is believing something solely because the divine being has said it through revelation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Evidences of Christianity (Boston, 1846; 1909).

Miscellaneous Essays and Discourses (Boston, 1847).

Lectures on Moral Science (Boston, 1862; 1872).

Baccalaureate Sermons, and Occasional Discourses (Boston, 1862).

The Law of Love and Love as a Law, or Moral Science, Theoretical and Practical (New York, 1869; rev. edn 1891).

An Outline Study of Man: Or, the Body and Mind in One System (New York, 1873).

Strength and Beauty: Discussion for Young Men (New York, 1874).

The Scriptural Idea of Man (New York, 1883).

Other Relevant Works

Hopkins's papers are at Williams College.

An Inaugural Discourse, Delivered at Williams College, Sept. 15, 1836 (Troy, N.Y., 1836).

The Central Principle: An Oration Delivered before the New-England Society of New York, Dec. 22, 1853 (New York, 1854).

Science and Religion: A Sermon Delivered in the Second Presbyterian Church, Albany, on Sabbath Afternoon, Aug. 24, 1856 (Albany, N.Y., 1856).

Faith, Philosophy, and Reason: A Baccalaureate Sermon, Delivered at Williamstown, Mass. August 18, 1850 (Boston, 1859).

Early Letters of Mark Hopkins (New York, 1929).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v6*

Carter, Franklin. *Mark Hopkins* (Boston, 1892).

Denison, John H. *Mark Hopkins: A Biography* (New York, 1935).

Marshall, John D., ed. *Mark Hopkins' Log and Other Essays* (Hamden, Conn., 1965).

Meyer, D. H. *The Instructed Conscience* (Philadelphia, 1972).

Perry, Arthur L. *Williamstown and Williams College* (Williamstown, Mass., 1899).

Rudolph, Frederick. *Mark Hopkins and the Log* (New Haven, Conn., 1956).

Spring, Leverett W. *Mark Hopkins, Teacher* (New York, 1888).

Yarmolinsky, Adam. "Mark Hopkins and the Log Revisited," *National Forum* 77 (1997): 40–43.

Edward W. O'Brien

HORKHEIMER, Max (1895–1973)

Max Horkheimer was born on 14 February 1895 in Stuttgart, Germany. After service in the German military in World War I at a domestic post, Horkheimer studied at several universities. At the recently established University of Frankfurt am Main, he earned his PhD in philosophy in 1922 and was habilitated in 1925. His adviser, Hans Cornelius, was a chief representative of neo-Kantianism. In the early 1920s Horkheimer wrote on aspects of Kant's philosophy. In the late 1920s Horkheimer turned to problems in the sociology of knowledge. He gained an interest in this area through friends at the *Institut für Sozialforschung* (Institute of Social Research), an avowedly Marxist think-tank at the University of Frankfurt.

In 1930 Horkheimer became Director of the Institute and held that position until 1958. Also in 1930 he assumed a professorship at Frankfurt in the field of "social philosophy," the first of its kind, created specially for him through the help of Paul TILLICH. Horkheimer's inaugural address as Institute Director, "The Present Condition of Social Philosophy and the Tasks of an Institute of Social Research," set the outlines of the Institute's endeavors for the next three decades. Horkheimer announced that under his directorship, the Institute would strive to bring about a unity of speculative philosophy and the empirical social sciences. Philosophers would pose theories about the nature of consciousness and experience. Empirical social scientists would test these theories against hard evidence, such as that derived from social survey questionnaires, "published statistics, reports from organizations and political associations, material from public agencies, etc.," and report the results to the philosophers (1993, p. 13). In turn, the philosophers would reflect on these results and offer reformulated theories to the social scientists, who would test them, report the results, and so on, with the process continuing indefinitely. Horkheimer asserted that he would "erect a dictatorship" at the Institute to ensure that this specific sort of cooperation among the members would be maintained uncompromisingly (1993, p. 11).

The principles behind this methodology were clearly Hegelian rather than Marxian. Horkheimer felt that an unusually high degree of collective perspicuity concerning human affairs would issue from the Institute's research program – an intellectual virtue consistent with Hegelianism that had Kantian overtones as well. Done separately, Horkheimer found speculative philosophy to be uninformed and naïve, while empirical research is condemned to "long, boring, individual studies that split up into a thousand partial questions, culminating in a chaos of countless enclaves of specialists" (1993, p. 9). The Institute would strive to be a handmaid to both classifications of learning, leading to ever sharper and more precise knowledge among scholars at large. Historians have inconclusively debated whether Horkheimer felt that the Institute could hasten progress in society generally, that is, beyond the realm of academia specified explicitly in the inaugural address.

Just as the Institute was setting out under Horkheimer, Hitler came to power in Germany. By early 1933 nearly every one of the members of the Institute, each of whom was Jewish and in some way tinged with leftism, had fled the country. For a year Horkheimer looked for a home for the Institute while waiting out the Nazis. An inquiry to the President of Columbia University, Nicholas Murray BUTLER, led to an offer by Columbia to house the Institute for a small building maintenance fee. In 1934 Horkheimer, along with several of the Institute's members, moved to New York City.

During the first years in New York, the Institute continued projects initially conceived before the exile from Germany. In particular, it pressed on with two big efforts that were to integrate philosophy and empirical social science more or less along the lines Horkheimer had specified at the inaugural. The first bore fruit in the 1936 *Studien über Autorität und Familie* ("Studies on Authority and the Family"). This 900-page work was written in German, published in Paris, and based mainly on work done in New York. The *Studien* was heavily theoretical, notwithstanding the specifications of the inaugural, because it was simply unpractical to continue with empirical work given that the Institute members (and all putative left intellectuals) were *personae non gratae* in Nazi Germany. The book introduced a pessimistic tone to Institute endeavors – Horkheimer's inaugural was incomparably optimistic – by arguing, among other things, that the diminution of paternal authority within the family, on account of unemployment and other buffets of capitalism, created the conditions whereby demagogic leaders could begin to gain broad traction among the populace. Here was

the emerging theory of Nazism and fascism that the Institute would further investigate in the 1940s. The *Studien* acknowledged a debt to an American work in sociology, *Middletown*, the now canonical 1929 study by Robert Lynd of Columbia.

Another project that Horkheimer tried to see to completion was one he had underscored in the inaugural: a survey of "skilled craftspeople and white collar workers" in Germany and other European countries (1993, p. 13). Due both to disagreements among the Institute staff over theoretical approaches and the loss of completed social survey instruments during the departure from Germany, this project came into being incompletely over the next fifteen years, in the form of occasional articles by Institute affiliates.

Aside from being Director, Horkheimer was one of the Institute's philosophers. According to his own plan, he was to formulate philosophical arguments in concert with findings from empirical research. Lacking such research, Horkheimer spent the mid 1930s composing essays in philosophy and intellectual history. These essays appeared in the Institute's journal, the *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* ("Journal of Social Research"), which had become effectively in-house with the Institute's move to New York.

In the *Zeitschrift* essays, Horkheimer tried to show that he had not been prematurely optimistic as he had surveyed the scene in the early 1930s. He strove to prove that he had fully reckoned with pessimistic counter-arguments to his own Hegelian belief, explicitly cited in the inaugural, that intellectual culture was about to achieve a new level of the unification of the rational and the real. Horkheimer did this by expressly challenging many of his own recorded assumptions, discoveries, and conclusions. In a 1933 essay (after Hitler's seizure of power but before the Institute's move to America), Horkheimer rethought his relationship to Kant. He castigated Kant for outlining a vision of the "moral subject" without reference to economic and social contexts. He ridiculed Kant's categorical imperative, by which the morality of actions is a function of

their effects on other persons. Horkheimer asked how could the categorical imperative have been practical in Kant's own era, an era in which there had been no scientific means to calculate effects broadly in society?

Horkheimer decided to give Kant credit for being an admirable, if anachronistic utopian. He also insisted that the one thing that could wash away the imperfection of utopianism from Kant and Hegel had decidedly come on the scene by his own day: economic progress. Given the abundance of wealth in the twentieth century, everyone had a chance to be moral along Kantian and Hegelian lines, since one did not have to worry that in sharing material property there might not be enough to go around. Moreover, the industrial economy had ushered in new disciplines of research and inquiry, specifically empirical social science, which was up to the challenge of doing the number-crunching required by the categorical imperative.

As Horkheimer continued to think through these issues, his optimism increasingly flagged. The final break came in two stages. In 1936 Horkheimer wrote an essay arguing that the only good thing about modernity was economic productivity; all of the habits of thought (including those of Kant and Hegel) that attended the rise of the capitalism were retrograde. In 1937, with help from two Institute members, Herbert MARCUSE and Theodor ADORNO, Horkheimer unveiled the concept of "critical theory" in the *Zeitschrift*. Here Horkheimer argued, among other things, that since the modern self was deeply malconditioned by capitalism, one hallmark of truly enlightened thought must be its manifest irrelevance. It appeared as if Horkheimer was now about to justify Institute aloofness, even though in the inaugural address of six years before he had committed the Institute to working with the scholarly world as given.

The Institute became less insular as the 1930s wore on. After the critical theory essay, Horkheimer and other members of the Institute made concerted efforts to integrate

themselves into American academic life. He taught at Columbia's night school and established contacts at the American Jewish Committee and other research foundations. When World War II began in Europe, Horkheimer retired the *Zeitschrift* and started an English-language journal, *Studies in Philosophy and Social Science*. In the opening volume, he wrote in a foreword: "Philosophy, art, and science have lost their home in most of Europe … . America, especially the United States, is the only continent in which the continuation of the scientific life is possible. Within the framework of this country's democratic institutions, culture still enjoys … freedom … . In publishing our journal in its new form we wish to give this belief its concrete expression." (Jay 1973, p. 167)

Horkheimer's work proceeded along two lines in the 1940s. In philosophical work, his own *métier*, Horkheimer extended the claims of pessimism that he had outlined in the later *Zeitschrift* essays. In Institute-wide endeavors in sociological research, Horkheimer supervised a number of projects that could at last claim to represent the sort of marriage of theory and empirical social science that Horkheimer had promised in 1931. The philosophical work resulted in a book that is today regarded as a classic of twentieth-century letters: *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, which Horkheimer co-authored with Adorno. For several years in the early 1940s Horkheimer and Adorno worked intensively on this book from their homes in Southern California. A first version was published in 1944 but circulated only to Institute members. A revised version was brought to print in 1947 by an Amsterdam publishing house. Unlike virtually everything else done by the Institute at that point in time, *Dialectic of Enlightenment* was written not in English but German and concealed from American readers as much as possible.

The thesis of the book was that the impulse toward rational thought in Western societies was itself responsible for the major examples of irrationalism rampant in the modern world: Nazism in central Europe; Stalinism in the Soviet Union; and "mass culture" (a term this book did much to bring into currency) in the United States. As the book stated starkly in its opening pages, "the wholly enlightened earth is radiant with triumphant calamity" (2002, p. 1). This situation had come about, the book argued, because rationality's step-by-step victory over superstition, religion, and the unknown, over the ages, had been enabled by a latent lust for annihilation on the part of rationality itself. Once rationality had banished every conceivable redoubt of faith and guesswork, all that remained was the underlying lust for annihilation. This unfortunate characteristic had to do something with itself in a world where there were virtually no pseudo-knowledge forms left to annihilate. Therefore the modern world, which had been ushered in by brilliant bursts of rationality, was fated to collapse into psychosis. This argument suggested that Horkheimer and Adorno had learned from Freud more than they had let on previously. In the late 1930s Horkheimer had evicted Erich FROMM from the Institute for being too much of a Freudian.

It is, however, imprecise to speak of *Dialectic of Enlightenment* as being a conventional book and as having a conventionally recognizable argument. It is a series of rather disjointed prefaces, chapters, excursuses, and aphorisms. Horkheimer himself said in so many words that he considered the book a failure. His correspondence reveals that during the first throes of composition in the early 1940s he hoped that the book would be the definitive statement of his career and would rank as one of the great summae of Western philosophy. His behavior on the completion of *Dialectic of Enlightenment* indicates that he considered this objective not to have been met. The only thing he did to make the book's argument available to American readers was to publish in English in the same year (1947) a sort of minor version of *Dialectic of Enlightenment* with significant optimistic

emendations, called *Eclipse of Reason*. Aside from this work and one talk at a philosophical conference in 1946, Horkheimer studiously endeavored to keep *Dialectic of Enlightenment* from American readers. He did the same thing with respect to German readers in the 1950s and 1960s, conceding to a republication in 1969 only after an extremely acrimonious series of encounters with student activists who demanded that the book be reprinted.

Horkheimer's achievements as Director of empirical research projects in America in the 1940s were also ambiguous. In the early 1940s the Institute produced several analyses of the receptivity and staying power of Nazism. The most notable of these was Franz Neumann's *Behemoth: The Structure and Practice of National Socialism* (1944). In the late 1940s the Institute turned to American subjects under a contract from the American Jewish Committee for a five-volume *Studies in Prejudice* with Horkheimer as supervisor. One volume of the *Studies*, *The Authoritarian Personality* (1950), instantly became a landmark in American sociology. More than any other work, *The Authoritarian Personality* (authored principally by Adorno), displayed the Institute's adeptness at using the means of statistical social science: questionnaires, response sheets, and surveys. The notable finding of *The Authoritarian Personality* was that American conservatives displayed identifiable psychological disorders.

It is telling that Horkheimer's name is not among those of the eleven authors who eventually came to print in the *Studies in Prejudice* series. Horkheimer did write a short foreword for the series and for each volume. These are remarkable only for their innocuousness. As Director of the overall project, Horkheimer spent many hours helping each author overcome conceptual difficulties and finish the work. Yet he rarely voiced the caustic arguments that characterized the series, particularly after he returned to Frankfurt, now a part of the new, American-dominated West Germany, in 1949.

The University of Frankfurt had invited Horkheimer back, not only to assume his professorship and to reestablish the Institute in its former home, but to become the university's President. He was skeptical of the offers. He eventually accepted probably because he knew that Americans, as opposed to Germans who had gone along with Nazism, would count most in his reformulated homeland. He became the first Jewish President of a German university, and served from 1951 to 1953. The Institute of Social Research, now referred to colloquially as the "Frankfurt School," became famous as the organization that had kept German culture alive during the country's darkest hour.

Horkheimer quickly tired of the old Nazis by whom he indeed found himself surrounded at the university and made friends with American administrators in West Germany, such as John J. McCloy, the American High Commissioner. Horkheimer was mortified to learn that by taking a job in Germany, he had lost his American citizenship. He went on an unsuccessful campaign to get it back, visiting the United States frequently. From 1954 to 1959 he lectured periodically at the University of Chicago. In 1958 he passed the Institute directorship to Adorno. In 1959 Horkheimer retired from his professorship at Frankfurt and moved to Switzerland, where he would live until his death on 7 July 1973 in Nuremburg, Germany.

In retirement, Horkheimer became a sort of goodwill minister and interpreter for the United States. The SDS (standing for "Socialist German Student League"), founded in Germany in 1959, greatly annoyed Horkheimer. He particularly resented what he perceived as its strident anti-Americanism, contradicting everything he had learned of America and its people in his fifteen years there. He tried to go around the growing student movement by giving talks to non-academic audiences about the benign nature of America. For example, he told German vacationers in 1963: "America is best compared

with classical Rome. Roman pride was not connected to the land, but lay in the consciousness of *civis Romanus sum*. 'I am an American' is the pride of an American .... [America] has always been an unthreatening nation ... . Its patriotism is not awakened in struggle against enemies, but has always been relatively light-hearted ...." (*Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 8, pp. 236–7) In private notes he wrote: "The difference between American and European citizens lies primarily in the fact that the former created their institutions through rational reflection, and as appropriately as possible." (1978, p. 201)

During the Vietnam War, Horkheimer became a figure of acute controversy on the student left. By 1967 activists in Germany demanded two things of him: first, to account for his uniformly pro-American views, and second, to republish his apparently radical and leftist writings of the 1930s and 1940s – the *Zeitschrift* essays and *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. He responded to the first demand by redoubling his efforts. For example, he wrote in his notes, "In Germany today, anti-Americanism has essentially the function of anti-Semitism. Therefore it should not be said that there is no longer any anti-Semitism in Germany." (*Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 14, p. 444) In a radio address, he said, "In power and influence, and in the areas of technology, science, and literature, America has caught up with, indeed surpassed Europe, and it wields wide authority in a complex and dangerous world … [yet one hears as a matter of course] in continental Europe of 'the uncultivated American.'" (*Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 13, p. 82). To the second demand, Horkheimer submitted in the late 1960s, authorizing a republication of a selection of the *Zeitschrift* essays and the milder *Dialectic of Enlightenment* of 1947. Both were introduced with new forewords that indicated Horkheimer's mixed feelings about these works. The books were soon translated into English and gained significant American readership for the first time.

Horkheimer was infuriated by the particularly rough treatment that the student activists reserved for his former colleague Adorno, whose death in 1969 Horkheimer and others attributed to the stress of dealing with the activists. When Horkheimer died in 1973, his most recent commentaries had been in recommendation of religious reaction, patriarchy, and the posture of the United States in Vietnam. In the 1970s and 1980s, Frankfurt School studies bloomed as members of the New Left entered into the scholarly ranks. Horkheimer remained the odd man out. He was one of the last members of the Institute to be honored with the publication of a set of collected writings in 1996.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Eclipse of Reason (New York, 1947).
Critical Theory: Selected Essays (New York, 1972).
Critique of Instrumental Reason: Lectures and Essays Since the End of World War II (New York, 1974).
Dawn & Decline: Notes 1926–1931 and 1950–1969 (New York, 1978).
Between Philosophy and Social Science: Selected Early Writings (Cambridge, Mass., 1993).
Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments, with Theodor W. Adorno (Stanford, Cal., 2002).

Other Relevant Works
Horkheimer's papers are in the Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Frankfurt am Main, Germany.
Gesammelte Schriften, 19 vols (Frankfurt am Main, 1985–96).

Further Reading
Benhabib, Seyla. *Critique, Norm, and Utopia: A Study of the Foundations of Critical Theory* (New York, 1986).
Benhabib, Seyla, et al., eds. *On Max Horkheimer: New Interpretations* (Cambridge, Mass., 1993).
Jay, Martin. *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the*

Institute of Social Research (Boston, 1973).

Nordquist, Joan. *Max Horkheimer: A Bibliography* (Santa Clara, Cal., 1990).

Pierson, Stanley. *Leaving Marxism: Studies in the Dissolution of an Ideology* (Stanford, Cal., 2001).

Schmidt, Alfred, and Norbert Altwicker, eds. *Max Horkheimer heute: Werk und Wirkung* (Frankfurt am Main, 1986).

Stirk, Peter. *Max Horkheimer: A New Interpretation* (Lanham, Md., 1992).

Wiggershaus, Rolf. *The Frankfurt School: Its History, Theories, and Political Significance* (Cambridge, Mass., 1994).

Brian Domitrovic

HORTON, Walter Marshall (1895–1966)

Walter Marshall Horton was born on 7 April 1895 in Somerville, Massachusetts. He received the BA summa cum laude from Harvard in 1917 and pursued further studies at Union Theological Seminary in New York, the Sorbonne in Paris, and the universities at Marburg and Strasbourg. His PhD in philosophy was awarded by Columbia University in 1926. After a brief teaching assignment at Union Theological Seminary in New York, he went to Oberlin College in 1925 where he was appointed Fairchild Professor of Systematic Theology. He received a Fulbright Grant to study and lecture at Strasbourg during 1952–3 and was awarded an honorary doctorate. He was later invited to teach during 1962–3 at United Theological College in Bangalore, South India, and in the following year at Chicago Theological Seminary. Though he traveled extensively and lectured worldwide, Oberlin would remain his home for the rest of his life. Horton died on 22 April 1966 in Oberlin, Ohio.

Writen in a popular style to communicate with ministers, not other academics, Horton's books were frequently chosen as "Book of the Month" by the Religious Book Club. He published scholarly articles in the *Christian Century*, *The Ecumenical Review*, the *Journal of Religion*, *Theology Today*, and other journals. His interests, abilities, and commitments covered a broad spectrum within the field of religion, as evidenced in the titles of his books. His earliest books (*Theism and the Modern Mood*, 1930; *Theism and the Scientific Spirit*, 1933; *A Psychological Approach to Theology*, 1931, in which he wrestles knowledgeably with Freud and the broader implications of his thought; and *Realistic Theology*, 1934) emphasize theology, but are oriented toward demonstrating the compatibility between theology and other areas of life. Fluent in both French and German, his *Contemporary Continental Theology* (1938) and *Contemporary English Theology* (1936) were also good interpreters of European thought for American readers.

Horton was aware of, and sensitive to, a religious spectrum broader than traditional Christian theology. This led him to an important joint effort with Henry N. WIEMAN in *The Growth of Religion* (1938), in which Horton surveys the nature, characteristics, and development of world religions. Using this background, Wieman suggests a new theology for the modern world. While Horton thought of himself as unapologetically Christian, he discerned a dynamic operative throughout the world that had religious significance. Wieman placed that dynamic within the newly established "empirical" tradition in theology (largely based at the University of Chicago). Horton's *Theology in Transition* (1943) and *Our Christian Faith* (1945) also embrace a broader-than-traditional concern. His specifically Christian commitment is expressed in *Our Eternal Contemporary: A Study of the Present-day Significance of Jesus* (1942), and *Can Christianity Save Civilization?* (1940). These

books anticipate many problems of the twenty-first century, including technology, economic justice, family relations, national-internationalism, and the rise of younger churches in what is often called the "third world."

Horton was a churchman and not just a theologian. The most significant concerns of his life (from his standpoint) were focused upon the "Ecumenical Movement," the movement toward unity within the "household of God" that would first result in the union of Christian churches, and eventually in the union of the world, the Kingdom of God on earth. These hopes are expressed in *Toward a Reborn Church: A Review and Forecast of the Ecumenical Movement* (1949) and consummately in *Christian Theology: An Ecumenical Approach* (1955), where Horton first surveys the doctrines with which all (or most) Christians agree and then examines – with considerable objectivity, understanding, and sympathy – the points on which they disagree. This book became the standard text in the introduction-to-theology courses in many theological seminaries in America during the late 1950s and early 1960s, and, for that reason, could be considered his most important work. Horton was not a religious imperialist, wishing to impose Christianity upon others, but an observer and scholar who simply became convinced that what Western Protestant Christianity affirmed was, in outline if not in detail, the future direction of the world.

Horton did not just *write* about ecumenical matters, but actively *participated* in the founding of the World Council of Churches in 1946 and in related ecumenical conferences from 1937 to 1962. These included the World Conferences on Faith and Order, which met at Oxford and Edinburgh in 1937, Lund in 1952, and Oberlin in 1957; the International Missionary Council, which met in Madras in 1938; the World Council of Churches, which met in London in 1946, Amsterdam in 1948, Evanston in 1954, and New Delhi in 1961. He also spent considerable time at the Ecumenical Institute in Chateau de Bossey, Switzerland. It was as a result of his initiative that the World Conference on Faith and Order met at Oberlin College in 1957.

A well-organized collection of Horton's works can be found in the archives of Oberlin College, including articles, reviews, sermons, radio broadcasts, poetry, lecture outlines, notes on proceedings and committee reports concerning the ecumenical movement, and correspondence, often in French or German, with European theologians. The leading English religious thinkers with whom he corresponded are Norman Pittenger and Charles Earle Raven (both of whom are interested in dialogue between science and theology). In these archives, a researcher can find a wealth of documentation on the Protestant ecumenical movement, beginning in 1910, and also on Horton's concern with promoting Jewish–Christian relations.

Horton was a liberal-minded Christian thinker who actively encouraged the union of Christendom and who thought of God's love as embracing the world, including its spectrum of religious traditions. The founding of the United Nations in 1948 corresponded politically with his religiously active interest in the ecumenical movement of promoting *united churches*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Theism and the Modern Mood (New York, 1930).

A Psychological Approach to Theology (New York, 1931).

Theism and the Scientific Spirit (New York, 1933).

Realistic Theology (New York, 1934).

Contemporary English Theology: An American Interpretation (New York, 1936).

God (New York, 1937).

Contemporary Continental Theology: An Interpretation for Anglo-Saxons (New York, 1938).

The Growth of Religion, with Henry Nelson Wieman (Chicago, 1938).
Can Christianity Save Civilization? (New York, 1940).
Our Eternal Contemporary: A Study of the Present-day Significance of Jesus (New York, 1942).
Theology in Transition (New York, 1943).
Our Christian Faith (Boston, 1945).
Toward a Reborn Church: A Review and Forecast of the Ecumenical Movement (New York, 1949).
Christian Theology: An Ecumenical Approach (New York, 1955).

Other Relevant Works
Horton's papers are at Oberlin College.
The Philosophy of the Abbé Bautain (New York, 1926).
Significance of Swedenborg for Contemporary Theology (New York, 1938).
Swedenborg and Contemporary Bible Interpretation (Boston, 1955).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Hammar, George. *Christian Realism in Contemporary American Theology: A Study of Reinhold Niebuhr, W. M. Horton, and H. P. Van Dusen* (Uppsala, Sweden, 1940).
Mountcastle, William W. *Neo-liberal Theology in the Thought of Walter Marshall Horton*. PhD dissertation, Boston University (Boston, 1958).

J. Edward Barrett

HOSPERS, John (1918–)

John Hospers was born on 9 June 1918 in Pella, Iowa. Important early influences were a Calvinist religious education, an independent study of astronomy that enabled him to teach a course in the subject as a college freshman, and reading Hume's *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion* while he was in college. He majored in English, receiving a BA from Central College in Iowa in 1939 and an MA in English from the University of Iowa in 1941. He then went to the graduate program in philosophy at Columbia University, where he studied with among others G. E. Moore, receiving a PhD in philosophy in 1944. His dissertation, "Meaning and Truth in the Arts," was published in 1946. He taught humanities at Columbia until 1948 when he became a professor of philosophy at the University of Minnesota, where he taught a variety of subjects including aesthetics, ethics, and epistemology, and wrote his influential *Introduction to Philosophical Analysis* (1953). In 1956 he was appointed a full professor at Brooklyn College of the City University of New York, where he wrote another widely adopted textbook, *Human Conduct: An Introduction to the Problems of Ethics* (1961).

Hospers was a visiting professor at the University of California at Los Angeles in 1960–61. In 1961 he met Ayn RAND in New York. His intense discussions with her strongly influenced his philosophical and political outlook, although she soon stopped talking to him after he made some mild public criticisms of her aesthetics views. In 1966 Hospers became head of the school of philosophy at the University of Southern California and editor of *The Personalist,* which was later renamed the *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly.* Hospers published *Libertarianism* in 1971 and he was the Libertarian Party's candidate for US President in 1972, receiving one electoral vote when a Republican elector defected. Hospers responds to critics of libertarianism in *Anarchy or Limited Government?* (1982) and *Law and*

the Market (1985). In 1982 he published a widely used textbook, *Understanding the Arts*. Since his retirement from Southern California in 1988 he has continued to teach and write.

In aesthetics, Hospers argued that a work of art can have meaning that goes beyond its purely "formal" properties, and includes the effect it evokes. But art makes no claims. Artistic truths are not true in the way scientific truths are but are true to human nature or experience, when art creates new ways of understanding. Furthermore, artistic expression is a feature of the work of art, not a feature of the artist.

In ethics, Hospers at first offered an acute account of the distinction between act and rule utilitarianism and defends a hedonistic theory of value. He later defended a form of rule egoism. In political philosophy, he argued that governments are justified only in protecting people's negative rights that others not physically interfere with them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Meaning and Truth in the Arts (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1946).

An Introduction to Philosophical Analysis (New York, 1953; 2nd edn 1967; 3rd edn 1988; 4th edn, Upper Saddle River, N.J., 1997).

Human Conduct: An Introduction to the Problems of Ethics (New York, 1961; London, 1962). Revised as *Human Conduct: Problems of Ethics* (Fort Worth, Tex., 1996).

Libertarianism: A Political Philosophy for Tomorrow (Los Angeles, 1971).

Understanding the Arts (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1982).

Anarchy or Limited Government? (San Francisco, 1982).

Law and the Market (Johannesburg, 1985).

Further Reading

Amer Phils 1950–2000

Brender, Myron. "Hospers on Psychoanalysis: A Critique," *Philosophy of Science* 32 (1965): 73–83.

Nelson, John O. "Hospers' 'Ultimate Moral Equality'," *Reason Papers* 13 (1988): 35–47.

Taliaferro, Charles. "The Ideal Aesthetic Observer Revisited," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 30 (1990): 1–13.

Elizabeth Harman

HOURANI, George Fadlo (1913–84)

George Hourani was born of Lebanese parents on 3 June 1913 in Manchester, England. For his junior and senior years, he moved to London to study classics at the Mill Hill School. In 1936 he received his BA in Greek and Latin literature, Greek and Roman history, and ancient and modern philosophy with honors from the University of Oxford. At the suggestion of Philip Hitti, the well-known historian, he entered Princeton University, where he received his PhD in history in 1939. His dissertation was published under the title *Arab Seafaring in the Indian Ocean in Ancient and Early Medieval Times* (1951) and reprinted several times. Hourani's scholarship was aided by his extensive knowledge of Greek, Latin, Arabic, English, and French and competence in Hebrew, German, Italian, and Spanish.

Hourani began his teaching career at the Arab College in Jerusalem, leaving for England when the English mandate over Palestine ended in 1948. He taught history at the University of Michigan from 1950 to 1967, and then completed his career as professor of philosophy at the State University of New York at Buffalo. He was named Distinguished Professor of Islamic Thought and Civilization, teaching there until his retirement in 1983. He died on 19 September 1984 in Buffalo, New York. Those of us who were fortunate to be his students not only benefited from his insistence

on high scholarly standards, but also enjoyed frequent invitations to his house.

More than anyone before him, Hourani brought to the attention of American intellectual circles the importance of Arab and Islamic philosophy. His publication of eight books and tens of articles include the first annotated English translations of some very important texts, such as *Fasl al-Maqal* (Decisive Treatise) by Averroës. Especially through his work on Islamic ethics and the relation of religion to philosophy, he demonstrated that, contrary to the common view, Arab/Islamic philosophy did not merely transmit Greek philosophy to the West, but was characterized by much originality, especially in the field of ethics, something that makes it worthy of study at American universities. His efforts were continued by his students, whom he viewed as his "future books"; several of them became well-known scholars at Western universities.

Hourani's early writings reflect a deep interest in Arab/Islamic culture, society, politics, and literature, as his book on seafaring and articles on Syria, Egypt, the Palestinian–Israeli conflict, and Arabic literature reveal. His interest in these issues did not diminish, as his TV and radio appearances, and other public activities, especially in the late 1970s, showed, but his later writings were more focused on pure philosophy, ethical issues, and the relation of religion to philosophy in Islam. Here he established himself as an original thinker and philosopher.

Hourani's prominence as a scholar was recognized by many prestigious awards and grants. SUNY promoted him to Distinguished Professor, and after his death established a graduate fellowship and a lecture series in his name. He served as President of the Middle East Studies Association in 1968–9 and the American Oriental Society in 1978–9.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Ethical Value (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1956; 2nd edn, New York, 1969).
"The Dialogue Between Ghazali and the Philosophers on the Origin of the World," *Muslim World* 48 (1958): 183–91, 308–14.
"Two Theories of Value in Medieval Islam," *Muslim World* 50 (1960): 269–78.
Averroës on the Harmony of Religion and Philosophy (London, 1961; 3rd edn 1976).
"Averroes on Good and Evil," *Studia Islamica* 16 (1962): 13–40.
"Ibn Sina's Essay on the Secret of Destiny," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 29 (1966): 25–48.
Islamic Rationalism: The Ethics of `Abd al-Jabbar (Oxford, 1971).
"Ibn Sina on Necessary and Possible Existence," *Philosophical Forum* 6 (1973): 74–86.
"Ghazali on the Ethics of Action," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 96 (1976): 68–88.
"*Zulm an-nafs* in the Qur'an in the Light of Aristotle," in *Recherches d'Islamologie* (Louvain, 1977), pp. 139–48.
Reason and Tradition in Islamic Ethics (Cambridge, UK, 1980).

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, *Proc of APA v58*
Marmura, Michael, ed. *Islamic Philosophy and Theology: Studies in Honor of George F. Hourani* (Albany, N.Y., 1984).

Shams Inati

HOWE, Julia Ward (1819–1910)

Julia Ward Howe, leading reformer, preacher, essayist, poet, and philosopher, is most famous for her poem, "The Battle Hymn of the Republic." Born Julia Ward on 27 May 1819 in New York City, she was the fourth of seven

children of Julia Rush Cutler and Samuel Ward, Jr., a partner in a Wall Street banking firm. Julia's great-grandmother Catharine Ray corresponded with Benjamin Franklin, while her grandmother, Esther Cutler, was an acquaintance of George Washington. Among those entertained at the Wards' New York home were Washington Irving and Charles Dickens. At her mother's untimely death, Julia, aged five, was left in the charge of an aunt and strict father. Witty and attractive, with red hair and blue eyes, Julia grew to be a little over five feet tall. In 1843 she married Samuel Gridley Howe, a physician and founder of the Perkins Institute for the Blind. The first of her six children was born in Rome the next year on their extended honeymoon trip. The Howes returned to Europe in 1850, journeyed to Cuba in 1859, to Greece in 1867, to England in 1872, the next year to Santo Domingo, and in the late 1870s Julia voyaged to the Middle East. Considered an outsider in Boston, and living a troubled married life, she nevertheless loved her home at "Green Peace." Although her husband opposed her public life, Howe succeeded in supporting causes and publishing books from 1855 until her death on 17 October 1910 in Oak Glen, Massachusetts.

Howe's correspondence was prolific and her friends many: Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Senator Charles Sumner of Boston, and philosophers William Torrey HARRIS of St. Louis, Lucy STONE, Antoinette Brown BLACKWELL, and perhaps her closest friend, Ednah Dow CHENEY. Howe often presided over the New England Woman's Club and suffrage associations. A sought-after speaker, invited to speak the world over, in Massachusetts she preached in the Unitarian Church of James Freeman Clarke, at the Association for the Advancement of Women's annual congresses, at Faneuil Hall, at the Boston Radical Club, and at Free Religious Association meetings. She lectured annually at the Concord School of Philosophy on such topics as Modern Society (1880); Philosophy in Europe, Kant (1881); Margaret Fuller: A Conversation (1882); Reminiscences of Emerson and Emerson's Relation to Society (1884, read by Cheney); Goethe (1885); Dante and Beatrice; and possibly also The Place of Women in Plato's Republic (1886) and Aristophanes (1887). During those years, her daughter Julia Romano Anagnos attended the Concord School, publishing before her untimely death *Philosophiae Quaestor*, in which she praised the school. In 1893 Howe was one of just two women invited to speak at the philosophy and science sessions of the Chicago World's Fair.

In 1861, after meeting Abraham Lincoln in Washington, D.C. and witnessing Civil War military maneuvers, Julia wrote the "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" which gave her lifelong fame. She wrote one play that achieved production in New York's Lyceum Theater in 1857, but it was condemned for being immoral because its love scenes were considered too violent. She was successful in publishing poetry and prose articles in national magazines, and in 1908 she became the first woman to be elected to the American Academy of Arts and Letters. Two years later she died of pneumonia at age ninety-one. She is buried in Mount Auburn Cemetery in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Accustomed to speaking French at an early age, Julia added Latin, and at age fourteen, Italian and later German to her arsenal of languages. Although her three brothers graduated from Columbia University, Julia was tutored at home and at Miss Gilbert's school on Bleeker Street until age sixteen. Her love of study, however, led her to read Cicero, Goethe, Schiller, and Paley, as well as Blair, Gibbons, Sand and Balzac – her motto being to follow "the great masters with my heart."

In her 1884 biography of Margaret Fuller, Howe comments on her education at Fuller's "Conversations." She describes the first class that took place at Elizabeth PEABODY's on 6 November 1839 as focusing on the limits that had been placed on women's education. Howe reported that Fuller taught the importance of tolerance through such subjects as ethics in

the ancient Greeks and fine arts, literature, family, school, church, and society. It was later in her life that Howe successfully in her own works carried out theories she had become acquainted with at the feet of Fuller.

Howe continually studied philosophy. Beginning in 1851 she read Comte, Hegel, Kant – always preferring him to Descartes – and Spinoza, her inspiration for writing "Distinctions between Philosophy and Religion." A new epoch in her intellectual life began in the 1860s with courses of lectures at the Radical Club in Boston, where she attended lectures by Jean Louis AGASSIZ, Lothrop, Whipple, Clarke, and Alger. She also renewed reading Kant and Spinoza. By the end of the Civil War in 1865 Howe claimed to have come to some philosophical conclusions. At age fifty she learned Greek that she might read Aristotle and Plato, which she did until her death. Her advice was, "Study Greek, my dear, it's better than a diamond necklace!"

Howe's three great causes were women's suffrage, abolition, world peace, and religious freedom. Along with Ralph Waldo EMERSON and other transcendentalists, she participated in the Free Religious Association. Her consciousness raised with the Unitarian Theodore Parker's addressing God from the pulpit as "Father and Mother of us all," Howe eventually became an advocate for women's rights. Twenty years behind Stone, Blackwell, and others of her generation, Howe nevertheless moved the suffrage movement forward with great energy. In 1868 she facilitated the founding of the New England Women's Club, and then the New England Woman Suffrage Association, the first major political organization to claim the franchise for women, of which she was President from 1868 to 1877 and 1893 to 1910. In 1869, as a leader of the American Women Suffrage Association, she spoke at the convention at St. Louis, and in 1876 at the fourth Congress of Women in Philadelphia. Also in service to the cause, she founded and edited the *Woman's Journal* from 1870 to 1890. She helped to establish the General Federation of Women's Clubs and was its Director from 1893 to 1898.

Early on, Howe claimed her unwillingness to secure the vote for women before it was secured for African Americans as well. This issue eventually split the women's movement. Fostering the peace movement, she was denied the opportunity to speak at the Peace Congress in England because she was a woman. Her response was to hire a hall in which to speak, which she did for five or six Sundays. A delegate to prison reform meetings in England, Howe believed that society had failed these inmates as much as they had failed society. In relation to the peace movement, she institutionalized Mother's Day, identifying it as a rallying day for peace. Howe preached and lectured in churches and at conferences, to illiterates at Santo Domingo, and to working women on Cape Cod. She was a founder of the American Friends of Russian Freedom and the first president of the United Friends of Armenia – causes, originally her husband's, which came to be her own.

An observer of Howe lecturing before a meeting of the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association noted that she talked "sensibly and philosophically," pointing out the problem that the "'elegant society'" in which she was invested fettered "the freedom of her soul" (letter from Lydia Maria CHILD to Eliza Scudder, 6 February 1870). It is possible, however, that Howe's restraint mixed with her urge for self-determination gave rise to both her activism and her philosophy.

While identified as a leading social figure, Julia Ward Howe has been little recognized as a philosopher. Nevertheless, she developed a social philosophy that was at once ethical, political, and feminist. Her philosophical method, oriented to process, is on the one hand Hegelian in her notion formulated in "Idols and Iconoclasts" of a reconciling progress of life, and on the other transcendental in its pursuit of wholeness or oneness from "halfness," the subject of her essay "The Halfness of Nature" in *Is Polite Society Polite? and Other Essays* (1895).

One philosophical issue that occupied Howe was that of human worth, particularly in respect to women. In her philosophical inquiry, she came to the conclusion that women share human rights and responsibilities, and that they are in fact the moral and spiritual equivalent to men, a conclusion that for her was like discovering a "new continent." The questions she asked which brought that conclusion originated in her consideration of three distinct issues: the awful responsibility of maternity, the possibility of love between man and woman as symbolizing a sacred truth, and the full dignity awarded the slave after the Civil War. Of the many areas of human worth and women on which she wrote, the role of sex in education was one that brought her to the edge of social mores; co-education, she believed, because it would foster equal exchange of thought, was best. In her 1874 *Sex and Education*, Howe repudiated the claim that the energy of women's brains was dissipated by scholarly activity, misplacing it from the system of female reproduction where the energy was more properly destined. All education, Howe believed, became an issue of the inherent dignity and human worth of every child, male and female.

Although a friend and disciple of Emerson, Howe found transcendentalism not wholly satisfying, especially its notion of self-sufficiency. Still, she allied herself not only to transcendentalism's enthusiasm for "emancipated thought," but also to the vision of the abolitionists for "emancipated humanity." Her questions were ever intent on the relation of thought and spirituality to humankind. She praised Goethe for not losing "sight of the ideal value of human life and character." When he "lifts the depths of human nature into the daylight of God's Providence … from his first work to his last," he proves that human values are God's values (1886, pp. 353, 365). Howe's notion of "God's values" mandates our coming up to human dignity. The Eastern religious and philosophical influences in transcendentalism were not lost on Howe, in fact, they had bearing on her notion of humanizing tolerance.

Howe also agreed with the emphasis on intuition in transcendentalism, relating it to social philosophy. In her essay on Goethe, Howe synthesizes her faith in women and her fears for society. For her, it is the intuitive strength of women that is "precious to society," whereas it is in the purely rational that civility will be lost. In Goethe she noted that form and custom in society "became living gems," but she foresaw in Germany harm coming to the civility that Goethe cultivated. The significance of toleration, which Howe learned from Margaret Fuller, became the underlying virtue in her 1895 work *Is Polite Society Polite? and Other Essays*. Politeness in society is not "exclusion" but rather sincere expression of "inward grace of good feeling." Having experienced "civil" war, Bostonian class "wars," and inhumanity in general, Howe sought to give civility philosophical prominence and meaning. Civility, being both ethical and socio/political, was for her serious and consequential. Human values, being foundational to civility, require social responsibility. This socio/political responsibility should convince Americans to feel special interest in maintaining polite feeling in community. Politeness is rhetorical in that it extends to expression in language as well. While eloquence shapes civil society, religion embodies it in politeness, love being its "interior source." In fact, tolerance in religion is the "external condition for politeness." Howe admits to her ethics of civility as being somewhat Confucian. Emerson is an example of the "polite" as she argues in her memoir of him, the reason she gives is that he recognizes "God above human affairs" in his lament over the death of his child.

Howe's emphasis on human worth within the individual is regarded also in society, for society is composed of individuals. Human worth that embodies a social mandate is derived on the one hand from her belief in God as ethical source and on the other from

her philosophy of the "halfness of nature." There is in man both reconciliation with God and opposition, hence man being God-like and not God-like. "Halfness" for Howe is a notion of being at once essential and in process of becoming. This "halfness" extends to nature, art, and to institutions – education, religion, marriage. Not only does all creation seek its other half but within that half is half, as in talent left wanting, or solitude seeking society. From this "halfness" comes the yearning, insistence, enthusiasm for wholeness. So, "halfness" obliges engagement in the struggle for wholeness; all creation must act as well as exist to find full being. It is incompleteness that is the foundation of all creation, "When we have done all in this that life allows us, we have not done more than half, the other half lying beyond the pale struggle and the silent rest." (1885, p. 178)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sex and Education: A Reply to Dr. E. H. Clarke's Sex in Education (Boston, 1874).

Modern Society (Boston, 1881).

Margaret Fuller (Marchesa Ossoli) (Boston, 1883).

"Emerson's Relation to Society," in *The Genius and Character of Emerson: Lectures at the Concord School of Philosophy*, ed. F. B. Sanborn (Boston, 1885).

"Goethe's Women," in *The Life and Genius of Goethe: Lectures at the Concord School of Philosophy*, ed. F. B. Sanborn (Boston, 1886).

"Women in the Greek Drama. Extracts from Julia Ward Howe's Lecture," in *The Congress of Women: Held in the Woman's Building, World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago, U.S.A., 1893*, ed. Mary Eagle (Chicago, 1894), pp. 102–3.

Is Polite Society Polite? and Other Essays (Boston, 1895).

Reminiscences, 1819–1899 (Boston, 1899).

At Sunset (Boston, 1910).

Other Relevant Works

Howe's papers are at Harvard University and the Library of Congress.

Julia Ward Howe and the Woman Suffrage Movement: A Selection from Her Speeches and Essays, ed. Florence Howe Hall (Boston, 1913).

The Walk with God, ed. Laura E. Richards (Boston, 1919).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v1*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Clifford, Deborah P. *Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory: A Biography of Julia Ward Howe* (Boston, 1979).

Grant, Mary H. *Private Woman, Public Person: An Account of the Life of Julia Ward Howe from 1819 to 1868* (Brooklyn, N.Y., 1994).

Hall, Florence Howe. *The Story of the Battle Hymn of the Republic* (New York, 1916).

Richards, Laura E., Maud Howe Elliot, and Florence Howe Hall. *Julia Ward Howe (1819–1910)*, 2 vols (Boston, 1915).

Therese Boos Dykeman

HOWELLS, William Dean (1837–1920)

William Dean Howells was born on 1 March 1837 in Martins Ferry, Ohio, and died in New York City on 11 May 1920. Though lacking in formal education, Howells read and studied voluminously in languages and literature throughout his youth. He worked long hours assisting his father, a publisher of small-town newspapers in Ohio, and later served as a reporter and city editor for the *Cincinatti Gazette*. Howells had modest early literary

success as a poet, placing some of his work in the *Atlantic Monthly* and collaborating with John J. Piatt on his first book, *Poems of Two Friends* (1860). Howells completed a campaign biography of Lincoln in the same year, and he used his resulting political influence to get an appointment as US consul to Venice (1861–5). During this time he found it increasingly difficult to place his poetry, so he turned back in the direction of journalism by writing travel sketches of Venice. These vignettes, which first appeared in the *Boston Advertiser* newspaper in 1864 and were published in 1866 as *Venetian Life*, were a success and earned praise from James Russell Lowell, editor of the *Atlantic Monthly*. The appearance and immediate success of Howells's travel sketches marked a decisive turn in his career, away from poetry in the romantic vein and toward a prose literature incorporating minutely observed, truthful portraits of everyday life.

In 1866 Howells became assistant editor of the *Atlantic Monthly* under James T. Fields. He was promoted to editor-in-chief in 1871 and served in that capacity until 1881. Howells wielded enormous influence in American letters during his time there. Through numerous essays, reviews, and other writings in the influential literary magazine, he championed the cause of realism in American literature. He also promoted the work of his friends, Mark TWAIN and Henry James. Howells, Twain, and James were the three most widely acclaimed American novelists of the late nineteenth century.

Howells's first novel, *Their Wedding Journey,* appeared in 1872. Henry ADAMS's contemporary review notes the novel's "extreme and almost photographic truth to nature … remarkable delicacy and lightness of touch … [and] idealization of the commonplace." The description could apply to any one of the more than forty works of realistic fiction Howells wrote. His two best-known novels are *The Rise of Silas Lapham* (1885), a tale of the moral rise and financial downfall of

a nouveau riche mineral-paint king of Gilded Age Boston, and *A Hazard of New Fortunes* (1890). The latter work, generally acclaimed as Howells's best and most realized novel, is a sprawling study of troubled social relations, labor strife, and class antagonism set in New York City. The realistic style of literature which Howells favored was eclipsed by naturalism in the 1890s, but he remained enormously influential and was widely revered as the Dean of American Letters until his death in 1920.

Howells achieved fame as a novelist, but he is also known as chief spokesman for the doctrine of literary realism. *Criticism and Fiction,* first published in 1891 and compiled from Howells's Editor's Study columns at *Harper's* (1886–91), remains his best-known statement of realism. Though Howells was not a systematic thinker, realism as he understood it and influentially propounded it is of considerable philosophical interest. It shares themes with William JAMES's pragmatism, and anticipates current studies of aesthetics and culture.

Howells brought the polemical zeal of a reformer to his writings on realism, which are a pleasure to read due to the abundant charm and wit of his prose style. Convinced that literature had an important and clearly identifiable purpose, he felt that writers too often failed to do justice to their vocation. This may be understood by comparing the respective unique purposes or values of natural science and literature. The natural sciences seek to improve human life through understanding the workings of the natural world. Literature seeks – or, rather, should seek – to improve human life through understanding the workings of human beings organized in societies. This practical purpose is the core of literary value, and it is obscured by overconcern for formal ingenuity, profundity, complexity, unity, and other familiar chestnuts of literary criticism. If literature does not help us to understand ourselves, so "that we may deal justly with ourselves and with one another," then high achievement in the more "aesthetic"

qualities counts for very little, according to Howells (1891, pp. 94–5).

Realism is both a theory of literary value and a method for achieving that value. Literature must be useful in the way indicated above, or it is a mere trifle of the cultured classes, and hardly worthy of serious attention other than censure. Howells's views in this respect resembled Leo Tolstoy's, a writer whom he had grown to admire in the 1880s. The realistic method is the "truthful treatment of material" (1891, p. 73). By "truthful" Howells did not mean exact duplication or representation of reality. Realism is not mere reporting. The realist writer must, as Howells scholar Everett Carter puts it, "select and arrange … symbols and conventions that would give a truthful impression of life as it appears to the average man of good sense in the culture for which he was writing" (Carter 1953, p. 136). Like the impressionist painter, the realist operates within an economy of means, painting scenes in vivid hues conveying the essence of characters and situations. Carter likened the result to a laboratory of human behavior, "where a reader may watch an experiment in social relationships, and can find out what will happen, given certain personalities reacting to each other under certain conditions" (Carter 1953, p. 101).

Howells's realism was influenced by the positivistic temper of the times, but avoided the fatalism, pessimism, and determinism associated with the later naturalists. His optimistic realism was more aligned with the pragmatism of William James, more interested in the cash value in experience of different ideas than in unifying or reductive visions of reality. Human beings were not seen as condemned to live out an unalterable life script, whether that script is provided by mechanistic laws of nature or by the ineluctable operation of unconscious conflicts. Both James and Howells were pluralists, free-willists, and meliorists; both believed that the physical environment and human fortunes alike can be significantly improved when the energies of human beings are harnessed to ideas that work. James did not insist that all true ideas worked equally well, were equally "true" for different persons, different times, and different places. Howells also was a "subjectivist" in this regard. The reader must be left to draw her own conclusions from the "experiments" she reads, and different readers legitimately may differ on the significance they find and the conclusions they draw – meaning is at most suggested, not dictated from on high.

Realism had to contend with two persistent impediments to literary truth, romanticism and sentimentalism. Romantic literature resorts to the extreme, the histrionic, and the ideal type in order to plumb reality above and below the surfaces of things. Howells ridiculed this exercise in literary metaphysics, likening it to a scientist studying a carefully constructed ideal model of a grasshopper, rather than venture out in to the field where the real, if stubbornly nonideal, grasshoppers reside. Romanticism's heavy reliance on devices such as allegory and symbolism provided no substitute for fidelity to everyday reality that was the stock-in-trade of the realist. Howells thus found romanticism an outmoded approach that fails to connect with average readers' lives. A romantic novel was not necessarily a bad novel, as acquaintance with the work of Hawthorne and Melville suggests. The same cannot be said for the sentimental, however. Sentimental literature was "literary lying," giving the public the vision of reality, usually false, that it demands. It pandered to preconceived notions and prejudices. A war-weary America proved a healthy market for the sentimental even in serious fiction, and sentimental dross crossed Howells's editor's desk in large quantities, to his dismay.

It might be difficult to understand why Howells, one of the leading literary lights of his day, would devote so much of his time and energy passionately advocating a theory of literary value whose proposed standard of taste would be none other than "the simple, the natural, and the honest." Surely, one wants to

say, there is more to literature and the other fine arts than that. Yet Howells was withering in his scorn for the notion of a standard of taste resting in, for example, the collective judgment of a group of specially cultured and trained critics, schooled in a canon of acknowledged masterworks – as Hume had proposed in his well-known essay on the standard of taste. One supposes that Howells's democratic and scientific propensities rebelled at a standard that removed "classics" from the test of experience, and that enjoined the majority of people who read literature from supposing they have a right to judge its worth. But in a day in which we turn (however wisely) to experts such as social scientists and psychologists for knowledge of the human condition, it can be hard to grasp why Howells would be so willing to jettison treasured aesthetic standards, including formal unity of the novel, in favor of fidelity to experience – and what an ordinary experience it was, many of his critics complained.

Howells insisted on a literature that is faithful to ordinary experience precisely because many, if not most, people are unfaithful observers of their own lives. Howells noticed this both in his own life and the lives of the ordinary people he so vividly depicted in his fiction. He saw people turning to novels for ideas on how one should live, with disastrous results. And he saw novelists turn to other novels, rather than to life, for guidance in their literary craft. The result of this curious situation is that, in an age of tremendous expansion in knowledge due to insistence that ideas be tested in experience, the great mass of Americans and the artists among them were doing just the opposite. We have the picture of a decentered, vaguely dissatisfied populace (later identified by sociology as "other-directed"), whose only chance of salvation – the shock of recognition a reader could find in one of the experiments of the realistic novel's social laboratory – is cut off from them, because artists have in effect chosen to prettily adorn the hospital room rather than help provide the means for the patient to revive.

What Howells saw when he gazed out on the gilded American scene, with its growing gap between rich and poor, increasing social class stratification and racial turmoil, was an other-directed populace that had ceased to trust in its own powers of observation; and, having ceased to trust, ceased to observe closely at all. These Americans turned to novels for guidance on how to live, just as a later generation would turn either to an institutionally entrenched professional class or to movies and television for the same advice. Howells, who himself suffered a psychological breakdown in the 1880s, "overcome by the feeling that all his life he had been playing roles" (Lynn 1971, p. 12), suffered no illusion that the trend toward social anomie would change for the better. But the least that literature could do, given its power as a means to hold a mirror up to the lives of people in varying degrees of personal dissatisfaction and despair, was own up to its own unique powers for good and potential for harm. Though he had earned scorn for having once advised writers to turn their gaze on the "smiling aspects" of American life, Howells was chastened in the late 1880s by the show trial and "civic murder" of Haymarket anarchists in Chicago and by personal tragedy (the death of his daughter Winifred in 1889). Considering the prospects for American life and American letters at the turn of the century, he would conclude that literature must rise up to its true calling of help and healing: "Art, indeed, is beginning to find out that if it does not make friends with Need it must perish." (1891, p. 184)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Poems of Two Friends, with John J. Piatt (Columbus, Ohio, 1860).

Venetian Life (New York, 1866; 2nd edn Boston, 1907).

The Rise of Silas Lapham (Boston, 1885; New York, 1958).

A Hazard of New Fortunes (New York, 1890; 2002).

Criticism and Fiction (New York, 1891). Reprinted in *Criticism and Fiction, and Other Essays*, ed. C. M. Kirk and R. Kirk (New York, 1959).

Other Relevant Works
Howells's papers are at Harvard University.
A Selected Edition of W.D. Howells, ed. E. H. Cady, Ronald Gottesman, Don L. Cook, and David Nordlow (Bloomington, Ind., 1968).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v1*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Carter, Everett. *Howells and the Age of Realism* (Philadelphia, 1954).
Gibson, William M., and George Arms. *A Bibliography of William Dean Howells* (New York, 1948).
Lynn, Kenneth S. *William Dean Howells: An American Life* (New York, 1971).
Pizer, Donald, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to American Realism and Naturalism: Howells to London* (Cambridge, UK, 1995).

Dean Graham

HOWISON, George Holmes (1834–1916)

George Holmes Howison was born on 29 November 1834, in Montgomery County, Maryland, and died on 31 December 1916 in Berkeley, California. He was the son of Robert Howison of Virginia and Eliza Holmes Howison of Maryland. Both parents derived from old families, they were Presbyterians, and were themselves slaveholders. Howison's biography is eclectic and colorful, but would be of little interest were it not for the fact that the biography made the philosopher, and its details form the basis of Howison's devotion to pluralism. Howison is perhaps the primary originator of philosophical pluralism in America, which is perhaps his greatest and most lasting contribution to philosophy. Grasping his varied life in outline is key to grasping the philosophy he propounded, the form it took, and his ability to influence others to adopt it, for it was as a spur to the thought of others that he had his greatest influence, particularly in the cases of Josiah ROYCE, William JAMES, and Borden Parker BOWNE. Howison did not publish prolifically as did these other three figures, but by every account his personal charisma and the force of his discourse moved his hearers to think and to change their thinking.

When Howison was four years of age, his parents forswore the institution of slavery, freed their slaves, and moved to Marietta, Ohio, on the Muskingum River, largely for the educational and cultural life of the young city. There was in Marietta a great variety of Christian sects, but they were distinguished by having forged an early consensus and ecumenism, a cooperative community in which even Protestants and Catholics worked together, an example of religious pluralism in action. There Howison attended first Marietta Academy and later Harmar Academy where he was afforded a classical education, particularly emphasizing the antique languages. He entered Marietta College at age fourteen and commenced his study of German, not touching upon philosophy until his senior year. After taking his BA degree in 1852, he first pursued Christian ministry, graduating from Lane Seminary in Cincinnati and being licensed to preach, but rather than taking a charge Howison returned home and served as a schoolteacher and principal in a series of Ohio towns, eventually being called to Salem, Massachusetts in 1862. There he met and married Lois Caswell, an English teacher in his school, who was related to several prominent

academic families, including the Angells of Yale and later Michigan, and President Caswell of Brown. During this time Howison continued to educate himself and developed a consuming interest in mathematics, a subject for which he had shown no aptitude as a student.

Having succeeded in every charge, as teacher, principal, master, and superintendent, each more prominent than the last, and having particularly distinguished himself as an administrator and organizer, Howison was given at age thirty the opportunity to take a post as professor at Washington University in St. Louis, arriving in 1864. He believed he was being appointed to a chair in English literature and was preparing lectures in those subjects but on arrival discovered a more established educator had been given the position. Howison accepted an appointment in mathematics instead and during the following years taught courses and even held chairs in all the branches of mathematics, including applied fields such as mechanics and astronomy, but also in political economy and Latin. He established a solid reputation as a scholar in mathematics with a treatise on analytic geometry that appeared in 1869 and an algebra primer that appeared in 1870. Here in St. Louis he also came into contact with that select subdivision of the St. Louis Philosophical Society called the Kant Club, which met at the home of William Torrey HARRIS. Howison joined at the time the club was reading Hegel's *Phenomenology*, and it was the association with Harris and the St. Louis Hegelians that turned Howison's interest to philosophy. Harris's *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* was started shortly afterwards and Howison published an important paper on the relations among the branches of mathematics in one of its early numbers. The Kant Club, of only a dozen members, had speeches by both Ralph Waldo EMERSON and Bronson ALCOTT. These visits seemed to have awakened in Howison a longing to return to New England and its wealth of intellectual culture. Washington University held no opportunity for him to pursue philosophy.

With excellent connections in New England, Howison was able to obtain a position as headmaster in the English High School in Boston. Shortly thereafter the young Massachusetts Institute of Technology made him its professor of logic and philosophy of science, in which capacity he served from 1872 to 1878. But then financial conditions forced MIT to eliminate a number of professorships, including Howison's. During these years he studied and wrote on numerous subjects, but began his earnest writing and lecturing in philosophy. After losing his position Howison gave a course of lectures at Harvard Divinity School, and one in the Concord School of Philosophy in its inaugural summer, and otherwise pieced together what work he could, getting to know both Emerson and Alcott better all the while. Perhaps most important among the activities of these years were the informal meetings in the Temple Street rooms of Thomas DAVIDSON with a small group that included William James and Borden Parker Bowne. American philosophical pluralism and American personalism were founded in those fortnightly meetings. These views were variously developed by James, Bowne, Davidson, and Howison, but an examination of the general commonalities leaves little doubt of their common origin.

Beginning in 1880 Howison used the opportunity of his unemployment to travel and study through Europe, meeting along the way various lights of philosophy. Being most impressed with the University of Berlin, "the most serious institution of a very serious nation," Howison enrolled in 1881, at forty-seven years of age. There the course of Jules Michelet turned Howison from Hegelian absolutism back to a Kantian strain of thinking which remained with him. Returning to the US in 1882, he hoped for a call to Harvard and had reason to think it likely to come, especially given what James calls "the extraordinary development of his intellect in the last four years." But Royce had been called to Harvard during Howison's absence and had

made a great impression. Howison taught privately for a year and then, dispirited, resigned himself to leaving Boston and accepted a position at the University of Michigan. Notwithstanding congenial colleagues and ample resources, Ann Arbor was not to the liking of the Howisons and finally the opportunity came for Howison, nearing fifty, to settle down and build something permanent. The University of California decided to begin a philosophy program and offered Howison the position of Mills Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy and Civil Polity in 1884, and an opportunity and resources to create a philosophy program according to his own vision. While California was a notoriously rough place and Berkeley was little more than a backwater in those days, the resources would be excellent, the position secure, and the autonomy promised in this position was very much to Howison's liking. His administrative genius, his connections to the eastern and mid-western intellectual elite, and his unrivaled talent for teaching insured him quick success. Over the next decades until his death, Howison proceeded to build the philosophy program and the Philosophical Union of the University of California, its program and reputation, to oversee the growing faculty and enrollment, and to loose upon the world a group of able and fiercely loyal students, including, for example, Arthur O. LOVEJOY. Howison's charisma as a teacher and ability to impart in his dealings the sense of his own personal involvement and solicitousness regarding all matters both professional and personal created for him a stature in the community that was formidable and permanent. He became a popular and controversial speaker and a towering cultural figure in Northern California and there created what has been called the California School of American personalism. His heterodox teachings about the nature of God placed him at odds with the theological community, but his incisive ability to defend it against all challenges and his personal charity and moral

excellence kept him safe from serious personal attacks.

The Philosophical Union was Howison's device for teaching beyond the university, and under its auspices he drew the leading figures in American philosophy to Berkeley to give courses of public lectures. William James and John DEWEY were among those who addressed the Union during Howison's days, but perhaps the most significant event was the first appearance by Josiah Royce in 1895. Howison organized a debate that became known in those regions as "the Great Philosophical Discussion," and more widely as "the Conception of God Debate." This event the New York *Times* termed "a battle of giants," while the New York *Tribune* said this was "the most noteworthy philosophical discussion that for many a day has taken place in this country." Royce was obliged to defend the ideas about God he had set out in *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy* (1885) against the criticisms of Howison, Joseph LeConte, and Sidney MEZES. LeConte had been Royce's teacher at Berkeley and later his colleague when Royce also taught at Berkeley in the English department. The audience filled the largest hall of the university. The proceedings were quickly published by the Union and a revised and greatly augmented edition appeared from Macmillan in 1897, now containing a large supplementary essay by Royce and an introduction and notes by Howison, as the debate continued to rage in print. As editor, Howison sometimes used his position to get the last word, correcting in added notes what he saw as Royce's misinterpretations of his view, and, still unsatisfied with the reception of the extended volume, he later published an article reinterpreting the entire proceeding from his viewpoint. The debate was sharp, as were relations between Royce and Howison in the days thereafter (Royce had, after all, been given the position Howison wanted at Harvard), but they remained friends, and indeed, it was Howison who was chosen to give the celebratory remarks on the career of

Royce in 1915 for the 1916 Royce *Festschrift*. Perhaps this debate would be no more than an interesting episode in the history of American thought except for the fact that it had a lasting effect on the content of American philosophy.

Howison's essential criticism of Royce derived from his own development through and beyond Hegel. Howison had come to the conclusion that any absolutism destroyed the metaphysical basis of individuality, rendering the individual an epiphenomenal outgrowth of the Absolute. While Royce never imagined that his version of absolute idealism had the effect of destroying individuality, Howison argued forcefully that this was the effect of Royce's doctrine. Knowing that he must answer this criticism, Royce first tried to distinguish his own brand of idealism from Howison's, and having not fully succeeded in his own estimation, set out upon a full-scale investigation of the metaphysical standing of the individual in his Gifford Lectures, *The World and the Individual* (1899–1901). Howison's powerful critique continued to work on Royce until he had so modified his vocabulary and mode of expression that by 1915 Howison no longer recognized Royce's thought as being a type of idealism at all. Howison's critique was a burr in Royce's saddle that resulted finally in the development of the pluralistic theory of community and interpretation for which Royce is now well known. Whether Royce fully abandoned the idea of the Absolute may be debated, but that the idea came to be expressed differently cannot be doubted. The version of personal idealism, communitarian and pluralistic, placing its greatest emphasis upon the idea of the individual self-active will, that Royce eventually articulated is due mainly to his own genius, but that he was obliged to struggle with the metaphysical standing of the individual was in large part Howison's contribution to his thinking. Royce's individual self-active will is almost identical to Howison's similar conception. But where Howison insisted that God is only the harmony among such wills

when they are guided by reason, Royce held on to a slightly more traditional idea of God. For all of William James's assaults on his absolutism, it was Howison's idealistic critique that penetrated Royce's defenses. Royce shared with Howison the conviction that reason, as expressed in logical thinking, has ontological weight and can lead to ontological knowledge, albeit abstract.

During the years of his greatest continuous exposure to James, between 1871 and 1880, Howison was a Hegelian. James recognized that Howison was transformed when the latter returned from Europe, and indeed James even remarked in a letter to Davidson in 1883 that Howison "seems now to me to be quite a different man, intellectually, from his former self …. He gave the best philosophic lecture, in point of form and impressiveness, I think I ever heard, the other night in Concord." While James often overstated things, the impression Howison left is clear, and James even expressed some regret at having backed Royce for the Harvard appointment before he became aware of how much Howison had advanced. But James did not see enough of Howison before the permanent departure for the West to allow the character of the change to set in deeply. For the rest of James's life he regarded Howison as a Hegelian and placed him in a box for criticism that Howison had long outgrown. However, what becomes evident in examining the ample correspondence between James and Howison thereafter is that their shared ground was and always had been philosophical pluralism. James shows little appreciation of Howison's mature position, owing almost entirely to Howison's reticence about publication, but it is clear that James was deeply prodded by Howison not to allow the pluralism in his pragmatism to fall into irrationalism and thereby slouch unaware towards materialism. Howison's goadings kept James through the 1890s pressed against the questions of metaphysics that had to be addressed as a ground for both the disjunctive and the conjunctive principles, those concepts

whereby individuals are distinguished onto-logically while yet existing in continuity. James's abortive theory of fields and later the ideas about "pure experience" hearken back to this influence. James became frustrated with this metaphysical work as he came to be more and more focused upon the epistemic roots of the relation of will and knowledge, but as with Royce, a particular conception of the will, fol-lowing Howison's model of the self-active individual intelligence, situated in a world of other such intelligences and responding to them, became James's model for individuality. Like Royce, James embraced the personalist standpoint in Howison's theory, although he developed the pluralism further and in direc-tions Howison could not embrace. James rightly sensed that Howison, like Royce, was allowing a certain conception of reason and logic to inform ontological claims, and Howison even more than Royce was willing to equate rational order with the order of neces-sary being. There was little of pragmatism in Howison's temper and thinking, whether early or mature.

Borden Parker Bowne is the member of the club who did the most to develop the idea of the person as an ontological starting point for philosophical reflection. Whether Bowne used the term "personalism" first is a matter of scholarly debate, but it is clear that Howison was calling his philosophy "personal idealism" before Bowne was using the label. Bowne was also a pluralist and a practicalist if not a prag-matist, holding that no philosophical problem was severe enough to hold practical action at bay for very long, and that the final solution to philosophical problems lay in practical action. In this domain Bowne and James were simi-larly opposed to Howison's rationalism. In method Bowne regarded the person as an indispensable starting point for philosophical reflection, and while reason never warranted claims of ontological knowledge, practical faith picked up where knowledge left off. Howison insisted upon ontological and eternal status for the individual person, and his notion

of pluralism was part and parcel of this con-viction. To abandon this claim was to threaten one's pluralism. Bowne like James endeavored to negotiate the problem of the metaphysical standing of the individual without giving his philosophical soul to logic. Bowne did not place the weight upon will that Howison, Royce, and James did. Instead he favored a conception of ontological freedom, a require-ment for coherently conceiving of the Worldground, and enlisting the individual "will" along with all other existences. Howison, in contrast, argued for a harmony of freedom and determinism in light of the demand that we conceive of divine causation as final rather than efficient, any efficient cau-sation being by definition sub-divine, and this view places him alone among the company discussed in embracing a kind of traditional metaphysics with some modifications. In this regard Howison's view was most like Davidson's "Apeirotheism," a fact of which Howison was aware and believed to be a simple coincidence of minds. Howison's view was also similar to that of British idealist J. M. E. McTaggart in a number of particulars, whose atheism Howison was much exercised in disproving. Also Howison was aware of the similarity in his philosophy to the views of British pragmatist F. C. S. Schiller, and Howison was at pains to show that Schiller's finite God was an error.

In distinction from Howison, all three of the major thinkers from his fortnightly meeting of the 1870s came to espouse some form of temporalist or process thought. The differing logical ontological demands of a temporalist metaphysics opened for them approaches to reflection that made their philosophies more viable in the rough and tumble scientific advances of the twentieth century. With rela-tional logic and temporalist ontologies Royce, James, and Bowne were able to find a flexi-bility in their approaches to metaphysics unavailable to Howison (and Davidson and McTaggart). This along with his slowness to publish his ideas has given Howison limited

visibility in the history of American philosophy. Even those scholars who do write about Howison's published work rarely appreciate the depth of his influence and his indispensable presence in the discussion that formed the important philosophies of pluralism and personalism.

In spite of constant cajoling from his interlocutors, Howison did not publish his own philosophical position in any form suitable for a public response until 1901, with a collection of essays bearing the perhaps unfortunate title of *The Limits of Evolution and Other Essays*. He was not attempting to deny that evolutionary theory does properly explain certain kinds of developments in biological life, but rather registering an objection to those who attempt to make the idea of evolution explain things beyond its genuine reach, such as social and moral development, but he also articulates in detail what many still hold to be limits in evolutionary theory. Expending most of his energy using a Kantian analysis to show that evolution cannot cross the gap between the phenomenal and the noumenal, Howison goes on to show that evolution cannot, without the help of extra non-empirical principles, bridge the gaps between inorganic and organic, and between physiological and logical genesis. Howison supplies the needed principles and their foundations, weighing especially against Spencer and his followers. The essays collected under this title really consist of formal lectures that stand alone. They indicate a world view that is unified but only give its outline in a preface that reads more like a manifesto of personal idealism than a defense of it. Howison takes the opportunity of a second edition to respond to critics in a new preface and an extensive appendix. The responses to this book did prod him into several public clarifications of his view, but by the time his doctrine finally became accessible to those who had not known him at first hand, the world was rapidly changing and his philosophical era had passed him by. Most of those who have written on him attribute his lack of willingness to publish

to a perfectionism about language and writing. In his use of language he was exacting, as indicated in part by his revision of a widely used dictionary of English synonyms (1892).

Howison's mature statement of his personal idealism is contained mainly in three essays: the preface to *The Limits of Evolution*; "Personal Idealism and Moral Aims"; and "The Many and the One," which was written for the 1904 Congress and Exposition of 1904 in St. Louis. First, Howison understands philosophical reason as a quest for unity, and his pluralism has to be understood as distinct from "chaotic individualism," of which he suspected James. In Howison's view, "*every* actual mind, as that mind in its wholeness *is*, is absolutely public and universal; and even in the mind's *temporal* aspect, the aspect of its struggle toward knowledge over the rugged road of experience, such a public and universal view must in every mind be potential." Therefore, everything that exists is either a mind, objectively available, or the contents of a mind, ordered and also available. The idea of privacy of existence is a logical error. Time and space are the products of the correlation of minds, whose essential correlation was neither spatial nor temporal, but logical. The fundamental constitution of these personal minds is moral and eternal, while God is the "fulfilled type" of every actual mind. Together these minds form a "republic" or a "City of God," and are free relative to the natural world, the rational order of which they are the source. The minds evolve toward an ideal union under the auspices of a final cause which is God's activity. The objective and public character of all minds renders moral virtue of an "intrinsically social and federal character," leading Howison to espouse a sort of democracy of immortal spirits in which moral endeavor and education are synonymous, and within which all problems are solvable and the freedom of each individual can be fulfilled.

In his maturity there were precious few subjects upon which Howison could not speak as an expert, few places in the US and Europe

where he had not gained a firsthand grasp of the land and the people, and no Western philosophical, humane, or scientific study of which he was not the master. Far more than his writing it was this breadth of living and learning, of touching and influencing the finest minds and subtlest thoughts of his age, that made Howison a crucial agent in the formation of American thought.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Treatise on Analytic Geometry, Especially as Applied to the Properties of Conics (New York, 1869).

A Primer of Algebra (Cambridge, Mass., 1870).

A Synopsis of Elementary Formal Logic in Questions (San Francisco, 1888).

The Conception of God, with Josiah Royce, et al. (Berkeley, Cal., 1895; 2nd edn, New York, 1897).

The Limits of Evolution and Other Essays Illustrating the Metaphysical Theory of Personal Idealism (New York, 1901; 2nd edn 1904).

Other Relevant Works

Howison's papers are at the University of California, Berkeley.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v23*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Buckham, John Wright, and Stratton, George Malcolm. *George Holmes Howison, Philosopher and Teacher* (Berkeley, Cal., 1934).

Burrow, Rufus, Jr. "Authorship: The Personalism of George Holmes Howison and Borden Parker Bowne," *The Personalist Forum* 13 (1997): 287–303.

———, "Teleological or Ethical Personalism: George Holmes Howison," in *Personalism: A Critical Introduction* (St. Louis, 1999), pp. 53–66.

Flewelling, Ralph Tyler. "George Holmes Howison: Prophet of Freedom," *The Personalist* 38 (1957): 5–19.

McDermott, John J. "The Confrontation between Royce and Howison," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 30 (1994): 779–90.

McLachlan, James. "George Holmes Howison: The Conception of God Debate and the Beginnings of Personal Idealism," in *The Personalist Forum* 11 (1995): 1–16.

———, "The Idealist Critique of Idealism: Bowne's Theistic Personalism and Howison's City of God," *The Personalist Forum* 13 (1997): 89–106.

Perry, Ralph Barton. "George Howison (1882–1894)," in *The Thought and Character of William James*, vol. 1 (Boston, 1935), pp. 763–77.

"Special Issue on George Holmes Howison," *The Personalist Forum* 15 (Spring 1999).

Wahl, Jean. "Howison and the Californian School," in *The Pluralistic Philosophies of England and America*, trans. F. Rothwell (London, 1925), pp. 222–38.

Randall E. Auxier

HUDSON, Jay William (1874–1958)

Jay William Hudson was born on 12 March 1874 in Cleveland, Ohio. He received his BA in 1905 and MA in 1906 from the University of California at Berkeley. Hudson then went to Harvard University where he received his MA in 1907 and his PhD in philosophy in 1908. His dissertation was entitled "The Treatment of Personality by Locke, Berkeley, and Hume: A Study, in the Interests of Ethical Theory, of an Aspect of the Dialectic of English Empiricism," which he later published.

Hudson was appointed assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Missouri in 1908, was soon promoted to full professor in 1913, and served as chair of the department for many years. In 1931 he was named the John Hiram Lathrop Professor of Philosophy at Missouri, a position he held until retiring in 1944. He was President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1938–9. In retirement he continued to teach as a visiting professor at the University of Kansas City in 1946, and at Stephens College in Missouri from 1945 to 1951. He died on 11 May 1958 in Columbia, Missouri.

Besides Hudson's successful novels, which for him were natural products of his philosophical thinking, he published five major books. His general philosophical stance favored the personal idealism of his teachers, George H. HOWISON at California and Josiah ROYCE at Harvard. His course on "American Ideals" was one of the most popular courses on campus. Hudson's work in political theory culminated in *Why Democracy: A Study in the Philosophy of the State* (1936). Political theory should be grounded, according to Hudson, in an ethical justification of basic principles. The political rights that constitutional democracy protects are themselves justified by their ability to protect and nurture the self-realization of individuals. Democracy is the best form of government because it provides the greatest opportunity for moral development. His book on religion, *The Old Faiths Perish: An Adventure in the Logic of Belief* (1939), similarly judges the progress of religion's ability to supply salvation by the standard of personal self-realization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Classification of Ethical Theories," *International Journal of Ethics* 20 (1910): 408–24.
The Treatment of Personality by Locke, Berkeley, and Hume: A Study, in the Interests of Ethical Theory, of an Aspect of the Dialectic of English Empiricism (Columbia, Miss., 1911).
The College and New America (New York, 1920).
The Truths We Live By (New York, 1921).
"America as an Educational Motive," in *Essays toward Truth: Studies in Orientation*, ed. Kenneth Robinson et al. (New York, 1924).
Why Democracy: A Study in the Philosophy of the State (New York, 1936).
The Old Faiths Perish: An Adventure in the Logic of Belief (New York, 1939).
"Recent Shifts in Ethical Theory and Practice," *Philosophical Review* 49 (1940): 105–20.

Other Relevant Works
"America's International Ideals," pamphlet for the Massachusetts Peace Society (Boston, 1915).
"The Arithmetic of War," pamphlet for the Massachusetts Peace Society (Boston, 1915).
"What is New Internationalism?" pamphlet for the Massachusetts Peace Society (Boston, 1915).
Abbé Pierre (New York, 1922).
No Where Else in the World (New York, 1923).
The Eternal Circle (New York, 1925).
Abbé Pierre's People (New York, 1928).
Morning in Gascony (New York, 1935).

Further Reading
Proc of APA v32, *Pres Addr of APA v4*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who's Who in Phil*

John R. Shook

HULL, Clark Leonard (1884–1952)

Clark L. Hull was born on 24 May 1884 in a log farmhouse near Akron, New York, and died on 10 May 1952 in New Haven, Connecticut. After finishing his elementary studies at the one-room school in Sickles, Michigan, and teaching for one year at the same school, he attended West Saginaw High School. In 1903 he continued his studies in Michigan at the Academy of Alma College. There he became fascinated by geometrical reasoning and by the power of the deductive method used by geometricians to generate new knowledge from previously known elements. At the end of his second year at the Academy, an attack of typhoid fever left him with a generalized bad memory for names. Once recovered from the illness, in 1906, Hull enrolled in Alma College as a freshman and took courses in mathematics, physics, and chemistry in order to prepare himself for a career as a mining engineer. Two years later, when working in an iron mine, he fell victim to an epidemic of poliomyelitis, which left him partially crippled for the rest of his life and ended his early hopes for a career in engineering. Looking for a new occupation, he chose psychology because this new field of science was allied to philosophy in that it involved theory, and would provide him an opportunity to design and work with automatic apparatus. As a preliminary survey for the subject, during his convalescence, he read William JAMES's *Principles of Psychology*.

After two further years of teaching at his old school, Hull entered the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, where he received his BA degree in 1913. The head of the psychology department, Walter B. PILLSBURY, had just published his *Psychology of Reasoning* (1910); and this probably reawakened Hull's early interest in reasoning. More important, however, was the influence of John P. Shepard, a learning psychologist who introduced Hull to the rigorous methodology of experimental research.

In 1914, after teaching for one year in a small normal school in Richmond, Kentucky, Hull began his graduate training at the University of Wisconsin in Madison. His hope was to contribute to a new experimental science of the higher mental processes. However, the practical atmosphere of the laboratory directed by Joseph JASTROW led him into the area of applied psychology. During his second year, he began his practice in the technique of hypnosis as a preparation for the medical psychology introductory course that Jastrow turned over to him. At about the same time, he was asked to teach a course in psychological tests and measurements. He received his MA in 1915 and Jastrow appointed him as an instructor of psychology in 1916.

In 1918, Hull obtained his PhD in psychology from Wisconsin with a dissertation on the "Quantitative Aspects of the Evolution of Concepts" (1920), which was the first study on the subject made with a rigorous experimental methodology. Although its emphasis lay on the measurement of the efficacy of various methods of developing concepts, Hull included a final "qualitative experiment" designed to observe the nature of the concept formation process itself. From his observations, he reached the conclusion that concept formation was a trial-and-error learning process regulated by Edward L. THORNDIKE's laws of effect and exercise.

Hull performed the quantitative experiments with a technique inspired by Hermann Ebbinghaus's memory experiments. The material consisted in series of Chinese characters with a common radical, which had to be discriminated and then associated to a nonsense syllable playing the role of the concept. The guiding principle for this experimental setting came from William James's notion that the perception of similarity is the essence of reasoning. Concept formation was only Hull's first step on the way to a scientific explanation of reasoning and intelligence.

Hull was promoted to assistant professor of psychology in 1920 at Wisconsin and began his work on aptitude testing. Concerned with the chaotic nature of the available material, he did much to encourage the construction and validation of tests. For example, he conceived a "universal" assessment battery that might predict the probable vocational aptitude of a youth in each occupation. As this necessitated the computation of large numbers of correlations, he invented a correlation machine that performed nearly all of the arithmetic work automatically. He also wrote *Aptitude Testing* (1928), a book that was widely known in its day.

In 1922 Hull was promoted to the rank of associate professor and named Director of the Laboratory of Psychology. He then started the research program that eventually led to the wealth of experiments reported in *Hypnosis and Suggestibility* (1933). Dissatisfied with the existing state of knowledge in a field so subjective and prone to delusion, Hull wrote a book that soon became a classic in the experimental study of hypnosis. In February 1924, when development of the correlation machine was well underway, Hull instituted a seminar on "reasoning" in order to isolate problems that could be made the object of experimental attack. One year later, in 1925, he studied John B. WATSON's behaviorism in another seminar for the purpose of determining "stimulus–response" definitions for the concepts of the "old" psychology of consciousness. By the end of the seminar, he had fully decided to attempt a neo-behavioristic explanation of mental processes that would be more sophisticated than Watson's.

According to Hull, it was the attack of Gestalt psychologist Kurt KOFFKA on the inadequacies of classical behaviorism that confirmed him in this decision. Having tried unsuccessfully to study in Germany with Koffka, he managed to bring him to Wisconsin. In January 1925, in a talk given at Madison, Koffka spent most of his time attacking behaviorism; and this fact left a poor impression on Hull. Instead of being converted to the Gestalt theory, he reached the conclusion "that Watson had not made out as clear a case for behaviorism as the facts warranted" (1952, p. 154). Consequently, he decided to improve on Watson's naïve associationism with a theory that would be systematic, in that it would be deductive, completely objective, materialistic, and totally reliant on the principles of mechanics.

By the end of 1927, Hull planned to publish a series of articles that he could later gather in a "*magnum opus*" on the psychology of thinking. In January 1928, however, when he read Ivan P. Pavlov's *Conditioned Reflexes*, he changed his plans and made the conditioned reflex the subject of his first theoretical article (1929).

In 1929, while teaching a summer course in the School of Education at Harvard University, Hull experienced considerable general opposition to his materialistic theory of knowledge. Discussions with Harvard philosophers Clarence I. LEWIS and Alfred N. WHITEHEAD strengthened his interest in theory building. He read Newton's *Principia* thoroughly, finding in this book a powerful scientific theory expressed in the mode of Euclidean geometry. From then on, Newton's set of postulates and theorems would be for him the model to follow in his own theorizing.

In 1929, Hull moved to Yale University as a research professor of psychology at the Institute of Human Relations. In 1947 he was appointed to a Sterling Professorship and held this position until his death in 1952. He was President of the American Psychological Association in 1935–6, and was a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the National Academy of Sciences. Hull was honored with the Warren Medal of the Society of Experimental Psychologists in 1945.

Although Hull was supposed to work on aptitude testing at Yale, his main goal was the construction of a system that integrated Thorndike's and Pavlov's learning theories. In 1935, when the Director, Mark May, gave

new impetus to the unification of social sciences, Hull's role became prominent at the Institute. With May's support, he organized a series of seminars and established contacts with the logical positivists of the "Vienna Circle." The alliance with this influential group gave prestige to his formal models and was instrumental in his rising to the forefront in American psychology. In this way, his projected "*magnum opus*" on thinking became a systematic theory of behavior.

Hull developed his system, however, in a somewhat piecemeal fashion. During the late thirties he elaborated the key concepts in "miniature systems," such as the *Mathematico-deductive Theory of Rote Learning* (1940). A little later, in 1943, he offered the first complete set of sixteen postulates in the *Principles of Behavior*, his most widely known book. This volume was intended to present only the basic theoretical framework to be eventually used in explaining more complicated behavioral phenomena. Explanation of such phenomena was then to be the subject of two further volumes focusing on individual and social behavior respectively. However, as time passed, Hull became progressively more engrossed in the quantification of the system. A coronary attack in 1948 convinced him that he would not live long enough to complete this ambitious program. Nevertheless, he was able to publish a final revision in *Essentials of Behavior* (1951), and to finish the manuscript on the single organism's behavior, which came out after his death under the title of *A Behavior System* (1952).

Hull's theory of behavior is a good example of hypothetico-deductive system-making in psychology. Taking the biological adaptation of the organism to its environment as a frame of reference, his theory assumes that survival depends upon optimal conditions of food, water, etc., as was shown in Walter B. Cannon's studies on the physiology of the hunger and thirst drives. When one of these conditions deviates from the optimum, the organism enters a state of need, which will be eliminated only through a particular sequence of movements called "adaptive behavior." It is the primary task of psychology to isolate the basic laws by which the stimulation arising from needs on the one hand, and from the external environment on the other, bring about such adaptive behavior. To fulfill this task, the use of unobservable logical constructs, or intervening variables, was permissible, provided that such constructs were functionally related to directly observable environmental events. The central postulates of Hull's system were concerned with learning or "habit," as he termed it. Being the highest and most significant phenomenon produced by the organic evolution, habit consisted in the strengthening of certain receptor–effector connections, or in the setting up of new connections, according to the principle of reinforcement.

In *Principles of Behavior* (1943) Hull explained reinforcement in terms of drive reduction. For learning to take place, the contiguity of stimulus and response had to be closely associated with a diminution in the drive generated by a need, the *Strength of Habit* ($_SH_R$) depending on the number of times it was reinforced. The construct *Drive* (D) made reference to a general tendency to action generated by the state of need. For instance, in the need of food, the hunger drive set organisms into a state of general restlessness. The behavior's concrete direction depended upon another hypothetical entity, the *Drive Stimulus* (S_D), or stimuli produced by the drive, such as, for example, "hunger pangs" – the stomach contractions aroused by hunger. These *persistent* stimuli get conditioned to all the responses of the habit leading to the food, and in this way they play a leading role in behavior. Without their distinctiveness there could be no way for the animal to learn to go to one place for food when hungry and to another place for water when thirsty. *Drive* (D) played a critical part not only in reinforcement, but also in *Reaction Potential* ($_SE_R$), the construct expressing the strength of the tendencies determining the vigor and per-

sistency of the activity. The reaction potential equation is based on the assumption that *Drive* (D) interacts with *Habit Strength* ($_SH_R$) in a multiplicative fashion to yield a value for the *Reaction Potential* ($_SE_R = {_SH_R}$ x D). In the final revision of *Essentials of Behavior*, the equation was modified to include the amount of reward among the reaction potential variables, because the quantitative aspects of reinforcement seemed to have no influence upon habit strength. Hull also changed the conception of primary reinforcement, which came to depend on the reduction of drive-stimuli, rather than drive. The change was due in part to the fact that a non-nutritive substance like saccharine was a powerful reinforcing agent. These and other substantial changes indicated that Hull was moving in the direction of a contiguity position and left open the question of the critical factor of reinforcement.

Hull's last major work, *A Behavior System*, consisted in applying his principles to the deduction of the simpler phenomena of individual behavior. In a sense, it was the continuation of Hull's projected "*magnum opus*" on higher mental processes. But he limited himself to animal learning, leaving the study of abstract thinking to the third volume on social behavior, which he never completed. As a result of his premature death, his system remained unfinished.

Hull's behavior theory has been subject to severe criticisms since the early 1950s. Some of his theoretical formulations are loose, not as highly constructed as it was originally thought, and depend upon very weak empirical evidence. And indeed modern psychology has progressed in a direction utterly at variance with the premises of Hullian behaviorism. The fall of logical positivism in the philosophy of science and the advent of modern cognitive psychology have put in evidence the weaknesses of the stimulus–response schema.

Hull's influence, however, cannot be minimized. Judging by the number of experimental studies engendered by his theory, he was the most influential of the American neo-behav-iorists between 1930 and 1950. And his disciple, Kenneth W. Spence, trained many who would become leading American experimental psychologists of the 1950s and 1960s.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Quantitative Aspects of the Evolution of Concepts," *Psychological Monographs* 28 (1920): 1–123.

Aptitude Testing (Yonkers-on-Hudson, N.Y., 1928).

"A Functional Interpretation of the Conditioned Reflex," *Psychological Review* 36 (1929): 498–511.

"Knowledge and Purpose as Habit Mechanisms," *Psychological Review* 37 (1930): 511–25.

Hypnosis and Suggestibility: An Experimental Approach (New York, 1933).

"Mind, Mechanism and Adaptive Behavior," *Psychological Review* 44 (1937): 1–32.

Mathematico-Deductive Theory of Rote Learning (New Haven, Conn., 1940).

Principles of Behavior (New York, 1943).

Essentials of Behavior (New Haven, Conn., 1951).

A Behavior System (New Haven, Conn., 1952).

Other Relevant Works

Clark's papers are at Yale University.

"Clark L. Hull," in *A History of Psychology in Autobiography*, vol. 4, ed. Edwin G. Boring et al. (Worcester, Mass., 1952), pp. 143–62.

Mechanisms of Adaptive Behavior: Clark L. Hull's Theoretical Papers, with Commentary, ed. Abram Amsel (New York, 1984).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Bio Dict Psych by Zusne, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Encyc Cog Sci, Encyc Psych, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v41, Who Was Who in

Amer v3

Ammons, Robert B. "Psychology of the Scientist: IV. Passages from the 'Idea Books' of C. L. Hull," *Perceptual and Motor Skills* 15 (1962): 807–82.

Beach, F. A. "Obituary of Clark Leonard Hull," National Academy of Sciences *Biographical Memoirs* 33 (1959): 124–41. Contains a bibliography of Hull's writings.

Gondra, Jose M. "Clark Hull's Cognitive Articles: A New Perspective on His Behavior System," *Revista de Historia de la Psicologia* 22 (2001): 113–34.

Kimble, G. A. "Psychology from the Standpoint of a Mechanist: An Appreciation of Clark L. Hull," in *Portraits of Pioneers in Psychology*, vol. 1, ed. G. A. Kimble, M. Wertheimer, and C. White (Washington, D.C., 1991), pp. 209–25.

Koch, Sigmund. "Clark L. Hull," in *Modern Learning Theory*, ed. William K. Estes et al. (New York, 1954), pp. 1–176.

Logan, Frank A. "The Hull-Spence Approach," in *Psychology: A Study of a Science*, vol. 1, ed. Sigmund Koch (New York, 1959), pp. 293–358.

Smith, Lawrence D. *Behaviorism and Logical Positivism: A Reassessment of the Alliance* (Stanford, Cal., 1986).

Spence, Kenneth W. "Clark L. Hull: 1884–1952," *American Journal of Psychology* 65 (1952): 639–46.

Triplet, Rodney G. "The Relationship of C. L. Hull's Hypnosis Research to His Later Learning Theory," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 18 (1982): 22–31.

José María Gondra

HUME, James Gibson (1860–1949)

James Gibson Hume was born on 12 September 1860 in Toronto, Canada. Soon after, his family moved north to a farm near Barrie, Ontario (then Canada West), where he was raised. He became a temperance activist in his teens and would remain one his entire life. After teaching school for a time, he began his advanced education at St. Catherine's Collegiate Institute in his mid twenties. He soon transferred to the University of Toronto, where he founded the school's first philosophy club and received a BA with honors in 1887, winning the Governor-General's Gold Medal in Mental Science and Classics.

At the urging of his undergraduate mentor, philosopher George Paxton YOUNG, he moved to Baltimore to start graduate study at Johns Hopkins University and to learn the new experimental psychology from G. Stanley HALL, one of the leaders in the young field. Hume studied with Hall for a year, but gained no practical experience in the laboratory because Hall was then in the process of moving to the newly opened Clark University where he would become President. Instead of going with Hall to Clark, Hume went to Harvard University where he studied with Francis BOWEN, William JAMES, and Josiah ROYCE, among others. His closest relationship, though, was with the social gospel theologian Francis Greenwood PEABODY.

Just as Hume was completing his MA degree in 1889, Young died suddenly, leaving open Toronto's chair in philosophy. Hume was underqualified for the position, but Canadian nationalist sentiment rallied behind him, pressuring the provincial government into appointing him to a position. At the same time American James Mark BALDWIN was given a post in metaphysics and logic. Hume was given a two-year fellowship to obtain a PhD before taking up his teaching duties. He traveled to the University of Freiburg, where he participated briefly in the psychology laboratory of Hugo MÜNSTERBERG as well as writing a thesis

entitled "Political Economy and Ethics" under the supervision of Alois Riehl. He received his PhD in philosophy in 1871.

Upon returning to Toronto to take up his position as professor of ethics and history of philosophy in 1891, he presented an address entitled "The Value of the Study of Ethics." Soon after, he presented a lecture to the Ontario Teachers Federation that was highly critical of "physiological" (experimental) psychology. Despite his misgivings about psychology, in 1892 he became a charter member of the American Psychological Association, which was founded by his old teacher, Hall, and joined members James, Royce, and Baldwin. He even traveled to Philadelphia in December 1892 to attend the nascent group's first annual meeting.

When Baldwin left Toronto for Princeton University in 1893, Hume became the sole professor of philosophy at Toronto. In 1894 he published a two-part article entitled "Socialism" in a local journal. The piece was, in essence, an extended call for the prohibition of alcohol. Along the way, however, he rejected pragmatism, "materialistic naturalism," and Herbert Spencer's social Darwinism. He also outlined a hierarchy of religions in which he declared Christianity to be superior to Stoicism, Epicureanism, and Hinduism, and Protestantism to be superior to Catholicism. He proclaimed that individualism (which, for him, implied Americanism) leads to anarchy, and that the individual must work for the greater good of society. Over the next few years he wrote a number of minor pieces on psychology, on Christianity, and on prohibition. He also wrote a short introduction to a collection of translations of Schopenhauer's works.

The major work of Hume's career, "Evolution and Personality," was first presented in an address in 1907. It was not published in full until 1922. In it he dubbed his general philosophical position "constructive idealism," which he declared to be "resolutely opposed to both materialism and rationalism."

Broadly speaking, his stance was in line with the British idealist tradition developed by Thomas Hill Green and Edward Caird and popularized in Canada by his mentor, Young, and by Queen's University philosopher John WATSON. The piece outlines a hierarchy of kinds of consciousness (self-consciousness, self-regulative consciousness, self-sacrificing consciousness, cooperating consciousness, etc.). These are hierarchically arranged into a kind of progressive ladder of morality which, he declared, could not possibly have been the product of evolution. He concludes with the assertion that "theism" – Christianity, specifically – explains the facts of consciousness better than materialism or "pantheism."

Hume regularly made presentations at the conferences of the American Psychological Association, the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology, and the American Philosophical Association through the first decade of the twentieth century. He published little, however, and when he did it was invariably in local journals or newspapers. During World War I he wrote several popular, polemical pieces on the destructive character of German philosophy (and philosophers), taking particular aim at his old teacher Münsterberg (who had moved to Harvard in 1892). In 1915 he removed all German works from his course reading lists.

Hume was never a popular teacher. As early as 1894, and again in 1904, there were newspaper items complaining of the teaching skills of some Toronto professors. In both cases Hume was among the targets. Both incidents led to investigations in which it was concluded that Hume was competent enough to avoid dismissal. In 1919 budgetary control of the psychology laboratory (which had lapsed into disuse under Hume) was taken away from the philosophy department and given over, first, to psychiatrist Charles K. Clarke, and then in 1921 to philosopher George Sidney BRETT, who would become head of the Toronto philosophy department on Hume's departure. In 1926, having reached the age of retirement,

Hume asked the administration for an extension to his career. The request was refused (though similar requests were granted to eleven of twelve others professors that year).

Hume served as chair of the Canadian Prohibition Bureau for a time after his retirement. He spent winters in Toronto and summers on his farm in Simcoe County, Ontario for the next twenty years. He died on 28 January 1949 in Brantford, Ontario.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Value of a Study of Ethics (Toronto, 1891).
Political Economy and Ethics (Toronto, 1892).
"Physiological Psychology," in *Minutes of the Thirty-first Annual Convention of the Ontario Teachers' Association* (Toronto, 1892), pp. 86–106.
"Socialism," *Knox College Monthly* 14 (1894): 601–14, 661–74.
"Prohibition as a Problem of Individual and Social Reform," *Acta Victoriana* 24 (1900): 5–112, 248–56.
"Evolution and Personality," in *Philosophical Essays Presented to John Watson* (Kingston, Ontario, 1922), pp. 298–330.

Further Reading
Green, Christopher D. "Toronto's 'Other' Original APA Member: James Gibson Hume," *Canadian Psychology* 43 (2002): 35–45.
———, "The Hiring of James Mark Baldwin and James Gibson Hume at Toronto in 1889," *History of Psychology* 7 (2004): 130–53.
Slater, John. *Minerva's Aviary: Philosophy at Toronto, 1843–2000* (Toronto, 2005), chaps 4, 6.

Christopher D. Green

HUMPHREY, George (1889–1966)

George Humphrey was born on 17 July 1889 in Boughton, Kent, England. He studied classics at the University of Oxford, and psychology at the University of Leipzig with Wilhelm Wundt. After teaching classics at St. Francis Xavier University in Canada from 1916 to 1918, he pursued a PhD in psychology at Harvard, and received it in 1920. He then served as assistant professor of psychology at Wesleyan University in Connecticut from 1920 to 1924, during which time he wrote a popular account of contemporary findings in experimental psychology entitled *The Story of Man's Mind* (1923). This book included reference to findings of the three major schools of psychology at that time: behaviorism, Gestalt psychology, and psychoanalysis.

In 1924 Humphrey became the Charlton Professor of Philosophy at Queen's University in Kingston, Ontario, Canada, with a mandate to introduce experimental psychology into the curriculum. In 1939, he helped found the Canadian Psychological Association and hired Donald O. Hebb as Queen's first lecturer in experimental psychology. During this period he also wrote two science fiction novels – entitled *Men are Like Animals* (1937) and *Go Home, Unicorn* (1935) – under the pseudonym "Donald Macpherson." During his years at Queen's, Humphrey established the academic foundation for the separation of psychology from the philosophy department, which took place in 1950 after his departure for the University of Oxford. In 1947 he became Oxford's first professor of psychology, and in 1948 he became the first Director of Oxford's Institute of Experimental Psychology. In 1956 he retired to Cambridge, England, where he died on 24 April 1966.

The pattern of Humphrey's lifetime research reflected his concern with integrating the separate approaches of the various schools. In writing *The Story of Man's Mind*, he had found that he could not deliver a popular account of problem solving by adults, or even

of the normal flow of adult mental associations, without recourse to the notion that all thought was guided by motives of some kind. In a second popular book, *Directed Thinking* (1948), he suggested that psychoanalysis might provide a rationale whereby even conflicting thought processes could be shown to have an underlying logical structure if the motives underlying them possessed common elements. Humphrey's *Thinking* (1951) is the most detailed account in English of the research on human mental problem solving that had been carried out in Germany by the Würzburg School, by Otto Selz, and by the Gestalt psychologists. Their experiments all demonstrated the importance of motivation ("set") in determining the sequence of thoughts.

Humphrey had also found, in writing *The Story of Man's Mind*, that any attempted description of a mental experience had to take into account the spatiotemporal and emotional background ("context") of the experience. He extended this observation to include classical conditioning. Having demonstrated experimentally that land snails can learn not to respond defensively to a sudden stimulus that is frequently repeated, he argued that a dog in a Pavlovian experiment, in which the dog had to learn to salivate at the sound of a metronome, first had to learn not to respond defensively to the metronome. He also showed that, if a person had learned to respond defensively to a particular tone because that tone had been regularly associated with an unpleasant stimulus, that same tone failed to evoke a defensive response if it formed one of a sequence of arpeggiated tones. The need to integrate discussions of background contexts into learning theory was emphasized in his book *The Nature of Learning* (1933). This book also helped pioneer the homeostatic approach, according to which organisms are viewed as "systems" that maintain not only physiological, but also psychological, equilibrium by correcting anomalous aberrations from a normal state.

In *The Story of Man's Mind*, Humphrey illustrated the role of experience in determining adult conduct by citing a case-history concerning a child who had been abandoned in France in the 1790s and who had been discovered, at about the age of ten, unable to walk, talk, or behave like non-abandoned ten-year-olds. This story, first told by J.-M. G. Itard, was translated by Humphrey and his first wife, Muriel Miller Humphrey, in *The Wild Boy of Aveyron* (1932).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Story of Man's Mind (Boston, 1923).
The Nature of Learning in Its Relation to the Living System (London, 1933).
Directed Thinking (New York, 1948).
Thinking: An Introduction to Its Experimental Psychology (London, 1951).

Other Relevant Works
Trans. with Muriel M. Humphrey, *The Wild Boy of Aveyron*, by J.-M. G. Itard (New York, 1932).
Go Home, Unicorn (London, 1935).
Men are Like Animals (London, 1937).

Further Reading
Bio Dict Psych by Zusne
Blackburn, Julian. "George Humphrey," *Canadian Journal of Psychology* 11 (1957): 141–50.

David J. Murray

HUNGERLAND, Isabel Payson Creed
(1907–87)

Isabel Creed was born in Alameda, California, on 25 June 1907. She received the BA degree in Latin from the University of California at Berkeley in 1930. After studying philosophy at the University of Oxford for one year, she

returned to Berkeley, receiving a PhD in philosophy in 1936. Married to art professor Helmut Hungerland, she spent most of her life in California. She taught in the philosophy department at the University of California at Los Angeles from 1936 to 1940, and then did non-academic work during World War II. After the war she lectured in the philosophy department at Berkeley during 1945 and 1946, and then taught in the department of speech there from 1947 to 1961. In 1961 she transferred to Berkeley's philosophy department, where she remained as professor of philosophy until her retirement in 1967. She was President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association in (1962–63), and President of the American Society for Aesthetics (during 1965–67). Hungerland died on 9 March 1987 in Berkeley, California.

Hungerland's research ranges from aesthetics to philosophy of language and history of philosophy. Her first book, *Poetic Discourse* (1958), juxtaposes aesthetics and philosophy of language. She believed that traditional problems in understanding, interpreting, and evaluating literature can be settled through a clearer understanding of language. Hungerland placed poetry alongside the other types of discourse, denying there are any special features of language essential to poetry that are not common to all types of discourse. She rejected the view that the language of poetry is emotive, as well as two common opposing views about truth and poetry. For Hungerland, the truth in poetry stemmed from the writer's unique ability to understand and articulate human behavior through the suggestive power of words. She also elucidated such topics as appraisals of literary worth, figurative language, symbols in poetry, and the interpretation of poetry, all by way of linguistic analysis.

Hungerland's second project, with George Vick, was a translation of Hobbes's *Logica* with a lengthy introduction, published as *Thomas Hobbes: Part 1 of De Corpore* (1981). The project arose when the authors recognized errors in the previous translation that lead to a misinterpretation of Hobbes's *Logica*. Specifically, the notions of naming and signifying were confused, which obscured a theory of signifying in Hobbes's *Logica*.

Hungerland was also concerned with the analysis of aesthetic concepts. She understood there are two sorts of features we ascribe to a work of art; following Frank Sibley, she referred to them as aesthetic and non-aesthetic. Statements referring to aesthetic features differ from those referring to non-aesthetic ones in that they do not have the same logical force because they are not verifiable in a straightforward way. Accordingly, the relationship between aesthetic and non-aesthetic is perceptual rather than logical, as one cannot reason one's way from the non-aesthetic to the aesthetic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Justification of the Habit of Induction," *Journal of Philosophy* 37 (1940): 85–103.

"Iconic Signs and Expressiveness," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 3 (1944): 15–21.

"The Interpretation of Poetry," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 13 (1955): 351–9.

"The Concept of Intention in Art Criticism," *Journal of Philosophy* 52 (1955): 733–41.

Poetic Discourse (Berkeley, Cal., 1958).

"Contextual Implication," *Inquiry* 3 (1960): 211–58.

"The Logic of Aesthetic Concepts," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 36 (1963): 43–66.

"Once Again, Aesthetic and Non-aesthetic," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 22 (1968): 285–95.

Other Relevant Works

"Hobbes's Theory of Signification," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 11 (1973): 459–82.

Trans. with George Vick, *Thomas Hobbes: Part I of De Corpore* (New York, 1981).

"The Updating of the Leviathan," *Hobbes Studies* 8 (1995): 37–45.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v7, Who's Who in Phil
Zuniga, J. A. "Critical Analysis and Its Subject Matter," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 32 (1973): 229–37.

Melanie McQuitty

HUNTINGTON, Edward Vermilye (1874–1952)

Edward Vermilye Huntington was born 26 April 1874 in Clinton, New York. He was educated at Harvard University, where he was a student of Josiah ROYCE, receiving his BA in 1895 and his MA in mathematics in 1897. Huntington taught mathematics at Harvard from 1895 to 1897 and Williams College from 1897 to 1899. He then attended the University of Strassburg, earning his PhD in mathematics in 1901 with a dissertation on algebra. He returned to join Harvard's mathematics department in 1901 and remained there until retiring in 1941, interrupted only by service in the Statistical Branch of the US War Department during World War I. In 1913 he was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He was one of the founders of the Mathematical Association of America and served as its President in 1919. He was also Vice President of the American Mathematical Society in 1924. Huntington died on 25 November 1952 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Huntington was one of the American postulate theorists whose work connected nineteenth-century contributions in algebraic logic to model theory that developed out of the early twentieth-century work of David Hilbert, Leopold Löwenheim, and Thoralf Albert Skolem. Huntington worked on axiomatics, algebraic structure theory, lattice theory, postulate theory, and Boolean algebra. His 1902 definition of a group was, Gerrit Birkhoff claimed, the "earliest American contribution to postulate theory," applying Hilbert's concepts of an independent and categorical set of postulates to algebra, "apparently for the first time" (Birkhoff 1976, p. 51).

Huntington corresponded with Charles PEIRCE, sending Peirce a preprint of "A Set of Independent Postulates for the Algebra of Logic" (1904), and he received from Peirce a "proof" that all Boolean algebras are distributive, which he published as a footnote. The correspondence between Peirce and Huntington points strongly toward the conclusion that it is only after Huntington defined Boolean algebras (including Peirce's 1880 axiomatization of Boolean algebra in "On the Algebra of Logic"), as complete complemented lattices, making it explicit for him, that Peirce fully recognized the lattice as a distinct mathematical entity.

In "A Set of Independent Postulates for the Algebra of Logic" (1904), Huntington examined Ernst Schröder's algebraic logic, and therefore helped develop model theory by making it relevant to logic. Examining the developments in logic at the start of the twentieth century and attempting to gauge the impact of the newest work of Gottlob Frege, Giuseppe Peano, David Hilbert, Bertrand Russell, of the postulate theorists, and its relation to the older work in algebraic logic from George Boole through Peirce and Ernst Schröder and looking at the current situation in logic, Huntington and Christine LADD-FRANKLIN (1905) declared that "it is too early to predict what the final outcome of this new movement will be." They questioned the logicist thesis that logic and mathematics are really one and the same. Huntington's more didactically attuned treatment of the subject of the postulate systems for algebras appeared as "The Fundamental Propositions of Algebra" (1911).

In his "New Sets of Independent Postulates for the Algebra of Logic" (1933), Huntington took a cue from Charles Peirce's manuscript "A Boolian Algebra with One Constant" of the winter of 1880–81 and from Henry Maurice SHEFFER's 1913 article "A Set of Five Independent Postulates for Boolean Algebras," which Peirce's manuscript anticipated. In his article, Huntington demonstrated that a Boolean algebra could be defined in terms of a single binary and a single unary operation, and saw Alfred North WHITEHEAD's early contributions to logic and algebra as the culmination of work on the Boolean algebra, writing that this work in algebraic logic and Boolean algebra was "originated by Boole, extended by Schröder, and perfected by Whitehead" (1933, p. 278). In "New Sets of Independent Postulates for the Algebra of Logic", "Independent Postulates for the 'Informal' Part of *Principia Mathematica*" (1934), and "Independent Postulates for an 'Informal' *Principia* System with Equality" (1934), he showed how Whitehead and Russell's propositional calculus can be considered a Boolean algebra. In a letter of 10 November 1905, Russell wrote to Lucy Donnelly (Feinberg and Karsils 1973, p. 32) that Huntington has "written works in which they make pleasing references to me." Russell also wrote to Helen Thomas Flexner on 15 March 1906 (Griffin 1992, p. 296) that he was "surprised and pleased" by what she had reported on his reputation at Harvard, adding that "I knew I was read by Royce and a young man named Huntington …" The reference to Huntington in the letter to Donnelly might have been to Huntington's "The Continuum as a Type of Order" (1905), where we read (1905, p. 151; 1917, pp. 1–2): "The fact that a complete definition of the continuum has been given in terms of order alone has been signalized by Russell," referring to Russell's *Principles of Mathematics* (Russell 1903, p. 303) "as one of the most notable achievements of modern pure mathematics …" In this work, Huntington anticipated the concepts of *relational structure* and *algebraic structure* (1905, §11). This article became the basis of his book *The Continuum* (1917), which was a standard work on set theory for many years.

Huntington helped spread the ideas of American postulate theory through his European contacts. During Karl Menger's visit to Harvard, Huntington introduced Menger and through him, the members of the Vienna Circle, to the theory (Menger 1994, pp. 163–6). Huntington and Russell met in 1912 when Huntington attended the Fifth International Congress of Mathematicians that was held at Cambridge University in the summer of 1912. Huntington spoke on "A Set of Postulates for Abstract Geometry, Expressed in Terms of the Simple Relation of Inclusion." Russell was present at the congress, serving as one of its secretaries and participating actively in the program, chairing several sessions, including the one on Thursday, 22 August 1912 at which Huntington was elected one of two secretaries. In his lecture, Huntington sought to develop solid geometry in terms of the logical relation of inclusion and replacing the undefined primitive concept of "point" with that of "sphere," where a point is defined as a sphere which includes no other sphere. In this investigation he also considered the independence, consistency, and categoricity of his set of postulates. Huntington's talk was commented upon by Whitehead (Hobson and Love 1913, pp. 53–4).

Huntington treated the algebra of logic as a *logica utens* rather than as a *logica magna*: the purpose of his work was to devise the smallest system of postulates, or axioms, that would be sufficient to deduce a known algebraic (or geometric) structure of a given complexity, for example, a group. The postulates chosen were to be those which, upon interpretation, would yield the mathematical object(s) required to satisfy the structure, for example, for group arithmetic. In this sense, his careful selection of postulates followed Hilbert's aim that it did not matter whether one called the elements of the postulational systems points, lines, and planes, or tables, chairs, and beer mugs. What

was significant was that, deducing through careful logic whatever was possible on the basis of the given postulates, and providing an interpretation to those elements, one arrived at a coherent and consistent mathematical structure, be that an algebraic group or the system of real numbers (1903) or complex numbers (1905), or of a geometrical universe (his 1913 papers), etc. He differed from contemporaries, such as Russell, however, by regarding his postulates as uninterpreted, to which an interpretation could afterward be given, whereas axioms were statements of "fact" in which the interpretation was provided in advance. The popular elaboration of his approach was given by Huntington in "The Postulational Method" (1937), in which it was spelled out in comparison with the axiomatic method.

The arbiter of any postulate system is its categoricity and completeness. In every work, Huntington endeavored to show the independence of his postulate system (or, in modern terms, axiom set) as well as its categoricity. If every interpretation of a postulate system is isomorphic to every other interpretation of that system, then the system is said to be *categorical*. In that case, every possible proposition in the language of that system is either true for every interpretation, or every possible proposition of that system is false for every interpretation. The postulate theory is *complete* if each possible proposition of the language of the system or of the negation of such a proposition is implied by the set of postulates. In contemporary mathematical logic, the study of the categoricty and completeness of a theory belongs to the branch of logic known as model theory.

In addition to his work in pure mathematics, especially in logic, Huntington also contributed to the applications of logic to physics, suggesting in his (1917) "The Logical Skeleton of Elementary Dynamics" that *force* be treated as a more fundamental concept of physics than *mass*; although this terminology is closer to Isaac Newton's conception of *energy* than to Albert EINSTEIN's, it indicates a readiness

to regard matter as secondary to energy or force as the most fundamental concept of dynamics. During World War I, Huntington worked on statistical problems, and he carried this interest forward in the 1920s by devising a fractional method of determining allotments for proportional representation for the US House of Representatives (1928).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Simplified Definitions of a Group," *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 8 (1902): 296–300.

"A Complete Set of Postulates for the Theory of Absolute Continuous Magnitude," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 3 (1903): 264–79.

"A Set of Independent Postulates for the Algebra of Logic," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 5 (1904): 288–309.

"Symbolic Logic," with Christine Ladd-Franklin, *Encyclopedia Americana* (New York, 1905), vol. 9. Reprinted in *Encyclopedia Americana* (New York, 1934), vol. 17, pp. 568–73.

"The Continuum as a Type of Order, I," *Annals of Mathematics* 6 (1905): 151–84.

"A Set of Postulates for Ordinary Complex Algebra," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 6 (1905): 209–22.

"The Fundamental Propositions of Algebra," in *Monographs of Modern Mathematics Relevant to the Elementary Field*, ed. John Young (Washington D.C., 1911), pp. 149–207.

"A Set of Postulates for Abstract Geometry, Expressed in Terms of the Simple Relation of Inclusion," (abstract) in *Proceedings of the Fifth International Congress of Mathematicians*, ed. Ernest Hobson and Augustus Love (Cambridge, Mass., 1913), vol. 2, pp. 466–70.

"A Set of Postulates for Abstract Geometry, Expressed in Terms of the Simple

Relation of Inclusion," *Mathematische Annalen* 73 (1913): 522–9.

The Continuum and Other Types of Serial Order (Cambridge, Mass., 1917).

"The Apportionment of Representatives in Congress," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 30 (1928): 85–110.

"New Sets of Independent Postulates for the Algebra of Logic," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 35 (1933): 274–304.

"Boolean Algebra. A Correction," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 35 (1933): 557–8, 971.

"Independent Postulates for the 'Informal' Part of *Principia Mathematica*," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 40 (1934): 127–36.

"Independent Postulates for an 'Informal' *Principia* System with Equality," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 40 (1934): 137–42.

"The Method of Postulates," *Philosophy of Science* 4 (1937): 482–95.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*

Birkhoff, Gerrit. "The Rise of Modern Algebra to 1936," in *Men and Institutions in American Mathematics*, ed. J. Tarwater, J. White, and J. Miller (Lubbock, Tex., 1976), pp. 41–63.

Bridgman, Percy Williams, et al. "Edward Vermilye Huntington, 1874–1952," *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 59 (1953): 399.

Corcoran, John. "From Categoricity to Completeness," *History and Philosophy of Logic* 2 (1981): 113–19.

Duren, Peter L., ed. *A Century of Mathematics in America* (Providence, R.I., 1988), vol. 1, pp. 269–73.

Feinberg, Barry, and Ronald Karsils. *Bertrand Russell's America, 1896–1945* (New York, 1973).

Griffin, Nick, ed. *The Selected Letters of Bertrand Russell, vol. 1: The Private Years, 1884–1914* (Boston, New York, and London, 1992).

Menger, Karl. *Reminiscences of the Vienna Circle and the Mathematical Colloquium* (Dordrecht, 1994).

Peirce, Charles Sanders. "On the Algebra of Logic," *American Journal of Mathematics* 3 (1880): 15–57.

———, "A Boolian Algebra with One Constant" (winter of 1880–81), in *Writings of Charles S. Peirce: A Chronological Edition, vol. 4: 1879–1884* (Bloomington, Ind., 1989), pp. 218–22.

Russell, Bertrand. *The Principles of Mathematics* (London, 1903).

Scanlan, Michael. "Who Were the American Postulate Theorists?" *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 56 (1991): 981–1002.

Irving H. Anellis

HUSIK, Isaac (1876–1939)

Isaac Husik was born on 10 February 1876 in Vaseutinez, Poltava, Russia. His father, Wolf Husik, was a Hebrew scholar and teacher. The family emigrated to the United States in 1888 to live in Philadelphia. Isaac abandoned his training to become a rabbi at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America when his questions about dogmas were not satisfied, but he remained an orthodox Jew his entire life. Husik turned to philosophy and received his degrees from the University of Pennsylvania: the BA in 1897; the MA in 1899; and the PhD in philosophy in 1903, studying with George Stuart FULLERTON.

Unable to obtain a regular philosophy appointment as a Jew, Husik taught Hebrew and Jewish philosophy at Gratz College in

Philadelphia from 1898 until 1916, and taught philosophy as a lecturer at the University of Pennsylvania from 1911 to 1916. In 1916 he was finally given an appointment as assistant professor of philosophy, after the efforts of colleagues Edgar A. SINGER, Jr. and William NEWBOLD. In 1922 Husik was promoted to full professor of philosophy, and held that position until his death. He served as a trustee of Gratz College for many years, and was editor of the Jewish Publication Society from 1924 until his death on 22 March 1939 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Husik was a superb scholar of Jewish, ancient, and medieval philosophy and theology. Competent in eleven languages, including Aramaic, German, Russian, and Arabic, he taught his ancient courses in Greek, and published translations of Greek and Jewish scholars including Aristotle and Albo. Since his colleagues Singer and Newbold were also specialists in the history of philosophy, the Pennsylvania philosophy department produced many capable graduates in that area, and the department has maintained that tradition of strength in philosophy's history down to the present day. Husik made another notable contribution to philosophy at Pennsylvania by applying his knowledge of philosophy of law (through earning the LL.B. degree from Pennsylvania in 1919) to introducing the first course in jurisprudence at the university in 1918.

Husik's *A History of Mediaeval Jewish Philosophy* (1916) was one of the earliest comprehensive studies of the field in America and remained in print over seventy years. He published several other important studies of Jewish philosophy, and edited the philosophical portions of the *Standard Jewish Encyclopaedia*. His work on Aristotle was not as widely influential but still highly regarded, and has been cited with approval by later Aristotle scholars. Husik's work on legal theory and the nature of justice displays influences from legal historicism, pragmatism, and realism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"On the Categories of Aristotle," *Philosophical Review* 13 (1904): 514–28.

Judah Messer Leon's Commentary on the "Vetus logica," a Study Based on Three mss., with a Glossary of Hebrew Logical and Philosophical Terms (Leiden, The Netherlands, 1906).

"Matter and Form in Aristotle: A Rejoinder," in *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, vol. 25 (Berlin, 1912).

A History of Mediaeval Jewish Philosophy (New York, 1916; 1930; Philadelphia, 1944).

"Studies in Gersonides," *Jewish Quarterly Review* ns 7 (1916–7): 553–94; 8 (1917–8): 113–56, 231–68.

"Joseph Albo, the Last of the Mediaeval Jewish Philosophers," *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 1 (1928): 61–72.

"The Philosophy of Maimonides," *Maimonides Octocentennial Series*, no. 4 (New York, 1935).

Philosophical Essays, Ancient, Mediaeval and Modern, ed. Milton C. Nahm and Leo Strauss (Oxford, 1952).

Other Relevant Works

"Averroës on the Metaphysics of Aristotle," *Philosophical Review* 18 (1909): 416–28.

"Theory of Independence," *Journal of Philosophy* 10 (1913): 347–53.

Trans., *Law as a Means to an End*, by Rudolf von Jhering (Boston, 1913).

"The Legal Philosophy of Rudolf Stammler," *Columbia Law Review* 24 (1924): 373–89.

Trans., *The Theory of Justice*, by Rudolf Stammler (New York, 1925).

Trans., *Sefer `ikarim*, 5 vols, by Joseph Albo (Philadelphia, 1929–30).

"The Authenticity of Aristotle's Categories," with William D. Ross, *Journal of Philosophy* 36 (1939): 427–33.

Further Reading

Nat Cycl Amer Bio

Levinthal, Louis E. "The Memory of Isaac Husik," *The Jewish Exponent* (19 April 1940).

Strauss, Leo. "Preface," to *Philosophical Essays, Ancient, Mediaeval & Modern*, by Isaac Husik (Oxford, 1952). Reprinted in *Jewish Philosophy and the Crisis of Modernity: Essays and Lectures in Modern Jewish Thought*, by Leo Strauss (Albany, N.Y., 1997), pp. 235–66.

John R. Shook

HYDE, William DeWitt (1858–1917)

William DeWitt Hyde was a clergyman, an educator, and a scholar. While his numerous articles and books offer the most enduring form of evidence of his legacy, Hyde also helped the Auburn Street Congregational Church and Bowdoin College recover from some of their most difficult circumstances. However, his scholarly pursuits and his administrative efforts were not disparate expressions of his talents and interests. By contrast, the varying levels of influence forged upon him by schools of thought such as idealism and pragmatism led to his successes in both arenas. He reasoned that an individual's metaphysical inclinations create a structure of aspiration in which one's most instrumental efforts find purpose and meaning. He is remembered as a practical idealist who was considered by many of his contemporaries to be worthy of high regard.

Hyde was born on 23 September 1858, in Winchendon, Massachusetts, to Joel Hyde and Eliza DeWitt Hyde. Joel's formal professional interests were split between a life of farming and woodworking. While apparently quite industrious, he preferred to spend a considerable amount of time studying theological matters. Eliza was also apparently quite industrious. Besides tending to the needs of her family at home, she was interested in studying theological matters and demonstrated a significant sense of musical talent. However, six weeks after William's birth, his mother died at the age of thirty. In the spring of 1866 his father died leaving his care a matter of some debate amongst his remaining relatives.

William spent the remainder of his youth being reared by a host of relatives. Eventually, care for the young boy was transferred to a cousin of his father and this gentleman's wife, John Hyde and Sarah Moseman Hyde of Southbridge, Massachusetts. Under their care, William's fortunes improved. Although he took time off from school to work at a mill, he soon discovered that he was a young man of keen intellect. Eventually, with the financial support of other relatives, he enrolled at Phillips Exeter Academy. Perhaps his first published work was written while he was a student at Phillips Exeter Academy, *The Real Diary of a Real Boy*. This work came as a result of his nomination by his classmates to be the one to tell the history of their class. Such enjoyable memories prompted him to return to Phillips Exeter to provide a long tenure of service as a member of the school's board of trustees.

Following graduation from Phillips Exeter, Hyde enrolled at Harvard University, where he received his BA in 1879, graduating eighth in his class and a member of Phi Beta Kappa. He was involved in co-curricular organizations such as the Christian Brethren and the Everett Athenaeum. As a member of the Philosophical Club, he heard guest lecturers by pragmatists such as William JAMES. However, during his sophomore year at Harvard, Hyde formally converted to Christianity and eventually made a commitment to serve as a minister. Little is known as to why Hyde initially chose Union Theological Seminary in New York for his ministerial training. Even less appears to be known as to why he chose to transfer from

Union to Andover Theological Seminary at the end of his first year. Speculation concerning this decision rests with Hyde's inclination to think in a more systematic fashion (as was popular at Andover) versus a more historical/critical fashion (as was popular at Union). Harvard philosopher George H. PALMER had introduced Hyde to the work of G. W. F. Hegel. Palmer's teaching, combined with the writings of Josiah ROYCE, had a profound influence on Hyde's appreciation of Hegel's philosophical notion of absolute idealism.

Hyde was called to serve as pastor of the Auburn Street Congregational Church in Paterson, New Jersey in 1883. His license to preach was issued by the Woburn (Massachusetts) Association but he was ordained in Paterson by the Reverend Amory S. Bradford of Montclair, N.J. During his brief time at Auburn Street, Hyde refocused the theological viability and financial solvency of the congregation. Although he enjoyed his duties as a minister, his inclinations to serve as a college faculty member and administrator were growing stronger and stronger.

In June 1885 Hyde was elected by a unanimous vote by the boards of overseers and trustees of Bowdoin College in Brunswick, Maine to serve the institution as President and the Stone Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy. On 23 June 1886 he gave his inaugural address to the Bowdoin College community. In a manner reminiscent of his exposure to the philosophical schools of pragmatism and idealism, he argued that Bowdoin's "usefulness to the community is its only claim to support. Its fruitfulness in service to the church, society and state constitutes its sole right to be." (1886, p. 22) Hyde's challenge to the Bowdoin community was desperately needed. Prior to his appointment, Bowdoin had gone without a president for several years and student enrollment was beginning to drop. Under Hyde's long tenure of leadership as President and professor of philosophy, positions he held until his death, Bowdoin and its reputation thrived. For

example, by his death on 29 June 1917 in Brunswick, Maine, Bowdoin's academic records indicate Hyde had appointed all but two of the current faculty members. The curriculum was transformed from being one that was almost entirely prescribed to being predominantly elective. Major gifts were cultivated for the construction of facilities for the sciences, the arts, and athletics. However, Hyde also cultivated a sense of influence beyond the Bowdoin campus. For example, in addition to serving as the university preacher at Harvard University from 1897 to 1899 and at the University of Chicago in 1902, he presented the Lyman Beecher Lectures at Yale University in 1916.

Hyde was the author and/or editor of over fifteen books and approximately 180 articles in various periodicals. In qualitative terms, Hyde's interests were so diverse that his work found its way into periodicals ranging from *Atlantic Monthly* to *Good Housekeeping* as well as from *The Congregationalist* to *Educational Review*. His first published article was in the September issue of the *New Englander* and was entitled "The Metaphysical Basis of the Belief in God." His first published book was *Practical Idealism*, in 1897.

Practical Idealism proved to be Hyde's chief metaphysical effort and provided a framework for many of his later works. In this work, he argued that thought constructs the natural world while love seeks to create a spiritual world. He took the opportunity to implore others to apply their own faith to create an understanding of the world. Hyde returned to this understanding of love in his *From Epicurus to Christ* (1904). The essence of his argument in this work is that five great philosophies of life and human personality were established between the time of Socrates and Jesus Christ. While each one of these philosophies possesses a significant sense of merit, Jesus's spirit of love proves to be the final philosophy needed for life.

This understanding of love continues to manifest itself in Hyde's work even when he

shifts the methodological approach in his writings from one that is primarily philosophical to one that is primarily biblical. In his work entitled *The Gospel of Good Will* (1916), Hyde argued that the cultivation of good will inevitably manifests itself as love for God and love for one's neighbor. The most immediate arena in which this sense of love is cultivated is the church. However, for Hyde, the church is called to share this sense of good will by sharing love with others. Inevitably, for Hyde the tests of the gospel of good will are evident in pragmatic efforts and the results they engender – especially when they appear to be successful in remaking the kingdom of the earth into the kingdom of heaven.

True to his philosophical commitments, Hyde's publications also include examples of how his practical idealism can profit various segments within the population – particularly educators. For example, in his *The Teacher's Philosophy In and Out of School* (1910), Hyde applied ideas he detailed in *From Epicurus to Christ* to what he defined as the identity of the teacher outside of the school. As a result, he was able to develop (and reportedly embody) an understanding of teachers "who are simply persons whose authority is based on their power to serve more intelligently and effectively the interests and aims, latent or expressed, in the minds and wills of all concerned" (1904, p. iii).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Practical Idealism (New York, 1897).
God's Education of Man (Boston, 1899).
The Art of Optimism as Taught by Robert Browning (New York, 1900).
Jesus' Way (Boston, 1902).
From Epicurus to Christ (New York, 1904).
The College Man and the College Woman (Boston, 1906).
Abba Father (New York, 1908).
Sin and Its Forgiveness (Boston, 1909).
The Teacher's Philosophy In and Out of School (Boston, 1910).

The Five Great Philosophies of Life (New York, 1911).
The Quest of the Best (New York, 1913).
Are You Human? (New York, 1916).
The Gospel of Good Will (New York, 1916).
The Best Man I Know (New York, 1917).
Self-Measurement (New York, 1924).

Other Relevant Works
Addresses at the Inauguration of the Rev. William DeWitt Hyde as President of Bowdoin College (Brunswick, Maine, 1886).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v1*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Addresses Delivered at Public Services at Bowdoin College, October Twenty-Fourth, Nineteen Hundred and Seventeen, and Other Tributes to the Memory of President William DeWitt Hyde (Brunswick, Maine, 1917).
Burnett, Charles T. *Hyde of Bowdoin: A Biography of William DeWitt Hyde* (Boston, 1931).

Todd C. Ream

HYSLOP, James Hervey (1854–1920)

James H. Hyslop was born on 18 August 1854 in Xenia, Ohio. He earned the BA from the College of Wooster in 1877. Although he immediately went into teaching upon graduation, his growing dissatisfaction with the religious denomination of his youth, Associate Presbyterianism, led him to pursue philosophical studies in Europe. From 1882 to 1884, he studied with Wilhelm Wundt, the founder of experimental psychology, at the

University of Leipzig. Upon returning to the United States in 1884, Hyslop briefly taught at Lake Forest College in Illinois and Smith College in Massachusetts, before winning a scholarship for graduate studies at Johns Hopkins University, where he received the PhD in philosophy in 1887.

Hyslop briefly taught at Bucknell College in Pennsylvania before moving to Columbia University, where he became a professor of logic and ethics (and also psychology) in 1889, joining philosophy professor and dean Nicholas Murray BUTLER. However, Hyslop's academic career was ended when he contracted tuberculosis; he left Columbia in 1902 to convalesce in upstate New York. He remained active in research and writing, however, pursuing his interests in the paranormal and immortality upon returning to live in New York City. While some scholars dismissed scientific study of paranormal phenomena such as extrasensory perception, clairvoyance, and telepathy, some noted scholars on both sides of the Atlantic shared his interest in these topics.

In 1882 scholars from the University of Cambridge founded the Society of Psychical Research, an organization dedicated to scientifically studying the paranormal. The members of the society included Henry Sidgwick, C. D. Broad, Henri Bergson, H. H. Price and William JAMES. When the head of the American Branch of the society, Richard Hogdson, died in 1905, Hyslop decided to found the independent American Society for Psychical Research to take its place. He served as both secretary and treasurer of the new organization until his death on 17 June 1920 in Upper Montclair, New Jersey.

During Hyslop's leadership of the American Society for Psychical Research, he oversaw the development of the organization's *Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research*, which contains most of his essays and research on the paranormal. While Hyslop dedicated himself to studying subjects that were shunned by some scientists as mere superstition (for instance, studying mediums who claimed to communicate with the dead), Hyslop's commitment to skepticism and the scientific method led him to believe that many paranormal claims were indeed fraudulent. Hyslop rejected both materialism and speculative idealism, preferring the empiricism of James. By studying both consciousness and paranormal phenomena with empirical methods, Hyslop set himself apart from philosophers and psychologists who were more materialist in orientation and who focused on physiology and brain function in the attempt to understand consciousness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Elements of Logic, Theoretical and Practical (New York, 1892).

The Elements of Ethics (New York, 1895).

Democracy: A Study of Government (New York, 1899).

Logic and Argument (New York, 1899).

Science and a Future Life (Boston, 1905).

Problems of Philosophy; or, Principles of Epistemology and Metaphysics (New York, 1905).

Enigmas of Psychical Research (Boston, 1906). 2nd edn, *Borderland of Psychical Research* (Boston, 1906).

Psychical Research and the Resurrection (Boston, 1908).

A Record and Discussion of Mediumistic Experiments. Proceedings of the American Society for Psychical Research, vol. 4, no. 1 (New York, 1910).

Psychical Research and Survival (London, 1913).

Life After Death: Problems of the Future Life and Its Nature (New York, 1918).

Contact with the Other World: The Latest Evidence as to Communication with the Dead (New York, 1919).

Other Relevant Works

A collection of Hyslop's letters is at Duke University.

"The Functions of Ethical Theory," *International Journal of Ethics* 1 (1891):

404–26.

"A Further Record of Observations of Certain Trance Phenomena," *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research* part 41 (1901).

"Problems of Science and Philosophy," *Philosophical Review* 12 (1903): 386–400.

"Has the Universe an Intelligent Back-Ground and Purpose?" *International Journal of Ethics* 14 (1904): 419–35.

"Professor William James' Interpretation of Religious Experience," *International Journal of Ethics* 14 (1904): 322–39.

"Remarks on Prof. Leuba's Criticisms," *International Journal of Ethics* 14 (1904): 220–27.

"Why Are We Imperialistic?" *International Journal of Ethics* 16 (1905): 1–15.

"William James and Immortality," *Journal of Philosophy* 12 (1915): 409–16.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v26*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Jastrow, Joseph. "James Hyslop's *Enigmas of Psychical Research*," *Journal of Philosophy* 3 (1906): 498–500.

Leuba, James H. "Empirical Data on Immortality," *International Journal of Ethics* 14 (1903): 90–105.

Prince, Walter F. "James Hervey Hyslop: Biographical Sketch and Impressions," *Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research* 14 (1920): 425–32.

Royce, Josiah. "James Hyslop's *Problems of Philosophy*," *International Journal of Ethics* 16 (1906): 236–41.

Greg Eow

I

IHDE, Don (1934–)

Don Ihde was born on 14 January 1934 in Hope, Kansas. Ihde grew up in a rural German-American community where his education began in a one-room school-house to which he commuted on horseback. Having spent his formative years driving tractors and threshing wheat, Ihde went on to study speech and drama at the University of Kansas, where he received his BA in 1956, and theology at Andover Newton Theological School, where he graduated first in his class with an M.Div. in 1959. While attending theological school, he studied under Paul TILLICH (who was at Harvard Divinity School), pursued his interest in higher criticism in biblical studies under the supervision of Norman Gottwald, and wrote his thesis on the philosophy of Nicolas Berdyaev. During his second year of study, Ihde became a chaplain at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He maintained this position until 1964 when he completed his PhD in philosophy at Boston University. As a doctoral student, Ihde focused upon philosophical problems found in the phenomenological tradition and wrote the first English-language dissertation on Paul Ricoeur, "The Phenomenological Methodology and Philosophical Anthropology of Paul Ricoeur" under the direction of John LAVELY and Erazim KOHÁK.

Ihde's first tenure-track position was at Southern Illinois University. He remained there until 1969 when he made the transition to the philosophy department of the State University of New York at Stony Brook. Throughout his career, he exerted a strong administrative presence: he was the initial doctoral program director and resumed those responsibilities intermittently thereafter; for eight years he served as department chair; and for five years he acted as the Dean of Humanities and Arts. Recently, Ihde enlarged the scope of inquiry conducted at Stony Brook by founding the Technoscience Research Group. He is presently Distinguished Professor of Philosophy at Stony Brook.

Since Ihde's philosophical work consists of original investigations that are multicultural in scope and written in a style that is bereft of unnecessary tribal language, he has frequently performed the duties of a phenomenological emissary. By introducing his unique post-foundational style of phenomenology (one that has much in common with the praxis orientation of American pragmatism) to new audiences, Ihde has come to acquire an international following of diverse scholars. Artists, architects, cultural studies theorists, engineers, historians, literary critics, philosophers, scientists, and sociologists frequently cite Ihde's work, request his presence on doctoral dissertation committees and institutional review boards, petition him to teach seminars and assess research. Furthermore, he has served as a consultant to numerous international organizations: Roskilde University in Denmark recruited him to develop research on hermeneutics and operating room instrumen-

tation; Learning Labs Denmark requested his assistance in developing research on the relation between bodies and learning; and the University of Bergen in Norway solicited him to develop research on media and mobile technology. It is not surprising, therefore, that Ihde's widely anthologized essays and frequently reissued books have been translated into numerous languages, including Danish, German, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Persian, and Swedish.

Ihde's research career has taken shape over the course of three phases: (1) he has been a philosopher who concentrates on understanding and enlarging the nature and scope of the phenomenological style of analysis; (2) he has been a philosopher of technology; and (3) he has been a technoscience theorist whose research overlaps with the interdisciplinary field of science and technology studies.

The initial phase of Ihde's career occurred after the publication of his first book, *Hermeneutic Phenomenology: The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur* (1971). Determined to avoid becoming labeled a Ricoeur scholar, Ihde wrote two books that were thematic in scope. His *Listening and Voice: A Phenomenology of Sound* (1976) reorients philosophy away from its taken-for-granted assumptions about vision and experience in order to analyze the phenomenon of auditory linguistic presence as an embodied experience. Ihde focuses upon concrete examples, including being immersed by the sound of a distinctive voice during a face-to-face conversation. In *Experimental Phenomenology* (1977), Ihde applies his active style of "doing phenomenology" as a means of introducing students to the study of phenomenology. By providing concrete visual examples, and correlating them to step-by-step exercises of perceptual variation, he helps students come to appreciate how the intentional act of perception is, even when hermeneutically structured, an embodied praxis. Furthermore, by analyzing how multi-stable perceptions of ambiguous drawings, such as Necker cubes, are constituted, he demonstrates that phenomenological analysis is an experimental form of conduct, one that, in some instances, has more

to offer epistemically than scientific analysis. When *Experimental Phenomenology* was written, scientists could explain only a delimited number of possible perceptual variations through the mechanism of neurological switch.

During the second phase of Ihde's career, he became a philosopher of technology. During this period, he introduced a new way of interpreting the history of the philosophy of technology and inaugurated a new way of investigating technology from a philosophical perspective. Although influenced by the classical phenomenologists, such as Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, and Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Ihde revises significantly their projects by analyzing technological praxis as an embodied activity. Husserl is shown to have prematurely divorced the lifeworld from the (putatively derivative) domain of science by obscuring how scientific knowledge is instrumentally mediated. Heidegger is shown to have maintained an untenable, dystopian perspective on technology, one that achieves its coherence by reifying the essence of technology vis-à-vis romanticized contrasts between large industrial technologies that reduce nature to standing reserve and poetic technologies that allow nature to be appreciated for its intrinsic worth. Merleau-Ponty is shown to have been sensitive to embodiment relations, although disinterested in turning the subject of technology into a worthy topic of sustained inquiry. It is during this phase that Ihde founded the first regular monograph series in English dealing with philosophy and technology, the Indiana Series in the Philosophy of Technology, and wrote *Technics and Praxis* (1979), *Existential Technics* (1983), *Technology and the Lifeworld: From Garden to Earth* (1990), and *Philosophy of Technology: An Introduction* (1993).

During Ihde's third phase, in which he became a technoscience theorist, he wrote and edited a number of books including *Instrumental Realism: The Interface between Philosophy of Technology and Philosophy of Science* (1991), *Expanding Hermeneutics: Visualism in Science* (1998), *Bodies in Technology* (2002), and *Chasing Technoscience: Matrix for Materiality*

(2003). Trying to bridge the gap between the philosophies of science and technology, Ihde argued that the philosophy of science, as traditionally conceived, is an incomplete enterprise because it fails to examine critically the role of technology in laboratory settings. By focusing upon the phenomenological theme of embodied perception – both micro-perception and macro-perception – Ihde establishes the importance of interpreting science in terms of the concrete, technological practices that engage scientists visually. What Ihde proposes, therefore, is a material hermeneutics that allows us to interpret instruments as non-linguistic analogues to texts. In doing so, he provides a means for us to understand how the reality that scientists study is co-constituted by the technological instruments they use, and he is able to argue convincingly against Diltheyan critics who claim that hermeneutics and the natural sciences remain separate and distinct enterprises. This focus on the topic of materiality enables Ihde to connect his research with a new group of intellectual interlocutors, science and technology studies theorists, such as Donna Haraway, Bruno Latour, and Andrew Pickering, who concentrate on matters pertaining to material agency. While Ihde appreciates their decisive refutations of social constructivism, he remains critical of their failure to posit the embedded and embodied human perceiver as the invariant origin of all knowledge claims.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hermeneutic Phenomenology: The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur (Evanston, Ill., 1971).
Sense and Significance (Pittsburgh, 1973).
Listening and Voice: A Phenomenology of Sound (Athens, Ohio, 1976).
Experimental Phenomenology (New York, 1977).
Technics and Praxis: A Philosophy of Technology (Boston, 1979).
Existential Technics (Albany, N.Y., 1983).
Consequences of Phenomenology (Albany, N.Y., 1986).
Technology and the Lifeworld: From Garden to Earth (Bloomington, Ind., 1990).
Instrumental Realism: The Interface between Philosophy of Technology and Philosophy of Science (Bloomington, Ind., 1991).
Philosophy of Technology: An Introduction (New York, 1993).
Postphenomenology: Essays in the Postmodern Context (Evanston, Ill., 1993).
Expanding Hermeneutics: Visualism in Science (Evanston, Ill., 1998).
Bodies in Technology (Minneapolis, 2002).

Other Relevant Works
Ed. with Evan Selinger, *Chasing Technoscience: Matrix for Materiality* (Bloomington, Ind., 2003).

Further Reading
Achterhuis, Hans, ed. *American Philosophers of Technology: The Empirical Turn* (Bloomington, Ind., 2001).
Expanding Phenomenology: A Critical Companion to Ihde, ed. Evan Selinger (Albany, N.Y., 2005).

Evan Selinger

INADA, Kenneth Kameo (1923–)

Kenneth Inada was born on 7 May 1923 in Honolulu, Hawaii. After serving in the US Army as a Sergeant of the 442nd Regimental Combat Team during World War II, Inada returned to Honolulu to begin his study of philosophy. After completing his BA in 1949 at the University of Hawaii, and his MA in 1951 at the University of Chicago, he received his PhD in Indian and Buddhist philosophy from the University of Tokyo in 1960, having been encouraged to study there by D. T. SUZUKI. Inada began his academic career at the University of Hawaii in 1960, where he spent nine years teaching philosophy before accepting an appointment as associate professor

of philosophy at the State University of New York at Buffalo in 1969. He retired as Distinguished Service Professor of Philosophy in 1997.

Inada's interest in Buddhist philosophy lay primarily in its naturalistic approach. As both a philosophy and way of life Buddhism presents a holistic account of natural processes without appeal to metaphysical elements. It likewise understands and effectively treats the causes of human suffering, stressing the individual experiential process as integral to a full realization of its philosophy. These characteristics of Buddhist – indeed, of Asian thought in general – Inada sought to expound and clarify throughout his scholarly career as a comparative philosopher. Initially concerned to correct mistaken views held about Buddhism (and *shunyata*, or "emptiness" in particular), Inada joined ranks with other contemporaries in comparative thought to quell the misreadings that often arise when one is influenced by "orientalism."

Inada also came to see a need within comparative philosophy to move forward toward a more radical understanding of the discipline, and to philosophize more globally on the ontological and cosmological dimensions of Asian thought. As he has lost touch with the interdependency of all life, Asiatic thought and culture offer, for Inada, not only a natural and holistic perspective on the world but also aesthetic and ethical values to help guide us in our behavior, both individually and socially.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Some Basic Misconceptions of Buddhism," *International Philosophical Quarterly* 9 (1969): 101–19.

"Buddhist Naturalism and the Myth of Rebirth," *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 1 (1970): 46–53.

"Whitehead's 'Actual Entity' and the Buddha's Anatman," *Philosophy East and West* 21 (1971): 303–16.

"Time and Temporality," *Philosophy East and West* 24 (1974): 171–9.

"Problematics of the Buddhist Nature of Self," *Philosophy East and West* 29 (1979): 141–58.

"Nagarjuna and Beyond," *Journal of Buddhist Philosophy* 2 (1984): 65–76.

Guide to Buddhist Philosophy, with Richard Chi, Shotaro Iida, and David Kalupahana (Boston, 1985).

"Two Strains in Buddhist Causality," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 12 (1985): 49–56.

"Environmental Problematics in the Buddhist Context," *Philosophy East and West* 37 (1987): 135–49.

"The Range of Buddhist Ontology," *Philosophy East and West* 38 (1988): 261–80.

"East–West Metaphysics of the Self," in *Culture and Self*, ed. Douglas Allen (Boulder, Col., 1997).

"A Theory of Oriental Aesthetics: A Prolegomenon," *Philosophy East and West* 47 (1997): 117–31.

"Rumination on the Chinese Philosophical Tradition," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 30 (2003): 327–40.

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *East–West Dialogues in Aesthetics* (Buffalo, N.Y., 1978).

Ed. with Nolan P. Jacobson, *Buddhist and American Thinkers* (Albany, N.Y., 1984).

Nagarjuna: A Translation of His Mulamadhyamakakarika with an Introductory Essay (Tokyo, 1970; Delhi, 1993).

"A Buddhist Response to Human Rights," in *Asian Perspectives on Human Rights*, ed. Claude Welch, Jr. and Virginia Leary (Boulder, Col., 1990), pp. 91–103.

Further Reading

Pilgrim, Richard. "Reply to Kenneth Inada," *Philosophy East and West* 39 (1989): 457.

Marty H. Heitz

INGERSOLL, Robert Green (1833–99)

Robert Green Ingersoll, "The Great Agnostic," was born on 11 August 1833 in Dresden, New York. He died on 21 July 1899 in Dobbs Ferry-on-Hudson, New York. He was the youngest son of an indifferently successful evangelical minister. The family moved steadily westward. By the time of Ingersoll's adolescence the family lived in Wisconsin, where he stumbled upon the poems of Robert Burns. His self-guided study of Burns and later Shakespeare, coupled with forced exposure to Christian scripture, defined his literary background. He apprenticed to a lawyer, read for the Illinois bar, and established a successful law practice in Peoria with his brother Ebon Clark Ingersoll. When the Civil War began, Ingersoll raised a regiment and was awarded the rank of colonel. He served with distinction and was captured, paroled, and discharged from service. By 1863 he had begun to serve the Union cause as a civilian speechmaker and to campaign for candidates of Abraham Lincoln's Republican Party. Ingersoll's gift for rhetoric was immediately prized. Less welcome was the fact that in the course of his self-education he had rejected his father's Christianity as obviously untrue and morally repugnant. In 1867 a Republican governor appointed Ingersoll Attorney General of Illinois, but his outspoken religious opinions barred him from elective office and from further political appointments. His brother Ebon, who held similar beliefs more circumspectly, served Illinois as a US Congressman from 1864 to 1871.

Ingersoll attained national prominence in 1876. At Indianapolis he gave a sentimental speech about the travails of Union soldiers in the Civil War; an evocative excerpt was widely reprinted as "A Vision of War." Contemporaries regarded it as the noblest statement on the war save only Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. Ingersoll reprised this speech to huge crowds each Memorial Day as long as he lived. Also in 1876 Ingersoll nominated James G. Blaine for President at the GOP convention in Cincinnati. Though Blaine was not nominated, Ingersoll's nominating speech – which famously described Blaine as a "plumed knight" – electrified the nation and was a staple of rhetoric texts for decades.

Ingersoll built an enviable career as an attorney; in connection with a high-profile Grant Administration political scandal, he orchestrated the lengthiest defense in a US criminal trial up to that time. Yet he enjoyed his most significant success as an orator. For three decades he was the GOP's premier political speechmaker, campaigning for every Republican presidential candidate but one from Ulysses Grant to William McKinley, all of whom attained the White House. The only Republican to lose a presidential bid during Ingersoll's public years was the one he declined to support.

During the 1870s Ingersoll emerged as the leading attraction on the American Chautauqua circuit. In an era when public lectures were the dominant mode of popular entertainment and learning, he was undisputed king of American oratory. After hearing Ingersoll speak at a political event in New York City, Mark TWAIN wrote home to his wife, "Lord! What an organ is human speech when it is employed by a master."

Crisscrossing the nation by train over three decades, Ingersoll gave more than 1200 lectures to packed, high-paying houses. He was seen and heard by more Americans than anyone else before motion pictures and radio. Ingersoll would stride onto a stage empty save for a small table and a pitcher of water, speaking for up to four hours without notes on subjects ranging from science to Shakespeare, from Reconstruction to Darwin, from improving the treatment of prisoners to elevating the status of women and ending the corporal punishment of children. But his most controversial subject was religion.

Ingersoll inveighed against the traditional Christian world view of his day. Inverting a bromide by Alexander Pope, he famously

quipped that "an honest God is the noblest work of man." In vivid prose he dismissed the concept of a deity as an obvious and deeply flawed human creation. "Each nation has created a god, and the god has always resembled his creators. He hated and loved what they hated and loved, and he was invariably found on the side of those in power." This brief quotation from "The Gods," one of Ingersoll's best-known lectures on religion, exhibits the accessibility, directness, humor, and insistent internal rhythm typical of his best material.

Ingersoll defended the right, indeed the obligation, of free men and women to inquire for themselves and to follow the truth where it led without regard for dogma. He ridiculed the notion that a world of pain and injustice could be the handiwork of a loving omnipotent God. Most of all, he savaged the doctrine of eternal punishment, then so central to American Christianity, as an incomprehensible miscarriage of justice: surely no offense committed by a mortal could merit perpetual torment!

Ingersoll was a household name during America's Gilded Age. On the platform and in print, he debated the leading Christian spokesmen of his era, from prominent American divines to British Prime Minister William Ewart Gladstone. In perhaps the greatest irony of Ingersoll's life, his chance meeting on a train with the devout New Mexico governor Lew Wallace prompted Wallace to write *Ben-Hur*. This religious novel would become the best-selling novel of the nineteenth century and inspire two influential twentieth-century motion pictures.

Ingersoll was known as "Colonel Bob" for his Civil War service and as "The Great Agnostic" for his opposition to popular piety. Driven in large part by Ingersoll's celebrity, popular American atheism, agnosticism, and iconoclasm enjoyed a period of prominence now known as the Golden Age of Freethought, roughly from 1875 to 1914. Irreligion was never broadly popular; it remained controver-

sial, and even at its height was reviled by most Americans. Still, its shadow never fell closer to the mainstream of American thought than during Ingersoll's public life. Ingersoll never pretended to academic eminence and had little contact with the philosophical establishment of his day. But his high-profile advocacy played a key role in exposing thoughtful Americans with or without formal education to such issues as the problem of evil and the injustice of eternal damnation. He used his celebrity to advocate for such then-advanced ideas as birth control and Darwin's theory of evolution.

Ingersoll's career took him to Washington and later New York. His home on Gramercy Park became a salon where freethinkers and radical reformers rubbed shoulders with leading figures in industry, politics, music, and the theatre. He numbered Thomas Edison and Andrew Carnegie among his personal friends, but also reform preacher Henry Ward BEECHER and socialist organizer Eugene DEBS.

Philosophy, politics, and freethought intersected at several points during Ingersoll's later public life. On several occasions he intervened in obscenity proceedings, using his White House connections (sometimes successfully) to rescue freethought activists from prosecution by decency crusader Anthony Comstock. On these occasions it worked to Ingersoll's benefit that his own family life was almost idyllically orderly and content. When liberal religious activist Charles Reynolds was charged with blasphemy for having lectured in Boonton, New Jersey, on the "religion of humanity," Ingersoll mounted a pro bono courtroom defense that created a media sensation. Reynolds was convicted; Ingersoll paid his fine. But his defense had heaped such ridicule on the proceedings that blasphemy prosecutions were all but unheard of thereafter.

If there was any issue on which Ingersoll fell short of advocating relentless naturalism, it was life after death. While never failing to oppose traditional ideas of heaven and hell, in his numerous popular funeral orations (such as

those for Beecher, Walt WHITMAN, and his brother Ebon) he flirted with hope that the beloved departed might yet smile down on loved ones left behind. He gave several well-compensated lectures at America's principal Spiritualist community, Lily Dale at Cassadaga, New York, though he never dabbled in Spiritualism himself.

At his death in 1899 Ingersoll was remembered from across the religious and political spectrum. Extravagantly Thomas Edison wrote, "I think that Ingersoll had all the attributes of a perfect man, and, in my opinion, no finer personality ever existed." Ingersoll was cremated and his ashes interred in Arlington National Cemetery. His fame persisted for decades following his death. A lavish twelve-volume set of his collected works was a coveted purchase among freethinkers, radicals, and reformers. Despite its high cost, the collected works went through a dozen editions between 1900 and 1929. For at least half a century following his death his published works were cited as a primary influence by Americans who had abandoned their childhood faith for atheism, agnosticism, or humanism, alongside Friedrich Nietzsche, Sigmund Freud, Thomas Paine's *The Age of Reason,* and impartial study of the Bible itself.

Ingersoll's early celebrity contrasts sharply with his present-day obscurity. Two factors account for this unfortunate state of affairs. First, subsequent developments catapulted many of his most controversial ideas into the mainstream, ending their dependence on a sectarian freethought movement for support. Mainstream Protestantism moved beyond hellfire and brimstone, perhaps partly because Ingersoll had shamed it into doing so; the argument over evolution entered general scientific discourse. To a degree, then, Ingersoll's memory became a casualty of the very success that many of his ideas enjoyed. The second factor driving Ingersoll's marginalization was the series of twentieth-century events that demonized American freethought: the crackdown on dissent during World War I, of which the Palmer Raids are iconic; Western alarm concerning the Russian Revolution of 1917; and later, Cold War McCarthyism. Add to that the conscious antipathy of faithful mainstream historians and commentators who were all too pleased to join in peripheralizing an uncomfortably popular irreligious thinker.

Today Ingersoll is too little remembered. Principal memorials include a small museum at his birthplace, a statue in a Peoria Park, and a memorial plaque upon New York's Gramercy Park Hotel, which occupies the site of his Manhattan townhouse. Contemporary Americans might benefit by bearing in mind this agnostic firebrand who was nonetheless a tireless apostle of family and fireside and a treasured arrow in the GOP's political quiver. Philosophers might better remember him for his seminal role in building popular awareness of such previously heretical ideas as the human authorship of religious creeds, racial and sexual equality, and ideals of political and social autonomy that would be foundational to the progressive reforms of the twentieth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Works of Robert G. Ingersoll, 12 vols, ed. C. P. Farrell (New York, 1900).
Letters of Robert G. Ingersoll, ed. Eva Ingersoll Wakefield (New York, 1951).

Other Relevant Works
Ingersoll's papers are in the Library of Congress, the Illinois State Historical Library in Springfield, and the New York Public Library.
The Best of Robert Ingersoll: Selections from His Writings and Speeches, ed. Roger E. Greeley (Buffalo, N.Y., 1986).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Religious Bio, Encyc Amer Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v9, Who Was Who in Amer v1

Anderson, David D. *Robert Ingersoll* (Boston, 1972).

Cramer, C. H. *Royal Bob: The Life of Robert G. Ingersoll* (Indianapolis, Ind., 1952).

Jacoby, Susan. *Freethinkers: A History of American Secularism* (New York, 2004).

Kittredge, Herman E. *Ingersoll: A Biographical Appreciation* (New York, 1911).

Larson, Orvin. *American Infidel: Robert G. Ingersoll* (New York, 1962).

Rogers, Cameron. *Colonel Bob Ingersoll: A Biographical Narrative of the Great American Orator and Agnostic* (Garden City, N.J., 1927).

Smith, Frank. *Robert G. Ingersoll: A Life* (Buffalo, N.Y., 1990).

Stein, Gordon. *Robert G. Ingersoll: A Checklist* (Kent, Ohio, 1969).

Thomas W. Flynn

ISENBERG, Arnold (1911–65)

Arnold Isenberg was born on 12 September 1911 in Boston, Massachusetts, and died on 26 February 1965 in East Lansing, Michigan. Isenberg displayed early academic talents cultivated at the Boston Public Latin School in the mid 1920s. It was a school known for its high scholarly standards and sharp disciplinary techniques. Here he developed his passions for argumentation, theory, languages, and literature. Isenberg followed in George SANTAYANA's footsteps, obtaining the editorial position on the school's literary magazine, the *Latin School Register*. He completed his preparation studies in 1928 and entered Harvard University. As a Harvard undergraduate he shifted the emphasis of his studies from literature to philosophy, attracted by the precision he found in philosophical work. Yet, throughout his edu-

cation he found it rewarding to continue to cultivate his fascination with the arts even as his concerns drifted into philosophical territory. Harvard offered a new and richer context for his studies of poetry and English, French, and German literature. It also provided the materials to promote his more novel interests in painting and music, and introduced him to the rigors of philosophical work in aesthetics and value theory. Isenberg received his BA in 1932 and his PhD in philosophy from Harvard in 1935.

Isenberg's talents won him numerous teaching appointments and visiting positions. Early in his career he accepted a position at Cornell University that he shortly left for an opportunity to return to Harvard as an instructor. He began to develop his thoughts on method in aesthetics and maintained an ongoing discussion with David PRALL on the matter. It was, however, his appointment at Queen's College of City University of New York in 1941 that supported his most productive period. New York City suited him, as did his intellectual community there. Isenberg found an environment of friendship and mutual respect among his colleagues, Herbert Bohnert, Donald DAVIDSON, John Goheen, and Carl HEMPEL, and it was in their presence that he refined his inquiries into figurative language and the relationship between aesthetics and belief formation. These years were also Isenberg's most prolific as a literary critic, during which he delivered lectures and published studied accounts of Robert Frost and William Shakespeare. After more than ten years, and shortly after departmental tensions led to the departures of Goheen and Davidson, Isenberg left Queen's College in 1952 and joined them at Stanford University. In 1962 he accepted an appointment at Michigan State where he continued his earlier work in ethics and co-edited a volume on aesthetic theory.

Isenberg published numerous articles in his short lifetime. While the large majority fell squarely in the areas of aesthetics and value theory, the occasion for any given article,

review, or talk rarely exhausted its relevance. There are three main reasons for the unusual scope of his writing. The first is the frequency with which he chose problems with recognized relevance in multiple areas of philosophy. In this respect, he continues to be known for his work on the form–content problem, as for his approach to methodology in analytic philosophy. Second, Isenberg was a strikingly assiduous reader. His inquisitiveness and careful writing led to work that as often evidenced deeply considered epistemic and metaphysical positions as aesthetic and normative ones. Finally, and most important philosophically speaking, Isenberg did not respect substantial, programmatic separations between metaphysics, epistemology, methodology, aesthetics, and ethics, not because these distinctions were murky or difficult to establish, but because such studies were in principle interpenetrating. He preferred a view of philosophy that privileged issues over areas, and considered it an achievement to have discerned a single determinate issue.

Isenberg's writing is customarily (though loosely) divided into three areas: (1) aesthetics; (2) ethics and general value theory (later expanding into issues in the philosophy of mind); and (3) criticism. It was in the early 1940s that Isenberg received his first substantial philosophical attention. Most notably, it was his article "Perception, Meaning, and the Subject Matter of Art" (1944) that initiated a discussion often revisited today. It was the first of a number of Isenberg's papers to address questions regarding the relationship of "form" to "subject matter" or "content." His interest in what is often termed the form–content problem was multifaceted. It piqued his interest as a subject of discussion in a variety of critical contexts, whether it was philosophy of music, literature, or the plastic arts. However, it also concerned him insofar as it illuminated broader issues of philosophical methodology.

"Perception, Meaning, and the Subject Matter of Art" begins with the then-popular subject of formalism. Isenberg thought that the insight of the formalists was their observation that "[s]ince there are great paintings with humble subjects and mediocre paintings with exalted subjects, it cannot be the subject of a painting that determines its value" (1973, p. xxx). In other words, whatever that feature is that determines that one work is better than another it must be something discernible in the works themselves. The formalists took it that form, the "mode of organizing color areas on the canvas" (1973, p. xxx), was precisely that feature in which aesthetic value inhered. Isenberg intended to show that the general formalist principle (that the form of a work of art, not its subject matter, determines its aesthetic value) does not imply the positions adopted by Roger Fry, Clive Bell, and others of their school. Bell specifically believed that the prizing of form meant that subject matter is irrelevant to the estimation of a work's value. If this is true, he argued, then abstract painting is more likely to be of quality than a representational work, being purged of inconsequential features. Likewise, the evaluation of a work in nonformalist language would suggest that the critic has confused some other value for a formal, hence properly aesthetic, one. Isenberg's notion that the opposition of form and content involves some confusion was not particularly novel, but he permanently altered the way the problem was conceived by arguing further that such an opposition is logically incoherent.

Isenberg showed that Bell's conclusions rested on a misunderstanding of "subject matter." The argument, briefly put, runs as follows: (1) whatever is visible, in the world or in pictures, is describable in a "formalist vocabulary"; (2) when we refer to any familiar object we utilize a nonformalist name or description; (3) the formalist vocabulary allows us to refer to things otherwise unfamiliar or, as yet, unclassifiable; and (4), however, the features that formalist language picks out are precisely those features by which we re-identify familiar items. Recognition of everyday

objects, or pictures of them (as pictures of *them*), depends on our ability to describe their formal features on the basis of perceived and recalled similarity. Our very recognition of subject matter, in the case of the plastic arts, is predicated on our ability to describe objects in terms of a formalist vocabulary. This leads to the conclusion that the aesthetic interest of an image is fully exhausted by its formal features. Subject matter, in the art-relevant sense, is simply a subclass of form distinguished by its familiarity. A contrast between subject matter and form is therefore logically incoherent. There is no properly principled reason for preferring "Arrangement in Grey" to "Whistler's Mother." Isenberg explains that confusion arises because a picture may be said to represent something in an asymmetrical way when used in conjunction with some convention or stipulation. Passport pictures and street signs serve such practical functions. However, it is not representation in the function sense, but representation in the subject matter sense that is of aesthetic interest.

Isenberg's analysis of subject matter as given by a presentational aesthetic made two important moves. The first was his suggestion that the very notion of subject matter in art results from the description of forms, some of which remain couched in simple sensory terms (or strictly formalist vocabulary), and others of which make use of physical terms (the language of subject matter) in virtue of their resemblance to other objects. On this point Isenberg departed from others like Bradley who spoke of the fusion of form and content as meaning in paint. Isenberg's account also made a second, methodological move that would be further nuanced in his later work. At this early point, it is represented by a certain direction of argumentation. Roger Fry was a critic, not a philosopher, as were many formalists. He took his inspiration from the writings of painters like Wassily Kandinsky, Fernand Leger, Kazimir Malevitch, and Piet Mondrian. Beginning with the works themselves, Isenberg was deeply suspicious of rhetoric addressing the form–content problem as a problem that was multiply instantiated. As Mary MOTHERSILL put Isenberg's position, "we do not *know* that there is some single metaphysical question relating form to content, but we are confronted with a variety of particular and, from the critic's point of view, practical questions, and these take precedence" (1973, p. xxviii). Beginning with critical practice and a concern for the works themselves, Isenberg convincingly argued his solution to the form–content discrepancy that had attracted the attention of many critics of formalism. Later he would argue that the same technique was necessary in the areas of music and literature. The problem, on Isenberg's view, was the tendency to "remoteness" (1973, p. 287) in philosophy. It was such remoteness, he thought, that brought philosophers like Morris WEITZ to do philosophy at excessive levels of abstraction. Just as Weitz thought that the formalists were attempting to establish a definition that would close the concept of art, rather than making an attempt to describe our positive experiences of it, so philosophers of music were tempted to think that the effects of music were attributable to presentiments of the Divine, rather than to the evocation of more ordinary emotions.

Isenberg actively advocated a new approach to aesthetics in "Analytic Philosophy and the Study of Art" (1987). He observed that much critical theory was being done by scholars, critics, and literary men. They were, however insightful, trained in a primary responsibility to their own crafts, and were to an extent "unaware of the responsibilities of analysis" (1973, p. 287). Critical theory and the study of art, he thought, could benefit from contemporary advances in analytic thinking. Isenberg put it to analytic philosophy to extend its accomplishments beyond areas already known to be highly technical in nature. While many problems in logic and epistemology are naturally amenable to analytic methods, Isenberg argued that there were significant and promising problems in social philosophy, philosophy

of religion, and aesthetics equally susceptible to such treatment. However, Isenberg also believed that successful philosophical work in aesthetics must be done with an eye towards the concrete questions raised by particular passages of critical writing. The aesthetician, he thought, should be a reasonably accomplished critic as well as a trained philosopher. For Isenberg, it was only in this way that one could obtain a discerning eye for the true problems of criticism.

Isenberg's approach to ethics was of a piece with his method in aesthetics. He consistently begins with the cultivated sensitivity of someone alive to the nuances of experience and the particularity of individual cases. His contributions to ethical theory frequently entailed a unique way of accounting for the significance of particular cases as instances of broader concepts. He argued against a deontological conception of moral valuation, for instance, by suggesting that the differing moral significance of various lies could not be accounted for on purely deontological grounds. A deontological theory can establish a reasonable disvalue of lying on the basis of the internal components of the act in general, but without reference to a particular lie, moral significance is not attributable. Isenberg argued that the true moral significance of various lies (not to mention the fact that lies may vary in their significance) becomes apparent in the variety and severity of their consequences. In a similar manner, Isenberg made careful study of the various kinds of pride and shame, though in this case only to conclude that their differing sources were irrelevant to their overall reasonableness.

Isenberg's work remains interesting as a body of writing that spanned the distance between the old aesthetics seen in Prall and John DEWEY and the new aesthetics of the linguistic philosophers, without falling under the auspices of either. He identified a number of problems in aesthetics and value theory that were linguistic in origin, but concerned himself equally with the phenomenological distinc-

tiveness of the aesthetic as against the cognitive and moral dimensions of experience. His accomplishment as a literary critic enlivened his philosophy with a respect for the particularity of individual cases, and his achievements in philosophy set a new standard for analytic rigor in criticism. Isenberg's work ultimately recommends to us a philosophy informed by the complicated experience of the things we think about.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Perception, Meaning, and the Subject Matter of Art," *Journal of Philosophy* 41 (1944): 561–75.

"Perishable Art," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 4 (1946): 217–29.

"The Technical Factor in Art," *Journal of Philosophy* 43 (1946): 5–18.

"Natural Pride and Natural Shame," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 10 (1949): 1–24.

"The Esthetic Function of Language," *Journal of Philosophy* 46 (1949): 5–19.

"Critical Communication," *Philosophical Review* 58 (1949): 330–44.

"The Problem of Belief," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 13 (1955): 395–407.

"On Defining Metaphor," *Journal of Philosophy* 60 (1963): 609–21.

"Deontology and the Ethics of Lying," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 24 (1964): 463–80.

Aesthetic Theories: Studies in the Philosophy of Art, with Karl Aschenbrenner (Englewood, N.J., 1965).

"Analytic Philosophy and the Study of Art," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 46 (1987): 125–36.

Other Relevant Works

Aesthetics and the Theory of Criticism: Selected Essays of Arnold Isenberg, ed. William Callaghan et al. (Chicago, 1973). Contains a biographical sketch of Isenberg.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v38
Sutter, Ronald. *Six Answers to the Problem of Taste* (Washington, D.C., 1979).

Erica Wagner

IVES, Charles Edward (1874–1954)

Charles Ives was born in Danbury, Connecticut, on 20 October 1874, and died in New York City on 19 May 1954. The most important American composer of concert music in the twentieth century, he demonstrated numerous innovations well in advance of his European contemporaries. His music synthesizes cultivated and vernacular styles. The recipient of early musical training from his father that was both rigorously orthodox and experimental, Ives studied composition at Yale University with the conservative Horatio Parker. After graduation with a BA in 1898 he joined the Mutual Life Insurance Company in New York City, eventually opening his own agency where he was responsible for many innovations in sales technique and estate planning. For twenty years, at night and on weekends, he composed music that would go largely unperformed until the 1930s.

In 1918, a heart attack announced his long physical decline due to diabetes, and he began revising for publication his Second Piano Sonata ("Concord, Mass., 1840–60") and *114 Songs*, both accompanied by extensive prose explications. By 1927 he stopped composing entirely. Henry Cowell introduced Ives to the public in 1928, publishing a movement from the Fourth Symphony in the journal *New Music*. John Kirkpatrick's enthusiastically received New York recital performance of the Second Piano Sonata in 1939 solidified his reputation further, and in 1947, Ives received the Pulitzer Prize for his Third Symphony.

His bandmaster father George had given Ives a firm traditional grounding in Bach and Beethoven as well as a taste for experimentation. Multiple (and physically separate) sound sources create a polyphony of musical events. Timbral and tonal experiments such as "piano drumming" led to essays in quarter tones and clusters. Equating happenstance with authenticity impelled him to reproduce what he heard as realistically as possible: the heterophony of mass revival singing or the enthusiastic mistakes of amateur instrumentalists.

Ives also identified strongly with the transcendentalists, to whom he paid tribute in his Second Piano Sonata with movements entitled "Emerson," "Hawthorne," "The Alcotts," and "Thoreau." Like Ralph Waldo EMERSON, the composer asserts a virile Americanness as the counterpoise to decadent European influence. He quotes lavishly, from Beethoven and Brahms but also notably from revival hymns, marches, and parlor song. He asserts the concept of a unifying "over-soul," in which entire worlds may be found within a brief song. Like Emerson, he is at ease with the fragmentary and the open-ended.

Ives insisted on the primacy of "substance" or essence over "manner" or technique. This last is the cornerstone of his aesthetic, and contains a moral quality that is also gendered: substance is manly, while manner is effete. The thorny difficulties of dissonance and polyrhythms are stronger than the blandishments of mere beauty.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Essays Before a Sonata, The Majority, and Other Writings (New York, 1962; 1970; 1999).
Memos (New York, 1972).

Other Relevant Works
The Ives Collection is at Yale University.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*,

Dict Amer Bio, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v42*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*

Burkholder, J. Peter. *All Made of Tunes: Charles Ives and the Uses of Musical Borrowing* (New Haven, Conn., 1995).

Cowell, Henry, and Sidney Cowell. *Charles Ives and His Music* (New York, 1955; 2nd edn 1969).

Perlis, Vivian. *Charles Ives Remembered: An Oral History* (New Haven, Conn., 1974).

Mary Ellen Poole

J

JACOBS, Jane Butzner (1916–)

Jane Butzner was born on 4 May 1916 in Scranton, Pennsylvania, the daughter of a medical doctor and a school teacher. At age twelve she traveled to New York City, immediately falling in love with its scale and density. In 1934, after graduating high school, she returned to New York City to study at Columbia University. Unable to find work because of the Depression, she explored the city by subway writing freelance articles on neighborhoods not familiar to readers of the *Herald Tribune* and *Vogue*. Urban context, inner city complexity, and the aesthetics of place became her primary focuses.

Frustrated at Columbia University by courses such as sociology which she considered insipid, she left in 1936, feeling that university degrees were not for her. Instead, she became a professional urbanist constantly observing, experiencing, and writing about urban environments. In 1944 she married architect Robert Hyde Jacobs. Like many independent thinkers, she rejects the notion of intellectual influence, citing only her good friend, fellow urbanist and ally, William H. Whyte. Her reading reflects her disdain for specialization, particularly when researching the fabric of cities. Specialization is fatal, she claims. Mixed land use, population density and diversity are the keys to a healthy, vibrant city. She fought hard against urban renewal, which created "a coat of one cloth." Jacobs believes that destruction of entire neighborhoods is a form of vandalism. Her ideas were tested in the 1950s, when she prevented the powerful New York bureaucrat Robert Moses from building a highway through Washington Square Park and the West Village. In 1952 she became an associate editor of Architectural Forum.

Jacobs's first book, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (1961), sharply criticized Robert Moses and historian Lewis MUMFORD for advocating destruction and reconstruction to create suburban cities. It remains a classic reference for urban planners and architects. Her later books looked at the economies of cities, the value of diversity, the relationship between cities and nations, and the ability of cities to nourish cultural and entrepreneurial energy. She moved with her family to Toronto in 1968, became a Canadian citizen, and engaged urban issues there.

Jacobs's most recent books employ the dialectic method to illustrate various viewpoints and how they develop and change over time. *Systems of Survival* (1992) compares government caretakers with business entrepreneurs, discussing their approaches to survival, growth, and maintenance of urban areas. In *The Nature of Economies* (2000) Jacobs ponders the role of rules and systems in economic development and wonders if they follow a similar path as those governing nature, including the notions of unpredictability and expansion.

Although some publicly denigrate her professional achievements, her books continue to influence generations of architects, planners, and environmental aestheticians. In 1996 Jacobs received the Thomas Jefferson Medal in

Architecture from the University of Virginia. In 2000 the National Building Foundation awarded her their Lifetime Achievement Award. Jacobs considers herself a thinker without an ideology, a pragmatist without philosophers' baggage, an ethicist against grandiose schemes that destroy communities, and most importantly, a writer who cares deeply about the aesthetics of urban places. She examines cities through various prisms: historic, social, economic, aesthetic, and moral. Jacobs is still exploring the positive and negative aspects of time in American urban neighborhoods.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Death and Life of Great American Cities (New York, 1961).

The Economy of Cities (New York, 1969).

A Question of Separatism: Quebec and the Struggle over Sovereignty (New York, 1980).

Cities and the Wealth of Nations (New York, 1984).

Systems of Survival: A Dialogue on the Moral Foundations of Commerce and Politics (New York, 1992).

The Nature of Economies (New York, 2000).

Further Reading

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio

Allen, Max. *Ideas that Matter: The World of Jane Jacobs* (Owen Sound, Ont., 1997).

Kunstler, Jim. "Jane Jacobs," *Metropolis* (March 2001): 130–33, 181–7.

Barbara Sandrisser

JAEGER, Werner Wilhelm (1889–1961)

Werner Jaeger was born on 30 July 1888 in Lobberich, Prussia, near the Dutch border. He studied at the University of Berlin with classicist and philologist Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, receiving his PhD in 1911. In 1914 he assumed the chair of Greek at the University of Basel (which had been Nietzsche's chair), but he soon went to the University of Kiel, where he could teach for several years after being declared unfit for service during World War I. He was called back to Berlin to take Wilamowitz's chair in 1921. By 1923 Jaeger had produced the first volumes of his critical edition of Gregory of Nyssa and his *Aristoteles: Grundlegung einer Geschichte seiner Entwicklung*.

The first volume of his *Paideia* appeared in 1933 in Germany, but he would not complete it in his homeland. Alarmed by Hitler's Nazi regime, he found a one-year position in 1934–5 as Sather Professor of Greek at the University of California at Berkeley. He then returned to America permanently in 1936 for a professorship at the University of Chicago, and that year he gave the Gifford Lectures at the University of St. Andrews, Scotland. In 1939 he became a university professor at Harvard University and headed the new Harvard Institute for Classical Studies, where he pursued his work on Gregory of Nyssa, more volumes of *Paideia*, and an edition of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. He retired from Harvard in 1959, and died on 19 October 1961 in Boston, Massachusetts.

Jaeger's *Aristoteles: Grundlegung einer Geschichte seiner Entwicklung* profoundly transformed the understanding of Aristotle and ever since has set the terms for further research and debate. Jaeger's depiction of Aristotle's writings places him as a Platonist initially, and shows how he gradually moved away from many Platonic stances while developing his own system. Jaeger is best remembered by a wider audience as the author of the three-volume *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*. That work portrays the Greeks' foremost concern with education as the motivating energy for their cultural achievements. Indirectly, Jaeger also has a profound story to tell about the Greeks' continued significance for modern Western civilization.

Jaeger won national and international fame as a teacher and a scholar before his death. He was awarded honorary degrees from universities around the world. His renown as an inspiring teacher and patient mentor kept him busy with students, some of whom have become important scholars as well.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Emendationum Aristotelearum Specimen (Berlin, 1911).

Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Metaphysik des Aristoteles (Berlin, 1912).

Nemesios von Emesa (Berlin, 1914).

Aristoteles: Grundlegung einer Geschichte seiner Entwicklung (Berlin, 1923). Trans. Richard Robinson, *Aristotle: Fundamentals of the History of His Development* (Oxford, 1948).

Paideia. Die Formung des griechischen Menschen, 3 vols (Berlin, 1933–6). Trans. Gilbert Highet, *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*, 3 vols (Oxford, 1939–45).

Diokles von Karystos: Die Griechische Medizin und die Schule des Aristoteles (Berlin, 1938; 2nd edn 1963).

Demosthenes: The Origin and Growth of his Policy, trans. Edward Schouten (Berkeley, Cal., 1938). Also published as *Demosthenes: der Staatsmann und sein Werden* (Berlin, 1939).

Humanism and Theology (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1943).

The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers (Oxford, 1947). Also published as *Die Theologie der frühen griechischen Denker* (Stuttgart, Germany, 1953).

Two Rediscovered Works of Ancient Christian Literature: Gregory of Nyssa and Macarius (Leiden, The Netherlands, 1954).

Early Christianity and Greek Paideia (Cambridge, Mass., 1961).

Other Relevant Works

Jaeger's papers are at Harvard University and his personal library is at the Center for Hellenic Studies in Washington, D.C.

Humanistische Reden und Vorträge (Berlin, 1937; 2nd edn 1960).

"The Problem of Authority and the Crisis of the Greek Spirit," in *Authority and the Individual* (Cambridge, Mass., 1937), pp. 240–50.

"Praise of Law: The Origin of Legal Philosophy and the Greeks," in *Interpretations of Modern Legal Philosophies*, ed. P. Sayrre (New York, 1947), pp. 352–75.

"The Moral Value of the Contemplative Life," in *Moral Principles of Action*, ed. R. N. Anshen (New York, 1952), pp. 77–93.

Ed., *Opera*, by St. Gregory of Nyssa (Leiden, 1952).

Scripta Minora, 2 vols (Rome, 1960).

Five Essays, trans. Adele Fiske (Montréal, 1966). Contains an autobiography and a bibliography of his writings.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v47*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Calder, William M., III. "Werner Jaeger," in *Classical Scholarship: A Biographical Encyclopedia*, ed. Ward W. Briggs and William M. Calder, III (London and New York, 1990).

Calder, William M., III, ed. *Werner Jaeger Reconsidered* (Atlanta, 1992).

Schadewaldt, Wolfgang. *Gedenkrede auf Werner Jaeger, 1888–1961: Mit einem Verzeichnis der Schriften Werner Jaegers* (Berlin, 1963). Contains a bibliography of Jaeger's writings.

John R. Shook

JAMES, Henry, Sr. (1811–82)

Born in Albany, New York, on 2 June 1811, Henry James was the son of William James, an Irish immigrant who through instinct, intelligence, and industry achieved social prominence and died as the second wealthiest man in the state of New York. Henry graduated with the BA from Union College in 1830. Something of a prodigal son, he returned home, working as an editor and studying law until his father's death in 1835, when he entered Princeton Theological Seminary. His departure from the seminary in 1838 without a degree signals a lifelong theological passion too pure to find satisfaction in orthodoxy. Married in 1840, Henry and Mary Robertson Walsh James had five children: William JAMES (born 1842), Henry (1843), Garth Wilkinson (1845), Robertson (1846), and Alice (1848). The children were educated in a variety of settings on both sides of the Atlantic, as James sought to encourage and challenge their minds while freeing their spirits from any external control. The uneven results of his pedagogy parallel those of his philosophy. William achieved brilliance in psychology and philosophy, as did Henry in literature; Alice's keen sensibility could not find or create an appropriate expression; Wilkie was wounded in the Civil War and later failed in an attempt to develop an agricultural community of freed slaves in the South; and Robertson never found a calling and succumbed to alcoholism. Henry lived long enough to appreciate the fortunes of his grown children; he died on 18 December 1882 in Boston, Massachusetts.

Henry James's intellectual fervor, free-ranging intellect, and colorful rhetoric inspired interest and admiration among his philosophical contemporaries, yet failed to win their full assent or even to satisfy his own desire for clear and cogent expression. For example, in response to James's *The Secret of Swedenborg* (1869), William Dean HOWELLS quipped that "he kept it," and son William circulated among the family a cartoon of a man flogging a horse with the caption, "Father's Ideas." But it is a mistake to dismiss James as a thinker in his own right. Without the consolation or support of orthodoxy, James was in a deeper sense the ultimate Protestant, taking the spiritual insights of Calvinism too seriously to be satisfied with its intellectual structure, even in his own formulations.

Like many of his contemporaries, most notably his personal friend Ralph Waldo EMERSON, James foresaw unprecedented possibilities if Americans would recognize the necessity of casting off the weight of the past and the encumbrances of contemporary institutions in order to begin a new life of dignity and purity. Yet James knew that the process of realizing these possibilities was more complex than his "fair unfallen friend" Emerson could conceive, and he knew that at the center of his quarrel with his contemporaries, both those of the party of the past and those of the party of the future, was a fundamental disagreement about human nature and the character of human experience. James had no sympathy for the pessimists who preached the old gospel of sin and redemption; however, he thought that the optimists gained their cheerfulness too easily, because they failed to grapple with the reality of evil. The fundamental problems of life, as he saw it, were not moral failings or physical disasters so much as the consequences of attachment to spiritual selfhood. Although ironic, it is fundamentally fortunate that self-attachment leads inevitably to tragedy, for by experiencing the evil of self-centeredness a person begins to see a new way of living, where true humanity can be found in the freedom and equality of all human beings.

Through a "fortunate fall" from self-centeredness into awareness that one's true reality inheres in the sociality of human nature, a person is also freed from thinking about God as a moralistic judge over and beyond human life and, instead, is liberated to see the divinity that emerges as human relations move toward freedom, equality, and harmony. For James, the creative power and redemptive love of God

transform the undeniably tragic elements of human experience into stages in the movement of life toward a state of individual and social being beyond tragedy. Out of personal tragedies and historical conflicts, he asserts, will grow a perfect, harmonious society, which will be the redeemed form of humanity. Thus, even wars and revolutions are seen as the means through which the transformation of selves into society proceeds.

He writes, "Old ways of thinking, especially worn-out ideas about God, are frustrating obstructions: I find myself incapable, for my part, of honoring the pretension of any deity to my allegiance, who insists on standing eternally aloof from my own nature, and by that fact confesses himself personally incommensurate and unsympathetic with my basest, most sensuous, and controlling personal necessities. It is an easy enough thing to find a holiday God who is all too selfish to be touched by the infirmities of his own creatures – a God, for example, who has naught to do but receive assiduous court for a work of creation done myriads of ages ago, and which is reputed to have cost him in the doing neither pains nor patience, neither affection or thought, but simply the utterance of a dramatic word; and who is willing, accordingly, to accept our decorous Sunday homage in ample quittance of obligations so unconsciously incurred on our part, so lightly rendered and so penuriously sanctioned on his. Every sect, every nation, every family almost, offers some pet idol of this description to your worship. But I am free to confess that I have long outgrown this loutish conception of deity. I can no longer bring myself to adore a characteristic activity in the God of my worship, which falls below the secular average of human character. In fact, what I crave with all my heart and understanding – what my very flesh and bones cry out for – is no longer a Sunday but a weekday divinity, a working God, grim with the dust and sweat of our most carnal appetites and passions, and bent, not for an instant upon inflating our worthless pietistic righteousness,

but upon the patient, toilsome, thorough cleansing of our physical and moral existence from the odious defilement it has contracted, until we each and all present at last in body and mind the deathless effigy of his own uncreated loveliness." (1869, pp. vi–vii)

James pleased neither the orthodox believers, who wanted to bring the judgmental force of a transcendent deity to bear on the immorality of individuals, nor the freethinking optimists, who wanted simply to leave religion behind so that humanity might progress smoothly forward. Neither did his thinking please James himself, for he was never satisfied with his own articulations. He found Swedenborg's metaphysics and Fourier's sociology superior to contemporary alternatives, yet finally inadequate to express the truths of his own experience. If reliance upon them renders his thinking abstruse to later readers, his frustration with even his own best formulations provides a pathway whereby James's insights may be retrieved.

James raised his children to be too independent to absorb even his ideas directly or to adopt his views whole cloth. Yet, in their own way, both of his famous sons continued to wrestle with his central preoccupations. William James's interest in psychology, pragmatism, empiricism, process metaphysics, and the varieties of religious experience, along with the junior Henry James's literary examinations of selfhood and the subtle challenges of self-perception, tap the experiential substance of their father's main concerns while moving beyond his expressions of them. Their accomplishments point to the richness of Henry James's insights into human experience, his courage in addressing them, and his humility about the success his expressions achieved.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

What Constitutes the State (New York, 1846).

Tracts for the New Times, No. 1., Letter to a Swedenborgian (New York, 1847).

Moralism and Christianity; or, Man's

Experience and Destiny (New York, 1850).

Lectures and Miscellanies (New York, 1852).

Love, Marriage, and Divorce, and the Sovereignty of the Individual: A Discussion between Henry James, Horace Greeley, and Stephen Pearl Andrews (New York, 1853).

The Church of Christ not an Ecclesiasticism: A Letter of Remonstrance to a Member of the "soi-disant" New Church (New York, 1854).

The Nature of Evil, Considered in a Letter to the Rev. Edward Beecher, D.D., Author of 'The Conflict of Ages' (New York, 1855).

Christianity the Logic of Creation (New York, 1857).

The Social Significance of Our Institutions: An Oration Delivered by Request of the Citizens of Newport, Rhode Island, July 4, 1861 (Boston, 1861).

Substance and Shadow, or, Morality and Religion in Their Relation to Life: An Essay on the Physics of Creation (Boston, 1863).

The Secret of Swedenborg: Being an Elucidation of His Doctrine of the Divine Natural Humanity (Boston, 1869).

Society the Redeemed Form of Man, and the Earnest of God's Omnipotence in Human Nature: Affirmed in Letters to a Friend (Boston, 1879).

The Literary Remains of the Late Henry James, ed. William James (Boston, 1884).

Other Relevant Works

James's papers are primarily at Harvard University, and also Amherst College, Union College, and Colby College.

"Swedenborg as a Theologian," *Massachusetts Quarterly Review* 1 (1848): 293–307.

"Stirling's *Secret of Hegel*," *North American Review* 102 (1866): 264–75.

"Horace Bushnell's *Vicarious Sacrifice*," *North American Review* 102 (1866): 556–71.

"Religion Old and New," *The Radical* 1 (1866): 97–101.

"Emanuel Swedenborg," *The Nation* 4 (1866–7): 329.

"The Radical Dogmatics," *The Radical* 2 (1867): 84–94.

"Spiritualism, Old and New," *The Atlantic Monthly* 29 (1872): 358–62.

"Spiritualism: Modern Diabolism," *The Atlantic Monthly* 32 (1873): 219.

"Letter to Francis Ellingwood Abbott: Deliverance, not Perfection, the Aim of Religion," *The Index* 7 (20 January 1876): 26.

"Letter to Francis Ellingwood Abbott: The Reconciliation of Man Individual with Man Universal," *The Index* 7 (3 February 1876): 52.

"Letter to Francis Ellingwood Abbott: The Philosophy of the Heart," *The Index* 7 (18 May 1876): 230.

"Some Personal Recollections of Carlyle," *The Atlantic Monthly* 47 (1881): 593–609.

Gunn, Giles, ed. *Henry James, Senior: A Collection of His Writings* (Chicago, 1974).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v13*

Grattan, C. *The Three James: A Family of Minds* (New York, 1962).

Habegger, Alfred. *The Father: A Life of Henry James, Sr.* (New York, 1994).

Hoover, Dwight W. *Henry James, Sr. and the Religion of the Community* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1969).

Kellogg, Julia A. *Philosophy of Henry James: A Digest* (New York, 1883).

Lewis, Richard W. B. *The James: A Family Narrative* (New York, 1991).

Matthiessen, F. O. *The James Family: A Group Biography* (New York, 1961).

Moseley, James G. *A Complex Inheritance: The Idea of Self-Transcendence in the Theology of Henry James, Senior, and the*

Novels of Henry James (Missoula, Mont., 1975).

Perry, Ralph B. *The Thought and Character of William James* (Boston, 1935).

Warren, Austin. *The Elder Henry James* (New York, 1934).

Young, Frederick H. *The Philosophy of Henry James, Sr.* (New York, 1951).

James G. Moseley

JAMES, William (1842–1910)

William James was born into a wealthy family on 11 January 1842 in New York City. He prospered in a milieu that provided some of the best that nineteenth-century America had to offer. He was educated at home, and with his family (including his famous novelist brother, Henry James, Jr.) made frequent trips to Europe. James's father, Henry JAMES, Sr., was deeply influenced by the mystical philosophy of Emanuel Swedenborg and he authored a number of books on theological topics. James's father also counted among his friends numerous literary and philosophical luminaries, including Ralph Waldo EMERSON and Henry David Thoreau. From the outset, James's environment was intellectually rich and impressively steeped in a diverse blend of philosophical and theological perspectives.

At the age of eighteen, James tried his hand at being an artist, studying painting with the prominent American artist William Hunt. He soon gave up art, however, feeling he had insufficient talent to make a career of it. James then went on to study chemistry and comparative anatomy at Harvard, and later, at the age of twenty-two, entered Harvard Medical School. While attending medical school, he took a year off to join the distinguished biologist Louis AGASSIZ in an expedition to the Amazon, to collect specimens in Brazil. James returned and completed his medical degree in 1869, but never practiced medicine. In 1873 he became an instructor in anatomy and physiology at Harvard. In 1875 he began teaching psychology at Harvard, and then philosophy, in 1879. James was professor of philosophy until his retirement in 1907. James achieved great eminence and popularity as a professor and public lecturer. His death on 16 August 1910 at his summer home in Chocorua, New Hampshire, was mourned as the passing of one of America's greatest philosophers.

Together with Charles S. PEIRCE and John DEWEY, James was a founder of pragmatism, America's only indigenous professional philosophical movement; and it is for his pragmatism that James is chiefly remembered today. Pragmatism is a quintessentially American philosophy because of its emphasis on practical consequences, action, and values; and it represents some of the most distinctive and enduring elements of the American national character. Almost a century after his death, James's brilliant and original contributions to philosophy continue to have wide influence and appeal. Chief among them are his pragmatic methodology and theory of truth, his fideism, especially as expressed in his doctrine of the will to believe, his philosophy of religion, and his radical empiricism. In addition to having a distinguished place in the history of philosophy, James is also regarded as one of the great figures in the history of psychology. His two masterpieces, *The Principles of Psychology* (1890) and *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (1902), are both classics in that field. It testifies to the breadth and depth of James's thought that these two books are also regarded as classics in philosophy.

Two major pillars provide the basis of James's philosophy. The first is his view that the mind is teleological, and that the function of mental activity is to fulfill the organism's purposes and interests. James's teleological conception of the mind is a reflection of the late nineteenth century's enchantment with the language and concepts of Darwinian evolu-

tionism. But James utilized the concepts and metaphors of Darwinism in ways which reached far beyond their original biological significance. Extending the notions of "the struggle for existence," "survival of the fittest," and "adaptation" to meet his own philosophical purposes, James argued that the function of human cognition must be understood in terms of the human struggle for success. Success, for James, was to be understood in light of the fact that human beings are purposive and goal-positing organisms. On the basis of this view, he argued that the adequacy of both our actions and beliefs must be measured in terms of the degree to which they help us fulfill those purposes and goals.

The second pillar of James's philosophy is his radical empiricism, that all phenomena are fully explicable in terms of actual or possible experience. James rejected what he called "transexperiential" objects and principles. As he stated in *Essays in Radical Empiricism* (1912), "everything real must be experienceable somewhere, and every kind of being experienced must somewhere be real" (1912, p. 81; all references are to the Harvard edition). James's analyses of personal identity, truth, knowledge, and reality reflect his adherence to this fundamental idea.

While James's teleological conception of mind and his radical empiricism constitute the basis for his analyses of particular philosophical concepts, they also constitute the basis of his metaphilosophy: his view of the nature and importance of philosophy itself. James's pragmatic method was meant to restore the empirical relevance of philosophy. James considered philosophical theories to be no different in important respects from the more ordinary claims of everyday life, in that they are useless if taken in isolation from the needs and purposes of the human beings who create and act upon them, and whom they ultimately must serve. As James put it, "The whole function of philosophy ought to be to find out what definite difference it will make to you and me, at definite instants of our life, if this world-formula or that world-formula be the true one." (1907, p. 30)

On the basis of his pragmatic criterion of meaningfulness, James rejected as meaningless those philosophies which he believed were excessively technical or speculative. He was particularly outspoken in his rejection of speculative metaphysics, especially as promulgated by his absolute idealist contemporaries such as British philosophers F. H. Bradley, H. H. Joachim, and T. H. Green, and also James's colleague and close friend at Harvard, Josiah ROYCE. In a rare moment of exasperation, cutting through the many detailed arguments he had offered against these philosophers, James asserted plainly that the philosophizing of speculative metaphysicians is "but pompous trifling," and that "the endowment of … professorship[s] for such … being[s] would be something really absurd" (1907, p. 52).

While James countered his speculative colleagues by insisting that philosophical claims must be understandable in terms of an individual's experience, it would be a mistake to interpret his version of empiricism in narrow or traditional terms. In advocating what he called the doctrine of "radical empiricism," James rejected the kind of empiricism which resulted in positivism or in scientism: the view which maintains that the methods and principles of empirical science provide the sole legitimate route to knowledge. He took as strong a stand against what he saw to be the excesses of his narrowly scientistic contemporaries as he did against the excesses of speculative metaphysicians. At the time, this was a bold position for James to take, since in the late nineteenth century the scientistic attitude was dominant in both academic and popular circles.

Throughout his career, James tried to steer a reasonable course between speculative metaphysics on the one hand, and scientism on the other. He described his aims in the opening chapter of *Pragmatism* (1907), where he announced that his pragmatic philosophy was intended to mediate between "tender-minded" (speculative) world views on the one hand, and "tough-minded" (scientistic) world views on the other (1907, p. 13). James sought, along

with the speculative metaphysicians, to bring out philosophy's potential to address the deepest metaphysical, moral, and religious issues; and at the same time – along with the narrower empiricists – to remain grounded in experience as the ultimate justification and test of philosophical claims.

James's justification of faith is one of the most notable aspects of his philosophy. In the title essay of his book *The Will to Believe, and Other Essays* (1897), James challenged the notion that evidence alone is the sole ground for justifying belief. He argued that there are occasions when the evidence for a belief is not sufficient, but the consequences of believing are so unusual or personally important that the subject may be justified in believing on pragmatic, moral, or what he sometimes called "passional" grounds. By emphasizing the pragmatic and moral contexts of believing, James sought to demonstrate the self-defeating and irrational nature of the philosophically ensconced principle of evidentialism: that belief is justified only to the extent that it is supported by adequate evidence. In "The Will to Believe" and elsewhere, James sought to contextualize the significance of concepts such as "belief," "evidence," and "justification" by reference to the wider context of the exigencies of life. Critics, intellectually scandalized by James's attempt to legitimize emotions and desires as justifications of belief, lost no time in thinking up new names for James's doctrine; "the will to deceive" and "the will to make-believe" were two favorites. However, James's position was far more subtle than his critics allowed. He was not remiss, as his critics believed, in failing to acknowledge what they took to be certain obvious conditions of epistemic justifiability. Rather, his goal was to undermine at the outset the prevailing epistemic and existential paradigm under which those conditions seemed so plausible.

Of the many philosophical concerns that occupied James throughout his life, the problem of free will and determinism held the most dramatic personal significance. In his twenties, James suffered from an episode of severe depression. The problem he faced was that his longtime absorption in the study of the physical sciences of his day, built upon the assumption of mechanistic causal laws, led him to have serious doubts about the possibility of free will. These doubts undermined his sense of his own power as a moral agent and left him in a state of despair. In various works, including *The Principles of Psychology*, *The Will to Believe*, *Some Problems of Philosophy* (1911), and *Pragmatism*, James addressed the issue of free will from different points of view, including that of science, speculative philosophy, introspective experience, and morality. In a notable diary entry written by James in 1870, he described the philosophical and psychological strategy he used to pull himself out of his depression. After renouncing as impossible the attempt to establish freedom of the will by means of evidential arguments, he proclaimed that "my first act of free will shall be to believe in free will" (1920, p. 247). In choosing to believe in free will, James argued, he thereby constituted the reality of the free will in which he believed. One may wonder whether a complex issue such as freedom of the will can be so easily resolved. Whether one thinks that James's argument is significant, misguided, or even merely tautological will be determined in part by one's own understanding of the meaning of "free will." James's voluntarism regarding the philosophical treatment of free will itself leaves interesting work to be done regarding the complex pragmatic and other possible meanings of the concept of freedom.

James's most interesting treatment of the issue of free will – one quite different from his discussion in the diary entry – appears in his essay "The Dilemma of Determinism," found in his book *The Will to Believe*. In this essay, James was guided by the insights he would later articulate in an article titled "The Will to Believe," namely, that in the context of a crucially important issue which is intellectually undecidable, it is entirely appropriate (indeed thoroughly rational) to make a decision on

moral and prudential grounds. In "The Dilemma of Determinism," James argued that since there is no sufficient evidence for deciding for or against free will (it is, in his terms, "intellectually undecidable"), and further, that since the consequences of belief in free will have considerable moral significance, it is therefore justifiable, and indeed perhaps even morally obligatory, to believe in free will on "passional grounds." "The Dilemma of Determinism" provides the most developed of James's arguments for free will, and the one most representative of his fideism and pragmatism.

James's theory of truth is perhaps the most well-known aspect of his philosophy, and it stands at the heart of his pragmatism. It is developed most fully in *Pragmatism* and *The Meaning of Truth* (1909), where James offered what he called a "genetic theory of what is meant by truth" (1907, p. 37). By this he meant that the nature of truth is not separable from the conditions under which it is justifiably ascribed. On James's revisionist interpretation, truth is seen not as a metaphysical category as previous philosophers had thought, but rather as an epistemological one.

The influence of Darwinism is especially evident in James's theory of truth. He held that the truth of a belief is determined by the degree to which it is "fit," the degree to which it ideally can survive, initially, in the life of the individual, and later, among a community of inquirers. A belief's survivability, in turn, is determined by the degree to which it can help human beings fulfill their purposes and interests. In his less careful moments, James equates the "most fit" (and hence, "most true") beliefs with those that *in fact* survive in the process of inquiry. This equation has inspired recent neopragmatists to count James as a precursor to their view that the truth of a belief is reducible to its acceptance within an epistemic community. But in fact, James's position on truth was far more subtle than this. He posited a hypothetical and normative conception of truth under which truth is constituted not necessarily by beliefs which *in fact* survive (some beliefs

may survive gratuitously), but rather by beliefs which *deserve* to survive, because they offer the best instruments for fulfilling purposes within the context of experience. James held (if not always consistently) that the mere survival of a belief – its consensual acceptance by a community – is not sufficient to guarantee its truth.

With regard to his theory of truth, no less than in the case of his doctrine of the will to believe, James's critics accused him of the worst philosophical transgressions: subjectivism and irrationalism. James was partly to blame for this, since he was often less than careful in articulating his position, sometimes choosing more dramatic but less nuanced modes of expression. James did indeed appeal to the subjective experience of the individual as the starting point of his theory of truth, but his theory did not end there. He argued that there is a structure within the context of experience itself which is outside the subject's control, and which sets the objective conditions of the subject's beliefs being true. James's goal was to defend a conception of truth which was objective, but which nevertheless had its basis in a subjective starting point. This is a difficult and perhaps even impossible task, but one which is far more complex and philosophically interesting than his critics supposed.

Just as the appeal to experience is central in James's theory of truth, so also is the normative element of his theory. In representing truth as *pragmatic* agreement with reality, James's goal was to transform the fundamental principles and assumptions of epistemology. Since the concept of pragmatic truth incorporates reference to the potential of an idea to be used for the fulfillment of purposes and interests, and since James held that the fulfillment of interests constitutes moral value, he concluded that truth is a normative, and specifically, a moral category. "Truth," as he put it, "is one species of good" (1907, p. 42; italics deleted). Similarly, from a pragmatic point of view, reality – which James characterized as the object of our true judgments about the world – is also infused

with human values. In James's hands, the philosophically entrenched distinction between facts and values was obliterated.

James's doctrine of radical empiricism lies at the foundation of his thought, and provides the metaphysical and epistemological underpinning of his pragmatic theories of truth and reality. In *Essays in Radical Empiricism*, James worked out his view of the metaphysical and epistemological primacy of experience. The key concept here is that of "pure experience," which James used to designate the ultimate metaphysical nature of the universe. As the ultimate reality, pure experience provides the basis of the pragmatic realities of our everyday world. James insisted, however, that pure experience not be understood as a single "stuff." Rather, "it is made of *that*, of just what appears, of space, of intensity, of flatness, brownness, heaviness, or what not" (1912, pp. 13–14). James held that a major advantage of his doctrine of radical empiricism is that it offered a way of transcending longstanding philosophical dualisms which had led philosophers into many unnecessary quagmires. He had particular interest in deconstructing the dualisms of knower/known, subjective/objective, mental/physical, thought/thing, and fact/value. James argued, against both his idealist and empiricist predecessors, that these dualistic categories do not represent anything ontologically basic. Rather, they are merely functional distinctions which teleological subjects make within the stream of their experience, distinctions which have proven useful as they seek to fulfill their purposes and interests. While James avoided many of the objections to which his idealist and classical empiricist predecessors were susceptible, it is still a matter of debate as to whether his own theory falters in important ways; especially when it comes to explaining the nature of the teleological subject and the concept of objective reference.

The concept of experience has varying but related functions in James's thought. There are interesting comparisons to be made, for example, between his early notion of the "blooming, buzzing confusion" in *The Principles of Psychology* (1890, vol. 1, p. 462), where "experience" is taken as a subjective, introspectable phenomenon, and his later conception in *Essays in Radical Empiricism* of experience as an ontological category. Moreover, in *Varieties of Religious Experience* and *A Pluralistic Universe* (1909), James gave the notion of experience a starring, yet different, ontologically basic role. Here experience is a stand-in for the divine: James characterized the divine as a field of experience in which all other fields of experience are encompassed.

James's philosophy of religion is one of the best-known areas of his thought. He considered religion to be the "great interest of [his] life" (1920, vol. 2, p. 58), and he dealt with religious topics over a wide range of his writings. Although he vigorously rejected the doctrines and practices of conventionally established religions, he offered two main sorts of arguments in favor of religious sensibility and belief. The first were pragmatic arguments, which were developed primarily in *Pragmatism*, and several articles in *The Will to Believe* (see in particular "The Will to Believe" and "Is Life Worth Living?"). Here he stressed the beneficial personal and moral consequences of belief in a deeper source of meaning and significance. The second were experiential arguments, found primarily in James's *Varieties of Religious Experience*.

The Varieties of Religious Experience is a subtle and stirring defense of the epistemic, moral, and spiritual value of religious experience. It is arguably James's most profound philosophical work. First and foremost, the book is an analysis of the phenomenology of religious experience, illuminating central aspects of the religious consciousness. Also in this book are seminal discussions on the relationship between philosophy and religion, in which James outlined what he took to be the inadequacy of philosophical methods to provide sufficient understanding or defense of religious claims. James tried to show that the personal experience of the individual provides

an effective (indeed the only effective) route to knowledge of the divine. One might say that *The Varieties of Religious Experience* is the most "anti-intellectual" of James's books. But he argued for his anti-intellectualism regarding religion with such power, subtlety, and originality that his readers are led to the deepest questions concerning the appropriate domain and limits of philosophical argument, and the role of philosophy in the richer context of experience and life.

In *Varieties of Religious Experience*, James's goal was to establish religion empirically. He challenged the prevailing understanding of what might justifiably count as evidence for religious claims, and argued that current views were excessively narrow and unimaginative. He sought to show that there is abundant evidence for the truth of religious claims, but one must be prepared to search for it: thoroughly, deeply, and often in unexpected places. He also used the metaphors of Darwinian evolution to support religious conclusions. His idea of the survival of the spiritually fittest constituted an innovative and revisionist application of Darwinian categories, and should forever undermine the commonly held belief that James was overly practical or materialistic in his view of human life.

James's work has influenced a wide range of thinkers, both in America and abroad. These include John Dewey, Henri Bergson, Alfred North WHITEHEAD, Bertrand Russell, Edmund Husserl, Ludwig Wittgenstein, and others in the fields of psychology, literature, science, and education. His influence also extended to numerous thinkers later in the twentieth, and into the twenty-first centuries, including W. V. QUINE, Thomas KUHN, Hilary PUTNAM, and Richard RORTY. James's analysis of mysticism has been of enormous interest and influence, and his discussions of this topic continue to play a central role in current philosophical debates. *The Principles of Psychology* and *Essays in Radical Empiricism* remain of considerable importance to phenomenological philosophers; and analytic philosophers as well are finding that *The Principles* offers important insights for the work they are doing in the area of cognitive science and on the nature of consciousness.

The philosophical topics to which James contributed, including realism, objectivity, representationalism, and the ethical and epistemic justification of belief, remain topics of wide current philosophical interest. Philosophers working in the area now called "virtue epistemology" are reviving the Jamesian view that epistemic judgments incorporate normative values. Moreover, for decades now we have seen extended debate between those philosophers who advocate metaphysical realism on the one hand, and pragmatically oriented feminist and other constructivist epistemologies on the other. There is generally wide interest in pragmatism, in both its historical and contemporary forms. It is clear that a century after he lived and worked, the subtlety and significance of James's philosophy continues to enrich philosophical debate.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Principles of Psychology, 2 vols (New York, 1890; 3 vols, Cambridge, Mass., 1981).

The Will to Believe, and Other Essays in Popular Psychology (New York, 1897; Cambridge, Mass., 1979).

Talks to Teachers on Psychology, and to Students on Some of Life's Ideals (New York, 1899; Cambridge, Mass., 1983).

The Varieties of Religious Experience (New York, 1902; Cambridge, Mass., 1985).

Pragmatism: A New Name for Some Old Ways of Thinking (New York, 1907; Cambridge, Mass., 1975).

The Meaning of Truth (New York, 1909; Cambridge, Mass., 1975).

A Pluralistic Universe (New York, 1909; Cambridge, Mass., 1977).

Some Problems of Philosophy (New York, 1911; Cambridge, Mass., 1979).

Essays in Radical Empiricism (New York, 1912; Cambridge, Mass., 1976).

Essays in Philosophy (Cambridge, Mass., 1978).

Essays in Religion and Morality (Cambridge, Mass., 1982).

Essays in Psychology (Cambridge, Mass., 1983).

Essays in Psychical Research (Cambridge, Mass., 1986).

Manuscript Lectures (Cambridge, Mass., 1988).

The Works of William James, 16 vols, ed. Frederick H. Burkhardt, Fredson Bowers, and Ignas K. Skrupskelis (Cambridge, Mass., 1975–1988). All sixteen volumes are listed above.

Other Relevant Works

James's papers are at Harvard University.

The Letters of William James, 2 vols, ed. Henry James (Boston, 1920).

The Writings of William James, ed. John J. McDermott (New York, 1967). Contains a bibliography of James's writings.

William James on Psychical Research, ed. Gardner Murphy and Robert Ballou (New York, 1973).

Writings 1878–1899 of William James, ed. Gerald Meyers (New York, 1987).

Writings 1902–1910 of William James, ed. Bruce Kuklick (New York, 1987).

William James on Exceptional Mental States: The 1898 Lowell Lectures, ed. Eugene Taylor (Amherst, Mass., 1990).

The Correspondence of William James, 12 vols, ed. Ignas K. Skrupskelis, Elizabeth M. Berkeley, and John J. McDermott (Charlottesville, Virg., 1992–2004).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils Before 1950*, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Blackwell Amer Phil*, *Blackwell Comp Phils*, *Blackwell Comp Prag*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Encyc Cog Sci*, *Encyc Ethics*, *Encyc Psych*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Encyc Relig*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v18*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v1*, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v21*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v10*

Barzun, Jacques. *A Stroll with William James* (New York, 1983).

Bird, Graham. William James (New York, 1986).

Corti, W. R., ed. The Philosophy of William James (Hamburg, 1976).

Cotkin, George. *William James, Public Philosopher* (Baltimore, 1990).

Edie, James. *William James and Phenomenology* (Bloomington, Ind., 1987).

Gale, Richard M. *The Divided Self of William James* (Cambridge, 1999).

Goodman, Russell. *Wittgenstein and William James* (Cambridge, UK, 2002).

Levinson, Henry S. *The Religious Investigations of William James* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1981).

Menand, Louis. *The Metaphysical Club* (New York, 2001).

Myers, Gerald E. *William James* (New Haven, Conn., 1986).

Perry, Ralph B. *The Thought and Character of William James*, 2 vols (Boston, 1935).

Putnam, Ruth Anna, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to William James* (Cambridge, UK, 1997).

Schneider, Herbert W., and Brand Blanshard, eds. *In Commemoration of William James, 1842–1942* (New York, 1942).

Seigfried, Charlene H. *William James's Radical Reconstruction of Philosophy* (Albany, N.Y., 1990).

Simon, Linda. *William James Remembered* (Lincoln, Neb., 1996).

Sprigge, T. L. S. *James and Bradley: American Truth and British Reality* (Chicago, 1993).

Suckiel, Ellen Kappy. *The Pragmatic Philosophy of William James* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1982).

———, *Heaven's Champion: William*

James's Philosophy of Religion (Notre Dame, Ind., 1996).

Taylor, Eugene. *William James on Consciousness beyond the Fringe* (Princeton, N.J., 1996).

Wilshire, Bruce. *William James and Phenomenology* (New York, 1979).

Ellen Kappy Suckiel

JAMESON, Fredric Ruff (1934–)

Fredric Jameson was born on 14 April 1934 in Cleveland, Ohio. He was awarded a BA from Haverford College in 1954, an MA from Yale in 1956, and his PhD in French from Yale in 1959. His dissertation was on "The Origins of Sartre's Style." Jameson began his teaching career at Harvard University as an instructor of French from 1959 to 1961, and was assistant professor from 1961 to 1967. In 1967 he accepted a position as professor of French and comparative literature at the University of California at San Diego. In 1976 he became a professor of French at Yale, teaching there until 1983. He then was professor of literature and history of consciousness at the University of California at Santa Cruz from 1983 to 1985. Jameson moved to Duke University in 1985, and in 1986 he was named William A. Lane Professor of Comparative Literature, and Director of the graduate program in literature and theory. Jameson presently has the title of distinguished professor of comparative literature at Duke.

Jameson is known as the foremost theorist of postmodernity, that empirical and theoretical phenomenon which swept the social and literary fields in the 1980s and 90s. In addition, he is considered to be a literary and cultural critic with Marxism at his core. His Marxism is rooted in the United States, which

he takes to be his principal object of study. He is a major theorist of the late twentieth century and has been widely influential. He apprenticed himself to two schools of thought, the first existentialism and Jean-Paul Sartre, the second German critical theory. He wrote his dissertation on the novels and philosophy of Sartre, and this was later published as *The Origins of a Style* (1961). The German Frankfurt School, led by the work of Walter Benjamin, Theodore ADORNO and Ernest Bloch, as well as the allied work of Georg Lukács, provides the foundation for his second turn. Jameson synthesized these two approaches in *Marxism and Form*. But a third shift then took place, which directed Jameson outward towards global tendencies in late capitalism, and the forms of explanations which global theorists outside the United States were developing. Nonetheless, his principal object of interest remains the United States and its role in the global cultural economy.

Jameson is known as a literary and cultural theorist. Yet his work is philosophical, and he has made a substantial contribution to contemporary social philosophy. Jameson's contribution comes as the invention of a new philosophical methodology, which can be widely used to undergird a wide range of studies of cultural and symbolic artifacts and processes. His work is parallel to Pierre Bourdieu, the French social theorist, an empirical and theoretically driven sociologist whose work has close connections with philosophy and philosophers. Jameson has made new contributions to philosophical thinking, while simultaneously focusing much of his attention on the dialectic between theory and method. In this way, philosophical thinking is used as a sort of super-method with the startling power to apply itself to many social, political and cultural fields. Similarly, by working with literary and cultural texts in a deeply theoretical and philosophical way, Jameson has suggested original ways of thinking in many areas.

Jameson has frequently been mislabeled as a Marxist theoretician. This label is sometimes used as a form of intellectual insult, sometimes as a dismissive slur to suggest his work is outdated. The labeling is, to some extent, misguided, and this is clear from his object of study, the nature and power of culture. Conceived in his way, culture is neither a traditional anthropological concern with ways of living, either ancient or modern, nor, in the world of aesthetics and literature, to be examined by a focus on high culture as the marker of civilized progress versus the converse, mass culture. Postmodern culture is his focus. The rise of the "postmodern" for him is synonymous with the idea of the "cultural dominant," in which ideas, virtuality, commodification, culture in the hands of the market, are not just important, but become the very center of human life itself and of its study. His philosophy must therefore, at a minimum, be nuanced as post-Marxist. It is the study of what we experience in the everyday to the exclusion of the ordinary and the material which is important. Thus for Jameson, as with many other theorists of the postmodern, the material world of economic necessity and political domination have become the backdrop to the explosion of cultural forms which now come to take charge. In this view, the avalanche of imagery, through our televisions, our recorded music, our teaching, our very discourse, is now the central object of interest. We see students who never leave, or want to leave, the internet; televisions now on an average of seven hours a day in American homes; the virtuality of our thinking (that is, thinking about images, rather than thinking about objects); the supercession of the imagined over the real; the ubiquity of the cell-phone, the endlessness of the earphone which is in place at breakfast, on the way to work, during work in some cases – all this points to a fundamental shift in what we ought to study in the twenty-first century. Culture, reformulated in this way, has become the necessary focus of our attention. And culture, the market, and commodification have become fused as one.

While Jameson's philosophy is Marxist, it is a thoroughly revised dialectical materialism. Jameson dismisses the base-superstructural philosophical structure of the Marxist tradition, the notion that culture and ideology are somehow mechanically and inextricably linked to the economic conditions of a given historical epoch. Instead, Jameson proposes the notion of a permanent cultural revolution, in which cultural artifacts are thrown up continuously, and create endless contradictions, in what he terms the ideology of form. Perhaps the easiest way to interrogate Jameson's philosophical contribution is to examine how he reinvents crucial elements of the Marxist legacy, especially the concepts of the dialectic, representation, totality and history, as well as reconceiving time.

First, in considering the dialectic, taken from Hegel rather than Marx, and then reformed through Jameson's examination of Theodor Adorno's "Negative Dialectics." Hegel is familiarly known as the great theorist of the dialectic, by which he sought to form a universal principle. For Hegel, history shaped a totality driven by a mystical universal spirit which worked out contradictions. As is well known, Marx adopted the Hegelian dialectic, but denied the role of the "Spirit" in history, and instead substituted the familiar materialist arguments. In Adorno's further reformulation, the interest in resolving problems of reification, standardization, and identity lay within his method of negative dialectics. In this process, he urges a sustained and enduring opposition to established thought and reason, to create something new through resistance. In this view, interpretation, the work of the critic and the philosopher, needs to be embedded in an awareness of history, which was later to become a central tenet of Jameson's methodological architecture. But for Jameson, dialectics has a broader meaning. For one thing,

dialectics is a profoundly reflective undertaking, offering up the possibility of creating a meta-critique of criticism itself. Dialectics also offers a way beyond reification, (the splitting and fragmentation of a broad understanding) bringing the necessary components of a comprehension of human society together.

In forming this view, Jameson adopts a purposefully complex writing style which is itself dialectical in nature. Sentences argue with one another. Contradictory ideas are placed in the same sentence, and parenthetical phrases are frequently included in the middle of rambling sections. All this is self-consciously made, and he has a twofold purpose in writing this way. First, his dialectical writing strives to reveal the complexity of thought which is needed to make sense of the world around us. Thus, in a single sentence he wants us to confront a series of ideas simultaneously, often contradictory ideas. It is as if the exercise of reading is made to be an elaborate semiotic exercise, in which a first idea (the signifier) is brought into collision with a second, (the signified) to make a third, (the sign) which results from the merging of the two. There are echoes of both Roland Barthes and Hegel here. His second purpose is to write against the culture he is seeking to understand. He wants systematically to slow us down, and to allow us to reflect on what we are reading and how we are thinking. One particularly telling example of his dialectical philosophy in operation is the dialectical interplay he creates between the Freudian theory of the subject and Marx's theory of history, used frequently to analyze particular forms of cultural objects.

Jameson's use of the notion of representation is also a key element in his philosophy. Having confirmed the world anew as the world of the Cultural Dominant, the issue of representation is crucial, and it is tied closely to the question of culture's philosophical centrality. We have always known that the world is not available to us immediately, but we have often acted as if it is. In Jameson's view, this strategy takes us back to the cul-de-sac of reification, through which we tell ourselves that the statistical imaginings can be transparently read, or that our texts can faithfully represent that which they imply.

While scientific sociology tries to side-step philosophical problems of language through rigid protocols, definitional work, and so forth, and literature through close textural readings, Jameson urges us to take the problem of cultural representation more seriously. He asks us to remind ourselves continuously that we approach the real only through language and the symbolic world. We are facing, therefore, a semiotic chain of meaning of some complexity. Society is not text, of course, but it is only available through text. We need, therefore, transdisciplinary ways of doing things, which he calls transcoding, a philosophical method borrowing from all kinds of disciplines. At the very least, if in the end we fall back on old formulations to get our work done, we should, from this renewed position, be able to conceptualize and historicize our practice as social analysts. Science, as well as philosophy thus conceived, is then, first and foremost, a cultural process.

In this world, the semiotic is the tool with which to study the symbolic most effectively. Jameson approaches semiotics in two ways, first through the work of Barthes, and then through Jacques Lacan. From Barthes, Jameson develops a theory of the chain of signifiers and signs which constitute the building-blocks from which meaning and forms of representation are generated, and in which the cultural is determined. Most especially from Barthes, he discovers the historicity of language and the context of language, which are both needed for sense to be created about the cultural. From Lacan, Jameson uses the formulations developed around the famous philosophical tripartite of the Imaginary, the Symbolic, and the Real. According to Lacan's epistemology, acts of consciousness presuppose a relationship

between three layers of understanding. The Real can never be immediately experienced. The Imaginary, of course, is the understanding of a world which does not exist, the Symbolic the understanding of the world through language. Forming the consciousness of the real is thus a semiotic task embedded deep in the human psyche. For Lacan, the development of the Imaginary precedes the development of the Symbolic. Children generate a world of imagination before they generate an understanding of language. So when we look at images, we see sources of meaning (the semiotic target), but we also see the sediment of the imagination. Images and meaning (the Real) are thus the result of the interplay between language or the Symbolic, and the Imaginary. These arguments together constitute the elements of a new philosophy of language.

It also necessary to come to terms with Jameson's account of history and of totality, concepts which are closely related in his work. Remembering the work of the "New Philosophers" in France during the 1970s, who rejected, once and for all, the totalizing and dictatorial arguments of Marxism, which had an account of everything, but which stifled independent thinking and denied the value of the subject, Jameson's famous insistence to "Always Historicize" comes against a backdrop of resistance, since it connotes a totalizing tendency embedded in the Marxist tradition. Jameson is famous for arguing for the inevitability of historical explanation in literary and cultural fields. This bold argument denies the separation of cultural production, either in the psyche of the creative worker or in the representation itself, from the social, and especially the historical, context. It should be said immediately that culture, broadly conceived, is not reduced to history in this formulation. Nor is it obvious the way that history is to be read, either through the lens of the cultural product giving us a window into history, or as something to be expressed directly through the cultural object.

Jameson routinely prioritizes capital in this formulation, arguing that there always exists a complex dialectical relationship between the economic form and the cultural form of a given epoch. As we have seen above, he calls this the ideology of form, a phrase in which he tries to encapsulate the contradictory nature of the sign system all societies produce in the relation between capital and culture. For Jameson, history is the "experience of necessity," and this alone prevents reification, the use of history as a final cause independent of meaning. It is the material base from which all societies are formed, and its understanding and working out in cultural forms. History is what hurts, what refuses desire and sets limits on individual and collective practice. It is therefore a ground and a horizon which cannot be transcended.

What of the totalizing tendencies in Jameson's philosophy? Clearly for him, nothing can exist beyond history. And one of the claims that Jameson makes is that Marxism provides an "untranscendable horizon" for analysis which embraces the whole. Interestingly, in the *Political Unconscious*, he turns to Durkheim, rather than to Marx or Hegel, to confirm that "…the very concept of totality is but the abstract form of society …" But Jameson reconceives the notion of totality to avoid problems of a "theological Marxism." Instead of standing for a belief, Jameson uses totality as a way of expressing a methodological commitment. Thus Jameson wants to insist that a historicizing and totalizing account must be implemented if we are to see beyond reification, obfuscation, and ideology to the absolute necessity which lies beyond. But he does not get caught up in the view that in this undertaking we shall liberate society as surely as night follows day.

Jameson confirms postmodernism's emphasis on denaturing time. If, in the postmodernist view, the newly constituted human subject has lost the capacity to put past and future together, as theorists of the postmod-

ern like Jameson propose, then this means, for Lacan, that the chain of signification has collapsed entirely, and with the loss of signification (history being one of the foundational units of signification) comes a loss of self and of sanity. Lacan proposes that schizophrenia is, in part, characterized by a loss of the signifying chain, the interlocking chain of signs which give the world meaning. We construct meaning from a web which involves the past, the future, and the present. Without these elements being present, we are left with a rubble of discontinuous signifiers which do not make sense in themselves, and are not connected. They are like a sentence sitting on its own. And in the world of the social, they become the basis for disorientation.

Further, if time is a function of speed, perceptible only in terms of the rate of change, postmodernity creates a world in which only speed exists without an opposite. We see a flood of images, a flow of simulacra. The older world crawled along on camels and horses; we rush along in planes and rockets. It is as if the older time had a thickness, a density which we have now lost. Our time is immediate, instantaneous, superficial in a profound sense, "thin," one is tempted to say. And this new conception of time has everything to do with the arrogance of the city over and against the provincial and the rural. We are sweeping away the world of old ideas to make the present new and entirely manipulable, replaced as needed by the urgency of the market form.

From Jameson's account, we can draw some powerful conclusions. In postmodernity, there is no "outside." Instead, all the moments in history are brought together in a single period, drawn in for the purposes of commodification. All times become the same, and the relations with time and space are shifted. What used to be historical time is now lost; we are cultural amnesiacs. The lost Eisenhower generation is an obvious example, through films like *American Graffiti* and its offshoots, or *Chinatown*, or *Il*

Conformista, or the flood of Shakespeare remakes, or the Austen films. What Jameson calls "the insensible colonization of the present by the nostalgia mode" fills the cultural landscape. Thus we can look back, and we can look forward, but we cannot see the present (1985).

This boils down to Jameson's "End of History" thesis. Nothing outside of late capitalism, nothing outside of postmodernism, no privileged point of critique; no way forward. In such a world in which the human subject has lost the capacity to organize past and future, it seems unlikely that the social form will move beyond the fragmentary, a world of social images entirely bound up with commodification and with the market. History stands still in postmodernity, with a sense of continual, rapid, and directionless change.

But Jameson's philosophy is, like Marx's, also a call to action. Since history has always been that of the hegemonic class, the only way to tell the whole story is to reconstruct the narrative of that class to which they were opposed, the story of popular culture. Here, in a beautiful phrase, Jameson speaks of "the reaudition of lost voices being created," and hints at the need to recast history widely, as has been the case in the 1980s and 90s, when new historians covered the globe recovering lost stories. Jameson is particularly interested in telling the stories of the globalized dispossessed, and tries to draw in African stories and Chinese stories, and accounts from others which have been neglected in the canon of the past. This polyphony of voices for him offers a way forward, a point "outside" the flowing stream of the postmodern consciousness. He thus seeks to dispel the hold that reification has, the attempt to make natural that which is constructed by capitalism, and this is the purpose of both poetry and social thought, in Jameson's view. Thus, alienation, that close ally of reification, is confronted by dialectical thinking and the avoidance of the obvious and the taken-for-granted. He argues that

much social philosophy and social theory is equally limited to fashionably interesting brand names of thinking that do not talk to each other. Thus, "progressive thinkers," if such a group can now be said to exist, are cut off from one another through their need to establish a new paradigm, and a new niche in the theoretical market. This private writing, both in the personal sense and in the theoretical sense, has serious political effects in dissolving opposition in theory, and, in a general sense, in alienating individuals one from another. Clearly implicit in his argument is the need for a generalizing philosophy and language, and a generalizing understanding to draw these progressive philosophies together.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Sartre: The Origins of a Style (New York, 1961).
Marxism and Form: Twentieth Century Dialectical Theories of Literature (Princeton, N.J., 1971).
The Prison-house of Language: A Critical Account of Structuralism and Russian Formalism (Princeton, N.J., 1972).
Fables of Agression: Wyndham Lewis, the Modernist as Fascist (Berkeley, Cal., 1979).
The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act (New York, 1981).
The Ideologies of Theory, Essays 1971–1986, 2 vols (Minneapolis, 1988).
Late Marxism: Adorno or the Persistence of the Dialectic (London, 1990).
Signature of the Visible (New York, 1990).
Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism (London, 1991).
The Geopolitical Aesthetic: Cinema and Space in the World System (Bloomington, Ind., 1992).
The Seeds of Time (New York, 1994).
Brecht and Method (London, 1998).
The Cultural Turn: Selected Writings on the Postmodern, 1983–1998 (London, 1998).
A Singular Modernity: Essay on the Ontology of the Present (London, 2002).

Other Relevant Works
The Jameson Reader, ed. Michael Hardt and Kathi Weeks (Oxford, 2000).

Further Reading
Comp Amer Thought
Anderson, Perry. *The Origins of Postmodernity* (London, 1998).
Bertens, Hans. *The Idea of the Postmodern* (London, 1995).
Burnham, Clint. *The Jamesonian Unconscious: The Aesthetics of Marxist Theory* (Durham, N.C., 1995).
Dowling, William. *Jameson, Althusser, Marx* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1984).
Goldstein, Philip. *The Politics of Literary Theory* (Tallahassee, Fla., 1990).
Homer, Sean. *Fredric Jameson* (New York, 1998).
Kellner, Douglas. *Postmodernism: Jameson Critique* (Washington, D.C., 1989).
Roberts, Adam. *Fredric Jameson* (London and New York, 2000).

Christopher Wilkes

JASTROW, Joseph (1863–1944)

Joseph Jastrow was born on 30 January 1863 in Warsaw, Poland. His father, Marcus Jastrow, was a German rabbi and Talmudic scholar, who led a Warsaw congregation until his involvement in the Polish rebellion against Russia forced him to emigrate to the United States. The family settled in Philadelphia where Rabbi Jastrow became a leader of conservative Judaism. Joseph Jastrow received his BA with honors from the University of Pennsylvania in 1884. Jastrow went on to study at Johns Hopkins University with G. Stanley HALL and Charles S. PEIRCE, undertaking a variety of psychological experiments with them, and obtained his PhD in psychology in 1886.

In 1888 Jastrow accepted the new position as professor of experimental and comparative psychology at the University of Wisconsin. Jastrow immediately established a laboratory for experimental psychology, and quickly became an internationally recognized pioneer in his research. He organized the first exhibition of the new experimental psychology at the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago, attracting leading psychologists from both the US and Europe.

After these successes, however, Jastrow fell into a debilitating depression in 1894, and would be faced by recurring depressions for the rest of his life. Nevertheless, throughout the 1890s Jastrow was able to conduct and initiate a tradition of hypnosis research that was successfully continued by his best-known students Clark HULL and Milton Erickson. Jastrow was also elected President of the American Psychological Association in 1900. Retiring from Wisconsin in 1927, he became a lecturer at the New School in New York but spent most of his time as a successful writer and radio personality. Jastrow wrote a column titled "Keeping mentally fit" that was syndicated in over 150 newspapers, and had an NBC radio program also about keeping mentally fit that was on the air from 1935 to 1938. Sadly, his last days were spent in treatment for depression at the Austen Riggs Foundation in Stockbridge, Massachusetts, where Jastrow died on 8 January 1944.

Jastrow was an early proponent of both the behavorist and Freudian movements. These theories later proved too narrow in their theoretical orientations for Jastrow's taste, as he perceived them as evolving into cults that demanded a religious type of adherence by their followers. In general, Jastrow's interests in psychology followed a familiar path concerned with acts of judgment, rationality, and self-control, and the subconscious forces that often undermine those acts. Like his friend William JAMES, whose psychology was another important influence, Jastrow felt an obligation to explain scientific psychology to the people. Going further than most psychologists and philosophers, Jastrow was also a public skeptic defending logic and science against superstition, numerology, hypnotism, religious dogma, faith-healing, and spiritualism. These interests likely contributed to his abandonment of Judaism and inspired his widely read early book, *Fact and Fable in Psychology*, published in 1900.

When active as an experimentalist, Jastrow developed various apparatuses to assess differences between voluntary and involuntary movement. This device was comparable to a scientific Ouija board that recorded patterns of involuntary hand movements. Furthermore, his work on illusions was also quite well known, especially his work dealing with ambiguous figures. His famous ambiguous rabbit–duck figure is still frequently reproduced today. Jastrow also helped pioneer studies concerning the dreaming of the blind. In one investigation, "Dreams of the Blind" (1888), Jastrow discovered that children who lose vision before ages five to seven will be denied visual dream imagery throughout their lives, while those blinded later in life will have dream imagery. All of these studies have been considered well-researched, thought-provoking discourses to this day.

Though successful when interested in his work, Jastrow never truly felt he had the proper temperament for his laboratory work. What he might have lacked as an experimentalist he made up for as a highly stylized and prolific writer as well as a popular speaker. He was America's greatest early popularizer of the new scientific psychology, which he called "naturalistic" psychology, rather than "behavioral" psychology. He wrote frequently on this new approach and was a regular contributor to many of the popular magazines of the day, including *Atlantic Monthly*, *Harpers*, *Scribners*, *The Nation*, *Outlook*, and *Popular Science Monthly*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Time-Relations of Mental Phenomena (New York, 1890).

Fact and Fable in Psychology (New York, 1900).

The Subconscious (New York, 1905).

The Qualities of Men: An Essay in Appreciation (New York, 1910).

Character and Temperament (New York, 1915).

The Psychology of Conviction: A Study of Beliefs and Attitudes (New York, 1918).

Keeping Mentality Fit: A Guide to Everyday Psychology (New York, 1928).

Piloting Your Life: The Psychologist as Helmsman (New York, 1930).

Effective Thinking (New York, 1931). Also published as *Managing Your Mind* (New York, 1931).

Freud: His Dream and Sex Theories (Cleveland, 1932). Also published as *The House that Freud Built* (New York, 1932).

Sanity First: The Art of Sensible Living (New York, 1935). Rev. edn *Getting More Out of Life* (New York, 1940).

Wish and Wisdom: Episodes in the Vagaries of Belief (New York, 1935).

The Story of Human Error (New York, 1936).

The Betrayal of Intelligence: A Preface to Debunking (New York, 1938).

Other Relevant Works

Jastrow's papers are at Duke University.

"On Small Differences in Sensation," with Charles S. Peirce, in *Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 3 (Washington, D.C., 1885), pp. 75–83.

"Dreams of the Blind," *New Princeton Revue* 5 (1888): 41–53.

"Studies from the Laboratory of Experimental Psychology of the University of Wisconsin," *American Journal of Psychology* 4 (1891): 198–223.

"The Mind's Eye," *Popular Science Monthly* 54 (1899): 299–312.

"Some Currents and Undercurrents in Psychology," *Psychological Review* 8 (1901): 1–26.

"The Status of the Subconscious," *American Journal of Psychology* 14 (1903): 343–53.

"The Physiological Support of the Perceptive Processes," *Journal of Philosophy* 7 (1910): 380–84.

"Heredity and Mental Traits," *Science* 40 (1914): 555–6.

"Charles S. Peirce as a Teacher," *Journal of Philosophy* 13 (1916): 723–5.

"Varieties of Psychological Experience," *Psychological Review* 24 (1917): 249–65.

"War and Sanity," *Education Review* 56 (1918): 91–107.

"The Neurological Concept of Behavior," *Psychological Review* 31 (1924): 203–18.

"The Animus of Psychical Research," in *The Case For and Against Psychical Belief*, ed. Carl A. Murchinson (Worcester, Mass., 1927).

"Concepts and 'isms' in Psychology," *American Journal of Psychology* 39 (1927): 1–6.

"The Conflict of the Psychologies," *Scientific Monthly* 29 (1929): 411–16.

"Joseph Jastrow," in *A History of Psychology in Autobiography*, vol. 1, ed. Carl Murchison (Worcester, Mass., 1930), pp. 135–62.

"The Current Chaos in Psychology: And the Way out via Psyche's Design for Living," *Scientific Monthly* 41 (1935): 97–110.

"Has Psychology Failed?" *American Scholar* 4 (1935): 261–9.

"American Psychology in the '80's and '90's," *Psychological Review* 50 (1943): 65–7.

Further Readings

Amer Nat Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v1, Who Was Who in Amer v2.

Blumenthal, Arthur L. "The Intrepid Joseph Jastrow," in *Portraits of Pioneers in Psychology*, vol. 1, ed. G. A. Kimble, M. Wertheimer, and C. White (Washington, D.C., 1991), pp. 75–87.

Hull, Clark. "Joseph Jastrow, 1863–1944," *American Journal of Psychology* 57

(1944): 261–5.

Murchison, Carl, ed. *The Psychological Register*, vol. 3 (Worcester, Mass., 1932), pp. 116–18. Contains a bibliography of Jastrow's writings.

Pillsbury, Walter B. "Joseph Jastrow, 1863–1944," *Psychological Review* 51 (1944): 261–5.

Varigny, M. Henry de. "Le laboratoire de psychologie experimental de l'universite de Madison," *Revue Scientifique* 1 (1894): 624–9.

Daniel Trippett

JEFFREY, Richard Carl (1926–2002)

Richard Jeffrey was born on 5 August 1926 in Boston, Massachusetts. He received his MA in philosophy in 1952 at Chicago University, and his PhD in philosophy in 1957 at Princeton University. He was a Fulbright Scholar at the University of Oxford in 1957–8, and a fellow at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton in 1963–4. Jeffrey studied with Rudolf CARNAP at Chicago, with Carl HEMPEL at Princeton, and with Kurt GÖDEL at the Institute for Advanced Study. He briefly taught electrical engineering at Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1958–9. He held appointments in philosophy departments at Stanford University from 1959 to 1963; City College of New York from 1964 to 1967; University of Pennsylvania from 1967 to 1974; and Princeton from 1974 to 1999. After 1999 Jeffrey was professor emeritus at Princeton and visiting professor at the University of California at Irvine. Jeffrey died on 9 November 2002 in Princeton, New Jersey.

Jeffrey's work is primarily in decision theory and epistemology, reaching into philosophy of science, philosophy of mind, and ethics. His work is unified by his commitment to, and development of, Bayesianism, the view that making up one's mind is a matter of adopting an assignment of judgmental probabilities, or features of such assignments. Jeffrey's writings vary from historical and philosophical overviews to close technical studies. He is the most influential philosopher of the twentieth century working in decision theory, and a main proponent of developing and securing the heritage of logical empiricism.

Jeffrey published *The Logic of Decision* in 1965, substantially drawing on work in measure theory by E. Bolker. He is the author of two textbooks in logic: *Formal Logic: Its Scope and Limits* (1967), and *Computability and Logic* (1974). Alongside Leonard Savage's *Foundations of Statistics*, *The Logic of Decision* is the most influential account of decision theory in which probabilities and utilities are subjective and related to preferences by a representation theorem. Unlike in Savage's theory, preferences in *The Logic of Decision* determine utility functions only up to fractional linear transformation. For two such functions U_1 and U_2, we have $U_1 = [(aU_2 + b)/(cU_2 + d)]$, where $ad-bc>0$, $cU_2(A) + d>0$, and $cU_2(T) + d = 1$ for any proposition A for which U_2 is defined and T is the necessary proposition. Probabilities vary across such transformations: $P_1 = P_2(cU_2 + d)$. Probabilities are unique if the utility function is unbounded. This unified theory attributes probabilities and utilities to the same objects (propositions closed under finite truth functional operations). Acts are propositions the agent has power to make true and thus receive probabilities and utilities. As an evidential account not taking a causal notion as primitive, this theory recommends taking one box in Newcomb scenarios. The second edition of *The Logic of Decision* introduces the notion of ratifiability to consider that decisions change probabilities and to bring about the recommendation to take both boxes. A ratifiable decision is a decision to perform an act of maximal expected desirability relative to the probabilities the agent thinks she will have if she finally decided to perform that act.

In epistemology, Jeffrey continues logical empiricism by championing *radical probabilism*, denying objective probability and abandoning attempts to analyze judgment into a rational and an empirical component, without residue. A non-foundational methodology, radical probabilism denies that probabilities are to be based on certainties. Probabilistic judgment is an immediate response to experience, and passing it is a subject matter-dependent skill. Updating by conditioning is generalized to "probability kinematics" ("Jeffrey conditionalization"), where an observation on a random variable X need not single out one value, but may prompt a new probability distribution over all values of X. Effects of observations, apart from the influence of prior probabilities, are captured by the "Bayes" factors [(new odds)/(old odds)] by which the observer's odds between hypotheses are updated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Logic of Decision (Chicago, 1965; 2nd edn 1983).
Formal Logic: Its Scope and Limits (New York, 1967).
Computability and Logic (Cambridge, UK, 1974).
Probability and the Art of Judgment (Cambridge, UK, 1992).

Other Relevant Works
"Ethics and the Logic of Decision," *Journal of Philosophy* 62 (1965): 528–38.
"Goodman's Query," *Journal of Philosophy* 63 (1966): 281–8.
"The Whole Truth," *Synthese* 18 (1968): 24–7.
"On Interpersonal Utility Theory," *Journal of Philosophy* 68 (1971): 647–56.
"Preference Among Preferences," *Journal of Philosophy* 71 (1974): 377–91.
"A Note on the Kinematics of Preference," *Erkenntnis* 11 (1977): 135–41.
"The Logic of Decision Defended," *Synthese* 48 (1981): 473–92.
"Judgmental Probability and Objective Chance," *Erkenntnis* 24 (1986): 5–16.
"Risk and Human Rationality," *The Monist* 70 (1987): 223–36.
"Probability Reparation: The Problem of New Explanation," *Philosophical Studies* 77 (1995): 97–101.
"Unknown Probabilities," *Erkenntnis* 54 (1996): 327–35.
Ed., *Selected Philosophical Essays*, by Carl Hempel (Cambridge, UK, 2000).
"Logicism Lite," *Philosophy of Science* 69 (2002): 447–51.

Further Reading
Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, *Oxford Comp Phil*
Bradley, Richard. "Conditionals and the Logic of Decision," *Philosophy of Science* suppl. 67 (2000): 18–32.
Costantini, Domenico, and Maria Carla Galavotti, eds., *Probability, Dynamics, and Causality: Essays in Honour of Richard C. Jeffrey* (Dordrecht, 1997).
Fishburn, Richard. "Tales of a Radical Bayesian," *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 38 (1994): 135–44.
Skyrms, Brian. "Ratifiability and the Logic of Decision," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 15 (1990): 44–56.
Van Fraassen, Bas C. "A Demonstration of the Jeffrey Conditionalization Rule," *Erkenntnis* 24 (1986): 17–24.

Mathias Risse

JENKINS, Iredell (1909–88)

Iredell Jenkins was born on 12 August 1909 in Blue Ridge Summit, Maryland. Educated at the University of Virginia, he received his BA in 1933, MA in 1934, and PhD in philosophy in 1937. His dissertation was titled "The Elements of Aesthetic Recognition and

Judgment." In 1935–6 he also studied at the University of Paris. From 1937 to 1946 Jenkins taught at Tulane University, rising to the rank of associate professor. From 1946 to 1949 he was assistant professor at Yale University.

In 1949 Jenkins became professor of philosophy and chair of the philosophy department at the University of Alabama, and he held these positions until his retirement in 1978. He also visited other universities, including Columbia, Yale, Northwestern, the Pacific Philosophy Forum Institute, and the Catholic University of America. He was also resident consultant on medical ethics at University of Alabama's Birmingham School of Medicine in 1971. Jenkins died on 9 April 1988 in Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

Jenkins wrote extensively about his two passions: art and social justice. His aesthetics was similar to John DEWEY's, as both emphasized how art is experience resulting from transactions with nature. Art is the sort of experience, like technology and theoretical science, that meets basic needs of human beings. Unlike the others, art expresses the particularity of individual things. Although widely reviewed, Jenkins's work on art had a small impact compared to his work on ethics, social justice, and philosophy of law. A defender of human rights, he published one book and dozens of articles in philosophy journals and law reviews.

During two of the most troubled decades for civil rights in America, Jenkins was a staunch supporter of basic civil liberties, civil rights, and equal opportunity. In the early 1960s, the author of the APA memorial to Jenkins reports, the opportunity for action arose and Jenkins threw himself into the battles over racial integration at the University of Alabama. The climax to his efforts came under terrific pressures in June 1963, with the Alabama governor on campus in protest, when Jenkins assisted the Office of Students Affairs in admitting its first two African-American students.

In Jenkins's theoretical reflections on rights and the law, gathered together in *Social Order and the Limits of Law: A Theoretical Essay* (1980), he views law and rights in a socially evolutionary way. Arguing that the traditional human rights of the eighteenth century must be both universal and unreservedly protected, Jenkins expressed suspicion towards any younger movement of social change that first announces a new right and then fights under that banner without asking about the consequences to more basic rights. Adjustments to the social order are always needed, but must proceed in a more deliberative way.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Art and the Human Enterprise (Cambridge, Mass., 1958).
Social Order and the Limits of Law: A Theoretical Essay (Princeton, N.J., 1980).

Other Relevant Works
"Imitation and Expression in Art," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 2 (1942): 42–52.
"The Postulate of an Impoverished Reality," *Journal of Philosophy* 39 (1942): 533–46.
"The Legal Basis of Literary Censorship," *Virginia Law Review* 31 (1944): 83–118.
"The Analysis of Justice," *Ethics* 57 (1946): 1–13.
"What is a Normative Science?" *Journal of Philosophy* 45 (1948): 309–32.
"The Present Status of the Value Problem," *Review of Metaphysics* 4 (1950): 85–110.
"Logical Positivism, Critical Idealism, and the Conception of Man," *Journal of Philosophy* 47 (1950): 677–94.
"The Role of Ethical Values in Legal Decisions," *Ohio State Law Journal* 12 (1951): 36–52.
"The Human Function of Art," *Philosophical Quarterly* 4 (1954): 128–46.
"The Significance of Conscience," *Ethics* 65 (1955): 261–70.
"Segregation and the Professor," *Yale*

Review 47 (Winter 1957): 311–20.

"Justice as Ideal and Idealogy," in *Nomos VI: Justice*, ed. Carl J. Friedrich and John W. Chapman (New York, 1963), pp. 191–228.

"The Genesis of Positive Law," *Archiv für Rechts und Sozialphilosophie* 50 (1964): 1–21.

"Theory and Practice in Law," *University of Florida Law Review* 19 (1966–7): 404–25.

"The Modern Distemper: The Failure of Purposiveness," in *The Concept of Order*, ed. Paul G. Kuntz (Seattle, Wash., 1968).

"The Case for Moral Cognitivism," *Tulane Studies in Philosophy* 18 (1969): 59–69.

"Authority: Its Nature and Locus," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 8 (1970): 177–90.

"The Conditions of Peace," *The Monist* 57 (1973): 507–26.

Further Reading

Proc of APA v62

Beardsley, Monroe C. "Jenkins's *Art and the Human Enterprise*," *Journal of Philosophy* 57 (1960): 163–7.

Beyleveld, Deryck, and Roger Brownsword. "Jenkins's *Social Order and the Limits of Law*," *Modern Law Review* 45 (1982): 479–86.

John R. Shook

JOHNSON, Charles Spurgeon
(1893–1956)

Charles Spurgeon Johnson was born on 24 July 1893 in Bristol, Virginia, the son of former slaves. He received his BA degree with honors from Virginia Union University in 1916 and began graduate work at the University of Chicago the same year. He earned a PhB degree in sociology in 1918 working primarily with Robert E. Park. During World War I, he spent a year in combat in France as a sergeant-major. He returned to Chicago in 1919, witnessing the postwar riot of 1919. Johnson was appointed associate director of a commission to study the race riot and did the bulk of the work investigating its origins and causes. This research was published as *The Negro in Chicago* in 1922. From 1921 to 1928 he worked with the National Urban League in New York directing research and editing the Urban League's magazine *Opportunity*. In 1928 he went to Fisk University in Tennessee, serving as chair of the department of social sciences from 1928 to 1946. He also served as Director of the Department of Race Relations from 1942 to 1947. In 1946 Johnson became the first African-American President of Fisk University. He served in that position until his death on 27 October 1956 in Louisville, Kentucky.

Johnson enjoyed a national and international reputation as a sociologist, race relations leader, service intellectual, and educator. In his work with the Chicago Commission on Race Relations, Johnson applied the training learned under Robert Park. As editor of *Opportunity*, Johnson became the entrepreneur of the Harlem Renaissance helping discover such giants of American letters as Langston Hughes, Arna Bontemps, Claude McKay, Zora Neale Hurston, and Countee Cullen. Johnson did his most productive work as a pure sociologist in the years 1934 to 1943. As co-author of *Race Relations* (1934), he summarized his theory of race relations. Subsequently, he published three seminal books: *Shadow of the Plantation* (1934); *Growing Up in the Black Belt* (1941); and *Patterns of Negro Segregation* (1943). Johnson also published two statistical-based works, *The Negro College Graduate* (1938) and *Statistical Atlas of Southern Counties* (1941), the latter co-authored by several staff associates.

In the sociology of race relations, Johnson was the link between Robert Park and Gunnar Myrdal. Park held that national law was immutable, and change only came with conquest, migration, war, pestilence, and depression. Johnson modified Park. Anticipating the "principal of cumulation," which Myrdal applied in *An American Dilemma*, Johnson argued that change could be accelerated by such artificial means as government policy changing behavior patterns in much the same manner that national catastrophes had modified behavior patterns in the past.

As Director of the Department of Race Relations at Fisk, Johnson challenged the etiquette of Jim Crow when he established the integrated Race Relations Institutes held every summer on campus. National and international leaders presented papers and held forums on the nature of and strategies for improving race relations. The dorms were interracial, and social activities included integrated dancing.

Johnson acted nationally and internationally as a service intellectual. In 1930 he was a member of the League of Nations commission which investigated "slaves and forced labor" in Liberia. During the New Deal, Johnson served the Roosevelt Administration as a service intellectual. Johnson was the first author of *The Collapse of Cotton Tenancy* (1935) and was instrumental in the lobbying for passage of the Bankhead-Jones Tenancy Act of 1937. In 1946 Johnson was one of twenty-seven members of distinguished educators to serve in Japan as advisors to the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers in Japan. Additionally in 1946 Johnson was one of the representatives of the United States during the initial United Nations' meeting of UNESCO in Paris.

As President of Fisk, Johnson established during the Korean War an early entry program, the Basic College. The program produced many future African-American leaders, such as David Levering Lewis, author of two Pulitzer Prize winning biographies of W. E. B. Du Bois; Hazel O'Leary, who served in President William J. Clinton's cabinet; and Johnnetta Cole, President of Spelman College. Despite not reaching the heights he had as a sociologist and denying a professor tenure in response to the pressures of the Red Scare, Johnson was an outstanding educator.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Negro in Chicago (Chicago, 1922).

The Negro in American Civilization: *A Study of Negro Life and Race Relations in the Light of Social Research* (New York, 1930).

Shadow of the Plantation (Chicago, 1934).

Race Relations: *Adjustment of Whites and Negroes in the United States*, with Willis D. Weatherford (Boston, 1934).

The Collapse of Cotton Tenancy, with Edwin R. Embree and Will Alexander (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1935).

The Negro College Graduate (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1938).

Growing Up in the Black Belt: Negro Youth in the Rural South (Washington, D.C., 1941).

To Stem This Tide: A Survey of Racial Tension Areas in the United States (Chicago, 1943).

Patterns of Negro Segregation (New York, 1943).

Into the Mainstream: *A Survey of Best Practices in Race Relations in the South* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1947).

Education and Cultural Crisis (New York, 1951).

Other Relevant Works

Johnson's papers are at Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee, and the Amistad Research Center at Tulane University in New Orleans, Louisiana.

Statistical Atlas of Southern Counties: Listing and Analysis of Socio-Economic Indices of 1104 Southern Counties, with Lewis W. Jones and Buford H. Junker (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1941).

Bitter Canaan: The Story of the Negro Republic (New Brunswick, N.J, 1987).

Further Reading
Encyc Amer Bio
Burgess, Ernest W. "Charles S. Johnson, Social Scientist, Editor and Educational Statesman," *Phylon* 17 (1956): 317–21.
Gilpin, Patrick J. "Charles S. Johnson and the Southern Educational Reporting Service," *Journal of Negro History* 63 (1978): 197–208.
Gilpin, Patrick J., and Marybeth Gasman. *Charles S. Johnson: Leadership Beyond the Veil in the Age of Jim Crow* (Albany, N.Y., 2003).
Robbins, Richard. *Sidelines Activist: Charles S. Johnson and the Struggle for Civil Rights* (Oxford, Miss., 1996).

Patrick J. Gilpin

JOHNSON, Francis Howe (1835–1920)

Francis Howe Johnson was born into a wealthy Boston family on 15 January 1835. He studied at Phillips Academy in Andover, Massachusetts, and graduated with a BA from Harvard University in 1856. Following his graduation from the Andover Theological Seminary in 1860, Johnson was pastor of the Congregational Church in Hamilton, Massachusetts, for several years before returning to Andover, where he taught at the Free Church and was later affiliated with Christ Church at Andover Seminary. His family wealth freed him from regular ministerial duties and permitted independent pursuits of literature, philosophy, and travel. In later life he retired to Washington, D.C., where he died on 27 October 1920.

Johnson authored two significant works: *What is Reality? An Inquiry as to the Reasonableness of Natural Religion* (1891) and *God in Evolution: A Pragmatic Study of Theology* (1911). In the late nineteenth century, American theologians and scholars faced a crisis over Darwin's theory of evolution. Some, like Charles HODGE of Princeton University and the renowned biologist Louis AGASSIZ, rejected evolution in any form. Agassiz argued that the appearance of evolution was actually the release of "latent" characteristics within species fixed by God. Others, including the evangelistic preachers Henry Ward BEECHER and Lyman ABBOTT, hailed "evolution" as the progressive enlightenment of humanity under God's benevolent hand, while dismissing Darwin's thesis of variation and natural selection. A few even affirmed evolution by natural selection, though holding that God guides variations subsequently promoted by environmental pressures.

Herbert W. SCHNEIDER has characterized Francis Howe Johnson as the "most scholarly" of a group of theologians connected to Andover, which included James T. BIXBY and Charles Fletcher Dole. Influenced by Hermann Lotze's practical idealism and the pragmatism of William JAMES, Johnson argues in *What is Reality?* that reality is fully encountered neither in empiricism, which isolates the perceiver from the external world, nor in rationalism, which diminishes the physical aspect of nature. The quest for the "thing-in-itself," or ultimate reality, becomes irrelevant with the realization that "things" are not just given but arise from *conflicts* that emerge within complex sets of relations. A thing is *real* in *fulfilling its promise* to overcome such conflicts.

The fact that conflict is integral to life leads Johnson to a partial endorsement of Darwin's theory of evolution by variation and natural selection. He agrees that environment plays a crucial role in the selection (more accurately the "unintelligent repression") of emergent variants. Writing before genetic mutation was well understood, Johnson points out that the mechanical accounts of variation proposed by Darwin and his successors were unconvincing.

Just as humans require a centered sense of self in order to recognize and redirect conflicts, so too does the basic process of variation and selection disclose an underlying guiding intelligence. Even protoplasm responds to stimuli in ways that are not *purely* mechanical, as minimal discriminations are made that amount to "atomic consciousness." For Johnson, such consciousness is proof that each evolutionary adaptation manifests at least a vestige of an original and guiding intelligence.

This guiding intelligence is unmistakably God at work in evolution. But the inevitable struggle for survival makes us wonder whether God resembles the Norse deity Odin, who revels in training gladiators. That this would deny an all-loving father forces Johnson to conclude that God's power is limited and that he could not have created a world free from all conflict. God, like all other beings, must direct means to ends to resolve conflicts, but this simply means that God frames and executes plans to increase the general beneficence of the universe. This is demonstrated by the fact that, for an increasing number of life forms, fitness for survival is measured by *cooperation* rather than conflict. Indeed, the ongoing development of human conscience represents the pinnacle of evolution.

In *God in Evolution*, Johnson enhances his pragmatist credentials by arguing that the ultimate human good is not "eternal rest" but ongoing *purposive activity*. Common experience tells us our greatest satisfactions are often discovered in life's "side issues": unexpected joys encountered in pursuit of other ends. For Johnson, this "progressive becoming," together with the "joyous uplifting of the soul" of life experience, is the epitome of authentic *worship*. Indeed, the ultimate consciousness of God would not be the resolution of all cosmic mysteries but the possibility of the boundless growth of worship.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Mechanical Evolution (Boston, 1884).
Theistic Evolution (Boston, 1884).

What is Reality? An Inquiry as to the Reasonableness of Natural Religion, and the Naturalness of Revealed Religion (Boston, 1891).
God in Evolution: A Pragmatic Study of Theology (New York, 1911).

Further Reading
Who Was Who in Amer v1
Ryan, Frank X. *Darwinism and Theology in America: 1850–1930, vol. 4: Science, Humanism, and the Scopes Trial* (Bristol, UK, 2002).

Frank X. Ryan

JONAS, HANS (1903–93)

Hans Jonas was born on 10 May 1903 in Mönchengladbach, Germany to Jewish parents. He attended the universities of Freiburg and Berlin from 1921 to 1923, where Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, and Ernst Troeltsch were his teachers. He then studied at the University of Marburg from 1924 to 1928 with Heidegger and theologian Rudolf Bultmann, earning his PhD in philosophy in 1928. In 1933 he emigrated to London, and then from 1935 to 1949 lived in Palestine (interrupted by service in the British Army during World War II) and then the new country of Israel for which he fought. In 1949–50 Jonas taught philosophy at McGill University in Montréal, Canada, and from 1950 to 1954 he taught at Carleton University in Ottawa. In 1955 he became professor of philosophy at the New School for Social Research in New York City, and taught there until retiring in 1976. He died on 5 February 1993 in New York City.

Jonas was one of the most widely read philosophers of the late twentieth century, due to his book *The Imperative of Responsibility*

(1979), which has sold more than 200,000 copies. Jonas attempts to design an ethics for our technological age, in which technology has dramatically enhanced human power and hence presents dramatically new moral problems. Among the most serious of the problems are caused by technology's vision of everything as a machine, its ability biologically to transform human beings, and its tendency to disrupt the long-term balance of life and nature on earth. The type of moral responsibility required to meet these problems is one which is primarily concerned with the future of humanity. As an overriding duty, according to Jonas, this care will justify what he terms an "imperative of responsibility" which can transcend all prior ethical theories and their narrow concern for intra-human relationships. Among the formulations that Jonas suggests are "Act so that the effects of your action are compatible with the permanence of genuine human life" and "Do not compromise the conditions for an indefinite continuation of humanity on earth."

Jonas's training in existentialism and philosophy of religion were brought together in his work on Gnosticism, as he interpreted its development and doctrines from the standpoint of certain themes from existentialism. With the notion of "cosmic dread," Jonas suggests that much Near-Eastern mythology along with Gnosticism is an attempt to explain how humanity came to be separated from the divine and how a reunion overcoming this dread might be effected. In the field of philosophy of biology, Jonas was influenced by A. N. WHITEHEAD's process pan-experientialism, arguing that all living organisms inwardly experience their life in action to some degree. This subjective experience of freedom cannot be reductively or mechanistically understood.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Gnosis und spätantiker Geist, 2 vols (Göttingen, Germany, 1934; 2nd edn 1954; 3rd edn 1964–6). Trans., *The Gnostic Religion: The Message of the Alien God and the Beginnings of Christianity* (Boston, 1958; 2nd edn 1963).

The Phenomenon of Life: Toward a Philosophical Biology (New York, 1966).

Philosophical Essays: From Ancient Creed to Technological Man (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1974).

Das Prinzip Verantwortung: Versuch e. Ethik für d. technolog. Zivilisation (Frankfurt am Main, 1979). Trans., *The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of Ethics for the Technological Age* (Chicago, 1984).

Mortality and Morality: A Search for the Good after Auschwitz, ed. Lawrence Vogel (Evanston, Ill., 1996).

Further Reading

Proc of APA v66

Aland, Barbara, ed. *Gnosis: Festschr. für Hans Jonas* (Göttingen, Germany, 1978).

Levy, David J. *Hans Jonas: The Integrity of Thinking* (Columbia, Miss., 2002).

Müller, Wolfgang. *Der Begriff der Verantwortung bei Hans Jonas* (Frankfurt am Main, 1988).

Spicker, Stuart F., ed. *Organism, Medicine, and Metaphysics: Essays in Honor of Hans Jonas on His 75th birthday, May 10, 1978* (Dordrecht, 1978). Contains a bibliography of Jonas's writings.

Wolin, Richard. *Heidegger's Children: Hannah Arendt, Karl Löwith, Hans Jonas, and Herbert Marcuse* (Princeton, N.J., 2001).

John R. Shook

JONES, Major Jake (1918–93)

Major J. Jones was born on 24 December 1918 in Rome, Georgia. He received his BA from Clark College in 1941. He then did graduate work at Gammon Theological Seminary where he earned a BD in 1944, and at Oberlin College for his MST in 1950. As did many African-American scholars of his generation, Jones earned his ThD from Boston University in 1957. While completing his education, he pastored United Methodist churches in Tennessee and Kentucky. He held several academic posts over the course of his career, including college minister and professor of religion at Fisk University, a member of the faculty at the Interdenominational Theological Center, President of Gammon Theological Seminary from 1967 to 1985, and then chaplain of Atlanta University Center for several years. He died on 22 January 1993 in Atlanta, Georgia.

Jones's work in social ethics and liberation theology gained him invitations to lecture at numerous institutions, such as Berkeley's Graduate Theological Union and Emory University. He also served on the board of directors for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and Black Methodists for Church Renewal, as well as being a member of the board of trustees for Clark College (which later became Atlanta University Center). He was President of the Association of United Methodist Theological Schools, and in 1985 President of the Society of Christian Ethics. He had a long career with numerous accolades, including a declaration from President William Tubman of Liberia in 1971, and the Distinguished Alumni Award from Boston University's School of Theology also in 1971.

Jones authored numerous articles and three major books: *Black Awareness: A Theology of Hope* (1971), *Christian Ethics for Black Theology* (1974), and *The Color of God: The Concept of God in Afro-American Thought* (1987). As black theology developed in the late 1960s, Jones played a significant role in the formation of a liberation and reconciliation-based theory of religion and theological discourse. Along with James H. CONE, J. Deotis Roberts, Gayraud Wilmore, and others, Jones formulated a response to social injustice, drawing together the best of the Christian faith and the philosophical punch of black power. Within his work, he employed the personalism he had studied at Boston University to explore the doctrine of God in ways that responded to the needs of African Americans. He avoided narrow perceptions of God and embraced a theological discourse that maintained the uniqueness of black religious expressions while also holding to a concern with broad applicability. In this sense, Jones promoted a theological discourse that sought to hold the particular and universal in creative tension. In interpreting the Christian message for African Americans, as Jones often commented, his aim within his teaching, church ministry, and writings was to promote an understanding of God's liberating activities in the world in ways that protested against injustice and encouraged human fulfillment.

Tied to this aim was a theory of black religion, highlighting a Christian orientation, that recognized the thick and complex nature of black religious experience. Attention to the complexity of black religion, Jones argued, was necessary in light of the manner in which it blended a variety of theological and religious sensibilities and cultural aesthetics within the context of oppression and struggle. Furthermore, according to him, the goal of black religion involved the promotion of greater self-identity and communal-social relationships through connection to the divine. In terms of ethics, Jones, like most working within the context of African-American experience, attempted to draw from Scripture a set of liberation-struggle principles that could then be applied to the particular situation of African Americans. To a lesser degree than some more "radical"

thinkers, he did not base his system of liberation ethics on a depiction of Jesus Christ as a revolutionary who sanctioned violence as a proper response to injustice. Rather, Jones sought to work out a system of ethics that highlighted the transformative power of *agape*. In part, this is a consequence of his early commitment to the theological principle of hope as the source of change. This principle, as Jones constructed it, appears concerned with the eventual possibility of reconciliation in ways that make violence both unpractical and ultimately an isolating process. Through this cautionary note, he sought to maintain the ability of black theology to be self-critical and open to dialogue by placing African-American experience within a larger sociopolitical context.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Black Awareness: A Theology of Hope (Nashville, Tenn., 1971).
Christian Ethics for Black Theology (Nashville, Tenn., 1974).
The Color of God: The Concept of God in Afro-American Thought (Macon, Georgia, 1987).

Further Reading
Burrow, Rufus, Jr. "Afrikan American Contributions to Personalism," *Encounter* 60 (Spring 1999): 145–67.
Jones, William R. *Is God a White Racist?: A Preamble to Black Theology* (Garden City, N.Y., 1973).
Roberts, J. Deotis. "Black Theological Ethics," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 3 (1975): 69–109.

Anthony B. Pinn

JONES, Rufus Matthew (1863–1947)

Rufus M. Jones was born on 25 January 1863 in South China, Maine. He came from a long line of Quakers, and Quakerism lay at the center of his universe all his life. His rural youth in Maine gave him a practicality and a capacity to communicate with people of all educational backgrounds. He never lost either of these, though he spent his adult life as a professor of philosophy. He graduated from Haverford College with a BA in 1885, writing his senior thesis on mysticism. He stayed at Haverford to earn an MA in history in 1886. After teaching at Quaker boarding schools, he spent a year in Europe, studying in France and Germany. More important, he had in that year his first mystical experience. He began teaching philosophy at Haverford in 1893, and was professor of philosophy there until retiring in 1934. Jones died on 16 June 1947 in Haverford, Pennsylvania, leaving behind a legacy of more than fifty books.

Jones interrupted his teaching only long enough to earn an MA in philosophy from Harvard University in 1901. There he studied ethics and idealism with George Herbert PALMER, metaphysics with Josiah ROYCE, social psychology with Hugo MÜNSTERBERG, and Greek philosophy with George SANTAYANA. William JAMES was away from Harvard in Europe at that time, but his influence on Jones was profound, especially through his *The Principles of Psychology* and *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. Jones shared Palmer's passion for ethics and James's interest in spiritual experience, yet he did not come to subscribe either to the monism of the former or to the radical empiricism of the latter. Both Palmer, who studied Meister Eckhart, and James shared a common respect for mysticism as a path to reality, despite the profoundly different ways in which they interpreted that reality. Jones himself was fundamentally a religious philosopher, an exponent of divine immanence, and a believer in the human potential to transform society. Very much a person of his time, he appreciated the

progressive and optimistic spirit of liberal thought. He was not alone in his enthusiasm for the religious life as essential mystical: his was the era of Evelyn Underhill, Dean Inge, and Friedrich von Hügel.

Social Law in the Spiritual World: Studies in Divine–Human Inter-relationship, published in 1904, was Jones's first systematic account of his thought. He recognized the value of the social sciences for the study of religion but rejected the materialist assumptions of social science. Additionally, he argued that the human personality is more than simply the result of external forces; there is within the person a will to be that cannot be dominated by social forces. Religion therefore begins with inward, personal experience – showing his deep Quaker roots as well as the influence of idealism and liberal Protestantism. In *Social Law*, he appealed to the testimony of the mystics, which became a theme of his many writings. It is a challenge to decide which of Jones's many books were most decisive, but surely his *Studies in Mystical Religion*, which appeared in 1909, is a major contribution. Drawing on his skills in philosophy, psychology, and history, the book is still regarded as a major contribution to scholarship on the mystical life. He wrote the book as the introductory volume to a series on the history of Quakerism, which he saw as the heir to continental mystics. In his many writings on mysticism, he made a distinction between what he called negative mystics and affirmative mystics. The first group stressed withdrawal from the physical world perceived by sense and studied by reason. They sought to experience the divine through asceticism. Their goal was annihilation of the self. They strove for the transitory moment of ecstasy, which they experienced as a loss of individuality in an endless sea of divinity. Affirmation mystics, however, valued the natural world as the place where divinity revealed itself. Union with God heightened rather than destroyed personality; it integrated the self and drove the mystic back into the world to serve humankind.

In *The Inner Life*, published in 1916, Jones proposed that many more people have been subject to mystical experiences than was commonly supposed. A mystical consciousness, though often not fully developed or cultivated, is present in most religious persons, but since most of them lack the literary gifts to describe and record their experiences, they have gone unrecognized. Mystical experiences come in mild as well as acute forms, he held. He described mystical experience as a direct and immediate awareness of divine presence, the encounter of human spirit and divine spirit with the discovery that they are in mutual and reciprocal correspondence. With these two ideas of affirmative mysticism and of a range of mystical experience, Jones democratized the mystical life, opening the depths of the spiritual life to a multitude of readers. In a steady stream of books, which often began as lectures while visiting colleges and universities, he expounded on these basic principles, and his writings nourished the spiritual hunger of many.

Jones also continued his historical investigation of mysticism in his *Spiritual Reformers of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (1914) and *The Flowering of Mysticism: The Friends of God in the Fourteenth Century* (1939). His writings gave little attention to the fierce asceticism of some mystics or to the aberrant psychology of others. He showed little interest in ecstatic experiences as well. All these, he felt, tended to draw people away from creative service to others, which he held was the hallmark of genuine mysticism. In this he showed himself very much a Quaker, even as he reshaped the Quakerism of his own day. His Quaker convictions also revealed themselves in his belief that mysticism flourished best in community (as in the collective quality of traditional Quaker worship), and in his suspicion of methods for the mystical life, which he considered artificial and contrived.

Jones's beloved Quakerism had been fractured by division in the early nineteenth century, and he gave great effort to heal those divisions. Quakers had split over doctrinal

issues, and his focus on direct experience rather than dogma helped Quakers in his day to recover unity. He was the most influential Quaker writer of the twentieth century. He also brought Quakers together in common service as a founder and longtime Chairperson of the American Friends Service Committee, whose relief efforts in Europe after the two major wars of the twentieth century earned the agency the Nobel Peace Prize in 1947.

The world of Jones was wider than the Religious Society of Friends (the formal name for Quakerism). His voice was an influential one in much of Protestant Christianity in the US as well as Britain. His Quaker-grounded concerns for peace took him around the world. In 1926 he met Mahatma Gandhi at his ashram in India. In 1938 he traveled to Germany with two other Quakers to meet with the Gestapo in an effort to provide relief for German Jews. At the invitation of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., he helped to lead an ecumenical effort in a study that resulted in the publication in 1931 of *Re-Thinking Missions*, a book that generated considerable controversy, especially among conservative Protestants. The report challenged much mission work, calling for more independence for Christians in Africa and Asia and for greater sensitivity to the rich cultures in which missionaries labored. Jones loved the religious life, but he could also be a prophetic voice, offering thoughtful criticism. The same person who wrote *The Inner Life* could also write a book entitled *The Church's Debt to Heretics*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Social Law in the Spiritual World: Studies in Divine–Human Inter-relationship (Philadelphia, 1904).
Studies in Mystical Religion (London, 1909).
The Quakers in the American Colonies (London, 1911).
Spiritual Reformers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (London, 1914).
The Inner Life (New York, 1916).
A Service of Love in War Time: American Friends Relief Work in Europe, 1917–1919 (New York, 1920).
The Later Periods of Quakerism (London, 1921).
Spiritual Energies in Daily Life (New York, 1922).
The Church's Debt to Heretics (New York, 1924).
Finding the Trail of Life (New York, 1926).
The Faith and Practice of the Quakers (London, 1927).
The Trail of Life in College (New York, 1929).
Pathways to the Reality of God (New York, 1931).
Mysticism and Democracy in the English Commonwealth (Cambridge, Mass., 1932).
The Trail of Life in the Middle Years (New York, 1934).
Re-Thinking Religious Liberalism (Boston, 1935).
The Eternal Gospel (New York, 1938).
The Flowering of Mysticism: The Friends of God in the Fourteenth Century (New York, 1939).

Other Relevant Works

Jones's papers are at Haverford College in Pennsylvania.
Rufus Jones: Essential Writings, ed. Kerry Walters (Maryknoll, N.Y., 2001).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Religious Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v38, Proc of APA in Phil Rev v58, Who Was Who in Amer v2, Who's Who in Phil
Fosdick, Harry Emerson. *Rufus Jones Speaks to Our Time* (New York, 1951).
Hinshaw, David. *Rufus Jones: Master Quaker* (New York, 1951).
Vining, Elizabeth Gray. *Friend of Life: The Biography of Rufus M. Jones* (Philadelphia, 1958).

Michael L. Birkel

JONES, William Thomas (1910–98)

William T. Jones was born on 29 April 1910 in Natchez, Mississippi. His father died shortly thereafter, and Jones and his siblings were raised in somewhat straitened circumstances by their mother. He nonetheless prospered academically, attending Swarthmore College, where he received a BA in 1931. He was awarded a Rhodes Scholarship to study philosophy at the University of Oxford from 1931 to 1934 and earned a B.Litt. in 1933; he counted mathematician Alan Turing among his close friends. He then did graduate study in philosophy at Princeton University, writing his dissertation with T. M. GREENE on Kant's theory of freedom, and he received his PhD in philosophy in 1937.

Jones took a position teaching philosophy at Pomona College in California in 1938, rising rapidly to the rank of professor. He was elected President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1969–70. Save for a year during 1953–4 teaching as professor of social and political philosophy at the US Naval War College in Annapolis, Maryland, Jones remained at Pomona until retiring in 1972, when he accepted a position at the California Institute of Technology. Jones taught at Cal Tech until 1985, and died on 30 September 1988 in Claremont, California.

Jones produced many books and dozens of articles during his career on a vast array of philosophical topics. Among his most important books must be included *Morality and Freedom in … Kant* (1940), *The Romantic Syndrome* (1961), and *The Sciences and the Humanities* (1965). He is best known for his multivolume *A History of Western Philosophy* (1952). Jones's *History* is his most influential contribution to philosophy. It provides a detailed history of Western philosophy from Thales to W. V. QUINE and Jacques Derrida with a single interpretative voice, and does so at a level accessible to the interested novice. His approach insists upon placing philosophi-cal theories in their appropriate cultural contexts, but is guided throughout by his conviction that "nothing takes the place of a direct, patient, and painstaking study of a great and subtle mind" (1975, vol. 1, p. x). Jones's *History* was an immediate success, rapidly adopted as required reading in history of philosophy curricula at many universities. It has sold hundreds of thousands of copies to date, and is still in wide use.

In *The Romantic Syndrome*, Jones develops a methodology to "enable students of culture to define their basic concepts with more precision." (1962, p. xiv) He then deploys this methodology to define the concept "romanticism." This framework for more rigorous analysis of cultural concepts has had considerable influence, particularly in the field of cultural anthropology. In *The Sciences and the Humanities* Jones offers an intriguing Kantian variant upon the neutral monism of William JAMES and John DEWEY, rejecting the fact/value dichotomy in favor of a continuum of more or less "designative" as opposed to "expressive" language. This replacement, he argues, allows us to understand that man understood as free moral agent and man understood as causal machine need not be in ontological conflict; indeed, that they play functionally complementary roles in the most full and satisfying experience of the world. There is much in this argument that is still suggestive for central debates in twenty-first-century philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Morality and Freedom in the Philosophy of Immanuel Kant (London, 1940).

Masters of Political Thought, 2 vols (London and Toronto, 1947).

A History of Western Philosophy, 4 vols (New York, 1952; 2nd edn 1975). 3rd edn adding a fifth volume co-authored with Robert Fogelin (New York, 1997).

The Romantic Syndrome (The Hague, 1961).

The Sciences and the Humanities (Berkeley, Cal., 1965).

Other Relevant Works
Facts and Values (Stockton, Cal., 1961).
"Public Roles, Private Roles," *Ethics* 94
   (1984): 603–20.
"Deconstructing Derrida: Below the Surface
   of *Difference*," *Metaphilosophy* 23
   (1992): 230–50.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v8, Proc of APA v72,
   Who's Who in Phil

Paul Hurley

JORDAN, David Starr (1851–1931)

David Starr Jordan was born on 19 January
1851 in Gainesville, New York. He joined the
first freshman class at the new Cornell
University in 1869 and graduated with an MS
degree in 1872. The next years of teaching at
small schools were unremarkable except for a
summer's research with famous naturalist
Louis AGASSIZ. Jordan earned an MD from
Indiana Medical College in 1875 and became
professor of biology at Butler University, where
he received his PhD in biology in 1878. The
next year he went to Indiana University as
professor of natural history. In 1885 Jordan
became President of Indiana University; at the
age of thirty-four he was the youngest college
president in America. He introduced a liberal
and progressive atmosphere along with an
elective curriculum and emphasis on science
and technology. His growing administrative
fame was matched by his rising reputation for
knowledge of North American fish species. In
1891 Jordan accepted the first Presidency of
Stanford University, infusing his educational
philosophy and scientific devotion. Jordan con-
tinued to be an extremely prolific writer, pro-
ducing some 650 articles and books on ichthy-
ology alone, with hundreds more publications
on a variety of other subjects. He became
Chancellor of Stanford in 1913 but soon
retired in 1916. Jordan died on 19 September
1931 in Palo Alto, California.

Jordan was among the most prominent
scholars of his day, but was never tempted
away from Stanford; among other offers he
declined the leadership of the Smithsonian
Institution. As a member of the California
State Fish Commission, his research of salmon
and fur seal populations rescued these species.
He was an assistant to the United States Fish
Commission from 1877 to 1891, and President
of the California Academy of Sciences for
many years. He participated in the 1925
Scopes trial in Tennessee as an expert witness
on Darwinian evolution. Jordan's enthusiasm
for academic freedom in both public schooling
and higher education was tied to his conviction
that education must first support the growth of
democracy. His commitment to intellectual
freedom powered his own crusades against
government corruption, imperialism, and inter-
national aggression, and his battles for civil lib-
erties and the rights of the accused. He
defended freedom of expression for commu-
nists, pacifists, reformers, and political dissi-
dents, most notably socialist Eugene DEBS and
the infamous Sacco and Vanzetti. Another
major cause was women's suffrage. In Jordan's
view, "the remedy for all abuses of freedom is
more freedom, larger experience, and larger
responsibility."

Jordan's progressive liberalism is stained by
two major blemishes. He was unable to protect
sociologist E. A. ROSS from the wrath of
Leland Stanford's widow, who demanded his
dismissal for his pro-labor and socialist stance.
The 1900 "Ross affair" was one of the first
major tests of real academic freedom in the US,
and Jordan was widely viewed as failing that
test. He should also be harshly judged for his
stance on racial inequality. He did not join
the extreme positions of John FISKE or William
Graham SUMNER in their Social Darwinism
(Jordan instead found altruism essential to
society) and their high estimation of the racial

superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race. However, Jordan did agree that racial heredity was fixed and largely determined intelligence, virtue, and capacity for self-government. Jordan upheld this sort of racism and approval of eugenics simultaneously with a belief in complete political equality for all. The tension between these views was moderated by Jordan's hope that enough citizens from the various races could forge a democracy by following Puritan virtues such as self-control, hard work, and community spirit.

After 1900 Jordan's national and international fame rested primarily on his tireless work as a peace activist. He was President of the World Peace Foundation from 1910 to 1914 and chaired the World Peace Conference in 1915. His primary argument for pacifism was that war erodes freedom for all parties and cultivates only vice. No long-term benefits of war can justify it, since the costs of war could instead relieve human poverty and suffering, and violence only engenders future violence and hate. Following his notions of eugenics, he also argued that war was wasteful for all races by eliminating the strongest. He understood that his type of pacifism was not religiously absolute, but pragmatically realistic, holding that some wars to end wars and wars against oppression could be justified. His was one of the strongest voices against involvement in World War I, but after the US entered the war he encouraged swift victory. After the war he supported the League of Nations and other international organizations for mutual aid, agreeing with other cosmopolitan pacifists like Jane ADDAMS that cooperation at sub-national levels would reduce blind patriotism and spread democracy. He was among the first to sketch a democratic world government that bypasses nation-states with world citizenship.

Jordan had no patience with speculative philosophy or theology, expecting empirical science gradually to replace metaphysics. His sensationalistic empiricism was matched with pragmatism's demand that any hypothesis be tested by consequences for truth. He appreci-ated Charles PEIRCE and William JAMES before most others, and later claimed that he was the first to publish the doctrine of pragmatism, in an 1893 article reprinted in *The Stability of Truth* (1911). Jordan's democratic faith, similar to that of John DEWEY whom he admired, rejected supernaturalism, mysticism, and doctrinal conformity. Jordan found in evolution the field of struggle permitting human improvement but there was no guarantee of progress. He absorbed the value of religion into social ideals without erecting humanity itself into an object of worship. In contrast with Dewey's humanistic atheism, Jordan held that God explains the cosmos's order and the principle of universal love; without faith in God, however mysterious, people could not hope.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manual of the Vertebrates of the Northern United States (Chicago, 1876; 2nd edn, New York, 1929).

The Care and Culture of Men (San Francisco, 1896).

Imperial Democracy (New York, 1899).

The Blood of the Nation: A Study of the Decay of the Races through the Survival of the Unfit (Boston, 1902).

The Philosophy of Despair (San Francisco, 1902). Repr., *The Philosophy of Hope* (San Francisco, 1907).

The Voice of the Scholar: With Other Addresses on the Problems of Higher Education (San Francisco, 1903).

Life's Enthusiasms (Boston, 1906).

Evolution and Animal Life (New York, 1907).

The Religion of a Sensible American (Boston, 1909).

The Stability of Truth: A Discussion of Reality as Related to Thought and Action (New York, 1911).

War and Waste (New York, 1913).

War and the Breed: The Relation of War to the Downfall of Nations (Boston, 1915).

Ways to Lasting Peace (Indianapolis, 1916).

Democracy and World Relations (New York, 1918).

The Higher Foolishness, with Hints as to the Care and Culture of Aristocracy (Indianapolis, 1927).

The Trend of the American University (San Francisco, 1929).

Other Relevant Works
Jordan's papers are at Stanford University.
Days of a Man, being Memories of a Naturalist, Teacher, and Minor Prophet of Democracy (New York, 1922).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v22*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Burns, Edward M. *David Starr Jordan: Prophet of Freedom* (Stanford, Cal., 1953).

Hays, Alice N. *David Starr Jordan: A Bibliography of His Writings, 1871–1931* (Stanford, Cal., 1952).

Spoehr, Luther D. *Progress' Pilgrim: David Starr Jordan and the Circle of Reform, 1891–1931* PhD dissertation, Stanford University (Stanford, Cal., 1975).

John R. Shook

JORDAN, Elijah (1875–1953)

Elijah Jordan was born on 28 March 1875 in Elberfeld, Indiana. He earned a BA from Indiana University in 1907, then an MA at Cornell University in 1908, before receiving a PhD in philosophy from the University of Chicago in 1911. His dissertation was titled "The Constitutive and Regulative Principles in Kant." He then returned to Cornell, where he was an assistant in philosophy in 1911–12,

and an instructor in 1912–13. In 1913 Jordan was appointed professor of philosophy and head of the philosophy department at Butler University in Indianapolis, Indiana, where he remained for the rest of his career. He was a member of both the Eastern and Western Divisions of the American Philosophical Association. He retired in 1944, after thirty-one years leading the philosophy department. He died on 18 May 1953 in Indianapolis, Indiana.

Order and disorder, especially as this dialectic related to the individual and society, was an early subject of Jordan's inquiries. In *Forms of Individuality* (1927), he wondered whether individualism, if contributing to order, might also be a catalyst for disorder. In the preface, he writes: "It seemed strange that the system of practical principles whose primary purpose is to exalt the individual should nevertheless produce a complete submergence of the individual in what appears to be sub-human or super-human mechanism ... ." (p. v) He concludes, therefore, that "the ultimate practical principle ... must be deduced from the nature of will ... . From this point it appeared that the unsatisfactoriness of practical life lies in just this negative and subjective pluralization of wills, and the attempt is made to find principles of the possibility of an objective or impersonal will as the basis of such order as exists ..." (p. v).

When the subject is aesthetics, Jordan conducts a similarly rigorous pursuit of clarification and ordering. The table of contents of *The Aesthetic Object* (1937) reads as a kind of taxonomy of aesthetic categories (color, tone, rhythm, mass, etc.). In the preface he writes: "One of the basic problems of aesthetic reflection is the question of the nature of the aesthetic experience ... . The other problem concerns the logical structure of the aesthetic object ... ." (p. ix) He goes on to specify that "the major problem of aesthetic theory is therefore that of the nature of the aesthetic object." In this book, Jordan aims to show "that a metaphysical substance is to be found for the aesthetic object, for it is upon a basis of this substance alone that depend those qualities and relational attributes

that distinguish the aesthetic object from other types of objects." (p. xi)

Jordan's later work, in particular *Business Be Damned* (1952), can be read as the attempt to apply some of his theoretical principles to the domain of practical, immanent social concerns. Jordan draws a sharp division between business and culture, as if the two are inherently incommensurable and entirely at odds with one another.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Life of Mind (Indianapolis, 1925).
Forms of Individuality: An Inquiry into the Grounds of Order in Human Relations (Indianapolis, 1927).
Theory of Legislation: An Essay on the Dynamics of Public Mind (Indianapolis, 1930; Chicago, 1952).
The Aesthetic Object: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Value (Bloomington, Ind., 1937).
The Good Life (Chicago, 1949).
Business be Damned (New York, 1952).
Essays in Criticism, with an introduction and synopses by Robert D. Mack (Chicago, 1952).
Theory of Legislation: An Essay on the Dynamics of Public Mind (Chicago, 1952).
Metaphysics: An Unfinished Essay, ed. Max H. Fisch (Evanston, Ill., 1956).

Other Relevant Works
Jordan's papers are at Butler University, Indiana, the University of Illinois, Urbana, and Michigan State University.
"The Unknowable of Herbert Spencer," *Philosophical Review* 20 (1911): 291–309.
"Idea and Action," in *Philosophical Essays in Honor of James Edwin Creighton*, ed. George H. Sabine (New York, 1917), pp. 245–65.
"The Philosophical Problem of Religion," ed. Max H. Fisch, *Ethics* 65 (1955): 192–200.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v5, *Proc of APA v28*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Barnett, George, and Jack Otis. *Corporate Society and Education: The Philosophy of Elijah Jordan* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1961).
Cornett, Robert A. "Individualism in the Ethics of Elijah Jordan," *Ethics* 66 (1955): 61–6.
Haworth, Lawrence. "The Experimental Society: Dewey and Jordan," *Ethics* 71 (1960): 27–40.
Mack, Robert D. "Individualism and Individuality in the Ethics of Elijah Jordan," *Ethics* 67 (1957): 139–42.
Murphy, Edward J. "Elijah Jordan's Legal Theory and its Metaphysical Background," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 12 (1976): 378–99; 13 (1977): 67–83.
Reck, Andrew J. "The Corporatism of Elijah Jordan," in *Recent American Philosophy: Studies of Ten Representative Thinkers* (New York, 1964), chap. 9.
Rucker, E. Darnell. *Corporate Reform and Economic Reality: A Critical Study of Elijah Jordan's Social Theory*. PhD dissertation, University of Chicago (Chicago, 1958).
Wilson, Hugh Van Rensselaer. "How Valid is Jordan's Disillusionment with Life and Thought?" *Ethics* 66 (1956): 279–83.

David Justin Hodge

The Dictionary
of Modern American Philosophers

THE DICTIONARY
OF MODERN AMERICAN
PHILOSOPHERS

Volume 3

K–Q

GENERAL EDITOR

John R. Shook

CONSULTING EDITORS

Richard T. Hull
Bruce Kuklick
Murray G. Murphey
John G. Slater

K

KAELIN, Eugene Francis (1926–)

Eugene Kaelin was born on 14 October 1926 in St. Louis, Missouri. He obtained his PhD in philosophy from the University of Illinois in 1954 and taught in the philosophy department at the University of Wisconsin from 1955 to 1965. He then was professor of philosophy at Florida State University from 1965 until his retirement in 1996. His major writings focused on issues in aesthetics where he blended themes from both the analytic and the continental traditions.

Kaelin maintains that aesthetic experience involves nonverbal communication, which takes place by means of the perception of an artwork (1970, p. 53). Kaelin's understanding of aesthetic experience as a form of communication has its roots in the aesthetic philosophy of Benedetto Croce. Kaelin accepts what he views as Croce's basic insight – namely, that art is akin to language in the sense that it is a vehicle for communication. At the same time, however, Kaelin is interested in overcoming Croce's fundamentally idealistic orientation in which the actual artwork is identified with the artist's intuition. For Croce, the material composition or physical entity (such as the painting on the canvas, the sculpted marble, the notated musical score, etc.) is the evidence by which we infer the existence of the internal intuition. This internal intuition – the creative, inner, and spiritual act of the artist – is the real artwork, while the material composition is merely its public externalization. Croce's aesthetic theory is a continuation of a much broader philosophical tradition in which the inner (internal, mental, subjective) is separated from and (often) prioritized over the outer (external, physical, objective).

Kaelin's resistance to Croce's idealism is part of a much deeper resistance to philosophical orientations that are fundamentally dualistic and built upon the plausibility of an atomistic analytic methodology. For example, Kaelin objects to analyses that seek to reduce the significance of aesthetic experience to the intent of the artist. On such views, if there is a supposed match between the intent and the external material composition, the appeal to intent becomes redundant. On the other hand, if there is a supposed deviation between the intent and the external material composition, the real artwork becomes, in principle, inaccessible to us. In fact, in either case, the criterion by which we would assess the claimed match or deviation is, in principle, inaccessible to us. In addition to these intrinsic difficulties, these kinds of reductive analyses are belied by the plain fact that sometimes artists approach their work without a clear intention in mind (1989, p. 22). In some cases, "the artist discovers his ideas as he works …. Far from being the initial act of creative expression, conception is rather the final. The artist may stop working when he discovers what he has said." (1962, p. 301)

Kaelin likewise warns against recoiling into the opposite reductive strategy. Analyses reducing the significance of aesthetic experience to viewer reaction are also unsatisfactory. First, we cannot treat the artist as simply one viewer among others, at least in some cases. In

certain cases, artistic intent carries special weight (1989, p. 24). Second and more importantly, these kinds of reductive views risk losing the notion of there being constraints on viewer reaction (1989, p. 25). Kaelin maintains that not just any old reaction will be appropriate to a given artwork and that the viewer is to bring to the work "only those associations that are controlled by the formal structures of the concrete object we call 'the work of art'" (1989, p. 25). These formal structures ground the authority of aesthetic judgments: "The greater authority of a trained perceiver stems from knowing by past acquaintance what constitutes the authentic controls of aesthetic response." (1989, p. 34) The existence of these structures insures that not all judgments regarding aesthetic significance are equal; not all interpretations carry equal authority.

The normative issue Kaelin is engaging concerns constraint on interpretation and the locus (or loci) of that constraint. Kaelin urges us to resist the temptation to reduce constraint (and ultimately significance, meaning, and value) to either artistic intent or viewer reaction. Instead, Kaelin favors a more holistic orientation with special emphasis on the formal structures of the artwork itself. Kaelin's position has its roots in existentialism and phenomenology, for example, in Martin Heidegger's account of Dasein as Being-in-the-world. Heidegger famously argued that an atomistic analytic methodology was inappropriate for understanding Dasein. A given dimension of Dasein's being may be examined, but such examination is intelligible only against the backdrop supplied by other "equiprimordial" dimensions of Dasein's being. Dasein must be understood as a unitary phenomenon. Kaelin likewise argues that atomistic analytic methodology is inappropriate for understanding aesthetic experience. While analysis may direct our attention to a particular dimension of aesthetic experience (such as artistic intent, viewer reaction, etc.), such analysis will always be against the

backdrop supplied by the other elements of that experience; in fact, against the backdrop of the unitary pre-reflectively given totality of that experience. Kaelin writes that "Art is communication, and not empty expression. When we stress the process of art as communication, rather than self-expression, we are emphasizing the sociality as opposed to the individuality of artists .... Even so, the process must be visualized from both its end-points, as well as from the central and mediating object which unites them." (1962, pp. 91–2)

Kaelin holds that the overcoming of reductive analyses requires a more holistic orientation as well as a return to the things themselves – the artwork. This, in turn, suggests that the proper methodology for philosophical aesthetics is phenomenology. He urges that we accept only those accounts of aesthetic significance that "accord with *an experience of* the qualities of an artwork as they appear to our attentive consciousness. We find ourselves here stipulating the necessity of the phenomenological reduction as the grounding principle for the judgment of aesthetic qualities ..." (1989, p. 160) Kaelin holds that the proper practice of phenomenology will enable the individual "to concentrate on the qualities of objects given to perception ..." (1989, p. 84) and will provide us with "the possibility of finding a categorical interpretation of the experience *in its own terms* ..." (1989, p. 94).

Kaelin argues that properly followed phenomenological methodology reveals three basic structures or "counters" that constrain our aesthetic judgments. The first counter he terms "organized sensual surfaces." This counter is a perceptually given aspect of the artwork. For example, in music the sensual surfaces include sounds and silences; in painting, anything that can be seen including lines, forms, colors, and space. The second counter he terms "experiential depth." This counter is an imaginatively given aspect of the artwork, a counter by which the artwork is able to point beyond itself to certain images or ideas. This counter is present

only in representational art. The third counter he terms "total expressiveness." This is the combination of the imaginative values of representation in works of art with the perceptual values of their sensual surfaces.

Against this backdrop Kaelin addresses two further issues: the function of art criticism and the function of public art education. Kaelin holds that the primary function of art criticism is not to issue pronouncements concerning rankings or classifications of artworks based upon appeals to general universal principles or rules. Instead, the primary function of art criticism is to further aesthetic communication. Kaelin writes: "If a work of art is created and experienced as a context of significance, it becomes the business of criticism to elucidate the significance unique to its context …. The critic's primary function, then, is to ensure aesthetic communication, and not to pass judgment, to assess 'values,' to place an artist in history as a 'major' or 'minor' contributor to his culture, or to create a new – verbal – work of art, which merely happens to be inspired by the experience of the work under consideration." (1970, p. 281) Art criticism furthers aesthetic communication when, by employment of proper phenomenological methodology, it calls attention to the formal structures of the artwork and, thereby, reveals the artwork's significance.

Kaelin understands the function and value of public art education largely in terms of the relationship between the formation of certain kinds of people and the sustaining of democratic political institutions. Kaelin points out that "to be trained in constructing or reconstructing the depth of artworks is to have one's intellect developed through exercise" (1989, p. 27), and that "the good of aesthetic education is to be found in the habits it inculcates" (1989, p. 61). These habits include the habits of engaging the sensibilities and the imaginations of individuals in ways that lead to the production of persons capable of appreciating works of art with the appropriate critical attitude (1989, p. 61). The value of these kinds of person in a democratic

society "seems as patent to me as that of the research scientist whose work allows us to solve the problems of our everyday living by making clear what results can be expected to follow upon sets of given conditions" (1989, p. 61). By training the perceptual and imaginative capacities of individuals and by inculcating critical thinking skills, aesthetic education contributes to the formation of citizens with the capacity to engage well in the deliberative participatory functions constitutive of democratic forms of government.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An Existentialist Aesthetic: The Theories of Sartre and Merleau-Ponty (Madison, Wisc., 1962).

An Existential-phenomenological Account of Aesthetic Education (University Park, Penn., 1968).

Art and Existence: A Phenomenological Aesthetics (Lewisburg, Penn., 1970).

The Unhappy Conscious: The Poetic Plight of Samuel Becket (Boston, 1981).

An Aesthetics for Art Educators (New York, 1989).

Other Relevant Works

"Aesthetics and the Teaching of Art," *Studies in Art Education* 5 (1964): 42–56.

"The Existential Ground for Aesthetic Education," *Studies in Art Education* 8 (1966): 3–12.

"Notes Toward an Understanding of Heidegger's Aesthetics," in *Phenomenology and Existentialism*, ed. E. N. Leed and M. Mandelbaum (Baltimore, Md., 1967), pp. 59–92.

"Aesthetic Education: A Role for Aesthetics Proper," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 2 (1968): 51–66.

"Can the Old Criticism be Taught?" *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 3 (1969): 129–52.

"The Existential Ground for Aesthetic Education," in *Existentialism and Phenomenology in Education*, ed. D. Denton (New York, 1974), pp. 53–62.

"Paul Ricoeur's Aesthetics: On How to Read a Metaphor," in *The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur*, ed. L. E. Hahn (Chicago, 1995), pp. 237–53.

Further Reading
Smoke, Jerry G. *A Comparison and Analysis of the Aesthetic Theories of Robin G. Collingwood and Eugene F. Kaelin*. PhD dissertation, Ball State University (Muncie, Ind., 1972).

Robert E. Money, Jr.

KAHN, Louis Isadore (1901–74)

Louis Kahn was born on 20 February 1901 in Kingisepp on the island of Ösel, Russia (the island is now called Saaremaa in Estonia). Kahn emigrated with his family to Philadelphia in 1906 and became a naturalized citizen in 1914. He attended city schools, then the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, and in 1920 he entered the University of Pennsylvania on an architecture scholarship. There he received a thorough Beaux Arts training under Paul Philippe Cret, graduating with his BA in architecture in 1924. Kahn worked as an urban planner in Philadelphia for many years, then traveled to Europe in 1928 and 1929, and in 1934 entered private practice (first on his own, then with George Howe, and later with Oscar Stonorov). He became chief critic of architectural design and later professor of architecture at Yale University (1947–57), and from 1957 until his death he taught architecture at the University of Pennsylvania. He received many honors, notably the gold medal of the American Institute of Architects (1971) and the Royal Institute of British Architects (1972). He died on 17 March 1974 in Penn Station, New York.

As an architect and theorist Kahn was a slow developer; it was only after clarifying his ideas through teaching that he was able to show his true originality. In "Structure and Form," a lecture recorded in 1960 for Voice of America and first printed in 1961, Kahn explored the Platonic elements of his architectural ideas. Kahn, like Plato, distinguished between the "form," or general idea that reflects the client's ideals as understood by the architect, and the "particular," specific plan which reflects the constraints of materials, finances, and building location. This argument reflects his Beaux Arts training and his interest in classical architecture. As David Brownlee notes, "While his intention was thus to broaden and strengthen modernist thinking, his open acceptance of the architecture and architectural thinking of the past also helped to inspire the more negative critique of twentieth-century architecture that came to be called Post Modernism" (Brownlee and De Long 1991).

The first independent commission he received was the Yale Art Gallery (1951–3), and already that shows characteristic traits: separately functioning parts clearly arranged according to structure and form. Kahn represents an alternative to the modernist vision of sleek glass boxes; he sought a monumental, massive quality modeled on classical exemplars, with strong axial symmetry and often processional in form. Functionalism is balanced by expansive gesture, expressing the idea of human needs. "He was a builder of beginnings," of *archai*, says Arthur Danto (Danto 1999, p. 203): the room, the street, the gathering place. The layout of plan and interior is intended to exhibit a clear distinction between "serving" and "served" spaces. That gives the architect leeway as to whether central or peripheral space is considered primary, or whether there might be an arrangement of separate units (as at the Salk Institute in California, laid out like a Renaissance piazza). Kahn always looked for a complementarity of site, community, structure, function, space, material, and form. Buildings were to display an inner disposition: "Talk to a brick and it will tell you it likes an arch," he declared in a 1972 interview (1991, p. 293).

Kahn produced fewer than a hundred designs, and only a handful of these were built. His own declarations of principle are home-grown, frequently gnomic and mystical. But taken with his own exemplary dedication to architecture they helped to inspire a whole generation of students.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Structure and Form," in *Louis I. Kahn*, by Vincent Scully (New York, 1962), pp. 114–21.

Louis I. Kahn: Writings, Lectures, Interviews, ed. Alessandra Latour (New York, 1991).

Louis Kahn: Essential Texts, ed. Robert Twombly (New York, 2003).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v58*, *Who Was Who in Amer v6*

Brown, Jack Perry. *Louis I. Kahn: A Bibliography* (New York, 1987).

Brownlee, David B., and David G. De Long. *Louis I. Kahn: In the Realm of Architecture* (Los Angeles, 1991).

Danto, Arthur. "Louis Kahn as archai-tekt," in *Philosophizing Art: Selected Essays* (Berkeley, Cal., 1999), pp. 185–204.

Scully, Vincent. *Louis I. Kahn* (New York, 1962).

Martin Donougho

KALLEN, Horace Meyer (1882–1974)

Horace Kallen was born on 11 August 1882 in Berenstadt, a town in the German (now Polish) province of Silesia, and died on 16 February 1974 in Palm Beach, Florida. His father, who had emigrated from Latvia, was assistant rabbi of the Orthodox Jewish community at Berenstadt. The Kallen family came to the United States when Horace was about five years of age and settled in Boston, where the father became the rabbi of a German-speaking Orthodox congregation. Horace distanced himself from his father, who wanted him to follow in his footsteps, but they were reconciled when the father was on his deathbed. Horace attended elementary and secondary schools and a traditional religious school, all of which left him with memories that troubled him the remainder of his life. He never accepted the teachings of his father's religion, nor of any other religion. When he was eighteen he entered Harvard, and in 1903 he received the BA degree magna cum laude. These were probably the most important years of his life for his intellectual and spiritual development. His interest in philosophy began shortly before he left home for Harvard when he found among his father's books a copy of Spinoza's *Ethics* and *Tractatus Theologico-politicus* in German translations. In his freshman year he took a course with George SANTAYANA and the next year courses with William JAMES and Barrett Wendell. Wendell, a Christian, traced in his course on American literary history the Hebraic elements in American political and literary thought and institutions. Kallen tried to resist and reject Wendell's teaching, but in private conferences with his argumentative student Professor Wendell won out. Kallen conscientiously strove to reclaim and to identify himself with his Jewish inheritance, what he called the Hebraic culture, although he maintained throughout his life a strong anticlerical bias and a rejection of all religious beliefs.

After graduating, Kallen took a position at Princeton University as an instructor in English, but after two years his contract was not renewed. It was intimated that had the administrators known that he was a Jew, he would not have been appointed to the instructorship, and it was also suggested that he was undesirable because he taught atheism. When in his old age he discussed this incident, he asked rhetorically how anyone could teach Shelley without referring to

his atheism. Kallen then returned to Harvard as a graduate student in philosophy. He wrote a dissertation on the nature of truth under the direction of Professor James, and was awarded the PhD in philosophy in 1908. For the next three years he was a lecturer in philosophy and assistant to James, Santayana, and Josiah ROYCE. Before completing his graduate studies, he received a fellowship that made it possible for him to travel to Europe where he studied with pragmatist F. C. S. Schiller at Oxford and attended the lectures of Henri Bergson in Paris. Both James and Wendell looked after Kallen's financial needs.

In 1911 Kallen became an instructor in philosophy and psychology at the University of Wisconsin, where he remained until 1918 when he resigned over his lack of academic freedom to defend pacifists during World War I. His years at Wisconsin had been productive. In 1914 his book on James and Bergson was published; in 1918 he published *The Structure of Lasting Peace*, and in the same year *The Book of Job as a Greek Tragedy*. In 1915 *The Nation* published his articles that contained the first formulation of his philosophy of democracy and cultural pluralism; and it was in those years that he became deeply involved in Zionist ideology and action. These developments made Kallen restless and eager to be in New York or Boston, where he could be more influential. Fortunately in 1919 the New School for Social Research (now the New School University) was founded in New York, and Kallen was asked to join the founding faculty comprised of Thorstein VEBLEN, John DEWEY, James Harvey Robinson and Charles Beard. Kallen eagerly accepted the invitation and became professor of philosophy and psychology. Among his many political and educational activities, Zionism and international pacifism were foremost. He supported the American Jewish Congress, the World Jewish Congress, the Conference on Jewish Relations, the American Association for Jewish Education, and the formation of Israel. He taught at the New School with pragmatic-minded colleagues Sidney HOOK and Morris R.

COHEN until 1969 and was professor emeritus until his death in 1974.

In 1935, reflecting upon his life and interests, Kallen wrote that although he felt that philosophy was his calling and that he enjoyed teaching it, he knew that he was not cast in the mold of a conventional philosopher or scholar. He had many social, economic, political, and cultural interests, including the labor movement, the consumers' cooperative movement, and civil liberties. He recalled the people who were the paramount influences on his development: James, Santayana, Wendell, Schiller, the psychologist Edwin B. HOLT, and the Jewish thinker Solomon SCHECHTER. In later years additional influences were Dewey, Justice Louis D. BRANDEIS, and the Unitarian minister Edward Everett Hale. On the walls of his study at his home were portraits of his parents, of Goethe, Jefferson, James, Santayana, Dewey, Schechter, and Zionist leader Judge Julian W. Mack. At different times Kallen gave a different name to his intellectual and moral position. He called his philosophy scientific humanism, free humanism, aesthetic pragmatism, cultural pluralism, individualism, the American Idea, and Hebraism. But no label pleased him, as he had a deep dread of all "-isms," all ideologies, or any closed body of ideas. His closest philosophical affinity was with pragmatism, and his closest personal affinity was with James, who considered Kallan as his protégé. When he knew that he would die before completing his last work, James entrusted Kallen with the manuscript of *Some Problems in Philosophy* which Kallen published in 1911.

If, as Kallen has said, James was the first democrat in metaphysics, then Kallen himself was the second. They both broke with a long philosophic tradition that can be traced back to pre-Socratic Greeks and coming down through Kant, Hegel, F. H. Bradley, and Royce. This tradition accepted as a fundamental premise a radical distinction between appearance and reality. Time, space, motion, and becoming, and what is experienced by the senses, were somehow not quite real and were mere appear-

ances. James and Kallen refused to accept the distinction between appearance and reality as aboriginal and final, because for them the distinction was secondary and functional. They looked for reality not in abstractions and logical processes but in the flow of experience and in the insights offered by the intelligence. They did not try to build systems but looked for instruction in the piecemeal character of knowledge and the plural character of reality that this knowledge disclosed. In the place of a universe they found a multiverse; in the place of one order they found no order at all or many orders, all of equal reality and value. In place of a single whole, a neatly organized system or Absolute, they found variety and multitudinous experience. Instead of denying appearance as mere error or illusion, they affirmed the reality of identity and change, of continuation and mutation, of the confluence of past and future. They affirmed the reality of "real duration," process, becoming, change, and novelty. They rejected rigid materialism and mechanistic explanations, and accepted the possibility of chance, uniqueness, of surprises and contingency.

In his metaphysics Kallen, like James, was a pluralist and temporalist, not a monist; and he, too, may have said to Royce, "Damn the Absolute!" Kallen was concerned with consequences and not with freezing essences or hypostatizing ideas or ideals. He held that percepts were basic and that concepts were secondary and derivative. There are unities as well as parts, but unities are important only as instrumental. There are relations but they are external and only associative. There are no finalities, no foregone conclusions, no certainties, no guarantees.

James's metaphysical pluralism also was evident in Kallen's cultural pluralism. Applying pluralism to the human scene, Kallen disavowed the state or society as the social absolute. If there are absolutes, there are many, as many as there individuals, for individuals are the human pluriverse. Individuals are the primary data and the primary values; and all principalities and powers, all societies and states, all kingdoms and governments are secondary and derivative. Persons stand in relation one to the other but the relations are external; society or state is not an organic entity but a free association of persons, who are free to disassociate and to form new societies, new states, new governments. In his belief in the primacy of the individual Kallen went beyond both James and Dewey. In this respect his thoughts can be associated best with Thomas Jefferson and Ralph Waldo EMERSON. "States, churches, industries, families are organizations, not organisms … . There are no social institutions which are primary, which are ends in themselves, as individuals are ends to and in themselves." All association is voluntary. Society, Kallen wrote, "is indeed only the name for the endlessly varying ways in which individuals associate with one another."

The name and fame of Horace Kallen, however, is identified not with the philosophy of Individualism, but with the idea of culture and the philosophy of cultural pluralism. His philosophy uses concepts that clearly implicate group existence and of identification of the individual with a group and its customs, laws, loyalties, and ideals. How did Kallen mediate between the individual and the group? Part of the answer can be found in Kallen's biography. Professor Wendell opened his student's mind to receive his Hebraic legacy, "converting" Kallen to Judaism – not to his father's religion, but to the Jewish/Hebraic heritage of culture, thought, and values, to a comfortable feeling of kinship with the Jewish people and their history and experience. Kallen at last felt that he had come home into his inheritance. "[T]he commingling of James's lectures and Wendell's crystallized in my mind into a new outlook, the results of which were: first, discovery of the meaning of 'equal' as used in the Declaration [of Independence]; second, recognition of the social role of freedom and of individual and group differences, later to be expounded at length in my own philosophy; and finally, such a reappraisal of my Jewish affiliations as required an acquiescence in my

Jewish inheritance and heritage, and expanding exploration into the content and history of both, and a progressively greater participation in Jewish communal enterprises."

In his first formulation of cultural pluralism, Kallen thought only of the ethnic groups to which Americans belonged, and he thought of membership in the group as something which the individual could not easily shed – that the ethnic group constituted a natural community, a *Gemeinschaft*. A person could cease being a citizen, or a church member, or a lawyer, but could not cease being a Jew or a Russian or an Anglo-Saxon without ceasing to be. A person, he wrote, cannot change his grandfather. In time, however, Kallen tended to think that all associations, without exception, were voluntary; that a person has the liberty to reject the fact that he is a Jew or a Pole or a Swede. While a person cannot change his grandfather, he can reject him as many have done. In a free society membership in a group is effected not by status but by contract.

In later years Kallen expressly qualified his individualism. No person is merely an individual. While the elemental term in every group is "the individual in his indefeasible singularity," he knew of no instance, Kallen added, "of an individual building his personal history solely by himself, from himself, on himself." "Rugged individualism," he wrote, can be viewed only as a case of extreme selfishness. Kallen criticized sharply those who questioned the patriotism of hyphenated Americans. The more societies a person "can join or leave, the more varied their forms and functions, the more abundant, the freer, the richer, the more civilized is likely to be the personality which lives and moves and nourishes its being among the diverse communions. It is the variety and range of his participation which does in fact distinguish a civilized man from an uncivilized, a man of faith and reason from an unreasoning fanatic, a democrat from a totalitarian, a man of culture from a barbarian. Such a man obviously orchestrates a growing pluralism of associations into the wholeness of his individuality."

The hyphen, he wrote, "unites very much more than it separates." By his spirit, by his faith and reason, a person "orchestrates" his diversities into a unity or a successful union; and a society, by the process of "orchestration" unites the unique and the diverse into a community alive to "to mutual appreciation and respect, to pleasure in one another, to cooperation with one another, or at worst to agreeing to disagree." The "union of the different" constitutes the spirit of the society or nation or association of nations. Hyphenation and orchestration make possible the American idea of "e pluribus unum," a union immeasurably enriched by the pluralism of cultures of which it is composed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

William James and Henri Bergson: A Study in Contrasting Theories of Life (Chicago, 1914).

The Book of Job as a Greek Tragedy (New York, 1918).

The Structure of Lasting Peace (Boston, 1918).

The League of Nations, Today and Tomorrow (Boston, 1918).

Zionism and World Politics (New York, 1921).

Culture and Democracy in the United States (New York, 1924).

Education, the Machine and the Worker (New York, 1925).

Why Religion (New York, 1927).

Frontiers of Hope (New York, 1929).

Indecency and the Seven Arts, and Other Adventures of a Pragmatist in Aesthetics (New York, 1930).

Judaism at Bay: Essays Toward the Adjustment of Judaism to Modernity (New York, 1933).

Individualism: An American Way of Life (New York, 1933).

A Free Society (New York, 1934).

The Decline and Rise of the Consumer: A Philosophy of Consumer Cooperation (New York, 1936; Chicago, 1946).

The Future of Peace (Chicago, 1941).

Art and Freedom (New York, 1942).

The Liberal Spirit: Essays on Problems of Freedom in the Modern World (Ithaca, N.Y., 1948).

The Education of Free Men (New York, 1949).

Patterns of Progress (New York, 1950).

Democracy's True Religion (Boston, 1951).

"Of Them Which Say They Are Jews" and Other Essays on the Jewish Struggle for Survival (New York, 1954).

Secularism Is the Will of God (New York, 1954).

Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea (Philadelphia, 1956).

Utopians at Bay (New York, 1958).

A Study of Liberty (Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1959).

Liberty, Laughter and Tears: Reflections on the Relations of Comedy and Tragedy to Human Freedom (De Kalb, Ill., 1968).

What I Believe and Why – Maybe (New York, 1971).

Creativity, Imagination, Logic: Meditations for the Eleventh Hour (New York, 1973).

Other Relevant Works

Kallen's papers are the American Jewish Archives in Cincinnati, Ohio; some are also at the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research in New York City.

Ed., *The Philosophy of William James, Drawn from His Own Works* (New York, 1925).

Ed., *Freedom in the Modern World* (New York, 1928).

Ed. with Sidney Hook, *American Philosophy Today and Tomorrow* (New York, 1935).

Ed. with John Dewey, *The Bertrand Russell Case* (New York, 1941).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Proc of APA v47*, *Who Was Who in Amer v6*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Hook, Sidney, and Milton R. Konvitz, eds. *Freedom and Experience: Essays Presented to Horace M. Kallen* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1947). Contains a bibliography of Kallen's writings.

Konvitz, Milton R., ed. *The Legacy of Horace Kallen* (Rutherford, N.J., 1987).

Ratner, Sidney, ed. *Vision and Action: Essays in Honor of Horace M. Kallen on his 70th Birthday* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1953).

Schmidt, Sarah L. *Horace M. Kallen: Prophet of American Zionism* (New York, 1995).

Milton R. Konvitz

KANTOR, Jacob Robert (1888–1984)

J. Robert Kantor was born on 8 August 1888 in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, to Russian immigrants. His first interest in science was in chemistry at the University of Chicago, but an introduction to psychology changed his focus. He earned a PhB in 1914 and a PhD in psychology in 1917 from the University of Chicago. His dissertation, "Functional Nature of the Philosophical Categories," examined the history of philosophy and explored how this historical analysis can aid psychology to overcome the prevailing model of psychology as the study of simple reflexes.

Kantor began lecturing at the University of Minnesota in 1915, but left in 1917 to join the psychology faculty at the University of Chicago as an instructor. In 1920 he accepted a psychology position at Indiana University, where he was promoted to associate professor in 1921, and full professor in 1923. Kantor founded the *Psychological Record* in 1937, and served on its editorial board. He was also a charter member of *Behaviorism*, and published frequent articles in these journals as well as the *Revista Mexicana de Análisis de la Conducta*. Kantor taught at Indiana until

retiring in 1959. He then moved to Chicago to live with his daughter, Helene J. Kantor, a professor of languages at the University of Chicago, and maintained his work habits and advanced the cause of a scientific psychology until his death on 2 February 1984 in Chicago, Illinois.

The predominating idea in psychology when Kantor started his career was that of a stimulus–response model in which all behaviors can be traced back to simple reflexes. Kantor advocated a view a psychology in which humans are viewed as living beings whose behavior arises from interactions within their environment and their past histories. This view was common among the members of the "Chicago School" in psychology, philosophy, and sociology; George H. MEAD's pragmatism and social behaviorism was its primary inspiration during the 1910s and 1920s. Kantor's contributions to this school of thought in psychology lie mainly in his historical analysis, which began with his dissertation, and his development of a logic of science that best serves psychology. His two-volume *Principles of Psychology* (1924, 1926) describes a science of psychology that was concerned with a naturalistic approach, one in which psychological events were described not in terms of biology nor in terms of psychic factors. Kantor would later describe this methodology as "interbehavioral psychology" because our behaviors are seen as arising within a series of events in which the person and the environment are seen as mutually responsible.

Kantor began his investigations into the social aspects of behavior with his *An Outline of Social Psychology* in 1929, still using the historical analysis that he had previously developed. He maintained this methodology until the publication of the first volume of *Psychology and Logic* in 1945. In this work and in *The Logic of Modern Science* (1953) he presented a logic of analysis of specific events, in contrast to the standard universal and transcendent systems in use by the psychologies that relied on biology, nonnatural psychic faculties, rote memorization, or comparison with animals. Kantor wanted scientific psychology to be based on the observations of human behavior and encompassing many methodologies: including physiological, cultural, and abnormal psychologies.

Kantor sought to purge scientific psychology of any sort of psychic or mysterious or nonnatural phenomena as a basis or explanation of human behavior. His logic of specificity was applied to ethics, aesthetics, and religion in *Interbehaviorial Psychology* (1957/1959). Kantor showed how scientific analysis can be applied in those areas that were (and still are) considered to be the domain of speculative philosophy. *The Interbehaviorist: A Newsletter of Interbehavioral Psychology* was founded to extend research in Kantor's ideas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Functional Nature of the Philosophical Categories (Chicago, 1917).

Principles of Psychology, 2 vols (Chicago, 1924, 1926).

An Outline of Social Psychology (Chicago, 1929).

An Objective Psychology of Grammar (Chicago, 1936).

The Nature of Psychology as a Natural Science (Chicago, 1938).

Psychology and Logic, 2 vols (Chicago, 1945, 1950).

Problems of Physiological Psychology (Chicago, 1947).

The Logic of Modern Science (Chicago, 1953).

Interbehavioral Psychology (Chicago, 1957; 2nd edn 1959).

The Scientific Evolution of Psychology, 2 vols (Chicago, 1963, 1969).

The Aim and Progress of Psychology and Other Sciences (Akron, Ohio, 1971).

The Science of Psychology: An Interbehavioral Survey, with Noel W. Smith (Chicago, 1975).

Cultural Psychology (Chicago, 1982).

Tragedy and the Event Continuum (Akron, Ohio, 1983).

Psychological Comments and Queries (Chicago, 1984).

Other Relevant Works

Kantor's papers in the Archives of the History of American Psychology at the University of Akron, Ohio.

"Conscious Behavior and the Abnormal," *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 13 (1918): 158–67.

"Suggestions toward a Scientific Interpretation of Perception," *Psychological Review* 27 (1920): 191–216.

"A Tentative Analysis of the Primary Data of Psychology," *Journal of Philosophy* 18 (1921): 253–69.

"An Attempt toward a Naturalistic Description of Emotions," *Psychological Review* 28 (1921): 19–42, 120–40.

"An Analysis of Psychological Language Data," *Psychological Review* 29 (1922): 267–309.

"The Psychology of Reflex Action," *American Journal of Psychology* 22 (1922): 19–42.

"The Psychology of the Ethically Rational," *International Journal of Ethics* 33 (1923): 316–27.

"Anthropology, Race, Psychology, and Culture," *American Anthropologist* 27 (1925): 267–83.

"The Significance of the Gestalt Conception in Psychology," *Journal of Philosophy* 22 (1925): 234–41.

"Language as Behavior and as Symbolism," *Journal of Philosophy* 26 (1929): 150–59.

"Man and Machine in Science," *Journal of Philosophy* 32 (1935): 673–84.

"The Current Situation in Social Psychology," *Psychological Bulletin* 36 (1939): 307–60.

"Postulates for a Logic of Specificity," *Journal of Philosophy* 37 (1940): 29–42.

"Jamesian Psychology and the Stream of Psychological Thought," in *In Commemoration of William James,*

1842–1942, ed. Brand Blanshard and Herbert W. Schneider (New York, 1942), pp. 143–56.

"The Aim and Progress of Psychology," *American Scientist* 34 (1946): 251–63.

"Behaviorism: Whose Image?" *Psychological Record* 13 (1963): 499–512.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Encyc Psych*, *Who Was Who in Amer v9*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Mahan, Harry C. *The Interactional Psychology of J. R. Kantor: An Introduction* (San Marcos, Cal., 1968).

Mountjoy, Paul T., and Jay D. Hansor. "Jacob Robert Kantor (1888–1984)," *The Interbehaviorist* 17 (1989): 18–20.

Ribes, Emilio. "In Obituario: J. R. Kantor (1888–1984)," *Revista Mexicana de Análisis de la Conducta* 10 (1984): 15–36. Contains a bibliography of Kantor's writings.

"Robert Kantor: An Obituary," *American Psychologist* 41 (1986): 1296–7.

Rubin, Douglas, and Dennis Delprato, eds. *New Ideas in Therapy: Introduction to an Interdisciplinary Approach* (Westport, Conn., 1987).

Smith, Noel W., P. T. Mountjoy, and D. H. Ruben, eds. *Reassessment in Psychology: The Interbehavioral Alternative* (Washington, D.C., 1983).

James C. Poteet II

KAPLAN, Abraham (1918–93)

Abraham Kaplan was born on 11 June 1918 in Odessa, Ukraine. His family immigrated to the United States in 1923 and he became a naturalized citizen in 1930. He received his BA in 1937 at the College of St. Thomas in St. Paul, Minnesota, and his PhD in philosophy from the

University of California at Los Angeles in 1942. He was professor of philosophy at New York University from 1940 to 1945; UCLA from 1946 to 1965; University of Michigan from 1962 to 1972; and the University of Haifa in Israel from 1972 to 1978. He was a visiting professor at Brandeis, Harvard, Columbia, University of Southern California, Antioch, Oregon State, and University of Hawaii. He served as President of the American Philosophical Association Pacific Division in 1958–9. For many years Kaplan was a very popular teacher of philosophy. In 1966 he was named one of the ten best college professors in the United States by *Time* magazine. He held both US and Israeli citizenship. Kaplan died on 19 June 1993 in Los Angeles, California.

Kaplan has argued for the continuing relevance of philosophy to society and the ongoing need for careful examination and critical assessment of the public role of philosophy. In *American Ethics and Public Policy* (1963), he tries to sketch an experimental basis for American public morality and policy. What America needs, he claims, is not more idealism, but more realistic ideals, not more exhortations to abstract virtue, but support of concrete measures for the improvement of specific situations. In *The Conduct of Inquiry* (1964) he examines the methodology, concepts, measurement, statistics, models, theories, etc. of the behavioral sciences, while emphasizing what unites the behavioral sciences. He offers guides to behavioral scientists, warning against pitfalls that may lie in their path, including the acceptance of fads and current fashions.

In *The New World of Philosophy* (1961) Kaplan gives extensive attention to Western and non-Western philosophical traditions, including Buddhism, Chinese and Indian philosophy, and Zen. Kaplan laments the fact that to a great extent philosophy has become institutionalized to serve the profession rather than the wider public. Philosophy is a means by which the philosopher orients himself to the world, determining what meaning he finds in events, what values are aspired to and what standards guide his choices in life. However different, philosophies involve a commonality of human problems. Kaplan stresses this commonality in his discussions of pragmatism, analytic philosophy, existentialism, communism, and non-Western views, finding resemblances in themes and problems as well as a preoccupation with values, especially moral and spiritual values.

He raises a number of searching questions about each world philosophy and offers possible answers to the questions: What part can pragmatism play in uniting people behind shared values? How does analytic philosophy conceive the relation between philosophy of science and other parts of the subject? Is not Indian philosophy actually religion rather than philosophy? To what extent can China's lack of progress for so many centuries be attributed to its philosophies?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Power and Society: A Framework for Political Inquiry, with Harold D. Laswell (New Haven, Conn., 1950; 1965).

The New World of Philosophy (New York, 1961).

American Ethics and Public Policy (Oxford, 1963).

The Conduct of Inquiry: Methodology for Behavioral Science (San Francisco, Cal., 1964; New Brunswick, N.J., 1998).

Love … and Death: Talks on Contemporary and Perennial Themes (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1973). Originated in an eleven-part television series, *The Worlds of Abraham Kaplan*.

In Pursuit of Wisdom: The Scope of Philosophy (Beverly Hills, Cal., 1977).

Other Relevant Works

Kaplan's papers are at California State Polytechnic University in Pomona, California.

"Sociology Learns the Language of Mathematics," in *Readings in the Philosophy of Science*, ed. Philip P. Wiener

(New York, 1953), pp. 394–412.

"Logical Empiricism and Value Judgments," in *The Philosophy of Rudolf Carnap*, ed. P. A. Schilpp (LaSalle, Ill., 1963), pp. 827–56.

Ed., *Individuality and the New Society* (Seattle, Wash., 1970).

Further Reading
Proc of APA v67, Who Was Who in Amer v11
Carnap, Rudolf. "Kaplan on Value Judgments," in *The Philosophy of Rudolf Carnap*, ed. P. A. Schilpp (LaSalle, Ill., 1963), pp. 999–1013.

Guy W. Stroh

KAPLAN, David Benjamin (1933–)

David Kaplan was born on 17 September 1933 in Los Angeles, California. He received his PhD from the University of California at Los Angeles in 1964. His dissertation was titled "Foundations of Intensional Logic." He began teaching philosophy at UCLA in 1961 as a lecturer, and was steadily promoted up to full professor, which is his current position. He was President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Division in 1980–81, and has received other honors.

Through his work in intensional logic and philosophy of language, Kaplan has also contributed to problems in epistemology and metaphysics. Along with Saul KRIPKE and Ruth Barcan MARCUS, Kaplan made major contributions to the theory of indexicals. His theory of rigid names, formulated independently of Marcus and Kripke's notion of the rigid designator, was first presented in a 1970 lecture and published in 1978. Unlike Kripke's rigid designator, Kaplan's version of this sort of expression designates the same thing in every possible world, regardless of whether the thing exists in that world. In his articles during the 1970s, and also a 1977 manuscript entitled "Demonstratives" (which has become one of the most widely circulated and cited philosophical works never actually published), Kaplan proposed a widely influential neo (or perhaps anti) Fregean theory of indexicals and proper names grounded on this conception of rigid designation. Also provocative is Kaplan's claim that his logic of indexicals reaches the same results of Kripke's arguments for contingent a priori propositions.

Kaplan's work on the nature of the meaning of proper names and indexicals has deep connections with the problem of the origin of a proper name's meaning. On his theory of direct reference, proceeding from his development of Bertrand Russell's concept of the singular proposition whose linguistic structure contains an object, naming occurs in some context when someone utters a sentence like "That is a rose." This is a type of causal theory of reference, also defended by Kripke, Hilary PUTNAM, and Keith DONNELLAN among others. In his more recent writings Kaplan has developed nuanced ways to deal with problems for the theory of direct reference. His sophisticated work has also energized further issues in modal semantics and metaphysics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Hempel and Oppenheim on Explanation," with Rolf Eberle and Richard Montague, *Philosophy of Science* 28 (1961): 418–28.
"Explanation Revisited," *Philosophy of Science* 28 (1961): 429–36.
"What is Russell's Theory of Descriptions?" in *Physics, Logic and History*, ed. Wolfgang Yourgrau and Allen Breck (New York, 1966), pp. 277–88.
"Quantifying In," *Synthese* 19 (1968): 178–214.
"Bob and Carol and Ted and Alice," in

Approaches to Natural Language, ed. Jaakko Hintikka, J. M. E. Moravcsik, and Patrick Suppes (Dordrecht, 1973), pp. 490–518.

"How to Russell a Frege-Church," *Journal of Philosophy* 72 (1975): 716–29.

"Dthat," in *Syntax and Semantics*, ed. Peter Cole (New York, 1978), pp. 221–53.

"On the Logic of Demonstratives," *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 8 (1979): 81–98.

"Opacity," in *The Philosophy of W. V. Quine*, ed. Lewis E. Hahn (La Salle, Ill., 1986), pp. 229–94.

"Demonstratives" and "Afterthoughts" in *Themes From Kaplan*, ed. Joseph Almog et al. (Oxford, 1989), pp. 481–563, 565–614.

"Words," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* suppl. 64 (1990): 93–119.

"A Problem in Possible World Semantics," in *Modality, Morality, and Belief: Essays in Honor of Ruth Barcan Marcus*, ed. Walter Sinnott-Armstrong et al. (Cambridge, UK, 1995).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v9*

Almog, Joseph, John Perry, and Howard Wettstein, eds. *Themes from Kaplan* (Oxford, 1989).

Burge, Tyler. "Kaplan, Quine, and Suspended Belief," *Philosophical Studies* 31 (1977): 197–203.

Creath, Richard. "On Kaplan on Carnap on Significance," *Philosophical Studies* 30 (1976): 393–400.

Perry, John. *The Problem of the Essential Indexical and Other Essays*, 2nd edn (Stanford, Cal., 2000).

Steinman, Robert. "Kripke Rigidity versus Kaplan Rigidity," *Mind* 94 (1985): 431–42.

John R. Shook

KAPLAN, Mordecai Menahem (1881–1983)

Mordecai Menahem Kaplan was born in the small Lithuanian town of Svencionys on 11 June 1881. His mother, Anna, had been raised in the Hasidic tradition of piety and mysticism while his father, Rabbi Israel Kaplan, was an adherent of the Lithuanian Jewish Mussar movement, which stressed ethical introspection, self-criticism, and penitence. At the age of nine Kaplan was brought to the United States, where he studied secular subjects in the New York City public schools and did religious studies with his father, Bible critic Arnold Ehrlich, and Hasidic savant Joseph Sossnitz. He pursued higher studies at the City College of New York (BA 1900), Columbia University (MA 1902), and the Jewish Theological Seminary of America (Rabbi, DD 1902). In 1909 he was appointed by Solomon SCHECHTER to head the newly established Teachers Institute of the Seminary and later to teach in its Rabbinical School as well. His principal subjects were homiletics, Midrash or traditional Jewish scriptural exegesis, and philosophies of religion. He remained at the Seminary for over fifty years until his retirement in 1963, influencing generations of rabbis and educators. Kaplan died at the age of 102 in New York City on 8 November 1983.

Concurrent with his educational work, Kaplan served as a rabbi of a prestigious Orthodox congregation and was also instrumental in establishing the Jewish Center, a New York synagogue which, although Orthodox, implemented his idea that a synagogue should fulfill the social, cultural, and recreational – and not only the religious – needs of its members. When a split developed in the congregation over Kaplan's heterodox views, a group of followers joined him in 1922 in founding the Society for the Advancement of Judaism, an experimental synagogue that was to become the fountainhead of Kaplan's new religious ideology. In 1935, he founded the *Reconstructionist* magazine, an influential journal of American Jewish opinion, which

served as a platform for his thought, and the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation for the publication of his books and the dissemination of his views. This was followed by the founding of a federation of like-minded synagogues and fellowships, such as the Reconstructionist Rabbinical College, an innovative school founded in 1968 for rabbis located in Wyncote, Pennsylvania. At the time of his death, Kaplan was acknowledged as one of the world's influential Jewish thinkers, as well as the founder of Reconstructionist Judaism, a new approach to Jewish theology and polity and the first Jewish religious denomination to originate in America. He was also recognized as an important spokesperson of liberal religious thought among Jews and Christians in the United States. Kaplan bequeathed an impressive literary legacy to future generations.

Judaism as a Civilization (1934) is still considered to be the most comprehensive program ever developed for Jewish life in America, including communal structure, religion, culture, and education. In this work, Kaplan aligns himself squarely with the sociological and functional approaches to culture and religion. *The Meaning of God in Modern Jewish Religion* (1937) is an ingenious attempt to reevaluate and reconstruct the traditional Sabbath and festivals of the Jewish calendar by associating them with a concept of God as the Power (or Process) making for freedom, justice, equality, cooperation, and this-worldly salvation. *The Future of the American Jew* (1948) provides an analysis of major Jewish concepts and values, including studies of the significance of peoplehood, teaching the Bible, the role of women, Jewish law, and Judaism and democracy. Kaplan unabashedly rejects the traditional idea of the Jews as a "chosen people." *A New Zionism* (1955) details the ethical and spiritual implications of the Zionist movement and the newly established State of Israel and presents a program for the "creative expansion of Torah" (Jewish culture, education, and religion) in Israel and the Jewish Diaspora.

In *Judaism Without Supernaturalism* (1958), Kaplan claims that Judaism can be revitalized and enhanced when freed from supernaturalism and when religious practices are reinterpreted as having symbolic rather than theurgic or magical meaning. Supernaturalism, a hindrance to good will, may be transcended by demythologizing the Bible and highlighting the universal aspects of a matured Jewish religion. *The Greater Judaism in the Making* (1960) is an historic overview of Judaism in Talmudic, medieval and modern times. Kaplan presents a critical analysis of the work of the leaders of Reform, Orthodox, and Conservative Judaism, as well as Zionism, together with a detailed restatement of his own position on peoplehood as a dimension of religion, the revelation of God in the human spirit through conscience and moral responsibility, and the Pentateuchal Torah as the first attempt on a large scale to chart the meaning and direction of human life.

The Purpose and Meaning of Jewish Existence (1964) is an analysis of the various theological rationales in the history of Judaism, including the Torah and the philosophers Philo, Maimonides, and Martin Buber. The core of the volume is a presentation of the thought of the German-Jewish founder of neo-Kantianism, Hermann Cohen. It contains a summary of Cohen's seminal work, *Religion of Reason Out of the Sources of Judaism*, together with Kaplan's own extensive commentary. Both Cohen and Kaplan were strongly rationalistic in their thinking, but Cohen's was an ideationist rationalism while Kaplan's was a functional rationalism. *If Not Now, When?* (1973) is a dialogue between Kaplan and theologian Arthur A. Cohen. The volume contains Kaplan's most far-reaching statements on several key issues, including the nature of religion, demythologizing the Bible, the essence of the God of Israel, Jewish identity, and transnaturalism.

In many respects, Kaplan's thought is an extension of the ideas of English poet and essayist Matthew Arnold and Hebrew philosopher and essayist Ahad Ha'am (Asher

Ginzburg). From Arnold, he took the idea of God as a Power (not ourselves) making for righteousness, and from Ahad Ha'am, the idea that the Jewish people's will to live was at the center of its culture and religion. Influenced by contemporary sociologists, philosophers, theologians, and scientists, Kaplan subsumed what he regarded as the major challenges to the Jews in the modern era under the categories of "nationalism" and "naturalism." The challenge of nationalism could be met head-on by a renewed dedication to Zionism, which he viewed as a salvational ideology and not merely a political movement, and by an implementation of democracy in all phases of religion and education. The challenge of naturalism, or the scientific world view, could likewise be met by the formulation and wholehearted endorsement of a religious naturalism, not unlike that of the American Protestant theologian Henry Nelson WIEMAN, and a this-worldly interpretation of salvation.

Kaplan's ideology needs to be viewed in the context of the work of sociologists Emile Durkheim, Max Weber, and Franklin Giddings, and their notion of the social or collective mind, as well as a response to certain emphases in American philosophical thought and religion. Such emphases include empiricism, pragmatism, pluralism, and process philosophy. Kaplan was particularly influenced by Josiah ROYCE (the philosophy of loyalty), Ralph Waldo EMERSON (the ideas of a hospitable universe and self-reliance), William JAMES (an emerging universe, "faith-tendencies" of human nature, and social responsibility), John DEWEY (the religious quality of the pursuit of ideal ends, including democracy), and Alfred North WHITEHEAD (the processive nature of all reality).

Kaplan's thought is in the mainstream of American religious liberalism, although he may justifiably be termed a radical modernizer because of his insistence that scientific method, empirical fact, and prevailing forms of philosophy be utilized as points of departure for religious thought. He was also clearly influenced by the Social Gospel movement of American Protestantism, emphasizing both the enrichment of individual personality and the development of democracy through ethical religion and social and economic reform.

According to Kaplan, Judaism is the dynamic and evolving religious civilization of the Jewish people, finding expression in history, culture, and religion. Judaism has exhibited remarkable ability to endure throughout history in accordance with the highest ethical purposes, despite changes in philosophical and theological opinion. What links the Jews together is not so much a static uniformity of ideas as a dynamic continuity of experience. The Jews constitute a permanent human society based on common hopes, fears, and yearnings. They are a community of historical recollection expressed in their *sancta* (sacred texts, events, customs, places, and persons) rather than a community of mind or uniform ideology. It is not theology, but rather collective identity or peoplehood that is central to Judaism. This sense of peoplehood originates in an intimate and intense collective sentiment for the ancestral national homeland in the land of Israel. Because of the deeply moral and spiritual culture and religion that their forbears developed there, the authors of the Bible erased memories of any brutal force and rapacious instincts through which the land may have been actually acquired. Nevertheless, despite its rootedness in a specific territory, Judaism evolved into a national civilization that was universal in content and reference and capable of giving birth to both Christianity and Islam. The sense of peoplehood among those who survived as Jews through the ages expressed itself in the will to self-government and self-education for the purpose of self-perpetuation. Central to the Five Books of Moses (the Torah) is concern for the principle of law and order in human relations (Genesis 18:19). This concern, together with details for the implementation of the principle of law and order in the life of ancient Israel, constitutes the expression of what God means to the Jewish people. It is the humanness of biblical law that reveals God (in opposition

to the traditional notion that it is God who reveals the law). The historical uniqueness of the Jewish people derives from its will to self-perpetuation expressed in both the biblical name for God, YHWH (Eternality), and in the idea of the various covenants between God and Israel related in the Bible. Like the Greek philosophers, the Israelites were obsessed with the quest for permanence, stability, and authenticity in a world of change and mortality.

Revelation, according to Kaplan, may be identified with the sense of collective consciousness and the collective conscience of a people, church, or society expressed in manifestations of responsibility, honesty, loyalty (love), and creativity. The sense of peoplehood echoes and responds to the vital human need to have something permanent to belong to and be proud of. The modern ethical notion of the equality of all individuals and groups before God necessitates the abandonment of the biblical and rabbinic doctrine of the "chosen people" and the substitution of the concept of *religious vocation*: the universal task of transforming one's society into a group motivated by the principle of active moral responsibility, a "people in the image of God."

A confirmed rationalist, Kaplan insisted that, for religion to be both enlightening and liberating, it should be based on faith in reason. A religious humanist, he believed that the primary concern of religion should be humanity rather than God. More important in religion than the idea of God is the concept of salvation, since whatever a religious community conceives salvation to be determines its idea of God. Salvation in the modern world is synonymous with durable happiness, life abundant, self-realization, or continuous growth and progressive approximation by the individual and society to the ideal of perfection. The salvation which religion should strive for consists of the advancement of the ideals of reliability or moral responsibility, integrity, loyalty or love, and creativity or spiritual growth.

Rejecting both divine omnipotence and the creator role traditionally assigned to God, Kaplan replaced the latter with the idea of creativity or the creative urge as the element of Divinity in the universe. Humanity and God should be regarded as correlative terms like parent and child, teacher and pupil, state and citizen, or king and subject. Statements about God failing to conform to this correlation should unhesitatingly be viewed as mythology. The term "God" denotes the experience of holiness and is related to the functioning of conscience, which is aptly described as "the pain of the human spirit."

A religious naturalist, Kaplan coined the term "transnaturalism" to identify the form of naturalism that recognizes the independent functioning of mind and spirit and conceives truth, justice, and freedom as operating in their own right and helping to bring order out of chaos, law out of violence, good out of evil, and love out of hate. Such a naturalism is compatible with belief in God and faith in humanity's highest values. It conveys trust in life and sees such trust as identical with belief in God. Transnaturalism insists that, just as the whole is more than the sum of its parts, so is the soul the "plus" of human nature and God the "plus" of the universe.

Kaplan regarded the normal human experience of frustration and bafflement as an indication of the possibility of improvement. Such a possibility assumes that the destiny of humanity is to transcend itself. At the root of transcendence is the need to be needed, to participate in a permanent human group dedicated to moral responsibility and conscience, which are the same as holiness. Moral responsibility is actually the human experience of the universal law of cosmic polarity, whereby everything in the universe is both independent and interdependent. Moral responsibility is the effort to experience God without resorting to anthropomorphic terminology, rational statements, or mystical exercises. Moral responsibility is a window through which humanity looks out on the cosmos and discovers God as the Power that makes for salvation. Salvation should be achieved through involvement in

rather than detachment from the world. Moral responsibility needs to be implemented among the members of a society, by the society as a whole towards each member, by each individual towards the society as a whole, and internationally between societies.

Kaplan wrote of evil as religion's worst quandary and the source of its crisis in the modern world. Theology's attempt to understand evil intellectually and to resign people to it actually contributes to the worsening of the human situation. Religion is too preoccupied with justifying "God's ways" and preaching resignation instead of actively seeking an end to exploitation and war. The various attempts to account for evil are erroneous because they derive from the incorrect notion that God is a Being like a human being. Insofar as Godhood is the correlate of humanity's efforts to improve human life, God is a Process. The creativity manifest in human responsibility, integrity, and loyalty or love, constitutes the Godhood or Divinity of the cosmos. This perspective shifts attention from metaphysical speculation to the inhumanity of individuals and groups. The worship of God must not be directed towards a Being who rewards and punishes but to the creative Process in the cosmos and in ourselves that brings order out of chaos and good out of actual and potential evil. Humanity must assert its own creativity in harmony with the Creativity of the cosmos in order to counter the evil in nature and in itself. Humanity attains salvation and redemption from futility and frustration, not by achieving victory over evil, but by engaging in the struggle to rid the world of it.

For Kaplan, the idea underlying democracy is that the interests uniting human beings, if they become truly aware of those interests, are strong enough to ward off the divisive influence of people's differences. The crucial problem of freedom is how to guard our individuality and the capacity to think for ourselves and yet cooperate with those whose backgrounds, upbringings, and outlooks are different from our own. This is an art, said Kaplan, that human beings are slow to learn. Democracy should be conceived as a process of social experimentation by which people are seeking to learn that art and to apply, step by step, the wisdom acquired as a result of such experimentation. That is why the art of free, voluntary cooperation, the ultimate objective of democracy, must constantly be cultivated. Fundamental is the understanding that, no matter how human beings may differ, they are all desirous of being free.

Kaplan believed that faith in democracy and its possibilities for human living had to be strengthened and deepened. The Hebrew Bible and the New Testament, together with the rites of the churches, should not be viewed, he believed, as the only means of teaching redemptive religion; rather, it should be possible to teach the meaning of human life with the aid of American *sancta* such as the great texts, events, and personalities of American history. Schools need not teach any particular concept of God but merely implant in children the conviction that there is a Process in the universe that makes for human self-fulfillment, that every deviation from democracy is fraught with evil consequence, and that every achievement of true democracy is a moral gain. Thus, every child would receive a truly religious education without violating church–state separation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A New Approach to the Problem of Judaism (New York, 1924).

Judaism as a Civilization: Toward a Reconstruction of American-Jewish Life (New York, 1934; 1957; 1967).

Judaism in Transition (New York, 1936).

The Meaning of God in Modern Jewish Religion (New York, 1937; 1962).

The Future of the American Jew (New York, 1948).

A New Zionism (New York, 1955; rev. edn 1959).

Questions Jews Ask: Reconstructionist Answers (New York, 1956; rev. edn 1966).

Judaism Without Supernaturalism: The Only Alternative to Orthodoxy and Secularism

(New York, 1958).

The Greater Judaism in the Making: A Study in the Modern Evolution of Judaism (New York, 1960).

The Purpose and Meaning of Jewish Existence: A People in the Image of God (Philadelphia, 1964).

Not So Random Thoughts (New York, 1966).

The Religion of Ethical Nationhood: Judaism's Contribution to World Peace (New York, 1970).

If Not Now, When? with Arthur A. Cohen (New York, 1973).

Other Relevant Works

Kaplan's papers are at Reconstructionist Rabbinical College in Wyncote, Pennsylvania.

Ed., *The Jewish Reconstructionist Papers* (New York, 1936).

Ed. with Eugene Kohn and Ira Eisenstein, *The New Hagadah for the Pesah Seder* (New York, 1941).

Ed. with J. Paul Williams and Eugene Kohn, *The Faith of America: Prayers, Readings, and Songs for the Celebration of American Holidays* (New York, 1951).

Dynamic Judaism: The Essential Writings of Mordecai M. Kaplan, ed. Emanuel S. Goldsmith and Mel Scult (New York, 1985).

Communings of the Spirit: The Journals of Mordecai M. Kaplan, vol. 1: 1913–1934, ed. Mel Scult (Detroit, 2001).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encyc Relig*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v6*

Ben-Horin, Meir. *Common Faith, Uncommon People* (New York, 1970).

Breslauer, S. Daniel. *Mordecai Kaplan's Thought in a Postmodern Age* (Atlanta, 1994).

Caplan, Eric. *From Ideology to Liturgy: Reconstructionist Worship and American Liberal Judaism* (Cincinnati, Ohio, 2002).

Cohen, Jack J. *The Case for Religious Naturalism* (New York, 1958).

———, *Guides for an Age of Confusion: Studies in the Thinking of Avraham Y. Kook and Mordecai M. Kaplan* (New York, 1999).

Davis, Moshe. *Mordecai M. Kaplan: Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, 2 vols (New York, 1953).

Eisenstein, Ira, and Eugene Kohn, eds. *Mordecai M. Kaplan: An Evaluation* (New York, 1952).

Goldsmith, Emanuel S., Mel Scult, and Robert M. Seltzer, eds. *The American Judaism of Mordecai M. Kaplan* (New York, 1990). Contains a bibliography of Kaplan's writings.

Gurock, Jeffrey S., and Jacob J. Schacter. *A Modern Heretic and a Traditional Community: Mordecai M. Kaplan, Orthodoxy, and American Judaism* (New York, 1997).

Kohn, Eugene. *Religious Humanism* (New York, 1963).

Libowitz, Richard. *Mordecai Kaplan and the Development of Reconstructionism* (New York, 1984).

Marcus, Jacob R., and Abraham J. Peck, eds. *The American Rabbinate, A Century of Continuity and Change: 1883–1983* (Hoboken, N.J., 1985).

Miller, Allan W. *God of Daniel S.* (New York, 1969).

Rogers, Delores S. *The American Empirical Movement in Theology* (New York, 1990).

Schulweis, Harold M. *Evil and the Morality of God* (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1984).

Scult, Mel. *Judaism Faces the Twentieth Century: A Biography of Mordecai M. Kaplan* (Detroit, 1993).

Steinberg, Milton. *A Partisan Guide to the Jewish Problem* (Indianapolis, 1945).

Emanuel S. Goldsmith

KARP, Carol Ruth Vander Velde
(1926–72)

Carol Ruth Vander Velde was born on 10 August 1926 in Forest Grove, Michigan. She was raised in a Dutch farming community until she moved to Indiana at age eleven. In 1948 she graduated with distinction from Manchester College, a small church-related school, and enrolled in the mathematics graduate program at Michigan State University where she received her MA in 1950. After spending a short time traveling as a violist in an all-female orchestra, she returned to mathematics as a graduate student at the University of Southern California. In 1952 she married Arthur L. Karp. Although her 1959 PhD in mathematics was awarded by Southern California, most of her graduate education took place at the University of California at Berkeley, where her advisor, Leon Henkin, had moved in 1953.

Karp began her career at the University of Maryland in 1958 and remained there as a professor of mathematics until her death on 20 August 1972 in College Park, Maryland. At Maryland she was the leader of a small, but energetic, group of faculty and students working in logic and served from 1968 until her death as a consulting editor of the *Journal of Symbolic Logic*.

In the fall of 1956 Henkin and Alfred TARSKI organized a seminar at Berkeley on infinitary logic, where Karp presented her work on the syntax of predicate logic with infinitely long expressions. While other logicians had previously used expressions of infinite length, hers was the first comprehensive work on the extension of first-order logic to languages that allow infinite conjunctions and disjunctions, as well as quantification over infinite sets of variables.

Karp finished writing her dissertation at the end of 1958 and her first publication appeared in 1962. However, Dana SCOTT and Tarski included some of her results in a 1958 paper and Henkin talked about them at the Symposium on Foundations of Mathematics held in Warsaw in September 1959. A monograph based on her dissertation, expanded and with a different focus, appeared in 1964. In her monograph and in later papers and talks, Karp gave some of the earliest applications of infinitary languages. For example, she shows in her 1963 paper that well ordering cannot be expressed in a language that allows infinite conjunctions and disjunctions but quantification over only finite sets of variables. In the same paper she gives conditions for two models to satisfy the same formulas in such finite quantifier infinitary languages.

Karp was motivated by Georg KREISEL to consider the syntax of infinitary languages that did not rely on the cardinality of the expressions. This led her to the development of primitive recursive functions on sets and collaborative work with set theorist Ronald Jensen. At the time of her death, Karp was working on a second monograph on infinitary languages that would have included her results on the connections between generalized recursion theory and infinitary logic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Independence Proofs in Predicate Logic with Infinitely Long Expressions," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 27 (1962): 171–88.

"A Note on the Representation of I-complete Boolean Algebras," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 14 (1963): 705–7.

Languages with Expressions of Infinite Length (Amsterdam, 1964).

"Nonaxiomatizability Results for Infinitary Systems," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 32 (1967): 367–84.

"Primitive Recursive Set Functions," with Ronald B. Jensen, in *Axiomatic Set Theory*, part 1, ed. by Dana Scott (Providence, R.I., 1971), pp. 143–76.

Further Reading

Green, Judy. "Carol Karp (1926–1972)," in *Women of Mathematics: A*

Biobibliographic Sourcebook, ed. Louise Grinstein and Paul Campbell (Westport, Conn., 1987), pp. 86–91.

Kueker, D. W., ed. *Infinitary Logic: In Memoriam Carol Karp* (New York, 1975).

Judy Green

KATZ, Jerrold Jacob (1932–2002)

Jerrold Katz was born on 14 July 1932 in Washington, D.C. He received his BA from George Washington University in 1954. He served with the US Army Counter Intelligence Corps from 1954 to 1956. He then received his PhD in philosophy from Princeton University in 1960. Katz was a professor of philosophy at Massachusetts Institute of Technology from 1963 to 1975. He then became Distinguished Professor of Philosophy and Linguistics at the City University of New York Graduate Center in 1975. He was a senior fellow at Harvard in 1964–5, and a Guggenheim Fellow in 1972–3. Katz taught at CUNY until his death on 7 February 2002 in New York City.

Although Katz's work covered a great many areas of philosophy, he is primarily known as a philosopher of language. His philosophical views changed dramatically over time, so that it is useful to think of his work as having two main periods. In his early work, Katz focused on the foundations of linguistics, particularly semantics. In this stage of his career, he was a strong supporter of many of Noam CHOMSKY's views about language and linguistics, at a time when these views were being hotly debated. In particular, he endorsed the view that a linguistic theory is primarily a theory about the minds of speakers of the language. Katz's most significant contribution in this period was his theory of "semantic markers." According to this theory, the meaning of a word or expression is given by the connections it has to other words and expressions. For example, the meaning of "chair" is to be analyzed as being composed of the concepts: Object, Physical, Non-living, Artifact, Furniture, Portable, Something with legs, Something with a back, Something with a seat, Seat for one (1972, p. 40). These other expressions (such as Object) were in turn defined by their connections to yet other expressions. Although widely influential, the theory of semantic markers was subjected to severe criticism by many philosophers of language for failing to connect the meaning of a word or expression with its truth conditions. However, this theory has recently experienced something of a revival. It is viewed by some as an important precursor to statistically based theories of concepts and cognition (such as stereotype and prototype theories of concepts).

Katz's second philosophical period centered around a radical rejection of some central claims of his earlier period. In particular, he gave up the mentalistic claims about linguistics. In its place, he developed a view according to which the subject matter of linguistics is a kind of abstract object, much as the subject matter of mathematics (such as numbers and sets) is a systematic collection of abstract objects. The job of linguistics is not primarily to construct a high-level psychological theory regarding human linguistic abilities. Rather, its primary task is to describe a certain kind of abstract entity: language.

In developing his linguistic theory, Katz defended a general Platonist metaphysics – according to which such things as numbers, proposition, etc. literally exist – from its many critics. Although much of Katz's second period of thinking differs from his first, there are several strands that unify his thought. One of the most important of these is his belief in the significance of the analytic/synthetic distinction. Although this distinction suffered heavily at the hands of W. V. QUINE, Hilary PUTNAM, and others, Katz was always a staunch supporter of the distinction. He treated the notion of analyticity as a scientific term, one which might undergo a change in meaning as linguis-

tic theory developed. According to him, the most appropriate use of the notion of an analytic sentence was not one that was "true in virtue of meaning alone." Instead, an analytic sentence is one in which various constituents of the sentence bear certain kinds of relations to one another. According to this revised notion of analyticity, "The present king of France is male" counts as analytic, even though it is not true in virtue of its meaning.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Problem of Induction and its Solution (Chicago, 1962).

"The Structure of a Semantic Theory," with Jerry A. Fodor, *Language* 39 (1963): 170–210.

An Integrated Theory of Linguistic Descriptions, with Paul M. Postal (Cambridge, Mass., 1964).

"Mentalism in Linguistics" *Language* 40 (1964): 124–37.

The Philosophy of Language (New York, 1966).

The Underlying Reality of Language and Its Philosophical Import (New York, 1971). Also published as *Linguistic Philosophy: The Underlying Reality of Language and Its Philosophical Import* (London, 1972).

Semantic Theory (New York, 1972).

Propositional Structure and Illocutionary Force: A Study of the Contribution of Sentence Meaning to Speech Acts (New York, 1977; Cambridge, Mass., 1980).

Language and Other Abstract Objects (Totowa, N.J., 1981).

Cogitations: A Study of the Cogito in Relation to the Philosophy of Logic and Language and a Study of Them in Relation to the Cogito (Oxford, 1986).

The Metaphysics of Meaning (Cambridge, Mass., 1990).

Realistic Rationalism (Cambridge, Mass., 1998).

Sense, Reference, and Philosophy (Oxford, 2004).

Other Relevant Works

"Interpretive Semantics vs. Generative Semantics," *Foundations of Language* 6 (1970): 220–59.

"Generative Semantics is Interpretive Semantics," *Linguistic Inquiry* 2 (1971): 313–31.

"The Relevance of Linguistics to Philosophy," in *On Noam Chomsky: Critical Essays*, 2nd edn, ed. Gilbert Harman (Amherst, Mass., 1982).

Ed., *The Philosophy of Linguistics* (Oxford, 1985).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Proc of APA v75*

"Book Symposium on *The Metaphysics of Meaning*," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 54 (1994): 127–83.

Cohen, Jonathan. "Analyticity and Katz's New Intensionalism: Or, If You Sever Sense from Reference, Analyticity Is Cheap but Useless," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 61 (2000): 115–35.

Dowling, William C. *The Senses of the Text: Intensional Semantics and Literary Theory* (Lincoln, Neb., 1999).

Harman, Gilbert. "Katz's Credo," *Synthese* 32 (1976): 387–94.

Kraut, Robert. "Metaphysical Explanation and the Philosophy of Mathematics: Reflections on Jerrold Katz's Realistic Rationalism," *Philosophia Mathematica* 9 (2001): 154–83.

Oliver, Alex. "A Realistic Rationalism?" *Inquiry* 43 (2000): 111–36.

Quine, W.V. "On a Suggestion of Katz," *Journal of Philosophy* 64 (1967): 52–4.

Searle, John. "Chomsky's Revolution in Linguistics," in *On Noam Chomsky: Critical Essays*, 2nd edn, ed. Gilbert Harman (Amherst, Mass., 1982).

"Special Issue on Jerrold Katz," *Philosophical Forum* 34 (September 2003).

Kent Johnson

KAUFMAN, Gordon Dester (1925–)

Gordon Kaufman was born on 22 June 1925 in North Newton, Kansas, where his father Edmund G. Kaufman was President of Bethel College from 1932 to 1952. He received his BA degree from Bethel College in 1947, an MA in sociology from Northwestern University in 1947, a BD from Yale Divinity School in 1951, and a PhD in philosophical theology from Yale University in 1955. He taught at Pomona College from 1953 to 1958, and at Vanderbilt University from 1958 to 1963. He was professor of theology from 1963 to 1969 and Edward Mallinckrodt, Jr. Professor of Divinity from 1969 to 1995 at Harvard Divinity School.

During the 1960s Kaufman established his reputation as a leading figure in the transition from neo-orthodoxy to the historicism and social constructivism which dominated much Christian theology from the 1970s onward. His *Relativism, Knowledge and Faith*, published in 1960, began with the premise of Karl Barth and the earlier "dialectical theologians" that direct knowledge of God outside the sphere of revelation is impossible. But, unlike Barth and his followers, Kaufman refused to ignore the challenge of conceptual relativism and the philosophical task of analyzing the conditions for knowledge. From the outset, Kaufman's approach was strongly influenced by the German philosopher Immanuel Kant, a stance that became increasingly more explicit. Like Kant, Kaufman regarded theological thought, which in his early career he associated with "metaphysics," as a drive toward the "synthesis" of all knowledge and experience. In Kaufman's historicist model, this synthesis included cultural and anthropological data of all kinds.

By the late 1960s, Kaufman had incorporated the methodology of analytic philosophy, which was then all-pervasive at Harvard and which confronted theology with the issue of whether its own "metaphysical" language was meaningful or coherent in any fashion. In *God the Problem* (1972), Kaufman inquired whether the word God refers to anything real, or whether our religious and theological ideas are merely artifacts of the "imagination." He also asked what such terms as God, revelation, transcendence, and divine "act" mean for Wittgenstein. It was here that Kaufman moved away from a faith-centered historicism toward a position that had affinities with earlier American pragmatism and that would become familiar as "constructivism" or "constructionism."

For theological discourse to be meaningful according to sound criteria, Kaufman argued, it must understand the notion of God, not as an object or facticity of some sort but as an "imaginative construct." This construct serves a "practical posture" in generating an appropriate world view or ordering personal experience in such a manner that moral activity and "seriousness about life" remain possible. Just as Kaufman in his early work applied Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*, at this stage he deployed the arguments in the *Critique of Practical Reason*, which treat God as a necessary "postulate" of thought that grounds morality. Kaufman also maintained, along with Kant, that Christian theism – the view that the divine is ultimately personal or "agential" – offers the best analogical framework within which to elaborate the symbol God.

During the 1970s, Kaufman refined this approach considerably by elaborating for the first time and in extensive detail the "method" of constructionism. In *An Essay on Theological Method* (1975), Kaufman pointedly defined theology as "construction." In emphasizing the triadic architecture of theology, the essay reveals Kaufman's intensive reading of Hegel during the first half of that decade. Kaufman characterized previous approaches as "first-order" and "second-order" theologies. First-order theology was obviously Barthianism, stressing God's self-disclosure through Scripture. Second-order theology corresponded to Kaufman's earlier stance. "Third-order theology" coincided with Kaufman's new position, which he retained for the remainder of his career.

Third-order theology does not begin with "faith" but with experience, including the varieties of "religious experience." Third-order theology is the third or synthetic "moment" (a Hegelian bit of nomenclature) in the enterprise of theological construction. It takes up into itself the first moment, which is naïve and unreflective doctrine or experience, along with the second moment, which is a pragmatic or humanistic assessment of that experience. Third-order theology departs from every effort to anchor God-talk in a particular religious tradition and sets forth a structure of discourse congruent with contemporary experience. Theological "constructions" are true and meaningful insofar as they enrich and order such experience at an ultimate level.

By the time he published his key work, *The Theological Imagination: Constructing the Concept of God* (1981), Kaufman had aligned this method of "pragmatic validation" for theological construction with the new social and political agendas that emerged during the Vietnam era. Theology is inauthentic, Kaufman insisted, if it does not contribute to a process of "humanization." Theological construction must take into account a variety of criteria, such as sensitivity to the diversity of world religions, gender issues, the multiplicity of moral values, and the ecological crisis. Kaufman termed this approach the "indigenization" of theology. Although the absolute referent for theology can never be described or known, constructivism requires that theologians immerse themselves in their own immediate cultural context. Theology must be devoted to critiquing those traditional and "absolutist" constructs of God that perpetuate social injustice in a given historical milieu. Thus the route of Kaufman's work had turned in the opposite direction. Whereas the early "neo-orthodox" Kaufman relied on the language of monotheistic absolutism to engage and critique cultural relativism, the later liberal Kaufman deployed the argot of cultural relativism to engage and critique monotheistic absolutism.

The third phase of Kaufman's writings brings these two polarities into some kind of clear tension. The shift was catalyzed by Kaufman's own reflections on the threat of nuclear holocaust, first signaled in his Presidential address to the American Academy of Religion in 1982 and his visit soon thereafter to Hiroshima, where the first atomic bomb had fallen. Theology, Kaufman declared, must set its face toward the ultimate limiting factor in all human experience: the prospect of planetary annihilation. Theology must be concerned neither simply with the salvation of souls nor with the relevance of ideas and symbols. Rather, it must address the survival of the species. Although essentially an exercise in "imaginative construction," theology cannot merely be a mouthpiece for the cultural fads and fashions of the day. The Christian symbol of God, Kaufman suggested in *Theology for a Nuclear Age* (1985), is not so bad after all, since it evokes a sense of both mystery and familiarity. Such a picture of God both "relativizes" and "humanizes" all other symbols and constructions. What Kaufman dubbed "nuclear eschatology" throws into a new perspective the fragility of all "ecological" communities, human and animal. The construct of God functions to "ground" the value of all life across the evolutionary continuum against the apocalyptic menace of nuclear catastrophe.

At the same time, Kaufman wrote in his book *In Face of Mystery: A Constructive Theology* (1993), the construct of God must be fundamentally "reconstructed," but not strictly as a feint for either authoritarian morals or activist politics. Apocalyptic terror underscores the importance of the symbol God as the "underlying reality" or "ultimate mystery" of our world. The symbol "orients" us toward the wider flanges of the "cosmic-historical trajectory" of life in this sector of the universe, pointing toward a "humanely" ordered future that is at once compatible with the idea of intelligent purpose. We cannot know or identify this evolutionary purpose but we can capture it provisionally or metaphorically. The difficulty lies in our tendency to absolutize or reify our metaphors and symbols.

In Face of Mystery reaffirms, without the hesitation evident in Kaufman's middle years, the centrality of Christian theological language, including the incarnation and the trinity. Christianity is neither one religion among many others nor an exclusive window on religious truth. The "normative" conception of the human upon which we build all adequate constructions of God must be informed by the image of Jesus. Theology, in the end, must be faithful to what H. Richard NIEBUHR called a "radical monotheism" that is "brought into significant connection with the poignancy and power of the story and character of Jesus and the radical ethic which he lived and inspired in others" (2001, p. 31).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Relativism, Knowledge and Faith (Chicago, 1960).
The Context of Decision: A Theological Analysis (New York, 1961).
Systematic Theology: A Historicist Perspective (New York, 1968).
God the Problem (Cambridge, Mass., 1972).
An Essay on Theological Method (Missoula, Mont., 1975).
Nonresistance and Responsibility, and Other Mennonite Essays (North Newton, Kan., 1979).
The Theological Imagination: Constructing the Concept of God (Philadelphia, 1981).
Theology for a Nuclear Age (Manchester, UK, 1985).
"The Influence of Feminist Theory on My Theological Work," *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 7 (1991): 112–15.
In Face of Mystery: A Constructive Theology (Cambridge, Mass., 1993).
"Some Reflections on a Theological Pilgrimage," *Religious Studies Review* 20 (1994): 177–81.
God, Mystery, Diversity: Christian Theology in a Pluralistic World (Minneapolis, 1996).
"My Life and My Theological Reflection: Two Central Themes," *American Journal of Theology and Philosophy* 22 (2001): 3–32.

Further Reading
Davaney, Sheila G., ed. *Theology at the End of Modernity: Essays in Honor of Gordon D. Kaufman* (Philadelphia, 1991).
Ray, S. Alan. *The Modern Soul: Michel Foucault and the Theological Discourse of Gordon Kaufman and David Tracy* (Philadelphia, 1987).
Weaver, Alain E., ed. *Mennonite Theology in Face of Modernity: Essays in Honor of Gordon D. Kaufman* (North Newton, Kan., 1996).

Carl A. Raschke

KAUFMANN, Felix (1895–1949)

Felix Kaufmann was born on 4 July 1895 in Vienna, Austria, and he died on 23 December 1949 in New York City. He was a student with Alfred SCHUTZ in Vienna for nearly twenty years, and introduced Schutz to the thought of Edmund Husserl, the founder of the phenomenological movement. Kaufmann's early work was in the study of law. He studied under Hans KELSEN, producing three books, *Logic and the Science of Law* (1921), *The Criteria of the Law* (1924), and *The Types of Intent in Criminal Law* (1929). He obtained a law degree in 1920, and his writings served a thesis for obtaining a PhD in philosophy in 1922. On the basis of the first book he obtained an unpaid position as a *Privatdozent* in the law faculty of the University of Vienna. While filling this unpaid position, he earned his living by serving as a manager in the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company. He continued his intellectual life in Vienna, and participated in discussions with groups of jurists, including a group centered around Kelsen. He also participated in the Vienna Circle where he steadfastly rejected positivism, referring to himself as "his loyal majesty's opposition" and intro-

ducing phenomenological themes into the discussions, and groups of sociologists and economists. In 1936 he published a general work in the social sciences, *Die Methodologie der Socialwissenschaften* (a different book, *Methodology of the Social Sciences*, was published in 1944).

When Germany invaded Austria in 1938, Kaufmann and his family, at the invitation of Alvin Johnson, traveled first to the London School of Economics and then to the New School for Social Research in New York, where Kaufmann at last obtained a paying university post in 1939. He was professor of philosophy at the New School until his death. Kaufmann was a founding member of the International Phenomenological Society in 1940, and a member of the editorial board of *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*. He was also engaged in humanitarian work, organizing and contributing to CARE packages to aid in the preservation of Husserl's manuscripts and the support of Husserl's assistants Eugen Fink and Ludwig Landgrebe. He also helped others, including Karl Popper, to escape the Nazis. In later life he corresponded extensively with pragmatists John DEWEY and Arthur BENTLEY.

Kaufmann was a polymath, publishing in law, philosophy, logic, mathematics (Husserl considered Kaufmann to be the most brilliant mathematician amongst his followers), economics, and the natural and social sciences generally. However, there was one theme that united all this work in various fields: methodology. He often referred to himself as a methodologist, and defined methodology as the logical analysis of scientific procedure. He believed that the methodologies of both the natural and social sciences should be thoroughly grounded in pure mathematics. However, as his thought progressed, his methodology included heuristic postulates and other less formal features, leading to his keen interest in the thought of Dewey. He nonetheless continued to be a loyal follower of Husserl's transcendental method (his analysis

of methodological issues were often based in phenomenological analysis of lived meanings). In law he championed Kelsen's pure theory of law, in which the normative nature of legal terms and laws belong to different "spheres."

In mathematics, he developed a constructivist theory of mathematics based in phenomenologically established basic concepts. His discussions included the set theoretical interpretation of mathematics (which he rejected), the Dedekind cut, and transfinite numbers, among others. In scientific method Kaufmann held that prescientific and scientific understanding mutually influenced each other. He developed a nuanced series of levels of laws of scientific procedures. The basic rules of science, while guiding all sciences (natural and social) are nonetheless not a priori laws. In *Methodology of the Social Sciences* he identified seven basic rules of science: (1) scientific decision: the basic decision in scientific research, consisting in deciding to add or delete a proposition from the *corpus* of propositions belonging to a particular science; (2) the methodological principle of sufficient reason: all scientific decisions must be grounded in a combination of procedural rules and evidence; (3) scientific situation: scientific decisions must be grounded in the totality of relevant knowledge currently accepted; (4) the principle of permanent control: empirical propositions are never immune from rejection based on further evidence; (5) the procedural correlate of the principle of contradiction: no proposition may be admitted to the scientific *corpus* of a particular science if it generates a contradiction within that *corpus*; (6) the procedural correlate of the principle of the excluded middle: undecidable propositions must not be admitted to a scientific *corpus*; (8) grounds: propositions reporting sense observations must play a key role as grounds of scientific reasoning.

Kaufmann found that many methodological problems are based in epistemological confusions, and developed a sophisticated epistemology, grounded in phenomenology, while steadfastly rejecting relativism in its various

forms. Scientific laws are laws relating observation and expectation, not laws of nature. His view of scientific procedure gradually shifted from a basis in logic and mathematics to one more based in a nuanced view of the actual presuppositions and practices of science, in part through the influence of Dewey.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Logik und Rechtswissenschaft (Tübingen, Germany, 1921).

Die Kriterien des Rechts (Tübingen, Germany, 1924).

Die philosophischen Grundprobleme der Lehre von der Straftrechtsschuld (Leipzig and Vienna, 1929).

Das Unendliche in der Mathematik und seine Ausschaltung (Leipzig and Vienna, 1930). Trans. Paul Foulkes and ed. Brian McGuiness, *The Infinite in Mathematics: Logico-mathematical Writings* (Dordrecht, 1978).

"On the Subject-Matter and Method of Economic Science," *Economica* 13 (1933): 381–401.

"Do Synthetic Propositions *a priori* Exist in Economics?" *Economica* n.s. 4 (1937): 337–42.

"The Significance of Methodology for the Social Sciences," *Social Research* 5 (1938): 442–63; 6 (1939): 537–55.

"Truth and Logic," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 1 (1940): 59–69.

"Strata of Experience," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 1 (1941): 313–24.

"The Structure of Science," *Journal of Philosophy* 38 (1941): 282–92.

"The Logical Rules of Scientific Procedure," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 2 (1942): 457–71.

"The Nature of Scientific Method," *Social Research* 12 (1945): 464–80.

"Three Meanings of Truth," *Journal of Philosophy* 45 (1948): 337–50.

"John Dewey's Theory of Inquiry," *Journal of Philosophy* 56 (1949): 826–36.

Other Relevant Works

Kaufmann's papers are at the University of Memphis and the University of Konstanz, Germany.

"Kant und der reine Rechtslehre," *Kantstudien* 29 (1924): 233–42.

"Logik and Wirtschaftswissenschaft," *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 54 (1925): 614–56.

"Was kann die mathematische Methode in der Nationalönomie leisten?" *Zeitschrift für Nationalökonomie* 2 (1930–31): 754–79.

"On Dewey's Logic," *Social Research* 7 (1940): 243–6.

"Phenomenology and Logical Empiricism," trans. Dorion Cairns, in *Philosophical Essays in Memory of Edmund Husserl*, ed. Marvin Farber (Cambridge, Mass, 1940), pp. 124–42.

Further Reading

Proc of APA v24, Who's Who in Phil

Helling, Ingeborg K. "A. Schutz and F. Kaufmann: Sociology between Science and Interpretation," *Human Studies* 7 (1984): 141–61.

———, "Alfred Schutz, Felix Kaufmann, and the Economists of the Mises Circle: Personal and Methodological Continuities," in *Alfred Schutz: Neue Beiträge zur Rezeption seines Werkes*, ed. Elisabeth List and Ilja Srubar (Amsterdam, 1988), pp. 43–68.

Reeder, Harry P. *The Work of Felix Kaufmann* (Washington, D.C., 1991). Contains a bibliography of Kaufmann's writings.

Srubar, Ilja. "On the Origin of Phenomenological Sociology," *Human Studies* 7 (1984): 163–89.

Stadler, Friedrich, ed. *Phenomenologie und Logischer Empirismus. Zentenarium Felix Kaufmann (1895–1959)* (Vienna,

1997).

Zilian, H. G. *Klarheit und Methode: Felix Kaufmanns Wissenschaftstheorie* (Amsterdam, 1990).

Harry P. Reeder

KAUFMANN, Walter Arnold (1921–80)

Walter Kaufmann was born on 1 July 1921 in Freiburg, Germany. His father was a Jewish convert to Protestantism; his Jewish mother never converted. At the age of twelve, Kaufmann himself officially abjured Christianity, because he no longer believed in the basic articles of the Christian faith: belief in Jesus, the Holy Ghost, and God. Later in 1933 he converted to Judaism. After his conversion, he intended to become a rabbi and attended both the Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums (where he was a student of Leo Baeck, whose *Judaism and Christianity* he later translated) and the Lehranstalt, where he participated in the full program of the rabbinical department. Although his intentions to become a rabbi were never realized, his early attitudes towards both Christianity and Judaism were decisive in defining some of his principal intellectual interests for the rest of his life.

After emigrating to the United States in 1939, Kaufmann took all the religion courses offered at Williams College, where he graduated with a BA and high honors in 1941. His graduate study at Harvard University was interrupted by service in the US Army during World War II, and he received his PhD in philosophy in 1947. He immediately joined the philosophy department at Princeton University, where he was a professor of philosophy until his death. Kaufmann held two Fulbright research professorships; the first was at Heidelberg (1955–6) and the second was at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem (1962–3). In 1972 he was a Phi Beta Kappa visiting fellow at Australian National University, where he returned again in 1974 to serve as a visiting fellow in the Research School of Social Sciences. In 1975, he was a visiting fellow in the Institute of Philosophy at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Kaufmann died on 4 September 1980 in Princeton, New Jersey.

Kaufmann was by no means a public figure or an original philosopher. Indeed, there were some in the guild of philosophers who simply refused to think of him as a philosopher and who, because of his wide range of interests in philosophy, literature, and poetry, dismissed him as a poet. Kaufman's location in the philosophical community was unclear. This was, in part, because he not only considered himself a heretical agnostic but also a loner in the sense of belonging to no school of thought. This lack of definition through affiliation is compounded by the fact that little is known about Kaufmann's life. There are no biographies of him, and even his *The Faith of a Heretic* does not help us much. Published in 1961, following an article of that title in the February 1959 issue of *Harper's Magazine*, it contains some autobiographical comments, but by Kaufmann's own admission, his book was not meant to be an autobiography: "it doesn't tell the story of my life." The little that is known about Kaufmann comes from casual comments he made about himself in books, interviews, and book reviews.

To say that Kaufmann was not an original philosopher is not in any way to derogate his scholarship but rather to indicate the particular mode in which he practiced philosophy. He neither invented new philosophical doctrines nor advanced any groundbreaking hypotheses. His approach to philosophy consisted largely in critically interpreting the basic texts of the history of philosophy. He was enormously knowledgeable about the history of philosophy and sought to expound that through his equally expansive knowledge of literature. It is undoubtedly this somewhat interdisciplinary

approach to philosophy that explains his persistent interest in existentialism, a philosophical movement that, in the early part of the twentieth century, was often mediated through works of literature. Kaufmann wrote in a lucid and often nontechnical style so that his works are, for the most part, easily accessible to the educated layperson.

Because of his deep interest in religion, it is tempting to think of Kaufmann as primarily a religious thinker, but he was first and foremost a philosopher and considered himself as such. He not only translated and edited the works of Nietzsche (*The Portable Nietzsche*, 1954) but also edited and wrote books such as *Existentialism from Dostoevsky to Sartre* (1956), *From Shakespeare to Existentialism* (1959), and *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist* (1968). He was interested not only in major philosophical questions, such as empiricism, the nature and tasks of philosophy, evil, truth, morality, language, and experience, but also in topics such as justice, death, and guilt.

Kaufmann was also a philosopher of religion (though not in the traditional sense), a subject to which he kept returning throughout his writings. Indeed, religion features as a major topic in several of his books, such as *Critique of Religion and Philosophy* (1958), *Religions in Four Dimensions* (1976), and *The Faith of a Heretic*. In all these writings, Kaufmann's attitude to religion, and to Christianity in particular, was far from being neutral. He saw Christianity as historically problematical because of such things as the Inquisition, Christianity's support for slavery, its doctrines of hell and predestination, and the religious wars conducted in its name. Kaufmann thought that all these things were not merely accidental to Christianity but stemmed from the essence of Christian teaching itself. He rejected the idea that Christianity was superior to Judaism. However, although he was a Jew, Judaism was for him largely a cultural rather than a religious identity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Critique of Religion and Philosophy (Princeton, N.J., 1958).

From Shakespeare to Existentialism: Studies in Poetry, Religion, and Philosophy (Boston, 1959). Also published as *The Owl and the Nightingale: From Shakespeare to Existentialism* (London, 1959).

The Faith of a Heretic (Garden City, N.Y., 1961).

Cain and Other Poems (Garden City, N.Y., 1962).

Hegel: A Reinterpretation (Notre Dame, Ind., 1966).

Tragedy and Philosophy (Garden City, N.Y., 1968).

Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist (New York, 1968).

Without Guilt and Justice: From Decidophobia to Autonomy (New York, 1973).

Existentialism, Religion and Death: Thirteen Essays (New York, 1976).

Religions in Four Dimensions: Existential and Aesthetic, Historical and Comparative (New York, 1976).

The Future of the Humanities (New York, 1977).

Life at the Limits (New York, 1979).

Time is an Artist (New York, 1979).

What is Man? (New York, 1979).

Discovering the Mind, 3 vols (New York, 1980).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *The Portable Nietzsche* (New York, 1954).

Ed., *Existentialism from Dostoevsky to Sartre* (New York, 1956).

Ed., *Hegel's Political Philosophy* (New York, 1970).

Trans., *I and Thou*, by Martin Buber (New York, 1970).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Amer Phils 1950-2000, Dict

Amer Bio

Trude, Weiss-Rosmarin. "An Interview with Walter Kaufmann," *Judaism* 30 (1981): 120–28.

Woelfel, J. "Religious Empiricism as 'ism': The Critical Legacy of Walter Kaufmann," *American Journal of Theology and Philosophy* 15 (1994): 181–96.

Edward P. Antonio

KEDNEY, John Steinfort (1819–1911)

John Steinfort Kedney was born on 12 February 1819 in Bloomfield, New Jersey, son of Henry and Marcia (Algood) Kedney. He attended Union College in Schenectady, New York, where he graduated with his BA in 1838. Kedney then went to the General Theological Seminary in New York City and graduated in 1841. Kedney was ordained as a church deacon in 1841 and was ordained as a priest in 1843. From 1842 to 1845 Kedney served as a church missionary in North Carolina. He served as a church rector in Salem, New Jersey (1847–52); Saratoga Springs, New York (1852–9); Society Hill, South Carolina (1859–65); Potsdam, New York (1865–70); and Camden, South Carolina (1870–71). In October 1871 he became a professor of divinity at the Seabury Divinity School in Faribault, Minnesota. Kedney retired in 1908 and died on 8 March 1911 in Salem, New Jersey.

Although Kedney was principally a theologian, he took two serious forays into philosophy. In his first substantial book, *The Beautiful and the Sublime: An Analysis of these Emotions and a Determination of the Objectivity of Beauty* (1880), he claimed that he did not wish to furnish a new manual to the science of aesthetics, but rather investigate the fundamental questions which underlie aesthetic theory. In order to reach the postulates of the science of aesthetics, he began with a justification in what he called a constructive philosophy. He used physical science, metaphysics, and theology to form a basis of thought. He claimed in the preface to the book that he had "endeavored to approach the ultimate philosophy from the aesthetic position" (1880, p. iv). Kedney said that for those who agreed with his initial ethical and psychological assumptions, this aesthetic philosophy should follow logically. He also claimed to not want to make applications to art and art criticism except insofar as it was needed for illustration, as his was a *pure* aesthetic theory. He explained that "it has always seemed to me a faulty method in most aesthetic treatises, the mingling up prematurely the consideration of Art with the investigation into the prior questions of the Emotion of the Beautiful, and the definition of Beauty; since these are pre-supposed as the origin of the art-impulse itself. Hence, I have endeavored to keep this branch of science *pure*." (1880, p. iv) The book was divided into two main parts: the beautiful and the sublime as subjective, and beauty as objective.

Kedney's second book, *Hegel's Aesthetics: A Critical Exposition* (1892) is a close reading of G. W. F. Hegel's aesthetic theory. Kedney's account explained Hegel's essential thought without going over minute detail or over ground that could be easily found elsewhere. He claimed that one needed to understand Hegel's philosophy of the Idea in order to fully understand his later treatment of the various arts. The book was divided into three parts: (1) the fundamental philosophy of Hegel's aesthetic theory along with Kedney's commentary; (2) the logical and historical development of the art impulse of Hegel; and (3) all the various arts in detail (architecture, sculpture, painting, music, and poetry). This third section is by far the largest, and it was here that Kedney gives his most important definitions and fundamental ideas of the application of aesthetic theory.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Catawba River and Other Poems (New York, 1847).

The Beautiful and the Sublime: An Analysis of these Emotions and a Determination of the Objectivity of Beauty (New York, 1880).

Christian Doctrine Harmonized and Its Rationality Vindicated (New York, 1889).

Hegel's Aesthetics: A Critical Exposition (Chicago, 1892).

Problems in Ethics, or, Grounds for a Code of Rules for Moral Conduct (New York, 1900).

Further Reading
Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v10*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Sarah Elizabeth Worth

KELLOGG, Laura Miriam Cornelius
(1880–c.1949)

Laura Miriam Cornelius (Minnie Kellogg) was born on 10 September 1880 on the Oneida Indian reservation near Green Bay, Wisconsin. She married Orrin Joseph Kellogg, a non-Indian lawyer from Minneapolis, in 1912. The location and exact date of her death is not known. Kellogg is credited with being, among her generation, the best active Native language speaker and best orator of the Iroquois. Her ability to speak in proper syntax in the Oneida, Mohawk, and English languages bestowed on her a political advantage and power. She was most influential in re-establishing the League of Iroquois Confederacy (Six Nations) by reconstructing the traditional political offices at the Onondaga Reservation in upstate New York, the historic capital of the League. She received Oneida titles of recognition associated with matrilineal lineages; she installed nine sachems of the Confederacy, which continue today.

Avoiding the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Indian boarding schools at Carlisle and Hampton, which used a military style of discipline, Kellogg graduated with honors from Grafton Hall, a private women's boarding school of the Episcopal Diocese. This school, only sixty miles from her home, was predominantly non-Indian. An ardent opponent of BIA schools, she believed in traditional American-Indian educational methods, which focus on learning by observing and doing. This method of teaching and learning might be part of the reason Kellogg never quite "fit in" with the established institutional education systems in the US. After graduating from Grafton Hall, for twelve years she drifted from one college to another – Stanford University, Barnard College, the New York School of Philanthropy (later the Columbia University School of Social Work), Cornell University, and the University of Wisconsin – but never earned a degree. She also travelled to Europe during these years.

One of the original three theorists of the Society of American Indians (along with Arthur C. Parker and Dennison Wheelock), Kellogg helped to found this organization in 1911, serving on its executive committee. In the fall of that year, the group held its first conference at which it addressed issues of tribal status, reservation life, and the education of Indian youth. Education was a special concern for Kellogg, and she served as Vice President of SAI's committee on education. Largely because of her call for "self help" for the "Indian race" as a member of the Society, the White press compared her to Booker T. WASHINGTON.

Turning against the property accumulation and inheritance economics of white society that produced child labor and sickness, sweatshops, dirty and unsafe working conditions, Kellogg advocated a communal development project for each indigenous tribal village, taking account of the diversity of resources. Equity, self-sufficiency, and special consideration of individual tribal resources and needs are the marks of her theoretical work. In her book, *Our Democracy and the American Indian* (1920), Kellogg criticizes Indian Services for destroying natural American-Indian leadership,

thus fostering dependence and pauperization. She recommends that Indian Affairs be placed in a trust, and governed in a balanced way by individuals of national and international standing, to serve as experts and consultants in administering, protecting, and developing American-Indian wealth.

Kellogg was both a theorist and an activist. In 1925 she took on a very large legal project, seeking to have some six to fifteen million acres of New York land returned to the Iroquois. Based on a 1922 report to the Everett Commission finding that the Iroquois were legally entitled to six million acres of New York State, she hired an attorney to file a claim to have these lands returned (*James Deere v. St. Lawrence River Power*). Kellogg's legal claim was that there were indigenous rights inherent in the Treaty of Fort Stanwix of 1784 between the Iroquois Nation and the state of New York, which assured the Iroquois people of their land. To support this legal action, she collected, among other contributions, many hard-earned dollars of her people, for which she later could not account, creating a swarm of controversy. In this action she fostered great hope in American-Indian communities that never came to fruition, because the case was lost. In the court's summary judgment, her arguments were rejected for "lack of jurisdiction." Appeals were fruitless. As a well-respected leader in the American-Indian community, had Kellogg won this most significant land claims case ever to be filed, "Indian Country" would look very different today, as would tribal economics, and sovereign nations.

After experiencing this legal loss – another example of the many governmental actions of legal genocide against her people, Kellogg suffered from severe depression, and scaled back her activity for a time. In the context of American-Indian culture and history, however, she remains a leader among Nations, and can be honored for having the foresight to keep active the legal status of American-Indian treaty rights, laying a foundation for later legal struggles.

Kellogg's "Lolomi' plan – a Hopi term meaning "perfect goodness be upon you" – was her other major theoretical construction. This plan was to develop American-Indian communities and restore pride, self-esteem, and self-sufficiency. A blueprint for restoring traditional values, the clan system, tribal sovereignty, and sustainable community development, the plan held that each individual community would need to assess its resources and needs in relation to the environment and the growth of the community. She theorized that finding an American-Indian place in history meant looking at how to live and share an indigenous philosophy of life, through traditional knowledge-keeping via a pedagogy of learning by doing. Finding an historical place meant developing pride of heritage in youth, and sharing that heritage through communal activities. In the Lolomi plan, Kellogg held out three fundamental strengths she hoped to re-energize, that were shared by all American–Indian nations: a unique power of abstraction; seasoned oratorial skills, and a special sense of humor. These characteristics were to be incorporated into American-Indian education and lifestyles, honoring the traditional wisdom of ancient tribal leaders.

As a leader in the American-Indian community, Kellogg was known sometimes to hold uncompromising positions with a stamina of argument. Yet her traditional values and knowledge helped transform legal actors and activities of American Indians into the twenty-first century. Her inability to stay at any one university for any length of time is perhaps indicative, not so much of her uncompromising nature, but rather, of her vision that could not be tamed by educational institutions, of her visionary concerns to raise American Indians out of their imposed genocidal restraints in the educational process, and of her economic theories of non-accumulative sharing and communal living. Her American-Indian philosophy, her ideas about the meaning, values, and ways of living life, continue to influence not only American Indians, but global indigenous

thought, as American Indians have entered an international dialogue.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Our Democracy and the American Indian: A Comprehensive Presentation of the Indian Situation as It Is Today (Kansas City, 1920)
Indian Reveries: Gehdos of the Lost Empire (Kansas City, 1921).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*
Clark, David Anthony Tyeeme. *Representing Indians: Fugitives and the Society of American Indians in the Making of a Common Culture*. PhD dissertation, University of Kansas (Lawrence, Kan., 2004).
Hauptman, Laurence M. "Designing Woman: Minnie Kellogg, Iroquois Leader," in *Indian Lives: Essays on Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Native American Leaders*, ed. L. George Moses and Raymond Wilson (Albuquerque, N.M., 1985).
McLester, Thelma Cornelius. "Oneida Women Leaders," in *The Oneida Indian Experience: Two Perspectives*, ed. Jack Campisi and Laurence M. Hauptman (Syracuse, N.Y., 1988).

Anne Waters

KELSEN, Hans (1881–1973)

Hans Kelsen was born on 11 October 1881 in Prague, Austro-Hungary (now in the Czech Republic). Three years later the family moved to Vienna, where Kelsen attended a Protestant primary school and Vienna's highly respected *Akademisches Gymnasium*. In 1906 Kelsen received a doctorate in law at the University of Vienna, and five years later he completed the *Habilitation*, which includes a major dissertation and leads to the *venia legendi* or state license to hold university lectures. Kelsen published the dissertation as *Main Problems in the Theory of Public Law* (1911). Notwithstanding its title, the treatise is decidedly juridico-philosophical, and its profound challenge to naturalism in legal science soon distinguished Kelsen.

After military service in World War I, Kelsen was appointed by Karl Renner, the Chancellor of the provisional government in the postwar Austrian state, to draft a new constitution. Kelsen completed a number of drafts, responding to the concerns of the various political parties that had a voice in the matter. The effort culminated in the Austrian Federal Constitution of October 1920, which, with many amendments, remains in effect today. Kelsen's most distinctive contribution to constitution-making is reflected in the provisions for centralized constitutional review, an entirely new institutional practice that would be adopted by several European states after World War II.

From 1921 to 1930 Kelsen served as Constitutional Court judge, and he held at the same time a professorship in the Faculty of Law at the University of Vienna. During this period he published a number of major works in legal theory, all containing a significant juridico-philosophical component: *The Problem of Sovereignty and the Theory of International Law* (1920), *The Sociological and Legal Concept of the State* (1922), *General Theory of Constitutional Law* (1925), and – much shorter but of great importance philosophically – *The Philosophical Fundamentals of Natural Law Theory and Legal Positivism* (1928). Politicians in Austria's right-of-center Christian-Social Party, unhappy with Kelsen's decisions as Constitutional Court judge, succeeded by means of a "constitutional reform" in ousting him from the Court, and he was removed from office early in 1930.

Kelsen left Vienna in the same year, accepting an offer of a professorship from the University of Cologne. The professorship was

short-lived. Enacted on 7 April 1933, the notorious Nazi statute on the "Restoration of the Professional Civil Service" authorized the dismissal of civil servants who were regarded by the Nazis as politically unreliable or were of Jewish ancestry, and Kelsen qualified on both counts. He spent the period from 1933 to 1940 in Geneva, where he held a professorship at the Institut Universitaire de Hautes Études Internationales. During this period, he published *Pure Theory of Law* (1934), and he completed the treatise, *Causality and Retribution* (which, but for World War II, would have appeared in Holland in 1941).

In May 1940 Kelsen and his wife Margarete, fearing that Switzerland would be unable to maintain its neutrality, left Geneva for the United States. After a difficult beginning – supported as a research fellow at Harvard Law School by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation – Kelsen was appointed as visiting lecturer (1942) and then as professor (1945) in the department of political science at the University of California at Berkeley. Even after retiring in 1952, Kelsen remained active at Berkeley. Kelsen died on 19 April 1973 in Berkeley.

During his years in America, *General Theory of Law and State* (1945), *Principles of International Law* (1952), a collection of essays entitled *What is Justice?* (1957), and a second, greatly expanded edition of *Pure Theory of Law* (1960) appeared. A treatise on the logic of legal norms, *General Theory of Norms*, and another on Plato, *The Illusion of Justice*, were published posthumously.

Kelsen's work in legal philosophy was already well known and widely discussed on the European Continent in the 1920s, prompting world-wide interest in his ideas. Roscoe POUND, prominent American legal philosopher and a keen student of continental legal philosophy, wrote in 1934 that Kelsen was "unquestionably the leading jurist of the time." A quarter of a century later, the distinguished Oxford legal philosopher H. L. A. Hart described Kelsen as "the most stimulating writer on analytical jurisprudence of our day." And another quarter of a century later, the Oxford legal philosopher Joseph Raz, rivaling his teacher Hart in distinction, referred to Kelsen's "range of interests and creative impulses" as "prodigious."

Kelsen's legal philosophy has proved difficult to assess. The difficulty in interpreting his work stems largely from the fact that although he is recognized by everyone as a legal positivist, his legal positivism differs in fundamental respects from traditional, fact-based legal positivism. Kelsen agrees with the traditional legal positivist in insisting on a sharp separation between law and morality, but he parts company by also insisting on a hard-and-fast distinction between law and fact, a reflection, in Kelsen's work, of the fact-value distinction made by the Baden neo-Kantians. Kelsen's "purity postulate" stands for the conceptual distinctions he makes on both fronts. The law is autonomous – and legal theory is pure – owing to the distinction between law and morality and to the distinction between law and fact.

Kelsen's legal philosophy, his approach to the law, is often described as "normative" or "normativistic," a quality he sees as stemming from the *sui generis* character of the legal norm or legal rule. The "normativity" of the law, as defended by Kelsen, can be interpreted in terms of either a strong or a weak normativity thesis. The strong normativity thesis calls for a normative justification of one's obligation to obey the law. As Joseph Raz puts it: "The concepts of the normativity of the law and of the obligation to obey it are analytically tied together. Kelsen … regards the law as valid, that is, normative, only if one ought to obey it." (Raz 1970, p. 60) Kelsen's legal philosophy is closer to classical natural law theory than to traditional, fact-based legal positivism, which makes no pretense of offering a normative justification of legal obligation, and Raz points to the similarity (Raz 1970, p. 67). Is there in Kelsen's own texts a counterpart to Raz's characterization? One route taken by Kelsen comes

close – the doctrine of bindingness (*Verbindlichkeit*). Kelsen himself writes: "By 'validity', the binding force of the law – the idea that it ought to be obeyed by the people whose behavior it regulates – is understood." (1957, p. 257) The legal subject is bound by the law, and the claim gives rise to the classical question in legal philosophy: How is the claim of bindingness to be justified? Kelsen's task is to adduce an argument on behalf of the strong normativity thesis without appealing either to morality or to fact, both appeals being ruled out by the purity postulate. What remains is a transcendental argument that draws on neo-Kantian premises.

However, from a perspective outside the legal system, no transcendental argument addressed to the doctrine of bindingness is compelling. Kelsen himself relativized his normative category (a distant, neo-Kantian cousin of Kant's categories in the *Critique of Pure Reason*) in pointing out that for anyone standing outside the legal system, say, the anarchist, who "refuses to see anything but naked power where jurists speak of the law" (1934, p. 34), no transcendental argument promises a demonstrative case on behalf of the contrary position.

From a perspective inside the legal system, however, Kelsen believes that the transcendental argument is indeed compelling. Following the familiar neo-Kantian practice of proceeding from the *Faktum der Wissenschaft* as something given, Kelsen takes, as his starting point, the fact of legal science. All the steps taken by legal science in its reconstruction of the law are likewise given, including bindingness, that is, the notion that the legal subject is bound by the law. Of course, that the very concept in question is "given" will be interesting only if there is an argument establishing its normative import. This is precisely what the transcendental argument is supposed to do. It runs as follows: bindingness, which is given, is *possible* only if the normative category is presupposed. Since bindingness is given, its possibility is not in dispute, and it

then follows that the normative category is, indeed, presupposed. It serves, in Robert Alexy's words, as a "transforming category" (Alexy 2002, p. 105), constituting the normative import of bindingness.

What can be said about the argument? Transcendental arguments along these lines, with application to the standing disciplines (history, sociology, or, in Kelsen's case, legal science), were defended by a number of neo-Kantian philosophers. The arguments have not fared well over time, however, and the objection to them cannot come as a surprise. By its nature, the transcendental argument will have force only if alternative approaches to the problem can be precluded. Kelsen thought he was on safe ground here. He assumed, first, that the only alternative approaches to his problem were traditional, fact-based legal positivism and natural law theory, and, second, that neither of these approaches was defensible. Kelsen did not, however, offer satisfactory arguments in support of either assumption. Beginning with the latter, his contemptuous dismissal of natural law theory has no force as an *argument* against natural law theory, which therefore remains an alternative to his own theory. What is more, even if Kelsen were able to offer sound arguments against the viability of both fact-based legal positivism and natural law theory, that would not settle the matter in his favor. For he undermines his first assumption, based on the old dictum *tertium non datur*, with the introduction of his own philosophy, the Pure Theory of Law, as a distinct species of legal philosophy alongside the two traditional philosophies. Having opened up the field in this way, he cannot now rule out the introduction of a fourth and even a fifth distinct species of legal philosophy.

Although, as noted, there is textual support for the strong normativity thesis, recent research suggests that another approach, this in the name of the weak normativity thesis, enjoys far more impressive textual support. The point of departure here is Kelsen's anti-

naturalism. He sought from the beginning to reply to the many naturalists in legal science and to work up an alternative to naturalism, with an eye to preserving the autonomy of the law, the purity of legal theory, but without any pretense of addressing, much less answering, the classical question posed by the strong normativity thesis.

A useful illustration of Kelsen's campaign against naturalism is found in his reply to Georg Jellinek, who figures more prominently in Kelsen's early work than any other. On first glance, Jellinek's "two-sides theory" of law seems to count as a normativity thesis, with, in particular, a juridico-normative "side" that appears to be irreducibly normative. Kelsen, however, argues correctly that on Jellinek's view, legal norms cannot be "anything other than 'is'-rules," with the "'ought' reflected – psychologically – in one's subjective consciousness of rule-governed action." On the basis of "this thoroughly psychologistic orientation toward the nature of legal norms" (1922, p. 119), Jellinek's legal theory is revealed for what it is, a species of radical empiricism. It is no accident that Kelsen speaks here of Jellinek's *psychologistic* orientation. The anti-naturalism of Kelsen's legal theory is a reflection of other anti-naturalistic programs developed in philosophy at the same time, not least among them the campaign against psychologism in logic and in the theory of knowledge, waged by Gottlob Frege and the early Edmund Husserl. Kelsen was aware of Husserl's role in this connection (see, e.g., 1922, p. 8).

Still, good arguments against naturalism do not, by themselves, count as an alternative to naturalism. They simply show – as Kelsen would have us believe – that naturalism is mistaken. Kelsen's alternative to naturalism is an ontology that bears a close resemblance to the Baden neo-Kantians' "two-worlds theory." Kelsen introduces his ontology in three steps: first, distinct methods or points of view (*Gesichtspunkte* or *Betrachtungsweisen*), which he drew from Wilhelm Windelband, Georg Simmel, and Wilhelm Wundt, one method directed to the natural sciences and another to the normative disciplines (legal science, ethics, logic, philology, and the like); second, a strict fact/value or is/ought distinction, familiar in Kelsen's day from the neo-Kantians and from Georg Simmel and Max Weber; and, third, the "two-worlds theory" or ontology itself. In Kelsen's ontology, both the physical and the psychical are found in the first world, while meaning-contents (*Sinngehalte*), of which legal norms are a species, occupy the second world. Here Kelsen faces the task of providing the rudiments of a conceptual scheme in order to make sense of the second world.

In Baden neo-Kantianism, philosophical *categories*, which serve to "constitute objective reality," are distinguished from *methodological forms*, found in the standing disciplines, which serve to process (*bearbeiten*) the material given in objective reality. Kelsen draws on these and related ideas, which were expressed most effectively in the work of Heinrich Rickert (see 1915, pp. 205–28), and adopts the standard neo-Kantian category of philosophical validity (*Geltung*), which constitutes the reality of the second world (see Rickert 1921, pp. 121–9). Within this second world, Kelsen distinguishes non-normative from normative meaning-contents, and within the latter class, he further distinguishes the non-juridical from the juridical, which consists of meaning-contents qua legal norms, specifically, in their reconstructed form. Their form is determined by the methodological form peculiar to legal science, namely, imputation or, as Kelsen sometimes writes, the "law of normativity" (1922, pp. 5–6). Thus, a judgment in the law, say, of liability reflects imputation qua methodological form.

This approach to Kelsen, the weak normativity thesis, provides an account of non-causal change or alteration, that is, a judgment of liability marks a change in certain legal relations, but not a causal change. And the weak normativity thesis suffices, Kelsen is arguing, if

the goal is to preserve the autonomy of law, the purity of legal theory. As his writings make clear, that was indeed his goal in his lengthy campaign against naturalism in legal science. The strong normativity thesis addresses the classical question in legal philosophy, how the legal subject's obligation to obey the law is to be justified. The weak normativity thesis addresses instead the issue of the autonomy of the law, an issue that exercised Kelsen and other academic lawyers in *fin de siècle* central Europe in the wake of the inroads into legal science made by naturalist theories of law.

Beginning in 1960, Kelsen changed his views fundamentally, abandoning the normative approach to the law in favor of an old-fashioned will theory of law. This last development is found in his posthumously published work, *General Theory of Norms* (1991).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hauptprobleme der Staatsrechtslehre (Tübingen, Germany, 1911)

Das Problem der Souveränität und die Theorie des Völkerrechts (Tübingen, Germany, 1920).

Der soziologische und der juristische Staatsbegriff (Tübingen, Germany, 1922).

Allgemeine Staatslehre (Berlin, 1925).

Die philosophischen Grundlagen der Naturrechtslehre und des Rechtspositivismus (Charlottenburg, Germany, 1928).

Reine Rechtslehre (Leipzig and Vienna, 1934). Trans. Bonnie Paulson and Stanley L. Paulson, *Introduction to the Problems of Legal Theory* (Oxford, 1992).

Kausalität und Vergeltung (The Hague, 1941). Trans., *Society and Nature: A Sociological Inquiry* (Chicago, 1943).

General Theory of Law and State, trans. Anders Wedberg (Cambridge, Mass., 1945).

Principles of International Law (New York, 1952).

What is Justice? (Berkeley, Cal., 1957).

Reine Rechtslehre (Vienna, 1960). Trans. Max Knight, *The Pure Theory of Law* (Berkeley, Cal., 1967).

Other Relevant Works

Kelsen's papers are at the Hans Kelsen Institute in Vienna, Austria.

Essays in Legal and Moral Philosophy, ed. Ota Weinberger, trans. Peter Heath (Dordrecht, 1973).

Allgemeine Theorie der Normen, ed. Kurt Ringhofer and Robert Walter (Vienna, 1979). Trans. Michael Hartney, *General Theory of Norms* (Oxford, 1991).

Die Illusion der Gerechtigkeit, ed. Kurt Ringhofer and Robert Walter (Vienna, 1985).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Alexy, Robert. *The Argument from Injustice. A Reply to Legal Positivism*, trans. Bonnie Litschewski Paulson and Stanley L. Paulson (Oxford, 2002).

Celano, Bruno. *La teoria del diritto di Hans Kelsen* (Bologna, 1999).

Dreier, Horst. *Rechtslehre, Staatssoziologie und Demokratietheorie bei Hans Kelsen*, 2nd edn (Baden-Baden, Germany, 1990).

Ebenstein, William. *The Pure Theory of Law* (Madison, Wisc., 1945).

Hauser, Raimund. *Norm, Recht und Staat. Überlegungen zu Hans Kelsens Theorie der Reinen Rechtslehre* (Vienna, 1968).

Heidemann, Carsten. *Die Norm als Tatsache. Zur Normentheorie Hans Kelsens* (Baden-Baden, Germany, 1997).

Métall, Aladár. *Hans Kelsen, Leben und Werk* (Vienna, 1968).

Paulson, Stanley L., and Bonnie L. Paulson, eds. *Normativity and Norms: Critical Perspectives on Kelsenian Themes* (Oxford, 1998).

Raz, Joseph. *The Concept of the Legal*

System (Oxford, 1970).

Rickert, Heinrich. *Der Gegenstand der Erkenntnis* (Tübingen, Germany, 1904).

———, *System der Philosophie* (Tübingen, Germany, 1921).

Tur, Richard, and William Twining, eds. *Essays on Kelsen* (Oxford, 1986).

Weinberger, Ota. *Normentheorie als Grundlage der Jurisprudenz und Ethik. Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Hans Kelsens Theorie der Normen* (Berlin, 1981).

Stanley L. Paulson

KEMENY, John George (1926–92)

John Kemeny was born on 31 May 1926 in Budapest, Hungary. His family emigrated to the United States in 1940, settling in New York City. Kemeny enrolled at Princeton University, but World War II interrupted his studies while he worked on the Manhattan Project solving equations for a year. Returning to school, he received his BA from Princeton in 1947 and his PhD in mathematics in 1949, specializing in logic and writing his dissertation on "Type-theory vs. Set-theory" under Alonzo CHURCH's direction. He also completed the requirements, except for the comprehensive examination, for an MA in philosophy, and for a year he was Albert EINSTEIN's graduate assistant.

In 1951 Kemeny was appointed assistant professor of philosophy at Princeton. In 1953 he moved to Dartmouth College, where he remained for the rest of his career as a professor of mathematics. He was chair of the mathematics department from 1955 to 1967, building up the college's graduate and undergraduate programs in mathematics. Kemeny was President of Dartmouth College from 1970 to 1982; among his accomplishments was trans-forming Dartmouth into a co-educational institution in 1972. He then returned to full-time teaching until his death.

In mathematics, Kemeny worked in game theory and probability theory, and designed the first course in "Finite Mathematics" that includes rudiments of logic, especially the class calculus, based on Venn diagrams, Boolean algebra and set theory, matrix theory, probability theory, and optimization theory; and he authored the first textbook for this course. In the early 1960s Kemeny and Thomas E. Kurtz created the computer programming language BASIC and developed time-sharing techniques to enable faculty and students to use computers in the classroom and office and make it easy for students to write their own programs. The first BASIC program was run at Dartmouth on 4 May 1964. Textbooks on programming BASIC and using it in courses in finite mathematics followed. He was strongly devoted to the simplicity and beneficence of BASIC as compared with other programming languages.

In logic, Kemeny's work was devoted to model-theoretic semantics for logical systems in the articles "Models of Logical Systems" (1948) and "A New Approach to Semantics" (1956). He combined his work in probability with his interests in philosophy and inductive logic by writing on Rudolf CARNAP's theory of probability of induction. Kemeny also considered science from the perspective of philosophy, believing that computers would be a benefit to humanity and an aid to education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Models of Logical Systems," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 13 (1948): 16–32.

"A New Approach to Semantics," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 21 (1956): 149–61.

Introduction to Finite Mathematics, with J. Laurie Snell and Gerald L. Thompson (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1957).

A Philosopher Looks at Science (Princeton, N.J., 1959).

Mathematical Models in the Social Sciences, with J. Laurie Snell (Boston, 1962).

"Carnap's Theory of Probability of Induction," in *The Philosophy of Rudolf Carnap*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (La Salle, Ill., 1963).

Random Essays on Mathematics, Education, and Computers (Princeton, N.J., 1964).

Man and Computer (New York, 1972).

Mathematical Models in the Social Sciences, with J. Laurie Snell (Cambridge, Mass., 1972).

Other Relevant Works

Finite Mathematical Structures (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1959).

Finite Mathematics with Business Applications (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1962).

BASIC Programming, with Thomas E. Kurtz (New York, 1967; 2nd edn 1971).

"What Every College President Should Know about Mathematics," *American Mathematical Monthly* 80 (1973): 889–901.

Computing for a Course in Finite Mathematics, with Thomas E. Kurtz and J. Laurie Snell (Reading, Mass., 1980).

Back to BASIC: The History, Conception, and Future of the Language, with Thomas E. Kurtz (Reading, Mass., 1985).

Structured BASIC Programming, with Thomas E. Kurtz (New York, 1987).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Who Was Who in Amer v11*

Steen, Lynn A. "Interview with John G. Kemeny," in *Mathematical People: Profiles and Interviews*, ed. Donald J. Albers and Gerald L. Alexanderson (Berlin, 1985), pp. 153–65.

Weiss, Eric A. "John George Kemeny," *Annals of the History of Computing* 15 (1993): 58–60.

Irving H. Anellis

KERNER, George Cyril (1927–2001)

George C. Kerner was born on 12 February 1927 in Jüri Palviste in Tartu, Estonia. When he was a teenager, he lost his father and older brother to World War II. He was urged by his mother to follow the retreating German army to the west, where he survived as a teenager buying and selling cigarettes and liquor in the black market. After the war, he attended some classes at the University of Cologne from 1946 to 1951. Somehow he made it to the United States. A dishwasher in Boston, he dreamed of one day going to Harvard University. On the way to realizing that dream, he earned a BA in 1950 and an MA in 1951 in philosophy at Michigan State University, where he studied under Henry LEONARD. He honorably served for two years in the US Army, and briefly studied at the University of Munich in 1956–7. He then entered Harvard University, where he received his PhD in philosophy in 1960, writing a dissertation on "Some Recent Ethical Theories and the Performatory Approach to Moral Language."

Kerner returned to Michigan State University as an assistant professor of philosophy in 1960. Only eight years later he was promoted to full professor. Unhappy with the scientific trend of American philosophy, he took an early retirement in 1987, mainly to finish his second book on ethics and to read three thinkers he greatly admired, Proust, Heidegger, and Wittgenstein, in their original languages. He was fluent in both of these languages as well as in his native Estonian. Kerner died on 20 July 2001 in Lansing, Michigan.

Kerner became a noted scholar of ethics early in his career. Besides his articles in philosophical journals, he probably will be remembered best for his two books *The Revolution in Ethical Theory* (1966) and *Three Philosophical Moralists: Mill, Kant, and Sartre* (1990). The earlier book sought to clarify the course of moral philosophy, examining the works of Charles L. STEVENSON, Stephen TOULMIN, and R. M. Hare. He used the performative theory

of J. L. Austin to show how evaluation and description are logically connected. It is an impressive book. The later work is a careful study of three important moral philosophers who he thought virtually exhausted the range of alternatives in ethics. This book focused on the question whether there are objective answers in the sphere of morality, and argued that there are none. This text also serves as an excellent and provocative introduction to moral philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Revolution in Ethical Theory (Oxford, 1966).
Three Philosophical Moralists: Mill, Kant, and Sartre (Oxford, 1990).

Other Relevant Works
"Approvals, Reasons, and Moral Argument," *Mind* 71 (1962): 474–86.
"Passions and the Cognitive Foundation of Ethics," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 33 (1970): 177–92.
"The Immorality of Utilitarianism and the Escapism of Rule-utilitarianism," *Philosophical Quarterly* 21 (1971): 36–50.
"Emotions are Judgments of Value," *Topoi* 1–2 (December 1982): 52–6.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v75
Honderich, Ted. "The Revolution in Ethical Theory," *Mind* 79 (1970): 294–303.

Ronald Suter

KEYSER, Cassius Jackson (1862–1947)

Cassius Jackson Keyser was born on 15 May 1862 in Rawson, Ohio. He received his BA in 1883 from Ohio Normal School (now Ohio Northern University), and then was a principal and superintendent of schools in Ridgeway, Ohio and Plattsburg, Missouri. He received his MA in 1896 and PhD in mathematics in 1901 from Columbia University in 1896 and 1901. Keyser was a professor of mathematics at Columbia from 1900 until his retirement in 1927. Among his better-known students was Emil Leon Post, who made important contributions to proof theory. Keyser was a member of the American Mathematical Society and a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He died on 8 May 1947 in New York City.

Keyser worked in philosophy of science, philosophy of mathematics, epistemology, logic, and foundations of mathematics. In 1907 he gave a popular lecture, published as *Mathematics* (1907), praising the "creators of modern logic," especially of logicism: "mathematics is included in, and, in a profound sense, may be said to be identical with Symbolic Logic" (1907, p. 13). Keyser had a keen interest in Charles Peirce as a philosopher and scientist and helped to promote an understanding of Peirce's work in this wider context of modern logic. In 1909 Keyser gave a lecture on "The Thesis of Modern Logistic" to the mathematics and astronomy section of the American Association for the Advancement of Science on the current state of affairs in logic. He explained how Russell's 1903 *Principles of Mathematics*, and especially its logic of relations, was a furtherance of the work of predecessors, especially Peirce, Ernst Schröder, and Giuseppe Peano. He stressed that he is referring to the "*thesis of modern logistic*," the logicism of Richard Dedekind, Gottlob Frege, and Russell, which holds that "the basis of logic is the basis of mathematics also – that, in other words, given the primitives of logic, mathematics requires none of its own but that in terms of the logical primitives all mathematical ideas and all mathematical propositions admit respectively of precise definition and of rigorous proof" (1909, p. 951).

For Keyser, Russell's "mathematical" or "symbolic" logic is in the same line of development as the "algebraic" logic of Boole, Peirce, and Schröder. Russell was not the creator of mathematical or symbolic logic; rather, he was the heir to the work of the algebraic logicians and remains an extension of the work of the Booleans.

Keyser helped introduce American and British philosophers and mathematicians to the latest work in logic of Russell. He wrote about the axiom of infinity and mathematical induction as discussed by Russell in *The Principles of Mathematics* and related works. In 1903 Keyser explained his views on the axiom of infinity, and there followed an exchange with Russell (Keyser 1904, 1905; Russell 1904). Keyser argued that the existence of an infinite class is assumed as an axiom of infinity, while Russell argued that, since Dedekind implied the existence of the actual infinite, but did not presuppose it, the axiom is not needed. Eventually, Russell came to agree with Keyser (Grattan-Guinness 2000, p. 342).

One of Keyser's goals, related to his exposition and discussion of Russell's work, was to provide philosophers with an appreciation for mathematics generally, and he wrote many surveys of noted philosophers who were also mathematicians. Keyser also related issues in mathematics and philosophy of mathematics to broader philosophical issues, such as fate and freedom.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Concerning the Axiom of Infinity and Mathematical Induction," *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 9 (1903): 424–34.

"The Axiom of Infinity: A New Supposition of Thought," *Hibbert Journal* 2 (1904): 532–53.

"The Axiom of Infinity," *Hibbert Journal* 3 (1905): 380–83.

Mathematics (New York, 1907).

"The Thesis of Modern Logistic," *Science* ns 30 (1909): 949–63.

Mathematical Philosophy. A Study of Fate and Freedom: Lectures for Educated Laymen (New York, 1922).

Thinking About Thinking (New York, 1926).

Mathematics as a Culture Clue and Other Essays (New York, 1947).

Portraits of Famous Philosophers Who Were Also Mathematicians (New York, 1947).

Other Relevant Works

"A Glance at Some of the Ideas of Charles Sanders Peirce," *Scripta Mathematica* 3 (1935): 11–37.

"Charles Sanders Peirce as a Pioneer," in *Galois Lectures*, *Scripta Mathematica Library* no. 5 (New York, 1941), pp. 87–112.

Further Reading

Proc of APA in Phil Rev v58, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Brent, Joseph L., III. *Charles Sanders Peirce: A Life*, 2nd edn (Bloomington, Ind., 1998).

Church, Alonzo. "Review of Keyser, 'Charles Sanders Peirce as a Pioneer'," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 6 (1941): 161–2.

Grattan-Guinness, Ivor O. *The Search for Mathematical Roots, 1870–1940: Logics, Set Theories and the Foundations of Mathematics from Cantor through Russell to Gödel* (Princeton, N.J., 2000).

Houser, Nathan. "Introduction," in *Writings of Charles S. Peirce: A Chronological Edition*, *vol. 4: 1879–1884*, ed. Christian Kloesel (Bloomington, Ind., 1989), pp. xix–lxx.

Russell, Bertrand. "The Axiom of Infinity," *Hibbert Journal* 3 (1904): 809–12.

Irving H. Anellis

KIES, Marietta (1853–99)

Marietta Kies was born on 31 December 1853 in Killingly, Connecticut, the second of five daughters raised by Miranda Young and William Knight Kies. She received the finest education available to a woman at that time, earning a BA degree from Mount Holyoke Seminary in 1881, and the MA and PhD degrees in philosophy from the University of Michigan in 1889 and 1891. She wrote her dissertation on "The Ethical Principle and Its Application in State Relations." As was common among academics at this time, she also studied in Europe, spending the 1892–3 academic year in Zurich and Leipzig.

Kies was professor of mental and moral philosophy at Mount Holyoke Seminary in Massachusetts (1881–2, 1885–91), and professor of philosophy at Colorado College (1882–5). She then taught philosophy at Mills College in California (1891–2), and at Butler University in Indiana (1896–9). She was one of very few women to teach philosophy at the college level in this era. Kies died of tuberculosis on 20 July 1899 in Pueblo, Colorado.

Kies was a member of the American idealist movement. She first studied with William Torrey HARRIS at the Concord Summer School of Philosophy in Massachusetts in the mid 1880s. While at the Summer School, she edited a compilation of Harris's lectures and essays on epistemology and metaphysics, titled *An Introduction to the Study of Philosophy* (1889). She then went to study at the University of Michigan on Harris's recommendation, where George Sylvester MORRIS, John DEWEY, and Henry Carter Adams were her teachers.

Kies produced two original works of political philosophy: *The Ethical Principle* (1892) and *Institutional Ethics* (1894) which contrast "justice," or egoism, with "grace," or altruism, and suggest how the two might be used to complement each other in society. The first book, *The Ethical Principle*, was her doctoral thesis. The second was essentially a rewrite of the first, but with some extremely important additions: on the school, the family, the administration of law, and the role of the Church in society.

The justice that Kies speaks of in these works is familiar enough to anyone acquainted with modern Western political thought. It is the principle of individuality in which egoism is primary. Under justice, each person is expected to assert his/her own rights and render unto others what is rightfully theirs. In the realm of justice, the individual "thinks, feels and acts, and receives the like in kind, nothing better, nothing worse" (1892, pp. 1–2). Society is simply an aggregate of individuals in the system that holds justice as primary, and social happiness is roughly equal to the sum of the happiness of all individuals within society. To Kies, this is a mistaken notion, which needs to be corrected by infusing grace into political theory.

Grace is the term Kies uses to describe the society in which altruism is the norm. Under grace, individuals set aside their own interests and desires, and work instead to do what is good for others – particularly for the poor and disadvantaged. It is important to note that Kies is not simply endorsing self-sacrifice for self-sacrifice's sake. Martyrdom is self-centered in Kies's view, because true altruism takes *others* as its object; it does not merely seek self-denial as an end in itself.

Both justice and grace have a place in economic and political decision-making in Kies's system, but grace can and should be more central. Significantly, Kies asserts that altruistic policies should be enacted by the state, because "spontaneous private charity" is not "definite and systematized" (1892, p. 87), so it cannot ensure that the weaker members of society are provided for. Therefore, altruism is to be promoted through the enactment of rational laws enforced by the state. It is worth debating whether an altruism that is imposed by the state can properly be called altruism, of course. Yet Kies believed it was perfectly acceptable for the state to require advantaged members

of society *to act as if* they are concerned about the poor. As a Christian Socialist in the progressive era, she was an early proponent of social welfare programs to fight poverty.

As a preface to her assertion that it is within the province of the state to enforce altruistic policies, Kies outlines three "attitudes that society presents to the individual" as models for behavior: (1) the principle of individualism, i.e., justice as discussed above; (2) an extreme socialism, in which individual rights "intersect at too many points" and obliterate individuality; and (3) true socialism, or helpfulness, in which individuals recognize that assisting the weak will benefit the whole. The attitude that she hoped would prevail corresponds to laws that she calls "constructive." Constructive laws ensure positive freedoms. They go beyond preventing one individual or group from harming another, but assert state power to promote the goals of members of a particular class, individually or collectively.

In Kies's understanding, protective laws dominate in a society based on justice. Protective laws provide only a thin layer of security from outside interference for each individual as an equal among equals. These include laws against trespass, theft, and assault as well as those requiring payment of taxes. Protective laws do nothing to nurture individual human potential, nor the growth of an entire class of people. Protective laws simply promote the pursuit of self-interest, and therefore are based on the principle of justice. Constructive laws, on the other hand, are more pro-active than this. Examples of such are laws establishing a progressive income tax and those that prohibit monopolies. In contrast to merely being required to pay taxes, and thus each contributing to the betterment of the whole on a minimal level, a progressive income tax recognizes economic inequities in society and places the burden of contributing to the financial well-being of the state on the wealthy. A constructive law like this requires that a certain level of altruism be enforced so that the state can elevate the living conditions of the poor.

Kies's rationale is typically Hegelian: society is an organic unity, and suffering by any of its members harms society as an entity.

Despite endorsing altruistic policies in economic and political life, Kies recognizes that there should be limits to state action. It is true that the state must intervene when a corporate body, such as the cotton or woolen industry, amasses so much power as to obliterate the autonomy of those beholden to it. Yet, if it is possible to reach a state of equity, with little or no state interference, this is preferable. Neither industrial forces nor state power should infringe upon human freedom. It would be as irrational for the state to overstep its bounds and thereby undermine individual freedom as it would for it to fail to act and allow individual freedom to be annihilated.

Kies saw a pragmatic mix of justice and grace increasingly manifesting itself in the public realm in her time and forecast that this would progressively be the case in the future. Given a chance to purchase a large tract of farmland, for example, the standard altruistic approach might in fact not be the best route to take. The "practical man" would realize that a "bonanza farm" benefits only the capitalist and exploits the workers who harvest the goods it produces. At the same time, a large farm is more efficient than several small farms and will produce a greater yield, thus creating more capital, both for the farm's owner and for the workers employed there. The "practical man," then, proceeds by mixing egoistic and altruistic approaches. He runs a large-scale farm, but hires workers at reasonable wages and carries on business dealings in an ethical manner.

Kies was not a strong proponent of women's rights, but she did touch on women's issues in these works. She updated Hegel's view of the family by asserting a sense of women's individuality within the household – a place in which unity, not individuality, is primary in Hegel's view. Given women's ability to be more involved in the public realm in Kies's era, there was no need for them to remain internal, subjective creatures who were completely fulfilled by their role

as wife and mother, as Hegel had envisioned. Interestingly, however, Kies did not see the need for women to be fully involved in political life. Women deserved voting rights, but only in areas that concerned them in her view, such as laws regarding education, public health, and labor regulations.

Kies was associated with not only the idealists Harris and Morris and the pragmatist Dewey, but also the personal idealist George Holmes HOWISON and the transcendentalist Ednah Dow CHENEY. She was close to a number of academic women as well, women whose names are unfamiliar today but whose influence and support made Kies's success in the academy possible: fellow philosophy graduate students at the University of Michigan, Eliza SUNDERLAND (PhD 1892), Caroline Miles Hill (PhD 1892), and Alice Graves (no degree); and fellow teachers Mary F. Hatch (Colorado College, Mills College), Ida G. Galloway (Mount Holyoke, Mills College), Georgiana Hodgkins (Mount Holyoke, Mills College), Flora Bridges (Mount Holyoke, Butler University), and Grace Julian Giddings Clarke (Butler University).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Ethical Principle and Its Application in State Relations (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1892).
Institutional Ethics (Boston, 1894).

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *An Introduction to the Study of Philosophy*, by William Torrey Harris (New York, 1889).

Further Reading
Amer Phils Before 1950
Mathews, Sherberne S., ed. *In Memoriam: Marietta Kies, A.M., Ph.D.: December 31, 1853–July 20, 1899* (Boston, 1900).
Rogers, Dorothy G., ed. *Women in the St. Louis Idealist Movement, 1860–1925*, 3 vols (Bristol, UK, 2003).
Rogers, Dorothy G. "Before 'Care':

Marietta Kies, Lucia Ames Mead, and Feminist Political Theory," *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy* 19 (2004): 105–17.

Dorothy Rogers

KILPATRICK, William Heard (1871–1965)

William Heard Kilpatrick was born on 20 November 1871 in White Plains, Georgia. He enrolled at Mercer University in 1888 and graduated with his BA degree in 1871. At Mercer's library, Kilpatrick came upon a copy of Darwin's *Origin of the Species*, which captured his interest and stimulated a lifelong interest in science. After graduation from Mercer, Kilpatrick enrolled in the graduate program at Johns Hopkins University. His graduate education was interrupted at the end of his first year, when he accepted a position as a teacher of algebra and geometry. In 1896 he accepted a position as Principal of Anderson Elementary School, and the following year he returned to Mercer University, having accepted an appointment as professor of mathematics and astronomy. At the end of his first year of teaching at Mercer, he enrolled in a summer school session at the University of Chicago, where he came under the influence of John DEWEY. After teaching at Mercer until 1906, Kilpatrick enrolled in the graduate program at Columbia University Teachers College in 1907, and received his PhD in education in 1912.

Kilpatrick began teaching at Teachers College as an instructor in 1909, before completing his doctoral studies, and was promoted to professor of philosophy of education in 1918. He spent his entire teaching career at Teachers College, where he was one of the most popular and highly respected instructors. He retired from Columbia in 1938. He died on 13 February 1965 in New York City.

Science and mathematics were among Kilpatrick's earliest academic interests, and this is reflected in his early appointments to instructional positions as an algebra and geometry teacher and a professor of mathematics and astronomy. His early teaching experience and his exposure to Dewey's ideas further broadened his intellectual horizons, stimulating an enduring concern not just for what students learned, but how they learned it. He began to integrate educational practices and ideas into political contexts, following Dewey's idea that there is an intimate connection between education, experience, and a democratic way of life. Kilpatrick quickly became a national leader of the progressive education movement and remained so until his death.

Of utmost importance to Kilpatrick was that students be stimulated continually to expand and integrate their experience, to examine and develop their values through social interaction with others. Toward this end, he developed what has become known as his project method, which is guided by a dominating purpose that is of interest to the students. According to Kilpatrick, the interests of the students should be at the heart of any project approach to education. The project method has four fundamental phases: purposing, which reflects the interests of the participants and sets the goals of the project, planning how to reach the desired goal, putting the plan into execution, and judging or evaluating the outcome of the plan. The project method aims to expand autonomy in pursuit of worthwhile activities and to develop a sense of moral responsibility.

As with Dewey, Kilpatrick viewed democracy as much more than simply the government, or the electoral process; rather, democracy both depends on and engenders a way of life. His project method was intended to foster nothing less than the progressive growth of a democratic way of life. He tried to establish these principles in his own teaching, and it is no wonder that his respectful attitude and genuine feelings of positive regard for his students gained him a place among the most popular instructors at Teachers College.

A gifted scholar, his concern for the interaction between individuals, society, and politics is reflected in Kilpatrick's many published works. Combining the analytical bent of a scientific mind with the attitudes and concerns of a progressive educator and philosopher allowed him to make significant and original contributions to the disciplines of education and philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Montessori System Examined (New York, 1914).

Froebel's Kindergarten Principles Critically Examined (New York, 1916).

Sourcebook in the Philosophy of Education (New York, 1923).

Foundations of Method: Informal Talks on Teaching (New York, 1925).

Education for a Changing Civilization (New York, 1926).

Our Educational Task, as Illustrated in the Changing South (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1930).

Education and Social Crisis: A Proposed Program (New York, 1932).

The Educational Frontier (Chicago, 1933).

Syllabus in Philosophy of Education (New York, 1934).

A Reconstructed Theory of the Educative Process (New York, 1935).

Remaking the Curriculum (New York, 1936).

The Art and Practice of Teaching (New York, 1937).

Group Education for a Democracy (New York, 1940).

Selfhood and Civilization: A Study of the Self–Other Process (New York, 1941).

Modern Education and Better Human Relations (New York, 1949).

Modern Education: Its Proper Work (New York, 1949).

Philosophy of Education (New York, 1951).

The Dutch Schools of New Netherland and Colonial New York (New York, 1961).

Other Relevant Works
Kilpatrick's papers are at Columbia University Teachers College and Mercer University.
"The Project Method," *Teachers College Record* 19 (1918): 319–35.
Ed., *The Teacher and Society* (New York, 1937).
Ed. with William Van Til, *Intercultural Attitudes in the Making: Parents, Youth Leaders, and Teachers at Work* (New York, 1972).
"Guiding Principles for a More Adequate Educative Process," *Educational Forum* 50 (1986): 253–62.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*
Beineke, John A. *And There Were Giants in the Land: The Life of William Heard Kilpatrick* (New York, 1998). Contains a bibliography of Kilpatrick's writings.
Chipman, Donald D., and Carl B. McDonald. "The Historical Contributions of William Heard Kilpatrick," *Journal of Thought* 15 (1980): 71–83.
Educational Theory 16 (January 1966). Special issue devoted to Kilpatrick.
Stevens, Robert L., and Michael G. Allen. "Teaching Public Values: Three Instructional Approaches," *Social Education* 60 (1996): 155–8.
Tenenbaum, Samuel. *William Heard Kilpatrick: Trail Blazer in Education* (New York, 1951).
Van Ausdal, Sarah J. "William Heard Kilpatrick: Philosopher and Teacher," *Childhood Education* 64 (1988): 164–8.
Van Til, William. "William Heard Kilpatrick: A Memoir," *Teaching Education* 2 (1988): 36–9.
Walks, Leonard J. "The Project Method in Postindustrial Education," *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 29 (1997): 391–406.

Michael R. Taylor

KIM, Jaegwon (1934–)

Jaegwon Kim was born on 12 September 1934 in Taegu, Korea. He attended Seoul National University from 1953 to 1955 before earning his BA at Dartmouth College in 1958 and his PhD in philosophy at Princeton University in 1962. He taught philosophy at Swarthmore, Brown, Michigan, Cornell, and Johns Hopkins before returning to the University of Michigan as professor of philosophy from 1971 until 1987. There he became the Roy Wood Sellars Professor of Philosophy in 1986. In 1987 Kim moved to Brown, where he became the William Herbert Perry Faunce Professor of Philosophy, which is his current position. He became a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1991. Kim edited *The Philosophical Review* for many years and has been the co-editor of *Noûs* since 1999. He has served on the editorial boards of several other major journals, including *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* and *Synthese*. He has held several positions in the American Philosophical Association, including President of the Central Division in 1988–9, and membership of the National Board of Officers.

Kim has made major contributions to both contemporary metaphysics and philosophy of mind. His understanding of events as property exemplifications represents one of two approaches now standard in metaphysics. His work on the concept of "supervenience" is widely used to understand a variety of philosophical issues. Kim has been most influential in the philosophy of mind, where his work has helped to shape the contours of debate for over two decades. Here he has been a consistent

critic of non-reductive physicalism, which was the orthodox view in the philosophy of mind before Kim's sustained attacks. In place of non-reductive physicalism, Kim has advocated a modified reductionist program to understand mind within a physicalist framework.

Kim understands events as substances (or individuals) exemplifying properties at a time. His account has two major principles. The *Existence condition* states the conditions under which an event exists (or occurs): event [*x*, *P*, *t*] exists just in case substance *x* has property *P* at time *t*. The second principle, the *Identity condition*, states the conditions under which two events are identical: [*x*, P, *t*] = [*y*, *Q*, *t*'] just in case *x* = *y*, *P* = *Q*, and *t* = *t*'. Here the account is stated in terms of one-place properties, but it can be generalized in fairly obvious ways to cover many-place relations. On Kim's account, events are structured complexes, individuated by their constitutive substances, properties and times. Moreover, the account downplays the distinctions between events, states, conditions and processes. All of these can be understood as structured complexes of substances exemplifying properties (or standing in relations) at a time or over a duration of time.

The leading alternative account, due to Donald DAVIDSON, understands events as concrete particulars capable of multiple descriptions. On this view, my moving down the street and my driving down the street are the same event described in two ways. By contrast, Kim's property-exemplification account finds two events in this example, constituted by two different properties. This result has been raised as a criticism of the property-exemplification view, the objection being that the view multiplies events implausibly. Kim deflects this criticism by distinguishing between properties and predicates. Hence the same event might be described with different predicates, so long as the different predicates pick out the same property. For example, the view allows that "His shirt is blue today" describes the same event as "His shirt is the color of the sky today." A second point is that different events may not be distinct (or

independent) events, since one event might include another. Hence, the view allows that my driving down the street is not a distinct event from my moving down the street, since the latter event is included in the former.

The notion of supervenience occurs in various philosophical contexts and gets various interpretations, but the core idea is that of a dependence relation. To say that one thing supervenes on another, or that one sort of thing supervenes on another, is to say that the former somehow depends on the latter, or that the latter somehow determines the former. For example, in ethics it is frequently claimed that the moral properties of an action supervene on its natural properties. In the philosophy of mind, it is claimed that mental events supervene on physical events. In metaphysics, it is claimed that wholes supervene on their parts. What do these claims about determination and dependency amount to? Should they all be understood the same way, or are there several relations of dependence that are philosophically important, and that need to be distinguished more carefully? Kim's work on supervenience clarifies and addresses these issues.

Kim distinguishes a variety of supervenience relations. For example, many philosophers have defended claims involving "weak supervenience": a family of properties *A* (for example, mental properties) *weakly supervenes* on a family of properties *B* (for example, physical properties) if and only if, necessarily, for any *x* and *y*, if *x* and *y* share all their *A*-properties then *x* and *y* share all their *B*-properties. The import of weak supervenience is that there exists a correlation between one kind of property and another. Specifically, two things that share their *B*-properties must also share their *A*-properties.

Alternatively, it is possible to define stronger relations. *A strongly supervenes* on *B* if and only if, necessarily, for any property *F* in *A*, if an object *x* has *F*, then there exists a property *G* in *B* such that *x* has *G*, and *necessarily* if any *y* has *G*, then *y* has *F*. This "strong supervenience" carries a modal force that is stronger

than weak supervenience. This is implied by the second occurrence of "necessarily" in the definition of strong supervenience. Various relations of strong supervenience can be defined by varying the interpretation of "necessarily." For example, there can be natural necessity, metaphysical necessity, logical necessity, or analytic necessity.

Which of these various characterizations of supervenience is correct? In some places, Kim takes the attitude that a thousand flowers should bloom: any number of supervenience relations are philosophically interesting, and their usefulness depends on context. In other places, Kim argues that weak supervenience is not strong enough to play the role that philosophers require. For example, philosophers defending naturalism in ethics often couch their positions in terms of weak supervenience. The idea is that natural properties are somehow metaphysically prior to moral properties, so that a thing's moral properties depend on its natural properties. But weak supervenience, Kim argues, is too weak to capture this idea. Lacking modal force, it is too weak to capture any dependence relation at all.

Kim's work in the philosophy of mind has been guided by one principal question: How can there be mind in a physical world? More exactly, how is it possible for minds and mental phenomena to exist in a world that is fundamentally physical? Kim tries to answer these questions within the framework of two assumptions. First, the world is fundamentally physical. Hence Kim's project is to give an account of mind within a physicalist framework. Second, the mental is causally efficacious. People have beliefs and desires. They deliberate and make choices, and their actions are at least sometimes the results of these deliberations and choices. Let us call this "realism" about the mental, or "mental realism." Kim argues that mental realism is an essential condition of agency, and therefore an essential part of our deepest self-conception. Hence Kim's project is to give an account of mind that preserves mental causation in a sufficiently robust

way. In sum, the project is to give an account of mind that both preserves mental realism, and stays within a physicalist framework.

The orthodox position in late twentieth-century philosophy of mind was non-reductive physicalism. As the label implies, the position combines physicalism about the mental with non-reductivism about the mental. The latter thesis implies that mental properties are not identical to physical properties. Alternatively stated, the laws governing mental phenomena, and the theories that express those laws, cannot be reduced to the laws governing physical phenomena, or to the theories that express physical laws. Hence non-reductive physicalism holds that the physical is fundamental but that the mental is (somehow) autonomous. Kim has mounted a sustained attack on this general position and its various versions. The essence of his argument is that non-reductive physicalism cannot preserve mental realism, or the causal efficacy of the mental.

One version of non-reductive physicalism is "emergentism." This is perhaps the earliest version of the position, and was popular as far back as the 1920s. According to this view, everything that exists is physical and has physical properties. However, given certain kinds of complexity among physical things and their physical properties, mental properties emerge. Highly complex physical organisms, such as human beings, have robust minds with robust causal powers. But all of this depends on their having bodies, whence minds emerge. Emergentism can seem to be an attractive position, seemingly preserving both physicalism and mental causation. However, Kim argues, the position does not withstand closer scrutiny. Consider some mental property (for example, having a belief that it is raining) that emerges out of brain activity or the like, and consider the causal efficacy of this property in relation to some action (for example, reaching for the umbrella). Kim argues that emergentism is faced with a dilemma. Either the mental property has independent causal powers, and it is in virtue of these that one reaches for the

umbrella, or the mental property has no new causal powers, but rather "piggy-backs" on the causal powers of its underlying brain activity. If we take the latter view, emergentism amounts to a kind of epiphenomenalism. That is, the position denies that the mental has any real causal efficacy, and talk about autonomous or irreducible mental phenomena becomes hollow. But if we take the former view, emergentism violates a basic commitment of physicalism: that the physical domain is "causally closed." The principle of causal closure amounts to this: any physical event that has a cause has a physical cause. Put another way, no physical event requires a non-physical cause, and therefore a non-physical explanation. This is a basic and essential commitment of physicalism, Kim argues. But it is violated if my reaching for the umbrella (a physical event) requires an *independent* mental cause (my belief that it is raining). Emergentism cannot preserve mental realism and physicalism at the same time.

This dilemma for emergentism suggests that physicalism requires a closer relation between the mental and the physical. Supervenience might provide for a closer relation: the world consists of physical things having physical properties, but mental properties supervene on physical properties. Non-reductive physicalism adds an irreducibility thesis: although mental properties supervene on physical properties, they are not reducible to physical properties. Kim argues that supervenience without reduction will not do the job. The problem is essentially the same as we saw for emergentism: we must consider the supervening mental properties, and we ask whether they have independent causal powers. If the answer to the question is yes, then the causal closure of the physical is violated. If the answer is no, then mental realism is violated and the position reduces to epiphenomenalism. This line of reasoning suggests that physicalism must embrace reductionism: physicalism can save the causal efficacy of the mental only by reducing the mental to the physical. On this view, mental properties have

causal efficacy because physical properties have causal efficacy, and mental properties are reducible to physical properties. In the 1980s Kim defended this line of reasoning, and defended a version of reductive physicalism couched in terms of strong supervenience: The mental can be reduced to the physical in the sense that the mental properties strongly supervene on physical properties, where strong supervenience is understood as above. In later work, however, Kim has argued that not even strong supervenience is strong enough to preserve both mental realism and physicalism. Nothing short of property identity is sufficient.

Kim's arguments against non-reductive physicalism, and in favor of a property identity theory (sometimes called type-type identity), have crystallized as follows. A kind of master argument invokes three principles. (1) *The Principle of Causal Closure:* All physical events that have a cause, have a physical cause. (2) *Mental Realism:* Mental properties are causally efficacious. In particular, mental events cause physical effects. (3) *The Principle of Causal Exclusion:* No effect has more than one independent, sufficient cause. The first two principles have been described. The third states that genuine causal over-determination is impossible. From these three principles, it follows that mental properties are identical (and therefore can be reduced) to physical properties, by this argument.

1. All physical events that have a cause, have a physical cause. (*Causal Closure*)
2. No effect has more than one independent, sufficient cause. (*Causal Exclusion*)
3. All physical events that have a cause have only physical causes. (from 1, 2)
4. Mental properties cause physical effects. (*Mental Realism*)
5. Mental properties are physical properties. (from 3, 4)

Kim has therefore tentatively defended a qualified property identity view, which he has labeled "multiple-type identity theory."

Consider that any mental property is "realizable" in various physical organisms. For example, it is plausible that any number of animals, possible or actual, can have beliefs, desires, visual images, and pains. This rules out the possibility that mental types can be reduced to physical types in a one-to-one relationship. Nevertheless, Kim argues, we might still be able to identify mental types with physical types in a "local" fashion. For example, we might identify human beliefs with physical property P, dog beliefs with physical property P^*, Martian beliefs with physical property P^{**}, etc. This sort of local reduction is not clearly possible, Kim points out. Nevertheless, he argues, reductions of this sort are standard in science, and we should not expect more regarding mind–body reductions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Supervenience and Mind: Selected Philosophical Essays (Cambridge, UK, 1993).

Philosophy of Mind (Boulder, Col., 1996).

Mind in a Physical World: An Essay on the Mind–Body Problem and Mental Causation (Cambridge, Mass., 1998).

Physicalism, or Something Near Enough (Princeton, N.J., 2005).

Other Relevant Works

"On the Psycho-Physical Identity Theory," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 3 (1966): 225–35.

"The Logic of the Identity Theory," with Richard B. Brandt, *Journal of Philosophy* 64 (1967): 515–37.

"Reduction, Correspondence, and Identity," *The Monist* 52 (1968): 424–38.

"Materialism and the Criteria of the Mental," *Synthese* 22 (1971): 323–45.

"Causation, Nomic Subsumption, and the Concept of Event," *Journal of Philosophy* 70 (1973): 217–36.

"Perception and Reference Without Causality," *Journal of Philosophy* 74 (1977): 606–20.

Ed. with Alvin Goldman, *Values and Morals* (Dordrecht, 1978).

"Causality, Identity, and Supervenience in the Mind–Body Problem," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 4 (1979): 31–49.

"The Role of Perception in A Priori Knowledge," *Philosophical Studies* 40 (1981): 339–54.

"Psychophysical Laws," in *Actions and Events: Perspectives on the Philosophy of Donald Davidson*, ed. Ernest Lepore and Brian McLaughlin (Oxford, 1985), pp. 369–86.

"What is 'Naturalized Epistemology'?" *Philosophical Perspectives* 2 (1988): 381–405.

"The Myth of Nonreductive Materialism," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 63 (November 1989): 31–47.

Ed. with Ansgar Beckermann and Hans Flohr, *Emergence or Reduction? Prospects of Nonreductive Physicalism* (Berlin, 1992).

"Can Supervenience and 'Nonstrict Laws' Save Anomalous Monism?" in *Mental Causation*, ed. John Heil and Alfred Mele (Oxford, 1993), pp. 19–26.

Ed. with Ernest Sosa, *A Companion to Metaphysics* (Oxford, 1995).

"The Mind–Body Problem After Fifty Years," in *Current Issues in Philosophy of Mind*, ed. Anthony O'Hear (Cambridge, UK, 1998), pp. 3–21.

"Physicalism and Panexperientialism: A Response to David Ray Griffin," *Process Studies* 28 (1999): 28–34.

"Making Sense of Emergence," *Philosophical Studies* 95 (1999): 3–36.

Ed., *Supervenience* (Aldershot, UK, 2002).

"The American Origins of Philosophical Naturalism," in *Philosophy in America at the Turn of the Century, Journal of Philosophical Research* suppl. (Charlottsville, Virg., 2003), pp. 83–98.

"Davidson's Philosophy of Mind/Psychology," in *Donald Davidson*,

ed. Kirk Ludwig (Cambridge, UK, 2002), pp. 113–36.

Further Reading

Oxford Comp Phil, *Pres Addr of APA v9*

Fodor, Jerry. "Special Sciences: Still Autonomous After All These Years," *Philosophical Perspectives* 11 (1997): 149–63.

Glymour, Clark. "A Mind Is a Terrible Thing to Waste," *Philosophy of Science* 66 (1999): 455–71.

Griffin, David R. "Materialist and Panexperientialist Physicalism: A Critique of Jaegwon Kim's 'Supervenience and Mind'," *Process Studies* 28 (1999): 4–27.

Hong, Chang-Seong. *On Jaegwon Kim* (Belmont, Cal., 2004).

Horgan, Terence. "Kim on the Mind–Body Problem," *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 47 (1996): 579–607.

Plantinga, Alvin. "Evolution, Epiphenomenalism, Reductionism," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 68 (2004): 602–19.

Rosenberg, Alexander, "On Kim's Account of Events and Event-Identity," *Journal of Philosophy* 71 (1974): 327–36.

Savellos, E. E., and U. D. Yalcin, eds. *Supervenience: New Essays* (Cambridge, UK, 1995).

Shoemaker, Sydney. "Kim on Emergence," *Philosophical Studies* 108 (2002): 53–63.

"Symposium on *Mind and the Physical World*," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 55 (2002): 640–80.

Zangwill, Nick. "Supervenience, Reduction, and Infinite Disjunction," *Philosophia* 26 (1998): 151–64.

John Greco

KING, Henry Churchill (1858–1934)

Henry Churchill King was born on 18 September 1858 in Hillsdale, Michigan, and died on 27 February 1934 in Oberlin, Ohio. King graduated from Oberlin College with his BA in 1879 and then received his BD degree from Oberlin Theological Seminary in 1882. He spent two years at the Harvard Divinity School and Harvard University studying philosophy, theology, ethics, and mathematics under the instruction of Francis Greenwood PEABODY, Francis BOWEN, and George Herbert PALMER. After receiving an MA degree in 1884 from Harvard University, he returned to Oberlin as associate professor of mathematics in 1884. He became associate professor of philosophy in 1890, professor of philosophy and theology in 1891, and professor of theology at Oberlin Seminary in 1897.

King used a sabbatical leave in 1893–4 to study theology, ethics, metaphysics, and church history at the University of Berlin. He was particularly influenced by Berlin professors Adolf von Harnack (church history), Julius Kaftan (theology), and Otto Pfleiderer (theology and ethics). Through them he encountered the metaphysical philosophy of Rudolf Hermann Lotze and the Christ-centered liberal theology of Albrecht Ritschl. For thirty years, King used Lotze's massive two-volume work on metaphysics, *Microcosmus*, as a text in his philosophy classes and edited a short summary entitled *An Outline of the Microcosmus of Hermann Lotze* (1895). King was also fond of William JAMES's *The Principles of Psychology* (1890) and used it as a text in a class on psychology, which was part of the philosophy curriculum of the 1890s.

The two major philosophical and theological works for which King is noted were published shortly after the turn of the twentieth century: *Reconstruction in Theology* (1901) and *Theology and the Social Consciousness* (1902). In these two works he laid out his proposal for a new philosophical foundation for Christian theology based on the personal-

ist philosophy and teleological idealism of Lotze. He also proposed a new method for doing Christian theology based on the liberal theological agenda of Ritschl and his "school," including Harnack and Kaftan. These intellectual interests brought King into close intellectual relationship with Boston University philosopher Borden Parker BOWNE and his students, who had also adapted Lotze's personalist metaphysics to the American scene. King had similar intellectual ties to other American liberal Protestant theologians influenced by Ritschl and Harnack, such as William Adams BROWN at Union Theological Seminary and Walter RAUSCHENBUSCH at Rochester Seminary.

King was President of Oberlin College from 1902 to 1927 and also taught as professor of theology there from 1897 to 1925. After his ascension to the Oberlin presidency in 1902, he directed much of his energy toward practical matters: college affairs, classroom teaching, and educational reforms rather than continued philosophical investigations and reflection. His 1903 presidential inaugural address on "The Primacy of the Person in College Education" (in 1904) reveals his interest in applying his brand of theological personalism to educational reform. Although he continued to read widely and publish books and articles touching on philosophical and theological themes, these works largely reiterated the ideas and conclusions presented in his pre-presidential writings. During World War I, King entered national public service, spending a year on the European front during 1918 and 1919 as Chairman of the Federal Council of Churches' Commission on the War and the Religious Outlook. In late spring 1919 President Woodrow Wilson appointed King as Co-Chairman of the International Commission on Mandates in Turkey, to explore postwar settlement issues in the Middle East. The resulting King–Crane commission report on the region was a significant international document detailing the political and cultural problems of the Middle East, although the European powers at Versailles unfortunately ignored its recommendations.

King's *Reconstruction in Theology* argued that theology had to redefine its task in the modern world if it hoped to fire the imagination of future generations. Curiously enough, King did not base his proposals on the existence of a "crisis of faith." On the contrary, he regarded the modern intellectual world as spiritually open and religiously receptive. What "makes this a religious age," he argued, is that there is "so much of genuine personal thoughtfulness concerning themes essentially religious" (1901, p. 26). The spiritual problem facing his generation, he believed, was quite specific: how to integrate and unify thought and life, a theme he returned to in his final book, *Seeing Life Whole* (1923). A new opportunity was opening up for theology due to the emerging convergence of philosophical, scientific, psychological, social, and religious interests. Theology had to join the reconstruction effort or lose its place in guiding the human quest for meaning.

Theology must no longer prop up what King termed the "religion of authority" by pretending that there are final, absolute, and certain statements of religious truth. A synthetic thinker by nature, King called on theologians and religious philosophers to connect the aims of modern science, philosophy, psychology, historical criticism, and social thought with the great spiritual aims of Christianity. As a Ritschlian, King assumed that the "core" of Christ's teachings and redemptive activity would not be lost in the process, but rather deepened and made more universally applicable. In its new guise, theology would become open-ended and collaborative, responsive and adaptive, alive to the inevitable tentativeness and partiality of its formulations. Its vision would not be set on the creation of logical systems of thought for their own sake but rather the illumination of practical spiritual issues. It would do this by insisting on the interconnectedness of all values: intellectual, emotional, and spiritual. Theology and phi-

losophy, he insisted, must speak on behalf of the "whole man," a term he relished; and the personalist philosophy offered the best way to do so.

King's irenic approach was undoubtedly one of the reasons for his popularity as a "religious philosopher" in liberal Protestant circles in the first quarter of the twentieth century. King introduced new scientific and philosophical ideas to a younger generation of college and seminary students. Using Lotze's philosophical personalism and the philosophical pragmatism emerging at Harvard and Chicago, King stressed the dangers of "scientific materialism" and the need for epistemological modesty in science. According to this philosophy, mathematical-mechanistic explanations do not exhaust the way causal processes work. Ideal, or teleological, factors were more fundamental. With Lotze and Bowne, King argued that philosophy and the human sciences were demonstrating that mechanical forces are everywhere subordinate to volitional ones. Natural laws do not simply operate mechanistically but reflect spirit and purpose. The essence of anything must be defined "in terms of purpose," he was fond of saying (1901, pp. 232–3). There is a spontaneous, relational dimension to all phenomena. Ultimate reality is personal, not impersonal; and the world is the expression of personal spirit.

This metaphysical claim constituted the heart of King's personalist philosophy. The human spirit is at home in the world. Every person is a microcosmic and "micro-ethical" reflection of macro-personal intentions. Humans have evolved in order to be able to share God's personal nature and to experience themselves as free, morally responsible, self-aware, purposeful persons. This sense of personhood is what is spiritually sacred and redemptive. And personhood can only survive by maintaining complex interactions and relationships with other personal agents. This philosophy, he insisted, was the only one that could unify human experiences by bridging the older philosophical antinomies between action and reflection, emotion and reason, matter and spirit, body and mind, causation and freedom, mechanism and volition, and so forth (1901, pp. 76–7).

The central philosophical concepts enabling unification, he argued, were "person" and "purpose." The contribution that theology can make is to articulate the religious reality and significance of genuine personhood. Theology will gain enormously if it makes its keystone the "sacredness of persons." Modern philosophy "holds that spirit, person, is for us the ultimate metaphysical fact" and "the one reality which we can take as the key to the understanding of all else" (1902, p. 210). Teachings and beliefs that cannot sustain that focus must be jettisoned or, at least, retooled. Theology must affirm that God creates and sustains a world that exists to support, enrich, and preserve the uniqueness and spiritual dignity of every person, and do so in the name of Christ. Theology therefore must be less preoccupied with tradition and doctrine, though these have their place, and more centered on the nature of personal life, on the lived experience of concrete persons. Not logic nor systematic exposition but ethics and psychology are its partners, King intimated (1901, p. 175).

All of King's later books tried to lay out in one way or another various aspects of this argument. *Theology and the Social Consciousness* focused on how the new emphasis on social service and justice in America required a personalist solution. Reform aims at the creation of environmental forces that foster the sacredness of every person. The social struggle is a real battle to preserve the worth of persons in the midst of impersonal and indifferent social and cultural forces. Participation in this battle, when pursued out of a genuine enthusiasm and love for the inner personal life of other persons, helps to enlarge one's own sense of self. The losing of oneself in the task of building the "common life" will always lead to a return of a higher self, one that has

participated in the creative energies of God's life.

In *Rational Living*, King tried to show how modern psychology, by demonstrating the radical unity of mind and body, reinforces the personalist philosophy. Following William James, King explained the "reflex effect" in which emotion, will, and thought work together and are inseparable (1905, p. 187), and thus action always determines reflection. If true, then the human spirit and the environments in which it functions cannot be disconnected. Psychology confirms that purpose and will guide thought and integrate the chaotic preconscious experiences of the self. King added that such integrative processes are enriched as they align themselves with the purposes that guide the cosmic order (1902, pp. 44–5).

King's philosophical idealism was not a denial of the reality of the natural order or of our ordinary perceptions. It was rather a claim that religious ideals permeated and determined this order. He believed it heightened respect and interest in the way the world worked, especially the way personal and spiritual relationships are embedded in every aspect of life. The existence of those connections became part of his philosophical argument for the necessity of believing in God, an argument similar to Immanuel Kant's argument for God's existence based on the "practical reason." Acting consistently on the basis of reverence for the sacredness of personal life required, King thought, faith that the world would ultimately support and validate such a commitment. Though it cannot be proven speculatively to be true, he admitted, the unquenchable feeling of rightness one gets from living this way forces one to believe as a practical matter that the world is guided by a divine will and purpose. As we act, we discover "that the universe is on the side of the will in its struggle" (1902, p. 45). But one must act in order to know this. In the moral act of living and revering persons, one confirms to oneself the existence of a world of larger spiritual purposes beyond oneself. God must exist, else our moral, social, and personal lives deceive us.

King did not ignore the problem of evil, which seems to undermine such claims; and he tried to reply to it, especially in *The Unreality of the Spiritual Life*. He suggested a kind of heroic, or Promethean, answer to the question of the sense of tragedy, loss, frustration, and divine silence faced by all who strive for human progress. Unfortunately, he never fully explained how the continued existence of such personally discouraging counter-forces in the world could be reconciled with his reassurance that the world must ultimately respond to our moral efforts and sustain every positive value we create. Historically, this issue would present great problems for theological and philosophical idealists like King after World War I.

King also never thoroughly analyzed the concept of "person" that was at the heart of his philosophy. On the one hand, his vagueness had the virtue of making his writings more accessible to the general public than the technical discussions of Lotze or Bowne. It also allowed him to apply his philosophy to a wide range of practical issues. On the other hand, however, he never specified what he meant philosophically by the term "person." His usage varied. Sometimes the word referred to individuality. But it could also connote self-awareness, autonomy, moral resolve, vivacity of spirit, or a capacity for human sympathy and empathy. They all tended to blend together. The ultimate result was that King came to be viewed as an inspiring philosophical voice in religious quarters, but not one likely to produce philosophical successors.

King's philosophy helped to prepare the way for future theologies that would interpret reality as an open system, and he helped to orient theological discussions to the problem of the individual trying to live meaningfully in a mass society. The suggestion that philosophy and theology could play positive therapeutic roles and support a "positive psychology" ("the true psychological method,

therefore, is always positive," he noted, 1905, p. 189) certainly swept through American colleges, churches, and public policy; and the efforts of King surely contributed to that trend, for better or worse. King was an important popularizer and promoter of a culturally influential brand of philosophical and religious idealism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Reconstruction in Theology (New York, 1901).

Theology and the Social Consciousness; A Study of the Relations of the Social Consciousness to Theology (New York, 1902).

Personal and Ideal Elements in Education (New York, 1904).

Rational Living; Some Practical Inferences from Modern Psychology (New York, 1905).

The Seeming Unreality of the Spiritual Life (New York, 1908).

The Laws of Friendship, Human and Divine (New York, 1909).

The Ethics of Jesus (New York, 1910).

The Moral and Religious Challenge of Our Times (New York, 1911).

Religion as Life (New York, 1913).

Fundamental Questions (New York, 1917).

A New Mind for the New Age (New York, 1920).

Seeing Life Whole: A Christian Philosophy of Life (New York, 1923).

Other Relevant Works

King's papers are at Oberlin College in Ohio.

Ed., *An Outline of the Microcosmus of Hemann Lotze* (Oberlin, Ohio, 1895).

"Religion as a Personal Relation," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 57 (1900): 553–69.

"Jonathan Edwards as Philosopher and Theologian," *Hartford Seminary Record* 14 (November 1903): 23–57.

"Christianity as the Only Hopeful Basis for Oriental Civilization," *International*

Review of Missions 2 (July 1913): 417–29.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v13*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Barnard, John. *From Evangelicalism to Progressivism at Oberlin College, 1866–1917* (Columbus, Ohio, 1969).

Cauthen, Kenneth. *The Impact of American Religious Liberalism* (New York, 1962).

Dorrien, Gary. *The Making of American Liberal Theology: Idealism, Realism, and Modernity, 1900–1950* (Louisville, Kent., 2003), pp. 62–72.

Knudson, Albert C. *The Philosophy of Personalism: A Study in the Metaphysics of Religion* (New York, 1927).

Love, Donald M. *Henry Churchill King of Oberlin* (New Haven, Conn., 1956).

William M. King

KING, Martin Luther, Jr. (1929–68)

Martin Luther King, Jr., was born Michael Luther King, Jr. on 15 January 1929 in Atlanta, Georgia. His father, Martin Luther King, changed his name and his son's first name from Michael to Martin Luther in 1934, after traveling to the World Baptist Alliance in Berlin and seeing Wittenberg Church where the famous theologian Martin Luther had begun the Protestant Reformation. King began his education at the Yonge Street Elementary School in Atlanta, graduating from high school at the age of fifteen. He then attended Morehouse College in Atlanta, receiving a BA degree in sociology in 1948. King was also ordained as a Christian minister in February 1948 at the age of nineteen at his father's church, Ebenezer Baptist Church in Atlanta, Georgia. In 1948 he entered Crozer

Theological Seminary in Pennsylvania. After three years of theological study, he was elected President of a predominantly white senior class, and was awarded the BD in 1951. With a fellowship won at Crozer, he enrolled in graduate studies in 1951 at Boston University and studied systematic theology. King married Coretta Scott in 1953, and the following year he accepted the pastorate at Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, Alabama. King received his PhD in systematic theology in 1955 from Boston University.

King was the pastor of Dexter Avenue Baptist Church from September 1954 to November 1959. Always ready to confront racial injustice wherever he found it, King was by this time a member of the executive committee of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the leading civil rights organization in the United States. He was ready in December 1955 to accept the leadership of the Montgomery Improvement Association, the organization which was responsible for the successful Montgomery Bus Boycott from 1955 to 1956. He was a founder and President of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) from 1957 to 1968, and moved to Atlanta in 1960 to direct its activities as well as being co-pastor with his father at Ebenezer Baptist Church. King led important protests in Birmingham, Alabama in the spring of 1963, prompting President Kennedy to send civil rights legislation to Congress which facilitated the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. King was the leader of the historic March on Washington on 28 August 1963 and was designated Man of the Year for 1963 by *Time* magazine. In addition to his civil rights activism, he was vice president of the national Sunday School and Baptist Teaching Union Congress of the National Baptist Convention. King was also elected to membership in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1964. He was assassinated on 4 April 1968 in Memphis, Tennessee.

King's renown as a civil rights leader espousing a nonviolent philosophy started with the 1955–6 Montgomery Bus Boycott. After he was elected President of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in 1957, he had an organizational structure from which to oversee the now escalating civil rights movement. The ideals of SCLC were taken from Christianity but its operational techniques of nonviolent protest were taken from Mahatma Gandhi.

King's fame grew as the civil rights movement spread from Montgomery to Greensboro, North Carolina in February 1960, when four young college students staged nonviolent sit-ins at the local Woolworth's lunch counter. Though King spoke at the founding of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) organized in April 1960 at Shaw University in Raleigh, North Carolina to coordinate more sit-ins, conflicts soon arose between King and the more militant college students. Tensions between these two organizations quickly rose when SCLC and SNCC both tried to stage mass demonstrations in Albany, Georgia during 1961–2. Largely unsuccessful in bringing about an end to racial apartheid in this city, King's more integrationist SCLC and SNCC's militant separatism thereafter took divergent paths to fighting racism.

King went on to fight racial segregation in Birmingham, Alabama, using similar tactics such as boycotts and mass demonstrations that had been successful in Montgomery six years earlier. He was arrested during one of the demonstrations in April 1963, and from his Birmingham jail cell wrote about his concerns and criticisms about the slow pace of justice for black Americans in his famous manifesto of the civil rights movement "Letter from a Birmingham Jail" on 16 April 1963. Birmingham caught the attention of the entire world, providing what King called a "coalition of conscience." Later in 1963 he directed the peaceful march on Washington, D.C., to which he delivered his famous "I Have a Dream" speech. After 1963 King gained an international reputation as a charismatic leader

and became the confidante of Presidents John F. Kennedy, President Lyndon B. Johnson, and other world leaders.

King was arrested numerous times for his participation in civil rights activities and his life was threatened frequently. He was personally abused and his home was bombed. In the spring of 1967, in speeches at the Chicago Coliseum and at Riverside Church in New York, King associated himself with the Vietnam peace movement. This resulted in opposition. In the middle of plans for a "Poor People's March in Washington," King made the second of two trips to Memphis to rally support for the garbage collectors there who were on strike for better wages and improved working conditions.

The night before he was assassinated, King delivered his last speech, the prophetic "I've been to the Mountaintop," at Mason Temple, the national headquarters of the Church of God in Christ, in Memphis, Tennessee. In this speech, King envisioned a future where the color of someone's skin would no longer matter.

King's lectures and remarks stirred the concern and sparked the conscience of several generations. The movements and marches he led brought significant changes in the fabric of American life. His courageous and selfless devotion gave direction to thirteen years of civil rights activities. His charismatic leadership inspired men and women, young and old, and whites and blacks in the American nation and abroad.

King contributed more to the causes of American national freedom and equality than any other individual of the twentieth century. In his short life, King was instrumental in helping Americans realize and rectify those unspeakable flaws, which were tarnishing the name of America. The events which took place in and around his life were earth-shattering, for they represented an America that was hostile and quite different from the America that is seen today. During his time, black Americans were treated as second-class citizens due to racial segregation. This meant that blacks were not allowed to sit at the same counter for lunch and had to sit only in the back seat of the bus. From 1955 to 1968 King exposed the racial injustice of this "other" America using Christian tenets and nonviolent active resistance. He tried to strike a delicate balance in appealing to moderate whites while at the same delivering a message of hope to black Americans that their days of being treated as second-class citizens were ending.

King did not denounce the American system of government. He condemned those practices allowed by the system, which are not consistent with its pronounced ideals. King was very much influenced by Gandhi, among many other people. He was particularly impressed by the results of Gandhi's campaign for independence from British rule in India. To encourage his followers to persevere in nonviolence, King frequently appealed to the fact that Gandhi had used the weapons of truth, noninjury, courage, and soul-force and still had been able to challenge the might of the British Empire to win independence for his people.

Gandhi strengthened King's belief that there is a moral obligation to resist evil. Like Gandhi, King stressed that nonviolence is not passive but active resistance. King was also similar to Gandhi in that he consistently declared that his nonviolent protests were directed against the forces of evil at work in the unjust systems, not against the persons who were involved in administering the systems. King also shared Gandhi's vision of the value of unearned suffering. He recognized that the willingness to suffer could arouse the conscience of the opponent and he drew strength from Gandhi's plea to his followers. The redemptive power of unearned suffering was a recurrent theme in King's sermons and writings. He also identified with Gandhi's insistence that nonviolence should include the internal nonviolence of the spirit.

King was convinced that *agape* could serve as the life force of creative nonviolence because it does not distinguish between friend and enemy,

but attempts to regard every man as a neighbor. In his concept of *agape* King was influenced by Paul TILLICH, as well as Anders Nygen, a Swedish bishop and theologian. King was also very much indebted to George Davis and the Boston personalists, especially L. Harold DEWOLF for the main development of his concept of agape. DeWolf maintained that the scriptures, while they stress the sinfulness of man, still emphasize his higher nature. He stressed that man bear upon his person the stamp of his maker. De Wolf explained that when man aspires to goodness, he is responding to the call of God that summons him to a maturation of his humanity.

In his speeches and writings, King frequently referred to his personalist conviction that man is made in the image of God. On one occasion King received the word that his home in Montgomery had been bombed. After reassuring himself about the safety of his wife and baby, he had to confront the rage of a crowd of blacks bent on retaliation. As he spoke to them, his own willingness to forgive prompted him to dispel their rage and to renew their commitment to nonviolence. His favorite topic in the meetings in the churches during mass demonstrations was the dialogue on forgiveness between Jesus and his disciple Peter, who had denied knowing Jesus in order to escape persecution.

To King, *agape* involves the recognition of the fact that all human life is interrelated. He asserted that humanity must be seen as a single process. All men are brothers and therefore, whatever directly affects one person affects all indirectly. For example, he recognized that not only did the American enslavement of blacks adversely affect the freedom of white labor, which had to bargain from the depressed base imposed by slavery, but also discrimination affects poor whites. The existence of injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. It is, therefore, necessary for each American to be actively concerned about injustices to every other American. When a police dog is used to attack a child in a Birmingham demonstration, it attacks every American.

Unlike his contemporary and black nationalist MALCOLM X, King was an integrationist. At the Lincoln Memorial on 28 August 1963, in his famous "I have a Dream" speech to an estimated 250,000 people, King praised the white persons who had participated in the March on Washington for realizing that their destiny was linked to the destiny of other races. Since all persons are interdependent, King's sermons and activities revealed his consistent commitment to national and international interracial cooperation.

King's philosophy of nonviolent resistance is based on six basic principles, and is outlined in his book *Stride Toward Freedom* (1958). In opposition to the proponents of Black Power and SNCC, who had lost faith in the philosophy and methods of nonviolence, he argued that blacks must regard themselves as Americans and that the solutions to their problems will not come through the creation of a separate black nation within this nation. Their goal must be full participation in the life of the nation and this attainment of power and self-fulfillment will come through alliances with dedicated whites. King's conviction that love is the unifying force at the center of the universe caused him to expand his concern to include the poor throughout the world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story (New York, 1958).
The Measure of a Man (Philadelphia, 1959).
The Strength to Love (New York, 1963).
Why We Can't Wait (New York, 1963).
Where Do We Go from Here? Chaos or Community (New York, 1967).
Trumpet of Conscience (New York, 1967).

Other Relevant Works

King's papers are at the Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change in Atlanta, Georgia.
The Papers of Martin Luther King, Jr., 14 vols, ed. Clayborne Carson (Berkeley, Cal., 1992–).

The Words of Martin Luther King, Jr., ed. Coretta Scott King (New York, 1983).

A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings of Martin Luther King, Jr., ed. James Washington (New York, 1986).

The Martin Luther King, Jr., Companion: Quotations from the Speeches, Essays, and Books of Martin Luther King, Jr., ed. Coretta Scott King (New York, 1993).

The Autobiography of Martin Luther King, Jr., ed. Clayborne Carson (New York, 1998).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Religious Bio, Encyc Amer Bio, Encyc Ethics, Encyc Relig, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v54, Who Was Who in Amer v4

Albert, Peter J., and Ronald Hoffman, ed. *We Shall Overcome: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Black Freedom Struggle* (New York, 1990).

Ansbro, John J. *Martin Luther King, Jr.: The Making of A Mind* (New York, 1982).

Assensoh, A. B. *Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and America's Quest for Racial Integration* (Ilfracombe, UK, 1987).

Bennett, Lerone. *What Manner of Man: A Biography of Martin Luther King, Jr.* (Chicago, 1989).

Colaiaco, James A. *Martin Luther King, Jr.: Apostle of Militant Nonviolence* (New York, 1993).

Carson, Clayborne. *In Struggle: SNCC and the Black Awakening of the 1960's* (Cambridge, Mass, 1995).

Carson, Clayborne, David J. Garrow, Vincent Harding, and Darlene Clark Hine, eds. *The "Eyes on the Prize" Civil Rights Reader: Documents, Speeches, and Firsthand Accounts from the Black Freedom Struggle, 1954–1990* (New York, 1991).

Erskine, Noel Leo. *King Among the Theologians* (Cleveland, 1995).

Fairclough, Adam. *Martin Luther King, Jr.* (Athens, Georgia, 1995).

Hanigan, James P. *Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Foundations of Nonviolence* (Lanham, Md., 1984).

King, Coretta Scott. *My Life with Martin Luther King, Jr.* (New York, 1993).

Lewis, David L. *King: A Critical Biography* (New York, 1970).

Oates, Stephen B. *Let the Trumpet Sound: The Life of Martin Luther King, Jr.* (New York, 1994).

Sitkoff, Harvard. *The Struggle for Black Equality 1954–1992* (New York, 1993).

Krishna Mallick

KLEENE, Stephen Cole (1909–94)

Stephen Kleene was born on 5 January 1909 in Hartford, Connecticut, and died on 25 January 1994 in Madison, Wisconsin. Despite spending most of his life in the Midwest, he never lost the New England accent that he acquired in his youth. After growing up in the household of his parents, Gustav Adolph and Alice Cole Kleene, he proceeded to Amherst College for his undergraduate education and received a BA in mathematics in 1930. Following his graduation, he went to Princeton for a doctoral program in mathematics and received his PhD degree in 1934 for a thesis written under the direction of Alonzo CHURCH. Kleene was appointed instructor of mathematics at the University of Wisconsin in 1935. After his promotion to assistant professor, a rank he held from 1937 to 1941, he then spent a year at Amherst College as associate professor. At this point the war intervened and he served as a Lieutenant Commander in the US Naval Reserve on active duty from 1942 to 1946.

After the war, he returned to Wisconsin as associate professorship of mathematics, and

in 1948 he became full professor, teaching the logic courses for a number of years until the arrival of his long-time colleague J. Barkley Rosser in 1962. Kleene was chair of the mathematics department during 1957–8 and 1960–62. He also was Dean of the College of Letters and Sciences from 1969 to 1974. He returned to his mathematics position until retiring in 1979. Retirement did not slow down his participation in the community of logicians, and he made valuable contributions to understanding the history of logic in the United States during the crucial decade of the 1930s.

The person who had the greatest influence on Kleene's career was his advisor at Princeton, Alonzo Church. This influence took several forms. One worth mentioning was Kleene's involvement with the Association for Symbolic Logic, in whose creation Church had taken a crucial role. Kleene served as President of the Association for two years, but more important was his service as editor of the research portion of *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* for many years.

Kleene's graduate students included John Addison, Clifford Spector, Richard Vesley, Yiannis Moschovakis, Joan Rand Moschovakis, and Robert Constable, who made contributions through many domains of mathematical logic and computer science. The list is not as impressive as Church's, but his success in bringing colleagues to Madison was greater than Church ever accomplished at Princeton. Among those logicians who taught at Wisconsin during Kleene's years, in addition to Rosser, were K. Jon BARWISE, Michael Morley, H. Jerome Keisler, and Kenneth Kunen. This constellation of logicians made Madison a center for logic in the Midwest, and a contender with Berkeley for leadership in the field of logic education in the country. One characteristic that helped to distinguish Madison's program from Berkeley's was an *esprit de corps*. That spirit cannot be separated from Kleene's own enthusiasm both for logic and for getting together with students outside the classroom as well as within. His zeal for rock-climbing had him leading group walks around Devil's Lake State Park north of Madison (he also climbed Mount Everest), and it was hard to miss a figure of his height. His academic success led to no displays of pretension, and he was willing to talk to beginning graduate students as well as foreign visitors.

One of the contributions that Kleene made to the field of logic was the writing of his textbook *Introduction to Metamathematics*, published in 1952. By the early 1950s the American logic community needed a text that would be accessible to beginning graduate students, as it did look as though logic might be here to stay. While the work of David Hilbert and his collaborator Paul Bernays had a great influence on Kleene, his book was distinctly the product of an approach to the subject in research and teaching that had been tried out in practice. It was the text from which many logicians of the generation after Kleene learned the subject and it received recognition in the form of translation into a number of languages. Kleene also wrote an undergraduate text, *Mathematical Logic* (1967), but it did not have the same distinctive role in educating the profession as the earlier volume. Kleene's writing leaned more towards the clear and explicit than towards the epigrammatic.

One individual of whom Kleene always spoke with respect was "Professor" Church. Kleene worked on a number of problems in conjunction with Church, and it was partly Church's presence at Princeton that accounted for the richness of the logic environment during Kleene's years there. After leaving the university as a student, he came back to the Institute for Advanced Study for two academic years separated by a quarter of a century and had a visiting position at the university in the 1950s for a year. It was unclear that the atmosphere for logic was ever richer than it was during the period of Kleene's graduate career. The presence of Kurt GÖDEL ensured that Kleene took part in some of the most lasting developments in the history of the subject.

Despite his admiration for Church, however, Kleene was never intellectually submissive. When he was working on his thesis, connected with work of Church on the lambda calculus, he and Rosser succeeded in finding an inconsistency in Church's system for the foundation of mathematics. This required Church to figure out a way to separate the inconsistent piece from the lambda calculus itself, understandably requiring Kleene to rewrite his thesis.

The confluence at Princeton of Church and Gödel provided two sources of input that proved definitive to Kleene's scholarly career, as they were interested in working on issues of effective computability as a way of trying to resolve problems in the foundations of mathematics. One of the principal philosophical oppositions of the time was between the intuitionists, following the leadership of L. E. J. Brouwer, and the formalists, as the school headed by David Hilbert was frequently known. Brouwer sought to overturn the hegemony of "classical" mathematics, which he found suspicious because of its dependence on a law of logic like that of the excluded middle. He argued that the use of such a law violated mathematical practice and suggested a kind of artificial mathematical existence as opposed to the genuine creation in the mind of the mathematician. Hilbert, by contrast, sought to define the nature of mathematical existence by means of appeal to ever more detailed analysis of the methods of proof, once a certain intuitive content has been given. It was clear that the notion of proof was in dispute in this period in a fundamental way.

What Church was trying to do, and what Kleene inherited from him, was the attempt to follow up the technical consequences of formal versions of both of these approaches. Church seemed to be happy following up a variety of foundations in the hopes of finding where they would lead rather than starting with philosophical preconceptions that ruled some of these starting-points out of court. In reading what Kleene had to say about intuitionist foundations, one is struck by the absence of polemic and by the interest in simply trying to clarify what the consequences were of using such foundations as a replacement for the classical version. It has to be admitted that Kleene did not bother about trying to preserve Brouwer's original anti-axiomatic attitude but was quite comfortable with the more moderate approach of students of Brouwer like Arend Heyting and A. S. Troelstra. After all, if he were going to evaluate a philosophical position in the spirit of Church, there had to be something to formalize.

Church used the formal device of the lambda calculus as his tool for understanding the notion of effective computability. The reason for the importance of "effectiveness" was that both sides in the philosophical debate felt it important to identify what characterized a successful proof. Recognition that a proof was a proof seemed to entail some version of effectiveness, from which Church developed the lambda calculus (and, almost at the same time, Haskell CURRY developed his system of combinatory logic, which was based on the same approach to functionality but without variables).

While Church was formulating the lambda calculus, Gödel came up with his theory of recursive functions. This alternative approach to the notion of computability may have seemed more natural to practicing mathematicians, but Kleene was able to establish that the two notions of computability of Church and Gödel in fact select out the same set of functions. This led Church tentatively to formulate what became known as Church's Thesis, that different characterizations of the notion of computability were bound to coincide extensionally. While Church was finally convinced of the justifiability of his thesis by Turing's work in the same decade, Kleene went ahead and created the discipline of recursive function theory. It is rather ironic that he used the name of Gödel's creation rather than that of his teacher Church for the new field. The equivalence of the different approaches to the field may have led Kleene to pick the name that he thought most likely to survive. In any case, in the time since Kleene's

original work, the term "computability" has crept back into use by contrast with "recursiveness," which has a particular technical use.

Much of Kleene's work in recursion theory is of more obvious mathematical appeal than philosophical. Some of those results, when phrased in intuitive terms, sound so obvious as not to have been worth the effort to prove. In Kleene's hands, however, the details were being worked out in a more formal setting in which some of the interpretations could not be called upon to contribute to the proof. For example, Kleene proved that if a set and its complement are both recursively enumerable, then the set is recursive. Intuitively, a set is recursively enumerable if there is a way of telling that an element belongs to that set, although if the element does not belong to the set, then no result is forthcoming. A set is recursive if there is a way of telling whether or not an element belongs to that set. If, however, there is a way of telling that an element belongs to a set and if, in addition, there is a way of telling that an element belongs to the complement, i.e., that the element does not belong to the set, then the two ways put together ensure that there is a procedure that establishes that the set is recursive. Many of Kleene's other results in creating recursive function theory have an equally intuitive explanation, but can require substantial work to justify formally.

Many results in recursion theory are associated with Kleene's name or with their formulation in *Introduction to Metamathematics* and elsewhere. One fundamental theorem goes under the name of the "s-m-n theorem" as a result of the notation Kleene used in his book. There are some theorems that seem to have a simple statement and proof, but the underlying content is rather more difficult to penetrate (like Kleene's fixed point theorem). In the course of time, Kleene's work in recursion carried him on to recursion in higher types, a subject that has been regarded even by practicing logicians as "difficult" and "esoteric." Some of that reputation may be associated with Kleene's own papers, which did not always furnish an overview before proceeding through some intimidating details.

One of the areas which Kleene helped to create was the area of degree theory. In this case the term "degree" refers to the level of unsolvability associated with a decision problem. As logician H. B. Enderton characterized the situation, some unsolvable decision problems are more unsolvable than others. Using the notion of an oracle to represent the ability to turn an unsolvable problem into a solvable one, degree theory looks at how many oracles are required in to order to solve a certain problem. The levels of complexity associated with unsolvable problems are classified into a hierarchy defined by Kleene (in conjunction with Emil Leon POST).

Among the other areas to which Kleene contributed by his articles were the theory of finite automata and the notion of realizability as a way of interpreting the statements of intuitionistic mathematics. Philosophically, Kleene did not favor intuitionism, but he was able to introduce an interpretation that isolated what was characteristic of constructive mathematics. This turned out to be especially appealing when the theory of computer science was looking for formal models for programming. Kleene did not attempt to create a philosophical system with the emergence of recursive function theory, but he did look at structures that went well beyond what had previously received the attention of logicians. In particular, the unsolvable was not condemned to an existence devoid of mathematical interest, when degree theory allowed subdivisions within the unsolvable world. At the Kleene Symposium held at the University of Wisconsin in 1978, the logician Robin Gandy quoted Coleridge in the context of Kleene's work: "Weave a circle round him thrice/ And close your eyes in holy dread,/ For he on honeydew hath fed/ And drunk the milk of paradise." These words convey some of the sense of mystery that accompanied the first expeditions into the realm of the uncomputable, into which so many have followed him.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"General Recursive Functions of Natural Numbers," *Mathematische Annalen* 112 (1936): 727–42.

"Lambda-Definability and Recursiveness," *Duke Mathematical Journal* 2 (1936): 340–53.

"On Notation for Ordinal Numbers," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 3 (1938): 150–55.

"Recursive Predicates and Quantifiers," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 53 (1943): 51–73.

"On the Forms of Predicates in the Theory of Constructive Ordinals," *American Journal of Mathematics* 66 (1944): 41–58.

"On the Interpretation of Intuitionistic Number Theory," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 10 (1945): 109–24.

"Recursive Functions and Intuitionistic Mathematics," *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians* (Providence, R.I., 1952), pp. 679–85.

Introduction to Metamathematics (Amsterdam, 1952).

"The Upper Semi-lattice of Degrees of Recursive Unsolvability," with Emil L. Post, *Annals of Mathematics* 59 (1954): 379–407.

"Hierarchies of Number-theoretic Predicates," *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 61 (1955): 193–213.

The Foundations of Intuitionistic Mathematics, Especially in Relation to Recursive Functions, with Richard Eugene Vesley (Amsterdam, 1965).

Other Relevant Works

Kleene's papers are at the University of Wisconsin.

"Recursive Functionals and Quantifiers of Finite Type I," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 91 (1959): 1–52.

"Recursive Functionals and Quantifiers of Finite Type II," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 108 (1963): 106–42.

"The Writing of *Introduction to Metamathematics*," *Perspectives on the History of Mathematical Logic*, ed. Thomas Drucker (Boston, 1991), pp. 161–8.

Further Reading

Who Was Who in Amer v12, Who's Who in Phil

Barwise, Jon, H. Jerome Keisler, and Kenneth Kunen, eds. *The Kleene Symposium* (Amsterdam, 1980).

Beth, Evert W. *The Foundations of Mathematics* (Amsterdam, 1959).

Boolos, George S., John P. Burgess, and Richard C. Jeffrey. *Computability and Logic*, 4th edn (Cambridge, UK, 2002).

Cooper, S. Barry. *Computability Theory* (Boca Raton, Fla, 2004).

Enderton, Herbert B. "Elements of Recursion Theory," in *Handbook of Mathematical Logic*, ed. Jon Barwise (Amsterdam, 1977), pp. 527–66.

Shoenfield, J. R. "The Mathematical Work of S. C. Kleene," *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 1 (1995): 8–43.

Thomas Drucker

KLIBANSKY, Raymond (1905–)

Raymond Klibansky was born on 15 October 1905 in Paris, France. He was the son of Hermann Klibansky, a representative of a German wine company, and Rosa Scheidt Klibansky. At the start of World War I the family returned to Frankfurt. Klibansky was educated in Paris, the Odenwald School, and at the Universities of Kiel, Hamburg, and

Heidelberg. Among his professors were Karl Jaspers and Ernst Cassirer. He received his PhD in philosophy from Heidelberg in 1928. From 1927 to 1933 he was an assistant professor of philosophy at the Heidelberg Academy, and a lecturer in philosophy at Heidelberg from 1931 to 1933. In 1933 he was dismissed from his teaching position because he was a Jew. Klibansky went to England, where he became a lecturer at King's College London from 1934 to 1936, and earned his MA from the University of Oxford in 1935. From 1936 to 1948 he was a lecturer in philosophy at Oriel College, Oxford, and also was Forwood Lecturer in Philosophy of Religion at the University of Liverpool during 1938–9. During World War II he was on the translation staff of the Foreign Office in London from 1941 to 1946.

In 1946 Klibansky accepted an appointment as Frothingham Professor of Logic and Metaphysics at McGill University in Montréal, Canada. He held this position until retiring in 1975. Concurrently, he also taught history of philosophy at the University of Montréal from 1947 to 1968. He was visiting professor at many other universities around the world, including those of Paris, Rome, and Tokyo, and was an active member of many philosophical societies. In 1981 he became a fellow of Wolfson College, Oxford. In 1995 he received the Grosse Bundesverdienstkreuz from the President of the German Republic, and an honorary doctorate from the University of Bologna; he has received honors from many other universities. Klibansky was President of the International Institute of Philosophy (1966–9), Société internationale pour l'étude de la philosophie médiévale (1968–72), and Société canadienne d'histoire et de philosophie des sciences (1959–72). He became a Companion of the Order of Canada in 2000. The Canadian Federation of the Social Sciences awards the Raymond Klibansky Book Prize each year.

Klibansky stands among Canada's greatest scholars of the history of philosophy. The range of his work stretches from Greek and Latin thought, through Hellenic and medieval philosophy, to modern European philosophy. Among his many accomplishments, he made vital contributions to the study of Plato and the influence of Platonism in medieval philosophy and theology. With Richard Hunt, Klibansky edited the journal *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* for many years. He translated and edited writings of Locke and Hume, and encouraged the study of modern philosophy in relation to earlier periods. He also encouraged interest in Canadian philosophical work.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Continuity of the Platonic Tradition during the Middle Ages: Outlines of a Corpus platonicum medii aevi (London, 1939; 2nd edn, Millwood, N.Y., 1982).

Saturn and Melancholy: Studies in the History of Natural Philosophy, Religion, and Art, with Erwin Panofsky and Fritz Saxl (New York, 1964).

Le Philosophe et la mémoire du siècle: tolérance, liberté et philosophie, with Georges Leroux (Paris, 1998).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with Ernest C. Mossner, *New Letters of David Hume* (Oxford, 1954).

Ed., *Philosophy in the Middle of the Twentieth Century*, 4 vols (Florence, Italy, 1958).

Ed. with H. J. Paton, *Philosophy and History: Essays Presented to Ernst Cassirer* (New York, 1963).

Ed. with David Pears, *La Philosophie en Europe* (Paris, 1993).

Ed. with Josiane Boulad-Ayoub, *La Pensée philosophique d'expression française au Canada: le rayonnement du Québec* (Sainte-Foy, Québec, 1998).

Further Reading

Groffier, Ethel, and Michel Paradis, eds. *The Notion of Tolerance and Human Rights:*

Essays in Honour of Raymond Klibansky (Ottawa, Canada, 1991).

Kohlenberger, Helmut, ed. *Reason, Action, and Experience: Essays in Honor of Raymond Klibansky* (Hamburg, Germany, 1979).

Park, Desiree, and Michael Whalley. "Bibliography of Raymond Klibansky," *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 29 (1975): 167–74.

John R. Shook

KLINE, George Louis (1921–)

George Kline was born on 3 March 1921 in Galesburg, Illinois. He was an undergraduate at Boston University from 1938 to 1941, after which he translated intercepted Nazi spy messages for the Federal Bureau of Investigation before entering the Army Air Corps in 1942. Assigned to the 15th Air Force in the European Theatre of Operations, he flew fifty bombing missions on thirty-six sorties as a navigator aboard a B-24 Liberator. In 1944 he received the Distinguished Flying Cross.

After the war, Kline studied philosophy at Columbia University, where his mentors were John H. RANDALL, Jr., Herbert W. SCHNEIDER, and James Gutmann. He earned his BA Phi Beta Kappa in 1947, his MA in 1948, and his PhD in philosophy in 1950. His dissertation, "Spinoza in Soviet Philosophy," was soon published as a book. Except for a year as visiting assistant professor at the University of Chicago in 1952–3, Kline taught philosophy at Columbia from 1950 until 1959. In 1959 he joined the Bryn Mawr College faculty as visiting lecturer in philosophy and Russian. He became associate professor of philosophy in 1960, full professor in 1966, Milton C. Nahm Professor of Philosophy in 1981, and retired in 1991. He has held Cutting, Ford,

Fulbright, Guggenheim, National Endowment of the Humanities, and Rockefeller fellowships, and has served as President of the Hegel Society of America and the Metaphysical Society of America.

Specializing in ethics, philosophy of religion, intellectual history, the relation between religious and political thought, and Russian philosophy, literature, and culture, Kline has written significant essays on Baruch Spinoza, Giambattista Vico, G. W. F. Hegel, Karl Marx, Friedrich Nietzsche, A. N. WHITEHEAD, Jean-Paul Sartre, Georg Lukács, Leszek Kolakowski, and about twenty Russian thinkers. Fluent in half a dozen languages and competent in several others, he has made important contributions as a translator and editor. An early champion and prolific translator of Russian poet Joseph Brodsky, he was Brodsky's guest at the 1987 Nobel Prize ceremony. As a speculative metaphysician, Kline has written on the ontology of future contingents, time, nihilism, and existentialism. Themes of his works include the idea that the future does not exist to be known and, more importantly, the various misuses of the so-called "world-historical future."

Kline's strength is his keen eye for precision. Those who do not understand that terminological rigor is necessary to study philosophy properly may regard this talent as pedantic, but professional philosophers appreciate Kline's several major clarifications of the technical or systematic vocabulary of philosophy. Examples include separating the ordinary and systematic uses of "abstract" and "concrete," distinguishing Hegel's speculative from empiricist senses of "concrete," differentiating the meaning of "materialism" between Marx and Engels, and identifying seven senses of the term *materiell* in Marx. In a seminal paper in 1974, Kline showed that puns in philosophical writing are seldom only stylistic conceits, but are often essential to justify or underscore related concepts. Since puns such as Hegel's *eigener Sinn* vs. *Eigensinn*, Nietzsche's *Untergehen* vs. *Übergehen*, and the Russian

mir = world vs. *mir* = peace, cannot be effectively translated, the thought is that much poorer in the second language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Spinoza in Soviet Philosophy (London and New York, 1952; Westport, Conn., 1981).

"Some Recent Reinterpretations of Hegel's Philosophy," *Monist* 48 (1964): 34–75.

"Leszek Kolakowski and the Revision of Marxism," in *European Philosophy Today*, ed. George L. Kline (Chicago, 1965), pp. 113–63.

Religious and Anti-Religious Thought in Russia (Chicago, 1968).

"Philosophical Puns," in *Philosophy and the Civilizing Arts: Essays Presented to Herbert W. Schneider*, ed. John P. Anton and Craig Walton (Athens, Ohio, 1974), pp. 213–35.

"Concept and Concrescence: An Essay in Hegelian-Whiteheadian Ontology," in *Hegel and Whitehead: Contemporary Perspectives on Systematic Philosophy*, ed. George R. Lucas, Jr. (Albany, N.Y., 1985), pp. 133–51.

"'Present', 'Past', and 'Future' as Categoreal Terms, and the Fallacy of the Actual Future," *Review of Metaphysics* 40 (1986): 215–35.

"The Use and Abuse of Hegel by Nietzsche and Marx," in *Hegel and His Critics: Philosophy in the Aftermath of Hegel*, ed. William Desmond (Albany, N.Y., 1989), pp. 1–34.

"The Systematic Ambiguity of Some Key Whiteheadian Terms," in *Metaphysics as Foundation*, ed. Paul Bogaard and Gordon Treash (Albany, N.Y., 1993), pp. 150–63.

"W. E. Hocking on Marx, Russian Marxism, and the Soviet Union," in *A William Ernest Hocking Reader*, ed. John Lachs and D. Micah Hester (Nashville, Tenn., 2004), pp. 349–66.

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Alfred North Whitehead: Essays on His Philosophy* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1963).

"Religious Motifs in Russian Philosophy," *Studies on the Soviet Union* 9 (1969): 84–96.

"The Dialectic of Action and Passion in Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit," *Review of Metaphysics* 23 (1970): 679–89.

"On the Infinity of Spinoza's Attributes," in *Speculum Spinozanum, 1677–1977*, ed. Siegfried Hessing (London, 1977).

"Form, Concrescence, and Concretum: A Neo-Whiteheadian Analysis," in *Explorations in Whitehead's Philosophy*, ed. Lewis S. Ford and George L. Kline (New York, 1983), pp. 104–46.

"Absolute and Relative Senses of *Liberum* and *Libertas* in Spinoza," in *Spinoza nel 350 Anniversario della Nascita: Atti del Congresso Internazionale, Urbino 1982*, ed. Emilia Giancotti (Naples, 1985), pp. 259–80.

"The Myth of Marx's Materialism," in *Philosophical Sovietology: The Pursuit of a Science*, ed. Helmut Dahm, Thomas J. Blakeley, and George L. Kline (Dordrecht, 1988), pp. 158–203.

Further Reading

Berlin, Isaiah. "Kline's *Spinoza in Soviet Philosophy*," *Oxford Magazine* 71 (1952–3): 232–3.

Eric v. d. Luft

KNIGHT, Frank Hyneman (1885–1972)

Frank H. Knight was born on 7 November 1885 in White Oak Township in McLean County, Illinois, and died on 15 April 1972 in

Chicago, Illinois. Knight's parents were farmers and he frequently missed school to help on the farm. He completed only two years of high school while his younger brother M. M. Knight quit school at age thirteen (later becoming a renowned historian at the University of California at Berkeley). Knight first attended the American University in Tennessee from 1905 to 1907, and spent one summer session at the University of Chicago in 1906. When the American University closed its doors in 1908, Knight enrolled in Milligan College in Tennessee. He worked as a secretary at the Jamestown Exposition during 1907–1908, and received a BA degree from Milligan in 1911. He then attended the University of Tennessee, earning both a BS and an MA in 1913. His master's thesis was on Gerhart Hauptmann, an early German social realist.

Knight then attended Cornell University, where he obtained his PhD in economics in 1916. He revised his dissertation for publication while working as an instructor in economics at the University of Chicago from 1917 to 1919. His dissertation was published as *Risk, Uncertainty and Profit* in 1921. He moved to the University of Iowa in 1919, first as associate professor of economics from 1919 to 1922 and then full professor from 1922 to 1928. While at Iowa, Knight translated Max Weber's *General Economic History* (1927). In 1928 he joined the faculty at the University of Chicago where he was professor of economics from 1927 until his retirement in 1955, and was given the title Morton D. Hull Distinguished Service Professor.

Knight was co-editor with Jacob Viner of the *Journal of Political Economy* from 1928 to 1945. He was named President of the American Economic Association in 1950 and he was awarded its Francis Walker Medal in 1957, an award presented every five years "to the living American economist who has made the greatest contribution to economics." He was a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences as well as the Italian national honor society,

Accademia Nazionale De Lincei. Knight was selected by the US Chamber of Commerce for its Great Living American Awards in 1959. His notable students include Milton Friedman, the 1976 Nobel Prize winner in economics; George J. Stigler, the 1982 Nobel Prize winner in economics; James M. Buchanan, the 1986 Nobel Prize winner in economics; Kenneth Boulding, a Commonwealth fellow; and Paul Samuelson as an undergraduate.

Knight made his reputation with *Risk, Uncertainty, and Profit* (1921). He attempted to explain why profits would not necessarily be eliminated under perfect competition. In providing his explanation he made the key distinction between "risk" and "uncertainty." Risk was a situation, according to Knight, to which one could assign a probability and which therefore could be insured against. In contrast, uncertainty was a situation for which the probability was unknown. Even in long-run equilibrium, Knight contended, entrepreneurs would earn a profit as a return for having to face uncertainty. Knight noted that a model which eliminates risk and uncertainty would also lack profit and as such, the standard model of perfect competition cannot have profit in the economic sense.

Another contribution by Knight to economics in this period was his article, "Some Fallacies in the Interpretation of Social Costs" (1924). In this article he addressed Pigou's conclusion that road congestion justified the taxation of roads. He argued that no government intervention was necessary. If roads were privately owned, the owners would reduce congestion by raising tolls, increasing the price of using the roads.

Knight was brought to Chicago in 1927 to teach history of economic thought, although he taught economic theory as well. He also developed a course on economics and social policy which he co-taught with the philosopher Charner Perry. *The Economic Organization*, a set of Knight's lecture notes, was published in 1933. This book was used as part of the introductory course in the social sciences for

undergraduates at the University of Chicago.

In addition to his work in economics, Knight was also a social philosopher and many of his writings reflect this. He was concerned about whether the public could understand the simplest economic truths as expressed in his 1950 presidential address to the American Economic Association. He was a proponent of *laissez-faire* as evidenced in his "The Ethics of Competition" (1923). He argued that the capitalist system could not be defended on ethical grounds. The economy, Knight argued, is too complex for government to understand. Government programs and interventions are too simplistic and the unintended consequences of intervention are more dangerous than the market outcome.

Knight's work in economics and social philosophy was also complemented with his realization regarding the importance of history. In *The Ethics of Competition and Other Essays* (1935), he argued that there was an "impassible gulf" between equilibrium states in economic theory and the path taken by the economy in reality. This required, according to Knight, a historical examination which cannot assume the movement toward equilibrium. For Knight, the market was morally suspect but so were orders from government. *Laissez-faire* is preferable because, although it holds individual greed as an absolute, the alternative is potentially much worse. Knight, along with Viner, is best known as the founder of the "Chicago School" of economics characterized by its highly systematic use of economic theory favoring free markets over government intervention.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Risk, Uncertainty, and Profit (Boston, 1921).

"The Ethics of Competition," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 37 (1923): 579–624.

"Some Fallacies in the Interpretation of Social Cost," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 38 (1924): 582–606.

The Economic Organization (Chicago, 1933).

The Ethics of Competition and Other Essays (Chicago, 1935).

The Economic Order and Religion, with Thornton W. Merriam (New York, 1945).

Freedom and Reform: Essays in Economics and Social Philosophy (Chicago, 1947).

Intelligence and Democractic Action (Cambridge, Mass., 1960).

Other Relevant Works

Knight's papers are at the University of Chicago.

On the History and Method of Economics: Selected Essays (Chicago, 1956).

Selected Essays by Frank H. Knight. Volume 1: "What is Truth" in Economics? ed. Ross B. Emmett (Chicago, 1999).

Selected Essays by Frank H. Knight. Volume 2: Laissez-Faire: Pro and Con, ed. Ross B. Emmett (Chicago, 1999).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Economics*, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*

Blaug, Mark, ed. *Frank Knight (1885–1972), Henry Simons (1899–1946), and Joseph Schumpeter (1883–1950)* (Cheltenham, UK, 1992).

Boettke, Peter J., and Karen I. Vaughn. "Knight and the Austrians on Capital and the Problem of Socialism," *History of Political Economy* 34 (2002): 153–74.

Greer, William. *Ethics and Uncertainty: The Economics of John M. Keynes and Frank H. Knight* (Cheltenham, UK, 2001).

Ross, Dorothy. *The Origins of American Social Science* (Cambridge, UK, 1991).

Ross, Emmett B. *The Economist as Philosopher: Frank H. Knight and American Social Science during the Twenties and Early Thirties*. PhD

dissertation, St. John's College (Winnipeg, Manitoba, 1990).

———, "Frank Hyneman Knight (1885–1972): A Bibliography of His Writings," *Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology*, archival suppl. 9, ed. Warren J. Samuels and Jeff Biddle (Greenwich, Conn., 1999), pp. 1–100.

Peter J. Boettke
Christopher J. Coyne

KNUDSON, Albert Cornelius (1873–1953)

Albert Cornelius Knudson was born on 23 January 1873 in Grandmeadow, Minnesota, the son of Asle Knudson, a Methodist minister, and Synneva (Susan) Fosse Knudson. Knudson earned the BA degree at the University of Minnesota in 1893, and the STB degree from Boston University in 1896. He continued graduate study with a concentration on philosophical studies with Borden Parker BOWNE at Boston University in 1896–7. Knudson studied church history, New Testament, and systematic theology at the universities of Jena and Berlin in Germany in 1897–8. He received the PhD in philosophy from Boston University in 1900.

Knudson's teaching career began in the field of church history at Iliff School of Theology in Denver from 1898 to 1900, followed by teaching appointments in philosophy and English Bible at Baker University from 1900 to 1902, and Allegheny College from 1902 to 1906. In 1906 Knudson became professor of Hebrew Bible and Old Testament at Boston University, and in 1921 he succeeded Henry C. Sheldon to the chair of systematic theology at Boston University. In 1926, Knudson was appointed Dean of the Boston University School of Theology, a position he held until 1938. He continued to teach full-time until 1943, and he pursued scholarly writing until his death. Knudson died on 28 August 1953 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Knudson's early works focused on the Old Testament, but 1921 marked the beginning of a new phase of his career in which he produced significant works in philosophical and systematic theology from the personalist perspective. He became one of the most influential Protestant theologians in the first half of the twentieth century, forming a bridge between conservative Methodism and liberal theology. Knudson's *The Philosophy of Personalism*, published in 1927, argued that personal idealism is the philosophy best qualified to provide an intellectual foundation for Christian theology. Like his teacher at Boston, Borden Parker Bowne, Knudson believed that taking personality as the key to reality is the soundest way to approach the problems of epistemology and metaphysics. In epistemology, Knudson believed that the intelligibility of the universe implies an intelligent creator, and in metaphysics he believed that a personal God provides the most adequate explanation of the causal ground of the world.

Knudson argued for the personhood and perfect personality of God, and he believed that God has no limitation other than self-limitation, which is primarily seen in the freedom granted to finite persons. Knudson believed in the supreme value of the soul, and he viewed human persons as ends in themselves. Much of Knudson's later work was devoted to applying personalism to Christian ethical reflection, focusing on moral problems related to the family, the state, the church, culture, and the economic order. He was particularly concerned with issues of war and peace. Knudson believed the hope for lasting peace lies in the combination of external global cooperation through the United Nations and the internal pursuit of the growth of moral responsibility through reason, conscience, and faith.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Old Testament Problem (Cincinnati, 1908).

The Beacon Lights of Prophecy: An Interpretation of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah (New York and Cincinnati, Ohio, 1914).

The Religious Teaching of the Old Testament (New York and Cincinnati, Ohio, 1918).

The Prophetic Movement in Israel (New York and Cincinnati, Ohio, 1921; 2nd edn, New York, 1946).

Present Tendencies in Religious Thought (New York, 1924).

The Philosophy of Personalism: A Study in the Metaphysics of Personalism (New York, 1927; 1949).

The Doctrine of God (New York, 1930).

The Doctrine of Redemption (New York, 1933).

The Validity of Religious Experience (New York, 1937).

The Principles of Christian Ethics (New York, 1943).

The Philosophy of War and Peace (New York, 1947).

Basic Issues in Christian Thought (New York, 1950).

Other Relevant Works

Knudson's papers are at Boston University.

"Religious Apriorism," in *Studies in Philosophy and Theology, by Former Students of Border Parker Bowne*, ed. E. C. Wilm (New York, 1922), pp. 93–127.

"Cardinal Principles of Protestantism," in *Protestantism: A Symposium*, ed. W. K. Anderson (Nashville, Tenn., 1944), pp. 125–36.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Proc of APA v27*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Brightman, Edgar S., ed. *Personalism in Theology: A Symposium in Honor of Albert Cornelius Knudson* (Boston, 1943). Contains a bibliography of Knudson's writings.

Buford, Thomas O., and Harold H. Oliver, eds. *Personalism Revisited* (Amsterdam and New York, 2002).

Burrow, Rufus, Jr. *Personalism: A Critical Introduction* (St. Louis, 1999).

DeWolf, L. Harold. "Albert Cornelius Knudson as Philosopher," *The Personalist* 35 (1954): 364–8.

Schilling, Paul S. "Albert Cornelius Knudson: Person and Theologian," in *The Boston Personalist Tradition in Philosophy, Social Ethics, and Theology*, ed. Paul Deats and Carol Robb (Macon, Georgia, 1986), pp. 81–103.

Mark Y. A. Davies

KOCH, Adrienne (1912–71)

Adrienne Koch was born on 10 September 1912 in New York City, and died there on 21 August 1971. She received her undergraduate education at New York University, earning her BA in 1933. She then received her MA in 1934 and PhD in philosophy in 1942 from Columbia University. Her dissertation on "The Philosophy of Thomas Jefferson" was written under the mentorship of Herbert W. SCHNEIDER, and won the Woodbridge Prize for best dissertation. Although trained as a philosopher, Koch gained recognition as a historian. However, Koch's research interests cannot be presented as initially philosophical and later historical. Koch's lifelong work between philosophy and history reflects the following central belief that guided her research: American political philosophy is inextricably bound to the study of the political writings and correspondences of America's founding statesmen whom Koch consistently dubs "philosopher-statesmen."

Koch was a philosophy instructor for five years at New York University while in

graduate school. During World War II, Koch worked as an analyst for the Office of Economic Warfare and as a political analyst for the National Planning Association. In 1946 she was hired by Tulane University, and later taught at the University of California at Berkeley from 1956 to 1964, and the University of Maryland at College Park from 1966 until her death in 1971. Her appointments were at various times in philosophy, history, political science, and American studies. She was a visiting professor at several universities and awarded fellowships and scholarships from the Guggenheim, Carnegie, and Rockefeller foundations.

Koch's general area of research was American political philosophy of the Enlightenment era. She focused both on the political philosophy of founding statesmen, and on utilizing Enlightenment thinking to illuminate contemporary political issues. Her contributions to political philosophy and history are as diverse as compiling and editing the works of American Enlightenment statesmen, publishing her novel ideas on the mutual influence between the original American philosopher-statesmen, and addressing contemporary political crises such as the Cold War and the rapid development of Third World countries.

Koch was also an advocate for women's liberation. At a time when working outside the home was not commonplace, she advocated coupling motherhood with a professional career. She herself balanced mothering twins, her academic career, and married life with economist Lawrence Kegan.

With regard to Enlightenment political philosophy, Koch focused on Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, John Adams, and John Quincy Adams. She co-edited compilations of the philosopher-statesmen's work, such as *The Life and Selected Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (1944) and *The Selected Writings of John Adams and John Quincy Adams* (1946). In other writings, she emphasized the mutual intellectual influence and strife between the leading figures who shaped early American government.

In *Adams and Jefferson: "Posterity Must Judge"* (1963), Koch intersperses original documents by both Adams and Jefferson within a chronological depiction of the political rivalry that developed between these two men whom she describes as dueling "titans." In *Jefferson and Madison: The Great Collaboration* (1964) Koch argues that her research into unpublished sources indicates that Jefferson's political philosophy is not exclusively "Jeffersonian" insofar as it developed out of an intense intellectual collaboration and deep friendship with James Madison. Her 1966 book *Madison's "Advice to My Country"* bolsters this claim by explicating Madison's individual philosophy as centered around the themes of liberty, justice, and union.

While she focused on the Enlightenment, Koch also addressed contemporary political issues and published on broader themes. In *Philosophy for a Time of Crisis: An Interpretation* (1959), she describes post-World War II political and social existence as verging on a state of monumental crisis. The crisis was precipitated by diverse, but not unrelated, events such as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, conflicts between communism and capitalism, and the rapid development of underdeveloped countries. Koch compiled selections from renowned intellectuals across disciplines as diverse as philosophy, physics, and religion whom she believes respond in unique ways to the crisis of the twentieth century. In a subsequent text, *Power, Morals, and the Founding Fathers: Essays in the Interpretation of the American Enlightenment* (1961), she adapted some of her own earlier published articles into a text which argues that the reflections of Franklin, Adams, Jefferson, and Madison on humanism and the productive relationship between power, liberty, and morals provide useful tools for approaching a resolution to the twentieth-century crisis.

Koch not only contributed to the existing scholarship on American Enlightenment thinking, and drew important connections

between American political philosophy and the founding statesmen, but she also applied the wisdom offered by historical and philosophical investigation to the resolution of contemporary issues.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Philosophy of Thomas Jefferson (New York, 1943).

"The Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions: An Episode in Jefferson's and Madison's Defense of Civil Liberties," *William and Mary Quarterly* 5 (1948): 145–76.

"The Status of Values and Democratic Political Theory," *Ethics* 68 (1958): 166–85.

Power, Morals, and the Founding Fathers: Essays in the Interpretation of the American Enlightenment (Ithaca, N.Y., 1961).

"Pragmatic Wisdom and the American Enlightenment," *William and Mary Quarterly* 18 (1961): 313–29.

Adams and Jefferson: "Posterity Must Judge", ed. Charles Sellers (Chicago, 1963).

Jefferson and Madison: The Great Collaboration (New York, 1964).

Madison's "Advice to My Country" (Princeton, N.J., 1966).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with William Peden, *The Life and Selected Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (New York, 1944).

Ed. with William Peden, *The Selected Writings of John Adams and John Quincy Adams* (New York, 1946).

Ed., *Philosophy for a Time of Crisis: An Interpretation* (New York, 1959).

Ed., *The American Enlightenment: the Shaping of the American Experiment and a Free Society* (New York, 1965).

Ed., *Jefferson: Great Lives Observed* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1971).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Who's Who in Phil*, *Women Phils*

"Adrienne Koch (1912–1971)," *The Maryland Historian* 3 (Spring 1972): 1–85. Special issue on Koch, including a bibliography of Koch's writings.

Sarah K. Donovan

KOCH, Sigmund (1917–96)

Sigmund Koch was born on 18 April 1917 in New York City to John Desider Koch and Helen Karman. While growing up, Koch spent much time writing poetry and reading classic works of literature. He began his undergraduate career in 1934 at New York University, where his interests switched from literature to philosophy and psychology. He earned a BA in both fields in 1938. Following his graduation, Koch attended the University of Iowa, where he interacted with well-respected scholars such as Kurt Lewin, Herbert FEIGL, and Kenneth Spence, and earned an MA in psychology in 1939. Koch went on to Duke University, where he received his PhD in psychology in 1942.

Koch stayed at Duke to join the psychology faculty, initially as an assistant professor and later as a full professor. In 1964 he returned to New York City and became the Director of the Ford Foundation's Program in the Humanities and Arts. His service at this organization included directing funding to support orchestras, and both private and public lectures aimed at an interdisciplinary approach for topics in the arts and sciences. From 1967 to 1971 Koch taught as a professor at the University of Texas at Austin. In 1971 he became a professor of psychology and philosophy at Boston University, and taught there until his death. In 1978 Koch was elected

President of two American Psychological Association divisions: General Psychology and Philosophical Psychology. Koch died on 10 August 1996 in Brookline, Massachusetts.

Koch was a prolific writer throughout his career. His best-known work may be *Psychology: A Study of a Science* (1959–63), which he edited; its six volumes provide a status report on his field of expertise. Koch was a critic of psychology, especially the area which dominated much of what, at the time, was considered the most "scientific" study of psychology: behaviorism. Koch's numerous critiques were not meant to discredit the field of psychology, but expose the shortcomings the quantitative, "sterile" discipline of behaviorism, and redirect psychology toward a more human-centered dimension in which mental processes and human functioning were considered to be of primary interest, not merely the measurable, objective behavior of the subject.

In the movement away from behaviorism, Koch developed several new techniques for collecting data for qualitative practices in psychological research, restoring faith in what was hitherto considered immeasurable by many behavioral psychologists and therefore, unworthy of study. With a more humanist approach, rather than one that attempted to eradicate the "human arena" (such as mental processes, creativity, meaning, etc.), Koch helped foster a shift away from behavioral studies and reopened psychologists' ability to conduct legitimate studies in a more human context.

Koch's later work focused on the creative process and aesthetics, as he was concerned with what drove humans to create. In 1982 Koch began his Aesthetics Research Project to study the creative processes of leading artists. By 1988, he had completed sixteen lengthy conversations (recorded on videocassettes and archived at Boston University) with such major artists as Edward Albee, Edward Larabee Barnes, Saul Bellow, Phyllis Curtin, Eric Hawkins, Arthur Miller, Toni Morrison, Virgil Thomson, Violette Verdi, and Richard Wilbur. In his studies, Koch found a correlation between artists' loss of self as the desire to create increased. He considered this ego loss accompanied with a strong urge to create to be a heightened mental state. The enormous amount of research and videotape that went into this project resulted in a tremendous database for studying creativity and the motives and drives behind this uniquely human trait.

Koch's primary contribution to psychology was that he was able to keep psychology "humanized" without discrediting it as a legitimate science. He developed many novel techniques for studying qualitative aspects of human psychology, and helped expose the weaknesses of a purely behavioral approach to the field of psychology. His lifelong interest in humanities aided in bringing the deeply human aspects of psychology, not merely the observable behavior, back to the forefront of psychological research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Current Status of Motivational Psychology," *Psychological Review* 58 (1951): 147–54.

"Theoretical Psychology, 1950: An Overview," *Psychological Review* 58 (1951): 295–301.

Ed., *Psychology: A Study of a Science*, 6 vols (New York, 1959–63).

"Psychological Science versus the Science-Humanism Antinomy: Intimations of a Significant Science of Man," *American Psychologist* 16 (1961): 629–39.

"Value Properties: Their Significance for Psychology, Axiology, and Science," in *The Anatomy of Knowledge*, ed. Marjorie Grene (London, 1969), pp. 119–48.

"Psychology and Emerging Conceptions of Science as Unitary," in *Behaviorism and Phenomenology*, ed. T. W. Wann (Chicago, 1970).

Ed. with David E. Leary, *A Century of Psychology as Science* (New York, 1985). Contains Koch's "Wundt's Creature at Age Zero, and as Centenarian: Some

Aspects of the Institutionalization of the 'New Psychology'," "The Nature and Limits of Psychological Knowledge: Lessons of a Century Qua Science," and "Postscript."

Psychology in Human Context: Essays in Dissidence and Reconstruction, ed. David Finkelman and Frank Kessel (Chicago, 1999).

Other Relevant Works
Koch's papers are at Boston University and Duke University.
"Clark L. Hull," in *Modern Learning Theory*, ed. William K. Estes et al. (New York, 1954), pp. 1–176.
"The Allures of Ameaning in Modern Psychology," in *Science and Human Affairs*, ed. R. Farson (Palo Alto, Cal., 1965), pp. 55–82.
"The Image of Man Implicit in Encounter Group Theory," *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 11 (1971): 109–28.
"Psychology's Bridgman vs Bridgman's Bridgman: An Essay in Reconstruction," *Theory & Psychology* 2 (1992): 261–90.
"The Human Agency of Science," in *Psychology, Science, and Human Affairs: Essays in Honor of William Bevan*, ed. Frank Kessel (Boulder, Col., 1995), pp. 17–33.

Further Reading
Encyc Psych
Finkelman, D., and F. Kessel. "Sigmund Koch: Human Agency and the Psychological Studies," in *Portraits of Pioneers in Psychology*, vol. 4, ed. G. A. Kimble and M. Wertheimer (Washington, D.C., 2000), pp. 359–80.
Leary, David E., Frank Kessel, and William Bevan. "Sigmund Koch (1917–1996): Obituary," *American Psychologist* 53 (1998): 316–17.
"One Big Idea: Koch on Psychology," *American Psychologist* 56 (May 2001): 405–67. Special issue on Koch.
Robinson, D. N. "Sigmund Koch – Philosophically Speaking," *American Psychologist*, 56 (2001): 420–24.

Daniel Trippett

KOCKELMANS, Joseph John (1913–)

Joseph J. Kockelmans was born on 1 December 1913 in Meerssen, The Netherlands. He passed his Gymnasium qualifying exam in 1942. His graduate work focused on the history of philosophy of mathematics, and he was awarded his PhD in mathematics in 1951 at the Angelico in Rome. Under the supervision of Herman Van Breda, the Director of the Husserl Archives, Kockelmans pursued post-doctoral studies in mathematics, phenomenology, and physics, and participated in seminars in Edmund Husserl's philosophy at the University of Louvain.

Kockelmans assumed his first post in 1963–4 at the Agricultural University of Wageningen in The Netherlands. He then moved to the United States to take a philosophy position at the New School for Social Research in 1964–5. From there, he taught at the University of Pittsburgh as professor of philosophy from 1965 to 1968. In 1968 he joined the philosophy department of Pennsylvania State University, and before retiring in 1996 he was named Penn State Distinguished Professor of Philosophy. In addition to teaching undergraduates and graduate students and directing numerous dissertations, his pedagogical contribution consisted of leadership roles in interdisciplinary programs, particularly those in which the sciences and the humanities are integrated. Specially designed programs were determined on the interests and expertise of doctoral students who came from both the humanities and the sciences. His determination to foster

interactions within the humanities and the sciences made him extremely important in working with and taking leadership roles in interdisciplinary seminars for faculty and graduate students. Finally, his concern for a more humanistic and foundational support for undergraduate education was realized in his serving with other faculty at Penn State in supporting a liberal arts and science basic set of courses for freshmen and sophomores.

Kockelmans has been sought after for the clarity of his critical explanations of philosophy in the continental tradition, especially hermeneutics and the thought of Heidegger. He is also known as a strong defender of pluralism in philosophy. During his career, Kockelmans won a gold medal from The Netherlands' Teyler's Tweede Genoostschap; he received an "Outstanding Achievement in Arts and the Humanities" medal from Pennsylvania State University; and he was elected a fellow of the Institute for the Arts and Humanistic Studies and the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Kockelmans was President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1986–7. He also served on the executive committee of the Society for Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy, was an editor of *Man and World*, and was a member of editorial boards of many journals including *Philosophical Quarterly, New Ideas in Psychology,* and *Journal of Philosophy of Religion.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Martin Heidegger: A First Introduction to His Philosophy (Pittsburgh, 1965).
Phenomenology and Physical Science: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Physical Science (Pittsburgh, 1966).
Edmund Husserl's Phenomenological Psychology: A Historico-critical Study (Pittsburgh, 1967).
The World in Science and Philosophy (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1968).
On the Truth of Being: Reflections on Heidegger's Later Philosophy (Bloomington, Ind., 1984).
Heidegger on Art and Art Works (Dordrecht, 1985).
Heidegger and Science (Washington, D.C., 1985).
Ideas for a Hermeneutic Phenomenology of the Natural Sciences: Contributions to Phenomenology, 2 vols (Dordrecht, 1993, 2002).
Edmund Husserl's Phenomenology (West Lafayette, Ind., 1994).

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *Phenomenology: The Philosophy of Edmund Husserl and Its Interpretation* (Garden City, N.Y., 1967).
Ed. with Theodore Kisiel, *Phenomenology and the Natural Sciences: Essays and Translations* (Evanston, Ill., 1970).
Ed., *On Heidegger and Language* (Evanston, Ill., 1972).
Ed., *Interdisciplinarity and Higher Education* (University Park, Penn., 1979).
Ed., *A Companion to Martin Heidegger's "Being and Time"* (Washington, D.C., 1986).
Ed., *Hermeneutic Phenomenology: Lectures and Essays* (Pittsburgh, 1988).
"Science, Ontology, Pluralities," in *Portraits of American Continental Philosophers*, ed. James R. Watson (Bloomington, Ind., 1999).

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v9
Stapleton, Timothy J., ed. *The Question of Hermeneutics: Essays in Honor of Joseph J. Kockelmans* (Dordrecht, 1994). Contains a bibliography of Kockelmans's writings.

Carl Hausman

KOFFKA, Kurt (1886–1941)

Kurt Koffka was born on 18 March 1886 in Berlin, Germany, and died on 22 November 1941 in Northampton, Massachusetts. After graduating from the Wilhelms Gymnasium in Berlin in 1903, he entered the University of Berlin, studying with Alois Riehl. In 1904, he traveled to Edinburgh, Scotland, to study literature and philosophy as well as English. In 1905, he returned to Berlin where in 1908 he obtained his PhD in psychology under the supervision of Carl Stumpf, with a thesis on rhythm as a factor in the visual modality. This topic was unusual because rhythm is normally thought of as an auditory phenomenon.

While at Berlin, Koffka made the acquaintance of Max WERTHEIMER and Wolfgang KÖHLER, with whom he would go on to develop the major principles of Gestalt psychology. After working briefly with Johannes von Kries (a critic of the logic underlying Fechnerian psychophysics) and Oswald Külpe (the sponsor of the Würzburg School of investigators of adult thinking and reasoning), Koffka moved in 1910 to Frankfurt as one of two research assistants (the other being Wolfgang Köhler) to Friedrich Schumann. There Koffka completed his Habilitationsschrift on the nature of mental imagery. In 1911 he accepted a teaching position under August Messer at the University of Giessen. While at Giessen, Koffka was visited by Edward C. Tolman, then a graduate student at Harvard. For Tolman this was the beginning of a lifelong interest in and sympathy towards Gestalt psychology.

Koffka remained at Giessen until 1924. During this period he wrote numerous articles on visual perception, as well as a book on child development entitled *Die Grundlagen der psychischen Entwicklung* (1921). In 1924 Koffka's book, in its second edition, was translated into English by Robert Morris Ogden as *The Growth of the Mind*. Ogden also arranged for Koffka to come to Cornell in 1924–5 and invited him to write "Perception, an Introduction to the Gestalt-theorie" (1922) for the *Psychological Bulletin*, which Ogden edited. Koffka's article was the first to bring Gestalt psychology to the attention of interested American readers. Although Koffka had intended this article to be followed by a second concerned with learning and memory viewed from a Gestalt perspective, this second paper was never written; and, in the view of Köhler at least, this fact was responsible for the false impression on the part of many Americans that Gestalt psychology was concerned only with perception.

After Koffka's visit to Cornell, as well as to the University of Chicago in 1925 and to the University of Wisconsin in 1925–6, he returned to Giessen. When an expected promotion failed to materialize, he emigrated to the United States, taking the William Allan Neilson Research Professorship at Smith College in Northampton, Massachusetts in 1927. Except for periods abroad, he remained at Smith for the remainder of his life.

During his years in Northampton, Koffka served as a sort of epicenter on the North American continent around which outbursts of discontent with Gestalt views were vented. A study of the ideas put forward in *The Growth of the Mind* suggests why this may have been. Based on research on the behavior of cats in puzzle boxes, the then leading American learning theorist, Edward L. THORNDIKE, had claimed that animals learn by trial and error. When behaviors happen to be successful, the connections between those behaviors and relevant stimuli are stamped in by the reward the animal receives. In *Growth of the Mind*, Koffka criticized this view. For Koffka, cats attempting to escape from a puzzle box actually display actions that are appropriate, rather than haphazard, with respect to their goal. More generally, he denied that higher mammals should be conceptualized as passive receptacles for the connection of stimulus to response, with all behavior consisting of nothing but unlearned reflexes or overlearned "habits."

Instead, in Koffka's view, higher organisms display evidence of being able to plan actions and execute them efficiently. They respond to

a simple stimulus in so many different ways that the word "stimulus" ought, he asserted, to be replaced by some new term. To incorporate the idea that a learned response is actually evoked by a "combination-of-stimuli-associated-with-memories-of-the-emotions-aroused-when-that-*combination*-had-first-been-encountered," Koffka chose the term "configuration." He also argued that no organism should be conceptualized as passively awaiting stimulation; organisms actively seek stimulation. In the case of animals and human infants, the direction of search is dictated by primary needs; in the case of human adults, it is dictated not only by primary needs but by learned desires and preconceived ideals.

Needless to say, these perspectives on animal and human behavior did not fit neatly into the Pavlovian and neo-behaviorist Zeitgeist of North American psychology in the late 1920s and 1930s. Clark L. HULL, who had heard Koffka's lectures at Wisconsin, so disapproved of some of the Gestalt principles that he undertook to show that an axiomatic theory of learning could be based entirely on Pavlovian principles. Indeed Pavlov himself is known to have disliked Gestalt psychology because he felt that many of its claims about holistic perceptual processing and the role of sudden insight in problem solution could be just as easily expressed in terms of conditioned reflexes.

In 1932, while at Smith, Koffka traveled to Uzbekistan at the invitation of the Soviet government to administer psychological tests to the local inhabitants. This was to be done with a view to facilitating governmental decision-making with regard to the type of educational facilities required for an agrarian population. Unfortunately Koffka became ill shortly after arriving in Uzbekistan and his visit was curtailed. During the period of his convalescence, however, he conceived the idea of a text in English on Gestalt psychology; and *Principles of Gestalt Psychology* (1935), written after his return to Smith, became the authoritative work on the subject.

The early chapters of the *Principles*, which are devoted to perceptual psychology, are a goldmine of experimental information concerning the role played by spatiotemporal context in determining the phenomenal appearance of embedded stimuli. Not only are sophisticated examples of figure–ground organizational processes described, but compendious accounts are provided for many perceptual phenomena, including contrast, constancies, effects arising from binocular (as opposed to monocular) presentation, illusions, and both sensory and figural after-effects. In the interpretation of these phenomena, Koffka borrowed the terminology of "forces" (a Newtonian concept) and "fields" (a Maxwellian concept) from physics.

With regard to "forces," for example, Koffka argued that within the visual field seen by a person in a short glance, organizational forces operate that are "cognitively impenetrable" in the sense that they are unlearned and are unaffected by the number of times they have gone into operation in the past. The interplay of these forces is such that elements of the display that are close together will be grouped together phenomenally and elements of the display that are identical to one another will "pop out" as self-contained clusters both from the background and from all the other elements not identical to those in the clusters.

Koffka also widened the scope of the application of the word "field" to distinguish between various broad categories of field. These included the *environmental* field (the person in relation to their physical environment), the *physiological* field (the person in relation to their present physiological state), the *psychophysical* field (referring to grouping and other forms of organization in a sensory field), the *behavioral* field (the person's actions in relation to ongoing situations), the *ego* field (the relationship between a person's collection of self-related memories and the physical environment), and the *social* field (the person in relation to the people around him or her). Each field is influenced by forces (including "attractions" and "stresses" in the behavioral and social fields).

The later chapters of the *Principles* were concerned with memory and thinking. For Koffka, memory traces can be influenced by various kinds of force. Two may be singled out here. First, Koffka argued that some memory traces could be set up that were not part of the general schema of memory traces that he labeled the "Ego." Such memory traces were stored physiologically and could sometimes influence behavior in a way inscrutable to both the patient and the doctor; but Koffka preferred to label such traces as "physiological," and to avoid the use of the term "unconscious." Second, if two traces are laid down at separate times and happen to be nearly identical in content, thinking about the later trace will automatically revive the earlier trace. Koffka offered an explanation for this automatic revival that was similar to an explanation also provided by Köhler and von Restorff in 1937, according to which the law of grouping by similarity that serves to organize elements perceived *simultaneously* also applies in the temporal domain when similar elements are perceived *successively*.

Although Koffka had been diagnosed with angina in 1936 and had had somewhat to restrict his activities, he continued in the last few years of his life to work on a variety of projects. In 1939 he traveled from Northampton to Oxford to take up a position as visiting professor at the University of Oxford, where he collaborated with Sir Hugh Cairns on studies of the effects of brain injury on visual perception. In 1940 he then returned to Northampton and to his duties at Smith, where he continued to teach until shortly before his death.

For North Americans, Koffka was in many ways the most influential of the Gestalt psychologists. He was the most proficient in English; he was the first of the Gestaltists to emigrate to the United States from Germany and the first to introduce Gestalt ideas to the North American audience. He was also the only one among the Gestaltists to publish, in the *Principles*, an extended technical account of the Gestalt perspective. Despite the cool reception accorded Gestaltist ideas in America during Koffka's lifetime, many of the general precepts offered in *The Growth of the Mind* and in the *Principles* were eventually assimilated into the body of American psychology, especially through the influence of Edward TOLMAN and Karl Lashley and those in the early days of the "cognitive revolution" who were, in turn, influenced by Tolman and Lashley. And, indeed, these precepts have recently been shown to have close affinities with those embodied in contemporary approaches such as "dynamic systems theory" (Murray and Farahmand 1998), approaches which have become quite fashionable in certain areas of contemporary psychology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Die Grundlagen der psychischen Entwicklung (Osterwieck am Harz, Germany, 1921). 2nd edn trans. by R. M. Ogden as *The Growth of the Mind* (London, 1924).

"Perception, an Introduction to the Gestalt-theorie," *Psychological Bulletin* 19 (1922): 531–85.

Principles of Gestalt Psychology (London, 1935).

Other Relevant Works

Koffka's papers are at the Archives of the History of American Psychology in Akron, Ohio.

Zur Analyse der Vorstellungen und ihrer Gesetze: Eine experimentelle Untersuchung (Leipzig, 1912).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Ash, Mitchell G. *Gestalt Psychology in German Culture, 1890–1967: Holism and the Quest for Objectivity* (Cambridge, Mass., 1995).

Harrower, Molly. *Kurt Koffka: An Unwitting Self-Portrait* (Gainesville, Fla., 1983).

Köhler, Wolfgang, and Hedwig von Restorff. "II. Analyse von Vorgängen im Spurenfeld. Zur Theorie der Reproduktion," *Psychologische Forschung* 21 (1937): 56–112.

Metzger, W. "Kurt Koffka, Professor der Psychologie," *Neue deutsche Biographie* 12 (1980): 417–18.

Murray, David J., and Bahar Farahmand. "Gestalt Theory and Evolutionary Psychology," in *Psychology: Theoretical-Historical Perspectives*, 2nd edn, ed. R. W. Rieber and K. Salzinger (Washington, D.C., 1998), pp. 254–87.

David J. Murray

KOHÁK, Erazim Vaclav (1933–)

Erazim Vaclav Kohák was born on 21 May 1933 in Prague, Czechoslovakia, to Miloslav Kohák and Zdislava Koháková. One of his first memories was that of his father being arrested by the Gestapo in 1941. His mother was arrested three years later. Kohák's paternal uncle sheltered him until the end of the war, when his parents returned to Prague. After the communist coup in 1948, Kohák's father was picked up for interrogation. Following the interrogation, Kohák's family posed as skiers and made a harrowing escape from Czechoslovakia through the border mountains into the American Zone of occupied Germany. After a time in refugee camps, Kohák's family traveled from Bremerhaven across the Atlantic to the United States, where they arrived in 1949.

Kohák received a scholarship to study at Colgate University in New York, where he studied from 1950 to 1954, when he received his BA degree in philosophy. It is here that Kohák discovered the work of Edmund Husserl, whose phenomenological perspective would have lasting influence on his views of how we experience the world. Following his graduation from Colgate, Kohák received a Danforth Fellowship enabling him to study at Yale University, where he completed an MA in philosophy in 1957 and a PhD in philosophy in 1958.

Kohák's first teaching position was at Gustavus Adolphus College in St. Peter, Minnesota, in 1958–9. In 1960 Kohák joined the philosophy department at Boston University where he taught until 1995 when he became professor emeritus. His primary philosophical interests have been phenomenology, environmental philosophy, and the philosophy of the renowned Czech philosopher Jan Patocka, student of Husserl and Heidegger and a key intellectual leader in the reform movements that eventually helped end communism. Kohák became the world's foremost authority on Patocka's thought, translating many of his works into English. Kohák's close connection with his homeland eventually led him to go back to Prague as a philosophy professor at Charles University in Prague, teaching half-time beginning in 1991 and full-time since 1995. He currently resides in Prague where he continues to develop his philosophy. In recent years, Kohák has been intensely engaged with the social and political issues of Central Europe, and he continues to be one of the world's best-known environmental philosophers. He is currently serving as a member of the Council of Czech television elected by the Parliament. In 1998 Kohák was awarded the Medal of Merit by the President of the Czech Republic and the Minister's Prize by Czech Minister of the Environment.

While in Boston, Kohák encountered the Boston personalism of Borden Parker BOWNE, Edgar Sheffield BRIGHTMAN, and Peter Anthony BERTOCCI. Bowne and Brightman were deceased, but Bertocci became a close friend and colleague. After initial great resistance to the ideas of personalism, Kohák found, through total absorption in the thought of Bowne, that personalism provided a way of seeing the world as a meaningful whole, a

world of persons, infused with purposive activity. During his career at Boston University, Kohák also became a profound interpreter of Husserl's phenomenological philosophy. Kohák's book *Idea and Experience: Edmund Husserl's Project of Phenomenology in Ideas I* (1978) elaborates Husserl's insight that to know is to see and that direct awareness of our experience provides a window through which to see the intersubjective reality of our world – an insight closely related to Boston personalism's claim that reality is personal.

Kohák concurs with the Boston personalist tradition that the person is the ultimate metaphysical category, that reality is a society of persons, and that nature is the activity and expression of a Cosmic Person. Kohák does not limit personhood to beings that are capable of self-reflective consciousness, however. According to Kohák, all of nature expresses purposive agency, and all purposive agency is personal and has intrinsic value. Kohák is critical of Bowne and Brightman for persisting in a "bifurcation of reality between the dignity of the personal and the putative instrumentality of the nonpersonal" (1984, p. 128). Kohák maintains that the whole world is personal, and it "includes a dimension of value, not merely as utility but as intrinsic, absolute value ingressing in the order of time" (1984, p. 70). For Kohák there are no subpersonal selves. Every thing that exists is personal. A person is a being worthy of respect, and all beings (all existing things) are worthy of respect. Kohák writes, "For a person, ultimately, is not just a being who possesses a psyche or manifests certain personality traits as much as a being who stands in a moral relation to us, a being we encounter as a Thou." (1984, pp. 128–9)

For Kohák purposive agency is synonymous with experience. Since Kohák believes that all of nature expresses purposive agency, he refers to nature as experience. The concept of nature as non-experiencing matter is an abstraction of our thought and does not represent nature as a living presence with a moral sense of its own. When we damage nature, we are denigrating experience as a whole, and when we denigrate experience, we decrease the overall value of the universe. He contends that "ecocide can become morally grievous only in the context of *nature as experience*, that is, nature ordered in terms of value and meaning, not in terms of mathematical and spatiotemporal relations only" (1997, p. 154).

Kohák accepts a communitarian conception of the person, but he expands the notion of person to include all organisms. He argues for the primacy of meaningful being in a morally ordered cosmos of which human persons are a part. Our rejection of the moral sense of nature and its meaningful being is for Kohák a "cunningly devised fable" and one of the great fallacies of modern Western thought. He argues that the modern Western claims of the primacy of the material have denied "the legitimacy of the vital and the moral," whereas "the recognition of the ontological primacy of the personal establishes the validity of the vital and the material" (1984, p. 130).

Kohák's position leads him to the seemingly absurd claim that woodchucks, porcupines, and perhaps even trees and rocks are personal modes of beings. But for him, such a claim is not absurd at all. More absurd is the notion that we are persons adrift in a solely material and amoral world, that we are somehow spirits in an alien world of matter. Such a view will never lead us to ecological healing, but only to greater alienation from nature and ourselves. Kohák argues that we must take the world personally in order to once again be in tune with its moral order. He affirms the world as personal, "conceiv[ing] of it as structured in terms of relations best understood on the model of meaningful relations among persons … and peopled by beings who are similarly best understood on the model of persons … rather than on the model of matter in motion" (1984, p. 209). He asserts that accepting the world as personal may lead to the re-personalization of our own lives and a greater sense of feeling at home in the natural world.

In agreement with Bertocci, his personalist colleague at Boston University, Kohák affirms the value of all existence. For him, "Value is not a function of reflective consciousness but of purposive agency as such." (1997, p. 168) He understands each living being to be an "epiphany of value" (1984, p. 199). Although all life forms subsume within themselves what we perceive as material or inorganic aspects, they cannot be reduced to these aspects. He recognizes that a life should not be reduced to materiality or instrumentality. To do so is to mistake an abstraction for the fullness of being. Each life is a meaningful presence, an ingressing of value into time that cannot be reduced to matter in motion or to biophysical processes.

Kohák sees all of life as "Person-al being, a focus of meaningful relations with a rightness and an integrity of [its] own" (1984, p. 207). Each living being, in his view, possesses intrinsic value by virtue of the joy, or enjoyment, of its own experience. He maintains that we commonly recognize this value in our pets, but unfortunately we often bracket off our personal relationships with our pets and continue to treat other non-human life forms solely as material beings that serve as instruments for human value attainment. He argues, however, that just as his dog is a person-al reality, "a meaningful presence of which materiality is but one component," so too is the life of a porcupine, or a cow, or a chicken (1984, p. 203). To treat them as part of a mechanized order is to ignore the value ingressing into time through their being. This may make it easier to manipulate nature and to use it for our purposes, but it depersonalizes the world, making it less of a home for us as persons. Nature is no longer a sacred presence; it becomes a dead world of matter. Kohák recognizes the importance of affirming the presence of the sacred in nature when he writes, "If we bracket out the dimension of the sacred from nature, the conception of nature at which we arrive will inevitably be one stripped of all but utilitarian value, nature as the reservoir of raw materials for the acts of human arbitrary will." (1986, pp. 59–60)

Rooted in Husserl's phenomenological insights, Kohák believes that human persons pre-reflectively experience nature as a meaningful whole characterized by purposive agency, or experience. It is only after great reflective effort that we are able to experience the world as a mechanism or simply as a store of raw materials. From Kohák's perspective, our pre-reflective intuition is truer to reality than the abstractions of our reflective thought when it comes to our experience of nature. In a sense, he is calling for a return to the innocence of our pre-reflective experience, but he is not arguing we reject the advances in technology made possible by reflective thought and science. He recognizes, however, that without an experience of nature as meaningful and valuable, our advances in technology can become ends in themselves to the detriment of nature as experience. When we understand nature as experience, we are able to see our relationship with nature as being personal, and we have moral responsibility in relation to the experience in nature. Nature as experience can never be solely a tool for human exploitation.

In sharing his vision of taking nature personally Kohák writes, "The repersonalization of our relationship to our animal world means … approaching it with respect, as ordered by a moral law, not only for our convenience" (1984, p. 213). He argues further, "We need to recognize that the suffering we impose on animals is not automatically justified by our convenience" (1984, p. 213). In his vision, nature is not simply a storehouse of raw materials; rather it is a personal world, and we should cherish and honor it. Such an attitude might make us less affluent, but Kohák argues that we will be far richer if we take nature personally. Seeing the world as personal and taking nature personally may also contribute to the re-personalization of the world of human persons as we cultivate an attitude of respect for all life, including human persons.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Victors and the Vanquished, with H. KKovályovou (New York, 1972).

Národ v nás (Toronto, 1978).

Idea and Experience: Edmund Husserl's Project of Phenomenology in Ideas I (Chicago 1978).

The Embers and the Stars (Chicago, 1984).

Ed., *Jan Patocka: Philosophy and Selected Writings* (Chicago, 1989).

Dopisy pres oceán (Prague, 1992).

Jan Patocka: filosoficky zivotopis (Prague, 1993).

P.S.: Psové (Prague, 1993).

Zivot v pravde a moderní skepse (Prague, 1994).

Clovek, dobro a zlo (Prague, 1994).

Hesla Erazima Koháka (Prague, 1995).

Pestrost a pravda (Prague, 1997).

Pruvodce po demokracii (Prague, 1997).

Zelená svatozár: Kapitoly z ekologické etiky (Prague, 1998).

The Green Halo: A Bird's-Eye View of Ecological Ethics (Chicago, 1999).

Other Relevant Works

"Creation's Orphan: Towards a Metaphysics of Artifacts," *Personalist Forum* 13 (1985): 22–75.

"Reply to Compton's 'On the Sense of There Being a Moral Sense of Nature'," *The Personalist Forum* 2 (Spring 1986): 56–60.

"Speaking of Persons: Mirror or Metaphor," *The Personalist Forum* 7 (Fall 1991): 41–57.

Trans., *An Introduction to Husserl's Phenomenology*, by Jan Patocka, ed. James Dodd (Chicago, 1996).

Trans., *Heretical Essays in the Philosophy of History*, ed. James Dodd (Chicago, 1996).

"Personalism: Towards a Philosophical Delineation," *The Personalist Forum* 13 (Spring 1997): 3–11.

"Varieties of Ecological Experience," *Environmental Ethics* 19 (1997): 153–71.

Trans., *Body, Community, Language, World*, ed. James Dodd (Chicago, 1997).

Philosophies of Nature: The Human Dimension, ed. Robert S. Cohen and Alfred I. Tauber (Dordrecht, 1998).

"The Person in a Personal World: An Inquiry into the Metaphysical Significance of the Tragic Sense of Life," in *Personalism Revisited: Its Proponents and Critics*, ed. Thomas O. Buford and Harold H. Oliver (Amsterdam and New York, 2002), pp. 75–100.

Further Reading

Burrow, Rufus, Jr. *Personalism: A Critical Introduction* (St. Louis, 1999).

Compton, John J. "On the Sense of There Being a Moral Sense of Nature," *The Personalist Forum* 2 (Spring 1986): 38–55.

Donovan, Michael. "Suspending Meaninglessness: Style, Philosophy, and the Recent Writings of Erazim Kohak," *Lyceum* 4 (Fall 1992): 5–25.

Mark Y. A. Davies

KOHLBERG, Lawrence (1927–87)

Lawrence Kohlberg was born on 25 October 1927 in Bronxville, New York, and committed suicide by throwing himself into the frigid Atlantic waters of the Boston Harbor on 19 January 1987. He was born into a wealthy Jewish family and attended the private Andover Academy in Massachusetts. After graduating, Kohlberg put off academic pursuits to aid in the Zionist cause at the end of World War II. He became a "second engineer" on an old freighter that helped smuggle Jewish refugees across the British blockade of Palestine. In 1948 he enrolled at the University of Chicago, and graduated with a BA degree in only one year. This was possible because he scored so high on admission tests that he was exempt from taking several preliminary undergraduate courses. Kohlberg

remained at the University of Chicago to pursue a graduate degree in psychology, with the purpose of becoming a clinical psychologist. However, he became interested in the theories of moral development proposed by French psychologist Jean Piaget, and changed his academic focus to the morality of children. He received his PhD in 1958, writing a dissertation on "The Development of Modes of Thinking and Choices in Years 10 to 16." He was an assistant professor of psychology at Yale University from 1959 to 1961, and a fellow of the Center of Advanced Study of Behavioral Science at Stanford University in 1962. From 1962 to 1968, he taught psychology at the University of Chicago. In 1968 he became professor of social psychology and education at Harvard University, and he held this appointment until his death.

Inspired by Piaget, Kohlberg investigated the development of moral thought. In his work on the development of moral judgment in children and adolescents, he interviewed them using hypothetical moral dilemmas to measure their level of moral reasoning. A famous example, Heinz Steals the Drug, reads as follows: "In Europe, a woman was near death form a very bad disease, a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that the doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging ten times what the drug cost him to make. He paid $200 for the radium and charged $2000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could get together only about $1000, which was half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said, 'No, I discovered the drug and I'm going to make money from it.' Heinz got desperate and broke into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife." (1963, p. 19)

Kohlberg asked whether or not Heinz should have stolen the drug. Whether or not they answered "yes" or "no" did not matter to Kohlberg, because he was instead interested in their moral reasoning used in judging the actions of Heinz. He then classifies each response in various stages of development. There are six stages, according to Kohlberg, within three major categories that represent fundamental shifts in moral perspectives of the individual.

The pre-conventional category is marked by individuals who do not operate as members of a society, where morality is external or isolated, and has two stages. Stage one is distinguished by an egocentric individual focused on avoiding breaking a fixed set of rules so as to avoid punishment. Stage two develops the concept of reciprocity: "if you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours." Then there is a major shift in reasoning to the conventional category. Individuals in this category understand that norms and conventions are necessary to uphold society. Kohlberg found that in stage three, an individual thinks that good behavior is having good motives and interpersonal feelings such as love and care for others, usually within a local community or family. Stage four improves on stage three in that it recognizes the value of laws and norms as developed by the "society as a whole." In these two stages, the individual begins to see themselves as members participating within a society. The final category is post-conventional, which conceives the individual as using moral reasoning based on principles, a "prior to society" perspective. These principles are the foundation of norms and laws, but it is recognized that there might not be a universal application of those norms and laws. If an individual is reasoning in stage five, they will believe in two things: that there are basic human rights and that there must be a democratic structure for changing "unjust" laws and norms. That individuals are capable of reasoning in this manner there is much empirical proof; however the same cannot be said of the sixth and final stage which aims at an individual who reasons with an understanding of universal principles. Kohlberg eventually took

this stage off of his scorecards used in the interviews, but maintained it as a theoretical ideal.

For Kohlberg, like Piaget, an individual does not reach each stage of moral reasoning by mere biological processes, nor is it the socialization of parents and teachers who teach each stage of development. Rather, an individual must be stimulated through experience, faced with a conflict within their current state of reasoning, before they will move to the higher stage. This is known as the cognitive-conflict model of change. Kohlberg also states that his theory involves moral thinking and not necessarily moral action, though he believes that there should be some relationship.

Kohlberg's theory has not gone without criticism. The primary, or at least most famous, criticism of the theory comes from Harvard psychologist Carol GILLIGAN. She believes that Kohlberg has created a stage theory that establishes an unfair gender bias, pointing out that he studied only males and that on his scale, women tend to reason at stage three while men seem capable of reasoning at stages four or five. Such "evidence" seems to support the idea that most women are somehow inferior moral reasoners compared to men. Gilligan says that a woman's moral reasoning is more context dependent and interpersonal than the abstract reasoning Kohlberg values as superior. The conversation that ensued created what is known as the Kohlberg–Gilligan debate, or the difference between a morality based on justice (the male perspective) versus a morality based on care (the female perspective).

In the final years of his life, Kohlberg focused more on the practical use of his theory. Since his theory was based on the cognitive-conflict model of change, he created "just communities" to encourage such moral developments. Kohlberg worked in cooperation with several elementary and secondary schools (and even a few prisons) to establish these communities, encouraging the individual participants to interact in a democratic manner and to develop their own critical thinking. Though he was able to start many of these Cluster schools, many of them unfortunately ceased operations after his death.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Development of Children's Orientations Toward a Moral Order: Sequence in the Development of Moral Thought," *Vita Humana* 6 (1963): 11–33.

"The Child as a Moral Philosopher," *Psychology Today* 7 (1968): 25–30.

The Philosophy of Moral Development: Moral Stages and the Idea of Justice (San Francisco, 1981). Contains a bibliography of Kohlberg's writings.

Moral Stages: A Current Formulation and a Response to Critics, with Charles Levine and Alexandra Hewer (Basel and New York, 1983).

The Psychology of Moral Development: The Nature and Validity of Moral Stages (San Francisco, 1984).

Child Psychology and Childhood Education: A Cognitive-developmental View (New York, 1987).

The Measurement of Moral Judgment, 2 vols, with Anne Colby (Cambridge, UK, 1987).

Lawrence Kohlberg's Approach to Moral Education, with F. Clark Power and Ann Higgins (New York, 1989).

Kohlberg's Original Study of Moral Development, ed. Bill Puka (New York, 1994).

Other Relevant Works

"Indoctrination Versus Relativity in Value Education," *Zygon* 6 (1971): 285–310.

"From *Is* to *Ought*: How to Commit the Naturalistic Fallacy and Get Away with It in the Study of Moral Development," in *Cognitive Development and Epistemology*, ed. Theodore Mischel (New York, 1971), pp. 151–235.

"The Adolescent as a Philosopher: The

Discovery of the Self in a Post-Conventional World," *Daedalus* 100 (1971): 1051–86.

Further Reading

Bio Dict Psych, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v9*

Hersh, Richard, Diana Poalitto, and Joseph Reimer. *Promoting Moral Growth: From Piaget to Kohlberg* (New York, 1979; 2nd edn 1983).

Modgil, Sohan, and Celia Modgil, eds. *Lawrence Kohlberg: Consensus and Controversy* (Philadelphia, 1986).

Munsey, Brenda, ed. *Moral Development, Moral Education, and Kohlberg: Basic Issues in Philosophy, Psychology, Religion, and Education* (Birmingham, Ala., 1980).

Schrader, Dawn, ed. *The Legacy of Lawrence Kohlberg* (San Francisco, 1990).

John William Bates V

KOHLER, Kaufmann (1843–1926)

Kohler was born on 10 May 1843 in Fürth in the Bavarian region of Germany. Beginning at the age of eight he received extensive Talmudic training, not at the *yeshiva* in his hometown but in private studies at Mainz, Altona, and Frankfurt am Main. Then, in a pattern that became classic among those who moved from traditionalist views to more liberal ones, he attended secular universities, studying first at Munich (1864–5), then at Berlin (1865–7), and finally at Erlangen (1867) where he received a PhD. This solid grounding in history and philological studies, including two years of postgraduate work at the university in Leipzig, made Kohler one of the most scholarly proponents of Reform Judaism in America.

Kohler emigrated to the United States in 1869, accepting a call to become rabbi of Beth-El Congregation in Detroit, Michigan. This welcome transition was also a necessary one because Kohler's revisionist ideas had made it impossible for him to find acceptance in any European synagogue. From there he moved in 1871 to Sinai Congregation in Chicago, Illinois, and then in 1879 to the eminent Temple Beth-El in New York City where he served for more than two decades until 1903. In these places he constantly sought to apply Jewish faith and practice effectively in modern circumstances.

But those circumstances, especially in cultures dominated by modern science and an appreciation of historical change, required adapting Judaism to contemporary perspectives. As a university student Kohler had determined that most traditional Jewish observances had not been instituted by God but rather by human predecessors. The Pentateuch, for instance, was not of divine origin; it was instead an accumulation of human dicta that had been shaped by the cultural conditions surrounding their emergence, each section relative to time and place. Rather than reject prior affirmations as useless in contemporary times, Kohler hoped to preserve the vital elements in Jewish traditions without perpetuating all that was outdated and inapplicable. He sought to reconcile Jewish ritual with the needs of congregants who had acculturated to a society that was predominantly influenced by Christian standards and customs. For example he adapted to a business ethic that required work on Saturday (the traditional Sabbath) by instituting Sunday worship services. This innovation was the first of its kind in America.

Kohler epitomized the perspective known as Reform Judaism, a movement which sought to adapt new knowledge to an old faith. He understood religion to be part of the evolutionary process, and, because change demanded adaptation, he criticized conformity to wooden forms. But at the same time he held tenaciously to essentials. For him adap-

tation was a sign of vibrant religious beliefs, not a symptom of weak resolve or wavering faith. Other religious leaders, notably David EINHORN, had preceded Kohler to this country, and they welcomed him as an able colleague. In 1870 Kohler confirmed his place in the movement even further by marrying Einhorn's daughter, Johanna.

From the very beginning Kohler was a strong advocate of what he considered vital to Jewish life, opposing both the traditionalism of Eastern European Jews and the snobbish indifference of Jews who had become more thoroughly acculturated into secular society. In 1885 he was a major influence at the Pittsburgh Rabbinical Conference, serving as principal author of that group's forthright manifesto which made Reform Judaism a distinctly separate movement in that religion. He collaborated in preparing the *Union Prayer Book* of 1892 which provided a uniform set of liturgies for Reform congregations. In 1903 he became President of Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, Ohio, holding that position until 1921. In retirement he returned to New York City and continued his passionate endeavors for humanitarian Jewish idealism. Kohler died on 28 January 1926 in New York City.

During his later years, Kohler contributed over 300 articles for the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, and he helped prepare the 1917 English translation of the Hebrew Bible. He always tried to understand the place of tradition and ritual in a world suffused with science and rational naturalism. His commitment to lasting social justice places him in the forefront of American religious leaders.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Backward or Forward (New York, 1885).
Guide for Instruction in Judaism (New York, 1899).
Grundriss einer Systematischen Theologie des Judenthums auf Geschichtliches Grundlage (Liepzig, 1910).
Hebrew Union College, and Other Addresses (Cincinnati, 1916).
Jewish Theology, Systematically and Historically Considered (New York, 1918).
Heaven and Hell in Comparative Religion, with Special Reference to Dante's Divine Comedy (New York, 1923).
The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church (New York, 1929).
Studies, Addresses and Personal Papers (New York, 1931).

Other Relevant Works

Kohler's papers are in the American Jewish Archives in Cincinnati, Ohio.
A Living Faith: Selected Sermons and Addresses from the Literary Remains of Dr. Kaufmann Kohler, ed. Samuel S. Cohon (Cincinnati, 1949).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encyc Cog Sci*, *Encyc Relig*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Ariel, Yaakov. "Kaufmann Kohler and His Attitude toward Zionism: A Reexamination," *American Jewish Archives* 43 (1991): 207–23.
Cohon, Samuel S. "Kaufmann Kohler the Reformer," in *Mordecai M. Kaplan: Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Moshe Davis (New York, 1953).
Philipson, David, et al., eds. *Studies in Jewish Literature, Issued in Honor of Professor Kaufmann Kohler* (Berlin, 1913).

Henry Warner Bowden

KÖHLER, Wolfgang (1887–1967)

Wolfgang Köhler was born of German parents on 21 January 1887 in Reval, Estonia, and died on 11 June 1967 at Enfield, Massachusetts. His

family moved to Germany when he was six. He studied philosophy, history, and natural science at the universities of Tübingen (1905–1906), Bonn (1906–1907), and Berlin (1907–1909), and wrote his PhD dissertation at Berlin in 1909 on psychoacoustics under the supervision of Carl Stumpf. He also attended lectures on physics by Walter H. Nernst and Max Planck.

Köhler's first academic position was as assistant to Friedrich Schumann at the Psychological Institute at Frankfurt. Shortly after he arrived at Frankfurt, Köhler was contacted by Max WERTHEIMER, for whom he procured research space in Schumann's laboratory. In Frankfurt Köhler was also joined by another of Stumpf's students from Berlin, Kurt KOFFKA, and it was at Frankfurt that the three psychologists – Köhler, Wertheimer, and Koffka – initiated the collaboration that became the "Gestalt movement."

In 1913 Köhler was appointed Director of the Anthropoid Station on Tenerife in the Canary Islands. There he carried out the famous experiments on problem solving by apes and other animals reported in *Intelligenzprüfungen an Menschenaffen* (1917, translated into English as *The Mentality of Apes*, 1924). Prevented from leaving Tenerife by the outbreak of World War I, Köhler only returned to Germany in 1920, when he was appointed acting director of the Psychological Institute at the University of Berlin. In 1921 he went to the University of Göttingen as professor of experimental psychology and philosophy, and Director of the Psychological Institute. In 1922 he accepted a regular appointment to the prestigious position of professor of psychology and Director of the Psychological Institute at Berlin, a position offered him in part because of the acclaim accorded his book *Die physischen Gestalten in Ruhe und im stationären Zustand* (1920). This work attempted to draw an analogy between physics and psychology by showing that there are objects in physical reality whose characteristics could be changed, under natural circumstances, in a holistic (Gestalt-like) fashion. For example, when one *part* of a block of conductive material is subjected to an electric current, the *whole* block can thereby be electrically charged.

Köhler's own research at Berlin was mainly focused on human memory (Murray 1995). In 1925–6 Köhler spent a year as visiting professor of psychology at Clark University. In 1934–5, he came again to the United States as William James Lecturer at Harvard and visiting professor at the University of Chicago. In 1935, the rise of Nazism forced him to emigrate to the United States, where he accepted a position as professor of psychology at Swarthmore College. He remained at Swarthmore until his retirement in 1958.

In 1938, Köhler's William James Lectures were published as *The Place of Value in a World of Facts*. This was Köhler's major philosophical work; although, in 1944, he also wrote a monograph with Hans Wallach entitled "Figural After-effects: An Investigation of Visual Processes" that incorporated ideas from the James Lectures, and he continued to develop these ideas in a number of articles to be found in hi*s Selected Papers* (1971). Upon retirement from Swarthmore, Köhler moved to Enfield, Massachusetts, but continued to give invited lectures at various universities. His final book, *The Task of Gestalt Psychology* (1969) continued to explore the ideas presented in *The Place of Value in a World of Facts*.

In order to summarize Köhler ideas, it is easiest to begin by imagining that one is standing outside the universe and seeing it as a whole. It displays continuity and the only way in which it can be described nontrivially is to segregate it into smaller units. But, *because* it is continuous, a decision has to be made concerning the criterion upon which the initial segregation is to be based. Let us assume that the initial segregation involves a distinction between matter and nonmatter. Because this distinction is the starting point for what follows, it will necessarily have to be maintained for the whole course of the argument; but in the last few pages of *The Place of Value in a World of Facts*, Köhler insisted – as P. W. BRIDGMAN had also done a decade earlier –

that, because a major problem for *any* science is to find the units into which continuous dimensions are to be segregated, the definition of "matter" is itself open to discussion.

Next, we have to assume that matter is not uniform, but needs to be segregated again. The classification of matter into two types, inanimate and animate, dated at least to Aristotle. But by Köhler's time, many scientists were trying to be logically precise about what it was that distinguished animate from inanimate matter in such a way that the distinction was worth maintaining. Vitalism, the notion that animate matter possessed a "life-force," had been proposed as an alternative to the materialist insistence on the reduction of animate to inanimate matter by a number of scientists in the generation just prior to Köhler's. In *The Place of Value in a World of Facts*, Köhler discusses the opposition between vitalism and materialism and argues against vitalism on the grounds that specification of the behavior of even inanimate matter requires principles beyond Newtonian mechanics, principles involving gravitational and electrical forces which, since Newton's time, had been found to be operative even at subatomic levels. The thrust of Köhler's argument against vitalism was that the laws of gravity and electricity that applied to inanimate matter (whether at a macroscopic or a microscopic level) also applied to animate matter. There was, therefore, no principled distinction to be drawn. On the other hand, the problem for science was that far more research was needed before the behavior of animate matter could be specified at the level of detail already associated with the behavior of inanimate matter.

According to Köhler, one of the reasons for believing that animate matter was subject to the same laws of physics as inanimate matter was that animate matter arrived at its present state by way of a long process of evolution. Köhler insisted, not only in *The Place of Value in a World of Facts*, but also in many talks and lectures delivered after 1938 (see Murray and Farahmand 1998), that evolution advances in such a way that it always obeys the laws of physics and chemistry. No new force appeared in the course of evolution.

At the same time, however, the evolution of animate tissue could display a feature that, while it also characterizes inanimate matter, had, in Köhler's view, often been overlooked. Any block of matter, inanimate or animate, can be subjected to forces of a gravitational or electrical kind; and these forces can operate in an unlimited way on that block of matter unless "constraints" inhibit or reduce the spread of these forces. Thus, for example, a strong pressure can be exerted from above onto the top surface of a block of elastic material (inanimate or animate); but the outcome of this exertion will depend on what is underneath the block. If the block is unsupported and the pressure is strong enough, the block will be pushed downwards indefinitely. If, however, the block is supported on another surface, the downward pressure, if it is strong enough, will cause internal stresses that mediate the deformation of the external surfaces of the block and squash it into a shape determined by the block's original dimensions, the elasticity of its material, and the algebraic sum of the downward and upward pressures.

With regard to animate matter, Köhler believed that evolution operated in such as way as to lead to anatomical structures or biochemical limitations of a kind that served both to facilitate the transmission of the influences of external forces and to limit the spread of the influence of these forces by providing anatomical or biochemical constraints that had themselves been subject to the influence of evolution. A block of brain tissue, for example, could be conceptualized as allowing mechanical and electrical forces to spread through it, but the spread would be constrained by anatomical, morphological, and biochemical features that had evolved over eons. Köhler insisted that the neuroscientists of his time were shortsighted in construing the spread of electric current in a block of brain tissue as limited to the linear propagation of currents down individual axons, currents that could in

turn be propagated to neighboring axons via synaptic mechanisms. He believed that a non-synaptic mode of propagation of electric currents could also occur in brain tissue. While there is indeed a growing modern literature on so-called "volume conduction" via chemical mediators in nonneural tissues (such as glial cells) and brain fluids (including blood and fluids surrounding axons), this is not what Köhler had in mind. He believed that electric current could be spread in the brain tissue as a result of the fact that the tissue itself could be conceptualized as a conducting medium furnished with the occasional surface that resisted the spread of the current. His best-known application of this view appeared in his monograph, with Wallach, on figural after-effects.

In *The Place of Value in a World of Facts*, Köhler also applied his theory of currents to the problem of memory storage in the brain. If a block of tissue carried a current of a given strength for a given time, the current itself would have two effects of particular relevance to memory theory. First, the current could cause the precipitation of chemical by-products induced by the current onto microhistological surfaces. Second, deposits of ions could be laid down on those surfaces that offered resistance to the conduction of the current. The end effect would be what Köhler called a "curious process of self-registration … if the current remains unaltered, the *same* picture is deposited continuously; as soon as the current changes its pattern, a correspondingly *new* design develops on the surface. Thus the current writes its own history." (1938, p. 240) Köhler provided a theory of memory traces that described how memory could be preserved in animate tissue following processes of electrical conduction also known to hold true for inanimate tissue.

In *The Place of Value in a World of Facts*, Köhler also focused on psychological issues. Philosophers, of course, had long been concerned with the question of how we attain a knowledge of physical reality via the senses. Experience that came through the senses Köhler called "phenomenal experience." He believed that it was the task of science to relate phenomenal experience to physical reality; and he insisted that, if we ignore misinterpretations due to illness or oddities of the environment such as mirages, phenomenal experience is usually a reliable basis for describing physical reality. This is because phenomenal experience bears a relationship to brain tissue activity that is very similar to the relationship between brain tissue activity (when it is processing sensory inputs) and physical reality. In three-dimensional physical reality, matter (both inanimate and animate) can be subdivided into the blocks we call objects. "Events" occur when these objects change location, color, shape, and so on against a relatively fixed background. In brain tissue, the corresponding activity is such as to match this subdivision, and the patterns of electrical currents can therefore be subdivided into those patterns reflecting objects and those reflecting backgrounds. Because phenomenal experience reflects brain activity, phenomenal experience is, in its turn, characterized by a subdivision of the perceived world into objects and backgrounds. The figure–ground organization characteristic of phenomenal experience, in other words, arises because phenomenal experience preserves (is "isomorphic" with) the broad pattern of corresponding brain activity; and that pattern itself is isomorphic with the particular subdivision of physical reality into objects and backgrounds that is normally described as "what we are seeing now."

The famous Gestalt demonstrations of figure–ground organization were undertaken by Wertheimer and Koffka, rather than by Köhler. Instead, Köhler focused on the consequences for memory theory of the above conceptual framework. He argued in particular that the range of phenomenal experiences is not restricted to those of perception in the here-and-now, but also to experiences in which we make use of memory retrieval. One type of memory experience on which he laid particular stress in *The Place of Value in a World of Facts* is the type in which a stimulus being per-

ceived elicits a feeling of familiarity without the perceiver's being able to specify exactly what it is of which the stimulus is reminiscent. A closely related memory experience is the type in which a stimulus (such as a picture of an acquaintance's face) is presented and elicits a feeling of familiarity (because we know the acquaintance) without also eliciting certain specific details of that acquaintance (for example, his or her name). To describe the existence of a "something" in phenomenal experience which cannot be named or described in detail, but is clearly "there" in the sense that those details need to be provided, Köhler adopted the term "transcendent." He employed the term in the sense of "that which is vague and illusive" rather than that of the Kantian a priori.

Moreover, when missing details (such as the name associated with the acquaintance's face) *are* provided, the person who has just had the phenomenal experience that had included the transcendent "something" knows that those details are correct. Hence, following phenomenal experiences that involve vague feelings of familiarity, a value of "rightness" or "wrongness" can be ascribed to subsequent phenomenal experiences in which that vagueness is resolved.

This notion leads to what is perhaps the central idea in *The Place of Value in a World of Facts*. For Köhler, the world of physical reality as described by physicists is one in which facts exist and events happen, but not one for which values of rightness or wrongness are relevant. On the other hand, in the world of phenomenal experience, values such as rightness or wrongness, goodness or badness, correctness or incorrectness, pleasantness or unpleasantness are *the* major determinants of the flow of events in our *thought*-lives, that is, the flow of successive phenomenal experiences. But by showing how phenomenal experience is determined via mediated events in brain tissue that themselves are isomorphic with physical reality and thereby reflect its laws, Köhler contended that the laws of physical reality could be seen as causal antecedents of phenomenal experiences that include values. He coined the term "requiredness" to refer to a characteristic of phenomenal experiences that involved predicative thinking (either in words or in images), namely that the propositions expressed in predicative thinking usually incorporate, or are closely associated with, human values. By showing that requiredness is a property of certain phenomenal experiences of a predicative kind, namely, those that contain a transcendent element (as in some memory experiences), Köhler implied that a logical link had been established between the laws of physical reality (that have no reference to requiredness) and the laws of phenomenal experiences of a predicative kind (that are characterized by requiredness).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Intelligenzprüfungen an Menschenaffen (Berlin, 1917; 2nd edn 1921). Trans. by Ella Winter as *The Mentality of Apes* (London, 1924).

Gestalt Psychology (New York, 1929).

Die physischen Gestalten in Ruhe und im stationären Zustand (Braunschweig, Germany, 1920).

The Place of Value in a World of Facts (New York, 1938).

Dynamics in Psychology (New York, 1940).

"Figural After-effects: An Investigation of Visual Processes," with Hans Wallach, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 88 (1944): 269–357.

The Task of Gestalt Psychology (Princeton, N.J., 1969).

Other Relevant Works

Köhler's papers are at the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia, the Archives of the History of American Psychology at the University of Akron, Ohio, and Harvard University.

The Selected Papers of Wolfgang Köhler, ed. Mary Henle (New York, 1971). Contains a bibliography of Köhler's writings.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v55*, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*

Ash, Mitchell G. *Gestalt Psychology in German Culture 1890–1967* (New York, 1995).

Boakes, Robert A. *From Darwin to Behaviourism: Psychology and the Minds of Animals* (Cambridge, UK, 1984).

Boudewijnse, Geert-Jan A. "The Rise and Fall of the Graz School," *Gestalt Theory* 21 (1999): 140–52.

Murray, David J. *Gestalt Psychology and the Cognitive Revolution* (New York, 1995).

Murray, David J., and Bahar Farahmand. "Gestalt Theory and Evolutionary Psychology," in *Psychology: Theoretical-Historical Perspectives*, 2nd edn, ed. R. W. Rieber and K. Salzinger (Washington, D.C., 1998), pp. 254–87.

Neisser, Ulric. "Wolfgang Köhler," in *National Academy of Sciences Biographical Memoirs*, vol. 81 (Washington, D.C., 2002), pp. 187–97.

Sherrill, R., Jr. "Natural Wholes: Wolfgang Köhler and Gestalt Theory," in *Portraits of Pioneers in Psychology*, vol. 1, ed. G. A. Kimble, M. Wertheimer, and C. White (Washington, D.C., 1991), pp. 257–73.

David J. Murray

KONVITZ, Milton Ridbaz (1908–2003)

Milton R. Konvitz was born on 12 March 1908 in Safad, Palestine, then a part of the Ottoman Empire (now located in Israel). The family had come to Safad from what is now Lithuania. His father, Rabbi Joseph Konvitz, came to the United States in 1914 to seek funds for the seminary (*yeshiva*) which Konvitz's maternal grandfather, Rabbi Jacob David Ridbaz, founded in Safad in 1905. The seven-year-old Konvitz, his mother and siblings followed their father to America a year later. But a deep personal bond to what would in 1948 become the State of Israel played an important yet complex role in Konvitz's later thought and writings. Konvitz was raised in Trenton, New Jersey, and attended New York University where he received a BS in 1928, an MA in philosophy in 1930, and also a JD in 1930. He passed the New Jersey bar examination in 1932, and then went to Cornell University to earn his PhD in philosophy in 1933. His dissertation committee was chaired by George H. SABINE, and an expanded version of the dissertation, *On the Nature of Value: The Philosophy of Samuel Alexander*, was published in 1946.

Konvitz returned to New Jersey to take a position in a law firm and, in 1935, to go into practice for himself. In 1938 he became General Counsel for the Newark Housing Authority and took part-time faculty positions at New York University, and at the New School for Social Research, teaching courses on the legal aspects of public housing, planning and conservation, judicial administration, legal method, and civil liberties. The latter course and that on public housing were among the first of their kind to be taught in this country.

In 1943, he served briefly as American Civil Liberties Union staff counsel at the request of Roger Baldwin, its founder. Almost at the same time, Thurgood Marshall, later to become the first African-American Supreme Court Justice, invited him to join the staff of the National Association of Colored People Legal Defense and Education Fund. During this period he published two more books: *The Alien and the Asiatic in American Law* (1946) and *The Constitution and Civil Rights* (1947). Furthermore, between 1943 and 1945 he published thirty-one articles. In addition, he was active in the New Jersey Urban League, the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, and the American Association of Jewish Education, and involved

with several Jewish journals. This intense burden made even greater his readiness to begin a long-desired academic career.

In 1946 Konvitz accepted the offer of a full-time position at Cornell University, to become one of four founding faculty members of Cornell's New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, with a joint appointment in Cornell's Law School. During his almost thirty years at Cornell, he also played a decisive role in the establishment of its Department of Near-Eastern Studies and the revival of a program of Jewish Studies. Retiring from Cornell in 1973, he and his wife, Mary Traub, moved back to Oakhurst, New Jersey, in 1992. Konvitz died on 5 September 2003 in Long Branch, New Jersey.

What soon came to distinguish Konvitz's teaching career at Cornell was a two-course sequence on "The Development of American Ideals," taught for over twenty years, always attended by hundreds of students. It linked Supreme Court decisions to underlying constitutional principles, and to the more basic ethical principles which he had found from his youth onward in literature, the Bible, Greek and Roman writers, the major philosophers, and the great figures of literature. Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg has acknowledged the importance his teaching had on her own thinking.

Konvitz was awarded fellowships by the National Endowment of the Humanities, the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton, the Guggenheim Foundation, and others. He served on numerous editorial boards of journals in Jewish studies and of more general interest to American Jewry, as well as in the field of labor relations and labor law (he was a founding editor of the *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*), philosophy, and African studies.

Konvitz received a number of honorary degrees from universities in the US, Israel, and Liberia. He was a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and was given special awards and prizes from New York University, Yeshiva University, and Hebrew University in Israel. He was honored by Liberia by being made Commander, and given the Grand Band of the Order of Star of Africa. These were in recognition of his direction, for almost thirty years, of the multi-volume Liberian Codification Project: the editing of the code of laws of the Republic of Liberia as well as editing the opinions of that country's Attorney General, and of the opinions of Liberia's Supreme Court from 1955 to 1980.

Konvitz was a most prolific writer who wove into his academic writings material from beyond the formal, academic boundaries of his disciplines: the legal aspects of labor-management relations, but above all constitutional law, civil rights, and liberties, and their bases in the two-century history of the origin and interpretation of the Declaration of Independence, the American Constitution, and especially the Bill of Rights. When writing in these various fields, he typically included quotations from great philosophers, literary figures, the Old and the New Testament, and those who had commented on them through the centuries. The great figures in these fields provided the framework for his commentaries on statutes and judicial decisions involving basic human and civil rights and fundamental liberties.

Konvitz's profound knowledge of, and his many written contributions to the field of Judaism are appropriately considered a part of his academic career. His family's religious background led to his being schooled early in Jewish writings. These included the demanding basic theological treatises such as the *Talmud* – a compilation of Jewish Oral Law up to the first centuries of the Current Era – and extensive discussions, debates and elaborations of these laws in the *Mishna*.

The drive to express himself through the written word, and his early concern with literature, philosophy, and religion had the result that, unlike the works of most academics, Konvitz's first publications predated by many years the award of his doctorate in 1933. His two earliest articles dealt respectively with the

British poet Robert Bridges, and Robert Frost and Edward Arlington Robinson. What he deemed particularly relevant in the work of the poets was their concern with ethics and the personal. Also still before he obtained his doctorate, his writings began to deal with philosophical issues. In the cases of Maimonides, Spinoza, and Marx, he was interested specifically in the extent to which Judaism influenced their thought.

Congruent with his work for the New Jersey Housing Authority and the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, many of his early writings focused more concretely on the legal aspects of civil rights and liberties, the best known being *The Constitution and Civil Rights*. In this and two early books dealing with aliens and immigration, his fundamental positions could already be discerned in his critical comments on decisions and opinions in these fields of Supreme Court justices or other judges who are seen to discriminate, to curtail, or to support executive or congressional curtailment of the "basic freedoms" of non-citizens in the US. His fundamental belief was that foreigners, like Americans, are first and foremost human beings with inalienable rights. Hence, no branch of this or any government may deny them these fundamental rights and liberties simply because they were of foreign nationality or origin, without evidence that denial is necessary because of "clear and present danger," which should be the only applicable criterion.

The roots of Konvitz's ideas about fundamental rights and of equality ultimately go back, on the one hand, to his position on the definition of religion – the individual's religious beliefs and acts claimed to be based on these beliefs – and even a step deeper: to his position on the place of "conscience." In *Religious Liberty and Conscience* (1978) he argued that the three arms of government must stay as much as possible even out of defining religion and conscience in order to avoid specifying what beliefs and acts individuals will not be permitted to claim as based on religion. In practice, this may not be completely possible,

but as a minimum, secular actors should not define them narrowly. The individual should be given "breathing space," citing Justice Brennan's phrase approvingly, even if breadth and "breathing space" lead, as they will, to occasional abuse. Accordingly, his own boundaries of these concepts are broad and highly ecumenical, including even atheism as a (religious) belief that warrants protection and respect.

Konvitz's most basic concept – from which all else flows, including his conceptualization of religion – is the idea of "conscience." "Since every man is made in the image of God, every man has dignity … and a conscience that purports to him, rightly or wrongly, to be the voice of God. This, at least, is how the believer reads the facts. Everyone, therefore, believer or non-believer, has a conscience that has the power to impose on him duties 'superior to those arising from any human relation.' He owes supreme allegiance to the command of his conscience. It is not, therefore, a question of 'religion' or 'religious belief' or relation to any Supreme Being or God." (1978, p. 45)

The relationship between Judaism and American ideals stimulated his writings throughout his life but assumed special prominence after his retirement. As with other fundamental topics about which he wrote, he saw more congruencies than differences in the ideals which lay at their bases, and what differences there were could result in enrichment rather than conflict. "There are many who fear hyphenation separates people and cultures; they fail to see that the hyphen can serve as a coupling." (Jewish-American being the example in this instance.) "Multiple loyalties can be multiple enrichments. A single loyalty can be a form of crippling monomania," he writes in *Torah and Constitution* (1998). "I see myself indissolubly as both an American and as a Jew. I could not for the life of me say where one ends and the other begins" (Danelski 1983, p. 65).

In the area of the relation between Christian and Jewish theological theses, Konvitz deals

explicitly with the issue of Jews as God's "chosen people." This assertion had made him uncomfortable throughout his life, when he began to admire the contributions to ethics by philosophers and theologians. Why should God not consider their contributions as coming from a "chosen people"; why would he choose at all? Konvitz's solution is to argue that the fact that one people is chosen simply does not logically exclude others from being chosen too, and that all humanity is "chosen" in the sense of having been created by God from Adam.

There is an interdependent set of propositions which serve as a common thread linking Konvitz's ideas to each other: everything is complex and is always changing in a way that the past is never gone. Consequently, there is always a fruitful tension, to be faced not only with strength, but with a cautious degree of optimism about its resolution in the future. Konvitz's degree of optimism varies with the time in which, and the topic about which he writes. The past must never be regarded as dead, but as inherent in the present and in the emerging future. This applies to ideas, to ideals, and to reality, both at the societal level and at that of individual. For the individual – especially if Jewish – there is the sense of having the complexity of being multiple "persons." There is the ideal self, the perceived real self, the self as perceived by others, the self presented to other persons with whom one is intimate, the self presented – in the case of Jews – to fellow Jews in general, and to non-Jews, all described in *Torah and Constitution.*

On the obligation of Jews to follow ritual law, Konvitz holds that such duty must be voluntary, as part of the individual's interpretation of what God has commanded, and of the individual's interpretation of the kind of Supreme Being, if any, which for that person exists. This theme is heard in *Nine American Jewish Thinkers* (2000), in which several of his subjects reject ritual and are agnostics if not atheists, nor necessarily Zionists. Yet the two topics, Israel and ritual, may be linked here because he was deeply concerned about the confrontation in Israel between traditionalists and secularists. Citing William JAMES among others, he urges recognition that each side has only part of the truth, and that both should exercise tolerance lest disaster befall.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Alien and the Asiatic in American Law (Ithaca, N.Y., 1946).

On the Nature of Value: The Philosophy of Samuel Alexander (New York, 1946).

The Constitution and Civil Rights (New York, 1947).

Civil Rights in Immigration (Ithaca, N.Y., 1953).

Fundamental Liberties of a Free People: Religion, Speech, Press, Assembly (Ithaca, N.Y., 1957).

A Century of Civil Rights, with Theodore Leskes (New York, 1961).

Expanding Liberties: Freedom's Gains in Post-war America (New York, 1966).

Religious Liberty and Conscience: A Constitutional Inquiry (New York, 1978).

Judaism and the American Idea (Ithaca, N.Y., 1978).

Torah and Constitution (Syracuse, N.Y., 1998).

Nine American Jewish Thinkers (New Brunswick, N.J., 2000).

Fundamental Rights: History of a Constitutional Doctrine (New Brunswick, N.J., 2001).

Other Relevant Works

Konvitz's papers are at Cornell University.

"Morris Raphael Cohen," *Antioch Review* 7 (1947): 487–501.

Ed. with Arthur E. Murphy, *Essays in Political Theory: Presented to George H. Sabine* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1948).

Ed., *Bill of Rights Reader: Leading Constitutional Cases* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1954; 5th edn 1973).

Ed. with Gail Kennedy, *The American Pragmatists: Selected Writings* (New York, 1960).

Ed., *First Amendment Freedoms: Selected Cases on Freedom of Religion, Speech, Press, Assembly* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1963).

Ed., *Judaism and Human Rights* (New York, 1972).

"Sidney Hook: Philosopher of the Moral-Critical Intelligence," in *Sidney Hook: Philosopher of Democracy and Humanism*, ed. Paul W. Kurtz (Buffalo, N.Y., 1980), pp. 3–16.

Ed., *The Legacy of Horace M. Kallen* (Cranbury, N.J., 1987).

Further Reading
Who's Who in Phil
Danelski, David J. *Rights, Liberties and Ideals: The Contributions of Milton Konvitz* (Littleton, Col., 1983). Contains a bibliography of Konvitz's writings.

Henry A. Landsberger

KORZYBSKI, Alfred Vladislavovich Habdank Skarbek (1879–1950)

Alfred Korzybski, a Polish count and scion of a wealthy family, was born on 3 July 1879 in Warsaw, Poland. He studied chemical engineering at the Polytechnic Institute in Warsaw. While serving with the Russian army in World War I, he was sent in December 1915 to Canada and the United States to oversee the purchase and shipment of munitions for the Russian army. Following the outbreak of the Russian Revolution and civil war in 1917, he remained in the United States and lived in Washington, D.C. and New York City. With a handful of colleagues Korzybski founded the Institute of General Semantics in Chicago in 1938. In 1946 he moved the Institute to Lakeville, Connecticut. The International Society for General Semantics was established in 1942 by some of Korzybski's students, including S. I. Hayakawa, Irving J. Lee,

and Wendell Johnson. In 1943 the journal *ETC: A Review of General Semantics* began publication. Korzybski lectured at Yale University and many other universities, but held no permanent academic post. He died on 1 March 1950 in Sharon, Connecticut.

With encouragement and editorial assistance from Columbia University mathematician Cassius J. KEYSER, Korzybski published *Manhood of Humanity: The Science and Art of Human Engineering* in 1921. In this work, he argued that the physiological development of mankind was required in order to overcome the conflicts that led to war. Korzybski's most important work was in semantics and semiotics. He sought to create a "General Semantics" which would be applicable to all modes of communication. Korzybski tried to develop a formal semantics for a "non-Aristotelian logic" based upon non-verbal, especially visual, expression, a kind of iconic calculus or hieroglyphic language. Keyser later developed some of Korzybski's semiotic notions along mathematical lines. Korzybski's experience of the periodic carnage of war convinced him that an alternative to verbal thinking was the solution to the problems of human existence.

In *Science and Sanity: An Introduction to Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics* (1933) Korzybski argued for the development of a visual semantic that could apply equally to science, philosophy, mathematics, psychology, and physiology, and thus devised a formal, non-Aristotelian logic as an iconic calculus. In that same work, he sought to promote sanity by removing semantic confusions. For that purpose, a principle of non-identity was established; for example, $cow_1 \neq cow_2$. Korzybski went so far as to argue that $1 \neq 1$, because the expression of the identity $1 = 1$ requires two distinct inscriptions of the numeral '1'.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Manhood of Humanity: The Science and Art of Human Engineering (New York, 1921; Lakeville, Conn., 1950).

Science and Sanity: An Introduction to Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics (Lancaster, Penn., 1933; 3rd edn, Lakeville, Conn., 1948; 4th edn 1958).

Time-binding, The General Theory: Two Papers, 1924–1926 (Lakeville, Conn., 1949).

Other Relevant Works

Korzybski's papers are at the Institute for General Semantics in Fort Worth, Texas.

A Memorandum (Chicago, 1940).

General Semantics Seminar 1937: Transcription of Notes from Lectures on General Semantics Given at Olivet College, ed. Edward L. Gates (Lakeville, Conn., 1964; 3rd edn, Brooklyn, N.Y., 2002).

Collected Writings, 1920–1950, ed. Charlotte Read (Englewood, N.J., 1990).

Further Reading

Who Was Who in Amer v2, Who's Who in Phil

Bois, Joseph S. *Breeds of Men: A Post-Korzybskian General Semantics* (Los Angeles, 1969).

———, *Breeds of Men: Toward Adulthood of Mankind* (New York, 1970).

———, *Art of Awareness: A Handbook on Epistemics and General Semantics*, 4th edn (Santa Monica, Cal., 1996).

Bulla de Villaret, Hélène. *Une nouvelle orientation dans la conduite de la vie: Introduction à la sémantique générale de Korzybski* (Paris, 1965; 1973).

ETC: A Review of General Semantics (Fort Worth, Tex., 1943–).

Falconer, Ted. *Creative Intelligence and Self-Liberation: Korzybski, Non-Aristotelian Thinking and Eastern Realization* (Williston, Vt., 2004).

Forsberg, Geraldine E. *Critical Thinking in an Image World: Alfred Korzybski's Theoretical Principles Extended to Critical Television Evaluation* (Lanham,

Md., 1993).

Paulson, Ross E. *Language, Science, and Action: Korzybski's General Semantics, a Study in Comparative Intellectual History* (Westport, Conn., 1983).

Irving H. Anellis

KOYRÉ, Alexandre (1892–1964)

Alexandre Koyré was born on 29 August 1892 in Taganrog, Russia. He was educated in Tiflis and Rostov-na-Don, at the University of Göttingen, where between 1908 and 1911 he studied mathematics with David Hilbert and phenomenology with Edmund Husserl, and at the University of Paris, Sorbonne from 1911 to 1914, studying philosophy with Henri Bergson and philosophy of mathematics with Léon Brunschvicq. After further study and some publications he received his PhD in philosophy in 1923 and the Docteur ès Lettres in 1929 from the University of Paris. Koyré began lecturing at the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes of the University of Paris in 1922, and was named Director of Studies in 1930, holding that position until his death.

During World War II, Koyré lived in New York City, helping to establish a university-in-exile, the Ecole Libre des Hautes Etudes, as well as teaching at the New School for Social Research. After World War II, he was a frequent visitor to the United States, spending half a year at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, New Jersey each year from 1955 to 1962 and also teaching as a visiting professor at Harvard, Yale, Johns Hopkins, the University of Chicago, and the University of Wisconsin. Koyré was general secretary and Vice President of the Institut International de Philosophie, a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, a recipient of the George Sarton Medal of the History of

Science Society, and of the Silver Medal of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. Koyré died on 28 April 1964 in Paris, France.

Interested in history of ideas and spiritual thought, he studied the religious thought of the mystics, especially Jacob Boehm, as well as the history of Russian philosophy and Plato, and produced French translations of the works of St. Anselm, Copernicus, Spinoza, and others. Early in his career, he was the author of a study of Bertrand Russell's treatment of cardinal numbers (1912) and wrote a major work on the Liar Paradox, *Epiménide le menteur* (1947). In his reply to Koyré's treatment of his work on cardinal numbers, Russell reminded readers that the center of the philosophical debate in the pages of the *Revue de métaphysique et de morale*, in which Russell, Louis Couturat, and Henri Poincaré were the major disputants, is the "logical definition of number" given in Russell and A. N. WHITEHEAD's *Principia Mathematica*.

Koyré's most sustained interests were in history and philosophy of science, especially their intersection. Galileo was for him the one who broke with Aristotelianism in all aspects, but most especially and importantly in astronomy and physics. The movement to the modern conception of the universe culminated with Newton. In *From the Closed World to the Infinite Universe* (1957) Koyré examined the slow development of Renaissance science as it took a modern, observational, experimentalist form, rejecting Aristotelian speculation. More importantly, the Copernican Revolution which rejected geocentricism in favor of heliocentricism, on the basis in part of the mathematical elegance of the descriptions supporting the heliocentric theory, in comparison with the geocentric theory that required complicated mathematical descriptions with increasing numbers of epicycles to account for the perturbation of the Martian orbit, marked for Koyré a new view of the universe, as openended and infinite, rather than as closed, fixed, and finite. Studies of Descartes allowed Koyré to trace the philosophical implications of this new view, and to elaborate a philosophy of modernity. The calculus, designed to permit mathematicians and scientists to accommodate to a universe of motion rather than a static universe in a way that geometry could not, and to deal with both infinitesimal and infinite magnitudes in their calculations, was one of the consequences of the new world view. For Koyré, *From the Closed World to the Infinite Universe* was a study of the radical changes in the patterns and framework of thought, one might say, borrowing Kuhn's terminology, of the paradigm shift from the Aristotelian to the Copernican universe, and a change as well of the accompanying underlying philosophical attitudes, based upon observation and experimentation, rather than upon authority.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Sur les nombres de M. Russell," *Revue de métaphysique et de morale* 20 (1912): 722–4.

Essai sur l'idée de Dieu et les preuves de son existence chez Descartes (Paris, 1922).

Descartes und die Scholastik (Bonn, 1923).

La Philosophie de Jacob Boehme (Paris, 1929).

La Philosophie et le problème national en Russie au début du XIXe siècle (Paris, 1929).

Trois leçons sur Descartes (La Caire, France, 1938).

Etudes galiléennes (Paris, 1939). Trans. John Mepham, *Galileo Studies* (Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1978).

Entretiens sur Descartes (New York and Paris, 1944)

Introduction à la lecture de Platon (New York, 1945). Trans. Leonora Rosenfield, *Discovering Plato* (New York, 1945).

Epiménide le menteur (Ensemble et catégorie) (Paris, 1947).

Mystiques, spirituels, alchimistes (Schwenckfeld, Sébastian Franck, Weigel, Paracelse) (Paris, 1955). Reprinted as

Mystiques, spirituels, alchimistes du XVIe siècle allemand (Paris, 1971).

From the Closed World to the Infinite Universe (Baltimore, Md., 1957).

La révolution astronomique (Copernic, Kepler, Borelli) (Paris, 1961). Trans. R. E. W. Maddison, *The Astronomical Revolution: Copernicus, Kepler, Borelli* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1973).

Mélanges Alexandre Koyré, publiés à l'occasion de son soixante-dixiéme anniversaire, 2 vols (Paris, 1964).

Newtonian Studies (Cambridge, Mass., 1965). Trans., *Etudes newtoniennes* (Paris, 1968).

Etudes d'histoire de la pensée scientifique (Paris, 1966; 2nd edn 1973).

Metaphysics and Measurement: Essays in Scientific Revolution (Cambridge, Mass., 1968).

Etudes d'histoire de la pensée philosophique (Paris, 1971).

Further Reading

Proc of APA v38, Who Was Who in Amer v5

Goswig Oleson, Søren. *Wissen und Phänomen: eine Untersuchung der ontologischen Klärung der Wissenschaften bei Edmund Husserl, Alexandre Koyré und Gaston Bachelard* (Würzburg, Germany, 1997).

Jorland, Gérard. *La Science dans la philosophie: les recherches épistémologiques d'Alexandre Koyré* (Paris, 1981).

Stoffel, Jean-François. *Bibiliographie d'Alexandre Koyré* (Florence, Italy, 2000).

Stump, James. B. "History of Science through Koyré's Lenses," *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* Part A 32 (2001): 243–63.

Irving H. Anellis

KRECH, David (1909–77)

Yitzhok-Eizik (Isadore) Krechevsky, who changed his name to David Krech in 1944, was born on 27 March 1909 in a small town near the border of Lithuania and Belarus. Krech died on 14 July 1977 in Berkeley, California. In 1913, his family emigrated to the United States and settled in New Britain, Connecticut. He received his BA in 1930 and MA in 1931 from New York University. Krech carried out doctoral research at the University of California at Berkeley with Edward TOLMAN on "hypotheses" in rats. His results, which provided support for Tolman's purposive behaviorism, showed that in solving discrimination problems rats tried out successive specific response strategies (hypotheses) until they achieved the correct solution. This marked the beginning of the continuity–discontinuity controversy in learning. After completing his PhD in psychology in 1933, Krech was awarded a National Research Council Fellowship that allowed him to spend the following year at the University of Chicago learning about neurophysiology from Karl Lashley.

The great depression of the 1930s had serious consequences for Krech. Unable to obtain an academic position, he was forced to remain at Chicago as a research assistant during 1935–7. Concerned with demoralizing social, as well as academic, conditions, he joined the radical organization New America and soon acquired a reputation as a social activist. This led to the termination of his appointment in 1937. Krech spent the next year as a research associate at Swarthmore College where he received an introduction to Gestalt psychology from Wolfgang KÖHLER. In 1938, he was offered his first real academic position as an assistant professor of psychology at the University of Colorado. However, his reputation as a radical preceded him and when he arrived in Boulder the position had been reduced to that of instructor. Things did not improve, and the next year, completely disillusioned, he left psychology to work full-time for New America.

In 1941, Krech began contributing to the war effort, first in the Division of Program Surveys and, after his induction into the army, at the Office of Strategic Services (now the CIA), assessing recruits who wanted to become spies. In these posts he developed a strong respect for social and personality psychology, and after the war, now an assistant professor at Swarthmore, he became a social psychologist. Krech's major contribution in this area was a textbook, *Theory and Problems of Social Psychology* (1948), written in collaboration with Richard Crutchfield. Krech had long been concerned with the role that psychologists could play in helping to improve society, and in the mid 1930s was a leader in establishing the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI). The textbook emphasized the application of the principles of learning and motivation to important social problems, such as international conflict and racial prejudice, which were also the concern of SPSSI.

Edward Tolman created an opening for Krech in the Berkeley psychology department in 1947, and he taught there until 1972. At Berkeley he returned to animal research, now interested in examining the relationship between brain and behavior. The most widely reported work from this phase of his career involved the comparison of the brains of rats raised in enriched or impoverished environments. The data revealed both chemical and structural differences, indicating that early environmental experience plays an important role in brain development.

A brilliant and innovative researcher, Krech has been characterized as a true generalist. He made important contributions to the fields of learning, perception, physiological, and social psychology. He also helped psychologists to recognize their duty to use the discipline for the good of society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"'Hypotheses' in Rats," *Psychological Review* 6 (1932): 516–32.

Theory and Problems of Social Psychology, with R. S. Crutchfield (New York, 1948).

Rev. edn, *Individual in Society: A Textbook of Social Psychology* (New York, 1962).

"Enzyme Concentrations in the Brain and Adjustive Behavior-Patterns," *Science* 120 (1954): 994–6.

Elements of Psychology, with Richard S. Crutchfield (New York, 1958; 2nd edn 1969).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with Jerome S. Bruner, *Perception and Personality: A Symposium* (Durham, N.C., 1950).

Ed. with George S. Klein, *Theoretical Models and Personality Theory* (Durham, N.C., 1952).

"David Krech," in *A History of Psychology in Autobiography*, vol. 6, ed. G. Lindzey (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1974), pp. 219–50.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Encyc Psych*, *Who Was Who in Amer v7*

"Bibliography of David Krech," *American Psychologist* 26 (1971): 82–6.

Innis, Nancy K. "David Krech: Scientist and Social Activist," in *Portraits of Pioneers in Psychology*, vol. 3, ed. G. A. Kimble and M. Wertheimer (Washington, D.C., 1998), pp. 294–306.

Petrinovich, Lewis, and James L. McGaugh, eds. *Knowing, Thinking, and Believing: Festschrift for Professor David Krech* (New York, 1976).

Nancy K. Innis

KREISEL, Georg (1923–)

Georg Kreisel was born on 15 September 1923 in Graz, Austria. His Jewish parents sent him to England before Germany's invasion. He studied mathematics at Trinity College,

Cambridge, where he received his BA in 1944, and became acquainted with Ludwig Wittgenstein. He served as an Experimental Officer for the British Admiralty during World War II from 1943 to 1946. Returning to Cambridge, he received his MA in mathematics in 1947. He later received a DSc degree in mathematics from Cambridge in 1962. Kreisel held mathematics positions at Cambridge from 1946 to 1948; the University of Reading from 1949 to 1954 and in 1957–8 and 1959–60; Princeton University from 1955 to 1957 and 1963–4; the University of Paris from 1960 to 1962; the University of California at Los Angeles in 1968; and Stanford University in 1958–9. From 1962 until retiring in 1985, Kreisel held a permanent position as professor of logic and foundations of mathematics at Stanford University. In retirement he returned to Austria, where he is associated with the Institut für Wissenschaftstheorie of the International Forschungszentrum in Salzburg. In 1966 he was elected fellow of the Royal Society of London.

Kreisel was a friend of Kurt GÖDEL, of Ludwig Wittgenstein, of W. V. QUINE, who heard a new mathematical result from Kreisel daily during tea at Princeton (Quine 1985, p. 268), and of Jean VAN HEIJENOORT, on whom he had a deep influence. On his side, Kreisel admitted a deep appreciation for van Heijenoort as well.

Kreisel worked on the λ-calculus of recursion theory, in which he showed that the class of Herbrand recursive functions, defined as total functions which are uniquely determined by a set of recursive equations, are identical to the class of hyperarithmetical functions. He also worked on recursive analysis and non-standard analysis, and on Church's Thesis, which he devised as a kind of reducibility axiom for constructive mathematics. Comparing its role to the role of dogmas and doctrines of the church, he contributed to model theory. He wrote the textbook *Elements of Mathematical Logic* with Jean-Louis Krivine. Kreisel also worked in proof theory

and its development intuitionistic logic and constructive mathematics, and in history and philosophy of logic, especially concerning Wittgenstein, Bertrand Russell, Gottlob Frege, and Kurt Gödel. He took a special interest in the Hilbert program, the work that derived from it, and explained the connection between the Hilbert program and David Hilbert's second problem on the question of the consistency of the axioms of arithmetic.

Subdividing proofs into constructive and nonconstructive ("indirect") proofs in the case of the existential theorems $\exists x F$, Kreisel argued in "Mathematical Significance of Consistency Proofs" (1958) that Hilbert's program for proving the consistency of arithmetic is defective, and he offered as a remedy which avoids this defect a program in which are checked the "*constructive (recursive) content or the constructive equivalent of the non-constructive concepts and theorems used in mathematic*s, particularly arithmetic and analysis" (p. 155). The method he devised is called the "unwinding of proofs" based on constructive existence proofs and employing such techniques as normalization and cut-elimination.

In "La prédicativité" (1960) Kreisel provided a technical discussion of the problem of whether a formalized axiom system can say anything about itself. It also contained Kreisel's detailed technical treatment of the problem of predicativity arising from self-reference as presented by the Russell Paradox.

With Stephen G. Simpson and Grigori Mints, Kreisel undertook metamathematical investigations of abstract language, arguing that "elementary metamathematics benefits from the use of abstract language" (1975, p. 39). This was their main thesis, which they illustrated by considering completeness and cut-elimination theorems. By "abstract language," they meant, for example, "the language of set theory or the many-sorted languages of higher type, in contrast to the 'concrete' languages of arithmetic or concatenation theory" (1975, p. 38). The language which they chose is the language of *Principia*

Mathematica; and in order to study the meta-mathematical problems of completeness and cut-elimination, they assumed a set-theoretic semantic interpretation for their *Principia* syntax. For their proof-theoretic mechanism, they adopted truth trees. In the context of their discussion of the completeness of an abstract linguistic model of a system $\mathfrak{R}$ of rules of derivation, they defined the proposition *A is valid* in terms of the class λ of sets considered, the kind r of valuations, and the subclass L' of formula on which the valuations are given, as *A is true in all valuations,* val $_\rho$ (λ, L', A), *depending on* λ, L', *and* ρ. They extended their results to infinitary logic L_ω, based upon the concept of *well-founded trees*, that is, trees in which each node is at a finite level and the formula at each node has been legitimately obtained by correct use of the derivation rules $\mathfrak{R}$. The extension of the completeness theorem for L_ω is defined as *A has a λ-founded $\mathfrak{R}$-tree iff* val $_\rho$ (λ, L', A), provided only λ is closed under some primitive recursive operations. The trees of L_ω in this model are universal search trees, or universal refutation trees. Kreisel and his co-authors show how to extend their results on completeness to L_ω model-theoretically, exploring the role of König's lemma on infinitary trees (i.e., trees with infinitely many branches, each of finite length), and consider the question of completeness for derivation rules (tree decomposition rules) both with and without cut. Finally, they apply their results to fragments of second-order arithmetic.

Kreisel and his co-authors raised the question of the relation between logic and mathematics. They repudiated the Hilbert program of eliminating abstract language from mathematics and substituting metamathematics in favor of their own stated goal of applying abstract language even to metamathematics. They illustrated this in a discussion of proof trees as tools for investigation of completeness and cut-elimination theorems, as well as in the example of application of their method to fragments of elementary mathematics,

Kreisel also worked on semantic tableaux for intuitionistic logic, showing the completeness of Beth's semantic tableaux for intuitionistic predicate logic. Evert Willem Beth claimed to have proved the completeness of semantic tableaux in various of his papers, although Stephen KLEENE and Kreisel in print, and Jaakko HINTIKKA, Kreisel, and Jean van Heijenoort in private communications, pointed out an error in Beth's proof of the completeness of intuitionistic first-order tableaux. Beth's "Completeness Results for Formal Systems" easily proved the completeness for first-order classical tableaux but simply brushed aside the objections of Kleene and Kreisel. The difficulty arose as a result of Beth's substitution of the precise model-theoretic concept of *decidability* of classical logic, which he replaced with the poorly defined concept of *security* in intuitionistic logic.

In "Elementary Completeness Properties of Intuitionistic Logic with a Note on Negations of Prenex Formulas," Kreisel proved that the negation of a prenex formula is provable intuitionistically if and only if it is provable in the classical predicate calculus; he also proved there that there exists a Herbrand type theorem for negations of prenex formulae of the predicate calculus.

Kreisel always took a philosophical approach to logic, not avoiding the technicalities of the mathematics, but seeking the broader meaning of the problems on which he worked. He often left his work incomplete, leaving ample work for others to fill in the details. His most important work on the technical and mathematical aspects of logic were in proof theory, especially on functionals in proof theory, recursive ordinals and ordinal notations, the complexity of proofs, first-order arithmetic and fragments, second-order and higher-order arithmetic and fragments, and relative consistency and interpretation. His interests in constructive mathematics focused on the metamathematics of constructive systems and intuitionistic mathematics, constructive mathematics, and on constructive

and recursive analysis. In model theory, his focus was on effective and recursion-theoretic model theory.

Regarding set theory, Kreisel (1976, p. 99) argued that, contrary to what he called a "popular misunderstanding," formalization did not help in avoiding paradoxes but rather it helped derive or expose them. But he also suggested that not even formalization was required for obtaining the paradoxes, since Georg Cantor, in his review of Frege's *Grundlagen der Arithmetik*, was critical of Frege's definition of *number* as the *extension of a concept* and had clearly shown that Frege's formulation would not hold for the Cantorian conception of *set*.

In philosophy of mathematics, Kreisel was a critic of foundational philosophies of mathematics, arguing in "Mathematical Logic: What Has It Done for the Philosophy of Mathematics?" (1967) that the Hilbert program has failed to live up to the demands which were placed upon it, but that a recursion-theoretic approach, such as was devised by "unwinding of proofs," provided the strongest proof-theoretical results for which one could hope. At the same time, he was equivocal concerning the character of mathematical logic, considering it on the one hand as the logic of mathematics, insofar as methods such as proof unwinding provided the best approximation to decidability that Hilbert's program had promised, and which he himself contributed in providing unwindings of proofs of a number of theorems of analysis and arithmetic, and, on the other hand as a branch of mathematics, insofar as model theory was a part of set theory. He also explored the relationship between Gottlob Frege's logicist foundations of mathematics and intuitionistic logic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Some Uses of Metamathematics," *British Journal for Philosophy of Science* 7 (1956): 161–73.

"Elementary Completeness Properties of Intuitionistic Logic with a Note on Negations of Prenex Formulas," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 23 (1958): 317–30.

"Mathematical Significance of Consistency Proofs," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 23 (1958): 155–82.

"Wittgensterin's Remarks on the Foundations of Mathematics," *British Journal for Philosophy of Science* 9 (1958): 135–58.

"The Cantor–Bendixson Theorem in Hyperarithmetic Analysis," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 23 (1958): 460–61.

"Hilbert's Programme," in *Logica: Studia Paul Bernays dedicata* (Neuchâtel-Switzerland, 1959), pp. 142–67. Revised version in *Philosophy of Mathematics: Selected Readings*, 2nd edn, ed. Paul Benacerraf and Hilary Putnam (Cambridge, UK, 1983), pp. 207–38.

"La prédicativité," *Bulletin de la Société mathématique de France* 88 (1960): 371–91.

"Ordinal Logics and the Characterization of Informal Concepts of Proof," in *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, 14–21 August 1958, Edinburgh*, ed. J. A. Todd (Cambridge, UK, 1960), pp. 289–99.

"Number-theoretic Concepts and Recursive Well-orderings," with Joseph Schoenfield and Hao Wang, *Archives of Mathematical Logic* 5 (1960): 42–64.

"On the Weak Completeness of Intuitionistic Predicate Logic," *Stanford Technical Report* 3 (January 1961): 1–38.

"Mathematical Logic," in *Lectures on Modern Mathematics*, ed. T. L. Saaty (New York and London, 1965), vol. 3, pp. 95–195.

"Model-theoretic Invariants: Applications to Recursive and Hyperarithmetical Operations," in *The Theory of Models*, ed. J. W. Addison et al. (Amsterdam, 1965), pp. 190–205.

Elements of Mathematical Logic (Model Theory), with Jean-Louis Krivine

(Amsterdam, 1967; 1971).

"Mathematical Logic: What Has It Done for the Philosophy of Mathematics?" in *Bertrand Russell, Philosopher of the Century*, ed. Robert Shoenman (London, 1967), pp. 201–72.

"Hilbert's Programme and the Search for Automatic Proof Procedures," in *Symposium on Automatic Demonstration, Versailles 1968* (Berlin, 1968), pp. 128–46.

"Two Notes on the Foundations of Set Theory," *Dialectica* 23 (1969): 93–114.

"Church's Thesis: A Kind of Reducibility Axiom for Constructive Mathematics," *Intuitionism and Proof Theory*, ed. Akiko Kino, John Myhill, and Richard Vesley (Amsterdam, 1970), pp. 121–50.

"Formal Systems for Some Branches of Intuitionistic Analysis," with Anne Sjerp Troelstra, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 1 (1970): 229–387.

"What Have We Learnt from Hilbert's Second Problem," in *Mathematical Developments Arising from Hilbert's Problems*, ed. F. E. Browder (Providence, R.I., 1976), part 1, pp. 93–130.

"On the Kind of Data Needed for a Theory of Proofs," in *Logic Colloquium '76*, ed. R. O. Gandy and J. M. Hyland (Amsterdam, 1977), pp. 111–28.

"Some Facts from the Theory of Proofs and Some Fictions from the General Proof Theory," in *Proceedings of the Fourth Scandinavian Logic Symposium and First Soviet-Finnish Logic Conference, Jyväskylä, Finland, 29 June–6 July 1976* (Dordrecht, 1979), pp. 3–23.

"Constructive Approaches to Logic," in *Modern Logic, a Survey: Historical Philosophical, and Mathematical Aspects of Modern Logic and Its Applications* (Dordrecht, 1980), pp. 67–91.

"Frege's Foundations and Intuitionistic Logic," *The Monist* 67 (1984): 72–91.

"Church's Thesis and the Ideal of Informal Rigour," *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 28 (1987): 499–519.

"Logical Aspects of Computation: Contributions and Distractions," in *Logic and Computer Science*, ed. P. Odifreddi (London, 1990), pp. 205–78.

Other Relevant Works

"A Survey of Proof Theory, I," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 33 (1968): 321–88.

"A Survey of Proof Theory, II," in *Proceedings of the Second Scandinavian Logic Symposium*, ed. J. E. Fenstad (Amsterdam, 1971), pp. 109–70.

"Bertrand Russell's Logic," in *Bertrand Russell: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. David F. Pears (Garden City, N.Y., 1972), pp. 168–74.

"The Use of Abstract Language in Elementary Metamathematics: Some Pedagogic Examples," with Grigori Mints and Stephen G. Simpson, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* 453 (1975): 38–131.

"Proof Theory: Some Personal Recollections," in *Proof Theory*, by Gaisi Takeuti (Amsterdam, 1987), pp. 395–405.

"Gödel's Excursions into Intuitionistic Logic," in *Gödel Remembered, Salzburg 10–12 July 1983*, ed. Paul Weingartner and Leopold Schmetterer (Naples, Italy, 1987), pp. 65–179.

Further Reading

Oxford Comp Phil

Odifreddi, Piergiorgio, ed. *Kreiseliana: About and Around Georg Kreisel* (Wellesley, Mass., 1996).

Quine, W. V. *The Time of My Life: An Autobiography* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985).

Irving H. Anellis

KRIKORIAN, Yervant Hovannes
(1892–1977)

Yervant Krikorian was born on 7 January 1892 in Aintab, Turkey, as the oldest of six children. His mother, Rebecca Momjiades, was of Greek and Armenian descent. His father, Hovanness Kara Krikorian, was a professor of psychology and philosophy at Central American College in Aintab and a minister in the Protestant Armenian Church. In 1912 Krikorian graduated from Robert College, an American Presbyterian missionary college located in Constantinople. After his graduation he spent two more years at Robert College, where he taught European history before escaping the 1915–16 Turkish massacres of the Armenians, leaving on a Greek freighter which eventually landed him in New York City. With the help of Armenian friends, Krikorian entered the Yale School of Divinity, receiving a BD in 1917. He continued his education at Harvard, where he received his MA in 1921 and his PhD in philosophy in 1933 with the dissertation on "The Concept of Mechanism."

In 1924 Krikorian accepted a position in the philosophy department of the City College of New York, where he remained until his retirement in 1962. He was chair of the department from 1939 until 1952. After his retirement, Krikorian moved to Washington, D.C. where he married the artist Kathleen Rogers in 1968. In Washington, Krikorian had teaching appointments at American University and at Howard University. Krikorian died on 28 November 1977 in Washington, D.C.

Krikorian was an advocate of philosophical naturalism and Marxism. He is best known for his work on *Naturalism and the Human Spirit* (1944), a collection of essays he edited that became quite influential. The collection includes essays by John Dewey, Sidney Hook, Herbert Schneider, Ernest Nagel, and John Herman Randall, Jr. The general tenet of this volume is that it puts all human activities and aspirations squarely within the "natural world," so that any human endeavor is best studied through the sciences.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Mechanical Explanation: Its Meaning and Applicability," *Journal of Philosophy* 24 (1927): 14–21.
"Meaning as Behavior," *Philosophy of Science* 8 (1941): 83–8.
Ed., *Naturalism and the Human Spirit* (New York, 1944).
"Empiricism and the Mind," *Journal of Philosophy* 46 (1949): 685–93.
"The Publicity of Mind," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 22 (1962): 317–25.
"Cohen's Rationalistic Naturalism," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 29 (1968): 264–73.
The Pursuit of Ideals (Springfield, Ill., 1970).
Recent Perspectives in American Philosophy (The Hague, 1973).

Other Relevant Works
"The College, the Community, and the Bertrand Russell Case," in *The Bertrand Russell Case*, ed. John Dewey and Horace Kallen (New York, 1941).
Ed. with Daniel J. Bronstein and Philip P. Wiener, *Basic Problems of Philosophy: Selected Readings* (New York, 1947).
Ed. with Abraham Edel, *Contemporary Philosophic Problems: Selected Readings* (New York, 1959).

Further Reading
Proc of APA v52, Who's Who in Phil

Cornelis de Waal

KRIPKE, Saul Aaron (1940–)

Saul Kripke was born on 13 November 1940 in Bay Shore, New York. He displayed prodigious mathematical talent as a child, and by age six he had acquired on his own a working

knowledge of Hebrew. In the fourth grade Kripke read all of Shakespeare's plays, and at age twelve he asked himself, "How do I know I am not dreaming?" His father, who was a rabbi and university teacher, told him that Descartes had written about this question, and Kripke responded by reading some philosophy as a teenager. Kripke studied at Harvard University, receiving a BA in 1962 but not before publishing his first contributions to logic. He then became a junior fellow at Harvard from 1963 to 1966, holding a concurrent position at Princeton as assistant professor of philosophy from 1964 to 1966. Kripke never received a doctorate, for the reason that no faculty at any of the universities with which he was associated felt qualified to examine him. He was lecturer at Harvard from 1966 to 1968, and then became associate professor at Rockefeller University in 1968 and full professor in 1972. Upon the dissolution of Rockefeller's philosophy department, he went to Princeton University in 1977 as McCosh Professor of Philosophy. After becoming emeritus professor in 1997, he was a visiting professor at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and the City University of New York. In 2003 he became a full-time professor of philosophy at the City University of New York Graduate Center.

Kripke is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the British Academy, and he has been awarded honorary doctorates from the University of Nebraska, Johns Hopkins University, and the University of Haifa. In 1973 he gave the John Locke Lectures at the University of Oxford. At Princeton, Kripke won the Behrman Award for distinguished achievement in the humanities in 1988. Kripke's work has been supported by the National Science and Guggenheim foundations, the American Council of Learned Societies, and National Endowment for the Humanities, among other institutions. He was the 2001 Winner of the Schock Prize in Philosophy, considered by many to be philosophy's Nobel Prize.

Both Kripke's books, *Naming and Necessity* (1980) and *Wittgenstein on Rules and Private Language* (1982), grew out of lectures he gave at Princeton. Both have been translated into several languages. He has also published many articles in logic and philosophy. He is probably the model for one of the main characters in Rebeccah Goldstein's novel *The Mind-Body Problem*.

On the strength of his contributions to formal logic, semantics, metaphysics, the theory of truth, the mind–body problem, and Wittgenstein interpretation, Kripke is now regarded as one of the foremost philosophers and logicians. He combines extraordinary technical gifts with non-technical arguments of great intuitive force. Robert NOZICK once referred to him as philosophy's one uncontested genius. By virtue of his achievements in modal logic, semantics, and metaphysics, Kripke has helped forge a position – the so-called New Theory of Reference – as influential in the latter twentieth century as ordinary language philosophy was in the middle and logical positivism was in the early part of the twentieth century.

In spite of the great advances in logic made in the latter half of the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century, the logic of modal notions remained relatively obscure until the late 1950s. It seems intuitively plausible that, for instance, if it is possible that P, for some proposition P, then it is necessary that it is possible that P. If it is necessary that "if P, then Q," may we infer from the necessity of P to the necessity of Q? It is difficult to see how to resolve a question like this by just contemplating the meaning of the words used to express it. One could of course write down axioms to codify such inferences as these, and C. I. LEWIS developed a number of axiomatic systems for this purpose. However, no formal demonstration was available to show that any such axiomatic system was consistent, or able to certify all inferences that are valid.

As a teenager Kripke developed a semantics for modal logic of just this sort. Related systems

were studied independently by such logicians as Stig Kanger. The core idea is that one component of the model in terms of which semantics is given is a set of W or worlds, in the spirit of Leibniz's notion of possible worlds. A formula of the language is then semantically analyzed in terms of that model's set of worlds. A formula is necessarily true just in case it is true in all worlds in the model, while it is possibly true just in case it is true at some. The semantics of the modalities *necessary* and *possible* is then defined in terms of the familiar quantifiers *all* and *some*.

Our notions of possibility and necessity are not, however, univocal. In one use of the word, for instance, it is not possible for John, who is a monolingual adult English speaker, to speak Swahili; in another usage of that word it is, since he could take classes to learn that language. Kripke codifies this *relative* notion of possibility by defining an *accessibility relation* on worlds. For any given world W, there is some subset W' of W such that each element of W' is accessible from W. These, intuitively, are the worlds that are possible relative to W. Kripke shows that different restrictions on the accessibility relation (transitivity, symmetry, reflexivity, etc.) yield different theorems of modal logic, and correspond to different axiomatic systems already understood. The innovation led to an explosion in work on modal logic beginning in the middle 1960s, and had profound implications for semantics and metaphysics, described below.

In *Naming and Necessity* Kripke astounded the philosophical world by undermining the dominant theory, the Description Theory of Names, which holds that the meaning of a proper name such as "Aristotle" may be articulated using some description such as "The student of Plato who was tutor to Alexander the Great." This theory also suggests a picture of how thoughts single out their objects, by containing a body of descriptive information, and they single out whatever object exemplifies that description.

Kripke's alternative theory of names argues that proper names are *rigid designators*, where a name N rigidly designates object O just in case N refers to O, and N refers to O in every world in which O exists. Whereas the expression, "The tutor of Alexander" might not have referred to Aristotle (he might never have been hired for the job), the name "Aristotle" cannot but refer to Aristotle, at least in every world in which Aristotle exists. Hence "Aristotle" rigidly designates Aristotle. However, the descriptions that are plausible candidates for the putative descriptive meaning of "Aristotle" (the tutor of Alexander, the author of *De Interpretatione*, etc.), do not have the same modal profile as the name whose meaning they were thought to explicate. For example, Aristotle might never have gone into philosophy or pedagogy, but might have chosen a life as a lowly swineherd. He would still have been Aristotle, but none of the descriptions associated with his name would have applied to him. Hence an explanation of the name's meaning in terms of descriptions seems untenable. Kripke offers other arguments against the Description Theory as well. Kripke reminds his readers of the power of intuitions as guides to philosophical knowledge, thereby challenging various orthodoxies. For instance, John Locke had held that insofar as alethic modalities such as necessity and possibility make sense at all, they do so only relative to how an object is described. Quine echoed this sentiment in contending that described as a mathematician, Jones is necessarily rational, whereas described as a cyclist, he is not. In Quine's hands this was meant as an attack on the very coherence of the alethic modalities. Kripke argues that this doctrine that the only modality is verbal contradicts intuition. We have already seen that Aristotle, *that very man*, might have led an obscure life outside of philosophy. By contrast it seems quite dubious that *this very piece of paper* on which I write could have been made of vellum rather than wood pulp. Claims of this form concern so-called *de re modality*. As with many other great works of philosophy, in *Naming and Necessity* we find a number of major themes tightly interwoven, and one of the most

significant is the centrality of our notion of de re modality.

From the premise that Hesperus is identical with Phosphorus, and the premise that both "Hesperus" and "Phosphorus" rigidly designate their bearer, it follows that Hesperus is necessarily identical with Phosphorus. Kripke remarks, however, that the identity of Hesperus and Phosphorus is only known a posteriori. Hence we may infer that "Hesperus is Phosphorus" is both necessary and a posteriori, a conclusion that disagrees with the long-standing doctrine that the necessary and the a priori coincide. Likewise, Kripke holds that *natural kind terms* such as "gold" and "water" have properties analogous to proper names construed rigidly: if "water" refers in the actual world to H_2O then it refers in all counterfactual situations to stuff with that same molecular structure. If water is H_2O, then it is necessarily but once again not a priori. Finally, consider the standard meter bar in Paris. We may stipulate from our armchairs that the expression "one meter" refers to the length of that bar. As a result it is a priori that the standard meter is one meter in length. On the other hand, that very bar might not have been one meter in length, since climatic perturbations might have changed its length due to a flaw in its protective casing. Consequently the claim that the standard meter is one meter is contingent if true. So that claim, if true, is contingent but also a priori.

Harmonizing with the work of Hilary PUTNAM, Keith DONNELLAN, and others, Kripke's view of names and related locutions suggests a view of how our words mediate our relation to the world. In entertaining the name "Aristotle" I do not think about that man by associating a number of descriptions with his name that pick him out uniquely. Rather, by virtue of my familiarity with the name I stand at the receiving end of a causal–historical chain of users that can trace back its provenance to the original dubbing or baptism of Aristotle with the name "Aristotle" (possibly but not necessarily at his birth). Because I might be

mistaken about some aspects of that historical provenance, I could be wrong about who are the referents of my names (and natural kind terms). The overall picture that emerges from the account of language that Kripke offers suggests our epistemic and semantic relation to the world to depend much less on what we know or believe about the meanings of our words, and much more about how we are causally situated in our social and physical environment than had commonly been acknowledged.

In *Naming and Necessity* Kripke also challenges a complacent acceptance of identity statements interpreted in such a way as to resolve philosophical problems. In philosophy of mind, many twentieth-century philosophers have contended that mental states are identical with states of the brain, or at least of the central nervous system. However, this identity is not thought to be a necessary truth; it seems conceivable that mental states could exist without any physical embodiment. Accordingly many philosophers held that mental states are identical to brain states, but only contingently so. Kripke attacks this notion of contingent identity on purely logical grounds. If A = B, then A and B share all their properties in common. Also, A has the "identity" property of being necessarily identical with A. But then B must have that same "identity" property, which is to say that B has the property of being necessarily identical with A as well. Hence any true identity statement, at least when the identity sign is flanked by genuine singular terms, must also be necessarily true.

Kripke then argued that mental states, such as the state of being in pain, are not identical to states of the central nervous system. As we have just seen, were they so identical they would necessarily be. However, Kripke argues, it certainly seems conceptually possible that there be a case of a pain that has no physical realization, or a physical state alleged to be identical to a sensation that is not in fact so. Perhaps, it might be replied, the sensation is necessarily identical to the brain state, but the

sensation is not essentially a pain? Kripke responds by observing that if a sensation is in fact a pain, it is hard to see how that very sensation might have been anything other than a pain. Notice that all one need grant to Kripke is (1) the necessity of true identity statements, (2) that it is conceptually possible that there be disembodied states of mind, or states of the central nervous system not identical to sensations, and (3) that pains and other sensations are essentially the sensations that they are. These three premises together argue against the alleged contingent identity of sensations and brain states.

A conception of names as rigid designators, as espoused in *Naming and Necessity*, is only a partial characterization of their semantics. That conception is compatible with Direct Reference (the doctrine that the meaning of a name is given entirely by its having the bearer that it does), but is also compatible with a Fregean conception according to which a name's meaning is not fully exhausted by its having the bearer that it does. (Nothing in principle rules out the set of descriptions alleged to be associated with a name being rigid in the way that the name is.) Although, as we have seen, in *Naming and Necessity* Kripke undermines one dominant position inspired by Frege, in that work and elsewhere Kripke scrupulously avoids espousing Direct Reference.

One familiar challenge to Direct Reference lies in the fact that attitude ascriptions seem to be sensitive to which of two co-referential names occur therein. Consider (1) Lois Lane thinks that Clark Kent is a reporter, and (2) Lois Lane thinks that Superman is a reporter. These last two sentences are exactly alike except for containing distinct but co-referring names. The first is true, the second is false. Assuming that the meaning of a sentence is a function of the meanings of its parts together with their mode of composition (the thesis of *compositionality*), if Direct Reference is true it will follow that (1) and (2) mean the very same thing, and so one must be true if the other is. This consideration, sometimes referred to as

Frege's Puzzle, is commonly invoked as a challenge to Direct Reference.

In his "A Puzzle About Belief" Kripke argues that Frege's Puzzle lacks force against Direct Reference. His reason is that the very same puzzle can arise with a single name. Peter might take the name "Padewerski" to have two bearers. One is the Polish pianist. The other is the Polish statesman. Unbeknownst to Peter, the name "Padewerski" refers to just one man who is more versatile than Peter had imagined. Nevertheless, on one reading of that name, "Peter thinks that Padewerski is a statesman" is true, on another reading that sentence is false. Kripke takes this example to show that Frege's Puzzle would arise even if every object had at most one name, and arises even if we accept a Fregean doctrine of sense as applied to names.

Kripke proposed a solution to the ancient Paradox of the Liar in his "Outline of a Theory of Truth" (1975). On one version of this paradox, the sentence, "This sentence is false" seems to be false if true, and if true, then false. If we assume further that every sentence is either true or false, and no sentence is both true and false, from the premise that "This sentence is false" is meaningful we may infer a contradiction. Kripke observes that an equally powerful paradox can be generated with a set of sentences considered in a situation in which some further facts hold. This *de facto* Liar paradox requires analysis just as much as the aforementioned *de jure* Liar paradox. Dominant solutions in the spirit of Bertrand Russell and Alfred TARSKI had proposed that for a sentence to be meaningful it cannot refer to itself. Rather, a sentence can refer to a sentence in a distinct language (perhaps an object language) and say of it that it is true, or false, and so forth.

Kripke proposes an analysis in which sentences are indeed able to refer to themselves, but when they do so in such a way as to generate paradox, they are neither true nor false. He envisions a base-level language on which predicates have both extensions and anti-extensions (where not falling into an extension does not imply falling into an anti-extension), and on

this basis constructs higher-level languages in ways constrained by the lower level. As the process of constructing these higher level languages proceeds, in some cases nothing new is added, with respect to what predicates fall into which extensions and which anti-extensions, from language level N to language level N+1. In that case we say that language level N is a *fixed point*. A sentence of language L lacks a truth value at level M just in case it lacks a truth value at a fixed point for L. Kripke shows that Liar-type sentences lack truth values under his fixed point construction. This approach does not shed light on the Strengthened Liar (one form of which is "This sentence is not true"), but has motivated others to build on Kripke's work to find systems that do.

In 1982 Kripke published *Wittgenstein On Rules and Private Language*, which immediately gained considerable attention. In this book he argues that the force of Wittgenstein's considerations about rule-following, as set forth primarily in the *Philosophical Investigations*, had not been fully appreciated. Kripke formulates a "skeptical paradox" to bring home the force of these considerations. Suppose a child is learning a mathematical operation such as addition (the example is generalizable to other rules such as those governing grammar, semantics, even etiquette). This child has only been exposed to a finite set of examples purporting to illustrate that operation of taking one number plus another number. For that reason, there is more than one way in which she might apply that operation to a new pair of numbers to be added, each of which is compatible with what she has observed thus far. For instance, having never seen a teacher add 1000 to 100,000, she might get the result 101,001 when she "adds" these numbers. This case of "addition" is compatible with what she has observed thus far, since her teachers had never covered this particular case for her. One might reply, "But then she didn't understand any of her lessons about addition that she did observe!" Kripke counters, on Wittgenstein's behalf, that this reply begs the very question at issue, which is what it means to grasp and conform to a putative rule.

Kripke's skeptical paradox points out that there seems to be a clear difference between conforming to a rule such as "plus" and some other rule of "addition," although there seems to be no substantive fact that makes one pattern of behavior conform to the "plus" rule more than any other pattern of behavior might. Kripke suggests that for there to be such a thing as a rule, and as a special case for an expression to be meaningful, there would have to be such a substantive fact in virtue of which one pattern of behavior conforms to a particular rule. Kripke then argues that no such substantive fact seems to be forthcoming. Any putative such fact is either insufficient to make it the case that one form of behavior conforms to a rule, or instead is simply a restatement of that very rule.

Some commentators, unconvinced that Kripke has properly interpreted Wittgenstein, have used "Kripkenstein" to denote that doctrine which Kripke claims to discern in Wittgenstein, leaving aside whether this claim is correct. Nonetheless, many commentators have found Kripkenstein's skeptical paradox and related ideas worthy of discussion in their own right. It has also been argued that the above skeptical paradox rests upon the assumption that for there to be such facts as what an expression ("plus", etc.) means, there must be some distinct, physical fact (including facts having to do with the agent's dispositions to behavior) in virtue of which that expression means what it does. This reductionism about meaning may be challenged, and if it is we may be doubtful that the skeptical paradox raises an urgent problem.

Since Kripke's publications on logic and reference, a controversy has arisen as to proper attribution of the original ideas for the New Theory of Reference. Philosophers such as Quentin Smith have claimed that Ruth Marcus anticipated some of the central ideas of *Naming and Necessity* without Kripke acknowledging her contribution. Kripke's colleagues at Princeton from that time, John Burgess and

Scott Soames, rallied to his defense. (Articles on both sides of the debate are collected in Humphreys and Fetzer 1998.) It cannot be denied that Kripke presented the main elements of the New Theory with unprecedented technical power and intuitive force.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Completeness Theorem in Modal Logic," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 24 (1959): 1–14.

"Identity and Necessity," in *Identity and Individuation*, ed. Milton Munitz (New York, 1971), pp. 135–64.

"Naming and Necessity: Lectures Given to the Princeton University Philosophy Colloquium, January, 1970," in *Semantics of Natural Language*, ed. Donald Davidson and Gilbert Harman (Dordrecht, 1972): 253–325, 763–9.

"Outline of a Theory of Truth," *Journal of Philosophy* 72 (1975): 690–716.

"Is There a Problem about Substitutional Quantification?" in *Truth and Meaning: Essays in Semantics*, ed. Gareth Evans and John McDowell (Oxford, 1976), pp. 325–419.

"Speaker's Reference and Semantic Reference," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 2 (1977): 255–76.

"A Puzzle About Belief," in *Meaning and Use*, ed. A. Margalit (Dordrecht, 1979), pp. 234–83.

Naming and Necessity, 2nd edn (Cambridge, Mass., 1980).

Wittgenstein On Rules and Private Language (Cambridge, Mass., 1982).

Other Relevant Works

"Semantical Analysis of Modal Logic," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 24 (1959): 323–4.

"The Undecidability of Monadic Modal Quantification Theory," *Zeitschrift für Mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik* 8 (1962): 113–6.

"Semantical Analysis of Modal Logic, I: Normal Propositional Calculi," *Zeitschrift für Mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik* 9 (1963): 67–96.

"Semantical Considerations on Modal Logic," *Acta Philosophica Fennica* 16 (1963): 83–94.

"Semantical Analysis of Modal Logic, II: Non-Normal Propositional Calculi," in *The Theory of Models*, ed. I. Addison, L. Henkin, and A. Tarski (Amsterdam, 1965), pp. 206–20.

"Semantical Analysis of Intuitionist Logic," in *Formal Systems and Recursive Functions*, ed. M. Dummett and J. Crossley (Amsterdam, 1965), pp. 92–130.

"A Problem in the Theory of Reference," in *Philosophie et culture: actes du XVIIe Congrès mondial de philosophie*, ed. V. Cauchy (Montréal, 1988), vol. 1, pp. 241–7.

Further Reading

Amer Phils 1950–2000, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Blackwell Analytic Phil*, *Blackwell Comp Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*

Fitch, G. W. *Saul Kripke* (Chesham, UK, 2004).

Hughes, Christopher. *Kripke: Names, Necessity, and Identity* (Oxford, 2004).

Humphreys, Paul, and James Fetzer, eds. *The New Theory of Reference: Kripke, Marcus, and Its Origins* (Dordrecht, 1998).

Preti, Consuelo. *On Kripke* (Belmont, Cal., 2002).

Schwartz, Stephen, ed. *Naming, Necessity, and Natural Kinds* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1977).

Soames, Scott. *Beyond Rigidity: The Unfinished Semantic Agenda of Naming and Necessity* (Oxford, 2002).

Stanley, Jason. "Names and Rigid Designation," in *A Companion to Philosophy of Language*, ed. Bob Hale and Crispin Wright (Oxford, 1998).

van Fraassen, Bas, and J. C. Beall. *Possibilities and Paradox: An Introduction to Modal and Many-Valued Logic*

(Oxford, 2003).

Wright, Crispin, and Alexander Miller, eds. *Rule-Following and Meaning* (Chesham, UK, 2002).

Mitchell S. Green

KRISTELLER, Paul Oskar (1905–99)

Paul Oskar Kristeller was born on 22 May 1905 in Berlin, Germany to Jewish parents who were victims of the Holocaust. Kristeller was educated at the Universities of Heidelberg, Berlin, and Freiberg in Germany, and the University of Pisa in Italy. He received his PhD degree in philosophy from the University of Heidelberg in 1928, studying with Karl Jaspers and Edmund Husserl. He also studied classical philology, and did postgraduate work with Martin Heidegger. After a 1933 law by Adolf Hitler prohibited Jewish persons from employment as university professors in Germany, Kristeller emigrated to Italy in 1934 and began teaching German language at the University of Pisa, where he earned another PhD and explored Renaissance manuscripts across Italy. He lost his position in 1938 after the Italian fascist government also excluded Jewish persons from academic positions and forced all non-Italian citizens to leave the country.

Kristeller then emigrated to the United States in 1939, taking a spring semester position at Yale University. In fall 1939 he joined the philosophy faculty of Columbia University, became a US citizen in 1945, was tenured in 1948, and was named the Frederick J. E. Woodbridge Professor of Philosophy in 1968. He helped found the *Journal of the History of Ideas* with Columbia colleagues. He retired from Columbia University in 1973, and continued to pursue his research of the Renaissance for another two decades. He died on 7 June 1999 in New York City.

Kristeller is credited with reviving Renaissance studies in the United States after World War II. He helped found the Renaissance Society of America, serving as the President from 1957 to 1959. He was also active in the American Philosophical Association and the Medieval Academy of America. He wrote several hundred books and articles, all dealing with Renaissance studies. His most important scholarly achievement was the six-volume work *Iter Italicum* published between 1963 and 1997, making important manuscript sources available to other scholars. He was also an expert on Renaissance Italian philosopher Marsilio Ficino. Kristeller is most known for his emphasis on Renaissance humanism as centered more in the study of grammar, rhetoric, poetry, history, and moral philosophy, and less in logic, natural philosophy, and metaphysics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Philosophy of Marsilio Ficino, trans. Virginia Conant (New York, 1943).

The Classics and Renaissance Thought (Cambridge, Mass., 1955).

Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters, 4 vols (Rome, 1956–96).

Catalogus translationum et commentariorum: Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries: Annotated Lists and Guides (Washington, D.C., 1960).

Latin Manuscript Books Before 1600: A List of the Printed Catalogues and Unpublished Inventories of Extant Collections (New York, 1960; 4th edn 1993).

Renaissance Thought: The Classic, Scholastic, and Humanistic Strains (New York, 1961).

Iter Italicum: A Finding List of uncatalogued or incompletely catalogued humanistic manuscripts of the Renaissance in Italian and other libraries, 7 vols (London, 1963–97).

Eight Philosophers of the Italian Renaissance (Stanford, Cal., 1964).

Renaissance Thought II: Papers on Humanism and the Arts (New York, 1965).

Renaissance Concepts of Man and Other Essays (New York, 1972).

Medieval Aspects of Renaissance Learning: Three Essays, ed. and trans. Michael Mooney (Durham, N.C., 1974; New York, 1992).

Renaissance Thought and Its Sources, ed. Michael Mooney (New York, 1979).

Renaissance Thought and the Arts: Collected Essays (Princeton, N.J., 1980; 2nd edn 1990).

Marcilio Ficino and His Work after Five Hundred Years (Florence, Italy, 1987).

Greek Philosophers of the Hellenistic Age (New York, 1993).

Other Relevant Works

Kristeller's papers are at Columbia University.

Ed. with Ernst Cassirer and John Herman Randall, Jr., *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man: Selections in Translation* (Chicago, 1948).

Renaissance Philosophy and the Mediaeval Tradition (Latrobe, Penn., 1966).

Ed. with Philip P. Wiener, *Renaissance Essays: From the Journal of the History of Ideas* (New York, 1968).

"A Life of Learning," in *American Council of Learned Societies*, vol. 12 (New York, 1990).

"Iter Kristellerianum: The European Journey (1905–1939)," with Margaret L. King, *Renaissance Quarterly* 47 (1994): 907–29.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Who's Who in Phil

Clough, Cecil H., ed. *Cultural Aspects of the Italian Renaissance: Essays in Honour of Paul Oskar Kristeller* (Manchester, UK, 1976).

Hankins, James, John Monfasani, and Frederick Purnell, eds. *Supplementum Festivum: Studies in Honor of Paul Oskar Kristeller* (New York, 1987).

Mahoney, Edward P., ed. *Philosophy and Humanism: Renaissance Essays in Honor of Paul Oskar Kristeller* (New York, 1976). Contains a bibliography of Kristeller's writings.

Mahoney, Edward P. "Paul Oskar Kristeller, 1905–1999," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 60 (1999): 758–60.

Lisa G. Guinn

KROEGER, Adolf Ernest (1837–82)

Adolf Ernest Kroeger was born on 28 December 1837 at Schwabstadt, Duchy of Schleswig. His father, the Rev. Jacob Kroeger, was a Lutheran minister who brought his family to America after the 1848 revolution. After settling the family in Davenport, Iowa, his father tutored him, promoting an interest in philosophy and literature. As a young man Kroeger entered banking and finance in Davenport, then obtained a position with the *New York Times* as its western reporter in St. Louis. During the Civil War, he served as an officer under Union General John C. Frémont. In September 1861 he married Eliza B. Curren, with whom he had four children. From 1863 to 1864 he served as assistant city treasurer of St. Louis, and city treasurer from 1865 to 1867.

After the war, Kroeger was a founding member of the St. Louis Philosophical Society. His friendship with its two leaders, William T. HARRIS and Henry C. BROKMEYER, dated from 1859. He was an ardent defender of human rights along the lines of Fichte's *Grundlage des Naturrechts nach Principien der Wissenschaftslehre*. A consistent devotee of Fichte's thought, he was the first to translate Fichte's major writings into English.

In 1871 Kroeger was implicated in the misuse of city funds. Unjustly convicted, he was sentenced to prison, leaving his family without income. Harris and Brokmeyer

appealed to the governor and assisted his family. Eventually he was pardoned, but his reputation and health were ruined. He died in 1882 at the age of forty-five.

In "The Difference between the Dialectical Method of Hegel and the Synthetic Method of Kant and Fichte" (1872), Kroeger contends that the ego is ontologically irreducible, rather than a moment or phase of a higher unity. Polarity is a necessary feature of human thought: the ego is an active center of thought, and stands in opposition to the non-ego, which resists or opposes it. The ego is conscious of itself only in having its activity checked by the non-ego. The recognition that something compels and resists the ego establishes the polarity. No amount of conceptual or dialectical analysis can deduce one member of this opposition from the other. He also defends the good sense of the common man against the spinning of intellectual labyrinths by philosophers, newspaper journalists, and politicians. Most importantly, Kroeger based a theory of natural rights and an interpretation of American government on this theory of the ego.

In "The Right to Suffrage" (1868), Kroeger claims that the arguments limiting suffrage to white men are unfounded and morally perverse. Each person has a natural right to affirm or reject his or her social world. Since the original framers of the Constitution are all deceased, each generation of new voters repeats and continues the social contract through general elections. Affirmation by voting cannot be restricted by the Constitution or the states because it is a logically prior and necessary condition of the Constitution and state governments. Furthermore, neither skin color nor ancestry can be rational criteria for the right to vote. He forecasts that political parties will one day vie for the black vote and thus gradually incorporate blacks into the mainstream of social life.

In *Our Form of Government and The Problems of the Future* (1863), Kroeger makes four arguments. First, natural rights are founded on the very nature of a rational being. Second, natural rights are embodied in the Declaration of Independence. Third, the Declaration is the founding document of American government, not the Constitution. Fourth, future problems for American government will emerge to the extent that people lose sight of the distinction between society, which is founded upon natural rights, and the Constitution, which secures those rights by establishing a state. He argues for a minimal state as the path to maximizing the freedom of rational agents, each of whom constitutes and is constituted by their social others.

Kroeger's analysis of the Declaration of Independence is of particular interest. He asserts that it is through the other's free causality that I recognize my own ego as free causality. And this freedom or self-determination is the necessary condition of rationality. People as rational agents are thus bound to each other, and from this the rights of man can be deduced. There are three rights stated in the Declaration. The right to life presupposes an enduring ego or self-determining agent that maintains its existence as a living being. Therefore the right to life is a right to the self-determination of one's body. The right to life also includes the right to the continuation of life – happiness, health, and a good name, as well as the right to employment. The right to freedom contains all acts necessary for moral freedom, including due process and freedom to emigrate. The right to happiness Kroeger sees as equivalent to the right to property, for a free agent is one who requires a restricted sphere for achieving his/her purposes unfettered by interference from others. Overall, the Declaration circumscribes the arena for reciprocal respect for persons. The Declaration does not secure these rights, however. The Constitution establishes the state, upon the consent of the governed, with only those powers necessary to secure the rights of the Declaration.

According to Kroeger, the history of the United States from colonial town hall meetings

to the final hammering out of the Constitution shows a dialectical development in which various types of opposition are held together in a synthesis. A mere confederation of states would generate the problem of a conflict between states, without a higher authority to mediate. The dispute between states rights advocates and centralized government requires mediation as well. Madison established the synthesis that states' rights would be secure, not as an end-in-itself, but as a means to check the power of central government. Moreover, establishing a state presupposes a society with determinate social relations and institutions. The latter cannot be abolished, for only in local communities do people directly recognize each other's rights. Yet local communities are notorious for injustices against individuals and minority groups. So a synthesis is required to mediate opposition between the local and the national. The states, existing in a Federation, would retain all powers not given to the general government by the Constitution. By securing the rights embedded in the Declaration, the Constitution contains principles of negation in the separation of powers and checks and balances. Laws that contradict the Constitution are themselves negated by the Supreme Court.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Our Form of Government and the Problems of the Future (St. Louis, 1863).
"The Right to Suffrage," St. Louis Dispatch (30 May 1868).
"The Difference between the Dialectic Method of Hegel and the Synthetic Method of Kant and Fichte," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 6 (1872): 184–7.

Other Relevant Works
The Minnesingers of Germany (New York, 1873).
Trans., *The Science of Knowledge*, by J. G. Fichte, ed. W. T. Harris (London, 1889).
Trans., *The Science of Ethics as Based on the Science of Knowledge*, by J. G. Fichte, ed.
W. T. Harris (London, 1897).

Further Reading
Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v3*
Alcott, Bronson. *The Journals of Bronson Alcott*, ed. Odell Shepard (Boston, 1938).
DeArmey, Michael H., and James A. Good, eds. *The St. Louis Hegelians*, 3 vols (Bristol, UK, 2001).
Goetzmann, William H. *The American Hegelians* (New York, 1973).
Harris, D. H. *A Brief Report of the Meeting Commemorative of the Early St. Louis Movement in Philosophy, Psychology, Literature, Art and Education* (St. Louis, 1922).
Kroeger, E. R. "Address," to the Missouri Historical Society (St. Louis, 1927).
Pochmann, Henry A. *German Culture in America: Philosophical and Literary Influences, 1600–1900* (Madison, Wisc., 1957).
Snider, Denton J. *The St. Louis Movement in Philosophy, Literature, Education, Psychology with Chapters of Autobiography* (St. Louis, 1920).

Michael H. DeArmey

KRUTCH, Joseph Wood (1893–1970)

Joseph Wood Krutch was born on 25 November 1893 in Knoxville, Tennessee. He attended University of Tennessee (BA 1915), and earned his graduate degrees in English from Columbia University (MA 1916, PhD 1924). He briefly taught composition at the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, while writing books and drama reviews for the *Saturday Review of Literature* and *The Nation*. His 1929 book, *The Modern Temper*, brought international attention for its diagno-

sis of modern alienation and despair. From 1924 to 1952 Krutch was a drama critic for *The Nation* and also served as associate editor from 1932 to 1937. During the summer of 1925, he was *The Nation*'s correspondent on the Scopes trial over teaching evolution, in Dayton, Tennessee. In 1937 he became professor of English at Columbia, serving until 1952 when he departed for a life as a private writer and naturalist in the Southwest. At his home in the desert near Tucson, Arizona, he continued to write books on American culture, conservation, and the human relationship with nature. *The Measure of Man: On Freedom, Human Values, Survival and the Modern Temper* won the 1955 National Book Award for nonfiction. He was a member of the American Academy of Arts and Letters, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and the American Philosophical Society. Krutch died on 22 May 1970 in Tucson, Arizona.

Krutch looked back to the tradition of humanism as a refuge from modernism, and his academic writings on culture, literature, aesthetics, and philosophy during the 1930s and 40s lament science's domination. He read Henry David Thoreau after writing *The Modern Temper* and wrote a biography of Thoreau in 1948. Thoreau's similar concerns for modern life's shallow materialism, his confidence in individuality, and his pantheistic naturalism gradually influenced Krutch's writings. His first book on nature, *The Twelve Seasons* (1949), may be his finest effort on nature's ways. Succeeding books celebrated nature's rhythms and offered an optimistic vision of harmonious natural life that sharply contrasted with his earlier pessimism. Krutch remained skeptical about modernism and wanted nothing to do with modern psychologies and philosophies that compromised traditional values in order to placate industrialism and science, such as socialism and behaviorism.

Krutch's most philosophical books are *The Great Chain of Life* (1956) and *Human Nature and the Human Condition* (1959). His humanism rested on our unique capacities for free choice and creating and pursuing values. Against the pragmatic confidence in scientific method and technology, Krutch preached faith in nature's ability to sustain humanity. Our spiritual lives can be similarly nourished by regular unity with nature, to regain the sense of beauty and joy essential to religious experience. He wrote, "The sense that nature is the most beautiful of all spectacles and something of which man is a part; that she is a source of health and joy which inevitably dries up when man is alienated from her; these are the ultimate reasons why it seems desperately important that the works of nature should not disappear to be replaced by the works of man alone."

The type of environmentalism espoused by Krutch is grounded on a mystical love for nature itself, not for any supernatural creator behind nature. This pantheism unites true environmentalism with religion. If it is nature that is directly responsible for our life, then that is divinity enough for Krutch. He also seemed to worry that supernaturalism harbored the notion that humanity was supremely important. This anthropocentric view motivated the typical "conservation" thinking of Krutch's time, and perhaps also today. In a famous 1954 essay, "Conservation is Not Enough," (in 1955) Krutch expresses a sentiment close to that of fellow ecologist Aldo LEOPOLD: "What is commonly called 'conservation' will not work in the long run because it is not really conservation at all but rather, disguised by its elaborate scheming, only a more knowledgeable variation on the old idea of a world for man's use only." Krutch goes on to say, "we must live for something besides making a living. If we do not permit the earth to produce beauty and joy, it will in the end not produce food either ... . Unless somebody teaches love, there can be no ultimate protection to what is lusted after."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Modern Temper (New York, 1929).
Five Masters: A Study in the Mutations of the Novel (New York, 1930).
Experience and Art: Some Aspects of the

Esthetics of Literature (New York, 1932).

Was Europe a Success? (New York, 1934).

Samuel Johnson (New York, 1945).

Henry David Thoreau (New York, 1948).

The Twelve Seasons (New York, 1949).

The Desert Year (New York, 1952).

"Modernism" in Modern Drama (Ithaca, N.Y., 1953).

The Measure of Man: On Freedom, Human Values, Survival and the Modern Temper (Indianapolis, 1954).

The Great Chain of Life (Boston, 1956).

Human Nature and the Human Condition (New York, 1959).

If You Don't Mind My Saying So: Essays on Man and Nature (New York, 1964).

And Even if You Do: Essays on Man, Manners and Machines (New York, 1967).

The Best Nature Writing of Joseph Wood Krutch (New York, 1969).

A Krutch Omnibus: Forty Years of Social and Literary Criticism (New York, 1970).

Other Relevant Works

Krutch's papers are at the Library of Congress, Harvard University, the University of Arizona, and the University of Tennessee.

Ed., *Great American Nature Writing* (New York, 1950).

The Best of Two Worlds (New York, 1953).

The Voice of the Desert (New York, 1955).

Grand Canyon (New York, 1958).

The Forgotten Peninsula: A Naturalist in Baja California (New York, 1961).

More Lives than One (New York, 1962). Krutch's autobiography.

Ed., *Thoreau: Walden and Other Writings* (New York, 1965).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*

Beach, Joseph Warren. "Mr. Krutch and Ideal Values in Literature," *Ethics* 48 (1938): 487–97.

Grey, Ramona J. "Modern Liberalism and Despair: The Pilgrimage of Joseph Wood Krutch," *American Studies* 38 (1997): 81–96.

Lehman, Anthony L. "Joseph Wood Krutch: A Selected Annotated Bibliography of Primary Sources," *Bulletin of Bibliography* 41 (June 1984): 74–80.

Margolis, John D. *Joseph Wood Krutch: A Writer's Life* (Knoxville, Tenn., 1980).

McClintock, James I. *Nature's Kindred Spirits: Aldo Leopold, Joseph Wood Krutch, Edward Abbey, Annie Dillard, Gary Snyder* (Madison, Wisc., 1994).

Rowley, Robert. "Joseph Wood Krutch: The Forgotten Voice of the Desert," *American Scholar* 64 (1995): 438–43.

Wise, Paul W. *Beyond God and Gaia: Expressions of Minimal Naturalist Spirituality in the Works of Aldo Leopold, Joseph Wood Krutch, Barry Lopez, and Rick Bass*. PhD dissertation, Michigan State University (East Lansing, Mich., 2001).

John R. Shook

KUHN, Thomas Samuel (1922–96)

Thomas Kuhn, probably the world's most influential theorist of science in the second half of the twentieth century, was born on 18 July 1922 in Cincinnati, Ohio. He earned all his academic degrees at Harvard, where he received a BS in 1943, an MA in 1946, and a PhD in physics in 1949. Kuhn began his academic career in 1952 teaching in the general education in science program established by his mentor, Harvard President James Bryant Conant. After failing to be awarded tenure in 1956, Kuhn became an assistant professor of history of science in the philosophy department at the University of California at

Berkeley, and was soon promoted to full professor. In 1964 he moved to Princeton University's newly established history and philosophy of science department, and in 1969 he was named M. Taylor Pyne Professor of Philosophy and History of Science. In 1979 he moved to the philosophy and linguistics department at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where from 1982 until his retirement in 1991, Kuhn was the Laurance S. Rockefeller Professor of Philosophy and History of Science. He was President of the History of Science Society during 1968–70, and was a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the National Academy of Sciences. Before his death, Kuhn had been trying to update his views on science first developed in his most famous book, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962). Kuhn died on 17 June 1996 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Kuhn belonged to the last generation of people trained in physics who still conceived of it as natural philosophy by more exact means, only to receive a rude awakening once World War II turned into the "The Physicists' War." Like many of his generation, Kuhn applied his physics in wartime service. Kuhn spent the war jamming German radar signals in East Anglia, England, where he applied the theories of his dissertation director, John Van Vleck (recipient of the 1977 Nobel Prize in Physics) who endorsed the use of physics as a bulwark of national defense well into the Cold War era. Much of Kuhn's subsequent career can be seen as a reaction against this position.

By the end of the war it became clear to Kuhn that he would be unable to pursue his natural philosophical interests as a physicist. Physics had made the fateful transition from, in Derek de Solla Price's terms, "little science" to "big science." Kuhn was fortunate that Harvard's visionary President Conant realized that many thoughtful young people found themselves in his position. Conant was keen to keep alive the classical ideal of science as an organized form of pure inquiry at a time when science was becoming increasingly captive to big business and the military. Conant designed "General Education in Science" not to increase the ranks of scientists but to teach future leaders of business and politics how to evaluate science properly. Conant enlisted the efforts of Kuhn and other disenchanted young scientists (notably Gerald Holton) to present case studies of science as a theoretically driven, methodologically disciplined, puzzle-solving activity – what Kuhn would later epitomize as "paradigm."

In preparing these courses, Conant despatched Kuhn to study other history and philosophy of science programs, especially in the United Kingdom. From Kuhn's correspondence with Conant in the immediate postwar period, it is clear that Conant represented the more sensitive of the institutional and larger social dimensions of science, whereas Kuhn persuaded Conant of the philosophical value of disciplines like astronomy and mechanics, the significance of which as a chemist Conant was otherwise inclined to underestimate. Once the courses were launched, Kuhn was at first Conant's teaching assistant but gradually took over full teaching responsibilities, as Conant became increasingly involved in the postwar reconstruction of Germany.

A peculiar feature of the specific General Education course co-taught by Conant and Kuhn, "Natural Sciences 4," was its restricted historical focus to roughly the period 1600 to 1900, when scientific experiments could be performed easily on a tabletop for public demonstration. This general focus carried into Kuhn's writing on the history of science, though its significance is typically overlooked by commentators who imagine Kuhn to have put forward an account of scientific change valid for all periods – and all disciplines – in the history of science.

Although both Conant and Kuhn were happy to demonstrate the practical applications of scientific research in their course, the conduct of science itself was always presented as something that could be, and should be,

evaluated solely in terms of how it addressed the problems it set for itself. The "little science" character of historic tabletop experiments fit the pedagogical bill perfectly, since they required a high degree of skill and ingenuity, but relatively low capital and labour costs. These experiments became the centerpieces for the famous *Harvard Case Histories*, a source-book for the early teaching of the history of science as a university subject. In this teaching one can see an attempt to construct a strong distinction between what is "internal" and "external" to science by careful editing of original source materials.

Despite their different disciplinary back-grounds and professional orientations, Conant (the politically engaged ex-chemist) and Kuhn (the politically disengaged ex-physicist) agreed that science had its own internal trajectory that could be specified independently of ambient social, political, and economic pres-sures. In a late interview (Sigurdsson 1990), Kuhn remarked that the scaled-up character of contemporary Big Science had not caused him to change his conception of science because he had been always interested in it *only* in its capacity as an exemplary form of knowledge, and nothing else. Indeed, he seemed to suggest that science might exist in a form that would bolster, say, the economy or national defence, all the while the fortunes of pure inquiry suffered. Precedents for this state of affairs included the fate of science in Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union, as Conant observed in his foreword to Kuhn's first book, *The Copernican Revolution* (1957). Arguably Kuhn thought that science suffered a similar fate even during the Cold War in America, a point that will be revisited below.

In his last extended interview (in Kuhn 2000), Kuhn judged Conant to be the smartest man he ever knew. Kuhn's dependency on Conant has been long a matter of public record. Among sociologists, Kuhn's early career is known as a case study of "cumulative advantage," that is, the empirically supported suspicion that those anointed for success early in their academic careers continue to flourish, regardless of output (Merton 1977). Kuhn's gratitude to Conant appears to have gone beyond the grave, as he chose as his main literary executor Conant's grandson, a conti-nental philosopher whose work is unrelated to Kuhn's. A more obvious alternative would have been Paul Hoyningen-Huene, a very able German philosopher of science whose study with Kuhn at MIT in the 1980s enabled him to write a book (Hoyningen-Huene 1993) that remains the most philosophically sophisticated presentation and defence of Kuhn's theoretical horizons.

Unsurprisingly, when Conant left Harvard in 1953, Kuhn came to be quickly seen as lacking intellectual focus, being neither scien-tist nor humanist at a time when the history and philosophy of science had yet to establish a clear disciplinary identity. From the stand-point of the humanists who still dominated Harvard's committees, Conant – the univer-sity's first scientist-president – was resented for having recklessly meddled with tradition by trying to pack the humanities faculties with failed scientists. Unfortunately, Kuhn appeared to live up to the tenure committee's worst sus-picions, as the pre-publication copy of *The Copernican Revolution* was rated no better than a sophisticated textbook.

Was the tenure committee's judgment too harsh? This appears to be the current consen-sus. In the wake of Kuhn's later public success and the attention he has drawn to their field, historians of science have unsurprisingly come to treat *The Copernican Revolution* as a "classic" (Westman, 1994). Nevertheless, the tenure committee managed to flag an issue that continued to haunt Kuhn throughout his professional career, namely, his aversion to interpreting unprocessed archival materials, that is, his failure to engage in the sort of "original" research so highly valued by humanists. All of Kuhn's historical research has been synthetic or otherwise based on pub-lished sources, a point that even his most devoted former student conceded in an

obituary. To be sure, while at Berkeley in the early 1960s, Kuhn led a project jointly sponsored by the American Physical Society and the National Science Foundation to produce an oral history of early modern quantum mechanics (Kuhn et al. 1967). But Kuhn merely designed the interviews with the likes of Neils Bohr and Werner Heisenberg, which he then conducted along with two very able graduate students, Paul Forman and John Heilbron. Kuhn deposited the old physicists' recollections in an archive for future historical use but did not himself attempt to analyze the data.

Kuhn's reluctance to interpret the physicists' words reflected historiographical scruples for which he would later become famous, if not notorious. Kuhn refused to write the history of a period in which the central intellectual debates remained open. For him, history's jurisdiction was confined to the status of the past as a foreign country, separated in time as if by space. This was one of the origins of the "incommensurability thesis" that Kuhn later associated with how inhabitants of a later paradigm regarded those of an earlier one. In a related and equally illuminating analogy, Kuhn likened historic shift in paradigms to the periodic switches that bilinguals perform between the two languages in which they are fluent: there are no word-to-word or even sentence-to-sentence translations, only decisions to adopt one linguistic framework or the other. Of his students from this period, Heilbron has adhered to Kuhn's views, producing an excellent intellectual biography of Kuhn's hero, Max Planck, whereas Forman strayed and ended up producing much of the most inspiring social history of twentieth-century physics.

Kuhn's troubled correspondence with Forman, who was also a Berkeley student activist, occupies a thick file in his MIT papers. It took place as Kuhn's *magnum opus*, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, was being taught in Paul FEYERABEND's philosophy seminar there, on the basis of which Feyerabend concluded that Kuhn's book was "ideology covered up as history." Kuhn's contemporaneous responses to Forman and Feyerabend suggest someone who, while perhaps dissatisfied with the current subsumption of science under what C. Wright MILLS had popularized as the "military-industrial complex," was reluctant to say openly that science had betrayed its classical mission of organized pure inquiry, perhaps because of the larger threat that a destabilized scientific establishment might pose to national security. Indeed, the general tenor of Kuhn's responses is that one should keep a "heads-down" attitude toward changes in the larger social environment, if they do not demonstrably impede one's own particular research trajectory. In correspondence with the sociologist Jessie Bernard in 1969–70, at the peak of the student movement, Kuhn elaborated that when faced with external social pressures, true scientists will turn conservative, sticking as closely as possible to their specialized problems. Kuhn did not regard biologists or social scientists – or indeed chemists after 1850 – as "scientists" in his strict sense precisely because they were incapable of insulating their problem-solving activities from larger societal demands.

Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* must rank among the most radically misread books of history, and may be the book that has benefited the most from its misreading. The big mistake most readers make is to think that Kuhn means "science" primarily in a descriptive rather than a prescriptive sense. Here it is worth recalling the plot of this book, which has now sold a million copies in twenty languages. It is basically an idealized history of science that would not have been out of place in the nineteenth century. Its thirteen chapters roughly track the phases of a science's life cycle, starting with its divisive pre-scientific roots in metaphysics, religion, and politics. For Kuhn, science begins in earnest once a group of inquirers, typically enjoying some institutional privilege or protection (such as a scientific society, a professional association, a university department) take control of the

means of knowledge production from such divisive elements. This happens once they adopt a "paradigm," which means both an exemplary piece of research and the blueprint it provides for future research. In securing a paradigm, researchers agree to a common pattern of work and common standards for adjudicating their knowledge claims. Most actual science – what Kuhn calls "normal science" – consists of little more than the technical work of fleshing out the paradigm's blueprint. Kuhn deliberately selects the phrase "puzzle-solving" (as in crossword puzzles) over "problem-solving" to underscore the constrained nature of normal science.

It follows that, as far as Kuhn is concerned, the Galilean image of the scientist as the heroic breaker of tradition is almost a complete myth. Most scientists are narrowly trained specialists, as conceived on the medieval master-apprentice model, who try to work entirely within their paradigm until too many unsolved puzzles accumulate. Kuhn once contrasted this feature of the scientific attitude with that of artists, who distinguish themselves by developing new paradigms even before the expressive potential of the old ones has been fully exploited. Once the number of such "anomalies" has reached a certain threshold, the paradigm is in "crisis," and only then do scientists legitimately engage in wide-ranging normative discussions about the future direction of their field. A "revolution" occurs when a viable alternative paradigm has been found. The revolution is relatively quick and irreversible. In practice, this means that an intergenerational shift occurs, whereby new scientific recruits are presented with a history that has been rewritten to make the new paradigm look like the logical outgrowth of all prior research in the field.

Why has Kuhn's book been so radically misread? Three reasons may be offered. First, in a period of university expansion (say, from the late 1950s to the early 1980s), the plot structure of *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* was read as a blueprint for con-

verting any discipline into a proper science – indeed, in a way that did not require a radical replacement of existing disciplines but simply an addition or a subdivision. This certainly captures how Kuhn was read by social scientists. Second, Kuhn's rather conservative appeal to "revolution" in the classical sense of a restoration of natural order was misread in hopefully Marxist terms by student radicals as a proactive strategy for overturning the status quo. Third, Kuhn's decision to focus on what he regarded as exemplary scientific episodes without drawing equally systematic attention to deficient ones allowed readers to infer Kuhn's openness to having his model extended into areas he did not explicitly discuss. But, as previously suggested, his MIT papers reveal that Kuhn discouraged any such extensions when formally raised. The sources and implications of these misreadings of Kuhn are extensively explored in Fuller (2000).

At the same time, Kuhn refused to have the idealized nature of his model of science used as a normative platform from which to criticize the failures of contemporary science. This comes out most poignantly in the thirty-year correspondence between Kuhn and Jerome Ravetz, who in 1971 published *Scientific Knowledge and Its Social Problems*, which remains the most politically and intellectually incisive application of Kuhn's theory of science to research conditions in the contemporary world. Anticipating later concerns for environmental degradation, overspecialization, and intellectual property, Ravetz argued that science was in a "post-normal" state of captivity because the research agenda had come to be dominated by the military-industrial complex. After a polite but uncomfortable correspondence over the book, Kuhn disowned Ravetz when the latter applied for a professorship in the history and sociology of science at the University of Pennsylvania in the late 1970s. Kuhn's letter of "recommendation" demonstrated, among other things, that he believed that a politically motivated and a scientifically adequate understanding of science were mutually exclusive.

It is common in accounts of Kuhn's significance to stress the supposedly central role he played in the 1960s and 70s in overturning logical positivism as the dominant philosophy of science, at least in the English-speaking world. In this context, it is often said that he stressed the historical, subjective, and social dimensions of science, bringing it closer to the rest of human experience – in contrast to the ahistorical, objective, and abstract conception of science favored by the positivists. The exact role that Kuhn himself played in this matter, however, is far from clear. It is true that soon after the publication of *Structure*, some ambitious young analytic philosophers, notably Dudley Shapere, translated Kuhn's rather amateurish understanding of philosophical issues into problems that could be treated by the linguistic techniques of the day. These were canonized as problems of "meaning variance," "theory-ladenness of observation," and so forth. Kuhn was also linked with other likeminded contemporaries such as Feyerabend, TOULMIN, and Norwood Russell HANSON. But Kuhn himself remained aloof from this incorporation of his work until the publication of *Structure*'s second edition in 1970 initiated a largely frustrating two-decade period of engagement with philosophical critics.

Kuhn's philosophical frustrations had several sources but, most fundamentally, he always thought of himself primarily as a philosopher and increasingly desired to be recognized as such. His closest colleague at Princeton was the positivist Carl HEMPEL, and upon moving to MIT, he was drawn to the treatment of concept acquisition and extension by the local cognitive scientists and formal semantic theorists. However, Kuhn was at heart, one might say, a "genetic epistemologist" who regarded the growth of knowledge at both the individual and the collective levels as an evolutionary process anchored in certain formative experiences (which, in the case of science, he associated with the acquisition of a "disciplinary matrix" and the mastery of "exemplars" in problem-solving). Among the few philosophical influences Kuhn openly admitted were Jean Piaget, Alexandre KOYRÉ, and Emile Meyerson, all of whom were "geneticist" in this sense. This helps to explain why despite the inspiration that Kuhn has provided to contemporary social studies of science, the only social process that seriously interested him was enculturation. He held that a scientist's competence, including her capacity for innovation, was largely prescribed by her original training, such that a paradigm shift had less to do with old scientists learning to see the world a new way than simply the replacement of old scientists with new ones trained differently.

Kuhn's genetic approach to knowledge conflicted with the analytic philosophers of science who came to dominate the field in the United States in the aftermath of logical positivism. For them epistemology was focused less on the origins than the ends of inquiry, especially correspondence to a common reality that, in principle at least, could be accessed even by inquirers operating with what Kuhn would regard as incommensurable paradigms. Kuhn found such a possibility historically ungrounded yet he also understood the need to come to grips with it. He openly admitted (sometimes it seemed with pride) just how little he knew of the technical details of logical positivism, even though he was popularly implicated in its demise. However, none of this deterred him from advancing a theory of semantic reference that does not rely on access to ultimate reality as its epistemic warrant. The theory has attracted the critical appreciation of another historically sensitive epistemologist, Ian HACKING, as well as some latterday followers of Wittgenstein (for example Sharrock and Read 2002), but otherwise has generated only more puzzlement. (The relevant articles and responses are compiled in Horwich 1993.)

In retrospect, Kuhn's global philosophical reputation was crystallized, no doubt unwittingly, in England rather than the US. In 1965, after only a few reviews of *The Structure of*

Scientific Revolutions had appeared in the US, Kuhn found himself on center stage in London at the International Congress of Logic, Methodology and the Philosophy of Science debating Karl Popper, at that point arguably the world's leading theorist of science. The idea for the debate was neither Kuhn's nor Popper's but that of Popper's heir apparent, Imré Lakatos. Lakatos, along with his friend Feyerabend, regarded Kuhn as Conant's anointed ideologue for US Cold War science policy, which they identified with, in Popper's terms, a "closed" rather than "open" society mentality. This charged political subtext surfaced in many of the talks assembled in the conference proceedings (Lakatos and Musgrave 1970), though Kuhn and subsequent American philosophers of science have tended to treat the politics as mere rhetoric. Instead, it has been treated, in more academically domesticated terms, as a squabble over the extent to which the philosophy of science should be held accountable to the history of science.

In taking the measure of Kuhn's legacy, it is puzzling how a physicist with an amateur understanding of history, philosophy, and sociology of science could have had such a profound impact on these fields, which already enjoyed a relatively high degree of sophistication. In effect, Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* offered a historian's sense of philosophy, a philosopher's sense of sociology, and a sociologist's sense of history. That this particular book should have such an enduring impact cannot be explained simply by its content, since many of its supposedly distinctive theses could also be found in the work of contemporaries such as Hanson, Feyerabend, and Toulmin. However, unlike them, Kuhn singularly benefited from the patronage of James Bryant Conant, to whom *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* is dedicated, helping to explain the idiosyncrasies of Kuhn's account. Yet, as our conceptual horizons come to be detached from Kuhn's Cold War context, his work may come to lose its hold on the meta-scientific imagination.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Copernican Revolution: Planetary Astronomy in the Development of Western Thought (Chicago, 1957).

The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (Chicago, 1962; 2nd edn 1970; 3rd edn 1996).

Sources for History of Quantum Physics: An Inventory and Report, with John Heilbron, Paul Forman, and Lini Allen (Philadelphia, 1967).

The Essential Tension: Selected Studies in Scientific Tradition and Change (Chicago, 1977).

Black-body Radiation and the Quantum Discontinuity, 1894–1912 (Oxford, 1978).

The Road since Structure: Philosophical Essays, 1970–1993, with an Autobiographical Interview, ed. James Conant and John Haugeland (Chicago, 2000).

Other Relevant Works

Kuhn's papers are at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Ed. with James Bryant Conant, *Harvard Case Histories in Experimental Science* (Cambridge, Mass., 1950).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Amer Phils 1950-2000, Bio 20thC Phils, Blackwell Analytic Phil, Blackwell Comp Phils, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Encyc Social Behav Sci, Oxford Comp Phil, Routledge Encycl Phil, Who Was Who in Amer v11

Andersen, Hanne. *On Kuhn* (Belmont, Cal., 2000).

Barnes, Barry. *T. S. Kuhn and Social Science* (London, 1982).

Bird, Alexander. *Thomas Kuhn* (Princeton, N.J., 2000).

Fuller, Steve. *Thomas Kuhn: A*

Philosophical History for Our Times (Chicago, 2000).

———, *Kuhn vs Popper: The Struggle for the Soul of Science* (Cambridge, UK, 2003).

Gattei, Stefano, ed. "The Kuhn Controversy," *Social Epistemology* 17 no. 2–3 (2003). Special issue of articles about Fuller's *Thomas Kuhn*.

Gutting, Gary, ed. *Paradigms and Revolutions: Appraisals and Applications of Thomas Kuhn's Philosophy of Science* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1979).

Hacking, Ian, ed. *Scientific Revolutions* (Oxford, 1981).

Horwich, Paul, ed. *World Changes: Thomas Kuhn and the Nature of Science* (Cambridge, Mass., 1993).

Hoyningen-Huene, Paul. *Reconstructing Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago, 1993).

Lakatos, Imré, and Alan Musgrave, eds. *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge* (Cambridge, UK, 1970).

Merton, Robert. *Sociology of Science: An Episodic Memoir* (Carbondale, Ill., 1977).

Nickles, Thomas, ed. *Thomas Kuhn* (Cambridge, UK, 2003).

Ravetz, Jerome. *Scientific Knowledge and Its Social Problems* (Oxford, 1971).

Sharrock, Wes, and Rupert Read. *Kuhn: Philosopher of Scientific Revolutions* (Cambridge, UK, 2002).

Sigurdsson, Skuli. "The Nature of Scientific Knowledge: An Interview with Thomas Kuhn," *Harvard Science Review* (Winter 1990): 18–25.

Westman, Robert. "Two Cultures or One? A Second Look at Kuhn's *The Copernican Revolution*," *Isis* 85 (1994): 79–115.

Steve Fuller

KUKLICK, Bruce (1941–)

Bruce Kuklick was born on 13 March 1941 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He attended the University of Pennsylvania from 1959 to 1963, where he graduated with a BA and honors in philosophy. In 1963–4 he was a Thouron Fellow at Oxford University, and then returned to the United States to earn an MA in philosophy from Bryn Mawr College in 1965. Kuklick then went back to the University of Pennsylvania where he received his PhD in American civilization in 1968. From 1969 to 1972 he was assistant professor of American studies and philosophy at Yale University. In 1972 he returned to Pennsylvania as a member of the history department, becoming a full professor in 1976. He is currently Nichols Professor of History at the University of Pennsylvania.

Kuklick's interests are wide-ranging, extending from baseball to diplomatic history to intellectual history to the history of philosophy. His books include *American Policy and the Division of Germany* (1972), *Josiah Royce: An Intellectual Biography* (1972), *The Rise of American Philosophy* (1977), *Churchmen and Philosophers* (1985), *The Good Ruler* (1988), *To Everything a Season: Shibe Park and Urban Philadelphia, 1909–1976* (1991), *Puritans in Babylon* (1996), and *A History of Philosophy in America, 1720–2000* (2001). His book on Josiah ROYCE is the first book-length study to do justice to Royce's philosophic accomplishments, including his work in logic. It prepared the way for *The Rise of American Philosophy*, which is a detailed study of the Harvard department of philosophy from 1860 to 1930. Especially outstanding is the description of the interaction between James and Royce which shows how each man altered and developed his philosophy in response to the other's work. The book also shows Kuklick's interest in the institutional basis of philosophy and demonstrates how changes in the university affected the work of its philosophers.

No less important is Kuklick's *Churchmen and Philosophers*. As Perry MILLER, Sidney

Mead and others have taught us, much of the best intellectual work in America has been done in theology, but Kuklick is the first to show how theology and philosophy intertwined. Starting with Edwards, he traces the development of the New England Theology through Nathaniel William Taylor, Horace Bushnell, Charles Hodge, and others, and demonstrates that this tradition found its modern culmination in the work of John Dewey. The seminaries, such as Andover Theological Seminary, formed the institutional basis for much of this development, a fact that has been obscured by the focus on the universities. In 2001 Kuklick brought much of his prior work together in his brief history of philosophy in America. Unlike most historians, he brought his story up to the year before the publication of his book, tracing the development of "the New Realism" from 1912 to the work of Wilfrid Sellars, devoting substantial attention to the influence of European thought in America from the logical positivists to Herbert Marcuse, dealing with W. V. Quine, Nelson Goodman, and the Harvard–Oxford axis, and finishing with Thomas Kuhn and Richard Rorty. Kuklick succeeds in giving these figures a historical context that has generally been lacking in other contemporary treatments.

Kuklick's output has been prodigious. And in emphasizing how the institutional matrix in which philosophers worked – the universities, the seminaries, the departments – influenced their world he has opened the way for a sociology of philosophy as a profession that promises interesting results. His contributions to the field of the history of American philosophy are the most considerable of anyone currently working in the field.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Mind of the Historian (Indianapolis, 1969).

Josiah Royce: An Intellectual Biography (Indianapolis, 1972).

American Policy and the Division of Germany: The Clash with Russia over Reparations (Ithaca, N.Y., 1972).

The Rise of American Philosophy, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1860–1930 (New Haven, Conn., 1977).

Churchmen and Philosophers from Jonathan Edwards to John Dewey (New Haven, Conn., 1985).

The Unitarian Controversy, 1819–1823 (New York, 1987).

The Good Ruler: From Herbert Hoover to Richard Nixon (New Brunswick, N.J., 1988).

To Every Thing a Season: Shibe Park and Urban Philadelphia, 1909–1976 (Princeton, N.J., 1991).

Puritans in Babylon: The Ancient Near East and American Intellectual Life, 1880–1930 (Princeton, N.J., 1996).

A History of Philosophy in America, 1720–2000 (New York, 2001).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Pragmatism* (Indianapolis, 1981).

"'Interesting Questions' in the History of Philosophy and Elsewhere," in *Philosophy in History: Essays on the Historiography of Philosophy*, ed. Richard Rorty, J. B. Schneewind, and Quentin Skinner (Cambridge, UK, 1984).

"Does American Philosophy Rest on a Mistake?" in *American Philosophy: A Historical Anthology*, ed. Barbara MacKinnon (Albany, N.Y., 1985), pp. 177–89.

Ed., *Writings, 1902–1910*, by William James (New York, 1987).

Ed., *Selected Essays of Edwards A. Park* (New York, 1987).

Ed., *Political Writings*, by Thomas Paine (Cambridge, UK, 1989).

Ed. with D. G. Hart, *Religious Advocacy and American History* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1997).

"Charles Hodge, Scottish Realism and the American Philosophical Tradition," in *Charles Hodge Revisited: A Critical*

Appraisal of His Life and Work, ed. John Stewart and James Moorhead (Princeton, N.J., 1997).

Further Reading
Campbell, James. "Kuklick's *A History of Philosophy in America, 1720–2000*," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 39 (2003): 297–304.
Louch, Alfred. "Professing Philosophy," *Metaphilosophy* 11 (1980): 259–71.

Murray Murphey

KULTGEN, John Henry, Jr. (1925–)

John H. Kultgen, Jr. was born on 16 October 1925 in Dallas, Texas. He received his BA with highest honors and Phi Beta Kappa membership from the University of Texas in 1947. He then did graduate study at the University of Chicago, receiving an MA in 1949 and a PhD in philosophy in 1952. He wrote his dissertation on "Metaphysical Principles in Chemical Explanation" with Rudolf CARNAP and Manley THOMPSON. He taught philosophy at Oregon State University from 1952 to 1956, and then at Southern Methodist University from 1956 to 1967. In 1967 he was appointed professor of philosophy at the University of Missouri, after the retirement of Abram Cornelius BENJAMIN.

Kultgen was President of the Southwest Philosophical Society in 1972. He has been a National Science Foundation Fellow for the Program in Engineering Ethics in 1979, 1981 and 1982. He has served as a consultant for ethics committees of the American Association of Engineering Societies and the National Council of Engineering Examiners. He was a visiting scholar in the Peace Studies Program at Bradford University in England in 1989. He was named the Peace Studies Professor of the Year by the University of Missouri in 1995 and again honored by Missouri with the title of Byler Professor of Philosophy for 1998.

Kultgen's early work focused on various problems in the history of science and philosophy of science, and also on metaphysics and epistemology. Alfred North WHITEHEAD was a large influence, along with John DEWEY's pragmatism and the phenomenology of Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, and Jean-Paul Sartre. In the early 1980s Kultgen's attention turned to applied ethics and political philosophy, and his writings increasingly became concerned with the ethics of engineering and technology, professional ethics, peace and nonviolence. Kultgen has also engaged the moral problem of nuclear deterrence, in articles and his book *In the Valley of the Shadow: Reflections on the Morality of Nuclear Deterrence* (1999). In his *Ethics and Professionalism* (1988), he holds professionals to the very high standard of having a duty of service to all in need, consistent with competence and modest economic compensation. His *Intervention and Autonomy: Parentalism and the Caring Life* (1995) argues the inevitability and desirability of the ideal of parentalism (his preferred term instead of paternalism) in all social relationships including political relations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Nature of Man, with Ronald Wetherington (Dubuque, Iowa, 1967).
Ethics and Professionalism (Philadelphia, 1988).
Intervention and Autonomy: Parentalism and the Caring Life (Oxford, 1995).
In the Valley of the Shadow: Reflections on the Morality of Nuclear Deterrence (New York, 1999).

Other Relevant Works
"Operations and Events in Russell's Empiricism," *Journal of Philosophy* 53 (1956): 157–67.
"Boyle's Metaphysic of Science," *Philosophy of Science* 23 (1956): 136–41.
"Universals, Particulars and Change," *Review*

of Metaphysics 9 (1956): 548–64.

"Philosophical Concepts in Mendeleev's *Principles of Chemistry*," *Philosophy of Science* 25 (1958): 177–83.

"Biological Evolution and American Metaphysics," in *The Impact of Darwinian Thought on American Culture*, ed. Mody Boatwright (Austin, Tex., 1959), pp. 43–61.

"The 'Future Metaphysics' of Peirce and Whitehead," *Kant-Studien* 51 (1959): 285–93.

"Intentionality and the Publicity of the Perceptual World," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 33 (1973): 503–13.

"The Ideological Uses of Professional Codes," *Business and Professional Ethics Journal* 1 (1982): 53–69.

"Davidson's Social Contract for Business," *Business and Professional Ethics Journal* 5 (1986): 28–39.

"Rational Contractors," *Journal of Value Inquiry* 12 (1987): 185–98.

"Purging Our Nuclear Intentions," *Peace and Justice Studies* 5 (Spring 1993): 43–60.

"The Vicissitudes of Common-Sense Virtue Ethics," *Journal of Value Inquiry* 32 (1998): 325–41, 465–78.

"Managing Violence under Military Professionalization," in *Institutional Violence*, ed. Deane Curtin (Amsterdam, 1999), pp. 265–85.

Ed. with Mary Lenzi, *Problems for Democracy* (Amsterdam, 2005).

Further Reading

Alexander-Smith, Robin. "Commentary on Kultgen's "The Ideological Use of Professional Codes," *Business and Professional Ethics Journal* 1 (1982): 71–4.

Donaldson, Tom. "Fact, Fiction, and the Social Contract: A Reply to Kultgen's 'Donaldson's Social Contract for Business'," *Business and Professional Ethics Journal* 5 (1986): 40–46.

John R. Shook

KUNTZ, Paul Grimley (1915–2000)

Paul Kuntz was born in Philadelphia on 22 November 1915. His parents were Franklin Samuel Kuntz, a Lutheran minister, and Sadie Treichler Grimley. He received his BA in philosophy with high honors from Haverford College. In 1940 he received an STB degree from Harvard University. That was followed by an STM degree in 1944 and a PhD degree in philosophy in 1946, both also from Harvard. He wrote his dissertation on "Religion in the Life and Thought of George Santayana," under Ralph B. PERRY. Kuntz served as instructor at Smith College from 1946 to 1948. From there he moved to Grinnell College first as assistant professor (1948–52), then associate professor (1952–7), and finally as professor (1957–66). While at Grinnell he held the position of Noble Professor from 1961 to 1966. His final appointment was at Emory University, where he went to become chair of the philosophy department, serving until 1969 and teaching as professor until his retirement in 1985. Kuntz died on 28 January 2000 in Atlanta, Georgia.

During his long career Paul Kuntz served as officer, director, or program chair for the Metaphysical Society of America, the Society for Aesthetics, and the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology. He took the lead in forming the Santayana Society, the Ghandi-King Society, and the International Society of Metaphysics. He was also a member of the Society of Christian Philosophers, the Maritain Society, the American Catholic Philosophical Society, and the American Philosophical Association.

Paul Kuntz's work in philosophy is extremely varied. He wrote on such figures as Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, Gandhi, Charles HARTSHORNE, Hume, Jefferson, R. H. Lotze, A. O. LOVEJOY, Karl Popper, George SANTAYANA, Bertrand Russell, Paul WEISS, and A. N. WHITEHEAD. The subjects of his writings include religion, metaphysics, language, process, hierarchy, order, chaos, sport, ethics, and aesthetics. His style of philosophy was speculative and plu-

ralistic, and was always influenced by the religious ideas that he brought to philosophy from his earliest days. These ideas led him to suppose that there was order in the universe even if philosophers, theologians, and other thinkers were not fully aware of the presence of that order.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Philosophy: The Study of Alternative Beliefs (New York, 1961).

The Concept of Order (Seattle, Wash., 1968).

Alfred North Whitehead (Boston, 1984).

Bertrand Russell (Boston, 1986).

The Ten Commandments in History: Mosaic Paradigms for a Well-ordered Society (Grand Rapids, Mich., 2004).

Other Relevant Works

Kuntz's papers are at Emory University.

"The Hidden Order of Anton Ehrenzweig," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 28 (1969): 349–60.

Ed., *Lotze's System of Philosophy*, by George Santayana (Bloomington, Ind., 1971).

"The Achievements of Paul Weiss," *Review of Metaphysics* 25 (1972): 47–70.

"Hume's Metaphysics: A New Theory of Order," *Journal of Religious Studies* 12 (1976): 170–89.

"Rudolf Hermann Lotze as Process Philosopher," *Idealistic Studies* 9 (1979): 229–42.

"The Coincidence of Opposites in the Modern World," *New Scholasticism* 55 (1981): 116–34.

"Gandhi's Truth," *International Philosophical Quarterly* 22 (1982): 141–55.

"Can Whitehead Be Made a Christian Philosopher?" *Process Studies* 12 (1983): 232–42.

"The I-Thou Relation and Aretaic Divine Command Ethics: Augustine's Study of Virtues and Vices in the Confessions," *Augustinian Studies* 16 (1985): 107–27.

Ed. with Marion Leathers Kuntz, *Jacob's Ladder and the Tree of Life: Concepts of Hierarchy and the Great Chain of Being* (New York, 1987).

"Naming the Categories: Back to Aristotle by Way of Whitehead," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 2 (1988): 30–47.

"Charles Hartshorne's Theory of Order and Disorder," in *The Philosophy of Charles Hartshorne*, ed. Lewis Hahn (La Salle, Ill., 1991).

"Cosmos and Chaos: Weiss's Systematic Categorization of the Universe," in *The Philosophy of Paul Weiss*, ed. Lewis Hahn (La Salle, Ill., 1995).

"Of Rights and Duties: A Jeffersonian Dialogue," *Modern Age* 38 (1996): 224–36.

"Whitehead's Category of Harmony: Analogous Meanings in Every Realm of Being and Culture," *Process Studies* 29 (2000): 43–65.

Further Reading

Proc of APA v74

Alexander, Thomas A. "Memorial Notice: Paul Grimley Kuntz," *Overheard in Seville, The Bulletin of the Santayana Society* 18 (Fall 2000): 22–3.

Nick Fotion

KUPPERMAN, Joel Jay (1936–)

Joel J. Kupperman was born on 18 May 1936 in Chicago, Illinois. He attended the University of Chicago, receiving the BA in 1954, BS in 1955, and an MA in 1956. He then attended Cambridge University from 1956 to 1959, and Harvard University in 1959–60. In 1960 he began teaching philosophy at the University of Connecticut, and completed his Cambridge PhD in philosophy in 1963. His dissertation

title was "Evaluations of Works of Art." He was promoted to full professor of philosophy in 1972. He was a National Endowment for the Humanities Fellow in 1981, a visiting professor at Corpus Christi College, Oxford in 1985, and an Earhart Foundation Fellow in 1995–6.

Kupperman's writings have concentrated on moral and value theory, moral psychology, and ethical themes in Asian philosophy. His first book, *Ethical Knowledge* (1970), argues that morality provides a kind of knowledge not reducible to psychological or social matters. Ethical language provides for something like a "justified true belief" analysis of moral knowledge, even though it does not satisfy any verificationist criteria or converges towards agreement across many people. The result of Kupperman's deliberations is a kind of moral cognitivism and realism. *The Foundations of Morality* (1983) rejects both Kantian deontology and utilitarianism's hedonism. Kupperman accepts the consequentialist view that the moral assessment of behavior is an assessment of its consequences, but holds that attitudes, and not individual acts, are the proper object of moral evaluation. This focus on moral attitudes, according to Kupperman, avoids the extremes of eternal moral truths and subjective preferences.

In Kupperman's later writings, starting with *Character* (1991), attention to moral attitudes shifts somewhat towards character, and his "character ethics" is advanced over its rivals, rules ethics and virtue ethics. Character provides the necessary unifying structure to a good and moral life (while the virtues, not unifiable, cannot accomplish this structure). Distinguishable stages of self-formation in childhood lead towards the reflective capacities of mature character. Morality ultimately is a matter of judging the stable and everyday decision habits of character, and not notable acts in unusual situations. *Value … And What Follows* (1999) pursues value realism by arguing that emotional states attribute values to things, instead of the view that emotional states simply are our valuations of things. Kupperman takes a pluralistic standpoint on values, while seeking a "moral perfectionism" compatible with a liberal government able to promote some intellectual and cultural values.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ethical Knowledge (London and New York, 1970).

The Foundations of Morality (London, 1983).

Character (Oxford, 1991).

Value … And What Follows (Oxford, 1999).

Learning from Asian Philosophy (Oxford, 1999).

Classic Asian Philosophy: A Guide to the Essential Texts (Oxford, 2001).

Other Relevant Works

"Confucius and the Nature of Religious Ethics," *Philosophy East and West* 21 (1971): 189–94.

"Aesthetic Value," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 9 (1972): 259–64.

"Art and Aesthetic Experience," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 15 (1975): 29–39.

"Comfort, "Realism vs. Idealism," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 12 (1975): 199–210 .

"Is the Nature of Physical Reality Unknowable?" *American Philosophic Quarterly* 15 (1978): 99–105.

"Vulgar Consequentialism," *Mind* 89 (1980): 321–37.

"Confucian Ethics and Weakness of Will," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 8 (1981): 1–8 .

"Character and Self-Knowledge," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 85 (1985): 219–38.

"Ethics for Extraterrestrials," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 28 (1991): 311–20 .

"Axiological Realism," *Philosophy* 71 (1996): 185–203.

"Pluralism and the Tradition of

Democracy," in *Can Democracy Be Taught?* ed. Andrew Oldenquist (Bloomington, Ind., 1996), pp. 45–60 .

"How Values Congeal into Facts," *Ratio* ns 13 (2000): 37–53.

"The Indispensability of Character," *Philosophy* 76 (2001): 239–50.

"Hedonic Treadmills, and Public Policy," *Public Affairs Quarterly* 17 (2003): 17–28.

Further Reading

Ahmad, M. Mobin. "Kupperman's *Ethical Knowledge*," *Ethics* 83 (1973): 346–51.

Dalgleish, Tim. "An Anti-anti-essentialist View of the Emotions: A Reply to Kupperman," *Philosophical Psychology* 10 (1997): 85–90.

Hurka, Thomas. "Kupperman's *Value … And What Follows*," *Philosophical Review* 110 (2001): 281–3.

Tiles, James E. "Turning to Others to Learn about Self," *Philosophy East and West* 52 (2002): 246–55.

John R. Shook

KURTZ, Paul Winter (1925–)

Paul Kurtz was born on 21 December 1925 in Newark, New Jersey. He received his BA from New York University in 1948, then went to Columbia University, where he earned his MA in 1949 and his PhD in philosophy in 1952. The title of his dissertation was "The Problems of Value Theory." From 1952 to 1959 Kurtz taught at Trinity College in Connecticut. He then was a professor of philosophy at Union College in New York State from 1961 to 1965, and during that time he also was a visiting lecturer at the New School for Social Research. In 1965 Kurtz became professor of philosophy at the State University of New York at Buffalo,

and taught there until retiring in 1991. He founded a publishing company, Prometheus Books, in 1969 in Amherst, New York. He remains President of Prometheus Books, and has added many other responsibilities during his career. He has authored or edited over forty books and many hundreds of articles.

Kurtz carries on the legacy of the pragmatic and naturalistic humanism that he acquired while at Columbia. Committed to the superior rationality of scientific inquiry, he has staunchly defended science and reason against all forms of superstition, mythology, and fraudulent deception. He is the founder and chair of both the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal (founded in 1976), the Council for Secular Humanism (founded in 1980), and editor-in-chief of the journal *Free Inquiry*. He is also founder and chair of the Center for Inquiry in Amherst, New York. He was Co-President of the International Humanist and Ethical Union, and Humanist Laureate and President of the International Academy of Humanism.

Kurtz has argued for a comprehensive philosophy of secular humanism in his many books. Long involved with the American Humanist Association, he contributed to the composition of the Humanist Manifesto II with Edwin WILSON in 1973, and authored the Humanist Manifesto III in 2000. Humanist principles such as grounding morality in human happiness and not supernatural revelation, and demanding respect for individual liberty, support an active democratic culture that encourages free participation by all citizens. Humanistic ethics in Kurtz's hands takes a broadly utilitarian concern for the long-term welfare of all people, but restricts this utilitarianism by appeal to basic liberty rights and adds a communitarian respect for social groups.

Several of Kurtz's books present his philosophical views of science, naturalism, ethical theory, and political theory. In the areas of philosophy of science and naturalism, central works are *Philosophical Essays in Pragmatic Naturalism* (1991), *The New Skepticism:*

Inquiry and Reliable Knowledge (1992), and *Skepticism and Humanism: The New Paradigm* (2001). Three more books develop his humanistic ethics: *Forbidden Fruit: The Ethics of Humanism* (1987), *Eupraxophy: Living without Religion* (1989), and *Affirmations: Joyful and Creative Exuberance* (2004).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Decision and the Condition of Man (Seattle, Wash., 1965).

The Humanist Alternative: Some Definitions of Humanism (Buffalo, N.Y., 1973).

The Fullness of Life (Buffalo, N.Y., 1974).

Exuberance: An Affirmative Philosophy of Life (Buffalo, N.Y., 1977).

A Secular Humanist Declaration (Buffalo, N.Y., 1980).

In Defense of Secular Humanism (Buffalo, N.Y., 1983).

A Skeptic's Handbook of Parapsychology (Buffalo, N.Y., 1985).

The Transcendental Temptation: A Critique of Religion and the Paranormal (Buffalo, N.Y., 1986).

Forbidden Fruit: The Ethics of Humanism (Buffalo, N.Y., 1987).

Living without Religion (Buffalo, N.Y., 1988).

Eupraxophy: Living without Religion (Buffalo, N.Y., 1989).

Philosophical Essays in Pragmatic Naturalism (Buffalo, N.Y., 1991).

The New Skepticism: Inquiry and Reliable Knowledge (Buffalo, N.Y., 1992).

Toward a New Enlightenment: The Philosophy of Paul Kurtz, ed. Vern L. Bullough and Timothy J. Madigan (New Brunswick, N.J., 1994).

The Courage to Become: The Virtues of Humanism (Westport, Conn., 1997).

Embracing the Power of Humanism (Lanham, Md., 2000).

Skepticism and Humanism: The New Paradigm (New Brunswick, N.J., 2001).

Affirmations: Joyful and Creative Exuberance (Amherst, N.Y., 2004)

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *American Philosophy in the Twentieth Century: A Sourcebook from Pragmatism to Philosophical Analysis* (New York, 1966).

Ed., *Moral Problems in Contemporary Society: Essays in Humanistic Ethics* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1969; 2nd edn, Buffalo, N.Y., 1973).

Ed., *Sidney Hook: Philosopher of Democracy and Humanism* (Buffalo, N.Y., 1983).

Ed., *Building a World Community: Humanism in the 21st Century* (Buffalo, N.Y., 1988).

Ed. with Timothy J. Madigan, *Challenges to the Enlightenment: In Defense of Reason and Science* (Buffalo, N.Y., 1994).

Ed., *Science and Religion: Are They Compatible?* (Amherst, N.Y., 2003).

Further Reading

Schneider, Herbert W. "Kurtz's *The Fullness of Life*," *Journal of Philosophy* 72 (1975): 53–4.

Walter, Edward F. "A Defense of Naturalism: A Reply to Paul Kurtz," *Journal of Value Inquiry* 7 (1973): 217–28.

John R. Shook

KYBURG, Henry Guy Ely, Jr. (1928–)

Henry E. Kyburg, Jr. was born on 9 October 1928 in New York City. He received a bachelor of chemical engineering degree from Yale University in 1948. Deciding to pursue philosophy, he did graduate study at Columbia

University, earning an MA in 1953 and a PhD in philosophy in 1955. His dissertation was titled "Probability and Induction in the Cambridge School." He was an assistant professor of mathematics at Wesleyan University from 1958 to 1961; a research associate at Rockefeller University in 1961–2; an associate professor of mathematics and philosophy at the University of Denver in 1962–3; and an associate professor of philosophy at Wayne State University from 1963 to 1965.

In 1965 Kyburg was appointed professor of philosophy at the University of Rochester. He served as department chair from 1969 to 1982. In 1982 he was named Burbank Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy and in 1986 he added the title of professor of computer science. He has received several National Science Foundation grants and a Guggenheim Fellowship. In 1982 Kyburg was honored with the Butler Medal for Philosophy in Silver from Columbia University and became a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He also was elected a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Science in 1995, and of the American Association for Artificial Intelligence in 2002. In 2001 Kyburg was appointed for a five-year term as a research scientist on artificial intelligence at the Institute for Human and Machine Cognition in Pensacola, Florida.

Kyburg's philosophical work has been primarily in epistemology, inductive logic and probability theory, and philosophy of science. His primary effort in epistemology has been to offer explanations of how a body of empirical knowledge can increase through the rational evaluation of new information. The main problem is how to assign a subjective probability, a degree of belief, to new propositions. Kyburg's approach in *Probability and the Logic of Rational Belief* (1961) and *The Logical Foundations of Statistical Inference* (1974) is to discard chance and use a finite-frequency interpretation of statistical probability. Kyburg's resulting principle of direct inference has aroused considerable controversy, espe-

cially from those like Isaac Levi who appeal to confirmational conditionalization. The "Petersen" example in dispute begins from a rational person's body of knowledge that contains these statements: (1) the proportion of Protestants among Swedes is 90% and (2) Peterson is a Swede. By Kyburg's direct inference, this person can infer a 90% probability that Petersen is a Swede. However, Levi has claimed, if the person also knows that (3) the proportion of residents of Stockholm is 85% and (4) Petersen is a resident of Stockholm, then the narrower "reference class" of Stockholm residents should decide the 85% probability that Petersen is a Swede. Their dispute over the appropriate reference class involves a disagreement over whether chance is to be derived from probability, or the reverse. The fields of epistemic probability and statistical inference, further stimulated by Kyburg's papers collected in *Epistemology and Inference* (1983) and his later books *Science and Reason* (1990) and *Uncertain Inference* (2001), have been energized by these and related issues.

In the field of computer science, Kyburg has been attempting to formulate methodologies of artificial intelligence, such as designing computer searches through data and computable inferences from data. The philosophical problems of induction and statistical probability all emerge anew when trying to guide computer inductive reasoning towards generating general knowledge.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Probability and the Logic of Rational Belief (Middletown, Conn., 1961).

Philosophy of Science: A Formal Approach (New York, 1968).

Probability Theory (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1969).

Probability and Inductive Logic (New York, 1970).

The Logical Foundations of Statistical Inference (Dordrecht, 1974).

Epistemology and Inference (Minneapolis,

1983).

Theory and Measurement (Cambridge, UK, 1984).

Science and Reason (Oxford, 1990).

Uncertain Inference, with Choh Man Teng (Cambridge, UK, 2001).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with Ernest Nagel, *Induction: Some Current Issues* (Middletown, Conn., 1963).

Ed. with Howard Smokler, *Studies in Subjective Probability* (New York, 1964; 2nd edn 1980).

Ed. with Peter Asquith, *Current Research in the Philosophy of Science* (East Lansing, Mich., 1979).

Ed. with Greg Carlson and Ronald Loui, *Knowledge Representation and Defeasible Reasoning* (Dordrecht, 1990).

Ed. with Mariam Thalos, *Probability is the Very Guide of Life: The Philosophical Uses of Chance* (Chicago, 2002).

Further Reading

Bogdan, Radu. *Henry E. Kyburg, Jr. & Isaac Levi* (Dordrecht, 1982).

Levi, Issac. "Direct Inference," *Journal of Philosophy* 74 (1977): 5–29.

Schick, Frederic. "Consistency and Rationality," *Journal of Philosophy* 60 (1963): 5–18.

Stone, Mark A. "Kyburg, Levi, and Petersen," *Philosophy of Science* 54 (1987): 244–55.

John R. Shook

L

LACHS, John (1934–)

John Lachs was born on 17 July 1934 in Budapest, Hungary. At the age of fifteen, the government nationalized his father's business and the family fled the country, first to Vienna, Austria, and then to Montréal, Canada, where Lachs finished a year in high school. At McGill University, he encountered the work of George SANTAYANA, a thinker who influenced his general view of philosophy as well as specific doctrines he would adopt. As a graduate student, Lachs enjoyed Yale University's pluralistic department and worked with Paul WEISS, Brand BLANSHARD, and Wilfrid SELLARS, the latter two serving as co-directors of his dissertation. He wrote his dissertation on "A Critical Examination of Santayana's Philosophy of Mind" and earned his PhD in 1961. In 1959 he found a home at the College of William and Mary where he would teach for the next eight years. In 1967 he began teaching at Vanderbilt University where he remains professor of philosophy. He has received six teaching awards and taught many reputable thinkers in American philosophy, including John Stuhr and Herman Saatkamp. He has achieved an accomplished publishing record and provided leadership for the American Philosophical Association as well as the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy. In 1993 he was named Vanderbilt's Centennial Professor of Philosophy.

Lachs's publications cover a rich array of topics, ranging from epiphenomenalism and God's omniscience to education and euthanasia. The heart of his work lies in his interest in human nature and well-being; he has been attentive to our fulfilling activities as well as the conditions that facilitate or impede them. His discussions are characterized by a concern for clarity, though he is also sensitive to the poetic and has produced a book of poems, *The Ties of Time* (1870). Equally important is his commitment to critically exploring alternatives (including unpopular ones), rooted in a rich appreciation of the history of philosophy. Lachs has collaborated with others, publishing articles on education with his wife, skepticism and contingency with Michael Hodges, and an English translation of J. G. Fichte's *Wissenschaftslehre* of 1794 with Peter Heath. Engagement with the German tradition contributed to his development of a theory of social life that focuses on the benefits and costs of mediation. Lachs has also devoted attention to issues in medical ethics. He is perhaps best known, however, for his interpretations of and contributions to American pragmatism.

Since the early 1960s Lachs has been a critical interpreter of Santayana, publishing articles and books to give this neglected philosopher's views the attention they deserve. He has written, for instance, on Santayana's views of mind, moral philosophy, and spirituality, arguing that Santayana offers insights relevant to contemporary life. While sympathetic to Santayana's systematic vision, Lachs has nevertheless also been critical of various parts of the system. He argues, for instance,

that Santayana conflates different meanings of matter and generally renders it an unintelligible surd that fails to help us better understand things; its value as a category is thus impaired. Even so, Santayana's influence on Lachs's thinking is apparent in a variety of his key positions.

Lachs has been committed to naturalism and realism throughout his career. He characterizes naturalism as the view that reality is a single system that operates in accordance with discoverable laws without the interference of any external agents; Lachs thus attributes agency to the natural world. This world includes conscious beings but also numerous additional entities and processes whose reality is independent of mind and human construction. In his early career, he focused on the nature of mind, drawing on Santayana to defend epiphenomenalism. The central claim of the impotence hypothesis is that while mental events have their origin in physical processes, they lack physical power and bring nothing into existence. Lachs argued that epiphenomenalism has three distinct advantages (1987, pp. 12–15). First, it accounts for the experienced duality of events. Though every substance is a material body, this does not mean everything we experience is reducible to the physical. Hence, epiphenomenalism can account for such things as feelings of hope and anger without suffering the dualist's problematic contention that mental events are causally efficacious or the materialist's reduction of them to mere physical phenomena. Second, the epiphenomenalist can account for intentionality. Physical events simply are; they are not *about* anything, though our intentions clearly are. While materialism cannot account for intentionality, epiphenomenalism can. The third advantage is epiphenomenalism's ability to incorporate dualist insights without shunning the lessons of science. Lachs later distances himself from the impotence hypothesis, noting that while it may be the most compelling position if we begin with a mind–body divide, he follows pragmatists like John DEWEY

in rejecting that starting point. Lachs nevertheless maintains his commitment to naturalism and realism, as we see in his discussion of human natures.

Ethically and politically, Lachs endorses moral relationalism and pluralism. Different psyches have different endowments and relations to the environment and so find satisfaction in different activities. Lachs argues that values are thus relative, albeit relative to the established natures of individuals and not to passing feelings or whims. In the face of the plurality of satisfactions, he advocates tolerance. He bases his case for it on an argument that there are plural human natures. Giving continued evidence of his realism, Lachs begins his case by acknowledging the difference between objective facts, to which our choices are irrelevant, and conventional facts, which depend entirely on our choices. The crux of the argument is his contention that choice-inclusive facts constitute a third type of fact. Such facts have an objective component but are also contingent on our choices or purposes. The fact that there is a large body of water south of Alabama is an objective fact, that we call it the "Gulf of New Mexico" a conventional fact, and that we identify it as a gulf a choice-inclusive fact. Deciding whether this body of water is better described as a sea or a gulf is determined by appealing not only to objective features (we only foolishly describe it as a desert) but also to the purposes the classification serves. Identifying a creature as human similarly involves choice-inclusive facts. Try as we might, we cannot find a single characteristic that pertains to all creatures we would call human; the boundaries between human and non-human are rather marked by a significant number of loosely interconnected features. Concluding that a being is human is not the discovery of a merely objective fact but the conferral of a social status with benefits of respect and recognition of rights. Lachs notes that historically we have extended the category, making it more inclusive, though we persist in basing what it means to be human

and how humans ought to be on our own favorite characteristics. The remedy is to recognize the choice-inclusive nature of our category and to acknowledge different natures with understanding and tolerance. Lachs argues that we should tolerate differences (if not celebrate the banquet of diversity) so long as they do not harm others. He does not devote much attention to exploring the harm principle, though his comments suggest that harms are defined by physical, social, political, and economic factors that kill, seriously maim or undermine others' pursuits of their own good.

Lachs's treatment of human fulfillment calls attention to our diverse natures and also to the joys connected with spirituality. Santayana's understanding of spirit (or consciousness) provides a helpful touchstone. Animal psyche, which is the seat of agency, treats the data of consciousness (essences) as signs concerning the environment relevant to its survival. Spirit, by contrast, rests in the immediate apprehension of each essence qua essence. It is absorbed in the present as it contemplates eternal essences, stripped of concern for the demands imposed by the external environment. Santayana's view of spirituality is of a piece with his epiphenomenalism, though Lachs recognizes in it a truth about our capacity for joy in the present moment. Hence, even after he turns from epiphenomenalism, Lachs continues to emphasize immediacy, arguing that it is a possible source of joyful transcendence from the rat race. Though he celebrates absorption in the present, Lachs does not neglect concern for the future. Instead, he acknowledges with Dewey that some of our activities can be both instrumental and consummatory, belonging to a means-ends continuum. Still, Lachs's embrace of Dewey's position is partial, limited by his acknowledgment that some means are largely or wholly devoid of joy. While social amelioration may help eliminate some of the onerous and painful activities necessary for life, Lachs considers it utopian to believe it will free us from them all.

Part of what tempers Lachs's optimism is his understanding of social life, developed in his distinctive theory of mediation (1981). Lachs argues that mediation, understood as acting on behalf of another, is the basis of social life. Its benefits include the civilized cooperation for which society is routinely celebrated. The natural unity of an act can be broken up, such that some individuals are responsible for its planning and others for its execution, while still others enjoy its results. By coordinating the activities of many individuals, we accomplish complicated feats, such as obtaining food from a market or electricity from a light switch, that make our efforts more efficient and life more comfortable. But Lachs recognizes that benefits and costs are correlative; public benefits carry private costs. (Interestingly, during the years he discusses the costs of mediation, Lachs enjoys its fruits by collaborating with others on various publications.) He argues that in shattering an action's unity of plan-execution-enjoyment, mediation introduces a separation between individuals and their actions. The attendant costs, which we too frequently overlook, include manipulation, passivity, impotence, psychic distance, and the refusal to accept responsibility for acts.

Lachs's theory of mediation offers a unique and compelling analysis of social life. While it bears the mark of German idealism, its central insight emphasizes the individual. Lachs recognizes the social nature of individuals (noting that even islands have submerged connections) without thereby reifying social institutions or the state. At the heart of his moral thinking is the view that individuals are the only moral substances. They alone are centers and sources of moral agency, for they alone possess the consciousness, desire, and activity requisite for value creation (1995, p. 53). Society lacks an organ of awareness as well as the experience of desire. Additionally a society's actions are to be found in individuals acting on its behalf. Mediation enriches the lives of individuals, enabling them to enjoy social goods, but without attention to its effects, individuals become cogs in a machine bereft of meaningful activity. To address the costs of mediation,

Lachs calls for increased directness and immediacy. (In the process, he concretely applies Charles PEIRCE's claim that mediated thirds have an immediate firstness.) The psychic distance resulting from mediation blinds us to the goals and efforts of others – to the richness of their lives beyond the roles they play – and also to basic life processes. Mediation protects many of us from the physical trials of production; it shields even more from the realities of death relevant to eating. Lachs urges us to recover a measure of immediacy or directness that restores a meaningful link between individual and act. An especially important tool is education concerning the diverse roles and structures that secure the benefits of mediation. Openness in institutional and political decision-making also proves a vital resource; social justice further ensures that we all enjoy the fruits of our labor. Although he has faith in social amelioration, Lachs recommends that we face its limits with equanimity and a cheerful embrace of the transcendence made possible by immediacy. While his theory of mediation has unfortunately received little attention, perhaps the forthcoming publication of *The Cost of Comfort*, a work that examines empirical evidence corroborating the theory, will generate more critical response.

A key part of Lachs's legacy is his commitment to rendering philosophy relevant to everyday life. His works focus on the ways social changes affect human flourishing; Lachs has written much on human happiness, social alienation, and issues of life and death especially in the context of medicine. He was an early contributor to discussions on euthanasia as well as critic of the doctor–patient relation. Throughout these discussions, he calls for a sober assessment of and preparation for death that acknowledges its place in the natural life cycle. Lachs's proposals both respect the autonomy of individuals and recommend that we surround the dying with the caring vitality of the living. In addition to identifying conditions of the good death, Lachs has been especially devoted to promoting the good life – or

better, good living – that recaptures meaning and immediacy in our diverse quests for personal development and satisfaction. Always a champion of the individual, he has become increasingly sensitive to our social conditioning and the conflicts that arise as we balance self-determination with caring for others in community. Education, whether professional or familial, remains our chief means of caring for and guiding the development of individuals. Lachs has been especially intent on recovering immediacy in the classroom, acknowledging and preserving the intergenerational immediacy typical of education, and urging teachers to embrace their calling in an infectious manner that ripples toward a wide audience. In this spirit, he served as general editor for "The Great Philosophers," a series of audiotapes designed to introduce the public to philosophy.

Lachs's efforts have issued in three major overlapping achievements. First, he has been an active contributor to the tradition of American philosophy. He has brought critical attention to Santayana's work and also developed the ideas of activity, plurality, toleration, as well as personal development and fulfillment. Second, his theory of mediation and his argument for human natures represent unique contributions valuable to students of the human condition. Finally, his continued efforts to make philosophy relevant to life offer us the model of a philosopher who aims to stimulate reflective thinking (both within and beyond academia) that issues in meaningful activity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Intermediate Man (Indianapolis, 1981).
Mind and Philosophers (Nashville, Tenn., 1987).
George Santayana (Boston, 1988).
The Relevance of Philosophy to Life (Nashville, Tenn., 1995).
In Love with Life (Nashville, Tenn., 1998).
Thinking in the Ruins: Wittgenstein and Santayana, with Michael Hodges (Nashville, Tenn., 1999).

A Community of Individuals (New York, 2002).

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *Animal Faith and Spiritual Life: Unpublished and Uncollected Works of George Santayana with Critical Essays on His Thought* (New York, 1967).
Trans. with Peter Heath, *The Science of Knowledge*, by J. G. Fichte (New York, 1970).
The Ties of Time (Montréal, 1970).
"The Personal Value and Social Usefulness of Philosophy," in *The Philosophical I" Personal Reflections on Life in Philosophy*, ed. George Yancy (Lanham, Md., 2002), pp. 237–48.
Ed. with D. Micah Hester, *A William Ernest Hocking Reader* (Nashville, Tenn., 2004).

Further Reading
Flamm, Matthew. "Cheering on Life: A Conversation with John Lachs," *Kinesis* 27 (2000): 4–24.

Patrick Shade

LADD, George Trumbull (1842–1921)

George Trumbull Ladd was born on 19 January 1842 in Painesville, Ohio, and died on 8 August 1921 in New Haven, Connecticut. His mother, Elizabeth Williams, was a descendent of Governor William Bradford, who arrived in the Massachusetts Bay Colony on the Mayflower in 1620. His father, Silas Trumbull Ladd, descended from another Mayflower passenger, William Brewster. At the time of his son's birth, Silas was Treasurer of Western Reserve College in Hudson, Ohio. In 1850, Silas entered the grocery business in Painesville, where George was raised, attended local schools and received private tutoring. Poor health in his early years discouraged active, outdoor childhood pursuits; he spent more time with books and developed a passion for classical studies. His family attended the Congregational Church and fostered religious interests that influenced his personal and his professional life.

In 1860, Ladd entered Western Reserve College, pursued the study of classics and philosophy, and learned German. Among the philosophers of the mind whose books he read were John Locke, Thomas Reid, Immanuel Kant, William Hamilton and John Stuart Mill. He graduated in 1864 with a BA degree and was awarded an honorary MA in 1867. Ill health delayed his planned entrance into Andover Theological Seminary until 1866 and hindered his studies there; but he managed to graduate in December 1869.

In 1869 Ladd began his career as a minister in Edinburg, Ohio. In his two years in Edinburg, Ladd pursued his studies in theology and philosophy and worked to improve as a public speaker. His sermons, more philosophical than religious, attempted to inform the members of his church about current biblical scholarship, philosophy, and advances in science. Instead of sermons that reinforced orthodox Calvinism, Ladd gave his parishioners a form of liberal Protestantism that tried to mediate between orthodoxy and modern views. This incompatibility between members of the church and their pastor was clear to both. Ladd resigned, moved the family back to Painesville, and began to speak at a number of Midwestern pulpits. The reputation and attention he earned in this way led to an invitation to become the minister of a large urban church in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. The Spring Street Congregational Church (later the Grand Avenue Congregational Church) provided more scope for the development of Ladd's views on theology and philosophy. Although he moved even further from traditional beliefs to more liberal views, he continued to try to balance orthodox beliefs with new ideas from

science that emerged under the influence of Charles Darwin's theory of evolution. In Milwaukee, he was outspoken on civic issues, opposing corruption in politics, supporting religious instruction in public schools, and preaching temperance.

When his growing reputation for preaching on topics of social improvement and education resulted in invitations to speak to college audiences, Ladd began to consider a career change that would provide a more suitable forum for his developing views on theology and philosophy. In the early months of 1879, he accepted a three-year appointment at the Andover Theological Seminary as the Southworth Lecturer on Congregationalism. In June of 1879, to his surprise, he was informed of his election to be the Edward Little Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy at Bowdoin College, a position which he also accepted, and from which he was still able to give lectures at Andover. In 1880 he became the Valeria Stone Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy at Bowdoin.

In 1881 Ladd was appointed professor of philosophy at Yale University, a position that he held until his retirement in 1905, when Charles M. Bakewell succeeded to Ladd's position. His textbooks and his teaching at Yale, which included founding a psychological laboratory (1892) and appointing an instructor, E. W. Scripture, to supervise it, helped to establish the new experimental psychology as a discipline. His academic career at Bowdoin and at Yale coincided with the transition from mental philosophy, the "old psychology," to a new scientific psychology in the United States.

Ladd was the second President of the American Psychological Association in 1893, serving after G. Stanley Hall and before William James. Ladd also was President of the American Philosophical Association in 1904–1905, and Vice President of the Section on Psychology and Anthropology of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1911–12. In his lifetime he received a number of honors, including honorary degrees from Western Reserve College (DD 1879, LLD 1895), from Yale (MA 1881), and from Princeton (LLD 1896). From Japan he received the Order of the Rising Sun (3rd Class 1899, 2nd Class 1907) and the gold medal of the Imperial Education Society of Japan (1907), of which he was an honorary member. Ladd's recognition in Japan was the result of the success of lectures there on philosophy, psychology, and religion, with applications to the modernization of the Japanese educational system. Several of his books on psychology and philosophy were translated into Japanese. He also lectured in India and in Korea and published books on his experiences there and in Japan.

Members of Ladd's generation came of age in the aftermath of the American Civil War and the growing influence of Darwin's theory of evolution. Notable members of this generation were William James (also born in 1842), George H. Palmer (b.1842), John Fiske (b.1842), Lester F. Ward (b. 1841), Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. (b. 1841), William G. Sumner (b.1840), G. Stanley Hall (b.1844), and Laurens P. Hickok (b.1844). They tended to be more skeptical of the religion of their fathers and more tempted by materialistic and mechanistic theories of the human mind and human behavior. Ladd's commitment to his religious beliefs and training never wavered, however, as he attempted to integrate new scientific scholarship and philosophical perspectives into established religious beliefs. He believed that the new scientific results and philosophy would reshape and invigorate but not contradict or replace established doctrine. For example, he devoted more than a decade to an examination of biblical literature and the claims that the Bible was divinely inspired and its teachings infallible. Ladd found no evidence in the Bible itself or in critical biblical scholarship to support the view that the Bible was divinely inspired or that its teaching was infallible. He rejected the story of Genesis regarding creation and embraced evolution without, however, rejecting a Christian God. His critical

examination of doctrinal issues and liberalization of beliefs appeared in the two volumes of *The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture* in 1883. Ladd's views were attacked as heretical sophistry by orthodox theologians who believed in the divine inspiration and infallibility of the Bible.

Just as he valued the new philosophical thought and scientific advance for its capacity to reinvigorate traditional religious doctrine, Ladd saw the opportunity to approach the human mind and soul through the methods of science. Nineteenth-century German academic philosophy had raised the possibility of a science of mind; and the methods and results of experiments in physiology and psychophysics promised to make that possibility a reality. When Ladd began his career at Bowdoin College, the teaching of mental philosophy was largely represented by theologian/philosophers influenced by the Scottish School of Common Sense and, in a few cases, by Kant and continental philosophies. This "old" psychology was represented by several texts published before mid century whose content was consistent with prevailing protestant religious beliefs. Transitional textbooks, such as Noah PORTER's *The Human Intellect with an Introduction upon Psychology and the Soul* (1868) and Thomas UPHAM's *Abridgement of Mental Philosophy* (1861), retained a commitment to a creator but also introduced research results from psychophysical and physiological laboratories into a metaphysical framework compatible with religious belief.

Ladd, like Porter, tried to mediate between his commitment to the metaphysical reality of mind and a soul independent of physiology and the more materialistic and mechanistic thrust of the new psychology. He had learned from and was sympathetic to the position of the German philosopher Hermann Lotze, whose lectures on psychology, metaphysics, and other topics he translated and published in the years 1884–7. Lotze, trained in physiology and possessor of a medical degree, incorporated into his philosophy the results of psychophysical and physiological research, believing, as did Ladd, that the resultant philosophy would mediate between the material body and the immaterial, metaphysical mind or soul. Both Ladd and Lotze were committed to a philosophical dualism that argued for the reality of a divinely created mind/soul inherent in human beings that obeyed laws of its own and was not just a manifestation of a physiological process. As Ladd stated it: "The development of Mind can only be regarded as the progressive manifestation in consciousness of the life of a real being, which although taking its start and direction from the action of the physical elements of the body, proceeds to unfold powers that are *sui generis*, according to laws of its own." (1890, p. 493)

Ladd's first and most significant contribution to the new psychology was *Elements of Physiological Psychology* (1887). One historian concluded that, except for this book, "his name would scarcely be remembered except by the historians of the science" (Roback 1952, p. 179). In the *Elements*, Ladd organized and condensed the results of the recent scientific studies in physiology and psychophysics that promised to provide new scientific facts about mind. He summarized in some detail what was known about the brain and the sensory-motor functions of the nervous system as a necessary basis for understanding the physiological mechanisms that related activities of the senses and the nervous system to conscious experience. He described and discussed the results of research on sensation and perception, on reaction time as a measure of the time taken by mental processes, on feeling and emotion, and speculated on the physical basis of higher mental processes, such as memory and will. These first 500 pages of the 900-page *Elements* emphasized the laboratory results produced by the new physiological, experimental psychology that had been given name and status by Wilhelm Wundt at the University of Leipzig. Ladd's *Elements* offered little to those interested in the abnormal, in anthropology

(social psychology), in instinct or the evolution of mind in the species or in individual development (Hall 1887).

For Ladd, the new psychology was a significant part of philosophy. He was not sympathetic to the rush of some of his colleagues in the new discipline to shed the metaphysical questions that no longer seemed to them appropriate to psychology as a natural science. He devoted the last 400 pages of the *Elements* to discussions of metaphysical issues, including the difficulties of defining consciousness and its primary phenomena for a scientific psychology and the impossibility of correlating changes in brain states with conscious experience. It was to metaphysics that Ladd appealed to make sense of the facts of mind that the laboratory produced. Readers interested in the summaries of experimental results alone would not be inclined to be interested in Ladd's metaphysical ruminations, while those interested in metaphysical issues would be equally disinclined to be interested in the pages of experimental results (Hall 1887). Whether readers ignored one part or another, the *Elements*, as the first significant source in English that gave access to the experimental results of the German psychological laboratories, spurred interest in America in the new science of psychology. Its popularity and usefulness as a handbook of the results of the new experimental psychology led to a revised edition (1911), with Robert S. Woodworth as coauthor, in which the largely philosophical discussions were omitted and the chapters on experimental results condensed.

Ladd also rearranged and edited the contents of *Elements of Physiological Psychology* to create a textbook for classroom use, *Outlines of Physiological Psychology* (1890; Japanese edition, 1901). This text emphasized the psychophysical and physiological results appropriate to a scientific study of mind and as such could have been a landmark offering in the new psychology. Unfortunately for Ladd, the text was greatly overshadowed by the huge success of James's *Principles of Psychology*

published in the same year. Ladd nevertheless continued to write for the serious beginning student, publishing *Psychology: Descriptive and Explanatory* (1894) and *Outlines of Descriptive Psychology* (1898), designed as a textbook for colleges and normal schools. His *Primer of Psychology* (1894, with a braille edition in 1895 and a Japanese edition in 1897) was written for the interested student or general reader who might want to pursue the study of psychology outside of a classroom. His *Philosophy of Mind* (1895) "argued the case for the reality of psychic life" (Mills 1969, p. 27). Despite differences in the scope and intent of these volumes, Ladd's focus was always on the status of psychology as a science and on its place within philosophy. Nevertheless, Ladd was a psychologist in transition. His introductory texts, like others of the period, were a blend of the old psychological terms and philosophical analyses of mental processes with the results of experiments reported from psychological laboratories.

Ladd defined psychology as "the science of the facts or states of consciousness, as such, and thus the life of that subject of the states which is called the Self, or the Mind" (1894, p. 7). This definition embodied Ladd's view of the discipline and earned him the label of "personalist" for his emphasis upon the self and a personal will that guided behavior. Ladd's psychology has been labeled more commonly "functional" by Edwin BORING (1950) for his emphasis on an active self, the adaptive function of consciousness, the implied purpose of mind as adaptive, and the potential for psychology to be useful. E. B. TITCHENER (1929), Boring's teacher, labeled Ladd's psychology as functional for similar reasons. As such, Ladd was part of a functional tradition that characterized the mental philosophy taught in American colleges throughout the nineteenth century as well as the functional biological tradition fostered by Darwin's theory of evolution.

Ladd rejected the old mental philosophy for its tendency to classify mental processes and

then use the name of the class as an explanatory faculty (e.g., we observe that we remember and explain our ability to remember by saying that we possess a faculty for remembering). Nevertheless, Ladd used, with apologies, the categories of intellect, feeling and conation or willing as descriptive terms for complex states of mind, as named by Kant but also employed in earlier American textbooks. Ladd conceived of these forms of psychical activity as consisting of contents and processes that enter into all mental states, with different combinations of processes producing different states of consciousness. He furnished consciousness with the contents and processes of the old psychology treated scientifically or traditionally, as appropriate to the evidence available and the susceptibility of the process to laboratory investigation. As in the textbooks of his contemporaries, Ladd included the latest results of laboratory experiments with respect to such topics as sensation and perception, feeling and memory, but relied on more traditional treatments of such topics as the sentiments, the nature of space, time and causation, and the will.

Conscious states, in Ladd's writings, were not simply "commotions" of the nerves but independent psychic realities experienced by a Self. The states were accessible through practiced introspection, in which attention to them is focused by an act of will. Attention was conceived of as a kind of mental energy, perhaps involuntarily focused in some circumstances, but more significantly guided by an act of will. Indeed, will not only directed attention, it also directed the body to act in an external physical world. Behavior, for Ladd was purposeful and self-directed. Mind and behavior were organized and guided by a plan; but Ladd's conception of the organization of behavior was in no sense deterministic. Will or volition was characterized by intelligence and foresight and expressed as free choice. Reason was the guide to and arbiter of moral conduct.

The science of psychology, of mind, consciousness, and conduct or behavior, was not complete for Ladd without a metaphysical supplement. The ends of behavior toward which an individual was moved, for example, were self-improving and moral. In his *Philosophy of Conduct* (1902), Ladd addressed the issue of ethical behavior and the ends toward which behavior was directed. There he expressed his belief in the individual as "a religious being whose mental life both rested upon and expressed a reality that was created and sustained by God" (Mills 1969, p. 170). In this sense Ladd was an idealist who attempted to find in psychology a way of bridging the gap between the world of physical reality and the ideal toward which the mind, and behavior, were directed. He moved through "the brambles of the new mental science and critical religious scholarship … toward a definition of the ideal-real. His functional approach to psychology and his conviction that man may control his own behavior were joined in the effort to place man in a world of realism and idealism." (Mills 1969, p. 166) For Ladd, psychology without metaphysics was merely a collection of facts; metaphysics opened the way for a spiritual life by a being capable of self-improvement through the action of volition directed toward ideal ends.

In his psychology and the philosophy of which it was a part, Ladd strove to retain the ideal and the real in a universe governed by an Absolute, an Intelligence that provided a unity to the world and the place of human beings within it. His commitment to a metaphysical dualism that posited an independent mind belonging to a self set him apart from those who were more willing to accept a materialistic monism that saw mind as an epiphenomenon. Ladd may have looked forward to a monism that he could accept, but he did not believe that psychology had yet reached that point in its development. His psychology and the accompanying philosophical and religious positions left him in an uncomfortable place among his colleagues in those fields. As E.S. Mills, Ladd's biographer, concluded:

His philosophical writings drew most

heavily upon the literature of the new mental science, the theories of Kant and Lotze, and principles of Christian theology. Theologians distrusted him because of his advocacy of science, psychologists became impatient with him because of his preoccupation with metaphysics, and professional philosophers … were generally unenthusiastic about his efforts to crowd so many kinds of reality into one grand view. (Mills 1969, p. 10)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Principles of Church Polity (New York, 1882).

The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture, 2 vols (New York, 1883).

Elements of Physiological Psychology (New York, 1887; rev. edn with Robert S. Woodworth, 1911).

Outlines of Physiological Psychology (New York, 1890).

"Psychology as So-called 'Natural Science'," *Philosophical Review* 1 (1892): 24–53.

Primer of Psychology (New York, 1894).

Psychology: Descriptive and Explanatory (New York, 1894).

Philosophy of Mind: An Essay in the Metaphysics of Psychology (New York, 1895).

Philosophy of Knowledge: An Inquiry into the Nature, Limits, and Validity of Human Cognitive Faculty (New York, 1897).

Outlines of Descriptive Psychology (New York, 1898).

A Theory of Reality: An Essay in Metaphysical System upon the Basis of Human Cognitive Experience (New York, 1899).

Essays on the Higher Education (New York, 1899).

Philosophy of Conduct: A Treatise of the Facts, Principles, and Ideals of Ethics (New York, 1902).

Philosophy of Religion, 2 vols (New York, 1905).

Knowledge, Life, and Reality: An Essay in Systematic Philosophy (London and New York, 1909; New Haven, Conn., 1918).

What Can I Know? (New York, 1914).

What Ought I to Do? (New York, 1915).

What Should I Believe? (New York, 1915).

What May I Hope? (New York, 1915).

The Secret of Personality: The Problem of Man's Personal Life as Viewed in the Light of an Hypothesis of Man's Religious Faith (New York, 1918).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Outlines of Metaphysics*, by H. Lotze (Boston, 1884).

Ed., *Outlines of Logic and of Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, by H. Lotze (Boston, 1885).

Ed., *Outlines of the Philosophy of Religion*, by H. Lotze (Boston, 1885).

Ed., *Outlines of Practical Philosophy*, by H. Lotze (Boston, 1885).

Ed., *Outlines of Aesthetics*, by H. Lotze (Boston, 1886).

Ed., *Outlines of Psychology*, by H. Lotze (Boston, 1886).

In Korea with Marquis Ito (New York, 1908).

Rare Days in Japan (New York, 1910).

Intimate Glimpses of Life in India (Boston, 1919).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Bio Dict Psych by Zusne*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v33*, *Pres Addr of APA v1*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Boring, E. G. *A History of Experimental Psychology*, 2nd edn (New York, 1950).

Fay, Jay Wharton. *American Psychology before William James* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1939).

Fuchs, A. H. "Contributions of American Mental Philosophers to Psychology in the United States," *History of Psychology* 3 (2000): 3–19.

Hall, G. S. "Ladd's *Elements of*

Physiological Psychology," *American Journal of Psychology* 1 (1887): 159–64.

Mills, Eugene S. *George Trumbull Ladd: Pioneer American Psychologist* (Cleveland, Ohio, 1969). Contains a bibliography of Ladd's publications.

Roback, A. A. *A History of American Psychology* (New York, 1952; 2nd edn 1964).

Titchener, E. B. "George Trumbull Ladd," *American Journal of Psychology* 32 (1921): 600–601.

———, *Systematic Psychology: Prolegomena* (New York, 1929), pp. 161–76.

Alfred H. Fuchs

LADD, John (1917–)

John Ladd was born on 24 June 1917 in Middletown, Connecticut. He attended Harvard University, where he received his BA in 1937, MA in 1941, and PhD in philosophy in 1948. He also earned an MA from the University of Virginia in 1941 and an honorary MA degree from Brown University in 1957. After teaching at the University of Göttingen in Germany in 1948–9, and teaching as an instructor at Harvard University in 1949–50, Ladd found a permanent home with the philosophy faculty at Brown University in 1950. In 1958–9 he visited the University of Oxford on a Guggenheim Fellowship. He was promoted to full professor in 1962, and retired in 1987.

Ladd was an active member in the American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy, serving as Secretary-Treasurer for thirteen years and as President during 1976–8. He was the first chair of the Committee on Philosophy and Medicine of the American Philosophical Association, and served on the Executive Committee and the Committee on Computers of the APA. He was a member of the AAAS Committee for Scientific Freedom and Responsibility from 1989 to 1995. He helped to found the Program in Biomedical Ethics at Brown, and served as its Director for several years. He was also involved in the establishment of the Center for the Study of Race and Ethnicity in America at Brown in 1987, served for four years as its Acting Director, and continues to participate in its activities.

Ladd's writings have concentrated on moral theory, moral psychology, action theory, and topics in applied ethics and social philosophy. He incorporated aspects of Kant's ethical theory into his views on rights and duties. In 1965 he produced a widely used translation of part 1 of Kant's *Metaphysics of Morals*, which went into a second edition (1999). His early writings dealt with special problems in analytic approaches to moral psychology and language. His studies of Navaho ethical language, published in 1957, supported his later standpoint of ethical relativism: "there are no absolute moral standards binding on all men at all times" (1973, p. 1).

Ladd's moral philosophy is allied with pacifism, and several of his articles criticize ethical premises that have been used to motivate and justify war. Besides being opposed to moral absolutism, he strongly urges that moral responsibility is always an individual matter, and that corporate moral responsibility is a fiction because only individuals can have moral duties. Loyalty to a group is likewise a fiction; people can be loyal only to others.

In "The Idea of Collective Violence" (1991), Ladd identifies five components to justifications of collective violence: (1) a Bifurcation into a moral group (us) and an immoral or sub-human group (them); (2) a Moral Disqualification of them; (3) use of a Doctrine of the Double-Standard to protect us from criticism; (4) a Doctrine of Group Mission to establish heroes defending us and our values; (5) and a conviction that this conflict is a Zero Sum Struggle so that no compromise or coexistence is possible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Value Judgments, Emotive Meaning, and Attitudes," *Journal of Philosophy* 46 (1949): 119–28.

"Free Will and Voluntary Action," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 12 (1952): 392–405.

The Structure of a Moral Code: A Philosophical Analysis of Ethical Discourse Applied to the Ethics of the Navaho Indians (Cambridge, Mass., 1957).

"The Ethical Dimensions of the Concept of Action," *Journal of Philosophy* 62 (1965): 633–45.

"The Idea of Collective Violence," in *Justice, Law and Violence*, ed. James B. Brady and Newton Garver (Philadelphia, 1991).

"The Idea of Community: An Ethical Exploration," *Journal of Value Inquiry* 32 (1998): 3–24, 153–74.

Other Relevant Works

"The Distinctive Features of Obligation-Statements," *Journal of Philosophy* 53 (1956): 653–62.

"Law and Morality," in *Law and Philosophy: A Symposium*, ed. Sidney Hook (New York, 1964).

Trans., *Metaphysical Elements of Justice: Part I of the Metaphysics of Morals*, by Immanuel Kant (Indianapolis, Ind., 1965; 2nd edn 1999).

"Loyalty," in *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Paul Edwards (New York, 1967).

Ed., *Ethical Relativism* (Lanham, Md., 1973; 1985).

Ed., *Ethical Questions Relating to Life and Death* (Oxford, 1979).

"Legalism and Medical Ethics," *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy* 4 (1979): 70–80.

"Euthanasia, Liberty, and Religion," *Ethics* 93 (1982): 129–38.

"Corporate Mythology and Individual Responsibility," *International Journal of Applied Philosophy* 2 (1984): 1–22.

"Bhopal: An Essay on Moral Responsibility and Civic Virtue," *Journal of Social Philosophy* 32 (1991): 73–91.

"Philosophical Reflections on Race and Racism," *American Behavioral Scientist* 41 (1997): 210–20.

Further Reading

Sandbacka, Carola. "Some Problems of Prescriptivism in Navaho Ethics," *Inquiry* 27 (1984): 255–67.

Schlaretzki, W. E. "A Critique of Ladd's Theory of Moral Prescriptions," *Ethics* 70 (1960): 322–7.

John R. Shook

LADD-FRANKLIN, Christine (1847–1930)

Christine Ladd was born on 1 December 1847 in Windsor, Connecticut, and died on 5 March 1930 in New York City. She received her BA in 1869 and the LLD in 1887 from Vassar College. After teaching science and mathematics in secondary schools for several years, she undertook graduate study at Johns Hopkins University, admitted under special circumstances because the university was not open to women. Although she qualified for the PhD degree in 1882 it was withheld at that time because of her gender, but granted more than four decades later when the university celebrated its semicentennial in February 1926. By then Ladd had attained an enviable reputation in both logic and psychology. She was the pioneer American woman in those two fields as well as in mathematics.

Ladd studied at Johns Hopkins with J. J. Sylvester and Charles S. PEIRCE, who became a lifelong friend and colleague. Her first paper on logic (1883) detailed her modification of the logical algebra of Boole and proposed that syllogistic reasoning might be reduced to a single formula, the "inconsistent triad" or "antilogism," whereby any two of the three proposi-

tions will yield a valid contradiction of the third. Josiah ROYCE referred to this as "the definitive solution of the problem of the reduction of syllogisms" and further commented that "it is rather remarkable that the crowning activity in a field worked over since the days of Aristotle should be the achievement of an American woman" (Shen 1927, p. 60).

Following completion of graduate work, Ladd married Fabian Franklin, a member of the mathematics faculty at Johns Hopkins and her former classmate. In 1891–2 they spent a year studying in Europe. By that time Ladd-Franklin had begun working on the problem of binocular vision, combining her mathematical interests with the new experimental psychology. She expanded her research on vision in the laboratories of G. E. Müller in Göttingen and H. von Helmholtz in Berlin, who held opposing theories of color vision with Müller following E. Hering's position. Ladd-Franklin's new theory attempted to incorporate the strong points of both. She assumed a photochemical model whereby complementary colors are due to retinal chemistry and proposed a three-stage evolutionary development of color sensation. Her contributions to color vision science continued to the end of her long life. In the year before her death a collection of her papers published between 1892 and 1926 appeared as *Colour and Colour Theories* (1929).

Ladd-Franklin never held a professorial appointment. She was however ceaselessly active in research and writing and taught as a part-time lecturer in psychology and logic at Johns Hopkins from 1905 to 1909, and after the family moved to New York City following her husband's shift from academia to journalism, at Columbia University from 1914 to 1927. She was associate editor for logic and psychology for J. M. BALDWIN's *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology* (1901–1902) and authored many of the articles, including some attributed to Peirce (Brent 1993, p. 275).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"On the Algebra of Logic," in *Studies in Logic*, ed. Charles S. Peirce (Boston, 1883), pp. 17–71.
"On Theories of Light-Sensation," *Mind* 2 (1893): 474–89.
"The Antilogism," *Mind* 37 (1928): 532–4.
Colour and Colour Theories (New York, 1929).

Other Related Works
Ladd-Franklin's papers are at Columbia University.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v26*, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v40*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*, *Women Phils*
Brent, Joseph. *Charles Sanders Peirce: A Life* (Bloomington, Indiana, 1993).
Cadwallader, Thomas C., and Joyce V. Cadwallader. "Christine Ladd-Franklin," in *Women in Psychology: A Bio-bibliographic Sourcebook*, ed. Agnes N. O'Connell and Nancy Felipe Russo (New York, 1990), pp. 220–29.
Shen, Eugene. "The Ladd-Franklin Formula in Logic: The Antilogism," *Mind* 36 (1927): 54–60.

Elizabeth Scarborough

LAFFERTY, Theodore Thomas (1901–70)

Theodore T. Lafferty was born on 3 June 1901 in Cherokee Nation, Indian Territory (now northeastern Oklahoma). At the age of fifteen he left school to join the US Army, and served for several years on tours in the Philippines, Siberia, Japan, and China. After demobilization Lafferty returned to the United States and attended the University of Chicago, where he received his BA, his MA in 1926, and his PhD

in philosophy in 1928. His dissertation, "The Logical and Epistemological Implications of the Theory of Perspectives," was written under the direction of George H. MEAD, whose pragmatism Lafferty adopted wholeheartedly.

After teaching for a short time at Chicago as an assistant professor, Lafferty became a professor of philosophy at Lehigh College in Pennsylvania, where he taught until 1945. In 1945–6 he taught at Hood College in Maryland. In 1946 he became professor of philosophy at the University of South Carolina. He was hired to replace the retired Josiah Morse, who had been nearly a one-man department of philosophy and psychology since 1911. Lafferty took over these broad duties, taught a wide variety of courses, and led psychology towards its own department by 1964. With the inauguration of the philosophy department in 1964, James W. Oliver arrived to take over the duties of department chair from Lafferty, and together they began further to expand the department. Lafferty retired in 1969 and taught for a year as visiting professor in 1969–70 at Columbia University. He died on 10 June 1970 in Columbia, South Carolina.

Lafferty applied the pragmatic and naturalistic philosophy of Mead and John DEWEY to the study of the nature and knowledge of values. Modern philosophy had required that objective values must be independent values, yet the physical sciences had difficulty locating them, setting up severe metaphysical difficulties. By showing how to overcome the subject–object dualism, Lafferty believed, pragmatism could show how to accept the relativity of values to human beings without thereby also supposing that such values must therefore be entirely subjective. In his "Empiricism and Objective Relativism in Value Theory" (1949), Lafferty set down his main principles: (1) the empirical test of a value is further experience, (2) a value tends to sensitize people to other values, and (3) values are sharable.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Theory of Perspectives as an Interpretation of Functional Analysis," *Journal of Philosophy* 26 (1929): 346–54.

"The Dualism of Means and Value," *Journal of Philosophy* 28 (1931): 393–406.

"Some Metaphysical Implications of the Pragmatic Theory of Knowledge," *Journal of Philosophy* 29 (1932): 197–207. Repr. with "The Dualism of Means and Value" in *Studies in Philosophy* (Bethlehem, Penn., 1932).

"Empiricism and Objective Relativism in Value Theory," *Journal of Philosophy* 46 (1949): 141–55.

"The Metaphysical Status of Qualities," *Journal of Philosophy* 50 (1953): 313–28.

Elements of Logic (Columbia, S.C., 1963).

Nature and Values: Pragmatic Essays in Metaphysics (Columbia, S.C., 1976).

Other Relevant Works

Lafferty's papers are at the University of South Carolina.

"A Scandal in Philosophy, or How to Make Philosophy Interesting," *International Journal of Ethics* 43 (1933): 439–43.

"The Material World," *Journal of Philosophy* 31 (1934): 505–13.

"Inter-Communication in Philosophy," *Journal of Philosophy* 43 (1946): 449–66.

"Valuation as Cognition," *Journal of Philosophy* 45 (1948): 181–8.

Further Reading

Proc of APA v43

Dewey, John. "Introduction," in *Studies in Philosophy*, by Theodore T. Lafferty (Bethlehem, Penn., 1932), pp. i–ii.

John R. Shook

LAMBERT, Joseph Karel (1928–)

J. Karel Lambert was born on 10 April 1928 outside Chicago, Illinois. He received a BA in 1950 from Willamette University and an MS in experimental psychology from the University of Oregon in 1951. In 1956 he received a PhD in psychology at Michigan State University, writing a dissertation on "A Logical-Mathematical Analysis of Tolman's Theory of Learning" under Henry S. LEONARD in philosophy and M. Ray Denny in psychology.

Lambert's first position was as assistant professor of psychology at the University of Alberta in Canada, but he did not stay working in psychology for long. During his doctoral study, he became convinced that a revision in classical predicate logic was required to accommodate non-denoting singular terms (such as "the knife seen by Lady Macbeth" or "five divided by zero") as genuine singular terms and not merely as disguised descriptive phrases. Lambert came to this conclusion through considerations in psychology, and in particular, through the requirements for formalizing a theory of learning. At Alberta, Lambert developed "free logic" in the early 1960s. The development of revisions of the classical predicate calculus to admit non-denoting terms was not unique to Lambert. In the 1960s, a number of other proposals emerged (for example, those due to Henry Leonard, Hugues LEBLANC, and Jaakko HINTIKKA). Nonetheless, it is fair to say that Lambert's formalization of free logic – and especially his proposal for combining free logic with a theory of definite descriptions, proposing a law governing descriptions now acknowledged as *Lambert's Law* – is the default position among proponents of free logic. For accessible recent discussions of Lambert's work, see Lambert's survey article "Free Logics" (2001).

As a result of the shift in his research interests to logic and the philosophy of science, Lambert transferred to the philosophy department at the University of Alberta in the early 1960s. In 1963 he became professor and chair of the philosophy department at West Virginia University. Lambert's research on free logic and free definite description theory continued, and he regularly taught classes on the philosophy of science. These lectures were eventually published in 1970 in *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science*, written with Gordon Brittan. This textbook has been widely used to teach introductions to the philosophy of science, and it has been translated into a number of languages and published in multiple editions.

In 1967 Lambert moved to the University of California at Irvine as professor of philosophy. He became a research professor of logic and the philosophy of science in 1994, and presently holds this position. His more recent research has continued to develop the formal theory of free logic, together with explorations of applications in metaphysics, philosophy of language, philosophy of science, and, more recently, in the theory of computation. His book *Meinong and the Principle of Independence* (1983) is a detailed study of Meinong's distinction between "being" (*sein*) and "being so" (*sosein*). Long derided as incoherent after Bertrand Russell's devastating critique as this was, Lambert shows that Meinong's account contains much of value. Lambert used the tools of free logic and shows that the theory of predication – and in particular, the options for the truth or falsity of *atomic* predications – is more complicated than the standard classical picture would lead us to believe. Another application of Lambert's work in free logic is to be found in the more recent literature on free logic and the theory of computation. Lambert's collaboration with the computer scientist Raymond Gumb (1997) provides a good example of how these techniques have also found a home outside philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Philosophical Problems in Logic: Some Recent Developments (Dordrecht, 1970).
An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science, with Gordon G. Brittan, Jr. (Englewood

Cliffs, N.J., 1970; 2nd edn, Atascadero, Cal., 1979; 3rd edn 1987; 4th edn 1992).

Derivation and Counterexample: An Introduction to Philosophical Logic, with Bas C. Van Fraassen (Encino, Cal., 1972).

The Nature of Argument, with William Ulrich (New York, 1980).

Meinong and the Principle of Independence (Cambridge, UK, 1983).

Logic Bivalence and Denotation, with Ermanno Bencivenga and Bas van Fraassen (Atascadero, Cal., 1986; 2nd edn 1991).

Free Logics: Their Character, Genesis and Some Applications Thereof (Sankt Augustin, Germany, 1997).

Free Logic: Selected Essays (Cambridge, UK, 2003).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Philosophical Applications of Free Logic* (Oxford, 1991).

"Outline of a Theory of Scientific Understanding," with G. Schurz, *Synthese* 101 (1994): 65–120.

"Definitions in Nonstrict Positive Free Logic," with R. Gumb, *Modern Logic* 7 (1997): 25–55.

"Free Logics," in *The Blackwell Guide to Philosophical Logic*, ed. L. Goble (Oxford, 2001), pp. 258–80.

"From Predication to Programming," *Minds and Machines* 11 (2001): 257–65.

Further Reading

Marcus, Ruth Barcan. "Reply to Dr Lambert's 'Quantification and Existence'," *Inquiry* 6 (1963): 325–7.

Morscher, E., and A. Hieke, eds. *New Essays in Free Logic: In Honour of Karel Lambert* (Dordrecht, 2002).

Quine, W. V. "Free Logic, Description, and Virtual Classes," *Dialogue* 36 (1997): 101–8.

Spohn, Wolfgang, Bas van Fraassen, and Brian Skyrms, eds. *Existence and Explanation: Essays Presented in Honor of Karel Lambert* (Dordrecht, 1991).

Wisan, R. N. "Lambert's Presuppositions," *Philosophical Studies* 13 (1962): 91–3.

Greg Restall

LAMONT, Corliss (1902–95)

Corliss Lamont's fiercely independent thinking challenged prevailing ideas in philosophy, economics, religion, patriotism, world peace, and the exercise of our civil liberties. Born to Wall Street wealth, he championed the cause of the working class, while derided as a "socialist" and a "traitor to his class." His humanist belief that earthlings have evolved without supernatural intervention and are responsible for their own survival and well-being on this planet caused traditionalists to label him a "godless atheist." His insistence that the United States maintain a productive relationship with the Soviet Union in the face of prevailing anti-communist hysteria earned him the accusation by Senator Joseph McCarthy of being "un-American."

Corliss Lamont was born on 28 March 1902 in Englewood, New Jersey, to Florence H. Corliss and Thomas W. Lamont, who was a partner in J. P. Morgan & Co. He was their second son in a family of four children. He enjoyed a loving, liberal, and privileged upbringing, with authors, poets, and statesmen as guests at the family dining table. While the older son followed his father into banking, Corliss pursued his mother's interest in philosophy. Several influences in his youth piqued his interest and shaped his future endeavors. His paternal Aunt Lucy, grieving over the tragic loss of her 21-year-old son, became obsessed with spiritualism through wishing to communicate with him. Lamont was intrigued with the "messages" she conveyed to the family and vowed to explore this possibility scientifically, which in a way he did in his PhD dissertation.

He had a strong sense of justice and truth, and was often a lone dissenter, standing on principle and championing the underdog. Tales of labor conditions always made him indignant, and years later his picture appeared on the front page of the *New York Times* – captioned "Son of Wall Street" – for his arrest at a furniture workers' protest in Newark, New Jersey, that had been forbidden by then Mayor Hague. Around Christmas of 1917 Lamont remembered his father had sailed home early from a trip to Europe to arrange a meeting with President Woodrow Wilson. His father's friend, William Boice Thompson, head of the American Red Cross, had been witness to the upheaval of the Bolshevik Revolution. Sympathetic to the Bolshevik cause, the two consulted with Lloyd George, Prime Minister of England, discussing allied support that would keep the Russian front open and divide Germany's war efforts. George answered that if they could persuade Wilson, England would join. However, their urgent attempts to meet Wilson were thwarted. A comment on their rejection was that anyone who would waste the Red Cross's money on such damn fool nonsense was not worth seeing. Lamont, who was fourteen when this happened, always wondered about Wilson's choice.

Lamont was educated at Phillips Exeter Academy and Harvard University, graduating with his BA in 1924. He spent that summer serving as a guide for the League of Nations in Geneva, Switzerland. Then in the fall he attended the University of Oxford where, by good luck, he arrived too late for a dorm assignment and was taken in by Julian and Juliette Huxley. He also spent many hours on Boar's Hill with old family friend and Poet Laureate, John Masefield, enjoying his recitations and his summer theatricals that were also attended by George Bernard Shaw. Lamont went on to take a PhD in philosophy at Columbia University in 1933. His dissertation was on issues of immortality and was later published as the *Illusion of Immortality* (1935), for which John DEWEY wrote an introduction

and which Lamont considered his most important book. In his nineties, he quipped light-heartedly that he should have dedicated it to his Aunt Lucy. Lamont was a part-time lecturer in philosophy at Columbia from 1928 to 1932 and 1947 to 1959. He also lectured on occasion at Cornell, Harvard, and the New School for Social Research. His usual course was on "The Philosophy of Humanism."

In 1934 Lamont visited the Soviet Union with his wife Margaret Irish, an enthusiast of Socialism, with whom he had four children. He was intrigued with the experiment with democratic docialism and a planned economy in the movement idealized by John Reed as the revolution that shook the world. This first inspired Lamont to write *The Peoples of the Soviet Union* (1935), a book that later would spark the wrath of Senator Joseph McCarthy. His next book aimed to popularize and explain the concept that seemed so dreaded by capitalists. It was entitled *You Might Like Socialism* (1939). He continued strongly to champion the ideals of the revolution, over-long he said, unbelieving of the anti-socialist sentiments that began saturating the American media, certain that its detractors were merely propagandists bent on its destruction, and who feared contagion would spark from a touted worldwide movement.

Lamont always remained independent in his thinking and his affiliations. Though many college-age idealists had joined the Communist Party, he refused. While being supportive of their rights, he always stated strong philosophical and organizational reservations. He was criticized by them for his refusal, yet on the other hand, he was also criticized by conservatives for his sympathies for socialism. Though his parents were more lenient and understanding, his own brother, Thomas Stillwell Lamont, in a twelve-page letter, seriously took him to task for "disgracing the family with your socialist antics." Lamont answered with great tolerance and respect in a long letter of his own that "without knowing it, dear Tom, you have delineated the ills of the twentieth century."

He proceeded to explain them all. Lamont ran unsuccessfully for US Senate in 1952 on the American Labor Party ticket, and attempted again in 1958 with the Independent Socialist Party.

An interesting landmark occasion took place at a 1942 Madison Square Garden rally advocating Soviet-American friendship. Both he and his father Thomas spoke from the same podium in support of continuing the relationship that more conservative elements were calling into question. A photo of Corliss Lamont at the microphone on this occasion constitutes the cover of the 1990 edition of his civil liberties book, *Freedom Is As Freedom Does*, first published in 1956.

Lamont considered himself primarily an author and educator, though he was in every sense of the word a philosopher. He recognized that he was not especially revered, for instance, by his colleagues in the philosophy department at Columbia. He may have been dismayed, but undaunted, knowing that his political activism distanced him from others whose philosophy he respected and considered "pure." In his later years Lamont would shrug off his feelings of philosophical isolation, saying that this is always the cost of following one's conscience in all matters. "Perhaps history will vindicate me," he almost wistfully mused. He scanned the *New York Times* obituary page daily; he would have been pleased by his own obituaries, as they were respectful.

Lamont greatly admired George SANTAYANA, whom he described as pure but whose stance disappointed him because of Santayana's non-engagement in defending Humanism and social reform. Santayana was no crusader and kept himself above the fray. His correspondence with Santayana is found in the Corliss Lamont Rare Book Reading Room at Columbia, and in *The Works of George Santayana*, for which Lamont provided most of the funding. Donations of letters, papers, works of art, and many historical collections have gone to the Rare Book Department at Columbia and to Philips Exeter Academy, including a giant painting by Diego Rivera of Corliss Lamont with his "Crime Against Cuba" pamphlet. At Columbia University, Lamont's professor John Dewey became a friend and mentor. Dewey wrote a praising introduction to Lamont's first book, *The Illusion of Immortality*, advising that it should be read and taken to heart by all. Lamont was a major contributor of funding for the critical edition of John Dewey's works published in the 1970s. On the deaths of both his mentors, Lamont initiated discussions to commemorate them, later published as dialogues. He also endowed a chair in Civil Liberties at Columbia Law School.

In an ironic miscarriage of justice to which Lamont was witness/participant, the American Civil Liberties Union succumbed to the fear of communist taint during the days of the House Un-American Activities Committee when they expelled one of its founders, the labor organizer and political activist, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, an admitted party member. Lamont had voted against this as they debated until two in the morning. Years later, at his instigation, the ACLU issued posthumously an apology for having failed her in its stated mission to uphold her rights to associate freely with whomever she chose, and voted to reinstate her to the ACLU Board.

The National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee had been formed to remedy this lapse and Lamont headed it for many years. He carried several landmark cases successfully to the courts, including a suit against the United States Postmaster General for interfering with his mail, which was brought to the US Supreme Court. The high court's unanimous decision was in Lamont's favor. Lamont prized a letter of apology from the CIA's Stansfield Turner for their surveillance of him and for having opened love letters to his wife. The CIA was fined and a check for $2,000 was awarded to Lamont by the court. His challenge to McCarthy is documented by Philip Wittenberg in *The Lamont Case* (1957). Research had shown that McCarthy's inquisition hearings were not authorized by the Senate Parent Committee.

Over a span of sixty years Lamont published close to thirty political and philosophical pamphlets. He promoted freedom of choice, the public's right to know, freedom of information, civil liberties, world peace and the United Nations. His second wife, Helen Boyden Lamb, was an author as well and an authority on Vietnam. Together they campaigned incessantly against the war in Vietnam. Years after the war had ended, his Harvard College roommate, Henry Cabot Lodge, nearing his last days, seemingly setting his desk and his conscience in order, sent him a note, referring to Lamont's criticism of US policy in Vietnam, saying, "You were right. We were wrong, I should have resigned in protest." With his third wife Beth Elberta Keehner, also a humanist activist, Lamont continued to publish pamphlets and place advertisements in the *New York Times*. He criticized Pentagon spending, participated in protests – even marching in a Washington D.C. anti-Gulf War demonstration – and denounced the policies of the State Department against Cuba. During his lifetime he was honored by many organizations such as the NAACP, including the Gandhi Peace Award in 1981. He served on the Board of Directors of the National Urban League, the ACLU, and the NECLC. He served also as an honorary president of the American Humanist Association until his death.

On 26 April 1995 Corliss Lamont died peacefully on a sunny day enjoying the birdsong in his own garden overlooking the Hudson, in Ossining, New York. A memorial tribute to his life in the form of a civil liberties debate attended by hundreds was held at Columbia University on 18 September 1995. To celebrate his centenary year in 2002 a civil liberties forum was held in the Law Department at Columbia University in which a dozen speakers warned of new civil liberties dangers with the recent passage of the USA PATRIOT Act. Many observed that Lamont would have been heartsick at the turn of events in the war against terrorism, US foreign policy, and American relationships with the rest of the world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Russia Day by Day, with Margaret I. Lamont (New York, 1933).

The Illusion of Immortality (New York, 1935; 5th edn 1990).

The Peoples of the Soviet Union (New York, 1935).

Soviet Civilization (New York, 1937).

You Might Like Socialism: A Way of Life for Modern Man (New York, 1939).

"Naturalism and the Appreciation of Nature," *Journal of Philosophy* 44 (1947): 597–608.

The Philosophy of Humanism (New York, 1949; Amherst, N.Y., 1997).

The Independent Mind (New York, 1951).

A Humanist Funeral Service (New York, 1954).

Freedom Is As Freedom Does: Civil Liberties in America (New York, 1956).

Freedom of Choice Affirmed (New York, 1967, 3rd edn 1990).

A Humanist Wedding Service (New York, 1970).

Remembering John Masefield (New York, 1971).

Lover's Credo: Poems of Love (New Hampshire, 1972).

Voice in the Wilderness: Collected Essays of Fifty Years (New York, 1974).

Yes To Life, Memoirs of Corliss Lamont (New York, 1981).

A Lifetime of Dissent (Buffalo, N.Y., 1988).

Other Relevant Works

Lamont's papers are at Columbia University and Harvard University.

Ed., *Dialogue on John Dewey* (New York, 1959).

Ed., *Dialogue on George Santayana* (New York, 1959).

Ed., *Man Answers Death, An Anthology of Poetry* (New York, 1959).

Ed., *The Trial of Elizabeth Gurley Flynn by the American Civil Liberties Union* (New York, 1968).

Ed., *Collected Poems of John Reed* (New

York, 1985).

Ed., *"Dear Corliss": Letters from Eminent Persons* (New York, 1988).

Ed. with Lansing Lamont, *Letters of John Masefield to Florence Corliss Lamont* (New York, 1989).

Further Reading

Who Was Who in Amer v11, Who's Who in Phil

Crane, Sylvia. "Corliss Lamont: An Outstanding Humanist," *Humanist in Canada* 39 (Winter 1988).

Crockett, Campbell. "The Naturalistic Humanism of Corliss Lamont," *The Personalist* 35 (1954): 369–79.

"East 70th Street, Lamonts, Father and Sons," *Fortune* 9 (July 1939).

Edwords, Fred. "Requiem for a Freedom Fighter," *The Humanist* 55 (July/August 1995).

Schapiro, Edward S. "Corliss Lamont and Civil Liberties," *Modern Age* 42 (2000): 158–75.

Wittenberg, Philip. *The Lamont Case: History of a Congressional Investigation* (New York, 1957).

Beth K. Lamont

LAMPRECHT, Sterling Power (1890–1973)

Sterling P. Lamprecht was born on 8 January 1890 in Cleveland, Ohio. He graduated from Williams College with a BA in 1911. He received his MA in philosophy from Harvard the next year, and then entered Union Theological Seminary, receiving his BD in 1915. There followed study in philosophy at Columbia where he received his PhD in philosophy in 1918; his dissertation was published that year as *The Moral and Political Philosophy of John Locke.* After a year's service in the US Infantry,

he returned as an instructor of philosophy at Columbia during 1919–21. He then was a professor of philosophy at the University of Illinois from 1921 to 1928. In 1928 he accepted a position in the philosophy department at Amherst College, where he was professor of philosophy until his retirement in 1956. He died on 15 October 1973 in Hanover, New Hampshire.

Lamprecht was a philosopher, historian of philosophy, and teacher of generations of students. He may be thought of as embodying and demonstrating possibilities for living what George SANTAYANA called the life of reason. His students at Amherst College playfully referred to him sometimes as The Greek Tradition, sometimes as Zeus; but his allegiances to Plato and Aristotle were combined with careful and ambitious historical scholarship devoted mainly to British philosophers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries – the empirical tradition Lamprecht deeply respected and saliently criticized. His interests as a historian went along with a more speculative concern for the major philosophical topics of nature, history, time, contingency, causality, and freedom. He viewed these concepts from the perspective of naturalism, which he defined as "a philosophical perspective, empirical in method, that regards everything … within one all-encompassing system of nature."

Lamprecht's book on Locke contained a careful situating of the philosopher in relation to seventeenth-century predecessors like Hobbes and the Deists, and he went on to write further about Locke and edit a selection of his works. Other significant essays include ones on Descartes's role in seventeenth-century English thought, on Hobbes, on Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees,* and an especially telling study, "Empiricism and Epistemology in David Hume" (1925). Lamprecht also wrote about twentieth-century philosophers such as Santayana and John DEWEY. Two of the older philosophers he most admired and lectured on with relish – Aristotle and Spinoza – had to wait for written consideration until he published his one-volume history of philosophy the year he retired from teaching. Reviewing that book, *Our*

Philosophical Traditions (1955), John H. RANDALL, Jr. called it the best one-volume history of philosophy to have appeared, and decades later that claim seems still arguable.

In his short book of essays *Nature and History* (they originated as the Woodbridge Lectures delivered at Columbia in 1949), Lamprecht cautioned his reader that "Metaphysics is not the place for either rapture or despair." It could be said that his teaching and writing generally avoided both qualities. As a lecturer on the history of philosophy, he took pains to give balanced estimates of the figures he took up in turn, even when – as with Leibniz or Hegel – he was not sympathetic to them. Although he admired both William JAMES and Dewey, he seemed less attracted to pragmatic accounts of knowledge than to the more spacious ones he found in Santayana, in A. N. WHITEHEAD, and above all in his teacher and mentor, F. J. E. WOODBRIDGE. He liked to speak of what he called "the Woodbridge tradition" as a way of viewing the forms of human life and experience as occurring in a context of natural events. Such "realism," as he called it, had its origins in Aristotle, and if as Coleridge said every man is either a Platonist or an Aristotelian, Lamprecht in his common-sense and open-minded methods of investigation seemed inclined toward Aristotle. But the charm and wit of many of his formulations remind us that he loved Plato's writings as well.

Although Lamprecht remained firmly secular in his beliefs, his sympathies toward religion are well shown in *Our Religious Traditions* (1950), where he provided forthright statements on Judaism, Catholicism, and Protestantism. But his deepest belief was probably stated in his essay "Naturalism and Religion" when he wrote "The middle way is, in religion as generally in life, the best way." (1944, p. 38)

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Moral and Political Philosophy of John Locke (New York, 1918).
Our Religious Traditions (Cambridge, Mass., 1950).

Nature and History (New York, 1950).
Our Philosophical Traditions: A Brief History of Philosophy in Western Civilization (New York, 1955).
The Metaphysics of Naturalism (New York, 1967).

Other Relevant Works
"Empiricism and Epistemology in David Hume," in *Studies in the History of Ideas*, vol. 2 (New York, 1925), pp. 219–52.
"Locke's Attack upon Innate Ideas," *Philosophical Review* 26 (1927): 145–65.
Ed., *Locke: Selections* (New York, 1928).
"Santayana, Then and Now," *Journal of Philosophy* 25 (1928): 533–50.
Ed., *Henry More, Enchiridion Ethicum* (New York, 1930).
"The Rôle of Descartes in Seventeenth Century England," in *Studies in the History of Ideas*, vol. 3 (New York, 1935), pp. 179–240.
"Animal Faith and the Art of Intuition," in *The Philosophy of George Santayana*, ed. Paul Schilpp (Evanston, Ill., 1940), pp. 113–34.
"Naturalism and Religion," in *Naturalism and the Human Spirit*, ed. Y. H. Krikorian (New York, 1944), pp. 17–39.
Ed., *De Cive; or, The Citizen*, by Thomas Hobbes (New York, 1949).
"Philosophy and Metaphysics: Metaphysics and Empiricism," in *Self, Religion, and Metaphysics: Essays in Memory of James Bissett Pratt*, ed. Gerald E. Myers (New York, 1961).

Further Reading
Nat Cycl Amer Bio v58, *Who Was Who in Amer v6*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Cohen, Barry, and James Humber. "Sterling Lamprecht's Critique of Causality," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 9 (1973): 41–54.

William H. Pritchard

LANDESMAN, Charles (1932–)

Charles Landesman was born on 17 December 1932 in Brooklyn, New York. He received his BA from Wesleyan University in 1954. He then attended Yale University, where he received his MA in 1956 and PhD in philosophy in 1959. Landesman was an assistant and associate professor of philosophy at the University of Kansas from 1959 to 1965. He then became a professor of philosophy at Hunter College of the City University of New York, where he taught as a member of the Graduate Faculty of CUNY until his retirement in 2003. Landesman served as department chair from 1967 to 1971 and 1979 to 1982. He was a Fulbright Lecturer at Ben Gurion University in Israel in 1992–3.

Landesman's *Discourse and Its Presuppositions* (1972) defended the view that the meaning of a sentence is useful for performing conventional linguistic actions. In support of this view, he held a psychologistic theory of communication and a realist position on universals. In several articles he developed his realism and arguments against abstract particulars.

In *Color and Consciousness* (1989) and *The Eye and the Mind* (1993), Landesman defends a representationalist theory of perception, arguing against direct realism. His "color skepticism" theory holds that no belief attributing color to an object can be true. Unlike the sense-data theory which seeks some actually existing mental entity to be colored, Landesman's representationalism does not claim that any mental state represents colors. This theory is not the same position as color eliminativism, because we are certainly aware of colors. Like after-images, in which nothing is really colored, colors fall under the category of Platonic universals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Discourse and Its Presuppositions (New Haven, Conn., 1972).
Philosophy: An Introduction to the Central Issues (New York, 1985).
Color and Consciousness: An Essay in Metaphysics (Philadelphia, 1989).
The Eye and the Mind: Reflections on Perception and the Problem of Knowledge (Dordrecht, 1993).
Introduction to Epistemology (Oxford, 1996).
Skepticism: The Central Issues (Malden, Mass., 2002).

Other Relevant Works

"Does Language Embody a Philosophical Point of View?" *Review of Metaphysics* 14 (1961): 617–36.
"Metaphysics and Human Nature," *Review of Metaphysics* 15 (1962): 656–71.
"Mental Events," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 24 (1964): 307–17.
"The New Dualism in the Philosophy of Mind," *Review of Metaphysics* 19 (1965): 329–45.
"Actions as Universals: An Inquiry into the Metaphysics of Action," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 6 (1969): 247–52.
Ed., *The Problem of Universals* (New York, 1971).
"Conduct and Rational Causation," *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior* 11 (1981): 241–52.
"Mill on Necessary Truth," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 8 (1983): 469–75.
"Reflections on Hobbes: Anarchy and Human Nature," in *The Causes of Quarrel: Essays on Peace, War, and Thomas Hobbes*, ed. Peter Caws (Boston, 1989), pp. 139–48.

Further Reading

Elugardo, Reinaldo. "Landesman on Abstract Particulars," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 35 (1975): 411–14.
Gibbons, Alan. "Landesman on Universals," *Philosophy and*

Phenomenological Research 35 (1975): 415–18.

John R. Shook

LANG, Berel (1933–)

Berel Lang was born on 13 November 1933 in Norwich, Connecticut. He received his BA (magna cum laude) in 1954 from Yale University and his PhD in philosophy from Columbia University in 1961. He has been professor of philosophy at the University of Colorado from 1961 to 1983, and the State University of New York at Albany from 1983 until he retired in 1997. He became professor of humanities at Trinity College in 1997. He has also held visiting professorships at Long Island University, The Hebrew University, University of Connecticut, Rensselaer Polytechnic University, and Wesleyan University.

Lang is a fellow of the Legacy Project, which preserves the memories and legacies of twentieth-century atrocities and violence, including the Holocaust. He has been an American Council of Learned Societies scholar (1994–5), a fellow at the Center for Judaic Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, a senior fellow for the Center for the Study of Religion in Public Life (1997–present), a Rothschild Fellow at the Hebrew University (1965), and Ina Levine Scholar-in-Residence at the US Holocaust Memorial Museum (2001–2002).

Lang's interests in philosophy have shifted and grown over the course of his career, but there is continuity that remains throughout concerning the underlying role of aesthetics, and especially with the role of representation, in a number of different forms, which permeates his philosophical corpus. Lang's early writings considered topics that are fairly central to aesthetics. He was one of the first philoso-phers to write works in English that had as their central goal placing Marxist work within the general field of modern aesthetics. He also goes to great length to describe an aesthetics of philosophy or an aesthetics of philosophical writing and helps to clarify what philosophy has to offer as a form or genre of writing. This is a recurring theme throughout his work and he has returned to the subject even late in his career.

A seemingly unrelated strand of Lang's writing on the Holocaust follows a continuation of themes that began with his work in aesthetics. The underlying line of continuity concerns representation, specifically, representation of the relationship between ethics and aesthetics within the Holocaust. He investigates questions with regards to intention, responsibility, forgiveness, and revenge, and suggests a theory of the history of evil that provides a context for the Holocaust both historically and morally. Lang argues that the Holocaust was not an anomaly of history, but since it happened once, it can happen again. He discusses the chain of causality that may have led to the Holocaust, along with deeper metaethical issues involving the relationship between history and memory. A number of his essays explore different ways in which we can interpret and represent the Holocaust now and in the future, emphasizing the notion that the past is anything but static and that any interpretation will influence future understandings.

Lang has covered an impressive number of topics with much philosophical insight and depth. Topics covered include, but are not limited to aesthetics, ethics, philosophical style, embodied mind, the Holocaust, business ethics, irony, and emotion. The range of philosophers he has published on includes Martin Heidegger, Karl Marx, René Descartes, Moses Maimonides, Alfred WHITEHEAD, Roger Fry, Susanne LANGER, John Stuart Mill, and Henry David Thoreau. Although the underlying theme of aesthetics does not always manifest itself in strictly traditional ways, it is seemingly always there, at times more prominent than at others.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Art and Inquiry (Detroit, 1975).

Philosophy and the Art of Writing (Lewisburg, Penn., 1983).

Act and Idea in the Nazi Genocide (Chicago, 1990).

The Anatomy of Philosophical Style: Literary Philosophy and the Philosophy of Literature (Oxford, 1990).

The Future of the Holocaust: Between History and Memory (Ithaca, N.Y., 1999).

Holocaust Representation: Art within the Limits of History and Ethics (Baltimore, Maryland, 2000).

Other Relevant Works

Marxism and Art: Writings in Aesthetics and Criticism, ed. Berel Lang and Forrest Williams (New York, 1972).

Ed., *The Concept of Style* (Philadelphia, 1979).

Ed., *Philosophical Style: An Anthology about the Writing and Reading of Philosophy* (Chicago, 1980).

Ed., *The Death of Art* (New York, 1984).

Ed., *Writing and the Holocaust* (New York, 1988).

Further Reading

Fackenheim, Emil L. "The Holocaust and Philosophy," *Journal of Philosophy* 82 (1985): 505–14.

Sarah Elizabeth Worth

LANGER, Susanne Katherina Knauth
(1895–1985)

Susanne Knauth was born on 20 December 1895 in New York City. In 1920 she graduated from Radcliffe College in Massachusetts, and married a historian, William L. Langer, in 1921. She went with her husband to study at the University of Vienna and then came back to Radcliffe to get a MA in 1924 and a PhD in philosophy in 1926. Langer taught at Radcliffe, Wellesley, and Smith colleges on temporary positions, despite her quality as a philosopher, and raised a family. She received a divorce in 1942, and in 1943 she taught philosophy at the University of Delaware, and from 1945 to 1950 lectured at Columbia University. She was professor of philosophy at Connecticut College from 1954 until her retirement in 1962. In 1960 she was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. She died on 17 July 1985 in Old Lyme, Connecticut.

Early in her career, Langer did what many have done since – she wrote an introductory logic text. In some ways, this was a conventional exposition, based on the WHITEHEAD-Russell system of logic. In other ways, it was unconventional and as such an anticipation of her future thought. Chapter 1 is entitled, "The Study of Forms," which presented logical form as a special case of form, or structure, in general. She compared and contrasted logical form with musical form (1937, pp. 24ff), and biological or physical form (1937, p. 37). The focus on structure and form, a keen sense of the ubiquity of form and structure, and of the importance of a sense of that ubiquity, remained with her throughout her life.

Langer's first significant work, *Philosophy in a New Key* (1942), became very popular, especially outside the academy, although it was hardly a traditional work. The basic project of the book was, in its historical context, remarkable. The previous fifty years of philosophy had seen a swing from the dominance of idealism at the end of the nineteenth century and first part of the twentieth to the dominance of scientific conceptions of philosophy such as logical positivism. Langer aimed to reject both of these dogmatic approaches, while taking from each what she saw as their truth. She took from idealism a focus on the mind as an ordering device operating with structures of symbols, but rejected its repudiation of any reality beyond the mind. She took from posi-

tivism the mind as a grasper of reality, but rejected what she saw as its narrow emphasis on the methods of science. She brilliantly understood what the majority of interpreters (especially the logical positivists themselves) had not understood, how Ludwig Wittgenstein's theory in *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* of the relation between language and the world was fundamentally one of great abstractness. It presented a *form*, which could be filled out in many ways. It was not at all an assumption of the model that language meant the language of science. Langer herself explored the possibility that language could include the presentational symbolisms of the emotions, the language of ritual and myth, and – most significantly for her future work – the language of music and the arts.

The chapter on music (1942, pp. 204ff) began with Clive Bell's famous idea of significant form as the key to the understanding of art. Langer proceeded to link significant form with artistic expressiveness: the significance of significant forms was exactly that they were expressions of feeling. Langer both adopted and yet transformed current notions. Her view was not formalist, in the sense that the internal structure of the form in itself was what counted. Rather, what mattered was the mind whose feeling the form expressed. But her view was formalist, in that the expression was significant by virtue of its form. She spoke of a "new philosophy of art, based on the concept of 'significant form'" (1942, p. 205). It was new, because it linked form and expression in a distinctive way.

This link of expression and form was then developed at length in Langer's best-known work of aesthetics, *Feeling and Form* (1953). She subtitled the book, "A theory of art developed from *Philosophy in a New Key*," and suggested that *Feeling and Form* could be regarded as "in effect, Volume II of the study in symbolism that began with" the earlier book (1953, p. vii). Langer famously defined art as "the creation of forms symbolic of human feeling" (1953, p. 40). Music was "a symbolic expression of the forms of sentience as [the composer]

understands them" (1953, p. 20). For Langer, these symbols were fundamentally abstract in character. "All forms in art, then, are abstracted forms: their content is only a semblance, a pure appearance, whose function is to make them apparent – more freely and wholly apparent than they could be if they were exemplified in a context of real circumstance and anxious interest. It is in this elementary sense that all art is abstract." (1953, p. 50) "The symbol is, from first to last, something created. The illusion, which constitutes the work of art, is not a mere arrangement of given materials in an aesthetically pleasing pattern; it is what results from the arrangement, and is literally something the artist makes, not something he finds." (1953, p. 67) Langer applied this general theory in subsequent chapters to the vast range of types of art – painting, sculpture, music, dance, literature, drama, and film.

One can appreciate Langer's proposal by beginning with the notion of symbol. Take the apparently simplest cases of so-called representational painting: Peter Rubens's portrait of his son; Pieter Brueghel's painting of a rural scene in *The Harvest*; and John Constable's painting of Salisbury Cathedral. Already it is clear these are not simple cases. Conventions of perspective and style are employed; choices are made about point of view, palette and color effect, balance, and so forth. We can complicate the matter by considering Lucien Freud's portrait of Queen Elizabeth II; Jean-Claude Monét's painting of Rouen Cathedral; Vincent van Gogh's haystacks. Style and theory of painting, choice of mode of representation become more prominent. Move on now to a cubist picture which might be of a guitar, or a woman and child, only in some quickly becoming unfamiliar sense. Or consider paintings of scenes which are in a representational style, but the scenes are mythical. Now move on yet again to strictly abstract painting: the looming rectangles of Mark Rothko, Frank Stella's concentric arcs, and so forth. Turn now to music: begin with Joseph Haydn's clock symphony, or Olivier Messiaen's birdcalls, and end up with Ludwig van Beethoven's late string

quartets. Move on to poetry, to dance, to sculpture, to film. At this point, it seems crazy to think of all these kinds of art as standing in one and the same relationship to some one kind of thing. Langer's answer was that it is not crazy; you just have to think abstractly enough, and you have to focus on the right kind of thing. Representational painting is a useful model for interpreting Langer, not because she generalized from the concrete way in which such a painting seemingly mirrored its subject, but because she abstracted from that concrete example a relationship that can be carried over to other kinds of art. Wittgenstein famously said he thought of the picture theory of language when he saw in a courtroom the model of a traffic accident used to assist the court to see what had happened. But the way in which for him language mirrors the world is much more abstract than the concreteness of the courtroom model. So it was for Langer. Linguistic symbols in the strict sense were discursive or referential. There were also what she called "presentational symbols" (1942, p. 96ff). These symbols presented whole forms wordlessly and indivisibly; these were the forms of art. We understand both forms of symbol as related in the same abstract way to what they symbolize.

Art's forms were symbolic of feeling; that was the sense in which they were for Langer expressions of feeling. That notion can also be built up from a simple-looking case. We begin with ordinary expressions of anger, say, or fear, or joy, or pride. Then we move from the painter throwing their brush across the room in anger, to Edvard Munch painting his famous scream. Then we move to a complex poetic expression of love, and on to Gerard Manley Hopkins's poems expressing the existential abyss of a wavering religious faith. Eventually here too we reach abstract expressionist painting, or dance, or sculpture, or – what in many ways is Langer's paradigm – music. What makes the angry throw not a work of art, and *The Scream* or *The Hawk* works of art is the unique complexity of the symbolic form embedded in those artifacts, and the unique complexity of the feeling which that

symbolic form symbolizes. The symbolic form is in the artist's mind; they make it appear in the artwork they create. The form symbolically mirrors the feeling.

Langer took from the expression theory of art the thought that art was the realization of feeling. She took from formalism the thought that what made an artifact an artwork was its form. She made the essence of art the realization of the symbolic form of feeling – not the expression of feeling, nor the realization of symbolic form, but both combined. She interposed between the artist and the artwork a symbolic, presentational form in the artist's mind; artistic creativity was the fashioning of an artwork which had that same form.

Despite the length at which Langer explained her view, and the detail of its application to cases, aestheticians have found her view elusive. Some have been unsympathetic critics. George Dickie, for instance (1971, pp. 80–81), dismissed her theory on the grounds that she leaves out the convention which, in Dickie's view, is needed to link the symbol with what is symbolized. But Langer deliberately omitted such a convention: here, the Wittgensteinian roots of her view manifested themselves. Following Wittgenstein, Langer talked about projections, not conventions. Take a map drawn on Mercator's projection. Mercator's projection, as a way of mapping the world, is a convention. But now imagine the relationship of the map to the world prescinding from its conventionality, looking at it as an internal relation. The convention is not fundamental; we can stand outside it and study it. But the relation of language to the world, and of art's symbolic forms to the feelings they symbolize, is fundamental. We cannot stand outside it, but only within it, and postulate it as a way to make sense of art.

Even John Casey, an interpreter astute enough to see how important Wittgenstein was to Langer, falters here. He takes the symbolic form to be intended by Langer to explain an artwork's meaning, and then complains, "Mrs. Langer's attempt to establish a natural, non-conventional form of meaning rests on the

assumption that meaning is an extra entity" (1966, p. 70), which is an assumption which Casey rightly rejects. But Langer rejected it too. Is it is proper to speak of the symbolic form as a meaning? It is certainly what it is that plays in the case of artistic symbols the same role that meaning plays in relation to purely linguistic symbols. To call that meaning, though, is to obscure the abstractness of the relationship which is identical in each case. Be that as it may, the relationship is internal to the symbolic form and the feeling. The relationship between a mirror-image and what produces it is not an extra entity, but is internal to that relationship.

Francis Sparshott senses well that Langer's view was not any straightforward version of the expression theory of art, in that what matters for Langer was the mental symbolic form of the feeling, not the actual feeling itself (1982, pp. 218–19). Langer thus avoided the naïve view that a piece of music, for example, was sad because it expressed some actual sadness being felt by the composer. But he believes Langer paid a price for this avoidance. Sparshott argues that, if the symbolic form of feeling thus becomes independent of any actual feeling, then it is no longer clear in what sense art is to be thought of as expression (1982, pp. 320–22). In Sparshott's view, Langer ended up with a theory of art as imitation, not as expression. It is not clear how far Sparshott's argument is really an objection, as opposed to an exposition. It would be an objection if it could be shown that Langer's view was forced endlessly to vacillate between the expression view and the imitation view; but that case is not made out.

Langer's philosophy was a new key implied a whole theory of the mind, as well as a whole theory of art. After the completion of her theory of art, she turned her attention to developing further the theory of the mind. Some preliminary essays appeared in 1962, but the whole theory appeared only in her final, and by far longest, work: *Mind: An Essay on Human Feeling* (1967–82). *Mind* can only be described as a work of staggering erudition and ambition. The key to the work is a simple inversion. One might think that sentience is the most general category of mentality, and feeling to be one form that sentience takes, perception another, say, abstract calculation another. Langer turned such a thought on its head. Feeling was the most general category of mentality; perception, or abstract calculation, were thus modes of feeling. The theory was continuous with her interest in art, in that art and the creation of art operated as a running example through out the book of mentality itself. Art was not so much one form of mentality, as the essence of mentality. As Arthur DANTO showed, the work seems to rely on an important insight into the mind. There is something that it is like to be me from the inside, and propositional knowledge will never reveal that. Danto refers to this "something" as a "densely knotted tissue of feeling of which we are enfabricated" (1984, p. 646). Langer's work may be seen as an attempt to present this densely knotted tissue.

Altogether unlike Langer's theory of art, her theory of the mind has received virtually no attention either inside or outside the philosophical academy. It is not difficult to see why. The work appeared just as cognitive science was in its infancy, and it was not hard to judge that this new and exciting discipline offered more promise for the understanding of mentality than Langer's reduction of mentality to feeling. Humanistic psychology of the kind Langer's work represented rapidly became unfashionable in philosophy and psychology alike. However, Langer's theory of art remains still one of the most interesting, most subtle, and most challenging theories in twentieth-century philosophy of art.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Practice of Philosophy (New York, 1930).
An Introduction to Symbolic Logic (Boston, 1937).
Philosophy in a New Key: A Study in the Symbolism of Reason, Rite, and Art (Cambridge, Mass., 1942; 3rd edn 1957).
Feeling and Form (New York, 1953).

Problems of Art (New York, 1957).

Philosophical Sketches (Baltimore, Md., 1962).

Mind: An Essay on Human Feeling, 3 vols (Baltimore, Md., 1967, 1972, 1982).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils Before 1950*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Blackwell Amer Phil*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v8*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Casey, John. *The Language of Criticism* (London, 1966).

Danto, Arthur. "Mind as Feeling, Form as Presence: Langer as Philosopher," *Journal of Philosophy* 84 (1984): 641–7.

Dickie, George. *Aesthetics: An Introduction* (Indianapolis, 1971).

Lachmann, Rolf. "Der Philosophische Weg Susanne K. Langers (1895-1985)," *Studia Culturalogica* 2 (1993): 65–114.

Schultz, William. *Cassirer and Langer on Myth: An Introduction* (New York, 2000).

Shiner, Roger A. "The Mental Life of a Work of Art," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 40 (1982): 253–68.

Sparshott, Francis. *The Theory of the Arts* (Princeton, N.J., 1982).

Roger A. Shiner

LASCH, Christopher (1932–94)

Christopher Lasch was born on 1 June 1932 in Omaha, Nebraska. He received his BA in 1954 from Harvard University, and his MA in 1955 and PhD in history in 1961 from Columbia University. While studying at Columbia, Lasch was influenced by historian Richard Hofstadter. Lasch taught history at Williams College in Massachusetts from 1957 to 1959, Roosevelt University in Illinois in 1960–61, the University of Iowa from 1961 to 1966, and Northwestern University from 1966 to 1970. In 1970 he became professor of history at the University of Rochester in New York, and in 1979 he was named Don Alonzo Watson Professor of History, holding that position until his death. He died on 14 February 1994 in Pittsford, New York.

Lasch was best known for being a social critic and analyzer of American society. His published works reflect his attempt to reach the public by choosing to focus more on a popular writing style and less on the academic and scholastic model. By doing so, Lasch became a well-known author with wide appeal to the academic and popular audiences. The book for which he is best known, *The Culture of Narcissism*, made Lasch a best-selling author when it was published in 1979. Lasch contributed frequently to several national magazines and newspapers, and was an advisor for the Center for the Study of Commercialism, an organization that analyzes society's reactions to capitalism and consumption.

Lasch believed in using history as social criticism, making the past relevant to the present and future. He emphasized the importance of discussing political and cultural issues as a basis for democratic politics. One of Lasch's most significant criticisms was his challenge to the concept that progress in American society was inevitable. According to Lasch, this misguided belief drove the consumptive nature of people and led to the erosion of self-hood and community. This argument led to his criticism of American industrialization and the capitalist system. Lasch argued that American capitalism eroded the skills of individuals (a process known as deskilling) and contributed to the decline of family values because it elevated profit and efficiency over craft and honor. Lasch did not identify with either the liberal or conservative elements and offered criticism of both. Although he offered few solutions to the problems he addressed, Lasch is credited with opening new discussions on cultural and social issues and making them

relevant to politics. He was also one of the few historians who successfully bridged the gap between the academic world and the popular reader.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The American Liberals and the Russian Revolution (New York, 1962).

The New Radicalism in America, 1889–1963: The Intellectual as a Social Type (New York, 1965).

The Agony of the American Left (New York, 1969).

The World of Nations: Reflections on American History, Politics, and Culture (New York, 1973).

Haven in a Heartless World: The Family Besieged (New York, 1977).

The Culture of Narcissism: American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations (New York, 1979).

The True and Only Heaven: Progress and Its Critics (New York, 1991).

The Revolt of the Elites and the Betrayal of Democracy (New York, 1995).

Other Relevant Works

Lasch's papers are at the University of Rochester.

The Minimal Self: Psychic Survival in Troubled Times (New York, 1984).

"History as Social Criticism: Conversations with Christopher Lasch," interview with Casey Blake and Christopher Phelps, *Journal of American History* 80 (1994): 1310–32.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Who Was Who in Amer v11

Elshtain, Jean Bethke. "Limits and Hope: Christopher Lasch and Political Theory," *Social Research* 66 (1999): 531–43.

Mattson Kevin. "Christopher Lasch and the Possibilities of Chastened Liberalism," *Polity* 36 (2004): 411–45.

Miller, Eric J. *American Sojourn: A Life of Christopher Lasch*. PhD dissertation, University of Delaware (Newark, Del., 2002).

Siegel, Fred. "The Agony of Christopher Lasch," *Reviews in American History* 8 (1980): 285–95.

Lisa G. Guinn

LAUDAN, Laurens Lynn (1941–)

Larry Laudan was born on 16 October 1941 in Austin, Texas. He received his BA magna cum laude in physics from the University of Kansas in 1962. He then studied philosophy, earning an MA in 1964 and a PhD in 1965 from Princeton University. His dissertation was titled "The Idea of a Physical Theory from Galileo to Newton: Studies in Seventeenth-Century Methodology," and he studied with Thomas Kuhn. Laudan was a lecturer in philosophy of physics at University College London from 1965 to 1969. In 1969 he became associate professor of philosophy and history of science at the University of Pittsburgh, and was promoted to full professor in 1972. He served as chair of the history and philosophy of science department during 1972–4 and 1976–7. From 1981 to 1983 he was a visiting research professor at the Center for Science and Technology Studies at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and then stayed as professor of philosophy of science and science studies from 1983 to 1987. From 1987 until his retirement in 1997, he was professor of philosophy at the University of Hawaii. Since 2000 he has been a senior investigator at the Instituto de las Investigaciones Filosóficas of National Autonomous University of Mexico.

Laudan's philosophy of science argues that scientific progress proceeds by problem-solving, of either the empirical or conceptual sort. Since science aims at increasing the number of solved empirical problems (which

often requires resolving conceptual problems), theories are rationally judged by their success in this practical aim. Unlike epistemologists who compare actual scientific methodology with abstract logical criteria having an extra-scientific origin, Laudan's pragmatist theory attempts to show how scientific knowledge has grown. Kuhn and Stephen TOULMIN have also made this attempt, and similarly emphasized the role of conceptual problems in theory change, although Laudan finds that even the core tenets of a scientific theory drift over time. In contrast with the positivist and formalist approaches of Karl Popper or Carl HEMPEL, Laudan does not require that theories be compared according to their derivable sets of observations. The impossibility of such a comparison, apparent by the 1970s, has encouraged scientific relativism, but Laudan is instead interested in the practical rationality of preferring more successful theories. In *Progress and Its Problems* (1977), he rejects several time-honored assumptions of previous philosophy of science, including the notions that scientific progress requires (1) a fixed methodology; (2) the cumulative retention of the successes of earlier theories; and (3) a convergence on "the truth." He argues that since we have no way of determining to what extent our scientific theories about unobservable entities are correct, it is irrational to believe that any of our theories are even partially true.

Laudan, unlike Paul FEYERABEND, does not abandon scientific realism for relativism after denying that we can justifiably make any claims about theoretical truth. To be a scientific realist, for Laudan, only requires recognizing the admitted practical benefits of using theoretical terms in a realist manner and thus requires accepting semantic realism, but scientific realism does not require believing that any of those terms actually corresponds to some reality. Nor does scientific realism receive support from the abductive argument, popularized by Hilary PUTNAM in the 1970s, that only a scientific theory's approximate truth could explain its practical success. As Laudan points out in "A Confutation of Convergent Realism" (1981) and *Science and Hypothesis: Historical Essays on Scientific Methodology* (1981), most past scientific theories enjoyed much empirical success without being true at all; and many scientific theories might, for all we know, actually be close to the truth without enjoying much practical success. Scientific realism cannot be defended by the principle that "if a scientific theory is true, then it will be successful," any more than a simplistic pragmatism could be defended by the principle "if a scientific theory is successful, then it is true."

Laudan's sophisticated pragmatism instead leaves behind the old epistemological search for a priori methodological rules. Laudan argues that methodological rules in science are best understood as hypothetical imperatives of the form, "to realize cognitive aim A, follow method B." Methodological rules therefore evolve along with science itself, and cannot be legislated outside of actual scientific progress. This normative naturalism, presented at length in *Science and Values* (1984) and *Beyond Positivism and Relativism* (1996), requires that epistemological rules of inference have a fallible status like every other scientific claim. The philosophical study of scientific methodology is naturalized, not by W. V. QUINE's reduction of epistemology to descriptive psychology, but by evaluating methodologies within the overall progress of actual scientific problem-solving.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Progress and Its Problems: Toward a Theory of Scientific Growth (Berkeley, Cal., 1977).

Science and Hypothesis: Historical Essays on Scientific Methodology (Dordrecht, 1981).

Science and Values: The Aims of Science and their Role in Scientific Debate (Berkeley, Cal., 1984).

Science and Relativism: Dialogues on the Philosophy of Science (Chicago, 1990).

Beyond Positivism and Relativism: Theory,

Method, and Evidence (Boulder, Col., 1996).

Other Relevant Works
"Grünbaum on 'The Duhemian Argument'," *Philosophy of Science* 32 (1965): 295–9.
"Two Dogmas of Methodology," *Philosophy of Science* 43 (1976): 585–97.
"A Confutation of Convergent Realism," *Philosophy of Science* 48 (1981): 19–49.
Ed. with Robert S. Cohen, *Physics, Philosophy and Psychoanalysis: Essays in Honor of Adolf Grünbaum* (Dordrecht, 1983).
Ed. with Arthur Donovan and Rachel Laudan, *Scrutinizing Science: Empirical Studies of Scientific Change* (Dordrecht, 1988).
"Normative Naturalism," *Philosophy of Science* 57 (1990): 44–59.
"Empirical Equivalence and Undetermination," *Journal of Philosophy* 88 (1991): 449–72.
The Book of Risks: Fascinating Facts about the Chances We Take Every Day (New York, 1994).
"Damn the Consequences!" *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 69 (1995): 27–34.
Danger Ahead: The Risks You Really Face on Life's Highway (New York, 1997).
"How about Bust? Factoring Explanatory Power Back into Theory Evaluation," *Philosophy of Science* 64 (1997): 306–16.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v10
Hull, David L., et al. "Laudan's Progress and Its Problems," *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 9 (1979): 457–65.
Leplin, Jarrett. *A Novel Defense of Scientific Realism* (Oxford, 1997).
McMullin, Ernan. "Laudan's Progress and Its Problems," *Philosophy of Science* 46 (1979): 623–44.
Psillos, Stathis. "Naturalism without Truth?" *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science* 28 (1997): 699–713.
Resnik, David. "Repairing the Reticulated Model of Scientific Rationality," *Erkenntnis* 40 (1994): 343–55.
Siegel, Harvey. "Laudan's Normative Naturalism," *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science* 21 (1990): 295–313.

John R. Shook

LAUER, Joseph Quentin (1917–97)

J. Quentin Lauer was born on 1 April 1917 in Brooklyn, New York. Lauer was ordained a Jesuit priest in 1948, and he eventually became a leading Hegel scholar and important contributor to continental philosophy. Lauer completed an ordinary doctorate as well as a prestigious Docteur-es-Lettres at the Sorbonne in 1954, writing a dissertation on Husserl and intentionality. Some sources claim that Lauer was the first American to receive a philosophy doctorate from the Sorbonne. He returned from Paris in 1955 to a position at Fordham University, where he remained on the philosophy faculty until 1994. Lauer also held visiting faculty positions at University of Texas, New School for Social Research, and Boston College. Lauer died on 9 March 1997 in Bronx, New York.

Lauer received numerous awards during his career, including the prestigious Aquinas Medal from the American Catholic Philosophical Association in 1985. Lauer also was President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1985–6, President of the Hegel Society of America, the General Editor of the SUNY series in Hegelian Studies,

and editor and referee for numerous journals and publications.

Lauer's most important work focused on the thought of G. W. F. Hegel. His *Hegel's Idea of Philosophy* (1971) included a highly regarded translation of Hegel's "Introduction" to the lectures on the history of philosophy, as well as Hegel's fragment on "Authority and Freedom." In addition to numerous scholarly articles in leading philosophical journals, Lauer wrote *A Reading of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit* (1976), *Essays in Hegelian Dialectic* (1977), and *Hegel's Concept of God* (1982).

Lauer is most widely known for his work on Edmund Husserl and transcendental phenomenology. Published as it was under the title *Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy* (1965), Lauer translated Husserl's "Philosophy as Rigorous Science" and "Philosophy and the Crisis of European Man." Lauer's helpful, expository introduction to these two essays gained enormous popularity and served as a principal introduction to phenomenology for generations of American college students. Lauer also wrote two early books on Husserl and *The Triumph of Subjectivity: An Introduction to Transcendental Phenomenology* (1958).

Lauer's thirty-six years at Fordham left an indelible mark on that university. He oversaw the transition from Fordham's small neo-scholastic department to its highly regarded graduate program in continental philosophy. As chair of the department and legendary professor, he supervised thirty-eight dissertations and captivated graduate and undergraduate students alike in the classroom. As did many Jesuit professor-priests, he lived in the residence halls with students. The Quentin Lauer Memorial Lectures at Fordham continue in honor of his memory.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
La Genèse de l'intentionnalité dans la philosophie de Husserl (Paris, 1954).
Phénoménologie de Husserl: Essai sur la Genèse de l'Intentionnalité (Paris, 1955).
The Triumph of Subjectivity: An Introduction to Transcendental Phenomenology (New York, 1958; 2nd edn 1978). Reprinted as *Phenomenology: Its Genesis and Prospect* (New York, 1965).
A Christian-Communist Dialogue, with Roger Garaudy (Garden City, N.Y., 1968).
Hegel's Idea of Philosophy, with a New Translation of Hegel's Introduction to the History of Philosophy (New York, 1971).
A Reading of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit (New York, 1976; 2nd edn 1993).
Essays in Hegelian Dialectic (New York, 1977).
Hegel's Concept of God (Albany, N.Y., 1982).
The Nature of Philosophical Inquiry (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1989).
G. K. Chesterton: Philosopher without Portfolio (New York, 1991).

Other Relevant Works
Trans., *Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy*, by Edmund Husserl (New York, 1965).

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v9, *Proc of APA v71*
Blanchette, Oliva. "Hegel's 'Phenomenology of Spirit' Revisited," *Philosophy and Social Criticism 5* (1978): 387–414.

Scott Hunter Moore

LAVELY, John Hillman (1916–)

John Hillman Lavely was born on 25 September 1916 in Des Moines, Iowa, and died on 6 October 2004 in Walpole, Massachusetts. He was the son of Horace Thomas Lavely and Gertrude Hillman Lavely. Lavely graduated from Allegheny College in 1938 with BA major in history and earned a degree in theology from Boston University School of Theology in 1941. Lavely received the PhD in philosophy from Boston University in 1950 under the direction of

Edgar Sheffield BRIGHTMAN. Lavely served as a Methodist pastor from 1941 to 1947, followed by four years of teaching philosophy at Albion College in Michigan.

In 1951, Lavely returned to Boston University to teach philosophy for the next thirty-one years. He served two terms as chair of the philosophy department and offered numerous courses in the Boston University School of Theology. In 1955 Lavely served on the examining committee for Martin Luther KING, Jr.'s doctoral dissertation with colleague L. Harold DEWOLF. Lavely's primary philosophical interest during his career at Boston University was philosophy of religion. Lavely retired in 1982.

A third-generation Boston personalist after Borden Parker BOWNE and Brightman, Lavely distanced himself from the vestiges of the anthropocentric and Cartesian perspectives of person and reality found in generations one and two. This shift is perhaps seen most profoundly in his understanding of the term "person" and in his views about the relationship between mind and body. For Lavely, "person" is not confined to human beings but is to be seen as an ontologically generic concept used to signify all centers of being with structure and function of their own. Lavely argued that personalists must reject a dualistic notion of mind and body, and he affirms that human persons are a part of the natural world that includes their own bodies. Lavely suggests that body and mind are abstractions and but partial differentiations of the more fundamental reality of the person.

Lavely's rejection of Cartesian dualism enables Boston personalism to more plausibly support the dignity of nature. He views non-human persons as peers to human persons in that all living experients are moral subjects deserving of respect. Lavely contends that unless Boston personalists free themselves of the residues of Cartesian thinking, they will not be able to ground an adequate ecological ethic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Faith and Knowledge: Is the Ineffable Intelligible?" in *Contemporary Studies in Philosophical Idealism*, ed. John Howie and Thomas O. Buford (Cape Cod, Mass., 1975), pp. 116–32.
"Edgar Sheffield Brightman: Good–and–Evil and the Finite–Infinite God," in *The Boston Personalist Tradition in Philosophy, Social Ethics, and Theology*, ed. Paul Deats and Carol Robb (Macon, Georgia, 1986), pp. 121–46.
"Reflections on a Philosophical Heritage," in *The Boston Personalist Tradition in Philosophy, Social Ethics, and Theology*, ed. Paul Deats and Carol Robb (Macon, Georgia, 1986), pp. 253–72.
"Personalism Supports the Dignity of Nature," *The Personalist Forum* 2 (Spring 1986): 29–37.
"What is Personalism?" *The Personalist Forum* 7 (Fall 1991): 1–33.
"Personalism Now and Then and Perhaps Here-after," *The Personalist Forum* 4 (Fall 1998): 21–41.

Other Relevant Works
"Autobiographical Sketch" and "A History of the Personalist Discussion Group (1938–1988)," in *Personalism Revisited: Its Proponents and Critics*, ed. Thomas O. Buford and Harold H. Oliver (Amsterdam and New York, 2002), pp. xvii–xxv.

Further Reading
Burrow, Rufus, Jr. *Personalism: A Critical Introduction* (St. Louis, 1999).

Mark Y. A. Davies

LAVINE, Thelma Zeno (1915–)

Thelma Zeno Lavine was born on 12 February 1915 in Boston, Massachusetts. She received a BA from Radcliffe College in 1936, and an MA in 1937 and PhD in philosophy in 1939, both

from Harvard University. Her PhD dissertation was entitled "The Naturalistic Approach to Theory of Knowledge" working with Ralph B. PERRY and David W. PRALL. She also studied with C. I. LEWIS and was influenced by his Kantianism. At Harvard Lavine studied psychology as well as philosophy, and her first teaching position was in both fields at Wells College where she taught from 1941 to 1943. She then was a professor of philosophy at Brooklyn College from 1946 to 1951, and the University of Maryland from 1955 to 1965. Lavine then went to George Washington University to become Elton Professor of Philosophy from 1965 until 1985. In 1985 she was appointed Clarence J. Robinson Professor of Philosophy and American Culture at George Mason University, a position that she held until her retirement in 1998.

Lavine wrote and lectured on a wide variety of topics, including the ideas of the Founding Fathers, Judaic thought, women's studies, and biomedical ethics. In addition to being an exceptional scholar she earned recognition as a distinguished teacher. At the University of Maryland she was given an Outstanding Faculty Member award, and at George Washington University she won an Outstanding Professor award. From 1965 to 1970, in addition to continuing to teach philosophy, she attended seminars at the Washington School of Psychiatry. In 1984 she was in an advanced training program in psychotherapy there.

One of Lavine's earliest writings, "Naturalism and the Sociological Analysis of Knowledge," was included by Yervant H. KRIKORIAN in *Naturalism and the Human Spirit*, together with essays by John DEWEY, Sidney HOOK, and other distinguished American philosophers. In her paper, Lavine takes Dewey's philosophy to be the "vanguard of twentieth-century naturalism." In 1991 she gave the fifth Patrick Romanell Lecture on Philosophic Naturalism, "Modernity and the Spirit of Naturalism," at the meeting of the American Philosophical Association Central Division. In her lecture Lavine presented an analysis of American naturalistic pragmatism in a historical context.

Writings by Lavine have been published in The Netherlands, the Federal Republic of Germany, and Japan as well as the United States. Perhaps her most unusual work is a television series, *From Socrates to Sartre: A Historical Introduction to Philosophy*. Consisting of thirty lectures, it was first presented by the Maryland Center for Public Broadcasting in 1979 and has appeared repeatedly on commercial as well as university television stations, and students could earn college credit for it. She dealt with the same topic in a book, *From Socrates to Sartre: The Philosophic Quest* (1984), of which 250,000 copies were published and which was translated into Japanese.

American philosophy became a major concern of Lavine's, especially Dewey and pragmatism, but also Charles S. PEIRCE, C. I. Lewis, Morris R. COHEN, John H. RANDALL, Jr., John J. MCDERMOTT, and others. However, her understanding of pragmatism and American philosophy and her own philosophic ideas were enriched by a strong background in European philosophy which she also wrote about.

Lavine was a founding member of SOPHIA, the Society of Philosophers in America, which was organized in 1987, and she has been active in the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy, of which she was President from 1992 to 1994. In 2000 she was honored by this organization, which presented her with the Herbert W. Schneider Award for distinguished contributions to the understanding and development of American philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Sociological Analysis of Cognitive Norms," *Journal of Philosophy* 39 (1942): 342–55.
"Naturalism and the Sociological Analysis of Knowledge," in *Naturalism and the Human Spirit*, ed. Yervant H. Krikorian (New York, 1944), pp. 183–209.
"Knowledge as Interpretation: An Historical Survey," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 10 (1950): 526–40; 11 (1950): 88–103.

"What is the Method of Naturalism?" *Journal of Philosophy* 50 (1953): 157–60.

From Socrates to Sartre: *The Philosophic Quest* (New York, 1984).

"Judaism in the Culture of Modernity," in *Philosophy, History, and Social Action*, ed. William O'Neill (Dordrecht, 1988), pp. 297–311.

"Modernity and the Spirit of Naturalism," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 65 (November 1991): 73–83.

"Postmodernism and American Pragmatism," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 7 (1993): 110–13.

"The Case for a New American Pragmatism," in *Challenges to the Enlightenment*, ed. Paul Kurtz and Tim Madigan (Amherst, Mass., 1994), pp. 73–83.

"Freud, Ricoeur, and the Conflict of Interpretations," in *Telling Facts: History and Narration in Psychoanalysis, Psychiatry and the Humanities*, ed. Joseph H. Smith (Baltimore, Md., 1994), pp. 264–83.

"America and the Contestations of Modernity: Bentley, Dewey, Rorty," in *Rorty and Pragmatism: The Philosopher Responds to His Critics*, ed. Herman J. Saatkamp, Jr. (Nashville, Tenn., 1995), pp. 37–49.

"Peirce, Pragmatism, and Interpretation Theory," in *Peirce's Doctrine of Signs: Theory, Applications, and Connections*, ed. Vincent M. Colapietro and Thomas M. Olshewski (New York, 1996), pp. 429–40.

"Contemporary Significance of the American Philosophic Tradition: Lockean and Redemptive," in *Reading Dewey: Interpretation for a Postmodern Generation*, ed. Larry A. Hickman (Bloomington, Ind., 1998), pp. 217–30.

Other Relevant Works

"Metaphysics and the Problem of Dissent," in *The Future of Metaphysics*, ed. R. E. Wood (New York, 1970), pp. 251–62.

"C. I. Lewis and the Problem of Phenomenalism," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 41 (1981): 386–95.

"Pragmatism and the Constitution in the Culture of Modernism," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 20 (1984): 1–19.

"Individuation and Unification in Dewey and Sartre," in *Doctrine and Experience: Essays in American Philosophy*, ed. Vincent G. Potter (New York, 1988), pp. 149–73.

"American Pragmatism: Transference and 'Aufhebung'," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 24 (1988): 469–86.

"Introduction," to *The Later Works of John Dewey, Vol. 16: 1949–1953*, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale, Ill., 1988).

"Paul Ricoeur and the Conflict of Interpretations," in *The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur*, ed. Lewis Hahn (La Salle, Ill., 1995).

Further Reading

Dabney, Dick. "Thelma Lavine: An Empress of Reason," *Washingtonian Magazine* (October 1980): 91–101.

Ryan, Frank X. "Affirming Dewey's Philosophy: A Rejoinder to Lavine," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 33 (1997): 1029–33.

Verheyen, Egon, and Iris Knell, eds. *Vivitur Ingenio: Essays in Honor of Thelma Z. Lavine* (Fairfax, Virg., 1998). Contains a bibliography of Lavine's writings.

Beth J. Singer

LAWSON, John Howard (1894–1977)

John Howard Lawson was born on 25 September 1894 in New York City, and died on 11 August 1977 in San Francisco, California. He is perhaps most remembered as one of the "Hollywood Ten" who was charged with contempt of Congress for refusing to

cooperate with the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1947. Lawson's commitment to social and political activism and his belief in the power of art to promote social change permeated his revolutionary philosophical aesthetics of both theater and film.

Lawson was the third child of Belle Hart and S. Levy Lawson, a general manager in the United States and Canada for Reuters news. Lawson attended Williams College, where he developed an interest in literature and playwriting, and he contributed several essays to school publications. After graduating with a BA degree in 1914, Lawson began writing plays and sending them to potential producers. Lawson's first play to reach the stage was *Servant-Master-Lover*, which was produced to contemptuous reviews on the west coast in 1916. When World War I broke out, he served from 1917 to 1919 in the American Ambulance Service in France and Italy, where he met his first wife, Kathryn Drain. He and Kathryn divorced in 1923, and Lawson remarried to Susan Edmond in 1925.

In the summer of 1917, while he was absent without leave from the ambulance service, Lawson lived in Paris with John Dos Passos (whom Lawson had met on the trip to Europe) and Robert Hillyer. During those months Lawson saw several important experimental productions at independent (noncommercial) Parisian theaters such as Jacques Copeau's Théâtre du Vieux Colombier and Aurélien-Marie Lugné-Poë's Théâtre de l'Oeuvre. After coming home for a short time after the war in 1919, Lawson returned to Paris in March of 1920 and lived there for the next two years. During his time in Paris, Lawson immersed himself in the new aesthetic developments of European avant-garde theater. Inspired by the techniques of expressionism and other nonrealistic theatrical forms, Lawson returned to the States in 1922 hoping to experiment with these new modes of performance.

The 1923 New York production of Lawson's nonrealistic drama, *Roger Bloomer*, provided audiences with one of the first examples of an American expressionist drama. The play garnered mixed reviews, and Lawson did not receive a great deal of recognition until 1925 when the highly regarded Theatre Guild produced what would become his most important work for the theater: *Processional*. In this experimental play with strong anti-establishment undertones, subtitled *A Jazz Symphony of American Life*, Lawson attempted to create a new theatrical form that he referred to as "political vaudeville." The play's leftist theme was presented through a unique combination of expressionism, jazz, burlesque, and vaudeville that offered a powerful metaphor for the turmoil of contemporary American life. A handful of conservative critics panned the production, but the majority of reviewers believed it to be a work of great merit. Critics marked Lawson as one of America's most promising young playwrights, a label that would cast a shadow over his career in the years to come as commentators impatiently waited for him to reach the full potential they had envisioned.

Lawson's socialist leanings were expressed not only through his drama, but through his theatrical activities as well. In 1926 he helped to form the Workers' Drama League, and in 1927, he teamed with John Dos Passos and several other avant-garde writers to establish the New Playwrights' Theatre. Both of these organizations aspired to produce and promote theatrical productions that dealt frankly with social problems of the day from a leftist perspective through experimental forms. Lawson's next three plays, *Nirvana* (1926), *Loud Speaker* (1927), and *The International* (1928), the latter two of which were produced by the New Playwrights' Theatre, were not well received. In 1928 Lawson was one of the first New York playwrights to cross over to film when he signed a contract to write screenplays for Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer (MGM) and moved to Hollywood, California. Lawson later suggested that he made the move in part because of his interest in experimenting with the stage potential of cinematic techniques, in addition to his need to earn a more secure living. He con-

tributed dialogue for a number of MGM and RKO Radio Pictures films. Throughout the 1930s Lawson spent his time between New York and California as he continued to write for the stage while working in Hollywood. Dismayed by the way studio executives sentimentalized, watered down, and sterilized his writing, Lawson joined with three other screenwriters in 1933 to revive the Screen Writers Guild – originally formed in 1921, it would later become the Writer's Guild of America – and he became the organization's first President. While he worked to organize the Guild in the 1930s, Lawson also joined and became more intensely involved with the Communist Party of the United States.

In his theater work of the 1930s, Lawson seemed to largely abandon formal theatrical experimentation in favor of realism. Lawson's realistic dramas sustained the weighty and often didactic leftist social criticism that had imbued his nonrealistic plays. *Success Story*, produced in 1932 in conjunction with the socially conscious Group Theatre in New York, was the first of Lawson's plays written in a realistic vein. This play provided a Marxist critique through the portrayal of a Faustian central character who sacrifices his soul to capitalism in order to succeed in the advertising industry. On the balance, *Success Story* received positive critical notices and the production ran for a respectable 121 performances.

Lawson's final three stage plays failed to garner critical acclaim. *The Pure in Heart* and *Gentlewoman*, both produced in 1934, actually gathered less attention than a public debate about the plays in the New York papers that lasted weeks after the close of the productions. Poor reception to *Marching Song* in 1937 continued his disillusionment with the American theater, and Lawson effectively ended his playwriting career in 1940 after he failed to interest the Group Theatre in a new script called *Parlor Magic*. Frustrated by his inability to pursue his political agenda through even the most progressive of theater organizations, Lawson decided to devote his efforts to film and polit-

ical activism. Many theater critics of the late 1930s felt that Lawson had allowed his communist convictions to dictate his art, thereby sacrificing aesthetics for didacticism. Despite the fact that Lawson was unable to live up to the expectations placed on him by theatrical critics in the 1920s, his realistic plays of the 1930s greatly influenced socially conscious writers such as Clifford Odets and other progressive theater artists of the period whose social protest dramas attempted to chronicle and call attention to the problems of working-class Americans.

Soured by his experiences in New York, Lawson pursued a more radical political course by joining and helping to found various socialist and communist organizations, and by 1937 he was rumored to be the head of the Communist Party in Hollywood. In the 1940s and through World War II, Lawson continued to write screenplays. In 1947, when he refused to say whether or not he was a Communist, Lawson was blacklisted by Hollywood film executives and never had another screenplay produced in his name. When his appeals were denied, Lawson served one year in jail in 1950–51 for contempt of Congress.

Lawson formulated his aesthetic principles most comprehensively in 1936 in *Theory and Technique of Playwriting*. Upon its publication, it became a primary resource book for leftist theater groups of the 1930s, and is today recognized as a classic book on the art of playwriting. Lawson later revised the book and reissued it in 1949 as *Theory and Technique of Playwriting and Screenwriting*. The new version reflected the change in Lawson's career focus, but his fundamental ideas related to dramaturgical aesthetics remained the same, reflecting his lifelong practice of combining the political and the aesthetic in his dramas. In these ways, Lawson's socially conscious aesthetics anticipated the highly influential Marxist theories and practices of Bertold Brecht.

Lawson built his aesthetic theory around the Aristotelian idea of dramatic conflict, suggesting that "since the drama deals with social rela-

tionships, a dramatic conflict must be a social conflict" (1949, p. 163). The first part of the book, which provides an elaborate and sweeping review of dramatic theory from the ancient Greeks to the 1930s, seeks to demonstrate the social nature of dramatic conflict as demonstrated in plays throughout history. He theorizes that the revolutionary theater will be built upon humankind's "conscious will." Lawson defined this "conscious will" as "man's ability to exert any rational control over the conditions of his existence" (1949, p. 85). By portraying the power of this "conscious will" through actions on stage, he believed audiences could be influenced to pursue revolutionary social change as modeled in dramatic works.

Lawson argues for the need for playwrights to include meaningful ideological content in drama by merging that content with effective form: "form is the key to the social meaning, or content, of a work of art" (1949, p. x). He asserts that writers should utilize all the rhetorical and aesthetic means possible in order to convince the audience to accept her or his vision of the world. Lawson's Marxism is present throughout the book. He suggests that his study of the history of dramatic aesthetics demonstrates that "the form of a work of art unites the creative activity of the individual with the historically evolved culture of the community in which he lives and works" (1949, p. x).

The second part of the book outlines Lawson's techniques for creating a revolutionary theater, which he compared to the methods of socialist realism. While certainly revolutionary in terms of the content Lawson hoped would emerge on stage, his theory of dramatic structure actually reflects the influence of Eugene Scribe's nineteenth-century formula for the "well-made play" that was co-opted by early realist playwrights such as Henrik Ibsen. Lawson suggests a structure of rising action that builds from exposition towards a climax through a progression of dramatic actions linked by cause and effect. The most important principles of Lawson's theory of dramatic form are those of conflict, action, and unity. Action

in a play arises out of a "social conflict in which the conscious will is exerted: persons are pitted against other persons, or individuals against groups, or groups against other groups, or individuals or groups against social and natural forces" (1949, p. 168). Conflict leads to actions that direct the conscious will towards a goal that reflects the social judgment and purpose of the dramatist. The conscious will is then "sufficiently strong enough to bring the conflict to a point of crisis" (1949, p. 168). Leftist theater, Lawson maintains, is the only type of theater that can stage plays demonstrating the conscious will to be focused on a definite social goal. The exercise of that conscious will thereby makes change possible.

The social purpose of a dramatist is what Lawson believes should determine the form of the central conflict of a drama. However, dramatic structure, Lawson argues, is not secondary to content. Rather, form itself plays an integral role in the social content of drama. He contends that playwrights must begin with a "root-idea"; a central idea or theme leading to a "root-action" (or climax) upon which the play will be built. In so doing, Lawson believes that a unified drama can be constructed which coherently and effectively demonstrates the artist's social and political point of view. While he develops his dramatic theory on the foundation of the "well-made play," Lawson's political and social commitments pervade the aesthetics of *Theory and Technique of Playwriting and Screenwriting*.

Although hampered professionally by his communist reputation, Lawson continued to write throughout the rest of his life. In 1950 he published *The Hidden Heritage* (written while he was serving his prison sentence), which analyzed European and American cultural traditions through the lens of class struggles. In *Film in the Battle of Ideas* (1953) and *Film: The Creative Process* (1964), Lawson combines his observations as a practicing screenwriter with a Marxist critique of content. Later in his life, Lawson taught at several colleges and universities. When he died in 1977, John Howard

Lawson left behind an influential body of dramatic aesthetics that helped to shape twentieth-century activist theater and film practice in the United States.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"'Inner Conflict' and Proletarian Art," *New Masses* (17 April 1934): 29–30.

"Towards a Revolutionary Theatre," *New Theatre* (June 1934): 6–7.

"Straight from the Shoulder," *New Theatre* (November 1934): 11–12.

"A Crisis in the Theatre," *New Masses* (15 December 1936): 35–6.

Theory and Technique of Playwriting (New York, 1936).

"The Obligatory Scene," *New Theatre* (March 1936): 18–19.

"A Comparative Study," *New Theatre and Film* (March 1937): 15–16.

"Art is a Weapon," *New Masses* (19 March 1946): 18–20.

The Theory and Technique of Playwriting and Screenwriting (New York, 1949).

The Hidden Heritage (New York, 1950; rev. edn 1968).

Film in the Battle of Ideas (New York, 1953; 1985).

"The Law of Conflict," in *American Drama and Its Critics*, ed. Alan S. Downer (Chicago, 1965), pp. 128–32.

"The Social Framework," in *American Playwrights on Drama*, ed. Horst Frenz (New York, 1965), pp. 22–40.

Film: The Creative Process (New York, 1964; rev. edn 1967).

Other Relevant Works

Lawson's papers are in the Morris Library of Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Roger Bloomer (New York, 1923).

Processional: A Jazz Symphony of American Life in Four Acts (New York, 1925).

The International (New York, 1927).

Loud Speaker (New York, 1927).

Success Story (New York, 1932).

With a Reckless Preface: Two Plays (*The Pure in Heart* and *Gentlewoman*) (New York, 1934).

Marching Song (New York, 1937).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*

Aaron, Daniel. *Writers on the Left* (New York, 1961).

Carr, Gary L. *The Left Side of Paradise: The Screenwriting of John Howard Lawson* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1984).

Chambers, Jonathan. "How Hollywood Led John Howard Lawson to Embrace Communism and How He Turned Hollywood Red," *Theatre History Studies* 17 (June 1997): 15–32.

Dos Passos, John. "Foreword," in *Roger Bloomer*, by John Howard Lawson (New York, 1923), pp. v–viii.

Goldstein, Malcolm. *The Political Stage: American Drama and Theatre in the Great Depression* (Oxford, 1974).

"Lawson, John Howard." *Cambridge Guide to American Theatre*, ed. Don B. Wilmeth and Tice L. Miller (Cambridge, UK, 1996).

Mishra, Kshamanidhi. *American Leftists Playwrights of the 1930s: A Study of Ideology and Technique in the Plays of Odets, Lawson, and Sherwood* (New Delhi, 1991).

O'Neill, Michael. "John Howard Lawson," in *American Playwrights, 1880–1945: A Research and Production Sourcebook*, ed. William W. Demastes (Westport, Conn., 1995), pp. 262–76.

Terry Brino-Dean

LAZARUS, Emma (1849–87)

Emma Lazarus was born on 22 July 1849 in New York City, and died there on 19 November 1887. The daughter of Esther

Nathan and Moses Lazarus, a successful businessman, Emma was privately tutored as a girl, and she received no formal higher education aside from the lectures she attended at the Concord School of Philosophy during the 1880s. Even so, she was well regarded in intellectual and social circles in both New York and Boston, having published her first volume of poetry when she was just sixteen years old. Lazarus is best known for her poem "New Colossus," which graces the Statue of Liberty. Yet she also wrote several essays on Judaism as a religious system and on the identity of the Jewish people, essays that are philosophical in nature and deserve critical attention.

Lazarus was from a well-established Sephardic Jewish family, which had lived in the United States for four generations at the time of Emma's birth. Like many assimilated American Jews in her day, she did not initially identify with the masses of Eastern European Jewish immigrants who strictly adhered to traditional customs and forms of worship. In the early 1880s, however, the brutal treatment of Jews in Russia awakened Lazarus to the harsh penalties thousands had paid for their faith, and she became an advocate of religious toleration and Jewish self-determination. She began contributing regularly to *The Hebrew American* and increasingly touched on Jewish themes in the many articles she wrote for *The Century* magazine.

Lazarus's life and intellectual work crossed the boundaries between philosophy, religion, and literature. She had close friendships and professional relationships within each area: philosophers William JAMES and William Torrey HARRIS; religious progressives Felix ADLER and Ralph Waldo EMERSON; and novelist Henry James.

Lazarus's earliest Jewish writings were essentially defenses and examinations of the character of Jewish notables in the face of growing anti-Semitism in Europe: "The Poet Heine," "Was the Earl of Beaconsfield a Representative Jew?" and "The Rabbi of Bacharach." In each of these essays, she makes a case for considering her subject as a whole and complex human being, rather than simply as a "type" whose motives, actions, and talents can be traced to their Jewishness.

Lazarus's other writings on Judaism range across harsh criticisms of anti-Semitic policies, critiques of Jewish culture, and reflections on religious practice. Essays like "Russian Christianity versus Modern Judaism" were directed to her non-Jewish readers. In this essay, she chastised Zenaide Ragozin for excusing the massacre and expulsion of Jews from Russia. While accepting many of Ragozin's negative characterizations of Jewish communities in the region, Lazarus maintained that ghettoization and lack of education and opportunity were at the root of the problem, not traits inherent in the Jewish people. Other writings, like "An Epistle to the Hebrews," were clearly directed to a Jewish audience. In this collection of essays from *The American Hebrew*, Lazarus spoke to her peers in the well-educated and assimilated Jewish community, taking a stance similar to that of other minority thinkers in this era.

Much as Booker T. WASHINGTON argued in regard to African-American culture and social life, Lazarus believed that providing vocational and technical training to Jewish immigrants would solve the majority of the problems that faced them in their overcrowded urban communities. She was familiar with the settlement house work of Jacob Schiff and Lillian Wald, who sought to bring "refinement" and "culture" to the Eastern Europeans they served, but she thought that the majority of Jewish immigrants simply needed a practical education. Despite standing up to defend her fellow Jews and being among the first to advocate establishing a Jewish homeland in Palestine, Lazarus often took on a patronizing tone in these essays. She reserved her expressions of pride in being Jewish for her poetry, as evidenced by one volume of her poetry, *Songs of a Semite* (1882).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Songs of a Semite: The Dance to Death and

Other Poems (New York, 1882).

"Emerson's Personality," *The Century* 24 (July 1882): 454–7.

"Judaism the Connecting Link between Science and Religion," *Hebrew American* 20 (1882).

"Russian Christianity versus Modern Judaism," *The Century* 24 (May 1882): 48–56.

"The Schiff Refuge," *American Hebrew* 20 (October 1882): 114.

"Was the Earl of Beaconsfield a Representative Jew?" *The Century* 23 (April 1882): 939–42.

"The Jewish Problem," *The Century* 25 (February 1883): 602–612.

"Heine, The Poet," *The Century* 29 (December 1884): 210–17.

The Poems of Emma Lazarus, 2 vols, ed. Josephine Lazarus (Boston, 1889).

Other Relevant Works

Lazarus's papers are in the American Jewish Historical Society in Waltham, Massachusetts.

Trans., *Poems and Ballads of Heinrich Heine* (New York, 1881).

The Letters of Emma Lazarus, 1868–85, ed. Morris Schappes (New York, 1949).

Emma Lazarus: Selections from Her Poetry and Prose, ed. Morris Schappes (New York, 1978).

An Epistle to the Hebrews, ed. Morris Schappes (New York, 1987).

Emma Lazarus: Selected Poems and Other Writings, ed. Gregory Eiselein (Peterborough, Ont., 2002).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v3*

Kessner, Carole. "The Emma Lazarus-Henry James Connection: Eight Letters," *American Literary History* 3 (1991): 46–62.

Lichtenstein, Diane. *Writing Their Nations: The Tradition of Nineteenth-Century American Jewish Women Writers* (New York, 1992)

Merriam, Eve. *Emma Lazarus. Woman with a Torch* (New York, 1956).

———, *The Voice of Liberty: The Story of Emma Lazarus* (Philadelphia, 1962).

Rusk, Ralph, ed. *Letters to Emma Lazarus in the Columbia University Library* (New York, 1939).

Vogel, Dan. *Emma Lazarus* (Boston, 1980).

Young, Bette Roth. *Emma Lazarus in the World: Life and Letters* (Philadelphia, 1995).

Dorothy Rogers

LAZEROWITZ, Alice Loman Ambrose (1906–2001)

Alice Ambrose was born on 25 November 1906 in Lexington, Illinois, and died on 25 January 2001 in Northampton, Massachusetts. She was orphaned at the age of thirteen, but was able to attend Millikin University, where she received the BA degree in philosophy and mathematics in 1928. After receiving her MA in 1929 and PhD in philosophy in 1932 from the University of Wisconsin, she attended the University of Cambridge, from which she eventually received a second PhD in 1938. At Cambridge, Ambrose studied with two of the giants of twentieth-century philosophy, G. E. Moore and Ludwig Wittgenstein.

Ambrose returned to the United States in 1935 to take a philosophy position at the University of Michigan. In 1937 Ambrose accepted a philosophy position at Smith College, where she taught until her retirement. A year after her arrival at Smith, she married her colleague Morris LAZEROWITZ, while usually publishing under her maiden name of Ambrose. She was promoted to full professor

in 1951, and was named Sophia and Austin Smith Professor of Philosophy in 1964. She held that position until her retirement in 1972. With her husband, she then taught as a visiting professor at Carleton College, Hampshire College, and the University of Delaware. Lazerowitz served as President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1975–6, and as editor of the *Journal of Symbolic Logic* from 1953 to 1968. She was also widely known as a social activist. Among her many contributions to the causes of peace and social justice was her chairing of the Committee for Freedom of Latin American Philosophers.

Lazerowitz's scholarship focused primarily in two areas. She was primarily a logician and philosopher of mathematics. Her *Fundamentals of Symbolic Logic*, written with Morris Lazerowitz in 1948, was one of the most influential textbooks on the new symbolic logic in the 1950s. The other focus of her work lay in the elaboration and extension of the views of her two great teachers, Moore and Wittgenstein. In the early 1930s, she was among the group of students to whom Wittgenstein dictated his *Blue and Brown Books*. Her last published book was a set of notes of Moore's *Lectures in Metaphysics, 1934–1935* (1992). In the intervening sixty years she published, often in collaboration with Morris Lazerowitz, numerous books and articles in which she followed Wittgenstein's and Moore's approach to linguistic analysis. Topics included such issues as Moore's defense of common sense, and fundamental philosophical concepts like thing, property, and number.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Self-Contradictory Suppositions," *Mind* 53 (1944): 48–59.

"The Problem of Justifying Inductive Inference," *Journal of Philosophy* 44 (1947): 253–71.

Fundamentals of Symbolic Logic, with Morris Lazerowitz (New York, 1948; 2nd edn 1962).

"Linguistic Approaches to Philosophical Problems," *Journal of Philosophy* 49 (1952): 289–300.

"Wittgenstein on Some Questions in Foundations of Mathematics," *Journal of Philosophy* 52 (1955): 197–213.

"On Entailment and Logical Necessity," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 56 (1956): 241–58.

"Three Aspects of Moore's Philosophy," *Journal of Philosophy* 57 (1960): 816–23.

Logic: The Theory of Formal Inference, with Morris Lazerowitz (New York, 1961).

Essays in Analysis (New York, 1966).

"Internal Relations," *Review of Metaphysics* 21 (1967): 256–61.

"Commanding a Clear View of Philosophy," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 49 (1976): 5–21.

Philosophical Theories, with Morris Lazerowitz (The Hague, 1976).

"The Defense of Common Sense," *Philosophical Investigations* 1 (1978): 1–13.

"A Priori Truth and Empirical Confirmation," with Morris Lazerowitz, *Critica* 15 (1983): 43–51.

Essays in the Unknown Wittgenstein, with Morris Lazerowitz (Buffalo, 1984).

Necessity and Language, with Morris Lazerowitz (New York, 1985). Contains a bibliography of Lazerowitz's publications.

Other Relevant Works

Lazerowitz's papers are at Smith College.

Ed. with Morris Lazerowitz, *G. E. Moore: Essays in Retrospect* (London and New York, 1970).

Ed. with Morris Lazerowitz, *Ludwig Wittgenstein, Philosophy and Language* (London and New York, 1972).

"The Yellow Book Notes in Relation to 'The Blue Book'," *Critica* 9 (1977): 9–23.

Ed., *Wittgenstein's Lectures, Cambridge, 1932–1935* (Totowa, N.J., 1979; Chicago,

1982).

"Moore and Wittgenstein as Teachers," *Teaching Philosophy* 12 (1989): 107–13.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Pres Addr of APA v8*, *Proc of APA v74*, *Who's Who in Phil*, *Women Phils*

Castañeda, Hector-Neri. "On Mathematical Proofs and Meaning," *Mind* 70 (1961): 385–90.

McQueen, Donald. "Necessity and Probability: A Reply to Professors Ambrose and Lazerowitz," *Mind* 83 (1974): 291–5.

Rankin, K. W. "Linguistic Analysis and the Justification of Induction," *Philosophical Quarterly* 5 (1955): 316–28.

Sheer, Richard. "Professor Ambrose on Proof," *Mind* 71 (1962): 247–8.

David E. Schrader

LAZEROWITZ, Morris (1907–87)

Born Morris Laizerowitz on 22 October 1907 in Lódz, Poland, Lazerowitz emigrated to the United States in 1915 and grew up in Omaha, Nebraska. After formal training in the violin and studying philosophy at the University of Nebraska with O. K. Bouwsma, he went to the University of Michigan where he received the BA in 1933 and the PhD in philosophy in 1936. Lazerowitz was a teaching fellow at the University of Michigan in 1935–6. He then pursued postdoctoral studies at the University of Cambridge in 1936–7 where he studied with G. E. Moore and Ludwig Wittgenstein, and at Harvard University in 1937–8. In 1938 he accepted a position in the philosophy department at Smith College, where he was a professor of philosophy until his retirement in 1973. In 1938 he married his Smith colleague, Alice Ambrose, with whom he engaged in a philosophical partnership that lasted until his death. Lazerowitz spent a year as a Fulbright Professor at Bedford College, London, in 1951–2. After he and Alice Lazerowitz retired from Smith, they taught as visiting professors at Carleton College, Hampshire College, and the University of Delaware. Lazerowitz died on 25 February 1987 in Northampton, Massachusetts.

In 1948 Lazerowitz, in collaboration with his wife, wrote *Fundamentals of Symbolic Logic*, one of the most influential textbooks on the new symbolic logic in the 1950s. While he worked broadly on issues in metaphysics in the tradition of philosophical analysis developed by Moore and Wittgenstein, Lazerowitz's chief contribution to philosophy lay in his development of the study that he called "metaphilosophy." Given that twenty-five hundred years of the history of Western philosophy seem to have produced nothing of the kind of disciplinary agreement that has regularly been produced by other scholarly disciplines, why do philosophers do philosophy? Lazerowitz found his answer at the boundaries of philosophy and psychoanalytic psychology.

Lazerowitz reaffirmed Wittgenstein's conception of philosophical analysis as a kind of therapy, but did so in a way that borrowed heavily from the work of Sigmund Freud. Philosophical activity is deeply rooted in pre-rational human concerns, and philosophical theories are most accurately understood as recommendations for semantic revision rather than answers to real questions about the world. The contention that philosophical claims express, in an often unrecognized way, collections of unconscious fantasies accounted for Lazerowitz's view that such claims generally lack any ascertainable truth values.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Strong and Weak Verification," *Mind* 48 (1939): 202–13.

Fundamentals of Symbolic Logic, with Alice Ambrose (New York, 1948; 2nd edn 1962).

"Are Self-Contradictory Expressions Meaningless?" *Philosophical Review* 58 (1949): 563–84.

"Strong and Weak Verification II," *Mind* 59 (1950): 345–57.

The Structure of Metaphysics (New York, 1955).

Logic: The Theory of Formal Inference, with Alice Ambrose (New York, 1961).

Studies in Metaphilosophy (London, 1964).

Philosophy and Illusion (London, 1968).

"A Note on 'Metaphilosophy'," *Metaphilosophy* 1 (1970): 91.

"Metaphilosophy," *Critica* 5 (1971): 3–27.

"Necessity and Probability," *Mind* 83 (1974): 282–5.

Philosophical Theories, with Alice Ambrose (The Hague, 1976).

The Language of Philosophy: Freud and Wittgenstein (Dordrecht, 1977).

"A Priori Truth and Empirical Confirmation," with Alice Ambrose, *Critica* 15 (1983), 43–51.

Essays in the Unknown Wittgenstein, with Alice Ambrose (Buffalo, 1984).

Necessity and Language, with Alice Ambrose (New York, 1985). Contains a bibliography of Lazerowitz's publications.

Other Relevant Works

"Moore and Philosophical Analysis," *Philosophy* 33 (1958): 193–220.

Ed. with Alice Ambrose, *G. E. Moore: Essays in Retrospect* (London and New York, 1970).

Ed. with Charles Hanly, *Philosophy and Psychoanalysis* (New York, 1970).

Ed. with Alice Ambrose, *Ludwig Wittgenstein, Philosophy and Language* (London and New York, 1972).

"Moore's Ontological Program," *Ratio* 14 (1972): 45–58.

"Wittgenstein: The Nature of Philosophy," *Critica* 19 (1987): 3–17.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Bio 20thC Phils, Proc of APA v61

Daya, K. "Some Considerations on Morris Lazerowitz's 'The Structure of Metaphysics'," *Mind* 67 (1958): 236–43.

Hartshorne, Charles. "The Structure of Metaphysics: A Criticism of Lazerowitz's Theory," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 19 (1958): 226–40.

Kattsoff, L. O. "Lazerowitz's Verbalism," *Philosophical Studies* 9 (1958): 17–19.

Yourgrau, Wolfgang. "Philosophy of Science and Analysis: A Reply to M. Lazerowitz," *Philosophy* 35 (1960): 147–51.

McQueen, Donald. "Necessity and Probability: A Reply to Professors Ambrose and Lazerowitz," *Mind* 83 (1974): 291–5.

Helen, Mercy, and Mihirvikash Chakravarty. "The Concept of Metaphilosophy," *Indian Philosophical Quarterly* 14 (1987): 141–8.

Reese, William L. "Morris Lazerowitz and Metaphilosophy," *Metaphilosophy* 21 (1990): 28–43.

David E. Schrader

LEACH, William Turnbull (1805–86)

William Leach was born on 1 March 1805 in Berwick-upon-Tweed, England. He received the MA in 1827 from the University of Edinburgh, where competence in logic and philosophy was provided alongside the classical education. He studied theology for three more years and was ordained a minister of the Church of Scotland in 1831, and then he answered the plea from Upper Canada for Presbyterian clergy. In 1835 he became minister of St. Andrew's Church in Toronto and helped to found Queen's College in 1841. Leach was politically conservative, scorning any democratic deviation from monarchy and God's providence. At the same time his theo-

logical views began to deviate from strict Calvinism, as he rejected predestination and accepted the importance of apostolic succession. In 1842 he joined the Church of England, was quickly ordained priest, and went to St. George's Church in Montréal, where he was rector until 1862. In 1854 he was made honorary canon of Christ Church and in 1865 he became archdeacon of Montréal.

Leach found time to teach and administrate. McGill University appointed him fellow and Vice-Principal in 1846, positions which he held until his death. He was professor of classical literature and a lecturer in mathematics and natural philosophy from 1846 to 1853. From 1853 to 1872 he solidified the philosophical curriculum by becoming professor of logic, rhetoric, and moral philosophy. He also served as Dean of the Faculty of Arts from 1853 to 1886. He added the degrees of DD, DCL, and LLD from various universities. After John Clark MURRAY arrived in 1872 to take the philosophy chair, Leach was Molson Professor of English Language and Literature from 1872 to 1883. He died on 13 October 1886 in Montréal, Québec.

Leach was described by his contemporaries as a widely read and versatile scholar of some brilliance. He was an energetic and successful teacher, whose often single-handed efforts kept McGill College going through its most difficult years. As the first philosophically trained scholar in Montréal of any influence, his long service and liberal mind elevated him far above the average teacher of philosophy for that era. At a time when nearly all teaching of philosophy was performed by clergy who subordinated thought to doctrine, Leach had sufficient talent and interest in philosophy for its own sake to disentangle it from theology. Still, the philosophy that Leach taught was the Scottish Common Sense realism designed to be congenial to the Protestant faith, although he did teach Kant and some other new ideas from Europe.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Sermon, Preached in St. Andrew's Church, Toronto, on the Thirtieth Day of November, 1837 (St. Andrew's Day) (Toronto, 1838).

A Discourse Delivered in St. Andrew's Church, Toronto, on the Thirtieth Day of November, 1838 (St. Andrew's Day) (Toronto, 1838).

A Discourse Delivered in St. Andrew's Church, Toronto, on the Fourteenth Day of December, 1838, Being a Day of Public Fasting and Humiliation, Appointed by Authority (Toronto, 1839).

A Discourse on the Nature and Duties of the Military Profession (Toronto, 1840).

A Discourse, Delivered to St. Andrew's Lodge (no. 1) of Freemasons (Toronto, 1841).

An Address on Rechabitism, Delivered at the Quarterly Meeting of the Members of the Independent Order of Rechabites (Montréal, 1845).

Sermon Preached in St. George's Chapel, Montréal, on Advent Sunday, 1851 (Montréal, 1851).

A Great Work Left Undone; or the Desideratum in Systems of Education (Montréal, 1864).

Further Reading
Dict Canad Bio

Armour, Leslie and Elizabeth Trott. *The Faces of Reason: An Essay on Philosophy and Culture in English Canada, 1850–1950* (Waterloo, Ont., 1981).

Borthwick, J. D. *History of the Diocese of Montreal, 1850–1910* (Montréal, 1910).

Macmillan, Cyrus. *McGill and Its Story, 1821–1921* (London and Toronto, 1921).

"Vice-principal Leach," *McGill University Magazine* 4 (1905): 14–15.

John R. Shook

LEBLANC, Hugues (1924–99)

Hugues Leblanc was born on 19 March 1924 in Sainte-Marie de Beauce near Québec City, Canada, and grew up in St-Hyacinthe, near Montréal, Québec. Leblanc received an MA degree at the University of Montréal in 1946 and then went to Harvard University where he received his PhD in philosophy in 1948, under W. V. QUINE. Leblanc taught philosophy at Bryn Mawr College from 1948 to 1967, then taught at Temple University as a professor of philosophy from 1967 until his retirement in 1992. He was chair of the Temple philosophy department from 1973 to 1979. Always loyal to his origins in French-speaking Québec, he returned to Canada upon retiring for an adjunct appointment at the University of Québec at Montréal from 1992 until illness forced him to stop work in 1996. Leblanc died on 10 September 1999 in Rockville, Maryland.

Leblanc was a Fullbright Fellow in 1953–4, an Eugenia Chase Fellow in 1958–9, and a Guggenheim Fellow in 1965–6. He was well recognized in his home country, receiving honorary doctorates from the University of Montréal and Dalhousie University, and election to the Royal Society of Canada. He served as an officer of the Association for Symbolic Logic and as a founder and later as President of the Society for Exact Philosophy, a Canadian-American organization devoted to annual conferences on philosophical logic and formal philosophy of science.

Much of Leblanc's work was devoted to what have been called "deviant" or non-standard approaches to logic, his teacher Quine having established what counts as standard in North American philosophy. Along with Karel LAMBERT, Leblanc was a pioneer of free logic, which allows for non-referring, or empty, singular terms, and thus must have restrictions on classical quantifier rules. He helped develop the substitutional interpretation of quantifiers. On this interpretation the universal quantifier "For all x, x is such and such" is true just in case all results of replacing the bound variable x with

a name are true. Quine's dictum "To be is to be the value of a bound variable" means that quantifiers are to be explained in terms of objects that satisfy, or make true, open sentences. This makes the interpretation of quantifiers a determinant of the ontological commitment of a theory. Leblanc's "truth value semantics" avoids this commitment by assigning a truth value outright to an atomic sentence involving names, without considering the meanings of its constituent predicate and names. Truth-functional compounds get their truth values in the usual way, and the truth value of a quantificational sentence is then stated in terms of the truth values of its instantiations (i.e., closed sentences) without reference to objects and satisfaction of open sentences. Leblanc used this semantics in his elementary logic textbook *Deductive Logic* (1972) and his papers on these topics are collected in *Existence, Truth, and Provability* (1982).

Later in his career Leblanc made important contributions in the development of probabilistic semantics, which provides a semantics in terms of assignments of probability to sentences, rather than the usual practice of using logical notions in the definition of probabilities. "Alternatives to Standard First-Order Semantics" (1983) surveys free logic, substitutional quantification, and probabilistic semantics. *Probability Theory and Probability Logic* (1999) collects the research on probabilistic topics and was published in the year of his death by his co-author. Leblanc had wide-ranging interests that led him to studies in classical first-order and second-order logic and the theory of types, many-valued logic, and modal, tense, and intuitionist logics. He was particularly interested in deductive systems as opposed to semantic models. Many of his papers were co-authored with students and other colleagues, whom he mentored and presented with open problems.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
An Introduction to Deductive Logic (New York, 1955).
Lógica matemática, with José Ferrater Mora

(Mexico City, 1955; 2nd edn 1962).

Statistical and Inductive Probabilities
(Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1962).

Techniques of Deductive Inference
(Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1966).

Deductive Logic, with William A. Wisdom
(Boston, 1972; 2nd edn 1976; 3rd edn
1993).

Truth-Value Semantics (Amsterdam, 1976).

Existence, Truth, and Provability (Albany,
N.Y., 1982).

Probability Theory and Probability Logic,
with Peter Roeper (Toronto, 1999).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Truth, Syntax and Modality* (Amsterdam,
1973).

Ed. with Raphael Stern and Raymond Gumb,
Essays in Epistemology and Semantics
(New York, 1983).

Ed. with Elliott Mendelson and Alex
Orenstein, *Foundations: Logic, Language,
and Mathematics* (Dordrecht, 1984).

"Alternatives to Standard First-Order
Semantics," in *Handbook of Philosophical
Logic*, ed. D. Gabbay and F. Guenthner
(Dordrecht, 1983), vol. 1, pp. 189–274.

Further Reading

Marion, Mathieu, and Robert S. Cohen.
*Québec Studies in the Philosophy of
Science: Essays in Honor of Hugues
Leblanc*, 2 vols (Dordrecht, 1995–6).

Nadeau, Robert. "Hommages á Hugues
Leblanc, philosophe logician,"
Philosophiques 13 (1986): 131–45.

Bernard Linsky

LEE, Harold Newton (1899–1990)

Harold N. Lee was born on 6 August 1899 in
Seattle, Washington. He received his BA (1922)

and MA (1924) from the University of Oregon,
and his PhD in philosophy from Harvard in
1930. He became an assistant professor of philosophy at Newcomb College of Tulane
University in 1925. He was promoted to full
professor in 1943, and taught at Tulane until
his retirement in 1970. He was head of his philosophy department for most of his career. Lee
was President of the Southwest Philosophical
Society in 1946, and President of the Southern
Society for Philosophy and Psychology in 1949.
He was the co-founder and co-editor of *Tulane
Studies in Philosophy*. Lee was also active in
several academic and civil rights organizations.
He served as President of the local chapter of
the American Association of University
Professors, and President of the Louisiana
League for the Preservation of Constitutional
Rights. In 1989 Lee was honored by the
American Civil Liberties Union for his efforts
promoting justice for minorities. Lee died on 31
July 1990 in New Orleans, Louisiana.

Lee pursued pragmatic approaches to values,
knowledge, and reality. With colleague Andrew
RECK, Lee made Tulane a center for the study
of American philosophy. He was primarily
influenced by his Harvard mentor C. I. LEWIS,
and fellow pragmatists George H. MEAD and
John DEWEY. Lee also incorporated Charles
PEIRCE's semiotics and process philosophy into
his thought, while rejecting the more Platonic
views of A. N. WHITEHEAD. His early work
focused on aesthetics, value theory, and ethics,
which all are concerned with values. Lee argued
that the study of values demonstrates how to
overcome the objective/subjective divide, since
values require both observer and observed;
hence all values are relational (or transactional)
in nature. Unlike the aesthetic attitude's absorption in the intrinsic value of intuited experience, the moral attitude is concerned with the
practical value of the consequences of voluntary
conduct.

Lee's later writings concentrated on epistemology and metaphysics. *Percepts, Concepts,
and Theoretic Knowledge* (1972) is his most
systematic work. Lee somewhat modified

Lewis's theory of "the givens" or "data" in experience, by emphasizing how they are in continual flux, they are not a kind of knowledge, and they are not subjective. For Lee, the field of intuited data was neither subjective nor objective, since that distinction only arises within knowledge's categories. Concepts are not applied to data; to avoid Kantian puzzles, perceptions should be understood as selective responses to similar contents, which give rise to stable concepts, then knowledge, and finally mind itself. Lee understood the mind as the active process of learning, which only arises from experience and remains within experience. The mind–body distinction is useful but not ontologically ultimate. Metaphysics is thereby liberated from fruitless dualistic problems and can again serve science. Metaphysics, like science, postulates hypotheses of underlying order to explain what is observed. While rational certainty was long held to be the special character of metaphysics, its testable hypotheses really only differ from scientific hypotheses by their wider generality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Perception and Aesthetic Value (New York, 1938).
"Methodology of Value Theory," in *Value: A Cooperative Inquiry*, ed. Ray Lepley (New York, 1949).
"The Meaning of 'Intrinsic Value'," in *The Language of Value*, ed. Ray Lepley (New York, 1957).
Symbolic Logic: An Introductory Text-book for Non-mathematicians (New York, 1961).
Percepts, Concepts, and Theoretic Knowledge: A Study in Epistemology (Memphis, Tenn., 1972).
"Discourse and Event: The Logician and Reality," in *The Philosophy of W. V. Quine* (La Salle, Ill., 1986), pp. 295–314.
"A Semiotic-Pragmatic Theory of Truth," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 26 (1988): 325–38.
"A Semiotic-Pragmatic Naturalism,"

Southern Journal of Philosophy 27 (1989): 55–70.

Other Relevant Works
Lee's papers are at Tulane University.
Ed., *Essays on the Theory of Value and Valuation, by Members of the Southwestern Philosophical Society* (Minneapolis, 1945).

Further Reading
Proc of APA v64, Who's Who in Phil
Jones, Martin M. "Sociality in Harold N. Lee's Thought," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 10 (1972): 325–32.
Reck, Andrew J., ed. *Knowledge and Value: Essays in Honor of Harold N. Lee. Tulane Studies in Philosophy*, vol. 21 (The Hague, 1972). Contain a bibliography of Lee's publications.

John R. Shook

LEHRER, Keith Edward (1936–)

Keith Lehrer was born on 10 January 1936 in Minneapolis, Minnesota. He received his BA in philosophy from the University of Minnesota in 1957, and his PhD in philosophy from Brown University in 1960. He taught at Wayne State University in 1963 and the University of Rochester from 1963 to 1973, before becoming a professor of philosophy at the University of Arizona. He was appointed Regents Professor in 1990, a position which he presently holds. He has had visiting positions at many universities in the United States and Europe, including Karl Franzens University, University of Salzburg, University of Witwatersrand, Simon Fraser University, and Stanford University. He has received numerous fellowships, grants, and awards, including several grants to direct seminars for the National

Endowment of the Humanities, an American Council of Learned Societies Fellowship, and a Guggenheim Fellowship. Lehrer was editor-in-chief of *Philosophical Studies* for many years and has served on the editorial boards of several other major journals, including *Grazer Philosophische Studien*, *American Philosophical Quarterly* and *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*. He has held numerous positions in the American Philosophical Association, including President of the Pacific Division in 1988–9, and Chair of the National Board of Officers from 1992 to 1995.

Early in his career Lehrer made significant contributions to the literature on free will and determinism. Later he became a leading interpreter and defender of the eighteenth-century common sense philosopher, Thomas Reid. Lehrer's book on Reid was largely responsible for a surge of interest in that philosopher, making Reid better known now than he was in previous centuries. Lehrer's greatest contributions, however, have been in epistemology. There he has defended and refined an original coherentist theory over the course of four decades. In the process, he has made significant contributions to nearly every important topic in contemporary epistemology, including the nature of epistemic justification, the analysis of knowledge, and skepticism. In recent years Lehrer has defended a general theory of rationality, also with strong coherentist themes.

Lehrer himself has identified a common theme unifying his work in these various areas: that of the "metamental," or mental states that have other mental states as their intentional object. The human mind, according to Lehrer, is a metamind. It is a monitoring system that evaluates first-order representations, such as desires and beliefs, and thereby turns them into uniquely human possessions: preferences and acceptances. Moreover, our metaminds involve preferences among preferences, thereby giving rise to control (and hence freedom), and they involve acceptances about acceptances, thereby giving rise to understanding (and hence knowl-

edge). It is this sort of mind, Lehrer argues, that makes us distinctively human. It distinguishes us from animals that act on desire, but that do not act with freedom. It distinguishes us from animals that possess information, but that do not possess knowledge. Metamind also allows kinds of concept formation that would otherwise be impossible, and it allows forms of rationality that would otherwise be impossible.

Not all true beliefs, or even true acceptances, amount to knowledge, since someone might believe or accept the truth without knowing it. A theory of knowledge tries to explain the difference – it tries to say what distinguishes knowledge from mere true belief or acceptance. The traditional answer has been justification: A person S knows that something p is the case only if S is justified in accepting that p is true, perhaps because S has sufficient reasons for thinking that p is true. This traditional answer, however, gives rise to questions about justification. What is it to be justified in accepting something, in the sense required for knowledge? What is it to have sufficient reasons in that sense? Lehrer answers these questions with a coherence theory of justification and knowledge: knowledge is true acceptance that appropriately coheres with other things that the knower accepts.

Lehrer's coherentist theory is unique in the way that it understands the key concept of coherence. The intuitive idea is this: a person's belief that p coheres with other things she believes just in case believing p is the most reasonable thing to do, given those other beliefs. For example, my belief that Providence is the capital of Rhode Island coheres with other things that I believe, in that believing this is the most reasonable option I have, given all the other things I believe about Rhode Island, my geography teachers, the reliability of maps, etc. But even this sort of coherence is not sufficient for knowledge, Lehrer argues, for some of those other things I believe might be mistaken. Suppose, for example, that I mistakenly believe that my favorite atlas contains no mistakes, and that this is partly my reason for believing

that Providence is the capital of Rhode Island. Would my belief about Rhode Island survive my finding out that my atlas does contain some mistakes? More exactly, would it still be reasonable for me to have my belief about Rhode Island, even without the assumption that my favorite atlas contains no mistakes, or even on the assumption that it does contain some mistakes? Lehrer reasons that if the answer is no, then I do not know that Providence is the capital of Rhode Island. However, if the answer is yes – if this would still be the most reasonable thing for me to believe even when my other beliefs are corrected – then I do know that Providence is the capital of Rhode Island.

Sometimes Lehrer has explained his position in terms of "undefeated justification." *S*'s belief has undefeated justification just in case (1) *S*'s belief coheres with the other things that *S* believes, and (2) any correction in *S*'s belief system would preserve that coherence. In other words, given any correction to *S*'s belief system, her belief that *p* would continue to cohere with the corrected system. Again, that is the intuitive idea. Lehrer cashes the idea out by providing a series of precise definitions of technical notions. The result is an original account of knowledge, together with original accounts of subjective justification and objective justification, all in terms of Lehrer's central idea of coherence.

It was noted above that knowledge is more than mere true belief or acceptance, and that traditionally the difference is understood in terms of justification. In 1963 Edmund GETTIER published an attack on this traditional understanding. Gettier showed that a belief could be both true and justified, and yet still fail to qualify as knowledge. Here is an example of the sort that Gettier gave: On the basis of excellent (although fallible) reasons, *S* believes that her co-worker Mr Nogot owns a Ford: Nogot testifies that he owns a Ford, and this is confirmed by *S*'s own relevant observations. From this *S* infers that someone in her office owns a Ford. As it turns out, *S*'s evidence is misleading and Nogot does not in fact own a Ford. However, another person in *S*'s office, Mr Havit, does

own a Ford, although *S* has no reason for believing this. Clearly, *S* does not know that someone in her office owns a Ford, even though this is true, she accepts it, and she is justified in accepting it on the basis of the evidence she has. The problem is to explain exactly why *S* lacks knowledge, and in the context of a theory that also explains why people do have knowledge in cases where they do.

According to Lehrer, *S* is indeed justified in believing that someone in her office owns a Ford, since this belief coheres with other things that *S* believes, including all of her relevant evidence. Nevertheless, *S*'s justification for her belief does not survive corrections to her belief system. In other words, *S* does not have "undefeated" justification for her belief. Consider the details of the case above. If *S*'s belief system is corrected so as to eliminate relevant errors, then her belief no longer coheres with the resulting system. More specifically, if we remove *S*'s belief about Nogot, and replaced it with the belief that Nogot does *not* own a Ford, then *S*'s belief that someone in her office owns a Ford does not cohere with the corrected system. This, Lehrer reasons, is what explains why *S* does not know.

Similar considerations are involved in Lehrer's response to skepticism. The skeptic's reasoning typically proceeds as follows: (1) People often accept what is false. And even when people accept what is true, there is some chance that they might have erred. (2) If there is some chance that one is incorrect in accepting that *p*, then one does not know that *p*. Therefore, (3) No one knows that *p*, even in cases where *p* is in fact true. Lehrer's response to this line of reasoning is to accept premise (1) but to deny premise (2). Even if there is some chance that one has erred in accepting that *p*, Lehrer argues, it does not follow that one does not know that *p*. This follows straightforwardly from Lehrer's account of knowledge, since it is possible to have justification for one's belief, and even undefeated justification for one's belief, even if there is some chance that one's belief is in error. We may put the point another

way: the mere possibility that one has erred is not sufficient, all by itself, to defeat one's justification. For it may be reasonable to believe that one is capable of error (that is, to believe that one is fallible), and to nevertheless believe that one has not erred in a particular case. In other words, it may be reasonable to accept the skeptic's point that there is always a chance of error, but to nevertheless accept that one is not in error regarding *p*, given all the other things that one accepts regarding *p*. In this way, Lehrer argues, we may "neutralize" the skeptic's (valid) objection that we are fallible, that there is always a chance that we err. In doing so, we avoid the extremes of both dogmatism and skepticism.

Being rational involves using one's reason with regard to what one does, intends, or prefers (practical rationality), and with regard to what one accepts and how one reasons (theoretical rationality). But what does it take for someone to be rational or reasonable in this sense? According to a widespread view, rationality consists entirely in reasoning well about means for achieving ends. This instrumentalist view of rationality implies that our goals and purposes (our ends) cannot be evaluated as rational or irrational. Lehrer argues against instrumentalism and its attendant "autonomy of ends" thesis. He suggests that we can construct a better theory if we focus on Aristotle's claim that man is a rational animal. By making the rationality of the person central, Lehrer argues, we can explain why other things are rational, including the person's preferences concerning his or her ends. For example, if I assume that I am rational, then this gives me a reason for saying that my preferences are rational, via the following argument. (1) I am rational. (2) I prefer that A. Therefore, (3) I am rational in what I prefer. In conclusion, (4) I am rational in my preference that A. Lehrer notes that the inferences to (3) and (4) are not deductive, but instead are explanatory. It is because I have certain dispositions to be rational (this is what (1) says), that I have a reason to think that my preferences are rational (this is what (3) and (4) conclude).

Lehrer suggests that I have a reason for accepting the first premise that I am rational by way of a similar looping argument. Roughly, the assumption that I am rational gives me a reason for thinking that I am rational in accepting the things that I do. Moreover, one of the things I accept is my own rationality. Therefore, my rationality explains why I am rational in accepting premise (1) above, that I am rational. This sounds circular, and it is. But Lehrer argues that the circle is not vicious. On the contrary, it is central to Lehrer's position that personal rationality is explanatory of other kinds of rationality: it is because I embody certain dispositions regarding my acceptances that what I accept, including premise (1), is rational. Of course this kind of looping argument does not allow us to prove that we are rational to a skeptic who denies it. But that is not what the argument is supposed to do. Rather, it is supposed to explain why premise (1) is rational.

Lehrer's theory also addresses a further question: What *makes* a person rational? Lehrer argues that what makes a person rational is her character: specifically, her various dispositions concerning what she prefers and accepts, as well her dispositions concerning how she reasons and how she changes, since these are also important aspects of a person's rationality. It is these dispositions that *make* me rational, although it is my rationality that explains and allows me to conclude *that* I am rational in what I prefer and accept. Here Lehrer invokes the metaphor of an arch to explain the relationship between my personal rationality and the rationality of my various undertakings. The first premise of my rationality is like the keystone of the arch, in that without it the arch collapses. But the keystone is supported by the other stones in the arch: I am a rational person because of my dispositions concerning what I prefer, what I accept, how I reason, and how I change.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Knowledge, Truth and Evidence," *Analysis* 25(1965): 168–75.
"Cans Without Ifs," *Analysis* 29 (1968):

29–32.

"Knowledge: Undefeated Justified True Belief," with Thomas Paxson, *Journal of Philosophy* 66 (1969): 225–32.

Knowledge (Oxford, 1974).

Rational Consensus in Science and Society: A Philosophical and Mathematical Study, with Carl Wagner (Dordrecht, 1981).

"Justification, Truth and Coherence," with Stewart Cohen, *Synthese* 55 (1983): 191–208.

"Metaknowledge: Undefeated Justified Belief," *Synthese* 74 (1988): 329–47.

Thomas Reid (New York, 1989)

Metamind (Oxford, 1990).

Theory of Knowledge (Boulder, 1990; 2nd edn 2000).

Self Trust: A Study of Reason, Knowledge and Autonomy (Oxford, 1997).

Other Relevant Works

"Ifs, Cans, and Causes," *Analysis* 20 (1960): 122–4.

"An Empirical Disproof of Determinism?" in *Freedom and Determinism*, ed. Keith Lehrer (New York, 1966), pp. 175–202.

Ed., *Freedom and Determinism* (New York, 1966).

Philosophical Problems and Arguments: An Introduction, with James Cornman and George Pappas (New York, 1968; 4th edn, Indianapolis, 1992).

Ed. with Adrienne Lehrer, *Theory of Meaning* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1970).

Ed. with Herbert Feigl and Wilfrid Sellars, *New Readings in Philosophical Analysis* (New York, 1972).

"Social Consensus and Rational Agnoiology," *Synthese* 31 (1975): 141–60.

Ed., *Analysis and Metaphysics: Essays in Honor of R. M. Chisholm* (Dordrecht, 1975).

Ed. with Ronald E. Beanblossom, *Thomas Reid's Inquiry and Essays* (Indianapolis, 1975).

Lehrer, Keith. "Coherence and the Racehorse Paradox," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*

5 (1980): 183–92.

"Metaknowledge: Undefeated Justification," *Synthese* 74 (1988): 329–47.

Ed. with Marjorie Clay, *Knowledge and Skepticism* (Boulder, Col., 1989).

"Freedom, Preference and Autonomy," *Journal of Ethics* 1 (1997): 3–25.

"The Quest for the Evident," in *The Philosophy of Roderick M. Chisholm*, ed. Lewis Hahn (Chicago, 1997).

"Rationality," in *The Blackwell Guide to Epistemology* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 206–20.

"Self-Presentation, Representation and the Self," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 64 (2002): 412–30.

"Reason and Autonomy," *Social Philosophy and Policy* 20 (2003): 177–98.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, Oxford Comp Phil, Pres Addr of APA v9

Alston, William P. "Has Foundationalism been Refuted?" *Philosophical Studies* 29 (1976): 287–305.

Bender, John, ed. *The Current State of the Coherence Theory: Critical Essays on the Epistemic Theories of Keith Lehrer and Laurence Bonjour* (Dordrecht, 1989).

Bogdan, Radu, ed. *Keith Lehrer* (Dordrecht, 1980). Contains Lehrer's "Self Profile" and a bibliography.

Brandl, J., W. Gombocz, and C. Piller, eds. *Metamind, Knowledge, and Coherence: Essays on the Philosophy of Keith Lehrer* (Amsterdam, 1991).

Chisholm, Roderick. "Keith Lehrer and Thomas Reid," *Philosophical Studies* 70 (1990): 33–8.

Duran, Jane. "Naturalizing Lehrer's Coherentism," *Philosophical Papers* 22 (1993): 199–213.

Fischer, John M. "Lehrer's New Move: 'Can' in Theory and Practice," *Theoria* 45 (1979): 49–62.

Fogelin, Robert J., and James Moor. "Lehrer on Incompatible Though Equally Coherent Systems," *Philosophical Studies* 64 (1991):

229–32.

Hilpinen, Risto. "Skepticism and Justification," *Synthese* 55 (1983): 165–74.

Kvanvig, Jonathan. "Is there an 'Us' in 'Justification'?" *Synthese* 62 (1985): 63–74.

Olsson, Erik, ed. *The Epistemology of Keith Lehrer* (Dordrecht, 2003).

Price, Terry. "Counterexamples and Prophylactics," *Philosophical Studies* 74 (1994): 273–82.

Shope, Robert. *The Analysis of Knowing: A Decade of Research* (Princeton, N.J., 1983).

"Symposium on *Self Trust*," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 49 (1999): 1039–74.

John Greco

LEIGHTON, Joseph Alexander (1870–1954)

Joseph Alexander Leighton was born on 2 December 1870 in Orangeville, Ontario, Canada, to James Leighton and Jane Speers Leighton. His education included a BA with high honors and the Governor General's Medal from Trinity College, Toronto in 1891; a PhD in philosophy from Cornell University in 1894; and an STB from the Episcopal Theological Seminary in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1896. While in Cambridge, Leighton participated in the seminars of William JAMES and Josiah ROYCE. He studied philosophy at the Universities of Tübingen, Berlin, and Erlangen in 1896–7.

Leighton served as professor of philosophy and chaplain at Hobart College in New York from 1897 to 1910. He was then appointed professor and head of the philosophy department at Ohio State University, where he taught from 1910 until his retirement in 1941. Leighton also was visiting or acting professor at Stanford University (1925), the University of California, Los Angeles (1928, 1937), the University of Utah (1932–3), and the University of Southern California (1938–9). Leighton was Vice President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1907, and President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1937–8. He served on national committees of the American Association of University Professors, was a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, served for many years as university preacher at Cornell University, and often preached in various Episcopal parishes. Leighton's membership in professional and scholarly societies also included the American Psychological Association and Phi Beta Kappa.

Influenced by American idealists such as Royce, James Edwin CREIGHTON, and George Holmes HOWISON, as well as British idealist Bernard Bosanquet, Leighton's scholarship throughout his long career reflects his interest in personal idealism, and in making idealist views cohere with interests in science and human values. Moving away from the abstraction of absolute idealism, Leighton adhered to a view of the world as an organic whole comprised of individual wholes, though always within the context of community. This dual focus on the individual and community is reflected in Leighton's many works in social and political philosophy, including *The Individual and the Social Order* (1926) and *Social Philosophies in Conflict* (1937), the latter researched during Leighton's travels in Europe. Later in his career, his interests in community expanded to include cultural anthropology. After his retirement, Leighton worked on a project in this area to be titled *The Diversity of Cultures and the Unity of Mankind*, which was cut short by failing eyesight. Leighton's *The Field of Philosophy* (1918) has been used in several editions as an introductory textbook.

As a philosopher, Leighton modeled a lifelong commitment to liberal education. A defender of these ideals within the academic world, Leighton's life and work also reflected

his diverse interests not only in poetry, science, religion, metaphysics, ethics, politics, and culture, but also in travel, golf, and fishing. According to Albert Chandler in the American Philosophical Association's memorial minutes, Leighton vigorously defended liberal education against over-specialization and narrow vocationalism. Leighton's political interests included a firm commitment to progressive democracy, staunch support of the League of Nations and the United Nations, and loyalty to both his Canadian background and American citizenship. Leighton died on 17 June 1954 in Worthington, Ohio.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Typical Modern Conceptions of God (New York and London, 1901).

Jesus Christ and the Civilization of Today (New York, 1907).

The Field of Philosophy (Columbus, Ohio, 1918; 4th edn, New York, 1930).

Man and the Cosmos: An Introduction to Metaphysics (New York, 1922).

Religion and the Mind of Today (New York, 1924).

The Individual and the Social Order: An Introduction to Ethics and Social Philosophy (New York, 1926).

Individuality and Education: A Democratic Philosophy of Education (New York, 1928).

Social Philosophies in Conflict: Fascism & Nazism, Communism, Liberal Democracy (New York, 1937).

Other Relevant Works

"Pragmatism," *Journal of Philosophy* 1 (1904): 148–56.

"The Objects of Knowledge," *Philosophical Review* 16 (1907): 577–87.

"Personality and a Metaphysics of Value," *International Journal of Ethics* 21 (1910–11): 23–36.

"Educational Preparedness for Peace," *The Scientific Monthly* 4 (July 1917): 5–21.

"Time and Logic of Monistic Idealism," in *Philosophical Essays in Honor of James Edwin Creighton*, ed. George H. Sabine (New York, 1917).

"An Estimate of Bosanquet's Philosophy," *Philosophical Review* 32 (1923): 625–32.

"Emergent Evolution and Individuality," *The Personalist* 11 (1930): 13–21.

"My Development and Present Creed," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York and London, 1930), vol. 1, pp. 425–41.

"Is Western Civilization Declining?" *The Personalist* 12 (1931): 21–31.

"The Principle of Individuality and Value," in *Contemporary Idealism in America*, ed. Clifford Barrett (New York, 1932), pp. 131–68.

"History as the Struggle for Social Values," *Philosophical Review* 48 (1939): 118–54.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, Pres Addr of APA v4, Proc of APA v28, Who Was Who in Amer v3, Who's Who in Phil

Cunningham, G. Watts. "Joseph Leighton's *Man and the Cosmos*," *Philosophical Review* 32 (1923): 308–12.

Hocking, William E. "Joseph Leighton's *The Individual and the Social Order*," *Philosophical Review* 37 (1928): 513–16.

Lamprecht, Sterling P. "Joseph Leighton's *Religion and the Mind of To-day*," *Journal of Philosophy* 22 (1925): 133–7.

Heather E. Keith
Steven A. Fesmire

LEONARD, Henry Siggins (1905–67)

Henry Leonard was born on 19 December 1905 in Newton, Massachusetts. He received his BA from Harvard in 1927, his MA in 1929, and his PhD in philosophy in 1931. He studied

with A. N. WHITEHEAD, who was a major influence on his thought for the rest of his life, C. I. LEWIS, and H. M. SHEFFER. Among his fellow students were W. V. QUINE and Nelson GOODMAN, both of whom were important for his later thought. Leonard remained at Harvard as a lecturer from 1931 to 1934, and after a year at the University of Rochester as instructor, returned to Harvard to teach from 1935 to 1937. He was an assistant and associate professor at Duke University from 1937 to 1949. In 1949 he went to Michigan State College (which became Michigan State University in 1955) as professor and head of the philosophy department. He was named University Professor in 1962, and held that title until his death on 11 July 1967 in Frankfurt, Germany. Leonard was President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1963–4.

Leonard was a philosophical logician during a time of great optimism that logic, viewed as a normative discipline, could be used not only to illuminate philosophical issues, but even more broadly to serve as a basis for practical success in life. While the purely formal roots for this conviction can be traced directly to Bertrand Russell and Whitehead's *Principia Mathematica*, Leonard's conception of logic was equally influenced by the work of the great American pragmatist Charles Sanders PEIRCE. The result was a conception of logic that included purely formal core, but also included areas of application as well. *An Introduction to The Principles of Right Reason* (1957) is a systematic expression of this conception of logic. Leonard presents a comprehensive informal semantics, including an account of definition that remains unsurpassed in the literature. Reviving a much older conception of the subject, Leonard defined logic in this sense as "the science of exact reasoning," (1957, p. 11) with the emphasis falling equally on "science" and "reasoning."

Leonard also brought broadly philosophical considerations to bear on logic itself. Advocates of the standard logic tended toward a parsimonious semantics structured around reference but not meaning, bivalence but not modality, and what now seem to many to be arbitrary assumptions regarding existence. Leonard's writings repeatedly question whether such a restrictive interpretation is reasonable, and his "Wide Language W," presented in part in "Essences, Attributes and Predicates" (1964), presents an alternative semantics that includes much of what had been ruled out by others. In addition, his article "The Calculus of Individuals and Its Uses," written with Goodman, questions another limitation imposed by standard logic, that while relations between classes are of theoretical interest, individuals as such bear no interesting relations to one another. Leonard and Goodman counter that assumption with their calculus. While Leonard's ideas were often radical for their time, they inspired much of the interesting later work in nonstandard logic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An Introduction to the Principles of Right Reason (New York, 1957).

"Authorship and Purpose," *Philosophy of Science* 26 (1959): 277–94.

"Authorship of Signs," *Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters* 45 (1959): 329–40.

"Interrogatives, Imperatives, Truth, Falsity and Lies," *Philosophy of Science* 26 (1959): 172–86.

"Reply to Professor Wheatley," *Philosophy of Science* 28 (1961): 55–64.

"Synonymy and Systematic Definitions," *Monist* 51 (1967): 33–68.

"The Calculus of Individuals and Its Uses," with Nelson Goodman, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 5 (1940): 45–55.

"Two-Valued Truth Tables for Modal Functions," in *Structure, Method and Meaning: Essays in Honor of H. M. Sheffer*, ed. Paul Henle, Horace M. Kallen, and Susanne K. Langer (New York, 1951).

"Essences, Attributes and Predicates,"

Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association 37 (1964): 25–51.

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v7, Proc of APA v41, Who Was Who in Amer v4, Who's Who in Phil

Wheatley, J. M. O. "Note on Professor Leonard's Analysis of Interrogatives," *Philosophy of Science* 28 (1961): 52–4.

James Van Evra

LEOPOLD, Aldo (1887–1948)

Aldo Leopold was born on 11 January 1887 in Burlington, Iowa, and died in Sauk County, Wisconsin on 21 April 1948. After attending the Lawrenceville School in New Jersey from 1904 to 1905, Leopold was a student at the Sheffield Scientific School at Yale (BA 1908). He received a master of forestry degree from the Yale Forestry School in 1909 and, later that same year, joined the US Forest Service where he began as a forest assistant at the Apache National Forest in southeastern Arizona. In 1911 he became the supervisor of the Carson National Forest in northern New Mexico. During that tenure, he created and edited the newsletter *Carson Pine and Cone.*

In 1914 Leopold was assigned to the US Forest Service district headquarters in Albuquerque, New Mexico, where he was eventually placed in charge of new ventures in recreation, game, fish, and publicity. He accepted a full-time position as the secretary of the Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce in 1918, and rejoined the Forest Service in 1919 as an assistant district forester, with significant administrative responsibilities: namely, personnel, finance, maintenance of roads and trails, and fire control for twenty million acres

of national forests in the Southwest. In 1923 he completed the *Watershed Handbook* in which he recorded observations on numerous inspection tours of Southwestern forests. In 1924 he accepted a transfer to the US Forest Products Laboratory in Madison, Wisconsin, where he became associate director. After leaving the Forest Service in 1928, Leopold conducted numerous game surveys of the Midwestern states, which were funded by the Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers's Institute. As Chairman of the Game Policy Institute of the American Game Conference, he formulated an American game policy that was adopted in 1930. In 1933 Leopold became the first professor of game management in the department of agriculture and economics at the University of Wisconsin. In 1935 he assisted in the founding of "The Wilderness Society." During that same year he acquired a Wisconsin farm in the sand country of central Wisconsin and built "the shack" that would become the setting for *A Sand County Almanac.* In the autumn of 1935 he traveled to Germany on a Carl Schurz Fellowship to study forestry and wildlife management. He established The Wildlife Society in 1937. In 1939 Leopold became the Chairman of a new department of wildlife management at the University of Wisconsin, a position that he held until his death. In 1943 he was appointed to a six-year term on the Wisconsin Conservation Commission, a position dominated by debates over deer management. His revised book manuscript, titled *Great Possessions*, was accepted by Oxford University Press in 1947. *Great Possessions* was published posthumously in 1949 as *A Sand County Almanac and Sketches Here and There.*

This publication is divided into three parts: "Part I: A Sand County Almanac," "Part II: Sketches Here and There," and "Part III: The Upshot." In "Part I: A Sand County Almanac," Leopold chronicles his nature observations, which are organized on a seasonal basis, month by month throughout one year. "Part II: Sketches Here and There" includes essays on conservation gathered over a forty-year period:

"Wisconsin," "Illinois and Iowa," "Arizona and New Mexico," "Chihuahua and Sonora," "Oregon and Utah," and "Manitoba." "Part III: The Upshot" – the most philosophical and systematic of his writing – includes the essays "Conservation Ethic," "Wildlife in American Culture," "Wilderness," and "The Land Ethic."

Aldo Leopold's most well-known and philosophically important essay, "The Land Ethic," was written after years of service in forestry and wildlife management. This essay expands the confines of ethical relations between individuals and society to include land. Leopold's collective term of land encompasses plants, animals, soil, and water. The land ethic implies a respect for all life within a biotic community, and that people are fellow citizens of that community. In other words, individuals should *value* the land.

Leopold broadened the concept of value beyond economics. A conservation program focused only on economic self-interest may exclude environmental factors that have no commercial value, but that are necessary to the health of the land. Leopold's philosophical disposition is understood as a departure – or at least a broadening – from Gifford Pinchot's utilitarian approach to conservation. According to the utilitarian approach, individuals have the right to use natural resources judiciously and sensibly. Leopold's land ethic clearly implies that the individual's first responsibility is to the biotic community of which he is a member. Leopold does not object to a wise use of natural resources as long as there is no resulting deleterious effect to the health of the land. His departure is really a change of focus from the individual and society to all members of the living community, to all living things.

Leopold formulated his land ethic as an evolutionary process of philosophical ethics. He explicitly states that all ethics are a "process of ecological evolution" (1949, p. 202). He claimed that ecologically and philosophically defined ethics are one and the same thing: "limitation on freedom of action in the struggle for existence" equals the "differentiation of social from the anti-social conduct" (1949, p. 202). The natural cooperation or symbiotic relation between individuals has also evolved in the political and economic arenas; ethical relations have necessarily intervened in the practice of selfish competition.

Leopold's land ethic is the product of an evolution in his own thought. From childhood, his life consisted of numerous and often extended excursions into the wild. His formal education in the biological sciences – zoology, botany, forestry, agriculture – gave informed direction to wildlife observations and was ripened by years of experience in the field. Leopold's reflections on nature are replete with references to biological evolution and geological processes. He often invoked Darwin, linking man's relationship with all other life. Using this background knowledge in Darwinian evolution, Leopold recognized that humans have a natural connection to all other life. Consequently, man should respect and value the land and all that the land includes – animals, plants, water, soil (organic and inorganic matter). On other occasions, he refers to the knowledge of earth's history as a way in which humans can appreciate nature. In his essay "Wisconsin" in "Part II: Sketches Here and There," Leopold remarks poetically in his observation of a crane in a marshland setting: "His [the crane's] tribe … stems out of the remote Eocene. The other members of the fauna in which he originated are long since entombed within the hills. When we hear his call we hear no mere bird. We hear the trumpet in the orchestra of evolution." (1949, p. 96)

Building on the ideas of Henry David Thoreau, John Muir, and George Perkins Marsh, Leopold recorded some of his most personal observations in "Part I: A Sand County Almanac." In the chapter entitled "February," he chronicles human and environmental history while cutting through an old oak tree of eighty years felled by lightning. The first few years bring back his cherished personal recollections of ownership of the farm on which

the tree grew. Continuing to cut into the deeper growth rings, he recounts the former owner – a bootlegger during the Great Depression. Although this owner hated the farm, the oak continued to grow, being "no respecter of persons" (1949, p. 9). Leopold recounts all the years – events good and bad – back to 1865, the birth of the tree. Curiously, this is the year when John Muir offered to buy a farm about thirty miles from the oak. Leopold then contemplates the cycle of natural regeneration while the hot coals from the oak heat his kettle. The ashes will ultimately become part of the soil from which apples will grow in his orchard, or perhaps will be the ground where an "October squirrel … is bent on planting acorns" (1949, p. 18).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Sand County Almanac and Sketches Here and There (New York, 1949).
Round River: From the Journals of Aldo Leopold, ed. Luna B. Leopold (New York, 1953).

Other Relevant Works
Leopold's papers are at the University of Wisconsin, Madison.
Aldo Leopold's Southwest, ed. David E. Brown and Neil B. Carmony (Albuquerque, N.M., 1990).
The River of the Mother of God and Other Essays by Aldo Leopold, ed. Susan Flader and J. Baird Callicot (Madison, Wis., 1991).
For the Health of the Land: Previously Unpublished Essays and Other Writings, ed. J. Baird Callicott and Eric T. Freyfogle (Washington, D.C., 1999).
The Essential Aldo Leopold, ed. Curt Meine and Richard L. Knight (Madison, Wis., 1999).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Ethics*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*
Callicott, Baird J., ed. *Companion to A Sand County Almanac* (Madison, Wis., 1987).
Flader, Susan L. *Thinking Like a Mountain: Aldo Leopold and the Evolution of an Ecological Attitude Toward Deer, Wolves and Forests* (Columbia, Miss., 1974).
Knight, Richard L., and Suzanne Riedel, eds. *Aldo Leopold and the Ecological Conscience* (Oxford, 2002).
Lorbiecki, Marybeth. *A Fierce Green Fire, An Illustrated Biography* (Helena, Mont., 1996).
McCabe, Robert. *Aldo Leopold, The Professor* (Amherst, Wis., 1987).
Meine, Curt. *Aldo Leopold: His Life and Work* (Madison, Wis., 1988).
Norton, Bryan G. "The Constancy of Leopold's Land Ethic," in *Environmental Pragmatism*, ed. Andrew Light and Eric Katz (London, 1996).

Charles Frederick Frantz

LEUBA, James Henry (1868–1946)

James H. Leuba was born on 9 April 1868 in Neuchâtel, Switzerland. After earning his BS degree in 1886 from the University of Neuchâtel, he moved to the United States in 1887. He embraced scientific naturalism but remained deeply interested in religion. His conviction that psychology could provide a scientific account of religious phenomena prompted him to enroll at Clark University. He completed a dissertation under G. Stanley HALL on Christian conversion and received his PhD in psychology in 1895. In 1897, two years after refusing a position at Wesleyan that would have required him to lead chapel services, Leuba accepted an invitation to teach psychology at Bryn Mawr College, an institution that ardently defended freedom of thought and expression. Most students found him a formidable and stimulating teacher. For his

part, Leuba thoroughly enjoyed teaching. For his contributions to psychology, Leuba was elected to membership as a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. After retiring in 1933, he reluctantly abandoned Bryn Mawr for winters in a warmer climate. Leuba died in Winter Haven, Florida, on 8 December 1946.

Leuba's 1896 article summarizing his findings on religious phenomena, published in the *American Journal of Psychology*, ascribed conversion to a series of "natural phases" rather than "superhuman interposition." His work was one of the first psychological analyses of religious experience published in the United States. In further publications Leuba drew eclectically on the work of historians, on studies of children and contemporary "primitive" peoples, and on results of questionnaires in various populations in efforts to describe feelings and thoughts of people committed to religious world views. Like many functional psychologists and pragmatist philosophers, especially William JAMES, Leuba held that religion arose during the course of evolution as an instrument for preserving and enhancing life. Humans were motivated to attempt relationships with supernatural beings, he argued, not so much by a desire to explain the world as by the hope that they could use the assistance of those beings to their advantage.

In contrast to many psychologists of his time, Leuba did not hesitate to make judgments about the validity of religious belief. He emphasized that while belief in a personal, supernatural God who intervened in the physical universe might once have been useful, modern science and philosophy had undermined the credibility of that belief. In *The Belief in God and Immortality* (1916) and again in an important article published in 1934, Leuba supported that view by presenting the results of questionnaires he had devised to determine the religious beliefs of one thousand physical, biological, and social scientists. His studies suggested that those intellectuals were abandoning belief in the personal, active God of the Judaeo-Christian tradition and did much to confirm the fears of conservative Christians such as William Jennings Bryan that American culture was moving in a secular direction. Indeed, Leuba was arguably more influential than any other individual in convincing such conservative Christians that they should take the offensive against liberal theology and unbelief.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Study in the Psychology of Religious Phenomena," *American Journal of Psychology* 7 (1896): 309–85.

The Psychological Origin and the Nature of Religion (Chicago, 1909).

A Psychological Study of Religion: Its Origin, Function, and Future (New York, 1912).

The Belief in God and Immortality: A Psychological, Anthropological and Statistical Study (Boston, 1916).

The Psychology of Religious Mysticism (New York, 1925).

God or Man? A Study of the Value of God to Man (New York, 1933).

"Religious Beliefs of American Scientists," *Harper's Monthly Magazine* 169 (1934): 291–300.

"The Making of a Psychologist of Religion," in *Religion in Transition*, ed. Vergilius Ferm (New York, 1937), pp. 173–200.

The Reformation of the Churches (Boston, 1950).

Further Reading

Bio Dict Psych, *Encyc Relig*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*

Helson, Harry. "James Henry Leuba, 1868–1946," *Bryn Mawr Alumnae Bulletin* (Feburary 1947): 16–17.

McBride, Katharine E. "James Henry Leuba: 1868–1946," *American Journal of Psychology* 60 (1947): 645–6.

Jon H. Roberts

LEVESQUE, Claude (1927–)

Claude Lévesque was born on 3 March 1927 on the Plateau Mont-Royal in the eastern section of Montréal, Canada. He was the fifth child of a family of eight; his mother was a musician, both in temperament and formation, and his father, a very religious man, if not a mystic, was a dentist who worked in a very poor social environment and thus was not spared financial difficulties. As a child, Lévesque developed a lasting passion for the theater and showed an early concern for diction, sonority and the musicality of speech, possessing a sensitiveness that would later become a major motif of his philosophical work. He studied humanities at the Collège Sainte-Marie, where he was a member of the college's theater company before joining the Compagnons de Saint-Laurent. He frequented the theater and radio circles, and also mingled with painters and artists, particularly with the Automatist group. At this time, he worked occasionally for the radio and considered pursuing a career in that field. However, when his father died, Lévesque decided to continue his studies, receiving his MA degree in medieval sciences at the Institut D'Études Médiévales of the University of Montréal in 1951. His experience with disease and death (his older sister also died when he was only fifteen) led him to profound philosophical and theological reflection, and he decided to enter the Dominican Order, not so much by attraction for the order as such, but rather because of its high intellectual reputation and social commitment. From 1953 to 1957 he studied theology at Ottawa's Dominican Studium. The Order's authorities then sent him to continue his studies in philosophy at the University of Montréal from 1957 to 1959. He received his PhD in philosophy there in 1960, and his dissertation on "The Process of Socialization" immediately granted him a position as associate professor of philosophy of the University of Montréal, where he taught until his retirement in 2002.

The year 1960 marked, in Québec, the beginning of a period known as the Quiet Revolution, rich in transformations of all sorts. The marginality as well as the originality of Lévesque's intellectual path might be difficult to fathom for an anglophone reader if he or she is unaware of the institutional and ideological issues involved in the development of philosophy in Canada, and especially in Québec. Indeed, it was not until the beginning of the postwar period that Canadian culture would finally undergo major changes. In Québec, the publication of the Automatists' manifesto *Refus global*, endorsed by the same artists whom Lévesque encountered in his youth, marked "the birth of modern thought in French Canada" and the awakening of the Québécois nation's movement towards emancipation and self-affirmation that the Quiet Revolution engendered in the 1960s. This period also triggered an important rupture of the traditional tie between philosophy and the religious education institutions, signaling the end of orthodoxies and dogmatisms. Lévesque's path, as he began teaching at the University of Montréal, coincided with this radical break wherein philosophy no longer held an ancillary position to theology and freed itself from a teaching that was up to that moment still largely dominated by neo-scholastic thought. Lévesque took an active part in the introduction of a much-needed new pluralism, and he also showed the way towards new modes of questioning. For example, he did not hesitate to change his assigned course on Thomism, and to call upon the knowledge of varied disciplines – sociology, psychology, linguistics, psychoanalysis – for what would now be known as a course in "Philosophical Anthropology." Throughout his career, he created many courses intertwining philosophical and literary works, a gesture that would greatly contribute to breaking down the walls between these disciplines. Lévesque tirelessly criticized, in his own words, "philosophy's congenital blindness to the play of writing," its illusory belief in the obvious, in the visibility and givenness of meaning, and in the

scientific purity of the concept. His intimate knowledge of psychoanalysis (he taught Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalysis during his career) was also a key factor in the intellectual openness and freedom of thought for which his teaching will always be so well known.

In the early 1960s Lévesque's postdoctoral research took him to France and Germany, where he met Paul RICOEUR as well as a young philosopher who would play a decisive role in the evolution of his own thought: Jacques Derrida. Back in Québec, he tried psychoanalysis and decided to leave the Dominican Order in 1965. Now a non-believer, the whole of metaphysics seemed to shake to its very foundations; a situation which puts him again, as in his youth, at a crossroads. Lévesque was led to a decisive choice; he must attempt the leap out of metaphysics. His reading of Maurice Blanchot's works, the continued study of Freud's thought, the further delving into the works of Nietzsche and Heidegger, the simultaneous publication in 1967 of Derrida's three books (*De la grammatologie*, *L'Écriture et la différence*, and *La Voix et le phénomène*) characterize some of the plural paths his own work thereafter passionately explored.

From his first book entitled *L'Étrangeté du texte*, a series of essays on Nietzsche, Blanchot, Freud, and Derrida published in 1976, to his most recent work published in 2002, *Par-delà le masculin et le féminin*, which again calls upon many authors, approached through both proximity and distance (Freud and Lacan, Levinas, Blanchot, Derrida, Bataille), Lévesque's interest, fascination even, for the immoderate, the excess, the tensions of contradiction through writing has never faltered. As philosopher Georges Leroux clearly states in his assessment of Lévesque's contribution, which represents, as he puts it, nothing less than "the development in Québec of the thought of difference," such an interest is no longer philosophical in the classical meaning of the term: " In a significant break from scholastic thought, and in the wake of both Georges Bataille's and Jacques Derrida's works, Lévesque puts forward a heterogeneous philosophy that resists as much the hegemony of analytic philosophy as traditional idealism. This thought is a thought of risk and of audacity, in the confrontation, always already marked by a certain vertigo, with the loss of meaning, the dissolution of ancient references, the abyss of difference. Carried by a vehement protestation against all certainties and all orthodoxies, his thought accepts the risk of nihilism if it is to constitute the only way out of metaphysics". This nihilism should not of course be interpreted in negative terms but rather, following Nietzsche, as a *re*affirmation of life, an intensity and excess of the "survie" which, being no longer bound to life nor death, encompasses both, beyond any mere opposition.

In 1979 Lévesque and Christie McDonald invited Jacques Derrida to take part, with a group of researchers, in a meeting on the questions of autobiography and translation in Montréal. These discussions led to the publication of the book entitled *L'Oreille de l'autre*, later translated in Japanese and English (*The Ear of the Other*, 1985). Lévesque made important interventions throughout the debates, notably during a round table dedicated to language and the mother tongue, when he questioned "québécois writers' discomfort within language and their quest for the mother tongue as a situation that is perhaps unique, perhaps universal." However, a simple political and nationalist interpretation of Lévesque's stand on one's exile within a language, although predictable in the Québécois context where the language issue is often oversensitive, is not a complete understanding of his position.

Dissonance (1988) resonates with the question of "otobiography." The motif of music (so "organically" related to the "ear") had already begun to be investigated through the question of Nietzsche's "otobiography," wherein the limits between the "*autos*," the "*bios*," the "body of work," and the subject's own body had been radically probed. There is but a step between the autobiographical ear and the cry's dissonance that tears it, and Lévesque, in this particular work, lends an ear

to what does not "sound right," to that which utters a strange and earsplitting noise, to that which "hurts the tympanum" in Nietzsche's clashing first work, *The Birth of Tragedy*. If the Nietzschean interpretation found here is largely inspired by the writings of Freud, Derrida and Blanchot, and if, like them, it seeks to deconstruct the traditional boundaries between philosophy, linguistics, aesthetics, and the political, *Dissonance* also constitutes an original and rich interpretation as it brings to light all the coherence and scope of Nietzsche's conception of language in a systematic mode that yet escapes all systems of thought. Unlike certain French works that have marked the reading of Nietzsche (those of Bernard Pautrat and Philippe Lacoue-Labarthe, amongst others), Lévesque insists on the fact that Nietzsche, far from simply opposing music and language, considers them inseparable; and that the cry, like music, is neither beneath nor beyond language, but its very limit. In *The Birth of Tragedy*, a double language is thus already at work, through a hybrid blend of objective and lyrical styles that leaves intact none of the oppositions deployed in Nietzsche's argumentation. It is one of Lévesque's merits that his reflection refuses any simple opposition between *melos* and *logos* (or between the figures of Dionysius and Apollo, Aeschylus, and Euripides, or the couple concept/metaphor). Taking a stand against other Nietzschean commentators, Lévesque does not consider the cry as part and place of an origin, of some nature complete and unscathed. In other words, the cry is not some pre-verbal dimension of language, resisting all articulation. The "cry's syntax" that is to be found in Nietzsche's work is utterly a writing, always in itself divided and duplicated from the origin. Futhermore, *Dissonance* does not limit itself to a technical or descriptive aspect of the question of music in the Nietzschean text, but rather allows us to reread the entire corpus, from its "origins" to *Ecce Homo*, in a new perspective. Through the wrought, intricate opposition between harmony (Nietzschean symbol of a dissonant multiplic-ity) and melody, this essay not only implies important consequences regarding the political, but also regarding philosophy itself, as it always stresses a set of values based on rigour, univocity of meaning, clarity of conceptual analysis, while remaining deaf to tone, pitch, timbre, to everything that intensely and energetically submits language to violent forces it no longer controls.

In *Le Proche et le lointain* (*The Near and the Distant*, 1994), a collection of essays on philosophy, beauty, art and psychoanalysis, Lévesque crosses yet again and in a new way the "borders set up between concept and affect, the theoretical and the narrative, essay and biography, statement and interview." In those chapters devoted to Jacques Brault (of whom he proposes a thorough hetero-autobiographical analysis of his narrative *Agonie*), Martin Gagnon, Françoise Collin, Régine Robin, Fernande Saint-Martin and Nicole Brossard, Lévesque also outlines the intellectual history of Québec and the mutations that have disrupted traditional philosophical thought. "À perte de vue" (*As Far as the Eye Can See*) was one of the working titles for this book, but *Le Proche et le lointain* conveys a paradoxical experience of conjunction wherein disjunction never really disappears. Proximity, closeness, the nearest or next of kin, the "here" itself can only be approached through the experience of exile, of the faraway, of estrangement, "the infinite distance, this fundamental separation from which what separates becomes rapport," as Blanchot so rightly puts it in *L'Amitié*, a work Lévesque has often commented upon. This proximity is what is at work in the "common strangeness" of friendship, always the closest while maintaining the other at a distance, each time celebrated in a unique way, for each friend, in this book. More than ever, the voice, thought and writing of Lévesque strive to estrange what is most familiar: "they compose, call forth rupture and produce rupture, call to boundaries and thrive upon the limit. This is what attracts me, what seems to entice the most in Lévesque's work. His unique way of standing

on the utmost border of language." This book is also important because of its treatment of the political and of the passive responsibility which poetry patiently calls for: "the country is never one of foundation, of race, it is of *transit*. It is up to poetry and literary creation to give this experience of transit to be thought" in the "violent separation," the "radical dispossession" of the subject, the affect of mourning and exile, the wounded and unsaturable overture that is language itself. On this gap of the self within the self and the *dérangement* of all identity, Lévesque gives a remarkable analysis.

In *Par-delà le masculin et le féminin*, Lévesque tackles the question of sexual difference not as "a question amongst others, a marginal and inconsequential motive" that would have "the object status of some regional science," but rather as a question that radically challenges all knowledge. Opposed to most discourses that think too readily of the body as merely contact, immediateness, and presence, Lévesque meticulously examines the positions of psychoanalysts (Freud and Lacan), philosophers (Nietzsche, Derrida, Levinas) and writers (Blanchot and Bataille), trying to approach the question of sex "beyond" the dualistic logic of phallocentrism that always favors, through the binary division of paired notions (masculine-feminine, activity-passivity, heterosexuality-homosexuality, etc.), the hierarchy and supremacy of the masculine. The fundamental question raised by this book is condensed in the "Beyond" of its title: "how can we take a step in this obscure 'region of attraction' without passing nor surpassing sexual difference, how can we move towards the excess of sex without overcoming it and restraining it?" (Michaud 2002). The whole interest and difficulty of this essay, nuanced yet without concessions, resides in its way of probing the problem, pushing the analysis of sexual difference to the limit, beyond "natural" facts, refusing to still to think this difference only in psychological if not physiological terms, but rather in *analytical* terms. In so doing, Lévesque is led to question the so-called evidence of phenomenological perceptions

linked to visibility, to conceptions, concepts and "facts," not to mention all the beliefs and prejudices that are often reinforced in the interventions of other approaches (with the exception of deconstruction), may they be psychoanalytical, sociological, or political. *Par-delà le masculin et le féminin* strongly defends an enigma, "the secret ever secret of sex," that always remains to us as illegible as it is impossible to violate, in spite of the ambient pornography or the recourse to the "natural," discourses that are both poor and distressing, and that too often pass themselves off as the said enigma.

In parallel to his teaching and writing – activities pursued with patience and discretion in a perfectly assumed solitude – it is worth noting that Lévesque did not, unlike many of his colleagues, shy away from the public space, his solitude never translating into withdrawal, and that, on the contrary, he always had the heart to give this public extension to his philosophical work. His generous presence, his art of conversation and dialogue, his deep voice and characteristic laughter have left a unique impression in the numerous interviews he has conducted with prominent contemporary figures, artists, intellectuals, and philosophers of all schools, as well as his countless contributions to Radio-Canada's broadcasts on the widest range of subjects ("The Psychoanalytical Revolution," "Does Philosophy exist in Québec?" "Literature and Nationalism," to name but a few). These programs, by their boldness, the subtlety of their understanding and the scope of their vision, have given a new impulse to "literary" programs and have made Lévesque one of the most respected figures of the intellectual community. This particular influence tied to his philosophical interventions in the public space (often on explosive political questions such as the "mother tongue," nationalism, and the distancing from all fusional communitarism), as well as a body of work renowned for the utmost elegance of its writing, have brought him many distinctions, including his election to the Royal Society of Canada in 1989 and in

1451

1991 to the Académie des Lettres du Québec, as well as the "Prix *Spirale* de l'essai" for his book *Par-delà le masculin et le féminin* in 2002.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

L'Étrangeté du texte. Essais sur Nietzsche, Freud, Blanchot et Derrida (Montréal, 1976; Paris, 1978).

Ed. with Christie V. McDonald, *L'Oreille de l'autre. Otobiographies, transferts, traductions. Textes et débats avec Jacques Derrida* (Montréal, 1982). Trans., *The Ear of the Other: Otobiography, Transference, Translation. Texts and Discussions with Jacques Derrida* (New York, 1985).

"Le Pas tragique," in *Tragique et tragédie de la tradition occidentale*, ed. Pierre Gravel and Timothy Reiss (Montréal, 1983), pp. 195–206.

Les Discours de la fin. Textes et entretiens avec des penseurs contemporains (Montréal, 1983).

L'Énigme du féminin. Textes et entretiens avec des penseurs contemporains (Montréal, 1985).

L'Homme et la vérité dans la philosophie contemporaine. Textes et entretiens avec des penseurs contemporains (Montréal, 1986).

Dissonance. Nietzsche à la limite du langage (Montréal, 1988).

"Language to the Limit," in *Nietzsche and the Rhetoric of Nihilism: Essays on Interpretation, Language, and Politics*, ed. Tom Darby, Béla Egyed, and Ben Jones (Ottawa, 1989), pp. 45–53.

"La Question du pays," in *Présentation à la Société Royale du Canada* (Ottawa, 1991), pp. 143–169.

Le Proche et le lointain. Essais (Montréal, 1994).

Par-delà le masculin et le féminin (Paris, 2002).

"Au nom du réel," *Cahier de L'Herne*, "Jacques Derrida", ed. Marie-Louise Mallet and Ginette Michaud (Paris: Éditions de L'Herne, 2004), pp. 212–18.

Other Relevant Works

"The World Remoteness of the Text," *Analecta Husserliana* 4 (1975): 132–42.

"L'Inscription du dialogue," *La Revue canadienne de littérature comparée* (Winter 1976): 42–59.

"L'écriture (de) la copule," *Études littéraires* 9 (1976): 305–316.

"Dissonance," *Études françaises* 17 (1982): 53–66.

"Situation de la modernité. Bataille, Freud, Nietzsche," *Philosopher* 8 (1988): 7–15.

"Lecture et interprétation," *Philosopher* 7 (February 1989): 10–18.

"Peinture sans frontières," *ETC. Montréal*, no. 18 (April 1992): 6–14.

"Portrait du philosophe en poète," *Philosopher* 13 (1992): 169–78.

"Ces livres où je lis ce qui me tue," *Écrits du Canada français* 80 (1994): 87–103.

"Souveraineté de la poésie," *Littérature* 13 (1994): 25–39.

"Les Lueurs glauques du regard critique. Remarques sur l'œuvre d'André Brochu," *Le Bulletin de l'Académie des lettres du Québec* 17 (February 1997): 12–21.

"Deux lectures d'Emmanuel Levinas," *Études françaises* 38 (2002): 123–33.

"Garder vive la mémoire," *Spirale* 145 (March-April 2004): 22–4.

Further Reading

Brodeur, Jean-Paul. "L'Étrangeté du texte (II). La critique du travail théorique," *Le Devoir* (17 April 1976).

Leroux, Georges. "La Philosophie au Québec depuis 1968. Esquisse d'une trajectoire," in *Panorama de la littérature québécoise contemporaine*, ed. Réginald Hamel (Montréal, 1997), pp. 569–87.

Leroux, Georges, and John T. Stevenson. "La Philosophie au Canada," in *Encyclopédie Philosophique Universelle*, ed. Jean-François Mattéi (Paris, 1998), vol. 4.

Michaud, Ginette. "L'Inassimilable meme," *Spirale* 89 (Summer 1989): 5.

———, "Chemin faisant," *Spirale* 142 (May 1997): 8–9.

———, "Le sexe, ce réel non su," *Spirale* 185 (July-August 2002): 11–13.

Ginette Michaud
Translated by Patrick Poirier

LEVI, Isaac (1930–)

Isaac Levi was born on 30 June 1930 in New York City. He received his BA from New York University in 1951, and then received his MA in 1953 and PhD in philosophy in 1957 from Columbia University. He wrote his dissertation, "The Epistemology of Moritz Schlick," under the direction of Ernest NAGEL. Levi began his teaching career at Western Reserve University as an instructor of philosophy in 1957, and was assistant professor there from 1958 to 1962. From 1962 to 1964 Levi was assistant professor at the City College of New York. Returning to Western Reserve in 1964, he was promoted to full professor in 1967, the same year that Western Reserve College merged with Case Institute of Technology to become Case Western Reserve University. He also served as chair of the philosophy department from 1968 to 1970. In 1970 he became professor of philosophy at Columbia University, and also served as chair of the department from 1973 to 1976 and from 1989 to 1992. He was named John Dewey Professor of Philosophy in 1992 after the retirement of Sidney MORGENBESSER, and held that position until his retirement in 2003.

Levi has been a visiting scholar at several universities, including Corpus Christi College, Cambridge in 1972–3; Darwin College, Cambridge in 1980 and 1993; Australian National University in 1987; All Souls College, Oxford in 1988; the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in 1994; and Wolfson College, Cambridge in 1997. In 1966–7 he was a Guggenheim Fellow and Fulbright Research Scholar at the London School of Economics. For many years he served on the editorial board of the *Journal of Philosophy*. He was elected to membership in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1986. He received a PhD honoris causa from the University of Lund in 1988.

Levi has made major contributions to epistemology and rational choice theory. His basic stance is pragmatism's naturalistic antifoundationalism, in which a theory of knowledge should explain the expansion and modification of existing knowledge, rather than engage in a quest for original, foundational, or a priori grounds of knowledge. Since all judgments upon changing one's knowledge itself depends on one's current knowledge base, the relations between potential new knowledge and present knowledge require a sophisticated treatment. Levi's epistemology begins from the criterion of internal consistency, and explores the rational means of modifying and expanding knowledge through observation and inference, while risking the introduction of error. Justifying such changes is the task of his complex inductive decision theory, which must judge "credal probabilities" that attempt to model actual learning more realistically than idealized Bayesian theory which cannot handle indeterminate probabilities. This requires an affirmative view, which Levi adopts, towards objective chance in statistical inference.

On Levi's epistemology, a distinction must be made between certainty and incorrigibility. A confidence amounting to practical certainty in one's unchallenged knowledge base is rational since that base is the starting point by which other potential knowledge is judged to be possible. This practical certainty is quite compatible with the epistemic point that all knowledge is corrigible, since no part of one's knowledge could be judged to be immune

from all future opportunities for learning. In philosophy of science, Levi's position therefore largely coincides with W. V. QUINE's combination of fallibilism with a realistic commitment toward our best current theories.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Gambling with Truth (New York, 1967; Cambridge, Mass., 1973).

The Enterprise of Knowledge: An Essay on Knowledge, Credal Probability and Chance (Cambridge, Mass., 1980).

Decisions and Revisions: Philosophical Essays on Knowledge and Value (Cambridge, UK, 1984).

Hard Choices: Decision Making under Unresolved Conflict (Cambridge, UK, 1986).

The Fixation of Belief and Its Undoing: Changing Beliefs Through Inquiry (Cambridge, UK, 1991).

For the Sake of the Argument: *Ramsey Test Conditionals, Inductive Inference and Nonmonotonic Reasoning* (Cambridge, UK, 1996).

The Covenant of Reason: *Rationality and the Commitments of Thought* (Cambridge, UK, 1997).

Other Relevant Works

"Putnam's Three Truth Values," *Philosophical Studies* 10 (1959): 65–9.

"Belief and Disposition," with Sidney Morgenbesser, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 1 (1964): 221–32.

"Induction and the Aims of Inquiry," in *Philosophy, Science and Method: Essays in Honor of Ernest Nagel*, ed. Sidney Morgenbesser, Patrick Suppes, and Morton White (New York, 1969), pp. 92–111.

"Direct Inference," *Journal of Philosophy* 74 (1977): 5–29.

"Serious Possibility," in *Essays in Honor of Jaakko Hintikka*, ed. Ilkka Niiniluoto et al. (Dordrecht, 1987), pp. 219–36.

"Escape from Boredom: Edification according to Rorty," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 11 (1981): 589–601.

"Liberty and Welfare," in *Utilitarianism and Beyond*, ed. Amartya Sen and Bernard Williams (Cambridge, UK, 1982), pp. 239–49.

Ed. with Leigh Cauman and Robert Schwartz, *How Many Questions? Essays in Honor of Sidney Morgenbesser* (Indianapolis, 1983).

"The Demons of Decision," *The Monist* 70 (1987): 193–211.

"Conflict and Inquiry," *Ethics* 102 (1992): 814–34.

"Inference and Logic According to Peirce," in *The Rule of Reason*: *The Philosophy of Charles Sanders Peirce*, ed. Jacqueline Brunning and Paul Forster (Toronto, 1997), pp. 34–56.

"Representing Preferences: Donald Davidson on Rational Choice," in *The Philosophy of Donald Davidson*, ed. Lewis Hahn (La Salle, Ill., 1999).

"Value Commitments, Value Conflict, and the Separability of Belief and Value," *Philosophy of Science* 66 (1999): 509–33.

"Objective Modality and Direct Inference," *The Monist* 84 (2001): 179–207.

"Contracting from Epistemic Hell Is Routine," *Synthese* 135 (2003): 141–64.

"Dispositions and Conditionals," in *Real Metaphysics: Essays in Honour of D. H. Mellor*, ed. Hallvard Lillehammer (London and New York, 2003), pp. 137–53.

Further Reading

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio

Bogdan, Radu. *Henry E. Kyburg, Jr. & Isaac Levi* (Dordrecht, 1982).

Jeffrey, Richard. "Indefinite Probability Judgment: A Reply to Levi," *Philosophy of Science* 54 (1987): 586–91.

Kyburg, Henry E., Jr. "Levi, Petersen, and Direct Inference," *Philosophy of Science*

50 (1983): 630–34.

Leeds, Stephen. "Levi's Decision Theory," *Philosophy of Science* 57 (1990): 158–68.

Misak, Cheryl. "Peirce, Levi, and the Aims of Inquiry," *Philosophy of Science* 54 (1987): 256–65.

Olsson, Erik J. "Avoiding Epistemic Hell: Levi on Pragmatism and Inconsistency," *Synthese* 135 (2003): 119–40.

Stone, Mark. "Kyburg, Levi, and Petersen," *Philosophy of Science* 54 (1987): 244–55.

John R. Shook

LEWIS, Clarence Irving (1883–1964)

Clarence Irving Lewis was born on 12 April 1883 in Stoneham, Massachusetts, and died on 3 February 1964 in Menlo Park, California. His childhood reflected both the ethic of hard work and the practical outlook typical of the Yankee character. His interest in philosophy had already awakened during his high school years, and continued as he entered Harvard University in 1902. Lewis's limited financial resources demanded he expedite his education, as his study of philosophy was supported by a job in a local shoe factory. This was the Harvard of the "great Department" and Lewis's own philosophical predispositions were further cultivated in the classrooms presided over by such giants as Hugo MÜNSTERBERG, William JAMES and Josiah ROYCE. In his third year, Lewis enrolled in the famous metaphysics course shared by Royce and James. This course left a lasting impression on Lewis; the issues engaged there under the tutelage of two of America's greatest philosophical intellects guided his own early thinking and found their way into Lewis's earliest published work. From this experience, Lewis came to express a sharp preference for Royce over James; the former emerging then and thereafter as Lewis's ideal of a philosopher. Indeed, in the preface to the final book he would publish in his own lifetime, Lewis invokes the name of his great teacher and indicates that behind the arguments to be found there, one can still discern the abiding influence of Royce.

From 1905 to 1908 Lewis taught English, first at a high school in Quincy, Massachusetts, and then at the University of Colorado. By fall of 1908 he was back at Harvard studying for his doctorate. James had retired, but Ralph Barton PERRY and George SANTAYANA now served alongside Royce. Perry's course on Kant left the most lasting impression during Lewis's graduate studies; he wrote his dissertation on a topic inspired by Kant, and later succeeded Perry in regularly offering that course to Harvard students. In addition to Perry's influence, Royce was still there to guide Lewis in his study of mathematical logic, thereby planting the seed that would come to fruition in Lewis's early contributions to modal logic. Lewis concluded his studies and earned his PhD in philosophy in 1910 with a dissertation titled "The Place of Intuition in Knowledge."

From 1911 to 1920 Lewis taught philosophy at the University of California at Berkeley. His need for a class textbook in logic led to his *Survey of Symbolic Logic* (1918). Still, for a native New Englander and a student of such philosophical giants as James and Royce, Harvard never lost is luster or appeal. After a decade's sojourn in the West, Lewis returned to Harvard as a lecturer in philosophy in 1920, and became an assistant professor the following year. It was at Harvard that he made his career, teaching in the same department that formed him, and developing the pragmatic insights of the great minds he encountered in its classrooms. Sabbatical opportunities allowed Lewis periodic returns to the west, but Harvard was his home from 1920 until his retirement in 1953. Lewis was President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1933–4. In retirement Lewis

taught for a year at Princeton, and then moved to Menlo Park, California, where he occasionally offered courses at Stanford University for some years before his death in 1964.

Lewis possessed an architectonic intellect, rendering his own temperamental preference for Kant and Royce more understandable. During that long career in Cambridge, Lewis's publications accurately mirrored the orderly manner in which he dealt with the problems of philosophy. In his early years, he did important work in symbolic logic and pragmatic epistemology. His initial years back at Harvard were spent with the newly arrived Charles Sanders PEIRCE manuscripts, in which he immersed himself for two full years. Reflecting upon this experience with the Peirce manuscripts, Lewis came to adopt the mantle of "pragmatist," but saw his own position as unique; occupying a place in the intellectual spaces between James, Royce, and John DEWEY. This recognition began a period of thinking and writing that resulted in *Mind and the World-Order* (1929), soon followed by *Symbolic Logic* (1932), written with C. H. Langford.

Lewis's major reworking of these themes of meaning and knowledge appears in *An Analysis of Knowledge and Valuation* (1946), where he extended his thought into the area of value. Increasingly by mid century his attention moved into the direction of ethics. In fact, the late stage of his career, and indeed his final years after leaving Harvard were spent preparing a series of manuscript essays which he had hoped would become a book dealing with ethics. During this period, he produced *The Ground and Nature of Right* (1955) and *Our Social Inheritance* (1957). Unfortunately, the ethics book stubbornly refused to take final form before Lewis's death in 1964, but under the editorial hand of John Lange, Lewis's 1959 lectures on the Foundations of Ethics, delivered at Wesleyan University, were prepared for publication as *Values and Imperatives* (1969). In addition, *The Collected Papers of Clarence Irving Lewis*, a volume of his articles covering the years from 1912 to 1957, appeared in 1970.

Lewis occupies a special place in the history of American philosophy, linking the era of William James and Josiah Royce with that of W. V. QUINE. His career was defined by the particular standards of professionalism that had come to mark the American academy as the twentieth century progressed. Consequently, Lewis was never the public philosopher that James and Dewey were, and his thought traveled down pathways that were more readily navigated by other professionals than by the educated lay public. Still, Lewis was intensely aware of the impact that professional philosophy might have on the wider world, and much of his mature career was spent investigating the elements of human moral knowledge and action. Quite simply, this type of knowledge mattered most, and in Lewis's mind, such knowledge was in grave jeopardy during the years leading up to mid century. While his writings hardly mention the deep problems confronting Depression era America, the horrors of Auschwitz and Hiroshima, or the anxious uncertainty of the early years of the Cold War, Lewis's late work on ethics, as theoretical as it was, would still be motivated by a need to address the concrete challenges of the human social order as it existed outside of the lecture halls of Cambridge.

Ralph Barton Perry kindled in Lewis a career-long interest in the philosophy of Kant, and adding this influence to his own intellectual disposition, it was natural for Lewis to develop many of his key ideas using a Kantian approach and vocabulary. Yet, in another sense, the development of his conceptualistic pragmatism also expresses the simple yet profound truth the James had articulated in "The Present Dilemma in Philosophy." In more than just the geography of his early career, Lewis combines both the "Rocky Mountain Tough" with the "Tenderfoot Bostonian." Focus upon empirical fact can be found rules in Lewis's thinking right alongside of the inquiry into abstract imperatives and rules of conceptual order. Both temperamental tendencies are to be found in his philosophical orientation. Their possible inter-

connection becomes a central theme in the development of his entire philosophical project. Just as Lewis found himself drawn both to the Pacific west and Atlantic east during his lifetime, so too his work had always been mindful of the legitimate demands made by both kinds of philosophical attitude, and his desire to combine the constant reference to empirical fact with the need for abstract ordering principles is clearly evident throughout his epistemology, value theory, and ultimately in the ethics of his final decade.

Lewis's epistemology is based upon the distinction between two fundamental elements; one aspect is the result of the legislative or categorial activity of the mind while the other is independent of human thought, and is identified as the given content. Lewis is adamant about the necessity of the latter element. It represents that part of experience that is not fashioned by thinking. The mind's inability to alter or displace it is clear evidence of its independence in the knowledge process. What is more, Lewis argues that without the certainty that can only come from this given element in experience, there could be no empirical probabilities whatsoever. If one were to relinquish a belief in given certainties of this sort, then one would be left with no alternative but skepticism. This, to Lewis, is unacceptable. The philosophical skeptic became Lewis's lifelong opponent, and he sought to defeat this adversary whenever and wherever it arose on the broad field of philosophical speculation.

Lewis's doctrine of the given was a crucial weapon in this struggle against skepticism. Nevertheless, he believed that earlier empiricism had not fully understood the character of this important element in knowledge. The examples that traditional empiricism offers of the given such as an immediate perception of a patch of color, or taste sensation present on the tongue, all fail to grasp its true nature and complexity. The given element in experience is no thin presence of immediate awareness, nor is it a mere fragmentary datum as customarily thought. Rather, his conception of the given has a thickness about it. Not simply confined to the receptivity of the present moment, it is instead the relational awareness of a specious present stretching both backwards into the past and forward to the future. Here, Lewis's position suggests a debt to James's own notion of the continuous character of the undifferentiated stream of thought. For Lewis, the given contains real relations within it, relations that only become articulated and precise when subjected to conceptual ordering. When so ordered, the given passes into the complex experience that constitutes the ground of empirical knowledge.

This ordering is accomplished by means of the legislative or categorical activity that Lewis treats under the heading of "the pragmatic apriori." Its roots can be found in Lewis's own logical studies in which he concluded that the traditional idea of a single set of objective and universal logical laws, attributable to reason or grounded in the very nature of reality itself is mistaken. In place of a single, authoritatively definable system of logical rules, there are instead a multitude of possible logical systems that could be employed. These systems are all internally consistent, so the decision to employ any one system of logical inference over the others that are available is made on pragmatic rather than strictly logical grounds.

Lewis's logical investigations lead him to reformulate the traditional Kantian idea of ordering categories in a more pragmatic fashion. Abstraction can analyze the knowledge process down into its components: the given, the a priori concept by means of which the given is ordered, and the act which interprets the one by the other. Rather than privileging the a priori as an absolute element in the mind, Lewis maintains that is pragmatic in nature, social in its constitution, and responsive to the practical ends of the human knower and actor. There are many possible systems of order, just as there are alternative systems of logic. A priori systems of order are deliberately chosen, and certainly can be altered in the face of further experience. For Lewis, the choice

between such a priori systems answers to the practical task of ordering experience in the light of ends to be achieved. Lewis was at work on his notion of the pragmatic a priori throughout the 1920s and gave his first systematic account of it in his *Mind and the World-Order* of 1929.

Lewis's most detailed expression of his theory of knowledge is in *An Analysis of Knowledge and Valuation* of 1946. By that time, Lewis's opponents were in clear focus. His ultimate aim in that work went beyond presenting a pragmatic theory of knowledge; he now sought to preserve the empirical basis of value judgments, and hence their cognitive meaningfulness against the skeptical attack of the logical positivists.

An Analysis of Knowledge and Valuation proceeds differently than does *Mind and the World-Order*. The latter work is, in terms of style, more narrative in its handling of epistemological problems than the former. *An Analysis of Knowledge and Valuation* is more technical; in it Lewis deploys his arguments using the symbolic notation of his logical studies as well as the more specialized vocabulary of academic philosophy. It presents a single sustained argument that proceeds through the problems of meaning, empirical knowledge, and valuation. This change is reflective of Lewis's now constant awareness of the skepticism of his positivist adversaries. Rejecting the view that meaning is originally located in language, Lewis argues that linguistic meanings are actually derivative of a deeper kind of meaningfulness to which he gives the name sense meaning. Entering into the established philosophical debate over analyticity, Lewis argues that linguistic expressions of analyticity are built upon something more primitive, a prelinguistic criterion-in-mind which is sense meaning. A sense meaning is a schema according to Lewis – it articulates a test routine and an imagined result that is anticipated to follow the execution of that test. Such criteria are entertained in mind prior to specific instances of application. Lewis argues that while one cannot readily imagine a chiliagon for example,

one can readily imagine counting the sides of a polygon and finding that there are one thousand sides. Similarly, while one cannot imagine "triangle in general," one can, writes Lewis, imagine following the periphery of a figure and discover that it forms a closed figure with three angles. Such conceptual meanings are social products and provide the ordering without which no knowledge nor effective practical action is possible. The presence of the appropriate sensory cues allows one to apply these a priori conceptual meanings to experience, thereby introducing the order so fundamental to subsequent action.

Lewis then goes on to examine the structure of our knowledge of the empirical world. Empirical knowledge is expressed in what he refers to as nonterminating judgments. Such judgments are nonterminating in that they cannot be decisively verified. They are probable only, and their probability is the result of the verification of the terminating judgments that they entail. Building upon his theory of sense meaning, the meaning of any nonterminating judgment is translatable into an inexhaustible series of terminating judgments, each of which expresses a hypothetical conditional statement. Each individual terminating judgment articulates a test routine and an imagined result; it thus identifies a test procedure as well as what one is to expect in direct experience as a result of performing that test. Upon carrying out the test routine, the actual occurrence of the anticipated result specified by the conditional conclusively verifies the terminating judgment in question. This conclusive verification of the terminating judgment establishes, in its turn, a measure of the probability of the related nonterminating judgment. The full meaning of that nonterminating judgment would be found in an infinite series of the terminating judgments that it entails.

Lewis offers an example with the nonterminating judgment of empirical fact, "There is a real piece of paper before me." One of the terminating judgments entailed by this nonterminating judgment would be "If I turn my eyes

right, the seen paper will be displaced left." The displacement of the paper that results from the actual turning of the head would be a decisive verification of the terminating judgment, and this in turn establishes the probability of the nonterminating judgment that entails it. What is more, the relations that are articulated here are, for Lewis, real relations disclosed in experience. Lewis asserts that whoever believes in such real connections in experience must also believe in a knowable yet independent reality. To disbelieve in such real connections is to give up any belief in the possibility of empirical knowledge, and with it, the possibility of effective action based upon foreseeable consequences.

In the crucial third book of *An Analysis of Knowledge and Valuation*, Lewis extends his theory of empirical knowledge beyond the limits of his earlier discussion in *Mind and the World-Order* by moving into the realm of value. Lewis was intent upon putting the noncognitivist theories of value and ethics to rout, and his main weapon is the establishment of values judgments as a species of empirical judgment. Contrary to the views of his positivist opponents, value judgments are not merely emotive reports of one's likes and dislikes, nor are they just speech performances that simply aim at the desire to influence the behavior of others. Rather, statements of value are nonterminating judgments that entail a whole series of terminating judgments. These latter behave here as they did in empirical statements of fact; they articulate a test routine and an imagined result, the execution of the test routine results in the direct encounter of a positively valued experience that Lewis calls intrinsic value. This direct encounter of experienced value is a predicted result specified by the terminating judgment. The actual accrual of this result is the verifying experience that establishes the empirical truth of the nonterminating judgment of value. Intrinsic value is the direct experience of the given as gratifying or grievous, and each terminating judgment articulates a test routine, or a line of practical activity, which results in the

production of just such a direct experience of the gratifying or grievous in one's immediate experience. Thus, there are immediate value experiences that are no different from the immediate empirical experiences that decisively verify the terminating judgments of fact.

In the closing pages of *An Analysis of Knowledge and Valuation*, Lewis announces his intention to make the transition to ethical theory. Indeed, his final two decades were absorbed by his attempt to articulate an ethical position consistent with the philosophical foundation he had already laid out. While he had already dealt with the influence that noncognitivism exerted in the area of value, its corrosive effect upon ethics remained to be considered. To be sure, Lewis tended to keep these debates within the confines of professional philosophy, yet he reminded his audience that there was much at stake in the wider world that would be affected by a retreat from meaningfulness in the realms of value and ethics.

As early as 1941 Lewis was publishing appraisals of logical positivism, and registering his concern over the erosion of ethical objectivity that followed in its wake. *An Analysis of Knowledge and Valuation* was the beginning of his response. His deep investigation into meaning and the mechanics of empirical knowledge served, in a way, as preparation for his treatment of the good in experience. Value judgments were shown to exhibit the same structure as judgments of empirical fact, capable of the same analysis into terminating and nonterminating judgments, and likewise susceptible to the same empirical verification. Having rescued value knowledge from subjectivism, Lewis concludes *An Analysis of Knowledge and Valuation* with the assertion that unlike questions of value, the central problems at stake in ethical theory, that is, the articulation of the meanings of justice and rightness can never be accomplished through an appeal to empirical facts alone. Consequently, he spent his final years at Harvard, as well as the bulk of his years in retirement, working out a theory of the right that was not reducible to his account of empirical knowledge. Once again,

drawing his inspiration from Kant, Lewis embarked on a theory of rightness that is centered upon a discovery of rational imperatives.

In 1955 Lewis published *The Ground and Nature of Right*, in which his doctrine of the rational imperatives receives its first systematic treatment. Where other pragmatists looked to social sources for the articulation of rules for action, Lewis takes a more traditional (and tender-minded) view of the principles that guide conduct. These, he argues, must lie in human nature in some native sense. As active and interested beings, the first imperative incumbent upon human beings is to be objective; to engage experience with an intelligent and objective appraisal of the facts as they truly are. This objectivity must permeate both thinking and action if human beings are to be effective practical agents in the world. Thus, thinking must conform to the imperatives of consistency and cogency, and action must be in accord with the imperatives of prudence and justice. The latter imperative is of special importance as it is the moral imperative that guides ethical conduct. This rational imperative of justice commands that human individuals adopt only those ways of acting that are justifiable for others to likewise adopt. It recognizes that individual human beings are autonomous moral agents, each capable of direct experiences of value and disvalue. As a consequence, each is obligated to recognize the objective reality of other autonomous individuals, and thus to refrain from interfering with other such individuals as they similarly pursue the summum bonum of a life that is good as a whole. Such a view certainly suggests Kant in its formal characteristics. As in the Kantian model, this imperative remains abstract and empty until it is applied to concrete situations by subordinate rules that are fashioned in the course of concrete experience, such as "Tell no lies" or "Keep your promises." In another way, Lewis's moral imperative restates a standard approach to justice that can be located within the tradition of classical liberalism.

In *Our Social Inheritance* of 1957, Lewis sketches an outline of a social theory built around the shared customs and beliefs inherited and acted upon by autonomous moral agents guided by these rational imperatives. In a reference to the global tensions of the day, Lewis asserts that collectivist social orders fail to understand that without autonomous human thinkers and actors, socially inherited customs and habits would ossify into stagnant, unthinking belief systems that could never retain their effective practical control over experience. Pragmatic agents, at once embodying the cumulative habits and beliefs of the past, yet also enjoying the individual autonomy and freedom to identify and articulate new proposed courses of action that may contribute to lives judged to be good on the whole by those who live them, represent the constituent elements of Lewis's pragmatic social ideal. In this manner, Lewis's final essays attempt to unite the many strands of his conceptualistic pragmatism into a consistent account of human experience, while at the same time standing as an alternative to what he took to be the bankruptcy of his positivist adversaries, especially in the critical areas of the good, the right, and the just.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Survey of Symbolic Logic (Berkeley, Cal., 1918).

Mind and the World-Order: Outline of a Theory of Knowledge (New York, 1929).

Symbolic Logic, with C. H. Langford (New York, 1932).

An Analysis of Knowledge and Valuation (La Salle, Ill., 1946).

The Ground and Nature of Right (New York, 1955).

Our Social Inheritance (Bloomington, Ind., 1957).

Values and Imperatives, ed. John Lange (Stanford, Cal., 1969).

The Collected Papers of Clarence Irving Lewis, ed. John Goheen and John L. Mothershead, Jr. (Stanford, Cal., 1970).

Other Relevant Works

Lewis's papers are at Stanford University.

"A Pragmatic Conception of the *A Priori*," *Journal of Philosophy* 20 (1923): 169–77.

"Logic and Pragmatism," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 2, pp. 31–51.

"Experience and Meaning," *Philosophical Review* 43 (1934): 125–46.

"Professor Chisholm and Empiricism," *Journal of Philosophy* 45 (1948): 517–24.

"The Categories of Natural Knowledge," in *The Philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead*, 2nd edn, ed. Paul Schilpp (New York, 1951), pp. 703–44.

"Realism or Phenomenalism?" *Philosophical Review* 64 (1955): 233–47.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils Before 1950*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Blackwell Amer Phil*, *Blackwell Comp Prag*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Ethics*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v4*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Cheng, Zhongying. *Peirce's and Lewis's Theories of Induction* (The Hague, 1969).

Colella, E. Paul. *C. I. Lewis and the Social Theory of Conceptualistic Pragmatism* (Lewiston, N.Y., 1992).

Haack, Susan. "C. I. Lewis," in *American Philosophy*, ed. Marcus Singer (Cambridge, UK, 1986), pp. 215–38.

Luizzi, Vincent. *A Naturalistic Theory of Justice: Critical Commentary on, and Selected Readings from, C. I. Lewis's Ethics* (Washington, D.C., 1981).

Milmed, Bella K. *Kant and Current Philosophical Issues: Some Modern Developments of His Theory of Knowledge* (New York, 1961).

Murphey, Murray G. *C. I. Lewis: The Last Great Pragmatist* (Albany, N.Y., 2005).

Reck, Andrew J. *The New American*

Philosophers: An Exploration of Thought since World War II (Baton Rouge, Louis., 1968), chap. 1.

Rosenthal, Sandra B. *The Pragmatic A Priori: A Study in the Epistemology of C. I. Lewis* (St. Louis, 1976).

Saydah, J. Roger. *The Ethical Theory of Clarence Irving Lewis* (Athens, Ohio, 1969).

Schilpp, Paul A., ed. *The Philosophy of C.I. Lewis* (La Salle, Ill., 1968). Contains Lewis's autobiography and bibliography.

Zeman, J. Jay. *Modal Logic: The Lewis-modal Systems* (Oxford, 1973).

E. Paul Colella

LEWIS, David Kellogg (1941–2001)

David Lewis was born on 28 September 1941 in Oberlin, Ohio. He received a BA from Swarthmore College in 1962, and a PhD in philosophy from Harvard University in 1967, where he worked under W. V. QUINE. He joined the philosophy department at the University of California at Los Angeles in 1966. He moved to Princeton in 1970, and later became the Class of 1943 University Professor of Philosophy, holding this position until his death. He was a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and an honorary fellow of the Australian Academy of the Humanities. He received honorary degrees from the universities of York, Cambridge and Melbourne. Lewis died on 14 October 2001 in Princeton, New Jersey.

Lewis is widely thought of as one of the leading philosophers of the later twentieth century. He wrote extremely influential books and articles on virtually every central topic in analytic philosophy, doing a good deal to set the agenda in metaphysics, philosophy of mind, philosophy of language, philosophical decision theory, and epistemology. His impact on meta-

physics was particularly profound. He came to dominate the field, and is regarded by many as the twentieth century's most important systematic metaphysician. The body of his philosophical work consists of four monographs and over a hundred articles, many of which appear in five volumes of his collected papers. In addition to achieving pre-eminence in American philosophical circles, Lewis had a particularly significant impact on the development of philosophy in Australia, where he often lived during American summers.

Lewis's doctoral thesis was reworked into *Convention* (1969). The book deepens our understanding of the platitude that language is conventional, by first providing a general account of what a convention is, and then explaining what the conventions of language are within that general framework. Lewis's basic idea was that a convention is a special kind of regularity because it is arbitrary, since the purposes it serves could just as well be served by something else. On the other hand, it is self-sustaining, on account of the fact that expected conformity by others induces one to conform oneself. It is arbitrary whether we drive on the left or the right; but supposing our expectation is that others drive on the right, we are given decisive reason to do the same. In the case of linguistic convention, the key regularity according to *Convention* was truthfulness in a language. A particular language like English involves a distinctive pairing system from words to meanings. To be truthful in English is to utter sentences that are true relative to that pairing system. Lewis's ideas on linguistic conventions were developed and revised in a subsequent paper, "Languages and Language," contained in *Philosophical Papers Volume 1*. *Convention* contains much that is highly intuitive, and yet also makes liberal use of somewhat technical material – in this case both game theory and formal semantics – in the service of clarity. This combination was to remain a pattern throughout Lewis's career.

The notion of a possible world makes an important appearance in *Convention*. Lewis's basic notion of the meaning of a sentence has two factors: the mood of the sentence (interrogative, declarative, etc.), and the truth condition associated with the sentence, which is a set of possible worlds. Take a simple case: Snow is white. The truth condition is the set of possible worlds where snow is white. Lewis's use of possible worlds to clarify important concepts and issues was hardly isolated to this case. It was a persistent theme throughout his career, nowhere better exemplified than in his second book *Counterfactuals* (1973), which investigates those ways of thinking and talking that report what would have happened if such and such had been the case. No better summary of that book can be provided than the one contained in its own opening paragraph: "'If kangaroos had no tails, they would topple over' seems to me to mean something like this: in any possible state of affairs in which kangaroos have no tails, and which resembles our actual state of affairs as much as kangaroos having no tails permits it to, the kangaroos topple over. I shall give a general analysis of counterfactual conditionals along these lines." Suppose a general says, "If I had attacked at dawn, I would have won the battle." Certainly, there are possible histories of the world in which the general attacks at dawn and wins the battle. And there are possible histories in which he attacks at dawn and does not win. What determines the truth of the general's speech? Lewis enjoins us to (roughly speaking) consider those possible histories which are very much like the actual world up until dawn, but which depart from the actual course of events with respect to the matter of an attack by the general. If the general wins in all of those "nearby" possible histories, the counterfactual is true. Otherwise it is false. Lewis's basic idea was not altogether new. But by all accounts, the systematic and rich analysis that he provided put the topic of counterfactuals onto center stage in analytic philosophy and made such turns of phrase as "at the closest possible world" part of the philosophical lexicon.

With an analysis of counterfactuals ready at hand, philosophers were encouraged to use

them to shed light on myriad areas of philosophical puzzlement. An example is Lewis's own counterfactual analysis of causation, which begins with the simple thought that event x causes event y just in case, were x not to have occurred, y would not have occurred either. The simple thought needed refinement and qualification. Suppose my shooting causes your death, but that if I hadn't shot you, someone else on the sidelines would. Then it is not true that if hadn't shot you, you wouldn't have died. Lewis was sensitive to these and other concerns, but he remained convinced that a satisfying account of causation could be built upon the counterfactual idea. His papers "Causation," "Postscripts to Causation," (in *Philosophical Papers Volume II*, 1986), and his more recent "Causation as Influence" (2000) sparked a large body of literature, much of which has been concerned, like him, to find a suitable version of the counterfactual idea, rather than to overthrow it altogether.

Lewis frequently, and famously, appealed to possible worlds as a tool in philosophical analysis. But what are possible worlds? To this question, Lewis offered a distinctive (and for many, somewhat shocking) answer, his so-called "modal realism." Possible worlds are concrete universes, just as concrete as this one, many of which contain flesh and blood individuals just like ourselves. What makes it true that there is a possible history in which donkeys talk – assuming that such a history is at least possible – is the existence of a concrete universe in which donkeys are talking. Such was Lewis's preferred picture of what a possible history really is. For the most part though, Lewis framed his philosophical analyses in such a way that they did not especially rely on that picture. For that reason, the popularity of his work was not much impeded by the fact that modal realism only attracted a relatively small following.

Why did Lewis believe the thesis that possible histories are bona fide concrete universes that really exist? Part of the story involves, surprisingly, a kind of conservatism. Unlike Quine,

and like G. E. Moore, Lewis had a profound respect for common sense. Since common sense embraces possibility and necessity, possible individuals as well as actual ones, so should philosophers. But why the particular conception of possible worlds as concrete? Some understanding of the matter can be achieved by noticing some converging themes in Lewis's philosophical temperament: on the matter of basic ontology, a nominalistic tendency to prefer a metaphysics of concrete objects over a metaphysics of abstracta; and on the matter of basic ideology, a preference for simple first-order languages (of the sort one learns in a basic predicate logic class) as a framework with which to describe the world over languages with primitive operators (such as primitive tense operators or, what is especially pertinent here, primitive modal operators). But more importantly, Lewis saw many problems and difficulties in the details of alternative approaches to possibility and necessity, many of which are laid out and explained in his third book *On The Plurality of Worlds* (1986). The metaphysical posit of an infinite plenitude of concrete universes, one for each possible history, was part of a grand metaphysical system that Lewis developed and refined throughout his career.

Lewis is a modern proponent of Hume's view that there are no necessary connections between distinct existences. What goes on at one time does not necessitate what goes on at earlier and later times. In Lewis's hands, this idea gets articulated in the form of "a principle of recombination," the view that any possible series of events can precede any other possible series of events and that any possible series of events can fail to precede any other possible series of events. He concludes that the laws of nature are not necessary: "Episodes of bread-eating are possible because actual; as are episodes of starvation. Juxtapose duplicates of the two, on the grounds that anything can follow anything; here is a possible world that violates the law that bread nourishes." (*On The Plurality of Worlds*, p. 91)

Lewis advocates a sort of anti-holism. The goings-on in the actual world (and possible worlds like the actual world) are determined by extremely local goings-on. Describe what is local to each and every point in space and time and you will have, in essence, captured the whole truth about the actual world.

The fundamental facts about the actual world are physical facts: they are the sorts of things that an ideal physics would capture. No fundamental fact about actual reality would be "left out" by an ideal physics.

Things share characteristics: being red; being negatively charged; being within ten feet of the Eiffel Tower; being forlorn; being between 3 and 6 kilograms. Lewis thought that not all characteristics are on a par. Some mark metaphysically deep similarities between things. Others less so. Lewis posited a kind of metaphysical hierarchy – a "naturalness" ranking – running from similarities that are maximally deep metaphysically speaking, to ones that are shallow to varying degrees. He then put this naturalness ranking to work in explicating a variety of metaphysically important notions, such as laws of nature, intrinsicality, physicalism, and so on, and also in providing an account of the nature of thought itself.

A number of Lewis's important papers were devoted to reconciling some phenomenon or other with his metaphysical system, though those papers were invariably written so as to be of interest to those philosophers who were not so interested in the larger system. One notable example is a topic of perennial philosophical interest: the relationship of matter and mind. Mental phenomena provide a pair of prima facie challenges to the physicalist in the form of consciousness (the existence of experience and feeling), and of intentionality (the fact of minds, and derivatively words, having content, being about something). Committed as he was to a metaphysical scheme according to which mind is nothing over and above the world described by physics, Lewis wrote a number of important papers that develop a physicalist conception of mentality. "An Argument for the Identity Theory," "Mad Pain and Martian Pain," (in *Philosophical Papers Volume 1*, 1983), "Psychophysical and Theoretical Identifications," "Reduction of Mind," and "What Experience Teaches" (in *Papers in Metaphysics and Epistemology*, 1999) together comprise one of the most developed physicalist treatments of consciousness and intentionality.

Another notable example is possible worlds, which as Lewis tells us, are concrete physical universes. A possible history is, in reality, another concrete universe. But is it not intuitively clear that I have many possible histories? How could this be if possible worlds are concrete universes, since I surely inhabit only one concrete universe – the actual one? The problem arises because on the one hand, Lewis says that individuals are "world-bound" – they inhabit only one possible world, and yet on the other, we think that there are many possible lives that an individual could have undergone. Once we suppose a possible life is another concrete history, it seems that no other possible life is a possible life of ours. Lewis was sensitive to this problem, and answered it with "counterpart theory": an individual might have had a certain feature is made true, if it is true, by the existence of a distinct possible individual who is relevantly similar to the former individual. We do not literally inhabit other possible worlds. But the existence of other individuals in other universes that are relevantly similar to ourselves suffices to make it true that we might have done this or that.

Laws of nature would seem to provide a counter-example to localism. Lewis himself, as we have seen, insists that the laws of nature are contingent. But could not the laws of nature vary while the local matters of fact stay the same? (In the limiting case, we might imagine two empty voids with different laws of nature governing them). Sensitive to such worries, Lewis provided an account of laws of nature that rendered them fully compatible with localism. His picture – much in the spirit of David Hume – was that laws of nature are merely those true generalizations that "achieve

an unexcelled combination of simplicity and strength" (Introduction to *Philosophical Papers Volume II*, p. xi). If the local facts remain constant across possibility, so too must the laws, since facts about which generalizations excel (in Lewis's sense) cannot vary unless the local facts do too.

Lewis wrote influential articles on many more topics, including formal semantics, conditional probability in relation to conditionals, the meanings of theoretical terms, objective chance and subjective credence, and the foundations of set theory (the latter figuring as the topic of his last monograph, *Parts of Classes*, 1991). Only a select few topics can be mentioned here.

Beginning with "Survival and Identity" (in *Philosophical Papers Volume 1*), Lewis was one of the most important proponents of the view that, just as objects have spatial parts, they also have temporal parts. To take a simple example, Lewis's theory maintained that there existed an instantaneous temporal part of Richard Nixon on 29 July, 2pm Greenwich Mean Time, 1954, that took up just as much space as Nixon, but which lasted only an instant. There is thus a deep metaphysical analogy between the way we take up space and the way we take up time. Just as we are spatially large things composed of vanishingly small things, so, according to Lewis's favored view, a persisting concrete object is composed of temporally fleeting things (indeed, instantaneous things).

Is free will compatible with determinism? The incompatibilist answers no, arguing that since we are not free to change the past and not free to break the laws of nature, then if determinism is true, we are not free at all. Lewis held that free will and determinism are compatible, offering his own novel diagnosis of where the incompatibilist goes wrong. In his paper "Are We Free to Break the Laws," Lewis argues that the incompatibilist illicitly trades on an ambiguity in the claim "We are not free to break the laws."

Is time travel possible? Does not admitting such a possibility lead to insoluble paradoxes? For example, if I could go back in time, then it seems I should be able to go back in time and kill my own grandparents. But then how would I have come to exist in the first place? Lewis's "The Paradoxes of Time Travel" is a sustained attempt to dispel illusions of paradox, arguing that there are no deep philosophical puzzles raised by the possibility of time travel. Do, then, the laws of nature actually permit it? Lewis says that this is not something for the philosopher to decide.

Common sense tells us that we know quite a lot about the world. The skeptic tells us that we do not know much. Lewis defends common sense without accusing the skeptic of making a mistake. In his "Elusive Knowledge" (in *Papers in Metaphysics and Epistemology*) he popularized and systematized a so-called contextualist approach to knowledge according to which the meaning of the verb "to know" does not stay fixed across conversational contexts. The upshot of his account is while ordinary people often speak the truth when they say "I know such and such," it is also the case that when one engages in argumentation with the skeptic, the verb "know" acquires a meaning such that one should concede that the skeptic is right when she says "We know hardly anything at all." Lewis's work on knowledge applies some of the lessons provided by his more general picture of how meaning is influenced by conversational dynamics, a picture outlined in "Scorekeeping in a Language Game" (in *Philosophical Papers Volume 1*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Convention (Cambridge, Mass., 1969).
Counterfactuals (Cambridge, Mass., 1973).
Philosophical Papers Volume I (Oxford, 1983).
Philosophical Papers Volume II (Oxford, 1986).
On the Plurality of Worlds (Oxford, 1986).
Parts of Classes (Oxford, 1991).
Papers in Philosophical Logic (Cambridge, UK, 1998).
Papers in Metaphysics and Epistemology

(Cambridge, UK, 1999).

Papers in Ethics and Social Philosophy
(Cambridge, UK, 2000).

Other Relevant Works

"Psychophysical and Theoretical
Identifications," *Australasian Journal of
Philosophy* 50 (1972): 249–58.

"Individuation by Acquaintance and by
Stipulation," *Philosophical Review* 92
(1983): 3–12.

"Lewis, David: Reduction of Mind," in *A
Companion to the Philosophy of Mind*, ed.
Samuel Guttenplan (Oxford, 1994), pp.
412–31.

"Causation as Influence," *Journal of
Philosophy* 97 (2000): 182–97.

"Redefining 'Intrinsic'," *Philosophy and
Phenomenological Research* 63 (2001):
381–98.

"Tensing the Copula," *Mind* 111 (2001):
1–13.

"Truthmaking and Difference-Making,"
Noûs 35 (2001): 602–15.

Further Reading

Amer Phils 1950–2000, *Blackwell Analytic
Phil*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Oxford
Comp Phil*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*

Armstrong, D. M., and Peter Forrest. "An
Argument against David Lewis' Theory of
Possible Worlds," *Australasian Journal of
Philosophy* 62 (1984): 164–8.

Butterfield, Jeremy. "David Lewis Meets
John Bell," *Philosophy of Science* 59
(1992): 26–43.

Chihara, Charles S. *The Worlds of
Possibility: Modal Realism and the
Semantics of Modal Logic* (Oxford, 1998).

Fogelin, Robert. "David Lewis on Indicative
and Counterfactual Conditionals,"
Analysis 58 (1998): 286–9.

Haack, Susan. "Lewis' Ontological Slum,"
Review of Metaphysics 33 (1977): 415–29.

Jackson, Frank. "David Kellogg Lewis:
Philosopher and Philosopher of Mind,"
Mind and Language 18 (2003): 281–5.

Jacquette, Dale. "Truth and Fiction in David
Lewis' Critique of Meinongian Semantics,"
Metaphysica 2 (2001): 73–106.

Linsky, Bernard. "Is Lewis A Meinongian?"
Australasian Journal of Philosophy 69
(1991): 438–53.

Loux, Michael J., ed. *The Possible and the
Actual: Readings in the Metaphysics of
Modality* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1979).

Margolis, Eric, and Stephen Laurence.
"Lewis' Strawman," *Philosophical
Quarterly* 52 (2002): 55–65.

Menzies, Peter. "Probabilistic Causation and
Causal Processes: A Critique of Lewis,"
Philosophy of Science 56 (1989): 642–63.

Preyer, Gerhard, and Frank Siebelt, eds.
*Reality and Humean Supervenience:
Essays on the Philosophy of David Lewis*
(Lanham, Md., 2001).

Pruss, Alexander. "David Lewis's
Counterfactual Arrow of Time," *Noûs* 37
(2003): 606–37.

Rescher, Nicholas. "How Many Possible
Worlds Are There?" *Philosophy and
Phenomenological Research* 59 (1999):
403–20.

Tooley, Michael. "The Stalnaker–Lewis
Approach to Counterfactuals," *Journal of
Philosophy* 100 (2003): 371–7.

John Hawthorne

LEWIS, Edwin (1881–1959)

Edwin Lewis was born on 18 April 1881 in
Newbury, England. At nineteen years of age,
he traveled to Labrador, Canada with Sir
Wilfred Grenfell, a missionary doctor who
worked in Newfoundland. While in Labrador,
Lewis joined the Newfoundland Methodist
Church of Canada. He then served in the
North Dakota Conference during 1904–5. He
was educated at Drew Theological Seminary

(BD 1908, ThD 1918) and New York State College for Teachers (BA 1915). He also received a DD from Dickinson College in 1926. He was an instructor in Greek and theology at Drew Theological Seminary from 1916 to 1918. He continued to teach at Drew, becoming an adjunct professor of systematic theology in 1918, and a full professor in 1920. Lewis remained at Drew until his retirement in 1951. He taught for a short time at Temple University before his death on 29 November 1959 in Madison, New Jersey.

Lewis's theology can be divided into early and late periods, as he changed his mind on the foundations of Christianity. The early Lewis defended two main premises: (1) Cartesianism – the quest to understand human nature begins with the inward experience of the individual mind; and (2) Kantianism – moral certainty is only possible in the noumena, which Lewis calls the supernatural. The first premise determines Lewis's ecclesiology in the sense that the Church is the possibility for the profession of the inward experience of the individual mind. The first premise is connected with the second premise in that the purpose of the Church is to extend the moral certainty that is found in the kingdom of God because the kingdom of God is supernatural. Lewis uses the supernatural to explain the relationship between faith and reason in the sense that reason points us toward the supernatural, and faith provides us with what reason cannot explain such as the kingdom of God. The kingdom of God as the supernatural is quite complicated in Lewis. The relationship of the individual members of the kingdom of God is explained in congruence with a personalistic idealism by Lewis. His personalistic idealism is explicitly found in his book entitled *Jesus Christ and the Human Quest* (1924), which uses British idealism to show how the foundation of Christianity is human nature, and Lewis defines human nature with his first premise.

Lewis's theological shift took place when he was one of the editors of the Abingdon Bible Commentary from 1926 to 1929 because he was confronted with the Scriptures, and this confrontation changed his theology. He characterized the shift as one from "philosophy to revelation." This shift manifested itself in his foundationalism. The earlier Lewis argued that the foundation of Christianity is human nature, but the latter Lewis argues that the foundation of Christianity is Christ himself. This Christological foundationalism is not an a priori foundation but one based on revelation alone. Lewis's use of revelation is quite complicated. Revelation cannot be known naturally as Lewis replaces the supernatural with the Christian since the foundation of Christianity is Christ alone. Whereas the kingdom of God was the supernatural for the earlier Lewis, the church is the supernatural for the latter Lewis, because the truth of Christ as the foundation is proclaimed in the Church as the Church – which is how revelation is known fully.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Jesus Christ and the Human Quest: Suggestions Toward a Philosophy of the Person and the Work of Christ (New York, 1924).
A Manual of Christian Beliefs (New York, 1927).
God and Ourselves: A Plea for the Reality, Adequacy, and Availability of God (New York, 1931).
A Christian Manifesto (New York, 1934).
A Philosophy of the Christian Revelation (New York, 1940).
A New Heaven and a New Earth (New York, 1941).
Christian Truth for Christian Living (Nashville, Tenn., 1942).
The Practice of the Christian Life (Philadelphia, 1942).
Creator and the Adversary (New York, 1948).
The Biblical Faith and Christian Freedom (Philadelphia, 1953).
The Ministry of the Holy Spirit (Nashville, Tenn., 1954).
Other Relevant Works

Ed. with Frederick Carl Eiselen and David
G. Downey, *The Abingdon Bible
Commentary* (New York, 1929).
"From Philosophy to Revelation,"
Christian Century (14 June 1939): 762.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio
"Bibliography of the Works of Edwin
Lewis," *Drew Gateway* 21 (Spring
1951): 63–6.
Hardwick, Charley D. "Edwin Lewis:
Introductory and Critical Remarks,"
Drew Gateway 33 (Winter 1963):
91–104.
Sims, John A. "Revelation and Apologetic
in the Theology of Edwin Lewis," *Drew
Gateway* 51 (Spring 1981): 1–32.
Sloan, Harold Paul. "Jesus Christ and the
Human Quest: A Criticism," *Methodist
Review* 108 (Summer 1925): 800–806.

Angela Kristen McWilliams

LEYS, Wayne Albert Risser (1905–73)

Wayne A. R. Leys was born on 29 June 1905 in Bloomington, Illinois. He received his BA from Illinois Wesleyan University in 1926. He was awarded a fellowhip to attend the University of Chicago, where he received his PhD in philosophy in 1930. The title of his dissertation was "Needs and Values in Religion," and he worked primarily with Edward S. AMES. Leys was associate pastor with Ames from 1930 to 1932, but decided to go into teaching instead. Leys was professor of philosophy at the Central YMCA College of Chicago from 1932 to 1945. From 1945 to 1963 he was professor of philosophy at Roosevelt University in Chicago, and also served as Dean of Faculties (1945–55), Vice President (1949–55), and Dean of the Graduate Division (1955–63). In 1964 he became professor of philosophy at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, a position that he held until his death. His colleagues Lewis HAHN, George AXTELLE, and Paul SCHILLP shared his interests in education, pragmatism, and social theory. Leys died on 7 March 1973 in Makanda, Illinois.

Throughout his career Leys was actively involved in professional and social organizations and government agencies, and these many experiences enlivened his philosophical work in ethics, educational theory, political and legal theory, public administration, and business ethics. Leys was a panel member of the National War Labor Board and the American Arbitration Association; research director of the ethical standards project of the National Institute of Labor Education; and President of the Board of the Student Christian Foundation.

Leys was also active with the American Society for Public Administration, the Commission on Educational Organizations of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and the American Civil Liberties Association. He served on several committees and the board of officers of the American Philosophical Association, was Secretary-Treasurer and Parliamentarian of the Western Division of the APA, and co-chaired the planning committee for the Thirteenth World Philosophy Congress in Mexico City in 1963. He supported the John Dewey Cooperative Research Project, the early stage towards publishing DEWEY's collected works, by serving on its editorial board from 1966 to 1973.

The book by Leys which made the greatest impact was *Ethics for Policy Decisions: The Art of Asking Deliberative Questions* (1952), which was widely reviewed and used in college courses. Like business ethics texts that had begun appearing some twenty years earlier, Leys's pioneering effort to apply philosophy to public policy helped gradually to open up this interdisciplinary field in the 1950s and 1960s. His book selected moral questions from ten ethical theories to develop a broad array of deliberative questions useful for analyzing policy problems. His pragmatic and experimental method makes no decisive judgment upon "the right answer" to any cases

considered, nor shows preference towards any of the ethical theories applied. His overall approach to moral reflection emphasizes how modern life presents conflicting duties and incoherent moral values, where no absolute rights of morality, justice, or law prevail universally. Realistic moral thinking deals creatively with each novel situation, prepared to invent the best compromise between relevant values.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Religious Control of Emotion (New York, 1932).
Introduction to Social Studies (Chicago, 1934).
A History of Scientific Progress, with Millard S. Everett (Chicago, 1935).
Civilization in the Making: A History of Intellectual and Social Progress, with Millard S. Everett (Chicago, 1935).
Philosophy and the Social Sciences (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1939).
Ethics and Social Policy (New York, 1941).
Ethics for Policy Decisions: The Art of Asking Deliberative Questions (New York, 1952).
Philosophy and the Public Interest, with Charner M. Perry (Chicago, 1959).
Teaching Ethics in Labor Education, with Case Materials, with Peter R. Senn (Washington, D.C., 1962).
Gandhi and America's Educational Future, with P. S. S. Rama Rao (Carbondale, Ill., 1969).

Other Relevant Works
Leys's papers are at Roosevelt University in Chicago, and at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.
"Types of Moral Values and Moral Inconsistency," *Journal of Philosophy* 35 (1938): 66–73.
"Ethics and Administrative Discretion," *Public Administration Review* 4 (Winter 1943): 10–17.
"Current Applications of Ethical Theory," *Journal of Higher Education* 21 (1950): 415–8.
"Human Values in the Atomic Age," in *The Impact of Atomic Energy*, ed. Robert A. Dahl (Philadelphia, 1953).
"Justice and Equality," *Ethics* 67 (1956): 17–24.
"Ethics and the Rule of Law," in *The Ethics of Business Enterprise* (Philadelphia, 1962), pp. 32–8.
"Was Plato Non-political?" *Ethics* 75 (1965): 272–6.
"Dewey's Social, Political, and Legal Philosophy," in *Guide to the Works of John Dewey*, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale, Ill., 1970).
"The Use and Abuse of Normative Definitions," in *Value and Valuation: Axiological Studies in Honor of Robert S. Hartman*, ed. John W. Davis (Knoxville, Tenn., 1972).
"Political and Moral Pluralism," in *The Abdication of Philosophy: Philosophy and the Public Good, Essays in Honor of Paul Arthur Schilpp*, ed. Eugene Freeman (La Salle, Ill., 1976).

Further Reading
Proc of APA v46, Who Was Who in Amer v5, Who's Who in Phil
Kadish, Mortimer R. "Leys's *Ethics for Policy Decisions*," *Philosophical Review* 62 (1953): 437–43.
Schubert, Glendon A., Jr. "The Public Interest" In Administrative Decision-Making: Theorem, Theosophy, or Theory?" *American Political Science Review* 51 (1957): 346–68.
Sparshott, F. E. "Plato as Anti-Political Thinker," *Ethics* 77 (1967): 214–19.

John R. Shook

LIEB, Irwin Chester (1925–92)

Irwin C. (Chet) Lieb was born on 9 November 1925 in Newark, New Jersey. After military service as a United States Navy fighter pilot, he earned a BA from Princeton in 1947, an MA from Cornell in 1949, and a PhD in philosophy from Yale in 1953. At Yale he studied with John E. SMITH and Paul WEISS. Lieb taught philosophy at Yale as instructor and assistant professor from 1952 to 1959. From 1959 to 1963 he was professor and department chair at Connecticut College. In 1963 he joined the faculty of the philosophy department at the University of Texas, where he also served as department chair (1968–72), associate dean of the Graduate School (1973–5), and Vice President and Dean of graduate studies (1975–9). During his years at the University of Texas he directed twenty-one doctoral dissertations. In 1971 he was President of the Southwestern Philosophical Society. In 1981 Lieb accepted a position as Provost and Vice President (serving until 1986) at the University of Southern California, where he was also professor of philosophy until his death on 23 May 1992 in Pasadena, California.

During his years at Yale, Lieb published several essays on the work of Charles S. PEIRCE and edited a collection of Peirce's letters to Lady Welby. In 1961 he edited *Experience, Existence and the Good: Essays in Honor of Paul Weiss*. In addition to numerous essays, he also published two books: *The Four Faces of Man: A Philosophical Study of Practice, Reason, Art, and Religion* (1971), and *Past, Present, and Future: A Philosophical Essay about Time* (1991).

In *The Four Faces of Man* Lieb focused on the interactions of human beings with "every other sort of thing," and discussed four of what he took to be the most basic realities that had emerged from those interactions. He identified each of the four realities, which he termed Individuals, The Good, God, and Time, with one of the four faces of human life: the practical, the rational, the religious, and the artistic, respectively. He thought that no one of these "four faces" is adequate in itself, and that reality is the ground for their equality.

Continuing to work a rich vein of traditional metaphysics, Lieb argued in *Past, Present, and Future* that time, as "the passing that occurs in individuals," is a fundamental reality. As he did in his other publications and lectures, Lieb entered into dialogue with the key figures of the history of philosophy, from Heraclitus, to Kant, to A. N. WHITEHEAD, Peirce, and Josiah ROYCE. One reviewer praised his book as a work that was "able to hold its own against the classic works of thinkers such as Henri Bergson."

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Logic and Reality," *Review of Metaphysics* 20 (1967): 662–89.
"Philosophical Discourse," *Personalist* 49 (1968): 322–30.
The Four Faces of Man: A Philosophical Study of Practice, Reason, Art, and Religion (Philadelphia, 1971).
"The Bearing of the Past," *Southwestern Journal of Philosophy* 3 (1972): 157–66.
"Individuals and the Past," *Review of Metaphysics* 25 (1972): 117–30.
"The Image of Man in Medicine," *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy* 1 (1976): 162–76.
"Happiness and the Good Life," in *The Good Life and Its Pursuit*, ed. Jude Dougherty (New York, 1984), pp. 19–34.
"The Ontological Standing of the Laws of Nature," *Review of Metaphysics* 39 (1985): 227–41.
"Time and Value," *Review of Metaphysics* 43 (1990): 475–94.
Past, Present, and Future: A Philosophical Essay About Time (Urbana, Ill., 1991).

Other Relevant Works
"Logical Constants, Part I," *Review of Metaphysics* 7 (1953): 36–52.
Ed., *Letters to Lady Welby*, by Charles S. Peirce (New Haven, Conn., 1953).
"Wittgenstein's Investigations," *Review of*

Metaphysics 8 (1954): 125–43.

"New Studies in the Philosophy of Charles S. Peirce," *Review of Metaphysics* 8 (1954): 291–320.

"The Nature of Ideas," *Review of Metaphysics* 11 (1957): 181–95.

"Philosophy as Spiritual Formation: Plato's Myth of Er," *International Philosophical Quarterly* 3 (1963): 271–85.

Ed., *Experience, Existence and the Good: Essays in Honor of Paul Weiss* (Carbondale, Ill., 1961).

"The Becoming of the Present," *Southwestern Journal of Philosophy* 1 (1970): 20–28.

"Charles Hartshorne's Recollections of Editing the Peirce Papers," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 6 (1970): 149–59.

"Being and Becoming," in *Creativity and Common Sense*, ed. Thomas Krettek (Albany, N.Y., 1987), pp. 252–61.

"Pragmatism and the Normative Sciences," in *Frontiers in American Philosophy*, vol. 1, ed. Robert Burch (College Station, 1992), pp. 273–84.

Further Reading
Who Was Who in Amer v10

Larry A. Hickman

LIEBER, Francis (1798–1872)

Francis Lieber was born on 8 March 1798 in Berlin, Germany. In 1820 he received a PhD in mathematics from the University of Jena. He then studied applied mathematics at the Universities of Halle and Dresden. He came to the United States as director and instructor of a Boston gymnasium in 1827, and soon after moved to Philadelphia as editor of the first *Encyclopaedia Americana*. He was pro-fessor of history and political economy at South Carolina College (now the University of South Carolina) from 1835 to 1856, and professor of history and political science at Columbia College (now Columbia University) from 1857 until his death. He was a founding member of the American Social Science Association in 1865. Lieber died on 2 October 1872 in New York City.

Lieber was the first academic in the US to hold the title of professor of political science. His successor to the chair of history and polit-ical science, John W. BURGESS, built on Lieber's development of the field to establish a superior school of political science at Columbia. As editor of the first and most widely used encyclopedia in the United States, he influenced the education of countless Americans. He was an encyclopedist, profes-sor, archivist, and publicist. In his political writings he advocated a strong federal gov-ernment on liberal principles and demanded that citizens participate in self-government. He rejected social contract theory; his often-used phrase "no right without its duties; no duty without its rights" incorporated elements of republicanism into American lib-eralism. Although better known for his con-tributions to political science, criminal justice, sociology, and international law, he should also be appreciated for his contributions to the discipline of philosophy, especially for his work on hermeneutics.

Lieber's general theory of hermeneutics was an original combination of German theory with Anglican principles, and was the first general theory of hermeneutics in the United States. He saw hermeneutics as an indispens-able part of one's relationship with others. Signs, of which language is the most impor-tant, are intricately connected to our psycho-logical being. Hermeneutics serves as the foundation for the study of law and politics, and for practical reason in general. His hermeneutics supported his ethical, political, legal, and social views. Lieber's legal and political hermeneutics was in many ways the

first developed attempt at an art that has pre-occupied modern legal theorists. Prior to Lieber there is no record of the word "hermeneutics" used in the fields of politics or law in the English language. Lieber's *Legal and Political Hermeneutics* (1838–9) was the first book published in the United States that used any form of "hermeneutics" in the title. His rules-based approach to hermeneutics was a novel approach to the discipline. He was the first to distinguish interpretation from construction using that terminology, and to offer rules and justification for each. His treatment of construction was a significant contribution to legal and political hermeneutics.

Lieber was also a precursor of other important developments in American philosophy. His treatment of meaning, signs, society, mind, and construction antedate and foreshadow discussions to come. Lieber, however, should not be referred to as a pragmatist. His views on meaning, truth, consciousness, evolution, and common sense belie any such comparison. Lieber warned that any text can have but one true meaning and that any interpretations must be true to the whole text (to the letter of the text and to the spirit of the text) as well as to the utterer. Although Lieber's work has similarities to pragmatism (with discussions of meaning, signs, society, mind, and construction), those similarities are more likely due to the issues of hermeneutics than the answers provided.

A renewed interest in the work of Lieber is evidenced by reprints of his major works and several recent publications dealing with various aspects of his thought.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manual of Political Ethics, Designed Chiefly for the Use of Colleges and Students at Law (Boston, 1838–9).

Legal and Political Hermeneutics (Boston, 1839).

On Civil Liberty and Self-government (Philadelphia, 1859).

Other Relevant Works

Lieber's papers are in the Henry E. Huntington Library in San Marino, California, Johns Hopkins University, Columbia University, and the Library of Congress.

Ed., *Encyclopaedia Americana* (Philadelphia, 1829–35).

The Stranger in America; Comprising Sketches of the Manners, Society, and National Peculiarities of the United States, 2 vols (London, 1835).

The Miscellaneous Writings of Francis Lieber, 2 vols, ed. Daniel Coit Gilman (Philadelphia, 1881).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v5*

Brown, Bernard E. *American Conservatives: The Political Thought of Francis Lieber and John W. Burgess* (New York, 1951).

Catalano, John. *Francis Lieber: Hermeneutics and Practical Reason* (Lanham, Md., 2000).

Curti, Merle. "Francis Lieber and Nationalism," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 4 (1941): 263–92.

Freidel, Frank. *Francis Lieber, Nineteenth Century Liberal* (Baton Rouge, La., 1947).

Smith, Wilson. *Professors and Public Ethics: Studies of Northern Moral Philosophers before the Civil War* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1956).

"A Symposium on *Legal and Political Hermeneutics*," *Cardozo Law Review* 16 (April 1995): 1883–2351. Contains a reprinting of *Legal and Political Hermeneutics*, ten articles about Lieber, and a bibliography of Lieber's writings.

Root, Elihu. "Francis Lieber," *American Journal of International Law* 7 (1913): 453–69.

John Catalano

LILLIE, Ralph Stayner (1875–1952)

Ralph S. Lillie was born on 8 August 1875 in Toronto, Canada. He received his BA from the University of Toronto in 1896, and briefly attended graduate courses at the University of Michigan before earning his PhD in biology at the University of Chicago in 1901. He was also awarded an honorary DSc from the University of Toronto in 1936. He taught physiology at the University of Nebraska from 1902 to 1905, at Harvard University in 1905–6, and at Johns Hopkins University in 1906–7. Lillie was a professor of physiological zoology at the University of Pennsylvania from 1907 to 1913, and then a professor of biology at Clark University from 1913 to 1920. From 1920 to 1924, he was a research biologist at the General Electric Company. In 1924, he became professor of general physiology at the University of Chicago, and held that position until retiring in 1940. Lillie died on 19 March 1952 in Chicago, Illinois.

Lillie's principal fields of interest were physiology, general biology, and philosophy of science. He was especially interested in the fundamental properties of living tissues and the stimuli that give rise to cell growth and division. He also studied the biological effects of radiation. Lillie was a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a member of many scientific societies including the American Society for Biology and the American Philosophical Society.

Lillie's philosophical contributions centered on the philosophy of biology, where he developed a nonmechanistic and nonmaterialistic approach to the study of life. He saw living organisms not as machines fully comprehensible in the terms of physics and chemistry, but as "processes" characterized above all by synthetic and integrative activity. The transition from inorganic to organic existence required no vitalistic principle, and could be explained as a reorganization of components made possible by the fact that nonliving matter is not rigidly determined by the laws of physics. Lillie regarded Heisenberg's indeterminacy principle as essential for the spontaneity exhibited by living organisms. The organism's growth, development, and behavior are not merely the product of the environment in which it is situated, but a reflection of an internal principle operating to some extent independent of its surroundings. Voluntary human action is only the most obvious example of a principle that is in fact at work throughout biology.

Lillie might appear committed to some type of dualism, but he expressly disavowed this implication. He firmly asserted that the physical and psychical are but two aspects of the same reality. He based this assertion on the observation that neither biological aspect is capable of existence independent of the other. Every living organism instead constitutes what he labeled a "psychophysical unity." He did not believe that this psychophysical unity had emerged anew at a particular point in the history of the universe. Instead, it was a natural outgrowth of a universe that is itself a psychophysical entity. Thus, voluntary human action is an example of a principle at work not merely throughout biology, but throughout the entire universe, as well. Lillie readily admitted the panpsychist implications of this view. In doing so, he manifested one of his most endearing features as a philosopher of biology: namely, the recognition that every account of living organisms rests on a metaphysical foundation that needs to be brought to light.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Protoplasmic Action and Nervous Action (Chicago, 1923).
General Biology and Philosophy of Organism (Chicago, 1945).

Other Relevant Works
Lillie's papers are at the University of Chicago.
"What is Purposive and Intelligent Behavior from the Physiological Point of View?" *Journal of Philosophy* 12 (1915):

589–610.

"The Scientific View of Life," *Journal of Philosophy* 25 (1928): 589–606.

"Biological Causation," *Philosophy of Science* 7 (1940): 314–36.

"Biology and Unitary Principle," *Philosophy of Science* 18 (1951): 193–207.

Further Reading

Who Was Who in Amer v3, *Who's Who in Phil*

Bawden, H. Heath. "The Psychical as a Biological Directive," *Philosophy of Science* 14 (1947): 56–67.

Herrick, C. Judson. "The Limitations of Science," *Journal of Philosophy* 26 (1929): 186–8.

<div align="right">Richard B. Gunderman</div>

LIN Yutang (1895–1976)

Lin Yutang was born Lin Ho-lok on 10 October 1895 in Banzai, Longxi county, in the Fujian province of China. At the age of seventeen he changed his name to Yutang, meaning "elegant language." His father was a country pastor, a second-generation Christian. Lin had many siblings and his family was not well-off, but he was able to attend mission schools and graduated with a BA in 1916 from St. John's University in Shanghai, an Episcopalian missionary institution known for training elite Westernized Chinese. From 1916 to 1919 he served as an English instructor at Qinghua University. In 1919 he left China to study at Harvard University with Bliss Perry and Irving BABBITT, received an MA degree in comparative literature there, and went on to study in Germany for his PhD in philology from Leipzig University in 1923. During his Beijing years from 1923 to 1926, he was professor of English at Peking University and he also served as Dean of Beijing Normal Women's College.

Fleeing from the warlord government in 1926, Lin taught temporarily at Amoy University and went on to join the revolution in 1927, serving as secretary to Eugene Chen, Foreign Minister of the Nationalist government in Wuhan. During his Shanghai years from 1928 to 1936, he served as English secretary at Academia Sinica under Cai Yuanpei, but devoted most of his time to writing essays both in English and Chinese, and was editor of several very popular Chinese-language journals. His American years lasted from 1936 to 1966, during which he mainly resided in New York City, but also included two trips back to China and several years of sojourn in France and travels in Europe. During this period, he did not hold any official position and wrote exclusively in English as a cosmopolitan writer. For his last ten years from 1966 until his death, he resumed writing in Chinese and resided in Taiwan and Hong Kong. Lin Yutang died on 26 March 1976 in Hong Kong.

Lin Yutang grew up at a time when China was undergoing an epistemic change from tradition to modernity which was characterized by a reevaluation of traditional values and an embrace of modern Western values. Given his Christian family background, Lin was predisposed to experience with comparative sensitivity the momentum of cultural change that resulted in the so-called "Chinese Renaissance." His versatile accomplishments also reflected those of a Renaissance Man. He served as an administrator for short intervals and was a successful educator. He was the compiler of the most popular English textbooks that helped a whole generation of Chinese to learn English. As a scholar, he was classicist in training. In addition to being a philologist, he was a commentator on Chinese classical works, biographer of Su Dongpo and author of a study on the history of Chinese journalism. As a writer, he tried all the genres – he was an essayist, novelist, poet, and playwright. But perhaps what distinguished him from most of his contemporary writers was that

he was a prolific bilingual writer in, as well as translator of, Chinese and English. He was also a public intellectual. Both in China and America, he was politically active as a critic and public speaker. He also spent more than a decade on researching and eventually inventing the first Chinese typewriter. Yet, to the American public at large, Lin was seen first of all as a "Chinese philosopher."

Lin Yutang's philosophy can be called a philosophy of Humor, or a humorous philosophy of life. It came from George Meredith's notion of the Comic Spirit, but was transformed into a cross-cultural idea substantiated by his incorporation and reinterpretation of the Chinese culture, both Confucian and Taoist but especially the latter. In *The Importance of Living* (1937), Lin articulates what he calls a "lyrical philosophy" out of his own experience of life and thought. To maintain human dignity in an age of cynicism and totalitarian threats to democracy and individual liberty, Lin argues that the ideal of the "scamp" is probably the saving spirit of the age. What he meant by the "scamp" is not just a traveling wanderer, but rather a free individual in spirit equipped with an aptitude towards life that is characterized by a detached sense of realism and a good sense of humor. By glorifying the spirit of the "scamp," Lin is in fact invoking the Taoist tradition in interpreting the "leisurely" attitude into what he understands as humor. In summarizing the best of the Taoist tradition as expressed in Chinese philosophy and culture, he believes that:

[The] highest ideal of Chinese culture has always been a man with a sense of detachment ("daguan") toward life based on a sense of wise disenchantment. From this detachment comes high-mindedness, a high-mindedness which enables one to go through life with tolerant irony ... . And from this detachment arise also his sense of freedom, his love of vagabondage and his pride and nonchalance. It is only with this sense of freedom and nonchalance that one eventually arrives at the keen and intense joy of living. (1937, p. 1–2)

In this Taoist scheme, a keen and joyful attitude toward life is taken as the ultimate aim attainable by a cultured individual. To arrive at such an enlightened position, the crucial disposition one needs to possess is a sense of "tolerant irony," which comes with a certain "high-mindedness." What generates such a sense of "tolerant irony," however, is a more basic requirement: the so-called "detachment." And this is a significant connection in that the notion of "tolerant irony" is a defining element in what Lin understands as humor, while "detachment" is a most important characteristic traditionally attributed to the Taoist way of life. The Taoist notion of "detachment" is usually understood in its narrow sense as a strategy of living resulting from disillusionment with the sociopolitical affairs and thus leading to a secluded life style often in the mountains. Lin Yutang's interpretation is significantly broader. "Detachment," which usually translates as "chaotuo," but as "daguan" in Lin's "humorous" appropriation, should be understood as having a free relationship towards life's tragedy. It means the ability to transcend from feeling first life's tragedy to seeing life's comedy. The tragic nature of human vicissitudes is in this perspective fundamentally comic at the same time. Lin calls such ability to shift from a tragic perspective to a comic perspective a sense of "wise disenchantment." The notion of "disenchantment," as we know it in the Western tradition, usually connotes a feeling of alienation that enhances one's pessimistic and tragic belief. It is certainly true that not everybody is able to make such transition. Qu Yuan, the first great poet in Chinese literature, stands aloof as a prime example of a tragic hero who, after addressing a series of questioning towards "Heaven" and getting no answer, committed suicide. What does one need to acquire, then, to be enlightened to undergo such transition? Lin Yutang argues that that is what the Taoist tradition has always been teaching. The fact that after Qu Yuan, no poet ever committed suicide again in over 2000 years indicates that Chinese poets have, according to Lin, successfully made that transition largely due to their adopting the "daguan"

attitude, or a free relationship towards life's tragedies. Lin cites Zhuangzi, Tao Yuanming, and Su Dongpo as examples of ideal personalities with "daguan" aptitude in different dynastic periods. And Lin Yutang shows that it is in these characters that humor abounds.

To Lin Yutang, to be tolerant is to have a reasonable understanding. Once one has attained a free relationship with life's tragedies and farcicalities, the natural tendency is to be forgiving and sympathetic. And this attitude is ontologically grounded in the humanistic aspect of the Confucian tradition, what Lin calls the "Spirit of Reasonableness." "Ontological ground" here does not refer to a system of thinking based on logical or metaphysical reasoning. Contrary to that, what Lin calls a "humorous thinking" or "humanized thinking" is the opposite to the "scientific thinking" strictly based on logical and objective method. While "scientific thinking" leads to specialized compartments of knowledge, "humanized thinking" leads to a reasonable understanding of the problems of living as such. "Humanized thinking" is not a matter of "logical necessity," because there is no logical necessity in human affairs. Rather it is rooted in mere common sense. In Lin's view, this "Spirit of Reasonableness" represents the essence and best side of Chinese civilization, a crystallization of the general Confucian emphasis on humanity. In this light, the only criterion for judging right or wrong in a quarrel, for instance, is to see whether one is "jiangli" ("talk reason") or not. As Lin explains, "reasonableness" translates "qingli," which is composed of "qing" ("human nature") and "li" ("eternal reason"). Thus, "jinqing" ("to be human," or "to be reasonable") becomes the highest goal. Anything that goes beyond reasonableness is immediately condemned as "bu jin qingli" ("moving far away from human nature"). Lin believes that this reasonable spirit has afforded the Chinese with a sound realism that even the emperor is regarded as an earthly figure who rules by a mandate from Heaven. And in a similar light, "the sage is no more than a reasonable person, like Confucius, who is chiefly admired for his plain,

common sense and his natural human qualities, in other words, for his great humanness" (1937, p. 423).

It is important to note that Lin Yutang's interpretation of Chinese philosophy should not be taken as an act of Oriental Other. Rather, it should be seen as a cross-cultural intervention into modernity at large. Lin was an exemplary figure of the first generation of Westernized intellectuals in modern China who consider themselves as Chinese as well as cosmopolitan world citizens. His "Chinese philosophy" is already a Westernized intellectual's retrieval of traditional Chinese culture. Oftentimes, his explanation of Chinese philosophical wisdom in America involved a passionate political commentary. In *Peace Is in the Heart* (1949), his less-publicized book in which he attempted to work out "a philosophy of world peace," he quoted a passage of Lao Tzu on the power of water and the philosophy of "lying low" and then added:

I am not worried lest America may not be able to assert a leadership of force and power; I am worried lest she may. I am concerned to see America assume a moral leadership, a leadership of humility, so that the world may pay her glad homage and uphold her forever. Like the great river that nourishes life along its valley, she shall by the exuberance and richness of her life be a blessing upon the peoples of the earth. She shall stay above, and the world shall not feel her weight; she shall walk in front and no one will wish her harm. For she shall then lead in kindness and unselfishness and justice and by that secret of unused power bring a new era of brotherhood to mankind. No one can dethrone her because of her power for goodness, and no one can take away from her, because she does not take possession. She shall not contend, and no one in the world can contend against her, and because she takes no credit, the credit can never be taken away from her. This is my Dream America. Will it come true? (1949, pp. 62–3)

BIBILIOGRAPHY

My Country and My People (New York, 1935).

The Importance of Living (New York, 1937).

The Wisdom of Confucius (New York, 1938).

The Wisdom of China and India (New York, 1942).

Between Tears and Laughter (New York, 1943).

The Wisdom of Laotse (New York, 1948).

Peace Is in the Heart (London, 1949).

On the Wisdom of America (New York, 1950).

Looking Beyond (New York, 1955).

From Pagan to Christianity (New York, 1959).

Other Relevant Works

Lin Yutang's papers are in the Palace Museum and the Lin Yutang Memorial Library in Taipei, Taiwan.

Letters of a Chinese Amazon and Wartime Essays (Shanghai, 1930).

The Little Critic: Essays, Satires and Sketches on China, First Series: 1930–1932 (Shanghai, 1935).

The Little Critic: Essays, Satires and Sketches on China, Second Series: 1933–1935 (Shanghai, 1935).

Confucius Saw Nancy and Essays about Nothing (Shanghai, 1935).

A History of the Press and Public Opinion in China (Chicago, 1936).

Moment in Peking (New York, 1939).

With Love and Irony (New York, 1940).

Leaf in the Storm (New York, 1940).

The Vigil of a Nation (New York, 1944).

The Gay Genius: The Life and Times of Su Tungpo (New York, 1945).

The Vermilion Gate (New York, 1953).

The Importance of Understanding: Translations from the Chinese (New York, 1960).

The Chinese Theory of Art: Translations from the Masters of Chinese Art (New York, 1967).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio

Ku, Hung-ming. *The Universal Order, Or the Conduct of Life* (Shanghai, 1906).

———, *The Spirit of the Chinese People* (Peking, 1915).

Lin, Taiyi. *Lin Yutang zhuan* (Taipei, 1989).

Qian, Jun. *Lin Yutang: Negotiating Modernity Between East and West*. PhD dissertation, University of California at Berkeley (Berkeley, Cal., 1996).

Sohigian, Diran J. *The Life and Times of Lin Yutang*. PhD dissertation, Columbia University (New York, 1991).

Qian Suoqiao

LINDBECK, George Arthur (1923–)

George A. Lindbeck was born on 10 March 1923 to Lutheran missionaries in Loyang, Honan, in north central China. At the age of seventeen he came to the United States to attend college. He earned a BA from Gustavus Aldolphus College in 1943, an M.Div. from Yale Divinity School in 1946, and a PhD in philosophy from Yale University in 1955, where he wrote a dissertation on Duns Scotus. He also studied in Toronto and Paris with Etienne GILSON and Paul Vignaux. Beginning in 1952 Lindbeck taught medieval philosophy and theology at Yale, and subsequently divided his teaching between Yale's religious studies department and its divinity school. He was selected to represent the Lutheran World Federation at the Second Vatican Council during 1962–5. Since the mid 1960s, Lindbeck's research and writing have contributed to national and international ecumenical dialogue. In 1982 he was named Pitkin Professor of Historical Theology at Yale. Lindbeck has continued to teach and write

since retiring in 1993, and in 2001 he was named a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Lindbeck's ecumenical work prompted him to reflect on the nature and function of theological doctrines. The result was his influential and controversial book, *The Nature of Doctrine: Religion and Theology in a Postliberal Age* (1984). This book shows the influence of Clifford GEERTZ, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Thomas S. KUHN, Peter L. BERGER, and a wide array of Protestant and Catholic theologians. Lindbeck's proposals, in conjunction with those of his Yale colleague Hans FREI, inaugurated what has become known as "postliberalism" – a theological effort to remedy perceived deficiencies in liberal Christian theologies while avoiding retreat to precritical orthodoxy.

Lindbeck proposes that religions be viewed as cultural–linguistic frameworks that structure human perceptions, experiences, attitudes, and actions. Becoming religious entails internalizing a semiotic system and acquiring a set of skills that together give rise to a distinctive form of life. Lindbeck likens this process to the training and practice required for gaining cultural and linguistic competence.

Although critical of cognitivist approaches that equate religious faith with belief in propositions, Lindbeck regards what he calls the "experiential-expressive" theory of religion as the chief competitor to his own. Associated with theological liberalism in the tradition of F. D. E. Schleiermacher, experiential-expressivism maintains that religious beliefs and practices are rooted in individual subjectivity. Humans have inner religious experiences that become externalized in words, deeds, symbols, and rituals. The precise nature of these religious experiences is debated among experiential-expressivists, but they are, by general agreement, preconceptual and potentially universally shared.

Lindbeck's cultural–linguistic theory denies that religion originates in private, preconceptual religious experience. Personal religious experiences may be nonreflective, but they are enabled and prompted by previously internalized systems of meaning. From a cultural–linguistic perspective, external communal religion precedes personal inner experience. A consequence is that different religions do not share an identical core experience symbolized in diverse ways; rather, they represent different cultural–linguistic systems that give rise to different religious experiences. The degree of diversity among these religious experiences varies according to the similarity or dissimilarity of the particular cultural–linguistic systems that are their context.

Once religions are viewed as cultural–linguistic systems, the experiential-expressivist claim that different religions are all true because they share a common experience of the divine loses credibility. Accordingly, Lindbeck takes up the question of religion and truth from the perspective of his cultural–linguistic theory of religion. What might it mean to say that one religion is uniquely and unsurpassably true? The question is important, thinks Lindbeck, because an adequate theory of religion must not exclude by methodological fiat claims to superiority made by particular religions.

Lindbeck addresses this issue by distinguishing between *categorical* and *ontological* truth. A categorically true religion, says Lindbeck, possesses concepts and categories adequate to ultimate reality. Adherents of a categorically true religion may make ontologically true or false religious statements, just as they may make correct or incorrect mathematical calculations. According to Lindbeck, religions that lack concepts and categories adequate to ultimate reality are categorically false. Such religions are neither true nor false ontologically; rather, they are *meaningless* just as describing the color red as "large" is meaningless.

Although Lindbeck maintains that religious utterances may correspond to reality, he emphasizes that this correspondence is not an attribute of religious statements themselves. On the contrary, such utterances are part of a "form of life, a way of being in the world, which itself corresponds to the Most

Important, the Ultimately Real" (1984, p. 65). Lindbeck compares his view to that of medieval scholasticism, which regarded truth as *adaequatio mentis ad rem* ("adequation of the mind to the thing"), noting that his cultural–linguistic theory broadens the medieval concept by envisioning an isomorphism of the entire life – and not merely the mind – to ultimate reality.

Lindbeck says that his cultural–linguistic theory of religion leads naturally to a "regulative" or "rule" theory of doctrine. As Lindbeck defines the term, "doctrine" denotes religious teachings regarded by a community as authoritative and essential. Doctrines are best viewed, Lindbeck thinks, as *rules* governing a particular religious group's discourse, attitudes, and behavior. Religious doctrines are analogous to grammar: just as grammatical rules establish norms for linguistic expression, so doctrinal rules provide guidelines for correct religious expression. Doctrinal propositions constitute second-order language meant to regulate first-order religious discourse (such as prayer, liturgy, preaching) and affirm "nothing about extra-linguistic or extra-human reality" (1984, p. 80). According to Lindbeck, doctrines "make intrasystemic rather than ontological truth claims" (1984, p. 80).

This last statement has been widely and wrongly interpreted to mean that Lindbeck views religious speech as a closed linguistic system, as if the crucial matter for religious faith is language about the divine rather than the divine itself. This misunderstanding arises from overlooking the distinction between first and second-order religious language. For Lindbeck, first-order religious language, when part of a categorically true religion and instantiated in a form of life, *does* correspond to extra-linguistic, extra-human reality. However, doctrines are second-order religious language, and they no more refer to extra-linguistic reality than do the rules of grammar. One should note, however, that Lindbeck intends here to speak of doctrine *qua* doctrine. He does allow that doctrines sometimes function nondoctrinally as first-order religious language, as when the Nicene Creed is recited in Christian worship.

Lindbeck thinks that a rule theory of doctrine is useful in ecumenical dialogue because it sometimes allows opposing doctrines to be reconciled by specifying when and where the rules apply, or by stipulating which rule takes precedence. Lindbeck also believes that his rule theory makes sense of doctrinal continuity and change. Regulative principles may remain unchanged, he says, even though expressed in historically conditioned language. At work here is the assumption that a doctrine's regulative content may be distinguished from its historically conditioned form. For example, Lindbeck argues that the christological doctrines of Nicea and Chalcedon entail at least three regulative principles: the "monotheistic principle," the "principle of historical specificity" (i.e., "the stories of Jesus refer to a genuine human being who was born, lived, and died in a particular time and place"), and the principle of "Christological maximalism" wherein "every possible importance is ascribed to Jesus that is not inconsistent with the first rules" (1984, p. 94). The Nicene and Chalcedonian creeds express these rules in the vocabulary of ancient classical culture, but the rules and not the form are permanently normative for Christian communities. Lindbeck here makes a *prescriptive* claim from the standpoint of his rule theory of doctrine.

Lindbeck maintains that his cultural–linguistic theory of religion gives rise to theology that is "intratextual" or "intrasemiotic." Rather than translating religious beliefs into external categories thought to be universal, the task of theology in a cultural–linguistic mode is to redescribe reality in terms of the framework of a specific religion. Lindbeck notes that for Christian theology this religious framework is largely, if not exclusively, the framework of the Bible. The biblical text, says Lindbeck in a frequently quoted statement, "absorbs the world, rather than the world the text" (1984, p. 118).

Lindbeck's approach to the Bible should not be confused with pre-critical orthodox approaches. Following Frei, Lindbeck regards the Bible as realistic narrative without supposing that it is historically accurate. The biblical narrative is "history-like" rather than "likely history." The religious value of the text is not compromised by this concession, thinks Lindbeck, because the abiding value of the Bible (as with the canonical texts of other religions) is its power to shape the perceptions and imaginations of readers, thereby creating a world in which believers may live.

Some critics have accused Lindbeck of commending a kind of sectarian fideism. They argue that an intratextual approach to theology depends on the assumption that religions form distinct, self-enclosed, and incommensurate semiotic systems impermeable to outside criticism. Whatever the merits of such charges, they call attention to Lindbeck's rejection of foundationalism. Religions are subject to rational testing procedures, says Lindbeck, but the rational norms applied cannot be formulated in "neutral, framework-independent language" (1984, p. 130). Ultimately, "the reasonableness of a religion is largely a function of its assimilative powers, of its ability to provide an intelligible interpretation in its own terms of the varied situations and realities adherents encounter" (1984, p. 131).

BIBILIOGRAPHY

The Future of Roman Catholic Theology (Philadelphia, 1970).

Infallibility (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1972).

"The Bible as Realistic Narrative," in *Consensus in Theology? A Dialogue with Hans Küng and Edward Schillebeeckx*, ed. Leonard Swidler (Philadelphia, 1980), pp. 81–5.

The Nature of Doctrine: Religion and Theology in a Postliberal Age (Philadelphia, 1984).

"The Story-Shaped Church: Critical Exegesis and Theological Interpretation," in *Scriptural Authority and Narrative Interpretation*, ed. Garrett Green (Philadelphia, 1987), pp. 161–78.

"Scripture, Consensus, and Community," in *Biblical Interpretation in Crisis*, ed. Richard John Neuhaus (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1989), pp. 74–101.

The Church in a Postliberal Age, ed. James J. Buckley (London, 2002).

Other Relevant Works

"The Problem of Doctrinal Development and Contemporary Protestant Theology," in *Man as Man and Believer*, ed. Edward Schillebeeckx and Boniface Willems (New York, 1967), pp. 133–49.

"The Sectarian Future of the Church," in *The God Experience*, ed. J. P. Whalen (New York, 1971), pp. 226–43.

"Barth and Textuality," *Theology Today* 43 (1986): 361–76.

"The Church's Mission to a Postmodern Culture," in *Postmodern Theology, Christian Faith in a Pluralistic World,* ed. Frederick B. Burnham (New York, 1989), pp. 37–55.

"Atonement and the Hermeneutics of Intratextual Social Empodiment," in *Nature of Confession: Evangelicals and Postliberals in Conversation*, ed. Timothy R. Phillips and Dennis L. Okholm (Downers Grove, Ill., 1997), pp. 221–40.

"Creeds and Confessions," in *The New Encyclopedia Britannica*, 15th edn (Chicago, 1998), vol. 26, pp. 785–8.

Further Reading

Marshall, Bruce D. "George Lindbeck," in *A New Handbook of Christian Theologians*, ed. Donald W. Musser and Joseph L. Price (Nashville, Tenn., 1996), pp. 271–7.

Marshall, Bruce D., ed. *Theology and Dialogue: Essays in Conversation with George Lindbeck* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1990).

Michalson, Gordon E., Jr. "The Response to Lindbeck," *Modern Theology* 4 (1988): 107–20.

Phillips, Timothy R., and Dennis L. Okholm, eds. *The Nature of Confession: Evangelicals and Postliberals in Conversation* (Downers Grove, Ill., 1996).

Tracy, David. "Lindbeck's New Program for Theology: A Reflection," *The Thomist* 49 (1985): 460–72.

Paul F. Sands

LINSKY, Leonard (1922–)

Leonard Linsky was born on 13 November 1992 in Chicago, Illinois. He received his BA in philosophy from the University of California at Berkeley in 1943. Upon completing his dissertation on Gottlob Frege and Rudolph CARNAP on reference under the supervision of Paul MARHENKE, Linsky received a PhD in philosophy from Berkeley in 1948. Linsky was appointed as assistant professor of philosophy in 1948 at the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, and taught there until 1967. He then became full professor in 1967 at the University of Chicago where he served as chair of the philosophy department. He retired in 1992, but has occasionally taught classes since then. Linsky was also a visiting professor at the University of Michigan, University of Wisconsin, Tel Aviv University, and the University of Amsterdam. He received a medal from the Université de Liège, Belgium. He served as President of the American Philosophical Association Western Division in 1976–7.

Linsky's scholarly work in philosophy of language, philosophy of logic, and early analytic philosophy spanned over three decades. He published his first edited anthology, *Semantics and the Philosophy of Language*, in 1952; the collection contains some of the most important classic papers in semantics and philosophy of language. Linsky published his first book, *Referring*, in 1967; it contains some of his previous published articles on Bertrand Russell's and Peter Strawson's theories of reference and descriptions. He published his second edited collection, *Reference and Modality*, in 1971, which includes many important pieces on modal contexts, opacity, and reference. His second book, *Names and Descriptions*, appeared in print in 1977. This work is a Fregean response to Saul KRIPKE's *Naming and Necessity*. In the academic year 1978–9, Linsky received a National Endowment for the Humanities Grant to work on a project about Frege's and Russell's theories of meaning, which eventually led to his third book, *Oblique Contexts*. While on leave from the University of Chicago during that same period, Linsky accepted Tel Aviv University's invitation to deliver the 1978 Yeshoua Bar-Hillel Memorial Lectures. A modified version of his three Bar-Hillel lectures was subsequently published in *Oblique Contexts*. Linsky was an Albert Einstein Visiting Scholar at the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities and returned to Tel Aviv University in the spring of 1981 to complete *Oblique Contexts,* which was published in 1983.

Linsky defended the Fregean view that proper names have a dual-component meaning: a *referential* component (the name's bearer) and a *cognitive* component (a Fregean sense). According to Linsky, when one first acquires a referential use of a proper name for a particular object, either by ostension or from other past users of the same name with the same reference, one invariably acquires a "criterion of identification," which is its sense. The criterion serves three functions. First, it identifies and re-identifies the same referent in different contexts and in different counterfactual situations. Second, it individuates the referent from everything else. Third, it forms, relative to a context of use, the informational content of the speaker's linguistic understanding of the name. An object is then said by Linsky to be the referent of a proper name, relative to a given occasion of use, just in case it satisfies, on that

occasion, the criterion of identification that the user of the name first acquired with the name and associates with the name as a matter of linguistic competence. Linsky's Fregean view is distinctive because he denies that a name's associated criterion of identification must have descriptive content. Thus, on Linsky's reading of Frege, Fregean senses need not be descriptions.

Linsky holds that, since proper names have or can have nondescriptive senses, some of Kripke's famous objections to the Fregean position can be met. In both *Names and Descriptions* and *Oblique Contexts*, Linsky focuses on two arguments that he attributes to Kripke. The first is that names lack a sense because they are rigid designators. The second is that names have no sense because, if they did, they would be sensitive to scope distinctions in modal contexts. Linsky's criticism of the first Kripkean argument is that being a rigid designator is compatible with a name's having a sense if its sense is a nondescriptive criterion of identification. For Linsky, a rigid designator is a singular term that refers to the same object in every possible world in which it has a referent (or, non-equivalently, it refers to the same object in every possible world in which that object exists). For Linsky, the name "Richard Nixon" is a rigid designator because it refers to Richard Nixon in every possible world in which it refers to something (or, in every world in which Nixon exists). According to Linsky, that is compatible with the claim that "Richard Nixon" also expresses a criterion of identification, which in this case is an "individual concept," namely, the concept of being the individual who is identical to *him* (while making a demonstration of Richard Nixon), that individuates Nixon in every counterfactual situation in which the name has a referent (or, in every counterfactual situation in which Nixon exists). The concept is an individual concept because it is necessarily true of, and true only of, a single individual, namely, Nixon. But it has no descriptive content since it is not true of Nixon by virtue of any contingent, purely qualitative property that only Nixon

has. Rather, it is true of Nixon because only Nixon is necessarily identical with himself.

Linsky's criticism of the second Kripkean argument is that it assumes that a name's being insensitive to scope-ambiguities in modal contexts is equivalent to its being insensitive to the de re/de dicto distinction in such contexts and that the latter is a consequence of a name's being a rigid designator. Linsky argues, however, that a name can be a rigid designator (in his sense) and still be sensitive to the modal de re/de dicto distinction. He cites Michael Dummett's example of "St. Anne," which (according to Dummett and Linsky) expresses (for many users of that name) the concept of being the mother of St. Mary. On the de re alethic modal reading, the sentence "St. Anne might not have been a mother" is true since, if things had been different in certain ways, for example, St. Anne may have been a virgin all her life, she would not have been a mother (in the biological sense). But on the de dicto alethic modal reading, the same sentence is false. For on that reading, the sentence is true only if, for every possible world, *W*, there is some possible individual *X* in *W* who is the referent of "St. Anne" in *W*, anyone in *W* who meets that condition in *W* bears *the-mother-of* relation to St. Mary in *W*, but *X* is not a mother in *W*. Since there can be no such world in which all of those conditions are met, "St. Anne might not have been a mother," is false on the de dicto modal reading and is not about our St. Anne or any actual person in particular. And yet, "St. Anne" rigidly designates St. Anne.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ed., *Semantics and the Philosophy of Language* (Urbana, Ill., 1952).
"Substitutivity and Descriptions," *Journal of Philosophy* 63 (1966): 673–83.
Referring (London, 1967).
Reference and Modality (Oxford, 1971).
"Two Concepts of Quantification," *Noûs* 6 (1972): 224–39.
Names and Descriptions (Chicago, 1977).
Oblique Contexts (Chicago, 1983).

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v8

Genova, A. C. "Linsky on Quine's Way Out," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 37 (1976): 109–15.

Tait, William, ed. *Early Analytic Philosophy, Frege, Russell, Wittgenstein: Essays in Honor of Leonard Linsky* (Chicago, 1997).

Vision, Gerald. "Linsky on Rigid Designation and Sense," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 58 (1980): 291–7.

Reinaldo Elugardo

LIPPMANN, Walter (1889–1974)

Walter Lippmann was born on 23 September 1889 in New York City. He attended private schools in New York City and entered Harvard University in 1906. Harvard profoundly shaped his conflicting desires for selecting a vocation as either an academic or a social activist. That he eventually decided to combine them in a career as a public intellectual is largely due to the combined influences of William JAMES, George SANTAYANA, and British socialist Graham Wallas. From James he learned to respect difference, appreciate the pragmatist values of pluralism, experientialism, and the ways in which vigilant and participatory action by literate citizens strengthened democracies. Santayana's influence was demonstrated in Lippmann's ability to criticize popular democracy from a conservative standpoint, and inspired the detachment and self-control Lippmann used in his writings, especially when criticizing the blunders and failures of politicians. Soon after arriving at Harvard, Lippmann became a socialist and was co-founder of the Harvard Socialist Club. He earned an MA in philosophy in 1910 and became a reporter for the socialist newspaper, *Boston Common.* In 1911 he went to work for muckraking journalist Lincoln Steffens. In the 1912 elections Lippmann supported the Progressive Party and former President Theodore Roosevelt. These efforts caught the attention of Herbert CROLY, who in 1914 invited him to join the staff of *The New Republic* where he worked as associate editor from 1914 to 1917. In 1917 Lippmann was appointed Assistant Secretary of War and after World War I he helped to draft peace agreements for the 1919 Paris Peace Conference.

In 1920 Lippmann left *The New Republic* and from 1921 to 1931 he was on the editorial staff of the *New York World,* serving as editor the last two years. In 1931 he began writing a syndicated column, *Today and Tomorrow*, for the New York *Herald Tribune.* Lippmann began living in Washington, D.C. in 1938 and his column later moved to the Washington *Post* in 1962. Though he initially supported Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal, Lippmann later changed his mind, uncomfortable with its collectivism (*The Good Society*, 1937). He continuously earned high marks for his political writings, as well as being a farsighted and incisive analyst of American foreign policy. He opposed the Korean War, McCarthyism, and the Vietnam War. He was awarded a special Pulitzer Prize citation in 1958 for his superior news analysis in *U.S. War Aims* (1944), *The Cold War* (1947), *Isolation and Alliances* (1952), and *Western Unity and the Common Market* (1962). He was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom in September 1964. In 1967 he stopped writing his regular newspaper column and moved back to New York City, where he died on 14 December 1974.

Lippmann was an influential journalist and public figure for over six decades, eventually earning the distinction of public philosopher. Throughout his career he supported both political parties (Democrats and Republicans), and was never beholden to either liberals or conservatives. His early involvement with socialism and muckraking journalism was followed

by a period of dark pessimism in the years after World War I. As the United States grew as a world power, he became increasingly uneasy about its democratic principles leading it to resolve political disputes in war. He also became increasingly apprehensive about the growing influence of the mass media to manipulate public opinion, particularly when it was used to garner support for American military intervention.

Lippmann's concerns about modern democracy are announced in his controversial books *Public Opinion* (1922) and *The Phantom Public* (1925). Both books expressed his growing disillusionment with pragmatic progressivism and its vision of participatory democracy, and directly criticized John DEWEY's hopes for an educated and politically active citizenry. Since the typical citizen is too ignorant, narrow-minded, and apathetic to help with national issues and problems, real political power should rest with elected officials and expert social scientists. These elites should "manufacture consent" by manipulating public opinion towards pre-decided goals. These attacks provoked Dewey to compose *The Public and Its Problems* (1927) in reply.

Lippmann's *A Preface to Morals* (1929) reveals the extent of influence from Santayana, and through Santayana, Aristotle's conception of practical reason. The search for happiness by satisfying desires only generates the illusion that increased freedom and power can produce the good life. Nothing is further from the truth, declares Lippmann, and modern religion cannot produce the good life either. What is required is the detached perspective of disinterestedness, the moral point of view, from which it is possible to evaluate our desires and how they may be practically satisfied.

During the 1920s and much of the 1930s, Lippmann carefully watched the domestic and international scene. He vacillated between advocating disarmament or increasing American naval strength, and whether to foster international cooperation or to build an Anglo-American domination of the seas. He argued against military intervention against Nazi Germany in hopes that somehow this would maintain the current system of international stability. After World War II, he recognized that the American policy of containment was haunted by the prospect of continuous if not total war. He also worried that such a policy would result in a misuse of American power both domestically and abroad. He foresaw how a policy of containment placed the United States on the defensive, forced to react continuously to Soviet aggression around the world. It also forced the United States to fund and support its own satellite states, puppet governments and agents, neglecting its own "natural allies" in the Atlantic community. Lippmann saw America's allies further alienated by the fact that they did not wish to become, like the nations of the perimeter, the clients of the United States, and their lands become future battlefields to be ravaged by Russian and American armies.

Lippmann's influence was also due to his ability to form cooperative relationships with leading politicians, to write about their policies with some insight, since in many cases he helped form them. According to one biography (Steel 1980), Lippmann played an important role in shaping American war aims in 1917, in helping Senator Borah defeat the Versailles Treaty, in settling an angry dispute with Mexico in the late 1920s, in developing the concepts of the 1940 destroyer-bases deal and of Lend-Lease, and even in responding to Soviet threats after the war.

Though inclined toward conservatism, Lippmann's proposals were contradictory and his fundamental preference for caution was clear. He usually adopted the views and endorsed the policies of those in power at the beginning of their terms. However, as their actions led them either to failure or placed the nation into some jeopardy, Lippmann reproached them and finally demanded their removal in favor of "safer" men; to see Franklin Roosevelt replaced by such men as Alf Landon or Wendell Willkie, Harry Truman

by Thomas Dewey and Dwight D. Eisenhower, and finally, Lyndon Johnson by Richard Nixon in 1968. This serial transition from admirer to critic reflected his ability continuously to re-evaluate political leaders and policies, no matter how promising they were initially. No matter what the political climate, Lippmann's prose, analysis, and insight were incisive and influential.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Preface to Politics (New York, 1913).

Drift and Mastery: An Attempt to Diagnose the Current Unrest (New York, 1914).

The Stakes of Diplomacy (New York, 1915).

The Political Scene: An Essay on the Victory of 1918 (New York, 1919).

Liberty and the News (New York, 1920).

Public Opinion (New York, 1922).

The Phantom Public (New York, 1925).

Men of Destiny (New York, 1927).

A Preface to Morals (New York, 1929).

The Method of Freedom (New York, 1934).

An Inquiry into the Principles of the Good Society (Boston, 1937).

U.S. Foreign Policy: Shield of the Republic (New York, 1943).

U.S. War Aims (New York, 1944).

The Cold War: A Study in U.S. Foreign Policy (New York, 1947).

Isolation and Alliances (Boston, 1952).

Essays in the Public Philosophy (Boston, 1955).

Western Unity and the Common Market (Boston, 1962).

Public Persons, ed. Gilbert Harrison (New York, 1976).

Other Relevant Works

Lippmann's papers are at Yale University.

The Essential Lippmann: A Political Philosophy for Liberal Democracy, ed. Clinton Rossiter and James Lare (New York, 1963).

Conversations with Walter Lippmann (Boston, 1965).

Early Writings, ed. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. (New York, 1970).

Force and Ideas: The Early Writings, ed. Gilbert Harrison (New Brunswick, N.J., 1970).

Public Philosopher: Selected Letters of Walter Lippmann, ed. John Morton Blum (New York, 1985).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v6*

Blum, D. Steven. *Walter Lippmann: Cosmopolitarianism in the Century of Total War* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1984).

Dewey, John. *The Public and Its Problems* (New York, 1927).

Diggins, John P. *The Promise of Pragmatism: Modernism and the Crisis of Knowledge and Authority* (Chicago, 1994).

Riccio, Barry. *Walter Lippmann: Odyssey of a Liberal* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1994).

Said, Edward. *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays* (Cambridge, Mass, 2000).

Seyd, Anwar. *Walter Lippmann's Philosophy of International Politics* (Philadelphia, 1963).

Steel, Ronald. *Walter Lippmann and the American Century* (Boston, 1980).

Jean Van Delinder

LLEWELLYN, Karl Nickerson
(1893–1962)

Karl N. Llewellyn was born on 22 May 1893 in Seattle, Washington. He spent most of his early years in Brooklyn, New York, and

Mecklenburg, Germany, subsequently entering Yale College in 1911. Llewellyn spent additional summers in Europe, both at the University of Lausanne and the University of Paris. He was in Paris when World War I began in 1914, and he immediately enlisted in the German Army. After being wounded in action, he received the Iron Cross second class and returned to the US in 1915.

Llewellyn entered Yale Law School in 1915, receiving his LL.B. magna cum laude in 1918 and his JD in 1920. He served as an instructor of law at Yale in 1919–20, and turned to full-time practice of commercial and banking law in New York from 1920 to 1922. He returned to Yale as an associate professor of law in 1922, moving to the Columbia University Law School in 1924. Llewellyn was made Betts Professor of Jurisprudence at Columbia in 1930, and was appointed Reporter for the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) in 1944. He made one final career move in 1951 to the University of Chicago Law School, where he was professor of law until his death. He supported the UCC's adoption by the states and serving as Federal Commissioner on the Rights, Liberties and Responsibilities of the American Indian. Llewellyn died on 13 February 1962 in Chicago, Illinois. He amassed a publications record of more than 240 books, journal articles, and essays; and left behind over 100 unpublished manuscripts.

Llewellyn is widely known for being a chief proponent of legal realism. In particular, he introduced his interests in cultural anthropology to his jurisprudence, and so developed and advocated his own version of a sociology of law. He was inclined to follow this lead by studying the work of William Graham SUMNER as presented at Yale College by one of Sumner's disciples, A. G. Keller, and was also influenced by Arthur L. Corbin and Wesley N. HOHFELD at Yale Law School. In opposition to Roscoe POUND, however, Llewellyn fervently denied that realism was a "school" that drew together an identifiable group of scholars around a settled core of principles or dogmas,

out of which their scholarship might be said to grow. Llewellyn's realism did claim, in opposition to formalism, that rules do not dictate results in particular cases, but that was not to claim that rules did not exist or guide judges' decisions. Rather, he proposed that realism was a method rather than a programmatic description of the legal process. One of his key observations is that a court observer can fairly speak of "reckonable" rather than predictable decisions, meaning that judicial decisions are sensitive to the particular facts arising in each case along with reasons that can be advanced to give more or less weight to them for purposes of the exercise of judicial judgment. Still, since facts do not themselves align in simple syllogisms to produce a result, we should not be surprised that more than one outcome is reckonable in any particular case. A realist, then, seeks to describe this methodology of judicial decision-making rather than waste time predicting decisions in particular cases.

From our vantage point in time, what is of interest is that such ready observations were in Llewellyn's day quite new and provocative. That so many such insights are now taken for granted suggests a measure of his continuing influence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cases and Materials on the Law of Sales (Chicago, 1930).

The Cheyenne Way: Conflict and Case Law in Primitive Jurisprudence, with E. Adamson Hoebel (Norman, Okla., 1941).

The Common Law Tradition: Deciding Appeals (Boston, 1960).

Jurisprudence: Realism in Theory and Practice (Chicago, 1962).

Other Relevant Works

Llewellyn's papers are at University of Chicago Law School.

"Some Realism about Realism," *Harvard Law Review* 44 (1931): 1222–64.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*,
  Comp Amer Thought, *Dict Amer Bio*,
  Encyc Social Behav Sci, *Routledge Encycl*
  Phil, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*

Twining, William. *The Karl Llewellyn*
  Papers: A Guide to the Collection
  (Chicago, 1968).

———, *Karl Llewellyn and the Realist*
  Movement (London, 1973).

D. W. Skubik

LLOYD, Alfred Henry (1864–1927)

Alfred H. Lloyd was born on 3 January 1864 in
Montclair, New Jersey. He received the BA in
1886 and PhD in philosophy in 1893 from
Harvard University, studying primarily with
William JAMES, Josiah ROYCE, and George H.
PALMER. From 1889 to 1891 he studied in
Göttingen, Berlin, and Heidelberg. Lloyd later
recalled that his appreciation for Anglo-
American thought only increased in Germany,
but his thought was guided towards synthesizing
the best parts of idealism, realism, and empiri-
cism. His philosophical training appealed to
John DEWEY, who brought him to Michigan in
1891. After Dewey and George MEAD left for the
University of Chicago in 1894, Lloyd assumed
the department administrative responsibilities,
and advanced to full professor by 1906. With his
colleague Robert WENLEY, Lloyd guided the
department toward its future excellence with
the later additions of Roy Wood SELLARS,
Charles Vibbert, and DeWitt PARKER. Known
for selflessness, integrity, and forthrightness
across campus, and admired for his admirable
moral and personal character by his philosoph-
ical colleagues, Lloyd was an exemplary and
productive scholar and teacher. He published
five books and over seventy articles. He was
active in campus organizations and the Western
Division of the American Philosophical
Association, which elected him their President in
1915–16. He also served as Dean of the graduate
school from 1915 to 1924, and Acting President
in 1925. Lloyd collapsed while giving a gradua-
tion address and died in Ann Arbor, Michigan,
on the next day, 11 May 1927.

In contrast to the more Hegelian and ratio-
nalistic idealism taught by Wenley, Lloyd
agreed with Dewey and Mead that neither
experience nor reality is determined by what
could be known to a perfect mind. On the one
hand, this refusal forbids science from deciding
what reality is, and so reductive materialism is
false. On the other hand, denying that reality
and mind are coextensive blocks the route
toward Absolute idealism taken by some of
their contemporaries, such as Royce, James
CREIGHTON, and William HOCKING. The
Michigan philosophers rejected the dualisms
that divided nature from consciousness and
objects from values. The experienced world of
valuable goods *is* the external world of physical
objects; what we experience is not trapped
inside nonnatural minds. No sharp disconti-
nuities persist; all realities must be both inter-
connected and mutually dependent on their
relationships. Following James and Royce in
pursuit of the problem of the part and whole,
and of the one and the many, Lloyd concluded
that reality is a contextual system of evolving
organic relations. Such systematicity forbids
postulating autonomous parts having only con-
tingent and external relations to other parts.
The law of the excluded middle, nominalistic
empiricism, extreme pluralism, and atomistic
materialism are all thus rejected. Lloyd could
not fully accept James's radical pluralism or
Dewey's emergent naturalism, although his
own process metaphysics is not far from either.

Lloyd agreed with Dewey and Mead's func-
tional and social psychology, moving away
from personal idealism as well. Ideas have
meaning and value because they serve to direct
successful efforts to transform the environment
in concert with others. Introspection catches
static concepts only by removing their living

force and relevance to knowledge. Lloyd's most pragmatic book is *Dynamic Idealism: An Elementary Course in the Metaphysics of Psychology* (1898), which parallels the maturing instrumentalism of his Chicago friends and anticipates the robust transactionalism of Dewey's later years. Life is self-active growth embodied in organism–environment systems. Free will and determinism are psuedo-problems. The will "is not arbitrarily creative but responsibly mediative. It is not something imposed on activity from without, but is itself part of activity." The personal is the ideal, but the ideal is not self-standing but always relationally dependent on the environment.

With Dewey and Jane ADDAMS, Lloyd's confidence in the fluidity of social relations justifies his rejection of isolating individualism, herdmentality nationalism, and morally divisive religions. The historian's method should be evolutionary (avoiding a quest for cycles or a template of fated progress), and focused on cultural values instead of dry facts. God, when properly understood, is that which is "inspiring or animating the natural with unlimited freedom and possibility." In Lloyd's vision of advancing international cosmopolitanism, a truly "united nations" would advance beyond the useful League of Nations by embracing cultural interchange and synthesis, which has always occurred despite political barriers. Lloyd's social democracy emphasizes rights to participation and productivity, necessary for personal development.

BIBILIOGRAPHY

Citizenship and Salvation; or, Greek and Jew: A Study in the Philosophy of History (Boston, 1897).

Dynamic Idealism: An Elementary Course in the Metaphysics of Psychology (Chicago, 1898).

Philosophy of History: An Introduction to the Philosophical Study of Politics (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1899).

The Will to Doubt: An Essay in Philosophy for the General Thinker (London, 1907).

Leadership and Progress and Other Essays of Progress (Boston, 1922).

Other Relevant Works

"Epistemology and Physical Science," *Philosophical Review* 7 (1898): 374–81.

"Ethics and Its History," *American Journal of Sociology* 11 (1905): 229–51.

"Radical Empiricism and Agnosticism," *Mind* 17 (1908): 175–92.

"The Possible Idealism of a Pluralist," *American Journal of Theology* 14 (1910): 406–21.

"The Duplicity of Democracy," *American Journal of Sociology* 21 (1915): 1–14.

"Negation and Direction," *Philosophical Review* 25 (1916): 482–99.

"Pragmatism and Metaphysics," *Journal of Philosophy* 14 (1917): 477–83.

"The Glory of Democracy – Poetry, Comedy, and Duty," *International Journal of Ethics* 28 (1918): 179–96.

"When Gods Are Born," *International Journal of Ethics* 29 (1919): 272–83.

"The Function of Philosophy in Reconstruction," *Journal of Philosophy* 16 (1919): 505–18.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v23*, *Pres Addr of APA v2*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Cross, A. L., D. H. Parker, and R. M. Wenley. "Alfred Henry Lloyd, 1864–1927," *Journal of Philosophy* 25 (1928): 124–30.

Perry, Charles M. "Alfred Henry Lloyd (1864–1927)," *Philosophia* 3 (1938): 12–22.

Randall, John Herman, Jr. "Josiah Royce and American Idealism," in *Philosophy after Darwin: Chapters for The Career of Philosophy, volume III, and Other Essays*, ed. Beth Singer (New York, 1977).

Shirk, Evelyn U. *Adventurous Idealism: The Philosophy of Alfred Lloyd* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1952).

John R. Shook

LOCKE, Alain Leroy (1885–1954)

Alain L. Locke played many roles in his life: cultural critic, editor, author, mentor, educator, patron of the arts, and philosopher. He was born on 13 September 1885 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and died on 9 June 1954 in New York City. He was the son of Mary H. Locke, a teacher in Camden, New Jersey who attended the Felix Adler Ethical Society. Locke's father, Pliny I. Locke, was a graduate of Howard University's Law School (1872), and worked for the Freedmen's Bureau and the Freedmen's Bank. Locke was among the first African-American graduates of the prestigious Central High School in Philadelphia. He received his BA from Harvard University in 1907. He was the first African American to win a scholastic competition to become a Rhodes Scholar at the University of Oxford from 1907 to 1910, earning a B.Litt. degree, and at the University of Berlin in 1910–11. He was an assistant professor of education at Howard University in Washington, D.C. from 1912 to 1917, and then founded Howard University's philosophy department when he became professor of philosophy in 1917. He was the first African American to be awarded a PhD from Harvard University's department of philosophy in 1918.

Locke's short essays, "Cosmopolitanism" (1908), "Oxford Contrasts" (1909), and "The American Temperament" (1911), written while a Rhodes Scholar, tell the story of his aversion to racial essentialism, whether in the form of European racialism or black *kitsch*. Locke's cosmopolitanism was a part of his lived experience in Europe, exemplified by his experiences with racial prejudice and his relationship with future luminaries such as Pixley K. I. Seme, creator of organizations that became the African National Congress in South Africa, and Horace M. KALLEN, future cultural pluralist and later a noted Zionist.

In many ways Locke's 1918 doctoral dissertation, "The Problem of Classification in the Theory of Value," prefigured his future theoretical contributions to value theory. His dissertation was completed under the direction of Ralph B. PERRY, who later wrote the definitive biography of the pragmatist William JAMES. Locke argued that values perpetually undergo transvaluation. Categorizing painting, for example, as potentially beautiful, rather than associating beauty with a formal proof in symbolic logic, is a way of categorizing the object of beauty that is not intrinsic to the object. Transvaluation for Locke makes it possible to associate beauty with proofs in symbolic logic. His work in axiology was coterminous with the development of his pragmatism. He considered the relationship between our daily world of practice and our world of value creation as tied together such that values existed in a living connection to activity. Locke arrived at his views through a review and critique of authors he found informative, especially Christian Freiherr von Enrenfels, Alexius Meinong, Franz Brentano, and Wilbur URBAN.

While an instructor at Howard University, prior to completing his doctoral dissertation, Locke presented a series of lectures, sponsored by the then nascent National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), in Washington, D.C. in 1916. These lectures were collected in an anthology, *Race Contacts and Interracial Relations* (1992). Locke was denied the opportunity to teach a course on race relations at Howard University because the then white administration in the arts did not consider the topic of race relations academically warranted. Consequently, the NAACP sponsored Locke's presentation. One reason for sponsoring him was that, as a baccalaureate graduate of Harvard University, a doctoral candidate in philosophy, and the first black Rhodes Scholar, he was among the most highly accomplished intellectuals in the black community. Locke argued that race did not determine culture and that race was not a biologically determined category. He contended that race was strictly socially defined and thereby constantly changing. Racialized groups for Locke were warranted in organizing themselves as socially shaped cultural groups, of which their racial-

ization was a cultural feature, in order to defeat racism and to promote their cultural goods. Race-consciousness, whether functionally beneficial as a way for groups to sustain cohesion and promote their unique cultural goods or as a vicious source of prejudice, was considered by Locke as relatively permanent. However, contrary to the then most noted anthropologist of race, Franz BOAS, and the tendency of the most noted sociologist and political activist of the time, W. E. B. DU BOIS, Locke rejected the link between blood and racial genius and blood and culture. Race was a nonnatural category. He tended to sustain the Darwinian picture of groups competing for scarce resources, where race was one way to form cohesion to maximized offspring chances, but he rejected the social Darwinian justification of racism, namely, that whatever race dominated surely was ipso facto evidence of their inherent superior cognitive ability. Racism for Locke was a function of practice – groups usurping undue material and status resources through an array of relationships.

Locke's value theory, developed in its nascent stage as early as his doctoral dissertation in 1918, and his exploration of the nature of racial ontology, introduced in his formative period, yet highly controversial and provocative, in his 1916 lectures, are the foundations for his unique version of pragmatism: critical pragmatism. Critical pragmatism promotes a deepseated commitment to transforming a world, too often filled with racial hatred and prejudice, through intellectual engagement in ways that do not rely on what he considered the enemies of cross-cultural communication – absolutism, metaphysics, and treating existing social groups, including any particular race or nation, as a natural creation rather than as the vagary of human manufacture. Rather than promoting ethics of absolutist principles, cultural uniformity, or a realism of aesthetics that contended that there are beauty-making properties tied to unchanging creations, Locke's critical pragmatism promoted aesthetic pluralism whereby beauty-making properties are considered subject to transvaluation. Neither an approach of reasoned judgments to convince the racists and those suffering from self-deprecation, often favored by liberals, nor the imposition of propaganda, often favored by absolutists, are genuine sources of aesthetic change. Racist images, like all other images, change for Locke through grand shifts, leaps, breaks, disjunctions, and rifts – transposition, transvaluation, transfiguring.

It was the Bahá'i faith that, in the 1920s, Locke found most spiritually satisfying. Unlike all other classical American pragmatists, such as John DEWEY or Jane ADDAMS, who were fundamentally Christian or Christian in the kinds of religious sensibilities they expressed, Locke attended Bahá'i firesides, titulary joined but never consistently practiced Bahá'i religious doctrine. Nonetheless, he wrote for the Bahá'i *World*, considered religious pluralism (the view that all religions provide a contribution to our understanding of spiritual possibilities) far more appealing than religious dogmatism, traveled to Haifa, a religious center for the Bahá'i, found the Bahá'i moral requirement of racial amity appealing, and maintained a lifelong respect for the Bahá'i faith.

Locke can be seen as one of the first "Renaissance" men of the modern age because he is best known for the crucial role he played in the Harlem Renaissance (1919–35), when his edited anthology *The New Negro* (1925) served as the anchor of an innovative collection of literary and art works that inaugurated the Renaissance. Harlem, a community in Manhattan, New York, was often identified as the center of a national cultural movement that attacked the popular definition of *humanitas* – particularly, activists attacked the categorization of humanity into racial kinds and their arrangement into hierarchies, and they attacked the way the black was treated as an inferior subject, incapable of creating aesthetically pleasing works, and as a living embodiment of the ugly encased in a biologically determined and unchanging racial category. From his position as a professor of philosophy from 1917 to 1954

at Howard University, Locke was the most influential intellectual associate of an entire generation of artists, writers, and scholars, including authors in the anthology, *The New Negro*: Langston Hughes, Claude McKay, Countee Cullen, Zora Neale Hurston, Montgomery Gregory, Albert C. BARNES, Jessie Fauset, Arthur A. Schomburg, James W. Johnson, Robert R. Moton, Kelly Miller, and Ralph Bunche. *The New Negro* also included illustrations by Winold Reiss and Aaron Douglas, as well as songs, a copy of an anti-slavery pamphlet cover, and African sculptures. The "Introduction" to *The New Negro* announced the existence of a generation of black activists who rejected the stereotypes associated with Negroes as poor imitators of white artistic creators and self-effacing minstrel musicians; rejected scholarship that was deferential to the way white racialists perpetuated the myth that black poverty was self-induced, and that white racist expropriation of black wealth through pillage and theft were non-existent. Authors in *The New Negro* portrayed blacks as responsible, creative, complex, and honorable agents. *The New Negro* poets, playwrights, artists, sculptors, and essayists avoided romanticizing African people as primitives, emotionally uncontrolled and lacking virtues. For different reasons, Houston A. Baker, Jr., in *Modernism and the Harlem Renaissance*, and George Hutchinson, in *The Harlem Renaissance in Black and White*, concur that the classical heritage which the vast majority of Renaissance authors hoped to recover was not a pristine African culture nor a vision of the pure emotive primitive. Locke was concerned to make apparent those features of African-American culture that existed historically, which were either nascent in the artistic production of the victimized black or openly expressed but ignored.

Locke's expressionism – namely, that the aesthetic dimension arises from experience and is often an expression or reflection of feelings and needs intricate to cultural realities – motivated his argument that black folk culture was a source of sophisticated and universally valuable aesthetic products. Locke rejected the traditional distinction between folk art and high art in which high art was the product of independent intellects uninfluenced by folk culture. High culture, for Locke, best existed as an expression of the sophisticated results of select folk expressions. The Renaissance for Locke was not a recovery of the classical, nor a return to a pristine past, but a recovery and creation of the universalizable within the past and present folk.

Locke's expressionism existed in conjunction with his advocacy theory approach. The project of aesthetic appreciation and creation, for Locke, in its best manifestation existed as a function of promoting human uplift. It was not the disinterested, dispassionate, unconnected, third-person observer of artistic form, structure, idiom, and theme that determined the beautiful. Rather, it was such for realistic features in living relationship to content, context, function, expression, experience, and contribution to human uplift that represented the best traditions of artistic creation. For Locke, artistic expression is invariably tied to the existence of some community, although likely a matter of individual creation. Commitment to a community's uplift or expressing some feature of a peculiar history is compatible with the creating of universally valuable art. In one sense, valuation is always tied to transvaluation and transposition. Thus, his view of indeterminacy in language translation, the sociality of language and the fluidity of possible meanings undergirded his approach to community and identity.

Locke favored moderate cosmopolitanism and democratic socialism, contrary to an approach to community that promoted racial nationalism advocated by the nationalist Marcus GARVEY, leader of the Universal Negro Improvement Association, or that of class analysis of Marxist-influenced socialist activists such as Hubert H. Harrison. Locke's approach is best exemplified by his anthology, *When Peoples Meet: A Study in Race and Culture*

Contacts (1942), co-edited with Bernard J. Stern, published by the Progressive Education Association and drawn from a series of lectures under the organizational leadership of Ruth BENEDICT. Locke and Stern collected papers that helped establish that communities are constantly in formation and that cross-cultural contact transforms the valuations each community considers unique to its own heritage. The dream of ethnic or racial authenticity and relative autonomy for the editors was a misguided dream, just as the dream of anarchists, communists, or radical cosmopolitans who favor the negation of all boundaries is defeated by our need to be in communities of close association, associations that need not become egregious forms of separatism.

Locke's approach to pedagogy was enlivened by his cosmopolitan approach to community and values. Cultural education in the arts creates alternative, non-racist, xenophobic, ethnocentric values and ways of viewing persons as full agents. It does so because artistic appreciation involves reformation of perception, whereas appeal to analysis, reasoned argumentation, and dialogue (literal mindedness) or propaganda (which relies on maintaining rigid categories and uses the same assumptions about reality as its object) all fail to accomplish a substantially new arena of thought. Locke, as the President of the American Association for Adult Education in 1945, introduced cultural education as a central feature of adult education. He edited a series, the *Brown Booklets*, that provided historical accounts of African-American life and accomplishment. As a tireless promoter of young artists and literature, he authored annual reviews of African-American literature for the journal *Opportunity*. The world of artistic creation, however, was as much involved in promoting stereotypes and demeaning images as the world of propaganda and literal argumentation. Locke was not oblivious to the problems of using progressive overgeneralizations, such as stylized-honored motifs of black achievers or romantic presentations of black culture as a culture enlivened by a desire

for human uplift without the terrors of interracial class exploitation. However, for Locke, there is a propensity for the ennobling to win out over the degrading. The object of degradation will, over time, surmount the ill effects of self or other deprecation. The agents of demeaning stereotypes and those that valorize the pain inflicted on others are likely to change, not as a function of what is arguably unwarranted, but as a function of what is unlikely to satisfy across cultural borders.

Locke's faith in art as ennobling and providing alternative perceptions was often criticized as romantic. W. E. B. Du Bois, the leading political and intellectual head of liberal and progressive activists during the Renaissance, criticized Locke for promoting art for its own sake and expecting alternative perspectives to be a substantive source for social change. Although Locke never claimed that cultural changes were the sole, primary, or fundamental causal agent for social change, he consistently maintained that altered perspectives through the arts were a crucial factor for the possibility of change. His rejection of folk culture as itself high culture, that is, the anarchist view that all cultural products are inherently equal, and his maintaining the distinction between high and low art, although within the context of advocacy art, was criticized by such artists as Zora Neale Hurston and Claude McKay as being elitist and as maintaining the stiffing view that African-American artists had a moral responsibility to engage in racial uplift.

Locke has also been criticized, especially by more contemporary authors, for occasionally treating racial groups as ethnic groups, for blurring the distinction between the two, and for occasionally treating race as a stable category or conflating racial identity and cultural productions. His use of such terms as "race geniuses" or "race gift" to depict an author or artistic contribution arguably shows that Locke was not completely free of thinking in terms of racial categories as categories defining kinds and contributions. Locke knowingly used romantic images of blacks on more

than one occasion. He thereby used ennobling stereotypes to fight demeaning stereotypes, facing the reality that stereotyping necessarily subordinates important individual distinctions and treats persons invariably as members of an undifferentiated group. This ameliorative use of stereotypes reflects his pragmatic theory of valuation, a theory that requires the continual reevaluation of categories used to picture reality. Locke's theory of valuation, his advocacy aesthetics, his insistence on moral imperatives as a necessary condition for the possibility of a moral community, his pedagogy of discipline and cultural integration, and his views of community as an evolving democratic experiment, all form a unique chapter of American pragmatism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Cosmopolitanism," *The Oxford Cosmopolitan* 1 (1908): 15–16.

"Oxford Contrasts," *Independent* 67 (July 1909): 139–42.

"The American Temperament," *North American Review* 194 (August 1911): 262–70.

The Negro in America (Chicago, 1933).

"Values and Imperatives," in *American Philosophy: Today and Tomorrow*, ed. Horace M. Kallen and Sidney Hook (New York, 1935), pp. 312–33.

Negro Art: Past and Present (Washington, D.C., 1936).

The Negro and His Music (Washington, D.C., 1936).

The Critical Temper of Alain Locke: A Selection of His Essays on Art and Culture, ed. Jeffrey C. Stewart (New York, 1983).

The Philosophy of Alain Locke: Harlem Renaissance and Beyond, ed. Leonard Harris (Philadelphia, 1989).

Race Contacts and Interracial Relations, ed. Jeffrey C. Stewart (Washington, D.C., 1992).

Other Relevant Works

Locke's papers are at Howard University in Washington, D.C.

Ed., *The New Negro: An Interpretation* (New York, 1925).

Ed. with Bernhard J. Stern, *When Peoples Meet: A Study in Race and Culture Contacts* (New York, 1942).

Ed. with R. M. McIver, *Group Relations and Group Antagonisms* (New York, 1944).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Blackwell Amer Phil*, *Blackwell Comp Prag*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Proc of APA v28*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*

Baker, Houston A., Jr. *Modernism and the Harlem Renaissance* (Chicago, 1987).

Buck, Christopher. "Alain Locke: *Bahá'i* Philosopher," *Bahá'i Studies Review* 10 (2001): 7–50.

Gatewood, Willard B. *Aristocrats of Color: The Black Elite, 1880–1920* (Bloomington, Ind., 1990).

Harris, Leonard, ed. *The Critical Pragmatism of Alain Locke: A Reader on Value Theory, Aesthetics, Community, Culture, Race, and Education* (New York, 1999).

Hutchinson, George. *The Harlem Renaissance in Black and White* (Cambridge, Mass., 1995).

Kofi Cain, Rudolph Alexander. *Alain Leroy Locke: Race, Culture, and the Education of African American Adults* (Amsterdam, 2003).

Linneman, Russell J., ed. *Alain Locke: Reflections on a Modern Renaissance Man* (Baton Rouge, La., 1982).

Washington, Johnny. *Alain Locke and Philosophy: A Quest for Cultural Pluralism* (Westport, Conn., 1986).

———, *A Journey into the Philosophy of Alain Locke* (Westport, Conn., 1994).

Watson, Steven. *The Harlem Renaissance: Hub of African-American Culture, 1920–1930* (New York, 1995).

Leonard Harris

LOCKWOOD, Belva Ann Bennett
(1830–1917)

Belva Lockwood was born Belva Ann Bennett on 24 October 1830 to Hannah Green Bennett and Lewis Johnson Bennett in Royalton, New York, a farming community in Niagara County. She earned a BS degree in 1857 from Genesee College (now Syracuse University, and a law degree in 1873 from the District of Columbia Law School (now George Washington National Law Center). She successfully petitioned for the right to argue cases before the District of Columbia courts, the federal courts, and the Supreme Court of the United States, all of which had been barred to women. She also became deeply involved in the women's rights movement. In 1884 Lockwood accepted the nomination of the Equal Rights Party as its presidential candidate, with running mate Marietta Stow, becoming the first viable woman candidate for the US presidency and winning the electoral vote of Indiana. She ran again on the Equal Rights Party ticket in 1888. She joined the progressive wing of the pacifist movement, helping to establish the Universal Peace Union in the 1880s. Her writings focused on women's issues, international law, and pacifism. Lockwood died on 19 May 1917 in Washington, D.C.

Lockwood's professional life followed a trajectory common for intellectual women in her time. She taught school as a teenager, married Uriah H. McNall at the age of nineteen, had a child almost immediately, and sought a career only after her husband died in 1853, leaving her with a small child to support. As a young widow, she returned to teaching in the public schools in upstate New York in order to earn a living, then established her own McNall School in Oswego, New York.

In the mid 1860s Lockwood developed an interest in law, so she applied to the law schools at Columbian and Georgetown universities, both of which rejected her because they did not admit women. She met Ezekiel Lockwood in Washington, D.C., whom she married in 1868. She was finally admitted to the District of Columbia Law School, from which she graduated in 1873, but she received her diploma and was admitted to the bar only after President Ulysses S. Grant interceded. Her husband shared her feminist views and accompanied her in court appearances on occasion so she could be heard by judges who refused to allow women even to speak in the courtroom, let alone argue a case. While in Washington, Lockwood successfully drafted and lobbied bills through Congress giving women the rights to earn equal pay as US government employees (1872), to argue cases before the federal courts (1878), and to argue cases before the Supreme Court (1879). She also successfully carried out many lawsuits for Native Americans that addressed both their individual and their tribal rights.

Lockwood's feminist writings include an article on the constitutional guarantee of rights to women (1871) and discussions of women in the political life in the US. Her address on "The Civil and Political Life of Women of the United States" was given to the Second International Woman's Congress in Geneva, Switzerland in 1887.

Lockwood demonstrates that she was a classic liberal feminist in theory, but a radical in practice. She argued that women are equal to men and wanted them to have access to the same social/political goods in the public realm: education, employment, economic, and legal rights. At the same time, she had a separatist streak, serving as the attorney-general of the Woman's Republic, a radical feminist group which scripted its own Declaration of Independence for women, similar to the Declaration of Sentiments issued by Elizabeth Cady STANTON and others at Seneca Falls in 1848.

As a lawyer, Lockwood was able to eradicate barriers to women's full participation in the legal and political arena, making her feminist theory more applied than that of many of her colleagues in the women's rights movement. Stanton could argue in favor of fair divorce and child custody laws, but Lockwood repre-

sented real women in the courtroom as they sought to be separated from their husbands. Julia Ward HOWE could issue a plea for women to strive for peace, but Lockwood introduced a bill to the US Congress to establish a court for international arbitration. Because Lockwood was engrossed in her work as a lawyer, she wrote less than some of her colleagues in the first wave of feminism, but the ways in which she tied theoretical concerns for women's rights to a real world feminist agenda was invaluable for the movement.

Lockwood had faith in the power of the law to correct wrongs done to women and minorities as well as to mediate international disputes when necessary. Although she did not publish any articles on the rights of Native Americans, she was one of their leading advocates in the courtroom, arguing on their behalf in dozens of land-claims cases. In fact, she won some of the largest land-claims judgments of her day. Her writings on arbitration focused not only on broad global agreements, but more localized regional avenues for addressing disputes, as in "The Growth of Peace Principles, and Methods of Propagating Them" (1895), "Arbitration and the Treaties" (1897), and "The Central American Peace Congress and an International Arbitration Court for the Five Central American Republics" (1908). Lockwood was as progressive in her pacifism as she was in her feminism, helping to push the movement forward by advocating a legal approach to international arbitration and mediation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Right of Women to Vote Guaranteed by the Constitution," a pamphlet (Washington, D.C., 1871).

"My Efforts to Become a Lawyer," *Lippincott's Monthly Magazine* 41 (1888): 215.

"Are We Christian?" *The Peacemaker* 8 (1890): 154.

"Women in Politics," *Journal of American Politics* 2 (1893): 385.

"A Complete List of all the Treaties Entered into by the United States with the Various Nations of the World from the Foundation of the Republic until July 15, 1893," a pamphlet (Philadelphia, 1893).

"International Arbitration Court and a Congress of Nations," a pamphlet (Washington, D.C., 1893).

"The Growth of Peace Principles, and Methods of Propagating Them," a pamphlet (Washington, D.C., 1895).

"A Resume of the International Arbitration and the National Conference at Washington, April 22d and 23d, 1896," a pamphlet (Philadelphia, 1896).

"Arbitration and the Treaties," a pamphlet (Washington, D.C., 1897).

"Peace and the Outlook: An American View," a pamphlet (Washington, D.C., 1899).

"Hague Arbitration Court; A Supplement to 'Peace and the Outlook'," a pamphlet (Washington, D.C., 1901).

"Woman Suffrage Work in the District of Columbia," *The Peacemaker* 21 (1902): 183.

"The Central American Peace Congress and an International Arbitration Court for the Five Central American Republics," a pamphlet (Washington, D.C., 1908).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v2*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Drachman, Virginia G. "Women Lawyers and the Quest for Professional Identity in Late Nineteenth-Century America," *Michigan Law Review* 88 (August 1990): 2414–43.

Foltz, Clara Shortridge. "Belva A. Lockwood, First Woman Presidential Candidate," *Women's Law Journal* 7 (1918): 27.

Fox, Mary Virginia. *Lady for the Defense: A Biography of Belva Lockwood* (New York, 1975).

Frances A. Cook, "Belva Ann Lockwood: For Peace, Justice, and President," *The Law Student's Helper* 1 (June 1893): 138–41.

Morello, Karen Berger. *The Invisible Bar: The Woman Lawyer in America, 1638 to the Present* (New York, 1986).

Winner, Julia H. *Belva A. Lockwood* (Lockport, N.Y., 1969).

Dorothy Rogers

LODGE, Rupert Clendon (1886–1961)

Rupert C. Lodge was born on 8 December 1886 in Rusholme, England, the son of Charles S. Lodge, a classics tutor. He was educated at Manchester Grammar School, and Brasenose College, Oxford, earning a BA in 1909. In that year he did postgraduate work at the University of Manchester where he served as a junior lecturer in philosophy in 1910–11. He returned to Oxford for the MA Oxon in 1912. On a traveling scholarship, he then studied philosophy at the universities of Marburg and Berlin from 1912 to 1914.

Lodge taught philosophy at Dalhousie University in Nova Scotia in 1913; the University of Minnesota during 1914–15, and from 1916 to 1920; and the University of Alberta in 1915–16. In 1920 he became a professor of philosophy at the University of Manitoba. He was visiting professor at Harvard University in 1928, and at New York University in 1938. He served as President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1926–7. After his retirement from Manitoba in 1947, he taught at the University of North Carolina, University of Alberta, Queen's College at Kingston, and Long Island University. Lodge died on 1 March 1961 in St. Petersburg, Florida.

Lodge's interest in both the history of philosophy and applied philosophy should be understood in the context of his own pluralistic "comparative" or "balanced" philosophy which constitutes his major contribution to the discipline. For Lodge, what must be balanced in applied philosophy are idealism, realism, and pragmatism, which are the three opposing ways of interpreting experience provided by academic philosophy. In dealing with any philosophical question all three responses must be taken seriously, and the contradictions between them should be resolved in practical activity. One of the many explanatory metaphors Lodge uses involves a tripod and pendulum. Each leg of the tripod represents one of the three schools of philosophy. The pendulum swinging from the apex of the tripod represents practical activity. As it swings toward one of the legs the other two exert a counter pull. If we are tempted to act on purely idealistic principles, for example, both realism and pragmatism ought to exert a moderating influence.

Lodge's justification for his pluralism lies in his reading of the history of philosophy, especially Plato and post-Kantian idealism. He argues that we learn from Plato to approach philosophical problems in true philosophical humility, examining with an open mind the arguments for and against each position with complete faith in the gradual evolution of truth. To J. G. Fichte's dichotomy of idealism and dogmatism (realism) Lodge adds pragmatism, agreeing with Fichte that speculative reason cannot help us decide which is most adequate. Though sympathetic to idealism, Lodge does not accept Fichte's argument that practical reason resolves the issue in favor of idealism. Lodge opts instead for his balanced philosophy in which all three have a part to play.

Lodge is one of the first twentieth-century philosophers to take applied philosophy seriously, writing about philosophy and the environment, philosophy of business, and the philosophy of education. More recently his position has been used as the basis for a poly-

centric theory of environmental ethics (Rabb 1992). Lodge has been described as a typically Canadian philosopher because of his accommodationist use of reason (see Armour and Trott 1981).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Meaning and Function of Simple Modes in the Philosophy of John Locke (Minneapolis, 1918).

An Introduction to Modern Logic (Minneapolis, 1920).

Plato's Theory of Ethics: The Moral Criterion and the Highest Good (London and New York, 1928).

Philosophy of Education (New York, 1937).

The Questioning Mind: A Survey of Philosophical Tendencies (London and New York, 1937).

Philosophy of Business (Chicago, 1945).

Plato's Theory of Education (London and New York, 1947).

The Great Thinkers (Boston, 1949; London, 1968).

Applied Philosophy (London and Boston, 1951).

Plato's Theory of Art (London and New York, 1953).

The Philosophy of Plato (London and New York, 1956).

Other Relevant Works

"Empiricism," in *Hasting's Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. 5 (Edinburgh, 1912), pp. 295–6.

Ed. and trans., *The Great Problems*, by Bernardino Varisco (London, 1914).

"The Division of Judgments," *Journal of Philosophy* 15 (1918): 541–50.

"Tests of Truth," *Journal of Philosophy* 17 (1920): 71–7.

"The Logical Status of Elementary and Reflective Judgments," *Journal of Philosophy* 17 (1920): 214–20.

"Negation in Traditional and Modern Logic," *Mind* 29 (1920): 82–90.

"The Psychological Aspect of the Platonic Value-Judgment," *Philosophical Review* 31 (1922): 237–56.

"Bosanquet and the Future of Logic," *Philosophical Review* 32 (1923): 589–98.

"Idealistic Logic and Philosophical Construction," *Philosophical Review* 41 (1932): 300–11.

"Immortality in Recent Philosophy," *Queen's Quarterly* 42 (1935): 234–41.

"Philosophy and Education," *Dalhousie Review* 14 (1935): 281–90.

"The Anatomy of Humour," *Queen's Quarterly* 43 (1936): 55–61.

"The Self in Modern Thought," *University of Toronto Quarterly* 5 (1936): 583–604.

"The Comparative Method in Philosophy," in *Manitoba Essays Written in Commemoration of the Sixtieth Anniversary of the University of Manitoba*, ed. Rupert C. Lodge (Toronto, 1937), pp. 403–32.

"De Amicitia," *International Journal of Ethics* 47 (1937): 224–30.

"Synthesis of Comparison," *Journal of Philosophy* 35 (1938): 432–40.

"Balanced Philosophy and Eclecticism," *Journal of Philosophy* 41 (1944): 85–91.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Canad Encyc*, *Pres Addr of APA v3*, *Proc of APA v35*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Armour, Leslie, and Elizabeth Trott. *The Faces of Reason: An Essay on Philosophy and Culture in English Canada, 1850–1950* (Waterloo, Ont., 1981).

Maundrell, Richard. "From Rupert Lodge to Sweat Lodge," *Dialogue* 34 (1995): 747–53.

Rabb, J. Douglas. "The Polycentric Perspective: A Canadian Alternative to Rorty," *Dialogue* 28 (1989): 107–15.

———, "From Triangles to Tripods: Polycentrism in Environmental Ethics," *Environmental Ethics* 14 (1992): 177–83.

J. Douglas Rabb

LOEMKER, Leroy Earl (1900–85)

Leroy E. Loemker was born on 28 December 1900 in Platteville, Wisconsin. The son of a Methodist minister, he received his BA from the University of Dubuque, Iowa, in 1921. From 1921 to 1924 he was a mathematics instructor at Dubuque. Loemker then attended Boston University, where he received his STB in 1927 and PhD in philosophy in 1931. The title of his dissertation was "The Criticism of Idealism in the Thought of G. E. Moore and R. B. Perry." During 1927–8 he studied in Germany as an American-German exchange scholar, and returned in 1938–9 as a Rosenwald Fellow.

In 1929 Loemker was appointed assistant professor of philosophy at Emory University, and was the only philosopher there until he hired Richard HOCKING in 1949 and Charles HARTSHORNE in 1955 to establish a doctoral program at Emory. Loemker was chair of the philosophy department for most of his years at Emory, and also he served as the first Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Science from 1946 to 1952. In 1960 he became Charles Howard Candler Professor of Philosophy and held that position until his retirement in 1969. He received Guggenheim and Fulbright fellowships for study at the University of Marburg, Germany in 1958–9; he was elected President of the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology in 1963; he was awarded Boston University School of Theology's distinguished alumni award in 1965; he received an honorary LLD degree from the University of Dubuque in 1953 and an honorary Litt.D. from Emory in 1979. Loemker died on 2 May 1985 in Melbourne, Florida.

Loemker's areas of expertise were the history of philosophy, metaphysics and epistemology, and philosophy of religion. His publications primarily concern Leibniz, and his translations and expositions contributed greatly to Leibniz scholarship. Educated in the personalist school of thought at Boston University under Edgar S. BRIGHTMAN, Loemker remained convinced that the concept of the person is central to both value systems and to reality. However, as he complains in a 1955 paper, "Some Problems in Personalism" (2002), Loemker believed that the personalism movement has been constrained by certain theological commitments from fully engaging twentieth-century scientific developments.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Struggle for Synthesis: The Seventeenth Century Background of Leibniz's Synthesis of Order and Freedom (Cambridge, Mass., 1972).

The Philosophy of Leibniz and the Modern World, ed. Ivor Leclerc (Nashville, Tenn., 1973). Contains ten papers by Loemker and four other papers.

Other Relevant Works

Loemker's papers are at Emory University.

"Leibniz's Doctrine of Ideas," *Philosophical Review* 55 (1946): 229–49.

"Leibniz's Judgments of Facts," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 7 (1946): 397–410.

"Boyle and Leibniz," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 16 (1955): 22–43.

Trans., *Philosophical Papers and Letters*, 2 vols, by Gottfried Leibniz (Chicago, 1956; 2nd edn, Dordrecht, 1969).

"Leibniz and the Herborn Encyclopedists," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 22 (1961): 323–38.

"The Case of the Emperor's Clothes," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 1 (1963): 1–8.

"Leibniz's Conception of Philosophical Method," *Zeitschrif für philosophische Forschung* 20 (1966): 507–24.

"The Metaphysical Status of Regulative Maxims in Leibniz and Kant," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 11 (1973): 141–7.

"Some Problems in Personalism," in *Personalism Revisited: Its Proponents and Critics*, ed. Thomas O. Buford (Amsterdam, 2002), pp. 171–85. A paper written in 1955.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v59, Who's Who in Phil

John R. Shook

LOEWENBERG, Jacob (1882–1969)

Jacob Loewenberg was born on 2 February 1882 in Tuckum, Latvia, which was then part of Czarist Russia. At the age of thirteen he moved with his family to Riga, where he found employment as an office boy. Afraid of being drafted into the Russian army, Loewenberg fled to Germany at the age of twenty-one. By way of London, he reached Boston on 17 September 1904. The next day he was admitted at Harvard, having received a loan from Harvard President Charles Eliot that covered part of his tuition. Loewenberg received his BA magna cum laude in 1908, MA in 1909, and PhD in philosophy in 1911, all from Harvard. Loewenberg became especially interested in Platonism (through George SANTAYANA) and in Kantianism (through Josiah ROYCE). His dissertation was titled "The Genesis of Hegel's Dialectical Method." He spent the year 1909–10 in Europe as a James Walker Fellow, partly at the University of Berlin and partly at the Sorbonne in Paris. Loewenberg became an American citizen in 1910.

After his graduation, Loewenberg assisted Royce in his metaphysics seminar while concurrently holding an instructorship at Wellesley College, first in German in 1912–13, and then in German and philosophy in 1913–15. In 1915 Loewenberg went to the University of California at Berkeley as an instructor in philosophy, became an assistant professor in 1918, associate professor in 1922, and full professor in 1925. From 1935 until 1941 he was chair of the philosophy department. On 1 July 1950 Loewenberg was dismissed from Berkeley because he refused to sign a non-communist declaration that had been prescribed by the Regents of the university. Loewenberg refused to sign the declaration because he considered it an unacceptable invasion of academic freedom. He was reappointed in 1952 as professor emeritus by decision of the California Supreme Court. In 1953 Loewenberg became a fellow in the university, and he was awarded a Doctor of Laws degree by the university in 1962. In 1962 he was recalled to active service to teach a seminar on Hegel's *Phenomenology*.

Loewenberg delivered the Carus Lectures in 1959, which became the basis for his book *Reason and the Nature of Things*, published in the same year. He was visiting lecturer in philosophy at Harvard in 1947–8, and held similar appointments at Columbia, Wells College, and Haverford College. He was President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1930–31 and was made an honorary member of Phi Beta Kappa in 1932.

In addition to his own work on Hegel, idealism, metaphysics, and aesthetics, Loewenberg edited Royce's *Lectures on Modern Idealism* (1919) and *Fugitive Essays* (1920). In 1968 he published his autobiography *Thrice-Born*. Loewenberg died on 27 March 1969 in Berkeley, California.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Hegels Entwürfe zur Enzyklopädie und Propädeutik, nach den Handschriften der Harvard-Universität (Leipzig, 1912).
"The Metaphysics of Critical Realism," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 4 (1923): 167–94.
"Critical Realism," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* suppl. 4 (1924): 86–129.
"The Fourfold Root of Truth," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 10 (1928): 207–41.
"Problematic Realism," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), pp. 255–84.
Dialogues from Delphi (Berkeley, Cal., 1949).

Royce's Synoptic Vision (Baltimore, Md., 1955)

Reason and the Nature of Things: Reflections on the Cognitive Function of Philosophy (La Salle, Ill., 1959).

Hegel's Phenomenology: Dialogues on the Life of the Mind (La Salle, Ill., 1965).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Lectures on Modern Idealism*, by Josiah Royce (New Haven, Conn., 1919).

Ed., *Fugitive Essays*, by Josiah Royce (Cambridge, Mass., 1920).

Ed., *Selections*, by G. W. F. Hegel (New York, 1929).

Thrice-born: Selected Memories of an Immigrant (New York, 1968).

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v4, Proc of APA v42, Who's Who in Phil

Cornelis de Waal

LOMAX, Alan (1915–2002)

Alan Lomax was born on 15 January 1915 in Austin, Texas, and died on 19 July 2002 in Safety Harbor, Florida. His lifelong interest in recording folk music started in 1933, when he and his father John Lomax made their first of many excursions into rural America collecting music for the Library of Congress. For the next five years he worked as his father's assistant while completing a BA in philosophy at the University of Texas, receiving it in 1936. This mixture of practical research experience and formal education served Alan throughout his prodigious career as folklorist and applied ethnomusicologist. He participated tirelessly in a variety of roles as collector, archivist, radio and television broadcaster, researcher, performer, and professor.

As the assistant in charge at the Archive of Folk Song at the Library of Congress from 1937 to 1942, Lomax expanded the archive holdings beyond musical examples, with extensive interviews of traditional artists such as Jelly Roll Morton, Son House, Honeyboy Edwards, and Muddy Waters. He also internationalized the archive's holdings with recordings made in Haiti and Samoa. Lomax developed a populist philosophy toward music, one that valued folk music and dance as human survival strategies at a time when many musicologists were categorizing non-European musical systems as primitive, lower degrees of culture. Lomax aimed to make America more democratic, and he thought folk song could do that. This stance would later help to establish Lomax as a folk music revival patriarch, as well as a blacklisted artist during McCarthyism. He responded to the harsh political climate of the Cold War and resistance to his recording projects by taking up residence in Europe for most of the 1950s, where he continued his folksong collecting and broadcasting.

Cantometrics, an analytical system for the description of folksong in its cultural context developed by Lomax during the 1960s, has been controversial and criticized primarily for its lack of analytical objectivity. Nevertheless, this approach anticipated the importance of culture and power relations recognized by ethnomusicological studies in the 1980s and 1990s. Alan Lomax believed folk music to be a social process capable of renewing human integrity and self-worth. Technology threatened to end these, Lomax believed, if its riches were controlled by the privileged few. He responded with the energy and drive of a cultural warrior. One of his primary contributions resulting from his commitment to cultural feedback and renewal involved the development and utilization of innovative ways to disseminate music and dance in accessible formats.

In 1985 Lomax founded the Association for Cultural Equity at Hunter College in New York City, where his collections were stored until their transferral to the Library of Congress in

2004. This organization, based on the idea that values in human systems can be perpetuated to create a sense of self-worth, continues Lomax's humanist philosophy toward music and dance. Congruent with his lifelong interest in folk music dissemination, the ACE includes the comprehensive Global Jukebox project, a multimedia tool for studying music and dance according to cantometrics and choreometrics. Lomax was posthumously given the Academy's Trustees Award by the National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences in 2003.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Mister Jelly Roll: The Fortunes of Jelly Roll Morton, New Orleans Creole and "Inventor of Jazz" (New York, 1950).
The Rainbow Sign (New York, 1959).
The Folk Songs of North America (New York, 1960).
Folk Song Style and Culture (Washington, D.C., 1968).
Cantometrics: An Approach to the Anthropology of Music (Berkeley, Cal., 1976).
Land Where the Blues Began (New York, 1993).

Other Relevant Works
American Ballads and Folk Songs, with John A. Lomax (New York, 1934).
Hard-Hitting Songs for Hard-Hit People, with Woody Guthrie and Pete Seeger (New York, 1967).
The Alan Lomax Collection. Rounder Records' comprehensive and ongoing project, begun in 1997, to publish over 140 compact disks of Lomax's recordings.
Alan Lomax: Selected Writings, 1934–1997, ed. Ronald D. Cohen (London and New York, 2003).

Further Reading
Cambridge Dict Amer Bio
Ferris, William R. "Folk Song and Culture: Charles Seeger and Alan Lomax," *New York Folklore Quarterly* 29 (1973): 206–18.
Filene, Benjamin. "'Our Singing Country': John and Alan Lomax, Leadbelly, and the Construction of an American Past," *American Quarterly* 43 (1991): 602–24.
Gregory, E. David. "Alan Lomax (1915–2002)," *Folk Music Journal* 8 (2004): 548–57.

LaDona Martin-Frost

LONERGAN, Bernard Joseph Francis (1904–84)

Bernard Lonergan was born on 17 December 1904 in Buckingham, Québec, Canada, and he died on 26 November 1984 in Pickering, Ontario. His father's family emigrated from Ireland to Canada in the early 1800s; his mother's family were originally immigrants to the American colonies but migrated to Canada after the war of independence, because of their support for the Loyalists. Lonergan's father, Gerald, was an engineering graduate of McGill University, who left his family in the spring to map the western territories of Canada and returned to them before winter. Lonergan's mother, Josephine (née Wood), was responsible, along with her sister Minnie, for raising Bernard and his two brothers, Gregory and Mark.

At age thirteen Lonergan entered Loyola College, a Jesuit school in Montréal. Although he was satisfied with his studies, he felt that the Jesuits did not challenge him as much as did his parish school: "at Loyola I loafed and passed exams with honors" (Crowe 1992, p. 5). Lonergan's perceived failure of Catholic education to address issues facing current society was to be a theme that animated his scholarship. His lifelong mission was to raise the standard of Catholic education and to bring it into the twentieth century.

On 29 July 1922, Lonergan entered the Jesuit novitiate at Guelph, Ontario. Although he had entertained a religious calling as a child, he did not act on it until he made a retreat at the Jesuit Novitiate in Montréal. For two years Lonergan underwent Jesuit formation of spirit, mind, and body. Spiritual formation focused on learning from the master of novices and from a list of readings, including *The Imitation of Christ*, Jesuit spiritual writings, and Alphonsus Rodriguez's *The Practice of Perfection and Christian Virtues*. Mental formation included classes in the standards of Latin and Greek, as well as in English, French, and singing. Physical formation involved calisthenics, domestic chores, and recreational activities, such as tennis and swimming. The culmination of these formative years was a pilgrimage he made with another novice, in May of his second year; for a month the two pilgrims walked from Buffalo via Niagara to the novitiate.

After his novitiate training, Lonergan entered the juniorate years in 1924. Although occupying the same house, the novices and juniors were separated by disciplinary structure. The routine in terms of intellectual, spiritual, and physical training was not much different from the novitiate years, except for depth and intensity and mathematics. By his second juniorate year, Lonergan was teaching Latin and Greek to novices and mathematics to fellow juniors, as well as preaching to the community. On the surface Lonergan's early formation in the Jesuits appeared uneventful, with its emphasis on the classics. But the task of translating these timeless texts was responsible for a radical transformation in Lonergan and had a significant impact on the development of his notion of transcendence.

The next step in Lonergan's Jesuit formation was the study of philosophy. Since the Canadian Jesuit providence did not have a house of philosophy at the time, Lonergan was sent to Heythrop College located a few miles from the University of Oxford. When Lonergan arrived in 1926, the college was a community of fewer than two hundred. Just as the four years in Guelph were important for Lonergan's spiritual formation, the four years in England were equally important for his intellectual development. The subjects covered in the courses that Lonergan took at Heythrop included epistemology, metaphysics, ethics, logic, psychology, mathematics, pedagogy, and history of philosophy. His main goal was not proficiency in philosophy per se, but rather preparation for a bachelor's degree from the University of London in the subjects Greek, Latin, French, and mathematics. He was awarded a BA from Heythrop in 1930.

During his studies at Heythrop College, Lonergan wrote several papers that reveal his early interest in cognition theory. The first paper, "The Form of Mathematical Inference," appeared in the college's in-house *Blandyke Papers* (no. 283) in 1928. Lonergan analyzes one of Euclid's geometrical proofs and distinguishes two types of inference, sensible and conceptual. According to Lonergan, the sensible inference is obtained from a "generic image" of the geometrical object and is the forerunner to his later notion of insight. In a second paper, "The Syllogism," appearing later the same year (*Blandyke Papers* no. 285), he appropriates the notion of visualization to logical inferences. In a third paper appearing the next year, "True Judgment and Science" (*Blandyke Papers* no. 291), he contrasts the mind's processes with its products. These papers reflect Lonergan's growth towards the later notion of rational self-consciousness.

The next step in Jesuit formation is regency, a period when the aspiring religious engage in practical work. Beginning in 1930, Lonergan taught at Loyola College in Montréal. His duties included a variety of courses, including Latin, Greek, French, English, calculus, analytic geometry, and mechanics. During his regency, he read Christopher Dawson's *The Age of the Gods* and J. A. Stewart's *Plato's Doctrines of Ideas*, which had a significant impact on his intellectual development. However, the regency years were a struggle for Lonergan; and although he had a crisis in

terms of his religious vocation, he once again dedicated himself to that calling.

In 1933 Lonergan began formal training in theology at the Collège de l'Immaculée-Conception in Montréal, and in November of that year he was transferred to the Gregorian University in Rome. Besides classes in theology he also wrote several papers – part of his famous "File 713-History" (a collection of unpublished papers) – some of which were concerned with both a practical and a theoretical analysis of history, especially in terms of Catholic social action. He was ordained to the priesthood on 25 July 1936. The following year he began ten months of tertianship in Amiens, France, where he learned of his future dissertation advisor, Charles Boyer.

In 1938 Lonergan returned to the Gregorian University to begin his doctoral work in theology. Upon consultation with Boyer, he chose the topic of operant grace in St. Thomas Aquinas. This period began for Lonergan an eleven-year "apprenticeship" to the theological doctor. In his dissertation, "Gratia Operans: A Study of the Speculative Development in the Writings of St. Thomas Aquin," Lonergan charted the historical development of the theory of grace from St. Augustine to St. Thomas, in order to address the Molinist and Bannezian controversy over human freedom and God's will. He concluded his study, identifying two themes that would loom large in his *verbum* project: "the idea of operative grace is an unsuspected compound of metaphysics and psychology" (2000, p. 449). He submitted a written copy of the dissertation on 1 May 1940 but, because of the war, did not defend it until 8 June 1943. He was finally awarded his doctorate on 23 December 1946, after publishing part of the dissertation and submitting the requisite number of copies to the Gregorian.

Lonergan departed Rome in May 1940, and upon arriving in Canada he was appointed to teach theology at Collège de l'Immaculée-Conception. In 1947 he moved to Regis College in Toronto, where he also taught theology. While in Canada, Lonergan published his well-known *verbum* articles from 1946 to 1949 in *Theological Studies*, which appeared later as the book *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas* (1967/1997). Work on the *verbum* project began around 1943 and focused on Thomistic cognitional theory, especially in terms of introspective rational psychology. In *Verbum*, Lonergan explored Thomas's understanding of *verbum mentis* or the inner word, as well as judgment in terms of the reflective act of the intellect. According to Lonergan: "The inner word of judgment is the expression of a reflective act, and that reflective act is the goal towards which critical wonder works." (1997, p. 105)

After the psychological analysis of the first part of *Verbum*, Lonergan shifts to metaphysics, a more general form of psychology. He distinguishes between souls and their potencies, potencies and their acts, and acts and their objects. According to Lonergan, the end point of intellectual activity is the real and true, which "is not merely utterance, *dicere*, but the utterance of intelligence in act" (1997, p. 150). Lonergan next turns to the notion of abstraction in terms of metaphysics and psychology. Metaphysically, abstraction involves the intelligible component, i.e., the form, of a thing, while psychologically, it is the "*intelligentia indivisibilium*" or the unity of the intelligible vis-à-vis fragmentary sensory input.

Lonergan concludes *Verbum* by grounding it in Thomas's Trinitarian notion of the *Imago Dei*, for the spiritual dynamism of human life reflects the inner dynamism in the life of the Trinity. Importantly, Lonergan distinguishes himself and Thomas from the conceptualists, who focus more on the products of the intellect than on its process. *Verbum* formed the basis from which Lonergan's major work on human understanding was to arise: "Only by the slow, repetitious, circular labor of going over and over the data, by catching here a little insight and there another, by following through false leads and profiting from many mistakes, by continuous adjustments and

cumulative changes of one's initial suppositions and perspectives and concepts can one hope to attain such a development of one's own understanding …. Such is the method I have employed, and it has been on the chance that others also might wish to employ it that this book has been written." (1997, p. 223)

In 1953 Lonergan was appointed to a faculty position in theology at the Gregorian University in Rome. At the time of the appointment he was working on a theory of human cognition, which was published in 1957 as *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*. Lonergan began work on *Insight* as soon as he had finished the last *verbum* article in 1949, although the earliest origins of the book are to be found in a series of lectures entitled "Thought and Reality" delivered at the Thomas More Institute in Montréal from 1945 to 1946. The initial project was to examine method generally in order to investigate theological method specifically. But the appointment at the Gregorian compelled him to publish what he had written to date. He was not to finish the larger project until 1972, with the publication of *Method in Theology*.

Insight is divided into two parts. The first part is concerned with insight as activity; its basic question is: What happens when we know? Lonergan proposes a cognitional theory to answer this question. The second part concerns insight as knowledge; here the question is: What is known when we know? The answer to this question is given in terms of the self-affirmation of the knower vis-à-vis Lonergan's cognitional theory, the notions of being and objectivity, metaphysics, ethics, and general and special transcendent knowledge. According to Lonergan, "The problem tackled in the book was complex indeed. At its root was a question of psychological fact. Human intellect does not intuit essences. It grasps in simplifying images intelligible possibilities that may prove relevant to an understanding of the data." (1957, p. 268)

Lonergan's purpose in writing *Insight* was "not to set forth a list of the abstract properties of human knowledge but to assist the reader in effecting a personal appropriation of the concrete, dynamic structure immanent and recurrently operative in his own cognitional activities" (1992, p. 11). The focus of that theory is insight itself and the method is turning insight onto itself as a conscious act. To that end, he begins by discussing examples of insights from mathematics and the natural sciences, as well as from common sense, concluding with the notion of judgment and reflective understanding. Insight is the activity that mediates between the abstract world of ideas and the concrete world of experience.

What then is Lonergan's cognitional theory? Lonergan begins his analysis of insight with Archimedes' dramatic insight into hydrostatics. The question posed to Archimedes by King Hiero was whether his gold crown contained an alloy, a task Archimedes was to complete without damaging the crown. His insight was into the different densities of objects and how to determine them. Insight into this example of insight illustrates the process of cognition, according to Lonergan. First, there is the level of experience and the question for understanding: What is it? Archimedes had the gold crown in hand and could not deface it but still needed to answer the question: Did the crown contain alloy? This question sets the conditions for its answer. Considering this question while at the baths, Archimedes had a spontaneous insight into the relationship of the crown's composition and its specific gravity. No wonder Archimedes went running through the streets of Syracuse shouting "Eureka!" From this level of understanding, the question for reflection arises: Is it so? Will the crown weigh differently in water based on its composition? The next step is to test the question and to make a judgment concerning the composition of the crown based on the evidence.

For Lonergan, then, the act of knowing is composed of experiencing, understanding, and judging. Importantly, this whole process is cyclical. As experiences expand, further questions for understanding present themselves. As

these questions are pondered, further insights into the relationships of experience occur. These insights engender further questions of judgment, which lead to further experience, etc. The coalescence of these insights gives rise to higher viewpoints into the intelligibility of our selves and our world.

During his tenure at the Gregorian, Lonergan wrote notes for his classes in theology, roughly 1,400 pages. In these notes, written in Latin, he continued to struggle with methodological issues, particularly the development of a notion of history and its role in Catholic theology. The other resources for the development of theological method were papers he delivered at various meetings and institutions. Lonergan taught at the Gregorian until 1965, when he returned to Montréal to undergo surgery for lung cancer. He returned to his appointment on the theology faculty at Regis College, holding that position from 1965 to 1975. In February of 1965 he made an important advancement in his work in theological method: the eight functional specialties. In addition, he extended the tripartite cognitional structure to include a fourth level: decision. This addition enabled him to integrate knowing and doing.

In his seminal book *Method in Theology* (1972/1990), Lonergan proposed a transcendental theological method "concerned with meeting the exigences and exploiting the opportunities presented by the human mind itself. It is a concern that is both foundational and universally significant and relevant." (1972, p. 14) Based on his revised cognitional structure of experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding, he enumerates and discusses eight functional specialties required for conducting theology. These specialties include research and communication at the level of experiencing; interpretation and systematics at the level of understanding; history and doctrine at the level of judging; and dialectic and foundation at the level of deciding. Each specialty is dynamically interrelated with the others and this integrated series of specialties

yields knowledge of a loving God. Importantly, Lonergan's method of theology leads not just to knowledge of a loving God but also to a being-in-love with God and others through religious conversion.

Lonergan was the Charles Chauncey Stillman Professor of Roman Catholic Theological Studies at Harvard Divinity School when *Method* was published in 1972. However, he occupied the Stillman chair for only one year, 1971–2, and then returned to Regis College in Toronto. In 1975 he became a visiting distinguished professor of theology at Boston College. There he taught seminars in theology, including his book *Method*, and in macroeconomics. Lonergan's interest in economics was not new but dated from the 1930s. During the Great Depression, he wrote several papers on economics, which in 1944 were combined into a single paper revised and entitled "An Essay in Circulation Analysis." Around 1977, he returned to the project to produce a primer to economics. Much of the revision was occasioned by a course "Macroeconomics and the Dialectic of History" that he taught from the late 1970s to the early 1980s. Lonergan proposed an analysis of economics in terms of production, exchange, and finance. The relationships of these three variables define, for Lonergan, the economic cycles of booms and slumps. In general, Lonergan's concern in macroeconomics was for a new world order based on enlightened individual concern for the welfare of society.

Lonergan retired from Boston College in 1983. He received numerous awards during his life, including seventeen honorary doctorates, as well as the Companion of the Order of Canada by Governor General Roland Michner in 1970 and the John Courtney Murray Award from the Catholic Theological Society in 1972. He was also elected a Corresponding Fellow of the British Academy in 1975. Lonergan's influence on twentieth-century Catholic theology and philosophy is unparalleled. His lifelong mission to bring Catholic studies into the twen-

tieth century was a resounding success. He certainly assisted his generation of Catholic scholars to mediate "between a cultural matrix and the significance and role of religion in that matrix" (1972, p. xi).

The Lonergan movement, named by his followers, continues to gain momentum. Several hundred doctoral dissertations investigate Lonergan's work. A perusal of the *Lonergan Studies Newsletter* reveals scores of bibliographic entries on or related to his thought and influence. There are numerous research centers and institutes, such as those in Toronto, Boston, Los Angeles, Washington, D.C., Sydney, and Melbourne. Several journals are devoted to Lonergan studies. Toronto University Press is publishing his collected works, projected at twenty-five volumes. Longtime colleague Fred Crowe comments on Lonergan's position in history: "the future will assign Lonergan a place toward either one end or the other, it will not leave him in the middle" (1992, p. 133).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Insight: A Study of Human Understanding (London and New York, 1957; 5th edn, Toronto, 1992).

Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas, ed. D. B. Burrell (Notre Dame, Ind., 1967, 2nd edn, Toronto, 1997).

Collection, ed. F. E. Crowe (New York, 1967; 2nd edn, Toronto, 1988).

Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas, ed. J. P. Burns (New York, 1971; 2nd edn, Toronto, 2000).

Doctrinal Pluralism (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1971).

Method in Theology (New York, 1972; 3rd edn, Toronto, 1990).

Philosophy of God, and Theology: The Relationship between Philosophy of God and the Functional Specialty, Systematics (London, 1973).

A Second Collection, ed. W. F. J. Ryan and B. J. Tyrrell (London, 1974).

The Way to Nicea: The Dialectical Development of Trinitarian Theology, trans. C. O'Donovan (Philadelphia, 1976).

Caring About Meaning: Patterns in the Life of Bernard Lonergan, ed. P. Lambert, C. Tansey, and C. Going (Montréal, 1982).

Understanding and Being: An Introduction and Companion to Insight, ed. M. Morelli and L. Morelli (Lewiston, N.Y., 1980; 2nd edn, Toronto, 1990).

A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J. F. Lonergan, ed. F. E. Crowe (Mahwah, N.J., 1985).

Topics in Education: The Cincinnati Lectures of 1959 on the Philosophy of Education, ed. R. M. Doran and F. E. Crowe (Toronto, 1993).

Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964 (Toronto, 1996).

For a New Political Economy, ed. P. J. McShane (Toronto, 1998).

Macroeconomic Dynamics: An Essay in Circulation Analysis, ed. F. G. Lawrence, P. H. Byrne, and C. Hefling, Jr. (Toronto, 1999).

Phenomenology and Logic: The Boston College Lectures on Mathematical Logic and Existentialism, ed. P. J. McShane (Toronto, 2001).

The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ, ed. M. G. Shields (Toronto, 2002).

Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980 (Toronto, 2004).

Other Relevant Works

Lonergan's papers are at the Lonergan Research Institute at the University of Toronto, Canada.

Collected Works of Bernard Longeran, 25 vols (proj.), ed. Frederick Crowe and Robert Doran (Toronto, 1988–).

The Lonergan Reader, ed. Mark D. Morelli and Elizabeth A. Morelli (Toronto, 1997).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Routledge Encycl Phil*

Boly, C. S. *The Road to Lonergan's Method in Theology: The Ordering of Theological Ideas* (Lanham, Md., 1991).

Braio, F. P. *Lonergan's Retrieval of the Notion of Human Being: Clarifications of and Reflections on the Argument of Insight, Chapters I–XVIII* (Lanham, Md., 1988).

Coelho, I. *Hermeneutics and Method: A Study of the 'Universal Viewpoint' in Bernard Lonergan* (Toronto, 2001).

Corcoran, P., ed. *Looking at Lonergan's Method* (Dublin, Ireland, 1975).

Crowe, F. E. *Lonergan* (Collegeville, Minn., 1992).

Crysdale, C., ed. *Lonergan and Feminism* (Toronto, 1994).

Dunne, T. *Lonergan and Spirituality: Towards a Spiritual Integration* (Chicago, 1985).

Fallon, T. P., and P. B. Riley, eds. *Religion and Culture: Essays in Honor of Bernard Lonergan, S.J.* (Albany, N.Y., 1987).

Flanagan, J. *Quest for Self-Knowledge: An Essay in Lonergan's Philosophy* (Toronto, 1997).

Gregson, V. *The Desires of the Human Heart: An Introduction to the Theology of Bernard Lonergan* (New York, 1988).

Kineris, Jim. *Bernard Lonergan's Philosophy of Religion: From Philosophy of God to Philosophy of Religious Studies* (Albany, N.Y., 2002).

Lawerence, F., ed. *Lonergan Workshop* (Chico, Cal., 1978–).

Liddy, R. *Transforming Light: Intellectual Conversion in the Early Lonergan* (Collegeville, Minn., 1993).

McShane, P., ed. *Foundations of Theology: Papers From the International Lonergan Congress 1970* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1972).

Melchin, K. *History, Ethics and Emergent Probability: Ethics, Society and History in the Work of Bernard Lonergan* (Lanham, Md., 1987).

Meynell, H. *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Bernard Lonergan* (London, 1976).

———, *The Theology of Bernard Lonergan* (Atlanta, 1986).

O'Callaghan, M. *Unity in Theology: Lonergan's Framework for Theology in Its New Context* (Lanham, Md., 1980).

Sala, G. *Lonergan and Kant: Five Essays on Human Knowledge* (Toronto, 1994).

Stebbins, J. M. *The Divine Initiative: Grace, World-Order, and Human Freedom in the Early Writings of Bernard Lonergan* (Toronto, 1995).

Stewart, W. A. *Introduction to Lonergan's Insight: An Invitation to Philosophize* (Lewiston, N.Y., 1996).

Tekippe, T. *What's Lonergan Up To In Insight?* (Collegeville, Minn., 1996).

Tracy, D. *The Achievement of Bernard Lonergan* (New York, 1970).

Turrell, B. *Bernard Lonergan's Philosophy of God* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1974).

James A. Marcum

LOOMER, Bernard MacDougall (1912–85)

Bernard M. Loomer was born on 5 March 1912 in Belmont, Massachusetts. He received a BA from Bates College in Maine in 1934 and a PhD in philosophy from the University of Chicago in 1942. His dissertation was titled "The Theological Significance of the Method of Empirical Analysis in the Philosophy of A. N. Whitehead." From 1942 to 1965, he was a professor of philosophy of religion at the University of Chicago Divinity School. He was also Dean of the Divinity School and a leader of the Federated Theological Faculty from 1945 to 1954. From 1965 to 1977, he was a professor of philosophical theology at the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley,

California. Loomer died on 15 August 1985 in El Cerrito, California.

Alfred North WHITEHEAD was a significant influence on Loomer's academic work and was the subject of his dissertation, which is considered a major contribution in the development of the movement known as process philosophy. Throughout his career, Loomer's writings drew on both empirical and rational aspects of Whitehead's thought, although, over the course of Loomer's career, rationalism played an increasingly more prominent role in his theological outlook. This tendency could be seen in the methodological focus of many of his writings and in his frequent critiques of philosophical positions that he characterized as taking leaps of logic. The empiricist strand in his thinking is evident in his appreciation of religious naturalism.

Charles HARTSHORNE credited Loomer with naming the process philosophy movement, though later in his life Loomer referred to the movement as "process-relational philosophy." By this switch Loomer emphasized the centrality of relationships in the process of becoming, a move away from a sole emphasis on process. One of his most prominent essays, "Christian Faith and Process Philosophy," published in 1949, defended process philosophy against the criticisms of conventional theology, most notably the idea that process philosophy does not allow for establishing the existence of an unambiguous religious and ethical reality. He also argued, against process theology's critics, that the empirical methodology of process thought does allow for identifying the workings of God in history. While he never abandoned the position that there is no point beyond history, he did maintain the ultimate ambiguity of nature and history.

Another of Loomer's works, "S-I-Z-E is the Measure" (1974), similarly incorporates religious thought and concepts of God into broad understandings of history, the natural world, and relational forms. Loomer asserts that there is no reasonable basis for identifying God only with the virtuous portions of the world and of history and that God must be present in the evil and suffering of the world – a move which represented a step away from the dominant perspective of religious naturalism. "S-I-Z-E" also expresses Loomer's belief that relationality is the ultimate criterion for the value of religious experiences. Relational components are best interpreted by their depth and breadth, with greater amounts of each contributing to the greater intensity of religious experiences while simultaneously allowing more room for contrast. Contrast contributes value to religious experience by allowing God to be experienced in varying and possibly contrasting ways. This leaves open the question of how one discerns what is of God and what is not.

Loomer's deanship at the University of Chicago Divinity School, undertaken at the relatively early age of thirty-three, likely curtailed his written theological output. The "Chicago School" of theology evolved into a center for process thought during Loomer's tenure as dean. The "Chicago School" of theology was an American theological movement centered at the University of Chicago and utilizing modern historical research to locate the presence of God in social and natural processes. His influence in facilitating and leading the Chicago School's continual refinement of concepts related to process philosophy should figure prominently in any measurement of his theological contributions. Loomer's leadership in the development of process theology continues to influence present-day process-oriented thinking and the religious institutions that this philosophical movement has shaped.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Ely on Whitehead's God," *Journal of Religion* 24 (1944): 162–79.
"Christian Faith and Process Philosophy," *Journal of Religion* 29 (1949): 181–203.
"Commentary on Theological Resources from the Biological Sciences," *Zygon* 1 (1966): 56–9.
"Empirical Theology within Process Thought," in *The Future of Empirical Theology*, ed. Bernard E. Meland

(Chicago, 1969), pp. 149–73.

"Whitehead's Method of Empirical Analysis," in *Process Theology: Basic Writings*, ed. Ewart Cousins (New York, 1971), pp. 67–82.

"S-I-Z-E is the Measure," *Criterion* 13 (1974): 5–8.

"Dimensions of Freedom," in *Religious Experience and Process Theology: The Pastoral Implications of a Major Modern Movement*, ed. Harry J. Cargas and Bernard Lee (New York, 1976), pp. 323–39.

"The Price of Greatness ('Ford to Nixon')," in *Religious Experience and Process Theology*, ed. Harry J. Cargas and Bernard Lee (New York, 1976), pp. 341–5.

"The Free and Relational Self," in *Belief and Ethics: Essays in Ethics, the Human Sciences and Ministry in Honor of W. Alvin Pitcher*, ed. W. Widick Schroeder and Gibson Winter (Chicago, 1978), pp. 69–86.

"The Future of Process Philosophy," in *Process Philosophy: Basic Writings*, ed. Jack R. Sibley and Pete A.Y. Gunter (Washington, D.C, 1978), pp. 513–38.

"A Process-Relational Conception of Creation," in *Cry of the Environment: Rebuilding the Christian Creation Tradition*, ed. Philip Joranson and Ken Butigan (Santa Fe, N.M., 1984), pp. 321–8.

"Process Theology: Origins, Strengths, Weaknesses," *Process Studies* 16 (1987): 245–54.

"The Size of God," in *The Size of God: The Theology of Bernard Loomer in Context*, ed. William Dean and Larry E. Axel (Macon, Georgia, 1987), pp. 20–51.

Other Relevant Works

Loomer's papers are at the University of Chicago.

"The Aim of Divinity Education," *Divinity School News* 16 (1949): 1–6.

"Tillich's Theology of Correlation," *Journal of Religion* 36 (1956): 150–56.

"Reinhold Niebuhr's *The Self and the Dramas of History*," *Pastoral Psychology* 9 (1958): 17–20.

"Theology in the American Grain," *Unitarian-Universalist Christian* 30 (1975): 23–34.

"Two Conceptions of Power," *Process Studies* 6 (1976): 5–32.

"Meland on God," *American Journal of Theology and Philosophy* 5 (1984): 138–43.

Unfoldings: Conversations from the Sunday Morning Seminars of Bernie Loomer (Berkeley, Cal., 1985).

Unfoldings II: Further Conversations from the Sunday Morning Seminars of Bernie Loomer (Berkeley, Cal., 1986).

Further Reading

Arnold, Charles H. *Near the Edge of Battle: A Short History of the Divinity School and the "Chicago School of Theology"* (Chicago, 1966).

Dean, William, and Larry E. Axel, eds. *The Size of God: The Theology of Bernard Loomer in Context* (Macon, Georgia, 1987). Contains a bibliography of Loomer's publications.

Frankenberry, Nancy. "Bernard Loomer: Introduction," in *The Chicago School of Theology*, vol. 2, ed. W. Creighton Peden and Jerome A. Stone (Lewiston, N.Y., 1996).

Lee, Bernard J., ed. "Special Issue on Bernard J. Loomer," *Process Studies* 16 (Winter 1987).

Meland, Bernard E. "In Response to Loomer," *American Journal of Theology and Philosophy* 5 (1984): 144–55.

Shaw, Marvin C. "The Romantic Love of Evil: Loomer's Proposal of a Reorientation in Religious Naturalism," *American Journal of Theology and Philosophy* 10 (1989): 33–42.

Towne, Edgar A. "Theological Education

and Empirical Theology: Bernard M. Loomer at the University of Chicago," *Journal of Religion* 84 (2004): 212–33.

William Neely
Kenneth A. Olliff

LORTIE, Stanislas-Alfred (1869–1912)

Stanislas-Alfred Lortie was born on 12 November 1869 in Québec City, Canada. After studying classics at the Petit Séminaire de Québec, Lortie was admitted into the Grand Séminaire de Québec in 1889. There he began his study of theology with Abbé Louis-Adolphe PâQUET, who then sent him to Rome for two years where Thomism was undergoing a revival. Lortie was ordained priest, received his doctorate in theology in 1892, and then returned to Canada and the Petit Séminaire de Québec to teach the philosophical component of the classics program. In 1900 he began teaching theology at the Grand Séminaire de Québec. He retired in 1911 and died in his brother's home in Curran, Ontario on 19 August 1912.

Lortie's impact on theology and philosophy in Québec extended well beyond his outstanding teaching at the Grand Séminaire. He published a three-volume textbook of philosophical theology in 1909–10, *Elementa philosophiae christianae ad mentem S. Thomae Aquinatis exposita*, that was widely praised and adopted. This was the first new comprehensive treatise on philosophy in French-speaking Canada since Jérôme Demers's 1835 book, *Institutiones philosophicae ad usum studiosae juventutis*, which had been the first philosophical work published in all of Canada. Lortie's clear exposition of Thomistic philosophy and theology met the need for an orthodox presentation of Catholicism's renewed commitment to Aquinas's system.

Lortie's writings are also notable for sympathies with the laboring class, the workers' right to organize, and socialism. He lectured and published on urban problems and socialism, always based on his own research and experiences. He became involved in local politics and union disputes. He was a close observer of the disruptions of the shoe industry strike of 1900, and assisted the Québec Archbishop's arbitration of the conflict. His study of contemporary life, "Compositeur typographe de Québec" (1904), is a highly detailed and accurate portrait of the life and troubles of a typical working-class family. In 1905 he organized a group of professors, social scientists, clerics, and journalists interested in social and economic conditions, called the "Société d'Economie Politique et Sociale."

Lortie was a significant part of the rising French Canadian nationalism at the start of the twentieth century. He embodied the aims of social action on Catholic principles, working for middle-class temperance, thrift, and family virtues. Although staying out of partisan politics, he did fight for French homogeneity and cultural pride. In 1902 he founded the Société du Parler Français au Canada with Adjutor Rivard, and helped to edit the *Bulletin du parler français au Canada*. His 1903 monograph on the origins of French-speaking settlers of Canada inaugurated the scientific study of the language of New France.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
L'Origine et le parler des Canadiens français: *études sur l'émigration française au Canada de 1608 à 1700, sur l'état actuel du parler franco-canadien, son histoire et les causes de son évolution* (Paris, 1903).
"Compositeur typographe de Québec, Canada (Amérique du Nord), salarié à la semaine dans le système des engagements volontaires permanents d'après les renseignements recueillis sur les lieux en 1903," in *Les ouvriers des deux mondes au Secrétariat de la Société d'économie*

sociale, no. 101 (Paris, 1904). Reprinted in *Paysans et ouvriers québecois d'autrefois* (Québec, 1968), p. 77–150.

Elementa philosophiae christianae ad mentem S. Thomae Aquinatis exposita, 3 vols (Québec, 1909–10).

Further Reading
Dict Canad Bio
Houde, Roland. *Histoire et philosophie au Québec* (Trois Rivières, Québec, 1979).
Lamonde, Yvan. *La philosophie et son enseignement au Québec (1665–1920)* (Montréal, 1980).
Provost, Honorius, ed. *Le séminaire de Québec: documents et biographies* (Québec, 1964).

John R. Shook

LOVEJOY, Arthur Oncken (1873–1962)

Arthur O. Lovejoy was born on 10 October 1873 in Berlin, Germany. His father was Wallace William Lovejoy, who came from Puritan stock, and his mother was Sara Oncken, daughter of a prominent Baptist minister in Germany. By the early 1880s his mother had died and his father had given up medicine for the Episcopal ministry. Moving the family often, Lovejoy's father continued his ministerial studies and took various church positions. Lovejoy attended several schools and finished high school in 1891 at the Germantown Academy outside Philadelphia. That summer the family moved to Oakland, California, and Lovejoy was admitted to the University of California in nearby Berkeley. He took the classical course in the College of Letters, and his studies included Latin, Greek, and modern languages, as well as courses in history, economics, science, and literature. Beginning as a junior, he focused on philosophy and came under the powerful influence of George Holmes HOWISON, who encouraged Lovejoy to pursue graduate work in philosophy, even though Lovejoy did not adopt Howison's idealism.

Upon graduation with his BA in 1895, Lovejoy decided, over the opposition of his father, to study philosophy at Harvard University. At Harvard, Josiah ROYCE and William JAMES had the greatest impact on Lovejoy. He admired Royce's critical intelligence and open-mindedness but rejected his absolute idealism. Lovejoy was disappointed with his one course with James on Kant, but admired James's personality and intellectual courage. He also found James's own philosophical positions more appealing than those of Royce. Lovejoy appreciated James's emphasis on the temporal aspect of reality, a theme that would be important in Lovejoy's own thinking. He also took courses from George H. PALMER, Hugo MÜNSTERBERG, and George SANTAYANA. In addition, he took classes in comparative religion, Hebrew religion, Sanskrit, and Buddhism. Lovejoy completed his work for the MA in philosophy in 1897, which turned out to be Lovejoy's only advanced degree. He continued his studies at Harvard during 1897–8, and then went to France for additional study in 1898–9. His work at the Sorbonne and the Bibliothèque Nationale focused on historical inquiries into Jewish and other religious thought. Influenced by William James's hostility to the PhD degree, Lovejoy never completed his doctorate after returning to the United States.

Lovejoy began his professorial career at Stanford University in 1899 with an appointment in philosophy. He taught a variety of courses including ethics, elementary logic, and philosophy of religion. While his first year was uneventful, in his second year Lovejoy was caught up in the controversy surrounding the dismissal of the economist E. A. ROSS, whose views had displeased Mrs. Leland Stanford, sole regent of the university. When it became clear that the issue involved academic freedom,

Lovejoy, along with several colleagues, resigned from the university to protest Ross's dismissal. Lovejoy worried that, if the Ross case went unchallenged, professors would lose the right to speak freely in class and to participate in social and political causes. Lovejoy, fortunately, secured another position as the only philosopher at Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri, to begin in fall 1901. He taught a full range of philosophy courses as well as volunteering at a social settlement in St. Louis. He remained at Washington University until 1907 when he accepted a one-year visiting appointment at Columbia University where he taught two courses, took advantage of the research libraries, and enjoyed concerts and the theater. After his year in New York, Lovejoy accepted a position in philosophy at the University of Missouri in Columbia, where he remained for two years teaching ethics, Kant, evolution, and English philosophy.

In spring 1910 Lovejoy joined the faculty of the Johns Hopkins University as professor of philosophy to teach graduate classes and conduct research. In addition to his work in philosophy and the history of ideas, Lovejoy, spurred on by his experience at Stanford, became an articulate advocate of academic freedom, and with colleagues such as John DEWEY he founded the American Association of University Professors in 1915. He became the first secretary of the organization and in 1918–19 served as President. His philosophical colleagues elected him President of the American Philosophical Association in 1916–17. In the 1930s Lovejoy published three major books, *The Revolt Against Dualism* (1930), *The Great Chain of Being* (1936), and with his colleague George BOAS, *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity* (1935). He remained at Johns Hopkins, except for brief visiting appointments, until his retirement in 1938. Particularly notable were his two visiting appointments at Harvard in 1932–3, when he delivered the William James Lectures that would become *The Great Chain of Being*, and again in 1937–8. He continued his research

and writing over the next two decades. In retirement he published an important collection of essays, *Essays in the History of Ideas* (1948), as well as *The Reason, the Understanding and Time* (1961) and *Reflections on Human Nature* (1961). A second collection of essays, *The Thirteen Pragmatisms and other Essays* (1963), was published shortly after his death. Over his long career Lovejoy published nearly 300 essays on a wide variety of topics, as well as numerous book reviews, pamphlets, and occasional pieces. Lovejoy died on 30 December 1962 in Baltimore, Maryland.

Lovejoy's many writings fall into three major areas: philosophy, history of ideas, and defense of academic freedom. In philosophy Lovejoy was an especially acute critic of other philosophers, and he often developed his own philosophical positions in opposition to the ill-considered arguments of his peers. He staked out a realist position in opposition to Howison and Royce. While he was sympathetic to James's pluralism and temporalism, he also criticized the looseness of James's arguments on behalf of pragmatism. Lovejoy was also an advocate of making philosophy more scientific and of instituting procedures within the discipline that would ensure philosophic progress.

Lovejoy's investigations in the history of ideas ranged from classical Greece and Rome to the twentieth century. He explored the development of religious ideas, notions of primitivism, the rise of temporalism and evolutionary thinking, aspects of the Enlightenment and Romanticism, and problems associated with relativity and relativistic physics. Lovejoy also developed the concept of the "unit-idea," especially in *The Great Chain of Being*. "Unit-ideas" are separate, atemporal entities that have persisted in human thought. The task of the historian of ideas is to trace these unit-ideas through their many manifestations and permutations over time. In addition to his own many efforts in the history of ideas, Lovejoy established *The Journal of the History of Ideas* in 1940 to provide a scholarly forum for the field. Lovejoy also helped establish academic

freedom as an important principle in American colleges and universities. In 1915 he helped draft the initial statement on academic freedom for the newly established American Association of University Professors. During both World War I and the communist scare following World War II, Lovejoy defended academic freedom but also limited the protection offered by the principle. Professors working actively for a German victory or who were members of the Communist Party should be denied protection of the principle, Lovejoy argued, because if they came to power they would abolish academic freedom.

Lovejoy's defense of academic freedom was part of his overall program to protect the integrity of ideas and the right of thinkers to follow their reason wherever it would lead them. Scholars and professors required academic freedom to pursue their inquiries and publish their results without interference, even when those results ran counter to received opinions or to the views of those in authority. The universities and colleges had by the early twentieth century become the primary sites of advanced research and the professors engaged in that work must, Lovejoy argued, be free of outside interference as they pursued their scientific, disinterested investigations. This professional position was necessary if Lovejoy and his professorial colleagues were to make progress in their many diverse investigations.

Many of Lovejoy's philosophical essays were written as critiques of his colleagues' positions. Lovejoy was especially skilled at dissecting the assumptions, presuppositions, and logic of philosophical arguments. A good example is "The Thirteen Pragmatisms" (1908) in which he identified thirteen versions of pragmatism including three theories of meaning, one meaningless theory of truth, eight theories of knowledge, and one ontological theory. Lovejoy urged pragmatists to decide which of these theories really represented the core of pragmatism and to reject those that he found logically or philosophically unsound. In the first two decades of the twentieth century, Lovejoy repeatedly urged his philosophical colleagues to adopt the methods of scientists so that they could resolve philosophical problems and begin to make real progress toward truth, instead of always returning to perennial problems. In his 1916 Presidential address to the American Philosophical Association, "On Some Conditions of Progress in Philosophical Inquiry," Lovejoy proposed that philosophers cooperate in the pursuit of truth. He urged his colleagues to become more procedurally systematic and to root out the sources of error in philosophic thinking. Man's rational capacity, he thought, would ultimately lead to agreement on disputed points if reason were consistently and carefully applied.

Lovejoy's one effort at cooperative philosophizing, his association with a group of philosophers who called themselves Critical Realists, the most prominent of whom was Santayana, failed to produce the kind of agreement Lovejoy hoped. *Essays in Critical Realism* (1920) was in part a response to an earlier volume by the New Realists in 1912. In opposition to the New Realists who argued for a direct realism in which the objects of experience were directly known, the Critical Realists generally adopted a dualistic and representative epistemology in which objects were real but our knowledge of them was mediated by ideas. Unfortunately, they could find no common ground on central epistemological questions, and the shared affinities that marked the volume hardly constituted progress toward science-like truth.

Lovejoy most fully developed his epistemological position in his 1928 Paul Carus Lectures of the American Philosophical Association, which were published as *The Revolt Against Dualism* (1930). In typical fashion, Lovejoy devoted most of the book to critiquing twentieth-century adherents of epistemological monism, particularly the new realists, the objective relativists, A. N. WHITEHEAD and Bertrand Russell. Lovejoy defended both epistemological and psychophysical dualism with a genetic argument. He argued that both grew naturally

out of man's reflection on his experience. He also argued for the real existence of ideas in the physical world and for the absolutely crucial role of ideas in mediating physical objects in the experiences that give rise to knowledge. Lovejoy concluded that the revolt against dualism had failed because of serious logical problems and an inability to account adequately for our ability to know directly a separate physical world. Epistemological and psychophysical dualism, Lovejoy argued, are logically consistent and capable of giving a rational account of the existence of physical reality and of our ability to gain reliable knowledge of that reality through ideas.

This philosophical defense of the existence and importance of ideas was crucial to Lovejoy's extensive work in the history of ideas. Lovejoy's scholarship in this field was marked by the discrimination among and between ideas and propositions in the writings of religious, literary, scientific, and philosophical writers, and by his efforts to trace the histories of what he called "unit-ideas." His "On the Discrimination of Romanticisms" (1924) is a good example of his emphasis on differentiating the various ideas that came to be associated with the term "Romanticism." He urged scholars to explore carefully the constituent ideas that made up such a broad conception. Lovejoy argued that it was in these separate and distinct ideas rather than in the overarching concept that scholars would find the keys to understanding the development of ideas associated with Romanticism. As he had done earlier with "Thirteen Pragmatisms," Lovejoy recommended that scholars begin to think of Romanticism in the plural rather than in the singular.

Lovejoy's most significant achievement in the history of ideas was *The Great Chain of Being*. The book was both a study of the idea of the Great Chain of Being, which had been a powerful scientific and philosophical concept in eighteenth and early nineteenth-century Europe, and a prime example of Lovejoy's methodology in the history of ideas. Lovejoy traced the ways in which philosophers and others used three "unit-ideas" – plenitude, continuity, and gradation – from the time of Plato to the early nineteenth century to understand how the world as they knew it came to be. In tracing the histories of these three ideas over more than two millennia, Lovejoy sought to uncover the logical processes by which thinkers moved from an absolute, static conception of the universe to a pluralistic and evolutionary understanding of the world. In many ways, Lovejoy's historical work was an effort to demonstrate how the ideas that undergirded his own pluralistic and temporalistic philosophy came to the fore by the nineteenth century. By describing the histories of the three constituent ideas embedded in the notion of the Great Chain of Being, Lovejoy hoped to have demonstrated that the many efforts to construct an unchanging, absolute universe had all foundered on the irreducible temporality of experience. Only an evolutionary conception of the universe could incorporate temporality in a rational account of the world.

Lovejoy was an important critical voice in American philosophy during the first half of the twentieth century. Always alert to flaws in logic and reasoning, Lovejoy urged his colleagues to cooperate in making progress in philosophical thinking. In his own work he adopted a temporalistic realism in which our knowledge of the physical world is gained through the mediation of ideas. This philosophical position, in turn, provided an impetus to understanding how in the course of two millennia philosophers and scholars had come to reject an absolute, unchanging conception of the universe in favor of an evolutionary pluralistic universe. As he had done with philosophy, Lovejoy as an historian of ideas urged his colleagues to discriminate carefully among the many constituent ideas that made up such overarching concepts as Pragmatism, Romanticism, or Nature. Finally, by vigorously defending academic freedom, Lovejoy worked to create the kind of environment in which scholars could pursue their inquiries unfettered by interference from authorities inside or outside the

university. In philosophy and in the history of ideas, Lovejoy's legacy is one of rigorous critical inquiry pursued rationally and logically regardless of where those investigations might lead. By defending academic freedom he helped to create a space where such inquiry could proceed unimpeded.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Thirteen Pragmatisms," *Journal of Philosophy* 5 (1908): 5–12, 29–39.
"On Some Conditions of Progress in Philosophical Inquiry," *Philosophical Review* 26 (1917): 123–63.
"Pragmatism *Versus* the Pragmatist," in *Essays in Critical Realism: A Cooperative Study of the Problem of Knowledge* (London, 1920), pp. 35–81.
"On the Discrimination of Romanticisms," *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 39 (1924): 229–53.
"A Temporalistic Realism," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 2, pp. 85–105.
The Revolt Against Dualism: An Inquiry Concerning the Existence of Ideas (La Salle, Ill., 1930).
Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity: A Documentary History of Primitivism and Related Ideas, with George Boas (Baltimore, Md., 1935).
The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea (Cambridge, Mass., 1936).
Essays in the History of Ideas (Baltimore, Md., 1948).
The Reason, the Understanding and Time (Baltimore, Md., 1961).
Reflections on Human Nature (Baltimore, Md., 1961).
The Thirteen Pragmatisms and Other Essays (Baltimore, Md., 1963).

Other Relevant Works
"The Dialectic of Bruno and Spinoza," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 1 (1904): 141–74.
"General Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure," with Edwin Seligman et al., *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* 1 (1915): 15–43.
"Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom in Wartime," with Edward Capps and A. A. Young, *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* 4 (1918): 29–47.
"Annual Message of the President," *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* 5 (1919): 2–32.
"Academic Freedom," in *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, ed. Edwin Seligman (New York, 1930), vol. 1, pp. 384–8.
"Reflections on the History of Ideas," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 1 (1940): 3–23.
"Communism Versus Academic Freedom," *The American Scholar* 18 (1949): 332–7.
Glass, Bentley, Owsei Temkin, and William L. Straus, Jr., eds. *Forerunners of Darwin: 1745–1859* (Baltimore, Md., 1959). Contains six essays by Lovejoy.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, Amer Phils Before 1950, Bio 20thC Phils, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Dict Amer Bio, Oxford Comp Phil, Pres Addr of APA v1, Proc of APA v36, Who Was Who in Amer v4, Who's Who in Phil
Beck, Lewis White. "Lovejoy as a Critic of Kant," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 33 (1972): 471–84.
Boas, George. "A. O. Lovejoy as Historian of Philosophy," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 9 (1948): 404–11.
———, "A. O. Lovejoy: Reason-in-action," *The American Scholar* 29 (1960): 535–42.
Campbell, James. "Arthur Lovejoy and the Progress of Philosophy," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 39 (2003): 617–43.

Dewey, John. "Some Comments on Philosophical Discussion," *Journal of Philosophy* 21 (1924): 197–209.

Duffin, Kathleen E. "Arthur O. Lovejoy and the Emergence of Novelty," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 41 (1980): 267–81.

Feuer, Lewis S. "The Philosophical Method of Arthur O. Lovejoy: Critical Realism and Psychoanalytical Realism," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 23 (1963): 493–510.

———, "Arthur O. Lovejoy," *The American Scholar* 46 (1977): 358–66.

Hintikka, Jaakko. "A. O. Lovejoy on Plenitude in Aristotle," *Ajatus* 29 (1967): 5–11.

Imber, Jonathan B. "Arthur O. Lovejoy and *The Revolt Against Dualism*," *Society* 32 (1995): 73–82.

Klausner, Neal W. "Three Decades of the Epistemological Dialectic," *Philosophy of Science* 14 (1947): 20–43.

Mandelbaum, Maurice. "Arthur O. Lovejoy and the Theory of Historiography," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 9 (1948): 412–23.

Randall, John H., Jr. "Arthur O. Lovejoy and the History of Ideas," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 23 (1963): 475–9.

Reck, Andrew J. "The Philosophy of Arthur O. Lovejoy (1873–1962)," *Review of Metaphysics* 17 (1963): 257–85.

———, "The Temporalistic Realism of Arthur O. Lovejoy," in *Recent American Philosophy: Studies of Ten Representative Thinkers* (New York, 1964), chap. 8.

"Symposium on Lovejoy, The Great Chain, and the History of Ideas," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 48 (1987): 187–263.

Wilson, Daniel J. *Arthur O. Lovejoy and the Quest for Intelligibility* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1980).

———, *Arthur O. Lovejoy: An Annotated Bibliography* (New York, 1982).

———, "Lovejoy's *The Great Chain of Being* After Fifty Years," Journal of the History of Ideas 48 (1987): 187–206.

Daniel J. Wilson

LUCKMANN, Thomas (1927–)

Thomas Luckmann was born on 14 November 1927 in Jesenice, Slovenia. He studied French, German, comparative languages, psychology, and philosophy in Vienna and Innsbruck in Austria. He emigrated to the United States to continue his studies at the New School for Social Research in New York City. His main teachers at the New School were Alfred SCHUTZ, Albert Salomon, Carl Mayer, and Karl Löwith. In 1953 he received his MA in philosophy, and three years later his PhD in sociology. From 1956 to 1960 he taught in the anthropology and sociology department at Hobart College, and from 1960 to 1965 he taught at the New School. From 1965 to 1970 he was professor of sociology at the Goethe University in Germany, and from 1970 to 1994 at the University of Konstanz in Germany.

In 1966 Luckmann published *The Social Construction of Reality* with Peter L. BERGER, which contains an alternative to the functionalism of Talcott PARSONS. The book made a great impact on the constructivist school in the social sciences, especially in the sociology of science and the new institutionalism within economics. In this book, Luckmann and Berger defended the view that the reality within which we live is the result of human action and consists of small and large institutions. Its meaning is determined by knowledge mediated through language and legitimized by these institutions. Reality does not exist apart from human beings, but the view of Luckmann and Berger goes deeper. Reality is inherently social in that it is a product of social agency, and its

objectivity is the product of a shared world view; that is to say, it is intersubjective. However, this must not be taken to imply that, for Luckmann, everything is just a construction. The construction of reality, although social, is based on the structure of individual consciousness and the structure of the life-world as egological and the mundane foundations of social life. As a human being, one lives in a social world, which, however, is not the boundary of one's experiences as the social world is only a part of one's total life-world.

Experience of transcendence and the social construction of religion are, for Luckmann, the ultimate references of sense and meaning and at the core of knowledge and social institutions. Transcendence is for Luckmann – in contrast to Berger's substantial definition of this term as an effect that transmundane reality has on experience and agency in everyday life – a mundane experience in the life-world of a human being. For Luckmann, thus, religion has its roots in the mundane life-world and has the social function of (re)integrating the individual into a meaningful social order. In developing the program of a protosociology, Luckmann provided the social sciences – and with that the sociology of knowledge as a general theory of agency and institution – with a phenomenological foundation. In his sociology of language and communication, Luckmann took a theoretical and empirical look at the core institutions of social life. In recent years, he has focused on the role of morality in everyday life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge with Peter L. Berger (New York, 1966).

The Invisible Religion: The Problem of Religion in Modern Society (New York, 1967).

Sociology of Language (Indianapolis, Ind., 1975).

The Structures of the Life-World, 2 vols, with Alfred Schütz (Evanston, Ill., 1973, 1989).

Life-World and Social Realities (London, 1983).

Theorie des sozialen Handelns (Berlin, 1992).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with James A. Beckford, *The Changing Face of Religion* (Newbury Park, Cal., 1989).

Ed., *Moral im Alltag* (Gütersloh, Germany, 1998).

Ed., *Kommunikative Konstruktion von Moral* (Opladen, Germany, 1999).

Further Reading

Lafferty, William M. "Externalization and Dialectics: Taking the Brackets off Berger and Luckmann's Sociology of Knowledge," *Cultural Hermeneutics* 4 (1977): 139–61.

Mason, Michael C. *The Privatization of the Sacred World: Thomas Luckmann's Phenomenologically Founded Sociology of Modern Religion*. PhD dissertation, Columbia University (New York, 1975).

Dirk Tänzler

LYALL, William (1811–90)

William Lyall was born on 11 June 1811 in Paisley, Scotland. He was educated at the Universities of Glasgow and Edinburgh. He was ordained minister of the Free Church of Scotland, and served congregations in Broxburn, West Lothian, Uphall, and Linlithgow before emigrating to British North America in 1848. His first appointment was as a tutor at the (Presbyterian) Knox College in Toronto. In 1850 he joined the Free Church College in Halifax, Nova Scotia, as a professor of mental and moral philosophy and of classical literature. It is astonishing that Lyall, teaching all of the arts subjects offered, found time to publish his major work, *Intellect, the*

Emotions and the Moral Nature in 1855. In 1860 he was transferred to the Theological Seminary in Truro, Nova Scotia. When it closed in 1863, Lyall returned to Halifax as professor of logic and psychology at Dalhousie College. He was awarded an honorary LLD from McGill University in 1864, and was named a founding fellow of the Royal Society of Canada when it was established in 1882. He taught at Dalhousie until his death on 17 Jan 1890 in Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Intellect, the Emotions and the Moral Nature was one of the earliest books of philosophy written in Canada, and among English-language texts it was preceded only by James BEAVEN's *Elements of Natural Theology* (1850). Lyall was influenced by the Scottish attitude toward religion, that religion should provide a reasoned argument for holding a belief in God, or for the promotion of self-restraint; religion should not just be a series of threatening diatribes on soul-saving. His philosophical predecessors were Thomas Reid and Dugald Stewart, founding members of the Scottish Common Sense School of philosophy. The Common Sense School became a background against which Lyall worked out his own philosophical views.

Intellect, the Emotions and the Moral Nature begins with an analysis of the intellect, declaring the fact of consciousness to be intuitively evident. The second part is an explanation of the emotions as the sources of our uniqueness as human beings, and the third part unites intellect and emotion in the moral, collective consciousness of a community. Lyall anticipates the developing neo-Hegelianism of the late nineteenth century. Consciousness, as understood by the followers of Hegel, including F. H. Bradley, Bernard Bosanquet, T. H. Green, and J. M. McTaggart, is the first ground of ideas of self and other. Lyall rejected the division, suggested by Descartes, between the cogito and the external world. When faced with two competing claims about the origins of experience – the world, or the conscious self – Lyall claimed that we intuitively grasp the truth of the primacy of consciousness, but that intuition does not negate the reality of the external world. We have no experiences without the idea of an external world, and without experience in an external world we have no ideas of space or time. One's world is not restricted to mental events. But neither is it a product of the imprinting of an external reality. Lyall writes that the imagination gives form to experience, and without the imagination there would be no inspirational force that gives shape to the emotional life that we so closely associate with conscious awareness. "If we go into the region of the imagination … if we observe its potent sway – how it etherealizes or spiritualizes matter itself, clothes it in its own beauty … who will say that all this is the result of mere organization?" (1855, p. 93) Lyall is neither accepting what the Common Sense School stated as obvious, that the world is just there; nor does he leave us trapped in our minds. The imagination bridges the metaphysical gap with which Descartes grappled, by giving us experience of a world that is neither pure matter nor pure idea.

Lyall was determined to accommodate two pressing dichotomies that his new home in Nova Scotia brought into sharp focus: the unavoidable externality of nature, and his belief in God. Humanity alone could not have created such a world of power and beauty, the Romantic world that shaped his imagination during his education, and an untamed wilderness that surrounded him. Reason was not enough to explain these different worlds; some account of the imagination and its power to construct the world was needed. A century later in 1963, Northrop FRYE would make the same point in *An Educated Imagination*, but to a much wider and more receptive audience.

Lyall resisted the plethora of "mental faculties" that had been developing in the writings of the Common Sense philosophers (for example, Dugald Stewart). Many mental faculties were designed to account for the varying behaviors and the fine distinctions discernible in the risky business of making moral judg-

ments. Lyall opted to discard the faculties, and simplify our contact with the external world. Ideas passing through the mind were made coherent by God's gift of rationality. Although idealist by inclination, Lyall never quite abandoned a mechanistic tripartide division of the mind.

In his moral philosophy, Lyall resists the strictures of reason alone. Perhaps the orderly life of Kant in the eighteenth century seemed too remote to make sense out of life in Nova Scotia in the mid nineteenth century, prior to Canadian confederation in 1867. For the Scottish philosopher the conflicts of moral life in the Maritimes, conflicts that Kant and his followers argued could be so neatly resolved by an educated will and a trained sense of duty, required empathic understanding before one could begin to generate theory. Lyall cuts to the quick in declaring the emotions to be critical to judgments about actions. His moral theory draws on both Kant and Hume.

Lyall separates the emotions from the intellect, attributing to them "a higher state" in his assessment of the intellect (1855, p. 284). When he later develops his moral theory he asserts that we "perceive the quality of rightness or wrongness," implying that our emotions inform us about situations where reason cannot (p. 487). Emotions are the source of these judgments in as much as they are also the source of actions, and therefore of actions being judged. Thus far he resembles Hume. But he departs from Hume's emotive account by insisting that our emotions are subject to a law of duty that is part of our human nature and to which law, through our awareness of it, we give reverence. Yet the affinity with Kant, that such a claim invites, is modified by Lyall, who thinks that the intellectual will and its attendant purity fail to explain the real force behind reverence for the moral law. This force comes from the emotion of love, the primary emotion that stands higher than the intellect and ascends beyond the muddles of daily life, beyond the immediate perceptions of right and wrong, the struggles

to do one's duty. In all actions love directs us towards the good. "Distant reverence is at most a cold feeling, and it is not properly approbation till there is love." (p. 510) The object of love is Being and this includes nature, community and God. Emotion is "the atmosphere of the mind; its vital breath" (p. 284), and love, as the most all-encompassing emotion resonates with the vitality of nature and all living beings. Love gives us knowledge of their awesome phenomenal states (the states we experience), something science cannot do.

Lyall's book is difficult to read, written in the convoluted Victorian prose of the nineteenth century. His frequent sermons throughout on the wonders of nature are more akin to a poet than a Scottish-trained philosopher. His explanations often rely on the metaphors of the imagination. His struggles to accommodate his educated mind to his overwhelming circumstances, so far removed from the orderliness of life in Edinburgh, are borne out in the multiplicity of poetic phrases and references to the natural world, as if each effort at capturing an illustrative example seemed to fall short of his goal.

Lyall was a displaced philosopher who refused to parrot the past or to abandon hope of explaining the unfathomable. With characteristic Scottish resolve he worked to adapt concepts and theories to new circumstances. In doing so he launched a tradition of a rational compromise that is exemplary of the early philosophical works written in Canada. Lyall's creative use of the concept of love as our link to both the moral and intellectual world generated the possibility of new conceptual associations that could resolve differences between communities, nature, and the Creator.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Intellect, the Emotions and the Moral Nature (Edinburgh and London, 1855).

Other Relevant Works
The Philosophy of Thought, a Lecture Delivered at the Opening of the Free

Church College, Halifax Nova Scotia, Session 1852–3 (Halifax, N.S., 1853).

Strictures on the Idea of Power: with Special Reference to the Views of Dr. Brown, in his "Inquiry into the Relation of Cause and Effect" (Edinburgh, 1842).

Further Reading

Canad Encyc, Dict Canad Bio

Armour, Leslie, and Elizabeth Trott. *The Faces of Reason: An Essay on Philosophy and Culture in English Canada, 1850–1950* (Waterloo, Ont., 1981).

Harvey, D. C. *An Introduction to the History of Dalhousie University* (Halifax, N.S., 1938).

McKillop, Brian. *A Disciplined Intelligence* (Montréal, 1979).

Page, F. Hilton. "William Lyall in His Setting," *Dalhousie Review* 60 (Spring 1980): 49–66.

Smale, Peter. "Rationality and Intuition in William Lyall's Philosophical Method," in *Religion and Science in Early Canada*, ed. J. D. Rabb (Kingston, Ontario, 1988), pp. 101–8.

Elizabeth Trott

LYMAN, Eugene William (1872–1948)

The philosophical Christian theology of Eugene W. Lyman contributed significantly to the intellectual landscape of American religious thought. Lyman was born on 4 April 1872 in Cummington, Massachusetts. His parents reared him in a family environment of ethical fervor and religious piety, and the liberal orthodoxy of his Congregational pastors reinforced the teachings of his parents. Lyman earned a BA from Amherst College in 1894, studying under philosophical idealist Charles Garman, and a BD from Yale University in 1899, working with biblical theologian Frank Porter. In 1901 he was ordained in the Congregational Church. Lyman received further training in European universities, associating with prominent Ritschlian thinkers Max Reischle, Adolf von Harnack, and Wilhelm Hermann in Halle, Berlin, and Marburg, between 1899 and 1901; as well as eminent religious philosophers Ernst Troeltsch, Rudolf Eucken, and Henri Bergson at Heidelberg, Jena, and Paris, from 1911 to 1912.

Lyman soon established a reputation as a gifted teacher and renowned scholar of Christian theology and religious philosophy. He held professorships in theology at Carleton College (1901–1904), Congregational Church College of Canada (1904–1905), Bangor Theological Seminary (1905–13), Oberlin College Graduate School of Theology (1913–18), and Union Theological Seminary (1918–42). He published numerous books on philosophical theology, including his initial volume *Theology and Human Problems* (1910), his wartime treatise *The Experience of God in Modern Life* (1918), and his magnum opus *The Meaning and Truth of Religion* (1933). Lyman also participated in the Armenian and Syrian Relief Committee, the Theological Society, the American Philosophical Association, and the Fellowship of Reconciliation. Lyman died on 15 March 1948 in Sweet Briar, Virginia.

Lyman's thought reflects the heritage of evangelical liberalism, adapting traditional Christianity to contemporary knowledge (Cauthen 1962, pp. 27–9). However, as Julius Bixler astutely observed, Lyman constantly eluded simple categorization:

He [Lyman] is not an absolute idealist, because he sets too much store by the reality of time and of the moral struggle; he is not allied with the mystics because of their sacrifice of the active and social aspects of religion to the quietistic; he is not a Ritschlian, because he is unwilling to give up metaphysics; and he hardly agrees with the relative condition in which pragmatism

leaves the idea of truth. But he does hold, with the idealists, that Mind dominates the cosmos; with the mystics, that intuitions are valid; with the Ritschlians, that religion works by value judgments; and with the pragmatists that truth comes by drawing on the entire spiritual life of man. (Bixler 1927, p. 336)

Lyman agreed with, yet moved beyond, evangelical liberalism. Whereas various evangelical liberals accentuated either the practical, moral, and political aspects of piety or the theoretical, rational, and ontological systems of philosophy (see Cauthen 1962, pp. 33–5), Lyman continued to underscore both, laying out a pragmatic realism, an ethical metaphysics, and a social neo-orthodoxy.

Theology and Human Problems adopted the pragmatic philosophy of William JAMES. "Theologies are judged, in the long run, not by their symmetry or elaborateness, but by their contribution to the solution of human problems." (1910, p. 1) However, Lyman rejected the relativistic assumptions of the Jamesian method. In *The Meaning and Truth of Religion*, he coupled pragmatism with realism, retaining a spatiotemporal view of theology and a utilitarian spirit of practicality, yet positing a given order of reality and universal truth. Lyman even accepted the immanent deity of the absolute idealists, discerning the "one increasing purpose" of an "eternal good will." Influenced by the creative evolutionism of Henri Bergson and the process cosmology of Alfred North WHITEHEAD, Lyman proposed rational arguments for classical theism. The religious experience of humanity, the upward thrust of evolution, and the teleological directionality of life corroborate the metaphysical existence of God (1922). In "Christian Theology and a Spiritualistic Philosophy" (1933) Lyman envisions "a Cosmic Creative Spirit who is the ground for the existence and ongoing of a world in which moral effort, intelligence, faith and love can triumph" (pp. 126–7).

Further, Lyman embraced the ethical Christianity of Albrecht Ritschl. Rejecting the personalistic individualism of the religious mystics, Lyman considered moral responsibility instead of private ecstasy the fulcrum of spiritual piety; "the appropriation of Christ by faith meant a life of moral freedom and loving, self-sacrificing service" (1914, p. 358). Still, Lyman opposed the anti-metaphysical (although not the anti-supernaturalistic) leanings of the Ritschlian school. Dogmatics must ground notions about the moral foundations of piety in theories on the ultimate nature of reality. In fact, the spiritual intuitionism of mysticism, as *The Meaning of Selfhood and Faith in Immortality* (1928) suggests, intimates the theological necessity of metaphysics. Human beings, imbued with psychical personalities and superphysical senses, immediately perceive and directly encounter eternally valid and ontologically real ethical values and moral principles. "In religious intuition … the whole self is engaged, and thus an indispensable condition is provided for a wider and richer apprehension of objective truth." ("Christian Theology and a Spiritualistic Philosophy" 1933, p. 121)

Finally, Lyman accepted the social gospel of Walter RAUSCHENBUSCH. If religion exists to solve human predicaments and define right action, then Christianity needs to confront civic dilemmas and develop economic values. In *The Experience of God in Modern Life* and *The God of the New Age* (1918), Lyman examined the systemic and corporate dimensions of sin and salvation, applying Christian principles, like love and tolerance, to social issues, such as industrialization and poverty. Undeniably, evil affects not only individual souls but also institutional structures; conversely, redemption effects not only personal justification but also cultural advancement. Hence, the ecclesiastical body of Christ should advocate the equitable distribution of wealth, the eradication of oppression, and the universal advent of justice. The social gospel compelled Lyman to protest American intervention in foreign conflict,

oppose certain aspects of Western capitalism, and support black students at Union Seminary. However, as the ravages of war dispelled the naïve optimism of Christian progressivism, the writings of Lyman echoed the new theology of neo-orthodoxy. Historical betterment no longer appeared inevitable; human nature no longer looked innately good; empirical science no longer seemed politically neutral. "Social progress," Lyman admitted, "is … not a swiftly unfolding and self-operating movement, but a tragically complicated and baffling problem." (*Experience of God in Modern Life*, 1918, p. 55) Even so, unlike neo-orthodox theologians, he upheld a cautious religious liberalism (see Horton, pp. 36–43). Eugene Lyman, among others, "endeavored in the 1930s and 1940s to keep alive the gospel-centered faith of liberal social Christianity" (Dorrien 2003, p. 19). Ultimately, the worldwide establishment of democracy emerges from the infinite and creative purposes of God rather than from the benevolent and philanthropic programs of humankind (see "The Kingdom of God and History," 1938). Nonetheless, since the people of the world stand as co-workers of God, and because the mission of the church serves as a vehicle for the kingdom, the earthly realization of "beloved communities" and "federal republics" requires the collaboration of divine resourcefulness and human agency.

Lyman's legacy lives on in his successors' efforts to reconcile rival scholarly positions, to traverse rigid theological boundaries, and to synthesize incompatible religious concepts. He adopted practical instrumentalism without accepting hard relativism; he embraced Christocentric morality without renouncing ontological truth; he admired political consciousness without anticipating inexorable progress; he acknowledged evolutionary theism without leaving temporal reality; he recognized spiritual knowledge without abandoning communal life; he accepted divine transcendence without compromising human activism. Lyman rendered empirical theology metaphysically substantive and religious ontology historically relevant.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Theology and Human Problems: A Comparative Study of Absolute Idealism and Pragmatism as Interpretations of Religion (New York, 1910).

"Must Dogmatics Forego Ontology?" *American Journal of Theology* 18 (1914): 355–77.

The Experience of God in Modern Life (New York, 1918).

The God of the New Age: A Tract for the Times (Boston, 1918).

"The Rationality of Belief in the Reality of God," *Journal of Religion* 2 (1922): 449–65.

The Meaning of Selfhood and Faith in Immortality (Cambridge, Mass., 1928).

The Meaning and Truth of Religion (New York, 1933).

"Christian Theology and a Spiritualistic Philosophy," in *Contemporary American Theology*, ed. Vergilius Ferm (New York, 1933), pp. 103–31.

"The Kingdom of God and History," in *The Kingdom of God and History* (Chicago and New York, 1938), pp. 73–104.

"Christian Faith and the Present Crisis," *Religion in Life* 9 (1940): 323–35.

Religion and the Issues of Life (New York, 1943).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v36*, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v58*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Bixler, Julius Seelye. "Lyman of Union: Exponent of Evolutionary Theism," *The Congregationalist* 112 (1927): 335–6.

Cauthen, Kenneth. *The Impact of American Religious Liberalism* (New York, 1962).

Dorrien, Gary. *The Making of American Liberal Theology: Idealism, Realism, and Modernity, 1900–1950* (Louisville, Kent., 2003).

Horton, Walter M. "Eugene W. Lyman: Liberal Christian Thinker," in *Liberal*

Theology, An Appraisal: Essays in Honor of Eugene William Lyman, ed. David E. Roberts and Henry P. Van Dusen (New York, 1942), pp. 3–44.

Hutchison, William R. *The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1976).

Snodgrass, Ernest L. *Naturalism and Supernaturalism in E. W. Lyman's Philosophy*. PhD dissertation, University of Chicago (Chicago, 1937).

Demian Wheeler

LYONS, David Barry (1935–)

David Lyons was born on 6 February 1935 in New York City. He is one of the preeminent philosophers of law in the United States but prior to his intellectual journey, Lyons worked for a short time as a machinist and draftsman while studying engineering at Cooper Union in New York. He received a BA from Brooklyn College in 1960 in philosophy and American studies. He then received both an MA and a PhD in philosophy from Harvard University in 1963. He did postdoctoral work on a Knox Fellowship at the University of Oxford, where he was introduced to legal philosophy by H. L. A. Hart, first by reading his work *Concept of Law* then by attending his seminars and lectures. Lyons's continued interest in utilitarianism was evident when he published his first book *Forms and Limits of Utilitarianism* in 1965, which reflected the ideas of Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill.

Lyons began teaching philosophy at Cornell in 1964, and received a Guggenheim Fellowship in 1970. He served as chair of Cornell philosophy department from 1978 to 1984, and began teaching in the Law School in

1979. While at Cornell, he was the recipient of numerous awards including the Clark Distinguished Teaching Award and was named the Susan Linn Sage Professor of Philosophy in 1990. He has also received major research fellowships from the Society for the Humanities and three fellowships from the National Endowment for the Humanities. Throughout his academic career he has directed seminars for legal practitioners discussing issues of ethics, constitutional law, and legal interpretation. In addition, he helped develop Cornell University's Program of Ethics and Public Life. When he retired from Cornell in 1995, he joined the faculty in the School of Law at Boston University in 1995 and was appointed professor of philosophy in 1998. Shortly thereafter in 2001 he was once again honored as the Law Alumni Scholar.

Lyons is a leading authority on legal philosophy, writing comprehensively on utilitarianism and the moral aspects of legal theory. His personal commitment to being a responsible citizen has directed his interest in the practical applications of law and its relationship to significant social moments in history, such as the civil rights movement. Influenced by the intellectual work of Bentham and Mill, in addition to his reasonable ideals, Lyons's philosophical scholarship encompasses a utilitarian approach. A "normative" theory, the central component of utilitarian theory is that right actions can be demonstrated by their effect on society. Utilitarianism holds that good is whatever brings the greatest happiness to the greatest number of people. In the context of law it provides a standard for appraising and guiding behavior in the interest of all citizens. Utilitarianism can further be understood as a theory, which claims that decisions should be made to promote good behavior.

Drawing from his knowledge of philosophy and deep understanding of the law and the role it plays in society, Lyons has authored seven books including *Ethics and the Rule of Law* (1984). He approaches the concept of law as an instrument to evaluate and determine

individual as well as social conduct or philosophically determine what is *good* or *bad* behavior. Furthermore, he recognizes the historical gravity of the law in that while it is capable of doing good, such as recognizing human rights (like the Geneva Convention), it can equally commit malevolence, for example, by upholding segregation and Jim Crow laws. Pointedly, Lyons is concerned with the values and ethics associated with "good" and "bad" within the legal framework. What does "good" or "bad" mean? How soundly is this argument constructed? Is their a moral standard underlying these arguments? And how can it be defended?

Lyons has engaged in various forms of political action and civil disobedience against South Africa's system of apartheid. He was arrested for participating in sit-ins on the Cornell campus urging divestment from South Africa. He also assisted in writing the principal Faculty and Staff Against Apartheid document, including why "Cornell Should Divest." His recent scholarship addresses monetary reparations claims made on behalf of African Americans.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Forms and Limits of Utilitarianism (Oxford, 1965).
In the Interest of the Governed: A Study in Bentham's Philosophy of Utility and Law (Oxford, 1973).
Rights (Belmont, Cal., 1979).
Ethics and the Rule of Law (Cambridge, UK, 1984).
Rights, Welfare, and Mill's Moral Theory (New York, 1994).
Mill's Utilitarianism: Critical Essays (Lanham, Md., 1997).
Moral Aspects of Legal Theory: Essays on Law, Justice, and Political Responsibility (New York, 1993).

Other Relevant Works
"The Internal Morality of Law," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 71 (1971): 105–19.
"Rawls versus Utilitarianism," *Journal of Philosophy* 69 (1972): 535–45.
"Ethical Relativism and the Problem of Incoherence," *Ethics* 86 (1976): 107–21.
"Moral Aspects of Legal Theory," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 7 (1982): 223–54.
"Derivability, Defensibility, and the Justification of Judicial Decisions," *The Monist* 68 (1985): 325–46.
"Basic Rights and Constitutional Interpretation," *Social Theory and Practice* 16 (1990): 337–57.
"Unfinished Business: Racial Junctures in U.S. History and Their Legacy," in *Justice in Time: Responding to Historical Injustice*, ed. L. H. Meyer (Baden-Baden, Germany, 2004), pp. 271–98.

Further Reading
Feinberg, Joel. "The Forms and Limits of Utilitarianism," *Philosophical Review* 76 (1967): 368–81.
Kavka, Gregory S. "Extensional Equivalence and Utilitarian Generalization," *Theoria* 41 (1975): 125–47.

Randy L. Wells

M

McCABE, Lorenzo Dow (1817–97)

Lorenzo Dow McCabe was born on 7 January 1817 in Marietta, Ohio, and died on 18 June 1897 in Delaware, Ohio. He received the BA in 1843 and MA in 1846 from Ohio University. From 1845 to 1871 he taught philosophy at Ohio Wesleyan University, first as professor of mathematics and mechanical philosophy and later as professor of philosophy. He also served as university Vice President from 1871 to 1873 and as Acting President from 1873 to 1876 and from 1888 to 1889. He received honorary degrees from Allegheny College and Syracuse University.

Although a devout Methodist and clergyman, McCabe championed a controversial philosophical argument against the traditional Christian doctrine of God's omniscience. As a staunch defender of the Methodist emphasis on human free will, he regarded divine "foreknowledge" of all future events as a threat to human agency and the biblical portrayal of God. He expounded his arguments for God's "nescience" of future contingent events in *The Foreknowledge of God* (1878) and further refined them in *Divine Nescience of Future Contingencies a Necessity* (1882).

McCabe's arguments were a response to the classical claim that God exists beyond "time" and hence knows all future historical events, even those arising from human freedom, with a timeless certainty, whether or not He actually causes or predestines them.

McCabe raised three primary objections to this view: (1) it fails to give due credit to the literal language of Scripture that describes God as repenting and responding to his creation; (2) it produces serious moral objections about the way God governs and judges the world; and (3) it strips God's own nature of precisely those "personal" characteristics that inspire human reverence for Him and enable humans to feel that they are participants in His life.

The last of these arguments, in particular, was philosophically intriguing to other American religious philosophers. McCabe argued that absolute divine foreknowledge would eliminate the element of freedom within God's own being, the very element that constitutes genuine personhood and allows one to enter into sympathetic personal relationships with other selves. According to McCabe, God must remain ignorant of the future free choices of humans in order to sustain genuine personal relationships with them. Furthermore, if God were certain of all future events, he would be depriving himself of the experience of spontaneous delight and pleasure in human redemption and sanctification. Nor could God really share the world's pain and suffering, as Christianity testifies. Therefore, McCabe concluded, "our future choices ought to be as truly contingent in his mind as they are contingent in ours" (1878, p. 306).

McCabe argued that this self-limitation on God's part guarantees that history remains

genuinely open and that human agency itself is meaningful to him. God guards His relationship with the world by staying within the temporal order, and he nurtures human freedom by relating to humans through persuasion rather than coercion, by way of "illumination, entreaty, warning, or command, but never by way of causative determination" (1878, p. 207). McCabe's philosophical approach had connections to the personalist philosophy coming out of Germany, and it anticipated some of the arguments made by later American process philosophers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Foreknowledge of God, and Cognate Themes in Theology and Philosophy (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1878).

Divine Nescience of Future Contingencies a Necessity (New York, 1882).

Other Relevant Works
McCabe's papers are at Ohio Wesleyan University in Delaware, Ohio.

Light on the Pathway of Holiness (New York, 1871).

"Prescience of Future Contingencies Impossible," *Methodist Review* 74 (1892): 753–69.

Further Reading
King, William M. "God's Nescience of Future Contingents: A Nineteenth-century Theory," *Process Studies* 9 (1979): 105–15.

Tiessen, David A. "The Openness Model of God: An Evangelical Paradigm in Light of Its Nineteenth-century Wesleyan Precedent," *Didaskalia* 11 (Spring 2000): 77–101.

William M. King

McCARTHY, John (1927–)

John McCarthy, perhaps the most influential defender of the "logic approach" to artificial intelligence, was born on 4 September 1927 in Boston, Massachusetts. He graduated in 1948 from the California Institute of Technology with a BS in mathematics. In 1951 he received a PhD in mathematics from Princeton University. He held mathematics positions at Princeton University from 1951 to 1953, Stanford University from 1953 to 1955, and Dartmouth College from 1955 to 1958. McCarthy then was a professor of communication science at Massachusetts Institute of Technology from 1958 to 1962. In 1962 McCarthy became professor of computer science at Stanford University. He was Director of the Artificial Intelligence Laboratory from 1965 to 1980. From 1987 to 1994 McCarthy was the Charles M. Pigott Professor of Engineering at Stanford, and he retired in 2001.

Among McCarthy's awards and distinctions are the A. M. Turing Award of the Association for Computing Machinery (1971), the Research Excellence Award of the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence (1985), the Kyoto Prize (1988), and the National Medal of Science (1990). He is a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Mathematical Society, the National Academy of Engineering, and the National Academy of Sciences.

McCarthy co-founded, with Marvin MINSKY, the AI Research Laboratory at MIT in 1959. He coined the term "artificial intelligence," and was one of the major influences in the development of the field. From the outset his work promoted a view of philosophy and AI as mutually relevant. McCarthy's research in AI engaged epistemological problems in particular. In several influential papers, he focused upon questions of learnability, and upon the representation and use of information. McCarthy recognized early on the importance of "common sense" to AI systems. By this he meant a system's ability to recognize the logical

entailments of believed propositions in a relevant but limited manner, in order to arrive at useful conclusions while avoiding an explosion of inferences. An attempt to partially answer this challenge is found in McCarthy's proposal of Circumscription, a formalization of the notion of *knowing enough to generalize* about a property or class.

Circumscription aims to enable generalizations from incomplete information, based on the conjecture that one has enough information about, roughly, the *essence* of a property to construct or recognize the class of objects possessing it. Since such conjectures are defeasible by the addition of new information, Circumscription is non-monotonic, a significant departure from standard applications of classical logic to programming. McCarthy's influence in bringing philosophy and AI together extends also to his treatments of the nature of intelligence, the ascription of psychological states to artifacts, the problem of free will, and various issues in philosophical logic, including the interpretation of modal logics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Programs with Common Sense," with Pat Hayes, in *Semantic Information Processing*, ed. Marvin Minsky (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), pp. 403–18.
"Some Philosophical Problems from the Standpoint of Artificial Intellligence," *Machine Intelligence* 4 (1969): 463–502.
"Epistemological Problems of Artificial Intelligence," in *Proceedings of the 5th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence* (Pittsburgh, 1977), pp. 1038–52.
"Ascribing Mental Qualities to Machines," in *Philosophical Perspectives in Artificial Intelligence*, ed. Martin Ringle (Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1979), pp. 161–95.
"Circumscription: A Form of Non-Monotonic Reasoning," *Artificial Intelligence* 13 (1980): 27–39.
Formalizing Common Sense (Norwood, N.J., 1990).

Defending AI Research: A Collection of Essays and Reviews (Stanford, Cal., 1996).

Other Relevant Works
"Applications of Circumscription to Formalizing Common Sense Knowledge," *Artificial Intelligence* 26 (1986): 89–116.
"Artificial Intelligence, Logic, and Formalizing Common Sense," in *Philosophical Logic and Artificial Intelligence*, ed. R. H. Thomason (Dordrecht, 1989), pp. 161–90.
"Todd Moody's Zombies," *Journal of Consciousness Studies* 2 (1995): 345–7.

Further Reading
Cambridge Dict Amer Bio
Haugeland, John, ed. *Mind Design: Philosophy, Psychology, Artificial Intelligence* (Cambridge, Mass., 1981; 2nd edn 1997).
Hilts, Philip J. *Scientific Temperaments: Three Lives in Contemporary Science* (New York, 1982).
Lifschitz, Vladimir, ed. *Artificial Intelligence and Mathematical Theory of Computation: Papers in Honor of John McCarthy* (Boston, 1991).
McCorduck, Pamela. *Machines Who Think* (San Francisco, 1979).
Williams, Sam. *Arguing A.I.: The Battle for Twenty-first Century Science* (New York, 2002).

Tim Kenyon

McCLENDON, James William, Jr. (1924–2000)

Although McClendon made a career out of arguing that theology does not need philosophical foundations, he employed philosophical tools as well as theological tools. His

use of philosophy is even more astonishing given his context as a self-described "Baptist theologian" in the sense that Baptists – which include Baptists, Congregationalists, and Mennonites – historically do not practice philosophy or theology in an academic sense. McClendon's philosophical theology depended most upon the analytic and pragmatic traditions.

James W. McClendon, Jr. was born on 6 March 1924 in Shreveport, Louisiana. His father attended a Methodist church, while his mother went to a Southern Baptist church. McClendon went to church mostly with his mother and was baptized in her church at the age of eleven. He enlisted in the navy during his first year of college because he felt a call to serve his country but never had to fight in World War II. In fact, the first time he even boarded a ship was the day that Japan and the United States signed their peace treaty. He earned his BA in chemistry at the University of Texas and received a call to serve the Church while there as well. He earned an MA in divinity degree at Southwestern Baptist Theological School in Fort Worth, Texas. He then went to Princeton Theological Seminary and earned an MA in theology, and returned to Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary to earn a ThD in theology in 1953. He studied with Walter Thomas Connor, a Baptist theologian who wrote his own doctoral dissertation on "Pragmatism and Theology" under Edgar Young MULLINS at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky. McClendon's other teachers during his study at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary included William Estep and T. B. Maston. He also did postdoctoral work in philosophy at the University of California in Berkeley with J. L. Austin and John Searle, and at the University of Oxford with Ian Ramsey.

McClendon's first teaching position was at Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary in San Francisco, California from 1954 to 1966. He was asked to leave after he supported a financial campaign to fund one of his students to go to Alabama to march with Martin Luther KING, JR. McClendon was hired by the University of San Francisco for the next academic year. With this teaching position, he was the first non-Catholic theologian to teach in a Catholic theology department in the United States. Although he was not yet a pacifist, he was asked to leave this school after three years of teaching for publicly speaking out against the war taking place in Southeast Asia. McClendon had visiting professorships at Baylor University, Goucher College, Stanford University, Temple University, the University of Notre Dame, and the University of Pennsylvania. He spent most of his teaching career, from 1971 to 1990, at the Church Divinity School of the Pacific, an Episcopal seminary that was part of the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley, California. In 1990 he went to Fuller Theological Seminary as a scholar-in-residence and remained there until his death on 30 October 2000 in Pasadena, California. He was President of the National Association of Baptist Professors of Religion and edited its dissertation book series. Throughout his academic career, he also served as an interim pastor for Baptist and Mennonite churches in California, Louisiana, and Texas.

Under W. T. Connor, McClendon wrote his dissertation entitled "The Doctrine of Sin and the First Epistle of John: A Comparison of Calvinist, Wesleyan, and Biblical Thought." The most important aspect of his dissertation is that it is the beginnings of his biblical realism, which holds that the Bible can be read apart from any specific hermeneutic tradition. This argument is present, in one way or another, throughout his career, climaxing in a debate involving David Wayne Layman and John Howard YODER (see Layman 1990. McClendon called his biblical realism "biblicism": the Bible is absolutely authoritative and thus self-interpreting.

McClendon's collection of essays, *Pacemakers of Christian Thought* (1962), contains his interpretation of modern theologians such as Karl Barth, Rudolph Bultmann, Emil Brunner, E. J. Carnell, W. T. Connor, Austin Farrer, Reinhold NIEBUHR, William

Temple, and Paul TILLICH. McClendon wrote another series of articles on topics in philosophical theology for *The Baptist Student* including "Creation, Man, and Sin," "Atonement, Discipleship, and Freedom," "Death, Resurrection, Survival, and Immortality," and "The Uniqueness of Christianity." These works are important because they set at least three precedents for McClendon's career: (1) his desire for his reading audience to be Baptists; (2) his interest in taking modern theologians seriously, and his hope that Baptists would take modern theology seriously as well; and (3) his interest in philosophical theology, and his attempt to teach Baptists how to think philosophically about theological problems and theologically about philosophical problems.

McClendon's next book was groundbreaking in theology as it started a new methodology in theology called "narrative theology." *Biography as Theology: How Life Stories Can Remake Today's Theology* (1974) analyzes the lives of four people – Dag Hammarskjöld, Charles Edward Ives, Clarence Jordan, and Martin Luther King, Jr. – giving a theological interpretation of those lives. McClendon claims that his *Biography as Theology* is a more focused and a more theological version of William JAMES's *Varieties of Religious Experience*. It is more focused because it only discusses four figures, and it is more theological because the categories that McClendon uses are theological categories like ecclesiology rather than psychological categories like experience.

In 1975 McClendon and his co-author, philosopher James M. Smith, published *Understanding Religious Convictions*. This book is McClendon's most technical philosophical work and should be read by anyone interested in the relations between philosophical theology, the philosophy of language, and political philosophy. In this book, McClendon and Smith use philosophers such as J. L. Austin, R. B. Braithwaite, William James, Ian Ramsey, Ludwig Wittgenstein, and William Zurdeeg to construct a speech-theory of reli-

gious language, to develop an account of truth that takes pluralism seriously, and to propose a science of convictions that is a theological version of James's science of religions. In 1994 another version of this book was published with the title *Convictions: Defusing Religious Relativism*. This version has the same goals as the first but employs different philosophers. While retaining Austin, James, and Wittgenstein, McClendon and Smith replace Braithwaite, Ramsey, and Zurdeeg with Stanley Fish, Richard RORTY, and John SEARLE. The second version is more up-to-date on scholarship in analytic philosophy and pragmatism and the authors are much more rigorous in their attack on religious relativism than in the first version.

Although *Biography as Theology* and *Understanding Religious Convictions* seem like two completely different types of book, McClendon manages to bring them together in his systematic theology in three volumes: *Ethics* (1986), *Doctrine* (1994), and *Witness* (2000). His is the first thorough systematic theology written by a Baptist theologian. Furthermore, beginning his systematic theology with *Ethics* is McClendon's way of emphasizing the importance of ordinary life and radical discipleship in the Church. And third, his systematic theology – and the beginning of his *Ethics* – creates a unity amongst churches that are not usually united; his Baptist theology has a small "b" because he includes in his "Baptist vision" any church that focuses on ordinary life and radical discipleship. According to McClendon, this vision includes Baptists (of all kinds), Congregationalists (of all kinds), Mennonites (of all kinds), Methodists (of all kinds), Quakers, and some Catholics (like Dorothy Day). The primary conviction of those who have the "Baptist vision" is that peace is more determinate than violence and thus that life – not death – is the end of the story for Christians.

In *Ethics*, McClendon constructs a three-stranded ethics – body ethics, social ethics, and resurrection ethics – that cannot be sepa-

rated as they are like three strands of a single rope, which McClendon recognizes is a Wittgensteinian analogy. In his body ethics, McClendon discusses the importance of the individual body for the development of an ethic that takes seriously biological needs such as desire, love, and sex. As an example of how McClendon understands these biological needs, he uses the relationship of Jonathon and Sarah Edwards as an exemplary in the sense that they both understood the struggle of fidelity in marriage; although this struggle was very real to both of them, they remained faithful to one another and to the Church because they met each other's needs. These needs are not strictly sexual, according to McClendon, but are found in a variety of religious experiences. Because he recognizes the necessity of an ecclesial community to make sense of one's biological needs – like Jonathon and Sarah Edwards did – he develops an ethics of community called social ethics. In his social ethics, he discusses the necessity of an ecclesial community to make sense of his three-stranded ethics. What happens when this community is no longer there for a Christian is exemplified by Dietrich Boenhoeffer – whose pacifism was no longer a possibility because he lacked a church to make sense of his peacefulness. If Boenhoeffer did in fact plot to kill Adolf Hitler, it is the absence of an ecclesial community that enabled Boenhoeffer to justify doing so. Unfortunately, this absence occurs quite often in the sense that McClendon uses it. For the absence of an ecclesial community is simply the result of the Church not being the Church. So Boenhoeffer's problem is that he was trying to remain faithful to a church that was not remaining faithful to Christ. Social ethics, then, is only possible when the Church is the Church. For the Church to be the Church, the third strand is crucial because the Church is the resurrected body of Christ for the world. Hence, in his resurrection ethics, McClendon discusses the relationship between Christ and the Church. For the Church would not be a community if Christ had not been resurrected

from the dead. Because he was resurrected from the dead, he defeated death; life, not death, is the end of the story. The Church is a witness to Christ's reign on earth – a reign that is "the peaceable kingdom," which is a phrase McClendon borrows from Stanley HAUERWAS. In *Ethics*, therefore, McClendon shows how Baptist churches ought to *live* in order to have the Baptist vision.

In *Doctrine*, McClendon shows what Baptist churches ought to *teach* in order to have the Baptist vision. Most importantly, for McClendon, is the role of the Trinity for the Christian life because the Trinity is how we understand our relationship with God. Our relationship with God is a performative one in the sense that ecclesial liturgy is performed in the name of the Trinity. For example, baptism is performed in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Likewise the Eucharist is the sharing of Christ's body for the purpose of uniting Christ's body called the Church. In the collection of his sermons entitled *Making Gospel Sense to a Troubled Church*, McClendon tells the story of how the Church he is pastoring is a broken body in the sense that it is disunified, so he takes the congregation to a smaller room so that they cannot avoid but being close to one another in a real physical sense. During that time, he preached on how the Church is a broken body; that broken-ness, though, is not a disunited brokenness but a unifying one in the sense that the Eucharist is the broken body of Christ and the body that the Church shares in unity. The body of Christ was served after the sermon but not before confession was practiced as a church. Not only does this story exemplify how the Trinity is performed through the Eucharist, but it also exemplifies how it is performed through prophetic preaching. For the purpose of the sermon McClendon preached that day was to remind that particular congregation that their life was constituted by God as the body of Christ with the Holy Spirit, and that life is a peaceable one because Christ was resurrected from the dead. If the Church

is disunited, then how can it be a witness to this peace that is only possible in Christ? To answer that question, McClendon's third volume develops a theology of witness.

After showing the relationship between the Trinity and the Church, McClendon shows the relationship between the Church and the world. This relationship is called witness exactly because the Church is a witness to how peace is only found in Christ as the body of Christ. Therefore, the Church engages with the world with the hope that the world might come to be a part of the body of Christ as well. This engagement involves knowing how to interpret culture, philosophy, and theology with the Baptist vision. McClendon's discussion on culture gives Baptists a way to interpret art, novels, and music theologically. McClendon's analysis of the history of art in America shows how most of it falls short of depicting "heaven on earth." If the artist is to give us a way to see the world, then that way for Baptists is that the kingdom of God is now. Some art in American history, however, tries to depict the land called America as a new earth; this art falls short of such a depiction because it does not paint a truthful story about America, and the violence that America is founded upon. If artists want to depict a new earth, they must paint ecclesial landscapes instead because Christ has brought the new earth and founded it on peace. McClendon's analysis of literature follows a similar line of argument to the one on art in the sense that he shows how most American literature concerns redemption, but its use of redemption is not theological but is simply a rugged individualism. The work of Ralph Waldo EMERSON, Henry David Thoreau, and Walt WHITMAN includes examples of how America is supposed to serve as a place of redemption, but all the authors really give us is a rugged individualism. Nathaniel Hawthorne, Herman Melville, and Walker PERCY are exceptions to McClendon's analysis; in fact, there is a sense in which McClendon thinks Percy ought to be the theological standard for what constitutes

American literature. Just as Percy is the standard in literature for McClendon, jazz music is the standard for culture as a whole. According to McClendon, jazz embodies the gospel more than any other American practice because it was invented as a way for people to cope with struggle just as the gospel gives Christians a way to cope with struggle. Not only that, however, for jazz necessitates God in that the best way to understand the extemporaneousness of what constitutes good jazz music is analogous to how the Holy Spirit is part of ecclesial liturgy.

Interpreting philosophy theologically is generally a good practice, and one that both philosophers and theologians should do. In most of his work, McClendon sets a good example for theologians of exactly how to do that. In his interpretation of Wittgenstein, however, McClendon does not do this well. He interprets the shift from the early to the later Wittgenstein as one of Christian conversion. He recognizes that there is no public witness as part of Wittgenstein's life so he calls Wittgenstein a "secret … Christian." The lack of public witness of Christianity in Wittgenstein's life goes against McClendon's "theology of witness" for at least three reasons – which correspond to his systematic theology: (1) McClendon has to interpret Wittgenstein's intentions outside of particularly Christian actions and thus places intentionality outside of the activity of the community called church; (2) the particularly Christian action that McClendon does find in Wittgenstein is confession, but even this action only makes sense in the greater context of church doctrine and thus cannot be called a necessarily Christian practice in Wittgenstein's life; (3) a "theology of witness" cannot be a private affair for both philosophical and theological reasons. Philosophically, McClendon violates Wittgenstein's arguments against the possibility of private language by arguing that Wittgenstein was a "secret … Christian" because this use of secrecy assumes that private thoughts are possible. If a "theology of

witness" can be lived secretly, then how are Christians to engage with the world *as* Christians? Unfortunately, McClendon never addresses this question as a possible problem with his interpretation of Wittgenstein. After he gives his interpretation of Wittgenstein, though, he does return to the McClendon who is a good example for how theologians should engage with philosophy when he gives a theological analysis of contemporary analytic philosophy of religion – namely Alvin PLANTINGA. McClendon gives a brief history of the relation between Plantinga's epistemology and philosophy of religion. He discusses the "evidentialism" of the early Plantinga, the "reformed epistemology" of the later Plantinga, and elaborates upon Merold Westphal's criticisms of Plantinga. His elaboration of Westphal's criticisms of Plantinga is a return to his two earlier books *Biography as Theology* and *Understanding Religious Convictions*. McClendon uses his earlier works to argue, contra Plantinga, first that Christian language is not propositional but is "embedded in the *practices* that constitute Christian existence" (2000, p. 277), and second that Plantinga is a relativist. Plantinga's relativism is found in his "Advice to Christian Philosophers" – which argues that Christian philosophers have their own projects and topics. According to McClendon, "others will find that they, too, have topics and projects distinctively their own" (p. 277). McClendon is then led to ask: "Can there … be such dialogues in a plural world in which the topics and projects of various groups are so plainly disparate?" (pp. 277–8) "Once Plantinga's first step is taken," he answers, "philosophers who take it can no longer shrug aside the challenge of relativism. What can still be attempted is to *defuse* it." (p. 278) Hence McClendon's attempt to defuse religious relativism – not only in his *Convictions* but also in his *Witness*.

The whole of McClendon's work is understood best in an argument given in John Milbank's *Theology and Social Theory*: "It is only a *mythos*, and therefore cannot be refuted, but only out-narrated, if we can *persuade* people – for reasons of 'literary taste' – that Christianity offers a much better story." (Milbank 1990, p. 330). This quote captures the elegance of McClendon's *Biography as Theology*, *Understanding Religious Convictions*, and his systematic theology as a whole. His systematic theology developed from (1) his desire for his reading audience to be Baptists and academic philosophers and theologians; (2) his interest in taking modern theologians seriously, and his hope that Baptists would take modern theology seriously as well; and (3) his interest in philosophical theology, and his attempt to teach Baptists how to think philosophically about theological problems and theologically about philosophical problems. Because of the continuation throughout his career of these three principles, McClendon's philosophical theology remained faithful to his Baptist roots.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Pacemakers of Christian Thought (Nashville, Tenn., 1962).
Biography as Theology: How Life Stories Can Remake Today's Theology (Nashville, Tenn., 1974).
Understanding Religious Convictions, with James M. Smith (Notre Dame, Ind., 1975).
Ethics: Systematic Theology, Volume I (Nashville, Tenn., 1986).
Doctrine: Systematic Theology, Volume II (Nashville, Tenn., 1994).
Convictions: Defusing Religious Relativism, with James M. Smith (Valley Forge, Penn., 1994).
Making Gospel Sense to a Troubled Church (Cleveland, 1995).
Witness: Systematic Theology, Volume III (Nashville, Tenn., 2000).

Other Relevant Works
"Baptism as a Performative Sign," *Theology Today* 23 (October 1966): 403–16.
"Religion and Language," *Pacific Philosophy Forum* 5 (February 1967): 77–82.
"Why Baptists Do Not Baptize Infants," in *The Sacraments: An Ecumenical Dilemma*,

ed. Hans Kung (New York, 1967), pp. 7–15.

"Christian Philosophers or Philosopher Christians," *Christian Century* 85 (9 October 1968): 255–8.

"How Is Religious Talk Justifiable?" in *American Philosophy and the Future*, ed. Michael Novak (New York, 1968), pp. 324–47.

"Can There Be Talk About God-and-the-World?" *Harvard Theological Review* 62 (1969): 33–49.

Ed. with Axel D. Steuer, *Is God God?* (Nashville, Tenn., 1981).

"Distinguishing Modern and Postmodern Theologies: George Lindbeck, Harvey Cox, Ronald Thiemann, Thomas Altizer, Mark C. Taylor," with Nancey C. Murphy, *Modern Theology* 5 (1989): 191–214.

"Christian Identity in Ecumenical Perspective: A Response to David Wayne Layman," with John Howard Yoder, *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 27 (1990): 561–80.

"Primitive, Present, Future: A Vision for the Church in the Modern World," in *The Primitive Church in the Modern World*, ed. Richard Hughes (Urbana, Ill., 1995), pp. 98–105.

Ed. with Curtis Freeman and C. Rosalee Velloso da Silva, *Baptist Roots: A Reader in the Theology of a Christian People* (Valley Forge, Penn., 1999).

"The Believers' Church in Theological Perspective," in *The Wisdom of the Cross: Essays in Honor of John Howard Yoder*, ed. Stanley Hauerwas et al. (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1999), pp. 309–26.

"The Radical Road One Baptist Took," in *Engaging Anabaptism: Conversations with a Radical Tradition*, ed. John D. Roth (Scottdale, Penn., 2001), pp. 15–24.

Further Reading

Harvey, Barry. "Doctrinally Speaking: James McClendon on the Nature of Doctrine," *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 27 (2000): 39–60.

Hauerwas, Stanley, Nancy Murphy, and Mark Nation, eds. *Theology Without Foundations: Religious Practice and the Future of Theological Truth, a Festschrift for James Wm. McClendon, Jr.* (Nashville, Tenn., 1994).

Hauerwas, Stanley. "Reading James McClendon Takes Practice: Lessons in the Craft of Theology," in *Wilderness Wanderings: Probing Twentieth-Century Theology and Philosophy* (Boulder, Col., 1997), pp. 171–87.

Layman, David W. "The Inner Ground of Christian Theology: Church, Faith, and Sectarianism," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 27 (1990): 480–503.

Milbank, John. *Theology and Social Theory* (Cambridge, Mass., 1990).

Patterson, Bob E. "'Original Sin' Revisited: McClendon, Niebuhr, and Feminist Theology," *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 27 (2000): 71–82.

Westmoreland-White, Michael L. "Reading Scripture in the Baptist Vision: James Wm. McClendon and the Hermeneutics of Participation," *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 27 (2000): 61–70.

Jacob Lynn Goodson

McCLURE, Matthew Thompson, Jr. (1883–1964)

Matthew T. McClure, Jr. was born on 27 April 1883 in Spottswood, Virginia. In 1904 he received his BA from Washington and Lee University in Virginia. In 1907 he received an MA from the University of Virginia. He taught philosophy there in 1909–10, after which he went to Columbia University where he obtained his PhD in philosophy in 1912. Having obtained a copy of the proofs of *The New Realism* (1912) from his mentor and New

Realist William P. MONTAGUE, McClure examined the movement in his dissertation, "A Study of the Realistic Movement in Contemporary Philosophy."

From 1912 until 1921 McClure was a professor of philosophy at Tulane University, after which he went to the University of Illinois. In 1926 he became head of its philosophy department, and in 1934, having first served for a year as Acting Dean, he became Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, remaining in that position until 1947. McClure retired four years later, in 1951. He served as President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1932–3. In 1938 he received an honorary Litt.D. from Washington and Lee University. McClure died on 28 July 1964 in New Orleans, Louisiana.

In *How to Think in Business* (1923), McClure sought to explain the main points of John DEWEY's *How to Think*, with its emphasis on the logic of problem solving, to the busy entrepreneur. In *An Introduction to the Logic of Reflection* (1925), a book that besides the influence of Dewey, also shows that of George SANTAYANA, McClure offers something like a working method for good reflective thought. In his introductory essays in *Early Philosophers of Greece* (1935), McClure argued for the continuity of scientific thought among the ancient Greeks and the role of observation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
A Study of the Realistic Movement in Contemporary Philosophy (Staunton, Virg., 1912).
"Perception and Thinking," *Journal of Philosophy* 13 (1916): 345–54.
"Pragmatism and Democracy," *Journal of Philosophy* 15 (1918): 481–8.
"Crises in the Life of Reason," *Journal of Philosophy* 18 (1921): 281–8.
How to Think in Business (New York, 1923).
An Introduction to the Logic of Reflection (New York, 1925).
"The Greek Conception of Nature,"
Philosophical Review 43 (1934): 109–24.
The Early Philosophers of Greece, with Historical Introduction (New York, 1935).

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v4, *Proc of APA v40*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Cornelis de Waal

McCORMICK, John Francis (1874–1943)

John Francis McCormick was born on 3 March 1874 in Chicago, Illinois. He entered the religious order of the Society of Jesus (the Jesuits) in 1891. He earned a BA in 1896 and an MA in theology in 1898 at St. Louis University, and was ordained a Catholic priest in 1906. In 1922 Loyola University Chicago conferred the LLD upon him. Beginning in 1908 McCormick held a variety of administrative and teaching positions in several Jesuit universities. He was a professor of philosophy at Xavier University in Ohio from 1911 to 1919; President of Creighton University in Nebraska from 1919 to 1925; professor of philosophy and head of the philosophy department at Marquette University in Wisconsin from 1925 to 1932; and finally professor of philosophy at Loyola University in Chicago from 1932 until his death in 1943. Although philosophy had been part of Loyola's curriculum since the founding of the university as St. Ignatius College in 1870, McCormick organized the courses into a university department and became its first chair in 1933.

In his writing, his teaching, and in the offices he held, McCormick focused on the teaching and practice of scholastic philosophy, being among the first in twentieth-century America to bring scholarly attitudes and methods to the retrieval of scholasticism. His published

work was almost exclusively written for neo-scholastic audiences, not to repeat dead formulas but to urge a fresh look at the traditions – especially, though not exclusively, Thomas Aquinas – in the light of contemporary concerns. He joined other neo-scholastic thinkers who believed that the American Philosophical Association was not addressing some issues of significance to contemporary American philosophers who taught in Catholic colleges and universities and, as a consequence, founded the American Catholic Philosophical Association in 1926 to provide such a forum. McCormick was President of that Association in 1928–9. His 1929 presidential address challenged the membership by insisting that reconstruction of scholastic philosophy needed to be grounded within the context of the present and required a scholarly historical understanding of all that occurred between the thirteenth and twentieth centuries.

McCormick was above all a teacher. His significance to American philosophy lay not in developing a specific philosophical theory or set of concepts, but in opening up for thousands of students the treasure of thought that constituted the revival of scholastic philosophy in this country. His own delight in learning spilled over and created experiences for his students that they never forgot. The "Recollections" by his student Clare Quirk Riedl (in Pegis 1944), written on behalf of all his students, paints a picture of a man who loved and pursued the truth, a pursuit that overflowed into teaching, humble and eager for knowledge, infecting his own students and his students' students. Riedl characterized McCormick's description of St. Thomas Aquinas (in McCormick's *St. Thomas and the Life of Learning*, 1937) as a picture of McCormick himself: "it was the truth he loved and not himself."

McCormick's influence may be seen to some extent in the two festschrifts produced in his honor, edited by Gerald Smith and Anton Pegis. Pegis also paid tribute to McCormick in dedicating to him his annotated edition of *The Basic Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas*, published in 1945. Pegis described his dedication of the edition of Thomas Aquinas as returning (Thomas) to his (Pegis's) "dear master" (McCormick, now dead) the gift (Thomas) that McCormick (when alive) had given him.

McCormick continued his scholarly teaching until his death on 14 July 1943 in Chicago. Some four months after his death, the American Association for the Advancement of Science invited him to become a member, which indicates the recognition that McCormick's influence received beyond neo-scholastic thinkers and teachers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Scholastic Metaphysics, 2 vols (Chicago, 1928, 1931).

"Presidential Address," *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 5 (1929): 18–25.

"God as the Goal of Evolution (e.g., Alexander's Space, Time and the Deity)," *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 7 (1931): 197–203.

"Neo-Scholasticism in America," *Modern Schoolman* 9 (1933): 95–6.

"The Burden of Intellect," *Modern Schoolman* 11 (1935): 79–81.

"Must there be a Christian Philosophy?" *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 12 (1936): 30–37.

St. Thomas and the Life of Learning (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1937).

"The Individual and the State," *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 15 (1939): 10–21.

"The 'Error' of Aristotle," *Modern Schoolman* 18 (1942): 51–3.

"The Pragmatism of William James," *Modern Schoolman* 18 (1942): 18–26.

Other Relevant Works

"The Tools of the Teacher of Philosophy," *Proceedings of the Jesuit Educational Association* 5 (1926): 216–20.

"Psycho-Physical Parallelism," *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 2 (1926): 51–66.

"Holism and Hylemorphism," *Proceedings of the Jesuit Educational Association* 8 (1929): 78–82.

"Suarez on Matter and Form," *Proceedings of the Jesuit Educational Association* 10 (1931): 41–6.

"A Jesuit Contemporary of Descartes," *Modern Schoolman* 13 (1937): 79–82.

"The Burden of the Body: A Note on QQ. Disp. De Virtutibus, q.2 (de Caritate), a. 10," *The New Scholasticism* 12 (1938): 392–400.

"Quaestiones Disputandae," *New Scholasticism* 13 (1939): 368–74.

"A Forerunner of the Scottish School," *New Scholasticism* 15 (1941): 299–317.

Further Reading
Who Was Who in Amer v2, Who's Who in Phil

Pegis, Anton, ed. *Essays in Modern Scholasticism in Honor of John F. McCormick, S.J., 1874–1943* (Westminster, Md., 1944).

Smith, Gerard, ed. *Jesuit Thinkers of the Renaissance: Essays Presented to John F. McCormick, S.J. by His Students on the Occasion of the 65th Anniversary of His Birth* (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1939).

Francis J. Catania

McCOSH, James (1811–94)

James McCosh was born on 1 April 1811 in Patna, Scotland. At the age of thirteen he began studies at Glasgow University, and graduated in 1829. He subsequently pursued a Masters of Divinity at the University of Edinburgh, where he studied under the evangelical theologian, Thomas Chalmers, and the leading Scottish philosopher, Alexander Hamilton. McCosh graduated and entered the ministry in 1834. Maintaining a deep interest in philosophy while working as a parish preacher, he wrote *The Method of the Divine Government* (1850), arguing that evidence of God's existence could be found in nature. In 1856 McCosh became professor of logic and metaphysics at Queen's College in Belfast, Ireland. There he completed his most systematic philosophical work, *The Intuitions of the Mind, Inductively Investigated* (1860). He also engaged in a written debate with John Stuart Mill, stemming from the latter's criticism of Hamilton.

In 1868 McCosh moved to the United States to become President of Princeton College. He wrote his highly regarded contribution to the history of philosophy, *The Scottish Philosophy, Biographical, Expository, Critical, from Hutcheson to Hamilton* (1875). He also dedicated considerable effort to reconciling evolutionary theory with theism in, for instance, *The Religious Aspect of Evolution* (1887). After retiring in 1888, McCosh remained active and influential at Princeton. He died on 16 November 1894 in Princeton, New Jersey.

McCosh attempted to adjudicate between epistemological extremes, with the hope of forging a palatable synthesis. At one pole are the rationalists, such as Plato and Descartes. As McCosh and many others see it, these philosophers develop deductive philosophical systems which, though potentially consistent, can claim no epistemological grounding in the world. They build lofty edifices disconnected from experience. At the other pole are the empiricists, who aim to root philosophy in the experiential. Though welcoming this second approach, McCosh contends that the empiricists go astray, providing a mistaken analysis of experience. Their errors lead to an exaggerated skepticism and a depleted world view. John Locke, for instance, fails to include substance as something knowable. And David Hume does the same for the individual self. McCosh considers the system of his own contemporary J. S. Mill

to be a mere extension of this program. A synthesis between the poles is needed.

One such synthesis is attempted by Immanuel Kant. However, in McCosh's view, Fichte carries Kant's position through to its genuine conclusions, emphasizing the unknowable. And, as a result, schools of romantic idealism – predicated on the denial of reason's access to the world – emerge. While McCosh applauds their anti-materialism, he regrets their disposal of rationality and their resulting reliance on mere emotion and faith. Though now by way of Kant's attempted synthesis and a move to irrationalism, philosophy has, again, been pushed into the purely speculative. Another attempt to forge a middle position comes from Thomas Reid, who, in opposition to Hume's skepticism, began the Scottish School of Common Sense. While another Scot, William Hamilton, sought to "combine the philosophies of Reid and Kant," McCosh sees his work as leading to transcendentalism. Hamilton's espousal of "the relativity of knowledge" (1875, p. 148) and his conclusion that the absolute is a negative notion, inconceivable and thus unknowable, re-invites the irrational. McCosh thinks reason can fare better, avoiding the extremes. Though rejecting many of Hamilton's key conclusions, McCosh commends his wisdom in looking to Reid. Coupling the empiricist's focus on experience and the rationalist's emphasis on fundamental principles or intuitions, McCosh, in the spirit of Reid, seeks to link the knower and the world it seeks to know.

Hume claims that experience provides no knowledge of a self, or the individual substance included in or persisting through the variety of experiences. Not only do we fail to "catch" ourselves "at any time without a perception," we "never can observe anything but the perception." No self amid the perception is experienced. Granting Hume's first point, McCosh denies his second. Hume's "very language contradicts itself. He talks of catching himself. What is this *self* that he catches?" Inherent to every perception is the recognition of a perceiving self:

"we never observe a perception alone. We always observe self as perceiving" (1875, p. 128). The self is not some metaphysical, unknowable entity. It is directly experienced. With any impression we are conscious, not only that something is receiving the impression, but that the receptor is conscious of what it receives. Moreover, this perceiving self is itself experienced not as a mere impression, but as an object, and one that is distinct from the not-self of experience. Relatedly, contra Hume, to remember is not merely to "reproduce" a set of sense impressions. Rather it includes the recognition that those particular impressions are *re*-produced, or that they were impressions experienced by the self in the past. Also included in memory is the recognition that the self that experienced the past impressions is continuous with that which now recalls them. Thus, in the activity of perception, we do have knowledge of a self; and it is knowledge of something that endures through its various impressions.

In the act of perceiving, we also posses knowledge of a not-self. We know an external object in our experience of its qualities. Both the object and qualities are known in "the same concrete act" (1875, p. 129). Embodied in the very experience of an object is the knowledge that it is distinct from us. McCosh rejects Mill's characterization of the external world as the possibility of future sense experiences. Not only does he deem this an emaciated understanding, he denies Mill the license to appeal to even that. In order to distinguish between the sensory possibilities (the external) and sensation itself (the internal), Mill relies on the "constitution of human nature." McCosh charges, however, that this concession embroils Mill in inconsistency, committing him to the very sort of mental capacities that McCosh emphasizes and Mill seeks to eliminate. And once we reject as inconsistent Mill's attempt to introduce the external world, Mill (unwittingly) traps us in "the shell of the ego." Now, although McCosh arrives at an external world by way of the mind's intuitions, these intuitions are not imposed on the world by the mind; rather they

afford us access to it. Here he rejects Kant's split between the objects present to the mind and objects in the world. A priori "forms" brought to the world by the mind could not, says McCosh, "guarantee any objective reality" (1860, p. 148). He sees Kantianism as resulting in what it opposed: "this philosophy, intended to overthrow the skepticism of Hume, has thus led to a skepticism which has had a more extensive sway than that of the cold Scotchman ever had" (1860, p. 148). Hamilton lands in skepticism as well. Space and time, cause and effect – these are stolen from the world and left as mere mental contributions.

Along with sensory data, we experience the self and the not-self, both of which endure. While their respective properties differ, they have a common relation to those properties. Seeking to denote what endures and underlies the qualities of both realms, McCosh employs the term "substance." Carefully examining experience, we recognize that we do experience substance, properly understood. It is no more than what is there with the experiential properties of both realms. While McCosh includes substance in his system, he eliminates the unknowable, "the mysterious something." Though the unknowable may well exist, to posit it is superfluous and unwarranted. We know substance only insofar as it is found with properties. But we know it nonetheless.

Given the differing qualities inhering in the two types of experienced substance, we do find a dualism in McCosh's position. Though neither type of substance depends on the other, both are closely related; both are there in our experience. It is this commonality that forges the epistemic connection between the two realms. We do not first possess ideas as the rationalist might have it, and then analyze those ideas to obtain knowledge. Nor do we, as the empiricist might have it, immediately attain impressions, from which we subsequently extract ideas. Rather, in the immediate, we obtain knowledge of individual things. Partial though that knowledge may be, it is right there in the concrete experience.

The intuitions have been hinted at: they are present in experience. We can now expand on McCosh's account of their nature. The intuitions are not such that they are "derived" from experience; we do not come to posses them experientially. They are capacities already within us, and as such, innate. We have no innate ideas, in the sense of mental representations or images. Nor have we innate "general notions." But we do have innate capacities for singular intuitions, intuitions being (at least) "perceptions formed by looking upon objects" (1860, p. 25). Prior to any experience of, say, a stone, we have the capacity to perceive, upon such an experience, that the stone must occupy space. (While such an intuition will be singular, it will follow general principles, which as noted below, can be discerned by careful introspection and analysis.)

Distinct is the question of how we come to recognize that we possess these capacities. Though they are within us independently of experience, we do not discover them without experience. We have no a priori knowledge of what our specific capacities are, nor even that we possess them. For, to recognize the capacities, they must be brought about as intuitions, and intuitions are activated only by way of experience. Without the appropriate experience, an intuition will lie dormant, as an unrecognized capacity. And while particular capacities for intuitions cannot be revealed to us without the relevant experience, the very nature of experience positively informs us that we have such intuitions. For, McCosh contends, the intuitions are required in order to "gather" or "acquire" experience in the first place. There would be no collection of experiences without them. And every experience contains some intuition or set of intuitions; intuitions are unavoidably present "in every waking moment of our existence" (1860, p. 28). This is not to say that, upon experience, we have an immediate awareness of their presence: the perception of a body need not include the explicit recognition that it resides in space. But the intuition that it must reside in space is, nonetheless, inextricably

embedded in the experience of the body. Again, although we attend experience with capacities for intuitions, we do not impose our intuitions onto the world. Rather the intuitions, according to McCosh, are the mechanisms by which we can come to know the world. "The truth is conceived by the mind, not formed" by it. "The one knows and the other is known." (1860, p. 17)

Once we recognize that we possess intuitions, how do we come to discern what they are? While McCosh holds science in high esteem, physiology cannot replace "self-inspection" here (1860, p. 8). Drawing on his understanding of the scientific method, McCosh presents us with an introspective method for discovering the intuitions. We begin with singular experience, which, again, will contain more than the mere sensory impression of colors, resistance, and so on. We must deliberately *observe* the elements of that internal experience. As above, we recognize that there in the concrete experience of a stone is our (possibly tacit) knowledge that it occupies space (albeit, at this stage, an unarticulated concept of space). We then *analyze* the observation of our internal experience. Extracting what is most essential among the particularities of the concrete experience, we identify the various intuitions at play and strive to isolate each one conceptually. We recognize, for instance, our knowledge that the stone cannot be located in one's hand and elsewhere at the same time. After a full analysis, we make an induction, extending the essential elements abstracted from our observation of experience. We might articulate, for instance, the general principle of thought that singularity of location is required of all objects. Through such a procedure, abstracting and generalizing from the various intuitions involved, we can discern the mind's conception of space.

More generally, from the singular experience – internally observed, analyzed, and extended – we can identify the necessary, eternal laws that govern the mind in experience. These truths are "metaphysical," insofar as they transcend the realm of possible sense experiences, and are discerned inductively. While certain parts of the physical world remain forever beyond our experience, since the mind is accessible by introspection, we can have greater assurance of our inductions regarding the mental realm than we can of those pertaining to the physical. For McCosh, a careful generalization of an intuition is by its "very nature" necessary and universal. And identifying the correct set of intuitions will provide a secure foundation for empirical science.

Although the principles we can discover by this method are necessary, they are not themselves logically demonstrable. Unarticulated though they may be, they are the "truths which we know directly" (1860, p. 24). While we cannot formally prove the principles of thought, we can discern that we indeed possess them, and that we do so necessarily. McCosh contends that such principles are required to assert any argument at all. Not only must an argument rest on fundamental, yet unprovable, premises, such unprovable principles must be invoked even to connect premises and conclusions: "… at the foundation of argument, and at every stage of the superstructure, there are mental principles involved which are either intuitive or depend on principles which are intuitive" (1860, p. 25).

We cannot simply select our favored principles and claim them to be intuitions. McCosh readily concedes that we may go astray in our attempt to discover these laws. For the laws are not themselves present in the immediate experience, and isolating them is a complicated and laborious endeavor. Hence our frequent disagreement on what they are: "metaphysical errors spring from … the improper formalization of principles which are real laws of our constitution" (1860, p. 61). Despite the possibility of error, however, we are not barred from identifying them. Our mistakes can be corrected. We can test a proposed principle, examine it to see if it is in fact necessary, thus self-evident. Necessity will ground an individual conviction as certain; it will also suggest its catholicity, in other words, the property of

being held by all. The principle's catholicity will in turn license employing the principle in our interactions with others.

Though dedicated to pursuing Reid's general program, McCosh considers Reid's list of self-evident "principles of commonsense" far too liberal, hence significantly mistaken. Seeking to remedy Reid's errors, McCosh attempts to accurately identify and classify the intuitions. In addition to the conviction that there is a self and a not-self, we have certain necessary convictions about space, time, and causation. According to McCosh, if we concede to Kant that the mind creates space, nothing bars us from concluding (with Fichte) that objects are also its products. Kant's reduction of space and time to the subjective thus stands, for McCosh, as "one of the most fatal heresies – that is, dogmas opposed to the revelations of consciousness – ever introduced into philosophy, and it lies at the basis of all the aberrations in the school of speculation which followed" (1860, p. 178). While McCosh considers many of our beliefs about space and time speculative, he holds that some of our most solid convictions pertain to these two concepts. For instance, we know bodies as extended in space; we know space to be continuous, or that no part of space can be separated from the rest. We know time as passing, continuous, and recalled in memory. Against Hume, we have intuitive knowledge of causal powers in objects. For Kant, causal power is but a product of the mind that unifies "scattered phenomena" (1875, p. 134); for Hamilton, the principle of causation is a "mere impotency of the mind" (1875, p. 148). Against all three and the skepticism they engender, McCosh contends that we experience, and thereby know, not only the self as a power, but also the not-self "as a power in resisting and impressing the self" (1875, p. 133). Experience contains knowledge of the self acting on the not-self and the not-self acting on the self. Skepticism results, again, only from a depleted and incomplete analysis of experience. Included in our experience is an "intuitive and necessary belief that" each effect "must have a cause in

something with a power to produce it" (1875, p. 413).

As is suggested by his distaste for post-Kantian romanticism and transcendentalism, McCosh denied the legitimacy of the rejection of reason and the appeal to the unknowable to save religion. Religion must ultimately find its footing in knowledge. And this knowledge cannot be only of appearances but of that which God has given us, the world. For McCosh, if the self is entirely distinct from the world, it is entirely distinct from God. The religious understanding begins then, not with faith beyond the realm of appearances, but with realism. McCosh holds the legitimization of our belief in causation to be imperative here; it is this belief that bridges the philosophical and the religious. Our causal intuitions connect us to the world and, through the world, to God. As McCosh sees it, erroneous accounts of causation lead Hume, Kant, and Hamilton astray from key arguments for God's existence. For instance, he criticizes Hume and Kant for concluding that theism requires a cause of God's existence. This error stems from their inadequate articulation of a genuine intuition. The causal principle need only be refined: "our intuitive conviction simply requires us to seek for a cause of a new occurrence" (1875, p. 136). Similarly, Hamilton, by giving a "defective and mutilated account" of causation (1875, p. 412), bars himself from the teleological argument, the inference to God's existence from the apparent design in nature.

McCosh's realism licenses empirical science as an essential component of religion's foundation. Although an adequate understanding of the world requires both religion and science, we should criticize neither from the context of the other. He wrote, "When a scientific theory is brought before us, our first inquiry is not whether it is consistent with religion, but whether it is true." (Sloane 1896, p. 233) And while, for McCosh, any genuine truth in science will ultimately be consistent with religion, we ought not be hasty in our judgment. These points bear significantly on debates about

human origin. On this issue, as with epistemology and ontology, McCosh finds himself between extremes: conservative theism on one side, and novel developments in the evolutionary theory on the other. Seeking again to adjudicate between poles, he denies that evolutionary theory genuinely conflicts with theism. Taking it to do so would only threaten the latter. The "supposed discrepancies," he holds, are at most temporary. In time, they will "disappear" (Sloane 1896, p. 235). Being deeply interested in the theory of evolution – or "development" as he called it before Darwin's *Origin of the Species* – he has no desire to uphold the doctrine of the special creation of individual species. Yet he also rejects the notion of chance selection, in favor of the teleological (without William Paley's mechanical emphasis). In fact, he sees evolutionary theory as lending considerable credence to the "argument from Final Cause": while nature does not reveal a purely progressive plan, God used "many and varied means" to bring humanity to where it is (1887, p. 30). Once settled at Princeton, McCosh pushed forcefully to have evolutionary theory included in the curriculum. Much of his philosophical work there was focused on the task of reconciling evolution and theism.

McCosh's own intuitions provided the basis for his attempted resolution of numerous debates. In their quest for rational principles, the rationalists neglect experience. Substance, the self, causation, and God are eliminated by the empiricists. The romantics and transcendentalists discard both reason and experience. Against these extremes, McCosh seeks to regain what has been lost by pointing to what has been overlooked: the set of knowledge-bearing rational principles discovered in experience, our intuitions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Method of the Divine Government, Physical and Moral (Edinburgh and New York, 1850).

Typical Forms and Special Ends in Creation, with George Dickie (Edinburgh and New York, 1855).

The Intuitions of the Mind, Inductively Investigated (London and New York, 1860).

The Supernatural in Relation to the Natural (London and New York, 1862).

An Examination of Mr. J. S. Mill's Philosophy; Being a Defence of Fundamental Truth (London and New York, 1866).

Christianity and Positivism (London and New York, 1871).

The Scottish Philosophy, Biographical, Expository, Critical, from Hutcheson to Hamilton (London and New York, 1875).

The Emotions (London and New York, 1880).

Energy: Efficient and Final Cause (New York, 1883).

Psychology: The Cognitive Powers (London and New York, 1886).

Psychology: The Motive Powers, Emotions, Conscience, Will (London and New York, 1887).

The Religious Aspect of Evolution (London and New York, 1887).

First and Fundamental Truths: Being a Treatise on Metaphysics (London and New York, 1889).

The Test of Various Kinds of Truth (New York and Cincinnati, 1889).

Our Moral Nature: Being a Brief System of Ethics (New York, 1892).

Other Relevant Works

McCosh's papers are at Princeton University.

"Mill's Reply to his Critics," *British and Foreign Evangelical Review* 17 (1868): 332–62.

The Laws of Discursive Thought: Being a Text-book of Formal Logic (London and New York, 1870; 2nd edn, New York, 1891).

Criteria of Diverse Kinds of Truth as opposed to Agnosticism: Being a Treatise on Applied Logic (New York and Edinburgh, 1882).

Agnosticism of Hume and Huxley, with a Notice of the Scottish School (New York, 1884).

Locke's Theory of Knowledge, with a Notice of Berkeley (New York, 1884).

Herbert Spencer's Philosophy as Culminated in His Ethics (New York, 1885).

John Witherspoon and His Times (Philadelphia, 1890).

The Prevailing Types of Philosophy: Can They Logically Reach Reality? (New York, 1890).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Bio Dict Psych by Zusne*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v5*

Hoeveler, J. David. *James McCosh and the Scottish Intellectual Tradition: From Glasgow to Princeton* (Princeton, N.J., 1981). Contains a bibliography of McCosh's writings.

Howe, M. A. de Wolfe. *Classic Shades: Five Leaders of Learning and their Colleges* (Boston, 1928).

Mill, John Stuart. *An Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy*, 3rd edn (New York, 1874). This edition contains replies to McCosh.

Sloane, William M., ed. *The Life of James McCosh: A Record Chiefly Autobiographical* (New York, 1896). Contains a bibliography of McCosh's writings.

Timothy D. Lyons

McCULLOCH, Warren Sturgis
(1898–1969)

Warren McCulloch was a charismatic figure who was present at the birth (one might even say he was the midwife) of the neurocomputational sciences during the 1940s and 1950s, largely as a consequence of the interaction of engineers, mathematicians, physiologists, and psychologists brought together at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and elsewhere during World War II. He helped found the American Society for Cybernetics and served as its first President in 1967–8.

McCulloch was born on 16 November 1898 in Orange, New Jersey, to James W. and Mary Hughes (Bradley) McCulloch, and he died on 24 September 1969 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. He attended Haverford College and then Yale University, where he was in the naval reserve during World War I and where he received a BA in philosophy and psychology. After earning an MA in psychology at Columbia University in 1923, and an MD at Columbia's College of Physicians and Surgeons in 1927, he completed an internship at Bellevue Hospital, participated in some research on experimental epilepsy and neurological disturbances resulting from head injury, and took graduate courses in mathematical physics at New York University. After a residency at Rockland State Hospital in Orangeburg, New York during 1932–4, he returned to Yale as a Sterling Fellow in the neurophysiology laboratory, where he began the first phase of the research career for which he is remembered.

During his time at Yale from 1934 to 1941, McCulloch participated with Dusser de Barenne and others in numerous experiments on the physiology and anatomy of the cerebral cortex, employing the cathode ray tube to measure changes in electrical potentials of cortex. They made detailed maps of intracortical and cortical-subcortical connections. From 1941 to 1952, McCulloch was associate and then full professor of psychiatry at University of Illinois College of Medicine in

Chicago, where he continued electrophysiological research, mostly on primate cortex, with G. von Bonin, Percival Bailey, and others.

In 1942 McCulloch accepted two young apprentices into his laboratory (and later into his home as members of his family), Walter Pitts and Jerome Lettvin. Pitts, then nineteen, was a brilliant autodidact with several languages and a deep interest in mathematics and mathematical logic who had come into contact with Bertrand Russell and Rudolf CARNAP at the University of Chicago. With Pitts, McCulloch wrote the paper for which he is best known, "A Logical Calculus of the Ideas Immanent in Nervous Activity" (1943). This paper analyzed "neural nets" in which neurons were treated as binary-state elements (conforming to the "all or nothing" law), operating in integral time, requiring a fixed number of excitatory synaptic inputs to fire, and capable of being blocked by a single inhibitory input. A simple kind of "learning" was represented by the activation of recurrent circuits, allowing a synaptic input to produce a sustained change in network properties. The symbolic language that McCulloch and Pitts employed, from Carnap's *The Logical Syntax of Language*, to describe such nets was an awkward choice for their purposes and left some features of their "proofs" opaque. In one place, they summarized their conclusions thus: "nets with circles [recurrent circuits] can compute, without scanners and a tape, some of the numbers the [Turing] machine can, but no others, and not all of them." This was essentially correct, though the paper has often been misinterpreted as saying something stronger: that McCulloch-Pitts nets are equivalent to Turing machines in computational power. As Stephen C. KLEENE subsequently showed, such nets have the computational power of finite automata or Turing-like machines with *finite* tapes. No such net has the computational power of a Turing machine with a potentially infinite tape. However, if one conceives of the environment of the neural net as the equivalent of a tape, and endows this environment with

unlimited storage capacity, the system as a whole is a Turing machine.

McCulloch and Pitts's "A Logical Calculus of the Ideas Immanent in Nervous Activity" is referred to in many anthologies of artificial intelligence and neurocomputing as the seminal work in those fields. Yet, apart from the flawed proofs, the paper had several drawbacks: for example, the "neural" networks thus represented were completely unrealistic, and, in principle, any nexus of causal connections could be employed with suitable parameters as a representational system as easily as the nervous system. Still, the paper had enormous appeal. It seemed to come at just the right time, when the promise of neurophysiological methods to reveal the workings of the brain coincided with the promise that powerful computing machines with much of the "reasoning" powers of the brain would be feasible. If nothing else, it was a metaphor that inspired, comparing the all-or-nothing discharge of a neuron in a neural net with the assertion of a true-false proposition in a symbolic system. It made one giddy with the possibility that we were at last on the way to understanding how the brain could be the organ of thought.

Although Pitts moved to MIT as Norbert WIENER's research assistant in 1943, Pitts and McCulloch continued to collaborate, producing a second important paper on neural nets in 1947, "How We Know Universals: The Perception of Auditory and Visual Forms." Here, they switched tactics, from developing universal networks to developing highly specific networks capable of recognizing universals. For example, they showed how auditory cortex could abstract chord and timbre from pitch assuming that representation of a given pitch shifts to different levels of the cortex as one moves along the auditory gyrus, and that the alpha rhythm is due to a scansion mechanism that sweeps vertically over these different levels of cortex, thereby enabling detection of chords whatever the pitches may be. Again, this was a demonstration of a feasible rather than an actual mechanism, the

alpha rhythm usually disappearing during acts of attention, but it began a long and rich tradition in the study of pattern recognition by neural networks.

In 1943 Weiner, together with physiologist Arturo Rosenblueth and electrical engineer Julian Bigelow, published the other great seminal paper in the search for machine intelligence, "Behavior, Purpose and Teleology," purporting to show that *purpose* could be realized mechanically by means of negative feedback, and instituting the field that came to be known as *cybernetics*, or the study of steering machines. In 1946 McCulloch arranged with the Josiah Macy foundation to fund a series of meetings on feedback mechanism, which were held annually until 1956, and brought together leading figures from many fields to discuss mechanisms manifesting purpose and intelligence. From all accounts, one of the most engaging features of the Macy conferences was McCulloch's flamboyant personality. A tall, gray-bearded man, ever ready to foster dramatic confrontations amongst his highly intelligent and idiosyncratic colleagues, he contributed much to the liveliness and creativity of these conferences, not least by his colorful tropes: thus, it would not be uncharacteristic of him to begin a talk, "Once I met a Spanish lady with violet eyes …" and then weave that alluring image somehow into a mathematical analysis of neural mechanics.

From 1952 until his death in 1969 McCulloch was a professor in MIT's Research Laboratory of Electronics. Wiener arranged for McCulloch, Lettvin, and a brilliant young neurobiologist from the University of Chicago, Patrick Wall, to join Pitts, where they were provided with a basement laboratory. Over the ensuing years, this laboratory became a meeting place for some of the most celebrated minds in the burgeoning cognitive science, or, as McCulloch sometimes referred to it, "experimental epistemology" (a pun on the EE of "electrical engineering"). McCulloch and his group undertook state-of-the-art experiments designed to demonstrate hard-wired mechanisms in the sensory systems along the lines set out in the 1947 paper on universals. The most famous production of this type was described by McCulloch, Lettvin, and others in a 1959 paper, "What the Frog's Eye Tells the Frog's Brain" (in 1965) which demonstrated "feature detectors" in the eye itself able to abstract contrast, convexity, and moving edges ("bug detectors") from light flux falling on the retina. Other experiments employing state-of-the-art techniques elucidated the operation of neural nets in the olfactory bulb and spine. These genetically built-in, low-level processors were said to provide a "physiological synthetic a priori."

From early on, symbolic logic had engaged McCulloch's interest, and during these years at MIT, his interest shifted more and more from active laboratory work to logical analysis of neural nets, often treating graphic depictions of nets as a form of logical notation. He had become acquainted with Charles S. PEIRCE's writings as early as 1929 when he was introduced to Peirce's treatment of "information" as a measurable quantity (in Baldwin's 1901 *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*). In 1941 he rediscovered Peirce's dot-X or chiastic symbols, capable of representing each of the sixteen possible truth-functions of a pair of propositions. Thus, a dot in the left compartment of the X means the left proposition alone is true, a dot in the right means the right alone is true, dots in left, right and top means either or both are true, dots in all four represent a tautology, etc. Subsequently, McCulloch and his associates experimented with probabilistic notation, in which a mean firing frequency or a shift in threshold substitutes for all-or-nothing impulses, and in the chiastic notation, probability values occupy the compartments of the X's instead of dots, restricted by the usual rules governing the products of probabilities. This interest in devising new symbolic notation increasingly abstracted from any relation to actual neural nets has since characterized one area of the neurocomputational movement.

McCulloch was impressed by Peirce's emphasis upon the fundamental character of triadic relations, and aware of Peirce's struggles

to develop an intensional logic. At the 1967 Ravello Conference on Neural Networks, he and Roberto Moreno-Diaz reported on their efforts to develop a triadic intensional logic in a project intended to equip a Mars lander with the ability to guess what its internal state and its surroundings demand of it during the interims between signals to and from earth. However, developing a triadic intensional logic proved very difficult, but McCulloch remained convinced of its potential for an alternative to materialistic and reductivist approaches to thought. In 1968 McCulloch wrote:

> Man viewed as a finite automaton, is neither just the homomorphic projections from a free monoid or subgroup with an identity, nor is he a mere machine, just matter in motion. He is at least both, and requires for his description a relation systematically excluded in each reduction. Unfortunately, that relation is triadic, and of such relations, we lack, even for extensional logic, an effective calculus. For years I have said this, and every time I have been asked why I thought it was of any importance. Tarski has always agreed with me, and in the summer of 1964, in Jerusalem, he put it even more sharply by saying that we have no effective calculus for any intensional relation. (quoted in Moreno-Diaz and Mira-Mira 1996)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Logical Calculus of the Ideas Immanent in Nervous Activity," with Walter Pitts, *Bulletin of Mathematical Biophysics 5* (1943): 115–33.

"A Heterarchy of Values Determined by the Topology of Nervous Nets," with Walter Pitts, *Bulletin of Mathematical Biophysics* 7 (1945): 89–93.

"How We Know Universals: The Perception of Auditory and Visual Forms," *Bulletin of Mathematical Biophysics* 9 (1947): 127–47.

Embodiments of Mind (Cambridge, Mass., 1965).

Collected Works, 4 vols, ed. Rook McCulloch (Salinas, Cal. 1989).

Other Relevant Works

McCulloch's papers are at the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia.

"Logic and Closed Loops for a Computer Junket to Mars," in *Neural Networks: Proceedings of the School of Neural Networks June 1967 in Ravello*, ed. E. R. Caianiello (New York, 1968), pp. 65–6.

Further Reading

Encyc Cog Sci

Anderson, James A., and Edward Rosenfeld, eds. *Talking Nets: An Oral History of Neural Networks* (Cambridge, Mass., 1998).

Heims, Steve Joshua. *The Cybernetics Group* (Cambridge, Mass., 1991).

Moreno-Diaz, Roberto, and José Mira-Mira, eds. *Brain Processes, Theories, and Models: An International Conference in Honor of W. S. McCulloch 25 Years after His Death* (Cambridge, Mass., 1996).

Wiener, Norbert. *Cybernetics, or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine* (New York, 1948).

Seth K. Sharpless

McDERMOTT, John Joseph (1932–)

John J. McDermott was born on 5 January 1932 in New York City. He received three degrees in philosophy: the BA from St. Francis College in 1953; the MA from Fordham University in 1954; and the PhD in philosophy with great distinction from Fordham University in 1959. His dissertation on William JAMES was under the direction of Robert C. Pollock. McDermott was a postdoctoral fellow in American Studies at Union Theological

Graduate School. McDermott was a professor of philosophy at Queens College of City University of New York from 1956 to 1977, and was on the graduate faculty from 1970 to 1977. In 1977 he went to Texas A&M University as professor of philosophy and head of the department. In 1981 he left the position of department head and became University Distinguished Professor of Philosophy and Humanities, which is his current position, and he also holds a joint appointment in College of Medicine. In 1970 he was awarded an LLD *honoris causa* from the University of Hartford. McDermott was a member of the National Board of Officers of the American Philosophical Association from 1989 to 1992.

McDermott's primary fields are American philosophy, philosophy of culture, environmental aesthetics, and medical humanities. McDermott played a key role in the resurgence of interest in classical American philosophy in the mid 1960s. He was involved in the formation of the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy (President 1978–80), and the William James Society (first President). McDermott edited volumes of writings by William James, John DEWEY, and Josiah ROYCE. He was the general editor of the critical edition of *The Correspondence of William James* (1992–2004).

McDermott's own philosophy is indebted to American philosophy, especially James. However, he does not merely "receive" from a multitude and range of thinkers and events (natural, historical, cultural, social) but he *creatively transforms* what is received and integrates it into a distinctive world view of his own. Further, he does not just "make it up out of whole cloth" nor does he passively describe alleged objective phenomena or "clear and distinct" ideas. His philosophy, therefore, embodies an impressive articulation of what has been, what has been thought, what is and what might possibly be or ought to be.

To the question, "How does McDermott *see* reality or the world in its most comprehensive terms?" a threefold response (which is really one) might be made: the world is a world of experiences, processes, and relations. This apparent threefold response is really singular since there is no experience (human or other) which is not processive and relational. McDermott, therefore, rejects any mode of metaphysical dualism or metaphysical idealism. He insists that while there is no world metaphysically isolated from us, there is a world, or worlds, metaphysically *independent* of us, whether individually or collectively. Thus, he can be designated a "realist" or, more accurately, a "creative realist." By presupposing a Jamesian "world in the making" or "unfinished universe" he was able to avoid both vacuous subjectivism and abstract objectivism. All realities are processive-relational realities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Culture of Experience: Philosophical Essays in the American Grain (New York, 1976).

Streams of Experience: Reflections on the History and Philosophy of American Culture (Amherst, Mass., 1986).

Other Relevant Works

"The American Angle of Vision," *Cross Currents* 15 (1965): 69–93, 433–60.

Ed., *The Writings of William James* (New York, 1967).

Ed., *The Writings of Josiah Royce*, 2 vols (Chicago, 1969).

Ed., *The Philosophy of John Dewey*, 2 vols (New York, 1969).

"The Philosophical Prospects for a New World," in *Two Centuries of Philosophy in America*, ed. Peter Caws (Oxford, 1980), pp. 240–49.

Ed., *A Cultural Introduction to Philosophy: From Antiquity to Descartes* (New York, 1985).

"Pragmatic Sensibility: The Morality of Experience," in *New Directions in Ethics*, ed. Joseph P. DeMarco and Richard Fox (New York, 1986), pp. 113–34.

"'Life is in the Transitions': Empiricism and

Contemporary Concerns," in *Doctrine and Experience: Essays in American Philosophy*, ed. Vincent G. Potter (New York, 1988), pp. 104–20.

"A Relational World: The Significance of the Thought of William James for Twentieth-Century Culture," in *Philosophie et Culture: actes du XVIIe Congrès mondial de philosophie*, ed. Venant Cauchy (Montréal, 1988), vol. 4, pp. 797–804.

Ed., *The Correspondence of William James*, 12 vols (Charlottesville, Virg., 1992–2004).

"Why Bother: Is Life Worth Living? Experience as Pedagogical," in *Philosophy and the Reconstruction of Culture*, ed. John J. Stuhr (Albany, N.Y., 1993), pp. 273–83.

"Ill-at-ease: The Natural Travail of Ontological Disconnectedness," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 67 (June 1994): 7–28.

Further Reading

Campbell, James, and Richard Hart, ed., *Philosophy and Experience: Conversations with John J. McDermott* (New York, 2006).

Malone, Michael. "Trumping Cynicism with Imagination," interview with John McDermott, in *A Parliament of Minds: Philosophy for a New Millennium*, ed. Michael Tobias, J. Patrick Fitzgerald, and David Rothenberg (Albany, N.Y., 2000), pp. 60–75.

Saatkamp, Herman, Jr. "1993 Herbert Schneider Award Citation," *Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy Newsletter* 65 (June 1993): 10–11.

Eugene Fontinell
Michael W. Allen

McDOUGALL, William (1871–1938)

William McDougall was born on 22 June 1871 in Chadderton, Lancashire, England, and died on 28 November 1938 in Durham, North Carolina. His father, Isaac Shimwell McDougall, was a chemical manufacturer who provided a comfortable life for his family in the suburbs of Manchester. William spent a year at a Real-Gymnasium in Weimar, Germany before entering Owens College of the University of Manchester in 1886, where he received a BSc in 1889 and a Geology I in 1890. He then attended St. John's College, Cambridge, on a scholarship where, to prepare for a career in medicine, he studied physiology, anatomy, and anthropology. He continued his medical education at St. Thomas's Hospital in London where he also carried out research on muscle physiology with Charles Sherrington. McDougall received his MD in 1898 and was elected a fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, an appointment he held until 1904. In 1898, he joined the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to the Torres Straits headed by anthropologist Alfred Cort Haddon. He remained in the Torres Straits for only a short time before going to Borneo to assist Dr. Charles Hose who was assessing the intellectual, moral, and physical condition of the indigenous tribes of head-hunters. McDougall's experiences on this expedition initiated a lifelong interest in individual differences, especially across ethnic groups.

Following his return from Borneo in 1899, McDougall spent a year studying experimental psychology with G. E. Müller at the University of Göttingen. In 1900 he accepted a part-time appointment at University College, London, where he taught a laboratory course in psychological methods. He was appointed to the Wilde Readership in Mental Philosophy at the University of Oxford in 1904. Except for service in the Royal Army Medical Corps during World War I from 1914 to 1918, McDougall remained at Oxford until 1920. In that year he moved to the United States to

take the chair in psychology vacated by the death of Hugo MÜNSTERBERG, in the department of philosophy and psychology at Harvard University. He left Harvard in 1927 to become professor and chair of the psychology department at Duke University, positions he held until his death in 1938.

McDougall believed that to understand human nature it was necessary to approach the problem both "from below upwards by way of physiology and neurology, and from above downwards by way of psychology, philosophy, and the various human sciences" (1930, p. 200). Although he always retained an interest in both neurology and psychology, early in his career he focused more on the former, whereas later he emphasized the psychological aspects of the mind–body problem. Philosophically, McDougall was an animist, believing that "mental and vital processes cannot be completely described and explained in terms of mechanism." There must be the "co-operation of some non-mechanical teleological factor ... the soul" (1911, p. 364). He recognized that physiological research had a role in that "we can only establish or disprove an undetermined activity of the soul by first discovering all other factors, and then showing that there remains, or does not remain, an inexplicable residue" (1902, p. 320). This point of view also led him to promote the investigation of psychical phenomena and he was active in both the British and American psychical societies.

In the early 1900s, McDougall proposed a theory of neural functioning that emphasized the role of the synapse in the psycho-physical process. This involved the production of a fluid he called neurin that flowed through the neural pathways and produced a reduction in the threshold of the synapse, resulting in more rapid neural conduction. McDougall believed that "every psychical state corresponds to the flow of neurin through a certain set of neurones which form a group of conduction paths .... [T]he physical processes in direct interaction with the soul" (1902, p. 332). He also applied his ideas on the role of neurin to the physiological processes involved in attention in the "drainage theory" which held that when two nerve paths were simultaneously excited the flow of neurin to the more strongly activated path determined attention. While physiologists rejected the drainage theory, psychologists saw it as useful; and E. G. BORING claimed: "Psychologically attention is drainage, whatever it may be physiologically." (Boring 1929, p. 642) McDougall also conducted research on attention and designed an apparatus, known as the "McDougall dotter," that was widely used to measure attention.

Although McDougall's philosophical position was outside the mainstream of psychology, his reputation as a psychologist in Britain, based on publication of several popular books, was substantial. He is best known for his ideas on instinct first outlined in *An Introduction to Social Psychology* (1908), a book that went through twenty-three editions. In this text, as well as in *Psychology: The Study of Behaviour* (1912), McDougall became the first to define psychology as "the positive science of conduct or behaviour" (1908, p. 15). However, his was not the mechanistic, stimulus–response (S–R) concept of behavior soon to be popularized by John WATSON in America. McDougall saw behavior as the "manifestation of purpose or the striving to achieve an end" (1912, p. 20). After he came to America, McDougall would come into direct conflict with Watson, especially with respect to the notion of instinct.

McDougall maintained that all behavior begins with innate tendencies that he called instincts. Instincts "are the essential springs or motive powers of all thought and action, whether individual or collective, and are the bases from which the character and will of individuals and of nations are gradually developed" (1908, p. 19). The choice of the term instinct later became a problem for McDougall. Unlike the typical view that an instinct involved a chains of reflexes, he defined it as "an inherited or innate psycho-

physical disposition which determines its possessor to perceive, and to pay attention to, objects of a certain class, to experience an emotional excitement of a particular quality upon perceiving such an object, and to act in regard to it in a particular manner, or, at least, to experience an impulse to such action" (1908, p. 29). Thus, an instinct had three aspects: cognitive (attention to or perception of objects), emotive, and conative (an impulse to act). Only the emotional core remained constant; both the cognitive and conative aspects could be changed by experience. In humans, instincts usually do not occur in a pure form; they combine to form sentiments which, for McDougall, were essential to the formation of an individual's character or personality. The sentiments, however, were largely ignored by psychologists.

McDougall expanded on his behavioristic approach in *An Outline of Psychology* (1923), published soon after he came to America. Unlike the S–R psychologists, who saw behavior as mindless and reflexive, McDougall considered all behavior – human and animal – to be purposive (goal-directed). McDougall's closest American theorists were John DEWEY and George MEAD who also advocated a teleological and social behaviorism, but no influences seems to have occurred between them. McDougall's approach was soon labeled "hormic" (from the Greek meaning "urge to action") psychology. In *An Outline of Psychology* McDougall critically examined research on both classical and instrumental conditioning. He was particularly critical of Edward L. THORNDIKE's studies of trial and error learning, and reported on several experiments with animals that he had carried out himself showing animals making intelligent, goal-directed responses.

With the publication of *An Outline of Psychology* the differences between McDougall's "sane" behaviorism and the behaviorism of Watson became even more obvious. In reviewing McDougall's book and in a 1924 public debate between the two men

(later published as *The Battle of Behaviorism*, 1929), Watson mocked McDougall's animistic philosophy and interest in parapsychology. McDougall was no less caustic, calling Watson's position "bizarre, paradoxical, preposterous, and outrageous" (1929, p. 41).

McDougall pursued another controversial interest soon after coming to America, when he gave a series of lectures on national eugenics, published as *Is America Safe for Democracy?* (1921). At the University of London, McDougall had been associated with Sir Francis Galton and shared his views concerning individual differences. In one of the lectures, entitled "The Island of Eugenia," he suggested a fantastic plan for a utopian society, based on eugenic principles that would produce world leaders from a select set of individuals.

McDougall was also widely criticized by the psychological research community for a long-term research project on the inheritance of acquired characteristics that he began at Harvard and continued during his years at Duke. He always maintained that ideas should be rejected only after they had been tested empirically, preferably in a university setting. However, his experiments, involving over thirty generations of rats, were not well controlled, and the results that he thought supported Larmarckian inheritance could not be replicated.

McDougall died knowing he had failed to convince American psychologists of the validity of his brand of behaviorism, hormic psychology – an approach that emphasized purposive, intelligent behavior. Had he lived today, many of his ideas might not have been rejected so readily.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Physiological Actors of the Attention Process," *Mind* 11 (1902): 316–51.
An Introduction to Social Psychology (London, 1908).
Body and Mind: A History and Defense of Animism (London, 1911).
The Pagan Tribes of Borneo, with Charles

Hose (London, 1912).

Psychology: The Study of Behaviour (London, 1912).

The Group Mind (Cambridge, UK, 1920).

Is America Safe for Democracy? (New York, 1921).

An Outline of Psychology (London, 1923).

Outline of Abnormal Psychology (New York, 1926).

The Battle of Behaviorism, with John B. Watson (New York, 1929).

The Energies of Men (New York, 1933).

Religion and the Sciences of Life (London, 1934).

Other Relevant Works

McDougall's papers are at Duke University.

"The Psychology they Teach in New York," in *Behaviorism: A Battle Line*, ed. William P. King (Nashville, Tenn., 1930), pp. 31–62.

"William McDougall" in *A History of Psychology in Autobiography*, vol. 1, ed. C. Murchison (Worcester, Mass., 1930), pp. 191–223.

"Experimental Psychology and Psychological Experiment," *Character and Personality* 1 (1933): 195–213.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Boring, E. G. *A History of Experimental Psychology* (New York, 1929).

Burt, C. "The Permanent Contributions of McDougall to Psychology," *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 25 (1955): 10–22.

Innis, Nancy K. "William McDougall: 'A Major Tragedy'?" in *Portraits of Pioneers in Psychology*, vol. 5, ed. G. A. Kimble and M. Wertheimer (Washington, D.C., 2003), pp. 91–108.

Robertson, A. L. *William McDougall: A Bibliography* (Durham, N.C., 1943).

Nancy K. Innis

McGILVARY, Evander Bradley (1864–1953)

Evander Bradley McGilvary was born on 19 July 1864 in Bangkok, Siam (now Thailand). His father Daniel McGilvary (Princeton class of 1856) and mother Sophia (Bradley) McGilvary were Presbyterian missionaries to Siam. In 1867 the family went to the northern Siam province of Chiang Mai in 1867 as founders of the Laos Mission, where McGilvary grew up. He returned to the United States at the age of nine to live in North Carolina and attend Davidson College, where he received his BA and graduated valedictorian of his class in 1884. After studying theology at Princeton Theological Seminary, where he received an MA in 1888, he returned to Siam for three years of service during 1891–4 as a translator to his father's Presbyterian Seminary in Chiang Mai. Upon returning to the US he obtained his PhD in philosophy from the University of California at Berkeley in 1897, writing a dissertation on "The Principle and the Method of the Hegelian Dialectic: A Defense of the Dialectic Against Its Critics." McGilvary also taught philosophy at Berkeley, first as an instructor during 1895–7 and as an assistant professor during 1897–9. In 1899 he became Sage Professor of Ethics at Cornell University. In 1905 he became professor of philosophy and head of the department at the University of Wisconsin, holding these positions until his retirement in 1934. McGilvary died on 11 September 1953 in Madison, Wisconsin.

McGilvary was frequently invited to lecture at several universities. McGilvary delivered the Howison Lecture in 1927, and the Mills Lecture in 1928, both at Berkeley. In 1939 he gave the Paul Carus Lectures for the American Philosophical Association. In these lectures he began putting together the views he had been developing for many years. His written account of the lectures was never completed; in 1956 it was published posthumously with a number of previously published essays as *Towards a Perspective Realism*. McGilvary was President of the Western Philosophical Association in

1911–12, and the American Philosophical Association (now Eastern Division) in 1913–14.

Unlike Descartes's metaphysics, which begins with an attempt at doubting all common sense, McGilvary's metaphysics is an effort to preserve as much of common sense as possible. McGilvary described his own philosophy as "perspective realism." Insofar as perspective realism is a metaphysics, it is to be conceived as an integration of physics and psychology. Visual perspectives provide the most intuitive examples of what perspectives are, although McGilvary would eventually extend the notion of a perspective to every aspect of reality, going so far as to consider even beauty a property objects have from a certain biological perspective. In the visual case, an array of "objects sensibly perceived by an observer from any one of the positions his eyes may occupy is his perspective from that position, and any object in that field is 'in that perspective'" (1956, p. 156).

In 1907, before adopting perspectivism as his central philosophical tenet, McGilvary published his first major work, "Pure Experience and Reality," in which he alleged a "crisis" in John DEWEY's system. In particular, he alleged that at the very least Dewey was "anti-realist" and, perhaps, even an idealist. Dewey replied energetically, denying McGilvary's numerous claims without, however, explicitly rejecting idealism in the precise terms that McGilvary demanded. McGilvary was given "a page and a day" to reply. Perhaps realizing that his response had been weak, one year later he published "The Chicago 'Idea' and Idealism," which straightforwardly invited Dewey to deny that he was an idealist. Dewey in a complimentary and sometimes even flattering rejoinder to McGilvary stated explicitly: "I deny I am an idealist." Henceforth, McGilvary spoke in laudatory terms of both Dewey and his philosophy.

Pragmatism exerted considerable influence on McGilvary's thinking, particularly in his rejection of what he regarded as the dogmatic approach of past philosophies. His rejection of dogmatism resulted in his acceptance of the method of postulates. Postulates he viewed not as dogmas but, rather, as useful assumptions in guiding his own inquiry. One postulate central to his philosophy was that every relation is a relation between terms that are not analyzable into relations, suggesting familiarity with the central arguments of F. H. Bradley's *Appearance and Reality*. It is likely that McGilvary's postulational approach was to a degree inspired by the American postulate theorists. These were philosophically aware mathematicians, mostly at Harvard University, whose interests were closely tied to another perspectivist philosopher, Bertrand Russell. Among them were such luminaries as Oswald VEBLEN, an influential topologist and a relation of Thorstein VEBLEN, and E. V. HUNTINGTON, who had authored a widely read introduction to the mathematical theory of continuity.

McGilvary's postulational approach implicitly defined the strength and limitations of his ontology, which relied in large measure on two fundamental distinctions, that between two kinds of properties: dynamic and nondynamic, and two kinds of individuals: things and substances. Dynamic properties constitute the subject matter of physics and provide the basis for nondynamic properties, such as secondary qualities. While substances are the sorts of individuals that consist in dynamic properties, things consist in substances combined with the nondynamic properties to which the substance's dynamic properties give rise. As for the relation between dynamic and nondynamic properties, McGilvary tells us only that the latter "grow" from the former "like branches grow from a tree" (1956, p. 35).

Physical objects and their properties are real, not ideal, according to McGilvary. But the properties a thing has are not had absolutely but rather are had from a perspective. This is true of both primary qualities (for example, shapes) and secondary qualities (for instance, colors). Colors, in fact, become properties of objects "from the perspective of the eye." Such

relativity to perspective is a distinguishing characteristic of McGilvary's "perspective realism," a term he coined to distinguish his own position from that of earlier perspectivists such as Russell, A. N. WHITEHEAD, Samuel Alexander, and George H. MEAD. For the most part, earlier perspectivists had concentrated on space and spatiality, but McGilvary attempted to extend perspectivism to memory and even the physical and physiological conditions that determine the attributes an object possesses. His realism, however, was less radical and merely acknowledged that the world given to experience is the real world as "common sense" would have it.

McGilvary cited William JAMES as the greatest single influence on his own work. There were, however, two important respects in which they differed. James had held that consciousness was not a thing but a relation. This position appears to have had an enormous effect on both McGilvary's metaphysics and his theory of knowledge. But the influence did not endure unqualified. Although for a number of years McGilvary held that vision was a relation, much like the relation *being a grandfather*, rather than an action, he later came to maintain that it involved both an activity as well as a relation. This activity he identified as a brain activity, an activity that gives rise to the nondynamic relation of consciousness: "We are now in a position to define the perspectivist's mind as an organism whose dynamic brain action is conditioning, or giving rise to, a nondynamic conscious relation of which it thereby becomes a term." (1956, p. 67)

Despite this introduction of dynamics to his relational theory of consciousness, McGilvary retained relations as basic ingredients of his ontology. Historically, they have always been of paramount interest to perspectivist philosophy. McGilvary's radical perspectivism was no exception. "Things" become little else than the "entireness" of their relational characters (for example, "being the grandson of T. H. Huxley"), while relations themselves depend on terms for their being, since their being is merely "being between." Nothing on this view either exists or is known to exist independently of its relation to other things. Notwithstanding James's enormous influence on McGilvary, it would be a mistake to characterize his philosophy in the broadest of terms as "philosophical psychology." Even though consciousness occupies center stage in a great number of McGilvary's published works, discussion very quickly turns to either what neurologists had uncovered or to metaphysical discussion of the relations of mind and matter. In regards to the former, McGilvary was particularly taken by the extraordinary work of the British neurologist, Charles Sherrington, whose "masterly guidance" he frequently acknowledged. Particularly towards the latter part of his philosophical life, McGilvary integrated what he took from the neurologists into an understanding of the relation of mind and matter. As he did so, his thinking became at once richer and more original.

Consciousness, secondary qualities, and visual objects induced by cortical stimulation are described as "epiphysical," meaning that they are the *result* of physical events without themselves *being* physical events. Further, coming into consciousness no more transforms the biological organism than entering into the relation of matrimony transforms the groom. Epiphysical phenomena are the byproducts of emergent nonphysical relations which give rise to mind – a mind being any "conscious biological organism." Although McGilvary relies on the concept of emergence, he is careful to distinguish his own position from "creative evolution," a theory brought into prominence by Henri Bergson as well as C. Lloyd Morgan's "emergent evolution." Such descriptions, McGilvary avers, place insufficient emphasis on novelty as an essential consequence of emergence. Because of this, he prefers the expression "innovative evolution." It is not to be ignored that perspective, also, enters into the production of epiphysical qualities and, therefore, innovative evolution.

McGilvary regarded consciousness, considered as an epiphysical relation dependent on

nerve activity, as the defining feature of his own "perspective realism." Consciousness is a nondynamic relation, which "supervenes" upon a dynamic process under dynamic neurological conditions. While it is tempting to view McGilvary's position as epiphenomenalism, he is careful to distinguish his own epiphysicalism from epiphenomenalism, a theory that enjoyed considerable popularity among philosophers of the period. Whereas epiphenomenalism maintains that a cognitive mental event, say, occurs at the end of a causal sequence beginning at one's sensory surface, epiphysicalism holds that the mental event while in some sense the "result" of physiological processes is not an "effect" of those processes in the way our understanding of causation in physics would have it. Notwithstanding this important difference between effect and result, inasmuch as consciousness supervenes on neurological processes, we are told that were there no such thing as consciousness, the nature of the physical world would not be what it is. This characterization anticipates the more general features of contemporary "supervenience" approaches to the philosophy of mind, championed in particular by Jaegwon KIM. Earlier, McGilvary had distanced himself from epiphenomenalism by rejecting the notion that mental events had no causal consequence on the physical world, a common objection to epiphenomenalism, which denied the possibility of such two-sided interactionism.

While his reliance on perspectives in his treatment of problems of the relation of mind and matter is sometimes difficult to discern, this is less so in the case of his examination of problems of space and time. On matters of space and time McGilvary assumed a largely orthodox point of view. But on the philosophical matter of how perspective space is to be regarded, he took a somewhat different view than other perspectivists who had fallen under the spell of what was then the "new physics." In a paper written in 1930, "A Tentative Realistic Metaphysics," he rejects the idea that

there are different spaces associated with our various senses. This view had been upheld by Russell but rejected by Samuel Alexander. McGilvary sides with Alexander but is drawn to the somewhat startling conclusion that the objects of our dreams hover about our heads in the very same space.

McGilvary's perspectivism, as well as that of those of his predecessors he acknowledges, owes a great deal to the revolution in physics initiated by Albert EINSTEIN. Philosophers had, since Leibniz, been familiar with the general features that define a perspective. The idea, however, had remained largely dormant until Einstein applied a relativity principle to all physical phenomena, not just dynamic ones, and then went on to apply such a principle to all frames of reference. It was the relation of frame of reference to perspective that generated a new interest in the philosophical notion of a perspective. McGilvary authored one paper explicitly devoted in its entirety to the theory of relativity, "The Lorentz Transformation and 'Space-Time'." In explaining the negative results of the Michelson–Morley experiment, H. A. Lorentz had produced equations that could be explained by assuming that the distance between two points on a solid object moving parallel to the motion of the earth would change if the object were rotated 90 degrees. Einstein had provided a derivation of these results that made no such assumption. McGilvary suggested an alternative, albeit based in principle on Einstein's postulates. While an assessment of the value of this exercise may be inconclusive, McGilvary's philosophical remarks on the nature of time and the present in particular retain a degree of importance that cannot be ignored.

McGilvary incorporated past events into present perspectives. Moreover, memory perspectives, for example, include what is perceptually past. Unlike perceptual perspectives where the past is merely inferred, past perspectives may be given in present memory perspectives. The objects of awareness from the perspective of a memory will have properties

differing from the original, owing to the occurrence of new experiences and relations that intervene between the time of one's original experience of the object and the time of the occurrence of the memory itself. This characterization, although somewhat different, bears a striking resemblance to the very conception McGilvary had alleged, years earlier, to exist as part of what he regarded as Dewey's idealism.

McGilvary accepted the idea that the present has duration and is not instantaneous. For this reason it has frequently been referred to as the "specious present." Acceptance of such a notion necessitated on his part a reconsideration of the meaning of the word "past" which, given his acceptance of a specious present, requires disambiguation. McGilvary argued that while an object in my room may be to the north of some other object in my room I cannot say of either object that one is to the north of my room. There may be other objects outside my room that are to the north of it, but they cannot be said to be to the north of it in the same sense of "north."

McGilvary takes this point to be analogous to the fact that within a specious present one event is not "past" with respect to some other event within that same specious present in the same sense that an event may be "past" relative to the specious present itself. In other words, events within a specious present precede one another in a different sense from that in which events outside a specious present may precede that very same specious present. Just as Hume had taken empiricism to whatever conclusion it led him, if McGilvary is to be remembered, he will be remembered as the philosopher who once having accepted perspectivism, carried it as far as his realism would allow.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Times, New and Old (Berkeley, Cal., 1928).
"A Tentative Realistic Metaphysics," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 2, pp. 109–32.

Toward a Perspective Realism, ed. Albert Ramsperger (La Salle, Ill., 1956).

Other Relevant Works
"The Summum Bonum," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 1 (1904): 1–27.
"The Stream of Consciousness," *Journal of Philosophy* 4 (1907): 225–35.
"Pure Experience and Reality," *Philosophical Review* 16 (1907): 266–84.
"Pure Experience and Reality: A Reassertion," *Philosophical Review* 16 (1907): 422–4.
"The Chicago 'Idea' and Idealism," *Journal of Philosophy* 5 (1908): 589–97.
"The 'Fringe' of William James's Psychology the Basis of Logic," *Philosophical Review* 20 (1911): 137–64.
"The New Realism," *Philosophical Review* 22 (1913): 57–65.
"Time and the Experience of Time," *Philosophical Review* 23 (1914): 121–45.
"The Warfare of Moral Ideals," *Hibbert Journal* 14 (1915): 43–62.
"Dialectical Arguments against Relative Simultaneity," *Journal of Philosophy* 28 (1931): 421–35.
"Perceptual and Memory Perspectives," *Journal of Philosophy* 30 (1933): 309–30.
"Freedom and Necessity in Human Affairs," *International Journal of Ethics* 45 (1935): 379–98.
"Space-time, Simple Location, and Prehension," in *The Philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead*, 2nd edn, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (New York, 1951).

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, Pres Addr of APA v2, Proc of APA v27, Who Was Who in Amer v3, Who's Who in Phil
Dewey, John. "Pure Experience and Reality: A Disclaimer," *Philosophical Review* 16 (1907): 419–22.
———, "Objects, Data, and Existences: A Reply to Professor McGilvary," *Journal of*

Philosophy 6 (1909): 13–21.

Murphy, Arthur E. "McGilvary's Perspective Realism," *Journal of Philosophy* 56 (1959): 149–65.

Stevens, Nathaniel H. "The Relativity Paradoxes: A Footnote to the Lovejoy-McGilvary Controversy," *Philosophical Review* 47 (1938): 624–38.

Steven Bayne

McINERNY, Ralph Matthew (1929–)

Ralph McInerny was born on 24 February 1929 in Minneapolis, Minnesota. He received a BA from St. Paul Seminary in 1951, and an MA at the University of Minnesota in 1952. He then attended Université Laval in Québec, earning a PhL in philosophy in 1953 and a PhD in philosophy in 1954. The title of his dissertation was "The Existential Dialectic of Søren Kierkegaard." His entire teaching career, after one year at Creighton in 1954–5, has been spent at the University of Notre Dame, where he became a full professor in 1969. Since 1978 McInerny has been the Michael P. Grace Professor of Medieval Studies. He has also served as the Director of the Medieval Institute from 1978 to 1985, and Director of the Jacques Maritain Center since 1979.

McInerny was editor of *The New Scholasticism* from 1975 to 1989. He was President of the Metaphysical Society of America in 1992–3, and President of the American Catholic Philosophical Association in 1980–81, the latter organization having also honored him with its St. Thomas Aquinas Medal for Eminence in Philosophy in 1993. In 1999 McInerny gave the prestigious Gifford Lectures in Glasgow, Scotland, and was honored with a festschrift and conference on his life and thought. McInerny's stellar academic resume is complemented by a vast array of publications in journalism and fiction. He was the founder and publisher of *Crisis: A Journal of Lay Catholic Opinion* (1981), for which he continues to write a monthly column. He is also the author of many books of fiction, including the popular Father Dowling stories. In 1993 he received the Boushercon (Mystery Writers) of America Lifetime Achievement Award. Like Socrates, he now devotes his time not just to philosophy but also to the composition of poetry, having published a book of verse, *Shakespearean Variations*, in 2001.

At the center of his achievements and spanning his entire career is a devotion to the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas, whose writings he has read daily since his youth. At Laval, McInerny became a student of the great Thomist, Charles DE KONINCK, known for his distinctive interpretation of Aquinas as a philosopher and marked by his fidelity to the teachings of Aristotle. By contrast, other influential twentieth-century schools of Thomism emphasize certain philosophical novelties they claim to have discovered in Aquinas. In the transcendental Thomism of Bernard LONERGAN, for example, Aquinas becomes the advocate of a theory of cognition that anticipates and provides resources for overcoming the modern epistemological turn in philosophy. Or, again, in the existential Thomism of Etienne GILSON, Aquinas develops a distinctive doctrine of the primacy of existence over essence, a doctrine so deeply indebted to Christian revelation that it merits being called a piece of Christian philosophy.

Laval or Aristotelian Thomism, as McInerny calls it, highlights Aquinas's role as a philosophical interpreter of Aristotle, as a disciple who carries forward the teaching of his mentor. This school finds in the commentaries on Aristotle, in contrast to the explicitly theological works, the considered philosophical teachings of Aquinas. Embracing Aristotle's order of philosophical disciplines, this school insists that philosophical inquiry presupposes a mastery of the logical works of Aristotle and that metaphysics presupposes and reposes

upon physics; it also defends the real, if limited, autonomy of philosophy in relationship to theology. Such an approach to Aquinas has seemed to some to diminish his philosophical originality. In response, McInerny might note that originality was not by itself a virtue in Aquinas's day. Besides, he would also urge, there is a rich philosophical dividend to Laval-style Thomism.

More than any of the other schools of Thomism, Aristotelian Thomism attends to the disciplines of logic and natural philosophy. From the beginning McInerny has been preoccupied with Thomas's logic, especially with the teaching on analogy, a teaching that is operative in nearly every important philosophical and theological discussion in Aquinas's corpus. Against the great Thomistic commentator Cajetan, McInerny argues that the doctrine of analogy is principally a logical, not a metaphysical, teaching, that it has to do directly with the order of naming and only indirectly with the order of being. McInerny's three book-length studies – *The Logic of Analogy* (1961), *Studies in Analogy* (1968), and *Aquinas and Analogy* (1996) – constitute a major contribution on this topic in the history of Thomism.

Most discussions of analogy in Aquinas focus on a specific application of the doctrine, the divine names, the account of how we name God neither univocally nor purely equivocally but by analogy to the perfections we experience in the world. In his most accomplished treatment of the subject, *Aquinas and Analogy*, McInerny includes at the end a discussion of the divine names. Even here he is careful to point out that, unlike many of his commentators, Aquinas does not refer to an analogy of being. Indeed, the teaching on the divine names provides the most dramatic contrast between the order of naming and the order of being. What we name first – any perfection appropriate to a creature – is ontologically last, having been caused by what is first in the order of being but last in our naming, God. Nothing more powerfully illustrates the resources of

Laval or Aristotelian Thomism as both an exegetical and a philosophical approach than McInerny's work on analogy. A large part of the case for analogy as logical, rather than ontological, doctrine consists in a careful analysis of the passages in Aquinas's commentaries on Aristotle where analogy figures prominently. Two things emerge from this analysis. First, Cajetan and other commentators were deceived by etymology, assuming that what Thomas calls analogy must correspond precisely to what Aristotle calls analogy. But whereas Aristotle typically uses analogy to speak of proportion between things, Aquinas uses it to speak of an ordered plurality among words, corresponding to Aristotle's notion of "things said in many ways by reference to one." Second, attention to Aristotle's conception of the proper order of learning, of the nature and role of logic in relation to the philosophical disciplines, highlights the status of analogy as a logical, not an ontological, doctrine.

In this and other works, notably in his translation, with introduction, notes, and interpretive essay on Aquinas's treatise, *Against the Averroists: On There Being One Intellect* (1993), McInerny shows Aquinas to be a remarkably astute philosophical commentator on Aristotle, whose interpretations hold up not just against the rivals of Aquinas's own day but also against contemporary interpreters of Aristotle. An openness to the properly philosophical teaching of Aquinas, as present especially in his commentaries on ancient philosophical texts, has allowed McInerny to discover neglected philosophical resources in Aquinas. So, for example, McInerny appeals to Aquinas's principles for interpreting Aristotle's *Metaphysics* as a unified whole, in order to rebut Werner JAEGER's influential thesis that Aristotle's text is a pastiche of incoherent doctrines. Jaeger and others see Aristotle investigating two incompatible subject matters, ontology and theology. By contrast and following Aquinas, McInerny distinguishes between a horizontal procedure, which examines "knowledge of what belongs per se

to being after the fashion of properties of its subject," and a vertical procedure, which seeks the "cause of its subject, the efficient and, preeminently, the final cause of whatever is, of being as being" ("Ontology and Theology in Aristotle's Metaphysics," in *Being and Predication* 1986). God enters into first philosophy, not as part of the proper subject matter, but as cause or principle of the subject matter, being as being. McInerny also appeals to Aquinas's commentaries on both Aristotle and Boethius to argue that Aquinas detected the roots of the distinction between essence and existence in a number of the texts of his ancient and medieval predecessors.

In *Aquinas on Human Action* (1992) one finds McInerny's standard ways of doing philosophy: careful analysis of the texts and arguments of Aquinas, accompanied by engagements with contemporary interpreters and philosophers. So, having articulated the basic account of human action in Aquinas, McInerny turns to a critical appraisal of David GAUTHIER's claim that Aquinas cannot be trusted as a commentator on Aristotle, particularly on the question of the ultimate end of human life. McInerny argues that Aquinas carefully lays out Aristotle's definition of happiness, shows that the definition itself is adequate, but that, as Aristotle himself acknowledged, Aristotle could provide only an incomplete account of how human beings might achieve happiness.

In his work on ethics, McInerny argues cogently that, although Aristotle does not himself speak of natural law, Aquinas's teaching is a legitimate development of Aristotle's conception of practical reason. And McInerny has been at the forefront of the late twentieth-century revival of natural law thinking, engaged in sustained debate with other Thomists over how best to articulate Aquinas's teaching. His chief interlocutors and opponents within the world of Catholic moral philosophy have been John Finnis and Germain Grisez, who accept some version of the fact/value split and who espouse an autonomy of practical reason and a basic-value egalitarianism. All of these suppositions strike McInerny as more Kantian than Thomistic; they run afoul of Aquinas's Aristotelian supposition that practical reasoning is ensconced within and operates by reference to a hierarchy of goods appropriate to human nature.

McInerny articulates in Aristotelian terms Aquinas's account of the primary principles of the natural law. The most fundamental principle, "do good, avoid evil," develops the Aristotelian thesis that the "good is what all desire," that is, all desire occurs under the formality of the good (*ratio boni*). However, if the good is already desired, then a precept urging us to pursue the good is uninformative and merely acknowledges the fact of desire. But, McInerny explains, the good is desired as perfective of, good for, the agent and this is "as true of the apparent good as of the real good." No apparent good is desired *as apparent* and there is no such thing, as McInerny puts it, as a "merely factual desire." One who chooses an apparent rather than a true good is simply in error. The precept commands that we pursue and act on what is in fact perfective of the agent, and it articulates a command that is woven into the fabric of human nature and expressed in Aristotelian language as natural inclination toward the good; this is entirely in keeping with Aquinas's claim that the order of precepts of the natural law corresponds to the order of natural inclinations. And it has important consequences for the modern thesis of a chasm between fact and value. As McInerny observes, "The supposedly troublesome transition from Is to Ought suggests that the formality of goodness, that which is perfective and fulfilling, is not already present in any desire." (*Ethica Thomistica* 1997) Given Thomas's position, there can be no serious problem with an is/ought gap, since "ought" is already embedded within the "is" of human nature and action.

One welcome consequence of McInerny's more Aristotelian reading of natural law in Aquinas is his unique contribution to a central

debate in late twentieth-century ethics. In works such as *Ethica Thomistica*, *Aquinas on Human Action: A Theory of Practice*, and *Art and Prudence* (1988), McInerny demonstrates how Aquinas offers an important alternative to the contemporary division between rule-based and virtue-based theories of ethics. In one way, McInerny integrates the two by depicting the virtues as insuring the proper application of the precepts of the natural law. But in another way, both the precepts of the natural law and the virtues are said to supply the ends of human action, in light of which prudence commands what is to be done in the concrete. Hence, law and virtue are two different but compatible ways of talking about the goods of human action.

One of the traditional projects McInerny defends is the oft-discredited project of natural theology, which purports to be able to reach certain truths about the existence and nature of God by unaided human reason. He devoted his recent Gifford Lectures to this topic, composing two books along the way: the unpublished *Preambula Fidei*, a technical and scholarly defense of our ability to know God by natural reason; and *Characters in Search of Their Author* (2001), a more accessible presentation of the same perspective. The latter book defends natural theology as "one version of the quest for God," as a way of coming to see our "part in a vast cosmic drama."

McInerny's defense of natural theology and natural law ethics puts him at odds with commentators such as Gilson and Jacques Maritain, who stress Aquinas's subsumption of philosophy within theology. In *The Question of Christian Ethics* (1993), McInerny defends the limited autonomy of philosophical or natural ethics against those who charge that there can be no ethics apart from revelation. On one hand, McInerny insists that the "catholic thinker can be expected to maintain the human mind's ability, even in a condition of sin, to grasp truths of the moral as well as speculative order." On the other, he notes that "apart from the light and reinforcement it

receives from a setting of grace and faith, natural reason is a feeble reed indeed on which to have to rely" and that the activity of "philosophizing" is inseparable "from the moral context of the philosopher's life."

A lifelong student, not just of Aquinas, but of Søren Kierkegaard and Cardinal Newman, McInerny never discounts the way affective commitments influence a philosopher's starting points. Moral virtues and vices shape the character of the philosopher, and to some extent determine what he is likely to exclude from, or include within, the purview of his philosophical enterprise. Indeed, McInerny wryly notes in *Characters in Search of Their Author* that many contemporary philosophers are predisposed to dismiss the project of natural theology, not because they have spent time dissecting and refuting the arguments at the heart of the project, but because they consider it unfashionable or outdated.

Many of McInerny's earliest essays were on Kierkegaard's pseudonymous works and on Kierkegaard's account of subjectivity, not as blazing a path for relativism, but as underscoring the way practical – moral and religious – truths must be embraced in a way of life, not merely contemplated by an indifferent, disembodied intellect. In spite of his distance from some of Maritain's views, McInerny is quite sympathetic, as is clear from the essays in *Art and Prudence*, to Maritain's attempts to develop a Thomistic aesthetics and to highlight the importance of knowledge by connaturality or affective affinity.

McInerny's sense of the lived context in which philosophical reasoning occurs is certainly one of the reasons he has aimed to present the wisdom of Aquinas not just to fellow scholars but also to a wider public. Typical of these efforts is *A First Glance at St. Thomas Aquinas: A Handbook for Peeping Thomists* (1990), a book dedicated to the great popularizer of great books, Mortimer Adler, to whom the term "peeping Thomist" was first applied by *Time* magazine. In each chapter of the book, McInerny excerpts a brief passage from Aquinas on fundamental topics

such as motion, creation, soul, the existence of God, and then offers a succinct introduction to Aquinas's thought.

It is perhaps unusual among Thomists to find such an appreciation of the dramatic, the aesthetic, and the literary. But certainly not for this Thomist, whose writings encompass a variety of philosophical, literary, and journalistic genres. McInerny's wit is on full display not just in his fiction, in titles such as *Rest in Pieces*, *Sine Qua Nun*, and *Body and Soil*; it makes appearances even in his philosophical works, as when, for example, he introduces the character Fifi LaRue in *Ethica Thomistica*. Such a supple, punning mastery of words and tales is fitting for a philosopher who has made analogy a lifelong field of investigation, a philosopher with an abiding interest in the multivalent meanings and functions of words.

McInerny expressed himself directly on the relationship between philosophy and poetry in his Marquette University Aquinas Lecture in 1981, *Rhyme and Reason: St. Thomas and Modes of Discourse*. McInerny contrasts Aristotle's conception of a plurality of philosophical methods, with varying degrees of certitude appropriate to different subject matters, with the "tragic desire" in modernity for a "single method which would enable us to solve all philosophical problems." McInerny describes in some detail the rich variety of literary genres philosophers have employed over the centuries. If we were to adopt the modern penchant for univocal discourse, we would be left with a very truncated list of philosophers and texts that "make the grade." For McInerny, Kierkegaard is the great counter-example to the dominant strain of modern philosophy, for Kierkegaard saw that it was necessary to adopt indirect, poetic modes of communication to an audience that, in its captivity to speculative philosophy, had forgotten what it means to be human. For Kierkegaard as for Aquinas, philosophy is about discovering and living a certain kind of life, the good life for human beings.

McInerny's work may be more wide-ranging than that of perhaps any other contemporary philosopher. But his work involves at its philosophical core careful examination of the basic questions of the great tradition of philosophy, questions that are not the exclusive possession of professional philosophers, but within the range to some extent of all human beings. McInerny's influence is as wide and deep as his body of work. Perhaps the most ingenuous testimony about McInerny's career comes from someone who is something of an outsider to the Catholic intellectual world, his former colleague at Notre Dame, the Protestant moral theologian Stanley HAUERWAS, for whom McInerny "was Notre Dame." In an essay for McInerny's *festschrift* entitled "McInerny Did It" (in Hibbs and O'Callaghan 1999) Hauerwas defends the significance of mystery writing for philosophy and theology. About McInerny, whom he blames for his obsession with mysteries, he comments, "Possible worlds metaphysics did not prepare me to believe it was possible to combine in one person philosophical astuteness, conservative Catholicism, and cultural urbanity. McInerny was all of these and more."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Logic of Analogy: An Interpretation of St. Thomas (The Hague, 1961).

From the Beginnings of Philosophy to Plotinus. Western Philosophy, Volume 1 (Chicago, 1963).

Thomism in an Age of Renewal (Garden City, N.J., 1966).

Studies in Analogy (The Hague, 1968).

Philosophy from Augustine to Ockham. A History of Western Philosophy, Volume 2 (Notre Dame, Ind., 1970).

Rhyme and Reason: St. Thomas and Modes of Discourse (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1981).

St. Thomas Aquinas (Notre Dame, Ind., 1982).

Ethica Thomistica (Washington, D.C., 1982). 2nd edn, *Ethica Thomistica: The Moral Philosophy of Thomas Aquinas*

(Washington, D.C., 1997).

History of the Ambrosiana (Notre Dame, Ind., 1983).

Being and Predication (Washington, D.C., 1986).

Art and Prudence (Notre Dame, Ind., 1988).

A First Glance at St. Thomas Aquinas: A Handbook for Peeping Thomists (Notre Dame, Ind., 1990).

Boethius and Aquinas (Washington, D.C., 1990).

Aquinas on Human Action (Washington, D.C., 1992).

The Question of Christian Ethics (Washington, D.C., 1993).

Aquinas Against the Averroists: On There Being One Intellect (Lafayette, Ind., 1993).

The God of Philosophers (Salt Lake City, Utah, 1994).

Aquinas and Analogy (Washington, D.C., 1996).

Thomas Aquinas (New York, 1998).

Characters In Search of Their Author: The Gifford Lectures (Notre Dame, Ind., 2001).

The Very Rich Hours of Jacques Maritain (Notre Dame, Ind., 2003).

Aquinas (Cambridge, UK, 2004).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Thomas's Commentary on the Ethics* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1993).

Ed., *Thomas's Commentary on De Anima* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1994).

Ed., *Distinguish to Unite; or, The Degrees of Knowledge*, *The Collected Works of Jacques Maritain*, vol. 7 (Notre Dame, Ind., 1995).

"How I Became a Christian Philosopher," *Faith and Philosophy* 15 (1998): 144–6.

Further Reading

Hibbs, Thomas M., and John P. O'Callaghan, eds. *Recovering Nature: Essays in Natural Philosophy, Ethics, and Metaphysics in Honor of Ralph McInerny*

(Notre Dame, Ind., 1999).

Frank, William A. "McInerny's *The Question of Christian Ethics*," *The Thomist* 59 (1995): 653–5.

Ross, James F. "'The Logic of Analogy' by Ralph McInerny," *International Philosophical Quarterly* 2 (1962): 633–42.

Thomas M. Hibbs

MACINTOSH, Douglas Clyde (1877–1948)

Douglas C. Macintosh was born on 18 February 1877 in Breadalbane, Ontario, Canada. His family was devoutly religious; his father was a descendant of Scottish Baptists and his mother a descendant of Congregational Puritans reaching back to John Cotton. Add to this the warming effects of revivalism and you have the piety of "traditional evangelical Christianity," the essence of which Macintosh claimed as his own throughout his life. This piety stressed personal religious experience manifested in conversion to God and a life guided by faith in God and the values of the Christian gospel. Macintosh became an ordained minister of the Baptist Church, and his higher education began at McMaster University in 1899 where he graduated with a BA in philosophy in 1903. He then went to the University of Chicago Divinity School, where he received his PhD in 1909. After a brief appointment as professor of biblical and systematic theology at Brandon College in Ontario, he joined the faculty of Yale University Divinity School in 1909 as a professor of theology. He was Dwight Professor of Theology in the Divinity School from 1916 to 1942, and professor of theology and philosophy of religion in the Graduate School from 1933 to 1942. Macintosh remained a Canadian citizen throughout his life, which ended on 6 July 1948 in Hamden, Connecticut.

Macintosh is generally categorized with Henry Nelson WIEMAN as one of the two great exponents of liberal empirical theology in the first half of the twentieth century. Both Macintosh and Wieman agreed with the Ritschlian position that viewed religious ideas as essentially a matter of value judgments. But the theologies that they developed on the basis of the empirical examination of human valuation differed markedly. Wieman restricted himself to the examination of common human experience, whereas Macintosh developed his theology on the basis of both common human experience and his professed Christian religious experience of God. Also, insofar as each appealed at times to pragmatic justifications of religious belief, Wieman and the Chicago School generally found the pragmatic instrumentalism of John DEWEY congenial, whereas Macintosh rejected Dewey's instrumentalism and appealed only to the pragmatism of William JAMES. Finally, against Ritschlian theology, Macintosh insisted on the need for metaphysics, believing that judgments of value need to be related to judgments of existence. These convictions were in place when he published *The Problem of Knowledge* in 1915 and constitute the thread of continuity uniting all of his publications. For Macintosh, theology is the necessary intellectual expression of religious experience, a product of personal appreciation of experienced religious value. His central concern was always to demonstrate the certainty of God's existence and the validity of the knowledge of God provided by Christian faith. His fully developed constructive position is to be found in part 3 of *The Problem of Religious Knowledge* (1940). The principal works that develop the several aspects of this constructive position are: *The Reaction Against Metaphysics in Theology* (1911), *The Problem of Knowledge* (1915), *Theology as an Empirical Science* (1919), *The Reasonableness of Christianity* (1925), *The Pilgrimage of Faith in the World of Modern Thought* (1931), and "Experimental Realism in Religion" (1931).

Macintosh's constructive position, which he calls "critical monistic realism in religion," has four constitutive parts: religious perception, empirical theology, normative theology, and metaphysical theology. He has summarily stated his position as follows: "I hold that there are absolute values, universally and eternally valid for persons, which values (or ideals) we can progressively learn to appreciate and realize; that reality is whatever it must be for there to be such values and for their realization by us to be imperative; that there are real persons, a real world of things, and an existent reality so divine in quality and function as to be a worthy object of religious trust and worship; that all of these realities, physical, humanly personal, and religious, or divine, exist independently of any ideas or subjective appearances of them; that of all these realities we can have some direct experience, from which we can gain some verified knowledge; and finally, that our limited knowledge of these various realities may be supplemented by intuitional thinking and a belief or faith which tends to become reasonable through critical and constructive thought." (1940, p. vii)

Critical monistic realism in religion begins with a theory of knowledge that establishes the validity of knowledge in general and of religious knowledge in particular. Macintosh wanted to validate the felt certainty of religious faith. He initially adopted the philosophy of absolute idealism during his years at McMaster University, but his experience at the University of Chicago led him to completely reject idealism and to turn to philosophical realism and empiricism. In his epistemological studies, he criticized and rejected naïve realism and dualistic realism, the former because it allowed no distinction between appearance and reality and the latter because it allowed us to know only the appearances but not the reality behind the appearances. He opted for epistemological realism of the monist variety, which recognizes a partial identity between ultimate reality and the appearances through which this reality is experienced by us. He termed this "perception

in a complex," the actual perception of reality in and through the presented content of experience. Religious experience provides a particular complex through which religious knowledge of the divine can be had. Religious knowledge is knowledge of that reality that is manifest in the existence of absolute values, universally and eternally valid for persons, and that makes those values imperative for us. Macintosh insists that this perception of the divine can only be had by those who make the "right religious adjustment" to the divinely functioning reality. This right adjustment includes an attitude of trust and receptivity, which are at the basis of personal conversion and a willingness to live one's life by the values so disclosed as absolute. Religious knowledge also recognizes the essentially numinous quality of the object of religious experience.

Empirical theology applies a distinctive form of scientific method to the data of religious experience in order to establish adequately tested religious truths. As a scientific theology, empirical realistic theology logically assumes the existence of the object of its inquiry. In a circular manner, it recognizes the divine in the experience of valuation of absolute ideals in living religious traditions, Christianity in particular, and then inquires into those experiential processes to discover the nature of the divine and the manner of its operation in human life. Macintosh wrote: "I have repeatedly claimed that, on the basis of religious perception … it ought to be and indeed is possible to formulate empirical laws as to what a dependably and divinely functioning reality can be depended on for, under stated specific conditions of religious adjustment. Empirical laws of religious experience, which, when stated in terms of the human subject's religious adjustment of a certain discoverably successful sort and its dependable consequences, would be laws of the normative psychology of religion, would be, when stated in terms of a divinely functioning reality's dependable response to such an adjustment on man's part, laws of empirical theology, i.e., laws of divine operation

in human religious experience. And on the basis of such laws the divine reality could be defined, incompletely but with essentially scientific certainty, as that which responds in these specific ways to the specified religious adjustment." (1940 p. 191)

Macintosh states a number of verified laws descriptive of the functioning of a divine reality when there is a right religious adjustment on the part of the person or group. Summarily stated, these are: the promotion of good will, the definite beginning of an ethico-religious life, the experience of Christian joy, a life of Christian love, an assurance of an essentially Christ-like God and of reconciliation with him, a sense of divine guidance, a sense of peace and healing in mind and body, and the reign of God's will in the social order.

Normative theology goes beyond the empirically verifiable knowledge that is the result of scientific theology. Critical monistic realism holds that reality is at least partially present in acts of perception. Scientific theology deals with that which is perceived and so can claim to be objective. Normative theology is entirely subjective: it has its basis in the religious or imaginal intuition which is the experience of faith in the transcendent aspects of ultimate reality or God. Normative theology must not contradict the truths of scientific theology, but it can appeal to the pragmatic principle enunciated by William James, which states that we have a right to believe those ideas that are necessary presuppositions of actions directed toward the realization of fundamental human purposes.

It is here that Macintosh brings into theology ideas that he believes are reasonable statements of faith. So we can reasonably believe in moral optimism, the conviction that the best aims of humanity and the purposes of God coincide. We can believe that God is one and acts in a consistent manner. We can believe that God, as the highest being, is personal in nature and purposefully seeks the highest ideals. We can believe that God is omniscient and omnipotent. We can believe that God is holy love. We

can believe that the transcendent God is the same God whose effects have been formulated by scientific theology.

Specifically Christian beliefs can also be reasonably held. Because Jesus is taken by Christians to be the supreme historical example of a person having the right religious adjustment, we are justified in finding in him clues to the character, will, and attitude of the transcendent God. Also, we can affirm the immanence of God in Jesus as a person intimately united to God. We can aspire to such an intimate union with God ourselves.

In all of his normative theology, Macintosh is accused by Wieman of exceeding the limits of empirical inquiry. But Macintosh replies that Wieman's God, based only on common human experience, lacks the content which makes God a meaningful and dynamic force in actual religious life. Metaphysical theology is the subjection of the ideas of scientific theology and the beliefs of normative theology to the critical examination of metaphysics. Macintosh sees this task as being beyond his abilities to do anything more than just begin. He insists that it is a task that must be done if theology is to be accepted as a valid source of truth and guidance in human life. He notes that contemporary metaphysics tends to be materialist in character, owing to the great success of the natural sciences in recent history. He insists that a genuine metaphysics must take into its world view the results of all modes of human inquiry, including theology. He believes that theological ideas will be winnowed by metaphysical assessment, but he also believes that theology can contribute to the successful development of an adequate metaphysics. Such metaphysical issues as the one and the many, the absolute and the relative, body and mind, law and chance, mechanism and teleology, the finite and the infinite, good and evil, all await critical dialogue with theology.

Toward the end of his career, Barthian crisis theology attracted a large following in America. Macintosh rejected it as a form of irrationalism antithetical to the convictions of empirical, sci-

entific theology. However, the neo-orthodox movement did eclipse his theology, and little attention has been given to Macintosh in succeeding years.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Reaction Against Metaphysics in Theology (Chicago, 1911).

The Problem of Knowledge (New York, 1915).

God in a World at War (London, 1918).

Theology as an Empirical Science (New York, 1919).

The Reasonableness of Christianity (New York, 1925).

The Pilgrimage of Faith in the World of Modern Thought (Calcutta, 1931).

Is There a God? A Conversation by Henry Nelson Wieman, Douglas Clyde Macintosh, Max Carl Otto (Chicago, 1932).

Social Religion (New York, 1939).

The Problem of Religious Knowledge (New York, 1940).

Personal Religion (New York, 1942).

Other Relevant Works

Macintosh's papers are at Yale University, the American Baptist Historical Society in Rochester, N.Y., and the Canadian Baptist Archives at McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario.

Ed., *Christianity In Its Modern Expression*, by George B. Foster (New York, 1921).

"Experimental Realism in Religion," in *Religious Realism*, ed. D. C. Macintosh (New York, 1931), pp. 349–52.

"Toward a New Untraditional Orthodoxy," in *Contemporary American Theology: Theological Autobiographies*, ed. Vergilius Ferm (New York, 1939), pp. 279–97.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*

Anderson, Victor. *Pragmatic Theology*

(Albany, N.Y., 1998).

Bewkes, Eugene G., and Julius S. Bixler, eds. *The Nature of Religious Experience: Essays in Honor of Douglas Clyde Macintosh* (New York, 1937).

Heim, S. Mark. "The Path of a Liberal Pilgrim: A Theological Biography of Douglas Clyde Macintosh," *American Baptist Quarterly* 2 (1983): 236–55; 4 (1985): 300–20.

Reinelt, Herbert R. "D. C. Macintosh," in *A Handbook of Christian Theologians*, ed. Martin E. Marty and Dean G. Peerman (Cleveland, 1965).

Warren, Preston. *Out of the Wilderness: Douglas Clyde Macintosh's Journeys through the Grounds and Claims of Modern Thought* (New York, 1989).

Thomas A. Byrnes

MacINTYRE, Alasdair Chalmers (1929–)

Alasdair MacIntyre was born on 12 January 1929 in Glasgow, Scotland. His parents, Eneas John MacIntyre and Margaret Emily Chalmers, held medical degrees from Glasgow University. MacIntyre earned a BA in classics from Queen Mary College of the University of London in 1949, and an MA in philosophy from the University of Manchester in 1951. Early in his career he held positions at Manchester, Leeds, Oxford, and Essex. MacIntyre came to the United States in 1970 where he has been professor of philosophy at Princeton, Brandeis, Boston, Wellesley, Vanderbilt (1982–8), Yale (1988–9), University of Notre Dame (1989–94), and Duke (1994–2000). Since 2000 he has been a senior research fellow in philosophy at Notre Dame. He was elected President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association (1984–5), a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences,

and a corresponding fellow of the British Academy. MacIntyre has been a Gifford Lecturer at Edinburgh, which resulted in *Three Rival Versions of Moral Inquiry* (1990). Swarthmore College, Queens University in Belfast, Williams College, and the University of Essex have all awarded him honorary degrees.

MacIntyre's influential work in ethics has occasioned renewed interest in virtue ethics. Early work on Freud and Marx contains the seeds of much of MacIntyre's later work. He belonged to the Communist Party from 1947 to 1956 but left amid revelations of Stalin's atrocities. Despite disagreement with the Party, a 1959 essay, "Notes from the Moral Wilderness," defended Marxism against the claim that it was responsible for Stalinism, faulting Stalinism for employing means incompatible with Marxist ends. Stalinism means, for MacIntyre, the denial of a common humanity, and thus a denial that the end of communist morality involves an acknowledgment of a common humanity. Stalinists displayed concern for the end but really were concerned only with achieving and maintaining power, and so they stood in the way of that shared end.

For MacIntyre the connection between Freud and Marx lies in human desires. Just as, according to Marx, some socially embedded rules repress natural human desire, so also, according to Freud, internalized societal norms repress natural human desires. If Marx's historical determinism can be said to have an ethics at all, its principal ethical concern is overcoming the socioeconomic conditions, and the rules and institutions that structure those conditions, that block self-actualization. Overcoming these historically inherited conditions results in a society of unalienated and free individuals. According to MacIntyre's early work, that result is the goal of history and human nature. But the end is not achieved while also alienating and oppressing individuals, as did Stalinism.

A central theme throughout MacIntyre's work is that any acceptable morality has to connect morality with history and shared human desire.

"The concept of human nature is therefore what binds together the Marxist view of history and Communist morality …. The separation of morality from history, from desire discovered through the discovery of that common human nature which history shows as emerging, leaves morality without a basis." (1959, vol. 8, p. 96) The achievement of a common human nature is the achievement of a telos which is set by that nature and discovered within an historically situated life. Modernity's divorce of moral philosophy from any concern with human nature and its telos is the source of much that MacIntyre finds corrupt in modern moral culture.

MacIntyre became disenchanted with Marxism after concluding that it failed as predictive social science and thus failed to provide a basis for the end toward which both history and human nature strive. Nevertheless, MacIntyre argues that Marx provided a vision of a society of individuals who are in agreement about ends and on rules for achieving those ends. Without such agreement "moralizing can no longer play a genuine role in settling social differences. It can only be an attempt to invoke an authority which no longer exists and to mask the sanctions of social coercion" (1966, p. 267). A society among whose members there was agreement on both ends and means existed, according to MacIntyre, in classical Greece, but none exists any longer. This leaves moral theory with a problem that much of MacIntyre's work after 1966 addresses: how can disagreements be overcome when those disagreements are among adherents to, not only different, but seemingly incommensurable, moral principles? Such disagreement occurs not only between cultures but within cultures whose traditions embed incommensurable principles. In MacIntyre's view we are heirs to numerous and incompatible moralities. Adherents to such rival moralities are without neutral grounds, appeal to which might resolve their differences. Thus, to one another they appear "to be merely uttering imperatives which express their own liking and their private choices" (1966, p. 266).

Relativism is the moral predicament such choices present. If there is no mutually recognized ground for moral rationality that differing convictions can appeal to in order to resolve their differences, there is only choice without reason. One can think of this choice as a will to power, as did Nietzsche; or, one can think the choice expressive of an attitude, the attitude, roughly, "I approve of this, do so as well," as did the emotivists. For the emotivist C. L. STEVENSON all "this is good" means is "I approve of this, do so as well." Neither Nietzsche nor emotivism is acceptable to MacIntyre and the central task of his *After Virtue* (1981/1984) is to provide an alternative. While he allows that the emotivist view accurately describes much of our current moral predicament – "that in moral argument the apparent assertion of principles functions as a mask for expressions of personal preference" (*After Virtue*, 1984, p. 19) – he thinks it at best a misleading account of what "this is good" means. Nietzsche's ambition was to expose every historical morality as merely one of many perspectives which relied on incoherent argument and expressed personal preference. In MacIntyre's view, Nietzsche, like the emotivists, "illegitimately generalized from the condition of moral judgment in his own day to the nature of morality as such" (*After Virtue*, 1984, p. 113). Indeed, in MacIntyre's account of the history of ethics, both emotivism and Nietzsche can be fully understood only against the background of the failures of the Enlightenment. That history is richly narrated in MacIntyre's major works, especially *After Virtue*, *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* (1988), and *Three Rival Versions of Moral Inquiry*.

Enlightenment philosophers tried to provide an epistemic foundation for objective and universal moral truth. In MacIntyre's history of this project not only do Enlightenment philosophers begin with premises that are incompatible, leaving debate between them irresolvable and interminable, but their views are also internally inadequate. For example, practical reason

for Immanuel Kant requires that one be able to consistently will that the maxim of one's action be a universal law. Yet, claims MacIntyre, while it may be immoral, "I can without any inconsistency whatsoever [will the maxim] 'Let everyone except me be treated as a means'" (*After Virtue*, 1984, p. 46). Likewise, utilitarians provide no resources for distinguishing between incommensurable pleasures, nor can they preclude injustice such as slavery, should it promote the greatest benefit for the greatest number. Such unmasking of underlying incoherence is a part of Nietzsche's project that endures in MacIntyre's work.

The legacy of the Enlightenment, a legacy illustrated in the opening pages of *After Virtue*, is the absence of community in contemporary moral life. Contemporary moral argument "degenerates into confrontations of assertion and counter assertion, because the protagonists of rival moral positions invoke incommensurable forms of moral assertion against one another" ("The Claims of *After Virtue*," 1984, p. 3). For example, from one side of the abortion debate claims are made that one has the right to control of one's body, claims derived from John Locke's philosophy of property rights. The other side claims the right to life of the fetus, a claim derived from religious prescriptions of natural law. And utilitarian claims are made against both. Such claims have a wide variety of historical origins, not only philosophical but "intricate bodies of theory and practice that constitute a human culture" ("The Claims of *After Virtue*," 1984, p. 4). In MacIntyre's diagnosis, the problem is that circumstances that gave theory its significance are lacking and we are left with fragments of theory and practice that are without those circumstances which were their home.

As a solution to the foregoing problem, MacIntyre's *After Virtue* proposes a view of the moral life which is a modified version of Aristotle's, a view which insists that teleology is essential to human nature and human practice. The rejection of Aristotelianism in the Enlightenment and, more specifically, the rejection of a distinction between fact and value is offered as the origin of the contemporary problem. The Enlightenment dropped the notion of a telos, the end of a human life, attempting instead to provide epistemic grounds for moral judgment. The result was interminable disagreement like that between Kant and utilitarianism. Within an Aristotelian frame one argues that we ought to live in such and such ways, since so living achieves the telos of human nature. For Aristotle, that telos, what is potential in us, is constituted by the facts of human nature. As MacIntyre argues from his early work on, without a telos within the reach of reason, reasoning about action is mere instrumental reasoning, since there is nothing to reason about but the means to satisfy individual preference. The prevalence, thinks MacIntyre, of such reasoning in modern culture renders modern culture emotivist. In addition to Nietzsche and emotivism, such instrumentality is, according to MacIntyre, a feature of Max Weber's sociology, Enlightenment liberals, and twentieth-century liberals such as John RAWLS. Rawls excludes concern with the ends of life from his theory of justice. In contemporary life, MacIntyre argues, inattention to the ends of life leads to a managerial, bureaucratic culture that fails to recognize a distinction between manipulative and non-manipulative social relations.

MacIntyre's *After Virtue* rejects the Aristotelian idea that human nature is metaphysically fixed. MacIntyre's view instead is that all conceptions of human nature are historical and fallible. Aristotle failed to see that his own flawed views of human nature were culturally and historically embedded, specifically excluding women and slaves from that nature. What MacIntyre adds to Aristotle is historicism. If we cannot understand moral argument as a contribution to a timeless moral debate concerning the epistemic foundations of moral judgment, as did Enlightenment philosophers, nor as derived from a metaphysically fixed yet accessible conception of the telos of human nature, then such argument must be rooted in history. While conceptions of

the telos are rooted in history, MacIntyre rejects the Marxist and Hegelian notion, to which he earlier subscribed, that teleology is essential to history itself. Rather than constructing a path already laid to some fixed end, we must begin where we are, with our conceptions of the difference between the sort of persons we currently are and the persons we could be. A strategy for getting from where we are to where we want to be must be made from within current understanding of current practices. Given the practices in which we are engaged, our various desires and emotions get rationally ordered by our understanding of how to get from where we are to where we want to be.

Expressing this historicist and anti-metaphysical conception of the human telos, in *After Virtue* MacIntyre says "the good life for man is the life spent in seeking the good life for man" (1984, p. 219). An account of such a life requires an account of the practices in which we are engaged, an account of how the practices fit into a human life and, finally, an account of what constitutes a moral tradition, a tradition within which the moral adequacy of the practices and the life of which they are a part get assessed. Each successive account is layered on what precedes it, and these provide the resources for MacIntyre's teleology, the notion of a practice being fundamental. Each in succession presupposes, but is not presupposed by, what precedes it. Each also has associated virtues. The virtues are habits of behavior that tend to enable achievement of goods internal to practices, habits that foster the good of a whole, unfragmented life and which promote the search for the good for human beings. Some virtues – honesty, justice, and courage – are according to MacIntyre essential to every practice and every tradition.

A practice for MacIntyre is an established form of cooperative activity which creates goods internal to the pursuit of the ends of the activity. Those ends, goods, and standards of excellence which participation in a practice strives to achieve are under constant review producing revised and improved conceptions of ends and the means of achieving them as well as generating new ends and new conceptions of ends. In this sense of a practice, physics, architecture, farming, chess, football, and the creation and maintenance of families and municipal and national communities count as practices. However, washing test tubes, throwing a football, planting corn, or watching a child's soccer game do not. However, the latter may well contribute to virtuous engagement in a practice.

The distinction between goods internal to a practice and those external to it is essential to MacIntyre's account of a practice, since goods internal but not those external to a practice partially define the ends of the practice. This renders the means of achieving an end partially constitutive of the end itself, and renders reasoning about means reasoning also about ends. Forms of experimental design and data collection that adequately represent patterns in nature, and so laws of nature, are goods internal to the practice of physics and without which discovering physical law would not be possible. Improved technology, on the other hand, is an external good. Some external goods may become necessary to sustain a practice. For example, the generation of new technologies by scientific research may be necessary for generating resources instrumentally necessary for continued scientific research. But internal and external goods need to be recognized as distinct. There is, according to MacIntyre, always a danger that the external goods will usurp the internal ones and thereby become more important than the practices themselves. Yet, without internal goods acquired and exercised in the course of achieving ends constituted by those internal goods, goods connected with practices have only instrumental value and the ends of a life remain unconnected to life as lived, leaving morality without a basis. This is what MacIntyre thinks wrong with modern culture, a culture which is the product of the discard of a virtue ethics.

Just as the goals and goods of a practice must be identified from within the practice, so also

the goals and goods of a human life must be identified from within a narrative which identifies the telos of an individual life, a narrative which clarifies how practices contribute to a worthy life. The identity of the self is then constituted by the unity of the life narrated. Given that narrative, an individual is not at liberty to choose from one moment to the next what is of value to one's life. That is already fixed, however fallibly and tentatively, by the narrative. "What is better or worse for X depends on the character of that intelligible narrative which provides X's life with its unity." (*After Virtue*, 1984, p. 225) The emotivist picture of the self allows complete liberty, since its desires are not ordered by reasoning about how to achieve the ends of practices in which it is engaged. Liberation of the self from the chains of teleology may be, for some, a virtue of emotivism, but not for MacIntyre.

Participation in practices requires explicit understanding of neither the rules of participation nor the narrative of one's life. Yet, without such understanding it remains, for MacIntyre, that a life is an enacted narrative; a life exhibits, or fails to exhibit, understanding of the expectations of participation. Moreover, those expectations are not subjective but rather subject to assessment by other participants in the practice. What counts as (good) football, chess, parenting, or physics is not alone up to the agent. Reasons for the manner of participation must be available and understandable to others. One is born into a culture already thick with practice-constituted roles and expectations for participation in those roles. As a participant one has possibilities of description within which the possibilities of participation are understood. Alternative ways to continue a practice or narrate a life and its worth are possible. Yet, continued participation must be made to conform to what has gone before and is subject to the assessment of others. MacIntyre's view of practices and the rules that structure them is deeply influenced by Wittgenstein's discussion of rules and practices in *Philosophical Investigations*.

In MacIntyre's reading of history in *After Virtue*, practices and associated virtues have a history and history does not reveal any unified conception of the virtues nor agreement about particular virtues. As a result some claim that MacIntyre himself succumbs to relativism. He offers Aristotelian teleology as an alternative to Nietzschean perspectivism, yet these can be thought incommensurable alternatives, and as such they present a choice without reason. This MacIntyre concedes. "For nothing I have said goes any way to show that a situation could not arise in which it proved possible to discover no rational way to settle the disagreements between two rival moral and epistemological traditions." (*After Virtue*, 1984, p. 277) The problem *After Virtue* set out to solve remained. "Thus *After Virtue*, in this respect as in others ought to be read as a work still in progress." (*After Virtue*, 1984, p. 278) What MacIntyre's project required at the end of *After Virtue* was an account of practical reasoning which would provide a "rational way to settle the disagreements between two rival moral and epistemological traditions."

The provision and refinement of such an account of practical reasoning is the task of *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* and succeeding publications. But the account there developed is teleological, broadly Aristotelian, and not all that distinct from the substantive theory of the moral life presented in *After Virtue*. "I have followed Aristotle in taking truth to be the telos of rational inquiry; and rational inquiry so conceived must involve progress toward that telos through the replacement of less adequate by more adequate forms of rational justification." (1994, p. 20) Here, for MacIntyre, broadly Aristotelian, teleological reason is not merely one among other ways, but the only way that creatures whose lives are essentially enmeshed in practices might reason. Not only is practical rationality embedded in and partially constituted by practices, but those whose practices place them in alternative, incompatible traditions must engage in teleological reasoning, if their traditions and practices are to endure.

Aristotelian and Humean traditions of reasoning are among those MacIntyre discusses at length in *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* The Aristotelian tradition defines individuals in terms of what in cooperation with others they do, their desires ordered by understanding what achieving the ends of those practices requires. Reasoning for such individuals is reasoning about the continuation of a practice. For Hume, individuals are defined in terms "of what they consume or enjoy," their relationships with others "in terms of who provides what for whom and of who threatens the satisfaction of others by the pursuit of their own satisfaction" (1987, p. 8). "The person whose norms of practical reasoning … are Humean is committed to viewing others [not as participants in a cooperative practice but] either as participating in the reciprocal exchanges of love and pride … or instead as persons of deviant and eccentric passions." (1987, p. 10) Ends sought by Humean individuals are accomplishment and consumption, which occasion that self-satisfaction and enjoyment which Hume calls pride. Such ends are very different from Aristotelian ends, but ends whose achievement still requires teleological reasoning.

While otherwise incommensurable traditions employ broadly Aristotelian and teleological reasoning, the pursuit of different ends imposes different constraints on practical reason; playing chess has different constraints than the pursuit of pride. Yet, no particular end of a worthy human life is presupposed by the broadly Aristotelian character of practical reasoning. At the end of *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* MacIntyre says there are alternative ways of developing the history the book narrates: "as Aristotelian, as Augustinian, as Thomist, as Humean, as post-Enlightenment liberal, or as something else" (1988, p. 402). It again seems that MacIntyre leaves unresolved the problem he set out to solve. However, while giving Aristotelian teleology a place it had not been given at the conclusion of *After Virtue*, MacIntyre, in important respects, abandons Aristotle in favor of St. Thomas Aquinas.

MacIntyre finds Aquinas superior to Aristotle for several reasons. Aquinas, unlike Aristotle, writes from tradition, taking account of alternative and incompatible traditions, proposing ways to overcome their differences while incorporating what is best in them and discarding what is no longer defensible. Moreover, Aquinas recognized that moral argument is open-ended and revisable, and so he developed requirements of practical reasoning for which Aristotle saw no need. Aristotle thought he had an uncontroversial standard of what was to be achieved, at least implicitly, in existing city-states. On the other hand, Aquinas realized that reasoning needed resources to reconcile alternative, incompatible views of the moral life.

While allowing there are alternative ways of developing history, MacIntyre insists that relativism is incoherent. Alternatives are thus not equally entitled to claims to truth. Indeed, adherents to alternative moral beliefs do not accept relativism but are rather committed to the truth of their respective beliefs. Such commitments, according to MacIntyre, leave them also "committed to a set of theses about rational justification" (1994, p. 8). For example, they must recognize that claims to truth are fallible, a commitment that further imposes a burden of justification, an "onus equally on adherents of every standpoint" (1994, p. 21). Further, one must understand one's own claims from the standpoint of alternative positions and provide not only a justification for those claims but account for alleged mistakes of alternative and competing claims. Thus while reasoning must always begin from within some particular tradition which limits it and constrains it, and while alternative developments of a tradition may be consistent with its history, "the exercise of philosophical and moral imagination are on occasion sufficient to enable inquiry to identify and transcend what in those limitations and constraints hinders inquiry and renders it sterile" (1994, p. 23).

Rejecting relativism, MacIntyre also avows the realism that seemed abandoned with the

rejection in *After Virtue* of the Aristotelian idea of a metaphysically fixed telos. The goal of practical reasoning had been to achieve understanding of a human life that is adequate to the telos of an historically situated human life. In *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* and later writings, the goal of practical reasoning is an understanding of the telos of a human life that is adequate to human life. For MacIntyre it remains, however, that reasoning must always begin from within some particular tradition which limits it and constrains it. His 1999 *Dependent Rational Animals* further develops Aquinian themes in MacIntyre's position.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Marxism: An Interpretation (London, 1953). Revised as *Marxism and Christianity* (New York, 1968).

The Unconscious: A Conceptual Analysis (London and New York, 1958; rev. edn 2004).

Difficulties in Christian Belief (London, 1959).

A Short History of Ethics: A History of Moral Philosophy from the Homeric Age to the Twentieth Century (New York, 1966).

Herbert Marcuse: An Exposition and a Polemic (New York, 1970).

Against the Self-Images of the Age: Essays on Ideology and Philosophy (London and New York, 1971).

After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory (Notre Dame, Ind., 1981; 2nd edn 1984).

Whose Justice? Which Rationality? (Notre Dame, Ind., 1988).

Three Rival Versions of Moral Inquiry: Encyclopaedia, Genealogy, Tradition (Notre Dame, Ind., 1990).

*Dependent Rational Animals: Why Human Beings Need the Virtue*s (Chicago, 1999).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with Antony Flew, *New Essays in Philosophical Theology* (New York, 1955).

Ed., *Hume's Ethical Writings: Selections* (New York, 1965).

Ed., *Hegel: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Garden City, N.Y., 1972).

"The Claims of *After Virtue*," *Analyse & Kritik* 6 (1984): 3–7.

"Practical Rationalities as Forms of Social Structure," *Irish Philosophical Journal* 4 (1987): 3–19.

"Moral Relativism, Truth and Justification," in *Essays in Honor of Peter Geach and Elizabeth Anscombe*, ed. Luke Gormally (Dublin, 1994), pp. 6–24.

The MacIntyre Reader, ed. Kelvin Knight (Notre Dame, Ind., 1998). Contains an extensive bibliographic essay.

Further Reading

Blackwell Comp Phils, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v9*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*

Ballard, Bruce. *Understanding MacIntyre* (Oxford, 2000).

Horton, John, and Susan Mendus, eds. *After MacIntyre: Critical Perspectives on the Work of Alasdair MacIntyre* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1994). Contains a bibliography of MacIntyre's writings.

McMylor, Peter. *Alasdair MacIntyre: Critic of Modernity* (London and New York, 1993).

Murphy, Mark C. *Alasdair MacIntyre* (Cambridge, UK, 2003).

Richard Liebendorfer

MACKAY, Donald Sage (1892–1951)

Donald S. Mackay was born on 8 September 1892 in St. Albans, Vermont, to Donald Sage Mackay and Helen Smith Mackay. His father was a distinguished clergyman in New York who had emigrated from Glasgow, Scotland. Mackay

graduated with a BA from Williams College in 1914, and earned a BD from Union Theological Seminary in 1917. He then served in the US Army during World War II, and was awarded the Croix de Guerre and the Distinguished Service Medal, as well as a Purple Heart.

Mackay returned to Columbia University, where he received the PhD in philosophy in 1924, writing a dissertation titled "Mind in the Parmenides." He was an assistant in philosophy in 1919–20, and a lecturer in 1920–21 at Columbia. He went to the University of California at Los Angeles in 1921 as an associate in philosophy, and was appointed instructor in 1922 and assistant professor in 1924. He joined the philosophy department of the University of California at Berkeley in 1927, and was promoted to full professor in 1938. He also served as chair of the department from 1946 until his death. He was President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association from 1942 to 1944. Mackay died while vacationing in Bend, Oregon, on 13 September 1951.

From the time of his dissertation, Mackay evidenced a profound interest in the philosophy of Plato. As book editor of the *Journal of Philosophy* for many years, he reviewed a steady stream of writings on Plato and Greek philosophy. His analysis of Plato's *Parmenides* and *Sophist* identify the principles of definition as processes of dialectical inquiry. He denied that the network of definitive Forms was not structured as a pyramid with Good at the apex. The task of the dialectician is to follow the strands interconnecting the forms wherever they lead until the ideal meanings have been distinguished from the tangle of existences in which they are involved. A judgment expresses the propositional nature of reality as meaning discovered in its subject matter but distinct from that subject matter. On Mackay's view, Plato in the *Parmenides* hints at and in the *Sophist* fully anticipated Aristotle's doctrine that it is in affirmation and negation that there is truth or falsehood. Much of Mackay's later career involved elaboration of these central Platonic doctrines and their implications for such subjects as aesthetics, the problem of relations, causality, succession, duration, and reason.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Mind in the Parmenides: A Study in the History of Logic (Los Angeles, 1924).

"Esthetic and Experimental Truth," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 10 (1928): 63–86.

"The Nature of Truth in Transformation," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 11 (1929): 117–37.

"An Historical Sketch of the Problem of Relations," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 13 (1930): 1–34.

"Causality and Effectuality," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 15 (1932): 129–44.

"The Displacement of the Sense-Datum," *Journal of Philosophy* 29 (1932): 253–9.

"The Limits of Possibility," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 17 (1934): 129–52.

"Succession and Duration," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 18 (1935): 117–200.

"The Analogy of Mind," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 19 (1936): 63–84.

"The Problem of Indivisibility in Plato's Dialectic," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 20 (1937): 131–54.

Knowledge and Society, with George P. Adams, William R. Dennes, Jacob Loewenberg, et al. (New York, 1938).

Selected Writings in Philosophy, with George P. Adams, William R. Dennes, Jacob Loewenberg, et al. (New York, 1939).

"Reason as Custodian," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 21 (1939): 183–204.

"The Illusion of Memory," *Philosophical Review* 54 (1945): 297–320.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v5, *Proc of APA v26*,
   Who's Who in Phil

Richard T. Hull

McKEON, Richard Peter (1900–1985)

Richard Peter McKeon was born on 26 April 1900 in Union Hill, New Jersey. McKeon entered Columbia University as a pre-law student in 1917, later switching to a pre-engineering curriculum. His studies were interrupted by World War I when in 1918 he became an apprentice seaman in the US Navy and served until the end of the war. Upon his return to Columbia in 1919, he changed his course of study to the humanities and earned both his BA and MA degrees in 1920. His master's thesis dealt with philosophical approaches to art and literature. McKeon continued his studies, focusing on philosophy, at the University of Paris where he earned the diplôme d'études supérieures and the diplôme d'élève titulaire de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes in 1923 and 1924. In 1925 McKeon returned to Columbia where he became an instructor in philosophy and Greek. His dissertation on the philosophy of Spinoza was written under the direction of Frederick J. E. WOODBRIDGE and John DEWEY. He completed his PhD in philosophy in 1928.

In 1929 Columbia appointed McKeon to the post of assistant professor of philosophy. He held this position until 1935, though he spent a year as visiting professor of history at the University of Chicago in 1934–5. In the early 1930s McKeon met Robert Maynard Hutchins, President of the University of Chicago, and found that he shared many of Hutchins's ideas for reforming collegiate education – such as grounding undergraduate studies in a general, not specialized, education strongly influenced

by philosophical analysis. After his year as visiting professor, McKeon was appointed professor of Greek and Dean of the Division of the Humanities in 1935. Along with Hutchins, Mortimer ADLER was also instrumental in bringing McKeon to Chicago. McKeon remained at Chicago until he retired in 1974, but he continued to teach part-time into the early 1980s. In 1976 a lifelong project finally came to fruition with the publication with Blanche Boyer of a critical edition of Peter Abailard's *Sic et Non*. McKeon died on 31 March 1985 in Chicago, Illinois.

McKeon was heavily involved in the reforms that shaped the college in the 1940s. He later disagreed with Hutchins, however, over issues of faculty involvement in the governance of the university. McKeon resigned his deanship in 1947, and was named Charles F. Grey Distinguished Service Professor of Philosophy and Greek. McKeon was also instrumental in the preliminary studies of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and developing the cultural and philosophical projects of UNESCO. He also served as President of the American Philosophical Association in 1951–2, Vice President of the International Federation of Philosophical Societies in 1953–4, and President of the International Institute for Philosophy during 1953–7. The late 1950s saw both the beginning of McKeon's involvement in a major reorganization project for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, and his participation in the Rockefeller Brothers Special Studies Project, an investigation into the moral, political, and economic aspects of relations between the United States and the rest of the world. Highlights of the later years of McKeon's career include his appointment as Carus Lecturer for the American Philosophical Association in 1963, and receiving the Quantrell Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching at the University of Chicago in 1971.

McKeon's scholarly breadth served as a centrifugal force in his philosophy. He wrote on a wide variety of subjects, from ancient, medieval, and contemporary philosophy to literary criti-

cism, democracy, and culture. Such wide-ranging pursuits were consistent with his over-arching interest in the nature of pluralism and its implications both philosophically and culturally. Philosophical pluralism was substantially aided by McKeon, and while this legacy lives on in many of his students, pluralism as a cultural and philosophical topic is gaining ground rather rapidly among scholars across the humanities and social sciences.

Pluralism, in McKeon's view, was not to be conceived as simply disaggregated and distinct modes of thought, forever cast as antagonistic opinions, perspectives, and beliefs. On the contrary, McKeon recognized the experience of pluralism as extending beyond differences which too often closed off consideration of what it is that allows for complementary understandings of presumed contrary positions. For McKeon, contrary philosophical positions were more often the result of differences in the mode of thought employed by the philosopher and not in any intractable differences of perspective or philosophical object. McKeon isolated four modes of thought that unnecessarily collide as a consequence of failing to recognize and distinguish between these modes of thinking. The first is "assimilation" which attempts to find similarity among differences and then integrates these distinct positions into a unified whole; the second is "discrimination" in which the perspective of the observer determines the nature or character of the object; the third is "construction" which seeks to find a complex whole through a process of building it up from its separate parts; and the fourth is "resolution" which attempts to find solutions by formulating suitable methods for each distinct set of problems at hand (1990). To recognize the methods by which philosophers construct and attempt to solve particular dilemmas and questions is to recognize the pluralistic nature of inquiry itself and the complementary truths which reside within diverse sets of philosophical and cultural positions.

McKeon's importance and contribution to American philosophy have yet to be fully realized. The depth and diversity of his philosophical works speak to McKeon's mature insight in approaching human thought in terms of complexity and diversity and not in the grand theoretical style of singular truths and methods.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Philosophy of Spinoza: The Unity of His Thought (New York, 1928).

The Philosophy of Aristotle (Chicago, 1940).

Science and Civilization, with Robert C. Stauffer (Madison, Wisc, 1949).

"Philosophy and Method," *Journal of Philosophy* 48 (1951): 653–82.

Democracy in a World of Tensions: A Symposium Prepared by UNESCO (New York, 1951).

Thought, Action, and Passion (Chicago, 1954).

Examination of Conscience for Labor Leaders, Employers and Workers (New York, 1956).

"Principles and Consequences," *Journal of Philosophy* 56 (1959): 385–401.

"Pluralism of Interpretation and Pluralism of Objects, Actions and Statements Interpreted," *Critical Inquiry* 12 (1986): 576–96.

Freedom and History: The Semantics of Philosophical Controversies and Ideological Conflicts (New York, 1952).

Other Relevant Works

McKeon's papers are at the University of Chicago.

Ed. and trans. with Narayanrao Appurao Nikam, *The Edicts of Asoka* (Chicago, 1959).

Ed. and trans. with Blanche B. Boyer, *Sic et Non: A Critical Edition*, by Peter Abailard (Chicago, 1977).

Rhetoric: Essays in Invention and Discovery, ed. Mark Backman (Woodbridge, Conn, 1987).

Freedom and History and Other Essays: An Introduction to the Thought of Richard McKeon, ed. Zahava K. McKeon

(Chicago, 1989).

On Knowing – The Natural Sciences, ed. David B. Owen and Zahava K. McKeon (Chicago, 1994).

Selected Writings of Richard McKeon, 2 vols, ed. Zahava K. McKeon and William G. Swenson (Chicago, 1998, 2005).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Pres Addr of APA v6*, *Proc of APA v58*, *Who Was Who in Amer v9*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Booth, Wayne. *Critical Understanding: The Powers and Limits of Pluralism* (Chicago, 1979).

Buchanan, Richard, and Victor Margolin, eds. *Discovering Design: Explorations in Design Studies* (Chicago, 1995).

Garver, Eugene, and Richard Buchanan. *Pluralism in Theory and Practice: Richard McKeon and American Philosophy* (Nashville, Tenn., 2000).

Plochmann, George Kimball. *Richard McKeon: A Study* (Chicago, 1990).

Richard McKeon: A Bibliography of His Published Works (Chicago, 1980).

Watson, Walter. *The Architectonics of Meaning: Foundations of the New Pluralism* (New York, 1985).

Jeffrey K. Beemer

McMAHON, Amos Philip (1890–1947)

Amos McMahon was born on 14 August 1890 in Warren, Ohio, and died on 21 June 1947 in New York City. A scholar of the humanities in the fullest sense, McMahon pursued his academic interests in the areas of art, history, philosophy, and the social sciences. A student of Harvard University, he obtained his PhD in philology in 1916. Only one year later, a portion of his dissertation, "The Mediaeval Conception of Comedy and Tragedy," appeared in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. McMahon worked in publishing until 1926, when he was appointed associate professor in the fine arts department of Washington Square College at New York University. In 1928 he was promoted to full professor of fine arts and chair of the department, positions he held until his death. Among his distinguished colleagues was Erwin PANOFSKY. McMahon principally taught art history, the literature of criticism and aesthetics, as well as the graphic arts.

While best known as an art historian and critic, McMahon was also recognized in philosophical circles. He had no formal credentials in philosophy, but his work was often theoretically concerned. It is thus little surprise that he published numerous articles and reviews in art historical journals, while also serving on the Honorary Board of the American Society for Aesthetics and involving himself in the New York University Philosophical Society.

McMahon's philosophical concerns were grounded in his broad interest in art as a phenomenon. He thought descriptive art history alone insufficient to stand as an explanation of fine works of art. Students and scholars of fine art must struggle with a host of issues relevant to the understanding of any given work, which meant not only the ideas and circumstances of its producers and patrons (that might themselves involve elements of ethnographic, anthropological, and psychological investigation), but the philosophy of the subject as well. Aesthetics, he believed, had too often been "surrendered" to writers with insufficient familiarity with, or care for, the works of art themselves. He observed that philosophical aesthetics was often practiced with a preference for an established philosophical program that left little room for an aesthetic theory derived from the actual study of artworks. Unless those knowledgeable with the history of fine arts discuss art in general, he thought, aesthetics was easy prey to those who would see it as a means to extend metaphysical, epistemological, or psychological positions.

McMahon thought that aesthetics had come under attack because of its own pursuit. Directed by the failures of others' attempts to develop successful theories of art, some theoreticians had begun to question whether there was in fact any principled distinction between art and artifacts generally. McMahon argued that the category "art" does indeed designate a unique kind of human product, and that beauty is its chief value. He approached his position from two different directions. The first was to deeply historicize the concept of art. While remaining ambiguous about the details, McMahon suggests that although we may hold that art consists of things that are valued simply because they are pleasant, rare, or expensive (values that may be held by many things, making artworks not particularly unique), the concept of an artwork has a unique history embedded in and evolving with traditions of making and viewing that began with Plato. In this way, art has a history in a formidable sense. We can speak of objects with some definite relationship to each other, and we can speak of other objects excluded from this relationship.

McMahon does not limit himself to historical claims, however. He also has a metaphysical thesis. Taking it largely for granted that the reader already accepts that artworks are radically different in kind from other human products, he adds, "When we see art objects, if what we see is not simply useful or accurate, we do well to call that which is ours, as well as something that can be shared with others, by the name of beauty. If beauty is not a property of matter and not an illusion of sense, it should be an ultimate idea." (1930, p. 297) McMahon argues rather mystically, "The essence to which we penetrate through works of art is beauty. Through art we have the power to realize, record, and communicate beauty effectively." (1930, p. 297) McMahon tends to collapse the distinction between art as a historical subject and art as a philosophical subject (artworks as objects with a shared history and artworks as objects with a shared nature). He also leaves it unclear what he intends the relationship to be between his historical argument and his metaphysical position,

and whether, or in what ways, one might be said to qualify or augment the other.

McMahon's historical and theoretical concerns interestingly lead him to another conclusion in the field of aesthetics. In *The Meaning of Art* (1930), McMahon compares established theories of meaning in the arts (meaning understood variously as pleasure, imitation, illusion, technique, empathy, expression, true communication, and the "goodness" or "badness" of a work) against the background of the art objects themselves. He finds all of the considered positions wanting, though frequently for reasons other than we might today, citing many classical and contemporary commentators in support of his evaluation. He argues that these views were not just false or simple errors. They each contain elements of accurate observation and understanding. They are, however, only partial understandings that elevate familiar features in art or in our experience of it to the status of sufficient causes. He suggests that the confusion is easily made. While art is concerned with a high and comprehensive value (beauty), its instantiations are only partial, and our intuitions of it are not uniform. If we do not properly understand the relationship between beauty and art, we are easily led to mistake a reasonably pervasive feature for the meaning of art as a whole.

Throughout his career McMahon was concerned to appropriately place the concept of beauty in aesthetic theory. While we can mistake something else for the salient value of art, he also thought that the concept of beauty could come to have an overstated importance. *Preface to an American Philosophy of Art* (1945) traces the transformation of the concept of art from the Greek notion of *techne* to the German idea of *Kunst*. These various accretions of meaning proceed from the notion of art as imitation or technique, to the application of the criterion of fineness or beauty that led to the indiscriminate inclusion of the plastic arts with music and literature as fine art. The identification of beauty with "sensuous knowledge" under rationalism then led to the creation of aesthetics as a kind of science. McMahon argues that all of these trans-

formations produced false problems that were merely confusions founded in a misunderstanding of history (witness the problem of interpreting the spiritual values of art on the rationalist model). It is not until he accounts for the German idealist tradition that he considers an aesthetic theory guilty of anything more than simple confusion or error. Error obtains an ethical dimension when beauty in art becomes an example of the creative will. In Friedrich Schelling's theories, art becomes a spiritual discipline, and the artist as genius becomes a law unto himself. On McMahon's telling of it, the beaux arts formula in the hands of the Germans made beauty cum art into a philosophy of art, value, life, and reality all in one, and Hitler became "the Absolute Artist of Romantic Idealism" (1945, p. 93). The argument of *Preface to an American Philosophy of Art* is an argument for a realistic and American philosophy of art. What exactly this philosophy would look like remains unclear, but American aesthetics, he urges, must proceed from basic American insights of moral idealism and intellectual naturalism with a grounding in Aristotelian concepts of technique and causation. Curiously, McMahon omits any discussion of Hegel and Nietzsche that might alter his sketch of German aesthetics, and does not consider the work of Henry James or John Dewey since pragmatism might have given shape to his positive project. *Preface to an American Philosophy of Art* is a valuable contribution to the history of aesthetic theory, but, like his earlier work, it suffers from a tendency to collapse historical and philosophical concerns with no clear program to sort them out.

McMahon was unconventional both as an art historian and an aesthetician. His demands of the scholar of fine art, and no less of himself, were lofty. However, it is easy to be sympathetic with his claim that a proper aesthetic theory must proceed from a familiarity with and a care for fine works of art.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"New Protagoras, a Pedantic Dialogue," *The Art Bulletin* 11 (June 1929): 187–205.
The Meaning of Art (New York, 1930).
"Would Plato Find Artistic Beauty in Machines?" *Parnassus* 7 (1935): 6–8.
Preface to an American Philosophy of Art (Chicago, 1945).

Other Relevant Works
Sextus Empiricus and the Arts (Cambridge, Mass., 1931).
The Art of Enjoying Art (New York, 1938).
Trans., *Treatise on Painting*, by Leonardo Da Vinci (Princeton, N.J., 1956).

Further Reading
Who Was Who in Amer v2
Schaper, Eva. "A Survey of Works on Aesthetics, 1945–53," *Philosophical Quarterly* 4 (1954): 356–72.

Erica Wagner

McMULLIN, Ernan (1924–)

Ernan McMullin was born on 13 October 1924 in County Donegal, Ireland. He received a BS in physics from Maynooth College in 1945, and stayed for a BD degree in 1948. He was ordained a priest and granted a fellowship in theoretical physics at the Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies where he worked with Erwin Schrödinger. His PhD in philosophy in 1954 at the University of Leuven was on Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle. McMullin began his career at the University of Notre Dame, where he was appointed instructor of philosophy in 1954. He was promoted up to full professor by 1967, and also served as department chair from 1965 to 1972. In 1984 he was named the John Cardinal O'Hara Professor of Philosophy and he held that position until retiring in 1994.

McMullin was a visiting professor at several universities, received five honorary doctorates, was elected to the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and served as President of four philosophical organizations: the American Catholic Philosophical Association in 1966–7; the Metaphysical Society of America in 1973–4; the Philosophy of Science Association in 1980–82, and the American Philosophical Association Western Division in 1983–4. He has authored two books, edited ten, translated one, and written over two hundred articles on a vast range of topics in the philosophy of science and other fields.

McMullin characterizes scientific reasoning as a complex process that occurs over time, has no specific terminal point, and is marked by a blend of induction, abduction, and deduction. This general process constitutes an extended causal inference he calls *retroduction*, which he distinguishes from "inference to the best explanation." Discovery and justification are not isolated steps of the process but are blended together throughout. The process usually begins with an induction to law-like correlations from observation, which, for McMullin, includes information obtained through sophisticated instruments. While these laws may assert systematic relations beyond the reach of human senses, they nonetheless call for explanation. In response, creative but plausible explanatory theories describing underlying causal structures are formulated, from which testable predictions are deduced. These hypotheses are evaluated by the degree to which they satisfy a set, not of rules, but epistemic values. In addition to empirical fit, McMullin specifies three types of "complementary" values: internal virtues, including logical consistency, coherence, and simplicity; contextual virtues, including consonance with other theories and the property of having no viable competitors; and diachronic virtues, which are properties established over time and include continuity, consilience, and fertility.

McMullin is a scientific realist. Particularly crucial to his realism are the diachronic virtues, especially fertility. A hypothesis is fertile when it offers novel predictions, helps to overcome anomalies, or guides research in its capacity as a metaphor. Early in his career, in reaction to logical positivism, he introduced a variant of what would decades later become a slogan for scientific realists, and a thesis McMullin retained: the fertility of our theories can only be explained by supposing that the theories are "rooted somehow in real structure" (1955, p. 149). In contrast to many other realists, McMullin does not focus on the success of science in general or speak in terms of the approximate truth of theories. Rather, he claims, there is a limited warrant for holding that entities exist that are similar to those postulated by individual successful theories, and the degree of warrant depends on the quality of the success.

McMullin has also significantly contributed to the literature on the history of the philosophy of science, historical conceptions of matter, philosophical issues arising in quantum mechanics and cosmology, the sociology of science, and the historical and contemporary relations between science and religion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Realism and Modern Cosmology," *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 29 (1955): 137–50.

Newton on Matter and Activity (Notre Dame, Ind., 1978).

"Values in Science," in *Proceedings of the 1982 Philosophy of Science Association*, Vol. 2, ed. P. D. Asquity and T. Nickles (East Lansing, Mich., 1983), pp. 3–25.

The Inference that Makes Science (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1992).

Other Relevant Works

"The Goals of Natural Science," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 58 (1984): 37–64.

Ed., *Evolution and Creation* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1985).

Ed., *The Social Dimensions of Science* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1992).

"Rationality and Paradigm Change in Science," in *World Changes: Thomas Kuhn and the Nature of Science*, ed. Paul Horwich (Cambridge, Mass., 1993), pp. 55–78.

"The Impact of Newton's *Principia* on the Philosophy of Science," *Philosophy of Science* 68 (2001): 279–310.

"Van Fraassen's Unappreciated Realism," *Philosophy of Science* 70 (2003): 455–78.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v9
Cushing, James T., Cornelius F. Delaney, and Gary M. Gutting, eds. *Science and Reality: Recent Work in the Philosophy of Science, Essays in Honor of Ernan McMullin* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1984).

Timothy D. Lyons

McMURRIN, Sterling Moss (1914–96)

Sterling McMurrin was born on 12 January 1914 near Salt Lake City, Utah, and died on 6 April 1996 in St. George, Utah. A distinguished professor of philosophy at the University of Utah for four decades, he also held key academic leadership positions there, both before and after his service as United States Commissioner of Education in President John F. Kennedy's Administration. McMurrin was the third of four sons, and his paternal grandfather achieved great stature in the Mormon hierarchy as an eloquent defender of the new faith. The McMurrin family was very much a part of Utah's cultural and religious elite. Sterling's father, Joseph, Jr., was a school teacher and probation officer who loved good books, entertained diverse ideas, and had his son reading Plato, Darwin, and Dante as a youth. McMurrin described his mother, Gertrude Moss McMurrin, as "completely open-minded and approachable, a person whose company I always delighted in." She hailed from ranch country, though hardly from humble circumstances. Her father, William Moss, was co-founder and general manager of the Deseret Land and Live Stock Company. McMurrin described himself as growing up "half ranch kid, half city kid." At age nine he began wrangling horses for his Grandfather Moss, and two summers later he was numbered among the ranch hands on the far-flung cattle and sheep operation. From his early teens, he was as comfortable with ranch life, physical labor, and practical challenges, as he was with books, ideas, and Utah's privileged class.

His family moved to Los Angeles when he was fourteen and he attended and graduated from Manual Arts High School. Asthma attacks threatened his health during his first year at the University of California at Los Angeles, so he returned to the drier climate of his native state and enrolled at the University of Utah in the autumn of 1933. Stimulated by philosophy professor E. E. Ericksen, among others, McMurrin earned his BA degree in history and political science in 1936, and his MA in philosophy in 1937. Sterling met Natalie Cotterel at the University of Utah when they were both undergraduates. After an extended courtship they were married in 1938. Natalie was central to Sterling's life and work for the next half century.

Starting in 1937 McMurrin taught in the Mormon Church's seminary and institute system, successively in Utah, Idaho, and Arizona. Students flocked to him wherever he taught, drawn by his theological knowledge and intellectual daring. His former seminary supervisor remembered McMurrin's classroom style: "No theological claim was too sacred to be challenged, nor too wild to merit consideration. He knew more about Mormon

theology, and the whole history of Christianity, than anyone in our system, before or since." McMurrin's intellectual courage brought him increasingly in conflict with church authorities, however, so he began investing his summers in doctoral study in philosophy and religion at the University of Southern California. His escape from the tightening institutional church environment was in the making.

Approaching thirty, McMurrin resigned his educational position with the LDS Church and devoted himself to full-time doctoral study at USC, completing his PhD in philosophy in 1946. The preface to his dissertation – which explored the relationship between positivism and normative value judgments – revealed more than such documents ordinarily do about a scholar's philosophy. He wrote:

> The moral crisis that characterizes our time is … the wide disparity … between man's technical attainment in the control of his environment and the effectiveness of his moral and spiritual idealism. It is increasingly imperative that the conduct of men and nations be brought under the dominion of a moral ideal. As a practical issue, this is … a responsibility of religion, education, and politics. But the integration of fact and value, necessary to both personal and social character, demands a theoretical foundation which will give meaning and direction to practical effort."

In over 250 subsequent articles, books, and essays on philosophy, education, and religion, McMurrin continued to explore the themes manifest in this early study: Human institutions must advance human dignity and respect individuality, and ethics must keep pace with technology.

While he eschewed affiliation with any philosophical school, McMurrin might be described as an existentialist without the angst. He had a tragic sense of history, feared for the human prospect, and wrote and spoke doggedly in pursuit of his ideal of social justice. His lively but gentle sense of humor buffered what might otherwise have become a grim outlook. Ultimately, McMurrin placed his faith in liberal education as the best hope for liberating the human race from ignorance, bigotry, and violence.

He accepted an appointment in philosophy at the University of Southern California in 1945, but after three years he moved to the University of Utah as professor of philosophy. Except for occasional short-term visits elsewhere, he taught at Utah from 1948 to 1988. He quickly became an intellectual lightning rod. Frequently invited to give public lectures and read scholarly papers, he addressed a great variety of social and philosophical issues. Always concerned with human dignity and freedom, he became a spirited defender of academic freedom on campus and an early activist in the field of civil rights in the community.

McMurrin spent the 1952–3 academic year on the east coast as a Ford Foundation Faculty Fellow, pursuing his scholarship at Columbia University, the Union Theological Seminary, and Princeton University. The following year he released a co-edited a book of readings, *Contemporary Philosophy*, and the next year he and B. A. G. Fuller published *A History of Ancient and Medieval Philosophy* and *A History of Modern Philosophy*. During the academic year 1957–8 an old theme resurfaced. McMurrin was invited to give a lecture on "The Philosophical Foundations of Mormon Theology" at the Ohio State University. Published in 1959, this treatise remains the most penetrating explanation of Mormon philosophy available. McMurrin extended this theme with a series of lectures in 1965 that resulted in the publication of a larger volume entitled *The Theological Foundations of the Mormon Religion*. It has been in print for nearly forty years.

McMurrin's success as a teacher, author, and social critic led to responsibilities in

academic administration. The two sides of the man, the thinker and the actor, continued to compete with one another, and the combination of the two propelled him to Washington. In 1954, he had become Dean of the College of Letters and Science, a position that he held until 1960 when he was named Vice President for Academic Affairs. In the mid 1950s, he also became associated with the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies. The Institute's founder, Walter Paepcke, invited the Utah professor to lead his executive seminar program for high public officials and prominent citizens. From 1954 to 1962, Sterling and his family spent part of every summer at Aspen where he led one group of distinguished leaders after another in reading classic texts and considering the saliency of ideas contained in them to contemporary national and world affairs.

Completely at ease with ideas and with people of stature, but largely unconscious of his notoriety, McMurrin now acted on a national stage. In 1958 the Department of State invited him to go as a special envoy to Iran where he spent five months as an advisor to the chancellor of the University of Tehran. Both before and after that sojourn, Columbia University tried to lure him to New York with an endowed chair. He was widely sought for advice in national policy circles concerning public education, higher education, and national human resource needs.

The day of John F. Kennedy's inauguration in January 1961, McMurrin received an invitation from the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham Ribicoff, to become United States Commissioner of Education. Ribicoff and McMurrin met briefly, and quickly established good rapport. The President accepted Ribicoff's nomination and shortly announced McMurrin's appointment as Commissioner. At his confirmation hearing, Senator Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania asked McMurrin if, as a Mormon, he could support desegregation of the public schools. He responded: "I'd like the committee to know that I do not agree with the policies of the Mormon Church with respect to Negroes, and I have made my position very clear to the leadership of the Mormon Church. I'm 100 percent in favor of desegregated schools." Clark and others were highly supportive of McMurrin and his appointment won swift approval from the Senate. Desegregation of education, the equalization of educational opportunity, and federal aid to public schools were all programs McMurrin pursued vigorously as commissioner.

The National Education Association clashed with the new commissioner from the start. Illustrative of McMurrin's relationship with the NEA was an early incident involving Admiral Hyman G. Rickover. In the wake of the Soviet Union's launching of the Sputnik satellite in 1957, the father of America's nuclear navy became a severe critic of US public education. He traveled, spoke, and wrote extensively about what he regarded as the evils of progressive education. Congressman John E. Fogarty, who chaired the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor and Education, invited Rickover to state his views before Congress. Fogarty then asked Commissioner McMurrin to deliver a statement of his views on the condition of American education. McMurrin had begun preparing his thoughts for the assignment when his deputy commissioner approached him and said that the NEA and the Office of Education, as with past assignments of this type, would form a joint committee to compose the requested document. Shocked, McMurrin replied, "If it is my views Congressman Fogarty wants, then it will be my views, and no one else's, that he gets." He wrote the essay long-hand in one evening, had it typed by his secretary, and then spent a few days tinkering with it as his schedule permitted. When he delivered the statement to the House Appropriations Committee, Congressman Fogarty ordered the US Government Printing Office to publish

100,000 copies of it. An abbreviated version appeared almost immediately in the *Saturday Review*.

Entitled "A Crisis of Conscience," McMurrin's address set the tone and framed the agenda for federal education policy during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.he charged:

> In education we are facing a crisis of conscience and collectively we are experiencing a sense of national guilt. We cannot deny that today we would command far more knowledge and have far more creativity, civic character, and national strength if our schools had been more rigorous in their intellectual discipline and … more adequately structured to the needs of our society. We have with lavish prodigality wasted the talent and energy of countless persons.

McMurrin stated that the aims of education cannot be defined in narrow or nationalistic terms, nor is it primarily through technological and scientific training that education serves national security. Without a "world-minded" citizenry, McMurrin wrote, "we cannot hope to satisfy the obligation of world leadership that history has conferred upon us." He called for better education across the board, urging that we "guard against the tendency to suppose that our national well-being is served primarily by advances in technology, however important and timely these may be … . The study of politics, history, and philosophy is fundamental to our cultural life, and no nation can achieve a lasting strength unless its character is expressed in great literature, art, and music."

McMurrin called upon the federal government to provide sound leadership for American education as well as material support, while not interfering with the tradition of local and state control over curricula and teaching. He proposed a new policy of *general* federal financial support for educa-tion, but one that avoided national control of schooling or educational and economic planning – which might infringe upon individual choice of educational pursuits. Finally, he admonished the nation to "turn a deaf ear to those reactionaries among us who are forever insisting that we abandon our democratic ideal and model our education on the aristocratic patterns of some European nations."

A Crisis of Conscience, republished in several forms, won laurels from policy-makers across the country and inspired much debate and some federal legislation. Like the president he served, McMurrin's ideas were bold and clear, his language graceful and compelling. After less than two years as US Commissioner, however, he submitted his resignation. Several factors seemed to have played into this decision. Still in his forties, he had children in school, and he and Natalie did not enjoy having their lives stretched across the country from the Potomac to the Great Salt Lake. He also missed teaching and writing, having been in one administrative post or another since assuming the deanship at the University of Utah in 1954. To return to Salt Lake City would be to go home to his scholarship for the first time in many years, and this he did.

The McMurrins left Washington, D.C., in September 1962, resuming their lives in Salt Lake City and his professorship at the University of Utah. It was not, however, to be a quiet period for him. He accepted appointments to a number of national and international commissions for the improvement of education, and served as director for the Committee for Economic Development's projects on education for fifteen years. He also served as a trustee of the Carnegie Foundation. In 1964 he was named E. E. Ericksen Distinguished Professor of Philosophy at the University of Utah. But he was brought back into the administration the next year, as Dean of the Graduate School. He retired from that post in 1978, but

remained active as the E. E. Ericksen Professor for another decade.

As his administrative career wound down, his scholarship picked up. Over the final decade and a half of his life, he authored or co-authored three books on philosophy and religion, including *Matters of Conscience: Conversations with Sterling M. McMurrin on Philosophy, Education, and Religion* (1996), edited several volumes of the Tanner Lectures, and published dozens of articles. McMurrin's lifelong influence as a philosopher-in-action helped to forge governmental, educational and religious institutions through the clarity and strength of his ideas and the courage with which he expressed and acted upon them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"A Crisis of Conscience: A Report on the State of American Education," *Saturday Review* (16 September 1961): 58–78.
"What About the Philosophy of Education?" *Journal of Philosophy 59* (1962): 629–37.
The Theological Foundations of the Mormon Religion (Salt Lake City, 1965).
Religion, Reason, and Truth: Historical Essays in the Philosophy of Religion (Salt Lake City, 1982).
Toward Understanding the New Testament, with Obert C. Tanner and Lewis M. Rogers (Salt Lake City, 1990).
Matters of Conscience: Conversations with Sterling M. McMurrin on Philosophy, Education, and Religion, with L. Jackson Newell (Salt Lake City, 1996).
Sterling M. McMurrin Lectures on Religion and Culture (Salt Lake City, 2004).

Other Relevant Works
McMurrin's papers are at the University of Utah in Salt Lake City.
Ed. with James L. Jarrett, *Contemporary Philosophy: A Book of Readings* (New York, 1954).
Ed. with B. A. G. Fuller, *A History of Philosophy*, 2 vols, 3rd edn (New York, 1955).

Further Reading
Proc of APA v70

L. Jackson Newell

MACQUARRIE, John (1919–)

John Macquarrie was born on 27 June 1919, in Renfrew, Scotland, an ancient town on the River Clyde located six miles from Glasgow. Macquarrie's Gaelic-speaking paternal grandfather came from the Island of Islay to Clydeside; his father was a shipyard pattern-maker and an elder in the Presbyterian Church. His upbringing engendered in him a deep religious commitment and an openness toward others. His nurturing in the evangelical, transcendent-theistic Christianity characteristic of the Church of Scotland was balanced by a Celtic sense of the immanence of the divine in all things. He was educated at the nearby Paisley Grammar School, and upon completion of the prescribed course, won a scholarship to the University of Glasgow, from which he received an MA with honors in mental philosophy in 1940 and a BD degree in 1943. Upon graduation, he rejected a scholarship for further graduate study in theology and joined the British Army as a chaplain.

Following his war service, Macquarrie became minister of St. Ninian's Church, Brechin (Church of Scotland), in 1948, and joined the University of Glasgow faculty as a lecturer in systematic theology in 1953. He completed his PhD in 1954 with a dissertation on Rudolf Bultmann and Martin Heidegger, which was the basis for his first book, *An Existentialist Theology*, published in 1955. This book was well received and widely reviewed in both the United Kingdom and the United States

and catapulted Macquarrie into prominence. He was called to Union Theological Seminary in New York City in 1962 as a professor of systematic theology. In 1965 he was ordained a priest in the Episcopal Church. In 1970, he became Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Christ Church, Oxford, where he served until retirement in 1986. Since then he has continued to study, lecture, and write, his prolific output now standing at nearly thirty books and several hundred articles, pamphlets, and essays.

Looking back on his career, Macquarrie speaks of the "existentialist phase" in which his theological career first flowered. In *An Existentialist Theology*, he focused on Bultmann's treatment of St. Paul's anthropology. His interpretation included Bultmann's program of demythologizing and Heidegger's existential analysis, which strongly underlay Bultmann's work. He wrote a companion book, *The Scope of Demythologizing* (1960), which dealt with Bultmann's critics on both the right and the left. In 1962, he and Edward Robinson translated Heidegger's seminal *Sein und Zeit* (*Being and Time*), a translation that was highly successful and has proved to be a durable work. He published *Studies in Christian Existentialism* (1965), a collection of essays, *Martin Heidegger* (1968), a small book in a series on the makers of contemporary theology, and *Existentialism* (1972), a thematic treatment of this influential philosophical movement. While always the theologian, Macquarrie has nonetheless appreciated existentialism for its anthropological focus, its phenomenological (nonspeculative) method, and its nonsubstantial view of human selfhood. He highly values the existential analysis of Heidegger, especially as providing a contemporary language for interpreting the Christian message, couched as it is in the "indirect" language of myth, symbol, analogy, and paradox. Macquarrie has never been uncritical of existentialism, especially when it restricts itself to individual existence and limits itself to the human dimension only. Heidegger himself resisted being called an existentialist and saw

the existential analytic of Dasein (human existence, basically) as the way into ontology, the study of Being. Macquarrie proved himself to be in thorough agreement with that view as he increasingly made use of the later Heidegger's ontological focus.

If Macquarrie's efforts as a co-translator of Heidegger's *Being and Time* has given him wide exposure and general appreciation in academic circles, it is his *Principles of Christian Theology* (1966) that has given him a prominent place in the Christian Church and theological education as a premier theologian. Macquarrie took the philosophical notion of Being as Christian theology's central and unifying concept. This reflects his existential-ontological approach, whereby the beginning point for theology is the analysis of human existence, and Being is that notion in terms of which God is to be interpreted. For purposes of ontological analysis, Macquarrie draws on Heidegger's understanding of Being as the condition of any thing having being at all. He interprets God as Holy Being or the letting-be of beings. God's tri-unity is understood as primordial being, expressive being, and unitive being, an understanding that connects with both philosophical analysis and theological tradition. Macquarrie structures his systematic theology in three parts: philosophical or natural theology (human existence, revelation, Being and God, language, religion); symbolic theology (Trinity, Jesus Christ in both person and work, the Holy Spirit and salvation, eschatology); and applied theology (church, ministry and mission, word and sacrament, worship and ethics).

Ever alert to the cultural and intellectual context in which theology must be written, Macquarrie produced a number of works in the 1960s and 1970s dealing with topical concerns: the intellectual ambience of theology and religious reflection (*Twentieth-Century Religious Thought*, 1963); issues of language occasioned by the challenge of positivism and linguistic empiricism (*God-Talk*, 1967); secularization (*God and Secularity*, 1968); situation ethics

and the new morality (*Three Issues in Ethics*, 1970). More or less coincident with his move to Christ Church, Oxford University, where he had duties as both theologian and canon, Macquarrie increasingly focused his writing on ecclesial and ecumenical concerns with *Paths in Spirituality* (1972), *The Faith of the People of God* (1972), *Christian Unity and Christian Diversity* (1975), *The Humility of God* (1978), and *Christian Hope* (1978).

Three works form a significant, late-career trilogy, focusing on humanity, deity, and Christ: *In Search of Humanity* (1982); *In Search of Deity* (1984), which was the Gifford Lectures of 1983–4; and *Jesus Christ in Modern Thought* (1990). Significant developments include an increasing emphasis on human self-transcendence, reflecting the influence of the eminent Roman Catholic theologian Karl Rahner; dialectical theism, Macquarrie's refinement of panentheism, where the organic model of deity is preferred and developed over the monarchical, transcendent-only model of classical theism; and the balancing of adoptionist and incarnational themes in the interpretation of Jesus Christ. Macquarrie's work is always deeply informed by both historical studies and contemporary reflection. To the traditional Anglican trilateral of Scripture, tradition, and reason, Macquarrie adds a deep feeling for experience and the convictional roots of rational thought.

Macquarrie's catholic approach to liturgy and ministry has served him well in his ecumenical efforts and writings, especially in his *Theology, Church, and Ministry* (1986) and *Mary for All Christians* (1991). He has lectured widely to both Roman Catholic and Protestant audiences, lay and professional. His career-long interest in the religious "other" and in interreligious dialogue issued in *Mediators between Human and Divine: From Moses to Muhammad* (1996), which presents a thoughtful, sensitive, and ungrudging approach to religious diversity. Eschewing both exclusivism and thoroughgoing relativism, he opts for a position of "openness and commitment," which honors the need to both give to and receive from other religious positions. Macquarrie's lucidity in expression, fair-mindedness in interpretation, theological commitment, and humility have earned him wide respect and deep affection from colleagues and students around the world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An Existentialist Theology: A Comparison of Heidegger and Bultmann (London and New York, 1955; 2nd edn 1965; 3rd edn 1972).

The Scope of Demythologizing: Bultmann and His Critics (London and New York, 1960).

Twentieth-Century Religious Thought (New York, 1963; 5th edn 2000).

Studies in Christian Existentialism (Philadelphia, 1965).

Principles of Christian Theology (New York, 1966; 2nd edn 1977).

God-Talk: An Examination of the Language and Logic of Theology (New York, 1967).

God and Secularity (Philadelphia, 1968).

Martin Heidegger (Richmond, Virg., 1968).

Three Issues in Ethics (New York, 1970).

Paths in Spirituality (New York, 1972; 2nd edn, Harrisburg, Penn., 1992).

Existentialism (Philadelphia, 1972).

Thinking about God (New York, 1975).

In Search of Humanity (London, 1982; New York, 1983).

In Search of Deity: An Essay in Dialectical Theism (London, 1984; New York, 1985).

Jesus Christ in Modern Thought (Philadelphia, 1990).

Heidegger and Christianity (New York, 1994).

Mediators between Human and Divine: From Moses to Muhammad (New York, 1996).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *A Dictionary of Christian Ethics* (Philadelphia, 1967; 2nd edn 1986).

Ed., *Contemporary Religious Thinkers from*

Idealist Metaphysicians to Existential Theologians (New York, 1968).

The Faith of the People of God: A Lay Theology (New York, 1972).

The Concept of Peace (New York, 1972; Philadelphia, 1990).

Mystery and Truth (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1973).

Christian Unity and Christian Diversity (Philadelphia, 1975).

The Humility of God: Christian Meditations (Philadelphia, 1978).

Christian Hope (New York, 1978).

Theology, Church and Ministry (New York, 1986).

Mary for All Christians (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1991).

Invitation to Faith (Harrisburg, Penn., 1995).

A Guide to the Sacraments (New York, 1997).

Christology Revisited (Harrisburg, Penn., 1998).

On Being a Theologian, ed. John H. Morgan (London, 1999). Contains a bibliography of Macquarrie's publications.

Further Reading

Cummings, Owen F. *John Macquarrie, a Master of Theology* (New York, 2002).

Kee, Alistair, and Eugene T. Long, eds. *Being and Truth: Essays in Honour of John Macquarrie* (London, 1986).

Long, Eugene T. *Existence, Being and God: An Introduction to the Philosophical Theology of John Macquarrie* (New York, 1985).

Morley, Georgina. *The Grace of Being: John Macquarrie's Natural Theology* (Bristol, Ind., 2001).

J. Harley Chapman

MADDEN, Edward Harry (1925–)

Edward Madden was born on 18 May 1925 in Gary, Indiana. He received his BA in 1946 and his MA in 1947 from Oberlin College. In 1950 he received the PhD in philosophy of science at the University of Iowa, working with Gustav BERGMANN on a dissertation titled "An Examination of Gestalt Theory." His early teaching positions in philosophy were at the University of Connecticut from 1950 to 1959, and at San Jose State University from 1959 to 1964. From 1964 until his retirement in 1980, Madden was professor of philosophy at State University of New York at Buffalo. He also held visiting positions at Brown, Toronto, American University of Beirut, Linacre College, and Princeton's Institute for Advanced Study. In retirement, he moved to Wilmore, Kentucky, where he was a visiting research fellow at Asbury College in 1981–2. He was an adjunct professor at the University of Kentucky from 1982 to 1994. Since 2000 he has lived in White River Junction, Vermont and continues actively to publish.

Throughout his professional career, Madden's main interests were philosophy of science, history of American philosophy, and philosophy of religion. He served on many editorial boards, including *Philosophy of Science*, *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, *The Works of William James*, and the *Critical Edition of the Letters of William James*. From 1960 to 1985 he served as general editor of the prestigious *Sourcebook Series in the History of the Sciences* by Harvard University Press, which added thirteen volumes during his tenure. He served on the Board of Advisors for the Peirce Edition Project from 1972 to 1980. He received the Herbert Schneider Award from the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy in 1991. He enhanced the profession specifically and intellectual culture generally by serving on important committees with the American Philosophical Association, the American Council of Learned Societies, and other scholarly organizations.

Madden is the author or co-author of nine books, and the editor or co-editor of four books. Perhaps his most widely read work is *Causal Powers* (1975), which he co-authored with Rom Harré. They critique the Humean tradition and defend a realist ontology and epistemology in philosophy of science, particularly in application to issues of cause, law, and explanation. Madden's books on early American philosophy, including *Chauncey Wright and the Foundations of Pragmatism* (1963) and *Civil Disobedience and Moral Law in Nineteenth-Century American Philosophy* (1970), display his longstanding interest in pragmatism and common sense philosophy in America.

Evil and the Concept of God (1968), co-authored with Peter Hare, concerns his thinking on the problem of evil, framed as what is now known as the evidential argument of evil as a strong objection to theism. Other writings display keen interest in agency theory, conscience and moral law, the influence of the Scottish Common Sense tradition in America, and the biography of key philosophers. In addition to these specialties, Madden pursued and lectured widely on a number of broad intellectual interests including Islamic art and architecture, Irish art and architecture, and nineteenth-century American religious movements.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Theories of Scientific Method: The Renaissance through the Nineteenth Century, with R. M. Blake and C. J. Ducasse (Seattle, 1960).

Philosophical Problems of Psychology (New York, 1962).

Chauncey Wright and the Foundations of Pragmatism (Seattle, 1963).

Chauncey Wright (New York, 1964).

Evil and the Concept of God, with Peter Hare (Springfield, Ill., 1968).

Civil Disobedience and Moral Law in Nineteenth-Century American Philosophy (Seattle, 1968).

Causal Powers, with Rom Harré (Oxford, 1975).

Causing, Perceiving, and Believing: An Examination of the Philosophy of C. J. Ducasse, with Peter Hare (Dordrecht, 1975).

Freedom and Grace: The Life of Asa Mahan, with James Hamilton (Metuchen, N.J., 1982).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Philosophical Writings: Representative Selections*, by Chauncey Wright (New York, 1958).

Ed., *The Structure of Scientific Thought: An Introduction to Philosophy of Science* (Boston, 1960).

Further Reading

Levine, Michael P. "Madden's Account of Necessity in Causation," *Philosophical Inquiry* 18 (1988): 1–22.

Meyers, Robert G. "The Roots of Pragmatism: Madden on James and Peirce," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 25 (1989): 85–121.

Wilson, Fred. "Dispositions Defined: Harré and Madden on Analyzing Disposition Concepts," *Philosophy of Science* 52 (1985): 591–607.

Zembaty, Jane S. *The Essentialism of Kripke and Madden and Metaphysical Necessity*. PhD dissertation, Georgetown University (Washington, D.C., 1976).

Michael L. Peterson

MAHAN, Asa (1799–1889)

Asa Mahan was born on 9 November 1799 in Vernon, New York. His religious upbringing in a devout Congregationalist home was tinged with frontier revivalism and marked by intense

struggles against traditional Calvinist doctrines of election and total depravity. At the age of seventeen, Mahan experienced an "absolute intuition" of God's purity and love, resulting in a long-sought assurance of his salvation and a conversion that dramatically reoriented his piety in a more activist, "soul-winning" direction. The New Light and New Divinity revivalism of this period – originally inspired by colonial preacher and theologian, Jonathan Edwards – was undergoing a shift toward softer varieties of Calvinism that readily accommodated a greater emphasis on emotions and on freedom of the will as focal points of conversion. Mahan immersed himself in this ethos of revivalism at every opportunity, abandoning accustomed notions of limited atonement and "natural inability" in favor of the more optimistic New Divinity theologies of Nathaniel Emmons and Nathaniel Taylor.

Mahan began to formally define his voluntarist position and the rudiments of an intuitionist "common sense" realism while he studied theology at Hamilton College in Clinton, New York. Heated debates between various rival schools of moderate Calvinism provided additional impetus to theological and philosophical reflection at Andover Theological Seminary, where he began graduate studies in 1824 upon his graduation from Hamilton. Mahan's recollections of Andover were not happy ones: "We solved our problems of theology as we had done those of geometry, when in College, and with no more seriousness or reverence in the one case than in the other." (1882, p. 154) What preserved his religious enthusiasm and his curiosity regarding the nature of the human will was his ongoing participation in revivals and his growing concern about slavery. He married Mary H. Dix in 1828 and was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church at Pittsford, New York, in 1829. A few years later he was called to the Sixth Presbyterian Church of Cincinnati, Ohio, where his involvement in Lane Theological Seminary afforded new opportunities to immerse himself in the arena of education.

As a trustee at Lane, Mahan encountered a volatile community of student abolitionists, led by Theodore Weld, and a conservative administration and board of trustees that tried to limit anti-slavery activism on campus. Sympathetic towards Weld and the "Lane Rebels," Mahan joined a mass departure of students for recently founded Oberlin College. He was elected the first President of the institution in 1835, joined by famed revivalist, Charles G. Finney, who became the professor of theology. Mahan immediately began his teaching duties as professor of mental and moral philosophy, and publishing on a wide range of theological and philosophical subjects. Mahan led Oberlin until 1850.

Mahan's most notable scholarly achievement during his Oberlin presidency was the publication of a widely acclaimed collegiate textbook entitled *Science of Moral Philosophy* (1848). Philosophy for Mahan had a "heaven appointed mission" to pursue truth wherever it led. From the Scottish realism of Thomas Reid and Dugald Stewart, Mahan assumed a primal correlation between the "known condition and wants of man" and divine revelation in the natural world and in Scripture. When confronted with the varied evidences of the moral law, the mind discovered through intuition the existence of the good as well as a sense of obligation to will that good. This sense was not just a matter of duty, but a more fundamental urge to love and serve the divine author of the moral law. Mahan sharply differentiated his version of "rightarian" moralism from Kant's categorical imperative by emphasizing the grounding of moral obligation in "the intrinsic character of the end itself," which was God. With Immanuel Kant, he stressed that intuition was a universal moral sense. But with the Scottish moralists and their American counterparts (including Francis Hutcheson and Francis Wayland), he associated the intuitions with an innate religious consciousness. A self-originating freedom of the will was central to the operating of this consciousness, with resulting decisions and

actions either in obedience or disobedience to God.

Mahan translated his ethical brand of common sense philosophy from a "religion of maxims and resolutions" into a "religion of love" that was indebted as much to Wesleyan and Arminian theology as it was to Scottish and German strands of moral philosophy. Mahan therefore readily developed the theological implications of moral intuition in terms of the traditional holiness doctrine of "entire sanctification" or "Christian perfection." He defined perfection as the state reached when one's "internal capacities" were completely adapted to the intuited moral requirements apprehended in nature and reasoned from Scripture. Absolute moral perfection was never attainable, but successive stages of perfection could be reached in the moral faculty. At any point where one's moral intentions and actions accorded with God's revealed will, a degree of perfection was realized. As the likelihood of falling away from this harmony of wills diminished, it was possible to reach higher levels of habitual conformity between intellect (understanding), sensibilities (emotions), and will. Ultimately, this "higher order" attainment represented a victory over sin and a transformation into the very image of God.

Mahan's version of Oberlin perfectionism has sometimes been referred to as an instance of "moral inflationism" because it drew so much attention not only to moral actions, but also to requisite emotions or "affections" directly linked to those actions. The will, according to Yale University philosopher and President Noah PORTER, "penetrated and energized" the affections. For Mahan, this meant that one must will "with all the heart," making for a distinctively Wesleyan understanding of moral intuitions that would be widely endorsed in the holiness movement of the nineteenth century. Although this Wesleyan-inspired development was not as philosophically rigorous as the moderate Calvinism which Mahan had initially endorsed, it did articulate a clear distinction between actions

and will, and with regard to the perfection of the latter, it expressed supreme confidence in human moral ability. "Ought" meant "can."

Mahan's general commitment to Scottish moralism and realist philosophy continued throughout the remainder of his teaching and administrative careers at Cleveland University (President and professor of mental and moral philosophy, 1850–55) and Adrian College in Michigan (President, 1860–71). More subtle refinements in his theology and philosophy, especially concerning epistemology, are evident in an impressive two-volume work written during his final years of semi-retirement in England, entitled *A Critical History of Philosophy* (1883). Mahan surveys all the major schools of philosophy in history, culminating in common sense realism. It was the universal scope of common sense judgments that, in Mahan's opinion, demonstrated the unrivaled superiority of the realists. Within this reasonable world, Mahan saw nothing but perfect congruence between the intuitions and divine disclosure in nature. Doctrines that were found only in Scripture, especially those pertaining to salvation, were not contrary to but above reason. They could be properly vindicated, though not actually verified, on the basis of their correspondence with the "known condition and wants of man": a correspondence discerned on the basis of "internal evidence." This was still a matter of reason for Mahan because it required a conscious alignment of the will to "rational convictions" based on solid evidence.

Mahan's latter years were marked by the death of his wife in 1863, remarriage in 1866 (to Mary E. Chase), and unflagging promotion of his philosophically grounded theology throughout eastern North America. Eventually, he settled in England and died on 4 April 1889 in Eastbourne, England. He is chiefly remembered today as a passionate and articulate defender of Oberlin perfectionism, an early spokesman for the American holiness movement, and a trans-Atlantic purveyor of the Keswick, or Higher Christian Life,

movement. His philosophical achievements are often overlooked because of the general demise of collegiate moral philosophy in the late nineteenth century. More recent rekindling of interest in the legacies of common sense realism and new versions of realism in the twentieth century may contribute to a renewed appreciation of Mahan's prolific writings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Scripture Doctrine of Christian Perfection (Boston, 1839).

A System of Intellectual Philosophy (New York, 1845; 2nd edn 1847).

Doctrine of the Will (New York and Oberlin, Ohio, 1845).

Science of Moral Philosophy (Oberlin, Ohio, 1848).

Modern Mysteries Explained and Exposed (Boston, 1855).

The Science of Logic; or, An Analysis of the Laws of Thought (New York, 1857).

Science of Natural Theology; or, God the Unconditioned Cause, and God the Infinite and Perfect as Revealed in Creation (Boston, 1867).

Theism and Anti-Theism in Their Relations to Science (Cleveland, Ohio, 1872).

Out of Darkness into Light; or, The Hidden Life made Manifest (Louisville, Kent., 1874).

A System of Mental Philosophy (Chicago, 1882).

A Critical History of Philosophy, 2 vols (New York, 1883).

Other Relevant Works

A small collection of Mahan materials are at Oberlin College in Ohio.

A Critical History of the Late American War (New York and Chicago, 1877).

Autobiography, Intellectual, Moral and Spiritual (London, 1882).

Further Reading

Appleton's *Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v2*

Dayton, D. L. "Asa Mahan and the Development of American Holiness Theology," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 9 (Spring 1974): 60–69.

Hamilton, James E. "Nineteenth Century Philosophy and Holiness Theology: A Study in the Thought of Asa Mahan," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 13 (Spring 1978): 51–64.

Madden, Edward H., and James E. Hamilton. *Freedom and Grace: The Life of Asa Mahan* (Metuchen, N.J., 1982).

Meyer, D. H. *The Instructed Conscience: The Shaping of the American National Ethic* (Philadelphia, 1972).

Noll, Mark A. "Common Sense Traditions and American Evangelical Thought," *American Quarterly* 37 (1985): 216–38.

Zikmund, Barbara Brown. *Asa Mahan and Oberlin Perfectionism*. PhD dissertation, Duke University (Durham, N.C., 1969).

Philip E. Harrold

MALCOLM, Norman Adrian (1911–90)

Norman Malcolm was born on 11 June 1911 in Selden, Kansas. His undergraduate years were at the University of Nebraska, where O. K. BOUWSMA was one of his teachers, and he received his BA in 1933. He then went to Harvard, earning the MA in 1938. The most important philosophical influences on him during his graduate years were G. E. Moore and Ludwig Wittgenstein, with whom he studied on a fellowship at the University of Cambridge in 1938–9. His Harvard PhD was granted in 1940. He was an instructor of philosophy at Princeton from 1940 to 1942 before joining the US Navy. After the war he returned to Princeton and then spent another year at

Cambridge during 1946–7 to study with Moore and Wittgenstein. In 1947 he joined the Sage School of Philosophy at Cornell. Malcolm became associate professor in 1950, and full professor in 1955. In 1964 he was appointed Susan Linn Sage Professor of Philosophy, and he chaired the department from 1965 to 1970. He was a fellow at the Center for Advanced Research in the Behavioral Sciences in Stanford in 1968–9; was President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1972–3; and joined the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1975. Malcolm retired from Cornell in 1978. During the last twelve years of his life he lived in London, and was appointed a visiting professor and fellow at King's College London, where he gave a seminar mainly devoted to the philosophy of Wittgenstein. Malcolm died on 4 August 1990 in London, England.

Malcolm was one of the most influential and important practitioners of ordinary language philosophy in the United States. He is also well known for his contributions to the study of Ludwig Wittgenstein's writings, including a memoir of him. Malcolm also made notable contributions to the philosophy of mind and to the problem of free will, in addition to a number of other significant articles in the history of philosophy, epistemology, and the philosophy of religion.

For Malcolm, the importance of studying the use of ordinary language came from the view of Wittgenstein and Moore that many philosophical problems and puzzles could often be put to rest or dissolved with proper attention to the way in which certain words like knowledge or thought were used outside of the context of philosophical discussion and argumentation. Given a sufficiently clear picture of how words are used in ordinary contexts, many supposed that philosophical problems would be revealed as byproducts of a systematic misuse of language by philosophers. On this view, a good many philosophical problems were generated by an excessively narrow view of the different senses of words. Attention to the full range of a word's senses would reveal a misuse of language to be at the root of a perceived philosophical difficulty, for a large number of cases.

The emphasis on ordinary language shaped almost every aspect of Malcolm's thinking. It is especially prevalent in his early work and the same basic method appears in his later work as well. For example, the idea that one could come to doubt even the most banal assertions rested upon a faulty view of how words like knowledge, belief, and doubt are properly used within ordinary language and conversation. The use of the word "know" in particular is only appropriate when some doubt is possible. Corresponding remarks hold for other terms, like "believe." Without such contextual sanctioning, the use of these words simply could not constitute a meaningful assertion. This sets up an important asymmetry in knowledge ascriptions with respect to the first, second, and third persons. From this view, Malcolm concludes that speakers cannot be said to know their own sensations or pains, and so on. Thus, it simply made no sense to preface the expression of a pain with "I know" where there is no question of the speaker's knowing.

These general views were commonplace among a number of other philosophers, such as G. E. Moore. However, Malcolm's investigations of ordinary language often yielded interesting and surprising results. In his article "Thoughtless Brutes" (in *Memory and Mind*, 1977) he contended that only of a creature that had language could we say that it had thoughts and consciousness. In contrast to other philosophers on this matter, Malcolm did not mean that language-less creatures did not have feelings and perceptions. On the contrary, Malcolm held that there was a large part of human and animal life that overlapped and that it was only the belief that all feelings and perceptions ought to be understood in propositional terms that kept philosophers from seeing this similarity. Nonetheless, there is another sense in which creatures without

language could not be said to be capable of fully *propositional* thought since it was only through the possession and use of language that a creature could form sentences, the vehicle of propositional content.

Malcolm held that there is a difference between *thinking* that a squirrel has run up a tree and *having the thought* the squirrel has run up the tree. The criteria for applying the former locution were much looser than they are for applying the latter. In particular, dogs and other language-less creatures could be truthfully said to think that such and such has happened. Malcolm saw no need to deny that. But to have a thought with a particular content was another matter. Malcolm contended that in order to credit a creature with the ability to have a thought one would have to assume that this creature had the ability to testify to his having this thought. This latter ability requires the possession of a language in a way that mere thinking does not. Although later thinkers were to acknowledge a good deal of complexity in the mental lives of animals, Malcolm's views were more nuanced than those of other philosophers of the period.

The role of language in the study of the mind shaped several of his other contributions. In his first and most notorious book *Dreaming* (1959), he argued for the thesis that talk of sleeping subjects being in certain characteristic mental states was a confusion. Specifically, the problem that Malcolm was most concerned with involved the idea that dreams are mental occurrences that happen to their subjects while they are asleep and unconscious. Malcolm argued that it made no sense to say that there could be mental occurrences that happen to a subject who could not be aware of them. With that in mind, one could not sensibly say that a given description of a dream was the report of a sequence of inner events within the sleeping subject's mind. In the absence of consciousness, there simply is nothing to report in that regard. Rather, careful attention to the language in which dreams are described reveals that dreams are not occurrences at all. Rather,

dream reports ought to be viewed as manifestations or dispositions to say certain things upon waking.

The argument starts from the premise that there is no legitimate or sensible first-person use of the sentence "I am dreaming," although there are sensible uses of "I am sleeping." Nor is there a legitimate judgment which has that content – not unless we are willing to admit a class of judgments that are essentially incommunicable, a prospect Malcolm finds abhorrent given that communication requires the conscious participation of at least two people. In the end, Malcolm says, "[w]hat we must learn is to *take* an after-sleep narration in a certain way…. Learning to take an awakened person's past tense narrative in this way is learning the concept of dreaming." (1959, p. 88)

The source of Malcolm's view here can be traced to Wittgenstein's much-quoted aphorism in *Philosophical Investigations* that "an inner process stands in need of outward criteria" (§580), which he quotes several times in his work. Malcolm took mental concepts to be associated with behavioral criteria and often gave dispositional analyses of them. In the absence of these criteria, mental predicates simply could not be applied. Just as importantly, he argued that mental concepts have a normative character. Malcolm gave this idea an anti-reductionist bent by saying that thoughts and beliefs, in virtue of being dispositions, could not be identified with any kind of event in the brain since the latter, but not the former, had a particular location and time.

Succeeding philosophers have found Malcolm's apparent elimination of the most compelling aspects of dreaming less than satisfactory. The idea that one could replace talk of inner occurrences with talk of behavior in the analysis of mental concepts and the accompanying thesis that all mental states must be ones that the subject of those states is aware of is a decidedly minority view. Malcolm's views about dreaming are probably best known as extreme illustrations of philosophical versions of behaviorism and are not now regarded as

serious theories of mental life or of dreaming.

Malcolm's views in the philosophy of mind owe a good deal to Wittgenstein's view of the centrality of language in understanding the structure and content of mental phenomena. They also owe much to Wittgenstein's view that the meaning of an expression involves how it is used and thus should be studied from the perspective of the actions of speakers, of what speakers manage to do with words. The idea that the actual or potential actions that speakers produce with the use of words plays an essential role in understanding their meanings is also at the forefront of Malcolm's views about knowledge, as briefly mentioned above. The reason why certain uses of words were ruled out as nonsensical, rather than just improbable or bizarre assertions, owes a great deal to the contention common among many that the meaning of a sentence or word is a matter of how it is used.

Malcolm also devoted several essays and a book to the topic of memory. He argued that there are several different kinds of memory, ranging from perceptual memory to factual memory. Factual memory is presupposed by all of the other types of memory, although Malcolm contended that one could imagine a creature that had only factual memory without possessing any of the other types.

Other than his work in the philosophy of mind, perhaps Malcolm's most well-known argument comes from his 1968 discussion of free will in his essay "The Conceivability of Mechanism." Malcolm argued that the view that all human actions are mechanically determinable was, in essence, incoherent and involved a kind of "pragmatic paradox." The very intention to assert or state the thesis of mechanism presupposes the legitimacy of intentional notions, such as purposive action and belief. Further, Malcolm argued that mentalistic and intentional notions are bound with normative considerations. Malcolm contended that one could not eliminate intentional notions in such a way as to make room for a mechanistic view of human behavior. The problem is particularly acute when trying to assert that mechanism is true of a human being. The idea is that mechanism and reductionist explanations are self-undermining; the very attempt to state them exposes their falsity. For if one succeeded in asserting mechanism, then there would be at least one intentional action after all.

In philosophy of religion, Malcolm defended a version of Ockam's ontological argument on which the important idea was one of necessary existence. Malcolm noted that there are two different arguments that could be called the ontological argument. The usual version, according to which existence is a property, Malcolm found flawed. However, there is another argument that can be found in Anselm's work that is much stronger. On this argument, what is important is that if God exists, then his existing is necessary. Malcolm argued that a version of this argument was valid.

Malcolm also made significant contributions to the study of Wittgenstein, although it is misleading to separate this work from his own, original work. As he did in other works, Malcolm defended and elaborated Wittgenstein's ideas regarding language and mind. Malcolm explored several of the more vexing questions regarding Wittgenstein's views, including the relationship between Wittgenstein's early and later writings and his views about religion, devoting book-length studies to both topics in his later work in addition to a number of essays. He also published a memoir detailing Wittgenstein's 1949 visit to the United States and Malcolm's conversations with him as a student at Cambridge and later. He also wrote an important, early review of Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations* which set the tone for the reception of that work. It was thanks to this review that attention to the private-language argument came to be a central focus of discussions of the *Investigations* in the succeeding years.

Malcolm's work is very much a product of its time. For example, the strategy of resolving philosophical disputes through considerations of the ordinary use of certain problematic

words has been out of fashion for some time in American philosophy, although it still can claim some adherents. However, many of his other arguments retain their interest and many of his articles are required reading for students of the free-will problem and for the interpretation of Wittgenstein's philosophy. Further, his arguments against reductionism with respect to mental predicates and his emphasis upon the normative aspects of discourse have been enduring concerns of contemporary American philosophy, if not always in quite the same way that Malcolm preferred to frame the issues.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Defending Common Sense," *Philosophical Review* 58 (1949): 201–21.
"Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations*," *Philosophical Review* 63 (1954): 530–59.
"Dreaming and Skepticism," *Philosophical Review* 65 (1956): 14–37.
Ludwig Wittgenstein, A Memoir, with G. H. von Wright (London, 1958).
Dreaming (London, 1959).
"Anselm's Ontological Arguments," *Philosophical Review* 69 (1960): 41–60.
Knowledge and Certainty (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1963).
"Descartes's Proof that his Essence is Thinking," *Philosophical Review* 74 (1965): 315–38.
"The Conceivability of Mechanism," *Philosophical Review* 77 (1968): 45–72.
Memory and Mind (Ithaca, N.Y., 1977).
Thought and Knowledge: Essays (Ithaca, N.Y., 1977).
Consciousness and Causality, with David Armstrong (Oxford, 1984).
Wittgenstein: Nothing is Hidden (Oxford, 1986).
Wittgenstein: A Memoir (Oxford, 1986).
Wittgenstein: A Religious Point of View? ed. Peter Winch (Ithaca, N.Y., 1994).
Wittgensteinian Themes: Essays 1978–1989, ed. G. H. von Wright (Ithaca, N.Y., 1995).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Blackwell Analytic Phil*, *Blackwell Comp Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v8*, *Proc of APA v64*
Ginet, Carl, and Sydney Shoemaker, eds. *Knowledge and Mind: Philosophical Essays* (Oxford, 1983). Contains a bibliography of Malcolm's writings.
Iseminger, Gary. "Malcolm on Explanations and Causes," *Philosophical Studies* 20 (1969): 73–7.
Linsky, Leonard. "Malcolm and the Use of Words," *Analysis* 26 (1965): 59–61.
Margolis, Joseph. "Malcolm on Knowledge," *Logique et Analyse* 10 (1967): 192–9.
Serafini, Anthony. "Norman Malcolm: A Memoir," *Philosophy* 68 (1993): 309–24.

Daniel Blair

MALCOLM X (1925–65)

Malcolm X, also later known as El-Hajj Malik El-Shabazz, was born Malcolm Little on 19 May 1925 in Omaha, Nebraska. His father was a Baptist minister who also worked as a political activist and organizer for Marcus GARVEY's United Negro Improvement. His preaching on black self-sufficiency ultimately led to his assassination by Black Legionaries, a splinter group of the Ku Klux Klan. Malcolm X's later radical black nationalism is attributed to his parents, who were both fervent Garveyites. After his father's death, Malcolm was placed in foster care as his mother was unable to provide for her eight children. He dropped out of school in the eighth grade, ending his formal education. He spent six years in state prison for burglary and there he encountered the teachings of Elijah Muhammad,

leader of the Lost-Found Nation of Islam, popularly known as the Black Muslims. He became a loyal disciple of Muhammad and changed his last name to X to symbolize how slavery had stolen the identity of black people. Upon his release from prison in 1952, he worked for Muhammad, recruiting hundreds of new members for the Nation of Islam, establishing temples in Boston and Philadelphia.

In 1953 Malcolm X became the Assistant Minister of the Detroit Temple and by 1954 he was promoted to Minister of the New York Temple. By 1955 he was attending the Afro-Asian Conference in Bandung as the honorable Elijah Muhammad's national representative. He married Betty X (Sanders) in 1958 in Lansing, Michigan and together they had four children. He left the Black Muslims in 1963 and traveled to Mecca where he changed his name to El-Hajj Malik El-Shabazz. Preaching a more conciliatory racial message, he founded the Organization of Afro-American Unity in 1964. He was assassinated by a Black Muslim on 21 February 1965 in Harlem, New York City.

Malcolm X was primarily interested in developing a philosophy of black self-empowerment in order to bring unity among the peoples of the African Diaspora. As a Black Nationalist, he rejected the idea of assimilation, since he thought it only replicated oppressive class dichotomies within black communities. Malcolm also turned his back on Christianity, particularly the Black Christian Church, which he thought played a hypocritical role in promoting assimilation in a society that rejected racial diversity. He was a charismatic speaker and is known for a provocative racial rhetoric that played on the fears and racial bigotry of whites. His initial rebelliousness against the rules of the dominant culture led him to the criminal underworld. As he matured, he worked to channel any self-destructive tendencies toward changing the political, economic, and social degradation of blacks.

At an early age he refused to internalize racial inferiority. According to his autobiography, a defining moment for him occurred in the eighth grade when he expressed an interest in becoming a lawyer. His white teacher made it clear that, as a black, he was only destined for menial jobs. Malcolm, who excelled in school, was humiliated and vowed to overcome the social inequity and racism that blacks faced in American society. After his life of crime led him to prison, Malcolm converted to Islam. He embraced an ascetic life style and began to focus on his spiritual development. This helped him rebuild his self-esteem and to begin "to overcome the degradation he had known" (Stuckley 1991, p. 697). He educated himself by reading voraciously, thereby improving his vocabulary and oratory skills. He wrote to Elijah Muhammad daily and developed a close relationship with him.

After his parole in 1952, Malcolm embarked on a new path as a major recruiter and evangelist for the Muhammad's Black Muslims. Always a charismatic orator, Malcolm quickly recruited hundreds of new members for the Nation of Islam, eventually creating a rift with Elijah Muhammad, who was also led to believe that Malcolm was attempting to usurp his authority. In an apparent response to Malcolm's remarks concerning the assassination of President John F. Kennedy in 1963 that the "chickens had come home to roost," Malcolm was ordered to be silent for ninety days by the Nation of Islam. By February 1964 Malcolm was informed that his suspension would be indefinite. Subsequently, he left the NOI and started his own organization, Muslim Mosque, Inc. In March 1964 he also founded the Organization of Afro-American Unity (OAAU) named in solidarity with principles and goals of the Organization for African Unity (OAU). Even though by now Malcolm was making a more conciliatory racial message and was seeking rapprochement with civil rights leaders like Martin Luther KING,

Jr., violence still seemed to follow him. Malcolm continued to receive death threats and his home was firebombed a week before he was assassinated.

In his early speeches, Malcolm proselytized for the Nation of Islam (NOI), attempting to educate black people about their history and disseminating a message of self-love, self-empowerment, and healthy living consistent with NOI doctrine. He also initially preached a philosophy of separatism and disdain for white people, who in accordance with NOI philosophy, were perceived as devils. Over time, Malcolm's speeches became less nationalistic, probably as Malcolm developed doubts about the veracity of some of the teachings and the practices of Elijah Muhammad. In his later speeches, he focused on black unity in the face of racial oppression.

Within thirteen years, Malcolm X transformed himself from a mere recruiter and spokesman for the Nation of Islam (NOI) to a visionary leader calling for a united black nation, preaching freedom from white oppression and calling for social justice through revolution that would not be delimited by nonviolence. He expanded his platform from separatism for Black Muslims to Pan-Africanism, encompassing black people everywhere. In 1955 he represented the NOI at the Afro-Asian conference in Bandung. In 1964, after leaving the NOI, Malcolm was invited by the Pan-African Leadership to attend the second Organization for African Unity (OAU) Summit. At this conference, Malcolm X, claiming to represent twenty-two million African Americans, presented a resolution detailing the plight of racism in the United States and seeking the unified support of all African Nations in combating racial oppression and promoting social justice. Members of the OAU agreed to present his resolution to the United Nations. All that remained was for Malcolm to form a coalition with Civil Rights Leadership. In the last year of his life, he sought to build alliances with the Civil Rights Movement, agreeing to work with Dr King to work to unite blacks in the cause of human rights. Although Malcolm had initially criticized King's nonviolence, he understood the political value of their alliance that transcended religious and other ideological differences.

Malcolm's racial philosophy is reflected in his speeches, which represent a dynamic evolution in his thinking. It is important to examine his speeches within the context of his life experiences, as the reader might easily misinterpret the apparent contradictions between earlier and later speeches as confusion on Malcolm's part. Malcolm X grew in his own self-understanding ultimately to reevaluate certain Islamic principles that he initially embraced. The same Malcolm who called whites "devils" came to see the possibility of relationships based on shared humanity rather than an extreme view of separatism. After his exposure to Islam outside of the United States, he acknowledged the possibility of harmonious relationships across racial boundaries and began to advocate universal human rights.

Malcolm always seemed to be searching to achieve his full potential. Everything he did evidenced commitment, intensity, and zeal. As a minister in the Nation of Islam, he learned all he could from Elijah Muhammad and then expanded his knowledge by learning from Muslims internationally. Malcolm embraced Black Nationalism and committed himself to building alliances nationally and internationally with black leadership, such as Patrice Lamumba, Kwame Nkrumah, and Ben Bellah, which led him to evolve in his thinking toward socialism and Pan-Africanism. He came to admire African-American leaders such as Paul Robeson. He sustained a collegial relationship with Adam Clayton Powell, Jr. who invited him to lecture at Abyssinia Baptist Church and through him met many Pan-African leaders who came to his church to participate in international forums.

He was not afraid to transform himself based on new information and self-understanding. Malcolm's hajj to Mecca confirmed the philosophical schism between Black Muslims and true Islam. He was mortified to find that he was ignorant of basic Islamic customs and became aware that he needed to learn Arabic in order truly to understand Islam. He also learned that harmony among people of different colors existed in Mecca where pilgrims of all hues embraced each others' humanity.

Malcolm X was a controversial leader with national and international appeal, whose life journey led to personal transformation and philosophical evolution. His philosophy polarized people either to revere or to revile him. He is reputed to have been most influential among the voiceless, downtrodden, lower socioeconomic classes of African Americans. His message had less appeal to middle-class blacks, who were more in favor of assimilation and the nonviolent teachings of Martin Luther King.

Malcolm X's final message was one of black unity. He thought that all black people should embrace self-determination and control their own economy. Malcolm's final challenge was to the black leadership to pick up the gauntlet of Black Nationalism, and demand unity across the African Diaspora, that calls for integrity, honesty, and black consciousness without compromise, that disdains white supremacy and the assimilation of the norms of dominant American culture and society, that elevates black culture to an equal height with all others and challenges posterity to reconstruct sociopolitical power structures. The full effect of Malcolm's life has yet to be determined. Most of his publications are speeches given between 1953 and 1965. His letters and personal papers are not presently available; many believe that a definitive critique and analysis of Malcolm's life and work is yet to be published.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Autobiography of Malcolm X, with Alex Haley (New York, 1965).

Malcolm X Speaks: Selected Speeches and Statements, ed. George Breitman (New York, 1965).

Malcolm X on Afro-American History (New York, 1967).

The Speeches of Malcolm X at Harvard, ed. Archie Epps (New York, 1968).

Two Speeches by Malcolm X (New York, 1969).

Malcolm X Talks to Young People (New York, 1969).

Other Relevant Works

Malcolm X: The Man and His Times, ed. John Henrik Clarke with A. Peter Bailey and Earl Grant (New York, 1969).

By Any Means Necessary; Speeches, Interviews, and a Letter, by Malcolm X, ed. George Breitman (New York, 1970).

The End of White World Supremacy: Four Speeches, ed. Benjamin Karim (New York, 1989).

The Black Book: The True Political Philosophy of Malcolm X (El Hajj Malik El Shabazz), ed. Yussuf Naim Kly (Atlanta, 1986).

Malcolm X: The Last Speeches, ed. Bruce Perry (New York, 1989).

Malcolm X Talks to Young People: Speeches in the U.S., Britain, and Africa (New York, 1991).

Malcolm X: Speeches at Harvard, ed. Archie Epps (New York, 1991).

February, 1965, the Final Speeches, ed. Steve Clark (New York, 1992).

Malcolm X Speaks Out, ed. Nan Richardson, Catherine Chermayeff, and Antoinette White (Kansas City, Missouri, 1992).

Malcolm A to X: The Man and His Ideas, ed. David Gallen (New York, 1992).

A Malcolm X Reader, ed. David Gallen (New York, 1994).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio,

Comp Amer Thought, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Encyc Relig*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*

Breitman, George. *The Last Year of Malcolm X: The Evolution of a Revolutionary* (New York, 1967).

———, *Malcolm X: The Man and His Ideas* (New York, 1969).

Carson, Clayborne. *Malcolm X: The FBI File*, ed. David Gallen (New York, 1991).

Cleage, Albert B. *Myths about Malcolm X: Two Views* (New York, 1968).

Cone, James H. *Martin & Malcolm & America: A Dream or a Nightmare?* (Maryknoll, N.Y., 1991).

Dyson, Michael Eric. *Making Malcolm: The Myth and Meaning of Malcolm X* (New York, 1995).

Gallen, David. *Malcolm X: As They Knew Him* (New York, 1992).

Jenkins, Robert L., and Mfanya D. Tryman, eds. *The Malcolm X Encyclopedia* (Westport, Conn., 2002).

Johnson, Timothy V. *Malcolm X: A Comprehensive Annotated Bibliography* (New York, 1986).

Karim, Benjamin. *Remembering Malcolm*, with Peter Skutches and David Gallen (New York, 1992).

Ovenden, Kevin. *Malcolm X: Socialism and Black Nationalism* (London, 1992).

Perry, Bruce. *Malcolm: The Life of a Man Who Changed Black America* (New York, 1991).

Sales, William W. *From Civil Rights to Black Liberation: Malcolm X and the Organization of Afro-American Unity* (Boston, 1994).

Stuckley, Sterling. "Malcolm X," in *Readers Companion to American History*, ed. Eric Foner and John A. Garraty (Boston, 1991), pp. 695–7.

Wolfenstein, E. Victor. *The Victims of Democracy: Malcolm X and the Black Revolution* (Berkeley, Cal., 1981).

Phyllis Curtis-Tweed

MANDELBAUM, Maurice Henry, Jr.
(1908–87)

Maurice Mandelbaum was born on 9 December 1908 in Oak Park, near Chicago, Illinois. He earned his BA in 1929 and MA in 1932 from Dartmouth College. While studying for his doctorate in philosophy at Yale University, he became a professor of philosophy at Swarthmore College in 1934. In 1936 he received his PhD in philosophy from Yale, working primarily with Marshall URBAN. His dissertation was quickly published as *The Problem of Historical Knowledge: An Answer to Relativism* (1938), which set his path as a philosopher of history and the social sciences. At Swarthmore, Mandelbaum joined colleague Wolfgang KÖHLER, who became a close friend and intellectual influence, especially concerning Gestalt psychology. Mandelbaum then was professor of philosophy at Dartmouth College from 1947 to 1957, and finally Johns Hopkins University from 1957 to 1974. He was President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1962–3, and he helped to found the journal *History and Theory* in 1962. Mandelbaum was the acknowledged leading philosopher of history and a prominent historian of philosophy in America, and a symbolic successor to Arthur LOVEJOY, another important influence. In retirement Mandelbaum taught part-time at Johns Hopkins until 1978, and then was an adjunct professor of philosophy at Dartmouth from 1979 to 1983. Mandelbaum died on 1 January 1987 in Hanover, New Hampshire.

Mandelbaum's philosophizing was always modest and careful. Against the grain of contemporary analytical philosophy, he preferred to follow C. D. Broad's characterization of "critical" philosophy, neither continental nor overly scientist. Mandelbaum's contributions to epistemology and ethics have generally been neglected in favor of his historical studies and reflections on history itself. However, Köhler provides a key for reconciling Mandelbaum's seemingly contradictory reliance both on per-

ceptual incorrigibility and naturalistic foundation through a Gestalt foundation.

Mandelbaum's first book, *The Problem of Historical Knowledge* (1938), and his later classic, *The Anatomy of Historical Knowledge* (1977), defended the possibility of historical knowledge based on a sophisticated ontology of qualities ("facets") and parts ("scope"), which shaped the representation of knowledge. He wished to forestall relativism before an exhaustive removal of potential sources of seeming disagreements of fact was conducted. Similar is his discussion of ethics, which preoccupied him throughout the 1940s and 50s. Like Köhler, Mandelbaum believed that moral qualities ("requiredness") could have a naturalistic foundation. They were commanding but extremely dependent on context, hence again the importance of part-whole circumstances.

Mandelbaum's work on epistemology resulted in *Philosophy, Science and Sense-Perception: Historical and Critical Studies* (1964). Combining impressive historical scholarship with phenomenological acumen, he again showed how sensory percepts are often veridical but it is precisely their shortcomings that put the perceiver on the path toward science in rationalizing their systematic error. In all cases, reflection on the situatedness of knowledge (historical, ethical, perceptual) enhances realism. The critical sections to Mandelbaum's monumental study of nineteenth-century thought, *History, Man and Reason* (1971), as well as his posthumous *Purpose and Necessity in Social Theory* (1987) are central works of this quiet thinker's philosophy.

Mandelbaum's plainly argued scientific and transcendent realism based on encultured individuals is revived in works by Roy Bhaskar, Christopher Norris, and Margaret Archer. Here, Mandelbaum's aloofness from his Gestalt foundation is misleading. To fully understand the unity in Mandelbaum's output, all of his contributions need to be put together and then reassessed according to a single standard. When this is done, the full power of Mandelbaum's thought emerges and his unique importance as a realist-Gestalt philosopher, tinged with, but never completely immersed in, continental theory, will be appreciated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Problem of Historical Knowledge: An Answer to Relativism (New York, 1938).

"Some Neglected Philosophic Problems Regarding History," *Journal of Philosophy* 49 (1952): 317–28.

"Societal Facts," *British Journal of Sociology* 6 (1955): 305–17.

Philosophy, Science and Sense-Perception: Historical and Critical Studies (Baltimore, Md., 1964).

"Language And Chess, De Saussure's Analogy," *Philosophical Review* 77 (1968): 356–7.

The Phenomenology of Moral Experience (Glencoe, Ill., 1955; 2nd edn, Baltimore, Md., 1969).

History, Man and Reason: A Study in Nineteenth-Century Thought (Baltimore, 1971).

"The Distinguishable and the Separable: A Note on Hume and Causation," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 12 (1974): 242–7.

"The History of Philosophy: Some Methodological Issues," *Journal of Philosophy* 74 (1977): 561–72.

The Anatomy of Historical Knowledge (Baltimore, Md., 1977).

Philosophy, History and the Sciences: Selected Critical Essays (Baltimore, Md., 1984).

Purpose and Necessity in Social Theory (Baltimore, Md., 1987).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Pres Addr of APA v7*, *Proc of APA v60*, *Who Was Who in Amer v9*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Beardsley, Elizabeth. "Moral Experience and Ethical Analysis," *Philosophical Review* 58 (1959): 519–30.

Dray, William H. "Mandelbaum on Historical Narrative," *History and Theory* 8 (1969): 287–94.

Lloyd, Christopher. "Realism and Structuralism in Historical Theory: A Discussion of the Thought of Maurice Mandelbaum," *History and Theory* 28 (1989): 296–325.

Verstegen, Ian. "Maurice Mandelbaum as a Gestalt Philosopher," *Gestalt Theory* 20 (2000): 46–58.

Ian Verstegen

MARCUS, Ruth Charlotte Barcan (1921–)

Ruth Barcan Marcus, one of the twentieth century's most important and influential philosopher-logicians, was born Ruth Charlotte Barcan on 2 August 1921 in New York City. She attended New York University (where she was a champion fencer), studying mathematical logic with J. C. C. Mckinsey and graduating with a BA in philosophy and mathematics in 1941. She earned her MA in philosophy in 1942, and PhD in philosophy in 1946, from Yale University. Her doctoral dissertation, supervised by Frederick B. FITCH, introduced predicates and quantifiers into systems of C. I. LEWIS's propositional modal logic. Three articles in the *Journal of Symbolic Logic* in 1946 and 1947 – published under the name Ruth C. Barcan before her marriage – established the foundations of quantified modal logic (QML). Following a postdoctoral fellowship taken at the University of Chicago, during which she participated in Rudolf CARNAP's seminar, she remained in the Chicago area, teaching as a visiting professor of philosophy at Northwestern University (and raising four children), as attention to her published writings grew. Particularly important was "Modalities and Intensional Languages," which defended quantified modal logic against then-popular objections proposed by W. V. QUINE to its legitimacy and intelligibility. First published in 1961, the paper was presented at a famous February 1962 symposium of the Boston Colloquium for the Philosophy of Science that included a formal response by Quine as well as subsequently-published discussion by Marcus, Quine, Dagfinn FØLLESDAL, and Saul KRIPKE.

Marcus was a professor of philosophy at Roosevelt College in Chicago from 1957 to 1963. In 1964 she became the first head of the philosophy department at the University of Illinois, Chicago Circle (now the University of Illinois at Chicago), building it in a period of six years from a faculty of two to a nationally prominent faculty of twenty. After three years at Northwestern University from 1970 to 1973, she went to Yale in 1973 to become Reuben Post Halleck Professor of Philosophy, a position she held until her retirement in 1992. In addition, she has held fellowships from the National Science Foundation (1963–4); the Rockefeller Foundation (1973, 1990); the Stanford University Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences (1979); the University of Edinburgh Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities (1983); Wolfson College, Oxford (1985, 1986); Clare Hall, Cambridge (1988); and the National Humanities Center (1992–3). A collection of many of her most important articles, *Modalities: Philosophical Essays*, appeared in 1993. Since 1994 she has been a visiting distinguished professor at the University of California at Irvine, as well as a senior research scholar at Yale.

Throughout her career, Marcus has been remarkably active in professional service. Very few other American philosophers have held as many important national and international professional offices, among them President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association (1975–6); Chair of the US National Committee of the International Union of History and Philosophy of Science (1977–9); Chair of the American Philosophical

Association Board of Officers (1977–83); President of the Association for Symbolic Logic (1983–6); and President of the Institut International de Philosophie (1989–92). Among the many honors she has received are permanent fellowship in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences (1977); the Medal of the Collège de France (1986); an Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters from the University of Illinois (1995); and the Wilbur Cross Medal of the Yale University Graduate School Alumni Association (2000).

Modal logic is the logic of the modes, such as necessity and possibility, of a proposition's truth or falsity. While C. I. Lewis (1912, 1932) had developed a series of five axiomatized systems (S1–S5) of modal logic utilizing sentential operators of necessity, possibility, and "strict" (necessary) implication, Marcus was the first to develop modal systems incorporating predicates, relations (including identity), and quantifiers. In doing so, she raised – and in many cases helped ultimately to settle – important issues in the philosophy of language and metaphysics. In her later work, she also made important contributions to the understanding of the consistency of moral codes (with their "deontic" modalities of obligation and permission) and the nature of belief.

One important element of QML as developed by Marcus (1947) is the Necessity of Identity principle, which may be expressed as $(\forall x)(\forall y)[(x = y) \Rightarrow \Box(x = y)]$, where "$\forall x$" and "$\forall y$" are universal quantifiers, "$=$" signifies identity, "$\Rightarrow$" is the strict implication operator, and "$\Box$" is the necessity operator. This theorem that all identities are necessary is an immediate consequence of the necessity of statements of self-identity, such as "$\Box(x = x)$", given a rule of inference allowing substitution of co-referential terms (e.g., of "x" for "y" in any formula, given x = y). However, it seemed paradoxical to many that a true identity statement such as "Cicero is Tully" should be necessary. It seems paradoxical partly because such names were widely regarded as having different descriptive contents as their meanings, and partly because

necessity was often not distinguished from logical truth (truth in virtue of logical form), analyticity (truth in virtue of meaning alone), and a priority (knowability without empirical evidence). Marcus defended the necessity of such identities by arguing that names are purely referential "tags" that designate their objects directly, without any descriptive content that could differ among different names. This response initiated the "direct" theory of reference, to which Saul Kripke and Keith DONNELLAN later added causal accounts of *how* directly referring names can preserve their reference over time. The 1990s saw a historical controversy over the extent to which the leading elements of Kripke's theory of reference and related doctrines were derived from Marcus (see Fetzer and Humphreys 1998).

An additional class of apparently contingent identity statements are those containing definite descriptions, such as "Benjamin Franklin is the first Postmaster General" or "9 = the number of planets"). Quine used such examples to object to the legitimacy and coherence of modal logic by arguing that inferences involving substitution of co-referential expressions into modal contexts based on such identities can fail. For example, assuming that mathematical truths are necessary, we may assert:

(1) $\Box(9>7)$, where "$>$" signifies the "greater than" relation; and
(2) 9 = the number of planets; but it does not follow that
(3) $\Box$(the number of planets > 7)

for there could have been six planets or even fewer. Unlike names, definite descriptions cannot plausibly be treated as directly referential tags with no descriptive content. However, statements containing them can be analyzed as existential quantifications in accordance with Bertrand Russell's general theory of definite descriptions. Doing so reveals – as Arthur SMULLYAN (1948) was the first to argue and as Marcus, citing Smullyan, also emphasized – an ambiguity in the scope of the necessity operator.

Thus, (2) may be analyzed as:

(2′) (∃x){[x numbers the planets & (∀y)(y numbers the planets → y = x)] & x = 9} [where "(∃x)" is an existential quantifier, "&" is the operator conjunction ("and"), and "→" is the operator of material implication ("if-then")]
and (3) is analyzed either as:
(3′) ❏(∃x){[x numbers the planets & (∀y)(y numbers the planets → y = x)] & (x>7)]}
or
(3″) (∃x){[x numbers the planets & (∀y)(y numbers the planets → y = x)] &❏(x>7)]}

Statement (3′) is false but is not a legitimate inference in QML from (1) and (2); (3″) is a legitimate inference from (1) and (2) in QML, but it is true. Following Kripke's careful distinction of necessity from logical truth, analyticity, and a priori (Kripke 1972), it is now widely accepted that all true statements of identity are necessary.

A second popular objection made by Quine to QML was that it carried with it an objectionable commitment to *essentialism*, the view that objects have some of their properties necessarily and others only contingently (Quine 1960). He argued that the apparent modal truths that "mathematicians are necessarily rational and not necessarily two-legged" and "bicyclists are necessarily two-legged and not necessarily rational," together with the proposition "*a* is a mathematician and a bicyclist," entail the contradictory conclusion that "*a* is and is not necessarily rational, and *a* is and is not necessarily two-legged." Thus, he concluded, modal logic cannot properly concern individual objects per se, but only concepts of objects or objects considered in a certain way. Marcus noted in response that, while quantified modal logic allows the formulation and hence intelligibility of sentences (such as '❏Fx') asserting that an object possesses a property necessarily, there are (as demonstrated in Parson 1969) systems of QML consistent with the falsehood of all such sentences except those

attributing necessary possession of "logical" attributes such as self-identity (which are not plausibly regarded as "essentialist" in the Aristotelian tradition of essential properties). Furthermore, she argued, statements attributing to an individual membership in a "natural kind," such as "*h* is a horse," are very plausibly and commonly regarded as necessary and essential. The contradictory conclusion about rationality and two-leggedness, she showed, can be avoided by drawing a scope distinction (rather as in the case of 9 and "the number of planets") between two interpretations of the initial premises. The first is:

❏ (x is a mathematician → x is rational) & ~❏(x is a mathematician → x is two-legged) [where "~" is the negation operator ("not")] ? (x is a bicyclist → x is two-legged) & ~❏ (x is a bicyclist → x is rational)

While the second is:

x is a mathematician → (❏x is rational & ~❏x is two-legged)
x is a bicyclist → (❏x is two-legged & ~❏x is rational)

On the first interpretation, the premises are true but are not sufficient in QML to generate the contradictory conclusion. On the second interpretation, the premises are sufficient (given that *a* is a mathematician and a bicyclist) to generate the contradictory conclusion, but are not plausible. It is now widely agreed that QML is not committed to essentialism in any objectionable way.

In addition to the Necessity of Identity, Marcus adopted, in her original development of QML, an axiom that soon came to be known as the *Barcan Formula*:

❏(∃x)a fi (∃x)❏a [where '❏' is the possibility operator, "(∃x)" is an existential quantifier, "a" represents any well-formed formula, and "⇒" is the operator of strict implication]

She also proved the converse: $(\exists x)\Box\alpha \Rightarrow \Box(\exists x)\alpha$. But whereas the converse of the Barcan Formula only allows inferences from what is actual (namely, something possibly satisfying the condition specified by "α") to a possibility (namely, that of something satisfying the condition specified by "α"), the Barcan Formula allows inferences from what is merely possible to what is actual – a seemingly more suspect procedure from an ontological or metaphysical point of view. Acceptance of the Barcan Formula seems to require that the domain of possible things not exceed the domain of actual things, for only then does the possibility of something satisfying a given condition guarantee that it is something *actual* that accounts for this possibility.

One approach to rendering plausible this limitation on the domain of the possible, subsequently proposed and discussed by Marcus (1972) lies in a *substitutional interpretation of quantification.* On this interpretation, "$(\exists x)\alpha$," for example, is true if and only if there is (or can be) a name the substitution of which into the formula "α" results in a true sentence. Such an interpretation potentially leaves open the question of whether all names actually refer; and it provides support for the Barcan Formula insofar as it is reasonable to suppose that the stock of names available for substitution is the same in modal and non-modal contexts. In a later writing (1985), she defended the Barcan Formula by rejecting *possibilia*, merely possible but non-actual objects, on the grounds that the identity required for objecthood applies only to actual things and that genuine reference to non-actual things is in any case impossible in consequence of the causal requirements for successful naming. This rejection of possibilia guarantees that the domain of the possible does not exceed that of the actual, and it allows for a standard objectual interpretation of quantification (as ranging over objects rather than names), although Marcus continued to maintain that substitutional interpretations are defensible and particularly useful for such purposes as formalizing fictional discourse.

Kripke's approach to modal logic, in contrast, allows the domain of possible worlds to include non-actual objects and thereby permits rejection of the Barcan Formula. The correctness of the Barcan Formula remains controversial.

Marcus's contribution to ethics lies primarily in her groundbreaking work on *moral dilemmas*: cases in which one has an obligation to do *x* and an obligation to do *y*, even though it is not possible to do both *x* and *y* (1980). Using a standard account of consistency, she rejected the then-prevailing view that any moral code that does not rule out the possibility of moral dilemmas is thereby inconsistent. She showed that moral dilemmas may arise even in moral codes based on a single principle, and she defined the consistency of a moral code as there being at least one possible set of circumstances in which all of its requirements or obligations are jointly obeyable. From the consistency of a moral code, then, it does not follow that all of its moral requirements are jointly obeyable in the actual world. On the contrary, Marcus argues, real moral dilemmas often arise; for example, when one promise can be kept only by violating another. In such cases, neither obligation is erased or canceled by the existence of the other; rather, one is "damned if one does, and damned if one doesn't." Indeed, it is morally important that conflicting obligations do not merely erase each other, for the possibility of genuine moral dilemmas provides one with a powerful moral motive to do one's best to prevent them from arising.

Marcus (1981, 1983, 1990) has also offered a comprehensive theory of the nature of belief, according to which: *x* believes that *S* just in case, under certain *agent-centered circumstances* including x's desires and needs, as well as *external circumstances,* x is disposed to act as if *S*, that actual or non-actual state of affairs, obtains. This is a largely behavioral rather than language-centered conception of belief, for it treats belief as a relation between a believer and a state of affairs, where states of affairs are understood not as linguistic or quasi-linguistic entities, but rather as possible structures of

actual objects, properties, and relations. Thus, since Hesperus and Phosphorus are the same object, the belief that Hesperus is rising is the same belief as the belief that Phosphorus is rising. This view accords well with Marcus's treatment of proper names as directly referential tags. Similarly, the limitation of states of affairs to structures involving *actual* objects accords well with the Barcan Formula. One consequence of the proposal is that one cannot literally believe anything impossible. Although one may assent to sentences that express impossibilities, assent is only speech behavior and is not always a final measure of believing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"A Functional Calculus of First Order Based on Strict Implication," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 11 (1946): 1–16.
"The Deduction Theorem in a Functional Calculus of First Order Based on Strict Implication," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 11 (1946): 12–16.
"The Identity of Individuals in a Strict Functional Calculus of Second Order," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 12 (1947): 12–15.
"The Elimination of Contextually Defined Predicates in the Modal System," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 15 (1950): 92–3.
"Extensionality," *Mind* 69 (1960): 55–62.
"Modalities and Intensional Languages," *Synthese* 13 (1961): 303–22.
"Iterated Deontic Modalities," *Mind* 75 (1966): 580–82.
"Essentialism in Modal Logic," *Noûs* 1 (1967): 91–6.
"Essential Attribution," *Journal of Philosophy* 67 (1971): 187–202.
"Quantification and Ontology," *Noûs* 6 (1972): 240–50.
"Classes, Collections, and Individuals," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 11 (1974): 227–32.
"Moral Dilemmas and Consistency," *Journal of Philosophy* 77 (1980): 121–35.
"A Proposed Solution to a Puzzle about Belief," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 6 (1981): 501–10.
"Rationality and Believing the Impossible," *Journal of Philosophy* 75 (1983): 321–37.
"Possibilia and Possible Worlds," *Grazer philosophische Studien* 25/26 (1985–86): 107–32.
"Some Revisionary Proposals about Belief and Believing," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* suppl. 50 (1990): 133–54.
Modalities: Philosophical Essays (Oxford, 1993).

Other Relevant Works
"Interpreting Quantification," *Inquiry* 5 (1962): 252–9.
"Classes and Attributes in Extended Modal Systems," *Proceedings of the Colloquium in Modal and Many Valued Logic, Acta philosophica fennica* 16 (1963): 123–36.
Ed. with Alan Anderson and R. M. Martin, *The Logical Enterprise* (New Haven, Conn., 1975).
"Dispensing with Possibilia," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Association* 49 (1976): 39–51.
Ed. with George Dorn and Paul Weingartner, *Logic, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science* (Amsterdam, 1986).
"The Anti-Naturalism of Some Language Centered Accounts of Belief," *Dialectica* 49 (1995): 113–29.

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, Blackwell Analytic Phil, Oxford Comp Phil, Pres Addr of APA v8, Women Phils
"Festschrift on Ruth Barcan Marcus," *Dialectica* 55 no. 3/4 (1999).
Fetzer, James, and Paul Humphreys, eds. *The New Theory of Reference: Kripke, Marcus and Its Origins* (Dordrecht, 1998).
Hintikka, Jaakko, and Gabriel Sandu. "The Fallacies of the New Theory of Reference," *Synthese* 104 (1995): 245–83.
Kripke, Saul. "Naming and Necessity," in

Semantics of Natural Language, ed. Donald Davidson and Gilbert Harman (Dordrecht, 1972): 253–325, 763–9.

Lambert, Karel. "Quantification and Existence," *Inquiry* 6 (1963): 319–24.

Lewis, C. I. "Implication and the Algebra of Logic," *Mind* 21 (1912): 522–33.

Lewis, C. I., and C. H. Langford. *Symbolic Logic* (New York, 1932).

Parsons, Terence. "Essentialism and Quantified Modal Logic," *Philosophical Review* 78 (1969): 35–52.

Quine, W. V. *Word and Object* (Cambridge, Mass., 1960).

———. "Reply to Professor Marcus' 'Modalities and Intensional Languages'," *Synthese* 13 (1961): 323–30.

Sinnott-Armstrong, Walter, Diana Raffman, and Nicholas Asher, eds. *Modality, Morality, and Belief: Essays in Honor of Ruth Barcan Marcus* (Cambridge, UK, 1995).

Smith, Quentin. "Marcus and the New Theory of Reference: A Reply to Scott Soames," *Synthese* 104 (1995): 217–44.

Smullyan, Arthur. "Modality and Description," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 13 (1948): 31–7.

Don Garrett

MARCUSE, Herbert (1898–1979)

Herbert Marcuse was born 19 July 1898 in Berlin, Germany. He was born into a wealthy family and educated in elite Berlin *gymnasia*. His education was interrupted when he was drafted into the army in 1916 during World War I. Marcuse turned to radical politics while quite young and was briefly active in the counter-cultural youth movement; during this period he also became a socialist. He was active in a Berlin soldiers' council in November 1918, during the abortive workers' and soldier's revolt that marked the end of the war. Marcuse watched and was sympathetic to the German revolution that drove Kaiser Wilhelm II out of power, establishing a Social Democratic government. Marcuse also applauded the Munich soviet uprising of 1919, led by the utopian socialist Kurt Eisner, and admired Rosa Luxemburg, the leader of the Marxist *Spartakusbund*. When Luxemburg was murdered by rightists in January 1919 – without a murmur from the Social Democratic Party (SPD), which had just taken the reins of power – Marcuse resigned from the SPD to protest against its "counterrevolutionary politics."

After demobilization, Marcuse attended Humboldt University in Berlin, but soon transferred to Freiburg University where he completed a PhD in literature in 1922 on the German artist-novel ("Der deutsche Künstlerroman"). He then worked as a bookseller in Berlin before he returned to Freiburg to write his habilitation in philosophy under Martin Heidegger in 1929. He began work at the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research in 1932 but had to flee to Geneva, Switzerland in 1933 when Hitler came to power. He then emigrated to the United States in 1934. From 1934 to 1942 he taught at Columbia University where the Institute for Social Research was granted offices and an academic affiliation. He became a US citizen in 1940. In December 1942 he began working at the Office of War Information as a senior analyst in the Bureau of Intelligence and in March 1943 he began working for the Office of Strategic Services as an intelligence analyst on Nazi Germany. After the end of World War II, he continued working for the United States government in the State Department as head of the Central European Section of the Office of Intelligence Research from 1945 to 1951. Still an avowed Marxist, Marcuse became dissatisfied with America's Cold War politics and returned to the academy. He taught political theory at Columbia University in 1952–3, and

at Harvard University in 1954–5. He was professor in political science at Brandeis University in Massachusetts from 1954 to 1965. He then taught in the philosophy department at the University of California at San Diego from 1965 until he retired in 1976. He died on 29 July 1979 in Starnberg, Germany.

Marcuse was one of the most celebrated members of the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt. The Institute was the American version in exile of the famous Frankfurt School, a radical think-tank which, after Hitler's rise to power in Germany, argued for a "critical theory of society" that transcended traditional Marxism and provide the basis for a new anti-authoritarian radicalism. Only Theodor ADORNO and Erich FROMM among Marcuse's Frankfurt School colleagues have won comparable renown.

For the rest of his life, Marcuse wrestled with the contrary implications of the early struggles he witnessed in Berlin. He believed in the necessity of a life-changing revolution, yet remained acutely aware that most real-world political forces (including socialist parties and trade unions) were gripped by a disabling conformism. In every phase of Marcuse's career, the tension between these tendencies occupied a central place in his thinking. During the period of SPD rule culminating in the Nazi victory of 1933, Marcuse worked to reconcile the notion of revolution with the unhappy realities of proletarian "reification" (as posited by the heterodox Marxist philosopher Georg Lukács) and what Marcuse's Freiburg University mentor Martin Heidegger called "thrown," unfree, heteronomous existence. After Hitler's ascent, with reification more visible and revolution less credible than ever before, Marcuse joined the Frankfurt Institute of Social Research, led by Max HORKHEIMER, whose work on class-consciousness and psychoanalysis (with Fromm) had spurred a sensibility attuned equally to revolution and counter-revolution.

From 1933 to 1941, while working for the Institute in exile (primarily at Columbia University), Marcuse wrote prolifically for Institute publications, probing totalitarianism, liberalism, culture, and ethics from the vantage point of a blend of theories unique to the Frankfurt School: Karl Marx on alienation, Max Weber on authority, and Sigmund Freud on sado-masochism. The writings of this period, while far from optimistic, remained cautiously and tenaciously hopeful about the realistic prospect of a revived socialism. But in the next period, under the pressure of war, the Institute circle (and world view) began to fracture and darken.

In 1942, not long after publishing a major philosophical work titled *Reason and Revolution* on Hegel, Marx, and dialectics, Marcuse left the Institute to become a wartime intelligence analyst in the Office of Strategic Services, focusing mainly on Germany. Here Marcuse's outlook darkened even further. Influenced by an eclectic mix of popular psychosocial theories (Frederick Taylor's theory of scientific management, behaviorist industrial psychology, and Jünger's theory of the mass *worker*), Marcuse's world view underwent a subtle metamorphosis. Now, instead of seeing alienation and liberation as partial, intertwined tendencies, he began to portray both as absolute – and as absolute opposites. This became strikingly clear in the series of influential books that he wrote after leaving government for academia: *Eros and Civilization* (1955), *Soviet Marxism* (1958), *One-Dimensional Man* (1964), and *An Essay on Liberation* (1969). Carefully examined, these books reveal a dual structure: an opening half, arguing that alienation is total, the working class is totally coopted and controlled, unions and parties are "totally mobilized" for the status quo, capitalism is impregnable, and realistic hope for resistance is nearly nil; followed by a second half in which Marcuse insists, in jarringly different style, that a utopian future, including a "permanent revolution of nature and the senses," can be attained by an aesthetically and erotically non-repressive "Great Refusal." Some of these totalizing claims

mutated slightly in Marcuse's later texts, written in the final decade of his life, after the New Left rose, flared, and exploded. But the core tension in his thinking remained clear to the end: an unblinkingly negative vision of a world portrayed as totally alienated, coupled with an absolute refusal to accept alienation. From this tension was born a surprisingly complex body of work.

At the time of his death in 1979, Marcuse was perhaps the most controversial philosopher in the world. He had risen from the shade of a government bureaucracy to a worldwide reputation as what *Time* magazine called "the guru of the New Left." Students and disciples such as Rudi Dutschke and Angela Davis won international notoriety for their radicalism. Marcuse was no less visible, vehemently protesting against the Vietnam War while sketching his pessimistic yet prophetic vision. Subsequently, the luster of his reputation has dimmed considerably. But Marcuse is still vividly remembered as an archetype, and paragon, of intellectual radicalism and engagement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hegels Ontologie und die Grundlegung einer Theorie der Geschichtlichkeit (Frankfurt, 1932). Trans. Seyla Benhabib, *Hegel's Ontology and the Theory of Historicity* (Cambridge, Mass., 1987).

Reason and Revolution: Hegel and the Rise of Social Theory (New York, 1941).

Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud (Boston, 1955).

Soviet Marxism: A Critical Analysis (New York, 1958).

One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society (Boston, 1964).

A Critique of Pure Tolerance, with Robert Paul Wolff and Barrington Moore (Boston, 1965).

Negations: Essays in Critical Theory (Boston, 1968).

An Essay on Liberation (Boston, 1969).

Five Lectures: Psychoanalysis, Politics, and Utopia (Boston, 1970).

Revolution oder Reform? Herbert Marcuse u. Karl Popper. Eine Konfrontation, with Karl Popper (Munich, Germany, 1971). Trans. M. Aylward and A. T. Ferguson, *Revolution or Reform? A Confrontation* (Chicago, 1976).

Counterrevolution and Revolt (Boston, 1972).

Studies in Critical Philosophy (Boston, 1973)

Die Permanenz der Kunst (Munich, Germany, 1977). Trans. Erica Sherover, *The Aesthetic Dimension: Toward a Critique of Marxist Aesthetics* (Boston, 1978).

Other Relevant Works

Marcuse's papers are at the Herbert-Marcuse-Archive, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek Frankfurt am Main, Germany.

"Contributions to a Phenomenology of Historical Materialism" (1928) *Telos* 4 (Fall 1969): 3–34.

"Über konkrete philosophie," *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 62 (1929): 111–28.

"Zur Wahrheitsproblematik der soziologischen Methode," *Die Gesellschaft* 2 (1929): 356–69.

"Transzendentaler Marxismus?" *Die Gesellschaft* 7 (1930): 304–26.

"On the Problem of the Dialectic" (1930–31), *Telos* 27 (Spring 1976): 12–39.

"Das Problem der geschichtlichen Wirklichkeit," *Die Gesellschaft* 8 (1931): 350–67.

"On the Critique of Sociology" (1931), *Mid-American Review of Sociology* 16 (Spring 1992): 15–30.

"On the Philosophical Foundation of the Concept of Labor in Economics" (1933), *Telos* 16 (1973): 9–37.

"Some Social Implications of Modern Technology," *Studies in Philosophy and Social Science* 9 (1941): 414–39.

Schriften, 9 vols (Frankfurt, 1978–).

Technology, War and Fascism: Collected Papers of Herbert Marcuse, Volume 1, ed. Douglas Kellner (London, 1998).

Nachgelassene Schriften, 3 vols to date (Lüneburg, Germany, 1999–).

Towards a Critical Theory of Society: Collected Papers of Herbert Marcuse, Volume 2, ed. Douglas Kellner (London, 2001).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Blackwell Comp Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v7*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v7*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Abromeit, John, and W. Mark Cobb, eds. *Herbert Marcuse: A Critical Reader* (New York, 2004).

Bokina, John, and Timothy J. Lukes, eds. *Marcuse: From the New Left to the Next Left* (Lawrence, Kan., 1994).

Katz, Barry. *Herbert Marcuse and the Art of Liberation: An Intellectual Biography* (London and New York, 1982).

Kellner, Douglas. *Herbert Marcuse and the Crisis of Marxism* (Berkeley, Cal., 1984). Contains a bibliography of Marcuse's writings.

MacIntyre, Alasdair. *Herbert Marcuse: An Exposition and a Polemic* (New York, 1970).

Mattick, Paul. *Critique of Marcuse: One-dimensional Man in Class Society* (New York, 1972).

Nordquist, Joan. *Herbert Marcuse: A Bibliography* (Santa Cruz, Cal., 1988).

Reitz, Charles. *Art, Alienation, and the Humanities: A Critical Engagement with Herbert Marcuse* (Albany, N.Y., 2000).

Wolff, Kurt H., and Barrington Moore, eds. *The Critical Spirit: Essays in Honor of Herbert Marcuse* (Boston, 1967).

David N. Smith

MARGENAU, Henry (1901–97)

Henry Margenau was born on 30 April 1901 in Bielefeld, Germany. From 1914 to 1920 he was trained in public schools and the Herford Teachers College to be a teacher. He emigrated to the United States in 1922 to attend Midland College in Texas, earning a BA in 1924. He received an MSc from the University of Nebraska in 1927. He joined the Yale University physics faculty as an instructor in 1928, received his PhD in physics from Yale in 1929, and was promoted up to full professor of physics by 1945. In 1950 he was named the first Eugene Higgins Professor of Physics and Natural Philosophy, and he held that position until retiring in 1969. He was President of the Philosophy of Science Association from 1950 to 1958, and was elected a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Margenau died on 8 February 1997 in Hamden, Connecticut.

Margenau's vast expertise in physics extended from microwave theory to spectroscopy and nuclear physics and many other core research areas. His interests included the philosophical foundations of physics and the philosophy of science more generally. Stimulated by Yale professor F. S. C. NORTHROP and visiting professor Ernst Cassirer in the 1930s, Margenau expanded his philosophical knowledge and was invited by the philosophy department to regularly teach a course in philosophy of physics. After gaining the confidence of Yale's philosophers, in 1946 Margenau became a member of the philosophy department in addition to physics. A person of deep faith, he also was a member of the Commission of the World Council of Churches from 1947 to 1960, and engaged the issue of atomic weapons. His faith in a divine creator was enhanced by his consideration of the otherwise inexplicable origin of the laws of nature. His book *The Miracle of Existence* (1984) collects together his theological arguments for super-naturalism.

Rejecting the possibility of reductively explaining consciousness, Margenau accepted

a mind–body dualism and defended free will. The basic data for physics is therefore phenomenal perception, from which all knowledge of the world is constructed. In *The Nature of Physical Reality: A Philosophy of Modern Physics* (1950), Margenau describes how the concepts of physics are generated from perception using "rules of correspondence," which have a nature similar to that of Northrop's "epistemic correlations" and P. W. Bridgman's "operational" definitions. However, Margenau rejected positivistic instrumentalism and operationalism, expecting that scientific theories will be understood realistically. All scientific principles and categories are both constructed and tested ultimately by perception, even our conceptions of space and time, and so they all have a fallible and revisable status. Margenau attempted to minimize the differences and tensions between the classical and quantum theories, looking to a basic definition of a causal law valid for both theories that simply describes how a future state is determined by a present state.

In *Ethics and Science* (1964), Margenau accepts the "is-ought" distinction that prevents science from generating or justifying moral obligations. Nevertheless, scientific methodology can be applied to ethics, since the distinction between the phenomenal realm and the theoretical construction realm can be found in morality. Margenau attempts to develop an ethical and meta-ethical philosophy by explaining how the satisfaction of a culture's primary (phenomenal) values can serve as the empirical test of a community's moral (theoretical) rules.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Foundations of Physics, with R. B. Lindsay (New York, 1936; 2nd edn 1957).

The Mathematics of Physics and Chemistry, with G. M. Murphy (New York, 1943).

The Nature of Physical Reality: A Philosophy of Modern Physics (New York, 1950).

Thomas and the Physics of 1958: A Confrontation (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1958).

Open Vistas: Philosophical Perspectives of Modern Science (New Haven, Conn., 1961).

Ethics and Science (Princeton, N.J., 1964).

Physics and Philosophy: Selected Essays (Dordrecht, 1978).

Einstein's Space and Van Gogh's Sky: Physical Reality and Beyond, with Lawrence LeShan (New York, 1982).

The Miracle of Existence (Woodbridge, Conn., 1984).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Integrative Principles of Modern Thought* (New York, 1972).

Ed. with R. A. Varghese, *Cosmos, Bios, Theos: Scientists Reflect on Science, God, and the Origins of the Universe, Life, and Homo Sapiens* (La Salle, Ill., 1992).

This is My Life: As a Poor Immigrant, Student, Physicist and Philosopher (Amherst, Mass., 1998).

Further Reading

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, *Who's Who in Phil*

Beck, Lewis White. "On Professor Margenau's Kantianism," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 11 (1951): 568–73.

Grünbaum, Adolf. "Realism and Neo-Kantianism in Professor Margenau's Philosophy of Quantum Mechanics," *Philosophy of Science* 17 (1950): 26–34.

Holcomb, Harmon R., III. "Latency versus Complementarity: Margenau and Bohr on Quantum Mechanics," *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 37 (1986): 193–206.

Laszlo, Ervin, and Emily B. Sellon, eds. *Vistas in Physical Reality: A Festschrift for Henry Margenau* (New York, 1976).

Werkmeister, William H. "Professor Margenau and the Problem of Physical Reality," *Philosophy of Science* 18 (1951): 183–92.

John R. Shook

MARGOLIS, Joseph Zalman (1924–)

Joseph Margolis was born on 16 May 1924 in Newark, New Jersey. He received his MA in philosophy in 1950, followed by his PhD in philosophy in 1953, both from Columbia University. His dissertation was titled "The Art of Freedom: An Essay in Ethical Theory." Margolis taught philosophy at numerous institutions including Long Island University (1947–56), the University of South Carolina (1956–8), the University of Cincinnati (1960–64), and the University of Western Ontario (1965–7). Since 1968, he has been a professor of philosophy at Temple University, where he has held the title of Laura H. Carnell Professor of Philosophy since 1991. He has also been visiting professor at Northwestern University, the University of California at Berkeley, the University of Toronto, and New York University. Margolis is a member of several national and international philosophical organizations, and served as President of the American Society for Aesthetics (1987–9). He also holds the title of Honorary Lifetime Member of the International Association of Aesthetics. He has served on the editorial boards of many journals including *American Philosophical Quarterly* and *The Monist*.

Margolis has made substantial contributions to many areas of philosophy including metaphysics, epistemology, philosophy of science, philosophy of history, aesthetics, and ethics. Margolis takes seriously Nietzsche's proclamations upon the death of God and the sickness of "nihilism," attempting to dwell in the conceptual space that lies between them. Perhaps the most fundamental unifying theme in Margolis's philosophical reflections is his defense of the doctrine of "the flux." This signifies his basic alignment with the strain of Western philosophical thinking that emphasizes change as opposed to permanence, becoming as opposed to being, or, in terminology favored by Margolis, historicity as opposed to invariance. He argues that defense

of the flux includes as constituent elements emphases on the importance of praxis, on the historicity of human beings (including their cognitive capacities), and on the denial of cognitive transparency and privilege. The emphasis on praxis signifies that "theory, science, cognition itself are guided by the largely tacit, biologically grounded activities of human societies seeking to survive and reproduce their numbers, always in accord with the contingent pattern of life of particular cultures" (*Pragmatism without Foundations*, 1986, p. xviii). The emphasis on the historicity of human beings and their cognitive capacities signifies that man is "in some profound sense formed by, a creature of and embodying, an historical language and culture, and that therefore his cognitive and praxical concerns are oriented and limited by the historical horizon of his own particular culture" (*Pragmatism without Foundations*, 1986, p. xviii). Acknowledgment of the historicity of human beings and their cognitive capacities, in turn, leads Margolis to reject the cognitive transparency of the world. He opposes the thesis that "there is a determinate match or adequation between the cognizable properties of the real world and the cognizing powers of the human mind such that the distributed truths of science or of other disciplined inquires may be assured that the inquiring mind does not, by its very effort, distort or alter or fail to grasp the world's independent (cognizable) structure …" (*Pragmatism without Foundations*, 1986, p. xvi). Margolis argues that once we deny cognitive transparency and cognitive privilege, all explicit or implicit appeals to invariance – whether in the form of appeals to nomological necessities, essences, bivalence, the law of excluded middle, etc. – become philosophically suspect. For Margolis, "if the human 'subject' is a 'product' of historical forces, then all the presumptions of ideal or asymptotic invariance collapse at once" (1993, p. 95).

Margolis argues that the crucial issue is not whether first-order inquires posit some form of invariance as part of their ongoing investigations and methodologies, but rather the modal status

of such posits. In other words, the interesting issue concerns the second-order legitimative issue of whether first-order posits of invariance are understood to be necessary. He writes that

The issue is not whether there are invariances: there are always 'indicative' uniformities, first-order invariances within the apparent world that promise to be as stable as you please – death and taxes, for instance. The point is rather that it is not conceptually necessary to assume that such 'indicative' regularities also embody strict epistemic or ontic invariances that cannot, on pain of incoherence or contradiction, be denied. The rejection of legitimative necessities (second-order philosophical necessities) violates no known rule of reason or reality … (1993, p. 113)

Margolis holds that a genuine defense of the flux, including an emphasis on praxis, an emphasis on the historicity of human beings and of human thinking, and a rejection of cognitive transparency and privilege, is incompatible with all appeals to "privileged neutrality, objectivity, universality, apodicticity, apriority, or modal necessity" (1996, p. 7). He characterizes his denial of invariance as "a philosophical 'bet,' a pragmatic, negative conjecture to the effect that no such invariance *will be* successfully sustained" (1989, p. 187). The denial of invariance is not put forward as an invariant modally necessary thesis. By treating the denial of invariance as a bet, Margolis aims to formulate his position so that it avoids traditional self-referential paradoxes.

If we reject cognitive privilege and modal invariance, can we avoid some form of cognitive anarchy, nihilism, or skepticism? If we reject cognitive privilege (essentialism, foundationalism, objectivism, etc.) and accompanying appeals to invariance (nomological necessities, essences, bivalence, the law of excluded middle, etc.), can we retain any sense of cognitive rigor (objectivity)? Furthermore, can we hold onto the notion of second-order legitimation of our first-order inquiries? Margolis views these as the central questions confronting both his own philosophy as well as contemporary philosophy in general. His answers are all affirmative, while trying to neither relapse into assertions of cognitive privilege nor recoil into nihilism pragmatism without foundations.

Margolis's view is pragmatic in the sense that it secures realism by emphasizing praxis and the survival of the species. It is undeniable that we act and survive by relying on those cognitive powers that we, in fact, exercise and possess. For Margolis, this is a sufficient basis for vindicating realism, minimally the view that "the capacity of human beings to sustain and discipline an investigation into what they take to be the real world – and, doing that, to state what is true about the world – is a capacity justifiably affirmed" (*Pragmatism without Foundations*, 1986, p. xiv). This vindication of realism is only a general view, and does not operate so as to vindicate any specific truth-claims within any particular domain of inquiry.

Margolis's view is without foundations in the sense that in addition to the denials of transparency, privilege, and modal invariance, it also includes the endorsement of what we might call an internal vindication of distributed truth-claims. In other words, distributed truth-claims, i.e., particular truth-claims, put forth within a particular domain of inquiry, are justified to the best of our lights and by appeal to principles, methods, theories, and so on that are internal to that form of inquiry. There is no capacity to step outside of first-order inquiry in order to grasp a neutral set of rules, principles, frameworks, etc., that can then be used to assess the adequacy of our first-order inquiry. Second-order legitimative inquiry, while distinct from first-order inquiry, is bound by the same constraints imposed on all forms of inquiry – namely, constraints that flow from the flux, the historicity of human beings, and the rest. Though he views these levels of inquiry as indissolubly linked (there being no first-order inquiry without second-order reflection on and attempts to legitimate first-order inquiry), there is no cognitive privilege to be had at either level.

Margolis urges that any sustained and plausible philosophical reflection concerning our cognitive relation to reality reveals an indissoluble combination of realist and idealist elements. The great mistake of those who defend the traditional correspondence theory of truth, for example, consists in their inability to recognize the unavoidability of this symbiosis. He writes that "I cannot, however, meaningfully ask whether the linguistic categories we do apply to the things of the world, in ways that may be learned, really do correspond to the things of the world – the question could only be answered by stepping outside of language altogether and, *per impossibile*, viewing, in a linguistically inexpressible way, the congruence between language and the world." (1966, p. 66)

Margolis holds that one lesson we learn from early modern philosophy is that insistence on a sharp distinction between ontology and epistemology (realism and idealism) can avoid skepticism only by appealing (explicitly or implicitly) to cognitive transparency and/or cognitive privilege. He argues that once we reject epistemic transparency and all forms of cognitive privilege, "no realism suited to rigorous inquiry … can escape the limitation that the world we inquire into is not cognitively accessible in any way that would support a disjunction between it and whatever *we* identify as the world we inquire into … . We may inquire into an independent world but we cannot state its nature as it is independently of our inquiries." (1987, p. 8)

Rigorous objective inquiry does not require modal invariance, whether that modal invariance is grounded in the nature of reality (the prejudice of the ancients) or in the nature of reason (the prejudice of the moderns). The rejection of all forms of cognitive transparency and privilege need not force us to recoil into some form of nihilism, skepticism, anarchism and the like. Instead, Margolis argues that successful navigation between these two extremes requires that we adopt a form of relativism. He calls his own version of relativism "robust rel-

ativism." He distinguishes robust relativism from the form of relativism that one typically encounters in the Western philosophical tradition, a form he terms "relationalism." He distinguishes the two as follows: "[Relationalism holds that] truth-values or truth-like values are themselves relativized or, better, *relationalized*, so that (for instance) 'true' is systematically replaced by 'true in L_k' (for some particular language, perspective, habit of mind, social practice, convention or the like, selected from among a set of relevant alternatives ['k'] that might well yield otherwise inconsistent, incompatible, contradictory values when judged in accord with the usual canonical bivalent values ('true' and 'false'), themselves taken to range over all such k's …. [Robust relativism, on the other hand, holds that] bivalent values are systematically replaced in a formal way by a logically weaker set of many-valued truth-values or truth-like values; so that, where, on the bivalent model, logical inconsistency or contradiction obtains, now, on the replacement model and in accord with appropriate relevance constrains, such logical incongruences (as we may call them) need no longer be treated as full logical inconsistencies, incompatibilities, contradictions, or the like …" (1991, p. 8)

Relationalism maintains that while particular claims are to be assessed in relation to given languages, perspectives, habits of mind, social practices, conventions and the like, these languages, perspectives, and the rest still stand under the canonical bivalent values. It is the maintenance of the canonical bivalent values that quickly leads to the generation of self-referential paradoxes and contradictions, historically thought to infect all forms of relativism. Robust relativism, on the contrary, avoids these formal criticisms by eliminating the canonical bivalent values, at least in certain domains of inquiry. The key to robust relativism is its claim that "decisions about the logic of any inquiry are not unconditionally a priori to that inquiry …. They are instead internal to and part of the cognitively pertinent characterization of the domain itself." (1991, p. 42)

Robust relativism does not entail the rejection of bivalence and excluded middle across *all* domains; rather, it simply requires that we remain open to the possibility of their rejection within specific domains of inquiry. It holds that in certain domains of inquiry (such as interpretations of art works, human history, high-order theories in physics and metaphysics), our best understanding of and truth-claims about a given sector of reality may well require the rejection of bivalence and the law of excluded middle and the adoption, instead, of "logically weaker, many-valued claims (as of plausibility, reasonableness, aptness and the like) if we are to salvage a measure of objectivity with respect to the inquiries of those sectors" (1987, p. 21). Opposition to robust relativism, therefore, must take issue with its substantive characterization of a particular domain of inquiry. Robust relativism cannot be defeated on formal grounds alone.

Given that robust relativism requires that we focus on substantive claims about the nature of certain domains of inquiry, Margolis holds that "relativism is not only not opposed to realism, but its advocates are positively committed to realism …" (*Pragmatism without Foundations*, 1986, p. 111). Furthermore, there is a conception of objectivity that remains available under robust relativism: "What is objective in the way of knowledge is, primarily, what is both salient and difficult to deny or eliminate, not merely in terms of our first-order inquiries but also at every level of critical or transcendental reflection upon whatever appears to be thus disclosed." (1987, pp. 103–104) According to Margolis, one thing that is both salient and difficult to deny is the implausibility of insisting that bivalence govern our thinking about every domain of inquiry. The reorientation that Margolis is trying to effectuate requires that our understanding of objectivity be revised. Many, under the influence of the dominant strands of Western philosophical thinking, will take this revision to be equivalent to surrender. He instead holds that revising our concept of objectivity in the way he counsels "is not to fall away from a stricter canon, as many suppose" because "there is no such canon, but there is objectivity enough for all our needs" (*Selves and Other Texts*, 2001, p. 150).

Margolis views robust relativism as a positive theory about human cognition: "Relativism is an affirmative doctrine, a positive claim about the conditions for successful truth-claims. It is, in a sense, a *strong theory* that favors *logically weak truth-claims* by which skepticism may be offset." (1991, p. 7) Robust relativism is not a skeptical, anarchistic, or nihilistic position. The key to harmonizing relativism and realism (objectivity) is the claim that "the nature of the questions raised, the properties of the entities or phenomena under examination, the very structure of the disciplines in question disallow resorting to a bipolar model of truth values" (*Pragmatism without Foundations*, 1986, p. 131). Margolis argues that robust relativism is particularly well suited for the realm of human culture – i.e., our understanding of human selves and, by extension, cultural phenomena like art works. He sharply distinguishes between cultural entities and physical entities. The former are as real as the latter, but "possess inherently distinctive structures – 'Intentional' or culturally significant, intrinsically interpretable structures – that mere physical entities simply lack." (*Selves and Other Texts*, 2001, p. 35) Under the rubric of "intentional structures" (or "intentional properties"), he includes "the linguistically and lingually meaningful, the representational, the expressive, the institutionally purposive or rulelike, the intentional and intensional as manifestations of cultural formation, the symbolic, the semiotic, the rhetorical, the stylistic, the traditional, the historical, the narrative" (*Selves and Other Texts*, 2001, p. 160). Margolis argues that sustained efforts within contemporary analytic philosophy to reduce intentional structures to nonintentional structures or to eliminate intentional structures from our understanding of cultural entities are misguided and that the arguments provided on behalf of such efforts are unpersuasive. Margolis rejects all forms of reductive and eliminative physicalism.

Margolis simultaneously argues that although the possession of intentional properties sharply distinguishes cultural entities from physical entities, acceptance of this sharp distinction does not entail a commitment to dualism (such as Cartesian mind–body dualism). Instead, he argues for the plausibility of a position he terms "embodiment" in which intentional structures are deemed to be incarnate in some physical entities. Appeal to embodiment is offered as a way to recognize "a profound ontic difference between what is culturally real and what is physically real – without … invoking dualism" (*Selves and Other Texts*, 2001, pp. 133–4). The view that cultural phenomena (intentional structures), including selves, are embodied in physical phenomena consists in the conjunction of the following theses: (1) cultural phenomena are "emergent" with respect to physical and biological nature; (2) cultural phenomena exhibit certain "sui generis" properties – intentional properties; (3) these intentional properties are indissolubly embodied in ("incarnate in") the properties of their embodying medium; and (4) since the embodied and embodying entities share physical/biological properties, we may speak of one particular's instantiating another (*Selves and Other Texts*, 2001, p. 134).

Margolis argues that robust relativism is a compelling philosophical position "in realist contexts wherever entities possess Intentional natures" (*Selves and Other Texts*, 2001, p. 107). Human culture is such a context and within that larger context, art supplies us with a paradigmatic example of how cultural entities, due to their possession of intentional structures, require that we abandon bivalent logic. When we reflect on interpretations of art works, we find that "there is no way to ensure a uniquely valid interpretation for any particular work" (*Selves and Other Texts*, 2001, p. 105). For example, "the interpretation of *Hamlet* supports (in some sense, rigorously or objectively) incongruent readings. It's in the nature of dramatic literature, we say, that that option may be preferred." (1991, p. 21)

The reality of cultural entities requires that we resist and abandon one of the strongest prejudices within the philosophy of science – the "unity of the sciences" program. The unity of the sciences program holds that the paradigm of objectivity is supplied by basic physics and that "with noticeably modest accommodation that paradigm method may be fitted to the entire variety of more complex sciences, ranging from chemistry and biology to psychology, sociology, history, linguistics, and perhaps literary criticism" (1987, p. xvi). Margolis argues that there are no compelling arguments that force us to view our inquiries into basic physics (or physical nature more broadly) as paradigmatic and controlling for all other inquiries. He does not deny the existence of scientific methodology, but he does reject the idea that there is a "method separable from – transcendentally, timelessly, invariantly applied to, necessarily and normatively appropriate for – any and every contingent historical practice addressed to the question of the truth about the world" (1993, p. 48). Not only should we abandon the prejudice that our inquiries into physical nature supply us with the paradigm of objective inquiry, we also should remind ourselves that our inquiries into physical nature are, themselves, culturally secured inquiries. Such inquiries get their meaning by their standing within the larger cultural context. Hence, it is important to remind ourselves that our inquiries into physical nature are, themselves, "radically human," their discipline "secured by us" (1987, p. xxi).

Margolis has extended his basic orientation, pragmatism without foundations, to the ethical sphere. He notes a tendency among contemporary moral philosophers (including John RAWLS, Karl-Otto Apel, Alasdair MACINTYRE, Jürgen Habermas, and Hans-Georg Gadamer) to retreat to a form of privilege. This retreat amounts to their abandoning "the themes of history and praxis that are now being taken up (however thinly) by mainstream theories in the philosophy of science" (1996, p. 4). One motivation for their retreat to privilege is their

inability to see how moral objectivity could be vindicated in any other way. What these contemporary thinkers believe is that "truth and objectivity are mortally threatened by the existential notion that the rational capacity to judge is itself an artifact of cultural formation" (1996, pp. 40–41). While the motivation for invoking some form of invariance is clear, Margolis argues that "the legitimizing arguments are hardly to be found" (1996, p. 4). Rawls, for example, continues to hold that there are certain invariant truths about human reason and that the original position enables us to spot the invariance. In this sense, Rawls continues to exempt something from the unfolding of history in an attempt to ground morality and moral objectivity. What Rawls fails to consider or counter is the objection that practical reason, itself, "may … be a 'construction' or artifact of social history" (1996, p. 29). Hence, "Rawls betrays the insoluble *aporia* of every constructivism that makes justice an artifact of a rational or reasonable process but does not consider *whether reason (a fortiori, the 'reasonable') is itself an artifact of history* as well." (1996, p. 114)

Margolis proposes several general yet substantive moral principles for our consideration. He terms one principle "summum malum." This principle calls attention to the fact that human beings are "most affected by the most extreme and prolonged suffering of whole populations or relatively large groups, under circumstances that they cannot control or much mitigate … for instance, those having to do with disease, hunger, starvation … enslavement, concentration camps, annihilation, the disorganization of family life, and the like" (1996, p. 215). Margolis suggests that we attempt to construct a morality around such general principles. Legitimization of such principles must be internal to human moral thinking itself. Furthermore, the fact that multiple moralities could be constructed upon the basis of such principles and that each could be reasonable or appropriate is something we should expect, not fear. The availability of a variety of plausible fundamental principles and moralities is what we are likely to find when we attempt to dwell between invariance and nihilism.

Over the course of his many writings, Joseph Margolis tackles a wide array of philosophical topics. His writings are unified by the philosophical orientation of pragmatism without foundations, which tries to sustain some variant of traditional values like truth, knowledge, and epistemic justification without following the traditional Western way of appealing to invariance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Language of Art and Art Criticism: Analytic Questions in Aesthetics (Detroit, 1965).

Psychotherapy and Morality: A Study of Two Concepts (New York, 1966).

Values and Conduct (Oxford, 1971).

Knowledge and Existence: An Introduction to Philosophical Problems (New York, 1973).

Negativities: The Limits of Life (Columbus, Ohio, 1975).

Persons and Minds: The Prospects of Nonreductive Materialism (Dordrecht, 1978).

Art and Philosophy (Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1980).

Culture and Cultural Entities: Toward a New Unity of Science (Dordrecht, 1984).

Philosophy of Psychology (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1984).

Pragmatism without Foundations: Reconciling Realism and Relativism (Oxford, 1986).

Psychology: Designing the Discipline, with P. Manicas, R. Harré, and P. Secord (Oxford, 1986).

Science without Unity: Reconciling the Human and Natural Sciences (Oxford, 1987).

Texts without Referents: Reconciling Science and Narrative (Oxford, 1989).

The Truth about Relativism (Oxford, 1991).

The Flux of History and the Flux of Science

(Berkeley, Cal., 1993).

Historied Thought, Constructed World: Conceptual Primer for the Turn of the Millennium (Berkeley, Cal., 1995).

Interpretation Radical but not Unruly: The New Puzzle of the Arts and History (Berkeley, Cal., 1995).

Life without Principles: Reconciling Theory and Practice (Cambridge, 1996).

What, After All, Is a Work of Art? Lectures in the Philosophy of Art (University Park, Penn., 1999).

The Quarrel between Invariance and Flux: A Guide for Philosophers and Other Players, with Jacques Catudal (Philadelphia, 2001).

Selves and Other Texts: The Case for Cultural Realism (University Park, Penn., 2001).

Reinventing Pragmatism: American Philosophy at the End of the Twentieth Century (Ithaca, N.Y., 2002).

The Unraveling of Scientism: American Philosophy at the End of the Twentieth Century (Ithaca, N.Y., 2003).

Moral Philosophy after 9/11 (University Park, Penn., 2004).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with R. Burian and M. Krausz, *Rationality, Relativism, and the Human Sciences* (Dordrecht, 1986).

"Reconciling Analytic and Feminist Philosophy and Aesthetics," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 48 (1990): 327–35.

"Exorcising the Dreariness of Aesthetics," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 51 (1993): 133–40.

Ed. with Tom Rockmore, *The Philosophy of Interpretation* (Oxford, 2000).

Ed. with Tom Rockmore and Armen Marsoobian, *The Philosophical Challenge of September 11* (Oxford, 2003).

Ed. with John R. Shook, *The Blackwell Companion to Pragmatism* (Oxford, 2005).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils

Carr, David. "Margolis and the Philosophy of History," *Man and World* 30 (1997): 139–44.

Danto, Arthur C. "Indiscernibility and Perception: A Reply to Joseph Margolis," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 39 (1999): 321–9.

Jaquette, Dale. "Margolis on Emergence and Embodiment," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 44 (1986): 257–61.

———, "Type-Token Distinction in Margolis's Aesthetics," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 52 (1994): 299–307.

Krausz, Michael, and Richard Shusterman, eds. *Interpretation, Relativism, and the Metaphysics of Culture: Themes in the Philosophy of Joseph Margolis* (New York, 1999).

<div align="right">Robert E. Money, Jr.</div>

MARHENKE, Paul (1899–1952)

Born on 5 January 1899 in Leibniz's hometown of Hannover, Germany, Paul Marhenke emigrated to California with his parents at the age of fourteen. After graduation from Pasadena High School, he entered the University of California at Berkeley to study mathematics and philosophy. He received his BA degree in 1919, his MA in 1922, and his PhD in philosophy in 1927. His dissertation was titled "A Relativistic Theory of Perception, Being a Solution of the Problem of Perception on the Basis of the Relativity of Space and Time."

In 1927 Marhenke was appointed as an instructor in philosophy at Berkeley, and rose through the academic ranks, eventually becoming professor of philosophy in 1947. He was President of the American Philosophical

Association Pacific Division in 1949–50. He was appointed chair of the philosophy department in 1952, just months before his untimely death at age fifty-three on 29 February 1952 in Berkeley, California.

Marhenke's publications included works on topics such as reference, mind, and the ontology of relations. They demonstrate not only his primary interests in the fields of analytic metaphysics, semantics, and logic, but also the breadth and scope of his scholarly interests and concerns. He had an early understanding and analysis of A. N. WHITEHEAD and Bertrand Russell's *Principia Mathematica*. Yet he was also an authority on Hume, and had expertise in the classics, as well as contemporary philosophy and science. Marhenke was a beloved colleague and teacher. His colleagues appreciated his infectious enthusiasm, scholarly rigor, humor, and friendliness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Problem of Error," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 10 (1928): 141–74.
"Belief and Fact," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 11 (1929): 167–98.
"The Reality of Relations," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 13 (1930): 165–87.
"Fact and Descriptive Reference," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 14 (1932): 117–48.
"The Constituents of Mind," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 19 (1936): 169–208.
"Possibility and Significance," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 17 (1934): 153–75.
"McTaggart's Analysis of Time," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 18 (1935): 149–73.
"Hume's View of Identity," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 20 (1937): 155–80.
"Rationality and Irrationality," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 21 (1939): 151–79.
"Propositions and Sentences," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 25 (1950): 271–98.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v5, *Proc of APA v26*

Shannon Kincaid

MARITAIN, Jacques (1882–1973)

Jacques Maritain was born on 18 November 1882 in Paris, France, and died on 28 April 1973 in Toulouse, France. He was the son of Paul Maritain, a prominent lawyer, and Geneviève Favre. His mother is thought to be the first woman to divorce her husband after Napoleon's divorce laws were restored in 1884. She brought him up in a privileged, *haute bourgeois* family headed by her father, Jules Favre, a founder of the Third Republic, which completed the secularization of French life begun by the Revolution of 1789. Teenage rebellion led Jacques to sympathize with the proletariat rather than his own class. At Lycée Henri IV during 1898–9, he befriended Ernest Psichari, grandson of Ernest Renan, secularist and religious skeptic. Maritain attended the Sorbonne from 1899 to 1902, during the high tide of positivism there, receiving licenses in philosophy and science. He also met Charles Péguy, a journalist and socialist and, in 1901, Raïssa Oumansoff (b. 12 September 1883). Her family had fled Jewish persecution in Russia and her brilliance won dispensation from the Sorbonne's minimum age requirement. All four converted to Catholicism.

In 1902, Jacques and Raïssa became engaged. In the *Jardin des Plantes* they agreed the science dispensed by the Sorbonne was "but death and dust" leading to "metaphysi-

cal anguish." They would either find a truth that could deliver them from "the nightmare of a sinister and useless world" or "commit suicide" so as to "die by a free act if it were impossible to live according to the truth" (R. Maritain 1942, pp. 72–8; J. Maritain, "Preface" 1928, p. xvii). Like Augustine's conversion, theirs would move to religion through philosophy. In the academic year 1903–1904, the "exultant quartette" of Jacques, Raïssa, Péguy, and Psichari attended lectures at the Collège de France by Henri Bergson, who offered a philosophy with "a sense of the absolute." On 26 November 1904 Jacques and Raïssa married. The young couple read Léon Bloy's novel *The Woman Who Was Poor* – which ends, "There is but one sadness, which is not to be one of the saints" – where "for the first time we found ourselves before the reality of Christianity" (R. Maritain 1942, p. 105). Jacques, Raïssa, and Véra – Raïssa's sister who lived with them until her death – converted to Catholicism on 11 June 1906, with Bloy as godfather. Then they moved to Heidelberg, where Jacques studied biology under Hans Driesch from 1906 to 1908. After returning to Paris, under the spiritual direction of priest Humbert Clérissac, first Raïssa, then Jacques experienced a "luminous flood" from encountering Aquinas's *Summa theologiae* and his establishment of God as the ultimate end of human life.

Maritain began teaching as professor of philosophy at Lycée Stanislaus in Paris from 1912 to 1914. He then moved to the Institut Catholique de Paris, where Maritain was first appointed assistant to the chair of the history of modern philosophy in 1914. He became full professor in 1921, and later was appointed to the chair of logic and cosmology, which he held from 1928 to 1939. World War I was especially trying for Maritain, who volunteered for service repeatedly, but was rejected for health reasons. Psichari and Péguy were killed in 1914. Maritain corresponded with Pierre Villard, a French officer who was killed in 1918, leaving most of his large fortune to

Maritain and Charles Maurras, leader of Action Française, for helping him through a spiritual crisis brought on by the war. This bequest allowed Maritain to teach when he chose, and his academic appointments were peripheral to his duties as public intellectual and author. In 1923 he purchased a house at 10 rue du Parc, Meudon, a suburb of Paris; there, Jacques and Raïssa hosted Sunday afternoon meetings, and eventually annual lecture-retreats, of the Thomist Circle they started in 1919. These events were extremely popular, and their guests created a Catholic renaissance in France. Here were Maritain's real students and the audience for his books, which were never addressed to professional philosophers. Maritain taught periodically at Étienne GILSON's Institute for Mediaeval Studies in Toronto from 1933 to 1945. He also had appointments at Columbia University from 1941 to 1944 and at Princeton University in 1941–2 and 1948–52. During this time he lectured at several universities, including Notre Dame and Chicago.

With *Distinguer pour unir, ou Les Degrés du Savoir* (1932) Maritain finally resolved the conflicts among science, philosophy, and religion he had lived through since 1902. He replaced the "either-or" of the positivists at the Sorbonne with a "both-and" drawn from materials in Aquinas. Aquinas provided Maritain a standpoint from which to argue that science did not replace philosophy and religion, but coexisted with them. Thus, "according to the principles of St. Thomas Aquinas, there can be *two* complementary knowledges of one and the same reality which is the world of sensible nature and of movement: the sciences of nature and the philosophy of nature" (*Distinguish to Unite* 1959, p. 202). But Maritain did not stop here, for beyond physics lies the "majesty and poverty" of metaphysics. Its poverty is that metaphysics is useless for offering data to science. But its majesty is that "metaphysics puts order" in "the speculative and practical intellect"; it is "good in and for itself" because of its "tran-

scendental object"; and finally it opens the mind to the realm of "supra-rational knowledge" above it. For there are "three wisdoms," not one: the philosophical wisdom of metaphysics; the wisdom of sacred theology known to Augustine and Aquinas; and the wisdom of mystical experience, exemplified by St. John of the Cross. Maritain's book spelled the death of positivism, for he had found a way to embrace the whole range of reason, from the most mundane sciences to mystical contemplation of God.

Distinguish to Unite; or, The Degrees of Knowledge shows how remaining deeply faithful to Aquinas freed Maritain to create solutions to contemporary problems, creating thereby a "living Thomism." Maritain positioned himself between Gilson's historically accurate Aquinas and the willingness of the "neo-scholastics," especially at Louvain, to jettison points essential to Thomism in order to engage contemporary philosophy on its own terms. Consequently, in intramural disputes among Thomists, Maritain repeatedly found himself side by side with Gilson.

Maritain's subsequent books on theoretical philosophy elaborated themes from *Degrees*. *Science et sagesse* (1935) and *Raison et raisons* (1948) clarified its basic conclusions, while *La Philosophie de la nature* (1935) was a step toward realizing the possibility of a modern philosophy of nature. But most of Maritain's efforts were directed toward metaphysics. In *A Preface to Metaphysics* (published in French in 1934, and translated into English in 1939) he clarified how being is the subject of metaphysics. Being has two senses. "The object first attained by the human intellect," described by Cajetan as "being clothed in the diverse natures apprehended by the senses," is not its subject, for "if it were, a child, as soon as he begins to perceive objects intellectually, would already be a metaphysician." That subject is "real being in all the purity and fullness of its distinctive intelligibility – or mystery. Objects, all objects, murmur this being; they utter it to the intellect, but not to all intellects, only to

those capable of hearing." And how does this happen? Through an "intuition of being," an "intellectual perception," "a very simple sight, superior to any discursive reasoning or demonstration." This insight is not a mystical vision of God, but prepares the way for mystical vision at the end of the ladder of the theoretical disciplines. Metaphysics is guided by the principles of "identity," "sufficient reason," and "finality," which help the mind make progress through the "intensive visualization" characteristic of philosophy, different from the linear or "extensive visualization" of science. The field of metaphysics is constituted principally by Thomistic topics: analogy; the transcendentals (unity, truth, goodness); and, above all, "a species of polarity," namely, "between *what* is, that which philosophers term essence or nature, and its *esse*, or existence," a doctrine further developed in *Court traité de l'existence et de l'existant* (1947). In *De la philosophie chrétienne* (1933) Maritain defended the controversial notion of Christian philosophy: "the designation *Christian* which we apply to a philosophy does not refer to that which constitutes it in its *philosophic essence*" but rather to the concrete "manner in which men philosophize," its "Christian state" in the heart of the believing philosopher. Several books developed an aesthetics in which Maritain combined Thomistic principles of beauty with his extensive knowledge of modern art and poetry.

If his spirituality set the ultimate goal of Maritain's life, and his philosophy energized it, his life took its distinctive form or shape from his life as a public intellectual. Here he lived at the intersection of Catholic religion and politics, pursuing "moral philosophy adequately considered," where faith joined philosophy to make reason "adequate" to living "in but not of the world." This most important sphere divides chronologically into Maritain the monarchist, the democrat, and the little brother. Maritain's career as public intellectual was bracketed by his response to two papal interventions: bending his knee to the tough-

minded Pius XI which opened his own tough mind; but sternly and prophetically replying to the less than tough-minded Paul VI.

When Maritain threw off secularism he initially abandoned republicanism, as well, seconded by his spiritual advisor, Fr. Clérissac, who "pitilessly mocked" his left-wing politics as "remains of the old man which should be sloughed off." Maritain turned to Action Française, dedicated to monarchy. Although Maurras was a positivist, Action Française attracted Catholics like Maritain, who were what he later called "integralists." In 1922 Maritain wrote *Antimoderne*, a call to arms against the modern world, and in 1925 exposed the three culprits responsible for modernity in *Trois Réformateurs: Luther, Descartes, Rousseau*. But in 1926 Pope Pius XI condemned Action Française. Maritain immediately obeyed and explained in *Une opinion sur Charles Maurras et le devoir des catholiques* (1926) and *Primauté du spirituel* (1927) that Maurras's slogan "politics first" was incompatible with the Catholic obligation to put "God first."

Pius's condemnation freed Maritain to follow the natural tendencies of his heart leftwards, but only by developing a political theory. *Humanisme intégral* (1936) set out his basic stance, followed by numerous other works. Politics involves people as well as ideas, and Maritain developed principles for making judgments about both. About persons, he, like Pascal, looked to both mind and heart, distinguishing "tough" from "soft minds," and "tender" from "dry hearts" (*Art and Faith*, 1948, pp. 114–15). Maritain knew that he was too "tender-hearted" to be a political or religious leader, but his "tough mind" gave him the strength to judge ideas and movements. This evaluation explains his vehemence for truth, since "it does not belong to us, we belong to it," and also his charity and magnetic personality. About political ideas, Maritain began with "finality," the human good. He had earlier concentrated exclusively on God, the "absolutely final end" toward which the

"vertical movement of history" moves. But this is only half the story; there is also a "horizontal movement of history" toward a "relatively final end," not God but justice toward neighbor and stewardship over the earth. At the level of human action, Maritain's humanism is "integral" because "both efforts are, in the long run, necessary for one another; but the most necessary is the vertical one" (*On the Philosophy of History*, 1957, pp. 154–5); while at the level of human nature, "man is at once a natural and a supernatural being" (*Integral Humanism*, 1968, p. 10). Maritain then added a realistic complication: his "law" of "two-fold simultaneous progress in good and evil." Along both vertical and horizontal axes, "in certain periods of history what prevails and is predominant is the movement of degradation, in other periods it is the movement of progress. My point is that both exist *at the same time, to one degree or another*." (*On the Philosophy of History*, 1957, p. 47)

Maritain concluded that the twentieth century was the time for democracy, but Christian democracy. Having left the Manichaeism that abandons the horizontal axis for the sake of the vertical alone, Maritain was not about to commit the opposite error, the "anthropocentric illusion" of sacrificing vertical progress for horizontal. "Whatever the regime of political life may be, authority, that is, the right to direct and command, derives from the people, but has its primary source in the Author of nature." (*Man and the State*, 1951, p. 27) Consequently, he rejected fascism and Russian communism, as well as capitalism. Fascism confused vertical with horizontal by attributing a divine "sovereignty" to the state; communism sacrificed justice to an illusory "paradise on earth of goodness." Particular applications followed: in the 1930s Maritain supported neither side in the Spanish Civil War; condemned the Italian invasion of Ethiopia; and signed the manifesto "For the Common Good" against a fascist takeover in France. During World War II, the

Maritains were in North America, working tirelessly for the Allied cause. His natural law theory led Maritain to argue for the list of rights incorporated in the 1948 United Nations Declaration on Human Rights, but he sagely advised against codifying reasons for them, since at the level of arguments insurmountable disputes would arise.

After the war, Maritain served as French Ambassador to the Holy See from 1945 to 1948, and then returned to Princeton to teach until 1952. He divided his time between France and the United States during the rest of the 1950s. On 1 January 1960, Véra died, and Maritain and Raïssa returned to France. After Raïssa's death on 4 November 1960, Maritain retired from the world, staying in Toulouse with the Little Brothers of Jesus (and becoming one of them in 1970) until his death in 1973.

In December 1965, Pope Paul VI ended Vatican Council II by summoning Maritain to Rome for public acclamation, implying that Vatican Council II had enacted Maritain's vision for the Church; but Maritain saw things differently. Maritain returned to Toulouse and wrote *Le Paysan de la Garonne* (1966), a scathing indictment of weaknesses in the Council. Maritain prefaced his indictment with a few positive pages: "For everything the Council has decreed and accomplished, I give thanks," taking special "joy" in the Church's opening to freedom, to brotherhood with non-Christians, to laymen, and to "the temporal mission of the Christian," though not, he added, of "the Church, which is occupied solely with the spiritual domain." To explain the problems he saw, Maritain reverted to his "double law" of "progress in good and evil" and singled out three classes of protagonists: "good" are those honest seekers of truth who have left behind "the rationalist and positivist visions of the universe," done in by thinkers like Gilson and himself. Filled with "immense religious aspirations," they are poised on the verge of a new realism in thought and action. But standing in the way of progress are two groups of *periti*: there are "neo-modernist"

theologians who engage in "a kind of 'immanent' apostasy, that is, one which intends to remain Christian at all costs," so inferior to the honest atheists who taught Maritain at the Sorbonne. They "falsely" invoke "the spirit of the Council" or even "the spirit of John XXIII." Maritain's distinction between a false "spirit of Vatican II" and the Council itself has remained fundamental for all subsequent considerations of Vatican II. Also evil are "men of science" who "speak like Pilate," asking "What is truth?" without wanting to find it. These are philosophers and scientists who have eschewed realism and, leading the first group astray, "betray the Gospel by dint of serving it" (*The Peasant of the Garonne*, 1968, pp. 1–11).

Maritain then provides a catalogue of errors analyzed by the *paysan* with prophetic precision: the "chronolatry," or idolatry of "contemporary currents of thought," where the Cartesian value of originality has replaced the Thomistic value of truth (chap. 2); the "insane mistake" of "kneeling before the world," which so reduces the vertical to the horizontal that "the world absorbs into itself the kingdom, then it is the world itself which *is* the kingdom of God" so that "it hasn't the slightest need to be saved from above," for achieving justice has replaced achieving salvation (chap. 3); and the abandonment of evangelizing out of a false love of non-Christians (chap. 4). Maritain's most severe critique is reserved for philosophical and theological "evils" (chaps 5–6). For false theologians, "the ultimate purpose of theology, finally, has become no longer Truth but Efficacy" (*The Peasant of the Garonne* 1968, p. 45), which leads directly to abandoning Church doctrine. Also wrong are attempts of contemporary philosophies or psychology to become handmaiden to theology. As an empiriological science, modern psychology cannot offer the "ontological explanations" theology needs. Philosophies like existentialism and phenomenology are not realisms, but have espoused what is most outmoded in modern philosophy,

its idealism; the only two realist philosophies in the twentieth century are Marxism and Thomism. The one hope Maritain saw was that removing canonical requirements might attract thinkers to Thomism "by appealing less to obedience and docility than to the freedom of the intellect in its pursuit of truth" (*The Peasant of the Garonne*, 1968, p. 169). Finally, while the "person" of "the Church herself is *without sin*," the "personnel" of the Church are sinners who should strive to safeguard "the two necessary aids" to salvation, liturgy and contemplative prayer (chap. 7; *On the Church of Christ*, 1973, p. 11). Again, Maritain explored areas that would see intense post-Conciliar problems: personnel, liturgy, and prayer.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

La Philosophie bergsonienne (Paris, 1914). Trans. Mabelle Andison as *Bergsonian Philosophy and Thomism* (New York, 1955).

Art et scholastique (Paris, 1920; 3rd edn 1935). Trans. J. F. Scanlan as *Art and Scholasticism* (New York, 1937).

Antimoderne (Paris, 1922).

Réflexions sur l'intelligence et sur sa vie propre (Paris, 1924; 4th edn 1930).

Trois Réformateurs: Luther, Descartes, Rousseau (Paris, 1925). Trans. as *Three Reformers: Luther, Descartes, Rousseau* (New York, 1936).

Une opinion sur Charles Maurras et le devoir des catholiques (Paris, 1926).

Primauté du spirituel (Paris, 1927). Trans. J. F. Scanlan as *The Things That Are Not Caesar's* (London and New York, 1930).

Le Docteur angélique (Paris, 1930). Trans. J. F. Scanlan as *St. Thomas Aquinas: Angel of the Schools* (London, 1948).

Religion et culture (Paris, 1930; 2nd edn 1946). Trans. J. F. Scanlan as *Religion and Culture* (London, 1931).

Distinguer pour unir, ou Les Degrés du Savoir (Paris, 1932; 4th edn 1946; 7th edn 1963). 4th edn translated by Gerald B. Phelan as *Distinguish to Unite; or, The Degrees of Knowledge* (New York, 1959).

Le Songe de Descartes (Paris, 1932). Trans. Mabelle Andison as *The Dream of Descartes: Together with Some Other Essays* (New York, 1969).

De la philosophie chrétienne (Paris, 1933). Trans. Edward Flannery as *An Essay on Christian Philosophy* (New York, 1955).

Du régime temporel et de la liberté (Paris, 1933). Trans. Richard O'Sullivan as *Freedom in the Modern World* (New York, 1936).

Sept leçons sur l'être et les premiers principes de la raison spéculative (Paris, 1934). Trans. as *A Preface to Metaphysics: Seven Lectures on Being* (New York, 1939).

La Philosophie de la nature: essai critique sur ses frontières et son object (Paris, 1935). Trans. Yves Simon as *Philosophy of Nature* (New York, 1951).

Science et sagesse: suivi d'éclaircissements sur la philosophie morale (Paris, 1935). Trans. Bernard Wall as *Science and Wisdom* (London and New York, 1940).

Lettre sur l'indépendence (Paris, 1935).

Humanisme intégral: Problèmes temporels et spirituels d'une nouvelle chrétienté (Paris, 1936). Trans. as *True Humanism* (London, 1938); trans. Joseph Evans as *Integral Humanism: Temporal and Spiritual Problems of a New Christendom* (New York, 1968).

Les Juifs parmi les nations (Paris, 1938). Trans. as *Antisemitism* (London, 1939) and as *A Christian Looks at the Jewish Question* (New York, 1939).

Situation de la poésie, with Raïssa Maritain (Paris, 1938). Trans. Marshall Suther as *The Situation of Poetry: Four Essays on the Relations between Poetry, Mysticism, Magic, and Knowledge* (New York, 1955).

A Travers le désastre (New York, 1941; Paris, 1945). Translated as *France, My Country, Through the Disaster* (New York, 1941).

Le Crépuscule de la civilisation (Montréal, 1941). Trans. Lionel Landry as *The Twilight of Civilization* (New York, 1943).

Les Droits de l'homme et la loi naturelle (New York, 1942; Paris, 1945). Trans. Doris Anson as *The Rights of Man and Natural Law* (New York, 1943).

Christianisme et démocratie (New York, 1943; Paris, 1945). Trans. Doris Anson as *Christianity and Democracy* (London, 1945).

Education at the Crossroads (New Haven, Conn., 1943). Also published as *L'éducation à la croisée des chemins* (Paris, 1947); rev. edn as *Pour une philosophie de l'education* (Paris, 1959; 3rd edn 1969).

Messages, 1941–1945 (New York and Paris, 1945).

La Personne et le bien commun (Paris, 1947). Trans. John J. Fitzgerald as *The Person and the Common Good* (New York, 1947).

Court traité de l'existence et de l'existant (Paris, 1947). Trans. Lewis Galantière and Gerald Phelan as *Existence and the Existent* (New York, 1957).

Raison et raisons, essais détachés (Paris, 1948). Trans. as *The Range of Reason* (New York, 1952).

Etienne Gilson, philosophe de la chrétienté (Paris, 1949).

La signification de l'athéisme contemporain (Paris, 1949).

Man and the State (Chicago, 1951). Also published as *L'Homme et L'État* (Paris, 1953).

Approches de Dieu (Paris, 1953). Trans. Peter O'Reilly as *Approaches to God* (New York, 1955).

Creative Intuition in Art and Poetry (New York, 1953). Also published as *L'Intuition créatrice dans l'art et dans la poésie* (Paris, 1966).

On the Philosophy of History (New York, 1957). Also published as *Pour une philosophie de l'histoire* (Paris, 1959).

Reflections on America (New York, 1958). Also published as *Réflexions sur l'Amérique* (Paris, 1959).

Liturgie et contemplation, with Raïssa Maritain (Paris, 1959). Trans. as *Liturgy and Contemplation* (New York, 1960).

Le Philosophe dans la cité (Paris, 1960).

La Philosophie morale (Paris, 1960). Trans. Joseph Evans as *Moral Philosophy* (New York, 1964).

Dieu et la permission du mal (Paris, 1963). Trans. Joseph Evans as *God and the Permission of Evil* (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1966).

Carnet de notes (Paris, 1965). Trans. Joseph Evans as *Notebooks* (Albany, N.Y., 1984).

Le Paysan de la Garonne: Un vieux laïc s'interroge à propos du temps présent (Paris, 1966). Trans. Micheal Cuddihy and Elizabeth Hughes as *The Peasant of the Garonne: An Old Layman Questions Himself about the Present Time* (New York, 1968).

L'Église du Christ, la personne de l'Église et son personnel (Paris, 1970). Trans. Joseph Evans as *On the Church of Christ: The Person of the Church and Her Personnel* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1973).

Approches sans entraves (Paris, 1973). Trans. Bernard Doering as *Untrammeled Approaches* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1997).

Other Relevant Works

Maritain's papers are at the Circle d'etudes Jacques et Raïssa Maritain in Molsheim, France, and the Jacques Maritain Center at the University of Notre Dame, Indiana.

"Preface," in *Lettres à Ses Filleuls, Jacques Maritain et Peirre van der Meer de Walcheren*, 2nd edn, by Leon Bloy (Paris, 1928), pp. ix–xix.

Art and Faith: Letters between Jacques Maritain and Jean Cocteau, trans. Jules Coleman (New York, 1948).

The Social and Political Philosophy of

Jacques Maritain, ed. Joseph W. Evans and Leo R. Ward (New York, 1955).

Une Grande Amitié, correspondence 1926–1972, with Julien Green (Paris, 1979). Trans. as *The Story of Two Souls* (New York, 1988).

Oeuvres complètes de Jacques et Raïssa Maritain, 16 vols (Paris and Fribourg, Switzerland, 1982–99).

The Collected Works of Jacques Maritain, 20 vols (proj.), eds Ralph McInerny, Frederick Crosson, and Bernard Doering (Notre Dame, Ind., 1995–).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, Encyc Relig, Oxford Comp Phil, Proc of APA v46, Routledge Encycl Phil, Who Was Who in Amer v5, Who's Who in Phil

Allard, J. L., and P. Germain. *Répertoire bibliographique sur la vie et l'oeuvre de Jacques et Raïssa Maritain* (Ottawa, Canada, 1994).

Bars, H. *Maritain en notre temps* (Paris, 1959).

Doering, B. *Jacques Maritain and the French Catholic Intellectuals* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1983).

Dougherty, Jude P. *Jacques Maritain: An Intellectual Profile* (Washington, D.C., 2003).

Evans, Joseph, ed. *Jacques Maritain: The Man and His Achievement* (New York, 1963).

Fuller, T., and J. Hittinger, ed. *Reassessing the Liberal State: Reading Maritain's Man and the State* (Washington, D.C., 2001).

Gallagher, Donald, and Idella Gallagher. *The Achievement of Jacques and Raïssa Maritain: A Bibliography* (Garden City, N.Y., 1962).

Hudson, D., ed. *Understanding Maritain* (Atlanta, 1987).

McInerny, Ralph. *The Very Rich Hours of Jacques Maritain* (Notre Dame, Ind., 2003).

Maritain, Raïssa. *Les Grandes amitiés: souvenirs* (New York, 1941). Trans. as *We Have Been Friends Together* (New York, 1942).

———, *Les Grandes amitiés: les adventures de la grace* (New York, 1944). Trans. as *Adventures in Grace* (New York, 1945).

———, *Le Journal de Raïssa* (Paris, 1963). Trans. as *Raïssa's Journal* (Albany, N.Y., 1974).

Smith, Brooke W. *Jacques Maritain: Antimodern or Ultramodern?* (New York, 1976).

Sweet, William, ed. *Études maritainiennes–Maritain Studies* (Ottawa, Canada, 1984–).

R. E. Houser

MARQUAND, Allan (1853–1924)

Allan Marquand was born on 10 December 1853 in New York City, and died there on 24 September 1924. He attended St. Paul's School prior to entering the College of New Jersey (now Princeton University), from which he graduated with a BA in 1874 as Latin salutatorian and class president. For the next three years he attended Princeton Theological Seminary and Union Theological Seminary, and was licensed by the New York Presbytery to preach but never was ordained. Instead, under the influence of James McCosh, his interests shifted to logic and philosophy. Marquand attended the University of Berlin from 1877 to 1878, where he was a student of Friedrich Harms, who was especially interested in the history of philosophy and metaphysics, history of logic, and the idealist philosophy of Fichte. Harms was the author of *Die Reform der Logik* (1874) and the posthumously published *Geschichte der Logik* (1881) and *Logik* (1886). Marquand then won a fellowship in philosophy at the newly opened Johns Hopkins University, and received his PhD in philosophy in 1880. He studied primarily with Charles Peirce, and contributed a paper titled "Note on an Eight-term Logic Machine" to the *Studies in Logic* (1883), edited by Peirce.

In 1881 President McCosh called Marquand to Princeton as a lecturer in logic, but Marquand held that post for only two years. The son of wealthy banker and art patron Henry Gurdon Marquand, he had developed a keen intellectual interest in Italian art. In 1883 McCosh appointed him as professor of art history, and in 1890 he became professor of archaeology and history of art, a post which he held until his retirement in 1921. In 1896–7 Marquand was a professor at the American School of Classical Studies in Italy. He also served as Director of the Museum of Historic Art from 1890 to 1921. His research, writing, and administrative work was devoted to the study of archaeology and art history, with particular attention to a number of otherwise obscure artists of the Italian Renaissance, in particular the members of the della Robbia family of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. He spent nearly a decade of research before producing his first monograph, on Greek architecture (1909), an indication of his painstaking, laborious efforts and his attention to detail. He is credited with elevating art and art history into viable university fields.

While at Johns Hopkins, Marquand made his first important contributions to logic and to mechanized logical operations. Peirce had already been the first to recognize the connection between Boolean algebra and electric switch circuits, and encouraged Marquand to explore machine logic. In 1881 Marquand was the first American to design a logic machine. He first designed rectangular diagrams for a large number of terms, composing the first publication of such a method. In that year he built a logic machine capable of processing arguments of eight terms, described in "A Machine for Producing Syllogistic Variations" (1883) with further details published in 1885. The machine contained three rectangular flaps, on which are written the two premises and the conclusion of the syllogism. The flaps are then caused to revolve about a horizontal axis. Next, one writes the contrapositive of the premises and of the conclusion on the back of the respective flaps. By the turn of a crank, the eight possible combinations of premises and conclusion are made to appear.

Peirce (1887) described the logic machine devised by Marquand (now at Princeton University) and the earlier machine designed by William Stanley Jevons as "mills into which the premises are fed and which turn out the conclusions by the revolution of a crank." Peirce explained that "Mr. Marquand's machine is a vastly more clear-headed contrivance than that of Jevons. The nature of the problem [of designing a thinking machine] has been grasped in a more masterly manner, and the directest possible means are chosen for the solution of it. In the machines actually constructed only four letters have been used, though there would have been no inconvenience in embracing six."

James Mark BALDWIN provided a more thorough account of Marquand's diagrams and their application to his mechanical devices in his article "Logical Machine" (1901). Baldwin explained the nature of the technique by which Marquand's machine manipulates syllogistic propositions and establishes the relationships between their terms in computing proofs. Baldwin explained how Marquand's design is much simpler and more efficient than other designs by Jevons or John Venn, requiring for a 10-term machine only 124 letters and 22 keys. Another major difference pointed out by Baldwin between Jevons's machine and Marquand's is that Marquand's design eliminates or "hides" erroneous or inconsistent conclusions, displaying only valid conclusions, whereas Jevons's machine displays only the valid conclusions which contain the terms introduced in the premises.

Before Marquand entirely abandoned logic for art history, with Peirce's continued assistance he was the first to design an electromechanical digital machine in 1885. Fifty years later another student of Peirce's logic, Arthur BURKS, helped build ENIAC, the world's first general-purpose electronic computer.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"A Logical Diagram for *n* Terms,"
   Philosophical Magazine 12 (1881): 266–70.
"A Machine for Producing Syllogistic
   Variations," in *Studies in Logic*, ed. Charles S.

Peirce (Boston, 1883), pp. 12–15.

"Note on an Eight-term Logic Machine," in *Studies in Logic*, ed. Charles S. Peirce (Boston, 1883), p. 16.

"A New Logic Machine," *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 21 (1886): 303–7.

Other Relevant Works
Greek Architecture (New York, 1909).
Della Robbias in America (Princeton, N.J., 1912).

Further Reading
Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v37, Who Was Who in Amer v1

Baldwin, James Mark. "Logical Machine," in *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, ed. James Mark Baldwin (New York, 1901), vol. 3, pp. 28–30. Repr., *Modern Logic* 7 (1997): 78–80.

Buck, George H., and Stephen M. Hunka. "W. Stanley Jevons, Allan Marquand, and the Origins of Digital Computing," *IEEE Annals of the History of Computing* 21 (October–December 1999): 21–7.

Ketner, Kenneth L., and Arthur F. Stewart. "The Early History of Computer Design: Charles Sanders Peirce and Marquand's Logical Machines," *Princeton University Library Chronicle* 45 (1984): 187–211.

Peirce, Charles S. "Logical Machines," *American Journal of Psychology* 1 (1887): 165–70. Repr., *Modern Logic* 7 (1977): 71–7.

Irving H. Anellis

MARSHALL, Henry Rutgers (1852–1927)

Henry Rutgers Marshall was born on 22 July 1852 in New York City, and he died there on 3 May 1927. Marshall attended Columbia University, earning a BA in 1873 and an MA in 1876. He began practicing architecture soon thereafter, and spent the next half-century designing prominent structures – including the Vorhees Library at Rutgers and "Naulakha," Rudyard Kipling's Vermont homestead – with his characteristically ebullient style. He became a member of the American Institute of Architects in 1882, a fellow in 1889, and served as president of the New York chapter in 1902. He received an LHD from Rutgers in 1903. In addition to practicing architecture, Marshall principally studied at the intersection of aesthetics and psychology. He lectured on art and beauty at numerous Ivy League universities, and served as the Executive Secretary of New York's Municipal Art Commission from 1919 until the time of his death. Though he never held an academic position in psychology, Marshall was elected to membership at the American Psychology Association's first meeting, and served as its President in 1907.

Marshall was an influential contemporary of several leading academics, such as Alexander Bain, Mary CALKINS, Josiah ROYCE, and Edward TITCHENER. His most significant work was *Pain, Pleasure, and Aesthetics* (1894), which William JAMES described as "epoch-making" and "full of shrewd and original psychology," and which George SANTAYANA described as containing "notable contributions" to philosophy.

Marshall's aesthetic theory argued that beauty is fundamentally a matter of the hedonic effect produced by works of art, and he argued that there is no characteristic common to all beautiful things, save for the power to be pleasing. Nonhedonistic aesthetic theories are inadequate, with objectivism being particularly bankrupt, because our aesthetic sense of beauty is a sort of subjective arousal. Marshall's view was more complex than a mere bald sensualism, encouraging various standards of aesthetic judgment. Unlike ephemeral hedonic pleasures, aesthetic pleasures – ranging from perceived impressions to contemplative judgments – should exhibit stability across contexts.

Marshall also held that the art-impulse is a means of attraction, and that artistic expression is "nature's means of enforcing social consolidation" – wrestling with, but ultimately not endorsing, hedonism in ethics.

Marshall viewed aesthetics as a special branch of introspective psychology dealing with algedonics, the science of pleasure and pain. Anticipating aspects of A. N. WHITEHEAD's metaphysics, Marshall collapsed the distinction between mental and physical hedonic states. He surmised that pleasure and pain are neither sensations nor emotions – they are not experiences, they qualify experiences – and suggested that they constitute two poles of a single qualitative continuum (the intermediary being our default state of indifference). Marshall also developed a physiological account of pleasure and pain that corresponded with his aesthetic and psychological theories, but this was shown to be empirically inadequate. This shortcoming overshadowed his work as a whole and subsequently obscured his philosophical reputation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Field of Aesthetics Psychologically Considered," *Mind* n.s. 1 (1892): 358–78, 453–69.
"Hedonic Aesthetics," *Mind* n.s. 2 (1893): 15–41.
Pain, Pleasure, and Aesthetics (New York, 1894).
Aesthetic Principles (New York, 1895).
Instinct and Reason (New York, 1898).
"The Relation of Aesthetics to Psychology and Philosophy," *Philosophical Review* 14 (1905): 1–20.
Consciousness (New York, 1909).
Mind and Conduct (New York, 1920).
The Beautiful (London, 1924).

Further Reading
Dict Amer Bio, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v11*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
James, William. "Marshall's Pain and Pleasure," *The Nation* 59 (1894): 49–51.
Kugelman, Robert. "Introspective Psychology, Pure and Applied: Henry Rutgers Marshall on Pain and Pleasure," *History of Psychology* 4 (2001): 34–58.
Santayana, George. "Review of Marshall, *Pleasure, Pain, and Aesthetics*," *Psychological Review* 1 (1894): 411–15.

Cory Wright

MARTIN, Charles Burton (1924–)

Charles B. Martin was born on 24 May 1924 in Chelsea, Massachusetts. After graduating with a BA with distinction in philosophy at Boston University in 1948, he commenced a D.Phil. in philosophy, awarded in 1959, working with John Wisdom at the University of Cambridge. He then undertook further study with Gilbert Ryle at the University of Oxford from 1951 to 1953. Martin began in 1954 what became a significant period of his life in Australia. He was a lecturer and then a reader at the University of Adelaide, and then he was appointed professor of philosophy at the University of Sydney in 1966. He left Australia in 1971 to become professor of philosophy at the University of Calgary, and taught there until retiring in 2001. He has been a visiting professor at many universities, including Harvard, Columbia, Michigan, Rochester, and Macquarie.

In *Religious Belief* (1959), his first major publication, Martin closely examines the claims of personal religious experience, and criticizes any defense of religious belief that defined the existence of "God" in terms of experience and practice. As real, God would be independent of these. He argued against phenomenalism, too, as defining reality in terms of experience. Against the objection that realism invites skepticism, he observed that "ontological commitments entail ontological embarrassments."

Martin next published "Remembering" in 1966 with Max Deutscher. They asked not *whether* we remember, but what it would involve if we succeeded. To think about what remembering involves reminds us that even if what we claim did occur, it might not be from *memory* that we represent it. How one represents the past might not be a *result* of what happened. As with religion, one gets into the thick of things not by defending belief but by exploring one's ontology.

While attacking traditional dualism, Martin was not convinced by the physicalism defended by U. T. Place and J. J. C. Smart, and rejected their position that physicalism would "rescue" what we say about thought and perception by "translating" the language of mentality into "neutral" terms. Martin argued that even if mentality is physical, that someone is thinking or feeling surpasses what anyone can observe in their brain or behavior. As with religious language, a philosopher should probe ontological commitments – not stretch them to make them fit acceptable beliefs.

Martin then developed his realism in various directions, maintaining, for instance, that how something is, "makes true" what we predicate of it. The success of predication is an ontological not a linguistic matter. Similarly, what something does in expressing some power lies beyond the occurrence itself – the power to do what it is not currently engaged in is part of its being. Nor do its disposition and its capacity reduce to what it has done or will do, nor to any series of conditional statements. In the same vein, Martin argued (against anti-realism) that whether something has happened or will happen is a fact that determines the truth-value of even unverifiable conjectures.

Martin's series of significant papers from the early 1950s through the 1960s concludes with his critique of Strawson's *Individuals* (1969). Strawson tried to respect the autonomy of experiential language as coexisting with objective descriptions of human beings. Martin argues that Strawson's "persons" whose behavior equally merits physical and personal descriptions have no possibility of the life after death that Strawson defended as part of traditional belief.

Notions of what things and people are disposed to do and what they are capable of remain central to Martin's philosophy. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, as his publications represent philosophy as general ontology, consequences for dualism begin to fall into place. Michael Dummett's anti-realism became the target of papers that develop Martin's own realism. The possibility of being "ontologically serious" had been brought into question within the contemporary philosophical tradition. Martin argued for ontological enquiry as philosophy's specific contribution to scientific understanding. Only as autonomous thinking can philosophy supplement scientific understanding.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Religious Belief (Ithaca, N.Y., 1959).

"Remembering," with Max Deutscher, *Philosophical Review* 75 (1966): 161–96.

"People," in *Contemporary Philosophy in Australia*, ed. R. Brown and C. D. Rollins (London, 1969).

"Knowledge Without Observation," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 1 (1971): 15–24.

"Substance Substantiated," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 58 (1980): 3–10.

"Anti-Realism and the World's Undoing," *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 65 (1984): 3–20.

"The New Cartesianism," *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 65 (1984): 236–58.

"Intentionality and the Non-Psychological," with K. Pfeifer, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 46 (1986): 531–54.

"Power for Realists," in *Ontology, Causality and Mind: Essays in Honour of David Armstrong*, ed. John Bacon (Cambridge, UK, 1993).

"The Need for Ontology: Some Choices,"

Philosophy 68 (1993): 505–22.

"Dispositions and Conditionals," *Philosophical Quarterly* 44 (1993): 1–8.

"Rules and Powers," in *Language, Mind and Ontology*, ed. James E. Tomberlin (Oxford, 1998).

"The Ontological Turn," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 23 (1999): 34–60.

"On Lewis and Then Some," *Logique et Analyse* 43 (2000): 43–8.

Other Relevant Works

"A Religious Way of Knowing," *Mind* 61 (1952): 497–512.

"Achilles and the Tortoise," with J. M. Hinton, *Analysis* 14 (1953): 56–8.

"Mr. Basson on Immortality," *Mind* 64 (1955): 249–53.

"The Perfect Good," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 33 (1955): 20–31.

"Identity and Exact Similarity," *Analysis* 18 (1958): 83–7.

Ed. with D. M. Armstrong, *Locke and Berkeley: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Garden City, N.Y., 1968).

"God, the Null Set, and Divine Simplicity," in *The Challenge of Religion*, ed. J. King-Farlow (New York, 1976).

"Proto-Language," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 65 (1987): 277–89.

"Life After Death," in *Philosophy: An Introduction Through Original Fiction*, ed. T. D. Davis (New York, 1987).

"Burial by Fire of a Phoenix: Metaphysics, Epistemology and Realism Under Attack," in *On the Track of Reason*, ed. Roger Beehler (Boulder, Col., 1992).

"How It Is: Entities, Absences and Voids," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 74 (1996) 57–65.

"Dispositions," with replies to Armstrong and Place, in *Dispositions: A Debate*, ed. D. M. Armstrong, C. B. Martin, and U. T. Place (Cambridge, UK, 1996).

"On the Need for Properties: The Road to Pythagoreanism and Back," *Synthese* 112 (1997): 193–231.

Further Reading

Heil, John, ed. *Cause, Mind, and Reality: Essays Honoring C. B. Martin* (Dordrecht, 1989).

Max Deutscher

MARTIN, Richard Milton (1916–85)

Richard M. Martin was born on 12 January 1916 in Cleveland, Ohio. He received his BA from Harvard University in 1938, his MA from Columbia University in 1939, and his PhD in philosophy from Yale University in 1941. His dissertation was on "A Homogeneous System for Formal Logic." He was an instructor in mathematics at Princeton University from 1942 to 1944, and at the University of Chicago from 1944 to 1946. From 1946 to 1948, Martin was an assistant professor of philosophy at Bryn Mawr College in Pennsylvania. In 1948 he became an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania, was promoted to associate professor, and taught there until 1959, when he became professor of philosophy at the University of Texas. From 1963 to 1973 he taught at New York University, and from 1973 until retiring in 1984, he taught at Northwestern University. He died on 22 November 1985 in Milton, Massachusetts.

Martin's interests included history and philosophy of logic and metalogic, especially algebraic logic and the logic of relations, and concentrated on the work in logic of Charles PEIRCE. He also worked extensively in philosophy of language, with special attention to the relation of logic and metaphysics, to the theory of meaning, and modality. He made further contributions to pragmatics, semiotics, mereology, and metalogic. He was a prominent and sought-after lecturer, visiting Yale, New School for Social Research, Temple, and Connecticut;

he also held fellowships at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford and the Institute for Advanced Studies in Princeton. He was a fellow of the American Council of Learned Societies, served on the executive committee of the American Philosophical Association during 1964–7, and was President of the Charles S. Peirce Society in 1981.

Martin's first serious independent effort to treat logic was "A Homogeneous System for Formal Logic" (1943). In "The Philosophical Import of Virtual Classes" (1964), he dealt with the New Foundations set theory devised by W. V. QUINE, examining the philosophical import of Quine's virtual classes. Martin was a prolific author, and the many studies in philosophy of logic, the metaphysical foundations of logic, theory of meaning, and theory of knowledge which he pursued over the years were gathered in his many books. Together with other logicians at Yale University such as Frederic B. FITCH, Ruth Barcan MARCUS, and Allan Ross ANDERSON, Martin contributed to *The Logical Enterprise* (1975), to provide a collage of articles representing the various philosophical applications of logic, including the question of existential import, and of systems of logic such as modal logic and multiple-valued logic.

In his historical studies of Peirce, Martin pointed out that Peirce had independently developed a first-order quantification theory for his logic of relations, nearly simultaneously with Gottlob Frege's development of a first-order functional logic in 1879 in the *Begriffsschrift*. Peirce's early efforts, beginning in 1867, were not wholly satisfactory, but by 1885 he had developed a full first-order theory as well as a second-order theory, It was Peirce's results that were adopted by Ernst Schröder in his *Vorlesungen über die Algebra der Logik*, in which form it was passed on to the international logic community even while Frege's work was relegated to near-oblivion until renewed attention was called to it by Bertrand Russell.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Homogeneous System for Formal Logic," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 8 (1943): 1–23.

Truth and Denotation: A Study in Semantical Theory (Chicago and London, 1958).

The Notion of Analytic Truth (Philadelphia, 1959).

Intension and Decision: A Philosophical Study (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1963).

Logic, Language, and Metaphysics (New York, 1971).

Events, Reference, and Logical Form (Washington, D.C., 1978).

Semiotics and Linguistic Structure: A Primer of Philosophical Logic (Albany, N.Y, 1978).

Belief, Reference, and Meaning (New York, 1979).

Pragmatics, Truth, and Language (Dordrecht, 1979).

Peirce's Logic of Relations and Other Studies (Dordrecht, 1980).

Logico-Linguistic Papers (Dordrecht, 1981).

Mind, Modality, Meaning, and Method (Albany, N.Y., 1983).

Metaphysical Foundations: Mereology and Metalogic (Munich, 1988).

Logical Semantics and Mereology (Amsterdam, 1992).

Other Relevant Works

"The Philosophical Import of Virtual Classes," *Journal of Philosophy* 61 (1964): 377–87.

"Of Time and the Null Individual," *Journal of Philosophy* 62 (1965): 723–36.

The Logical Enterprise, with Frederic B. Fitch, Allan Ross Anderson, and Ruth Barcan Marcus (New Haven, Conn., 1975).

Ed., *Studies in the Scientific and Mathematical Philosophy of Charles S. Peirce*, by Carolyn Eisele (The Hague, 1979).

"A Memo on Method: Hilary Putnam,"
*Philosophy and Phenomenological
Research* 42 (1982): 587–603.

"On the Language of Theology: Hartshorne
and Quine," in *Existence and Actuality:
Conversations with Charles Hartshorne*,
ed. John B. Cobb, Jr. and Franklin I.
Gamwell (Chicago, 1984), pp. 43–77.

"On the Metaphysical Status of
Mathematical Entities," *Review of
Metaphysics* 39 (1985): 3–21.

Further Reading
Who Was Who in Amer v9
Anderson, Alan Ross. "On Professor
Martin's Beliefs," *Journal of Philosophy*
59 (1962): 600–606.

Power, William L. "Philosophic Logic and
Process Theory in the Work of Richard
M. Martin," *Process Studies* 5 (1975):
204–13.

Putnam, Hilary. "Semantical Rules and
Misinterpretations: Reply to R. M.
Martin's 'A Memo on Method',"
*Philosophy and Phenomenological
Research* 42 (1982): 604–9.

Suppes, Patrick. "Scientific Causal Talk: A
Reply to Martin," *Theory and Decision*
13 (1981): 363–80.

Irving H. Anellis

MARVIN, Walter Taylor (1872–1944)

Walter T. Marvin was born on 28 April 1872
in New York City. He received his BA degree
from Columbia College in 1893. The next year
he studied at the University of Jena in Germany.
He returned to New York City to study at the
General Theological Seminary of the Episcopal
Church in 1894–5, and Columbia University
from 1895 to 1897. Going back to Germany in
1897, he studied at the universities of Halle

and Bonn, and received his PhD in philosophy
from Bonn in 1898. From 1898 to 1899 he was
an assistant to Nicholas Murray Butler at
Columbia University. Then from 1899 to 1905
he was an instructor at Adelbert College of
Western Reserve College. From 1905 to 1910 he
was an assistant professor and a preceptor at
Princeton University. In 1910 he was appointed
Collegiate Church Professor of Logical and
Mental Philosophy at Rutgers College, where he
became Dean in 1921. In 1925, when public
higher education in New Jersey was reorganized
into Rutgers University, he became Dean of the
College of Arts and Sciences, a position he held
until his death two weeks prior to his scheduled
retirement. Marvin died on 26 May 1944 in
New Brunswick, New Jersey.

Marvin earned his niche in the history of
American philosophy as a new realist. In the
first decade of the twentieth century, with the
increasing professionalization of philosophy,
philosophers began to associate in groups,
sharing common ground and establishing tech-
nical vocabularies with agreed-upon definitions.
For two centuries epistemology had been
regarded as foundational to science and philos-
ophy, especially as a consequence of the influence
of Kant's critical or transcendental method. The
task of epistemology was to explain the relation
between the knower and the object of knowl-
edge. The new realists were epistemological
monists, holding that the object of knowledge is
both a datum in the consciousness of the knower
and the object in the world external to the
knower – in other words, that the datum and
external object are identical. Marvin joined five
other philosophers – E. B. Holt, W. P.
Montague, R. B. Perry, W. B. Pitkin, and E. G.
Spaulding – to publish "The Program and First
Platform of Six Realists" in the *Journal of
Philosophy* in 1910. In 1912 the group pub-
lished *The New Realism: Co-operative Studies in
Philosophy*, which includes an appendix that
contains their program and platform.

Prior to joining the new realist group, Marvin
had written and published works on systematic
philosophy and metaphysics. Although these

early writings reflected the objective idealism imbibed during his student years in Germany, he appreciated the contribution of the natural sciences to our understanding of the world. His last book, written before the weight of his administrative duties took its toll on his creativity, was devoted to the history of European philosophy, with particular emphasis on the natural sciences and social developments as contributors to the advance of philosophical understanding of the general nature of reality.

The new realists, with their identification of the datum in the mind with the external object of knowledge, resolved "dogmatically," as Marvin remarked with pleasure, the critical problem of epistemology. Direct perception furnished true knowledge, reducing epistemology to psychology, the special natural science that studies cognition. For Marvin this did not mean the elimination of metaphysics, as it has meant for recent logical positivists and analytic philosophers, but, on the contrary, as the title of the essay he contributed to the new realists' cooperative volume reveals, "the emancipation of metaphysics from epistemology." For Marvin metaphysics is the study of the logical foundations the sciences. Instead of depending on epistemology as foundational, he maintained it needs logic and the sciences in their most rigorous formulation. By drawing upon all the departments of a person's intellectual life, and especially the sciences, metaphysics may provide or at least contribute to a general theory of reality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Giltigkeit unserer Erkenntnis der objektiven Welt (Halle, Germany, 1898).
Syllabus of an Introduction to Philosophy (New York and Berlin, 1899).
Introduction to Systematic Philosophy (New York, 1903).
First Book in Metaphysics (New York, 1912).
"The Emancipation of Metaphysics from Epistemology," in *The New Realism; Cooperative Studies in Philosophy* (New York, 1912), pp. 43–95.
History of European Philosophy: An Introductory Book (New York, 1917).
Love of Wisdom, by Two of Her Lovers (Philadelphia, Penn., 1949).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v33*, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v55*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Blandshard, Brand, *The Nature of Thought* (London and New York, 1939), vol. 1, pp. 394–415.
de Waal, Cornelis, ed. *American New Realism*, 3 vols (Bristol, UK, 2001).
Dewey, John. "The Short-Cut to Realism Examined," *Journal of Philosophy* 7 (1910): 553–7.
Harlow, Victor E. *Bibliography and Genetic Study of American Realism* (Oklahoma City, Okla., 1931).
Laird, John. *A Study of Realism* (Cambridge, UK, 1920).
McGilvary, E. B. "The New Realism," *Philosophical Review* 22 (1913): 57–65.
Schneider, Herbert W. *Sources of Contemporary Realism in America* (Indianapolis, 1964).
Sellars, Roy Wood. *American Philosophy from Within* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1969).

Andrew J. Reck

MASLOW, Abraham Harold (1908–70)

Abraham Maslow was born on 1 April 1908 in New York City, and died on 8 June 1970 in Menlo Park, California. His parents were Russian Jewish immigrants, and Maslow grew up with a strong sense of his Jewish identity. Emotionally estranged from his parents at an early age, Maslow found solace in intellectual life; but in college he struggled to find a

program of study that could fully engage him. He simultaneously studied philosophy at City College in New York City and law at Brooklyn Law School, before transferring to Cornell University in 1927. Still unsettled, Maslow transferred to the University of Wisconsin in 1928 where he completed his BA in psychology in 1930.

Maslow's interest in psychology was due in large part to the influence of behaviorist psychologist John B. WATSON. A flamboyant promoter of psychological dreams, Watson promised a practical science of human behavior capable of vanquishing all manner of personal and social limitations. Maslow was transfixed by this seductive vision, and he later recalled seeing "unrolling before me into the future the possibility of a science of psychology, a program of work which promised real progress, real advance, real solutions of real problems. All that was necessary was devotion and hard work." (1979, p. 277) At Wisconsin, Maslow put his idealism into action and he basked in the intellectual energy of such prominent psychologists as Clark HULL and William Sheldon. Enrolling in the doctoral program in 1930, Maslow became the first graduate student of Harry Harlow who later became world famous for his studies of infant bonding in monkeys.

Inspired by Harlow's scientific precision, Maslow developed into a skilled experimentalist and a "fine monkey man" (Nicholson 2001, p. 80). Completing his PhD in psychology in 1934, Maslow was obliged to confront the economic uncertainties of the Depression and lingering anti-Semitism within the American university establishment. Unable to secure an academic post, he enrolled in medical school at the University of Wisconsin, but lacking motivation he dropped out after a year. Maslow was offered a postdoctoral fellowship in 1935 at Teachers College of Columbia University to work with the well-known functionalist psychologist Edward L. THORNDIKE. Happily accepting this position, Maslow moved to New York City where he was influ-

enced by analyst Alfred Adler, anthropologist Ruth BENEDICT, Gestalt psychologists, and psychologist Kurt Goldstein whose concept of "self-actualization" would figure prominently in Maslow's subsequent theorizing. Upon completing his fellowship, Maslow accepted a position at the teaching intensive Brooklyn College in 1937, which was one of the few institutions willing to hire Jewish faculty in large numbers.

Maslow moved to Brandeis University in 1951, where he was professor of psychology until he retired in 1969 and became a resident fellow of the Laughlin Institute in California. Originally trained as an experimental psychologist, Maslow became increasingly estranged from scientific psychology as his career progressed. At Brandeis, he spent little time doing empirical research and devoted himself instead to the project of fashioning a new "third force" or humanistic psychology that would transcend the limitations of behaviorism and psychoanalysis.

Maslow outlined the basic tenets of humanistic psychology in his 1954 text *Motivation and Personality*, and in the late 1950s and 60s he worked hard to establish an institutional framework for this alternative psychology. In 1961 he helped found the *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* and in 1963 he helped establish the Association for Humanistic Psychology, an organization that included prominent psychologists such as Charlotte Bühler, Rollo MAY, Henry MURRAY, and Carl Rogers. Building on the success of this humanistic project, Maslow published *Toward a Psychology of Being* (1962); and he applied humanistic psychology to business in *Eupsychian Management* (1965) and to science in *The Psychology of Science* (1966).

Elected President of the American Psychological Association in 1968, Maslow's breadth of vision grew ever more expansive and he began to contemplate the possibility of a "still 'higher' Fourth Psychology, transpersonal, transhuman, centered in the cosmos … going beyond humanness, identity [and] self-

actualization" (1968, pp. iii–iv). Although he promoted a psychology of hope and transcendence, Maslow found little repose in his private life and he often complained of feeling unappreciated by his family, colleagues, and students. Frequently stressed and dissatisfied, he died of a heart attack at age sixty-two. His final major work, *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature,* was published posthumously in 1971.

In a discipline known for its technical specialization, Maslow stands out for his breadth of interest and philosophical style. As a graduate student, he complained bitterly about the narrow, anti-philosophical character of psychology, and unlike many of his colleagues, socialization into the field did not temper his enthusiasm for the broader questions about human nature and the ways it could be studied. Although the bulk of Maslow's theoretical works are fragmentary and unsystematic, they were not without inspirational value and rhetorical power. The theoretically loose, visionary quality of his writing appealed to those dissatisfied with the mechanical exactitude of academic psychology and earned him a wide following in psychology and the general public.

Philosophically akin to romanticism, humanistic psychology was both an encompassing critique of mainstream psychology and psychoanalysis, and an optimistic vision of a new and more humane science of human nature. Maslow criticized behaviorism's inattention to human potential and uniqueness; its uncritical reliance on animal models; its deterministic assumptions, unbridled faith in positivist methodology and "overstress on technique" (1970, p. 11). Equally critical of psychoanalysis, Maslow argued that Freudian theory was a depressing reduction of the human spirit to nineteenth-century biology. Although these attacks on mainstream psychology were widely quoted, Maslow envisioned humanistic psychology as a refinement rather than a wholesale repudiation of existing approaches. "I certainly wish to be understood as trying to enlarge science, not destroy it." (1966, p. xvi) Proud of his own training as a behavioral scientist, he hoped somehow to finesse the rigor and discipline of the natural sciences with the breadth, creativity, and openness of the humanities. This new psychology would in turn point the way to a scientifically based system of ethics and ultimately to "Eupsychia," a "psychological utopia in which all men are psychologically healthy" (1970, p. 277).

Maslow's most important theoretical contribution to humanistic psychology was the "hierarchy of needs" – a theory of human motivation that encompassed biological constraint and humanistic transcendence. First published in 1943, Maslow's hierarchy of needs integrated existing motivational theories into five sets of basic goals: physiological, safety, love, esteem, and self-actualization. Maslow argued that needs were arranged hierarchically in order of biological urgency. Lower needs would "monopolize consciousness" until satisfied, at which point higher needs would then dominate. At the very apex of the hierarchy was "self-actualization" which Maslow described as "man's desire for self-fulfillment, namely to the tendency for him to become actualized in what he is potentially" (1970, p. 46).

Although Maslow presented this hierarchy as rigorous, objective science, it contained significant political implications. The placement of material needs as a precondition for higher needs is less a universal human truth than a reflection of American middle-class sensibilities (Shaw and Colimore, 1988). American values are also evident in the pronounced individualism of his psychology. Echoing liberals such as Adam Smith, Maslow placed the autonomous individual at the center of his psychology and he argued that unobstructed self-interest was the best way to insure the public good. Although Maslow strenuously denied the charge, his approach appeared to condone an individualistic, self-seeking approach to life and a culture of narcissism. Feminist theorists

have also suggested that the vision of self-hood as a hierarchy is itself a reflection of a Western male bias that privileges autonomy and independence at the expense of relatedness and reciprocity (Cullen 1994).

Maslow was not indifferent to such criticism and he commented pointedly on the Western, male values that are contained in the ostensibly neutral discourse of science. Despite his awareness of these issues, Maslow found it difficult to completely abandon the scientism of his youth. He continued to view science "as a God" and looked to biology as a basis for psychology and ethics (1979, p. 426). His stinging criticisms of the shortcomings of scientific psychology were accompanied by an unwavering biological essentialism where "truth, goodness beauty, [and] justice" would ultimately be explained through "biochemical, neurological, endocrinological substrates or body machinery" (1971, p. 22).

The hierarchy of needs became one of the best-known motivational theories in psychology and it held considerable appeal to those searching for a nonreligious spiritual vocabulary (see Fuller 2001). Humanistic psychology was also an important ideological resource in the liberationist movements of the 1960s. Influential feminists such as Betty FRIEDAN drew on Maslow's concept of self-actualization to explain the alienation of American women. For counter-culture activists such as Abbie Hoffman, the language of self-actualization was a warrant to challenge convention and trust inner impulses (Hoffman 1980). Maslow himself was uneasy about the spiritual and political conclusions that others drew from his work and in his private correspondence he characterized student activists as "perpetual adolescents" and complained bitterly about "dominant, castrating" women (1979, pp. 603, 77).

Maslow was much more enthusiastic about the popularity of the hierarchy of needs as a management theory and he eagerly pursued opportunities to apply humanistic psychology to business. The hierarchy became a staple in discussions of organizational behavior; and in business schools it continues to enjoy the status of "classic among classics" (Cullen 1994, p. 127). Maslovian thought remains an important touchstone for meaning-based jobs, human relations training and worker participation in management. Although humanistic psychology is at the margins of academic psychology, Maslow's work helped diversify the questions and categories of American psychology. The "hierarchy of needs" has evolved into a psychological classic familiar to every psychology undergraduate; and, more than thirty years after his death, Maslow remains one of the most recognized names in American psychology. More significantly, popularizations of Maslow's work have translated technical psychological language of "needs" and "self-actualization" into an everyday idiom for gauging and transforming the modern self.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Dominance-Feeling, Behavior, and Status," *Psychological Review* 44 (1937): 404–24.

Principles of Abnormal Psychology: The Dynamics of Psychic Illness, with Béla Mittelmann (New York, 1941).

"Self-Esteem (Dominance-Feeling) and Sexuality among Women," *Journal of Social Psychology* 16 (1942): 259–94.

"A Theory of Human Motivation," *Psychological Review* 50 (1943): 370–96.

Motivation and Personality (New York, 1954; 2nd edn 1970).

Toward a Psychology of Being (Princeton, N.J., 1962; 2nd edn 1968).

Eupsychian Management (Homewood, Ill., 1965).

The Psychology of Science: A Reconnaissance (New York, 1966).

The Farther Reaches of Human Nature (New York, 1971).

Religions, Values, and Peak-Experiences (New York, 1994).

Other Relevant Works
Maslow's papers are in the Archives for the

History of American Psychology at the University of Akron, Ohio.

The Journals of A. H. Maslow, ed. Richard J. Lowry (Monterey, Cal., 1979).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*, *Who's Who in Phil*

"Bibliography of Abraham Maslow," *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 10 (1970): 98–110.

Buss, Allan. "Humanistic Psychology as Liberal Ideology," *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 19 (1979): 43–55.

Cullen, Dallas. "Feminism, Management and Self-Actualization," *Gender, Work & Organization* 1 (1994): 127–37.

———, "Maslow, Monkeys and Motivation Theory," *Organization* 4 (1997): 355–73.

Daniels, Michael. "The Myth of Self-Actualization," *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 28 (1988): 7–38.

Fuller, Robert C. *Spiritual, but Not Religious: Understanding Unchurched America* (New York, 2001).

Herman, Ellen. *The Romance of American Psychology: Political Culture in an Age of Experts* (Berkeley, Cal., 1995).

Hoffman, Abbie. *Soon to Be a Major Motion Picture* (New York, 1980).

Hoffman, Edward. *The Right to Be Human: A Biography of Abraham Maslow* (Los Angeles, 1988).

Nicholson, Ian A. M. "'Giving up Maleness': Abraham Maslow, Masculinity and the Boundaries of Psychology," *History of Psychology* 4 (2001): 79–91.

Shaw, Robert, and Karen Colimore. "Humanistic Psychology as Ideology: An Analysis of Maslow's Contradictions," *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 28 (1988): 51–74.

Ian A. M. Nicholson

MATES, Benson (1919–)

Benson Mates was born on 19 May 1919 in Portland, Oregon. He received his BA at the University of Oregon in 1941. During World War II he served as a cryptographer. He received his PhD in philosophy from the University of California at Berkeley in 1948. Mates joined the philosophy department at Berkeley in 1948, rising to the rank of full professor in 1964, where he remained until his retirement in 1989. A gentle person, with a remarkable talent for funny anecdotes, Mates was regarded with affection and admiration by students. He is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and was President of the American Philosophical Association Pacific Division in 1983–4.

A historian of philosophy, philosopher of language, and logician, Mates has done groundbreaking work on logic in antiquity, and ancient skepticism, and is an internationally recognized Leibniz scholar. *Stoic Logic* (1953) remains one of the best works on the logic of the Old Stoa; its discussion of Diodorean implication inspired Arthur Prior's work on tense logic. "Synonymity" (1950) contributed an enduring puzzle to the philosophical literature on meaning and the propositional attitudes. Mates proposed that synonymous expressions were everywhere intersubstitutable in a language including modal operators and propositional attitude verbs, since anything weaker takes words to be synonymous which intuitively are not. But Mates noted that clear cases of synonymy seem to fail the strengthened criterion in embedded attitude contexts, for intuitively we cannot substitute "Hellenes" for the last occurrence of "Greeks" in "Nobody doubts that whoever believes all Greeks are Greeks believes all Greeks are Greeks."

Mates's article "Analytic Sentences" (1951) is an important early response to W. V. QUINE's criticism of analyticity in "Two Dogmas of Empiricism" published in 1950. "On the Verification of Statements about Ordinary Language" (1958) sparked a famous debate

with Stanley CAVELL in "Must We Mean What We Say?" (1958) on the adequacy of armchair intuitions about meaning. Mates's classic logic text *Elementary Logic* (1965) introduced a novel model theory that does not rely on satisfaction, and is still widely used and admired. *Skeptical Essays* (1981) is devoted to the thesis that "[t]he principal traditional problems of philosophy are genuine intellectual knots: they are intelligible enough, but at the same time they are absolutely insoluble" (p. 3). This book deals with semantical and set-theoretic paradoxes, the problem of freedom of the will, and the problem of the external world.

Mates's masterwork, *The Philosophy of Leibniz: Metaphysics and Language* (1986), gives a nominalist reading of Leibniz's philosophy. *The Skeptic Way: Sextus Empiricus's Outlines of Pyrrhonism* (1996) provides a new translation of *Outlines*, a substantial interpretive introduction, and extensive philosophical commentary on this canonical work of ancient skepticism. Mates emphasizes ways in which the ancient skeptic differs from the modern. The ancient skeptic balances considerations against one another to achieve a state of *aporia* or puzzlement, rather than recommending the state of doubt of modern skeptics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Synonymity," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 25 (1950): 201–26.
Stoic Logic (Berkeley, Cal., 1953).
Elementary Logic (Oxford, 1965; 2nd edn 1972).
Skeptical Essays (Chicago, 1981).
The Philosophy of Leibniz: Metaphysics and Language (Oxford, 1986).
The Skeptic's Way: Sextus Empiricus's Outlines of Pyrrhonism (Oxford, 1996).

Other Relevant Works
"Diodorean Implication," *Philosophical Review* 58 (1949): 234–42.
"Analytic Sentences," *Philosophical Review* 60 (1951): 525–34.

"On the Verification of Statements about Ordinary Language," *Inquiry* 4 (1958): 161–71.
"Sense Data," *Inquiry* 10 (1967): 225–44.
"Descriptions and Reference," *Foundations of Language* 10 (1973): 409–18.
"Identity and Predication in Plato," *Phronesis* 24 (1979): 211–29.
"On Refuting the Skeptic," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 58 (1984): 21–35.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v9
Cavell, Stanley. "Must We Mean What We Say?" *Inquiry* 1 (1958): 172–212.
Church, Alonzo. "Intensional Isomorphism and Identity of Belief," *Philosophical Studies* 5 (1954): 65–73.
Føllesdal, Dagfinn. "Mates on Referential Opacity," *Inquiry* 1 (1958): 232–8.
Mondadori, F. "The Philosophy of Leibniz," *Philosophical Review* 99 (1990): 613–29.
Putnam, Hilary. "Synonymity, and the Analysis of Belief Sentences," *Analysis* 14 (1954): 114–22.
Salmon, Nathan, and Scott Soames, eds. *Propositions and Attitudes* (Oxford, 1988).
Skryms, Brian. "Mates Quantification and Intensional Logic," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 59 (1981): 177–88.

Kirk Ludwig

MATHEWS, Shailer (1863–1941)

Shailer Mathews was born on 26 May 1863 in Portland, Maine, and died on 23 October 1941 in Chicago, Illinois. The son of Jonathan Mathews and Sophia Lucinda Shailer, he was of old Yankee stock that included in his maternal line generations of teachers and ministers. During Mathews's education at Colby

College from 1880 to 1884, he came under the influence of President Albion SMALL, a founding figure of American sociology who had studied under important German historical economists. Colby also introduced Mathews to the idea of Darwinian evolution, a life-changing experience that his autobiography *New Faith for Old* (1936) characterizes as the seminal influence for his lifelong philosophical interest in the social evolution of religious doctrine. Mathews's autobiography indicates that he entered Colby a rather naïvely pious young man, the son of a Baptist deacon, but he left the college with an intent concern to discover the "germ" of Christian faith inside its historically mutable expressions, and with a desire to reconcile that central germ or core of belief with modern thought and, in particular, modern science.

Mathews graduated from Colby with a BA in 1884 (he later received Colby's MA as well). His religious interests led him from Colby to Newton Theological Institution (1884–7). Refusing ordination, he returned to Colby in 1887 to teach rhetoric, followed (at Small's insistence) by history and political economy. At Small's recommendation, in 1890–91 Mathews took a year of intensive study of political economy at the University of Berlin, where Small's economics professor Adolph Wagner imparted to Mathews a reformist understanding of social evolution that was strongly to mold his later thought. Small was hired away in 1892 by the University of Chicago to head its sociology department, and in 1894 Mathews followed him to Chicago to join its Divinity School. Mathews first taught New Testament history and interpretation (1894–1906), and then historical and comparative theology (1906–33). In 1899 he was made junior dean of Chicago's Divinity School, and in 1908 became the school's Dean, a position he held until his retirement in 1933.

Mathews's religious–philosophical interests shifted sharply in the years he was at Chicago as a result of his move from the New Testament department to that of historical and comparative theology. The early phase of his career was dominated by exegetical concerns and, in particular, by an interest in studying the New Testament documents in their late-Palestinian Jewish cultural and historical context. This phase of Mathews's work culminated in his summative exegetical statement, *The Messianic Hope in the New Testament* (1905). During the same period, Mathews was actively involved in the social gospel movement, through which he sought both to disseminate the results of German higher criticism to American churches at a popular level and to urge churches to engage in social reform movements, such as limiting child labor and supporting women's suffrage. Mathews participated in the American Institute of Sacred Literature created by University of Chicago President William Rainey Harper. Through the Chautauqua movement, Institute faculty, Mathews lectured widely in churches and colleges around the nation, introducing American audiences to biblical exegesis and the social gospel. As an aid to the educational efforts of the Institute and Chautauqua, Mathews wrote what was to become one of the most influential of all social gospel works, *The Social Teaching of Jesus* (1897), one of the first exegetical works in the United States to take note of German scholar Johannes Weiss's claim that Jesus's proclamation of the reign of God as recorded in the Christian gospels had an eschatological backdrop.

Mathews also participated in the missionary work of Harper's Institute by editing a number of journals during this period, each of which sought in various ways to popularize biblical scholarship and influence the social sphere. These included the short-lived *Christendom*, which began and ceased publication in 1903 by merging with *The World Today*, a journal Mathews edited up to its demise in 1911. In 1912 Mathews succeeded Harper as editor of the widely circulated *Biblical World*, which was to publish some of his most significant articles, including the 1915 "Theology and the Social Mind."

Mathews's move to the Divinity School's department of historical and comparative

theology in 1906 precipitated a refocusing of his theological interests from biblical themes to questions about social evolution (or, as Mathews preferred to say, "social process"). The overriding concern of the second phase of Mathews's theological career was to isolate the perduring themes of Christian faith within their varying historical expressions and to relate these themes to modern thought and, in particular, modern science. Important works that reflect this concern include *The Church and the Changing Order* (1907) and *The Gospel and the Modern Man* (1910).

World War I was a moment of crisis for social gospel theologians like Mathews. Key social gospel works, including Mathews's *Social Teaching of Jesus*, had adopted progressivist, this-worldly theories of the reign of God, theories that were undergirded by an idealistic notion of historical evolution. The war severely challenged the optimistic assumption of some social gospellers that the reign of God would inevitably be realized in history as historical evolution moved to ever more progressive ends.

Mathews's thinking in this period was heavily influenced by the pragmatism of John DEWEY, with its assumption that historical evolution was ineluctably tending towards universal democratization, and that war was a means by which American democracy might ultimately be exported to less developed (read: less democratic) nations of the world. However, though Mathews and other social gospellers have been criticized for the ease with which they accepted these pragmatic, progressivist, and idealistic interpretations of history and historical conflict, the war period (and the critiques of social gospel theology that arose out of it) caused Mathews to think more carefully than he had previously done about the theme of social evolution and the relation of Christian belief to social progress.

In articles such as "Theology and the Social Mind" Mathews distinguishes between "creative" and "counter" social minds (echoing Lester WARD'S *Dynamic Sociology*) and notes that the relationship between faith and cultural change is a reciprocal one, not one in which evolutionary progress is inevitable or automatic. That is to say, movement to the desired goals of the social process requires conflict, interaction between competing ideas and social groups, and change that is engineered by social reformers. Other important articles that deal with this question, and that carefully define Mathews's social process theology, include "The Evolution of Religion" (1911), "The Social Origin of Theology" (1912), "Generic Christianity" (1914), "The Historical Study of Religion" (1916), and "Theology from the Point of View of Social Psychology" (1923). These articles, as well as books written during the same period (including in particular the 1916 *The Spiritual Interpretation of History*), were important seminal works in what has come to be called the Chicago School of Theology, which emphasizes the study of religious belief within its social context.

The period of Mathews's career following World War I was characterized both by a continuation of his interest in the social context of belief, and by defensive reaction to neo-orthodox theology, which was highly critical of liberal and social gospel theologians such as Mathews. In this phase of his thought, Mathews tended to focus his social process theology on particular themes, including the development of the idea of God and of the notion of the atonement in Christian theology. Two significant works reflecting these interests are *The Atonement and the Social Process* (1930) and *The Growth of the Idea of God* (1931).

In response to neo-orthodox theologians such as Reinhold NIEBUHR, Mathews tended to adopt the self-designation of "modernist" in the post-World War I period. In works such as *The Faith of Modernism* (1924), Mathews describes modernism as a theological methodology that seeks to discover permanent evangelical values and to express these according to the creative social mind of a culture. He distinguishes modernism from liberalism – the

primary target of neo-orthodox criticism – by focusing on what is unchanging within changing expressions of Christian faith. Mathews's defensive response to neo-orthodox critics during the postwar period also led him to revise his very popular 1897 life of Jesus, retitled as *Jesus on Social Institutions* (1928). This revised book was designed, as the previous one had been, to provide a foundation for Christian social activism. In addition, Mathews recognizes the validity of the neo-orthodox critique of progressivist–idealidist theories of history and of this-worldly notions of the reign of God. He incorporates the eschatological turn of German exegetes, such as Johannes Weiss, far more thoroughly and effectively than in his 1897 book on Jesus.

Mathews deserves attention for a number of reasons. As has been noted, he was among the first American exegetes to recognize the importance of the work of Johannes Weiss, which revolutionized biblical scholarship at the turn of the twentieth century. He also stressed the important link between Christian faith and social action, a link that was perhaps to some extent broken by neo-orthodox theologians and that has been retrieved by political and liberation theologians. Mathews also deserves credit for having helped found the Chicago School of Theology with George B. FOSTER and Edward S. AMES and others, which has exercised an important and continuing influence on the intellectual life of American religious bodies over a number of generations.

Philosophically, Mathews was an eclectic thinker. Though, under the influence of neo-orthodox critiques of liberal theology, some appraisers of his thought have emphasized the significance of German liberal Protestant theologians, such as Adolf von Harnack, on Mathews, it is clear that the early (and seminal) phase of his theology was primarily influenced by historical economists, such as Wagner, and by founding figures of American sociology, including Small, Ward, and Richard ELY. All were working out of the social process notions of the German historical economics school,

which resisted Adam Smith's contention that the economic structures of society are governed by immutable natural laws and that these laws are not susceptible to human intervention or social manipulation. These early sociological insights, along with Dewey's pragmatism, molded Mathews's thought in its early stages.

Because Mathews's theology emphasized social process, he sought to incorporate the influential process philosophy of Alfred North WHITEHEAD. However, as Mathews's autobiographical writings admit, his engagement with Whitehead's thought was never fully successful. His social process thinking moves along an entirely different track than that charted by Whitehead's philosophy of cosmic process. Throughout his career, Mathews worked more or less consistently from the social process base he had established early in his academic work, employing themes drawn from Small, Ely, and Ward, with an undergirding of pragmatist ideas drawn primarily from Dewey.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Social Teaching of Jesus: An Essay in Christian Sociology (New York, 1897).

The Messianic Hope in the New Testament (Chicago, 1905).

The Gospel and the Modern Man (New York, 1910).

"The Evolution of Religion," *American Journal of Theology* 15 (1911): 57–82.

"The Social Origin of Theology," *American Journal of Sociology* 18 (1912): 289–317.

"Generic Christianity, " *Constructive Quarterly* 2 (1914): 702–23.

"Theology and the Social Mind," *Biblical World* 46 (1915): 201–48.

"The Historical Study of Religion," in *A Guide to the Study of the Christian Religion*, ed. Gerald B. Smith (Chicago, 1916), pp. 19–79.

The Spiritual Interpretation of History (Cambridge, Mass., 1916).

"Theology from the Point of View of Social Psychology, " *Journal of Religion* 3 (1923): 337–51.

The Faith of Modernism (New York, 1924).

Jesus on Social Institutions (New York, 1928).

The Atonement and the Social Process (New York, 1930).

The Growth of the Idea of God (New York, 1931).

New Faith for Old (New York, 1936).

Other Relevant Works

Mathews's papers are at the University of Chicago.

"Christian Sociology," *American Journal of Sociology* 1 (1895–6): 69–78, 182, 359–60, 457–72, 604–17, 771–84.

"Christian Sociology," *American Journal of Sociology* 2 (1896–7): 108–17, 274–87, 416–32.

"The Social Teaching of Paul," *Biblical World* 19 (1902): 34–46, 113–21, 178–89, 279–87, 370–77, 432–42; 20 (1902): 31–47, 123–33, 178–90.

The Church and the Changing Order (New York, 1907).

"Primary and Secondary Christianity," *Biblical World* 53 (1919): 235–40.

The Validity of American Ideals (New York, 1922).

"Theology from the Point of View of Social Psychology," *Journal of Religion* 3 (1923): 337–51.

"Social Patterns and the Idea of God," *Journal of Religion* 11 (1931): 159–78.

Immortality and the Cosmic Process (Cambridge, Mass., 1933).

"Theology as Group Belief," in *Contemporary American Theology*, ed. Vergilius Ferm (New York, 1933), pp. 161–93.

The Church and the Christian (New York, 1938).

Is God Emeritus? (New York, 1940).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Religious Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v11, Who Was Who in Amer v2

Arnold, Charles H. *Near the Edge of the Battle: A Short History of the Divinity School and the Chicago School of Theology, 1896–1966* (Chicago, 1966).

Grant, Frederick C. "Ethics and Eschatology in the Teaching of Jesus," *Journal of Religion* 22 (1942): 359–70.

Krumbine, Miles H., ed. *The Process of Religion: Essays in Honor of Dean Shailer Mathews* (New York, 1933).

Lindsey, William D. *Shailer Mathews's Lives of Jesus: The Search for a Theological Foundation for the Social Gospel* (Albany, N.Y., 1997).

Smith, Kenneth, and Leonard Sweet. "Shailer Mathews: A Chapter in the Social Gospel Movement," *Foundations* 18 (1975): 219–37, 296–320; *Foundations* 19 (1976): 53–68, 152–70.

William D. Lindsey

MAURER, Armand Augustine (1915–)

Armand Maurer was born on 21 January 1915 in Rochester, New York. In 1945 he was ordained priest in the Congregation of St. Basil and received the Licentiate in Mediaeval Studies from the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, and then he received the PhD in philosophy from the University of Toronto in 1947. He taught philosophy and theology in the Pontifical Institute and the University of Toronto from 1948 until retiring in 1982. In 1966 he was elected fellow of the Royal Society of Canada and in 1978 he was President of the American Catholic Philosophical Association, whose Aquinas Medal he received in 1987.

Maurer apprenticed himself to Etienne GILSON and like his master he used history as a lens on philosophy. Maurer's main historical field, medieval Latin philosophy, seems more unified than what came before or after. M. De

Wulf held that philosophical content, a "common scholastic synthesis," produced this unity, but Gilson pointed to a common religious belief that held "Christian philosophies" together, while they differed in philosophical doctrine. Maurer sided with Gilson and distinguished the philosophizing of the Masters of Arts from that practiced by theologians. Among Masters of Arts, Maurer focused on Siger of Brabant, whose "fidelity" to Aristotle occasionally "put him in conflict with the Christian faith" (1983, p. 20). In his study of Ockham, Maurer offered a memorable comparison of three theologians: "the central theme of Ockham's philosophy is the singular or individual thing (*res singularis*), as common nature (*natura communis*) is the focal point of Scotism and the act of existing (*esse*) is at the heart of Thomism." (1999, p. 540)

Maurer's greatest contribution to philosophy was arguably his series of translations and studies of Aquinas and Gilson, focused mainly on metaphysics. He summed up Aquinas's existentialism with a backward glance:

> While not neglecting other aspects of being, such as form and essence, St. Thomas offers a radically new interpretation of being by emphasizing its existential side. This was a decisive moment in the history of Western metaphysics, for St. Thomas was transforming previous Greek and mediaeval conceptions of being, which gave primary place to form … . St. Thomas was the first to appreciate fully the supremacy of the act of existing over essence. (1968, p. 11)

But past is also prologue:

> The theologians of the Middle Ages produced a variety of metaphysics as their instruments. With Descartes the ties between religion and metaphysics were cut, as metaphysics prided itself in dispensing with the theology from which it came. Metaphysics then lost its sense of identity, and philosophy took up arms against it with Kant's critique and Comte's positivism. Metaphysics died at their hands, and the condition of its revival is the return to theology. (1993, p. xix)

The more Maurer, philosopher and Christian, looked to the past, the more he found wisdom for the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Recent Philosophy: Hegel to the Present, with Etienne Gilson and Thomas Langan (New York, 1966).
St. Thomas and Historicity (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1979).
About Beauty: A Thomistic Interpretation (Houston, Tex., 1983).
Being and Knowing: Studies in Thomas Aquinas and Later Medieval Philosophers (Toronto, 1990).
The Philosophy of William of Ockham in the Light of its Principles (Toronto, 1999).

Other Relevant Works
Trans., *St. Thomas Aquinas: On Being and Essence* (Toronto, 1968).
Trans., *St. Thomas Aquinas: The Division and Methods of the Sciences* (Toronto, 1986).
Medieval Philosophy (New York, 1962).
Trans., *Master Eckhart: Parisian Questions and Prologues* (Toronto, 1974).
Ed., *St. Thomas Aquinas 1274–1974: Commemorative Studies* (Toronto, 1974).
Ed., *Siger of Brabant, Quaestiones in Metaphysicam* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1983).
Trans., *St. Thomas Aquinas: Faith, Reason and Theology* (Toronto, 1987).
Trans., *Christian Philosophy. An Introduction*, by Etienne Gilson (Toronto, 1993).
Trans., *Thomism: The Philosophy of Thomas Aquinas*, by Etienne Gilson (Toronto, 2002).

Further Reading
Houser, R. E., ed. *Laudemus viros gloriosos: Essays in Medieval Philosophy*

in Honor of Armand Maurer (South Bend, Ind., 2005).

R. E. Houser

MAY, Rollo Reese (1909–94)

Rollo May was born as Reese May on 21 April 1909 in Ada, Ohio, and died on 22 October 1994 in Tiburon, California. His father, Earl Tittle May, was a field secretary for the Young Men's Christian Association. Earl May, his wife Matie, and their six children moved to Michigan when Rollo was a young boy. During his time at Michigan State College, May helped create a college magazine entitled *The Student*; however, after the magazine ran an editorial which criticized the state legislature, May was asked to leave. He transferred to Oberlin College, where in 1930 he received a BA in English in addition to three minors: history, literature, and Greek. After earning his degree, May went to the American College at Salonika, Greece, from 1930 to 1933, where he taught English and attended several seminars given by respected psychoanalyst Alfred Adler. This intellectually stimulating period in Greece apparently inspired May to pursue greater, more ambitious questions about man and his place in the world. In 1933, influenced by his religious upbringing and his psychological knowledge gleaned from his time in Greece, May returned to America, enrolling at New York City's Union Theological Seminary. While taking some time off to help his five siblings deal with their recently divorced parents, May returned to Michigan State College, where he counseled male students.

On his return to the Union Theological Seminary, the confluence of May's life events began to blossom and develop into his own original brand of thought, as he studied under the tutelage of the eminent Paul TILLICH, whose work uniquely blended themes of existential philosophy, psychology, and theology. In 1938 May earned his BD degree. He preached for two years at a Congregational church in Verno, New Jersey, but left the ministry and began his struggle with tuberculosis. During this period May published his first two books, *The Art of Counseling: How to Gain and Give Mental Health* (1939) and *Springs of Creative Living: A Study of Human Nature and God* (1941).

May earned his PhD in psychology from Columbia University in 1949. His dissertation, published as *The Meaning of Anxiety* (1950), was well received and reflected the growing popularity of humanistic or client-centered psychology that would aid in dismantling the dominance of behavioral psychology. In 1948 May joined the faculty of the William Alanson White Institute of Psychiatry, Psychoanalysis, and Psychology in New York City, where his colleagues included Erich FROMM and Harry Stack SULLIVAN. He also was a psychology lecturer at the New School for Social Research from 1955 to 1976, and served as visiting professor at Harvard in 1964, Princeton in 1967, New York University in 1971, Yale in 1972, University of California, Santa Cruz in 1973, and Brooklyn College in 1974–5.

May left teaching in 1976 and moved to California to resume his clinical practice, while maintaining several secondary capacities at the Saybrook Institute in San Francisco and the California School of Professional Psychology. In 1987 the Saybrook Institute opened the Rollo May center, a facility intended to promote research and publication in areas related to May's field of interests.

May's unique style of counseling fused existential philosophy and spirituality. During his first struggles with tuberculosis, May meditated upon the philosophy that he had continuously espoused: through courage and acceptance of the inevitable tragedies and hardships that human beings will face, personal freedom

can be discovered. The importance of *courage* and being able to overcome the anxieties of life cannot be overemphasized in its importance to May's own philosophy, concepts that were markedly influenced by May's studies with Tillich and his insatiable reading of European existential philosophers such as Søren Kierkegaard. For May, the concept of courage was not meant to be the opposite of Kierkegaard's despair, but rather the ability to continue on, courageously and authentically, in the face of despair.

In 1958, May, along with Ernest Angel and Henri F. Ellenberger, were editors of *Existence*, a book which introduced America to existential psychology. This new brand of psychology had many parallels to certain aspects of humanism (the similarities being so strong that the two fields are often thought of as virtually synonymous) and phenomenology in that it examines the subjective experience of the individual's inner world. When dealing with the therapeutic approach, existentialism differs from other psychotherapies in that it does not focus primarily on early childhood experiences and the conflict among unconscious drives and instincts, as that the of Freudian school of thought. And, unlike some neo-Freudian therapies and behaviorism, existential therapy does not place its primary focus on environmental influences and conflicts. Instead, the existential approach attempts to promote self-fulfillment, creativity, and a personal, almost spiritual strengthening of the *will*, by heightening the client's level of awareness concerning the "givens" of existence that all human beings must face. These existential inevitabilities include the manner in which one develops one's own unique ways of dealing with the ultimate concerns or anxieties caused by human existence such as isolation, choice, personal responsibility, ascribing meaning to one's life, death, and so on.

By the late 1970s, May had become one of the most influential and important American psychologists of his time. Other psychiatrists, such as Viktor Frankl (best known for his book *Man's Search for Meaning*) were writing on similar themes. The central message of May's psychology remained the same: while hardships, cruel twists of fate, and anxiety are imbued in the life of all human beings, by fully accepting these existential conditions inherent in life, one can begin to find dignity, worth, and a power or courage that lies within all persons. By introducing the ideas of European existential philosophers into mainstream America, May added an important dimension to American psychotherapy and social work.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Art of Counseling: How to Gain and Give Mental Health (New York, 1939).
Springs of Creative Living: A Study of Human Nature and God (New York, 1941).
The Meaning of Anxiety (New York, 1950).
Man's Search for Himself (New York, 1953).
Psychology and the Human Dilemma (Princeton, N.J., 1967).
Existential Psychology (New York, 1969).
Love and Will (New York, 1969).
Power and Innocence: A Search for the Sources of Violence (New York, 1972).
The Courage to Create (New York, 1975).
Freedom and Destiny (New York, 1981).
The Discovery of Being: Writings in Existential Psychology (New York, 1983).
The Cry for Myth (New York, 1991).

Other Relevant Readings

May's papers are at the University of California at Santa Barbara.
Ed. with Ernest Angel and Henri F. Ellenberger, *Existence: A New Dimension in Psychiatry and Psychology* (New York, 1958).
Ed., *Symbolism in Religion and Literature* (New York, 1960).
"Individual Consciousness and Responsibility," in *Ethics in an Age of Pervasive Technology*, ed. Melvin

Kranzberg (Boulder, Col., 1980), pp. 151–6.

Further Readings

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Who Was Who in Amer v11*

Abzug, Robert H. "Rollo May as Friend to Man," *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 36 (1996): 17–22.

Bugental, James. "Rollo May (1909–1994)," *American Psychologist* 51 (1996): 418–9.

———, "Outcomes of an Existential-Humanistic Psychotherapy: A Tribute to Rollo May," *Humanistic Psychologist* 28 (2000): 251–9.

DeCarvalho, Roy J. "The Humanistic Ethics of Rollo May," *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 32 (1992): 7–18.

Hannush, Mufid-James. "The Development of the Self in the Light of the Existential-Humanistic Psychology of Rollo May," *Review of Existential Psychology and Psychiatry* 24 (1999): 73–103.

Reeves, Clement. *The Psychology of Rollo May* (San Francisco, 1977).

Daniel Trippett

MAYS, Benjamin Elijah (1894–1984)

Benjamin Elijah Mays was born on 1 August 1894 (or possibly 1895) near Rambo (now Epworth), South Carolina. He received his BA with honors from Bates College in Maine in 1920, and also received his ordination as a Baptist minister in 1919. After three semesters of graduate work at the University of Chicago Divinity School, he was persuaded to teach mathematics at Morehouse College in Atlanta, and also pastured at Shiloh Baptist Church, until 1924. Returning to Chicago, he continued his studies with professors Shirley Jackson CASE, Edwin AUBREY, and Henry Nelson WIEMAN,

and completed his MA with a thesis on "Pagan Survivals in Christianity." He then taught English at South Carolina State College in 1925–6; was Executive Secretary of the Tampa Urban League from 1926 to 1928; and was National Student Secretary of Atlanta's Young Men's Christian Association from 1928 to 1930.

In 1930 Mays accepted an offer from the Institute of Social and Religious Research to undertake, with Baptist minister Joseph W. Nicholson, a study of nearly 800 black churches across America. Their results, published in *The Negro's Church* (1933), reveal the full extent of the impoverishment and marginalization of black churches. Although emphasizing how the churches are crucial to upholding the spirits of the oppressed and centers for democratic and tolerant fellowship, Mays and Nicholson also pursued the issue of inadequate preaching and congregational organization, pointing to the lack of college education and theological degrees among the clergy. Their sociological study of black religion in America shaped the field for the next decades.

In 1932 Mays went back to Chicago to complete his doctorate. He received his PhD in religion in 1935, writing a dissertation on "The Negro's God as Reflected in His Literature." Continuing the sociological analysis of *The Negro's Church* inspired by Chicago's Robert PARK, Mays studied periods of black writing in poetry, novels, biography, sermons, and spirituals in their sociohistorical context to understand their conceptions of God. Where Mays allowed himself to reveal his own perspective, he found compelling the moral vision of black Christianity that would advance progressive liberalism towards greater equality and genuine democracy for all.

From 1934 to 1940 Mays was Dean of the Howard University School of Religion. He then was President of Morehouse College from 1940 to 1967. He also served for twelve years on the Atlanta school board, and became its first black president in 1970. Mays was honored with dozens of honorary university degrees, and a granite monument in his native Greenwood

County in South Carolina in 1981. He died on 28 March 1984 in Atlanta, Georgia.

As one of the most prominent black educators and theologians, Mays viewed himself as continuing the Social Gospel tradition of Walter RAUSCHENBUSCH. He was very active in national and international religious organizations where he persuasively argued for his positions on race and class. In 1937 he discussed nonviolent resistance to oppression with Mahatma Gandhi at a World Conference of the YMCA in India. He was elected Vice President of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America in 1944, and was a delegate from the Black National Baptist Convention to the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1948. From 1948 to 1954 he served on the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches. As a staunch opponent of segregation, he brought many of these types of religious organizations to condemn racism and segregation world-wide.

Mays became a national leader of the civil rights movement. He was a supporter of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, the American Crusade to End Lynching, the Southern Conference Educational Fund, and a major leader of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Among his many students at Morehouse were theologian Howard THURMAN and minister Martin Luther KING, JR. King credited Mays for guiding him toward the ministry and for inspiring him with important spiritual and philosophical guidance toward the principles of Christian love and nonviolence. After King's assassination, his professor at Boston University, L. Harold DEWOLF, gave the first funeral eulogy at Ebenezer Baptist Church in Atlanta, and Mays gave the second funeral eulogy at Morehouse College.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Negro's Church, with Joseph W. Nicholson (New York, 1933).

The Negro's God as Reflected in His Literature (Boston, 1938).

Seeking to be Christian in Race Relations (New York, 1946; 2nd edn 1957; 3rd edn 1964).

Disturbed about Man (Richmond, Virg., 1969).

Lord, the People Have Driven Me On (New York, 1981).

Other Relevant Works

Mays's papers are at Howard University and Morehouse College.

Ed., *A Gospel for the Social Awakening: Selections, Edited and Compiled from the Writings of Walter Rauschenbusch* (New York, 1950).

"I Have Been a Baptist All My Life," in *A Way Home: The Baptists Tell Their Story*, ed. John S. Childers (Atlanta, 1964).

"Why I Believe There Is a God," in *Why I Believe There Is a God: Sixteen Essays by Negro Clergymen* (Chicago, 1965).

Born to Rebel: An Autobiography (New York, 1971).

Quotable Quotes of Benjamin E. Mays (New York, 1983).

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays Speaks: Representative Speeches of a Great American Orator, ed. Freddie C. Colston (Lanham, Md., 2002).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v8*

Carter, Lawrence E., ed. *Walking Integrity: Benjamin Elijah Mays, Mentor to Martin Luther King Jr.* (Macon, Georgia, 1998).

Dorrien, Gary. "Benjamin E. Mays and the Theology of Racial Justice," in *The Making of American Liberal Theology, vol. 2: Idealism, Realism, and Modernity, 1900–1950* (Louisville, Kent., 2003), pp. 415–30.

Mikelson, Thomas J. *The Negro's God in the Theology of Martin Luther King, Jr.: Social Community and Theological Discourse*. ThD dissertation, Harvard University (Cambridge, Mass., 1988).

John R. Shook

MEAD, George Herbert (1863–1931)

George H. Mead was born on 27 February 1863 in South Hadley, Massachusetts, and died on 26 April 1931 in Chicago, Illinois. His father Hiram was a pastor of Congregational churches in New Hampshire and Massachusetts before becoming a professor at the Oberlin Theological Seminary in Oberlin, Ohio. Following Hiram's death, his mother Elizabeth taught at Abbot Academy in Andover, Massachusetts, and then served for ten years as President of Mount Holyoke Seminary and College. Mead earned his BA from Oberlin College in 1883. After several years as a teacher and tutor for college-bound students, he resumed his formal education in 1887 by enrolling at Harvard University to begin work toward a PhD. While at Harvard, he studied philosophy with professors George Herbert PALMER and Josiah ROYCE, and he spent a summer as a tutor for William JAMES's ten-year-old son. In the fall of 1888 he left Harvard to begin three additional years of graduate study in philosophy and physiological psychology at the universities of Leipzig and Berlin. His professors in Germany included Wilhelm Wundt, Hermann Ebbinghaus, Friedrich Paulsen, and Wilhelm Dilthey. During his final year in Germany he married Helen Castle, whose father was a founder of the Castle & Cooke Company of Hawaii.

Mead began his professional career in 1891 as an instructor at the University of Michigan, hired by John DEWEY. When Dewey was called to the University of Chicago in 1894 to head a new department of philosophy, psychology, and pedagogy, Mead moved with him to become part of a department that included two other faculty formerly connected with the University of Michigan: James H. TUFTS and James R. ANGELL. Mead remained a member of the Chicago philosophy faculty until his death in 1931. Although Mead never completed work on his dissertation at the University of Berlin, his lack of this degree was not a serious impediment to his academic career, either at Michigan or Chicago. He rose to the rank of full professor of philosophy in 1907 and chaired the department following the retirement of Tufts. He was President of the Western Philosophical Association in 1916–17. Near the end of his career he was honored by being chosen to give the Paul Carus Lectures of the APA, in December 1930.

In addition to his academic work, Mead devoted a good deal of time to the leadership of various voluntary organizations working toward educational and social reform in the city of Chicago. Beginning in 1908 he served for fourteen years on the Board of Directors of the University of Chicago Settlement, a social service institution inspired by the example of Jane ADDAMS's Hull-House. During much of this period he held the position of treasurer for the Settlement and was a leading member on its finance committee. He chaired the organization's committee on studies and publications for a number of years, and was President of the Board of Directors from 1919 to 1922. Mead also served for a decade, along with Jane Addams, as a Vice President of the Immigrants' Protective League, and in 1910 he played a leading role on an ad hoc Citizens' Committee formed in an attempt to resolve the grievances leading to a strike by 25,000 of the city's garment workers. He was for twenty-five years an active member of the large and influential City Club of Chicago. From 1908 to 1914 he chaired the club's committee on public education, and from 1912 to 1922 he was a member of the club's Board of Directors. He served as Chair of this Board in 1917–18 and as President of the club during 1918–20.

Mead is recognized both for his contributions to the pragmatic tradition in American philosophy, and for the influence his ideas have exerted upon the school of symbolic interactionism in American sociology. Most of this latter influence and many of his contributions to philosophy are closely linked to the course on social psychology he regularly taught at Chicago beginning in 1900. This course had a direct influence upon many students and colleagues in philosophy and sociology, and an

indirect influence upon many others in the years following his death in 1931. The "Chicago School of sociology" was in part inspired by Mead, especially Ellsworth FARIS and Herbert BLUMER. Shortly after Mead's death, Charles W. MORRIS, one of his former students who had recently returned to the University of Chicago as a faculty member, began the job of editing student notes taken in several offerings of Mead's social psychology course in order to create the volume titled *Mind, Self and Society* (1934). Of all Mead's works, this has been most widely read by philosophers and sociologists.

Three additional volumes based upon Mead's lectures and unpublished manuscripts were published after his death. These include *The Philosophy of the Present* (1932), *Movements of Thought in the Nineteenth Century* (1936), and *The Philosophy of the Act* (1938). Preoccupation with his posthumously published works has led some readers to the misconception that Mead published little of importance during his lifetime. But while it is true that he published no book-length manuscripts, he did publish numerous essays and book reviews during his Chicago years. The full bibliography of his writings includes over ninety such items, at least forty of which are relatively substantial in length and content. These essays and reviews deserve careful examination not only because they help us to trace the development of Mead's thought, but also because they throw a good deal of light upon the ideas presented in his posthumously published writings. The most important of these early publications have been reprinted in *George Herbert Mead: Selected Writings* (1964) and *George Herbert Mead: Essays on His Social Philosophy* (1968).

The overall coherence of Mead's thought is best grasped by seeing how his various contributions to both social psychology and philosophy are grounded in an organic model of conduct given its classical formulation by Dewey's 1896 article, "The Reflex Arc Concept in Psychology." Dewey offered a critique of the simplistic and overly mechanical stimulus–response model of conduct ("the reflex arc concept") then prevalent in the field of psychology. In its place Dewey urged a new view of conduct in which stimulus and response are regarded as functionally definable moments within an ongoing process of behavioral coordination. This process of conduct, Dewey held, was better termed "organic" than "reflex" because of the manner in which stimulus and response reciprocally affect one another: in a typical act of eye–arm coordination, for instance, the reaching guides the looking and seeing just as much as the looking and seeing guide the reaching. Furthermore, the response does not simply follow upon or replace the stimulus; it mediates, transforms, enlarges, or interprets the initial stimulus content of an experience. As Dewey put it, we typically do not just respond *to* a stimulus, but give the stimulus added meaning by responding *into* it.

This organic model of conduct, to whose further elaboration not only Dewey but also Mead and Angell made significant contributions, supplied the conceptual basis for the functionalist approach to psychology and philosophy characteristic of the Chicago School at the beginning of the twentieth century. In his earliest publications Mead applied Dewey's organic model of conduct in a number of ways. First, in essays such as "Suggestions Toward a Theory of the Philosophical Disciplines" (1900), "The Definition of the Psychical" (1903), and "Concerning Animal Perception" (1907), he attempted to show how the distinction between subjective and objective elements of experience could be treated as a functional, rather than a metaphysical, distinction. Mead attempted to avoid the notion of an independently existing mental reality with all the familiar problems of idealism or psychophysical dualism to which this notion had historically led. Mead argued that our perception of physical objects is the result of what Dewey described as the mediation or interpretation of a stimulus content by the ways we respond into it. Such objects arise within our experience

when our distance experience of colors, odors, sounds, etc. is mediated by imagery drawn from previous manipulatory or contact experiences. Subjective or psychical consciousness, on the other hand, is a phase of human conduct that arises when our action is unable to proceed because of ambiguous stimuli or conflicting response tendencies. It is to be understood in terms of the functional role it plays in the resolution of such ambiguities or the reconstruction of such inhibited conduct.

A few years later, in a series of articles published between 1909 and 1913, Mead expanded early Chicago functionalism by including insights from his growing interest in social psychology. He now saw that an adequate functionalism needed to emphasize not only the *organic* character of human conduct but also its fundamentally *social* nature. Furthermore, while his earlier essays had focused on the ways in which perceived physical objects and subjective consciousness arise and function within conduct, he now emphasized the social dimensions of conduct that make such developments possible. Mead thus moved toward an increasingly genetic and social kind of functionalism. Some indication of the new directions in which his thought was moving can be gleaned from an inspection of the titles he gave to his publications of this period. These include "Social Psychology as a Counterpart to Physiological Psychology" (1909), "What Social Objects Must Psychology Presuppose?" (1910), "Social Consciousness and the Consciousness of Meaning" (1910), "The Mechanism of Social Consciousness" (1912), and "The Social Self" (1913). In these essays Mead formulated almost all the main concepts of his mature social psychological thought, elaborated further in such essays as "A Behavioristic Account of the Significant Symbol" (1922) and "The Genesis of Self and Social Control" (1925). Later, with editorial help from Charles Morris, they were presented once again in *Mind, Self and Society*.

Beginning with an analysis of the social dimensions of animal and human conduct, Mead offers a genetic hypothesis concerning the manner in which human language may have arisen from the rudimentary kind of social act he calls a "conversation of gestures." He also sets forth social and genetic theories of human self-consciousness and rational thought. Self-consciousness, he argues, is a social achievement rather than a biological given: we achieve self-consciousness when we learn to respond to ourselves in the roles of specific others and eventually in the role of a "generalized other." In this manner we enter into our own conduct as socially meaningful objects. Similarly, we acquire the capacity for rational thought or reflective intelligence when our acquisition of language gives us a set of socially meaningful "significant symbols" that we then use to interpret our experience and analyze problems encountered in our behavioral interaction with our physical and social environments. All of these social psychology theories make use of one of Mead's most distinctive concepts: the human social capacity to "take the attitude or the role of the other." This capacity to respond to one's own acts and vocal gestures as others in one's social environment tend to respond to them, he contends, is the key behavioral mechanism by which we import into our conduct those social structures that make possible our acquisition of language, significant symbols, rational intelligence, and self-consciousness.

What Mead found appealing about this theory was that it took a completely naturalistic and nondualistic view of everything distinctive about human beings. Human language, personality, self-awareness, and rational thought were all manifestations of the biological and social structures of human conduct.

Mead also formulated a naturalistic conception of the *moral* dimension of human experience in such essays as "Suggestions Toward a Theory of the Philosophical Disciplines," "The Philosophical Basis of Ethics" (1908), "The Social Self" (1913), "Scientific Method and the Moral Sciences" (1923), and "Philanthropy from the Point of View of Ethics" (1930).

Mead takes the same functionalist approach to moral reflection that he elsewhere takes to other aspects of our experience. Our consciousness of established moral values, he holds, is not an intimation of some special realm of standards existing apart from human life; rather, it is an awareness of meanings that have arisen within human social conduct and have acquired special normative status because of their effectiveness in guiding that conduct in satisfying ways. Similarly, our moral reasoning is simply the application of our symbolically mediated intelligence to conflicts of values that have arisen within human experience. Sometimes these conflicts are resolved by extensions or new applications of old meanings; sometimes they require the construction of new moral meanings. In either case, our moral consciousness and moral thought have nothing to do with a heavenly city not built with human hands; they are functional moments in "a great secular adventure" in which conflicts or ambiguities arising within human social existence repeatedly call upon us to revise the moral meanings of our social situations in ways that alter our social conduct and sometimes the very social structure of our selves.

As Mead developed this naturalistic view of human selves in his social psychology lectures and writings, he often referred to himself as a psychological "behaviorist." At other times, when he was working out various technical philosophical implications of his analysis of human social conduct, he referred to himself as a "pragmatist." His use of the first label is understandable – given its vogue in American academic psychology during the 1920s – but nevertheless misleading. Although Mead was always concerned with conduct or behavior in his social psychology, he shared neither the methodological strictures nor the mechanical model of behavior espoused by the classical behaviorists. The term "pragmatism," on the other hand, accurately applies to Mead's philosophical orientation but is too vague to be enlightening. We can make this term less vague, however, by specifying what Mead took to be the definitive characteristics of philosophical pragmatism.

Philosophical pragmatism has two fundamental features, Mead suggests in *Movements of Thought in the Nineteenth Century* and "The Philosophies of Royce, James, and Dewey in their American Setting" (1930). One is a psychology that regards reflective intelligence as a phase of conduct or behavior; the other is a view of knowledge based upon the notion of experimental inquiry, in which problems arising within conduct are dealt with by means of hypotheses that are tested by their ability to resolve these problems and thereby get conduct successfully going again. Mead illustrates these features of pragmatism by means of two brief references to the "laboratory habit of mind" endorsed by Charles PEIRCE (the only references to Peirce in all of Mead's publications) and a somewhat longer discussion of the philosophy of James. But it is Dewey whom Mead sees as advocating the most defensible version of pragmatism. Mead's main reason for calling himself a pragmatist is that he saw himself in fundament agreement with Dewey's point of view, from the beginning of their friendship at the University of Michigan until the end of his life. Dewey's thought, more than any other influence, gave shape to Mead's mature philosophical orientation, and most of his philosophical energies were devoted to the detailed explorations of Dewey's pragmatism.

Chief among these explorations was Mead's sustained analysis of the social dimensions of human conduct, and the use of this analysis as a basis for the development of those social psychological theories already mentioned. Even if Mead had accomplished nothing else, these social psychological achievements would have been sufficient to guarantee him a place of some importance in the history of American pragmatism. But Mead's philosophizing explored many other ideas arising from his analysis of human social conduct. In such essays as "Scientific Method and Individual Thinker" (1917) and "A Pragmatic Theory of Truth" (1929), for instance, he enriched

Dewey's view of scientific inquiry by showing how the personal experience of a socially structured human individual functions in the resolution of problems that have arisen within a shared or common world of objects constituted by a community of social selves. And in his later writings, he attempted to show how the patterns of our social conduct – especially the exercise of the human capacity "to take the attitude or the role of the other" – might be involved not only in our ordinary experience of space and time, but also in the constitution of the alternative space–time systems that figure prominently in Einsteinian physics. This last line of exploration is what accounts for Mead's frequent references to the concepts of Alfred North WHITEHEAD in such essays as "The Genesis of Self and Social Control" (1925), "The Objective Reality of Perspectives" (1927), "A Pragmatic Theory of Truth" (1929), and "The Nature of the Past" (1929) – as well as in *The Philosophy of the Present* and *The Philosophy of the Act*. Throughout the 1920s Mead sought to mine Whitehead's early works on the philosophy of nature for insights on relating the objects and structures of recent physical theory to his own social analysis of human conduct and experience.

Mead was inclined to embrace Whitehead's concept of nature as an organization of "perspectives" or alternative space–time stratifications, but he revised this view in order to make room for the emergence of minds that could think their way into a plurality of these perspectives. Only in this way, Mead believed, would it be possible to account for the shared world of everyday experience and scientific inquiry. Not surprisingly, he found the key to this proposed revision in his own view of the human social capacity to "take the attitude or the role of the other." Sociality, he suggested in the 1930 Carus Lectures (included in *The Philosophy of the Present*), might even be construed as a fundamental feature of nature as a whole. If this were done, it would be possible to articulate a meaningful sense in which the appearance of human thought in nature was a culmination of that sociality present throughout nature.

Such provocative attempts to develop the philosophical implications of human social conduct point toward the conclusion that Mead might most accurately be labeled a *social* pragmatist. Certainly, his persistent explorations of the social dimensions of human conduct and experience constitute his most distinctive contribution to the pragmatic tradition in American philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Philosophy of the Present, ed. Arthur E. Murphy (La Salle, Ill., 1932).

Mind, Self and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist, ed. Charles W. Morris (Chicago, 1934).

Movements of Thought in the Nineteenth Century, ed. Merritt H. Moore (Chicago, 1936).

The Philosophy of the Act, ed. Charles W. Morris et al. (Chicago, 1938).

The Social Psychology of George Herbert Mead, ed. Anselm Strauss (Chicago, 1956). A revised edition was published as *On Social Psychology: Selected Papers* (Chicago, 1964).

George Herbert Mead: Selected Writings, ed. Andrew J. Reck (Indianapolis, 1964).

George Herbert Mead: Essays on His Social Philosophy, ed. John W. Petras (New York, 1968).

The Individual and the Social Self: Unpublished Work of George Herbert Mead, ed. David L. Miller (Chicago, 1982).

Other Relevant Works

Mead's papers are at the University of Chicago.

"Suggestions Toward a Theory of the Philosophical Disciplines," *Philosophical Review* 9 (1900): 1–17.

"The Definition of the Psychical," in *Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago*, first series, vol. 3 (Chicago, 1903), pp. 77–112.

"Concerning Animal Perception," *Psychological Review* 14 (1907): 383–90.

"The Philosophical Basis of Ethics," *International Journal of Ethics* 18 (1908): 311–23.

"Social Psychology as a Counterpart to Physiological Psychology," *Psychological Bulletin* 6 (1909): 401–408.

"What Social Objects Must Psychology Presuppose?" *Journal of Philosophy* 7 (1910): 174–80.

"Social Consciousness and the Consciousness of Meaning," *Psychological Bulletin* 7 (1910): 397–405.

"The Mechanism of Social Consciousness," *Journal of Philosophy* 9 (1912): 401–406.

"The Social Self," *Journal of Philosophy* 10 (1913): 374–80.

"Scientific Method and Individual Thinker," in *Creative Intelligence: Essays in the Pragmatic Attitude* (New York, 1917), pp. 176–227.

"The Psychology of Punitive Justice," *American Journal of Sociology* 23 (1918): 577–602.

"A Behavioristic Account of the Significant Symbol," *Journal of Philosophy* 19 (1922): 157–63.

"Scientific Method and the Moral Sciences," *International Journal of Ethics* 33 (1923): 229–47.

"The Genesis of Self and Social Control," *International Journal of Ethics* 35 (1925): 251–77.

"The Objective Reality of Perspectives," in *Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress of Philosophy*, ed. Edgar S. Brightman (New York, 1927), pp. 75–85.

"The Nature of the Past," in *Essays in Honor of John Dewey*, ed. John J. Coss (New York, 1929), pp. 235–42.

"A Pragmatic Theory of Truth," in *University of California Publications in Philosophy*, 11 (1929): pp. 65–88.

"Philanthropy from the Point of View of Ethics," in *Intelligent Philanthropy*, eds Ellsworth Faris et al. (Chicago, 1930), pp.

133–48.

"The Philosophies of Royce, James, and Dewey in their American Setting," in *John Dewey: The Man and His Philosophy* (Cambridge, Mass., 1930), pp. 75–105.

"The Philosophy of John Dewey," *International Journal of Ethics* 46 (1935): 64–81.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils Before 1950*, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Blackwell Amer Phil*, *Blackwell Comp Prag*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Ethics*, *Encyc Psych*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v2*, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v41 & 42*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Aboulafia, Mitchell, ed. *Philosophy, Social Theory, and the Thought of George Herbert Mead* (Albany, N.Y., 1991).

———, *The Cosmopolitan Self: George Herbert Mead and Continental Philosophy* (Urbana and Chicago, 2001).

Baldwin, John D. *George Herbert Mead: A Unifying Theory for Sociology* (Newbury Park, Cal., 1986).

Blumer, Herbert. *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1969).

———, *George Herbert Mead and Human Conduct*, ed. T. J. Morrione (Walnut Creek, Cal., 2004).

Cook, Gary A. *George Herbert Mead: The Making of a Social Pragmatist* (Urbana and Chicago, 1993).

Corti, W. R., ed. *The Philosophy of George Herbert Mead* (Amriswil, Switzerland, 1973).

Cronk, George. *The Philosophical Anthropology of George Herbert Mead* (New York, 1987).

De Waal, Cornelis. *On Mead* (Belmont, Cal., 2002).

Gunter, Pete A. Y. *Creativity in George*

Herbert Mead (Lanham, Md., 1990).

Hamilton, Peter, ed. *George Herbert Mead: Critical Assessments*, 4 vols (London and New York, 1992).

Joas, Hans. *G. H. Mead: A Contemporary Re-examination of his Thought* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985).

Lowy, Richard. "George Herbert Mead: A Bibliography of the Secondary Literature with Relevant Symbolic Interactionist References," *Studies in Symbolic Interaction* 7 (1986): 459–521.

Miller, David L. *George Herbert Mead: Self, Language, and the World* (Austin, Tex., 1973).

Rosenthal, Sandra B., and Patrick L. Bourgeois. *Mead and Merleau-Ponty: Toward a Common Vision* (Albany, N.Y., 1991).

Rucker, Darnell. *The Chicago Pragmatists* (Minneapolis, 1969).

Scheffler, Israel. *Four Pragmatists: A Critical Introduction to Peirce, James, Mead, and Dewey* (New York, 1974).

Gary A. Cook

MEAD, Lucia True Ames (1856–1936)

Lucia Ames was born on 5 May 1856 in Boscawen, New Hampshire to Nathan P. and Elvira Ames. She died on 1 November 1936 in Brookline, Massachusetts. A writer and teacher, Mead was deeply involved in Boston's intellectual and social/political life. Her older brother, Charles, was a publisher through whom she met her husband, the peace activist, Edwin Doak Mead. Her brother also introduced her to William Torrey HARRIS, leader of the American idealist movement, under whose direction she studied philosophy.

Kant's moral and political philosophy was of interest to Mead, particularly his theory of peace. By the late 1890s she had become a core member of the antiwar movement, writing numerous books, pamphlets, and articles on pacifist theory, pacifist pedagogy, and peace activism. Unlike many activists whose understanding of pacifism was not as well-grounded theoretically as Mead's was, she remained a pacifist throughout World War I. In fact, she made an even stronger stance for peace after this war, calling for US support of the effort to establish a world court and a league of nations.

A feminist, Mead was a founding member of the Woman's Peace Party in 1915 and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom in 1922. She was also, along with Jane ADDAMS, a chief organizer and speaker at the 1914 International Conference of Women Workers to Promote Permanent Peace, where she read a paper on "Women, World War, and Permanent Peace." Mead's arguments on behalf of peace were not maternalistic. A liberal feminist, she argued instead for pacifism from a humanistic point of view. The connection between feminism and pacifism for her was social/political. Women may have more of an understanding of the damage caused by war and thus more motivation to work for peace, but this is because of their social role, not because of anything inherent in their nature *as women* for Mead.

In 1897 the businessman Albert Smiley invited Mead to the third of his annual peace conferences at Lake Mohonk in New York, where she presented a paper on educating the public about peace advocacy. These conferences provided an appropriate venue for Mead to develop her pacifist theory because, like Smiley and other Mohonk participants, she was not an absolute pacifist but instead favored international arbitration as a means to attaining peace. The key to a peaceful world for Mead was to establish both a world court and an international alliance of nations – what would become the League of Nations, and later the United Nations. Mead knew Kant's *Perpetual Peace* well, as did her colleagues

Addams and Emily Green BALCH, who co-founded the Woman's Peace Party with her in 1915.

Mead authored several books and numerous pamphlets and articles on peace, most notably *Patriotism and the New Internationalism* (1906), *Swords and Ploughshares* (1912), and *Law or War* (1928). In these works she tied rationality to pacifism. Promoting brotherly love is not enough to avert war. Clear lines of communication, accountability, and procedures for intervention are necessary to ensure that disputes between nations do not escalate and become violent conflicts. World governments must establish a *rational* system of international cooperation to make and maintain peace by establishing world bodies to mediate when disagreements arise between nations. She also developed a full-fledged pacifist pedagogy, particularly after World War I when it became clear that a deep understanding of pacifistic practice was necessary in order to bring about lasting peace. In the end, Mead worked out a four-phase theory of peace: (1) pacifistic action as patriotic action; (2) peace as internationalism; (3) absolute rejection of war as an option; (4) peace through education.

Peace, altruism, and internationalism were inherently intertwined for Mead. She wanted to help to redefine the meaning of the word "patriotism" so that it represented, instead of simply the willingness to go to war, a deep commitment to bettering the plight of others. Only a deeply rooted altruism, embedded in the principles of society itself, could help to realize this sort of patriotism. This would entail a uniform and equitable social/political structure to ensure the welfare of all – fair housing, adequate sanitation, excellent education, empowering labor practices, and a just penal system. For Mead, it was in taking action to better others in these ways that an individual becomes truly patriotic.

Mead's understanding of the individual as a member of the world community also motivated her. That is why she believed so strongly that a world body, organized around the idea of ensuring lasting peace around the globe, would ultimately succeed in at least alleviating the damage done by war – and perhaps make war a thing of the past.

Mead developed a number of curricula for both schools and churches to teach young people about peace. These included historical information about the nature and causes of war; the economic, political, and human costs of war; and methods for averting war through communication, mediation, and/or arbitration. Her approach to pacifism was *rational*. In working to educate children about peacemaking and peacekeeping, Mead was not under the illusion that disagreements and disputes will disappear for all time. She did maintain, however, that an education in pacifist principles and practices gives children the tools they need to mediate disputes in their own lives individually. Then, as future leaders, they will know about alternatives to war and violence and will therefore be more likely to pursue other options.

Mead's concern with education is important, particularly when considering women's philosophy. Pedagogical theory was *the* avenue through which women were able to enter philosophic discourse throughout the nineteenth century. Therefore, this aspect of Mead's work helps open the door to a branch of philosophic thought that has too often been excluded.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Great Thoughts for Little Thinkers (New York, 1888).

Memoirs of a Millionaire (New York, 1889).

To Whom Much is Given (New York and Boston, 1899).

A Primer of the Peace Movement (Boston, 1904).

Patriotism and the New Internationalism (Boston, 1906).

"Teaching Patriotism and Justice," a pamphlet (Boston, 1907).

"Patriotism and Peace, How to Teach

Them in Schools," a pamphlet (Boston, 1910).

Swords and Ploughshares; or, the Supplanting of a System of War by the System of Law (New York, 1912).

"Women and the War System: How the System Affects Women," a pamphlet (Boston, 1912).

"Outline of Lessons on War and Peace," a pamphlet (Boston, 1915).

"A Pacifist Program for Preparedness," a pamphlet (Washington, D.C., 1916).

"What the Christian Church Needs to Know about War and Peace," *Methodist Review* 106 (November–December 1923): 839–51.

Law or War (New York, 1928).

Other Relevant Works

Mead's papers are at Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania.

Ed., *The Overthrow of the War System* (Boston, 1915).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v28*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Alonso, Harriet Hyman. *Peace as a Women's Issue: A History of the U.S. Movement for World Peace and Women's Rights* (Syracuse, N.Y., 1993).

Craig, John M. *Lucia Mead (1856–1936) and the American Peace Movement* (Lewiston, N.Y., 1990).

Rogers, Dorothy G. "Before 'Care': Marietta Kies, Lucia Mead, and Feminist Political Theory," *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy* 19 (2004): 105–17.

Dorothy Rogers

MEAD, Margaret (1901–78)

Margaret Mead was born on 16 December 1901 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Her father, Edward Sherwood Mead, was a professor of economics at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, and her mother, Emily Fogg Mead, was a sociologist and social welfare reformer. Mead attended DePauw University for one year before transferring to Bernard College in New York City, graduating with a BA in psychology in 1923. She married Luther Cressman in that year. She then earned her MA in psychology in 1925 and her PhD in anthropology from Columbia University in 1929. In 1926 she began a lifelong position as a curator of ethnology at the American Museum of Natural History in New York City. She did not receive her first academic appointment until 1954, when she became an adjunct lecturer at Columbia University. Her other academic appointments included visiting professor at the University of Cincinnati's department of psychiatry in the late 1950s, Sloan Professor at the Menninger Foundation in 1959, and Chair of Social Sciences and professor of anthropology at Fordham University from 1968 to 1970. She died on 15 November 1978 in New York City.

Mead's early education was experiential, awakening in her an interest in learning through empirical observation, skills that later served her well as an anthropologist. As a girl, she often accompanied her mother on her field trips studying Italian immigrants in Hammonton, New Jersey. Her early exposure to different ethnic groups and cultures helped develop her strong sense of social justice and egalitarianism. During her senior year at Bernard, she came under the tutelage of Franz Boas, the preeminent figure in the relatively new field of anthropology. Boas's hypothesis was that culture, or learned behavior, explained differences among societies rather than inborn capacities. This revolutionary perspective would later lead Mead and fellow

anthropologist Ruth BENEDICT to collaborate in studying the relationship between personality development and culture. Mead's primary contribution was in clarifying the ways in which children learn to obey cultural norms.

Although Boas was responsible for framing Mead's philosophical approach to anthropology, Ruth Benedict's influence was pervasive in many other areas of her life. Though Benedict had received a doctorate in 1922, she worked in a subordinate position similar to administrative assistant to Boas, since few women received faculty positions at that time. Boas relied on Benedict for communication with his students in the field and she wielded influence disproportionate to her position. She soon became Mead's mentor and then lifelong friend and collaborator. Many years later Mead acknowledged (1972) that each had read everything the other wrote. Working with Boas and Benedict laid the groundwork for Mead's future.

In 1925 Mead traveled to American Samoa to study the problems girls in a different culture encounter during their adolescent years, to determine if they suffered the same difficulties and anxieties as Western young women. Returning from Samoa by ship in 1926, Mead met Reo Fortune, a young Australian psychologist. Eager for the intellectual repartee she had missed for the past year, she and Fortune spent much of the seven-week trip talking with each other. In the fall Mead threw herself into a position as assistant curator of ethnology at the American Museum of Natural History, the center of her work world for the rest of her life. She was indecisive about her personal situation until 1927 and finally divorced Cressman in 1928.

Fortune switched to anthropology and in 1928, getting married on the way, Mead and Fortune traveled to conduct fieldwork on Manus Island, off the coast of New Guinea. They organized their observations of island village activities by developing a methodology

they later called "event analysis." On this trip, Mead elected to study children's mental development, and specifically wanted to research animistic thinking of young children in a preliterate society; she questioned whether children attribute spiritual qualities to objects. She collected 35,000 drawings by children and eventually decided that spirits and ghosts did not populate the world of children as they did the world of their parents, since the children did not humanize inanimate objects, like a moon, by drawing a face on it. She concluded that animism was culturally learned.

Mead and Fortune returned to New York in September 1929 to discover Mead was a best-selling author. Although her dissertation ("An Inquiry into the Question of Cultural Stability in Polynesia") was completed in 1929, it was the 1928 publication of *Coming of Age in Samoa* that launched her public career. The language today does not seem provocative, but Americans in the 1920s were shocked to read Mead's descriptions of rendezvous by young Samoans under the palm trees. The book rejected nature as the cause of the angst of adolescence, credited nurture as responsible for the problems faced by the new breed called teenagers, and set the stage for Mead's becoming a spokesperson on rearing children.

Mead and Fortune spent the next two years in the United States. Mead wrote her second book, *Growing Up in New Guinea*, a title she probably would not have selected had she realized people would confuse it with her first book. In the summer of 1930 the couple traveled west to study the Omaha Native Americans in Nebraska. This was Mead's most discouraging fieldwork, partly because working through interpreters was unsatisfying and partly because of their situation. Fortune was angry and unhappy when he learned that the Omaha no longer practiced ceremonial rituals and he had a great deal of difficulty unraveling information about their spiritual world. Mead felt poor governmental

policies had left the Omaha culturally bankrupt.

In the fall of 1931 Mead and Fortune lived in three villages in New Guinea and Mead's fieldwork resulted in a third book, *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies* (1935), and a third husband. British anthropologist Gregory BATESON was studying the Iatmul and, immediately upon their meeting during the 1932 Christmas holiday, the three became friends and shared techniques for observing, collecting, and interpreting information.

During this time Benedict had been investigating the role temperament plays in an individual and, by extension, the society in which an individual is a member. In New Guinea the trio reviewed the manuscript of Benedict's *Patterns of Culture*, discussed her concept of culture as "personality writ large" (1973, p. 206), and extended Benedict's ideas to the personal level. At the time, Mead considered the ideas exciting theoretical concepts, graphically organized around the points of a compass (1972, pp. 238–9), with aggressive temperaments to the north, nurturing temperaments to the south, and various possibilities for other directional points.

Although Mead did not directly publish an article that used the theoretical construct that she, Bateson, and Fortune developed, it influenced her thinking, especially as she wrote *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies*. Mead described both male and female Arapesh as gentle and nurturing, both male and female Mundugumor as aggressive and harsh, and, in a reversal of gender roles in American society, Tchambuli males as nurturing and females as aggressive. "We are forced to conclude," Mead wrote, "that human nature is almost unbelievably malleable" (1935, p. 280). Because this book reversed Western gender norms, it has been hailed as a feminist classic. It has also been criticized because of Mead's tendency to generalize about gender roles in the three societies she studied and the limited time she

observed each. That she could so easily find three tribes with the temperaments she attributed to each was also suspect. Mead's analysis of societal temperament probably owes a great deal to personal issues since she was caught in a situation with two men who exemplified two of the compass points at the same time they were reading and discussing Benedict's book. Despite the complex theoretical framework and the intense personal relationships that influenced *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies*, Hilary Lapsley contends its strength lies in Mead's position that "men and women can be other than they are" (1999, p. 237) if they are not constrained by their society.

Mead divorced Fortune in 1935 and married Bateson in 1936, and they combined honeymoon with research in Bali. In 1939 the couple realized World War II was imminent and returned to New York. Mead also suspected she was pregnant and wanted to make sure she did not, as she had previously, suffer a miscarriage. Mary Catherine Bateson was born 8 December 1939 after Mead insisted on holding up the delivery while the photographer sent for a flashbulb. Mead practiced the relaxed childcare and breastfeeding she had observed in other cultures and advocated. Whether she anticipated or perhaps initiated a trend, Mead selected an unknown pediatrician named Benjamin Spock long before his ground-breaking and best-selling book, *The Common Sense Book of Baby and Child Care*, with its assurance to parents that they were the best judges of their child's health and comfort, a philosophy Mead embraced.

During World War II, Mead and Bateson joined other anthropologists in contributing to the war effort. In 1942 she wrote *And Keep Your Powder Dry*, a book to help Americans understand their attitudes toward conflict and war. She traveled officially to Great Britain to investigate cross-cultural misunderstandings between British women and American servicemen who had flooded the country, and she crisscrossed the United States in this time of food shortages and rationing to study food habits

and improvement of nutrition. She and Ruth Benedict served as the first directors of the Council of Intercultural Relations, now the Institute for Intercultural Studies, whose goal was and still is to seek a cultural approach to international problems.

Mead was horrified when atomic bombs dropped on Japan. Feeling the world had changed for ever, she wrote in *Blackberry Winter* (1972) that she tore up every page of an almost completed book. Actually, she did not destroy the entire book; about 200 pages of various chapter drafts from *Learning to Live in One World*, dated 9 July 1945, and a second book Mead began after the surrender of Japan still exist. They are housed in the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C., along with over 500,000 items she bequeathed, one of the largest collections from a single individual.

The years 1947 to 1950 were difficult for Mead, with major losses in her life through divorce and death. Mead and Bateson separated in 1947 and ultimately divorced in 1950. He was Mead's only husband to take the initiative in leaving the marriage, a sadness Mead felt the rest of her life. A second sadness was the loss in 1948 of Ruth Benedict, a friend, colleague, and probably a lover, from a coronary thrombosis. In *With a Daughter's Eye: A Memoir of Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson* (1984), Mary Catherine Bateson acknowledged the relationship and it is discussed fully in Lapsley's *Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict: The Kinship of Women* (1999).

Mead typically handled personal issues by throwing herself into her work and did so again. The 1928 choice of fieldwork on Manus had been a fortuitous one. After both Japanese and American soldiers marched across the island during World War II, Mead was in a perfect position to study how rapid change affects a culture. Mead made a field trip to contrast pre and postwar Manus in 1953, and detailed her observations in *New Lives for Old: Cultural Transformation – Manus, 1928–1953* (1956). She eventually made four additional trips there.

Criticism of Mead surfaced from South Pacific islanders after her death. She based her positive comments about Manus progress (1956) on the Western definition of the word, ignoring that the Manus people might not view the bulldozing, blasting, and building as beneficial. Some of the people Mead studied argued that she made a fortune from writing about them but had not directly returned any of it. Also chafing was her ignoring racism prevalent in whites-only clubs and writing that they are "a people without history" (1956, p. 21) when in fact they have a long history, albeit not a Westernized one. Some concerns have seemed unfair because they are based on Mead as a person of the time in which she lived. She referred to peoples of the South Pacific as "primitive," a pejorative term today although in Mead's time typically used to describe a culture without written language.

In her senior years, Mead's appearance, wearing a long cloak and carrying a shepherd's crook in lieu of a cane, symbolized her unique and dramatic personality. Mead believed the field of anthropology encompassed the world and kept herself and her views in the public eye, a place she relished and worked to maintain by effectively teaching, speaking, and writing. As a teacher she was extremely popular; one semester over 600 non-anthropology students signed up to take her course at Yale University. Her lecture schedule was frenetic, with 100 engagements a year. She also aired her views on multiple topics on radio programs and was one of the talking heads of television in its early days.

It was through her writing, however, that Mead became an American icon. A complete bibliography of materials authored by her would list about 1,500 entries, an average of 150 books and articles every year of her half-century career, a prodigious output. Best known by the public was her monthly column for *Redbook* magazine, written with collaborator Rhoda Métraux, a column that continued for sixteen years, an unprecedented length of time for an anthropologist to write for the popular press.

Mead's work influenced a generation of Americans. Her detractors blamed her for lax

sexual standards and general permissiveness among young people. Although she could not single-handedly be responsible for those accomplishments, Mead contributed to mainstream American thought on a huge variety of issues, from education (a curriculum relevant to students is needed) to special education (include students with special needs in regular education classrooms) to freedom of choice (allow abortion, although she personally considered it too close to taking a life) to volunteerism (provide volunteers with greater respect and benefits) and to bisexuality (is a normal form of human behavior). Mead saw the world as becoming a single community in which each individual is valued; she rebuked the government for not supporting alternative fuels and not practicing greater conservation of natural resources; and she worried that world leaders would try to manipulate the media to control how history viewed them, rather than waiting for time to shape their legacy.

Mead popularized the term "generation gap" to refer to changes in values and mores held by those born before World War II and those after. Some societies, which she called *postfigurative*, are traditional ones with minimal change from generation to generation and pose little potential for generational conflict. The possibility of conflict, however, is present in *cofigurative* cultures, in which one group dominates another, and in *prefigurative* cultures, where change occurs continuously. While older adults often view youth in the latter cultures as rebelling, Mead believed young people simply have a different perception and will eventually move into responsible societal roles. The term "generation gap" has mutated, moved into marketing and become hackneyed, but Mead's philosophical concept of social conflict across generational issues remains valid. Mead also envisioned a society in which grandparents encourage young people to help them stay abreast of current trends and in return grandparents give youth a sense of times past and help them prepare for a constantly changing

society. She saw diversity as a resource and lauded a diverse society as one in which each learns from the other.

Not all of her ideas were well targeted or enduring. When she suggested decriminalization of marijuana, she was flooded with abusive responses that generally ignored her warning about overuse of prescription drugs as a greater danger. Mead herself backed down after negative response from columns that suggested trial marriages as a way to lower the divorce rate and recommended matching children of a similar temperament with parents whose temperament was compatible.

Although Mead's legacy is primarily as a spokesperson and activist, she is also recognized as one of the leaders in the development of the school of culture and personality. Generally considered synonymous with psychological anthropology, it was a major thrust of the field from the late 1920s, when Mead, Benedict, and other students of Boas were intrigued with the confluence of personality and culture, until the 1950s. By then, the tendency for gross generalization led to criticism. Mead, for example, strongly supported a book written by friend Geoffrey Gorer and psychologist John Rickman. The book, intended to help Americans understand the Russian character, presented the premise that, by tightly swaddling infants, Russian children grow into dictatorial, guarded adults. Similarly, other complex problems were oversimplified by seeking unifying themes that would provide global answers. Eventually the culture and personality school was bypassed by mainstream anthropology.

The most serious challenge to Mead's work came after her death. With much publicity, Harvard University Press published *Margaret Mead and Samoa: The Making and Unmaking of an Anthropological Myth* by Australian Derek Freeman in 1983, followed by his second book, *The Fateful Hoaxing of Margaret Mead* in 1999. Freeman's basic criticism accuses Mead of preplanning findings to support cultural rather than biological

reasons for behavior, spending too little time in the field to collect adequate data, being misled by her lack of proficiency with the language, exaggerating the sexual behavior of Samoans, and ignoring violence in Samoan life. Luther Cressman came to Mead's defense by writing an articulate response (1988) in which he denied the possibility of any collusion between Boas and Mead. Martin Orans (1996) credits Mead with providing detailed field notes, not the behavior of someone who was trying to hide information. She did, however, have a limited time in the field, was never overly proficient with foreign languages, and presented data that do not hold up to statistical rigor. Of course, in 1925 Mead was a youthful innovator feeling her way in a new field and should not be judged by modern research standards. Freeman's books and the publicity they generated muted Mead's legacy, although his intensity and tenacity in working to discredit Mead have made him appear more interested in a vendetta than scholarly pursuit of truth.

Despite criticisms, Mead's contributions to American thought are many and her messages about a variety of topics continue to provide valuable insights and answers to problems that remain troublesome in the twenty-first century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Coming of Age in Samoa: A Psychological Study of Primitive Youth for Western Civilisation (New York, 1928).

Growing Up in New Guinea: A Comparative Study of Primitive Education (New York, 1930).

Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies (New York, 1935).

And Keep Your Powder Dry (New York, 1942).

New Lives for Old: Cultural Transformation – Manus, 1928–1953 (New York, 1956).

Culture and Commitment: A Study of the Generation Gap (Garden City, N.Y., 1970).

Blackberry Winter: My Earlier Years (New York, 1972).

An Anthropologist at Work: Writings of Ruth Benedict (New York, 1973).

Letters from the Field: 1925–1975 (New York, 1977).

Other Relevant Works

Mead's papers are at the Library of Congress.

Cooperation and Competition among Primitive Peoples (New York, 1937).

Male and Female: A Study of the Sexes in a Changing World (New York, 1949).

"The Impact of Culture on Personality Development in the US Today," *Understanding the Child* 20 (1951): 17–18.

The Study of Culture at a Distance, with Rhoda Métraux (Chicago, 1953).

Margaret Mead: Some Personal Views, ed. Rhoda Métraux (New York, 1979).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Dict Amer Bio, Encyc Amer Bio, Encyc Social Behav Sci, Who Was Who in Amer v7

Bateson, Mary Catherine. *With a Daughter's Eye: A Memoir of Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson* (New York, 1984).

Bowman-Kruhm, Mary. *Margaret Mead: A Biography* (Westport, Conn., 2003).

Cressman, Luther. *A Golden Journey: Memoirs of an Archaeologist* (Salt Lake City, Utah, 1988).

Gordon, Jane, ed. *Margaret Mead: The Complete Bibliography 1925–1975* (New York, 1976).

Howard, Jane. *Margaret Mead: A Life* (New York, 1984).

Lapsley, Hilary. *Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict: The Kinship of Women* (Amherst, Mass., 1999).

Orans, Martin. *Not Even Wrong: Margaret*

Mead, Derek Freeman, and the Samoans (Navato, Cal., 1996).

Mary Bowman-Kruhm

MEEHL, Paul Everett (1920–2003)

Paul E. Meehl was born on 3 January 1920 in Minneapolis, Minnesota, and died there on 14 February 2003. He entered the University of Minnesota in 1938 as a medical student, migrated within a year to psychology, and received his BA summa cum laude in 1941. He remained at Minnesota for doctoral studies in psychology, where he was influenced by the "dustbowl empiricist" approach of the Minnesota department. He worked closely with B. F. SKINNER, D. G. Paterson, and Starke Hathaway. Upon obtaining the PhD in psychology in 1945, he joined the Minnesota psychology faculty as an assistant professor.

In 1951 Meehl began a concurrent career as a practicing psychotherapist, undergoing a training analysis and becoming a psychoanalyst in 1958. He came into contact at Minnesota with philosopher Herbert FEIGL, who had arrived from the University of Iowa in 1939. Meehl became Feigl's protégé and collaborator; and with Wilfrid SELLARS, Michael SCRIVEN, and others, they founded the Minnesota Center for Philosophy of Science in 1953.

Meehl was associated with philosophy at Minnesota throughout his career. He was promoted to full professor of psychology in 1951, and appointed Regents Professor of Psychology at Minnesota in 1968, a post he held until his retirement in 1990. Meehl continued to occasionally teach courses in his retirement and continued to publish. Meehl was chair of the psychology department from 1951 to 1957, and from 1971 to 1990 he was also a professor of philosophy at Minnesota.

Meehl was President of the American Psychological Association in 1962 and was elected to the National Academy of Sciences in 1987. In 1996 Meehl was honored with the award for Outstanding Lifetime Contribution to Psychology by the American Psychological Association.

One of the most overtly philosophical of modern psychologists, Meehl's basic philosophical orientation was a version of logical empiricism much influenced by Feigl. Meehl was strongly committed to determinism, realism, and the discovery of lawful relations in a unified science framework. His primary aim in psychology was to reveal latent mental entities via logical and statistical analysis: pursuing this goal, he expanded this philosophy over the years while working across a wide range of psychological subfields. Ideas relating to concept formation and validation were a focus early in his career. Two co-authored papers, the first with Kenneth MacCorquodale in 1948 on the distinction between intervening variables and hypothetical constructs in the context of neo-behaviorist learning theory, and the second with Lee Cronbach in 1955 on construct validity in psychological testing, have become important methodological references in psychology. Meehl's *Clinical vs. Statistical Prediction* (1954), which compared statistical prediction of outcomes against intuitive clinical judgments, was informed by ideas of probabilistic truth criteria. His conclusion that clinical judgment is never superior to actuarial prediction has not been readily accepted in psychological practice.

Meehl devoted much attention to theory construction in psychology, emphasizing the need for open concepts. In 1962, based on his experience in psychotherapeutic practice (he ran a private practice from 1951 to 1993), he advanced a theory of schizophrenia that modeled his ideas about theory building. Difficulties encountered in connection with creation of his own theory led him to mount a critique of methodology and theory construc-

tion in psychology. Psychology makes little progress, claimed Meehl, because its theories are not susceptible to refutation. In the course of this critique, from 1970 onward, he further expanded his own philosophy onward, incorporating several Popperian ideas, notably falsifiability and verisimilitude. Characteristically, Meehl retained his emphases on determinism and lawfulness even while adopting much of the critique of positivist empiricism. Meehl extended his interest in concept definition to issues of classification generally, and much of the rest of his career was devoted to developing statistical procedures for identifying putative taxonomic groups of symptoms and behaviors in psychiatric contexts. He developed many multivariate statistical procedures for the detection of natural classes of mental and behavioral activity.

A unique figure among psychologists of his generation, Meehl was a psychologist who desired a rapprochement between philosophy and psychology and who contributed, in the context of the shifts of emphasis in his career, a thoroughgoing, philosophically informed critique of scientific psychological theorizing at all levels of the discipline. Incidental to his main endeavors as a psychological theorist, he pursued interests in many other philosophical issues, including the mind–body and freedom–determinism questions. He delivered several trenchant critiques of logical fallacies inherent in clinical psychology's practice. Meehl was particularly interested in the contrast between theory in scientific psychology and in other intellectual domains, most notably law and history, and wrote extensively on the relations of law and psychology. Not the least of his subsidiary philosophic contributions was his revival of the idea of psychological hedonism by his recasting of hedonic tone as "hedonic capacity," a measurable individual-difference variable. An eclectic Freudian, Meehl wrote on problems connected with the scientific status of psychoanalysis, and also contributed occasional papers on subjects including voting behavior, the insanity defense, privacy, religion and mental health, parapsychology, and guilt.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"On a Distinction between Hypothetical Constructs and Intervening Variables," with Kenneth MacCorquodale, *Psychological Review* 55 (1948): 95–107.

Clinical vs. Statistical Prediction: A Theoretical Analysis and a Review of the Evidence (Minneapolis, 1954).

"Construct Validity in Psychological Tests," with Lee Cronbach, *Psychological Bulletin* 52 (1955): 281–302.

"Schizotaxia, Schizotypy, Schizophrenia," *American Psychologist* 17 (1962): 827–38.

"The Compleat Autocerebroscopist: A Thought-Experiment on Professor Feigl's Mind–Body Identity Thesis," in *Mind, Matter, and Method: Essays in Philosophy and Science in Honor of Herbert Feigl*, ed. Paul K. Feyerabend and Grover Maxwell (Minneapolis, 1966), pp. 103–80.

"Law and the Fireside Inductions: Some Reflections of a Clinical Psychologist," *Journal of Social Issues* 27 (1971): 65–100.

Psychodiagnosis: Selected Papers (Minneapolis, 1973).

Selected Philosophical and Methodological Papers of Paul E. Meehl, ed. C. Anthony Anderson and Keith Gunderson (Minneapolis, 1991).

Other Relevant Works

"Hedonic Capacity: Some Conjectures," *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic* 39 (1975): 295–307.

"Theoretical Risks and Tabular Asterisks: Sir Karl, Sir Ronald, and the Slow Progress of Soft Psychology," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 46 (1978): 806–34.

"Paul E. Meehl," in *History of Psychology in Autobiography*, vol. 8, ed. Gardner Lindzey (Palo Alto, Cal., 1989), pp.

337–89.

"Clarifications about Taxometric Method," *Applied and Preventive Psychology* 8 (1999): 165–74.

"Using Meta-Scientific Studies to Clarify or Resolve Questions in the Philosophy and History of Science," with David Faust, *Philosophy of Science* suppl. 69 (2002): 185–96.

Further Reading
Bio Dict Psych
Howard, George S. "When Psychology Looks Like a 'Soft' Science, It's for Good Reason!" *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology* 13 (1993): 42–7.
Keuth, Herbert. "On Prior Probabilities of Rejecting Statistical Hypotheses," *Philosophy of Science* 40 (1973): 538–46.

David C. Devonis

MEIKLEJOHN, Alexander (1872–1964)

Alexander Meiklejohn was born on 3 February 1872 in Rochdale, England. He emigrated with his family to the United States in 1880 and settled in Pawtucket, Rhode Island. He attended Brown University and received his BA in 1893. He then received a PhD in philosophy at Cornell University in 1897, and began teaching philosophy that year at Brown as an assistant professor of philosophy. Meiklejohn was promoted up to full professor and also served as Dean from 1901 to 1912. From 1912 to 1923 he was President of Amherst College. He was President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1924–5. In 1926 he became professor of philosophy and education at the University of Wisconsin, and retired in 1938. While at Wisconsin, Meiklejohn continued to experiment with educational reforms, and designed an Experimental College which operated from 1927 to 1932. In the late 1930s he led the School of Social Studies for adult education in San Francisco, California. In retirement he continued to publish his ideas about philosophy of education and educational reform. He was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1963. He died on 16 December 1964 in Berkeley, California.

Meiklejohn's liberal and experimental philosophy found expression in his creative work in pedagogy and philosophy of education, and in his passionate devotion to freedom of speech. *The Experimental College* (1932) was widely influential, and provoked many later experiments by liberal arts colleges in the 1950s and 1960s. His Experimental College at Wisconsin fostered intellectual community between students and between students and teachers; traditional lecturing methods were replaced; grades and examinations were eliminated; and the curriculum was tightly controlled. While his specific techniques were not adopted completely anywhere else, modified versions of his suggestions gradually spread throughout US higher education during the second half of the twentieth century.

Meiklejohn was one of the founders of the American Civil Liberties Union in 1920. After World War II, freed from the responsibilities of teaching, he lectured widely across America, wrote several books, and soon became one of America's most prominent defenders of freedom of speech and academic freedom. In his justification of the First Amendment to freedom of speech, citizens have a special right and privilege to discuss freely political issues and any other issue. Rather than starting from the individual's right to speak, Meiklejohn preferred to argue that in a democracy, it is the overriding responsibility of the public to hear everyone's voice. On his theory, the government can never preemptively silence a speaker in a public forum, even if there might be a foreseeable danger. Meiklejohn was a vocal and forceful critic of the anti-communist

purges and loyalty oaths, and also made an impact on court decisions protecting citizens from consequences when they criticize public officials. The Meiklejohn Civil Liberties Library at Berkeley, founded in 1965, carries on his legacy and spirit of defending civil rights.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Liberal College (Boston, 1920).
Freedom and the College (New York, 1923).
The Experimental College (New York, 1932).
What Does America Mean? (New York, 1935).
Education between Two Worlds (New York, 1942).
Free Speech and Its Relation to Self-Government (New York, 1948).
Political Freedom: The Constitutional Powers of the People (New York, 1960).

Other Relevant Works
Meiklejohn's papers are in the State Historical Society of Wisconsin in Madison, Brown University, and Amherst College.
"Philosophers and Others," *Philosophical Review* 34 (1925): 262–80.
"Inclinations and Obligations," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 16 (1948): 203–23.
Alexander Meiklejohn: Teacher of Freedom, ed. Cynthia Stokes Brown (Berkeley, Cal., 1981).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v51, Pres Addr of APA v3, Proc of APA v38, Who Was Who in Amer v4, Who's Who in Phil
Brennan, William J. "The Supreme Court and the Meiklejohn Interpretation of the First Amendment," *Harvard Law Review* 79 (November 1965): 1–20.

Hill, Walker H., ed. *Learning and Living: Proceedings of an Anniversary Celebration in Honor of Alexander Meiklejohn* (Chicago, 1942).
Nelson, Adam R. *Education and Democracy: The Meaning of Alexander Meiklejohn, 1872–1964* (Madison, Wisc., 2001).
Tussman, Joseph. "Remembering Alexander Meiklejohn," *Liberal Education* 70 (Winter 1984): 323–42.

John R. Shook

MELAND, Bernard Eugene (1899–1993)

Bernard Meland was born of immigrant Norwegian parents on 28 June 1899 in Pullman, Illinois, a south Chicago suburb. The family moved to nearby Homewood in 1910, where he was raised in the Lutheran Church and later became a Presbyterian. He did his undergraduate work at Park College (BA 1925), a Presbyterian school in Kansas City, Missouri. He then earned a BD from McCormick Theological Seminary. He completed his PhD at the Divinity School of the University of Chicago in 1929 when it was at the height of its influence as a "modernist" school within liberal Protestant theology. His dissertation, "A Critical Analysis of the Appeal to Christ in Present-day Religious Interpretations" was written under the direction of Gerald B. Smith, following a year of study in Germany. His first appointment was in 1930 as professor of religion at Central College in Fayette, Missouri. In 1936 he joined the faculty of Pomona College in California, where he taught courses in the history and philosophy of religion. In 1945 he returned to the University of Chicago Divinity School as professor of constructive theology. Meland retired in 1964. He published fourteen books, edited two volumes, and published 150 articles from 1930 to 1989.

Meland died on 8 February 1993 in Chicago, Illinois.

Meland's career and his thought were intimately connected to the phases of theology at Chicago's Divinity School during the first two thirds of the twentieth century. He studied under Shirley Jackson CASE and Shailer MATHEWS during the sociohistorical period (roughly 1908–26) of "the early Chicago School of Theology," which focused on the functional adaptation of groups and individuals to their historical, cultural, and natural environments. He was influenced particularly by the mystical strains of Gerald Smith. He participated in the empirical theology at Chicago (1926–46), which was dominated by the empiricism and realism of Henry N. WIEMAN. Meland himself embodied the third phase of theology at Chicago (1946–66), commonly called "constructive theology." Here he reworked concepts of elementalism, the structure of experience, a new realism, and appreciative awareness. Although he was commonly associated with Wieman's empirical theology, a form of liberal Protestant theology deeply formed by the assumptions and methods of modern science, Meland's emphasis was more on the aesthetic dimension of religious experience and the symbolic forms of culture than on an empiricism defined by the scientific method.

As a liberal Protestant, Meland was interested more in the reconstruction of the symbols and practices of Christian faith within the modern context ("constructive theology") than in the interpretation of historic doctrines and practices of Christianity (systematic theology). As a representative of empirical theology, his philosophy of religion had several aspects. First it was liberal, by establishing religious thought on the basis of experience rather than the authority of tradition. His liberalism was shaped more by William JAMES and Henri Bergson, emergent evolution, and the new physics, than by Kant, Darwin, or Newton. Second, his philosophy of religion was naturalistic: the one realm of reality is the natural concrete world of lived experience, a world broader than those of reductionistic materialism or humanism. Third, it was empirical: it focused on the concrete character of events in order to discover and generalize commonly shared features of experience. Fourth, it was experiential: it was focused on the concrete relational context rather than the Kantian or liberal evangelical experience of a transcendent reality. Fifth, it was realistic: it was critical of the mentalism and rationalistic tendencies of much liberal thought. Sixth, it was process-relational: it offered a speculative vision of the whole generalized in the categories of the process metaphysics of Alfred North WHITEHEAD.

Meland's empirical theology, which he also called "empirical realism," was an alternative to the abstract concept of experience found in classical empiricism. Experience, as conceived by modern empiricists, is thought to consist only of sense experience. Hume taught that all of our ideas follow from and copy sense impressions, with the result that all relations and dynamic continuities were supposed to be foreign to experience, attached only by practice, custom, or habit. Deeply influenced by emergent evolution, the new physics, and the organismic thinking developed by Bergson, James, and Whitehead, Meland's "radical empiricism" represented a deeper understanding of experience. Instead of appealing to a religious experience (conversion) or to a religious quality of experience (Friedrich Schleiermacher's feeling of absolute dependence or Paul TILLICH's ultimate concern), he appealed to the mystery and depth of experience as such. Drawing on James's radically empirical notion of "the perceptual flux" and on organismic thought based on the new physics and emergent evolution, Meland claimed that the most immediate empirical datum is the sheer act of existing. We live more deeply than we can think. Experience, as a lived bodily event, is richer than sense experience, linguistic expression, or conceptualization.

Throughout the 1930s Meland described his view of experience as "mystical naturalism." The sense of a "more" to experience was expressed as an "elementalism" or "creaturalism," a sense that the roots of life go into the universe itself, that we are children of the earth, that we are earthbound, that we belong to a vast, cosmic neighborhood, which prompts "the worship mood" of awe and wonder. In contrast to modes of thought that begin with a categorial scheme employed as a literal description of reality, empirical realism was a form of religious inquiry rooted in elementalism, which begins with "the primacy of perception." Perception is deeper than consciousness and richer than conception. The perceptual field is the ongoing stream of occurrences in which we participate bodily. The idea of the perceptual flux conveys the fullness of the concrete data and leads to meaning as knowledge by acquaintance, which is infinitely richer than the knowledge acquired through conceptualization.

The range of meanings in his empirical realism was not rooted in a penumbra of mystery that supervenes and enters experience; it was rooted in the mystery and depth of the immediacies themselves. Experience as lived conveys a contextual ground of relations which is part of every concrete experience and constitutes a holistic event more ultimate than our conceptions. Relations are not imposed by the mind on reality; they are experienceable and experienced. They are felt as immediately as anything else and are as real as the terms they relate. When perception, instead of sensation or conception, is given priority, experience includes transitions, activity, the sense of beauty, and a "more." The contextual or relational ground of any event is seen to be a datum in its own right prior to and independent of language and thought.

In Meland's radical empiricism, this contextuality of experience appeared at "the fringe of consciousness." Deeper than all forms of conscious experience are the happenings and configurations of events in which the relationships

and complexity of meaning provide a depth of context that defies ready observation or analysis. Perceptual experience provides every occurrence of awareness with a "fringe," which persistently evades conceptualization. The primary and initial cognitive response to this contextual depth at the fringe of consciousness is "appreciative awareness," an openness to the range of data beyond our comprehension, which includes maximum receptivity, identification, and discrimination. Existence understood within the context of radical empiricism embraces simultaneously qualities of immediacy and ultimacy. Ultimacy is not a supervening reality which casts its shadow on experience or invades experience from outside. It is a dimension of experience within the "Creative Passage" that transpires to give depth of meaning to the human situation as immediately discerned within our structured experience.

Meland did not restrict his understanding of experience to the subjective life of the individual. It is the concrete event of the mutual inherence of the body and the relational context. Pure experience and its contextual depth are available as more than a preconscious flux awaiting conceptualization. Experience, in its fuller meaning, is a perception of the depth of relations within a larger world. Subjectivity, while still of prime importance as a dimension of experience, is never viewed just as a closed track of internal reflection or reverie but as immediate access to what opens out into the world as lived experience. Individuals are integrated into a fuller orbit of meaning and valuation as they emerge from their individual tracks of perception and participate in the depth of experience.

The immediacies of experience are conveyed simultaneously within both the individual and culture. A persisting inheritance of contextual relations within the stream of experience is transmitted culturally as bodily feeling from age to age. Given the relational character of experience, lived experience is a patterned occurrence as well as a channeling of feeling

within individual tracks of perception. Another way to state this is to say that experience has both a personal and a social character. Experience is always an internal ordering of responses within individual lives, but individuals exist in relationship with one another within certain geographical bounds and partake of common occurrences, which, in turn, give rise to specific instances of conscious experience. There is an inner channeling of events in individual memories, sensibilities, and bodily characteristics, which make up the psyche, but there is also an outer channeling of experience in the form of the social customs and public practices of culture.

The key to Meland's idea of culture is his notion of "the structure of experience." When experience is defined as a relational concept, the term "culture" becomes intrinsic to the idea of experience. Culture is a particularized fruition within the realm of experience. As a component of experience, culture is the human flowering of existing structures and facilities, becoming manifest as an ordered way of life in the imaginative activities and creations of a people, their arts and crafts, their architecture, their furniture and furnishings, their costumes and designs, their literature, and their public and private ceremonies, both political and religious. Culture neither simply produces experience nor simply expresses experience. Culture exists as a mode of reciprocal interaction between pure experience and structured meaning through the medium of language. Language is the primary means of culture in conveying the depth of experience and shaping our encounter with the deeper realities of lived experience. The forms of culture, which embody the contextual character of lived experience beyond the individual tracks of subjective experience, are internalized by the individual by way of symbolization.

The structure of experience is the most elemental level of meaning in any culture. This concept is rooted in James's version of radical empiricism and Whitehead's notion of causal efficacy, which imply that experience is con-

tinuous and that the meanings that have emerged persist in some form to give character to every successive event. The structure of experience is shaped by the ethos of a culture (the complex of sensibilities, the sentiments and the dispositions of a community) and by the mythos of a culture (the persistent reservoir of psychical energy and sensitivity and persisting pattern of meaning and valuation imaginatively projected through metaphor and drama). Mythos is not to be equated with myth (an elemental ingredient in mythos) or mythology (a secondary level of imaginative reflection within the mythical mode) but is the pattern of sensibilities projected through metaphor. The elemental myth of a culture gives shape to this cultural mythos. It conveys to conscious experience something of the depth of awareness, which would otherwise remain at the level of bodily feeling. While mythologies are expendable, myth, as a persisting expression of the primal response of sensitivity and wonder in a culture, is not.

The structure of experience integrates the individual life of the person with the fund of valuations related to the ethos and mythos of a culture through the shaping of perception. Perception is simultaneously a bodily event in which the data are freshly encountered through participation and a valuating event coterminous with the act of individuation by which what is encountered is felt, grasped, apprehended, valued, and finally interpreted within a frame of meaning that is organic to the life of the person. The cycle of responses of a culture gives rise to a complex of symbols and signs, which contribute to a sense of orientation and familiarity. Like the genetic code operating at the level of physical inheritance, this funded social inheritance becomes a given, expressing itself concretely in each individual existence as a past selectively merging with immediacies to emerge as a present moment of living in intentional acts.

Our perceptual experience is apprehended and interpreted through "frames of meaning." An individual internalizes the structure of expe-

rience (the nurturing context of meanings, feelings, and valuations) through "symbolization." The personality of the individual, existing in this structure of experience, is formed by a subtle and almost imperceptible process of taking into its consciousness and feelings the cultural meanings and values thus transmitted. Language is not merely a tool used by the autonomous subject of experience to express the experience of the subject but is involved in conveying the fullness, and shaping the meaning, of primal experience. In addition to the organic structure, then, the resources of culture, internalized through symbolization, determine the nature of the experience of the individual.

What is noteworthy for Meland in this larger concept of experience is that structure, valuation, and meaning are already present in each individual event and person; they are not added to experience. What we perceive in the vital immediacy of experience is not a chaos of unformed impressions awaiting form through conceptualization. We live out of a world that is given, out of structures of meaning susceptible of reconception and even recreation. But the freedom to partake of a new historical situation is, in a way, defined and given by the historical fabric of occurrences, which now define one's intentionality in this historical moment of time. In short, experience includes a social and cultural world. This is another dimension of the "new realism," or "empirical realism," namely, the realities outside and other than self-experience, existing independently of it, though engaging it both continuously and in intermittent encounters. The imagery of self-experience that dominated earlier liberal thought has given way to a strong sense of otherness that is conveyed in lived experience in its primal and cultural forms. In this form, Meland has gone beyond the subjectivism and mentalism of much earlier liberal thought, expanded the realism in Wieman's thought, and formulated the otherness of the neo-orthodox theologies of Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, and Reinhold NIEBUHR in a naturalistic and empirical framework.

Meland's concept of God is set within this naturalistic framework. God is a human construct built from experience in both its subjective and cultural forms of the ultimate mystery within the Creative Passage in which we live. God, in the religious sense, is a contemplative concept, whereby the mind synthesizes the mystery and multiplicities of the depth of experience into a term of devotion. The empirical meaning of the term God, its "correspondence" to the mystery and depth of experience, is not an objective being or person but rather the cosmic implications of the complex sustaining relations of our environment. God is the "community of behaviors" within the Creative Passage, which are bent on qualitative achievement. God is a structure of infinite goodness and incalculable power, which we do not create but experience. Sensitivity, rather than mind or will, dominate Meland's philosophical thinking about God. Aesthetic, rather than moral or metaphysical, categories shape his philosophical concept of God. He designates this reality through such images as "the sensitive nature within nature" and the "depth and ultimacy within the creative passage." God is the ultimate efficacy within the natural world that works toward qualitative attainment.

Meland's form of empirical theology is a bridge between the older liberalism of the enclosed subject and the postliberalism of autonomous interpretation. It is a philosophy of religion that stands between a naïve foundationalism, on the one hand, and a radical deconstruction, which portrays experience as merely the product of language and culture, on the other. His empirical method continued the liberal theological project in two ways. First, he retained the critical, anti-authoritarian stance in theological method that liberalism initiated. Authority rests in reality itself, in its depth and richness, not in an authority which can prescribe or proscribe beliefs about reality. Second, he attempted to ground theology in experience. Our religious beliefs about reality depend on an empirical description of the depth and richness of reality as it is experienced in individual, cult, and culture.

Meland is also a key transition figure between classical liberal theology and postliberal theology. Before the current term "postliberal" became fashionable as a way of describing the pragmatic, cultural, linguistic, and textual approaches to religion, Meland was critical of some of the basic characteristics and themes of liberal theology. Throughout his writings, his empirical method is postliberal in at least three ways. First, his stress on realism or otherness makes him a thorough, persistent critic of all forms of liberalism that reduce experience and reality to the subjectivity of the individual. As early as 1934 he began to challenge the restriction of liberal religion to the subject. Historic liberalism, which was basically Kantian in its philosophical method, Darwinian in its view of evolution, and Newtonian in its understanding of the physical universe, could be characterized as an enclosure within self-experience, the result of which was to circumscribe every meaning to the human, mental sphere. Meland's empirical realism claims, like all forms of neo-orthodox theology, that otherness is real. However, unlike most other postliberal theologians who tried to replace the subjectivity and mentalism of liberal idealism with an otherness that cast its shadow from beyond this world, Meland's otherness is incorporated into the notion of "withness," so that ultimacy and immediacy travel together as the depth of concrete experience.

Second, Meland's particular version of foundationalism was uncharacteristic of that found in previous liberal theology. His effort to ground theological method in experience, and particularly his appeal to the primal context or primal ground of experience as a source of theology, not only sounds like the language of one who is searching for the foundations of faith and theology behind language and story but is an argument that faith and theology are indeed grounded in a reality which is deeper and richer than language, texts, cult, and culture. However, if foundationalism is defined, as it is by most anti-foundationalists today (for example, neo-pragmatists, linguistic theorists,

historicists, and deconstructionists) as the thesis that our beliefs can be warranted or justified by appealing to some item of knowledge that is self-evident or beyond doubt, then Meland's work is anti-foundational at its core. Certainty is denied, not only because of the limitations of the human structure, but also because of the unavailability of ultimacy in naturalism and empiricism. He found no certainty in any human equation. However, his relativism rests not only on the fact of cultural pluralism but also on the relatedness of reality itself. His solution to the problem of relativism is to appeal to ultimacy within the immediacy of experience itself in its various dimensions. The answer to relativism is not absolutism or even foundationalism, in the strict sense, but relativity itself. The fact that our human formulations are not to be taken as direct accounts or descriptions of what is ultimate and real in experience is not to be understood to mean that we stand dissociated from these depths of reality, including value and ultimacy, in experience.

Third, Meland, in emphasizing the relation of language and culture to experience, employed a postliberal methodology. He did not conceive of experience as isolated within the conscious subject. It has both cultural breadth and metaphysical depth. His concept of experience placed him closer to the postliberal theologies than to historic liberalism. His entire philosophy of religion consisted of a reciprocity of meaning among experience, language, and culture. Experience is not reducible to language and culture, a reduction which some postliberal theologies come close to making. However, even when experience is not explicitly reduced to the epiphenomenon of linguistic systems, the failure to develop a theory of the relation between experience and culture leaves one of the most fundamental issues between liberal and postliberal theologies not just unresolved, but even unexplored. The genius of Meland's empirical method is that he explored this problem for more than half a century and provided a concept of experience which does

not force one into an either/or choice between the liberal appeal to experience or the postliberal focus on language and culture. These were not either/or choices, because experience is a richer concept than most liberal theologies conceived, including both a depth of relations and linguistic and cultural embodiments of that depth. Language and culture are inherently connected with the depth of reality and a structure of experience that grounds all their fallible forms. Unlike postliberal theology, Meland's postliberal empirical realism treats experiential, linguistic, and cultural modes of theology not as discreet methods, perspectives, or options but as aspects or elements of a realism that provide an empirical context for philosophy of religion and theology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Modern Man's Worship: A Search for Reality in Religion (New York, 1934).

American Philosophies of Religion, with Henry N. Wieman (Chicago, 1936).

Seeds of Redemption (New York, 1947).

America's Spiritual Culture (New York, 1948).

The Reawakening of Christian Faith (New York, 1949).

Faith and Culture (Oxford, 1953).

Higher Education and the Human Spirit (Chicago, 1953).

The Realities of Faith: The Revolution in Cultural Forms (Oxford, 1962).

The Secularization of Modern Culture (Oxford, 1966).

Fallible Forms and Symbols: Discourses on Method for a Theology of Culture (Philadelphia, 1976).

Other Relevant Works

Meland's papers are at the University of Chicago.

"Toward a Valid View of God," *Harvard Theological Review* 24 (1931): 197–208.

"The Appreciative Approach in Religion," *Journal of Religion* 14 (1934): 194–204.

"The Faith of a Mystical Naturalist," *Review of Religion* 1 (1937): 270–78.

Write Your Own Ten Commandments (Chicago, 1938).

The Church and Adult Education (New York, 1938).

"The New Language in Religion," *Religion in the Making* 2 (1942): 275–89.

"Interpreting the Christian Faith within a Philosophical Framework," *Journal of Religion* 33 (1953): 87–102.

"New Dimensions of Liberal Faith," *Christian Century* 74 (1957): 961–3.

"How is Culture a Source for Theology?" *Criterion* 3 (1964): 10–21.

"For the Modern Liberal: Is Theology Possible? Can Science Replace It?" *Zygon* 2 (1967): 166–86.

"Liberalism, Theological," in *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 14th edn (London, 1968), vol. 13, pp. 1020–22.

"Introduction: The Empirical Tradition in Theology at Chicago," in *The Future of Empirical Theology*, ed. Bernard Meland (Chicago, 1969), pp. 1–62.

Essays in Constructive Theology: A Process Perspective, ed. Perry LeFevre (Chicago, 1988).

Further Reading

Who Was Who in Amer v12, *Who's Who in Phil*

Dean, William. *American Religious Empiricism* (Albany, N.Y., 1986).

Frankenberry, Nancy. *Religion and Radical Empiricism* (Albany, N.Y., 1987).

Inbody, Tyron. *The Constructive Theology of Bernard Meland: Postliberal Empirical Realism* (Atlanta, 1995).

Minor, William S. *Creativity in Henry Nelson Wieman* (Metuchen, N.J., 1977).

Mueller, J. J. *Faith and Appreciative Awareness: The Cultural Theology of Bernard Meland* (Washington, D.C., 1981).

Peden, Creighton. *The Chicago School: Voices in Liberal Religious Thought* (Bristol, Ind., 1987).

Rogers, Dolores Joan. *The American Empirical Movement in Theology* (New York, 1990).

Tyron Inbody

MELDEN, Abraham Irving (1910–91)

A. I. Melden was born on 9 February 1910 in Montréal, Canada. He received his BA in 1931 at the University of California at Los Angeles, his MA in 1932 at Brown University, and his PhD in philosophy at University of California at Berkeley in 1938. He was appointed instructor of philosophy at Berkeley (1939–41), and served as assistant, associate, and full professor of philosophy at University of Washington (1946–64). He then was professor of philosophy at the University of California, Irvine (1964–77). In 1962 he was elected President of the American Philosophical Association Pacific Division. Melden died on 17 November 1991 in Irvine, California.

Melden was primarily interested in ethics, rights, and action theory. He believed that philosophy is nothing if not lucid and detailed. For over forty years he practiced the careful analysis of important concepts concerned with action theory and ethics, especially the notion of human rights. His own clear writing style, with its use of frequent and apt examples, perfectly fits his conception of philosophy as an attempt to clarify and make sense of human action, freedom and rights. His 1961 book *Free Action* is a good illustration of his clarity. He opens up his discussion of the whole topic of free action by asking whether we can hold someone morally responsible for killing someone in a car accident as the result of impairment caused by drinking too much whiskey. This is a problem concerning free choice and causation. The more we know about the circumstances of the whole action

seems to show that the result was causally necessitated by deciding to drink, deciding to drive under its influence, and being thus unable to avoid the tragic result. Yet, the person made voluntary decisions to drink and drive. In other words, the person was not compelled. A causal chain of events was working with its predictable result, but still the chain of events was initiated by free or voluntary choice and the person knew what he was doing. Melden's example is lucid and apt for his purposes of opening up the whole discussion of free action and how it relates to the predictability of causal sequences as well as how it relates to the concept of moral responsibility. His succeeding chapters discuss in detail how this and other similar cases can be understood: how decision, choice, prediction, and the voluntary can be sensibly explained.

While Melden became noted for his skillful editing of essays on moral philosophy and human rights, perhaps his own most important work is his 1977 *Rights and Persons*, wherein he tries to explain why rights are centrally important to morality. For Melden, human rights involve the basic right of persons to pursue their interests, and this right is fundamental and inalienable. It is the source of any special rights that people may have. There is a long tradition in ethics emphasizing duty or obligations as primary. Historically, rights have had to fight for their rightful place. Moreover, rights have been often regarded as principally political or legal rather than moral. Melden does not deny the importance of moral obligation, but he does believe that it must be coordinated with the inherent right of the agent.

Moral duties or obligations without rights would be for Melden just as bad as rights subordinated to duties. Rights need to be recognized as of equal, not peripheral or subordinate, importance. He attempts to dispel misconceptions about rights that would present conceptions of moral rights to promote economic privilege and inequity. Moral rights, he argued, may be justifiably enjoyed, not against, but only *with* humanity. He takes up the relation

between the obligation to keep promises and the rights of the promisee as agent, in order to explain what kind of rights are violated in breaking promises. He extended his discussion of rights to personal relations and the family, as well as to justice, institutions, and persons. For Melden, rights are not reducible to duties or obligations or simply right conduct. Rights are intimately connected with human personality and, as he views them, are an essential feature of moral situations.

Melden believed that moral reasons for actions are grounded in facts, but these facts are not simply impersonal or neutral; they have their morally relevant values built into them. The facts of human action are, as it were, bathed in an atmosphere of values, personal agency, and the recognition of rights. It is a mistake to think of rights as basically political or legal. More fundamentally, they are personal, human, and moral. To take away the concept of rights from ethics is to leave ethics empty. David BRAYBROOKE, among others, in his 1968 *Three Tests for Democracy* acknowledges the strong influence of Melden's concept of rights.

Melden admits that the notion of moral rights has not fared well in philosophy. He cites Jeremy Bentham and others who dismissed the notion of natural or universal rights as nonsense, or fictitious. Even those philosophers who, like Kant, allowed a conception of the rights of man had, according to Melden, an overly constricted view or a view that reduces rights to duties, a view that claims we have rights only insofar as we have duties. Melden gave a detailed analysis of the role rights play in relation to keeping promises. Promising is a personal transaction, not an impersonal or abstract relation. Two parties are involved who must see that each has rights due to them. To promise is to underwrite, by the support one pledges, the agency of another. As a formal device a promise also involves mutual understanding. For Melden, moral rights are not conditions that confine us. The right of human beings to pursue their interests is no *mere* liberty. Rights call for a concrete setting in which they may be enjoyed. For moral purposes, Melden emphasized that persons are *not* faceless placeholders in institutional arrangements. They are individuals with their distinctive interests and personalities.

Melden was a great proponent and expositor of the idea of human rights at a time when this idea was subject to both criticism and neglect by philosophers. It is fair to say that Melden has had some influence in returning philosophy's attention to this topic. He admits that framing a clear and cogent conception of human rights is no easy task. Nature does not offer us people made from fixed molds and nonpersons from still others. Decisions have to be made by courts and administrators and states in all the practical affairs of life about who has moral rights, such as infants, fetuses, seriously retarded individuals, or those Melden calls psychopaths and sociopaths. Lacking any exact or mathematically precise notion of a person or human being deserving rights, how can any reasonable notion of human rights be maintained? Melden raised the difficult question of whether sociopaths and psychopaths have fundamental rights of moral agents, not to display the impossibility or absurdity of the notion of human rights, but rather to show how important and challenging it is. For Melden, the problem of clarifying the meaning and justifying the many applications of the idea of human rights is an ongoing and critical problem for any adequate system of ethics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Why Be Moral," *Journal of Philosophy* 45 (1948): 169–81.

"On Promising," *Mind* 67 (1958): 523–41.

Rights and Right Conduct (Oxford, 1959).

Free Action (London, 1961).

"Reasons for Action and Matters of Fact," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 35 (October 1962): 45–60.

Rights and Persons (Oxford, 1977).

"On Moral Rights," in *Ethical Theory in the Last Quarter of the Twentieth Century*, ed.

Norman E. Bowie (Indianapolis, 1983), pp. 107–27.

Rights in Moral Lives: A Historical Philosophical Essay (Berkeley, Cal., 1988).

Other Relevant Works

Melden's papers are at the University of California at Irvine.

Ed., *Ethical Theories: A Book of Readings* (New York, 1950; 2nd edn 1967).

Ed., *Essays in Moral Philosophy* (Seattle, Wash., 1958).

Ed., *The Theory of Practical Reasons*, by Arthur E. Murphy (LaSalle, Ill., 1964).

Ed., *Human Rights* (Belmont, Cal., 1970).

"Do Infants Have Moral Rights?" in *Children's Rights: Moral Essays on Developing Persons*, ed. W. Aiken and H. LaFollette (Totowa, N.J., 1980), pp. 199–220.

"Are There Welfare Rights?" in *Income Support: Conceptual Policy Issues*, ed. P. Brown, C. Johnson, and P. Vernier (Totowa, N.J., 1981), pp. 259–78.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, Pres Addr of APA v7, Proc of APA v66

Braybrooke, David. *Three Tests for Democracy: Personal Rights, Human Welfare, Collective Preference* (New York, 1968).

Davis, Lawrence H. *Theory of Action* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1979).

Machan, Tibor R. "Some Recent Work on Human Rights Theory," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 17 (1980): 103–15.

Radford, Robert T. *Freedom and Explanation: A Critique of Melden's Action Theory*. PhD dissertation, University of Texas (Austin, Tex., 1970).

Wilkins, Burleigh T. "Meldon on Willing," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 31 (1971): 444–50.

Guy W. Stroh

MENCKEN, Henry Louis (1880–1956)

Henry Louis Mencken was born on 12 September 1880 in Baltimore, Maryland, and he died there on 29 January 1956. His father August, a German-American, was a successful cigar manufacturer. As an agnostic and self-made man, August Mencken was proud of having relied upon his own mind to forge his thoughts on matters of business, politics, and religion. His fiercely independent nature and hard-nosed realism, no doubt, influenced his son, whose own skeptical and cynical attitudes came to define Mencken's own brand of social philosophy and critical realism. Mencken attended the Baltimore Polytechnic Institute, graduating as valedictorian of his class in 1896. Yet while Mencken excelled in his studies, he did not continue his formal education beyond high school. He had little respect for formal education and wanted to be out working in the thick of world affairs. He chose to make his own way as a journalist.

Mencken did take correspondence courses in journalism before taking his first job as a reporter for the Baltimore *Morning Herald* in 1899. In one capacity or another, he would remain with the newspaper business for the rest of his working life. After only two years with the *Morning Herald*, he became its Sunday editor. In 1906 he began his lifelong association with *The Baltimore Sun*. Although he was the editor of *The Evening Sun* for a brief period, he primarily wrote opinion columns for the paper throughout his career.

Mencken's social commentary was not limited to his work with newspapers, however. As a writer for magazines and more importantly as an owner of *The Mercury*, one of the more critically astute and intellectually probing magazines in the early decades of the twentieth century, Mencken continued to attack absurdities of American life and thought, in general. He never wearied at being what he called the nation's "critic of ideas." From 1914 to 1923 he was co-editor of the *Smart Set* with George Jean Nathan; together they founded

the *American Mercury* in 1924, and Mencken was its sole editor from 1925 to 1933.

Mencken embraced libertarianism, dedicated to undermining all ideas harmful to intellectual freedom and all institutions that fostered them. For Mencken that meant striking blows at religion and politics, especially the religion of "Puritanism" and the politics of democracy. He believed that both democracy and religion were enemies of human potential, both hampering and limiting individual achievement. Behind Mencken's thinking lay the influence of three of the nineteenth century's most powerful minds: Charles Darwin, Ralph Waldo EMERSON, and, most importantly, Friedrich Nietzsche. Mencken developed his own code of self-reliance from his reading of Emerson and adapted it to Darwin's ideas on the "survival of the fittest." For Mencken, only the strong and independent individual would be fit to survive in the competitive social environment of the modern period. With his reading of Nietzsche, moreover, Mencken found a powerful vision that mirrored much of his own and gave what Mencken saw as authoritative support for his own developing philosophy.

To Mencken goes the credit for popularizing Nietzsche to readers of his day, especially among young intellectuals. With the publication *The Philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche* in 1908, Mencken revealed both Nietzsche and himself as iconoclastic skeptics, as strong minds capable of breaking through illusionary conventions to reality, as champions of free and strong individuals. The strong individual, as Mencken admiringly quoted Nietzsche as saying in his book on the philosopher, must "attack error wherever he saw it" and "proclaim truth wherever he found it. It is only by such iconoclasm and proselytizing that humanity can be helped" (1908, p. 201). But the strong individual must first be free to rise above the mediocre in life, as Mencken believed, above the mentally numbing social order of a democracy, especially.

Mencken's main attack upon democratic notions came with his publication of *Notes on Democracy* in 1926. Mencken used the

book to speak out against what he saw as growing powers of the government and the social control of individuals by powerful state forces. He generally portrays government as a social evil and its democratic citizens as weak and gullible. The theme that carries the book is that democracy weakens the intellectually superior by championing the mediocre majority. Mencken paraded the same philosophy before his readers in *The American Mercury*, pointing to the socially debilitating effects of democratic thinking that led to rule by mob mentality, a mindset that was in itself governed by what Mencken saw as an overweening American Puritanism.

Mencken defined this Puritanism in its widest sense as any group or institution bent on infringing upon an individual's liberty. But he cast his harshest criticism at religious groups, particularly at fundamentalists whom Mencken believed were trying to keep Americans mired in ignorance and superstition. In his *Treatise on the Gods*, published in 1930, he took aim at fundamentalist groups, in particular, and religion, in general, citing the superstitions of democracy and evangelicalism as a burden on nineteenth-century intellectual progress. This book is Mencken's most thorough and convincing in terms of research and argumentative presentation. He discusses at length the nature and origin of religion, its evolution, varieties, and Christian form, as well as its twentieth-century variations. But as with most of his thinking, Mencken weaves a bit of Darwin and Emerson together with much of Nietzsche. He argues that religion in its Christian form failed through a democratization process that enslaved individual believers to institutional dogma that, over time, divorced itself from the creative force of Jesus Christ.

Mencken considered Christ to be a man of superior intelligence and extraordinary abilities and, using Nietzsche's insight into human nature, placed him into the category of a "Dionysian" individual. Christ was neither the son of God nor God, as Mencken considered

him, rather he was a radical thinker and disabling force that threatened social order with creative change. Christians, as Mencken saw them, were not willing to risk such change and were all too often imposing their particular order upon others. Like his championing of strong individuals against "mediocre morons" in *Notes on Democracy*, Mencken's *Treatise on the Gods* ultimately denounces the consequences of democracy, which finally condemns individuals to the common fate of being just average. And for the average person, as Mencken concludes, religion might be a necessity; but for Mencken, such average types can only hinder a society's progress.

Mencken's notions on liberty and progress, no doubt, account for the popularity of both *Notes on Democracy* and *Treatise on the Gods*. During the 1920s he gained international fame through his writings in *The Mercury*, chiefly through his attacks on the forces of Puritanism. He viciously took aim at such forces in his reportage of the 1925 Scopes trial, for instance, championing John Scopes for breaking Tennessee law by teaching evolution in schools while denouncing Tennessee for surrendering to demands of unenlightened fundamentalists. Mencken himself was taken to court several times for the pieces he published in *The Mercury*, especially when he questioned the moral authority of leading dignitaries in that stronghold of Puritanism known as the New England Watch and Ward Society. Through such trials and reportage on trials, Mencken became the heroic libertarian of his day.

As Mencken wrote to a friend in 1923, "I am, in brief, a libertarian of the most extreme variety and can imagine no human right that is half as valuable as the simple right to pursue the truth at discretion and utter it when found." (Williams, 1977, p. 124) In his aggressive pursuit of truth, Mencken qualifies as a philosopher of a peculiar brand. His was a philosophy built on truths aimed at action. Rather than discerning consequences of ideas before acting on them, as a pragmatist might,

Mencken lived his ideas knowing the consequences he wanted, enabling the actions of his thought.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche (Boston, 1908).

Men Versus the Man (New York, 1910).

In Defense of Women (New York, 1918).

The American Language: A Preliminary Inquiry into the Development of English in the United States (New York, 1919).

Prejudices: First Series (New York, 1919). Subsequent books in this series are *Second Series* (New York, 1920), *Third Series* (New York, 1922), *Fourth Series* (New York, 1924), *Fifth Series* (New York, 1926), and *Sixth Series* (New York, 1927).

Notes on Democracy (New York, 1926).

Treatise on the Gods (New York, 1930).

Treatise on Right and Wrong (New York, 1934).

Other Relevant Works

Mencken's papers are at the Enoch Pratt Free Library in Baltimore, Maryland.

Happy Days, 1880–1892 (New York, 1940).

Newspaper Days, 1899–1906 (New York, 1941).

Heathen Days, 1890–1936 (New York, 1943).

The Impossible H. L. Mencken: A Selection of His Best Newspaper Stories, ed. Marion E. Rogers (New York, 1991).

My Life as Author and Editor, ed. Jonathan Yardley (New York, 1993).

Thirty-five Years of Newspaper Work: A Memoir, ed. Fred Hobson et al. (Baltimore, Md., 1994).

H. L. Mencken on Religion, ed. S. T. Joshi (Buffalo, N.Y., 2002).

Mencken's America, ed. S. T. Joshi (Athens, Ohio, 2004).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*

Bode, Carl. *Mencken* (Carbondale, Ill., 1969).

Dorsey, John. *On Mencken* (New York, 1980).

Douglas, George H. *H. L. Mencken: Critic of American Life* (Hamden, Conn., 1978).

Hobson, Fred. *Mencken: A Life* (Baltimore, Md., 1994).

Schrader, Richard J. *H. L. Mencken: A Descriptive Bibliography* (Pittsburgh, 1998).

Schrader, Richard J., ed. *H. L. Mencken: A Documentary Volume* (Detroit, 2000).

Stenerson, Douglas C., ed. *Critical Essays on H. L. Mencken* (Boston, 1987).

Teachout, Terry. *The Skeptic: A Life of H. L. Mencken* (New York, 2002).

Williams, W. H. A. *H. L. Mencken* (Boston, 1977).

Jason G. Horn

MERRIAM, Alan Parkhurst (1923–80)

Alan Parkhurst Merriam was born on 1 November 1923 in Missoula, Montana. He earned a BA in music from Montana State University in 1947, and an MM from Northwestern University in 1948. His attention turned to anthropology under the tutelage of Melville Herskovits and Richard Waterman, and in 1951 Merriam was awarded the PhD degree in anthropology from Northwestern. He taught at Northwestern University in 1953 and 1954, and again from 1956 to 1962. During the interim years of 1954 to 1956, he taught at the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee. In 1962 he became professor of anthropology at Indiana University, where he later became chair of the department. He co-founded the Society for Ethnomusicology and edited the journal *Ethnomusicology* from 1952 to 1958. Merriam died on 14 March 1980 in a plane crash near Warsaw, Poland.

Merriam was instrumental in making the discipline of ethnomusicology a legitimate academic endeavor. His seminal work, *The Anthropology of Music* (1964), argued that the appropriate way to understand music in any culture was through a multilevel approach. First, music must be understood in terms of its technical aspects, such as tone, pitch, meter, timbre, and instrumentation. Merriam suggests that this has been the focus of musicology. A complete understanding of music, however, demands an understanding of the role that music plays in the lives of the people of a particular culture. Important features of music as a cultural practice include: when music is played, who is or becomes a musician, what music means for a culture, and what the status of music and the musician is socially. In short, there are complex patterns of behavior surrounding the practice of music in a culture which must be understood in addition to the technical aspects of the music.

Drawing on the work of such figures as Ernst Cassirer, Susanne LANGER, and Thomas MUNRO, Merriam addressed the relationship between philosophical aesthetics and his conception of ethnomusicology. He advocated understanding music through its symbolic function, both through the symbolism inherent in the music itself, whether in the music's text or tonal qualities, as well as the music's symbolism that reflects other cultural values, beliefs, and practices. Merriam also challenged both the cross-cultural application of traditional Western philosophical aesthetics, as well as the thesis that all art forms share fundamentally similar qualities. Merriam claimed that traditional Western aesthetics possesses six general features or concepts: the aesthetic attitude, art for art's sake, art's capacity to produce

emotion, beauty as a property of objects, an intention on the part of the artist to create something aesthetic, and a developed philosophy of the aesthetic. With this conception in mind Merriam argued, based on his own fieldwork with the Flathead Indians and the Basongye, that it is not true that this conception of the aesthetic is found in all cultures, and thus one must not assume that Western aesthetics necessarily says something revealing about all forms of art worldwide.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Ethnomusicology: A Discussion and Definition of the Field," *Ethnomusicology* 4 (1960): 107–14.
"The Jazz Community," with Raymond W. Mack, *Social Research* 38 (1960): 211–22.
The Anthropology of Music (Evanston, Ill., 1964).
"The Arts and Anthropology," in *Horizons of Anthropology*, ed. Sol Tax (Chicago, 1964), pp. 224–36.
"Definitions of 'Comparative Musicology' and 'Ethnomusicology': An Historical-Theoretical Perspective," *Ethnomusicology* 21 (1977): 189–204.

Other Relevant Works
Merriam's papers are at Indiana University.
"CA Book Review: *The Anthropology of Music*," with others, *Current Anthropology* 7 (1966): 217–30.
Ethnomusicology of the Flathead Indians (Chicago, 1967).
An African World: the Basongye Village of Lupupa Ngye (Bloomington, Ind., 1974).

Further Reading
Card, Caroline, ed. *A Tribute to Alan P. Merriam* (Bloomington, Ind., 1981). Contains Merriam's bibliography of writings.
Kealiinohomoku, Joann W. "Alan P. Merriam (1923–1980)," *Dance Research Journal* 13 (1980): 57–8.
Nettl, B. "Alan P. Merriam: Scholar and Leader," *Ethnomusicology* 26 (1982): 99–105.
Wild, S. A. "Alan P. Merriam: Professor," *Ethnomusicology* 26 (1982): 91–8.

Matthew Turner

MERTON, Thomas (1915–68)

Thomas Merton was born on 31 January 1915 in Prades, France, the son of New Zealander Owen Merton and American Ruth Jenkins Merton. In 1916 the family moved to Douglaston, New York where they lived until Ruth's death in 1921. Following his mother's death, Merton lived with his maternal grandparents on Long Island; joined his father briefly in Bermuda; and then moved with him to France where, in 1926, he enrolled at the Lycée Ingres in Montauban, France. Merton reports in his autobiography that it was an unhappy time, unlike his later experiences at Ripley Court and at Oakham School in England where he thrived. When Owen Merton died in 1931, Merton became an orphan at age sixteen. He traveled to Italy and the United States and continued his studies at Oakham until 1933 when he was awarded a scholarship to Clare College, Cambridge. Following a tumultuous year at Cambridge, Merton was ordered back to America by his guardian. He entered Columbia University, receiving his BA in 1938 and his MA in English in 1939. He studied with several prominent professors there, including Joseph Wood KRUTCH, and wrote a master's thesis titled "Nature and Art in William Blake." For a time Merton pursued his doctorate, and in January 1940 he also began teaching English composition in the School of Business at Columbia University. In September 1940 he accepted a teaching appointment at St. Bonaventure University in Olean, New York, where he had spent two

summers writing with his friends, Robert Lax and Ed Rice.

While at Columbia, Merton was drawn to Catholicism; he took instruction and in November 1939 was received into the Catholic Church. Having decided to become a priest, he interviewed with the Franciscans, was accepted for candidacy, but was refused admission to the order. In 1941, while teaching at St. Bonaventure, he made a Holy Week retreat at the Abbey of Our Lady of Gethsemani in rural central Kentucky near Elizabethtown. In December 1941, he left teaching and returned to Gethsemani to enter the Trappists, formally known as the Cistercian Order of the Strict Observance. For the remainder of his life, Brother Louis (his religious name) lived as a monk and rarely left the monastery grounds. Merton took simple vows in 1944, made solemn vows in 1947, and was ordained in 1949. He served his community as Master of Scholastics from 1951 to 1955 and as Master of Novices from 1955 to 1965. In 1965, he became the first American Trappist to receive permission to live as a hermit. In the last year of his life Merton traveled to Alaska, New Mexico, California, and finally Asia. Merton died on 10 December 1968 by accidental electrocution in Bangkok, Thailand, at a meeting of Asian Benedictines and Cistercians.

As a Trappist monk, Merton made three vows: the vow of obedience to his abbot; the vow of stability by which he promised to stay with this community for life; and the vow of *conversio morum* by which he committed himself to ongoing conversion of life. The latter vow encompasses chastity and poverty. While he lived the life of an ordinary monk, Merton's achievements as a writer set him apart, if not in the eyes of his community then certainly in the eyes of those outside it. Merton was a committed writer when he entered the monastery. As a youngster, he had tried writing stories; as a university student, he wrote for the *Columbia Jester* and spent summers writing novels. One of his essays was published in *The New York Times*. When Merton decided to become a

Trappist, he was certain he would have to abandon writing. That was not to be. Encouraged by his abbot, Dom Frederic Dunne, Merton wrote the story of his conversion. The outstanding reception accorded his autobiography, *The Seven Storey Mountain* (1948), soon made it a bestseller. His subsequent prodigious literary output made him the best-known Trappist monk in North America and, eventually, throughout the world, as his books were translated and published in Europe, Latin and South America, and Asia. In the twenty years following the publication of his autobiography, he wrote and published more than a hundred books and countless articles, and at his death he left a substantial body of work for posthumous publication.

With writings ranging over a variety of genres – autobiography, journals, articles and books on a host of subjects, poetry, literary essays and reviews, and letters – Merton showed himself to be a versatile and accomplished writer. While Merton's writings engage perennial spiritual issues, they do so in the context of his times. For example, while *The Seven Storey Mountain* is a classic story of religious awakening, conversion, and commitment, its appeal for a postwar generation and its continuing appeal for contemporary audiences lay, in part, in how Merton's story is at once his own and that of his readers. His account of searching and spiritual awakening strikes a universal human chord as Merton reflects and engages the realities of twentieth-century life, including war, violence, death, human longing, and religious faith. The autobiography previews the themes that came to define Merton's life and work: spirituality, curiosity about world religions, engagement in social issues posed by war, and lifelong monastic commitment.

For most of his adult life, Merton kept a journal. Journal-writing was for him an exercise that honed his poetic eye in observations of the natural world, an outlet for thoughts and feelings otherwise unexpressed in the silence of his monastic life, and an avenue

for ideas sparked by reading and study. Journal writing became a spiritual practice; although, as a writer, he could not resist publishing excerpts from those journals in book form. *The Sign of Jonas* (1953) served as a sequel to *The Seven Storey Mountain*, offering an insider's view of life in the monastery. Two more journals followed: *Secular Journal* in 1959, and *Conjectures of a Guilty Bystander* in 1966. Others were published posthumously, including *The Asian Journal of Thomas Merton* (1973); *Woods, Shore and Desert* (1982); *A Vow of Conversation* (1988); and *Thomas Merton in Alaska* (1989). In making arrangements for his literary estate, Merton provided for publication of his complete personal journals, stipulating that they could be published twenty-five years after his death. They were published in seven volumes under the general editorship of Brother Patrick Hart.

Merton's books reflected wide interests: monasticism, contemplation, social issues, literature and the world's religions. Even before *The Seven Storey Mountain* catapulted the young monk into the public eye, Merton had published two volumes of poetry, *Thirty Poems* (1944) and *A Man in the Divided Sea* (1946), and he continued to write poems until his death in 1968; his last book of poetry, *The Geography of Lograire* (1969), appeared in the year after his death. Like his other writings, Merton's poetry reflected growing and changing interests and ranged from devotional themes and monastery life to more inclusive spiritual themes of cultural alienation and conflict.

Merton was also a prolific letter writer, as evidenced by the five volumes of selected letters, published under the general editorship of William H. Shannon, and the volumes of correspondence that have appeared in more recent years, including those with Robert Lax, James Laughlin, Jean Leclerq, Czeslaw Milosz, and Rosemary Radford Ruether. Each volume of the selected letters reveals a dimension of Merton's interests. There are letters on religious experience and social concerns, letters to family and friends, letters on religious renewal and spiritual direction, letters to writers, and letters in times of crises. The fifth volume, *Witness to Freedom* (1994), completes publication of what Merton called "The Cold War Letters," written between October 1961 and October 1962, in which Merton responded to the growing threats of nuclear proliferation and Cold War hostility. Merton kept copies of these one hundred and eleven letters to mimeograph and circulate to friends. "Cold War letters" are scattered throughout the first four volumes of selected letters. Merton's correspondents included a host of prominent twentieth-century religious figures, intellectuals, activists, and writers. In addition to those noted above, Merton corresponded with Daniel Berrigan, Ernesto Cardenal, Dorothy Day, Jacques MARITAIN, Boris Pasternak, Walker PERCY, D. T. SUZUKI, and Evelyn Waugh. His letters offer readers an uncensored glimpse into his thought and situate his other writings within his life narrative.

In a retrospective of his writing, occasioned by a query from a correspondent in 1968, Merton divided his writings into three periods: 1938–49, 1950–60, and 1961–8. Merton described the first period, including *The Seven Storey Mountain* and *Secular Journal*, *Thirty Poems*, *A Man in the Divided Sea*, and *Seeds of Contemplation* (1949), as "first fervor stuff," written when he was quite ascetic and life at Gethsemani was very strict, which "resulted in a highly unworldly, ascetical, intransigent, somewhat apocalyptic outlook," characterized by "rigid, arbitrary separation between God and the world, etc." The second period included books such as *No Man Is an Island* (1955), *The Sign of Jonas*, *Thoughts in Solitude* (1958), *The Silent Life* (1957), and *Strange Islands* (1957), books written during a transitional period when he "began to open to the world" and to read psychoanalysis, Zen Buddhism, and existentialism (1990, pp. 384–5). Merton's writings during the third period, beginning with *Disputed Questions* (1960), bore marks of the changes he had

experienced during the fifties; they included *Seeds of Destruction* (1964), *Raids on the Unspeakable* (1966), *Conjectures of a Guilty Bystander* (1966), *Emblems in a Season of Fury* (1963), *The Way of Chuang Tzu* (1965), and *Gandhi on Non-Violence* (1965).

Merton's spiritual writings center around a question he posed in 1948 in *What Is Contemplation?* In the books that followed Merton considered and reconsidered the question, "what is contemplation?" His response reflected his own spiritual practice and experience, both his deepening inner experience and his growing awareness of the world around him, an awareness enriched by the wisdom of the world's religions. Merton uses "contemplation" to name both a way of prayer and the experience that way of prayer makes possible. Contemplative prayer, as Merton explained to Abdul Aziz, a Muslim living in Pakistan, is wordless prayer. Contemplative prayer "is not 'thinking about' anything, but a direct seeking of the Face of the Invisible." This simple way of prayer "does not mean imagining anything or conceiving a precise image of God." Rather, "it is a matter of adoring Him as invisible and infinitely beyond our comprehension, and realizing Him as all." This way of prayer "tends very much" to what Muslims call *fana* – the disappearance of self or the death of the ego (1985, p. 64).

Contemplation also names the experience of God. While in his earliest writings, Merton relies on the traditional language of infused contemplation, later he develops a language that is more his own, a language influenced by extensive reading in Eastern religions as well as his own ever-deepening experience of prayer. In *New Seeds of Contemplation* (1962), Merton discusses what contemplation is and is not. Contemplation is neither trance nor ecstasy. It is not "the hearing of sudden unutterable words, nor the imagination of lights" (1962, pp. 10–13). Contemplation is "life itself, fully awake, fully active, fully aware that it is alive" (1962, p. 1). Merton describes contemplation as awareness of the Reality that is the Source, experience of the transcendent and inexpressible God, the experience of being touched by God, awakening to the Real within. Contemplation is a response to God's invitation. "A door opens in the center of our being and we seem to fall through it into immense depths which, although they are infinite, are all accessible to us; all eternity seems to have become ours in this one placid and breathless contact." (1962, p. 227)

In choosing these metaphors of awakening and awareness, Merton attempts to express what is ineffable. Contemplation is the apophatic way, the dark way. Yet, words serve to make the mystery of this way known, in a limited sense, to others. In addition to the language of awakening and awareness, Merton likens contemplation to rebirth: "You seem to be the same person and you are the same person that you have always been: in fact, you are more yourself than you have ever been before. You have only just begun to exist. You feel as if you were at last fully born … And yet now you have become nothing." (1962, pp. 227–8)

In the context of his writings on contemplation, Merton develops and explicates his theological anthropology and his theology of God. Merton distinguishes between what he calls the "false" and "true" self. The false self is the external, exterior self; it is superficial, illusory, and egotistic. Merton likens the false self to a mask, a shadow. The true self is the internal, interior self; it is the center. It is deep, transcendent, and mysterious. The true self both knows God and is known by God. Merton refers to the point of contact between the self and God as the *point vierge*, the virginal point, "the point at which [one] can meet God in a real and experimental contact with His infinite actuality" (1962, p. 37). In speaking of the false and true self, Merton is not positing the existence of two separate selves nor is he denying the reality of the false self. The true self is not another self but rather the authentic self –masked and hidden behind the appearance of the false self.

Earlier in *The Seven Storey Mountain*, Merton told of reading Aldous Huxley and

realizing that the human spirit "could find the absolute and perfect Spirit, God. It could enter into union with Him" that "was a matter of real experience" (1948, p. 186). From his reading of Huxley's *Ends and Means*, Merton took two concepts: the existence of "a supernatural, spiritual order, and the possibility of real, experimental contact with God" (1948, p. 186). From his reading of William Blake, he drew a sense of the necessity of faith and a consciousness that "the only way to live was to live in a world that was charged with the presence and reality of God" (1948, p. 191), a consciousness deepened by his reading of Gerard Manley Hopkins. But it was Merton's reading of Etienne GILSON's *The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy* that "was to revolutionize" his "whole life" as he discovered the concept of *aseitas* – "the power of a being to exist absolutely in virtue of itself, not as caused by itself, but as requiring no cause, no justification for its existence except that its very nature is to exist" (1948, p. 172). God is "being *per se*" beyond images and concepts (1948, p. 173). "What a relief it was for me, now, to discover not only that no idea of ours, let alone any image, could adequately represent God but also that we *should not* allow ourselves to be satisfied with any such knowledge of Him." (1948, pp. 174–5)

Merton would mine these youthful realizations for the rest of his life. The contemplative came to know God in an experiential way. The mature Merton would articulate that persons have their very being in God, "that hidden ground of Love for which there can be no explanations." Called by many names – Being, Atman, Pneuma, Silence – God is the reality in which humans discover that they are one with everything (1985, p. 115). Merton, the contemplative, recognized that the biblical vision of the indwelling God is obscured by overemphasis on the transcendence of the God who is "out there" and whom humans try to manipulate by prayer and so reduce God to an object. But, Merton insists, there is "no such thing" as God because God is neither a "what"

nor a "thing" but a pure "*Who*" (1962, p. 13). God is "directly and intimately present, as the very ground of our being" while he cautions, "being at the same time infinitely transcendent" (1971, p. 175).

Merton's contemplative practice led him to re-engagement with the world. Merton's "turning toward the world" is evident in November 1958 when Merton writes to Pope John XXIII to say: "It seems to me that, as a contemplative, I do not need to lock myself into my solitude and lose all contact with the rest of the world." (1985, p. 482) Rather, he envisions sharing "a contemplative grasp of the political, intellectual, artistic and social movements in this world" with artists, writers, publishers, and poets with whom he is corresponding. Earlier that year in March, he had had a "vision," at the corner of Fourth and Walnut in the business district of Louisville, which has become symbolic of Merton's "return" to the world. "I was suddenly overwhelmed with the realization that I loved all those people … that we could not be alien to one another even though we were total strangers. It was like waking from a dream of separateness …. It is a glorious destiny to be a member of the human race," a race of people "walking around shining like the sun" (1966, pp. 156–8).

In the years that followed, Merton became increasingly disturbed by the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the intensification of international hostilities. In summer 1961, he wrote two poems, "Chant to be Used in Processions around a Site with Furnaces" and "Original Child Bomb," one on the Holocaust, the other on the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In September 1961, he wrote "A Letter to Pablo Antonio Cuadra Concerning Giants" in which he exposed the dangers of the two superpowers, whom, drawing on Ezekiel, Merton refers to as Gog and Magog. "Gog is a lover of power, Magog is absorbed in the cult of money: their idols differ … but their madness is the same." (1977, p. 375) In October, he published in *The Catholic Worker*

a chapter from *New Seeds of Contemplation*, entitled "The Root of War Is Fear" with introductory paragraphs making clear that war was *the* issue. Humanity faced disaster and the need for action was urgent. Merton took action as a writer, generating a personal appeal in his "Cold War Letters" and producing a flurry of articles on nuclear war and Christian responsibility, many collected and reprinted in *Passion for Peace,* edited by William H. Shannon (1995). Aware of the way technology had transformed modern warfare, Merton argued that war must be opposed and the practice of nonviolence taught and embraced. Merton's efforts brought opposition from the authorities of his Order and in April 1962 he received an order forbidding him to write anti-war articles. Merton obeyed, but he had already taken a stand.

During the 1960s, Merton continued writing on nonviolence and against racism and the plight of indigenous peoples. Merton's social essays reflect engagement with issues of his day that was not inconsistent with his contemplative life, but was a natural outgrowth of his life as a monk. Although Merton never left the monastery for "the world," he learned to embrace the world from within his monastery, exercising his moral responsibility as a Christian and as a citizen. The monastery afforded him a unique perspective on the world and his literary gifts enabled him to exercise the responsibility of that perspective.

Merton's contemplative practice also enabled him to reach out to others through ecumenical and interreligious dialogue. Deeply grounded in his own tradition, Merton was open to the wisdom of other religions. During his years at Columbia, Merton was interested in oriental mysticism and inspired by conversations with the visiting Hindu monk, Bramachari. During the 1950s, Merton continued to read the classics of Eastern spirituality and, in March 1959, began corresponding with D. T. Suzuki. The dialogue they initiated in 1959 appeared in *New Directions 17* (1961) and in *Zen and the Birds of Appetite* (1968).

Merton's openness to dialogue is especially evident in his letters. His correspondence with Christians, Hindus, Buddhists, Jews, and Muslims documents a vision of Christianity that transcends difference and capitalizes on commonality, particularly the common ground of deep spiritual experience. Without disregarding or dismissing difference, Merton acknowledged and celebrated the unity of humanity. He engaged in grassroots dialogue, fostered by interpersonal exchange. His correspondence with Abdul Aziz illustrates well Merton's encounter with faiths and traditions of his correspondents. He wanted to learn about Islam, to read the Qur'an, to be mindful of the holy days celebrated by Muslims and in all things to be in solidarity with his friend, but Merton did not presume to chant the Qur'an. He was faithful to his own tradition and respectful of traditions of others.

Thomas Merton had a vocation to unity: "If I affirm myself as Catholic merely by denying all that is Muslim, Jewish, Protestant, Hindu, Buddhist, etc. in the end I will find that there is not much left for me to affirm as a Catholic and certainly no breath of the Spirit with which to affirm it." (1966, pp. 128–9) The affirmation of his faith could not deny another's. Nor could his Catholicism be less than truly "catholic" as he discovered that "the deepest level of communication is not communication but communion … beyond words … beyond speech … beyond concept" (1973, p. 308).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Seven Storey Mountain (New York, 1948).
What Is Contemplation? (Holy Cross, Ind., 1948).
Seeds of Contemplation (New York, 1949).
The Sign of Jonas (New York, 1953).
No Man Is an Island (New York, 1955).
The Silent Life (New York, 1957).
Strange Islands (New York, 1957).
Thoughts in Solitude (New York, 1958).
Secular Journal (New York, 1959).

Disputed Questions (New York, 1960).

The New Man (New York, 1961).

New Seeds of Contemplation (New York, 1962).

Emblems in a Season of Fury (New York, 1963).

Seeds of Destruction (New York, 1964).

Gandhi on Non-Violence (New York, 1965).

The Way of Chuang Tzu (New York, 1965).

Conjectures of a Guilty Bystander (New York, 1966).

Raids on the Unspeakable (New York, 1966).

Mystics and Zen Masters (New York, 1967).

Zen and the Birds of Appetite (New York, 1968).

Contemplative Prayer (New York, 1969).

Contemplation in a World of Action (New York, 1971).

Woods, Shore and Desert, ed. Joel Weishaus (Santa Fe, N.M., 1982).

A Vow of Conversation, ed. Naomi Burton Stone (New York, 1988).

Other Relevant Works

Merton's papers are in the Thomas Merton Center at Bellarmine University in Louisville, Kentucky.

Thirty Poems (Norfolk, Conn., 1944).

A Man in the Divided Sea (Norfolk, Conn., 1946).

The Geography of Lograire (New York, 1969).

The Asian Journal of Thomas Merton, ed. Naomi Burton, Brother Patrick Hart, and James Laughlin (New York, 1973).

The Collected Poems of Thomas Merton (New York, 1977).

The Hidden Ground of Love: The Letters of Thomas Merton on Religious Experience and Social Concerns, ed. William H. Shannon (New York, 1985).

The Road to Joy: Letters to New and Old Friends, ed. Robert E. Daggy (New York, 1989).

Thomas Merton in Alaska: The Alaskan Conferences, Journals and Letters (New York, 1989).

The School of Charity: The Letters of Thomas Merton on Religious Renewal and Spiritual Direction, ed. Brother Patrick Hart (New York, 1990).

The Courage for Truth: Letters to Writers, ed. Christine M. Bochen (New York, 1993).

Witness to Freedom: Letters in Times of Crisis, ed. William H. Shannon (New York, 1994).

Passion for Peace: The Social Essays, ed. William S. Shannon (New York, 1995).

Run to the Mountain: The Story of a Vocation (*Journals, vol. 1: 1939–41*), ed. Brother Patrick Hart (San Francisco, 1995).

Entering the Silence: Becoming a Monk and Writer (*Journals, vol. 2: 1941–52*), ed. Jonathan Montaldo (San Francisco, 1996).

A Search for Solitude: Pursuing the Monk's True Life (*Journals, vol. 3: 1952–60*), ed. Lawrence Cunningham (San Francisco, 1996).

Turning Toward the World: The Pivotal Years (*Journals, vol. 4: 1960–63*), ed. Victor Kramer (San Francisco, 1996).

Dancing in the Water of Life: Seeking Peace in the Hermitage (*Journals*, vol. 5: 1963–5*), ed. Robert E. Daggy (San Francisco, 1997).

Learning to Love: Exploring Solitude and Freedom (*Journals, vol. 6: 1966–7*), ed. Christine M. Bochen (San Francisco, 1997).

The Other Side of the Mountain: The End of the Journey (*Journals*, vol. 7: 1967–8*), ed. Brother Patrick Hart (San Francisco, 1998).

The Inner Experience: Notes on Contemplation, ed. William H. Shannon (San Francisco, 2003).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*,

Who Was Who in Amer v5

Breit, Marquita, and Robert Daggy. *Thomas Merton: A Comprehensive Bibliography* (New York, 1986).

Cooper, David. *Thomas Merton's Art of Denial: The Evolution of a Radical Humanist* (Athens, Georgia, 1989).

Cunningham, Lawrence. *Thomas Merton and the Monastic Vocation* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1999).

Kilcourse, George. *Ace of Freedoms: Thomas Merton's Christ* (Notre Dame, 1993).

Labrie, Ross. *Thomas Merton and the Inclusive Imagination* (Columbia, Missouri, 2001).

Mott, Michael. *The Seven Mountains of Thomas Merton* (Boston, 1984).

O'Connell, Patrick F., ed. *The Vision of Thomas Merton* (Notre Dame, Ind., 2003).

Shannon, William H. *Thomas Merton's Paradise Journey: Writings on Contemplation* (Cincinnati, Ohio, 2000).

———, *The Silent Lamp*: *The Thomas Merton Story* (New York, 1992).

Shannon, William H., Christine M. Bochen, and Patrick F. O'Connell. *The Thomas Merton Encyclopedia* (New York, 2002).

Christine M. Bochen

MEYER, Leonard Bunce (1918–)

Leonard Meyer is an influential teacher and writer in musicology, music theory, and musical aesthetics. He was born in New York City on 12 January 1918. His education included study at Bard College from 1936 to 1938, a BA with emphasis in philosophy from Columbia University in 1940, an MA in music at Columbia in 1948, a PhD in the history of culture at the University of Chicago in 1954, and composition lessons from Stefan Wolpe and Aaron Copland. Starting in 1946, Meyer taught at the University of Chicago, first as a member of the music department, and later as chair (1961–70), and then as professor of humanities (1972–5). From 1975 to 1988, Meyer was the Benjamin Franklin Professor of Music and Humanities at the University of Pennsylvania. He also held visiting professorships at Wesleyan, Harvard, Eastman, and the University of California at Berkeley as Ernest Bloch Professor (1970–71).

Meyer's interdisciplinary training and interests led him to integrate ideas from Gestalt psychology, pragmatist philosophy, and analytical formalism to produce a highly flexible theory of musical syntax and expression that avoided the extremism of the earlier absolutist, referentialist, formalist, and expressionist views. In Francis SPARSHOTT's terms, Meyer's theory "contrives a fusion of formal and expressive properties, which other aestheticians find it necessary to contrast" (Sparshott 1980, pp. 244–5). While formalism led Eduard Hanslick, among others, to deny the importance of emotional expression in music, Meyer's theory links the formal qualities within the music directly to the arousal of emotion and meaning in the listener.

The first statement of Meyer's theory appeared in *Emotion and Meaning in Music* (1956), where he argued that "emotion or affect is aroused when a tendency to respond is arrested or inhibited" (p. 14). Misused meaning is an example of the more general tendency to derive meaning from the creation and subsequent denial of expectations for pattern completion in the mind of the listener. While relying on psychological universals borrowed from Gestalt theory – including *Prägnanz* (the tendency toward the simplest, most stable shape), the Law of Good Continuation, and the Law of Return – Meyer's theory also made room for the arousal of different meanings in different listeners, depending on their experience and memory. "Without thought and memory," he asserts, "there could be no musical experience …. An understanding of

the way in which thought and memory operate throws light both upon the mechanism of expectation itself and upon the relation of prior experience to expectation." (1956, p. 87) This recognition of the possibility of different perceptions of the same pattern laid the groundwork for Meyer's exploration of culturally contingent patterns and meanings in later books. At the same time, his reliance on "natural" psychological laws creates an ambivalence of emphasis between universalism and cultural contingency that continued throughout his career.

Like most modern music theorists, Meyer tended to emphasize the musical element of pitch – in melodic and harmonic patterns – above the elements of rhythm, tone color, and texture. An exception is found in his second book, *The Rhythmic Structure of Music* (1960), which was written with Grosvenor Cooper. Extending the layer analysis technique of Heinrich Schenker already adapted in his first book from pitch to rhythm, his second book explores how patterns of stressed and unstressed beats, measures, and phrases function in tonal music to arouse and confirm or deny expectations.

In *Music, The Arts, and Ideas* (1967), Meyer reinterpreted his concept of expectation in the mathematical terms of information theory, arguing that stylistic development in the late twentieth century had reached a point of fluctuating stasis because of the multiplicity of styles and information flooding the mainstream culture. In place of the ahistorical formalism then prevalent in music theory and aesthetics, he recommended the radically empirical attitude of "transcendental particularism" as a means of restoring emphasis on immediate sense experience and the contingencies of history and culture. At the same time, the most famous of the essays in this book, "Some Remarks on Value and Greatness in Music," abounds with formalist Eurocentric assumptions about what constitutes good and great music (a drawback recognized by Meyer himself in a footnote to the paperback edition).

With *Explaining Music* (1973), Meyer began to use the term *implication* in place of expectation and to discuss its workings in more limited historical epochs, with particular emphasis on the influence of culture on pattern perception in tonal music of eighteenth and nineteenth-century Europe. Part of *Explaining Music* is a catalogue of the way in which natural Gestalt principles and culturally learned factors are adjoined in the development and recognition of melodic structures, such as the archetype of the "changing note" pattern involving circular motion "away from and back to stability" (1973, p. 191). Further work in the 1970s on the changing note pattern with Robert Djerdingen increasingly led Meyer to the belief that developments in musical style embody changes in culture and ideology. In *Style and Music: Theory, History, and Ideology* (1989), Meyer explored ways that specific aspects of Romantic musical style embodied changes in cultural ideology, arguing for example that the tendency of Romantic melodies to stretch rather than balance each other in consecutive phrases reflects the contemporary bourgeois concept of individualism. At a time when music theorists were becoming institutionally separate from musicology (especially with the founding of the Society for Music Theory in 1967, for which he served as President in 1987 and 1988), the historicist emphasis of this work set it apart from that of most other music theorists.

Meyer's latest book, *The Spheres of Music* (2000), reaffirms the broad interdisciplinary nature of his approach with essays collected from the 1970s through the 1990s involving psychology, anthropology, history, and culture (though his stylistic interests remain rather narrowly concentrated to works of Mozart and Beethoven). The final essay, "A Universe of Universals," suggests a career-closing balance on the universalist side, partly in repudiation of postmodern skepticism. As Meyer puts it, "Recognizing the existence of universals and theorizing about their nature is indispensable because we can construct a coherent aesthetic

and a viable history of music only by scrupulous attention to nature as well as to nurture and by trying to understand and explain their intricate interactions. My speculations and arguments do not pretend to be definitive; they should, rather, be thought of as hypotheses … that need to be tested against the facts of human behavior. The *real* work remains to be done." (2000, p. 303)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Emotion and Meaning in Music (Chicago, 1956).
The Rhythmic Structure of Music, with Grosvenor Cooper (Chicago, 1960).
Music, The Arts, and Ideas: Patterns and Predictions in Twentieth-Century Culture (Chicago, 1967).
Explaining Music (Chicago, 1973).
Style and Music: Theory, History, and Ideology (Philadelphia, 1989).
The Spheres of Music: A Gathering of Essays (Chicago, 2000).

Further Reading

Lorraine, Renee. *Tendencies and Inhibitions: Reflections on a Theme by Leonard Meyer* (New York, 1999).
Sparshott, Francis. "Meyer, Leonard," in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (London, 1980), pp. 244–5.
Spitzer, Michael. "Meditations on Meyer's Hobby Horses: Levels of Motivation in Musical Signs," *Applied Semiotics* 4 (1997): 201–207.

Claire Detels

MEYER, Max Friedrich (1873–1967)

Max Meyer was born on 15 June 1873 in Danzig, Germany. A chance reading of Lazarus Geiger's *Der Ursprung der Sprache* (1869) stimulated his interest in mind and behavior, and in the spring of 1892 he enrolled in the University of Berlin, where he eventually attended a seminar given by Carl Stumpf. This led to Stumpf's direction of Meyer's 1896 doctoral dissertation on audition and determined the direction of much of his later work. At Berlin, Meyer also encountered Max Planck, from whom he developed a commitment to abstract, stipulative theoretical models. Planck may also have been a source of Meyer's belief that behavior can be understood in terms of neural processes without postulating the intervention of mental force.

In 1898, after being dismissed from Stumpf's laboratory in a disagreement over data interpretation, Meyer traveled first to London to work briefly with James Sully and then to the United States to take a fellowship under G. Stanley HALL at Clark University. Despite the turmoil of this period, Meyer completed work on the psychology of music and cochlear function in hearing. On the strength of these papers, he was appointed to the University of Missouri as professor of experimental psychology in 1900.

At Missouri, Meyer translated Ebbinghaus's *Psychology: An Elementary Text-Book* (1908), interpolating into the text three of his own idiosyncratic models of neural architecture. He then elaborated these models and their underlying theoretical reasoning in *The Fundamental Laws of Human Behavior* (1911), a remarkable book. Appearing two years before John B. WATSON's famous behaviorist manifesto, it has been called the first "completely behavioristic explanation of human action" (Pillsbury 1929, p. 290). Meyer rejects the explanatory use of mental states except as shorthand for the operation of complex nervous processes, emphasizes the importance of behavior, and limits the scientific value of introspection solely to "the fact that it aids us in discovering the laws of nervous function" (1911, p. 239). He also exhibits an uncompromising neurophysiological reductionism elaborated through a series of

rationally derived, associationist models of neural architecture. Starting from what is known about mental states and behavior, Mayer's models stipulate what nervous mechanisms *must* be like. In working out this approach, he was more a forerunner of modern cognitive neuropsychology than of behaviorism.

In succeeding years, Meyer published numerous papers and several books, of which the most important was *The Psychology of the Other-One* (1921); but he never became part of the American psychological mainstream. In 1929 a questionnaire assessing attitudes toward extramarital sexual relations was distributed to students at Missouri with Meyer's tacit approval. Public outcry led to his dismissal in 1929. Meyer then spent two years in research at the Central Institute for the Deaf in St. Louis, and was visiting professor of psychology at the University of Miami from 1932 to 1940. During his remaining years he continued to publish. Meyer died on 14 March 1967 in Miami, Florida.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Über Kombinationstöne und einige hierzu in Beziehung stehende akustische Erscheinungen," *Zeitschrift für Psychologie und Physiologie der Sinnesorgane* 11 (1896): 177–229.
The Fundamental Laws of Human Behavior (Boston, 1911).
The Psychology of the Other-One (Columbia, Miss., 1921).

Other Relevant Works
Meyer's papers are in the Archives of the History of American Psychology at the University of Akron, Ohio, the University of Missouri, and the State Historical Society of Missouri in Columbia.
Contributions to a Psychological Theory of Music (Columbia, Miss., 1901).
Trans., *Psychology. An Elementary Text-Book,* by Hermann Ebbinghaus (Boston, 1908).

A Brief Manual of Psychology Demonstrations (Columbia, Miss., 1922).
Fitting into a Silent World: The First Six Years of Life (Columbia, Miss., 1934).
How We Hear: How Tones Make Music (Boston, 1950).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, Bio Dict Psych by Zusne, Who Was Who in Amer v5
Esper, E. A. "Max Meyer: The Making of a Scientific Isolate," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 2 (1966): 341–56.
———, "Max Meyer in America," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 3 (1967): 107–31.
Hirsh, I. J. "Max Frederick Meyer: 1873–1967," *American Journal of Psychology* 80 (1967): 644–5.
O'Donnell, John M. *The Origins of Behaviorism* (New York, 1985).
Pillsbury, W. B. *The History of Psychology* (New York, 1929).

Robert H. Wozniak

MEZES, Sidney Edward (1863–1931)

Sidney Edward Mezes was born on 23 September 1863 in Belmont, California. He received his BS from the University of California at Berkeley in 1884, but his father's death and the ensuing supervisory duties of the estate delayed Mezes's graduate education until 1889 when he entered Harvard University. He received the BA in 1890, the MA in 1891, and the PhD in philosophy in 1893, studying primarily with William JAMES, Josiah ROYCE, and George H. PALMER. His dissertation was titled "Pleasure and Pain Defined." During the year 1893–4 he taught first at Bryn Mawr and then the University of Chicago.

In the fall of 1894 Mezes went to the University of Texas as adjunct professor of philosophy, and was rapidly promoted to full professor by 1900 and Dean of the College of Arts in 1902. During these years he was the only philosophy professor. In 1908 he became President of the University of Texas and oversaw tremendous growth in programs and budget. He resisted an invitation to become US Commissioner of Education in 1913, but in 1914 he did resign from Texas to become the fourth President of the College of the City of New York. In 1917 President Wilson called upon Mezes to head an inquiry into preparations for the Paris Peace Conference, and this body's deliberations influenced Wilson's Fourteen Points proposal for ending World War I and establishing a League of Nations. Under Mezes's administration of City College, technology, business, and education schools were established, academic standards were raised, and enrollment nearly quadrupled. Mezes received honorary LLD degrees from Southwestern University, the University of California, University of Cincinnati, and New York University. After retiring due to failing health in 1927, he lived in Arizona, Europe, and California. Mezes died on 10 September 1931 in Altadena, California.

Mezes was unable to accept either materialism or idealism, having absorbed the lessons of his Harvard philosophy education which supplied severe objections to both positions. A dualism that permitted some kind of mental-physical interaction seemed the most practical and scientific. For Mezes, any view that rendered human freedom and responsibility illusory was unacceptable. *Ethics: Descriptive and Explanatory* (1901), his major work, distinguished "subjective" and "objective" morality as phases of a naturalized ethics. Subjective morality, or the conscience, guides our actions adequately, but often fails to conform to the highest standards of objective morality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Freedom: Its Relation to the Proof of Determinism," *International Journal of Ethics* 3 (1893): 366–81.

"Pleasure and Pain Defined," *Philosophical Review* 4 (1895): 22–46.

"Worth and Goodness as Marks of the Absolute," in *The Conception of God: A Philosophical Discussion Concerning the Nature of the Divine Idea as a Demonstrable Reality*, ed. George H. Howison (Berkeley, Cal., 1895; New York, 1897).

"The Cause and Function of Conscience," *Philosophical Review* 5 (1896): 502–21.

Ethics: Descriptive and Explanatory (New York, 1901).

"The Essentials of Human Faculty," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 1 (1904): 28–55.

"Our Conscious States Picture and Apprehend our Nervous Processes," *Journal of Philosophy* 28 (1931): 600–607.

Other Relevant Works

Mezes's papers are at City College of New York, University of Texas, and Yale University.

"What is Matter?" *Popular Science Monthly* 75 (June 1908): 28–39.

"Preparations for Peace," in *What Really Happened at Paris: The Story of the Peace Conference, 1918–1919*, ed. C. Seymour and E. M. House (New York, 1921).

Further Reading

Dict Amer Bio, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v30*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

"In Honor of Sidney Edward Mezes," *City College Alumnus* 27 (October 1931): 143–64. Special issue about Mezes.

McGilvary, Evander B. "Mezes's *Ethics: Descriptive and Explanatory*," *Philosophical Review* 10 (1901): 298–303.

Robinson, Frederick B., et al. *Sidney Edward Mezes, September 23, 1863–September 10, 1931: In Memoriam* (New York, 1931).

Rudy, S. Willis. *The College of the City of New York: A History, 1847–1947* (New York, 1949).

John R. Shook

MICHALOS, Alexandros Charles (1935–)

Alex C. Michalos was born on 1 August 1935 in Cleveland, Ohio. He earned a BA degree in history from Western Reserve University in 1957. From there he went to the University of Chicago where he was awarded an MA in logic in 1965, a BD in comparative religion in 1965, and a PhD in philosophy of science in 1966. He taught philosophy at State College in St. Cloud, Minnesota from 1962 to 1964, and the State University of New York at Plattsburg from 1964 to 1966. In 1966 he joined the philosophy faculty at the University of Guelph in Ontario, where he taught until 1994, when he moved to the University of Northern British Columbia at Prince George to teach political science. In 1993 he was elected a fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, and in 2002 he joined the Canadian Commission for UNESCO.

During his graduate studies he published a short novel, *What Did You Expect?* (1959), and in his early years of teaching he wrote two textbooks in logic, *Principles of Logic* (1969) and *Improving Your Reasoning* (1970). His next book was a critical examination of the points in dispute between Karl Popper and Rudolf CARNAP. In 1978 he brought his work on logic and probability theory to culmination in *Foundations of Decision Making*. Its aim, he has said, "was to provide an explication of rational decisions and decision processes that was empirically well-grounded in the latest social scientific research and in the philosophic tradition of pragmatism." In developing his cost/benefit model he took it for granted that human beings are endowed with limited computational capacity, which led him to a middle position between two competing sorts of theories, the maximizers and the satisfiers.

After developing his model, Michalos came to realize that it had a major deficiency, because there was no general empirical theory of satisfaction that could provide a common measure of benefits and costs. Utility theory was not able to do the job. What was needed was a theory that revealed the rich determinants of people's revealed preferences and thus presented possibilities for public policy-making that would be sensitive to those determinants and not merely to their effects. In 1985 he published a paper on multiple discrepancies theory; it provided the foundational theory for his cost/benefit model. This theory, which is much too complicated to summarize here, has proved to be his most cited publication.

During the period when he was trying to find a theory to undergird his model, Michalos undertook a comparative study of the quality of life in the United States and Canada; the results of this study were published in five volumes between 1980 and 1982. His work on this project, which was awarded the Secretary of State's Award for Excellence in interdisciplinary studies in the area of Canadian Studies in 1984, spurred him to develop his multiple discrepancies theory. Once he had the theory, he undertook to test it by surveying 18,000 undergraduates in 39 countries, which involved translating the questionnaire into 18 languages. This test of student well-being showed that his theory performed as well in Bangladesh and Tanzania as it did in Sweden and Canada. The results came out in four volumes between 1991 and 1993. In recent years he has been compiling an encyclopedia of social indicators and quality of life, and he has been applying his theory to a study of the cases

which have arisen under the North American Free Trade Agreement and the Agreement on Internal Trade.

Even though much of his work has been of an empirical nature, Michalos has always retained an interest in philosophical problems in applied ethics, especially those related to the notion of the quality of life. In addition he was the founder or co-founder of five journals: *Social Indicators Research* (1974), *Journal of Business Ethics* (1982), *Teaching Business Ethics* (1997), the *Journal of Academic Ethics* (2003), and the *Journal of Happiness Studies* (2003).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Principles of Logic (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1969).

Improving Your Reasoning (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1970).

The Popper–Carnap Controversy (The Hague, 1971).

Philosophic Problems of Science and Technology (Boston, 1974).

Foundations of Decision Making (Ottawa, 1978).

North American Social Report, 5 vols (Boston, 1980–82).

"Multiple Discrepancies Theory (MDT)" *Social Indicators Research* 16 (1987): 347–413.

Militarism and the Quality of Life (Toronto, 1989).

Global Report on Student Well-Being, 4 vols (New York, 1991–3).

A Pragmatic Approach to Business Ethics (Thousand Oaks, Cal., 1995).

Good Taxes: The Case for Taxing Foreign Currency Exchange and Other Financial Transactions (Toronto, 1997).

Essays on the Quality of Life (Boston, 2003).

Further Reading

"Michalos, Alexandros," in *Canadian Who's Who*, vol. 38 (Toronto, 2003).

Hodgson, Bernard J. "Michalos and the

Theory of Ethical Theory," *Journal of Business Ethics* 29 (2001): 19–23.

John G. Slater

MIËS VAN DER ROHE, Ludwig (1886–1969)

Ludwig Miës was born on 26 March 1886 in Aachen, Germany, and died on 17 August 1969 in Chicago, Illinois. Miës attended the Aachen technical Hochschule until the age of fifteen, and then he was apprenticed in a local architectural firm while taking evening classes. In 1905 he moved to Berlin to take a job as a draftsman, then joined first Bruno Paul's firm and later that of Peter Behrens (both founding members of the German Werkbund). His first houses display various influences: English Arts and Crafts, Prussian vernacular, Karl Schinkel's neoclassicism, and even the early Frank Lloyd WRIGHT. In the 1920s Miës refashioned himself, leaving his wife and children, changing his name to Miës van der Rohe (artificially combining his father's name and his mother's maiden name, Rohe), and adopting an avant-garde aesthetic. He forged links with Dutch *De Stijl*, exhibited a utopian project for a glass-walled skyscraper (1921–2), and became Vice President of the Werkbund. This early phase culminated in his design for the German Pavilion in Barcelona (1929), a modernist landmark. Miës orchestrated the feeling of spatial flow both inside and out, and through the use of glass walls and canopies opened interior to garden. As head of the Bauhaus during 1930–33 he sought a non-political accommodation with the Nazi regime. In 1938 he emigrated to the United States, having accepted an invitation to head the Armour Institute, later named the Illinois Institute of Technology.

Miës designed the ITT campus, notably Crown Hall. Its rectangular shape, exposed

roof beams and steel mullions, attention to material and detail, and its use of glass to enclose the interior space, became the prototype of many later buildings. His glass and steel skyscrapers – for example, the Seagram Building (1954–8) – have been imitated in cities throughout the world. It remains a matter of controversy whether the inhuman result is fair to Miës's ideas or shows rather their betrayal; glass walls repel the city as much as mediate between inside and outer world. Miës received many honors, notably the gold medals of both the Royal Institute of British Architects (1959) and the American Institute of Architects (1960).

Largely self-taught, Miës read and loved to quote various philosophers, including Augustine and Aquinas on order and disposition. His early view that "architecture is the will of an epoch translated into space" (Johnson 1953, pp. 188, 191), reflects Oswald Spengler's cultural determinism. He was much given to aphorism, although the most famous – "Less is more" – derives from a 1954 *Time* magazine profile and not the man himself. The organic architecture he wished his students to learn recalls Wright, yet goes back to his own emphasis on natural development or *Gestaltung*: "I do not design buildings. I develop buildings" (1968, p. 451), he declared. Similarly he rejected formalism: "Form is not the aim of our work, but only the result." (Johnson 1953, p. 189) He thought of the city as a jungle, to which individual buildings had to adapt.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Mies Speaks," *Architectural Review* 144 (December 1968): 451–2.
Mies van der Rohe Archive: The Museum of Modern Art, vols 1–4, ed. Arthur Drexler (New York, 1986); vols 5–20, ed. Franz Schulze (New York, 1990–91).

Other Relevant Works

Miës's occasional writings are collected in books by Johnson and Carter, below.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*
Blake, Peter. *The Master Builders* (New York, 1960).
Carter, Peter. *Miës van der Rohe at Work* (New York, 1974).
Johnson, Philip. *Miës van der Rohe* (New York, 1947; 2nd edn 1953; 3rd edn 1978).
Lambert, Phyllis, ed. *Miës in America* (New York, 2001).
Neumeyer, Fritz. *The Artless Word: Miës van der Rohe on the Building Art* (Cambridge, Mass., 1991).
Riley, Terrence, and Barry Bergdoll, eds. *Miës in Berlin* (New York, 2001).
Schulze, Franz. *Miës van der Rohe. A Critical Biography* (Chicago, 1985).
Spaeth, David A. *Ludwig Miës van der Rohe: An Annotated Bibliography and Chronology* (New York, 1979).

Martin Donougho

MILEY, John (1813–95)

Methodist theologian John Miley was born on 25 December 1813 in Butler County, Ohio. Following his graduation from Augusta College with his BA in 1834 and MA in 1837, Miley entered the Methodist ministry through the Ohio Conference in 1838. He served as minister in several Ohio churches for several years until transferring to the east coast, serving churches in New York and Connecticut from 1852 to 1873. In 1873 he went to Drew Theological Seminary in New Jersey as professor of systematic theology in 1873. A successful teacher and leader, Miley was noted as one of the "Great Five" professors who led Drew and American Methodism for several decades. He held his position at

Drew until his death on 13 December 1895 in Madison, New Jersey.

Miley's *Atonement in Christ* (1879) discussed dominant theories of atonement and defended the governmental theory of atonement set forward by Grotius, a seventeenth-century theologian. By defending Grotius, Miley argued to keep the justice of God's moral dictates. It is a governmental theory of atonement because of Miley's use of justice. In fact, the strength of his theory of atonement is found in his connection of justice with atonement. According to him, forgiveness is only possible because all of justice is found on the cross with the death of Christ. In other words, our experience of justice is our experience of the suffering of Christ. This argument places justice in the body of Christ. The weakness of his theory of atonement, however, is that it is also an economic theory of atonement. He argues that the suffering of Christ is the "penal substitution" for our sin, and that this "penal substitution" is necessary for salvation. In fact, the purpose of this "substitutional punishment" is the salvation of humanity. Since Miley makes atonement about the salvation of humanity for him, then he reduces Christ to that of a commodity to be exchanged in the economy of salvation – which is the weakness of his theory of atonement in the sense that it reduces Christ to a commodity. This exchange, therefore, necessitates a change in God in the sense that salvation for humanity is only possible if God suffers.

In his *Systematic Theology* (1892–4), Miley presents a "Methodist Arminianism" as a means of differentiating Methodism from Calvinism and Romanism. He thought that Calvinism was problematic because its doctrine of predestination limited "the freedom of choice," and he thought that Romanism was problematic because its roots were Greek philosophy and not Christian Scripture. His systematic theology also develops both the possibilities and the limitations of using the scientific method in theology. His interest in using the scientific method is motivated by his use of reason. He posited that reason was necessary for faith, and he thought the scientific method could help in his positing of reason as necessary for faith.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Doctrine of Assurance," *Methodist Review* 39 (1857): 559–76.
"The Idea of God as a Law of Religious Development," *Methodist Review* 47 (1865): 5–29.
Atonement in Christ (New York, 1879).
"The Freedom of Choice," *Methodist Review* 63 (1881): 434–62.
Systematic Theology, 2 vols (New York, 1892–4).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio
Allen, Josiah C. "Miley's Atonement in Christ," *Methodist Quarterly Review* 19 (1882): 610–23.
Chaplain, John F. "Miley on the Atonement," *Methodist Studies* 62 (1880): 698–709.
Cherry, Conrad. "The Theology of John Miley," *Drew Gateway* 33 (1963): 71–81.
Chiles, Robert E. *Theological Transition in American Methodism*, *1790–1935* (New York, 1965).

Angela Kristen McWilliams

MILGRAM, Stanley (1933–84)

Stanley Milgram was born on 15 August 1933 in Bronx, New York. He graduated from Queens College with a BA in 1954, after spending four years studying political science. He turned down an acceptance to the School of International Affairs at Columbia University after learning about Harvard's department of

social relations, where he went to work with such established figures in psychology as Gordon ALLPORT, Talcott PARSONS, Roger Brown, and Erik ERIKSON. But it was the influence of Solomon Asch, while Milgram was working as Asch's teaching and research assistant, which had the greatest impact upon his intellectual development. It was Asch's subjective judgment of line length that showed a tendency to conformity that provided the paradigm for Milgram's doctoral dissertation: a comparison, using auditory cues, of the conformity behavior between two nationalities, French and Norwegian. This study established his lifelong research paradigm: investigating conformity and authority. Milgram received his PhD in social psychology in 1960.

Milgram taught briefly at Yale from 1960 to 1962, where he conducted his best-known experiment regarding the deference to authority figures. His studies showed that a majority (65 per cent) of the subjects would willingly inflict what they perceived as harmful shocks to an unseen "victim," if they were ordered to by an authority figure. Impacting moral and ethical issues ever since, this idea that authority figures can override or suppress our moral sense in our deliberations over moral actions has led to insight into how things like the Holocaust could have happened, and that our moral beliefs are less rigid than we had thought. The outcry over the willful manipulation and emotional stress from following orders to inflict pain on a human "subject" that followed the publication of these studies led to the increased concern for well-being of human research subjects that we see in place today, as well as the instituting of internal review boards to investigate any possible negative impact upon human subjects prior to the experiment.

Milgram returned to Harvard in 1963 as an assistant professor of social psychology, where he continued his research into group dynamics. It was there that he developed the innovative "lost-letter" technique that is used to measure the attitudes of a community, inno-vative in that it relied on action (the nailing of a found "lost" letter), rather than poll or other measurements based on words. He was able to use this technique to predict the outcome of the 1964 presidential elections. He also developed a series of studies to investigate the number of acquaintance connections between any two people; of the completed connections it was shown that it took around five people to deliver a package to a stranger in a different city using people whom they knew on a first-name basis only (the progenitor of the "six degrees of separation" idea).

In 1967 Milgram left Harvard to accept a full professorship from the Graduate Center of the City University of New York to head its social psychology program, after Harvard did not offer him tenure. While there, he was awarded a grant from CBS to investigate the relationship between television violence and viewer aggression, and he earned the honor of having been the first and only researcher to have persuaded a major television network to film episodes of a popular series to meet the requirements of an experiment. The results of the study demonstrated that those who viewed the anti-social episodes were no more likely to act in anti-social ways than those who viewed the pro-social ones.

Milgram's research at Yale, Harvard, and later CUNY, has impacted not just social psychology, but the world of ethics as well, as his studies demonstrated the influence authority figures have upon our ethical decision-making process. He died on 20 December 1984 in New York City.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Behavioral Study of Obedience," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 67 (1963): 371–8.

"Personality Characteristics Associated with Obedience and Defiance toward Authoritative Command," *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality* 1 (1966): 282–9.

"The Small World Problem," *Psychology*

Today 1 (1967): 60–67.

Television and Antisocial Behavior: Field Experiments, with R. Lance Shotland (New York, 1973).

Other Relevant Works
Milgram's papers are at Yale University.
The Individual in a Social World: Essays and Experiments (Reading, Mass., 1977; 2nd edn, New York, 1992).

Further Readings:
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v8*
Blass, Thomas, ed. *Obedience to Authority: Current Perspectives on the Milgram Paradigm* (Mahwah, N.J., 2000).
Blass, Thomas. *The Man Who Shocked the World: The Life and Legacy of Stanley Milgram* (New York, 2004).

James C. Poteet II

MILLER, David Louis (1903–86)

David Miller was born on 6 May 1903 in Lyndon, Kansas to immigrant German parents. He received a BA in mathematics and physics at the College of Emporia in 1927. He entered the University of Chicago in 1928, where his courses with George Herbert MEAD decided him on a career in philosophy. Mead directed his dissertation on emergent evolution, but after his death Miller finished his work with Charles W. MORRIS and received his PhD in philosophy in 1932.

In that year of economic depression Miller found himself without any prospect of a regular job, but he managed to find temporary work as an instructor at the University of Chicago, an instructor at a federally funded campus in downtown Chicago and, at the same time, a guide at the Chicago World's Fair, where he became a bodyguard for Sally Rand, the famous fan dancer. Finally, in 1934 he accepted a philosophy position at the University of Texas at Austin. Miller was President of the Southwestern Philosophical Society in 1949. It was during his second tenure as chair of the department from 1949 to 1959 that a doctoral program was established and the faculty grew from four to ten members. He retired in 1978 and died on 8 January 1986 in Austin, Texas.

Miller developed his own philosophical views, first in the area of philosophy of science and then, after the publication of over twenty articles and a book in that field, in the larger area that concerned him most: the interrelation of the individual, value, and society. His book in the philosophy of science, *Modern Science and Human Freedom* (1959), indicated that for him the two topics were closely interrelated. His concentration on the larger theme culminated in his publication in 1967 of a book of sweeping vision, *Individualism: Personal Achievement and the Open Society*. A book on Mead followed, as well as many articles and invited lectures on Mead, William JAMES, Josiah ROYCE, David Hume, and the topics of freedom, value, and the individual and society. In the course of a long and productive career David Miller authored four books and sixty-seven articles.

From the beginning a forceful and accomplished speaker, Miller became, in spite of the justice of his grading, a popular teacher. An imposing figure of a man, erect, large-boned, and over six feet tall, he yet captivated his students, both graduate and undergraduate, with his gentle humor and patience. Those who knew him well cherished other traits that stamped his everyday life and personality. He was an accomplished cabinetmaker, carpenter, and poet. His remarkable talent for taking the point of view of the other, his deep appreciation of the uniqueness of individual lives, and his tender concern for children and the disadvantaged was plain for all to see. In all such matters he came to be esteemed as a man of genuine wisdom.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Philosophy of A. N. Whitehead, with George V. Gentry (Minneapolis, 1938).

Modern Science and Human Freedom (Austin, Tex., 1959; 2nd edn 1969).

Individualism: Personal Achievement and the Open Society (Austin, Tex., 1967).

George Herbert Mead: Self, Language, and the World (Austin, Tex., 1973; 2nd edn 1980).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with Charles W. Morris, John M. Brewster, and Albert M. Dunham, *The Philosophy of the Act*, by George H. Mead (Chicago, 1938).

Ed., *The Individual and the Social Self*, by George H. Mead (Chicago, Ill., 1982).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Proc of APA v60*, *Who Was Who in Amer v9*, *Who's Who in Phil*

M. Jones, P. Nobo, J. Nobo, Yen-Ling Chang, eds. *The Individual and Society: Essays Presented to David L. Miller on His Seventy-fifth Birthday* (Norman, Okla., 1978).

Douglas Browning

MILLER, Dickinson Sergeant (1868–1963)

Dickinson Sergeant Miller was born on 7 October 1868 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He studied with George FULLERTON at the University of Pennsylvania, receiving his BA in 1889. He then studied psychology under G. Stanley HALL at Clark University, but left a year later to attend Harvard University, where he received both the BA and MA degrees in 1892. At Harvard, he was particularly influenced by William JAMES and remained a lifelong friend. Miller next went to Germany where he studied at the universities of Berlin and Halle, receiving the PhD in philosophy from Halle in 1893.

Miller became an associate professor in philosophy at Bryn Mawr College in 1894. He left in 1899 to become an instructor at Harvard, teaching there until 1904 when he began teaching at Columbia University and remained until 1919. While at Columbia, he was ordained a deacon in the Episcopal Church, and in 1911 took the additional position of professor of Christian apologetics at General Theology Seminary. He resigned from his seminary position in 1924 after the Episcopal bishops condemned all but literal readings of the Christian creed. He taught at Smith College from 1924 to 1926. During the 1930s and 40s he lived in Europe, where he met with the Vienna Circle positivists, Ludwig Wittgenstein, and George SANTAYANA. Miller died on 13 November 1963 in Boston, Massachusetts.

Although a close friend of James, Miller was one of his most insightful critics. In "'The Will to Believe' and the Duty to Doubt" (1899) and "James's Doctrine of 'The Right to Believe'" (1942), Miller argued against James's will to believe doctrine, insisting that it amounted to nothing more than a "right to Make Believe" because it failed to link a belief's justification with fact and evidence. Miller also objected to James's radical empiricism in "Naïve Realism: What Is It?" (1909) and "A Debt to James" (1942), persuasively demonstrating the inadequacy of its account of perceptual knowledge.

But Miller was more than just a critic of James. He was an important early advocate of the analytic method, insisting that philosophical problems could be resolved through the logical analysis of key concepts. His use of this method led to an original account of knowledge in "The Meaning of Truth and Error" (1893), which James credited with giving him the courage to accept pragmatism, as well as an important defense of soft determinism in "Free Will as Involving Determinism and Inconceivable Without it" (1934), and views

on religion, morality, and social issues that deserve being revisited.

BILIOGRAPHY
Das Wesen der Erkenntnis und des Irrthums (Halle, Germany, 1893).
"The Meaning of Truth and Error," *Philosophical Review* 2 (1893): 408–25.
"'The Will to Believe' and the Duty to Doubt," *International Journal of Ethics* 9 (1898): 169–95.
"Naïve Realism: What Is It?" in *Essays Psychological and Philosophical in Honor of William James* (New York, 1908), pp. 233–61.
"Is There Not a Clear Solution of the Knowledge Problem?" *Journal of Philosophy* 34 (1937): 701–12; 35 (1938): 561–72.
"A Debt to James," in *In Commemoration of William James*, ed. Brand Blanshard and Herbert W. Schneider (New York, 1942), pp. 24–33.
"James's Doctrine of 'The Right to Believe'," *Philosophical Review* 51 (1942): 541–58.

Other Relevant Works
"The Relations of 'Ought' and 'Is'," *International Journal of Ethics* 4 (1894): 499–512.
"The Defense of the Faith Today," *Bulletin of the General Theological Seminary* 1 (1915): 25–30.
"Moral Truth," *Philosophical Studies* 1 (1950): 40–46.
Philosophical Analysis and Human Welfare: Selected Essays and Chapters from Six Decades, ed. Loyd D Easton (Dordecht, 1975).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v51*, *Proc of APA v37*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*

Mark Moller

MILLER, George Armitage (1920–)

George A. Miller was born on 3 February 1920 in Charleston, West Virginia. He received his BA in 1940 and a Masters in Speech Science in 1941, both from the University of Alabama. His PhD in psychology was awarded by Harvard University in 1946. Miller was assistant professor of psychology at Harvard from 1946 to 1951, and then was associate professor of psychology at Massachusetts Institute of Technology from 1951 to 1955. Miller then returned to Harvard as associate professor from 1955 to 1958 and was full professor from 1958 to 1968. He also was the chair of the psychology department at Harvard from 1964 to 1967 and co-director of the Center for Cognitive Studies. He then went to Rockefeller University as visiting professor in 1967–8 and then was professor of psychology from 1968 to 1979. In 1979 he moved to Princeton University as professor of experimental psychology. From 1982 until his retirement in 1990 he was James S. McDonnell Professor of Psychology, and was the Director of Princeton's Cognitive Neuroscience program from 1989 to 1994.

Miller is best known as a pioneer in psycholinguistics and as a leader of the "cognitive revolution" in psychology. He has published a large number of books and articles. Among the most significant are *Language and Communication* (1951); "The Magical Number Seven, Plus or Minus Two" (1956); *Plans and the Structure of Behavior* (1960), co-authored with Eugene Galanter and Karl Pribram; "Some Psychological Studies of Grammar" (1962); *Language and Perception* (1976); *Spontaneous Apprentices: Children and Language* (1977); and *The Science of Words* (1991).

In addition to being an extremely productive researcher and writer, Miller has been an active institution-builder and statesman for psychology. He founded the Harvard Center for Cognitive Studies with Jerome Bruner in 1960, and founded the Princeton Cognitive Science

Laboratory with Gilbert HARMAN in 1986. Miller was President of the American Psychological Association in 1969. Miller has won numerous awards, including the National Medal of Science in 1991, and the American Psychological Association's Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award. He was elected to the National Academy of Sciences in 1962, and he played an important role in the creation and development of the behavioral sciences section of the Academy during the 1960s.

The focal point of Miller's work is the psychology of language and communication. He began his career in the 1940s as a "good behaviorist" working in the Harvard Psycho-Acoustic Laboratory under S. Smith STEVENS. Although by the mid 1950s Miller had come to believe that the behaviorists were unable to answer – or even to ask – the important questions about language and communication, his break with behaviorism was by no means absolute. Miller's cognitivism shares a sufficient number of common features with behaviorism that some historians have argued (such as Leahey 1992) that his "cognitive revolution" was not a revolution but only a leadership change within behaviorist psychology.

While Miller accepted many of behaviorism's methodological precepts, especially the injunction that all theoretical terms must be operationally defined, he differed in a number of ways from the behaviorist mainstream of the 1940s and 50s. For example, Miller believed that "mentalistic" concepts were needed if psychology was to explain complex phenomena such as language. In addition, he was very uncomfortable with using laboratory animals, such as rats and pigeons, as models for human psychological behavior. To Miller, the interesting and important thing about humans was their ability to communicate using complex language, something that no rat or pigeon could simulate.

The digital computer, on the other hand, could, in Miller's view, model complex linguistic behavior; and this led him to subscribe to the "physical symbol system hypothesis" –

the idea that both the digital computer and the human brain are members of the same "broad class of systems capable of having and manipulating symbols [and that are] realizable in the physical universe" (1981, p. 215). Like his friend and fellow leader of the cognitive revolution, Herbert SIMON, Miller believed that the computer allowed psychologists to generate operational definitions of terms, such as mind and purpose, which mainstream behaviorists did not think could be operationalized.

When Miller first came to Harvard, World War II was at its height. The military was very interested in communications research, and Harvard's Psycho-Acoustic Lab was the leading academic center for such study. It is therefore no surprise that Miller's first project as a graduate student, only published after the war in 1947, was military in origin: a study for the US Signal Corps on jamming radio communications.

Convinced that "grass grows in the cracks" between disciplines, Miller sought a way following the war to apply his new knowledge of communications engineering to psychology. In October 1948 he discovered Claude Shannon's information theory and in 1949 he introduced it to psychology in "Statistical Behavioristics and Sequences of Responses," co-authored with Frederick Frick. They advanced two novel ideas: the Index of Behavioral Stereotypy, and the "course of action." Neither term would gain popularity, but the concepts behind them quickly became influential.

The Index of Behavioral Stereotypy, which Miller later applied to Skinnerian conditioning in *Language and Communication* (1951), was an indicator of the degree of randomness in a creature's behavior. As the degree of randomness of a behavior is the inverse of its degree of predictability, Miller's index was designed to serve as a quantitative indicator of the predictability of an organism's behavior, a useful measure for assessing the extent to which that organism has learned to adapt to its environment.

Influenced by John VON NEUMANN and Oskar Morgenstern's idea of "strategy" as outlined in *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*

(1944), Miller and Frick also argued that a proper measure of the predictability of behavior must go beyond the "discrete response" to take the *sequence* of actions into account. Because the organism's actions are rarely independent of one another, in other words, the whole "course of action" must be analyzed.

The idea of a course of action was particularly important to Miller because it promised a way to analyze language. Language long had been recognized as perhaps the most complicated of all behaviors. Consequently, if language could be analyzed within the behaviorist system, then any behavior could. From 1948 to 1951, Miller worked to use his new information theory to bring together S. S. Stevens's psychophysics and B. F. SKINNER's operant conditioning in the study of language. The result of this effort, the text *Language and Communication* (1951), became one of the foundational works of psycholinguistics.

Language and Communication begins by describing the physical attributes of the human communication system and the mechanisms by which sounds are transmitted through the air. After laying this psychophysical groundwork, Miller then moves to address the harder issues surrounding linguistic behavior. It was not too difficult for behaviorists to account for the learning of words through either classical or Skinnerian (operant) conditioning: a person, through positive or negative reinforcement, learns to associate particular sounds with specific objects or actions. The compounding of words into sentences, however, was, for behaviorists, a more difficult phenomenon to explain. Each word in a sentence clearly depends on other words, both before and after it, as well as upon a host of nonverbal behaviors (gestures, facial expressions, etc.). Also, although ordered, human speech patterns are not fully deterministic. A statistical analysis of sentences as linguistic courses of action therefore seemed appropriate to Miller, as such an approach could take into account both the dependency of words on other words and the probabilistic nature of language.

Information theory was only the beginning for Miller, however. He recalls that he "was deeply involved in the statistical properties of sequences of symbols and written messages when I encountered A. N. CHOMSKY in 1954, who looked at it and said 'that will never converge on English'" (1986, p. 207). Noam Chomsky had argued that the statistical analysis of communication through information theory was insufficient to account for the complexity and regularity of natural language. Miller and Chomsky began to work closely together in 1955, co-authoring a number of influential papers over the next several years. With Chomsky's criticisms of information theoretic models of language as a stimulus, Miller began to search for a new model for human language. Written during this fertile period of question and change, "The Magical Number Seven", Miller's most famous paper, represents both a culmination of and a departure from information theory. Significantly, it was at that time that he realized that he "never would be a good behaviorist" (1986, p. 209).

In "The Magical Number Seven," Miller analyzes the results of experiments on absolute judgment (the ability to discriminate between stimuli) and on immediate memory, finding severe limits in the human communication system in both areas. Significantly, the nature of these limitations is quite different: "Absolute judgment is limited by the amount of information [measured in bits]. Immediate memory is limited by the number of items. In order to capture this distinction in somewhat picturesque terms, I have fallen into the custom of distinguishing between *bits* of information and *chunks* of information." Even more important, "the span of immediate memory seems to be almost independent of the number of bits per chunk." This curious feature of immediate memory is crucial, for it allows us to "increase the number of bits of information that it [our memory] contains simply by building larger and larger chunks, each chunk containing more information than before" (1956, pp. 92–3). To give this successive "chunking" of

information a name, Miller borrows from communications theory the term "recoding."

Miller concludes "The Magical Number Seven" by applying the idea of recoding to language, his favorite topic, remarking that "the most customary kind of recoding that we do all the time is to translate into a verbal code." This process of linguistic recoding was of great importance to Miller, who called it "the very lifeblood of the thought process." Consequently, he argued, psychologists should spend less time studying rats in T-mazes and more time investigating recoding. If they did so, he predicted, they would find that "a lot of questions that seemed fruitless twenty or thirty years ago may now be worth another look" (1956, pp. 95–6).

Miller saw his idea of recoding as linked to Chomsky's ideas about grammar and syntax. Their point of connection was the computer. Chomsky's definition of a grammar made it almost identical to a computer program, as both involved the manipulation of symbols according to the sequential application of a set of logical rules. To Miller, recoding clearly was a similar process. He saw the chunks of information produced by recoding as symbolic representations formed, organized, and related to one another according to a set of rules akin to a grammar – or a program. Even more he reasoned that if each language's grammar was like a program, then the transformational grammar must be analogous to the operating system of the human mind.

The particular computer program Miller used as a model of mind was the *Logic Theorist* of Allen NEWELL and Herbert Simon (1956). To Miller, the most important feature of Newell and Simon's program was that it combined the idea of feedback with the principle of hierarchical organization. In Newell and Simon's program, procedures were organized hierarchically, with one procedure containing many sub-routines. A kind of master routine transferred control of operations from level to level of the hierarchy to suit the situation. Each routine in this hierarchy was a

feedback loop wherein the present state of the machine was tested against a goal state, with action being taken if the goal and present states were not equal. After each action, the test was repeated. When the present state came to equal the goal state, then control was passed back to a superior routine. In this way, feedback loops were nested within one another.

Miller saw in the idea of nested feedback loops a model mechanism of language generation and the key to analyzing complex behavior in general. By 1959, Miller had developed this idea into a consciously anti-behaviorist system in *Plans and the Structure of Behavior*, a groundbreaking work co-authored with Karl Pribram and Eugene Galanter.

By the late 1950s, the computer metaphor of mind had come to mean for Miller that strict behaviorism had to be abandoned. The mind had to be explored for complex behavior to be explained. At the same time, he believed, the computer also meant that psychology could study such "mentalistic" concepts as mind and purpose and still be scientific. It could do so, he argued, because the computer enabled one to model mental processes in a rigorous mathematical fashion, and then to put one's model to the test. Computers provided the novel opportunity to embody the ghost of the mind in a machine and so to wed theoretical model building to experimentation. As Miller later remarked, "The generation before me felt that you couldn't use a term without having a physical instantiation of it. And on that criterion, we now have physical instantiations, by means of computers, of fabulous things!" (1986, p. 204)

In Miller's more recent work he continued his investigations into the psychology of language and communication, though since the late 1960s his focus shifted steadily away from grammars and syntactical structures to words. This has included the processes by which children learn to attach meanings to sounds and symbols, explored in *Spontaneous Apprentices* (1977) and *The Science of Words*, and especially the development of WordNet, a

semantic lexicon for the English language. Miller began the WordNet project in 1985, and it continues today. Interestingly, this research has undercut Chomsky and Miller's early emphasis on the primacy of syntax over semantics, revealing the interdependence of grammars and lexica. This result is in keeping with recent studies of "expert" cognition which have shown that experts think differently in their areas of expertise than they do in other areas, partly because they have developed a sophisticated conceptual framework (akin to a grammar) that allows them to make sense of new data, and partly because they have mastered a large set of data (words), which is essential for constructing and elaborating such conceptual frameworks.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Language and Communication (New York, 1951).

"The Magical Number Seven, Plus or Minus Two," *Psychological Review* 63 (1956): 81–97.

"Finite State Languages," with Noam Chomsky, *Information and Control* 1 (1958): 91–112.

Plans and the Structure of Behavior, with Eugene Galanter and Karl Pribram (New York, 1960).

Psychology: The Science of Mental Life (New York, 1962).

"Introduction to the Formal Analysis of Natural Languages," with Noam Chomsky, in *Handbook of Mathematical Psychology*, vol. 2, ed. R. Duncan Luce, Robert Bush, and Eugene Galanter (New York, 1963), pp. 269–321.

Language and Perception, with P. N. Johnson-Laird (Cambridge, Mass., 1976).

Spontaneous Apprentices: Children and Language (New York, 1977).

The Science of Words (New York, 1991).

Other Relevant Works

"The Masking of Speech," *Psychological Bulletin* 44 (1947): 105–29.

"Statistical Behavioristics and Sequences of Responses," with Fred Frick, *Psychological Review* 56 (1949): 311–25.

"A Statistical Description of Operant Conditioning," *American Journal of Psychology* 64 (1951): 20–36.

"Some Psychological Studies of Grammar," *American Psychologist* 7 (1962): 748–62.

"Trends and Debates in Cognitive Psychology," *Cognition* 10 (1981): 215–25.

"The Background to Modern Psychology," in *States of Mind: Conversations with Psychological Investigators*, ed. Jonathan Miller (London, 1983), pp. 12–28.

"George A. Miller: Leadership in the Cognitive Shift," in *The Cognitive Revolution in Psychology*, ed. Bernard Baars (New York, 1986), pp. 198–223. An interview with Miller.

"George A. Miller," in *A History of Psychology in Autobiography*, ed. Gardner Lindzey (Stanford, Cal., 1989), pp. 391–420.

"The Cognitive Revolution: An Historical Perspective," *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 7 (2003): 141–4.

Further Reading

Bio Dict Psych

Chomsky, Noam. *Syntactic Structures* (The Hague, 1957).

Crowther-Heyck, Hunter. "George A. Miller, Language, and the Computer Metaphor of Mind," *History of Psychology* 2 (1999): 37–64.

Edwards, Paul. *The Closed World: Computers and the Politics of Discourse in Cold War America* (Cambridge, Mass., 1996).

Harman, Gilbert, ed. *Conceptions of the Human Mind: Essays in Honor of George A. Miller* (Hillsdale, N.J., 1993).

Hirst, William, ed. *The Making of Cognitive Science: Essays in Honor of George A. Miller* (New York, 1988).

Leahey, Thomas H. *A History of*

Psychology: Main Currents in Psychological Thought, 3rd edn (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1992).

Newell, Allan, and Herbert Simon. "The Logic Theory Machine: A Complex Information Processing System," *IRE Transactions on Information Theory* 1 (1956): 61–79.

Hunter Crowther-Heyck

MILLER, James Wilkinson (1902–93)

James Wilkinson Miller was born on 9 March 1902 in Marquette, Michigan, and died on 19 May 1993 in Williamsburg, Virginia. His father, Albert E. Miller, was a lawyer and his mother, Elizabeth, belonged to the politically prominent Wilkinson family. After receiving a BA at the University of Michigan in 1924, Miller entered graduate study in philosophy at Harvard University where he earned an MA; this was followed by a PhD in 1927. He spent 1927–8 at the University of Paris as a traveling fellow of Harvard. He was an instructor and tutor in philosophy at Harvard for seven years beginning in 1928. In 1929 he and Mary Elliott Cairns, a student at Radcliffe College, were married; they had two sons.

In 1935 Miller accepted a position as associate professor in philosophy at the College of William and Mary. When he arrived at his new post, Miller was the only philosopher in the department of philosophy and psychology. During the next two decades he was instrumental in building the foundations for the modern department of philosophy, independent of the psychology department, with Miller becoming its head in 1943; in the same year he was promoted to full professor. In 1946 he became Chancellor Professor, a position he held until 1955. Miller also served with distinction as Dean of the Faculty during especially difficult years from 1938 to 1946. He was called on to serve as Acting President for a brief period in 1951. In 1955 Miller left William and Mary to become the MacDonald Professor of Philosophy at McGill University in Montreal where he taught until his retirement in 1970.

Miller's research and teaching interests were primarily in logic and epistemology, but he also pursued topics in aesthetics, including musical theory. His most important publication, *The Structure of Aristotelian Logic* (1938), displays both his mastery of modern logical theory and his familiarity with classical philosophy. His epistemological outlook was heavily influenced by British empiricism, and he published several articles critical of Cartesian foundationalism. He felt very strongly that undergraduate education in philosophy should include a broad exposure to the history of philosophy, a pedagogical outlook that is reflected in the philosophy curriculum at William and Mary to this day.

Miller is remembered personally by a generation of William and Mary graduates as an outstanding teacher who affected their lives and intellectual careers. Moreover, he had a direct and strong influence on the development of philosophy as a profession both in Virginia and in the South generally, having been a founding member of the Virginia Philosophical Association and a member of the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology. He was also a member of Phi Beta Kappa and the American Philosophical Association.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Structure of Aristotelian Logic (London, 1938).
Logic Handbook (New York, 1958).

Other Relevant Works
"Logical Dualism," *Journal of Philosophy* 47 (1950): 341–53.
"Descartes' Conceptualism," *Review of Metaphysics* 4 (1950–51): 239–46.
"The Logic of Terms," in *Structure, Method and Meaning: Essays in Honor of Henry*

M. Sheffer, ed. Paul Henle (New York, 1951), pp. 35–41.

"The Development of the Philosophy of Socrates," *Review of Metaphysics* 6 (1952–53): 551–61.

"The Logic of the Synthetic A Priori," *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 16 (1975): 465–75.

Other Relevant Works
Who's Who in Phil

David H. Jones

MILLER, John William (1895–1978)

John William Miller was born on 8 January 1895 in Rochester, New York. He earned a BA from Harvard in 1916. A conscientious objector, he volunteered for the ambulance corps and served in France during World War I. He returned to Harvard for graduate studies in philosophy, studying with Edwin HOLT, William HOCKING, Josiah ROYCE and William JAMES. Miller had a special interest in German philosophy, particularly the work of the idealists Kant, Fichte, and Hegel. Miller received the PhD in philosophy in 1922 for his dissertation on "The Definition of the Thing," which considers the relationship between ontology, epistemology, and semiotics. His work always showed the influence of his years at Harvard and in particular the debate between Royce and James over the existence of an absolute. Miller's own work reflected a desire to find a compromise between these two positions, a midway point between skepticism and authoritarianism, or subjectivism and objectivism.

Miller began his teaching career at Connecticut College in 1922, and then went to Williams College in Massachusetts, where he was professor of philosophy from 1924 until his retirement in 1960. Miller dedicated himself to the life of a liberal arts college professor at Williams, winning numerous teaching awards and honors. In 1945 he became Hopkins Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy, succeeding his retired colleague James B. PRATT.

During his teaching career, Miller only made six presentations of his own philosophical views, including two essays published in the *Journal of Philosophy* ("The Paradox of Cause" in 1935 and "Accidents Will Happen" in 1937) and four professional talks: "Freedom as a Characteristic of Man in a Democratic Society" (American Political Science Association, Chicago, 1938), "History and Humanism" (Harvard Philosophy Club, 1948), "The Midworld" (Harvard Philosophy Club, 1952), and "The Scholar as Man of the World" (Phi Beta Kappa Society, Hobart College, 1952).

Only after Miller's retirement and at the urging of some former students, most notably George P. Brockway who had become an editor at W. W. Norton, did Miller arrange to have his writings published. Norton has since published several of his works, including his dissertation, "The Definition of the Thing," as well as a collection of essays, *The Paradox of Cause and Other Essays* (1978). Miller died on 25 December 1978 in North Adams, Massachusetts, and is buried near the Williams College campus. Upon his widow's death in 1993, their home became part of the Williams College Campus and is known as the Miller House.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Paradox of Cause and Other Essays (New York, 1978).
The Philosophy of History (New York, 1978).
The Definition of the Thing with Some Notes on Language (New York, 1981).
The Midworld of Symbols and Functioning Objects (New York, 1982).
In Defense of the Psychological (New York, 1983).

Other Relevant Works

Miller's papers are at Williams College, Massachusetts.

"The Paradox of Cause," *Journal of Philosophy* 32 (1935): 169–75.

"Accidents Will Happen," *Journal of Philosophy* 34 (1937): 121–31.

"For Idealism," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 1 (1987): 260–69.

Further Reading

Proc of APA v52

Brockway, George P. "John William Miller," *The American Scholar* 49 (1980): 236–40.

Colapietro, Vincent M. *The Fateful Shapes of Human Freedom: John William Miller and the Crisis of Modernity* (Nashville, Tenn., 2003).

Epstein, Joseph, ed. *Masters: Portraits of Great Teachers* (New York, 1981), pp. 155–64.

Fell, Joseph P. *The Philosophy of John William Miller* (Lewisburg, Penn., 1990).

Tyman, Stephen. *Descrying the Ideal: The Philosophy of John William Miller* (Carbondale, Ill., 1993).

Greg Eow

MILLER, Perry Gilbert Eddy (1905–63)

Perry Miller was born on 25 February 1905 in Chicago, Illinois. His father (a physician) and his mother (related to Mary Baker EDDY) were New Englanders by birth and descent. After one year at the University of Chicago (1922–3), he traveled widely and held a series of jobs, the last of which, as a sailor, took him to Africa. Returning to Chicago, he completed his BA degree in 1928 and his PhD in English in 1931. To prepare his dissertation, a study of the origins and development of Congregationalism in seventeenth-century New England, he moved to Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1930. Appointed as an instructor in the history and literature program at Harvard in 1931, he received tenure in English in 1939, and became Harvard's first professor of American literature in 1946. During World War II he served from 1942 to 1945 in the Office of Strategic Services. He became the first Powell M. Cabot Professor of American Literature in 1960, and he held this position until his death on 9 December 1963 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Miller's renown as a literary and cultural historian rests almost entirely on the books and essays he wrote on Puritanism in New England. With one principal exception, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province* (1953), most of this work was published within a span of eleven years, from 1933 to 1943. After returning from the war, Miller devoted himself to the nineteenth century, especially the antebellum period, although he also published an intellectual biography of Jonathan Edwards (1949). Few of his investigations of nineteenth-century culture were received with anything like the enthusiasm that his work on the Puritans aroused, although his major anthology *The Transcendentalists* (1950) provided a powerful reinterpretation of that movement as socially engaged.

Everything Miller wrote was infused with elements of a grand narrative design: because we have been stripped of the certainties that marked Christianity before the rise of modern science, we must confront the flux of modernity on our own. Another, overlapping narrative concerned the identity of America. Every effort to fix in place our national identity was doomed to fail, unable to capture the paradoxes that lurked below the surface of things; unity always gave way to complexity. Miller inherited the first design from Henry ADAMS; from Adams and the great romantics he also inherited a high understanding of history as "art," a means of imposing "form" on the chaos of modernity. Hence, his recurrent celebration of the intellectual artistry of certain thinkers who, like Jonathan Edwards or

Herman Melville, sought out the "reality" that others covered over or ignored. More evoked than defined, this reality was often cast as the "terror" that lay beneath the surface of things: the passions or contradictions that undermined conventional wisdom.

What were these contradictions? Some were the stuff of standard intellectual history, but others were peculiar to Miller. Much affected by certain prophets of modern science, such as Heisenberg, and convinced that his was a post-Christian era, he found as far back as the sixteenth century an "epistemological crisis" that threatened any pretense of intellectual security. This crisis was at once historical and a timeless feature of the human condition. Miller regarded his investigations of the past, and especially his work on early New England, as exposing a "representative" situation: how, beginning with the Puritans, intellectuals responded to uncertainty. Although uncertainty never disappeared, Miller celebrated and, in his own scholarship, continually reenacted the romantic quest to find an underlying unity. His relish for exposing unexpected depths went hand-in-hand with an admiration for John DEWEY's instrumentalism. Here the contradictions begin to multiply. Preferring a naturalistic or secular pragmatism to "fixed" ways of thinking, Miller was also a critic of liberal optimism and its indifference to religion, finding in the neo-orthodoxy of Reinhold NIEBUHR and even in the Calvinism of the Puritans a more appealing account of human nature than what Dewey and liberalism provided. Moreover, he was a self-described "lone wolf" who had little sympathy for the Deweyan program of a socialized intelligentsia. The figures he admired were outsiders and naysayers: Melville, Edwards, Roger Williams, and John Cotton, to name but four. Aware of the ambivalence about democracy in the Puritans and thinkers like Ralph W. EMERSON, he shared much of that ambivalence, extolling the authority of the Byronic hero or "genius," be he a tyrant like the fictional Ahab or the aloof Edwards, who turned against his congregation and town.

Miller relied on key words or symbols to convey his master design. It is no simple matter to translate or clarify these master terms, especially those that pervade his work on the nineteenth century: "nature," "machine," "mechanical," "mind," "matter," "reality," and the "sublime." These were often paired as opposites, rooted in or alluding to the antagonism between consciousness and circumstance, mind or art and matter. Other than mind, his most persistent master symbol was "America." The epiphany he had while in Africa in the mid 1920s, that his life work was the "mission of comprehending … the innermost propulsion of the United States" (*Errand into the Wilderness*, 1956, p. viii), resonates in the final few words of his essay on the Puritans' understanding of "errand": "they were left alone with America" (p. 15), which also was the situation he imagined as being his own.

His inflections of America owed much to the tradition of cultural criticism that arose with Emerson and the transcendentalists, to be renewed during Miller's formative years by writers as dissimilar as Henry MENCKEN and Vernon Parrington. The confusions of that tradition reappear in his own pages: the meaning of America lay in the West, in wild nature; yet the men who learned from Europe and were least provincial were also some of our best interpreters. Revivalism was a powerful source of the new national identity, yet revivalism led to anti-intellectualism, and his heroes, most of them liberals, questioned this form of Christianity. The dominant culture was conformist, yet certain movements and individuals (transcendentalism, Theodore Parker) were all the more American for turning against that culture – again, as he imagined himself doing. As one of his friends and former students has noted, he could behave as though he were one of the roughs, a latter-day Walt WHITMAN or Ernest Hemingway. Yet he was an immensely bookish man with little in the way of a public life or audience outside his classroom. Few of his key words or symbols have resonated with other cultural historians either in his day or

since, probably because his quest for the secret depths made his work seem esoteric.

What did he accomplish as a historian of Puritanism? Attentive to the training in philosophy, logic, and rhetoric at Harvard College, and to the scholarship cited by the ministers, he recognized the rationalism – the confidence in the human intellect – that accompanied their Calvinism. Similar evidence led him to the sixteenth-century educator Peter Ramus's system of logic, which Miller interpreted as a means of resolving the epistemological crisis of nominalism. His most influential argument, and within Puritan studies the most controversial, concerned the Calvinism of the colonists. Proposing that these Puritans could not tolerate Calvin's arbitrary God, Miller regarded their theological project as an effort, necessarily paradoxical, to preserve that very God even as they harnessed the divine power to a contractual, two-sided covenant. He also proposed that the colonists moved toward a de facto liberalism via ideas such as "preparation for salvation," a means of allowing "works" a greater role in the order of salvation. This argument enabled him to account for the decay of Calvinism as an unintended and ironic consequence of ideas designed to buttress orthodox theology. "Declension," the master irony of *From Colony to Province*, was his way of introducing the Americanization of the colonists as they passed into being provincials beset by unexpected change. His portrait of Cotton Mather depicts someone diminished by the paradoxes that accumulated within second and third-generation Puritanism, who eventually sanctioned a shallow, conformist version of piety. Miller's intellectual biography of Edwards had as its core premise the modernity of a theologian whom Miller regarded as a naturalist aspiring to comprehend reality, a writer who wanted language to coincide exactly with what was real. Despite misjudging the influence of John Locke, Miller's impassioned biography spurred a wider interest in Edwards and led to the project, which he headed until his death, of a multivolume *Collected Works* that encompassed most of Edwards's books and manuscripts. At the time of his death he was working on a comprehensive study of antebellum culture, fragments of which were published as *The Life of the Mind in America* (1967).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Orthodoxy in Massachusetts 1630–1650 (Cambridge, Mass., 1933).

The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century (Cambridge, Mass., 1939).

Jonathan Edwards (New York, 1949).

The New England Mind: From Colony to Province (Cambridge, Mass., 1953).

Errand into the Wilderness (Cambridge, Mass., 1956).

The Raven and the Whale (New York, 1956).

Nature's Nation (Cambridge, Mass., 1967).

The Responsibility of Mind in a Civilization of Machines, ed. John Crowell and Stanford J. Searl, Jr. (Amherst, Mass., 1979).

Sources for The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century, ed. James Hoopes (Williamsburg, Virg., 1981).

Other Relevant Works

Miller's papers are at Harvard University.

Ed. with Thomas H. Johnson, *The Puritans* (New York, 1938).

Ed., *The Transcendentalists: An Anthology* (Cambridge, Mass., 1950).

Ed., *American Thought: Civil War to World War I* (New York, 1954).

Ed., *The American Puritans: Their Prose and Poetry* (New York, 1956).

Ed., *The American Transcendentalists: Their Prose and Poetry* (Garden City, N.Y., 1957).

Ed., *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, 2 vols (New Haven, Conn., 1957, 1959).

Ed. with Thomas H. Johnson, *The Puritans*, 2 vols (New York, 1963).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*,

Comp Amer Thought, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encycl Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*

Butts, Francis. *Perry Miller and the Ordeal of American Freedom*. PhD dissertation, Queens University (Kingston, Ontario, 1980).

Hollinger, David. "Perry Miller and Philosophical History," *History and Theory* 7 (1968): 189–202.

Skotheim, Robert. *American Intellectual Histories and Historians* (Princeton, N.J., 1966).

David D. Hall

MILLS, Charles Wright (1916–62)

C. Wright Mills was born on 28 August 1916 in Waco, Texas. After graduating from Dallas Technical High School in 1934, and anticipating a career as an engineer, Mills entered Texas A&M College. In 1935 Mills transferred to the University of Texas, where he received a BA in 1938 and an MA in philosophy and sociology in 1939. In 1939 he entered the doctoral program in sociology at the University of Wisconsin. Mills completed his course work in 1941 and was appointed associate professor of sociology at the University of Maryland, with his high blood pressure giving him a deferment from military service. Mills was awarded his PhD in sociology in 1942. His dissertation, *Sociology and Pragmatism* (published in 1964), applied the sociology of knowledge to the development of the philosophy of pragmatism, especially the work of Charles PEIRCE, William JAMES, and John DEWEY. He used the themes he developed there in much of his later writing. For Mills, the University of Maryland provided both an opportunity to become involved in what was going on in Washington, D.C., and a way-station on the road to Columbia University and New York. At Maryland he began writing for progressive magazines like the *New Republic* and continued to define himself as an innovative intellectual and sociologist, concerned with the fundamental issues of the era. He saw reformism and liberalism, illustrated by the New Deal, as no longer a valid answer to American and world problems.

In 1945 Mills took a position as research associate at Columbia's Bureau of Applied Social Research (BASR). He was appointed assistant professor of sociology at Columbia College in 1946, and was promoted to associate professor in 1950 and to full professor in 1956. But Mills's ties with Columbia and professional sociology in general were loosening more and more, after a clash with the BASR Director, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and then with his department. Mills once again began to occupy the role of a marginal man, both at Columbia and in relation to his political friends in New York who negatively viewed his sociological interests. But his empirical work served him well, giving credibility to subsequent books.

Mills continued to focus on the different social classes and their political impact in *New Men of Power* (1948), *White Collar* (1951), and *The Power Elite* (1956). Mills visited Europe in 1956, and he was a Fulbright Lecturer at the University of Copenhagen between 1956 and 1957. He visited Cuba in 1960, interviewing Castro, Che Guevara and others, and published *Listen Yankee* in 1960. A day or two before he was scheduled to debate A. A. Berle, Jr. on national television, he had a massive heart attack. After a trip to Europe, Mills returned to his home in West Nyack, New York, where he died on 20 March 1962, just prior to the publication of *The Marxists,* a broad-ranging analysis of many different species of Marxism.

While still a graduate student at Wisconsin, Mills developed a close relationship with Hans Gerth, who brought to the faculty ideas from European classical sociology, including the work of Max Weber and Karl Marx.

Collaboration with Gerth later resulted in two joint books: *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (1946) and *Character and Social Structure* (1953). Mills's early article, "Situated Actions and Vocabularies of Motive" (1940), foreshadowed the situational emphasis within the new field of ethnomethodology that emerged decades later. His article in the *American Journal of Sociology*, "The Professional Ideology of Social Pathologists" (1943), criticized sociologists for writing textbooks on social problems which avoided fundamental classical ideas like the negative impact of social stratification.

The Causes of World War Three was published in 1958 and *The Sociological Imagination* appeared in 1959. Three years after Mills's death, *The New Sociology* was published, a book of essays in his honor. His own essays were collected in 1963, and his doctoral dissertation finally found a publisher in 1964; his addresses were published in 1968, and his letters appeared in 2000. Three biographies of Mills were written (Scimecca 1977, Horowitz 1983, Tilman 1984) as well as a book on his approach to the power elite (Domhoff and Ballard 1968), and at least three books were dedicated to him. In 1964 the Society for the Study of Social Problems began to give a yearly prize for the book that "best exemplifies outstanding social science research and an understanding of the individual and society in the tradition of the distinguished sociologist, C. Wright Mills." In 1997 a survey of members of the International Sociological Association asked them to identify the ten books published in the twentieth century which they considered to be the most influential for sociologists. They ranked *The Sociological Imagination* second, preceded only by Max Weber's *Economy and Society*.

Although some viewed Mills as a pessimist (Chasin 1990), in fact he appears to have been a utopian (Horowitz 1983), somehow managing to carry forward Enlightenment ideals and a conviction as to the promise of sociology during a time of pessimism, cynicism and fear. As a lifelong practicing pragmatist, Mills would have appreciated the fact that his work lives on in an era in which it is perhaps more urgent than ever before both to understand the world and to change it.

Examining Mills's life and work from the perspective of the twenty-first century, sociologists generally have emphasized Mills's analysis of social classes, elites, and social stratification and their impact on society and the individual, as illustrated by the phenomenon of alienation. We see this focus of Mills in one of his earliest articles, "The Professional Ideology of Social Pathologists," where he critically analyzes textbooks on social problems for ignoring the European tradition of sociological analysis, especially the work of Marx and Weber on social classes, alienation, and social stratification.

Later, in Mills's trilogy on social stratification – *The New Men of Power*, *White Collar*, and *The Power Elite* – Mills attempted to make up for this deficiency, succeeding in achieving scholarly credibility as a leading sociologist with fundamental insights into America's social classes. This was a focus that meshed closely with his egalitarian ideals as well as his interests in power and social change. All three books were concerned with the passivity or alienation of the masses as well as power within the United States as a whole and not just specific organizations or social classes. The 500 "new men of power" he studied joined with the business and political elite to stabilize the economy and maintain existing patterns of social stratification. *White Collar* centered on the newly emerging middle class, a diverse group including middle managers, salaried professionals and technicians, sales people and office workers.

Like David Riesman in *The Lonely Crowd* (1950) and William H. Whyte in *The Organization Man* (1956), Mills was concerned with the isolation and alienation of the white-collar individual, who he felt was adrift in a society that failed to question its fundamental structures. Mills's *The Power Elite*

came to grips with the impact of the continuing technological revolution throughout the world, following through on pragmatism's focus on science's impact on human affairs. Mills argued neither for a conspiracy among elites nor for the evils of capitalism, but rather drew a complex picture of top, middle, and lower levels of power working together, building on Max Weber's analysis of class, status, and power. However, Mills's *The Causes of World War Three* and *Listen Yankee* lacked such a balanced argument supported by data, with his voice becoming shrill and partisan.

In light of all of Mills's achievements in analyzing social stratification in the United States, it was his *The Sociological Imagination* that proved to be his most influential book. How is this to be explained? It was in that book that Mills returned to his pragmatic and sociological roots – by contrast with his emphasis on urgent political causes – perhaps providing the elements required for fulfilling what he called "the promise of sociology." Mills castigated both "grand theory," as illustrated by Talcott PARSONS, and "abstracted empiricism," as exemplified by the research at the BASR. Instead, the researcher should learn to shuttle up and down language's levels of abstraction, informing abstract theory with historical and empirical specificity. Taking pragmatic action to confront "personal troubles" as well as "public issues" remained important for the social scientist, yet such action must be informed by an understanding of the complexities involved.

Mills succeeded in charting a general course for sociologists to follow the scientific ideal, of opening up to all knowledge relevant to the complexities of a given problem, by contrast with the failure of specialized sociologists to communicate with one another. He had returned to his earlier analysis of the methodological approach of sociologists within textbooks on social problems. *The Sociological Imagination* carried that analysis further not only by emphasizing the importance of shut-

tling far up and down language's "ladder" of abstraction but also by specifying the kinds of phenomena that abstract concepts should take into account. In that early paper Mills had mentioned "social stratification" and "total social structures," but now he became more explicit, stating that "the sociological imagination enables us to grasp history and biography and the relations between the two within society" (1959, p. 6–7).

Presently there are forty-three distinct sections of the American Sociological Association with little communication across those boundaries. Mills's vision pointed toward a scientific method which would employ systematically concepts centering on social structure (such as social stratification) *as well as* concepts focusing on the individual (such as alienation) *as well as* concepts oriented to historical change (such as anomie). As a result of such a broad orientation to the research process, the individual sociologist would be able to range widely over the complex problems of modern society. The sociologist would avoid both "grand theory" with no empirical or historical basis and "abstracted empiricism" with no broad theoretical relevance.

Such breadth, which follows the ideals of the scientific method for openness to all relevant phenomena as well as for the rapid cumulative development of understanding, was of little practical use for Mills unless it addressed the most fundamental problems of modern society. The importance of the sociologist's commitment to such efforts is suggested by Mills's use of "imagination" in his title. That points squarely to the individual's emotions, just as Nietzsche did in the title of his *The Gay Science* (1887). Mills saw such commitment as essential to a scientific approach to sociology, just as Charles Peirce viewed the irritation of doubt as fundamental to the scientific method. In his appendix, "On Intellectual Craftsmanship," Mills suggested the basis for developing such commitment calling for scholars not to "split work from

their lives." There he foreshadowed Alvin GOULDNER's call for a "reflexive sociology" in his *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology* (1970). Mills's approach to language was the key to integrating his diverse elements of philosophy and sociology into a concrete program that could build on his ideas, despite his own relative alienation from academia.

By continuing to move up language's ladder of abstraction we come to epistemology, illustrated by the scientific method which Mills centered on in *The Sociological Imagination*. It was there that he sketched directions for following scientific ideals that included a deep commitment to one's problem, the definition of a problem using abstract concepts so as to invoke links to fundamental problems in society, the use of such concepts to open up to a wide range of phenomena, including the investigator's own personal experiences within that wide range, and coming far down language's ladder of abstraction so as to test hypotheses empirically. By moving even further up language's ladder of abstraction we come to metaphysics, illustrated by Mills's pragmatic stance throughout his life.

Throughout Mills's many confrontations with the power of stratification in American society over the life of the individual, whether within the labor movement, in the situation of the middle class, in the elite strata of society, within the discipline or sociology or in his own personal life, there was a search for some path to achieve "the all-around growth of every member of society." Perhaps Mills has given us the elements needed to move in this direction, and perhaps his approach to language will enable us to initiate that journey. From this perspective, Mills was a Moses who took social scientists to the Promised Land, yet was unable to enter it himself.

Attempts to build on Mills's work can be seen in his influence on the development of the New Left and what came to be called "critical sociology"; in the assessment of his peers within the International Sociological Association; in the publication of Mills's unpublished writings along with his addresses and letters; in the biographies and other publications on Mills's work; and in the numerous and continuing citations of that work by social scientists and others as well. For Mills succeeded in giving voice to Enlightenment optimism, perhaps still buried deeply within all of us moderns, and in resonating even in our present era clouded by pessimism, fear, ignorance, and cynicism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Situated Actions and Vocabularies of Motive," *American Sociological Review* 5 (1940): 904–13.

"The Professional Ideology of Social Pathologists," *American Journal of Sociology* 49 (1943): 165–80.

From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, with Hans H. Gerth (New York, 1946).

The New Men of Power: *America's Labor Leaders* (New York, 1948).

The Puerto Rican Journey: New York's Newest Migrants, with C. Senior and R. Goldsen (New York, 1950).

White Collar: The American Middle Classes (New York, 1951).

Character and Social Structure: The Psychology of Social Institutions, with Hans H. Gerth (New York, 1953).

The Power Elite (New York, 1956).

The Causes of World War Three (New York, 1958).

The Sociological Imagination (New York, 1959).

Listen, Yankee: The Revolution in Cuba (New York, 1960).

The Marxists (New York, 1962).

Other Relevant Works

Mills's papers are at the University of Texas.

Ed., *Images of Man: The Classic Tradition in Sociological Thinking* (New York, 1960).

Power, Politics and People: The Collected Essays of C. Wright Mills, ed. Irving L.

Horowitz (New York, 1963).

Sociology and Pragmatism: The Higher Learning in America (New York, 1964).

Letters and Autobiographical Writings, ed. Kathryn Mills with Pamela Mills (Berkeley, Cal., 2000).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encycl Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*

Bottomore, T. B. *Critics of Society: Radical Thought in North America* (New York, 1969).

———, *Sociology as Social Criticism* (New York, 1974).

Chasin, Barbara H. "C. Wright Mills, Pessimistic Radical," *Sociological Inquiry* 60 (1990): 337–51.

Denzin, Norman K. "On the Sociological Imagination Revisited," *Sociological Quarterly* 31 (1990): 1–22.

Domhoff, G. William, and Hoyt C. Ballard. *C. Wright Mills and the Power Elite* (Boston, 1968).

Gouldner, Alvin W. *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology* (New York, 1970).

Horowitz, Irving L., ed. *The New Sociology: Essays in Social Science and Social Theory in Honor of C. Wright Mills* (New York, 1964).

Horowitz, Irving L. *C. Wright Mills: An American Utopian* (New York, 1983).

Phillips, Bernard. *Beyond Sociology's Tower of Babel: Reconstructing the Scientific Method* (New York, 2001).

Scimecca, Joseph A. *The Sociological Theory of C. Wright Mills* (Port Washington, N.Y., 1977).

Tilman, Rick. *C. Wright Mills: A Native Radical and His Intellectual Roots* (University Park, Penn., 1984).

Bernard Phillips

MINSKY, Marvin Lee (1927–)

Marvin Minsky was born on 9 August 1927 in New York City. He attended the Bronx High School of Science, and then served in the US Navy during 1944–5. He began undergraduate studies in 1946 at Harvard University, receiving his BA in mathematics in 1950. During his subsequent doctoral work at Princeton University, he began his seminal work on machine learning by constructing a machine, the "SNARC," that was intended to learn a task on the basis of something analogous to reward. He received his PhD in mathematics in 1954, writing his dissertation on "Neural Nets and the Brain Model Problem." From 1954 to 1957 he was a junior fellow of the Harvard Society of Fellows.

In 1958 Minsky became an assistant professor of mathematics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In 1959 he co-founded MIT's Artificial Intelligence Laboratory with John MCCARTHY, serving as its co-director until 1974. In 1974 he became a full professor in the electrical engineering department, and Donner Professor of Science. In 1990 he became Toshiba Professor of Media Arts and Sciences, which is his current position at MIT. He is a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers, and the Harvard Society of Fellows, and served a term as President of the American Association for Artificial Intelligence in 1981–2. Among Minsky's many awards and prizes are the Turing Award of the Association for Computing Machinery (1970), the Killian Award at MIT (1989), the Japan Prize (1990), and the Benjamin Franklin Medal (2001).

The philosophical significance of Minsky's work falls mainly within those areas of philosophy of mind continuous with the cognitive and computer sciences. Minsky argued that our minds are team efforts, compounded out of the operations of many *agencies* – a term of art designating subpersonal specialized systems of widely varying complexity and functional level. Though related to artificial intelligence notions

like *schemas* and *scripts*, such agencies are more functionally inclusive than either. They also have vaguely conative properties: besides representing information, they have positive expectations of data that will fit a situation, along with the capacity for self-activation. What virtue this approach loses through imprecise definition it seeks to regain by accounting for an unexplainably intelligent system in terms of a "society" of less intelligent, and hence more understandable, systems (1985). Subordinate to this thesis, and separable from it, is the claim that knowledge-representation is best explained or modeled by Minsky's notion of *frames*, in terms of which he sometimes characterizes his agencies. The idea is that of a data structure with "slots" for the representation of properties, and made stereotypical through the occurrence of default values for the properties of such situations generally.

Both of these specific approaches to cognition and human agency deeply influenced a variety of contemporary and subsequent views, including the homuncular functionalism of Daniel DENNETT and William Lycan. Minsky's influence on the philosophical wing of AI resulted not simply from the number or impact of his publications, but through his many supervisees who went on to successful research careers in turn. Even when wholly or partially rejected, as by theorists like Hubert DREYFUS or Jerry FODOR, Minsky's approach provoked replies which are themselves influential in the recent philosophy of mind.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Steps Toward Artificial Intelligence," *Proceedings of the Institute of Radio Engineers* 49 (1961): 8–30.

"Matter, Mind and Models," in *Information Processing: Proceedings of IFIP Congress 65*, vol. 1, ed. W. Kalenich (London, 1965), pp. 45–9.

Computation: Finite and Infinite Machines (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1967).

"A Framework for Representing Knowledge," *MIT-AI Laboratory Memo* no. 306 (Cambridge, Mass., 1974). A condensed version is in *Mind Design*, ed. John Haugeland (Cambridge, Mass., 1981), pp. 95–128.

The Society of Mind (New York, 1985).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Semantic Information Processing* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968).

"Form and Content in Computer Science," *Journal of the Association for Computing Machinery* 17 (1970): 197–215.

"Why Intelligent Aliens will be Intelligible," in *Extraterrestrials: Science and Alien Intelligence*, ed. Edward Regis, Jr. (Cambridge, UK, 1985), pp. 117–28.

The Turing Option: A Novel, with Harry Harrison (New York, 1992).

"Negative Expertise," *International Journal of Expert Systems* 7 (1994): 13–19.

Further Reading

Bio Dict Psych, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*

Crevier, Daniel. *AI: The Tumultuous History of the Search for Artificial Intelligence* (New York, 1993).

Dennett, Daniel. *Consciousness Explained* (Boston, 1991).

Dreyfus, Herbert. "A Framework for Misrepresenting Knowledge," in *Philosophical Perspectives in Artificial Intelligence*, ed. Martin Ringle (Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1979), pp. 110–23.

Horgan, John. "Marvin L. Minsky: The Mastermind of Artificial Intelligence," in *Understanding Artificial Intelligence*, ed. Sandy Fritz (New York, 2002), pp. 131–7.

Marshall, John C. "Close Enough for AI: Comments on Marvin Minsky's 'The Society of Mind'," *Journal of Semantics* 5 (1986–87): 169–73.

Tim Kenyon

MISIAK, Henryk (1911–92)

Henryk Misiak was born on 4 February 1911 in Dolsk, Poland, and died on 31 August 1992 in New York City. He received his BA at the Seminary in Gniezno-Poznan in 1930, and an STL in 1937 from Jana Kazimierza University in Lvov. On 15 June 1935 he was ordained a Roman Catholic priest. From 1936 to 1939 Misiak served as an instructor at the Lyceum Poland. Although he intended to begin studies at Louvain in 1939, the outbreak of World War II prevented this. In December of that year, Misiak escaped into Hungary, from which he traveled to France in 1940. After the fall of France, he again escaped, this time to England with Polish students in his care. From 1940 to 1944, he taught at the Polish College in London and Glasgow and from 1942 to 1944 he studied psychology at Glasgow University. In 1944 Misiak came to the United States to study experimental psychology at Fordham University. There he received his PhD in psychology in 1946, with a dissertation entitled "Age and Sex Differences in Monocular and Binocular Critical Flicker Frequency." He subsequently pursued postdoctoral studies in neurophysiology at Columbia University.

Misiak taught psychology at Fordham from 1948 to 1980. He was a charter member of the American Catholic Psychological Association, founded in 1948. He was a fellow of the American Psychological Association and the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Misiak's writings took two directions. In the first, often published as textbooks in collaboration with Virginia Staudt Sexton, a psychology professor at Hunter College in New York City, he addressed the philosophical background and bases of twentieth-century psychology. In the second, he presented the results of experimental studies in physiological psychology, specializing in perceptual (critical flicker fusion), psychopharmacological, and psycho-endocrinological research.

Misiak's general position was that psychology had diverse philosophical roots, and that these were the most important, if not the exclusive, source of the "new" science. On the one hand, he recognized the importance of experimental psychology in its own right and believed that in the conduct of scientific studies, psychologists should hold their metaphysical conceptions in abeyance. In *Catholics in Psychology* (1954), for example, he defended scientific psychology against Catholic critics on the basis of psychology's autonomy. On the other hand, however, Misiak objected to the materialistic bias in much of American psychology. He felt that the divorce of psychology from philosophy, although it may have been a necessity in the early stages of the science's development, had been detrimental to both; and in *The Philosophical Roots of Scientific Psychology* (1961), he concluded that "turning to philosophy in the solution of theoretical problems is beneficial and even imperative for psychology" (1961, p. 129).

For Misiak, scientific psychology needed an adequate philosophical anthropology; but an adequate philosophical anthropology would have to do justice to the physical, mental, and spiritual aspects of human life. Interestingly, he did not presuppose that the philosophical ground of scientific psychology should be scholastically based. Rather he felt that the phenomenological tradition had much to offer psychology in this regard, although it would need to develop sound methods and not be isolated from psychology.

Misiak's writings on the relationship between philosophy and psychology had an international perspective. In presenting the history of psychology in various countries, Misiak described how local conditions affected the development of thought. As psychology matured, he thought, national differences would diminish. Psychology would then be empirical, experimental, and philosophically sophisticated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Catholics in Psychology, with Virginia
    Staudt (New York, 1954).
*The Philosophical Roots of Scientific
    Psychology* (New York, 1961).

Other Relevant Writings
"What Catholics are doing in Psychology at
    Home and Abroad," *American Catholic
    Psychological Newsletter* suppl. no. 16
    (July 1955): 1–2.
History of Psychology, with Virginia Staudt
    Sexton (New York, 1966).
*Phenomenological, Existential, and
    Humanistic Psychologies*, with Virginia
    Staudt Sexton (New York, 1973).
Psychology Around the World, with Virginia
    Staudt Sexton (Monterey, Cal., 1976).

Further Reading
Kugelmann, Robert. "American Catholic
    Psychological Association: A Brief History
    and Analysis," *Catholic Social Science
    Review* 5 (2000): 233–49.

Robert Kugelmann

MITCHELL, Ellen Smith (1838–1920)

Ellen Smith was born on 21 December 1838 to
Edwin R. and Harriet H. Smith in Geddes,
New York, near Syracuse. She married a man
named Merrit Slade at the tender age of sixteen,
and a bitter poem written two years later indi-
cates that she was probably abandoned by him.
She was educated at Homer Academy in
upstate New York, where she took the teacher
training course. After graduating from Homer
in 1859, she taught in the public schools in
Port Byron and Cairo, Illinois. By 1865 she
had moved to St. Louis to be with Joseph W.
Mitchell, a lawyer whom she married in 1867,
and had begun a career as a writer and public

intellectual. She died on 17 May 1920 in
Syracuse, New York.

Mitchell was a member of the American
idealist movement in St. Louis, Missouri and
later in Concord, Massachusetts. She was active
in the St. Louis branch of the movement,
attending meetings of its Philosophical Society
and contributing to its *Journal of Speculative
Philosophy*. She also led women's philosophy
discussion groups, first in St. Louis and then in
Denver where she taught philosophy at the
University of Denver from 1890 to 1892. She
was one of the very few women of her genera-
tion to teach philosophy at a co-educational
institution. She was also one of only six women
to lecture at the innovative Concord School of
Philosophy during the 1880s, speaking on
Aristotle's view of friendship in 1887.

Mitchell published several philosophical
works: two articles in *Journal of Speculative
Philosophy*, one lecture at the Concord School,
two lectures at women's congresses, and one
book, *A Study of Greek Philosophy* (1891). Her
contributions to *Journal of Speculative
Philosophy* include a critique of Schopenhauer,
entitled "The Philosophy of Pessimism" (1886)
and a Hegelian interpretation of Plato, "The
Platonic Dialectic" (1888). She joined her idealist
contemporaries in her criticisms of
Schopenhauer, who she believed created a
system in which the choice between negation
and affirmation lies solely with the individual, a
point of view destined in the end to nihilism.
Mitchell's article on the Platonic dialectic consists
of a Hegelian reading of the Platonic dialogues,
which she reproduced in her *Study of Greek
Philosophy*.

Mitchell's "Study of Hegel" (1884) and
"Plea for the Fallen Women" (1874) were both
presented at the congresses of women that met
regularly in the late nineteenth century. Despite
their divergent themes – Hegel's philosophy
and prostitution, respectively – both demon-
strate that she had a respectably clear under-
standing of the American idealist program. The
"Study" shows an understanding of Hegel as
the early American idealists understood him. It

focuses on the relation of mind to nature, subject to object, the unity behind all finite objects that makes them recognizable, and the relation of the individual to society. Her "Plea" provides evidence of Mitchell's feminism – a cause embraced by many in the idealist movement. In the "Plea" Mitchell maintains that with more career options women would be less likely to reach the levels of degradation and poverty that drive them to prostitution. She also insists that the demand for prostitutes contributes to the cyclical nature of the problem: men seek out prostitutes; women desperate to support themselves turn to this "oldest profession" because they see no other options. The double standard regarding the sexual behavior of men and women allows men to be immoral by patronizing prostitutes, but forbids women to express their sexuality when single and their potential infidelity when married.

Mitchell's *Study of Greek Philosophy* drew heavily on the work of Hegel and Zeller, amounting to essentially a paraphrase at times. Yet when she wrote it, Hegel's *History of Philosophy* was not yet in English translation. Therefore, with this work, Mitchell was indeed presenting something new to a reading public in America that was unable to study Hegel's work in German. After receiving harsh criticism for this book in a review published in *Philosophical Review*, Mitchell stopped writing purely philosophical work. She did, however, continue to meet and work with women's groups, one of which she formed when she returned home to support and care for her aging mother. Toward the end of her life, she was revered in Syracuse where she had grown up, leading a women's Round Table discussion group, corresponding with Julia Ward Howe, and remaining involved in women's rights and suffrage activism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Plea for the Fallen Woman," in *Papers Read at the Second Congress, Chicago, Oct. 15–17, 1874* (Chicago, 1874).
"A Study of Hegel," in *World Congress of Women* (Baltimore, Md., 1884).

"The Philosophy of Pessimism," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 20 (1886): 187–94.
"Friendship in Aristotle's Ethics," Concord School of Philosophy lecture synopsis, *The Boston Evening Transcript* (27 July 1887).
"The Platonic Dialectic," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 22 (1888): 212–23.
A Study of Greek Philosophy (Chicago, 1891).
The Hidden Soul of Harmony (Chicago, 1900).

Further Reading

Rogers, Dorothy G. "Paraprofessional Philosophy, Stage I: Grace Bibb, Ellen Mitchell, and the Concord School of Philosophy," in *America's First Women Philosophers, 1860–1925: Transplanting Hegel* (Bristol, UK, 2005).
Rogers, Dorothy G., ed. *Women in the St. Louis Movement, 1860–1925* (Bristol, UK, 2003), vol. 1.
Snider, Denton J. *The St. Louis Movement in Philosophy* (St. Louis, 1920).

Dorothy Rogers

MITCHELL, Lucy Sprague (1878–1967)

Lucy Sprague was born on 2 July 1878 to Otho and Lucia Elvira Atwood Sprague in Chicago, Illinois. She married economist Wesley Clair Mitchell in 1912. Lucy Mitchell died on 15 October 1967 in New York City. A leader in progressive educational reform, Mitchell was influential both for her scientific, experimental work in childhood education, and her leadership in founding and directing the Bank Street School for Teachers, an institution that has for eighty years been a leading force in many areas of educational reform.

Mitchell came of age in a transitional time of women's history, when women were entering

higher education and professions in ever-increasing numbers. As a child, she was denied regular schooling, first because she had a tutor, and secondly because of her anxiety in the competitive classrooms. Although she regretted the loss of regular schooling, she educated herself by reading nearly all of the books in her family's library.

Mitchell was influenced throughout her life by three reform-minded women who each had a revolutionary effect in some area of educational progress: Jane ADDAMS, a leader in community education; Alice Freeman Palmer, an influential scholar in women's higher education; and Harriet Johnson, a pioneer in nursery school education. In her young adolescence she frequently visited Addams's Hull-House, where she would have witnessed some early educational experiments of the Progressive Age. Mitchell agreed with all of Addams's positions throughout her life, beginning with her support for labor unions during the Pullman strike (which required her, as an adolescent, to take a stand against her wealthy father). Later, in her twenties, once Mitchell formulated her plan to commit her energy and money to improving childhood education as a means of building a better society, she went to Chicago to talk over her plan with Addams, who was supportive of it. As Joyce Antler, her biographer, says of Mitchell's work: "underlying all was the influence of Jane Addams" (Antler 1987, p. 156).

Mitchell began study at Radcliffe College in 1896, where she took all of the philosophy classes that Harvard offered, with William JAMES, Josiah ROYCE, and George Herbert PALMER. In 1900 she graduated with the first "Honors" BA degree in philosophy that Harvard had ever awarded to a Radcliffe student. During the time she was at Radcliffe, she lived with the Palmers. Alice Palmer, who had become President of Wellesley at age twenty-six and was one of its most effective leaders, approached education in a style she called "heart culture," a personal, caring approach to college education, an approach

that Mitchell carried with her throughout her career.

Mitchell moved to Berkeley in 1903, and became the first Dean of Women at the University of California at Berkeley in 1906. She also was given a faculty appointment in English, becoming the first woman on Berkeley's faculty. She began to utilize her "curriculum of experience" at Berkeley, forming personal relationships with the students, and developing a curriculum of sexual education for female students.

Not satisfied with her career at Berkeley, and in an effort to find alternative careers for women, the Mitchells returned to New York City in 1912, where she worked as a researcher/apprentice to five women who occupied significant positions in social reform movements: Lillian Wald (founder of Henry Street Settlement house), Florence Kelley (National Secretary of the Consumers' League), Mary Richmond (a pioneer in social work), Pauline Goldmark (social researcher), and Julia Richman (educational administrator). It was during this time that she decided to develop a career improving childhood education, deciding, she believed, that the school is the most powerful site of social reform, and the basis for the "good life."

John DEWEY was an important personal and professional influence on Mitchell. She had met Dewey when her father entertained the new professors at the University of Chicago, but he did not become a major influence in her life and work until she moved to New York and began working to improve childhood education. In New York, while teaching, she took classes with Dewey and Edward THORNDIKE at Teachers College, Columbia University. Mitchell and her husband also had a close personal friendship with the Deweys. In every way Mitchell both defined and reflected the progressive era philosophies of reform and social change through educational progress. Throughout her early professional life, perhaps because of her work as the Dean of Women in Berkeley, she worked to make sex education a part of K-12 schooling.

In 1916 Mitchell and a group of like-minded educators formed the Bureau of Educational Experiments (BEE), which she chaired, and which was funded by a gift from her cousin, Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge. Originally the BEE hoped to establish quantitative norms of childhood physical and mental growth, a project that after five years Mitchell eventually came to believe was unrealistic. Although she later moved more toward qualitative analysis, she always emphasized scientific observations of children as essential in teaching and understanding them. By her own description, during this time, she "was a member of a widespread group of pioneers who were working on a scientific approach to social reorganization in the field of educational research" (Antler 1987, p. 283).

With Harriet Johnson, the Bureau of Educational Experiments pioneered the nursery school movement which provided childcare for professional women, and studied early childhood development. As a teacher, Mitchell was involved in a series of educational experiments. She taught with Caroline Pratt in the "Play School," a student-centered education setting in which children learned through their own explorations, through active participation, and physical activity. The Play School emphasized equality for boys and girls, and confused parents by requesting that both the boys and girls come to class attired in overalls. The Play School moved to the Mitchell's backyard, educating all of her own children, and was eventually renamed the City and Country School. The BEE nursery school and Pratt's City and Country School, both of which she oversaw as the Director of BEE, combined both scientific observations of children with progressive educational methods. Particularly important was their idea of using everyday objects to understand ideas – they worked through ideas using wooden blocks, clay, and paints. The teachers and researchers at the both of the BEE schools believed in the importance of teaching children to connect with their surroundings, and so incorporated frequent field trips to sites around New York. They visited the zoo, rode a ferryboat, visited the docks, and looked at massive bridges.

Mitchell's first book was the 1921 groundbreaking children's book, *The Here and Now Story Book* that encouraged children to build stories from the rhythms of their own everyday experiences. The book was considered a radical new movement in children's literature and quickly became a best-seller, garnering the praise of educational psychologists. Like later twentieth-century feminists, Mitchell was opposed to many "children's" fairy tales, due to storylines that reinforced class and gender prejudicial stereotypes. Her later books for children explored relationships between geographic environments and the people and animals who lived in them, starting with the contemporary and familiar then moving back in time to teach history, foreshadowing the contemporary social science studies.

In 1930 the administrative offices of the BEE moved with the nursery, now run by Harriet Johnson, to New York City's Greenwich Village. Here Mitchell began a new venture, the Cooperative School for Student Teachers. Formed by an alliance of eight experimental schools, the CSST educated the "whole teacher," those who would then work in progressive, experimental, and experiential education. (The CSST was later known simply as the Bank Street School for Teachers.) A number of well-known faculty from the recently opened New School for Social Research offered classes there, as did Mitchell, Harriet Johnson, Elizabeth Healy, and Barbara Biber. Following what she had learned from working with children, the student teachers at the Bank Street School were prepared for "social reconstruction" through experiential classes, field trips, and studies of the communities where they were placed. After 1934 the student teachers also went on longer field trips to visit impoverished areas of Appalachia and surrounding communities.

Mitchell had always hoped that her work with teachers would be incorporated into the

public schools, and in 1943 Bank Street began providing experiential workshops for teachers in New York City schools. Eventually Bank Street housed the Bank Street School for Teachers, the Associated Experimental Schools, the Writers' Laboratory (for writers of children's books), the Public School Workshops, and a Division of Studies and Publications. All of these projects and organizations were cooperative ventures, but most of them were founded and administrated by Mitchell.

In 1951, looking back on her work with the Bank Street School for Teachers, Mitchell said, "we organized our curriculum around experiences planned to give understanding of children, understanding of the modern world, experimental experience with the arts, acquisition of classroom skills, and insight into curriculum building" (1951, p. xxvi). While these ideals no longer seem revolutionary to classroom teachers, the Bank Street teachers had to convince educational administrators that these were indeed worthy goals.

For over sixty years Mitchell combined educational scholarship in both research and actual practice with founding and administrating innovative programs. She also set an example for other women in doing this professional work while raising four children and being in partnership in a productive marriage. Her Bank Street activities demonstrated the effectiveness of a child-centered education, and continue to influence childhood development specialists and educators.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Young Geographers: How They Explore the World and How They Map the World (New York, 1934).

My Country 'Tis of Thee: The Use and Abuse of Natural Resources, with Eleanor Bowman and Mary Phelps (New York, 1940).

The People of the U.S.A.: Their Place in the School Curriculum, with Johanna Boetz and others (New York, 1942).

Our Children and Our Schools (New York, 1951).

Two Lives: The Story of Wesley Clair Mitchell and Myself (New York, 1953).

Know Your Children in School (New York, 1954).

Other Relevant Works

Mitchell's papers are at Columbia University.

"School Children and Sex Idealism," *Survey* 32 (1914): 327–8.

"Children's Experiments in Language," *Progressive Education* 5 (1928): 21–7.

"Making Young Geographers instead of Teaching Geography," *Progressive Education* 5 (1928): 217–23.

"Geography with Five-Year Olds," *Progressive Education* 6 (1929): 232–7.

"A Cooperative School for Student Teachers," *Progressive Education* 8 (1931): 251–5.

"Imagination in Realism," *Childhood Education* 8 (November 1931): 129–31.

"Children as Geographers," *Education* 52 (1932): 446–50.

"Social Studies for Future Teachers," *Social Studies* 26 (1935): 289–98.

"Ages and Stages," *Child Study* 15 (February 1938): 1944–7.

"Natural Regions of the United States: Their Work Patterns and Their Psychologies," *Progressive Education* 15 (1938): 187–209.

"Making Real Teachers," *Education Outlook* 20 (January 1946): 52–63.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v53*

Antler, Joyce. *Lucy Mitchell: The Making of a Modern Woman* (New Haven, Conn., 1987). Contains a bibliography of Mitchell's writings.

Judy D. Whipps

MOHANTY, Jitendra Nath (1928–)

Jitendra Mohanty was born on 26 September 1928 in Cuttack, Orissa, India. Mohanty received his BA in 1947 and MA in 1949 from Calcutta University, and his PhD in philosophy from the University of Göttingen in Germany in 1954. In his distinguished career, Mohanty has held various teaching and administrative positions. He was the Vivekananda Professor and head of the philosophy department at Burdwan University in India from 1962 to 1967; Acharya B. N. Seal Professor of Mental and Moral Sciences at the University of Calcutta from 1967 to 1972; professor of philosophy at the New School for Social Research from 1973 to 1978; George Lynn Cross Professor of Philosophy at the University of Oklahoma from 1977 to 1985; and since 1985 Mohanty has been professor of philosophy at Temple University. He has also been Woodruff Professor of Philosophy and Asian Studies at Emory University from 1998 to 2002.

Mohanty's chief systematic contributions to philosophy may be grouped into four categories: Modes of Givenness, Reformulation of Transcendental Philosophy, Layers of Selfhood, and Four Dogmas. Very early in his career (1956), Mohanty distinguished between the theoretical and the practical modes of givenness (the latter further subdivided, following Kant, into the technologically practical and the morally practical). The objects that are given in these modes are distinguished accordingly: generalities, universals, and abstract entities in the theoretical; and the objects of outer perception and persons in the practical. This distinction between theory and practice continued to be one of his central concerns. In the early 1990s in a series of lectures at Jadavpur University at Calcutta he developed this distinction systematically from a historical perspective to demonstrate that "what theory does, at its best, *is to reinterpret practice in its discourse,* and thereby seek to *appropriate* it as its extension, its application, its actualization. *Theory thus proclaims and establishes its sovereignty, and accords to*

practice the dignity of realizing the theory." (Gupta 2000, p. 33)

In Part 3 of *The Concept of Intentionality* (1970) Mohanty attempts to come to grips with the relation between intentionality and reflexivity found in the West and India alike. Influenced by Maurice Merleau-Ponty and taking into account the idea of bodily subjectivity, Mohanty tries to find a place for the Freudian psychoanalysis in the Husserlian framework, which leads him to propose a theory of the degrees of intentionality and the degrees of reflexivity. He argues that the two series vary inversely, implying thereby that the greater and more determinately object-oriented the intentionality (as in "knowledge"), the less self-consciousness it is; and the more reflexive it is, the less determinately intentional it is (for example, in feelings and volitions). Mohanty argues that the degree of intentionality on his scheme varies with the degree of transparency of consciousness and both depend upon the presence or absence of a *hyletic* component in the intentional experience.

While showing how Husserl in his theory of meaning attempts to keep a balance between the extremes of Platonism and anti-Platonism (psychologism), Mohanty develops a more generalized theory of consciousness according to which consciousness is not a one-dimensional series of mental events, but rather a correlation between two series: one belonging to the level of temporal mental acts and the other to the level of ideal meanings, the correlation being a many-one correlation (many different acts having the same content).

This leads him to an interpretation and a rehabilitation of transcendental philosophy, which Mohanty now construes not as a search for the conditions of the possibility of a putative science but rather as an answer to the following question: How, in the privacy of mental acts, do objective *meanings* get constituted? Given that the world is a tissue of meanings, it would result in a demonstration of the constitution of the world in the intentional life of the transcendental ego. In some of his later works, including

Phenomenology between Essentialism and Transcendental Philosophy, Mohanty argues that the transcendental ego and the empirical ego are not two different egos; they are one and the same considered from two different perspectives. The ultimate foundation of experience is neither consciousness alone nor the world alone, but rather consciousness-of-the-world recognized as an intentional structure.

In *The Self and its Other*, Mohanty argues for a complex stratified theory of the identity of a self. The self is a higher order identity founded on several lower order identities such as the identity of a bodily subject, the identity of a person as a historical entity, the identity of an ego realizable in a "reduction" to the inner stream of consciousness, and the identity of a subject or self-consciousness. He also argues for an internal relationship of a self to its others by showing that just as a self can find itself through the others, so the other can also be found within oneself.

In some of his recent works (such as his "Response to the Critics," in Gupta, 2000), Mohanty emphasizes the need to overcome four dogmas: (1) the dogma of "exclusive oppositions"; (2) the dogma of "the privacy of the mental"; (3) the dogma of the irreducibly public availability of language; and (4) the dogma of "one-level philosophical truth." Dogma 1 posits, for example, an opposition between essentialism and historicism. Dogma 2 takes the mental to be private by excluding such mental entities as thoughts and theories. Dogma 3 overlooks the phenomenological-subjective aspect of language. Dogma 4 (to which the above three are reducible) is corrected by recognizing that philosophical truths are multi-leveled. Realism and idealism, essentialism and historicism can each be true at a different level of discourse.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Edmund Husserl's Theory of Meaning (The Hague, 1964; 2nd edn 1969; 3rd edn 1976).

Gangesa's Theory of Truth (Santiniketan, India, 1966).

Phenomenology and Ontology (The Hague, 1970).

The Concept of Intentionality (St. Louis, Miss., 1972).

Husserl and Frege (Bloomington, Ind., 1982).

The Possibility of Transcendental Philosophy (Dordrecht, 1985).

Transcendental Phenomenology: An Analytical Account (Oxford, 1989).

Reason and Tradition in Indian Thought (Oxford, 1992).

Theory and Practice (Calcutta, 1994).

Phenomenology between Essentialism and Transcendental Philosophy (Evanston, Ill., 1998).

Logic, Truth, and the Modalities (Dordrecht, 1999)

The Self and Its Other: Philosophical Essays (Oxford, 2000).

Classical Indian Philosophy (Lanham, Md., 2001).

Explorations in Philosophy, vol. 1: Indian Philosophy, vol. 2: Western Philosophy, ed. Bina Gupta (Oxford, 2001–2002).

Between Two Worlds, East and West: An Autobiography (Oxford, 2002).

Further Reading

Gupta, Bina, ed. *The Empirical and the Transcendental: A Fusion of Horizons* (Lanham, Md., 2000). A collection of essays in honor of Mohanty.

Kirkland, Frank, and D. P. Chattopadhyaya, eds. *Phenomenology, East and West: Essays in Honor of J. N. Mohanty* (Dordrecht, 1993).

Krishna, Daya, and K. L. Sharma, eds. *The Philosophy of J. N. Mohanty* (New Delhi, 1991).

Bina Gupta

MONTAGUE, William Pepperell, Jr.
(1873–1953)

William Pepperell Montague was born on 24 November 1873 in Chelsea, Massachusetts. He was a son of Helen Maria Cary Montague and William Pepperell Montague, a lawyer who was mentioned by Charles S. PEIRCE as one of the members of the Metaphysical Club in the early 1870s. Montague Jr. studied at Harvard with Josiah ROYCE, William JAMES, Hugo MÜNSTERBERG, George PALMER, and George SANTAYANA. He had a great admiration for Peirce, whose 1898 lectures "Reasoning and the Logic of Things" he probably attended. Peirce also commented on some of his student essays. Though suspended by the university in his sophomore year, Montague received his BA in 1896 and his MA in 1897 from Harvard. In 1898 he obtained his PhD in philosophy, also from Harvard, with a dissertation titled "An Introduction to the Ontological Implicates of Practical Reason." Montague was part of the first large group of philosophy graduate students to attend Harvard and achieve their own prominence; his fellow graduate students include J. E. BOODIN, E. B. HOLT, A. O. LOVEJOY, R. B. PERRY, W. SAVERY, and W. H. SHELDON. On 5 August 1896, Montague married the psychiatrist Helen Weymouth Robinson, and they had two children.

Following his graduation, Montague became an Austin Teaching Fellow at Harvard, and he taught for one year at Radcliffe College. In 1899 he went to the University of California at Berkeley, where he took up the post of instructor in philosophy under the post-Kantian idealist George HOWISON. At Berkeley Montague took a mathematics course with Irving Stringham, which had a lasting impact on his thought. For one thing, it strengthened his conviction that numbers could not possibly be a product of the human mind. As he later put it in an autobiographical essay: "It would be easier and less absurd to suppose that Baedeker had by his descriptions created the Jungfrau at which I am now looking than to suppose that the mathematicians of this planet create by their technique of procedure the timeless truths which they discover." ("Confessions of an Animistic Materialist," 1930, p. 142) It was also at Berkeley that Montague befriended Harry OVERSTREET. Montague remained at Berkeley for four years, before moving to Barnard College of Columbia University in 1903. At Columbia he was a tutor of philosophy until 1906, after which he was appointed an instructor in philosophy. In 1907 he became a member of the Graduate Faculty and was promoted to assistant professor. In 1910 he became associate professor, in 1920 full professor, and in 1941 he was appointed Johnsonian Professor of Philosophy, holding that position until his retirement in 1947. Montague died on 1 August 1953 in New York City.

During his long tenure at Columbia, Montague was President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1923–4, and chaired three US delegations to the International Philosophical Congress in Oxford in 1920, Prague in 1934, and Paris in 1937. In 1928 Montague became Carnegie Visiting Professor of International Relations in Japan, Czechoslovakia, and Italy. In 1930 he delivered the Terry Lectures at Yale, in 1932 the Ingersoll Lectures at Harvard, and in 1933 the Carus Lectures at the University of Chicago. In contrast to Berkeley, which was heavily dominated by idealism, Columbia University was a stronghold of realism, providing a much more hospitable environment for his philosophical views, which were decidedly realistic.

Philosophically, Montague was a bold and daring thinker. To him philosophy reaches its highest pinnacle when it is great in vision, even if it is poor in proof. Philosophy, for Montague, was an attitude, a project, and a method. The true philosophical attitude is one of defiant independence; it is a state of being uncompromised by any deference to established views or creeds. The central project of philosophy is the search for a synthesis of basic knowledge and tracing its implications. The core method of

philosophy is not one of careful analysis or proof, but one of imaginative vision. Montague explained in *Great Visions:* "The pride of philosophy is in its disclosure of significant possibility." (1950, p. 16) By taking this view, Montague advocated what he called a "pure cooperative Anarchism" (1930, p. 57).

Montague distinguished philosophy from three other domains: science, religion, and art. With science, philosophy shares the emphasis on free and critical inquiry, but in contrast to science it focuses on questions too general and too comprehensive for the scientific palate. Montague observed in *Great Visions:* "In very truth the scientists want the earth; and I suggest that we give it to them while the giving is good. For us in philosophy what then will remain? Why, of course, the sea will remain, the ocean of possibilities to be discovered by imagination and vision and enjoyed without limit or surcease by us and by all who love beauty and wonder." (1950, p. 12) Like religion, philosophy embodies a vision of the cosmos and humanity's place in it. However, whereas in religious systems human hopes, fears, and aspirations may enter in the construction of a view of the natural and the supernatural, the philosopher's interpretation must satisfy the demands of reason. Finally, comparing philosophy with art, Montague observed that in his creativity the philosopher is like the artist, but unlike the artist the philosopher severely restricts himself in the sort of creations he allows. The philosopher concentrates solely on creations that are probably true and that are clear guides for action.

During the 1909 meeting of the American Philosophical Association, Montague joined Perry, Holt, Walter PITKIN, Walter MARVIN, and Edward SPAULDING in a revolt against metaphysical idealism, which then dominated philosophy. On the instigation of Montague and his Columbia colleague Pitkin, this collaboration resulted in "The Program and First Platform of Six Realists," which was published in 1910. The paper generated significant debate, especially within the *Journal of Philosophy* and the *Philosophical Review*, and became an official discussion piece at the 1910 American Philosophical Association meeting. Key to the position of the new realists was their firm belief that an important part of the objects known are independent of the knowledge relation. In line with this conviction, the new realists rejected psychologism (which would make the laws of logic depend on how we think), maintained a doctrine of external relations (our knowing the object does not change the object), and were advocates of a doctrine of direct perception. While initially a polemical movement, the new realists developed a number of positive theses in a second cooperative venture, *The New Realism*, which appeared in 1912. This volume also spurred ample debate. However, major problems with the new realists' stance (such as the problem of error) and differences among its six proponents caused the movement to fade away by the end of the decade. Montague advocated a subsistential realism, which set him apart from the other new realists. Montague did not consider objective reality in terms of objects perceived though the senses, as most of these realists, but in terms of meanings grasped conceptually.

Throughout his career Montague displayed a lively interest in the mind and he developed a naturalistic conception of the mind in terms of potential energy. The empirical scientist cannot perceive potential energy any more than she can perceive conscious thought, so why would not thought be a species of potential energy? Potential energy comes to the surface only when it expresses itself in kinetic energy. The most powerful microscope is unable show the potential energy concealed in something as simple as a coiled spring. Hence, whereas *kinetic* energy can be observed, measured, and so on, potential energy, or *anergy* as Montague also called it, cannot. Yet the coiled spring somehow preserves in actuality the effects of the kinetic energy that was put in it when it was wound and is ready to release them. When we compare the coiled spring with the central nervous system, with its billions of cells intri-

cately connected and continuously fueled with impulses from the senses, could this not be seen as a field of potential energy of a sufficient complexity to account for the human mind? Montague thought that it did. Furthermore, such an interpretation would explain not only the private nature of consciousness, but also its duration, its purposiveness, and how it preserves, through memory, the past in the present. In this manner, Montague could maintain an almost Cartesian psychophysical duality, while holding on to naturalism. Montague avoided the deeper problem of how unconscious matter could attain consciousness by arguing that sentience is not an emergent property of a certain distribution of particles, but is intrinsic to material being itself. This is Montague's panpsychic postulate, for which he developed in *Belief Unbound* (1930) what he called "the preface to a proof."

Montague's ethical doctrine can be described as an individualistic, albeit far from egoistic, hedonism that focuses on love and enthusiasm. Since life is growth, Montague considered the good life the more abundant life. As he put it in *Great Visions,* "greater joys and beauties of life are to be had, not by keeping to the middle way [as Aristotle said] but by 'living dangerously' and risking all for some higher cause" (1950, p. 119). At the same time, Montague reserved an important place for sympathy. A life that embodied love to the full "would include in itself, through sympathy, the desires, interests and aims, the potentialities in short of all lives, present and future" (1930, p. 58).

Within philosophy of religion Montague maintained a type of pantheism. He thought that there was too much goodness and purposiveness in the universe for it to be the outcome merely of blind mechanistic processes. At the same time there exists too much evil and inconsequentiality in the world for the universe to be truly the product of an all-powerful, all-knowing, and entirely good God. In consequence, Montague conceives of a finite deity who has an enormous power, but it is a power that is nonetheless limited. Faithful to his panpsychistic postulate, Montague even raises the hypothesis that the universe might be some sort of animal, which like all animals would live in an environment. However, whereas commonly the environment is an external constraint upon the animal, the environmental constraints upon the God-animal would be solely internal ones. It would consist of "its own confused and recalcitrant constituents: 'that in God which is not God'" ("Confessions of an Animistic Materialist," 1930, p. 149).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Program and First Platform of Six Realists," with E. B. Holt, W. P. Marvin, R. B. Perry, et al., *Journal of Philosophy* 7 (1910): 393–401.
"A Realistic Theory of Truth and Error," in *The New Realism* (New York, 1912), pp. 251–300.
The Ways of Knowing; or, The Methods of Philosophy (New York, 1925).
"Truth Subsistential and Existential," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 10 (1928): 243–63.
Belief Unbound: A Promethean Religion for a Modern World (New Haven, Conn., 1930).
The Chances of Surviving Death (Cambridge, Mass., 1934).
The Ways of Things: A Philosophy of Knowledge, Nature, and Value (New York, 1940).
Great Visions of Philosophy: Varieties of Speculative Thought in the West from the Greeks to Bergson (La Salle, Ill., 1950).

Other Relevant Works
"Professor Royce's Refutation of Realism," *Philosophical Review* 11 (1902): 43–55.
"A Theory of Time Perception," *American Journal of Psychology* 15 (1904): 1–13.
"May a Realist be a Pragmatist?" *Journal of Philosophy* 6 (1909): 460–63, 485–90, 543–48, 561–71.
"The Einstein Theory and a Possible Alternative," *Philosophical Review* 33

(1924): 143–70.

"A Materialistic Theory of Emergent Evolution," in *Essays in Honor of John Dewey* (New York, 1929), pp. 257–73.

"Confessions of an Animistic Materialist," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 2, pp. 135–59.

"The Geometry of the Good Life," *Columbia University Quarterly* 24 (1932): 383–91.

"The Story of American Realism," *Philosophy* 12 (1937): 1–22.

"Substance, Potentiality and Cause: A Positivistic Theory of Rationalistic Categories," *Travaux du IXe Congrès International de Philosophie* (Paris, 1937), pp. 71–7.

"The Human Soul and the Cosmic Mind," *Mind* 54 (1945): 50–64.

"Gulliver's Posthumous Travels to Riemann's Land and Lobachevskia (with an apology to Mr. J-n-th-n Swift and a warning to all Euclideans)," *Scripta Mathematica* 23 (1947): 225–30.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v43*, *Pres Addr of APA v3*, *Proc of APA v27*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Cohen, Morris R. "The New Realism," *Journal of Philosophy* 10 (1913): 197–214.

De Waal, Cornelis, ed. *American New Realism 1910–1920*, 3 vols (Bristol, UK, 2001).

Dewey, John. "The Short-Cut to Realism Examined," *Journal of Philosophy* 7 (1910): 553–7.

Klausner, Neal W. "Three Decades of the Epistemological Dialectic," *Philosophy of Science* 14 (1947): 20–43.

Lowe, Victor. "Montague's Vision of Philosophy," *Review of Metaphysics* 6 (1953): 397–424.

McMurrin, Sterling M. "Montague's Promethean Religion," *The Personalist* 28 (1947): 173–90.

Parker, Francis. "Realism without Error," *The Monist* 51 (1967): 224–37.

Sheldon, W. H. "Professor Montague's 'The Ways of Things'," *Journal of Philosophy* 37 (1940): 505–23.

"William Pepperell Montague (1873–1953)," *Journal of Philosophy* 51 (1954): 593–636. Issue devoted to Montague.

Cornelis de Waal

MONTGOMERY, Edmund Duncan (1835–1911)

Edmund Duncan Montgomery was born on 19 March 1835 in Edinburgh, Scotland, and died on 17 April 1911 in Hempstead, Texas. Montgomery was probably the illegitimate son of Duncan McNeill (Lord Colonsay), a noted Scottish jurist, and Isabella Davidson of Montgomery. At the age of four, his mother took him to Paris and then to Frankfurt to be tutored. In 1852 Montgomery became a medical student at the University of Heidelberg. Here he also met his future wife, the German sculptress Elisabet Ney. In 1855, when Elisabet Ney moved to Berlin to study with the sculptor Christian Daniel Rauch, Montgomery left Heidelberg for the University of Berlin to study with Johannes Müller, a recognized authority on the physiology of the nervous system. He remained in Berlin as a medical student until January 1856, when he transferred to the University of Bonn to study with Ludwig von Helmholtz. The lectures of Helmholtz profoundly influenced Montgomery's thinking about the problem of the relation between body and mind – the problem that was to become central in all of his philosophical writing. Helmholtz also may have focused

Montgomery's attention on Kant's system of critical philosophy.

For the required practical training in hospitals, Montgomery went to the University of Würtzburg where in 1858 he received his MD degree. After brief internships in Prague and Vienna, Montgomery moved to London. He became a resident physician at the German Hospital, began biological research at St. Thomas's hospital, and in 1862 became a member of the Royal College of Physicians of London. But health problems soon caused Montgomery to move to Madeira where he set up a medical practice and, in 1863, married Elisabet Ney.

In 1867, after moving to Rome, Montgomery's first scientific monograph, *On the Formation of So-Called Cells in Animal Bodies*, was read before the Royal Society of London. This work contained an account of the apparatus, methods, and materials used in Montgomery's biological experiments in London, a description of the various types of observations he made, and the revolutionary conclusions he had drawn regarding the nature of the fundamental living unit. Rejecting the two prevailing cell-theories – the vitalistic and the mechanistic theories – Montgomery's experiments led him to conclude that: (1) the basic living unit is not the cell but rather a living "substance" that can perform certain adaptive, vital activities; and (2) the ability of the substance to perform these activities is due to the inherent chemical structure of the substance itself. These radical conclusions were to provide the foundation for Montgomery's development of his mature "Philosophy of Vital Organization."

Montgomery moved in 1868 to Munich, where Elisabet Ney was working on sculptures of various political notables such as King Ludwig II, Bismarck, and Garibaldi. By the end of 1870 Montgomery had completed an epistemological treatise entitled *Die Kant'sche Erkenntnisslehre widerlegt vom Standpunkt der Empirie*. In this work, Montgomery claimed that the fundamental flaw in Kant's transcendentalist philosophy was his arbitrary division of the cognitive faculty into an active "understanding" and a passive "sensibility." He argued that this division required Kant to invent another faculty, the productive imagination, to mediate between the two. On Montgomery's view, every phase of the cognitive process involves activity. Even thought must be explained on a physiological basis as a product of evolutionary interaction of organism and environment, in other words, as successive responses to a continuous chain of stimuli. For example, Montgomery proposed that the concepts of space and time are derived from the organism's capacity to remember and connect its successive experiences of particular, concrete events and spaces.

For reasons unknown (it is speculated that Ney was involved in Bismarck's political intrigue), Montgomery and his wife emigrated to America at the end of 1870. After a short stay with friends in Thomasville, Georgia, they moved in 1873 with their two sons and housekeeper to Liendo Plantation in Hempstead, Texas. Montgomery devoted his first five years at Liendo to the microscopic examination of protozoa in an effort to solve the mystery of the nature and origin of life. In 1878 he published the results of these experiments in three articles titled "Monera and the Problem of Life" for *Popular Science Monthly*. In these articles, Montgomery argued that only through experimental observations of primitive life forms could one explain how one of the chief properties of life, in other words, living motion, is accomplished. Montgomery answered this fundamental question in terms of chemical processes, the alternate expansion and contraction of protoplasm through chemical composition and decomposition. In opposition to the prevailing biological theories of Darwin, Spencer, and Haeckel, which held that the complex organism is an aggregate of individual units (cells) in which the fundamental properties of life inhere, Montgomery claimed that the substrata of nature are concentrations of actual and potential energies. On his view – prophetic

of the atomic theories of today – there are no inert elements anywhere in nature. All forms of matter are essentially equilibrated energies whose equilibrium certain other energies have the power to disturb.

During his nearly forty years of almost complete isolation at Liendo, Montgomery maintained his contacts in Europe and America through personal letters and publications in numerous philosophical journals, including *Open Court, Monist, Mind,* and *New Ideal.*

In these publications, Montgomery made his most significant contributions to philosophy and science. He developed and defended his theory of vital organization through chemical elaboration. On the question of how evolution occurs, both organic and inorganic, Montgomery proposed a novel account in which all matter has intrinsic spontaneity and "newly arising modes of specific activity … . This evidently introduced into nature by a more or less incidentally occurring combination of material elements … that react in new and specific ways on being influenced or acted upon by surrounding existents." (1893, p. 61) Charles PEIRCE, in the columns of the *The Monist* where Montgomery's paper appeared, applauded the fact that a philosopher "as subtle and profound" as Dr. Montgomery was arguing for what Peirce called "absolute chance" (1992, p. 334).

Montgomery considered the most fundamental problem in philosophy to be the nature of consciousness. Montgomery's approach to this problem was to search for "the producing substantial matrix" of mental phenomena. He located this matrix in the complex organic structure of the brain, which itself is the evolutionary outcome of chemical organization. Montgomery further distinguished between an organism's capacity for conscious activity and its conscious content. Mental states, he claimed, are fleeting, powerless, and insubstantial. Though Montgomery viewed mental states as a functional outcome of extramental organic activity, he also argued that they provided an indispensable guiding function for an organism's interaction with extramental power-complexes. For without any mental states, no intentional purposive activity would occur. Thus, despite his distinction between the mental and nonmental, Montgomery considered himself a "naturalistic monist" by virtue of his stress on the organic unity of individuals and the interdependence of mind and body.

At Liendo, Montgomery also developed his theory of the organic foundations of knowledge which he had begun in Munich. His fundamental principle was that knowing involves organic reaction rather than mere reception, and hence, can have no meaning without reference to an environment. Rejecting presentative, coherence, and correspondence theories of knowledge, Montgomery developed a symbolic theory in which the mental states of an organism – which are aroused by interactions with things in the external world – are symbolic representations of their existence and characteristics. Montgomery also maintained that knowledge was merely predictive of reality through "its accurate foreshadowing of actually realizable interactions between ourselves and other things" (1884, p. 373). Thus, although Montgomery rejected the pragmatism of Shadworth Hodgson and William JAMES, his views on the nature, formation, and function of concepts were similar to those of C. I. LEWIS and his views on the scientific method and truth similar to those of Peirce.

To complete his evolutionary philosophy of vital organization, after 1884 Montgomery began constructing an ethics and theology which he called "naturalistic humanitarianism." On this view, the foundations of both morality and religion lie in the social and organic relations of human beings. Montgomery rejected the existence of either an infinite or a finite universal mind, claiming that it is "a misleading illusion to believe that there exists any moral purpose and direction in the universe outside human consciousness" ("Scientific Theism,"1886, p. 573). However, he also rejected the label "agnostic." For Montgomery's theological position involved a

conception of divinity comprising "all the co-operating conditions (powers) which create and sustain the highest values now known or in process of realization" (Keeton 1950, p. 251). With respect to morality, Montgomery maintained that "the possibility of ethical conduct is altogether dependent on some degree of free self-determination, and on some amount of free volitional control, not only over our ideas, but also over our motor or executive apparatus" (1895, p. 46). He also insisted that the goal of morality was "rationality," by which he meant the cultivation of the human organism as the locus of moral progress and an increasing cooperativeness among human beings.

Montgomery devoted the last decade of his life to summing up and defending his life's work in three major treatises. Due to the novelty of his theories and his extremely critical and polemical writing style, Montgomery had received little recognition from his contemporaries. The rediscovery of his worth in the mid twentieth century was due to the efforts of two scholars, M. T. Keeton and I. A. Stephens. In the words of the former, Montgomery's "major originality was in the pattern of components which he fabricated and applied to scientific and philosophic problems" (Keeton 1950, p. 300). For Montgomery had not only systematically rejected the prevailing theories of his time but he also proposed a revolutionary biological hypothesis, namely, that the power of living things to reintegrate their chemical unity after damage evolved out of the inherent creativity of the interactions of matter. Unfortunately, the full value of Montgomery's remarkable and historically precocious synthesis of philosophy and biology has to this day remained unexplored by contemporary philosophers, despite the insight and efforts of Keeton and Stephens.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
On the Formation of So-Called Cells in Animal Bodies (London, 1867).
Die Kant'sche Erkenntnisslehre widerlegt vom Standpunkt der Empirie (Munich, 1871).
The Vitality and Organization of Protoplasm (Austin, Tex., 1904).
Philosophical Problems in the Light of Vital Organization (New York and London, 1907).
The Revelation of Present Experience (Boston, 1910).

Other Relevant Works
"Monera and the Problem of Life," *Popular Science Monthly* 13 (1878): 455–60, 563–71, 677–89.
"The Dependence of Quality on Specific Energies," *Mind* o.s. 5 (1880): 1–29.
"The Unity of the Organic Individual," *Mind* o.s. 5 (1880): 318–36.
"The Substantiality of Life," *Mind* o.s. 6 (1881): 321–61.
"Causation and Its Organic Conditions," *Mind* o.s. 7 (1882): 209–30, 381–97, 514–32.
"The Object of Knowledge," *Mind* o.s. 9 (1884): 349–83.
"The Dual Aspect of Our Nature," *Index* 6 (1885): 199–201, 221–5, 270–74, 306–8.
"Space and Touch," *Mind* o.s. 10 (1885): 227–44, 377–98, 512–31.
"The Scientific Basis of Religious Intuition," *Index* 6 (1886): 570–74.
"Scientific Theism," *Index* 6 (1886): 438–41, 570–74.
"Cope's Theology of Evolution," *Open Court* 1 (1887): 160–64, 217–20, 274–7, 300–303.
"Are We Products of Mind?" *Open Court* 1(1887): 423–6, 459–60, 480–83, 512–13, 587–90, 617–20.
"Mental Activity," *Mind* o.s. 14 (1889): 488–510.
"Psychical Monism," T*he Monist* 2 (1892): 338–56.
"Automatism and Spontaneity," *The Monist* 4 (1893): 44–64.
"Ethics and Biology," *International Journal of Ethics* 5 (1894): 44–63.
"The Integration of Mind," *Mind* 4 (1895): 307–19.

"To Be Alive, What Is It?" *The Monist* 5 (1895): 166–91.

"Actual Experience," *The Monist* 9 (1899): 359–81.

Further Reading

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Keeton, Morris T. *The Philosophy of Edmund Montgomery* (Dallas, 1950). Contains a bibliography of Montgomery's writings.

Loggins, Vernon. *Two Romantics and Their Ideal Life: Elisabet Ney, Sculptor; Edmund Montgomery, Philosopher* (New York, 1946).

Müller-Münster, Eugen. *Elisabeth Ney: die seltsamen Lebensschicksale der Elisabet Ney und des Edmund Montgomery, 1833–1907* (Leipzig, 1931).

Peirce, Charles S. "Man's Glassy Essence," in *The Essential Peirce*, vol. 1 (Bloomington, Ind., 1992), pp. 334–51.

Stephens, Ira K. *The Hermit Philosopher of Liendo* (Dallas, 1951). Contains a bibliography of Montgomery's writings.

Luise Helene Morton

MOODY, Ernest Addison (1903–75)

Ernest A. Moody was born on 27 September 1903 in Cranford, New Jersey. After receiving his BA from Williams College in 1924, Moody studied at Columbia, receiving his MA in 1933, and his PhD in philosophy in 1936. His dissertation was titled "The Logic of William of Ockham." After graduating, he was a lecturer in philosophy at Columbia for intermittent periods between 1939 and 1955, interrupted by working as an economist for the family business, Moody's Investors Service in New York (founded by his father John Moody), and by operating a Texas cattle ranch.

Having set aside plenty of time for research and writing, Moody was a productive scholar as well. In 1956 he was awarded the Haskins Medal, presented annually by the Medieval Academy of America for outstanding scholarship, and also the Butler Medal in Silver at Columbia. From 1958 until his retirement in 1969, he was professor of philosophy at the University of California at Los Angeles, and he also served as department chair from 1961 to 1964. He was President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1963–4. He died on 21 December 1975 in Ventura, California.

Moody was one of the world's most respected experts in late medieval and renaissance logic and science. He published extensively on medieval philosophy and logic, including essays and books on Ockham, Galileo, Avampace, Bernard of Arezzo, Buridan, and Nicholas of Autrecourt. While his interests typically centered on issues of logic and the philosophy of science, his essays were wide-ranging discussions of diverse topics such as metaphysics, metereology, physics, and ancient Greek philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Logic of William of Ockham (London and New York, 1935).

"Ockham, Buridan, and Nicholas of Autrecourt," *Franciscan Studies* 7 (1947): 113–46.

"Galileo and Avempace," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 12 (1951): 163–93, 374–422.

Truth and Consequence in Mediaeval Logic (Amsterdam, 1953).

"Empiricism and Metaphysics in Medieval Philosophy," *Philosophical Review* 67 (1958): 145–63.

"The Age of Analysis," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 37 (1964): 53–68.

Studies in Medieval Philosophy, Science,

and Logic: Collected Papers 1933–1969 (Berkeley, Cal., 1975).

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *Iohannis Buridani Questiones super libris quottuor de caelo et mundo*, by Jean Buridan (Cambridge, Mass., 1942).
"Professor Pegis and Historical Philosophy," *Franciscan Studies 5* (1945): 301–8.
Trans. with Marshall Clagett, *The Medieval Science of Weights, Scientia and Ponderibus: Treatises Ascribed to Euclid, Archimedes, Thabit ibn Qurra, Jordanus de Nemore and Blasius of Parma* (Madison, Wisc., 1952).
Ed. with others, *Venerabilis Inceptoris Guilelmi de Ockham Expositionis in Libros Artis Logicae Prooemium*, by William of Ockham (St. Bonaventure, N.Y., 1978).

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v7, Proc of APA v49, Who Was Who in Amer v6, Who's Who in Phil

Shannon Kincaid

MOORE, Addison Webster (1866–1930)

Addison W. Moore was born on 30 July 1866 in Plainfield, Indiana. Moore received the BA (1890) and MA (1893) degrees from DePauw College. After some graduate study of neo-Hegelian philosophy at Cornell, he transferred to Chicago upon hearing of John Dewey's arrival there. He took part in the ongoing psychological research as James Angell's assistant, and absorbed the developing functionalism and pragmatism of Dewey, Angell, and George H. Mead. Moore joined the Chicago philosophy faculty soon after receiving his PhD in philosophy in

1898, and he took over the Logic and Metaphysics courses after Dewey's departure for Columbia University in 1904. Moore was President of the Western Philosophical Association in 1911–12, and President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1917–18. Suffering from poor health, Moore retired early in 1929. While in England for a philosophy congress, Moore died on 25 August 1930 in London. He was respected by his colleagues as an energetic and original thinker, and beloved for his personal character and professional demeanor.

Moore was the most prominent and vigorous supporter of Dewey's instrumentalist version of pragmatism in its early years of controversy. Unlike Dewey or Mead, who rarely answered the numerous critics, Moore never hesitated to engage idealist and realist challengers. His argumentative and polemical writings earned him the nickname "the bulldog of pragmatism" (a title that later passed to Sidney Hook). In a way similar to T. H. Huxley's relationship with Charles Darwin, Moore offered an artful and persuasive elaboration of Dewey's philosophy. Moore's strength was epistemology, and his critiques of Hegelian and realist rationalisms are often clearer and more devastating than those of Dewey or William James.

Moore, like fellow Chicago graduate H. Heath Bawden, expanded upon the beginnings of Chicago social psychology to overcome dualism by explaining experience as a natural function of organic life. The mental processes transforming experience are phases of goal-oriented behavior in concert with that of others. Rejecting mechanistic psychology, ideas are essentially teleological. Moore's early research with Angell and Dewey on the reflex arc showed that conscious thought is not a separable component of behavior, but has only a functional existence for accounting for eventual conduct. Both sensationalism and idealism wrongly separate sensations from thought, vainly seeking to define the independent contributions of each to knowledge. Without an external world to cause sensations, or an inner mind to manipulate

sensations, the distinction between mind and nature collapses. Experience just refers to an interacting system of environment and organism; we directly experience the world without any intermediating representations.

In Moore's functionalism, attentive consciousness is created by the tension between competing neural demands and dissolves when it establishes a new habit harmonizing these demands. Moore, with Dewey and James, applied Darwinian evolution to regard higher organisms as learners establishing new habits to survive in a dynamic world. The notion of "problem-solving" thus served as the prototype of any habit-forming and reforming process. Knowledge consists of preserved workable habits for specific goals, and so Moore's empiricism was anti-foundationalist, fallibilist, and situational. Moore was easily frustrated by critics' accusations of subjectivism and relativism, since he regarded pragmatism as the only way to rescue rational objectivity and empirical science from the clutches of the principal rivals of the day: sensationalism's solipsism, dualism's skepticism, and idealism's rationalism. Science's experimental methods, Moore concluded, cannot aim at duplicating in thought some allegedly fixed and independent structure of the world; science is only the process of reorganizing more effective experience. Thought is validated only insofar as it assists the reconstruction of an activity that brought it into existence.

Moore argued that both the new realism (defended by R. B. PERRY) and critical realism (George SANTAYANA) fail to account for error by inconsistently locating veridical ideas or essences in perception, while blaming the perceiving for introducing error. We must have some criterion (such as a capacity to predict future consequences) to judge which perceptions are valid, or else admit that perceptions are either all true or all false. Non-pragmatists assume that knowledge can only be of some independent object. Moore's pragmatism explicitly requires that knowledge can only be of objects created by the human process of transforming the environment during successful problem-solving. Philosophy can rescue values from subjectivity or fanaticism by scientifically testing and improving values for their service to improving social conditions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Some Logical Aspects of Purpose," in *Studies in Logical Theory. Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago,* second series, vol. 11 (Chicago, 1903), pp. 341–82.

"Pragmatism and Its Critics," *Philosophical Review* 14 (1905): 322–43.

"Experience, Habit and Attention," *Psychological Review* 14 (1907): 292–7.

"Truth Value," *Journal of Philosophy* 5 (1908): 429–36.

"Pragmatism and Solipsism," *Journal of Philosophy* 6 (1909): 378–83.

Pragmatism and Its Critics (Chicago, 1910).

"Bergson and Pragmatism," *Philosophy Review* 21 (July 1912): 397–414.

"The Aviary Theory of Truth and Error," *Journal of Philosophy* 10 (1913): 542–6.

"Pragmatism, Science and Truth," *Philosophical Review* 24 (1915): 631–8.

"Reformation of Logic," in *Creative Intelligence: Essays in the Pragmatic Attitude* (New York, 1917), pp. 70–117.

"Some Lingering Misconceptions of Instrumentalism," *Journal of Philosophy* 17 (1920): 514–19.

Other Relevant Works
Moore's papers are at Dartmouth College.

"Reaction-Time: A Study in Attention and Habit," with James R. Angell, *Psychological Review* 3 (1896): 245–58.

"Existence, Meaning and Reality in Locke's Essay and in Present Epistemology," in *Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago*, first series, vol. 3 (Chicago, 1903), pp. 29–51.

"The Opportunity of Philosophy," *Philosophical Review* 27 (1918): 117–33.

"Some Logical Aspects of Critical Realism," *Journal of Philosophy* 19 (1922): 589–96.

"Substance and Existence in Neo-Realism," in *Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress of Philosophy*, ed. Edgar S. Brightman (New York, 1927), pp. 278–84.

Collected Writings of Addison W. Moore, 3 vols, ed. John R. Shook (Bristol, UK, 2003). Volume 1 contains a bibliography of Moore's writings.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v33*, *Pres Addr of APA v2*, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v40*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Addison Webster Moore: A Memorial (Chicago, 1930). Addresses by Edward S. Ames, Henry H. Hilton, James H. Tufts, and George H. Mead.

Crouch, J. Brent. "Introduction," to vol. 3 of *Collected Writings of Addison W. Moore*, pp. ix–xx.

Pratt, Scott. "Introduction," to vol. 2 of *Collected Writings of Addison W. Moore*, pp. vii–xx.

Rucker, Darnell. *The Chicago Pragmatists* (Minneapolis, 1969).

Shook, John R. "Introduction," to vol. 1 of *Collected Writings of Addison W. Moore*, pp. ix–xx.

Wolstein, Benjamin. "Addison Webster Moore: Defender of Instrumentalism," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 10 (1949): 539–66.

John R. Shook

MOORE, Ernest Carroll (1871–1955)

Ernest Carroll Moore was born on 20 July 1871 in Youngstown, Ohio. He received his BA in 1892 and his Bachelor of Law degree in 1894, both from Ohio Normal University. He then received his MA from Columbia University in 1896. Moore completed his PhD in philosophy at University of Chicago in 1898, where he studied under John DEWEY. Moore began teaching at the University of California at Berkeley as an instructor in philosophy in 1898, and from 1901 to 1906 he was an instructor and assistant professor of education at Berkeley. In 1906 he became Superintendent of Schools for the City of Los Angeles. He left California to become professor of education at Yale University in 1910. In 1913 he accepted a similar appointment at Harvard, and for the academic year 1913–14 he was one of a very few scholars ever to have held joint appointments at Harvard and Yale. He returned to California in 1917 to take up the post of President of the Los Angeles State Normal School, which within two years became the University of California, Southern Branch and, eventually, the University of California at Los Angeles. In 1936 he left administrative duties to return to the classroom as professor of philosophy and education. He was married to Kate Gordon Moore, professor of psychology at UCLA. He retired from UCLA in 1941, and died on 23 January 1955 in Los Angeles.

Moore's career exemplified his philosophical commitments. He attempted to use every avenue open to him to put his knowledge of philosophy into practice through teaching, writing, and administration. Philosophical interests permeate Moore's works on the history of education. He published several volumes on this subject, ranging from education in classical times up through a history of instruction in the United States. He also concerned himself with the nature of education, its aims and purpose. In addition to philosophical works, he published numerous volumes on educational administration. His commitment to philosophy and progressive education remained strong throughout his career, as did his view that philosophy should be applied to our lives and times. Dr Moore was known for his love of the ancient philosophers, and was strongly influenced by the thought of William JAMES and especially by his former teacher, Dewey.

Moore found himself embroiled in controversy in 1934 when he refused to permit continuation of UCLA's Student Open Forum. The Forum was sponsored by the Political Science Department and the National Student League, and often included communist speakers that aroused Moore's opposition to continuation of the Forum. But this controversy did not tarnish his high reputation in the field of education. He was elected to a three-year term on the California Teachers Association Board of Directors, served as President of the Southern Section of the California Teachers Association in 1909, and 1918, was President of the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in 1914, and President of the Western Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in 1930. He received honorary LLD degrees from four universities, he was a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, an honorary member of the Stanford Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa, a member of the Hellenic Society of Great Britain, an Officier d'Académie of France, and a Chevalier de la Légion d'Honneur of France.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
What Is Education? (Boston, 1915).
Fifty Years of American Education: A Sketch of the Progress of Education in the United States from 1867 to 1917 (Boston, 1917).
What the War Teaches about Education, and Other Papers and Addresses (New York, 1919).
The Story of the United States (Los Angeles, 1932).
The Story of Instruction: The Beginnings (New York, 1936).
The Story of Instruction: The Church, the Renaissances, and the Reformations (New York, 1938).

Other Relevant Works
Moore's papers are at the University of California at Los Angeles.
"What is Meant by Social Activity?" in *Essays in Honor of John Dewey on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. John J. Coss (New York, 1929).
I Helped Make a University (Los Angeles, 1952).

Further Reading
Nat Cycl Amer Bio v40, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*

Michael R. Taylor

MOORE, Jared Sparks (1879–1951)

Jared Sparks Moore was born on 29 September 1879 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. He was the son of Benjamin P. Moore and Florence Sparks, and named after his maternal grandfather, the historian and educationalist Jared Sparks, who was President of Harvard from 1849 to 1853. In 1897 Moore graduated from Marston's University School for Boys. Three years later, having received his BA from Johns Hopkins in 1900, he went to Harvard where he obtained his MA in 1903 and his PhD in philosophy in 1905, working under Josiah ROYCE. His dissertation was on "The Metaphysical Problem of Relation Considered as a Category in a System of Synthetic Transcendentalism."

After two years as an assistant at Harvard, Moore went to teach philosophy at Western Reserve University in 1907, where he remained for the rest of his career. In 1925 he was promoted to Handy Professor of Philosophy and chair of the department. He was a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and Vice President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association. In addition to his academic work, Moore was involved in several organizations including the United World Federalists and the Holy House for Crippled Children, of which he was a trustee. He had a strong interest in art, music, and literature. Moore retired in 1950 and died

on 10 April 1951 in Boston, Massachusetts.

In his *Foundations of Psychology* (1921), which was translated into Chinese in 1924, Moore defended an introspective psychology. In *Rifts in the Universe* (1927), he sought to address the mind–body dualism by advocating a plural monism. Moore considered himself a personalist and was a member of the Personalist Discussion Group. However, he described himself as a "querulous personalist," because he combined his personalist stance with a denial of mentalism and a desire to develop a naturalistic personalism that is consistent with his Anglican faith. Moore was a close friend of personalist Edgar S. BRIGHTMAN.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Foundations of Psychology (Princeton, N.J., 1921; 2nd edn with H. Gurnee, 1933).
Rifts in the Universe: A Study of the Historic Dichotomies and Modalities of Being (New Haven, Conn., 1927).

Other Relevant Works
"The System of Transcendental Values," *Journal of Philosophy* 11 (1914): 244–8.
"A Defense of the Foundations of Psychology," *Journal of Philosophy* 20 (1923): 405–13.
"The Problem of the Self," *Philosophical Review* 42 (1933): 487–99.
"A Reconsideration of Hegelian Forms," *The Monist* 44 (1934): 1–58.
"Beauty as Harmony," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 2 (1943): 40–50.
"Personalistic Definitions," *Personalist* 30 (1949): 57–65.

Further Reading
Nat Cycl Amer Bio v41, *Proc of APA v25*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Cornelis de Waal

MOORE, Thomas Verner (1877–1969)

Thomas Verner Moore was born on 22 October 1877 in Louisville, Kentucky, and died on 5 June 1969 in Burgos, Spain. Moore entered the Paulist novitiate in 1897 and was ordained a priest in 1901. He studied psychology with Edward Aloysius PACE at Catholic University of America from 1901 to 1903, receiving a PhD with his dissertation on "A Study in Reaction Time and Movement" in 1904. While teaching at Catholic University's Institute of Pedagogy in New York City during 1903–1904, he studied educational psychology with Edward L. THORNDIKE. In 1904, he pursued experimental psychology but not a degree with Wilhelm Wundt in Leipzig; but his time there was cut short by tuberculosis. His Leipzig project, *The Process of Abstraction: An Experimental Study* (1910), was completed only after further interruption by a priestly assignment in California. Moore began teaching philosophy at the Catholic University in 1909, and in 1910, he obtained an appointment in psychology. He remained on the psychology faculty until retiring in 1947.

Moore held that all psychological investigation rests upon philosophical presuppositions. For his presuppositions he drew upon the scholastic tradition, which had been renewed in the late nineteenth century. Along these lines, he defined psychology as "the science of human personality" (1924, p. 9). While at Leipzig, he had met Charles Spearman, who developed factor analysis, a method for discovering structural regularities in statistical data. Moore later argued that factor analysis provided evidence in support of mental faculties as described in scholastic terms, and that Spearman's "general factor" of intelligence supported the idea of a human soul.

Desiring to open a child psychological clinic, Moore began the study of medicine in 1911. He returned to Germany to work with Emil Kraepelin, who had developed a nosology for mental disorders. There he also investigated meaning and imagery in Oswald Külpe's psy-

chological laboratory. With the advent of World War I, Moore returned home, completing his medical studies with Adolf Meyer at Johns Hopkins University in 1915. A year later Moore's clinic opened in Washington, D.C.; and in 1918, he served in the US Army medical corps in psychiatric centers in France. In 1924, Moore left the Paulists and joined the Benedictines, founding St. Anselm's Priory near the Catholic University of America. In 1947, the year he retired from active teaching, Moore entered the Carthusian order, living in their charterhouse, St. Mary of Miraflores, in Burgos, Spain. He helped to found the Carthusian Foundation, in Vermont, and lived there from 1950 to 1960. In 1960, he returned to Miraflores, where he spent the remainder of his life.

In his major works, Moore integrated general psychology and psychopathology under a "functionalist" psychology. Following Meyer, he viewed mental disorders as disturbances of the entire personality, understood psychobiologically. In *Dynamic Psychology* (1924), he focused on the adjustments people make to the surrounding world in relation to their desires. "Adjustment" for Moore is a broad term with a basis in a philosophy of the will, and it includes the adjustment of the individual to God. In *Cognitive Psychology* (1939), he focused on the functioning of the mind with its faculties.

Moore wove together philosophical with empirical considerations, refusing to divorce psychology from philosophy. He conducted experimental studies, employed statistical analyses, discussed their philosophical implications, and consistently presented his own presuppositions. He incorporated psychoanalytic techniques and concepts into his psychology, coupling an appreciation of Freud's work with a critique of his philosophical anthropology. Moore's work, which integrates scholastic philosophy with the modern sciences, represents a high point in the neoscholastic movement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
A Study in Reaction Time and Movement (New York, 1904).
The Process of Abstraction: An Experimental Study (Berkeley, Cal., 1910).
Dynamic Psychology (Philadelphia, 1924).
Cognitive Psychology (Philadelphia, 1939).
The Nature and Treatment of Mental Disorders (New York, 1943).
The Driving Forces of Human Nature and Their Adjustment (New York, 1948).

Other Relevant Works
A Historical Introduction to Ethics (New York, 1915).
Heroic Sanctity and Insanity: An Introduction to the Spiritual Life and Mental Hygiene (New York, 1959).

Further Reading
Who Was Who in Amer v5, *Who's Who in Phil*
Gillespie, C. Kevin. *Psychology and American Catholicism: From Confession to Therapy?* (New York, 2001).
Neenan, Benedict. *Thomas Verner Moore: Psychiatrist, Educator and Monk* (New York, 2000).

Robert Kugelmann

MORE, Paul Elmer (1864–1937)

Paul Elmer More was born on 12 December 1864 in St. Louis, Missouri. After receiving his BA from Washington University in 1887, he taught Latin at Smith Academy in St. Louis until 1892. During those years he traveled to Europe in 1888–9, published a book of poetry in 1890, and received an MA from Washington University in 1891. He entered Harvard to study Oriental and classical languages in 1892. There

he began a lifelong friendship with Irving BABBITT, who was a fellow student in Sanskrit. Babbitt and More were to become the leading figures in the New Humanism, an important literary-intellectual movement of the first few decades of the twentieth century.

In 1894 More's novel *The Great Refusal* appeared. He left Harvard with an MA in 1895 to teach Sanskrit and classical languages at Bryn Mawr College in Pennsylvania. Finding this teaching unsatisfying, he left after two years and retired to a cabin in Shelburne, New Hampshire for two years of solitary study and meditation. There he determined to devote himself to literary-philosophical writing rather than creative writing.

Following this period of withdrawal and meditation, More married in 1900 and began a career in literary journalism, holding a series of editorial positions with the New York *Independent*, the New York *Evening Post*, and the *Nation*. From 1904 to 1921, his essays on literature, culture, and philosophy appeared in eleven volumes titled *Shelburne Essays*. Friends suggested he use separate titles for each book, but he believed his writing must stand or fall as a single whole. The *Shelburne Essays* treat a wide diversity of authors and subjects, but, taken together, constitute a coherent history of ideas from the Renaissance to the beginning of the twentieth century. In a similar way, the volumes of his *The Greek Tradition* form an intellectual history from the death of Socrates to the Council of Chalcedon. More resigned from the *Nation* in 1914 to engage in independent scholarship, making his home in Princeton, New Jersey. There he remained for the rest of his life, turning increasingly to philosophical subjects. Beginning in 1917 he occasionally gave lectures on philosophy and classics at Princeton University over the next few years.

Characteristic emphases in More's writing include the dualism in human consciousness, the importance of the inner check, suspicion of romantic expansiveness and utopianism, and the preference for reason checked by experience over rationalism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Great Refusal; Being Letters of a Dreamer in Gotham (Boston, 1894).

Shelburne Essays, vol. 1 (Boston, 1904).

Shelburne Essays, vol. 2 (Boston, 1905).

Shelburne Essays, vol. 3 (Boston, 1905).

Shelburne Essays, vol. 4 (Boston, 1906).

Shelburne Essays, vol. 5 (New York, 1908).

Shelburne Essays, vol. 6 (Boston, 1909).

Shelburne Essays, vol. 7 (Boston, 1910).

The Drift of Romanticism, Shelburne Essays, vol. 8 (Boston, 1913).

Aristocracy and Justice, Shelburne Essays, vol. 9 (Boston, 1915).

Platonism (Princeton, 1917).

With the Wits, Shelburne Essays, vol. 10 (Boston, 1919).

A New England Group and Others, Shelburne Essays, vol. 11 (Boston, 1921).

The Religion of Plato, The Greek Tradition, vol. 1 (Princeton, N.J., 1921).

Hellenistic Philosophies, The Greek Tradition, vol. 2 (Princeton, N.J., 1923).

The Christ of the New Testament, The Greek Tradition, vol. 3 (Princeton, N.J., 1924).

Christ the Word, The Greek Tradition, vol. 4 (Princeton, N.J., 1927).

The Demon of the Absolute, New Shelburne Essays, vol. 1 (Princeton, N.J., 1928).

The Catholic Faith (Princeton, N.J., 1931).

The Sceptical Approach to Religion, New Shelburne Essays, vol. 2 (Princeton, N.J., 1934).

On Being Human, New Shelburne Essays, vol. 3 (Princeton, N.J., 1936).

Pages from an Oxford Diary (Princeton, N.J., 1937).

Other Relevant Works

More's papers are at Princeton University and Harvard University.

The Essential Paul Elmer More: A Selection of His Writings, ed. Byron C. Lambert (New Rochelle, N.Y., 1972).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio,

Comp Amer Thought, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v27*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Dakin, Arthur Hazard. *A Paul Elmer More Miscellany* (Portland, Maine, 1950). Contains a bibliography of More's writings.

———, *Paul Elmer More* (Princeton, N.J., 1960).

Davies, Robert M. *The Humanism of Paul Elmer More* (New York, 1958).

Duggan, Francis X. *Paul Elmer More* (New York, 1966).

Tanner, Stephen L. *Paul Elmer More: Literary Criticism as the History of Ideas* (Albany, N.Y., 1987).

Stephen L. Tanner

MORGENBESSER, Sidney (1921–2004)

Sidney Morgenbesser was born on 22 September 1921 in New York City. He received a BA in Jewish philosophy from the Jewish Theological Seminary in 1941 and was ordained as a rabbi. He also received a BSS from the City College of New York in 1941. He then studied at the University of Pennsylvania, completing an MA in 1950 and his PhD in philosophy in 1956. After teaching at Swarthmore College and the New School for Social Research, Morgenbesser joined the faculty of Columbia University in 1954, where, with the exception of visiting appointments at Princeton University and the Hebrew University, he remained throughout his career. In 1975 he was named John Dewey Professor of Philosophy, a position he held until retirement in 1991. He continued occasionally to teach as a special lecturer at Columbia until 1999. Morgenbesser died on 1 August 2004 in New York City.

Morgenbesser's teaching and scholarly engagement extended to departments across the Columbia campus, including economics, physics, and sociology. His career reflects his longstanding appreciation of John DEWEY, both for Dewey's scholarly work and his lifetime of active involvement in ongoing issues of social concern. Morgenbesser's early student and collegial contacts with Nelson GOODMAN and Ernest NAGEL were also influential.

Morgenbesser's main interests were in theory of knowledge, human rights, philosophy of the social sciences, and pragmatism. He had a commanding knowledge of the ideas and literature in many of the major areas of philosophy and the social sciences. In addition, Morgenbesser remained personally involved in the political and ethical controversies of the day. He was an intellectual force in the Jewish community in debates and deliberations that touch on these and other matters. Morgenbesser played critical roles in developing the field and practice of medical ethics in New York City, and in stimulating subsequent philosophical research. He was a member of the editorial board of the *Journal of Philosophy* for most of his career. He also served on the editorial boards or as unofficial advisor to publications such as *Social Research*, *Economics and Philosophy*, *Svahra*, *The Nation*, and *The New York Review of Books*. He was named honorary chair of the Conference on Methods and for many years participated in and provided intellectual guidance for its biannual programs.

Morgenbesser authored or co-authored over fifty articles and reviews on a wide variety of topics, in journals and magazines so diverse as to include *The Reconstructionist*, *Commentary*, *The New Republic*, *Scientific American*, along with more standard academic venues in philosophy and other fields. In addition, he edited or co-edited six anthologies, including *Philosophy of Science* (1960) which set the stage for subsequent such volumes in this field.

Morgenbesser's influence, though, extends far beyond that of his written work. He taught, lured into philosophy, and helped initiate and encourage the projects of generations of students. He has been a resource, intellectual

confidant, and acute critic not only to his colleagues at Columbia, but to scholars around the globe. At lectures and in discussion, his now widely repeated pithy comments would go right to the heart of the matter, exposing or challenging a position's basic assumptions and commitments. The *festschrift* in his honor, *How Many Questions?* (1983), provides but a small sample of the scope of Morgenbesser's interests and the range of scholars on whom he had an impact.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Decline of Religious Liberalism," *The Reconstructionist* 19 (1953): 17–24.
"On the Justification of Beliefs and Attitudes," *Journal of Philosophy* 51 (1954): 565–76.
"Character and Free Will," with Arthur Danto, *Journal of Philosophy* 54 (1957): 493–505.
"Approaches to Ethical Objectivity," *Educational Theory* 7 (1957): 180–86.
"Social Inquiry and Moral Judgement," in *Philosophy and Education*, ed. Israel Scheffler (Boston, 1958): 180–200.
"Role and Status of Anthropological Theories," *Science* 128 (1958): 72–9.
"The Deductive Model and Its Qualifications," in *Induction: Some Current Issues*, ed. Henry Kyburg and Ernest Nagel (Middletown, Conn., 1963), pp. 169–80.
"Perception: Cause and Achievement," in *Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, ed. Marx Wartofsky (Dordrecht, 1963), pp. 206–12.
"Belief and Disposition," with Isaac Levi, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 1 (1964): 221–33.
"Is It Science?" *Social Research* 33 (1966): 255–71.
"The Realist-instrumentalist Controversy," in *Philosophy, Science and Method: Essays in Honor of Ernest Nagel*, ed. Sidney Morgenbesser, Morton White, and Patrick Suppes (New York, 1969), pp. 200–18.

"Imperialism: Some Preliminary Distinctions," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 3 (1973): 3–44.
"Experimentation and Consent: A Note," in *Philosophical Medical Ethics*, ed. Stuart Spicker and H. Tristam Engelhardt (Dordrecht, 1977), pp. 97–110.
"Picking and Choosing," with E. Ullman-Marglit, *Social Research* 44 (1977): 757–85.
"The Question of Isaiah Berlin," with J. Lieberson, *New York Review of Books* 27 (1980): 38–42.

Other Relevant Works
Ed. with Arthur Danto, *Philosophy of Science* (New York, 1960).
Ed. with James Walsh, *Free Will* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1962).
Ed. with Patrick Suppes and Morton White, *Philosophy, Science, and Method: Essays in Honor of Ernest Nagel* (New York, 1969).
Ed. with Virginia Held and Thomas Nagel, *Philosophy, Morality, and International Affairs* (Oxford, 1974).
Ed., *Dewey and His Critics: Essays from the Journal of Philosophy* (New York, 1977).
Bryan Magee Talks to Sidney Morgenbesser about the American Pragmatists, Films for the Humanities (Princeton, N.J., 1997). Broadcast in 1987 on the television series "Great Philosophers: A History of Western Philosophy."

Further Reading
Cauman, Leigh, Isaac Levi, and Robert Schwartz, eds. *How Many Questions? Essays in Honor of Sidney Morgenbesser* (Indianapolis, 1983). Contains a bibliography of Morgenbesser's writings.

Robert Schwartz

MORGENTHAU, Hans Joachim (1904–80)

Hans Joachim Morgenthau was born on 17 February 1904 in Coburg, Germany. His father, Ludwig, was a medical doctor who fervently supported the emperor and so named Hans after Wilhelm's II youngest son, Prince Joachim of Prussia. Morgenthau enrolled in philosophy at the University of Frankfurt am Main in 1923, but then switched to jurisprudence at the University of Munich. He passed his first law examination in February 1927 and immediately enrolled in the three-year Referender (legal internship) leading up to the second law examination. He became increasingly frail and was diagnosed with tuberculosis in December 1927; one of his lungs was surgically removed and he spent five months recovering in a sanatorium. He subsequently joined the staff of Hugo Sinzheimer to complete his internship during 1928–31. Sinzheimer was a professor at the University of Frankfurt and the Labor Academy; Morgenthau assisted him in his law office and as his teaching assistant at the university. After completing his internship, Morgenthau passed the second law examination, and became an assistant judge in May 1931.

Morgenthau received a doctoral law degree in 1929 from the University of Frankfurt. During his time in Frankfurt, he met and was influenced by a wide range of intellectuals, such as Max HORKHEIMER, Karl Mannheim, Theodor ADORNO, Herbert MARCUSE, and Erich FROMM. His doctoral dissertation in international law and the sociology of law, titled "The Nature and Limits of Judicial Function in International Law," was published in 1929, and received positive reviews from leading scholars such as Hersch Lauterpacht. He then became an assistant to a legal philosophy scholar, Eduard Baumgarten, at the University of Geneva. Baumgarten was one of a few German followers of William JAMES and of pragmatism. He tried to obtain a tenure position for Morgenthau, but rising anti-Semitism fueled by the growing power of the Nazis made this impossible. In 1931 Morgenthau began teaching international law, international organization, and international relations at the Graduate Institute for International Studies in Geneva. Hans KELSEN examined and praised Morgenthau's Habilitation thesis in 1934. Because of Nazification in Germany and its attendant anti-Jewish impact in Geneva, Morgenthau took a post teaching international law at the Instituto de Estudios Internacionales y Economicos in Madrid, Spain in the spring of 1935. He and his wife were subsequently stranded in Italy after the outbreak of civil war in Spain, and later traveled to Paris to await the end of hostilities. In fact, their apartment in Madrid was shelled during an attack in December 1936, and virtually all Morgenthau's papers were destroyed.

In July 1937 Morgenthau fled to the United States and began teaching political science at Brooklyn College in New York City. He next took a post during 1939–43 at the University of Kansas City teaching in the liberal arts and at the law school. He became a naturalized US citizen in 1943, passed the Missouri bar exam, and then moved to the University of Chicago in the fall of 1943, where he spent the greater part of his career as professor of political science and contemporary history. Morgenthau also founded and directed the Center for the Study of American Foreign and Military Policy at Chicago in 1950, which closed on his age-mandated retirement from Chicago in 1971. He was a Distinguished Professor of Political Science and Modern History at the City University of New York from 1971 to 1974, and then taught at the New School for Social Research as University Professor of Political Science until his death. He died on 19 July 1980 in New York City.

During his career, Morgenthau was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1958, authored nine books, and published more than 400 essays and journal articles. He held twenty guest professorships at major academic institutions in the US and abroad during his long career, including Harvard, Yale,

Columbia, Princeton, Salzburg, Madrid, Geneva, New Delhi, and Haifa. Between 1950 and 1980, he gave more than 1300 guest lectures sponsored by leading universities and civic organizations around the world, and was the recipient of seven honorary doctorates.

Morgenthau is best known for his realist theory of international politics. As set forth in his seminal 1948 work, *Politics Among Nations*, the theory rests upon six principles. First, realism assumes a rational theory can capture and model behavior in international affairs because objective laws that govern this behavior are themselves grounded in human nature. (The relative stability of this nature over time and across cultures is thus essential to our understanding human interactions.) Second, interests can usefully be defined in terms of power, power being an autonomous sphere of action for international actors. Third, this notion of interests, defined as power, is universally valid; that is, it is a cross-culturally valid construct, even though particular content and manner of control by one human being over another must be contextualized to be properly understood. Fourth, universal moral principles cannot be applied to actions taken by states, at least in the abstract, since prudence is the supreme (and so properly guiding) virtue in politics. Fifth, realism does not identify, confuse, or conflate the particular moral aspirations of any particular nation with the moral laws of the universe. (Hence, one is justified in maintaining a skeptical outlook on just what universal moral principles there may be, as only parochial principles are clearly identifiable.) Sixth and finally, this realism understands the political sphere to be autonomous, and so separate from other spheres, such that the question "how does *X* affect the power of the nation?" is to be distinguished from other questions and concerns, like whether *X* accords with moral or legal or economic principles.

Morgenthau's realism was constructed in opposition to the then-dominant idealism in international relations. This latter theory focused on prescriptions for properly conducting foreign affairs, such as how best to structure and operate the post-World War I League of Nations and the post-World War II United Nations: "that a rational and moral political order, derived from universally valid abstract principles, can be achieved here and now." Morgenthau's realism was an attempt to create a positivist science of international relations that would permit an analysis of what states actually do, as opposed to what they ought to do. This science would consider only what desires and interests actually shape policy and action as opposed to what one might argue should be proclaimed and done: "… that the world, imperfect as it is from the rational point of view, is the result of forces inherent in human nature" (1948, p. 3).

Morgenthau was not insensitive to, nor did he ignore, the normative realm in his theoretical analysis; that charge, however common against realists in general and Morgenthau in particular, misread his aims. He insisted that before one could make the argument that a state's policy "ought" to be *X*, we must know what interests and forces could be expected to lead a state to proclaim and do other than *X* and how they would need to change before *X* could be the anticipated outcome. First and foremost, a theory of international relations must be a tool that can be used to understand the way the world is, not the way it should be. Only then might one move to the next level, and suggest how one can criticize and ultimately alter the way things are. This can be seen in Morgenthau's own writings, which are filled both with rigorous explication as well as policy criticism and prescriptions for change (consider, for example, his writings on the Vietnam conflict). The latter advice never appears without the former foundation in the way the world is.

Morgenthau's work initiated the shift from idealist perspectives on world affairs to a realist viewpoint during the Cold War and arguably remains dominant today in the post-Cold War era. Yet, for all its scientific value and theoretic staying power, there have been serious ques-

tions raised about realism since Morgenthau's death. Basic key assumptions have come under attack from the left and right of the political and theoretical spectrum, raising doubts about how long this legacy will survive. On the one hand, for example, Morgenthau presumes that states are the central actors in international affairs, and that one can draw a sufficiently sharp distinction between local or national politics and international politics so as not to permit confusion or conflation of their respective interests and power issues for analytical purposes. But whether states remain the only critical actors today for analytical purposes, given the rise of multinational corporations and international nongovernmental organizations with significant reach and power, is questionable. On the other hand, the existence of supranational, international governmental and intergovernmental organizations like the World Trade Organization and the European Union suggests such a real diminution of state sovereignty (read "power") that realist analysis must grow to encompass them; and yet one reasonably wonders whether this increase in scope does not rend the realist framework's fabric by continuing to insist on a discrete realm of autonomous state actor activity.

Similarly problematic are the demands by citizens, organizations, and even states that international actors, of whatever size or composition, take certain prescriptions or norms into account when developing and implementing international as well as national policies. Hence, human rights issues, including the norms of democracy and the manner of their export, are no longer only a matter of what might draw attention from political actors *vis-à-vis* states, but encompass expectations raised before judges in national and international tribunals that require response from actors ranging from medium-sized nation-bound businesses to intergovernmental organizations. Morgenthau's realism cannot clearly stretch this far. This may present the greatest theoretical challenge to realism in the twenty-first century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

La réalité des normes, en particulier des normes du droit internationaux: fondements d'une théorie des normes (Paris, 1934).

Scientific Man versus Power Politics (Chicago, 1946).

Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace (New York, 1948).

In Defense of the National Interest: A Critical Examination of American Foreign Policy (New York, 1951).

Dilemmas of Politics (Chicago, 1958).

The Purpose of American Politics (New York, 1960).

Politics in the Twentieth Century, 3 vols (Chicago, 1962).

Truth and Power: Essays of a Decade, 1960–1970 (New York, 1970).

Other Relevant Works

Morgenthau's papers are at the Library of Congress.

"Fragment of an Intellectual Autobiography: 1904–1932," in *Truth and Tragedy: A Tribute to Hans J. Morgenthau*, ed. Kenneth W. Thompson and Robert J. Myers (Washington, D.C., 1977).

Human Rights and Foreign Policy (New York, 1979).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v7*

Frei, Christoph. *Hans J. Morgenthau: An Intellectual Biography* (Baton Rouge, La., 2001).

Mastny, Vojtech, ed. *Power and Policy in Transition: Essays Presented on the Tenth Anniversary of the National Committee on American Foreign Policy in Honor of Its Founder, Hans J. Morgenthau* (Westport, Conn., 1984).

D. W. Skubik

MORRIS, Bertram (1908–81)

Bertram Morris was born on 7 July 1908 in Denver, Colorado. He attended the University of Colorado for two years before transferring to Princeton University, where he earned his BA in English with highest honors in 1930. He then received a PhD in philosophy from Cornell University in 1934, writing a dissertation on "An Analysis of the Aesthetic Experience and of the Aesthetic Judgment as Reflected upon a General Theory of Values." Morris was an instructor in philosophy and English at the University of Wyoming during 1934–6, before his appointment as assistant and then associate professor of philosophy at Northwestern University, where he taught from 1936 to 1947. In 1947 he became associate professor of philosophy at the University of Colorado in Boulder, joining the long-time head of the department, Walter B. Veazie. He was soon promoted up to full professor and taught there until his retirement in 1977. He died on 19 February 1981 in Boulder, Colorado.

Morris was a highly visible and active participant in campus, city, and state politics. He was a member of several civic and government organizations and committees, and was frequently involved in efforts to improve public and higher education in Colorado. He was appointed a trustee of the State Colleges and University Consortium of Colorado in 1977 by Governor Richard Lamm. He also was the Director of the Colorado Civil Liberties Union for several years, and served on the National Council of the American Association of University Professors from 1960 to 1977. Recognized for his contributions to the profession of philosophy, he was a member of the executive committee of the American Philosophical Association, and a member of the board of trustees of the American Society for Aesthetics. In 1977 the Bertram Morris Colloquium of Social Philosophy was founded by the University of Colorado at Boulder.

Morris wrote primarily on aesthetics, aligning with process and pragmatic views of art and aesthetic experience. From his education at Cornell, Morris absorbed the aesthetics of British idealism, especially the work of Bernard Bosanquet. He was also heavily influenced by John DEWEY's *Art and Experience*. In *The Aesthetic Process* (1943) Morris argues that art and beauty are emotional processes with origins, culminations, and conclusions. The qualities that characterize art and beauty are the results of such processes and cannot be understood apart from them. Attempting to surmount to subjective-objective dichotomy, he depicts human values and purposes as integral to the aesthetic process, without reducing aesthetic qualities to a merely subjective existence. Although the artwork is the result of conscious aims, he holds that the creative process will always transcend original plans.

Morris's other major philosophical work was *Philosophical Aspects of Culture* (1961). His sustaining themes for the study of social philosophy are (1) the immanent norms of culture; (2) the relation of moral principles to social life; (3) the use of power for promoting the social good; and (4) the arts of expression and communication. Morris's standpoint is cultural relativism, although he does declare that cultural progress will always promote the value of persons. Each culture has an evolving "focus" of ends and means to achieve them, and the arts of a culture can be evaluated according to the degree that an artwork contributes to the culture's focus of that time-period.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Aesthetic Process (Evanston, Ill., 1943).
Philosophical Aspects of Culture (Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1961).
Science, Folklore and Philosophy, with Harry Girvetz, George Geiger, and Harry Hantz (New York, 1966).
Institutions of Intelligence (Columbus, Ohio, 1969).

Other Relevant Works
Morris's papers are at the University of

Colorado at Denver.

"Philosophy of Criticism," *Philosophical Review* 55 (1946): 611–33.

"The Art-process and the Aesthetic Fact in Whitehead's Philosophy," in *The Philosophy of Alfred North*, 2nd edn, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (New York, 1951).

"Dewey's Theory of Art," in *Guide to the Works of John Dewey*, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale, Ill., 1970), pp. 156–82.

"Studies in Modern Philosophy: On Hobbes's Humanism," in *Philosophy and the Civilizing Arts: Essays Presented to Herbert W. Schneider*, ed. Craig Walton and John P. Anton (Athens, Ohio, 1974).

Further Reading

Lang, Berel, William Sacksteder, and Gary Stahl, eds. *The Philosopher in the Community: Essays in Memory of Bertram Morris* (Lanham, Md., 1984). Contains a bibliography of Morris's writings.

John R. Shook

MORRIS, Charles William (1901–79)

Charles W. Morris was born on 23 May 1901 in Denver, Colorado. He studied engineering and then psychology before completing his undergraduate study at Northwestern University, receiving his BS in 1922. Inspired by William JAMES and John DEWEY, Morris then pursued philosophy and studied with pragmatist George Herbert MEAD at the University of Chicago. Morris wrote a dissertation titled "Symbolism and Reality: A Study in the Nature of Mind" and received his PhD in philosophy in 1925. He was an instructor in philosophy at the Rice Institute in Texas from 1925 to 1931. From 1931 to 1947 he was an associate professor of philosophy at the University of Chicago, and from 1948 to 1958 he held the title of lecturer at Chicago. From 1958 to 1971 he held a special appointment as research professor at the University of Florida. Morris died on 15 January 1979 in Gainesville, Florida.

During the 1930s and 40s Morris articulated and promoted a general theory of symbols ("semiotic") that he believed would endow philosophy with sufficient theoretical and scientific power to better understand all things from mathematics to cultural discourse to mental illness (understood as symbolic processes gone awry). For Morris, philosophy and the semiotic founded by Charles PEIRCE were more than academic, technical projects. He believed semiotical sophistication was key to better understanding, engaging, and criticizing the century's revolutionary developments in science as well as social theory and politics. Morris was happy to collaborate with the philosophers of the Vienna Circle (and their American and British sympathizers) who also aspired in the 1930s to bring epistemological and scientific sophistication to popular culture. He helped Rudolf CARNAP, Hans REICHENBACH, and Philipp FRANK emigrate to the US, find academic appointments, and adjust to American life. He also articulated semiotic as a positivist-friendly synthesis of American pragmatism and the Vienna Circle's anti-metaphysical scientific philosophy. In a series of papers reflecting this collaboration as well as Morris's leadership (with Carnap and Otto Neurath) of the Unity of Science Movement and its *International Encyclopedia of Unified Science*, he presented semiotic as a pragmatic generalization of Carnap's logical syntax (Carnap 1937). In his *Logical Positivism, Pragmatism, and Scientific Empiricism* (1937), he described how a mature semiotic theory of symbols would address not only formal relations within a language but also semantic and pragmatic relations to the world and language users, their expectations, beliefs, and values. One instance of Morris's and, more broadly, pragmatism's liberalizing effects on logical empiricism was Carnap's adoption of Morris's tripartite

schema as he outlined a "complete" semantic theory of language (Carnap 1939, 1963).

Though collaborating eagerly with different philosophical and scientific programs, Morris always considered himself a pragmatist. In the early 1950s, he wrote privately that "in technical philosophy I feel closer to Mead than to anyone else. In a general sense I consider myself as part of the movement of American pragmatism as represented by Peirce, James, Dewey, C. I. LEWIS, and Mead" (1992, pp. 38–9). The breadth of Morris's career and interests is remarkable, for he tirelessly pursued unifying, synthetic approaches to both technical and broadly philosophical problems. Besides seeking to harmonize American pragmatism and early twentieth-century analytic philosophy and philosophy of science under the umbrella of semiotic, for example, he also attempted to carry the nineteenth and twentieth-century debate in American philosophy concerning religion and science (represented, for example, by Paul CARUS's journal *The Monist*) into an increasingly scientific and international world. Morris's entrance into this debate was through his lifelong interest in Buddhism, which he began to incorporate into his philosophical writings with the book *Paths of Life* (1942). This book articulated a Buddhistic "world religion" that Morris continued to develop and promote in his postwar career. He traveled to China and India in the late 1940s, regularly reviewed manuscripts for the journal *Philosophy East and West*, and was an active participant in the postwar humanist movement.

For multiple reasons, Morris's philosophical career declined after World War II. His major work *Signs, Language, and Behavior* (1946), in which he proposed central concepts and terminology for a future science of semiotic, was heavily criticized by philosophers (including Dewey and, most vigorously, Arthur BENTLEY) for what they perceived as an unacceptably behavioral and biological approach to symbols and meanings (see Morris's responses to critics in 1948). Morris's project was also out of step with postwar analytic philosophy that was inter-

ested less in the scientific and cultural ambitions embraced by the Unity of Science Movement and more in the study of formal logic and ordinary language. This professionalization and depoliticization among academic philosophers was encouraged by the highly anti-communist political climate of McCarthyism, while the specific decline of the Unity of Science Movement and its ideals was hastened by the reputations of Otto Neurath and the larger movement he led as "communistic" (Reisch 2005).

During the 1950s and 60s, Morris persevered in his semiotic project, which became increasingly empirical and questionnaire-based. His work was by this time largely disconnected from philosophy. He was read mainly by social scientists dedicated like Morris to promoting a synthetic postwar "science of man" (1951) and by students of semiotics in the tradition of Peirce, such as Thomas SEBEOK and Roman Jakobson in the United States and by Karl Otto Apel and Ferruccio Rossi-Landi in Europe.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Six Theories of Mind (Chicago, 1932).

Logical Positivism, Pragmatism, and Scientific Empiricism (Paris, 1937).

Paths of Life: Preface to a World Religion (Chicago, 1942).

Signs, Language, and Behavior (New York, 1946).

The Open Self (New York, 1948).

"Signs about Signs about Signs," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 9 (1948): 115–33.

"The Science of Man and Unified Science," *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 80 (1951): 37–44.

Varieties of Human Value (Chicago, 1956).

Signification and Significance: A Study of the Relations of Signs and Values (Cambridge, Mass., 1964).

The Pragmatic Movement in American Philosophy (New York, 1970).

Writings on the General Theory of Signs (The Hague, 1971).

Image (New York, 1976).

Symbolism and Reality: A Study in the Nature of Mind (Amsterdam, 1993).

Other Relevant Works

Morris's papers are at the Institute for American Thought at Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis, and at the University of Chicago.

Ed., *Mind, Self, and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*, by George H. Mead (Chicago, 1934).

"The Correspondence between Charles Morris and Ferruccio Rossi-Landi," ed. Susan Petrilli, *Semiotica* 88 (1992): 37–122.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Pres Addr of APA v4*, *Proc of APA v52*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Black, Max. "The Semiotic of Charles Morris," in *Language and Philosophy*, ed. Max Black (New York, 1949), pp. 168–85.

Carnap, Rudolf. *The Logical Syntax of Language* (London, 1937).

———, "Foundations of Logic and Mathematics," in *International Encyclopedia of Unified Science* (Chicago, 1939), vol. 1, no. 3.

———, "Intellectual Autobiography," in *The Philosophy of Rudolf Carnap*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (La Salle, Ill., 1963), pp. 3–84.

Fiordo, R. A. *Charles Morris and the Criticism of Discourse* (Bloomington, Ind., 1976).

Reisch, George. *How the Cold War Transformed Philosophy of Science: To the Icy Slopes of Logic* (Cambridge, 2005).

Rossi-Landi, Ferruccio. "Signs about a Master of Signs," *Semiotica* 13 (1975): 155–97.

George A. Reisch

MORRIS, George Sylvester (1840–89)

George S. Morris was born on 15 November 1840 in Norwich, Vermont. His father was a devout Congregationalist, maintaining a Puritan home life and ardently supporting abolition and temperance. Morris graduated first in his class with his BA at Dartmouth College in 1861 but delayed seminary enrollment to volunteer for the Second Vermont Brigade, serving as regimental postmaster. After witnessing several battles including Gettysburg, Morris was mustered out in August 1863 and returned to Dartmouth for the MA in 1864. That year he began study at Union Theological Seminary with Henry B. SMITH. Smith's liberalizing influence was an introduction to historicism and idealism. Morris abandoned plans for the ministry and followed Smith's advice to undertake two years' study of philosophy in Germany. Courses with H. Ulrici and F. A. Trendelenburg, along with readings of Kant, Schelling, and Hegel, guided Morris towards a synthesis of Aristotle and voluntaristic idealism that envisioned an organically growing unity of humanity with God.

As philosophy chairs were almost exclusively occupied by ministers and seminary graduates in that era, Morris instead taught as professor of modern languages and literature at the University of Michigan from 1870 to 1880. Since Michigan's chair of philosophy was occupied by popular preacher Benjamin F. Cocker (who taught from 1869 to 1883), Morris's hopes for a philosophy position waited until the new John Hopkins University asked him to give visiting lectures during the January months of 1878 and 1879. Josiah ROYCE attended the 1878 lectures and Morris was one of Royce's examiners for his doctorate awarded that spring. President Gilman of Johns Hopkins then offered Morris a half-time lecturer appointment starting in the spring of 1880 to join philosophy faculty Charles PEIRCE and G. Stanley HALL, and this appointment lasted until 1885. Since Morris was teaching fall semesters at Johns Hopkins, Michigan made him professor of ethics, logic,

and history of philosophy at Michigan for the spring semesters starting in 1881. He was a full-time professor and head of the philosophy department at Michigan from 1885 until his untimely death on 23 March 1889 in North Lake, Michigan.

His first book, *British Thought and Thinkers* (1880), develops criticisms of sensationalistic materialism made by British neo-idealists such as T. H. Green. Human perception cannot be a passive reception of given sensations, since the mind demonstrably plays an active role in establishing experience's organization, meaning, and value. Materialism cannot dismiss the reality of teleological causes, necessary for life and reason. *A Critical Exposition of Kant's Critique of Pure Reason* (1881) reflects Trendelenburg's Aristotelian attacks upon the Kantian threat of subjectivism and rationalism. Consciousness must transcend any individual mind because a self-reflective consciousness could know itself as such only insofar it understands some larger whole of which it is a part. A personality has life only as a functioning part of society and ultimately, of God.

Morris's most constructive work emerged when he gave the prestigious Ely Lectures at Union Theological Seminary in 1883, published as *Philosophy and Christianity*. Supernaturalism's dualism cuts off humanity from God, while Hegelianism's inexorable dialectic eliminates human potentiality and responsibility. Life is goal-directed activity, which is its own end. For life to possess both freedom and significance, we must exist in a web of organic relations with the wider social systems of life that comprise God. The best form of absolute idealism will follow Hegel's clue that experience and reason mutually interpenetrate: the meaning of any mental process is determined only by its functioning within the growth of the larger whole embracing each person, and that knowledge is the reward of successful cooperative interaction with one's environment. The distinction between intelligence and reality has only a logical function without any metaphysical implications. "By his self-conscious personality … man finds himself, not cut off from, but indissolubly bound up with, all the rest of existence, including the Absolute (God) itself. It is thus precisely by his personality that man finds himself taking hold upon the infinite, joined to it, and capable of becoming organically one with it …" Knowledge of God is thus possible; philosophy, psychology, and religion are ultimately the same enterprises. Natural science is supreme in its own sphere of investigations; science cannot contradict philosophy or religion unless science's truths are rashly supposed to be the only truths. Knowledge does not aim at eternal truths about fixed realities, somehow guaranteed by God's purely logical and unchanging mind. Instead, Morris's universe, unlike that of most other neo-Hegelianisms of that era, is an active process of directed growth at every level. God is therefore in process as well, and humanity's moral character and conduct affects divine providence.

Morris traveled across Europe in 1885, visiting the leading idealists in Scotland and Britain, and attending lectures by J. E. Erdmann in Halle and Wilhelm Wundt in Leipzig. Upon his return Cornell University repeatedly tried to lure him to the chair of philosophy and Christian ethics, but without success. Morris's last work, *Hegel's Philosophy of the State and of History* (1887), further reflects his agreement with Edward Caird and Bernard Bosanquet that mind is thoroughly social in origin and functioning. Morris's view of the social life of personality was a forerunner in America to the next generation of young idealists who incorporated a social psychology including Royce, John DEWEY, George MEAD, and Alfred LLOYD. Dewey was Morris's finest student at Johns Hopkins, colleague at Michigan from 1884 to 1888, and successor to Morris's chair upon his death. Dewey followed Morris's call for a renewal of social philosophy and political liberalism. Neither Kantian nor utilitarian ethics can ground social philosophy. Kant's deontological ethics fails to realize how the subjective will exists only in socially

practical acts. The new social philosophy envisioned by Morris also opposes utilitarianism's false individualism and hedonistic psychology. Democracy should be freed from an obsession with selfishness and liberty rights, and redirected towards its true ethical aim of personal self-realization for all within a religious community of mutual love.

For Morris, religion is essentially an "experimental" science of ethics, better pursued in a democracy than in any aristocracy or theocracy. The ethical community follows the model of the perfect person provided by scripture, and this perfection is potentially attainable over time. Christian theology (and absolute idealism) must not depict human conduct as irredeemably sinful; nor should it depict morality as blind obedience. Self-realization, which is self-knowledge, requires experience and learning. "Of spiritual knowledge or the knowledge peculiarly appropriate and necessary for the perfect man, it is even more profoundly true than of any other, that it is founded in and must be confirmed by experience, – taking this latter term in its truest and original sense, as denoting, not a mere passive reception of impressions, but an active 'testing,' 'trying,' or 'finding out'" (*Philosophy and Christianity*, 1883, p. 233).

Morris's conclusions that the Christian theistic trinity is the absolute mind, and that the ethical community should be the ideal Christian life, did not earn approval from some later idealists, such as Michigan philosopher Robert WENLEY, who worried that Morris's philosophy was always controlled by his Congregationalist piety. Although this is a largely accurate observation, those most indebted to Morris's socially organic idealism (such as Dewey) emerged as social progressives who demanded that religious experience must be democratic and nondenominational.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Hodgson on Time and Space," *American Presbyterian and Theological Review* n.s. 5 (1867): 217–38.

"The Final Cause as Principle of Cognition and Principle in Nature," *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* 9 (1874): 176–204.

"The Theory of Unconscious Intelligence, as Opposed to Theism," *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* 11 (1876): 247–91.

"The Philosophy of Art," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 10 (1876): 1–16.

British Thought and Thinkers (Chicago, 1880).

"Kant's Transcendental Deduction of the Categories," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 15 (1881): 253–74.

Kant's Critique of Pure Reason (Chicago, 1882).

"Philosophy and Its Specific Problems," *Princeton Review* ns 9 (1882): 203–32.

Philosophy and Christianity (New York, 1883).

Hegel's Philosophy of the State and of History (Chicago, 1887).

Other Relevant Works

Morris's papers are at the Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Trans., *History of Philosophy from Thales to the Present Time* by F. Üeberweg (New York, 1871–3).

"Friedrich Adolf Trendelenburg," *New Englander* 33 (1874): 287–336. Reprinted in Jones 1948, pp. 335–84.

"Vera on Trendelenburg," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 8 (1874): 92–4.

"The Immortality of the Human Soul," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 33 (1876): 695–715.

"Spinoza – A Summary Account of His Life and Teaching," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 11 (1877): 278–99.

"A Report on Wundt's *Logik* (Bd. I. *Erkenntnisslehre*)," abstract in *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* 1 (1882): 84.

"English Deism and the Philosophy of Religion," *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* 1 (1882): 177.

"The Fundamental Conceptions of University and Philosophy," *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* 2 (1883): 54.

"The Philosophical Conception of Life," *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* 3 (1883): 12–13.

"Dr. Cocker's Philosophical Attitude," *Michigan Argonaut* 1 (1883): 245–7.

"The Philosophy of the State and of History," in *Methods of Teaching History*, 2nd edn, ed. G. S. Hall (Boston, 1883), pp. 149–66.

"Revised Draft of Unused Introduction," for *Philosophy of the State and of History*, in Jones 1948, pp. 385–412.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*

Buckham, John W. "A Group of American Idealists," *The Personalist* 1 (1920): 18–31.

Dewey, John. "The Late Professor Morris," *Early Works of John Dewey*, vol. 3 (Carbondale, Ill., 1969), pp. 3–13.

Goetzman, William, ed. *The American Hegelians* (New York, 1973).

Jones, Mark E. *George Sylvester Morris: His Philosophical Career and Theistic Idealism* (Philadelphia, 1948).

Randall, John Herman, Jr. "Josiah Royce and American Idealism," in *Philosophy after Darwin: Chapters for The Career of Philosophy, volume III, and Other Essays*, ed. Beth Singer (New York, 1977).

Rebec, George. "George Sylvester Morris," *Michigan Alumnus* 14 (1908): 188–90.

Riley, I. Woodbridge. "Two Types of Transcendentalism in America," *Journal of Philosophy* 15 (1918): 281–92.

Wenley, Robert M. *The Life and Work of George Sylvester Morris* (New York, 1917). Contains a bibliography of Morris's works.

John R. Shook

MORROW, Glenn Raymond (1895–1973)

Glenn R. Morrow was born on 29 April 1895 in Calhoun, Missouri. He studied initially at Westminster College in Missouri, receiving the BA degree in 1914. He entered Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary for a year in 1916–17, and then attended the University of Missouri for the MA in 1918. After serving for a year in the US Army, Morrow entered Cornell University, which awarded him the PhD in philosophy in 1921. His dissertation was titled "The Ethical and Economic Theories of Adam Smith: A Study in the Social Philosophy of the Eighteenth Century." During 1921–2 he did postgraduate work at the University of Paris.

Morrow taught Greek at Westminster College from 1914 to 1916. He returned to Cornell in 1922 as a lecturer in philosophy, and then taught philosophy from 1923 to 1929 at the University of Missouri, rising to the rank of associate professor. He was appointed professor of philosophy at the University of Illinois in 1929. In 1939 he became professor of philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania, and was named the Adam Seybert Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy in 1947. He also served as Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences from 1944 to 1952. During his career Morrow also had visiting positions at the Universities of Munich and Vienna in 1933–4, was a Guggenheim Fellow at the American School of Classical Studies in Athens in 1952–3, and a Fulbright Scholar at the University of Oxford in 1956–7. He served as President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1939–40. Morrow retired in 1965, and died on 31 January 1973 in Swarthmore, Pennsylvania.

Morrow had a reputation for meticulous scholarship. He was in the vanguard of the movement to bring twentieth-century philosophical analysis and philological methods to produce critical editions and studies of the Platonic corpus. His studies of Plato's views on

slavery decisively refuted the historicism that Plato disapproved of the institution and won him the admiration of many other classical scholars. But the same kind of careful exegesis is found in his work on Adam Smith's ethical and economic theories. Morrow was instrumental in helping Paul Wilpert of the University of Cologne in resurrecting the *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* from the dormancy it suffered during World War II.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Ethical and Economic Theories of Adam Smith (New York, 1923).
Adam Smith, 1776–1926: Lectures to Commemorate the Sesquicentennial of the Publication of "The Wealth of Nations," with John Maurice Clark et al. (Chicago, 1928).
Plato's Law of Slavery in Its Relation to Greek Law (New York, 1939).
"Plato and the Rule of Law," *Philosophical Review* 50 (1941): 105–26.
"The Philosophical Presuppositions of Democracy," *Ethics* 52 (1942): 297–308.
"The Distinctive Contributions of Philosophy to the Issues of the Peace," *Ethics* 56 (1946): 273–9.
"Necessity and Persuasion in Plato's Timaeus," *Philosophical Review* 59 (1950): 147–63.
"Plato's Conception of Persuasion," *Philosophical Review* 62 (1953): 234–50.
Plato's Cretan City: An Historical Introduction to the Laws (Princeton, N.J., 1960).

Other Relevant Works
"The Ethics of the Wealth of Nations," with H. J. Davenport, *Philosophical Review* 34 (1925): 599–611.
"The Theory of Knowledge in Plato's Seventh Epistle," *Philosophical Review* 38 (1929): 326–49.
Ed. and trans., *Studies in the Platonic Epistles* (Urbana, Ill., 1935). 2nd edn, *Plato's Epistles* (Indianapolis, 1962).

"The Decline of Professional Morale," in *The Idea of a Modern University*, ed. Sidney Hook, Paul Kurtz, and Miro Todorovich (Buffalo, N.Y., 1974).

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v4, Proc of APA v46, Who's Who in Phil

Richard T. Hull

MOTHERSILL, Mary (1923–)

Mary Mothersill was born on 27 May 1923 in Edmonton, Alberta. She received her BA from the University of Toronto in 1944, and her PhD in philosophy from Harvard University in 1954. Her dissertation on value theory and the work of C. I. LEWIS and Charles STEVENSON was titled "Moral Theory and Meta-Ethics." Mothersill held appointments teaching philosophy at Vassar College from 1947 to 1951, Columbia University from 1951 to 1953, the University of Connecticut from 1953 to 1957, the University of Michigan from 1957 to 1958, the University of Chicago from 1958 to 1961, and Barnard College of Columbia University from 1964 until her retirement in 1992. She was also visiting scholar at Wolfson College, Oxford; All Soul's College, Oxford; and the University of London. She served as Vice President (1997–8) and President (1998–9) of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association. She is currently professor emerita and a senior scholar at Columbia University.

Mothersill's general approach to philosophy attempted to conjoin common-sense practices of ethical discussion and art criticism with philosophically informed ideas. This general approach toward philosophical practice can be seen in her paper "'Unique' as an Aesthetic Predicate" (1961). She argues that while many

claim that all artworks are unique, this claim is either unhelpful or uninteresting. She attempts to diffuse this platitude by showing that upon analysis, it has little substantive meaning. Of course, all works of art are unique insofar as they are ontologically distinct individuals, but this interpretation is uninteresting. If unique, however, is supposed to be a property that is a good-making quality of the work, then more needs to be said about exactly what it is about a particular work that makes it so unique, and thus the burden is placed on describing why that specific property is a good-making quality.

Mothersill's early work focused on ethics. Ethical philosophy at the time Mothersill was writing was in part concerned with the difficulties involved in advancing a theoretically neutral ethical philosophy. In order to combat this difficulty, philosophers utilized the distinction between normative ethics and metaethics. Metaethics is the branch of philosophy that purports to analyze ethical predicates and establish criteria for their application, and not commend or exhort any particular action, which belongs to the domain of normative ethics. Mothersill's ethics questioned the legitimacy of this distinction. Metaethical theories themselves are inherently normative, insofar as the normativity of ethical terms comes not only from the meanings of the words themselves, but also from the context in which they are used. It makes no sense, then, to attempt to understand their meaning in isolation. Further, philosophers' reliance on the view that normativity is the distinguishing feature of ethical discourse is mistaken if normative predicates such as "good" and "right" have application beyond the bounds of ethical discourse, and thus an analysis solely within the context of ethics will not exhaust the use to which these words can be put.

In Mothersill's aesthetics, a central theme is the resolution of a tension brought about by two vastly different claims. The first claim is that there are no principles or laws of taste that can be used to justify inferential judgments about whether works of art are beautiful. The second is that despite the first claim, legitimate judgments of works of art are possible. Criticism of the arts is both justified and fruitful, as evidenced both by the copious amount of art criticism that exists, as well as our strong, common-sense intuition that we are justified in taking a work of art to be beautiful. The solution to this tension turns on the question of relevance, which purports to ask: what features of art are relevant to successful and legitimate criticism of them? Drawing influence from David Hume and Immanuel Kant, as well as Arnold Isenberg, Mothersill claimed that beauty is the feature of art works that is relevant to proper aesthetic judgments. Her major book-length work *Beauty Restored* (1984) is an attempt to motivate this claim while providing an account of the meaning and indispensability of the concept of beauty in our philosophical and critical discourse.

Mothersill's account opposes a substantial portion of the aesthetic theory of her contemporaries, on the question of how her contemporaries addressed the question of relevance. Despite the many answers that were offered, many held that positive answers to the question (such as Monroe Beardsley's unity, complexity, and intensity) were either easily defeasible or trivial. This claim was the predominant insight of what Mothersill calls the "anti-theorists," which includes such figures as Paul Ziff, Morris Weitz, and Stuart Hampshire. Such proponents of the institutional theory of art such as George Dickie and Arthur Danto also belong to the catalogue of anti-theorists. In general, the anti-theorist contention is that since no good answer to the question of relevance is forthcoming, we should maintain that art is an open concept, subject to revision. While agreeing with the anti-theorists that rigid definitions of art are not worthwhile, Mothersill argued that the anti-theorists are still committed to principles of taste, that is, generalizations about what constitute legitimate critical features of a judgment of a work of art. If not, there would be nothing to distinguish works of art from things that are not works of art.

Mothersill finds a fundamental mistake in analytic philosophical aesthetics, contending that both pro-theorists and the anti-theorists alike accept the following argument about what an aesthetic theory of taste must look like: either there are principles of taste, or we are committed to subjectivism or relativism, and since subjectivism or relativism is clearly wrong, then we must accept principles of taste. This is a false dilemma. We do not have to accept either relativism or principles of taste, and can nevertheless have an account of what is important in works of art. It is the concept of beauty that provides the way out of this dilemma.

Mothersill's positive account of beauty claims that beautiful works cause pleasure in virtue of their aesthetic properties. Aesthetic properties are the properties of works of art that we take to be the cause of the pleasure that we experience. However, since any property of a work could just as well be a property of another work which does not please us, aesthetic properties must belong to individuals alone. Individuals are particular works of art, for example, paintings and faithful reproductions or particular pieces of music. The experience of aesthetic properties is characterized by what Mothersill refered to as "apprehensio ipsa," a phrase borrowed from Aquinas's account of the beautiful, which means "apprehension in itself." The term is intended to stress that more is involved in the experience of a beautiful thing than just mere perception of an object. Rather, when we recognize that an individual pleases us in a way we are accustomed to call aesthetic, the properties we point to when asked to express reasons for our judgment are the aesthetic properties. Through this account of beauty, there is thus a method for deciding which works of art are good ones, and a foundational justification for art criticism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Moral Philosophy and Meta-Ethics," *Journal of Philosophy* 49 (1952): 587–94.

"The Use of Normative Language," *Journal of Philosophy* 52 (1955): 401–11.

"Moral Knowledge," *Journal of Philosophy* 56 (1959): 755–63.

"'Unique' as an Aesthetic Predicate," *Journal of Philosophy* 58 (1961): 421–37.

"Critical Reasons," *Philosophical Quarterly* 11 (1961): 74–8.

Ethics (New York, 1965).

Beauty Restored (Oxford, 1984).

"Aesthetic Laws, Principles, and Properties," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 47 (1987): 77–82.

"The Antinomy of Taste," in *Kant's Aesthetics*, ed. Hud Hudson (Atascadero, Cal., 1991): 75–85.

"Beauty," in *A Companion to Aesthetics*, ed. David Cooper (Oxford, 1995): 44–51.

"In Defense of Hume and the Causal Theory of Taste," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 55 (1997): 312–17.

"Aesthetics: The Need for a Theory," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 24 (2000): 244–54.

Other Relevant Works

"C. I. Lewis: Hedonistic Ethics on a Kantian Model," *Philosophical Studies* 5 (1954): 81–7.

"Agents, Critics and Philosophers," *Mind* 69 (1960): 433–46.

"Critical Comments," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 20 (1961): 195–8.

"Professor Wick on Duties to Oneself," *Ethics* 71 (1961): 205–208.

"Professor Hughes on Moral Condemnation," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 40 (1962): 328–37.

"Professor Prior and Jonathan Edwards," *Review of Metaphysics* 16 (1962): 366–73.

"Anscombe's Account of the Practical Syllogism," *Philosophical Review* 71 (1962): 448–61.

"Is Art a Language?" *Journal of Philosophy* 62 (1965): 559–72.

"Introduction," to *Aesthetics and the Theory of Criticism*, ed. Arnold Isenberg, W. Callaghan, et al. (Chicago, 1973), pp. xix–xxxix.

"Notes on Feminism," *The Monist* 57 (1973): 105–14.

"*Apprehensio Ipsa Placet*: A Starting Point for Aesthetics," *Journal of Philosophy* 74 (1977): 733–35.

"Some Notes on What Can't Be Said," in *How Many Questions?* ed. Leigh Cauman (Indianapolis, 1983), pp. 208–22.

"The Moral Dilemmas Debate," in *Moral Dilemmas and Moral Theory*, ed. H. E. Mason (Oxford, 1996), pp. 66–85.

"Old Age," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 73 (1999): 9–23.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, Pres Addr of APA v10

Guyer, Paul. "Mary Mothersill's Beauty Restored," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 44 (1986): 245–55.

Isenberg, Arnold. "Critical Communication," *Philosophical Review* 58 (1949): 330–44.

Sircello, Guy. "Beauty in Shards and Fragments," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 48 (1990): 21–35.

Matthew Turner

MUELDER, Walter George (1907–2004)

Walter George Muelder was born on 1 March 1907 in Boody, Illinois, the son of Epke Hermann Muelder and Minne Horlitz Muelder. He grew up in a German Methodist parsonage and was introduced at a young age to the ideas of Boston personalism and Walter RAUSCHENBUSCH's social gospel. Muelder attended high school in Burlington, Iowa, and college at Knox College in Galesburg, Illinois, where he earned the BS degree in 1927. He earned his STB from Boston University in 1930 and completed his PhD in philosophy in 1933 under Edgar S. BRIGHTMAN at Boston University. His dissertation was titled "Individual Totalities in Ernst Troeltsch's Philosophy of History." Muelder completed a year of study in 1930–31 under Paul TILLICH in Frankfurt, Germany. The decade prior to the completion of Muelder's doctorate marked a time of growing commitment to the causes that would become lifelong passions: organized labor, pacifism, democratic socialism, ecumenism, and personalism.

During 1933–4, Muelder was a Methodist minister on a two-point circuit in northern Wisconsin. The next six years were spent at Berea College in Kentucky, where Muelder taught philosophy and the Bible until 1940. His first scholarly publications came during this time. Muelder also became more active in the Socialist Party, and he was a delegate to a convention of the Socialist Party in Chicago. However, Muelder was always "suspicious of those who read Marx through the eyes of sectarian socialist fundamentalism" (1983, p. 18). He rejected Stalinist Communism in favor of a democratic socialism that was both self-critical and respectful of civil liberties.

In 1940 Muelder accepted an appointment at the University of Southern California to teach Christian theology and Christian ethics. During World War II, Muelder was an outspoken pacifist and also spoke out against the relocation of both Japanese American citizens and noncitizens into concentration camps. He became increasingly aware of widespread discrimination and racism, and his commitment to civil rights for persons of all races grew stronger.

In 1945 Muelder became Dean of Boston University School of Theology, an appointment he held until 1972. During his tenure as Dean, Muelder became one of the world's most prominent ecumenical leaders. He served the World Council of Churches for many years, serving in many high-level capacities, including Chair of the Commission on Institutionalism from 1955 to 1963 and Chair of the Board of the Ecumenical Institute from 1961 to 1968. After his retirement, Muelder taught occasional courses at Boston University for many years

until 1994. Muelder died on 12 June 2004 in Boston, Massachusetts.

Muelder was an outstanding educator and scholar who helped bring greater coherence and relevance to the discipline of Christian social ethics, and he helped continue to deepen and strengthen the Boston personalist tradition. Muelder also had a lasting influence on society through the prophetic works and words of his students. Martin Luther KING, Jr., the most well-known student at Boston University during Muelder's tenure, points to Muelder as being a significant influence on his approach to social action even though he did not take a course with Muelder. Muelder remained committed to the political ideals of democratic socialism even in the midst of the rabid anticommunism of the 1950s. At times critics referred to him as the part of the "pink fringe of Methodism," a criticism he once made humorous by having pink lining sewed into one of his jackets for a special School of Theology occasion.

Perhaps more than any other Boston personalist, Muelder emphasized the communitarian nature of the person. Muelder described the person as a socius with a private center, affirming both the person's relations to the community and the integrity of the person's experience. The person-in-community does not exist outside of relations with the community, but the person is also not just the sum of his or her relations. According to Muelder, "Wholes have qualities which the parts (components) do not have." Although the "person-in-community" perspective is reflected in Brightman's formulations of the personalistic moral laws, Brightman's main emphasis is on the individual person. Boston philosopher L. Harold DeWolf and Muelder expanded on Brightman's formulations by highlighting their communitarian aspects and emphasizing the social experience of persons. Muelder argued that the communitarian aspects of the moral laws are implicit in Brightman's formulations, but it is important to emphasize the social context in which personal moral responsibility takes place. The communitarian aspects of the moral laws focus on the question: "In what social context do we choose?" The communitarian moral laws include the Law of Co-operation, the Law of Social Devotion, and the Law of Ideal Community (1966, pp. 113–24). All three of these laws presuppose that human persons are a part of a moral community in which they "are aware that they share common goals and experiences and make decisions in light of this awareness" (1966, p. 114).

Muelder also reflected on the implications of Boston personalism for ecological ethics. He made a personalist investigation of the person/body/environment relationship in his essay, "Person as Embodied and Embedded" (1994). Muelder held to the more traditional personalist definition of person "as an experient (a self) capable of reason and willing ideal values" (1994, p. 1). However, he realized that such a definition of person is problematic when coupled with the traditional personalist understanding of reality as "a society of persons divine and human." The ontological status of nonhuman beings comes into question when both formulations are accepted. Instead of altering the traditional personalist view of the person, Muelder modified the personalist conception of reality. He affirmed the ontological status of nonhuman aspects of nature and leans towards expanding the "notion of experience beyond consciousness as, for example, is done in the philosophies of [Charles] PEIRCE, [John] DEWEY, and [Robert] NEVILLE." Muelder affirmed the reality of "preconscious transactions which are value oriented," and he includes such transactions, or experiences, in his definition of reality. He agreed with Peter A. BERTOCCI and John H. LAVELY that "the various modalities of the subconscious and unconscious … belong to the person as a whole," and he agrees with Lavely that mind and body are abstractions, "partial differentiations of a more fundamental reality."

Muelder's recognition of the reality and value of nonhuman experients allows him to expand

his notion of community to include all of life. Thus his position may be described as an ecological communitarian personalism that affirms the person-in-ecological-community. His view of our intimate connection with nature and his view that non-human beings are also centers of value activity, led him to adopt Albert Schweitzer's position that human persons should practice a "reverence for life." Muelder believed this attitude should express itself through efforts to create a just, participatory, and ecologically sustainable society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Religion and Economic Responsibility (New York, 1953).

The Idea of a Responsible Society (Boston, 1955).

In Every Place a Voice (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1957).

Foundations of a Responsible Society (New York, 1960).

Methodist Social Thought and Action. Methodism and Society in the Twentieth Century, vol. 2 (New York, 1961).

Moral Law in Christian Social Ethics (Richmond, Virg., 1966).

The Ethical Edge of Christian Theology: Forty Years of Communitarian Personalism (New York, 1984).

Other Relevant Works

Muelder's papers are at Boston University.

Historical Outline of the Bible, with Edgar S. Brightman (Berea, Kent., 1936).

Ed. with Lawrence Sears, *The Development of American Philosophy: A Book of Readings* (Boston, 1940; 2nd edn 1960).

"Personalism, Theology, and Natural Law," *Philosophical Forum* 14 (1956): 3–20.

"Person and Community," *Philosophical Forum* 20 (1962): 35–59.

"The Ecological Era," *The Foundation* 67 (1970): 3–25.

"Socialism Revisited: A Personalistic Perspective," *Idealistic Studies* 9 (1979): 1–16.

"Pilgrimage to Communitarian Personalism," in *Foundation of Ethics*, ed. Leroy Rouner (Notre Dame, Ind., 1983), pp. 76–97.

Ed. with Nils Ehrenstrom, *Institutionalism and Church Unity: A Symposium* (New York, 1983).

"Communitarian Dimensions of the Moral Laws," in *The Boston Personalist Tradition in Philosophy, Social Ethics, and Theology*, ed. Paul Deats and Carol Robb (Macon, Georgia, 1986), pp. 237–52.

"Personalism's Debt to Hegel," in *The Boston Personalist Tradition in Philosophy, Social Ethics, and Theology*, ed. Paul Deats and Carol Robb (Macon, Georgia, 1986), pp. 39–54.

"Edgar S. Brightman: Person and Moral Philosopher," in *The Boston Personalist Tradition in Philosophy, Social Ethics, and Theology*, ed. Paul Deats and Carol Robb (Macon, Georgia, 1986), pp. 105–20.

"Autobiographical Sketch," in *Personalism Revisited: Its Proponents and Critics*, ed. Thomas O. Buford and Harold H. Oliver (Amsterdam and New York, 2002), pp. 125–7.

Further Reading

Who's Who in Phil

Blackwell, Michael D. *Pacifism in the Social Ethics of Walter George Muelder* (Lewiston, N.Y., 1995).

Burrow, Rufus, Jr. *Personalism: A Critical Introduction* (St. Louis, 1999).

Deats, Paul, ed. *Toward a Discipline of Social Ethics: Essays in Honor of Walter George Muelder* (Boston, 1972). Contains a bibliography of Muelder's writings.

Mark Y. A. Davies

MUELLER, Gustav Emil (1898–1987)

Gustav Mueller was born on 12 May 1898 in Bern, Switzerland. He received the BA from Gymnasium Bern in 1917, took the Staatsexamen in 1920, studied at the University of Heidelberg in 1921, and received the PhD in philosophy from the University of Bern in 1923, with a dissertation on the relation of Marx to Hegel. He studied in the British Museum in 1924. Beginning in 1925, he taught at the University of Oregon for five years before the onset of the depression of the 1930s forced the university to cut about one-fourth of its faculty. In 1930 he accepted a position as associate professor of philosophy at the University of Oklahoma. He was promoted to full professor in 1940, and he taught there until his retirement in 1968. He served as Chairman of the department from 1942 to 1947, and was among the first faculty members named Research Professor. Mueller was elected President of the Southwestern Philosophical Society for 1947. After returning to his native Bern in 1968, he continued to teach for another six years and published a number of smaller writings on a variety of subjects. Mueller died on 10 July 1987 in Bern, Switzerland.

Mueller rejected the label of "Hegelian" that was sometimes applied to him, preferring to be known as a *systematic* philosopher. He never denied that Hegel was an important influence on his thinking, and he published several books (in English and German) and numerous essays about Hegel; but he regarded Plato, and not Hegel, as (in his words) "the founder of philosophy as dialectic." Mueller's published work spans more than half a century, covering almost every topic that philosophers have found worth thinking about, including art, architecture, ontology, religion, history, education, politics, war, poetry, and fiction. He wrote several studies of American philosophers, and published a book, *Amerikanische Philosophie* (1936) that was among the first German-language surveys of American philosophy.

A recurring theme in Mueller's writings is the impossibility of ever formulating a final and complete statement of the truth. In Hegel's famous phrase, "*das Wahre ist das Ganze*" (the truth is the whole – that is, everything). This means, in the words of Alfred North WHITEHEAD, that "in philosophical discussion, the merest hint of dogmatic certainty as to finality of statement is an exhibition of folly" (in the Preface to *Process and Reality*). If we invest our position with such illusory finality and completeness, we cease to be philosophers and become ideologues. Ideology is incompatible with true philosophy, and is the enemy of truth.

In what is probably his best-known essay, "The Hegel Legend of 'Thesis–Antithesis–Synthesis'," Mueller inveighs against the embalming of Hegel's living dialectic into a bloodless abstract formula. In Mueller's view, we have (literally) endless concrete instantiations of dialectic, which obviate the need ever to be satisfied with reciting the vacuous *thesis-antithesis* mantra. Mueller's own life exemplified the richness and diversity found in his philosophical reflections. He published seven volumes of poems (all in German) and wrote four plays (two in English and two in German), two of which were actually staged. He played the guitar and composed music for that instrument. He loved good food and good wine and, even more, good conversation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Geschichtsphilosophie Grundbegriffe bei Marx (Bern, Switzerland, 1924).

Indien. Ein Zyklus in Arabesken und Andere Gedichte (Bern, Switzerland, 1927).

"The Paradox of Ethics," *Ethics* 39 (1929): 456–68.

"Concerning Platonic Aesthetics," *Journal of Philosophy* 30 (1933): 337–46.

Amerikanische Philosophie (Stuttgart, Germany, 1936; 2nd edn 1950).

"Plato and the Gods," *Philosophical Review* 45 (1936): 457–72.

Philosophy of Our Uncertainties (Norman, Okla., 1936).

"The Art of Living," *Ethics* 48 (1937):

401–15.

What Plato Thinks (Chicago, 1937).

Der Mensch im Sein (Stuttgart, Germany, 1938).

Hegel über Offenbarung, Kirche und Philosophie (Munich, Germany, 1938).

Hegel über Sittlichkeit und Geschichte (Munich, Germany, 1939).

"On Being and Becoming," *Philosophy of Science* 10 (1943): 149–62.

"The One and the Many," *Philosophical Review* 53 (1944): 46–61.

"What is Man?" *Philosophical Review* 53 (1944): 444–64.

"Experimental and Existential Time," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 6 (1946): 424–35.

Abseits: Gedichte von Gustav E. Müller (Bern, Switzerland, 1946).

"The Function of Aesthetics in Hegel's Philosophy," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 5 (1947): 49–53.

Philosophy of Literature (New York, 1948).

The World as Spectacle (New York, 1948).

Education Limited (Norman, Okla., 1949).

Discourses on Religion (New York, 1951; 2nd edn 1965).

Dialectic: A Way into and within Philosophy (New York, 1956).

The Interplay of Opposites: A Dialectical Ontology (New York, 1956).

"The Hegel Legend of 'Thesis–Antithesis–Synthesis'," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 19 (1958): 411–4.

Hegel: Denkgeschichte eines Lebendigen (Bern, Switzerland, 1959).

Plato: The Founder of Philosophy as Dialectic (New York, 1965).

Origins and Dimensions of Philosophy: Some Correlations (New York, 1965).

Hegel: The Man, His Vision and Work (New York, 1968).

Other Relevant Works

Trans., *Hegel: Encyclopedia* (New York, 1959).

Instead of a Biography (New York, 1970).

Schwimmer im Licht: Gedichte und Doppelreime (Bern, Switzerland, 1982).

Further Reading

Who's Who in Phil

Shafer, Ingrid H. "Gustav Mueller," *The Owl of Minerva* 19 (Fall 1987): 125–6.

Kenneth R. Merrill

MULFORD, Elisha (1833–85)

Elisha Mulford was born on 19 November 1833 in Montrose, Pennsylvania, to Silvanus Sandford Mulford, owner of a local general store. Raised an orthodox Congregationalist, he began his education at Cortland Academy in New York, and entered Yale University in 1852. It was during his years at Yale that Mulford's Congregationalist beliefs began to erode. He graduated with his BA in 1855 and then studied law with his uncle, William Jessup. Mulford then studied theology at Andover and Union Theological Seminaries, originally intending to pursue a career as a Congregationalist minister. However, time spent at both academies apparently confirmed Mulford's spiritual crisis and, shortly after finishing Andover, he became an Episcopalian. Mulford then embarked on a European tour, spending considerable time in Halle and Heidelberg in Germany. He returned to the United States and was ordained deacon in the Episcopal Church in 1861 and priest in 1862. Mulford married Rachel Price Carmalt on 17 September 1862.

Mulford held a number of ministerial posts, in Darien, Connecticut (1861); South Orange, New Jersey (1861–4); and Friendsville, Pennsylvania (1877–81). From 1864 to 1877 he lived in his hometown without clerical responsibilities. He received an LLD from Yale in 1872, wrote several pieces for the

Independent and *Scribner's Monthly*, and also produced his two most significant publications, *The Nation* (1870) and *The Republic of God* (1881), during these years. In 1881, Mulford moved to Cambridge, Massachusetts, and began teaching apologetics at the Episcopal Theological School there. He also lectured at schools and societies in the surrounding area and continued writing, producing several articles for the *Independent* during this period. Mulford died on 9 December 1885 in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and is buried in Sleepy Hollow Cemetery in Concord, Massachusetts.

Mulford was greatly influenced by the thinking of G. W. F. Hegel, F. J. Stahl, F. A. Trendelenburg, J. K. Bluntschli, and Frederick Denison Maurice, with whom he was personally acquainted. His first work, *The Nation*, sought to define the origins, function, and ethical underpinnings of the state; while *The Republic of God* joined religion with philosophy to posit an expansive vision of the universe emphasizing the role of the individual. In both works, Mulford joined religious language with democratic nationalism and underscored the importance of "natural rights," which he believed were merely formalized by the Constitution. *The Nation* is considered to be one of the earliest methodical examinations of political theory by an American writer.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Nation: The Foundations of Civil Order and Political Life in the United States (New York, 1870).
The Republic of God: An Institute of Theology (Boston, 1881).

Further Reading

Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio
Brown, Colin. "Elisha Mulford (1833–85) and His Influence: A 'Fame Not Equal To His Deserts'?" *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 108 (January 1984): 25–58.

Duyckinck, Evert A., and George L. Duyckinck. "Mulford, Elisha," in *Cyclopaedia of American Literature*, vol. 2 (Philadelphia, 1875), pp. 946–7.
Herzberg, Max J. *The Reader's Encyclopedia of American Literature* (New York, 1962), p. 772.

Margaret Nunnelley

MULLINS, Edgar Young (1860–1928)

E. Y. Mullins was born on 5 January 1860 in Franklin County, Mississippi, the fourth of eleven children. The son and grandson of Baptist ministers, at the age of sixteen Mullins entered the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas and graduated in 1879. He experienced an evangelical "conversion" the next year, was baptized by his father, and within a year was studying for the ministry at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky. Upon graduation in 1885, he served pastorates in Harrodsburg, Kentucky (1885–8), Baltimore, Maryland (1888–95), and after a brief stint with his denomination's mission board, served his final pastorate in Newton Centre, Massachusetts (1896–9). He left Massachusetts to return to the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary as the school's fourth president in 1899 and served until his death. Mullins died on 23 November 1928 in Louisville, Kentucky.

During his three decades of leadership, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary was the largest seminary in the world and Mullins became his denomination's most recognized theologian and spokesperson. His was the guiding hand in the preparation of *The Baptist Faith and Message*, Southern Baptists' first official confession, published in 1925. Besides his duties as seminary administrator

and professor of theology, he served as President of the Southern Baptist Convention from 1921 to 1924 and played a key role in forming the Baptist World Alliance, serving that international fellowship as President from 1923 to 1928. His literary output included seventeen books and nearly one hundred articles, pamphlets, and book reviews. At the time of his death the seminary erected a memorial which honored Mullins as "preacher, teacher, scholar, administrator, Christian statesman, world citizen, and servant of God."

Mullins's thought was rooted in traditional Baptist theology, to which his ministerial ordination attested. He readily affirmed the idea of a religious conversion (as had been his own experience) while at the same time insisting that good works were the expected evidence of such an experience. The seven years in Baltimore proved formative in an enhanced social consciousness as he observed and sought to address some of the societal ills of a diverse urban environment. That setting, plus the New England pastorate, also provided an opportunity to broaden his theological thought through dialogue with various university faculties. He became conversant with the ideas of European and American thinkers who were influencing theology, philosophy, and psychology.

Mullins could be described as an evangelical, but not a fundamentalist. The modernist-fundamentalist controversy formed the backdrop for his years of leadership and influence and he sought to be a mediating voice. He affirmed traditional Christology and the supernaturalism of the Bible but refused to dismiss evolutionary theory (his position resembling that of theistic evolution), and insisted that science and religion both had vital roles to play and that both should be free to pursue their paths autonomously. He staunchly defended the historical Christian faith, while at the same time being critical of interpreting that faith in a manner that was isolated from other disciplines. The spirit of the times made it difficult to promote any kind of meaningful balance and he was offended by what he considered to be the abrasive approach of many in both the fundamentalist and modernist movements.

Religious experience emerged as critical to Mullins's approach. While he arrived at different conclusions owing to his evangelical convictions, he was nonetheless informed by the experiential emphasis of Friedrich Schleiermacher, the personalism of Borden Parker BOWNE, and especially the pragmatism of William JAMES. Their influence was clearly evident in his apologetic offering, *Why is Christianity True?* They provided concepts that were helpful to him in understanding and discussing the faith and the reality of conversion. He saw the experience of the individual as the starting part for theological understanding and insisted that Christian experience was clear evidence of God's activity in the world.

In *Axioms of Religion*, Mullins's best-known work, he tried to interpret the identity and distinctive message of Baptists. In his estimation their historical significance could be summed up in an insistence on the "competency of the soul in religion," by which he meant that "all souls have an equal right to direct access to God," and that "religion is a personal matter between the soul and God." That denied any religion by proxy (and thus invalidated infant baptism), insisting instead upon a personal experience of justification and regeneration, and a resultant congregation of believers in which baptism evidenced individual faith. It also demanded a separation of Church and state, since a person's acceptance or rejection of religious faith must involve no external coercion.

Mullins managed to navigate his course during difficult decades when American Christianity, and especially Protestantism, seemed polarized by two competing positions. He maintained relationships, though often strained, with those in the theological camps of

both conservatives and moderates. In his beloved Southern Baptist Convention, and among Baptists and evangelicals in general, Mullins's thought remains pervasive as a source of reference and as a stimulus for discussion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Why is Christianity True? (Philadelphia, 1905).

The Historical Significance of the Baptists (Richmond, Virg., 1907).

The Axioms of Religion: A New Interpretation of the Baptist Faith (Philadelphia, 1908; 2nd edn, Nashville, Tenn., 1978).

Baptist Beliefs (Philadelphia, 1912).

Freedom and Authority in Religion (Philadelphia, 1913).

The Christian Religion in Its Doctrinal Expression (Philadelphia, 1917).

The Life in Christ (New York, 1917).

Spiritualism, A Delusion (Nashville, Tenn., 1920).

Christianity at the Cross Roads (Philadelphia, 1924).

Other Relevant Works

Mullins's papers are at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky.

"Is Jesus the Author of Religious Authority?" *The Review and Expositor* 1 (1904): 55–70.

"The Theological Trend," *The Review and Expositor* 2 (1905): 506–21.

"Baptists in the Modern World," *The Review and Expositor* 8 (1911): 345–52.

"The Modern Issue as to the Person of Christ," *The Review and Expositor* 8 (1911): 13–31.

"The Jesus of Liberal Theology," *The Review and Expositor* 12 (1915): 174–92.

"Nietzsche and His Doctrine," *The Review and Expositor* 12 (1915): 20–28.

"Pragmatism, Humanism, and Personalism," *The Review and Expositor* 5 (1918): 501–15.

"The Contribution of Baptists to the Interpretation of Christianity," *The Review and Expositor* 20 (1923): 383–95.

"The Present Situation," *The Review and Expositor* 20 (1923): 129–37.

"God and War," *The Review and Expositor* 21 (1924): 456–58.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v21*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Ellis, William. *A Man of Books and a Man of the People: E. Y. Mullins and the Crisis of Moderate Southern Baptist Leadership* (Macon, Georgia, 1985).

Mullins, Isla May. *Edgar Young Mullins: An Intimate Biography* (Nashville, Tenn., 1929).

Schreiner, Thomas, ed. *E. Y. Mullins in Retrospect* (Louisville, Kent., 1999).

Michael Don Thompson

MUMFORD, Lewis (1895–1990)

Lewis Mumford was born on 19 October 1895 in Flushing, Long Island, New York, and he died on 26 January 1990 in Amenia, New York. He spent his childhood in New York City, exploring and studying the city, its neighborhoods, and cultural life. He attended the College of the City of New York, Columbia University, and the New School. Although he excelled at his studies, he never received a college diploma. He enlisted in the US Navy in April 1918 and after World War I established himself as a journalist and cultural critic. In the course of his sixty-year career as a writer, he published some thirty books and over a

thousand short essays and reviews. Mumford received many honorary degrees and was a visiting professor at several prestigious universities including Stanford University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the University of Pennsylvania, and the University of California, Berkeley.

Mumford was a founding member of the Regional Planning Association of America and was an honorary member of many planning institutes. In 1961 Mumford received the National Book Award for his *The City in History*, a monumental work that focused on the evolution of the city from ancient times to the present. In later years, he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1964, the National Medal for Literature in 1972, Prix Mondial del Duca in 1976, the National Medal of Arts in 1986, and the Smithsonian Institution's Hodgkins Gold Medal. He was made a Knight Commander of the British Empire in 1975. Known as one of the great public intellectuals of the twentieth century, Mumford played an important role in shaping public policy debates in the United States, including those on urban development, transportation, housing and the environment, opposition to the Vietnam War, and nuclear disarmament.

Mumford's work is unsurpassed in its intellectual depth and originality. He synthesized the insights of many philosophers, planners, writers, and cultural critics while developing his own distinctive and holistic approach to understanding the human condition. Patrick Geddes's work on urban development motivated Mumford to study and understand the relationship of human interaction and the environment. Walt WHITMAN taught him the importance of human creativity, culture, and subjectivity. He shared a long dialogue with Van Wyck Brooks, with whom he expressed a deep passion and concern for the troubling discrepancy between the ideals of democracy and freedom and the reality of material suffering in the United States. Whereas Karl Marx viewed human development as a succession

of class struggles and revolutions in the mode of production, Mumford viewed history as a cultural product that is contingent and open. Rather than following a developmental logic, history is a sequence of remote events and actions where small and ostensibly remote decisions can have far-reaching global consequences. Reflecting the American philosopher George SANTAYANA, who argued that those who forget the past are condemned to relive it, Mumford noted that those who do not review the past will "not have the sufficient insight to understand the present or command the future: for the past never leaves us and the future is already here" (1967, p. 13).

Mumford rejected the philosophy of *homo faber*, man the tool-user, and embraced a conception of humans as *homo symbolicus*, as meaning creators, symbol users, and signifying agents. This conception is most prominent in his historical studies of the city and urban culture. To Mumford, the "city was primarily a storehouse, a conservator and accumulator" of culture and human creativity (1961, p. 97). Diverse groups and organizations, along with a heterogeneity of abstract designs, scripts, and verbal signs contributed to the notion of the city as a container of human culture and a magnet for attracting people and ideas. One important concern in Mumford's work was to understand the reflexive relationship between cemeteries and cultural creation. The "necropolis," the "city of the dead," Mumford argued, "is the forerunner, almost to the core, of every living city" (1961, p. 7). Every culture's respect for the dead is a cultural expression of the human desire for a "fixed meeting place and eventually a continuous settlement" (pp. 6–7). Cemeteries, sacred caves, and shrines gave people their first conception of architectural space and their first glimpse of the power of a territory and space to intensify spiritual receptivity and emotional exaltation, a view closely shared by sociologist Emile Durkheim in his *Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. More broadly, Mumford's insight on the evolution of cities drew attention

to the formative role of cemeteries and other sacred places in the development of Western culture. As he put it, "in the earliest gathering about a grave or a painted symbol, a great stone or sacred grove, one has the beginning of a succession of civic institutions that range from the temple to the astronomical observatory, from the theatre to the university" (p. 9).

Mumford's views of the city and culture played an important role in the development of a vision of modern architecture and urban planning. In the 1920s and 1930s he helped found the Regional Planning Association of American, an informal group of architects and planners. Through his group, Mumford called for the establishment of "regional cities" as an alternative to the deleterious consequences of urban congestion. Similar to Ebenezer Howard's conception of the "garden city," the regional city would be a sustainable community surrounded by farms that would supply the city with food and nourishment. Mumford developed these ideas in the context of the rapid socioeconomic transformation of urban America. His idea of regional cities embraced decentralized pedestrian spaces and regional planning to manage human development on a scale that respects the natural environment, and enlivens culture and human life. Although he championed small-scale, decentralized development, Mumford was an outspoken opponent of suburban sprawl and viewed suburbs as anti-cities that decimate nature and culture. He also railed against large-scale public works including urban renewal slum clearance programs, expressway building, and high-rise public housing developments. Such mammoth projects struck him as arrogant expressions of a depraved culture. He inveighed against both the congestion of people and activity in urban areas as causing alienation. In the 1950s he fiercely resisted and campaigned against Robert Moses's efforts to build an expressway through New York City's Washington Square Park. In this capacity, Mumford became a major inspiration for the mobilization of historic preservation groups and other grassroots organizations dedicated to preserving the cultural vitality of the city.

Mumford was an intense critique of the dehumanizing tendencies of modern science and technology, an interest that reflects long-standing sociological and philosophical concerns with the destructive aspects of modernity. In his early work, *Technics and Civilization* (1934), Mumford viewed technology as a force of social betterment and liberation that would lead to improvements in society. Yet he also drew upon Thorsten VEBLEN to argue that modern society's domination of nature had empowered capitalism, so "that human gains of technics have been forfeited by perversion in the interests of a pecuniary economy" (1934, p. 377). In his *The Myth of the Machine* (1970), however, he embraced a deeply cynical view of technology as a deleterious force that corrupts culture and debases human beings. Reflecting Max Weber's critique of the "iron cage" of instrumental rationality, Mumford assailed modern society's singular reliance on bureaucratic-technological solutions to social problems. One of his most famous concepts was the *megamachine*, a centralized power structure dedicated to conquest, exploitation, and cultural domination. The first megamachines appeared in the early civilizations of China, Egypt, and India. In these societies, an insular and select group of elites created a hierarchical system of social relations that regimented and enslaved people using the precepts of efficiency, calculability, specialization, and technological control. For Mumford, megamachines have a long history and there is a clear historical trajectory from the megamachines that created the Egyptian pyramids, the St. Petersburg of Peter the Great, and the nuclear arsenals during the Cold War. Mumford probed far back into history to undercover the origins and development of megamachines in an effort to understand modern society's single-minded obsession with technology, science, and bureaucratic power.

Throughout his intellectual life, Mumford cultivated himself as an antagonist toward consumerism, military conquest, and bureaucratic rationalism. Like Daniel Riesman, C. Wright MILLS, and other public intellectuals, Mumford seemed at odds with the dominant trends in US society, culture, architecture, and metropolitan development. One of Mumford's more poignant arguments was that twentieth-century fascism and communism were the most recent manifestations of the military-bureaucratic despotism of ancient regimes. In *The Myth of the Machine* Mumford attacked the US Pentagon as the most recent example of a horrific militarism, a "symbol of the absurdity of totalitarian absolutism" (1970, pp. 180–81). The pentagon is a metaphor in Mumford's work with the five vertices each representing a key concept: power, prestige, property, productivity, and profit. These elements are functionally interconnected and operate in a holistic fashion to organize destruction on a planetary scale. Yet the irony for Mumford is that vast population of the world is now subject to the decisions of a small number of technocratic experts whose narrow specialization and insularity breed incompetence and ineptitude that can have lethal consequences.

Mumford's works share a concern that humans create the organizations and technologies that ultimately come to enslave them. For example, in 1970, when the World Trade Center was being built, he assailed the structure as "a characteristic example of the purposeless giantism and technological exhibitionism that are now eviscerating the living tissue of every great city" (1970, pp. 340–41). Mumford's writings in his later years increasingly embrace an apocalyptic tone with forewarnings of impending doom and catastrophe. Despite his pessimism, Mumford stressed that any genuine and meaningful response to the crisis of modern society must begin in the realm of psyche and seek to redefine the self and subjectivity. His experience taught him that social change "is not merely a matter of appropriating catchwords or starting [political parties]: it is a matter of altering the entire basis upon which our present venal and mechanistic and life-denying civilization rests" (Luccareli 1995, p. 19). Mumford's prescient critiques continue to be revered and celebrated and his work has become more popular with scholars over the years. He is now rightly acknowledged as a social theorist whose ideas and insights are recognized by sociologists, philosophers, and literary critics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Story of Utopias (New York, 1922).

Sticks and Stones: A Study of American Architecture and Civilization (New York, 1924).

The Golden Day: A Study in American Experience and Culture (New York, 1926).

American Taste (San Francisco, 1929).

Herman Melville: A Study of His Life and Vision (New York, 1929).

The Brown Decades: A Study of the Arts in America, 1865–1895 (New York, 1931).

Technics and Civilization (New York, 1934).

The Culture of Cities (New York, 1938).

Men Must Act (New York, 1939).

Faith for Living (New York, 1940).

The South in Architecture (New York, 1941).

The School of Humanities: A Description (Stanford, Cal., 1942).

The Social Foundations of Post-War Building (London, 1943).

Thomas Beer, Artistocrat of Letters (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1944).

The Condition of Man (New York, 1944).

City Development: Studies in Disintegration and Renewal (New York, 1945).

Values for Survival: Essays, Addresses, and Letters on Politics and Education by Lewis Mumford (New York, 1946).

Man as Interpreter (New York, 1950).

The Conduct of Life (New York, 1951).

Art and Technics (New York, 1952).

Toward a Free World: Long-Range Planning under Democratic Control (New York, 1952).

In the Name of Sanity (New York 1954).

From the Ground Up: Observations on Contemporary Architecture, Housing, Highway Building, and Civic Design (New York, 1956).

The Transformations of Man (New York, 1956).

The Human Way Out (Wallingford, Penn., 1958).

Roots of Contemporary American Architecture (New York, 1959).

The City in History: Its Origins, Its Transformations, and Its Prospects (New York, 1961).

The Story of Utopia (New York, 1962).

The Highway and the City (New York, 1963).

The Myth of the Machine, Vol. 1: Technics and Human Development (New York, 1967).

The Urban Prospect (New York, 1968).

Ralph Waldo Emerson: Essays and Journals (Garden City, N.Y. 1968).

Myth of the Machine, Vol. 2: The Pentagon of Power (New York, 1970).

Interpretations and Forecasts, 1922–1972: Studies in Literature, History, Biography, Technics, and Contemporary Society (New York, 1973).

The Future of Technics and Civilization (London, 1986).

Other Relevant Works

Mumford's papers are at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia.

The Human Prospect, ed. Harry T. Moore and Karl W. Deutsch (Boston, 1955).

Architecture as a Home for Man: Essays for Architectural Record, ed. Jeanne M. Davern (New York, 1975).

My Works and Days: A Personal Chronicle (New York, 1979).

Sketches from Life: The Autobiography of Lewis Mumford, the Early Years (New York, 1982).

Lewis Mumford and Patrick Geddes: The Correspondence, ed. Frank G. Novak (New York, 1995).

The Lewis Mumford Reader, ed. Donald L. Miller (Athens, Georgia, 1995).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Who Was Who in Amer v10*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Blake, Casey N. *Beloved Community: The Cultural Criticism of Randolph Bourne, Van Wyck Brooks, Waldo Frank & Lewis Mumford* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1990).

Halton, Eugene. "Lewis Mumford's Organic Worldview," in *Bereft of Reason: On the Decline of Social Thought and Prospects for its Renewal* (Chicago, 1995), chap. 4.

Hughes, Thomas P., and Agatha C. Hughes, eds. *Lewis Mumford: Public Intellectual* (Oxford, 1990).

Luccarelli, Mark. *Lewis Mumford and the Ecological Region: The Politics of Planning* (New York, 1995).

Miller, Donald L. *Lewis Mumford: A Life* (New York, 1989).

Newman, Elmer S. *Lewis Mumford: A Bibliography, 1914–1970* (New York, 1971).

Kevin Fox Gotham

MUNGER, Theodore Thornton
(1830–1910)

Theodore Munger was born on 5 March 1830 in Bainbridge, New York. He received his BA from Yale College in 1851, and then graduated from Yale Divinity School in 1855. After some graduate study at Andover Theological School,

he was ordained in 1856 and served as pastor of Village Congregational Church in Dorchester, Massachusetts until 1860. He then was pastor at various churches around Boston, in Haverhill, Massachusetts from 1863 to 1869, Providence, Rhode Island from 1869 to 1871, and Lawrence, Massachusetts from 1871 to 1875.

With the assistance of the liberal Washington GLADDEN, Yale College President Noah PORTER, and William College's Mark HOPKINS, Munger overcame conservative Congregationalist objections to be installed minister at the North Adams Church in Massachusetts, where he served from 1877 to 1885. The United Congregational Church in New Haven called Munger in 1885, where he preached until retiring in 1901. He also was a fellow of Yale University from 1887 until his death. He died on 11 January 1910 in New Haven, Connecticut.

Munger was one of the most prominent Congregational clergy who represented the sudden collapse of the denomination's Calvinism during the 1870s and 1880s in favor of a more progressive and liberal Christianity. With other progressives such as Newman SMYTH at the neighboring First Congregational Church of New Haven, and George HARRIS and William Jewett TUCKER at Andover Theological Seminary, Munger demanded a reconciliation between the divine and the natural, and between religion and science. Under the label of "progressive orthodoxy," this new theology welcomed historicism and biblical criticism, which understood the Bible as a humanly created record of God's gradual revelation to humanity described in poetry and metaphor, and that this communion of experience with God has continued to the present. A disciple of Horace BUSHNELL, Munger based his theology on lived experience rather than Calvinism's abstract principles. Abandoning supernaturalism and demanding that religion answer to reason, he searched for common-sense and understandable ways of depicting God, nature, and humanity in close relation.

Munger's *Freedom of Faith* (1883) was his most studied book, and its prefatory essay on "The New Theology" came to be regarded as the movement's first statement of principles. Most controversial were his positions on de-emphasizing biblical authority, toleration of divergent religious opinions, the acceptability of evolution, and the thesis that personal responsibility for sin in this life should be replaced by social responsibility for each other with further opportunity after death to achieve salvation. He consistently argued with his denomination in favor of intellectual freedom, combating periodic efforts to enforce rigid creeds on clergy and church members. Munger's understanding of religion as powerfully influential and essential for the moral development of society towards the Kingdom of Christ was one of the themes picked up and pursued by the Social Gospel movement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

On the Threshold (Boston, 1881).
The Freedom of Faith (Boston, 1883).
Lamps and Paths (Boston, 1884).
The Appeal to Life (Boston, 1887).
Character through Inspiration, and Other Papers (Boston, 1897).
Horace Bushnell: Preacher and Theologian (Boston, 1899).
The Message of Christ to Mankind (Boston, 1899).
Essays for the Day (Boston, 1904).

Other Relevant Works
Munger's papers are at Yale University.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v31*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Bacon, Benjamin W. *Theodore Thornton Munger: New England Minister* (New Haven, Conn., 1913).
Dorrien, Gary. *The Making of American Liberal Theology: Imagining Progressive*

Religion, 1805–1900 (Louisville, Kent., 2001), pp. 293–304.

<div style="text-align:right">John R. Shook</div>

MUNITZ, Milton Karl (1913–95)

Milton K. Munitz was born on 10 July 1913 in New York City. He received his BA from City College of New York in 1933, and his MA in 1935 and PhD in philosophy in 1939 from Columbia University. His dissertation was on "The Moral Philosophy of Santayana." In 1946 he became assistant professor of philosophy at New York University, was promoted up to full professor, and served as department chair from 1968 to 1973. In 1973 he was appointed Distinguished Professor of Philosophy at Bernard Baruch College of the City University of New York, and for the next ten years until retiring in 1983 he also was a member of the Graduate Faculty of CUNY. Munitz received Ford, Fulbright, and Guggenheim fellowships and held visiting appointments at State University of New York at Brockport, US Military Academy at West Point, and Bar Ilan University in Israel. He was awarded the Butler Medal in Silver from Columbia University in 1963. During his retirement he published three more books. Munitz died on 23 September 1995 in Scarborough, New York.

Munitz greatly contributed to philosophical cosmology and scientific ontology. He had a career-long focus on the problem of creation, taking a naturalistic stance without adopting any absolute perspective. His empiricist demand for meaningful conceptions and pragmatic confirmations of such questions as "Is the universe finite of infinite?" and "How was the universe created?" exemplifies his search for the unification of science with metaphysics. In *Space, Time, and Creation* (1957) he even

subjects Albert Einstein's general relativity to this sort of analysis. In *The Mystery of Existence* (1965), Munitz decides that the question of why there is something rather than nothing is a genuinely meaningful and philosophical question; he concludes that by his scientific criteria the question will remain unanswerable.

Further study on the question of existence led Munitz to a prolonged study of philosophy of language, logic, and semantics. *Existence and Logic* (1974) offers analysis of statements of singular existence and the statement that the world as a whole exists. Munitz argues that existence should be equated with what it is to be the universe and has no positive meaning beyond this final whole. In his last books, his cosmological speculation begins to merge with his deep interest in mystical and transcendental religions. Moving away from naturalism, or perhaps expanding naturalism, he portrays reality as far deeper and richer than what perception and science can discover. His final speculations are presented in *The Question of Reality* (1990) and *Does Life Have a Meaning?* (1993) which make lasting contributions to philosophical cosmology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Space, Time, and Creation: Philosophical Aspects of Scientific Cosmology (Glencoe, Ill., 1957).

The Moral Philosophy of Santayana (New York, 1958).

The Mystery of Existence: An Essay in Philosophical Cosmology (New York, 1965).

Existence and Logic (New York, 1974).

Cosmic Understanding (Princeton, N.J., 1986).

The Question of Reality (Princeton, N.J., 1990).

Does Life Have a Meaning? (Buffalo, N.Y., 1993).

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *Theories of the Universe: From*

Babylonian Myth to Modern Science
(Glencoe, Ill., 1957).

Ed. with Howard Kiefer, *Ethics and Social
Justice* (Albany, N.Y., 1970).

Ed., *Identity and Individuation* (New York,
1971).

Ed., *Logic and Ontology* (New York,
1973).

Ed. with Peter Unger, *Semantics and
Philosophy* (New York, 1974).

Further Reading

Proc of APA v70, Who's Who in Phil

Inada, Kenneth K. "Munitz's Concept of
the World: A Buddhist Response,"
Philosophy East and West 25 (1975):
309–17.

Sweeney, Leo. "The Mystery of Existence,"
Modern Schoolman 44 (1966): 57–73.

John R. Shook

MUNRO, Thomas (1897–1974)

Thomas Munro was born on 15 February 1897
in Omaha, Nebraska, and died on 15 April
1974 in Sarasota, Florida. He was the son of
Alexander Munro, a school administrator and
Mary Spaulding Munro, a musician. Thomas
Munro attended Amherst College (1912–15),
and received his BA (1916) and MA (1917) in
philosophy from Columbia University. Munro
enlisted in the army shortly thereafter,
becoming a sergeant with the psychological
services of the Medical Corps. After his dis-
charge, he returned to Columbia as an instruc-
tor of philosophy from 1918 to 1924. He
received the Columbia PhD in philosophy in
1920 with a dissertation titled "Theories of
Adaptation, in Biology, Sociology, and Ethics."

In 1924 Albert BARNES, a famous modern art
collector, hired Munro to work for Barnes as
assistant educational director of the Barnes

Foundation near Philadelphia. From 1924 to
1927 he was visiting professor of modern art at
the University of Pennsylvania. He married
Lucille Nadler in 1925. Between 1928 and
1931, Munro taught in the philosophy depart-
ment at Rutgers University. In 1928 he pub-
lished *Scientific Method in Aesthetics*, which set
forth his positivist view of art criticism. In 1931
he accepted a joint appointment as curator of
education for the Cleveland Museum of Art
and professor of art history at Case Western
University, where he would remain until his
retirement in 1967. He published a number of
books, not only in philosophy and aesthetics,
but also in art history and art criticism. His
most influential works are *The Arts and Their
Interrelations* (1949), *Toward Science in
Aesthetics* (1956), *Evolution in the Arts, and
Other Theories of Cultural History* (1963),
and *Form and Style in the Arts* (1970). He also
published numerous articles on a wide range of
topics in aesthetics. Munro was greatly influ-
enced by Max Dessoir, who led the first
International Congress for Aesthetics in 1913.
In 1942 Munro proposed the formal organi-
zation of the American Society for Aesthetics,
which was founded informally by Felix Gatz in
1939. In 1945 the new Society took over the
Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism and
Munro became its editor. In 1962 Munro
became contributing editor and was made
Honorary President of the Society by its Board
of Trustees.

Munro's efforts to advance aesthetics as a
discipline in the United States are exemplary,
and philosophy of art is greatly indebted to
him. Munro gave a definition of aesthetics in
Art Education, its Philosophy and Psychology:
"When art criticism becomes sufficiently
general and fundamental, covering a wide
range of art and scrutinizing value standards, it
becomes aesthetics. When art history becomes
sufficiently general and fundamental, reveal-
ing major cultural epochs, styles, trends, and
causal relations, it merges with aesthetics.
When psychology discloses main recurrent
factors in personality and social behavior which

affect the creation and the use of art, it merges with aesthetics. When semantics deal constructively with aesthetics terms and meaning, it merges with aesthetics. There is no distinct subject of aesthetics in the nature of things." (1956, p. 325) This definition displays the interdisciplinary nature of Munro's position in aesthetics, which greatly influenced his course of action in institutionalizing aesthetics as a relevant subject in American education.

Munro was greatly influenced by the philosophy and teaching of John DEWEY, his professor at Columbia University. Munro was among the first thinkers to attempt to formulate a science of aesthetics. His model for aesthetics is distinctly methodological, historical, and empirical. Three basic concepts in Munro's theory of art are classification, morphology, and evolution of art. Although Dewey was skeptical about the value of classification, Munro defended the classification of the arts as necessary to ascertain facts. Munro eschewed concepts of beauty, artistic creation, and inspiration, choosing instead to focus on the cultural, psychological, and evolutionary functions of art in society. His concept of morphology highlights his scientific method. Munro's morphology treats the form, structure, relations, and changes in works of art as analogous to plants and animals. On Munro's account, morphology works to give value to the particular functional relation of specific artworks. His evolutionary account of art is so broad, yet thorough, that he manages to indicate how almost every social factor serves to influence art.

Munro's classification of art, found in *The Arts and Their Interrelations*, is particularly remarkable as it attempts to expose the implications of understanding art in terms of aesthetic attitude and aesthetic experience. Munro argues that most criticism and interpretation of art is taken up without agreement on the usage of critical terms. He argues that aestheticians should examine interrelations to rid the discipline of traditional assumptions and confusions (1949, p. 5). Munro defends his project

of classification against those who think that such endeavors are trivial: "The way in which arts are defined and classified affects the practical organization and conduct of the arts themselves. It is bound up with educational administration, and helps to determine how the arts shall be taught; what shall be the curricula of art academies, music institutes, and liberal arts colleges." (1949, p. 6)

Munro first offers a descriptive account of the definition of art which combines a number of ways of understanding the term *art*, as a certain set of skills, the products of such skills, domains of human culture, and divisions of those domains which are identified as particular art forms such as painting, sculpture, etc. Second, Munro proposes a specifically aesthetic definition of art to embrace all of the ways of understanding the term *art*, by emphasizing a core definition: Art is skill in making or doing that which is used or intended as a stimulus to satisfactory aesthetic experience, often along with other ends or functions; especially in such way that the perceived stimulus, the meanings it suggests, or both, are felt as beautiful, pleasant, interesting, emotionally moving, or otherwise valuable as objects of direct experience, in addition to any instrumental values (1949, p. 7). This definition carries a number of difficulties in its terms. Munro explains the connotations of each term to provide clarification. *Making or doing* covers performance, *used or intended* connotes behavior, *along with other ends or functions* avoids deeming aesthetic experience as the sole or primary function of art objects, and *stimulate* is used in a psychological sense (1949, p. 7). Munro characterizes a work of art in terms of this definition, as an arrangement of stimuli in space, time, or both (1949, p. 9).

After providing a tentative definition of art, Munro proceeds to outline some of the confusions in using the term *fine arts*. He charges that this term is generally used in a very narrow sense, creating an implicit divide between high art and low art, and he is critical of such honorific and exclusionary use. Fine art is usually

construed as pointing to painting, sculpture, and architecture, excluding so-called minor arts. Munro proposes that some of the confusion would be alleviated if we were to adopt the use of the term *visual arts*. This term speaks to a definite quality of artworks, as visual stimuli. Munro concedes that there are of course many other types of arts, such as auditory arts, which he outlines later in this book. However, he points out that there is significant overlap between the auditory arts and visual arts in that music is visual in the sense that it is usually read off a score. Also, theater, dance, and film are visual arts in one sense but employ an auditory element. Munro stresses the overlap and interrelation of each type of art.

In outlining a classificatory notion of visual arts, Munro addresses a group of arts as primarily addressing the sense of sight. He asserts that these works appeal to other senses also, but that visual qualities are primary. He gives a partial list of Visual Arts, beginning with Pictorial Arts and Types of Pictorial Art. Munro gives an extensive outline of divisions and subdivisions. The major divisions include: painting, drawing, printmaking, still photography, mosaic, wood inlay, tapestry, embroidery, collage and montage, and colored lights (1949, p. 107). Other major divisions include nonpictorial graphic arts such as writing and printing, combined pictorial–verbal arts, sculptural arts, and useful designs and decorative arts. Munro elaborates on every major division by outlining all possible activities and products that satisfy his definition.

In forming a taxonomy of art based on a particular definition, Munro encounters a number of products or activities that must be included if his definition is to stand. For example, taxidermy and embalming fall under the heading Sculptural Arts, and animal husbandry falls under the rubric Useful and Decorative Arts. Munro's justification for characterizing such activities as art lies in the fact that animals are bred for their coloring, form, or other particular visual characteristics. For example, domesticated show rabbits are often

bred to have a particular shape: the width of the shoulders are to be equal to the width of the rabbit's hips, the rabbit is to have a uniform arch in its back, and the feet must not be splayed outwards or inwards. Munro argues that his definition holds because these practices are primarily performed to produce a visual stimulus, which translates into an aesthetic experience.

It may seem that Munro's account of classification is too broad, and he allows everything to be admitted to the category named *art*. Munro's broad account does indeed give value to practices not normally considered artistic. However, this broad account articulates exactly what Munro desired for a classificatory scientific account of art. Munro bases his classification on a scientific methodology of observation. Aesthetic considerations are present in such practices because they are observable. This account exposes the interrelation of aesthetic qualities with other cultural functions and ends. In this way, Munro resists the exclusive conceptions of art, which proliferated during his time. Munro's account forces its readers to confront the aesthetic considerations of a wide range of products and practices. The field of aesthetics, especially in the United States, is greatly indebted to the efforts of Thomas Munro.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Scientific Method in Aesthetics (New York, 1928).
"Art, Aesthetics, and Liberal Education," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 3 (1944): 91–106.
The Arts and Their Interrelations (New York, 1949).
"Morphology as a Branch of Aesthetics," in *Mélanges d'esthétique et de science de l'art offerts à Etienne Souriau* (Paris, 1952), pp. 205–16.
Toward Science in Aesthetics: Selected Essays (New York, 1956).
Art Education, Its Philosophy and Psychology: Selected Essays (New York,

1956).

"Suggestion and Symbolism in the Arts,"
Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism 15
(1956): 152–80.

"Meanings of Naturalism in Philosophy and
Aesthetics," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art
Criticism* 19 (1960): 406–15.

"Do the Arts Evolve? Some Recent
Conflicting Answers," *Journal of
Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 19 (1961):
407–17.

*Evolution in the Arts, and Other Theories of
Cultural History* (Cleveland, 1963).

Oriental Aesthetics (Cleveland, 1965).

*Form and Style in the Arts: An Introduction
to Aesthetics Morphology* (Cleveland,
1970).

Other Relevant Works

An Introduction to Reflective Thinking (New
York, 1923).

American Economic Life (New York, 1925).

Primitive Negro Sculpture (New York,
1928).

Great Pictures of Europe (New York, 1930).

Methods of Teaching the Fine Arts (Durham,
N.C., 1935).

*The Creative Arts in American Education:
The Interrelation of the Arts in Secondary
Education* (Cambridge, Mass., 1960).

Further Reading

*Proc of APA v47, Who Was Who in Amer
v6, Who's Who in Phil*

Hungerland, Helmut. "Thomas Munro,"
Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism 33
(1974): 4–6.

Munro, Eleanor. *Memoir of a Modernist's
Daughter* (New York, 1988).

Osborne, Harold. "Museums and Their
Functions," *Journal of Aesthetic Education*
19 (1985): 41–51.

Joan Grassbaugh Forry

MÜNSTERBERG, Hugo (1863–1916)

Hugo Münsterberg was born on 1 June 1863
in the Prussian city of Danzig, and died on 16
December 1916 in Boston, Massachusetts.
After completing a course of study at the
Danzig Gymnasium in 1881, Münsterberg
enrolled at the University of Leipzig in 1882.
There he began his study of psychology with
Wilhelm Wundt, who had recently established
one of psychology's first research laborato-
ries. Münsterberg took his doctoral exam with
Wundt before moving to Heidelberg, where he
completed work on his doctoral thesis, *Die
Lehre von der Natürlichen Anpassung in ihrer
Entwickelung, Anwendung und Bedeutung*
(1885), and pursued studies in medicine and
philosophy with the goal of informing his psy-
chological researches.

In 1887, after having been awarded an MD
from Heidelberg, Münsterberg began lecturing
on psychology at the University of Freiburg. He
remained at Freiburg until 1892, publishing both
on idealist philosophy and physiological psy-
chology. During this period, his best-known
works were *Die Willenshandlung. Ein Beitrag
zur physiologischen Psychologie* (1888) and the
Beiträge zur experimentellen Psychologie
(1889–92). In 1892 Münsterberg was persuaded
by William JAMES to accept a three-year appoint-
ment to direct the new psychological laboratory
at Harvard University. The psychology program
at Harvard was embedded in the philosophy
department, an arrangement that allowed
Münsterberg to pursue both psychological and
philosophical work in the company of scholars
such as James, Josiah ROYCE, George
SANTAYANA, and George Herbert PALMER.
Except for two years from 1895 to 1897 when
Münsterberg returned to Freiburg, he remained
at Harvard until his death.

In the course of his career, Münsterberg had
a number of administrative responsibilities.
He was chair of the Harvard's philosophy
department from 1899 to 1905, served as
President of the American Psychological
Association in 1898, and was President of the

American Philosophical Association in 1908–1909. Münsterberg also organized and directed the International Scientific Congress held in conjunction with the 1904 St. Louis World's Fair, and he was the founding director of the America-Institute in Berlin.

Münsterberg's early work in Freiburg focused heavily on refining physiological theories of the reflex-arc, but after arriving at Harvard he began to explore the relationship between psychology and philosophy. As a philosopher committed to a system of Fichtean idealism, he was compelled to maintain that the realm of the physical object was distinct from the world of the mental or psychical object. However, his writings on psychology's place in the system of human knowledge reveal a complex and sometimes paradoxical understanding of the interaction between the physical and psychical realms.

Münsterberg's publications in the decade surrounding the turn of the century comprise in large part a series of critiques of the unsophisticated philosophical underpinnings of psychology as practiced by his American colleagues. In the German tradition, laboratory work was one component of a larger psychological program that incorporated philosophical systems, while in America the laboratory work itself was rapidly coming to dominate psychological discourse. Münsterberg was troubled by what he saw as a confusion of the mental and physical realms in American psychology. The physiological measurements that formed the basis of experimental psychology could not by themselves, he argued, provide the scholar with any meaningful understanding of the mental facts or objects they accompanied. The entire experimental program in psychology was valid only if philosophers could develop a system by which the non-physical mental states, which by definition could not be measured directly, could be uniquely and certainly correlated to empirically observable physical states.

Münsterberg laid much of the blame for the state of American psychology on the prominence of positivist philosophy. Positivism, which he believed to have gained favor in intellectual circles primarily as a result of nineteenth-century advances in the physical sciences, encouraged scientists to assume that their experimental measurements had meaning in the absence of larger explanatory frameworks. The most serious consequence of positivist influence for psychology, in Münsterberg's opinion, was the tendency of psychologists to assume that their external physiological measurements were in some way a direct assessment of internal mental states.

In a joint address before the American Psychological Association and the American Philosophical Association in 1905, Münsterberg expressed his belief that throughout modern human history, idealism and positivism had moved in cycles, with one waxing as the other waned (1906). Long dominant, he thought positivism was now once again in decline and idealism would rise to take its place. The ascendance of idealism was, in Münsterberg's opinion, long past due, and towards this end he was a close ally and vocal supporter of his Harvard colleague Josiah Royce.

The study of Münsterberg's philosophical work in this period is problematic for several reasons, not least of which is his failure to develop (or even attempt) the idealist theory of mind that he so often claimed was necessary. His major philosophical work, *Philosophie der Werte* (1908), along with its English-language companion, *The Eternal Values* (1909), laid out much of his idealist program but never sufficiently addressed the psychological relationship between the physical and the mental. *The Eternal Values* is an impressive work nonetheless, consisting mainly of a discussion of the nature of will and its relation to human action. Münsterberg argued that will was the conscious striving to satisfy values, whether individual values or over-individual values, and the experience of knowing the world was the result of these exercises of will.

One way in which Münsterberg did attempt to make a positive contribution to the understanding of psychology's relationship to philosophy can be found in his efforts to locate psychology's place in the system of human knowledge. This is a topic to which Münsterberg returned repeatedly in his writing; and the clearest exposition of his system of categorization can be found in "The Position of Psychology in the System of Knowledge" (1903). The system of knowledge described in this article (and the accompanying chart) consists of a hierarchical classification scheme in which all aspects of human inquiry are sifted on the axes of *theoretical* versus *practical* and *individual* versus *over-individual*. One important result of this classification scheme is that psychology ends up as the root science of the mental world, a position that parallels that of physics as the root science of the physical world.

While Münsterberg's primary goal in this article is explaining and defending his categorization of the systems of knowledge, he devotes a portion of the text to a discussion of voluntaristic psychology. The work that he terms "voluntaristic" is that which attempts to reach a subjective understanding of the inner experience of human consciousness. In reading his descriptions of this work, it is hard not to see echoes of William James and his insistence on the primacy of the human experience of consciousness. Münsterberg suggests that these explorations may achieve a deeper and more satisfying understanding of human nature than experimental psychology would otherwise allow, and he concludes that any meaningful psychology must accept the dualism of the human mind by incorporating both externally verifiable phenomenalistic accounts of the mind and these internally based voluntaristic accounts.

Münsterberg was a famously prolific scholar, no less in this early period than in the better-known later years of his career. As already indicated, some large portion of his literary output was a critique of other psychologists's lack of philosophical understanding of their own work. He did, however, also publish a substantial body of more properly psychological work. Thus, for example, the Harvard Psychological Laboratory produced an impressive body of experimental work under his direction, much of it collected in the *Harvard Psychological Studies*; but Münsterberg insisted on a sharp division between the experimental and speculative work of his students.

In accepting appointment at Harvard, Münsterberg had conceived of his role in America as equal parts psychologist and cultural ambassador. In keeping with this vision, he produced an impressive quantity of writing in both German and English on the cultural traits and behaviors of both nations. His work in this line brought him a great deal of popular attention; and in 1908 it prompted Harvard President Charles Eliot to request that Münsterberg restrict his public activities to those related to his psychological work. This request was the beginning of a heated and emotional exchange of letters between the two men. The conflict ended with Münsterberg's reluctant acceptance of Eliot's position, but, in a letter to Eliot dated 17 May 1908, Münsterberg claimed that the incident broke "the spring of … [his] faith and enthusiasm."

It was not long after this that Münsterberg shifted his interests away from philosophical systems and began working in applied psychology. His easily popularized applied work, most famously his studies of courtroom psychology (*On the Witness Stand*, 1908) and industrial efficiency (*Psychology and Industrial Efficiency*, 1913), brought him the scorn of many of his professional colleagues but significant fame in American society at large. Given that this work was far better received in his adoptive nation than his philosophical speculations had ever been, it is possible to suggest that this shift in Münsterberg's work was prompted at least in part by a desire to find professional satisfaction outside of the academy which he felt had turned against him.

In December of 1916, on the eve of America's active involvement in World War I, Hugo Münsterberg died of a brain aneurysm while giving a psychology lecture to a classroom of Radcliffe students. The dramatic circumstances of his death, in combination with his high-profile pro-German propaganda work in the years immediately prior to it, guaranteed that his death would be a widely reported media event. In the decades following his death, he continued to be remembered as one of the founding figures of applied psychology in the United States, but his earlier philosophical work has been largely ignored by American scholars in favor of Royce's more developed idealist system.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Die Lehre von der Natürlichen Anpassung in ihrer Entwickelung, Anwendung und Bedeutung (Leipzig, Germany, 1885).

Die Willenshandlung. Ein Beitrag zur physiologischen Psychologie (Freiburg, Germany, 1888).

Beiträge zur experimentellen Psychologie (Freiburg, Germany, 1889–92).

Psychology and Life (Boston, 1899).

On the Witness Stand. Essays on Psychology and Crime (New York, 1908).

Philosophie der Werte. Grundüge einer Weltanschauung (Leipzig, Germany, 1908).

The Eternal Values (Boston, 1909).

Psychology and Industrial Efficiency (Boston, 1913).

Other Relevant Works

Münsterberg's papers are at the Boston Public Library and Harvard University.

American Traits from the Point of View of a German (Boston, 1901).

"The Position of Psychology in the System of Knowledge," *Harvard Psychological Studies* 1 (1903): 641–54.

The Americans (New York, 1904).

"Emerson Hall: Emerson as Philosopher," *Harvard Psychological Studies* 2 (1906): 1–39.

"The Problem of Beauty," *Philosophical Review* 18 (1909): 121–46.

American Problems from the Point of View of a Psychologist (New York, 1910).

American Patriotism and Other Social Studies (New York, 1913).

The War and America (New York, 1914).

The Peace and America (New York, 1915).

The Photoplay: A Psychological Study (New York, 1916).

Tomorrow. Letters to a Friend in Germany (New York, 1916).

Hugo Münsterberg on Film: The Photoplay, a Psychological Study, and Other Writings, ed. Allan Langdale (New York, 2002).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v13*, *Pres Addr of APA v1*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Benjamin, L. T., Jr. "Hugo Münsterberg: Portrait of an Applied Psychologist," in *Portraits of Pioneers in Psychology*, vol. 4, ed. G. A. Kimble, and M. Wertheimer (Washington, D.C., 2000), pp. 113–29.

Colapeitro, Vincent. "Let's All Go to the Movies: Two Thumbs Up for Hugo Münsterberg's *The Photoplay* (1916)," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 36 (2000): 477–501.

Goldman, Henry. "The Applied Psychology of Hugo Münsterberg," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 2 (1918): 116–29.

Hale, Matthew, Jr. *Human Science and Social Order: Hugo Münsterberg and the Origins of Applied Psychology* (Philadelphia, 1980).

Keller, Phyllis. *States of Belonging: German-American Intellectuals and the First World War* (Cambridge, Mass., 1979).

Kuklick, Bruce. *The Rise of American Philosophy* (New Haven, Conn., 1977), chap. 11.

Münsterberg, Margaret. *Hugo Münsterberg. His Life and Work* (New York, 1922).

Spillmann, Jutta, and Lothar Spillmann. "The Rise and Fall of Hugo Münsterberg," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 29 (1993): 322–38.

Susan Marie Groppi

MURPHEY, Murray Griffin (1928–)

Murray Murphey was born on 22 February 1928 in Colorado Springs, Colorado. He received the BA from Harvard University in 1949. His interests were in both American civilization and philosophy, and he studied with Perry MILLER and F. O. Mathiesson in the former field, and W. V. QUINE in the latter. He also audited classes with C. I. LEWIS and started a friendship with long-time Harvard philosopher Burton DREBEN. Murphey received a PhD in American Studies from Yale in 1954, but again worked in philosophy. His dissertation on Charles PEIRCE was completed in 1954 under Rulon Wells in the philosophy department. A revised version, *The Development of Peirce's Philosophy*, was published in 1961.

Murphey accepted a two-year postdoctoral fellowship in 1954 at the University of Pennsylvania and in 1956 was appointed to assistant professor in its department of American civilization. Serving for many years as department chair, Murphey identified its investigations with a social scientific approach to the study of American culture, using first a variety of sociological methods, then forms of quantitative analyses, and finally the techniques of cultural anthropology. He also edited the official journal of the American Studies Association, *American Quarterly*. For a quarter century, from the early 1960s to the mid 1980s, American Civilization at Pennsylvania under his leadership was recognized not only for its distinctive approach but for the high level of its training and its contribution to the field of a number of well-known practitioners. Murphey retired in 2000.

His scholarship over this period reflected his commitment to the study of philosophy. He continued his interest in the history of American philosophy and especially the pragmatist tradition. Notable are his two-volume *A History of Philosophy in America* (1977), co-authored with Elizabeth FLOWER; and Murphey's own *C. I. Lewis* (2005).

Murphey contributed to the philosophy of history, writing *Our Knowledge of the Historical Past* (1973) and *Philosophical Foundations of Historical Knowledge* (1994). Both of these books drew on Murphey's deep knowledge of the social sciences, his historical erudition, and his unparalleled command of the latter-day pragmatic tradition, especially as it had been worked out at Harvard in the writings of Quine, Nelson GOODMAN, and Hilary PUTNAM. Nonetheless, Murphey was often at odds with the relativistic aspects of the thought of these men. Instead, in a critique of late twentieth-century forms of pragmatism, he combined the commonsense realism he had learned from Peirce with the scientific empiricism absorbed from the logical positivists. The result was a position that argued for the objectivity of historical knowledge.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Development of Peirce's Philosophy (Cambridge, Mass., 1961).
Our Knowledge of the Historical Past (New York, 1973).
A History of Philosophy in America, 2 vols, with Elizabeth Flower (New York, 1977).
Philosophical Foundations of Historical Knowledge (Albany, N.Y., 1994).
C. I. Lewis (forthcoming).

Other Relevant Works
"Kant's Children: The Cambridge Pragmatists," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 4 (1968): 3–33.
"Science and Religion," *American Quarterly*

20 (1968): 275–95.

"American Civilization at Pennsylvania," *American Quarterly* 22 (1970): 489–502.

"The PsychoDynamics of Puritan Conversion," *American Quarterly* 31 (1979): 135–47.

"Towards an Historicist History of American Philosophy," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 15 (1979): 3–18.

"On the Scientific Study of Religion in the United States, 1870–1980," in *Religion and Twentieth Century American Intellectual Life*, ed. Michael Lacey (Cambridge, UK, 1989), pp. 136–71.

Further Reading

Hay, Cynthia. "Historical Theory and Historical Confirmation," *History and Theory* 19 (1980): 39–57.

Bruce Kuklick

MURPHY, Arthur Edward (1901–62)

Arthur E. Murphy was born on 1 September 1901 in Ithaca, New York. His father, Edward Charles Murphy, was a professor of engineering at Cornell University. His mother, Emilie Atkinson, was a school teacher. In 1903 Murphy's father went to work for the Geological Survey and was transferred to California. The Murphys settled in Napa, close to the University of California at Berkeley. Murphy received BA degrees in philosophy and political science from the University of California in 1923. He was valedictorian, and as the "most distinguished student" of his graduating class he received the University of California Gold Medal. In 1925 he received the PhD in philosophy from the same institution.

Murphy was hired by the University of California as an instructor in philosophy in 1926. He remained there until June 1927, when he became, for one year, an instructor at the University of Chicago. He spent the following year as an assistant professor at Cornell University. From 1929 to 1931, he was again at the University of Chicago, this time as an associate professor. At Chicago he was a colleague of George Herbert MEAD, whose posthumously published Carus Lectures Murphy edited (*The Philosophy of the Present*, 1932). From Chicago, and at the age of only twenty-nine, Murphy moved on to Brown University as full professor. In 1939, he became head of the department of philosophy at the University of Illinois. In 1945, he returned to Cornell as chair of its philosophy department, becoming Susan Linn Sage Professor in 1946. He remained at Cornell until 1953, when he took the chair in the philosophy department of the University of Washington. In 1958 he became chair of the philosophy department at the University of Texas, a position he held until 1961. Murphy died on 11 May 1962 in Austin, Texas.

In addition to these appointments, Murphy had several visiting positions throughout his career. From 1931 until his death, he served on the editorial committee of the *International Journal of Ethics*; from 1934 until 1939, he was book editor for the *Journal of Philosophy*; from 1936 until his death he edited the Prentice-Hall Philosophy Series; and from 1949 to 1953 he edited the *Philosophical Review*. He presented two series of Machette Lectures, in 1948 at Purdue University and in 1952 at Brooklyn College. He presented the Carus Lectures at Berkeley in 1955, then spent years revising and expanding them for publication. They appeared posthumously as *The Theory of Practical Reason* (1965). From 1943 to 1946 he served as chair of the American Philosophical Association's Commission on the Function of Philosophy in American Education, and with the other members of the Commission he co-authored *Philosophy in American Education* (1945). In 1950–51, he was President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association. He was a member of Phi Beta Kappa and a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Murphy's earliest philosophical work was in epistemology and metaphysics. In a number of articles and reviews beginning in 1926, he articulated his best-known doctrine, a view he called *objective relativism* (OR). OR begins by rejecting what Murphy called the absolutist presupposition (AP), the claim that objectivity and "ultimate relativity" are incompatible (1927, p. 123). AP states that a quality or aspect of a perceived object or event cannot be both objective – belonging to that object or event itself – and relative – belonging to that object or event "from a standpoint, and under such limitations as the perspective relations involved in perception impose" (1963, p. 67). AP is presupposed by both monistic realism, the view that the data we immediately experience in perception are objective and therefore not "ultimately and intrinsically relative" (1927, p. 123), and dualistic realism, according to which immediately perceived perceptual data are relative and therefore not objective. By denying AP, OR becomes a *tertium quid* according to which the data that we immediately perceive are both objective and relative. Murphy took OR to answer the question, "how can we say that we are perceiving the *real* object when what is *given* in perception is not the object as it *really* is?" According to OR, "what is seen is an aspect of the object, and … the object really does own all its aspects, under the conditions and from the standpoint of observation …. The object, in all its aspects, is what it is perceived to be, and in thus apprehending it we are seeing it as it is." (1963, p. 67)

Accompanying this epistemological claim, OR also maintains that events are, ontologically speaking, more basic or fundamental than objects. An object is essentially something having only internal relations; an event is essentially something having only external relations. The book sitting on the table before me is an object, since it would be the same book were it located somewhere else (in China, at the publisher, on a shelf, etc.). But the *occurrence* of the book on the table before me is an event, since it depends on "its situation and relationships ….

As an event, the situation is caught up in a whole network of interactions and circumstances, without which it would not be what it is." (1927, p. 126) If AP is true and a property cannot be both objective and relative, then objects must be substantives and events must be mere properties of objects. But OR denies AP and is thus able to assert that events – entities with external relations – are primary, in other words, substantives of which objects – entities with internal relations – are properties. If OR is true and existence/occurrence is substantive despite its relativity, then "[e]xistence is not a character of objects, but objects are characters of existence, of events" (p. 131).

By the mid 1930s Murphy had abandoned some, but not all, of OR. He eventually came to think of OR as having three separable "aspects" or "phases." He continued to endorse the first of these, which he called *contextual analysis* (CA). CA is the "primarily logical or analytic" aspect of OR which "stresses the essentially contextual meaning or reference of statements, and the fact that, when this reference is made plain, many of the 'paradoxes' which in the past have served as grounds for the dialectical demolition of legitimate knowledge-claims are eliminated" (1963, p. 68). To employ the method of CA is "to take particular pains to know what we are talking about, where statements made are supposed to apply, and how their truth-claim is to be tested" (1943, p. 297). The use of CA in philosophy results in *critical philosophy*, which Murphy was careful to distinguish from "critical philosophy" in the sense in which that phrase was used by British philosopher C. D. Broad.

Murphy rejected the second, epistemological aspect of OR, *perspective realism*, especially as it was defended by E. B. McGILVARY. On this view, the objects of perception really have all the characteristics they are perceived to have from various perspectives, for example, one and the same pair of railroad tracks is both parallel (from one perspective) and convergent (from another). To this view, Murphy objected that there must be a sense in which the tracks are *not really* convergent, since an actual train cannot run on convergent

tracks. So either, when the perspective realist says that the tracks are "really" convergent, he means that they really *look* convergent (which is not only trivial but returns us to the traditional epistemological difficulty that OR was supposed to help overcome) or he is committing himself to a paradoxical and chaotic phenomenalism "in which everything truly is what it appears to be" (1963, p. 72).

In its third phase, OR develops into a *speculative philosophy*, which Murphy defined as metaphysical inquiry that seeks to give a rational, unified account of the experienced world by articulating a picture of reality as a whole. This account must be not only general, in that it applies to all specific aspects of reality, but also, and more importantly, *ultimate*, in that it provides the most fundamental and basic account of reality possible. Speculative philosophy begins with concepts that derive their meaning from specific, relatively narrow contexts and then generalizes those concepts in its characterization of reality as a whole. On Murphy's view, there is nothing essentially wrong with generalizing concepts that originate in, and derive their meaning from, special contexts. But as employed in speculative philosophy, and especially by A. N. WHITEHEAD and Samuel Alexander, this method tends to yield unsatisfactory results:

> A generalization which extends our knowledge of the world and can secure confirmation through its applicability to independently ascertainable fact is a great contribution to our knowledge. A generalization which depends upon an ambiguous terminology to import into its descriptions a "concreteness" due to association with human personality, emotions and the like, to which, as thus generalized, they are not entitled, is less helpful. (1996, p. 153)

In general, the problem with OR that resulted in speculative philosophy is that it paid insufficient attention to the contextual meaning of philosophically charged terms. It did not take to heart the lesson of contextual analysis and so resulted in objectionably extravagant metaphysics.

In 1940 Murphy completed a manuscript entitled "Contemporary Philosophy." In this book-length work, he surveyed a number of philosophical trends current between 1890 and 1940, including idealism, pragmatism, realism, and speculative philosophy, and he articulated his own views on what philosophy and philosophical method can and should be. This work was not published in Murphy's lifetime, but much of it was eventually edited by Marcus SINGER and published as "Pragmatism and the Context of Rationality" (1993) and *Reason, Reality and Speculative Philosophy* (1996). Singer writes in his preface to the latter work that "Contemporary Philosophy" was "in some ways a casualty of World War II, since [Murphy's] main interests and concerns were redirected so dramatically by that war and what he perceived as the needs of the time" (1996, p. xi). Murphy's interests and concerns swung away from epistemology and metaphysics and in the direction of moral and social philosophy, specifically to the question of the role played by reason in ethical and practical affairs. This work appeared in numerous articles and two books, *The Uses of Reason* (1943) and *The Theory of Practical Reason* (1965).

According to Murphy's mature account of morality and practical reason, the concept of a *practical reason*, of a reason or justification for action, makes sense only with regard to agents, beings who are personally responsible for the things they do: "the conceptions of practical action and of personal agency are so intertwined that neither makes usable sense without the other" (1965, p. 9). But it is not just agency that is required to make sense of practical reason. What is needed are agents who are concerned with, and accountable to, one another in their actual everyday interactions. What is more, persons are capable of engaging in practical reasoning only insofar as they belong to a community and share a life. One can employ practical reason only if he understands the reasons given within his community to justify conduct both

practically and morally. The shared moral life of a community involves moral common sense, which is itself essential to community. Our moral ideas originate in, refer to, and attempt to advance that community.

Practical reasons are those reasons used by responsible and concerned agents to justify claims "that some things are, in our human situation, worth having and some actions worth doing" (p. 54), and this way of justifying such claims is perfectly proper. The "should" of practical reason can only be understood by members of a moral community. If humans were not "concerned and competent … responsible agents" of that sort, then "the language of practical justification would have no use, for nobody would know what to make of it" (p. 55). A practical reason is also a moral reason to the degree that it is an essential condition of the continued participation in the communities (such as a family, state, or church) in which humans must participate and in which "right" and "wrong" are used to justify practices.

Murphy was well known and respected among academic philosophers during his lifetime. Since his death, his stature has diminished radically. Murphy is rarely if ever mentioned in the work of contemporary metaphysicians, epistemologists, or ethicists. It seems Singer is correct to say that Murphy is "nearly unknown today in [America] and altogether unknown abroad" (1996, p. xxxvii). Murphy's efforts towards a contextual and pluralistic realism deserves renewed attention.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Objective Relativism in Dewey and Whitehead," *Philosophical Review* 36 (1927): 121–44.
The Uses of Reason (New York, 1943).
"The Common Good," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 24 (1951): 3–18.
Reason and the Common Good: Selected Essays, ed. William H. Hay and Marcus G. Singer (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1963). Includes a bibliography of Murphy's works.
The Theory of Practical Reason, ed. A. I. Melden (La Salle, Ill., 1965).
"Emerson in Contemporary Thought," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 24 (1988): 309–16.
"Pragmatism and the Context of Rationality," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 29 (1993): 123–78, 331–68, 687–722.
Reason, Reality, and Speculative Philosophy, ed. Marcus G. Singer (Madison, Wis., 1996).

Other Relevant Works
"Mr. Lewis and the A Priori," *Journal of Philosophy* 29 (1932): 169–81.
Ed., *The Philosophy of the Present*, by George H. Mead (Chicago, 1932).
"The Fruits of Critical Realism," *Journal of Philosophy* 34 (1937): 281–92.
"Conscience, Tolerance, and Moral Discrimination," *Ethics* 49 (1939): 286–308.
"Moore's Defense of 'Common Sense'," in *The Philosophy of G. E. Moore*, ed. Paul Schilpp (Evanston, Ill., 1942).
Philosophy in American Education: Its Tasks and Opportunities, with Brand Blanshard, C. J. Ducasse, Charles Hendel, and Max C. Otto (New York, 1945).
"Ideas and Ideologies, 1917–1947," *Philosophical Review* 56 (1947): 374–89.
Ed. with Milton R. Konvitz, *Essays in Political Theory: Presented to George H. Sabine* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1948).
"Whitehead and the Method of Speculative Philosophy," in *The Philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead*, 2nd edn, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (New York, 1951).
"McGilvary's Perspectival Realism," *Journal of Philosophy* 56 (1959): 149–65.
"John Dewey and American Liberalism," *Journal of Philosophy* 57 (1960): 420–36.

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, *Encyc Ethics*, *Pres Addr of*

APA v6, Proc of APA v36, Who Was Who in Amer v4, Who's Who in Phil

Bouswsma, O. K. "Mr. Murphy on Good Will," *Journal of Philosophy* 42 (1945): 630–38.

Edel, Abraham. "Is Naturalism Arbitrary?" *Journal of Philosophy* 43 (1946): 141–51.

Hay, William H. "The Standpoint of the Universe, if It Has One, Is Not That of Our Moral Situation," *Ultimate Reality and Meaning* 16 (1993): 73–86.

Kolenda, Konstantin. *In Defense of Practical Reason: A Study and an Application of Arthur Murphy's Theory* (Houston, Tex., 1969).

Robischon, Thomas. "What is Objective Relativism?" *Journal of Philosophy* 55 (1958): 1117–32.

Schon, Donald A. "Arthur Murphy on the Theory of Practical Reason," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 28 (1968): 423–9.

Singer, Marcus G. "Two American Philosophers: Morris Cohen and Arthur Murphy," in *American Philosophy* (Cambridge, UK, 1985), pp. 295–329.

Robert Lane

MURPHY, Gardner (1895–1979)

Gardner Murphy was born on 8 July 1895 in Chillicothe, Ohio, the son of Edgar Gardner Murphy, a southern reformer, and Maud King, an author. In 1916 he earned a BA from Yale and in 1917 an MA from Harvard. Murphy joined the Yale Hospital Unit of the US Army Expeditionary forces, and after being sent to France, he served as a second lieutenant in the Army Corps of Interpreters from 1918 to 1919. In 1919 Murphy returned to the United States to attend Columbia University, where he was greatly influenced by the psychology chairman Robert S. Woodworth, which led to Murphy's interest in social psychology. In 1923 he earned his PhD in psychology from Columbia.

Murphy started teaching the history of psychology at Columbia in 1923, and subsequently wrote the *Historical Introduction to Modern Psychology* (1929), a book which borrowed ideas from classic works of Plato and Aristotle and fused them with modern psychological theories. The book included chapters on Freudian psychoanalysis (before Freud was widely appreciated) and philosopher/psychologist William JAMES, whose work Murphy greatly admired. Murphy's range of interest in social psychology included areas such as the effects of segregation on African-American students. This research became an impetus for Kenneth and Mamie Clark's work on the self-image of black students, a work which was used in the Supreme Court's 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education*, eventually leading to the abolition of segregated schools. In 1926 he married Lois Barclay, who became a prominent psychologist as well.

In 1931 Murphy wrote the seminal work *Experimental Social Psychology*, which explained how social psychology could be conducted in a more scientific manner. It was this book which earned him the Nicholas Murray Butler award in 1932. Murphy became President of the Society for Psychological Study of Social Issues in 1937, creating a manifesto, signed by over 2,000 professional psychologists, claiming that human nature is not predisposed to war, but is instead naturally disposed to live at peace. Along with participation in many other organizations, Murphy was President of the American Psychological Association in 1944.

Murphy started a department of psychology at City College of New York in 1940. While in New York, he taught courses on personality and conducted experiments on the relation between emotion and perception. He also had great interest in parapsychology (perhaps influenced by his readings of James) and along with that of J. B. Rhine of Duke University, Murphy's work was responsible for the establishment of several universities beginning to teach and

conduct research on parapsychology. Murphy studied the much neglected social problems between Hindus and Muslims, and spent six months in 1950 living in India to research the topic. From 1952 to 1967 he was Director of Research at the Menninger Foundation in Topeka, Kansas. Murphy was a professor of psychology at George Washington University from 1968 to 1973. He died on 18 March 1979 in Washington, D.C.

Besides furthering research methods on parapsychology, Murphy's main contribution to psychology was that he took social psychology into the experimental arena, helping legitimize and popularize the field as something that could be studied scientifically. Concerning the "nature versus nurture" polemic, Murphy's theory of personality posited human development is both social and biological; thus, he was equally interested in social and biological influences on human behavior. Murphy, along with Elmer Green, helped popularize biofeedback as a genuine psychological tool, allowing subjects, through the use of biofeedback technology, to recognize the physical "triggers" that occur when entering into a particular emotional or cognitive state. Hence, the ideal of this technique is that subjects can learn to control their problems, such as unwanted psychological stress, by recognizing what the physical cues are associated with their changing mental states. Biofeedback was widely used in the 1970s and is still used by psychologists and doctors in treating certain disorders.

Murphy is remembered as a pioneer in social psychology, theories of personality, researching the relation between affect and perception, promoting peace and human welfare, as well as a man who was earnestly concerned with developing new techniques to alleviate human problems.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Historical Introduction to Modern Psychology (New York, 1929).
Experimental Social Psychology (New York, 1931).
Human Nature and Enduring Peace (Boston, 1945).
Personality: A Biosocial Approach to Origins and Structure (New York, 1947).
In the Minds of Men: The Study of Human Behavior and Social Tensions in India (New York, 1953).
Human Potentialities (New York, 1958).
Development of the Perceptual World (New York, 1960).
William James on Psychical Research (New York, 1960).
Challenge of Psychical Research: A Primer of Parapsychology (New York, 1961).
Asian Psychology (New York, 1968).
Encounter with Reality: New Forms for an Old Quest (Boston, 1968).
Western Psychology: From the Greeks to William James (New York, 1969).
Outgrowing Self-Deception (New York, 1975).

Other Relevant Works
Murphy's papers are in the Archives of the History of American Psychology at Akron University in Ohio; the Menninger Foundation in Topeka, Kansas; and the Concord Free Library in Massachusetts.
"Notes for a Parapsychological Autobiography," *Journal of Parapsychology* 21 (1957): 165–78.
"Gardner Murphy," in *A History of Psychology in Autobiography*, vol. 5, eds E. G. Boring and Gardner Lindzey (New York, 1967), pp. 253–82.
"William James on the Will," *Journal of the History of Behavioral Science* 7 (1971): 49–70.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*
Murphy, Lois Barclay. *Gardner Murphy: Integrating, Expanding and Humanizing Psychology* (Jefferson, N.C., 1990).

Contains a bibliography of Murphy's writings.

Peatman, John G., and Eugene L. Harley, eds. *Festschrift for Gardner Murphy* (New York, 1960).

Daniel Trippett

MURRAY, Anna Pauline (1910–85)

Pauli Murray was born on 20 November 1910 in Baltimore, Maryland. She received her BA degree from Hunter College in 1933. For some time after graduation, Murray worked as a teacher through the Works Progress Administration (WPA). During this period, she also developed contacts with important literary figures such as Vincent Benét and Langston Hughes, as well as Eleanor Roosevelt. Based on encouragement received from Benét, Murray eventually published a collection of poems titled *Dark Testament* that highlighted the ongoing struggle for equal rights.

Murray became involved with the Workers Defense League in part due to a personal experience of discrimination while riding a bus. This work sparked an interest in the law. She eventually enrolled in Howard University's Law School and earned the JD in 1944 as the only woman in her class. She also received the LL.M. degree in 1945 from the University of California, Berkeley, after being denied admission to Harvard University although she had won a Rosenwald Fellowship for study at the university. In 1951 she published a book titled *State's Laws on Race and Color*, and this book had great impact on the manner in which lawyers fought against segregation. Five years later she published an account of her family titled *Proud Shoes: The Story of an American Family*. In 1965 she became the first African American to earn the Doctor of Juridical Science degree from Yale Law School.

During the course of the years from 1946 through 1977, Murray held a variety of prestigious positions. In 1946 she became the first African American to hold the position of Deputy Attorney General of California. Shortly after accepting this position she was named Woman of the Year by the National Council of Negro Women, and in 1947 she was named Woman of the Year by *Mademoiselle* magazine. She eventually accepted a position in 1956 as the only female associate at the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton, and Garrison in New York City. Her interest expanded to the global context, in part inspired by continued racial discrimination and violence in the United States and growing independence in Africa. Following this expanding agenda, Murray agreed to move to Ghana to work as a senior lecture at the Ghana School of Law. While there, she co-authored *The Constitution and Government of Ghana*.

After returning to the United States, Murray continued her work in civil rights through an appointment to the President's Committee on Civil and Political Rights in 1962. Three years after accepting this appointment, she played a prominent role in the founding of the National Organization for Women. In 1967–8 she accepted an appointment as Vice President and professor of political science at Benedict College in Columbia, South Carolina. In 1968 she became a professor of American studies at Brandeis University in Massachusetts, and was named Louis Stulberg Professor of Law and Politics in the American Studies department, holding that title until she left Brandeis in 1973.

Whether working for the rights of sharecroppers, participating in sit-ins as a student at Howard University's Law School, or joining the civil rights movement, Murray made clear her devotion to democracy and human rights. In her work for justice and equality, all structures of power and authority were fair game, even the Church. Her involvement on the

"Special Commission on Ordained and Licensed Ministries," combined with her contacts with feminist scholars at the Episcopal Divinity School in Cambridge, Massachusetts, sensitized her to inequalities within the Church. She determined to use her skills, talents, and tenacity to change the Church's doctrine regarding the role of women in formal church life. And although her efforts initially met with frustration and a brief departure from the Episcopal Church in protest at its discriminatory practices, she returned and expanded her struggle for full inclusion in lay activities to include a quest for the priesthood. Murray began studies at General Theological Seminary in New York City in 1973 in preparation for a life in church ministry. She reflected on this move as a radical existential transformation, a redirection of personal religiosity toward the application of moral and spiritual forces to social problems. For her, the value of ordination was the manner in which it allowed for an even more complex set of tools for the betterment of the United States. This general care is more than an internally derived imperative; it becomes, through call to ministry, an overt and institutionally recognized obligation. There was a personal dimension to Murray's push for the ordination of women. The death of her close friend, Irene Barlow, raised questions concerning her connection to the Church and the ability of this connection to aid people during the most pressing moments of life. In her position as a layperson, she had been unable to provide Barlow the last rites. This realization, combined with reflection upon her life objectives and priorities resulted in Murray pushing for her own ordination as an Episcopal priest.

Murray received her M.Div. degree from General Theological Seminary in 1976, and then she became the first African-American woman to be ordained an Episcopal priest in 1977. She ministered in the Episcopal Church of the Atonement in Washington, D.C. and the Church of the Holy Nativity in Baltimore, Maryland, before retiring in 1984. She died on 1 July 1985 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Murray strove to make sense of social dynamics, notably the human suffering she encountered as an attorney, professor, and an African-American woman. Her theological orientation strongly resembled the personalism of Martin L. KING, Jr., the Social Gospel (and its social and humanizing efforts), and liberal theology growing out of the mid century thought of philosopher of religion Paul TILLICH. She believed that human dignity and progress could be achieved through nonviolent direct action and persistent critique of social ills. Her work sheds light on the frameworks used by feminist scholars such as Letty Russell, Rosemary Ruether, and Mary DALY.

Murray combined feminist thought with the best of the growing black theology movement. She proposed in writings such as "Feminist Theology and Black Theology" (her 1976 thesis) and "Black, Feminist Theologies: Links, Parallels, and Tensions" a theological and philosophical perspective that was pro-black and pro-woman. Through sermons, lectures, and social protest activities, Murray spent her years of ministry attempting to correct for these flaws and, through religious and social agitation, humanize life. In recent years there has been a surge in research on Pauli Murray, particularly her theology, political activities, and relationship with Eleanor Roosevelt. She is recognized as a pioneering figure in the recognition of and response to racism and sexism as connected modes of discrimination.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

State's Laws on Race and Color, and Appendices Containing International Documents, Federal Laws and Regulations, Local Ordinances, and Charts, 1955 Supplement (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1955).

Human Rights U.S.A.: 1948–1966 (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1967).

Proud Shoes: The Story of an American Family (New York, 1978).

Song in a Weary Throat: An American

Pilgrimage (New York, 1987). Repr., *Pauli Murray: The Autobiography of a Black Activist, Feminist, Lawyer, Priest, and Poet* (Knoxville, Tenn., 1989).

Other Relevant Works
Murray's papers are at Radcliffe College in Cambridge, Massachusetts.
"Black, Feminist Theologies: Links, Parallels, and Tensions," *Christianity and Crisis* 40 (14 April 1980): 86–95.
"Black Theology and Feminist Theology," in *Black Theology: A Documentary History*, ed. Gayraud S. Wilmore and James H. Cone (Maryknoll, N.Y., 1979).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, Who Was Who in Amer v8
Haney, Elly. "Pauli Murray: Acting and Remembering," *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 4 (1988): 75–9.
Hiatt, Suzanne R. "Pauli Murray: May Her Song Be Heard at Last," *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 4 (1988): 69–73.
Humez, Jean M. "Pauli Murray's Histories of Loyalty and Revolt," *Black American Literature Forum* 24 (1990): 315–35.
Pinn, Anthony B. "Religion and America's Problem Child: Notes on the Development of Pauli Murray's Theology," *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 15 (1999): 21–39.
"Pauli Murray's Notable Connections," *Journal of Women's History* 14 (Summer 2002). Special issue on Murray.

Anthony B. Pinn

MURRAY, Henry Alexander, Jr.
(1893–1988)

Henry Alexander Murray was born on 13 May 1893 in New York City. In 1911 Murray entered Harvard University, although he was, admittedly, more interested in "rowing, rum, and romanticism." He received a BA in 1915, concentrating on history, and entered the Columbia College of Physicians and Surgeons in New York City. George Draper, an instructor at Columbia, had a tremendous influence on Murray, edifying him about the important role that psychological factors play in contributing to physical illness. In 1919 Murray received his MD and then went on to earn an MA in biology in 1920. Subsequently, Murray went back to Harvard University, where he worked under chemist L. J. Henderson on confirming the Hasselbach-Henderson equation. This project involved a simultaneous measuring of different variables in the blood, and this fruitful work led to the further development of blood plasma by other future researchers.

Murray was a surgical intern at the Presbyterian Hospital in New York City from 1920 to 1922. Following this, he studied the aging of chick embryos, after receiving a fellowship at the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research. In 1924 Murray went to the University of Cambridge, where he earned his PhD in biochemistry in 1927. In that same year, he returned for a third time to Harvard, as an assistant to the highly respected psychopathologist Morton Prince. Prince founded the Harvard Psychological Clinic; Murray succeeded as Director after Prince's death in 1929.

As Director and professor of psychology, Murray introduced psychoanalysis to the university curriculum, as well as developing several novel ideas for the scientific study of personality (which Murray entitled "personology"). He played a role in developing the Thematic Apperception Test, which is still regularly used in clinical psychology for assessing personality traits. In 1938, he published *Explorations in Personality*, which is still a

widely read text for those who study personality. After publishing several works, Murray joined the US Army in 1943 and headed the personnel selection program for the Office of Strategic Services, going on to train agents in the United States, China, England, and Europe. For his extraordinary service he was awarded the Legion of Merit in 1946 and was discharged in 1948. When he returned to Harvard, Murray embarked on a twenty-five year program that studied personality within a social context and influenced many future researchers. He retired in 1962, and although his prolific writing appeared to cease after leaving Harvard, his groundbreaking work on the study of personality remains highly influential. Murray died on 23 June 1988 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Murray's choice to study personality differed from his mentors such as Prince, who specialized in multiple personalities and hypnosis. Instead, Murray's theoretical approach was more akin to Jungian analysis with a primary interest in depth psychology. Murray had begun reading Carl Jung's work in 1923, and the two later met and became lifelong friends. Through a series of serendipitous events, Murray discovered the works of author Herman Melville, who became a case study for Murray's pioneering work in personality. Although his writings on Melville were never published, Murray's ideas were examined for decades by Melville scholars, and with Murray continuing to produce articles on depth psychology, he became extremely well known among the academic community. Murray's approach to studying personality opposed the classical large-scale statistical measurements of small animals, and instead, involved rigorous studies, at various levels, of individual human beings, while using an interdisciplinary group of researchers.

Using techniques that he developed, such as the Thematic Apperception Test, Murray was able to use projective tests, which are tests usually involving ambiguous stimuli to be interpreted by the subject. Murray administered TAT cards, typically depicting one or more people in a slightly ambiguous scene, and allowed the subjects to freely respond, creating a story and expressing feelings that they thought would explain the indeterminate scene on the card. By examining an ambiguous social scene depicted by the card, Murray felt that many of the subjects own personality traits may be revealed in the process of responding to the TAT cards. Murray also studied how personality is affected by the dynamics of mythology from both a personal and social context, and was an avid environmentalist, antinuclear war activist, and strong supporter of the Democratic Party. However, what Murray will be remembered for the most was being a pioneer in the advancement of new, scientific and experimental techniques to assess personality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Explorations in Personality: A Clinical and Experimental Study of Fifty Men of College Age (New York, 1938).

Personality in Nature, Society and Culture, ed. Clyde Kluckhohn (New York, 1948; 2nd edn 1953).

Myth and Myth Making (Boston, 1968).

Other Relevant Works

Murray's papers are at the Henry Murray Research Center for the Study of Lives at Radcliffe College and the Harvard University Archives.

"Introduction," to *Pierre; or, The Ambiguities*, by Herman Melville (New York, 1949).

Endeavors in Psychology: Selections from the Personology of Henry A. Murray, ed. Edwin S. Schneidman (New York, 1981).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*

Maddi, Salvatore R., and Paul T. Costa. *Humanism in Personology: Allport, Maslow, and Murray* (Chicago, 1972).

Robinson, Forrest G. *Love's Story Told: A Life of Henry A. Murray* (Boston, 1992).

White, R. W. "Exploring Personality the Long Way: The Study of Lives," in *Further Explorations in Personality*, ed. A. I. Rabin et al. (New York, 1981), pp. 3–19.

Zucker, Robert A. *Personality Structure in the Life Course: Essays on Personology in the Murray Tradition* (New York, 1992).

Daniel Trippett

MURRAY, John Clark (1836–1917)

John Clark Murray was born on 19 March 1836 at Thread and Tannahill near Paisley, Scotland. Murray attended Paisley Grammar School and then both Glasgow and Edinburgh Universities. He received his MA from Edinburgh and also studied at the Universities of Heidelberg and Göttingen. In 1862 Murray was appointed to the chair of mental and moral philosophy at Queen's University, in Kingston, Canada. Murray's tenure at Queen's is memorable primarily for his vocal promotion of higher education for women. Murray married activist and poet Margaret Polson in 1865. After a decade, Murray moved to fill the same position at McGill College in Montréal in 1872, joining William LEACH, and remained there for over forty years. Murray held the John Frothingham Chair of Mental and Moral Philosophy at McGill from 1873 until his retirement in 1903.

While at McGill, Murray continued as an advocate of women's education, and also taught philosophy classes and lectured on psychology. In addition, he published nine books, forty articles, numerous reviews, and some verse. His writings, which discussed topics ranging from Spinoza to independent Canadian nationhood, include articles published in prominent American journals like the *Philosophical Review* and the Chicago-based journal *Open Court*, as well as in the *British Quarterly*, *Macmillan's Magazine*, and the *Canadian Monthly*. Murray was awarded an LLD from the University of Glasgow and was a charter member of the Royal Society of Canada. Murray's controversial views on women's rights and the role of arts in the university curriculum precipitated a quarrel with McGill Principal William Dawson and Murray was forced to retire in 1903. Murray died on 20 November 1917 in Montréal, Canada.

Murray's philosophical thinking was a blend of Calvinism, German idealism, and Scottish Common Sense Realism. He was particularly influenced by William Hamilton, but also maintained an interest in science, particularly physics and physiology, throughout his career. His two texts on psychology were particularly influential in the United States. *The Industrial Kingdom of God*, Murray's fascinating attempt to provide a solution to the growing problems of industrial society by merging classical liberalism and ethical idealism, was written in 1887, but was not published until 1982.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An Outline of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy (Boston, 1870).

The Ballads and Songs of Scotland, in View of Their Influence on the Character of the People (London, 1874).

Memoir of David Murray (Paisley, Scotland, 1881).

A Hand-Book of Psychology (Paisley, Scotland, and London, 1885).

An Introduction to Ethics (Boston, 1891).

An Introduction to Psychology (Boston, 1904).

He That Had Received the Five Talents (London, 1904).

A Hand-Book of Christian Ethics (Edinburgh, 1908).

The Industrial Kingdom of God (Ottawa, 1982).

Other Relevant Works
Murray's papers are at McGill University.
Trans., *Solomon Maimon: An Autobiography* (Paisley, Scotland, and Boston, 1888).

Further Reading
Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, *Canad Encyc*, *Dict Canad Bio*
Armour, Leslie, and Elizabeth Trott. *The Faces of Reason: An Essay on Philosophy and Culture in English Canada 1850–1950* (Waterloo, Ontario, 1981), pp. 105–75.
———, "John Clark Murray," in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Literature*, ed. William Toye (Toronto, 1983), p. 538.
Irving, John A. "The Development of Philosophy in Central Canada from 1850 to 1900," *Canadian Historical Review* 31 (1950): 252–87.
"John Clark Murray," in *A Supplement to Allibone's Critical Dictionary of English Literature and British and American Authors*, vol. 2, by John Foster Kirk (Philadelphia, 1900), p. 1160.
Terpstra, Nicholas. "A Tale of Two Cities: John Clark Murray's Search for the Industrial Kingdom of God," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 27 (Fall 1992): 5–27.

Margaret Nunnelley

MURRAY, John Courtney (1904–67)

John Courtney Murray was born in New York City on 12 September 1904 to a Scottish-American lawyer, Michael John Murray, and his Irish-American wife, Margaret Courtney Murray. At the age of sixteen he joined the Society of Jesus, receiving an excellent and extensive education. Murray earned his BA from Weston College in 1926 and his MA from Boston College in 1927. After spending several years in the Philippines teaching English and Latin, he pursued advanced theological training at Woodstock College in Maryland. In 1933, three years into his program of study, Murray was ordained a Catholic priest. A year later he completed his STL degree. The last stage of his formal education took place at the Gregorian University in Rome, where he earned an STD degree in 1937.

In 1937, Murray returned to Woodstock College to serve as professor of dogmatic theology, a position he held for the remaining thirty years of his life. In 1951–2 he held a visiting appointment at Yale University. In addition to teaching, Murray served as editor of *Theological Studies*, a respected and scholarly Catholic theological journal, from 1941 to 1967. During this time he also published a steady stream of articles. His writings garnered widespread attention in his home country and abroad, and by the 1950s he was recognized as one of the most influential American Catholic theologians of his day. His stature led to his appointment as a *peritus*, or expert, at the Second Vatican Council during the early 1960s. Murray died on 16 August 1967 in New York City.

To appreciate Murray's significance, it is essential to recall the orientation of the Roman Catholic Church toward the wider world in the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth centuries. This was an era of rapid and profound change in the Western world that led to the reengineering of the structures of government and society and the reevaluation of inherited notions about knowledge, human nature, and the cosmos. In particular, liberal ideals concerning human freedom, equality, and democratic government were embraced by an ever-widening circle, as was the authority of new "scientific" approaches to everything from the origins of humankind to the historical unfolding of the Bible. Of themselves these developments were challenging enough, but they were rendered all the more unpalatable by the loud anti-Catholicism expressed by many avatars of

the new age and the occasional paroxysms of anticlerical excess that accompanied revolutionary political change in erstwhile Catholic strongholds like France and Italy. In a series of pronouncements Pope Pius IX condemned the hallmarks of the modern age in no uncertain terms and urged Catholics to resist them, thereby setting the tone that would resonate powerfully throughout the Catholic world for roughly a century. Murray represents one of a small number of prominent Catholic intellectuals in the middle decades of the twentieth century who advocated a more sympathetic and constructive response to modernity.

Murray's public engagement with the issue of the church's relationship to modern society began in 1940 with a lecture series entitled "The Construction of a Christian Culture," in which he argued that a fuller appreciation of core Christian doctrines could help rescue American culture from what he termed its "deep abasement," restoring a proper understanding of the dignity and spiritual autonomy of human beings. He soon tinctured his argument with an ecumenical note quite remarkable for the times. Recognizing the pluralism of American society, he now urged cooperation among all theistic faiths in the common cause of the nation's redemption. Murray's call inspired criticism from powerful voices within the American Catholic hierarchy. In the eyes of many Catholic leaders at this time, interfaith ventures were controversial because they downplayed or ignored altogether the significance of the discrepancies between faiths, on matters of doctrine and praxis, thereby opening the door to religious indifferentism. In attempting to build bridges between faith communities, it seems that Murray was ahead of his time.

In the second half of the 1940s Murray shifted his attention to issues of church and state. In response to the spread of the liberal vision of government, Pius IX and a number of his successors articulated their view of the ideal model, or "thesis," of church–state relations. In a perfect world the state would promote the dominance of the Roman Catholic Church – the one true church, as they saw it – and restrict alternative religious bodies. Unfettered religious freedom and the tolerance of confessional pluralism were dangerous policies that exposed souls to the threat of heresy. Such pronouncements from Rome left American Catholics in an uncomfortable situation. Not only did it nourish anti-Catholic nativism in the United States, it placed the religious commitments of Catholics at odds with their patriotic desire to celebrate the freedoms enshrined in the American Constitution.

In a steady stream of articles, Murray attempted to reconcile recent papal pronouncements with the principles of freedom of conscience and the separation of church and state. He argued that the thesis enunciated by recent popes was designed as a response to specific challenges faced in decidedly secular polities like republican France, where the church was being almost completely overshadowed by a state with "religious pretensions" and "absolutist tendencies." The United States, Murray argued, was quite distinct from the secularizing countries of Europe, and so recent papal prescriptions did not apply. What made the US distinctive was the First Amendment, which sharply delineated the spiritual from the worldly, requiring religious bodies and the state to operate in separate spheres. In the American model, the integrity of the spiritual sphere is affirmed and defended from encroachment by the state, which willingly acknowledges the limits of its own competence.

In addition to interpreting the recent papal thesis in a way that restricted its relevance, Murray offered a sweeping overview of the history of the Catholic approach to church–state relations that accommodated the American model. At those points in its history when the Roman Catholic Church has been most firmly guided by reason, he argued, it has recognized the coexistence of two powers, the temporal and the spiritual. These two powers are to exercise their authority in those areas appropriate to each, with neither the state nor the church overwhelming the other power.

This was the position taken by Pope Gelasius in the year 494, in his famous letter to Emperor Anastasius I. It was developed in its most systematic fashion by the thirteenth-century theologian John of Paris. Murray insisted that the First Amendment separation of church and state is very much in keeping with this larger Catholic tradition.

Murray freely granted that times have changed since the days of Gelasius and John of Paris. While they developed their ideas when monarchic forms of government were the norm, in the modern era democracy increasingly has emerged as the new paradigm. Such a change need not be considered problematic, Murray insisted. On the contrary, the church should be open to the evolution of political, social, and economic forms. Judging from the successful spread of democracy, Murray deemed it an "intention of nature," and he praised it for its implicit recognition of the dignity and responsibility of human beings. A necessary corollary to democratic government is the guarantee of basic civil liberties, including the freedom of religious association.

Although his admiration for the First Amendment was clear, Murray's combined his sympathy with criticism for those instances when the judicial branch failed to maintain the proper balance between church and state. He was distressed in particular by recent Supreme Court decisions that forbade the government from supporting religious bodies. The target of these rulings, he believed, was the contentious issue of public funding for the Catholic school system, and he saw in the rulings a new expression of anti-Catholic nativism.

Murray's approach to church–state relations earned him many admirers, as well as his share of detractors, both at home and abroad. Many American Catholic bishops and intellectuals recognized the potential of Murray's arguments to defuse some of the suspicion Catholics routinely encountered in American society, and they saw him as an ally in the struggle to win government support for Catholic schools. His critics, however, believed that Murray's views contradicted official papal pronouncements, and they appealed to Rome to censor him. This latter party appeared to achieve a major victory in 1953 when Alfred Cardinal Ottaviani, secretary of the Holy Office, publicly affirmed the recent papal thesis on church–state relations and criticized "liberalizing" alternatives. Although Murray's name was not specifically mentioned, he was clearly the object of Ottaviani's attack.

Concerned about the extent to which Ottaviani spoke for the pope himself, Murray appealed directly to Rome for clarification. Pope Pius XII's personal secretary assured him that Ottaviani had simply expressed his private opinions and not the official church position. Buoyed by this affirmation, Murray dared to go public with the news. In a 1954 speech at the Catholic University of America, he noted how the pope had distanced himself from Ottaviani's position. Murray's opponents, led by Ottaviani, returned fire, setting in motion an investigation by the Holy Office into Murray's views. The investigation eventually concluded that several of Murray's propositions were "erroneous." In response, his superiors ordered Murray to submit all future writings on the subject of church and state to Jesuit headquarters in Rome, and they advised him to pursue other avenues of inquiry. In encountering such restrictions and censure, Murray found himself in the company of a number of prominent continental theologians like Henri de Lubac, Yves Congar, and Karl Rahner, all of whom suffered on account of their efforts to encourage a rapprochement between the Roman Catholic Church and the modern era.

After having a number of essays on church–state issues rejected by Jesuit censors, Murray finally took the advice of his superiors to heart and shifted the focus of his intellectual engagement. In the second half of the 1950s he issued a series of articles concerning the "public philosophy" of the US. Public philosophy refers to the foundational truths widely

accepted as self-evident within a given society, a consensus which helps generate a common identity and sense of purpose. Murray averred that at the founding of the US and during its early history the nation possessed a public philosophy. This philosophy was based upon the belief in universal truths that could be readily discerned through the use of human reason. These truths included the belief in God and God's moral law, the value of liberty, and the integral relationship between liberty and virtue. A free society could only be maintained when its citizens were committed to living according to God's moral law and when human laws served to reinforce the same.

Murray also expressed his concern that the US had entered a new era of "post-modern man," in which its public philosophy and the "intuitive wisdom" upon which it had been built were no longer widely embraced. They had been marginalized by new orientations such as positivism and pragmatism, which had dismissed the idea of God and universal laws, believing instead that all values and conventions are human-made and contingent. Murray coupled his jeremiad with an expression of hope that American society could once again construct a workable public philosophy, noting that the major religions could supply many of the resources for such an endeavor. He highlighted in particular the parallels he saw between the venerable Catholic notion of natural law and the universal truths recognized by the founding fathers.

Murray's essays and public appearances during the 1950s found an enthusiastic audience and earned him widespread recognition as one of the foremost American Catholic intellectuals of his day. His profile was enhanced still further, and his audience notably enlarged, when his recent essays were published together in a volume in 1960 entitled *We Hold These Truths: Catholic Reflections on the American Proposition*. Appearing on the eve of John F. Kennedy's presidency, the book offered a valuable perspective on the position of Catholics in American society, an issue of

tremendous interest at the time. Henry Luce, the editor of *Time* magazine, deemed the publication of the book newsworthy enough to merit placing Murray's face on the cover of his popular periodical, accompanied by a long and laudatory article.

The affirmation Murray received in his home country was soon replicated at the highest levels of the Roman Catholic Church. During the papacy of Pius XII, the thought of progressive theologians often met with substantial resistance. The climate changed dramatically during the brief pontificate of John XXIII, who initiated the Second Vatican Council from 1961 to 1965, and modernizers like Murray, de Lubac, and Rahner were allowed to play a prominent role. Francis Cardinal Spellman appointed Murray as an expert and advisor on church–state issues to the delegation of American bishops. Murray used the opportunity to highlight the importance of addressing the matter of religious freedom, and he played a major role in the drafting of one of the sixteen doctrinal statements produced at the council, *Dignitatis humanae personae*, known in English as *The Declaration of Religious Freedom*. The final version of this document contained the very ideas of Murray's that had generated so much suspicion only a few years before: his historical and contextual reading of the Catholic doctrine of church–state relations that allowed for the affirmation of the principle of religious freedom without contradicting modern papal pronouncements on the issue. In the final years of his life Murray dedicated much of his energy to elucidating the achievements of the Second Vatican Council, particularly *The Declaration of Human Freedom*. In 1964 he published a book on the doctrine of the Trinity entitled *The Problem of God*, a product of years of teaching about the subject at Woodstock College.

Murray also expressed his learned opinion about the Catholic position on artificial contraception, one of the most contentious issues within the church at the time. His opinion was solicited in 1964 by Cardinal Richard Cushing

of Boston, who was formulating a response to a proposed amendment to Massachusetts state law that would repeal the penalties imposed upon those who sold or distributed artificial means of birth control. Murray recommending backing the amendment. Echoing his earlier position on the necessary separation of church and state, he argued that civil law should be limited to restraining gross excesses of behavior; it is neither an effective nor an appropriate tool for enforcing the finer points of sexual morality. Moreover, civil law needs to be attuned to the evolving popular consensus on moral issues. Motivated by their proper understanding of the difference between morality and law and the value of religious freedom, he argued, Catholics should repudiate a coercive application of the law that enforces standards not commonly accepted by the community. Murray expressed his views on the subject again in 1966 in connection with high-level discussions within the Catholic Church over whether its ban on artificial birth control should be continued. Murray sided with the majority of theologians and ethicists engaged in the talks, who recommended lifting the ban.

Murray is regarded by many as among the finest theological minds thus far produced by the Catholic Church in America. He is remembered in particular for his effort to bring the church into a productive dialogue with the dominant values and practices of the modern era. For his achievements he remains an inspiration to Catholics who are sympathetic with that dialogue.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

We Hold These Truths: Catholic Reflections on the American Proposition (New York, 1960).
The Problem of God Yesterday and Today (New Haven, Conn., 1964).
Religious Liberty: Catholic Struggles with Pluralism, ed. J. Leon Hooper (Louisville, Kent., 1993).

Other Relevant Works
Murray's papers are at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C.
Bridging the Sacred and the Secular: Selected Writings, ed. J. Leon Hooper (Washington, D.C., 1994).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*
Ferguson, Thomas P. *Catholic and American: The Political Theology of John Courtney Murray* (Kansas City, Miss., 1993).
Gonnet, Dominique. *La Liberté religieuse à Vatican II: La contribution de John Courtney Murray* (Paris, 1994).
Hooper, J. Leon. *The Ethics of Discourse: The Social Philosophy of John Courtney Murray* (Washington, D.C., 1986).
Hughson, D. Thomas. *The Believer as Citizen: John Courtney Murray in a New Context* (New York, 1993).
McElroy, Robert. *The Search for an American Public Theology: The Contribution of John Courtney Murray* (New York, 1989).
Pavlischek, Keith J. *John Courtney Murray and the Dilemma of Religious Toleration* (Kirksville, Miss., 1994).
Pelotte, Donald. *John Courtney Murray: Theologian in Conflict* (New York, 1976).

Robert E. Alvis

N

NAGEL, Ernest (1901–85)

Ernest Nagel was born on 16 November 1901 in Nový Mesto in Bohemia, Austro-Hungarian Empire (now in the Czech Republic). He and his family emigrated to the United States in 1911, and he became an American citizen in 1919. He attended City College of New York, where he graduated with a BS in 1923, and studied with Morris R. COHEN. Nagel then received his MA in 1925 and PhD in philosophy in 1930 from Columbia University, where his teachers included John DEWEY. He wrote his doctoral dissertation on the logic of measurement, a topic which continued to interest him throughout his career. He taught philosophy at Columbia beginning in 1931, and in 1955 his title became John Dewey Professor of Philosophy. He retired in 1970, and continued to teach in retirement. He also was a visiting professor in 1966–7 at Rockefeller University. Nagel was President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1954–55, and in 1977 he was elected to the National Academy of Sciences. He died on 20 September 1985 in New York City.

Nagel's most important contributions were in philosophy and logic of science, logic, philosophy of logic, and philosophy of mathematics. With Cohen, he wrote *Introduction to Logic and Scientific Method* (1934), one of the earliest introductory logic textbooks for philosophy undergraduate courses to include symbolic logic. It employed the axiomatic method, while retaining features of older textbooks that covered formal and informal fallacies, syllogistic, inductive logic, and scientific method. Cohen and Nagel promoted the ideas of Charles PEIRCE, and succeeded in entrenching much of his logical views in philosophy of science and logic in the US. The *Introduction to Logic and Scientific Method* and an abridged version, *An Introduction to Logic*, remained in use for three decades, and in 1993 a revised edition was published by logician John Corcoran. With James Roy Newman, Nagel authored *Gödel's Proof* (1958), a popular exposition of Kurt GÖDEL's incompleteness theorems and of their philosophical import, which suggested that the Heisenberg Indeterminacy Principle in physics, among other phenomena, was an example of the kind of uncertainty to which Gödel's theorems pointed.

Nagel taught both introductory logic and advanced logic, focusing on systems of propositional and first-order logic. Among the students in both his introductory and advanced logic courses at Columbia was mathematics major Leon Henkin, who became one of America's leading logicians. Nagel himself was interested in the historical development of logic. For example, he explored aspects of the nineteenth-century developments in algebra and related aspects of number theory for the development of logic and the conception of mathematical truth (1935). In *The Formation of Modern*

Conceptions of Formal Logic in the Development of Geometry (1939), Nagel considered the philosophical influence import of the development of non-Euclidean and projective geometry on the nineteenth-century conception of the mathematical enterprise, on the nature of mathematical truth, and the nature and foundations of mathematics. He noted that the creation of projective and non-Euclidean geometries led such mathematicians as Moritz Pasch, Giuseppe Peano, and David Hilbert, among others, to investigate theorems that held true in non-Euclidean geometry but not in Euclidean geometry, and thus to reexamine the foundations of geometry, which in turn led them to move away from the intuitively intelligible to the abstractly axiomatic approach. Nagel also argued that the concept of duality made possible by alternative geometries, especially projective geometry, was allowed in, and worked only within, the axiomatic approach, where terms are undefined and replacing, for example, "point" with "line" or "collinear" with "concurrent," led from one true theorem to another, equally true but different in content, and the proofs of such theorems were deductively obtained.

Initially, under the influence of Cohen, Nagel was a logical realist, combining the logical positivism of the Vienna Circle with the pragmatism of Peirce. Nagel argued that the principles of logic are a priori, representing universal and eternal features of nature. Nagel anticipated W. V. QUINE's conception in "Two Dogmas of Empiricism" that the dichotomies of the analytic and synthetic and the formal and empirical or a priori and a posteriori are both artificial.

Employing "empiricism" as a synonym for Peirce's "pragmatism" and "pragmaticism," Nagel defined it as a tool or procedure for the study and description of reality, and held it to be a methodology that avoids the traditional philosophical and logical puzzles that "derive almost entirely from isolating knowledge from the procedures leading up to it, so that

it becomes logically impossible to attain" (quoted in Buchler 1939, p. xvi). As an advocate for Peirce's pragmatism, Nagel held that Peirce sought "to construct a system of philosophy so comprehensive that for a long time to come achievements in all departments of research, in mathematics, in the natural sciences, in history, in sociology, would appear simply as details filling out its outline" (Buchler 1939, p. xiii). Nagel claimed that the "recognition of the role played by symbols or language in human behavior and knowledge," together with the "recognition that human knowledge is an achievement of biological organisms functioning in social contexts," were Peirce's two most fundamental insights. Peirce, he thought, understood his semiotic to provide a systematizing theory that would unite the findings of both the formal (logical) and the empirical (biologico-social) approaches of inquiry.

Nagel gradually moved towards an operationalist conception in which he held both logic and science to be abstract and functional. The laws, principles, and conceptions of logic and science are developed by extrapolation and generalization of experiential knowledge and derive their meaning from the coherence they bestow upon our understanding of the universe. This position was most thoroughly expressed in his *Logic without Metaphysics* (1957). In science, Nagel adopted a reductionist thesis as a counterpart to his operationalism, considering the behavioral and social sciences to be ultimately translatable to the terms and concepts of the physical sciences. In his most influential work, *The Structure of Science: Problems in the Logic of Scientific Explanation* (1961), and other writings, he argued for the systematic reduction of the behavioral and social sciences to physical science, despite the apparent references which they make to nonobservable entities and despite their appeals to value judgments. Nagel was committed to the unity of the sciences and to experimental psychology as the scientific basis of the behav-

ioral sciences. Nagel's conception of psychology and its application to psychoanalysis received its most detailed treatment and elaboration in the work of Guiliano Di Bernardo, especially his *La logica dell'analisi funzionale e la psicanalisi* (1975). Nagel did not, however, claim that this kind of reductionism would be a simple matter, and pointed out, on the contrary, that the reduction of even one branch of physics to another involved great complexities, for example, the reduction of classical thermodynamics to statistical mechanics. Nagel noted also that, despite Heisenberg's Indeterminacy Principle, deterministic factors remained in quantum mechanics, most notably the Planck constant in the Schrödinger equation.

Nagel's approach to philosophy of science was through its techniques and procedures and its methodology, in such works as *On the Logic of Measurement* (1930) and *The Structure of Science: Problems in the Logic of Scientific Explanation*. Nagel also contributed the conception of the nature of scientific theory and the relation of scientific methodology and theory formulation. With Sylvain BROMBERGER and Adolf GRÜNBAUM, Nagel wrote on the role of observation and experimentation in the formation and formulation of scientific theories (1971). Among the tools used by science in formulating hypotheses to which Nagel gave particular attention were those of logic and mathematics. He focused early in his career on probability, writing *Principles of the Theory of Probability* (1932), and later in his career he worked on induction (1963). He consistently defended the frequency theory of probability, based upon experimental-observational methodology of the random coin toss.

In both his early pragmatic positivism and in his later operationalism, Nagel stressed the rational nature of the scientific enterprise and of its methodology. Referring to his mature philosophy as "contextualist naturalism," Nagel rejected reductive materialism in favor of a broad naturalism (1945). His rationalism is evident in his concern for the logic of the sciences, as reflected in *Sovereign Reason* (1954) and in *The Structure of Science*, in which the logical nature of the scientific endeavor is made paramount.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

On the Logic of Measurement (New York, 1930).

Principles of the Theory of Probability (Chicago, 1939).

Introduction to Logic and Scientific Method, with Morris R. Cohen (New York, 1934). 2nd edn, *An Introduction to Logic*, ed. John Corcoran (Indianapolis, 1993).

The Formation of Modern Conceptions of Formal Logic in the Development of Geometry (Bruges, Belgium, 1939).

Logic without Metaphysics, and Other Essays (New York, 1957).

Sovereign Reason, and Other Studies in the Philosophy of Science (Glencoe, Ill., 1954).

Gödel's Proof, with James R. Newman (New York, 1958; 2nd edn 2001).

The Structure of Science: Problems in the Logic of Scientific Explanation (New York, 1961).

Observation and Theory in Science, with Sylvain Bromberger and Adolf Grünbaum (Baltimore, Md., 1971).

Teleology Revisited and Other Essays in the Philosophy and History of Science (New York, 1979).

Other Relevant Works

Nagel's papers are at Columbia University.

"'Impossible Numbers': A Chapter in the History of Modern Logic," *Studies in the History of Ideas* 3 (1935): 429–74.

"The Formation of Modern Conceptions of Formal Logic in the Development of Geometry," *Osiris* 7 (1939): 142–222.

"Are Naturalists Materialists?" with John Dewey and Sidney Hook, *Journal of Philosophy* 42 (1945): 515–30.

Ed. with Salo W. Baron and Koppel S. Pinson, *Freedom and Reason: Studies in Philosophy and Jewish Culture, in Memory of Morris Raphael Cohen* (Glencoe, Ill., 1951).

"Charles Sanders Peirce, a Prodigious but Little-known American Philosopher," *Scientific American* 200 (April 1959): 185–92.

Ed. with Patrick Suppes and Alfred Tarski, *Logic, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science* (Stanford, Cal., 1962).

Ed. with Henry E. Kyburg, Jr., *Induction: Some Current Issues* (Middletown, Conn., 1963).

Ed. with Richard B. Brandt, *Meaning and Knowledge: Systematic Readings in Epistemology* (New York, 1965).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils 1950-2000*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v6*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v9*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Buchler, Justus. *Charles Peirce's Empiricism* (New York, 1939).

Di Bernardo, Guiliano. *La logica dell'analisi funzionale e la psicanalisi* (Trent, Italy, 1975).

Dougherty, Jude. "Nagel's Concept of Science," *Philosophy Today* 10 (1966): 212–21.

Grünbaum, Adolf. "The Structure of Science," *Philosophy of Science* 29 (1962): 294–305.

Madden, Edward H. "Ernest Nagel's 'Structure of Science'," *Philosophy of Science* 30 (1963): 64–70.

Morgenbesser, Sidney, Patrick Suppes, and Morton White, eds. *Philosophy, Science, and Method: Essays in Honor of Ernest Nagel* (New York, 1969).

Pattaro, Sandra T. *Sviluppi critica del pensiero scientifico moderno nell ricon-struzione metodologica di Ernest Nagel* (Bologna, Italy, 1991).

Reichenbach, Hans. "Reply to Ernest Nagel's Criticism of My Views on Quantum Mechanics," *Journal of Philosophy* 43 (1946): 239–47.

Wilkins, Burleigh T. "Nagel's Critique of Psychoanalysis," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 24 (1964): 383–96.

Irving H. Anellis

NAGEL, Thomas (1937–)

Thomas Nagel was born on 4 July 1937 in Belgrade, Yugoslavia. He emigrated to the United States and became a US citizen in 1944. He was educated at Cornell University (BA 1958), Corpus Christi College, Oxford (BPhil 1960), and Harvard University, where he received a PhD in philosophy in 1963 under the supervision of John RAWLS. He was an assistant professor of philosophy at University of California at Berkeley from 1963 to 1966, before moving to Princeton University, where he was a professor of philosophy from 1966 until 1980, becoming full professor in 1972. He then moved to New York University, where he was chair of the philosophy department during 1981–6. In 1986 he added an appointment to the Law Faculty, where he became Fiorello LaGuardia Professor of Law in 2001. In 2002 he was appointed University Professor at NYU. Nagel has also held visiting appointments in Oxford, South Africa, and Mexico, and at other leading institutions in the United States, together with a number of notable lectureships and fellowships in philosophy. He is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, as well as a corresponding fellow of the British Academy.

Nagel's career opened with two articles which he published in 1959: on Hobbes, and on "Dreaming." These were followed by

articles on "Physicalism" (1965) and "Sexual Perversion" (1969). The latter article proposed that normal sexual desire incorporated certain Gricean conditions on mutual acknowledgement that perversion failed to satisfy; homosexuality was not therefore to be classed as a perversion, though perversions were not necessarily morally discreditable. Nagel's systematic thinking first became evident in *The Possibility of Altruism*, which developed a theme that was to become prominent in his later writings. Human beings are able, he argued, to adopt an impersonal standpoint, and to judge actions and policies from a timeless or unselfish perspective. Prudential action is possible because we do not act on our present desires alone, and we have reasons for action above and beyond our present desires for certain future states. Altruism is similarly possible because we do not act only on selfish desires and because we have impersonal reasons above and beyond our deriving personal gratification from helping others for helping them. Appreciating the force of impersonal reasons entails seeing one's own interests and desires as no more important and no more deserving or demanding of fulfillment than the interests and desires of others, just as prudential action requires us to regard a present desire, however powerful, as not meriting being acted upon. The view sometimes ascribed to Hume, that only personal desires motivate and that moral motivation requires an experienced passion to mediate action, was rejected. The theory of objective goodness is associated in modern times with G. E. Moore, with whose views Nagel's had some affinity. Increasingly, however, Nagel was persuaded that our capacity to adopt an impersonal perspective operates only sporadically and produces a permanent state of tension and irresolution. It is in competition with another feature of minds in general, not just the human mind: the irrevocably first-person nature of experience.

Nagel's emerging ideas about first-person experience were elaborated in "What is it Like to Be a Bat?" (1974). He argued that the problem of consciousness was probably intractable philosophically. Other philosophers like J. J. C. Smart, David Armstrong, and Hilary PUTNAM had explored attempts to identify mind and brain. Resistance to identity became a noteworthy feature of Anglo-American philosophy beginning in the 1970s and the *qualia* problem continues to be treated as a hard or impossible problem for the ideal of a unified science. The concept of experience, it was repeatedly shown, does not lend itself to analysis in physicalist terms, even if one rejects the hypothesis of an immaterial soul, and Nagel's treatment was related to Saul KRIPKE's 1972 discussion of pain concepts in *Naming and Necessity*. For every conscious creature, Nagel argued, there is something that it is like to be that creature and to experience the world from that creature's perspective. The subjective character of experience could not be captured by functionalism or the identity-theory, he argued, since these presuppose no point of view. While an observer can acquire copious information about the experiences of animals who hang upside down from trees, emit high-pitched shrieks, and navigate by echolocation through a study of their sensory systems and behavior, the student of bats cannot learn what it is like to be the subject of those experiences, actually to *be* a bat. Empathy and imagination, as well as the inferences we can make from anatomy and physiology, fall well short of giving us knowledge of what it is like to be another. Yet there is a fact of the matter about what it is like to be a bat. Physicalism is accordingly untrue, Nagel argued, insofar as it implies that all the facts about experience can be expressed from an objective standpoint. More generally, "there are facts that do not consist in the truth of propositions expressible in a human language."

Nagel next sought to work out the implications of subjectivity for normative theory. Moral and political theories, as he had made clear in *The Possibility of Altruism*, are formulated from an objective perspective. Yet their justification has to take into account the expe-

riences of the persons who act and suffer under moral regulation. From the first-person perspective, a conscious being's pains and pleasures count more than the pains and pleasures of other creatures. We can forget or ignore this feature of our constitutions when engaged in moral theorizing or when transported by the nobility of the impersonal perspective. However, our egoism limits what we can ask of ourselves and of others. This limitation has a bearing on the problem of affluence, and more generally on problems of distributive justice as discussed in Nagel's *Equality and Partiality* (1991).

A number of Nagel's papers on experiential and perspectival questions appeared in the 1970s. A paper on "The Absurd" (1971) argued that from the objective point of view each individual's aspirations are pointless and each life is meaningless. Once this is appreciated, it cannot be ignored, but existential despair is not the proper response, for the absurdity of life really does not matter. "Death" (1970) tackled the Epicurean question whether death is an evil, and, if so, for whom it is an evil. Nagel argued that death is bad for the person who dies, though not for that person at any particular time, i.e., not at the moment of death, or before, or after death. Events and states of affairs can be bad for a person because she would as a matter of fact have been better off had the event not occurred or the state of affairs not obtained, even if she does not subjectively suffer on account of the event or state of affairs. (Being hated is presumably worse for a person than being only mildly disliked, even if she is unaware that she is.) "Moral Luck" (1976) addressed the problems of determinism and responsibility. Nagel observed that ordinary attributions of responsibility for causing harm do not control for contingency. Chance and accidental circumstances contribute to many of the bad outcomes we are blamed for and blame others for. "The things for which people are morally judged are determined in more ways than we at first realize by what is beyond their control …. Ultimately, nothing or almost

nothing about what a person does seems to be under his control." (1979, p. 26) Any individual who was alive and culpably cooperative in Hitler's Germany might have been an obscure and harmless peasant in another country. All wrongdoing is in this sense radically accidental, since I do not choose when and where to be born. Yet guilt is ascribed and self-ascribed according to how things turn out. Nagel argued that guilt-ascription is manifestly irrational: on the view from nowhere, no one is responsible for anything and agency disappears. Responsibility is a kind of cognitive illusion of the first-person standpoint.

Mortal Questions (1979) summarized the analytic-phenomenological papers of the 1960s and 70s, continuing his principle themes: how experience and objectivity offers sharp insights into commonplaces of everyday life. *The View from Nowhere* (1986), developed from the Tanner Lectures of 1979, provided a lengthy discussion of objectivity and its limits. Nagel held fast to what he termed "normative realism." He distinguished the sense in which moral inquiry was different from inquiry into natural objects and processes, reaffirmed his commitment to impersonal reasons, and insisted on a link between the acceptance of those reasons and the truth of the theory embodying them. The moral epistemology defended was largely unclear to reviewers of the *View From Nowhere*, who nevertheless praised the book's sensitive handling of the conflict between the embedded and the detached standpoint as these affected the treatment of the classic problems of free will, personal identity, the evil of death, and moral obligation.

In "War and Massacre" (1972) Nagel suggested that the moral dilemmas of warfare indicate that the world may be not only a bad, but an evil place, in which ethical unification cannot be achieved. Dilemmas may involve conflicts between personal and impersonal considerations that do not merely set selfishness against altruism, but first-person values such as integrity and innocence against third-person

values such as welfare or the preservation of life. The fact that I cannot justify my actions as a torturer *to* my victim in terms he could accept, regardless of the greater good supposed to flow from torture, counts against the moral acceptability of torture. Ordinary combat presents the same problem.

Nagel maintained an interest in general political philosophy and in questions of equality, war, poverty, and social justice. He was the associate editor of *Philosophy & Public Affairs* from 1970 to 1982 and co-edited with Marshall Cohen and Thomas Scanlon a series of readers in political and social theory drawn from the journal. His own contributions in this area reflected his perspectival framework. According to consequentialists, I am obliged to do what will, depending on the particular version of the theory under consideration, increase welfare, defined and measured in some manner. I ought, on this view, to take the $600 currently sitting in my bank account and buy a washing machine for the needy family down the street; but no philosophical argument will induce me to do this. The claim that I am impersonally obliged to do this merely brings into focus the fact that it is a feature of the first-person standpoint that a conscious creature's propensities to action are not overwhelmingly determined by its impersonal obligations. Nagel argued that the theory of distributive justice ought not overreach itself by placing demands on well-off agents that are disconnected from their existing or foreseeable internal motivations. "The impersonal desire for equality meets severe obstacles from individual motivation at every step, in regard to the basic institutions to which individuals are willing to give their allegiance, in the process of democratic politics, and in the operations of the economy." (1991, p. 95) This recognition drove Nagel, influenced by Scanlon, to a kind of contractualism in which, despite his acknowledgment that bargaining power differed amongst the different strata of a society, agreement or consensus was held to be a condition of legitimacy. Imposed deprivations, Nagel continued to think, had to

be justified to those persons whom they deprived (p. 33).

Nagel's position on demanding-ness bore some relation as well to the anti-theory movements of the 1980s. P. F. Strawson pointed to the limitations of "revisionary" philosophical theories, and Bernard Williams questioned the meta-ethical basis of theories of impersonal obligation. Excess demanding-ness, whether Kantian or utilitarian, was increasingly seen as an element of utopian fantasy or a darkly totalitarian impulse in moral theory. But where Williams offered promises of emancipation, drawing on pre-modern and even anti-modern ethical paradigms, Nagel suggested that the best we could hope for was a slow escape from moral paralysis. Nagel insisted that we are committed to the modern goal of enhancing welfare impartially, even if our commitment is limited. There are, he insisted, standards of rationality and rightness that demand to be met in political and personal life, and these, he argued, cannot be identified with the particular desires of agents, which may be irrational, conflicted, or wrong; there is a distinction between empirical psychology and normativity that makes morality possible. At the same time, *Equality and Partiality* suggested that social inequality and gender inequality were not altogether remediable since the enforcement of comparable outcomes across the society would, he believed, result in unacceptable infringements on personal agency (1991, p. 112f). Affirmative action, he had argued in "Equal Treatment and Compensatory Discrimination" in 1973 (reprinted in *Mortal Questions*), was not absolutely unjust. The *prima facie* entitlements of meritocratic desert could be outweighed by broader social needs, but the pull to equality was in turn offset by the disutilities and grievances induced by aggressive leveling. Nagel's considered view was that sexual and racial discrimination constituted a lesser injustice in American society than discrimination on the basis of intelligence (1979, p. 99). By this he did not mean to imply that the superior economic and social outcomes of white versus black and

men versus women were unjust, though explained by the inferior intelligence of the latter groups, but rather that eliminating racial and sexual inequality would not, contrary to commonly held belief, eliminate the most unjust features of American society.

Nagel has published more collections of reviews and essays, including *Other Minds* (1995) and *Concealment and Exposure* (2002). A recent book, *The Myth of Ownership* (2002), advocates redistributive taxation. Nagel's view is that government actions can reduce the conflict between personal and impersonal perspectives, and such conflict-reduction ought to be a prominent principle in policy-making. Two of Nagel's prominent students, Samuel Scheffler and Susan Wolf, have taken up aspects of the problem of impersonal "agent-neutral" versus personal "agent-relative" perspectives.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Possibility of Altruism (Oxford, 1970).
Mortal Questions (Cambridge, UK, 1979).
The View from Nowhere (Oxford, 1986).
Equality and Partiality (Oxford, 1991).
Other Minds: Critical Essays, 1969–1994 (Oxford, 1995).
The Last Word (Oxford, 1997).
The Myth of Ownership: Taxes and Justice, with Liam Murphy (Oxford, 2002).
Concealment and Exposure and Other Essays (Oxford, 2002).

Other Relevant Works
"Physicalism," *Philosophical Review* 74 (1965): 339–56.
"The Boundaries of Inner Space," *Journal of Philosophy* 66 (1969): 452–8.
"Death," *Noûs* 4 (1970): 73–80.
"Armstrong on the Mind," *Philosophical Review* 79 (1970): 394–403.
"The Absurd," *Journal of Philosophy* 68 (1971): 716–27.
"Brain Bisection and the Unity of Consciousness," *Synthese* 22 (1971): 396–413.
"War and Massacre," *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 1 (1972): 123–44.
"Rawls on Justice," *Philosophical Review* 82 (1973): 220–34.
"Equal Treatment and Compensatory Discrimination," *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 2 (1973): 348–62.
"What is it Like to Be a Bat?" *Philosophical Review* 83 (1974): 435–50.
Ed. with Virginia Held and Sidney Morgenbesser, *Philosophy, Morality, and International Affairs* (Oxford, 1974).
"Libertarianism without Foundations," *Yale Law Journal* 85 (1975): 136–49.
"Moral Luck," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* suppl. 50 (1976): 137–55.
"The Limits of Objectivity," in *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values, vol. 1*, ed. Sterling M. McMurrin (Salt Lake City, Utah, 1980), pp. 75–139.
Ed. with Marshall Cohen and Thomas Scanlon, *Marx, Justice, and History* (Princeton, N.J., 1980).
"The Objective Self," in *Knowledge and Mind*, ed. Carl Ginet and Sydney Shoemaker (Oxford, 1983), pp. 211–32.
What Does It All Mean? A Very Short Introduction to Philosophy (Oxford, 1987).
"What Makes a Political Theory Utopian?" *Social Research* 56 (1989): 903–20.
"Consciousness and Objective Reality," in *The Mind–Body Problem*, ed. Richard Warner and Tadeusz Szubka (Oxford, 1994), pp. 63–8.
"Personal Rights and Public Space," *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 24 (1995): 83–107.
"Justice and Nature," *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 17 (1997): 303–21.
"Conceiving the Impossible and the Mind-Body Problem," *Philosophy* 73 (1998): 337–52.
"Davidson's New *Cogito*," in *The Philosophy of Donald Davidson*, ed. Lewis Hahn (Chicago, 1999), pp. 195–206.
"The Psychophysical Nexus," in *New Essays on the A Priori*, ed. Paul Boghossian and Christopher Peacocke (Oxford, 2000), pp.

432–71.

"Rawls and Liberalism," in *The Cambridge Companion to Rawls*, ed. Samuel Freeman (Cambridge, UK, 2003), pp. 62–85.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*

Christie, Juliette. "Against Nagel: In Favor of a Compound Human Ergon," *Dialogue* 38 (1996): 77–81.

Dombrowsky, Daniel. "Thomas Nagel as a Process Philosopher," *American Journal of Theology and Philosophy* 15 (1994): 163–80.

Flanagan, Owen. "Consciousness, Naturalism, and Nagel," *Journal of Mind and Behavior* 6 (1985): 373–90.

Hacker, P. M. S. "Is There Anything It Is Like to Be a Bat?" *Philosophy* 77 (2002): 157–74.

Harré, Rom. "Nagel's Challenge and the Mind-Body Problem," *Philosophy* 74 (1999): 247–70.

Korsgaard, Christine. "The Reasons We Can Share: An Attack on the Distinction between Agent-Relative and Agent-Neutral Values," *Social Philosophy and Policy* 10 (1993): 24–51.

Malcolm, Norman. "Subjectivity," *Philosophy* 63 (1988): 147–60.

Smilansky, Saul. "Nagel on the Grounds for Compensation," *Public Affairs Quarterly* 9 (1995): 63–73.

Catherine Wilson

NAHM, Milton Charles (1903–91)

Milton Charles Nahm was born 12 December 1903 in Las Vegas, New Mexico, and died on 5 March 1991 in Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania. He studied at the University of Pennsylvania, receiving his BA, Phi Beta Kappa, in 1925. Nahm also obtained his MA in 1926 and PhD in 1932 in philosophy from Pennsylvania. Nahm studied under Edgar A. SINGER, who was a great influence, inspiring Nahm to take an empirical idealist position in many of his writings. Nahm also studied at Oxford as a Rhodes scholar during this time, receiving a BA in 1928 and BLitt in 1929. Nahm was an instructor of philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania in 1929 and 1930. In 1931 he began teaching philosophy at Bryn Mawr College. He was promoted to full professor in 1946 and was named Leslie Clark Professor in the Humanities in 1970. He also chaired the philosophy department from 1946 until 1972 when he retired. Nahm held two Bollingen Foundation Fellowships, in 1950 and 1958. He held a National Endowment for the Humanities Senior Fellowship in 1972 and 1973. He served on the governing board of the American Society of Aesthetics from 1958 to 1964, and 1967 to 1970. Nahm also served as Secretary-Treasurer of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division from 1947 to 1951, and was Vice President of the Eastern Division during 1955–6.

Nahm's dissertation, *The Aesthetic Response: An Antinomy and Its Resolution*, was published in 1933. In 1934 *Selections from Early Greek Philosophy* was published. This work became an important and popular philosophical resource as three subsequent editions were published, each revised and expanded, through 1964. Outside of this particular work on Greek philosophy, the body of Nahm's work focused on aesthetics and the philosophy of art. His monograph *Aesthetic Experience and Its Presuppositions* was published in 1946 and reprinted in 1968. This book was followed by his most important work in aesthetics, a book entitled *The Artist as Creator: An Essay of Human Freedom* (1956), which was reissued in paperback as *Genius and Creativity: An Essay in the History of Ideas* (1965). Nahm addresses the problem of freedom as assumed in artistic activity. He

describes his position on this problem in the preface: "I believe that this has been the principal unexamined presupposition of the majority of aesthetic theories and that the specification of the problem since the middle of the eighteenth century has merely made explicit an assumption present to philosophy of art from its beginnings. I believe, also, that human freedom has remained a largely unexamined assumption of aesthetic theory because such problems as the ugly and ugliness have been obscured by a methodology and terminology which are not necessarily unique to philosophy of art or even integrated to this field." (1956, p. vii)

The Artist as Creator: An Essay of Human Freedom is Nahm's most important work in aesthetics, exposing a number of theoretical mishaps throughout the history of aesthetics. He gives a detailed account of the interrelations between aesthetic and other areas of philosophy such as metaphysics and epistemology. The first chapter takes up the problem of creativity and freedom, in which Nahm offers a critical analysis of three classical theories of artistic freedom. The first two theories are natural explanations. The Aristotelian model of creation highlights rational free choice, while the Atomists make a distinction between cosmic making and human acting. The third theory is Platonic, a nonnatural explanation which highlights divine inspiration and limits human agency. Nahm offers a critique of the perpetuation of these theories of creation and freedom throughout the history of aesthetics. He charges that a disjunction is made between imitation and imagination, holding that imagination is used as an instrument to rid philosophy of mimetic accounts. Imagination is seen as a viable solution for the problem of artistic freedom; the artist's imagination is evidence of autonomy.

In the second chapter of *The Artist as Creator*, Nahm withholds proposing a solution and moves to critique another philosophical mistake, what he calls the Great Analogy. The Great Analogy, which can be traced back to ancient mimetic accounts of creation, holds that the artist is analogous to God, in the sense that both are creators. Nahm outlines a problem with this conception in framing the question in this way: if God created the world, and everything in it including the artist and all her materials, then how does an artist create anything new? Nahm disentangles the question by separating out three conflicts, each conflict concerned with different, but interrelated, preemptive questions. The first conflict is an aesthetic conflict, ultimately concerned with the definition of creation. What is creation? What does it mean to create something? The second conflict is a cosmological conflict, primarily concerned with theological questions about the nature of God. Who or what exactly is God and what is the nature of God? The third conflict is a microcosmic conflict, concerned with the reconciliation of God's making and human acting. Here Nahm employs the strategy proposed by the Atomists. Nahm aims to establish a theory of fine art adequate to account for the emergence of the unique yet intelligible work of art, the work of art that is new, yet understandable within a preconceived context.

This problem of human freedom, as taken up by the discussion on the Great Analogy, plays into such notions of the beautiful and sublime and theories of genius. In chapter three, Nahm continues his criticism of adopting theological models for philosophical aesthetics. He explains that the polarization of beauty and ugliness is analogous to good and evil, thus, ugliness becomes the aesthetic analogy to evil. After tracing the problem of ugliness throughout the history of aesthetics, Nahm criticizes that the notion of ugly, as analogue to evil, is a nonaesthetic notion. Evil is not a problem for aesthetics, and the fact that ugly has become a sign for evil is not to be solved by aesthetics. Rather, the ugly should be examined in terms of artistic freedom. He suggests a move in line with Plotinus, that we should consider the ugly as providing artistic contrast and necessary conflict (1956, p. 123). But such a considera-

tion maintains that artistic freedom is qualified by a plan or purpose.

Questions of the Great Analogy, artistic freedom, and ugliness converge on the problem of genius, which Nahm takes up in chapters four through six. He traces historical conceptions of genius: genius as irrational madman, genius as prophet. Nahm criticizes these conceptions of genius as being conditioned by conceptions of the hero, the saint, or the prophet. He argues that the artistic genius can be distinguished from saints, prophets, and heroes because of attention paid to the beautiful and sublime. Nahm proposes a strictly aesthetic usage of such terms as creativity, inspiration, and freedom. Restricted usage of these terms would, on his account, alleviate philosophical misconceptions. Nahm charges that theologically laden conceptions of genius and creation ignore the work of art and also the judgment of that work of fine art (1956, p. 127). At the end of this first half of *The Artist as Creator*, he argues for the dismissal of such nonaesthetic notions as mere presuppositions. We can now regard creation as philosophically significant in its restricted usage. Creation, for Nahm, is to give a material a new shape, which is consequently intelligible within a context, despite its novelty (1956, p. 209).

After this insightful critique of theological origins of problems in aesthetics, Nahm utilizes the second half of *The Artist as Creator* to construct a positive account of aesthetic value. Nahm proposes a solution that emphasizes the artwork itself and its own structure. Nahm maintains that there is a structure of an artwork, a limited structure, which is embedded within a totality of all structures. This distinction can be easily maintained with regards to the "great analogy" which construes God as creator of the totality of structures and the artist as creator of the structures of specific works. Though this analogy can be maintained, Nahm is cautious on this point. The limited structure of the artwork employs traditional structural terms such as "image," "symbol," and "object made," all of which are to be

regarded on the same level (1956, p. 240). On Nahm's account, creativity is neither about perfection or originality alone, but a blend of the two, in which the artist must find a new way to express him or herself within certain limitations. Such limitations include limitations by materials or medium, constraints of signs or the socially accepted norms of signifier and signified, feelings, and values. To create within these confines is to continually define and redefine artistic freedom. Ultimately, the artist who is operating within certain confines, and subsequently creating new meanings within these confines, must stir audience members to contemplate values and to create new values. For Nahm, aesthetic value that has the ability to speak to other kinds of value, such as moral value, due to the reflection of artistic originality to human existence.

Nahm gives significant value to the interpretation of the spectator. The artist directs the spectator to make judgments on an artwork. The processes of creating, perceiving, and interpreting form a limited structure, toward which comparison can be directed. Comparison can be made in two directions: (1) toward the concrete object, and (2) toward what the object ought to be. The first direction allows for judgments of fact and judgments concerned with freedom of choice while the second direction allows for normative judgments of aesthetic value (1956, p. 275). From the conjunction of these two forms of comparison, a generic structure of value arises. On this account, artworks become what Nahm calls mechanisms, or events for examining value.

Nahm's work took a bold and important turn in philosophy. His work represents a distinctive method of doing aesthetics, as his work consistently situates itself within a specific body of critical aesthetic writing and utilizes examples of artworks from many disciplines. Nahm addressed the problem of human freedom in relation to aesthetics while simultaneously attempting to expose theological models built into philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Aesthetic Response: An Antinomy and Its Resolution (Philadelphia, 1933).
Selections from Early Greek Philosophy (New York, 1934).
Aesthetic Experience and its Presuppositions (New York, 1946; 2nd edn 1968).
The Artist as Creator: An Essay of Human Freedom (Baltimore, Md., 1956). Paperback edn published as *Genius and Creativity: An Essay in the History of Ideas* (New York, 1965).
Art: a Bryn Mawr Symposium (Bryn Mawr, Penn., 1940; New York, 1972).

Other Relevant Works
Ed. with F. P. Clarke, *Philosophical Essays in Honor of Edgar Arthur Singer, Jr.* (Oxford, 1942).
"Edgar A. Singer, Jr., and the Aesthetic of Empirical Idealism," *Journal of Philosophy* 54 (1957): 584–94.
Las Vegas and Uncle Joe: The New Mexico I Remember (Norman, Okla., 1964).
Ed., *Readings in Philosophy of Art and Aesthetics* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1974).

Further Reading
Proc of APA v65, *Who's Who in Phil*
Baird, James. "Creating Art," *Review of Metaphysics* 11 (1957): 108–21.
Schueller, Herbert M., ed. "Vita" and "Bibliography" of Milton Nahm, *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 30 (1972): 437, 438–40.

Joan Grassbaugh Forry

NASH, John Forbes, Jr. (1928–)

John F. Nash, Jr. was born on 13 June 1928 in Bluefield, West Virginia. He received his BS and his MS in mathematics from the Carnegie Institute of Technology in 1948. In 1950 he received his PhD in mathematics from Princeton University. He taught at Princeton for one year, and then was a professor of mathematics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology from 1951 until 1959. He also worked for the Rand Corporation for brief periods in 1950, 1952, and 1954. In 1959 he began to suffer from schizophrenia, a disease that afflicted him for decades. He began to recover in the 1980s, and in the 1990s he returned to Princeton University in a senior research position, continuing his mathematical research. He received the John von Neumann Theory Prize in 1978 and the Leroy P. Steele Prize in 1999. His most prestigious award came in 1994, when he won the Nobel Prize for Economics.

Although Nash has done brilliant work in many areas, he is best known for his revolutionary work in game theory in the early 1950s. In two of his papers he founded axiomatic bargaining theory and introduced what is now called the "Nash solution" to the bargaining problem. In two others he introduced the notion of an equilibrium and the distinction between cooperative and non-cooperative games. He also introduced the "Nash program" for cooperative games, treating non-cooperative games as basic, and cooperative games as non-cooperative games in which communication and bargaining are available as formal moves in the game. Also, Nash proved that in every non-cooperative game with a finite number of players, each of whom has a finite number of pure strategies, at least one equilibrium exists either in pure or in mixed strategies. This equilibrium – called a "Nash equilibrium" – is a set of strategies, one per player, each of which is utility-maximizing (for the player choosing it) relative to the others.

Nash's work is philosophically significant because it has importance for the theory of rational choice and for moral and political philosophy. To give just one example, in any situation that can be modeled as a solvable, non-cooperative game, it seems that rational,

fully informed agents will choose strategies that intersect in a Nash equilibrium. After all, such strategies are utility-maximizing relative to one another; thus, assuming that a rational agent always seeks to maximize his utility relative to the choices he expects from other people, it seems that rational, fully informed agents are sure to achieve a Nash equilibrium. It cannot be claimed that perhaps no such equilibrium exists, since Nash proved otherwise. An apparent result, however, is that rationality, far from being the solution to humanity's problems, can *cause* some of those problems. Nash equilibria often are non-optimal, and optimal outcomes often fail to be in equilibrium. An outcome, *O*, is non-optimal in the sense used here if there is another outcome in the game that grants each player more utility than *O* grants. Rationality, it seems, can sometimes make each person *worse off* than he or she would be were everyone to act irrationally.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Equilibrium Points in N-person Games," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 36 (1950): 48–9.
"The Bargaining Problem," *Econometrica* 18 (1950): 155–62.
"Non-cooperative Games," *Annals of Mathematics* 54 (1951): 286–95.
"Two-person Cooperative Games," *Econometrica* 21 (1953): 128–40.
The Essential John Nash, ed. Harold Kuhn and Sylvia Nasar (Princeton, N.J., 2002).

Further Reading
Cambridge Dict Amer Bio
Harsanyi, John C. *Rational Behavior and Bargaining Equilibrium in Games and Social Situations* (Cambridge, UK, 1977).
Nasar, Sylvia. *A Beautiful Mind: A Biography of John Forbes Nash, Jr., Winner of the Nobel Prize in Economics, 1994* (New York, 1998).

John J. Tilley

NASR, Seyyed Hossein (1933–)

Seyyed Hossein Nasr was born in Tehran, Iran, on 7 April 1933 (19 Farvadin 1312 A.H. solar). From both his father, Seyyed Valiallah, and his mother, Ashraf, he inherited a strong spiritual and intellectual pedigree. Seyyed Valiallah Nasr, like his father before him, was a noted physician who provided medical care to the Iranian royal family, though later in his life he left his medical practice to head the Iranian educational system and to serve as Professor and Dean of the Teachers' College, Tehran University. Seyyed Hossein Nasr, after completing his early formal education in the traditional Iranian and Islamic school system, arrived in the United States of America on 17 December 1945 to begin his high school education at the Peddie School in Hightstown, New Jersey, from which he graduated as the valedictorian in 1950. He then graduated from Massachusetts Institute of Technology with a BA in physics in 1954. Subsequently, he received an MA degree in geology and geophysics from Harvard University in 1956, and his PhD in history from Harvard in 1958, specializing in Islamic cosmology and science, under the tutelage of scholars such as I. Bernard COHEN, Harry A. WOLFSON, George Sarton, and Hamilton Gibb.

Upon completion of his doctoral degree from Harvard, Nasr returned home to Iran having lived for thirteen years in the United States. From 1958 until 1979 he held the post of professor of philosophy and the history of science at the Faculty of Letters at Tehran University. In the years 1962 and 1965 he was a visiting professor at Harvard University. He was the first Agha Khan Professor of Islamic Studies at the American University of Beirut in 1964–5. In 1973 he founded and presided over the Iranian Academy of Philosophy. The 1979 Iranian Revolution forced Nasr to flee his homeland; he returned to the United States where he accepted temporary teaching posts at the University of Utah (1979) and Temple University (1980–83). From 1984 until the present Nasr, still living in exile, is the University Professor of Islamic

Studies at George Washington University in Washington, D.C.

The honors and distinctions bestowed upon Nasr throughout his career are too many to enumerate. In 1973 he was elected to the Institut International de Philosophie. He presented the prestigious Gifford Lectures at the University of Edinburgh in 1980–81, published in 1981 under the title *Knowledge and the Sacred*. His lifelong contribution to philosophy was recognized in 2001 when the Library of Living Philosophers dedicated the twenty-eighth volume of its renowned series to Nasr, as the first Muslim thinker to be included in the collection.

Nasr's academic research is exhaustive, including over sixty authored or edited volumes, and over 500 articles written or translated into twenty-two languages. Perhaps his most important is the aforementioned *Knowledge and the Sacred*. Other major works include: *Science and Civilization in Islam* (1968), *The Encounter of Man and Nature: The Spiritual Crisis of Modern Man* (1968), and *The Need for a Sacred Science* (1993).

Especially in the Western world, but also within the Islamic world itself, Nasr is mostly recognized for his in-depth exegesis and commentary on the Islamic world view in general and Islamic traditional sciences in particular. Little, if anything, concerning the Islamic world has eluded Nasr's attention. His written works and lectures have addressed general audiences as well as his academic colleagues, concerning Islamic metaphysics, rituals, aesthetics, ethics, science, logic, law, medicine, philosophy, history, and Sufism, the Islamic mystical tradition. His writings are standard references to the Islamic heritage, its practices and theories. He has made the Muslim world more accessible to Western audiences while at the same time further elaborating on the complexities inherent in the revealed tradition. Texts deserving special mention in this regard include: *Ideals and Realities of Islam* (1966), *Islamic Life and Thought* (1981), and *Traditional Islam in the Modern World* (1987). Each of these texts includes detailed explanations of Muslim ideas and practices united within the living Islamic tradition, covering topics such as: the Qu'ran, the Prophet Muhammad, the *Shari'ah* (Divine Law), *jihad* (exertion/struggle), Islamic education, Islamic cosmology, and Islamic architecture, to name but a few.

In the wake of the terrorist attacks in the United States on 11 September 2001, Nasr responded with *The Heart of Islam: Enduring Values for Humanity* (2002), written for a broader audience to dispel misperceptions of Islam instigated by this tragic event and others, while at the same time calling for further ecumenical exchange between the world's living traditions. In sum, Nasr's acumen of both Islamic and Western intellectual history, as well as the respect earned through his service to dialogue amongst civilizations, positioned him to be a voice of calm and reason in such chaotic times.

Counter-intuitively, Nasr's original contributions to philosophy stem from his continuation of a philosophical heritage that contemporary academic philosophy has dismissed. Undeterred by the prevalent trend to compartmentalize academic subjects into separate disciplines and departments such as philosophy, religious studies, natural sciences, and so forth, or even to create subdivisions within philosophy itself (for example, epistemology, applied ethics, philosophy of religion, and so on), Nasr instead proffers a comprehensive philosophical system united under metaphysics. He has been one of the most outspoken proponents of *Philosophia Perennis* (Perennial Philosophy), or what is also known as traditionalism. Central to *Philosophia Perennis* is the shared recognition that there is a single transcendent unity (Reality), to borrow a phrase from another prominent traditionalist thinker Frithjof Schuon, to all authentic religious traditions. Along with other significant philosophers in this lineage, such as A. K. COOMARASWAMY, René Guénon, and Huston SMITH, Nasr's metaphysics emanates from this primordial source. Uncannily, Nasr moves seamlessly from one traditional cosmology to the other demonstrating their shared wisdom.

The opening pronouncement of *Knowledge and the Sacred* reads, "In the beginning Reality was at once being, knowledge, and bliss and in that 'now' which is the ever-present 'in the beginning,' knowledge continues to possess a profound relation with that principal and primordial Reality which *is* the Sacred and the source of all that is sacred." (1981, p. 1) In all of his writings, this transcendent Reality (the Sacred, the Divine, God) serves as the *axis mundi* around which Nasr's world view circumambulates. All knowledge and all action guided by knowledge, according to Nasr, are grounded in the Sacred. "To be human is to know," Nasr writes, "and also to transcend oneself. To know means therefore ultimately to know the Supreme Substance which is at once the source of all that comprises the objective world and the Supreme Self which shines at the center of human consciousness and which is related to intelligence as the sun is related to its rays." (1981, p. 4)

The problem, however, is that knowledge and, hence, the world has become desacralized. Humankind, through the process it has tautologically identified as "progress," has divorced itself from its sacred origins. Since the Scientific Revolution, traditional metaphysics has been disregarded entirely by modern secular science and philosophy has become the mere handmaiden of science. Rather than mediating all epistemic pursuits, which should aim at knowing Reality, philosophy has instead become the means by which to justify what science is doing irregardless of philosophy's findings. Moreover, religion has even been torn away from philosophy, not to mention from science itself. Whereas previously, traditional sciences, which include biology, cosmology, medicine, philosophy, metaphysics, and so on, understood natural phenomena and humanity itself as *vestigia Dei* (signs of God), modern science has severed the universe, including humans, from God, according to Nasr. The natural world or cosmos has a meaning beyond itself, one of which modern secular science is intentionally ignorant.

To characterize modernity's secularization of the universe, Nasr borrows from Greek mythology. Like Prometheus, man has revolted against the heavens. Science in absentia from the Sacred is firstly hubristic and secondly dangerous. The Promethean model, in contradistinction to what he terms "Pontifical Man" – the understanding that mankind is the lynchpin between the cosmos and the Sacred – is both unethical and sacrilegious. Moreover it is recklessly leading to the current erosion of our environment.

The environmental crisis is a primary concern for Nasr, who, unlike other thinkers struggling with this current reality, addresses it from a Traditionalist's standpoint. Well educated in the history of science, both Western and Eastern, Nasr surveyed the modern landscape of ideas and technology in four lectures delivered at the University of Chicago in 1966, later published as *The Encounter of Man and Nature: The Spiritual Crisis of Modern Man*. It is the first of his studies on this subject, and he confronts modernity's "progressive" march as it trespasses on earth. Here again, identifying the root of the environmental crisis, he contends that "nature has become desacralized for modern man … ." (1968, p. 18) In other words, since modern science has excluded a transcendent source and meaning to the cosmos, it sees nature as an end to itself, to which man (i.e., science) is the sole arbiter.

The historical unfolding of this ideology culminated in the Industrial Revolution and its lasting legacy. Forgotten are the traditional sciences which sought to understand the cosmos as a means to knowing the Sacred origin; nature is now a means to man's own selfish ends. In the former view, nature is *vestigia Dei* and, hence, a living symbol of God. In the latter view, on the other hand, nature derives meaning or value only from its usefulness to humans. Nasr states:

Only rarely has any voice been raised to show that the current belief in the domination of nature is the usurpation, from the religious point of view, of man's role as the custodian

and guardian of nature …. And this secularized knowledge of nature divorced from the vision of God in nature has become accepted as the sole legitimate form of science. (1968, pp. 19–20)

Nasr adds:

The Baconian assertion that mankind should gain power via domination over the environment exalted man's status, resulting in a completely anti-metaphysical, desacralized science. "That the harmony between man and nature has been destroyed, is a fact which most people admit. But not everyone realizes that this disequilibrium is due to the destruction of the harmony between man and God." (p. 20)

Ravaged by industrialization, the earth has been reduced to a mere resource for sustaining human life (and individual greed), rather than a living reminder of the transcendent Reality to which we should be thankful. For Nasr, our defacing of the earth began when we defaced the Other, namely God. Though science has employed philosophy to develop an "ethics" to justify its current practices, Nasr insists that until we return to our sacred origins and once again align our epistemic pursuits to the overriding metaphysical reality, the devastation of the earth will continue; science, religion, and philosophy must be united. All other efforts will be stopgaps at best; the only true solution is to focus our attention once and for all on that primordial Reality, which is the everlasting guide to our scientific pursuits or *scientia sacra* ("sacred science"), as Nasr calls them.

Nasr's philosophy seems out of place in the contemporary philosophical discourse, especially in America. This is no surprise to Nasr himself, as he is American by exile and his philosophical perspective is thoroughly grounded in a metaphysics long since forgotten in contemporary philosophical parlance. Precisely for this reason Nasr's voice remains unique and extremely important. Amongst the new jargon of competing philosophers on the contemporary stage, Nasr frequently offers sobering words that hark back to "sacred wisdom." For example, in the introduction to a volume on Sufism, relating a modernist critique of this traditional school of thought, Nasr states that

… in the present situation, it would be wonderful if people in America and Western Europe could do nothing for the next ten years but read Hafiz and Rumi (two of the most famous Iranian Sufi poets) and so allow the natural environment to improve and the air to become a bit less polluted so that they can breathe more easily … . Sufi poetry is not simply an opium for its readers and even it be opium for some people, it is much less harmful to the body and soul than the drugs being used so extensively in the modern world today. (Lewisohn 1999, vol. 2, p. 6)

Nasr's comprehensive perspective, which meticulously maintains the interconnectivity of all things under the rubric of traditionalist metaphysics, lends a distinct critical framework to our contemporary milieu.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An Introduction to Islamic Cosmological Doctrines (Cambridge, Mass., 1964; 2nd edn, Albany, N.Y., 1993).

Three Muslim Sages (Cambridge, Mass., 1964).

Ideals and Realities of Islam (London, 1966).

Science and Civilization in Islam (Cambridge, Mass., 1968; 2nd edn 1987).

The Encounter of Man and Nature: The Spiritual Crisis of Modern Man (London, 1968). Repr., *Man and Nature: The Spiritual Crisis of Modern Man* (London, 1976).

Sufi Essays (London, 1972). Reprinted as *Living Sufism* (London, 1980; 3rd edn, Chicago, 1999).

Islam and the Plight of Modern Man (London, 1976).

Islamic Science: An Illustrated Study (London, 1976; Chicago, 1998).

Sadr al-Din Shirazi and His Transcendental Theosophy (London, 1978; 2nd edn, Tehran, 1997).

Islamic Life and Thought (London, 1981).

Knowledge and the Sacred (New York, 1981).

Islamic Art and Spirituality (London, 1987).

Traditional Islam in the Modern World (London, 1987).

Muhammad: Man of Allah (London, 1982). 2nd edn, *Muhammad: Man of God* (Chicago, 1995).

The Need for a Sacred Science (Albany, N.Y., 1993).

Religion and the Order of Nature (Oxford, 1996).

The Spiritual and Religious Dimension of the Environmental Crisis (London, 1999).

The Heart of Islam: Enduring Values for Humanity (San Francisco, 2002).

Islam: Religion, History, and Civilization (San Francisco, 2003).

Other Relevant Works

Trans., *Shi'ite Islam*, by Allamah Tabataba'i (Albany, N.Y., 1975; 2nd edn 1977).

Ed., *The Essential Writings of Frithjof Schuon* (New York, 1986).

Ed., *Islamic Spirituality: Foundations*, vol. 19 of *World Spirituality: An Encyclopedic History of the Religious Quest* (New York, 1987).

Ed. with H. Dabashi and S. V. R. Nasr, *Shi'ism: Doctrines, Thoughts and Spirituality* (Albany, N.Y., 1988).

Ed. with H. Dabashi and S. V. R. Nasr, *Expectations of the Millennium: Shi'ism in History* (Albany, N.Y., 1989).

Ed., *Islamic Spirituality: Manifestations*, vol. 20 of *World Spirituality: An Encyclopedic History of the Religious Quest* (New York, 1991).

Ed. with Katherine O'Brien, *In Quest of the Sacred: The Modern World in the Light of Tradition* (Oakton, Virg., 1993).

Ed. with Oliver Leaman, *The History of Islamic Philosophy*, 2 vols (London, 1996).

Ed. with Mehdi Aminrazavi, *The Islamic Intellectual Tradition in Persia* (London, 1996).

Ed. with Mehdi Aminrazavi, *An Anthology of Philosophy in Persia*, 2 vols (New York, 1999–2000).

Further Reading
Amer Phils 1950–2000

Aslan, Adnan. *Religious Pluralism in Christian and Islamic Philosophy: The Thought of John Hick and Seyyed Hossein Nasr* (Richmond, UK, 1998).

Faghfoory, Mohammed H., ed. *The Beacon of Knowledge: Essays in Honor of Seyyed Hossein Nasr* (Lexington, Kent., 2003).

Hahn, Lewis E., Randall E. Auxier, and Lucian W. Stone, Jr., eds. *The Philosophy of Seyyed Hossein Nasr* (La Salle, Ill., 2001). Contains Nasr's autobiography and bibliography.

Lewisohn, Leonard, ed. *The Heritage of Sufism*, 3 vols (Oxford, 1999).

Moris, Zailan, ed. *Knowledge is Light: Essays in Islamic Studies Presented to Seyyed Hossein Nasr by His Students in Honor of His Sixty-sixth Birthday* (Chicago, 1999).

Lucian W. Stone, Jr.

NATANSON, Maurice Alexander
(1924–96)

Maurice Natanson was born on 26 November 1924 in New York City to a family of modest means. His father, Charles Natanson, was a professional actor in the Yiddish Theater who traveled widely and encouraged young Maurice's passion for literature. A self-described "wanderer," Natanson started his college career at Brooklyn College, but, after

spending a year as a social worker in Brooklyn assigned to monitor families and individuals on relief, he transferred to Lincoln Memorial University in Harrogate, Tennessee, where he graduated with his BA in 1945. Aspiring to a career as a psychoanalyst, Natanson enrolled at a newly established medical school in New Jersey and took the first-year course of study, which he later claimed was enormously formative for his sense of himself as a philosopher and teacher. The school folded after a year, however, and in 1947 Natanson returned to New York City to work toward his masters degree at New York University, where he studied with Sidney HOOK, Susanne LANGER, and James Burnham. Under the latter's direction he wrote a thesis on Otto Rank, "Psychoanalysis and Aesthetics," and was awarded the MA in 1948. On Hook's recommendation Natanson then moved to the University of Nebraska to become William WERKMEISTER's assistant and complete his doctorate. There he was introduced to Edmund Husserl's *Logische Untersuchungen*, largely through Marvin FARBER's presentation in his *The Foundation of Phenomenology*. Having become interested in Jean-Paul Sartre's work through some lectures that William BARRETT had delivered while visiting New York University, Natanson chose to do his dissertation on Sartre and received his PhD in philosophy in 1950 for what would become his first book, *A Critique of Jean-Paul Sartre's Ontology*. While at Nebraska he met and married an English professor, Lois Janet Lichtenstein, with whom he had three children.

After a year as a philosophy instructor at Nebraska, Natanson was awarded a postdoctoral grant in 1951 from the American Council of Learned Societies. Drawn by the distinction of its faculty, which included Aron GURWITSCH, Karl Löwith, and Alfred SCHUTZ, among many others, Natanson chose to return to New York City and the New School for Social Research where, on the recommendation of Herbert SPIEGELBERG, he apprenticed himself to Schutz. Schutz would remain a touchstone of

Natanson's thinking throughout his career. With Schutz he studied Husserl intensively and became deeply acquainted with issues in philosophy of the social sciences. In 1953 he earned the Doctor of Social Science degree with a dissertation on *The Social Dynamics of George Herbert Mead*.

From 1953 to 1957 Natanson taught philosophy at the University of Houston, and then moved to the University of North Carolina in 1957. During these years, his many publications served to introduce the exotic transplants from Europe – phenomenology and existentialism – to a wider American audience. By 1964 there was growing demand on college campuses for courses in these areas, and, always something of an outsider, Natanson now found himself a leading light within a larger movement. After a year as visiting professor at the University of California at Berkeley in 1964–5, he accepted a position as one of the founding philosophy faculty at the University of California at Santa Cruz. He remained at Santa Cruz until 1976, when he moved to the philosophy department at Yale University. In 1973 he published his best-known work, *Edmund Husserl: Philosopher of Infinite Tasks*, which received the National Book Award in 1974. Natanson retired from Yale in 1995 and he and Lois returned to Santa Cruz, where he died on 16 August 1996.

Natanson's imagination was aroused by problems of selfhood and social reality in the broadest sense, problems that find expression in literature, art, medicine, and psychiatry, as well as sociology, history, and philosophy. With a novelist's fascination in the telling detail and a sociologist's interest in the meanings lived by actors on the social scene, Natanson was drawn to the first-person method of reflective description in Husserl's phenomenology and its extension in the work of thinkers like Sartre and Heidegger. Developing what he himself called an "idiosyncratic" version of existential phenomenology, Natanson sought to combine what others tended to hold apart: Husserl's *transcendental* account of consciousness as

source of the world's meaning and the *existential* thesis that all consciousness is finite – situated, limited by its placement in history, society, and nature. For Natanson, moments of existential abjection and absurdity share with art the power to disclose something like the self's transcendental vocation. From these moments, however, no "science of philosophy" could be made, and so in his writings Natanson parted company with Husserl's ideal of philosophy as rigorous science and developed a highly supple idiom for carrying out phenomenological analyses, one that owes as much to Søren Kierkegaard, Fyodor Dostoevsky, Samuel Beckett, and James Agee as it does to Husserl or Sartre. Though as a student of Husserl's students Natanson belongs to phenomenology's third generation, he was the first to craft a style for doing phenomenology that is wholly in the American grain.

It is a mistake to turn to Natanson's writings for a few abstractable theses that are identifiably "his" contribution. Though there are such things – for instance, the claim that the artist and philosopher share a desire to uncover the essential conditions that make up the world as it is lived pre-reflectively – it is not merely the theses, but also the way they are gained and presented, that constitute Natanson's lasting contribution. His writings everywhere attest a profound assimilation of Kierkegaard's protest against any philosophy from which the philosopher is absent, and they offer not merely the results, but the enactment, of existential inquiry. Such inquiry exemplifies Natanson's thinking: a relentless pursuit of the paradox of a "subject" who is "in the world," a "consciousness" which is both an element of the world and the condition of its revelation. Natanson adapted phenomenological description to his purpose of revealing this paradoxical creature. Describing our taken-for-granted experience in everyday life, an experience that underlies the sociological notions of typification and social role, Natanson identifies an initial form of "anonymity" in which the self makes its appearance, the anonymity of doing every-

thing as "one" does. But through brilliant descriptions of "transmundane experiences" – pathological cases, existential crises, artistic and religious epiphanies – Natanson uncovers the "absurd" as the fragility, the intrinsic questionability, of all typification and order. He thereby locates a self capable of (but also condemned to) philosophizing. This latter moment of selfhood – which Natanson, like Husserl, identified with ultimate self-responsibility and the life of reason – indicates a further, and quite different, form of anonymity: the individual's radical singularity as a kind of destiny beholden to the proto-phenomenological imperative, know thyself!

This imperative underwrites Natanson's distinctive defense of Husserl's "transcendental reduction" against Sartre's (and the other existentialists') rejection of it. The Sartrean picture of consciousness as negation, as a radically free explosion toward the world, overlooks what only the reduction can disclose, namely, that consciousness has a history, an origin, roots in what Husserl called the Lifeworld. Admittedly, this was not Husserl's own understanding of the reduction – which he held to reveal an absolute, worldless, "transcendental" ego – but rather an existentialized version of it, which brings the self-reflecting, philosophizing ego before an infinite task of self-uncovering, a perpetual unfolding of the sedimented meaning that his or her own (hitherto anonymous) actions in the world have constituted. Thus for Natanson, the reduction is not an artificial philosophical technique but the royal road to the uncanny, the strange, in the career of the individual. By tracing this career, Natanson illuminates the paradoxical stance of philosophy by way of the world of everyday reality: it is both its radical critique and one of its own possibilities.

Natanson's work thus serves as a permanent philosophical provocation, a call to think for oneself. With regard to traditional philosophical problems – realism/idealism, solipsism, relativism/absolutism, skepticism, and so on – Natanson's writings contain descriptions that

illuminate the contours of such issues as they arise at the intersection of everyday life and critical reflection, but they resolutely refuse to pass beyond the phenomenological data toward dialectical, reductive, metaphysical, or other "solutions." To the suggestion that this abdicates philosophy's responsibility to provide systematic answers, Natanson would surely remind us that philosophy without a philosopher is a paltry thing, and that the dialectician with a solution to life's paradoxes remains, in her solitary hours, a human being caught up in them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Critique of Jean-Paul Sartre's Ontology (Lincoln, Neb., 1951).
The Social Dynamics of George Herbert Mead (Washington, D.C., 1956).
Literature, Philosophy, and the Social Sciences (The Hague, 1962).
The Journeying Self: A Study in Philosophy and Social Role (Reading, UK 1970).
Edmund Husserl: Philosopher of Infinite Tasks (Evanston, Ill., 1973).
Phenomenology, Role, and Reason: Essays on the Coherence and Deformity of Social Reality (Springfield, Ill., 1974).
Anonymity: A Study in the Philosophy of Alfred Schutz (Bloomington, Ind., 1986).
The Erotic Bird: Philosophy in Literature (Princeton, N.J., 1998).

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *Collected Papers, vol. 1: The Problem of Social Reality*, by Alfred Schutz (The Hague, 1962).
Ed., *Philosophy of the Social Sciences: A Reader* (New York, 1963).
Ed., *Essays in Phenomenology* (The Hague, 1966).
Ed., *Phenomenology and Social Reality: Essays in Memory of Alfred Schutz* (The Hague, 1970).
Ed., *Phenomenology and the Social Sciences*, 2 vols (Evanston, Ill., 1973).

Further Reading
Who Was Who in Amer v12
Crowell, Steven G., ed. *The Prism of the Self: Philosophical Essays in Honor of Maurice Natanson* (Dordrecht, 1995). Contains a bibliography of Natanson's writings.
Crowell, Steven G. "A Conversation with Maurice Natanson," in *The Prism of the Self* (Dordrecht, 1995), pp. 289–334.
Webb, Rodman B. "The Life and Work of Alfred Schutz: A Conversation with Maurice Natanson," *Qualitative Studies in Education* 5 (1992): 283–94.

Steven Crowell

NEGLEY, Glenn Robert (1907–81)

Glenn Robert Negley was born on 5 November 1907 in Indianapolis, Indiana. He attended Butler University in Indiana, earning both a BA and MA in philosophy, studying with Elijah JORDAN. In 1934 he began attending the University of Chicago, earning a PhD in philosophy in 1939. While at Chicago, he worked as a legislative assistant for philosopher Thomas V. SMITH, then a member of the Illinois State Senate.

After earning his doctorate, Negley briefly taught philosophy at the University of Oklahoma, the University of Illinois at Urbana, and the University of Texas. During World War II he served in the US Army and rose to the rank of major before he was honorably discharged at the end of the war. He joined the philosophy department of Duke University in 1946 and remained there until he retired in 1975. He served as director of graduate studies from 1946 to 1950 and department chair from 1950 to 1956. Negley died on 15 May 1981 in Durham, North Carolina.

Negley was an admirer and defender of the philosophical idealism and social theory of his teacher, Elijah Jordan. The Hegelian search of

coherent and stable categories is exemplified in Negley's first book, *The Organization of Knowledge: An Introduction to Philosophical Analysis* (1942). Jordan's social theory of corporatism emphasized a social will and life over and above individual wills, and Negley similarly replied upon social institutions as the foundations for morality and law in his book *Political Authority and Moral Judgment* (1965). Moral action, Negley asserts, depends on the pre-existence of a legal order ably administrated, and hence he concludes that the law cannot be justified by appeal to morality. The proper administration of social institutions and government agencies should therefore receive far more scrutiny and aid.

Negley's concern for the preservation and enhancement of social values led him into the study of utopian visions and societies. Since today's society is the result of once utopian thinking, the present value and potential impact of utopian philosophizing cannot be ignored. His large collection of books about utopian societies was donated to Duke University, and forms the nucleus of the Glenn Negley Collection of Utopian Literature, one of the finest collections of its kind.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Organization of Knowledge: An Introduction to Philosophical Analysis (New York, 1942).

The Quest for Utopia: An Anthology of Imaginary Societies, with J. M. Patrick (New York, 1952).

Democracy vs Dictatorship, with Thomas V. Smith (Washington, D.C., 1953).

Political Authority and Moral Judgment (Durham, N.C., 1965).

Other Relevant Works

"Cybernetics and Theories of Mind," *Journal of Philosophy* 48 (1951): 574–81.

Utopian Literature: A Bibliography with a Supplementary Listing of Works Influential in Utopian Thought (Lawrence, Kan., 1977).

Further Reading
Proc of APA v56
Barendt, Eric M., ed. *Privacy* (Burlington, Vermont, 2001).
Laski, Harold Joseph. *The Dangers of Obedience and Other Essays* (New York, 1968).

Jean Van Delinder
John R. Shook

NELSON, Everett John (1900–88)

Everett J. Nelson was born on 18 October 1900 in Castle Rock, Washington. He received his MA in 1925 from the University of Washington. He went on to Harvard University, where he studied with C. I. Lewis and received his PhD in philosophy in 1929 with a dissertation on "An Intensional Logic of Propositions." After a year of study at universities in Germany and France, Nelson returned to teach philosophy at the University of Washington in 1930, where he was promoted to full professor in 1941, and also served as department chair from 1947 to 1952. In 1952 he became professor of philosophy and department chair at Ohio State University. He doubled the size of the philosophy faculty to eighteen and brought the department to national prominence. He was chair until 1968 and professor until retiring in 1971. He was President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1946–7, and President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1966–7. In retirement, Nelson returned to his native state, where he died on 29 September 1988 in Seattle.

Nelson worked in the fields of logic, philosophy of logic, epistemology, and metaphysics. He followed up his doctoral dissertation with further work in logic, writing articles on

"Intensional Relations" (1930), "The Square of Opposition," (1932), and "Deductive Systems and the Absoluteness of Logic" (1933). In discussing Bertrand Russell and A. N. WHITEHEAD's *Principia Mathematica*, Nelson began by arguing (1932) that if the criticisms of William Johnson and John Keynes concerning the traditional square of opposition are correct, then the analysis of *9 and *10 of *Principia Mathematica* for the definition of first-order propositions and the definition of *10 of particular first-order propositions are wrong, and perhaps the tautological nature of all of the propositions of *1–*5 of *Principia* is open to question. What is at issue in the dispute of the traditional square of opposition, as compared to the Boolean or existential square of opposition, is that syllogisms which are valid when the existence of at least one element of a class or domain is assumed, may turn out, on being rendered in the predicate logic, to be invalid when an empty set is assumed. In "Whitehead and Russell's Theory of Deduction as a Non-mathematical Science" (1934), Nelson examined the theory of deduction in *Principia Mathematica* as a "non-mathematical" science.

In epistemology and metaphysics, Nelson argued that there must be metaphysical assumptions grounding the possibility of inference and knowledge, including the ultimate categories of substance and causality. Dubious of any direct inductive argument for an external world, Nelson was not impressed either by any positivistic reduction of statements about external things to statements about phenomena. By "substance," Nelson required an independent reality with relatively stable dispositional properties, and denied that such properties could be analyzed into events and natural laws, which themselves presuppose substances (1947). Confessing to leanings towards Platonism in philosophy of logic (1949), Nelson accordingly rejected the notion that logical truths are empirically empty tautologies, and rejected the verificationist theory of meaning.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Intensional Relations," *Mind* 39 (1930): 440–53.

"The Square of Opposition," *The Monist* 42 (1932): 269–78.

"Deductive Systems and the Absoluteness of Logic," *Mind* 42 (1933): 30–40.

"Whitehead and Russell's Theory of Deduction as a Non-mathematical Science," *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 40 (1934): 478–86.

"The Inductive Argument for an External World," *Philosophy of Science* 3 (1936): 237–49.

"Professor Reichenbach on Induction," *Journal of Philosophy* 33 (1936): 577–80.

"The External World and Induction," *Philosophy of Science* 9 (1942): 261–7.

"Contradiction and the Presupposition of Existence," *Mind* 55 (1946): 319–27.

"A Defense of Substance," *Philosophical Review* 56 (1947): 491–509.

"The Relation of Logic to Metaphysics," *Philosophical Review* 58 (1949): 1–11.

"Philosophical Analysis," *Philosophical Review* 61 (1952): 72–90.

"Categorial Interpretation of Experience," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 13 (1952): 84–95.

"The Verification Theory of Meaning," *Philosophical Review* 63 (1954): 182–92.

"Creativity as a Philosophic Category," *Journal of Philosophy* 55 (1958): 953–62.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v5, Proc of APA v62, Who Was Who in Amer v9, Who's Who in Phil

Irving H. Anellis
John R. Shook

NEUTRA, Richard Joseph (1892–1970)

Richard Neutra was born on 8 April 1892 in Vienna, Austria, and died on 16 April 1970 while visiting Wuppertal, Germany. Before entering professional school to study architecture, Neutra received a classical education which included philosophy, literature, ancient Greek, and eight years of Latin. By the time he entered the Technische Hochschule in Vienna, he was well prepared to pursue architecture from both philosophical and practical vantage points. He was a student of Adolf Loos who became his mentor. After receiving his degree in architecture, Neutra moved to Berlin to apprentice with Erich Mendelsohn. In 1923 he emigrated to the United States to live in New York City with his new wife, Dione Niedermann.

Neutra initially thought he could earn a living by designing inexpensive, prefabricated houses because they could be easily and quickly constructed. In 1924 Neutra worked for Holabird and Roche, the largest architectural firm in Chicago and spent the fall of that year working with Frank Lloyd WRIGHT at Taliesen. During that year, he delivered a lecture on Ludwig MIËS VAN DER ROHE. Neutra's lecture helped Miës come to Chicago to work for Holabird and Roche after the Nazis closed the Bauhaus in 1933.

Neutra sought to expand his thinking about architecture, art, technology and environment. In 1925 he set sail for Europe to spend a month in Dessau, Germany, the new home of the Bauhaus under the leadership of Walter Gropius. There he met with architects, artists, and designers such as Joseph Albers, Marcel Breuer, Lyonel Feininger, Wassily Kandinski, Paul Klee, and Laslo Moholy-Nagy. Upon return to the US, he settled in Los Angeles, but suffering from a lack of employment, he again set sail in 1930. He lectured his way around the world, including Japan, China, and Eastern and Western Europe. This trip, and others which would bring him to the Middle East and Africa, had a profound effect on his philosophy of architecture.

Neutra called his philosophy "biorealism." Today it might be called environmental aesthetics. He believed that the environment permeates our inner being. In his final book of essays, *Nature Near* (1989), he explained that the environment colors our individual behavior and synthesizes our physiological, sensory, psychological, and spiritual qualities. A conclusion of this theory is that the environment is what turned us into human beings as our planet and the universe evolved over millions of years. He felt that it was the responsibility of environmental designers of all kinds to respect and enhance the many gifts the earth offers, especially clean air and water. Designing should be a collaborative mission. Designers must dispense with the dualistic notion that interior and exterior forces are separate from each other. Good design, he suggested, should stretch space and deepen time by creating environmental harmony, functional efficiency, and human enhancement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Architecture of Social Concern in Regions of Mild Climate (São Paulo, Brazil, 1948).

Mysteries and Realities of the Site (Scarsdale, N.Y., 1951).

Survival Through Design (Oxford, 1954).

Richard Neutra: 1950–1960, ed. W. Boesiger (New York, 1959).

Life and Shape (New York, 1962).

Richard Neutra, with Rupert Spade (New York, 1971).

Pflanzen, Wasser, Steine, Licht, with Dione Neutra (Berlin, 1974).

Other Relevant Works

Neutra's papers at the University of California, Los Angeles.

The Architecture of Richard Neutra: From International Style to California Modern, ed. Arthur Drexler and Thomas S. Hines (New York, 1982).

Richard Neutra, Promise and Fulfillment, 1919–1932: Selections from the Letters

and Diaries of Richard and Dione Neutra
(Carbondale, Illinois, 1986).

Nature Near: Late Essays of Richard Neutra,
ed. William Marlin (Santa Barbara, Cal.,
1989).

Richard Neutra: Complete Works, ed. Peter
Goessel (Köln and New York, 2000).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encycl Amer
Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v57*, *Who Was
Who in Amer v5*

Hines, Thomas S. *Richard Neutra and the
Search for Modern Architecture: A
Biography and History* (New York, 1982;
Berkeley, Cal., 1994).

McCoy, Esther. *Richard Neutra* (New York,
1960).

Sack, Manfred. *Richard Neutra* (Zurich,
1994).

Barbara Sandrisser

NEVILLE, Robert Cummings (1939–)

Robert C. Neville was born on 1 May 1939 in St.
Louis, Missouri. He received his education at
Yale University, earning the BA in 1960, MA in
1962, and PhD in philosophy in 1963. He was
ordained as elder in the Missouri East Conference
of the United Methodist Church in 1966, and has
been a pastor in Missouri and New York. From
1963 to 1965 Neville was a philosophy instruc-
tor at Yale; from 1965 to 1971 he was an assis-
tant and associate professor of philosophy at
Fordham University; and from 1971 to 1977 he
was associate and full professor at State University
of New York at Purchase. In 1978 he went to
State University of New York at Stony Brook as
professor of philosophy and religion and chair of
the religion department; from 1982 to 1985 he
was Stony Brook's Dean of Humanities and Fine
Arts; and then he returned to teaching until 1987.

In 1987 Neville became professor of philoso-
phy, religion, and theology and chair of the
religion department of Boston University, and
was soon elevated to the responsibilities of Dean
of the School of Theology in 1988. In 2003 he
became Dean of Marsh Chapel and chaplain of
Boston University. He has been President of the
Metaphysical Society of America in 1988, the
American Academy of Religion during 1990–92,
the International Society for Chinese Philosophy
in 1992–3, and the Association of United
Methodist Theological Schools. He received an
honorary DD from Lehigh University, and a
doctorate honoris causa from the Russian
Academy of Sciences.

Neville's theology has been constructed from
traditional Christian doctrines and his selective
interpretations of the pragmatism, semiotics,
and process traditions of American philosophy.
He holds that religious hypotheses can be prag-
matically tested in experience, but not proven in
any a priori fashion. While theology is meta-
physical, asking after conditions of experience,
it is actual lived experience to which any theo-
logical hypothesis must answer. The meaning of
religious beliefs, semiotically understood, is not
representational but instrumental. Religion there-
fore leads to experimental engagements with the
world, resulting in more or less valuable infor-
mation; religious language is not trapped in a
hermeneutically sealed enclosure of culture. This
empirical and realistic understanding of religious
truth nevertheless recognizes the biologically and
culturally conditioned existence of human
inquirers.

Religious inquiry, for Neville, fundamentally
asks why there is anything at all and why things
have their complex determinate forms. Neville's
preferred answer to the existence of the world
and its entities is the postulate of God as the
creator *ex nihilo*. While finding in A. N.
WHITEHEAD's process thought some useful con-
ceptions of the divinity as active creator, Neville
rejects the process theology view that creation
and God are united in the process of creativity,
and worries that Whitehead's God cannot know
our subjective selves. Neville defends the doctrine

of the Trinity as three aspects of God: God as the source of creation, the telos of creation, and the activity of creation. While God is deeply involved in creation, permitting most intimate knowledge of the world, an ontological distinction remains between creator and created. Each existence contains within its nature essential self-relating features and accidental features relating it to other things including God. In *The Recovery of the Measure* (1989), Neville proposed a philosophy of nature based on the concept that "all determinate things are harmonies of essential and conditional features." Neville finds the relational qualities of beauty and goodness in everything. However, this is not the sort of optimistic view that Neville accuses process theology of fostering. For Neville, human life balances between fragile harmonies and the chaos of contingency. From our limited perspective, evil is quite as real as goodness, and this contrast established value. God is an inspiration of hope and love but cannot be directly cognized since God is the indeterminate and infinite ground of Being, while all we experience is the totality of the world with all its variety.

Neville does not take much interest in process philosophy's theory of the radical openness of the future and of human freedom. For Neville, all creativity must be God's creativity; human freedom is our own self-development through God's creativity, and God's final plans cannot be affected in any way by the actions of created things. This is not classical determinism or theological predestination for Neville, as the process of God's sustaining creativity itself supplies our being.

Neville has written extensively on Chinese and Indian religion and theology, finding interesting points of comparison between them, process theology, and his own views. He also has engaged concerns in bioethics, behavioral therapy, war and peace, and technology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

God the Creator: On the Transcendence and Presence of God (Chicago, 1968; 2nd edn, Albany, N.Y., 1992).

The Cosmology of Freedom (New Haven, Conn., 1974; 2nd edn, Albany, N.Y., 1995).

Soldier, Sage, Saint (New York, 1978).

Creativity and God: A Challenge to Process Theology (New York, 1980; 2nd edn, Albany, N.Y., 1995).

Reconstruction of Thinking (Albany, N.Y., 1981).

The Tao and the Daimon: Segments of a Religious Inquiry (Albany, N.Y., 1982).

The Puritan Smile (Albany, N.Y., 1987).

Recovery of the Measure (Albany, N.Y., 1989).

Behind the Masks of God (Albany, N.Y., 1991).

A Theology Primer (Albany, N.Y., 1991).

The Highroad around Modernism (Albany, N.Y., 1992).

Eternity and Time's Flow (Albany, N.Y., 1993).

Normative Cultures (Albany, N.Y., 1995).

The Truth of Broken Symbols (Albany, N.Y., 1996).

The God Who Beckons: Theology in the Form of Sermons (Nashville, Tenn., 1999).

Boston Confucianism: Portable Tradition in the Late-Modern World (Albany, N.Y., 2000).

Symbols of Jesus: A Christology of Symbolic Engagement (Cambridge, UK, 2001).

Religion in Late Modernity (Albany, N.Y., 2002).

Other Relevant Works

"Man's Ends," *Review of Metaphysics* 16 (1962): 26–44.

"Some Historical Problems about the Transcendence of God," *Journal of Religion* 47 (1967): 1–9.

"Paul Weiss's Philosophy in Process," *Review of Metaphysics* 24 (1970): 276–301.

"Defining Death," in *Human Life: Problems of Birth, of Living, and of Dying*, ed. William Bier (New York, 1977), pp. 181–91.

"Pluralism and Finality in Structures of Existence," in *John Cobb's Theology in Process*, ed. David Ray Griffin and Thomas J. J. Altizer (Philadelphia, 1977), pp. 67–83.

"Philosophic Perspectives on Freedom of Inquiry," *University of Southern California Law Review* 51 (1978): 1115–29.

"From Nothing to Being: The Notion of Creation in Chinese and Western Thought," *Philosophy East and West* 30 (1980): 21–34.

"Whitehead on the One and the Many," in *Explorations in Whitehead's Philosophy*, ed. Lewis S. Ford and George L. Kline (New York, 1983), pp. 257–71.

"Buddhism and Process Philosophy," in *Buddhism and American Thinkers*, ed. Kenneth K. Inada and Nolan P. Jacobson (Albany, N.Y., 1984), pp. 121–42.

"Wang Yang-ming and John Dewey on the Ontological Question," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 12 (1985): 283–95.

"Achievement, Value, and Structure," in *Creativity and Common Sense: Essays in Honor of Paul Weiss*, ed. Thomas Krettek (Albany, N.Y., 1987), pp. 124–44.

Ed., *New Essays in Metaphysics* (Albany, N.Y., 1987).

Ed. with Thomas P. Kasulis, *The Recovery of Philosophy in America: Essays in Honor of John Edwin Smith* (Albany, N.Y., 1997).

"Time, Temporality, and Ontology," in *The Philosophy of Charles Hartshorne*, ed. Lewis Hahn (La Salle, Ill., 1991), pp. 377–95.

"On Buddha's Answer to the Silence of God." *Philosophy East and West* 41 (1991): 557–70.

"Paul Weiss's Theology," in *The Philosophy of Paul Weiss*, ed. Lewis Hahn (La Salle, Ill., 1995), pp. 389–414.

"John E. Smith and Metaphysics," in *Reason, Experience, and God: John E. Smith in Dialogue*, ed. Vincent M. Colapietro (New York, 1997).

"A Paleopragmatic Philosophy of History of Philosophy," in *Pragmatism, Neo-pragmatism, and Religion: Conversations with Richard Rorty*, ed. Charley D. Hardwick and Donald A. Crosby (New York, 1997), pp. 43–60.

"Philosophy at the Beginning of the New Millennium," in *A Parliament of Minds*, ed. Michael Tobias et al. (Albany, N.Y., 2000).

Ed., *Ultimate Realities* (Albany, N.Y., 2001).

Ed., *Religious Truth* (Albany, N.Y., 2001).

Ed., *The Human Condition* (Albany, N.Y., 2001).

"A Peircean Theory of Religious Interpretation," in *Pragmatism and Religion*, ed. Stuart Rosenbaum (Urbana, Ill., 2003).

Further Reading

Berthrong, John H. *Concerning Creativity: A Comparison of Chu Hsi, Whitehead, and Neville* (Albany, N.Y., 1998).

Chapman, J. Harley, and Nancy K. Frankenberry, eds. *Interpreting Neville* (Albany, N.Y., 1999).

Norman, Ralph V. "The Compleat Metaphysician: A Conversation with Robert Cummings Neville," *Soundings* 82 (Fall–Winter 1999): 339–56.

"The Thought of Robert Cummings Neville," *American Journal of Theology and Philosophy* 18 (September 1997). Essays about Neville, with his replies.

Yong, Amos, and Peter Heltzel, eds. *Theology in Global Context: Essays in Honor of Robert Cummings Neville* (New York, 2004).

John R. Shook

NEWBOLD, William Romaine (1865–1926)

William Romaine Newbold was born on 20 November 1865 in Wilmington, Delaware. The son of an Episcopal priest, he studied religion,

ancient languages, and philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania. He received his BA in 1887 with prizes in Latin and philosophy, and taught as a lecturer while studying for his doctorate in philosophy with George Stuart FULLERTON. After receiving his PhD in philosophy in 1891 (the second awarded by Pennsylvania), and some study at the University of Berlin, he permanently joined the Pennsylvania faculty.

Newbold was an instructor of philosophy at Pennsylvania from 1892 to 1894, assistant professor from 1894 to 1903, professor from 1903 to 1907, and Adam Seybert Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy from 1907 until his death. His colleagues during those years, Edgar A. SINGER, Jr. (who succeeded Newbold as Seybert Professor) and Isaac HUSIK, were more Pennsylvania graduates trained by Fullerton. Newbold also served as Dean of the Graduate School from 1896 to 1904. Pennsylvania honored him with an LLD degree in 1921. He died on 26 September 1926 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Newbold's expertise was concentrated in ancient languages, ancient philosophy, early and medieval Christian and Gnostic theology, and the psychology of religion. He had an extraordinary talent for translating Greek, Latin, and Aramaic. A deeply religious man, he was interested in spiritualism and assisted investigations into a wide variety of psychic phenomena by the Society for Psychical Research and the Seybert Commission for the Investigation of Spiritualism.

Newbold's talent for cryptography, used by the US Military Intelligence during World War I, led to his strange obsession of later years. After military experts failed to decipher the mysterious Voynich manuscript's pictographs and codes, they showed it to Newbold in 1919. He soon became convinced that the manuscript was composed by the thirteenth-century English philosopher and scientist Roger Bacon. Newbold's deciphering efforts were at first praised in the popular media and scientific journals, but devastating criticism soon erupted

and his reputation was shattered. Undaunted, he worked on the manuscript until his death; no one has produced a plausible translation to this day.

Newbold was warmly remembered as an inspiring teacher of high standards and intense devotion to scholarship. His translations of Aristotle, neo-Platonists, and other early Hellenic figures were useful to his students and colleagues but never published. Students regretted that he did not publish more of his work, but they cherished their time spent with him.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Bibliographical: Taurellus," *Journal of Philosophy* 2 (1905): 125–8.

"Bardaisan and the Odes of Solomon," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 30 (1911): 162–204.

"A Syriac Valentinian Hymn," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 38 (1918): 1–33.

"The Syriac Dialogue 'Socrates.' A Study in Syrian Philosophy," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 57 (1918): 99–111.

"The Eagle and the Basket on the Chalice of Antioch," *American Journal of Archaeology* 29 (1925): 357–80.

"Five Transliterated Aramaic Inscriptions," *American Journal of Archaeology* 30 (1926): 288–329.

Other Relevant Works

Newbold's papers are at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

The Cipher of Roger Bacon, ed. Roland G. Kent (Philadelphia, 1928).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v22, Who Was Who in Amer v1

Alexander, Hartley Burr. "William Romaine Newbold," *Journal of Philosophy* 23 (1926): 586–8.

Kent, Roland G., ed. *Newbold Memorial Meeting* (Philadelphia, 1927). Contains a bibliography of Newbold's writings.

Montgomery, James A. "William Romaine Newbold," *American Journal of Archaeology* 31 (1927): 101.

John R. Shook

NEWELL, Allen (1927–92)

Allen Newell was born on 19 March 1927 in San Francisco, California. In 1945 Newell joined the US Navy. His father Robert Newell was a distinguished professor of radiology at Stanford Medical School, and he joined a group of scientific observers for the Bikini nuclear tests. At his father's request, Newell was assigned to the Navy ship carrying the team, given the duty of mapping radiation distribution, and this experience ignited his passion for science. After his tour of duty, Newell studied physics at Stanford, earning his BA degree in 1949. At Stanford he took six courses with distinguished mathematician George Polya, learning the importance of heuristics in creative thinking. Newell did graduate studies in mathematics at Princeton in 1949–50, where he was introduced to game theory, but he then left to join the Rand Corporation to do more experimental research. In 1954 Newell attended a lecture by Oliver Selfridge, during which he realized that adaptive intelligence systems could be built that were more complex than anything yet done.

In 1955 Herbert SIMON convinced Newell to move to the Carnegie Institute of Technology, where he completed a PhD in industrial administration in 1957, while still employed by Rand. In 1961 he became a professor at CIT (later renamed as Carnegie Mellon University), where he played a central role in creating a world-class department of computer science. Newell became the U. A. and Helen Whitaker University Professor of Computer Science, and held this position at Carnegie Mellon until his death on 19 July 1992 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Newell earned numerous honors throughout his career in the diverse fields in which he worked. He was elected to the National Academy of Sciences in 1972, and to the National Academy of Engineering in 1980. He became the first President of the American Association for Artificial Intelligence in 1980, and he earned a Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award from the American Psychological Association in 1985. A month before his death he was awarded the National Medal of Science.

Newell was a founder of artificial intelligence as well as a pioneer of cognitive science. He was sometimes a philosopher, as seen in his methodology for understanding human cognition, which was to build a single set of mechanisms capable of producing all cognitive behavior in humans: a unified theory of cognition. For Newell, understanding came in the building. Nonetheless, the dozens of systems he helped design, culminating in "Soar," developed with John Laird and Paul Rosenbloom, progressed by introducing philosophically relevant innovations, such as implementing a knowledge level in which the system is described as using what it knows to attain its goals, and defining problem spaces in which sub-goals are identified to resolve impasses.

In 1987 Newell delivered the William James Lectures to the philosophy department at Harvard University, which formed the basis for his *Unified Theories of Cognition* (1990). Newell suggested that human beings can be regarded as symbol processing systems, transforming states by syntactically operating on symbols, thereby applying the central tenet of the computational theory of mind.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Logic Theory Machine: A Complex Information-Processing System," *IRE Transactions on Information Theory* 2 (1956): 61–79.

GPS: A Case Study in Generality and

Problem Solving, with George Ernst (New York, 1969).

"Computer Science as Empirical Enquiry: Symbols and Search," with Herbert Simon, *Communications of the ACM* 19 (March 1976): 113–26.

"Physical Symbol Systems," *Cognitive Science* 4 (1980): 135–83.

"The Knowledge Level," *Artificial Intelligence* 18 (1982): 87–127.

Unified Theories of Cognition (Cambridge, Mass., 1990).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with Paul Rosenbloom and John Laird, *The Soar Papers: Research on Integrated Intelligence* (Cambridge Mass., 1993).

Further Reading

Who Was Who in Amer v10

Boden, Margaret, ed. *The Philosophy of Artificial Intelligence* (Oxford, 1990).

Laird, John, and Paul Rosenbloom. "The Research of Allen Newell," *AI Magazine* 13 (Winter 1992): 19–46.

McCorduck, Pamela. *Machines Who Think* (San Francisco, 1979).

Simon, Herbert. "Allen Newell 1927–1992," *IEEE Annals of the History of Computing* 20 (April–June 1998): 63–76.

Christopher Viger

NIEBUHR, Helmut Richard (1894–1962)

H. Richard Niebuhr was born on 3 September 1894 in Wright City, Missouri. He was the shy scholar of the family, the role of gregarious public figure having been taken by his older brother, Reinhold NIEBUHR. Their father Gustav had immigrated from Germany in 1878; he was a leading pastor in their German-speaking denomination, the Evangelical Synod of North America, which later merged with the German Reformed Church, and then later merged with the Congregationalist denomination to form the United Church of Christ. His sister, Hulda, was professor of Christian education at McCormick Theological Seminary. Along with Walter RAUSCHENBUSCH and Paul TILLICH, the Niebuhrs were the leading theological ethicists in twentieth-century America. All were blessed, partly by their bilingual skills, with theological depth and an ability to think from more than one perspective. Indeed, H. Richard Niebuhr's ability to enter into the perspective of others was a prominent source of his profundity.

Niebuhr graduated from Elmhurst College in Illinois in 1912 (but at that time Elmhurst did not grant degrees). He then graduated from Eden Seminary in St. Louis in 1915, and was ordained in 1916. Niebuhr received an MA from Washington University in St. Louis in 1917, and briefly taught at Eden Seminary before undertaking study at Union Theological Seminary and Columbia University in New York City; Washington University; and the University of Michigan and the University of Chicago. In 1922 he began theological studies at Yale while pastoring at local churches, earning his BD in 1923 and his PhD in philosophy in 1924. He was President of Elmhurst College from 1924 to 1927, and then taught theology at Eden Seminary. In 1931 Niebuhr became professor of Christian ethics at Yale University Divinity School. In 1954 he was named Sterling Professor of Theology and Christian Ethics and held that position until his death. Niebuhr died on 5 July 1962 in Greenfield, Massachusetts.

Niebuhr wrote his dissertation at Yale University on "Ernst Troeltsch's Philosophy of Religion." He adopted Troeltsch's empirical demonstration that philosophies and faiths are shaped by historical and social contexts. "We are in history as a fish is in water," Niebuhr later wrote. He adopted Troeltsch's historical relativism as his own. He rejected Kantian and Enlightenment efforts to validate

an ethic in a priori universality. But he argued that a remaining Kantian residue caused Troeltsch still to search for what is eternally and universally true, which contradicted his own methodological assumptions. It prevented Troeltsch from solving the problems he posed.

Kant rejected experientially particular knowledge of God, and relied instead on the universal a priori, which Niebuhr thought a serious error. Niebuhr advocated instead empirical knowledge of God that originated within particular experience. He pointed to the empirical realism of his Yale professor Douglas Clyde MACINTOSH, and to some extent William JAMES and Henri Bergson, as more promising.

The Great Depression of 1929, and Hitler's takeover of Germany in 1933, shook Niebuhr's liberal faith. Caring deeply about the millions who suffered from the Depression, and anticipating as a bilingual German-American the pain of the impending war, Niebuhr experienced a profound collapse of hope. In the midst of this crisis, he discovered the foundation for faith that became the central theme of his theology and ethics: "the fundamental certainty given to me then … was that of God's sovereignty." It was a decisive "break with the so-called liberal or empirical theology" that "defined God primarily in value-terms," and an adoption instead of a trust in the sovereignty of God as the fundamental center of faith. "It does not mean to believe in a kindly spirit somewhere who may help us in our more or less pious endeavors, but it does mean that we have seen the enemy and the judge of our sin as our redeemer." (1960, p. 249)

Niebuhr's advocacy of the sovereignty of God included three essential themes. The first theme was the reality of God's rule in and over all, including the bitter and the tragic. The only way to be freed from destructive idolatries such as nationalism, racism, and greed was to discover loyalty to the living God as the source and judge of all life. This sovereign God, the real ruler in and over all, Niebuhr dis-

covered in his "tower experience" amid the crises of 1929–33. The second theme was the independence of the living God from subjective values and human institutions. Niebuhr made a passionate and prophetic attack on liberal idealism, an idolatry that had engulfed church and world alike, substituting subjective human desires and optimistic human ideals for God: "A God without wrath brought people without sin into a kingdom without judgment through the ministrations of a Christ without a cross." (1937, p. 193) The third theme was that if theology was based on the sovereign God rather than on subjective values, God's character and actions must be known in our own experience and history; otherwise theology depends on subjective values and undermines meaningful affirmation of God's independence of those subjective values. Niebuhr argued this point in four essays during the 1930s: "Value-Theory and Theology," "Theology and Psychology: A Sterile Union," "Can German and American Christians Understand Each Other?" and "Religious Realism in the Twentieth Century." Niebuhr rejected Kantian agnosticism, and instead developed his understanding of God as revealed in Christ. His attack on the Kantian starting point began under the label of critical realism, then objective relativism, then historical relationism, and continued through his last writings on faith and responsibility in dialogue with post-Kantians such as Karl Polanyi, Ludwig Wittgenstein, and Maurice Merleau-Ponty (Keiser 1988).

In *The Meaning of Revelation* (1941) Niebuhr insists, "we are not trying to describe a common human certainty gained in a common human experience; yet on the other hand we are not seeking to set forth a private and mystic assurance which is not subject to the criticism of our community" (1941, p. 141). The individualistic existentialism of Søren Kierkegaard, Rudolf Bultmann, and the early Karl Barth reduces revelation to an encounter between the unknowable self of God and the inner self of the believer, an encounter

devoid of structure, content, and history. This kind of individualism produces a dualism that compartmentalizes Christ and the believer in an inner realm of private selfhood, and offers little guidance for responsible selfhood in an outer realm of society, law, and nature.

When Niebuhr speaks of God as the self we meet in history, his model for selfhood is the socially responsible self, the self in faithful relation, embedded and situated in history, as in Martin Buber and George Herbert MEAD (1941, pp. x, 65, 146; 1989, p. 46). God's particular way of relating within history is not merely historical accident disconnected from the real, unknowable God. The real God is in relation, not in abstraction from relation. A responsible self is a self who acts, within the drama of historical interaction, and who is known in those actions. "Selves are known in act or not at all." (1941, pp. 145–6, also pp. 65–73, 129–30; 1989, p. 48) The relative historical particularities of God's actions and covenants, their existential and physical embodiments and their repeated patterns, are a part of the disclosure. Revelation is historically concrete, has rich descriptive content, and is subject to historical verification or correction. "It is like a decisive moment in the common life of friends. In the face of some emergency a person may act so as to reveal a quality undisclosed before. Through that revelatory moment a friend is enabled to understand past actions which had been obscure and to prophesy the future behavior of the revealer." (1941, p. 129)

Niebuhr writes, "When we speak of revelation we mean that moment when we are given a new faith, to cleave to and to betray, and a new standard, to follow and deny …. From this point forward we must listen for the remembered voice in all the sounds that assail our ears, and look for the remembered activity in all the actions of the world upon us. The God who reveals himself in Jesus Christ is now trusted and known as the contemporary God, revealing himself in every event; but we do not understand how we could trace God's working in these happenings if he did not make himself known to us through the memory of Jesus Christ; nor do we know how we should be able to interpret all the words we read as words of God save by the aid of this Rosetta stone." (1941, p. 154)

According to Niebuhr, within the limits of historical relativism we cannot validate an ethic by universal rationality. Claims to universality are falsified by honesty about our historical particularity: our claim to universality leads to a defensiveness that blinds us to our own biases; it leads us to denigrate the concreteness and richness of our own social and historical context; and it leads us to denigrate the thick concreteness of others' social and historical contexts, experiences, and narratives. Thus a Kantian bias for the universal and rational becomes exclusionary, disrespectful, and closed.

How might one validate an ethic within the limits of historical relativism? Niebuhr worked out an eightfold methodology not always noticed by his readers (Stassen 1996, chap. 4). He saw "history as the laboratory in which our faith is tested." His first book, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* (1929), showed how churches have accommodated their national, racial, ethnic, class, and regional loyalties. His second book, *The Kingdom of God in America* (1937), took a clue from Henri Bergson's distinction between times when prophetic religion flows like hot lava and changes society, and those more usual times when it cools to petrified rock shaped by the society to which it conforms. He examined times in the history of American churches when religion was authentically transforming rather than defensively conforming: the early Puritan period produced new churches, human rights, and constitutional democracy; the Great Awakenings likewise brought prophetic change; and the Social Gospel brought a Christianity working for economic justice. Had he written later, he would have included the 1960s civil rights movement. All these authentically transforming movements were distin-

guished by their active faith in God's sovereignty over all of life not only over a private sphere; by their keen awareness that God is independent of human ideals or social arrangements and not identified idolatrously with human empires; and by their seeing God as disclosed in faithful patterns of acting in history. Christian ethics thus has rich prophetic content. These three themes of prophetic Christianity acquire validity not through Enlightenment universals but through the laboratory of history.

In *Christ and Culture* (1951), Niebuhr used these three themes of prophetic transformation to evaluate five ideal types of relation between faith and reason, church and state, peace and war, or loyalty to Christ and loyalty to culture. The five types are: (1) radical distancing from the most compromising dimensions of culture – "Christ against culture"; (2) surrendering of the prophetic dimensions of faith in accommodation to culture – "Christ of culture"; (3) the two-level Thomistic synthesis of Christ and culture – "Christ above culture"; (4) the two-realm dualism of his brother, Reinhold – "Christ and culture in paradox"; and (5) the authentically transformationist "Christ transforming culture." This typology has been widely employed and also criticized (see Scriven 1988; Yoder in Stassen et al. 1996; and articles in the symposium on "Reassessing *Christ and Culture*" 2003).

In the 1950s, Niebuhr reacted against Karl Barth's Christocentrism and seldom spoke of God's self-disclosure in Christ. He adopted a much more abstract and distant language, speaking of God as the One beyond the many, The Universal who is infinitely distant from all particulars, The Source of all Being (1960).

His ethics became abstract. This decade brought the Cold War, the Korean War, the McCarthy anti-communism crusade, the growth of the United Nations, and decisions by the United States about new responsibilities in Asia, Europe, Africa, and Latin America. None of these struggles appears in Niebuhr's writings. His silence contrasts curiously with his prophetic calls in previous decades to resistance against Hitler, to repentance for obliteration bombing, to equal justice for Germany and Japan after the war, to compassion for war's victims, to repentance for racial injustice.

In his Earl Lectures at Riverside Church in New York City in 1962, his final writing before his death, Niebuhr returned to Christ as "symbolic form with the aid of which we tell each other what life and death, God and man, are *like*; but even more he is … an image, a scheme or pattern in the mind which gives form and meaning to their experience" (1963, p. 154f). "The needy companion … is a Christo-morphic being, apprehended as in the form of Christ." He interprets life through the cross. He commends "Christians who think of and, in part, conduct their lives as imitations of Christ, as conformities to his mind; who follow him, are his disciples, live, suffer, and die with him" (1963, pp. 154–5, 163–5, 175–6). He points to new resolution of the problems of universality and particularity, and God's goodness in the presence of evil, via the symbolic form of Jesus Christ. He writes prophetically again of militarism and the Cold War (1962, pp. 4–7).

In *The Responsible Self: An Essay in Christian Moral Philosophy* (1963), Niebuhr develops his alternative to teleological and deontological ethics: kathekontological ethics or the ethics of the fitting response. This ethics focuses not on ideals or rules, but on response to what God is doing in shaping the context and the fitting response. Generations of students heard him say: "Responsibility affirms: 'God is acting in all actions upon you. So respond to all actions upon you as to respond to God's action'." What is fitting depends on an understanding of God's actions and the appropriate response to those actions in the social context where we act. Keiser (1996, pp. 103–25), using notes from Niebuhr's lectures and his published writings, summarizes Niebuhr's ethics of response as interpreted through Christ as symbolic form.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Social Sources of Denominationalism (New York, 1929).

The Church Against the World, with Wilhelm Pauck and Francis P. Miller (New York, 1936).

The Kingdom of God in America (Chicago and New York, 1937).

The Meaning of Revelation (New York, 1941).

Christ and Culture (New York, 1951).

The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry, with Daniel Day Williams and James Gustafson (New York, 1956).

Radical Monotheism and Western Culture, with Supplementary Essays (New York, 1960).

The Responsible Self: An Essay in Christian Moral Philosophy (New York, 1963).

Faith on Earth: An Inquiry into the Structure of Human Faith (New Haven, Conn., 1989).

Theology, History, and Culture (New Haven, Conn., 1996).

Other Relevant Works

Niebuhr's papers are at Harvard University and Eden Theological Seminary in St. Louis, Missouri.

"Religious Realism in the Twentieth Century," in *Religious Realism*, ed. D. C. Macintosh (New York, 1931), pp. 413–28.

"Value Theory and Theology," in *The Nature of Religious Experience: Essays in Honor of Douglas Clyde Macintosh* (New York, 1937), pp. 93–116.

"The Ego-alter Dialectic and the Conscience," *Journal of Philosophy* 42 (1945): 352–9.

"The Center of Value," in *Moral Principles of Action: Man's Ethical Imperative*, ed. R. N. Anshen (New York, 1952), pp. 162–75.

"The Idea of Covenant and American Democracy," *Church History* 23 (1954): 125–35.

"Sören Kierkegaard," in *Christianity and the Existentialists*, ed. Carl Michalson (New York, 1956), pp. 23–42.

"Reformation: Continuing Imperative," *Christian Century* 77 (1960): 248–51.

"The Illusions of Power," *The Pulpit* 33 (1962): 4–7.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v47*, *Proc of APA v36*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Chrystal, William G. "The Young H. Richard Niebuhr," *Theology Today* 38 (1981): 231–5.

Cook, Martin L. *The Open Circle: Confessional Method in Theology* (Minneapolis, 1991).

Diefenthaler, Jon. *H. Richard Niebuhr: A Lifetime of Reflections on the Church and World* (Macon, Georgia, 1986).

Fowler, James W. *To See the Kingdom: The Theological Vision of H. Richard Niebuhr* (Nashville, Tenn., 1974). Contains a bibliography of Niebuhr's writings.

Grant, C. David. *God The Center of Value: Value Theory in the Theology of H. Richard Niebuhr* (Fort Worth, Tex., 1984).

Harrison, Beverly W. *H. Richard Niebuhr: Towards a Christian Moral Philosophy*. PhD dissertation, Union Theological Seminary (New York, 1974).

Hoedemaker, L. A. *The Theology of H. Richard Niebuhr* (Philadelphia, 1970).

Keiser, R. Melvin. *Recovering the Personal: Religious Language and the Post-Critical Quest of H. Richard Niebuhr* (Atlanta, 1988).

———, *Roots of Relational Ethics: Responsibility in Origin and Maturity in H. Richard Niebuhr* (Atlanta, 1996).

Kliever, Lonnie D. *H. Richard Niebuhr* (Waco, Tex., 1977).

Ottati, Douglas F. *Meaning and Method in H. Richard Niebuhr's Theology* (Washington, D.C., 1982).

Ramsey, Paul, ed. *Faith and Ethics* (New York, 1957). Contains a bibliography of Niebuhr's writings.

Scriven, Charles. *The Transformation of Culture: Christian Social Ethics After H. Richard Niebuhr* (Scottdale, Penn., 1988).

Sherry, Terrence Owen. *The Christo-Morphic, Hermeneutical Theology of H. Richard Niebuhr: Shaped by Christ* (Lewiston, N.Y., 2003).

Stassen, Glen H. *The Sovereignty of God in the Theological Ethics of H. Richard Niebuhr*. PhD dissertation, Duke University (Durham, N.C., 1967).

Stassen, Glen H., D. M. Yeager, and John Howard Yoder. *Authentic Transformation: A New Vision of Christ and Culture* (Nashville, Tenn., 1996).

Symposium on "Reassessing *Christ and Culture*," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 23 (2003): 101–69.

Werpehowski, William. *American Protestant Ethics and the Legacy of H. Richard Niebuhr* (Washington, D.C., 2002).

Glen H. Stassen

NIEBUHR, Karl Paul Reinhold (1892–1971)

With the exception of Martin Luther KING, JR., Reinhold Niebuhr was more influential than any other twentieth-century theologian in the United States. He contributed to American social and political philosophy and was arguably the century's most important social ethicist.

Reinhold Niebuhr was born on 21 June 1892 in Wright City, Missouri, to Gustav Niebuhr, a pastor of the German Evangelical Synod and Lydia Hosto Niebuhr, the daughter of a West Coast missionary in the same synod. A sister, Hulda, and a brother, Walter, preceded Karl. Another brother, Helmut Richard NIEBUHR, followed him. Reinhold was ten when the family moved to Lincoln, Illinois. He spent his adolescence in Lincoln before leaving for Elmhurst College, the synod's small boarding school near Chicago, and then he attended Eden Theological Seminary, the synod's seminary near St. Louis, from which Niebuhr graduated in 1913 at the age of twenty. That spring his father died, and Reinhold was installed as the pastor of his father's church. Decades later he would write about his father as "the first formative religious influence" in his life and would describe him in a manner that held equally true for Reinhold: he "combined a vital personal piety with a complete freedom in his theological studies" (1956, p. 3). He also shared his father's fierce drive and his mother's capacity for work and devotion to it.

In 1913 Niebuhr arrived at Yale's Divinity School, where he earned a BD in 1914 and an MA in 1915. In August 1915 he took up his post at Bethel Evangelical Church in Detroit. The Detroit years were decisive. On the anvil of Detroit's harsh industrial reality, the trauma of World War I, and the onset of the Great Depression, Niebuhr tested the alternatives he then found wanting: religious and secular liberalism and Marxism. All these belonged to his relentless theological efforts to illumine events of the day and render them meaningful. Detroit also kindled the prophetic indignation that always marked Niebuhr; it impelled his quest to understand society and to change it. The very function of theology, he wrote in Detroit, is to aid "the ethical reconstruction of society" by forging a religious imagination that sustains a commitment to public life and guides policy decisions that represent the leading edge of justice (1927, p. 39). Niebuhr found himself deeply engaged in civic social issues: opposing Henry Ford as well as the Ku Klux Klan; championing the labor movement; serving on the Mayor's Inter-racial Committee and the Detroit Council of Churches Industrial Relations Committee;

joining the Fellowship of Reconciliation; and pastoring a congregation that itself had become, under his leadership, a notable community force in its own right. Niebuhr even published his first book in Detroit, *Does Civilization Need Religion?* (1927). Shortly after, he published a volume of personal meditations that remains popular, *Leaves from the Notebook of a Tamed Cynic* (1929).

After leading his Detroit church for thirteen years, in 1928 Niebuhr became professor of Christian Ethics at the Union Theological Seminary in New York City and taught there until 1960. Always a dramatist of theological ideas in the public arena, with a large secular as well as religious audience, Niebuhr's literary output over these years was remarkable. In one decade alone, from 1942 to 1952, he published over 700 articles, wrote chapters for numerous books edited by others, founded and edited the influential bi-weekly, *Christianity and Crisis*, and penned five books of his own, including his theological masterpiece, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, given as the Gifford Lectures in 1941 and 1943. *The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness* (1944), *Faith and History* (1949), and *The Irony of American History* (1952) are other major works of this period.

These mid century decades as a writer were matched by an ambitious travel, teaching, and consulting schedule, all of which brought Niebuhr public access and acclaim. He served the Federal Council of Churches and World Council of Churches in various capacities and traveled widely in the United States and abroad on the lecture circuit. Developments in Europe, especially Great Britain and Germany, captured his ongoing attention and commentary. In the post-World War II years he was a member of the Council of Foreign Relations and served as a member of the US delegation to the UNESCO conference in Paris. The US State Department recruited him as a consultant for its Policy Planning Staff, ironically at the same time the FBI continued to assemble its thick file on him because of his past socialist politics and continued dissent from many national policies. His

influence reached beyond his base in theological education and showed itself in the work of luminaries such as diplomat George Kennan, policy advisor Dorothy Fosdick, poet W. H. Auden, literary critic Lionel Trilling, historian Arthur SCHLESINGER, JR., columnists Marquis Childs and James Reston, political scientist Hans MORGENTHAU, political and social philosopher Isaiah Berlin, and psychiatrist Robert Coles, together with religious leaders such as Martin Luther King, Jr., Rabbi Abraham HESCHEL, John Courtney MURRAY, and John C. BENNETT. Harvard offered him a university professorship and his *alma mater*, Yale University, considered him for its presidency. *Time* magazine put him on the cover of its twenty-fifth anniversary issue in 1948; *Life* magazine featured him in both 1946 and 1948. Together with Paul TILLICH, the colleague he helped bring to Union Seminary from Nazi Germany, Niebuhr commanded the theological heights in the 1940s and 1950s and, with Tillich, enjoyed recognition as a leading public intellectual.

When Niebuhr moved to New York City and Union Seminary in the summer of 1928, he was already a celebrity on the Protestant circuit. He had done no doctoral studies, however, and the skeptical faculty approved his appointment by only one vote, even after it had been made clear his salary would be paid by a benefactor, Sherwood Eddy, who sought Niebuhr as a publicist for pacifist causes. Before long, however, Niebuhr published the volume that launched his academic career and established himself as a formidable thinker. *Moral Man and Immoral Society* was written in the course of one summer and has been in print continuously since its publication in 1932, often finding use as a text in political theory and social philosophy. This was not yet Niebuhr's contribution to theology, but it did establish the baselines of the social ethics school that would come to be associated with him, labeled as "Christian realism."

Moral Man and Immoral Society meant to demolish the liberalism of those who dreamt that social change could be accomplished by

educational and evangelical means, and to press the case that justice could not be realized apart from religion's alliance with power leveraged against economic, social, and political privilege. "There is no ethical force strong enough to place inner checks upon the use of power if its quantity is inordinate." (1932, p. 164) This attention to the play of power, together with Niebuhr's contention that Enlightenment reason and moral idealism were as ideologically tainted and subject to self-serving interests as religion itself, was the "realism" component. "Christian" referred to the sources of Niebuhr's theological doctrine of human nature and the making of history. While on the basis of his realism he rejected a belief in human perfectibility and the inevitability of progress (the secular and religious liberalism of his day), he also recognized and elaborated the reality of human freedom and the human capacity for self-transcendence. This means "indeterminate possibilities" on the part of creatures who, created in the image of God, are always breaking the mold. Yet creative human freedom also means that good and evil tend to grow apace. Greater evils are commonly the corruption of greater goods. Moral accomplishments may be real but they are never secure.

Niebuhr worked out his dialectical doctrine of human nature as both incurably fallible and boundlessly creative in a way that sought to avoid the fusion of religion and politics while at the same time harnessing religion as a power for social transformation and a source of energy for the social struggle ("the ethical reconstruction of society" noted above). In doing so, Niebuhr and Christian realism placed issues of power at the heart of the moral life, while viewing the moral life itself as a continuing battleground of both self-regarding and other-regarding, or "social," impulses. Since, as he argued in *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, self-regarding impulses are compounded in the lives of groups ("we" *vis à vis* "they"), group relations will be determined "by the proportion of power which each group possesses, at least as much as by any rational and moral appraisal of the comparative needs and claims of each group" (1932, p. xxiii). A decent life in society, then, is not guaranteed by any better education or religion but only by a system of checks and balances. Niebuhr concluded that the relevant, proximate moral norm for the ordering of society is justice rather than love, and the relevant strategic goal is the most equitable distribution of power possible. A later aphorism, from *The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness: A Vindication of Democracy and a Critique of Its Traditional Defense*, captured Christian realism and the implications of *Moral Man and Immoral Society* well: "Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible; but man's inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary." (1944, p. xi)

Marxism influenced Niebuhr throughout the 1920s and 1930s. It offered a coherent framework of meaning for the storm and struggle of these years and it did so in ways that generated, rather than abandoned, hopes for a more just social order. Later Niebuhr would elaborate the reasons for this framework and these hopes in his masterpiece of theological anthropology, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*. In that work Marxism is no longer a salient source. But in the 1930s it was, and it accompanied his preoccupation with a political-economic crisis that in turn led him into both socialist thought and socialist politics and, in the 1940s, to the left flank of the Democratic Party. He helped found the Union for Democratic Action in 1941, serving as its first national chairman, and also chaired the successor organization, Americans for Democratic Action. He worked ardently for the socialist cause as the moving spirit of the Fellowship of Socialist Christians. He helped to set up the Delta Cooperative Farm in Hillhouse, Mississippi, and the Southern Tenant Farmer's Union, and supported the candidacy of Norman Thomas for president on the Socialist Party ticket in 1932 and 1936. Later in that decade and the next he found Franklin Roosevelt persuasive. Roosevelt's skillful fashioning of both national unity and a dynamic mixed economy countered Niebuhr's convic-

tion that capitalism could not be reformed. And while he did not wholly abandon his attention to political economy and his attention to white racism (America's gravest social problem, in his judgment), he turned more and more to global politics and the need to rally US support for resistance to the specter of fascism. The role and responsibilities of the US as a global power became one of his major themes from the 1940s to the end of his career in the mid 1960s. Niebuhr, a chief intellectual source for the school of diplomacy known as "political realism," ended his years as a critic of US presence in Vietnam and a citizen worried about the consequences of imperial power on the part of a nation that never thinks of itself as an empire (*The Irony of American History*, 1952).

Niebuhr turned to theological study with heightened purpose in the years following *Moral Man and Immoral Society*. Classic Protestant sources (the Hebrew prophets, the Gospels, St. Paul, Augustine, the Reformation, Kierkegaard) fed a conviction he had already announced in the preface to *Reflections on the End of an Era*: "Adequate spiritual guidance can come only through a more radical political orientation and more conservative religious convictions than are comprehended in the culture of our era." (1934, preface) Those "more conservative religious convictions" eventually displaced his Marxism as a source of insight and became elaborated as the "doctrine of man" of his *magnum opus*, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, which also was the work that established him as a formidable purveyor of Christian apologetics.

In 1952 Niebuhr suffered a series of small neurological attacks that left him partially paralyzed on his left side and forced him to scale back his enormous energy to a fraction of what it had been. Nonetheless, his teaching continued, as did his writing. *Christian Realism and Political Problems*, *The Self and the Dramas of History*, *The Structure of Nations and Empires*, and *Man's Nature and His Communities* all appeared between 1953 and 1965. But his public appearances were sharply curtailed and

his became a most unaccustomed "view from the sidelines," to note the title of an article published in 1967 (reprinted in 1985). In it he pays touching tribute to Ursula Compton Niebuhr, the Oxford theology graduate he met at Union in 1930–31 and whom he married in December of the following year. The founder of the department of religion and professor of religion at Barnard College, she cut back her workload after Reinhold's strokes. In due course the Niebuhrs relocated from Manhattan to their summer home in Stockbridge, Massachusetts, where Niebuhr died on 1 June 1971.

Niebuhr's memorial service was held in the First Congregational Church in Stockbridge. The church's early pastor, Jonathan Edwards, had been among the handful of American theologians whose stature matched that of the one to whom final respects were now paid. Rabbi Abraham Heschel paid his respects in words Niebuhr himself might have chosen to describe his rabbi friend: "He appeared among us like a sublime figure out of the Hebrew Bible … . Niebuhr's life was a song in the form of deeds." (Fox 1985, p. 293)

Assessing Niebuhr's legacy is an ongoing enterprise. Langdon GILKEY has shown that Niebuhr's incisive treatment of religion was a critical breakthrough for twentieth-century thought, while his description of the dynamic character of historical life anticipated the change and relativity twentieth-century sciences would find present in all of life. Gilkey and others have also emphasized Niebuhr's capacity to find a critical posture from which to expose the shortcomings of all self-enclosed systems of thought, whether religious or secular; he was both a master of ideological critique and an insistent teacher that "doctrine" from whatever source must be submitted to the test of lived life. He was particularly eager to demolish the monistic perspectives of the privileged, just as he was also eager to generate courage among his students and colleagues to enter the unknown and the challenging. It was axiomatic for Niebuhr that credulity was never a substitute for faith, or doctrine and ideology a substitute

for truth and thought (Gilkey 2001). Roger Shinn has noted, on a related point, that while Niebuhr was indeed a master of "the hermeneutics of suspicion" and had no peer in analyzing the sins of the powerful and the case they made for themselves, he understood less well the frustrations and resignation of people buried in the struggle. Niebuhr invariably took the side of the disadvantaged and joined them in organizing countervailing power. Such was in accord with his contention that injustice flows from imbalances of power. Yet he was better at criticizing those who would not relinquish or share power than understanding the inner world and the social world of those who faced obstacles in claiming power (Shinn 1968). Feminists have found Niebuhr clearly wanting. An article that helped launch the feminist movement, Valerie Saiving's "The Human Situation: A Feminine View," included major criticisms of Niebuhr. What he deemed "human nature" included little of women's experience, their nature, their sin, or their contributions. In short, those who must proudly claim power in order more fully to attain and live their humanity received notably less attention in Niebuhr's understanding of human nature and the dramas of history than the nature and history of those of whom Niebuhr was the piercing critic: largely North American and North Atlantic influential white men. His own brother, H. Richard Niebuhr, himself a prominent theological ethicist at Yale University, anticipated another feminist criticism. Reinhold, in famously distinguishing large group dynamics and their moral resources from those of face-to-face relationships (in *Moral Man and Immoral Society*), had romanticized circles of intimacy. While Reinhold did acknowledge that "social conflicts … may be more deadly for operating at close range" (1935, p. 116), he was susceptible not only to his brother's point but one elaborated by Beverly Wildung Harrison, a student of Reinhold who became the founding figure in Christian feminist social ethics. Harrison's objection is that the "public/private" dualism in Niebuhr's remaining liberal political ideology obscured for him the ways in which larger social groups play out patterns that are learned in smaller ones, especially the family. The home, together with other communities of close-in relationships, is the first school of justice – and injustice (Harrison 1985, p. 27). This shortcoming in Niebuhr's thought was compounded, Harrison and others have pointed out, by the choice of sacrificial love over mutual love as the ultimate moral norm in Niebuhr's famous dialectic of love and justice. Self-sacrificial love as the highest of loves is in accord with human nature understood in terms of the transcendent ego of the individual. While the free spirit of the individual self certainly is a theme in Niebuhr's theological anthropology, the preference of self-sacrificial over mutual love is nonetheless curious for a theologian and social philosopher so keenly aware of humanity's social "being" and of the self's embeddedness in society as was Niebuhr. His own insistence that the "law" of our life is love as other-regarding impulses in an interdependent existence appears to argue for reciprocity or mutuality as the basic context and reason for sacrificial love itself, rather than mutual love as a lesser sort judged and inspired by sacrificial love (*agape*).

Despite these criticisms, none of Niebuhr's critics has doubted his intellectual power or the insights that flowed from his dialectic of human beings as both incurably fallible and endlessly creative. None has failed, either, to commend his works as sources of continuing insight for present-day issues.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Does Civilization Need Religion? A Study in the Social Resources and Limitations of Religion in Modern Life (New York, 1927).

Leaves from the Notebook of a Tamed Cynic (New York, 1929).

Moral Man and Immoral Society: A Study in Ethics and Politics (New York, 1932).

Reflections on the End of an Era (New York, 1934).

An Interpretation of Christian Ethics (New

York, 1935).

The Nature and Destiny of Man: A Christian Perspective, 2 vols (New York, 1941–3).

The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness: A Vindication of Democracy and a Critique of Its Traditional Defense (New York, 1944).

Faith and History: A Comparison of Christian and Modern Views of History (New York, 1949).

The Irony of American History (New York, 1952).

The Self and the Dramas of History (New York, 1955).

The Structure of Nations and Empires (New York, 1959).

Man's Nature and His Communities (New York, 1965).

Other Relevant Works

Niebuhr's papers are at the Library of Congress.

Reinhold Niebuhr: His Religious, Social and Political Thought, ed. Charles Kegley (New York, 1956; 2nd edn 1984).

The Essential Reinhold Niebuhr, ed. Robert Brown (New Haven, Conn., 1985).

Reinhold Niebuhr: Theologian of Public Life, ed. Larry Rasmussen (Minneapolis, 1988).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Encyc Ethics*, *Encyc Relig*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Brown, Charles. *Niebuhr and His Age: Reinhold Niebuhr's Prophetic Role and Legacy*, 2nd edn (Harrisburg, Penn., 2002).

Fox, Richard W. *Reinhold Niebuhr: A Biography*, 2nd edn (Ithaca, N.Y., 1996).

Gilkey, Langdon. *On Niebuhr: A Theological Study* (Chicago, 2001).

Harland, Gordon. *The Thought of Reinhold Niebuhr* (Oxford, 1960).

Harrison, Beverly. "The Role of Social Theory in Religious Social Ethics," in *Making the Connections: Essays in Feminist Social Ethics* (Boston, 1985), pp. 54–80.

Kegley Charles W. *Reinhold Niebuhr: His Religious, Social, and Political Thought*, 2nd edn (New York, 1984).

Kegley Charles W., and Robert W. Bretall, eds. *Reinhold Niebuhr: His Religious, Social, and Political Thought* (New York, 1956).

McCann, Dennis. *Christian Realism and Liberation Theology* (Maryknoll, N.Y., 1981).

Rice, Daniel F. *Reinhold Niebuhr and John Dewey: An American Odyssey* (Albany, N.Y., 1993).

Robertson, D. B. *Reinhold Niebuhr's Works: A Bibliography*, (Lanham, Md., 1983).

Shinn, Roger L. *The New Humanism* (Philadelphia, 1968).

Stone, Ronald H. *Professor Reinhold Niebuhr: A Mentor to the Twentieth Century* (Louisville, Kent., 1992).

Larry L. Rasmussen

NIELSEN, Kai Edward (1926–)

Kai Nielsen was born on 15 May 1926 in Marshall, Michigan. He was raised in Moline, Illinois and after graduating from high school he attended the US Maritime Academy in 1944 and served in the Merchant Marine in 1944–5. He attended St. Ambrose College in Iowa from 1945 to 1947, transferred to the University of North Carolina where he earned his BA in English with honors in 1949, and then earned a PhD in philosophy in 1955 from Duke University, writing a dissertation on "Justification and Morals." He was instructor of philosophy at Hamilton College in New York from 1955 to 1957, assistant professor of philosophy at Amherst College from 1957 to

1960, visiting assistant professor of philosophy at New York University in 1960–61, and associate professor of philosophy at Harpur College in New York in 1961–2. In 1962 he became associate professor of philosophy at New York University, was promoted to full professor in 1967, and served as department chair in 1967–8. From 1970 until retiring in 1989, Nielsen was professor of philosophy at the University of Calgary, and also was department chair from 1984 to 1989. Since 1993, he has been adjunct professor of philosophy at Concordia University in Montréal, Canada.

Nielsen has been one of Canada's most eminent philosophers for over three decades. He was one of the founders of the *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* in 1971, elected President of the Canadian Philosophical Association for 1983–4, and became a fellow of the Royal Society of Canada in 1988. As a staunch defender of pragmatic naturalism, skeptical atheism, and Marxist egalitarianism, Nielsen is simultaneously one of philosophy's clearest writers and most controversial figures. He has published more than twenty monographs and edited volumes, and more than four hundred articles.

Nielsen launched his rejection of theism in two books, published in the same year, 1973: *Scepticism* and *Ethics without God*. Religious skepticism (unlike philosophical skepticism) is warranted, because arguments for the existence of a theistic God are failures. Religious experience cannot serve as a rational foundation, and theological arguments must specify what is meant by "God." If an anthropomorphic God is intended, such a conception is easily shown false by modern knowledge. On the other hand, any sophisticated conception of God uses religious language to speak about God in a way that prevents any reasonable verification or falsification, and such language is hence meaningless. *Ethics without God* asks whether morality can be disentangled from religion, and Nielsen answers affirmatively, offering a broadly consequentialist ethical theory. That there must be such an ethical theory capable of justifying moral rules becomes obvious when considering the divine command theory and related theories. The fact that God has commanded or willed moral rules does not legitimate them, since sheer tyranny carries no reasonable moral legitimacy. Whether we are justified in believing that God is not a tyrant must logically depend on our ability to appeal to an independent moral theory to judge God and the ordained moral rules. Similarly, whether the existence of God can supply life with meaning and purpose requires independent standards. These arguments are developed and supplemented in subsequent writings, including *Philosophy & Atheism: In Defense of Atheism* (1985) and *God, Scepticism and Modernity* (1989).

Nielsen's social and political theory was formed with heavy influences from Marxism and John RAWLS. To arrive at a socialist outcome that could satisfy the demands of both equality and liberty, Nielsen proposes largely to accept Rawls's principles of justice, with the provision that roughly equal distribution is more reasonable than Rawlsian unequal distribution. In *Equality and Liberty: A Defense of Radical Egalitarianism* (1985), Nielsen argues that capitalism cannot satisfy the principles of justice, which require among other goods a meaningful occupation and health care for all. Against libertarians, such as Robert NOZICK, he takes the view that maximizing freedom is achievable only after equalization of wealth. In *Marxism and the Moral Point of View: Morality, Ideology, and Historical Materialism* (1989), Nielsen anticipates and refutes the complaint that the Marxist suspicion of ideology leaves Marxism with no moral position from which to criticize capitalism. In *Globalization and Justice* (2003), the failures of global capitalization to meet even basic expectations of justice are rehearsed. Although globalization is even threatening democracy itself, he finds hope in global democratic socialism, which would, he claims, receive far greater approval around the world.

Although there are no objective or purely rational foundations for morality, Nielsen understands the alternative of subjectivism to be a satisfactory moral theory, so long as it can be pragmatically reasonable to be moral in order to achieve happiness. The question, "Why should I be moral?" is neither meaningless nor contradictory, but satisfactorily answerable for the sort of people that Rawls places in the original position for deciding principles of justice. Although morality is essentially tied to culture, resulting in cultural relativism, it is possible at least to require universalizability for morality, as Rawls does in following Kant on this point; and in Nielsen's view the universalizability test can at least helpfully expose partiality and prejudice. The ideals of justice emerge from considering what rational people would together find to be the most practical way to achieve their vision of the good life. Perhaps Nielsen is best classified as a rule utilitarian, although his relativistic and pluralistic refusal to define happiness or "the good" separates him from classical utilitarianism.

Nielsen's metaphilosophical views emphasize anti-foundationalism and pragmatic naturalism. Unlike traditional naturalism, which simply substitutes foundational faith in science for faith in the supernatural, Nielsen's pragmatic, historicist, and pluralistic naturalism is what remains after the excesses of supernaturalism, dualism, and idealism have fallen into mythology. This naturalism converges with the neopragmatism of Richard RORTY, about whom Nielsen has sympathetically written. Nielsen's *On Transforming Philosophy: A Metaphilosophical Inquiry* (1995) and *Naturalism Without Foundations* (1996) are the most detailed presentations of his naturalism and pragmatism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Reason and Practice: A Modern Introduction to Philosophy (New York, 1971).

Contemporary Critiques of Religion (New York and London, 1971).

Ethics without God (Buffalo, N.Y., 1973; 2nd edn 1990).

Scepticism (New York, 1973).

An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion (London, 1982; New York, 1983).

Equality and Liberty: A Defense of Radical Egalitarianism (Totowa, N.J., 1985).

Philosophy & Atheism: In Defense of Atheism (Buffalo, N.Y., 1985).

God, Scepticism and Modernity (Ottawa, Ontario, 1989).

Marxism and the Moral Point of View: Morality, Ideology, and Historical Materialism (Boulder, Col., 1989).

Why Be Moral? (Buffalo, N.Y., 1989).

Search for Community in a Withering Tradition: Conversations between a Marxian Atheist and a Calvinian Christian, with Hendrik Hart (Lanham, Md., 1990).

Does God Exist? The Debate between Theists & Atheists, with J. P. Moreland (Nashville, Tenn., 1990; Buffalo, N.Y., 1993).

After the Demise of the Tradition: Rorty, Critical Theory and the Fate of Philosophy (Boulder, Col., 1991).

On Transforming Philosophy: A Metaphilosophical Inquiry (Boulder, Col., 1995).

Naturalism Without Foundations (Amherst, N.Y., 1996).

Naturalism and Religion (Amherst, N.Y., 2001).

Globalization and Justice (Amherst, N.Y., 2003).

Other Relevant Works

"On Finding One's Feet in Philosophy: From Wittgenstein to Marx," *Metaphilosophy* 16 (1985): 1–11.

"Philosophy as Critical Theory," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 61 (September 1987): 89–108.

Further Reading

Beehler, Rodger, Béla Szabados, and David Copp, eds. *On the Track of Reason:*

Essays in Honor of Kai Nielsen (Boulder, Col., 1990). Contains a bibliography of Nielsen's writings.

Hook, Sidney. "For an Open Minded Naturalism," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 13 (1975): 127–36.

Kamooneh, Kaveh. "Justice as Fairness or as Equality?" *Journal of Value Inquiry* 21 (1987): 65–71.

Meynell, Hugo. "Aspects of the Philosophy of Kai Nielsen," *Dialogue* 25 (1986): 83–92.

Steglich, David. "A God By Any Other Name … ," *Religious Studies* 26 (1990): 117–21.

John R. Shook

NOCHLIN, Linda (1931–)

Born Linda Weinberg in Brooklyn, New York, on 30 January 1931, she received her BA in philosophy from Vassar College (1951), her MA in English from Columbia University (1952), and her PhD in art history from the Institute of Fine Arts of New York University (1963). She married and bore two children. She became Mary Conover Mellon Professor of Art History at Vassar College (1971–9); then Distinguished Professor of Art History at City University in New York (1980–90); and Professor of Art History and the Humanities at Yale University (1989–92). She is presently Lila Acheson Wallace Professor of Modern Art at New York University's Institute of Fine Arts. Among other honors, she has won Guggenheim and National Endowment for the Arts fellowships and was named a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Nochlin's manifesto, "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?" (1988), led to the development of the new field of feminist art history. She is also an astute aesthetician, whose work on the concepts of realism, feminist perspectives on art, and political dimensions of art has broken new ground. Nochlin argued that late nineteenth-century French realism differed from earlier realist movements by focusing on the immediate moment and by making adherence to fact the aim of art (1971, p. 41). She found that the realists' desire to translate appearances into art required significant involvement in their cultural context (1971, p. 50), and this insight allowed her to probe relationships between art and social conditions more fully than other art historians had done. She was the first to posit that women had not achieved greatness in art largely because of their social situation and social beliefs about them. Her work set off a search for women artists and their works – represented in the catalogue of *Women Artists* (1976) – that led in turn to further study of the effects of ideologies on the production of art.

In another important essay, "Women, Art, and Power" (1988), she argued that ideology manifests itself as much in what is not as in what is represented in both the visual structures and the thematic choices of art works (1988, p. 2). Nochlin later called her approach to the politics of art and art history "thinking art history Otherly," explaining that when one sees from the perspective of an Other – such as a woman – then politics become part of the act of seeing itself and cannot be separated out as if it were an additional element (1989, p. xv). Her feminist vantage point also allowed her to see that formalism had functioned to prevent viewers from seeing works historically. Perhaps her best explanation of what it means to see historically occurs in *The Body in Pieces* (1994), in which she analyzes separate cases of the fragment in modern visual art, such as a body part, without succumbing to the temptation to generalize about them. If she were to propose a theory of the fragment, it would work on a model of difference, not one of unified discourse. Nochlin's most important contribution to aesthetics is her complex sense of the relationships that always exist between self and history. In *Representing Women* (1999) she questions the possibility that

any single methodology (and she commands many) can suffice in interpreting art, preferring instead a flexible process of constant questioning between object and method (1999, p. 10). Her commitment to historical understanding is always combined with a sense of play and a love of visual pleasure.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Impressionism and Post-impressionism, 1874–1904: Sources and Documents (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1966).
Realism and Tradition in Art, 1848–1900: Sources and Documents (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1966).
Realism (Harmondsworth, UK, 1971).
Women Artists: 1550–1950, with Ann Sutherland Harris (New York, 1976).
Women, Art, and Power, and Other Essays (New York, 1988).
The Politics of Vision: Essays on Nineteenth-Century Art and Society (New York, 1989).
The Body in Pieces: The Fragment as Metaphor of Modernity (London, 1994).
Representing Women (London, 1999).

Other Relevant Works
Ed. with Thomas Hess, *Woman as Sex Object: Studies in Erotic Art, 1730–1970* (New York, 1972).
Gustave Courbet: A Study of Style and Society (New York, 1976).
Ed. with Henry Millon, *Art and Architecture in the Service of Politics* (Cambridge, Mass., 1978).
Ed. with Tamar Garb, *The Jew in the Text: Modernity and the Construction of Identity* (New York, 1996).

Further Reading
Cambridge Dict Amer Bio
d'Souza, Aruna, ed. *Self and History: A Tribute to Linda Nochlin* (New York, 2000).

Estella Lauter

NOONAN, John Thomas, Jr. (1926–)

John Noonan was born on 24 October 1926 in Boston, Massachusetts. He received his BA summa cum laude in English from Harvard in 1946. He then went to the Catholic University of America for philosophy, getting his MA in 1949 and his PhD in 1951. He returned to Harvard and received his LLB in 1954. He has had a variegated and distinguished career. He was a special staff member with the National Security Council in 1954–5. From 1955 to 1961 he worked in the Boston law firm of Herrick, Smith, Donald, Farley, and Ketchum, and also won an election to a local political office. He was professor of law at Notre Dame from 1961 to 1966 and at the University of California at Berkeley from 1967 to 1986.

In 1985 Noonan was appointed to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, where he is now senior judge. He also presently holds the Maguire Chair in Ethics at the Kluge Center of the Library of Congress. He has lectured at various universities and was on the board of directors of the Center for Human Values in Health Sciences during 1969–71, and the Institute for the Study of Ethical Issues during 1971–3. He has served as consultant to various institutions, among them the Papal Commission on the Family, Population, and Natality in 1965–6, and the Ford Foundation in 1968. He has been active and often an officer in many professional groups, including the American Association for Legal and Political Philosophy, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Canon Law Society of America, the Institute for Research in Medieval Canon Law, the Population Council, and the American Law Institute of Phi Beta Kappa. He was editor of the *Natural Law Forum* and the *American Journal of Jurisprudence* from 1961 to 1970. He has received many honorary doctorates and various other awards, among them the Aquinas Medal of the American Catholic Philosophical Association, the John Gilmary Shea Prize, the Christian Culture Medal, and the Laetare Medal.

Noonan's influence reflects the variety of his activities and writings. His books have dealt with history, canon law, civil law, ethics, moral theology, legal and political philosophy, the courts, political issues, and how all of these interact with one another. He is also a master stylist who can summarize his encyclopedic knowledge with clarity, verve, and telling examples. He can even make his reports of legal cases engrossing. His history of the usury issue showed how moralists and theologians worked out that problem, thus clarifying how other moral problems could be handled. His account of how the Catholic Church had dealt with contraception led many to think it would change its position. His discussion of the development of Curial views on the dissolution of marriages enlightened many in regard to the church and its functioning as well as to the nature of marriage. His writings on abortion served as a major source for pro-life arguments. His chronicle and analysis of the giving and taking of bribes made clear why it has been a ubiquitous and complex moral problem. His works on the exercise of religious freedom shed much light on this newly developing phase of constitutional law. His view that perhaps the most characteristic feature of our mode of government is its constitutional protection of religious free choice and rejection of an established religion has received widespread acceptance. At first he was read mainly by Catholics but in time he was seen as one of the leading intellectuals of the century, whose works illuminate the functioning of the Catholic Church, how moral theories develop, the evolution of legal systems, the interaction of culture and morality, the interplay of politics, courts and moral notions, ethical values and lawyers, and the role of religion in society.

In his first book, *The Scholastic Analysis of Usury* (1957), Noonan presented in detail the complex story of how the Catholic Church over centuries modified its position on usury. Noonan's analysis showed how the Church, although requiring centuries, could and did rethink and reform its positions about a major question of morality. In *Contraception* (1965) Noonan applied the same detailed, historical method to the treatment of contraception by Catholic theologians and canon lawyers. The nineteenth and twentieth centuries saw the acceptance of love as of primary importance in intercourse, a wide increase in the practice of contraception, the development of the birth control movement and the acceptance in 1930 by the Anglicans of birth control as permissible for moral reasons. In the 1900s, however, the Catholic Church became more insistent in maintaining its rejection of artificial birth control while admitting birth control through the rhythm method. These years saw long debates over what might constitute morally acceptable methods of control, especially after the discovery of the anovulant pill. Thus, on the eve of the Vatican Council, many Catholics who held birth control to be acceptable expected the Church to modify its position. In the appendix added to the second edition, Noonan noted that with the encyclical *Humani generis* Pope Paul VI had made the prohibition of artificial contraception established Church doctrine. Noonan raised no objection to this, although he seemed to have expected the contrary.

Noonan has shown that the same sort of development occurred in the way the Catholic Church worked out its claims and procedures regarding the dissolution of marriages. In *Power to Dissolve* (1972), he discussed six cases from 1653 to 1923 which had been appealed to the Curia, and which show how over centuries it interpreted and reshaped canon law regarding marriage so that its decisions remained true to Catholic beliefs while recognizing the effect of the variety of patterns found in what people call marriage. In his account of these cases Noonan shows how canon law, initiated in the twelfth century by Gratian's law school collection of texts, was developed into a complex and comprehensive set of rules recognizing six forms of marriage, only one of which is indissoluble by any authority, the others being either dissoluble or invalid, according to the circumstances and the decision

of the tribunals. He thus made clear why it is difficult to get an annulment and why many people think Rome grants divorces, under the name of annulments.

In regard to the abortion issue, Noonan holds that *Roe v. Wade* had no legal basis since the so-called right to privacy can be found nowhere in the US Constitution. The decision was thus an illegitimate and unprincipled imposition on the nation of their personal beliefs by seven justices. It also violated the Constitution, which reserves lawmaking to the legislators. He noted that while it was strongly supported by the media and such groups as the American Civil Liberties Union, it went contrary to strongly majoritarian views, as established by numerous polls, that would limit considerably the accessibility of abortion. He pointed out that it claimed not to decide when human life begins but then held that it begins at birth, thus justifying abortion at any point of pregnancy. He argued further that it was destructive of family structure, was oppressive to the poor, and violated the medical ethics of the past two thousand years. He noted too that it led to hundreds of thousands of deaths per year. Given the political situation, he saw the only effective resolution, as after the Dred Scott case, to be an amendment to the Constitution and discussed the best way of formulating it. With his elaboration of such arguments Noonan became one of the most effective voices of the pro-life movement.

Noonan points out that while the judiciary is in theory an independent branch of government, judges are approved and appointed by the other two branches and so the three branches interfunction closely. Over the course of time there is an ebb and resurgence in how the Supreme Court favors the flow of power in the direction of the federal government or of the states. Noonan argues that in the 1990s the Supreme Court started to shift this flow towards the states.

In what may be his most influential work, *The Lustre of Our Country* (1998), Noonan discusses the exercise of religious freedom. He holds that the most characteristic and impor-tant feature of our government is that it requires both the separation of church and state and the free exercise of religion. He points out that though the phrase "separation of church and state" comes from Jefferson, who used it in writing to some Baptist constituents about how the first amendment would protect them from Congregationalist attacks, the idea that there should be no national church and that there should be a constitutional guarantee of free exercise of choice and action in regard to religion was James Madison's, who was only partially successful in getting it accepted as the first amendment.

Noonan also points out that there is an ongoing development in the acceptance and meaning of free choice in religious matters. In the early decades of the country several states continued to provide varying degrees of support for a given denomination. But in the middle of the nineteenth century a major crisis arose with the spread of the abolitionist movement, which was a religious crusade led by various Protestant ministers, who rejected as immoral the federal law which held slaves to be simply chattels. In the late 1800s there arose the question of whether the courts could render judgment on a religious practice, namely polygamy, with the result that the Mormons were forced to modify their doctrine. Since the 1940s the Supreme Court has taken up a number of religious freedom cases and frequently rendered decisions which for Noonan are inconsistent and lack any common principle, such as allowing federal aid to religious colleges but not to religious elementary schools. This is a clear sign of a continuing and necessary process of development in this area of the law. At the same time, the example of the American experiment in religious freedom has been noted and followed in varying degrees by numerous countries and even by the Catholic Church, which has reversed its centuries-long endorsement of church–state unity and recognized the exercise of free choice of a religion to be a natural right. The separation of church and state in America has permitted all religions to

flourish much more than they did in situations of church–state union. For Noonan, this was to be expected, for religion itself requires a free choice to adhere to it. But he also recognizes that the free exercise of religion, while protective of unpopular beliefs, can frequently be disruptive of established institutions and habits. This precarious condition is the price of our constitutional liberty.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Scholastic Analysis of Usury (Cambridge, Mass., 1957).

Contraception: A History of Its Treatment by the Catholic Theologians and Canonists (Cambridge, Mass., 1965; 2nd edn 1986).

The Church and Contraception: The Issues at Stake (New York, 1967).

"An Almost Absolute Value in History," in *The Morality of Abortion: Legal and Historical Perspectives*, ed. John T. Noonan, Jr. (Cambridge, Mass., 1970), pp. 46–50.

Power to Dissolve: Lawyers and Marriages in the Courts of the Roman Curia (Cambridge, Mass., 1972).

Persons and Masks of the Law: Cardozo, Holmes, Jefferson, and Wythe as Makers of the Masks (Berkeley, Cal., 1976).

A Private Choice: Abortion in America in the Seventies (New York, 1979).

Bribes (New York, 1984).

Religious Freedom: History, Cases, and Other Materials on the Interaction of Religion and Government, with E. M. Gaffney (New York, 1986).

The Believer and the Powers That Are: Cases, History, and Other Data Bearing on the Relation of Religion and Government (New York, 1987).

The Lustre of Our Country: The American Experience of Religious Freedom (Berkeley, Cal., 1998).

Narrowing the Nation's Power: The Supreme Court Sides with the States (Berkeley, Cal., 2002).

Other Relevant Works

The Antelope: The Ordeal of the Recaptured Africans in the Administrations of James Monroe and John Quincy Adams (Berkeley, Cal., 1977).

Ed. with K. I. Winston, *The Responsible Judge: Readings in Judicial Ethics* (Westport, Conn., 1993).

Ed. with R. W. Painter, *Professional and Personal Responsibilities of the Lawyer* (New York, 1997).

Further Reading

Allitt, Patrick. *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics, 1950–1985* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1993).

McGreevy, John T. "A Case of Doctrinal Development, John T. Noonan: Jurist, Historian, Author, Sage," *Commonweal* 127 (17 November 2000): 12–17.

Starr, Kevin. "Judge John T. Noonan, Jr.: A Brief Biography," *Journal of Law and Religion* 11 (1994): 151–76.

Gerard J. Dalcourt

NORTHROP, Filmer Stuart Cuckow
(1893–1992)

F. S. C. Northrop was born on 27 November 1893 in Janesville, Wisconsin. After receiving a BA from Beloit College in 1915 and an MA from Yale University in 1919, he went to Harvard University, where he earned another MA in 1922 and a PhD in philosophy in 1924. He was appointed to the Yale faculty in 1923 as an instructor in philosophy, and was promoted to full professor in 1932. He chaired the philosophy department from 1938 to 1940, and was the first Master of Silliman College from 1940 to 1947. In 1947 Northrop was appointed Sterling Professor of Philosophy and Law, and he held that title until retiring in 1962. He was President

of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1962–3. He died on 21 July 1992 in Exeter, New Hampshire.

Northrop was very active in several academic and cultural organizations. In 1949 he was decorated by the government of Mexico with the Order of the Aztec Eagle for his studies in Mexican culture, one result of which is his chapter titled "The Rich Culture of Mexico" in the best-selling *The Meeting of East and West*. In 1958 he served as the US Representative in the thirteen nations SEATO round table conference in Bangkok, Thailand. Northrop was a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a member of the New York Philosophy Club and the American Academy of Political and Social Science. He counted as his friends such notable figures of the twentieth century as J. M. McTaggart, A. N. WHITEHEAD, Albert EINSTEIN, Ludwig Wittgenstein, and Muhammed Iqbal. His cosmopolitan experience and interest in international relations resulted in several books, including *European Union and United States Foreign Policy: A Study in Sociological Jurisprudence* (1954).

Northrop worked in all major branches of philosophy. His major contribution to philosophy is in epistemology, specifically his typology of concepts. He divides all concepts into two kinds: intuition and postulation. The source of the meaning of the concept is the source of its difference for Northrop. A concept by intuition is one that denotes, and the complete meaning of which is given by, something that is immediately apprehended. Northrop gives blue in "the sense of the sensed color" as an example of a concept by intuition. The other kind of concept is concept by postulation, whose meaning in whole or in part is designated by the postulates of the deductive theory in which it occurs. Blue in the sense of wavelength frequency in electromagnetic theory is a concept by postulation.

According to Northrop, these two types of concepts exhaust the available concepts (i.e., providing terms with meanings) from which any scientific or philosophical theory can be constructed and therefore provides a means to do

comparative philosophy, analyze and solve the problem of world peace, tame nations, provide a philosophical anthropology, explain why economists from Adam Smith to Karl Marx were incapable of providing a dynamics to supplement their statics, and to ground art and religion as well as legal and ethical theory. Northrop substantiates these claims in *The Logic of the Sciences and the Humanities* (1947).

Northrop's epistemology must deal with a question that every bifurcationist epistemology has to answer: "What is the relationship between the two types of concepts?" Plato uses the word "participation" or "imitation" to characterize this relationship. Kant uses schemata; Reichenbach used coordinate definition. For Northrop the answer is epistemic correlation: "an epistemic correlation is a relation joining an unobserved component of anything designated by a concept by postulation to its directly inspected component denoted by a concept by intuition." To recur to the example given above, sensed blue is related to theoretic blue by an epistemic correlation. This relation is not the relation of "causality" or "identity." Concept by postulation blue does not cause concept by intuition blue. Concept by intuition blue is a multivalued relation as Northrop, following Whitehead's analysis. One relata of concept by intuition blue is the frequency currently associated with concept by postulation blue. To assume that only one of the relata of a relation could cause that relation is as silly as assuming that the female (or the male) member of a marriage causes the marriage. Nor is the proper relation between postulation and intuition "identity," as can easily been seen using "blue." Concept by postulation blue is not identical with concept by intuition blue, but is just one among many relata that go to form this complex secondary quality. Neither identity nor causality is the proper relation between sensed blue and theoretic blue.

The problem here is what is the epistemic correlate of one's directly inspected visual image, not the problem of what is really real. Unlike (certain interpretations of) Plato and

Plotinus, there is in Northrop no propensity to degrade or downgrade the world as it is sensed in favor of the world as known by concepts by postulation. To experience the visual image of blue is as epistemically valuable and irreducible as knowing blue postulationally. The two sources of all our knowledge give information that is both complementary and supplementary. Without concepts by intuition we could never know the world in its particularity; without concepts by postulation we could never know the world in its universality and necessity. We now have enough information to give a name to Northrop's epistemology. He calls it "logical realism in epistemic correlation with radical empiricism." In other words, reason (in the form of concepts by postulation) epistemically correlated with the senses (in the form of concepts by intuition).

Northrop was an important participant in the emerging field of comparative philosophy. He asserted that Eastern philosophy emphasized the intuition or aesthetic type of concept, while Western philosophy emphasized the postulation or theoretical type of concept. Therefore, the East has focused on the arts, while the West has been preoccupied with science. Since both kinds of concept are essential and complementary categories of experience, the Eastern and Western traditions can benefit from mutual learning and sharing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Science and First Principles (New York, 1931).

The Meeting of East and West: An Inquiry Concerning World Understanding (New York, 1946).

The Logic of the Sciences and the Humanities (New York, 1947).

The Taming of the Nations: A Study of the Cultural Bases of International Policy (New York, 1952).

European Union and United States Foreign Policy: A Study in Sociological Jurisprudence (New York, 1954).

The Complexity of Legal and Ethical Experience: Studies in the Method of Normative Subjects (Boston, 1959).

Philosophical Anthropology and Practical Politics (New York, 1960).

Man, Nature, and God: A Quest for Life's Meaning (New York, 1962).

The Prolegomena to a 1985 Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica, which will be able to present itself as a Science of the True (Woodbridge, Conn., 1985).

Other Relevant Works

Northrop's papers are at Yale University.

"The Complementary Emphases of Eastern Intuitive and Western Scientific Philosophy," in *Philosophy East and West*, ed. Charles A. Moore (Princeton, N.J., 1944), pp. 168–234.

Ed., *Ideological Differences and World Order: Studies in the Philosophy and Science of the World's Cultures* (Princeton, N.J., 1949).

"Whitehead's Philosophy of Science," in *The Philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead*, 2nd edn, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (New York, 1951).

Ed. with Helen H. Livingston, *Cross-cultural Understanding: Epistemology in Anthropology* (New York, 1964).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Pres Addr of APA v6*, *Who Was Who in Amer v10*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Benne, Kenneth D. "F. S. C. Northrop and the Logic of Ideological Reconstruction," *Educational Theory* 20 (1970): 99–120.

Inada, Kenneth K. "Northropian Categories of Experience Revisited," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 19 (1992): 25–49.

Seddon, Frederick. *An Introduction to the Philosophical Works of F. S. C. Northrop* (Lewiston, N.Y., 1995).

Fred Seddon

NOZICK, Robert (1938–2002)

Robert Nozick was born on 16 November 1938 in Brooklyn, New York. The son of Russian immigrants, he was educated in the Brooklyn public schools. His interest in philosophy was sparked by an early encounter with Plato, as he reports: "When I was 15 years old, or 16, I carried around on the streets of Brooklyn a paperback copy of Plato's Republic, front cover facing outward. I had read only some of it and understood less, but I was excited by it and knew it was something wonderful." Nozick went to Columbia University in 1955 where he majored in philosophy, working closely with Sidney MORGENBESSER. After receiving his BA at Columbia in 1959, he went to Princeton University where he earned his PhD in philosophy in 1963, under the supervision of Carl G. HEMPEL. He was assistant professor of philosophy at Princeton from 1963 to 1965; assistant professor at Harvard University from 1965 to 1967; and associate professor at Rockefeller University from 1967 to 1969. In 1969, at the age of thirty, he was appointed full professor of philosophy at Harvard, where he remained for the rest of his career. He served as department chair from 1981 to 1984. In 1985 Harvard University appointed him Arthur Kingsley Porter Professor of Philosophy. In 1998 he was named Joseph Pellegrino University Professor, and held that position until his death on 23 January 2002 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Nozick held numerous honors and awards. He was a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, a corresponding fellow of the British Academy, a member of the Council of Scholars of the Library of Congress, and a senior fellow at the Harvard Society of Fellows. He held fellowships from the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences in 1971–2; the Rockefeller Foundation in 1979–80; the National Endowment for the Humanities in 1987–8; and the Guggenheim Foundation. He was John Locke Lecturer at Oxford University in 1997, and President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1997–8. In 1998, he was awarded the American Psychological Association's Presidential Citation, which honored him as "one of the most brilliant and original living philosophers."

Nozick published five books during his career. *Anarchy, State and Utopia* (1974) offered a vigorous critique of the fundamental principles of distributive justice. *Philosophical Explanations* (1981) addressed such fundamental matters as the nature of the self, the character of knowledge, the source and status of free will, and the basic structure of ethical norms. *The Examined Life* (1989) included reflections on themes such as love, death, sex, happiness, creativity, evil, and wisdom. *The Nature of Rationality* (1993) provided novel accounts of rational action and rational belief. *Invariances* (2001) addressed such wide-ranging subjects as quantum mechanics, consciousness, and the nature of necessity. In addition, Nozick published a volume of his collected papers, *Socratic Puzzles* (1997), which included essays on ethics and political philosophy, choice and utility, philosophical methodology, as well as works of short fiction. In addition to these six books, his 1963 dissertation, *The Normative Theory of Individual Choice*, was published in 1990 and addressed a number of problems in decision theory and game theory.

Although it is Nozick's political philosophy in *Anarchy, State and Utopia* that made a name for him among the wider public, his greatest influence among academic philosophers can also be traced to his discussion of Newcomb's Problem (1969) and his "tracking" theory of knowledge in *Philosophical Explanations*. Indeed, entire volumes of critical essays have been devoted to discussions of each of these views. Numerous additional article-length discussions of Nozick's work have been published in a wide range of journals. Despite this large secondary literature, Nozick resolutely refused to attend or respond to critics, saying that "what pleases me and excites me is to think new thoughts about new topics."

Throughout his career, Nozick's thinking and writing were characterized by technical prowess, a lively and accessible style, highly engaging examples, and an interdisciplinary focus. From his earliest work to his latest, he drew on work from fields such as decision theory, evolutionary biology, economics, and physics, making original use of conceptual resources from these fields, identifying novel puzzles on their bases, and bringing empirical results to bear on longstanding philosophical questions. His interdisciplinary interests were nurtured by his Harvard and MIT colleagues. He was an active member of the Society of Fellows, where he had dinner weekly with leading scholars from various disciplines. And he co-taught courses with, among others, renowned lawyer Alan Dershowitz, biologist and essayist Stephen Jay Gould, and Nobel Prize-winning economist Amartya SEN. Notorious for asking probing and difficult questions, Nozick was widely known as an excellent philosophical conversationalist.

Nozick first gained visibility in the philosophical community through his 1969 discussion of Newcomb's Problem. A being with heretofore infallible predictive powers confronts you with a choice between (1) taking an opaque box that contains either no money, or some sizable sum; and (2) taking that opaque box as well as a transparent box that contains an additional sum of money. This being has already decided whether to fill the opaque box based on its prediction on what you will decide. Rationality seemingly requires you to choose both boxes. However, it is also known that in all previous cases, those who have chosen both boxes have discovered the opaque box to be empty, whereas those who have chosen only the opaque box have discovered it to contain the sizable sum. Which choice should you now make? Nozick's detailed and insightful discussion of this case and its analogues served as a basis for many important distinctions in decision theory, including the distinction between causal utility, the utility associated with outcomes that are caused by the act in question, and evidential utility, which is the utility associated with the outcomes for which the act in question offers evidence.

It was Nozick's *Anarchy, State and Utopia* that propelled him to the attention of the wider public. Winner of a National Book Award, the book was listed by *The Times Literary Supplement* as one of "The Hundred Most Influential Books Since the War." Along with John RAWLS's *Theory of Justice*, it was standard reading in political philosophy courses in American and European universities for the rest of the twentieth century. It has been credited with serving as one of the major intellectual underpinnings of the Reagan–Thatcher era. Nozick argued that the strongest sort of state that can be legitimately defended is a minimal state, a state strong enough to protect citizens against violence and theft, and to ensure the enforcement of contracts, but containing no provisions for redistribution of wealth or resources. Such a state, he suggested, might arise naturally, as the result of "invisible hand" forces.

The task of distributive justice, Nozick contended, can be captured by the slogan "From each as they choose, to each as they are chosen." Whether a particular distribution of goods is just depends on the process by which the distribution came about, not on the pattern that the distribution exhibits. Just as we would consider it legitimate for basketball player Wilt Chamberlain to acquire wealth as the result of each citizen voluntarily giving a quarter to watch him play, so too might it be legitimate for the resources of society to be distributed in radically inequitable ways: "no … distributional patterned principle of justice can be continuously realized without … stop[ping] people from transferring resources as they wish to … or continually (or periodically) interfer[ing] to take from some persons resources that others … chose to transfer to them." Such coercive interference, he maintained, is unjustified: it involves a violation of "persons' rights not to be forced to do certain things." In addition, he maintained that there is much that is appealing about the minimal

state itself: "the minimal state … [which is] the only morally legitimate state … is the one that best realizes … utopian aspirations … treating us with respect by respecting our rights" and allowing us to pursue our own chosen ends with dignity and respect.

Nozick's *Philosophical Explanations* won the Ralph Waldo Emerson Award of Phi Beta Kappa. He addressed a number of traditional philosophical problems, including the nature of personal identity, the question of why there is something rather than nothing, the nature of knowledge and the status of skepticism, the relation between free will and determinism, the legitimacy of punishment, the status and structure of ethical claims, and the meaning of life. Methodologically self-conscious, the book represented itself as offering "explanations" rather than "proofs" – responses to our "puzzlement, curiosity, [and] desire to understand" that render our conceptual commitments more "coherent and better understood." Of the many proposals in *Philosophical Explanations*, the discussions of knowledge, personal identity, and free will provoked the greatest interest among professional philosophers. Nozick proposed that in order to know something, we must "track" the truth: S knows that p if and only if (1) p is true, (2) S believes that p, (3) if p weren't true, S wouldn't believe p (by the method that she does), and (4) if p were true, S would believe that p (by the method that she does). Because the view denies "closure" – according to which if S knows that p and S knows that p implies q, then S knows that q – it provides a novel answer to the skeptic. One can allow that we know all sorts of ordinary propositions about the external world, while conceding that we do not know that we are not subject to massive delusion by an evil demon. While few philosophers – not even Nozick himself – accepted this account as a definitive characterization of the nature of knowledge, and while many found its starting point implausible, the view played an important role as a foil in discussions of knowledge over the next decades.

Nozick's views on identity over time – that "to be something later is to be its closest continuer" – were similarly innovative and similarly controversial. By suggesting that identity over time might be determined in radically extrinsic ways, Nozick opened up important new avenues for discussion.

Nozick's *The Examined Life* offered a wide-ranging collection of speculative essays and "meditations" on topics of perennial human concern, such as love, happiness, sex, and evil. A number of the essays offered important insights into the problems they addressed – the discussion of love, for example, includes an influential discussion of the non-interchangeability of the beloved, and the discussion of parents and children includes a widely cited criticism of the legitimacy of unrestricted inheritance laws. As a whole, however, the book did not have major influence among academic philosophers.

In *The Nature of Rationality*, Nozick suggested that previous discussions of rational belief and rational decision-making had given insufficient weight to what he called "symbolic utility" – the utility associated with the outcomes and actions that are symbolized by the act in question. Throughout the course of the volume, Nozick applied the idea to a number of extant puzzles in rational choice theory and decision theory, including Newcomb's problem, Prisoner's dilemmas, issues in the ethics of belief, and the lottery paradox. While the proposals put forth in *The Nature of Rationality* did not provoke the sort of widespread discussion associated with his first two books, certain of its insights – particularly its discussion of the role of principles in overcoming weakness of the will – generated considerable interest.

Nozick's final work, *Invariances: The Structure of the Objective World*, published shortly before his death, was even more wide-ranging than his earlier writings. Drawing on resources from analytic philosophy, evolutionary psychology, quantum mechanics and cosmology, Nozick addressed topics as diverse as

the relativity of truth, the nature of objectivity and necessity, the function and origins of consciousness, and the genealogy of ethics. The central insight of the work is that objectivity is "invariance under all admissible transformations." This allows us to answer the question of why there is an objective world. If we assume that there is a process of evolutionary cosmology, akin to that of evolutionary biology, then we can see why objective laws would be most "heritable," and hence why they would be present in most universes – "the greater the number of transformations that a law is invariant under, and the wider their number, the greater is that law's heritability." This appeal to invisible-hand explanations, echoing the opening pages of *Anarchy, State and Utopia,* typifies Nozick's ability to approach problems from a novel direction. Similarly provocative is his account of necessity. Something is necessary only if we cannot imagine how it might be otherwise. But our inability to imagine things, Nozick suggests, may result from constraints on our cognitive capacities, not from the nature of things themselves. As a result, he proposes, it may be that "lack of invention is the mother of necessity."

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Anarchy, State and Utopia (Oxford, 1974.)
Philosophical Explanations (Oxford, 1981).
The Examined Life (New York, 1989).
The Normative Theory of Individual Choice (New York, 1990).
The Nature of Rationality (Princeton, N.J., 1993).
Socratic Puzzles (Cambridge, Mass., 1997).
Invariances: The Structure of the Objective World (Cambridge, Mass., 2001).

Other Relevant Works
"Newcomb's Problem and Two Principles of Choice," in *Essays in Honor of Carl G. Hempel*, ed. Nicholas Rescher (Dordrecht, 1969).
"On the Randian Argument," *Personalist* 52 (1971): 282–304.
"Simplicity as Fall-Out," in *How Many Questions? Essays in Honor of Sidney Morgenbesser*, ed. Leigh Cauman, Isaac Levi, and Robert Schwartz (Indianapolis, 1983), pp. 105–19.
"Experience, Theory, and Language," in *The Philosophy of W. V. Quine*, ed. Lewis Hahn (La Salle, Ill., 1986), pp. 339–67.

Further Reading
Amer Phils 1950–2000, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Ethics*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v10*, *Proc of APA v76*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v14*
Arrow, Kenneth J. "Nozick's Entitlement Theory of Justice," *Philosophia* 7 (1978): 265–79.
Brueckner, Anthony. "Losing Track of Nozick," *Ratio* 5 (1992): 194–8.
Campbell, Richmond, and Lanning Sowden, eds. *Paradoxes of Rationality and Cooperation* (Vancouver, 1985).
Corlett, J. Angelo, ed. *Equality and Liberty: Analyzing Rawls and Nozick* (New York and London, 1991).
Dancy, Jonathan. "On the Tracks of the Skeptic," *Analysis* 44 (1984): 121–6.
Goldman, Alan H. "The Entitlement Theory of Distributive Justice," *Journal of Philosophy* 73 (1976): 823–35.
Hailwood, Simon. *Exploring Nozick: Beyond Anarchy, State and Utopia* (Aldershot, UK, 1996).
Held, Virginia. "John Locke on Robert Nozick," *Social Research* 43 (1976): 169–95.
Hurley, Susan L. "A New Take from Nozick on Newcomb's Problem and Prisoner's Dilemma, *Analysis* 54 (1994): 65–72.
Lacey, A. R. *Robert Nozick* (Princeton, N.J., 2001).
O'Neill, Onora. "Nozick's Entitlements," *Inquiry* 19 (1976): 468–81.
Paul, Jeffrey, ed. *Reading Nozick: Essays on Anarchy, State and Utopia* (Lanham, Md., 1981).

Schmidtz, David, ed. *Robert Nozick* (Cambridge, UK, 2002).

Sosa, Ernest. "Beyond Skepticism, To the Best of Our Knowledge," *Mind* 97 (1988): 153–88.

Sterba, James P. "In Defense of Rawls against Arrow and Nozick," *Philosophia* 7 (1978): 293–303.

Luper, Stephen, ed. *The Possibility of Knowledge: Nozick and His Critics* (Totowa, N.J., 1987).

Wolff, Jonathan. *Robert Nozick: Property, Justice and the Minimal State* (Stanford, Cal., 1991).

Tamar Szabó Gendler

O

Schubert M. Ogden was born on 2 March 1928 in Cincinnati, Ohio. He received a BA (1950) from Ohio Wesleyan University, and a BD (1954) and PhD (1958) from the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. He also studied at Johns Hopkins University (1950–51) and Philips-Universität in Marburg, Germany (1962–3). With the exception of three years as University Professor of Theology at the University of Chicago during 1969–72, he served from 1956 until 1993 on the faculty at Perkins School of Theology and, following its inception, in the Graduate Program in Religious Studies at Southern Methodist University, from which he retired as University Distinguished Professor of Theology Emeritus. Among many other honors, he was elected President of the American Academy of Religion (1976–7) and was awarded honorary degrees from Ohio Wesleyan University, the University of Chicago, and Southern Methodist University.

Ogden's specific vocation has been Christian systematic theology, a discipline that, on his view, must define its own task. Many believe that no other recent theologian has more thoroughly and critically articulated the nature of theology. The titles of two of Ogden's major works, *On Theology* (1986) and *Doing Theology Today* (1996), point to his professional self-consciousness. But he has sought to clarify what theology should do in order further to do it. His address to other central theological questions is signaled by the titles of his other major works, including *The Reality of God and Other Essays* (1966), *Faith and Freedom* (1979), and *The Point of Christology* (1982).

Ogden holds that present-day theology, as heir to the modern age, properly reasserts the formal self-conception of theological liberalism. Its theological task is to correlate the Christian faith with contemporary human existence, by explicating the abiding Christian claim so that it is communicated to contemporary men and women and to explicate contemporary existence so that Christian faith is shown to be its proper interpretation. But Ogden also refines this definition. Communicating Christian faith as the proper understanding of contemporary existence is, in the first instance, a task of Christian witness, which is the actual or prospective speech and deeds in which Christians seek to express Christian faith. Hence, he defines theology in the strict sense as critical reflection on the essential claims to validity of Christian witness. Christian witness claims to be both adequate to its content and fitting to its situation. What is said or done takes into account the particular contemporary context in which witness occurs. Critical reflection on this claim is the task of practical theology. In contrast, systematic theology is concerned with the claim of Christian witness to be adequate. This claim, Ogden continues, is itself twofold: (1) the claim to be appropriate to Jesus as Christians experience him, and (2) the claim to be credible to human existence. Acts of Christians witness both claim to represent the understanding by

which all Christian belief is properly marked and assert that this understanding represents the way things really are. Theological reflection on this witness is required whenever its appropriateness or credibility becomes problematic, perhaps because one encounters other Christians who understand their faith differently, or finds that certain experiences challenge one's Christian belief about the way things really are. Thus, theology's function is to serve Christian witness itself. That service can only be indirect because theology is properly distinguished from witness as the attempt to determine whether the claims of witness are in fact valid.

Ogden also says that systematic theology is critical reflection defined by the twofold question: What is the meaning of Christian faith, and is it valid? In order to render her or his proper service to Christian witness, the theologian is bound to ask about the appropriate understanding of Christian faith, its meaning, and whether this understanding is a valid representation of the way things really are. Ogden's work as a whole is distinctive because it never compromises the conviction that these two questions are mutually irreducible; neither can be critically answered by critically answering the other. This means that theology should avoid two mistaken alternatives: on the one hand, the conclusion that some understanding is credible because it represents Jesus as Christians experience him and, on the other hand, the conclusion that some understanding is appropriately Christian because it is valid. Asking about the meaning of Christian faith requires a primary norm for what is appropriately Christian. Some theologians have taken the Scriptures or, alternatively, the essential "biblical message" contained within the Scriptures to be this norm; others have affirmed Scripture and tradition; still others have said that the norm is given by the words and deeds of the so-called historical Jesus. All of these accounts, Ogden holds, conflict with the principle on which the church determined the New Testament canon itself: primary authority belongs to writings authored by the apostles as witnesses to Jesus, so that Jesus himself is, as Ogden says, the primal Christian sacrament authorizing that authority. But more than two centuries of modern biblical study have now shown that the New Testament writings were mistakenly thought to be apostolic and are actually dependent on earlier sources. Ogden came to believe that the primary norm of appropriateness can only be the earliest Christian witness behind the New Testament texts and available through historical-critical study of them.

Once the primary norm of appropriateness has been identified, its meaning can be interpreted. For Ogden that interpretation depends on clarity about the question the earliest Christian witness was meant to answer. In continuity with the theology of Rudolf Bultmann, Ogden interprets Christian faith to answer the existential question: What is the meaning of ultimate reality for me? This is, he holds, *the* human question, because it is asked and answered in some way or another by all humans at the deepest level of their consciousness. However different those answers may be, he argues, we all share an ineradicable confidence that life is ultimately meaningful or worth living. This is because humans not only exist but also understand that they exist, so that what they become is always determined to some extent by how they choose to understand themselves as a part of the encompassing reality in which they are set. Since we live by way of decision for a self-understanding, our activities always express some answer to the question of our worth within the whole of reality. Ogden also calls this self-understanding the decision of faith, and its authentic possibility is, according to the apostolic witness, represented explicitly through Jesus. Hence, the point of Christian faith is, for Ogden, entirely an existential one. It is fully interpreted when the self-understanding decisively disclosed through Jesus is set forth. Christian faith is this: the primal source and final end of human life and everything else in the world is the God of boundless love, who

gives to all things everlasting worth and calls all humans always to lead their lives in unreserved love for this God and, accordingly, for the world God loves. But if that formulation states appropriately what Christian faith claims to be valid, it is another question whether the statement is credible. For this, among other reasons, Ogden holds that the systematic theologian must also be a philosopher; the task of validating and invalidating answers to the existential question is a philosophical task. Indeed, all implications taken into account, critical reflection on the universal nature of human existence and reality is *the* philosophical task. Thus, theological reflection on the credibility of Christian faith is responsible to the norm of common human experience and reason.

In so defining the norm, Ogden's point is that all humans are existentially aware of ultimate reality; in that sense, its meaning for us is commonly experienced. This is not to say that every human being always decides for the authentic possibility. But decision for a false or unrealistic self-understanding makes no sense unless authenticity was an alternative, just as it makes no sense to speak of an immoral choice if the chooser was ignorant of what she or he ought to have done. Thus, a statement about the meaning of ultimate reality for us is validated by appeal to what is ever-present in human experience or, put another way, validated through reasons authorized by human existence itself. Making the point in more traditional theological terms, Ogden says that ultimate reality is originally revealed or present in the innermost or implicit awareness of all human beings, and the credibility of Christian faith depends on whether the authentic possibility universally presented to human beings is presented again explicitly or decisively revealed through Jesus as Christians experience him.

In these same terms, the defining object of philosophical reflection is the original revelation. Because human beings are commonly aware of ultimate reality as authorizing their authentic possibility, Ogden says that the defining philosophical task is metaphysical on the one hand and ethical on the other. On this formulation, metaphysics is critical reflection on the universal nature of reality and of human beings in relation to it, and philosophical ethics is critical reflection on the moral law, to which all human decisions or actions ought to conform. Because it is authorized by ultimate reality, the moral law may also be called metaphysical, in the sense that it articulates the authentic relation of human beings to reality as such. Assuming that metaphysics includes what has been called the metaphysics of morals, in other words, we can say that metaphysics is the inclusive philosophical task. Still, the distinction between metaphysics and ethics is important to Ogden because it makes clear that the credibility of the Christian faith involves not only the truth of its beliefs about the nature of things but also the rightness or justice of its principles for human action, an understanding Ogden explicitly formulated through his encounter with twentieth-century liberation theology.

Ogden's major philosophical contribution unites an existentialist account of human being, indebted in part to the early Martin Heidegger, with a neoclassical account of reality indebted to the process metaphysics of Alfred North WHITEHEAD and Charles HARTSHORNE. The existentialist account provides the main resource for analyzing the structure of human existence and explicating the question to which the Christian faith (and, in Ogden's understanding, every religion) claims to be a credible answer. Process metaphysics provides the main resource for analyzing the structure of reality and explicating a credible concept of God and the world. In uniting the two, Ogden argues that existentialist philosophy specifies to human subjectivity the process formulation of reality, even while the former is rescued from a merely existentialist account of human freedom through a social conception of God and the world. The neoclassical theism of process metaphysics is an especially important resource because, for Ogden, the Christian theological tradition as a whole has been, from its earliest appropriation of classical Greek metaphysics,

so thoroughly controlled by an understanding of God that is now widely seen to be incredible. The classical account speaks of God as inclusively absolute or eternal and therefore incapable of change. Among the many philosophical difficulties with that account, Ogden underscores the incoherence between its understanding of God and the existential question. If the divine reality is eternally incapable of change, nothing done in the world can make any difference to it, and therefore the abiding confidence in our ultimate worth, expressed by all human activity, makes no sense. In contrast, neoclassical metaphysics, as presented by Ogden, defines God as the universal individual, the supremely temporal being that necessarily coexists with everything else throughout all time, receiving completely and preserving forever every change in the world. Only this individual can be the objective ground for the "invincible faith" that our decisions "somehow make a difference which no turn of events in the future has the power to annul" (1966, p. 36). With this conclusion, Ogden completes his distinctive argument for the reality of God.

Ogden has also advanced a consequential revision of neoclassical metaphysics. He argues, against both Whitehead and Hartshorne, that thoroughly critical statements about reality as such are properly transcendental, by which he means that their terms apply to all things, including God, literally or in the same sense. For this reason, he holds that speaking of God in psychic terms, for instance, calling God a person who is conscious or knows or loves or commands, is symbolic speaking. This is not to deny that such statements may be valid. But if the statement "a divine person exists" is true, it is symbolically true, and it cannot be validated until it is reformulated in the terms of a transcendental metaphysics, as Ogden does in speaking of God as the universal individual. This accounting is important, he believes, in a context where many doubt that ultimate reality can be credibly conceived as personal and where dialogue between Christianity and other world religions is especially imperative. At the

same time, true symbolic formulations have their own distinct importance, because speaking of God primarily has a religious function, namely of expressing an answer to the existential question for the sake of living authentically. Accordingly, Ogden never wavers in his conviction that "Jesus is the Christ" means "through Jesus, God is decisively disclosed as boundless love." Whenever and wherever the future seeks a reasoned response to the Christian witness of faith, the human adventure will find in Ogden's legacy an exceptional servant.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Christ Without Myth: A Study Based on the Theology of Rudolf Bultmann (New York, 1961).

The Reality of God and Other Essays (New York, 1966).

Faith and Freedom: Toward a Theology of Liberation (Nashville, Tenn., 1979).

The Point of Christology (San Francisco, 1982).

On Theology (San Francisco, 1986).

Is There Only One True Religion or Are There Many? (Dallas, 1992).

Doing Theology Today (Valley Forge, Penn., 1996).

Further Reading

Beck, William D. *Schubert Ogden on the Relationship between Theology and Philosophy*. PhD dissertation, Boston University (Boston, 1980).

Caraway, James E. *God as Dynamic Actuality: A Preliminary Study of the Process Theologies of John B. Cobb, Jr. and Schubert M. Ogden* (Washington, D.C., 1978).

Devenish, Philip E., and George L. Goodwin, eds. *Witness and Existence: Essays in Honor of Schubert M. Ogden* (Chicago, 1989). Contains a bibliography of Ogden's writings.

Franklin I. Gamwell

OLAFSON, Frederick Arlan (1924–)

Frederick Olafson was born on 1 September 1924 in Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada. He was educated at Harvard University, earning his BA in 1947, MA in 1948, and PhD in philosophy in 1951. He did postdoctoral study in 1951–2 at the University of Oxford. He served as instructor of philosophy at Princeton University (1950–51); at Harvard University (1952–4); at Vassar College, as assistant and associate professor of philosophy (1954–60); as visiting professor at Stanford University (1957); at Johns Hopkins University, as associate professor of philosophy (1960–64); and at Harvard, as professor of education and philosophy (1964–71). He then went to the University of California at San Diego as professor of philosophy from 1971 until his retirement in 1991. He was also the chair of the department from 1973 to 1976, and associate dean of graduate studies and research from 1980 to 1985.

Olafson has written extensively on ethics, existentialism, and Martin Heidegger. In *Principles and Persons: An Ethical Interpretation of Existentialism* (1967) he explains what existentialism has to say about the nature of value, choice, and moral freedom. Olafson maintains that neither Jean-Paul Sartre nor Heidegger has given more than merely a sketch of an ethical theory. Olafson suggests that what these philosophers give us is not a conceptual analysis of ethics but, at best, insights from which we have to draw ethical implications, since they were primarily interested in ontology and in the question of what it is to be a human being. However, they opened up a whole series of important issues concerning choice, autonomy, freedom, authenticity, etc., which directly bear on ethics.

In *Ethics and Twentieth Century Thought* (1973) Olafson carries his interests beyond existentialism, taking on the heroic task of examining the various ways ethics has been treated by philosophy, the social sciences, and by the humanities in the twentieth century. He observes that as a form of knowledge to guide people's lives, ethics in the twentieth century becomes extremely *problematic* – in sharp reversal to its traditional role of providing answers. This *problematic* is a constant note in Olafson's attempt to chart its course by philosophers as diverse as John DEWEY, Sartre, Heidegger, G. E. Moore, Ludwig Wittgenstein, and others. His chapter on ethics and the social sciences discusses Karl Marx, Max Weber, Sigmund Freud, and others and their relevance to ethics. His chapter on ethics and the humanities discusses historians, literary critics, and novelists including James Joyce, Franz Kafka, and André Gide.

In *Heidegger and the Ground of Ethics* (1998) Olafson continues to draw out insights beyond his earlier books on this German thinker. Olafson admits that Heidegger never dealt directly with questions of normative ethics, but finds that there is a section in *Being and Time* devoted to what Heidegger calls *Mitsein* (our being in the world together with one another), and also to Heidegger's idea of *Fürsorge* (one human being's caring about another), where important implications for ethics can be located. Olafson tries to use these Heideggerian concepts to begin to form a defensible notion of ethics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Principles and Persons: An Ethical Interpretation of Existentialism (Baltimore, Md., 1967).

Ethics and Twentieth Century Thought (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1973).

The Dialectic of Action: A Philosophical Interpretation of History and the Humanities (Chicago, 1979).

Heidegger and the Philosophy of Mind (New Haven, Conn., 1987).

"The Unity of Heidegger's Thought," in *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*, ed. Charles B. Guignon (New York, 1993), pp. 97–121.

What is a Human Being: A Heideggerian View (New York, 1995).

Heidegger and the Ground of Ethics: A Study of Mitsein (New York, 1998).
Naturalism and the Human Condition: Against Scientism (London, 2001).

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *Justice and Social Policy* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1961).
Ed., *Society, Law and Morality* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1961).

Further Reading
Hodge, Joanna. *Heidegger and Ethics* (London, 1995).
Melden, A. I. "Olafson on Education," in *Educational Judgments: Papers in the Philosophy of Education*, ed. James Doyle (London, 1972), pp. 196–206.

Guy W. Stroh

OPPENHEIM, Frank Mathias (1925–)

Frank M. Oppenheim was born on 18 May 1925 in Coldwater, Ohio. He was educated at Loyola University of Chicago, where he received his BA in classics, his MA in philosophy in 1947, his PhL in 1949, and STL in 1956. At St. Louis University he received his PhD in philosophy in 1962. Oppenheim entered the Roman Catholic religious order of the Jesuits in 1942 and was ordained in 1955. He has been a professor of philosophy at Xavier University from 1961 to 2003, when he retired to become research professor of philosophy. He is a member of the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy (executive committee, 1967–70) and the Jesuit Philosophical Association (President, 1971–2). He was awarded a Shell Foundation grant in 1968–9. He received the Herbert W. Schneider Award from the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy in 1999.

A leading interpreter of Josiah ROYCE, Oppenheim attempts to clarify and justify Royce's position as one of America's greatest systematic religious and moral philosophers. In his two major works, *Royce's Mature Philosophy of Religion* (1987) and *Royce's Mature Ethics* (1993), Oppenheim has documented in detail Royce's creative development and has tried to free Royce's thought from the stereotyping of it as Hegelian idealism. He has also been a leading force in finding and using neglected and unpublished sources of Royce's later works. Locating experiential and pragmatic elements in Royce's mature philosophy, he seeks to justify Royce's claim that his later thought is closer to Charles PEIRCE and pragmatism than to Hegel and older forms of idealism.

Oppenheim shows how Royce's creative advance goes well beyond Peirce and William JAMES in his idea of the need for "a loyal community of interpretation," emphasizing Royce's idea of the importance of loyalty, as well as loyalty to loyalty, for both the philosophy of religion and moral philosophy. He shows how Royce deepened and advanced his concept of loyalty after *The Philosophy of Loyalty* (1908). Royce reinterpreted his metaphysical, ethical, and religious ideas in terms of an enhanced *uberty*, or fruitfulness, and *musement*, terms that he borrowed from Peirce. As Oppenheim interprets Royce, it is not only that loyalty is necessary to all religion and ethics, but it is necessary also to reality or complete truth.

Royce, more than Peirce and most others, was also deeply concerned with the problem of evil in the world. The presence of evil in all its varieties presents a serious challenge to any philosophy that hopes to find a meaningful and satisfactory religious and moral interpretation of life. According to Oppenheim, Royce was never satisfied that he had found a completely satisfactory interpretation and ground for moral lawfulness and religious devotion. Oppenheim tries to show how Royce grappled with these problems in his late published and unpublished works, especially in his 1913 *The Problem of Christianity*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Josiah Royce's Intellectual Development: An Hypothesis," *Idealistic Studies* 6 (1976): 85–104.

Royce's Voyage Down Under: A Journey of the Mind (Lexington, Kent., 1980).

"The Idea of Spirit in the Mature Royce," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 19 (1983): 381–95.

Royce's Mature Philosophy of Religion (Notre Dame, Ind., 1987).

"A Roycean Response to the Challenge of Individualism," in *Beyond Individualism*, ed. Donald Gelpi (Notre Dame, Ind., 1989), pp. 87–119.

Royce's Mature Ethics (Notre Dame, Ind., 1993).

Behind the Bits: Managing the Media Maze, with Helen C. Swift (Lanham, Md., 1998).

Reverence for the Relations of Life: Re-imagining Pragmatism via Josiah Royce's Interactions with Peirce, James and Dewey (Notre Dame, Ind., 2004).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *The Reasoning Heart: Toward a North American Theology* (Washington, D.C., 1986).

Ed. with Richard Hocking, *Josiah Royce, Metaphysics* (Albany, N.Y., 1998).

Ed., "Josiah Royce, A Critical Study of Reality," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 30 (1998): 713–68.

Ed., *Josiah Royce Late Writings: A Collection of Unpublished and Scattered Works*, 2 vols (Bristol, UK, 2001).

Further Reading

"Oppenheim, Frank M." *Directory of American Scholars*, 8th edn (New York, 1982), vol. 4.

Guy W. Stroh

ORMOND, Alexander Thomas
(1847–1915)

Alexander T. Ormond was born on 26 April 1847 near Punxsutawney, Pennsylvania. He began school in western Pennsylvania at the Academies of Glade Run and Elderton. Ormond attempted to join the Union Army when the Civil War began, but he was too young. At the age of seventeen, he became a teacher in a country school near his home. Ormond began college at Miami University in Ohio in 1869, but its temporary closure forced to return to teaching at the end of his first year. He resumed school at the College of New Jersey, which became Princeton University, in 1873, supporting himself while attending classes. Ormond received his BA in 1877, as well as a Chancellor Green Mental Science Fellowship that enabled him to pursue graduate studies at Princeton. He received his MA in 1878 and his PhD in philosophy in 1880. Miami University also awarded him an honorary law degree in 1900.

Ormond assumed his first college-level teaching post at the University of Minnesota in 1880, and served as a professor of philosophy and history there until 1883. He returned to Princeton that year at the behest of President James MCCOSH to become the Stuart Professor of Mental Science and Logic. In 1898 Ormond was named the first McCosh Professor of Philosophy, a post he held until 1913. Known to his students as "Jeremy" because of his frequent references to Jeremy Bentham, Ormond also lectured at Princeton's Theological Seminary and was an active advisor to three Princeton presidents, including Woodrow Wilson. In addition, Ormond served as the President of the Princeton board of education for a number of years. In 1913, Ormond resigned from Princeton's faculty to become President of Grove City College in western Pennsylvania. Ormond held this post until his death on 18 December 1915 in Elderton, Pennsylvania.

Ormond was a member of the American Philosophical Association, and was its President in 1902–1903. He was also a member of the

American Psychological Association. Ormond wrote four books and numerous journal articles, including pieces for the *Princeton Review* and the *Psychological Review*, over the course of his career. His books included *Basal Concepts of Philosophy: An Inquiry into Being, Non-Being, and Becoming* (1894) and *Concepts of Philosophy* (1906). The version of Kantian philosophy presented in *Concepts of Philosophy* was particularly influential among students. Ormond also regularly wrote poetry, although only one poem, "The Watcher at the Pier," was ever widely distributed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Basal Concepts of Philosophy: An Inquiry into Being, Non-Being, and Becoming (New York, 1894).

Foundations of Knowledge, in Three Parts (New York, 1900).

Concepts of Philosophy (New York, 1906).

The Philosophy of Religion (Princeton, N.J., 1922).

Other Relevant Works

"'Basal Concepts.' – A Rejoinder," *Philosophical Review* 4 (1895): 535–8.

"Philosophy and Its Correlations," *Philosophical Review* 12 (1903): 113–29.

"James McCosh as Thinker and Educator," *Princeton Theological Review* (July 1903).

Further Reading

Nat Cycl Amer Bio v34, *Pres Addr of APA v1*, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v26*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Alexander, Archibald. "Professor Ormond's 'Basal Concepts in Philosophy'," *Philosophical Review* 4 (1895): 306–10.

"Recollections of Professor Ormond," *Princeton Alumni Weekly* (19 January 1916): 347–9.

Tufts, James H. "Ormond's *Foundations of Knowledge*," *Philosophical Review* 10 (1901): 57–62.

Margaret Nunnelley

OTTO, Max Carl (1876–1968)

Max C. Otto was born on 28 September 1876 at Zwichau in Saxony, Germany, and died on 2 October 1968 in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. In 1881 he was brought by his parents from Germany to West Virginia. He left school after finishing the sixth grade to work in the family restaurant. When he was sixteen, he left home and went to work as a messenger for the R. G. Dun Rating Agency in Chicago, and later he worked at the Milwaukee YMCA and the Salvation Army, before he decided that he needed more education and went back to school. It was when he worked with the Salvation Army that he developed his technique of giving "chalk talks," in which he illustrated points he was making with pictures and sketches at the chalk board, a device at which he became very adept and that became very popular. All his life he would entertain and amuse his friends by sending them cartoons, sketches, or drawings, and this device became a regular feature of his immensely popular lectures.

At a relatively late age he enrolled at Carroll College in Wisconsin, and after a year he transferred to the University of Wisconsin, receiving a BA in history in 1906. After a year of advanced study, first at the University of Chicago and then the University of Heidelberg, he returned to the University of Wisconsin and earned a PhD in philosophy in 1911, working with professors E. B. MCGILVARY and Frank C. SHARP. He was appointed assistant professor of philosophy at Wisconsin in 1907, and spent the rest of his long career there. Otto was promoted to full professor of philosophy not long after his initial appointment, and served as chair of the philosophy department from 1936 until his retirement in 1947. He was President of the American Philosophical Association Western Division in 1929–30.

Otto became the most well-known member of the philosophy department, which included like-minded pragmatists Boyd BODE and Horace KALLEN, and he was undoubtedly the

most controversial person in the university. Otto was an extraordinarily popular professor, regularly filling the largest lecture halls with enthusiastic students and eager listeners. He taught a course entitled "Man and Nature" nearly every semester to classes of over 300 students, which were regularly oversubscribed. He generated such controversy that on at least four occasions there were organized attempts to get him fired from the faculty, initiated by clerical critics and others in the state, including members of the legislature, who were alarmed at Otto's teaching of what they took to be pernicious atheism and radicalism. He was a threat to their dogmatic peace of mind, and (as happened with Socrates) some thought that he was corrupting the youth. The first of these attempts occurred in 1912, when Otto was still an untenured member of the faculty, the last in 1932; all of them were rebuffed by the administration of the university. Given Otto's immense popularity among students and alumni in the state, there is no knowing what would have happened if he had been dismissed.

Otto was an ardent admirer of William JAMES and John DEWEY, and developed his own form of pragmatism, which he called humanistic pragmatism, or, sometimes, scientific humanism. His courses and writings reflected his deep philosophical commitment to making philosophy relevant to the problems of human beings. His first book, *Things and Ideals: Essays in Functional Philosophy* (1924) was followed by *Natural Laws and Human Hopes* (1926). His third book, *The Human Enterprise*, was published in 1940. Its subtitle, *An Attempt to Relate Philosophy to Daily Life*, is an apt and accurate summary of his aims in his books and in his teaching. *Science and the Moral Life: Selected Writings* was published in 1949.

In 1943 Otto was one of five well-known members of the profession selected by the American Philosophical Association to serve on the newly established Commission on the Function of Philosophy in Liberal Arts Education, which traveled around the country to meet in organized sessions with various groups of people interested in the topic. *Philosophy in American Education: Its Tasks and Opportunities* (1945), to which Otto contributed two chapters, "Professional Philosophy and the Public" and "Philosophy in the Community," stemmed from the work of this commission. Brand BLANSHARD gave the following account of working with Otto on the Commission: "I enjoyed the months of service on this commission. They might have been debilitating if the members had been prickly toward each other, for we had to travel thousands of miles in each other's company, crossing the continent twice by train. One member in fact did not take these long trips with us. Max Otto seems to have felt, as the one pragmatist in the group, that his conception of philosophy and its function was so different from that of the rest of us that his presence would be an apple of discord; so, though he was personally well liked, he worked in comparative independence." Otto's contributions to this cooperative volume are very independent, and hardly seem part of it. In these chapters Otto pursues his own vision and his own program of what philosophy should bring to the public and the community. They are essential reading for anyone interested in Otto's philosophy.

Otto was first and foremost dedicated to the idea of making philosophy work and live in the lives of men and women, especially working men and women, who confront the hard realities of life everyday in their working and family lives and have to toil to put food on the table and keep a roof over their heads. Otto had little patience with such epistemological problems as the reality of the external world, the existence of other minds, and the other traditional topics of metaphysics and epistemology. In his writings he manifested a gift for poetic metaphor and striking images as well as a knack for using everyday language to explain and invigorate his ideas.

Perhaps the idea Otto was most well known was what he called creative bargaining (or, on occasion, realistic idealism), which was an idea inspired by James's essay, "The Moral Philosopher and the Moral Life." Otto was

intrigued by a method for resolving conflicts of interests, and was first presented in *Things and Ideals* and developed in his other books. Otto's method, described briefly, is: "An honest [and thorough] attempt to appreciate the aims in conflict and their relation to the circumstances responsible for just those aims. The search for a new set of aims [a more comprehensive aim] in which the conflicting ones may be absorbed. The invention of a workable program through which the new set of aims can come to fruition." (1945, p. 161) "The word 'bargaining'," Otto says, "refers to the two-sided aspect of the venture; the word 'creative' … to the search and discovery of a novel *modus vivendi* in which the original aims are gathered up and transmuted." (1945, pp. 161–2) Otto emphasizes that this method is profoundly different from compromise; compromise aims at "splitting the difference," so that each of the contending parties gives up something wanted in order to attain some other part of what was aimed at, whereas in creative bargaining the aim is to "discover a new end which, when discovered … will profit all who are involved." The aim throughout is to bring about "the best possible adjustment of competing desires," "the most livable life for all," an aim which Otto more than once identifies with bringing about "general human happiness," which is what he regarded as the proper function of organized society. For Otto, the transcendent interest is "an organization of affairs which will enable mankind to move step by step toward the fulfillment of life generously and nobly achieved" (1940, pp. 349, 367). Thus, Otto says, "acquaintance with it as a method, and training in its application, are … supremely important as educational ideals … for our time" (1945, p. 162).

For some persons, Otto says, "life is a series of business transactions," because modern business has evolved for so many people into their overriding interest, trumping all others, and this is a distortion of the proper and sensible end of human life, "the *human* enterprise." Business, in Otto's view, is properly only a part of life, but Business, with a capital "B," has loomed so large as to become identified with life itself. "A society which refused to identify life with business, which recognized business, as generally conceived, to be parasitic on life, and which recreated itself in response to this recognition, would liberate and develop human powers now left to atrophy or to find satisfaction in sentimentalism or dreaming." (1924, p. 155) "The significant fact is that preoccupation with the interests of business has become almost universal and … an obsession." (1926, p. 87) "The philosophy of business is more widely disseminated in the public mind, more deeply ingrained in the public emotions … than at any time in history. In the pervasive vernacular of this philosophy, business has sold business to mankind." (1926, p. 87) "The encroachment of business into every domain of life … constitutes the most sinister threat against the deepest interests of mankind … has indeed in many ways already destroyed the very conditions upon which these deepest interests must depend if they are to live." (1926, p. 92) In conclusion: "Shall business have a *place* in life, or *be* life? [This] is … the momentous social question of our time." (1926, p. 93)

This nonconformist radical-seeming view on the relation of business to life is what made Otto so controversial and feared and the target of so many attempts to get him removed from his teaching position, for it seemed to so many of little intellect and encrusted souls to amount to a radical subversion of American life – recall the saying of Calvin Coolidge, around that same time, that "The business of America is business." Another factor was his pronounced atheism. Otto distinguished sharply between cosmic atheism and ethical atheism, claimed that too many people who decried cosmic atheism, who professed a militant faith in the existence of God, were at the same time ethical atheists, people who failed to live up the ethical ideals that faith in God was meant to support and require. Otto was a cosmic atheist and a Unitarian. However, he insisted that he was not an ethical atheist. Although he expressed an

"affirmative faith in the nonexistence of God" (1940, p. 334), he maintained that the idealistic moral work which faith in the existence of God had previously buttressed now needs to be accomplished without this cosmic metaphysical faith, since so many powerful figures in the society, though they loudly profess to be religious and God-fearing, are actually ethical atheists – that is, acquisitive, materialistic, rapacious, greedy, and immoral. This idealistic moral work consists of bringing about the moral aims mentioned above, working towards "general human happiness," and finding peaceful means of resolving international conflicts, in which appeals to "the existence of God" serve no function at all.

Otto was concerned all his life with "the problem of how to bring what we know and do into harmony with what we desire to be" (1940, p. 225). If wisdom is construed as accrued knowledge and understanding applied to the guidance and improvement of life, then Otto in his writings and his lectures manifests wisdom in abundance. Otto's philosophy belongs to the hallowed tradition of philosophy as the love of wisdom applied to life, rather than philosophy as the love of disputation on abstruse questions irrelevant to living a life good for others as well as oneself.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Things and Ideals: Essays in Functional Philosophy (New York, 1924).
Natural Laws and Human Hopes (New York, 1926).
Is There a God? A Conversation, with Henry Nelson Wieman and Douglas Clyde Macintosh (Chicago, 1932).
The Human Enterprise: An Attempt to Relate Philosophy to Daily Life (New York, 1940).
Philosophy in American Education: Its Tasks and Opportunities, with Brand Blanshard, Curt J. Ducasse, Charles W. Hendel, and Arthur E. Murphy (New York, 1945).
Science and the Moral Life: Selected Writings (New York, 1949).

Other Relevant Works
"Meditation on a Hill," *Philosophical Review* 39 (1930): 329–50.
"The Social Philosophy of John Dewey," *Journal of Social Philosophy* 5 (1939): 42–60.
"College Students and Philosophy," *Journal of Higher Education* 10 (1939): 405–11.
"The Distinctive Philosophy of William James," in *William James: The Man and The Thinker* (Madison, Wisc., 1942), pp. 7–27.
"On a Certain Blindness in William James," *Ethics* 8 (1943): 184–91.
"Scientific Humanism," *Antioch Review* 3 (1943): 530–45.
"Speech and Freedom of Speech," in *Freedom and Experience: Essays Presented to Horace M. Kallen*, ed. Sidney Hook and Milton R. Konvitz (New York, 1947), pp. 78–91.
"John Dewey," in *In Honor of John Dewey on his Ninetieth Birthday* (Madison, Wisc., 1951), pp. 5–23.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v3, *Proc of APA v42*, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Burkhardt, Frederick, ed. *The Cleavage in Our Culture: Studies in Scientific Humanism in Honor of Max Otto* (Boston, 1952).
Mailer, Julia Hanks. "Otto as a Teacher," in *University, Madison U.S.A.*, by Robert E. Gard (Madison, Wisc., 1970).
The Max C. Otto Jubilee Dinner Addresses (Madison, Wisc., 1947).
Taha, Intissar. *Pragmatism and the Concept of Freedom in the Writings of Boyd H. Bode, William H. Kilpatrick, and Max C. Otto*. PhD dissertation, Ohio State University (Columbus, Ohio, 1958).

Marcus G. Singer

OVERSTREET, Harry Allen (1875–1970)

Harry A. Overstreet was born on 25 October 1875 in San Francisco, California. He received his BA from the University of California at Berkeley in 1899, and his BS from Oxford University in 1901. Upon returning to Berkeley, he became an instructor in philosophy and was promoted to associate professor in due course. The early influence of George H. HOWISON's idealistic social philosophy directed Overstreet's course towards the cause of social democracy. In 1911 Overstreet was appointed professor of philosophy at City College of New York, to replace the deceased John J. McNulty. He was the head of the department of philosophy and psychology at City College until retiring in 1939. For all but two of those years, Morris R. COHEN was his philosophy colleague, and together they built up the department during the 1930s by adding Abraham EDEL, Y. H. KRIKORIAN, and Philip WIENER. Overstreet also was a lecturer at the New School for Social Research from 1924 to 1936. He was President of the American Association for Adult Education in 1940–41. Overstreet died on 18 August 1970 in Falls Church, Virginia.

During the middle of the twentieth century, at a time when several New York City philosophers such as John DEWEY, Sidney HOOK, and Nicholas Murray BUTLER were also on the national stage as public intellectuals, Overstreet was not overshadowed and was in fact the most widely read. His book *The Mature Mind* (1949) sold half a million copies in just three years, and won the 1950 *Parents Magazine* Book Award. Using insights from psychology and psychoanalysis, Overstreet depicted education as a lifelong process of mental growth and social tolerance, two civic virtues essential for democratic life. With his wife, Bonaro Wilkinson Overstreet, he wrote more books about adult education, mental health, democracy, and their techniques for stimulating the intellectual growth of adults. A key theme in their work is their conviction that mental and moral maturity is reached when a person can maintain self-respect while respectful towards others having different cultures and beliefs.

Overstreet practiced the democratic pluralism and civil rights that he preached in his books. He made sure that the philosophy department welcomed women and ethnic minorities, he organized the department along democratic and cooperative principles, and he encouraged freedom of thought and speech. In this open forum of debate, he argued strenuously against communism during the Cold War, and also turned his critical eye towards government activities hostile to civil rights. Of paramount concern for Overstreet was America's continued progress towards a more open and pluralistic society in which the mental unhealthiness of prejudice and bigotry could be exposed and gradually healed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Influencing Human Behavior (New York, 1925).

About Ourselves: Psychology For Normal People (New York, 1927).

The Enduring Quest: A Search for a Philosophy of Life (New York, 1931).

We Move in New Directions (New York, 1933).

A Guide to Civilized Loafing (New York, 1934). Also published as *A Guide to Civilized Leisure* (New York, 1934).

A Declaration of Interdependence (New York, 1937).

Let Me Think (New York, 1939).

Our Free Minds (New York, 1941).

The Mature Mind (New York, 1949).

The Great Enterprise: Relating Ourselves to the World (New York, 1952).

The Mind Alive, with Bonaro W. Overstreet (New York, 1954).

The Mind Goes Forth: The Drama of Understanding, with Bonaro W. Overstreet (New York, 1957).

What We Must Know about Communism, with Bonaro W. Overstreet (New York, 1958).

The War Called Peace: Khrushchev's Communism, with Bonaro W. Overstreet (New York, 1961).

The Iron Curtain: Where Freedom's Offensive

Begins, with Bonaro W. Overstreet (New York, 1963).

The Strange Tactics of Extremism, with Bonaro W. Overstreet (New York, 1964).

The FBI in Our Open Society, with Bonaro W. Overstreet (New York, 1969).

Other Relevant Works

Overstreet's papers are at Indiana University in Bloomington.

"The Process of 'Reinterpretation' in the Hegelian Dialectic," *Journal of Philosophy* 1 (1904): 512–19.

"Change and the Changeless," *Philosophical Review* 18 (1909): 1–22.

"Philosophy and Our Legal Situation," *Journal of Philosophy* 10 (1913): 113–30.

"The Function and Scope of Social Philosophy," *Journal of Philosophy* 11 (1914): 533–43.

"God as the Common Will," *Hibbert Journal* 13 (1914): 1–20.

"Philosophy and the New Justice," *International Journal of Ethics* 25 (1915): 277–91.

"Why We Are Hungry for a Philosophy," *Survey Graphic* 65 (1931): 357–403.

Further Reading

Dict Amer Bio, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v55*, *Proc of APA v44*, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Brennan, James P. *Harry Allen Overstreet's Concept of the Mature Mind*. PhD dissertation, University of Wyoming (Laramie, Wyoming, 1996).

Rappaport, Yvonne K. *The Whole World was Their Classroom: The Contributions of Harry and Bonaro Overstreet to the Field of Adult Education*. Ed.D. dissertation, Virginia Tech University (Blacksburg, Virg., 1998).

Stubblefield, *Towards a History of Adult Education in America* (London and New York, 1988).

John R. Shook

OWENS, Joseph (1908–)

Joseph Owens was born on 17 April 1908 in Saint John, New Brunswick, Canada. He was educated at St. Mary's College, Brockville, Ontario, and at seminaries in Woodstock, Ontario and Montréal, Québec. He was ordained a priest in the religious community of Redemptorists in 1933. He received a licentiate in medieval studies from the Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies in Toronto, Ontario in 1946 and a PhD in medieval studies from that institution in 1951. His licentiate thesis was titled "The Common Nature: A Study in Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus." His doctoral dissertation concerned the Greek background of medieval philosophy and was published as *The Doctrine of Being in the Aristotelian Metaphysics* in 1951.

In 1954 Owens became a fellow of the Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies and a professor in the philosophy department of the University of Toronto. He retired in 1973, though he continued to teach and direct dissertations both at the philosophy department and the Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies until 1992. He also taught at the Academia Alfonsiana in Rome in 1952–3 and at Assumption University in Windsor, Ontario in 1954–65. He was a visiting professor at Purdue University in 1968 and 1970. He was President of the American Catholic Philosophical Association in 1965–6, the Metaphysical Society of America in 1971–2, the Society for Ancient Greek Philosophy in 1971–3, and the Canadian Philosophical Association in 1981–2. He was appointed a member of the Catholic Commission for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs from 1968. He was made a fellow of the Royal Society of Canada in 1963. Owens received honorary doctorates from Mount Allison University in 1975, Catholic University of America in 1983, and St Francis Xavier University in 1988. He received the Aquinas Medal from the American Catholic Philosophical Association in 1972.

Owens's voluminous writings had two foci – Aristotelianism and Thomism, though he also ranged widely over aspects of ancient and medieval philosophy relevant to his two main interests. Owens was, both in his historical interests and his philosophical approach, deeply influenced by Etienne GILSON, one of the great pioneers in the modern study of medieval philosophy, and the founder of the Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies in 1923. That approach is sometimes termed "Thomistic existentialism." It seeks to understand Thomism as the fruition of ancient Greek and medieval Arabic philosophical speculation on existence as an act or the actuality of essence. It also seeks to draw out the consequences of an argument that God, as a first principle of all, is, uniquely, not composed of essence and existence, but rather is the very act of existence itself. Owens saw his historical work as "scholastic" in the literal sense, that is, as revealing the principles implicit in the tradition in which he worked.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Doctrine of Being in the Aristotelian Metaphysics (Toronto, 1951; 2nd rev. edn 1963).
Saint Thomas and the Future of Metaphysics (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1957).
A History of Ancient Western Philosophy (New York, 1959).
An Elementary Christian Metaphysics (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1963).
An Interpretation of Existence (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1968).
Saint Thomas on the Existence of God, ed. John Catan (New York, 1980).
Aristotle, ed. John Catan (New York, 1981).
Human Destiny: Some Problems for Catholic Philosophy (Washington, D.C., 1985).
Towards a Christian Philosophy (Washington, D.C., 1990).
Cognition: An Epistemological Inquiry (Houston, Tex., 1992).
Some Philosophical Issues in Moral Matters: *The Collected Ethical Writings of Joseph Owens*, ed. Dennis Billy and Terence Kennedy (Rome, 1996).

Further Reading
Gerson, Lloyd P., ed. *Graceful Reason: Essays in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy Presented to Joseph Owens, CssR* (Toronto, 1983).

Lloyd P. Gerson

P

PACE, Edward Aloysius (1861–1938)

Edward Aloysius Pace was born on 3 July 1861 in Starke, Florida, and died on 26 April 1938 in Washington, D.C. He studied at St. Charles College in Ellicott, Maryland, from 1876 to 1880, then at the North American College and Urbanian Pontifical University in Rome from 1880 to 1886. Ordained a Roman Catholic priest in Rome in 1885, he received an STD from Urbanian in 1886, at which point he returned to the United States. In 1888, after John Keane, the first rector at the Catholic University of America (which was to open in 1889), selected him to join the faculty, he spent a year in study at Louvain and in Paris. He received a PhD in psychology in 1891 from the University of Leipzig under Wilhelm Wundt, with a dissertation entitled "Das Relativitätsprinzip in Herbert Spencer's psychologischer Entwicklungslehre."

In 1891 Pace began teaching psychology at the Catholic University, where he established a laboratory of experimental psychology. The following year, he became one of the first elected members of the newly formed American Psychological Association; he presented a series of reports on his experimental studies of pain and other sensory phenomena at its meetings.

Pace became professor of philosophy at the Catholic University in 1894 and held this position until 1935. In 1899 he became the first Director of the university's Institute of Pedagogy. He also served as Dean of the School of Philosophy from 1895 to 1899, 1906 to 1914, and 1934 to 1935, and as vice rector from 1925 to 1936. Pace was one of the founders and editors of the *Catholic Encyclopedia* in 1904, and with Thomas Edward SHIELDS he began the *Catholic Educational Review* in 1911. In 1926 Pace became first president of the American Catholic Philosophical Association, and for many years he co-edited its journal, *The New Scholasticism*. Pace was awarded the Papal Medal Pro Ecelesia et pontifice, and was elevated to Monsignor in 1920. Georgetown University honored Pace with the Camillo Cardinal Mazzella Academy of Philosophy award in 1935.

One of the leading figures in the Thomistic revival in the United States, Pace published work centered in the areas of philosophy, education, and psychology. His point of departure was the spirit of the new scholasticism, for which truth could never contradict truth. On this principle scientific investigations could only harmonize with the truths uncovered philosophically, since their end was one and the same ultimate truth. Philosophically, in other words, there is a "passion for unity" (1896, p. 192). The sciences, whose findings must be separated from the mechanistic interpretation wrongly given them, belong together in a single hierarchy from physics to theology.

In Pace's view, psychology investigates the proximal causes of mental phenomena, while philosophy seeks their ultimate cause: the rational, immortal human soul. Education

must learn from biology and psychology, but its ends are transcendent. While the sciences study the phenomena, philosophy strives to know "the ultimate reality beneath" (1896, p. 192); and for this type of synthesis, Aquinas is the model. A full account of nature demands a teleological perspective. As a Thomist, Pace held that revealed truths only perfect humanly discovered truths, so there could be no conflict between reason and revelation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Das Relativitäts-prinzip in Herbert Spencer's psychologischer Entwicklungslehre (Leipzig, Germany, 1891).

"The Growth and Spirit of Modern Psychology," *American Catholic Quarterly Review* 19 (1894): 522–44.

"St. Thomas and Modern Thought," *Catholic University Bulletin* 2 (1896): 188–97.

"The Soul in the System of St. Thomas," *Catholic University Bulletin* 4 (1898): 50–61.

"Modern Psychology and Catholic Education," *Catholic World* 81 (1905): 717–29.

Lectures on Methods of Teaching Religion (Wilmington, Dd., 1928).

Other Relevant Works

Pace's papers are at Catholic University of America and Trinity College in Washington, D.C.

"The Teleology of St. Thomas," *The New Scholasticism* 1 (1927): 213–31.

"The Purpose of Man," *The New Scholasticism* 12 (1938): 209–20.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v40*, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v48*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Braun, William P. *Monsignor Edward A. Pace, Educator and Philosopher*. PhD dissertation, Catholic University of America (Washington, D.C., 1968).

Hart, Charles A., ed. *Aspects of the New Scholastic Philosophy* (New York, 1932).

Misiak, Henryk, and Virginia Staudt. *Catholics in Psychology* (New York, 1954).

Ryan, John K. "Edward Aloysius Pace," *The New Scholasticism* 35 (1961): 141–51.

Robert Kugelmann

PALMER, George Herbert (1842–1933)

George Herbert Palmer was born on 19 March 1842 in Boston, Massachusetts, and died on 7 May 1933 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. He received the BA at Harvard in 1864, then taught high school for a year in Salem, Massachusetts. In 1865 he enrolled at Andover Theological Seminary and took courses there for two years, and then he studied for two years in Tübingen, Germany, where among his teachers was Christoph Sigwart. This was his only long stay away from Cambridge, Massachusetts, though he later traveled during summers to Scotland with Edward Caird. Upon his return to the United States in 1869 (without a PhD), he enrolled at Andover Theological Seminary where he received a BD degree in 1870.

Palmer became an instructor in Greek at Harvard University in 1870 and later also taught in four other Harvard departments: philosophy, divinity, fine arts, and English. As a Greek instructor, he produced a translation of the Odyssey, but Palmer transferred to philosophy in 1872 to assist longtime Harvard philosopher Francis BOWEN. There was occasional work in other departments, but he continued to teach philosophy until 1913. Palmer was promoted to assistant professor of philosophy in 1873, full professor in 1883, and Alford Professor of Philosophy in 1889. His second passion was literature, and he wrote

about George Herbert, Robert Browning, and Shakespeare. He also had a variety of roles in the administration of the university.

When Palmer attended Harvard as a student in the 1860s there were around 1,000 students and thirty teachers. When he began to teach there it had not changed much. Philosophy still had associations with theology, and it was thought appropriate that he had earned a seminary degree. Charles BAKEWELL correctly noted that young philosophers were not supposed to disturb the faith. However, Palmer's taste was for hard questions. Because of his belief that philosophy departments should offer a wide variety of opinions, he transformed the Harvard philosophy department. Palmer is remembered above all as the man who brought international prestige to Harvard by hiring William JAMES, Josiah ROYCE, George SANTAYANA, and Hugo MÜNSTERBERG. It has been estimated that he taught over fifteen thousand Harvard students. Palmer also strongly influenced the growth of many other American philosophy departments for several decades, because it was usually his decisive recommendation that brought Harvard philosophy graduates to their first teaching positions.

The English liberal theologian F. D. Maurice first led Palmer to philosophy. He then turned to John Stuart Mill, but began to find his own philosophical standpoint in Kant. Philosophically, he is mainly remembered for his work in ethics. *The Nature of Goodness* (1903), his work most often referenced, emphasizes the distinction between extrinsic and intrinsic goodness. Extrinsic goodness is goodness that a thing possesses by virtue of its ability to produce something else. Intrinsic goodness is a property that belongs to certain wholes so organized that every part is good for every other part. Palmer always thought of himself as a moderate idealist and, like most idealists, he associated goodness with self-realization. Self-realization is possible, however, only in a social order. Palmer distinguished two selves, a conjunct self and a separate self.

Social relations compose the conjunct self. Palmer insisted, however, that the separate self considered by itself is unintelligible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The New Education, Three Papers (Boston, 1887).
Self-Cultivation in English (New York, 1898).
The Glory of the Imperfect (New York, 1898). Reprinted in *Self-Cultivation in English and The Glory of the Imperfect* (New York, 1917).
The Field of Ethics (Boston, 1901).
The Nature of Goodness (Boston, 1903).
The Teacher: Essays and Addresses on Education, with Alice F. Palmer (Boston, 1908).
Ethical and Moral Instruction in Schools (Boston, 1909).
The Ideal Teacher (Boston, 1910).
The Problem of Freedom (Boston, 1911).
Intimations of Immortality in the Sonnets of Shakespeare (Boston, 1912).
Trades and Professions (Boston, 1915).
Formative Types of English Poetry (Boston, 1918).
Altruism: Its Nature and Varieties (New York, 1919).

Other Writings
Palmer's papers are at Wellesley College.
Ed., *The English Works of George Herbert*, 6 vols (Boston, 1905).
The Life of Alice Freeman Palmer (New York, 1909).
A Herbert Bibliography. Being a Catalogue of a Collection of Books Relating to George Herbert (Cambridge, Mass., 1910).
"Josiah Royce," *Harvard Graduates' Magazine* 25 (1916): 165–70.
"The Monologue of Browning," *Harvard Theological Review* 11 (1918): 121–44.
"Introduction," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York,

1930), vol. 1, pp. 17–62. Also published as *The Autobiography of a Philosopher* (New York, 1930).

"In Dedication: Josiah Royce," in *Contemporary Idealism in America*, ed. Clifford Barrett (New York, 1932), pp. 1–10.

The Lord's Prayer (Boston and Chicago, 1932).

An Academic Courtship: Letters of Alice Freeman and George Herbert Palmer, 1886–1887, ed. Caroline Hazard (Cambridge, Mass., 1940).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v6*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Kuklick, Bruce. *The Rise of American Philosophy: Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1860–1930* (Cambridge, Mass., 1977).

Linenthal, Arthur J. *Two Academic Lives: George Herbert Palmer and Alice Freeman Palmer* (Boston, 1995).

Perry, Ralph B., Charles Bakewell, and William E. Hocking. *George Herbert Palmer 1842–1933, Memorial Addresses* (Cambridge, Mass., 1935).

Leslie Armour

PANOFSKY, Erwin (1892–1968)

Erwin Panofsky was born on 30 March 1892 in Hannover, Germany. He attended the universities of Berlin, Munich, and Freiburg from 1910 to 1914, and received his PhD in art history from the University of Freiburg in 1914. He then worked at the Warburg Library in Hamburg, a large collection pertaining to European cultural and intellectual history belonging to Panofsky's mentor, the historian Aby Warburg. The University of Hamburg was a new institution when Panofsky began teaching there in 1926 as its first professor of art history. At Hamburg, he became acquainted with art historian Alois Riegl and the neo-Kantian philosopher Ernst Cassirer, whose theories became influential on Panofsky's work. Panofsky stayed at the University of Hamburg until 1933, when he was dismissed from his post by the Nazi Party, which was ousting Jews from official positions. The following year, Panofsky and his first wife, Dora Mosse Panofsky, also an art historian, emigrated to the United States, where he began teaching at New York University and Princeton University. In 1935, Panofsky joined the faculty of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton as professor of art history in the School of Historical Studies, where he stayed for the remainder of his career, with occasional appointments as visiting lecturer at various universities and colleges in the United States. Among these were the Norman Wait Harris Lectureship at Northwestern University in 1938, the Mary Flexner Lectureship at Bryn Mawr College in 1939, the Charles Eliot Norton Professorship of Poetry at Harvard University in 1947 and 1948, and the Gottesman Lectureship at the University of Uppsala, Sweden, in 1952. He retired from Princeton in 1962, and was Samuel F. B. Morse Professor at New York University until his death on 14 March 1968 in Princeton, New Jersey.

Panofsky is considered one of the foremost art historians of the twentieth century, and his groundbreaking work on aesthetic theory, history, and art's expression of the human condition have made him an important figure to contemporary philosophy as well. Panofsky's work belongs to the philosophy of art and the philosophy of culture, given his historical orientation toward aesthetic appreciation and evaluation. Studying art, for Panofsky, was a way to study changing cultural norms, expectations, anxieties, and achievements. During the course of his career he published seminal

texts in aesthetics and beyond, exploring iconography, iconology, the Renaissance, myth, Netherlandish painting, baroque, film, science, and the meaning of symbol and style. Art itself came to be understood as imbued with culture and history, requiring not only empirical but theoretical appreciation. Panofsky's era has been called the heroic phase of art history, when its disciplinary borders were extended beyond inquiry into the work of art as an isolated artifact to instead include claims of the integration of theory and history into art.

His early work was on the German Renaissance painter Albrecht Dürer. His dissertation, *Dürers Kunsttheorie* ("Dürer's Theory of Art"), an account of Dürer's theories on human proportions and their relation to artistic theories of the Italian Renaissance, was published as a book in 1915. Panofsky continued to write on Dürer; in 1923 he collaborated with art historian and co-founder of the Warburg Library, Fritz Saxl, to write *Dürer's Melencolia I*, where he began to develop his unique theory of iconology that would become his most enduring achievement. During the 1920s, Panofsky also published various articles on interpretation, representation, and proportion. He studied the evolution of incorporation of the spectator's viewpoint in the history of representation, claiming that Renaissance art achieved the systematic method for synthesizing the viewer and the work in the construction of perspective, creating the foundation for building new ways to consider projection in the future. With this achievement, subjectivity and objectivity become harmoniously interdependent, a theme which reflected Panofsky's own neo-Kantianism, as well as Cassirer's influence. The best-known article from this period is "Idea," from 1924, where he explicitly develops this theory of the relationship between subjective intellect and representation of images. This article would be published again in German in 1960, and then in English in 1968 as *Idea: A Concept in Art History* after Panofsky's death.

In 1939 Panofsky published *Studies in Iconology: Humanist Themes in the Art of the Renaissance*, based on his Flexner Lectures at Bryn Mawr College that year. His first book in English after his emigration to the United States was perhaps his most famous and influential; here he advanced his method of iconology, which he had begun to develop in his work from the twenties. Panofsky theorized iconology in contrast to iconography. Iconography, for Panofsky, meant the study of subject matter of works of art, whereas iconology is concerned with the larger cultural and intellectual meanings of that matter. Panofsky identifies iconology as "art history turned interpretive," where the artwork is apprehended as a cultural text, a product of the "essential tendencies of the human mind," again betraying a Kantian appreciation for the mind's ability to not just reflect but rather produce reality.

Iconology can be understood in the context of three levels of aesthetic interpretation, as elaborated by Panofsky in the preface to *Studies in Iconology*. Pre-iconographic understanding is a basic understanding of a work's elements, composition and description. Iconographic understanding entails identifying features of the work that represent other texts – Panofsky's example is Leonardo da Vinci's *Last Supper*. An iconographical analysis of it would read the painting as translation, or mirror, of the Gospel Scripture it depicts. Iconological understanding does not only consider the text within the painting, it considers the *painting as text*, meaning, a representation of Renaissance aesthetic concerns – balance, harmony, perspective – along with Renaissance era cultural preoccupations such as Christianity, or virtues like justice. Narrower iconological analysis refers to the images, stories and allegories of conventional subject matter. Deeper iconological interpretation requires analysis of the intrinsic content of the work, which constitutes "the world of 'symbolical' values."

Moreover, the innovation of perspective is an instance of the intellectual and scientific advances and enthusiasm characteristic of the Renaissance, reflecting a notion of the self as fixed in the present, looking back at the past.

The self-consciousness of the historical greatness of Renaissance achievements is embodied in the use of perspective: as a way of looking, perspective reveals the epistemological confidence of the period, an excitement about the present as distinct from the past.

Leonardo's effective use of perspective would therefore be considered part of the meaning of the *Last Supper* as well. Iconology relies upon Panofsky's distinction between the representational and the textual. The painting tells a story in the representation – that is iconography. Regarding the very fact of the painting as a cultural story itself – this is iconology. This is what Panofsky means when he claims that the meaning of an artwork "is apprehended by ascertaining those underlying principles which reveal the basic attitude of a nation, a period, a class, a religious or philosophical persuasion – qualified by one personality and condensed into one work."

Panofsky includes the crystallization of culture in art as part of its value, thereby greatly expanding the vocabulary of aesthetic understanding and appreciation. His privileging of the intellectual achievements of art illustrates the nature of the philosophical and aesthetic debates of the era. Iconology represents a strong shift away from formalism, another mid twentieth-century aesthetic sensibility, which emphasized the formal, aesthetic features of an artwork, eschewing evaluation located in theory, culture, and history, and instead considering art as a value unto itself.

As both an art historian and cultural critic, Panofsky hailed popular cinema as a complex art form at a time when it was still struggling for academic legitimacy and when distinctions of high and low art were not being critically challenged. Film for Panofsky was remarkable in the context of art history, because it is the first art form that did not prompt technological innovation but was instead discovered as a result of it. In 1934 Panofsky began to discuss film in academic lectures and presentations, and in 1936 he became a member of the advisory committee at the Museum of Modern Art's Film Department, a post he held until 1950. One of his early informal lectures on cinema, "On Movies," presented to the department of art and archeology at Princeton in 1934, was later elaborated and published under the titles "Style and Medium in the Moving Pictures" and "Style and Medium in the Motion Pictures" (1947) in various journals and books on film and art theory, as it gained prominence among film scholars and art critics. In this essay Panofsky describes the unique aesthetic experience of moviegoing by highlighting the temporal features afforded by cinema, noting that the spectator's aesthetic experience occurs in time. Panofsky suggests that cinema, as an art form, has transformative potential for the meaning of art and creation of visual epistemologies. In 1960, Panofsky was elected the first honorary member of the Society of Cinematologists of the New York University Faculty Club.

In 1946 Panofsky returned to the subject of Dürer with *The Life and Art of Albrecht Durer*, based on his Harris Lectures at Northwestern in 1938. Here Panofsky continues his ongoing study of the artist's own fascination with "the German mentality," as quoted by Panofsky, as well as his humanistic approach to art. In Dürer, Panofsky observes a "constant struggle between reason and intuition, generalizing formalism and particularizing realism, humanistic self-reliance and medieval humility," drawn to the reflections of history and culture in his work, particularly Dürer's mathematical precision.

Panofsky offered an iconological interpretation of architecture with *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism* (1951), where he argues that architectural design mirrors intellectual thought and narrative content. By looking at cathedrals erected in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in and around Paris, Panofsky, in effect, was "reading" architecture like a language, to suggest that architectural form is not isolated to answering merely functional and structural questions, but instead reflects epistemological, political, and spiritual mandates of a particular time and place.

Early Netherlandish Painting (1953) was Panofsky's last monumental book, based on the Norton Lectures he gave at Harvard in the late 1940s. Panofsky offers a detailed analysis of Flemish painting from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, claiming that the paintings of Jan Van Eyck signal the high moment of perfect integration of Christian symbolism with naturalistic representation in painting, such that the appearance of Christian iconography does not disrupt or destabilize the realism of the work, but is woven into it, and supports it. For Panofsky, Christian symbolism has become, in effect, part of what we come to think of as nature. This again reflects his humanistic orientation toward art: his interpretive practice seeks to construe art-making as world-making, a central theme of the work of American philosopher Nelson GOODMAN, who was strongly influenced by Panofsky.

Panofsky's *Pandora's Box: The Changing Aspects of a Mythical Symbol* (1956), co-written with Dora Mosse Panofsky, is an iconological case study, exploring the evolution of the iconological status of Pandora, the first woman of mythology. The authors trace the origins of the phrase "Pandora's box" to Erasmus of Rotterdam, c. 1500, and follow the changing representations of Pandora as a "beautiful evil" and "Pagan Eve" in various cultural texts, including Italian Mannerist painter Rosso Fiorentino's portrait from circa 1530. *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art* (1960) was based on Panofsky's Gottesman Lectures at the University of Uppsala from 1952. Here Panofsky identifies the self-consciousness of Renaissance art as an impulse to distinguish itself from the Middle Ages and antiquity by containing elements of a longing to return to nature, or to antiquity, as a way of marking the distinction of the new era.

Although Panofsky died in 1968, his earlier works have continued to be translated and published in the decades since his death. *Problems in Titian, Mostly Iconographic* (1969), is based on Panofsky's Wrightsman Lectures at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, sponsored by New York University's Institute of Fine Arts. In addition to the posthumous English publication of *Idea: A Concept in Art History* (1968), a seminal book-length essay by Panofsky from 1924 was translated from German into English as *Perspective as Symbolic Form* (1991). Many of Panofsky's essays have been edited and published, including *Three Essays on Style* (1995).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dürers Kunsttheorie, vornehmlich in ihrem Verhältnis zur Kunsttheorie der Italiener (Berlin, 1915).

Dürers Stellung zur Antike (Vienna, 1922).

Dürers Melencolia I, with Fritz Saxl (Leipzig, 1923).

'Idea': Ein Beitrag zur Begriffsgeschichte der älteren Kunsttheorie (Leipzig, 1924).

Perspektive als symbolische Form (Hamburg, 1927).

Die theoretische Kunstlehre Albrecht Dürers (Freiburg, 1934)

Studies in Iconology: Humanist Themes in the Art of the Renaissance (New York, 1939).

The Codex Huygens and Leonardo da Vinci's Art Theory (London, 1940).

Albrecht Dürer (Princeton, N.J., 1943).

Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism (Latrobe, Penn., 1951).

Early Netherlandish Painting: Its Origins and Character (Cambridge, Mass., 1953).

Meaning in the Visual Arts (New York, 1955).

The Life and Art of Albrecht Durer (Princeton, N.J., 1955).

Pandora's Box: The Changing Aspects of a Mythological Symbol, with Dora Mosse (New York, 1956).

Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art (Stockholm, 1960).

Durer's Apocalypse (London, 1964).

Idea: A Concept in Art History (New York, 1968).

Other Relevant Works

Panofsky's papers are in the Archives of American Art, Washington, D.C.

Ed. and trans., *Abbot Surger on the Abbey Church of St.-Denis and Its Art Treasures* (Princeton, N.J., 1946).

"Style and Medium in the Motion Pictures," *Critique* 1 (1947): 5–28.

Galileo as a Critic of the Arts (The Hague, 1954).

The Iconography of Correggio's Camera di San Paolo (London, 1961).

Saturn and Melancholy: Studies in the History of Natural Philosophy, Religion and Art, with Raymond Klibansky and Fritz Saxl (New York, 1964).

Problems in Titian, Mostly Iconographic (New York, 1969).

Perspective as Symbolic Form (New York, 1991).

Three Essays on Style (Cambridge, Mass., 1995).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Who Was Who in Amer v4, Who's Who in Phil

Hasenmueller, Christine. "Panofsky, Iconography, and Semiotics," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 36 (1978): 289–301.

Holly, Michael A. *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1984).

Lavin, Irving, ed. *Meaning in the Visual Arts: Views from the Outside: A Centennial Commemoration of Erwin Panofsky (1892–1968)* (Princeton, N.J., 1995).

Levin, Thomas Y. "Iconology at the Movies: Panofsky's Film Theory," *Yale Journal of Criticism* 9 (1996): 27–55.

Manning, David. "Panofsky and the Interpretation of Pictures," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 13 (1973): 146–61.

Marjorie Jolles

PÂQUET, Benjamin (1832–1900)

Benjamin Pâquet was born on 27 March 1832 in Saint-Nicolas, Lower Canada (now Québec Province). He attended the Petit Séminaire de Québec, and at his mother's urging, then enrolled at the Grand Séminaire de Québec in 1854 to become a priest. After three years of theology studies with Elzéar-Alexandre TASCHEREAU, he was ordained priest in 1857. He served as assistant priest at Québec's Cathedral of Notre Dame until 1862. Recognizing his potential as a professor, the Université Laval in Québec sent him to Rome's Pontifical Gregorian University to study moral theology. He received a doctorate in theology in 1866.

In 1866 Pâquet returned to a theology position at l'Université Laval. There he taught Catholic theology, ethics, politics, natural law, and the law of nations until 1879, and also was dean from 1871 to 1873 and procurator of the Grand Séminaire from 1879 to 1885. His candidacy for elevation to bishop was repeatedly thwarted by ultramontane opponents in Québec during the 1870s and 80s. However, he was favored with prestigious appointments by Rome, as apostolic protonotary in 1876, privy chamberlain in 1877, adviser to the Congregation of the Index in 1878, and domestic prelate in 1887. He was Director of the Grand Séminaire and rector of l'Université Laval from 1887 to 1893. He lived out his last years in semi-retirement, and had the satisfaction of seeing his nephew, Louis-Adolphe PÂQUET, become a prominent theologian at l'Université Laval. Pâquet died on 25 February 1900 in Québec City.

Pâquet's lectures on *Le Libéralisme* (1872) were well received as accurate expositions of the papal stance against the European philosophy of liberalism and its associated views of human nature and the basis of political rights. However, he persistently fought the clerical extremists in French Canada who upheld the ultramontane beliefs that political power proceeds from God to the Pope, and through

him to the Catholic Church, which then locally controls all civil authorities. As a moderate like Cardinal Taschereau, Pâquet was not alarmed by local movements towards civil progress and gradual liberalization, and believed that the Church and priests should stand aloof from the political arena. Pâquet and other moderate Catholic leaders guided the Church through very difficult decades when unrestrained anti-British sentiment and conservative French nationalism could have destroyed the fragile French-speaking community.

BIBIOGRAPHY

Discours prononcé à la cathédrale de Québec, le 10 avril 1869: cinquantième anniversaire de la prêtrise de Pie IX (Québec, 1869).

"Notice biographique sur Mgr F. Baillargeon, archevêque de Québec," *Revue canadienne* 7 (1870): 788–815.

Le Libéralisme; *leçons données à l'université Laval* (Québec, 1872).

"Discours," in *Spoliation des biens de la Propagande*; *protestation solennelle faite à l'université Laval* (Québec, 1884), pp. 33–41.

Quelques lettres suivies de quelques remarques par l'abbé J. B. Proulx, *vice-recteur de l'université Laval, à Montréal* (Montréal, 1891).

Further Reading
Dict Canad Bio

Chabot, Marc. "Un libéral catholique: Benjamin Pâquet (1832–1900)," in *Figures de la philosophie québécoise après les troubles de 1837* (Montréal, 1988), pp. 198–240.

Laflamme, J.-C.-K. "Monseigneur Benjamin Pâquet," Université Laval *Annuaire* (Québec) (1900–1901): 153–63.

M. A. de F. (Alexis Pelletier). *Quelques observations critiques sur l'ouvrage de M. l'abbé B. Pâquet, intitulé "Le libéralisme"* (Montréal, 1872).

Proulx, J.-B. *Réponse à Mgr B. Pâquet,*
recteur de l'université Laval (Montréal, 1891).

Un catholique (Alexis Pelletier). *La source du mal de l'époque au Canada* (Montréal, 1881).

John R. Shook

PÂQUET, Louis-Adolphe (1859–1942)

Louis-Adolphe Pâquet was born on 4 August 1859 in Saint-Nicolas, Québec. He entered the Petit Séminaire de Québec in 1872 and after successful classical studies and clerical training he became a priest in 1879. For further theological study he went to Rome's l'Université de la Propagande, and he defended his doctorate thesis before Pope Leo XIII in 1883. Upon returning to Québec that year he was appointed to the faculty of theology at l'Université Laval, a position which he held until his death. He was President of l'Université Laval from 1903 to 1938. During these years he continued to teach theology, and also taught Christian social theory for the school of social sciences and the philosophy department (which he had inaugurated in 1884). He was regarded as Canada's preeminent theologian and a major leader of the Catholic Church in Canada. The Vatican appointed him to the role of official interpreter for pontifical directives concerning French Canada. He founded the Canadian Academy Saint-Thomas d'Aquin, dedicated to research on Aquinas. He died in Québec City on 24 February 1942.

Pâquet wrote numerous texts, treatises, and sermons. His monumental study of Thomism, *Disputationes théologicae seu commentoria in Summam theologicam Sancti Thomae*, still stands as one of the most learned expositions of Aquinas's *Summa Theologica* produced in French Canada. Pâquet's outstanding devotion to securing Thomism as the foundation of

Catholicism was matched by his commitment to the supremacy of the Pope and the nationalistic destiny of French Catholicism in Canada. Pâquet lectured and published on a wide variety of social and political issues from a conservative Catholic standpoint. Many of his shorter writings on topics from feminism to liberalism to war and socialism are collected in *Discours et allocutions* (1915) and *Etudes et appreciations* (1917–32).

Pâquet's "Sermon on the Vocation of the French Race in America," an address given at the Champlain monument on the occasion of the Diamond Jubilee of the Saint-Jean-Baptiste Society of Québec in 1902, outlines his vision of positive French influence on Canada. Characterizing the French Catholics in North America as divinely appointed to a spiritual mission, Pâquet predicted that they would rescue Canada from materialism and other Anglo-Saxon vices. The French Canadian people have, he said,

> … the privilege of being entrusted with this social priesthood granted only to select peoples. I cannot doubt that this religious and civilizing mission is the true vocation and the special vocation of the French race in America. Yes, let us not forget, we are not only a civilized race, we are pioneers of a civilization; we are not only a religious people, we are messengers of the spirit of religion; we are not only dutiful sons of the Church, we are, or we should be, numbered among its zealots, its defenders, and its apostles. Our mission is less to handle capital than to stimulate ideas; less to light the furnaces of factories than to maintain and spread the glowing fires of religion and thought, and to help them cast their light into the distance … . Let us not step down from the pedestal, where God has placed us, to walk commonly among those generations who thirst for gold and pleasure. We must leave to other nations, less inspired with the ideal, the kind of feverish mercantilism and vulgar bestiality that rivets them to material things. Our own ambition must aim higher; our thoughts and aspirations must be loftier.

Applying this vision of French Catholic superiority, Pâquet did not hesitate directly to engage the Church in the complex political questions about the fate of Catholics in Canada.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

La Foi et la raison en elles-mêmes et dans leurs rapports (Québec, 1890).

Disputationes théologicae seu commentoria in Summam theologicam Sancti Thomae, 6 vols (Québec, 1893–1903).

Droit public de l'Eglise, 4 vols. *Principes généraux*; *L'Eglise et l'éducation à la lumière de l'histoire et des principes chrétiens*; *L'Organisation religieuse et le pouvoir civil*; *L'Action religieuse et la loi civile* (Québec, 1908–15).

Discours et allocutions (Québec, 1915).

Le Pape et la guerre (Québec, 1917).

Etudes et appreciations, 6 vols (Québec, 1917–32).

Mélanges canadiens (Quebec, 1918).

L'Ecueil démocratique (Québec, 1918).

L'oeuvre universitaire (Québec, 1920).

L'Organisation professionnelle (Montréal, 1921).

Une Grande force catholique et nationale (Québec, 1931).

Le Rôle primordial de la fin (Ottawa, 1938).

Au soir de la vie: modestes pages philosophico-religieuses (Québec, 1938).

Other Relevant Works

Pâquet's papers are at the Séminaire de Québec.

"Coup d'oeil sur l'histoire de l'enseignement de la philosophie traditionelle au Canada," *Mémoires de la Société Royale du Canada* 3rd ser., 11 (1917): 37–60.

"A Sermon on the Vocation of the French Race in America," in *French-Canadian Nationalism*, ed. Ramsey Cook (Toronto, 1969), pp. 154–8.

Further Reading
Canad Encyc
Houde, Roland. *Histoire et philosophie au Québec* (Trois Rivières, Québec, 1979).
Lamonde, Yvan. *La philosophie et son enseignement au Québec (1665–1920)* (Montréal, 1980).
Provost, Honorius, ed. *Le séminaire de Québec: documents et biographies* (Québec, 1964).
Simard, Georges. "Monseigneur Louis-Adolphe Pâquet." *Mémoires de la Société Royale du Canada*, third series, 41 (1942): 36–41.

John R. Shook

PARK, Edwards Amasa (1808–1900)

Edwards Amasa Park was born on 29 December 1808 in Providence, Rhode Island. His father, Calvin Park, was professor of moral philosophy and metaphysics at Brown University, and was a Congregationalist theologian in the Jonathan Edwards tradition of New Divinity Calvinism. Edwards Park began college studies at Brown at the age of thirteen and graduated with his BA in 1826, already prepared to follow precisely in his father's theological heritage. Park went to Andover Seminary in 1828 to study with another New Divinity theologian, Leonard Woods. He graduated from Andover in 1831, was ordained into the ministry, and became pastor of the Congregationalist church in Braintree, Massachusetts. In 1835–6 he was professor of mental and moral philosophy at Amherst College. In 1836 Andover Seminary appointed him to the position of Bartlet Professor of Sacred Rhetoric. Upon Woods's retirement in 1847, Park was named Abbot Professor of Christian Theology at Andover, which he held until retiring in 1881. Park died on 4 June 1900 in Andover, Massachusetts.

Park's New Divinity theology represented the leading standpoint for Congregationalism during the middle portion of the nineteenth century. Through his books and many articles in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, which he edited from 1851 until 1881, he defended the last surviving branch of New Divinity theology from more conservative Calvinism (represented by Princeton's Charles HODGE) and more liberal and progressive views emerging at Union Theological Seminary (by Henry Boynton SMITH) and entrenching at Andover after Park's departure (such as George HARRIS). Most of Park's scholarship was directed toward preserving and explaining Edwards, the New Divinity tradition, and the history of New England theology.

Despite Park's valiant efforts, the heritage of Edwards was too divided and contentious for one person to hold together. Even Park's distinctive stance against original sin, holding that sin was each person's responsibility, was rejected by many other Edwardsian Calvinists as a surrender to Arminianism's reliance on free will. The New Divinity's effort to understand revivalism as a response of the heart to God's call to repent seemed to lead Park away from predestination toward the view that the human will was not inherently sinful and that salvation was a matter of one's personal responsibility. Park's essay on "The Theology of the Intellect and that of the Feelings" (1850) tried to forge a compromise with rational theology by finding a role for the emotions in religious knowledge, and suggesting that false doctrines arise from excessive literal readings of Scripture. His critics, particularly Hodge and Smith, charged that Park used his category of "theology of the feelings" conveniently to discredit any doctrines he did not share.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Theology of the Intellect and that of the Feelings," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 7 (1850): 533–69.
The Associate Creed of Andover Theological Seminary (Boston, 1883).

Discourses on Some Theological Doctrines, as Related to the Religious Character (Andover, Mass., 1885).

Memorial Collection of Sermons (Boston, 1902).

Selected Essays of Edwards A. Park, ed. Bruce Kuklick (New York, 1987).

Other Relevant Works

Park's papers are at Andover-Newton Theological Seminary in Newton, Massachusetts.

Memoir of the Life and Character of Samuel Hopkins, D.D. (Boston, 1852; 2nd edn 1854).

Ed., *The Works of Samuel Hopkins, D.D., with a Memoir of his Life and Character*, 3 vols (Boston, 1852).

Ed., *The Works of Nathanael Emmons, D.D., Third Pastor of the Church in Franklin, Mass.: with a Memoir of His Life*, 6 vols (Boston, 1860).

The Life and Character of Leonard Woods (Andover, Mass., 1880).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v9*

Cecil, Anthony C., Jr. *The Theological Development of Edwards Amasa Park: Last of the "Consistent Calvinists"* (Missoula, Mont., 1974).

Foster, Frank H. *Life of Edwards Amasa Park* (New York, 1936).

John R. Shook

PARK, Robert Ezra (1864–1944)

Robert Park was born on 14 February 1864 in Harveyville, Pennsylvania, and grew up in Red Wing, Minnesota. In 1882 he entered the University of Minnesota, but transferred after one year to the University of Michigan, where he received his PhB in 1887, studying under John DEWEY who influenced his growing interest in progressive reform. He worked as a journalist in Minneapolis, Detroit, Denver, New York, and Chicago from 1887 through 1898. In 1898 he entered Harvard University to study psychology and philosophy, earning an MA in philosophy in 1899. In 1899 he traveled to Germany where he studied at the University of Berlin. He also spent a semester studying at the University of Strasbourg, followed by a few years at the University of Heidelberg studying philosophy and psychology. His dissertation, *Masse und Publikum*, was written under the supervision of Wilhelm Windelband (and later published in English in 1972). He received his PhD from the University of Heidelberg in 1904, but he had returned to Harvard in 1903 to complete his dissertation and teach for two years as an assistant, lecturing in philosophy.

From 1905 to 1914 Park worked as Secretary of the Congo Reform Association and as an aide to Booker T. WASHINGTON at Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Alabama. He moved to Chicago in 1914, where he was a lecturer in sociology at the University of Chicago from 1914 to 1923, followed by appointment as a full professor of sociology. He served as President of the American Sociological Society in 1925. After his retirement in 1933, he was a lecturer at Fisk University in Tennessee from 1936 until his death. Park died on 7 February 1944 in Nashville, Tennessee.

Park had a tremendous influence on the development of social psychology and sociology in the United States. Much of his contribution came from the influence he had on the work of colleagues and students. Along with W. I. THOMAS and George H. MEAD, Park was part of the nucleus of the early Chicago school of sociology that was aligned with the philosophy of pragmatism. His notion of the self was influenced by William JAMES. Park adapted James's psychological insights to char-

acterize social roles and social control. He conceptualized the characteristics of the sociological stranger (the "marginal man") and how the stranger makes use of his freedom from conventional social control. His approach to society as a system of interactions was influenced by Georg Simmel. He particularly called attention to general processes of collective behavior through which social institutions are formed and modified. Throughout his career he looked for a general pattern ("natural history") that would apply to all collaborative movements, whether political revolutions or religious movements.

Park was especially interested in studying social problems within the laboratory of the city. He saw the structure of the city as produced by the collective efforts of people attempting to live and work together. Collaborative human struggles give rise to ecological orders based on competition (or symbiosis) and social orders based on symbolic communication. The study of race relations was of paramount importance to Park. His interest in racial relations grew out of the nine years he spent working with Booker T. Washington and living in the South. His work on race relations focused on the adaptations of African Americans in the United States, conceptualized as particular instances of general processes of conflict, assimilation, and accommodation between groups.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Principles of Human Behavior (Chicago, 1915).

Old World Traits Transplanted, with Herbert A. Miller (New York, 1921).

Immigrant Press and its Control (New York, 1922).

Introduction to the Science of Sociology, with Ernest W. Burgess (Chicago, 1924).

City, with Ernest W. Burgess and Roderick D. McKenzie (Chicago, 1925).

"Human Migration and the Marginal Man," *American Journal of Sociology* 33 (1928): 881–93.

Race and Culture (Glencoe, Ill., 1950).

Human Communities: The City and Human Ecology (Glencoe, Ill., 1952).

Society: Collective Behavior, News, and Opinion, Sociology and Modern Society (Glencoe, Ill., 1955).

On Social Control and Collective Behavior: Selected Papers, ed. Ralph H. Turner (Chicago, 1967).

Other Relevant Works

Park's papers are at the University of Chicago.

The Crowd and the Public, and Other Essays, ed. Henry Elsner, Jr. (Chicago, 1972).

Collected Papers of Robert Ezra Park, 3 vols (New York, 1974).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Dict Amer Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v37, Who Was Who in Amer v2

Lal, Barbara Ballis. *The Romance of Culture in an Urban Civilization: Robert E. Park on Race and Ethnic Relations in Cities* (London, 1990).

Lindner, Rolf. *The Reportage of Urban Culture: Robert Park and the Chicago School*, trans. Adrian Morris et al. (Cambridge, UK, 1996).

Lyman, Stanford M. *Militarism, Imperialism, and Racial Accommodation: An Analysis and Interpretation of the Early Writings of Robert E. Park* (Fayetteville, Ark., 1992).

Masuoka, Jitsuichi, and Preston Valien, eds. *Race Relations: Problems and Theory, Essays in Honor of Robert E. Park* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1961).

Matthews, Fred H. *Quest for an American Sociology: Robert E. Park and the Chicago School* (Montréal, Canada, 1977).

Osman, David S. *The Emergence of Urban Sociology: Robert Ezra Park and the Approach to the Urban Unvironment,*

1895–1930 (Charlottesville, Virg., 1969).
Raushenbush, Winifred. *Robert E. Park: Biography of a Sociologist* (Durham, N.C., 1979). Contains a bibliography of Park's writings.

Ione Y. DeOllos
Jack Weller

PARKER, De Witt Henry (1885–1949)

De Witt Henry Parker was born on 17 April 1885. He received his BA at Harvard in 1906, and his PhD in philosophy, also at Harvard, in 1908. During his time at Harvard, Parker took courses with William JAMES, Josiah ROYCE, and George Herbert PALMER, and his dissertation was "The Nature and Object of Historical Knowledge." Parker was instructor of philosophy at the University of Michigan in 1908–1909, and the University of California at Berkeley in 1909–10. He then returned to Michigan in 1910, where he remained for the rest of his career. Parker was promoted to associate professor in 1921, full professor in 1925, and served as chair of the philosophy department from 1929 until his death. Parker died on 21 June 1949 in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

During his career, Parker held several temporary posts, including lectureships at the University of California (1924–5), the Metropolitan Museum of Art (1926), the University of Wisconsin (1927), the University of Chicago (1929), Harvard University (1932, 1935), and a visiting professorship at Columbia University during the winter of 1946–7. Parker was a member of various professional societies, and he was President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1929–30.

Parker's philosophical interests included idealism and aesthetics, both driven by an emphasis on human values. In his first book, *The Self and Nature* (1917), he defended a plu-

ralistic idealism in which personal wills are the most fundamental realities. Parker returned to this theme in his last book, *Experience and Substance* (1941). His work on aesthetics included *The Principles of Aesthetics* (1920) and *The Analysis of Art* (1926) which incorporated a series of lectures he gave at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Parker's aesthetics, influenced by British idealist Bernard Bosanquet, defended a form of subjectivism. Parker also wrote on ethics and metaphysics. His personal philosophical interests included politics as well as questions about the value of the two world wars.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Self and Nature (Cambridge, Mass., 1917).
The Principles of Aesthetics (Boston, 1920; 2nd edn 1946).
The Analysis of Art (New Haven, Conn., 1926).
Human Values (New York, 1931).
Experience and Substance (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1941).
Philosophy of Value (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1957).

Other Relevant Works
"The Metaphysics of Historical Knowledge," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 2 (1913): 103–86.
"On the Notion of Value," *Philosophical Review* 38 (1929): 303–25.
"Empirical Idealism," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, eds G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 1, pp. 163–83.
"Reflexive Relations," *Philosophical Review* 42 (1933): 303–11.
"The Metaphysics of Value," *International Journal of Ethics* 44 (1934): 293–311.
"Value and Existence," *Ethics* 48 (1938): 475–86.

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v3, Proc of APA v23, Who Was Who in Amer v2, Who's Who in Phil

Reck, Andrew J. "Dewitt Parker's Metaphysics of Values," in *Recent American Philosophy: Studies of Ten Representative Thinkers* (New York, 1964), chap. 6.

Werkmeister, W. H. "Parker's Theory of Human Values," in his *Historical Spectrum of Value Theories, vol. 2: Anglo/American Group* (Lincoln, Neb., 1973), pp. 145–70.

<div align="right">

Heather E. Keith
Steven A. Fesmire

</div>

PARKHURST, Helen Huss (1887–1959)

Helen Huss Parkhurst was born on 3 January 1887 in Manhattan, New York. She was not related to another Helen Parkhurst born that same year who also became an educator in New York City. Parkhurst received her BA in 1911 and her MA in 1913, both from Bryn Mawr College. She taught for one year in 1911–12 at Dwight School in Englewood, New Jersey. In 1917 she received her PhD in philosophy from Bryn Mawr, with a dissertation entitled "Recent Logical Realism." While she was a student she spent a year as visiting fellow at the University of Cambridge in 1913–14, where she studied under Bertrand Russell and G. E. Moore. In this period she also visited Paris where she studied with Henri Bergson. She taught at Johns Hopkins University in 1915–16. During 1916–17 she was assistant professor in fine arts at Bryn Mawr. In 1917 she joined the philosophy faculty of Barnard College, Columbia University, where she remained until her retirement in 1952. She became assistant professor in 1924, associate professor in 1931, and full professor in 1944. Parkhurst died on 14 April 1959 in New York City.

Parkhurst's main specialty was aesthetics, a field she was drawn to after a study of Italian Renaissance painting. Parkhurst traveled extensively through Europe, Asia, and South America, in part related to her study of architecture. She received a Guggenheim Fellowship in 1931 to study North African and European architecture.

The central idea behind Parkhurst's *Beauty: An Interpretation of Art and the Imaginative Life* (1930) is that art is the supreme means through which we try to reconcile the basic antithetical elements of our nature. What we seek to reconcile are our cravings, "on the one hand for the uncomplicated, the easy, the regular, the familiar, the permanent, the predictable, and, on the other hand, for the complex, the difficult, the strange, the impermanent, the unpredictable" (1930, p. 30). As for our urge to express ourselves, Parkhurst – aligning herself with George Santayana – held that emotion is essentially about nothing but that it clamors for an object. If such an object is not easily found, we create one ourselves (1930, p. 34).

Cathedral (1936) is divided into three parts: the visible, the invisible, and the incorruptible. Whereas the first part looks at the role of the cathedral in medieval life, the remaining two parts see the cathedral as the mirror of that life, reflecting, as Parkhurst put it, "with amazing completeness the beliefs, hopes, fears, dreams, and mystical imaginings of mediaeval man" (1936, p. v).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Recent Logical Realism (Lancaster, Penn., 1917).

Beauty: An Interpretation of Art and the Imaginative Life (New York, 1930).

Cathedral: A Gothic Pilgrimage (Boston, 1936).

Great Books (New York, 1943).

Other Relevant Works

 "Platonic Pluralism in Esthetics," *Philosophical Review* 28 (1919): 466–78.

"The Obsolescence of Consciousness,"

Journal of Philosophy 17 (1920): 596–606.

"The Ethical and Aesthetic Implications of Realism," with W. P. Montague, *Mind* 30 (1921): 172–84.

"More Things in Heaven and Earth," *Journal of Philosophy* 21 (1924): 533–43.

"The Philosophic Creed of William Pepperell Montague," *Journal of Philosophy* 51 (1954): 593–603.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v33, Who Was Who in Amer v3, Who's Who in Phil

<div align="right">Cornelis de Waal</div>

PARRY, William Tuthill (1908–88)

William T. Parry was born on 22 October 1908 in Nutley, New Jersey. He earned his BA in psychology in 1928 from Columbia College, and his PhD from Harvard University in 1932. His dissertation on "Implication" was written under Alfred North WHITEHEAD. He was an assistant professor of philosophy at Harvard University from 1933 to 1937. He then held non-academic jobs and served in the US Army during World War II. In 1946 he joined the philosophy faculty of the University of Buffalo, and taught there until his retirement in 1979. Parry died on 13 August 1988 in Point Chautauqua, Dewittville, New York.

Parry studied C. I. LEWIS's logic of entailment, and developed an axiom system for a new type of implication, his "analytic implication." This system avoids the paradoxes in Lewis's system, in which a necessary proposition implies any proposition, and an impossible proposition implies any proposition. In Parry's system, any conclusion containing a term not already present in one of its premises

is invalid. Parry's work in modal logic was foundational for that field. His 1939 article on "Modalities in the *Survey* System of Strict Implication" demonstrates that all modalities can be reduced to forty-two, and also shows that no further reduction is possible.

In "Comments on a Variant Form of Natural Deduction" (1965), responding to Irving COPI's "Another Variant of Natural Deduction" (1956), Parry became embroiled in the controversy surrounding the correctness of the quantifier rules in Copi's *Symbolic Logic*. Parry shows that "the system of natural deduction proposed by Copi made by varying one restriction on Universal Generalization (UG) of the system of his Symbolic logic, is incorrect ..." (1965, p. 119). Parry showed that Copi's restrictions on the UG rule were inadequate precisely because Copi had failed to make use of W. V. QUINE's device of flagging the instantial variable in an inference by Existential Instantiation or Universal Generalization. Dag Prawitz (1965) showed that Parry's system is correct, by transforming deductions of it into corresponding deductions in Gentzen's system of natural deduction.

With Edward Hacker, Parry later turned to Aristotelian syllogistics and devised an arithmetization of syllogisms. Their *Aristotelian Logic* (1991) was a textbook of traditional syllogistics, designed as a corrective to many symbolic logic textbooks that omit traditional logic. Parry and Hacker held that such omissions are a mistake simply because "traditional logic contains many topics of value" (1991, p. ix), although they held that Gottlob Frege contributed more to modern logic than any else (p. 495). Hacker had used a system of pluses and minuses (1967), assigned on the basis respectively of whether a term is distributed or undistributed, and assigning 1 and 2 for positive terms, –1 and –2 for negative terms. Together, Hacker and Parry devised a similar technique for Boolean syllogisms, in which any or all of the terms may be empty.

<div align="center">1869</div>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Ein Axiomsystem für eine neue Art von Implikation (analytische Implikation)," *Ergebnisse eines Mathematisches Colloquium* 4 (1933): 5–6.

"Modalities in the *Survey* System of Strict Implication," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 4 (1939): 131–54.

"Comments on a Variant Form of Natural Deduction," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 30 (1965): 119–22.

"Pure Numerical Boolean Syllogisms," with Edward A. Hacker, *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 8 (1967): 321–4.

Aristotelian Logic, with Edward A. Hacker (Albany, N.Y., 1991).

Other Relevant Works

Parry's papers are at State University of New York at Buffalo.

"The Unity of Opposites: A Dialectical Principle," with Vivian J. McGill, *Science and Society* 12 (1948): 418–44.

"The Logic of C. I. Lewis," in *The Philosophy of C. I. Lewis*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (LaSalle, Ill., 1968), pp. 115–54.

"In Memoriam: Clarence Irving Lewis (1883–1964)," *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 11 (1972): 129–40.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Proc of APA v62*

Copi, Irving M. *Symbolic Logic* (New York, 1954).

———, "Another Variant of Natural Deduction," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 21 (1956): 52–5.

Goodman, Nelson. "Parry on Counterfactuals," *Journal of Philosophy* 54 (1957): 442–4.

Hacker, Edward A. "Number System for Immediate Inferences and the Syllogism in Aristotelian Logic," *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 8 (1967): 318–20.

Johnson, Fred. "Parry Syllogisms," *Notre Dame Journal of Symbolic Logic* 40 (1999): 414–19.

Prawitz, Dag. *Natural Deduction: A Proof-theoretical Study* (Stockholm, 1965).

Irving H. Anellis

PARSONS, Charles Dacre (1933–)

Charles Parsons was born on 13 April 1933 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. He is the son of the American sociologist Talcott PARSONS. Parsons has noted that his father had a significant impact on his early intellectual development, providing him with a model of science as a vocation and steering him in the direction of figures such as Kant. In 1954 Parsons received a BA in mathematics from Harvard University. He studied philosophy at King's College, Cambridge in 1954–5, and then went back to Harvard, where he earned the MA in 1956 and the PhD in philosophy in 1961. His doctoral thesis, "On Constructive Interpretation of Predicative Mathematics," advised by Burton DREBEN and W. V. QUINE, is concerned with mathematical developments in Hilbertian proof theory, especially as these were being shaped at the time by Georg KREISEL, Kurt Schütte, and others.

Parsons was a junior fellow in the Society of Fellows at Harvard from 1958 to 1961. He was assistant professor of philosophy at Cornell University in 1961–2 and at Harvard from 1962 to 1965. He became associate professor at Columbia University in 1965 and remained there until 1989, becoming a full professor in 1969. In 1989 he took a position at Harvard, where he became Edgar Pierce Professor of Philosophy in 1991. He was an editor of the *Journal of Philosophy* from 1966 to 1990 and has served a term as an editor of *The Bulletin of Symbolic Logic*. He was President of the Association for Symbolic Logic from 1989 until 1992, and has been a fellow of the American

Academy of Arts and Sciences since 1982.

Parsons's work includes technical contributions to mathematical logic, especially proof theory, as well as contributions to the philosophy of logic, the philosophy of mathematics, and Kant scholarship. His work in the philosophy of logic and the philosophy of mathematics extends over a remarkable range of topics and issues, and is widely held to be some of the most informed and sophisticated philosophical writing in these areas in recent times. He has written influential essays on mathematical intuition, the semantic paradoxes (especially the Liar paradox), the distinction between sets and classes, mathematical structuralism, the foundations of the iterative conception of set, predicative and constructive mathematics, substitutional quantification, modal and intensional logic, Platonism, and Kant's philosophy of arithmetic. He has also written important papers or commentaries on the views of Gottlieb Frege, L. E. J. Brouwer, Paul Bernays, Kurt GÖDEL, Quine, Hilary PUTNAM, Hao WANG, Edmund Husserl, and Franz Brentano.

One central line of argument in Parsons's work is that intuition has a significant if limited role to play in the foundations of mathematical knowledge. Influenced primarily by Kant, Hilbert and Bernays, Parsons has developed an account of the intuition of symbol configurations, of which stroke–string types (i.e., types of tokens such as ||||) are a particular example. He has investigated how far such a view of intuition will take us in mathematics. He has explored the view in connection with elementary syntax and arithmetic and, to some extent, with issues of predicativity and impredicativity. In his writings on set theory and Gödel he has investigated how far the notion of intuition can be extended in higher set theory. Parsons develops a view on which the natural numbers, sets, and other pure mathematical objects are not objects of intuition. He favors a kind of mathematical structuralism concerning such objects, a view that might be called metalinguistic structuralism. He has been interested in tracing the points at which structuralist considerations enter into mathematical thinking. Because we intuit objects such as stroke–string types and because this plays a role in the foundations of mathematical knowledge, structuralism cannot be the whole truth about mathematics, even if the intuition of symbol configurations is too limited to take us very far into mathematics. Parsons's view of intuition, however, can be thought of as playing a role in an account of the genesis of reference to mathematical objects.

Another important set of investigations in Parsons's writings is concerned with how the notions of set, class and truth are related. He has emphasized the analogy between paradoxes of truth, such as the Liar, and paradoxes of sets or classes, such as Russell's paradox. It is natural to hold that the paradoxes of set theory exhibit limitations on our ability to generalize predicate places. If we think of the concept of truth in connection with the generalization of sentence places then, in a manner similar to the Russell paradox, the Liar paradox exhibits limitations on our ability to generalize sentence places. Just as the one limitation can be interpreted as the nonexistence in some cases of a set or class to be the extension of a given predicate, so the other can be viewed as the nonexistence in some cases of a proposition expressed by a given sentence. If truth is taken instead as a predicate of sentences, there is still a close connection between problems about truth and the possible nonexistence of extensions.

Parsons finds the division between sets and classes, as this has been used in modern set theory, to be problematic in some respects. In his work on set theory he has investigated the distinction between sets as objects that are determined in stages in a quasi-combinatorial manner and classes as logical objects that are determined by extensions of predicates or properties. Some of Parsons's ideas on these topics have led to interesting work on issues about what it could mean to quantify over all sets. He has developed a view according to which the expression "for any set x" is ambiguous. There is also on his view a kind of systematic ambiguity involved in the Liar paradox.

Parsons's writings on Kant and other major figures in logic and mathematics are notable for their penetrating insights, rigor, attention to detail, and historical scholarship. Most of the important philosophical papers Parsons wrote up until 1977 are included in his book *Mathematics in Philosophy* (1983). In addition to producing many publications since that time, Parsons co-edited the posthumous writings of Gödel.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Hierarchies of Primitive Recursive Functions," *Zeitschrift für mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik* 14 (1968): 357–76.

"Mathematical Intuition," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 80 (1979–80): 145–68.

"Intensional Logic in Extensional Language," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 47 (1982): 289–328.

"Objects and Logic," *The Monist* 65 (1982): 491–516.

Mathematics in Philosophy: Selected Essays (Ithaca, N.Y., 1983).

"Arithmetic and the Categories," *Topoi* 3 (1984): 109–121.

On Constructive Interpretation of Predicative Mathematics (New York, 1990).

"The Structuralist View of Mathematical Objects," *Synthese* 84 (1990): 303–46.

"Structuralism and the Concept of Set," in *Modality, Morality and Belief: Essays in Honor of Ruth Barcan Marcus*, ed. Walter Sinnott-Armstrong (Cambridge, UK, 1995), pp. 74–92.

"What Can We Do 'in Principle'?" in *Logic and Scientific Methods*, ed. M. Dalla Chiara et al. (Dordrecht, 1997), pp. 335–54.

"Intuition and the Abstract," in *Philosophie in synthetischer Absicht*, ed. M. Stamm (Stuttgart, 1998), pp. 155–87.

"Intuition and Number," in *Mathematics and Mind*, ed. A. George (Oxford, 1994), pp. 141–57.

"Reason and Intuition," *Synthese* 125 (2000): 299–315.

"Husserl and the Linguistic Turn," in *Future Pasts: The Analytic Tradition in Twentieth-Century Philosophy*, ed. J. Floyd and S. Shieh (Oxford, 2001), pp. 123–41.

"Structuralism and Metaphysics," *Philosophical Quarterly* 54 (2004): 56–77.

Other Relevant Works

"Mathematics, Foundations of," in *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, vol. 5 (New York, 1967), pp. 188–213.

"On a Number–Theoretic Choice Schema and Its Relation to Induction," in *Intuitionism and Proof Theory*, ed. J. Myhill, A. Kino, and R. Vesley (Amsterdam, 1970), pp. 549–63.

"On n-quantifier Induction," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 37 (1972): 466–82.

"The Impredicativity of Induction," in *Proof, Logic and Formalization*, ed. M. Detlefsen (London, 1992), pp. 139–61.

"The Transcendental Aesthetic," in *The Cambridge Companion to Kant*, ed. Paul Guyer (Cambridge, UK, 1992), pp. 62–100.

"Platonism and Mathematical Intuition in Kurt Gödel's Thought," *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 1 (1995): 44–74.

Further Reading

Benacerraf, Paul, and Hilary Putnam, eds. *The Philosophy of Mathematics: Selected Readings*, 2nd edn (Cambridge, UK, 1983).

Martin, Robert, ed. *Recent Essays on Truth and the Liar Paradox* (Oxford, 1984).

Resnik, Michael, ed. *Mathematical Objects and Mathematical Knowledge* (Aldershot, UK, 1995).

Tieszen, Richard, and Gila Sher, eds. *Between Logic and Intuition: Essays in Honor of Charles Parsons* (Cambridge, UK, 2000).

Richard L. Tieszen

PARSONS, Talcott (1902–79)

Talcott Parsons was born on 10 December 1902 in Colorado Springs, Colorado. His family moved to New York City in 1918. He entered Amherst College in Massachusetts in 1920 to study biology and prepare for a career in medicine. However, after being introduced to the writings of Clarence AYRES and Thorstein VEBLEN, he switched his studies to economics and sociology. After receiving the BA from Amherst College in 1924, he studied at the London School of Economics with Bronislaw Malinowski, where he became interested in functionalism. He went on to study at the University of Heidelberg in 1925–6 where he first encountered the work of Max Weber, and received a DPhil degree in economics with a dissertation on capitalism.

Parsons was an instructor of economics and sociology at Amherst in 1926–7. He joined Harvard University in 1927, teaching sociology in the economics and social ethics departments. He joined the sociology department when it was established in 1931. Due to budget cuts at Harvard, Parsons remained an instructor of sociology until 1936 when he was finally promoted to assistant professor. He was promoted to associate professor in 1939 and became a full professor of sociology in 1944. In 1946 he became chair of a new interdisciplinary social science program combining sociology, cultural anthropology, and social psychology called the department of social relations. Parsons remained in the position until 1970, when the department was disbanded and a separate sociology department was reestablished. Parsons was elected President of the Eastern Sociological Society in 1942, co-chaired the European Section of the Harvard School of Overseas Administration in 1943–5, and was President of the American Sociological Association in 1949. He was President of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences from 1967 to 1971. After he retired in 1973, Parsons held several visiting professorships in the United States as well as Sweden, Japan, and Germany. He died on 8 May 1979 in Munich, Germany.

Parsons emerged from his sojourn at Heidelberg as a lifelong scholar of Weber. His adoption of Weberian methodology meant rejecting the positivism of, among others, Herbert Spencer, William Graham SUMNER, and Pitirim Sorokin. Specifically, he argued in *The Structure of Social Action* (1937) that on the background of Alfred North WHITEHEAD's philosophy of science, the sociology of Vilfredo Pareto, Emile Durkheim, and Weber could be taken to picture the development toward integrated, democratic society in the twentieth century, dismissing then contemporary totalitarianism. The two-pronged structure of social action, juxtaposing anomie and integration, he suggested, made sociology a science that helped study the logic of American and European societies.

In *The Social System* (1951), Parsons proposed a theory analyzing the structure of societies through action patterns that emulated dichotomous value-orientations in social roles, reconciling cultural, social, and psychological levels of system-building. Between 1951 and 1956 he delineated four analytical schemes for understanding social action, namely, the pattern variables, AGIL scheme, LIGA scheme, and the four-function scheme – the latter first introduced in *Economy and Society* (1956, with Smelser).

On the background of the four-function scheme, not losing sight of the action cum structure analytical venture, he revised his systems approach once again in the early 1960s. He came to develop a scheme of four symbolic media characterizing interaction in highly differentiated, modern democracy. Money, power (understood as *non-zero sum* expansive entity involving rights and responsibilities), influence, and value-commitment came to embody the fabric of society in *Politics and Social Structure* (1969). The background to the theory of societal community was two essays delineating emergence of modern systems in the course of the history of civilization starting with ancient Egypt (1966, 1971).

His last major effort was a volume on *The American University* (1973, with Platt), picturing his lifelong concern with the university as harbinger of occidental culture and societal integration. His last political statement concerned the near-fascist deviance in President Nixon's obsession with power (1977, with Gerstein). He left an unfinished book yet to be published, *The American Societal Community*.

Despite his merits as promoter of sociology (in a Weberian, not Spencerian sense), as well as prolific author of systematic theory but also essays on contemporary problems, he ended up a contested scholar rather than revered classic. His critics came from many quarters, including Marxism in the 1960s and the "Frankfurt School" in the 1980s. However, after 1990 Parsons's work began to be recognized for its analytical clarity and empirical relevance. In the age of globalization, his systems approach has proved a theory for understanding modern democracy as it has developed in the wake of the end of the Cold War.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Structure of Social Action (New York, 1937).

The Social System (Glencoe, Ill., 1951).

Economy and Society, with Neil Smelser (London, 1956).

Societies (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1966).

Politics and Social Structure (New York, 1969).

The System of Modern Societies (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1971).

The American University, with Gerald Platt (Cambridge, Mass., 1973).

Other Relevant Works

Parsons's papers are at Harvard University.

Trans., *Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, by Max Weber (London, 1930).

"On Building Social Systems Theory: A Personal History," *Daedalus* 99 (1970): 826–81.

The Theory of Social Action: The Correspondence of Alfred Schutz and Talcott Parsons, ed. Richard Grathoff (Bloomington, Ind., 1978).

Talcott Parsons on Institutions and Social Evolution: Selected Writings, ed. Leon Mayhew (Chicago, 1982).

Talcott Parsons: The Early Essays, ed. Charles Camic (Chicago, 1990).

Talcott Parsons on National Socialism, ed. Uta Gerhardt (New York, 1993).

The Talcott Parsons Reader, ed. Bryan S. Turner (Malden, Mass., 1999).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Economics*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Who Was Who in Amer v7*

Barber, Bernard, and Uta Gerhardt, eds. *Agenda for Sociology: Classic Sources and Current Uses of Talcott Parsons's Work* (Baden-Baden, Germany, 1999).

Black, Max, ed. *The Social Theories of Talcott Parsons: A Critical Examination* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1961).

Bourricaud, François. *The Sociology of Talcott Parsons* (Chicago, 1981).

Gerhardt, Uta. *Talcott Parsons: An Intellectual Biography* (New York, 2002).

Hamilton, Peter, ed. *Talcott Parsons: Critical Assessments*, 4 vols (London, 1992).

Johnson, Benton. *Functionalism in Modern Sociology: Understanding Talcott Parsons* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1975).

Loubser, Jan J., et al., eds. *Explorations in General Theory in Social Science: Essays in Honor of Talcott Parsons*, 2 vols (New York, 1976).

Nordquist, Joan. *Talcott Parsons* (Santa Cruz, Cal., 1987). A bibliography about Parsons.

Robertson, Roland, and Bryan Turner. *Talcott Parsons: Theorist of Modernity* (London, 1991).

Uta Gerhardt

PARSONS, Terence (1939–)

Terence Parsons was born on 26 July 1939 in Endicott, New York. He received his BA degree in physics from the University of Rochester in 1961, and his PhD in philosophy from Stanford University in 1966. From 1965 to 1972 Parsons taught at University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, rising to the rank of associate professor. In 1972 he went to the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, becoming full professor of philosophy there. From 1979 to 2000 Parsons was professor of philosophy at the University of California at Irvine, and since 2000 he has been professor of philosophy and linguistics at the University of California at Los Angeles.

Parsons is a major contributor to numerous areas of philosophy, including philosophy of language and linguistics, metaphysics, philosophical logic, and the history of these areas. These diverse interests are unified by the theme of constructing a formal semantics for natural language. A primary focus of Parsons's research has been to expose the underlying metaphysics of natural languages like English by clarifying the logical properties of these languages. In numerous books and publications, Parsons has shown the importance of clarifying the logical structure of natural language via the apparatus of formal languages of mathematical logic. In particular, he has argued that various important metaphysical claims can be defended by this technique. For instance, in *Events in the Semantics of English* (1990), Parsons presents a sophisticated development and defense of the Davidsonian view that even our simplest sentences contain quantification over events. In particular, Parsons shows how this view successfully addresses a broad range of syntactic and semantic issues of contemporary theoretical linguistics. For example, the proper logical structure of "Mary built the house" is not simply "Bmh", with the meaning that Mary (m) stands in the relation of building (B) to the house (h). Instead, Parsons argues that there are linguistic and philosophical reasons for treating the sentence as having a much more complicated structure, roughly given by the gloss "There is an event e which occurs before the present time, and e is a building event with Mary as the agent of e and the house as the theme of e, and the event e culminates." Parsons treats verbs as fundamentally predicates of events (or other event-like entities), although the verb also specifies certain relations, such as "x is the agent of y" that organize the verb's subject, object, etc. into their appropriate semantic roles in the sentence. Similarly, the extra predicate "culminates" enables the sentence to be distinguished from its progressive form, "Mary was building the house", which does not entail that the house was ever built (for example, in the case where Mary dies before finishing it). In such a case the event of building does not culminate, but is said to "hold."

In *Indeterminate Identity* (2000), Parsons has defended the view that identity is not a determinate relation. For example, if a ship is rebuilt bit by bit until the resulting ship is made of entirely different parts, it is natural to wonder whether the resulting ship is identical to the ship before any rebuilding began. Parsons argues that there is no answer to such a question because ships are only indeterminately identical. Therefore, the fact that we cannot determine whether the two ships are the same is not due to a failing of our rational powers or an imperfection of language, but is due to the metaphysical nature of the universe.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Nonexistent Objects (New Haven, Conn., 1980).
Events in the Semantics of English (Cambridge, Mass., 1990).
Indeterminate Identity (Oxford, 2000).

Other Relevant Works
"Essentialism and Quantified Modal Logic," *Philosophical Review* 78 (1969): 35–52.
"An Analysis of Mass Terms and Amount Terms," *Foundations of Language* 6 (1970): 362–88.

"What Do Quotation Marks Name? Frege's Theories of Quotations and That-Clauses," *Philosophical Studies* 42 (1982): 315–28.

"Assertion, Denial and the Liar Paradox," *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 13 (1984): 137–52.

"Why Frege Should Not Have Said 'The Concept Horse Is Not a Concept'," *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 3 (1986): 449–65.

"On the Consistency of the First-Order Portion of Frege's Logical System and of his Identification of Truth-Values with Courses of Values," *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 28 (1987): 161–8.

"Russell's Early Views on Denoting," in *Philosophical Analysis*, ed. David Austin (Dordrecht, 1988), pp. 17–44.

"The Progressive in English: Events, States and Processes," *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12 (1989): 213–41.

"True Contradictions," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 20 (1990): 335–54.

"Anaphoric Pronouns in Very Late Medieval Supposition Theory," *Linguistics and Philosophy* 17 (1994): 429–45.

"What is an Argument?" *Journal of Philosophy* 93 (1996): 164–85.

"Set Theory with Indeterminacy of Identity," with Peter Woodruff, *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 40 (1999): 473–95.

"Underlying Eventualities and Narrative Progression," *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25 (2002): 681–99.

Further Reading

Hetherington, Stephen. "Parsons and Possible Objects," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 62 (1984): 246–54.

Hintikka, Jaako. "Are There Nonexistent Objects? Why Not? But Where Are They?" *Synthese* 60 (1984): 451–8.

Kent Johnson

PATRICK, George Thomas White
(1857–1949)

George T. W. Patrick was born on 19 August 1857 in North Boscowen, New Hampshire. When he was seven, the family moved to Lyons, Iowa. He received a BA from the University of Iowa in 1878, and after working in Iowa and Colorado he went to Yale Divinity School, earning his BD in 1885. He then went to John Hopkins University for graduate study in philosophy and psychology with G. Stanley HALL, wrote a dissertation on "The Fragments of the Work of Ephesus on Nature," and received his PhD in philosophy in 1888.

In 1887 Patrick was appointed head of the department of mental and moral science and didactics at the University of Iowa. He soon established a psychological laboratory there and was responsible for psychology instruction until the arrival of Carl Emil SEASHORE in 1897. Patrick was professor of philosophy at Iowa until retiring in 1928. He was a member of Phi Beta Kappa and the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and served as President of the Western Philosophical Association (now the Western Division). In retirement, he lived near Stanford University, and he died on 21 May 1949 in Palo Alto, California.

Patrick engaged in some philosophical speculation inspired by recent experimental psychology and social psychology. He applied psychology to the problem of explaining war in *The Psychology of Relaxation* (1916), by suggesting that it is the relaxation of the effort to sustain civilization by surrendering to animal selfish instincts. He then offered a theory of gradual social evolution in *The Psychology of Social Reconstruction* (1920), which recommended eugenics among other measures. His philosophical psychology distinguished the mind from consciousness, attempting to separate explanations of mind as intelligent behavior from explanations of consciousness. Mind is easier to explain for Patrick, for the natural processes of the body, especially the

organizing and controlling functions of the brain, display intelligence. Following C. Lloyd Morgan, Patrick offered an emergent naturalism theory in *What is the Mind?* (1929) to explain the relation of brain and consciousness, especially concerned to preserve the reality of values from the simplistic mechanistic materialism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Psychology of Relaxation (Boston, 1916).
The Psychology of Social Reconstruction (Boston, 1920).
"The Emergent Theory of Mind," *Journal of Philosophy* 19 (1922): 701–8.
An Introduction to Philosophy (Boston, 1924). Published as *The World and Its Meaning: An Introduction to Philosophy* (Boston, 1925). 2nd edn, with Frank M. Chapman, as *An Introduction to Philosophy* (Boston, 1935).
What is the Mind? (New York, 1929).

Other Relevant Works
Patrick's papers are at the University of Iowa.
Trans. with Maude Patrick, *Philosophy of the Present in Germany*, by Oswald Külpe (London, 1913).
George Thomas White Patrick, An Autobiography: Teacher and Philosophy, ed. Herbert Martin (Iowa City, Iowa, 1946).

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v1, *Proc of APA v23*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Seashore, Emil C. "George Thomas White Patrick," *American Journal of Psychology* 62 (1949): 451–2.

John R. Shook

PATTEN, Simon Nelson (1852–1922)

Simon Patten was born on 1 May 1852 in Sandwich, Illinois. He attended Northwestern University during 1874–6 and then the University of Halle in Germany, from which he earned a PhD degree in 1879 after studying economics and writing a dissertation on local taxation in the United States. His mentor in Germany, Johannes Conrad, an eminent member of the Historical School of economists, influenced Patten's conception of the complexity of human nature and the role of group feelings and action in social change. He was also influenced by British economists to be skeptical about the organicism and historicism that characterized the Historical School. Patten struggled upon returning to the United States in 1879. He briefly attended law school and over next six years held a succession of elementary and high school teaching positions in Illinois and Iowa. He was one of three founders of the American Economic Association, and in 1885 he published his first book, *The Premises of Political Economy*, at his own expense. In 1888 he became a professor of economics at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania. The University of Pennsylvania dismissed Patten in 1918 because of his opposition to United States entry into World War I. By that time, his writing had become increasingly speculative and inaccessible. Patten died on 24 July 1922 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

From the late 1880s until World War I, Patten was one of the best-known and most influential scholars and teachers of economics of his generation. He was the first person to study systematically the transition from an economy of scarcity to an economy of abundance in industrial countries. He was widely acknowledged to be the first to realize that because men and women in these countries would no longer be forced to struggle for the basic necessities and comforts of life, they must develop new social, aesthetic, moral, and religious values and new restraints against destructive desires.

Patten developed his ideas about the economy of abundance and policies to encourage appropriate restraints to make that economy sustainable in many books and articles. Most of his writing was highly technical as well as tortured and elliptical. However, in 1907 he published *The New Basis of Civilization*, which was reprinted eight times between 1908 and 1915. This book was based on a series of public lectures and heavily edited by his friends. Patten articulated his theories in plain language and drew implications from them for policy that strongly influenced the new profession of social work.

Patten's ideas informed social policy through his students. These included Edward T. Devine, who as both director of a social agency and an educator helped to define the profession of social work; Rexford G. Tugwell, an economist who served in senior positions in the federal government in the 1930s and 1940s; and Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor from 1932 to 1945 and the first woman to serve in the cabinet.

For a generation the concept of abundance was synonymous with Simon Patten. He established the economics of consumption as the basis of abundance and linked its sustainability to strong policies to address the causes and consequences of poverty and create incentives for individuals to restrain feelings and desires that could compromise it. Nevertheless, there was no continuity between Patten's work and the rediscovery of the economics of abundance and its consequences for policy by economists and social theorists, notably John Kenneth GALBRAITH, in the 1950s and 1960s.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Premises of Political Economy (Philadelphia, 1885).
The Consumption of Wealth (Philadelphia, 1889).
The Theory of Dynamic Economics (Philadelphia, 1892).
The Development of English Thought (New York, 1898).

The Theory of Prosperity (New York, 1902).
The New Basis of Civilization (New York, 1907).
The Social Basis of Religion (New York, 1911).

Other Relevant Works
Patten's papers are at the University of Pennsylvania and the archives of the American Economic Association in Nashville, Tennessee.

Further Reading
Comp Amer Thought, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Economics*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v11*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Fox, Daniel M. *The Discovery of Abundance: Simon N. Patten and the Transformation of Social Theory* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1967).

Daniel M. Fox

PAYNE, Daniel Alexander (1811–93)

Daniel Payne was born on 24 February 1811 in Charleston, South Carolina. Although born in the south during the time of slavery, Payne and his family were free. His early education consisted of lessons from his mother, training available through the Cumberland Street Methodist Episcopal Church, and training by tutors in the basics of several ancient languages, history, the natural sciences, and Scripture. Payne worked to educate young children in his community, although laws against educating African Americans resulted in the dismantling of the school he started in South Carolina. Payne enrolled in Gettysburg Theological College in 1835 because of his growing interest in the pastorate, but health issues necessitated the end of his formal education in 1837.

Payne was ordained by the Lutheran Church (Franckean Synod) two years after ending seminary training and he began a long career in church ministry. In 1841 he left the Lutheran Church and affiliated with the African Methodist Episcopal Church (AME Church). As a member of this denomination he continued his commitment to formal education by developing educational opportunities for young people in Philadelphia. In addition to this educational work, he was ordained and pastored Israel Bethel AME Church in Baltimore, Maryland. Through his direct relationship with the educational system and with the AME Church, Payne began to publish articles that extended his concern with formal education by encouraging ministers within the Church to seek opportunity to refine their grasp of philosophy, theology, and the other basic elements of a classical education. His stance on formal education was convincing, and as a result he was made chair of the AME Church's Committee on Education. In this capacity he developed a curriculum to be followed by those entering AME Church ministry. For Payne this educational agenda was one dimension of his attack on emotion-based and intellectually weak folk religion dominant within many of the local churches. He was much more interested, for example, in formal hymns and thoughtful sermons than old spirituals and the religious energy of ecstatic experience encouraged through superficial sermons by untrained preachers.

In 1848 Payne began work on a history of the AME Church that explored its doctrinal development, historical progression, and its theological and philosophical foundation. This history was followed by other texts: *The Semi-Centenary and the Retrospection of the AME Church in the United States of America* (1866); The *History of the African Methodist Episcopal Church from 1816 to 1856* (1891); and *Recollections of Seventy Years* (1888).

In 1852 Payne was elected a bishop of the AME Church. With greater visibility and control over a larger region of the Church, Payne began developing literary groups and lyceums to encourage attention to theological and philosophical issues of the day. A more institutionally significant development initiated by Payne was the purchase of Wilberforce University in Ohio. After purchasing this institution, he guided its development for several years as its President from 1863 to 1876. He was the first African American to head a college in the United States. In his later years he was a prolific author and lecturer. He died on 29 November 1893 near Xenia, Ohio.

Although Payne had no formal training in philosophy, his sermons, speeches, and lectures addressed numerous philosophical issues as they related to the development of the African-American community during the nineteenth century. He gave a considerable amount of attention to the problem of evil and the manner in which African Americans might respond to this issue in keeping with a firm faith in good and clear sense of historical context. This issue was particularly important in light of slavery, the devastation of the Civil War and the failure of Reconstruction. In addition, Payne's writings speak to a concern with philosophy of identity as it relates to the effort of African Americans to gain stature as full citizens of the United States. Other issues debated within African-American communities did not escape his attention, and as a result he gave considerable thought to the relationship between Africa and African Americans. Some argued for emigration as the proper stance – the movement of African Americans back to Africa for cultural renewal, political progress – and the natural outgrowth of a teleological understanding of history. Payne connected African Americans to the United States, and argued that the identity and purpose of African-American life is revealed through work within the context of North America. He maintained that a proper relationship to Africa involved missionary activity by which African Americans took Christian sensibilities to foreign lands as a part of divine providence. He warned, however, that they must avoid introducing yet another form of imperialism.

Issues of ontology were present in Payne's writings and sermons to the extent that his time period was marked by a sense of American "choseness" (in other words, manifest destiny) that often involved a degrading of African Americans through a questioning of their humanity and their ability to participate within American society as equals. Payne argued that African Americans were in fact children of God. Regarding this point, in a speech titled "Welcome to the Ransomed" (1862), he discussed the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. He remarked that "the Eternal loves all, and manifests the infinity of his nature, by his universal care for all mankind. In this, He also demonstrates His universal Fatherhood, and thereby establishes the brotherhood of man." African Americans, by this connection to the divine, are worthy of full participation in the life of this country. And in fact, the positive development of the United States required their creativity and talents exercised with morality and an ethic of honest labor. Payne was convinced that slavery deformed humanity by damaging moral agency. However, with freedom came the potential for moral regeneration and active participation in the unfolding of God's plan for humanity. In this sense, Payne's abolitionist sensibilities were guided by a philosophy of human progress as an inevitable part of a divine plan.

These various dimensions of his work made Daniel Payne one of the most important figures of the nineteenth century, and arguably the most important African-American church leader of his era.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Semi-centenary and the Retrospective of the African Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America (Baltimore, Md., 1866).

Treatise on Domestic Education (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1885).

Recollections of Seventy Years (Nashville, Tenn., 1888).

History of the African Methodist Episcopal Church from 1816 to 1856 (Nashville, Tenn., 1891).

Other Relevant Works

The Pleasures and other Miscellaneous Poems (Baltimore, Md., 1850).

Sermons Delivered by Bishop Daniel A. Payne before the General Conference of the A.M.E. Church, Indianapolis, Ind., May, 1888, ed. C. S. Smith (Nashville, Tenn., 1888).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v4*

Angell, Stephen, and Anthony Pinn. *Social Protest Thought in the AME Church, 1862–1939* (Nashville, Tenn., 2000).

Coan, Josephus Roosevelt. *Daniel Alexander Payne, Christian Educator* (Philadelphia, 1935).

Griffin, Paul R. *Black Theology as the Foundation of Three Methodist Colleges: The Educational Views and Labors of Daniel Payne, Joseph Price, Isaac Lane* (Lanham, Md., 1984).

Smith, Charles S. *The Life of Daniel Alexander Payne* (Nashville, Tenn., 1894).

Wilmore, Gayraud S. *Black Religion and Black Radicalism: An Interpretation of the Religious History of Afro-American People*, 3rd edn (Maryknoll, N.Y., 1998).

Anthony B. Pinn

PEABODY, Andrew Preston (1811–93)

Andrew Preston Peabody was born on 19 March 1811 in Beverly, Massachusetts. His father Andrew, a teacher, wanted him to be educated in order to enter the Christian ministry. As a young child Andrew displayed remarkable academic ability. At the age of three he was able to read, and he passed the entrance examinations of

Harvard College at the age of twelve. Finishing his studies at fifteen, he was one of the youngest persons ever to graduate with a BA from Harvard in 1926. At the age of seventeen, Peabody became principal at Portsmouth Academy in New Hampshire. In 1829 he returned to Harvard to study at the divinity school and graduated with a BD in 1832. In 1833 he was ordained and became junior pastor of South Parish in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. His senior colleague, Dr. Nathan Parker, minister of South Parish Unitarian Church, died only two or three weeks later, and Peabody was promoted to the post.

While a pastor, he published a series of sermons, short essays, and lectures and gained a reputation as a scholarly writer. He was regarded as a devoted pastor and inspiring preacher. Peabody wrote for the *Whig Review* and the *Christian Register*. He defended Unitarianism and argued that the Bible supported its beliefs. In 1853 he became editor of *The North American Review*, a position he held for ten years. Among his social causes was the promotion of temperance, the abolition of slavery, and pacifism. He was a vice president of the American Peace Society for fifty years. In 1860 he was appointed professor of Christian morals at Harvard, and also was preacher to the university. He served twice as acting president of Harvard. He retired in 1881, and died on 10 March 1893 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Peabody wrote over one hundred sermons and addresses along with his many books. He also published translations of Plutarch and Cicero and edited *A Commentary on the New Testament* with Rev. John Hopkins Morison. In *A Manual of Moral Philosophy* (1873) Peabody discusses conscience, sources of knowledge, virtue, self-control, honesty, courage, manners, and government. In the section on sources of knowledge, he states that, with the exception of direct communication from God, all knowledge is derived from observation. His concept of honesty greatly involves obligations and relationships with others. He writes that honesty enjoins the paying of debts and the performance of contracts. Peabody was considered one of the leading critical writers of his time. He was known as a biblical scholar and an elegant writer who had exceptional reasoning ability. His addresses were as clear as his writings and were admired by many.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Lectures on Christian Doctrine (Boston, 1844).
Christian Consolations. Sermons Designed to Furnish Comfort and Strength to the Afflicted (Boston, 1847).
Conversation: Its Faults and Its Graces (Boston, 1856).
A Sunday School Hymn Book: with Devotional Services (Boston, 1857).
Christianity the Religion of Nature: Lectures Delivered before the Lowell Institute (Boston, 1864).
Bringing Young Children to Jesus: A Sermon Preached at Providence, R.I. (Boston, 1865).
Reminiscences of European Travel (New York, 1868).
A Manual of Moral Philosophy: Designed for Colleges and High Schools (New York, 1873).
Christianity and Science: A Series of Lectures (New York, 1874).
Christian Belief and Life (Boston, 1875).
Harvard Reminiscences (Boston, 1888).

Other Relevant Works
Peabody's papers are at Harvard University.
Physical and Mental Training (Portsmouth, N.H., 1855).
Jesus Walking on the Sea: A Sermon of Faith and Hope (Boston, 1864).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v3*
Young, Edward J. *Andrew P. Peabody: A Memoir* (Cambridge, Mass., 1896).

Hani Morgan

PEABODY, Elizabeth Palmer (1804–94)

Elizabeth Palmer Peabody was born on 16 May 1804 in Billerica, Massachusetts and died on 3 January 1894 in Boston, Massachusetts. Besides being a teacher, Peabody was a member of the transcendentalist circle and the transcendentalist "Hedge Club," a bookseller, a publisher, an editor, a writer, an art and a literary critic, an abolitionist, and a reformer. Her mother, an excellent teacher, provided her with creative home schooling, but later Elizabeth would further educate herself in the "outside" world; Ralph Waldo EMERSON, for example, gave her Greek lessons. She also benefited from the inspiring sermons of William Ellery Channing, the Unitarian minister and "spiritual father" of transcendentalism. Her early employment involved serving as amanuensis to Channing. Later on in life, Peabody would write a moving tribute to Channing and extol his concept of theology in her *Reminiscences of Rev. Wm. Ellery Channing* (1880).

After teaching at various private schools for about a decade, Peabody took a position in Bronson ALCOTT's experimental Temple School in Boston from 1834 to 1836. Her venture with Alcott prompted her to write *Record of a School* (1835) in which she outlined his teaching methodologies as well as his belief in encouraging children's independent and intuitive thinking. She tried to stave off negative responses to Alcott's open classroom discussions of human anatomy. And ultimately, she advocated a type of education that fostered communal harmony rather than the excessive individualism of the transcendentalist movement.

Peabody was the eldest of the illustrious Peabody sisters of Salem. These included Mary Peabody, the writer and teacher who would marry educator Horace Mann, and Sophia Peabody, an aspiring artist who would become Nathaniel Hawthorne's wife. Elizabeth might arguably be viewed as the most intellectually versatile of the sisters, to which her many interests in education, philosophy, reform, and literature attest. Her interest in education was sparked by the influence of her mother, who was a remarkable teacher, and of Bronson Alcott. Traditionally, she is best known as one of the founders of the kindergarten in America, having learned the principles from Friedrich Froebel's writings, but she was involved in many other ventures throughout her lifetime, ventures which went beyond the strict parameters of True Womanhood – and its attendant focus on nurturing or teaching – into the public sphere of men's ideas and activities.

In 1839 Peabody opened her famous bookshop and lending library – as well as meeting place for intellectuals – in Boston. Among the literati who graced the premises was Margaret Fuller, who held her series of "Conversations" for Boston's elite daughters between 1839 and 1840. Transcendentalists and reformers like Orestes BROWNSON, Theodore Parker, Emerson, and Channing gathered there. George and Sophia Ripley planned their utopian enterprise, Brook Farm, at her bookshop. Peabody, ever mindful of mentoring male geniuses, persuaded Hawthorne to write three children's collections, which she published under her own imprint. Never relinquishing her appreciation of pedagogical methodology, she also published several handbooks on teaching by Anna Cabot Lowell and by Louisa Minot.

Emerson entrusted Peabody with the editorship of the transcendentalist journal *The Dial* in the last two years of its existence, though not without protest from Fuller, who never fully appreciated Peabody's intellect. Peabody published some of her own essays in *The Dial*, and inevitably, those that were inspired by discussions of Brook Farm and other communal utopias were the most interesting and successful. These essays included "A Glimpse of Christ's Idea of Society" (October 1841); "Plan of West Roxbury Community" (January 1842); and "Fourierism" (April 1844).

In 1844 Peabody joined Charles Kraitsir, a Hungarian refugee physician, in opening up an

academy in Boston. She was attracted to Kraitsir's study of linguistics and German idealistic philosophy for the same reason she was attracted to transcendentalist ideas which equated language with natural symbols and placed intuition above the intellect (Neussendorfer 2000, p. 243).

With the failure of *The Dial* in 1844, Peabody courageously established her own intellectual and transcendentalist journal, *Aesthetic Papers*, but unfortunately, only one issue in 1849 was released, although that issue included Thoreau's famous essay, "Resistance to Civil Government." Her combined interest in linguistics, pedagogy, aesthetics, history, and theology inspired many of her writings of this period, the most well-known essays being "The Dorian Measure" and "Language" in the issue of *Aesthetic Papers*. Peabody continued to be fascinated by aesthetics, and she collected her earlier writings on the aesthetics of painter Washington Allston as well as other essays she had written about theology, atheism, and transcendentalism in a volume, *Last Evening with Allston and Other Papers* (1886).

Peabody's interests in pedagogy, as influenced by Kraitsir, Pestalozzi, and Froebel, culminated in *Lectures in the Training Schools for Kindergartners* (1886). In the 1840s Peabody advocated using charts to instruct students and the system of history teaching devised by Polish educator Josef Bem. She was inspired by Margarethe Schurz, the wife of Carl Schurz, US Secretary of the Interior, in her successful education of her verbally adept daughter. Schurz pointed Peabody to the kindergarten experience as the reason for her daughter's success. Peabody, always convinced that the early years were instrumental for a child's verbal development and language acquisition, established her first kindergarten in 1860 on Beacon Hill in Boston. With her sister Mary Peabody Mann, Elizabeth wrote a handbook for kindergarten training called *Moral Culture of Infancy, and Kindergarten Guide* (1863). In 1867 and 1868 Peabody toured many of Froebel's kindergartens in major German cities and helped establish the "English Froebel Society" in England, on her way home. In 1870–71, she served as the kindergarten expert for the US Senate, and many kindergartens sprang up throughout the United States because of her activism. She founded the periodical, *The Kindergarten Messenger*, and edited it from 1873 to 1877. She also organized the American Froebel Society in 1878 and became its first President.

Peabody was also interested in reform movements and revolutionary causes. She supported the efforts of Hungarian revolutionary, Lajos Kossuth, and assisted his two sisters, who were also exiled, going so far as to write an essay on behalf of Madame Kossuth Meszlenyi. By mid century, Peabody was strongly advocating for anti-slavery causes and befriended Frederick DOUGLASS and William Lloyd GARRISON. She mentored Mattie Griffith, in her writing of *Autobiography of a Female Slave* (1857). She constantly bombarded Hawthorne and her sister Sophia with abolitionist writing, which alienated her from Hawthorne. And she was even able to have a meeting with President Abraham Lincoln to discuss the abolitionist cause. Also from mid century on Peabody became a more vocal proponent of women's rights, attending various conventions, such as the Boston Woman's Rights Convention in 1855.

On a personal level, she tried to help victimized and battered women and also campaigned for the education of the underprivileged and for freed slaves. In her sixties, Elizabeth Peabody took up the cause of Native Americans, and with her sister Mary helped Paiute Indian leader, Winnemucca, tell her story through writing and through speaking engagements. Peabody was intent upon revealing the corruption of the US government in their shabby treatment of the Indians and wrote countless essays and letters on behalf of Winnemucca and her cause. Even at the age of eighty, Peabody was concerned with social reform and donated a large monetary sum (an

endowment given to her by students who had attended her kindergarten many years earlier) to the Paiutes. Peabody's lifelong success could be measured by the many hearts and minds she touched, as educator, publisher, reformer, literary critic, and cultural historian.

Peabody's philosophical ideas are tied to her transcendentalist views and to her pedagogical principles, which certainly intersected, especially in her tenure as assistant to Alcott at his school. In her recording of daily lessons at the Temple School, *Record of a School*, Peabody discusses the fundamentals of teaching children: she agrees with Alcott in fostering introspection, self-knowledge, and an appreciation of nature, as a vehicle towards sparking the imagination. She does differ from Alcott in maintaining that "a private conscience in the young will naturally be the highest," whereas Alcott "thinks a common conscience is to be cultivated in a school" (1835, p. xiv). Peabody feels that since each child has an innate sense of duty, his individuality can be encouraged, without jeopardizing the welfare of the collective unit. Peabody calls for children to express themselves freely, as "No subject interests children as much as self-analysis." (p. xx) Both Alcott and Peabody asked students to engage in journal-writing and free association to access their innermost thoughts. Encouraging free expression rather than the rules of grammar, they sound much like present-day teachers of composition: "Every one knows that a technical memory of words and of rules of composition, gives very little command of language; while a rich consciousness, a quick imagination, and force of feeling seem to unlock the treasury." (p. xxvi) Though Peabody finally had a falling out with Alcott when the community accused him of being too candid with students about sexual reproduction, she, as a true Romantic, does defend him from not straying "from the Principle of Beauty, which is the law of the Imagination" (p. xlii). But ultimately, she felt that Alcott was too manipulative in eliciting responses from students.

In the transcendentalist vein, Peabody shared many of the German idealists' perspectives of language. Her interest in history, especially in biblical exegesis, and in language, was manifest in her devotion to J. G. Herder's *The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*, which she used as a textbook for her literary salon for women in Boston. From Herder, she adopted the idea that all words, of all languages, had their common origins in nature (Gura 1977, p. 155). Her belief that words were symbolic of eternal truths in nature was common to the American transcendentalists' theory of the Oversoul. Peabody read Emerson's *Nature* enthusiastically, when it appeared in 1836. Her appropriation of Herder's philosophy of scriptural language culminated in several seminal essays, "Language" and "The Dorian Measure," that appeared in her *Aesthetic Papers* and that were later republished in *Last Evening With Allston And Other Papers*. In her essay "Language," Peabody reviews Horace Bushnell's ideas about linguistics and states "that language is not arbitrary or accidental, but springs out of nature, with which it has vital connection" (p. 139). In "The Dorian Measure" Peabody, influenced by the writings of Karl Otfried Mueller, compared the Dorian culture to her contemporary Christian culture to applaud the classical model of balance and symmetry, the harmony of the arts, the well-rounded education of body and soul, and the emphasis upon a universal morality for the common welfare. She finds fault with the contemporaneous Americans' egotism in preventing a harmonious commonwealth, and she poses the rather blasphemous question, "Can Christ govern mankind as completely as Apollo governed the Dorians?" (p. 116). In an essay for *The Dial*, "Brook Farm Interpretation of Christ's Idea of Society," Peabody aligns the early Christian society of Christ and his disciples with the classical ideal. She asserts that "Morals and Religion are not something induced upon the human being, but an opening out of the inner life." (p. 199)

In the 1840s Peabody contributed several essays about utopian living to the transcen-

dentalist journal *The Dial*, (also later reprinted in *Last Evening with Allston*) about Fourierism in America and about the Brook Farm experiment, where her future brother-in-law, Hawthorne, found a home for a short while. In these essays, Peabody decries the rampant individualism she perceives in American society and pleads for community over competition, which were ostensibly the hallmarks of Brook Farm. But she also warned about the social hierarchies that could appear, even in utopia. Though she visited Brook Farm, Peabody was never a member, but her writings about the experiment show her apprehensions as well as hopes for communal living. In "Brook Farm Interpretation of Christ's Idea of Society" (in *Last Evening with Allston*) Peabody proclaims that, "The final cause of human society is the unfolding of the individual man into every form of perfection, without let or hindrance, according to the inward nature of each." (1886, pp. 198–9) She suggests that education can prevent tyranny over the individual by an institution or government. Appropriating ideas from Channing, Swedenbourg, and Fourier in her essay "Fourierism," Peabody ultimately decides that the Fourierist experiment will not succeed unless it is "made alive by Christ." In "Egotheism, The Atheism of To-Day," an essay she writes for *The Religious Magazine* (1858) which also appears in *Evening with Allston*, Peabody laments the fact that reformers of her time have succumbed to an extreme and debilitating individualism: "The Egotheist sees that nothing man says or does is as great as himself, the sayer and the doer." (1886, p. 252)

In *Lectures in the Training Schools for Kindergartners*, Peabody, drawing from the ideas of European educators Pestalozzi and Froebel, discusses the proper relationship of the child "to his fellows, to nature, and to God" (p. i). She focuses on mother-love as the key to good nurturing and establishes a psychological model for children's behavior. She also reiterates her earlier idea, a transcendentalist tenet, that the individual self could be aligned with the communal self in the classroom; using Froebel's principles, she asserts that "conscious individuality, which gives the sense of free personality, the starting point, as it were, of intelligent will, is perfectly consistent with and even dependent on the simultaneous development of the social principle in all its purity and power" (p. 37). Peabody also cites Goethe in her analysis of the child's nature and the parent's projection: "The child teaches his parents (as Goethe has said) what his parents omitted to teach him." (p. 87) And in describing the need for the transcendentalist reconciliation of mind and matter, of spirit and body, Peabody again alludes to Goethe: "A word is both spiritual and material, being an articulate form of the voice, which, as Goethe happily said, is the nearest spiritual of our bodily powers, taking significance from the articulating organs, which are symbolical, like everything else in material nature ...." (pp. 89–90) Thus, children can readily understand at an early age figurative language, and Peabody ultimately perceived them, in the manner of the typical Romantic, as "living books of nature" (p. 189). Peabody believed that the task of the kindergarten teacher (or the mother) is not to enforce learning upon the child but to "awaken – the feelings of harmony, beauty, unity, and conscience" (p. 194).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Record of a School, Exemplifying the General Principles of Spiritual Culture (Boston, 1835). 3rd edn, *Record of Mr. Alcott's School, Exemplifying the Principles and Methods of Moral Culture* (Boston, 1874).

A Plea for the Use of the Fine Arts in the Decoration of Churches (New York, 1857).

Moral Culture of Infancy, and Kindergarten Guide, with Mary Peabody Mann (New York, 1863; 1870).

Reminiscences of Rev. Wm. Ellery Channing, D.D. (Boston, 1880).

Last Evening with Allston and Other Papers (Boston, 1886)

Lectures in the Training Schools for Kindergartners (Boston, 1886).

Sarah Winnemucca's Practical Solution of the Indian Problem (Cambridge, Mass., 1886).

Other Relevant Works

Peabody's papers are in Boston Public Library, Antioch College, New York Public Library, and the Concord Free Library in Massachusetts.

"Principles and Methods of Education: My Experience as a Teacher," *American Journal of Education* 32 (1882): 721–42.

Letters of Elizabeth Palmer Peabody: American Renaissance Woman, ed. Bruce A. Ronda (Middletown, Conn., 1984).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v12, Women Phils

Baylor, Ruth M. *Elizabeth Palmer Peabody: Kindergarten Pioneer* (Philadelphia, 1965).

Baym, Nina. "The Ann Sisters: Elizabeth Peabody's Millennial Historicism," *American Literary History* 3 (1991): 27–45.

Deese, Helen R. "A New England Women's Network: Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, Caroline Healey Dall, and Delia S. Bacon," *Legacy* 8 (1992): 77–91.

Gura, Philip F. "Elizabeth Palmer Peabody and the Philosophy of Language," *ESQ: A Journal of the American Renaissance* 23 (1977): 154–63.

Idol, John. L., Jr. "Elizabeth Palmer Peabody: A Tireless Hawthorne Booster," in *Hawthorne and Women: Engendering and Expanding the Hawthorne Tradition* (Amherst, Mass., 1999), pp. 36–44.

Irons, Susan H. "Channing's Influence on Peabody: Self-Culture and the Danger of Egoism," *Studies in the American Renaissance* 16 (1992): 121–35.

Jones, Diane Brown. "Elizabeth Palmer Peabody's Transcendental Manifesto," *Studies in the American Renaissance* 16 (1992): 195–207.

Neussendorfer, Margaret. "Elizabeth Palmer Peabody," in *Dictionary of Literary Biography*, vol. 223, *The American Renaissance in New England, Second Series* (Detroit, 2000), pp. 231–51.

Ronda, Bruce A. *Elizabeth Palmer Peabody: A Reformer on Her Own Terms* (Cambridge, Mass., 1999).

Monika Elbert

PEABODY, Francis Greenwood (1847–1936)

Francis Greenwood Peabody was born on 4 December 1847 in Boston, Massachusetts, and died on 28 December 1936 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. He was the youngest child of Ephraim and Mary Jane Peabody. His father was a prominent Unitarian minister whose death in 1856 left the family in a difficult situation; they lived in a frugal manner and were aided financially by friends. Francis's sister Ellen married the president of Harvard University, Charles W. Eliot, and among his cousins was philosopher Francis Ellingwood ABBOTT. Francis attended the Dixwell school in Boston, then graduated from Harvard College (BA 1869), and the Harvard Divinity School (MA, STB 1872). During 1872–3, he studied in Germany with August Tholuck at the University of Halle. After returning to America, Peabody taught briefly at Antioch College in Ohio in 1873. He was ordained minister of First Parish Church in Cambridge, Massachusetts, on 31 March 1874. Peabody remained there until 1879 when he resigned due to illness. In 1880 he became a lecturer of ethics and homiletics for the Harvard Divinity

School, and then served as Parkman Professor of Theology from 1881 to 1886, preacher to the university from 1886 to 1906, Plummer Professor of Christian Morals from 1886 until his retirement in 1912, and Divinity School Dean from 1901 to 1906.

By 1906 Peabody had created a department of social ethics in Harvard's Divinity School and was elected Chairman. He helped to establishing a departmental library, a museum, and programs of instruction at the graduate and undergraduate level. From 1890 until his death he was on the board of trustees of Hampton Institute in Virginia for American Indians and African Americans. He had over 200 publications, and he was the first American exchange professor at the University of Berlin in 1905. He was awarded the Order of the Prussian Crown in 1907 for his excellence as an educator. Peabody gave the Lyman Beecher Lectures at Yale Divinity School in 1904, and the Hibbert Lectures at Oxford University in 1925.

In Peabody's 1909 book, *The Approach to the Social Question*, he discusses aspects of economics, social science, ethics, and religion. In the section on social science, he discusses the scientific method and how it leads one to appreciate the infinity of nature, as well as problematic relationships between people, such as the instability of the modern family. The chapter on economics examines the thought of various philosophers including Marx and Engels.

Peabody was a leading theologian in the field of social ethics. He was a strong advocate of the "Social Gospel," a movement based on social and economic reform. He opposed the growing commercialism and materialism of American society. Peabody believed in voluntary worship, and under his leadership Harvard became the first American college where worship was not mandatory. He shared the view, with his colleagues William JAMES and Josiah ROYCE, that people possess freedom of the will. His contributions to American thought included opposition to intellectual ideology he believed was harmful to the Christian faith. He criticized the belief that science was the only means to truth. Peabody argued that science could provide no knowledge of spiritual principles. As an advocate of nineteenth-century German religious thought, he argued in favor of philosophers like Kant, Fichte, Hegel, Lotze, and Schleiermacher. His ideas on social ethics were often aimed at solving modern social and ethical problems of civilization. The trends that he began in social ethics have had an influence on higher education that have persisted to the present day.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Jesus Christ and the Social Question (New York, 1900).

The Religion of an Educated Man (New York, 1904).

Jesus Christ and the Christian Character (New York, 1905).

The Approach to the Social Question (New York, 1909).

The Christian Life in the Modern World (New York, 1914).

The Religious Education of an American Citizen (New York, 1917).

The Apostle Paul and the Modern World (New York, 1923).

The Social Teaching of Jesus Christ (Philadelphia, 1924).

The Church of the Spirit (New York, 1925).

Other Relevant Works

Peabody's papers are at Harvard University and Hampton University.

Mornings in the College Chapel (Boston, 1896).

Afternoons in the College Chapel (Boston, 1898).

Mornings in the College Chapel, second series (Boston, 1907).

Sunday Evenings in the College Chapel (Boston, 1911).

Sundays in College Chapels since the War (New York, 1921).

"Ephraim Peabody," in *Reminiscences of Present-Day Saints* (Boston, 1927).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Long, Grace D. *Francis Greenwood Peabody's Methods of Social Ethics: From Moral Science to Applied Christianity*. PhD dissertation, Drew University (Madison, N.J., 1987).

Hani Morgan

PEGIS, Anton Charles (1905–78)

Anton Pegis was born on 24 August 1905 in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. He received his BA in 1928 and MA in 1929 from Marquette University. In 1929 he went to study with Etienne GILSON at his newly established Institute of Mediaeval Studies at the University of Toronto, Canada, receiving his PhD in philosophy there in 1931. He held philosophy positions at Marquette from 1931 to 1937 and Fordham University from 1937 to 1944, before returning as professor of history of philosophy at the Institute in Toronto with a concurrent appointment in the graduate department of philosophy at Toronto from 1944 to 1952. Pegis was elected President of the Institute in 1946 and oversaw the expansion of its faculty, programs, and renowned library.

In 1952 Pegis resigned as President of the Institute to become Director of the Catholic Textbook Division of Doubleday and Company in New York, although he continued to lecture part time at Toronto. After nine years at Doubleday, he returned in 1961 to his appointment at the Institute and Department in Toronto, where he taught until his retirement in 1971. As emeritus, Pegis offered occasional courses at Toronto and helped establish the Graduate Center for Thomistic Studies at the University of St. Thomas in Houston, Texas.

He served as the Center's first Director from 1976 until his death on 13 May 1978 in Toronto, Canada. Among his offices and distinctions, he was President of the American Catholic Philosophical Association in 1946 and awarded its Aquinas Medal in 1975; he was elected Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada in 1950; and he was awarded an honorary LLD by Marquette in 1956.

Pegis was the first of a prominent group of historians of medieval philosophy, which included Joseph OWENS and Armand MAURER, who were students of Gilson and who spent their careers at his Institute of Mediaeval Studies at Toronto. All were dedicated to Gilson's project of the historical recovery of medieval philosophy, particularly that of Thomas Aquinas, and largely endorsed his highly controversial idea that it exemplified what he termed Christian philosophy. Pegis's historical research ran the gamut of the medieval period and was principally concerned with the medieval assimilation of Greek philosophy and especially of Aristotle's psychology. This assimilation, according to Pegis, was not simply a baptism of Greek sources, in which offending theses were corrected or excised, but an innovation, in which Greek philosophy was taken in new directions and revitalized under the influence of the overarching theological purpose to which it was put. With Gilson, therefore, Pegis rejected the neoscholastic reading of medieval philosophy, meant to support the nineteenth-century revival of Thomism as a philosophically legitimate enterprise, that as a matter of historical fact philosophy existed in the middle ages, and above all in Aquinas, as an autonomous science, wholly independent of its instrumental use by theology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

St. Thomas and the Problem of the Soul in the Thirteenth Century (Toronto, 1934).

St. Thomas and the Greeks (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1939).

"The Mind of St. Augustine," *Mediaeval Studies* 6 (1944): 1–61.

"Nature and Spirit: Some Reflections on the

Problem of the End of Man," *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 23 (1949): 452–63.

"St. Thomas and the Unity of Man," in *Progress in Philosophy*, ed. J. A. McWilliams (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1955), pp. 153–73.

The Middle Ages and Philosophy (Chicago, 1963).

"St. Anselm and the Argument of the *Proslogion*," *Mediaeval Studies* 28 (1966): 228–67.

"St. Thomas and the Coherence of the Aristotelian Theology," *Mediaeval Studies* 35 (1973): 67–117.

Other Relevant Works

Ed. and trans., *Basic Works of St. Thomas Aquinas*, 2 vols (New York, 1945).

Trans., *St. Thomas Aquinas*: *On the Truth of the Catholic Faith* (New York, 1955).

Further Reading

Maurer, Armand. "Anton Charles Pegis (1905–1978)," *Mediaeval Studies* 46 (1979): xvii–xix.

O'Donnell, J. Reginald, ed. *Essays in Honour of Anton Charles Pegis* (Toronto, 1974).

Slater, John G. *Minerva's Aviary: Philosophy at Toronto 1843–1943* (Toronto, 2005), chap. 15.

Zedler, Beatrice. "Presentation of the Aquinas Medal," *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 49 (1975): 238–41.

Stephen D. Dumont

PEIKOFF, Sylvan Leonard (1933–)

Leonard Peikoff was born on 15 October 1933 in Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada. His father was a surgeon and Peikoff originally planned to become a physician, attending the University of Manitoba. Changing his interests to philosophy, he received his BA, MA and PhD in philosophy in 1964 from New York University. He studied with Sidney HOOK and wrote a dissertation on "The Status of the Law of Contradiction in Classical Logical Ontologism." From 1957 until 1973, he taught philosophy at Hunter College in New York, Long Island University, New York University, the University of Denver, and the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn.

Peikoff is the preeminent interpreter of the ideas of the novelist-philosopher Ayn RAND. He met Rand as a college freshman in 1951 and studied closely with her for some thirty years, until her death. Rand designated Peikoff her intellectual heir and described him as the first objectivist philosopher other than herself.

Rand worked primarily as a novelist and her philosophy is found in a variety of places including novels, essays, and monographs, but she never wrote a step-by-step explanation of her philosophy as a whole. This is what Peikoff provides in his landmark contribution, *Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand* (*OPAR*), published in 1991. This book is a comprehensive, hierarchically structured presentation of Rand's views in all the major branches of philosophy: metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, politics, and aesthetics. In *Objectisism*, Peikoff identifies the fundamentals of Rand's philosophy in metaphysics and epistemology and then their implications in the other (evaluative) branches, which she regarded as derivative. In doing so, he not only provides lucid explanation of the reasoning behind Rand's views, helpfully identifying their relationship to prominent historical schools, such as idealism and materialism, mysticism and skepticism, he also demonstrates how Rand's views on wide-ranging topics constitute a tightly integrated *system* of thought. While Rand is most widely known for her advocacy of selfishness and laissez-faire capitalism, the core of philosophy, in her view, is epistemology. For an understanding of our basic means of obtaining knowledge will determine the

methods one employs (and thus the conclusions one reaches) on all other philosophical questions. Indeed, the name that Rand gave to her philosophy reflects the central significance to her of issues of method.

Objectivism makes the centrality of epistemology clear. Over the first several chapters, Peikoff lays out the seminal discovery of Rand's philosophy: her theory of concept-formation as an essentially mathematical process. In forming a concept, a person's mind is grasping commensurable characteristics that particular existents share in common, while omitting the specific measurements of each. Accordingly, Rand defended the objectivity of concepts, meaning that concepts are a grasp of existential fact but in a form distinctive to human consciousness. She disagreed equally with all forms of nominalism and of (Platonic) realism; she rejected the former as subjectivist and the latter as "intrinsicist," her name for the view that universals exist in reality apart from man. In his earlier essay "The Analytic-Synthetic Dichotomy," Peikoff shows how Rand's view on this issue refutes the longstanding distinctions between analytic and synthetic truths and between necessary and contingent truths.

Objectivism proceeds by showing how Rand's theory of concepts along with her view of reality underlies her views regarding everything from the nature of art to the value of money to the significance of sex. All are bound together in a consistent, coherent whole. In ethics, for instance, Peikoff explains Rand's theory of value, demonstrating that values, like concepts, are objective. The concept of "value," she argues, presupposes the concept of life, which leads her to the conclusion that life is the proper standard of value and that rational egoism, as man's means of survival, is the essence of virtue.

In politics, Peikoff explains Rand's understanding of the nature and foundations of individual rights (life, liberty, property) and her defense of a government confined to the protection of those rights. He points out the dangers posed by having more than that, or less. Rand rejected libertarians as "hippies of the right" who fail to appreciate the objective value of liberty (relying, instead, on subjectivist or intrinsicist conceptions of its value).

In aesthetics, Peikoff explains how art is a concretization of metaphysics. Through the choice of subject and the style in which he portrays it, an artist conveys the essence of reality, as he sees it. Art serves a human need as much as food or water, in Rand's view, but this is a need of our consciousness: the need to experience one's view of the world in concrete, perceptual form. "Philosophy by itself cannot satisfy man's need of philosophy," as Peikoff puts it (1991, p. 418). That need, however, cannot be escaped, as Peikoff demonstrates in his 1982 book, *The Ominous Parallels*, which deals with the similarity between the ideas responsible for Nazi Germany and those prevalent in the contemporary US. Intended to illustrate the objectivist theory of history, the book offers an eye-opening account of the fact that, because man is a conceptual being, philosophy is the fundamental force directing human life.

While it has become a cliché to insist that we must remember the Holocaust, what is most important, Peikoff argues, is to identify and uproot the deepest cause of the Holocaust so as to prevent any recurrence of such an evil. By means of thorough historical and philosophical analysis, he reveals the Nazis to have been not a lunatic fringe, but a culmination of respected, mainstream ideas that had been gathering force – and expressly championed by influential philosophers – for centuries. The essence of Nazism, Peikoff shows, is the union of collectivism, irrationalism, and the ethics of self-sacrifice. Although Hitler is commonly condemned as an egoist, Peikoff demonstrates that his popularity and continued support stemmed in substantial part from his explicit, repeated appeals to the "noble" ideals of altruism. People were receptive because they had been schooled on such ideas for centuries. A precondition for accepting the Nazi precept that "the *volk* is everything," for instance, is the belief that selfishness is evil and that you, *qua* individual, are

nothing, existing only to serve the group, as altruists and collectivists had long been preaching. Such denial of self similarly paves the way for the "following orders" mentality that impelled countless German soldiers to acquiesce in inflicting unspeakable horrors against millions of people, day after day. "A man indoctrinated with the notion that reason is impotent and self-sacrifice is his moral duty," Peikoff observes, "will obey anyone." (1982, p. 328)

By examining the ideas espoused by such philosophical luminaries as Plato, Kant, and Hegel, Peikoff demonstrates how the roots of the totalitarians' rise rested in philosophy, above all in such thinkers' view of reason. The influence of Kant was by far the most destructive. Peikoff describes what were originally two very different cultures, Germany and the US, and then shows how, as a result of the extensive introduction of Kant's philosophy to the US in the nineteenth century (accelerating after the Civil War), the US grew increasingly like Germany in its politics, economics, arts, and culture. This is the equivalent of a controlled experiment showing philosophy's power, with chilling effect, as Peikoff cites prominent, respected American figures today in various fields voicing ideas that could just as easily have been taken from Weimar Germany.

Beyond these two books, much of Peikoff's work has been in lectures and courses. His 1984 course "Understanding Objectivism" is widely recognized among students of objectivism as a major breakthrough in dissecting common mistakes in applying Rand's philosophy to ordinary life. In these lectures, Peikoff particularly illuminates the error of regarding philosophical principles as floating abstractions detached from life and reality. In 1990 and 1991, before the publication of *Objectivism*, Peikoff gave a twenty-four-lecture graduate seminar that delved into the main issues raised in the book in much greater detail than space permitted in the book.

In most of his post-*Objectivism* work, Peikoff has focused more on methods of proper, objective thinking than on substantive doctrines within Rand's thought. "Objectivism through Induction," for instance, a course given in 1998, explains the principles of objectivism as inductive conclusions based, like all scientific truth, on observation. His lecture courses are available on tape from the Ayn Rand Bookstore of the Ayn Rand Institute in Irvine, California. Building from his study of Rand and having studied the history of physics to understand better the nature of induction, Peikoff is currently working with a physicist, David Harriman, on a broader theory of the nature and proper role of induction in physics and philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:
The Ominous Parallels: The End of Freedom in America (New York, 1982).
Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand (New York, 1991).

Other Relevant Works
"Maybe You're Wrong," *The Objectivist Forum* 2 (1981): 8–12.
"Fact and Value," *The Intellectual Activist* 5 (18 May 1989): 1–6.
"The Analytic-Synthetic Dichotomy," in *Introduction to Objectivist Epistemology*, 2nd edn, by Ayn Rand, ed. Leonard Peikoff and Harry Binswanger (New York, 1990), pp. 88–121.

Further Reading
Gotthelf, Allan. *On Ayn Rand* (Belmont, Cal., 2000).

Tara Smith

PEIRCE, Benjamin (1809–80)

Benjamin Peirce was born on 4 April 1809 in Salem, Massachusetts, and he died on 6 October 1880 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. His father, Benjamin, was a Massachusetts legislator and the first librarian of Harvard College. The son obtained the BA degree in 1829 from Harvard where he had the formative experience of reading Nathaniel Bowditch's proof sheets (which he extensively corrected and revised) for his translation of Pierre-Simon Laplace's four-volume *Mécanique Céleste*. During the next two years he taught at the Round Hill School in Northampton, Massachusetts, working with the founder George Bancroft. Bancroft and J. G. Cogswell made this the first secondary school in the country that was designed to attain at least the higher standards of the English and German schools of the time. In 1831 Peirce was appointed a tutor at Harvard College and became responsible for the entire mathematics program. In 1833 he obtained his MA degree from Harvard and was appointed University Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy. Nine years later, in 1842, he was made the first Perkins Professor of Astronomy and Mathematics, a post he held for the rest of his life. In 1867 Harvard awarded him an honorary LLD degree.

In 1833 Peirce married Sarah Hunt Mills with whom he raised a family of four sons and one daughter. The eldest son, James Mills, became a professor of mathematics at Harvard and first dean of the graduate school, and the youngest son, Herbert Henry Davis, became a diplomat. It was Charles Sanders PEIRCE, however, who, as a philosopher, logician and scientist, most exemplified the intellectually innovative and wide-ranging genius of his father.

Benjamin Peirce played a key role in establishing a professional scientific community in the US through, for example, his involvement in the founding of the Smithsonian Institution and the National Academy of Sciences. In the creation and functioning of a number of other organizations he played important background roles, only being recognized publicly when he was called on to assume a prominent role as when he was appointed consulting astronomer for the Nautical Almanac (1849–67) and superintendent of the US Coast Survey (1867–74). As superintendent of the Coast Survey, Peirce obtained an act of Congress authorizing scientific operations to create a transcontinental geodetic connection from coast to coast along the 39th parallel. He appointed his son Charles to be in charge of gravity determinations for the US, such determinations being necessary to establish the transcontinental link. As superintendent, Peirce also helped his good friend and colleague, Louis AGASSIZ, mount an expedition around the tip of South America to collect evidence that Agassiz hoped would refute Darwin's theory of evolution. During all of these activities Peirce remained a professor at Harvard where he almost single-handedly introduced research as a component function of a university mathematics department in the US. Among his students were Simon Newcomb and George W. Hill who became leaders of the scientific community of their generation. Peirce was instrumental in bringing from England one of the greatest mathematicians of the time, J. J. Sylvester, to the newly founded Johns Hopkins University.

Peirce enjoyed broad interests in poetry, literature, music, and theater. He frequented dining clubs, meetings, and social gatherings. He was a man of great personal force and magnetism. He received substantial recognition in his lifetime in the form of honorary degrees, elected memberships in academies at home and abroad, and in other ways. He was a member of the American Philosophical Society, the Royal Society of London, and a corresponding member of the British Association for the Advancement of Sciences. He was an honorary fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh and the University of St. Vladimir in Kiev, and he was a correspondent in the mathematical class of the Royal Society of Sciences at Göttingen.

He served as President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1853 and held offices in other national organizations including the American Social Science Association. Peirce used his influence chiefly to advance science education.

Mathematics research and teaching were what Peirce evidently regarded as his main contribution and legacy. He authored eleven textbooks, with six at an elementary level. Though not especially influential at the time, they contained advances which set an example for future textbook writers. According to student accounts, he was patient, approachable, and above all inspiring, but he aimed high and was never inclined to teach down to his less capable students. The bulk of his research publications concerned astronomy, geodesy and mechanics, and it was his computation in 1848 of the general perturbations of Uranus and Neptune that first established his scientific reputation. He also contributed to experimental methodology and in his time was widely known for his criterion for rejecting aberrant experimental data. Nevertheless his work in pure mathematics has proven to be at least as enduringly important, especially in what he termed linear associative algebra. The often-quoted assertion that "Mathematics is the science which draws necessary conclusions" is the first sentence of his treatise on the subject (1870, p. 97). In it he developed means to classify all complex associative algebras of dimension less than seven. It provided ideas that aided Charles Peirce in his development of the logic of relatives.

Benjamin Peirce's philosophical interests ranged far beyond the theoretical questions in mathematics and logic for which he is usually remembered. He propounded a broad and far-reaching evolutionary rationalism based on Laplace's Nebular Hypothesis, which held that the solar system has evolved from a giant revolving gaseous mass that has cooled and condensed. Peirce's evolutionary philosophy gave emphasis to five key elements: (1) *Chaos*, which "had for Peirce a definite mathematical meaning – that set of initial conditions from which, under the differential equations of dynamics, nothing followed"; (2) *Matter*, "in itself inert, and without powers or properties except that of receiving and retaining any amount of impressed mechanical force"; (3) *Force*, "the great wonder worker, which gave the universe all its dynamic properties"; (4) *Motion*, "the chief characteristic of the universe ... the sole clue to the presence of both force and matter, and ... without motion there would be no events at all"; and (5) *Equilibrium of forces*. "In inorganic systems, a balance of forces produces no change in motion, whereas unstable equilibrium results in an acceleration. The striking thing about organic or living systems, Peirce held, was just their ability to remain in unstable equilibrium without destructive motion taking place." Peirce noted that "given the primal chaos with its homogeneous distribution of matter and energy, ... the slightest speck of discontinuity would suffice to start nebular evolution, by providing a focus for gravitational attraction."

Peirce's evolutionary cosmology included a number of doctrines that would reappear in the philosophy of his son Charles. He held that there was such an intimate relation between the structure of the universe and that of mind that "the parallel developments in the realms of matter and spirit formed a single cosmology, a vast orderly cosmos infused with ideality." Peirce was a strong advocate of the underlying continuity of the universe and of the fundamental lawfulness of evolution. At bottom, the universe has to be rational (law governed) to be intelligible. "Peirce's chief faith was in the ultimate agreement of all observers as to the laws of nature, however much they may differ when they first began to speculate." Charles Peirce described his father's philosophy as an ideal-realism, "the opinion that nature and the mind have such a community as to impart to our guesses a tendency toward the truth, while at the same time they require the confirmation of empirical science." Benjamin Peirce's most sustained expression of his philosophical system came near the end of

his life in a series of lectures on "Ideality in the Physical Sciences" given in 1879 at the Lowell Institute in Boston and, again the following year, at the Peabody Institute in Baltimore. In 1881, after his death, the lectures were edited by his son, James Mills Peirce, and published in Boston.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
A System of Analytic Mechanics (Boston, 1855).
Linear Associative Algebra (Washington, D.C., 1870). 2nd edn, ed. Charles S. Peirce, *American Journal of Mathematics* 4 (1881): 97–229; repr. (New York, 1882).
Ideality of the Physical Sciences, ed. J. M. Peirce (Boston, 1881).

Other Relevant Works
Peirce's papers are at Harvard University.
An Elementary Treatise on Plane Trigonometry with Its Applications to Heights and Distances, Navigation and Surveying (Boston, 1836).
An Elementary Treatise on Sound (Boston, 1836).
An Elementary Treatise on Algebra (Boston, 1837).
An Elementary Treatise on Plane and Solid Geometry (Boston, 1837).
An Elementary Treatise on Plane Geometry (Boston 1840). Printed in embossed characters on one side of each leaf: advertised as "the first scientific book ever printed for the use of the blind."
An Elementary Treatise on Plane and Spherical Trigonometry (Boston, 1840).
An Elementary Treatise on Curves, Functions, and Forces, 2 vols (Boston, 1841, 1846; 2nd edn 1852).
"Formulae for the Perturbations of Neptune's Longitude and Radius Vector," *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 1 (1846–8): 285–95.
"Criterion for the Rejection of Doubtful Observations," *Astronomical Journal* 2 (1852): 161–3.
"Presidential Address," *American Association for the Advancement of Science Proceedings* 7 (1853): xvii–xx.
"Working Plan for the Foundation of a University" (Cambridge, Mass., 1856).
"On the Formation of Continents," *Canadian Journal of Industry, Science, and Art* 3 (1858): 69–70.
"A New System of Binary Arithmetic," Appendix No. 6, US Coast Survey Report for 1876 (Washington, 1879), pp. 81–2. Reprinted in *Modern Logic* 7 (1997): 67–70.
"The National Importance of Social Science in the United States," *Journal of Social Science* 12 (1880): xii–xxi.
"The Nebular Theory," in *Sketches and Reminiscences of the Radical Club*, ed. Mrs John T. Sargent (Boston, 1880), pp. 243–50.
"The Impossible in Mathematics," in *Sketches and Reminiscences of the Radical Club*, ed. Mrs. John T. Sargent (Boston, 1880), pp. 376–80.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v8*
Cohen, I. Bernard, ed. *Benjamin Peirce: "Father of Pure Mathematics" in America* (New York, 1980). Contains a bibliography of Peirce's publications.
Hawkes, H. E. "Estimate of Peirce's Linear Associative Algebra," *American Journal of Mathematics* 24 (1902): 87–95.
Hogan, Edward. "'A Proper Spirit is Abroad': Peirce, Sylvester, Ward, and American Mathematics, 1829–1843," *Historia Mathematica* 18 (1991): 158–72.
Lenzen, Victor F. *Benjamin Peirce and the U.S. Coast Survey* (San Francisco, 1968).
Miller, Lillian B., Frederick Voss, and Jeannette M. Hussey. *The Lazzaroni* (Washington, D.C., 1972).
Walsh, Alison. *Relationships Betweeen Logic and Mathematics in the Works of*

Benjamin and Charles S. Peirce. PhD dissertation, Middlesex University (London, 2000).

<div align="right">

Albert C. Lewis
Nathan Houser

</div>

PEIRCE, Charles Sanders (1839–1914)

Charles S. Peirce (pronounced "purse") was born on 10 September 1839 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. He was the second son of Benjamin PEIRCE, Harvard professor of mathematics and astronomy, and Sarah Hunt Mills. Charles Peirce obtained his BA from Harvard in 1859, and in 1860 he studied with the naturalist Louis AGASSIZ before entering Harvard's Lawrence Scientific School in 1861. In July of that year he was appointed a regular aide in the US Coast Survey. In 1862 he received his MA degree from Harvard, and on 16 October of that same year he married Harriet Melusina Fay, who later became a prominent feminist and social activist. In 1863 he graduated summa cum laude with an BS in chemistry from the Lawrence Scientific School.

After his graduation Peirce continued to work for the Coast Survey. In November of 1872 he was put in charge of pendulum research to determine the exact shape of the earth. Working with European geodesists, he continued to do internationally respected pendulum research until he resigned from the Survey in 1891. From October 1869 until December 1872 he was also an assistant at the Harvard Observatory, which led to his *Photometric Researches* (1878), the only book he published during his lifetime. While still in Cambridge in the early 1870s, he joined Chauncey WRIGHT, his lifelong friend William JAMES, Oliver Wendell HOLMES, Jr., and others, in discussions which they called "The Metaphysical Club." Peirce introduced his doctrine of pragmatism to this club, and

this event was brought to the world's attention in 1897 by James. Presumably to honor James, Peirce later adopted Santiago (St. James) as a middle name, inspired by a mistake in Ernst Schröder's *Vorlesungen über die Algebra der Logik*, where he is incorrectly listed in the bibliography as "Peirce, Charles S(antiago)."

Apart from his appointment as lecturer of logic at Johns Hopkins from 1879 to 1884, Peirce never held an academic position, though he did deliver series of lectures at Harvard (1865, 1869, 1903), and at the Lowell Institute (1866, 1892, 1903). His students at John Hopkins included Joseph JASTROW, Allan MARQUAND, Oscar Howard Mitchell, Thorstein VEBLEN, Christine LADD-FRANKLIN, and John DEWEY. While at Hopkins, Peirce edited and published an influential volume entitled *Studies in Logic* (1883) consisting of essays by him and his students, and also performed psychological experiments. Peirce's short academic career is due in part to his cantankerous personality, in part to powerful enemies, and in part to the appearance of immorality caused by his second marriage to Juliette Froissy Pourtalais just two days after his divorce from Zina Fay who had left him six years before. Juliette's uncertain background – even today almost nothing is known about her – no doubt aggravated the issue.

In 1887 the Peirces moved to a small farmhouse near Milford, Pennsylvania, a few hours by train from New York City. Fueled by grandiose but unpractical plans, and stimulated by the booming economy, they quickly transformed the farmhouse into a mansion which Peirce called "Arisbe." Soon the economic depression set in. Nothing came of Peirce's plans and the property was quickly too expensive for them to maintain. Often going for days without food or firewood, they lived in poverty, aided by periodic gifts collected and sent by James. Peirce died on 19 April 1914 in Milford, Pennsylvania. He left no children.

After leaving the Coast Survey in December 1891, Peirce spent the last decades of his life as an independent scholar. In addition to a great

quantity of highly original work, Peirce contributed hundreds of book reviews, mostly for *The Nation*, supplied numerous entries for James Mark BALDWIN's *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology* (earlier he had written about 16,000 entries for the Century Dictionary), wrote college textbooks and even schoolbooks in mathematics, and developed a correspondence course in logic. Though highly successful with his reviews and the articles he wrote for Paul CARUS's journal *The Monist,* Peirce failed to get any of his book manuscripts published. The latter include those for two logic books: "How to Reason" (1894), and "Minute Logic" (1902).

About ninety percent of Peirce's writings were never published during his life. Part of this was because of his high standards (Ralph Waldo EMERSON's observation that genius is always sufficiently the enemy of genius by over-influence, certainly applies to Peirce), part of it was due to powerful enemies, such as Harvard President Charles W. Eliot and famed physicist Simon Newcomb, and part of it was because he did not fit the fashions of the day. Nonetheless, Peirce's lifetime writings are estimated to total no fewer than 10,000, with new materials still being discovered. Shortly after Peirce's death, Josiah ROYCE arranged for Peirce's papers to be sent to Harvard, where they remain, though much of the material related to his scientific work is preserved in the National Archives.

Peirce is probably best known as the founder of pragmatism and for his semiotics. Though pragmatism preceded the full development of his semiotics, in his mature view pragmatism is located within semiotics. The seed of Peirce's pragmatism flows from his celebrated pragmatic maxim, which was later made famous by James. Roughly, this maxim states that a conception means only the totality of the practical consequences we can conceive the object of that conception to have. The purpose of this maxim is to eliminate waste of intellectual effort. Intertwined with pragmatism is Peirce's rejection of the traditional conception of science as systematized knowledge, arguing that what

defines science more than anything is the devoted, well-considered, life *pursuit* of knowledge. Hence Peirce's first rule of reason is that in order to learn one must desire to learn, from which follows his famous corollary: Do not block the way of inquiry.

Peirce not only contributed to a staggering array of scientific issues, he also devoted much attention to a classification of the sciences. This classification is here used to structure his main contributions to philosophy. His first divide is between mathematics and the positive sciences. He then divides the positive sciences into philosophy and the special sciences, subdividing the latter into the physical and psychical sciences. Philosophy is subdivided into phenomenology, the normative sciences (esthetics, ethics, logic), and metaphysics.

At the basis of Peirce's classification lies mathematics. Modifying his father's definition of mathematics as the science that draws necessary conclusions, Peirce defined mathematics as the study of how things can be supposed to be, stressing that mathematicians are in principle unconcerned whether the products of their labor have any bearing on positive fact (which allows their conclusions to be necessary). From this follows Peirce's claim that mathematics is not a positive science. However, workers in the positive sciences do fall back on mathematics when they are faced with complicated phenomena, the study of which would benefit from formalization. Thus we get mathematical physics, mathematical economics, and so on. The field Peirce himself was particularly interested in is logic, the study of how people should reason when they seek true answers to the questions they ask, and he was a pioneer in the mathematization of logic. His contributions include the expansion of the logic of George Boole and Augustus De Morgan to include the logic of relations, quantification, probability theory, the development of a single-connective logic, the intuitionist negation, and truth-function analysis. He also experimented with three-valued logic and proved what is now called

Peirce's Law: $((A{\rightarrow}B){\rightarrow}A){\rightarrow}A$ (where Æ expresses implication). Beginning in the 1880s Peirce shifted his attention from algebraic to geometric logic, inspired by his study of Euler's diagrams and the use of diagrams in chemistry. In 1896 he completed his *entitative graphs*, with the universal quantifier, disjunction, and negation as primitives, and which have the full expressive power of algebraic first-order logic with equality. They were soon replaced by the more sophisticated *existential graphs*, which have the existential quantifier, conjunction, and negation as primitives. The existential graphs encompass three sub-theories, the alpha, beta, and gamma graphs, corresponding respectively to propositional, predicate, and modal logic. In both the entitative and the existential graphs geometrical diagrams are devised and experiments are performed upon them.

Peirce had a great influence on twentieth-century mathematical logic, mainly through Ernst Schröder's *Vorlesungen über die Algebra der Logik* (1890–95), Thoralf Skolem, and Giuseppe Peano, who based his notation of predicate calculus on Peirce's general algebra of relations of the first half of the 1880s. Like Boole, but against Frege and much of twentieth-century logic, Peirce considered logic a calculus for analyzing human reasoning, rather than a means for describing natural language.

The positive sciences deal with positive facts, that is, facts that cannot be obtained by reasoning alone. First comes phenomenology, or *phaneroscopy* as Peirce called it, which studies the phaneron or the collective total of all that is in any way or in any sense present to the mind. Phaneroscopy includes an analysis of the phaneron, using medieval distinctions between the various types of mental separation, such as precision and dissociation. Reflection upon the phaneron also reveals the three categories – firstness, secondness, and thirdness – that are at once pervasive and exhaustive, meaning that they are present in all we can think of, and that any attempt to frame a fourth category will give a result that is reducible to the first three.

In Peirce's classification, the normative sciences study phenomena in relation to specific ends. Traditionally these have been beauty, goodness, and truth, giving the disciplines of aesthetics, ethics, and logic. According to Peirce, logic is dependent upon ethics. Just as ethics aims to tell you *should* act if you want to attain goodness, logic purports to tell you how you *should* reason if you want to attain truth (attaining the truth being one species of goodness). Peirce heavily criticized those who see logic as part of psychology or who believe that logic must be grounded in metaphysics. He distinguished three basic kinds of reasoning: abduction, deduction, and induction. In abduction a series of apparently unrelated premises is replaced by a single proposition, called the hypothesis, which brings them all together and explains them. Building on this threefold distinction, he sketched the dynamics of scientific inquiry as follows: we begin with an abduction, that is, the formation, selection, and adoption of a hypothesis. Next, by means of deduction, predictions are derived from this hypothesis. Finally, these predictions are tested through induction, leading to a confirmation, rejection, or modification of the hypothesis.

Peirce was one of the founders of semiotics, the doctrine of signs that aims to furnish a general theory of representation and interpretation. Semiotics is intended as a formal theory. It studies "what *would be* true of signs in all cases." In contrast to Ferdinand Saussure's binary semiology, Peirce's semiotics is triadic. Correlating his notion of the sign with the three categories, he defined the sign as something (a first) that relates something else (its object) to a third (its interpretant). On Peirce's definition signs are always embodied. There is always something not as such a sign that comes to function as a sign. This he called the *ground* or the *representamen*. Since, for him, the interpretant is itself always a potential sign to some future interpretant, there results an unlimited, triadic process of sign-action or *semiosis*. In fact on Peirce's semiotic conception of man, we appear to ourselves as a sign that needs con-

tinuous interpretation. However, later on he also allowed for a *final interpretant,* which is the interpretation that would finally be decided upon as the true one at the end of inquiry, thus situating his pragmatic conception of truth within his semiotic system.

Peirce long struggled with the question whether logic is only part of semiotics or whether it is synonymous with it, eventually settling for the second option. He divided this logic-semiotics into speculative grammar, critical logic, and speculative rhetoric. *Speculative grammar* studies the criteria something must meet to be a sign, the different types of signs, and furnishes a classification of them. Critical logic and speculative rhetoric each focus on one of the two relations of the sign. *Critical logic* is the study of the conditions under which signs can refer to their objects, and *speculative rhetoric* is the study of the conditions under which signs can refer to their interpretants. Of the three only speculative rhetoric studies the sign relation in all its fullness.

Following his definition of the sign, Peirce makes three basic classifications that lie at the heart of his typology of signs. The first classification is with respect to the different types of object that can become a sign, namely qualities, individuals, and general types. This first classification includes Peirce's tone-token-type distinction, which in an impoverished form gained prominence as the type-token distinction. A *type* is a significant form; a *token* is one of its instantiations. For instance, all occurrences of the word "the" on this page are different tokens of the same type. A *tone* is an indefinite character, such as the quotation marks surrounding "the," the face of the font used, the blackness of the ink, etc. The second classification concerns the different ways signs can signify an object. This classification includes Peirce's well-known distinction between icons, indices, and symbols. The *icon* signifies through resemblance, the *index* through contiguity, and the *symbol* through a connection established by a rule of interpretation. The third and final classification details the different ways a sign can

affect an interpreter; it can suggest a quality, an existing object, or a law.

An important maxim of logic is the celebrated *pragmatic maxim.* It states that any conception used in philosophy, religion, or otherwise, cannot mean anything other than the totality of the practical consequences we can conceive the object of that conception to have. For Peirce, these practical consequences are the experiential effects that can influence future rational or deliberative conduct. This connects the maxim directly with the notion of self-control, making it clearly a normative maxim. The pragmatic maxim forms the core of pragmatism of which Peirce is considered the founder. He rejected, though, what pragmatism was soon to become under the hands of James, F. C. S. Schiller, and others, and he renamed his own view *pragmaticism.* He particularly rejected the conflation of truth and meaning (and even utility) by other pragmatists, and their strong nominalistic leaning. For the realist Peirce it is not the individual act that counts, nor the particular experiential effects, but the *habits* that are generated.

Application of the pragmatic maxim to the concept of truth has led to a new theory of truth, generally referred to as the pragmatic theory of truth, in which something is true when in the long run it would be agreed upon by the community of inquirers. For Peirce, only what would be believed in such an "ultimate opinion" is real, rejecting any appeal to unknowable things in themselves on the ground that any such appeal is incoherent. Peirce not only maintained that were inquiry to continue long enough we would be fated to reach an ultimate opinion for any question we might ask, but also that for many of our beliefs we have already reached it, even though we cannot say for any *particular* belief we are holding that we have done so. In this way Peirce wedged a third alternative between dogmatism and skepticism – called *fallibilism* – by rejecting the dogmatist's claim that we know with certainty that some particular beliefs are true, while avoiding the skeptic's conclusion that it follows from

this that *all* our beliefs must be regarded untrustworthy. Instead, Peirce maintained that although we cannot be absolutely certain of any single one of our ideas, we can trust them overall. He defended his pragmatic conception of truth against the so-called buried secrets objection. Due to a lack of data, an inquiry into whether Cleopatra sneezed three times on her second birthday might not give a definite answer, no matter how much it is inquired into. Still we would call the claim that she did so true or false, and the sneezes, if they happened, real.

The third branch of philosophy is metaphysics. Metaphysics studies the most general features of reality and real objects to create a worldview that can become a roadmap for the special sciences. Since metaphysics comes after logic, logic's imperatives apply full force to metaphysics. Metaphysics, for Peirce, is an observational science that should obey the important principle never to settle a priori what can conceivably be settled by experience. His own contributions to metaphysics center on the issue of nominalism and realism, his evolutionary cosmology, and his so-called neglected argument for the reality (though not the existence) of God.

Aligning himself partly with Duns Scotus, Peirce considered himself a realist. Not only did he maintain, against the relativist, that there is a real world independent of what we might think it to be, but also, against the nominalist, that there are real generals (including natural kinds and natural laws). This latter view he called his *extreme Scholastic realism*. This view hinges in part on a distinction between reality and existence. For Peirce, something is *real* when it is independent of what anyone in particular thinks about it. However, not everything that is independent of what we may think about it needs to exist. For instance, for Peirce, natural laws, some possibilities, and God, are all real (i.e., independent of what anyone in particular may think about them), but they do not exist. In this way he avoided the oddity of having to say, for instance, that natural kinds exist. One of his repeated criticisms of the prag-

matism of James and others is that their views were too nominalistic.

Writing after Darwin, Peirce advocated an evolutionary cosmology in which all regularities in nature and consciousness are products of growth. Briefly put, the universe originated in the infinite past out of pure spontaneity, developing through habit formation into a state of absolute regularity in the indefinite future. Natural laws emerge like habits, and objects come into existence, meaning that they develop certain habitual relations to others like it. He classed this view as an objective idealism, arguing that matter is effete mind, that is, mind hidebound with habit. This objective idealism is supported by what he termed the "principle of continuity." On this principle we should assume things continuous as much as possible. Peirce was wary of an undue emphasis on discontinuities, such as Descartes's mind–body dualism. Besides *tychism* (the view that real chance is operative in the universe) and *synechism* (the view that the universe becomes more lawlike), the universe is also characterized by *agapasm*, or evolution by creative love. Evolution by creative love is not the purposeless result of minute departures from habitual processes (as with Darwinism), nor is it a blind development, rigidly imposed by external causes and deterministic laws, but is guided by the positive power of sympathy to which the continuity of mind gives rise. For Peirce, there is moreover a close affinity between human rationality and order in the universe, sometimes referring to the latter as *concrete reasonableness*. In fact, he maintained a process ontology that combines his outlook in metaphysics and logic in that it takes relations between individuals and things as more basic than the individuals themselves. Also, advocating a developmental teleology, he maintained that the ends are not antecedently fixed but are themselves evolving.

In his neglected argument for the reality of God, Peirce aimed to stay close to religious experience (recall that, for Peirce, metaphysics is an observational science). He called the

argument neglected, because theologians ignore it, intent as they are to protect doctrinal purity rather than stimulate religious experience. It is an argument for the *reality* of God, not the *existence* of God, because to say that God exists would confine Him to the brute, mechanical sphere of action and reaction, and reduce religion to mere fetishism. Starting from *musement*, the pure play of our fancy, the argument is an abductive one meant to be broadly inspiring rather than narrowly formalistic.

Peirce's activities in the special sciences are widespread and impressive, covering both physics and psychics. He worked extensively on the calculation of the shape of the earth. He did pioneering work on the magnitude of stars and the form of the Milky Way. He was the first to use a wavelength of light to represent the meter with great precision. He invented a new projection of the earth that gave a world map with a minimum distortion of the distance between any two points (this "quincuncial" map was later used for charting air routes). He was a pioneer in mathematical economics and he engaged in experimental psychology. In the applied sciences he developed a bleaching process for wood pulp, made calculations for a suspension bridge over the Hudson River, and developed a process for preventing scaling in locomotive boilers. Almost as an afterthought, he suggested the idea of the electronic switching-circuit computer, at a time when all computing machines were purely mechanical. Impressive as this list already is, it is easily extended.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Photometric Researches, Made in the Years 1872–1875 (Leipzig, 1878).

Studies in Logic by Members of the Johns Hopkins University (Boston, 1883; Amsterdam, 1983).

The Collected Papers of Charles S. Peirce, 8 vols, ed. Charles Hartshorne, Paul Weiss, and Arthur Burks (Cambridge, Mass., 1931–5, 1958).

The Writings of Charles S. Peirce: A Chronological Edition, 6 vols, ed. Peirce Edition Project (Bloomington, Ind., 1982–99). 30 vols projected to be published.

Reasoning and the Logic of Things: The Cambridge Conference Lectures of 1898, ed. Kenneth L. Ketner and Hilary Putnam (Cambridge, Mass., 1992).

Pragmatism as a Principle and Method of Right Thinking, ed. Patricia Ann Turrisi (Albany, N.Y., 1997).

Other Relevant Works

Peirce's papers are at Harvard University and National Archives in Washington, D.C.

The Charles S. Peirce Papers, 33 reels of microfilm (Cambridge, Mass., 1966).

Charles Sanders Peirce: Contributions to The Nation, 4 vols, ed. Kenneth L. Ketner (Lubbock, Tex., 1975).

The New Elements of Mathematics, 5 vols, ed. Carolyn Eisele (The Hague, 1976).

Semiotic and Significs: The Correspondence Between Charles S. Peirce and Victoria Lady Welby, ed. Charles S. Hardwick (Bloomington, Ind., 1977; 2nd edn, Elsah, Ill., 2001).

Historical Perspectives on Peirce's Logic of Science, 2 vols, ed. Carolyn Eisele (New York, 1985).

Charles S. Peirce Semiotische Schriften, 3 vols, ed. Christian J. W. Kloesel and Helmut Pape (Frankfurt am Main, Germany, 1986–93).

The Essential Peirce, 2 vols, ed. Peirce Edition Project (Bloomington, Ind., 1991, 1998).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils Before 1950*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Blackwell Amer Phil*, *Blackwell Comp Phils*, *Blackwell Comp Prag*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Encyc Ethics*, *Encyc Psych*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*

Anderson, Douglas. *Strands of System: The Philosophy of Charles Peirce* (West

Lafayette, Ind., 1995).

Apel, Karl Otto. *Charles S. Peirce: From Pragmatism to Pragmaticism* (Amherst, Mass., 1981).

Boler, John. *Charles Peirce and Scholastic Realism* (Seattle, Wash., 1963).

Brady, Geraldine. *From Peirce to Skolem* (Amsterdam, 2000).

Brent, Joseph. *Charles Sanders Peirce: A Life*, 2nd edn (Bloomington, Ind., 1998).

Brunning, Jacqueline, and Paul Forster, eds. *The Rule of Reason: The Philosophy of Charles Sanders Peirce* (Toronto, 1997).

Buchler, Justus. *Charles Peirce's Empiricism* (London and New York, 1939).

Burch, Robert W. *A Peircean Reduction Thesis: The Foundations of Topological Logic* (Lubbock, Tex., 1991).

Colapietro, Vincent. *Peirce's Approach to the Self* (Albany, N.Y., 1989).

De Waal, Cornelis. *On Peirce* (Belmont, Cal., 2001).

Eisele, Carolyn. *Studies in the Scientific and Mathematical Philosophy of Charles S. Peirce* (The Hague, 1979).

Feibleman, James K. *An Introduction to Peirce's Philosophy* (New York, 1946).

Fisch, Max H. *Peirce, Semeiotic, and Pragmatism* (Bloomington, Ind., 1986).

Goudge, Thomas A. *The Thought of C. S. Peirce* (Toronto, 1950).

Hausman, Carl R. *Charles S. Peirce's Evolutionary Philosophy* (Cambridge, UK, 1993).

Hookway, Christopher. *Peirce* (London, 1985).

Houser, Nathan, Don Roberts, and James Van Evra, eds. *Studies in the Logic of Charles Sanders Peirce* (Bloomington, Ind., 1997).

Kent, Beverly. *Charles S. Peirce: Logic and the Classification of the Sciences* (Kingston, Ontario, 1987).

Ketner, Kenneth L. *A Comprehensive Bibliography of the Published Works of Charles Sanders Peirce*, 2nd edn (Bowling Green, Ohio, 1986).

———, *His Glassy Essence: An Autobiography of Charles Sanders Peirce* (Nashville, Tenn., 1998).

Ketner, Kenneth L., ed. *Proceedings of the C. S. Peirce Bicentennial International Congress* (Lubbock, Tex., 1976).

Liszka, James Jakob. *A General Introduction to the Semeiotic of Charles Sanders Peirce* (Bloomington, Ind., 1996).

Menand, Louis. *The Metaphysical Club* (New York, 2001).

Misak, C. J. *Truth and the End of Inquiry: A Peircean Account of Truth* (Oxford, 1991).

Misak, C. J., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Peirce* (Cambridge, UK, 2004).

Moore, Edward C., Richard S. Robin, and Philip P. Wiener, eds. *Studies in the Philosophy of Charles Sanders Peirce, Second Series* (Amherst, Mass., 1964).

Murphey, Murray G. *The Development of Peirce's Philosophy* (Cambridge, Mass., 1961).

Orange, Donna M. *Peirce's Conception of God: A Developmental Study* (Lubbock, Tex., 1984).

Parker, Kelly A. *The Continuity of Peirce's Thought* (Nashville, Tenn., 1998).

Potter, Vincent G. *Charles S. Peirce on Norms and Ideals* (Amherst, Mass., 1967).

Rescher, Nicholas. *Peirce's Philosophy of Science* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1978).

Roberts, Don D. *The Existential Graphs of Charles S. Peirce* (New York, 1973).

Robin, Richard. *Annotated Catalogue of the Papers of Charles S. Peirce* (Amherst, Mass., 1964).

Rosenthal, Sandra B. *Charles Peirce's Pragmatic Pluralism* (Albany, N.Y., 1994).

Shin, Sun-Joo. *The Iconic Logic of Peirce's Graphs* (Cambridge, Mass., 2002).

Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society (Amherst, Mass., 1965–).

Wennerberg, Hjalmar. *The Pragmatism of C. S. Peirce: An Analytical Study* (Lund, Sweden, 1962)

Wiener, Philip P., and Frederic Harold Young, eds. *Studies in the Philosophy of*

Charles Sanders Peirce (Cambridge, Mass., 1952).

Cornelis de Waal

PENELHUM, Terence Michael (1929–)

Terence Penelhum was born on 26 April 1929 in Bradford-on-Avon, England. He became a Canadian citizen in 1961. He received an MA with first class honours in philosophy from the University of Edinburgh in 1950, and a BPhil from Oxford, where he was the Alexander Campbell Fraser Scholar at Oriel College, in 1952. He was a lecturer, assistant professor, and associate professor of philosophy at the University of Alberta from 1953 to 1963. He was an associate professor and professor of philosophy at the University of Calgary from 1963 to 1978, and then a professor of religious studies at the University of Calgary from 1978 until retiring in 1988. While at Calgary, he served as head of the philosophy department from 1964 to 1970, as Dean of Arts and Science from 1964 to 1967, and as the Director of the Calgary Institute for the Humanities from 1976 to 1979. He was a President of the Canadian Philosophical Association in 1968.

Penelhum has held visiting teaching appointments at the Universities of California at Berkeley, Colorado, Michigan, British Columbia, Washington, and Waterloo, and has been a visiting scholar, associate, or fellow at Corpus Christi College, Clare Hall, and St. Edmund's College, Cambridge, and at the Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities, University of Edinburgh. He has acted as a consultant or council member for a variety of organizations, including the Canada Council and the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research, and in 1984 was the Canadian representative, nominated by Prime Minister Trudeau, at the conference on the Life Sciences and Humanity, sponsored by the Japan Foundation at the request of Prime Minister Nakasone, in Hakone, Japan. He has been awarded honorary doctorates by Lakehead University, and the universities of Lethbridge, Waterloo, and Calgary. He was made a fellow of the Royal Society of Canada in 1975, and in 1988 he was awarded the Canada Council Molson Prize for the Humanities and Social Sciences.

Penelhum has produced important philosophical work in four main areas: the logic of certain ethically relevant concepts, particularly pleasure and its cognate notions, questions concerning persons and their identity, and particularly questions concerning the possibility of disembodied existence, Hume scholarship, and the philosophy of religion, with a particular interest in questions concerning skepticism, faith, and the religious ambiguity of the world. These areas overlap one another and one of the many strengths of Penelhum's writing lies in his ability to see the relevant cross-connections between various areas of philosophy. Added to this is his ability to see clearly both sides of a given issue, and to allow his ability to think clearly and rigorously to be used on behalf of positions which he himself does not find immediately congenial. In many areas, but particularly in the philosophy of religion, philosophers have often found dispassionate discussion of issues as difficult as it is desirable, but Penelhum's work shows clearly that clear-headed analysis of arguments is as achievable in this area of philosophy as in others.

In his early work on the logic of pleasure Penelhum made use of the positive points of Gilbert Ryle's analysis of the concept, while rejecting Ryle's central claims. Pleasure, he argued, is episodic, not dispositional, though it is clearly neither a sensation nor a feeling. Rather, pleasure is a heed concept allied to attending: it "is an effortless form of attention" (1957, p. 502), and while Ryle is right that enjoying digging (for example) does not involve two activities, it does involve two events.

In *Survival and Disembodied Existence* (1970) Penelhum produced a strong, important and still unanswered attack on the very possibility of disembodied existence. "To entertain an opinion that there exist in the material universe pure unembodied thinking spirits is mere romancing," said the mature Kant in the *Critique of Judgment*, and in *Survival and Disembodied Existence* Penelhum provided the arguments that back up such a claim. As a philosopher who is also a believer he accepts the possibility of life after death, and this means that his picture of, and justification for, such a possibility does not involve the sort of substance dualism which some philosophers find essential to the notion of a post-mortem existence. If his arguments are correct – and they currently stand unrefuted in the literature – many accounts of the possibility of immortality are in severe difficulty.

Penelhum's writings on Hume concentrate on questions concerning personal identity and on issues in the philosophy of religion, but they are not confined to these areas. As a recent critic, Donald Ainslie, noted, his writings "are … recognized as classics in Hume scholarship." He adds, "Penelhum has been," along with writers such as Páll Árdal and Annette BAIER, a "leader in turning us from the tendency to read in isolation only those bits of text that supported whatever picture of Hume we favored." This is perhaps particularly true with regard to Hume's picture of the self, where Hume's remarks at various points in the *Treatise* seem (as Hume recognized) strangely at odds with one another. Penelhum, however, holds that Hume's philosophy has a systematic character, with his skepticism and naturalism fitting together without conflict, and in three major papers, collected in *Themes in Hume*, he offers a detailed account of Hume's position and of various possible ways of dealing with Hume's apparent inconsistencies. That Penelhum's work in the history of philosophy is by no means confined to Hume is made clear by pieces such as his analysis of the concept of faith in Aquinas (1977), his treatment of the historical importance of skepticism in papers such as "Skepticism and Fideism" (1983), "Atheism, Skepticism and Fideism" (1992), and in his discussion of "Thomas Reid and Contemporary Apologetic" (1998), not to mention the important works on Butler, especially *Butler* (1985) and "Butler and Human Ignorance" (1992).

Penelhum's writings on the philosophy of religion range widely. As the titles of many of his works reveal, a central interest is religious epistemology, an area in which he has paid particular attention to the attempts by various contemporaries such as William ALSTON and Alvin PLANTINGA to circumvent the skeptical considerations that abound in this area.

Penelhum suggests that there are two versions of the "parity argument," found in John Locke's writings, which is the argument that puts religious beliefs on a par with what might loosely be styled common-sense beliefs, particularly beliefs in the general trustworthiness of sensory impressions. There is an "aggressive version" of the argument, which holds that it is "inconsistent to accept common sense and deny belief in God," an argument to be found in writers such as Pascal and Kierkegaard, and a "permissive version" of the argument, which holds more gently "that *both* the believer *and* the unbeliever are functioning *rationally*, that is, are functioning not *irr*ationally."

However, accepting either version will lead us to see that there may be a multitude of world views, each with internal consistency, each with communities of believers or non-believers, and each with (internal) defenses against charges from the perspective of other world views. Earlier philosophers such as Locke and Boyle, perceiving this difficulty, held (1) that natural theology would yield the existence of a god, and (2) that the existence of the god of their particular religion was validated by miracles in a way which other faiths could not equal, but both parts of this claim are unpersuasive to modern ears. The result is that, even if one thinks that what Plantinga has labelled the

Great Pumpkin objection (the view that *any* supernatural claim is defensible on parity grounds) is too extreme, there are nonetheless a wide variety of different and incompatible systems which appear all to have good (whether or not they are equally good) claims to provide rational belief systems. "If this is right," Penelhum concludes "then we are left with the situation that the permissive version of the Parity Argument presents: that it is not irrational to hold religious beliefs as basic …. But this epistemological permission is bought at the price of recognising that it is not irrational not to, either … Another way of expressing the situation I have described is to say that our world is *religiously ambiguous*," a result, Penelhum suggests, which "ought to be disturbing to the believer." "Theologians," he suggests, should abandon the lamentable and fashionable practice of rejoicing in the fact that no one has yet succeeded in proving God's existence. They should *deplore* this failure, and try to rectify it." The believer is left with a simple problem: "if religion is true, why is it not more obviously true?" This question, Penelhum believes, is as important as it is unanswered.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Hume on Personal Identity," *Philosophical Review* 64 (1955): 571–89.

"The Logic of Pleasure," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 17 (1957): 488–503.

"Personal Identity, Memory, and Survival," *Journal of Philosophy* 56 (1959): 882–903.

"Divine Necessity," *Mind* 69 (1960): 175–86.

"Pleasure and Falsity," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 1 (1964): 81–91.

"Divine Goodness and the Problem of Evil," *Religious Studies* 1 (1966): 95–107.

Survival and Disembodied Existence (London, 1970).

Religion and Rationality (New York, 1971).

Problems of Religious Knowledge (London, 1971; New York, 1972).

Hume (London, 1975).

"Human Nature and External Desires," *The Monist* 62 (1979): 304–19.

"Skepticism and Fideism," in *The Skeptical Tradition*, ed. Myles Burnyeat (Berkeley, Cal., 1983), pp. 287–318.

God and Skepticism: A Study in Skepticism and Fideism (Dordrecht, 1983).

"Our Technology and Our Moral Resources," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* (1985): 515–21.

Butler (London, 1985).

"Parity is Not Enough," in *Faith, Reason, and Skepticism*, ed. Marcus Hester (Philadelphia, 1992), pp. 98–120.

David Hume: An Introduction to His Philosophical System (West Lafayette, Ind., 1992).

Reason and Religious Faith (Boulder, Col., 1995).

Themes in Hume: The Self, The Will, Religion (Oxford, 2000).

Christian Ethics and Human Nature (London, 2000).

Other Relevant Works.

Ed. with J. J. MacIntosh, *The First Critique: Reflections on Kant's Critique of Pure Reason* (Belmont, Cal., 1969).

Ed., *Immortality* (Belmont, Cal., 1973).

Ed., *Faith* (New York, 1989).

"Butler and Human Ignorance," in *Joseph Butler's Moral and Religious Thought: Tercentenary Essays*, ed. Christopher Cunliffe (Oxford, 1992), pp. 117–39.

"Ethics With God and Ethics Without," in *On the Track of Reason: Essays in Honor of Kai Nielsen*, ed. Rodger Beehler, David Copp, and Béla Szabados (Boulder, Col., 1992), pp. 107–18.

"A Belated Return," in *Philosophers Who Believe*, ed. Kelly James Clark (Downers Grove, Ill, 1994), pp. 223–36.

"Reflections on Incorporeal Agency," in *Critical Reflections on the Paranormal*, ed. Michael Stoeber and Hugo Meynell (Albany, N.Y., 1996): 119–32.

Further Reading.

MacIntosh, J. J., and H. Meynell, eds. *Faith, Scepticism and Personal Identity: Essays in Honour of Terence Penelhum* (Calgary, 1994).

J. J. MacIntosh

PEPPER, Stephen Coburn (1891–1972)

Stephen Coburn Pepper was born on 4 April 1891 in Newark, New Jersey, and died on 1 May 1972 in Berkeley, California. His family background was both artistic and academic. His paternal grandfather was a minister who had served as President of Colby College. His father Charles Hovey Pepper was an artist best known as a portrait painter. His father studied in art schools abroad, and the young Stephen Pepper lived in Paris for six years until 1899. The family then moved to Concord, Massachusetts, where he spent most of his remaining childhood. When he was twelve years old, his family traveled around the world. On this tour, Pepper began to keep a journal, which he continued for most of his life.

Pepper attended Harvard University, receiving his BA in 1913, MA in 1914, and a PhD in philosophy in 1916 with a dissertation entitled "A Theory of Value in Terms of Stimulus and Response." Pepper had become a philosophy major after taking a course in ethics in his junior year taught by George H. PALMER. He heard also lectures by George SANTAYANA, but Ralph Barton PERRY influenced Pepper the most. Much of Pepper's later work in metaphysics and value theory developed from Perry's *Present Philosophical Tendencies* and *General Theory of Value.*

Upon graduation, Pepper taught for one year at Wellesley College, after which he served in the military as an officer during World War I. In 1919 Pepper joined the philosophy department of the University of California at Berkeley. He was named Mills Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy and Civil Polity in 1954, succeeding George P. ADAMS in that appointment, and he retired in 1958. From 1939 to 1947 he also served as Assistant Dean of the College of Letters and Science, and was chair of the philosophy department from 1952 to 1958. Pepper's strong interest in art, and his popular course in aesthetics, resulted in his serving as chair of the art department from 1938 to 1952. Though always a philosopher, Pepper took seriously his role as chair of the art department. At this time, university art departments tended to emphasize art history and theory. Pepper sought balance and variety, insisting that greater value should be given to the creative work of active artists. Pepper wrote numerous books, articles, and reviews on aesthetics. His first book, *Modern Color* (1923), was co-authored with artist Carl Gordon Cutler.

After his retirement in 1958, Pepper taught as a visiting scholar at Macalaster, Tulane, Carleton, and Williams, as well as the San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz campuses of the University of California. Three times he was called back to teach at Berkeley. Among his many awards are honorary degrees from Colby College (LHD), Tulane (LHD), and the University of California (LLD). He was a member of many professional organizations, and served as President of the American Philosophical Association Pacific Division in 1935–6.

Pepper's work is difficult to summarize as he worked in many fields, but he made special contributions to three areas: metaphysics, general value theory, and aesthetics. For Pepper, all begins with metaphysics. He thought of metaphysical systems as being somewhat like scientific hypotheses, except unlimited in scope. In his 1942 book, he spoke of them as "world hypotheses." He was never able to settle on a single metaphysical position as having the whole truth. Instead, he saw four, equally acceptable, world hypotheses: formism, mechanism, organicism, and contextualism. "Formism" is Pepper's

term for the sort of philosophy offered by Plato. "Mechanism" is his term for the naturalism of Hobbes or Hume. "Organicism" is the absolute idealism of Hegel. "Contextualism" is John DEWEY's pragmatism. Each of these hypotheses is based on a different way of seeing the world. For instance, mechanism interprets the world in mechanical terms. These ways of visualizing the world Pepper called "root metaphors." These metaphors have questionable labels. For example, if Pepper meant by "organicism" Hegel's absolute idealism, why not simply describe it as such? The answer is that doing this would invite endless historical and textual questions that are better avoided: "Did Hegel *really* say that?" "Well, Hegel said that, but did he *mean* …?" "Then there's *this* passage," and so on.

Pepper disdained any attempt to combine the best features of each of these four world hypotheses, seeking some single and completely adequate theory of metaphysics. He was convinced that such mixtures would only lead to confusion. According to Pepper, each world hypothesis can only be worked out on its own terms. Late in life, Pepper thought he had discovered a fifth world hypothesis, which he called "selectivism." Its root metaphor is the purposive act, which he saw (though critics disagreed) as somewhat like A. N. WHITEHEAD's "actual occasion." He set forth this hypothesis in some detail in his Carus Lectures, published as *Concept and Quality* (1967).

Pepper's concern with the purposive act seems to have developed out of his study of value theory. He had come to feel that Perry's "value as any object of any interest" was an oversimplification. Here he was influenced by various psychologists, notably his colleague at the University of California, E.C. TOLMAN, author of *Purposive Behavior in Animals and Men* (1932). He even found a place in his value theory for the theory of evolution, as most philosophers since Herbert Spencer have not. Pepper saw our values as emerging through a number of "selective systems" of a purposive sort which lead us (legislating) in different ways. These range from

such simple things as the need for a drink of water when we are thirsty, to the need to save the world from the threat of global warming or nuclear war. Pepper thought that we are dealing here with *facts,* not simply emotions. It is a *fact* that some things (water, for example) will satisfy my thirst; others will not. It is a *fact* that some actions will lead to nuclear war and others will not. Pepper's views on value theory were set forth in a number of works, from his 1947 *Digest of Purposive Values*, to his monumental *The Sources of Value* (1958), considered the last major work in general value theory of the twentieth century, and his *Ethics* (1960).

Pepper's finest work was done in aesthetics. Early on, Pepper admired Dewey's work on aesthetics, especially in *Art as Experience* (1934). But he felt that Dewey had improperly included elements that did not belong in a pragmatist, or contextualistic, aesthetic. In 1937 he published his own *Aesthetic Quality: a Contextualistic Theory of Beauty*. Actually, Pepper thought that each world hypothesis would lead to its own aesthetic theory. In his *The Basis of Criticism in the Arts* (1945), probably his most valuable work in aesthetics, he examined a work of art in light of how each hypothesis would view it. As it happens, he was able to find a favorite book in which each type had been set forth. Thus, Santayana's *The Sense of Beauty* is his chosen example of mechanistic or naturalistic criticism. Naturalists tend to value the arts in terms of the pleasure or pain they produce, and for Santayana, art is "pleasure objectified." The example chosen for organistic criticism is Bosanquet's *Three Lectures on Aesthetic*. Organicists see everything as related in some way to everything else, and emphasize *unity*. And, of course, Dewey's work, despite its perceived faults, is his choice in discussing the contextualistic criticism. There does not seem to be a fully developed work on formism as an aesthetic theory, since Plato left no such book. Aristotle's *Poetics* is the obvious choice, though it survived only as an incomplete set of notes.

At the conclusion of *The Basis of Criticism in the Arts*, Pepper added an essay on the work of

art, which he saw as a curiously neglected topic in the literature of aesthetics. But he felt the topic needed more elaboration than could be given in a single essay, which led to *The Work of Art* (1955). In brief, he thought that when we speak of a work of art we can mean at least three different things: the control object, the perceptual object, and the object of criticism. What he meant is more easily illustrated than defined. Consider Leonardo's *Mona Lisa*. First, there is the wood panel hanging in the Louvre; that is the control object. Suppose, as Pepper no doubt had been, you are taken to *see* this object when you are, say, four years old. You later return as a teenager, and return again as a twenty-two-year-old college graduate, and again at the age of forty, and make one last visit when you are seventy-two. Thanks to the temperature and humidity controls in the museum, the painted wood panel remains much the same. But *you* have changed. Over the years you learned to appreciate the skill of the artist in ways you had not before. Perhaps you studied art history, or even tried your hand at painting. All this *adds* something to each subsequent perception; hence the perceptual object and the object of criticism change. Pepper called this "funding and fusion," and this view has important implications for critical theory. We dislike "reruns" on television, but a great work of art creates a new, richer experience with each viewing, and the greatest may be inexhaustible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aesthetic Quality: A Contextualistic Theory of Beauty (Cambridge, Mass., 1937).

World Hypotheses: A Study in Evidence (Berkeley, Cal., 1942).

The Basis of Criticism in the Arts (Cambridge, Mass., 1945).

A Digest of Purposive Values (Berkeley, Cal., 1947).

The Work of Art (Bloomington, Ind., 1955).

The Sources of Value (Berkeley, Cal., 1958).

Ethics (New York, 1960).

Concept and Quality: A World Hypothesis (La Salle, Ill., 1967).

Other Relevant Works

Pepper's papers are at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, and at the University of California at Berkeley.

"Emergence," *Journal of Philosophy* 23 (1926): 241–5.

"The Quest for Ignorance or the Reasonable Limits of Skepticism," *Philosophical Review* 45 (1936): 126–43.

"Some Questions on Dewey's Esthetics," in *The Philosophy of John Dewey*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (New York, 1939), pp. 369–89.

"Santayana's Theory of Value," in *The Philosophy of George Santayana*, ed. Paul Schilpp (Evanston, Ill., 1940), pp. 217–39.

"Metaphysical Method," *Philosophical Review* 52 (1943): 252–69.

"A Brief History of General Theory of Value," in *A History of Philosophical Systems*, ed. Vergilius Ferm (New York, 1950), pp. 493–503.

"Lewis' Theory of Value," in *The Philosophy of C. I. Lewis*, ed. Lewis Hahn (La Salle, Ill., 1968), pp. 489–502.

"Survival Value," *Zygon* 4 (1969): 4–11.

"The Search for Comprehension, or World Hypotheses," in *The Nature of Philosophical Inquiry*, ed. Joseph Bobik (Notre Dame, Ind., 1970), pp. 151–67.

"Autobiography of an Aesthetics," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 28 (1970): 275–86.

"A Dynamic Theory of Perception," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 22 (1971): 42–6.

"Santayana's Retreat from Existence," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 10 (1972): 187–95.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Amer Phils Before 1950, Bio 20thC Phils, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v57, Pres Addr of APA v4, Proc of APA v45, Who Was Who in Amer v5, Who's Who in Phil

Burtt, E. A. "The Status of 'World Hypotheses'," *Philosophical Review* 52 (1943): 590–601.

Duncan, Elmer H. "Stephen C. Pepper: A Bibliography," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 28 (1970): 287–93.

Edel, Abraham. "Science and Value: Some Reflections on Pepper's 'The Sources of Value'," *Review of Metaphysics* 14 (1960): 134–58.

Efron, Arthur, ed. "Root Metaphor: An Interdisciplinary Conference," *Journal of Mind and Behavior* 3 (Summer–Autumn 1982). Special double issue on Pepper.

Efron, Arthur, and John Herold, eds. "Root Metaphor: The Live Thought of Stephen C. Pepper," *Paunch* 53/54 (1980). Special double issue devoted to Pepper.

Handy, Rollo. "Pepper's View of Value as Selective System," in *Value Theory and the Behavioral Sciences* (Springfield, Ill., 1969), pp. 120–44.

Lee, Donald S. "Adequacy in World Hypotheses: Reconstructing Pepper's Criteria," *Metaphilosophy* 14 (983): 151–61.

Margolis, Joseph. "Professor Pepper on Value Theory," *Ethics* 69 (1959): 134–9.

Reck, Andrew J. "Stephen C. Pepper: Philosophy of Values," in *The New American Philosophers: An Exploration of Thought Since World War II* (Baton Rouge, Louis., 1968), pp. 44–80.

"Symposium on Stephen C. Pepper's 'On the Uses of Symbolism in Sculpture and Painting'," *Philosophy East and West* 19 (1969): 265–91.

Werkmeister, W. H. "Stephen Pepper and the Sources of Value," in *Historical Spectrum of Value Theories, Vol. II: The Anglo-American Group* (Lincoln, Neb., 1973), pp. 275–306.

Elmer H. Duncan

PERCY, John Walker (1916–90)

Walker Percy was born on 28 May 1916 in Birmingham, Alabama, and died on 10 May 1990 in Covington, Louisiana. In 1929 his father lost a long struggle with serious depression and committed suicide. Walker later remembered his reaction to that news: "I didn't feel guilty or responsible the way some children of suicides do. I was angry. And I was determined not only to find out why he did it but also to make damn sure that it didn't happen to me." At fourteen, Percy began a lifelong philosophical project, or search, as he would later name it. By the time he entered the University of North Carolina for a premedical program, he was convinced science could solve every problem. Still he had read George SANTAYANA's *The Last Puritan*, Leo Tolstoy, Fyodor Dostoevsky, and Shakespeare. After receiving his BS in chemistry in 1937, Percy began medical studies at the College of Physicians and Surgeons at Columbia University in New York City. There he also entered psychiatric analysis with Dr Janet Rioch. He interned in pathology at Bellevue Hospital where he contracted tuberculosis, as did several other class members. He spent the next few years in sanitariums in upstate New York, where he voraciously read literature and philosophy, especially Søren Kierkegaard. It was at Saranac Sanitarium that, as Percy recalled, "I gradually began to realize that as a scientist – a doctor, a pathologist – I knew so very much *about* man, but had little idea what man *is*." His search was to focus upon the mystery that surrounds an individual life.

In 1946 his illness under some control, Percy resolved to become a writer, to live around New Orleans, and to marry Mary Bernice Townsend. In a short while, the couple converted to the Roman Catholic Church; Walker took *John* as his baptismal name. By this time, four of the five major conceptual influences on his career had appeared: literature, science, existentialism,

and Catholicism. The fifth one arrived in 1947 when he rented a home near Loyola University in New Orleans owned by Julius Friend, a philosophy professor and co-author with James FEIBLEMAN for a book that caught Percy's attention, *The Unlimited Community*, in which pragmatism was a prominent feature. Friend left his library in the rental house, and Walker soon devoured major parts of it under Friend's guidance, including various works related to Charles PEIRCE – the fifth major influence on Percy.

In 1948, in order to provide a quiet place for pursuit of his chosen vocation of writing, the Percys moved to Covington, a short drive north of New Orleans. There he lived for the rest of his life, producing a steady stream of essays and novels. While he did occasionally teach a class at a nearby university after his first published novel, *The Moviegoer*, won the National Book Award for 1960, principally he stayed home to study and write.

In 1963 he returned to science for a few years after Gentry Harris M.D. invited him to be an associate in a National Institute of Mental Health team research project on clinical processes in the treatment of schizophrenia. Harris, the team leader, was also a scholar of Peirce's work and was impressed with Walker's recent publications in philosophical and psychiatric journals dealing with aspects of Peirce's semeiotic. Percy was an early defender of semeiotic, Peirce's theory of signs, against its corrupters and misusers such as Charles MORRIS or Thomas SEBEOK. This is a disposition Percy shared with John DEWEY, who in a well-known series of journal discussions had assailed Morris in defense of Peirce. Peirce was neither a practitioner nor a founder of semiotics; it is a terminological confusion to regard his semeiotic as contemporary semiotics (or vice versa), just as physic is not physics. As an admirer of Percy's understanding of Peirce, Harris wanted Percy as a member of his interdisciplinary research team (which also included the anthropologist Stanley Diamond and other psychiatrists).

Harris made tapes of clinical sessions involving family schizophrenia, then sent them to Covington where both Percys listened carefully with Walker writing long reports on his ideas and impressions, particularly relating to aspects of clinical communication and semeiosis. These experiences in psychiatric research clearly impacted Percy's later writing.

During his career, Percy received many awards and accolades. His last major honor was being selected by the National Endowment for the Humanities to present the Jefferson Lecture which he delivered in 1989. He focused principally upon his affinity with Peirce and his vigorous lifelong insistence upon the importance of individual human existence. He argued that the sciences of mankind are fundamentally incoherent, and that this fact is persistently avoided by practitioners of such sciences who appear to prefer a form of scientism which systematically overlooks important basic features of human science. Percy reasoned that semeiotic was a means for healing this incoherence, and for evolving the narrow scientism into a full-fledged healthy science of mankind.

One cannot grasp Percy only through his essays without experiencing his novels: strategies such as memorization, note-taking, summary, secondhand description are inadequate. Like Wittgenstein, Percy was a "shower," one who tried to show a phenomenon so others could experience it and draw its meaning for themselves. Attempting to grasp his philosophy without reading his art would be like counting the number of punctuation marks in a summary of a screenplay as a substitute for seeing (being shown) the finished movie. Moviegoers attend for a showing; novels are do-it-yourself movies.

Percy's philosophical contributions do not fit standard contemporary classification schemes, nor did he set out to design a grand approach. Rather he wrestled with a particular set of problems using the resources he could obtain. He is principally an explorer or

a pioneer, or (as he often said) a searcher. He drew inspiration for his tools from the combination of literature, Roman Catholic thought, pragmaticism, science, and existentialism. To date, only his Catholicism and existentialism have been adequately discussed by critics and commentators.

The unique individual human self is Percy's focus. His body of work can be profitably compared to Plato's blend of literary brilliance, penetrating self-exploration, and methodological emphasis. He viewed the novel as a diagnostic device, but only in the hands of each reader. Percy manufactured the diagnostic tool, but only each individual reader can apply the instrument.

Percy considered his fiction (supplemented by his other works) as inquiry for *life encounter*, a handy label we can coin here for problem solving or inquiry one conducts in personal life activities or situations, the kind of inquiry an individual does concretely. Science as usually understood is inquiry done collectively on classes. Both life encounter and typical science use similar logic. Proponents of scientism advocate science as inquiry aiming at truths about classes, while denying any other source for useful human knowledge. Percy regarded scientism as inadequate, narrow, and self-defeating. His aim was to broaden the scope of science and to acknowledge other areas of life as amenable to inquiry. Life encounter acknowledges physical and social science but adds that there also is a kind of inquiry undertaken by individuals, concerning their personal place in the world, an inquiry that uses a logic similar to that of sciences such as chemistry or physics or mathematics or psychology. However, life encounter proposes that while an individual is indeed a member of this or that class of entities, an individual person is also more than just a member of some class or other, is more than a collection of matter and chemicals – each person has meaning, uses meaning, is meaningful. Moreover, conclusions reached by one unique individual about life are not automatically transferable to others, as are the results of typical science.

Another chief point concerns the phenomenon of interpreting: in Percy's robust phrase, we *take the meaning* of another person. He saw that this was an event one could observe as a scientist, as real as any other event in a laboratory. His patient devastation of crude behavioristic reductions of such phenomena is found throughout his career – most notably in *Message in the Bottle*. It is also clear that he regarded Peirce's semeiotic as the antidote to the behavioral reductionist extremism of Charles Morris or B. F. SKINNER or contemporary semiotics.

Although Percy proposed a few technical philosophical doctrines and ideas, his principal ability and tool involved exercising a method of semeiosis by which he created great and artful living examples (his novels), living diagrams, through the medium of which each of us can conduct our own unique exploratory search of discovery. Details of this method are explicated in Percy's correspondence in *A Thief of Peirce* (1995, pp. 15–18, 256–84). Percy was one of the latest distinguished literary practitioners of the ancient Socratic tradition of therapeutic philosophy. Because the search of self-examination is implicit in every life within every eon, Percy's literary masterpieces of self-discovery will be perennially relevant because the way of the individual search is a permanent human requirement. While none of us can by convenient recipe replicate Percy's own search to grasp the meaning of individual life, one can receive aid and comfort in the undertaking through the tools he provided.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Moviegoer (New York, 1961).
The Last Gentleman (New York, 1966).
Love in the Ruins (New York, 1971).
The Message in the Bottle (New York, 1975).
Lancelot (New York, 1977).
The Second Coming (New York, 1980).

Lost in the Cosmos (New York, 1983).

The Thanatos Syndrome (New York, 1987).

Signposts in a Strange Land, ed. P. H. Samway (New York, 1991).

Other Relevant Works

Percy's papers are at the University of North Carolina.

Conversations with Walker Percy, ed. L. A. Lawson and V. A. Kramer (Jackson, Mississippi, 1984).

More Conversations with Walker Percy, ed. L. A. Lawson and V. A. Kramer (Jackson, Mississippi, 1993).

A Thief of Peirce: The Letters of Kenneth Laine Ketner and Walker Percy, ed. P. H. Samway (Jackson, Mississippi, 1995).

The Correspondence of Shelby Foote and Walker Percy, ed. J. Tolson (New York, 1997).

"Peirce and Modern Semiotic," ed. Kenneth Laine Ketner, *DoubleTake* 8 (2002): 52–8.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v10*

Coles, Robert. *Walker Percy: An American Search* (Boston, 1978).

Crowley, J. Donald, and Sue Mitchell Crowley, eds. *Critical Essays on Walker Percy* (Boston, 1989).

Elliott, Carl, and Lantos, John, eds. *The Last Physician: Walker Percy and the Moral Life of Medicine* (Durham, N.C., 1999).

Gretlund, Jan Nordby, and Westarp, Karl-Heintz, eds. *Walker Percy: Novelist and Philosopher* (Jackson, Miss., 1991).

Hobson, Linda Whitney. *Walker Percy: A Comprehensive Descriptive Bibliography* (New Orleans, 1988).

Ketner, Kenneth Laine. *His Glassy Essence: An Autobiography of Charles Sanders Peirce* (Nashville, Tenn., 1998).

———, "Rescuing Science from Scientism:

The Achievement of Walker Percy," *The Intercollegiate Review* 35 (1999): 22–7.

Samway, S. J., Patrick H. *Walker Percy: A Life* (New York, 1997).

Tolson, Jay. *Pilgrim in the Ruins: A Life of Walker Percy* (New York, 1992).

Wright, Stuart. *Walker Percy, A Bibliography: 1930–1984* (Westport, Conn., 1986).

Kenneth Laine Ketner

PERRY, Charles Milton (1876–1942)

Charles M. Perry was born on 10 November 1876 in Union Township, Branch County, Michigan He received his BA from Albion College in 1900. He then served as a Michigan public school teacher and administrator until 1905. He received his PhD in philosophy from the University of Michigan in 1911. Perry spent a year at Michigan as a philosophy instructor, and the next year abroad as a Morris Philosophy Fellow. He then devoted several years to religious and social service, first as a Unitarian minister in Iowa City during 1914–19, and later as a social service worker in Minnesota during 1919–23. In 1923 he joined the University of Oklahoma as a full professor and as chair of the philosophy department. He held these positions until his death on 11 June 1942 in Norman, Oklahoma.

Perry was active in many academic and community organizations. He was President of the Oklahoma Academy of Science in 1937–8; President of the Southwestern Philosophical Conference in 1939–40, and State Chairman of the American Civil Liberties Union in 1938–9. He belonged to the Oklahoma Educational Association, the American Association of University Professors, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He served on the executive board of the

Western Division of the American Philosophical Association and served a term as chair of its Committee on the Place of Philosophy in the University. Perry was equally active in his university and community. For example, he was an enthusiastic member, and at one time President (1934–5), of the faculty club, where he was an avid member of the square dance group. He also was a member of the Norman Chamber of Commerce and the University of Oklahoma Alumni Association.

Perry's major work is *Toward a Dimensional Realism* (1939), which elaborates his idea that events consist of two antagonistic elements. The first element is "departure or change"; the second is "identity, or point of reference," meaning "an essence, an identity, which simply *is* and is not modified by subsequent relations" (1939, pp. 7, 8). Perry wants to account for these elements – the changing and the changeless – without treating either as less real than the other. He thus proposes a "dimensional analysis" of events (1939, pp. 7ff). When we speak of the "changeless" in an event, we signify not something that cannot change, but something that "does not change in the line of action or direction of change in the event. The 'changeless' … may change but … it does so in some … direction that is indifferent to or at right-angles with the advance of the event – the numerical values of its change lie in another dimension; that is what makes it 'changeless'." (1939, p. 10) After further developing his notion of dimensional analysis, primarily as it relates to events, Perry then applied it to other topics, including space and time, cause and effect, subject and object, and social change. Although fascinating, the book is often obscure, as reviewers at the time pointed out. Perry's articles are a more accessible route to his thought.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Principle for Realism," *Journal of Philosophy* 24 (1927): 533–42.

"A New Herakleiteanism," *Journal of Philosophy* 25 (1928): 225–33.

"Purpose in the Doctrine of Contradiction," *Journal of Philosophy* 25 (1928): 627–34.

"Essences Sublimated," *Journal of Philosophy* 27 (1930): 57–65.

"Epistemology Re-examined," *Philosophical Review* 40 (1931): 444–58.

Toward a Dimensional Realism (Norman, Okla., 1939).

The Multidimensional Society: Directions in Midst of Change (Norman, Okla., 1940).

"Matter and God," *Journal of Philosophy* 37 (1940): 645–51.

Democracy in Change: A New Dimension (Norman, Okla., 1941).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *The St. Louis Movement in Philosophy: Some Source Material* (Norman, Okla., 1930).

Henry Philip Tappan, Philosopher and University President (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1933).

"Alfred Henry Lloyd (1864–1927)," *Philosophia* 3 (1938): 12–22.

Further Reading

Proc of APA in Phil Rev v54, Who Was Who in Amer v2, Who's Who in Phil

John J. Tilley

PERRY, Charner Marquis (1902–85)

Charner M. Perry was born on 15 March 1902 in Franklin, Texas, and died on 14 September 1985 in Hart, Michigan. He earned his BA in 1924 and MA in 1925 from the University of Texas. He completed his PhD in philosophy at the University of Chicago in 1926, writing a dissertation titled "The Genesis and Operation of Moral Judgments: A Study of British Theories from Hobbes to Adam Smith." He was an instructor at the University of Minnesota in

1926–7. On 10 June 1927 he married Faith Adams. Later that year, he became an adjunct professor of philosophy at the University of Texas, a post he held until 1933.

In 1933 Perry joined the philosophy faculty at the University of Chicago, where he spent the rest of his career. He was an assistant professor from 1933 until 1944, an associate professor from 1944 until 1951, and a full professor from 1951 until he retired in September 1967. He chaired the philosophy department from 1948 until 1960. During his career he was a member of Phi Beta Kappa, the Society for Social Research, and the American Philosophical Association. In 1931–2 he was a fellow of the Social Science Research Council. He was President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1954–5. Perry was also a long-time editor of the journal *Ethics* (formerly the *International Journal of Ethics*). In 1934 he joined colleague Thomas Vernor SMITH as co-editor of that journal, and he was the lone editor from 1948 until 1967.

Perry's best-known philosophical work is "The Arbitrary as Basis for Rational Morality" (1933), in which he defends what William FRANKENA calls a "postulation theory" of ethics. According to such theories, moral reasoning derives from fundamental ethical premises, each of which represents not a truth-claim but a postulate, or commitment, by which we have chosen to live. In Perry's view, the problem of determining what is morally valuable is not the problem of discovering moral truths but that of finding good reasons for one's choices. Such reasons are relative to personal desires, interests, and the like. This is not to say that reason is the slave of the passions, for reflection and deliberation have great power to modify one's long-term goals. It is to say, however, that variation is inevitable, that people will differ in their fundamental value judgments. More than that, one's desires and interests normally underdetermine one's choices; thus, each person is thrown back, ulti-mately, on an *arbitrary* commitment to various principles. This commitment not only makes choice possible, but also determines, to a great extent, the desires and interests – indeed, the very personality – of the individual. Hence it shapes the content of each person's basic value judgments. Consequently, morality rests, ulti-mately, on "an arbitrary, underived commit-ment to certain … guiding principles and purposes" (1933, p. 138).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Arbitrary as Basis for Rational Morality," *International Journal of Ethics* 43 (1933) 127–44.

"Knowledge as a Basis for Social Reform," *International Journal of Ethics* 45 (1935): 253–81.

"The Forms and the Substance of Liberalism," *International Journal of Ethics* 46 (1936): 308–29.

"The Relation Between Ethics and Political Science," *International Journal of Ethics* 47 (1937): 163–79.

"Principles of Value and the Problem of Ethics," *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 1 (1939): 666–83.

The Philosophy of American Democracy (Chicago, 1943).

"The Rationale of Political Discussion," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 28 (1955): 18–28.

"Moral Bases of Agreement and Cooperation in a Pluralistic Society," in *Ethics and Bigness: Scientific, Academic, Religious, Political, and Military*, ed. Harlan Cleveland and Harold D. Lasswell (New York, 1962), pp. xlvii–lxiv.

"Violence – Visible and Invisible," *Ethics* 81 (1970): 1–21.

"Ethics and Democracy," *Ethics* 83 (1973): 87–107.

Further Reading
Who Was Who in Amer v9, *Pres Addr of APA v6*

John J. Tilley

PERRY, Ralph Barton (1876–1957)

Ralph B. Perry was born on 3 July 1876 in Poultney, Vermont. With thoughts of entering the ministry, Perry attended Princeton as an undergraduate, receiving his BA in 1896. He then went to Harvard, completing his PhD in philosophy in 1899. Though he did not become a Presbyterian minister as he had once planned, Perry retained a strong interest in religion and was especially interested to understand the intersections of belief and theory in philosophy. Perry considered idealism and skepticism to be potentially false and misleading tendencies in modern thought. His major philosophical project was the rational justification of moral ideals.

To understand the direction of Perry's career requires some consideration of the philosophical environment at Harvard in the 1890s, especially the influence of Josiah ROYCE and William JAMES upon Perry's style of thought. Later in his career, Perry would note the division of philosophy students at Harvard into two main camps, the camps of Royce and James, and that the choice he had then felt was being presented to him as a philosophy student was between an older absolutism (in Royce's philosophy) and a flippant radicalism (in James's philosophy). His move towards James's philosophy was decisive, leading Perry to integrate a cognitive and pluralistic stance in his philosophical work, from which he would later develop a naturalistic philosophy of morality and a theory of values.

Perry was instructor of philosophy first at Williams College in 1899–1900, and then at Smith College from 1900 to 1902. Perry returned to Harvard in 1902, and his career there spanned the course of five decades. Perry was promoted to full professor of philosophy in 1913, and retired in 1946. He had developed a strong relationship with James, which led to the production of several works on James, including his two-volume intellectual biography, *The Thought and Character of William James* (1935), which earned him the Pulitzer Prize in 1936. Perry was President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1920–21. In 1937–8 he gave the Spencer Trask Lectures at Princeton University on "The Meaning of the Humanities." In 1942 Perry was made a member of the National Institute of Arts and Letters. Perry died on 22 January 1957 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Perry's many books and articles established him as a forerunner of the "New Realism" movement in American philosophy. He also wrote books for a more general audience, producing a number of works in which he related philosophy to the concrete moral and political concerns of the time. By temperament, he was liberal and pragmatic, and there was a notable utilitarian cast to his thinking. The moral philosophy he developed emphasized inclusiveness and valued the social development of an integrative form of personality. His moral philosophy was connected to his understanding of ethics, the function of which, Perry believed, was to create as general or complete a view of the system of interests within which one is situated and to equip one with the knowledge necessary for the greatest fulfillment of interests. To Perry, what gave philosophy its legitimacy was that it was, when properly understood and applied, supportive of an intelligence and goodwill which served the general progress of values.

Perry's early work was devoted to clarifying issues of method and to differentiating current schools and trends in American philosophy. In 1905 he published *The Approach to Philosophy*, followed by one of the most widely read of his works in 1912, *Present Philosophical Tendencies*. During this early period, Perry's article "The Ego-Centric Predicament" (1910) appeared in the *Journal of Philosophy*. Perry's purpose in the article was clearly expressed: to make evident that the arguments of idealism were invalid.

According to Perry, the egocentric predicament consists of the *dependence* of consciousness upon ideas. In thinking of things or men-

tioning them, we have ideas of the things thought of or mentioned. This formulation, while true, cannot lead us to knowledge – not even knowledge about ideas. The only thing that can be safely asserted is that ideas are just ideas. The idealist has made claims – without sufficient method or proof – that everything is an idea and that only ideas exist. The egocentric predicament, while it genuinely describes the situation of knowing, does not provide for the knowledge of other types of existence, namely, of objects existing in relations of *independence*.

While refuting idealism, "The Ego-Centric Predicament" also served as a kind of polemic for philosophical realists interested in developing a full critique of idealism and to create the technical formulations by which to begin advancing the epistemological agenda of the "New Realism." Later that year the *Journal of Philosophy* published "The Program and Platform of Six Realists," indicating both the timeliness and influence of Perry's article and the interest of other philosophers to join the campaign for a "new realism." Although the "new realism" never developed into a coherent school of philosophers, Perry would use it to conceptualize a naturalistic understanding of morality and a theory of values. His two most significant works in these areas are *The Moral Economy* (1909) and the *General Theory of Value* (1926).

In *The Moral Economy*, Perry conceived of morality mainly as prudence, which he characterized as a type of intelligence. The prudent mind, as Perry described it, seeks to balance right-mindedness and open-mindedness in the pursuit of interests. As Perry conceived it, moral theory originated from and applied directly to the everyday business of living. In this way, Perry sought to cast morality as fundamentally practical and rational, and saw "practical wisdom" as the goal of moral theory. We are moral, Perry declared, because of an irrevocable commitment to life – that is, to the goodness of life. Each person is "morally liable" for the contribution he or she makes (or does not

make) to the general quotient of well-being. This quotient of well-being is what sustains and improves the general field of interests, for which we are, as rational beings, responsible.

The moral world is sprung from the natural, as Perry explained it. Life introduces a bias in nature, in the direction of what organisms take to be their interests. By natural design, the organism conceives of life in terms of sufferings and fulfillments, calamities and successes. The fortunes of the organism are in the most elementary sense termed good or bad, comprising an ethical dialectic in nature. Perry termed the various units of life through which the existence of the organism is built up, "interests." Goodness, in the most basic sense, is the "fulfillment of interest" (1909, p. 11). Morality enters the world at the moment "when interest meets interest" (1909, p. 13). Perry rendered life as a moral drama, in which interests are compelled to recognize other interests and are formed into partnerships or alliances against the "common hereditary enemy": "the heavy inertia and common wear of the cosmos" (p. 13). "Through morality a plurality of interests becomes an *economy*, or *community of interests*." (p. 13) Morality is thus a procedure of adjusting interests, whether in one or more organisms, so as to unify and coordinate interests in the common tasks of fulfillment. The moral economy comes into being as a "*massing of interests against a reluctant cosmos*" (1909, p. 14). The point upon which Perry most insisted in his moral theory was that, "In all cases the strength of morality must lie in its liberality and breadth." (p. 14)

The existence of the moral economy, Perry believed, generates an undeniable distinction between isolated interest and group (or systemic) interest. Because of this distinction, the moral economy stipulates an essential difference between what is "good" and what is "morally good." The operation of the moral good and the logical appeals upon which it rests attach our lives and actions to the system of interests. As a result, persons integrate a systematic purpose in the fulfillment of their inter-

ests, relating their interests to the judgment and well-being of the community. That a moral good is posited, and operates in fact, Perry believed, implies that there is "one ultimate good, the fulfillment of the system of interests" towards which every moral economy aspires, or ought to aspire.

There is a clear and strong element of enlightened rationalism in Perry's formulation of the moral economy. A higher interest, by natural design, providentially guides interests, forming the "controlling interest" of the moral community. The higher interest owes its status, Perry declared, to its liberality and comprehensiveness; it seeks the maximum fulfillment of interests that conditions will allow. The undeniable power of the higher interests was akin to gravity, as Perry conceived of it: "Morality is not a useful fiction … it is a body of compelling truth that will convince wherever there is a capacity to observe and reason … . [T]he saving grace of morality is directly operative in life; needing no proof from any adventitious source, because it proves *itself* under observation." (1909, p. 41)

This higher interest is the controlling interest of the moral community insofar as it represents the adjudication of interests (whether as postponed, suppressed, modified) "as is necessary for their maximum joint fulfillment" (1909, p. 54). From the moral processes and controlling interest of the moral community, persons come to develop a sense of "moral purpose," an identity by which they seek the morally preferable course of action and are cognizant of the higher interest.

The key issue in *The Moral Economy* is determining what counts (or more importantly what does not count) as an interest. The issue here is the question of how inclusive the representation of interests is or ought to be in the moral economy. The issue, Perry believed, is decisive for the progressive quality of the moral economy. In the progressive moral economy, as Perry described it, all interests must count: no one simple interest is superior to another. Yet, in moral matters interests must yield to the greater number of interests fulfilled. To Perry, "no interest can be condemned except upon grounds that recognize its claims, and aim so far as possible to provide for it among the rest. No interest can be rationally rejected as having no value, but only as having too great a cost." (1909, p. 64) Thus, Perry affirmed the utilitarian-progressive features of the moral economy, believing such an economy respected the dignity of persons through a fundamental respect for the rational powers of the individual to recognize the claims of the higher interest. In addition, Perry believed the controlling interest of the moral economy was conducive to "good will": "The justification of any act lies in its being provident; in its yield of immediate fulfillment and its generous allowance for the other interest, the remote interest, and the interest that is as yet only surmised. The good will is the will to participate productively, permissively, and formally in the total undertaking of life." (1909, p. 69)

The Moral Economy included a discussion of virtues and their progressive ordering. The presence of a particular virtue, Perry explained, a virtue's purpose, is to align choice and behavior with values, that is, to fix choice and behavior upon certain principles. These principles and virtues, Perry explained, arise out of the experiment of living. A set of virtues will persist in the moral economy only to the extent to which they have been "verified" in the history of society as contributing to some definite value. There is, thus, "no final and comprehensive order of virtues" (1909, p. 73). While virtues are relative to the particular values and conditions of a society, this does not, Perry believed, prevent us from understanding the non-subjective realities of the moral economy. Moral economies could be observed in empirical terms and studied for the facts they yield. A moral economy will have its own order of principles and values – its own stage of organization – corresponding to a level of general fulfillment toward which it aims. Thus, moral economies could be compared and contrasted and their progressive characters could

be objectively determined, "tested" even, Perry believed.

Of course, there were many questions and issues attending Perry's formulations in *The Moral Economy* which he would seek to answer in the *General Theory of Value*. If the moral economy was not to be understood in relativistic terms, the question of values and their so-called objective character needed to be further addressed. Towards that end, Perry explained a distinction must be drawn between describing the world in terms of the factual properties of its objects and the various acts of approving and ordering of its objects. Value, he stipulated, refers to the special character of an object, making that object of interest to someone. Value resided between interest and object, in a personal relation to the object.

Thus, Perry stipulated a difference between cognition and valuation. Truth and error were associated with cognition, with the presence or absence of factual properties attaching to objects we have become prepared, cognitively, to receive. This cognitive activity is independent of the opinions – positive or negative – we hold of objects. In valuing an object, we are invested in its being according to the attitude we hold of it. Valuing promotes the attitude we have towards an object – towards an object's being consistent with our personal preferences and judgments – whereas cognition prepares us to deal with an object's actual existence.

Perry maintained value and valuation were not relative or subjective. Insofar as we hold opinions of objects, values exist. These values were neither true nor false, as in the case of matters of cognition. The purpose of value theory was to provide the means for studying judgments about interests. Whether or not an object was "good" or not, that is, whether or not this attitude served the interest of the person, could, Perry believed, be empirically studied. For that matter, as he indicated in *The Moral Economy*, Perry believed a critique of values was possible. What permitted the ranking of value was the existence of principles, of standards, through which interests and

actions could be judged and their values compared. An object is worthy of our interest and/or action to the extent of its value; the better object – that is, the better interest, the better claim – is the one in which we find more value. Perry listed three standards of measurement – *intensity*, *preference*, and *inclusiveness*. These standards, Perry believed, enabled a clarification of the terms of comparison, making clear that value was variable with its circumstances and that some comparisons were in fact incommensurable. The ability to measure comparative value was thus limited, but was, ultimately, a matter of quantity, Perry believed.

Religion was of particular interest to the formulations of both *The Moral Economy* and the *General Theory of Value*. In both works, Perry sought to justify formal moral procedures – in rational and democratic terms – and to construct an ethical ideal for society. The highest good of a society could only be achieved where the individual developed a harmonious personality, a personality sufficiently inclusive as to recognize a diversity of interests and objects of value. But how to make inclusiveness a requirement, that is, how to impose the demand for such a personality? Would the sense of duty suffice? It seems not. The sense of duty, Perry thought, was not sufficient to move individuals towards integrative, harmonious development of their personalities and interests.

The moral community was dependent not on formal duty, abstractly considered, but on "good-will" (1909, p. 113). Goodwill, Perry explained, was a virtue connected with piety, a religious value arising from a reverence for living well, not just for oneself but "for all life" (ibid.). It is the spirit of goodwill, Perry explained, "rather than narrow complacency that inspires my assuming of the special tasks and responsibilities defined by proximity, descent, and special aptitude. Life as a whole is built out of individual opportunities and vocations. It is required only that while I live effectively and happily, as circumstance or choice may determine, I should conform myself to those principles which harmonize with life, and

bring an abundance of the whole out of the fruitfulness of individual effort." (p. 113) "Good-will is the moral condition of religion, where this is corrected by enlightenment." (p. 113) In the *General Theory of Value*, Perry referred again to this theme of universal benevolence, in terms of "a personal will socially directed and socially multiplied" (1926, p. 685). The "general concurrence" of goodwill Perry saw as owing to its reasonability. Yet this concurrence was greater than the reasoning of any one person, representing, Perry thought, a kind of "perfected will." "When persons live in accord the total situation is something greater than the person, as truly the organism is something greater than a cell." (p. 685)

The *General Theory of Value* was more specific than *The Moral Economy* on the subject of a deity. In the former, Perry expressed the belief that God's existence had been compromised in the history of religion by an anthropomorphic desire to worship him. To Perry, God was both a "norm of legitimate aspiration" – a general will socially embodied – and a divine being exceeding the social order, simultaneously. In the spirit of William James, Perry concluded, "God is a being far exceeding and surpassing man, and yet dependent on man's moral effort. The world becomes divine through being willed to be divine …. [I]ts being divine is conditioned by the dynamic faith through which high resolves are carried into effect. God's existence may in this sense result from a belief in God, though not from a belief that God already exists." (1929, pp. 687–9)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Approach to Philosophy (New York, 1905).

The Moral Economy (New York, 1909; 1937).

"The Ego-Centric Predicament," *Journal of Philosophy* 7 (1910): 5–14.

"A Realistic Theory of Independence," in *The New Realism: Cooperative Studies in Philosophy* (New York, 1912), pp. 99–151.

Present Philosophical Tendencies, a Critical Survey of Naturalism, Idealism, Pragmatism and Realism Together with a Synopsis of the Philosophy of William James (New York, 1912).

General Theory of Value: Its Meaning and Basic Principles Construed in Terms of Interest (New York, 1926).

"A Theory of Value Defended," *Journal of Philosophy* 28 (1931): 449–60.

The Thought and Character of William James, 2 vols (Boston, 1935; abr. edn, Cambridge, Mass., 1948).

Realms of Value: A Critique of Human Civilization (Cambridge, Mass., 1954).

Other Relevant Works

Perry's papers are at Harvard University.

In the Spirit of William James (New Haven, Conn., 1938).

Puritanism and Democracy (New York, 1944).

"Realism in Retrospect," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 2, pp. 187–212.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Ethics*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v43*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v3*, *Proc of APA v32*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Aspell, Patrick J. "Objective Knowledge According to Ralph Barton Perry," *New Scholasticism* 36 (1962): 49–75.

Cohen, Morris R. "The New Realism," *Journal of Philosophy* 10 (1913): 197–214.

Dewey, John. "The Short-Cut to Realism Examined," *Journal of Philosophy* 7 (1910): 553–7.

Kehler Jr., Walter H. "Some Observations on the Ethics of Ralph Barton Perry," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce*

Society 16 (1980): 141–52.

Klausner, Neal W. "Three Decades of the Epistemological Dialectic," *Philosophy of Science* 14 (1947): 20–43.

Kuklick, Bruce. *The Rise of American Philosophy: Cambridge, Massachusetts 1860–1930* (New Haven, Conn., 1977).

McGilvary, E. B. "The New Realism," *Philosophical Review* 22 (1913): 57–65.

Montague, William P. "The Story of American Realism," *Philosophy* 12 (1937): 1–22.

Reck, Andrew. "The New Realism of Ralph Barton Perry," in *Recent American Philosophy: Studies of Ten Representative Thinkers* (New York, 1962).

Schneider, Herbert W. "Emergence of Naturalistic Realisms," in *A History of Philosophy in America*, 2nd edn (New York, 1963), pp. 493–524.

Werkmeister, W. H. "Perry: Value as an Object of Interest," in *Historical Spectrum of Value Theories, vol. 2: Anglo/American Group* (Lincoln, Neb., 1973), pp. 112–44.

Dean Papas

PHILLIPS, Wendell (1811–84)

Wendell Phillips was born on 29 November 1811 in Boston, Massachusetts, and died there on 2 February 1884. After graduating from Boston Latin School, he received his BA from Harvard College in 1831 and then a law degree from Harvard in 1833. After Phillips married Ann Terry Greene in 1837 and was inspired by her anti-slavery convictions, he dropped his law practice and threw himself into the abolition movement. He stepped to the forefront of this movement by spontaneously defending abolitionist editor Elijah P. Lovejoy before an agitated crowd filling Boston's Faneuil Hall on 7 December 1837. Although Phillips did not agree with William Lloyd GARRISON's pacifism, they were united upon the idea that abolitionists should also support women's rights, and Phillips was Garrison's primary ally during the 1840s and 50s.

Phillips was the most visible and loudest proponent of abolition across the northern and mid-western states. Famous for his rhetorical style, he was a national celebrity. His speeches at innumerable cities and towns were transmitted and amplified by telegraph, newspapers, and book publishers that repeated his lectures and collected them for publication. In his books *The Constitution, A Pro-slavery Document* (1844) and *Can an Abolitionist Vote or Hold Office under the United States Constitution?* (1845), he argued that the North should withdraw from the Union. However, by 1860 Phillips was advocating a violent resolution to slavery and rejoiced at the start of the Civil War.

Upon the war's end, Garrison abandoned the abolition movement as fulfilled, but Phillips took the presidency of the much smaller American Anti-Slavery Society in order to fight for black equality and the right to vote that was eventually enshrined in the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution in 1870.

Phillips also turned his oratory and writing skills to the cause of labor and unionism. Unlike other former abolitionists, such as Edwin L. Godkin, Phillips did not view private property rights as any obstruction to organized labor. Just as capitalists had perfected the skills of cooperation, combination, and eliciting government aid, the working class could hardly be anti-American for only imitating the wealthy. Phillips went further than many pro-unionists when he predicted that the working class would survive and win this political struggle to achieve an egalitarian and socialist society by taxing the rich out of existence. Rejecting laissez-faire capitalism's view that the sanctity of private property is all that is needed to ensure freedom and individualism, Phillips revived Thomas Jefferson's vision of independence and Ralph Waldo EMERSON's disdain for material wealth.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Constitution, a Pro-slavery Compact
(Boston, 1844; 2nd edn 1845; 3rd edn
1856).

*Can an Abolitionist Vote or Hold Office
under the United States Constitution?*
(New York, 1845).

The Philosophy of the Abolition Movement
(New York, 1860).

Speeches, Lectures and Letters (Boston,
1863; 1884).

Speeches, Lectures and Letters, Second Series
(Boston, 1891).

Other Relevant Works

Phillips's papers are at Harvard University
and the Boston Public Library.

*Wendell Phillips on Civil Rights and
Freedom*, ed. Louis Filler (New York,
1965).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*,
Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, *Comp Amer
Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*,
Nat Cycl Amer Bio v2

Austin, George L. *The Life and Times of
Wendell Phillips* (Boston, 1884).

Bartlett, Irving. *Wendell Phillips, Brahmin
Radical* (Boston, 1961).

———, *Wendell and Ann Phillips: The
Community of Reform, 1840–1880* (New
York, 1979).

Sherwin, Oskar. *Prophet of Liberty: The Life
and Times of Wendell Phillips* (New York,
1958).

Stewart, James B. *Wendell Phillips: Liberty's
Hero* (Baton Rouge, Louis., 1986).

John R. Shook

PIATT, Donald Ayres (1898–1967)

Donald A. Piatt was born on 22 October 1898
in Huntington, Indiana, the first of five children
of Walter Burton Piatt and Evelyn Belle Ayres
Piatt. He received a PhB degree from the
University of Chicago in 1919 and stayed for
graduate study, earning his PhD in philosophy
in 1925. He studied with pragmatists George
H. MEAD, James H. TUFTS, and Addison W.
MOORE, and wrote a dissertation on "Mind
and Nature." From 1925 to 1931 Piatt taught
philosophy at the University of Texas, where he
was promoted up to full professor. From 1931
until retiring in 1965 he was professor of phi-
losophy at the University of California at Los
Angeles. He served for more than ten years as
chair of the philosophy department. In 1948–9
he was President of the American Philosophical
Association Pacific Division. He died on 2
February 1967 in Los Angeles, California.

Piatt absorbed and embraced the philoso-
phy of the later years of the Chicago school of
pragmatism. Like his peers Thomas V. SMITH
(doctorate in 1922) and Charles W. MORRIS
(doctorate in 1925), Piatt was destined for a
career promoting pragmatism during its time of
eclipse after World War II. The heavy demands
of teaching and administration resulted in few
publications, yet they were penetrating, useful,
and widely respected. Although Piatt's own
pragmatism was most heavily indebted to John
DEWEY, he could take a critical and constructive
stance towards Dewey's views because of his
study of other pragmatisms, especially those
of Mead and William JAMES. Piatt's article
"Immediate Experience" (1928) illustrates this
capacity, by attempting to clarify and defend
Dewey's position that each experience contains
ineffable and indescribable qualities which are
immediately had without conceptual media-
tion, and which are not internal mental repre-
sentations but rather direct presentations of
realities. Such immediate qualities are not can-
didates for knowledge by themselves, Piatt
explains, because knowledge is a matter of rela-
tions between meaningful experiences. His later

article, "That Will-O'-the-Wisp, the Innocent Inscrutable Given" (1935), further pursues this issue of whether immediate experiences in their own right can be, or generate, some type of empirical knowledge. His contribution to *The Philosophy of John Dewey* (1939) on Dewey's logic is one of the more perceptive studies ever composed; Dewey himself described Piatt's effort as the best essay in the volume.

Piatt's APA presidential address, "Philosophy, Pragmatism, and Human Bondage" (1949), places much responsibility on modern philosophy for the world's anxieties over war, rampant technology, and loss of values. Philosophy has divorced facts from feelings and values, kept the mind apart from nature, and has aligned itself with dehumanizing mechanism and determinism. Pragmatism is precisely the needed philosophy of freedom and creativity because it promises to reverse these longstanding intellectual trends.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Mr. Montague on the Relativity of Truth," *Journal of Philosophy* 25 (1928): 323–6.
"Immediate Experience," *Journal of Philosophy* 25 (1928): 477–92.
"That Will-O'-the-Wisp, the Innocent Inscrutable Given," *Journal of Philosophy* 32 (1935): 337–50.
"Dewey's Logical Theory," in *The Philosophy of John Dewey*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (Evanston, Ill., 1939), pp. 105–34.
"Philosophy, Pragmatism, and Human Bondage," *Philosophical Review* 58 (1949): 412–28.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v40

John R. Shook

PILLSBURY, Walter Bowers (1872–1960)

Walter B. Pillsbury was born on 21 July 1872 in Burlington, Iowa, and died on 3 June 1960 in Ann Arbor, Michigan. His parents were William Henry Harrison Pillsbury, a Methodist minister, and Eliza Crabtree Bowers Pillsbury. Pillsbury was attracted to psychology while a student of H. K. Wolfe at the University of Nebraska, from which he graduated with the BA degree in 1892. In 1893 Pillsbury went to Cornell University to study with Edward Bradford TITCHENER, who had recently come to Cornell from Wundt's laboratory in Leipzig. When Pillsbury arrived at Cornell, Titchener had not yet made his famous distinction between "structural" and "functional" psychology and the lines of battle among the American psychological systems had not yet formed. Pillsbury was thus trained in an eclectic view; and throughout his career he refused to link himself to one or another of the psychological schools.

While a graduate student, Pillsbury collaborated with Titchener in translating Oswald Külpe's *Einleitung in die Philosophie*, published in English as *Introduction to Philosophy* (1897). In those days psychology was still part of the Sage School of Philosophy at Cornell; and Pillsbury also wrote reviews and abstracts of philosophical books and articles for the newly established *Philosophical Review*. In 1896 he received the PhD in psychology from Cornell under Titchener with a dissertation on reading that dealt with systematic issues in apperception and attention. He thus became one of the first experimental psychologists trained entirely in America.

In 1897 Pillsbury obtained a psychology appointment at the University of Michigan, where he established and developed a program and then eventually a department of psychology. In 1925 Pillsbury was elected into the prestigious National Academy of Sciences. When the psychology department was formed in 1929, splitting from philosophy, he served as its first chair. He remained at Michigan for

the remainder of his career, retiring in 1942. During his years in Ann Arbor, he became well known for his work on attention, publishing an authoritative book on the topic in 1906. Pillsbury is also remembered for a widely used textbook, *Essentials of Psychology* (1911), which had three editions by 1930. One particularly notable feature of Pillsbury's text was its definition of psychology as "the study of behavior." While he was among the first to define psychology in this way in print, Pillsbury was not a behaviorist. He always felt that the behaviorist definition of psychology, promoted by John B. WATSON, was too narrow.

Wider effects of Pillsbury's work include influence on intelligence testing and eugenics. His *Elementary Psychology of the Abnormal* (1932) and other writings discussed supposed hereditary mental problems, claimed that intelligence cannot be improved by education, and had little sympathy for the social class of "true degenerates." Other works include a book with C. L. Meader entitled *The Psychology of Language* (1928), and *The History of Psychology* (1929). These, together with his other books and numerous articles on psychological topics – particularly those of his early years – left an indelible mark on the field.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

L'Attention (Paris, 1906). 2nd edn, *Attention* (New York, 1908).

The Psychology of Reasoning (New York, 1910).

The Essentials of Psychology (New York, 1911; 2nd edn 1920; 3rd edn 1930).

The Psychology of Nationality and Internationalism (New York, 1919).

Education as the Psychologist Sees It (New York, 1925).

The Psychology of Language, with Clarence L. Meader (New York, 1928).

The History of Psychology (New York, 1929).

Elementary Psychology of the Abnormal (New York, 1932).

Other Relevant Works

Pillsbury's papers are in the Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Trans. with E. B. Titchener, *Introduction to Philosophy*, by Oswald Külpe (New York, 1897).

"The Place of Movement in Consciousness," *Psychological Review* 18 (1911): 83–99.

"The Datum," in *Philosophical Essays in honor of James Edwin Creighton*, ed. George H. Sabine (New York, 1917), pp. 162–74.

"Walter B. Pillsbury," in *A History of Psychology in Autobiography*, vol. 2, ed. Carl Murchison (Worcester, Mass., 1932), pp. 265–95.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych by Zusne*, *Encyc Psych*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v44*, *Pres Addr of APA v1*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*

Dallenbach, Karl M. "Walter Bowers Pillsbury: 1872–1960," *American Journal of Psychology* 74 (1961): 165–73.

McGrade, M. C., and Karl M. Dallenbach. "A Bibliography of Walter Bowers Pillsbury," *American Journal of Psychology* 74 (1961): 174–6.

Miles, Walter R. "Walter Bowers Pillsbury," *National Academy of Sciences Biographical Memoirs*, vol. 37 (New York, 1964), pp. 267–91.

Raphelson, Alfred C. "Psychology at Michigan: The Pillsbury Years, 1897–1947," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 16 (1980): 301–12.

Rand B. Evans

PINCOFFS, Edmund Lloyd (1919–93)

Edmund Pincoffs was born on 7 June 1919 in Chicago, Illinois. He received the BA in 1941 at the University of North Carolina, and the PhD in philosophy from Cornell in 1957. He first taught philosophy at the University of Houston from 1955 to 1965, rising through the ranks to become associate professor and chair of the department. He then became professor of philosophy and education at the University of Texas at Austin, where he remained until his retirement in 1989. He served as Associate Dean of the graduate school (1967–8) and chair of the department (1976–80). He was visiting fellow at Princeton University (1962–3) and he also had visiting appointments at Oberlin College and the University of Cambridge. In 1981–2 he held a National Endowment for the Humanities senior fellowship and a fellowship at the National Humanities Center. He was President of the Southwestern Philosophical Society in 1962, and also was President of the International Association for Philosophy of Law and Social Philosophy. Pincoffs was elected President of the American Philosophical Association Central Division for 1992–3. Pincoffs died on 7 November 1993 in Austin, Texas.

In his *Quandaries and Virtues* (1986) Pincoffs criticizes quandary ethics – a contemporary approach affirming the primacy of solving moral problems, of finding what one should do to resolve a moral perplexity. This influential school claims that one must obey the bare rules, such as "keep your promises." One must be conscientious and rule-responsible. Pincoffs maintains that ethics is larger than such a view imagines. Being conscientious and following rules is not enough. Rules are not always helpful in solving moral puzzles. One must also consider virtue-ethics where all the classical virtues are central. Quandary ethics stands opposed to Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics, Aquinas, and Hume, who were concerned with inculcating excellent moral character and in finding the good for man. They were not greatly concerned with justifying difficult choices in dealing with perplexities. It is a distortion to reduce ethics to finding what one ought to do in a difficult situation, and contemporary ethicists too often adopt this approach, he says. Pincoffs says that the argument for quandary ethics – that the chaotic tempo of our times dictates a practical, problem-solving ethics – is historically false. Ancient societies knew violent changes and yet virtue ethics flourished even then, as in Stoicism.

Pincoffs demonstrates that the conception one has of one's own moral character may determine one to break the rule of keeping promises. Personal ideals will lead one to abide by a prior agreement one has made, because keeping that agreement is more worthy of one's character than not keeping it and following a set of rules. The one who walks the *second* mile, and goes beyond the mere keeping of rules, exhibits true character and virtue.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Rationale of Legal Punishment (New York, 1966).
Quandaries and Virtues: Against Reductivism in Ethics (Lawrence, Kan., 1986).
Philosophy of Law: A Brief Introduction (Belmont, Cal., 1991).

Other Relevant Works
"Debatability and Moral Assertion," *Philosophical Quarterly* 12 (1962): 1–12.
"What Can Be Taught?" *The Monist* 52 (1968): 120–32.
"Quandary Ethics," *Mind* 80 (1971): 552–71.
"On Avoiding Moral Indoctrination," in *Educational Judgements*, ed. J. Doyle (London, 1975), pp. 59–73.
Ed., *The Concept of Academic Freedom* (Austin, Tex., 1975).
"Due Process, Fraternity and a Kantian Injunction," in *Due Process*, ed. J. R. Pennock and J. W. Chapman (New York,

1977), pp. 172–81.

"Are Questions of Desert Decidable?" in *Justice and Punishment*, ed. J. B. Cedarblom and W. Blizek (Cambridge, Mass., 1977), pp. 75–88.

"Government and Character," *Social Theory and Practice* 17 (1991): 327–35.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v10, *Proc of APA v65*, *Who Was Who in Amer v11*

Louden, Robert B. "On Pincoffs' Conception of Ethics," *Journal of Philosophical Research* 19 (1994): 9–22.

MacIntyre, Alasdair. "My Station and Its Virtues," *Journal of Philosophical Research* 19 (1994): 1–8.

"The Nature of Virtue Ethics: Its Political Relevance." Issue dedicated to Pincoffs. *Social Theory and Practice* 17 (Summer 1991).

Edward W. O'Brien

PITCHER, George Willard (1925–)

George Pitcher was born on 19 May 1925 in Newark, New Jersey. He received his BS from the US Naval Academy in 1946, and then he attended Harvard, where he received his MA in 1954 and PhD in philosophy in 1957. In 1956 Pitcher became instructor of philosophy at Princeton University, and remained there for the rest of his career. He was a Guggenheim fellow in 1965, and by 1970 he was promoted to full professor. Pitcher retired in 1981 and continued to publish papers for some years as emeritus professor.

Pitcher's early work centered on Ludwig Wittgenstein and various applications of his *Tractatus* and later works to philosophical problems of language and perception. His book *The Philosophy of Wittgenstein* (1964) gives a short biography of Wittgenstein, a discussion of the *Tractatus* on sense data, propositions, and language, and an exposition of these same issues in his later work. Pitcher was inspired to follow a line of argument against representationalism towards a direct realist theory of perception. In "Pain Perception" (1970) Pitcher argued that feeling a pain is a type of direct sense perception of a part of one's body that is abnormal or damaged.

Pitcher defends a kind of restricted direct realism in his book *A Theory of Perception* (1971). Perceiving is a causal reception of beliefs through the senses. The argument that perception results in inner mental states like sense-data supposes that the same proximate cause must result in the same immediate effect, so that hallucinations and genuine perceptions are indistinguishable. Against this argument, Pitcher suggests something like a reliabilist account of perceptual belief, in which non-conscious yet true perceptual beliefs caused by external objects, and these beliefs are dispositions to certain behaviors. Pitcher appeals to recent psychological studies of perception to support his thesis.

Pitcher's interests in philosophy of mind and perception also led him to the study of George Berkeley in a monograph and some articles. His exposition and critiques in *Berkeley* (1977) primarily concern Berkeley's theory of perception, his account of abstraction and mental activity, his dispute with realism, his own development of idealism, and his moral philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Philosophy of Wittgenstein (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964).
A Theory of Perception (Princeton, N.J., 1971).
Berkeley (London, 1977).

Other Relevant Works
"On Approval," *Philosophical Review* 67 (1958): 195–211.
"Necessitarianism," *Philosophical Quarterly* 11 (1961): 201–12.
Ed., *Truth* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964).
"Emotion," *Mind* 74 (1965): 326–46.
Ed., *Wittgenstein: The Philosophical*

Investigations (Garden City, N.Y., 1966; Notre Dame, Ind., 1968).

Ed. with Oscar P. Wood, *Ryle: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Garden City, N.Y., 1970; London, 1971).

"Pain Perception," *Philosophical Review* 79 (1970): 368–93.

"Austin: A Personal Memoir," in *Essays on J. L. Austin* (Oxford, 1973), pp. 17–30.

"Sensations and Information: A Reply to Cornman," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 56 (1978): 65–7.

"Berkeley on the Mind's Activity," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 18 (1981): 221–7.

"The Misfortunes of the Dead," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 21 (1984): 183–8.

"Berkeley on the Perception of Objects," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 24 (1986): 99–105.

Ed., *Berkeley on Vision: A Nineteenth-century Debate* (New York, 1988).

Further Reading

Atherton, Margaret. "Pitcher's *Berkeley*," *Journal of Philosophy* 76 (1979): 42–52.

Cornman, James W. "Might a Tooth Ache but There Be No Tooth Ache? *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 55 (1977): 27–40.

Graham, Jody. "Common Sense and Berkeley's Perception by Suggestion," *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 5 (1997): 397–423.

Kline, A. David. "Berkeley, Pitcher, and Distance Perception," *International Studies in Philosophy* 12 (1980): 1–8.

Maund, J. B. "On the Distinction between Perceptual and Ordinary Beliefs," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 38 (1977): 209–19.

Noren, Stephen J. "Pitcher on the Awfulness of Pain," *Philosophical Studies* 25 (1974): 117–22.

Rorty, Richard. "Wittgenstein, Privileged Access, and Incommunicability," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 7 (1970): 192–205.

John R. Shook

PITKIN, Walter Boughton (1878–1953)

Walter B. Pitkin was born on 6 February 1878 in Ypsilanti, Michigan. He was the son of Caleb Seymour Pitkin, a devout Presbyterian, prohibitionist, and apostle of women's suffrage, and Lucy T. Boughton. Following a brief part-time career as a newspaper writer for his father's paper and for the *Detroit Evening News*, Pitkin enrolled in the University of Michigan, where he studied with Robert M. WENLEY and received the BA degree in 1900. In the same year he obtained an appointment at the Paris World Fair Commission, which enabled him to spend time at the Sorbonne. In 1903 he received a BD from the Startford Theological Seminary. Pitkin also studied at the Universities of Berlin and Munich.

In 1905 Pitkin met William JAMES and began publishing on James and pragmatism. From 1905 to 1909 Pitkin was lecturer in philosophy and psychology at Columbia University. He also joined the editorial staff of *The New York Tribune* (1907–1908) and *The New York Evening Post* (1909–10). In 1912 Pitkin joined Columbia's new Pulitzer School of Journalism as a professor of journalism, and he also continued to offer philosophy and psychology courses. He retired in 1943.

Pitkin was one of the six new realists, together with Ralph B. PERRY, E. B. HOLT, Arthur O. LOVEJOY, William P. MONTAGUE, and Edward G. SPAULDING. Key to this movement was the firm conviction that there are objects that are independent of the knowledge relation. While originally a polemical movement, the new realists developed some of their positive theses in *The New Realism* (1912) to which Pitkin was a contributor.

Pitkin's exposure to shell-shocked soldiers in World War I shifted his focus to popular non-fiction, of which *Life Begins at Forty* (1932) and *A Short Introduction to the History of Human Stupidity* (1932) became the most popular. In the latter, Pitkin included, among many others, Walt WHITMAN, Albert EINSTEIN, and also himself. Pitkin has been described as

a crusading, opinionated, provocative iconoclast. He had a quarrel with the Québec legislature for his description of French Canadians, and he received heavy criticism for calling President Wilson pathologically unhappy in *The Psychology of Happiness* (1929).

A staunch critic of overspecialization, Pitkin was many things, including a butler, a composer, a cook, a hard cider manufacturer, a cattle boss, and a junk dealer in Paris. He was American Editor of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1927–8), and a story supervisor for Universal Pictures (1929). In 1933 he launched a farmers' cooperative in Centerville, Maryland. He helped set up a 33,000-acre wheat ranch in Texas. He built a $100,000 98-foot four-keeled catamaran which sank on its maiden voyage down the Hudson River on New Year's Eve of 1939. He was an editor for *Parents Magazine* (1927–30) and *The Farm Journal* (1935–8), and wrote hundreds of pulp fiction stories. He died on 25 January 1953 in Palo Alto, California, when he was working on a new book called *Let's Enjoy Life Again*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Logical Problems, Old and New," *Journal of Philosophy* 2 (1905): 231–5.

"Universals: A Criticism," *Journal of Philosophy* 2 (1905): 600–608.

"A Problem of Evidence in Radical Empiricism," *Journal of Philosophy* 3 (1906): 645–50.

"The Self-Transcendency of Knowledge," *Philosophical Review* 15 (1906): 39–58.

"Some Neglected Paradoxes of Visual Space," *Journal of Philosophy* 6 (1909): 601–8, 645–55; 7 (1910): 92–100, 204–15.

"James and Bergson; or, Who is Against Intellect?" *Journal of Philosophy* 7 (1910): 225–31.

"The Program and First Platform of Six Realists," with E. B. Holt, W. T. Marvin, W. P. Montague, R. B Perry, and E. G. Spaulding, *Journal of Philosophy* 15 (1910): 393–401.

"Philosophy and the Flatfish," *Journal of Philosophy* 8 (1911): 682–8.

The Art and Business of Story Writing (New York, 1912).

"Some Realistic Implications of Biology," in *The New Realism: Cooperative Studies in Philosophy* (New York, 1912), pp. 378–467.

"The Empirical Status of Geometrical Entities," *Journal of Philosophy* 10 (1913): 393–403.

"Time and Pure Activity," *Journal of Philosophy* 11 (1914): 521–6.

Capitalism Carries On (New York, 1915).

Columbia War Papers (New York, 1917).

Must We Fight Japan? (New York, 1921).

The Twilight of the American Mind (New York, 1928).

The Psychology of Happiness (New York, 1929).

The Art of Learning (New York, 1931).

The Consumer: His Nature and His Changing Habits (New York, 1932).

Making Man Safe for Mankind (Baltimore, Md., 1938).

Other Relevant Works

Life Begins at Forty (New York, 1932).

A Short Introduction to the History of Human Stupidity (New York, 1932).

Let's Get What We Want! A Primer in a Sadly Neglected Art (New York, 1935).

On My Own (New York, 1944). Pitkin's autobiography.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*

Bergson, Henri. "A propos d'un article de Mr. Walter B. Pitkin intitulé: 'James and Bergson'," *Journal of Philosophy* 7 (1910): 385–8.

Cohen, Morris R. "The New Realism," *Journal of Philosophy* 10 (1913): 197–214.

James, William. "Mr. Pitkin's Refutation of 'Radical Empiricism'," *Journal of*

Philosophy 3 (1906): 712.

McGilvary, E. B. "The New Realism,"
Philosophical Review 22 (1913): 57–65.

Cornelis de Waal

PLANTINGA, Alvin Carl (1932–)

Alvin Plantinga was born 15 November 1932 in Ann Arbor, Michigan, the son of Cornelius and Lettie Plantinga. He was the oldest of three brothers, including Cornelius, who became President of Calvin Theological Seminary. Plantinga did undergraduate work at Jamestown College and Harvard University before receiving a BA in philosophy from Calvin College in Michigan in 1954. He received the MA in philosophy from the University of Michigan in 1955, and the PhD in philosophy from Yale University in 1958. His dissertation was on "Ethics and Metaphysical Naturalism."

From 1958 to 1963 Plantinga was assistant and then associate professor of philosophy at Wayne State University. From 1963 to 1982, he was professor of philosophy at Calvin College. In 1982 Plantinga became the John A. O'Brien Professor of Philosophy at the University of Notre Dame, where he also directed the Center for Philosophy of Religion from 1984 to 2002. Plantinga has received numerous academic fellowships, including those of the Guggenheim, National Endowment for the Humanities, and American Council of Learned Societies. In 1975 he became a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He has delivered many named lectures, including the 1988 Wilde Lectures at Oxford and the 1987–8 Gifford Lectures at Aberdeen. Plantinga was President of the American Philosophical Association Central Division in 1981–2, and President of the Society of Christian Philosophers during 1983–6.

Plantinga has published more than a dozen books and well over one hundred articles in journals, magazines, and anthologies. He is one of the most influential American philosophers of religion of the twentieth century. He is almost single-handedly responsible for the remarkable resurgence in philosophy of religion and Christian philosophy that swept the United States in the last thirty years. His areas of research interest and production have set the stage for discussion and debate among those interested in natural theology, religious epistemology, and philosophical theology. When Plantinga defends a philosophical position, that position becomes a focal point of professional interest and generates copious publications of response, rebuttal, and support.

Plantinga's impact has gone well beyond philosophy of religion and has defined research programs in metaphysics, logic, and epistemology. The actualist possible worlds semantics he developed in *The Nature of Necessity* (1974) remains significant for modal logic and modal metaphysics, and his analysis of epistemic warrant as proper function has proved one of the most fruitful theories in post-Gettier epistemological research. Very few contemporary philosophers have matched Plantinga's impact on philosophy.

Nonetheless, philosophy of religion in general, and the epistemology of religious belief in particular, hold Plantinga's lasting contributions. From *God and Other Minds* in 1968 to *Warranted Christian Belief* in 2000, Plantinga's greatest contribution has been in defense of the claim that belief in the God of theism has no reason for shame in the court of epistemic evaluation. Plantinga has argued that any epistemological theory that rules out the possibility of rational or justified theistic belief will prove to be implausible.

The defense of this thesis has come in three major phases, with many minor embellishments and nuances. The first of these three phases appears in *God and Other Minds*; the second in *The Nature of Necessity* and *God, Freedom, and Evil* (1974); and the third in

"Reason and Belief in God" (1983) and the surrounding body of literature on Reformed Epistemology, culminating in the tome *Warranted Christian Belief*. The form of his defense of theistic belief in each of these phases is unexpected, provocative, and philosophically potent.

Two qualifying notes about Plantinga's program are appropriate before considering details of these three phases. First, Plantinga's primary concern is what he identifies in *Warranted Christian Belief* as the de jure objection to theism: the objection that, even if theism is true, no one can be rational in believing in it, since there is not enough evidence, or enough of the right kind of evidence, to lend it proper epistemic pedigree. This objection, rather than the de facto objection that theism is simply false, has been the main avenue of philosophical attack on theism through most of the twentieth century. Consequently, Plantinga's focus is not on apologetics or natural theology, but on the epistemology of religious belief. Second, while Plantinga has turned his attention specifically to Christian belief in recent years, his primary emphasis throughout his career has been on the defensibility of theistic belief in general. His main target has been the naturalism and atheism permeating the academy in recent decades, which has shunned theism in any form.

The provocative nature of Plantinga's work is manifest in his first book. The first three chapters of *God and Other Minds* are startling; they comprise over one hundred pages of argument that the three paradigm instances of natural theology – the ontological, cosmological, and teleological arguments – all fail as proofs of God's existence. In the second part of the book, however, he argues that a similar verdict must hold for the most popular arguments *against* theism, notably the argument from evil, so that an unsettling rational parity hovers over the discussion. Before declaring agnostic stalemate, however, Plantinga turns to the problem of other minds and demonstrates that the best argument for belief in other minds, the argument from analogy, fails in a way reminiscent of the failure of the teleological argument. This result touches off a thorough investigation into the nature of rational belief and its relation to philosophical argumentation, from which Plantinga derives the amazing, though tentative, conclusion: "If my belief in other minds is rational, so is my belief in God. But obviously the former is rational; so, therefore, is the latter." (1968, p. 271)

Plantinga's indirect defense of theism proceeds from the frequently overlooked failure of philosophy to enable justification of obvious truths. Apparently, Plantinga concludes, rigorous philosophical validation is not necessary for rational belief. But if this is so, why must we conclude that theistic belief without rigorous philosophical validation is irrational or in some way inappropriate? Why should religious beliefs meet a higher standard than other beliefs? Such an approach shifts the burden of proof in a way many have found dialectically dizzying. Inducing philosophical vertigo among critics of theism has become Plantinga's trademark; it has proved his most powerful, and to many his most frustrating, philosophical ploy.

In *The Nature of Necessity* Plantinga applies modal metaphysics to two traditional weapons in the theist's arsenal, the ontological argument for God's existence and the free will defense against the argument from evil. He also treats these two subjects in *God, Freedom, and Evil*, published in the same year but without most of the technicality of *The Nature of Necessity*.

Plantinga's ontological argument is a revision of the modal argument popularized years before by Charles HARTSHORNE and Norman MALCOLM, a version he had considered and reluctantly dismissed in *God and Other Minds*. This form of the argument focuses on the *necessity* of God's unsurpassable greatness, rather than on its purported facticity. Plantinga relies on the indirect defense of theism introduced above to conclude that the ontological argument, while not demon-

strative, is nonetheless adequate to ground rational theistic belief for those convinced of the truth of its key premise, that it is possible that some necessarily maximally great being exists. Plantinga claims to have developed a sound form of the argument, but not one that compels assent on pain of irrationality. In making this claim, Plantinga incorporates into his indirect defense of theism the growing consensus among epistemologists that epistemic justification is modest and person-relative. What counts as justified for a cognizer in one set of circumstances may not count for others in similar circumstances. Hence, one might well be justified in believing in God on the basis of Plantinga's ontological argument, while others might be justified in rejecting the argument.

Plantinga exhibits no such modesty in his free will defense, based on his idea of "transworld depravity," which exposes the failure of the logical argument from evil against belief in God. This defense is in chapter 9 of *The Nature of Necessity*, and a less technical formulation is in part one of *God, Freedom, and Evil*. The logical argument from evil asserts an inconsistency between theism and evil, so that both cannot be instantiated in the same world. The more modest empirical argument admits the consistency of theism and evil, but argues that the amount or severity of evil in the world renders God's existence improbable or unlikely. Plantinga has addressed the empirical argument in various works, but his primary contribution has been his rebuttal of the logical argument. Many philosophers of religion, including leading atheist philosophers, have acknowledged the finality of his criticism and declared the logical argument philosophically dead. Furthermore, virtually every major criticism of Plantinga's defense has been revealed to harbor either a logical flaw of its own or a fundamental misunderstanding of transworld depravity. Work on the argument from evil has switched in the last thirty years to a nearly exclusive focus on the empirical argument, and a large reason for this shift is the growing consensus that Plantinga has solved the logical problem. Plantinga's complex solution is fully explained in Robert Adams's chapter in Tomberlin and van Inwagen (1985), and in Sennett (1992).

Despite the difference of modesty about his conclusions, Plantinga's treatments of the ontological argument and the free will defense share similarities important to understanding his significance. First, both have been hotly debated. Even thirty years after their initial publication one finds new materials addressing them. Both are prime examples of Plantinga's dominance over research programs in contemporary philosophy of religion. Second, these arguments represent an important maturation of philosophy of religion in their employment of techniques of logic, modal metaphysics, and epistemology. Today's philosopher of religion must be well trained in contemporary philosophy in order to keep up with the discipline. Furthermore, many contemporary philosophers of religion are well known for significant contributions in other areas of philosophy. This impressive mainstreaming of the subject is due in large part to Plantinga's blending of the concerns of philosophy of religion with those of philosophy in general, represented most notably in the theistic arguments of *The Nature of Necessity*.

This last point is further confirmed by the fact that *The Nature of Necessity* is not simply, nor even primarily, a work in philosophy of religion; it is primarily a work in modal metaphysics, in which Plantinga develops what has become the definitive semantics for modal metaphysics committed to *actualism*, the doctrine that entities bear properties only in worlds in which they exist. Much of Plantinga's work in this volume has been the center of discussion in metaphysics since its publication. For example, Plantinga's definition of a possible world as a maximally consistent state of affairs, eschewing more popular tendencies to think of them as sets or propositions, has generated much debate. Plantinga stands alongside Saul KRIPKE and David LEWIS

as a pioneers in contemporary modal logic.

The third phase of Plantinga's defense of theistic belief takes on the widely held conviction he calls "evidentialism," the view that belief in God can be rational only if it is supported by propositional evidence. Plantinga holds that theism requires no such evidence. After all, many paradigmatically rational beliefs do not require it. Our perceptual beliefs, memory beliefs, and simple logical and mathematical beliefs are all considered "properly basic," rational without appeal to any other beliefs, but grounded firmly in experiences appropriate to produce such beliefs. Plantinga argues that theistic belief is similarly grounded in appropriate experience. He labels this position "Reformed Epistemology," because of its conceptual origins in the work of John Calvin and other great Reformed theologians such as Karl Barth and Herman Bavinck.

Plantinga's defense of Reformed Epistemology developed in two distinct stages. In the first phase he adopted the indirect strategy he employed twice before, arguing that there is no good reason to exclude theistic belief from the foundations of a rational noetic system, and that any putative reasons appeal either to an indefensible conception of epistemic justification or to an arbitrary double standard that holds theistic belief to stricter requirements than other kinds of belief. His major publication in this phase was a long essay entitled "Reason and Belief in God," the cornerstone of a 1983 collection of papers exploring Reformed Epistemology edited by Plantinga and his colleague at Calvin, Nicholas WOLTERSTORFF.

In his second Reformed Epistemology stage, Plantinga developed a positive epistemological theory that he argued provides the conceptual framework for properly basic theistic belief and even immediate knowledge of God. His fully mature argument for this framework appeared in *Warranted Christian Belief*. Plantinga bases his argument on the Calvinistic notion of the *sensus divinitatis*, the idea that God has provided us with an epistemic faculty whose function is to perceive immediately the presence and action of God in the world. Plantinga develops a theory of the *sensus divinitatis* as functioning alongside of and isomorphic to such familiar epistemic faculties as perception, memory, and the intuitive grasp of fundamental logical relationships. As noted above, Plantinga's program is not apologetic; he does not claim that his epistemological theory shows theistic belief to be true. He claims to show only that, if theism is true, a plausible epistemological theory shows how it can be justified or "warranted," his preferred term.

As in the case of his forays into modality, Plantinga's work is not simply an instrument for undergirding theism. He develops a full-blown epistemological theory in the two volumes that constitute the prequel to *Warranted Christian Belief*, published together in 1993 as *Warrant: The Current Debate* and *Warrant and Proper Function*. In these volumes Plantinga argues that the proper subject of epistemological research is not simply justification, which he argues has little to do with knowledge; rather, he proposes, we should be seeking a theory of *warrant*, that property which, added to true belief, produces knowledge.

In *Warrant: The Current Debate* Plantinga investigates every major theory of analytic epistemology and finds each deficient as an account of warrant. In *Warrant and Proper Function* he presents his own theory, which states roughly that a belief has warrant if and only if it is produced by properly functioning epistemic faculties operating in an environment conducive to their proper function. This theory is externalist in that the warrant of a belief need not be available to reflective cognizers; one may not be able to ascertain through introspection which of one's beliefs are warranted. Plantinga's theory is, ironically, in the tradition of the naturalized epistemologies of such secular theorists as John DEWEY (who advanced "warranted assertibility" as the aim of inquiry), W. V. QUINE, Alvin GOLDMAN, and Robert NOZICK.

Like his theory of modality, Plantinga's theory of warrant as proper function has been the focus of much debate apart from his use of it in defense of theistic belief. Many consider the theory the finest attempt to date to make sense of foundationalist epistemology in the post-Enlightenment era, when Cartesian dreams of infallible foundations and justificatory certainty are long dead. Whether or not one accepts the theory of proper function, it is a seminal theory of contemporary epistemology, one that has generated much literature and that will continue to do so. Herein lies another example of the "mainstreaming" of issues in philosophy of religion and of the philosophers who consider them into broader areas of contemporary philosophy.

Plantinga's philosophical interests and contributions are by no means limited to those surveyed in this essay. For example, Plantinga's criticisms of the empirical argument from evil has issued in ingenious challenges to commonly held beliefs about probability. He has also contributed significantly to specialized issues of Christian philosophy, such as debates over methodological naturalism in the philosophy of science and the defensibility of Christian exclusivism. Furthermore, Plantinga has taken a central practical role in the growth in Christian philosophy over the last thirty years. He is a founding member and served as third president of the Society of Christian Philosophers, a society of over one thousand members and the largest special focus philosophical organization in the world, which also publishes *Faith and Philosophy*, one of the most prestigious philosophy of religion journals. Plantinga's inaugural address at Notre Dame, entitled "Advice to Christian Philosophers" (1984), has been anthologized many times, and is understood by Christian philosophers to be the foundational document in the current resurgence of Christian philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
God and Other Minds: A Study of the Rational Justification of Belief in God (Ithaca, N.Y., 1968).
God, Freedom, and Evil (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1974).
The Nature of Necessity (Oxford, 1974).
"The Probabilistic Argument from Evil," *Philosophical Studies* 35 (1979): 1–53.
"Reason and Belief in God," in *Faith and Rationality*, ed. Alvin Plantinga and Nicholas Wolterstorff (Notre Dame, Ind., 1983), pp. 16–93.
"Advice to Christian Philosophers," *Faith and Philosophy* 1 (1984): 253–71.
"Alvin Plantinga: Self Profile," in *Alvin Plantinga*, ed. James E. Tomberlin and Peter van Inwagen (Dordrecht, 1985), pp. 3–97.
"An Evolutionary Argument against Naturalism," *Logos* 12 (1991): 27–49.
Warrant: The Current Debate (Oxford, 1993).
Warrant and Proper Function (Oxford, 1993).
"Christian Philosophy at the End of the 20th Century," in *Christian Philosophy at the Close of the Twentieth Century*, ed. Sander Griffioen and Bert Balk (Kampen, The Netherlands, 1995), pp. 29–53.
Warranted Christian Belief (Oxford, 2000).
Essays in the Metaphysics of Modality, ed. Matthew Davidson (Oxford, 2003).

Other Relevant Works
"Necessary Being," in *Faith and Philosophy*, ed. Alvin Plantinga (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1964), pp. 97–110.
"Induction and Other Minds," *Review of Metaphysics* 19 (1966): 441–61.
"World and Essence," *Philosophical Review* 79 (1970): 461–92.
"Actualism and Possible Worlds," *Theoria* 42 (1976): 139–60.
"The Boethian Compromise," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 15 (1978): 129–38.
Does God Have a Nature? (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1980).

"Is Belief in God Properly Basic?" *Noûs* 15 (1981): 41–51.

"Positive Epistemic Status and Proper Function," *Philosophical Perspectives* 2 (1988): 1–50.

"Justification in the 20th Century," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 50 suppl. (1990): 45–71.

"Pluralism: A Defense of Religious Exclusivism," in *The Rationality of Belief and the Plurality of Faith: Essays in Honor of William P. Alston*, ed. Thomas D. Senor (Ithaca, N.Y., 1995), pp. 191–215.

"Methodological Naturalism?" in *Facets of Faith and Science*, ed. J. van der Meer (Lanham, Md., 1995), vol. 1, pp. 177–221.

The Analytic Theist: An Alvin Plantinga Reader, ed. James F. Sennett (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1998).

"On Heresy, Mind, and Truth," *Faith and Philosophy* 16 (1999): 182–93.

"Rationality and Public Evidence: A Reply to Richard Swinburne," *Religious Studies* 37 (2001): 215–22.

Further Reading

Amer Phils 1950–2000, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Phil*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v9*

Beilby, James K. *Naturalism Defeated? Essays on Plantinga's Evolutionary Argument against Naturalism* (Ithaca, N.Y., 2002).

Feldman, Richard. "Proper Functionalism," *Noûs* 27 (1993): 34–50.

Flew, Antony. "Compatibilism, Free Will, and God," *Philosophy* 48 (1973): 231–44.

Fumerton, Richard. "Plantinga, Warrant, and Christian Belief," *Philosophia Christi* 3 (2001): 341–51.

Hoitenga, Dewey. *From Plato to Plantinga: An Introduction to Reformed Epistemology* (Albany, N.Y., 1992).

Kvanvig, Jonathan, ed. *Warrant in Contemporary Epistemology: Essays in Honor of Plantinga's Theory of Knowledge* (Lanham, Md., 1996).

McLeod, Mark S. *Rationality and Theistic Belief: An Essay on Reformed Epistemology* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1993).

Parsons, Keith M. *God and the Burden of Proof: Plantinga, Swinburne, and the Analytic Defense of Theism* (Buffalo, N.Y., 1989).

Pike, Nelson. "Plantinga on Free Will and Evil," *Religious Studies* 15 (1979): 449–73.

Quinn, Philip. "In Search of the Foundations of Theism," *Faith and Philosophy* 2 (1985): 469–86.

Sennett, James F. *Modality, Probability, and Rationality: A Critical Examination of Alvin Plantinga's Philosophy* (New York, 1992).

———, "The Analytic Theist: An Appreciation," in *The Analytic Theist: An Alvin Plantinga Reader*, ed. James F. Sennett (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1998), pp. xi–xviii.

———, "Reformed Epistemology and the Rationality of Theistic Belief," in *God Matters*, ed. Ray Martin and Chris Barnard (New York, 2003), pp. 219–31.

Sosa, Ernest. "Proper Functionalism and Virtue Epistemology," *Noûs* 27 (1993): 51–65.

Stump, Eleonore. "Orthodoxy and Heresy," *Faith and Philosophy* 16 (1999): 147–63.

Swinburne, Richard. "Plantinga on Warrant," *Religious Studies* 37 (2001): 203–14.

Tomberlin, James E., and Peter van Inwagen, eds. *Alvin Plantinga* (Dordrecht, 1985).

van Inwagen, Peter. "Some Remarks on Plantinga's Advice," *Faith and Philosophy* 16 (1999): 164–72.

James F. Sennett

POKAGON, Simon (1830–99)

Simon Pokagon was born in the spring of 1830 in a Potawatomi community near Lake James in present-day Steuben County of northeastern Indiana. Shortly after his birth his family moved to a camp near Dowagiac in the St. Joseph Valley of southwestern Michigan. Like many tribal nations, the Potawatomi are composed of several distinct bands and Simon's father, Leopold, was a leader of the Neshnabek, one of these groups. Leopold negotiated successful treaties between his tribe and the United States federal government, and this work influenced his son's subsequent career as a writer and public speaker on Indian causes.

Scholars know little about Pokagon's private life. His exact date of birth is unknown, as is the full name of his mother, Elizabeth. According to his memoirs, he began to learn English at the age of twelve upon befriending a Christian missionary. Shortly afterwards, Pokagon's father died, and the youngster was sent to a school affiliated with Notre Dame College in Indiana. Pokagon then attended Twinsburg Institute, a college preparatory school located near Cleveland, Ohio. In 1893, while he was a student at Twinsburg, he met and married a woman named Lonidaw (Victoria Cougoneo), who also was Potawatomi.

In 1864 Pokagon went to Washington, D.C. as a member of a Potawatomi delegation seeking financial compensation for lands they had ceded to the United States. While in Washington, Pokagon met President Abraham Lincoln and the Secretary of the Interior, John Palmer Usher. Usher's agreement to pay back the Potawatomi band marks the beginning of Pokagon's controversial career as an Indian advocate.

Pokagon often was mired in disagreement with his tribe regarding financial and governmental activities. Although his band eventually petitioned the US Commissioner of Indian Affairs to reject any claims made by Pokagon

on behalf of the Potawatomi, the activist grew increasingly popular among non-Indians as a spokesperson of Indian causes. His most significant public appearance occurred at the 1893 Columbian Exposition in Chicago, an event that was heavily publicized in the media. Writings attributed to Pokagon from this period include "An Indian on the Problems of His Race" (1895), "The Future of the Red Man" (1897), and "Simon Pokagon on Naming the Indians" (1897). These writings, like much of the published works and lectures of his Indian contemporaries, including Gertrude BONNIN, Charles EASTMAN, BLACK ELK, and Luther STANDING BEAR, sought to instruct non-Indian readers in tribal and pan-Indian culture and traditions. For example, in "Naming the Indians," Pokagon discussed the importance of indigenous sovereignty, which he believed American translators overlooked when they took it upon themselves to rename Native peoples and tribal nations.

Pokagon lived during an era of extraordinary transformation for numerous tribes and nations, and his writings reflect his concern with sovereignty and tradition regarding ownership of land and of tribal culture. His political decisions differed from those of much of his tribe and this resulted in tensions with his band over strategies and policies in dealing with the United States. Pokagon's difficulties with his band, which occurred while he simultaneously enjoyed non-Indian acclaim, illustrate the difficult and complicated choices and lifestyles available to Native individuals and populations during this era.

Pokagon began to suffer from ill health in the late 1890s. Attesting to his popularity among non-Indians, newspapers published updates on his deteriorating health. Pokagon died on 28 January 1899 near Hartford, Michigan. Scholars now believe that a popular posthumous work published under his name, *Queen of the Woods* (1899), was largely written by someone else. However his other writings continue to provide insight into the complex philosophical, rhetorical, and politi-

cal strategies utilized by nineteenth-century Native writers and speakers to promote the rights of indigenous peoples.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Red Man's Greeting (Hartford, Mich., 1893).

The Red Man's Rebuke (Hartford, Mich., 1893). Repr. in *Indian Nation: Native American Literature and Nineteenth-century Nationalisms*, by Cheryl Walker (Durham, N.C., 1997).

"An Indian on the Problems of His Race," ed. Albert Shaw, *American Monthly Review of Reviews* 12 (December 1895): 694–5.

"The Future of the Red Man," *Forum* 23 (August 1897): 698–708.

Birch Bark Booklets, 6 vols (Hartford, Mich., 1899). Includes "Algonquin Legends of Paw Paw Lake" and "Algonquin Legends of South Haven."

Algonquin Legends of South Haven (South Haven, Mich., 1900).

Pottawattamie Book of Genesis: Legend of the Creation of Man (Hartford, Mich., 1901).

Other Relevant Works

Pokagon's papers are in the National Museum of the American Indian in New York.

"Simon Pokagon on Naming the Indians," *American Monthly Review of Reviews* 16 (September 1897): 320–1.

"Indian Superstitions and Legends," *Forum* 35 (July 1898): 618–29.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio

Clifton, James. "Pokagon, Simon," in *Encyclopedia of North American Indians*, ed. Frederick Hoxie (Boston, 1996).

Clifton, James. "Simon Pokagon's Sandbar: Potawatomi Claims to Chicago Lakefront," *Michigan History* 71 (September–October 1987): 12–17.

Dickason, David H. "Chief Simon Pokagon: The Indian Longfellow," *Indiana Magazine of History* 57 (1971): 127–40.

O-gi-maw-kwe mit-i-gwa-ki (Queen of the Woods) (Hartford, Mich., 1899).

"O-gi-maw-kwe mit-i-gwa-ki"; Big Chief's Poem Has Been Dramatized and Will Be Played," *New York Times* (5 May 1904): 1.

"Pottawatomie Chief Dying; He Is Simon Pokagon, the Author of a Book on the Indian Wars," *New York Times* (31 July 1897): 1.

Ruoff, A. LaVonne Brown. "Simon Pokagon," in *Handbook of Native American Literature*, ed. Andrew Wiget (New York, 1996), pp. 277–80.

Julia Chenot GoodFox

POLANYI, Michael (1891–1976)

Michael Polanyi was born on 12 March 1891 in Budapest, Hungary, into a prosperous middle-class Jewish-Hungarian family. His father, Michael Pollacsek, was a civil engineer and building contractor for Budapest's suburban railways, and his Russian-born mother, Cecile Wohl, was a woman with strong interests and involvement in Hungarian intellectual life. Michael was the brother of Karl Polanyi, the renowned economic and social historian.

Polanyi entered the University of Budapest Medical School in 1909 and completed his studies in 1913. He continued to pursue his first love, science, at the Technische Hochschule in Karlsruhe, Germany. With the outbreak of World War I in 1914 he returned to Hungary to serve as a medical officer in the Austro-Hungarian army. During this time he published

a number of scientific papers on topics in physical chemistry, and carried on a correspondence with Albert EINSTEIN who was impressed with the quality of the work of this obscure young army officer.

While convalescing from diphtheria Polanyi wrote a thesis on the adsorption of gases which was accepted in 1916 as a doctoral dissertation by the University of Budapest. After receiving a PhD in physical chemistry in 1917, Polanyi returned to Karlsruhe in 1919, and subsequently accepted an appointment in 1920 at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Fiber Chemistry in Berlin. A series of scientific successes led to a promotion in 1923 to the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Physical Chemistry where he remained until Hitler's rise to power in 1933. During this ten-year period he developed a growing interest in the political developments that were occurring in Germany and Russia. He organized a political discussion group at the Institute, which included fellow Hungarian scientists John VON NEUMANN, Eugene Wigner, and Leo Szilard.

From 1933 to 1948 Polanyi held a chair in physical chemistry at the University of Manchester. His attention to and interest in the political developments of the time and in the deeper philosophical questions they raised were sharpened dramatically during a visit to the Soviet Union in 1935. He learned from the leading communist theoretician Nikolai Bukharin, that the idea of pure science was held to be an artificial construct of bourgeois society and that there was only applied science serving the interests of the state and the current five-year plan. Thereafter he became a leading voice in defense of pure science and intellectual freedom. Years later when Princeton University conferred on Polanyi an honorary Doctor of Science degree at its bicentennial celebration in 1949, it called him "a veteran campaigner against those who would take from science the freedom she requires for the pursuit of truth."

Polanyi published his first major philosophical work, *Science, Faith and Society*, in 1946.

Thereafter he devoted himself exclusively to philosophical questions, and in 1948 the University of Manchester created a chair for him in social studies. He was invited in 1951–2 to give the Gifford Lectures at the University of Aberdeen. These lectures became the basis of his principal work in philosophy, *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy* (1958). With its sweeping new theory of knowledge, the publication of *Personal Knowledge* established Polanyi as a major voice in the philosophy of science, especially in the United States. The University of Chicago offered him a tenured appointment in philosophy of science in 1951, but he was denied the requisite visa because of an alleged past involvement with a subversive political group. This was likely a reference to his membership, with his brother Karl, in a leftist/progressive student society, the Galileo Circle, while a medical student in Budapest.

In 1960 Polanyi was made a research fellow at Merton College in Oxford University, the position he held until his death. In the 1950s he had begun to lecture extensively in the United States, where he continued to develop, refine, and apply his theories. Polanyi gave the Terry Lectures at Yale University in 1962, visited Duke and Stanford, and spent 1965–6 at the Center for Advanced Studies at Wesleyan University. These lectures became the foundation for his last major work, *The Tacit Dimension*, published in 1966.

Polanyi's philosophical writings were and continue to be more widely known and read in the United States, where he spent more of his time in later years, than in Europe. During the 1960s and early 1970s he was a visiting professor at many American universities, among them Stanford, Duke, Yale, Virginia, University of California at Berkeley, and Chicago. He was made an honorary member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and was a fellow of the Royal Society in Britain. By 1972 Polanyi's health declined and he returned to Oxford. Polanyi died on 22 February 1976 in Northampton, England.

With a fully articulated theory of personal knowledge, Polanyi sought to undermine the ideal of modern science of a strictly detached objective knowledge. He argued that such a concept made an anomaly of "the responsible choices of man, his moral and esthetic ideals [and of] the fact of human greatness." The initial point of departure in his philosophical investigations resides in his examination of the "nature and justification of scientific knowledge." He begins by rejecting the idea that such knowledge is wholly objective, detached, and impersonal. This false ideal of scientific detachment has its origins in the critical philosophy of the Enlightenment, beginning with Descartes and culminating in Kant. It sought to re-establish the ground of all knowledge by moving from complete skepticism to absolute certitude by means of universal methodic doubt. It is therefore the central dogma of modern science that knowledge must be based on that which cannot be doubted, that it must be grounded in that which is unshakable and indubitable, and that it must be wholly explicit. Polanyi rejects this as nonsense. Plato's *Meno* shows us that all knowledge cannot be explicit, that we always "know more than we can tell." Knowledge would not be possible if it were entirely explicit, for if this were the case we could never know a problem, much less look for its solution.

Knowledge possesses a fiduciary character; it rests upon trust, upon an act of believing. Polanyi finds the origin of this insight in St. Augustine who "brought … Greek philosophy to a close by inaugurating for the first time a post-critical philosophy. He taught that all knowledge was a gift of grace, for which we must strive under the guidance of antecedent belief: *nisi credideritis, non intelligitis* [unless you believe, you will not understand]." (1958, p. 266) For Polanyi, as for Augustine, belief in all its forms and manifestations is the source of all knowledge: "Tacit assent and intellectual passions, the sharing of an idiom and of a cultural heritage, affiliation to a like-minded community: such are the impulses which shape our vision of the nature of things on which we rely for our mastery of things. No intelligence, however critical or original, can operate outside such a fiduciary framework." (p. 266)

Science proceeds from a set of premises or beliefs. "The premises … on which all scientific teaching and research rest are the beliefs held by scientists on the general nature of things." (1946, p. 11) Foremost among these is the belief that there is a reality with a hidden structure, which is capable of being known. To the question, how does scientific discovery work, Polanyi gives an answer similar to what Charles PEIRCE called abduction. "*How can we tell what things not yet understood are capable of being understood?* The answer [is] that we must have a foreknowledge sufficient to guide our conjecture with reasonable probability in choosing a good problem and in choosing hunches that might solve the problem." (1946, p. 14) For Polanyi this is "creative guesswork," the "art of guessing," what might also be called forming a hypothesis: "The propositions of science … appear to be in the nature of guesses. They are founded on the assumptions of science concerning the structure of the universe and on the evidence of observations collected by the methods of science; they are subject to a process of verification in the light of further observations according to the rules of science; but their conjectural character remains inherent in them." (1946, pp. 31–2)

But if science is only guesswork, why do we accept any one guess as superior to any other? Polanyi finds a clue to the answer in Gestalt psychology. Particulars are perceived jointly so that the object of perception is an integrated configuration or pattern. But unlike the Gestaltists for whom perception is passive, Polanyi considers the perceiving subject to have an active role in the shaping of experience. This active shaping or integrating of experience he declares to be "the great and indispensable tacit power by which all knowledge is discovered … and held to be true" (1966, p. 6). Every act of knowing is "an active comprehension of the things known." (1958, p. vii) By this he means that knowledge is an action that requires some

kind of skill, whether it is theoretical or practical.

His most original insight is that knowledge involves two kinds of awareness, one which is focal (in other words: explicit, public, objective) and the other which is subsidiary (or implicit, personal, subjective). But knowledge can never be entirely focal. When it occurs in the form of a problem, "the subsidiary aspect looms large." For example, when we drive a nail with a hammer we are aware of both but in different ways. The focus of our attention is the nail being driven, but we are also aware, in a subsidiary fashion, of the feeling of the hammer in our hand as it drives the nail. The feeling of the tool in our palm, the feeling of our fingers as they grasp the handle, and the feeling of the hammer as an extension of our hand and fingers as it strikes the nail, constitute the particulars of our subsidiary or tacit awareness.

We dwell tacitly in these particulars in an act of integrated awareness such that together they produce the wholeness of our focal awareness. The relationship between these two forms of awareness is a "from-to" relationship. We attend *from* our tacit or subsidiary awareness of the particulars *to* our explicit or focal awareness of the object. The particulars of our subsidiary awareness (the hammer, and the fingers, hand, arm and body of which the hammer is an extension) together constitute the *proximal* term of the relationship. The nail being driven into the wood is the *distal* term. It is the particulars in the proximal term of which we know more than we can tell. "Our body is the ultimate instrument of all our external knowledge." (1966, p. 15) Knowledge is always an act of indwelling in these particulars in such a way that they yield to clues about the object of our focal awareness. "It is not by looking at things, but by dwelling in them, that we understand their joint meaning." (1966, p. 18)

The general epistemological reform called for in the theory of tacit knowing guided Polanyi in the development of his political, social, and moral thought. He argued that modern critical philosophy, with its ideal of objective, impersonal knowledge, yielded historically to the moral nihilism of Nietzsche in the nineteenth century, which in turn prepared the way for the totalitarian states, of both the left and the right, of the twentieth century. Using the objective ideal of knowledge as its model, modern critical thought produced the ideal of moral perfectionism and sought to establish morality in terms of a supreme and universal principle such as the categorical imperative of Kant or the greatest happiness principle of Bentham and Mill.

Consequently, the modern world suffers not from a deficiency of morality but from an excess of moral passion and fanaticism. Nihilism itself is an example of moral excess as are the totalitarianisms of the twentieth century. Communism and fascism are not forms of secular religion. They are expressions of moral excess and moral fanaticism, not of religious fanaticism. They represent the extreme versions of the modern quest for moral perfection, but with the most horrific results. The acts of violence, brutality, and cruelty, which they commit, are justified in terms of sublime moral ideals. Polanyi calls this moral inversion: "a condition in which high moral purpose operates only as the hidden form of an openly declared inhumanity" (1969, p. 16).

The tension between nihilism and skepticism on the one hand and moral perfectionism on the other has erupted in two different directions: in the extreme romantic individualism of Rousseau and Nietzsche and in the totalitarianism of Marx. While these appear to be diametrically opposed, they in fact are alternative ways of reconciling "a belief in moral perfection with a complete denial of moral motives" (1974, p. 143). Nihilism, skepticism, and perfectionism are joined in their common scorn for traditional morality as banal and hypocritical, and lacking in authenticity.

Polanyi's rejection of this arises out of his theory of tacit knowing. In his first philosophical treatise, *Science, Faith and Society*, he describes science as a republic, a community of inquirers who share a common belief in the

existence of a real world whose hidden truths are capable of being discovered. Intrinsic to this belief is a love of the truth, which includes moral truth. It is through professing an obligation to a particular set of scientific principles and ideals residing in a particular tradition of science that an individual becomes a member of this republic and acquires the freedom to conduct experimental investigations. So it is with all other modes of inquiry including moral inquiry. Freedom is acquired through membership in a community, a membership which entails an obligation to a particular set of values and traditions. "Just as an individual cannot be obliged in general," he writes, "so also he cannot be free in general." (1974, p. 65)

Polanyi's moral philosophy stands in the tradition of the eudaimonistic ethics of Aristotle. In repudiating the perfectionism of modern critical philosophy, he reminds us that *moral excellence* in the Aristotelian sense and *moral perfection* in the modern sense are not at all the same thing. Moral perfection is a commitment to reaching an ideal specifically expressed in a supreme and universal principle. Moral excellence on the other hand involves a commitment to a developmental way of life. In the eudaimonism of Aristotle and Polanyi, one's ideal self (one's moral character) is a complex and richly woven tapestry. It entails the pursuit of excellence not only in morality but also in other facets of life, in art, science, religion, politics, and so on. A commitment to moral perfection is a commitment to an illusion while a commitment to moral excellence is a commitment to a concrete set of goals and purposes made possible by our empathy or dwelling in the unspecifiable particulars of our subsidiary awareness (in other words, our *daimon*, the sum of our better potentialities) for the purpose of focusing on a specifically reachable goal.

This implicit Aristotelian eudaimonism in Polanyi's moral philosophy helps us better to understand the central importance of liberty. At the very heart of his liberalism is an affirmation of intellectual freedom, the heart of his social and political thought. The essence of liberty does not lie in a discrete, unencumbered individual who is free to do whatever he pleases so long as he refrains from encroaching on the freedom of others. This moral minimalism would bring us to the brink of moral anarchy and eventually into nihilism. A genuinely free society cannot be indifferent to such things as justice and injustice, to honesty and fraud, to compassion and cruelty, to knowledge and ignorance. These are not matters for the private individual to decide in the solitude of his own heart independently of the commonly held beliefs of society.

There must be boundaries for freedom to exist, and these boundaries must be shaped by moral consensus. But moral consensus cannot be equated with a formal set of laws nor can freedom be confined to a formal definition. "Only within a free society can free institutions preserve freedom." In other words, a tradition of freedom is necessary for actual freedom. When this tradition is assimilated into the moral character of the individual citizen, it renders her free. It "dwells within the peoples of free countries." It does not exist "in the explicit content of … constitutional rules, but in the tacit practice of interpreting these rules" (1955, p. 31). The survival of free institutions cannot be guaranteed by the existence of a code of law alone. It can only be assured by the continuous practice of interpreting this code and by the art of living a free life in light of this interpretation. Much of this lies within the tacit dimension of our lives.

Traditional practices by which freedom is defined and limited, far from being an adversary and a threat to liberty, are a vital source of its renewal and growth. These practices make possible the process of continuous social and moral improvement in a free society. They stand in opposition to the idea that we are capable of reaching moral perfection. Our moral allegiance must be to what Polanyi calls "a manifestly imperfect, if not *immoral* society; and we … find, paradoxically, that our duty lies in the service of ideals which we nevertheless know we cannot possibly

achieve" (1975, p. 214). So in a free society we have a responsibility to learn the limits of freedom. In learning these limits we are capable of transcending them and of moving "in the direction of continually richer and fuller meanings" and thereby expanding "limitlessly the firmament of values under which we dwell" (1975, p. 216).

It was one of Polanyi's richest insights that the limitations of an imperfect world make possible the limitless expansion of the horizons of human life. We find the genius of his philosophy not only in his reformulation of modern epistemology by reinstating the fiduciary character in human knowledge to its rightful place, but in the way in which he connected the complexities and subtleties of personal knowledge with a wide range of moral, social. and political issues which still compel our attention.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Science, Faith and Society (London, 1946).
The Logic of Liberty (Chicago, 1951).
Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy (Chicago, 1958).
The Study of Man (Chicago, 1959).
Beyond Nihilism (Cambridge, UK, 1960).
The Tacit Dimension (Garden City, N.Y., 1966).
Knowing and Being: Essays by Michael Polanyi, ed. Marjorie Grene (Chicago, 1969).
Meaning, with Harry Prosch (Chicago, 1975).

Other Relevant Works
Polanyi's papers are at the University of Chicago.
"On Liberalism and Liberty," *Encounter* 4 (March 1955): 29–34.
Scientific Thought and Social Reality: Essays by Michael Polanyi, ed. Fred Schwartz (New York, 1974).
Society, Economics, and Philosophy: Selected Papers of Michael Polanyi, ed. Richard T.Allen (New Brunswick, N. J., 1996).

Further Reading
Bio Dict Psych
Allen, Richard T. *Polanyi* (London, 1990). Contains a bibliography of Polanyi's writings.
Apczynski, John V. *Doers of the Word: Toward a Foundational Theology Based on the Thought of Michael Polanyi* (Missoula, Mont., 1977).
Gelwick, Richard. *The Way of Discovery: An Introduction to the Thought of Michael Polanyi* (New York, 1977).
Gill, Jerry H. *The Tacit Mode: Michael Polanyi's Postmodern Philosophy* (Albany, N.Y., 2000).
Jha, Stefania R. *Reconsidering Michael Polanyi's Philosophy* (Pittsburgh, 2002).
Kane, Jeffrey. *Beyond Empiricism: Michael Polanyi Reconsidered* (New York, 1984).
Langford, Thomas, and William H. Poteat, eds. *Intellect and Hope: Essays in the Thought of Michael Polanyi* (Durham, N.C., 1968).
The Logic of Personal Knowledge: Essays Presented to Michael Polanyi on His Seventieth Birthday (London, 1961).
Poirier, Maben W. *A Classified and Partially Annotated Bibliography of All Forms of Publications, Sound Recordings, Internet Documents, etc. by and about the Anglo-Hungarian Philosopher of Science Michael Polanyi* (Toronto, 2002).
Poteat, William H. *Polanyian Meditations: In Search of a Post-Critical Logic* (Durham, N.C., 1985).
———, *A Philosophical Daybook: Post-Critical Investigations* (Columbia, Missouri, 1990).
Prosch, Harry. *Michael Polanyi: A Critical Exposition* (Albany, N.Y., 1986).
Sanders, Andy E. *Michael Polanyi's Post-Critical Epistemology: A Reconstruction of Some Aspects of "Tacit Knowing"* (Amsterdam, 1988).
Thomson, Alexander. *Tradition and Authority in Science and Theology: With Reference to the Thought of Michael*

Polanyi (Edinburgh, 1985).

Torrance, Thomas F., ed. *Belief in Science and in Christian Life: The Relevance of Michael Polanyi's Thought for Christian Faith and Life* (Edinburgh, 1980).

Paul Nagy

POLS, Edward (1919–)

Edward Pols was born on 1 February 1919 in Newark, New Jersey. As an undergraduate major in English literature at Harvard College from 1936 to 1940 he took only one philosophy course, a one-year historical survey of major philosophers, but by his senior year his interest had turned toward philosophy. He served in the US Army from July 1942 until March 1946, spending two years in England, France, and Germany as a first lieutenant, earning the Bronze Star. During his military service he began to study and write philosophy, despite the difficulties of those times. A fifty-page unpublished essay from December 1943, written at Cornell University as he was finishing a total-immersion study of German and things German, foreshadowed some of the chief themes of his first book, *The Recognition of Reason* (1963).

Pols returned to Harvard University late in the spring 1946 semester as a graduate student in philosophy, receiving his MA in 1947 and his PhD in philosophy in 1949. His doctoral dissertation, "The Idea of Freedom in the Metaphysics of Whitehead," is highly critical of Alfred North WHITEHEAD. Its last chapter proposed instead a metaphysical doctrine that is recognizably a more mature version of the 1943 Cornell essay. That chapter did not appear in the published version of his dissertation, *Whitehead's Metaphysics* (1967), because the prior publication of *The Recognition of Reason* had made it superfluous.

Pols taught at Princeton University as an instructor of philosophy in 1948–9. In 1949 he went to Bowdoin College, as assistant professor until 1955, associate professor until 1962, full professor until 1975, and William R. Kenan, Jr. Professor of Philosophy and Humanities until 1984. He retired early from teaching in 1984, but served as research professor until 1994, when Bowdoin named him Kenan Professor Emeritus. In 1986–7 Pols was President of the Metaphysical Society of America.

Pols writes that his claim to originality rests on a complex doctrine whose several related themes recur in his 1963, 1975, 1982, 1992, and 1998 books: (1) the human person is a causally significant power whose unity consists of a universal component embodied in a particular component; (2) the human person is regarded as a *primary being*, expressed in a hierarchy of subordinate primary beings each of which is causally significant; (3) the causal relation is not merely temporally sequential but also formal/telic; (4) the power of the human person is that of a rational agent, and the most important expression of that power is in radically realistic knowing of that which is other than the agent; (5) such knowing is a fusion of the rational and the experiential that is not captured in the usual epistemological categories; (6) such knowing, in its creative reflexive use, called radically originative reflection, justifies its own radically realistic capacity. Pols pursues these themes further in a book in progress whose working title is *On Rational Agency*.

Besides metaphysics, Pols's interests include philosophy of art, philosophy of religion, and the philosophical aspects of several scientific and literary disciplines. His poetry has appeared in the *Sewanee Review*, the *Massachusetts Review*, and Erwin A. Glikes and Paul Schwaber's 1964 anthology, *Of Poetry and Power: Poems Occasioned by the Presidency and by the Death of John F. Kennedy*. In 1982 he began a fruitful collaboration with psychologist Barbara S. Held, resulting in several co-authored articles and influencing her 1995

book, *Back to Reality: A Critique of Postmodern Theory in Psychotherapy.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Recognition of Reason (Carbondale, Ill., 1963).

Whitehead's Metaphysics: A Critical Examination of "Process and Reality" (Carbondale, Ill., 1967).

Meditation on a Prisoner: Towards Understanding Action and Mind (Carbondale, Ill., 1975).

The Acts of Our Being: A Reflection on Agency and Responsibility (Amherst, Mass., 1982).

Radical Realism: Direct Knowing in Science and Philosophy (Ithaca, N.Y., 1992).

Mind Regained (Ithaca, N.Y., 1998).

Other Relevant Works

"To Live at Ease Ever After," *Sewanee Review* 66 (1958): 229–51.

"Consciousness-Makers and the Autonomy of Consciousness," *Yale Review* 60 (1971): 514–31.

"Power and Agency," *International Philosophical Quarterly* 11 (1971): 293–313.

"Action and its Physiological Basis," *Review of Metaphysics* 31 (1978): 365–86.

"The Ontology of the Rational Agent," *Review of Metaphysics* 33 (1980): 689–710.

"The Conditions of Ontic Responsibility," *Review of Metaphysics* 35 (1981): 297–319.

"After the Linguistic Consensus: The Real Foundation Question," *Review of Metaphysics* 40 (1986): 17–40.

"On Knowing Directly: The Actualization of First Philosophy," *Review of Metaphysics* 41 (1987): 229–53.

"Realism versus Antirealism: The Venue of the Linguistic Consensus," *Review of Metaphysics* 43 (1990): 717–49.

"Logical Implication and the Ambiguity of Extensional Logic," *Review of Metaphysics* 47 (1993): 235–59.

"Knowing God Directly," *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 45 (1999): 31–49.

"Rational Action and the Complexity of Causality," *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology* 22 (2002): 1–18.

Further Reading

Colapietro, Vincent M. "Human Agency: The Habits of Our Being," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 26 (1988): 153–68.

Kirkpatrick, Frank G. *Together Bound: God, History, and the Religious Community* (Oxford, 1994).

Eric v. d. Luft

POPKIN, Richard Henry (1923–)

Richard H. Popkin was born on 27 December 1923 in Bronx, New York. Both parents were emancipated Jews who were born in the United States of immigrant parents from a village near Vilna, Lithuania. Popkin attended high school during 1937–40 at De Witt Clinton, one of the finest public schools in the city. He received his BA and MA degrees from Columbia University in 1943, the year in which he married Juliet Greenstone. In 1944 he was a graduate student at Yale University, but he returned to receive his PhD in philosophy from Columbia in 1950 with a dissertation entitled "The Neo-Intuitionist Theory of Mathematical Logic." Popkin's first philosophy appointment was at the University of Connecticut in 1946–7. He then was a professor of philosophy at the University of Iowa from 1947 to 1960, and Claremont College in California from 1960 to 1963. In 1963 Popkin helped found the philosophy department at the University of California at San Diego by becoming its first chair. He then was professor of philosophy at

Washington University in St. Louis from 1973 to 1985. He also held visiting appointments at the University of California, Berkeley, as well as Duke, Brandeis, McGill, CUNY, Tel Aviv, UCLA, and Emory. After becoming professor emeritus he became adjunct professor of history and philosophy at the University of California at Los Angeles, where he continues to pursue research and writing.

Popkin was a Fulbright Research Professor at Paris (1952–3) and at Utrecht (1957–8); Guggenheim Fellow (1970); ACLS Fellow (1966); NEH Fellow (1975); William Andrews Clark Professor at UCLA (1981–2 and 1997–8); visiting scholar at Bibliothek Herzog August, Wolfenbüttel, Germany (1987); visiting scholar at the Folger Shakespeare Library (1988); Director of the Leiden Summer Seminar, Foundation for Intellectual Research (1990); visiting research fellow, Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies at Arizona State University (1991); research fellow at Institute for the Humanities, University of Michigan (1992); and Woodruff Distinguished Professor at Emory University (1993 and 1994). Popkin was elected fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1996. In addition, Popkin is a founder and co-director of the *International Archives of the History of Ideas*; founding editor and president emeritus of the *Journal of the History of Philosophy*; and director of the Foundation for Research in Intellectual History (1990–95).

Popkin's dissertation topic suggested an interest in skepticism. Intuitionism was developed in part by the Dutch mathematician L. E. J. Brouwer, in response to challenges he posed to the foundations of mathematics. Popkin's focus soon shifted from mathematics to pure skepticism and the history of philosophy. *The History of Scepticism from Erasmus to Descartes* (1960) is a book of revolutionary importance. However, the seeds of Popkin's radically revisionist history of philosophy first appeared in a series of articles on "The Sceptical Crisis and the Rise of Modern Philosophy" published in the *Review of Metaphysics* in

1953–4. Expanded versions of the *History of Scepticism* appeared in subsequent years. The most recent edition is entitled *The History of Scepticism: From Savonarola to Bayle* (2003).

Throughout his entire academic life Popkin studied the arguments of Sextus Empiricus, along with their dissemination, their interpretations, and their influences on philosophers and theologians. When Popkin started his career, there was little interest in the history of philosophy in America and even less in skepticism as a body of philosophical positions and systematically ordered arguments. Skepticism at most was a mere label for a doubting attitude. The tremendous resurgence of interest in skepticism (and Pyrrhonism) over the past three decades is in good measure because of Popkin's persistent explorations in the history of philosophy, especially from the sixteenth century to the present.

The Protestant Reformation created a perfect milieu for skeptical arguments. One needed to know which book was the Bible, what were the marks of the True Church, etc. When the Latin texts of Sextus were printed in 1562 and 1569, a handbook for intellectual war was made available to the Reformation and Counter-Reformation polemicists. The impact of the criterion problem, namely by what standard can we determine the truth of a given claim, created imponderable difficulties for all parties. To determine the truth of a claim we need to know that the standard is itself true. Thus truth requires a criterion and the criterion must be true. Or we can try to avoid that circular reasoning by asking for a criterion of truth, and then a criterion of that criterion, etc. A whole chain of difficulties ensues: for example, criteria relevant to sense perception, to logical principles, etc.

When Popkin was at Iowa, he became interested in Judaism both personally and religiously, and also as a scholarly exploration. Popkin devoted several years to studying who was who in Spanish and Portuguese Jewry. With the expulsion of the Jews from Spain in 1492, many fled to The Netherlands and

although often several generations from their Jewish origins, they sought to reconnect with their roots. People who were Catholics "on the outside," but remained Jewish on the inside, were known as Marranos. Popkin soon became interested in Isaac La Peyrère who maintained that the Bible was not the history of all mankind but only of the Jews. He advanced the thesis that there were Jews before Adam. His book on the subject of these so-called pre-Adamites was known to be in Spinoza's possession. Popkin soon saw a connection with the sort of Bible criticism that was emerging from La Peyrère's studies and the Marrano Messianism that was being developed. Thus Popkin tied the skeptical (philosophical) crisis of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries together with the skepticism being engendered by the Marranos. The views of Sabbatai Zevi, the Jewish mystical Messiah from Izmir, caught on like wildfire among European Jewish communities, but they also generated skeptical (criteria) problems. In any case, the problem in one sense was solved when Sabbatai became a Muslim. As for La Peyrère's pre-Adamism, it unfortunately played an important role in the articulation of racist theory in the early nineteenth century.

Popkin has the remarkable quality of being able to take the received wisdom on any topic and turn it upside down, requiring a rethinking of that wisdom. No one bothered to notice what Berkeley meant when he said he was offering a refutation of skepticism. Berkeley meant *real* skepticism, not just religious doubts. Berkeley was familiar with the arguments of Sextus Empiricus and especially of Pierre Bayle, and designed his arguments to meet their objections. When he said he was refuting the skeptics, he meant it. Similarly, both Jewish and Christian philosophers and theologians of the second half of the seventeenth century were constantly on the lookout for messianic and millennialist ideas. Two examples: a vast amount of Newton's writing is devoted to a study of prophecies, and Sir Robert Boyle was a founding member of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England. Why New England? Because Boyle believed that the Indians are a remnant of the Lost Tribes of Israel, and that conversion of Jews was especially dear to God and facilitated the return of the Messiah. Even Berkeley's trip to Connecticut in 1728 may have been influenced by the hope to convert the (Jewish) Indians. Popkin has studied these and related themes which so greatly interested many philosophers and theologians of earlier centuries.

Popkin's interest in Amsterdam and its Jewish community naturally brought him to Spinoza, and he has published many articles and a book on Spinoza (2004). It was once thought that Spinoza was excommunicated from the community by a collection of narrow-minded Jews who were hostile to all philosophical ideas and especially to Spinoza's. However, a closer examination of that community reveals that they were not anti-intellectual religious hard-liners, but prosperous businessmen who fully appreciated the freedom which the Dutch Republic and Amsterdam afforded them. Perhaps their complaint was that Spinoza had taken up La Peyrère's thesis that Moses could not have written the Pentateuch. Spinoza expanded on that claim in his own writings, and offered arguments that undermined the very idea of prophecy. Popkin sees this as constituting a skeptical challenge to all Bible-based religion. Spinoza is thus a founder of what was to become known as Bible criticism. On the other hand, there seems to be no question but that his was an abrasive personality. Popkin does not believe that all the details regarding Spinoza's expulsion have yet been assembled. Perhaps the businessmen in the community simply did not like a trouble-maker in their midst, which has happened to other philosophers.

Popkin's critical eye has taken him in other directions. Most spectacularly, he became interested in the assassination of US President John F. Kennedy. He read the twenty-six volumes of the Warren Commission's report, interviewed

witnesses and reporters, and concluded there was no case against Oswald, the putative assassin. Since Oswald was himself killed while in Dallas police custody, there was no satisfactory resolution. But Popkin turned up considerable counter-evidence to the Warren Commission conclusions, which appeared in his *The Second Oswald* (1966).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The History of Scepticism From Erasmus to Descartes (Assen, the Netherlands, 1960).

Philosophy Made Simple (Garden City, N.Y., 1956).

Introduction to Philosophy (New York, 1961).

The Second Oswald (New York, 1966).

Philosophy and the Human Spirit: A Brief Introduction (New York, 1973).

The High Road to Pyrrhonism, ed. Richard A. Watson and James E. Force (San Diego, Cal., 1980).

The Third Force in 17th Century Thought (Leiden, 1991).

Skeptical Philosophy for Everyone, with Avrum Stroll (Amherst, N.Y., 2002).

The History of Scepticism: From Savonarola to Bayle (Oxford, 2003).

Spinoza (Oxford, 2004).

Other Relevant Works

Isaac La Peyrère (1596–1676): His Life, His Work, and His Influence (Leiden, 1987).

Ed. with Arjo Vanderjagt, *Scepticism and Irreligion in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Leiden, 1993).

Ed. with Gordon Weiner, *Jewish Christians and Christian Jews* (Dordrecht, 1994).

Ed., *Columbia History of Western Philosophy* (New York, 1999).

Ed. with José R. Maia Neto, *Skepticism in Renaissance and Post-Renaissance Thought: New Interpretations* (Amherst, N.Y., 2004).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils

Harris, H. S. "The Sceptical History of Philosophy," *Clio* 28 (1999): 415–28.

Watson, Richard A., and James E. Force, eds. *The Sceptical Mode in Modern Philosophy: Essays in Honor of Richard H. Popkin* (Dordrecht, 1988). Contains Popkin's autobiography and bibliography.

Harry McFarland Bracken

PORTER, Noah (1811–92)

Noah Porter was born on 14 December 1811 in Farmington, Connecticut, and died on 4 March 1892 in New Haven, Connecticut. He entered Yale College at sixteen and graduated with his BA in 1831. Porter came early under the influence of Samuel Taylor Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection*. He studied for the ministry at Yale Divinity School without graduating, and then served as Rector of Hopkins Grammar School in New Haven in 1838, the same year he was ordained. Porter then assumed a pastorate in New Milford, Connecticut, during 1836–43. Tiring of small-town parish duties, he became Clark Professor of moral philosophy and metaphysics at Yale in 1847, a title that he held until his death in 1892 when George T. LADD assumed it. He received the honorary DD degree from the City University of New York in 1858, and the honorary LLD from Edinburgh in 1886.

Porter yearned for a mastery of German thought, and received permission to study at the University of Berlin under Adolph Trendelenburg. He returned to Yale, surer of himself and somewhat under the influence of Descartes, Locke, and Kant. His book *The Human Intellect*, considered a great achievement, was published in 1868. This treatise assailed English associationist philosophy and attempted to show how German idealism could modify the "mental science" derived from the

Scottish Common Sense school. In 1875 Porter published *The Elements of Intellectual Science*, an abridgement of *The Human Intellect*. Both books were standard college texts until the end of the nineteenth century, when William JAMES's *The Principles of Psychology* replaced them in 1890.

In 1871 Porter became President of Yale, retaining that position until 1886. He was among the last generation of American scholars to hold a college presidency and a professor's chair at the same time at a major college. After stepping down from the Presidency, he continued as professor of philosophy until his death in 1892. As President, Porter defended traditional collegiate education, while, along with other scholars at Yale who had also studied in Germany, he reformed education by setting up a system intended to produce whole, or liberal graduates. Porter always wrote within the framework of evangelical faith and hope, and condemned materialistic and nihilistic philosophies of the day, for example Herbert Spencer and the positivists. He understood colleges to be Christian institutions with a required curriculum which were supposed to turn out well-rounded men of faith and culture. He was an advocate of a liberalized evangelicalism, yet he is also seen as conservative and orthodox.

Porter considered the problem of knowledge; he thought that a vigorous study of the mind was a necessary prelude to understanding the nature of man, the metaphysics of nature, and the existence of God. The philosopher must settle first the questions concerning the certainty of the act of knowing. In *The Human Intellect* Porter insisted that the student of philosophy must study psychology, an inductive science, before metaphysics. Introspection, more than observation, gives us the data of psychology; we must study our own minds at work. Our minds are not passive, as John Locke and John Stuart Mill had held. Porter rejected the associationist view of the human mind as too mechanical and irrational and believed that the mind was active. The mere association of ideas is no substitute for reasoning.

Porter maintained that knowledge does not begin with Locke's "simple ideas" but with wholes and patterns. The mind analyzes these patterns into ideas and then articulates them in language. We know that things exist in relation to one another. The important relation of cause and effect (which Hume had explained as only a subjective contribution of the mind to the act of knowing) and spatial and temporal relations are, in Porter's theory, as objective as things themselves. Thing is related to thing – that is the pattern by which the mind actively grasps and knows the external world. One can analyze experience by breaking it down into its parts, after it has been grasped as a whole, and also seeing how important language is to these processes. Porter's views on these matters were refined in Germany by his contact with the ideas of Karl Becker and Adolph Trendelenburg.

For Porter, it is the self, the individual agent, which knows things, which remembers, reasons, and interprets. The self is conscious of itself and knows its own operations. We have immediate knowledge of the self and its mental states; these mental states are changing and variable; they come and pass away. But we are conscious that our *mental* selves are unchanging and permanent, and are distinct from our changing mental states. The self is one stable entity, with many states belonging to it. Kant was therefore wrong in asserting that we cannot know the "thing-in-itself," for we know the self as a permanent reality. Porter also claims that the self knows the not-self, and this knowledge, too, is certain knowledge. Since it is certain, it is clear that the not-self (for example, ordinary objects in everyday life) is also objectively real. We can and do know matter directly, and so the world external to the mind is objectively real.

Continuing Porter's analysis further, the active, individual self, by its own innate power, has an intuitive knowledge of the body to which it belongs. All perceptive knowledge beyond this is gradually extended in range and power as the child reaches adult years.

Fundamental laws and necessary truths are known by intuition. For Porter, the "categories" – general classes under which everything that can be affirmed about any subject, like space, time, and cause – are not imposed by the mind upon chaotic perceptions to create rational order, but are valid for describing the external world. For example, the category of "cause" denotes a real relation in a real world outside human subjectivity. True causes and effects exist.

Porter left the Congregational ministry in order to teach at Yale and begin the serious study of philosophy. But he left a place for God in his system of thought. He said that man need not know completely in order to know at all. Since the human mind is finite, it cannot know completely the Absolute, the Infinite Being, yet the mind can know God in a finite way. The Infinite must be assumed to account for the finite universe; hence, God must exist. We know *that* God exists; we have a partial knowledge of *what* God is. Porter uses the argument from design: the ordered universe reveals God as rational designer, as a thinking agent, a self-existent intelligence.

Porter's God is active. God carefully constructed the universe, made its laws, and designed nature as we observe it. In his contribution to a symposium on "Law and Design in Nature" (1879) Porter says that a universe of law is, by that very fact, a universe of design. Facts and phenomena are related, and the relations of design are certainly as factual as the relations of causality. These relations are not invisible or occult (hidden), they are as visible as natural cause and effect. The agency of spirit is as real in nature as the presence of matter. The reality of law and design is unthinkable and inexplicable without antecedent and controlling purpose. This plan or method in nature is confirmed by observation: the divine purpose is clearly traceable in many of the arrangements found in nature. Why then do so many materialists and scientists say there is no purpose in the natural world? One reason is that natural effects seem to be caused by physical agency alone. Porter responds by saying that though the effect might be brought about by physical agency, still the effect is designed by God. The supernatural agency is hidden within the natural order so that some do not see it. Many discern this the action of the Designer, while many fail to discern it.

From 1846 Porter also taught ethics at Yale, and in 1885 he published *The Elements of Moral Science* based on his college lectures. In this work Porter advances a Christian theory of morals; the teachings of Christianity, he thinks, can be looked at as an ethical system. But his standpoint is reason, not revelation. Porter argued that man is a moral being, and that right and wrong are discerned by the intellect, but that the conscience, while certainly part of the mind, is not a separate faculty of the mind. The standard, or norm, in morality is the moral law, an immutable ingredient of man's moral nature. A contemporary described Porter as a eudaemonist, one who defines and enforces moral obligation by its relation to happiness or personal well-being, in the tradition of Aristotle. Porter derived the "ought" of duty from the "is" of human nature, and stressed certain ends toward which we should strive. The moral agent, the individual person, is largely self-regulating and inner-directed, though not completely autonomous.

Porter's *The Elements of Moral Science* contains a careful and thorough analysis of conscience. Moral sense and conscience mean the same thing: the intellect and sensibility working on general or specific problems of morality. An optimistic streak runs through Porter's approach to ethics. Conscience, for example, can be improved and sharpened by cultivation and development. If one's conscience is in doubt, or in error, one can seek spiritual guidance. Porter realistically acknowledged that conscience can become debased and darkened. Self-evident truths may be overlooked or forgotten. It is possible to fall prey to a sophisticated and yet shallow moral code. It is easy to confuse darkness for light and vice versa. Moral purity can be defiled by perver-

sions; the human intellect can slip into degeneracy, though the conscience can never be destroyed. The influences of religion are always there to strengthen an erring mind.

Porter warns the reader that the independence of conscience can be pushed too far, so as to remove it beyond the reach of outside influences; if it were completely autonomous it would need no instruction nor ever be in danger of debasement, which is unrealistic and unnatural. Though everyone agrees conscience ought to be obeyed, it is not infallible. Some of its judgments may be mistaken, while others are only probable. Despite these qualifications, Porter writes that conscience remains the supreme and ultimate authority. Still, it is true, he says, that a man while obeying his conscience, may do what is not right. Porter adds that in cases where someone cannot master the intricacies of logic in a perplexing or disputed question of morality, he should rely not on reasoning but on feeling and on sound, practical judgment. For those capable of analysis, intellect should be relied on.

Benevolence, or the love of neighbor, is the fulfilling of the law; it is pure and disinterested. Anticipating situational ethics, Porter affirms that justice is a form of love, and the Christian promotion of love throughout history has reinforced individual human worth and human rights. From Christianity has come the sense of personal honor which flows from the conviction of personal responsibility, itself founded on individual freedom. Christian ethical man developed a sense of veracity, personal worth, and self-respect which has expressed itself in opposition to slavery and in the cultivation of sexual purity and self-control, constituting human decency. The Christian ethical system stresses both individual effort and a social dimension; virtuous behavior begins at home but should flow over to social progress at every level. The noblest feature of Christian ethics is its insistence on the beauty of the virtues, though Porter reminds us that the zeal of reformers is often excessive. The overzealous reformer needs a prudent respect for rational-ity and common sense. Interestingly, Porter writes a fine passage on our duties to animals, claiming that a merciful man is merciful to his beast. Vivisection is frowned upon. Though animals are subordinate to human beings, we must train the animals under our care, increase their enjoyment and relieve the suffering of starving and disabled creatures.

In 1880 a serious and significant dispute arose between Porter, Yale's president, and William Graham SUMNER, Yale's professor of political and social science. Sumner assigned Herbert Spencer's *The Study of Sociology* as a textbook. Porter objected to the book's use in a letter to the trustees, suggesting that Spencer's atheistic materialism would morally and religiously harm immature students and therefore damage the college. The controversy became widely publicized in the newspapers. Porter appeared privately before the trustees with a prepared statement. One year later, in June 1881, Sumner replied in a long letter to the faculty and the corporation. Over time, the controversy cooled down; Sumner did not resign, as he had threatened to do, but he soon withdrew the offending textbook.

The Porter–Sumner conflict went far beyond the single issue of academic freedom. It is instructive to look into this notable disagreement, for it reveals Porter's philosophy of education, his respect for the enduring value of ethics, and his concern for the curriculum at Yale. The very nature, content, and future of that curriculum was at stake in 1880. Porter understood Yale to be a Christian institution which should nurture the spiritual well-being of its student body. Everything that Porter said and did lay within the context of a liberal evangelicalism. With both faith and logic, he defended the traditional collegiate education in all its liberal humanism. The President of Yale wanted his college, within a well-regulated plan of study, to continue to teach history, literature, philosophy, Latin, and Greek: all of the classical studies. These disciplines would ideally form the men of Yale into cultured citizens who would uphold family values.

Porter saw the traditional family as essential to the nation.

Sumner held a very different view of what was best for Yale. This young, ambitious, somewhat egotistical social scientist withdrew Spencer's *The Study of Sociology* as a text because, horrified by all the publicity, he thought that if he used this book in his course the students would watch his every word and report it, more or less incorrectly, to the newspapers. Thus, Sumner's response was conciliatory. In the winter of 1880 he also praised Porter for acting throughout in a "courteous and kindly spirit." It would seem that Porter's defense of his veto of Spencer was reasonable. He told the trustees that *The Study of Sociology* was indefensible in the curriculum because the book was an unscientific attack against theism, and that it was only a dogmatic pamphlet containing some intolerant sarcasm. Porter also objected to an experimental course such as sociology within the liberal arts curriculum. Sumner responded by charging Porter with meddling beyond his jurisdiction and claimed that the president brought a priori theological criteria to bear upon a responsible member of the faculty. Interestingly, Sumner himself held no high opinion of Herbert Spencer, or this particular book, and resented its cosmic naturalism. But he wanted to use *The Study of Sociology* in his class because, though faulty as a text, it was the best of a bad lot of available studies on sociology. Sumner believed that Spencer's naturalism and agnosticism were irrelevant to his purposes in class. Furthermore, Sumner candidly said that he did not want to teach agnosticism. So far, it seems that both men argued the case well, but there were deep divisions between the President and the professor.

The controversy came down to the question: how should the curriculum at Yale proceed? Porter, champion of classical traditions, held that moral truths and values were found in the subject matter of every course of study, even the physical sciences. Every human activity included implicit assumptions about moral obligations. Sumner, on the contrary, wanted to separate scientific theory from ethical consequences and significance. For this sociologist, nearly all human experience could be discarded as "founded on authority, tradition, arbitrary invention or poetic imagination." Literary men and women, like poets and novelists, possess no objective knowledge, while human history is rife with prejudice, error and emotion. Only objective, empirical science can correct all such nonsense. Porter's response was that there is bias in ethical preferences, hidden or not, in all science and scientists.

Sumner dismissed Porter's philosophic idealism, which saw the American college as the perfection of the Christian family. Such a view was only an old humanistic dream for Sumner, who wanted a new shift in education, with new electives made available. Sumner thought philosophic studies were a waste of time; since philosophy was only a matter of opinion, not fact, it dwelt in unverifiable abstractions. Sumner, the upholder of laissez-faire and free trade, was advancing a positivist indictment and overthrow of classical studies like metaphysics, ethics, and even literature. For him, the classics kept out new ideas and promoted obscurantism, standing in the way of the oncoming social sciences which were useful for the student. These views were anathema to Porter, who saw them as destructive of all he stood for, and an end to what Yale needed to preserve. It is no wonder that he considered Sumner as an academic outlaw. Some, thinking chiefly of academic freedom, see Porter as the villain of the dispute. Others, wearying of perplexing technology and desiring to preserve the humanities, think he argued well. Today, undergraduate Yale is still a liberal arts college.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Human Intellect (New York, 1868).
The American Colleges and the American Public (New Haven, 1870; New York, 1969).
The Elements of Intellectual Science (New

York, 1875).

Science and Sentiment (New York, 1882).

The Elements of Moral Science (New York, 1885).

Kant's Ethics: A Critical Exposition (Chicago, 1886).

Other Relevant Works

The Sciences of Nature versus the Science of Man; *a Plea for the Science of Man* (New York, 1871).

"Law and Design in Nature," *North American Review* 128 (1879): 537–43.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Bio Dict Psych by Zusne*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v1*

Blau, Joseph L. *Men and Movements in American Philosophy* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1963), chap. 3.

Bledstein, Burton. "Noah Porter versus William Graham Sumner," *Church History* 43 (1973): 340–49.

James, Walter T. *The Philosophy of Noah Porter (1811–1892)*. PhD dissertation, Columbia University (New York, 1951).

Merriman, George, ed. *Noah Porter, A Memorial by Friends* (New York, 1893). Contains a bibliography of Porter's writings.

Schneider, Herbert W. *A History of American Philosophy*, 2nd edn (New York and London, 1963).

Edward W. O'Brien

POSNER, Richard Allen (1939–)

Richard A. Posner was born on 11 January 1939 in New York City. He received his BA in English summa cum laude from Yale College in 1959. In 1962 he graduated from Harvard Law School with a JD magna cum laude. During his law school study, he was elected the president of the Harvard Law Review. After graduation, he clerked for United States Supreme Court Justice William J. Brennan Jr. from 1963 to 1965, and then worked in the next several years as an assistant to Commissioner Philip Elman of the Federal Trade Commission, an assistant to the Solicitor General of the United States Thurgood Marshall, and as general counsel of President Johnson's Task Force on Communications Policy.

Posner began teaching law in 1968 at Stanford Law School as an associate professor, and from 1969 to 1981 he taught at University of Chicago Law School as a professor of law (and as Lee and Brena Freeman Professor of Law after 1978). After his appointment to the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit in 1981, he still teaches as a senior lecturer. Posner founded the *Journal of Legal Studies*, and worked as a research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research. He also engaged in private consulting and became, from 1977 to 1981, the first president of Lexecon Inc., a firm made up of lawyers and economists that provides economic and legal research and support in antitrust, securities, and other litigation.

Posner became a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit in December 1981, and served as the Chief Judge of the Court from 1993 to 2000. During this period of time, he received numerous honorary degrees of doctor of laws from universities such as Syracuse University, Georgetown University, Yale University, University of Pennsylvania, and Northwestern University. In 1994 he received the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation Award in Law from the University of Virginia, and in 1998 he was awarded the Marshall-Wythe Medallion by the College of William and Mary. Posner also actively participates in many associations and is a key

member of many of them, such as the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Economic Association and the American Law Institute. He served as the President of the American Law and Economics Association from 1995 to 1996, and he edits the *American Law and Economics Review*, the journal of the American Law and Economics Association.

As a full-time federal judge, a law-school professor, a researcher and scholar, and a public intellectual (in his own words), Posner has shown extraordinary energy and intelligence with his prolific writings. He has produced numerous books and hundreds of articles and book reviews, covering a wide range of topics from economic analysis of law and justice to studies of federal court system, relations between law and literature, sexuality and sex-related laws, aging, public health, public intellectuals, democracy, Clinton's impeachment trial, and the 2000 presidential election, to name a few. His books have been translated into many different languages including French, German, Italian, Spanish, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Greek.

It is his economic analysis of law, however, that first established Posner's major academic achievement, contributing to the thriving field of law and economics. Influenced by utilitarianism and early economists such as Ronald Coase and Guido Calabresi who applied economic theories into tort law, Posner expanded the application of economics to a variety of other legal subjects, such as antitrust, public utility and common carrier regulation, contracts, family law, criminal law, primitive law, racial discrimination, jurisprudence, privacy and procedure. Based on the assumption that people are rational maximizers of their satisfactions, Posner argued that economics can explain both market and nonmarket behavior of people involved in or affected by laws and legal institutions. He proposed and sought to test the theory that the common law is best explained as if the judges were trying to promote economic efficiency, and called for major reforms and urged wealth maximization as a goal of legal and social policy.

As an extension of his methodology in early studies, Posner adopted and proposed a pragmatic approach to law in his more recent writings. Strongly questioning the function of normative moral philosophy in study and professionalization of law, Posner suggests that scholars and practitioners should approach legal and policy judgments "on facts and consequences rather than on conceptualism and generalities". Different from philosophical pragmatism, Posner's "everyday pragmatism" tries to send a lay sense of pragmatism to people facing current problems and seeking practical solutions. According to Posner, a pragmatic judge aims at decisions that are most reasonable, when all things, both case-specific and systemic consequences, are considered. Legal pragmatism should be empiricist and forward-looking, not completely bound by past decisions through strict deductions. Posner tried to show how pragmatic adjudication makes more sense in solving critical issues, such as Clinton's impeachment and the 2000 presidential election.

Consistent with his approach, Posner strongly encourages interdisciplinary study of law. Pointing out limitations of traditional doctrinal analysis of law in most law schools, Posner calls for incorporations of other fields of science, and argues for the importance of applications in law of analytic methods, empirical techniques and findings of social sciences. His study of law and economics and later efforts to embrace, for example, sociology, psychology, and literature in his writings are such examples.

Posner has been criticized by conservatives who question his moral relativism and his pragmatism that leaves doubts about deductive legal analysis. Liberals object to his refutation of moral philosophy in the study of law and legal institutions. Posner's pure economic approach to human interactions and analyses in sensitive issues such as abortion, baby selling, and racial discrimination also

POST

bothered many people. Nevertheless, there is little question that his legal career and profession as a law professor, a judge, a scholar, and a public intellectual have had a great influence on his works.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Economic Analysis of Law (Boston, 1973; 6th edn 2003).

Antitrust Law: An Economic Perspective (Chicago, 1976).

The Economics of Justice (Cambridge, Mass., 1981).

Tort Law: Cases and Economic Analysis (Boston, 1982).

The Federal Courts: Crisis and Reform (Cambridge, Mass., 1985).

Law and Literature: A Misunderstood Relation (Cambridge, Mass., 1988; 2nd edn 1998).

The Problems of Jurisprudence (Cambridge, Mass., 1990).

Sex and Reason (Cambridge, Mass., 1992).

Aging and Old Age (Chicago, 1995).

Overcoming Law (Cambridge, Mass., 1995)

Law and Legal Theory in England and America (Oxford, 1996).

The Problematics of Moral and Legal Theory (Cambridge, Mass., 1999).

Public Intellectuals: A Study of Decline (Cambridge, Mass., 2001).

Frontiers of Legal Theory (Cambridge, Mass., 2001).

Law, Pragmatism, and Democracy (Cambridge, Mass., 2003).

Other Relevant Works

An Affair of State: The Investigation, Impeachment, and Trial of President Clinton (Cambridge, Mass., 1999).

Breaking the Deadlock: The 2000 Election and the Courts (Princeton, N.J., 2001).

Catastrophe: Risk and Response (Oxford, 2004).

Further Reading

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio

Culp, Jerome. "Judex Economicus," *Law and Contemporary Problems* 50 (Autumn 1987): 95–140.

Knight, Jack, and James Johnson. "Political Consequences of Pragmatism," *Political Theory* 24 (1996): 68–96.

Smith, Steven D. "The Pursuit of Pragmatism," *Yale Law Journal* 100 (1990): 409–49.

Bin Liang

POST, Emil Leon (1897–1954)

Emil Leon Post was born on 11 February 1897 in Augustów, Poland, the son of Polish Jews Arnold and Pearl Post. His family emigrated to the United States when he was seven years old, arriving in May 1904 and settling in New York City. As a child, he lost an arm as the result of an accident. He was educated in New York City, attending Townsend Harris High School, a school for advanced students located on the campus of the City College of New York. He next attended the City College of New York, where his first interest was astronomy, and from which he received his BS in 1917. While an undergraduate he made a significant contribution to the study of differential equations and the inversion of Laplace transforms. In this work, Post considered the differential operator D^n, and asked what it would mean if n were not an integer. He did not submit this result to the American Mathematical Society until 1923, however, and it was not published until 1930. He went on to Columbia University for his graduate studies, receiving his MA in 1918 and his PhD in mathematics in 1920. At Columbia, he was a student of Cassius Jackson KEYSER, and took Keyser's seminar on the recently published *Principia Mathematica* of Alfred North

WHITEHEAD and Bertrand Russell. His doctoral thesis, "Introduction to a General Theory of Elementary Proposition," was one of the significant achievements in mathematical logic in the early twentieth century.

Post taught at the City College of New York, where his students included such logicians as Martin Davis, known for his work in recursion theory, and editor of Post's collected works, and, beginning in 1935, at Columbia. For much of his life, however, Post was unable to hold regular academic assignments due to illness, suffering severe bouts of bipolar disorder (manic-depression), which kept him hospitalized for lengthy periods. In the academic year following receipt of his doctorate, he was a Proctor Fellow at Princeton University, then returned to Columbia to serve on its faculty. It was there that his first bout of bipolar disease struck him. After his first hospitalization, he joined the faculty at Cornell University in 1924, but was struck a second time. Not until 1927 was he well enough to take up a job as a high school teacher, during which period he married Gertrude Singer in 1929, with whom he had a daughter Phyllis. In 1932 he joined the faculty of City College, but suffered another relapse, until he was able to return to his post in 1935. In 1938 he became assistant professor of mathematics, and taught at City College until his death. He taught sixteen hours of courses each semester, and thereafter had little time for research. The electric shock treatment which he received for his ailment contributed to his early death, and he died of a heart attack after such treatment on 21 April 1954 in upstate New York.

Recollecting the situation of logic in the United States in the 1920s, W. V. QUINE wrote that Post through those years was working alone in New York, and his achievements were "little heeded" (Quine 1985, p. 83). It has been widely assumed that, under the influence of Bertrand Russell's *Principles of Mathematics* of 1903 and Whitehead and Russell's *Principia Mathematica* of 1910–13, the majority of mathematical logicians had abandoned work

on algebraic logic for logistic after World War I. Post was thought to be the only logician outside of Poland to work on propositional logic; but when he himself was confronted with this declaration singling him out as the only non-Polish logician working on propositional logic, Post corrected his interlocuter (presumably Alfred TARSKI) by making it known that he had been born in Poland. European logicians came to learn of the work of their American colleagues in the 1920s and 1930s through such means as Karl Menger's visit to America; Post was among the American logicians with whom Menger, then still a young mathematician at the University of Vienna and a member of the Vienna Circle, met in New York City (Menger 1944, p. 211).

In his dissertation, Post proved the consistency and completeness of the propositional calculus described in Whitehead and Russell's *Principia Mathematica*, a significant event in the development of proof theory. He is credited with having introduced the concepts of "completeness" and "consistency," attaining results in the 1920s similar to those of Kurt GÖDEL, Alonzo CHURCH, and Alan Turing in the 1930s, but not publishing them. Only after reading Gödel's "*Über die formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia mathematica und verwandter Systeme, I*" did he realize that he had delayed too long in publishing his own work, and entered into correspondence with Gödel.

Post's definition of completeness was one of the strictest to be formulated. A logistic system, according to Post, is *complete* if and only if for any well-formed formula F, either F is a theorem of the system or the system would become inconsistent if F were added to the system as an axiom. Under these conditions, the propositional calculus is complete, but pure first-order logic is not. Like Tarski, Post took a semantic approach to consistency. But whereas Tarski defined a system to be consistent if and only if every well-formed formula is a theorem of the system, Post defined a system to be *consistent* if and only if no well-formed formula consisting of only a propositional

variable is a theorem of the system. Indeed, Eugenio Beltrami's relative consistency proof of Lobachevskii's hyperbolic geometry (Beltrami 1868) and similar relative consistency proofs were thrown open to question by Gödel's incompleteness results, all of which violate Post's criterion.

Also in his dissertation Post presented truth tables, using "+" and "−" rather than "T" and "F" or "1" and "0". His main inspirations were the algebraic logicians, William Stanley Jevons, John Venn, and Ernst Schröder, as well as Whitehead, Russell, and C. I. LEWIS, all three of whom had a strong background in the tradition of the algebraic logicians (Shosky 1997, p. 12). Together with Jan Łukasiewicz, who presented the truth tables in his paper on "Three-valued Logic" (1920) and Ludwig Wittgenstein, who presented a truth table for implication in the *Tractatus Logico-philosophicus* (1922), Post has shared credit for the development of truth tables. In fact, Charles PEIRCE had used truth tables as early as 1902; and there are samples of the matrix evaluation of the truth-values of molecular propositions much earlier, in Peirce's 1885 article "On the Algebra of Logic: A Contribution to the Philosophy of Notation."

In his dissertation, Post showed how to generalize truth tables for both classical logic and associated sets of postulates, when those sets are treated as uninterpreted formal systems. This led him later to anticipate the algorithmic approach of Andrei Markov, in which well-formed formulae are words, that is, strings of symbols generated from other, specified strings. Post developed his approach in 1921 in "Introduction to a General Theory of Elementary Finite Combinaty Propositions," and in 1936 in "Finite Combinatory Processes – Formulation I." At first, Post credited the ideas for his combinatory approach to decidability problems to Peirce and Schröder, but later he credited his former teacher Keyser. Post devised a formulation allowing an arbitrary alphabet and instructions that permit simultaneous combination of parts of previous words, or strings of symbols created from that alphabet, in a computation with certain constant words. Post's theorem asserts that such instructions can be replaced by instructions rendered in the normal form gP _ P g, which renders it possible to proceed from any word beginning with g and placing g at the end of the terminated word.

With his reductive or combinatory procedure, it was easy for Post to determine whether a well-formed formula is decidable or not for a given system. A set of formulae is *recursive enumerable* if its members can be generated from the values of an effectively calculable function; and *recursive* if the complement of the recursive enumerable set is also recursive enumerable.

In 1947 Post proved the recursive unsolvability of the word problem for semigroups, meaning that it is impossible to determine whether the arbitrarily chosen strings A and B are equivalent, where A and B are equivalent provided B can be obtained from A by starting with A and applying a finite sequence of specified operations prescribing the production of one string from the other. Markov obtained the same result at that very same time, and began developing it in his "theory of algorithms" in 1951.

In 1936 Post proposed what is now known as a "Post machine," a kind of automaton which predates the notion of a "program" which John VON NEUMANN studied in 1946. He also showed that the word problem for semigroups was recursive insoluble in 1947, a problem posed by Axel Thue in 1914. Defining a set R as Turing reducible to T if R can be computed using S as an "oracle," a tape in a Turing machine having all information on it about the membership of the set S, Post proved that there exists a recursive enumerable set C to which every recursive enumerable set is Turing reducible. The equivalence of the Post machine to the Turing machine, and of Post computability, Turing computability and the Î-calculability of Church led to the acceptance of Church's Thesis, according to which any "rea-

sonable computer" can be simulated by a Turing machine, as the correct formalization of the informal concept of a function computable by an effective procedure, as a recursive function.

Among the problems which Post suggested in application of decidability to algebra was that of constructing a finitely presented group with unsolvable word problem, instead gave an example of a finitely presented group with no way to decide if a given element lies in the sub-semigroup generated a fixed finite set. This problem was undertaken by William Warner Boone while a graduate student; and although he failed in his effort, his work led him in 1957 to prove the Boone–Novikov Theorem, the word problem for groups.

A number of logicians worked to solve Post's problem, which asks whether there exists a recursive enumerable set which is non-recursive to set R to which C is not Turing reducible, by exhibiting a non-recursive set that is recursive enumerable but has a lower degree of solvability than the Halting problem, among these in particular being Al'bert Abramovich Muchnik and Richard M. Friedberg, who proved that there is such a set.

Post's major pioneering contributions to recursion theory were published, together with seminal papers of Gödel and Turing, Church, and Stephen KLEENE, by Martin Davis in his anthology *The Undecidable: Basic Papers on Undecidable Propositions, Unsolvable Problems and Computable Functions*. This collection included Post's "Finite Combinatory Processes – Formulation I" and his hitherto unpublished "Absolutely Unsolvable Problems and Relatively Undecidable Propositions – Account of an Anticipation" in which Post reflects upon his results of the 1920s that anticipated Gödel's major work.

The extension of Post's work on propositional logic led to work in multiple-valued logics as well, in particular a three-valued logic, beginning with a study of Łukasiewicz's work on three-valued logic. This led Post to his own treatment of finitary-valued logics generalized as m-valued logic. The algebraic structure of these multiple-valued logics resulted in Post algebras. These are extensions of Boolean algebras that treat of Post classes, that is, of classes of Boolean functions closed under composition or supposition.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Introduction to a General Theory of Elementary Finite Combinatory Propositions," *American Journal of Mathematics* 43 (1921): 163–85.

"Finite Combinatory Processes – Formulation I," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 1 (1936): 103–5.

The Two-Valued Iterative Systems of Mathematical Logic (Oxford and Princeton, N.J., 1941).

"Formal Reductions of the General Decision Problem," *American Journal of Mathematics* 65 (1943): 197–215.

"Recursively Enumerable Sets of Positive Integers and Their Decision Problems," *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 50 (1944): 284–316.

"The Upper Semi-lattice of Degrees of Recursive Unsolvability," with Stephen C. Kleene, *Annals of Mathematics* 59 (1954): 397–407.

"The Modern Paradoxes," ed. Ivor Grattan-Guinness, *History and Philosophy of Logic* 11 (1990): 85–91.

Other Relevant Work

Post's papers are at the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia.

Solvability, Provability, Definability: The Collected Works of Emil L. Post, ed. Martin D. Davis (Boston, 1994).

Further Reading

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Davis, Martin D. "American Logic in the 1920s," *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 1 (1995): 273–8.

——. "Emil Post's Contributions to Computer

Science," in *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Symposium on Logic in Computer Science* nos. 5–8 (Pacific Grove, Cal., June 1989), pp. 134–6.

—. *The Universal Computer: The Road from Leibniz to Turing* (New York, 2000).

Davis, Martin D., ed. *The Undecidable: Basic Papers on Undecidable Propositions, Unsolvable Problems and Computable Functions* (New York, 1965).

Friedberg, Richard M. "Two Recursively Enumerable Sets of Incomparable Degrees of Unsolvability (Solution to Post's Problem, 1944)," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* 43 (1957): 236–8.

Grattan-Guinness, Ivor O. "The Manuscripts of Emil L. Post," *History and Philosophy of Logic* 11 (1990): 77–83.

Menger, Karl. *Reminiscences of the Vienna Circle: A Mathematician's View* (Dordrecht, 1944).

Quine, W. V. *The Time of My Life: An Autobiography* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985).

Rine, David C., ed. *Computer Science and Multiple-Valued Logic: Theory and Applications*, 2nd edn (Amsterdam, 1984).

Swieczkowska, Halina, ed. "Emil L. Post and the Problem of Mechanical Solvability: A Survey of Post's Contributions in the Centenary of His Birth," *Studies in Logic, Grammar, and Rhetoric*, vol. 2 (1998). A special issue of this Polish journal about Post.

Uspenskii, Vladimir A. *Post's Machine*, trans. R. Alavina (Moscow, 1983).

Irving H. Anellis

POTAMKIN, Harry Alan (1900–33)

Harry A. Potamkin was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on 10 April 1900, and died on 19 July 1933 in New York City. Potamkin was a pioneer in early American film criticism. He is remembered for his formalist and Marxist aesthetics, and the great influence he had on a generation of cinema theorists before his untimely death. Potamkin's writings on film culture were successfully able to elevate the level of intellectual dialogue on the art of film in the US and pave the way for a film culture that was socially conscious as well as technically and stylistically masterful.

Potamkin was born the fourth child of a poor family of Russian immigrants. His father was a well-educated man who earned his living selling fish in the slums of Philadelphia. In his teens Potamkin worked various jobs and aspired to become a poet. After graduating from high school, Potamkin attended the University of Pennsylvania where he worked to hone his skills as a poet and contributed a number of poems to school literary journals. One of his poems from this period, which provided a scathing critique of President Woodrow Wilson, was published in the *Liberator*, a leftist journal sympathetic to communism. Potamkin was unable to complete his degree at Pennsylvania because he could not pass a mandatory swimming test. He earned a BS in English from New York University in 1921.

Potamkin's first job was as a social worker at the Smith Memorial Playground in Philadelphia. Among his responsibilities was to direct an experimental program that sought to teach inner city children through techniques referred to as "educational play." He also founded a newspaper for young people called *The Village Gazette* which published, amongst other things, his own poetry and plays. In the meantime, he also submitted his poems to various avant-garde publications, and he self-published and edited eight issues of a literary magazine that he called *The Guardian*. In 1925 Potamkin married Elizabeth Kleiman, and a year later they took a belated honeymoon to Europe that would have a profound impact on Potamkin's career.

While in Europe, Potamkin had hoped to meet some of the young writers that he admired and bring back some of their work. To his surprise, the people Potamkin met in Paris, including surrealists, Dadaists, and socialists, were engaged in enthusiastic and intense discussions about motion picture production and theory in ways that Potamkin had never imagined. Potamkin read articles on the cinema published in French film journals. He participated in programs at the Théâtre du Vieux Colombier, the Studio des Ursulines, and various cinema clubs where he experienced a wide variety of films by French, German, Swedish, and Soviet formalists. The burgeoning independent film movement, with its accompanying brand of innovative and idealistic criticism, inspired Potamkin to transfer his artistic focus to the aesthetics of the cinema.

Few literary figures and intellectuals in the United States were seriously concerning themselves with motion pictures in this period. American film criticism chiefly took the form of journalistic movie reviews. While in Europe, Potamkin had begun to see the aesthetic possibilities of film, and he went about the process of educating himself about the technology and history of the cinema upon returning to the States. He read books and articles covering technical issues in film production and learned about the individuals and socioeconomic forces that were shaping the art of film in the US. He also continued to immerse himself in the theoretical writings of a diverse array of thinkers who were investigating the psychological and aesthetic aspects of cinema. Meanwhile, Potamkin saw as many movies as he could afford and worked to support himself and his wife by writing poetry, prose, plays, and songs for children's magazines. By mid 1927, with his interest in poetry waning, Potamkin began to focus his writing almost solely on the cinema. In six short years, he would leave an indelible mark on American film theory and criticism.

Potamkin's film writings of the 1920s were influenced by the aesthetic ideals of New Criticism, which had helped to shape Potamkin's approach as a poet. New Criticism, which emphasized analysis of the aesthetic qualities of a work apart from considerations of historical and biographical considerations, and which pointed aestheticians towards formal questions of language, style, and structure, guided Potamkin's early film criticism as it had guided his poetic art. It was therefore quite instinctive of him to concentrate his film analyses on the formal qualities of movies as autonomous and independent works of art.

The first three years of Potamkin's film criticism tended to focus almost exclusively on internal film structure and technique. His articles began appearing in publications such as the avant-garde *Close-Up*, as well as trade journals including the *National Board of Review Magazine*, *Theater Guild Magazine*, *American Cinematographer*, and *Billboard*. Potamkin directed attention to the unique formal qualities of film, insisting that the cinema develop an independence from theater and literature and demonstrate formal artistry in its own right. He advocated the use of expressive camera shots and edits, such as steep angles, close-ups, and fade-outs, that could be incorporated meaningfully into films rather than used simply as devices for emotional effect. He was one of the first to draw attention to the power and importance of sound and screen movement in filmmaking, demonstrating how both could be incorporated evocatively into the aesthetic structure of a film. Because Potamkin wrote about commercial as well as experimental movies, his articles eventually reached a wide readership through publications including *Cinema* and *Vanity Fair*.

Potamkin's critique of American filmmaking and the motion picture industry was based on his distaste for Hollywood's emphasis on the literal presentation of narrative content. Filmmakers were either not able or not willing to experiment with expressive formal techniques in order to unify form with content in ways that contributed meaning and value to a movie. Never before had a US film critic investigated the formal aesthetics of American movies with such scrutiny and intellectual creativity.

At the end of the 1920s, Potamkin's criticism took a turn away from formal theory and towards an examination of the social, political, and economic forces at work in the creation and reception of film art. This was due in large part to Potamkin's reaction to the stock market crash of 1929 and the Great Depression of the 1930s, which activated his political sensibilities. The social turmoil of this period caused many artists and intellectuals to gather together to advocate radical answers to the problems in the American socioeconomic system. Like others, Potamkin was drawn to leftist causes, and he helped support them by joining organizations with Marxist sympathies, such as the John Reed Club and the Young Pioneers. He served on the advisory staff of the Film and Photo League, which was formed in 1930 to produce short independent films and documentaries that would document the struggles of the working classes.

Potamkin's activities in these regards branded him a communist. Although it is doubtful that he was actually a member of the US Communist Party, Potamkin clearly thought of himself as a communist, and he sought to use his film criticism to advocate Marxists causes and cultivate an awareness of class struggle in the public conscience. He found himself unable to ignore the socioeconomic context of film art, and Potamkin consequently turned away from the formalist aesthetics that he had spent three years developing in favor of criticism that was much more politically engaged. A motion picture could no longer be examined as an autonomous work of art; it could only analyzed through a lens that was able to lay bare the social and cultural milieu in which the film was created.

In 1930 Potamkin became the film critic for the *New Masses*, the most influential leftist cultural publication of the period. Through the rest of his career, whether writing for the *New Masses* or for other publications, Potamkin's criticism demonstrated a Marxist perspective, continually examining films and filmmakers with a heightened sense of class consciousness.

His work revealed a revised set of standards and values that emphasized the ideological statements embedded within motion pictures. Content became Potamkin's primary interest, and he suggested now that content should guide all structural choices in films.

Aesthetic values were not to be ignored, but Potamkin argued that such considerations were less important than the ideologies inherent in movies. For instance, although Potamkin was impressed with the technical mastery and sociopolitical awareness demonstrated by Soviet formalists such as V. I. Pudovkin and Sergei Eisenstein, he was critical of their strict adherence to formal practices like the montage. Potamkin emphasized the filmmaker's social and political responsibility in innovative ways; he asked that directors be ever-mindful of the social messages and potential impact of their work while also demanding a high standard of aesthetic discipline. The critical effectiveness of Potamkin's writing varied; sometimes his political orientation came through so strongly in his reaction to a film that his criticism seemed dogmatic. At other times his ideology was fused so well with his aesthetic analysis that he was able to reveal original and illuminating insights on a wide variety of films.

In the last three years of his life, Potamkin's criticism revealed an innate tension between his political convictions and his aesthetic values. He clearly hoped for a cinema that would be constructed on the basis of high artistic principles, but he also desired that motion pictures be used for socially constructive purposes. Potamkin advocated a film culture that would not simply entertain passive audiences in luxurious movie palaces, but rather drive them into the streets to take action inspired by what they had witnessed on the screen. When he died in 1933 due to complications caused by stomach ulcers, Potamkin was only six years into his career as a film critic, and he was already being recognized internationally as one of the world's finest writers on the cinema. Potamkin's sophisticated and rigorous criticism, imbued by high aesthetic standards and moral imperatives,

helped create a dynamic foundation for the philosophy of film in the United States.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Compound Cinema: The Film Writings of Harry Alan Potamkin, ed. Lewis Jacobs (New York, 1977).

Further Reading

DeCherney, Peter. "Cult of Attention: An Introduction to Seymour Stern and Harry Alan Potamkin (Contra Kracauer) on the Ideal Movie Theater," *Spectator: The University of Southern California Journal of Film and Television* 18 (Spring–Summer 1998): 18–25.

"New Film School," *The New Republic* 77 (22 November 1933): 49.

"Obituary," *The Nation* 137 (16 August 1933): 171.

Terry Brino-Dean

POTTER, Charles Francis (1885–1962)

Charles F. Potter was born on 28 October 1885 in Marlboro, Massachusetts. His family was simple and hard-working (his father was employed in a shoe factory); they were also religious, and active in the First Baptist Church. From a very early age, the church and the school were Potter's two main interests. He was an excellent student and almost from the beginning was interested in religious questions. The church provided him with a number of opportunities to exhibit his quick mind, and its Sunday school and youth programs gave him opportunities for public speaking. At age fourteen, due to a lack of finances, Potter was forced to drop out of school to work in the office of the shoe factory. At the same time, he became a Sunday school teacher; the boys in his class asked many of the questions that he himself had asked. Because he had not yet discovered adequate answers, he determined to receive a college and theological school education. By taking a job in his spare time with the local paper, the *Daily Enterprise*, Potter was able to return to high school. At the age of seventeen, he had succeeded in having some fiction published in a magazine, and the Baptists had licensed him to preach.

Potter entered Bucknell University in the fall of 1903, with only two and a half years of high school and twenty dollars in his pocket. In his sophomore year he transferred to Brown University so that he could be nearer his home. At Brown, he was taken under the wing of President William Herbert Perry Faunce, who had a liberalizing influence on him. It was through Faunce that Potter was made aware of the works of the liberal German theologian Adolf Harnack, the author of *What is Christianity?* Later Potter named one of his sons after Faunce, and when he decided to transfer from the Baptist to the Unitarian Church, he discussed his proposed move with Faunce. Although he did excellent work at Brown, he returned to Bucknell for his junior year because the Pennsylvania school was much less expensive.

Potter graduated from Bucknell with a BA summa cum laude in June 1907. That fall he entered the Newton Theological Institute, chosen because it was near his home. At the end of the first year, at the age of twenty-two, he became the minister of the Calvin Baptist Church in Dover, New Hampshire. He also married Clara Cook and was ordained into the Baptist ministry. After two years at Dover, Potter became the minister of the Mattapan Baptist Church to be nearer his theological school in order to complete the final two years on his degree. At this time he had begun to question the foundations of the Christian faith; returning to the Institute also would provide him with an opportunity to seek answers. He was thoroughly grounded in Greek, took the basic course in Hebrew, and was exposed to "Higher Criticisms." He received his BD degree from Newton in 1913.

With a growing family and strong intellectual doubts about the validity of many of the tenets he had accepted as a child, Potter resigned from the Baptist ministry in January 1914. He could no longer believe in the church's teaching about messianic prophecy and the second coming of Christ; nor could he believe in saving grace and salvation through the blood of Jesus, as did his Baptist colleagues. Since he had begun to preach more about ethical concerns, he decided to become a Unitarian.

Potter's first position as a Unitarian was in a mission church in Edmonton, Alberta, where under his leadership the first Unitarian church in that city was built. During this period (1914–16), Potter first heard of John H. DIETRICH who was preaching on humanism in Spokane, and later about Curtis W. REESE in Des Moines, Iowa, who was preaching a similar faith under the caption "the Religion of Democracy." At this time, Potter said, "My 'theology' was … a sort of experimental, non-supernatural Personalism. It was loosely monistic, but not very well integrated."

Potter left Edmonton in May 1916 to return to his hometown, as minister of the Marlboro Unitarian Church. In 1918 he moved to the Wellesley Hills Unitarian Church, where he remained only a year. In 1919 he became the minister of the West Side Unitarian Church in New York City, where he remained until 1925. In these six years Potter took a small nucleus of a church, enlarged its membership, relocated it in a modern building, and made it an effective influence in the New York community.

During Potter's tenure in New York, the conflict between fundamentalism and modernism was raging in the mainline Protestant denominations. It was during this time that Potter and John Roach Straton, pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church and the unchallenged leader of the fundamentalist cause in New York City, engaged in four debates. The first was held in the Calvary Baptist Church on 20 December 1923 before an overflow crowd of 2500. The subject was "Resolved, That the Bible Is the Infallible Word of God." The next three debates were held in Carnegie Hall before a packed house. The second debate, "Resolved, That the Earth and Man Came from Evolution," the third, "Resolved, That the Miraculous Virgin Birth of Jesus Is a Fact and that It Is Essential Christian Doctrine," and the fourth held on 28 April 1924 was "Resolved, That Jesus Christ Was Entirely Man instead of Incarnate Deity." Each debater won two debates each, but Potter was unable to schedule the fifth debate, "Resolved, That Jesus Christ Will Return in Bodily Presence to This Earth and Establish the Reign of Universal Peace and Righteousness."

In 1925 the Scopes Trial was held in Dayton, Tennessee. Potter attended as "a librarian and Bible expert for the defense." In many respects the Scopes Trial was a recapitulation of the second Straton–Potter debate. This time, however, the central characters were Clarence Darrow and William Jennings Bryan, and the stakes were higher. Bryan had collaborated with Straton in the debates, and most of their arguments were similar. Darrow had Potter work up a list of historical and other inaccuracies in the Bible, but was able to make use of only a few of them. Potter was convinced that the people of Dayton who instigated the Scopes Trial got the idea from the Potter–Stratton debates.

Two months before the Scopes Trial, Potter resigned from the ministry of West Side Unitarian Church. That fall he became the Executive Secretary of Antioch College in Yellow Springs, Ohio. His main responsibility was fundraising, although he taught a course in comparative religions. Apparently he was less successful in raising money for Antioch than he expected to be. He left Antioch in January 1927 to head the Bureau of Lectures of the National Association of Book Publishers. This position provided him an opportunity to encourage the building and expansion of libraries in America. In a short time, however, at the urging of friends, he accepted a call to become the minister of the Universalist Church of the Divine Paternity in New York. The church was

old, with a prestigious tradition, but Potter proved too radical for its congregation. He resigned in March 1929, resolved to organize a humanist society in New York.

Six months after leaving the ministry of Divine Paternity, on 29 September 1929, Potter held a service to organize the First Humanist Society of New York. This first meeting was held in Steinway Hall, which seated 250, and the hall was packed. Potter explained his understanding of humanism, which he saw as "a new faith for a new age." After the service 206 people signed cards expressing interest in the movement, and 106 signed as charter members of the society. Potter conducted his first humanist wedding on 2 November 1929, his first humanist funeral on 3 March 1931, and his first recognition service on 3 June 1934, with a rosebud used to symbolize new life and its celebration.

From the time that Potter founded the First Humanist Society of New York until his death, he made a precarious living by lecturing and writing. He always remained a strong advocate of what were considered liberal causes. He was founder (in 1938) and Director of the Euthanasia Society of America. He also was an advocate of birth control, the abolition of capital punishment, "civilized divorce laws," and women's rights. He worked to promote the reading of books, for he believed that reading good books would raise the cultural level of Americans and strengthen democracy. He appeared before committees in both the US Senate and the House of Representatives to urge lower postal rates for books.

Exactly when Potter became a humanist is unclear. When he left the ministry of West Side Unitarian Church, he apparently was struggling with the question of humanism. Shortly after moving to Antioch College, he wrote an article for the student publication, *Blaze*, entitled "Humanism–Theism," in which he clearly supported the former. It is evident that Potter had been reading the works of John Dietrich, whom he quoted extensively in that brief article.

Harry Elmer Barnes said of Potter's religious development, "Dr. Potter passed through a drastic intellectual evolution before he espoused Humanism: Baptist, conservative Unitarian, radical Unitarian, misplaced Universalist, and all-out Humanist." The last few years of Potter's life were plagued with suffering. In the late 1950s he developed cancer of the stomach, and underwent surgery in 1960; shortly thereafter he was a passenger in an automobile accident and was seriously injured. Finally, cancer won and Potter died on 4 October 1962 in New York City.

Potter was thought "the rebel of religious humanism" primarily for two reasons. First, he was always interested in what lay beyond the senses, if anything. This curiosity led him in the direction of extrasensory perception and, at times, spiritualism, subjects that were anathema to most humanists. Second, there was a conflict within the humanist movement over whether humanists should work within the established liberal denominations, trying to humanize them, or organize their own societies. Potter rebelled against such humanists as John Dietrich, Curtis Reese, and A. Eustace HAYDON who thought it best to work within the established liberal denominations. Wallace P. Rusterholtz said, "To Potter, credit is chiefly due for divorcing Humanism from Unitarianism."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Story of Religion (New York, 1929).
Humanism: A New Religion, with Clara Potter (New York, 1930).
Humanizing Religion (New York, 1933).
Is That In The Bible? (New York, 1933).
Technique of Happiness (New York, 1935).
Beyond the Senses (New York, 1939).
Creative Personality: The Next Step in Evolution (New York, 1950).
The Faiths Men Live By (New York, 1954).
The Lost Years of Jesus Revealed (Greenwich, Conn., 1958).
The Great Religious Leaders (New York, 1958).

Did Jesus Write this Book? (New York, 1965).

Other Relevant Works
The Preacher and I: An Autobiography (New York, 1951).
Fundamentalist versus Modernist: The Debates between John Roach Straton and Charles Francis Potter, 4 vols, ed. Joel A. Carpenter (New York, 1988).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v52*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*
Olds, Mason. *American Religious Humanism* (Minneapolis, 1996).
Rusterholtz, Wallace P. *American Heretics and Saints* (Boston, 1938).

Wesley Mason Olds

POTTER, Van Rensselaer (1911–2001)

Van Rensselaer Potter created the term "bioethics" in 1970 and developed this new concept as a bridge between the sciences and humanities and between medical and environmental ethics. His passion for nature emerged from being raised on his family's farm. He was born on 27 August 1911 near Pierpoint in Day County in northeastern South Dakota on the edge of the Coteau des Prairie. His scientific interests were developed at South Dakota State University where he majored in chemistry, earning his BS in 1933. He then received his PhD in biochemistry from the University of Wisconsin in 1938. He spent his career at the McArdle Laboratory for Cancer Research of the University of Wisconsin studying the metabolism of cancer from 1940 to 1982. He died on 26 September 2001 in Madison, Wisconsin.

Potter's contributions to basic oncology focused on distinctive metabolic pathways in cancer cells and formed the basis of modern cancer therapeutics. He was elected President of the American Society for Cell Biology in 1965 and President of the American Association for Cancer Research in 1974. He was honored as a fellow in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the National Academy of Science.

In the late 1960s Potter turned his attention to the nature of human progress, particularly issues surrounding environmental sustainability. His philosophical thinking was influenced by a fellow faculty member, Aldo LEOPOLD, who invented the concept of land ethics and developed the field of game management. Potter's first book *Bioethics: Bridge to the Future* (1971) described our lack of attention to and wisdom about the health of our planet's ecosystem. Moreover, he consistently emphasized the importance of humility in the face of such ecological complexities and demonstrated his own authenticity by living a green life-style.

Mainstream medicine largely ignored Potter's work. Rather than become an ecological and evolutionary science and develop concern for environmental and public health, medicine took a more molecular genetic and clinical turn. As a result, biomedical ethics focused more on the ethical implications of medical technology. Potter's second book on bioethics was entitled *Global Bioethics* (1988). The term "global" implies both broad intellectual scope and international orientation. Later in life, he was honored by several international ethics societies, including the International Association of Bioethics in 1998 and the International World Congress in Spain in 2000. In his late eighties, he founded the Global Bioethics Network composed of diverse individuals from around the world. He attempted to link his efforts to those of other international organizations such as the United Nations.

Potter shared his ethical thinking in approximately fifty articles, which complimented his over three hundred in the field of biochemistry and cancer research. He continued to explore

new conceptions of bioethics as he became more concerned about the spiritual aspects (deep bioethics), economic disparities (privilege bioethics), and the explicit disconnections among the different fields (bridge ethics). He urged his Madison colleagues and the Global Bioethics Network to create a bioethics that was more responsive to the needs of sustaining life on our planet.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Bridge to the Future: The Concept of Human Progress," *Journal of Land Economics* 38 (1962): 1–8.

Bioethics: Bridge to the Future (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1971).

"Humility with Responsibility – A Bioethic for Oncologists," *Cancer Research* 35 (1975): 2297–306.

Global Bioethics: Building on the Leopold Legacy (East Lansing, Mich., 1988).

"Fragmented Ethics and 'Bridge Bioethics'," *Hastings Center Report* 29 (1999): 38–40.

Further Reading

Who Was Who in Amer v14

Reich, Warren T. "The Word 'Bioethics': Its Birth and the Legacies of Those Who Shaped It," *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal* 4 (1994): 319–35.

Reich, Warren T. "The Word 'Bioethics': The Struggle Over Its Earliest Meanings," *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal* 5 (1995): 19–34.

Peter J. Whitehouse

POTTER, William James (1829–93)

William James Potter was born on 1 February 1829 in North Dartmouth, Massachusetts. He grew up in a Quaker community as an extremely serious and very shy person. Potter was educated in the district schools of Dartmouth, the Friends Board School at Providence, Rhode Island, and the Bridgewater Normal School. He graduated from Harvard College with the BA degree in 1854, having been strongly influenced by William E. Channing and Theodore Parker. After teaching a year, he entered Harvard Divinity School in 1856. From 1857 to 1859 he studied at various German universities. Potter was ordained and installed on 28 December 1859 as minister of the First Congregational Society of New Bedford and served in this position until retirement in 1892. Potter died on 21 December 1893 in Boston, Massachusetts.

During the Civil War, Potter was noted nationally as a minister who addressed the great issues facing society. Edwin M. Stanton, the Secretary of War, had Potter drafted and assigned to the Sanitary Commission, which was responsible for military hospitals. Seeking the betterment of the world, Potter devoted his ministry to temperance, women's suffrage, civil service reform, the rights of the freedmen, the Indians, the Chinese, and other oppressed peoples, and education of the young.

When Potter and others formed The Free Religious Association (FRA) in 1867, his name was dropped from the *Unitarian Year Book*'s list of Unitarian ministers. He was secretary of the FRA from 1867 to 1882, and President from 1882 to 1893. Potter also served as editor of *The Index* from 1880 to 1886. It was due to Potter's efforts that the FRA developed an international correspondence with leaders of other religions, which contributed to the development of the World Congress of Religion in 1893.

By 1865, Potter became increasingly uncomfortable with representing himself as a Christian, and thus the desire for a universal religious fellowship came to dominate his religious thought more and more. This shift from Christianity to a universal religion is evident in Potter's hundreds of essays and sermons, many printed in *The Index*. Under the influence of Darwin's theory of evolution, Potter began to

develop an intuitional approach that looked behind animal instincts to inherited habit and social affections. For Potter, the material universe in all its aspects has been created and shaped by an internal power. On the basis of the information provided by science concerning the development of the universe and this planet, Potter contended that humans have a moral sense and reason that must have its source in the Eternal Power. He rejected the supernatural or the miraculous as arguments for a special revelation from a deity or for religious truth in general. To Potter, all religions were natural, so he made no distinction between natural religion and those religions which claimed to be revealed. As Potter became more acquainted with the world's religions, he became less concerned with trying to validate the universality and permanence of essential Christianity and more concerned with natural religion. Potter was also influenced by Theodore Parker's view of absolute religion and its three primary ideas – God, duty, and immortality – which were given by direct natural revelation in the human consciousness. Potter also agreed with Parker that Jesus was to be understood as both an exceptionally great religious teacher and a fallible human being. However, as Potter's ministerial career developed, he placed less emphasis than did Parker on the contributions of Jesus, due to his increasing interest in natural religion and the world's religions.

Potter moved from transcendentalism to empiricism, as he accepted the doctrine of evolution and saw science as the standard for testing our beliefs. However, Potter did not limit science to the domain of the material world and its forces. Rather, he provided an expanded empirical approach that included mental and moral functions that we call spiritual or religious, even though these functions had been understood in the past on the basis of erroneous theories. Potter viewed God as immanent in nature and human beings, although at the same time transcending each. Potter's empirical orientation led him to a pantheistic view of God.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The National Tragedy: Four Sermons Delivered before the First Congregational Society, New Bedford, on the Life and Death of Abraham Lincoln (New Bedford, Mass., 1865).
Twenty-five Sermons of Twenty-five Years (Boston, 1885).
Lectures and Sermons (Boston, 1895).

Other Relevant Works
Essays and Sermons of William James Potter (1829–1893), Unitarian Minister and Freethinker, 2 vols, ed. W. Creighton Peden and Everett J. Tarbox, Jr. (Lewiston, N.Y., 2003).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v13*
Peden, W. Creighton. *Civil War Pulpit to World's Parliament of Religion: The Thought of William James Potter, 1829–1893* (New York, 1996). Contains a bibliography of Potter's writings.

W. Creighton Peden

POUND, Ezra Loomis Weston (1885–1972)

Ezra Pound was born on 30 October 1885 in Hailey, Idaho. He graduated with a BA from Hamilton College in 1905, and earned his MA in Romance languages from the University of Pennsylvania in 1906. Pound left the United States in 1907 for travel in Europe, and while living in England he became the London editor of the *Little Review* in 1917. Upon moving to Italy in 1924 he began a public campaign of criticism of American and British democracy, which included broadcasting Fascist propaganda in America. This activity led to an indictment for treason against the US, for which he

was deemed mentally unfit to stand trial. Pound was detained in a Washington, D.C. hospital from 1946 to 1958. After his release he returned to Italy where he lived until his death on 1 November 1972 in Venice, Italy.

Pound holds prominence in twentieth-century poetry both as a skillful practitioner and as a critic of virtually unparalleled influence. His major works of poetry are *Homage to Sextus Propertius* (1918), *Hugh Selwyn Mauberley* (1920), and the *Cantos* (1925–60). Pound's major significance in the philosophy of literature is located in his championing of two movements in literary theory: imagism and vorticism. The first of these is the more significant in the overall scheme of twentieth-century poetry and the one in which he had a more central hand. The overriding motivation of the imagists, whose program Pound designed in 1912, was to incite the clear rendering of ideas in poetry by means of concrete images rather than by description, ornamentation, and commentary. This aim was oriented as a revolt against the sentimental and highly decorated verse that had become the standard in English poetry in the nineteenth century.

Pound's formulation of imagism was also inspired by the philosophy of Henri Bergson. With its rejection of mechanistic approaches to nature in favor of *élan vitale*, or a creative driving force constantly developing in the natural world, Bergson's philosophy provides an intellectual template for imagism which tries to capture an idea in an image, much as it might be derived from actual experience, rather than as the product of an analytic treatment. Pound's literary theory was furthered also by the influence of the Orientalist Ernest Fenollosa. Under this influence, Pound came to regard the Chinese characters as representative of a type of writing more appropriate for the communication of ideas than the alphabetic, because its characters supposedly stood for concepts in a more direct way, originating as they did as pictures of their objects of representation. This view of language and its possibilities enlarges the project of imagism in that it makes it possible for the very form of language as well as its content to represent concrete images.

Having established it as a preeminent avant-garde movement, Pound began to promote the art movement of vorticism, which was founded by the writer and painter Wyndham Lewis. Its central motivating factors were a rejection of sentimentality in art and reflected the influence of Italian futurism, with its effort to aesthetically express the dynamism of the emerging machine age. Thus, the image of Pound's earlier imagism obtained a dynamic quality, as he saw befitting the time, and became, for him, a vortex.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Spirit of Romance (London, 1910; 2nd edn 1952; 3rd rev. edn 1953).
Gaudier-Brzeska: A Memoir (London, 1916; 2nd edn 1961).
Pavannes and Divisions (New York, 1918).
How to Read (London, 1931).
ABC of Reading (London, 1934).
Make It New (London, 1934).
Polite Essays (London, 1937).
Guide to Kulchur (London, 1938; 2nd edn 1952).
Literary Essays of Ezra Pound, selected and introduced by T. S. Eliot (Norfolk, Conn., 1954).
Pavannes and Divagations (Norfolk, Conn., 1958).

Other Relevant Works
Most of Pound's manuscripts and letters are in the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.
Personae of Ezra Pound (London, 1909).
Canzoni of Ezra Pound (London, 1911).
Ripostes (London, 1912).
Hugh Selwyn Mauberley (London, 1920).
The Cantos of Ezra Pound (New York, 1970).
Poems and Translations (New York, 2003).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*,
    Comp Amer Thought, *Dict Amer Bio*,
    Encyc Amer Bio, *Who Was Who in
    Amer v5*
Carpenter, Humphrey. *A Serious Character:
    The Life of Ezra Pound* (Boston, 1988).
Nadel, Ira, ed. *The Cambridge Companion
    to Ezra Pound* (Cambridge, UK, 1999).
Surette, Leon. *Pound in Purgatory: From
    Economic Radicalism to Anti-Semitism*
    (Urbana, Ill., 1999).

Kyle Broom

POUND, Nathan Roscoe (1870–1964)

Roscoe Pound was born on 27 October 1870 in Lincoln, Nebraska. He was classically trained in languages and the sciences at the University of Nebraska and received the BA degree in 1888. Pound's innovative graduate studies in botany under the tutelage of Charles E. Bessey, resulted in a doctoral dissertation written jointly with Frederic E. Clements, published in 1898, on *The Phytogeography of Nebraska*. The *Phytogeography* established the American school of plant ecology (Tobey 1981) and for his part Pound received the first Nebraska PhD earned "in course" in 1899. Already a member of Phi Beta Kappa and Sigma Xi, Pound was awarded the international scientific medal of the *Académie Internationale de Géographie Botanique* also in 1899. Concurrent with his botanical studies, Pound apprenticed in his father's law firm and completed a year of formal study at Harvard University Law School. The youthful Nebraska botanist became a lawyer, writing briefs, arguing civil cases, and writing opinions as a specially appointed Commissioner for the Nebraska Supreme Court while teaching law courses part time at the University of Nebraska.

After Pound was appointed Dean of the College of Law at the University of Nebraska in 1903, his botanical interests were increasingly eclipsed by his energetic concentration on the social, historical, and philosophical aspects of legal education and the law. His professional star rose rapidly, garnering faculty appointments in law at Northwestern University from 1907 to 1909, the University of Chicago in 1909–10, and Harvard University from 1910 to 1916, where he also served as Dean from 1916 to 1936. He became Harvard's first University Professor after stepping down as Dean, teaching from 1936 until his death on 1 July 1964 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Pound was a major conduit for new ideas imported from the social sciences that resulted in energizing American legal thought at the turn of the century. He was as profoundly inspired by sociology as Karl LLEWELLYN was by anthropology. Pound's distinctly "sociological turn" was fundamentally important for both sociology and law. His legal theories about the social nature of law revolutionized judicial practice in America and provided an underlying roadmap for US Supreme Court decisions for nearly half a century. Albion W. SMALL, the influential editor of the *American Journal of Sociology*, privately rated Pound's specifically sociological contributions as the most important of contemporary developments – developments of which Pound was "not merely *magna pars* but practically the whole thing." Pound was also strongly influenced by sociologist Edward A. ROSS, who was at Nebraska at the same time. Pound's short monograph "A New School of Jurists" (1904) advanced the central sociological insight that "law is a social institution." Emphasizing that law must be sensitive to social change, social scientific data, and social needs, in 1906 he delivered a scorching critique to the American Bar Association on "The Causes of Popular Dissatisfaction with the Administration of Justice." In the following year he published a short article on "The Need

of a Sociological Jurisprudence," outlining the basis of a lifetime project that culminated a half-century later in the massive five-volume *Jurisprudence* (1959).

The unifying theme in Pound's legal, scientific, and philosophical work concerns the distinctively social nature of law. Pound detailed the advent of sociological thinking in the law in essentially the same way that, as a botanist, he catalogued and documented the invasion of new plant species into existing biomes. He relentlessly utilized classificatory methodologies to identify intellectual patterns and explicate the shifting ecology of legal structures through time and space. For him, law was not fixed but dynamic, and always under construction. He continually reworked and amplified his theory of social "interests" by rejecting conceptions of inherent "rights" in favor of a more dynamic model of society. This model called for the adjudication of competing interests to be carefully researched and weighed responsibly involving as required judicially, administratively, legislatively, and/or informally. To assist in such adjustments, Pound advocated systematic social scientific data collection to inform judicial, administrative, and legislative decision-making.

Pound encouraged cooperative exchanges between jurists, lawyers, and sociologists by organizing in Chicago the inaugural meeting of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology in 1909. Practicing what he preached, he conducted pioneering sociological surveys of criminal justice in Cleveland (1921) and the administration of justice in eastern China (1946–8), gave direction to studies of crime and criminal justice in Boston (1934–6), and instrumentally steered the socio-logical aspects of President Herbert Hoover's National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement (1931). The integral links between Pound's scientific training as a botanist, his legal scholarship, and his sociological imagination together forge a complex and dynamic whole not easily grasped by disciplinarians who work narrowly within botany, law, or sociology alone.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A New School of Jurists," *University Studies* (of Nebraska) 4 (1904): 249–66.

The Phytogeography of Nebraska, with Frederic Clements (Lincoln, Nebr., 1898).

"The Causes of Popular Dissatisfaction with the Administration of Justice," *Report of the Annual Meeting of the American Bar Association* 29 (1906): 395–417.

"The Need of a Sociological Jurisprudence," *Green Bag* 19 (1907): 607–15.

"A Theory of Social Interests," *Publications of the American Sociological Society* 15 (1920): 16–45.

Social Control through Law (New Haven, Conn., 1942).

"Sociology of Law," in *Twentieth Century Sociology*, ed. Georges Gurvitch and Wilbert E. Moore (New York, 1945).

Some Problems of the Administration of Justice in China (Nanking, China, 1948).

Jurisprudence, 5 vols (St. Paul, Minn., 1959).

Other Relevant Works

Pound's papers are in the Nebraska State Historical Society and the Harvard University Law School.

Ed. with Felix Frankfurter, *Criminal Justice in Cleveland* (Cleveland, 1921).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*

Glueck, Sheldon, ed. *Roscoe Pound and Criminal Justice* (Dobbs Ferry, N.Y., 1965).

Hull, N. E. H. *Roscoe Pound and Karl*

Llewellyn (Chicago, 1997).

Setaro, Franklyn C. *A Bibliography of the Writings of Roscoe Pound* (Cambridge, Mass., 1942).

Strait, George A. *A Bibliography of the Writings of Roscoe Pound, 1940–1960* (Cambridge, Mass., 1960).

Tobey, Ronald C. *Saving the Prairies: The Life Cycle of the Founding School of American Plant Ecology, 1895–1955* (Berkeley, Cal., 1981).

Wigdor, David. *Roscoe Pound: Philosopher of Law* (Westport, Conn., 1974).

Michael R. Hill

PRALL, David Wight (1886–1940)

David Wight Prall was born on 5 October 1886 in Saginaw, Michigan, and died on 21 October 1940 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. In 1909 he received a BA degree from the University of Michigan, studing mathematics, chemistry, and English and German literature. Prall stayed at the University of Michigan for graduate studies in German and rhetoric, earning the MA in 1910. Prall was an instructor in English at Cornell University from 1910 to 1912, and at the University of Texas from 1912 to 1914. He became increasingly interested in the philosophical study of the nature of value, and went to the University of California at Berkeley to pursue doctoral studies in 1914. Prall was awarded his PhD in philosophy in 1918. His dissertation, in large part a defense of philosophical naturalism, was entitled "A Study in the Theory of Value." In 1918–19, Prall was an instructor of philosophy at Amherst College in Massachusetts. He traveled in Europe in 1919–20, and studied logic and mathematical philosophy with Bertrand Russell in England. A brief tenure as instructor of philosophy at Harvard in 1920–21 was followed by an

appointment as professor of philosophy at the University of California at Berkeley from 1921 to 1930. Prall returned to Harvard as a professor of philosophy in 1930, later serving as acting chair of the department in 1938–9. In 1937–8, Prall served as both Vice President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association and President of the Pacific Division. He stayed at Harvard until his death in 1940. Prall was recognized as a great teacher. He was also active in social, political, and educational issues. As President of the Cambridge Union of University Teachers, Prall was involved with issues concerning college enrollment and hiring policies, which motivated the unsuccessful challenge to his full-time appointment at Harvard.

Prall lectured on, and published widely in, aesthetics, value theory, abstract ideas, truth, and the history of philosophy. A series of essays published in *University of California Publications in Philosophy* contributed to the development of the philosophical naturalism that runs throughout all of Prall's writings. These essays are on such topics as "Metaphysics and Value," "Naturalism and Norms," "Abstract Ideas," and "The Inaccessibility of Truth." Prall's first major work on aesthetics, *Aesthetic Judgment* (1929), gives an exposition of the more general categories of aesthetic judgment, aesthetic experience, aesthetic surface, as well as aesthetic materials, as they pertain to certain realms of sensuous perception, such as sound, color, and space. Prall gives particular attention to the beauty of aesthetic surface as it is distinguished from the beauty of art generally. In addition, more specific aesthetic phenomena – for example, rhythm, expressiveness, and symbolism – are analyzed with respect to how they are applied to the fine arts (music, poetry, painting, sculpture, etc.), as well as what Prall calls the "combined" arts (such as theater, opera, and prose). Prall then discusses the role of criticism and the value of art and artists to society.

Prall's distinctive contribution to the field of aesthetic inquiry rests in his account of differ-

ent types of sensuous orders pertaining to both auditory and visual aesthetic presentation. "Intrinsic" orders are constituted by spatial and temporal formal elements that are self-sufficient and not dependent on other elements. Temporality, for example, is such an order. "Imposed" orders, however, are constituted by elements added to an intrinsic order. Rhythm, for example, is said to be an imposed order related to temporality. Prall, referring to John DEWEY in particular, suggests the importance of a pluralistic approach to aesthetic inquiry, which "is as necessary to sound thinking in the regions of art as Mr. Dewey has found it to be in social and political thinking" (1929, p. vii).

In his book *Aesthetic Analysis* (1936), Prall argues that the chief concern of aesthetics is to analyze the immediate and direct experience of the qualitative "surface" of our experienced world, or, differently put, that which is presented to our senses. In particular, he seeks to articulate the dimension of qualitative presentation, of qualities concretely had and directly felt. The aesthetic, according to Prall, is less concerned with the "physical wave motions" of sound, for example, but rather content marked by "attracting, exciting quality; deep, rich color, moving, emotional sound" (1936, p. 11). Whereas other species of analysis (he discusses the examples of psychology and physiology) aim to remove such qualities from their direct perception, toward conceptualization and intellectualization, Prall distinguishes aesthetic analysis as that which analyzes qualitative surface not as a means to some other end, but as an end in itself.

For Prall, aesthetic analysis should combine the insights of both emotivism and formalism. On the one hand, he places a strong emphasis on the distinctly sensuous, perceptual character of aesthetic experience, coupled with the significance of quality and feeling. He argues that the direct perception of qualitative surface is always accompanied by some emotive element. The success of aesthetic analysis should be judged by how well it articulates the unifying completion of the process of emotional perception. To this end, Prall asserts that "emotionally intuited content" is the primary object of aesthetic perception (1936, p. 9). This claim suggests a crucial connection between aesthetic experience and consciousness. If the chief characteristic of aesthetic experience is the condensation of process into quality, then we must have the capacity to be perceptually aware of felt qualitative content. On the other hand, Prall's perceptual formalism stipulates that the direct perception of qualitative surface can only be fully understood by analyzing particular relational orders which are fundamental to different aesthetic experiences. To hear a musical melody as a melody, for example, we need to be able to apprehend the relational structures pertinent to it, such as pitch, interval, and duration. This attention to such structures reflects the significance of formal considerations for Prall's account. He also refers to aesthetics as a "science of the immediate," provided we understand science to mean that which seeks to explore relational structures (1936, pp. 11–12).

Prall suggests that we are often too practical to train ourselves to cultivate aesthetic response, so we must learn perceptual discrimination. Such training requires familiarity with a variety of qualitative and quantitative formal characteristics as they exist in particular works of art, as well as in artistic traditions as a whole. Developing alertness to qualitative and quantitative relations of elements gives art its palpable quality and provides a framework out of which more complex designs are constituted. To this end, Prall recommends a degree of technical competence toward both the creation of art and the criticism of it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Study in the Theory of Value," in *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 3 (1921): 179–290.

"The Present Status of the Theory of Value," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 4 (1923): 77–103.

"Metaphysics and Value," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 5

(1924): 115–40.

"Naturalism and Norms," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 7 (1925): 53–86.

Aesthetic Judgment (New York, 1929).

Aesthetic Analysis (New York, 1936).

Other Relevant Works

"Abstract Ideas," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 8 (1926): 147–71.

"The Logical Substantive," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 9 (1927): 35–60.

"The Inaccessibility of Truth," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 11 (1929): 201–32.

"Implication," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 13 (1930): 127–63.

Further Reading

Dict Amer Bio, *Pres Addr of APA v4*, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v50*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Dewey, John. "The Meaning of Value," *Journal of Philosophy* 22 (1925): 126–33.

McCarty, Richard. "The Thick and Thin of David Prall's Aesthetics," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 24 (1986): 133–9.

Romanos, George D. "On the 'Immediacy' of Art," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 36 (1977): 73–80.

Ushenko, Andrew. "Esthetic Immediacy," *Journal of Philosophy* 38 (1941): 68–72.

Michael David Székely

PRATT, James Bissett (1875–1944)

James B. Pratt was born on 22 June 1875 in Elmira, New York. As the son of a prominent banker and a devout Presbyterian mother, he enjoyed a comfortable family life steeped in religious piety. An interest in religion and philosophy soon developed and gained momentum at Williams College, where he studied with philosopher John E. Russell. After graduating with his BA in 1898 he enrolled at Harvard University, where he studied philosophy under William JAMES and Josiah ROYCE. Frustrated with the confusing and sometimes contentious state of philosophical instruction at Harvard, Pratt advanced only as far as a MA degree in 1899. He studied law for a year at Columbia University, then taught Latin for two years at an academy near his home in Elmira. In 1902 he resumed graduate study in philosophy by taking courses at Berlin University during a year of European travel. Along with his new friend and classmate, William Ernest HOCKING, Pratt most appreciated Otto Pfleiderer's course in the philosophy of religion. After a four-year absence, Pratt returned to Harvard where he studied under William James, receiving a PhD in philosophy in 1905. He began teaching philosophy at Williams College in 1905, where he remained until his retirement in 1943. John William MILLER, an idealist, was his philosophy colleague for much of that period. Pratt died on 15 January 1944 in Williamstown, Massachusetts.

Pratt's publishing career was launched in 1907 with *The Psychology of Religious Belief*. Here, and in his next work, *What is Pragmatism?* (1909), Pratt demonstrated both an appreciation of William James's accomplishments in the empirical study of religious experience as well as a departure from his mentor's pragmatist philosophy. Pratt was interested in the psychological impact of religious doctrines and beliefs on the human mind, adopting a functionalist approach to the study of religion that was qualified by his deep conviction that there remains something distinctive about religious experience itself. He rejected as too abstract the idealist reconstruction of religion, drawing on the growing criticism offered by James, Charles PEIRCE, and John DEWEY. In the course of his search for a philosophical grounding of religious experience, however, Pratt signaled an emerging

commitment to a version of metaphysical realism that would lead him beyond the limited epistemological concerns of the pragmatists. This independent direction eventually gave rise to his most noteworthy achievements in the psychology and philosophy of religion. It also earned him membership in a loosely organized movement in American philosophy known as critical realism.

Pratt's friend and colleague, Gerald E. Myers, describes the publication of *Essays in Critical Realism* in 1920 as a "famous moment in American philosophy." A group of philosophers which included Arthur O. LOVEJOY, George SANTAYANA, and Charles A. STRONG, joined Pratt in advocating a new approach to the classic epistemological dualism between ideas and objects. Pratt asserted that the mind can indeed point beyond itself in an intentional way, possessing a uniquely self-transcendent capacity. Against Locke and certain "neo-realists," who overlooked the intricate amalgamation or "quality-group" of sensory perception and structures of meaning (conception), Pratt held that the chasm between knower and known, mind and object, is bridged by an *active* process of perception that combines reaction with intention. In sharp contrast with the apparent solipsism of Locke's epistemology, a real outer reference to independently existing things is obtained, "*not* [as] a part of one's own experience, but [as] a bit of reality in its own right" ("Critical Realism and the Possibility of Knowledge," 1920, p. 95). While distortion or error may occur in perception and the "ultimate nature of reality" is beyond one's immediate grasp, Pratt's critical realism assumed a sufficient coordination (or teleology) between the psycho-physical capacity of mind and "outer reference" in the rest of nature to facilitate reliable perceptions beyond one's original "mental content."

Pratt did not think critical realism required traditional metaphysics, but he admitted a kind of "faith" or "inborn hypothesis" regarding the independence of external reality. Perhaps this was only the instinctive belief in or reasoning about such a reality that humans practice routinely in everyday life or, as he later suggested, it might reflect a belief in powers that ultimately control the destiny of the world and all creatures therein. Pratt's realist epistemology prompted further inquiry in the philosophy of religion throughout the 1920s and 1930s, especially as he pursued the implications of a functional psychology of religious experience which, for many of his contemporaries, had "destroyed its object." In *The Religious Consciousness* (1920) and subsequent works, Pratt defended metaphysics, whether of the materialistic or "spiritualistic" variety, as a worthy scholarly vocation even though it exceeded the limits of verifiable human experience. As much as he professed a chastened interest in the more immediate phenomena examined by psychology, he could not resist speculation regarding the "truths of theology" and the "benefits of mysticism" in his later books. These interests are pronounced in his occasional forays in the comparative study of religions (inspired in part by Otto Pfleiderer), including *India and Its Faiths* (1915) and *The Pilgrimage of Buddhism* (1928), as well as in the summaries of his epistemology in *Personal Realism* (1937) and *Naturalism* (1939).

Pratt's dual interest in theology and philosophy is reflected in his roles as President of the eastern branches of the American Theological Society in 1934, and President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1935–6. In *Can We Keep the Faith?* (1941) and in other later works, including numerous essays in *Harvard Theological Review* and the *Journal of Philosophy*, he defended an accommodating form of "immanent teleology" that accounted for his wide-ranging views on world religions and contemporary developments in the philosophy of religion. Although often overlooked in most accounts of Pratt's contributions to twentieth-century realism, his wife Catherine Mariotti Pratt, a devout Italian Catholic, was a major influence in this ongoing interest in religion.

Like other students of William James, Pratt remained intensely concerned with religious and moral questions in the troubled period between the two world wars.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Psychology of Religious Belief (New York, 1907).
What is Pragmatism? (New York, 1909).
Democracy and Peace (Boston, 1916).
"Critical Realism and the Possibility of Knowledge," in *Essays in Critical Realism* (New York, 1920).
The Religious Consciousness: A Psychological Study (New York, 1920).
Matter and Spirit: A Study of Mind and Body in Their Relation to the Spiritual Life (New York, 1922).
Adventures in Philosophy and Religion (New York, 1931).
Personal Realism (New York, 1937).
Naturalism (New Haven, Conn., 1939).
Can We Keep the Faith? (New Haven, Conn., 1941).
Reason in the Art of Living: A Textbook of Ethics (New York, 1949).
Eternal Values in Religion (New York, 1950).

Other Relevant Works
Pratt's papers are at Williams College.
India and Its Faiths: A Traveler's Record (Boston, 1915).
The Pilgrimage of Buddhism and a Buddhist Pilgrimage (New York, 1928).
"Why Religions Die," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 16 (1940): 95–123.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Pres Addr of APA v4*, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v54*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Browning, Willis P. *James Bissett Pratt's Psychology of Religion*. PhD dissertation, Boston University (Boston, 1950).
Myers, Gerald E., ed. *Self, Religion, and Metaphysics: Essays in Memory of James Bissett Pratt* (New York, 1961). Contains a bibliography of Pratt's writings.
Santoni, Ronald E. *The Realism of C. J. Ducasse and J. B. Pratt: A Comparison and Critique*. PhD dissertation, Boston University (Boston, 1961).

Philip E. Harrold

PUTNAM, Hilary Whitehall (1926–)

Hilary Putnam was born on 31 July 1926 in Chicago, Illinois. His father Samuel was an author and translator. After 1934 the family lived in Philadelphia, where Putnam received his BA degree in 1948 from the University of Pennsylvania, with mathematics and philosophy as his subjects. He obtained his PhD in philosophy at the University of California at Los Angeles in 1951, working with Hans REICHENBACH who supervised his dissertation on the concept of probability. Although Putnam distanced himself from logical empiricism, his close contacts with Reichenbach and another logical empiricist, Rudolf CARNAP, are visible in his work.

Early in his career Putnam taught philosophy at Northwestern University in 1952–3 and at Princeton University from 1953 to 1961, and then he was professor of philosophy of science at Massachusetts Institute of Technology from 1961 to 1965. He then became professor of philosophy at Harvard in 1965 and remained there the rest of his career. In 1976 he became Walter Beverley Pearson Professor of Modern Mathematics and Mathematical Logic; later he was also named Cogan University Professor. He retired in 2000. Harvard, the birthplace of American pragmatism, has been his intellectual home for more than a quarter of a century. Putnam, indeed, is one of the leading neoprag-

matists today. He is married to Ruth Anna PUTNAM, another important interpreter of the pragmatist tradition. Together with Richard RORTY and other "post-analytic" thinkers, Putnam is responsible for the recent renewal of interest in pragmatism among both analytic philosophers and their critics. In addition to Rorty, Putnam has been influenced by many other major late twentieth-century philosophers, including his Harvard colleagues W. V. QUINE and Nelson GOODMAN, with whom he has shared many insights but whose relativistic views he has criticized. While Putnam can be classified as a post-analytic philosopher, he has never abandoned aims and methods characteristic of the analytic tradition, such as argumentative rigor and conceptual clarity.

Putnam has written extensively on virtually any topic deserving philosophical attention. We may roughly divide his significant philosophical activities into three main areas: (1) the philosophy of mind and language; (2) the debate over realism in metaphysics and the philosophy of science; and (3) the metaphilosophical discussion of the nature of philosophy itself, including its ethical relevance in contemporary society. Putnam's views in each of these areas are fundamentally pragmatist, although his philosophical interests are by no means restricted to pragmatism. It must be kept in mind, however, that Putnam is, as his critics have often perceived, a "moving target." He has probably changed his views more often than any other first class philosopher, except perhaps Bertrand Russell. Yet, his transformations have not been opportunistic reactions to critics' arguments but results of self-reflective intellectual work, of his having found serious flaws in his own former positions.

In the 1960s and 70s, Putnam became well known as a pioneer of *semantic externalism*, more precisely the causal theory of reference (independently developed by Saul KRIPKE), and the *functionalist* theory of the mind. He later gave up functionalism, embracing a conception of the mind closer to Aristotle and Ludwig Wittgenstein instead. But he continues to hold an externalist view on semantics, without the scientistic assumptions often attached to such views.

According to Putnam, the external world with which speakers of a language causally interact must play a crucial role in the fixation of the reference of the linguistic expressions they use. One of Putnam's famous thought experiments pertaining to this issue is the science fiction scenario known as the "Twin Earth." What really exists in the natural world environing us – in this case, whether its seas and rivers are full of H_2O or some other complex substance XYZ phenomenally indistinguishable from H_2O – partly determines what our linguistic expressions mean; in this case, whether our word "water" refers to H_2O or XYZ. As there is only XYZ to be found on the Twin Earth, although that imagined planet is otherwise identical with ours, the people living there can only refer to XYZ when they speak about water, just as we refer to H_2O. "Meanings ain't in the head," but partly in the world we speak about.

Moreover, there is a "division of linguistic labor" that contributes to the determination of reference: language-users need not individually know the correct descriptions of the referents of their terms in order to be able to refer. For instance, we can refer to electrons by using the word "electron," even though few of us (practically speaking, only theoretical physicists) know what electrons *are* in the sense of being able to accurately describe their properties. For ordinary language-users, it is sufficient that there are such experts in the linguistic community.

The environing natural and social world plays its role in the fixation of reference by imposing causal constraints on successful referring. In the absence of causal connections with H_2O, for example, we could not refer to this substance by the word "water." But this account of causal constraints should not, Putnam reminds us, be taken as a reductive causal explanation of the metaphysical nature of reference. In the 1980s and 90s, Putnam rejected the idea that reference could be reduc-

tively defined in terms of causal (or any other physical, nonnormative, nonintentional or nonsemantic) notions. Attacking physicalists and other reductive naturalists who defend causal theories of reference, he queried whether the reference of our term "causes" is itself causally fixed as a part of the fundamental causal structure of the universe. This is something he finds unintelligible. There is no way to escape normative notions in semantics; words can be used rightly or wrongly. No part of the world, including causality, can self-identify itself as causally explanatory.

We may understand Putnam's picture of reference – it is indeed a picture rather than a fully elaborate theory, let alone a reductionist one – as Wittgensteinian in a broad sense, ignoring the fact that it is unclear whether any notion of reference can be maintained in a Wittgensteinian conception of language-games. There is no ultimate (scientific or any other) explanation in causal, naturalized terms of the fact that our language-use is referential or representational. What is significant is simply that language *is used* by human beings engaged in actual linguistic practices (language-games). This usage is guided by the multifarious practical purposes our language-games serve.

Functionalism, which Putnam defended in the 1960s and early 70s, is the view that mental or psychological states are "functional states" of an entity. Such states can be possessed by biological organisms, such as humans, but there is no reason why they could not be possessed by artificially created intelligent systems, such as computers. The "hardware" is inessential, insofar as the functional organization of the system is complex enough. Thus, human mental states and actions are comparable to the "software" of a computer. In this way, we are, according to functionalists, analogous to computers.

Although Putnam has maintained the basic ideas of his philosophy of language, his views in the philosophy of mind have undergone much more drastic changes. By the late 1980s he came to see functionalism as a scientific and utopian project. We have no meaningful notion of an ideal psychological theory that could identify our functional states in a manner in which the functional states of a computer can be identified. The functionalist's conceptions of human perception and conception rely on what Putnam has called a "Cartesian-cum-materialist," seventeenth-century picture of the mind. The functionalist does not sufficiently appreciate the pragmatist (and Wittgensteinian) point that to have a mind is to engage in irreducibly intentional activities in the world, instead of just manipulating formal symbols.

Putnam's views might still be described as functionalist in the sense of emphasizing the practical functions human beings (and potentially any beings with minds) must perform in a common natural and social world, but he is no longer a functionalist in the specific sense in which that term is used by philosophers of mind. Typical functionalists are reductive materialists in the same way as typical causal theorists of reference. Against both, Putnam has urged that there is no way to naturalize the normative and intentional notions we need to account for our mental and linguistic capacities.

Partly in relation to his struggle with semantic externalism and functionalism, Putnam has progressed from a scientific (metaphysical) realism through what he used to call "internal realism" toward a commonsense realism, or "cultivated" naïve realism, which he claims to find in the philosophy of the later Wittgenstein. In his critique of metaphysical realism, Putnam has regularly employed the views of Immanuel Kant, the American pragmatists William JAMES and John DEWEY, and Wittgenstein. Instead of detailed interpretations of these classics, he has tried to create and recreate his own conception of realism and truth, drawing inspiration from their ideas.

For Putnam, *metaphysical realism* is the combination of three theses: (1) there is a way the world is in itself, mind and language-independently; i.e., the world consists of a fixed set of mind-independent objects and their properties;

(2) this independent world can, in principle, be described in a complete, unique, absolutely true representation (presumably an ideal scientific theory); (3) truth is a nonepistemic notion of correspondence between linguistic items (statements, beliefs or theories) and the objects and/or states of affairs existing in the mind and language-independent world. Putnam's *internal realism* is the denial of all three theses. Claiming that the world can be correctly described from a number of different perspectives, reflecting our interests and purposes, Putnam's internal realism is a version of the *pluralism* one finds in pragmatists like James and Dewey. The internal realist says that no description of the world, not even the most advanced scientific one, is the world's or nature's own. Descriptions available to us are grounded in human purposes and practices. Ontology, truth, and reference are internal to conceptual schemes serving different purposes. The upshot of this conceptual relativity is that we live in a human world; there is no "ready-made" world. It is, in Putnam's view, dangerously scientistic and culturally harmful to think about natural science as being somehow more intimately in touch with the true structure of reality than other human language-games.

After his mid 1970s "conversion" from metaphysical to internal realism, Putnam frequently characterized truth as idealized epistemic justification, idealized rational acceptability, or idealized warranted assertability, viewing truth as an epistemic notion to be contrasted to the radically nonepistemic conception of truth advocated by correspondence theorists. More recently he has come to think that his epistemic theory of truth and the internal realism of which it was an element were misguided attempts to replace the unintelligible picture of metaphysical realism by a rival picture. We should, instead of succumbing to either metaphysical or internal realism, adopt a commonsensical "natural realism." Putnam's other preferred labels of "pragmatic realism," and "realism with a small 'r'," still accurately apply.

The metaphysical realist's theses should not, Putnam now holds, simply be denied: we cannot adopt their negations, because the negation of an unintelligible statement is equally unintelligible as the original statement. The metaphysical realist does not, according to Putnam, reach for something (such as an absolute description of the way the world is) that is a meaningful goal and that we only fail to achieve. Rather, our inability to describe the world absolutely is no failure at all, because the very idea of such a description collapses into unintelligibility – as does the internal realist's view, if construed as the negation of such an idea. This change in Putnam's views took place in mid 1990s. Again, his position has a pragmatist background, insofar as Putnam finds James's natural realism, along with Wittgenstein's and John Austin's focus on the "ordinary," among his sources.

Putnam continues to view the notion of correspondence as an occult notion which does little genuine work in our philosophical attempt to understand the nature of truth. Similarly, he continues to criticize minimalistic "disquotational" theories, according to which Alfred TARSKI's equivalence "'p' is true if p" tells us everything we need to know about the concept of truth. Truth cannot be just something language-internal; it is a representational relation between language-users' utterances and a largely nonlinguistic reality, even though metaphysical attempts to describe this relation as correspondence (or as some epistemic surrogate) inevitably lead to trouble. Truth can no more be explicitly defined than can other irreducible semantic or epistemic notions; it is a key element in a conceptual network which enables us to use terms such as "statement," "refers," "belief," "thought," etc. These are, as Putnam likes to put it, "world-involving" notions, entangled with our practical habits of action in the (natural and social) world we live in. Putnam no longer offers any epistemic replacement for the metaphysical realist's nonepistemic notion of truth. His conception of truth can be described as pragmatist, although one

should not consider pragmatism an independent "theory" of truth intended as a rival to correspondence, coherence and disquotational theories. In the pluralistic spirit of pragmatism, Putnam might be willing to grant that all these views contain genuine insights but that none of them completely captures the nature of truth. It has been argued that metaphysical realism is not an "all or nothing" affair: one can endorse one or two among the above-mentioned theses (1)–(3), without endorsing all of them. Putnam has replied that those theses make little sense unless connected with each other.

Even though Putnam has rejected the internal realism he initially propounded, he continues to think that the metaphysical or scientific realist's attempt to find a privileged scientific standpoint for describing the world as it is in itself, independently of practice-laden human perspectives, is a complete failure. His attacks on strong forms of realism have turned into more general attacks on the reductionist, scientistic dream of representing ultimate reality in terms of scientific (physical) theories.

Putnam believes that his rejection of metaphysical realism can be combined with a pragmatic (common-sense) realism affirming the objectivity and independence of the world. Putnam has been interpreted as a relativist or even an idealist, but he has reminded his critics that he never regarded the facts obtaining in the world as dependent on how we use language in any normal sense of the word "dependent." Still, there is no privileged (scientific) perspective available for any absolute description of those facts. No things or properties are simply out there, in the absence of human conceptualization. One possibility would be to interpret Putnam's view as an "empirical realism" in a Kantian sense. The world would, according to such a (re)interpretation, still be constituted by our purpose-oriented practices roughly in the manner in which the empirical world is a human construction, without being illusory or fictitious, according to Kant's transcendental idealism.

Putnam's views on realism and truth are a mixture of Kantian, pragmatist, and Wittgensteinian insights. There is a sense in which the world, and truths about it, are human constructions, but this should not be read superficially as a Protagorean relativist doctrine of individual human beings or societies as "measures" of what is the case. Rather, it is always from a perspectival human point of view that we say whatever we say about the world we take to be real. Following Wittgenstein, Putnam has recently emphasized the *context-sensitivity* of linguistic meaning, epistemic justification, and rationality. It is only in particular contexts of philosophical bewilderment that, for instance, we are required to justify our beliefs about objective worldly facts. And it is only contextually, in specific situations, that we can and should take our words as "corresponding" to how things are; there is no general metaphysical essence of correspondence. As there are several relevant contexts of investigation and justification, this view is close to pragmatic pluralism.

Putnam has asked how philosophy can make the world and human lives better, again drawing from classical pragmatism, especially James's and Dewey's "meliorism." A pivotal issue for all three thinkers is the relation between facts and values. Against the orthodox positions of twentieth-century analytic philosophy, Putnam has argued that no principled dichotomy between facts and values can be drawn. Facts – all facts that can be found in our humanly structured world – are value-laden, and values are factually dependent. Values are ubiquitous; they extend into each and every corner of our experience and thought. Putnam does not deny that the distinction between facts and values may be useful in various contexts, but an essentialistically conceived dualism is pernicious. Putnam has been particularly eager to criticize skeptical and relativist theories of ethics, which construe values as merely subjective or (if considered objective) "queer" metaphysical entities that ought to be banished from our scientific world-picture. Again, Putnam's anti-scientism and pluralism are the keys to his position. It is a fundamental mistake to believe

that science has such a privileged perspective for describing the world that it could reduce values, or normativity in general, to something purely factual. Putnam also engages with the philosophical assumptions of economics, especially with Amartya Sen's views, which he finds congenial to his purposes of overcoming this dualism. Sen's famous "capabilities approach," he argues, illuminates the fact/value entanglement.

Putnam defends the ungrounded, nonfoundationalist (but humanly fundamental) status of ethics. The ethical is in no need of external justification: no science can teach us to make the kind of distinctions requiring "moral perception" (which is to be distinguished from any mysterious intuition). Making such distinctions (e.g., between someone's "suffering unnecessarily" and her or his "learning to take it") requires "a skill that, in Iris Murdoch's words, is 'endlessly perfectible,' and that as she also says, is interwoven with our (also endlessly perfectible) mastery of moral vocabulary itself" (2002, p. 128). Putnam is opposed to any picture in which ethics is treated as something to be justified "from outside," be that picture evolutionary, utilitarian, or contractarian. All these pictures try to defend ethics in nonethical terms. Putnam's ethical writings show that he has been influenced not only by philosophers classifiable as analytic, post-analytic, or pragmatist, but also by ethical and social or political thinkers more distant from the analytic and pragmatist traditions, including Murdoch, Sen, and even Emmanuel Levinas.

In *Ethics without Ontology* (2004) Putnam writes an "obituary" of ontology, continuing to attack the assumptions of metaphysical realism, this time through his defense of the fact/value entanglement. Putnam challenges the standard order of priority among philosophical subdisciplines, especially metaphysics and ethics. As classical pragmatists (particularly James) argued, our ethical needs may legitimately influence our metaphysical commitments. In a Jamesian spirit, Putnam has urged that we need to develop "moral images of the world" in which metaphysical and ethical elements are profoundly entangled. Putnam has even attempted to bring religious issues, typically marginalized in scientifically oriented analytic philosophy, back to the center of philosophy. While it would be an exaggeration to call him a philosopher of religion, he has written insightful papers on religious language and the possibility of rationally discussing religious belief, noting that "scientific" attacks on theism are based on misunderstandings. As Wittgenstein argued, religious believers do not treat the belief that God exists as an hypothesis requiring evidential support. Scientistic critics of religion fail to understand religious forms of life and religious uses of language.

For Putnam, religious ideas ought to be "tested in practice," as pragmatists taught us, though not in a scientific laboratory but in the "laboratory of life" (1997, p. 182). Putnam eventually arrives quite close to Wittgensteinian quietism or mysticism, according to which it is impossible to communicate religious insights in meaningful language. The problem of whether religious faith can be rationally examined from an external viewpoint remains unsolved. Putnam's religious thought is thus troubled by tensions, but then again this may be a sign of a deep religious thinker. Putnam has described himself as a "believer" and a "practicing Jew."

Putnam's pragmatist focus on moral objectivity, the fact/value entanglement, and the prospects of religious values within a pluralist understanding of the equal legitimacy of various different aspects of human life, can be understood as developing a *philosophical anthropology*, although this is a term Putnam does not use. The human being, both individually and collectively, is at the center of his position, both in his "theoretical" and "practical" philosophy (which are not separable). Putnam's main efforts, his metaphilosophical discussions included, are intended to make sense of our problematic existence in this world, to make a difference to how we live. "The ultimate issue," he says, "is the position of man in the world" (*Words and Life*, 1994, p. 522).

Our philosophical questions are not simply "optional," as Rorty and other critics of philosophy have thought. Philosophy itself is a deeply human project, aiming at a humanly relevant world view instead of any impersonal "absolute conception." "At its best, philosophical reflection can give us an unexpectedly honest and clear look at our own situation, not a 'view from nowhere' but a view through the eyes of one or another wise, flawed, deeply individual human being." (1992, p. 178)

His humanistic orientation has led Putnam to join the classical pragmatists' pursuit of making philosophy an "attempt to achieve the good" (1990, p. xi). He subscribes to "[t]he heart of pragmatism," the idea that "notions that are indispensable to our best practice, are justified by that very fact" (Clark and Hale 1994, p. 260). His reflections on reference, truth, the mind, values, religion, and other issues can be seen as fallible, self-critical attempts to find out what "our best practice" amounts to in these diverse cases and what kind of philosophically relevant commitments it makes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Philosophy of Logic (New York, 1971).
Mathematics, Matter, and Method (Cambridge, UK, 1975).
Mind, Language, and Reality (Cambridge, UK, 1975).
Meaning and the Moral Sciences (London, 1978).
Reason, Truth and History (Cambridge, UK, 1981).
Realism and Reason (Cambridge, UK, 1983).
The Many Faces of Realism (La Salle, Ill., 1987).
Representation and Reality (Cambridge, Mass., 1988).
Realism with a Human Face, ed. James Conant (Cambridge, Mass., 1990).
Renewing Philosophy (Cambridge, Mass., 1992).
Words and Life, ed. James Conant (Cambridge, Mass., 1994).
Pragmatism: An Open Question (Oxford and Cambridge, Mass., 1995).
The Threefold Cord: Mind, Body, and World (New York, 1999).
Enlightenment and Pragmatism (Assen, Neth., 2001).
The Collapse of the Fact/Value Dicotomy and Other Essays (Cambridge, Mass., 2002).
Ethics without Ontology (Cambridge, Mass., 2004).
Three Jewish Philosophers: Buber, Rosenkranz and Levinas (forthcoming).

Other Relevant Works
"Minds and Machines," in *Dimensions of Mind*, ed. Sidney Hook (New York, 1960), pp. 148–80.
"The Meaning of 'Meaning'," in *Language, Mind and Knowledge. Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, vol. 7, ed. Keith Gunderson (Minneapolis, 1975), pp. 131–93.
"Realism and Reason," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 50 (August 1977): 483–98.
"Comments on Chomsky's and Fodor's Replies," in *Language and Learning: The Debate between Jean Piaget and Noam Chomsky*, ed. M. Piattelli-Palmarini (Cambridge, Mass., 1980), pp. 335–40.
Ed. with Wilhelm K. Essler and Wolfgang Stegmüller, *Epistemology, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science: Essays in Honour of Carl G. Hempel* (Dordrecht, 1985).
Ed. with Ted Cohen and Paul Guyer, *Pursuits of Reason: Essays in Honor of Stanley Cavell* (Lubbock, Tex., 1993).
"Putnam, Hilary," in *A Companion to the Philosophy of Mind*, ed. Samuel Guttenplan (Oxford, 1994), pp. 507–13.
"God and the Philosophers," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 21 (1997): 175–87.
"Strawson and Skepticism," in *The Philosophy of P. F. Strawson*, ed. Lewis Hahn (La Salle, Ill., 1998), pp. 273–87.
"To Think with Integrity," *Harvard Review*

of Philosophy 8 (2000): 4–13. Putnam's farewell lecture upon his retirement.

"Pragmatism Resurgent: A Reading of *The American Evasion of Philosophy*," in *Cornel West: A Critical Reader*, ed. George Yancy (Oxford, 2001), pp. 19–37.

"Was Wittgenstein *Really* an Anti-Realist about Mathematics?" in *Wittgenstein in America*, ed. Timothy McCarthy and Sean C. Stidd (Oxford, 2001), pp. 140–94.

"Intelligence and Ethics," in *A Companion to Pragmatism*, ed. John R. Shook and Joseph Margolis (Malden, Mass., 2005).

Further Reading

Amer Phils 1950–2000, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Blackwell Analytic Phil*, *Blackwell Comp Phils*, *Blackwell Comp Prag*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v8*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*

Auxier, Randall, and Lewis Hahn, eds. *The Philosophy of Hilary Putnam* (Chicago, forthcoming). Contains Putnam's autobiography and bibliography.

Boolos, George, ed. *Meaning and Method: Essays in Honor of Hilary Putnam* (Cambridge, UK, 1990).

Clark, Peter, and Bob Hale, eds. *Reading Putnam* (Oxford, 1994). Contains Putnam's "Comments and Replies," pp. 242–95.

Conant, James, and Ursula Zeglen, eds. *Hilary Putnam: Pragmatism and Realism* (London and New York, 2002). Contains Putnam's replies.

Hildebrand, David L. *Beyond Realism and Antirealism: John Dewey and the Neopragmatists* (Nashville, Tenn., 2003).

Hill, Christopher, ed. "The Philosophy of Hilary Putnam," *Philosophical Topics* 20 (Spring 1992). Issue devoted to Putnam.

Horgan, Terence, ed. "Hilary Putnam," *Erkenntnis* 34 (May 1991). Issue devoted to Putnam.

Müller, Axel. *Referenz und Fallibilismus: Zu Hilary Putnams pragmatischen Kognitivismus* (Berlin, 2001).

Norris, Christopher. *Hilary Putnam: Realism, Reason and the Uses of Uncertainty* (Manchester, UK, 2002).

"On Putnam," *Revue International de Philosophie* 55 (December 2001). Issue devoted to Putnam.

Pessin, Andrew, and Sanford Goldberg, eds. *The Twin Earth Chronicles: Twenty Years of Reflection on Hilary Putnam's "The Meaning of 'Meaning'"* (Armonk, N.Y., 1996).

Pihlström, Sami. *Structuring the World: The Issue of Realism and the Nature of Ontological Problems in Classical and Contemporary Pragmatism* (Helsinki, 1996).

———, "Hilary Putnam as a Religious Thinker," *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies* 11 (1999): 39–60.

Rorty, Richard. *Objectivity, Relativism, and Truth* (Cambridge, UK, 1991).

Willaschek, Marcus, and M.-L. Raters, eds. *Hilary Putnam und die Tradition des Pragmatismus* (Frankfurt am Main, 2002).

Sami Pihlström

PUTNAM, Ruth Anna (1927–)

Ruth Anna Putnam was born on 20 September 1927 in Berlin, Germany. Her mother was Jewish and the family suffered great hardships in Nazi Germany. She emigrated to the United States after World War II and entered the University of California at Los Angeles, earning a BS in chemistry in 1954. She then received her PhD in philosophy at UCLA in 1962 and married Hilary PUTNAM in that year. She taught philosophy at Wellesley College from 1963 to 1998, and is presently professor emerita. In addition to an active publishing record on a variety of philosophical topics, she has partici-pated in

numerous Jewish organizations and causes in the US and Israel.

Putnam's work has been primarily concentrated in topics of epistemology, philosophy of science, moral and value theory, and political theory. Her early writings ask probing questions about empirical knowledge. What began as a protest against the notion of internal "mental" representations resulting from perception grew over the years into an interest in reviving a type of direct and externalist realism inspired in part by William JAMES, John DEWEY, and John Austin. Since only some perceptions are knowings, formed by conceptual judgments about what is perceived, no paradoxes arise from the fact that different people do not perceive the same features of an object in different contexts. Although direct, perceptions that are knowings rely on a person's background social knowledge; this is why scientific method invests so much community expertise on gathering and evaluating those rare observations genuinely useful for testing theories.

Putnam has found that not only are the objects of common sense experience directly perceivable, but so are their values. She has argued that "the facts" of what is perceived are mutually dependent on "the values" that we are interested in pursuing. No description, even a scientific description, is free from entanglement with a normative valuation involved in the establishment or significance of that description. She therefore rejects the philosophical "fact-value dichotomy" that enforces a sharp distinction between propositions of fact and normative judgments. Hilary Putnam, in several articles in the 1980s and 90s, has defended this view as well. Ruth Anna Putnam proposes that our formation and use of beliefs and desires make a "seamless web" through action. She also rejects the Quinean plan of permitting only value-free science to give the definitive account of how things are. Her pragmatism is realistic without being scientistic or reductionistic. The processes of improving the "fit" between theories and reality, so emphasized by traditional realists seeking correspondence, are

humanly normative processes that selectively decide what is relevant to theory formation and testing.

The tradition of classical pragmatism has informed much of Putnam's work on moral, social, and political theory as well, and she has enriched and extended that tradition in return. She has brought renewed attention to the pragmatic approach to moral theory as an alternative to the stalemate between objectivism and subjectivism. Her work on James's view of morality is especially valuable. James brings to attention how we occasionally experience transitions from a "normal moral life" (fulfilling accepted duties and following stable values that make up our character) and "critical ethical moments" (opportunities to take on some new role or adopt quite different values). During moments of moral crisis, what is right or good to do cannot be prejudged by any concrete moral principle, since in these moments the relevance of available moral principles is precisely up for decision. Perhaps some sort of supreme yet vague principle or ideal could be appealed to, like "respect others' dignity," "become a better person," or "become a more valuable member of society," but the problem of precisely how I should do this still remains and this creates the moral crisis. Putnam's analysis of James's view reveals how reflectively resolving such crises are both major character transformations and risky experiments: we do not know to what extent we may succeed, yet we face a forced choice since making no changes is also a momentous moral choice.

From Putnam's pragmatic perspective on our capacity for gradually transforming character, which is also our modifications to social relations, people are neither tightly trapped in cultural traditions nor free to take completely detached stands for surveying the rationality of one's culture or political system. In "Neither a Beast nor a God" (2000) Putnam pragmatically surmounts the supposed liberal–communitarian divide by aligning with a political liberalism somewhat like John RAWLS's later position that acknowledges the strength of communal or

national bonds of loyalty. Since Rawls's political liberalism cannot be fully neutral towards all communities within a country, some justification is still needed for invasive state power. Putnam points out that Rawls ignores the likelihood that most citizens of a pluralistic country enjoy the common political goods of living in a just democratic society and approve toleration, accepting the trade-off that the reflective autonomy permitting this mature stance diminishes unthinking conformity to one's own tradition. Building on this appeal to common democratic goods and the toleration grounded in fundamental respect for human dignity, Putnam would go beyond political liberalism towards a more comprehensive liberalism that can justify some state power (like taxes and public education) while placing constraints on that power to respect human dignity.

Putnam, like Richard RORTY, sees an alternative to foundational or a priori political theorizing, by taking the experimental view that societies with greater respect for human dignity foster greater human flourishing and tend to sympathetically blend their cultures with neighbors, gradually enlarging the moral community. This possibility of continued enlargement of sympathy and respect for others, for which Rorty only hopes, actually has an established empirical ground that fallibly justifies our commitment to continuing liberalism's experiment. Putnam also emphasizes that liberalism by its nature can and will learn from other religious and cultural traditions, so liberalism will likely take new and diverse political forms for experimentation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"On Empirical Knowledge," in *Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, vol. 4, ed. Robert Cohen and Marx Wartofsky (Dordrecht, 1969), pp. 379–84.

"Seeing and Observing," *Mind* 78 (1969): 493–500.

"Creating Facts and Values," *Philosophy* 60 (1985): 187–204.

"Weaving Seamless Webs," *Philosophy* 62 (1987): 207–20.

"Epistemology as Hypothesis," with Hilary Putnam, *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 26 (1990): 407–33. Reprinted as "Dewey's *Logic*: Epistemology as Hypothesis" in *Words and Life*, by Hilary Putnam (Cambridge, Mass., 1994), pp. 198–220.

"Justice in Context," *Southern California Law Review* 63 (1990): 1797–810.

"The Moral Life of a Pragmatist," in *Identity, Character, and Morality*, ed. Owen Flanagan and Amelie Rorty (Cambridge, Mass., 1990), pp. 67–89.

"Why Not a Feminist Theory of Justice?" in *Women, Culture and Development*, ed. Martha Nussbaum and Jonathan Glover (Oxford, 1995), pp. 298–331.

"Some of Life's Ideals," in *The Cambridge Companion to William James*, ed. Ruth Anna Putnam (Cambridge, UK, 1997), pp. 282–99.

"The Loneliness of Koheleth," in *Loneliness*, ed. Leroy Rouner (Notre Dame, Ind., 1998), pp. 143–59.

"The Moral Impulse," in *The Revival of Pragmatism*, ed. Morris Dickstein (Durham, N.C., 1998), pp. 62–71.

"Perceiving Facts and Values," *Philosophy* 73 (1998): 5–19.

"Democracy without Foundations," *Ethics* 110 (2000): 388–404.

"Neither a Beast nor a God," *Social Theory and Practice* 26 (2000): 177–200.

"Taking Pragmatism Seriously," in *Hilary Putnam: Pragmatism and Realism*, ed. James Conant and Urszula Zeglen (London and New York, 2002), pp. 7–11.

"Democracy and Value Inquiry," in *A Companion to Pragmatism*, ed. John R. Shook and Joseph Margolis (Malden, Mass., 2005).

Other Relevant Works

"Rights of Persons and the Liberal Tradition," in *Social Ends and Political Means*, ed. Ted Honderich (London, 1976), pp. 90–110.

"Doing What One Ought to Do," in *Meaning and Method: Essays in Honor of Hilary Putnam*, ed. George Boolos (Cambridge, UK, 1990), pp. 279–93.

"William James's Ideas," with Hilary Putnam, *Raritan* 8 (Winter 1989): 27–44. Reprinted in Hilary Putnam, *Realism with a Human Face* (Cambridge, Mass., 1990), pp. 217–31.

"Must We Mean What We Do?" *S'vara: A Journal of Philosophy, Law, and Judaism* 2 (Winter 1991): 52–60.

"Education for Democracy," with Hilary Putnam, *Educational Theory* 43 (1993): 361–76. Reprinted in Hilary Putnam, *Words and Life* (Cambridge, Mass., 1994), pp. 221–41.

"The Quarrel between Poetry and Philosophy," with Hilary Putnam, *Overheard in Seville: Bulletin of the Santayana Society* 14 (Fall 1996): 1–14.

Ed., *The Cambridge Companion to William James* (Cambridge, UK, 1997).

"Perception from Moore to Austin," in *The Story of Analytic Philosophy*, ed. Anat Biletzki and Anat Matar (London and New York, 1998), pp. 182–96.

Further Reading

Lerner, Bernice. "From Subject to Citizen: The Story of Ruth Anna Putnam," in *The Triumph of Wounded Souls* (Notre Dame, Ind., 2004), pp. 97–131.

Smart, J. C. C. "Ruth Anna Putnam and the Fact-Value Distinction," *Philosophy* 74 (1999): 431–7.

John R. Shook

PYLYSHYN, Zenon Walter (1937–)

Zenon Pylyshyn was born on 25 August 1937 in Montréal, Québec, Canada. He earned a Bachelor of Engineering degree in engineering physics from McGill University in 1959. He then did his graduate work at the University of Saskatchewan, receiving an MSc in control systems in 1960 and a PhD in experimental psychology in 1963, working with Neil MckAgnew. He was a Canada Council Senior fellow for two years, and then he became a professor of psychology and computer science at the University of Western Ontario in 1965, where he was also honorary professor of philosophy and electrical engineering. From 1985 to 1994, Pylyshyn was also the National Director of the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research's Program in Artificial Intelligence and Robotics. In 1990 he received the Donald O. Hebb Award from the Canadian Psychological Association. Pylyshyn left Western Ontario in 1994 for Rutgers University to become Board of Governors Professor of Cognitive Science and the Director of the Rutgers Center for Cognitive Science. In 1998 he was elected Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada. He is also fellow of the Canadian Psychological Association and the American Association for Artificial Intelligence. In 2004 he won the Jean Nicod Prize for research in cognitive science that has philosophical significance. He is on the editorial boards of eight scientific journals and has published well over a hundred scientific articles and book chapters.

Pylyshyn's empirical work as Director of the Visual Attention Lab at Rutgers University is motivated by his Visual Indexing Theory or FINST as it was first named (for FINgers of INSTantiation). According to his theory, non-conceptual reference is required in vision. At a very early stage in visual processing a few (four to six) salient features or objects are individuated, before their properties or locations are encoded, by being indexed for further cognitive processing, just the way that demonstratives, such as "this," pick out objects without describing them. Pylyshyn also holds that early visual processing is modular, in that it cannot be influenced by other things we know. For example, even if we know how a certain visual illusion is

produced, we cannot make the illusion disappear.

In his more theoretical work Pylyshyn argues that our cognitive architecture consists of specialized task specific modules, such as early vision, which interface with central cognition in which any knowledge can influence any other knowledge in cognitive processing. Pylyshyn holds that all mental processing, in the modules and in central cognition, consists in the transformations of linguistically structured representations distinct from our public language representations. A consequence of this view, for which Pylyshyn has produced empirical evidence and theoretical arguments, is that vision does not involve imagery in the sense of recreating a pictorial scene in our heads, a view many psychologists hold.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"What the Mind's Eye Tells the Mind's Brain: A Critique of Mental Imagery," *Psychological Bulletin* 80 (1973): 1–24.

Computation and Cognition: Toward a Foundation for Cognitive Science (Cambridge, Mass., 1984).

"Connectionism and Cognitive Architecture: A Critical Analysis," with Jerry Fodor, *Cognition* 28 (1988): 3–71.

"Is Vision Continuous with Cognition? The Case for Cognitive Impenetrability of Visual Perception," *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 22 (1999): 341–423.

"Visual Indexes, Preconceptual Objects, and Situated Vision," *Cognition* 80 (2001): 127–58.

"Mental Imagery: In Search of a Theory," *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 25 (2002): 157–237.

Seeing and Visualizing: It's Not What You Think (Cambridge, Mass., 2003).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Perspectives on the Computer Revolution* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1970; 2nd edn, Norwood, N.J., 1989).

Ed., *The Robot's Dilemma: The Frame Problem in Artificial Intelligence* (Norwood, N.J., 1987).

Ed. with Kenneth M. Ford, *The Robot's Dilemma Revisited: The Frame Problem in Artificial Intelligence* (Norwood, N.J., 1996).

Ed. with Ernest Lepore, *What is Cognitive Science?* (Malden, Mass., 1999).

Further Reading

Bio Dict Psych

Antony, Michael. "Fodor and Pylyshyn on Connectionism," *Minds and Machines* 1 (1991): 321–41.

Butler, Keith. "Connectionism, Classical Cognitivism and the Relation Between Cognitive and Implementational Levels of Analysis," *Philosophical Psychology* 6 (1993): 321–33.

Chalmers, David. "Connectionism and Compositionality: Why Fodor and Pylyshyn were Wrong," *Philosophical Psychology* 6 (1993): 305–19.

Christopher Viger

Q

QUINE, Willard Van Orman (1908–2000)

W. V. O. Quine was born on 25 June 1908 in Akron, Ohio, the second of two children of Cloyd Robert Quine and Harriet Ellis Van Orman Quine. He graduated with a BA summa cum laude in mathematics from Oberlin College in 1930. Quine completed his MA in 1931 and PhD in 1932 at Harvard University. He wrote his dissertation on "The Logic of Sequences: A Generalization of *Principia Mathematica*," under the direction of Alfred North WHITEHEAD. He was then awarded a Frederick Sheldon Traveling Fellowship, which took him to Vienna, Warsaw, and Prague.

Quine and his first wife Naomi Clayton, whom he married in Marblehead, Massachusetts in 1930, departed for Vienna in August, where Quine attended Moritz Schlick's lectures and meetings of Schlick's discussion group, the logical-postivist Vienna Circle; he there met A. J. Ayer, Kurt GÖDEL, Karl Menger, Hans Hahn, and Hans REICHENBACH. In Warsaw he worked with Alfred TARSKI. In 1931, while in Prague attending lectures by Rudolph CARNAP, Quine learned from Whitehead that he had been elected to the first class of the Society of Fellows at Harvard; as a junior fellow, for three years he received financial support without any duties. His first child, Elizabeth, was born on 28 August 1935, and a second daughter, Norma, was born on 25 May 1937.

At the end of his term as a junior fellow in 1936 Quine started a three-year instructorship in philosophy at Harvard. In 1941 Quine was promoted to associate professor. Quine entered the US Navy in October 1942 as a lieutenant, working in radio intelligence in Washington, D.C., deciphering codes used by German submarines. He was discharged in late 1945 with the rank of lieutenant commander and returned to Harvard in February 1946. He and his wife were divorced in 1947; on 2 September 1948 he married Marjorie Boynton. Also, in 1948 he was promoted to full professor of philosophy and appointed a senior fellow of the Society of Fellows. His son, Douglas, was born on 20 December 1950. Quine's fourth and last child, Margaret, was born on 1 February 1954.

In 1956 Quine was appointed Edgar Pierce Professor of Philosophy, and held that position until retiring in 1978. He received numerous honorary degrees, including University of Oxford (1953), Oberlin College, (1955), Ohio State University (1957), Washington University, (1966), University of Chicago (1967), Temple University (1970), and University of Cambridge (1978). In 1996 Quine received the Kyoto Prize in Creative Arts and Moral Sciences. His wife Marjorie died on 14 April 1998. Quine died on 25 December 2000 in Boston, Massachusetts.

Quine was one of the most important and influential philosophers of the twentieth century. He will be most remembered as an American philosopher and logician who worked within the analytic tradition of empiricism. He reacted against some of its underlying assumptions, developed a naturalistic conception of philosophy, and formulated an extremely complex position in the style of tra-

ditional systematic philosophy. His literary output was prodigious in such areas as mathematical logic, set theory, the philosophy of language, metaphysics, epistemology, and the philosophy of logic.

His early contributions were to logic. Quine's first two books, *A System of Logistic* (1934) and *Mathematical Logic* (1940), both aimed to improve on the symbolic and mathematical logic developed in Bertrand Russell and A. N. Whitehead's *Principia Mathematica*. From May to September 1942, he was a visiting professor at the University of São Paulo in Brazil and adapted his lectures for the Portuguese book *O sentido da nova lógica* (1944). His *Methods of Logic* was published in 1950. A revised edition of *Mathematical Logic* appeared in 1951. He then published *From a Logical Point of View* (1953), a collection of nine "logico-philosophical" essays, all but one of which were previously published. The title was recommended by his Harvard colleague Henry D. AIKEN, after they had heard Harry Belafonte perform the calypso song "From a Logical Point of View" in a Greenwich Village nightclub. Two essays in the volume, "On What There Is" and "Two Dogmas of Empiricism" are classics of analytic philosophy.

Quine became internationally known in 1951 with his article "Two Dogmas of Empiricism." This essay, perhaps the most important and influential essay ever written in analytic philosophy, challenges widely accepted principles of logical discussion. It is not possible, he claimed, to validate individual statements by checking each against our experiences. Often labeled as the "Duhem–Quine" Thesis, this view holds that new experiences can only test an entire system of thought, which led to Quine's rejection of the two dogmas of empiricism: the analytic–synthetic distinction and reductionism. By the former doctrine, Quine means the view that declarative sentences separate into analytic sentences – those that are true or false solely in virtue of their meanings – and synthetic sentences – those that are true or false in virtue of both their meanings together with how the world is. "All bachelors are married" is an example of a true analytic sentence; "All bachelors are nervous" is an example of a false synthetic sentence. Reductionism, as Quine intended it, is the view that for each synthetic sentence there is associated with it exclusive confirming and disconfirming experiential conditions. The logical positivists endorsed both of these doctrines, along with the semantic thesis of verificationism, according to which a sentence is cognitively meaningful just in case it is either verifiable or analytic.

The positivists hoped to defend empiricism by showing that every meaningful synthetic sentence either has an experiential content or reduces to sentences with an experiential content. Sentences of logic and of mathematics, however, are analytic: they are necessary solely on the basis of their meanings. Quine denied both of these dogmas without, however, rejecting empiricism. A major part of his research program was devoted to elaborating and defending empiricism detached from these two dogmas.

In 1960 Quine published his most famous and influential book *Word and Object*. This book was at the center of discussion in the philosophical world of analytic metaphysics, epistemology, and philosophy of language for many years after being published, and continues to generate new and animated discussion. In the justly famous chapter 2 of *Word and Object*, Quine imagines a field linguist trying to translate the language of a faraway tribe; he dubs this exercise "radical translation." While a rabbit runs by, one native utters "Gavagai." In like situations, the linguistic uses "Lo, a rabbit" and so, the field linguist posits that "Gavagai" translates (means the same as) "Lo, a rabbit." If she learns that the native assents to, and dissents from, "Gavagai" in just those circumstances where she assents to, and dissents from, "Rabbit?", then this evidence supports her translation of one expression for the other.

Most sentences are, of course, not so directly connected to sensory stimuli. Translating these less sensory (or observational) sentences requires what Quine calls "analytical hypotheses." One of Quine's more controversial doctrines is that different analytical hypotheses while yielding distinct translations might nevertheless both equally well facilitate communication. The doctrine can be put even more strongly: there is no (possible) evidence that can distinguish among these diverse analytical hypotheses. This doctrine is Quine's so-called "indeterminacy of translation" – the view that no single correct translation exists. No one analytical hypothesis can be singled out as the correct one as long as all can be fit together in effective communication.

In *Word and Object,* Quine also discusses language acquisition and the genesis of reference, defending the view that before being proficient with a language a child must first learn a cluster of interrelated grammatical particles and constructions, such as pronouns, numerals, the *is* of identity, and so on.

In 1963 Quine published *Set Theory and Its Logic.* Three years later he published two collections, *Selected Logic Papers* and *The Ways of Paradox, and Other Essays.* Another collection, *Ontological Relativity and Other Essays,* appeared in 1969. In 1970 he and J. S. Ullian coauthored *The Web of Belief,* a brief tract on scientific method, and Quine published *Philosophy of Logic.* Quine's dissatisfaction with his account of language learning in *Word and Object* later produced *The Roots of Reference* (1974), in which he speculates about how children acquire their referential apparatus.

While Quine's early interests were in the foundations of logic and mathematics, later in his career, however, his research turned to epistemological questions about how we acquire scientific knowledge and why it works as well as it does for us. He tagged his position "naturalized epistemology." Naturalism rejects the view that scientific knowledge is justified on extra-scientific grounds. Quine set as an ideal the replacement of philosophy by science.

Naturalized epistemology becomes the scientific investigation of the acquisition of science.

Quine defends naturalism on the basis of two other doctrines that he embraced, namely, "holism" and "unregenerate realism." According to the doctrine of holism (the denial of reductionism), not every single sentence of a scientific theory is associated with a unique set of confirming and disconfirming experiences; therefore, you cannot separate sentences into those that are true in virtue of how the world is, and into those that are true solely by virtue of their meanings alone. By an unregenerate realism, Quine means that scientific knowledge is continuous with commonsense knowledge, and so, we cannot raise global doubts about such knowledge. An unregenerate realist sees that the skeptical challenge confronting science must arise from within science; and so, the reasons for rejecting science are just further scientific claims.

Empiricism, for Quine, is the view that both the scientific evidence and the meanings of words ultimately must rest upon our senses. He is not an introspective empiricist in the manner of John Locke, George Berkeley, David Hume, or the early Carnap. Rather, Quine's empiricism is externalized. Since Quine holds that scientific theories are statable as distinct sets of sentences, and that the evidence for, and the meanings of, these distinct sets of sentences are ultimately sensory, he naturally infers that the evidential basis for science is best evaluated from the standpoint of language acquisition. To say that the evidential basis for science is best evaluated from the standpoint of language acquisition Quine means that in learning the meaning of any given sentence, what one must learn is exactly what evidence there is for the truth of that sentence. According to Quine, language acquisition should be studied behavioristically. The advantage of his empiricism over the earlier introspective one is that language learning, on Quine's account, becomes as a matter of course both public and amenable to investigation by intersubjective techniques.

Quine's answers to the central epistemological questions – how is scientific knowledge acquired and why does it work so well? – begins with his philosophical naturalism. This naturalism is the doctrine that the best theories of science and, in particular, of learning are those according to which children are endowed with a capacity to acknowledge and collect recurrent salient sensory stimuli. Because children are also innately disposed to babble and to imitate the speech of adults, and also because they are amenable to behavioral conditioning, and behavioral reinforcement largely from adults very soon has them responding to concomitant nonverbal stimulus conditions by producing the appropriate strings of linguistic sounds. The rabbit races by and the child thereupon utters the words "There goes a rabbit" while at the same time pointing out a rabbit, and thereby elicits the child's assent. The observation sentences of a language can be acquired by the simple method of ostension: when a rabbit is present, a parent notices the rabbit and then notices that the child sees it as well. While pointing at the rabbit, the parent then elicits "Rabbit." The child imitates the parent's utterance with her own utterance of "Rabbit." The parent then positively reinforces the child's utterance. Occasionally, the child employs the expression "Rabbit" even when no rabbit is present; inasmuch as the parent negatively reinforces these utterances, the child tends not to use "Rabbit" when rabbits are not present. The psychological mechanism that lies behind these instances of language acquisition – namely, inductive generalization over observed similarities – is the familiar and simple one of conditioning.

Once a child has mastered several observation sentences that are directly pitched to concurrent nonverbal stimuli, then she can learn the "nonobservation sentences" that are not tied to concurrent nonverbal stimuli. These sentences obviously form the bulk of the entire language. In order to master a nonobservation sentence a child must learn how to segment whatever observation sentences she has already learned into short recurrent patterns – that is, she must learn how to segment such sentences into words. So, as it were, the unstructured string "Theregoesarabbit" becomes the segmented sentence "There goes a rabbit." Eventually, according to Quine, the child obtains the referential apparatus – the *is* of identity, quantification, and so on – and thereby, the child is able to learn much of the common-sense knowledge about the world that surrounds her. Talk of ordinary objects, as Quine likes to say, is close at hand, and then science is not far behind. Theoretical sentences inherit whatever empirical content they carry via the diverse connections that they carry with the observation sentences of the language. In only a matter of time, then, the child goes beyond behavioristic conditioning and induction in order to acquire language that surpasses observation sentences.

Because the theoretical sentences receive their empirical content from their diverse connections with observation sentences, if any given observation which is implied by an hypothesis together with relevant background assumptions fails to materialize, there will be plenty of distinct alterations that can explain away the incongruity. According to Quine, there is no recipe for deciding what to do in such cases.

By Quine's holistic account of natural knowledge, the apparent necessity of logic and mathematics is explained by their centrality to one's web of belief and not by their being analytic (true by definition). Their centrality is demonstrated by the great degree of disruption to one's web of belief that would ensue if some logical or mathematical truth were given up as false.

Quine calls the desideratum that the least possible modification is to be done to one's web of belief the "maxim of minimum mutilation." Still, sometimes the drastic step of denying a general principle, or even a logical or mathematical "law," will have to be taken. He cites the example of how quantum mechanics can be accommodated to one's web of belief if one is prepared to relinquish the law of

excluded middle – this is the law that sates that every proposition is either true or false.

Quine argues for his empiricism naturalistically: he argues for it, that is, on the grounds of natural science: the only evidence for science, ultimately, is the activation of our nerve endings. So, on Quine's view, natural science and empiricism dovetail to support one another. According to natural science, empiricism is true, and according to, natural science is justified. According to Quine this does not mean that science is infallible; rather, its current reliance on a physicalist ontology and on an empiricist epistemology might very well some day slip. For all we know, it might be the case that one day science comes to countenance within its ontology disembodied spirits in addition to the physical objects and it might also be the case that one day science admits extrasensory as well as sensory perception into the theory of knowledge.

During the 1980s Quine published *Theories and Things* (1981), *The Time of My Life: An Autobiography* (1985), and *Quiddities: An Intermittently Philosophical Dictionary* (1987). In 1990 he published *Pursuit of Truth,* in which he clarifies various views on meaning, reference, and knowledge. His last book was *From Stimulus to Science* (1995). Prior to the publication of this book, Quine had disagreed with the logical positivists, in particular, with Carnap, about whether applied mathematics had any empirical content. Carnap held the view that mathematics lacks any empirical content even though it is necessarily true; Quine had held that applied mathematics has empirical content and that it is only contingently true. According to Quine, mathematics acquires whatever empirical content it has by virtue of being associated with a collection of distinct sentences which themselves carry empirical content. For example, "5 + 7 = 12" acquires whatever empirical content it has by being connected to other statements that have empirical content. The sentence seems necessary because of its deep centrality in our overall conceptual scheme and its distant remoteness from our

sensory experience. In *From Stimulus to Science,* Quine finally came to agree with Carnap that mathematics lacks empirical content altogether.

In August 1999, at the World Congress of Philosophy in Boston, references to Quine's philosophy were commonplace. Participants from as far away as Novosibirsk, Beijing, and Bombay, from all over Eastern and Western Europe, from the Middle East and Africa, from South and Central America were completely comfortable discussing, for example, the indeterminacy of translation, the inscrutability of reference, the underdetermination of theory, ontological relativity, radical translation, and naturalized epistemology; all are originally Quine's terms. What was most striking was that each time a Quinean thesis was mentioned, the speaker just assumed everyone present would understand what was being discussed. It is hard to imagine a greater testament to the substance and durability of a philosopher's achievements. Quine's work has become part of the philosophical canon, and it is here to stay.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A System of Logistic (Cambridge, Mass., 1934).

Mathematical Logic (New York, 1940; 2nd edn, Cambridge, Mass., 1951).

Elementary Logic (Boston, 1941; 2nd edn, New York, 1965).

O sentido da nova lógica (São Paulo, Brazil, 1944).

Methods of Logic (New York, 1950; 2nd edn 1959; 3rd edn 1972; 4th edn, Cambridge, Mass., 1982).

From a Logical Point of View: Nine Logico-Philosophical Essays (Cambridge, Mass., 1953; 2nd edn 1961).

Word and Object (Cambridge, Mass., 1960).

Set Theory and Its Logic (Cambridge, Mass., 1963; 2nd edn 1969).

The Ways of Paradox, and Other Essays (New York, 1966; 2nd edn, Cambridge, Mass., 1976).

Selected Logic Papers (New York, 1966; 2nd

edn, Cambridge, Mass., 1995).

Ontological Relativity and Other Essays (New York, 1969).

The Web of Belief, with J. S. Ullian (New York, 1970; 2nd edn 1978).

Philosophy of Logic (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1970; 2nd edn, Cambridge, Mass., 1986).

The Roots of Reference (La Salle, Ill., 1974).

Theories and Things (Cambridge, Mass., 1981).

The Time of My Life: An Autobiography (Cambridge, Mass., 1985).

Quiddities: An Intermittently Philosophical Dictionary (Cambridge, Mass., 1987).

Pursuit of Truth (Cambridge, Mass., 1990; 2nd edn 1992).

From Stimulus to Science (Cambridge, Mass., 1995).

Other Relevant Works

Quine's papers are at Harvard University.

Dear Carnap, Dear Van: The Quine–Carnap Correspondence and Related Work, ed. Richard Creath (Berkeley, Cal., 1990).

Quintessence: Basic Readings from the Philosophy of W. V. Quine, ed. Roger F. Gibson, Jr. (Cambridge, Mass., 2004).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils 1950-2000*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Blackwell Amer Phil*, *Blackwell Analytic Phil*, *Blackwell Comp Phils*, *Blackwell Comp Prag*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v6*, *Proc of APA v75*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Barrett, Robert B., and Roger F. Gibson, Jr., eds. *Perspectives on Quine* (Oxford, 1990).

Davidson, Donald, and Jaakko Hintikka, eds. *Words and Objections: Essays on the Work of W. V. Quine*, 2nd edn (Dordrecht, 1975).

Dilman, Ilham. *Quine on Ontology, Necessity, and Experience: A Philosophical Critique* (Albany, N.Y., 1984).

Føllesdal, Dagfinn, ed. *Philosophy of Quine*, 5 vols (New York, 2000–2001).

Gibson, Roger. *Enlightened Empiricism: An Examination of W. V. Quine's Theory of Knowledge* (Gainesville, Fla., 1988).

Gibson, Roger, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Quine* (Cambridge, UK, 2004).

Gochet, Paul. *Ascent to Truth: A Critical Examination of Quine's Philosophy* (Munich: Philosophia, 1986).

Hahn, Lewis E., and Paul A. Schilpp, eds. *The Philosophy of W. V. Quine* (La Salle, Ill., 1986; 2nd edn 1998). Contains Quine's autobiography and bibliography.

Harding, Sandra G., ed. *Can Theories be Refuted? Essays on the Duhem–Quine Thesis* (Dordrecht, 1976).

Hookway, Christopher. *Quine: Language, Experience, and Reality* (Stanford, Cal., 1988).

Kirk, Robert. *Translation Determined* (Oxford, 1986).

Lauener, Henri. *Willard Van Orman Quine* (Munich, Germany, 1982).

Leonardi, Paolo, and Mario Santambrogio, eds. *On Quine: New Essays* (Cambridge, UK, 1995).

Nelson, Lynn Hankinson, and Jack Nelson. *On Quine* (Belmont, Cal., 2000).

Orenstein, Alex. *W. V. Quine* (Princeton, N.J., 2002).

Orenstein, Alex, and Petr Kotatko, eds. *Knowledge, Language, and Logic: Questions for Quine* (Dordrecht, 2000).

Romanos, George D. *Quine and Analytic Philosophy* (Cambridge, Mass., 1983).

Swoyer, Chris, and Robert W. Shahan, eds. *Essays on the Philosophy of W. V. Quine* (Norman, Okla., 1978).

Ernie Lepore

The Dictionary
of Modern American Philosophers

THOEMMES

THE DICTIONARY
OF MODERN AMERICAN
PHILOSOPHERS

Volume 4

R–Z

GENERAL EDITOR

John R. Shook

CONSULTING EDITORS

Richard T. Hull
Bruce Kuklick
Murray G. Murphey
John G. Slater

R

RADER, Melvin Miller (1903–81)

Melvin Rader was born on 8 November 1903 in Walla Walla, Washington. He attended the University of Washington in Seattle, receiving his BA in 1925, his MA in 1927, and his PhD in English in 1929. His dissertation, *Presiding Ideas in Wordsworth's Poetry*, was published in book form in 1931. Rader began his career teaching English at the University of Idaho and at Western Reserve University before returning in 1930 to the University of Washington as assistant professor of philosophy. With the exception of a year at the University of Chicago as visiting associate professor (1944–5), he remained at the University of Washington for his entire career, becoming associate professor in 1944 and then full professor in 1948. Rader was President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association (1953–4). Rader retired in 1971, and later spent a year as Solomon Katz Lecturer in 1980 at the University of Washington. He died on 14 June 1981 in Seattle.

Aesthetics was the central focus of Rader's philosophical writings and interests. He wrote on the aesthetics of poetry as well as art's universal properties and its role in expressing human values. Rader's first published works dealt specifically with William Wordsworth and the legacies of eighteenth and nineteenth-century philosophy apparent in his poetry. In the book version of *Presiding Ideas in Wordsworth's Poetry* from 1931, Rader showed how the epistemological debates of Wordsworth's era were reflected in his poetry by exploring Wordsworth's contradictory celebration of the self's deep attachment to the senses in light of his "unsensationistic theory of mind." Rader challenged the conventional notion that the sensual self is the hero of Romantic poetry and literature by claiming that Wordsworth saw the self as primarily identified with the mind.

Despite Wordsworth's rhapsodic accounts of sensuous experience, in the end he claims that only the mind can know eternal and universal truths – which represent "the voice of God" – whereas the senses can only experience impermanence. Both intuition and experience speak to the individual, but ultimately, Rader argues, Wordsworth was allied with the thinkers who privileged mind over experience. This choice, between intuition and experience, would persist in the philosophy of American transcendentalism and nineteenth-century theories about the role of the active imagination in communicating with God. These questions preoccupied Rader again when he returned to this subject with *Wordsworth: A Philosophical Approach* (1967). Here Rader continued to work on the puzzle of the dominance of feeling over thought in Wordsworth's poetry, and his earlier argument shifted instead to a critique of the dualism inherent in the question of Wordsworth as a man of experience versus intuition. In this later analysis Rader celebrated Wordsworth's ability to reconcile dualisms, to overcome the limits of dualistic thinking that separate body and mind, nature and spirit, appearance and reality.

In 1935 Rader edited and introduced *A Modern Book of Esthetics*, a widely used anthology of more than thirty readings in aesthetics dealing with different attempts at the definitions of art, with selections covering a broad philosophical range. Essays on art by David Hume, George SANTAYANA, Friedrich Nietzsche, Sigmund Freud, John DEWEY, and numerous others are collected and arranged thematically, according to definition, such as art as semblance, art as beauty, and art as wish-fulfillment. The question of art's definition was a persistent fascination for Rader. In his own writings, he was skeptical of our tendencies to enclose art by defining it, and instead proposed that we allow for the openness of art's meaning by thinking of it as a social practice expressive of human values in contrast to the earlier views of art as imitative, decorative, or merely concerned with only form and beauty. Art, for Rader, could express truth, but truth defined as "value socially communicable," as opposed to the truth-telling done by science, which Rader characterized as "accurate description." Truths found in art, unlike in science, cannot be easily translated into another language, for art's content is inseparable from its form.

The cultural preoccupations of the postwar United States included, among other things, an embrace of technology and fear of communism, and Rader addressed these social phenomena in his work. Rader's understanding of art as an inherently social endeavor was linked to his deeply humanistic engagement with issues concerning community and the social good, and he wrote in depth about fascism, socialism, communism, and liberalism during the course of his career. In addition to publishing several articles on community and social ideals during the 1940s and 1950s, he wrote *Ethics and Society: An Appraisal of Social Ideals* (1950) and *Ethics and the Human Community* (1964). In his general philosophy anthology *The Enduring Questions* (1956), Rader included a lengthy section on social and political philosophy, with excerpts from Plato, Thomas Hobbes, John Stuart Mill, and Karl Marx. Concerns about the individual's negotiation, use, and potential conflict with technology appeared in several articles between the mid 1940s to the early 1960s. In each, Rader affirmed the value of democracy and diversity within community in confronting and interpreting technology in order to promote progress.

Rader continued to explore and develop theories of value – aesthetic, moral, and social – in the writings from his later career. Specifically, his socially oriented approach toward art as the expression of human values continued to develop in *Art and Human Values* (1976), which was co-authored with Bertram Jessup. They sought to understand art not as disinterested or isolationist but instead as a gestalt, an integral part of the whole fabric of human culture and experience, asking not "What can art alone do?" but rather "What can art *do best*?" Rader intended to expand aesthetic inquiry beyond questions of beauty, form, and feeling pertaining to works of art themselves, in order to also understand art's social purpose, and its relationship to and articulation of fundamental moral values, as well as economic, political, and historical concerns.

Rader was an active citizen in democratic politics as well as an accomplished academic, and much of his work during his career reached beyond the academy. In 1979 Rader published *Marx's Interpretation of History* for the purposes of clarifying the seeming contradictions in Marx's theory of history, which Rader found often misunderstood and misrepresented. In doing so he admitted to agreeing with "the Marxists that a profound restructuring of our social order is necessary." In addition to his largely academic texts on democracy and social ideals, he also published widely on the very real concerns of fascism, which he saw as not only a political movement but an aesthetic one as well. In response to Mussolini's remark that there can be no compromise between fascism and democracy, Rader wrote *No Compromise: The Conflict between Two Worlds* (1939), methodically elaborating the history of fascism

and arguing for the inevitability of its clash with democracy. An outspoken civil libertarian, Rader was accused of being a communist subversive in 1948 by the Canwell Committee, the State of Washington's Committee on Un-American Activities. Rader, his wife, and *Seattle Times* reporter Edwin Guthman undertook a long investigation in order to prove the accusations false. He was later exonerated, and Guthman won a Pulitzer Prize for covering the story. Rader's memoir *False Witness* (1969) recounts the experience, which only heightened his commitment to the project of liberal American democracy. In 1957, and again from 1961 to 1962, Rader served as the President for the Washington State chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Rader's last book, *The Right to Hope*, was completed just days before his death in 1981. The book is a collection of essays written over several years, many of which had appeared earlier in journals or as lectures, addressing questions of art, technology, democracy, alienation, and community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Presiding Ideas in Wordsworth's Poetry (Seattle, 1931).

No Compromise: The Conflict between Two Worlds (New York, 1939).

Ethics and Society: An Appraisal of Social Ideals (New York, 1950).

The Enduring Questions: Main Problems in Philosophy (New York, 1956).

Ethics and the Human Community (New York, 1964).

Wordsworth: A Philosophical Approach (Oxford, 1967).

Art and Human Values, with Bertram Jessup (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1976).

Marx's Interpretation of History (Oxford, 1979).

The Right to Hope: Crisis and Community (Seattle, 1981).

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *A Modern Book of Esthetics: An Anthology* (New York, 1935; 2nd edn 1951).

"The Root Values of Art," *Journal of Philosophy* 38 (1941): 324–31.

"The Conflict of Fascist and Democratic Ideals," *Antioch Review* 3 (1943): 246–61.

"Polarity and Progress," *Journal of Philosophy* 42 (1945): 673–83.

"Science and World Community," *Scientific Monthly* 62 (1946): 500–10.

"Isolationist and Contextualist Esthetics: Conflict and Resolution," *Journal of Philosophy* 44 (1947): 393–406.

"Toward a Definition of Cultural Crisis," *Kenyon Review* 9 (1947): 262–78.

"Technology and Community," *Scientific Monthly* 66 (1948): 502–13.

"Crisis and the Spirit of Community," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 27 (1954): 40–58.

"The Artist as Outsider," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 16 (1958): 306–18.

"Community in Time of Stress," *University of Colorado Studies* (1961): 83–98.

"Marx's Interpretation of Art and Aesthetic Value," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 7 (1967): 237–49.

False Witness (Seattle, 1969).

"The Factualist Fallacy in Aesthetics," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 28 (1970): 435–9.

"Dickie and Socrates on Definition," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 32 (1974): 423–4.

"The Imaginative Mode of Awareness," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 33 (1974): 131–7.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Pres Addr of APA v6*, *Proc of APA v56*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Marjorie Jolles

RAMSEY, Robert Paul (1913–88)

Paul Ramsey was born on 10 December 1913 in Mendenhall, Mississippi. He was the son of John William Ramsey, a Methodist minister, and Mamie McCay. He was educated at Millsaps College (BS 1935), Yale Divinity School (BD 1940), and Yale University (PhD in religion, 1943). While at Yale he was a graduate student of H. Richard NIEBUHR. Ramsey was instructor in history and social sciences at Millsaps College (1937–9), and was assistant professor of Christian ethics at Garret Biblical Institute of Northwestern University (1942–4). He then taught in Princeton University's new department of religion as assistant professor from 1944 to 1947, associate professor from 1947 to 1954, and professor from 1954 to 1982. He was named Harrington Spear Paine Professor of Religion in 1957. He also was chair of the religion department in 1959–63, 1973, and 1976. He died on 29 February 1988 in Princeton, New Jersey.

Ramsey's extraordinarily active and prolific career included writing eleven books, editing six others, and being the recipient of eight honorary degrees from many colleges and universities. He was a Kent Fellow of the Society for Religion in Higher Education (President, 1950s). He was instrumental in forming the Society of Christian Ethics (President, 1962–3), was elected a member of the American Theological Society (President, 1964–5), and was a trustee of the Council on Religion and International Affairs (1968–75). He served on the Drew University Board of Trustees from 1968 to 1975. He was elected to the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Science in 1972, and in 1981 he was named recipient of the Henry Knowles Beecher Award for contributions to Ethics and the Life Sciences.

One of the giants of philosophical and ethical discourse, Ramsey's specialty was Christian ethics. His best-known work, *Basic Christian Ethics* (1950), was for decades one of the most widely used undergraduate texts, as well as an extensively used book for seminary training. Ramsey argued that the mythological and apocalyptic language of Scripture provides insight into the nature of morality; the relationship between the two is foundational to all his work. Christian ethics is rooted in Scripture and in an understanding of God's covenanting commitment with women and men. *Basic Christian Ethics* marked a watershed in Ramsey's own thinking, and represents the core of his later writings. Its issues continue to be highly relevant today. In its opening sentence Ramsey states: "The first thing to be said concerning Christian ethics is that it cannot be separated from the religious foundation." He goes on to assert that a person's relation to God is of vital importance. Thus, the centrality of God's activity and nature was established rather than a reliance upon pure legalism or an inevitable faith in progressiveness, an idea which was so prevalent in Ramsey's college years. Rather, he writes, what is important is the centrality of Christian love and the necessity for Christian practice. "Whether in the old law or in the new covenant, God manifests His will in something objectively given to which man must conform rather than something conformable to man. Christian ethics is an ethics of perfection which cuts man to fit the pattern, not the pattern to fit man." (1950, p. 85) Also inherent in Ramsey's thinking is his belief in the efficacy of Christian ethics which supercedes any natural law, whether or not such a morality is imbedded in human hearts. While Ramsey's understanding of Christian morality and his exploration of what is right or obligatory for a Christian was fine-tuned and honed to a deeper level in later writings, this concept remained as the core of his thinking. Tangential to these ideas was his position as the principal Protestant opponent of situation ethics. Social morality, he felt, could not be founded nor based upon any situational ethic.

In the 1940s Ramsey's primary concern focused upon the topic of justification for killing. While a student at Millsaps College, he was a pacifist. Under the influence of both

H. Richard Niebuhr and Reinhold NIEBUHR at Yale, Ramsey moved away from a liberally idealistic Protestantism to a Niebuhrian realism. As he developed his just war theory, Ramsey asked the provocative question in *The Just War*, "how do porcupines make love" and answered: "Carefully!" (1968, p. 141) He used this question and answer as a parable of ways nations relate in a multinational world. They cannot get along with or without one another. Chastising liberals and conservatives, Ramsey stated both avoided thinking about the actual use of power for positive purposes or its political morality. He felt that both groups, liberals and conservatives, believed the use of force could be eliminated before banishing porcupine nation-states from the planet.

Ramsey became a spokesperson for counterforce strategy – unlike many Roman Catholics, especially in Great Britain, who had concluded that nuclear pacifism was the appropriate response to issues of a just war. For him, this counterforce strategy is what should form the conscience of free people, with a "collateral" deterrence that such a policy could afford. He favored the possibility that "a bluff," or the appearance of a willingness to release massive nuclear weapons, could serve as a deterrent to any enemy. Writing optimistically, he declared that strange things have happened throughout the history of war. He cited as an example the records of tribes living close to death in a desert who fought cruel wars, including planned attacks upon women and children, and the use of poisoned arrows. Yet they did not poison the wells. Such an action, he felt, would be a policy of mutual homicide which he labeled a form of "society-contra-society warfare" (1968, p. 258). Ramsey reversed his support for "a bluff" as a possible moral deterrent in a letter to *Newsweek* (5 July 1982). He acknowledged that collateral civilian damage becomes an aftermath of war. He withdrew his support of the "bluff," for two reasons: it would not be a deterrent and "one should never occasion mortal sin in others, tempt them to it or enlist them for it. It is never right to do evil, or to intend to do evil, so that good may come." He did not deny that consequences are irrelevant; however, his primary focus concerned questions of agency and means.

In 1957 Ramsey edited Jonathan Edwards's famous 1754 essay *Freedom of Will* with a 130-page introduction that many consider a definitive analysis of Edwards's Calvinism. Ramsey presented both a study of eighteenth-century intellectual life in the United States and an examination of the problem of free will with a comparison of Edwards's thoughts to those of Hume, Leibniz, and Locke. Ramsey highlighted Edwards's relevancy to contemporary philosophical context, feeling that liberal theologians of his time could have benefited from an analysis of the thoughts of Edwards, thereby gaining in substance and firmness of ideas. Or, put another way, "from the point of view of the history of ideas, as well as from the perspective of persons who are persuaded that the latest is bound to be the most advanced philosophy, it is striking that two hundred years ago Edwards was saying the same thing that is being said today, with variation and often not as well, by the latest analysts of the determinist school" (1957, p. 11).

Ramsey's later years witnessed the development of broad, innovative and daring medical research. Perceptions as to what constitutes an ethical experiment or procedure were evolving, leading Ramsey to consider their moral implications and apply his extensive analytical and technical skills. In 1970 Ramsey published both *The Patient as Person* and *Fabricated Man: The Ethics of Genetic Control*. Five years later he published *The Ethics of Fetal Research*, and three years later *Ethics at the Edges of Life: Medical and Legal Intersections* based upon the Hampton Lectures he gave at Columbia University. In these writings Ramsey argued that love and care for another does not allow for active euthanasia but "does allow one to die." In addition, he challenged the use of children for research unless the medical procedures were for their benefit. Dealing with the topics of euthanasia, abortion, and the overt

neglect of newborn babies, Ramsey clearly emphasized the value of human life in every stage.

A philosophical idealism can be traced throughout Ramsey's writings, perhaps reflecting his Methodist roots. Although he was never ordained, this Wesleyan influence never faded. His first teaching position was at Garret Theological Seminary; his papers are in the Duke University Library, and he served for many years as trustee at Drew University. All are Methodist-related institutions. Beginning with his dissertation, "The Concept of Man in the Philosophy of Josiah Royce and Bernard Bosanquet," this idealism continued with his first book *Basic Christian Ethics* in 1950, to the editing of Jonathan Edwards's *Ethical Writings* in 1989, to opposition to situation ethics in the 1960s, to his just war theories and often controversial position in the 1970s in support of the Vietnam War, to his interest in medical ethics beginning in 1968. This "family relationship" of ideas lasted right up until the final decade of his life. Throughout his lengthy career, this continuum was grounded in his assertions stated in *Basic Christian Ethics*. This foundation is the biblical understanding of the righteousness of God and the reign of that righteousness in the Kingdom of God in Jesus Christ as the two sources of Christian love. This love is manifest to neighbor, to care for the vulnerable, to deliverance for captives and regard for aliens, and in medical situations; it is the unifying theme of his life work. In all of Ramsey's extended interests and works, Christian ethics cannot be separated from the religious foundation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Basic Christian Ethics (New York, 1950; Louisville, Kent., 1993).

Christian Ethics and the Sit-In (New York, 1961).

War and the Christian Conscience: How Shall Modern War Be Conducted Justly? (Durham, N.C., 1961).

Nine Modern Moralists (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1962).

The Limits of Nuclear War: Thinking about the Do-Able and the Un-Do-Able (New York, 1963).

Again, the Justice of Deterrence (New York, 1965).

Deeds and Rules in Christian Ethics (Edinburgh and London, 1965; New York, 1967).

Who Speaks for the Church? A Critique of the 1966 Geneva Conference on Church and Society (Nashville, Tenn., 1967).

The Just War: Force and Political Responsibility (New York, 1968). Revised edition, with introduction by Stanley Hauerwas (Lanham, Md., 2002).

Fabricated Man: The Ethics of Genetic Control (New Haven, Conn., 1970).

The Patient as Person: Explorations in Medical Ethics (New Haven, Conn., 1970; 2nd edn 2002).

The Ethics of Fetal Research (New Haven, Conn., 1975).

Ethics at the Edges of Life: Medical and Legal Intersections (New Haven, Conn., 1978).

Speak Up for Just War or Pacifism, with epilogue by Stanley Hauerwas (State College, Penn., 1988).

Other Relevant Works

Ramsey's papers are at Duke University.

Ed., *Freedom of the Will*, The Works of Jonathan Edwards, vol. 1 (New Haven, Conn., 1957).

Ed., *Faith and Ethics: The Theology of H. Richard Neibuhr* (New York, 1957).

Ed., *Religion: Essays* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1965).

Ed. with Gene H. Outka, *Norm and Context in Christian Ethics* (New York, 1968).

Ed. with John F. Wilson, *The Study of Religion in Colleges and Universities* (Princeton, N.J., 1970).

Ed. with Richard A. McCormick, *Doing Evil to Achieve Good: Moral Choice in Conflict Situations* (Chicago, 1978).

Ed., *Ethical Writings*, The Works of Jonathan

Edwards, vol. 8 (New Haven, Conn., 1989).

The Essential Paul Ramsey: A Collection, ed. W. Werpehowski and S. Crocco (New Haven, Conn., 1994). Contains a bibliography of Ramsey's writings.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Bio 20thC Phils

Attwood, David. *Paul Ramsey's Political Ethics* (Lanham, Md., 1992).

Curran, Charles E. *Politics, Medicine, and Christian Ethics: A Dialogue with Paul Ramsey* (Philadelphia, 1973).

Gustafson, James M. *Ethics from a Theocentric Perspective*, vol. 2 (Chicago, 1984), pp. 84–94.

Johnson, J. T., and D. H. Smith, eds. *Love and Society: Essays in the Ethics of Paul Ramsey* (Missoula, Mont., 1974).

Long, Stephen D. *Tragedy, Tradition, Transfiguration: The Ethics of Paul Ramsey* (Boulder, Col., 1993).

McKenzie, Michael C. *Paul Ramsey's Ethics: The Power of 'Agape' in a Postmodern World* (Westport, Conn., 2001).

Outka, Gene. *Agape: An Ethical Analysis* (New Haven, Conn., 1972).

Vaux, Kenneth L., Sara Vaux, and Mark Stenberg, eds. *Covenants of Life: Contemporary Medical Ethics in Light of the Thought of Paul Ramsey* (Dordrecht, 2002).

Nancy Hurd Schluter

RAND, Ayn (1905–82)

Ayn Rand was born Alisa Zinovyevna Rosenbaum on 2 February 1905 in St. Petersburg, Russia, to middle-class, cultured, largely non-observant Jewish parents. At age sixteen she entered Petrograd University, gradu-ating three years later, in 1924; history was her major subject and philosophy her special interest. She subsequently studied for a year at the State Technicum for Screen Arts. In early 1926 she emigrated to the United States, and eventually took up residence in Hollywood, where she changed her name to Ayn Rand. She worked initially as a screen writer for the Cecil B. DeMille studios. Her first play, *Night of January 16th*, was produced on Broadway in 1935, and the first of her four novels, *We the Living*, was published in 1936. *Anthem* followed in 1938, *The Fountainhead* in 1943, and *Atlas Shrugged*, her magnum opus, in 1957.

In 1951, Rand moved permanently to New York City. After the publication of *Atlas Shrugged*, she turned to nonfiction, elaborating on the philosophy expounded in the novels and applying it to current cultural and political issues. She lectured widely at universities and colleges and to private groups throughout the US, and wrote numerous essays, many published in periodicals she edited or co-edited: *The Objectivist Newsletter* (1962–5), *The Objectivist* (1966–71), and *The Ayn Rand Letter* (1971–6). The philosophical speeches from her novels, and her philosophic essays and lectures, became the basis for a series of seven book-length collections, starting in 1961. Rand died on 6 March 1982 in New York City.

Original manuscripts of Rand's novels are in the Library of Congress. Most of her surviving papers and documents are held in the Ayn Rand Archives, a department of the Ayn Rand Institute in Irvine, California. Rand's books have sold over twenty million copies; readers often speak of her novels as having changed their lives. A growing number of academic philosophers are taking an interest in her work.

In an afterword to *Atlas Shrugged* Ayn Rand said: "My philosophy, in essence, is the concept of man as a heroic being, with his own happiness as the moral purpose of his life, with productive achievement as his noblest activity, and reason as his only absolute." Rand's vision of human beings as able to achieve great things, and of the universe as open to their efforts, is clearly a sig-

nificant part of her widespread appeal. Happiness, for her, is the emotional state that results from the achievement of objective values. Such values and the means to them can only be identified by reason, and Rand holds that they cannot be achieved without such virtues as independence, integrity, honesty, justice, productiveness, and pride.

Rand's virtue-focused rational egoism differs from traditional eudaimonism in that Rand regards ethics as an exact science. Rather than deriving her virtues from a vaguely defined human function, she takes "Man's Life" – i.e., that which is required for the survival of a rational animal across its lifespan – as her standard of value. This accounts for the nobility she ascribes to production – "the application of reason to the problem of survival" (1966, p. 9). For Rand, reason is man's means of survival, and even the most theoretical and spiritual functions – science, philosophy, art, love, and reverence for the human potential, among others – are for the sake of life-sustaining action. This, for her, does not demean the spiritual by "bringing it down" to the level of the material; rather, it elevates the material and grounds the spiritual.

The foundation of Rand's philosophy is a thesis which has often been called "metaphysical realism," and which she calls *the primacy of existence*. It states that "reality, the external world, exists independent of man's consciousness … this means that A is A, that facts are facts, that things are what they are – and the task of man's consciousness is to *perceive* reality *not* to create or invent it." Rand argues that this metaphysics is axiomatic – that it is contained in all knowledge and so presupposed in any attempt to deny it.

Following Aristotle, Rand views the world as made up of individual entities, and understands causality as the relationship between an entity and the actions necessitated by its nature. Choice is a type of causality. It is the nature of reason, our distinctive form of consciousness, to be volitional; its operation is up to us.

Rand draws a sharp distinction between that which is caused by human choice – "the man-made," and that which is not – "the metaphysically given." This distinction provides the foundation for her view of objectivity both in epistemology and in ethics. Metaphysically given facts cannot be judged and man-made phenomena must be. The standard is the metaphysically given requirements of human survival.

Our principal survival-requirement is *knowledge*. Rand distinguishes between the automatic, metaphysically given knowledge of sense-perception, and the volitional products of reason. Perception is a form of awareness that results inexorably from a causal interaction of the perceiver with his environment. As such, it cannot be judged and serves as an epistemological given on which conceptual knowledge will be built. Epistemology for Rand is a normative discipline describing how to build conceptual knowledge on perceptual. The basic principle of her epistemology is that "the rules of cognition must be derived from the nature of existence and the nature, the *identity*, of [man's] cognitive faculty." (*Introduction to Objectivist Epistemology*, 1990, p. 82)

Rand defines reason as "the faculty that identifies and integrates the material provided by man's senses" (1965, p. 20). With our senses we perceive entities (including their attributes). Reason identifies these existents by *interrelating them*. For example, Newtonian physics interrelates the perceived motions of falling apples and wandering planets. To grasp such far-flung connections we need to deal with a vast quantity of information. However, Rand observes, we are only able to hold a limited number of discrete items in mind at once. This limitation creates a need for "unit economy," which is fulfilled by concepts, the basic units of thought.

A concept is a man-made *integration* of similar existents into a single mental entity – a unitary awareness of indefinitely many existents of the same kind. The concept "man," for example, enables us to think and learn about all men (past, present, and future) at once; and to call someone a man is to bring the whole of our knowledge about men (medical, psychological, philosophical, etc.) to bear on him.

Rand presents her theory of concept formation in *Introduction to Objectivist Epistemology* (*ITOE*), published first as a multi-part series in *The Objectivist* in 1966–7, and then as a monograph in 1967. Properly formed concepts unit-economize by integrating similar existents. Rand analyses similarity as a matter of variation in degree or measurement along a quantitative axis. Two items are similar, relative to a third, when their differences in measurement are comparatively insignificant. We form concepts by isolating a group of similar existents (or "units") by differentiating them from foils, and then integrating the units by omitting their particular measurements. In omitting these measurements we do not turn our attention away from their differences to some underlying sameness. Rather, we interrelate the units (and a potential infinity of other units) by projecting a range along the quantitative axis. The integration is retained by means of a word, and the units' differentiation from all other existents is maintained by a definition in traditional genus-differentia form.

Our first concepts are formed by integrating perceived entities or their attributes. These concepts then form the basis for wider integrations and more precise differentiations, resulting in a complex conceptual hierarchy. In *ITOE*, Rand lays out the process of concept formation in detail, and explains how it applies to various sorts of concepts including concepts of entities, actions, attributes, materials, conscious phenomena, and philosophical axioms. She describes the methods of proper definition and discusses when it is valid to form a new concept. A 1979 reprinting of *ITOE* includes an essay by Leonard PEIKOFF, written from the standpoint of Rand's theory of concepts, that attacks the analytic–synthetic dichotomy. An expanded second edition, published in 1990, includes extensive excerpts from epistemology workshops Rand gave during 1969–71 for a group of philosophers and graduate students.

Rand argues that traditional theories of concepts either reify concepts (realism), or else make concepts arbitrary (conceptualism and nominalism). On her view, concepts are man-made, but they are made in order to apprehend reality, and so must be formed in the specific manner demanded by the nature of consciousness and of its objects. When so formed, concepts are neither *intrinsic* features of reality nor *subjective* creations of consciousness. They are *objective* "products of a cognitive method of classification whose processes must be performed by man, but whose content is dictated by reality" (1990, p. 54).

The very integration of a concept's units depends on knowledge of the contrasting foils. And the similarities on which abstract concepts are based can only be grasped on the basis of a chain of prior concepts (terminating with ones formed directly from perception). Because of these facts, concepts are only meaningful in the context of a vast hierarchical system. If we don't define our concepts properly, there is a danger of "stealing" concepts – of using them in disregard for their place in the hierarchy, rendering them cognitively meaningless.

Rand's ethics is founded on an argument that the concept "value" depends on the concept "life" and so is only meaningful in the context of an organism pursuing its life as its ultimate value. Animals automatically desire what they need to survive, but human desires are based on volitional thinking. So, each person must adopt his life as his ultimate value, and then choose to discover and enact the means necessary to achieve it. Someone who does not pursue life can have no values at all, and is irrelevant to ethics.

Because of the quantity of information involved, we cannot assess the survival impact of actions considered as isolated particulars. We need to proceed conceptually, discovering the broad categories of values man's survival requires, and what virtues are necessary to achieve them. We need a *code of values* with "man's life" as its standard.

Rand identifies three cardinal values: Reason, Purpose, and Self-esteem, with the corresponding virtues of Rationality, Productiveness, and Pride. Reason is our means of survival. Rationality is the acceptance of reason as one's only source of knowledge and guide to action.

Rationality requires a person to do *his own* thinking (*independence*) and stay true to it in *action* (*integrity*). It requires *honesty* – the refusal to fake reality – because the unreal does not exist and can be of no value. It requires *justice* – the moral evaluation of others – because rational, productive people are good *for us*, while irrational parasites are worthless or dangerous.

Survival requires an all-encompassing purposefulness, with all of one's other purposes integrated to a central productive *purpose*. *Productiveness* is the application of reason to the creation of the products and services necessary for survival. To define and achieve rational purposes, a person must be certain of his competence and worth – he must achieve *self-esteem*. This requires the virtue of *pride* – a commitment to living up to the highest rational standards. Thus Rand calls pride "moral ambitiousness." It is, in effect, productiveness applied to one's character: "as man is a being of self-made wealth, so he is a being of self-made soul" (1957, p. 1020).

In such an ethics, one's *interests* are defined not as the satisfaction of whatever one happens to desire, but by what is actually in one's interest – by what furthers one's life. Thus, for Rand, there are "no conflicts of interest among rational men": each rational egoist benefits from the virtues of the others. But these benefits are only possible if each individual is free to exercise reason. For human beings, survival thus requires the banishment of *initiated force,* and the identification of individual rights. A right, Rand says, is "a moral principle defining and sanctioning a man's freedom of action in a social context" (1965, p. 124). The fundamental right is the right to life, which is the source of all other rights, principally the rights to liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness. The only moral political system is the one that protects individual rights, including property rights: *laissez-faire capitalism.*

Rand criticizes prior ethicists for conceiving of values as either *intrinsic* (as in Plato, Moore, and religious traditions) or as *subjective* (hedonism, utilitarianism, Nietzsche, pragmatism, etc.). On her view values are *objective*. Values (like concepts) are formed by a consciousness in accordance with the facts of reality. To be a value something must be *identified* by an agent as furthering his life. The identification is, in Rand's terminology, man-made, as is the choice to live that gives it meaning. But the relationship between the value and the agent's life is metaphysically given, as is the need to identify this relationship conceptually.

Rand thus conceives of objectivity as the relationship between a volitional consciousness and mind-independent reality when that consciousness adheres to the methods required by its nature and the nature of its objects if it is to know, and live in, reality. This new conception of objectivity shapes not only her view of concepts and values, but through them her entire epistemology and ethics, and the whole of her philosophic system. For this reason she called the system *Objectivism*.

In regard to the list of "Further Reading" in the Bibliography which follows, it should be said that the secondary literature on Rand varies greatly in caliber. Because she has not yet received substantial attention from first-rate philosophical scholars, publications of inferior quality have acquired undeserved prominence. These writings show limited understanding of her views, often even distorting them. Many are ill-conceived attempts to assimilate aspects of her thought to those of alien traditions, such as the Kantian, Hegelian, analytic, existentialist, or feminist. Some of these writings appear in the list of "Further Reading." The best secondary work on Rand thus far has been done by her own students, especially Leonard Peikoff, Harry Binswanger, and Allan Gotthelf. We have included some of their writings below. Peikoff's *Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand* should be singled out. It is a full-length systematic study, reflecting sustained philosophical discussion with Rand across the last thirty years of her life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
We The Living (New York and London, 1936; 2nd edn 1959).
Anthem (London, 1938; 2nd edn 1946).
The Fountainhead (New York, 1943; 25th

anniversary edn., 1968).

Atlas Shrugged (New York, 1957).

For the New Intellectual: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand (New York, 1961).

The Virtue of Selfishness: A New Concept of Egoism (New York, 1964; 2nd edn 1965).

Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal (New York, 1966; 2nd edn 1967).

Introduction to Objectivist Epistemology (New York, 1967; expanded edn, ed. Harry Binswanger and Leonard Peikoff, 1990).

Night of January 16th (New York, 1968).

The New Left: The Anti-Industrial Revolution (New York, 1971). Expanded edn, *Return of the Primitive: The Anti-Industrial Revolution*, ed. Peter Schwartz (New York, 1999).

The Romantic Manifesto: A Philosophy of Literature (New York, 1971; 2nd edn 1975).

Philosophy: Who Needs It, ed. Leonard Peikoff (New York, 1982).

The Voice of Reason: Essays in Objectivist Thought, ed. Leonard Peikoff (New York, 1990).

Other Relevant Works

Rand's papers are in the Ayn Rand Institute in Irvine, California.

The Early Ayn Rand, ed. Leonard Peikoff (New York, 1984).

The Ayn Rand Lexicon: Objectivism from A to Z, ed. Harry Binswanger (New York, 1986).

The Ayn Rand Column: A Collection of Her Weekly Newspaper Articles, Written for the Los Angeles Times, with Additional, Little-known Essays, ed. Peter Schwartz (New Milford, Conn., 1991; 2nd edn 1998).

Ayn Rand's Marginalia: Her Critical Comments on the Writings of over 20 Authors, ed. Robert Mayhew (New Milford, Connecticut, 1995).

Letters of Ayn Rand, ed. M. S. Berliner (New York, 1995).

Journals of Ayn Rand, ed. D. Harriman (New York, 1997).

Russian Writings on Hollywood, ed. M. S. Berliner (Marina del Rey, Cal., 1999).

The Ayn Rand Reader, ed. Gary Hull and Leonard Peikoff (New York, 1999).

The Art of Fiction: A Guide for Writers and Readers, ed. T. Boeckmann (New York, 2000).

The Art of Nonfiction: A Guide for Writers and Readers, ed. Robert Mayhew (New York, 2001).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils 1950–2000*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Ethics*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who was Who in Amer v8*, *Women Phils*

Binswanger, Harry. "Ayn Rand's Philosophic Achievement," *The Objectivist Forum* 3 nos. 3–6 (1982): 8–13, 1–2, 1–4, 1–12.

Binswanger, Harry. "Life-Based Teleology and the Foundations of Ethics," *The Monist* 75 (1992): 84–102.

Branden, Nathaniel, and Barbara Branden. *Who Is Ayn Rand?* (New York, 1962).

Britting, Jeff. *Ayn Rand* (New York, 2004).

Den Uyl, Douglas, and Douglas Rasmussen. "Nozick on the Randian Argument," *The Personalist* 59 (1978): 184–205.

Den Uyl, Douglas, and Douglas Rasmussen, eds. *The Philosophic Thought of Ayn Rand* (Urbana, Ill., 1984).

Gladstein, Mimi R. *The New Ayn Rand Companion*, 2nd edn (Westport, Conn., 1999).

Gladstein, Mimi R., and Chris M. Sciabarra, eds. *Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand* (University Park, Penn., 1999).

Gotthelf, Allan. *On Ayn Rand* (Belmont, Cal., 2000).

Machan, Tibor. *Ayn Rand* (New York, 2000).

Nozick, Robert. "On the Randian Argument," *The Personalist* 52 (1971): 282–304.

Peikoff, Leonard. *Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand* (New York, 1991).

Allan Gotthelf
Gregory Salmieri

RANDALL, John Herman, Jr. (1899–1980)

John Herman Randall, Jr. was born on 14 February 1899 in Grand Rapids, Michigan. His father, John Herman Randall, Sr., was a liberal minister in Baptist churches and then the Community Church in New York, who imparted to his son a love of thought, ethical issues, and literature, also of northern forests and lakes, and travel to Europe. Randall attended Columbia University and went into philosophy there, earning a BA in 1918, an MA in 1919, and a PhD in philosophy in 1922. His dissertation was on "The Problem of Group Responsibility to Society." He studied with John Dewey, and was even more influenced by Frederick J. E. Woodbridge, by John J. Coss and in art by Wendell T. Bush. He was also much influenced by a small, close circle of friends, most of whom became fellow teachers of philosophy at Columbia: James Gutmann, Horace Fries, Herbert Schneider, and Irwin Edman. Other influences were Albert Redpath, a stockbroker, and Frank Tannenbaum, a former anarchist leader and an historian of Latin America. His wife, Mercedes Moritz Randall, was a prominent writer and peace activist.

Columbia made Randall a lecturer in philosophy in 1920, and he remained there for the rest of his career. After twenty-five years of productive teaching and writing, Randall in the 1940s and 50s had a decade of inner agony and psychiatric problems, including an alcohol problem. But he recovered and did a great deal more fruitful work, including the volumes of his magnum opus, *The Career of Philosophy* (1962, 1965). Many of his students of five decades became philosophers all over America. He became the first Woodbridge Professor of Philosophy in 1951. In 1956–7 Randall was President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division. He officially retired in 1967, but taught and wrote until he suffered a stroke in 1976. He died on 1 December 1980 in New York City.

Randall was one of the first group of teachers of Columbia's pioneering general education course, "Contemporary Civilization in the West." With the publication of an intellectual history of the West that grew out of this course, *The Making of the Modern Mind* (1926), in print for over fifty years, he became widely known. In 1925 he inherited from Woodbridge the year-long graduate course in the history of philosophy, which became his major instrument of influence on generations of young philosophers and others at Columbia.

Randall was tall and became stout (wryly identifying with Plato and Thomas Aquinas), but loved hiking, canoeing and the tools of carpentry. He was a polished, prepared lecturer, often hilariously witty, but shy within and less skilled with students in seminars. He had a prodigious memory, and in a scholarly lifetime before computers he wrote by reading and remembering his library of 12,000 books, and the boxes of them he took to write at the farm in Vermont. He could not take Freud seriously either as a philosopher or a therapist. He called himself a socialist, and voted for the pacifist socialist candidate Norman Thomas, never Roosevelt, even during World War II. In 1946 he wrote the nominating biography that helped win his wife's pacifist mentor, Emily Greene Balch, a Nobel Peace Prize. He judged Marx a very reductionist philosopher, Stalin a tyrant, and American communists political schemers. In 1935 he resigned his office in the American Federation of Teachers when communists took it over. But he opposed purging communists from universities after World War II. He welcomed refugee scholars from Hitler's Europe and helped motivate philosophers to welcome them, at a time when some other professional associations voted to exclude them. He helped bring Ernst Cassirer and Paul O. Kristeller to Columbia, the latter becoming his closest colleague in later years. He was a generous colleague to younger philosophers, and amongst these was perhaps closest to Justus Buchler.

Most of Randall's teaching and writings were on the history of philosophy. But the distinction between being an historian of philosophy and

"developing an original philosophy" breaks down in his case, since he formulated his own points and those of the naturalist philosophers of his time primarily, not exclusively, in the course of interpreting the texts of earlier philosophers. Randall usually called himself a naturalist and a functionalist, as Woodbridge did, rather than a pragmatist as Dewey did. He said that "naturalist" implied a stronger belief in the world we are part of, and its intelligibility, and a stronger link to like-minded philosophers of the past, back to Aristotle.

In Randall's earlier decades, to be "naturalist" meant to the public to be non-religious. He learned from his minister father, who did not believe in a personal God or in any narrow creed, and from the historian of Christian theology, Arthur Cushman McGiffert, that the Christianity of the early Greek Fathers was varied, symbolic, and multivalent. It was not literal or dogmatic, much less modern fundamentalist; nor had this complexity ever completely died out in the evolving, never static, churches. Randall was secular, but he never broke with his father or turned upon Christianity, even when he signed his radical colleague Corliss LAMONT's *Humanist Manifesto* in 1933. His attitude and his exegesis were sympathetic. When students asked, "But *do* you believe in God?" Randall would smile and say, "That depends on what you mean by God," being neither deceptive nor joking, but taking a complex, favorable stance. In this spirit he helped his colleagues Fries and Schneider set up at Columbia one of the first secular programs of the study of religion. In this spirit, much later, he co-taught seminars with modern theologian Paul TILLICH.

The Making of the Modern Mind begins with a discussion of "the richness of the Christian tradition," both in itself and in its incorporation of much of classical civilization. Elsewhere, Randall argued the compatibility of scientific knowledge with religious sensibilities and aspirations, but not with claims of separate religious truths. He presented religion, as his father had, not as any creed or church, but, almost anthropologically, as an emotional basis, a vision like unto art, a way of life, capable of terrible abuse, but also of exalted heights.

Randall used "naturalist" to mean a complex and intellectually optimistic position. While recognizing the endlessness of debates about "the real world," he did believe in a natural universe, material and other, which is not "out there," beyond subjective minds, but one which we, bodies and minds alike, are fully part of. Very sympathetic to German and other idealists, he still held with Aristotle that the universe is prior to our mental processes. Fascinated by words, like any philosopher, he disagreed with the prominent twentieth-century philosophers who held that words are mazes and languages are barriers that we can never quite pass. He elucidated the usages of Greek words *nous* and *ousia* in class, and also German words such as *Vernunft* and *Bewusstsein*, but he made no great fuss about English words. He believed that our languages, like our muscles, are hard to master initially, but *can* then become useful *tools* to understand and manipulate the world.

Randall held, with Aristotle, that the world (including ourselves) is intelligible and knowable, that it is natural for us to learn and know, and that organized rational inquiries, the sciences, are the ways to acquire that immense knowledge. "Which are the liberating arts? Mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology …." Likewise, what we call values, though not graspable like rocks and trees, are not irrational subjective whims of individuals and isolated cultures. It is natural for human societies to generate values (not, obviously, the same values everywhere) to live with ourselves and others, and it is natural for us to explore, compare, debate, modify, and improve our values, preferably by rational means. Randall was optimistically different from those modern philosophers and more numerous writers and literary scholars who were skeptical about language, meaning, truth, the sciences, and values, who held that language and values are meaningless, the world is unintelligible chaos, and our proper attitude is despair.

All these positions Randall tried to illustrate from the history of philosophy. Naturally, he dwelt on Aristotle, not anachronistically as a modern naturalist and functionalist, but as the mighty pioneer philosopher of the naturalness and intelligibility of the universe, and of the possibility and (preliminary) contents of the various intellectual, natural and social sciences. Aristotle's unmoved mover was *not* a divinity, and his soul was not supernatural but a function. Students were startled to hear Randall translate, "The soul of an axe is cutting." He elaborated on this in his *Aristotle* (1960), which proved widely convincing. Much more controversial was his treatment of Plato, in classes and in his *Plato: Dramatist of the Life of Reason* (1970) in which he followed Woodbridge's *The Son of Apollo*. Plato was not a "metaphysician" in the bad sense, preaching an erroneous Theory of Forms, much less a totalitarian state. He was, rather, a benign (not sneering) ironist, setting forth discussions and arguments about then new ideas in which he and other Greek intellectuals were interested, establishing important points for the first time, casting doubt on many more, delineating the characters, virtues, and foibles of his milieu, a beautiful paean to rationally conducted life and thought.

Randall's most original archival scholarship was done on a Guggenheim Fellowship to Italy in 1933–4 on the Averroist (Aristotelian) school of philosophers at the University of Padua in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries. He found and maintained that they were far from being the alleged formulaic fossils immune to Renaissance humanism who resisted modern science but were surpassed by Galileo. Rather, they, especially Pomponazzi and Zabarella, were engaged in evolving, fruitful thought in the various natural sciences, relevant steps up which Galileo ascended and extended. Randall's *The Development of Scientific Method in the School of Padua* (1940) was widely convincing, though, as with any pioneering work, later research and criticism by Kristeller, Neal Gilbert, and others have modified its findings.

Randall's treatment of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries naturally centered on "the gradual development of science" which "produced the really great revolution from the medieval to the modern world." He was impressed and moved by Spinoza's "reverent attitude" toward nature newly revealed as never before by the mathematical scientists. Randall generated an influential image, "the Newtonian world machine," a cosmos like a stationary engine, wheeling forever without any evolution, and an influential hypothesis, that the philosophers and scientists of the eighteenth century were engaged in the fruitful but failing attempt to discern equally simple mathematical laws that would describe and prescribe for the human mind and human society.

Randall, like his Columbia colleague in history, Jacques Barzun, emphasized, indeed gloried in, the tremendous variety and contrariety of the sentiments and movements of the Romantics, not a school of literature but a cultural epoch of all Europe. In *The Career of Philosophy*, he devoted more space to the German philosophers of the age than to any other tradition. He was less interested in twentieth-century philosophers, and could never finish the last volume of *The Career of Philosophy*.

It is difficult to pinpoint Randall's lasting influence on American philosophy. Other schools than "Columbia naturalism" were more prominent from the mid twentieth century on. If American optimism and liberalism have declined, in various senses, this crystallized philosophical expression of them may have declined with them. Yet many members of other movements and indeed other professions still hold in whole or in part to these basic naturalist positions: a secular but not adversarial stance toward religion, a belief in the genuine reality and intelligibility of the universe and of the ability of the many sciences to illuminate it, and a conviction that the long history of philosophy is not just a chronicle of errors, but a 2500-year record of how a number of human minds achieved remarkable and abidingly relevant insights.

Insofar as these sentiments are still a part of the American intellectual baseline, Randall lives on.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An Introduction to Reflective Thinking, with Herbert Schneider and James Gutmann (Boston, 1923).

The Western Mind: Its Origins and Development, 2 vols (New York, 1924). Expanded edn., *The Making of the Modern Mind* (Boston, 1926; 2nd edn 1940).

Our Changing Civilization, How Science and the Machine are Reconstructing Modern Life (London and New York, 1929).

Religion and the Modern World, with John H. Randall, Sr. (London, 1929).

Nature and Historical Experience: Essays in Naturalism and the Theory of History (New York, 1958).

The Role of Knowledge in Western Religion (Boston, 1958).

Aristotle (New York, 1960).

The School of Padua and the Emergence of Modern Science (Padova, Italy, 1961).

The Career of Philosophy, vol. 1: From the Middle Ages to the Enlightenment (New York, 1962).

How Philosophy Uses Its Past (New York and London, 1963).

The Career of Philosophy, vol. 2: From the German Enlightenment to the Age of Darwin (New York and London, 1965).

The Meaning of Religion for Man (New York, 1968).

Hellenistic Ways of Deliverance and the Making of the Christian Synthesis (New York, 1970).

Plato: Dramatist of the Life of Reason (New York, 1970).

Philosophy After Darwin: Chapters for "The Career of Philosophy" Volume 3, and Other Essays, ed. Beth J. Singer (New York, 1977).

Other Relevant Works
"Dualism in Metaphysics and Practical Philosophy," in *Essays in Honor of John Dewey on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. John J. Coss (New York, 1929), pp. 306–23.

"Liberalism as Faith in Intelligence," *Journal of Philosophy* 32 (1935): 253–64.

Philosophy: An Introduction, with Justus Buchler (New York, 1942).

"John Dewey, 1859–1952," *Journal of Philosophy* 50 (1953): 5–12.

"Naturalistic Humanism," in *Patterns of Faith in America Today*, ed. F. Ernest Johnson (New York, 1957), chap. 5.

"Talking and Looking," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 30 (1957): 5–24.

"Arthur O. Lovejoy and the History of Ideas," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 23 (1963): 475–9.

"The Art of Language and the Linguistic Situation: A Naturalistic Analysis," *Journal of Philosophy* 60 (1963): 29–56.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils 1950-2000*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Pres Addr of APA v6*, *Who was Who in Amer v7*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Anton, John P., ed. *Naturalism and Historical Understanding: Essays on the Philosophy of John Herman Randall, Jr.* (Albany, N.Y., 1967). Contains a bibliography of Randall's writings.

Barzun, Jacques, ed. *A History of the Faculty of Philosophy, Columbia University* (New York, 1957), chaps. 2, 3.

Reck, Andrew J. *The New American Philosophers: An Exploration of Thought since World War II* (Baton Rouge, Louis., 1968), chap. 4.

Shea, William M. *Intelligence, Intelligibility and God: An Horizon Analysis of the American Naturalist Philosophies of Frederick J. E. Woodbridge and John Herman Randall, Jr.* PhD dissertation, Columbia University (New York, 1973).

Francis B. Randall

RANSOM, Reverdy Cassius (1861–1959)

Reverdy Ransom was born on 4 January 1861 in Flushing, Ohio. He received his BA degree from Wilberforce University in 1886, and continued to study the humanities and social sciences on his own. He was licensed to preach in the African Methodist Episcopal Church (AME Church) in 1883, and assigned to his first pastorate in 1885. His style of ministry gained the attention of church leadership and community officials, and this resulted in community service opportunities on the regional and national level. For example, in 1936 he was elected the first African-American commissioner of the Ohio Board of Pardon and Parole, and in 1941 President Franklin D. Roosevelt made him a member of the Volunteer Participation Committee in the Office of Civil Defense. He was also the first President of the National Fraternal Council of Negro Churches in 1934.

In Chicago Ransom developed the Institutional Church and Social Settlement House in 1900 as a way of combining religious and social commitments. It was the first AME Church consciously devoted to social Christianity, and its impact was immediate. For example, his sermons against organized crime resulted in the bombing of the church, but this did not alter his philosophy of ministry. From this church Ransom was assigned to a series of prestigious congregations on the East Coast. His success in local ministry resulted in various promotions and ultimately election as a bishop in the AME Church in 1924. He reflected on his years of ministry in his 1949 autobiography, *The Pilgrimage of Harriet Ransom's Son*. Ransom died on 22 April 1959 in Xenia, Ohio.

In addition to an interest in the philosophy of socialism as early as the late nineteenth century, Ransom's analysis of the US and its problems points to the type of sociological work then pioneered by figures such as W. E. B. Du Bois. It is likely that Ransom's work with Du Bois on the Niagara Movement exposed him to Du Bois's version of pragmatism learned from William James during study at Harvard University.

Ransom's ministry was unique within the AME Church in that it freely combined the social gospel, socialism, and pragmatic sensibilities. As historians note, he was one of the most important church leaders of his historical period.

Ransom's concern with human rights continued after his retirement from activity ministry. Even at an advanced age, he provided vision and guidance for the AME Church through, for example, the creation of the "African Methodist Social Creed," which addressed the proper response to issues such as the destructive nature of prejudice and religious freedom.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Spirit of Freedom and Justice: Orations and Speeches (Nashville, Tenn., 1926).
The Negro: The Hope or the Despair of Christianity (Boston, 1935).
The Pilgrimage of Harriet Ransom's Son (Nashville, Tenn., 1949).

Other Relevant Works
Ransom's papers are at Wilberforce University and Payne Theological Seminary in Ohio.
Making the Gospel Plain: The Writings of Bishop Reverdy C. Ransom, ed. Anthony B. Pinn (Harrisburg, Penn., 1999).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*
Meier, August. *Negro Thought in America, 1880–1915: Racial Ideologies in the Age of Booker T. Washington* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1988).
Morris, Calvin S. *Reverdy C. Ransom: Black Advocate of the Social Gospel* (New York, 1990).
Wills, David. "Reverdy C. Ransom: The Making of an A.M.E. Bishop," in *Black Apostles: Afro-American Clergy Confront the Twentieth Century*, ed. Richard Newman and Randall K. Burkett (Boston, 1978).

Anthony B. Pinn

RAPOPORT, Anatol (1911–)

Anatol Rapoport was born on 22 May 1911 in Lozovaya, Russia where he attended revolution-era public schools until emigrating to the US in 1922. He became a naturalized US citizen in 1928. Before turning to mathematics, Rapoport studied music, first in Chicago and then in Vienna from 1929 to 1934 at the State Academy of Music and Performing Arts. The rise of Nazism cut short his career as a pianist and conductor and he returned to the US where he took up the study of mathematics. He studied at the University of Chicago, where he received his BS in 1938, his MS in 1940, and his PhD in mathematics, under the direction of Nicholas Rashevsky, in 1941. He served as a captain in the US Air Force during World War II, assigned to liaison work between US and Russian forces.

After the war, Rapoport returned to the University of Chicago where in 1947 he joined the Committee on Mathematical Biology. He taught as an assistant professor at Chicago for seven years. In 1954–5 he was a fellow at the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University, conducting research in cybernetics. In 1955 he accepted a position as associate professor of mathematical biology at the University of Michigan. In 1960 he was promoted to professor and senior research mathematician at the University of Michigan's Mental Health Research Institute. In 1968–9 he spent a year as professor of applied mathematics at the Technical University of Denmark, returning then to Michigan for a final year. In 1970 he moved to the University of Toronto where he became professor of psychology and mathematics, and also professor for peace and conflict studies. After taking a mandatory retirement in 1976, Rapoport continued occasionally to teach at Toronto and other universities as professor emeritus. In 2001 he finally ended his teaching responsibilities but has continued to publish.

Rapoport has been a leading member of numerous societies and professional organizations including the American Mathematical Society, the Mathematical Association of America, the Biometric Society, the International Society for General Semantics, the Society for General Systems Research, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and the Canadian Peace Research and Education Association. He has served as President of the International Society for General Semantics (1953–5), The Society for General Systems Research (1955–66), and the Canadian Peace Research and Education Association (1971–2). In 1976 Rapoport received the Lenz International Peace Research Prize and he has been awarded honorary degrees from the University of Western Michigan, the University of Toronto, the Royal Military College, and the University of Bern. He has published twenty books and over four hundred articles.

As a scientist, mathematician, expert on game theory and social thinker, (and an early music theorist), Rapoport belongs to many categories. Much of his work belongs to areas of game theory and its social applications. Starting from his early work, which modelled biological systems including symbiosis, he was led to broader examination of cooperation as an extension of biological notions.

From the beginning Rapoport has worked across disciplinary boundaries, in particular looking at ways in which biology and economics can attack issues. With Ludwig von BERTALANFFY, Ralph Gerard, and Kenneth Boulding he founded *The Society for General Systems Research*, which became the *International Society for the Systems Sciences.*

Much of Rapoport's work is most readily classified as scientific, with an eye to social applications, rather than specifically as philosophical. His general philosophical bent in using game theory is aimed at strategies for cooperation rather than at the more common philosophers' focus on individual self-protection. Unlike philosophers such as David GAUTHIER in *Morals by Agreement*, Rapoport showed that morality is ultimately derivable from prudential interests. This is particularly

clear in his approach to the Prisoner's Dilemma, where two prisoners are separated and informed that regardless of what the other person does, each will do better by confessing, whereas both can see that collectively they will do better if neither confesses (when both "cooperate"). His analysis resulted in the development of and support for the strategy *Tit for Tat*, which consists of playing a cooperative play on the first trial and then imitating the other player in all other trials. The success of this strategy in the tournament organized by Robert Axelrod, and published in 1984 in *The Evolution of Cooperation* has been widely noted. *Tit for Tat* is robust, thriving in a variety of environments, immediately punishes and immediately forgives, is as transparent as possible, and does not attempt to outdo the other agent. This strategy looks in no way like the kind of self-directed prudential strategy that, since Plato's *Republic,* has seemed to many social philosophers to be the most basic kind of rational self-interest, and so his work challenges a long philosophical tradition. Rapoport had previously noted in his book *Prisoner's Dilemma* that *Tit for Tat* should elicit cooperation if played consistently, but that book is a psychological study, not a work on achieving peace. In *Peace* he imbeds the discussion of *Tit for Tat* in a larger context that uses ideas from his earlier interest in systems, his knowledge of biology, and his commitment to something like Karl Popper's "third world" of conceptual structures.

His work has consistently been directed toward broad social goals of harmony, agreement, conflict resolution, and peace. It is characteristic of his background in biological thinking that his connection with ecology and with ways of conceptualizing peace does not come directly from the philosophical tradition.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Science and the Goals of Man (New York, 1950).
Operational Philosophy: Integrating Knowledge and Action (New York, 1953).
Fights, Games, and Debates (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1960).
Strategy and Conscience (New York, 1964).
Prisoner's Dilemma: A Study in Conflict, with A. M. Chammah (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1965).
Two-Person Game Theory: The Essential Ideas (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1966).
Games Which Simulate Deterrence and Disarmament (Clarkson, Ontario, 1967).
N-Person Game Theory; Concepts and Applications (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1970).
The Big Two: Soviet-American Perceptions of Foreign Policy (New York, 1971).
Experimental Games and Their Uses in Psychology (Morristown, N.J., 1973).
Conflict in Man-made Environment (Harmondsworth, UK, 1974).
Semantics (New York, 1975).
The 2 x 2 Game, with M. Geyer and D. Gordon (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1976).
Mathematical Methods in the Social and Behavioral Sciences (New York, 1983).
General System Theory: Essential Concepts and Applications (Cambridge, Mass., 1986).
The Origins of Violence (New York, 1989).
Decision Theory and Decision Behavior: A Normative and Descriptive Approach (Dordrecht, 1989).
Canada and the World, with Anthony Rapoport (Toronto, 1992).
Peace, an Idea Whose Time Has Come (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1993).

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *Game Theory as a Theory of Conflict Resolution* (Dordrecht, 1974).
Certainties and Doubts: A Philosophy of Life (Montréal, 2000).
Skating on Thin Ice (Oakland, Cal., 2002).

Further Reading
Bio Dict Psych
Diekmann, Andreas, and Peter Mitter, eds. *Paradoxical Effects of Social Behavior:*

Essays in Honor of Anatol Rapoport (Heidelberg, Germany, 1986).

William R. Abbott

RATNER, Joseph (1901–79)

Joseph Ratner was born on 26 March 1901 in London, England. He emigrated with his family to Winnipeg, Manitoba, in 1904. He attended City College in New York, receiving his BA in 1922. He continued his philosophical education at Columbia University. Upon receiving his MA at Columbia in 1923, he studied at Cambridge University on a moral science fellowship at Trinity College. Ratner returned to Columbia in 1926, where he served as a lecturer in philosophy until the completion of his PhD in philosophy in 1930. During this time, Ratner worked as a teaching and research assistant for John DEWEY, forming a friendship which would last until Dewey's death in 1952. Ratner promoted Deweyan pragmatism throughout his career. He was an instructor of philosophy at the City College of New York from 1940 to 1945, and then was an independent author until his death on 22 May 1979 in New York City.

Besides his own writings, Ratner published several influential editions of DEWEY's work. With Dewey's full support and grateful cooperation, he produced a series of thematic collections that functioned as a sort of "first-generation" exegesis of Deweyan pragmatism. These included *The Philosophy of John Dewey* (1928), *Characters and Events* (1930), *Intelligence in the Modern World* (1939), and *Education Today* (1940).

While Ratner was a vitally important figure in the continued development of Dewey's thought, he also made significant contributions in other fields of philosophic inquiry. First and foremost, Ratner wrote and edited

several books on Spinoza, most importantly his 1930 *Spinoza on God*. Here he argued for a neo-pragmatic approach to Spinoza's philosophical concept of God, and he implicitly and explicitly emphasized the metaphysical and ontological similarities between Spinoza's naturalism and the naturalism of the American pragmatists.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Spinoza on God (New York, 1930).
"The Correspondence Theory of Truth," *Journal of Philosophy* 32 (1935): 141–52.
"Scientific Objects and Empirical Things," *Journal of Philosophy* 32 (1935): 393–408.
"Science as History," *Journal of Philosophy* 34 (1937): 393–413.
"Introduction to John Dewey's Philosophy," in *Intelligence in the Modern World: John Dewey's Philosophy*, ed. J. Ratner (New York, 1939), pp. 3–241.

Other Relevant Works
Ratner's papers are at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.
Ed., *The Philosophy of Spinoza* (New York, 1927).
Ed., *The Philosophy of John Dewey* (New York, 1928).
Ed., *Characters and Events; Popular Essays in Social and Political Philosophy*, by John Dewey (New York, 1930).
Ed., *Intelligence in the Modern World: John Dewey's Philosophy* (New York, 1939).
Ed., *Education Today*, by John Dewey (New York, 1940).
Ed., *John Dewey: Philosophy, Psychology, and Social Practice* (New York, 1963).
"A Reply to George Eastman's review of *John Dewey: Philosophy, Psychology, and Social Practice*," *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 4 (1965): 105–107.

Further Reading
Who's Who in Phil
Eastman, George. "*John Dewey: Philosophy,*

Psychology, and Social Practice, ed. Joseph Ratner," *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 4 (1965): 95–104.

Shannon Kincaid

RATNER, Sidney (1909–96)

Sidney Ratner was born on 18 June 1909 in New York City. He studied philosophy at City College, receiving his BA in 1931. He began his postgraduate studies at Columbia University, in a philosophy department headed by John DEWEY, receiving his MA in philosophy in 1931. He received his PhD in the history department at Columbia in 1942. Immediately after his graduation from Columbia, Ratner began working as a historian and economist in the Roosevelt administration. He first worked as a researcher for the Board of Economic Warfare and the Foreign Economic Administration. He then worked as a principal economist in the US State Department. After leaving the State Department in 1946, Ratner joined the faculty of the history department at Rutgers University, where he expanded his research and writing on American economic history and philosophy. Ratner retired in 1978 at the rank of distinguished professor. Throughout his career, he was a strong supporter of Deweyan pragmatism and American philosophy in general, and he was an esteemed member of the Society for the Advancement of American philosophy. In 1989 he received the society's highest honor, the Herbert W. Schneider Award. Ratner died on 9 January 1996 in Princeton, New Jersey.

Ratner's interests in pragmatism, economics, and democracy set the foundations for his continuing work and considerable influence in American economic history. In the words of his wife, Louise ROSENBLATT (distinguished philosopher of education and literacy theorist),

Ratner was truly a "pragmatist's pragmatist," and he was influential not only as a scholar, but also as a public intellectual who made some important contributions to American society. Another of Ratner's interests was the history of the US Supreme Court, and he used his expertise to assist in President Roosevelt's controversial attempt to increase the number of justices on the bench of the high court. Ratner played a crucial role in finding a precedent for Roosevelt's appointments in the post-Civil War administration of Ulysses S. Grant.

Even while working for the government, Ratner continued to publish. Before his graduation from Columbia, he had edited a volume in honor of John Dewey's eightieth birthday, and he published several essays on historical objectivity and the role of psychology in historical studies. In 1942 he published *American Taxation: Its History as a Social Force in Democracy*, establishing himself as one of the foremost scholars on the relationships between democracy and economics. For Ratner, as for any pragmatic theorist of history, there was no clean break between the supposedly "descriptive" claims of economics and history, and the normative implications of political and social decision-making. In his 1959 essay, "History as Experiment," Ratner argued that history was not simply a dead vault of past events and ideas, but a living force which had great impact on, and could help guide, our economic and political decisions.

Ratner was a well-rounded scholar. Besides his contributions to history, he also published a volume in honor of Horace M. KALLEN (1953), and edited the voluminous correspondence between Dewey and political theorist Arthur F. BENTLEY. He also wrote essays on democracy, and even developed Deweyan critiques of Locke and Leibniz.

Ratner's groundbreaking approach to a new theory of economic history was where he made his most significant scholarly contributions. His books on economics ranged from an analysis of influential American families and their fortunes (1953), to taxation and democ-

racy (1967), and tariffs (1972). His theory of economics and history reached its culmination in the landmark *Evolution of the American Economy* (1979), written with James Soltow and Richard E. Sylla. Here, he finally brought together the descriptive elements of economics and history with the normativity inherent in political decision-making. In *Evolution*, Ratner wrote that "[m]any American economic histories in the past have been predominantly narrative … . By contrast, this work will combine an analytical narrative of economic growth with an evaluation of economic welfare … [and will] focus on the important role decisions by different social groups and their leaders have played in shaping and changing the structure of the economy." (1979, p. 4)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Taxation: Its History as a Social Force in Democracy (New York, 1942).

New Light on the History of Great American Fortunes: American Millionaires of 1892 and 1902 (New York, 1953).

Taxation and Democracy in America (New York, 1967).

The Tariff in American History (New York, 1972).

The Evolution of the American Economy: Growth, Welfare, and Decision Making, with James Soltow and Richard E. Sylla (New York, 1979).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *The Philosophy of the Common Man: Essays in Honor of John Dewey to Celebrate his Eightieth Birthday* (New York, 1940).

"Presupposition and Objectivity in History," *Philosophy of Science* 7 (1940): 499–505.

"The Historian's Approach to Psychology," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 2 (1941): 95–109.

Ed., *Vision and Action: Essays in Honor of Horace M. Kallen* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1953).

Ed., *Inquiry into Inquiries: Essays in Social Theory*, by Arthur F. Bentley (Boston, 1954).

"The Naturalistic Humanism of John Dewey and Arthur F. Bentley," *Humanist* 14 (1954): 81–7.

"The Ethics of Democracy," *Humanist* 15 (1955): 15–17.

"History as Experiment," *Antioch Review* 19 (1959): 315–27.

Ed., *John Dewey and Arthur F. Bentley: A Philosophical Correspondence, 1932–1951* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1964).

"Introduction," to *The Later Works of John Dewey*, vol. 6, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale, Ill., 1985).

"John Dewey's Critique of Leibniz and Locke," *Studia Leibnitiana* 19 (1987): 74–84.

Further Reading

Who Was Who in Amer v11, *Who's Who in Phil*

Haack, Susan. "Memorial: Sidney Ratner, 1908–1996," *Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy Newsletter* 74 (June 1996): 12–13.

Shannon Kincaid

RAUSCHENBUSCH, Walter (1861–1918)

Walter Rauschenbusch was born on 4 October 1861 in Rochester, New York. His father was a sixth-generation Lutheran clergyman from the Westphalia region of Germany, who converted to the Baptist faith after emigrating to the United States in the 1840s. Rauschenbusch spent his childhood in Rochester and Germany. He studied at a gymnasium school in Gutersloh, Germany, where he received a diploma in 1883, graduating at the top of his class. Rauschenbusch received his BA degree from the University of Rochester in 1884 and

a BD from Rochester Theological Seminary in 1886. He later received honorary DD degrees from the University of Rochester (1902) and Oberlin College (1916).

Rauschenbusch's family and intellectual roots nurtured him in a nineteenth-century evangelical pietism that emphasized personal salvation through Jesus Christ. However, when he studied at Rochester Theological Seminary in the mid 1880s, Rauschenbusch was introduced to the tradition of British and American theological liberalism. He was especially influenced by the mid nineteenth-century Anglican priest Frederick Robertson and the American theologian Horace BUSHNELL. Through the influence of these two men, Rauschenbusch developed a liberal interpretation of the doctrine of the atonement, which emphasized Christ's suffering as the basis for the Christian life. His liberal views put him at odds with many of his professors at Rochester Theological Seminary, who emphasized more orthodox theologies of salvation. Rauschenbusch emerged as the leading candidate for the presidency of a Baptist seminary in India after his graduation from seminary in 1886. However, one of his former professors warned Baptist leaders of his liberal leanings, ultimately costing him the position.

Rauschenbusch served as the pastor of the Second German Baptist Church in New York City from 1886 to 1897. As the minister of a working-class German immigrant congregation in a neighborhood near the "Hell's Kitchen" section of the city, he developed the major contours of his social thought. In his early years in New York, Rauschenbusch was influenced by a disparate range of religious and secular thinkers, including the holiness theology of the Irish Methodist leader William Arthur, the Christian asceticism of the Russian novelist Leo Tolstoy, and the philosophical idealism of Josiah ROYCE. He also incorporated the idealism of the American utopian novelist Edward BELLAMY, the Fabian socialism of Beatrice and Sidney Webb, and the democratic political theories of Giuseppe Mazzini, pioneer of the mid nineteenth-century Italian independence movement.

Rauschenbusch also became a follower of the economic teachings of Henry GEORGE. George was a staunch advocate of the so-called "single tax," whereby money raised through taxation would be used to support a variety of public welfare programs. Richard ELY, an economist at Johns Hopkins University and the University of Wisconsin, was also a major influence on Rauschenbusch. Building upon an earlier tradition of British Christian socialism, represented by mid nineteenth-century Anglican clergymen, such as Robertson and F. D. Maurice, Ely's proposals for economic reform were based upon the teachings of Jesus in the synoptic gospels. Rauschenbusch was also influenced by American clergymen, such as Josiah STRONG, W. D. P. Bliss, and Washington GLADDEN. The writings of Strong and Gladden, along with Ely, represented the origins for the movement of liberal Protestantism that became known as the social gospel. This movement of Protestant clergy and academicians, as well as denominational and ecumenical organizations, advocated a variety of social–economic reform measures, justifying their proposals by the ethics of Jesus's teachings. While not a unified theological tradition, the social gospel provided much of the religious and moral impetus behind the American Progressive Era between 1890 and 1920.

In 1889 Rauschenbusch and a handful of supporters launched a short-lived New York City newspaper, *For The Right*. Although the paper folded in 1891, many of the themes articulated by Rauschenbusch in this periodical anticipated the theological and moral arguments for Christian social reform that would be used in the 1890s and early 1900s by social gospel leaders, such as George Herron and Charles Sheldon. In this paper and in his early writings, Rauschenbusch castigated traditional Christianity's exclusive insistence on personal salvation. He called for a modern interpretation of Christianity that would address the pressing social and economic problems of the times,

focusing primarily on the rights of the urban poor and working class.

In 1891 Rauschenbusch's congregation granted him a sabbatical leave. Since the mid 1880s, he had lost much of his hearing and he traveled to Germany in hopes of finding medical treatment. Although he found no solution for his deafness, he spent time at the University of Berlin, where he absorbed the work of the German liberal theologians Albrecht Ritschl and Adolf von Harnack. Although Rauschenbusch was critical of the political conservatism of most German theological liberals, their idealistic emphasis upon the kingdom of God became central to all of his later writing. While in Germany, he completed an extensive handwritten manuscript to which he gave the working title "Christianity Revolutionary." The manuscript would remain unknown until 1968, when an edited version of the work was published under the revised title, *The Righteousness of the Kingdom*. In 1892 Rauschenbusch, along with a handful of Baptist ministers in New York and Philadelphia, founded "The Brotherhood of the Kingdom." Reflecting the intellectual inspiration he had received in Germany, the Brotherhood was a fellowship of Protestant clergy and laity, which provided a forum for Rauschenbusch and several of his colleagues to address numerous political and social issues from a Christian perspective. Many papers that Rauschenbusch presented at Brotherhood gatherings were published in northern Baptist periodicals and academic journals, including *Biblical World*, *The American Journal of Sociology*, and *The American Journal of Theology*.

Rauschenbusch's hearing loss made it increasingly difficult for him to carry on the work of his pastoral ministry. In 1897 he accepted a faculty appointment in New Testament studies at Rochester Theological Seminary in the school's German division (the same division that his father August had headed between 1858 and 1888). The seminary's mission was geared toward training German-immigrant pastors for ministry in the United States, and Rauschenbusch taught practically every subject in the curriculum, including biblical studies, theology, and American history. In 1902 he became professor of church history in the seminary's primary English division and remained in this position until his death. Rauschenbusch died on 25 July 1918 in Rochester, New York.

Between 1907 and 1917 Rauschenbusch wrote three books that marked him as the major theological exponent of the social gospel movement in North America. In 1907 he published his most influential work, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*. Combining the dual themes of societal crisis and the opportunities afforded to contemporary men and women to engage in prophetic Christian social action, the book became one of the most influential works on American religion. Rauschenbusch's narrative combined the theological arguments of German liberal theologians, such as Ritschl and Harnack, with the biblical exegesis of American liberal theologians, such as Shailer MATHEWS and Francis Greenwood PEABODY. He argued that the primary significance of Jesus's teachings was not eschatological but social. The persistent theme of *Christianity and the Social Crisis* was that the doctrine of the kingdom of God was central to an understanding of Jesus's social and theological message. Rauschenbusch viewed the kingdom as the most significant doctrine in church history, because it highlighted Jesus's imperative to work for social reform. According to Rauschenbusch, Jesus "nourished within his soul the ideal of a common life so radically different from the present that it involved a reversal of values, a revolutionary displacement of existing relations" (1907, p. 90). Rauschenbusch stressed how Jesus's teachings could be applied as economic remedies in America, providing a basis for creating a society that protected the rights of the nation's workers from capitalistic exploitation. In the book's famous summary, however, he cautioned his readers that the goal of Christianity was only to approximate a society of social and democra-

tic equality. "In asking for faith in the possibility of a new social order, we ask for no Utopian delusion. We know well that there is no perfection for man in this life; there is only growth toward perfection …. At best there is always but an approximation to a perfect social order. The kingdom of God is always but coming." (1907, pp. 420–21)

Rauschenbusch followed up *Christianity and the Social Crisis* with two other books that expanded his theological arguments. In 1912 he published *Christianizing the Social Order*, which represented his most detailed discussion of how America could build a just economic and political order based upon the theological principles of a prophetic liberal Christianity. In 1917 he published *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, a book that represented Rauschenbusch's first and only effort to write a more systematic treatment of his key theological beliefs related to the doctrine of God, salvation, the nature of evil, and, most especially, the kingdom of God. While *A Theology for the Social Gospel* received modest praise during Rauschenbusch's lifetime, the work would be cited in later years as one of the most important volumes in twentieth-century theological liberalism. Between 1907 and 1917 Rauschenbusch also published numerous articles and books of a more devotional nature, including *Prayers of the Social Awakening* (1910), *Unto Me* (1912), *Dare We Be Christians?* (1914), and *The Social Principles of Jesus* (1916), the latter published as a religious study guide for college students. The popularity of his writings was augmented by his appeal as a lecturer during the height of the Progressive Era between 1908 and 1917. Rauschenbusch's public standing was affected by World War I. While not an absolute pacifist, he took a staunch position in favor of American neutrality. His opposition to the war, his efforts to defend the political motives of Germany, and his own German ancestry brought him heavy criticism from numerous religious and secular leaders. He became a member of the antiwar Fellowship of Reconciliation in 1916, lobbying American politicians and church leaders to stay neutral and to protect the civil liberties of German-Americans. Rauschenbusch died before the end of World War I, and his death has been viewed as a symbolic end of the social gospel movement in the United States. However, his teachings remained very influential for many secular and religious reformers in North America in the decades following his death.

In contrast to other American proponents of theological liberalism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Rauschenbusch focused on the practical application of his theological ideas. His major contribution to the history of American philosophy and theology was an ability to synthesize disparate intellectual traditions, ranging from postmillennial American evangelicalism of the early nineteenth century to theological and philosophical liberalism of the late nineteenth century. It is this mediating tendency in his theology that has led many to classify Rauschenbusch as an "evangelical liberal." Rauschenbusch was highly critical of American evangelicalism's exclusive insistence on the need for individual salvation, and he criticized church leaders who advocated a premillennialist view of the second coming of Christ. However, he collaborated with Ira Sankey, the musical partner of the famed revivalist Dwight Moody, in the publication in the 1890s of a two-volume German translation of Sankey's gospel hymns.

Rauschenbusch combined an eloquent literary style with a compelling theological message, which addressed the urban American context. Unlike much of the progressive idealism of the early social gospel, represented by clergy such as Washington Gladden, Rauschenbusch displayed a more vigorous engagement with numerous late nineteenth and early twentieth-century intellectual resources. While many of his writings reflected an irenic spirit toward the heritage of American evangelicalism, the intellectual heart of his theology came from the legacies of German, English, and American theological liberalism. His social thought incorporated and paralleled the philosophical idealism of American personalism.

Like personalist pioneers Borden Parker BOWNE, Josiah Royce, and Henry Churchill KING, Rauschenbusch stressed the immanence of God and the sacredness of human personality as the primary means to understand God's relationship to the world. Central to Rauschenbusch's theological outlook was his optimistic view of God's role in history, which largely derived from German idealists, like Ritschl and Harnack. Although Rauschenbusch remained confident that social progress would occur, it was not inevitable, and it would require great sacrifices on the part of society to achieve a just society. The tradition of liberal Protestant idealism that Rauschenbusch spawned proved catalytic in the thought of many later American social reformers. The most prominent American who cited an intellectual debt to Rauschenbusch was Martin Luther KING, Jr. While King expressed concern over Rauschenbusch's evolutionary views on social progress, he was attracted to Rauschenbusch's use of liberal Christian teachings in the quest for social justice.

Rauschenbusch emphasized the importance of the kingdom of God as the primary means to understand Christianity's historical, theological, and social significance. However, his idealism was tempered by his belief in what he called the "super-personal" nature of human evil, anticipating the arguments from a later generation of American neo-orthodox theologians. While Rauschenbusch rejected traditional Christian interpretations of the doctrine of original sin, he asserted that evil represented an organic social phenomenon that inevitably manifested itself collectively in modern society. "The life of humanity is infinitely interwoven, always renewing itself, yet always perpetuating what has been. The evils of one generation are caused by the wrongs of the generations that preceded, and will in turn condition the sufferings and temptations of those who come after." (1917, p. 79) Rauschenbusch's vision of a just society made generous use of late nineteenth-century democratic socialist ideals. Although he identified himself as a Christian

socialist, his reform measures were largely predicated upon a model of liberal capitalism. He advocated extensive government regulation of business monopolies; however, he rejected more radical measures of political socialism and never himself became a member of the American Socialist Party. Throughout his major writings, he cautioned his audience against faith in creating a perfect political order in a fashion envisioned by many socialists and liberal progressives of the early twentieth century. "History laughs at the optimistic illusion that 'nothing can stand in the way of human progress.' It would be safer to assert that progress is always for a time only, and then succumbs to the inevitable decay." (1907, p. 279)

Despite Rauschenbusch's impact upon later generations of secular and religious liberalism, his idealism would be critiqued by American neo-orthodox theologians, like Reinhold NIEBUHR and H. Richard NIEBUHR in the 1930s. At the same time, these theologians conceded that Rauschenbusch represented one of the more chastened figures coming out of the turn-of-the-century liberal Protestant tradition. In his 1937 book, *The Kingdom of God in America*, H. Richard Niebuhr acknowledged that Rauschenbusch, more than most liberals of his generation, succeeded in balancing idealistic beliefs in social progress with classical theological notions of human sinfulness, as articulated by Christian theologians, such as Augustine, Martin Luther, and John Calvin. Rauschenbusch believed that "the reign of Christ required conversion and the coming kingdom was crisis, judgment as well as promise" (1937, p. 194).

Consistent with a long succession of German philosophers since the time of Immanuel Kant, Rauschenbusch tended to universalize human experience around shared cultural and social values. While other American secular and religious liberals of his generation were heavily influenced by philosophical pragmatism, Rauschenbusch tended to resist this movement, especially on matters of educational reform.

His thought also manifested a marked conservatism on matters of gender. While supportive of women's suffrage, he was ambivalent about women working outside the home and, like most America Protestants of his generation, he tended to see women as the moral caretakers of society.

Significant aspects of Rauschenbusch's social thought lived on in his children and grandchildren, many of whom translated his idealism in ways that departed from Rauschenbusch's own deeply rooted Christian faith. Two of his sons, Stephen and Paul, were active in the economic reform practices associated with Franklin Roosevelt's "New Deal" administrations of the 1930s. Rauschenbusch's grandson, born to his eldest child, Winifred, is the pragmatist philosopher Richard RORTY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Christianity and the Social Crisis (New York, 1907).
Christianizing the Social Order (New York, 1912).
Prayers of the Social Awakening (Boston, 1910).
Unto Me (Boston, 1912).
Dare We Be Christians? (New York, 1914).
The Social Principles of Jesus (New York, 1916).
A Theology for the Social Gospel (New York, 1917).

Other Relevant Works
Rauschenbusch's papers are at the American Baptist Historical Society in Rochester, New York.
The Righteousness of the Kingdom, ed. Max L. Stackhouse (Nashville, Tenn., 1968).
Walter Rauschenbusch: Selected Writings, ed. Winthrop Hudson (New York, 1984).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Encyc Relig*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v19*, *Who was Who in Amer v1*

Beckley, Harlan. *Passion for Justice: Retrieving the Legacies of Walter Rauschenbusch, John A. Ryan, and Reinhold Niebuhr* (Louisville, Kent., 1992).
Dorrien, Gary. *The Making of American Liberal Theology*, 2 vols (Louisville, Kent., 2001, 2003).
Evans, Christopher H., ed. *The Social Gospel Today* (Louisville, Kent., 2001).
Hopkins, Charles H. *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865–1915* (New Haven, Conn., 1940).
King, William M. "'History as Revelation' in the Theology of the Social Gospel," *Harvard Theological Review* 76 (1983): 109–29.
Minus, Paul M. *Walter Rauschenbusch: American Reformer* (New York, 1988).
Phillips, Paul T. *A Kingdom on Earth: Anglo-American Social Christianity, 1880–1940* (University Park, Penn., 1995).
Sharpe, Dores R. *Walter Rauschenbusch* (New York, 1942).
Smucker, Donovan E. *The Origins of Walter Rauschenbusch's Ethics* (Montreal, 1994).

Christopher H. Evans

RAWLS, John Bordley (1921–2002)

John Rawls was born on 21 February 1921 in Baltimore, Maryland. He was the second of five sons of William Lee Rawls and Anna Abell Stump. Both of Rawls's parents were interested in political affairs. Rawls's father, a self-trained lawyer, was a friend of Maryland Governor Albert Ritchie, and his mother was once President of the local chapter of the League of Women Voters. Rawls graduated summa cum laude from Princeton University in 1943, where his interest in philosophy developed under the

influence of the Wittgensteinian philosopher Norman Malcolm. After enlisting in the army and serving as an infantryman in the Pacific theater during World War II, Rawls returned to Princeton in 1946 for his graduate work, earning his PhD in philosophy in 1950. His dissertation was titled "A Study in the Grounds of Ethical Knowledge: Considered with Reference to Judgments on the Moral Worth of Character." He spent a year at the University of Oxford as a Fulbright Fellow.

Rawls was an instructor in philosophy at Princeton from 1950 to 1952, an assistant and associate professor of philosophy at Cornell from 1953 to 1959, and professor of philosophy at Massachusetts Institute of Technology from 1960 to 1962. He joined the Harvard philosophy department in 1962 where he was later promoted to James Bryant Conant University Professor in 1979, holding that position until retiring in 1991. His first book, *A Theory of Justice*, which was completed while on fellowship at Stanford's Center for Advanced Study, was published in 1971. *Political Liberalism* appeared in 1993, two years after his retirement from Harvard. Both at Harvard and after his retirement, Rawls at times worked closely with his friend and colleague Burton Dreben, whose criticism and encouragement was especially important in the 1990s, as Rawls continued to refine the ideas of political liberalism despite his failing health. He refused numerous awards over the years, but accepted honorary degrees from Oxford, Princeton, and Harvard, which celebrated his life and work in a 2003 memorial service. He was President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1974–5. He also received the National Humanities Medal in 1999, in part for his mentorship of women in philosophy. Rawls died on 24 November 2002 in Lexington, Massachusetts.

Rawls is widely regarded as the most influential and important political philosopher of his time. It is often said that the publication of *A Theory of Justice* played a decisive role in the revival of Anglo-American moral and political philosophy, which, by the middle part of the twentieth century, had been relegated by many philosophers to the task of linguistic analysis, with a focus on an increasingly narrow set of moral and political concerns. By contrast, *A Theory of Justice* presents an ambitious and sweeping account of justice based on a distinctive approach to moral-political justification. The work takes as its starting point ideas from the great tradition of liberal political thought, for which Rawls had a deep and abiding appreciation. When the revised edition of *Theory* appeared in English toward the end of Rawls's life, the book had already been translated into nearly two dozen languages, with an enormous impact worldwide in philosophy, law, and the social sciences. It quickly became a modern classic, joining, as Ronald Dworkin has observed, the list of works that a properly educated person ought to recognize.

Rawls's career may be divided into two main periods. The first period is defined primarily by the development of his theory of justice, called "justice as fairness." This period includes not only *A Theory of Justice*, but also Rawls's early articles as well as his essays from the 1970s which build upon the principal themes of *Theory* and respond to some of the book's many critics. A second period begins with the essays published throughout the 1980s which introduce ideas that later appear in *Political Liberalism* and which enable Rawls to recast justice as fairness as a "political conception of justice." This period is defined primarily by the notion of "political liberalism" with its idea of "public reason." The later period also includes Rawls's philosophical exchange with Jürgen Habermas and his account of international law and justice in *The Law of Peoples*. While the two periods of Rawls's work are by no means radically divergent, disagreement persists about the extent to which they are continuous or discontinuous.

A principal theme of both periods is justice; specifically, the justice of a society's basic insti-

tutional framework. The guiding idea behind Rawls's theory of justice is that our lives and projects should not be determined by pervasive inequalities that are rooted in contingent social and economic circumstances. How, then, should we arrange the institutional structure of society in order both to achieve a proper distribution of social benefits and burdens and to minimize arbitrary distinctions in the assigning of basic rights and opportunities? Rawls answers this question by means of two principles of justice, initially introduced in an early article, "Justice as Fairness" (1958), and expounded in detail in *A Theory of Justice*. According to the final statement of the two principles in *Theory*, each person, first, has an equal right to a system of equal basic liberties that includes rights to speech, conscience, integrity, legal protection, and political participation. Second, social and economic inequalities are permissible only if they satisfy two conditions. According to what Rawls calls "fair equality of opportunity," these inequalities must (1) be attached to positions and offices that all have fair chance to attain. This means that persons who are similarly talented and motivated should have the same chances for success in the social system, regardless of their starting places in life. And, according to what he calls the "difference principle," (2) social and economic inequalities must be to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged members of society.

The two principles of justice strike a balance between liberty and equality. The first principle, which is presented as lexically prior to the second, protects the rights and freedoms celebrated by classical liberalism. However, while the first principle of justice recognizes a right to *personal* property, Rawls does not treat ownership of the means of production as a matter of basic liberty. Indeed the second principle of justice, with its ideas of fair equality of opportunity and the difference principle, demonstrates a strong commitment to egalitarianism, thereby distinguishing Rawls's conception of justice from classically liberal views

which would permit far greater social and economic inequality. He does not attempt to work out all of the institutional implications of justice as fairness in *Theory*. Yet the second principle would seem to require a sharp reduction in existing inequalities in education, access to medical care, opportunities for political influence and income and wealth. He rejects the notion that, in the very institutional design of society, some persons might be sacrificed politically or economically for the greater welfare of others. In this sense, his theory of justice also stands in contrast to utilitarianism, with its focus on the greatest good for the greatest number. The problem with utilitarianism is that it cannot adequately explain our considered judgment that the rights and interests of *each* member of society must be protected. One of the main goals of *Theory* is to provide a systematic alternative to the utilitarian views that had long dominated modern moral and political philosophy.

This alternative consists not only of the two principles of justice, but also of an argument for their justification which connects justice as fairness to the social contract tradition. Rawls advances a procedural argument in support of the two principles, suggesting that principles of justice are valid insofar as they would be subject to agreement in a suitably constructed initial choice situation. In what Rawls calls the "original position," we are to imagine rational and mutually disinterested agents who must choose the principles that will serve publicly as the basis of their social institutions and as the final court of appeal for settling disagreements over justice. Agents in the original position are, however, behind a "veil of ignorance," deprived of specific information about their particular place in society. An agreement about justice must be reached without knowledge of anyone's particular class, social status, natural assets and talents, and conception of the good life. Persons situated in the original position know only general facts about human beings and social life, and they know that they want "primary

goods," or goods that they would need in their status as fully cooperating, free, and equal citizens. Because of the constraints of the veil of ignorance, as well as additional formal constraints on the possible principles of justice, the original position is said to be a fair choice situation that reflects the moral equality of persons. Under these constraints and without the ability to bargain on the basis of existing social power, Rawls argues that agents in the original position would want to minimize the burdens associated with the lowest position in the social order. Given a list of various conceptions of justice, agents in the original position would reject utilitarianism and other competing views in favor of principles of justice which recognize the priority of basic rights and liberties and protect the least advantaged members of society.

A society is just insofar as it is organized in terms of Rawls's two principles of justice. And the two principles of justice are valid because they would be chosen in the original position. But we might still ask: What justifies the original position as the starting point for seeking principles of justice? Rawls answers this question by relying on the nonfoundationalist notion of "reflective equilibrium." Self-evident first principles are not necessary in order to begin the work of moral and political philosophy. Instead, some of our judgments, such as the wrongness of slavery, might serve as "provisional fixed points" for testing the adequacy of other ideas. In seeking reflective equilibrium, we compare alternate proposals to such "considered judgments" at all levels of generality, revising both our principles and judgments until we identify the conception of justice that most convincingly renders our judgments consistent with one another and with sound principles of justice. Thus the original position is based on ideals of freedom, equality, and fairness that we accept, or would accept on due reflection. As a procedural device that represents and further specifies these ideals, it is simply part of an overall theory that should fit together coherently and

best explain our considered judgments about justice.

In the decades after its publication, *A Theory of Justice* has been the focus of leading debates in moral and political philosophy, inspiring both liberal philosophers and legions of critics. Three varieties of criticism are especially noteworthy. First, libertarians reject the egalitarianism of justice as fairness, particularly the redistributive implications of the difference principle. According to Robert NOZICK and other libertarian philosophers, the difference principle would violate individual liberty by interfering with the property rights and choices of persons who are said to be entitled to goods acquired through free and fair individual transactions. Second, feminist critics target numerous alleged biases and blind spots in Rawls's theory. Perhaps the most serious criticisms have been raised by Susan Moller Okin, who has argued that Rawls does not sufficiently address the problem of injustice within the gendered family, where the attitudes and moral psychology of future citizens are shaped in significant ways. Finally, communitarians criticize the liberal individualism of Rawls's theory of justice. Michael Sandel, for example, suggests that, especially in its reliance on the original position, Rawls's theory presents an untenable conception of the person as an "unencumbered self," disconnected from community and the constitutive ends and attachments that are necessary for moral reasoning.

According to Rawls, the changes to his view in the 1980s, beginning with "Kantian Constructivism in Moral Theory" (1980), were not based on these or other external criticisms. Rawls instead became increasingly concerned with a problem internal to his own theory. The third and final part of *A Theory of Justice* is devoted to the question of stability, namely, the question of whether and how citizens living in a society governed by the two principles of justice would acquire an adequate sense of justice as well as the requisite motivation to maintain just institutions. A major component of Rawls's treatment of the stabil-

ity question is an argument for the congruence of the right and the good, that is, an argument about why citizens should understand acting justly to be part of the human good. The problem, however, is that under the very political institutions recommended by the two principles of justice free human beings will inevitably affirm a number of reasonable conceptions of the good life, many of which will be incompatible with the Kantian commitments of Rawls's own congruence argument. It is this "fact of reasonable pluralism" that led Rawls to introduce a number of new ideas over the course of the next decade in an effort to modify and correct his account of how a just society could also be stable over time. The recently published *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement* (2001) presents a unified account that includes many of these new ideas along with other important changes to the Rawlsian theory of justice.

In *Political Liberalism* these new ideas take center stage. In this work and the essays leading up to it, justice as fairness is interpreted as a strictly *political* conception of justice. A political conception of justice can be worked out in terms of the fundamental ideas of a democracy's public political culture and is intended to apply only to the basic institutional structure of society. It should also be possible to express a political conception as freestanding, separate from the comprehensive religious and philosophical doctrines which provide answers to questions concerning God, matters of first philosophy, nonpolitical values and the meaning of human life. Rawls includes under the category of "comprehensive doctrine" not only traditional religious views, but also the moral doctrines of philosophical liberals such as Immanuel Kant and John Stuart Mill. The idea of a political conception of justice must be understood as in principle independent from all such doctrines and, along with the notion of "overlapping consensus," it enables Rawls to provide an account of stability which is consistent with the fact of reasonable pluralism. In attempting to reach overlapping consensus, citizens accept a political conception of justice not as a mere compromise or

modus vivendi, but on the basis of their comprehensive religious and philosophical doctrines. A political conception is thus morally embedded in the comprehensive doctrines of citizens. Ideally each citizen in an overlapping consensus would understand that all other citizens are committed to a reasonable political conception of justice, albeit on the basis of different, underlying comprehensive grounds.

One goal of political liberalism is the reinterpretation of justice as fairness. But, from the perspective of political liberalism, justice as fairness must be understood as simply one member of a family of reasonable political conceptions of justice. Indeed, the theory of political liberalism is also designed to address its own distinctive questions, brought about by the recognition of the fact of reasonable pluralism. How can a diverse group of citizens, especially citizens with deep and abiding religious convictions, also endorse a political conception of justice that supports a constitutional democracy? In light of persistent disagreement about doctrinal matters, the common good and even justice itself, how can we understand democratic decisions as politically legitimate? Rawls answers this latter question by means of a "liberal principle of legitimacy" based on a "criterion of reciprocity." According to this criterion, citizens and officials must offer justifications for the exercise of political power which they reasonably think other citizens might reasonably accept. Thus a key term in the theory of political liberalism is *reasonableness*, which is applied to political conceptions of justice, comprehensive doctrines, forms of disagreement and other ideas. While the meaning of reasonableness depends in part on the subject matter to which the term is applied, it is the notion of a reasonable citizen that seems to support many of the other claims of political liberalism. A reasonable citizen is prepared to offer and abide by fair terms of cooperation and to treat others as politically free and equal, capable of and interested in exercising their basic moral powers. Reasonable citizens also acknowledge the burdens of judgment, or the idea that failure to reach agreement in impor-

tant matters might be due to the difficulties in reasoning and judgment encountered by even sincere and conscientious deliberators.

Along with liberal legitimacy and reasonableness, with its supporting conceptions of the person as a free and equal citizen and society as a fair system of cooperation, the "idea of public reason" is also a core idea in Rawlsian political liberalism. Public reason expresses an ideal of democratic citizenship. As a moral "duty of civility," it provides guidance to citizens and officials in their political deliberation and decision-making. While the idea of public reason is not intended to govern the "background culture" of civil society, it does apply to the official "public political forum" of courts, legislatures, campaigns and voting booths, at least with respect to fundamental political questions, that is, constitutional essentials and matters of basic justice. When these questions are at stake, citizens and officials honor public reason by conducting their deliberation and decision-making in terms of the criterion of reciprocity and by turning to the values of a reasonable political conception of justice. The idea of public reason thus requires that citizens and officials avoid relying solely on comprehensive justifications, whether religious or secular, in setting the fundamental terms of their political association.

In steering clear of the claims of comprehensive doctrines, Rawls suggests that political liberalism is simply applying "the principle of toleration to philosophy itself." Yet it is this feature of political liberalism that has provoked the most controversy. One set of questions in the secondary literature has focused on Rawls's unwillingness to appeal to truth-claims in defending a political conception of justice or the other main ideas of political liberalism. Even some liberal philosophers who admire Rawls's theory of justice reject what Joseph Raz has called the "epistemic abstinence" of his later writings. Indeed, Jürgen Habermas, in his exchange with Rawls, argues that notions of consensus and reasonableness are an insufficient basis for establishing the moral validity of the political values of political liberalism. Moreover, while some

critics have examined the status of claims to truth or moral validity in Rawlsian theory construction, others have raised questions about the status of these claims in Rawlsian public reason, which instructs citizens and officials sometimes to restrain their appeal to the whole truth of their comprehensive doctrines. Concerns that these restraints are unnecessary, unfair or even counterproductive are especially widespread among philosophers, political theorists and legal scholars who are interested in the role of religion in the public square. In "The Idea of Public Reason Revisited" (1997), Rawls responds to some of these concerns by advancing a "wide view" of public reason that is even more permissive of religious discourse and argument than the interpretation of public reason originally presented in *Political Liberalism*.

A final component of Rawls's political philosophy is his attempt to extend a contractarian account of justice to the field of international law and relations. In *The Law of Peoples*, Rawls follows Kant in first assuming the standpoint of a liberal democracy before attempting to locate, from that standpoint, principles of justice that would hold between different societies, or "peoples." The set of principles proposed by Rawls – the so-called "Law of Peoples" – not only specifies just relations between liberal peoples, but also supports the claim that a liberal people's foreign policy should reflect toleration of nonliberal peoples that are still "decent." According to Rawls's model, a decent society is nonaggressive and organized in terms of a consultation hierarchy which, among other features, secures for all members of society some role in decision-making as well as basic human rights to life, liberty, personal property, and formal equality. Basic human rights are not equivalent to liberal constitutional rights. So while a decent people must recognize liberty of conscience and protect members of minority religions, it might also refuse to incorporate the separation of church and state into its political organization. In this and other ways, a decent people would fall short of satisfying the conditions of liberal justice. Nevertheless, in contrast to aggressive,

"outlaw states," peoples that meet the minimal normative criteria associated with decency are to be tolerated and acknowledged as members of a "Society of Peoples." In addition to these important distinctions between types of peoples, *The Law of Peoples* also addresses other pressing issues of foreign policy and global justice, including just war doctrine, distributive justice among peoples, and the duties of well-ordered societies to assist societies that are burdened with unfavorable social conditions, such as a lack of resources, knowledge or political tradition.

Along with the other works published toward the end of his life, *The Law of Peoples* also provides insight into Rawls's general understanding of the nature and purpose of philosophy. Students of moral and political philosophy might turn to his *Lectures on the History of Moral Philosophy*, based on his lecture course at Harvard, in order to consider Rawls's approach to teaching the history of philosophy and his influence on the many philosophers who studied with him. And students might turn to *The Law of Peoples* for his account of political philosophy as "realistic utopia." A realistically utopian political philosophy, which follows Rousseau in taking human beings as they are and laws as they ought to be, extends the limits of what seems possible in political life. By enabling us to imagine the real possibility of just institutions, a realistic utopia, Rawls argues, gives meaning to our political projects and reconciles us to the social world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Theory of Justice (Cambridge, Mass., 1971; 2nd edn 1999).

Political Liberalism (New York, 1993; 2nd edn 1996). 2nd edn contains a second introduction and the "Reply to Habermas."

The Law of Peoples (Cambridge, Mass., 1999).

Collected Papers, ed. Samuel Freeman (Cambridge, Mass., 1999).

Lectures on the History of Moral Philosophy, ed. Barbara Herman (Cambridge, Mass., 2000).

Justice as Fairness: A Restatement, ed. Erin Kelly (Cambridge, Mass., 2001).

Lectures on the History of Political Philosophy, ed. Samuel Freeman (Cambridge, Mass., 2005).

Other Relevant Works

Rawls's papers are at Harvard University.

"Outline of a Decision Procedure for Ethics," *Philosophical Review* 60 (1951): 177–97.

"Two Concepts of Rules," *Philosophical Review* 64 (1955): 3–32.

"Justice as Fairness," *Philosophical Review* 67 (1958): 164–94.

"The Justification of Civil Disobedience," in *Civil Disobedience: Theory and Practice*, ed. Hugo A. Bedau (New York, 1969), pp. 240–55.

"Fairness to Goodness," *Philosophical Review* 84 (1975): 536–54.

"The Independence of Moral Theory," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 48 (1975): 5–22.

"The Basic Structure as Subject," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 14 (1977): 159–65.

"Kantian Constructivism in Moral Theory," *Journal of Philosophy* 77 (1980): 515–72.

"The Basic Liberties and Their Priority," in *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values, III (1982)*, ed. Sterling M. McMurrin (Salt Lake City, Utah, 1982), pp. 1–87.

"Justice as Fairness: Political not Metaphysical," *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 14 (1985): 223–51.

"The Idea of an Overlapping Consensus," *Oxford Journal for Legal Studies* 7 (1987): 1–25.

"The Priority of Right and Ideas of the Good," *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 17 (1988): 251–76.

"Afterward: A Reminiscence," in *Future Pasts: The Analytic Tradition in Twentieth-Century Philosophy*, ed. Juliet Floyd (Oxford, 2001), pp. 417–30.

"For the Record," in *Philosophers in Conversation: Interviews from the Harvard Review of Philosophy*, ed. S. Phineas

Upham (London and New York, 2002).

Further Reading

Amer Phils 1950-2000, Bio 20thC Phils, Blackwell Analytic Phil, Blackwell Comp Phils, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Encyc Ethics, Oxford Comp Phil, Pres Addr of APA v8, Proc of APA v77, Routledge Encycl Phil

Barry, Brian. "John Rawls and the Search for Stability," *Ethics* 105 (1995): 874–915.

Daniels, Norman. *Justice and Justification* (Cambridge, UK, 1996).

Daniels, Norman, ed. *Reading Rawls*, 2nd edn (Stanford, Cal., 1989).

Davion, Victoria, and Clark Wolf, eds. *The Idea of Political Liberalism: Essays on Rawls* (Lantham, Md., 2000).

Dombrowski, Daniel. *Rawls and Religion: The Case for Political Liberalism* (Albany, N.Y., 2001).

Freeman, Samuel, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Rawls* (Cambridge, UK, 2003).

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Inclusion of the Other*, ed. Ciaran Cronin and Pablo De Greiff (Cambridge, Mass., 1998).

Kukathas, Chandran, ed. *John Rawls: Critical Assessments of Leading Political Philosophers*, 4 vols (London and New York, 2003).

Kukathas, Chandran, and Philip Pettit. *Rawls: A Theory of Justice and its Critics* (Stanford, 1990).

Larmore, Charles. "The Moral Basis of Political Liberalism," *Journal of Philosophy* 96 (1999): 599–625.

Nagel, Thomas. "The Rigorous Compassion of John Rawls," *The New Republic* (25 October 1999): 36–41.

Nordquist, Joan. *John Rawls: A Bibliography* (Santa Cruz, Cal., 2003).

Nozick, Robert. *Anarchy, State, and Utopia* (New York, 1974).

Okin, Susan Moller. *Justice, Gender and the Family* (New York, 1989).

Pogge, Thomas. *Realizing Rawls* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1989).

Richardson, Henry, and Paul Weithman, eds. *The Philosophy of Rawls*, 5 vols (New York, 1999).

Sandel, Michael. *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice* (Cambridge, UK, 1982).

"Symposium on John Rawls," *Ethics* 105 (1994): 1–63.

"Symposium on Rawlsian Theory of Justice: Recent Developments," *Ethics* 99 (1989): 695–944.

"Symposium: Rawls and the Law," *Fordham Law Review* 72 (2004): 1381–2175.

Talisse, Robert B. *On Rawls* (Belmont, Cal., 2001).

James W. Boettcher

RAYMOND, George Lansing (1839–1929)

George Lansing Raymond was born on 3 September 1839 in Chicago, Illinois. His father, Benjamin Wright Raymond, had been one of the first mayors of Chicago, from 1839 to 1840 and again from 1842 to 1843. Raymond graduated with a BA from Williams College in 1862 and from Princeton Seminary with a BD in 1865. As a college student, Raymond showed promising talent as a poet; while a freshman he competed against the entire college to win the first prize in a verse contest. His interest in poetry led to a more general fascination with representation, form, and art theory, which became his main philosophical focus. From 1865 to 1868 he traveled throughout Europe, studying aesthetics at the University of Tübingen and studying rhetoric and oratory in Paris. Raymond taught rhetoric, oratory, and literature at Williams College from 1874 to 1880. In 1880 he became the first professor of oratory and aesthetic criticism at Princeton University, where he remained until 1905. From 1905 to 1912, he was professor of aesthetics at George Washington University in Washington, D.C. Raymond died on 11 July 1929 in Washington, D.C.

Raymond's monumental series of seven volumes entitled *Comparative Aesthetics* was published between 1886 and 1906. The series was celebrated as the most systematic, ambitious, and comprehensive aesthetics project ever to be published, and it was enormously popular, going through many editions. The series addresses all practices considered forms of fine art by mid nineteenth-century American standards: poetry, painting, sculpture, music, and architecture. In each volume, Raymond stresses the underlying form of each art practice, suggesting that unity is an essential feature of all works of art.

The series is notable for its distinction from the German philosophy that held considerable sway in mid nineteenth-century American and British academia. Aesthetics, in Raymond's time, was either narrowly focused on very specific questions concerning a single art practice, or was written in a style devoid of artistic sensitivity. In contrast, Raymond became well known for bringing his subtle aesthetic sensibility to a broad range of artistic practices and questions to argue for their essential interrelatedness. Raymond's work also stood out for its naturalistic orientation toward aesthetics, characterized by careful, empirical – almost scientific – research and classification, as opposed to the highly abstract idealism that was then in vogue.

Unity of form was a central principle that Raymond developed in his series. In each volume he applies the same questions to a wide range of areas of artistic endeavor. In *The Representative Significance of Form* (1900), he set out to understand "the kinds of truth derivable from nature and from man." He asks of gardening the very questions he poses to historic painting and poetry, and concludes that there are three kinds of artistic significance: the religious-artistic, the scientific-artistic, and the artistic-artistic. Religious-artistic significance is likened to art produced by inspiration and, for Raymond, is the most instinctive, while scientific-artistic significance results from investigation and is the most reflective. Artistic-artistic significance occurs as a result of imagination, which

Raymond defines as part inspiration, part investigation, and which entails a kind of struggle between instinctive and reflective ways of knowing. These same themes appear in *Art in Theory* (1894), in which he explores the very definition of art by discussing its distinction from nature and the differences between use and beauty.

The Genesis of Art-Form (1892) seeks to locate the mental and material origins of artistic form, wondering if art is a rendering of an artist's own mind, or the forms of nature. The volumes on poetry, music, and painting, sculpture and architecture very self-consciously follow the same format as developed in *The Representative Significance of Form*, which, Raymond tells us in his preface, was written first, despite being published toward the end of the series sequence.

Raymond published *The Essentials of Aesthetics* in 1906, in which he argues for a set of essential artistic methods that underpin all art forms and practices. Raymond's empirical approach was balanced by an interest in psychology, then only a nascent discipline. Raymond devotes several chapters to questions of the artist's emotions, the meaning of genius, and, as in *The Representative Significance of Form*, the imagination – what he called "the mind within." Stressing the representative force of art – as opposed to the imitative or communicative – Raymond evokes the necessity of the imagination for apprehending and responding to that which is represented. In this regard, he elevates both the artist and the spectator as engaging in a uniquely aesthetic experience.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Poetry as a Representative Art (New York, 1886).

The Genesis of Art-form (New York, 1892).

Rhythm and Harmony in Poetry and Music, together with *Music as a Representative Art* (New York, 1894).

Art in Theory (New York, 1894).

Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture as Representative Arts (New York, 1895).

The Representative Significance of Form (New

York, 1900).

Proportion and Harmony of Line and Color in Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture (New York, 1906).

Other Relevant Works

Raymond's papers are at Williams College, Massachusetts.

The Orator's Manual: A Practical and Philosophical Treatise on Vocal Culture, Emphasis and Gesture (Chicago, 1879).

The Writer, Being One of a Series of Handbooks upon Practical Expression (New York, 1893).

The Aztec God and Other Dramas (New York, 1900).

The Essentials of Aesthetics (New York, 1906).

The Psychology of Inspiration; an Attempt to Distinguish Religious from Scientific Truth and to Harmonize Christianity with Modern Thought (New York, 1908).

Ethics and Natural Law; a Reconstructive Review of Moral Philosophy Applied to the Rational Art of Living (New York, 1920).

An Art Philosopher's Cabinet: *Being Salient Passages from the Works on Comparative Aesthetics of George Lansing Raymond*, ed. Marion Miller (New York, 1915; rev. edn 1920).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v8*, *Who was Who in Amer v1*

Munro, Thomas. "The Strange Neglect of George Lansing Raymond: Some Needed Researches in American Aesthetics," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 13 (1955): 533–7.

Shissler, Barbara. "George Lansing Raymond's Comparative Aesthetics," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 19 (1961): 327–37.

Marjorie Jolles

RECK, Andrew Joseph (1927–)

Andrew J. Reck was born on 29 October 1927 in New Orleans, Louisiana. A Phi Beta Kappa student at Tulane University, he received his BA in 47 and MA in 1949. Reck then received his PhD in philosophy from Yale University in 1954. He taught at Yale as an instructor from 1955 to 1958. Returning to Tulane University in 1958 as an assistant professor of philosophy, Reck was promoted to full professor in 1964. He was chair of the philosophy department from 1969 to 1989 and Director of the Masters of Liberal Arts Programs starting in 1983. He was President of the Southwestern Philosophical Society in 1973, the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology in 1977, the Metaphysical Society of America in 1978, and the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy in 1998–9. He has been editor or board member of several journals, and distinguished visiting professor at several universities. Reck retired from full-time teaching in 2003, and presently resides in New Orleans.

In his career as a philosopher spanning more than fifty years, Reck has achieved recognition as a leading interpreter of American philosophy and proponent of speculative philosophy. In their interpretation of American philosophy, Reck's writings place him alongside John E. SMITH and Morton WHITE in respect to depth of scholarship, critical acumen, and sensitivity to American cultural life as a whole. The interpretive portion of his six books and more than one hundred and eighty articles, ranging from the Founding to the present, insightfully examines the thought of philosophers either in a form which is "sympathetic, synoptic, and focal", or in a manner in which one finds a philosopher (or philosophy) at work in the public arena, addressing what DEWEY calls the "problems of men." Only the American transcendentalists and the St. Louis Hegelians have eluded Reck's focus. His publications can be divided into four groups: first, his series of papers on the Founding, focusing on the

American Revolution, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights; second, the book and articles on William JAMES; third, his systematic interpretations of speculative philosophy, including many major American philosophers active during the twentieth century; fourth, his series of papers developing substance metaphysics.

Reck eschews certain approaches to the history of philosophy. A. O. LOVEJOY's concentration on the history of single ideas is too Platonistic and unrevealing of the complex interactions between a thinker and his culture. Reck believes that consideration of a philosopher's ideas from the standpoint of various disciplines leaves the reader unaware of the systematic complexity of his thought, and diminishes his stature as a "great" philosopher. Reck is sympathetic with John Smith's critique of "program philosophy," in which problems are treated with a set technique aiming at clarifying meaning. Clarity is a desideratum, but such analyses often exhibit affinities with dogmatic theology in that rival approaches, speculative philosophy especially, are ignored. Whenever possible, Reck graciously combats the anti-philosophy of political conservatives. For example, Reck notes that the historian Daniel J. Boorstin, who contends that "we do not need American philosophers because we already have an American philosophy, implicit in the American way of life" (1977, p. 353), has a predilection for pragmatism and process philosophy in his own writings, confirming the contention of Aristotle that those who argue against philosophy do so on philosophical grounds. In regard to finding a common ground for American philosophy, Reck thinks this is to be found in the major documents of this country: "Within the whirl of ideas and events … the meanings and values are discernibly focalized in documents." (1991, p. 551)

In an important series of papers, Reck has analyzed in detail the use of Enlightenment philosophy by the Founding fathers in their documents. He uses premier scholarly studies as guides in understanding and ordering the large array of tracts, letters, and documents used or written by the Founders. Central to Reck's studies is the book by Henry F. May, *The Enlightenment in America*. Reck uses May's distinctions between stages of Enlightenment to show how the Founding, from revolution to the Bill of Rights, passes through the stages of reason, skepticism, revolution, and common sense. Reck shows that the contractarian Declaration of Independence is, contrary to Morton White's claim, both a natural rights doctrine and utilitarian, the latter being subordinated to the former, in the same way that John RAWLS's second principle of fair equality of opportunity is subordinate to the first liberty principle of justice. Reck argues that the Constitution was carefully constructed on the basis of an Enlightenment discernment of important moments in the history of political philosophy. The Bill of Rights, the work of Madison and Jefferson, is shown to have been advanced by the writings of Joseph Priestly and Richard Price. Locke's *A Letter Concerning Toleration* played a major role in respect to religious liberty, but the Americans went beyond Locke, who placed restrictions on tolerance (for example, intolerance for atheists). Jefferson concluded early on in his Virginia Statute of 1779 that "the opinions of men are not the object of civil government, nor under its jurisdiction." All together, the American experience, from revolution to the Bill of Rights, represents, in Reck's memorable words, the "synthesis of logic and history" and that "America is the Enlightenment nation." (1991, p. 87)

Reck has also focused on William James, especially his psychology. He shows just how much of a break James made with classic epistemology, and its attempt to justify knowledge. For example, the problem of how the mind can know that it correctly represents its object is resolved by James within the boundaries of scientific psychology. Stimulated perhaps by Josiah ROYCE's claim that the Absolute is necessary as inclusive of finite minds and their objects in order for there to be truth and error,

James substitutes the psychologist for the Absolute. James resolves the dispute between nominalists and realists, coming down on the side of a modified conceptualism. Using his phenomenological insights, such as fringe, object of thought, and topic of thought, Reck shows that James held that thought is particular (an image plus fringe) and the object of thought ("all that thought thinks exactly as it thinks it") is particular. The topic of thought is that section of the total object which the mind selects and holds in abeyance as "the same." Thus, the topic of thought may be singular or universal.

Reck's work on American speculative philosophy includes his two books, *Recent American Philosophy (1967)* and *The New American Philosophers* (1970). His impressive scholarship on twenty-two philosophers discussed in these books preserves for future generations of students systematic accounts of unique and diverse philosophical efforts by Americans. These books demonstrate that the Golden Age of American philosophy is not over, that America has produced more than the "classic six" of James, Charles PEIRCE, Dewey, Royce, George SANTAYANA, and A. N. WHITEHEAD. This fact is refreshing, and raises hopes that such creative reflection will continue, despite the present domination of media and popular culture on the one side, and the entrenched professionalism of many philosophers on the other.

The other division of Reck's passion for speculative philosophy is the many papers and a book, *Speculative Philosophy* (1972), on substance metaphysics. Over a period of thirty years Reck has articulated and defended a modified version of Aristotle's theory of substance, against the full range of opposing metaphysics, including Hegelianism, process philosophy, relativity physics, alleged implications of symbolic logic, and essentialism. In regard to essentialism, the difficulty in distinguishing essential properties of substance from accidental properties might lead one to think that all properties are equal. This would entail either that all properties are essential (monadism) or all accidental, a view which runs headlong against the quest for patterns and kinds in science, as well as common sense, which views knowledge as referential and revealing of what there is. The solution to the difficulty with essentialism, Reck suggests, is pragmatic, operational, and functional. What is essential or accidental depends on the task at hand (the "topic" selected), and therefore this distinction is ontologically neutral. This contention explains Reck's admiration for James's functional theory in *Essays in Radical Empiricism*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Substance, Process, and Nature," *Journal of Philosophy* 55 (1958): 762–72.

"Substance and Person," *The Personalist* 41 (1960): 327–39.

Recent American Philosophy: Studies of Ten Representative Thinkers (New York, 1964).

Introduction to William James (Bloomington, Ind., 1967).

The New American Philosophers: An Exploration of Thought since World War II (New York, 1970).

Speculative Philosophy (Albuquerque, N.M., 1972).

"The Philosophical Background of the American Constitution(s)," in *American Philosophy*, ed. Marcus Singer (Cambridge, UK, 1986), pp. 273–93.

"The Republican Ideology," in *Ideology and American Experience*, ed. John K. Roth and Robert C. Whittemore (Washington, D.C., 1986), pp. 73–96.

"Philosophy in the Debates at the United States Constitutional Convention of 1787," in *Constitutionalism: The Philosophical Dimension*, ed. A. Rosenbaum (New York, 1988), pp. 113–24.

"Moral Philosophy and the Framing of the Constitution," in *Liberty, Property, and the Foundations of the American Constitution*, ed. E. Paul and H. Dickman

(Albany, N.Y., 1989), pp. 23–41.
"The Enlightenment in American Law," *Review of Metaphysics* 44 (1991): 549–73, 729–54; 45 (1991): 57–87.

Other Relevant Works
"The Philosophy of Andrew Ushenko," *Review of Metaphysics* 11 (1958): 471–85; 673–88.
Ed., *George Herbert Mead, Selected Writings* (New York, 1964).
"Process Philosophy, a Categorical Analysis," *Tulane Studies in Philosophy* 24 (1975): 58–91.
"Categories and Justus Buchler," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 14 (1976): 31–45.
"Natural Law in American Revolutionary Thought," *Review of Metaphysics* 30 (1977): 686–714.
"Being and Substance," *Review of Metaphysics* 31 (1978): 533–54.
"William James on Ultimate Reality and Meaning," *Ultimate Reality and Meaning* 2 (1979): 40–58.
"Blanshard's Rationalism and the Critique of Empiricism," in *The Philosophy of Brand Blanshard*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (La Salle, Ill., 1980).
"John E. Smith as Interpreter of American Philosophy," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 22 (1986): 239–57.
"The Place of William James's 'Principles of Psychology' in American Philosophy," in *The Philosophical Psychology of William James*, ed. Michael DeArmey and Stephen Skousgaard (Washington, D.C., 1986), pp. 1–16.
"Head and Heart: The Mind of Thomas Jefferson," in *Doctrine and Experience: Essays in American Philosophy*, ed. Vincent G. Potter (New York, 1988), pp. 22–47.
"The Five Ontologies of Paul Weiss," in *The Philosophy of Paul Weiss*, ed. Lewis Hahn (La Salle, Ill., 1995).
"Substance and Chisholm's Concept of the Person," in *The Philosophy of Roderick M. Chisholm*, ed. Lewis E. Hahn (Chicago, 1997), pp. 501–508.
"Cotton Mather (1663–1728) on Ultimate Reality and Meaning," *Ultimate Reality and Meaning* 24 (2001): 280–91.

Further Reading
Bertocci, Peter A., and Richard M. Millard. "Values and Ethical Principles," *Philosophical Forum* (Boston) 22 (1964–5): 82–6.
Buchler, Justus. "Reply to Reck's 'Categories and Justus Buchler': The Structure of the Whole, the Location of the Parts," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 14 (1976): 47–53.
Neville, Robert. "Knowledge and Being: Comments on Griesbach and Reck," *Review of Metaphysics* 25 (1972): 40–46.

Michael H. DeArmey

REESE, Curtis Williford (1887–1961)

Curtis W. Reese was born on 3 September 1887 on a farm in Madison County in the Blue Ridge Mountains of North Carolina. The Reese family were devout Southern Baptists, and many of the men were Baptist ministers. When Reese earned his first dollar he gave it to the Baptist minister to help pay his salary. At age nine he "accepted Christ as his personal saviour." He stood before the congregation and confessed that he was a lost sinner and trusted Christ to save him. Although it was mid-winter, he and other converts were baptized in an outdoor creek.

In his mid teens, Reese thought that God had given him "the call" and he decided to prepare for the ministry. In the meantime, his family had moved to the little college town of Mars Hill, North Carolina, so he did his undergraduate work at Mars Hill Baptist College

and graduated in 1908, and was soon ordained to the Baptist ministry. He then went to Alabama to live for the summer with his brother T. O. Reese who was the minister of the First Baptist Church in Geneva, while he served as acting pastor of a small rural church at Beliwood. He departed from Alabama in September 1908 to enter the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky. There he supported himself by pastoring two churches at a half-time rate, one at Gratz and the other at Pleasant Home. At the latter church, he met Fay Rowlett Walker, whom he married on 7 February 1913.

There were two important influences on Reese during his time as a student in Louisville. The first was that in his classes he came in contact with higher biblical criticism which in time undermined his belief that the Bible is the infallible word of God. The second was that he once attended the Unitarian Church in Louisville, and although he was a hostile attendant, he took a pamphlet on the social gospel written by the Reverend George G. Peabody. He was especially struck with the notion of "salvation by character" rather than by faith in specific religious beliefs.

Upon receiving his degree from Louisville in 1910, he became the "state evangelist" for the Southern Baptist Churches which were separated from the Northern Baptist Churches in Illinois. After a year, he became the minister of the First Baptist Church in Tiffin, Ohio, a rather liberal Northern Baptist Church. In time he thought he could speak about what he believed, but that he was not free to speak about what he did not believe. He no longer believed the Bible was the infallible word of God, nor could he believe in the Virgin Birth of Jesus, nor the redemption of mankind through the death of Jesus on the cross, "a doctrine that was now repulsive to me," nor could he believe in hellfire for those not saved, a doctrine which he "found impossible to reconcile with my own belief in a good and just God."

Reese realized that his beliefs were quite contrary to Baptist doctrine. He considered

transferring into a more liberal denomination whose beliefs were more compatible with his. He considered the Unitarian, the Universalist, and the Christian Churches. In time, he met with the Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference, Reverend Ernest C. Smith, when Smith was on church business in Toledo, Ohio. In preparation for the meeting, Reese wrote out his own creed, and read it to Smith. In it he said: "I believe in: 1. A universal Father, God. 2. A universal brotherhood, mankind. 3. A universal right, freedom. 4. A universal motive, love. 5. A universal aim, progress." After discussing the creed, Smith assured Reese that his beliefs were most compatible with those of Unitarians.

On 1 June 1913 Reese resigned as Baptist minister in Tiffin to become the minister of the Unitarian Church in Alton, Illinois and his new position began on 1 September. He later confessed how the interim between his two positions was "the most difficult financially of my life." His Baptist family was shocked upon learning he had become a Unitarian. His mother wrote "that she would rather have heard of my death than that I had become a Unitarian." A sister had some six months before named a second son after Reese, but upon hearing of her brother's change of faith, she changed her son's name to Bruner Truett, after two of the most famous Southern Baptist ministers. Of his tenure in Alton, Reese thought it one of the highest periods of his life. He had complete freedom of the pulpit and sympathetic understanding from his congregation.

Reese became the minister of the First Unitarian Church in Des Moines, Iowa on 1 December 1915. It was here that another development in his thought occurred: he moved from a comfortable liberal theism to naturalistic humanism. He was influenced in his development by studying the philosophical works of Roy Wood Sellars, a Unitarian and a member of the philosophy department at the University of Michigan. In the spring of 1917 Reese preached a sermon entitled "A Democratic View of Religion," which marked his change

from theism to humanism. Later that year the meetings of the Western Unitarian Conference were held in Des Moines, and John DIETRICH, a minister in Minneapolis, picked up a copy of Reese's sermon, read it and later discussed it with Reese. Dietrich informed him their views were rather similar, but he referred to his position as humanist. In time, Dietrich and Reese as well as other ministers in the conference became known as humanists in contrast to theists, so their chance meeting provided the beginning of the humanist movement in the American Unitarian Association.

In Des Moines Reese became interested in the poor housing conditions in the city, a concern he expressed to the mayor who suggested Reese speak to the governor. Reese succeeded in gaining Governor W. L. Harding's support by creating the Iowa Housing Bill, and largely due to Reese's intense lobbying, it passed without a negative vote. It was alleged to be the first state housing bill to be passed in the United States. Reese, the "father" of the bill, was appointed the first Housing Commissioner of the State of Iowa, a position which he held along with that of minister of his church.

Reese became the Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference on 1 September 1919. His new base of operations was Chicago, and his primary responsibility was to help churches secure the "right" and most capable ministers for their pulpits. Although this administrative position was potentially controversial, he was able to retain the respect of both the conservatives and the radicals. During this period Reese was elected to the Board of Directors of Meadville Theological School, then located in Meadville, Pennsylvania. For some time attempts to relocate the school to a more advantageous city had failed. Reese wanted to relocate the school in Chicago, and to that end, he secured a pledge of $100,000 from Morton D. Hull, a wealthy businessman and active Unitarian. At its next meeting, in February 1926, the Board of Directors voted to bring Meadville to Chicago. At about the same time Reese secured the promise of another significant

sum from Hull to build a new Unitarian church in Hyde Park on the edge of the University of Chicago campus. It was not surprising that when the honorary degrees were awarded in 1927 Reese became the youngest recipient of the Doctor of Divinity degree from Meadville.

Reese embarked on a five-month trip around the world in November 1928. He stopped in India to represent the American Unitarian Association at the centennial celebration of Brahmo Samaj, a kind of "Hindu Unitarianism" started by Ram Mohun Roy in the early part of the nineteenth century. Reese attended the main meetings held in January 1929 in Calcutta, where he was in great demand as a speaker. He gave nine addresses to various groups, and at the University of Calcutta he received a standing ovation for saying, "No race or nation, whatever its color or culture, is good enough or wise enough to rule another race or nation – and that means both England in India, and America in the Philippines." Although Reese had spoken to numerous groups on his way to India, including Japan, this was his most enthusiastic reception.

In addition to his position as Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference, Reese was President of Lombard College, a Universalist school located in Galesburg, Illinois. His appointment apparently was an attempt to bring the Unitarians to the aid of the Universalists in saving the school from financial collapse. Reese was President for only a little over a year from 1928 to 1929; the depression worsened its financial situation and in 1933 the school became a part of Meadville Theological School.

In January 1930 Reese resigned as Western Conference Secretary to accept the position of Dean at the Abraham Lincoln Centre in Chicago, which had been founded in 1905 by the Unitarian minister Jenkin Loyd Jones. Reese lived in an apartment in the Centre designed by the famous architect Frank Lloyd WRIGHT. The programs of the Centre were many and varied. There was a clinic for counseling about "optional parenthood." The Centre sponsored study classes, social service, a boys' and girls' camp, a public library, domestic science classes,

instruction in music with glee clubs and an orchestra, various special activities for boys and girls, and dramatics. A Friday morning forum provided a platform for outstanding speakers of all varieties of opinion. The Centre also published a journal, *Unity*, of which John Haynes Holmes was editor for many years, and in time Reese also became editor. Non-Jews, Jews, and blacks were on the staff of the Centre, and in the early days Reese maintained a fifty percent balance of whites and blacks in all programs, but as the neighborhood changed the percentage of blacks increased. Reese also served on an astonishing number of committees devoted to social service which included a Juvenile Court Committee, the Board of Directors of the Religious Education Association, the Urban League, and the Humanist Press Association.

Occasionally he taught courses at George Williams College and at the Central Young Men's Christian Association College in Chicago, in the area of "Principles and Methods of Adult Education". After retiring as Dean of the Abraham Lincoln Centre in 1957, Reese and his wife moved to Kissimmee, Florida. On 22 May 1959 he was presented the Weatherly-Holmes Award for service to liberal religion by the American Unitarian Association. Reese died while attending a Board of Directors' meeting at Meadville Theological School and commencement in Chicago Illinois, on 5 June 1961.

In the world of ideas Reese's importance lies in his development of a humanist understanding of religion with a strong social ethic, which he aggressively promoted in his writings and addresses. In an address at the Unitarian Summer School held at Harvard in 1920, he stated, "Liberalism is building a religion that would not be shaken even if the thought of God were to pass away." He admitted theism is philosophically possible but not religiously necessary. In 1933 he served on a committee to edit "A Humanist Manifesto." In 1941 he was one of the founders of the American Humanist Association, serving as its President in 1949–50,

and was acknowledged as a "humanist pioneer" in 1956.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Humanism (Chicago, 1926).
Humanist Religion. (New York, 1931).
"The Faith of Humanism," in *The World's Great Sermons*, ed. S. E. Forster (Garden City, N.J., 1943).
The Meaning of Humanism (Boston, 1945).
"Priorities of Spiritual Conversion," in *Voices of Liberalism*, vol. 1 (Boston, 1947).
"Time for Liberal Action?" in *Voices of Liberalism*, vol. 2 (Boston, 1948).

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *Humanist Sermons* (Chicago, 1927).
Ed., *Friedrich Nietzsche*, by George Burman Foster (New York, 1931).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Who was Who in Amer v4*
Olds, Mason. *American Religious Humanism* (Minneapolis, 1996).
Robinson, David. *The Unitarians and the Universalists* (Westport, Conn., 1985).

Mason Olds

REICHENBACH, Hans (1891–1953)

Hans Reichenbach was one of the most influential figures in philosophy of science during the twentieth century. He promoted a form of logical empiricism in Germany which he and others, notably, Rudolf CARNAP, Herbert FEIGL, and Carl HEMPEL, brought to the United States before World War II. While making substantial, enduring contributions to the kinds of problems and methods philosophers of science employ, Reichenbach also cultivated talented students, including Hilary PUTNAM

and Wesley SALMON, and wrote regularly for popular audiences.

Reichenbach was born on 26 September 1891 in Hamburg, Germany. He first studied engineering at the Technical University in Stuttgart before studying mathematics, physics and philosophy at the Universities of Berlin, Erlangen, Göttingen, and Munich. He completed his dissertation on the concept of probability and earned his PhD in philosophy from the University of Erlangen in 1916. His teachers included some of the most celebrated physicists and philosophers of the twentieth century, including Max Born, Ernst Cassirer, Albert EINSTEIN, David Hilbert, Max Planck, and Arnold Sommerfeld. By 1919 Reichenbach had become a *privatdozent* in Stuttgart, and known in scientific and philosophical circles for his talents in physics as well as for his interpretations of relativity theory and quantum theory. In 1926 Reichenbach applied for a permanent position in philosophy in Berlin, but soon found obstacles in his way to full academic recognition and success. This pattern would recur throughout his career. In part, Reichenbach's trouble was intellectual, in so far as his technical philosophical interests in *Wissenschaftstheorie* were foreign to conventional European disciplinary divisions. His philosophical writing was highly technical and closely tied to the work of physicists and mathematicians. This was a radical departure from the methods of mainstream philosophers in Germany, who saw philosophy as prior to and methodologically distinct from natural science. In part, his trouble was political. Like Otto Neurath, Reichenbach was a scientific philosopher who had flirted with socialist politics. Before and after serving in the military in Russia from 1915 to 1917, Reichenbach had some political involvement with the student socialist movement. His political past was a liability when it came to securing a regular academic post.

From 1920 on Reichenbach published popular pieces on the theory of relativity, on radio, on the impact of radio technology on culture, as well as monographs on the history of astronomy and physics. These writings appeared in popular German periodicals such as *Die Neue Rundschau* and *Die Umschau*. In the early 1930s Reichenbach became the science editor for *Die Deutsche Welle*, the national radio station for Germany. In this position he nurtured the public thirst for news of science.

After a dispute with the physicist Max Planck, his sponsor, about the extent of his prior socialist engagements, Reichenbach finally obtained a position at the University of Berlin in natural philosophy and physics, which he held from 1926 to 1933. The appointment was not to a full professorship in philosophy, but instead to a special assistant professorship in the physics department. Einstein and Planck were among those instrumental in securing the Berlin position, although they had tried, without success, to seat Reichenbach in a full professorship.

In Berlin, Reichenbach founded a philosophical circle, the Society for Empirical Philosophy, which existed from 1927 to 1933. Reichenbach's Berlin group, like the well-known Vienna Circle around Moritz Schlick at the University of Vienna, held that philosophical problems could be solved only by carefully framing them in language of formal logic, and that philosophical theories could be confirmed or disconfirmed only by empirical evidence. While Schlick's circle followed upon the so-called First Vienna Circle of Neurath, Philipp FRANK, and Hans Hahn, Reichenbach's followed the Society for Positivist Philosophy organized in Berlin by Josef Petzoldt. Like the Circle around Schlick, Reichenbach's group included scientists and philosophers such as Reichenbach's student Carl Hempel and psychologist Wolfgang KÖHLER. Though the two groups had significant differences, both were dedicated to reframing philosophical problems and presuppositions in light of the results and methods of modern science and logic.

One important collaborative venture between Reichenbach and the Vienna Circle

was the journal *Erkenntnis*. Always seeking to promote and cultivate scientific philosophy, Reichenbach founded the journal as a conversion of the older *Annalen der Philosophie* with the support of its publisher, Felix Meiner. After many delays, *Erkenntnis* appeared in 1930 as the voice of the new scientific style in philosophy. Although it was originally to be collaboratively edited by Reichenbach, Carnap and Schlick, Schlick pulled out of the project as the result of philosophical differences with Reichenbach and Carnap. The journal nonetheless became the voice of scientific philosophy (and logical empiricism) as it grew and took shape in Vienna, Berlin, and elsewhere. As correspondence in Reichenbach's archive shows, he tirelessly used the journal to pursue constructive dialogue among philosophers and to promote the merits of scientific philosophy to those who inquired about it.

As the political landscape of Germany turned ominous in the early 1930s, especially for those like Reichenbach with partly Jewish ancestry, he found himself defending *Erkenntnis* against the attacks of scientist and philosopher Hugo Dingler. Reichenbach had already responded in the early 1920s to Dingler's attacks against the claims of Einstein's General Theory of Relativity that space and time were not Euclidean. Ten years later Dingler publicly denounced the new scientific philosophy growing in Reichenbach's journal and his Society for Empirical Philosophy as akin to mischievous Bolshevism. In the fall of 1933 Reichenbach was abruptly dismissed from the University of Berlin under the government's so-called "Race Laws." Reichenbach had Jewish grandparents on his father's side, and so failed to meet the conditions of Aryan purity stipulated by the Nazi government. Evidence of anti-Semitism against him appears in Reichenbach's correspondence well prior to 1933. For example, in 1930 Reichenbach received a letter from a scientific journal to which he regularly contributed, requiring that he certify his Aryan ancestry. The journal explained that it was no longer accepting submissions from non-Aryan authors. Reichenbach did not take this and other such requests and signs of deepening institutionalized anti-Semitism seriously, and he was shocked by his dismissal in 1933.

Along with many other German intellectuals, Reichenbach emigrated to Istanbul where the Turkish government had begun recruiting refugee scholars for a new university. Together with others, including the Austrian mathematician Richard VON MISES, Reichenbach signed a five-year contract in which he promised to begin teaching in Turkish within five years and the Turkish government promised to create adequate classrooms, libraries, and laboratories.

Although Reichenbach used his five years in Turkey effectively for writing and corresponding with his many displaced colleagues, his experience was frustrating. Unable to teach courses related to his research interests, he taught philosophy in a university that he believed was poorly planned and poorly served the needs of its students and society. Although he was given a budget for books, most of the books ordered never arrived, even after a number of years. Reichenbach eventually learned that the money for the books had been "lost" in the chain of government officials through which book orders passed. His administrators furthermore refused to allow him a leave of absence when Sidney HOOK and others succeeded in arranging a one-year position for Reichenbach at New York University. Resolving to leave Turkey upon expiration of his contract, Reichenbach took the advice of Charles MORRIS at the University of Chicago (who had helped arrange for Carnap's position there) and published a book in the United States before seeking an American academic appointment. The result was *Experience and Prediction* and, in 1938, an appointment as professor of philosophy of science at the University of California at Los Angeles.

Upon arrival in the United States, Reichenbach again encountered political obstacles. With the United States at war with

Germany in the early 1940s, he was classified by the US government as an enemy alien and effectively placed under house arrest. Aside from his trips to campus, he was required to remain at home. While this was far less severe than the internment suffered by Japanese-Americans in California, it did cause Reichenbach to consider whether he could remain in America. He did remain, however, and he thrived at UCLA where he taught for the rest of his life. His philosophical and professional ambitions suffered little as a result of his emigration. After a lifetime strewn with obstacles to his intellectual pursuit, he found at the end of his life that his path was much easier. Just before his death, he accepted an invitation to deliver the prestigious William James Lectures at Harvard University. However, he unexpectedly died on 9 April 1953 in Los Angeles, California.

Much as his colleagues Herbert Feigl and Philipp Frank established institutes for scientific philosophy in America, and Otto Neurath, Rudolf Carnap and Charles Morris produced their *International Encyclopedia of Unified Science*, Reichenbach always hoped to rescue his journal *Erkenntnis* from its German fate and transplant it to North America. After Felix Meiner continued publishing the Nazi-denounced journal at great risk, the University of Chicago nearly succeeded in purchasing the title from Meiner in the late 1930s and again in the early 1940s. Yet Reichenbach never succeeded in reestablishing *Erkenntnis* or bringing any other journal under his control. *Erkenntnis* was, however, revived in 1975, long after its last issues during the war were published in Holland, with the help of its original publishing company Felix Meiner Verlag.

Although Reichenbach was unable to recapture the editorship of *Erkenntnis*, his influence on philosophy was great. With the help of his students such as Carl Hempel, Wesley Salmon, and Hilary Putnam, Reichenbach helped establish philosophy of science as one of the central areas of professional philosophy in North American universities. After the war, he orga-

nized conferences that helped the profession define and debate its central goals and methods and he continued to promote the virtues of scientific philosophy to non-specialists both inside and outside of academia. Though he had trouble finding a publisher, his book *The Rise of Scientific Philosophy* was one of the best-selling introductions to philosophy of science of his day. It helped to establish the reputation of philosophy of science as a vibrant field dealing both with traditional philosophical problems and with new questions in response to exciting developments in the sciences.

Reichenbach published scores of scholarly papers in professional scientific and philosophical journals along with many books, beginning with his doctoral dissertation on the concept of probability in 1916. His major works fall into three main categories. He made important contributions to the philosophy of physics, specifically to the philosophical issues relating to our understanding of space and time. He also introduced much to the methodology and epistemology of science, with particular emphasis on solving the problem of induction and on the interpretation of probability. Finally, he was also a major force in shaping general methods and approaches in philosophy beyond the philosophy of science.

Much of Reichenbach's early work in the philosophy of science concerned philosophical issues which arose from developments in mathematics and physics. He held that the combination of the development of non-Euclidean geometries in the late nineteenth century together with Einstein's theories of relativity raised anew the question of the metric properties of space and time. Reichenbach attempted to show that the question of the geometry of space was an empirical, scientific question, rather than a question of a priori metaphysics, as Kant had so influentially argued. In his first book, *Relativitätstheorie und Erkenntnis Apriori*, and then in the widely studied *Philosophie der Raum-Zeit-Lehre*, Reichenbach distinguished between

formal, logical-mathematical theories and the application of such theories as physical ones. Systems of geometry, whether Euclidean or non-Euclidean, as formal theories, when true, are true as a matter of logical analysis, independently of experience. The application of such theories to the physical world, however, is an empirical matter, subject to test by empirical evidence. Determining which formal logical-mathematical theories apply to the physical world is a problem which Reichenbach called "coordination." Empirical knowledge is a matter of coordinating formal theories with the recorded data of empirical observation. Here, he emphasized, one always has a choice. One can, for example, choose to retain Euclidean geometry as one's physical geometry of space, as long as one is willing to adjust other aspects of one's physical theory. For example, if the data from the measurement of a stellar parallax tell us that the interior angles of a triangle do not sum to 180 degrees, we can either choose a non-Euclidean geometry as the geometry of physical space, or we can posit what Reichenbach called "universal forces" to explain the deformation of the lines which make up the observed triangle.

In *Experience and Prediction* Reichenbach attempts to solve Hume's skeptical doubts about what philosophers now call inductive inference, our reasoning from past to future regularities. Such inferences are central to both scientific and everyday reasoning. We judge that sugar will dissolve in water on the basis of past instances of the behavior of sugar in water. In scientific contexts we carefully control the initial conditions and we quantify outcomes based on our scientific goals. In everyday life our observations may be more casual and less precise, but we generalize from past experience in the same manner. Hume argued that there is no ultimate philosophical justification for such reasoning. He showed that such reasoning could only be justified as a form of logical inference or as an inference from experience. But he pointed out that such inferences are

not justified by reason, and that any attempt to justify such an inference by appeal to experience would be circular, relying on the very principle itself for justification.

Reichenbach's novel proposal attempts to accept Hume's reasoning while still allowing that there is a use of inductive reasoning which can be pragmatically justified. Reichenbach claimed that he was not attempting to justify an inductive principle, like the principle that the future will be like the past, but rather to *vindicate* an inductive *method*. He argued that the inductive method can be vindicated as a method guaranteed to find the truth, if there is a truth. His idea is that the truth an inductive method could discover is a truth about the probability of an outcome. One begins with an assignment of probability to an outcome. Reichenbach calls this a *posit*. Then one makes observations, and adjusts the probability based on the relative frequency of the actual outcome in the observed trials. If there is a truth about the actual probability of the occurrence or event in question, this method will approach this probability in the limit. That is, with further trials and adjustments, the posited probability will approach the actual probability if there is an actual probability.

A hallmark of Reichenbach's approach to many other topics in philosophy and particularly the philosophy of science was the judicious application of formal methods. Reichenbach pioneered the application of a three-valued logic to the interpretation of quantum mechanics. He also attempted to come up with a formal characterization to the general notion of a law of nature. However, unlike many of his contemporaries, he did not think that the resources of deductive logic were adequate to frame a formal definition of the concept of laws of nature, or of the related notions of counterfactual conditionals and causal inference. Although he held that laws of nature could not be simply expressed in terms of the universal quantifier and material conditional of first-order deduc-

tive logic, Reichenbach attempted to develop a precise characterization of the notion of a law of nature through a careful logical analysis of natural language. It was his conviction that there is a "hidden precision of language" within the ordinary natural language of scientists and laypersons.

While most of his published works engage technical issues in the logic and methodology of science, Reichenbach had interests in all areas of philosophy. This is particularly evident in *The Rise of Scientific Philosophy*, where he deals with such themes as the nature of moral directives, evolution, and the search for certainty, as well as on topics in logic and the philosophy of science. As he canvasses the history of philosophy, he describes a series of attempts to overreach on the part of philosophers. The desire for certainty and the need for moral directives, for example, without a clear scientific methodology, led philosophers to posit philosophical systems which lacked empirical grounding. With the tools of modern logic and scientific methodology, he argues, we can make advances in these areas. In the realm of ethics, for example, he holds that ethical claims are expressions of our volitional nature. We classify as "good" those things we desire, and as "bad" those things from which we are repulsed. Traditional systems of moral philosophy are simply compilations of our shared volitions. They are not universal directives of reason. The study of such systems should instead proceed by the scientific observation of the collective behavior of human beings.

While Reichenbach's writings on moral theory are not widely cited today, the emotivism view he defended is still discussed, if not widely held, by moral theorists today. His contributions to the philosophy of science, to epistemology, and more specifically to the logic and methodology of science, however, have remained enormously influential. While the particular philosophical claims generated by the Berlin School of logical empiricists and the Vienna Circle's logical positivists have undergone much criticism and revision, the method-

ological tools brought by Reichenbach and his collaborators to philosophy in the twentieth century fundamentally changed the shape of philosophical discourse to this day.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Relativitätstheorie und Erkenntnis Apriori (Berlin, 1920). Trans. Maria Reichenbach, *The Theory of Relativity and A Priori Knowledge* (Berkeley, Cal., 1964).

Philosophie der Raum-Zeit-Lehre (Berlin and Leipzig, 1928). Trans. Maria Reichenbach, *The Philosophy of Space and Time* (New York, 1958).

Experience and Prediction: An Analysis of the Foundations and the Structure of Knowledge (Chicago, 1938).

Philosophic Foundations of Quantum Mechanics (Berkeley, Cal., 1944).

Elements of Symbolic Logic (New York, 1947).

The Rise of Scientific Philosophy (Berkeley, Cal., 1951).

Nomological Statements and Admissible Operations (Amsterdam, 1954).

The Direction of Time (Berkeley, Cal., 1956).

Laws, Modalities, and Counterfactuals (Berkeley, Cal., 1976).

Other Relevant Works

Reichenbach's papers are in the Archives of Scientific Philosophy at the University of Pittsburgh.

Atom und Kosmos. Das physikalische Weltbild der Gegenwart (Berlin, 1930). Trans., *Atom and Cosmos: The World of Modern Physics* (London, 1932).

Von Kopernikus bis Einstein (Berlin, 1927). Trans. Ralph B. Winn, *From Copernicus to Einstein* (New York, 1942).

Gesammelte Werke, 9 vols, ed. Andreas Kamlah and Maria Reichenbach (Wiesbaden, Germany, 1977).

Selected Writings, 1909–1953, with a Selection of Biographical and

Autobiographical Sketches, 2 vols, ed. Maria Reichenbach and Robert S. Cohen (Dordrecht, 1978).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v5*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Chisholm, Roderick. "Reichenbach on Observing and Perceiving," *Philosophical Studies* 2 (1951): 45–8.

Danneberg, Lutz, Andreas Kamlah, and Lothar Schäfer, eds. *Hans Reichenbach und die Berliner Gruppe* (Wiesbaden, Germany, 1994).

McMahon, William E. *Hans Reichenbach's Philosophy of Grammar* (The Hague, 1976).

Nagel, Ernest. "Professor Reichenbach on Quantum Mechanics: A Rejoinder," *Journal of Philosophy* 43 (1946): 247–50.

Parrini, Paolo, Wesley C. Salmon, and Merrilee H. Salmon, eds. *Logical Empiricism: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives* (Pittsburgh, 2003).

Peijnenburg, Jeanne. "Reichenbach's Philosophy of Mind," *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 10 (2002): 437–53.

Poser, Hans, et al., eds. *Reichenbach: Philosophie im Umkreis der Physik* (Berlin, 1998).

Putnam, Hilary. "Hans Reichenbach: Realist and Verificationist," in *Future Pasts: The Analytic Tradition in Twentieth-Century Philosophy*, ed. Juliet Floyd and Sanford Shieh (Oxford, 2001), pp. 277–87.

Richardson, Alan W. "Science As Will and Representation: Carnap, Reichenbach, and the Sociology of Science," *Philosophy of Science* suppl. 67 (2000): 151–62.

Salmon, Wesley, ed. *Hans Reichenbach: Logical Empiricist* (Dordrecht, 1979).

Salmon, Wesley, and Gereon Wolters, eds. *Logic, Language, and the Structure of Scientific Theories: Proceedings of the Carnap-Reichenbach Centennial, University of Konstanz, 21–24 May 1991* (Pittsburgh, 1994).

Spohn, Wolfgang, ed. *Erkenntnis Orientated: A Centennial Volume for Rudolf Carnap and Hans Reichenbach* (Dordrecht, 1991).

Traiger, Saul. "The Hans Reichenbach Correspondence: An Overview," *Philosophy Research Archives* 10 (1984): 501–11.

Van Cleve, James. "Probability and Certainty: A Reexamination of the Lewis–Reichenbach Debate," *Philosophical Studies* 32 (1977): 323–34.

Saul Traiger

REINHARDT, Adolph Dietrich Friedrich (1913–67)

Ad Reinhardt was born on 24 December 1913 in Buffalo, New York, and died on 30 August 1967 in New York City. His early education was completed in the public schools of Queens, New York, and he entered Columbia University in 1931. At Columbia he studied art history with Meyer Shapiro and aesthetics with Irwin Edman, receiving a BA in 1935. From 1936 to 1941 Reinhardt was a participant in the Works Progress Administration Federal Art Project. His paintings and collages of this period were characteristically nonrepresentational, consistent with his belief that representational images were no longer a viable option for a serious artist. In the late 1940s Reinhardt's paintings showed the influence of the abstract expressionist artists with whom

he was associated. Through the 1950s his work became increasingly reductive. The freely brushed asymmetric organizations of strong color developed into iconic, formal, symmetrical compositions, using simple geometries and limited chromatic contrasts. His interest in Buddhism grew while studying at New York University between 1946 and 1952. He turned away from Western art historical precedents toward the philosophical and aesthetic models associated with Eastern cultures. Increasingly his work reflected an aesthetic of denial and negation, as he sought to produce an art that was pure art – images that resisted interpretation as representations of objects, events or the expression of emotions or ideas.

Reinhardt's writing often took the form of aphoristic statements, listing what art was not, rather than what it was. In the last decade of his life his paintings became even more dramatically austere. Typically, a sixty-inch square canvas was painted with what appeared to be a brushstroke-free single dark color. With extended study, areas of closely related hues and values appeared and then disappeared. What had been previously perceived as static was transformed into a slow dynamic rhythm. Reinhardt described these images as the most "modern" modern art, the most "abstract" abstract painting of his time. They were evocative, but not referential, and they were his ultimate exemplification of an aesthetic that denied that art reflected life or that it referred to it. For him art was "art-as-art" and "everything else was everything else" (1962, p. 37).

From 1942 to 1947 Reinhardt was employed as an artist-commentator on the liberal New York newspaper, *PM*. Using collaged type and clippings from old books and newspapers, he satirized the political and cultural life of the city, and often included commentaries that reflected his acerbic views of the commercialization of the art world. These diagrammatic commentaries satisfied his need to use graphic modes of expression without contaminating the aesthetic images of the fine art that was produced in his painting studio. This bifurcation was consistent with his belief that once a work of art left the studio it lost its identity as art and was transformed into a commodity, unless it was conserved in the tomb-like precincts of a fine arts museum.

In 1947 Reinhardt joined the faculty of Brooklyn College to teach art history, a position that he held until his death in 1967. This position allowed him to paint, write, and teach independently from the commercial gallery system. His paintings and essays were ethical declarations reified into provocative aesthetic forms that asked as many questions as they answered, for both himself and those others who were provoked by them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Americans 1963," *Art International* 6 (20 December 1962): 36–7.
Art as Art: The Selected Writings of Ad Reinhardt, ed. Barbara Rose (New York, 1975).
Ad Reinhardt (New York, 1991).

Other Relevant Works
Reinhardt's papers are in the Archives of American Art, Washington D.C.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*
Hess, Thomas. *The Art and Comic Satires of Ad Reinhardt* (Rome, 1975).
Inboden, Gudrin. *Ad Rinehardt: Timeless Painting* (London, 1988).
Lippard, Lucy R. *Ad Reinhardt* (New York, 1966; 1981).
Rowell, Margit. *Ad Rinehart and Color* (New York, 1980).

Nathan Knobler

REISER, Oliver Leslie (1895–1974)

Oliver L. Reiser was born on 15 November 1895 in Columbus, Ohio. He attended Ohio State University, where he received his BA in 1921, MA in 1922, and PhD in philosophy in 1924, writing a dissertation on "Creative Monism." He was an instructor in philosophy at Ohio State in 1925 before going to the University of Pittsburgh as an assistant professor of philosophy in 1926. He remained at Pittsburgh his entire career; he was promoted to full professor in 1943 and retired in 1966. Before the arrival of Adolf GRÜNBAUM in 1960 and the many analytic philosophers who followed, Reiser's colleagues were Mont Robertson Gabbert and Richard Hope. He was a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and a member of Phi Beta Kappa and Sigma Xi. Reiser died on 6 June 1974 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Reiser's interests ranged across epistemology, philosophy of science, philosophy of mind, and metaphysics. An advocate of science and scientific humanism, he was an original signer of the first Humanist Manifesto in 1933 and also a signer of the second in 1973. Among his friends were Albert EINSTEIN and John DEWEY. Einstein suggested Reiser use "cosmic humanism" instead, probably because Reiser was no materialist and his search for a metaphysically satisfactory synthesis of the sciences, religions, and values took his cosmological speculations far beyond contemporary science. Alfred KORZYBSKI counted Reiser among his admirers, and Reiser incorporated much of Korzybski's theory of general semantics into his own philosophy, especially evident in *The Promise of Scientific Humanism toward a Unification of Scientific, Religious, Social and Economic Thought* (1940).

Beginning with *Philosophy and the Concepts of Modern Science* (1935) and continuing through a series of books over the next three decades, Reiser searched for an emergent naturalism that made room for higher levels of conscious mind above that of humanity. The world is evolving into "World Sensorium" or "psychosphere" of social and democratic (but not culturally pluralistic) mind, in concert with the higher consciousness familiar to mystics. Reiser advocated the development of "radio-eugenics," apparently a technology for manipulating an accelerated rate of positive mutation in humans. In his last large works, *Cosmic Humanism* (1966) and *Cosmic Humanism and World Unity* (1974), he develops his vision of pantheism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Alchemy of Light and Color (New York and London, 1928).

Humanistic Logic for the Mind in Action (New York, 1930).

Humanism and New World Ideals (Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1933).

Philosophy and the Concepts of Modern Science (New York, 1935).

The Promise of Scientific Humanism toward a Unification of Scientific, Religious, Social and Economic Thought (Boston, 1940).

A New Earth and a New Humanity (New York, 1942).

Planetary Democracy: An Introduction to Scientific Humanism and Applied Semantics, with Blodwen Davies (New York, 1944).

The World Sensorium: The Social Embryology of World Federation (New York, 1946).

World Philosophy: A Search for Synthesis (Pittsburgh, 1948).

Nature, Man, and God: A Synthesis of Pantheism and Scientific Humanism (Pittsburgh, 1951).

Unified Symbolism for World Understanding in Science, Including Bliss Symbols (Semantography) and Logic, Cybernetics and Semantics (Sydney, 1955).

The Integration of Human Knowledge: A Study of the Formal Foundations and the Social Implications of Unified Science (Boston, 1958).

Man's New Image of Man: An Interpretation

of the Development of American Philosophy from Puritanism to World Humanism (Pittsburgh, 1961).

Cosmic Humanism: A Theory of the Eight-dimensional Cosmos Based on Integrative Principles from Science, Religion, and Art (Cambridge, Mass., 1966).

This Holyest Erthe: The Glastonbury Zodiac and King Arthur's Camelot (London, 1974).

Cosmic Humanism and World Unity (New York, 1974).

The Intent of Creation: Man's Search for Cosmic Meaning (Lakemont, Georgia, 1978).

Further Reading

Who Was Who in Amer v6, Who's Who in Phil

Berman, Sanford I. *Logic and General Semantics: Writings of Oliver Reiser and Others* (San Francisco, 1989).

McGill, V. J. "Reiser's *The Promise of Scientific Humanism*," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 2 (1941): 108–11.

John R. Shook

RESCHER, Nicholas (1928–)

Nicholas Rescher was born on 15 July 1928 in the German town of Hagen, Westphalia. His family moved to the United States in 1938 for political reasons, as his father Erwin Hans Rescher was not sympathetic to National Socialism. Rescher studied mathematics and philosophy at Queens College in New York City (BA 1949), where he met teachers such as Herbert G. Bohnert (a disciple of Rudolf Carnap), Donald Davidson, and Carl Hempel. He then became a graduate student at Princeton University's philosophy department, where Alonzo Church strengthened Rescher's interest in logic. Rescher earned his PhD in philosophy in 1952. Following a period of military service, he spent some years at the Rand Corporation in California. Rescher's academic career began in 1957 at Lehigh University, where Rescher taught philosophy until 1961.

At Lehigh, Rescher laid the foundations of his first well-known publications on the history of Arabic logic, and also he met Adolf Grünbaum, who helped bring Rescher to the University of Pittsburgh as professor of philosophy in 1961, where he has been ever since. Grünbaum and Rescher formed the nucleus of Pittsburgh's philosophy department which soon became world famous, including such figures as Kurt Baier, Alan R. Anderson, Nuel D. Belnap, and Wilfrid Sellars. In 1964 Rescher founded the *American Philosophical Quarterly* (serving as editor until 1993), and later on the *History of Philosophy Quarterly*. Rescher also served as chair of the philosophy department and Director of the Center for Philosophy of Science, established in 1960. Rescher was awarded honorary degrees from Lehigh University, Queens College, Loyola University of Chicago, the University of Konstanz, and the Argentina National Autonomous University of Cordoba. He was President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1989–90, and also President of the American Catholic Philosophical Association, the Metaphysical Society, the G. W. Leibniz Society, and the Charles S. Peirce Society. In 1977 he was elected an honorary member of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. In 1983 he received an Alexander von Humboldt Prize by the German Federal Republic for distinguished scholarship in the humanities.

Rescher is a prominent defender of pragmatism, and an extremely prolific author (over one hundred books) in nearly every field in philosophy. In order to understand Rescher's thought we must remember that Leibniz has always been his favorite philosopher because – as Rescher often notes – of Leibniz's many-sidedness and his ability in utilizing logic and

mathematics towards philosophical ends. This differentiates Rescher from John DEWEY and other pragmatist thinkers, who deem symbolic tools less important. He is not an adherent of Leibniz's doctrine, but of his mode of philosophizing. In this sense he views the German philosopher as "the" master in the use of the formal resources of symbolic thought in the interest of the clarification and resolution of philosophical issues. Rescher received a typical analytic training, with teachers like Hempel and Church leaning towards the logical empiricist brand of the analytic tradition. On the other hand, already at the beginning of his career he tended to see formal logic not as an objective in itself, but rather as an instrument for pursuing larger, philosophical purposes.

Rescher's early interests shifted from the history of Arabic logic and philosophy, to logic and analytic philosophy of science, and then to epistemology, metaphysics, ethics, and a philosophy of science conceived in much broader terms. More recently his work has considered issues pertaining to social philosophy, political philosophy, and metaphilosophy. It should not be forgotten, however, that contrary to the tendencies dominating American contemporary thought, Rescher always maintained a constant interest in the history of philosophy. This is how he describes his broad vision of the philosophical work: "The period after the First World War had seen the diffusion of a more and more narrowly constricted view of the task of philosophy …. The spread of the logical positivist ideology so trenchantly articulated in A. J. Ayer's *Language, Truth, and Logic* typifies the culmination of this narrowing of views. Though I myself was largely reared in the ethos of this perspective, it gradually dawned on me that the mission of those of us who began to be active in philosophy after World War II was to reverse this impoverishment of our subject by the inter-war generation. Our task – as I saw it – was to work for a widened conception of the field, to effect broader synthesis, and to restore active concern for the historic problems of the traditional

range of philosophical deliberation. We were to restore a concern for wholeness and system – not by abandoning the penchant for exactness and detail of the pre-war generation, but by fusing details into meaningful structures …. Those who followed in the footsteps of Moore and Russell and Carnap often lost sight of the real problems – as these masters never did. I viewed this tendency with increasing distaste, and felt that while detailed technical studies were indeed indispensable, their utility was purely instrumental, and lay wholly in their bearing on the large traditional issues of the field." (1982)

Today pragmatism is currently gaining new strength in the American philosophical circles. The contemporary neopragmatism thriving in the United States has a tenor largely indebted to Richard RORTY, while Hilary PUTNAM's rediscovery of William JAMES's philosophy and of pragmatism in general is rather recent, and the comments on it are still scanty. Rescher's pragmatist stance is less well known than Rorty's even though it is older, for the reason that Rescher's thought is widely perceived as a form of idealism. His American colleagues seem to believe that Rescher's conceptual idealism is more important than his methodological pragmatism. In fact neither position may be distinguished in Rescher's thought by a neat border line, nor can either be deemed to be more important than the other. Rescher's philosophy is a sort of holistic system.

Rescher draws a distinction between a more flexible "pragmatism of the left" and a more conservative "pragmatism of the right." He notes once again that there seem to be as many pragmatisms as pragmatists. Usually, however, those who are interested in pragmatism from an historical point of view tend to forget that a substantial polarity is present in this tradition of thought. The "pragmatism of the left" or "subjective pragmatism" endorses a greatly enhanced cognitive relativism, while the "pragmatism of the right" or "objective pragmatism" sees the pragmatist stance as a source of cognitive security. Both positions are eager to assure plu-

ralism in the cognitive enterprise and in the concrete conduct of human affairs, but the meaning they attribute to the term "pluralism" is not the same. Rescher sees Charles S. PEIRCE, Clarence I. LEWIS and himself as adherents to the pragmatism of the right, with William James, F. S. C. Schiller, and Rorty as representatives of the pragmatism of the left. The "right" or "objective" pragmatism is based on what works impersonally for the realization of some objective purpose, in an impersonal way. In Rescher's view, pragmatism, thus, is essentially a venture in validating objective standards.

But what does the "pragmatism of the right" really come to? Parochial diversity is something that a postmodern pragmatist like Rorty gladly accepts in order to achieve results which are, at the same time, subjectivistic and relativistic. On the other hand, even Rescher sees practical efficacy as the cornerstone of our endeavors, but at the same time he takes efficacy to be the best instrument we have at our disposal for achieving objectivity.

The social world created by people asks that we constantly live having some purposes in mind, and objective pragmatism is just concerned with the effective and efficient achievement of purpose (what works). However, the purposes that Rescher talks about are not mine, or yours: they are not, in a word, correlated to the particular tastes of individuals or particular social groups. They can be rather taken to be all collective human endeavors whose rational roots are ultimately reducible to the nature of human condition as such. This means that all people happen to share a natural environment to which they give order resorting to their rational-intellectual capacities. Of course the largely autonomous social world assumes different shapes according to the different cultural traditions; but, still, we are somewhat compelled to assume a broad "principle of correspondence," according to which human purposes match the inputs that are set by the conditions of homo sapiens, as biological evolution on this planet and social evolution in our cultural environment have shaped us.

Rescher's kind of pragmatism leads to objectivity, in the sense that objective constraint, and not personal preference, is the fundamental premise of our cognitive goals. What we mean to achieve in starting the process of empirical knowledge is control over the natural environment of which we are ourselves essential part, and this control, in turn, may be both active (interactionistic) and passive (predictive). Although he openly declares his idealistic stance, Rescher recognizes the presence of a "reality principle" that is practically forced upon us just in view of our belonging in the natural world, and despite the fact that we play, in that same world, a very special role (quite different, that is, from the role played by stones, stars, or animals). Our control over nature, in turn, can never be total. We create the social–linguistic world, but not natural reality. It should be admitted that we have access to natural reality only through social and linguistic tools, but it is fallacious to draw, from this premise, the conclusion that people create the whole of reality, both social and natural. Any clear border line between the social and the natural world is therefore illusory. Nature imposes inescapable constraints upon us; but, at the same time, people always see nature from their point of view, as their condition of "accessibility" to nature itself. However, there is no need to conceive of this condition in purely individualistic and solipsistic terms: it rather pertains to the entire human species.

Different human groups categorize reality in different ways, even though these differences are never so great as to prevent a reasonably good communication among them. So we are bound to ask: How are these communal projects set up, given the inevitable difference among the many groups that actually form humankind? Can we really find a common basis which is shared by all human beings as such, so preventing the risk that talk about communal projects is just wishful thinking? According to Rescher we certainly can, and the basic reason is that human social life is a

rational reaction of self-adaptation to the natural environment from which social groups themselves evolved. Thus, objective pragmatism claims that (1) our social–linguistic world evolved out of natural reality; (2) this social–linguistic world acquires an increasing autonomy; (3) between the social and the natural worlds there is no ontological line of separation, but just a functional one; (4) however, the accessibility to natural reality is only granted by the tools that the social–linguistic world provides us with; (5) this means that our knowledge of natural reality is always tentative and mediated by our conceptual capacities; (6 there is no need to draw relativistic conclusions from this situation, because the presence of "an objective reality that underlies the data at hand" puts objective constraints on personal desires that we are able to overcome at the verbal level, but not in the sphere of rational deliberations implementing actions.

Rescher stresses that the conceptual apparatus we employ itself makes a creative contribution to our view of the world, and his holistic (or systemic) stance is clearly influenced by Hegel and F. H. Bradley. It should be noted that Rescher immediately tied these idealistic insights to the philosophy of science, leading him to the conclusion that scientific discovery, Galileo notwithstanding, is not a matter of simply "reading" what is written in the book of nature, but is rather the outcome of a process of interaction between nature on the one side, and human mind on the other. The contribution that mind gives to the construction of "our science" is at least as important as that provided by nature: no science, as we know it, would be possible without the contributions of the mind.

In the early 1970s Rescher launched his project of rehabilitating a conceptual idealism which maintains both that we understand the real in mind-invoking terms of reference, and that ontological materialism is correct in holding that the human mind and its operations are ultimately rooted (be it causally or superveniently) in the machinations of physical process. On the one hand Rescher accepts the Kantian view that our knowledge is strongly determined by the a priori elements present in our conceptual schemes, and that they indeed have an essential function as long as our interpretation of reality is at stake. On the other hand, however, he tends to see these aprioristic elements as resting on a contingent basis, and validated on pragmatic considerations.

For Rescher, the mind makes a great contribution towards shaping reality-as-we-see-it, but the very presence of the mind itself can be explained by adopting an evolutionary point of view. There is no neat distinction between ontology and epistemology in Rescher's works, because of his holism and his view that the separation between factual and conceptual (synthetic/analytic) is not sharp, but rather fuzzy. Yet there is another reason, which is connected to the ontological opacity of the real world. We can have access to the unconceptualized world only through conceptualization, which is, in turn, the key feature that characterizes our cultural evolution.

Rescher never diminishes the importance of biological evolution, which is specifically geared to the natural world and, after all, is supposed to precede our cultural development from the chronological point of view. The fact is, however, that it is cultural evolution that distinguishes us from all other living beings that happen to share our planet with us. Just for this reason Rescher claims that idealism, broadly speaking, is the doctrine that reality is somehow mind-correlative or mind-coordinated. However, his specifically conceptual idealism stands in contrast to an ontological doctrine to the effect that mind somehow constitutes or produces the world's material. Scientists will not find in his philosophy the basic anti-scientific attitude endorsed by the classical idealists and some contemporary neo-idealist thinkers, who deem natural science unimportant because it deals with a second-level reality that is created by the human (or divine) mind (or spirit).

If the real (mind-independent) world exists, a distinction may be drawn between nature-as-we-understand-it, and nature itself. Is this dis-

tinction ontological or epistemological? To answer this question, we should be able to trace a line of separation between ontology and epistemology neater than the one Rescher is inclined to accept. Rescher's suggestion, however, would be that our conceptual machinery is at work even when we try to gain access to nature itself because our access to the world is always mind-involving. It might be objected that there is a real distinction, because we know that our history is both biological and cultural, although our cultural life needs a preexistent biological basis in order to develop. However, not much can be said about nature itself. By using our scientific instruments and theories we are able to shed some light on the natural history of the earth (and of the universe at large), but this natural history is always ours, because it is conducted by following our mental patterns and categories and by using the scientific instruments and theories that we build. We can push our sight so far as to imagine an era when no categorization of the world took place because no men were around. Still, even in this case we must have recourse to categorization just to imagine a situation of this kind (which can be presumed to have been real because, after all, evolutionary epistemology gives good reasons for assuming that humankind was not present on our planet since the beginning). Any "absolutely objective" ontology is then left in the background, because precious little can be known about it and it represents a *via negativa* that does not take us very far.

What can we possibly think about this natural reality in itself, and how can we say what it is like? Even for imagining a world totally devoid of human presence, we must use human concepts. As we said previously, conceptualization is not an option we can get rid of, but a built-in component of our nature as human beings. According to Rescher, we can only distinguish between the *that* and the *what* of this purported mind/thought independent reality. In this case, we are sensibly entitled to claim *that* it exists, while simply rejecting the

challenge to specify *what* it is like. Going back to the example of science, we know for sure *that* there are errors in present-day science, but cannot say *what* they are. Rescher's conception of scientific realism is thus strictly tied to his version of the distinction between reality-as-such and reality-as-we-think-of-it. He argues that there is indeed little justification for believing that our present-day natural science describes the world as it really is, and this fact does not allow us to endorse an absolute and unconditioned scientic realism. In other words, if we claim that the theoretical entities of current science correctly pick up the "furniture of the world," we run into the inevitable risk of hypostatizing something – our present science – which is an historically contingent product of humankind, valid only this particular period of its cultural evolution.

As for political and ethical issues, if we want to be pluralists in the true spirit of Western democratic thought, we must abandon the quest for a monolithic and rational order, together with the purpose of maximizing the number of people who approve what an authority like the government does. On the contrary, we should have in mind an acquiescence-seeking society where the goal is that of minimizing the number of people who strongly disapprove of what is being done. We should never forget that the idea that all should think alike is both dangerous and anti-democratic, as history shows with plenty of examples. Since consensus is an absolute unlikely to be achieved in concrete life, it is desirable but not essential; consensus is no more than one positive factor that has to be weighed along with many others.

Both Rescher's epistemology and political/ethical philosophy rest on his skepticism about idealization. In neither case we can get perfect solutions to our problems, short of supposing some actually unattainable idealization. We have to be fallibilists in epistemology because we are emplaced in suboptimal conditions, where our knowledge is not (and cannot be either) perfected. We have to be realistic and settle for the best imperfect estimates we

can obtain. Since we cannot realize a Habermas-style idealized consensus, we must settle for what people will go along with, i.e. "acquiesce in." This may not be exactly what most or many of us would ideally like but, in any case, if we insist on "perfection or nothing," we shall get either nothing or a situation very far away from our ideal standards. In the sociopolitical context, "realism" means settling for the least of the evils because, as history teaches, disaster will follow if we take the line that only perfection is good enough.

According to Rescher, the overcoming of analytic philosophy's ill-conceived foundationalism means neither the end of philosophy itself, nor the refusal to recognize its cognitive value. He agrees with Rorty's assertion that philosophers cannot detach themselves from history or forsake the everyday and scientific conceptions that provide the stage setting of their discipline. But, nevertheless, he claims that the dissolution of philosophy is a deeply wrong answer. Skeptics of all sorts would like to liberate humankind from the need of doing philosophy, pointing out that it has thus far been unable to answer our questions in a proper way. Rescher, to the contrary, invites us to take sides because abandoning philosophical subjects is a leap into nothingness. Of course we can escape into the history of philosophy conceived of in merely philological terms, or into technical minutiae, but this is tantamount to cognitive vacuity. The need to philosophize stems from our very nature of inquiring beings, and is built in the cultural evolutionary heritage that we all share.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Development of Arabic Logic (Pittsburgh, 1964).

Essays in Philosophical Analysis (Pittsburgh, 1969).

Many-Valued Logic (New York, 1969).

Scientific Explanation (New York, 1970).

Temporal Logic, with Alasdair Urquhart (New York, 1971).

Conceptual Idealism (Oxford, 1973).

The Coherence Theory of Truth (Oxford, 1973).

Methodological Pragmatism (Oxford, 1977).

Peirce's Philosophy of Science (Notre Dame, Ind., 1978).

Scientific Progress: A Philosophical Essay on the Economics of Research in Natural Science (Oxford, 1978).

Induction (Pittsburgh, 1980).

The Limits of Science (Berkeley, Cal., 1984).

The Strife of Systems (Pittsburgh, 1985).

Scientific Realism (Dordrecht, 1987).

Ethical Idealism (Berkeley, Cal., 1987).

A Useful Inheritance: Evolutionary Epistemology in Philosophical Perspective (Lanham, Md., 1989).

A System of Pragmatic Idealism, 3 vols (Princeton, N.J., 1992–4).

Pluralism: Against the Demand for Consensus (Oxford, 1993).

Philosophical Standardism (Pittsburgh, 1994).

Luck: The Brilliant Randomness of Everyday Life (New York, 1995; Pittsburgh, 2000).

Process Metaphysics (Albany, N.Y., 1996).

The Limits of Science (Pittsburgh, 1999).

Realistic Pragmatism (Albany, N.Y., 2000).

Epistemology: On the Scope and Limits of Knowledge (Albany, N.Y., 2003).

Realism and Pragmatic Epistemology (Pittsburgh, 2005).

Scholastic Meditations (Washington, D.C., 2005).

Other Relevant Works

"Curriculum Operis" in *Philosophers on Their Own Work*, vol. 9, ed. A. Mercier and M. Svilar (Frankfurt am Main, 1982), pp. 199–236.

Enlightenting Journey: The Autobiography of an American Scholar (Lanham, Md., 2002).

"Pragmatism and Practical Rationality," *Contemporary Pragmatism* 1 (2004): 43–60.

"Pragmatic Idealism and Metaphysical Realism," in *A Companion to Pragmatism,*

ed. John R. Shook and Joseph Margolis (Oxford, 2005).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v9*

Almeder, Robert, ed. *Praxis and Reason: Studies in the Philosophy of Nicholas Rescher* (Washington, D.C., 1982).

———, "The Limits of Natural Science: Rescher's View," in *Science at Century's End*, ed. M. Carrier (Pittsburgh, 2000), pp. 40–60.

Bottani, Andrea. *Verità e coerenza: suggio su'll epistemologia coerentista di Nicholas Rescher* (Milan, 1989).

Coomann, Heinrich. *Die Kohaerenztheorie der Wahrheit: Eine kritische Darstellung der Theorie Reschers von Ihrem historischen Hintergrund* (Frankfurt am Main, 1983).

Marsonet, Michele. *The Primacy of Practical Reason: An Essay on Nicholas Rescher's Philosophy* (Lanham, Md., 1996).

Sosa, Ernest, ed. *The Philosophy of Nicholas Rescher: Discussion and Replies* (Dordrecht, 1979).

"Symposium on *A System of Pragmatic Idealism*," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 54 (1994): 377–457.

Triplett, Timm. "Rescher's Metaphilosophy," *Metaphilosophy* 30 (1999): 209–30.

Weber, Michel, ed. *Rescher and Process Philosophy: Critiques and Replies* (Berne and New York, 2004).

Wüstehube, Azel, and Michael Quante, eds. *Pragmatic Idealism: Critical Essays on Nicholas Rescher's System of Pragmatic Idealism* (Amsterdam, 1998).

Michele Marsonet

RICOEUR, Paul (1913–)

Paul Ricoeur was born on 27 February 1913, just outside Lyons, France. His mother, Florentine, died when he was seven months old, and his father, Jules Ricoeur, was killed during the Battle of the Marne in 1915. Both Paul and his sister, Alice, were thereafter raised by their paternal grandparents in Rennes. In 1931 he became engaged to Simone Lejas, whom he married in 1935. Also in 1931, Ricoeur received his *agregation* from the Sorbonne in Paris, a credential that entitles the recipient to a guaranteed position in the French university system until retirement. His first teaching post as professor of philosophy was in 1935 at a lycée in Alsace, on the border separating France and Germany. However, it was during the war years that Ricoeur found the opportunity to become immersed in serious philosophical reflection, for on 7 June 1940 he became a prisoner of war until the cessation of hostilities in 1945.

In 1948, three years after his release, Ricoeur became the *Maitre de conferences* in the history of philosophy at the University of Strasbourg, and on 29 April 1950 he received his Doctoratés-lettres from the Sorbonne. In 1956 Ricoeur secured the highly coveted and eminent Chair of General Philosophy at the Sorbonne. In the 1950s and early 1960s he also visited the United States to lecture at Haverford, Columbia, and Yale. In 1967 Ricoeur departed the Sorbonne to take a position at the newly built University of Paris X at Nanterre, and also followed Paul TILLICH as the John Nuveen Chair of Divinity at the University of Chicago. During these years he divided his time between France and the United States. He became so influential in the United States that in 1978 Ricoeur was elected as a foreign member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He continued to teach up to two quarters per year at Chicago until he was made John Nuveen Professor Emeritus of Divinity in 1991. His last major position in France was Dean of Humanities at Nanterre, from which he retired in 1980.

Ricoeur has received many honorary doctorates from universities around the world. He also has won numerous awards, including the Dante Prize from the University of Florence in 1988, the Karl Jaspers Prize from the University of Heidelberg in 1989, the Leopold Lucas Prize from the University of Tübingen in 1990, and the French Academy Grand Prize for Philosophy in 1991. He delivered the prestigious Gifford Lectures at Edinburgh University in 1986.

In a career that spanned seventy years, Paul Ricoeur established himself as one of the most prolific and enduring philosophers of the twentieth century. His most significant and noteworthy contribution has been in the area of *hermeneutics*: a school of thought that emphasizes the centrality of *interpretation* as a means to self-knowledge and awareness. In formulating his particular brand of hermeneutic philosophy, Ricoeur drew upon a range of influences that include phenomenology, psychoanalysis, existentialism, and Anglo-American analytic philosophy. What emerged was a philosophical method, the principal aim of which was to challenge the assumption that existing subjects can possess an immediate awareness of both themselves and the world. Ricoeur saw that we are ineluctably rooted in sociocultural contexts, and only by way of interpreting the signs, symbols, narratives, and myths of the historical circumstance in which we find ourselves, can we acquire an understanding of who we are. Ricoeur rejects the assumptions of empiricism, realism, and transcendentalism in favour of a theory of subjectivity and consciousness that underscores the symbolically mediated nature of human experience.

Although his early works, *Freedom and Nature* (1950) and *Fallible Man* (1960), were dedicated to a study of the human will and its limitations – a project inspired by his reading of the existential philosophy of Gabriel Marcel and Karl Jaspers while in captivity during the war – his writings since 1960 sought to highlight how, because the world shows up through the linguistic articulations of humanity, we are first and foremost beings who interpret and are interpreted in turn. Throughout *The Symbolism of Evil* (1960), *Freud and Philosophy* (1965), *The Rule of Metaphor* (1975), the three volumes of the magisterial *Time and Narrative* (1983–5), and *Oneself as Another* (1990), which many perceive to be the most refined statement of his philosophy to date, one finds an exploration of the various ways language and interpretation function as that through which both the world and other beings become manifest to us.

Throughout these books, Ricoeur argues that *all* self-understanding and comprehension – philosophical, scientific, and religious – is the product of a long *textual* analysis that seeks layers of hidden meaning that everyday knowledge obscures from view. This notion of the *text* is perhaps Ricoeur's most seminal and influential theory and is also the key to grasping his overall philosophical enterprise. At its most simple, a text is described as "any discourse fixed in writing" (1981, p. 145). *Discourse*, as defined by Ricoeur, distinguishes itself from theories of language, such as is advanced by structuralism, that study words and signs in isolation from the speaking subject. Discourse occurs when a speaker actually says something to someone about something, marking an event that can be historically recalled. In opposition to structuralism's emphasis on language as object, Ricoeur's hermeneutics specifies the act of speaking as well as the ability of the speaker to generate new and surprising combinations of sentences to suit particular contexts.

In challenging the presumptions of those who think of language as an impersonal system, Ricoeur attempts to show how intricately cohesive the dialectic between language and being actually is. Only when language is understood as that through which humans realize their ultimate potential, as well as that by virtue of which they can engage the world most comprehensively, is its essential function revealed. Discourse is tied to the world insofar as it has a concrete reference towards which it

intends. In speaking, individuals intentionally reach out to someone with a view to making something happen. To employ the language of speech-act theory, individuals do things with words. This fact suggests that because discourse occurs as an event having intentional content, it is meaningful. Consequently, if discourse is realized as an event it is meaningful, and the meaning endures after the event has passed.

According to Ricoeur, our ability to understand an event of discourse is facilitated by the production of what he calls "the work" (1981, p. 136). Whenever discourse is laboured with a view to giving it an organized and coherent unity, it becomes a work. In this process, language is styled until it takes a form that can be repeatedly recognized and subject to scrutiny. What was once a fleeting event may, after such styling, take the form of a literary document, or of some other genre. All symbolic cultural monuments testify to this process; their unity and meaning bear witness to the creative impulses of those seek to impose what Ricoeur calls "rationality of meaning" on "the irrationality of the event" (1981, p. 137). What such symbols and monuments point to is thus the existence of authors whose lives were devoted to producing a "work of language" (1981, p. 138).

One of Ricoeur's most striking claims is that everything we know of ourselves and our world is mediated through works of discourse, whether they be scientific, sacred, political, or literary. This fact implies that all knowledge is knowledge of another in so far as the texture of our beliefs is woven from the various works we have read and studied, works that are the progeny of those who sought to render an event meaningful. This conclusion is also true of those for whom sacred symbols are the key to self-understanding, for a symbol bears witness not to some immediate relationship to reality but to an artisan's creative effort to impose meaning on the transient flow of discursive events.

What is unique to Ricoeur's philosophy of interpretation and fundamentally separates him from his predecessors in the hermeneutic tradition is the belief that once discourse is fixed in text, narrative, or symbol, it then acquires independence from the psychological intent of its author. Whereas the proponents of Romantic hermeneutics contended that the job of interpretation was studying texts in order to recover the authorial intention behind them, Ricoeur says "thanks to writing, the 'world' of the *text* may explode the world of the *author*" (1981, p. 139). All writing or textuality, defined as any work that seeks to give unity to a set of disparate events, detaches itself from its "psycho-sociological conditions of production and thereby opens itself to an unlimited series of readings, themselves situated in different socio-cultural conditions" (1981, p. 139). Once completed a text acquires *distance* from both its author and original context, resulting not only in a loss of authorial intent ("what the author *really* meant to say"), but also in the potential to be appropriated by others in historically foreign contexts.

The most obvious consequence of this detachment from original authorial intent, of course, is that once a text explodes the world of the author and gathers a life of its own, it can mean different things to different readers at different times, depending on the historical circumstances in which it is studied. Ricoeur famously referred to this detachment of texts from their original contexts as the "conflict of interpretations." Due to the fact that a text will be interpreted according to the psycho-sociological makeup of whoever is reading it at a given time, it contains within itself what Ricoeur terms a "surplus of meaning," a capacity to produce an endless stream of interpretations. For example, a segment of scripture will appear differently in the readings of poets, religious scholars, scientists, or feminists. However, a consequence of any one of these readers' inability to recover the document's "psycho-sociological conditions of production," none of them will exhaust its power to generate a plurality of meanings in diverse contexts.

What the text offers us, thus, is not unfettered access to the psychodynamics of the author, but a possible mode of what the

German philosopher Martin Heidegger calls being-in-the-world. If it is not possible to go behind the text, the work, or the symbol, to recover its original provenance and meaning, readers may yet surrender to the world that it opens up *before* them. Ricoeur follows G. W. F. Hegel and Sigmund Freud in believing that the self can never attain absolute consciousness, as the Cartesian tradition of philosophy maintained, but that "we understand ourselves only through the long detour of the signs of humanity deposited in cultural works" (1981, p. 143). From this point of view, self-identity is a process of discovery, one that requires comprehending the human heritage captured in textual and symbolic form. To come to know oneself demands an exposure to the multiple worlds that every text can disclose. Hence, for Ricoeur, what the text offers is not simply an insight into a distant world, but an invitation to actualize in one's own life the possibilities such a world purveys.

Ricoeur's hermeneutic philosophy emphasizes how, by shifting focus from sign to discourse, the creative powers of language become fundamental to the process of self-formation. In understanding oneself and the world through the texts of others, one is "from start to finish a being-interpreted" (1974, p. 11). Language and semantics cannot properly be separated from life and selfhood as an object of analysis. Only through language is life in all its potential and plenitude experienced.

From 1960 to 1980, Ricoeur advanced his theory of hermeneutic textuality to great acclaim, especially in the United States, where he was considered a mediating force in the cultural war that then raged between proponents of structuralism and deconstruction. However, with the appearance in the 1980s of the monumental three-volume *Time and Narrative*, Ricoeur emerged as a philosophical star, not only in the US and France, but worldwide. The erudition and acuity evident throughout his books impressed a wide variety of scholars and earned Ricoeur a readership far beyond the confines of philosophy. What made *Time and Narrative* so significant and popular was its extension of the theory of the text to issues of narratives and life-stories. In highlighting the philosophical importance of storytelling, Ricoeur showed that what philosophers often dismiss or disregard as unfit for serious appraisal is in fact pivotal for an understanding of how self-consciousness is constituted.

The central thesis of *Time and Narrative*, and of its sequel, *Oneself as Another*, is that, to play on the Socratic maxim, *an un-narrated life is not worth living*. What had motivated Ricoeur's work on textuality was the belief that the only way to know oneself was through the artistic and linguistic creations of others. The need to have an identity is born thus of a desire to recognize oneself in the marks and traces of great works of imagination. The relationship to psychoanalysis is obvious: genuine self-awareness demands a relinquishing of ego-consciousness with a view to liberating latent unconscious energy, a process achieved through the power of symbolic interpretation. In *Freud and Philosophy*, Ricoeur had argued that the psychoanalytic method extended to experience as a whole, and this by virtue of the fact that *all* self-cognition is predicated upon interpretation of the textual and symbolic network of references that precede consciousness. Understanding is never a matter of grasping a literal truth, but of unfolding the multiple layers of meaning that comprise the world of the text – a process equivalent to psychoanalysis; this accounts for Ricoeur's naming Freud (along with Marx and Nietzsche) among his "masters of suspicion," a term that expresses the need for constant vigilance against the seduction of the literal.

In his theory of narrative identity, Ricoeur synthesizes this reading of Freud and the theory of textual identity as outlined above. His primary objective, in so doing, is to demonstrate how a life is comprised in large measure by fiction or narrative. If Plato had seen fit to denounce the artist for dabbling in illusion at the expense of the real, Ricoeur

challenges such a perception by dramatically underscoring that stories and literature are integral to the process of self-formation. He thereby acknowledges the wisdom of Freud's assertion that the stories we tell of ourselves are, in many ways, more important than the lives we actually lead.

Although each and every self belongs from birth to a matrix of stories – personal, cultural, social, and national – it is only when such stories are recounted and considered in the light of one's *own* narrative that they can constitute a *life*-story. From this perspective, personal identity is the process whereby individuals take responsibility for the narrative coherence they bring to the hitherto unrecounted stories of which they are a part. Such, argues Ricoeur, is "the pre-history of the story told, the beginning of which is chosen by the narrator" (1991, p. 30).

Being a narrator of one's own life, on the model Ricoeur advances, is a process whereby selves continually attempt to render concordant the discordant flux of stories that figure as their background horizon. From a hermeneutic perspective, becoming self-aware is an open-ended project, one that evolves according to a dialectic of "sedimentation and innovation" where subjects act as mediators between the actual world to which they already belong (sedimentation) and the possibilities that unfold through engagement with the world of the text (innovation). By facilitating readers in their endeavours to make sense of the vast network of narratives in which they have been inserted, such imaginative, or what Ricoeur prefers to call, "semantic" innovation, teaches that we can become "the hero *of our own story*, without actually becoming the *author of our own life*" (1991, p. 32). For even though we cannot choose our own background horizon, we can decide how best to interpret it and the extent to which we either limit or expand its possibilities. Hence, for Ricoeur, "we are justified in speaking of life as a story in its nascent state, and so of life as *an activity and a passion in search of a narrative*" (1991, p. 29).

Most commentary on Ricoeur since the publication of *Time and Narrative* and *Oneself as Another* has focussed on the ethical implications of his theory of narrative selfhood. In creating a narrative identity, readers are forced to choose between multiple interpretations latent within the text. This need to choose demands both a surrendering of one's ego to the text, as well as a decision concerning which imaginary world ought to be appropriated by the self; this suggests that while a text may no longer be guided by the intention of its author, it nevertheless continues to impose on readers "a vision of the world that is never ethically neutral" (1988, p. 249). Interpretation involves an ethical moment whereby subjects are invited to admit into the fabric of their lives narratives that may appear, at least initially, unsettling and alien.

By fully exposing ourselves to the forgotten stories of the "anonymous forces of history" (1988, p. 205), we bear witness, in our own personal narratives, to the memory of suffering and dispossession that all officially sanctioned narratives tend to obscure. This process of "telling otherwise" (1999, p. 9), or of appropriating the world of the victim as distinct from that of the victor, signals for Ricoeur the vital transition from the space of the text to the ethical–political sphere of action and justice. Moreover, this process underscores how, at the heart of the hermeneutic impulse, lies a "duty to remember" (1999, p. 11), not simply to perpetuate the past but to ensure that past wrongs are not repeated in the future. For without a sense in one's own life of a world in which suffering is the norm, there is every chance of a return to horror. Accordingly, appropriating the world of the victim represents, in Ricoeur's view, the best hope for inoculating humanity against future disasters.

Ricoeur's hermeneutic philosophy is a long meditation on the necessity of ensuring that collective/personal identity does not become subject to ideological manipulation. By emphasizing the centrality of interpretation in the

process of self-formation and understanding, Ricoeur illustrates the importance of suspicion in relation to what appears as truth or reality. In the case of the subject, Ricoeur has shown how a life that is instructed and informed by literature and stories – a narrated life – results not merely in a self open to the possible, but a self capable of acting for the realization of a just future. Ricoeur is the contemporary thinker who has thoroughly convinced us of the ethical power of language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Gabriel Marcel and Karl Jaspers. Philosophie du mystère et philosophie du paradoxe (Paris, 1948).

Le Volontaire et l'involontaire (Paris, 1950). Trans. E. V. Kohak, *Freedom and Nature: The Voluntary and the Involuntary* (Evanston, Ill., 1966).

Histoire et verité (Paris, 1955). Trans. Charles Kelbley, *History and Truth* (Evanston, 1965).

L'Homme fallible (Paris, 1960). Trans. Charles Kelbley, *Fallible Man* (Chicago, 1965).

La Symbolique du mal (Paris, 1960). Trans. Emerson Buchanan, *The Symbolism of Evil* (New York, 1967).

De l'interpretation: Essai sur Freud (Paris, 1965). Trans. Dennis Savage, *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation* (New Haven, Conn., 1970).

The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics, ed. D. Ihde, trans. Willis Domingo et al. (Evanston, Ill., 1974).

Political and Social Essays, ed. David Stewart and Joseph Bien, trans. Donald Stewart et al. (Athens, Ohio, 1974).

La Metaphore vive (Paris, 1975). Trans. R. Czerny with K. McLaughlin and J. Costello, *The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-Disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language* (Toronto, 1978).

Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning (Fort Worth, Tex., 1976).

Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences, ed. and trans. J. B. Thompson (Cambridge, UK, 1981).

Temps et recit, 3 vols (Paris, 1983–5). Trans. K. MacLaughlin and D. Pellauer, *Time and Narrative*, 3 vols (Chicago, 1984–8).

Soi-même comme un autre (Paris, 1990). Trans. K. Blamey, *Oneself as Another* (Chicago, 1992).

La Critique et la conviction: entretien avec François Azouvi et Marc de Launay (Paris, 1995). Trans. K. Blamey, *Critique and Conviction* (Cambridge, UK, 1998).

Le Juste (Paris, 1995). Trans. D. Pellauer, *The Just* (Chicago, 2003).

Le Juste II (Paris, 2001).

La Mémoire, l'histoire, l'oubli (Paris, 2000). Trans. K. Blamey and D. Pellauer, *Memory, History, Forgetting* (Chicago, 2004).

What Makes Us Think? A Neuroscientist and a Philosopher Argue about Ethics, Human Nature, and the Brain, with Jean-Pierre Changeux, trans. M. B. DeBevoise (Princeton, N.J., 2000).

Parcours de la reconnaissance: trois études (Paris, 2004).

Sur la traduction (Paris, 2004).

Other Relevant Works

Husserl: An Analysis of His Phenomenology, ed. and trans. E. G. Ballard and L. E. Embree (Evanston, Ill., 1967).

The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur: An Anthology of His Work, ed. C. Regan and D. Stewart (Boston, 1978).

"The Creativity of Language," in *Dialogues With Contemporary Continental Thinkers*, ed. Richard Kearney (Manchester, UK, 1984), pp. 17–35.

"Myth as the Bearer of Possible Worlds," in *Dialogues With Contemporary Continental Thinkers*, ed. Richard Kearney (Manchester, UK, 1984), pp. 36–43.

Lectures on Ideology and Utopia, ed. G. H. Taylor (New York, 1986).

"Life in Quest of Narrative," in *On Paul Ricoeur: Narrative and Interpretation*, ed. David Wood (London and New York, 1991), pp. 20–33.

"Narrative Identity," in *On Paul Ricoeur: Narrative and Interpretation*, ed. David Wood (London and New York, 1991), pp. 188–200.

A Ricoeur Reader: Reflection and Imagination, ed. M. Valdes (Toronto, 1991).

"Self as Ipse," in *Freedom and Interpretation: The Oxford Amnesty Lectures 1992*, ed. B. Johnson (New York, 1993).

Figuring the Sacred: Religion, Narrative, and Imagination, ed. Mark I. Wallace (Minneapolis, 1995).

"Fragility and Responsibility," in *Paul Ricoeur: The Hermeneutics of Action*, ed. Richard Kearney (London, 1996), pp. 15–22.

"Memory and Forgetting," in *Questioning Ethics: Contemporary Debates in Philosophy*, ed. Mark Dooley and Richard Kearney (London and New York, 1999), pp. 5–11.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*

Clark, S. H. *Paul Ricoeur* (London and New York, 1990).

Dosse, François. *Paul Ricoeur: les sens d'une vie* (Paris, 1997).

Greisch, Jean. *Paul Ricoeur: L'itinérance du sens* (Paris, 2001).

Hahn, Lewis E., ed. *The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur* (Chicago, 1995). Contains Ricoeur's autobiography and bibliography.

Ihde, Don. *Hermeneutic Phenomenology: The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur* (Evanston, Ill., 1971).

Kaplan, David. *Ricoeur's Critical Theory* (New York, 2003).

Kearney, Richard. *Poetics of Modernity: Toward a Hermeneutic Imagination* (New Jersey, 1995).

———, *On Stories* (London and New York, 2002).

Kemp, T. P., and D. Rasmussen. *The Narrative Path: The Later Works of Paul Ricoeur* (Cambridge, Mass., 1989).

Madison, G. B. *The Hermeneutics of Postmodernity: Figures and Themes* (Bloomington, Ind., 1988).

Reagan, Charles E. *Paul Ricoeur: His Life and His Work* (Chicago, 1996).

Simms, Karl. *Paul Ricoeur* (London and New York, 2002).

Van Leeuwen, T. M. *The Surplus of Meaning: Ontology and Eschatology in the Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur* (Amsterdam, 1981).

Venema, Henry I. *Identifying Selfhood: Imagination, Narrative, and Hermeneutics in the Thought of Paul Ricoeur* (New York, 2000).

Wall, John, William Schweiker, and W. David Hall, eds. *Paul Ricoeur and Contemporary Moral Thought* (London and New York, 2002).

Mark Dooley

RIEBER, Charles Henry (1866–1948)

Charles H. Rieber was born on 19 August 1866 in Placerville, California, not far from the birthplace of Josiah ROYCE. He studied at the University of California at Berkeley, where he received a BA degree in 1888. During his undergraduate years, Rieber was influenced by idealist philosopher George H. HOWISON. After graduation, he spent a decade in the California public school system, first as a teacher of mathematics, then as a principal. In 1890 he married painter Winifred Smith. When Rieber was accepted for graduate studies in philosophy at

Harvard University in 1898, he and Winifred already had four children. At Harvard, Rieber studied with William JAMES, George H. PALMER, George SANTAYANA, and Hugo MÜNSTERBERG. He earned an MA degree in 1899, and a PhD in philosophy in 1900, writing a dissertation on "Tactual Illusions: An Experimental Proof of the Spatial Harmony of Sight and Touch." While he was studying at Harvard, his wife painted several celebrated portraits of department professors, including James, Royce, and Palmer.

Rieber spent two years at Stanford University as an assistant professor of logic from 1901 to 1903. In 1903 Howison invited him to join the philosophy faculty of the University of California at Berkeley. By 1905 he was an associate professor of logic, and was promoted to full professor of logic in 1910. Organizer of the still ongoing University Summer Session, Rieber served as the program's head from 1911 to 1916. In 1922 he moved south to become a professor of philosophy and first Dean of the College of Letters and Science at the university's Southern Branch in Los Angeles, while also serving as Associate Director of University Extension. Until 1936 he served as professor of philosophy and Dean. He was instrumental in helping to establish the modern university known as the University of California at Los Angeles, and he was the first to refer to it as such. Rieber died on 28 February 1948 in Los Angeles, California. In 1963 UCLA dedicated a new student housing building in his honor, named Charles Rieber Hall.

Rieber was an able administrator, and taught throughout his career. His teaching centered on logic, yet he also offered courses in the philosophy of religion and the philosophy of literature. Given his influences at Berkeley and Harvard, he emerged an exponent of modern idealism, with signature elements drawn from Howison and Royce. He was also sympathetic to Kant's epistemology and Fichte's idealistic metaphysics. However, his affinity for mathematics and logic led some colleagues (who were familiar with his teaching) to argue that

Rieber's work is most similar to Plato's idealism with its injunction that math and logic are the conceptual instruments through which humans gain unmediated access to both truth and divinity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Pragmatism and the A Priori," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 1 (1904): 72–91.
"Is Inversion a Valid Inference?" *Mind* 22 (1913): 258–9.
Footnotes to Formal Logic (Berkeley, Cal., 1918).
"One of the Things that Abide," in *Lectures in Philosophy, Delivered in Grace Scripps Clark Hall During the Months of March and April, 1929* (Claremont, Cal., 1929).

Further Reading
Who was Who in Amer v2

David Justin Hodge

RIEPE, Dale Maurice (1918–)

Dale Riepe was born on 22 June 1918 in Tacoma, Washington. He received his BA in philosophy from the University of Washington in 1944. He did his graduate work at the University of Michigan, receiving his MA in 1946 and his PhD in philosophy in 1952. He spent the academic year 1951–2 on a Fulbright award in India and completed his dissertation on "Early Indian Philosophical Naturalism." Among his teachers at Michigan were William K. FRANKENA, Charles STEVENSON, Arthur W. BURKS and Irving M. COPI.

Riepe held philosophy positions at Carleton College in Minnesota from 1948 to 1951, University of South Dakota from 1952 to 1954, University of North Dakota from 1954 to 1959, and C. W. Post College in 1962–3. Riepe

was professor of philosophy at the State University of New York at Buffalo from 1963 until his retirement in 1986. While at Buffalo Riepe served as Associate Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and chair of the Department of Social Sciences in 1964–5.

Riepe's scholarship included Asian philosophy, philosophical naturalism and an emphasis on the application of philosophical ideas to concrete social problems, especially in the tradition of radical neo-Marxist thought. His work on Asian philosophy focused heavily on naturalism in the philosophy of India. He contrasted "naturalism" with "idealism." He meant by "naturalism" any philosophy committed to the primacy of sense experience as a way of knowing, committed to the mind-independent existence of an ordered world that does not exclude human responsibility, and committed to denying the existence of a supernatural or transcendent teleology. He meant by "humanism" a focus on human beings as part of a natural order in which reason must be used to determine the moral direction of their lives (1964, pp. 6–7). Riepe explored naturalistic elements of Indian philosophy both in his dissertation and in *The Naturalistic Tradition in Indian Thought* (1961).

Extending his work on Indian thought, Riepe analyzed its influence on American philosophers such as Ralph Waldo EMERSON and William JAMES, particularly in his well-received *The Philosophy of India and Its Impact on American Thought* (1970). In *Indian Philosophy since Independence* (1979) he examined the ways in which naturalism and idealism in India and elsewhere influence the development of historical and political conditions. In addition to this work, he pursued his interest in radical social philosophy by editing and contributing to many anthologies and edited volumes on the subject.

Riepe also co-authored an introductory text titled *The Structure of Philosophy* (1966), published a philosophical novel titled *The Owl Flies by Day* (1979), and created illustrations for *The Quick and the Dead* (1948) by M. J. Cohn. Besides his scholarly contributions,

Riepe is remembered for a robust and at times outlandish sense of humor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Early Indian Philosophical Naturalism (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1953).
"What is a Scientific Naturalist at Mid-Century?" *Journal of Philosophy* 55 (1958): 726–34.
The Naturalistic Tradition in Indian Thought (Seattle, 1961; 2nd edn 1964).
The Philosophy of India and Its Impact on American Thought (Springfield, Ill., 1970).
"On the Proper Interpretation of Indian Religion and Philosophy" *Philosophic Exchange* 1 (1972): 177–91.
Indian Philosophy since Independence (Amsterdam and Calcutta, 1979).
Asian Philosophy Today (New York, 1981).
Objectivity and Subjectivism in the Philosophy of Science with Special Reference to India (Calcutta, 1986).

Other Relevant Works
Riepe's papers are at the State University of New York at Buffalo.
The Structure of Philosophy: A New Organization of Readings, with Jack Pustilnik (Totowa, N.J., 1966).
"Critique of Idealistic Naturalism: Methodological Pollution in the Main Stream of American Philosophy," in *Radical Currents in Contemporary Philosophy*, ed. David H. DeGrood, Dale Riepe, and John Somerville (St. Louis, 1971).
Ed. with David DeGrood and Edward D'Angelo, *Reflections on Revolution* (Bridgeport, Conn., 1971).
Ed., *Phenomenology and Natural Existence: Essays in Honor of Marvin Farber* (Albany, N.Y., 1973).
The Owl Flies by Day (Amsterdam, 1979).
Ed. with David DeGrood and Edward D'Angelo, *Philosophy and Revolutionary Theory* (Amsterdam, 1987).

Further Reading

Mathur, D. C. "On Understanding Indian Philosophical Naturalism," *Philosophic Exchange* 1 (Summer 1972): 193–7.

Andrew D. Spear

RILEY, Isaac Woodbridge (1869–1933)

I. Woodbridge Riley was born on 20 May 1869 in New York City, the son of Isaac and Katherine Southmayd (Parker) Riley, and died on 2 September 1933 in Cape May, New Jersey. Riley's father was pastor of the Thirty-fourth Street Reformed Church in New York City, and then of the Westminster Presbyterian Church in Buffalo, New York after the family moved there in 1875. Riley briefly attended the English School in Florence, Italy, and then returned to the US, where he attended Yale University and received a BA degree in 1892. Riley presented a thesis on "The Metaphysics of Mormonism" for his MA in philosophy at Yale in 1898, and further expanded this work to earn a PhD in philosophy in 1902. It was published the same year under a new title, *The Founder of Mormonism: A Psychological Study of Joseph Smith*. Riley's study concerns the first of his chief interests in philosophy, the exposition and critique of various religions, with a special focus on Mormonism and Christian Science. The book drew immediate criticism for what many felt was his unfair and inadequate portrait of the life and teachings of Joseph Smith, leading to a public denunciation of his account by the President of the Mormon Church in Salt Lake City.

Riley was appointed professor of philosophy at the University of New Brunswick in Canada in 1902. In 1904 he accepted an appointment at Johns Hopkins University as a Johnston Research Scholar, under the direction of the distinguished psychologist James Mark BALDWIN. Over the next decade, Riley published an annual series of reports in the *Psychological Bulletin*, in which he surveyed work published in the history of psychology. He was interested during this period in what he called the metaphysics of psychology, an important area of knowledge which forestalled, he believed, any attempt totally to divorce philosophy and psychology.

During his time at Johns Hopkins, Riley also pursued his second major interest in the history of American philosophy, which led to the publication of *American Philosophy: The Early Schools* (1907), which surveys the colonial period from approximately 1680 to 1820. His book was the first full-length study of a substantial portion of the history of philosophy in America. He provides an analysis in this work of what he regarded as the five major schools of thought in American philosophy at that time: puritanism, idealism, deism, materialism, and realism. The book is mainly an expository rather than a critical work, and Riley's aim, which he fulfills very well, is to provide a portrait of "the psychological characteristics and intellectual development of each of the more important thinkers … a summary of his doctrines, and the transitional relations to predecessors and successors, both at home and abroad" (1907, p. vii). This work represented a quite significant contribution to the philosophical literature because it brought together in one place material which had hitherto been scattered, inaccessible or generally unknown. An unusual feature of Riley's analysis is that he classifies deism by university, rather than by philosopher or religious movement, with discussions of the then dominant views at Yale, Harvard, and Princeton all included. He provides an overview of the thought of Jonathan Edwards, Joseph Buchanan, Joseph Priestly, Thomas Cooper, and Samuel Miller, among others.

In 1908 Riley became professor of philosophy at Vassar College, succeeding H. Heath BAWDEN, and he taught at Vassar until his death. During most of that time his philosophy

colleague was Durant DRAKE. Riley followed up his earlier pioneering work with another important study of the history of American philosophy, *American Thought from Puritanism to Pragmatism and Beyond* (1915), which for many years stood as the most comprehensive discussion of American philosophy. This book continued Riley's presentation of the sources, influences, and development of American thought. It began with a summary of his earlier study, and then added discussions on transcendentalism, evolutionism, modern idealism, modern realism, and pragmatism. As well as covering such major figures in American thought as Ralph Waldo EMERSON, Josiah ROYCE, Charles Sanders PEIRCE, John DEWEY, and William JAMES, Riley also included an overview of the sources of these philosophers as well as of the views of their major critics.

In the following years, Riley continued to teach and write on topics in his discipline, and he developed his interest in the study of normal and abnormal speculative movements. One such study earned him a brief period of notoriety. In 1917 his essay "The Faith of Christian Science" appeared in the *Cambridge History of American Literature*, a work which was then regarded as the most significant contemporary publication on American literature. Riley attacked the character of Mary Baker EDDY, the founder of Christian Science, accusing her of plagiarizing much of her work, *Science and Method*, from earlier sources. He also suggested that much of her religious inspiration was due to psychological problems. He rashly appealed to the theory of psychoanalysis to explain the origin of Eddy's religious beliefs. The tone of the article is mocking and unsympathetic; his criticisms are occasionally dogmatic, speculative, and often unsubstantiated. The article irritated many supporters of Christian Science, and the controversy even reached the front page of *The New York Times* on 19 April 1921. The outrage that followed prompted the volume to be withdrawn by the publisher, G. E. Putnam's Sons, until Riley's article could be replaced with a more balanced study. Riley did later publish the original article in *The Faith, the Falsity and the Failure of Christian Science* (1925).

Riley was invited to teach at the Sorbonne in France in 1920, where he met Henri Bergson, one of the best-known philosophers in the world at the time. Riley's lectures in France on representative American philosophers were later published as *Le Génie Américain* (1921). In *Men and Morals* (1929), a more general study, he provided an overview of the history of ethics from Greek myth and philosophy up to the influential views of William James, a philosopher whom Riley admired and who had a significant influence on his own thinking. Riley's final work, *The Meaning of Mysticism*, appeared in 1931. It was a subject in which he was much interested, and which had some influence on his religious views.

Riley was a historian, expositor, and occasionally trenchant critic of philosophical and religious ideas and trends. His meticulous study of the figures and movements of American philosophy is a valuable contribution to the study of the history and development of American thought.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
American Philosophy: The Early Schools (New York, 1907).
American Thought from Puritanism to Pragmatism (New York, 1915; 2nd edn 1923).
Le Génie Américain (Paris, 1921).
The Faith, the Falsity and the Failure of Christian Science, with Frederick Peabody and Charles Humiston (New York, 1925).
From Myth to Reason (New York, 1926).
Men and Morals (New York, 1929).
The Meaning of Mysticism (New York, 1931).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Brendan Sweetman

RITCHIE, Eliza (1856–1933)

Eliza Ritchie was born on 20 May 1856 near Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, to Amelia Almon Ritchie and Judge J. W. Ritchie. She died on 5 September 1933, also in Halifax. One of the first professional academic women in the discipline of philosophy, Ritchie was educated at Dalhousie University (BA 1887) and Cornell University (PhD 1889). Her dissertation was titled "The Problem of Personality." She also studied at the University of Leipzig in Germany and at the University of Oxford during 1892–3.

Ritchie was the third woman to earn the PhD in philosophy in America, preceded by May Preston Slosson in 1880 and Julia Henrietta GULLIVER in 1888. Ritchie was the first Canadian woman to earn a doctorate degree in North America. She was also one of the first fifteen women to join the American Philosophical Association. Ritchie taught philosophy at Vassar College in 1889–90 and at Wellesley College from 1890 to 1899. She then returned to Dalhousie University to teach arts and humanities courses from 1900 to 1927. During her career she published several articles and a number of book reviews in *Philosophical Review* and *International Journal of Ethics*.

Ritchie's career path was a promising one when she accepted a position as an assistant professor at Wellesley, but a change in administration resulted in her departure from the college in 1899, and her academic career was sidetracked. Among eight women released between 1890 and 1900, Ritchie's interest in abstract idealism and theoretical ethics did not appeal to the new Wellesley president, Julia Irvine. As Irvine worked to improve the quality of the faculty and update the curriculum, she supported Mary Whiton CALKINS in establishing a laboratory for experimental psychology, at that time a branch of philosophy. This was one of the first ten such labs in the country and the first at a women's college, so was an important innovation that contributed to building Wellesley's reputation. Irvine then replaced

Ritchie with Eleanor McCullough Gamble, today considered a psychologist, not a figure whose work crosses over between philosophy and psychology as is the case with Calkins and Christine LADD-FRANKLIN.

Ritchie was left with few professional options after leaving Wellesley, so she returned to Halifax and her alma mater, Dalhousie University. Sex bias hampered her career advancement, however. She taught only non-credit courses at Dalhousie, generally in the arts rather than in philosophy, and she did so as a volunteer because the university did not hire women faculty at that time. Even so, Ritchie was deeply involved in the growth and development of Dalhousie, fundraising for the first women's dormitories and serving (again as a volunteer) as the warden of women in 1912–13.

In her first published work, *The Problem of Personality* (1889), Ritchie investigates the psychological, physiological, and metaphysical explanations of what constitutes human personhood. She considers the problem of the mind–body split and discusses current theories of animism that "psychic life is present throughout all matter" (1889, p. 35). This is followed by entertaining the question of personality, whether personality consists primarily in self-consciousness or in individual character. She ends the work with an inquiry into the personhood of God. In this final section, she briefly but effectively builds on the work begun by two members of the St. Louis idealist movement, Susan BLOW and George Holmes HOWISON, by observing that the claim that God has personality does not imply the same limitations regarding self-consciousness as it does in the discussion of human personality, because God is infinite and eternal.

Questions about the validity of religious truth dominated much of Ritchie's work, as in "Truth-Seeking in Matters of Religion" (1900), "The Essential in Religion" (1901), "Notes on Spinoza's Conception of God" (1902), and "The Reality of the Finite in Spinoza's System" (1904). Throughout these

works, she is concerned with recognizing that religious truth sometimes defies scientific explanation. She is also interested in exploring the concept of the divine as spirit in the Hegelian sense and/or substance in Spinoza's system. In both cases, she is willing to attribute superlative knowledge and power to the god that animates life, to let religious truth stand outside daily human experience.

Ritchie was also concerned with ethics, both as an outgrowth of religion, and as a philosophical construct. In "The Ethical Implications of Determinism" (1893), she argued that the moral judgments and choices of human beings are freely made, but also limited in scope. Like other creatures in the world, we are bound by the laws of nature, by our own intellectual and physical abilities. "It is irrational to speak of any occurrence as though it sprang into existence of itself," Ritchie said, "unrelated to and in independence of, all other physical and psychical phenomena" (p. 532). Ritchie agreed with Spinoza that only our truly voluntary actions are free actions. She simply wanted to establish that, because we exist within a natural world that is given rather than created by us, there are limits to what can be called voluntary actions. Another of the first professional academic women philosophers, Julia Gulliver, took issue with Ritchie's stance on free will and determinism, and published a response to it in a later issue of *Philosophical Review*.

Ritchie was one of the few academic women philosophers in her day to publish on women's issues. Christine Ladd-Franklin and Julia Gulliver made their feminist commitments known, but other women with comparable status, Calkins and Ellen Bliss TALBOT, for instance, were cautious about taking a feminist stance, at least in their written work. Ritchie's article on "Women and the Intellectual Virtues" (1901) provides a valuable link between one academic woman's intellectual and activist lives. In this piece, she followed the line of thinking first introduced by Mary Wollstonecraft late in the eighteenth century that women are equal in intellect to men. Any differences in reasoning abilities that women display are the result of differences in education and social roles. This was a natural stance for Ritchie to take as a feminist whose view of women grew out of a longstanding humanist tradition. She and her sisters Mary and Ella were well-known as some of Nova Scotia's most vocal advocates for the equal treatment of women in education, employment, and political life. Eliza brought added legitimacy to the women's rights movement as an academic and public intellectual in Canada in the early twentieth century and gave a number of public lectures on the subject.

Like many women of her era, Eliza Ritchie remained single all her life in order to devote herself to her work. Teaching at Dalhousie for nearly three decades as a volunteer, she also served on its Board of Governors from 1919 to 1925, another first for a woman in Canada. She also helped establish the *Dalhousie Review*, serving on its editorial board. The university recognized Ritchie's commitment and contributions to the institution by awarding her an honorary LLD degree in 1927. In 1985 the university memorialized Ritchie by establishing a graduate scholarship in her name for female students in fields in which women are under-represented.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Problem of Personality (Ithaca, N.Y., 1889).

"The Ethical Implications of Determinism," *Philosophical Review* 2 (1893): 529–43.

"The Ethical Implications of Determinism: Reply," *Philosophical Review* 3 (1894): 67–8.

"Pfleiderer on Morality and Religion," *Philosophical Review* 5 (1896): 619–23.

"Morality and the Belief in the Supernatural," *International Journal of Ethics* 7 (1896): 180–91.

"Truth-Seeking in Matters of Religion," *International Journal of Ethics* 11 (1900): 71–82.

"The Essential in Religion," *Philosophical Review* 10 (1901): 1–11.

"Women and the Intellectual Virtues," *International Journal of Ethics* 12 (1901): 69–80.

"Notes on Spinoza's Conception of God," *Philosophical Review* 11 (1902): 1–15.

"The Reality of the Finite in Spinoza's System," *Philosophical Review* 13 (1904): 16–29.

"The Toleration of Error," *International Journal of Ethics* 14 (1904): 161–71.

Other Relevant Works
Songs of the Maritimes: An Anthology of the Poetry of the Maritime Provinces of Canada (Toronto, 1931).

Further Reading
Canad Encyc
"Eliza Ritchie Hall Honors Canada's First Female PhD," *Dal News* 18 (28 October 1987): 1.

"Eliza Ritchie," program of the Formal Opening and Naming Ceremony of Eliza Ritchie Hall of Dalhousie University on 20 October 1987 (Halifax, N.S., 1987).

Gulliver, Julia H. "Reply to Eliza Ritchie's 'The Ethical Implications of Determinism," *Philosophical Review* 3 (1894): 62–7.

Dorothy Rogers

ROBACK, Abraham Aaron (1890–1965)

A. A. Roback was born on 19 June 1890 in Goniondz, Russia (now Poland), the youngest of four children of Isaac and Leba (Rahver) Roback. Roback emigrated to Montréal, Canada with his family in 1892 where he attended public schools and received a Jewish education in the Talmud Torah Hebrew Free School. He earned the BA with honors in philosophy and was awarded the Prince of Wales Medal from McGill University in 1912. Roback studied with J. W. A. Hickson in philosophy and with William D. Tait in experimental psychology. He attributed his introduction to the scientific method to Hickson, a former student of Alois Riehl and an admirer of David Hume.

Roback entered the graduate program in philosophy and psychology at Harvard University in 1912. He began his dissertation, "The Interference of Will-Impulses," under Hugo MÜNSTERBERG and earned the PhD under Herbert S. Langfeld in 1917, a year after Münsterberg's death; the dissertation was published in 1918. Roback held a Traveling Fellowship at Princeton during 1916–17 and a National Research Council Fellowship at Harvard during 1923–5.

Roback taught psychology at several universities, including University of Pittsburgh (1917–18), Northeastern University (1918–21), and Harvard and Radcliffe College (1920–23). Roback was a psychology instructor for the University Extension Division of Massachusetts from 1926 to 1949. From 1949 to 1958 he was professor of psychology and chair of the psychology department at Emerson College in Boston. Roback died on 5 June 1965 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Roback's interests spanned philosophy, psychology, language, and Jewish culture. He criticized the tendency of American psychologists to neglect philosophy and argued for the importance of ethical and moral issues in psychology. His constitutional theory of individual character reflected his interests in the will and in inherited national characteristics. Roback contributed to the development of applied psychology, designing tests of higher mental processes that were, in his view, left unmeasured by objective multiple-choice tests.

Roback was a prolific author whose scholarly and popular books and articles addressed many areas of psychology and Jewish culture. An ardent Yiddish scholar, in 1929 he taught

the first course on Yiddish literature at an American University for the University Extension Division of Massachusetts. Much of the Yiddish collection at Harvard was amassed by Roback. He published the first biography of Yiddish author I. L. Peretz, whom he considered a "collective psychologist." Roback also examined Jewish influences in philosophy, literature, and science.

Roback published the first book-length critique of behaviorism in 1923, attacking behaviorists for their anti-philosophical stance, their materialism, and their environmentalism. Roback was influenced by personalistic psychologists Morton Prince (who had been a student of William JAMES) and Gordon ALLPORT. In 1927 he published an authoritative text on *The Psychology of Character*, and an exhaustive *Bibliography of Character and Personality* including references in many languages. The text, which surveyed the treatment of personality across a wide range of disciplines, influenced psychologists interested in the burgeoning study of personality. Roback served on the editorial board of the international journal *Character & Personality*, founded in 1932, and contributed entries on personality to H. C. Warren's *Dictionary of Psychology* (1934). In 1952 he published a history of American psychology that devoted considerable attention to the indigenous theological and philosophical roots of the field.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Interference of Will-Impulses, with Applications to Pedagogy, Ethics and Practical Efficiency," *Psychological Monographs* 25 (1918), whole no. 111.
Behaviorism and Psychology (Cambridge, Mass., 1923).
Bibliography of Character and Personality (Cambridge, Mass., 1927).
The Psychology of Character, with a Survey of Temperament (London and New York, 1927; 2nd edn 1928; 3rd edn 1952).
Jewish Influence in Modern Thought (Cambridge, Mass., 1929).

"Personality Tests – Whither?" *Character & Personality* 1 (1933): 214–24.
I. L. Peretz, Psychologist of Literature (Cambridge, Mass., 1935).
Behaviorism at Twenty-five (Cambridge, Mass., 1937).
The Psychology of Common Sense: A Diagnosis of Modern Philistinism (Cambridge, Mass., 1939).
The Story of Yiddish Literature (New York, 1940).
Personality in Theory and Practice (Cambridge, Mass., 1950).
History of American Psychology (New York, 1952; 2nd edn 1964).
Destiny and Motivation in Language: Studies in Psycholinguistics and Glossodynamics (Cambridge, Mass., 1954).
Contemporary Yiddish Literature (London, 1957).
History of Psychology and Philosophy (New York, 1961).

Other Relevant Works

Roback's papers are at Harvard University and the Massachusetts Historical Society in Boston; a small collection is in the Canadian Jewish Congress National Archives in Montréal, Canada.
Ed. with others, *Problems of Personality: Studies Presented to Dr. Morton Prince, Pioneer in American Psychopathology* (New York and London, 1925).
Ed., *Clinical and Experimental Studies in Personality*, 2nd edn, by Morton Prince (Cambridge, Mass., 1939).
Psychology through Yiddish Literature: Apologia pro vita yiddicia (Cambridge, Mass., 1942).
William James, His Marginalia, Personality and Contribution (Cambridge, Mass., 1942).
Ed., *The Albert Schweitzer Jubilee Book* (Cambridge, Mass., 1945).
Ed., *Present-day Psychology: An Original Survey of Departments, Branches,*

Methods, and Phases, Including Clinical and Dynamic Psychology (New York, 1955). Includes Roback's "The Psychology of Literature," pp. 865–96.
Freudiana (Cambridge, Mass., 1957).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Proc of APA v39*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Berger, Joseph. *The Destiny and Motivation of Dr. A. A. Roback: A Critical Essay* (Cambridge, Mass., 1957).
Rome, David. *The First Jewish Literary School. Canadian Jewish Archives*, vol. 41 (Montréal, 1988), pp. 60–132.

Nicole B. Barenbaum

ROBINSON, Abraham (1918–74)

Abraham Robinsohn was born on 6 October 1918 in Waldenburg, Germany (now Walbrzych, Poland). His father, Abraham Robinsohn, was the private secretary to David Wolfson until the latter's death in 1915, after which Robinsohn worked for the Jewish National Fund. His wife, Lotte Bahr, was the daughter of a Jewish teacher and was herself a teacher. His father died in May 1918, four months before his birth, and his mother moved the family to Waldenburg in Lower Silesia. Later they moved again to Breslau, Silesia, where Lotte worked for a Zionist organization devoted to the emigration of Jews to Palestine. In 1933, as the National Socialists came to power in Germany, the family emigrated to Palestine and lived in Tel Aviv and Jerusalem. Abraham entered Jerusalem University in 1936 to study mathematics under the renowned set theorist Abraham Fraenkel. Within two years, Fraenkel said that he had nothing more to teach his brightest student,

and Robinsohn began to think about study abroad. At the end of 1939 he received a fellowship from the French government and he went to study in Paris, but five months later his studies were cut short by the German invasion of France in June 1940. He fled to England, where he anglicized the spelling of his name to Robinson and spent the war working at the Royal Aircraft Establishment in Farnborough, where he designed delta wings for fighter jets, among other projects. At Farnborough, he studied aeronautics and in June 1942 he was admitted as an "associate fellow" to the Royal Aeronautical Society.

Early in 1944 Robinson married Renée Kopel, an actress and fashion designer from Vienna who was also a refugee in London. After the war Robinson returned briefly to Jerusalem to see his family there, and to complete the formalities required to receive his MSc in mathematics, with minors in physics and philosophy, from Hebrew University. Back in London, he continued his studies for the PhD in mathematics (awarded in 1949) at Birkbeck College of the University of London, where he wrote his dissertation, "On the Metamathematics of Algebra," under Paul Dienes. Meanwhile, he had begun his first academic position teaching mathematics and aeronautics at the newly founded College of Aeronautics at Cranfield, just outside of London, where he taught in the department of aerodynamics as a senior lecturer.

In 1950 Robinson attended the first International Congress of Mathematicians after the war, at Harvard University. He presented an invited paper, "On the Applications of Symbolic Logic to Algebra," in a special symposium that also included Alfred Tarski, Stephen Kleene, and Thoralf Skolem. Robinson's lecture, drawn from his thesis, dealt with models and algebras of axioms for which he introduced diagrams and transfer principles in an especially innovative way, by means of which he was able to establish results concerning algebraically closed fields.

Philosophically, Robinson said that at this point he was committed to "a fairly robust philosophical realism," meaning that he accepted the full "reality" of mathematical entities. As he explained in his paper, the formal languages used in his paper were only constructs to describe structures, which he took for granted. What impressed him about the approach to mathematics using models was how they made it possible to establish results "whose proof by conventional means is not apparent." This in its way was a prophetic work, because it foretold an important direction in which Robinson's own contributions to mathematical logic and model theory would develop over the next several decades.

In 1951 Robinson published *On the Metamathematics of Algebra*. He was also promoted to deputy head of the department of aeronautics at Cranfield, but this was a position he did not hold for long. That same year, he accepted an associate professor position in the department of applied mathematics at the University of Toronto in Canada. He was intended to replace Leopold Infeld, who was returning to his native Poland largely for political reasons, and Robinson was expected to teach both introductory mathematics, pure and applied, as well as aeronautics. In fact, he taught not only basic courses on calculus and analytic geometry, but also more specialized courses on aerodynamics, fluid mechanics, and differential equations, including an occasional advanced seminar on supersonic wing theory. Most of his publications at Toronto dealt with applied mathematics, including supersonic airfoil design. His book on *Wing Theory*, written with his former student at Cranfield, J. A. Laurmann, concerned both sub and supersonic airfoil design.

Robinson's interests were turning away from applied mathematics, and in the summer of 1952 he attended a colloquium in Paris on mathematical logic. His contribution, "L'application de la logique formelle aux mathématiques," applied the generalized completeness theorem to algebraically closed fields of characteristic zero. In 1955 he published a book summarizing much of his early work in mathematical logic and model theory, *Théorie métamathématique des idéaux*. That same year he also published "On Ordered Fields and Definite Functions," an important paper in *Mathematische Annalen*, that gave a model theoretic proof of David Hilbert's seventeenth problem, namely that a positive definite real rational function can be expressed as a sum of squares of rational functions. The following year Robinson published his fourth book, *Complete Theories*, which extended ideas he had first presented in his thesis. This work, crucial in the development of model theoretical algebra, included such important concepts as model completeness, model completion, and the Prime Model Test, along with results like proof of the completeness of real-closed fields and proof of the uniqueness of the model completion of a model-complete theory. Meanwhile, Robinson was beginning to attract a small group of graduate students who were specifically interested in studying mathematical logic, among them Paul Gilmore, A. H. Lightstone, and Elias Zakon.

In 1956 Toronto promoted Robinson to the rank of full professor, but this was not enough to keep him at Toronto, and later that same year he returned to the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, where he accepted the chair in mathematics of his former teacher, Abraham Fraenkel. At Hebrew University's Einstein Institute of Mathematics, Robinson taught courses on linear algebra and hydrodynamics, as well as an advanced course on logic which he at first team-taught with Fraenkel. By now, Robinson's interests were focusing on local differential algebra, especially work done previously by Joseph Ritt on initial and boundary values. But another change was about to take place, and at a meeting on

Foundations of Mathematics in Warsaw in the summer of 1959, Robinson presented a paper on "Model Theory and Non-Standard Arithmetic." Nonstandard models more generally would soon lead to his best-known theoretical work, namely his creation of nonstandard analysis.

Meanwhile, Fraenkel had retired as Chairman of the mathematics department at the Hebrew University, and in 1959 Robinson was chosen as his successor. Still working on differentially closed fields, Robinson published a major paper that same year using Seidenberg's elimination procedures to show how a model completion could be given for the axioms of differential fields. He then took the differentially closed fields as models of the "closure" axioms for the completion, and it might be said that Robinson invented the subject of differential closed fields.

In 1960 Robinson was invited to spend a year at Princeton University while Alonzo CHURCH was on a sabbatical leave. It was at Princeton that Robinson made his most controversial discovery, that of nonstandard analysis. He had been working on nonstandard models of arithmetic as Skolem had developed the subject, when one day he had the bright idea of using nonstandard models for analysis, from which it was a short step to his introduction of nonstandard analysis. He first announced his new ideas on this subject in a lecture on "Non-Standard Arithmetics and Non-Standard Analysis" at a special seventy-fifth anniversary meeting of the Association for Symbolic Logic in January 1961. This provided the first outlines of his new idea of how a rigorous foundation could be given for the calculus using infinitesimals.

Beginning with Skolem's work on proper extensions of the natural numbers formulated in the lower predicate calculus, Robinson took the same approach to the real numbers, all of which he explained in a new book, *Introduction to Model Theory*, which had a separate section devoted to nonstandard analysis. While in the United States, he spent several months at the University of California at Berkeley, where he worked on an appropriate nonstandard language for nonstandard arithmetic. Invited by the philosophy department at the University of California at Los Angeles to give a lecture there, Robinson as well as his wife were impressed by the climate and people working in mathematics, philosophy, and logic, and it was not long before he accepted a joint appointment at UCLA in mathematics and philosophy in 1962, where he assumed the chair of Rudolf CARNAP.

Meanwhile, during his last year at the Hebrew University, Robinson published a revised version of his first book, *On the Metamathematics of Algebra*, whose new title, *Introduction to Model Theory and to the Metamathematics of Algebra*, added the emphasis that he felt his most recent work required. He wanted to demonstrate how important concepts of algebra could be given natural generalizations within the framework of model theory, and he believed that the value of this approach within mathematics had not as yet been sufficiently appreciated.

At UCLA, Robinson taught logic, axiomatic set theory, and a course on applications of logic to analysis in the mathematics department, and courses on modern logic and the philosophy of mathematics in the philosophy department. But the time required for service in two departments eventually became too much of a burden, and he gave up his appointment in philosophy, although he remained active in the Logic Colloquium which had been founded at UCLA by C. C. Chang and Richard Montague. It was while Robinson was at UCLA that nonstandard analysis began to receive considerable notice, in part because of a proof he and his graduate student Allen Bernstein published in 1966 which solved the invariant subspace theorem in Hilbert Space for the case of polynomially compact operators. In the words of his colleague at UCLA, C. C. Chang, this result "instantly rocked the mathematical world."

While at UCLA, Robinson published numerous articles and two books, one on *Numbers and Ideals*, the other his definitive explication of his new theory, *Nonstandard Analysis*. This made clear one of the most basic points of his commitment to logic, namely that through model theory, mathematics itself could achieve results that were otherwise difficult, if not impossible to obtain. Although he understood the utility of infinitesimals, which in his view appeal naturally to our intuition, he used mathematical logic to give them a rigorous introduction and then applied the theory in diverse areas, including theorems from the calculus, differential geometry, non-metric topological spaces, Lebesgue measure, Schwartz distributions, complex nonstandard analysis, analytic theory of polynomials, entire functions, linear spaces, Hilbert spaces, spectral theory, topological groups, and Lie groups. Robinson also held out the possibility that nonstandard analysis would prove useful in applications to mathematical physics, and in the closing chapter of the book even suggested that nonstandard analysis might require rewriting the history of mathematics, especially where history of infinitesimals and the calculus were concerned.

In 1967 Robinson made the last of his academic moves, this time to Yale University, where he was later given a Sterling Professorship in 1971, and he held this title until his death. At Yale, he attracted a large number of graduate students and post-doctoral researchers, all of whom were particularly interested in mathematical logic and model theory. He began to apply nonstandard analysis to a number of new areas, including economics, about which he wrote several papers with his colleague at Yale, the economist Donald J. Brown, on "nonstandard economies." With his colleague Peter Roquette, by then at the University of Heidelberg, Robinson also worked for several years in particular on applications of nonstandard analysis to number theory.

Robinson was elected President of the Association for Symbolic Logic (1968–9), during which time he was especially active in promoting special colloquia and summer schools to increase interest in logic throughout Latin America and Japan. In April 1973 he received the most significant honor of his career, when the L. E. J. Brouwer Medal was conferred on him by the Dutch Mathematical Society. He died on 11 April 1974 in New Haven, Connecticut, having been elected a member of the National Academy of Sciences only a few days earlier.

Robinson's contributions to philosophy are most evident in his approach to foundations, which he developed most explicitly in a paper he wrote for the International Congress for Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science when it met in Jerusalem in the summer of 1964. This was later published as "Formalism 64," and was intended to present Robinson's views on the nature of mathematics, based upon his experience as both an applied mathematician and as a mathematical logician. Basically, he had advanced from his earlier acceptance of Platonic realism to a more formalist position in the spirit of David Hilbert. But Robinson intended the title of his paper to reflect the fact that his ideas were updated from Hilbert's original version of formalism, in part because of the results of Kurt GÖDEL on, among other things, the undecidability of the Continuum Hypothesis. This was all complicated by the subsequent proof by Paul Cohen just a year earlier, when he established the independence of the Continuum Hypothesis in 1963, and this too influenced Robinson's views considerably. As he said in "Formalism 64":

I feel quite unable to grasp the idea of an actual infinite totality. To me there appears to exist an unbridgeable gulf between sets or structures of one, or two, or five elements, on one hand, and infinite structures on the other hand or, more precisely, between terms denoting sets or structures

of one, or two, or five elements, and terms purporting to denote sets or structures the number of whose elements is infinite.

Although Robinson had come to believe that any reference to an infinite totality was meaningless, he also accepted the Leibnizian position that infinitary concepts should be regarded as useful fictions, and that mathematicians should "continue the business of Mathematics as usual, i.e. we should act as if infinite totalities really existed." What Robinson meant by saying that any reference to an infinite totality was meaningless is that "its terms and sentences cannot possess the direct interpretation in an actual structure that we should expect them to have by analogy with concrete (e.g. empirical) situations." But neither were the rules of logic arbitrary, since he held the laws of contradiction and the excluded middle to be "basic forms of thought and argument which are prior to the development of formal Mathematics."

Robinson included many of these ideas in a lecture he presented in June of 1965 at an International Colloquium on Philosophy of Science held at Bedford College, London. This was devoted to "The Metaphysics of the Calculus," and he argued that limits were not the best foundation upon which to present the calculus to students, but that infinitesimals offered a much more intuitive and natural approach. He further elaborated his philosophical views in a paper contributed to a Festschrift for Arend Heyting, for which he outlined an ultimate foundation for mathematics considered partially with reference to the history of mathematics. Robinson pointed out that just as the discovery of non-Euclidean geometries undermined faith in Euclidean geometry as the only true geometry of space, the results of Gödel and Cohen had similarly destroyed the hope that there could be any single, absolutely true version of set theory. Just as mathematicians had come to accept both Euclidean and non-Euclidean

geometries, so too were both standard and nonstandard versions of arithmetic and analysis acceptable mathematically. This all served to reinforce for Robinson the appropriateness of formalism as a foundation for mathematics.

Robinson summarized his views on formalism at one of the last international meetings he ever attended, a European meeting of the Association for Symbolic Logic held in Bristol in 1973, where he was concerned that despite the great advances mathematics itself had made, there was much less to be said for progress in finding the correct foundations for mathematics. This was highlighted in the case of the infinite in particular:

> I expect that future work on formalism may well include general epistemological and even ontological considerations. Indeed, I think that there is a real need, in formalism and elsewhere, to link our understanding of mathematics with our understanding of the physical world. The notions of objectivity, existence, infinity, are all relevant to the latter as they are to the former (although this again may be contested by a logical positivist) and a discussion of these notions in a purely mathematical context is, for that reason, incomplete.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"On the Application of Symbolic Logic to Algebra," *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1950* (Providence, R.I., 1951), vol. 1, pp. 686–94.

On the Metamathematics of Algebra (Amsterdam, 1951).

Complete Theories (Amsterdam, 1956; 2nd edn 1977).

Théorie métamathématique des idéaux (Paris, 1955).

"Model Theory and Non-Standard Arithmetic," in *Infinitistic Methods: Proceedings of the Symposium on*

Foundations of Mathematics, Warsaw, 2–9 September 1959 (Oxford, 1961), pp. 265–302.

"Recent Developments in Model Theory," in *Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science. Proceedings of the 1960 International Congress for Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science*, ed. Ernest Nagel, Patrick Suppes, and Alfred Tarski (Stanford, Cal., 1962), pp. 60–79.

"Non-Standard Analysis," *Indagationes Mathematicae* 23 (1961): 432–40.

Introduction to Model Theory and to the Metamathematics of Algebra (Amsterdam, 1963; 2nd edn 1974).

"Formalism 64," in *Proceedings of the International Congress for Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science, Jerusalem, 1964* (Amsterdam, 1964), pp. 228–523.

Numbers and Ideals: An Introduction to Some Basic Concepts of Algebra and Number Theory (San Francisco, 1965).

Nonstandard Analysis (Amsterdam, 1966).

"Nonstandard Arithmetic," *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 73 (1967): 818–83.

"Some Thoughts on the History of Mathematics," *Compositio Mathematica* 30 (1968): 188–93.

Selected Papers of Abraham Robinson, 3 vols, ed. H. J. Keisler et al. (New Haven, Conn., 1979).

Other Relevant Works

"On Predicates and Algebraically Closed Fields," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 19 (1954): 103–14.

"On Ordered Fields and Definite Functions," *Mathematische Annalen* 130 (1955): 257–71.

"Completeness and Persistence in the Theory of Models," *Zeitschrift für mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik* 2 (1956): 15–26.

Wing Theory, with J. A. Laurmann (Cambridge, UK, 1956).

"Relative Model-Completeness and the Elimination of Quantifiers," *Dialectica* 12 (1958): 394–407.

"On the Concept of a Differentially Closed Field," *Bulletin of the Research Council of Israel* 8 (1958): 113–28.

"Solution of an Invariant Subspace Problem of K. T. Smith and P. R. Halmos," with Allen R. Bernstein, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* 16 (1966): 421–31.

"Infinite Forcing in Model Theory," *Proceedings of the Second Scandinavian Logic Symposium, Oslo, 1970* (Amsterdam, 1971), pp. 317–49.

"Forcing in Model Theory," *Symposia Mathematica* 5 (1971): 69–82.

"The Cores of Large Standard Exchange Economies," with Donald J. Brown, *Journal of Economic Theory* 9 (1974): 245–54.

Further Reading

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, *Proc of APA v47*, *Who Was Who in Amer v6*

Dauben, Joseph W. "Abraham Robinson and Nonstandard Analysis: History, Philosophy, and Foundations of Mathematics," *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science* 11 (1988): 177–200.

———, *Abraham Robinson: The Creation of Nonstandard Analysis, a Personal and Mathematical Odyssey* (Princeton, N.J., 1995).

———, "Abraham Robinson. October 6, 1918–April 11, 1974," *Biographical Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences* 82 (2002): 1–44.

Davis, Martin, and Reuben Hersh. "Nonstandard Analysis," *Scientific American* 226 (1972): 78–86.

Macintyre, Angus. "Abraham Robinson, 1918–1974," *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 83 (1977): 646–66.

Joseph W. Dauben

ROBINSON, Daniel Sommer (1888–1977)

Daniel S. Robinson was born on 19 October 1888 in North Salem, Indiana. He earned a BA from Butler University in 1910. From Yale University he received an MA in 1911, and from Yale Divinity School a BD in 1912. He was a member of the chaplains corps, serving as a lieutenant in World War I. Before completing his PhD in philosophy at Harvard University in 1917, he spent a year abroad at Breslau University in Germany. At Harvard, he studied with Josiah ROYCE and William Ernest HOCKING and was deeply influenced by their idealist philosophies.

In 1919–20 Robinson was instructor of philosophy at the University of Wisconsin, and then assistant professor from 1920 to 1922. At the University of Miami in Ohio, he taught as professor of philosophy from 1922 to 1929. He then served as professor and head of the department of philosophy at Indiana University from 1929 to 1939. He was President of Butler University from 1939 to 1942. In 1937 he was a delegate to the Ninth International Congress of Philosophy, held that year in Paris. He was President of the American Philosophical Association Western Division from 1942 to 1944. In 1946 he was appointed professor of philosophy and Director of the School of Philosophy at the University of Southern California, and he held the positions until retiring in 1954. Robinson was a visiting professor at Bethany College in West Virginia from 1954 to 1956, and then returned to California in retirement. He died on 29 November 1977 in Los Angeles.

Robinson wrote the entry on "Idealism" for the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, and reviewed books for the journal *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*. In his encyclopedia article, he concedes that philosophical idealism is losing its status as a privileged philosophical viewpoint. And yet, he counters that state of affairs with a mitigating perspective: "The great Idealistic tradition has survived many other historic periods of turmoil and has often been reborn in prolonged periods of settled and peaceful social conditions." He concludes, "It seems highly unlikely that such a rich heritage of philosophical thought will vanish entirely."

Besides his studies of American idealism and Scottish philosophy that he published later in his career, Robinson published several books on a variety of topics. *The Principles of Reasoning: An Introduction to Logic and Scientific Method* (1924) was a widely used text that went through three editions, remaining popular despite being among the last textbooks to omit recent advances in symbolic and mathematical logic. His book *The Principles of Conduct: An Introduction to Theoretical and Applied Ethics* (1949), by contrast, was extremely forward-looking, as it was the first book published by an American philosopher to use the term "applied ethics" in its title, and Robinson substantially helped to shape and advance the new field.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Principles of Reasoning: An Introduction to Logic and Scientific Method (New York, 1924; 2nd edn 1936; 3rd edn 1947).

The God of the Liberal Christian (New York, 1926).

Illustrations of the Methods of Reasoning (New York, 1927).

An Introduction to Living Philosophy (New York, 1932).

Political Ethics: An Application of Ethical Principles to Political Relations (New York, 1935).

The Principles of Conduct: An Introduction to Theoretical and Applied Ethics (New York, 1949).

Crucial Issues in Philosophy: Studies of Current Problems and Leading Philosophers from the Standpoint of Philosophical Idealism (Boston, 1955).

Royce and Hocking, American Idealists: An Introduction to their Philosophy, with Selected Letters (Boston, 1968).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *An Anthology of Recent Philosophy: Selections from the Writings of the Greatest 20th Century Philosophers* (New York, 1929).

Ed., *Studies in Philosophy* (London, 1952).

Ed., *Philosophical Studies* (Boston, 1953).

Ed., *The Story of Scottish Philosophy: A Compendium of Selections from the Writings of Nine Pre-eminent Scottish Philosophers* (New York, 1961).

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v5, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v60*, *Proc of APA v51*, *Who Was Who in Amer v7*, *Who's Who in Phil*

David Justin Hodge

ROELOFS, Howard Dykema (1893–1974)

Howard D. Roelofs was born on 7 April 1893 in Grand Rapids, Michigan. He attended Amherst College during 1911–13, and then returned to Michigan to attend the University of Michigan, where he received his BA in 1915 and MA in 1916. He married Miriam Hubbard in 1917 and attended to the needs of family life for some years. Returning to his education, he went to Harvard University where he earned his PhD in philosophy in 1925, writing his dissertation on "The Nature and Function of Authority."

From 1927 to 1931 Roelofs was associate professor of philosophy at Stanford University. He was visiting professor at the University of California at Berkeley in the spring of 1931, and at Amherst College in 1931–2. In 1932 he became Obed J. Wilson Professor of Ethics and head of the philosophy department at the University of Cincinnati, holding these positions until his retirement in 1960. During that time he and philosophy colleague Van Meter AMES increased the prestige of the department that their predecessor, Guy Allan TAWNEY, had gradually built. Roelofs also served as Dean of the College of Liberal Arts from 1933 to 1936. He was active in the American Philosophical Association, Phi Beta Kappa, and the Guild of Scholars of the Episcopal Church. In 1949 he received an honorary LHD degree from Ripon College. He lived during his retirement in East Aurora, New York, where he died on 12 August 1974.

Roelofs maintained a philosophy of Aristotelian realism in epistemology combined with Cartesian metaphysical dualism and a firm conviction in the Christian creeds. He encountered enough pragmatism at Harvard to become convinced of its fundamental errors, and several of his articles criticize William JAMES's experimental attitude toward religion and the treatment of mind in John DEWEY's empirical naturalism. In "The Experimental Method and Religious Beliefs" (1929) Roelofs complains against James that the efficacy of religious faith cannot be experimentally tested, since an experimenter would not have genuine faith, and those with genuine faith have no need for experimenting. In "The Predicament of Naturalistic Empiricism" Roelofs argues that Dewey has not overcome Cartesian dualism because he rashly attributes supposed qualities of feeling to nature without any self to possess those feelings.

Roelofs submitted his own views to searching criticism in print. The two most sophisticated efforts he made to show why his favored positions survive critique are "Theology in Theory and Practice" (1951) and "A Case for Dualism and Interaction" (1955). In the latter article, he cannot permit the empiricist to claim superiority over dualistic interactionism, since the mind–body distinction is already in experience. Granting the scientific point that matter appears to have preceded mind in time, this in no way establishes the unique reality of matter. Gladly confessing that an explanation of the unity of mind and body is still needed, Roelofs still finds that dualistic interaction accounts for more of the evidence of experience.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Factuality: A Regulative Ideal," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 14 (1932): 61–92.

"The Distribution of Terms," *Mind* 36 (1927), pp. 281–91.

"The Experimental Method and Religious Beliefs," *Mind* 38 (1929): 184–206.

"Sine Qua Non Conditions," *Mind* 39 (1930): 194–201.

"The Predicament of Naturalistic Empiricism," *Mind* 44 (1935): 300–316.

"A Note on Probability and Ontology," *Philosophical Review* 44 (1935): 484–7.

"Democracy and the Curriculum," *The Southern Review* 5 (Autumn 1939): 335–45.

"Second Thoughts on Causation, Dualism, and Interaction," *Mind* 56 (1947): 60–71.

"Theology in Theory and Practice," in *Christianity and Reason*, ed. Edward D. Myers (Oxford, 1951).

"A Case for Dualism and Interaction," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 15 (1955): 451–76.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v48, Who Was Who in Amer v6, Who's Who in Phil

John R. Shook

ROGERS, Arthur Kenyon (1868–1936)

Arthur K. Rogers was born on 17 December 1868 in Dunellen, New Jersey. Rogers received his BA degree from Colby College in 1891. The following academic year, 1891–2, he studied at Johns Hopkins University. Rogers was an instructor in the Chicago Academy in 1893–4. During 1894–5 he was enrolled in the Hartford School of Sociology. He then served as assistant superintendent of the Charity Organization Society in Hartford, Connecticut from 1895 to 1896. Rogers received his PhD in philosophy from the University of Chicago in 1898, writing on a dissertation entitled "Psycho-physical Parallelism." At Chicago he studied with John DEWEY, James R. ANGELL, and George H. MEAD.

After receiving his doctorate, Rogers taught philosophy and pedagogy in 1899–1900 at Alfred University. In 1900 he was appointed professor of philosophy and education at Butler College, where he taught until 1910. From 1910 to 1914 he was professor of philosophy at the University of Missouri and head of the department. In 1914 he became professor of philosophy at Yale University, teaching until 1920, when he asked for early retirement in order to devote himself fully to research and writing. His retirement was lamented by students and colleagues, as he had a fine reputation as a teacher. His textbook *A Student's History of Philosophy*, first published in 1901, may have been the most widely used introductory text in America of that time. It was in print for almost fifty years and went through multiple editions and printings. His retirement proved productive, as he completed several books and important essays. Rogers died on 1 November 1936 in Boston, Massachusetts.

Rogers first adopted the psychological functionalism, pragmatism, and broad Hegelian outlook of the Chicago School, publishing several articles in its defense in the early years of the 1900s. However, he underwent a conversion towards a more straightforward allegiance to realism and criticized his former teachers. Rogers made his mark in American philosophy as a critical realist, as an ethicist, and as an historian of philosophy. He preferred to label his philosophy "empiricism," distinguishing his conception of experience from that of traditional English empiricism by stressing that qualities and relations are abstracted from the ordinary experience from which all beliefs arise and to which they must return for verification. This tenet of pragmatism, along with a coherence criterion of knowledge (but not of truth), survived his intellectual evolution.

Rogers is best remembered as a critical realist. At the height of his career as a professional philosopher he joined a group of six others – Durant DRAKE, Arthur LOVEJOY, James PRATT, George SANTAYANA, Roy Wood SELLARS, and Charles STRONG – to produce a cooperative volume titled *Essays in Critical Realism: A Co-operative Study of the Problem of Knowledge* (1920). This type of epistemological realism was called "critical" partly by design, and partly because of already established usage. It sought to escape the difficulties of new realism, which asserted that reality is directly experienced, and the ambiguities and errors of the older realism of Locke and his successors, without succumbing to the connotations surrounding the word "critical" imposed by Kant and the neo-Kantians. Prior to their organization as a group, the word "critical" had been in usage by the seven critical realists to describe an epistemology that defined cognition as a triadic relation between knower, datum, and object of knowledge. Even within the group two wings concerning the status of the datum emerged, and Rogers belonged to the "essence" wing, whose most prominent member was Santayana.

The essay Rogers contributed to *Essays in Critical Realism* focused on the problem of error. Defending a clearly defined correspondence theory of truth, Rogers devoted the body of his essay to demonstrating that the alternative theories of absolute idealism, new realism, and pragmatism were internally incoherent and less adequate in their explanation of error than critical realism.

Rogers, like the other critical realists, had already made substantial progress in the development of his own philosophy when he joined the group, and he continued his work until his death. While employing logic and the methodology of the clarification of meanings, deductive reasoning, and hypothesis confirmable in experience, Rogers's philosophy is intrinsically metaphysical, with personality as the key to reality. He advocated theism as the most realistic cosmic hypothesis.

In the field of ethics, Rogers, although honed in sociology, described human values as ideals that are imperative as norms, standards, and goals, even if they do not exist in time and place. Rogers's conception of ideals was wholly consonant with his critical realistic epistemology that interpreted the datum as "essence." It was also sustained by the influence of Plato, which, filtered through the interpretations of R. W. EMERSON, A. E. Taylor, and John Burnet, profoundly shaped Rogers's own realistic metaphysics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Parallelism of Mind and Body from the Standpoint of Metaphysics (Chicago, 1899).

The Religious Conception of the World: An Essay in Constructive Philosophy (New York, 1907).

"The Problem of Error," in *Essays in Critical Realism: A Co-operative Study of the Problem of Knowledge* (New York, 1920), pp. 117–60.

The Theory of Ethics (New York, 1922).

What Is Truth? An Essay in the Theory of Knowledge (New Haven, Conn., 1923).

Morals in Review (New York, 1927).

"Empiricism," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 2, pp. 223–35.

"Is Religion Important?" in *Religious Realism*, ed. Douglas C. Macintosh (New York, 1932).

The Socratic Problem (New Haven, Conn., 1933).

Ethics and Moral Tolerance (New York, 1934).

Other Relevant Works

The Life and Teachings of Jesus: A Critical Analysis of the Sources of the Gospels, Together with a Study of the Sayings of Jesus (New York, 1894).

A Brief Introduction to Modern Philosophy (London and New York, 1899).

A Student's History of Philosophy (New York, 1901; 2nd edn 1907; 3rd edn 1932).
English and American Philosophy since 1800: A Critical Survey (New York, 1922).

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v46*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Blanshard, Brand. *The Nature of Thought* (London, New York, 1939), vol. 1, pp. 416–44.
Harlow, Victor E. *Bibliography and Genetic Study of American Realism* (Oklahoma City, Okla., 1931).
Laird, John. *A Study of Realism* (Cambridge, UK, 1920).
Schneider, Herbert W. *Sources of Contemporary Realism in America* (Indianapolis, 1964).
Sellars, Roy Wood. *American Philosophy From Within* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1969).

Andrew J. Reck

ROLSTON, Holmes, III (1932–)

Holmes Rolston III was born on 19 November 1932 in Staunton, Virginia, the son of Holmes Rolston, a rural Presbyterian minister, and Mary Winifred Rolston. Growing up in the Shenandoah Valley, Rolston had many opportunities to immerse himself in nature. During the summer months he visited the farm of his maternal grandparents in Alabama and explored the surrounding wilderness. With a profound interest in nature, he decided to study physics and biology as an undergraduate. He received his BS from Davidson College in North Carolina in 1953. He then received a BD from Union Theological Seminary in 1956, and his PhD in theology and religious studies at the University of Edinburgh in 1958. From 1958 to 1968 Rolston worked as an ordained Presbyterian minister in the Appalachian Mountains of southwest Virginia. During this time he studied botany, zoology, mineralogy, geology, and paleontology at East Tennessee State University. He became a noted bryologist and naturalist. Disturbed by the rapid technological development of the surrounding wilderness, he strove to preserve the natural integrity of mountain regions in southwest Virginia and northeast Tennessee, especially Mount Rogers and Roan Mountain. He felt compelled to study philosophy to integrate apparent conflicts between his religious faith and atheistic naturalism.

Rolston completed an MA in philosophy of science from the University of Pittsburgh in 1968, and accepted a position at Colorado State University as an assistant professor of philosophy and religion in that year. He was associate professor (1971–6) and professor of philosophy (1976–present), currently holding the position of University Distinguished Professor of Philosophy. During 1974–5 he was a visiting scholar at the Center for the Study of World Religions at Harvard University. In 1991 he was the Distinguished Visiting Russell Fellow at the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley, California, and was a noted lecturer at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences and at Gustavus Adolphus College. A member of the International Society for Environmental Ethics, he served as President from 1989 to 1994. He is also a member of the following organizations: American Academy of Religion (President of Rocky Mountain–Great Plains Region); Society for Conservation Biology (member of the board of governors); American Association for the Advancement of Science; Society of Biblical Literature; American Philosophical Association; and Phi Beta Kappa. Rolston is the associate editor of the journal *Environmental Ethics*. He delivered the Gifford Lectures at the University of Edinburgh in 1997–8, which were later published in his book *Genes, Genesis and God: Values and Their Origins in Natural and Human History* (1999). He received the

Templeton Prize for Progress toward Research or Discoveries about Spiritual Realities in 2003. Rolston plans to use the Templeton award (over a million dollars) to endow a chair in religion and science at Davidson College.

His most influential writings are the seminal article "Is There an Ecological Ethic?" (1975) and his book *Environmental Ethics* (1988), in which he formulates a systematic ethical theory of the environment. Rolston is widely recognized as the father of environmental ethics as an academic discipline. In *Environmental Ethics*, Rolston's fundamental proposition is that humans have *duties* to the environment: that is, to sentient life (higher animals), nonsentient life (lower animals and plants), species (especially endangered), and ecosystems (all life, rivers, mountains, inorganic matter). Humans have duties beyond those that they have to each other because nature has *intrinsic* value. Environmental ethics is more than an ethics of resource/use and benefits/cost. In harmony with Aldo LEOPOLD's "Land Ethic," Rolston's ethical theory is *ecocentric* rather than anthropocentric. Although wild nature – sentient and nonsentient life – is amoral, humans must have genuine respect and duties toward it. Nonhuman life is part of a larger ecosystem of which humans are also members. We have an obligation not to interfere with the delicate balance of life within the ecosystem. More fundamental to Rolston's ecocentrism, however, is that nonsentient life should be valued since evolution has demonstrated that sentience (including humans) is an outgrowth of nonsentient life. Moreover, all life is intrinsically valuable, regardless of human consciousness. Nature's life-value is only reflected by consciousness.

Rolston argues that duties to endangered species can outweigh duties to sentient life – even including human life. He refers to the sparse population of the mountain gorilla (about 240 during the writing of his book) in the Parc des Volcans, a national park in Rwanda. If the park were eliminated, it could sustain about 36,000 people at a subsistence level, 25 percent of one year's population growth. Without solving more serious problems, the extinction of the mountain gorilla would only provide momentary relief in space for a very small portion of the growing population.

On a philosophical level, Rolston's argument is based on a higher value of *species* over individuals. Human-caused extinction terminates the generative process that produces biodiversity. Conversely, natural extinction allows new species to arrive. Artificial extinction (human-caused) is a closed door for regenerative processes in nature. While having no duty to preserve rare species in a natural extinction, humans do have duties to protect endangered species from artificial extinction. Rolston believes that duties to ecosystems transcend duties to individuals, including sentient life, nonsentient life, and endangered species. Ecosystems provide diversity, unity, and active stability. The process of maintaining stability in nature often involves conflict. Ethical philosophy is misguided when it eschews this conflict in favor of cooperation. What is expected in a culture should not be required in wild nature. Predators and parasites have necessary functions in an ecosystem.

The overarching principle of Rolston's theory of environmental ethics is *systemic value*. Rather than a thing, systemic value is a process. He states: "The inventiveness of systemic nature is the root of all value, and all nature's created products have value so far as they are inventive achievements." (1988, p. 198) "Inventive achievements" imply a progressive evolutionary trend. Indeed, Rolston believes in what astronomers call the "anthropic principle" – an unfortunate term not to be confused with anthropocentrism. It means that the structure of our universe has allowed the genesis of life and mind. Rolston accepts that evolution may involve a certain amount of chance, but not entirely. For Rolston, diversity and advancement (increased complexity through time) are proof that evolution is not entirely random. The possibility that nature can be valued systemically indicates the presence of an

"anthropic principle." Systemic valuation leads to an *ecological valuation*, a process in which the subject (the human viewer) and valued object (nature) are within the same circumscribed field. "We say that valuing is in as well as of nature." (1988, p. 203) This is possible since human beings have evolved from nature and are part of it. What humans are looking at in nature are not just things but a process of interconnections.

In *Genes, Genesis and God* Rolston strives to reconcile naturalistic evolutionary theory with religious belief. His approach is twofold. Rather than discrete entities, genes evolve in organisms that are part of families, species, and ultimately, ecosystems. Rolston discredits genetic theories that do not take into account this holistic perspective. Second, the rise of human culture and its manifestations – science, ethics, and religion – cannot be explained solely by naturalized evolution, namely, genetics and natural selection. Genes are amoral; they are neither selfish nor altruistic, but they do have intrinsic value since information is stored and transmitted through them. Consequently, Rolston disagrees with Richard Dawkins's idea that genes are selfish. The term "selfish" implies the attribute of autonomy. Because genes ultimately function in an ecosystem, the information they code changes through adaptation. The many levels and interconnections within an ecosystem mold the genetic information.

Rolston argues that culture transcends genetics. Nature precedes culture but does not determine it. By definition, culture is transmitted through history by symbols (language), and is present only in the species of *homo sapiens*. Where natural selection occurs from outside-to-in (environment to genes), culture occurs from inside-to-out – a conscious selective process. Science, a manifestation of culture, transcends genetics through the intellect, but it is not the final word. While the objective knowledge that science offers is useful, it does not answer questions about the meaning of life.

Rolston believes that only ethics, and ultimately religion, address the questions con-

cerning life's value. Curiously, reflection on genesis of life produces a religious response. This phenomenon implies a connection between religion and wild nature. The key word "reflection" is manifest only in human beings. Therefore, only humans exhibit religious behavior. Always mindful of the need to reconcile religion and nature, Rolston eloquently draws a connection between nature and sin. He states: "Part of the human genius is the genesis of sin …. Genesis is the story not of the fall from perfection, but of the 'fall' of the aboriginal couple from innocence into sin and of their awakening into this state." (1999, pp. 299–301) The ability to reflect – "innocence" to "awakening" – is implicit in Rolston's remarks. This quotation resonates with Henri Bergson's opening sentence in *Two Sources of Morality and Religion*: "The remembrance of forbidden fruit is the earliest thing in the memory of each of us, as it is in that of mankind." (1935, p. 9)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

John Calvin versus the Westminster Confession (Richmond, Virg., 1972).
"Is There an Ecological Ethic?" *Ethics* 85 (1975): 93–109.
Philosophy Gone Wild: Essays in Environmental Ethics (Buffalo, N.Y., 1986).
Science and Religion: A Critical Survey (New York, 1987).
Environmental Ethics: Duties to and Values in the Natural World (Philadelphia, 1988).
Conserving Natural Value (New York, 1994).
Genes, Genesis and God: Values and Their Origins in Natural and Human History (Cambridge, UK, 1999).

Other Relevant Works
"Disvalues in Nature," *The Monist* 75 (1992): 250–78.
"Does Nature Need to be Redeemed?" *Zygon* 29 (1994): 205–29.
Ed., *Biology, Ethics, and Origins of Life* (Boston, 1995).

"The Bible and Ecology," *Interpretation: Journal of Bible and Theology* 50 (1996): 16–26.

"Ecological Spirituality," *American Journal of Theology and Philosophy* 18 (1997): 59–64.

"The Land Ethic at the Turn of the Millennium," *Biodiversity and Conservation* 9 (2000): 1045–58.

"Environmental Ethics in Antarctica," *Environmental Ethics* 24 (2002): 115–34.

Ed. with Andrew Light, *Environmental Ethics: An Anthology* (Cambridge, Mass., 2002).

Further Reading

Benzoni, Francisco. "Rolston's Theological Ethic," *Environmental Ethics* 18 (1996): 339–52.

Callicott, J. Baird. "Rolston on Intrinsic Value: A Deconstruction," *Environmental Ethics* 14 (1992): 129–44.

Thomas, Emyr. "Naturogenic Value and Genuine Biocentrism," *Environmental Values* 6 (1997): 355–60.

Charles Frederick Frantz

RORTY, Richard McKay (1931–)

Richard Rorty was born on 4 October 1931 in New York City. His parents were intellectuals and social activists who worked for Workers Defense League, and were part of the non-communist (Trotskyite) Left in the 1940s. Rorty's grandfather was the Social Gospel theologian Walter RAUSCHENBUSCH. His early childhood experiences help shape his mature thoughts on political issues. When he was fifteen he entered the University of Chicago and was awarded a BA in 1949 and a MA in 1952, studying with Charles HARTSHORNE. He then went to Yale University and earned his PhD in philosophy in 1956. His dissertation, "The Concept of Potentiality," was supervised by Paul WEISS. At Yale he was a philosophy instructor in 1956–7. He then enlisted in the United States Army, serving from 1957 to 1958. Thereafter, he was an instructor and assistant professor of philosophy at Wellesley College from 1958 to 1961. He then moved to Princeton University where he achieved the rank of Stuart Professor of Philosophy. Rorty left Princeton in 1982 to go the University of Virginia as University Professor of the Humanities, remaining there 1998, when he became a professor of comparative literature at Stanford University. He was President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1979–80. He has been the recipient of several honors and grants including a Guggenhein Fellowship in 1973–4 and a MacArthur Fellowship during 1981–6.

While Rorty is most conveniently identified as a neo-pragmatist, this label can easily be misleading. His indebtedness to John DEWEY is acknowledged, and he often refers to himself as a pragmatist. However, he has also claimed to have found inspiration in the thought of Ludwig Wittgenstein and Martin Heidegger. Hence, Rorty does not fit neatly into the pragmatic school of thought, nor, for that matter does he fit neatly into either the analytic or continental schools. His thinking is pragmatic in stressing the importance of *praxis* over *theoria*, but he has taken what is called (but did not coin) "the linguistic turn." Where most pragmatists are committed to situating thinking in terms of experience, Rorty sees language as the only medium in which to work. This linguistic orientation comes from Wittgenstein and analytic philosophy. However, his style of thinking is not narrowly focused on technical problems of philosophy that seems to be the method of all analytic thinkers. Rather, he tends to situate thinking in a historical context. This is an approach he acquired from Heidegger and other continental thinkers. Thus, he presents the reader with a challenging amalgam of different approaches in his philosophical practice: pragmatic, linguistic,

and historical. At one point he briefly embraced the label of postmodernist, but later he felt that this term had too much unnecessary baggage to be useful. However, if postmodernism is the distrust of systematic attempts to find an underlying unity to philosophical projects, it may have some relevance.

Rorty came to philosophical prominence after publishing *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* in 1979. In this work, he launched a critique of the entire epistemological enterprise that has served as a cornerstone of philosophical tradition. Starting with an analysis of Descartes, he wanted to show how the problems associated with a theory of knowledge were misguided. As long as one held to a view of the mind as an interior reflection of an outer world, one would always be stuck with host of dualisms: inner versus outer, mind versus body, subjectivity versus objectivity, appearance versus reality. All of these dualisms can be dispensed with, as well as the question of the foundation of knowledge, once one drops the view of the mind as the seat of representations of the world. Rorty wants to show how rational, empirical, and/or transcendental questions about knowledge of the world can be dismissed as resting on the metaphor of the mind as a mirror. Hence, any question of getting things right about the world is made irrelevant. The whole notion of a true representation of reality is grounded in the hope that something like a God's-eye perspective can be achieved. Once this hope is seen as a useless passion, one can proceed to a more pragmatic notion of beliefs. As Rorty puts it, objectivity should be replaced by solidarity. The desire to get things right once and for all can be replaced by the quest for intersubjective agreement. Fidelity towards an objective view of the world is not as valuable as loyalty towards one's fellow citizens.

What served as a preface to his criticism of epistemology are his early thoughts on eliminative materialism. Since his rejection of epistemology as a viable philosophical project is based on his rejection of the notion of a Cartesian subject, Rorty had prepared the way by arguing that inner subjective states could be replaced by talk about brain states. Where other materialists had tried to argue that mental states were identical to material states, Rorty took a different approach. There is no need to show how two seemingly irreconcilable states were really denoting the same object, all one had to show was that one side of the identity equation could be dispensed with. An example of how the identity of beliefs could be eliminated can be shown in the following historical account. Prior to the rise of modern science, the only way humans had to explain natural events was by reference supernatural agency, as in the belief that the sun was Apollo carrying the sun across the sky in his chariot. Once the notion of gravity was discovered, such a belief in a supernatural agent behind the scenes was no longer necessary to explain this natural phenomenon. Science came to be seen as a better way to predict events than was mythological identity of a God's behavior and the sun's motion. So, when one comes to recognize that the workings of the brain could account for the behavior of humans, there was no further need to posit anything like a soul or self, a subject behind the scenes, to predict people's behavior. One can simply drop or eliminate such beliefs as an inner person over and above the material workings of the brain. Rorty's whole approach in these matters was not to promote what has come to be known as cognitive science. He was making a much more pragmatic move. Rorty was trying to show how one's vocabulary in discussing a philosophical topic made a difference in one's beliefs about that topic. In this way, he wanted to show that one way of talking about a person, the vocabulary of science could replace the vocabulary of inner subjectivity. But he was not making any claims about the validity of science in making true claims about the human behavior. Rather, one could change one way of talking for another way of talking and not lose anything important. This is, obviously, a controversial move. Dualists do not think that one can eliminate

talk of the mental without substantial damage to our way of talking about agents, nor do scientific realists like the idea that science is just a convenient way of talking. However, from reading his early papers on eliminative materialism, with the emphasis on eliminative rather than materialism, one can begin to discern much of Rorty's later style of thinking. His orientation is pragmatic, and he uses a manner of narrative recontextualization in dealing with philosophical problems in terms of vocabularies in telling a better story.

Rorty's view that one's entry into philosophical discussion is best seen as contingent upon the metaphors and different vocabularies which are employed, gives his writings a distinctly literary quality. Among the different definitions he has offer on how he sees philosophy is that it is "a kind of writing." In this way, he wanted to emphasize philosophy's identity with the humanities rather than with science in approaching philosophical topics. Philosophy, like great literature, should aim at edifying readers rather than convincing them of the truth of its propositions. If this seems rather deflationary towards the tradition of philosophical speculation inaugurated by Plato, it is meant to be. Rorty thinks that philosophers should avoid argumentation and proof about lofty topics such as Truth, the Good, and Rationality. To borrow a theme from Wittgenstein, one should bring metaphysical words back to their ordinary use. Thus, rather than naming intellectual ideals, these terms can be interpreted as moral virtues by defining them pragmatically. For example, instead of seeking the Truth, one speaks truthfully. Instead of aiming at the Good, one does a good deed. Instead of being inspired by Rationality, one acts in a rational manner. For Rorty, one should see philosophy as the art of conversation. Another definition that Rorty has used is that philosophy is a "family romance." Doing philosophy is a personal struggle to find one's voice from within all those other thinkers who preceded one in the tradition. There are still plenty of stories for philosopher to tell about the heroes and villains from the past. To many who have taken philosophical problems as a serious enterprise, Rorty's ironic style of philosophy seems destructive of a noble and grand tradition. However, he denies that it would mean an end of philosophy. Since philosophy should not aim at getting things right, there is no way philosophy could come to an end. As long as the conversation is continuing, there is philosophical "progress."

In his social and political philosophy, Rorty maintains an uneasy alignment with the Enlightenment. He accepts the fact that the Enlightenment has provided Western culture with the basic beliefs without which a democracy could not function: equality, liberty, and toleration. However, he is unhappy with the Enlightenment's need for a theory of human nature and the belief in universal rationality as necessary conditions for self-governing. For Rorty, there is no need to ground social practices in a priori principles. One can dispense with a theory of man possessing a faculty of reason to discern universal truths and still accept the Enlightenment's heritage. Democratic practices, as well as others, can be articulated from within a pragmatic and historicist perspective. The most he thinks "bourgeois liberalism" needs is an ethnocentric justification. He denies that this position would lead to a self-defeating relativism. Since we are the heirs to Enlightenment practices, these beliefs have become part of our way of life, and since the only way one can understand social norms is find how they are played out in one's language-game, this gives them all the credibility they need.

Politically, Rorty presents a creative mixture of leftist politics and national pride. He has argued that America as a nation is unique in its secular experiment with democracy, its beliefs in social justice, and its commitment to progressive economic reform. For America's commitment to these ideals it deserves praise. It offers those who are oppressed and those who have to sell their labor in the marketplace the best place to gain a sense of fairness. Not in favor of radical solutions to social problems, he

has urged his leftist colleagues to seek for piecemeal reforms and practical solution to political issues. His position has infuriated those on the extreme left and the extreme right. Marxists and other leftists want to argue that America as a nation is morally bankrupt and needs radical change. Those from the conservative right do not like his lack of religious values toward eternal verities and his ideas about redistributing wealth. However, Rorty finds nothing inconsistent with his identification with those who are socially disadvantaged and poor, and his praise of America for its commitment to democratic ideals; its hope for equality among classes and genders; and its attempt to bridge the gap between the rich and the poor. The experiment of America is the experiment of self-creation. As he puts it, "We are the greatest poem because we put ourselves in the place of God: our essence is our existence, and our existence is in the future."

Rorty's influence has been greatest in scholarly areas outside of philosophy proper. To most philosophers, his thinking has lapsed into a form of nihilism or cynicism. His harshest critics come from those camps where he has claimed inspiration. For example, those who have been also influenced by Dewey maintain that Dewey's method was more scientific than Rorty wishes to acknowledge, and those who follow Heidegger feel that Heidegger's central insight into the meaning of being has been ignored by Rorty. Only Wittgensteinians have not found much to criticize. This may be because Wittgenstein's own practice of philosophical therapy, on not being bewitched by philosophical language, has some resonance with Rorty's deflationary view of epistemology, truth, and rationality. However, many other scholars in literature, rhetoric, political science, and cultural studies have found in his work an abundance of riches to explore.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature (Princeton, N.J., 1979).
Consequences of Pragmatism: Essays, 1972–1980 (Minneapolis, 1982).
Contingency, Irony and Solidarity (Cambridge, UK, 1988).
Objectivity, Relativism and Truth: Philosophical Papers Volume 1 (Cambridge, UK, 1991).
Essays on Heidegger and Others: Philosophical Papers Volume 2 (Cambridge, UK, 1991).
Achieving Our Country: Leftist Thought in Twentieth Century America (Cambridge, Mass., 1998).
Truth and Progress: Philosophical Papers Volume 3 (Cambridge, UK, 1998).
Philosophy and Social Hope (London, 2000).
The Future of Religion, with Gianni Vattimo, ed. Santiago Zabala (New York, 2005).

Other Relevant Works
"Pragmatism, Categories and Language," *Philosophical Review* 70 (1961): 197–223.
"The Subjectivist Principle and the Linguistic Turn," in *Alfred North Whitehead: Essays on His Philosophy*, ed. George L. Kline (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1963), pp. 134–57.
"Mind–Body Identity, Privacy, and Categories," *Review of Metaphysics* 19 (1965): 24–54.
Ed., *The Linguistic Turn* (Chicago, 1967; 2nd edn 1992).
"In Defence of Eliminative Materialism," *Review of Metaphysics* 24 (1970): 112–21.
"Idealism, Holism, and 'The Paradox of Knowledge'," in *The Philosophy of Brand Blanshard*, ed. Paul Schilpp (La Salle, Ill., 1980), pp. 719–38.
"Pragmatism, Relativism and Irrationalism," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 53 (1980): 719–38.
"Deconstructionist Theory," in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism* (Cambridge, UK, 1985).
Ed. with J. B. Schneewind and Quentin Skinner, *Philosophy in History* (Cambridge, UK, 1985).

Debating the State of Philosophy: Habermas, Rorty, and Kolakowski, ed. Józef Niznik and John T. Sanders (Westport, Conn., 1996).

"Introduction," to *Empiricism and the Philosophy of Mind*, by Wilfrid Sellars (Cambridge, Mass., 1997), pp. 1–12.

"Realism, Antirealism and Pragmatism: Comments on Alston, Chisholm, Davidson, Harman and Searle," in *Realism/Antirealism and Epistemology*, ed. Christopher Kulp (Lanham, Md., 1997), pp. 149–71.

Against Bosses, against Oligarchies: A Conversation with Richard Rorty, with Derek Nystrom and Kent Puckett (Charlottesville, Virg., 1998).

"Pragmatism," in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward Craig (London, 1998), vol. 7, pp. 632–40.

"Davidson's Mental–Physical Distinction," in *The Philosophy of Donald Davidson*, ed. Lewis E. Hahn (Chicago, 1999), pp. 575–94.

"A Pragmatist View of Contemporary Analytic Philosophy," in *The Pragmatic Turn in Philosophy*, ed. William Egginton and Mike Sandbothe (New York, 2004).

Further Reading

Amer Phils 1950–2000, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Blackwell Analytic Phil*, *Blackwell Comp Phils*, *Blackwell Comp Prag*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v8*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*

Auxier, Randall E., and Lewis E. Hahn, eds. *The Philosophy of Richard Rorty* (Chicago, 2006). Contains Rorty's autobiography and bibliography.

Brandom, Robert B., ed. *Rorty and His Critics* (Oxford, 2000).

Crosby, Donald A., and Charley D. Hardwick, eds. *Pragmatism, Neo-pragmatism, and Religion: Conversations with Richard Rorty* (New York, 1997).

Festenstein, Matthew, and Simon Thompson,
eds. *Richard Rorty: Critical Dialogues* (Cambridge, 2001).

Gander, Eric M. *The Last Conceptual Revolution: A Critique of Richard Rorty's Political Philosophy* (Albany, N.Y., 1999).

Gross, Neil. "Richard Rorty's Pragmatism: A Case Study in the Sociology of Ideas," *Theory and Society* 32 (2003): 93–148.

Guignon, Charles, and David Hiley, eds. *Richard Rorty* (Cambridge, UK, 2003).

Hall, David L. *Richard Rorty: Prophet and Poet of the New Pragmatism* (Albany, N.Y., 1994).

Hottois, Gilbert, and Maurice Weyembergh. *Richard Rorty: ambiguïtés et limites du postmodernisme* (Paris, 1994).

Kolenda, Konstantin. *Rorty's Humanistic Pragmatism* (Tampa, Fla., 1990).

Kuipers, Ronald A. *Solidarity and the Stranger: Themes in the Social Philosophy of Richard Rorty* (Lanham, Md., 1997).

Malakowski, Alan R. *Richard Rorty* (Princeton, N.J., 2002).

Malakowski, Alan R., ed. *Reading Rorty: Critical Responses to Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature (and Beyond)* (Oxford, 1990).

Melkonian, Markar. *Richard Rorty's Politics* (Amherst, N.Y., 1999).

Nielson, Kai. *After the Demise of the Tradition: Rorty, Critical Theory, and the Fate of Philosophy* (Boulder, Col., 1981).

Peters, Michael A., and Paulo Ghiraldelli, Jr., eds. *Richard Rorty: Education, Philosophy, and Politics* (Lanham, Md., 2001).

Pettegrew, John, ed. *A Pragmatist's Progress: Richard Rorty and American Intellectual History* (Lanham, Md., 2000).

Reese-Schäfer, Walter. *Richard Rorty* (Frankfort am Main, 1991).

Rothleder, Dianne. *The Work of Friendship: Rorty, His Critics, and the Project of Solidarity* (Albany, N.Y., 1999).

Rumana, Richard. *On Rorty* (Belmont, Cal., 2000).

———, *Richard Rorty: An Annotated*

Bibliography of Secondary Literature (Amsterdam, 2002).

Saatkamp, Herman, Jr., ed. *Rorty and Pragmatism: The Philosopher Responds to His Critics* (Nashville, Tenn., 1995).

Richard Rumana

ROSEN, Stanley Howard (1929–)

Stanley Rosen was born on 29 July 1929 in Warren, Ohio. He earned a BA at the University of Chicago in 1949, having attended classes for only nine months because he had been excused by placement exams from the rest of the program. His undergraduate school year was largely devoted to reading and writing poetry; his first book, *Death in Egypt* (1952), was a collection of poems. From 1950 to 1952 Rosen studied in the philosophy department at the University of Chicago, and from 1952 to 1955 he studied with Chicago's Committee on Social Thought. He studied Greek with David Grene, political philosophy with Leo STRAUSS, and other philosophical subjects (including Thomas Aquinas and Descartes) with Yves SIMON. His 1955 PhD dissertation, "Spinoza's Argument for Freedom of Speech," was completed under the direction of Strauss.

In 1956 Rosen joined the philosophy department at Pennsylvania State University, where he was later appointed Evan Pugh Professor of Philosophy. He was a Fulbright research professor at the University of Paris in 1960–61. While in Paris he spent time in the company of Alexandre Kojève, whose influence on him was no less significant than that of Strauss, and whose philosophical doctrines he analyzes, in connection with those of Strauss, in the title essay of *Hermeneutics as Politics* (1987). In 1994, after almost forty years at Penn State, Rosen left for Boston University where he is Borden Parker Bowne Professor of Philosophy

and University Professor. He was a President of the Metaphysical Society of America. Rosen has been a visiting professor and lecturer at many universities; recently he was the Priestley Lecturer at the University of Toronto in 1997, the Cardinal Mercier Lecturer at the Catholic University of Leuven in 1998, and the Etienne Gilson Lecturer at the Institut Catholique in Paris in 2003.

Rosen's philosophical legacy is twofold. His lectures served as a paradigm of philosophical teaching for several generations of doctoral students, many of whom now hold positions at colleges and universities throughout the United States and Canada as well as overseas. His influence may extend even further, however, through his many books and over 125 articles and chapters in books. Rosen's writing, a mixture of boldness and concision leavened with wit, has won him a worldwide reputation among students of metaphysics and epistemology, political philosophy, rhetoric, and literary theory. His books have been translated into French, Polish, Catalan, Japanese, and Chinese.

The breadth of Rosen's thought makes it difficult to characterize his philosophical accomplishments in a few words. His first book, *Plato's Symposium* (1968), and his later books and articles on Plato's metaphysical and political thought, including *Plato's Sophist* (1983) and *Plato's Statesman* (1995), transformed Plato studies in the English-speaking world. When *Plato's Symposium* was published, the field was dominated by analytically trained scholars, and it was customary to study the arguments of the Platonic dialogues in abstraction from other, ostensibly insignificant features of the text. Thanks in large part to Rosen's work, scholars now understand that the philosophical significance of the arguments cannot be grasped apart from the dramatic and literary contexts in which they are advanced, and that the dialogues must be studied as coherent literary wholes.

Rosen has also written on the most influential philosophers of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, including *G. W. F. Hegel* (1974),

The Question of Being: A Reversal of Heidegger (1993), and *The Mask of Enlightenment: Nietzsche's Zarathustra* (1995). His interest in the history of philosophy has never been merely philological or antiquarian, however. Throughout his career, he has turned to the past in order to come to grips with the present. He learned from Strauss and Kojève that the genuine philosopher is above all engaged with the present, and that the thought of the ancients is indispensable for understanding our modern and postmodern situation. At the same time, it would be fair to say that in certain fundamental respects he has always been a Platonist – with the caveat that he is centrally concerned to correct modern misperceptions of Plato, including the tendency to see him as a somewhat crude forerunner of systematic thought. Rosen argues forcefully for the goodness of reason. His reliance, wherever possible, on nontechnical language reflects his conviction that ordinary experience is the basis of the intelligibility of philosophy. He returns repeatedly to the problem of the relation between philosophy and poetry, or to put it another way, to the relation between the accurate articulation of our apprehension of what is and the contemplation of conceptual structures of our own making. Finally, no other contemporary thinker has so consistently and compellingly articulated the essential role of Socratic eros in the philosophical endeavor.

In his second (and probably most influential) book, *Nihilism* (1969), Rosen introduces the overriding critical theme of his *ouevre*. The book begins by reflecting on the consequences of the separation of the conception of "reason" from the conception of "good" in modern rationalism, which took the value-neutral science of mathematics as its model. It follows from this separation that reason can say nothing about its own goodness, or that the assertion of goodness is necessarily nonrational. In Rosen's formulation, nihilism is a condition in which the sense or significance of speech is indistinguishable from silence. Yet he shows that the two leading critical responses to

modern rationalism in the twentieth century, Heideggerian ontology and the "ordinary language philosophy" originated by Wittgenstein, culminate in the silence of internal contradiction and radical historicity. In the face of this philosophical crisis, which he sees as only one of the more recent manifestations of the perennial problem of nihilism, Rosen advises us to reacquaint ourselves with Plato's understanding of the Ideas as objects of noetic vision and the Good as the fundamental principle of intelligibility. But as he explains at length in *The Question of Being*, this reacquaintance is impeded by the powerful influence of Heidegger's misinterpretation of Platonic metaphysics as a kind of ontological utilitarianism that itself gives rise to an instrumentalist conception of reason and thus to nihilism.

Like *Nihilism*, *The Limits of Analysis* (1980) is a spirited defense of philosophical reason and in particular of metaphysics. In this book Rosen shows that analytical philosophy depends for its intelligibility on the context of analysis, but is unable to provide a conceptual understanding of this context (and in particular of the analyst himself). The analytical project of conceptualizing the world thus fails, but its failure is highly illuminating: "the very attempt to understand the world leads to a conceptual reconstruction that separates us … from the world we set out to understand" (p. 222). Analytical philosophy is unable to maintain the distinction between philosophy and poetry, which is to say that it culminates in nihilism. While "there is no solution … compatible with our humanity" to the problem of conceptual reconstruction, we can at least "retain our grip on the problem and hence avoid dissolution by its ostensible solutions" (p. 222). We may do so only by moderating what Pascal called the *esprit géométrique*, or the desire for a theoretically rigorous account of human experience, with the *esprit de finesse*, the judicious understanding of experience as a unity of irreducibly heterogeneous elements. Because analytical philosophy is intrinsically

immoderate, however, Rosen predicts that it "will succumb, sooner or later, to some combination of doctrines drawn from post-Heideggerian thought" (p. 153).

While the foregoing prediction has proved prescient, Rosen is not aligned with deconstructionism and post-modernism. The latter modes of thought are no less lacking in *finesse*, and therefore no less extreme, than those they seek to replace. The philosophical *esprit de finesse* is characterized by openness to the wholeness of the whole. This openness is rooted in Socratic eros, and Heidegger's philosophical epigones are erotically deficient. To take a small but telling example, Jacques Derrida's attempted deconstruction of Plato's *Phaedrus*, which rests upon his characterization of Plato as "nothing by intention but a metaphysician of presence," fails because Derrida "seems to have a tin ear for theology" and "has nothing to say about divine madness" (1987, pp. 72–4). These shortcomings render him insensitive to the relevant context of analysis, namely, the dramatic and literary wholeness of the dialogue itself, and thus to the evident playfulness of the passages he takes so seriously. Rosen asserts that Heidegger's misinterpretation of Plato is rooted in a similar mistake (1993, pp. 10, 191).

Eros links the human and the divine. It is accordingly suppressed when the difference between these spheres is no longer admitted, or, put another way, when metaphysics succumbs altogether to Derridean *différence* and therewith to the denial of transcendence. In that case, as Rosen makes clear in *Hermeneutics as Politics*, humanity threatens to degenerate into bestiality. Rosen's defense of the erotic enterprise of philosophy thus turns into a defense of humanity itself. This becomes especially clear in two of his collections of essays, *Metaphysics in Ordinary Language* (1999) and *The Elusiveness of the Ordinary* (2002). Rosen maintains that the need for the extraordinary activity of philosophy arises in ordinary experience: "all human beings desire the good life," and "the good life always participates in philosophy" (1999, p. 232). Put another way, the

ordinary, understood as "the common web of human experience," is "that from which we make our approach to philosophy" (2002, pp. 296–7). Philosophy must accordingly offer an account of its relation to ordinary experience that establishes its own ability to provide "a plausible response to the needs elicited in human beings by the everywhere compelling features of everyday life" (1999, p. 230). Everyday life, however, is captured neither by Heidegger's notion of "average everydayness," which amounts to the "denatured residue of the richness of ordinary experience," nor by Nietzsche's conception of the everyday as "the decadent residue of worn-out world-historical epochs" (2002, pp. 295–6). Philosophy must furthermore avoid transforming ordinary experience into a technical artifact, as in the case of Husserlian and Heideggerian phenomenology on the one hand and ordinary language analysis on the other. We may note in this connection that Rosen's very high ranking of Plato seems to reflect his agreement with Strauss that the Platonic dialogues provide a truer phenomenology of pre-theoretical life, and in particular of the ordinary beginnings of philosophy, than other thinkers have been able to furnish.

While he learned much from Strauss, Rosen's own thought moves well beyond political philosophy into the domain of metaphysics, about which Strauss essentially remained silent (see 2000 with 1991 and 2002, pp. 135–58). Furthermore, Rosen's Platonism is perfectly consistent with his preference for modern enlightenment over the ostensibly more moderate and prudent conservatism of the ancients. This preference proceeds from the recognition that "the modern revolutionary enterprise … [is] more noble than the classical understanding of noble resignation" (1999, p. 238). As Rosen is quick to point out, the insight expressed in this claim is neither ancient nor modern. It springs instead from philosophy itself, a way of life that is at all times open to human beings. "The greater nobility of modernity is not the consequence of modern arguments, but rather of the genuine philosophical

nobility of the ancients, as manifested in the revolution instigated by Socrates." (1989, p. 19)

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Death in Egypt (Columbus, Ohio, 1952).
Nihilism: A Philosophical Essay (New Haven, Conn., 1969).
G. W. F. Hegel: An Introduction to the Science of Wisdom (New Haven, Conn., 1974).
The Limits of Analysis (New York, 1980).
Plato's Sophist: The Drama of Original and Image (New Haven, Conn., 1983).
Hermeneutics as Politics (Oxford, 1987; 2nd edn, New Haven, Conn., 2003).
Plato's Symposium (New Haven, Conn., 1968; 2nd edn 1987).
The Quarrel Between Philosophy and Poetry: Studies in Ancient Thought (London and New York, 1988).
The Ancients and the Moderns: Rethinking Modernity (New Haven, Conn., 1989).
The Question of Being: A Reversal of Heidegger (New Haven, Conn., 1993).
Plato's Statesman: The Web of Politics (New Haven, Conn., 1995).
The Mask of Enlightenment: Nietzsche's Zarathustra (Cambridge, UK, 1995).
Metaphysics in Ordinary Language (New Haven, Conn., 1999).
The Elusiveness of the Ordinary: Studies in the Possibility of Philosophy (New Haven, Conn., 2002).

Other Relevant Works
"Order and History," *Review of Metaphysics* 12 (1958): 257–76.
"Thought and Action," *Inquiry* 2 (1959): 65–84.
"Wisdom: The End of Philosophy," *Review of Metaphysics* 16 (1962): 181–211.
"Reflections on Nihilism," *Man and World* 1 (1968): 64–95.
"Theory and Practice in Hegel: Union or Disunion?" in *Hegel's Social and Political Thought*, ed. Donald Phillip Verene (Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1980), pp. 35–46.
"Leo Strauss and the Quarrel Between the Ancients and the Moderns," in *Leo Strauss's Thought*, ed. A. Udoff (Boulder, Col., 1991), pp. 91–112.
"The Metaphysics of Ordinary Experience," *Harvard Review of Philosophy* 5 (1995): 41–57.
"Leo Strauss and the Possibility of Philosophy," *Review of Metaphysics* 53 (2000): 541–64.
"The Identity of, and the Difference between, Analytical and Continental Philosophy," *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 9 (2001): 341–8.
"Are We Such Stuff As Dreams Are Made On? Against Reductionism," in *Gadamer's Century: Essays in Honor of Hans-Georg Gadamer*, ed. Jeff Malpas (Cambridge, Mass., 2002), pp. 257–77.

Further Reading
Bai, Tongdong. "Plato, Strauss, and Political Philosophy: An Interview with Stanley Rosen," *Diotima: A Philosophical Review* 2 (2001): 3–26.
Friedrich, Volker. *"Ich bin ein Gott": Volker Friedrich im Gespräch mit Karl R. Popper, Max Bense, Gianni Vattimo, Richard Rorty, Neil Postman, Stanley Rosen, Carl Mitcham* (Munich, Germany, 1995).
Hibbs, Thomas. "Modern Ancients: Stanley Rosen's Achievement," *The Weekly Standard* 8 (25 November 2002): 31–4.
Hill, Geoffrey. "Discourse: For Stanley Rosen," *The New Criterion* 21 (June 2003): 32.
Margolis, Joseph. "Interpretation at Risk," *The Monist* 73 (1990): 312–30.
Perelman, Charles. "Reply to Stanley H. Rosen's 'Thought and Action'," *Inquiry* 2 (1959): 85–8.

Jacob Howland

ROSENBERG, Harold (1906–78)

Harold Rosenberg was born on 2 February 1906 in Brooklyn, New York, and died on 11 July 1978 in Springs, Long Island, New York. In 1924, after a year at City College of New York, he entered the Brooklyn Law School and graduated with an LLB degree in 1927. During the 1930s and 40s he held a number of positions in government agencies while building a reputation as a highly regarded poet. His first book of collected poems, *Trance Above the Streets*, was published in 1942. Rosenberg, a social commentator and critic of the arts, was prominently associated with the growth and influence of the so called "action painters" who were active and influential in both the United States and Europe during the 1950s and 60s.

In 1935 Rosenberg joined the staff of the *Art Front*, a publication that supported the social, political, and aesthetic interests of artists employed on the Federal Art Projects. It was during this association that he began to write art criticism. *The Partisan Review* published his seminal essay "On the Fall of Paris" (1940), in which he argued that modern art was not a progressive historical movement rooted in the developing concerns of nineteenth-century European artists working in opposition to the aesthetic precepts of the established academies. Modern art derived instead from the assimilation of worldwide cultural influences.

In 1952 Rosenberg published "The American Action Painters." He opposed the followers of the English aestheticians, Roger Fry and Clive Bell, who denied the importance of the referential function of "Modern Art." Rosenberg instead stressed the aesthetic significance of its formal compositional characteristics. He argued that the organization of the visual elements in a work of art were subordinate to the evidence of the events that produced it. For Rosenberg, it was the record of the process, the acts of the artist, and the residue of that action embedded in the material forming each painting or sculpture, that shaped its essential meaning and value. He described the art object as an art event, requiring the empathy and commitment of responsive viewers. Though he was a champion of abstract art, he insisted on the legitimacy and potency of referential images of deeply felt personal and social values.

From 1966 to 1978 Rosenberg was professor of art at the University of Chicago, and from 1967 to 1978 he was the art critic for *The New Yorker* magazine. Often combative in his criticism of the art establishment, Rosenberg always connected aesthetics with ethics. In his final years, deeply angered by his belief that the arts had been co-opted by the media, the museums, and the commercial interests that benefited from them, his writing became increasingly critical and contentious.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"On the Fall of Paris," *The Partisan Review* 7 (1940): 440–48.

Trance Above the Streets (New York, 1942).

"The American Action Painters," *Art News* 51 (December 1952): 22–3, 48–50.

The Tradition of the New (New York, 1959).

Arshile Gorky: The Man, The Time, The Idea (New York, 1962).

The Anxious Object: Art Today and Its Audience (New York, 1964).

Artworks and Packages (New York, 1969).

Act and the Actor: Making the Self (New York, 1970).

Barnet Newman: Broken Obelisk and Other Sculptures (Seattle, 1971).

The De-definition of Art, Action Art to Pop to Earthworks (New York, 1972).

Discovering the Present: Three Decades in Art, Culture and Politics (Chicago, 1973).

De Kooning (New York, 1974).

Art on the Edge: Creators and Situations (New York, 1975).

Barnet Newman (New York, 1978).

Art and Other Serious Matters (Chicago, 1985).

The Case of the Baffled Radical (Chicago, 1985).

Other Relevant Works
Rosenberg's papers are at the Getty Research
    Institute in Los Angeles, California.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Who
    Was Who in Amer v7*
Cortright, Barbara. *Philosophic Themes in
    the Writings of Harold Rosenberg*, PhD
    dissertation, University of New Mexico
    (Albuquerque, N.M., 1993).
Klinkowitz, Jerome. *Rosenberg, Barthes,
    Hassan: The Postmodern Habit of
    Thought* (Athens, Georgia, 1988).
Orton, Fred. "Action, Revolution and
    Painting," in *Pollack and After: The
    Critical Debate*, 2nd edn (New York,
    2000), pp. 261–87.

Nathan Knobler

ROSENBLATT, Louise Michelle (1904–)

Louise Rosenblatt was born on 23 August 1904
in Atlantic City, New Jersey. She received her BA
with honors in English from Barnard College of
Columbia University in 1925, and then studied
French for a year at the University of Grenoble.
She returned to Barnard College to teach in the
English department in 1927, and completed her
PhD in comparative literature at the Sorbonne in
Paris in 1931. She taught in the English depart-
ments of Barnard College (1928–38) and then
Brooklyn College (1938–48). During this time
she married fellow pragmatist and philosopher
Sidney RATNER. Rosenblatt was professor of
education at New York University from 1948
until the mandatory retirement age in 1972.
Since 1972 she taught at Rutgers University,
Michigan State University, University of
Pennsylvania, and elsewhere. She was inducted
into the Reading Hall of Fame in 1992, given the
John Dewey Society 2001 award for contribu-

tions to education and culture, and has received
numerous other honors. Rosenblatt has recently
resided in Princeton, New Jersey, and since 1996
she has occasionally been a scholar in residence
during winter months at the University of
Miami, Florida.

There were two important early influences in
Rosenblatt's career. The first was her college
roommate at Barnard, Margaret MEAD, who
encouraged Rosenblatt to take anthropology
courses as an undergraduate. These courses
had a significant impact on her notion of the
ways in which culture and environment influ-
enced the development of an individual. The
second influence was one of Rosenblatt's col-
leagues in the philosophy department at
Columbia, John DEWEY. Her work is repre-
sentative of a pragmatist approach to the aes-
thetics of reading. Rosenblatt was one of the
early members of the Conference on Methods
in Philosophy and the Sciences, which studied
the works of Dewey, Charles PEIRCE, and
William JAMES at Columbia in the early 1930s.

Rosenblatt's most important contribution to
academia began with her first book, *Literature
as Exploration* (1938), which inaugurated the
reader response theory. In this book, along
with a number of other publications, most
notably *The Reader, the Text, the Poem: The
Transactional Theory of the Literary Work*
(1978), Rosenblatt outlines a theory of reading
which is understood as a transactional process
between the reader and a text. She emphasizes
that there are no generic readers or generic
texts, only individual readers interacting with
individual texts at particular times and in par-
ticular contexts. Using this as a starting point,
a theory of reading needs to take into account
the dynamic relationship between the reader
and his or her text. Rosenblatt emphasizes what
she calls an aesthetic reading of a text. This kind
of reading (as opposed to efferent or practical
reading) allows one to focus on a literary text
as a work of art and encourages a reader not
only to pay attention to the literal meanings of
the words, but the feelings in the reader that the
associations with the words arouse.

Rosenblatt rejects the deconstructionist suggestion that if there is no one right way to interpret then all standards fall apart. She says that standards for good reading are always agreed upon in general; standards like coherent interpretations, a close reading of texts, and of other basic assumptions of the text that are identifiable. Although she denies that there can be one right answer or absolute reading of a text, she does suggest that there can be several probable interpretations, depending on what the reader brings to the text. For Rosenblatt, the reader takes an active role as both reader and interpreter.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

L'idée de l'art pour l'art dans la littérature anglaise pendant la période victorienne (Paris, 1931).

"The Writer's Dilemma," *International Journal of Ethics* 46 (1936): 195–211.

Literature as Exploration (New York, 1938; 1976; 1995).

"Toward a Cultural Approach to Literature," *College English* 7 (1946): 459–66.

"The Poem as Event," *College English* 26 (1964): 123–8.

"Toward a Transactional Theory of Reading," *Journal of Reading Behavior* 1 (1969): 31–51.

The Reader, the Text, the Poem: The Transactional Theory of the Literary Work (Carbondale, Ill., 1978).

"What Facts Does This Poem Teach You?" *Language Arts* 57 (1980): 386–94.

"The Reader's Contribution to the Literary Experience," *English Quarterly* 14 (1981): 1–12.

"The Literary Transaction: Evocation and Response," *Theory into Practice* 21 (1982): 268–77.

"The Aesthetic Transaction," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 20 (1986): 122–8.

Further Reading
Who's Who in Phil

Clifford, John, ed. *The Experience of Reading: Louise Rosenblatt and the Reader-response Theory* (Portsmouth, N.H., 1991). Contains Rosenblatt's bibliography.

Douglas, Wallace. "Rosenblatt's Theory of the Literary Transaction," *CEA Critic* 41 (May 1979): 34–8.

Farrell, Edmund, and James Squire, eds. *Transactions with Literature: A Fifty-year Perspective, for Louise M. Rosenblatt* (Urbana, Ill., 1990).

Karolides, Nicholas J. "Theory and Practice: An Interview with Louise M. Rosenblatt," *Language Arts* 77 (1999): 159–70.

Sarah Elizabeth Worth

ROSS, Edward Alsworth (1866–1951)

Edward Alsworth Ross was born on 12 December 1866 in Virden, Illinois. He attended Coe College in Iowa, earning a BA in 1886. He taught two years at the Fort Dodge Commercial Institute and from 1888 to 1889 studied at the University of Berlin and traveled in France and England. In 1890 Ross began graduate study in economics at John Hopkins University in Maryland, where he worked with Richard T. ELY and earned his PhD in political economy in 1891. His dissertation on "Sinking Funds" was published in 1892.

Ross taught political economy, history, and sociology at the University of Indiana in 1891–2, Cornell University in 1892–3, and was professor of economics at Stanford University from 1893 to 1900. Dismissed from Stanford in 1900 for his outspoken support of progressive reforms, Ross was appointed professor of sociology at the University of Nebraska in 1901. In 1906 he was invited to join the economics department as a professor of sociology at the University of Wisconsin, chaired by his former

mentor, Richard Ely. Ross organized a separate department of sociology and anthropology in 1929, serving as chair from 1929 until his retirement in 1937. He was Secretary of the American Economic Association in 1892, and was President of the American Sociological Society in 1914 and 1915. He also served as national chair of the American Civil Liberties Union from 1940 to 1950. He died on 22 July 1951 in Madison, Wisconsin.

Influenced by French social thinkers including Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Emile Durkheim, and Gabriel Tarde, Ross emphasized the objective and *sui generis* nature of society over the individual, particular and subjective experience. In his *Social Psychology* (1908) he stakes out the collective as the proper domain of social psychology rather than the individual, an approach which sociology largely abandoned by the end of his career.

Ross was a pioneer in articulating the distinct nature of sociology, including its theory, method, and practices. He thought sociology was destined to be superior to all the other social sciences. In *Social Control* (1901), he demonstrates his affinity for order, arguing that since they were derived from objective social facts, "social processes" were the proper unit of investigation for sociology, rather than individuals, groups or collectives. Like Lester Frank WARD, he acknowledged that inchoate psychic factors were the primary sources or causes of social phenomena, but Ross was careful to avoid reducing one into other, concentrating more on studying relationships between aggregates. It is only at this level of understanding (social phenomena) that sociologists can begin to formulate generalizations and laws that emphasize common properties between heterogeneous types of data.

Ross is associated with the emergence of academic scientific racism, coining the phrase "race suicide" in his article, "The Causes of Racial Superiority" (1901). This article reflects his now discredited views on racial hierarchies based on Darwinian "survival of the fittest" assumptions about human evolution. His

writing on the objective, rational nature of sin in modern society led to addictions like alcoholism being viewed as social problems rather than being reduced to individual failures. His writings on sin also foreshadowed the work of Edwin H. Sutherland on white-collar crime.

Ross was also a writer and popularizer of sociology, contributing many essays to fashionable magazines such as *Atlantic Monthly* and *Century*. His books, *Changing America* (1912) and *The Social Trend* (1922), contributed to the emergence of American sociology from its European roots, demonstrating the effectiveness of statistical analysis in helping sociologists to identify recurring patterns and trends in order to formulate predictions in studying the effects of social change.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sinking Funds (Baltimore, Md., 1892).

Honest Dollars (Chicago, 1896).

Social Control: A Survey of the Foundations of Order (New York, 1901).

"The Causes of Racial Superiority," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 18 (1901): 67–89.

Foundations of Sociology (New York, 1905).

Sin and Society: An Analysis of Latter-Day Iniquity (Boston, 1907).

Latter Day Sinners and Saints (New York, 1910).

The Changing Chinese: The Conflict of Oriental and Western Culture in China (New York, 1911).

Changing America: Studies in Contemporary Society (New York, 1912).

The Old World in the New: The Significance of Past and Present Immigration to the American People (New York, 1914).

Russia in Upheaval (New York, 1918).

The Principles of Sociology (New York, 1920).

The Russian Bolshevik Revolution (New York, 1921).

The Social Trend (New York, 1922).

The Russian Soviet Republic (New York, 1922).

The Social Revolution in Mexico (New York, 1923).

Roads to Social Peace (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1924).

Standing Room Only? (New York, 1927).

New-Age Sociology (New York, 1940).

Other Related Works

Ross's papers are at the State Historical Society of Wisconsin Library and the University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

Social Control, and the Foundations of Sociology: Pioneer Contributions of Edward Alsworth Ross to the Study of Society, ed. Edgar F. Borgatta and Henry J. Meyer (Boston, 1959).

Seventy Years of It: An Autobiography of Edward Alsworth Ross (New York, 1936).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Bio Dict Psych by Zusne, Comp Amer Thought, Dict Amer Bio, Encyc Amer Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v18, Who was Who in Amer v5

Hertzler, Joyce O. "Edward Alsworth Ross: Sociological Pioneer and Interpreter" *American Sociological Review* 16 (1951): 597–612.

McMahon, Sean H. *Social Control and Public Intellect: The Legacy of Edward A. Ross* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1999).

Weinberg, Julius. *Edward Alsworth Ross and the Sociology of Progressivism* (Madison, Wisc., 1972).

Jean Van Delinder

ROSS, Ralph Gilbert (1911–2000)

Ralph Ross was born on 27 August 1911 in New York City. His father, a successful lawyer, powerfully influenced his intellectual development, reading classical literature to his family but preaching no doctrine, preferring that his sons should shape their own destiny nourished by a liberal and cosmopolitan heritage. Headed as an undergraduate for Columbia University, Ross's plans changed abruptly because of the onset of respiratory problems. Instead, he headed for the dry climate of the southwest and enrolled at the University of Arizona, where he completed his BA in 1933. At Arizona, Professor M. R. Schneck inducted him into philosophy and further shaped his future by urging him to do graduate work at Columbia University under Professor F. J. E. WOODBRIDGE, regarded as one of the most gifted philosophy teachers in the United States. Schneck also introduced Ross to Morris R. COHEN at the City College of New York; Cohen became one of Ross's philosophical counselors during his graduate career.

Ross wrote of his seven years at Columbia: "In my graduate years … I learned most from Woodbridge, who was a truly great teacher, from Professor Herbert SCHNEIDER (who was to remain a life-long friend and occasional collaborator) and from Ernest NAGEL." In those years, his interest in aesthetics and literature, strongly shaped by Schneck, deepened. Following the promptings of Nagel and Cohen, he felt compelled to concentrate on and to teach logic and the philosophy of science. Schneider drew him into the study of political philosophy and morals. In Ross's own words: "Schneider raised questions about obligation, a moral and political category, that puzzled me and seemed ever more important. For years I returned to Columbia to talk to him about them. Only in a book called *Obligation: A Social Theory* (1970) did I answer most of those questions to my own satisfaction." Under Woodbridge's supervision, Ross completed his MA degree in 1935 and his PhD in philosophy in 1940. His dissertation, "Skepticism and Dogma," a study of the thought of F. H. Bradley, was published in 1940.

Throughout his lifetime, Ross's interests continued to expand. At all stages of his academic career he taught literature and the social

sciences in addition to philosophy. His classroom and formal scholarly work always expressed an unusually capacious view of philosophy – not, perhaps, of philosophy viewed as a bounded technical discipline with rigidly defined sub-fields, but rather as a mode of thinking and a way of life.

His early academic appointments at the University of Newark from 1935 to 1940, and Queen's College of the City of New York from 1940 to 1945, allowed him to influence many young minds during an unusually turbulent political era. Ross was a brilliant and outspoken exponent of liberalism and democracy, taking a stand in the face of the counterclaims of Marxism, Stalinism, and other anti-democratic ideologies. His lifelong commitment emerged, that "one should have many subjects to philosophize about and should learn many things expertly enough to incorporate them in a large philosophical view." It was this kind of commitment that drew him to New York University where Sidney Hook chaired the philosophy department. Ross began as an assistant professor of philosophy and coordinator of the social science program during 1945–47, and then became associate professor of philosophy and coordinator of the humanities program during 1947–51. During this period Hook and Ross began a lifelong friendship; Ross later delivered one of the eulogies for Hook. Hook, one of America's leading exponents of pragmatism and instrumentalism, inspired Ross's interest in John Dewey and pragmatism. Ross edited and introduced several volumes of writings by classical American philosophers, including three volumes of Dewey's collected works.

In the intellectual circles of New York where politics and political theory were central to the life of the mind, Ross and Hook were often viewed as partners in the public debates that were part of the Cold War era. They were public intellectuals, frequently contributing to publications like *Partisan Review*, *The New Leader*, and *Commentary*. Their common purpose was to oppose what Jean-François Revel called "the totalitarian temptation." It was during this

period that Ross served as secretary of the Commission of Inquiry into Forced Labor.

In the early 1950s and 1960s Ross became a prominent spokesman within and on behalf of the general education movement which had been nurtured at Harvard, Columbia, and the University of Chicago. The movement sought to restore the honored place of the liberal arts as the center of undergraduate education. In its various forms, general education usually emphasized the reading of classical texts from a broad humanistic perspective, a commitment to undergraduate instruction in the face of the increasing academic dominance of intense specialization, and a multidisciplinary or cross-disciplinary curriculum. Such convictions led Ross throughout his entire academic career to accept administrative responsibilities for directing large and vibrant programs that were avowedly multidisciplinary.

In 1951 Ross became a professor of philosophy and humanities and chair of the legendary humanities program (founded by philosopher Albury Castell with Joseph Warren Beach) at the University of Minnesota. The humanities program was the largest unit of the department of interdisciplinary studies whose curriculum was entirely devoted to the general education of undergraduates. Under Ross's leadership from 1951 to 1966 he added many academic and nonacademic luminaries to the faculty as permanent members or as visitors. These appointments included Saul Bellow, Isaac Rosenfeld, Benjamin Nelson, William Phillips, Allan Bloom, John Berryman, and numbers of others from the larger nonacademic world of humane learning and letters.

Ross's scholarly work also reflects his broad philosophical and interdisciplinary perspectives. Three examples must suffice. With Ernest van den Haag, an economist, psychoanalyst and scholar of jurisprudence, he co-authored a massive work, *The Fabric of Society: An Introduction to the Social Sciences*, published in 1957 under the editorial direction of Professor Robert K. Merton, the famed Columbia University sage of sociology.

Working with two poets and literary critics, colleagues John Berryman and Allen Tate, he co-authored a unique text, *The Arts of Reading* (1960). It taught students how to read and analyze works of literature, philosophy, and politics. Reviewing Ross's major monograph, *Obligation: A Social Theory* (1970), Melvin Toumin of Princeton University, wrote that Ross's achievement was to have located moral questions "in the context of everyday *group* life, that is, in the social and political spheres of conduct."

In 1966 Ross accepted the Hartley Burr ALEXANDER Chair of Humanities and Professor of Philosophy at Scripps College, and simultaneously was appointed professor of philosophy, government, and liberal studies at Claremont Graduate School. The chair also included the stewardship of Scripps's required humanities program (at that time a three-year curriculum). He retained these administrative and academic posts until his emeritus status was granted in 1977. In retirement Ross taught selected courses at the Claremont Colleges and in 1992 was honored by an ongoing appointment as a fellow of the Gould Center at Claremont McKenna College. He continued to write until some months before his death on 7 April 2000 in Uplands, California.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Skepticism and Dogma: A Study in the Philosophy of F. H. Bradley (New York, 1940).

The Fabric of Society: An Introduction to the Social Sciences, with Ernest van den Haag (New York, 1957).

The Arts of Reading, with John Berryman and Allen Tate (New York, 1960).

Symbols and Civilization: Science, Morals, Religion, Art, with Ernest van den Haag (New York, 1962).

Obligation: A Social Theory (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1970).

Literature and the Arts: The Moral Issues, with Harry Girvetz (Belmont, Cal., 1971).

Other Relevant Works

"Democracy, Party, and Politics," *Ethics* 64 (1954): 100–25.

"Academic Freedom and Faculty Status," *Commentary* 22 (1956): 131–9.

"Art as Knowledge," *Sewanee Review* 69 (1961): 579–600.

"The Scientist's Responsibility to His World," *Journal of Human Relations* 11 (1963): 161–72.

"Moral Obligations of the Scientist," in *Applied Sociology: Opportunities and Problems*, ed. A. W. Gouldner and S. M. Miller (New York and London, 1965), pp. 429–38.

"The Experience of Value," in *Philosophy and the Civilizing Arts: Essays Presented to Herbert W. Schneider*, ed. Craig Walton and John P. Anton (Athens, Ohio, 1974), pp. 316–44.

"A Glance at Experience," in *Sidney Hook: Philosopher of Democracy and Humanism*, ed. Paul Kurtz (Buffalo, N.Y., 1983), pp. 291–304.

Further Reading

Howe, Quincey, ed. *Humanitas: Essays in Honor of Ralph Ross* (Claremont, Cal., 1977). Contains a bibliography of Ross's writings.

Philip Siegelman

ROWE, William Leonard (1931–)

William Rowe was born on 26 July 1931 in Detroit, Michigan. He received the BA degree in philosophy from Wayne State University in 1954, and completed a BD degree summa cum laude at Chicago Theological Seminary in 1957. He then moved to the University of Michigan where he received his MA in 1958 and PhD in philosophy in 1962. His disserta-

tion, "An Examination of the Philosophical Theology of Paul Tillich," was written under William ALSTON. From 1960 to 1962 Rowe taught at the University of Illinois at Urbana. Since 1962 he has taught at Purdue University, where he was promoted to full professor of philosophy in 1969, and served as head of the philosophy department from 1981 to 1991. He has also held visiting appointments at Wayne State University (1963–4) and the University of Michigan (1970). In 1986–7 he was President of the Central Division of the American Philosophical Association.

Rowe is primarily a philosopher of religion. His many contributions to this field are distinguished by their clarity, rigor, originality, and sensitivity toward the claims of theism. His work has played a leading role in the remarkable revival of analytic philosophy of religion since the 1970s. Two major projects may be identified in his philosophy of religion, the first of which involves the elaboration and defense of various arguments against the truth of theism.

The centerpiece in Rowe's "natural atheology" is undoubtedly the evidential argument from evil, which (in one form or another) he has consistently defended for over two decades. In the first edition of his popular textbook, *Philosophy of Religion: An Introduction* (1978), Rowe provided his first sustained defense of the evidential argument, and repeated his effort at greater length in 1979 in his now classic and widely anthologized paper, "The Problem of Evil and Some Varieties of Atheism." Rowe focuses on a hypothetical instance of intense animal suffering – involving the slow and painful death of a fawn trapped in a forest fire caused by lightning – and states that such instances of suffering strike us as pointless. Upon reflecting on the fawn's suffering, we fail to see any greater goods connected to it in such a way as to require its permission by an omnipotent, omniscient being intent on securing those goods. And even if we were to grant that the fawn's suffering, despite appearances to the contrary, does in fact serve some greater (and God-justifying) good, it

would be highly unreasonable to believe the same regarding all instances of apparently pointless human and animal suffering that occur daily in our world. Rowe thus makes a crucial inference from inscrutable evil ("So far as we can see, the fawn's suffering is pointless") to gratuitous evil ("[It is likely that] The fawn's suffering is pointless"). To this inference, Rowe adds what he takes to be a necessary truth: God (in other words, an omnipotent, omniscient, perfectly good being) would not permit any evil unless he has a morally sufficient reason for doing so. But given that it is very likely that at least some evil is gratuitous, it follows that it is highly unlikely that God exists. Although in later writings Rowe modified and refined his evidential argument in certain respects, the basic structure of the argument remained the same from 1978 until 1995.

More recently, objections raised by Alston against the inference from inscrutability to pointlessness have caused Rowe to develop a skeptical attitude toward his earlier formulations of the evidential argument. In 1996 he published a quite different evidential argument that proceeded, via an application of Bayes's Theorem, directly from the claim that no good we know of justifies God in permitting certain evils to the conclusion that there is no God. This argument, like Rowe's earlier attempts, spawned a vigorous debate regarding the logic and cogency of evidential arguments.

A further atheological argument advanced by Rowe involves a consideration of the much-neglected topic of divine freedom. In his most comprehensive study of this subject, *Can God Be Free?* (2004), Rowe argues that the ascription to God of the properties of moral unsurpassability and libertarian freedom results in an incoherent conception of God. He considers a number of possible responses drawn from the writings of Leibniz, Clarke, Aquinas, Jonathan Edwards, and a host of contemporary writers, but concludes that each fails to remove the fundamental flaw in the theistic picture of God.

The second major project in Rowe's philosophy of religion involves a meticulous and powerful critique of various theistic arguments, particularly the so-called "big three": the cosmological argument, the ontological argument, and the argument from design. He carries this out with great force in *The Cosmological Argument* (1975) and *Philosophy of Religion* He examines and rejects various historically significant versions of the cosmological argument, with particular attention given to the argument as developed by Samuel Clarke in the eighteenth century.

Rowe's work is not restricted to natural theology and atheology, but also encompasses in-depth studies of Paul TILLICH and Thomas Reid. His study of Tillich's philosophical theology culminated in his first published book, *Religious Symbolism and God* (1968). He begins with a careful analysis of Tillich's doctrine of God as "being-itself" (which he does by modeling Tillich's doctrine on the concept of a universal and Plotinus's concept of the One) before proceeding to examine Tillich's claim that God does not exist or is beyond existence, as well as Tillich's theory of religious symbolism and myth. Rowe's second book-length study of a major thinker, *Thomas Reid on Freedom and Morality* (1991), takes him beyond the philosophy of religion and into the seventeenth and eighteenth-century debates over freedom and necessity. Against the background of the Lockean (compatibilist) conception of freedom, Rowe provides an illuminating account and defense of Reid's case in support of libertarian freedom and agent-causation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Religious Symbols and God: A Philosophical Study of Tillich's Theology (Chicago, 1968).
The Cosmological Argument (Princeton, N.J., 1975; 1998).
Philosophy of Religion: An Introduction (Encino, Cal., 1978; 2nd edn, Belmont, Cal., 1993; 3rd edn 2001).

Thomas Reid on Freedom and Morality (Ithaca, N.Y., 1991).
Can God Be Free? (Oxford, 2004).

Other Relevant Works
"The Problem of Evil and Some Varieties of Atheism," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 16 (1979): 335–41.
"The Evidential Argument from Evil: A Second Look," in *The Evidential Argument from Evil*, ed. Daniel Howard-Snyder (Bloomington, Ind., 1996), pp. 262–85.
Ed., *God and the Problem of Evil* (Malden, Mass., 2001).

Further Reading
Howard-Snyder, Daniel, ed. *The Evidential Argument from Evil* (Bloomington, Ind., 1996).
Jordan, Jeff, and Daniel Howard-Snyder, eds. *Faith, Freedom, and Rationality: Philosophy of Religion Today* (Lanham, Md., 1996).

Nick Trakakis

ROYCE, Josiah (1855–1916)

Josiah Royce was born on 20 November 1855 in Grass Valley, California. He received his BA in classics in 1875 from the new University of California in Berkeley, studied philosophy in Germany for a year, and returned to attend Johns Hopkins University where he earned a PhD in philosophy in 1878. His dissertation was titled "Interdependence of the Principles of Human Knowledge"; Royce received the fourth doctorate in philosophy granted by an American university. He taught composition and literature at the University of California at Berkeley from 1878 to 1882. In 1882 he was appointed to the Harvard philosophy faculty as

a replacement during William JAMES's sabbatical, and he never left Harvard. He was promoted to professor of the history of philosophy in 1892 and served as department chair from 1894 to 1898. He gave the Gifford Lectures at the University of Aberdeen in 1899–1900. He was President of the American Psychological Association in 1902 and President of the American Philosophical Association in 1903–4. He was named Alford Professor of Philosophy in 1914, and held that title until his death on 14 September 1916 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Royce was among the most accomplished, ingenious and original thinkers America has produced, and stands as an equal among its true giants, including Peirce, James, and George SANTAYANA. Their students were especially careful not to try to choose a superior among them. The generation included figures such as George H. MEAD, Alain LOCKE, W. E. B. DU BOIS, William E. HOCKING, and John E. BOODIN, to name but a few, who all departed from Harvard with doctorates and several masters, and burdened with the philosophical task of reconciling seemingly contrary truths that would absorb them for a lifetime.

Royce was descended from immigrants and pioneers who sought their fortune in the westward movement. The unformed conditions of California probably influenced the development of his philosophical ideas, particularly regarding his ideas about community, which are among his most important contributions to philosophy. The mystical fervor of Royce's mother may have motivated Royce's thorough critique of mysticism. When present the elder Royce was an unrelenting disciplinarian and an enthusiastic Campbellite. The emphasis among Campbellites upon Pauline Christianity, rejecting all creeds, sects and denominations while insisting upon the full sufficiency of the New Testament and the individual's right interpretation thereof, probably has something to do with Royce's later emphasis upon Paul in his interpretation of Christianity. Royce's own view of organized religion and religious experience was moderate and his non-participation more a matter of lack of inclination rather than a reaction. The importance of *agapic* love in Royce's philosophy is rooted in his Christian up-bringing, but his reinterpretation of its meaning in terms of a progressive and universal sense of "loyalty" seems not to be an idea one would be likely to find in the California context.

At the University of California, Royce read Darwin, Mill, and Spencer under the watchful eye of the philosophically inclined geology professor Joseph Le Conte, leading to a crisis of religious faith and a short flirtation with skepticism. Royce was an evolutionist from the earliest days of his higher education, but rejected Darwin's materialist interpretation, embracing instead a moderate personalistic naturalism like Le Conte's. In Germany he studied philosophy with Wilhelm Windelband and Rudolf Hermann Lotze, and physiological psychology with Wilhelm Wundt. If Royce had flirted with romantic philosophy early in his education, his experience in Germany turned him decidedly and permanently toward Kantian philosophy. He was never a serious follower of Hegel, nor himself a Hegelian philosopher, although a persistent misunderstanding of his thought under this label emerged early and has endured in spite of Royce's own efforts and the efforts of subsequent interpreters to dispel it.

Among Royce's important accomplishments of his last years in California was the development of his temporalist philosophy. He began the construction of his philosophical system by means of a critique of ontology, by which he meant the study of the form(s) of independent existences and their relations. In 1881 in an article published in the *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* and another in *Mind*, he examined all the ontologies defended in his day and argued that every ontology is a useful postulate at best. He also rejected ontological necessity here, embracing by implication a descriptive method in metaphysics. The present acts by which we construct our possible future experi-

ence must be regarded as real, and these acts involve a temporal structure that is irreducibly threefold. The past and present must be "acknowledged" and the future "anticipated" in every act. Most striking in this account is Royce's definition of the "present" as the "acknowledgement" of other conscious beings and *their* possible experience. What he would later call "the community of interpretation" is therefore already present in his first efforts at systematic metaphysics. Also notable is his account of the future as holding the anticipated objects of experiences not yet had, the products of our "projections." He recognized that the "myths" we tell ourselves in practicing ontology should be informed by moral ends and aspirations. This creative approach to descriptive metaphysics, ontology, the sociality of present experience, and the relation of act to possibility suffices to give Royce, along with Peirce, a claim to being the first process philosopher in the US. Many of Royce's interpreters have claimed that his position on ontology changed in his first major work, *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy* (1885). He did become increasingly convinced of the power of reflective reason to deliver truths which, if they should fail to hold in relation to the Whole, would render the entire enterprise of knowing vain and pointless, and would undermine the moral purposes for which all persons live. By 1885 he concluded that we have no choice but to believe the "myth" we construct for ourselves in reflection, and that there are decisive rational methods for judging among the competing myths.

While in the West, Royce struggled with skepticism about the knowability of the world in itself, with the ethical egoism of various thinkers, with individualism, romanticism, and with many other fundamental philosophical (especially epistemological) orientations. California, then as now, certainly lent itself to free thinking, but the insight into the temporal interrelatedness of all genuine individuality seems to have come to Royce, alone among all the progeny of California, after arriving in Boston in 1882. His temporalist personal idealism was an answer, both philosophical and religious, to the problems posed by California's opportunity either to achieve the beloved community, to fail in the attempt, or to ignore the possibility and fall into selfish and blind egoism. The explicitly moral terms in which he wrote the early history of California are based upon his moral insight about the individual's relation to community, wherein each present act is an act of social consciousness. In assessing the actors in this history he tacitly or explicitly asked at each turn the question whether each had allowed himself to be informed by immanence of a Kingdom of Ends, in which case he is a hero, or by the failure to recognize this truth, acting in service to an ultimately illusory "independent" self, in which case he is treated as a villain – and there were far more villains than heroes in early California by Royce's account.

The years between 1882 and 1895 established Royce as one of the most eminent American philosophers. His publication in 1885 of *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy*, and in 1892 of *The Spirit of Modern Philosophy*, both based on Harvard Lectures, secured his place in the philosophical world. The former of these contained a new "proof" for the existence of God based upon the reality of error, which drew much attention. To be in error is to be in error in comparison to some total truth, Royce argued, and we must either hold ourselves infallible or accept that even our errors are evidence of a world of truth (1885, chaps 10–11). Having made it clear that idealism depends upon postulates and proceeds hypothetically, Royce defends the necessity of objective reference of our ideas to a universal whole within which they belong, for without these postulates, "both practical life and the commonest results of theory, from the simplest impressions to the most valuable beliefs, would be for most if not all of us utterly impossible" (1885, p. 324). Hence, the justification for idealistic postulates is practical. Royce confronts the fact that he has not and perhaps cannot

offer a complete or satisfactory account of "the relation of the individual minds to the all-embracing mind" (1885, p. 371), but pushes ahead in spite of this difficulty to offer the best account he can manage. This takes the form of an expression of his personalism:

> The ambiguous relation of the conscious individuals to the universal thought … will be decided in the sense of their inclusion, as elements in the universal thought. They will indeed not become "things in the dream" of any other person than themselves, but their whole reality, just exactly as it is in them, will be found to be but a fragment of a higher reality. This reality will be no Power, nor will it produce the individuals by dreaming of them, but it will complete the existence that in them, as separate beings, has no rational completeness. (1885, pp. 380–81)

This is an unavoidable hypothesis, and its moral and religious aspect point to an Absolute. The sense of "Absolute" Royce defended was quite different from the ideas of Hegel and British idealist F. H. Bradley. Royce's Absolute is the ground and originator of community, a personal, temporal being who preserves the past in its entirety, sustains the full present by an act of interpretation, and anticipates every possibility in the future, infusing these possibilities with value as the ideal of community. The principal difference between Royce's Absolute and the similar idea held by other thinkers is its temporal and personal character, and its interpretive activity. This divine activity Royce increasingly came to see in terms of the notion suggested by Peirce of "agapasm," or "evolutionary love."

Royce returned to California in 1895 to speak to the Philosophical Union at Berkeley, defending his concept of God from George Holmes HOWISON, Joseph Le Conte, and Sidney Edward MEZES, a meeting the New York *Times* called "a battle of the giants." Royce offered a new modal version of his proof for the reality of God based upon ignorance rather than error, upon the fragmentariness of individual existence rather than its epistemological uncertainty. However, Howison attacked Royce's doctrine for having left no ontological standing for the individual over against the Absolute, rendering his idealism a kind of pernicious impersonalism. Royce never intended this result and responded to Howison's criticism first in a long supplementary essay to the debate (1897), and then by developing the philosophy of the individual person in greater detail in his Gifford Lectures, published as *The World and the Individual* (1899, 1901). Simultaneously Royce was enduring a resolute assault on his hypothetical absolutism from James. Royce later admitted that his engagement with the philosophy of Bradley may have led to a more robust version of the Absolute than was warranted, and his persistent reading of Spinoza might have had similar effects.

The First Series of Gifford Lectures made the case against three historical conceptions of being, called "realism," "mysticism," and "critical rationalism," by Royce, and defending a "Fourth Conception of Being." It is worthy of note that in his 1915 course on "Metaphysics" Royce says that one could substitute the term "interpretation" for "conception" in the phrase "Fourth Conception of Being" (see 1998, p. 168). Whether one sees the account in the Gifford Lectures as a conception or an interpretation is immaterial to Royce, a merely verbal matter. Realism, according to Royce, held that to be is to be independent, while mysticism and critical rationalism advanced other criteria: immediacy in the case of mysticism and objective validity in the case of critical rationalism. As hypotheses about the fundamental character of being, Royce shows that each of these conceptions falls into contradiction. In contrast he offers as his hypothesis that "to be is to be uniquely related to a whole." This formulation preserves the three crucial aspects of being, namely the Whole, the individual, and the relation that constitutes them. Where previously Royce's hypotheses

about ontology had taken for granted that relations are discovered in the analysis of terms, here he claims that terms are constituted by their relations, and insofar as terms are taken to refer to entities, as we must assume, we are obliged to think about individuals as uniquely constituted by a totality of relations to other individuals and to the Whole that are theirs alone. In the second series of Gifford Lectures Royce temporalizes these relations, showing that we learn to think about ideas like succession and space by noting differences and directionality within unified and variable "time spans," or qualitative, durational episodes of the "specious present." He explains, "our temporal form of experience is thus peculiarly the form of the Will as such" (1901, p. 124). For him, the will is the inner dynamism that reaches beyond itself into a possible future and acts upon an acknowledged past. Space and the abstract descriptions that are appropriate to it are a falsification of this dynamism, and a metaphysical error, especially in the case of "realism," which proceeds from taking these abstractions literally. Philosophy itself proceeds along descriptive lines and therefore must offer its ontology as a kind of fiction. But ideas, considered dynamically in light of what they do in the world of practice and qualities, do have temporal forms and are activities. The narrative presentation of ideas, such as belongs to the "World of Appreciation," is "more easily effective than description … for space furnishes indeed the stage and the scenery of the universe, but the world's play occurs in time" (1901, pp. 124–5). Time conceived abstractly in the "World of Description," although it can never be wholly spatialized, provides us with an idea of eternity, while time lived and experienced grounds this description (and every other), historically, ethically, and aesthetically. Since philosophy proceeds descriptively rather than narratively, "the real world of our Idealism has to be viewed by us men as a temporal order," in which "purposes are fulfilled, or where finite internal meanings reach their final expression and attain unity with external meanings"

(1901, p. 134). Hence, for Royce, it is a limitation of conceptual thought that obliges us to philosophize according to logic rather than integrating our psychological and appreciated experience into our philosophical doctrines. There is ample evidence for supposing a parallelism between our conceptual and perceptual experiences, and for using the former as a guide to the latter, according to Royce, particularly with regard to the way that the idealization of our inner purposes enables us to connect them with the purposes of others in a larger whole of which we have no immediate experience. We can appreciate the sense of fulfillment we find in serving a larger whole and form our characters progressively upon the ways in which those experiences of fulfillment point us ever outwards, beyond the finite self, but we are not so constituted as to be capable of an immediate experience of the greater Whole to which our experiences belong. We cannot help supposing that there is some experiencer within whose inner life the Whole exists, but only the inevitability of the assumption and not any experiential content assures us of the reality of such an experiencer.

This social metaphysics lays the groundwork for Royce's philosophy of loyalty. *The Philosophy of Loyalty* (1908) sets out one of the most original and important moral philosophies in the recent history of philosophy. His notion of "loyalty" was essentially a universalized and ecumenical interpretation of Christian *agapic* love. Broadly speaking Royce's is a virtue ethic in which our loyalty to increasingly less immediate ideals becomes the formative moral influence in our personal development. As persons develop, becoming better able to form loyalties, which is the practical and ongoing devotion to a cause bigger than themselves, and as these loyalties become unifiable in the higher purposes of groups of persons over many generations, humanity is better able to recognize that the highest ideal is the creation of a perfected "beloved community" in which each and every person shares. The beloved community as an ideal experi-

enced in our acts of loyal service integrates into Royce's moral philosophy a Kingdom of Ends, but construed as immanent and operative instead of transcendental and regulative. While the philosophical status of this ideal remains hypothetical, the living of it in the fulfillment of our finite purposes concretizes it for each and every individual. Each of us, no matter how morally undeveloped we may be, has fulfilled experiences that point to the reality of experience beyond what is given to us personally. This wider reality is exemplified most commonly when we fall in love.

Royce called his later philosophy "absolute pragmatism," which is the claim that ideals are thoroughly practical, and the more inclusive ideals are maximally practical. The concretization of ideals cannot therefore be empirically doubted except at the cost of rendering our conscious life utterly inexplicable. If we admit that the concretization of ideals genuinely occurs, Royce argues, then we are not only entitled but compelled to take seriously and regard as real the larger intelligible structures within which those ideals exist, which is the purposive character of the divine Will. The way in which persons sort out higher and lower causes is by examining whether one's service to a given cause destroys the loyalty of others (which is what is best in them). The higher causes are less destructive of the loyalties of others. Ultimately personal character reaches its acme in the service of lost causes, such as the Christian idea of the Kingdom of Heaven, through which we may learn that our ultimate loyalty is to loyalty itself.

The final phase of Royce's thought, exemplified by *The Problem of Christianity* (1913), involved the application and further illustration of the concepts he had defended since 1881. Some have seen here a fundamental shift in his thinking but the evidence is far from conclusive. His hypothetical ontology, temporalism, personalism, his social metaphysics based on the fourth conception of being remain clear, along with the operation of *agapic* loyalty and the unity of finite purposes in the ideal of the beloved community. There is no obvious shift in method and no overt move to abandon idealism. Royce himself declared that the "successive expressions" of the philosophy of loyalty "form a consistent body of ethical as well as religious opinion and teaching, verifiable, in its main outlines, in terms of human experience, and capable of furnishing a foundation for a defensible form of metaphysical idealism" (1913, vol. 1, p. ix). Royce never was an absolutist in either method or ontology; his ethics and religious philosophy certainly grew and matured, but the basic philosophical framework did not shift. Having provided throughout his career an idealistic way of grasping the Will, in contrast to Schopenhauer's pessimistic treatment, it remained for Royce to rescue Pauline Christianity, in a universalized and modernized form, from the critique of Nietzsche and others who tended to understand will in terms of power and who had rightly observed that the historic doctrine was no longer believable to the modern mind. Striking in this work is the temporal account of the Holy Spirit, the Holy Catholic Church and the communion of saints as a universal community. This community is a process of mutually interpretive activity which requires shared memory and shared hope.

Towards the end of his life as social and political conditions in the world deteriorated, Royce wrote furiously. At the outbreak of World War I he argued that an international insurance corporation, administered by a league of nations, which would pay reparations to any nation that was the victim of aggression, would have the effect of securing world peace. Although he had become frail, Royce's bitter disappointment at the imperialist aggression of his beloved Germany may have hastened his relatively early demise at age sixty.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Primer of Logical Analysis for the Use of Composition Students (San Francisco, 1881).
The Religious Aspect of Philosophy (Boston,

1885).

California, from the Conquest in 1846 to the Second Vigilance Committee in San Francisco [1856]: A Study of American Character (Boston, 1886).

The Feud of Oakfield Creek: A Novel of California Life (Boston, 1887).

The Spirit of Modern Philosophy: An Essay in the Form of Lectures (Boston, 1892).

The Conception of God: A Philosophical Discussion Concerning the Divine Idea as a Demonstrable Reality, with Joseph Le Conte, George H. Howison, and Sidney E. Mezes (New York, 1897).

Studies of Good and Evil: A Series of Essays upon the Problems of Philosophy and of Life (New York, 1898).

The World and the Individual: The Four Historical Conceptions of Being, First Series (New York, 1899).

The Conception of Immortality (Boston, 1900).

The World and the Individual: Nature, Man, and the Moral Order, Second Series (New York, 1901).

Outlines of Psychology: An Elementary Treatise with Some Practical Applications (New York, 1903).

Herbert Spencer: An Estimate and Review (New York, 1904).

The Philosophy of Loyalty (New York, 1908).

Race Questions, Provincialism, and Other American Problems (New York, 1908).

William James and Other Essays on the Philosophy of Life (New York, 1911).

The Sources of Religious Insight (New York, 1912).

The Problem of Christianity, 2 vols (New York, 1913).

War and Insurance (New York, 1914).

The Hope of the Great Community (New York, 1916).

Other Relevant Works

Royce's papers are at Harvard University.

"Kant's Relation to Modern Philosophic

Progress," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 15 (1881): 360–81.

"Mind-stuff and Reality," *Mind* 6 (1881): 365–77.

"The Problem of Job," *The New World* 6 (1897): 261–81.

"The Reality of the Temporal," *International Journal of Ethics* 20 (1910): 257–71.

Lectures on Modern Idealism, ed. Jacob Loewenberg (New Haven, Conn., 1919).

Fugitive Essays, ed. Jacob Loewenberg (Cambridge, Mass., 1920).

The Social Philosophy of Josiah Royce, ed. Stuart Gerry Brown (Syracuse, N.Y., 1950).

Royce's Logical Essays, ed. Daniel S. Robinson (Dubuque, Iowa, 1951).

The Religious Philosophy of Josiah Royce, ed. Stuart Gerry Brown (Syracuse, N.Y., 1952).

Principles of Logic (New York, 1961).

The Basic Writings of Josiah Royce, 2 vols, ed. John J. McDermott (Chicago, 1969).

The Letters of Josiah Royce, ed. John Clendenning (Chicago, 1970).

Josiah Royce's Seminar, 1913–1914: As Recorded in the Notebooks of Harry T. Costello (New Brunswick, N.J., 1963).

Metaphysics, ed. William E. Hocking, et al. (Albany, N.Y., 1998).

Josiah Royce's Late Writings: A Collection of Unpublished and Scattered Works, 2 vols, ed. Frank M. Oppenheim (Bristol, UK, 2001).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Amer Phils Before 1950, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Bio Dict Psych by Zusne, Bio 20thC Phils, Blackwell Amer Phil, Blackwell Comp Phils, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Religious Bio, Encyc Amer Bio, Encyc Ethics, Encyc Psych, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v25, Oxford Comp Phil, Pres Addr of APA v1, Proc of APA in Phil Rev v26, Routledge Encycl Phil, Who Was Who in

Amer v1

Auxier, Randall E., ed. "The Conception of God Debate and the Relevance of Royce," *The Personalist Forum* 15 (Spring 1999). Special issue on Royce.

———, *Critical Responses to Josiah Royce, 1885–1916*, 3 vols (Bristol, UK, 2000).

Buranelli, Vincent. *Josiah Royce* (New York, 1964).

Clendenning, John. *The Life and Thought of Josiah Royce*, 2nd edn (Nashville, Tenn., 1999).

Corrington, Robert S. *The Community of Interpreters* (Macon, Georgia, 1987).

Fuss, Peter. *The Moral Philosophy of Josiah Royce* (Cambridge, Mass, 1965).

Hine, Robert V. *Josiah Royce: From Grass Valley to Harvard* (Norman, Okla., 1992).

Jarvis, Edward A. *The Conception of God in the Later Royce* (The Hague, 1975).

Kegley, Jacquelyn Anne. *Genuine Individuals and Genuine Communities: A Roycean Public Philosophy* (Nashville, Tenn., 1997).

Kuklick, Bruce. *Josiah Royce: An Intellectual Biography* (Indianapolis, 1972).

Loewenberg, Jacob. *Royce's Synoptic Vision* (Baltimore, Md., 1955).

Mahowald, Mary Briody. *An Idealistic Pragmatism: The Development of the Pragmatic Element in the Philosophy of Josiah Royce* (The Hague, 1972).

Marcel, Gabriel. *Royce's Metaphysics*, trans. Virginia Ringer and Gordon Ringer (Chicago, 1956).

Oppenheim, Frank M. *Royce's Mature Philosophy of Religion* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1987).

———, *Royce's Mature Ethics* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1993).

———, *Reverence for the Relations of Life: Re-imagining Pragmatism via Josiah Royce's Interactions with Peirce, James and Dewey* (Notre Dame, Ind., 2004).

Robinson, Daniel S. *Royce and Hocking: American Idealists* (Boston, 1968).

Smith, John E. *Royce's Social Infinite: The Community of Interpretation* (New York, 1950).

Trotter, Griffin. *The Loyal Physician: Roycean Ethics and the Practice of Medicine* (Nashville, Tenn., 1997).

Randall E. Auxier

RUBENSTEIN, Richard Lowell (1924–)

Richard Rubenstein was born on 8 January 1924 in New York City. He was a student at Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, Ohio (1942–5) and then at the University of Cincinnati, where he received his BA in 1946. Ordained as a rabbi when he graduated from the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in 1952, Rubenstein served Jewish congregations in Brockton and Natick, Massachusetts, for the next four years. Graduate study at Harvard University, where the Christian theologian and philosopher Paul TILLICH was a major influence, led to his STM degree in theology in 1955 from Harvard Divinity School and his PhD in the history and philosophy of religion in 1960. Rubenstein served as chaplain to Jewish students at Harvard from 1956 to 1958 and then as director of the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation and chaplain to Jewish students at the University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Mellon University from 1958 to 1970.

During his Pittsburgh years, Rubenstein emerged as a Jewish writer whose thought would be even more significant than it was controversial; and Rubenstein's thought was definitely controversial. The Holocaust became a governing influence on his philosophy. In August 1961 Rubenstein visited Berlin, Germany. His meeting with Heinrich Grüber, a prominent Christian leader who had resisted the Nazis, convinced Rubenstein that the issue of God and the Holocaust must be confronted directly. The result was *After Auschwitz* (1966),

which was one of the first books to explore the religious implications of the Holocaust. Rubenstein's analysis sparked ongoing debate, because it contended that belief in a covenantal and redeeming God – one who is active in history – was not credible after Auschwitz. The controversy caused by *After Auschwitz* linked Rubenstein to three Protestant thinkers: Thomas J. J. ALTIZER, William Hamilton, and Paul M. Van Buren. The four were dubbed "death of God theologians."

With controversy about *After Auschwitz* and the "death of God" movement ongoing, Rubenstein continued to publish. Four important works appeared between 1968 and 1974. *The Religious Imagination* (1968) drew on Sigmund Freud's thought to interpret religion. It was followed by *Morality and Eros* (1970); *My Brother Paul* (1972), which discussed the differences and similarities that Rubenstein saw between Saint Paul's outlook and his own; and *Power Struggle* (1974), in which Rubenstein offered instructive insights about his life and scholarly work. None of these writings, however, would be as widely noted as *After Auschwitz* or a brief but pointed book called *The Cunning of History* (1975).

The Cunning of History defended several disturbing propositions. In no way did it condone the Holocaust, but Rubenstein's analysis argued that, far from being an aberration or a sign of the decline of "progress," the Holocaust was an extreme expression of Western civilization's nationalism, "scientific" racial thinking, problem-solving rationality, technology, and bureaucracy. These ingredients of modernity, Rubenstein contended, could make state-sponsored population riddance a "rational" policy. Not only did the Nazis enact such a policy against the European Jews, but in doing so, they revealed the inadequacy of morality and religion to prevent such destruction. As a result, Rubenstein affirmed, it no longer made sense to say that human beings possess rights by nature. Human beings only have rights as members of political communities. *The Cunning of History* received limited attention at first, but one of its readers was the novelist William Styron. He reviewed the work favorably in *The New York Review of Books* and then discussed it approvingly in *Sophie's Choice* (1979), his best-selling Holocaust novel. A new paperback edition of *The Cunning of History* appeared in 1978, and the book's prominence in Holocaust studies was assured.

Rubenstein relocated to Florida State University in 1970, where he became the Robert O. Lawton Distinguished Professor of Religion in 1977 and taught until 1995. In the late 1970s, Rubenstein became interested in the work of the Reverend Sun Myung Moon's Unification Church. This interest led to Rubenstein's presidency of two institutions affiliated with the Unification Church: The Washington Institute for Values in Public Policy and the University of Bridgeport. He led Bridgeport from 1995 to 1999. His links with Unification Church projects encouraged his interests in international relations and, in particular, Asian culture, economics, politics, and religion.

Rubenstein's wide-ranging scholarship also includes *The Age of Triage* (1983), a study of surplus populations and genocide, and *Approaches to Auschwitz* (1987). Co-authored with John K. Roth, the latter book is one of the first studies of the Holocaust jointly written by a Jew and a Christian. In these books, Rubenstein accents history, politics, economics, and sociology as well as philosophy, with reference to religious thought and practice, the conditions that produce human conflict, and the safeguards that are needed to limit that conflict's destructiveness. None of Rubenstein's writing is likely to eclipse the significance of *After Auschwitz*. Particularly in the United States, its impact on Jews and Christians has continued to be substantial.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

After Auschwitz: Radical Theology and Contemporary Judaism (Indianapolis, 1966). Rev. edn, *After Auschwitz: History, Theology, and Contemporary Judaism*

(Baltimore, Md., 1992).

The Religious Imagination: A Study in Psychoanalysis and Jewish Theology (Indianapolis, 1968).

Morality and Eros (New York, 1970).

My Brother Paul (New York, 1972).

Power Struggle: An Autobiographical Confession (New York, 1974).

The Cunning of History: Mass Death and the American Future (New York, 1975).

The Age of Triage: Fear and Hope in an Overcrowded World (New York, 1983).

Approaches to Auschwitz: The Holocaust and Its Legacy, with John K. Roth (Atlanta, 1987; rev. edn, Louisville, 2003).

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils

Braiterman, Zachary. *(God) After Auschwitz: Tradition and Change in Post-Holocaust Jewish Thought* (Princeton, N.J., 1998).

Haynes, Stephen R., and John K. Roth, eds. *The Death of God Movement and the Holocaust: Radical Theology Encounters the Shoah* (Westport, Conn., 1999).

Roth, John K., ed. *Ethics after the Holocaust: Perspectives, Critiques, and Responses* (St. Paul, Minn., 1999).

Rubenstein, Betty Rogers, and Michael Berenbaum, eds. *What Kind of God? Essays in Honor of Richard L. Rubenstein* (Lanham, Md., 1995).

John K. Roth

RUDNER, Richard Samuel (1921–79)

Richard Rudner was born on 3 October 1921 in New York City. Raised by Max and Louise Kurz who adopted him as an infant, he married Martha Kaufman in 1946, and fathered a son, anthropologist David Rudner, and a daughter Katie, an attorney. In 1946 he earned his BA from Queens College in New York City, where he studied under Carl HEMPEL. He then received his MA in 1948 and PhD in 1949 from the University of Pennsylvania. He was mentored by Nelson GOODMAN and wrote his dissertation on "Four Studies of the Aesthetic Object." He taught philosophy at Cornell University in 1948–9, Washington University in St. Louis from 1949 to 1952, the Naval Systems Project at Tufts University from 1952 to 1954, Swarthmore College from 1954 to 1956, and Michigan State University from 1956 to 1962. In 1962 Rudner returned to Washington University in St. Louis as professor of philosophy, and in 1963 he succeeded Lewis HAHN as department chair, serving until 1971. He also had visiting appointments at Bryn Mawr College, the University of Western Ontario, Harvard University, and the University of California at San Diego, and had a year's study as a Guggenheim Fellowship at King's College, Cambridge. He was professor of philosophy at Washington University until his death on 27 July 1979 in St. Louis.

Rudner made important contributions in several philosophical areas, including philosophy of science, epistemology, and aesthetics. He was editor-in-chief of *Philosophy of Science* from 1958 to 1975. He challenged the customary division between the approaches of putatively value-laden science such as sociology and anthropology and those of putatively value-free science such as physics and chemistry. His book-length work, *The Philosophy of Social Science* (1964), is a sustained argument for this view. While these non-separatist ideas were controversial from the start, more recent developments in philosophy of science have tended to endorse them. The latter work features Rudner's now famous distinction between "method" and "methodology" used to underline the difference between aspects of the scientific enterprise that differ from science to science owing to differences of subject matter and are in that respect "subjective," and other aspects that, owing to the more nearly rock-bottom universality of such concepts as

concept, evidence, counter-evidence, confirmation, scientific theory, and truth, may be seen as definitive features of rational investigation no matter the nature of the subject.

Of further interest are Rudner's explications, developments, and extensions of ideas originating with Goodman. A prominent example is his "Introduction to Simplicity" (1961). As considerations of simplicity are central to choice among competing theories of the same subject matter, and as Goodman's monumental contributions to explicating this concept are largely available only to those equipped to tackle Goodman's *The Structure of Appearance*, Rudner's article provides a pithy précis of Goodman's analysis, making it available to the philosophical community at large, or at least to its analytically oriented members.

A third component of Rudner's work lies in the area that has come to be known as "semiotic aesthetics." Rudner makes a critical distinction between those properties of an artwork that warrant classification as aesthetic features and those that deserve to be counted as artistic features. Aesthetic features directly present themselves (or are capable of thus presenting themselves) to one or another observer of the work on some occasion of such observation, while artistic features that must be known and appreciated if one is to evaluate the work's artistic merit responsibly, including the historical context of its production, the intentions of its creator, the physical materials used, and a number of similar properties that *do not* directly present themselves to a viewer.

Rudner's philosophy, whether expressed in epistemological, ontological, or semiotic, eschewed abstract metaphysics in favor of strict physicalism. Unifying facets of his work included his nominalism, his extensionalism, his pragmatism, and his commitments to rigor, precision, and rationality in all intellectual endeavors.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Formal and Non-Formal," *Philosophy of Science* 16 (1949): 41–8.

"Counter-intuitivity and the Method of Analysis," *Philosophical Studies* 1 (1950): 83–9.

"The Ontological Status of the Esthetic Object," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 10 (1950): 380–88.

"On Semiotic Aesthetics," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 10 (1951): 67–77.

"The Scientist Qua Scientist Makes Value Judgments," *Philosophy of Science* 20 (1953): 1–6.

"Remarks on Value Judgments in Scientific Validation," *Scientific Monthly* 79 (September 1954): 151–3.

"Some Problems of Non-Semiotic Aesthetic Theories," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 15 (1957): 298–310.

"An Introduction to Simplicity," *Philosophy of Science* 28 (1961): 109–19.

The Philosophy of Social Science (New York, 1964).

Other Relevant Works
Rudner's papers are at Washington University in St. Louis.

"A Note on the Likeness of Meaning," *Analysis* 10 (1950): 115–17.

"On *Sinn* as a Combination of Physical Properties," *Mind* 61 (1952): 82–4.

"Can Science Provide an Ethical Code?" *The Humanist* 18 (September–October 1958): 291–8.

"Sign Process and Valuation: A Reply to Copi," *Journal of Philosophy* 55 (1958): 340–44.

"On Seeing What We Shall See," in *Logic and Art: Essays in Honor of Nelson Goodman*, ed. Richard Rudner and Israel Scheffler (Indianapolis, 1972).

"Show or Tell: Incoherence Among Symbol Systems," in *The Philosophy of Nelson Goodman Part 1*, *Erkenntnis* 12 (1978): 129–51.

Further Reading
Who Was Who in Amer v7
Harrison, Stanley M. "Rudner's
   'Reproductive Fallacy'," *Philosophy of the
   Social Sciences* 11 (1981): 37–44.

Robert Barrett

RYAN, John Augustine (1869–1945)

John Augustine Ryan was born on 25 May 1869 in Vermillion, Minnesota. He began attending a public school before transferring to a parochial school, and decided to become a diocesan priest. He attended St. Thomas (later St. Paul) Seminary in St. Paul, Minnesota and was ordained in 1898. He served only one summer as a parish priest in Belle Creek, Minnesota, before Archbishop John Ireland arranged for him to attend the Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C. He received a bachelor's degree in sacred theology in 1899, a licentiate in sacred theology in 1900 and a doctorate in sacred theology in 1906. He taught at St. Paul Seminary from 1902 to 1915. He then moved to the Catholic University of America as associate professor of political science in 1915, was promoted to professor of theology in 1917, and then was appointed Dean of the School of Sacred Sciences in 1919. He was elevated to monsignor by Pope Pius XI in 1933. President Franklin Roosevelt appointed him to the Industrial Appeals Board of the National Recovery Administration in July 1934. Ryan also gave the benediction at Roosevelt's second and fourth inaugurations. Forced to retire from academic life at age seventy in 1939, Ryan remained active on the National Catholic Welfare Board. He died on 16 September 1945 in St. Paul, Minnesota.

Ryan was one of America's earliest and most visible proponents of labor legislation calling for child labor restrictions, maximum hours, and a living wage for all employees. Also active in civil liberties causes, Ryan was a founding member of the American Civil Liberties Union and a proponent of suffrage for women. A well-known intellectual and moral figure, Ryan's influence as a spokesman and activist for reform causes spanned the Progressive and New Deal eras. In addition to his voluminous writings, speeches, and sermons, he provided tireless service to reform organizations such as the National Consumers' League and the National Conference of Catholic Charities. He also testified before, and served on, several state minimum wage committees and boards.

Ryan's social theology was based on the premise that Catholicism could help create a moral basis for modern economic practices. Arguing that economic behavior motivated by self-interest rather than what was best for the common good had resulted in an unjust society where many people were deprived of even basic necessities. In his doctoral dissertation, published as *A Living Wage: Its Ethical and Moral Aspects* (1906), Ryan first argued that it was important to study economic life in the light of Christian principles, as a way to make them practicable in the realm of industry. His primary ethical argument for labor and civil liberties legislation was the proposition, derived jointly from the Christian tradition and natural rights theory, that people are imbued with human dignity. To Ryan it followed that able-bodied persons were entitled to meet their basic needs through their own labor, even under modern conditions where so many workers did not have access to any productive resources other than their labor.

A "right and reasonable" life required that a person have access to those things that will enable them to maintain the respect and recognition of the other members of society. That Ryan's perspective was influential is evident in the text of virtually every state minimum wage ordinance passed during the Progressive Era. These mandated that wage boards consider

the needs of workers when setting minimums in various industries.

For Progressive Era social reformers a fundamental problem was the unequal bargaining power within markets, and within labor markets in particular (Prasch 1998). Ryan, along with many of the economists of his time, such as Sidney and Beatrice Webb, John Hobson, and Henry Rogers Seager, argued that the material circumstances of the participants could undermine even a formally "equal" bargaining process, with adverse effects for those who could least afford them (1916, p. 329). Ryan criticized the idea that those whose bargaining power was strengthened by monopoly or the economic distress of another were acting ethically if they used these advantages for their own profit. He believed that those who approved of such bargains were incorrect to ignore "the moral claims of needs, efforts, or sacrifices" (1916, p. 332).

Ryan concluded, with the then-emerging Catholic social thought tradition, that inequalities in bargaining power meant that free market outcomes could not claim to be the final arbiter of economic justice in society. In addition to religious arguments, and those he derived from natural rights, Ryan invoked the common sense of the unbiased convictions of the community to repudiate the theory that free contracts are always just, and to maintain that when the laborer is compelled to accept less than a certain decent minimum of remuneration he is in truth defrauded (1906, p. 37). For Ryan, a just social order, even in a modern industrial state, had first to ensure that a person's labor could provide them with the material grounds for what he took to be an eternal and unchanging standard, "a right and reasonable life."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Living Wage: Its Ethical and Economic Aspects (New York, 1906).

Alleged Socialism of the Church Fathers (St. Louis, 1913).

Distributive Justice: The Right and Wrong of Our Present Distribution of Wealth (New York, 1916).

The Church and Socialism and Other Essays (Washington, D.C., 1919).

Social Reconstruction (New York, 1920).

A Catechism of the Social Question, with R. A. McGowan (New York, 1921)

Declining Liberty and Other Papers (New York, 1927).

The Catholic Church and the Citizen (New York, 1928).

Questions of the Day (Boston, 1931).

A Better Economic Order (New York, 1935).

Seven Troubled Years, 1930–1936: A Collection of Papers on the Depression and on Problems of Recovery and Reform (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1937).

Social Doctrine in Action: A Personal History (New York, 1941).

Other Relevant Works

Ryan's papers are at the Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C.

The Church and Labor, with Joseph Husslein (New York, 1920).

The State and the Church, with Moorhouse F. X. Millar (New York, 1922).

Catholic Principles of Politics, with Francis J. Bohland (New York, 1940).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v39*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Beckley, Harlan. *Passion for Justice: Retrieving the Legacies of Walter Rauschenbusch, John A. Ryan, and Reinhold Niebuhr* (Louisville, Kent., 1992).

Broderick, Francis L. *Right Reverend New Dealer: John A. Ryan* (New York, 1963).

Gearty, Patrick. *The Economic Thought of Monsignor John A. Ryan* (Washington, D.C., 1953).

Kennedy, Robert G., ed. *Religion and Public Life: The Legacy of Monsignor John A. Ryan* (Lanham, Md., 2001). Contains a bibliography of Ryan's writings.

Prasch, Robert E. "American Economists and Minimum Wage Legislation During the Progressive Era: 1912–1923," *Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 20 (1998): 161–75.

Robert E. Prasch

RYAN, John Kenneth (1897–1981)

John K. Ryan was born on 29 October 1897 in Caledonia, Minnesota. After service in the US Army in 1918, He received his BA from Holy Cross College in 1920, and his STB degree from Urbania University in Rome in 1922. He was ordained priest in 1924, and taught as an instructor of philosophy at St. Mary's College and the College of St. Theresa in Winona, Minnesota from 1924 to 1930. Ryan returned to graduate school to earn his PhD in philosophy at Catholic University of America in 1933, writing a dissertation on "Modern War and Basic Ethics."

In 1931 Ryan joined the faculty of the School of Philosophy at Catholic University. In 1947 he was appointed domestic prelate and given the title of Right Reverend Monsignore by Pope Pius XII. Ryan became Dean of the School of Philosophy in 1956 after the retirement of Dean Ignatius SMITH, and served until 1967, to be succeeded in turn by Dean Jude P. DOUGHERTY. He retired from teaching in 1968 and remained active at the Catholic University campus for several years. Ryan died on 26 December 1981 at St. Anne's Hospice in Winona, Minnesota.

Ryan was one of the more prominent Catholic philosophers in the US during the twentieth century. In his leadership role at Catholic University, he led its School of Philosophy to an even more respected academic stature. Professionally, he was also a leader in his fields of the history of philosophy and theology. He served on the editorial board of the *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, was an editorial advisor for the *Encyclopedia Americana*, and edited the book series *Studies in Philosophy and the History of Philosophy* with Catholic University of America Press. In 1961 he was awarded the Benemerenti Medal by the Papacy.

Among Ryan's many interests in the history of philosophy and theology, he devoted the most work to the thought of Augustine, Aquinas, Duns Scotus, and St. Francis de Sales.

He was also a leading voice in discussions about the role of philosophy in Catholic education, and the responsibilities of Catholic education in general, during a period when prejudice against Catholicism was prevalent in American academia. His contribution in 1949 to a symposium in the *Journal of Higher Education* supporting academic freedom only aroused the scorn of Sidney HOOK, who accused Catholicism of promoting totalitarianism and dogmatism (Hook 1949).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Modern War and Basic Ethics (Washington, D.C., 1933; Milwaukee, Wisc., 1940).

"Philosophy and Catholic Education," in *Essays on Catholic Education in the United States*, ed. Roy Defarrari (Washington, D.C., 1942).

"The Problem of Truth," in *Essays on Thomism*, ed. R. E. Brennan (New York, 1942).

The Reputation of St. Thomas Aquinas among English Protestant Thinkers of the Seventeenth Century (Washington, D.C., 1948).

"Truth and Freedom," *Journal of Higher Education* 20 (1949): 349–52.

Basic Principles and Problems of Philosophy (Westminster, Md., 1954).

John Duns Scotus, 1265–1965, with Bernardino M. Bonansea (Washington,

D.C., 1965).

Other Relevant Works

Trans., *Introduction to the Devout Life*, by St. Francis de Sales (New York, 1950).

Ed., *Philosophical Studies in Honor of the Very Reverend Ignatius Smith, O.P.* (Westminster, Md., 1952).

Trans., *The Confessions of St. Augustine* (Garden City, N.Y., 1960).

Ed., *Twentieth-century Thinkers: Studies in the Work of Seventeen Modern Philosophers* (Staten Island, N.Y., 1965).

Ed., *Ancients and Moderns* (Washington, D.C., 1970).

Further Reading

Hook, Sidney. "Academic Confusions," *Journal of Higher Education* 20 (1949): 422–5.

John R. Shook

S

SABINE, George Holland (1880–1961)

George H. Sabine was born on 7 December 1880 in Dayton, Ohio, and died on 18 January 1961 in Washington, D.C. He received a BA in 1903 and a PhD in philosophy in 1906 from Cornell University. He wrote his doctoral dissertation on the beginnings of English associationism. While still a graduate student, he published articles in scholarly journals, including the first of his articles on David Hume that was published in the *Philosophical Review*, with which he had a later association as an editor. He taught philosophy at Stanford University from 1907 to 1914, the University of Missouri from 1914 to 1923, and at Ohio State University from 1923 to 1931.

In 1931 Sabine was called to Cornell University as Susan Linn Sage Professor of Philosophy, a position that he held until his retirement in 1948. From 1940 to 1944 he was also Dean of the Graduate School, and from 1943 to 1946 he was Vice President for Academic Affairs. During his tenure as Vice President he had an active role in the establishment of several new schools and the engagement of many new professors as the university was expanding in the years immediately following the end of World War II. Following his retirement, Sabine was visiting professor at the University of Washington, the University of Oregon, and Northwestern University. Following the death of his wife, Sabine was invited to make his home at Telluride, a distinguished student residence at Cornell, where he lived for the last four years of his life. In 1957 he delivered, under Telluride auspices, three public lectures on Marxism that were heard by many hundreds of students and faculty members in the largest auditorium on the Cornell campus and were subsequently published as a monograph by Cornell University Press.

Sabine was chiefly famous for *A History of Political Theory* that was published in 1937 (the last edition that he prepared, the third, was published in 1961 shortly after his death). The book, comprised of nearly a thousand pages and covering the full range of political thought from the ancient Greeks through Marxism, communism, and fascism, was recognized and acclaimed throughout the world as the standard, or perhaps even classic, history of political ideas. The work has been translated into Greek, Italian, Hebrew, Japanese, Arabic, Indonesian, Hindi, Spanish, Persian, and Chinese. It is famous not only for its scholarship, but also for its critical style, its insights, and its just treatment of countless vexing value problems. As a leading political philosopher and scholar, Sabine was awarded honorary degrees by Union College, Kenyon College, Oberlin College, the University of Missouri, and Ohio State University. He was President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1938–9. Upon his retirement in 1948, colleagues and former students presented him with a notable festschrift: *Essays in Political Theory Presented to George H. Sabine*, published by Cornell University Press.

Although Sabine's lifelong special interest was the complicated history of seventeenth-century English religious and political thought, his favorite thinker was the eighteenth-century philosopher David Hume, whose *Treatise of Human Nature* had a profound influence on Sabine's study and understanding of the course of social and political thought. In the Preface to the third edition of *A History of Political Theory*, Sabine states that his own philosophical preference as a historian was Hume's criticism of natural law and its applications in religion, ethics, and politics. So far as he could see, Sabine wrote, "it is impossible by any logical operation to excogitate the truth of any allegation of fact, and neither logic nor fact implies a value." Consequently, Sabine believed that the fusion of these operations in Hegelian idealism or in its Marxian variant "merely perpetuated an intellectual confusion inherent in the system of natural law." The natural law belief in rational self-evidence, and the belief that there is a determinate order of evolution or historical progress are equally unverifiable. "As for values, they appear … to be always the reaction of human preference to some state of social and physical fact; in the concrete they are too complicated to be generally described even with so loose a word as utility." Sabine thought of his approach as a "sort of social relativism." Political theory is, on the one hand, a part of philosophy and science, and on the other hand, it is a reflection upon morals, economics, government, religion, and law. Ideally, the historian of political theory should neglect neither factor. "Ideally both should be conceived and presented by a historian with equal clearness; political theory in action ought to receive equal treatment with political theory in books." Admittedly, however, this demand on the historian's scholarship "is impossibly heavy." The world-wide acclaim of *A History of Political Theory* is, however, evidence that the author's scholarship was heavy enough to satisfy the demand.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Radical Empiricism as a Logical Method," *Philosophical Review* 14 (1905): 696–705.

"The Social Origin of Absolute Idealism," *Journal of Philosophy* 12 (1915): 169–77.

"Liberty and the Social System," *Philosophical Review* 25 (1916): 662–75.

"Rationalism in Hume's Philosophy," in *Philosophical Essays in Honor of James Edwin Creighton*, ed. George H. Sabine (New York, 1917), pp. 42–60.

"Pluralism: A Point of View," *American Political Science Review* 17 (1923): 34–50.

"The Philosophy of James Edwin Creighton," *Philosophical Review* 34 (1925): 230–61.

"The Pragmatic Approach to Politics," *American Political Science Review* 24 (1930): 865–85.

A History of Political Theory (New York, 1937; 2nd edn 1950; 3rd edn 1961; 4th edn 1973).

Marxism (Ithaca, N.Y., 1958).

"Social Studies and Objectivity," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 16 (1941): 125–42.

"Beyond Ideology," *Philosophical Review* 57 (1948): 1–26.

"The Two Democratic Traditions," *Philosophical Review* 61 (1952): 451–74.

"Justice and Equality," *Ethics* 67 (1956): 1–11.

Other Relevant Works

Sabine's papers are at Cornell University.

Trans. with Walter J. Shepard, *The Modern Idea of the State*, by H. Krabbe (New York, 1922).

Trans. with Stanley B. Smith, *On the Commonwealth*, by Cicero (Columbus, Ohio, 1929).

"The *Colloquium Heptaplomeres* of Jean Bodin," in *Persecution and Liberty: Essays in Honor of George Lincoln Burr*

(New York, 1931), pp. 271–310.

Ed., *The Works of Gerald Winstanley* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1941).

Democracy and Preconceived Ideas (Columbus, Ohio, 1945).

Ed., *Areopagitica, and Of Education*, by John Milton (New York, 1951).

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v4, *Proc of APA v34*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Konvitz, Milton R., and Arthur E. Murphy, eds. *Essays in Political Theory Presented to George H. Sabine* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1948). Contains a bibliography of Sabine's writings.

Powell, Thomas Reed, and Paul A. Freund. "A Comment on Professor Sabine's 'Pragmatic Approach to Politics'," *Political Science Quarterly* 81 (1966): 52–62.

Milton R. Konvitz

SAID, Edward Wadie (1935–2003)

Edward Said was born on 1 November 1935 in Jerusalem, Palestine (now in Israel), and died on 25 September 2003 in New York City. His father was a prosperous businessman who had lived in the United States. Said moved with his family to Cairo, Egypt in 1947. At the age of twelve, Said started attending the American School in Cairo, before entering the elite Victoria College, also in Cairo, where his classmates included the future King Hussein of Jordan and the actor Omar Sharif. In 1951 his parents sent him to a private school in the United States, Mount Hermon School in Northfield, Massachusetts. He received his BA from Princeton in 1957. He then attended Harvard University where he received his MA in 1960 and PhD in English literature in 1964, and won the Bowdoin Prize. In 1963 Said became an assistant instructor in the English department at Columbia, becoming full professor in 1970. In 1977 he was appointed to an endowed chair, becoming the Parr Professor of English and Comparative Literature. In 1989 he became Old Dominion Foundation Professor in the Humanities in 1989, and held this position until his death. He was also named a University Professor, the highest academic position at Columbia. Said was awarded the Picasso Medal by UNESCO in 1994, had many honorary doctorates bestowed upon him, and was given the Fulton Owais Prize in 1998 for his lifetime contributions.

Said's dissertation on "The Letters and Short Fiction of Joseph Conrad," and his first book, *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography* (1966), are where he began to explore themes that led to his theories about culture and imperialism. His second book, *Beginnings* (1975), examined literary inspiration in relationship to the meaning of modernism. It won Columbia's Lionel Trilling Award in 1976.

Said is most famous for his work as an intellectual and critic. As well as contributing articles to many newspapers (including *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *Le Monde Diplomatique, The Times*, *The Observer*, *Al-Hayat*, *Al-Ahram*, and *El Pais*), he was on the editorial board of over twenty journals and wrote over twenty books. Said was also a fine pianist, and for many years was the music critic for *The Nation*. Alongside Daniel Barenboim, a world-famous Israeli conductor and pianist, Said established the West-Eastern Divan Orchestra, a youth orchestra composed of Arab and Israeli players.

Said's profound sense of social justice influenced all of his work. Reflecting on this perspective in a BBC Reith Lecture in 1993, he commented, "'If you wish to uphold basic human rights you must do so for everyone,

not just selectively for the people that your side, your culture, your nation designates as okay."

His personal sense of displacement and homelessness permeated Said's writing. He arrived in the United States as a schoolboy in 1951, and for the rest of his life wrote about the ways in which he lacked roots inspired his intellectual thinking, as well as the way his Palestinian identity was difficult to maintain in exile. Said also was shunned by some Palestinians because he was an Anglican. Given this cultural fragmentation, Said struggled with self-esteem issues and health problems throughout his life – as a young man, he had a spring catarrh and a case of trachoma, as well as persistent stomach problems. Said's health problems were considerable, and began when he was a child. He wrote about feeling both critiqued and attacked over many parts of his body, including his posture, eyes, stomach, feet, tongue, back, body hair, chest, and hands. Said was diagnosed with chronic lymphocyte leukemia in September 1991, spurring him to write his memoir, *Out of Place*, published in 1999. In that book, as in much of his writing, Said's personal sense of dislocation is evident. His response to his health problems was characteristic of his approach to politics and life: he built a number of strong friendships with people from other faiths and received state of the art treatment from a Jewish doctor.

From 1977 to 1991 Said was a member of the Palestinian National Council, and throughout his life he was one of the most prominent international spokespeople for the Palestinian cause. He believed that the history of Palestinians had been occluded, and advocated the end of the Israeli occupation, removal of settlements, return of East Jerusalem, and a process of self-determination for Palestinians. Said was an independent thinker and was critical of the Palestinian leadership, however. He once said that he wanted to establish a Palestinian state so he could critique it.

His position on Palestine was fiercely independent. For example, he supported a two-state solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict, argued for normalization of relations between Israel and those Arab states at peace with Israel, and was very critical of the Oslo Accord. Said critiqued the power imbalances which pressured Palestinians and Arab states to accept the concessions of the United States and Israel in the Oslo Accord. He later argued that the Oslo Accord had resulted in an increase in the number of settlements and the amount of land actually taken from Palestinians.

Said also accused Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat of being incompetent, undemocratic and corrupt in *The End of the Peace Process* (2001). Not surprisingly, Said's positions on the Palestine–Israeli conflict were often controversial with critics on the right and the left. His books were banned by Arafat's administration in 1995, and yet he was also accused of being "Arafat's man in New York." Said was accused of being soft on terrorism – for instance, in a series of interviews which were published in a book entitled *Culture and Resistance* (2003), he simply stated that terrorism was a weapon of the weak and the oppressed. He was also accused of anti-Semitism and being a Nazi. His Columbia University office was ransacked and set on fire, and he received numerous death threats. Speaking about such harassment, Said commented that "I think what they want is my silence. Unless I die, it's not going to happen."

Said's most famous publication is *Orientalism* (1979) and it is widely regarded as a classic. Said argues that "Orientalism" has three meanings. First, it is an academic field that studies "the Orient" and posits certain knowledge about its race, character, culture, history, society, and traditions. Second, it is also a style of thought as opposed to Occidentalism. Finally, Said argues that Orientalism is a Western style of dominance over the Orient. For Said, the phrase "Oriental" is "canonical." He comments that

the Orient is designated as Asia or the East, geographically, morally, culturally. Said also argues that European culture has managed and produced the Orient – politically, socially, economically, militarily, ideologically, and scientifically.

However, Orientalism is not simply a European fantasy, but is a practice with significant material dimensions. It places the West in a position of superiority over the Orient. The relationship between the Occident (the West) and the Orient is one of power, domination, and hegemony. Colonialists assume that they know what is in the best interests of the subject peoples. Therefore there is a three-way force between the Orient, Orientalism, and the Western consumer of Orientalism.

Said's view of culture relies upon, and adapts, Foucault's notion of power as productive. He comments, "We can better understand the persistence and the durability of saturating hegemonic systems like culture when we realize that their internal constraints upon writers and thinkers were productive, not unilaterally inhibiting." Said also stresses that Orientalism not only is a rationalization for colonial rule, it also anticipates and justifies colonization in advance. The prejudicial views developed within the Orientalist discourse help to reduce the moral standing of people from non-Western countries, which is used as a further justification for colonialist expansion and other imperialist acts. In this regard, Said examines the style, figures of speech, narrative devices, and the historical settings of particular cultural representations not to see whether they are accurate or not, but instead to examine the way they make the Orient speak. He strongly emphasizes the importance of the West in constructing the Orient: that Orientalism makes sense at all depends more on the West than on the Orient, and this sense is directly indebted to various Western techniques of representation that make the Orient visible, clear, "there" in discourse about it.

Said's analysis of the binaries associated with Orientalism is particularly interesting. He points out that the Oriental is often assumed to be childlike, irrational, depraved, and different, whereas the colonialists are seen as mature, rational, virtuous, and normal. For instance, Islam is represented by the Orientalists as symbolizing terror, devastation, barbarians, and the demonic; while the West is seen as civilized, Christian, and originating.

In the second half of *Orientalism*, Said distinguishes between "latent orientalism" (which involves unconscious prejudices about the nature of the Orient) and "manifest orientalism" which refers to explicitly stated views about Oriental societies, languages, literatures, and history. However, this distinction between "latent" and "manifest" Orientalism has been criticized by later scholars for being a simplistic binary, and for poorly theorizing the relative importance of each category. This book was enormously influential because it challenged many of the fundamental assumptions underpinning Western constructions of the Middle East. It questioned the very authority upon which many Western academics had built their scholarly reputations, and indirectly led to a surge in subaltern studies which attempted to write colonial history from below.

As a seminal text within the field, *Orientalism* has been the subject of a great deal of debate and discussion. A number of common criticisms have emerged from these discussions. Perhaps the most important criticism has been that the book fails to recognize sufficiently the agency of colonized people. That is, Said's discussion of *Orientalism* seems to place too much emphasis on the power of the Occident, and almost no emphasis on the power of the Orient to resist this process. Said recognized some of the validity of this critique in his later work, *Culture and Imperialism*.

Culture and Imperialism (1993) was written a number of years after *Orientalism*,

and expands upon many of the arguments in that earlier book. It develops Said's earlier insights about the importance of discursive and cultural domination in the imperialist project. By examining nineteenth and twentieth-century literature, Said emphasizes the importance of cultural domination within the process of colonization – it is fundamental to ensuring that people within the metropolitan centers believe that they should rule people who are positioned as subordinate and inferior.

Culture and Imperialism has a much broader focus than *Orientalism*, seeking to explore the processes of colonization and imperialism within Africa, India, parts of the Far East, Australia, and the Caribbean. Also, Said made a strong effort within *Culture and Imperialism* to rectify one of the limitations of *Orientalism*: the failure to examine resistance to imperialism. Another important feature of *Culture and Imperialism* is its emphasis on literary representation and narrative as an important element in the colonial process. Said emphasized that while stories are at the heart of what explorers and novelists say about colonized countries, they are equally important as sites of resistance. Narratives are equally important for colonized people in the process of resisting colonization and asserting their own history and identity.

Said's interest in the ways in which the West objectifies Islam, introduced in *Orientalism*, was a constant theme of his later intellectual work. In *Covering Islam: How the Media and Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World* (1981), Said argued that the way "Islam" is constructed in the West is often inaccurate because it reflects ethnocentrism, cultural and racial hatred, and various other forms of hostility. Said stressed that Islam contains enormous variation, with more than 800 million people and dozens of societies, states, and cultures (principally within Africa and Asia). Said argued that it was unfair to blame Islam for the repression,

abrogation of personal freedoms, and unrepresentative regimes which go on in many Islamic countries. He argued that Islam itself was doctrinally blameless for such abuses. Said also stressed that the discourse on Islam is colored by the political and economic context in which it occurred, both in the East and the West. Everything about Islam, he said, is saturated with politics. The political issues which have influenced these modern interpretations of Islam include: oil, wars, the rise of Hamas and Hizbollah, terrorism, and various bombings. Said argued that passion, prejudice, and political interests associated with such issues had strongly colored interpretations of Islam, and had resulted in unfair generalizations about terrorism being applied to every Muslim.

Throughout his life, Said did not shy away from controversial positions. He believed that it was a central part of the role of an intellectual to confront orthodoxy, ask embarrassing questions, and to represent people who were being mistreated. In *The World, the Text and the Critic* (1984), he argued that intellectuals must challenge and explore theory, highlight inconsistencies and flaws, and challenge the hegemonic power of cultural formulations. Said believed that a critic must make connections between their work and social justice issues. Intellectuals, Said believed, needed to make connections between issues which were previously kept separate, and devise alternative courses of individual and collective action in order to destabilize hegemonic understandings of society. He argued that a key role of intellectuals was to oppose abuse, tyranny, and domination and to help to reclaim those subjugated knowledges which have been otherwise suppressed.

Throughout his remarkable career, Said was able to craft new ways of being a public intellectual. His work was passionate and engaged, fearless and controversial. He was quite prepared to adopt unpopular positions, and to critique those in authority. He not

only transformed thinking within the academy, particularly through his ground-breaking work in *Orientalism* and *Culture and Imperialism*, but he also expressed his views in a very public manner through his significant newspaper commentaries. He lectured in over 150 universities throughout North America, the Middle East, Africa, and Europe. Said was a central figure in the development of post-colonialism as an important theoretical framework and he had a huge interdisciplinary impact, not only in the field of literature, but also within disciplines as diverse as politics, history, and anthropology. His status as an American spokesperson on Palestinian issues was also unparalleled during his lifetime.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography (Cambridge, Mass., 1966).

Beginnings: Intention and Method (New York, 1975).

Orientalism (New York, 1979).

Covering Islam: How the Media and Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World (New York, 1981).

The World, the Text and the Critic (London, 1984).

After the Last Sky (New York, 1986).

Culture and Imperialism (New York, 1993).

The Politics of Dispossession: The Struggle for Palestinian Self-determination, 1969–1994 (New York, 1994).

Reflections on Exile and Other Essays (Cambridge, Mass., 2000).

The End of The Peace Process: Oslo and After (New York, 2001).

Culture and Resistance (New York, 2003).

Freud and the Non-European (London, 2003).

Humanism and Democratic Criticism (New York, 2004).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with Christopher Hitchens, *Blaming the Victims: Spurious Scholarship and the Palestinian Question* (London, 1988).

Out of Place: A Memoir (New York, 1999).

The Edward Said Reader, ed. Moustafa Bayoumi and Andrew Rubin (New York, 2000).

Power, Politics, and Culture: Interviews with Edward W. Said, ed. Gauri Viswanathan (New York, 2001).

Culture and Resistance: Conversations with Edward W. Said, with David Barsamian (Cambridge, Mass., 2003).

From Oslo to Iraq and the Road Map (New York, 2004).

Further Reading

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio

Ansell-Pearson, Keith, Benita Parry, and Judith Squires, eds. *Cultural Readings of Imperialism: Edward Said and the Gravity of History* (London, 1996).

Ashcroft, Bill, and Pal Ahluwalia. *Edward Said: The Paradox of Identity* (London, 1999).

Bové, Paul A., ed. *Edward Said and the Work of the Critic: Speaking Truth to Power* (Durham, N.C., 2000).

Hart, William D. *Edward Said and the Religious Effects of Culture* (Cambridge, UK, 2000).

Hussein, Abdirahman A. *Edward Said: Criticism and Society* (London, 2002).

Kennedy, Valerie. *Edward Said: A Critical Introduction* (Malden, Mass., 2000).

Marrouchi, Mustapha. *Edward Said at the Limits* (Albany, N.Y., 2004).

Sprinker, Michael, ed. *Edward Said: A Critical Reader* (Oxford, 1992).

Varadharajan, Asha. *Exotic Parodies: Subjectivity in Adorno, Said, and Spivak* (Minneapolis, 1995).

Wood, Michael. "On Edward Said," *London Review of Books* 25 (23 October 2003): 3–6.

Mark Sherry

SALMON, Wesley Charles (1925–2001)

Wesley Salmon was born in Detroit on 9 August 1925, the middle child of Wallis and Ruth Springer Salmon. His father was a mechanical and electrical engineer. After studying in Detroit at Wayne University in 1943–4, he transferred to the University of Chicago where he first met Rudolf CARNAP and received his MA in 1947 with a thesis on Whitehead's conception of freedom. He then entered the doctoral program at the University of California at Los Angeles, where Hans RIECHENBACH supervised his dissertation on John Venn's theory of induction. Salmon received his PhD in philosophy in 1950. Although Reichenbach died in 1953, he remained, along with David Hume, a dominant influence on Salmon's philosophical work, almost all of which was in philosophy of science.

Salmon taught philosophy at the State College of Washington from 1951 to 1954, Northwestern University in 1954–5, and Brown University from 1955 to 1963. He went to Indiana University in 1963, where he was appointed Norwood Russell Hanson Professor of History and Philosophy of Science in 1967. He then taught at the University of Arizona from 1973 to 1981. He was President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1977–8, and a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He was University Professor of Philosophy at the University of Pittsburgh from 1981 to 1999. His last teaching position was as a visiting professor at Kyoto University in 2000. He died on 22 April 2001 in an automobile accident near Madison, Ohio, while returning home to Pittsburgh from a family visit in Indiana.

During the early years of his philosophical career until the mid 1960s, Salmon concentrated mainly on induction, probability, and confirmation. Hume's problem of induction challenged the very foundations of science by questioning whether there could be any *rational* justification of claims that went beyond what we could observe. Reichenbach accepted Hume's arguments that there could be no non-circular deductive or inductive argument to establish the truth of conclusions of such ampliative arguments, but he offered a pragmatic justification for the standard method of inductive generalization. That is, he tried to show that whether or not nature is uniform, the method of induction by enumeration would be successful if any other method could succeed. Salmon believed that although Reichenbach's justification was not adequate – as it justified not just one rule but a whole class of asymptotic rules – it nevertheless provided a valid basis for attempting a more satisfactory justification. In a series of papers, Salmon tries to bring the problem into sharper focus. He exposes the defects of Max BLACK's criticisms of the pragmatic justification and his proposed ordinary-language dissolution of the problem of induction. He adopts Herbert FEIGL's distinction between validation and vindication, and develops a criterion of linguistic invariance which, in the presence of normalizing conditions, he thought would be sufficient to isolate Reichenbach's rule of induction (analogous to Carnap's straight rule) and bolster the pragmatic justification. The general idea behind linguistic invariance is that inductive relations between objective evidence and factual hypotheses depend upon the *content* of evidence statements and hypotheses, not upon the linguistic form in which they are stated. He also offers a resolution of Nelson GOODMAN's notorious grue-bleen paradox, using the criterion of linguistic invariance to reevaluate the crucial fact that not all grue things match one another in the way that all green things match one another, and similarly for bleen and blue things. Despite real progress in clarifying the nature of induction, Salmon's final assessment of the matter was that this significant problem remains an unsolved but valuable part of Hume's philosophical legacy.

Some of Salmon's most important work on probability and confirmation arises from his

close study of Carnap, for whom he had the highest respect despite their profound disagreement about the foundations of inductive logic. Carnap, along with many other philosophers, accepts the intuitively appealing idea of founding inductive reasoning on a relationship of partial entailment in much the same way as deductive reasoning can be seen as founded on full entailment. Salmon explores this and other analogies that have been drawn explicitly or implicitly between deduction and induction, and he shows unequivocally how our intuitions about these matters easily lead us astray. In his close study of the theorem on total probability, which serves as a transitivity rule in the standard calculus of probability, Salmon sorts out several valid and invalid inductive transitivity relations and sets down conditions under which a probabilistic analog of deductive contraposition is admissible and when it is not. Salmon exposes the radically ambiguous nature of the concept of confirmation: in some cases when we say that a hypothesis is confirmed we mean that it has a high degree of confirmation in an absolute sense; in others we mean that its probability or degree of confirmation has been increased to some degree (incremental confirmation). Carnap had drawn the distinction, but it was widely ignored or misunderstood before Salmon reiterated Carnap's results, extended them and applied them in philosophical contexts. He shows that much of the counterintuitive character of incremental confirmation arises from a strong tendency to think about inductive reasoning as analogous to deductive truth-functional logic.

In addressing the questions of whether science yields objective information about the world and whether science itself is a rational enterprise, Salmon maintains a strong realist position grounded in the principles of logical empiricism that were developed in the early years of the twentieth century. In particular, he shows how the considerations that convinced physical scientists of the reality of atoms and molecules provide a philosophically sound argument for realism that does not exceed the bounds of empiricism. His argument differs substantially from the many defenses of realism that have been offered in response to Bas VAN FRAASSEN's constructive empiricism which, although it does not deny the existence of unobservable entities, rejects the possibility of our knowing anything about them. Despite not having a complete solution to Hume's problem, Salmon offers an affirmative answer to the key question of whether inductive logic contains the resources to provide legitimate inferences from data about observables to conclusions about unobservables.

In related work, Salmon considers Thomas KUHN's claim that choices among scientific theories are based on considerations that go beyond observational data, logic and scientific confirmation. To answer Kuhn, he argues that a Bayesian approach provides a more satisfactory conception of confirmation than the simpler hypothetic-deductive (H-D) model or something akin to it that underlies Kuhn's views. Bayes's theorem is an uncontroversial part of the mathematical calculus of probability, but its use as a model of scientific confirmation is problematic. This is so primarily because of the way Bayesians typically assign prior probabilities to hypotheses on a purely subjective or personal basis. Salmon tries to show how objectivity can be obtained within the Bayesian framework. He argues that while features such as judgment and persuasion, so important to Kuhn's account of theory choice, have no role in the H-D model, they do figure as plausibility considerations that can be assessed objectively and used to determine prior probabilities in the Bayesian analysis.

Concurrent with his work on confirmation, Salmon turned his attention to the problem of scientific explanation after Carl HEMPEL published his *Aspects of Scientific Explanation* in 1965. According to Hempel, explanations are arguments that show that the event to be explained was to be expected with deductive certainty or high probability in the light of the explanatory premises. Salmon characterizes Hempel's conception of explanation as "epis-

temic" because of the logical relationship that holds between the statements of explanatory laws and antecedent facts and the event to be explained. In response to some problems arising from Hempel's model of inductive-statistical explanation, such as the difficulty of showing how improbable events could be explained, Salmon developed his statistical-relevance (S-R) model of explanation. According to this model, an event is explained when a probability value (whether high, low, or middling) can be assigned to its occurrence in the light of all the evidence that is statistically relevant to it. Salmon's careful analysis of the differences between explanations and arguments led to his rejection of the epistemic conception ("a third dogma of empiricism"), and pushed him towards the view that causal factors – including probabilistic causal factors – are essential to scientific explanation. This in turn led to a deeper study of the intertwined problems of causality and explanation, which constitutes the major focus of his mature work.

In the late 1970s Salmon formulated a process theory of causality, which includes the "at-at" theory of causal transmission. In this work, he draws a basic distinction between causal interactions (which are localized in space-time) and causal processes (which may extend throughout vast regions of space–time). He then analyzes the concept of causal propagation on the basis of the ability of causal processes to transmit marks. This analysis draws upon Bertrand Russell's at-at theory of motion, which provided a resolution of Zeno's paradox of the flying arrow. Salmon argues that this explication of causal propagation makes sense of the ability of causal processes to transmit causal influence without invoking anti-Humean "powers" or "necessary connections." Salmon's causal account of explanation maintains that to explain an event is to exhibit it as occupying its (nomologically necessary) place in an intelligible pattern. His account differs from Michael SCRIVEN's earlier conception of causal explanation in offering a careful analysis of physical causality rather than treating the concept of

causality as too primitive to be analyzed. Salmon's conception is also called "ontic" because it emphasizes existent physical relationships. The ontic conception differs from Hempel's epistemic conception and from the modal conception that says that because of the lawful relations between the conditions leading up to the event to be explained, there is a relationship of "nomological necessity" between the antecedent conditions and the event. Nomological necessity can be said roughly to derive from laws of nature similar to the way logical necessity derives from the laws of logic.

Salmon's causal theory depends heavily on a distinction between causal processes and pseudo-processes. After several years of appealing to Reichenbach's concept of mark transmission to distinguish the two, he was persuaded to adopt instead a conserved-quantity theory that was proposed by Phil Dowe. Salmon regards the process theory of causality, including its fundamental concept of causal interaction, as an answer to Hume's problem of causal connections. He believes that the "cause-effect" terminology is heavily context-dependent – involving human background knowledge, interests and purposes – but that there is an underlying causal structure involving causal processes and interactions, which is thoroughly objective. He also maintains that his view of physical causation is not reductionist, and allows for the possibility that other kinds of causation are present in areas where human intentions and interrelations are involved.

Salmon made important contributions to our philosophical understanding of space and time with his work on the one-way speed of light, clocks and simultaneity in special relativity, and the curvature of physical space. His introductory book *Space, Time and Motion* (1975) is a pedagogic masterpiece.

Salmon was what universities call a "lifelong learner." As a full professor, he continued to take both undergraduate and graduate courses in physics and mathematics whenever he felt that he needed to increase his knowledge of these fields to tackle the philosophical

problems that interested him. At age sixty, he took up the study of Italian, and became proficient enough to write and lecture on philosophy on his trips to Italy. At the time of his death, he was working on a book-length study of Italian scientists from Galileo to Fermi.

Although it would be difficult to find a philosopher more open to criticism, willing to revise his views when he saw their shortcomings, and generous in his tolerance of opposing points of view, Salmon remained steadfastly true to the Humean principles of logical empiricism that informed all his work. It is sadly ironic that he died less than a week before he was to deliver the 2001 Reichenbach Lecture at UCLA. His paper for that lecture, "The Causal Structure of the World," was his final contribution to philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Should We Attempt to Justify Induction?" *Philosophical Studies* 8 (1957): 33–8.

Logic (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1963; 2nd edn 1973; 3rd edn 1984).

"On Vindicating Induction," in *Induction: Some Current Issues*, ed. Henry E. Kyburg, Jr. and Ernest Nagel (Middletown, Conn., 1963), pp. 27–41.

"The Concept of Inductive Evidence," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 2 (1965): 1–6.

The Foundations of Scientific Inference (Pittsburgh, 1967).

"The Justification of Inductive Rules of Inference," in *The Problem of Inductive Logic*, ed. Imre Lakatos (Amsterdam, 1968), pp. 24–43.

Statistical Explanation and Statistical Relevance (Pittsburgh, 1971).

Space, Time and Motion: A Philosophical Introduction (Encino, Cal., 1975; 2nd edn, Minneapolis, 1981).

"An 'At-At' Theory of Causal Influence," *Philosophy of Science* 44 (1977): 215–24.

"The Philosophical Significance of the One-way Speed of Light," *Noûs* 11 (1977): 353–92.

"A Third Dogma of Empiricism," in *Basic Problems in Methodology and Linguistics*, ed. Robert E. Butts and Jaakko Hintikka (Dordrecht, 1977), pp. 149–66.

"Why Ask, 'Why?'? – An Inquiry Concerning Scientific Explanation," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 51 (1978): 683–705.

"Propensities: A Discussion Review," *Erkenntnis* 14 (1979): 183–216.

"Probabilistic Causality," *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 61 (1980): 50–74.

"Rational Prediction," *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 32 (1981): 115–25.

Scientific Explanation and the Causal Structure of the World (Princeton, N.J., 1984).

Four Decades of Scientific Explanation (Minneapolis, 1990).

"On the Alleged Temporal Anisotropy of Explanation," in *Philosophical Problems of the Internal and External Worlds*, ed. John Earman et al. (Pittsburgh, 1993): 229–48.

"Causality Without Counterfactuals," *Philosophy of Science* 61 (1994): 297–312.

"Causality and Explanation: A Reply to Two Critiques," *Philosophy of Science* 64 (1997): 461–77.

Causality and Explanation (New York, 1998).

"Explanation and Confirmation: A Bayesian Critique of Inference to the Best Explanation," in *Explanation: Theoretical Approaches and Applications*, ed. G. Hon and S. S. Rakover (Dordrecht, 2001), pp. 61–91.

Reality and Rationality, ed. Phil Dowe and Merrilee H. Salmon (Oxford, 2005).

Other Relevant Works

"Carnap's Inductive Logic," *Journal of Philosophy* 64 (1967): 725–39.

Ed., *Zeno's Paradoxes* (Indianapolis, 1970).

"An Encounter with David Hume," in *Reason and Responsibility,* ed. Joel Feinberg (Encino, Cal, 1975), pp. 190–208.

"The Philosophy of Hans Reichenbach,"

Synthese 34 (1977): 5–88.

"Van Fraassen on Explanation," with Philip Kitcher, *Journal of Philosophy* 84 (1987): 315–30.

Ed. with Philip Kitcher, *Scientific Explanation* (Minneapolis, 1989).

"Causation," in *The Blackwell Guide to Metaphysics*, ed. Richard M. Gale (Oxford, 2002), pp. 19–42.

"Commit It Then to the Flames …," in *Logical Empiricism: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. Paolo Parrini, Wesley C. Salmon, and Merilee H. Salmon (Pittsburgh, 2003), pp. 375–87.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v8*, *Proc of APA v75*, *Who Was Who in Amer v14*

Fetzer, James H., ed. *Probability and Causality: Essays in Honor of Wesley C. Salmon* (Dordrecht, 1988).

Galavotti, Maria Carla, and Alessandro Pagnini, eds. *Experience, Reality, and Scientific Explanation: Essays in Honor of Merrilee and Wesley Salmon* (Dordrecht, 1999).

McLaughlin, Robert, ed. *What? Where? When? Why? Essays on Induction, Space and Time* (Dordrecht, 1982).

Salmon, Merrilee H., et al. *Introduction to the Philosophy of Science* (Indianapolis, 1999).

Merrilee H. Salmon

SANBORN, Herbert Charles (1873–1967)

Herbert C. Sanborn was born on 18 February 1873 in Winchester, Massachusetts. He received his PhB from Boston University in 1896, studying with personalist Borden Parker BOWNE. He then received his MA from Tufts College in 1897. With the Jacob Sleeper fellowship awarded by Boston University, he studied at the University of Heidelberg in 1900. For several years he taught languages and served as headmaster at public schools in Massachusetts and Connecticut to finance further study at Germany universities. He returned to Heidelberg in 1901–2; went to Berlin in 1903 and Halle in 1904; and studied at the University of Munich from 1906 to 1908, where he received his PhD magna cum laude. His dissertation was titled "Über die Identität der Person bei William James" which explored JAMES's theory of consciousness and personal identity, under the supervision of professor Georg Friedrich von Hertling. He then joined the staff of Leipzig's Psychology Institute during 1908–9 where Wilhelm Wundt still presided as its Director.

In 1909 Sanborn returned to the United States to begin his appointment as professor of philosophy and psychology at Washington College in Maryland. In 1911 he was called to Vanderbilt University as associate professor of philosophy and psychology. In 1921 he was promoted to full professor and became head of the department of philosophy and psychology. He led the philosophy department during a period of tremendous growth for Vanderbilt. When he arrived to undertake all of the philosophy instruction, the campus only served around 1300 students. Under his leadership psychology became prepared to split off to become a separate department (which occurred in 1952) and more philosophy faculty were added. For many summers he also taught at the nearby Peabody College of Education. Sanborn was President of the Southern Society for Psychology and Philosophy in 1923, and delivered his presidential address on "Aesthetics and Civilization." He retired in 1942, and died on 6 July 1967 in Nashville, Tennessee.

Sanborn was quite proficient in the German language and formed a strong attachment to the German culture and people. From 1904 to 1908 he published several texts of German literature for American readers, adding introduc-

tions, notes, vocabulary lists, and conversational exercises. In September 1916 he delivered an address on "The Faith of a Hyphen" to the first garden festival of the local German-American Alliance society, referring to the hyphen forming the label of "German-American." Sanborn translated Theodor Lipps's *Psychological Studies* in 1926. He also published a book on the history and training of the dachshund dog breed in 1937, and studied birds and bird songs.

Sanborn's understanding of mind, psychology, and philosophical methodology was strongly influenced by his encounters with the personal idealism of Bowne, German idealism, and James's pragmatism. For Sanborn, pluralism is desirable in both philosophy and science; no system in philosophy or field of science should be permitted to dictate the nature of reality. In "Methodology and Psychology" (1928) he observed that psychology is as fragmented into competing theories as philosophy has always been. This is no embarrassment in Sanborn's view, because the sciences only provide partial insights into nature, and its theories have but pragmatic validity and cannot override lived experience. For example, the only growth of which we know intimately is the growth of our own mental powers; the materialist's appeal to evolutionary growth to explain mind inverts their proper relationship. Sanborn does not object to some appeal to mechanistic causality in psychological theorizing, so long as it does not replace the teleological explanations essential to that field as well.

Sanborn's rejection of strict behaviorism was accompanied in his writings by an appeal to the "self" as necessary for psychology and philosophy. Often using examples from James, he argued that psychology must start from the active, purposive intellect embedded in a cultural environment. This "individual" or "personality" may be analyzed into mental processes such as habits, perceptions, etc., but these are unreal abstractions. Sanborn's emphasis on the foundational nature of "personality" aligned him with the idealistic tradi-

tion of personalism, of which Edgar S. BRIGHTMAN was then the leader, but Sanborn favored a more positivistic empiricism hospitable to science rather than metaphysical idealism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Über die Identität der Person bei William James (Leipzig-Eutritzsch, Germany, 1909).

"A Personalistic View of Art," in *Personalism and the Problems of Philosophy: An Appreciation of the Work of Borden Parker Bowne*, ed. Ralph Tyler Flewelling and Rudolf Eucken (New York, 1915).

"Aesthetics and Civilization," *Peabody Journal of Education*, vol. 1 (Nashville, Tenn., 1923).

"The Function of Clothing and Bodily Adornment," *American Journal of Psychology* 38 (1927): 1–20.

"Methodology and Psychology," *Philosophical Review* 37 (1928): 15–41.

"Methodology in Psychology," in *Behaviorism: A Battle Line*, ed. William P. King (Nashville, Tenn., 1930), pp. 94–123.

"The Meaning of Clothes," in *Sex in the Arts: A Symposium*, ed. John F. McDermott (New York, 1932), pp. 278–315.

"Observations of Apparently Unlearned Behavior," *Journal of Comparative Psychology* 14 (1932): 79–95.

"Are There Any Individuals?" *Journal of Psychology* 8 (1939): 225–35.

"An Examination of William Stern's Philosophy," *Character & Personality* 7 (1939): 318–30.

"Experiment as Creative Act," *Journal of General Psychology* 41 (1949): 249–61.

"Philosophies and Psychologies," *The Personalist* 31 (1950): 29–41.

"Hegelian Influences in Brightman," *The Personalist* 34 (1953).

"The Meeting Point of Philosophy and Psychology," *Rivista Methods* 9 (1957): 35–6.

Other Relevant Works

Sanborn's papers are at Vanderbilt University.

Trans., *Psychological Studies*, by Theodor Lipps (Baltimore, Md., 1926).

"The Democratic Control of Education," *School and Society* 32 (1930): 108–18.

"The Inheritance of Song in Birds," *Journal of Comparative Psychology* 13 (1932): 345–64.

"A Side-light on the Katharsis," *The Classical Journal* 33 (1938): 322–35.

Further Reading

Who Was Who in Amer v4, Who's Who in Phil

Balz, Albert G. A. *Southern Teachers of Philosophy* (Lexington, Kent., 1954), p. 103–4.

John R. Shook

SANGER, Margaret Louise Higgins
(1879–1966)

Margaret Sanger was born Margaret Louise Higgins on 14 September 1979 in Corning, New York. Born into a poor, hard-working Irish Catholic family, she was the sixth of eleven children. Her later activism was probably influenced by watching her mother die at age fifty after eighteen pregnancies. Two of her sisters helped her to attend school at Claverack College and Hudson River Institute. In 1900 she enrolled in White Plains Hospital as a nurse probationer. Though she was working toward a registered nursing degree, her formal education ended in 1902 when she married William Sanger. In 1910 the family moved to New York City, where she became a visiting nurse among the immigrant population on the Lower East Side. During this time she gradually became a socialist/union and feminist activist for the

Industrial Workers of the World and participated in many radical strikes, including the 1912 strike of textile workers in Lawrence, Massachusetts. Sanger's work as a nurse and her emerging feminist consciousness gradually led to her interest in sex education and women's health. She also came to share Emma GOLDMAN's ideas that women had the right to control their sexual and reproductive freedom.

In 1912 Sanger was invited to write a column on female sexuality and hygiene entitled "What Every Girl Should Know" for the New York *Call*. Though this column was quickly censured as obscene, it brought Sanger more publicity. She returned to work as a visiting nurse among the immigrant population on the Lower East Side and began to concentrate efforts to raise awareness about the dangers of frequent childbirth, miscarriage and self-induced abortion to women's health. In 1914 she published a radical feminist newspaper, *Woman Rebel*, and circulated a pamphlet on contraception called *Family Limitation*. Since distributing information about sex education through the mail was considered obscene and contraception was illegal in the United States, Sanger fled to England after a warrant was issued for her arrest. While in England she studied with British sexual theorist Havelock Ellis and Dutch feminist physician Aletta Jacobs. She returned to the United States in October 1915 to face charges, just as her husband's trial for his role in distributing sex education materials was garnering publicity. The charges against her were finally dropped after her five-year-old daughter, Peggy, suddenly died on 6 November 1915, and a wave of sympathy elevated public support for Sanger. She had separated from her husband in 1914 and finally divorced him in 1920; she married J. Noah H. Slee in 1922, but kept her now famous last name.

Sanger and her sister Evelyn Byrne opened the first birth control clinic in Brooklyn, New York on 16 October 1916. Modeled on the Dutch system of medically supervised clinics, the Brooklyn facility was an act of civil disobedience since distribution of information about

birth control was still illegal. As she made legalization of birth control a priority Sanger distanced herself from the radical left, seeking support instead from physicians and academic eugenicists. In 1921 she formed a national lobbying group called the American Birth Control League; this organization became Planned Parenthood in 1942. She also reached out to the African-American community and was outspoken in her opposition to racism; she joined efforts with such figures as W. E. B. DU BOIS to build humanitarian services for African Americans. For example, in 1930 she opened a family planning clinic in Harlem, staffed by a black physician and a black social worker. Between 1920 and 1960 many states legalized contraception, though it was controlled as a medical matter requiring a doctor's prescription rather than a woman's right. During the second half of the twentieth century, fears of overpopulation facilitated political support for birth control. Sanger worked with family planning leaders in Europe and Asia and helped found the International Planned Parenthood Federation in 1952, serving as its first President until 1959.

As a pioneer in the birth control movement, Sanger is credited with extending women's liberation to include sexual freedom. She worked tirelessly to reduce the number of unwanted children in order to create a more equitable society. However, her efforts were frustrated more by social norms than the lack of knowledge or technological innovations to prevent unwanted pregnancies. After her exposure to British neo-Malthusians she began to formulate socioeconomic justifications for limiting family size. In addition, Ellis's liberation theories helped her to formulate the rationale that intercourse should not just be for procreation, but be a pleasurable experience for women.

Her association with the embryonic eugenics movement has tainted Sanger's reputation in recent decades, although she never promoted race or class-based eugenics and always advocated the individual's right to make reproductive choices. Two generations of influential race leaders, including Du Bois and Martin Luther KING, JR. gratefully recognized Sanger's efforts to improve people's lives by reducing the economic strain of too many children born into already financially strapped families.

Sanger's early recognition of overpopulation laid the groundwork for the importance of family planning as a global issue. She lived to see the 1965 Supreme Court decision, *Griswold vs. Connecticut*, which made birth control legal for married couples. Sanger died on 6 September 1966 in Tucson, Arizona. In 2000, she was selected by *Time* magazine as one of the one hundred most influential Americans of the twentieth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Birth Control and Racial Betterment," *The Birth Control Review* 3 (February 1919): 11–12.

"Why Not Birth Control Clinics in America?" *The Birth Control Review* 3 (May 1919): 10–11.

Women and the New Race (New York, 1920).

The Pivot of Civilization (Elmsford, N.Y., 1922).

Happiness in Marriage (Elmsford, N.Y., 1926).

Motherhood in Bondage (Elmsford, N.Y.,1928).

My Fight for Birth Control (New York, 1931).

Margaret Sanger: An Autobiography (New York, 1938).

Other Relevant Works

Sanger's papers are in the Library of Congress and Smith College in Massachusetts.

The Margaret Sanger Papers, 101 microfilm reels, ed. Esther Katz et al. (Bethesda, Md., 1994, 1996).

The Selected Papers of Margaret Sanger, Volume 1: The Woman Rebel, 1900–1928, ed. Esther Katz (Urbana, Ill., 2002).

The Selected Papers of Margaret Sanger, Volume 2: Birth Control Comes of Age,

1928–1939, ed. Esther Katz (Urbana, Ill., 2005).

Further Reading

Comp Amer Thought, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v52*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*

Black, Edwin. *War Against the Weak: Eugenics and America's Campaign to Create a Master Race* (New York, 2003).

Chesler, Ellen. *Woman of Valor: Margaret Sanger and the Birth Control Movement in America* (New York, 1992).

Du Bois, W. E. B. "Black Folk and Birth Control," *The Birth Control Review* 16 (June 1932): 166.

Ellis, Havelock. "The World's Racial Problem," *The Birth Control Review* 4 (October 1920): 14–16.

Forster, Margaret. *Significant Sisters: The Grassroots of American Feminism, 1839–1939* (New York, 1985).

Gordon, Linda. *The Moral Responsibility of Women* (Urbana, Ill., 2002).

Grossmann, Atina. *Reforming Sex: The German Movement for Birth Control and Abortion Reform, 1920–1950* (New York, 1995).

McCann, Carole R. *Birth Control Politics in the Unites States, 1916–1945* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1994).

Moore, Gloria, and Ronald Moore. *Margaret Sanger and the Birth Control Movement: A Bibliography, 1911–1984* (Metuchen, N.J., 1986).

Reed, James. *From Private Vice to Public Virtue: The Birth Control Movement and American Society Since 1830* (New York, 1978).

Jean Van Delinder

SANTAYANA, George (1863–1952)

Jorge Nicolás Ruiz de Santayana, who later called himself George Santayana, was born on 16 December 1863 in Madrid, Spain, and died on 26 September 1952 in Rome. His parents were both Spanish, and both had lived in the Philippine Islands where they had met. This was a second marriage for Santayana's mother, whose first husband was a member of the Sturgis family of Boston. She had five children by that marriage (three of whom survived to adulthood) before the premature death of her American husband in 1857. Santayana's parents were married in Madrid in 1862, and not long after the birth of their only child, George, the following year, the family moved to the nearby medieval town of Avila, where the boy spent his first eight and a half years.

The marriage of Santayana's parents was not successful, and in 1868 or 1869, when Santayana was five years old, his mother left Spain with the three children of her first marriage and sailed for America, where she settled in Boston. For Santayana, this abandonment by his mother at such a tender age had to have significant consequences. He remained with his father in Avila for another three and a half years. Then, in 1872, Santayana's father took him to America, and the family was reunited in Boston. After six months however, his father, who could not speak English, returned to Avila permanently. Father and son were afterward reunited only when Santayana, during summer vacations, traveled to Europe and visited his father and other relatives in Spain.

Santayana, at the age of eight and a half, had come to America speaking not a word of English, but he quickly acquired facility in the language. After some time in ordinary Boston elementary schools, he was enrolled in the Boston Public Latin School, where he distinguished himself and won prizes for his poetry. After graduating in 1882, he went to Harvard University. He took an active role in college life by drawing cartoons for the *Lampoon*, the

student magazine, and performing in the plays put on by the Hasty Pudding Club. Though he had up to this time written only poetry, he was attracted to philosophy and in his second year chose that subject as his major. This period is often referred to as the Golden Age of the Harvard philosophy department. William JAMES and Josiah ROYCE were its most brilliant lights and Santayana studied with both. James became Santayana's mentor, though the two men were very different in temperament and in their philosophical positions and never became personal friends. Santayana's BA was awarded summa cum laude and in absentia in 1886, he having already sailed for Germany and graduate studies in philosophy at Göttingen and Berlin. After two years, he felt out of sympathy with the prevailing German academic philosophy, and doubted whether he could compose a successful doctoral dissertation in German. He therefore returned to Harvard, and received his PhD in 1889, writing a dissertation on the German philosopher Rudolf Hermann Lotze.

In the fall of 1889 Santayana became a temporary philosophy instructor, which started his Harvard teaching career that spanned some twenty-two years. He later claimed to have no vocation for teaching and said that he never really liked being a professor. However, a number of his former students have contradicted this self-evaluation, saying that he was a kind and considerate teacher and a compelling lecturer. During his student days and as a young instructor at Harvard, Santayana wrote poetry almost exclusively and was known – along with William Vaughan Moody, Robert Morss Lovett, Joseph Trumbull Stickney, and others – as one of the neo-traditionalist "Harvard Poets." His first book, *Sonnets and Other Verses*, was published in 1894, but pressure from the Harvard administration drove Santayana toward writing in his professional field. In 1896 he published his first philosophical book, *The Sense of Beauty*, with the New York firm of Charles Scribner's Sons, who remained his American publisher for his

entire career (as Constable and Co. of London was his lifelong principal English publisher). This book became a classic in the field and expresses Santayana's aesthetic philosophy, which maintains that the individual invests the aesthetic object with the beauty that he perceives in it.

Publication of *The Sense of Beauty* resulted in Santayana's promotion to the rank of assistant professor in 1898. In 1907 he was made full professor, following publication of the five volumes of *The Life of Reason: Or the Phases of Human Progress*. The volumes are titled: *Introduction and Reason in Common Sense* (1905), *Reason in Society* (1905), *Reason in Religion* (1905), *Reason in Art* (1905), and *Reason in Science* (1906). Some have viewed *The Life of Reason* as Santayana's closest approach to a pragmatist standpoint. However, Santayana disliked James's personalism and radical empiricism, severely criticized John DEWEY's naturalism as "half-hearted" in the 1920s, and never agreed with pragmatism's view of truth.

During his twenty-two years of teaching at Harvard, Santayana produced a great quantity of books, articles, and reviews. In 1900 Scribner's brought out *Interpretations of Poetry and Religion*, which expresses Santayana's conception of religion as poetry. As imaginative, mythic, and symbolic interpretations of the condition of man in the universe, the great religions of the world may be said to have a kind of symbolic truth, though they are not factual accounts of real events. This remained Santayana's position on religion and is reiterated in a late work of 1946 entitled *The Idea of Christ in the Gospels; or, God in Man: A Critical Essay*. In 1901 Santayana published *A Hermit of Carmel, and Other Poems*, his final book of new poems. After this time, he wrote some significant literary criticism, but mainly concentrated on philosophy and only occasionally composed a poem.

Santayana's literary critical work, incorporating a fundamental analysis of the philosophical basis of the writer's conception of the

world that he was describing, is exemplified in *Three Philosophical Poets: Lucretius, Dante, and Goethe* (1910). In this book, Santayana analyzes the works of these three masters, finding the Roman poet Lucretius the most satisfactory for having effectively incorporated in his *De rerum natura* (On the Order of Nature) the naturalistic and materialistic philosophy of Democritus and Epicurus (a philosophical position akin to Santayana's own).

In America, Santayana always regarded himself as an exile. Since his undergraduate years, he had continued to spend almost every summer in Europe, and he dreamed of returning there to live. When his mother died in 1912, leaving him a substantial sum of money, he was able to realize this dream. At the age of forty-eight, he resigned his professorship and moved permanently to Europe. Boston was astonished at his resignation and an official at Harvard thought the action quite immoral. Santayana was warned in a letter from the philosophy department Chairman, George H. PALMER, not to become a "floater" (presumably, a rootless ne'er-do-well).

In Europe, Santayana moved about quite a lot at first, looking for an ideal place in which to settle. He lived in Paris, spent the World War I years in England (principally at Oxford), paid lengthy visits to relatives in Spain, and finally settled in Rome in the mid 1920s. For most of his thirty-odd years in Rome, Santayana lived in fine hotels, usually occupying only a single room.

Throughout his forty-year sojourn in Europe, from 1912 to 1952, during which he never returned to America, Santayana devoted himself to writing. Wherever he might be, whether at home in Oxford or Paris or Rome, or on summer vacation trips to Venice or Cortina d'Ampezzo, Santayana rose early and spent the morning writing. He was a professional philosopher and man of letters, passionately devoted to his craft, and in these forty years in Europe produced a huge body of work. In addition to countless articles published in professional journals and other periodicals, he

wrote a number of important books. *Egotism in German Philosophy* came out in 1915 and was much criticized for being propagandistic. *Character and Opinion in the United States: With Reminiscences of William James and Josiah Royce and Academic Life in America* was published in 1920. In 1922 his *Soliloquies in England and Later Soliloquies* presented some fifty-five relatively short essays on a host of subjects, many of which dealt with aspects of the English landscape, character, literary figures and their writings, politics and philosophy. In 1923 a selection of his *Poems* was published, as was *Scepticism and Animal Faith: Introduction to a System of Philosophy*. The twenty-seven chapters of *Scepticism and Animal Faith*, difficult because of their technical character, are designed to prepare the reader for the four-volume presentation of Santayana's mature philosophy, which was to follow under the general title of *Realms of Being*.

Realms of Being, referred to by Santayana as his *magnum opus*, represents the fullest expression of his philosophy. This work consists of four separate books, each devoted to a principal aspect of the system, titled *The Realm of Essence* (1927), *The Realm of Matter* (1930), *The Realm of Truth* (1938), and *The Realm of Spirit* (1940). Taken together, the *Realms of Being* represent over thirteen years of intense concentration and labor. But during those years Santayana also produced a number of other books of various kinds on various subjects, including *The Last Puritan: A Novel in the Form of a Memoir* (1935), a fictional biography of an ill-fated young American patrician, Oliver Alden. This novel, written by Santayana over a period of some forty-five years, largely as a recreation from his labors in technical philosophy, has been compared to the best work of Henry James.

World War II made life in Rome very trying; particularly frustrating for Santayana was the increasing problem of obtaining transfers of money from his financial agents in America. In 1941, totally cut off from his funds, Santayana moved into a hospital nursing home in Rome

operated by an order of English Roman Catholic nuns called the Blue Sisters of the Little Company of Mary. There he spent the final eleven years of his life, occupying a single room, in which he continued his writing. His remaining years were very productive. During the war he wrote his autobiography; because of wartime restrictions and difficulties, it was eventually published in three separate volumes: *Persons and Places: The Background of My Life* (1944); *The Middle Span* (1945); and *My Host the World* (1953). It was not until 1986, with the publication of the MIT Press critical edition of Santayana's autobiography, that the work appeared in a single-volume edition bearing Santayana's original title and containing previously omitted material.

In 1950 a large book was published that, like his novel *The Last Puritan*, Santayana had composed over nearly half a century. *Dominations and Powers: Reflections on Liberty, Society, and Government* expresses Santayana's views on politics. The point of the title, as Santayana explains in a 1946 letter, is "to distinguish beneficent from vexatious government." Santayana expresses his dissatisfaction with political liberalism and its concomitants of democracy and republicanism. He believed a consortium of numerous countries, like the United Nations, or its predecessor the League of Nations, to be incapable of solving serious international problems. He felt that the authority of individual great nations was the power under which the peace and prosperity of the world was to be achieved. The great thing was for powerful nations to avoid crushing the individuality of smaller ones, to permit them to preserve their native political forms and customs, and by these measures encourage the success and prosperity of all nations.

Santayana's final large-scale project, undertaken in the last couple of years of Santayana's life with his friend and literary secretary, Daniel Cory, was to reduce his early five-volume *The Life of Reason* to a single volume. Santayana died on 26 September 1952 in Rome, Italy. The single-volume *The Life of Reason* was published a year later, as was *The Poet's Testament: Poems and Two Plays*, a collection of mostly early material that had not previously been published.

Over the course of his long career, Santayana articulated a complete system of philosophy. Critics have questioned the originality of his system, but Santayana was not so much interested in originating novel philosophical ideas as he was in effectively combining and organizing the great philosophical insights of earlier thinkers. He had the highest regard for the ancient Greeks, greatly admiring Plato and Aristotle and incorporating certain of their views into his own. Spinoza he acknowledged as his master among the moderns. But he allied himself most closely with Democritus and the Ionian philosophers who, despite their differences, all agreed that there was an ultimate, irreducible principle or element underlying all natural phenomena. Democritus articulated the idea that all of existence consisted of atoms, irreducibly tiny elements of matter, combining and recombining and continually moving through the void. Santayana thought that the views of these early naturalists and materialists in philosophy were essentially correct and he subscribed to the fundamental tenets of their philosophy. Matter, for Santayana, is the fundamental element of being.

The four volumes of *Realms of Being* explain Santayana's philosophy of naturalism and materialism. He devotes a book to each of the realms of essence, matter, truth, and spirit. These realms, however, should not be thought of as regions or elements of being, but rather as types or features of the world of our experience. Primary and fundamental to Santayana's whole system is his doctrine of essences.

Critics have considered essences a Platonic concept irreconcilable with Santayana's avowed materialism. But unlike Plato's ideal archetypes, Santayana's essences are individual and multifarious forms of definiteness; and generic essences have no superiority over specific ones. For Santayana, the realm of essence consists of an infinite number of real

but immaterial and non-existent forms. These forms or essences are not subject to space or time and are, therefore, unchanging and indestructible. While Santayana's essences are not material, neither are they merely mental. All of our perceptions, or even thoughts, are essences; but the reality of essences does not depend upon anyone thinking of them.

Though real and imperishable, essences are completely passive and inefficacious. In Santayana's system, the locus of all power and efficacy is matter. It can be loosely defined as the unconscious source of all existence. But because, in its pristine state of pure potentiality, matter is formless, it necessarily defies actual description. Matter, in Santayana's view, has the power to select and combine with essences to create substance, which constitutes all the objects of the physical world. Essences, thus instantiated by matter, are not used up or changed in any way; they are always available for repeated use in other combinations or in a repetition of the same combination.

The implications of a materialistic philosophy, like that of Santayana or Democritus, are very significant. In such a view, everything is natural; there is no supernatural. There is, therefore, no God to provide an origin or rationale for existence, which is irrational and incomprehensible. Everything is contingent. Man is an animal for whom, in a godless and non-anthropocentric universe, there is no afterlife and no special dispensation of any sort. Unconscious nature is necessarily indifferent to the plight of man, and human life is ultimately without meaning.

The realm of truth consists simply of all those essences that are selected by matter for actualization. As in the case of essences, truth is immaterial and eternal; but it is always about events that take place in time. Also, like essences, truth is independent of mind: something is true whether anyone ever knows about it or not. It is the sum of all the facts, a record of everything that has ever happened.

According to Santayana's modified skepticism, we can never know reality directly, and therefore our knowledge of the truth must be mediated through symbols. We know the truth by intuiting essences effectively symbolic of reality, when the idea we have of events corresponds to what has been actualized in the world. Our belief that the perceptible world really exists and must be dealt with occurs through what Santayana calls "animal faith." He attaches no religious meaning to this term; it refers simply to our instinctive tendency to believe in the reality of the world that we perceive. We may on occasion be mistaken in trusting to the accuracy of our perceptions, but without animal faith human life would be impossible. And though truth may be infinitely complex, it is completely commonplace. Of course, for human beings some truths are of much greater importance than others.

Spirit is the term Santayana uses for what other philosophers call consciousness or mind. Though itself immaterial (like essences and truth), spirit is produced by matter when it achieves a certain degree of organization, as in a human being. Spirit is the psyche or vital physical organism which has become self-aware. Spirit's natural vocation would be the disinterested intuition of essences, the contemplation of essences for their own sake. But the demands of the vital organism or psyche with which the spirit is conjoined arouse the spirit out of its contemplative state and require that it attend to its environment for the purpose of promoting the well-being of the individual whose spirit it is. Matter, however, and not spirit, remains the sole efficacy and power in the world. For Santayana, it is matter over mind, and not the reverse.

Spirit is generated by and is a lifelong accompaniment to a living organism. For Santayana, there is no freeing of the spirit at death for continued experience. There is no afterlife, no reincarnation, no heaven of any sort. From Santayana's naturalistic and materialistic point of view, the individual spirit is extinguished at death, and there can be no disembodied spirits, no gods, angels, devils, or other supernatural beings. Thus, while Santayana's philosophy

denies the possibility of life after death, it emphasizes the importance of life on earth and places a supreme value upon human happiness. For Santayana, the good life – the life of reason – is one based upon self-knowledge and one that harmonizes the passions and subscribes to the Greek ideal of moderation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sonnets and Other Verses (Cambridge, Mass., and Chicago, 1894).

The Sense of Beauty: Being the Outlines of Aesthetic Theory (New York and London, 1896; Cambridge, Mass., 1988).

Lucifer: A Theological Tragedy (Chicago and New York, 1899).

Interpretations of Poetry and Religion (New York and London, 1900; Cambridge, Mass., 1989).

A Hermit of Carmel, and Other Poems (New York, 1901).

The Life of Reason: Or, The Phases of Human Progress, 5 vols (New York and London, 1905–6). One-volume edn (New York and London, 1954).

Three Philosophical Poets: Lucretius, Dante, and Goethe (Cambridge, Mass., 1910).

Winds of Doctrine: Studies in Contemporary Opinion (New York and London, 1913).

Egotism in German Philosophy (New York, 1915).

Character and Opinion in the United States: With Reminiscences of William James and Josiah Royce and Academic Life in America (New York, 1920).

Soliloquies in England and Later Soliloquies (New York and London, 1922).

Poems: Selected by the Author and Revised (New York and London, 1923).

Scepticism and Animal Faith: Introduction to a System of Philosophy (New York and London, 1923).

Dialogues in Limbo (London, 1925; New York, 1926).

Platonism and the Spiritual Life (New York and London, 1927).

The Realm of Essence: Book First of Realms of Being (New York and London, 1927).

The Realm of Matter: Book Second of Realms of Being (New York and London, 1930).

The Genteel Tradition at Bay (New York, 1931).

Some Turns of Thought in Modern Philosophy: Five Essays (New York and Cambridge, UK, 1933).

The Last Puritan: A Memoir in the Form of a Novel (London, 1935; New York, 1936; Cambridge, Mass., 1994).

Obiter Scripta: Lectures, Essays and Reviews, ed. Justus Buchler and Benjamin Schwartz (New York and London, 1936).

The Realm of Truth: Book Third of Realms of Being (London, 1937; New York, 1938).

The Realm of Spirit: Book Fourth of Realms of Being (New York and London, 1940).

Realms of Being (New York, 1942). One-volume edition.

Persons and Places: The Background of My Life (New York and London, 1944).

The Idea of Christ in the Gospels; or, God in Man: A Critical Essay (New York, 1946).

The Middle Span (New York, 1945; London, 1947).

Dialogues in Limbo, with Three New Dialogues (New York, 1948).

Dominations and Powers: Reflections on Liberty, Society, and Government (New York and London, 1951).

My Host the World (New York and London, 1953).

The Poet's Testament: Poems and Two Plays (New York, 1953).

Other Relevant Works

Santayana's papers are at Harvard University, Columbia University, the University of Texas, and the University of Waterloo, Canada.

"Brief History of My Opinions," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 2,

pp. 239–57.

Philosophy of Santayana: Selections From the Works of George Santayana, ed. Irwin Edman (New York, 1936).

The Works of George Santayana, 15 vols, the "Triton Edition" (New York, 1936–40).

The Letters of George Santayana, ed. Daniel Cory (New York and London, 1955).

Essays in Literary Criticism of George Santayana, ed. Irving Singer (New York, 1956).

The Idler and His Works, and Other Essays, ed. Daniel Cory (New York, 1957).

Animal Faith and Spiritual Life: Previously Unpublished and Uncollected Writings by George Santayana with Critical Essays on His Thought, ed. John Lachs (New York, 1967).

The Birth of Reason and Other Essays by George Santayana, ed. Daniel Cory (New York, 1968).

Selected Critical Writings of George Santayana, 2 vols, ed. Norman Henfrey (Cambridge, UK, 1968).

Physical Order and Moral Liberty: Previously Unpublished Essays of George Santayana, ed. John Lachs and Shirley Lachs (Nashville, Tenn., 1969).

Lotze's System of Philosophy, ed. Paul G. Kuntz (Bloomington, Ind., 1971).

The Complete Poems of George Santayana: A Critical Edition, ed. William G. Holzberger (Lewisburg, Penn., 1979).

The Works of George Santayana, vol. 1. Persons and Places: Fragments of Autobiography, ed. William G. Holzberger and Herman J. Saatkamp, Jr. (Cambridge, Mass., 1986).

The Works of George Santayana, vol. 5. The Letters of George Santayana, in 8 books, ed. William G. Holzberger (Cambridge, Mass., 2001–2005).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Amer Phils Before 1950, Bio 20thC Phils, Blackwell Amer Phil, Blackwell Comp Phils, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Dict Amer Bio, Encyc Amer Bio, Encyc Ethics, Encyc Psych, Oxford Comp Phil, Proc of APA v26, Routledge Encycl Phil, Who Was Who in Amer v3, Who's Who in Phil

Ames, Van Meter. *Proust and Santayana: The Aesthetic Way of Life* (New York, 1937).

Arnett, Willard E. *Santayana and the Sense of Beauty* (Bloomington, Ind., 1955).

Bosco, Nynfa. *Il realismo critico di Giorgio Santayana* (Torino, Italy, 1954).

Butler, Richard. *The Mind of Santayana* (Chicago, 1955).

Christophe, Vera. *Zur Erkenntnistheorie George Santayanas: eine Philosophie ausserhalb des American Mainstream* (Frankfurt am Main, 1992).

Cory, Daniel. *Santayana, the Later Years: A Portrait with Letters* (New York, 1963).

Duron, Jacques. *La pensée de George Santayana: Santayana en Amérique* (Paris, 1950)

Izuzquiza, Ignacio. *George Santayana, o, La ironía de la materia* (Barcelona, Spain, 1989).

Kerr-Larson, Angus, and Herman Saatkamp, Jr., eds. *Overheard in Seville: Bulletin of the Santayana Society* (Waterloo, Ontario, 1983–). Contains bibliographies of secondary literature.

Lachs, John. *George Santayana* (Boston, Mass., 1988).

Lachs, John, and Michael Hodges. *Thinking in the Ruins: Wittgenstein and Santayana on Contingency* (Nashville, Tenn., 2000).

Lamont, Corliss, ed. *Dialogue on George Santayana* (New York, 1959).

Levinson, Henry Samuel. *Santayana, Pragmatism, and the Spiritual Life* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1992).

Lind, Bruno. *Vagabond Scholar: A Venture into the Privacy of George Santayana* (New York, 1962).

McCormick, John. *George Santayana: A Biography* (New York, 1987).

Munitz, Milton K. *The Moral Philosophy of*

Santayana (New York, 1958).

Price, Kenneth M., and Robert C. Leitz, eds. *Critical Essays on George Santayana* (Boston, Mass., 1991).

Saatkamp, Herman, Jr., and John Jones. *George Santayana: A Bibliographical Checklist, 1880–1980* (Bowling Green, Ohio, 1982).

Schilpp, Paul A., ed. *The Philosophy of George Santayana* (Evanston, Ill., 1940; 2nd edn, New York, 1951). Contains Santayana's autobiography and bibliography.

Singer, Beth. *The Rational Society: A Critical Study of Santayana's Social Thought* (Cleveland, 1970).

Singer, Irving. *Santayana's Aesthetics* (Cambridge, Mass., 1957).

———, *George Santayana, Literary Philosopher* (New Haven, Conn., 2000).

"Special Issue on Santayana," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 10 (Summer 1972).

Sprigge, Timothy. *Santayana: An Examination of his Philosophy* (London, 1974).

William G. Holzberger

SAPIR, Edward (1884–1939)

Edward Sapir was born on 26 January 1884 in Lauenberg, Pomerania, in Prussia (now Lebork, Poland), to Lithuanian Jewish parents. He spent his childhood first in England and after 1890 in the United States. Sapir grew up in New York City and was educated at Columbia University, where he received a BA in German in 1904, an MA in German in 1905, and a PhD in anthropology in 1909, working with Franz BOAS. After fellowships at the University of California at Berkeley and the University of Pennsylvania, in 1910 Sapir went to Ottawa, Canada, to study native languages as chief ethnologist of the newly created Division of Anthropology of the Geological Survey of Canada, within the Department of Mines. In 1925 he began his teaching career as a professor of anthropology at the University of Chicago, and in 1931 Sapir was appointed Sterling Professor of Anthropology and Linguistics at Yale University, a position that he held until his death on 4 February 1939 in New Haven, Connecticut.

Sapir made several significant contributions to American linguistics, anthropology, and related fields. He was a prolific writer and his collected works contain a diverse number of articles on topics ranging from the laws of sound change to reviews of poetry and music. He wrote several important studies of Native American languages and their classification. He began his career by describing in great detail the languages of California, some of which are now dead. Sapir also described several other languages in Canada and some of the languages of Native Americans, helping to refine the ways in which these languages are classified with respect to one another. Sapir also made substantial contributions to the study of poetry.

Sapir is best known within philosophy as a key proponent of what has become known as the "Sapir–Whorf" hypothesis. This hypothesis is also known as perhaps the most radical form of linguistic relativism, the doctrine sometimes described as the view that the notion of what exists is determined by or is "constructed" by the language one speaks. Many of the more characteristic and extreme aspects of the classical versions of linguistic relativism were articulated by Sapir's student at Yale, Benjamin WHORF. There are different versions of their hypothesis, ranging from the obvious sense in which speaking a language can make available certain kinds of thoughts that one might not otherwise be able to have had, to the more radical and metaphysically loaded claims that have characterized a good deal of relativist thinking and writing in the twentieth century. It is with this second group of claims that Sapir's name has been associated.

The relativistic claim is that languages may differ in arbitrarily different ways and that one's view of the universe is determined, at least in large part, by the structure of one's language and culture. On the more extreme versions of this view, different languages encode different metaphysics or world views of the universe by virtue of the presence or absence of certain grammatical devices, such as the availability of plural markers for temporal expressions in English and their absence in Hopi. Further, these world views may vary in sometimes dramatic ways, in much the same way that different languages may vary.

Many of the most well-known expressions of the relativist position come directly from Sapir's writing. In an often-quoted passage, he wrote: "Human beings do not live in the objective world alone, nor alone in the world of social activity as ordinarily understood, but are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression for their society. It is quite an illusion to imagine that one adjusts to reality essentially without the use of language and that language is merely an incidental means of solving specific problems of communication or reflection. The fact of the matter is that the 'real' world is to a large extent unconsciously built up on the language habits of the group …. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached …." (1929)

Although there are different ways in which passages such as these could be understood, the power that Sapir here and elsewhere attributed to natural languages with respect to the cognitive lives of its speakers is quite striking. The following passage quite clearly expresses this view: "Language … actually defines experience for us by reason of its formal completeness and because of our unconscious projection of its implicit expectations into the field of experience …. Such categories as number, gender, case, tense … are not so much discovered in experience as imposed upon it because of the tyrannical hold that linguistic form has upon our orientation in the world." (1931)

Although the thesis of linguistic relativism that half bears Sapir's name has long been out of favor, it is important to note that many of its more characteristic ideas stem more from Whorf's writings than they do from Sapir's. The differences between their views are of some significance. On Sapir's own view, there is no hard and fast distinction between a language and the culture of its speaker. Indeed, if anything, the lines of influence between language and culture go in both directions. Sapir is at pains to describe the mutual influence of language and culture on each other throughout his career. The asymmetry of the influence of language on thought and culture one finds in some of his writing obscures this more nuanced understanding found elsewhere in his work. It is important to note in this regard that Sapir's own view about language was much broader than many current views are. As some of his later works make clear, Sapir thought that there was no clear line separating language from culture. This makes assessing his own brand of relativism somewhat more difficult. Even so, much of what many later philosophers have found objectionable about relativism is present in Sapir's work.

Equally important to the assessment of Sapir's contributions are his views about the place of culture and its influence on the individuals within it. Sapir's discussion of the interaction between culture and language highlight one aspect of his work that was especially important for anthropology. For Sapir, the patterns of behavior that were characteristic of a particular culture left a great deal of room for individual variation and for differences in personalities and creativity. A culture's influence on the individual mind was only so deep. It is ironic then that so much of Sapir's work has been pressed into service for the thesis of linguistic determinism while his own views on culture and society sought to make room for significant differences between individuals living within the same social group.

Although many of the views about language, culture and thought that Sapir assumes have

been abandoned, the idea that individual differences between languages might prompt differences in world view among their users is a persistently attractive idea to many in anthropology, psychology and elsewhere. Although the rise of cognitive science in the 1960s and 70s and a number of experimental investigations of the relationship between language and other systems of mental and perceptual representation can be fairly said to have put to rest some of the more extreme versions of the "Sapir–Whorf" hypothesis, the view has never entirely died and is periodically revived and remains an ongoing subject of debate.

Sapir also made important contributions to the question of the psychological reality of various linguistic constructs. In his important 1933 article, "The Psychological Reality of Phonemes," Sapir put forth the thesis that there was an underlying "psychic reality" to many of the constructs of linguistic theory, and that the psychological dimension of language was essential to the scientific study of its structure and form. This view would eventually be eclipsed by the rise of behaviorism as well as the structuralist view that linguistics ought to proceed by capturing the regularities in the distribution of various linguistic phenomena.

Many of Sapir's own analyses testify to his mentalism. He held that the outward form of a given linguistic item – such as a phoneme – often hid the underlying laws which were present in the mind of the speaker. Indeed, the very delineation of the objects of linguistic theory had to make reference to the intentions and beliefs of speakers of the language, since language is essentially the outward sign of linguistic agency. Removing talk of mentality and intentions from the discussion of language would simply be changing the subject.

The exact form in which "mentalism" finds its way into linguistics has changed a good deal since Sapir's time. The linguists who succeeded Sapir in the following years explicitly disavowed any association with mentalism, preferring to work instead with a purely instrumental and observational conception of the objects of linguistics. Linguists like Leonard BLOOMFIELD were to use and modify Sapir's descriptive techniques for transcribing various languages in order to capture the differences and similarities among different constructions within the language, and to discover the generalities among these relationships without attributing any psychological significance to these underlying laws. Unlike many of his successors in the structuralist tradition, Sapir never adopted the strict behaviorist views so characteristic of that school. Indeed, in many ways Sapir's views were ahead of their time by virtue of his emphasis upon the psychological reality of the laws governing how different linguistic constructions resemble and differ one another, a fact which is now recognized by many in linguistics.

Sapir made some of the first concrete proposals concerning the psychological reality of various aspects of linguistic structure, although the idea that there were laws governing the structure of language and that these laws were essentially psychological in nature is much older. Although his position was eclipsed by the rise of structuralist linguists and their attendant behaviorism, the themes of Sapir's interpretation of linguistic theory foreshadowed some of the characteristic ideas of Noam CHOMSKY and other cognitive scientists and their emphasis on the psychological interpretation of linguistic theory.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Time Perspective in Aboriginal American Culture (Ottawa, 1916).
Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech (New York, 1921; 2nd edn 1942).
"Sound Patterns in Language," *Language* 1 (1925): 37–51.
"Language as a Form of Human Behavior," *English Journal* 16 (1927): 421–3.
"Speech as a Personality Trait," *American Journal of Sociology* 32 (1927): 892–905.
"The Status of Linguistics as a Science," *Language* 5 (1929): 207–14.
"Conceptual Categories in Primitive

Languages," *Science* 74 (1931): 578.

"The Psychological Reality of Phonemes," *Journal de Psychologie Normale et Pathologique* 30 (1933): 247–65.

"Personality," in *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (New York, 1934), vol. 14, pp. 492–5.

"Grading: A Study in Semantics," *Philosophy of Science* 11 (1944): 93–116.

Other Relevant Works
Sapir's papers are at the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia.
Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language, Culture, and Personality, ed. D. G. Mandelbaum (Berkeley, Cal., 1949). Reprinted as *Language, Culture, and Personality: Selected Writings* (Berkeley, Cal., 1956).
The Collected Works of Edward Sapir, 16 vols (Berlin, 1989–2001).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, Bio Dict Psych by Zusne, Bio 20thC Phils, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Dict Amer Bio, Encyc Social Behav Sci, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v33, Routledge Encycl Phil, Who Was Who in Amer v1
Benedict, Ruth. "Edward Sapir," *American Anthropologist* ns 41 (1939): 465–77.
Cowan, William, Michael K. Foster, and Konrad Koerner, eds. *New Perspectives in Language, Culture, and Personality: Proceedings of the Edward Sapir Centenary Conference* (Philadelphia, 1986).
Darnell, Regna. *Edward Sapir: Linguist, Anthropologist, Humanist* (Berkeley, Cal., 1990).
Koerner, Konrad, ed. *Edward Sapir: Appraisals of His Life and Work* (Philadelphia, 1984). Contains a bibliography of Sapir's writings.
Lucy, John R. *Language Diversity and Thought* (Cambridge, UK, 1992).
Spier, Leslie, A. Irving Hallowell, and Stanley

S. Newman, eds. *Language, Culture, and Personality: Essays in Memory of Edward Sapir* (Menasha, Wisc., 1941).

Daniel Blair

SAVAGE, Minot Judson (1841–1918)

Minot Judson Savage was born on 10 June 1841 in Norridgewock, Maine. He grew up in conditions of poverty, frequent illness, and sporadic, poor schooling. His parents were attracted to the extreme emotionalism often found in revival settings, and at the age of thirteen Savage seems to have undergone a traumatic conversion experience. After finishing high school he taught in similar institutions for a few years before enrolling in Bangor Theological Seminary. Graduating in 1864, he was ordained into the Congregationalist ministry and sailed with his new bride to work as a home missionary in northern California. There he attracted public attention for his notably polished writings and urbane oratory. He returned east in 1867 to serve as pastor in Framingham, Massachusetts, and then in Hannibal, Missouri, where he quickly made the First Congregational Church the largest of that denomination in the state.

Between 1869 and 1872 Savage resolved many of the doubts and misgivings that had troubled him for several years. He had always lived by the principle that theology should correspond to one's understanding of the world. Wide reading in church history, biblical criticism, and evolutionary science had led him to question static notions that were lodged in mainstream American religion, especially several pessimistic holdovers from Calvinism. As a consequence of this mental anguish and intellectual probing Savage converted to Unitarianism in 1873 and served a church in Chicago for a year before moving to the site of

his most productive and influential years of his career in the pulpit of Church of the Unity in Boston from 1874 to 1896. There Savage became known as one of the greatest preachers of the era. He spoke without notes to huge audiences, utilizing a dignified, lucid approach that seemed directly to penetrate each listener. His sermons were published individually in two popular series of tracts, and they also were the basis of many of his books, many of which went through several printings. He helped prepare a denominational catechism and a songbook for public worship. These accomplishments led to a final decade from 1896 to 1906 of ministry at Church of the Messiah in New York City, where Savage became even more emphatically identified as one of the most productive and influential Unitarians of the late nineteenth century.

The ideas which Savage embraced after so much intellectual turmoil during his formative years were fundamentally optimistic and framed to accord with evolutionary processes. He conceived of God as a life force that permeated physical reality, guiding nature as it unfolded according to divine intentions. Salvation for humanity consisted primarily of people discerning the ends of evolutionary development and then aligning their lives with the movement of things as all components fulfilled the general purpose of life. For Savage this did not destroy true Christian values but rather made it possible for people to turn from non-essential matters to those of permanent worth. Creeds and institutions could be outgrown, as inevitably they must because change in a Darwinian world was part of reality, and people improved their vision by distinguishing between the passing and the permanent in matters of faith and morals. God as the immanent force in Life's transformations infused progressive change with meaning and purpose. People were blessed with knowledge about themselves and these benign changes, all leading to the realization that humanity was the culminating point of all cosmic processes.

Savage's sincere accommodation of Protestant views to modern culture encouraged many to reject a large number of traditional doctrines as unrealistic and inapplicable. He led many to affirm the goodness of life amid an unfriendly universe. Trust in a providence which worked through nature led believers to a greater love for humanity in general and to a belief in immortality. A final decade of retirement allowed Savage to continue his insistence on the importance of intellectual and ethical impulses that moved humankind toward greater perfection. His uplifting message epitomized the emphases that characterized much of American liberalism before twentieth-century wars and social upheavals fostered less optimistic definitions of human nature and ethical progress. After retirement in 1906 he moved to Boston and remained fairly active until his death there on 12 May 1918.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Christianity, the Science of Manhood (Boston, 1873).
The Religion of Evolution (Boston, 1876).
The Morals of Evolution (Boston, 1876).
Belief in God: An Examination of Some Fundamental Theistic Problems (Boston, 1881).
Beliefs about the Bible (Boston, 1883).
My Creed (Boston, 1887).
The Evolution of Christianity (Boston, 1892).
Jesus and Modern Life (Boston, 1893).
Life Beyond Death (New York, 1899).
The Passing and the Permanent in Religion (New York, 1901).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v1*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Robinson, David. *The Unitarians and the Universalists* (Westport, Conn., 1985).

Henry Warner Bowden

SAVERY, William Briggs (1875–1945)

William Savery was born on 26 September 1875 in Attleboro, Massachusetts. He received his BA from Brown University in 1896, and then entered Harvard University, receiving the MA in 1897. He studied at the University of Berlin in 1897–8 on a Sheldon Fellowship, and then returned to Harvard to earn his PhD in philosophy in 1899, writing a dissertation on "Some Fundamental Ethical Concepts, with Special Reference to the Concepts of Responsibility and Freedom." Savery's first teaching position was as professor of philosophy at Fairmont College in Kansas (now Wichita State University) from 1900 to 1902. In 1902 he was appointed professor of philosophy and chair of the department of philosophy and psychology at the University of Washington. After psychology became a separate department in 1915, he continued as philosophy chair until his death. Savery died on 8 December 1945 in Seattle, Washington.

Savery was an important scholar and teacher during his forty-three years of leadership at the University of Washington. During that period the philosophy department expanded, graduate study began, and the first doctorates in philosophy were awarded. He had a reputation for the sort of freethinking and liberal teaching that attracted criticism by the local media and conservative clergy. He was prominent on the campus in the state for his active role in advancing the liberal and progressive movement. After his death, Philosophy Hall was renamed Savery Hall. Savery was highly respected among his philosophy colleagues across America. He was Mills Professor at the University of California at Berkeley in 1933, and visiting professor at Columbia University in 1935–6. He also taught during summers at Harvard University, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of California at Berkeley, the University of California at Los Angeles, and Stanford University. He was elected President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1931–2. He was a member of Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Kappa Sigma, the American Association of University Professors, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

During the first two decades of his career, Savery concentrated on teaching and developing the curriculum, and published very little. However, his philosophical orientation toward a broad and pluralistic naturalism had been inspired by his Harvard teachers William JAMES and George SANTAYANA. Further study of pragmatists Charles S. PEIRCE and John DEWEY further influenced Savery's pragmatic naturalism. His American Philosophical Association presidential address on "Chance and Cosmogony" offers a development of Peirce's theory of inductive probability for a philosophy of science and a non-reductive naturalism. Following William James, Savery called this kind of naturalism "concatenism," which holds that nature is composed of a plurality of individuals that partially overlap but are not parts of any greater all-inclusive type of being. Consistent with this ontological pluralism, Savery developed his "synoptic" theory of truth. As there are six basic logical types of increasingly complex propositions, from observation propositions to conjunction propositions, the six different theories of truth are designed to best fit each of these proposition types. The six theories of truth are the intuitionist, copy, identity, pragmatic, coherence, and adherence theories. The synoptic theory of truth combines the best features of these theories, and remains close to the pragmatic theory of truth.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"On the Nature of Objective Reference," *Journal of Philosophy* 23 (1926): 393–407.
"Chance and Cosmogony," *Philosophical Review* 41 (1932): 147–70.
"A Defense of Hedonism," *International Journal of Ethics* 45 (1934): 1–26.
"Possibility and Pluralism," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 17 (1934): 199–223.
"Concatenism," *Journal of Philosophy* 34

(1937): 337–54.

"The Synoptic Theory of Truth," *Philosophical Review* 47 (1938): 347–74.

"The Significance of Dewey's Philosophy," in *The Philosophy of John Dewey*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (Evanston, Ill., 1939), pp. 481–513.

Other Relevant Works
Savery's papers are at the University of Washington.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v4, Proc of APA in Phil Rev v55, Who Was Who in Amer v2, Who's Who in Phil

Richard T. Hull
John R. Shook

SCHAFF, Philip (1819–93)

Philipp Schaf was born on 1 January 1819 in Chur, Switzerland, and died on 20 October 1893 in New York City. He modified the spelling of his name around 1847 after emigrating to the United States. Schaff attended the University of Tübingen from 1837 to 1839, the University of Halle in 1839, and the University of Berlin in 1840. Exposed to the historical approach to scriptural study, in those years Schaff developed his lifelong ecumenical vision of "Evangelical Catholicism," which combines Protestantism's focus on the gospel and Catholicism's connection to the early church. Among his influential teachers were F. C. Baur, F. A. Tholuck, F. W. J. Schelling, and Augustus Neander. In 1841 he received his degree in theology, and his thesis became his first publication in the same year, entitled *Die Sünde wider den Heiligen Geist* (The Sin against the Holy Spirit). In 1842, he became a *Privatdozent* in the University of Berlin, but in 1843 he decided to accept a position at the German Reformed Seminary in Mercersburg, Pennsylvania.

Schaff arrived in the United States in 1844 after being ordained to the ministry of the Reformed Church at Elberfeld three months earlier. Over the course of nineteen years, Schaff and his only colleague John Williamson Nevin developed their controversial thought known as the Mercersburg Theology. Controversy surrounding Schaff began with his inaugural address, which he published in revised form as *The Principle of Protestantism* (1845). In this address, he interpreted the Reformation as a historical development arising from positive aspects within the Catholic Church, which opposed the traditional view of it as a rebellion from medieval Catholicism. As a result, he was investigated for heresy by the Synod and found innocent in 1845. In 1846, he was investigated again for his view on the "middle state," which holds that those without the opportunity to convert to Christianity during life are given the chance of conversion upon death. Again, charges of heresy were dropped.

Between the years 1853 and 1864, Schaff made his first of fourteen trips to Europe. Committed to the synthesis of German and American thought, Schaff held that German theology could reach its fruition only though its immersion into American life. His major works during this period include *What is Church History?* (1846), *History of the Apostolic Church* (1853), *America: A Sketch of the Political, Social and Religious Character* (1855), and *Germany, Its Universities, Theology and Religion* (1857). In addition, he edited the journals *Mercersburg Review* and *Der Deutsche Kirchenfreund*.

In 1863, he took a leave of absence from Mercersburg and moved to New York City. Resigning from the seminary in 1865, Schaff began his career in New York as Secretary of the New York Sabbath Committee, a post he held from 1864 to 1870. In 1870, Schaff joined the faculty of Union Theological Seminary,

where he would stay for the rest of his life, and he converted to Presbyterianism, the denomination associated with the seminary. He was active in the Evangelical Alliance, the Alliance of the Reformed Churches, and the Church of England-authorized American Committee of Bible Revision, the last of which produced the Revised Version of the King James Bible in 1885. In 1888, he founded the American Society for Church History.

One month before his death in 1893, Schaff gave an address entitled "The Reunion of Christendom," at the World's Parliament of Religions in Chicago, in which he called for a union of all Christian churches. His major publications during this latter period include *History of the Christian Church* (1882–92) and *American Church History* (1893–7). He was also involved in many editing and translating projects as well, such as J. P. Lange's *Commentaries on the Holy Scripture*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Die Sünde wider den Heiligen Geist, nebst einem historischen Anhang über des Lebensende des Francesco Spiera (Halle, Germany, 1841).
The Principle of Protestantism, trans. John W. Nevin (Chambersburg, Penn., 1845).
What is Church History? A Vindication of the Idea of Historical Development (Philadelphia, 1846).
History of the Apostolic Church with a General Introduction to Church History (New York, 1853).
America: A Sketch of the Political, Social and Religious Character, ed. Perry Miller (Cambridge, Mass., 1855).
Germany, Its Universities, Theology and Religion (Philadelphia, 1857).
Church and State in the United States (New York, 1888).
History of the Christian Church, 8 vols (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1882–92).

Other Relevant Works
Schaff's papers are at Union Theological Seminary and Lancaster Theological Seminary, Pennsylvania.
Ed. with J. J. Herzog et al., *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, 13 vols (New York, 1908–14).
Manuscript Correspondence of W. J. Mann and Philip Schaff, microfilm at University of Chicago Library (Chicago, 1958).
The Mercersburg Theology, ed. James Nichols (Oxford, 1966).
Reformed and Catholic: Selected Historical and Theological Writings of Philip Schaff, ed. Charles Yrigoyen and George Bricker (1979).
Penzel, Klaus, ed. *Philip Schaff: Historian and Ambassador of the Universal Church, Selected Writings* (Macon, Georgia, 1991).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v3*
Bowden, Henry W., ed. *A Century of Church History: The Legacy of Philip Schaff* (Carbondale, Ill., 1988).
Graham, Stephen R. *Cosmos in the Chaos: Philip Schaff's Interpretation of Nineteenth-Century American Religion* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1995).
Nichols, James H. *Romanticism in American Theology: Nevin and Schaff at Mercersburg* (Chicago, 1961).
Pranger, Gary K. *Philip Schaff (1819–1893): Portrait of an Immigrant Theologian* (New York, 1997).
Schaff, David. *The Life of Philip Schaff* (New York, 1897).
Schriver, George H. *Philip Schaff: Christian Scholar and Ecumenical Prophet* (Macon, Georgia, 1987).

Dana Noelle McDonald

SCHAPIRO, Meyer (1904–96)

Meyer Schapiro was an American art historian and critic. He was born Meir Schapiro in Siauliai, Lithuania, on 23 September 1904, and died in New York on 3 March 1996. Schapiro emigrated to the United States when he was three, his name becoming Meyer, and he grew up in the immigrant neighborhood of Brownsville and attended public schools not far from the Brooklyn Museum in New York. He began studying art at the Hebrew Educational Society in Brownsville and was chosen by Brooklyn Boys High School to attend art classes at the Brooklyn Museum. He received a Pulitzer Scholarship and a Regents Scholarship to attend Columbia University in New York City in 1920, where he studied math, languages, literature, anthropology, philosophy, and art history, receiving a BA in the latter two fields in 1924. A grant from the Carnegie Corporation allowed him to travel in Europe and the Near East in 1926–7. He earned his Columbia PhD in art history in 1929. Schapiro began teaching art history at Columbia in 1928 as a lecturer, became assistant professor in 1936, associate professor in 1946, and full professor in 1952. He also lectured at New York University (1932–6) and the New School for Social Research (1936–52). In 1966–7 Schapiro held the Charles Eliot Norton Lectureship at Harvard University and in 1967–8 was the Slade Professor of Art at the University of Oxford. Columbia bestowed upon him its highest rank of University Professor in 1965 and in 1973 he retired to become University Professor Emeritus.

His 1973 work *Words and Pictures* applied semiotics to the study of medieval illuminated manuscripts. He served as visiting lecturer at the Collège de France in Paris in May of 1974. In that year on his seventieth birthday, twelve preeminent artists produced and sold a series of lithographs, etchings, and screenprints in order to raise money for an endowed chair in Schapiro's name at Columbia University. On his ninetieth birthday his brother Morris A.

Schapiro established a second endowed Meyer Schapiro Professorship of Modern Art and Theory. In 1994 the West Wing of the Brooklyn Museum was reopened, with the donation of five million dollars by his brother, as the Morris A. and Meyer Schapiro Wing.

Four volumes of Schapiro's writings were collected and published, beginning in 1971. The first volume entitled *Romanesque Art* represents his medieval scholarship; the 1977 book *Modern Art*, which received the National Book Critics Circle Award in 1978 and the Mitchell Prize for Art History in 1979, contain his essays on Abstraction, Paul Cézanne, Georges Seurat, Vincent van Gogh and others; the third volume published in 1979 includes more of his work on medieval and Renaissance studies; and the fourth volume deals with the *Theory and Philosophy of Art*, which presents Schapiro's studies of several philosophers. However, more than his published works – notable for the clarity of thinking and prose style – Schapiro is known by almost everyone who came into contact with him for his real genius of teaching and conversation. Schapiro had an enormous influence on the intellectual life of New York in general and on art history in particular, influencing the work of Linda NOCHLIN, Robert Herbert, and T. J. Clark. Early in his career he was known as a scholar of Romanesque sculpture and medieval aesthetics, having written his dissertation on the early twelfth-century abbey of St Pierre in Moissac, France. Part of that dissertation, which also recognized the expressive possibilities of Romanesque sculpture, was published in the *Art Bulletin* in 1931. As a Marxist in the 1930s, he was interested in the social, political, and economic contexts of art, and supported the investigation of the charges against Leon Trotsky – a commission led by Schapiro's colleague at Columbia, John DEWEY.

Schapiro was essentially a humanist scholar whose interests went far beyond his initial field of medieval studies, eventually embracing nineteenth and twentieth-century art as well. Even in abstraction he saw human content, particu-

larly in the person of the artist. For Shapiro, excepting its human value, there was no such thing as a universal norm or ideal in art – as in classicism, for example. He brought contemporary artists to his art history classes at Columbia. He was friends with Andre Breton and other exiled Surrealists during the early 1940s, as well as Robert Motherwell, Barnett Newman, Willem de Kooning, Wolf Kahn, Jan Muller, and George Segal. He believed in the independence and unique creativity of the artist, and he remained active as an artist himself (drawing, painting, and sculpture). In addition to his scholarly interest in early Christian, Byzantine, medieval, and modern art, Schapiro also addressed the theory and philosophy of art. However, he was always interested in art in the context of culture – although not to the exclusion of the aesthetic integrity of the art object's formal aspects – and in the complex interrelationships of form and content that would ultimately be addressed by collective scholarship over a period of time. One of Schapiro's most famous critiques (published in a 1969 festschrift for Kurt Goldstein) suggested that Martin Heidegger, applying only his own methodology and preconceptions, misread van Gogh's painting of shoes as being those of a peasant rather than those of the artist. For Schapiro, the shoes were symbols of the artist, human individuality, and freedom. Jacques Derrida revisited the issue in his 1978 *Restitutions*. Schapiro was also critical of Bernard BERENSON, whose attitude, he felt, was too much concentrated on beauty and the formal elements of art, without regard for expression or social, political, or cultural context. Although Schapiro's own writing is known for its precision, he was more interested in experiencing and exploring the work of art. Like Dewey, he insisted on a degree of open-mindedness. In fact, Dewey consulted with Schapiro regarding his own book on aesthetics, *Art As Experience* (1934).

Meyer Schapiro was a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the National Institute of Arts and Letters, and the American Philosophical Society. In 1987 he was named a MacArthur Foundation Fellow. Amongst the many tributes to Meyer Schapiro at the time of his death was that of poet David Shapiro: "But Meyer had I think a Spinozist love of the cosmos and the cosmos in art that was an extraordinary blessed and liberating and, I think, spiritual attitude. I once asked him about this, and he did indeed reply that he liked to read Spinoza each year – and sweetly added – in the original Latin."

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Romanesque Sculpture of Moissac," *Art Bulletin* 13 (1931): 249–350. Reprinted in *Romanesque Art: Selected Papers* (New York, 1977) and as a book (New York, 1985).
Vincent Van Gogh (New York, 1950).
Paul Cezanne (New York, 1953; rev. edn 1973).
"The Still-Life as Personal Object: A Note on Heidegger and Van Gogh," in *The Reach of Mind: Essays in Memory of Kurt Goldstein, 1878–1965*, ed. M. Simmel (New York, 1968).
Words and Pictures (New York, 1973).
Modern Art, 19th and 20th Centuries: Selected Papers (New York, 1977).
Late Antique, Early Christian and Medieval Art: Selected Papers (New York, 1979).
Theory and Philosophy of Art: Style, Artist and Society (New York, 1994).

Other Relevant Works
Schapiro's papers are at Columbia University.
Schapiro, Lillian M., and Daniel Esterman, eds. *Meyer Schapiro: His Painting, Drawing, and Sculpture* (New York, 2000).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v11*
Bird, Jon, et al., eds. *Meyer Schapiro* (Oxford, 1994).
Dickstein, Morris. "The Artist and the Citizen: Meyer Schapiro's Values," *Dissent*

44 (Fall 1997): 69–75.

Hefferman, James. "Speaking for Pictures: The Rhetoric of Art Criticism," *Word and Image* 15 (January–March 1999): 19–33.

Koerner, Joseph L. "The Seer – *Theory and Philosophy of Art: Style, Artists and Society (Selected Papers Vol. IV)* by Meyer Schapiro," *New Republic* 212 (9 January 1995): 33–9.

Shapiro, David. "On Meyer Schapiro: Radiant Pluralist (1904–1996)," *American Poetry Review* 26 (November 1997): 9.

Schapiro, Lillian M. *Meyer Schapiro: The Bibliography* (New York, 1995).

"Symposium: Meyer Schapiro," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 55 (Winter 1997): 1–18.

Shelley Wood Cordulack

SCHAUB, Edward Leroy (1881–1953)

Edward L. Schaub was born on 13 August 1881 in Decorah, Iowa, and died on 24 May 1953 in Durham, North Carolina. Schaub attended Charles City College and then went to the State University of Iowa, where he earned the MA degree summa cum laude in 1908. Awarded a Sage Fellowship from Cornell University, Schaub completed his PhD in philosophy in 1910, writing a dissertation on "The Doctrine of the Primacy of the Practical Reason in the Jena Period of J. G. Fichte's Philosophy."

Cornell hired Schaub as an instructor of philosophy in 1910–11 and he spent the year studying at the University of Berlin. In 1911–12, he was assistant professor of philosophy at Queen's University in Kingston, Ontario, Canada. Following this, in 1912–13, Schaub took his third one-year job, this time as acting professor at the State University of Iowa. In 1913 Schaub joined the philosophy faculty at Northwestern University. Chair of the phi-

losophy department for fifteen years, Schaub was also named John Evans Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy in 1921. In 1922–3, Schaub was President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association. He also served as President of the American Theological Society. Schaub retired in 1946, having spent thirty-three years at Northwestern as a professor of philosophy.

During World War I, Schaub was chief of landlord/tenant relations on campus, and in 1918 Schaub took a leave of absence to participate in national service. In the first years of Franklin D. Roosevelt's Administration, Schaub was advisor to the Department of Agriculture. He was awarded a fellowship to lecture in Calcutta, India, in 1929, and made his way to Berlin and Naples, among other European cities, to present his work. Schaub's experiences in India eventually inspired his *Progressivism: An Essay in Social Philosophy* (1937).

Schaub was a highly respected scholar on German idealism. From 1926 to 1936 Schaub was editor of *The Monist*. His work on Kant, Fichte, Hegel, idealism, and the psychology of religion appeared in the *Harvard Theological Review*, the *Philosophical Review*, and the *Journal of Religion*. Schaub also translated *Elements of Folk Psychology: Outlines of a Psychological History of the Development of Mankind* by Wilhelm Wundt (1916), and *The Aim of Human Existence: Being a System of Morality Based on the Harmony of Life* by Eugenio Rignano (1929).

The American Philosophical Association sent Schaub to Königsberg, Germany, as its representative for the bicentenary celebration of Kant's birth in 1924. In 1925, Schaub edited a volume of collected papers on Kant that were presented at Northwestern's own bicentenary conference.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Hegel's Criticisms of Fichte's Subjectivism," *Philosophical Review* 21 (1912): 566–84; 22 (1913): 17–37.

"Functional Interpretations of Religion: A Critique," in *Philosophical Essays in Honor of James Edwin Creighton*, ed. George H. Sabine (New York, 1917), pp. 328–56.

"A Sociological Theory of Knowledge," *Philosophical Review* 29 (1920): 319–39.

"Bosanquet's Interpretation of Religious Experience," *Philosophical Review* 32 (1923): 652–67.

"Spirit Militant and Spirit Harmonious," *Philosophical Review* 32 (1923): 154–81.

"The Kantfeier in Königsberg," *Philosophical Review* 33 (1924): 433–49.

Philosophy Today: Essays on Recent Developments in the Field of Philosophy (Chicago, 1928).

Progressivism: An Essay in Social Philosophy (Calcutta, India, 1937).

"J. G. Fichte and Anti-Semitism," *Philosophical Review* 49 (1940): 37–51.

Other Relevant Works

Trans., *Elements of Folk Psychology: Outlines of a Psychological History of the Development of Mankind*, by Wilhelm Wundt (London, 1916).

Ed., *Immanuel Kant: Papers Read at Northwestern University on the Bicentenary of Kant's Birth* (Chicago, 1925).

Trans. with Paul Crissman, *The Aim of Human Existence: Being a System of Morality Based on the Harmony of Life*, by Eugenio Rignano (Chicago, 1929).

Ed., *Spinoza: The Man and His Thought* (Chicago, 1933).

Ed., *William Torrey Harris, 1835–1935* (Chicago, 1936).

Further Reading

Nat Cycl Amer Bio v42, *Pres Addr of APA v3*, *Proc of APA v27*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who's Who in Phil*

David Justin Hodge

SCHECHTER, Solomon (1847–1915)

Even though the year of his birth is not known, ranging from 1847 to 1850, the date usually given for Solomon Schechter is 7 December 1847. His birthplace was Focsani, Romania, and he was the son of a Hasidic ritual slaughterer who schooled him in Hebrew at an early age. Beginning when he was ten years old, he studied at yeshivot in Piatra and Lvov. His intellectual promise helped facilitate emancipation from the ghetto of an openly anti-Semitic country to enjoy the benefits of historical scholarship in advanced German universities. Schechter attended Bet Hamidrash, a rabbinical seminary in Vienna, from 1875 to 1879 where he learned to approach classic Jewish texts historically and philologically. He received a rabbinical diploma in the latter year but never served as such in a synagogue, preferring to continue a life of scholarly analysis instead. From 1879 to 1882 he pursued talmudic and secular studies in Berlin. As a prime example of Haskalah or Jewish Enlightenment he advocated critical, scientific scrutiny of Jewish traditions, known locally as the *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, using humanistic epistemology to revitalize Jewish culture. Greater contact with Gentile culture, especially German academic historicism, made it possible to study Hebrew texts with modern analytic tools and thus create new Jewish literature for contemporary readers.

In 1882 Schechter moved to England where he gave private tutorials and lectured on the Talmud at Jews' College in London. This was the beginning of an impressive career marked by erudition and scholarly accomplishment. In 1890 he was appointed lecturer and reader in talmudic and rabbinic literature at the University of Cambridge. Perhaps his most significant achievement came in 1897 when he unearthed a tremendous cache of manuscripts and fragments in both Hebrew and Arabic, stored in the Genizah synagogue in Cairo, Egypt. He transferred this entire collection of 50,000 to 100,000 essential source materials to Cambridge and laid the foundations for a rich

variety of new studies that ranged from forgotten sects to missing literary classics from ancient and medieval Judaism.

After two decades of fruitful work in England, Schechter was invited in 1902 to become President of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York City, and he held this position until his death there on 19 November 1915. His convictions about modern learning techniques renovated the school's curriculum, attracted a vital, young faculty, and made the school a notable center of vigorous Jewish scholarship. During the last decade of his life he continued to display the perennially wide interests of a Judaica scholar by serving as an editor for the Jewish Publication Society, editing the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, and writing scores of entries for *The Jewish Encyclopedia*.

Schechter pursued two ideals that were difficult to reconcile. On the one hand, he embraced humanistic standards of analysis and interpretation, and yet on the other he wanted to retain Jewish tradition and revitalize its meaning for contemporary practitioners. Attracted to modern secular universities, still he opposed what he called intellectual anti-Semitism: creating images of Judaism and determining the meaning of Hebrew texts by non-Jewish scholars. He held that Jews needed to write their own modern studies by providing critically accurate editions of traditional texts, providing introductions and commentaries to them, and thus making rabbinic thought available to wide audiences by discussing Judaism in philosophical and theological terms. Trying to hold tradition and modernity together, Schechter hoped that scholarly exactitude and personal piety could avoid the secularist assimilation of Reform Judaism while also rising above the arid rigidities of Eastern European Orthodoxy.

His ideal of nurturing a vibrant Jewish faith that could feel at home in modern culture while not capitulating to it led Schechter to help found Agudath Jeshurun and then in 1913 the United Synagogue of America, which were institutional bases for a centrist position known as Conservative Judaism. Devotion to tradition and flexible attitudes about innovation stood behind what he called "Catholic Israel," an ideal of Jewish vitality that lived in human communities, not in inert books. Divine revelation, he held, was actualized through new interpretations and ritual enactments, working together to create a dynamic collective consciousness. Change could enhance freshness and yet preserve continuity with ancient beliefs. Schechter's personal example, his publications, guidance of the seminary, and efforts within rabbinical organizations helped build Conservative Jewish thought and practice into a distinctively American denominational form.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Aboth of Rabbi Nathan (London, 1887).
Studies in Judaism, 3 vols (Philadelphia, 1896–1924).
Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology (New York, 1909).
Seminary Addresses and Other Papers (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1915).

Other Relevant Works
Schechter's papers are in the Archives of the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York City.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encyc Relig*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Bentwich, Norman. *Solomon Schechter: A Biography* (Philadelphia, 1938).
Gillman, Neil. *Conservative Judaism: The New Century* (West Orange, N.J., 1996), chap. 3.
Mandelbaum, Bernard. *The Wisdom of Solomon Schechter* (New York, 1963).
Oko, Adolph. *Solomon Schechter: A Bibliography* (Cambridge, UK, 1938).

Henry Warner Bowden

SCHEFFLER, Israel (1923–)

Israel Scheffler was born on 25 November 1923 in Brooklyn, New York. Scheffler received a BA from Brooklyn College in 1945 and an MHL from the Jewish Theological Seminary in 1949. He received his PhD in philosophy in 1952 from the University of Pennsylvania, working with Nelson GOODMAN. Scheffler was appointed to the faculty of education at Harvard University in 1952. He was named Victor S. Thomas Professor of Education and Philosophy in 1964, a position he held until his retirement in 1992.

Scheffler's writings are far ranging and reflect the scope and influence of ideas of the American pragmatists, W. V. QUINE, and especially Goodman. His *Four Pragmatists* (1974) offers an introduction to Charles PEIRCE, William JAMES, John DEWEY, and George MEAD. Throughout his career, he has published extensively in the philosophy of education, dealing both with standard problems in epistemology and with issues related to the aims and processes of education. His applications of analysis to educational theory have made him a leading figure in the philosophy of education.

A number of Scheffler's articles are collected in his *Inquiries: Philosophical Studies of Language, Science and Learning* (1986). Several of the earliest publications are in metaethics, being devoted, in particular, to analyses of ethical naturalism and justification. *Of Human Potential* (1985) and *In Praise of the Cognitive Emotions* (1991) address issues in both the philosophy of mind and the philosophy of education.

Scheffler has also published widely in the philosophy of science. His papers on explanation, predication, confirmation, teleology, and empiricism develop theories that are elaborated and brought together in his general work, *The Anatomy of Inquiry* (1963). Scheffler's *Science and Subjectivity* (1967) criticizes subjectivist interpretations of observation, meaning, reference, and theory change in science. His nuanced defense of scientific objectivity is in opposition to both the "standard view," as well as the accounts

of Thomas KUHN, Paul FEYERABEND, N. R. HANSON, and related thinkers.

A characteristic feature of Scheffler's work is his avoidance of intensional and modal notions, and his commitment to inscriptional strategies instead in philosophical semantics. In various publications he has shown how to deal with many of the core topics in the philosophy of language while remaining within these stark limitations. Scheffler's paper, "An Inscriptional Approach to Indirect Discourse" (1954), was perhaps the first account of the semantics of indirect discourse. His account was extended to certain propositional attitudes in *Anatomy of Inquiry*. In *Beyond the Letter* (1979) Scheffler offers detailed treatments of ambiguity, vagueness, and metaphor, while his *Symbolic Worlds* (1997) applies his nominalistic approach to nonlinguistic symbols, for example, to ritual. In "A Plea for Pluralism" (1999), Scheffler develops his metaphysical doctrine of pluralistic realism as a new alternative to Charles Peirce's monism and Goodman's irrealism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Language of Education (Springfield, Ill., 1960).
The Anatomy of Inquiry: Philosophical Studies in the Theory of Science (New York, 1963).
Conditions of Knowledge: An Introduction to Epistemology and Education (Chicago, 1965).
Science and Subjectivity (Indianapolis, 1967; 2nd edn 1982).
Reason and Teaching (Indianapolis, 1973).
Four Pragmatists: A Critical Introduction to Peirce, James, Mead, and Dewey (London, 1974).
Beyond the Letter: A Philosophical Inquiry into Ambiguity, Vagueness, and Metaphor in Language (London, 1979).
Inquiries: Philosophical Studies of Language, Science and Learning (Indianapolis, 1986).
Of Human Potential: An Essay in the Philosophy of Education (London, 1985).
In Praise of the Cognitive Emotions (London,

1991).

Work, Education and Leadership: Essays in the Philosophy of Education, with Vernon A. Howard (New York, 1995).

Symbolic Worlds: Art, Science, Language, Ritual (Cambridge, UK, 1997).

Other Relevant Works

"An Inscriptional Approach to Indirect Discourse," *Analysis* 14 (1954): 83–90.

Ed. with Richard Rudner, *Logic and Art: Essays in Honor of Nelson Goodman* (Indianapolis, 1972).

Teachers of My Youth: An American Jewish Experience (Dordrecht, 1995).

"A Plea for Plurealism," *Transactions of the Peirce Society* 35 (1999): 425–36.

"My Quarrels with Nelson Goodman," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 62 (2001): 665–73.

Ed. with Seymour Fox and Daniel Marom, *Visions of Jewish Education* (Cambridge, UK, 2003).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils

Elgin, Catherine, ed. "Festschrift in Honor of Israel Scheffler," *Synthese* 94 (January 1993).

Siegel, Harvey, ed. *Reason and Education: Essays in Honor of Israel Scheffler* (Dordrecht, 1997).

Robert Schwartz

SCHILLING, Sylvester Paul (1904–94)

Sylvester Paul Schilling was born on 7 February 1904 in Cumberland, Maryland, the son of Ida C. Weber Schilling and Sylvester Schilling. He earned the BS from St. John's College in Maryland in 1923. Schilling earned three degrees from Boston University: the MA in 1927; BST in 1929; and the PhD in philosophy in 1934. He wrote his dissertation on "The Empirical and the Rational in Hegel's Philosophy of Religion," working with Edgar Sheffield BRIGHTMAN. The proximity of Harvard University exposed Schilling to the teaching of William Ernest HOCKING, Ralph Barton PERRY, and Alfred North WHITEHEAD.

Ordained as a minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church, Schilling served in pastorates in the Baltimore Annual Conference from 1932 to 1945. From 1945 to 1953, he was professor of systematic theology and philosophy of religion at Westminster Theological Seminary in Westminster, Maryland. In 1953 Schilling began teaching at Boston University School of Theology in the department of systematic theology, where he remained until his retirement in 1969. From 1954 to 1969, Schilling also served as chair of the Division of Theological Studies in the Boston University Graduate School, and he helped guide the doctoral work of Martin Luther KING, Jr. During retirement, Schilling taught at Union Theological Seminary in Manila, Philippines in 1969–70; Wesley Theological Seminary in Washington, D.C., during 1970–73; Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary in Illinois in 1974; and Andover Newton Theological School in Massachusetts from 1978 to 1981. Schilling died from car accident injuries on 6 May 1994 in Hagerstown, Maryland.

Influenced by Boston personalism, Schilling used the personal analogy to think about the meaning of God, while cautioning against attributing to God the limitations of finite persons. Sharing the commitment to social action of his contemporaries in the personalist tradition, Schilling emphasized social salvation as the goal of Christian social thought and action in his *Methodism and Society in Theological Perspective* (1960). Schilling shared his personalist teacher Brightman's concern about the presence of evil in a world created by a good God, and he addressed this problem in his work *God and Human Anguish* (1977) in which he hypothesizes limits within divine power.

Schilling made use of his first sabbatical leave in 1959–60 in Heidelberg, Germany, to begin writing his *Contemporary Continental Theologians* (1966), which analyzed the systematic theologies of eleven thinkers. Schilling became acutely conscious of the debate between theism and atheism, and this led to a second sabbatical in 1966–7 to undertake a critical examination of the thought of contemporary atheists that was published in his *God in an Age of Atheism* (1969). Schilling's next major work was *God Incognito* (1974) in which he investigates transcendent realities not ordinarily identified as God. Schilling's last major work was devoted to an analysis of the theological content of Christian hymns, *The Faith We Sing* (1983).

In the years prior to his death, Schilling cultivated his interest in environmental ethics, medical ethics, hymnology, and the interpretation of philosophy for lay people.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Isaiah Speaks (New York, 1958).
Methodism and Society in Theological Perspective (New York, 1960).
Contemporary Continental Theologians (Nashville, Tenn., 1966).
God in an Age of Atheism (Nashville, Tenn., 1969).
God Incognito (Nashville, Tenn., 1974).
God and Human Anguish (Nashville, Tenn., 1977).
The Faith We Sing (Philadelphia, 1983).

Other Relevant Works
Schilling's papers are at Boston University.
"Developments in My Thought," in *The Boston Personalist Tradition in Philosophy, Social Ethics, and Theology*, ed. Paul Deats and Carol Robb (Macon, Georgia, 1986), pp. 187–208.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v68

Mark Y. A. Davies

SCHILPP, Paul Arthur (1897–1993)

Paul Schilpp was born on 6 February 1897 in Dillenburg, Hessen-Nassau, Germany, as the seventh child of the Reverend Hermann Schilpp and Emilie Dittmar, the daughter of the publisher Georg Dittmar. In 1913 his parents sent him to the United States for his education. Schilpp received his MA in philosophy in 1922 from Northwestern University with a thesis entitled "The Doctrine of a Finite God in Its Relation to the Problem of Evil." He also received a BD from Garrett Theological Seminary. In 1936 Schilpp received a PhD in philosophy from Stanford University with a dissertation entitled "Kant's Precritical Ethics." While at Stanford, Schilpp assisted the German phenomenologist Moritz Geiger and Moritz Schlick of the Vienna Circle.

Ordained to the ministry in 1918, Schilpp served as pastor to Calvary Methodist Church in Terre Haute, Indiana, from 1918 to 1921. He taught psychology and religious education at the College of Puget Sound in 1922–3, and was a professor of philosophy at the College of the Pacific from 1923 to 1934. Schilpp then was a professor of philosophy at Northwestern University from 1936 to 1965. After his retirement from Northwestern, he was a distinguished research professor of continuing education at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale from 1965 to 1982. He taught as adjunct professor at the University of California at Santa Barbara from 1982 to 1987, and then returned to Southern Illinois as an emeritus professor. Schilpp was President of the Western (now Central) Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1958–59. He was an editor for *Religious Humanism* and served as consultant to *Encyclopedia Britannica* for more than thirty years. Schilpp died on 6 September 1993 in Carbondale, Illinois.

Schilpp described his time at seminary as "revolutionary," because his religious outlook shifted from fundamentalism to "critical modernism," his political stance changed from German imperialism to American democracy,

and his attitudes of militarism and republicanism shifted to pacifism and the nonviolent doctrines of Norman Thomas Socialism (1996, p. 25). Schilpp later shifted from pacifism to world government as the most realistic means of achieving world peace. In his presidential address to the Western APA, he "spoke out against the engulfing of Western philosophy by logical positivism" and stated that "philosophy should be concerned with the broad issues of life" (1959, p. 69). Similarly, in a talk entitled "The Ostrich Syndrome," Schilpp protested against "the lack of involvement by too many scholars in the affairs of the real world" (p. 75).

Schilpp's greatest contribution to philosophy is *The Library of Living Philosophers*, inaugurated by a volume on John DEWEY in 1939. Schilpp edited the series until 1981. Inspired by F. C. S. Schiller's 1933 lecture "Must Philosophers Disagree?", the series offers volumes that examine outstanding philosophers. Each volume contains an intellectual autobiography, critical essays, replies to each essay by the philosopher, and a bibliography. Schilpp edited the volumes on Dewey, George SANTAYANA, A. N. WHITEHEAD, G. E. Moore, Bertrand Russell, Ernst Cassirer, Albert EINSTEIN, Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, Karl Jaspers, C. D. Broad, Rudolf CARNAP, Martin Buber (with Maurice Friedman), C. I. LEWIS, Karl Popper, Brand BLANSHARD, Jean-Paul Sartre, Gabriel Marcel, W. V. QUINE, and Georg Henrik Von Wright (with Lewis HAHN).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Do We Need a New Religion? (New York, 1929).

The Quest for Religious Realism (New York, 1938).

Kant's Pre-critical Ethics (Evanston, Ill., 1938; 2nd edn 1966; 3rd edn 1977).

Human Nature and Progress (San Jose, Cal., 1940).

The Crisis in Science and Education (Tucson, Ariz., 1963).

Other Relevant Works

Schilpp's papers are at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, and at Northwestern University.

Ed., *Higher Education Faces the Future* (New York, 1931).

Ed., *The Library of Living Philosophers* (La Salle, Ill., 1939–81).

"Santayana on the Realm of Spirit," in *The Philosophy of George Santayana* (Evanston, Ill., 1940), pp. 377–98.

"Whitehead's Moral Philosophy," in *The Philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead*, ed. Paul Schilpp (Evanston, Ill., 1941), pp. 561–618.

"The Abdication of Philosophy," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 32 (1959): 19–40.

"Science, Theology, and Ethical Religion," *Zygon* 1 (1966): 186–90.

Reminiscing: Autobiographical Notes, with Madelon Golden Schilpp (Carbondale, Ill., 1996).

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v6, Who Was Who in Amer v11, Who's Who in Phil

Freeman, Eugene, ed. *The Abdication of Philosophy: Philosophy and the Public Good* (La Salle, Ill., 1976). Essays in honor of Schilpp.

Rama-Rao, P. S. S. "The Theistic Humanism of Paul A. Schilpp," *Darshana International* 6 (1966): 52–61.

Michael W. Allen

SCHLESINGER, Arthur Meier (1917–)

Arthur Bancroft Schlesinger, Jr. was born on 15 October 1917 in Columbus, Ohio. His father was the noted American social and intellectual historian Arthur Meier Schlesinger, Sr.

(1888–1965) and his mother Elizabeth Bancroft Schlesinger, an early advocate of studying women's history, believed that she was a descendant of the great nineteenth-century historian and public official George Bancroft. In his early teens, he decided to remove "Bancroft" from his name and replace it with "M." Schlesinger was educated at Phillips Exeter Academy in Exeter, New Hampshire and Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts where he received a BA summa cum laude in history in 1938. He studied with F. O. Matthiessen and Perry MILLER, and his honors thesis was soon expanded into a book, *Orestes A. Brownson: A Pilgrim's Progress* (1939).

Schlesinger was a postgraduate Henry Fellow at Peterhouse College, Cambridge during 1938–9, and a member of the Harvard Society of Fellows from 1939 to 1942. He was with the Office of War Information from 1942 through 1943 and the Office of Strategic Services from 1943 to 1945. He was associate professor of history at Harvard from 1946 to 1954 and full professor from 1954 until he resigned in 1962. He served as a visiting fellow at the Institute of Advanced Study at Princeton University in 1966. He was appointed Albert Schweitzer Professor of Humanities at the City University of New York in 1966 and held this position until his retirement in 1996.

Schlesinger served as a consultant to the Economic Cooperation Administration in 1948 and from 1951 to 1952 to the Mutual Security Administration. He was a member of Adlai Stevenson's campaign staff in 1952 and 1956; in 1960 he worked as a speechwriter in John F. Kennedy's presidential campaign. He was appointed Special Assistant to the President by President John F. Kennedy in 1961 and held the position until 1964, serving as Special Assistant to the President for Latin American Affairs from 1961 to 1963. He served as National Chairman of the Americans for Democratic Action (1953–4), President (1981–4) and Chancellor (1984–7) of the American Institute of Arts and Letters, and President of the Society of American Historians (1989–92). He has been awarded two Pulitzer Prizes; one for history in 1946 for *The Age of Jackson* (1945) and another for biography in 1966 for *A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House* (1965), which was also awarded the National Book Award that same year. *A Thousand Days* was also awarded the Gold Medal for History and Biography from the American Institute of Arts and Letters in 1967. Schlesinger was awarded a second National Book Award in 1979 for *Robert F. Kennedy and His Times* (1978). He was awarded both the Francis Parkman Prize for the History and the Bancroft Prize in 1958 for *The Age of Roosevelt, vol. 1: The Crisis of the Old Order, 1919–1933*. Among his many other honors and awards are the Fregene Prize for Literature (Italy, 1983) and the Bruce Catton Prize for History (1996). He also holds honorary degrees from many institutions, including Oxford (1987).

Schlesinger is a noted historian of the American presidents, particularly their philosophies and policies including those of Andrew Jackson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, and Richard Nixon. His perspective is informed by the liberal tradition and he is a key exemplar of political liberalism as a philosophy in the twentieth century. As part of the John F. Kennedy Administration he observed the inner workings of the presidency of the United States, which when combined with his historical knowledge, came to identify several important trends in the Executive Office of the President in recent decades. Since the 1930s the number of staff members appointed by the President increased substantially resulting in a cadre of people who were personally loyal to the person holding the office of president, not subject to outside approval or control. These observations caused him to coin the phrase "imperial presidency" to characterize how in the twentieth century the office has grown into a countervailing power consisting of unelected (and unaccountable) advisors serving at the pleasure of the President, resembling the relationship ministers in a royal court have to a king.

The office of White House Chief of Staff has developed into what is in many (but not all) administrations a dominant executive position or "prime minister." Schlesinger found this very likely to occur if the Chief of Staff was a strong figure and the presidency was held by someone who left day-to-day governance to his staff. Schlesinger also saw this trend accompanied by the declining importance of the cabinet as it was being gradually replaced with new advisory bodies such as the National Security Council and the Office of Management and Budget.

Schlesinger's work is important to understanding the cyclical nature of "progressive moments" in advancing liberalism, particularly the groundwork laid by the New Deal to the later development of the 1950s Civil Rights Movement and the 1960s Great Society. It should come as no surprise that these "progressive moments" have been interspersed by neo-conservative opposition – political, economic and social – arising in opposition to the perceived liberalism of the previous era.

Schlesinger argues in *The Disuniting of America* (1991) that the politics of identity accompanying the rise of multiculturalism is contributing to the declining ethic of community engagement that civil society so desperately needs to muster discourse and dissent in a society that is increasingly polarized and fearful for its security. His recent work on American foreign policy, such as *War and the American Presidency* (2004), discusses the dangers of replacing its recent policy of deterrence and containment to unilateralism and preventive war.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Orestes A. Brownson: A Pilgrim's Progress (Boston, 1939).
The Age of Jackson (Boston, 1945).
The Vital Center: The Politics of Freedom (Boston, 1949).
The General and the President, with Richard Rovere (New York, 1951).
The Crisis of the Old Order (Boston, 1957).
The Coming of the New Deal (Boston, 1958).
The Politics of Upheaval (Boston, 1960).
Kennedy or Nixon (Boston, 1960).
The Politics of Hope (Boston, 1963).
A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House (Boston, 1965).
The Bitter Heritage: Vietnam and American Democracy (Boston, 1967).
The Crisis of Confidence: Ideas, Powers, and Violence in America (Boston, 1969).
The Imperial Presidency (Boston, 1973).
Robert F. Kennedy and His Times (Boston, 1978).
The Cycles of American History (Boston, 1986).
The Disuniting of America: Reflections of a Multicultural Society (New York, 1991).
War and the American Presidency (New York, 2004).

Other Relevant Works
Schlesinger's papers are at the John F. Kennedy Library, National Archives and Records Administration in Boston, Massachusetts.
A Life in the Twentieth Century: Innocent Beginnings, 1917–1950 (Boston, 2000).

Further Reading
Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Encyc Amer Bio*
Alder, David G., and Larry N. George. *The Constitution and the Conduct of American Foreign Policy* (Lawrence, Kan., 1996).
Depoe, Stephen P. *Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., and the Ideological History of American Liberalism* (Tuscaloosa, Ala., 1994).
Diggins, John P. *The Liberal Persuasion: Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and the Challenge of the American Past* (Princeton, N.J., 1997).

Jean Van Delinder

SCHMIDT, Karl (1874–1961)

Karl Schmidt was born on 28 August 1874 in Frankfurt, Germany, and died on 26 August 1961 in Laconia, New Hampshire. Schmidt studied mathematics, physics, and philosophy at the universities of Marburg (1893–4), Berlin (1894–7), and then again at Marburg where he received his PhD in philosophy in 1900. While at Marburg, Schmidt studied with the neo-Kantian philosopher Paul Natorp. His dissertation, "Beiträge zur Entwicklung der Kant'schen Ethik," was an exposition of Kant's ethics intended to show that Kant's early writings already contain nearly all the main ideas of his later critical ethics.

Upon receiving his doctorate Schmidt became an assistant in physics at the University of Marburg in 1900–1901. Also in 1900 he married Edith Kimball of Boston, whom he had met while she was visiting Berlin. With the help of Harvard psychologist Hugo MÜNSTERBERG, Schmidt emigrated to the United States where he became a lecturer at Harvard, teaching the general foundations of mathematics during 1901–1903. Then he became a visiting professor of physics at Bates College in Maine in 1903–1904, before accepting a position as professor of mathematics and astronomy at the University of Florida from 1904 to 1908.

Schmidt returned to Cambridge, Massachusetts in 1908, where he taught occasionally at Harvard. Schmidt's "Studies in the Structure of Systems" (1912–13) is based on a course of lectures he delivered at Harvard in the spring of 1911. Schmidt was a strong advocate of cooperation within philosophy and was on those grounds sympathetic with the American New Realists, who included Harvard philosopher Ralph B. PERRY. In 1927 Schmidt obtained an appointment at Carleton College in Minnesota as acting professor of philosophy. From 1928 until his retirement in 1947 he was professor and chair of the philosophy department at Carlton College. Schmidt also wrote music criticism and he was a skilled pianist.

In *From Science to God* (1944), Schmidt developed a theology based on his own experience as a scientist who was initially preoccupied solely with the "intelligibles" of physics, but who became increasingly enchanted with a faith that is commensurable with the insights of both the physicist and traditional religions (later in life Schmidt became an ardent Quaker). Contrasting his views with those of Ernest HOCKING, Schmidt took the universal community of truth-seekers (physicists pursuing natural science) as his starting point, and showed how the faith generated in that enterprise could be developed into a rational faith in creation and a creator. Earlier, in *The Creative I and the Divine* (1937), Schmidt had already drawn a close connection between the methodology of mathematics and physics and arguments for the existence of a soul and of God.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beiträge zur Entwicklung der Kant'schen Ethik (Marburg, Germany, 1900).

"Critique of Cognition and Its Principles," *Journal of Philosophy* 6 (1909): 281–7.

"Studies in the Structure of Systems," *Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods* 9 (1912): 197–204, 317–21, 431–40; 10 (1913): 64–75; 30 (1933): 645–59.

The Creative I and the Divine: Introduction to a Systematic Philosophy (New York, 1937).

"Freedom and Democracy," *Journal of Philosophy* 39 (1942): 365–81.

From Science to God: Prolegomena to a Future Theology (New York, 1944).

Other Relevant Works

"The Theory of Functions of One Boolean Variable," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 23 (1922): 212–22.

Further Reading
Who's Who in Phil

Cornelis de Waal

SCHNEEWIND, Jerome Borges (1930–)

Jerome Schneewind was born on 17 May 1930 in Mt Vernon, New York. He received the BA degree from Cornell University (1951). At Princeton University he received the MA (1953) and PhD (1957) degrees in philosophy. He served in the US Army Signal Corps from 1954 to 1956. Early teaching positions in philosophy were at the University of Chicago, Princeton University, and Yale University. Mid-career appointments were held at the University of Pittsburgh (1964–75), and Hunter College and the CUNY doctoral faculty (1975–81). At Pittsburgh he also served as Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (1968–73), at Hunter College as Provost (1975–81), and he has had other academic administrative positions. In 1981 he became professor of philosophy at Johns Hopkins University, and also served as chair of the department (1981–91); he retired in 2002. He has been a visiting professor at various American and European universities (Santa Clara, Leicester, Helsinki, and Halle). He has been chair of visiting committees to the philosophy departments of some dozen well-known US universities, activities which paralleled his membership on the editorial board of several major philosophy journals.

Schneewind's chairing of the American Philosophical Association's committee on teaching (1972–7), is particularly notable because of its bearing on his attitude toward the shaping of student–educator interactions, and because of his philosophy of moral education. Schneewind's work has been recognized by Guggenheim and National Endowment for the Humanities fellowships, and by his selection in 1996 as a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Professional activities include membership on the American Philosophical Association's committee on the status and future of the profession, service as President of the APA Eastern Division (1995–6), and also as chair of the APA National Board of Officers (1999–2002).

Early publications by Schneewind include the editing of, and introductions to, three separate collections of essays by John Stuart Mill and about Mill's work. These three collected editions share a network of methodological themes, and disclosed Schneewind's interest in looking beneath the surface meanings of specific moral views in order to detect the vital, social, and human circumstances of which they are a part. These early publications revealed the often-unnoticed rich elaborations of British moral philosophy which were projected during the Victorian period of the late nineteenth century. Mill is the centerpiece of a moral tableau extending backward to Joseph Butler and forward to Henry Sidgwick. The methodological lesson Schneewind offers is that the moral theorizing which is set out in original sources ought to be positioned toward, and appraised within, the contextual secondary critical literature. The mature version of that lesson for him is that moral philosophy, within a given period of time, and the history and criticism of that moral philosophy are to proceed, not side by side, as if they were independent factors now opportunely and externally yoked, but rather as alternating phases of moral reflection which metamorphose into each other. There is an internal relation between them, such that each cognitive tendency is deployed into subsenses of itself through the agency of the other. Problems in individual moral theories are abstract and lifeless until they are couched in their now-recovered, imaginatively reenacted network of actual questions, singular difficulties, and considered elisions.

Schneewind works off an erotetic, historical logic, one which has its parallels, if not its backing, in the philosophy of history of R. G. Collingwood. Moreover, Schneewind's appetite for a close analysis of individual moral philosophies, as situated in their changing historical settings, has been sharpened by a self-imposed tutelage in the writings of C. D. Broad, and in the works of such exacting idealists as J. M. E. McTaggart, T. H. Green, F. H. Bradley, and, most tellingly, Henry Sidgwick. Some techniques used by Schneewind in advancing his historical and critical moral philosophy are an

imaginative and novel blend of the earlier work by these British thinkers.

Main themes in Schneewind's phased approach to the history of moral theory in the Western world include: the perfecting of a reliable methodology to identify some moral constants; a balancing of the relatively more constant moral cognitions with their relatively more variable and more vivid moral content; and some harmonizing of the autonomy of ordinary adult persons with the heteronomy of cooperating individuals. He is concerned with the ethical implications of the human quests for power, but not as mere force; justice, but never as mere law; and liberty, but not through merely curbing the freedom of others.

Schneewind's detailing of essential features in the thought of Mill, Sidgwick, and Kant provide telling moments of his reconstruction of Western moral theory. Mill is highlighted as the most influential philosopher in the English-speaking world in the nineteenth century. Although Mill is not to be taken, then or now, as the most profound of pure thinkers, especially not in metaphysics and epistemology, his social thought on moral, political, and social issues was dominant in its various and more practical lines. Such a judgment presages Schneewind's more recent claim that it is precisely Mill's social thought that is worthy of being revisited in our own times and, in fact, is receiving almost disproportionate attention as measured by the volume of studies given over to it. We have a Mill *rebirth* on our hands, one which abides unflinchingly by Bentham's view that the happiness of mankind was the goal for which he and all men ought to work.

For Schneewind, several themes feed into the resurgence of interest in Mill's work in social thought. First of all is Mill's theory of history, born out of the reflections of Auguste Comte and the Saint-Simonians. The theory is built around the notion of an oscillation between two historical epochs: the critical age and the organic age. In the critical period, rulers misdirect their powers from social goals to more personal, and more inappropriate, subjective

ends. No groups or factions can get their views sufficiently accepted to provide the cohesiveness for well-ordered, just societies. But with the reactive change back into the organic period, sufficient margins of power of shared thoughts and opinions lead to a regrouping of societies around shared guidelines for thinking and, ultimately, acting. Dispersion of power is faulty, but integration of power lends itself to a centering effect of shared partnerships in pursuit of the common good. Such a line of thought cannot help but be relevant to our own time when we are imperfectly, but hopefully, heading into an age of global morality and more just social systems.

Another of Mill's emphases undergoing a rebirth is his belief that the danger in most social thought is not to be found in its aberrations, but instead resides in its regular quotient of half-truths. Mill's penchant for detecting half-truths in our opponents' opinions, or in our own beliefs, was remarkable in his time and is commended as a feature of the pursuit of sound historical research. Finally, there is the emphasis on bringing other forms of literature, and even poetry, into our reading of the *attitude*, or stance, a society takes in its political, moral, and religious thought. Mill was appreciative of literature and poetry, and of philosophy as a form of literature. Schneewind pursues original sources in the same spirit. Schneewind as successful educator and historical researcher is partly beholden to Schneewind as successful literary critic.

As far as the utilitarian strain of moral philosophy goes, Sidgwick, perhaps even more so than Bentham and Mill, provides support for Schneewind's account of moral philosophy and its history. Sidgwick qualified and upgraded the Bentham/Mill axis of utilitarian theory, by making it more sensitive to the intuitionist emphases in ethics by William Whewell and some of the German idealists, especially Kant. Arguably, Sidgwick is Schneewind's source text for his forays into modern moral thought. Schneewind argues that Sidgwick's formulations have played a substantial role in deter-

mining the broad outlines of twentieth-century Anglo-American ethical theory. Schneewind's rehabilitation of Sidgwick for contemporary moral philosophy runs parallel to, and is supported by, other circumstances which confirm and even highlight the importance of his most carefully wrought publication, *Sidgwick's Ethics and Victorian Moral Philosophy* (1977). This monograph gives backing for the important claim that moral philosophy and its history is *sui generis* in Western intellectual history, and is not a secondary variable dependent on a primary body of religious, metaphysical, and epistemological theories. Schneewind holds that we cannot know what a moral belief or claim means until we know what it denies and what it implies. Important moral theory includes a deniable past which it is shedding because of its relative inadequacies, and it has a future because of newly relevant moral stances or attitudes. More briefly, reflecting Collingwood's erotetic logic, every significant moral claim or belief is an answer to a question, and we cannot know what the belief means until we can reconstruct the question and the problematic which it addresses.

Justifying Schneewind's critical attention to Sidgwick are three other factors which have slipped into place in the closing decades of the twentieth century. First, there is a surge of interest in Victorian studies. A new generation of historians specializing in nineteenth-century British intellectual culture is thoroughly recasting that field of study. Second, there is a decided spurt of interest in utilitarian moral philosophy and its entire stable of socially relevant arguments. Normative moral theory is making bold at present to displace metaethics with its epistemological commitments. And third, there is a renewed appetite for Kantian studies, including those which make feminist themes explicit. Grounds adduced from these more recent Kantian studies confirm Schneewind's novel stance on Kant's moral theory, one which guards against copybook attempts to cast Kant as a pure deontologist, and takes notice of Kant's biases against Catholics, Jews, and women.

The methodology used by Schneewind in his historical work on modern moral philosophy is suitably introduced through his brief analyses of two pieces of one-time orthodoxy which are no longer serviceable. Each of the two identifies a problematic which is no longer entertained in its initial version nor with its original powers to control lines of discussion. These studies by Schneewind were contributions to edited volumes on the logic and the history of moral theory. The first study is "Moral Knowledge and Moral Principles" (1970) and the second a paper entitled "The Divine Corporation and the History of Ethics" (1984). The first sets out a four-point scheme that perhaps some contemporary moral theorists have taken for granted and is, basically, a strict deductive model for some cognitivists in ethics. The model is structured around the notions that knowledge in ethics is guided by a set of moral principles that are mainly general (context free), thoroughly binding (exempt from exceptions), substantive (not merely abstract), and foundational (having originating powers). Schneewind offers a substitute model which explores the analogies between ethics and science, constructed along lines similar to those in the philosophy of science of John Dewey and Thomas Kuhn. A key notion in Schneewind's revised model centers on the theory of internal-relatedness. He looks to an interwoven structure of theory and data such that key terms in ethics are theory laden, and theory is a set of cross-referencing grounds and warrants using a vocabulary of terms reflecting the attitudes of an interpreting community.

A second orthodoxy, presented most clearly in the theologies of Thomas Aquinas and the neo-Thomist Francisco Suarez, summarizes the main import of late medieval theology with its theories of divine law and natural law. God appears as the supreme, sovereign supervising agent in a cooperative enterprise where finite agents are assigned role-specific duties such that the work of the entire cooperative venture is accomplished. A scheme of rewards and punishments is proper to this Divine Corporation. Rewards follow merits, and punishments attach

to breaches of obligations. Happiness can be gained, but one must be worthy of happiness. For example, the concept of being worthy of happiness reappears as a remnant of "Divine Corporation" theory that is preserved in Kant's moral theory. This judgment helps support Schneewind's thesis that modern moral philosophy from Montaigne to Kant can be interpreted as a declination from the orthodox, late-medieval reliance upon some supreme, divine supervisor toward a reliance upon finite human agents who autonomously and freely legislate their own moral laws. Schneewind's comprehensive study, *The Invention of Autonomy* (1998), positions moral theorists at various stages of removal from the half-dozen principles that constitute the format of the Divine Corporation model. This work gains its foreground clarity when we see a progressively dimming Divine Corporation model in its background, rather like the looming figure in the frontispiece of Hobbes's *Leviathan* (1651), though no longer possessing the full powers of absolute sovereignty suggested there. One of the attributes of divinity as construed by Thomas Aquinas (and later cited by Samuel Taylor Coleridge) was the attribute of aseity (from *a se*, in and of itself). The narrative structure of Schneewind's account of the invention of autonomy in Western moral theory has it developing out of divine aseity and reaching its finished product in human autonomy.

To grasp the full effect of Schneewind's methodological and pedagogical stances, his monograph *The Invention of Autonomy* and his anthology *Moral Philosophy from Montaigne to Kant* (1990) need to be seen as twin aspects of a single enterprise. The latter grew out of Schneewind's commitments as educator, and from his desire, and felt duty, to make accessible to students a suitable range of materials for comprehending the full effect of the still-novel theses that the history of moral philosophy is in its own category; that it is not dependent on the traditional approaches of modern philosophy stressing epistemological and metaphysical subject matters; and that it can even contribute clarifi-

cations to those more traditional branches of philosophy. The materials in the anthology *Moral Philosophy* find their full genealogy given in *The Invention of Autonomy*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Backgrounds of English Victorian Literature (New York, 1970).
Sidgwick's Ethics and Victorian Moral Philosophy (Oxford, 1977).
The Invention of Autonomy (Cambridge, UK, 1998).

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *Essays on Literature and Society*, by John Stuart Mill (New York, 1965).
Ed., *Mill's Ethical Writings* (New York, 1965).
Ed., *Mill: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1968).
"Moral Knowledge and Moral Principles," in *Knowledge and Necessity*, vol. 3 (New York, 1970), pp. 249–62.
Ed., *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*, by David Hume (Indianapolis, Ind., 1983).
"The Divine Corporation and the History of Ethics," in *Philosophy and History*, ed. Richard Rorty, J. B. Schneewind, and Quentin Skinner (Cambridge, UK, 1984), pp. 173–91.
Ed., *Moral Philosophy from Montaigne to Kant* (Cambridge, UK, 1990; 2003).
Ed., *Giving: Western Ideas of Philanthropy* (Bloomington, Ind., 1996).
Ed., *Teaching New Histories of Philosophy* (Princeton, N.J., 2004).

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v10
Brender, Natalie, and Larry Krasnoff, eds. *New Essays on the History of Autonomy: A Collection Honoring J. B. Schneewind* (Cambridge, UK, 2004).

Bertrand Helm

SCHNEIDER, Herbert Wallace (1892–1984)

Herbert W. Schneider was born on 16 March 1892 in Berea, Ohio. He received his high school education in Brooklyn, New York, where he graduated from Boy's High School in 1909. After beginning his college studies at City College of New York, Schneider transferred to Columbia in 1913 and completed his BA in 1915. At Columbia, he studied under John DEWEY and received his PhD degree in philosophy in 1917. Schneider became Dewey's teaching assistant in 1918 and developed a close working relationship with Dewey. The relationship influenced Schneider greatly, orienting him towards a concern with social philosophy and ethical theory. He was not in Dewey's shadow long before becoming a major philosopher in his own right. He gained a considerable reputation in the United States and in Europe (with many of his works being translated into various languages) for his distinct style of philosophical scholarship, a style combining his interests as a philosopher, religious scholar, and intellectual historian.

After serving for a number of years as instructor and assistant professor at Columbia, Schneider was appointed full professor of religion and philosophy in 1929. The program in religion was new, and the appointment was consistent with Schneider's research interests, which combined the study of religion, history, and philosophy. One of his first acts in his newly appointed position was to institute a graduate seminar in the study of religious movements in American culture.

In 1930 one of Schneider's best-known works was published, *The Puritan Mind*, a study of the moral and intellectual features of New England Puritanism. The appeal of Puritanism to the philosopher Schneider explained in historical terms. If the once living history of a religion like Puritanism was still worth studying, it was for the philosophical novelty and dialectical paths that religion had embodied in relation to the social life of a community. Philosophy, Schneider believed, was not a mere "disembodied" contribution to the evolution of knowledge; it was "part of a man's person" (1930, p. 6). His study of New England Puritanism was accordingly a study of philosophical "facts," which he believed could not be separated from the study of biography and culture. To study the Puritan intellect, according to Schneider, required the study of careers and social movements and this so as to comprehend as fully as possible "the lives and deaths of famous ideas" (1930, p. 7).

Schneider, it should be noted, wrote *The Puritan Mind* before New England Puritanism had become a major field of interest to American historians. His study helped give shape to the newly formed discipline of the "history of ideas" in the United States, which Schneider viewed as a branch, or an extension, of philosophical study. Unlike his contemporaries, Arthur LOVEJOY and Vernon Parrington, who viewed the study of ideas in terms of "units" or "currents," Schneider viewed the mind as belonging to an "ever changing past" which must be approached in "the self-same spirit of imaginative adventure" (1930, p. 4f). His work was different from that of Perry MILLER on New England Puritanism, with its preoccupation with the intricacies of Puritan rhetoric and theology. Schneider felt it was the responsibility of the philosopher to be concerned with the apprehension of the "living ideas" of the past. The logician, Schneider asserted, might perform his "anatomical dissection" of the "skeleton of an idea," but this provides little more than a sense of "the mechanics of its life." Logic is at most an instrument of an idea's "living functions." The philosopher, to understand ideas of the past rightly, in this case the ideas of Puritanism in America, needs to apprehend them "against a background of their social habitat" (1930, p. 7).

Schneider's monumental *A History of American Philosophy* appeared in 1946. The scope and detail of Schneider's analysis of the history of American philosophy remain unparalleled. His *History* was a collaborative venture with Joseph L. BLAU, who supplied the exten-

sive bibliographies to each chapter, and was intended to be used with Blau's anthology of *American Philosophical Addresses*. Schneider offered a fairly comprehensive historical account of the status of philosophy in America to recent movements, and the second edition (1963) added chapters that brought the story up to his own times. The philosophical schools of the "old and new realisms" were of considerable interest to Schneider, especially the works of William JAMES, Ralph Barton PERRY, and George SANTAYANA, which he saw as marking a definite shift from or break with previous traditions of thought in America. In his own more metaphysical works, Schneider continued the realistic and naturalistic tradition he inherited. Like his similarly influenced colleague at Columbia, John H. RANDALL, Jr., Schneider advocated a relativistic and contextual methodology for empirical inquiry into reality and its "ways of being." His book of that title, *Ways of Being* (1962), is the culmination of that work. Schneider was not optimistic about the future of that type of empirical naturalism; although he made no predictions for the future of American philosophy, he foresaw a declining interest in American empiricism in favor of analytical logic, semantics, and phenomenology.

The dominant impression Schneider sought to impart through his *History* was that the search for a "nativist tradition" in American thought was futile; even the most "characteristic" and "genteel" patterns of American thought were foreign inspirations (1946, p. vii). To Schneider, the philosophical past was "as fully confused as the present" and it was, therefore, important not to try to impose a central content, dominant note, or moral lesson on the past (or present) (1946, p. ix). History, Schneider felt, including the writing of the history of philosophy, involves us in the problems of a variety of contexts and a multiplicity of ideas and directions, from which we gain only (and at best) a loose hold on the uses and value of philosophical thought, past and present. Schneider had an especially strong

sense that he and his contemporaries were in the "experimental stages" of writing intellectual history, and, to his credit, he distrusted and departed significantly from the neat thematic outlines and homogenizations of the American past that were then in vogue. He resisted strongly making any generalizations about American character or theorizing about patterns of mental development, believing such writings to have only the appearance of being profound and to belong to the lowest levels of what he termed "wisdom literature."

From 1952 to 1956 Schneider was head of the Division of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies in the Department of Cultural Activities with UNESCO in Paris. His interest in political theory, in particular the theory of human rights and his continuing involvement in several UNESCO projects, led to the development of his philosophical work on public morality. He presented this work as public lectures at Indiana University, in the spring of 1954, and then in the presentation of those lectures as a book, *Three Dimensions of Public Morality* (1956).

In *Three Dimensions*, Schneider speculated that the once revolutionary faith of the Enlightenment in "liberty, equality, and fraternity", along with the moral order essential to the good society, had been disintegrating. Liberty, equality, and fraternity he viewed as the fragmented terms of political discourse, each operating independently of the other without any regard being shown for the essential interdependence between the three terms as belonging to a single public vocabulary and unifying political vision. The three ideals that were once by tradition parallel had become, as he showed in his analysis of various nations and the international community, the isolated sources of confusing divergences within and between nations.

To Schneider, the urgent philosophical need in politics was not merely to render a moral analysis of the modern political situation of fragmentation but to demonstrate empirically how these three traditional ideals can again be correlated in the lives of citizens, nations, and

the international community. In this, the philosopher, he proposed, must balance the pursuit of the practical problems of politics with the theoretical articulation of the elements of public ethics. Indeed, well before "communitarianism" had become the critical interest of sociologists and political theorists, Schneider, in *Three Dimensions*, set himself to the task of clarifying the relations that obtain between liberty and equality, between rights and needs, and sought to highlight the disposition and habits supportive of these relations.

Schneider was President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1948–9. He retired in 1957 from Columbia, and died on 15 October 1984 in Claremont, California. Recognizing Schneider's achievements, the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy awards each year its Herbert Schneider Award for lifetime contributions to the understanding and advancement of American philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Puritan Mind (New York, 1930; London, 1931).

Meditations in Season: On the Elements of Christian Philosophy (Oxford, 1938).

A History of American Philosophy (New York, 1946; 2nd edn 1963).

Three Dimensions of Public Morality (Bloomington, Ind., 1956).

Morals for Mankind (Columbia, Missouri, 1960).

Ways of Being: Elements of Analytical Ontology (New York, 1962).

Sources of Contemporary Philosophical Realism in America (Indianapolis, 1964).

Civilized Religion: An Historical and Philosophical Analysis (New York, 1972).

Other Relevant Works

Schneider's papers are at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.

"Ways of Being," *Journal of Philosophy* 25 (1928): 365–78.

"The Significance of Benjamin Franklin's Empirical Philosophy," in *Studies in the History of Ideas* (New York, 1932), vol. 2, pp. 291–312.

"Metaphysical Vision," *Philosophical Review* 58 (1949): 399–411.

"Santayana and Realistic Conceptions of Authority," *Journal of Philosophy* 49 (1952): 312–19.

"Recollections of John Dewey," *Claremont Quarterly* 11 (1964): 23–35.

"Teleological Prescriptions and Descriptions," in *The Philosophy of Georg Henrik von Wright*, ed. Lewis Hahn (La Salle, Ill., 1989).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Pres Addr of APA v5*, *Who Was Who in Amer v8*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Anton, John P., and Craig Walton, eds. *Philosophy and the Civilizing Arts: Essays Presented to Herbert. W. Schneider* (Athens, Ohio, 1974). Includes essays by Schneider and a bibliography of his writings.

Barzun, Jacques, ed. *A History of the Faculty of Philosophy, Columbia University* (New York, 1957).

Reck, Andrew J. *The New American Philosophers: An Exploration of Thought since World War II* (Baton Rouge, Louis., 1968), chap. 4.

Smith, John E. "Herbert Schneider on the History of American Philosophy," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 25 (1987): 169–77.

Vogt, Peter. "Herbert Schneider and the Ideal of an Intelligent Society," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 38 (2002): 393–411.

Dean Papas

SCHOENBERG, Arnold Franz Walter
(1874–1951)

Arnold Schönberg was born in Vienna, Austria on 13 September 1874. One of three children of Jewish-Hungarian parents from Bratislava, Schoenberg spent his early years in Vienna working as a composer, and composition teacher to Alban Berg and Anton Webern, among others. From 1926 to 1933 he taught composition at the Prussian Academy of Arts in Berlin. After Hitler's rise and the removal of Jews from German academic positions in 1933, Schoenberg emigrated to the United States. He taught music for a year at the Malkin Conservatory in Boston, and then lectured on music at the University of Southern California in 1935–6, where John CAGE became his student. In 1936 he became professor of music at the University of California at Los Angeles, teaching there until 1944. He became a US citizen in 1941, thereafter spelling his name as Schoenberg. He continued to compose works in retirement, and was elected to membership in the American Academy of Arts and Letters in 1947. Schoenberg died on 13 July 1951 in Los Angeles, California.

Schoenberg's main views on the philosophy and theory of music can be found in his book of essays, *Style and Idea* (1965), which he compiled in his final years from a vast collection of mainly unpublished essays from much earlier in his life. However, his influence on musical thought and composition derives in larger part from his invention of serial, twelve-tone composition in 1923. He is also known for his serial works and those of his students Alban Berg and Anton Webern, and the wide adoption and further development of serialism in the post-World War II period, especially at the Darmstadt Summer School and at major American universities. Both the essays and the twelve-tone method are rooted in the transcendental idealist aesthetics of nineteenth-century German Romanticism, especially in Arthur Schopenhauer's view of music as non-representational, and in music critic Eduard Hanslick's view of musical content as based on pure tonally moving forms rather than expression. In his earliest writings Schoenberg views musical works as extending from a fundamental musical idea, the "Grundgestalt." After the composer's break from tonal harmony in 1923, the Grundgestalt becomes the "Grundreihe" – the basic row or serial ordering of the twelve chromatic pitches in the octave.

Another tie between Schoenberg and transcendental idealism was his Hegelian-style belief that the break from tonality was an inevitable, irreversible historical development, despite his strong respect for the formal functions of tonality and the works of great tonal music masters from Johann Sebastian Bach through Johannes Brahms. Before 1923, Schoenberg attempted a variety of strategies for breaking out of tonality, including settings of violently expressionistic poetry in *Pierrot Lunaire* (1913), short orchestral tone poems in *Farben* (1916), and short motivic studies. The first completely twelve-tone piece was the final waltz from the *Fünf Klavierstücke* (1923), organized entirely on rhythmically varied repetitions of his first row form. Thereafter, he used more complex arrangements and transformations of twelve-tone rows in such works as the *Opus 31 Variations for Orchestra* (1928). During the Nazi era, Schoenberg's style moved in the direction of Jewish religious themes and the use of occasional references to tonality.

After World War II, the influence of Schoenberg's twelve-tone row increased in the 1950s with the move of Olivier Messiaen, Karlheinz Stockhausen, Pierre Boulez, Milton BABBITT, and others to extending his serial methods to other musical parameters. While many formerly serialist composers, including Phillip Glass, George Rochberg, and Krzysztof Penderecki, repudiated strict serial composition after 1960, the twelve-tone row continued to be a major influence on American music theory and pedagogy in the late twentieth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Style and Idea, ed. Leonard Stein (New York, 1965).

The Musical Idea and the Logic, Technique, and Art of Its Presentation, ed. and trans. Patricia Carpenter and Severine Neff (New York, 1995).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*

Leibowitz, René. *Schoenberg and His School: The Contemporary Stage of the Language of Music* (New York, 1949).

Claire Detels

SCHRAG, Calvin Orville (1928–)

Calvin O. Schrag was born into a Mennonite farming community on 4 May 1928 in Marion, South Dakota. He received his BA in 1950 from Bethel College in Kansas and then proceeded to Yale Divinity School, where he received his BD in 1953. In 1957 he received his PhD in philosophy from Harvard, where he had developed a keen interest in Alfred North WHITEHEAD's process philosophy which seemed to provide him a welcome alternative to classical metaphysical speculation. While at Harvard he served as teaching assistant to Paul TILLICH and was also greatly influenced by John WILD. Wild was another Harvard professor, who left Harvard a few years later for Northwestern University in protest against Harvard's philosophy department's adoption of a rigidly analytic approach to philosophy and was the most important driving force in the 1960s behind the great expansion of interest in continental philosophy, phenomenology, and existentialism in America. Schrag also made a significant contribution to this expansion with his first two books, *Existence and Freedom* (1961),

which had its origin in his Harvard dissertation, and *Experience and Being* (1969).

In 1957 Schrag was appointed assistant professor of philosophy at Purdue University where he remained until his retirement in 2000. During this time he traveled widely and held visiting appointments at the University of Illinois, Northwestern University, and Indiana University. In 1982 Purdue awarded him with the first named chair in its School of Liberal Arts, the George Ade Distinguished Professor of Philosophy. During these years he produced an impressively long list of essays and articles, along with eight books.

Throughout his long and highly productive career Schrag has played a key role in the development of continental philosophy in America. His own philosophical development mirrors the way in which continental philosophy in America has itself developed over the last several decades. Starting with an early interest in the existential philosophy of Søren Kierkegaard and Martin Heidegger (the "existence-problem"), Schrag increasingly devoted his attention to issues in the phenomenology of lived experience and, subsequently, to issues in philosophical hermeneutics as they pertain to the human sciences, discourse, action, textuality, rhetoric, and communication. In more recent years, he has addressed himself to the challenges posed to a phenomenologically and hermeneutically oriented philosophy by various "postmodern" writers and has also returned to an early interest: the philosophy of religious experience.

As one of the early exponents of the phenomenological movement in America, Schrag has greatly influenced subsequent generations of American continental philosophers. His relation to classical phenomenology was never merely expository but always involved a serious attempt at critique and reassessment aimed at "reconfiguring" this tradition and, in particular, at freeing the notion of "subjectivity" from its traditional epistemological-metaphysical context by resituating it in the domain of praxis, in such a way as to mark out a path to a new humanism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Existence and Freedom: Towards an Ontology of Human Finitude (Evanston, Ill., 1961).

Experience and Being: Prolegomena to a Future Ontology (Evanston, Ill., 1969).

Radical Reflection and the Origin of the Human Sciences (West Lafayette, Ind., 1980).

Communicative Praxis and the Space of Subjectivity (Bloomington, Ind., 1986).

The Resources of Rationality: A Response to the Postmodern Challenge (Bloomington, Ind., 1992).

Philosophical Papers: Betwixt and Between (Albany, N.Y., 1994).

The Self after Postmodernity (New Haven, Conn., 1999).

God as Otherwise than Being: Towards a Semantics of the Gift (Evanston, Ill., 2002).

Convergence amidst Difference: Philosophical Conversations across National Boundaries (Albany, N.Y., 2004).

Other Relevant Works

"My Dialogue with Twentieth-Century Continental Philosophy," in *Portraits of American Continental Philosophers*, ed. James R. Watson (Bloomington, Ind., 1999).

Further Reading

Matustík, Martin Beck, and William L. McBride, eds. *Calvin O. Schrag and the Task of Philosophy after Postmodernity* (Evanston, Ill., 2002).

Ramsey, Ramsey Eric, and David James Miller, eds. *Experiences between Philosophy and Communication: Engaging the Philosophical Contributions of Calvin O. Schrag* (Albany, N.Y., 2003).

Gary B. Madison

SCHUMPETER, Joseph Alois Julius
(1883–1950)

Joseph Schumpeter was born on 8 February 1883 in Triesch, Moravia, which was then part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (now in the Czech Republic). His father, a manufacturer of textiles, died when Schumpeter was four. Six years later his mother married an officer in the Austro-Hungarian army, enabling Schumpeter to enter what was then the leading institution of secondary education in Vienna, the Theresianum, attended mostly by the heirs of the Empire's elite. In 1901 he enrolled at the University of Vienna, receiving a JD in 1906. During his last year he participated in a seminar taught by Eugen von Boehm-Bawerk; among his fellow students were Ludwig VON MISES, Rudolf Hilferding, Emil Lederer, Otto Bauer, and Felix Somary, each of whom went on to distinguished careers, either in economics or in politics, or both.

In 1908 Schumpeter published a major work, *Das Wesen und der Hauptinhalt der theoretischen Nationalökonomie* (The Nature and Essence of Economy Theory), with which he habilitated the following year to earn the right to teach as a university professor. His first position was at the University of Czernowitz, at the easternmost edge of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, from 1909 until 1911. He then taught economics at the University of Graz until 1921. In 1912 he published what he regarded as his most important work, *Die Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung* (The Theory of Economic Development). In 1913–14 he taught at Columbia University. After the end of World War I, he served on the Commission to Socialize the German Coal Industry, and from March to October of 1919 as Austrian Secretary of Finance. From 1921 until 1924 he was the President of the Biedermann Bank in Vienna. From 1925 to 1932 he was a professor of economics at the University of Bonn in Germany. In 1927–8 and 1930 he taught at

Harvard University, and in 1931 at Hitosubashi University in Japan. From 1932 until his death, he was a professor of economics at Harvard University. Schumpeter died on 8 January 1950 in Taconic, Connecticut.

In 1940–41 Schumpeter served as the President of the Econometric Society, and in 1942 he published *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy,* his best-known work. In 1948 he was elected President of the American Economic Association, and was to be the President of the International Economic Association in 1950. *Ten Great Economists from Marx to Keynes* (1951), *History of Economic Analysis* (1954), and *Das Wesen des Geldes* (1970) were published posthumously.

In his well-known book on the history of economics, Robert Heilbroner treats Schumpeter as one of the "worldly philosophers". As an economic philosopher, the highly interdisciplinary orientation of Schumpeter's writings exceeded the traditional scope of economic theory and the history of economic thought. He straddled the line between economic theory and social theory, as he pursued an interest in methodological issues relating to the challenge of advancing economics and economic theory beyond the boundaries of the neoclassical paradigm. Schumpeter conceived of economics as an integrated social science destined to combine economic theory, economic history, economic sociology, and economic statistics. Economics was to be the central social science in, of, and to modern society, as a civilization whose most important sphere of human and social activity is economic in nature. Though frequently associated with the Austrian School in economics, Schumpeter's perspective resulted from a unique blend of different traditions, concerns, and theories.

Initially, Schumpeter's concern was directed at identifying the inherently static nature of neoclassical economic theory. In *Das Wesen und der Hauptinhalt der theoretischen Nationalökonomie*, he undertook to make explicit the underlying social imagery of neo-classical economics, as far as the functioning of the market process and the rise of capitalism was concerned. He concluded that as neoclassical economists were concerned with the study of an economic system assumed to have an inherent tendency towards states of equilibrium, the implicit vision of social life they presupposed was of the modern market economy as a stationary state characterized best as a "circular flow." Yet, Schumpeter contended, this vision evidently is in conflict with the defining characteristics of market economies in general – as they are governed by competition – and with the actuality of modern conditions, as they are capitalist in nature. Schumpeter agreed with Karl Marx that capitalism is inherently dynamic, not static, and that the bourgeoisie is a social class which, in order to sustain its position in the overall social structure, continually must revolutionize the instruments of production, and thus all social relations. With its emphasis on equilibrium states, neoclassical economics is unable to provide a theory that would do justice to the dynamism of the economic process in modern, capitalist societies. To Schumpeter, then, the defining challenge for economic theorists in the early twentieth century was to present a framework that would make it possible to theorize the dynamic nature of modern capitalism. What is the source of the dynamism? What would a more suitable theoretical framework have to look like? Still, the purpose of such a framework would not be to supplant neoclassical economics, but to complement it.

In his early masterpiece *Die Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung*, Schumpeter developed a dynamic theory of modern capitalism. Framing economic development as the consequence of innovations, or "new combinations," he examined the economic, social, and cultural origins of change and innovation in the process of economic development within a largely economic framework, and concluded that ultimately, the entrepreneur is the source of qualitative economic development (as opposed to quantitative economic growth). In

the history of economic theories on growth and development, *The Theory of Economic Development* is unique in that it is built around a category both economic and sociological. While neoclassical economists tend to presuppose that the entrepreneur is a product of the free market system comparable to the capitalist, banker, manager, or worker, Schumpeter argued that the innovative activity of entrepreneurs is the economy's life-blood. Yet Schumpeter's combination of economic and sociological conceptions made smooth incorporation of his theory of the entrepreneur and economic development into the rigid models of mainstream neoclassical economics impossible, while sociologists with their more flexible frameworks of analysis may have shied away from the difficulties associated with immersion in economic thought and terminology. As a consequence, the second edition of this work, published in 1926 and the basis for the English translation, transposed the theory of entrepreneur onto the level of a more formal theory of the "entrepreneurial function."

In *Economic Doctrine and Method*, published first in 1912, Schumpeter provided what he called "an historical sketch," tracing the development of economics as a science from the ancient Greeks, through the physiocrats, Adam Smith, the emergence of the classical paradigm of political economy, to the German Historical School and Austrian marginal utility theory.

In 1939 Schumpeter published his most expansive work, *Business Cycles*. The subtitle aptly denotes the content of the work: *A Theoretical, Historical, and Statistical Analysis of the Capitalist Process*. In two volumes, Schumpeter set out to "test" his theory of economic development. In more than 1000 pages, he presented the theoretical framework of his analysis, the different components of a market economy and its functioning, and three historical sketches. Examining the respective histories of economic development in Germany, Britain, and the United States, he again placed the entrepreneur at center-stage.

At this point, however, his depiction of the entrepreneur had lost most of its former glory. As a detailed account of capitalist development from the late eighteenth century on, the main focus is on the different business cycles; he traced the "swarming" of innovations and the economic crises that result from the disequilibrating activity of the entrepreneur. Yet, despite Schumpeter's concern with entrepreneurial capitalism, he was not a proponent of the theory of free markets. While he believed in the self-healing forces of the market, he did not do so blindly. Rather, he conceded that businesses have a tendency to undermine, eliminate, or exploit markets, and strive to attain a position of monopoly. Before we can claim that markets work, especially when, where, and how, the larger political and economic context must be considered. Markets are not a universal feature of modern capitalist society, but their facilitation is a constant challenge.

Schumpeter did not regard state intervention as the solution to economic problems, as it produces types of distortion, and it amplifies how large corporations are responsible for market distortions. Rather than presenting a "remedy," government tends to amplify the distorting nature of large business organizations: the more concentrated capitalism is becoming, the less markets are likely to work. As he wrote in the preface, "[s]cientific analysis of an organic process easily creates the impression that the analyst 'advocates' letting that process alone … . In order to … make it clear that my analysis lends no support to any general principle of *laissez-faire*, I have sometimes indicated valuations of my own, though I do not think them interesting or relevant in themselves." (1939, p. vi) The possibility and nature of markets is bound to change over time, as is the role, power and size in society of large corporations.

Similarly, the role of entrepreneurship changes over time: rather than being a constant, the actual role and condition of entrepreneurship must be reassessed continuously, not presumed as a categorical feature of

capitalism anywhere, and anytime. Indeed, Schumpeter's perspective is highly compatible with Michael POLANYI's concept of "embeddedness": entrepreneurship is embedded socially, politically and culturally. Its importance differs depending on historical context, religious traditions, cultural patterns, political institutions and structures of inequality. Whether entrepreneurs play a crucial role in bringing about economic development depends on the particulars of context. During the nineteenth century, at the stage of competitive capitalism, economic progress would not have occurred without the identifiable input of identifiable entrepreneurs. In the age of the modern corporation, however, entrepreneurs began to fulfill a much more ideological function, as they served to conceal the actual working of increasingly concentrated economies.

Just as the distinction between *dynamic* and *static* features of modern economics was central to Schumpeter's theory, so too was his historical analysis of the transition from entrepreneurial, or competitive, capitalism, to managerial, or corporate capitalism. In the set of his writings that comprises *The Theory of Economic Development*, *Business Cycles*, and a large number of articles up to the 1940s, where the entrepreneur played a key role, his work rested on an action-theoretical and voluntaristic approach wherein creative individuals energize the economic and historical process. In another set of works, ranging from the 1921 essay "Sozialistische Möglichkeiten von heute" (Socialist Possibilities of Today) to *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy* (1942), and "The March into Socialism" (1950), Schumpeter traced the emergence of post-entrepreneurial, managerial capitalism where innovation has been rationalized to a degree that approaches a circular flow at a level that routinizes "new combinations" brought about by "energetic" individuals.

In *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*, with which Schumpeter's name came to be associated above all, he addressed issues pertaining to the intersection of economics, political theory, and sociology. Contending that at the stage of managerial capitalism, in economies increasingly dominated by large corporations, the entrepreneurial function no longer was being fulfilled by individual entrepreneurs, but instead by planning departments in businesses, and even in government, responsible for identifying opportunities for innovations, or new combinations. Under such circumstances, the pattern of rationalizing investment, production and distribution tended to reconstitute itself as economic planning. Schumpeter's claim that capitalism would prepare its own downfall and facilitate the move toward "socialism" continues to be one of his most contested hypotheses.

The concept of creative destruction is of central importance to Schumpeter's relevance today. Under conditions of globalization, this concept is uniquely applicable. In the chapter on "The Process of Creative Destruction" (1942, pp. 82–6), he introduces the term in order to capture the most disconcerting dimensions of capitalism: all improvements of the economic process, all increases in productivity, all innovations and new combinations, are likely to come at the price of the destruction of forms of production and economic life that were in place for shorter or longer periods of time. The actors involved in the latter forms of production are bound to pay a price as a new form of economic life – a different kind of enterprise, a different method of production – takes hold. Innovations constantly revolutionize the economy from within, destroying old economic structures and creating new ones. "This process of Creative Destruction is the essential fact about capitalism." (1942, p. 83)

Schumpeter considered himself John Maynard Keynes's nemesis. Keynes's work was eclipsed from the 1950s to 1970s, but reemerged after 1980, especially after 1983, the year of centennial celebrations of Marx's death and Keynes's birth. Schumpeter's politico-economic orientation went well with comparisons of Marx and Keynes, especially

since this was the year of his birth also. Contrary to Marx and Keynes, however, Schumpeter represented a conservative outlook: he regarded the age of competitive capitalism as the height of human civilization. In turn, his return after the period of neglect was due in large part to his having advocated the idea of entrepreneurship, which came back into favor during the Reaganomics of the 1980s. However, while this may have been the main reason, there was little substance to it. As has been pointed out repeatedly, Schumpeter tends to be among the theorists that are cited relatively frequently, but rarely read. In addition, he was far more complicated than the recent association of his thought with conservative and free-market position would allow for. Normatively, he certainly was a conservative; yet, analytically – as he was influenced by Max Weber – he was far more interested in the idea of value–freedom, meaning especially that beyond one's normative orientation, it is important to be willing to face facts, especially where facts contradict basic assumptions and are unpleasant.

The distorting impact of large business organizations is especially true with regard to the implications of the rise of modern management, a travesty violating principles of competitive capitalism. In Schumpeter's view, the "merger movement" was effectively the merging of business and bureaucracy, creating a vast system of control that undermines the principle of modern individualism and autonomy. With the rise of modern management, the entire framework undergoes a reorientation that produces a reconfiguration of the values–facts relationship in advanced, capitalist and democratic societies. The most explicit consequence was that bureaucratic capitalism has more in common with actually existing socialism than with nineteenth-century competitive, or entrepreneurial, capitalism. Such, a paradoxical condition ensued regarding the reconciliation of facts and norms, foreshadowing key dilemmas that have been shaping the direction of globalization.

Today, Schumpeter's contribution is most important in the areas of economic sociology, evolutionary economics, and globalization studies. Schumpeter as a worldly philosopher applies not merely with regard to entrepreneurship as a form of economic and social action, but also to issues pertaining to the reconciliation of facts and norms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Das Wesen und der Hauptinhalt der theoretischen Nationalökonomie (Leipzig, 1908).

Die Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung (Leipzig, 1912; 2nd edn 1926). Revised and trans. Redvers Opie, *The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle* (Cambridge, Mass., and Oxford, 1935).

Epochen der Dogmen- und Methodengeschichte (Tübingen, Germany, 1924). Trans. R. Aris, *Economic Doctrine and Method: An Historical Sketch* (Oxford, 1954).

Business Cycles: A Theoretical, Historical, and Statistical Analysis of the Capitalist Process (New York, 1939).

Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy (New York, 1942).

Imperialism and the Social Classes, trans. Heinz Norden, ed. Paul Sweezy (New York, 1951).

Ten Great Economists from Marx to Keynes (Oxford, 1951).

History of Economic Analysis, ed. Elizabeth Schumpeter (Oxford, 1954).

Das Wesen des Geldes (Göttingen, Germany, 1970).

Other Relevant Works

Schumpeter's papers are at Harvard University.

"Sozialistische Möglichkeiten von heute," *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaften und Sozialpolitik* 48 (1921): 305–60.

"The March into Socialism," *American*

Economic Review 40 (1950): 446–56.

Essays of J. A. Schumpeter, ed. R. V. Clemence (Cambridge, UK, 1951).

The Economics and Sociology of Capitalism, ed. Richard Swedberg (Princeton, N.J., 1991).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Economics*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*

Allen, Robert Loring. *Opening Doors: The Life and Work of Joseph Schumpeter*, 2 vols (New Brunswick, N.J., 1991).

Augello, Massimo M. *Joseph Alois Schumpeter: A Reference Guide* (Berlin, 1990).

Frisch, Helmut, ed. *Schumpeterian Economics* (New York, 1982).

Heilbroner, Robert L. *The Worldly Philosophers* (New York, 1986), pp. 288–310.

Medearis, John. *Joseph Schumpeter's Two Theories of Democracy* (Cambridge, Mass., 2001).

Stevenson, Michael I. *Joseph Alois Schumpeter: A Bibliography, 1905–1984* (Westport, Conn., 1985).

Swedberg, Richard. *Schumpeter: A Biography* (Princeton, N.J., 1991).

Harry F. Dahms

SCHURMAN, Jacob Gould (1854–1942)

Jacob Gould Schurman was born on 22 May 1854 at Freetown, Prince Edward Island, and died on 12 August 1942 in New York City. He began his university studies near his hometown at Prince of Wales College in 1870. After two years he moved on to Acadia University in Nova Scotia where he studied from 1872 to 1875, and then to the University of London where he received the BA in 1877 and the MA in 1878. From 1877 to 1880 he studied in Paris, Edinburgh, and (as a Hibbert Fellow) in Heidelberg, Berlin, and Göttingen. Schurman was appointed professor of English literature, logic, and political economy at Acadia University in 1880. Two years later he became professor of philosophy at Dalhousie University in Nova Scotia.

In 1885 the Cornell family, who had founded the university at Ithaca, New York, persuaded Schurman to become the chair of philosophy there. Seven years later, he became President of Cornell University and in that year became a naturalized citizen. Schurman held the presidency for twenty-nine years; during his tenure Cornell became one of the leading American universities. He established research professorships, and campaigned for scholarly standards. His early work on establishing rules for intercollegiate athletics played a part in the later foundation of the Ivy League. He was a convinced democrat in his academic and political life alike and sought to wipe out every form of discrimination on the Cornell campus. The support of African-American women and scholarships for Chinese students were among his causes. His work on the Philippine Commission was not popular with those who thought the islands should be kept under American tutelage and he spent much of the rest of his life campaigning for Philippine independence.

Throughout his professional career, Schurman had a growing interest in politics, and during leaves of absence from Cornell he served as the first chairman of the Philippines Commission and as US Minister to Greece and Montenegro. He was US Minister to Greece (1912–13), and after his retirement from Cornell in 1920, he was named US Envoy to China (1921–5), and the Ambassador to Germany (1925–30).

All of Schurman's strictly philosophical books were written between 1881 – when he

was still at Acadia – and 1896, a few years after his acceptance of the Cornell presidency. Another work, *The Balkan Wars* (1914), contains the start of a philosophy of history, and it remains relevant to its subject matter as diplomatic history. German idealism, especially Kant, informed his philosophical writings. With his former student, James E. CREIGHTON, Schurman developed Cornell's Sage School of Philosophy into a robust center of idealism. They founded and co-edited the *Philosophical Review* in 1892, which immediately became the premier American journal for philosophy.

Schurman's writings first attracted attention because they dealt with the conflicts between science and religion and responded to the issues posed by the theory of evolution. His worl view was founded solidly on reason and experience, and his early works deal with the moral issues posed by people who applied Darwinism to social ethics. *The Ethical Import of Darwinism* (1887) argued against the Social Darwinists that evolution has only an indirect bearing on moral principles. Moral theories cannot be based upon scientific principles, yet an indirect bearing of biological science on them stems from two sources: one is the facts of history, the other, the place of humanity in the universe. Moral theories have factual premises, and different historical situations pose different problems. Schurman argued that this does not invalidate Kantian universal ethics, however. It merely complicates the problem of deciding which moral maxim is to be applied on a given occasion. Schurman insisted that the universe is evolving and with it the social systems that must respond to physical and historical change. This affects the way that we apply moral principles, but not necessarily the principles themselves.

Schurman also hoped to find a rational foundation for religion, and two of his later books focus on his attempts to do this. It is legitimate, he argued, to hold that there is a divine prius at the root of reality. He believed that such notions can be argued about rationally without the emotions that aroused so much deadly dispute of the kind he had seen in the Balkans.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Kantian Ethics and the Ethics of Evolution (Edinburgh and London, 1881).
The Ethical Import of Darwinism (New York, 1887).
Belief in God: Its Origin, Nature, and Basis (New York, 1890).
Agnosticism and Religion (New York, 1896).
The Balkan Wars, 1912–1913 (Princeton, N.J., 1914).

Other Relevant Works
Schurman's papers are at Cornell University.
"The Genesis of the Critical Philosophy," *Philosophical Review* 7 (1898): 1–22, 131–65, 225–47.
"Kant's Theory of the a priori Forms of Sense," *Philosophical Review* 8 (1899): 1–22.
"Kant's a priori Elements of Understanding as Conditions of Experience," *Philosophical Review* 8 (1899): 225–46, 337–56.
"Kant's A Priori Elements of Understanding," *Philosophical Review* 8 (1899): 449–64.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v40*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*
Armour, Leslie, and Elizabeth Trott. *The Faces of Reason, An Essay on Philosophy and Culture in English Canada 1850–1950* (Waterloo, Ontario, 1981), pp. 176–215.
Maynard, Moser. *Jacob Gould Schurman: Scholar, Political Activist, and Ambassador of Good Will, 1892–1942*, PhD dissertation, University of Santa Barbara (Santa Barbara, Cal., 1976).
Randall, John Herman, Jr. "Josiah Royce and American Idealism," in *Philosophy after Darwin: Chapters for The Career of Philosophy, volume III, and Other Essays*, ed. Beth Singer (New York, 1977).

Leslie Armour

SCHUTZ, Alfred (1899–1959)

Alfred Schutz was born in Vienna, Austria, to an upper-middle-class secularized Jewish family, on 13 April 1899. After service in World War I, he obtained a doctorate in philosophy of law at Vienna in 1921 with Hans KELSEN, also studying marginal-utility economics. Soon after that he became quite interested in the methodology of social sciences developed by Max Weber, and initially attempted, unsuccessfully, to ground it in the philosophy of Henri Bergson. With his friend Felix KAUFMANN, he then studied Edmund Husserl's *Vorlesungen zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewusstseins* (1928) and *Formale und transzendentale Logik* (1929), and thereafter considered himself a constitutive phenomenologist. Schutz published *Der sinnhafte Aufbau der sozialen Welt* in 1932, and at the urging of Tomoo Otaka, sent a copy to Husserl. He declined the latter's invitation to become his assistant, but visited him several times a year until Husserl died in 1938.

When the German invasion of Austria arrived, Schutz moved his wife and children first to Paris and then to New York City in 1939, where he lived the rest of his life. His correspondence with Aron GURWITSCH documents this period well. He continued to work for a private banking firm (Husserl had called him a bank executive by day and phenomenologist by night), and starting in 1943 he taught sociology during evenings at the New School for Social Research. He soon was teaching part-time in both sociology and philosophy, and had influential students in both disciplines, including Maurice NATANSON. Schutz served as chair of the philosophy department from 1952 to 1956, and was professor of philosophy and sociology until his death. In 1940 Schutz and Marvin FARBER were leading organizers of the *International Phenomenological Society* and they edited its journal, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, for many years. Schutz died on 20 May 1959 in New York City.

After Schutz's death his book *Der sinnhafte Aufbau der sozialen Welt* was reprinted in Germany (1960) and translated as *The Phenomenology of the Social World* (1967). Also, the first three volumes of his *Collected Papers* were published in 1962, 1964, and 1966. His work was then part of the worldwide surge of interest in phenomenology beginning in that era and influenced a score of disciplines, and there were translations into ever more European and Asian languages. There is a vast secondary literature and even a video of his life and thought.

Some call Schutz a phenomenological sociologist, perhaps because he had famous students in that science, but the vast majority of his publications are in philosophy. As he himself told his colleague Leo STRAUSS, he was not "a philosophically sophisticated sociologist" but "a sociologically sophisticated philosopher." In current terms, he is a philosopher of social science, although that title was not used in his time. But he did refer to his work as "methodology of the social sciences." That requires two comments.

First, Schutz used *"Geisteswissenschaften"* and *"Kulturwissenschaften"* in addition to *"Sozialwissenschaften"* in the 1932 work. This variously expressed category includes not only the "social sciences" of economics, jurisprudence, sociology, and political science, but also biography and the histories of art economics, music, philosophy, and politics, which are historical sciences, and while in the United States in the 1940s and 50s he added cultural anthropology, linguistics, and the sciences of mythology and religion to the list. Given the extension of the concept, "human sciences" or even "cultural sciences" are preferable expressions in English.

Second, Schutz uses *"Wissenschaftstheorie"* and *"Wissenschaftslehre"* as synonyms for *"Methodenlehre."* The former expressions can be rendered as "theory of science" or, more concisely and with an easily formed adjective, "science theory," which is preferable because it covers disciplinary classification and basic concepts as well as rules of procedure. Moreover, it is inclusive of reflections by scientists themselves on those topics, which Schutz considered natural to the cultural sciences, whereas to call such reflections philosophical can be exclusionary with respect to scientists' own reflections on

their disciplines. For Schutz, a science theorist of whatever discipline reflects on and thus learns from actual scientific practice. Then a philosopher can offer insights that scientists (beginning with scientific science theorists from scientific disciplines) might find beneficial. This can be called "gentle prescriptivism" and might explain why Schutz's work is appreciated in many disciplines.

Schutz arranges his insights under the headings of (1) disciplinary classification; (2) basic concepts; and (3) methodological postulates.

(1) Disciplinary classification: Schutz did recognize science-based practical disciplines, in other words, applied sciences, but says little about them or their specific difference from the sciences in the strict sense, which are theoretical. The contrast between the constitution of the sub-universes of theoretical science and that of everyday practical life is, however, the theme of his most famous essay, "On Multiple Realities" (1945). In addition to analyzing dream and fantasy, he contrasts practical life and scientific contemplation with respect to such aspects as their tensions of consciousness (wide-awakeness versus disinterestedness), a specific *epoché* (suspension of doubt versus suspension of practical relevancies), and prevalent forms of spontaneity (working versus theoretical thinking).

The theoretical disciplines are for Schutz explicitly and implicitly divided in a number of ways. First, philosophy is different from science at least with respect to its scope, scientific science theorists tending to concern themselves only with their own particular disciplines while philosophical science theorists tend to concern themselves with science in general and all its species and particulars. Next, some sciences, for example, logic, are concerned with form while others are concerned with content. Schutz agrees with Husserl that formal logic can be used formally to unify all knowledge, but otherwise has little to say about it. The sciences concerned with content divide then into the natural sciences and the cultural sciences. The former are derived through abstracting from the common-sense constructs with which everything is originally

constituted in everyday life, while the latter respect those original constructs.

The cultural sciences divide in turn into the strictly social sciences and the historical sciences. The former are concerned with the living, in other words, "contemporaries," their situations, relationships, actions, and products as directly and indirectly understood and influenced. For Schutz, the latter are concerned with the actions, relationships, and so on of others who are dead and thus "predecessors," a distinction that has become problematic with the rise of so-called "contemporary history."

How particular sciences differ from one another is not well analyzed by Schutz, but he does recognize that each science has a further particularized cognitive style and correlative "finite province of meaning" or theoretical universe. Any new problem must not only partake of the universal style of the province in question, but must be compatible with (or refute) solutions in its theoretical universe. Schutz also recognized different schools of thought within particular sciences, for example, classical and modern economics, economics being actually the science about which he has the most to say.

(2) Basic concepts: beginning in his *Aufbau*, Schutz attempts to clarify the basic concepts (*Grundbegriffe*) of the interpretative sociology of Weber and then all of the cultural sciences. *"Subjektiver Sinn"* is what an actor bestows on her own actions and is the fundamental datum of cultural science for Schutz. The usual translation is "subjective meaning." In later work, however, he used "construct" and "interpretation" instead of "meaning," and in one of his very last writings he points out that Weber's contrasting *objektiver Sinne* of the partner, everyday observer, scientific observer, and philosopher are equally subjective, in other words, relative to each type of interpreter. To avoid the undesirable connotations of "subjective" and "objective," one might speak in English of "insider" and, with pertinent qualifications, "outsider" interpretations or constructs, which also allude to in-groups and out-groups, as Schutz himself does in late works. Cultural

science (and philosophy) can then be said to seek intersubjective outsider theoretical interpretations of everyday common-sense insider interpretations. Further basic concepts include "the interpretation of one's own and others' experiences, meaning-establishment and meaning-interpretation, symbol and symptom, motive and project, meaning-adequacy and causal adequacy, and, above all, the nature of ideal-typical concept formation" (1967, p. xxxi).

(3) Methodological postulates: methodology in the strict signification is the third topic of Schutz's theory of science. Although "procedural rule," an expression borrowed from Felix Kaufmann, is an explicit synonym, Schutz's preferred expression is "postulate." It can be speculated that he preferred the latter expression because it connotes that somebody postulates the rule to somebody, for example, the rules of procedure proposed by science theorists to practicing scientists. His implicit and explicit postulates for the cognitive disciplines can be expressed as "oughts."

First, both philosophers and scientists ought to adopt the theoretical attitude in order to pursue knowledge for the sake of knowing (*Bildungswissen*), as Max Scheler put it. This entails struggling against political and moral ideologies in order to be value neutral, as Max Weber urged. Schutz emphasizes the postulate of rationality: one ought to rely on formal logic to be sure of logical consistency and compatibility not only within a particular discipline but also with propositions of other disciplines, and even with those propositions of everyday life that are accepted by a science. In addition, one ought to seek the maximum of clarity and distinctness for all propositions.

If both philosophers and scientists seek such logical rationality, how do they differ? One might expect a constitutive phenomenologist to assert that one ought to resort to the transcendental–phenomenological *epoché* to reduce the natural attitude of the special sciences as well as everyday life to the transcendental attitude of first philosophy. But Schutz considers constitutive phenomenology of the natural attitude –

phenomenological psychology (which is discussed below) – sufficient for his purposes.

There are schools of thought not only within particular sciences but also within philosophy, philosophical theory of science included. Here Schutz opposes positivism and advocates phenomenology. Two texts from the 1950s, one posthumously published, contain his objections to positivism (1997 and 1962, pp. 48–66). Implicit postulates of phenomenology itself include that one ought to reflect and that one ought to grasp essential structures or "eidos." Moreover, cognitive claims in phenomenology ought to be confined to what can be made evident, which includes psychic processes and purely ideal objects as well as sensuous and cultural objects.

If one were to engage in a formal science, for example, grammar as well as logic and mathematics, then the postulate would be that one ought to abstract from content (an obvious point that is only implicit in Schutz's science theory). The term he seems to contrast with formal is "empirical," but if this includes what phenomenologists call "material eidos," then a word like "non-formal" is preferable. Practically all of Schutz's science theory is concerned with non-formal science.

Schutz was concerned with the cultural rather than the naturalistic sciences. In the texts critical of positivism, he is careful to state where he agrees with the positivists concerning scientific knowledge on such things as restricted universality, predictability, and objectivity. He nevertheless considers the sociocultural world concrete (in other words, it is the whole from which abstraction proceeds), and thus fundamental. In contrast, according to the postulate constitutive for the naturalistic sciences, one ought to abstract from what makes persons and cultural objects what they are, in other words, one ought to abstract from the common-sense constructs always already bestowed upon them. There are also postulates for species and particular naturalistic sciences, but if one does not perform this fundamental naturalistic abstraction, one retains the subject matter of the cultural sciences. In this

age of naturalism, however, a postulate may well be needed whereby the cultural scientist ought explicitly to refrain from performing the naturalistic abstraction on the basis of which there can develop such things as behaviorism.

Within the cultural sciences, an implicit postulate for the social sciences (in the strict signification) is that one ought to abstract from the region of predecessors. For Schutz, the corresponding implicit postulate for the historical sciences would be that one ought to abstract from the region of contemporaries, but with the rise of so-called "contemporary history," that calls, as mentioned, for reconsideration.

There are two especially important and explicit postulates for the cultural sciences in general: they are the postulate of adequacy and the postulate of subjective meaning. Here "adequacy" signifies that each term in a scientific model referring to human action ought to be constructed in such a way that it would be accepted as understandable and reasonable by the actor and also her partners and onlookers in everyday life. Although he does not say so, it can be surmised that Schutz would expect that the thoughts expressed about scientific practice by science theorists ought to have analogous adequacy as judged by the scientists themselves.

The postulate of subjective interpretation, as Schutz also expressed the second general postulate, holds for philosophical, scientific, and common-sense outsider as well as for insider understanding. In his earlier thought, he relies on a postulate drawn from Georg Simmel whereby one ought to trace all concrete social phenomena back to modes of individual behavior. But in later thought, he also recognized not only in-groups and out-groups, but also what might correlatively be called "shared constructs" relative to them, in other words, shared insider interpretations and shared outsider interpretations. What Schutz assumes with this postulate, then, is that the actor understands what she is doing and that anyone who wants to understand the meaning of an action ought to investigate the common-sense individual insider interpretation in which it is constituted. Only the

actor knows when her action begins and ends, what phases it has, and, above all, its purpose.

An example from Weber is apt. Walking in the woods, one comes upon a stranger chopping wood. Is she accumulating fuel for the winter? Is she trying out a new ax? Is she doing it as exercise for her health? Is she a country girl visiting home from the city and enjoying a sort of nostalgia? The action could have any of these (or yet other) meanings. Which of these is true can be ascertained through interviewing and participant observation. Partners and everyday observers can help the scientist understand, but the ultimate answer comes from the actor. Thus, according to the postulate of subjective meaning, the interpretations of the actors themselves are what cultural science ought to build its models from and, according to the postulate of adequacy; such everyday understanding ultimately ought to provide the standard against which cultural–scientific interpretations are examined.

And for Schutz, a key question – chiefly addressed in Part 2 of the *Aufbau* and in "On Multiple Realities" – therefore concerns how actions originally become meaningful, both on the fundamental level of common sense and on the higher levels of science and science theory. His analysis can be briefly sketched as follows.

First, an individual plans an action, for example, painting a house. What he conceives is what will have happened, in this example, the house as painted. This plan or project is formed in thinking. If there is a decision to execute the plan either immediately or at another time, others can observe the somatic aspect of the action, unless it is something like a person performing mental arithmetic or a surgeon deciding against an operation. It is also difficult to observe one's own action while performing it. But after the whole or a phase of the action has occurred, the individual is the one most able to ascertain how successful what happened was in relation to the plan. Shared projects and actions are analogous.

Three additional comments are necessary. First, it is possible for the planner and retrospective examiner to be somebody other than

the actor, as when a parent is teaching a child to brush her teeth; thus there can be and usually is a social dimension to meaningful action. Second, while all meaningful actions (and actions are by definition meaningful) originate in the way described, they readily become habitual or routine, so that one usually does not engage in planning, executing, and examining, but deals with problems straightforwardly and automatically. And third, such habitual and social actions by self and other (and own and other groups), along with social relationships and interactions, situations, and products (like the painted house), are not only all meaningful, but also make up the cultural world constituted in common-sense thinking – a world found by the cultural scientist to be the preselected and pre-interpreted world of everyday life that is the scene of practical actions.

Schutz's description is noetico-noematic or phenomenological because produced through reflection on projecting or planning and on the plan as projected or planned, and the same goes for executing and then retrospectively examining the action. The plan itself is an ideal object, a concept or construct. But planning, executing, interpreting, understanding, etc., are psychic processes occurring within what Husserl calls the stream of "inner time."

Since psychic processes would seem to belong to the finite province of meaning or theoretical universe pertaining to psychology, they would be defined by the basic concepts of this discipline and investigated by the methods proper to it. Hence Schutz's commitment to constitutive phenomenology of the natural attitude rather than transcendental phenomenology needs clarification. He does not discuss what sort of science phenomenological psychology is, but since meaning is originally constituted within the inner time of the self and since such meaning makes things cultural, it is difficult not to consider it a cultural science. He did know that Husserl projected a cultural–scientific psychology. In addition, William JAMES's *Principles of Psychology* seems to contain for Schutz a viable theory of psychology.

Implicit in Schutz's phenomenological–psychological approach is that individual life ought to be provisionally abstracted from the rest of the world. When this abstraction is relaxed, one returns to the intersubjective world. Thus, a psychology is foundational for the cultural sciences in a way that is roughly similar to the way physics is foundational for the naturalistic sciences in positivism, in other words, chemistry depends on physics, biology on chemistry, and the social sciences on biology, provided everything is treated as a natural thing. For Schutz, the psychology of the abstracted individual comes first; then comes social psychology, in which individual others are understood; then come the groups investigated in the various social and historical sciences, all of which thematize aspects of the concrete socio-cultural world.

Most phenomenologists in and since Schutz's time have been far more interested in metaphysical problems than in the science-theoretical problems that interested him, his friend Gurwitsch, and their master Husserl. Their theory of science can be continued in many ways. In relation to Schutz, for example, it can be recognized on the basis of Gurwitsch's interpretation of Gestalt psychology that cultural objects are cultural by virtue of the uses and values they have correlative to willing and valuing prior to common-sense interpretation. This would correct for a certain intellectualism in Schutz. Then again, there are many particular cultural–scientific disciplines whose basic concepts and methodological postulates need to be ascertained, clarified, and communicated, and these include practical disciplines, such as nursing, as well as cognitive ones – in other words, the various social and historical sciences. Schutz's work can be expected to continue to exert influence for years to come.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Der sinnhafte Aufbau der sozialen Welt. Eine Einleitung in die verstehende Soziologie (Vienna, 1932). Trans. George Walsh and Frederick Lehnert as *The Phenomenology of the Social World* (Evanston, Ill., 1967).

Collected Papers, vol. 1: The Problem of Social Reality, ed. Maurice Natanson (The Hague, 1962).

Collected Papers, vol. 2: Studies in Social Theory, ed. Arvid Brodersen (The Hague, 1964).

Collected Papers, vol. 3: Studies in Phenomenological Philosophy, ed. Ilse Schutz (The Hague, 1966).

Reflections on the Problem of Relevance, ed. Richard M. Zaner (New Haven, Conn., 1970).

"Choice and the Social Sciences," in *Lifeworld and Consciousness: Essays for Aron Gurwitsch*, ed. Lester E. Embree (Evanston, Ill., 1972), pp. 565–90.

The Theory of Social Action, ed. Richard Grathoff (Bloomington, Ind., 1978).

Collected Papers, vol. 4, ed. Helmut Wagner, George Psathas, and Fred Kersten (Dordrecht, 1996).

Alfred Schütz Werkausgabe , 9 vols, ed. Richard Grathoff, Hans-Georg Soeffner, and Ilja Srubar (Konstanz, Germany, 2003–2008).

Other Relevant Works

Schutz's papers are archived at Yale University. Copies are at the Archival Repository of the Center for Advanced Research in Phenomenology at the University of Memphis, Tennessee; the Sozialwissenschafts Archiv at the University of Konstanz, Germany; and Waseda Daigaku Schutz Bunko at Waseda University, Japan.

"Husserl and His Influence on Me," ed. Lester Embree, *Annals of Phenomenological Sociology* 2 (1977): 40–44.

The Theory of Social Action: The Correspondence of Alfred Schutz and Talcott Parsons, ed. Richard Grathoff (Bloomington, Ind., 1978).

Alfred Schutz and Aron Gurwitsch: Briefwechsel 1939–1959, ed. Richard Grathoff (Munich, Germany, 1985). Trans. J. Claude Evans as *Philosophers in Exile:*

The Correspondence of Alfred Schutz and Aron Gurwitsch, 1939–1959, Bloomington, Ind., 1989).

"Positivistic Philosophy and the Actual Approach of Interpretative Social Science: An Ineditum of Alfred Schutz from Spring 1953," ed. Lester Embree, *Husserl Studies* 14 (1997): 123–49.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Encyc Social Behav Sci, Oxford Comp Phil, Proc of APA v37, Routledge Encycl Phil

Algarra, Manuel Martin. *Materiales para el estudio de Alfred Schutz* (Pamplona, Spain, 1991).

Cox, R. R. *Schutz's Theory of Relevance: A Phenomenological Critique* (The Hague, 1978).

Embree, Lester, ed. *Worldly Phenomenology: The Continuing Influence of Alfred Schutz on North American Human Science* (Washington, D.C., 1988). Contains a bibliography of secondary literature.

Embree, Lester, ed., *Alfred Schutz's "Sociological Aspects of Literature": Text Construction and Complementary Essays* (Dordrecht, 1996)

———, *Schutzian Social Science* (Dordrecht, 1999).

Gorman, Robert A. *The Dual Vision: Alfred Schutz and the Myth of Phenomenological Social Science* (London, 1977).

Grathoff, Richard, and Bernhard Waldenfels, eds. *Sozialität und Intersubjektivität: Phänomenologische Perspektiven der Sozialwissenschaften im Umkreis von Aron Gurwitsch und Alfred Schutz* (Munich, Germany, 1983).

List, Elisabeth, and Ilja Srubar, eds. *Alfred Schütz: neue Beiträge zur Rezeption seines Werkes* (Amsterdam, 1988).

Natanson, Maurice. *Anonymity: A Study in the Philosophy of Alfred Schutz* (Bloomington, Ind., 1986).

Sprondel, W. M., and R. Grathoff, eds. *Alfred Schutz und die Idee des Alltags in den*

Sozialwissenschaften (Stuttgart, Germany, 1979).

Thomason, Burke C. *Making Sense of Reification: Alfred Schutz and Constructionist Theory* (Atlantic Highlands, N.J. and London, 1982).

Vaitkus, Steven. *How Is Society Possible?: Intersubjectivity and the Fiduciary Attitude as Problems of the Social Group in Mead, Gurwitsch, and Schutz* (Dordrecht, 1991).

Wagner, Helmut. *Alfred Schutz: An Intellectual Biography* (Chicago, 1983).

Webb, Rodman B. *The Presence of the Past: John Dewey and Alfred Schutz on the Genesis and Organization of Experience* (Gainesville, Fla., 1976).

Williame, Robert. *Les fondements phénoménologiques de la sociologie compréhensive: Alfred Schutz et Max Weber* (The Hague, 1973).

Wolff, Kurt, ed. *Alfred Schutz: Appraisals and Developments* (Dordrecht, 1984).

Lester Embree

SCHWARZSCHILD, Steven Samuel
(1924–89)

Steven S. Schwarzschild was born on 5 January 1924 in Frankfurt am Main, Germany. He emigrated to the United States in 1939. He was educated at City College of New York, the Jewish Theological Seminary, the University of Cincinnati (BA 1948), and the Hebrew Union College. He received rabbinic ordination from the Hebrew Union College and was awarded a DHL degree in 1955 for a dissertation entitled "Two Modern Jewish Philosophers of History: Nachman Krochmal and Hermann Cohen" directed by Samuel Atlas. Schwarzschild was rabbi to the Jewish community in Berlin from 1948 to 1950. He later served as a rabbi to a Reform congregation in Fargo, North Dakota

and a conservative one in Lynn, Massachusetts.

He left the congregational rabbinate in 1964, when he was appointed professor of religion at Brown University. In 1966 he moved to the philosophy department and Jewish Studies program of Washington University in St. Louis, and was a professor in these departments until his death. He received a chair in Jewish Studies in 1967 and directed the Jewish Studies Program from 1974 to 1980. He also served as the editor of *Judaism: A Quarterly Journal* from 1961 to 1969. He died on 4 December 1989 in St. Louis, Missouri.

Schwarzschild quickly established himself as an intellectual leader and defender of the rationalist tradition in Jewish philosophy. The historical figures who influenced him the most were Plato, Moses Maimonides, Immanuel Kant, and Hermann Cohen. He saw in them a commitment to the priority of practical reason and a fundamental distinction between what is the case and what ought to be. In its present form, the world is morally unacceptable and must be transformed to bring it into closer approximation to the ideals articulated by the Hebrew prophets and apprehended by pure reason. To Schwarzschild these ideals include honesty, integrity, and repentance for sin, compassion for the less fortunate, socialism, and pacifism. The task of realizing them is infinite and provides us with a standard for measuring the progress of the human race. In opposition to those who maintained the distinction between is and ought, he saw Aristotle, Spinoza, and Hegel as people who tried to close it. To maintain, as Hegel did, that the real is the rational is for Schwarzschild to succumb to moral complacency.

In theological terms, God is always transcendent to the world, never immanent. According to Schwarzschild, that insight forms the basis of Jewish monotheism and separates Judaism from most versions of Christianity. The world, though redeemable, has not yet been redeemed. To know the world is to see that the fundamental task that defines us as human beings is the obligation to improve it,

not defend it. Any suggestion that God and humans are locked into a determinism that prevents contemplation or realization of alternatives to the status quo is unacceptable. As a blueprint for what the best alternative should be, Judaism is best understood as a rational system for improving the quality of human life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Personal Messiah – Toward the Restoration of a Discarded Doctrine," *Judaism* 5 (1956): 123–35.

"To Re-Cast Rationalism," *Judaism* 11 (1962): 205–9.

"A Jewish Perspective on International Relations," in *Rediscovering Judaism: Reflections on a New Theology*, ed. Arnold Wolf (Chicago, 1965).

"Torah for Our Time," in *Varieties of Jewish Belief*, ed. Ira Eisenstein (New York, 1966).

"The Legal Foundation of Jewish Aesthetics," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 9 (1975): 29–42.

"The Tenability of H. Cohen's Construction of the Self," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 13 (1975): 235–50.

"The Unnatural Jew," *Environmental Ethics* 6 (1984): 347–62.

"On Jewish Eschatology," in *The Human Condition in the Jewish and Christian Traditions*, ed. F. Greenspahn (New York, 1986), pp. 171–211.

"An Agenda for Jewish Philosophy in the 1980's," in *Studies in Jewish Philosophy*, ed. Norbert Samuelson (Lanham, Md., 1987), pp. 101–25.

The Pursuit of the Ideal: Jewish Writings of Steven Schwarzschild, ed. Menachem Kellner (Albany, N.Y., 1990).

"Essential Characteristics of the Jewish View of Reality: Judaism as a Living Historical Phenomenon," *Ultimate Reality and Meaning* 14 (1991): 221–30.

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, *Proc of APA v63*
Seeskin, Kenneth. "The Rational Theology of Steven S. Schwarzschild," *Modern Judaism* 12 (1992): 277–86.

Kenneth Seeskin

SCOTT, Dana Stewart (1932–)

Dana Scott was born on 11 October 1932 in Berkeley, California. He received the BA from the University of California in 1954 and a PhD in mathematics from Princeton in 1958, supervised by logician Alonzo CHURCH. Scott was an instructor of mathematics at University of Chicago from 1958 to 1960; assistant and associate professor of mathematics at University of California at Berkeley from 1960 to 1963; and professor of philosophy and mathematics at Stanford University from 1963 to 1969. He then went to Princeton University, as a professor of philosophy and mathematics from 1969 to 1972. He taught at the University of Oxford as a professor of mathematical logic from 1972 to 1981. In 1981 Scott returned to the United States to become University Professor of Computer Science, Mathematical Logic, and Philosophy at Carnegie Mellon University from 1981, and he also was named the Hillman Professor of Computer Science in 1989. Scott taught at Carnegie Mellon until his retirement in 2003. Scott received many fellowships and honors for his work, as well as election to membership of the US National Academy of Sciences and the British Academy.

Scott is one of the leading mathematical logicians in the philosophical community. His influence has encouraged work in mathematical logic of the highest technical caliber, of the sort that should be relevant to philosophy generally, rather than only some special applied "philosophical logic." Early work on the theory of automata led to the Turing Award of the Association for Computing Machinery in 1976. He also made contributions to the study of

infinitary languages, model theory, and set theory. Several of his contributions involved finding mathematical models that treated various entities as primitive individuals rather than the conventional approach of trying to construct them as sets of more familiar objects. His most widely known work is in theoretical computing science on semantics for programming languages. This derives from his semantics for the lambda calculus, the logic of function terms originally developed by Church to investigate issues in the theory of computability.

Scott had an important influence on the development of modal logic via the so-called "Lemmon-Scott manuscript" that circulated widely beginning in 1966. It presented the now standard Henkin style, model theory for modal logic and the use of canonical models in completeness proofs, single models in which any non-theorem can be falsified at some possible world. The manuscript also introduced the method of filtration, thus leading to a program of determining results about the decidability of various logics. Scott influenced philosophical interest in the addition of quantifiers to modal logic in discussions with logicians around the University of California at Los Angeles, leading to his "Advice on Modal Logic," despite his often quoted worry that so far the mathematics served up by modal logic was so much "Coca Cola" (1973, p. 245). Scott's concern about the combination of technical devices in logic with philosophical insight in philosophical applications led in "Background to Formalization" (1973) to his "error theory" justifying a particular semantics for many-valued logic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Finite Automata and Their Decision Problems," with M. Rabin, *IBM Journal of Research and Development* 3 (1959): 114–25.
"Measurable Cardinals and Constructible Sets," *Bulletin de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences, Série des sciences mathématiques, astronomiques et physiques* 9 (1961): 521–4.
"Advice on Modal Logic," in *Philosophical Problems in Logic: Some Recent Developments*, ed. Karel Lambert (Dordrecht, 1970), pp. 143–73.
"On Engendering an Illusion of Understanding," *Journal of Philosophy* 68 (1971): 787–807.
"Continuous Lattices," in *Toposes, Algebraic Geometry and Logic*, ed. F. W. Lavere (Berlin, 1972), pp. 97–136.
"Background to Formalization," in *Truth, Syntax and Modality*, ed. Hugues Leblanc (Amsterdam, 1973), pp. 244–73.
An Introduction to Modal Logic, with E. J. Lemmon (Oxford,1977).

Further Reading
Humberstone, I. L. "Heterogeneous Logic," *Erkenntnis* 29 (1988): 395–435.

Bernard Linsky

SCRIVEN, Michael John (1928–)

Michael Scriven was born on 28 March 1928 in Beaulieu, England. He received his BA in mathematics in 1948 and his MA in philosophy of mathematical logic in 1950 from the University of Melbourne, and then received his PhD in philosophy from the University of Oxford in 1956. Scriven taught philosophy at the University of Minnesota from 1952 to 1956, and Swarthmore College from 1956 to 1960. From 1960 to 1967 he was professor of the history and philosophy of science at Indiana University; from 1967 to 1978 he was professor of philosophy at the University of California at Berkeley; from 1978 to 1982 he was University Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Francisco.

By the early 1980s Scriven's expertise and international reputation in applied philosophy

and applied social psychology in the fields of educational theory, evaluation, technology studies, and informal logic led him to a series of positions emphasizing these areas. He was professor of education at the University of Western Australia from 1982 to 1989 where he founded and directed the Center for Tertiary Education Institute from 1983 to 1989. He was professor and Director of the Evaluation Institute of the Pacific School of Psychology in Palo Alto, California from 1989 to 1992. He was project director of the Evaluation of Teaching Project at Western Michigan University from 1990 to 1994, visiting professor of education at the University of North Carolina, Greensboro from 1996 to 1999, professor of psychology at Claremont Graduate University from 1997 to 2002 and director of its Evaluation Program during 1997–2000, and professor of evaluation in the School of Education at Auckland University in New Zealand from 2003 to 2004.

In 2004 Scriven became Associate Director and Program Director of the Evaluation Center at Western Michigan University and he also holds an appointment in the philosophy department. He has served as a senior fellow in the National Science Foundation's Office of Research, Evaluation and Dissemination. He was President of the American Educational Research Association and was the first president of one of the two associations that merged to become the American Evaluation Association. He was also the founding editor of its journal and the recipient of its President's Prize and the AEA's Lazarsfeld Medal.

Scriven has been a longtime critic of narrow positivism and excessive rationalism in epistemology, logic, and philosophy of science. He has also rejected determinism, reductive materialism, and crude behaviorism for the social sciences. With Stephen TOULMIN, Scriven has been one of the foremost advocates in the second half of the twentieth century for a more value-oriented and pragmatic understanding of human reasoning processes. Against the notion that deductive logic sets the only standard for reasoning, he has defended the logic of probative inferences, which are common inferences yielding knowledge that cannot be properly classified as either deductive nor quantitatively probabilistic in nature. He has contributed greatly to the fields of informal logic, critical thinking, and practical reasoning in many writings, including his book *Reasoning* (1976).

In the field of evaluation, Scriven substantially aided the evolution of educational evaluation to professional status and later towards consolidation as a discipline. His rejection of positivism and its legacy of a sharp fact-value dichotomy has helped him overcome the widespread notion that evaluation could not be objective or scientific. From its emergence in the 1960s as a tool for judging the educational quality of teaching, programs, and schools, evaluation has grown with his guidance towards an interdisciplinary field offering a general evaluation methodology for application to almost any organization, policy, process, and product.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Limits of Physical Explanation," in *Philosophy of Science: The Delaware Seminar*, ed. Bernard Baumrin (New York, 1963), vol. 2, pp. 107–35.

Primary Philosophy (New York, 1966).

"The Methodology of Evaluation," in *Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation*, ed. R. W. Tyler et al. (Chicago, 1967), pp. 39–83.

Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation, with Ralph Tyler and Robert Gagné (Chicago, 1967).

Reasoning (New York, 1976).

The Logic of Evaluation (Point Reyes, Cal., 1981).

Evaluation Models: Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services Evaluation (Boston, 1983).

"The Evaluation Taboo," in *Philosophy of Evaluation*, ed. Ernest House (San Francisco, 1983), pp. 75–82.

"Probative Logic," in *Argumentation: Across the Lines of Discipline*, ed. J. A. Blair et al (Dordrecht, 1987), pp. 7–32.

"Beyond Formative and Summative Evaluation," in *Evaluation and Education: At Quarter Century*, ed. M. W. McLaughlin and D. C. Phillips (Chicago, Ill., 1991).

Evaluation Thesaurus, 4th edn (Newbury, Cal., 1991), pp. 19–64.

Hard-won Lessons in Program Evaluation (San Francisco, 1993).

"The Logic of Evaluation and Evaluation Practice," in *Reasoning in Evaluation: Inferential Links and Leaps*, ed. Deborah Fournier (San Francisco, 1995).

Critical Thinking: Its Definition and Assessment, with Alec Fisher (Point Reyes, Cal., 1997).

"The Limits of Explication," *Argumentation* 16 (2002): 47–57.

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with Herbert Feigl, *The Foundations of Science and the Concepts of Psychology and Psychoanalysis* (Minneapolis, 1956).

"The Mechanical Concept of Mind," *Mind* 62 (1953): 230–40.

"The Age of the Universe," *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 5 (1954): 181–90.

"Modern Experiments in Telepathy," *Philosophical Review* 65 (1956): 231–53.

"The Logic of Criteria," *Journal of Philosophy* 56 (1959): 857–68.

"Philosophy of Education: Learning Theory and Teaching Machines," *Journal of Philosophy* 67 (1970): 896–908.

"Causation as Explanation," *Noûs* 9 (1975): 3–16.

Ed. with Stewart I. Donaldson, *Evaluating Social Programs and Problems: Visions for the New Millennium* (Mahwah, N.J., 2003).

Further Reading

"Michael Scriven: Viewpoints on Education Evaluation," an interview, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 1 (March-April 1979): 66–72.

John R. Shook

SCUDDER, Vida Dutton (1861–1954)

Vida Dutton Scudder was born on 15 December 1861 in Madura, India. Her father, a Congregationalist missionary, was drowned shortly after Vida's birth, and her mother returned with her to Massachusetts. She had a privileged upbringing, surrounded by well-to-do and loving relatives, and exposed to beauty in art and nature. She traveled extensively in Europe with her mother, and attended the most exclusive Boston private schools for girls. She received a BA from Smith College in Massachusetts in 1884, and did postgraduate work at Oxford. In 1887 she was appointed an instructor of English at Wellesley College in Massachusetts. Smith College awarded her an MA degree in 1889. She became a full professor of English in 1910 and remained at Wellesley until her retirement in 1928. Scudder died on 9 October 1954 in Wellesley, Massachusetts.

While at Oxford, Scudder was profoundly influenced by John Ruskin's lectures. Though she had been brought up with Ruskin's early works of art criticism, she was unfamiliar with his later views on socialism and political economy. Ruskin linked the modern industrial system to the ugliness in the England of his time, and tried to foster an aesthetic revival. For the first time, the necessity of using her talents and education to help those less privileged became clear to her. While still in England, she joined the Salvation Army, where time spent in "dirty garrets" eased the pain that her too-fortunate circumstances were causing her.

Upon returning to the United States, she at first tried to make a career of writing, but felt she had nothing to say. She wrote the thesis that earned her master's degree from Smith College, later incorporated in her book, *The Life of the Spirit in the Modern English Poets* (1895). A family friend convinced her to become a teacher, and helped her secure a position in the English department at Wellesley College, where she remained for forty years. There she instituted, despite administrative disapproval, a

course called "Social Ideals in English Letters." She taught Langland, Thomas More, Swift, Blake, and the Utopians, and directed students as a final project to write Utopias of their own. Art for art's sake, she felt, was useless. Works of literature were studied as social documents relating to their time. The text of the same title, based on that course, was for years her best-selling book.

Scudder's sense of social obligation was the impetus for her founding, with several other graduates of women's colleges, the College Settlement Association. In settlement houses, college women worked and in some cases lived among the poor in blighted neighborhoods, seeking to improve conditions there by providing books, classes, sanitary and exercise facilities, relief work, and by organizing trade unions. The college women in turn would be transformed and enlightened, she hoped, by exposure to other classes and races. The New York House was opened in 1889; Denison House in Boston in 1892; others followed. During the quarter-century before World War I, college settlement houses were in their prime. Scudder's semi-autobiographical novel *A Listener in Babel* (1903) details this period of her life.

During the prewar years, Scudder became active in many other reform causes, serving as a delegate to the Boston Central Labor Union, helping to form the Boston Women's Trade Union League and the Episcopal Church Socialist League, and officially joining the Socialist Party in 1911. The following year she supported striking textile workers in Lawrence, Massachusetts, drawing criticism both from the WTUL and from Wellesley for her strong stand. She credited the *Fabian Essays in Socialism*, edited by George Bernard Shaw and published in 1889, with giving her a set of practical, constructive ideas about history and economics, grounding her yearnings for social justice in solid thinking.

Scudder's socialism cannot be understood outside the context of her Christianity. Although raised a Congregationalist, she,

along with her mother, had converted to Episcopalianism under the influence of Philips Brooks. Her love of European religious art and of the writings of the saints drew her very close to Catholicism. She felt that the message of the Gospels – treating one's fellow man as one would be treated – was essentially that of socialism. She attended the Church of the Carpenter, founded by William Dwight Porter Bliss with the blessing of Phillips Brooks to carry out the principles of Christian Socialism. She also joined the Society of Christian Socialists. In 1912 she published *Socialism and Character*, in which she tries to show the commonality between Marxism and Christianity.

Scudder gave careful consideration in her literary studies to writers who were not professedly Christian. She admired Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound* for its passionate sorrow for the misery of the human race, which, she felt, stirred the desire to redeem. In 1895 she published *Witness of Denial*, another book drawn from years of her college lectures, in which she shows the positive contribution of agnosticism to faith in the nineteenth century. Each phase of denial, she holds, was a struggle for freedom, which ultimately resulted in men once again seeking the spiritual.

In addition to Church associations that were openly socialist, Scudder had a long affiliation with the Church Social Union, an Episcopal study group, and the Society of the Companions of the Holy Cross, an Episcopal fellowship group. The sole obligation placed on Society members was daily intercession: prayer in favor of another. Although she did not count it the highest form of prayer, she considered intercession an important spiritual exercise. Praying for a thing, moreover, Scudder felt, would naturally result in working towards its accomplishment. Under her influence, the Society became more concerned with issues of social justice than previously, and intercessionary prayer led to petitions in favor of new labor laws and against

the imprisonment of conscientious objectors and political prisoners.

Although Scudder supported the United States involvement in World War I, she later became a pacifist. In the early years, her apologia for war "was contained in one word: chivalry." To her, chivalry connoted defense of the weak. Unmarried and childless herself, with no one dear to her fighting, she questioned the friends who were making such a "to-do over the holocausts of youth slain." Might not a nobler destiny await these youth in the next world? However, by the 1920s, Scudder had begun to question those beliefs, and the emergence of a heroic and radical pacifism such as Gandhi exhibited, a pacifism which demanded the reorganization of society, resulted in her conversion.

Her scholarship after the turn of the century mirrors her politics. She had always been interested in the lives of the saints, and had made numerous pilgrimages to sites associated with her favorites, Saint Francis of Assisi among them. However, she did not initially focus her scholarship on him. In the early years of the century, Scudder published two books about Saint Catherine of Siena, the very public and politically active fourteenth-century nun. *Saint Catherine of Siena as Seen in Her Letters* (1905) is an edition of Catherine's correspondence, while *The Disciple of a Saint* (1907) is a fictionalized account of the "family" which surrounded and supported Catherine in her endeavors. But after World War I, Scudder turned her attention to Saint Francis, the twelfth-century friar whose life embodied humility and simplicity. Whereas Catherine counseled Popes, served as ambassador to the Florentines, and helped to design a Crusade, Francis left a prosperous, well-connected family to live in utter poverty. Scudder published *Brother John* in 1927, followed in 1931 by *The Franciscan Adventure*. These works, among many others, established her as a Franciscan scholar.

Scudder often agonized over her conflicting loyalties to academics, social action, and religion. The radical stand she took on many issues resulted in chastisement from the Wellesley administration at times and dissension within various of the organizations of which she was a member at others. She severed her connection with her beloved Denison House in 1911 because she realized she was too radical for the committee. She sometimes neglected her professional career in her lifelong commitment of caring for her mother. Nevertheless, though focusing on any one of her varied interests might have made her a well-known name in that field, she was not moved by desire for celebrity. Integrating spirituality with the improvement of man's lot on earth, organizing politically to that end (she once counted herself a dues-paying member of fifty-nine societies bent on reform), and inspiring others to do that work through writing, lecturing, and teaching was her legacy.

Though Scudder was scornful of the feminist agenda, ironically she did much to advance it. She had little patience with demonstrations for freedom and equality; women, she felt, rather than bemoaning their lack of freedom, should work towards greater economic equality for all members of society. Women's own lot would naturally improve as their usefulness increased and social redemption was achieved. Generations of educated women were inspired to follow her lead.

BIBILIOGRAPHY

Socialism and Spiritual Progress, A Speculation: An Address Delivered Before the Society of Christian Socialists, Boston (Boston, 1891).

The Life of the Spirit in the Modern English Poets (Boston and New York, 1895).

The Witness of Denial (New York, 1895).

Christian Simplicity (Boston, 1898).

Social Ideals in English Letters (Boston and New York, 1898).

Introduction to the Study of English Literature (New York, 1901).

A Listener in Babel: Being a Series of Imaginary Conversations Held at the Close of the Last Century and Reported (Boston and Cambridge, Mass., 1903).

Religion and Socialism (New York, 1910).

Socialism and Character (Boston, New York, 1912).

Socialism and Sacrifice (New York, 1915).

The Church and the Hour: Reflections of a Socialist Churchwoman (New York, 1917).

Social Teachings of the Christian Year: Lectures Delivered at the Cambridge Conference, 1918 (New York, 1921).

Brother John: A Tale of the First Franciscans (Boston, 1927).

The Franciscan Adventure: A Study in the First Hundred Years of the Order of St. Francis of Assisi (London, Toronto, and New York, 1931).

The Christian Attitude toward Private Property (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1934).

Church and Social Justice (New York, 1934).

Christian Citizenship (Atlantic City, N.J., 1934).

On Journey (New York, 1937).

The Privilege of Age: Essays Secular and Spiritual (New York and London, 1939).

Other Relevant Works

Scudder's papers are at Smith College in Northampton, Massachusetts.

Ed., *An Introduction to the Writings of John Ruskin* (Boston, 1890).

My Quest for Reality (Wellesley, Mass., 1952).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v4*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*

Corcoran, Theresa. *Vida Dutton Scudder* (Boston, 1982).

Dorrien, Gary J. *The Making of American Liberal Theology: Idealism, Realism, and Modernity, 1900–1950* (Louisville, Kent., 2003).

Mann, Arthur. *Yankee Reformers in the Urban Age* (Cambridge, Mass., 1954).

Strong, Douglas M. *They Walked in the Spirit: Personal Faith and Social Action in America* (Louisville, Kent., 1997).

Cicily Vahadji

SEARLE, John Rogers (1932–)

John Searle was born on 31 July 1932 in Denver, Colorado. His father, G. W. Searle, was an electrical engineer and his mother, Hester Searle, was a doctor. He began his undergraduate studies at the University of Wisconsin in 1949, and transferred to the University of Oxford in 1952 with a Rhodes Scholarship. He completed his Oxford BA in 1955 and remained at Oxford as a lecturer at Christ Church College while working for the MA and DPhil degrees, which were both conferred in 1959. Upon leaving Oxford, he became a professor of philosophy at the University of California at Berkeley in 1959, where he currently holds the position of Mills Professor of the Philosophy of Mind and Language. Searle has been awarded numerous honors and fellowships, including membership in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the Jean Nicod Prize. Searle was President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Society in 1989–90.

Searle has written extensively on topics in the philosophy of mind and language, and taken together, his writings constitute a comprehensive account of three central aspects of human experience: language, mind, and social reality. The starting point for his work is language, and in particular, speech acts, which he takes to constitute the basic units of linguistic communication. While a student, Searle was chiefly

influenced by two of Oxford's most famous philosophers of language, P. F. Strawson and J. L. Austin. His doctorate thesis, written under Strawson's supervision, explored the implications of Austin's work on speech acts for the notions of sense and reference. Searle subsequently developed a comprehensive treatment of the nature of speech acts, culminating in his first book, *Speech Acts* (1969). He extended the Austinian analysis of how language is used to do such things as assert, promise, and command, to develop both a detailed analysis of the general nature of a speech act and a taxonomy of the range of speech acts.

The fundamental premise behind Searle's analysis is that language use is a rule-governed activity. The first goal in studying communication, then, is to distinguish the range of possible linguistic actions (speech acts), and specify the rules that correspond to each one. On Searle's account, every speech act has two parts: a *propositional content* determined by predication and reference, and an *illocutionary force*, the particular way in which the propositional content is offered (such as a promise or a threat). Speech acts fall into different kinds according to variations in their illocutionary force. There are five basic types of illocutionary force, and so, five basic things one can do with language: (1) make a claim about how the world is (*assertives*); (2) try to get someone to do something (*directives*); (3) undertake an obligation to do something oneself (*commissives*, e.g., promise); (4) express one's feelings (*expressives*, e.g., congratulate someone); and (5) affect a change in the world by means of one's speaking (*declarations*, e.g., christen a ship).

Each type of illocutionary force has its own associated rules or conditions, and one central task of *Speech Acts* is to specify these conditions. The conditions themselves are of four kinds: conditions on the propositional content of the act; conditions on the background conditions under which the act can be performed; conditions for the sincere performance of the act; and what Searle calls an *essential* condition,

which characterizes what counts as an action of the kind in question. Taking the case of asserting as an example, the specific conditions are as follows: any proposition at all can be asserted, subject to the background conditions that the hearer does not already know it and the speaker has some evidence for its truth. A speech act is an assertion when it counts as "an undertaking to the effect that [the proposition asserted] represents an actual state of affairs" (1969, p. 66), and it is sincere just in case the speaker believes what she asserts. Just as these conditions demarcate what counts as an act of assertion, analogous conditions are constitutive of other speech acts.

In subsequent work, Searle extended the analysis of *Speech Acts* in several directions. First, he undertakes a more thorough taxonomy of the range of speech acts. This also involves him in tackling a variety of "nonstandard" uses of language, including indirect speech acts, fictional discourse and figurative language (see the essays collected in *Expression and Meaning*, 1979). Second, he tackles one of the central, yet unexplained, notions employed in the account of speech acts: intentionality.

Intentionality is the property of "aboutness" or "directedness" that both our linguistic items and many of our mental states (such as beliefs, desires, and hopes) possess. For example, the sentence "John grimaced at the taste of the medicine," in addition to being written in black letters and containing eight words, is *about* a certain individual, namely, John. In a similar way, my belief that the sun is currently hidden by clouds is *about* the sun. Speech acts are intentional on two levels: first, they involve producing linguistic items (sounds or marks) that have intentionality (that are about something); second, they involve mental items that also have intentionality, namely, specific intentions of the speaker to produce certain effects on their hearer(s). Examining this crucial aspect of the theory of speech acts resulted in *Intentionality* (1983).

In Searle's view, the intentionality of linguistic items derives from the intentionality of

mental states, which have their intentionality *intrinsically*. It is this phenomenon of intrinsic intentionality that Searle seeks to explain by cashing out the relationship between an intentional state and its object, in effect, explaining how intentional states represent their objects. Searle's solution parallels the account of speech acts in important respects; indeed, the account of speech acts provides the key to explaining intentionality. Four crucial points of connection exist between speech acts and intentional mental states or events. First, there is a counterpart to the distinction between propositional content and illocutionary force, namely, between the "representational content" of the intentional state and the "psychological mode" (e.g., hope, belief, or desire) in which that content is held. Second, like speech acts, intentional states have what Searle calls a *direction of fit*. For example, beliefs, like assertions, have a mind-to-world direction of fit: they are correct when what is in the mind fits (corresponds correctly to) the world. Desires, like intentions, are the opposite: they succeed when the world comes into line with what is in the mind. The third point of connection is that the performance of each speech act just *is* the expression of an intentional state with the same content, and the actual possession of that intentional state is the condition for the sincerity of the speech act. If I assert that Sara is double-crossing me, I express the belief that she is, and my assertion is sincere just in case I do actually hold this belief. Fourth, the conditions of satisfaction for various speech acts carry over quite directly to the intentional states that have corresponding directions of fit, as we just saw for assertion and belief.

These connections constitute the central features of Searle's characterization of the intentionality of our mental states. They provide a structure for understanding the relation between an intentional state and its content. However, a further question remains: how intrinsic intentionality arises. Searle is clear that intentionality must ultimately have a biological explanation. He takes it to be one of the hall-marks of our mental lives, but while emphasizing its importance, he rejects one of the most popular approaches to intentionality in the literature, computationalism or what he calls *Strong AI*.

Against computationalism, Searle has produced one of the best-known arguments in the philosophy of mind: the Chinese Room Argument (CRA). First presented in Searle (1980), it has engendered a vigorous and lasting debate between Searle and other philosophers and cognitive scientists. The target of CRA is Strong AI's idea that the mind is in essence a computer, because the brain implements a (very elaborate) computer program that moves from one mental state to another solely by attending to the structural or syntactic properties of those states. The key idea to which Searle objects is that such manipulation of structural properties could possibly suffice to generate intrinsic content in those states. Searle disputes that merely running a computer program could generate a mind; at best, a program simulates mental processes.

At the heart of Searle's argument is a thought experiment. We are to imagine a room in which a person (Searle himself) is locked with a set of rules in English for manipulating Chinese characters *solely on the basis of the characters' shapes*. When a piece of paper bearing a string of Chinese characters is slipped under the door, Searle looks up the characters (by their shapes) in his book of rules, which instructs him as to what to do next (look up other instructions or write down certain characters). This eventually results in his writing a string of Chinese characters on another bit of paper and sliding it back under the door. Suppose that Searle is so good at manipulating the characters and rules that from outside the room it looks as though a native Chinese speaker is providing responses to questions slipped under his door. This appearance, however, is deceiving: the person in the room does not understand Chinese, but merely manipulates the symbols as instructed by the rules. The problem for Strong AI lies in the following fact: the person in the

room is analogous to a computer. He follows a set of rules, a program, for manipulating his data according to its formal features. The person's failure to understand Chinese shows, Searle claims, that the computer does not understand what it computes either. Running a computer program is not sufficient to have a mind. There is something extremely compelling about Searle's CRA, and it has attracted a great deal of critical attention (see Preston and Bishop 2002). However, the general consensus among cognitive scientists seems to be that the CRA is ultimately unsuccessful, although critics disagree about what precisely is wrong with the argument.

Searle (1992) develops a second (and in his view stronger) argument against computationalism: formal (computational) properties could not possibly suffice for intentionality (or consciousness) because they are *observer-relative*. Whether something is instantiating a given program is not a brute fact about the universe, but depends on a decision by observers to treat a certain physical process as an instantiation of that program. As Searle puts it, "syntax is not intrinsic to physics" (1992, p. 208). This argument challenges the computationalist to show how computational properties are objective properties of physical entities.

Because Searle rejects computationalism, he must provide a different explanation of the source of intrinsic intentionality. This leads him to what he takes to be the defining feature of mental life: consciousness. His strong commitment to the importance of the first-person perspective – what mental states are like from the inside – is most visible here. At the same time, his thoroughgoing naturalism demands that this respect for the *subjective* nature of consciousness be satisfied within an explanation of consciousness as a biological product, as the result of *objective* processes occurring in the brain.

As with intentionality, Searle rejects any attempt to treat consciousness as a computational phenomenon. Instead, he advocates a view he calls *biological naturalism*, which treats the explanation of consciousness as analogous to bodily processes such as digestion. Just as there is nothing more to digestion than the causal processes occurring in the stomach, consciousness is simply the effect of processes occurring in the brain. The key idea here is that consciousness is at once *caused by* lower-level processes occurring in the brain, and at the same time is a higher-level *feature of* the brain. Consider a second analogy: the solidity of a table is caused by lower-level properties of the molecules of which the table is composed, but at the same time, the table's solidity is a higher-level feature of the system of molecules taken together. Consciousness, on Searle's view, works the same way. It is caused by the lower-level features of the brain's component neurons, and is at the same time a feature of the system (the brain) as a whole. Unlike solidity or digestion, however, consciousness is not entirely reducible to its underlying processes, by retaining an irreducibly subjective dimension.

With this account of consciousness in place, Searle is able to connect it with intentionality, via what he calls the *Connection Principle* (CP). According to CP, there are no intentional mental states that are not at least in principle accessible to consciousness. Intrinsically intentional states always have what Searle calls an *aspectual shape*: they represent their content under a particular description or from a specific point of view. This aspectual shape cannot be fully characterized in third-person terms, because it is inherently subjective in nature. As a result, the only way to account for the intentionality of an unconscious mental state (in particular, for its aspectual shape) is to require that the mental state be accessible to consciousness; only in surfacing to consciousness does aspectual shape become visible. This view of consciousness has several important implications, both for Searle's general account of the mind, and for the study of cognitive science. For Searle, it provides a naturalistic foundation for intentionality, language, and (as we will see momentarily) social reality. For cognitive science, it mandates a focus on consciousness, rather than cognition, and places primary atten-

tion on physical processes occurring in the brain.

With this account of consciousness, intentionality, and language in place, Searle turns his attention to the social dimension of human experience, in order to investigate the nature of facts about such human-made institutions as governments, money, and soccer games. Searle takes such *institutional* facts to be objective, and seeks to understand how such facts come into being. How, for example, given that soccer is a human creation, can it be an objective fact (as it is) that Brazil won the World Cup in 2002?

Searle takes the explanation of institutional facts to depend on three factors: collective intentionality; the assignment of functions to objects; and constitutive rules. The notion of *collective intentionality* captures our ability to have shared intentional states. When an orchestra plays Brahms's *Fourth Symphony*, each of its members has an individual intention to play her own part. But she also shares with the other players a collective intention to play the symphony. This collective intention, Searle argues, is not reducible to a collection of individual intentions. Rather, it is a distinct sort of intention linked to our ability to engage in cooperative behavior. At the same time, humans (and other animals) are able to *assign functions* to all sorts of objects. We use fallen logs as benches, and sharp sticks as skewers to roast marshmallows. Of particular interest to Searle are cases in which the assignment of a function depends not on the physical features of the object (as with the log-bench), but only on our collective assignment to it of that function. Searle's paradigmatic example here is money. Certain bits of paper count as money only because we collectively assign them that status. In such cases, which Searle calls *status functions*, our treating the object as having its assigned function is constitutive of its having that function. Searle points out that all such *constitutive rules* are of the form "X counts as Y in (context) C": certain bits of paper count as money in the United States. (This notion of

constitutive rule was already visible in *Speech Acts* in Searle's specification of the essential conditions on the various speech acts.)

Institutional reality is created when collective intentionality, the assignment of functions, and constitutive rules come together in a very specific way. Through collective intentionality, we assign a status function to something, where that function corresponds to a constitutive rule of the form "X counts as Y in C." The X in question has its function only in virtue of our recognizing it as having that function. So, for example, certain rules are constitutive of the game of soccer because we regard them as such. On the basis of this collective recognition, matches can be played and won, and objective facts about those matches – facts that bottom out on assignments of status functions to objects – are created. In this way, it comes to be an objective fact that Brazil won the 2002 World Cup.

Searle has written on a number of other topics, including metaphysical realism, truth, normativity, and rationality. All of his writings display certain deep philosophical commitments, as well as a characteristic style. Philosophically, Searle concentrates his attention on metaphysical questions rather than epistemological ones. He begins each inquiry with a commonsensical realism about the facts of our experience: it's just a fact that we're conscious, that our mental states have intentionality, that there are objective facts about social reality, and he undertakes to discover what lies behind these facts. He takes some of the most important facts to be those that report our first-person experience; in all areas of enquiry, Searle is careful not to dismiss the first-person perspective. At the same time, he is committed to naturalism: philosophical explanations must be consistent with our best science. This leads him to emphasize our biological abilities, and to be very skeptical of computation as having any place in causal explanations of the natural world. From these commitments, he develops a comprehensive account of our nature, and our relation to the world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language (Cambridge, UK, 1969).

Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts (Cambridge, UK, 1979).

Intentionality: An Essay in the Philosophy of Mind (Cambridge, UK, 1983).

Minds, Brains and Science (Cambridge, Mass., 1984).

Foundations of Illocutionary Logic, with Daniel Vanderveken (Cambridge, UK, 1985).

The Rediscovery of the Mind (Cambridge, Mass., 1992).

The Construction of Social Reality (New York, 1995).

The Mystery of Consciousness (New York, 1997).

Mind, Language and Society: Philosophy in the Real World (New York, 1998).

Rationality in Action (Cambridge, Mass., 2001).

Consciousness and Language (Cambridge, UK, 2002).

Other Relevant Works

"How to Derive 'Ought' from 'Is'," *Philosophical Review* 73 (1964): 43–58.

"Austin on Locutionary and Illocutionary Acts," *Philosophical Review* 77 (1968): 405–24.

The Campus War: A Sympathetic Look at the University in Agony (New York, 1971).

Ed., *The Philosophy of Language* (Oxford, 1971).

"Reiterating the Differences: A Reply to Derrida," *Glyph* 2 (1977): 198–208.

"Metaphor," in *Metaphor and Thought*, ed. A. Ortony (Cambridge, UK, 1979), pp. 83–111.

"Minds, Brains, and Programs," *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 3 (1980): 417–24.

"Indeterminacy, Empiricism, and the First Person," *Journal of Philosophy* 84 (1987): 123–46.

"Consciousness, Explanatory Inversion, and Cognitive Science," *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 13 (1990): 585–642.

"Is the Brain a Digital Computer?" *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 64 (November 1990): 21–37.

"The Connection Principle and the Ontology of the Unconscious: A Reply to Fodor and Lepore," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 54 (1994): 847–55.

"Searle, John R.," in *A Companion to the Philosophy of Mind*, ed. Samuel Guttenplan (Oxford, 1994), pp. 544–50.

"Truth: A Reconsideration of Strawson's Views," in *The Philosophy of P. F. Strawson*, ed. Lewis Hahn (Chicago, 1998), pp. 385–401.

"Consciousness, Free Action and the Brain," *Journal of Consciousness Studies* 7 (2000): 3–22.

"Free Will As a Problem in Neurobiology," *Philosophy* 76 (2001): 491–514.

"Why I Am Not a Property Dualist," *Journal of Consciousness Studies* 9 (2002): 57–64.

Further Reading

Amer Phils 1950–2000, Bio 20thC Phils, Blackwell Analytic Phil, Oxford Comp Phil, Pres Addr of APA v9, Routledge Encycl Phil

Burkhardt, Armin. *Speech Acts, Meaning, and Intentions: Critical Approaches to the Philosophy of John R. Searle* (Berlin, 1990).

Christensen, Carleton. *Language and Intentionality: A Critical Examination of John Searle's Later Theory of Speech Acts and Intentionality* (Würzburg, Germany, 1991).

Derrida, Jacques. *Limited Inc* (Evanston, Ill., 1988).

Di Lorenzo Ajello, Francesca. *Mente, azione e linguaggio nel pensiero di John R. Searle* (Milan, 1998).

Dilman, Ilham. *Mind, Brain, and Behaviour:*

Dicussions of B. F. Skinner and J. R. Searle (London and New York, 1988).

Fotion, Nick. *John Searle* (Princeton, N.J., 2000).

Grewendorf, Günther, and Georg Meggle, eds. *Speech Acts, Mind and Social Reality: Discussions with John R. Searle* (Dordrecht, 2002).

Hirstein, William. *On Searle* (Belmont, Cal., 2001).

Koepsell, David, and Laurence S. Moss, eds. *John Searle's Ideas about Social Reality: Extensions, Criticisms, and Reconstructions* (Malden, Mass., 2003).

Lepore, Ernest, and Robert van Gulick, eds. *John Searle and His Critics* (Oxford, 1991). Contains a bibliography of Searle's writings.

Nolte, Reinhard. *Einführung in die Sprechakttheorie John R. Searles: Darst. u. Prüfung am Beispiel d. Ethik* (Freiburg, Germany, 1978).

Parret, Herman, and Jef Vershueren, eds. *(On) Searle on Conversation* (Amsterdam, 1992).

Preston, John, and Mark Bishop, eds. *Views into the Chinese Room: New Essays on Searle and Artificial Intelligence* (Oxford, 2002).

Schäfer, Eric. *Grenzen der künstlichen Intelligenz: John R. Searles Philosophie des Geistes* (Stuttgart, Germany, 1994).

"Searle With His Replies," *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 55 (June 2001). Issue devoted to Searle.

Smith, Barry, ed. *John Searle* (Cambridge, UK, 2003).

"Symposium on *The Construction of Social Reality*," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 57 (1997): 427–58.

Vanderveken, Daniel. *Meaning and Speech Acts* (Cambridge, UK, 1990).

Reinaldo Elugardo

SEASHORE, Carl Emil (1866–1949)

Carl Emil Seashore was born Carl Sjöstrand on 28 January 1866 in Mörlunda, Sweden. His name was changed to Seashore after he arrived with his family in Boone County, Iowa, in 1869. A talented musician, Seashore studied at Gustavus Adolphus College in Minnesota, receiving the BA in 1891, and then went to Yale University for graduate work. He received the PhD in psychology in 1895, studying with Edward W. Scripture, and became one of the first American psychologists to obtain his graduate education entirely in the United States.

Seashore returned to Iowa in 1897 to begin a lifelong association with the State University of Iowa (later the University of Iowa), as assistant professor of psychology. He was promoted to full professor in 1902, and became head of the philosophy and psychology department in 1905. In 1908 he added the responsibilities of the position of Dean of the Graduate College. Seashore was President of the Western Philosophical Association in 1909–10, and President of the American Psychological Association in 1911. He was elected to the National Academy of Sciences in 1922. Seashore retired in 1937 but returned to serve as acting Dean of the Graduate College from 1942 to 1946. Seashore died on 16 October 1949 in Lewiston, Idaho.

Music, which he approached as an experimental psychologist and psychometrist, was Seashore's primary research interest. He was more interested in identifying and measuring the component parts of musical skill than in promoting any particular aesthetic theory, building several machines and tests for measuring physical dimensions of instrumental and vocal performance. His most important contribution to psychology, however, derived from his administrative activity. Seashore identified strongly with a view of academic work as self-sacrificing commitment to public service, and wrote extensively on the responsibilities of students and educators at all levels

of university education. From his vantage point as both the head of psychology and Dean in a period of early rapid growth of the field, Seashore saw vistas of potential for psychology as an integrative discipline. He was an architect of the modern comprehensive academic psychology program, promoting especially the growth of clinical and community psychology in his support of the creation and expansion of the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station.

Like many scientific psychologists of his generation he eschewed philosophy for empirical study and organizational activity. At Yale he rejected the philosophical psychology of John Trumbull LADD for the empiricism of Scripture, which he continued to practice during his career. He took it as a matter of course that science had superseded philosophy in psychology, but he was not unsympathetic to philosophy.

The Iowa philosophy and psychology department's climate of intense empiricism fostered by Seashore became, in the next decades, a locus of close relations between positivism and psychology, notably between Gustav BERGMANN and Kenneth Spence. Herbert FEIGL recounted that he approached Seashore with trepidation as a new Iowa philosophy faculty member in 1931 with a proposal to conduct a seminar in the philosophical problems of psychology from a logical empiricist viewpoint. Surprisingly to Feigl, Seashore, known for his impatience with impractical schemes, replied, "Feigl, that's good!" (Feigl 1959, p. 115).

Seashore is one of the few academic psychologists represented in a work of art: he was one of the models for Grant Wood's 1937 lithograph "The Honorary Degree."

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Elementary Experiments in Psychology (New York, 1908).
The Psychology of Musical Talent (New York, 1919).
The Individual in Higher Education (Washington, D.C., 1926).
Psychology of Music (New York, 1938).
In Search of Beauty in Music: A Scientific Approach to Musical Esthetics (New York, 1947).

Other Relevant Works
"The Play Impulse and Attitude in Religion," *American Journal of Theology* 14 (1910): 505–20.
"A Child Welfare Research Station," *Bulletin of the University of Iowa* no. 107 (Iowa City, Iowa, 1916).
"Carl Emil Seashore," in *A History of Psychology in Autobiography*, vol. 1, ed. Carl Murchison (Worcester, Mass., 1930), pp. 225–97.
Pioneering in Psychology (Iowa City, Iowa, 1942). Contains a bibliography of Seashore's writings.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Pres Addr of APA v1*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*
Feigl, Herbert. "Philosophical Embarrassments of Psychology," *American Psychologist* 13 (1959): 115–28.
Miles, Walter R. "Carl Emil Seashore," in *National Academy of Sciences Biographical Memoirs* 29 (New York, 1956), pp. 265–316. Contains a bibliography of Seashore's writings.
"Seashore Commemorative Number," *University of Iowa Studies in Psychology* no. 12 (Iowa City, Iowa, 1928).
Stoddard, George C. "Carl Emil Seashore: 1866–1949," *American Journal of Psychology* 63 (1950): 456–62.

David C. Devonis

SEBEOK, Thomas Albert (1920–2001)

Thomas Sebeok was born on 9 November 1920 in Budapest, Hungary, the only child of Veronica Perlman and Dezso Sebeok. He died on 21 December 2001 in Bloomington, Indiana. Sebeok's basic schooling took place in Budapest. In 1936 he moved to Cambridge, England and enrolled in Magdalene College. His father, anticipating World War II, advised him to join him in New York City and Sebeok arrived in 1937, later taking citizenship in 1944. Already the influences at Magdalene College, which would become the *telos* of his career, began their work. There he met I. A. Richards and learned of his work with C. K. Ogden on meaning. There too he forayed into the hapless 1926 attempt by D. L. MacKinnon to render in English the 1920 *Theoretishe Biologie* of Jakob von Uexküll. Sebeok could make no sense of that English. Much later he returned to the work in German, and after 1982 von Uexküll's work became pivotal through Sebeok's influence in the North American and global development of semiotics.

By 1939 Sebeok was enrolled at the University of Chicago, majoring in linguistics. In his senior year he studied with Leonard BLOOMFIELD. In classes that "were minuscule" in size, as he reports it (in a manuscript titled "Summing Up," among his posthumous papers), he developed the first of his papers to be published (1942). "I want to stress," Sebeok says, "Bloomfield's scarcely appreciated, withal quite explicit, links with semiotics, especially during his final Chicago years." He then quotes Bloomfield to the effect that "meaning" is a notion "necessarily inclusive, since it must embrace all aspects of semiosis that may be distinguished by a philosophical or logical analysis." Sebeok would come to call this "the semiotic web" (1975).

The principal influence upon Sebeok at Chicago was Charles MORRIS, whose *Writings on the General Theory of Signs* Sebeok published in 1971. After a falling-out between

Sebeok and Richard MCKEON resulted in Sebeok's expulsion from the humanities, Morris steered Sebeok into anthropology to complete his BA degree in 1941. Sebeok eventually saw that "the persevering hostility" to Morris on the part of Robert Hutchins as University of Chicago President, supported by McKeon in the Humanities Division and Mortimer ADLER in Great Books, set back the nascent rise of semiotics in the United States "by easily a quarter of a century." Within anthropology Sebeok began to develop a "biological way of thinking." On the second page of an undated manuscript among his posthumous papers, handwritten on stationary of the Washington, D.C., Cosmos Club, after the heading "The Tradition I Stem From," he lists as his principal influences the philosopher Charles Morris, the philologist Roman Jakobson, the theoretical and experimental biologist Jakob von Uexküll with his son the medical doctor Thure von Uexküll, and finally the animal psychologist Heini Hediger. He describes himself as a "Biologist Manqué."

Jakobson entered the picture especially after Sebeok transferred from Chicago to Princeton in 1942 to continue his graduate studies. Sebeok did not get along with his assigned thesis advisor at Princeton, so for actual direction he commuted to New York where Jakobson was teaching in exile at the New School for Social Research. Sebeok always regarded his regular consultation with Jakobson as the real guidance he received toward his 1943 MA in anthropological linguistics. That was the year he joined the Indiana University faculty at Bloomington. His Indiana activities were prodigious. Besides his regular academic activities teaching in the English department as a professor of linguistics, he worked for the OSS in the Air Force Language Training Program (quickly as Director) for, among other things, preparation of agents to parachute behind enemy lines in the Baltics. ("World War II propelled me to clutch the verbal code rather than the molecular code," he explained in his 1984 Semiotic Society of America address, as to how

events resolved the agony of his attraction in the 1940s to a career rather in genetics and biology over linguistics and anthropology.)

In 1945 Sebeok completed his Princeton PhD in Oriental languages and civilizations and settled in at Indiana in several programs and departments, but especially at one of its celebrated and unique "research centers," the Research Center for Language Studies, to which name, as Director, he later added semiotics. Sebeok was named Distinguished Professor of Linguistics in 1967 and established programs in semiotics. In 1978 his title changed to Distinguished Professor of Linguistics and Semiotics, sharing with his friend and colleague, Umberto Eco, the signal honor of holding a designated chair of semiotics. In 1991 he retired from full-time teaching and became Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Anthropology, of Linguistics, of Semiotics, and of Central Eurasian Studies. Over his long career he received five honorary doctorates, many fellowships, and the Distinguished Service Award of the American Anthropological Association. He was a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, President of the Linguistic Society of America in 1975, and President of the Semiotic Society of America in 1984. From 1998 until his death in 2001 Sebeok was the Director of the Center for Applied Semiotics at Indiana University.

Jakobson's influence in Sebeok's linguistic studies was crucial, but not in his gradual evolution as a semiotician. Pivotal here was his Chicago-acquired taste for the biological way of thinking. The academic year 1960–61 at the Stanford Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences was decisive. Given his background in linguistics and anthropology, one would have expected Sebeok to approach semiotics from the standpoint advocated by Ferdinand de Saussure and his followers under the rubric of "semiology." But Sebeok never for a moment fell for the idea that semiosis could be adequately reduced or assimilated to a linguistic model of signifying, an idea he simply brushed aside as a "pars pro toto"

fallacy – without denying that the semiological studies had a rightful place within the larger scope of semiotics proper.

Sebeok devoted that year to catching up on biology, animal communication in particular, a study for which he coined the term "zoösemiotics" in 1963. Eventually this focus led him to distinguish sharply between *language*, as having in itself nothing to do with communication but which, through exaptation, gives rise to linguistic communication as species-specifically human, and *communication*, which is a universal phenomenon of nature. Events, as he put it, placed him "at the storm center of a foolish controversy about whether animals have language, to which the one word answer is: 'No!'"

Zoösemiotics was just the beginning. Ironically, McKeon, in his "Introduction" to *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, published the year after the expulsion of Sebeok from the humanities at the University of Chicago, stated the criterion whereby his erstwhile student would establish himself over the next sixty years as the most important figure in the twentieth century development of semiotic consciousness. McKeon observed that a thinker's influence is marked by the "forms of speech, distinctions, and information" that transmute through usage into "the accustomed materials of a culture and tradition." This criterion marks Sebeok as the dominant twentieth century influence on the intellectual tradition that goes by the name "semiotics."

Consider even the word "semiotics." That was by no means the dominant term for discussion of signs over the first three-quarters of the twentieth century. The dominant term was "semiology," attributed to the linguistic views of Ferdinand de Saussure. Nor was the term "semiotics" the preferred term of the avowed followers of Charles Sanders PEIRCE, that other late-nineteenth-century founder of the study of signs. In Peircean circles, common wisdom held that the study of signs should be called "*semeiotic … never semiotics*" (Fisch 1978, p. 322). For Sebeok himself, "semiotics" was

always the preferred term that he adopted and promoted in full awareness of the dominant currents of early and mid-twentieth-century development, currents against which he swam and over which he ultimately prevailed.

Sebeok's choice of "semiotics" as the logically proper name for the doctrine of signs may well have been made during his crucial year at Stanford. Soon afterwards, in 1962 at Indiana, he took a first step toward developing a larger paradigm for the study of signs in communication by organizing a conference on the theme "paralinguistics and kinesics" that brought together leading figures from cultural anthropology, education, linguistics, psychiatry, and psychology – when all of these disciplines were still language-dominated though, in Sebeok's mind, nascent with the broader perspective that his study of animal communication had convinced him was necessary. How nascent was this broader perspective was dramatically illustrated by the conference participants who had to wait for Margaret MEAD, near the conference's conclusion, to declare that "semiotics" is the very word to cover "patterned communication in all modalities," linguistic or not. Considering that "the selection of some single term seemed a persuasive device to advance unified research," Sebeok titled the volume from that conference *Approaches to Semiotics* (1964) and used the title again in 1969 to launch his book series with the publisher Mouton.

The *Approaches to Semiotics* volume from the 1962 Indiana conference may be said to mark the beginning of semiotics as an intellectual movement in North America. An assimilation of the seminal semiotic work of Peirce was already underway, notably in the persons of Jakobson and Sebeok. In his 1984 SSA presidential address (published in 1985), Sebeok refered to Peirce as "our lodestar," tracing his "evanescent influence" even upon the work of Ogden and Richards. In Peirce, not only was to be found the beguiling vision of the ubiquity of signs and sign use but, also, a profound treatment of formal or pure semi-

otics, which Peirce equated with logic in general. The SSA was the offspring of the First North American Semiotics Colloquium in the United States at the University of South Florida in the summer of 1975. October of the following year saw the First Annual SSA Meeting.

Already Sebeok had established the term "anthroposemiotics" (1968) to cover study of the human use of signs, as in 1963 he had established the broader term "zoösemiotics." In 1981 Martin Krampen, in an article published under Sebeok's editorship in the international journal Sebeok had helped name *Semiotica* (which would be Latin for "semiotics"), introduced the term "phytosemiotics" for study of the action of signs among plants and between plants and animals viewed from the side of the plants. The three terms – phytosemiotics, zoösemiotics, anthroposemiotics – completed the naming of the knowledge arising from the action of signs corresponding to the traditional division of living nature into plants, animals, and humans, and soon enough inspired Sebeok (1990) to consider the action of signs as criterial of life. He advanced the further thesis that sign-science and life-science are coextensive, a vision he named "biosemiotics," and used the term to entitle a volume including the challenge to his thesis as too narrow. Central to biosemiotics was the biology of Jakob von Uexküll. Over the last decade of his life he tirelessly promoted both. He came also to see a close affinity between semiotics and cognitive science, as the latter was developing toward the end of the twentieth century (1991).

Sebeok's influence has permeated all the terms and distinctions of debate in the development of the study of signs as an inherently interdisciplinary intellectual paradigm global in scope. The open question within semiotics at that juncture, marked by a formal conference addressing just this point of how far the action of signs extends, was no longer whether semiology is superordinate to, co-ordinate with, or subaltern to semiotics, but only whether semiotics is broader even than

zoösemiotics. On this question two positions had emerged.

There was the comparatively conservative position (how ironic for time to cast the revolutionary figure of Sebeok in such a pose) which would extend semiotics to the whole of living things, plants as well as animals and microorganisms. The conservative faction in the matter of whether the action of signs, and hence the paradigm of semiotics, can be extended beyond the sphere of cognitive life rallied under Sebeok's coinage, "biosemiotics."

The more radical faction (chief among which must be counted Peirce himself, and most recently Robert Corrington 2000) did not quarrel with the inclusion of phytosemiotics along with zoösemiotics and anthroposemiotics under the umbrella of semiotics, but argued that even this extension leaves out something that must be included, namely, the physical universe at large which surrounds biological life and upon which all life depends. The radical faction in semiotics by the end of Sebeok's life argued that what is distinctive of the action of signs is the shaping of the past on the basis of future events. In this accounting, the action of signs (or "semiosis") can be discerned even in formation of rocks and stars as *physiosemiosis*, to be codified under the rubric of "physiosemiotics." Whatever proves to be the full extent of sign action, Peirce's proposal that the universe as a whole, even if it does not consist exclusively of signs, is yet everywhere perfused with signs, is a thesis that better than any other sums up the life and pioneering work of Sebeok.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Notion of Zoosemiotics" (1963). Reprinted in *Frontiers in Semiotics,* ed. John Deely, Brooke Williams, and Felicia Kruse (Bloomington, Ind., 1986), pp. 74–5.

"Zoösemiotics," *American Speech* 43 (1968): 142–4.

Perspectives in Zoosemiotics (The Hague, 1972).

"The Semiotic Web: A Chronicle of Prejudices," *Bulletin of Literary Semiotics* 2 (1975): 1–63.

Contributions to the Doctrine of Signs (Bloomington, Ind., 1976).

The Sign & Its Masters (Austin, Tex., 1979; 2nd edn, Lanham, Md., 1989).

"You Know My Method": A Juxtaposition of Charles S. Peirce and Sherlock Holmes, with Jean Umiker-Sebeok (Bloomington, Ind., 1980).

The Play of Musement (Bloomington, Ind., 1981).

"Vital Signs," *American Journal of Semiotics* 3 (1985): 1–27.

I Think I Am A Verb: More Contributions to the Doctrine of Signs (New York, 1986).

A Sign Is Just a Sign (Bloomington, Ind., 1991).

American Signatures: Semiotic Inquiry and Method (Norman, Okla., 1991).

Semiotics in the United States (Bloomington, Ind., 1991).

Signs: An Introduction to Semiotics (Toronto, 1994; 2nd edn 2001).

The Forms of Meaning: Modeling Systems Theory and Semiotic Analysis, with Marcel Danesi (Berlin, 2000).

Global Semiotics (Bloomington, Ind., 2001).

Semiotica dell'io, with Susan Petrilli and Augusto Ponzio (Rome, 2001).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Myth: A Symposium* (Philadelphia, 1955).

Ed., *Style in Language* (Cambridge, Mass., 1960).

Ed. with A.S. Hayes and M.C. Bateson, *Approaches to Semiotics: Cultural Anthropology, Education, Linguistics, Psychiatry, Psychology* (The Hague, 1964).

Ed., *Portraits of Linguists: A Biographical Source Book for the History of Western Linguistics, 1746–1963* (Bloomington,

Ind., 1966).

Ed., *Animal Communication: Techniques of Study and Results of Research* (Bloomington, Ind., 1968).

Ed. with Alexandra Ramsay, *Approaches to Animal Communication* (The Hague, 1969).

Ed., *A Perfusion of Signs* (Bloomington, Ind., 1977).

Ed., *How Animals Communicate* (Bloomington, Ind., 1977).

Ed., *Sight, Sound, and Sense* (Bloomington, Ind., 1978).

"Prefigurements of Art," *Semiotica* 27 (1979): 3–73.

Ed. with Jean Umiker-Sebeok, *Speaking of Apes: A Critical Anthology of Two-Way Communication with Man* (New York, 1980).

Ed. with Umberto Eco, *The Sign of Three: Dupin, Holmes, Peirce* (Bloomington, Ind., 1983).

"A Semiotic Perspective on the Sciences: Steps Toward a New Paradigm," with Myrdene Anderson, John Deely, Martin Krampen, Joseph Ransdell, and Thure von Uexküll, *Semiotica* 52 (1984): 7–47.

Ed., *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Semiotics*, 3 vols (Berlin, 1986; 2nd edn 1994).

Ed. with Jean Umiker-Sebeok, *The Semiotic Sphere* (New York, 1986).

Ed. with Jean Umiker-Sebeok, *Biosemiotics* (Berlin, 1992).

"Opening Remarks, July 6, 1992, for the seminar 'Semiotics in the United States' held in Urbino, Italy," *Semiotica* 147 (2003): 75–102.

Further Reading

Who Was Who in Amer v14

Anderson, Myrdene. "Thomas Albert Sebeok (1920–2001)," *American Anthropologist* 105 (March 2003): 228–31.

Bouissac, Paul, Michael Herzfeld, and Roland Posner, eds. *Iconicity: Essays on the Nature of Culture, Festschrift for Thomas A. Sebeok on His 65th Birthday* (Tübingen, Germany, 1986).

Brier, Søren ed. "Thomas Sebeok and the Biosemiotic Legacy," *Cybernetics and Human Knowing* 10 no. 1 (2003). Special issue about Sebeok.

Corrington, Robert S. *A Semiotic Theory of Theology and Philosophy* (Cambridge, UK, 2000).

Danesi, Marcel. *The Body in the Sign: Thomas A. Sebeok and Semiotics* (Ottawa, 1998).

Danesi, Marcel, ed. *The Invention of Global Semiotics: A Collection of Essays on the Life and Work of Thomas A. Sebeok* (Ottawa, 2001).

Deely, John. *Introducing Semiotic: Its History and Doctrine* (Indianapolis, 1982).

———, "Semiotics and Biosemiotics: Are Sign-science and Life-science Coextensive?" in *Biosemiotics*, ed. Thomas Sebeok and Jean Umiker-Sebeok (Berlin, 1992), pp. 45–75.

———, *Elements of Anthroposemiosis, or The Human Use of Signs* (Lanham, Md., 1994).

———, ed. *Thomas A. Sebeok: Bibliography, 1942–1995* (Bloomington, Ind., 1995).

———, "The Word 'Semiotics': Formation and Origins," *Semiotica* 146 (2002): 1–49.

Deely, John, and Susan Petrilli, eds. "Semiotics in the United States and Beyond," *Semiotica* 97 nos 3–4 (1993).

Fisch, Max H. "Peirce's General Theory of Signs" (1978). Reprinted in *Peirce, Semeiotic, and Pragmatism. Essays by Max H. Fisch*, ed. Kenneth L. Ketner and Christian J. W. Kloesel (Bloomington, Ind., 1986), pp. 321–55.

Hoffmeyer, Jesper. *Signs of Meaning in the Universe* (Bloomington, 1996).

Morris, Charles. *Writings on the General Theory of Signs* (The Hague, 1971).

Peirce, Charles S. "The Basis of

Pragmaticism in the Normative Sciences" (1906), in *The Essential Peirce*, vol. 2, ed. Peirce Edition Project (Bloomington, Ind., 1998), pp. 371–97.

Petrilli, Susan, and Ponzio, Augusto. *Thomas Sebeok and the Signs of Life* (Cambridge, UK, 2001).

Umiker-Sebeok, Jean, "Thomas A. Sebeok: A Bibliography of His Writings," *Semiotica* 147 (2003): 11–73.

John Deely

SEELYE, Julius Hawley (1824–95)

Julius Hawley Seelye was born on 14 September 1824 in Bethel, Connecticut. He graduated with his BA in 1849 from Amherst College. He then studied at Auburn Theological Seminary, graduating in 1852. Seelye then studied philosophy at the University of Halle during 1851–3. He was ordained to the ministry in 1853 in Schenectady, New York, and served as minister of the First Reformed Dutch Church until 1858. Seelye became professor of mental and moral philosophy at Amherst College in Massachusetts in 1858. In 1875–6 he represented the Tenth District of Massachusetts in the Forty-fourth Congress.

After his public service, Seelye remained a professor of philosophy and was chosen as President of Amherst in 1877, where he was also minister to the college during a successful presidency marked by growth in faculty and financial resources. Seelye appointed Charles E. GARMAN as assistant professor of philosophy in 1880, who carried on the tradition of outstanding philosophy teaching at Amherst. Seelye retired in 1890 and died on 12 May 1895 in Amherst, Massachusetts.

Seelye taught a conservative moral philosophy and traditional Congregational theology at Amherst for thirty-two years. Because evolution was not considered a body of knowledge acceptable for Christians to teach at Amherst, President Seeyle in his 1877 inaugural address effectively prohibited the teaching of evolution on Amherst's campus. This announcement was met with strong resistance. Professor B. K. Emerson, professor of geology and zoology, continued teaching evolution, while the department of biology gave instruction understood to be consistent with the biblical account of creation. In 1880, President Seelye responded by removing geology courses from the required curriculum. The College countered in 1884 by creating formal departments, creating the department of mineralogy and geology, in which courses could be selected among a group of elective sciences. Seelye's innovative "Amherst System," widely adopted at other colleges, introduced a governance system in which students are allowed to govern their own affairs and decide on disciplinary methods through a College Senate.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Way, the Truth, and the Life: Lectures to Educated Hindus, Delivered on his Late Visit to India (Boston, 1873).

Christian Missions (Boston, 1875).

Amherst College: The Relations of Learning and religion (Springfield, Mass., 1877).

Duty: A Book for Schools (Boston, 1891).

Citizenship: A Book for Classes in Government and Law (Boston, 1894).

Other Relevant Works

Seelye's papers are at Amherst College, Massachusetts.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v6*

Fuess, Claude M. *Amherst: The Story of a New England College* (Boston, 1935).

Le Duc, Thomas. *Piety and Intellect at Amherst College, 1865–1912* (New York, 1946).

Robert Wilson-Black

SELLARS, Roy Wood (1880–1973)

Roy Wood Sellars was born on 9 July 1980 in Egmondville, near Seaforth, Ontario, Canada. He was the son of Ford Wylis Sellars, a teacher and doctor, and Mary Stalker. The family soon moved to the University of Michigan where their father completed his medical education. The family eventually located to Pinnebog, a rural community in northern Michigan, where Roy Wood spent his formative years. After a year spent at the Ferris Institute in Big Rapids to prepare himself for the university, and another year teaching at the local one-room schoolhouse, he enrolled in the University of Michigan in 1899, where he came under the influence of the philosophers Alfred Henry LLOYD and Robert Mark WENLEY. Although Sellars's natural philosophical disposition was quite different from that of his idealist teachers, the subject was his principal interest when he graduated with his BA in 1903. He continued his study of philosophy at Hartford Theological Seminary, the University of Wisconsin, the University of Chicago, and finally back at the University of Michigan. In 1905 he was invited back to the University of Michigan as a replacement instructor, where he stayed as a regular faculty member after receiving his PhD in philosophy from Michigan in 1908. He remained a professor of philosophy at Michigan for over forty years. He spent the academic year 1909–10 in France and Germany where he became acquainted with Henri Bergson and Hans Driesch, in sharp contrast to whom he began to develop his own version of evolutionary naturalism. In 1911 he married a cousin, Helen Maude Stalker, and in the next two years two children were born: Wilfrid Stalker SELLARS, who also became an eminent philosopher, and Cecily Sellars, who became a psychologist.

At the University of Michigan Sellars regularly taught courses in the philosophy of science and his closest associates included many scientists. A particularly close associate was the distinguished neural anatomist, C. Judson Herrick, with whom he frequently discussed scientific perspectives on the mind–body problem. In this scientific environment Sellars's own philosophical perspective was formed and came to fruition. He published prolifically and was duly recognized by the philosophical community. In 1918 he was elected Vice President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association, and in 1923–4 he was President of the Western Division of the APA. He retired from the University of Michigan in 1950 and moved to Ontario, Canada, and to New York where he continued a very active life of writing and lecturing. Sellars moved back to Ann Arbor, Michigan in the early sixties after the death of his wife and daughter. He continued an active life of writing, on some occasions taking up issues developed by his son Wilfrid. Sellars was honored by a special symposium at the University of Notre Dame on the occasion of his ninetieth birthday. He died on 5 September 1973 in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Sellars was a systematic philosopher with epistemology as the keystone of his philosophical system. When he started his academic career in philosophy, idealism was the entrenched orthodoxy and the fashionable current alternative was the kind of direct realism contained in the cooperative volume by Ralph B. PERRY and others, *The New Realism* (1912). As an alternative to both of these options, Sellars articulated a theory of the nature, conditions, and reach of human knowledge that he called "critical realism." His first book, *Critical Realism* (1916), and his contribution to the cooperative volume, *Essays in Critical Realism* (1920) – joined by George SANTAYANA, Charles STRONG, A. O. LOVEJOY, J. B. PRATT, A. K. ROGERS, and Durant DRAKE – were devoted to articulating his critical realism. In this account of knowledge, the mind-independent object was directly known through the mediation of subjective meanings. Perception was the basic cognitive unit and was construed as a complex act consisting of the interpretive grasp of external

objects causally guided by subjective sensory impressions. Sense data were seen not as the objects of perception but only as the means of perceiving, which latter is the fundamental noetic act by which the independent object is disclosed. Perceptual knowing on this account does not terminate in subjective states of mind but in a grasp of an enduring public object to which we must adjust. Sellars, then, was not faced with the daunting task of inferring external things from the knowledge of internal states since what is "directly" though "mediately" known is the external thing via internal discriminations and cues. He viewed this "natural realistic attitude" as the perspective of common sense and saw scientific explanation as continuous with and a refinement of it. By means of higher levels of knowing built upon this basic perceptual knowledge the independent world which is initially disclosed in perception is elaborated in more fine-grained detail by scientific theorizing. Human knowing in its paradigmatic instances is a matter of the gradual disclosure of the structure of the physical world with which we interact.

Much of Sellars's philosophical effort was spent on developing a sophisticated epistemological theory, "critical realism," which would underwrite the realism both of common sense and of science. His theory involved an analysis of the conditions, nature and extent of the various levels of knowledge that kept "directness" in knowledge while allowing "mediation" in the process. At the most basic level he proposed a casual theory of sense data as a functional ingredient in a direct account of perception. Perception is paradigmatically directed toward the group of middle-sized physical objects in our environment but this basic information can be manipulated and extrapolated in sophisticated ways to yield scientific theories that displayed the elemental structure of the same physical world. Human knowing is an affair of levels, an achievement capable of improving as techniques improve.

In virtue of this critically realistic theory of knowledge, Sellars felt that he had put himself in a position to articulate a naturalistic metaphysics and philosophy of mind. He had shown how we could have cognitive access to an independent reality whose structure and characteristics he could now discuss. On the general ontological level Sellars was a materialist, at a time when such a view was not at all fashionable, and the materialism he endorsed was continuous with a realistic understanding of natural science. The entities that ultimately constitute the world are physical systems characterized by intrinsic endurance. The macrocosmic systems we directly encounter are secondary endurants that are ultimately composed of primary endurants the structure and characteristics of which it is the business of physics to determine. Secondary endurants are temporal and contingent while the primary endurants are thought of as eternal and necessary.

Sellars avoided the pitfalls of reductive materialism by stressing the dynamism and organization of matter in such a way as to account for emergent novelty. His acceptance of the significance of organization led him beyond reductive materialism to an evolutionary account which involved emergent properties as a function of organization. In *Evolutionary Naturalism* (1922), Sellars presented a theory of evolutionary levels in nature wherein the higher levels were characterized by genuinely novel properties which emerged from the integrative causality at the lower level. He argued that there are junctures in nature at which critical organization occurs, giving rise to novel properties describable by different kinds of laws. The levels he distinguished were matter, life, mind, and society. The differences between these four levels, though real, were seen ultimately to be matter of degree.

The level in which Sellars was most interested was that involving the emergence of mind. As organisms become more complex they become capable of storing and using past experience to guide their responses to their environment. Organisms capable of this kind of relatively sophisticated behavior are characterized as "minded" and as a class they constitute the

level of mind. This general picture served as the background for Sellars's efforts to deal with what he regarded as the pivotal problem of philosophy, namely, the mind–body problem. He knew that older materialisms foundered on their inability to do justice to the categories of mind and consciousness, and he accepted the burden of showing that his materialism was not similarly deficient. Armed with his critical realist epistemology and his emergent cosmology, Sellars tackled the mind–body problem. The cognitive system is basically the organism, and the mind most specifically is the brain in the context of the central nervous system. Sellars was well aware, however, that this quasi-behavioral account of mind did not of itself do justice to the subjective dimension of human experience, that of consciousness. In addition, we have a self-acquaintance with ourselves that is not reducible to knowledge about ourselves, even as minded. His behavioral account of mind had to be supplemented by an explanation of the privacy of consciousness as well as the phenomenon of introspection.

In contrast to those who maintained that the fact of consciousness points to something other than the brain-mind, Sellars responded that we are not here concerned with two things but simply with two kinds of knowledge of the same thing. The knowledge that objective psychology and neurophysiology present us of the brain-mind is like our knowledge of any other physical system. Consciousness, however, is a function of our bearing a unique relation to one physical system, namely, our own brain, the relation of being literally on the inside of it participating in its function. Our consciousness is the inner qualitative content of that physical system that is our brain, which we also know about the outside. We are not dealing with two things but merely the "inner" and "outer" aspects of the same thing. Its evolutionary role would appear to be related to the level of guidance required for our sophisticated responses to environmental pressures. Evolution has favored those organisms that have a heightened awareness of their environ-

ment and can foresee the consequences of possible actions. Sellars presented an integrated view of these various aspects of his philosophy in *The Philosophy of Physical Realism* (1932).

Although Sellars's reputation was made primarily by his work in epistemology and metaphysics, from his earliest years he was also concerned with the dimension of value both ethical and religious. Early in his career he published *The Next Step in Democracy* (1916) and *The Next Step in Religion* (1918), and one of his very last efforts was *Social Patterns and Political Horizons* (1970). Consistent with his overall vision, he argued for a critical naturalism in values, scientific humanism in religion, and what he called social realism in politics. Against the background of a general theory of value, he developed an account wherein moral rules and standards were to be constructed, informed by a detailed knowledge of the human situation and guided by moral sensitivity. These standards, which are then the expression of a balance of knowledge and feeling, evolve over time with the changing human situation. Secondly, he viewed religion as a pervasive cultural force but one which now should give way in favor of a responsible scientific humanism. He was one of the drafters of the *Humanist Manifesto* (1933), and around the same time he wrote a number of articles for *The New Humanist* explaining and defending humanism as a religion. Although one of his earliest books was in political philosophy, most of his work in this area was done late in life. Here his concern with genuine participative democracy led him in a socialist direction. It was not a utopian socialism, however, but one tempered with an understanding of political realities.

Sellars was a powerful systematic thinker. In publications that spanned over sixty-five years he articulated a coherent vision of a person's place in the world, a vision informed by contemporary science and motivated by genuine humanism. He was a bit out of step with his time. He was a materialist, a metaphysician, and a scientific realist when these

were unfashionable, but he did articulate a unified vision of a kind of naturalism that is more appreciated now than in his day.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Critical Realism (Chicago, 1916).

The Next Step in Democracy (New York, 1916).

The Next Step in Religion (New York, 1918).

"Knowledge and Its Categories" in *Essays in Critical Realism* (New York, 1920).

Evolutionary Naturalism (Chicago, 1922).

The Principles and Problems of Philosophy (New York, 1926).

Religion Coming of Age (New York, 1928).

The Philosophy of Physical Realism (New York, 1932).

Principles of Emergent Realism: Philosophical Essays, ed. W. P. Warren (Lewisburg, Kent., 1973).

Lending a Hand to Hylas (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1968).

Reflections on American Philosophy from Within (Notre Dame, Ind., 1969).

Other Related Works

The Essentials of Logic (Boston, 1917).

The Essentials of Philosophy (New York, 1917).

Social Patterns and Political Horizons (Nashville, Tenn., 1920).

"Realism, Naturalism, and Humanism," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 2, pp. 261–85.

"Philosophy of Organism and Physical Realism," in *The Philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead*, ed. Paul Schilpp (Evanston, Ill., 1941), pp. 405–33.

Ed. with V. J. McGill and Marvin Farber, *Philosophy for the Future: The Quest of Modern Materialism* (New York, 1949).

Principles, Perspectives and Problems of Philosophy (New York, 1970).

"Reflections on the Career of Marvin Farber," in *Phenomenology and Naturalism: Essays in Honor of Marvin Farber*, ed. Dale Riepe (Albany, N.Y., 1973).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v3*, *Proc of APA v47*, Who *Was Who in Amer v6*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Delaney, C. F. *Mind and Nature: A Study of the Naturalistic Philosophies of Cohen, Woodbridge and Sellars* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1969).

Melchert, Norman. *Realism, Materialism and the Mind: The Philosophy of Roy Wood Sellars* (Springfield, Ill., 1968).

The New Scholasticism 45 (April 1971). Special issue on Sellars.

Reck, Andrew J. "The Critical Realism of Roy Wood Sellars," in *The New American Philosophers: An Exploration of Thought since World War II* (Baton Rouge, Louis., 1968), chap. 7.

"A Symposium in Honor of Roy Wood Sellars," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 15 (1954): 1–103. Contains a bibliography of Sellars's writings.

Warren, William P. *Roy Wood Sellars* (Boston, 1975).

C. F. Delaney

SELLARS, Wilfrid Stalker (1912–83)

Wilfrid Sellars was born on 20 May 1912 in Ann Arbor, Michigan. His father, Roy Wood SELLARS, was a naturalistic philosopher of considerable distinction in the first half of the twentieth century. Wilfrid was his father's son both genetically and philosophically. He received a BA from the University of Michigan in 1933,

and an MA from the University of Buffalo in 1934. He then went to the University of Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar, and received a BA with first class honors in philosophy, politics, and economics in 1936. He received an MA from Oxford in 1940. He attended Harvard during the next year, but never completed a PhD degree. Sellars was an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Iowa from 1938 to 1943. After military service in the US Navy from 1943 to 1946, he joined the philosophy faculty at the University of Minnesota. He became full professor in 1951 and served as chair of the philosophy department from 1952 to 1959 (in the last year he was visiting Yale). From 1958 to 1963 he taught at Yale University, and then he moved to the University of Pittsburgh as University Professor of Philosophy and research professor of the history and philosophy of science, a post he held until his death. Sellars was President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1970–71. He died on 2 July 1989 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Sellars was a systematic philosopher, but not a writer of books. His profound influence on the philosophical scene was primarily through his numerous (over one hundred) substantial constructive essays in almost all areas of philosophy. He had a systematic philosophical vision that ranged from logic through language, philosophy of science, metaphysics, and epistemology to ethics, and all the pieces fit together into an integrated whole. Moreover, he was deeply immersed in the history of philosophy and carried on his constructive philosophizing in a running dialogue with the great figures of the past, a point often lost on his more narrowly analytic contemporaries. Substantively he stood firmly in the Kantian tradition (his regular Kant seminar was famous) and was personally influenced by H. A. Prichard, Cook Wilson, J. L. Austin (and through them by Wittgenstein) and in the US by Rudolf CARNAP, W. V. QUINE, and C. I. LEWIS. Through it all he was his own person, fashioning a systematic vision of persons-in-the-world

that was continuous with that of his father while being addressed to a more technically sophisticated philosophical community.

While clearly an "article" philosopher, there was one magnum opus, "Empiricism and the Philosophy of Mind" (1956), which contained a devastating critique of phenomenalism and foundationalism in epistemology in general ("The Myth of the Given"). It also sketched a positive philosophy of mind involving both a verbal behavioral theory of meaning and a functional account of thought. This was followed in 1962 by "Philosophy and the Scientific Image of Man" where he drew the famous distinction between our ordinary understanding of our place in the world, "The Manifest Image," and the more austere explanatory picture, "The Scientific Image," in which what is distinctive about us does not have such a prominent place. The project of philosophy was to fashion a synoptic vision of persons-in-the-world that integrated these two images in a metaphysical picture of how all things fit together in a coherent world.

Sellars's philosophical orientation involved a thoroughgoing critique of Cartesianism in all its guises: foundationalism in epistemology, privileged access to the mental in the philosophy of mind and all dimensions of dualism in metaphysics and ethics – and this critique was thoroughly systematic. Given the systematic character of his thought, however, there is no easy way into his system. But a relatively easy way to approach his thought is through the "myths" and "images" he made famous.

The first of these, "The Myth of the Given," targets the alleged "givenness" of sensory experience and of introspection in turn. Epistemic givenness seems to be required by the threat that without such there would be an infinite regress of justification and thus no justification at all. The thought is that if empirical knowledge is to be ultimately justified it must rest on a foundation of basic knowings of either a perceptual or introspective sort. Sellars agrees that our knowledge cannot be inferential all the way down but calls into question the assump-

tion that these non-inferential starting points must themselves be epistemic. He uses the "Myth of Jones" to dispel this "Myth of the Given."

Jones, a primitive cognizer, does start with non-inferential perceptual beliefs and achieves a non-inferential grasp of his own mental states but in neither case is the belief in question self-justifying. Jones is originally trained to respond to objects in his perceptual field by the appropriate reports in language. These primitive thinkings-out-loud are not inferred from prior beliefs but are the result of training. They are not intrinsically epistemic but derive their epistemic authority from the fact that "we" and ultimately Jones himself can come to see on the basis of reasoning that his report is a good reason to believe that-p. This is not to say that Jones originally inferred that-p but rather that he is now capable of inferring that there is indeed a good reason so to believe; similarly with introspective reports. Just as Jones was trained to respond directly and reliably to perceptual objects, he can also be trained to respond directly and reliably to his own thoughts, in other words, his own short-term propensities to say that-p. The language of "thoughts" and "sensations," items which were originally theoretically postulated to explain features of our behavior, now acquire a new reporting role. Jones can give reliable self-descriptions of what is going on in his own mind without inferring the information from anything else. Moreover, Jones gives these self-descriptions of his own mental states in the language that is basically public and intersubjective. However, the status as knowledge of these reports is not from any kind of privileged access but from the fact that both kinds of reporting claims are judgments bound up in a social framework of justification. Neither report is self-warranting or self-justifying since the justification is proximately a matter of being licensed by certain constitutive principles of our conceptual framework and ultimately a matter of the acceptability of this framework as a whole. Epistemic givenness is seen to be a mere myth.

If Sellars's epistemology and philosophy of mind are anti-Cartesian, his metaphysics is even more stridently so. The realistic postulational epistemology sketched above is "writ large" in his philosophy of science. Rejecting positivist and empiricist philosophies of science, Sellars articulates a robustly realistic view of scientific theories and the entities they postulate. Given his view of the close connection between explanatory power and ontological significance, it is thus reasonable to believe that postulational science provides us with the best account of the structure and make-up of our world. His mantra was "science is the measure of what there is, that it is, and of what there is not, that it is not." The scientific picture of the world is ontologically primary.

Sellars articulates this view through the *manifest image–scientific image* distinction, with the relationship between the two images being far from simple. Though scientific image is ontologically primary, the manifest image is not simply superseded or replaced by it. With the manifest image Sellars means our ordinary conception of the world of macro-objects and persons in which we conceive of ourselves both as thinkers and as agents in common sense. It is the world as theoretically elaborated by Aristotle and his descendants down to Strawson. This picture of the world, although methodologically indispensable, is in the final analysis false. The true picture of the world is the one in the process of being articulated by postulational science. This "Scientific Image" is a genuine rival and one considerably more austere and disenchanted but it is strongly recommended by the increasingly complete and powerful explanations provided by the natural sciences. But Sellars resists reductionism. Although ontologically primary, "the Scientific Image" cannot stand alone. Meanings, abstract terms, norms and ultimately persons must be somehow fused with it into a synoptic vision of the world in which we live and act.

The complication is that "the Scientific Image" is thoroughly naturalistic having no place for Platonic or mentalistic entities of any

sort. Sellars needs accounts of our basic semantical notions that are compatible with this austere naturalistic description of the world. While the surface grammar of our language seems to invite Platonism and mentalism, he sees this invitation as basically misleading. While "meaning" statements seems to require a relational account, Sellars argues on the contrary that they simply classify linguistic items functionally in terms of linguistic roles. Reference and denotation are handled similarly. Second, he continues in the same spirit to explain abstract singular terms with regard to linguistic types which are metalinguistic roles. Next, practical reasoning, actions and norms have to be integrated into the picture and he does this by extending his functional account of thoughts to violations and intentions, especially those we-intentions characteristic of a group, and tying these volitions and intentions to conduct.

This brings him finally to "persons." To think of an individual as a person is to think of it as a member of a community whose we-intentions determine the standards of the community in ways that give rise to those rights and duties that specify membership in it. Hence, the concept of the person is not really reconciled with "the Scientific Image" but rather joined to it in such a way that the world as described by science is now "our" world in virtue of its relation to our purposes and intentions.

Sellars had a powerful philosophical influence on those who entered his sphere but his sphere was smaller than it ought to have been. He was a systematic and historically informed thinker at a time when this was unfashionable and his writing style in contrast to his lecturing was notoriously difficult. But his views are still very much alive in his students and at the University of Pittsburgh, the philosophy department he made famous.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Empiricism and the Philosophy of Mind," *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science, vol. 1: The Foundations of Science and the Concepts of Psychology and Psychoanalysis*, ed. Herbert Feigl and Michael Scriven (Minneapolis, 1956), pp. 253–329. Repr. with an introduction by Richard Rorty and a study guide by Robert Brandom (Cambridge, Mass., 1997).

Science, Perception and Reality (New York and London, 1963).

Philosophical Perspectives (Springfield, Ill., 1967).

Science and Metaphysics: Variations on Kantian Themes (New York, 1968).

Essays in Philosophy and Its History (Dordrecht, 1975).

Naturalism and Ontology: The John Dewey Lecture for 1974 (Reseda, Cal., 1979).

Pure Pragmatics and Possible Worlds: The Early Essays of Wilfrid Sellars, ed. J. Sicha (Reseda, Cal., 1980).

Other Relevant Works

Sellars's papers are at the University of Pittsburgh.

The Metaphysics of Epistemology: Lectures, ed. P. Amaral (Reseda, Cali., 1989).

Kant and Pre-Kantian Themes: Lectures by Wilfrid Sellars, ed. Pedro Amaral (Atascadero, Cal., 2002).

Kant's Transcendental Metaphysics: Sellar's Cassirer Lectures and Other Essays, ed. Jeffrey F. Sicha (Atascadero, Cal., 2002).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils 1950-2000*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Blackwell Analytic Phil*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v8*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*

Alston, William P. "Sellars and the 'Myth of the Given'," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 65 (2002): 69–86.

Aune, Bruce. "Sellar's Two Images of the World," *Journal of Philosophy* 87 (1990): 537–45.

Bonevac, Daniel. "Sellars vs. the Given," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 64 (2002): 1–30.

Castañeda, Hector-Neri, ed. *Action, Knowledge and Reality: Critical Studies in Honor of Wilfrid Sellars* (Indianapolis, Ind., 1974). Contains Sellars's autobiography and bibliography.

Delaney, C. F., et al., eds. *The Synoptic Vision: Essays on the Philosophy of Wilfrid Sellars* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1977).

Dennett, Daniel. "Comment on Wilfrid Sellars," *Synthese* 27 (1974): 439–44.

DeVries, William, and Timm Triplett. *Knowledge, Mind and the Given: Reading Wilfrid Sellars's "Empiricism and the Philosophy of Mind," Including the Complete Text of Sellars's Essay* (Indianapolis, Ind., 2000).

Hochberg, Herbert. "Sellars and Goodman on Predicates, Properties, and Truth," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 3 (1978): 360–68.

Lehrer, Keith, and David Stern. "The 'Denouement' of 'Empiricism and the Philosophy of Mind'," *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 17 (2000): 201–16.

The Monist 65 (July 1983). Special issue on Sellars.

Noûs 7 (May 1973). Special issue on Sellars.

Philosophical Studies 54 (September 1988). Special issue on Sellars.

Philosophical Studies 101 (December 2000). Special issue on Sellars.

Pitt, Joseph C. *Pictures, Images, and Conceptual Change: An Analysis of Wilfred Sellars' Philosophy of Science* (Dordrecht, 1981).

Pitt, Joseph C., ed. *The Philosophy of Wilfrid Sellars* (Dordrecht, 1978).

Putnam, Hilary. "Comment on Wilfrid Sellars," *Synthese* 27 (1974): 445–55.

Quine, W. V. "Sellars on Behaviorism, Language and Meaning," *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 61 (1980): 26–30.

Seibt, Johanna. *Properties as Process. A Synoptic Study of Wilfrid Sellars Nominalism* (Atascadero, Cali., 1990).

C. F. Delaney

SELZNICK, Philip (1919–)

Philip Schachter (he changed his name to Philip Selznick in young adulthood) was born on 8 January 1919 in Newark, New Jersey. He completed his undergraduate education at City College of New York earning a BSS in 1938. He earned an MA in sociology in 1943 and a PhD in sociology in 1947 from Columbia University. He then completed a law degree in 1951 at the University of Utrecht, The Netherlands. He taught sociology at the University of Minnesota in 1946–7 and the University of California at Los Angeles from 1947 to 1952. He joined the sociology faculty of the University of California at Berkeley in 1952, where he created the Center for the Study of Law and Society in 1961. He became a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and in 2003 he won the Law & Society Association's Kalven Prize. He retired in 1984 and remains active at Berkeley as professor emeritus.

Sociologists of Selznick's generation do not think of themselves as doing, or wish to give the impression of doing philosophy. Sociology during this era had already been imbued with positivism and Spencerism, two philosophies of the social that had led the discipline down paths it still prefers to forget. Selznick and his contemporaries rejected both of these earlier projects in favor of Talcott PARSONS's structural functionalism, which stressed both the individual agency and the structural constraints to action that are indicative of modern liberal bureaucratic society.

For Selznick, sociology would not engage in philosophy, but in the formulation of a general theory that would be testable at the level of the "middle range" of conscious actual experience. A general theory, akin to a philosophy of society, would emerge from the careful consideration of particular cases: a theory of institutions emerges from the study of actual existing bureaucracy. This methodology is adopted by Selznick because of the limitations placed on academic knowledge by the "highly contingent" nature of truth. The project would not be

a philosophy of society, but a theory of the social and the dynamics of its stability and change. Selznick's concerns in regard to the need to develop a general theory of "purposive organization" that explains the "informal" and "non-rational" dimensions of trade unions, governments, corporations, parties, social movements, and other formal organizations. These are of special interest because they are "rationally ordered instruments" where people come together to achieve a clearly articulated set of goals. Philosophy to Selznick is too abstract; sociological theory must serve the concrete purpose of guiding social change. His early theory of bureaucracy and organization, his foundational study of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and his later writings on communitarianism all attest to a consistent concern with social change and the rationalization of social life.

An implicit philosophical concern is with the application of pragmatism to sociological theory. Selznick asks questions regarding the relationship of individuals to the social institutions that they directly experience either as workers or citizens. He asks whether in a society characterized by increasing rationalization, can social change understood by Selznick as the working out of Enlightenment, be guided to a successful result by social theory? To Selznick the increasing bureaucratization and expanding anomic mass culture seem to be calling progress into question along with the autonomy of the individual. Selznick later expresses these questions in attempting to construct a liberal communitarism in his later writings on community and morality.

Selznick's *TVA and the Grass Roots: A Study in the Sociology of Formal Organization* (1949) is both a theory of organizations and an institutional history of one of the largest public projects of the New Deal. Along with his *Leadership in Administration* (1957), this work ultimately influenced sociological work in social history, public administration, public policy, and social movements. As Selznick was active in the Socialist-Left movements of the 1930s, he turned his attention in *The Organizational Weapon* (1952) to these same organizations, in particular the Communist Party USA.

Selznick later writes of his "intense, fruitful, and in some ways extraordinary" encounter with American Trotskyism which established "the fate of ideals in the course of social practice … the conditions and processes that frustrate ideals or, instead, give them life and hope" as a central theme of his work. Selznick was also influenced through associations with the feminist sociologist Gertrude Jeager Selznick, the Frankfurt School's Leo Lowenthal, and Daniel BELL by the critique of Enlightenment and progress.

This same contradiction of frustrated ideals that still "give life and hope" is very much present in his later writings on community and communitarianism. During the 1970s Selznick turned towards theoretical writings that would at the same time intervene into those conditions which frustrate social progress. Legal aspects of these social processes first interested him, but he soon turned to the problem of community in contemporary society. He presents community and society as complementary "frames of reference." Much of the communitarian writing of the 1980s by both sociologists and non-sociologists focused on a basic sociological point: there are no well-formed individuals bereft of social bonds or culture. Political philosophers such as Alasdair MACINTYRE and Michael Sandel are "doing sociology." Sociology and communitarianism are in fundamental agreement regarding the social origins of the self, and that communitarians are simply following a historic tendency of sociologists to criticize atomistic individualism. Selznick identifies communitarianism with the central problems of sociology. There is little difference between the communitarian perspective on politics and a proper sociological perspective on society. Selznick points to the vital role that sociological knowledge plays in governing, and the role of communitarianism as a political doctrine based upon sociological principles. Sociological theory occupies a

"special office" in this regard. The goal is to develop a sociological theory of the origins, character, and development of morality, the self, institutions. This theory will be embodied within a liberal communitarianism which will bind liberty to a secure ethic of "social responsibility."

Selznick's work is noteworthy for its contributions to sociological theory and its blending of pragmatism, structural functionalism, and the engaged critical sociological imagination.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

TVA and the Grass Roots: A Study in the Sociology of Formal Organization (Berkeley, Cal., 1949).

The Organizational Weapon: A Study of Bolshevik Strategy and Tactics (New York, 1952).

Sociology: A Text With Adapted Readings (Evanston, Ill., 1955).

Leadership in Administration: A Sociological Interpretation (Evanston, Ill., 1957).

Law, Society, and Industrial Justice (New York, 1969).

Law and Society in Transition: Toward Responsive Law, with Philippe Nonet (New York, 1978).

The Moral Commonwealth: Social Theory and the Promise of Community (Berkeley, Cal., 1992).

The Communitarian Persuasion (New York, 2002).

Further Reading
Cambridge Dict Amer Bio
Kagan, Robert A., Kenneth I. Winston, and Martin Krygier, eds. *Legality and Community: On the Intellectual Legacy of Philip Selznick* (Lanham, Md., 2002).

B. Ricardo Brown

SEN, Amartya Kumar (1933–)

Amartya Sen was born on 3 November 1933 in Santiniketan, located north of Calcutta in West Bengal, India, where the poet, writer and philosopher Rabindranath Tagore founded the Vishvabharati University. His father, Ashutosh Sen, taught chemistry at Dhaka University (now in Bangladesh). Sen began his formal education in Dhaka at St. Gregory's school, but soon moved to Santiniketan. Tagore was a close friend of Sen's maternal grandfather who taught Sanskrit in Santiniketan. Tagore chose the name Amartya, which means immortal in Sanskrit. Sen's mother, Amita Sen, was a writer who performed in many of the dance-dramas that Tagore wrote, and edited a literary magazine in Bengal. Sen received a BA from Presidency College in Calcutta in 1953, majoring in economics with a minor in mathematics. He then attended Trinity College, Cambridge, studying economics for a year. A year later he returned to Calcutta, where he was appointed to a chair in economics at the newly created Jadavpur University. After being awarded the Prize Fellowship from Trinity College in 1955, he returned to Cambridge to study philosophy. He earned a BA from Trinity College in 1956 and received his PhD in philosophy in 1959. During 1960–61, he visited Massachusetts Institute of Technology and spent one summer at Stanford University.

In 1963 Sen became professor of economics at the Delhi School of Economics and at the University of Delhi, and taught there until 1971. He spent one year at the University of California at Berkeley in 1964–5. He joined the faculty of the London School of Economics in 1971, and then moved to the University of Oxford in 1977 as professor of economics, becoming Drummond Professor of Political Economy in 1980. In 1988 Sen went to Harvard University as professor of economics and philosophy. He was appointed as the Master of Trinity College, Cambridge

in 1998. In January 2004 he returned to Harvard University as professor of population and international health. He also is a fellow at Trinity College. Sen received the Nobel Prize in Economics in 1998 for his work on poverty and famine in the subject of welfare economics within the field of development economics. He received the Indira Gandhi Gold Medal Award of the Asiatic Society in 1994, the Eisenhower Medal in the United States in 2000, and the Honorary Companion of Honour in the United Kingdom in 2000.

As a child, Sen was deeply affected by an encounter with a group of famine victims in 1943 who came to his campus and he found out that they had not eaten for about 40 days. Now an Oxbridge academic and Nobel Prize winner, he has spent a lifetime fighting poverty with analysis rather than activism. Known in his native India as the Mother Teresa of economics, his ideas have a global impact.

Sen has been writing about development issues since the mid 1950s and 1960s. From 1957 to 1976 Sen worked on choice of techniques, surplus labor in Indian agriculture, and the rationale for import substitution in Indian planning. His fellowship dissertation on *Choice of Techniques* was published as a book in 1960 and soon went through two more editions. In the second phase, from 1976 onwards, he moved on to welfare economics and challenged the conventional utilitarian theory. He began applied work on the Bengal famine, leading to the concept of entitlement, and branched outwards into intensive studies of poverty and deprivation. This became his remarkable achievement. He studied famines in Bangladesh and sub-Saharan countries and established a new school of thinking. He found that the Bengal famine of 1943 was a man-made one and could have been prevented if free media were active. The result of Sen's study is the creation of a new set of concepts in economics and philosophy with human concerns at the center. The Nobel Prize committee recognized Sen's contribution in the field of development economics with a particular interest in the impoverished members of society.

Sen has made significant contribution to at least four fields: social choice theory, welfare economics, economic measurement, and development economics. Sen attempted to rescue welfare economics from two extremes. On the one hand, the pessimistic free-marketers argue that there is no point in government intervention and that the individuals should be left to choose whatever the market made available in response to their choices. On the other hand, the statists conclude that authoritarian choices had to be made by governments on other people's behalf. Sen argued that perfection in social decision-making is unnecessary. Partial comparisons between people can help and majority decisions do carry weight, as long as the interests of the less assertive citizens are not ignored.

The strongest features of Sen's work, joining his economics and philosophy together, are ethics and a sense of common humanity. He not only measured poverty in economic terms, he also understood poverty as a lack of capability to understand. His concern is about economic justice. There is more to well-being than can be measured by GDP statistics.

In his book *Development as Freedom* (1999), Sen argues that while markets have many merits, they should not be followed blindly as providing the solution to every problem. One should focus, not on efficiency or utility or procedural justice or rights, but on the substantive economic, social, and political freedoms that enhance the lives individuals are able to lead. Sen shows how this approach not only reveals the shortcomings in many dominant approaches to economics and political philosophy, but also gives one way of understanding the basic dilemmas of global poverty and development. Economic and political freedoms are not mutually exclu-

sive but are interlinked. Democracy is necessary for economic development. He has great faith in freedom as broadly conceived, which includes political freedom, economic facilities, social opportunities, transparency guarantees, and protective security (the five "instrumental freedoms"), which provide the safety nets of adversely affected groups. Markets need to be supplemented with social safety nets, and economic growth must co-exist with local cultures.

One of the key notions in Sen's work is the concept of capability, and the theoretical framing of his ideas is sometimes referred to as the capability approach. Sen stresses the central concern with capabilities and not on theory. He argues consistently through all his writings about the importance of public participation and dialogue and therefore the need for any framework of thinking to be open enough to be utilized in diverse settings: hence the use of the term "approach." Sen's notion of capabilities derives from a distinction he draws between functionings and capabilities. The significance of the distinction is very marked when one considers how social policy is evaluated. Capabilities are actions one values doing, as Sen says, "Valued doings and beings." Functionings, on the other hand, are what one actually manages to achieve, such as consumption, self-respect, or participation in the community. If one evaluates social policy only in terms of functionings, without taking into account capabilities, one may get very skewed results. Sen's famous example that illustrates this contrasts two men who are hungry. One man is fasting because of religious conviction. The second man has nothing to eat because he has no money, no opportunity to earn money to buy food and no chance to establish social relations that will provide him with food. If one evaluated only functionings (eating), one would view the situation of the two as the same. However, if one evaluates capabilities, one looks at how the man who is fasting has chosen not to eat, but may choose differently in other circumstances. He has freedom and rationality. The man who cannot buy food has not chosen to go hungry. His rationality concerning gaining enough to eat is not accompanied by conditions of freedom. An evaluation that fails to take account of opportunities for gaining an income, establishing social relations and having freedom of choice – including religious freedom – would be very partial, and would not address the heart of the social injustice.

In *Poverty and Famines* (1981), Sen used "entitlements" as his organizing concept to demonstrate that famines are often not explained by food shortage or distribution, but by disruptions in peoples' rights to food. This book is a mathematically sophisticated work on poverty measurement and social-choice theory. Sen backed up his argument with mathematical models and detailed micro-economic data on regional and occupation-specific income patterns. For instance, he showed that during the 1974 famine in Bangladesh, which coincided with a peak year of food availability, those most likely to starve were rural laborers who had lost their jobs and thus their wages.

In addition to the books that Amartya Sen has written and the lectures that have been published, another significant contribution that he has made is participating in the United Nations' annual *Human Development Report* which assesses countries not just by their GNP but also by their achievements in areas such as health, education, gender equality, and political liberty. The report includes an index, which is today a widely cited alternative to the World Bank's more narrowly conceived ranking of economic development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Choice of Techniques (Oxford, 1960).
Collective Choice and Social Welfare (San Francisco, 1970).
On Economic Inequality (Oxford, 1973).
"Starvation and Exchange Entitlements: A General Approach and Its Application to

the Great Bengal Famine," *Cambridge Journal of Economics 1* (1977): 33–61.

"Utilitarianism and Welfarism," *Journal of Philosophy* 74 (1979): 463–89.

Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation (Oxford, 1981).

Choice, Welfare, and Measurement (Cambridge, Mass., 1982).

Resources, Values, and Development (Cambridge, Mass., 1984).

Commodities and Capabilities (Amsterdam, 1985; 2nd edn, Oxford, 1999).

On Ethics and Economics (Oxford, 1987).

Inequality Reexamined (Cambridge, Mass., 1992).

Development as Freedom (New York, 1999).

Rationality and Freedom (London, 2002).

Other Relevant Works

Employment, Technology and Development: A Study Prepared for the International Labour Office within the Framework of the World Employment Programme (Oxford, 1975).

Ed. with Bernard Williams, *Utilitarianism and Beyond* (Cambridge, UK, 1982).

Ed. with Martha C. Nussbaum, *Quality of Life* (Oxford, 1993).

Further Reading

Oxford Comp Phil

Alkire, Sabina. *Valuing Freedoms: Sen's Capability Approach and Poverty Reduction* (Oxford, 2002).

Basu, K., P. Pattanaik, and K. Suzumura, eds. *Choice, Welfare, and Development: A Festschrift in Honour of Amartya K. Sen* (Oxford, 1995).

Chapman, Bruce. "Rights and Constraints: Nozick versus Sen," *Theory and Decision* 15 (1983): 1–10.

Crocker, David A. "Functioning and Capability: The Foundations of Sen's and Nussbaum's Development Ethic," *Political Theory* 20 (1992): 584–612.

Nunan, Richard. "Harsanyi vs Sen: Does Social Welfare Weigh Subjective Preferences?" *Journal of Philosophy* 78 (1981): 586–9.

Putnam, Hilary. "Fact and Value in the World of Amartya Sen," in *The Collapse of the Fact/Value Dichotomy and Other Essays* (Cambridge, Mass., 2002), pp. 46–64.

"Symposium on Amartya Sen's Philosophy," *Economics and Philosophy* 17 (April 2001): 1–88.

Krishna Mallick

SHARP, Frank Chapman (1866–1943)

Frank Chapman Sharp was born on 30 July 1866 in Union City, New Jersey, and died on 4 May 1943 in Madison, Wisconsin. He was the son of Alexander Hall and Eliza Jeanette (Chute) Sharp. He graduated with a BA in 1887 from Amherst College. After working as a tutor, he enrolled at the University of Berlin where he earned a PhD in philosophy in 1892. At the time he went to Germany, American universities were just starting to develop graduate work, while German universities were known as leading the world. In 1892–3, Sharp taught German at the Condon School for Boys in New York City. While teaching at Condon, Sharp also held a position as head worker at the University Settlement. In 1893 he became an instructor of philosophy at the University of Wisconsin where he stayed until his retirement in 1936. In 1896 he was promoted to assistant professor, and in 1905 he became full professor. Sharp was a member of various organizations including the Western Philosophical Association of which he was President in 1907–1908, Phi Beta Kappa, the American Philosophical Association, Chi Phi, and the University Club of Madison, Wisconsin.

In 1893 Sharp published his first book, *The Aesthetic Element in Morality*. He contributed many articles to philosophical journals, including the *International Journal of Ethics*, where he primarily discussed ethical issues and moral problems. His most important book was *Ethics* (1928). His last book *Business Ethics* (1937) was also significant as a nearly unique treatment of the subject, staying in print for forty years.

Sharp is considered one of the pioneers of business ethics. Some of the topics discussed in *Business Ethics* were: fair service, fair treatment of moral competitors, and moral progress in the business world. One of the main themes of the book is to help the reader evaluate which business practices are right and which are wrong. Sharp states that although there are a minority of businessmen who make their living through racketeering, it would be libelous to characterize all businessmen as only interested in making money without caring at all about what is right and wrong. He gives examples of right and wrong business practices and cites their characteristics. Describing a fair exchange, for example, Sharp points out that in this type of transaction both parties know what they are getting and giving. An example of an unethical business practice would be over-persuasion because it is based upon preying on another's weakness of will.

During his years of teaching at Wisconsin, Sharp was known as an incisive and conscientious teacher. Students described him as always ready to help those who were searching for explanations on the difficult subject of ethical conduct; and he had a reputation for leading students to insights that made them explore topics more thoroughly. The Frank Chapman Sharp Memorial Prize has been awarded since 1990 by the American Philosophical Association for work on the philosophy of war and peace.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Aesthetic Element in Morality and Its Place in a Utilitarian Theory of Morals (New York, 1893).
Shakespeare's Portrayal of the Moral Life (New York, 1902).
A Study of the Influence of Custom on the Moral Judgment (Madison, Wisc., 1908).
Success: A Course in Moral Instruction for the High School (Madison, Wisc., 1909; 2nd edn 1913).
Education for Character: Moral Training in the School and Home (Indianapolis, 1917).
Ethics (New York, 1928).
Business Ethics: Studies in Fair Competition, with Philip G. Fox (New York, 1937; 1965).

Other Relevant Works
Sharp's papers are at the University of Wisconsin.
Good Will and Ill Will: A Study of Moral Judgments (Chicago, 1950).

Further Reading
Nat Cycl Amer Bio v33, *Pres Addr of APA v1*, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v54*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Vivas, Elisio. "Ethical Empiricism and Moral Heteronomy," *Philosophical Review* 49 (1940): 447–53.

Hani Morgan

SHEFFER, Henry Maurice (1882–1964)

Henry M. Sheffer was born on 1 September 1882 in Ukraine, Russia. When he was ten years old, his family emigrated to the United States and settled in Boston, where he attended Boston Latin School. He then went to Harvard University, receiving his BA in 1905, MA in 1907, and PhD in philosophy in 1908 for his dissertation titled "A Program of Philosophy Based on Modern Logic." The readers for his

dissertation were philosopher Josiah ROYCE, psychologist Edwin B. HOLT, and mathematician Edward V. HUNTINGTON. Sheffer studied logic in Europe on a Sheldon Traveling Fellowship for two years, and then taught at a series of universities for one year each: Seattle, Cornell, Minnesota, Missouri, and City College of New York. In 1916 he became an assistant professor of philosophy at Harvard University, was promoted up to full professor in 1938, and taught at Harvard until his retirement in 1952. Sheffer died on 17 March 1964 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Sheffer was strongly influenced by Royce and, through Royce, by Charles Sanders PEIRCE. Reflecting on the early 1930s, W. V. QUINE wrote that "American philosophers associated Harvard with logic because of Whitehead, Sheffer, Lewis, and the shades of Peirce and Royce ..." (1985, p. 83). When Sheffer taught logic during the 1930–31 academic year, he still talked of papers by Oswald VEBLEN and Huntington, as well as of aspects of Bertrand Russell and Alfred North WHITEHEAD's *Principia Mathematica* and of some of his own work, while mentioning David Hilbert only so as to reject his formalism (Quine 1985, p. 82).

Sheffer's most important contribution to logic was the logical operator now called the "Sheffer stroke," which is also known as the NAND (*Not AND*) operator: p NAND q is true if and only if not both p and q are true. This single logical operator can be used to construct any Boolean function. Sheffer presented his logical operator in a 1913 paper "A Set of Five Independent Postulates for Boolean Algebras with Application to Logical Constants," one of his very few publications. Although the term "Boolian algebra" originated with Peirce, who used it in the manuscript "A Boolian Algebra with One Constant" of the winter of 1880–81 (Peirce 1989, pp. 218–21), and also "Note on the Boolian Algebra" of fall 1881 to spring 1882 (Peirce 1989, pp. 264–6), this term's earliest appearance in print seems to be in Sheffer's 1913 article.

Peirce anticipated the Sheffer stroke as well in "A Boolian Algebra with One Constant." In this paper, Peirce also presents the Peirce arrow (or the NOR operator) which is the only other logical operator that can by itself provide for a truth-functionally complete set. Because Peirce's books and manuscripts did not reach Harvard until late 1914, it seems that Sheffer discovered his logical operator without knowledge or benefit of Peirce's work. There is no evidence that Royce or anyone else could have conveyed knowledge of Peirce's work on this aspect of logic to Sheffer. Peirce biographer Joseph Brent says that it could only have been after the autumn of 1926, when Paul WEISS first arrived at Harvard, that Weiss discovered in a basket marked "to be discarded" one of Peirce's most important papers in logic titled "A Boolian Algebra with One Constant" (Brent 1996, §16). Written about 1880, while Peirce was at Johns Hopkins University, it proposed a Boolean algebra with one constant and was "a striking anticipation" of Sheffer's identical proposal. There is, unfortunately, no means of ascertaining *when* this document was placed in the "to be discarded" basket, or by *whom* it was placed there.

Bertrand Russell's "most immediate" reference in the lectures on logical atomism in which a "modified truth table" occurred were to papers by Sheffer and Jean Nicod, and he notes the use to which the Sheffer stroke could be put to reduce the number of propositions required for *Principia*. Shosky (1997, p. 11) argues therefore that Sheffer relied "on Frege's use of material implication and at least the truth table technique" to arrive at the Sheffer stroke, and that Russell derived the truth table matrix independently. However, one of the columns in the matrix defining the sixteen binary connectives includes what has come down to us as the Sheffer stroke (along with its negation, Peirce's arrow). Peirce's influence on Sheffer's work was decided, and it appears that Sheffer borrowed the multiplication tables used by Peirce to apply to logic (Grattan-Guinness 1997, p. 600). Sheffer's work on

truth tables occurs in a mimeographed manuscript titled "General Theory of Notational Relativity" (1921) which Sheffer circulated among his friends and colleagues, and which was the basis of a talk given by Sheffer at the Sixth International Congress of Philosophy, held at Harvard in September 1926, summarized in Sheffer (1927). But Sheffer's methods differed from the truth-table method as we know it today (Grattan-Guinness 1997, p. 600).

The Sheffer stroke has proved fruitful for logic, leading, for example, to the development of combinatory logic. Nicod (1917) simplified the axiom system developed by Sheffer. Using the Sheffer stroke, the second edition of *Principia Mathematica* (Russell and Whitehead 1925, pp. xv–xix) replaces the five primitive propositions *1.2–*1.6 of the first edition. In his "New Sets of Independent Postulates for the Algebra of Logic" (1933), Huntington took a cue both from Peirce's "A Boolian Algebra with One Constant" and Sheffer's "A Set of Five Independent Postulates for Boolean Algebras" to demonstrate that a Boolean algebra could be defined in terms of a single binary and a single unary operation. Moses Schönfinkel was the creator of combinatory logic. In his 1924 article "Über die Bausteine der mathematischen Logik," he developed a system which was constructed as an extension of the concept of the Sheffer stroke to first-order functional calculus. Schönfinkel presented a universal connective U of mutual exclusivity which reduces all functions to single-valued functions and treats the values of these functions as truth-values. Thus, for a binary relation $F(x, y)$, we construct the single-valued function $fX(y)$; and for classes F and G of Schönfinkel's system, we rewrite UFG as (UF)G, which is to be translated as "F and G are mutually exclusive (classes)." We can define the usual logical connectives of propositional calculus in terms of U, and eliminate the variables of first-order, and even higher-order, functional calculi.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Ineffable Philosophies," *Journal of Philosophy* 6 (1909): 123–9.

"A Set of Five Independent Postulates for Boolean Algebras with Application to Logical Constants," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 14 (1913): 481–8.

"Notational Relativity," in *Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress of Philosophy*, ed. Edgar S. Brightman (New York, 1927), pp. 348–51.

"Quantifiers," in *Freedom and Experience: Essays Presented to Horace M. Kallen*, ed. Sidney Hook and Milton R. Konvitz (Cornell, N.Y., 1947), pp. 313–16.

Other Relevant Works
Sheffer's papers are at Harvard University.
"General Theory of Notational Relativity," mimeographed manuscript, 1921.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v38, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*

Anellis, Irving H. "Peirce Rustled, Russell Pierced: How Charles Peirce and Bertrand Russell Viewed Each Other's Work in Logic, and an Assessment of Russell's Accuracy and Role in the Historiography of Logic," *Modern Logic* 5 (1995): 270–328.

Brent, Joseph. "The Singular Experience of the Peirce Biographer," in *Spaces and Significations*, ed. Roberta Kevelson (New York, 1996).

Grattan-Guinnes, Ivor. "Benjamin Peirce's *Linear Associative Algebra* (1870): New Light on Its Preparation and 'Publication'," *Annals of Science* 54 (1997): 597–606.

Henle, Paul, Horace M. Kallen, and Susanne K. Langer, eds. *Structure, Method, and Meaning: Essays in Honor of Henry M. Sheffer* (New York, 1951).

Huntington, Edward V. "New Sets of Independent Postulates for the Algebra of

Logic," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 35 (1933): 274–304, 557–8, 971.

Nicod, Jean G. P. "A Reduction of the Number of Primitive Propositions of Logic," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 19 (1917): 32–41.

Peirce, Charles S. *Writings of Charles S. Peirce, vol. 4: 1879–1884*, ed. Christian J. W. Kloesel (Bloomington, Ind., 1989).

Quine, W. V. *The Time of My Life: An Autobiography* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985).

Scanlan, Michael. "The Known and Unknown H. M. Sheffer," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 36 (2000): 193–224.

Schönfinkel, Moses. "Über die Bausteine der mathematischen Logik," *Mathematische Annalen* 94 (1924): 305–16.

Shosky, John. "Russell's Use of Truth Tables," *Russell: Journal of the Bertrand Russell Archives* 17 (Summer 1997): 11–26.

Irving H. Anellis

SHELDON, Wilmon Henry (1875–1980)

Wilmon H. Sheldon was born on 4 April 1875 in Newton, Massachusetts, and died on 26 February 1980 in Rutland, Vermont. His degrees were all from Harvard University: BA (1895), MA (1896), and PhD in philosophy (1899). Written under the direction of Josiah ROYCE, his dissertation was titled "The Identity of the Theoretical and Practical Attitudes." He also studied with William JAMES and George SANTAYANA. Sheldon taught philosophy at the University of Wisconsin (1899–1900), Harvard University (1901–1903), Columbia University (1903–1905), Princeton University (1905–1909),

and Dartmouth College (1909–20). In 1920 he became a professor of philosophy at Yale University, where he chaired the department from 1923 to 1926. Sheldon became Clark Professor of Philosophy in 1936, and held that position until his retirement as emeritus professor in 1943. He was President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1921–2; Nathaniel Taylor Lecturer at Yale Divinity School in 1936; Mahlon Powell Lecturer at Indiana University in 1942; F. J. E. Woodbridge Lecturer at Columbia University in 1943; and G. H. Howison Lecturer at the University of California at Berkeley in 1943.

Jean Wahl's remark in 1920 that for Sheldon the reconciliation of philosophies is *un effort longuement poursuivi* was not an overstatement – and the effort continued undiminished until his death sixty years later. Sometimes Sheldon found another philosophic type to reconcile, and sometimes he developed a new method of reconciliation, but the general intent persisted over his entire career. This creed he expressed succinctly: "It is better to be broad in our sympathies, to embrace conflicting doctrines in the hope of later reconciling them … than to retain a narrow and unprogressive consistency." Closely related to his belief in reconciliation is his belief that philosophic types represent basic human needs. Reconciliation is represented as a conservation of value. The best philosophy, then, is the philosophy that appeals to the most lasting values; after many centuries of weeding, humankind has settled on the basic philosophical types as representing those values. The single most lasting of all values is the value of the conservation of those types (reconciliation). Historical eclecticism is not what Sheldon has in mind. To him, reality cannot be metaphysically understood without knowledge of the distinct ways in which it has been understood in the past. No one could be less interested in historical scholarship for its own sake. For Sheldon, philosophy has a "job" to do in contemporary civilization. The types of philosophy must be organized so that a unified

view is achieved, a view that can serve as a "guide of life." He modestly admits the fallibility of the unified view he offers and hopes that it will be improved in the future. The choosing and arranging of types is something that must be done constantly. It is significance rather than precision he values; it is the search by each generation for *some* significant arrangement that is invaluable, not any supposedly ideal arrangement.

In his metaphilosophy Sheldon develops a theory of the relations between philosophical types and sometimes claims that this theory is itself a metaphysics describing the generic traits of the real when actually, as a metaphilosophy, it cannot describe more than the generic traits of philosophy. When he finds that philosophical types are related in polar ways, he draws the dubious inference that in any true ontology there must be polar pairs corresponding to the conceptions of the real in the ontologies between which he has found polar relations.

Sheldon declared war on all "analysis," from the "critical" method to recent linguistic philosophy. The fervor of his guide-of-life view is largely a reaction against analysis. He is in dead earnest, has high hopes for philosophy, and is not willing to see its position in the world drop to that of a mere game. Philosophy is not worth its salt unless it can produce a body of usable doctrine, and usable doctrine can be found only by "doing things" in the world, not by debating the logical justification for doing anything.

In his early work Sheldon spoke sometimes in terms of guides and sometimes in terms of maps without making a distinction between the two. In his eagerness to denounce analysis, he ignored the fact that there are philosophers who are neither analysts nor metaphysicians of his own kind. When he recognized exceptions to this disjunction, he also recognized the usefulness of a distinction between maps and guides. One exception that especially impressed him was existentialism. He finds heartwarming existentialism's concern for human acts (its emphasis on a guide of life) but feels that it leaves something important to be desired,

namely a map of the universe. The existentialists are so taken with humanity that they have suppressed nature. They propose to guide human action in a universe they have left unintelligible. In a quite different way, process philosophy, Sheldon thinks, also omits a map of the universe. One might suppose that, since process philosophy is so interested in science, it is interested in a map of the universe. However, it is interested in science only as a *method*, not as a body of results. Method is lost without results, as a guide of life is lost without a map. It avails one not at all to know precisely how to act if one knows nothing about what one is going to act on.

Sheldon's career-long effort to reconcile systems shifted the battleground from metaphysics to metaphilosophy. He settled the strife by adopting an unorthodox metaphilosophy, but now the question is whether philosophers will agree on the metaphilosophy. Is there any reason to suppose that they will agree more on that than they did in the first place?

After publishing his most comprehensive metaphysical work, *God and Polarity: A Synthesis of Philosophies* (1954) Sheldon published three books of nontechnical philosophy in which attention to love took the place of his earlier attention to polarity and reconciliation of types of philosophy: *Sex and Salvation* (1955), *Rational Religion: The Philosophy of Christian Love* (1962), and *Agapology: The Rational Love-Philosophy Guide of Life* (1965).

Well into his eighties Sheldon regularly attended meetings of the New York Philosophy Club where there were lively debates among philosophers teaching as far away as Princeton and Yale. Club members remembered him fondly. Sidney HOOK's recollections are especially telling:

There was something very lovable about the catholicity of Sheldon's mind – he was always ready to recognize a positive contribution in any philosophical position even when he couldn't accept a single argument offered in its behalf. Sometimes I was

troubled by this intellectual hospitality … . There were three things I admired in Sheldon's writing and philosophical discourse. First was his ingenuity. There was an Aristotelian homeliness about his approach which enabled him to use the facts of ordinary experience to drive home his points on abstract questions of causation and teleology. Second was his honesty. He never concealed his prejudices. He would articulate them as if they were the most natural things in the world … . Finally, there was a playfulness about Sheldon's philosophical discussions. One got the impression that he took philosophy with the greatest seriousness but at the same time that he didn't take any particular philosophical position very seriously. (Hook 1965)

Among members of both the New York Philosophy Club and the American Philosophical Association Sheldon was famous for taking pride in emulating Socrates in the *Symposium*. A former student, David Bidney, wrote him: "I could never match your unrivalled Socratic ability to enjoy the spirit of alcohol while discoursing shrewdly and humorously about life and nature." Another former student, Richard BRANDT, recalled: "Like Socrates, you can spend a happy evening and see most philosophers my age under the table!"

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Strife of Systems and Productive Duality: An Essay in Philosophy (Cambridge, Mass., 1918).

"On the Nature of Mind," *Journal of Philosophy* 38 (1941): 197–207.

America's Progressive Philosophy (New Haven, Conn., 1942).

Process and Polarity (New York, 1944).

"Critique of Naturalism," *Journal of Philosophy* 42 (1945): 253–70.

"The Criterion of Reality," *Review of Metaphysics* 1 (1948): 3–37.

God and Polarity: A Synthesis of Philosophies (New Haven, Conn., 1954).

Sex and Salvation (New York, 1955).

Rational Religion: The Philosophy of Christian Love (New York, 1962).

Agapology: The Rational Love-Philosophy Guide of Life (Boston, 1965).

Other Relevant Works

Sheldon's papers are at Yale University.

"The Metaphysical Status of Universals," *Philosophical Review* 14 (1905): 195–203.

"A Definition of Causation," *Journal of Philosophy* 11 (1914): 197–208, 253–64, 309–20, 365–76.

"Necessary Truths and Necessary Being," *Journal of Philosophy* 26 (1929): 197–209.

"Science, Philosophy, and Certainty," *Philosophical Review* 39 (1930): 243–57.

"Some Bad Results of Kant's Thought," in *The Heritage of Kant*, ed. G. T. Whitney and D. F. Bowers (Princeton, N.J., 1939), pp. 163–79.

"The Task of Present-day Metaphysics," in *American Philosophy Today and Tomorrow*, ed. Horace Kallen and Sidney Hook (New York, 1935), pp. 449–61.

"Mailbag: Excerpts from Letters Edited with Comments by Brand Blanshard," *Philosophical Review* 54 (1945): 197–259.

"What Can Western Philosophy Contribute to Eastern?" *Philosophy East and West 5* (1956): 291–304.

Conversations with Sheldon, ed. John MacPartland, (New York, 1976).

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v3, *Proc of APA v54*, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Burtt, Edwin A. "The Problem of Philosophic Method," *Philosophical Review* 55 (1946): 505–33.

Hare, Peter H. "W. H. Sheldon's Philosophy of Polarity: A Metaphilosophy," *The Personalist* 48 (1967): 200–16.

Hook, Sidney. Paper presented at New York Philosophy Club, 25 March 1965. In the Sheldon Papers at Yale University.

Krikorian, Y. H. "Sheldon's Synthetic Metaphysics," *Journal of Philosophy* 52 (1955): 365–80.

Maritain, Jacques. "Philosophical Cooperation and Intellectual Justice," *Modern Schoolman* 22 (1944): 1–15.

Randall, John Herman, Jr. "A Note on Mr. Sheldon's Mind," *Journal of Philosophy* 42 (1946): 209–14.

Reck, Andrew J. "Wilmon H. Sheldon's Philosophy of Philosophy," *Tulane Studies in Philosophy* 7 (1958): 111–28.

Wahl, Jean. "Sheldon's 'Strife of Systems'," *Revue Philosophique* 89 (1920): 447–56.

Peter Hewitt Hare

SHERBURNE, Donald Wynne (1929–)

Donald Sherburne was born on 21 April 1929 in Proctor, Vermont. He entered Middlebury College in 1947, and graduated valedictorian of his class with BA degrees in philosophy and English and Phi Beta Kappa membership in 1951. He was awarded a Dutton Fellowship to study at Oxford University where he earned a BA in philosophy, politics, and economics in 1953. He was drafted into the US Army and served from 1954 to 1956. Upon discharge, he entered Yale University where he earned his PhD in philosophy in 1960. With the addition of one chapter and some minor revisions, his dissertation was published by Yale University Press in 1961 as *A Whiteheadian Aesthetic: Some Implications of Whitehead's Metaphysical Speculation*. Sherburne's love for A. N. WHITEHEAD's metaphysics never waned, and most of his scholarly activity has been devoted to developing and furthering Whitehead's work. Certainly one of his most significant contributions to Whiteheadian scholarship is his co-editorship, with David Ray Griffin, of the notoriously messy first edition of *Process and Reality*, which resulted in the Corrected Edition published in 1978.

In 1960 Sherburne accepted a philosophy position at Vanderbilt University, where he taught until his retirement in 1995. During his tenure at Vanderbilt, he served as department chair for two terms, 1973–80 and 1990–94. He was a senior fellow with the National Endowment for the Humanities in 1977–8, and received the Jeffrey Nordhaus Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching in 1984. He was President of the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology in 1979, and President of the Metaphysical Society of America in 1994. He currently serves on the editorial advisory board for *Process Studies* (since 1971) and is an editorial consultant for *Philosophy and Religious Archives* (since 1978). He has delivered dozens of invited presentations, including the John Dewey Lecture at the University of Vermont, the Mahlon Powell Lecture at Indiana University, and the Matchette Lectures at Emory University and the Catholic University of America.

While A. N. Whitehead is the central figure in the vast majority of Sherburne's work, his primary concern has been to do justice to humanity as part of nature. Indeed, his interpretation of Whitehead is centered on this theme, going all the way back to *A Whiteheadian Aesthetic*. Sherburne's later encounter with continental philosophy, especially figures such as Albert Camus, Jean-Paul Sartre, and Maurice Merleau-Ponty, has enriched and deepened this quest for naturalism. Sherburne recognizes that Whitehead is often seen as a peculiar philosopher with an esoteric vocabulary, making his work seem insular. Sherburne is dedicated to showing the depths of Whitehead's connections and contributions to the broader philosophical community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Whiteheadian Aesthetic: Some Implications of Whitehead's Metaphysical Speculation (New Haven, Conn., 1961).

"Meaning and Music," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 24 (1966): 57–83.

A Key to Whitehead's Process and Reality (New York, 1966).

"Whitehead Without God," *The Christian Scholar* 50 (1967): 251–72.

"Whitehead's Psychological Physiology," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 7 (1969): 401–7.

"Reason and the Claim of Ulysses: A Comparative Study of Two Rationalists, Blanshard and Whitehead," *Idealistic Studies* 4 (1974): 18–34.

"Mais où sont les neiges d'Antan?" in *Metaphysics as Foundation: Essays in Honor of Ivor Leclerc*, ed. P. Bogaard and G. Treash (New York, 1992), pp. 111–21.

"Whitehead and Dewey on Experience and System," in *Frontiers in American Philosophy*, vol. 1 (College Station, Tex., 1992), pp. 95–101.

"Some Reflections on Sartre's Nothingness and Whitehead's Perishing," *Review of Metaphysics* 48 (1994): 3–17.

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with David Ray Griffin, *Process and Reality: Corrected Edition*, by Alfred North Whitehead (New York, 1978).

Ed. with Januze Polanowski, *Whitehead's Philosophy: Points of Connection* (New York, 2004).

Further Reading

Cobb, John B., Jr. "The 'Whitehead without God' Debate: The Critique," *Process Studies* 1 (1971): 91–100.

———, "Sherburne on Providence," *Process Studies* 23 (1994): 25–9.

Valenza, Robert J. "Aesthetic Priority in Science and Religion," *Process Studies* 31 (2002): 49–76.

William T. Myers

SHIELDS, Charles Woodruff (1825–1904)

Charles Woodruff Shields was born on 4 April 1825 in New Albany, Indiana. He attended several classical schools as befitted the son of Hannah Woodruff and James Reed Shields, who was a jurist and founding father of the new Midwestern state. In 1844 he graduated with a BA from the College of New Jersey, and for three years thereafter he studied at the nearby Princeton Theological Seminary, obtaining a BD in 1847. After ordination in 1849 he married, resided in Brooklyn, New York, and filled various pulpits temporarily in churches throughout Long Island. In 1850 the young preacher became minister of the Second Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and quickly gained a reputation for an ability to discourse persuasively on a great many topics. Shortly after arriving in Philadelphia, he published a short treatise on the intriguing topic of "Philosophia Ultima," an ambitious project that eventually diverted his professional concentration from clerical to academic themes.

There was something in Shields's perspective and inclination that sought wholeness or "complete philosophy" in whatever topic he contemplated. During his ministerial years, for instance, he sought greater harmony among the mainstream Protestant denominations that existed around him. Most of these orthodox Christian churches were, he held, essentially the same in their central doctrines. They had also successfully retained historical patterns of ecclesiastical management. Shields sought to add an inclusive form of group worship to these other elements and thus use liturgy as well as compatible creeds and polity to help reunite denominations into a harmonious American Protestantism. His effort to produce guidelines for worship among churches with simplistic liturgies, particularly in offering a book of common prayer for Presbyterians, was a significant example of his pervasive interest in reconciling apparently disparate elements of a topic into a more inclusive, integrated, system.

On a more intellectually challenging level Shields was determined to reconcile the findings of modern science with the conventional tenets of Christian belief. This was not a new objective in his day, but in 1865 wealthy friends raised enough funds to establish a professorship of the harmony of science and revealed religion at the College of New Jersey (later Princeton University), the first of its kind in any American school of higher learning. Shields occupied that chair created expressly for him from 1866 until his retirement in 1903, a year before his death. He died on 26 August 1904 at his summer home in Newport, Rhode Island.

Shields defended Christian orthodoxy with polished lectures, compelling eloquence, and personal aplomb. The fact that he decided to enter Episcopal orders, becoming a deacon in 1898 and being ordained priest the following year, serves as an additional indication of his concern for compromise, conciliation, and inclusiveness. He wanted to incorporate data from various forms of inquiry into a single field of philosophical understanding where discrete elements could be made mutually to support each other. In this "philosophia ultima" he hoped to reconcile apparent conflicts between scientific findings about the natural world and Christian theological statements regarding similar phenomena. In such a survey one could, he maintained, return to the use of theology as a science of religion, assuming a more philosophical position that avoided parochial concerns, especially catechetical indoctrination. Since philosophical concepts and procedures lay at the heart of both religion and science, Shields hoped to use balanced analysis as a common denominator between the two categories in order to adjudicate what seemed to be contradictory claims between them. His personal efforts formed the basis for graceful lectures, and these in turn were published in a number of books that reached a much wider audience by the end of the nineteenth century.

In spite of his quest for a comprehensive philosophical overview that harmonized the burgeoning fields of biology, physics, psychology, biblical criticism, and systematic theology, Shields is to be remembered more for his attempt than for anything approaching fulfillment. As scientific knowledge increased exponentially, it became impossible for one person to comprehend all of it. Yet the integrative ideal remains, and Shields is noteworthy as one who perpetuated both the hope and challenge to later generations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Philosophia Ultima (Philadelphia, 1861).

The Directory for Public Worship and the Book of Common Prayer Considered with Reference to the Question of a Presbyterian Liturgy (Philadelphia, 1863).

Religion and Science in their Relation to Philosophy: An Essay on the Present State of the Sciences (New York, 1975).

The Final Philosophy; or, System of Perfectible Knowledge Issuing from the Harmony of Science and Religion (New York, 1877).

The Order of the Sciences (New York, 1882).

Philosophia Ultima; or, Science of the Sciences, 3 vols (New York, 1888–1905). Vol. 1, *An Historical and Critical Introduction to The Final Philosophy as Issuing from the Harmony of Science and Religion.* Vol. 2, *The History of the Sciences and the Logic of the Sciences.* Vol. 3, *The Scientific Problems of Religion and the Christian Evidences of the Physical and Psychical Sciences.*

The United Church of the United States (New York, 1895).

Church Unity (New York, 1895).

The Scientific Evidences of Revealed Religion (New York, 1900).

Further Reading

Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v13*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Henry Warner Bowden

SHIELDS, Thomas Edward (1862–1921)

Thomas E. Shields was born on 9 May 1862 at Mendota, Minnesota, and died on 15 February 1921 in Washington, D.C. His parents had emigrated from Ireland in 1850 and settled as farmers in the expanding territory of the Northwest. He graduated from the College of St. Francis in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, in 1885, and from the Seminary of St. Thomas Aquinas in St. Paul, Minnesota, in 1891. He was ordained a Catholic priest the same year. Shields then received an MA in theology from St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore in 1892, and a PhD in biology from Johns Hopkins University in 1895.

In 1895 Shields returned to St. Paul, where he taught biology and psychology in the Seminary of St. Thomas Aquinas. In 1902 he joined the faculty of the Catholic University of America as an instructor in physiological psychology. In 1909, he was named chair of the newly created Department of Education, and taught at Catholic University for the remainder of his life. With psychologist Edward A. PACE, Shields founded the *Catholic Educational Review* in 1911, the same year in which he founded Sisters College, a normal school for nuns affiliated with the Catholic University, and the Catholic Education Press. His major works include the autobiographical *The Making and Unmaking of a Dullard* (1909), and *Philosophy of Education* (1917). He also published a number of textbooks intended for use in elementary schools.

Shields's life and work illustrate the possibility that a thinker can at the same time be both progressive and traditionalist, practical and theoretical. His contributions did much to achieve the kind of synthesis between modern science and enduring truths that was the goal of neo-scholastic philosophy during the early twentieth century. Leading neo-scholastics of the time, such as Pace and Brother John Chrysostom, testified to the importance of Shields's program for reform of parochial education in the United States.

Shields combined a functionalist approach to mental activity, drawing on Herbert Spencer, with physiological psychology, especially as applied to education by G. Stanley HALL and John DEWEY. Shields emphasized the need for reform of pedagogical methods to adapt teaching to the actual conditions of the developing mind of the child. Grounding his educational reforms in an Aristotelian conception of the person as a unity of soul and body, he emphasized the sensory, affective, and intellectual aspects of education. For Shields the main purpose of education was to develop the mental and bodily plasticity of children to prepare them for a rapidly changing society.

Criticizing Dewey and others for secularizing education, Shields insisted that religion be the unifying core of all education. Through active experience in the classroom, the teaching of religion can transform rudimentary human instincts into Christian virtue. Shields also found common ground between the applications of modern psychology to education – beginning with sensorimotor activity, especially song, in the early years, and moving gradually to abstraction – and the teaching methods of Christ, who began with parables. Shields argued against the use of the catechism to teach religion in the elementary schools, as overloading the memory with abstract and, for the child, meaningless words. He stressed instead beginning with the feelings, which are ever "the bow and thought the arrow" (1908, p. 124) in mental life. In its comprehensive nature, Shields's philosophy of education bears some resemblance to that of Maria Montessori.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Twenty-Five Lessons in the Psychology of Education (Washington, D.C., 1905–1907).

The Education of Our Girls (New York, 1907).

The Teaching of Religion (Washington, D.C., 1907).

"The Method of Teaching Religion," *Catholic Educational Association Bulletin*

5 (1908): 199–237.

Teachers Manual of Primary Methods (Washington, D.C., 1912).

Philosophy of Education (Washington, D.C., 1917).

Other Relevant Work

Shields's papers are at the Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C.

The Making and Unmaking of a Dullard (Washington, D.C., 1909).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Ward, Justine. *Thomas Edward Shields: Biologist, Psychologist, Educator* (New York, 1947).

Robert Kugelmann

SHIMONY, Abner Eliezer (1928–)

Abner Shimony is one of the world's leading philosophers of science and an eminent physicist. He has also published poetry and a novel, *Tibaldo and the Hole in the Calendar* (1998), which tells the story of the calendar reform of 1583 in a manner admirable for introducing young people to science. Shimony was born on 10 March 1928 in Columbus, Ohio. He received his BA in mathematics and philosophy from Yale University in 1948, his MA in philosophy from University of Chicago in 1950, and his PhD in philosophy from Yale in 1953. After serving in the US Army Signal Corps from 1953 to 1955, he earned a second PhD in physics from Princeton University in 1962. In 1962 he became assistant professor of philosophy at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and was promoted to associate professor in 1968. In 1973 he was appointed associate professor of philosophy and physics at Boston University, was promoted to full professor in 1973, and taught at Boston until retiring in 1994. He was President of the Philosophy of Science Association in 1995–6. In retirement he remains active in lecturing around the world, research, and publishing.

Shimony's *Search for a Naturalistic World View*, a two-volume collection of his papers published in 1993, won the Lakatos Prize in 1996 for an outstanding contribution to the philosophy of science. These essays are interrelated parts of a continuing investigation into the prospect for a naturalistic world view, within which metaphysics as illuminated by natural science coheres with epistemology, as illuminated by scientific method.

Volume 1, *Scientific Method and Epistemology*, contains essays introducing Shimony's world view including his argument for a naturalistic but non-physicalistic treatment of mind, his evolutionary approach to perception including his impressive argument that detailed study of empirical psychology enhances rather than undermines our confidence in perception as a source of knowledge about the world, his seminal technical contributions to Bayesian epistemic probability including his classic Dutch book result and an exciting alternative derivation from the idea of epistemic probability as epistemic estimate of a frequency, in addition to his very important work on scientific inference. It could be argued that Shimony's classic treatment of objective Bayesian probability theory is one of the most thoughtful and informed treatments of scientific inference ever published. It converts personal probability into a constructive instrument for learning about the world. The next essay in the volume suggests improvements on Shimony's earlier treatment. Reading these two essays together, along with the three technical essays on Bayesian probability theory and the essays on a naturalistic world view, is a very effective way to exhibit scientific inference as a central component of epistemology. These essays present and illustrate Shimony's thesis that methodology itself is an empirical

enterprise, in which we learn from experience how to refine our learning from experience. Volume 1 concludes with an essay on Thomas KUHN and another on fact and value, both of which are judicious acknowledgments of the social context of science while defending the objectivity of the scientific enterprise.

Volume 2, *Natural Science and Metaphysics*, contains Shimony's famous essays on measurement and nonlocality in quantum mechanics, as well as his very interesting treatments of metaphysical illuminations from the scientific treatment of complex systems and the nature of time. His profound investigations into the problem of quantum entanglement and nonlocality have been major contributions to the design of experiments testing for violations of classical probability inequalities (Bell's Inequalities) and to understanding implications of their outcomes for contextual hidden variable theories and the interpretation of quantum theory and its compatibility with special relativity.

Shimony continues to draw upon his profound contributions to quantum mechanics and its philosophical implications, as well as his seminal contributions to Bayesian epistemology, to develop a measured treatment of science as a source of knowledge.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"An Ontological Examination of Causation," *Review of Metaphysics* 1 (1947): 69–92.
"Coherence and the Axioms of Confirmation," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 10 (1955): 1–28.
"Amplifying Personal Probability," *Philosophy of Science* 34 (1967): 326–32.
"Metaphysical Problems in the Foundations of Quantum Mechanics," *International Philosophical Quarterly* 18 (1978): 3–17.
"Contextual Hidden Variables Theories and Bell's Inequalities," *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 35 (1984): 25–45.
Search for a Naturalistic World View, 2 vols (Cambridge, UK, 1993).

"Some Historical and Philosophical Reflections on Science and Enlightenment," *Philosophy of Science* suppl. 64 (1997): 1–14.

Other Relevant Works
"On Carnap: Reflections of a Metaphysical Student," *Synthese* 93 (1992): 261–74.
Tibaldo and the Hole in the Calendar (New York, 1998).

Further Reading
Cohen, Robert S., Michael Horne, and John Stachel, eds. *Quantum Mechanical Studies for Abner Shimony*, 2 vols (Dordrecht, 1997).

William L. Harper

SHOEMAKER, Sydney Sharpless (1931–)

Sydney Shoemaker was born on 29 September 1931 in Boise, Idaho. He received his BA in philosophy from Reed College in 1953 and his PhD in philosophy from Cornell University in 1958. He taught philosophy at Ohio State from 1957 to 1960. Then he returned to Cornell to join the philosophy faculty in 1961, where he was made Susan Linn Sage Professor of Philosophy in 1978, his current position. Shoemaker has held fellowships from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Guggenheim Foundation. He has given several major lectures around the world, including the John Locke Lectures at Oxford in 1972. He served as co-editor of *The Philosophical Review* from 1964 to 2002. He has held several offices in the American Philosophical Association, including President of the Eastern Division in 1993–4.

Shoemaker has written on various topics in metaphysics, epistemology, and philosophy of mind. There is one unifying project of his work:

to articulate and defend a materialist account of the human person. There are many aspects of personhood that seem to count against a materialist account. For example, it is not clear how materialism can understand the nature of minds, or give an adequate account of various mental phenomena. Nor is it clear how materialism can account for the identity of persons through time. If the same person can have different bodies, or if it is possible for some persons to exist with no body at all, then how can persons be no more than their material bodies? Shoemaker's project is to examine these problems and others, and to show that they can be resolved within a materialist framework.

Materialist accounts of mind seemingly face a dilemma. On the one hand, materialism is committed to the thesis that everything that exists, including minds and mental states, is material. On the other hand, it would seem that various mental states (for example, beliefs, desires, images, etc.) could not be material. It seems at least possible that beings with very different sorts of material bodies could nevertheless have beliefs, desires, and images; and beings with no bodies at all might enjoy various sorts of mental states. But then how can mental phenomena be material phenomena? We may press the problem by considering an example. Suppose we discover that, in human beings, the occurrence of pain is always accompanied by the firing of C-fibers in the brain. It is tempting for the materialist to identify pain with the firing of C-fibers, holding that pain is nothing more and nothing less than the firing of C-fibers, much in the way that water is nothing more and nothing less than H_2O molecules. But it seems perfectly conceivable that a different sort of being, entirely lacking in C-fibers, could nevertheless experience pain. Put another way, there are possible worlds where some living things have pain but do not have C-fibers. In consequence, pain cannot be identified with the firing of C-fibers.

Shoemaker has been a leading defender of "functionalism" in philosophy of mind, to respond to these sorts of problems with mind–brain identity. According to functionalism, mental phenomena cannot be identified with physical phenomena in any straightforward way. For example, pain cannot be identified with the firing of C-fibers. Instead, mental phenomena such as pains and beliefs are to be understood as higher-order functional states having a functional role in a thinker's psychology. A functional role, in turn, is to be understood in terms of the state's causal relations, or how it fits into a network of causes and effects. For example, pain is to be understood (very roughly) as that state of the organism that is caused by damaged tissue, and that is the cause of crying out, avoidance behavior, and so on. To take another example, the belief that it is raining is to be understood (again, very roughly) as that state of the organism that is caused by certain sorts of visual imagery and is the cause of appropriate sorts of behavior, such as reaching for one's umbrella.

On Shoemaker's view, mental states can be *defined* in terms of their functional roles. To say that something is in pain *means* that it is in the appropriate functional state. This understanding allows that mental states such as pains and beliefs can be "realized" in very different sorts of beings. Hence human beings, Martians, and disembodied spirits can all be in pain, since all can be in the functional state that defines pain. Importantly, this can be so even if they share no material states at all.

How is Shoemaker's functionalism a materialist view? According to Shoemaker, the view does not entail materialism, but it is consistent with it. The materialist can embrace a functionalist account of minds and mental phenomena, and then hold further that all realizations of the mental are in physical organisms. According to Shoemaker, non-material minds are possible but not actual. But this is as strong a position as the materialist ever wanted, Shoemaker argues. The position is that, as a matter of fact, everything is material, including minds and mental phenomena.

Problems remain, however. For example, it is not clear that all mental phenomena can be

given a functionalist account. Most importantly, a number of philosophers have argued that it is not possible to give a functional account of the "qualitative" aspects of mental phenomena, such as the qualitative feel of pains and itches, or "what it is like" to see a sunset or remember a kiss. Shoemaker has conceded that a fully functional account of qualia is not possible, but has argued that this fact does not present a serious problem for materialism. For example, he has argued that important aspects of qualia, such as phenomenal similarity, can be given a functionalist account. Shoemaker has also argued that the materialist can account for privileged access to qualitative mental states, and for other special sorts of self-knowledge regarding the mental.

The most obvious position for materialism in the philosophy of mind is to identify mental states with material states of the brain or central nervous system. This approach faces serious difficulties, however. Hence Shoemaker attempts to articulate and defend an alternative while remaining within a materialist framework. The most obvious position for materialism regarding personal identity is to identify persons with their bodies. But this approach faces difficulties as well, and once again Shoemaker attempts an alternative.

One problem with the view that persons are identical with their bodies is that it seems possible that the same person can have different bodies at different times. Even worse, it seems possible that a person might exist with no body at all. Literature is full of scenarios in which a protagonist changes bodily form (from a human being to a bird, for example), inhabits the body of a different person, or survives the death of his body. But then it seems impossible that a person is identical with his or her body. In place of this, Shoemaker defends the view that personal identity is a matter of psychological continuity. *A* is the same person as *B* if and only if *A* and *B* share the right sort of continuity among various psychological features. For example, you are the same person as the child in the photograph if and only if the right

sort of continuity exists between the child's psychology (for example, her perceptions, beliefs, memories, and desires) and your own. Of course, continuity of psychology does not entail sameness of psychology – certainly you will not have exactly the same psychology now as the child did earlier. Rather, the relation must be understood in terms of temporal stages, exhibiting the right sort of causal connections. The proposed view of personal identity fits nicely with a functionalist account of mind. Given that mental states are to be understood in terms of their causal relations, including their relations to other mental states, it is guaranteed that a persisting person will display psychological continuity of the right sort. That is, on a functionalist account, to have experiences, beliefs, memories, desires, etc. *just is* for these states to be causally related to further mental states in appropriate ways.

Once again, the view that Shoemaker adopts is consistent with materialism but does not entail it. Hence the psychological continuity view nicely explains our intuitions that persons can change bodies, or even exist with no body at all. The materialist adds that this is merely a logical possibility; something that one can coherently imagine or talk about. In the real world, however, persons are always "realized" in bodies. In fact, the same person is always realized in the same body.

The psychological continuity view does face problems, however. One problem is presented by scenarios where there is more than one person who is psychologically continuous with another. For example, suppose that *A*'s brain is split, the two halves are successfully transplanted in *B* and *C*, and the resulting persons share equal continuity with *A*. It is not clear what the psychological continuity view should say here. On the one hand, *B* and *C* cannot both be identical with *A*, since they are not identical with each other. Moreover, it seems arbitrary to say that *B* is *A* or that *C* is *A*, or that *B* is *A* just in case *C* does not survive, or that *C* is *A* just in case B does not survive. Shoemaker argues that the view can accommodate these sorts of concerns, however.

For example, he adds a "no branching" stipulation to the conditions for personal identity, and he argues that some of our intuitions about personal identity should be abandoned or revised.

Another problem for Shoemaker's functionalism is to account for the importance of personal identity. On the present view, my surviving in the future is entirely a matter of there existing one and only person with the right sort of psychological continuity. But why should I care so much about that? Alternatively, why should not *A* be concerned that *both B* and *C* survive, in just the way one is usually concerned about one's future self, even if neither *B* nor *C* is identical to *A*? Again, Shoemaker argues, our intuitions here need to be revised. It might seem that we care about psychological continuity just because continuity usually accompanies personal survival, and what we really care about is survival. Just the opposite is true, Shoemaker argues. We care about personal survival because survival usually accompanies psychological continuity. What we really care about, however, is the continuity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Self-Knowledge and Self-Identity (Ithaca, N.Y., 1963).
Identity, Cause, and Mind: Philosophical Essays (Cambridge, UK, 1984; 2nd edn 2003).
Personal Identity, with Richard Swinburne (Oxford, 1984).
The First-Person Perspective, and Other Essays (Cambridge, UK, 1996).

Other Relevant Works
"Personal Identity and Memory," *Journal of Philosophy* 56 (1959): 868–81.
"Self-Reference and Self-Awareness," *Journal of Philosophy* 65 (1968): 555–67.
"Persons and their Pasts," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 7 (1970): 269–85.
"Functionalism and Qualia," *Philosophical Studies* 27 (1975): 291–315.
"On Projecting the Unprojectible," *Philosophical Review* 84 (1975): 178–219.
"Some Varieties of Functionalism," *Philosophical Topics* 12 (1981): 93–120.
Ed. with Carl Ginet, *Knowledge and Mind: Philosophical Essays* (Oxford, 1983).
"Introspection and the Self," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 10 (1986): 101–20.
"Qualia and Consciousness," *Mind* 100 (1991): 507–24.
"Phenomenal Character," *Noûs* 28 (1994): 21–38.
"Self and Body: Self, Body, and Coincidence," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* suppl. 73 (1999): 287–306.
"Realization and Mental Causation," in *Physicalism and Its Discontents*, ed. Carl Gillett (Cambridge, UK, 2001), pp. 74–98.
"Kim on Emergence," *Philosophical Studies* 108 (2002): 53–63.

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, Oxford Comp Phil, Pres Addr of APA v10
Armstrong, D. M. "The Causal Theory of Properties: Properties According to Shoemaker, Ellis and Others," *Metaphysica* 1 (2000): 5–20.
Brueckner, Anthony. "Shoemaker and Second-Order Belief," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 58 (1998): 361–4.
Conee, Earl. "The Possibility of Absent Qualia," *Philosophical Review* 94 (1985): 345–66.
Lycan, William G. "Williams and Stroud on Shoemaker's Sceptic," *Analysis* 31 (1971): 159–62.
Perry, John, ed. *Personal Identity* (Berkeley, Cal., 1975).
Tye, Michael. "Shoemaker's 'The First-Person Perspective and Other Essays'," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 60 (2000): 461–4.

John Greco

SIDORSKY, David (1927–)

David Sidorsky was born on 7 July 1927 in Calgary, Canada. Sidorsky received his BA in 1948 and MA in 1952 from New York University. He was awarded the PhD in philosophy at Columbia University in 1962. His doctoral dissertation is titled "The Nature of Disagreement in Social Philosophy: Four Criticisms of Liberalism," which provided the material for his introductory essay to *The Liberal Tradition in European Thought*, an anthology of European liberalism which he edited and which was published in 1971. Sidorsky was made an honorary doctor of humane letters by the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in 1990.

In 1959 Sidorsky was appointed instructor of philosophy at Columbia University, and was promoted up to full professor by 1969. He has also taught at Washington Square College of New York University, New York University School of Law, and at the Institute of Philosophy of the University of Calgary. His academic honors include the National Endowment of the Humanities Fellowship, the Chamberlain Fellowship, the Council of the Humanities Summer Fellowship, and the Columbia University Fellowship in Philosophy. Sidorsky was Vice President of the American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy during 1986–9, and has been a member of the advisory panel in philosophy of the National Endowment for the Humanities. He has held posts on the editorial board of *Social Philosophy and Policy* and on the board of advisors for the Institute for Social Philosophy and Policy of Bowling Green University.

Sidorsky's philosophical scholarship has been of significance to twentieth-century American and European thought, and can be classified in a fourfold manner. His two primary areas of specialization are in social and political philosophy and ethical theory. His two secondary domains of concentration are the connection between philosophy and literary theory and the history of twentieth-century philosophy. Sidorsky has published on John DEWEY's pragmatism and on the relationship between logical positivism and ordinary language analysis. Sidorsky entered philosophy through his interest in Deweyan pragmatism, especially under the tutelage of Sidney HOOK. His interest later moved to ordinary language philosophy, albeit with the latter understood as a proposed merger of pragmatism with logical positivism, presided upon by his teacher, Ernest NAGEL.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Note on Three Criticisms of Von Wright," *Journal of Philosophy* 62 (1965): 739–42.

"Are Rules of Moral Thinking Neutral: A Note on Liberty and Equality," *Mind* 77 (1968): 569–71.

"On Liberalism and Liberal Education," in *Sidney Hook: Philosopher of Democracy and Humanism*, ed. Paul Kurtz (New York, 1983), pp. 97–112.

"Pluralism, Contextualism, and Distributive Justice," *Social Philosophy and Policy* 1 (1983): 172–93.

"Modernism and the Emancipation of Literature from Morality: Teleology and Vocation in Joyce, Ford, and Proust," *New Literary History* 15 (1983): 137–53.

"Moral Pluralism and Philanthropy," *Social Philosophy and Policy* 2 (1987): 108–27.

"Pragmatism: Method, Truth and Value," in *Pragmatik*, ed. H. Stachowiak (Hanover, Germany, 1987), pp. 93–112.

"Multiculturalism and the University," *Partisan Review* 4 (1993): 709–22.

"Beyond the Vienna Circle," *Partisan Review* 1 (1996): 153–61.

"The Third Concept of Liberty and the Politics of Identity," *Partisan Review* 4 (2001): 536–61.

"Incomplete Routes to Moral Objectivity: Four Variants of Naturalism," *Social Philosophy and Policy* 18 (2001): 177–217.

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *The Liberal Tradition in European*

Thought (New York, 1970).

Ed., *John Dewey, The Essential Writings* (New York, 1977).

Ed., *Essays on Human Rights: Contemporary Issues and Jewish Perspectives* (Philadelphia, 1979).

Further Reading

Castañeda, Hector-Neri. "A Note on Deontic Logic," *Journal of Philosophy* 63 (1966): 231–4.

Marcia Morgan Vahrmeyer

SIMON, Herbert Alexander (1916–2001)

Herbert Simon was born on 15 June 1916 in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and died on 9 February 2001 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. His father, Arthur Simon, was an electrical engineer and later a patent attorney who came to the United States from Germany in 1903. His mother, Edna Marguerite Merkel, was an accomplished pianist and piano teacher. His uncle Harold, once a student of the economist John R. COMMONS, had books on economics and psychology in which Simon discovered that human behavior can be studied scientifically. He was admitted to the University of Chicago with a full scholarship in 1933, and began applying the kind of mathematical rigor found in the hard sciences, such as physics, to the social sciences. He earned his BA in political science in 1936, and remained at the University of Chicago for graduate studies. In early 1937 he had his first publication. During his graduate studies, Simon worked with the econometrician and mathematical economist Henry Schultz, the mathematical biophysicist Nicholas Rashevsky, and the philosopher Rudolf CARNAP. All three taught Simon something of the application of mathematics to science. Simon was also strongly influenced by Charles

MERRIAM and Harold Lasswell in the political science department. He was a research assistant to Clarence Ridley, and by 1939 Ridley and Simon had become national authorities on measuring public services. While technically still a research assistant, Simon was made the director of Administrative Measurement Studies for a three-year project at the University of California at Berkeley. Working evenings and weekends during his time at Berkeley, Simon completed his PhD in political science for the University of Chicago in 1942. He later turned his dissertation into his first book, *Administrative Behavior*.

In 1942 Simon attempted to enlist for combat duty but his color blindness kept him out of World War II. Instead, he took a political science position at the Illinois Institute of Technology in Chicago. During this time he attended the seminars of the Cowles Commission for Research in Economics. In 1946 he became chair of the department of political and social science at IIT. Simon left IIT for the Carnegie Institute of Technology in Pittsburgh in 1949, to help found a new Graduate School of Industrial Administration (GSIA), which quickly became one of the top business schools in the world. In 1952 Simon became a consultant for RAND, where he met Cliff Shaw and later Allen NEWELL. By 1955 Newell and Simon, together with Shaw, began using computers to model human reasoning based on their insight that computers were not mere number crunchers, since they could be programmed to process arbitrary symbols. Newell, Shaw, and Simon became pioneers in cognitive science and artificial intelligence research. Newell and Simon helped establish the world-class computer science department at (the renamed) Carnegie Mellon University. With the change in his research and a shift in thinking at GSIA away from his views, Simon moved to the psychology department in 1965, becoming the Richard King Professor of Computer Science and Psychology, the position he held until his death. He remained a member of GSIA as associate dean and also became a

member of the departments of philosophy and social and decision sciences. In 1972 Simon declined an invitation to be a candidate for the Presidency of CMU, instead becoming a member of the Board of Trustees.

Simon's distinguished career earned him a great number of honors. In 1978 he was awarded the Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences for his work in bounded rationality. His other honors include the Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award from the American Psychological Association in 1969; the Frederick Moser Award from the American Society of Public Administration in 1974; the A. M. Turing award, with Allen Newell, from the Association for Computing Machinery in 1975; the Distinguished Fellow Award from the American Economic Association in 1976; the James Madison Award from the American Political Science Society in 1984; the National Medal of Science from President Reagan in 1986; the Gold Medal Award for Psychological Science in 1988; the John von Neumann Theory Prize from the Operations Research Society of America and the Institute of Management Science in 1988; and the Research Excellence Award from the International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence in 1995. He was a fellow in many professional societies and awarded dozens of honorary degrees from universities around the world. Simon was also elected to the National Academy of Sciences in 1967 and the following year he became a member of the President's Scientific Advisory Committee.

Though Simon published in virtually all of the social sciences and some of the natural sciences, his research was a remarkably consistent investigation into human reasoning and decision-making. The application of his work took him across many disciplines but his key insights are philosophically important to the philosophy of mind, particularly as it intersects with cognitive science and artificial intelligence research. Simon's first important contribution to understanding human thought came from critiquing the received view of rationality in economics and management sciences, the subjective expected utility (SEU) theory. According to SEU, economic and management decisions are made by determining which of the alternatives available is optimal. It is supposed that these decisions take into account the world in all its complexity, including the consequences of any possible actions (1947). Such decisions require having a utility function to measure the desirability of any future state of affairs; they require being able to determine future states of affairs that will arise from distinct courses of action; and, they require being able to determine the likelihood of particular future states obtaining. From this information it is determined which course of action has the greatest expected value. Of course, SEU is only an idealization, as it is impossible in practice to specify a single utility function to account for competing and contradictory interests, just as it is impossible to determine all possible future states arising from distinct courses of action or to determine the likelihood of the future states we can predict. "When these assumptions are stated explicitly, it becomes obvious that SEU theory has never been applied, and never can be applied – with or without the largest computers – in the real world." (1983, p. 14) However, Simon realized that once practical limits are imposed, the adequacy of SEU depends more on the approximating assumptions than the theory itself. "Once we accept the fact that, in any actual application, the SEU rule supplies only a crude approximation to an abstraction, an outcome that may or may not provide satisfactory solutions to the real-world problems, then we are free to ask what procedures human beings actually use in their decision making …." (1983, p. 16) In particular, Simon launched an empirical investigation to determine how we actually make decisions.

Simon's positive account of decision-making, bounded rationality, and its application to microeconomics is the work for which he was awarded his Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences in 1978. Using thinking aloud protocols, that is, having people talk out loud as they are

thinking through a problem and listening to what they say about what they are doing, Simon realized that rather than being optimizers, human problem-solvers are "satisficers." What he meant by this term is that people find satisfactory or good enough solutions. Moreover, we do not consider all or even most of the possible alternatives facing us. Though in principle anything could be relevant to any situation we are considering, most things in practice are only weakly related so we treat them as irrelevant. The space of possible solutions to most problems is vastly beyond our cognitive abilities to explore. Simon thought that one of the functions of emotions is to focus attention, thereby limiting the number of things we take to be relevant. Thus, his theory of rationality not only avoids SEU's commitment to omniscient agents, even as idealizations, it makes our value systems a fundamental determiner of our decisions in such a way that different values can influence our decisions at different times, the others being deemed irrelevant in those circumstances.

Computers opened a new world of empirical research into human reasoning for Simon. Together with Newell and Shaw, Simon came to realize that since computers could be programmed to process arbitrary symbols, they could be used to solve problems that human reasoners solve. Simon viewed such computer programs as theories of reasoning, formally equivalent to theories about dynamical systems in the physical sciences. A program determines what a computer will do based on its current state as determined by its input and stored memory. Executing the program is equivalent to solving equations specified by a theory in that the program determines a future state of a system given an initial state. Computers provided a way to test various processes in problem-solving domains such as chess, the Towers of Hanoi problem, and even proving logic theorems in Alfred North Whitehead and Bertrand Russell's *Principia Mathematica*. By comparing the computer's output to that of humans, certain processes could be ruled out as forms of human reasoning. By inference to the best explanation, the processes performed by programs that reproduce human problem-solving behavior are taken to be the very processes we use.

Simon's methodology in using computers to investigate human reasoning rests on his fundamental hypothesis, seminal in the "cognitive revolution," that humans and computers alike are instances of physical symbol systems that process information. Seen at this level of abstraction, a science investigating the information-processing itself, independent of its physical instantiation, is possible; the science of human reasoning, cognitive science, need not wait on neuroscience. "Finally, there is a growing body of evidence that the elementary information processes used by the human brain in thinking are highly similar to a sub-set of the elementary information processes that are incorporated in the instruction codes of present-day computers. As a consequence it has been found possible to test information-processing theories of human thinking by formulating these theories as computer programs – organizations of the elementary information processes – and examining the outputs of computers so programmed. The procedure assumes no similarity between computer and brain at the 'hardware' level, only similarity in their capacities for executing and organizing elementary information processes." The importance of the physical symbol system hypothesis is a cornerstone of cognitive science. Moreover, it is a philosophical view in that it offers a cluster of concepts and a level of abstraction by which investigation can proceed. Whatever its ultimate fate, it will remain a crucial stage in our coming to understand our own minds.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-making Process in Administrative Organization (New York, 1947; 2nd edn 1957; 3rd edn 1976).

"A Behavioral Model of Rational Choice," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 69

(1955): 99–118.

Models of Man (New York, 1957).

"Information Processing in Computer and Man," with Allen Newell, *American Scientist* 52 (1964): 281–300.

"Motivational and Emotional Controls of Cognition," *Psychological Review* 74 (1967): 29–39.

The Sciences of the Artificial (Cambridge, Mass., 1969; 2nd edn 1981; 3rd edn 1996).

Human Problem Solving, with Allen Newell (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1972).

Models of Discovery and Other Topics in the Methods of Science (Dordrecht, 1977).

Models of Thought, vol. 1 (New Haven, Conn., 1979).

Models of Bounded Rationality, 2 vols (Cambridge, Mass., 1982).

Reason in Human Affairs (Stanford, Cal., 1983).

Models of Thought, vol. 2 (New Haven, Conn., 1989).

Models of My Life (New York, 1991).

Economics, Bounded Rationality and the Cognitive Revolution, with others (Aldershot, UK, 1995).

An Empirically Based Microeconomics (Cambridge, UK, 1997).

Other Relevant Works

Representation and Meaning: Experiments with Information Processing Systems, edited with Laurent Siklóssy (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1972).

"From Substantive to Procedural Rationality," in *Method and Appraisal in Economics*, ed. S. J. Latsis (Cambridge, UK, 1976), pp. 129–48.

"Computer Science as Empirical Enquiry: Symbols and Search," with Allen Newell *Communications of the ACM* 19 (March 1976): 113–26.

"On How to Decide What to Do," *Bell Journal of Economics* 9 (1978): 494–507.

"Herbert A. Simon," in *A History of Autobiography in Psychology*, vol. 7, ed.

Gardner Lindzey (San Francisco, 1980), pp. 435–72.

"The Patterned Matter that is Mind," in *Mind Matters: A Tribute to Allen Newell*, ed. David Steier and Tom Mitchell (Mahwah, N.J. 1996), pp. 407–31.

Further Reading

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, *Who Was Who in Amer v14*

Augier, Mie, and James G. March, eds. *Models of a Man: Essays in Memory of Herbert A. Simon* (Cambridge, Mass., 2004).

Crowther-Heyck, Hunter. *Herbert A Simon: The Bounds of Reason in Modern America* (Baltimore, Md., 2005).

Earl, Peter E., ed. *The Legacy of Herbert Simon in Economic Analysis*, 2 vols. (Cheltenham, UK, 2001).

Klahr, David, and Kenneth Kotovsky, eds. *Complex Information Processing: The Impact of Herbert A. Simon* (Hillsdale, N.J., 1989).

McCorduck, Pamela. *Machines Who Think* (San Francisco, 1979).

Steier, David, and Tom Mitchell, eds. *Mind Matters: A Tribute to Allen Newell* (Mahwah, N.J. 1996).

Christopher Viger

SIMON, Yves René (1903–61)

Yves R. Simon was born on 24 March 1903 in Cherbourg, France, to Auguste Simon and Berthe Porquet dit la Féronnière. In 1919 he passed the Baccalauréat-ès-Lettres in Cherbourg, and in 1922 he received his Licence-ès-Lettres in philosophy from the Université de Paris (Sorbonne). After further study in philosophy and medicine, he received his PhD in philosophy in 1934 from the Institut Catholique de

Paris where he studied with Jacques MARITAIN and wrote a dissertation titled "Introduction à l'ontologie du connaître." Simon taught philosophy at the Catholic University of Lille from 1930 to 1938, and during this period he also taught a course at the Institut Catholique, edited a book series for the publisher Téqui from 1934 to 1938, and served as secretary of the journal *Revue de Philosophie*. In 1938 he emigrated with his family to the US. He was a professor of philosophy at the University of Notre Dame from 1938 to 1948, and at the University of Chicago as a member of the Committee on Social Thought from 1948 until 1959. Simon died on 11 May 1961 in South Bend, Indiana.

Like his mentor Jacques Maritain, Simon was an outstanding Thomist philosopher in epistemology, ontology, and the nature of freedom, and a prominent Catholic defender of democracy. Wary of fascism and communism, he sought a socially responsible Catholicism that pursued social justice within a democratic framework. In the books that he published during his lifetime, especially *Nature and Functions of Authority* (1940), *Philosophy of Democratic Government* (1951), and *A General Theory of Authority* (1961), Simon developed a theory of democratic politics that did not rely on controversial assumptions about freedom or morality. Catholic theologians had long been suspicious towards liberal democracy's pursuit of maximum freedom and its toleration of moral relativism. Simon argued that democracy need not receive justification from such aims. Nor should democracy be criticized for ignoring the special political skills of intellectual elites. Preferring Aristotle to Plato, Simon held that the exercise of political power requires political wisdom which can be attained, albeit not easily, by adults regardless of occupation. Political wisdom is not the special province of any intellectual class, and indeed modern technocratic classes, their sciences, and their plans for social engineering are simply the latest type of threat of tyranny. Democracy is the form of government best designed to prevent tyranny.

The proper origin of political authority is the sustaining of the community and the community good, which in turn requires deliberation upon goods, common action to pursue them, and central guidance and regulation of conduct. Authority, Simon declares, "is, like nature and society, unqualifiedly good" (1951, p. 59). His theory of community and authority rests on the existence of common goods, long denied by many liberal theorists as far back as Hobbes. A common good, as opposed to a private good that many can enjoy irrespective of whether others also enjoy it, is according to Simon, a good that "is of such a nature as to call for common pursuit and common enjoyment" (1965, p. 90). He argued that the common good, democratically decided upon, takes priority over personal goods, although the virtuous citizen possessing practical knowledge will still be able freely to pursue personal goods consistent with, and often contributing towards, the common good. He stressed that the autonomy of the individual should not be sacrificed to the common good, and struggled with the acknowledged inevitable tensions between community aims and personal aims. Of special concern is his position that the citizen has an obligation to obey authority and conform one's conscience to authority; in *Philosophy of Democratic Government*, for example, there appears to be little opportunity for conscientious objection, serious protest, or civil disobedience.

Simon suggested ways of re-humanizing science and technology, such as advocating a greater respect for the agricultural way of life and its closer harmonies with nature. Technology is neither intrinsically good nor evil; a natural philosophy and ethics that values persons and nature should supply a replacement for mechanistic and value-free science and hence would be able to judge the proper uses of technology. Simon's natural law ethics is grounded on the interdependent virtues with prudence at the center.

The many books posthumously published from manuscripts and lectures advance Simon's

moral, social, and political theory by filling in many details. For example, in *Work, Society, and Culture* (1971) he argues that the value of work has been exaggerated by both Marxist and capitalist ideologies, eclipsing such goods as contemplation and pure science. Social justice can be advanced in a capitalist society, though preferably without government redistribution schemes. In *The Definition of Moral Virtue* (1986) and *Practical Knowledge* (1991) Simon expands upon his efforts to revive Aristotle's conception of *phronesis* and Aquinas's use of *habitus*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Introduction à l'ontologie du connaître (Paris, 1934). Trans. Vukan Kuic and Richard Thompson, *An Introduction to Metaphysics of Knowledge* (New York, 1990).

Critique de la connaissance morale (Paris, 1934). Trans. Ralph McInerny, *A Critique of Moral Knowledge* (New York, 2002).

La Campagne d'Ethiopie et la pensée politique française (Lille, France, 1936).

Trois leçons sur le travail (Paris, 1936).

Nature and Functions of Authority (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1940).

La Grande crise de la République française, observations sur la vie politique des Français de 1918 à 1938 (Montréal, 1941). Trans. James Corbett and George McMorrow, *The Road to Vichy, 1918–1938* (New York, 1942).

La Marche à la délivrance (New York, 1942). Trans. Victor Hamm, *The March to Liberation* (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1942).

Prévoir et savoir: études sur l'idée de la nécessité dans la pensée scientifique et en philosophie (Montréal, 1944). Trans., *Foresight and Knowledge*, ed. Ralph Nelson and Anthony O. Simon (New York, 1996).

Par delà l'expérience du désespoir (Montréal, 1945).

The Community of the Free, trans. Willard R. Trask (New York, 1947).

Philosophy of Democratic Government (Chicago, 1951).

Traité du libre arbitre (Liège, France, 1951).

A General Theory of Authority (Notre Dame, Ind., 1961).

The Tradition of Natural Law: A Philosopher's Reflections, ed. Vukan Kuic (New York, 1965).

Freedom and Community, ed. Charles P. O'Donnell (New York, 1968).

Freedom of Choice, ed. Peter Wolff (New York, 1969).

The Great Dialogue of Nature and Space, ed. Gerard J. Dalcourt (Albany, N.Y., 1970).

Work, Society, and Culture, ed. Vukan Kuic (New York, 1971).

Jacques Maritain: Homage in Words and Pictures, with John H. Griffin (Albany, N.Y., 1974).

The Definition of Moral Virtue, ed. Vukan Kuic (New York, 1986).

Practical Knowledge, ed. Robert J. Mulvaney (New York, 1991).

Other Relevant Works

Simon's papers are at the Jacques Maritain Center at the University of Notre Dame.

Philosopher at Work: Essays, ed. Anthony O. Simon (Lanham, Md., 1999).

Further Reading

Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v50, Who Was Who in Amer v1, Who's Who in Phil

Fuller Timothy. "Conversational Gambits in Political Theory: Yves Simon's Great Dialogue," *Political Theory* 10 (1982): 566–79.

Hittinger, John. *Liberty, Wisdom, and Grace: Thomism and Democratic Political Theory* (Lanham, Md., 2002).

Kuic, Vukan. *Yves R. Simon: Real Democracy* (Lanham, Md., 1999).

Murphy, Arthur E. "An Ambiguity in Professor Simon's *Philosophy of Democratic Government*," *Philosophical Review* 61 (1952): 198–211.

Rourke, Thomas R. *A Conscience as Large as the World: Yves R. Simon versus the Catholic Neoconservatives* (Lanham, Md., 1997).

Simon, Anthony O. *Acquaintance with the Absolute. The Philosophy of Yves R. Simon: Essays and Bibliography* (New York, 1998).

Torre, Michael D., ed. *Freedom in the Modern World: Jacques Maritain, Yves R. Simon, Mortimer J. Adler* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1989).

John R. Shook

SINGER, Edgar Arthur, Jr. (1873–1954)

Edgar A. Singer, Jr. was born on 13 November 1873 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He received his BS degree in engineering from the University of Pennsylvania in 1892. In 1894 he earned a PhD in philosophy from Pennsylvania, writing on "The Composite Nature of Consciousness." His father also earned his own doctorate in 1896, writing on "The Content of Education, Historically Considered." The psychology department at Harvard University gave Singer his first academic appointment from 1894 to 1896. At Harvard, Singer worked alongside pragmatist William JAMES.

In 1896 Singer returned to the University of Pennsylvania where he accepted the first of a series of appointments as senior fellow in philosophy (1896–8), instructor of philosophy (1898–1903), and assistant professor of philosophy (1903–1909). The Spanish–American War drew Singer away from the academy briefly; he served as a sergeant in the First US Volunteers. In 1909 he returned to the University of Pennsylvania as professor of philosophy. He was given the Adam Seybert Professor of Philosophy chair in 1929. Singer occupied this chair until 1946 when he retired. In 1944, his alma mater awarded him an honorary LLD.

Singer was the President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1930–31. Singer was a member of several professional groups including the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Philosophical Society, Phi Beta Kappa, the Philosophical Circle of New York, and the Fullerton Club of Philadelphia. Singer died on 4 April 1954 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Singer characterized his philosophy as "empirical idealism" as he sought to retain idealism's promise of human freedom in an apparently mechanistic world while, at the same time, fully embracing the empirical method. As Milton C. NAHM explained, "Singer was basically interested in the solution to the problem of human freedom and he saw clearly that originality and creativity are but alternative names for freedom in the aesthetic universe of discourse. The question uppermost in Singer's mind was the reconciliation of mechanism and freedom." (Nahm 1957, p. 585)

Like Francis Bacon and William James, Singer averred that knowledge is power and that human progress is the result of cooperation in the control of nature. But Singer had much more than scientific mastery of our environment in mind. The moralist is the architect of human cooperation and the artist provides the creativity that is necessary to both the prudent moralist and the effective scientist. The artist reveals the shortcomings and tragedies of the human condition, thereby arousing discontent, but also inspires the courage that the moralist and the scientist need to create anew. Despite Singer's stress on the artist and aesthetics, he was dedicated to the precision and methodology of early twentieth-century pragmatic empiricism. He carefully defined his philosophical terms and based his insights on observation of human behavior, demanding that all philosophical conclusions be tested by experimentation.

Singer's pragmatic philosophy made an impact on the development of systems engi-

neering, through his student and colleague C. West CHURCHMAN and Russell L. Ackoff. In 2000, the School of Engineering and Applied Science of the University of Pennsylvania established the Ackoff Center for Advancement of Systems Approaches.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Modern Thinkers and Present Problems: An Approach to Modern Philosophy through Its History (New York, 1923).

Mind as Behavior and Studies in Empirical Idealism (Columbus, Ohio, 1924).

Fool's Advice (New York, 1925).

On the Contented Life (New York, 1936).

In Search of a Way of Life (New York, 1948).

Experience and Reflection, ed. C. West Churchman (Philadelphia, 1959).

Other Relevant Works

"Choice and Nature," *Mind* ns 11 (1902): 72–91.

"On Mechanical Explanation," *Philosophical Review* 13 (1904): 265–83.

"Mind as an Observable Object," *Journal of Philosophy* 8 (1911): 180–86.

"Man and Fellow-Man," *Journal of Philosophy* 10 (1913): 141–8.

"The Pulse of Life," *Journal of Philosophy* 11 (1914): 645–55.

"Confessio Philosophi," in Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 2, pp. 289–310.

"On a Possible Science of Religion," *Philosophical Review* 40 (1931): 105–23.

"Beyond Mechanism and Vitalism," *Philosophy of Science* 1 (1934): 273–95.

"Mechanism, Vitalism, Naturalism. A Logico-Historical Study," *Philosophy of Science* 13 (1946): 81–99.

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v4, *Proc of APA v30*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Blake, R. M. "Professor Singer's Philosophy of Science," *Journal of Philosophy* 22 (1925): 382–4.

Clarke, Francis P., and Milton C. Nahm, eds. *Philosophical Essays in Honor of Edgar Arthur Singer, Jr.* (Philadelphia and London, 1942). Contains a bibliography of Singer's writings.

Flower, Elizabeth. "Comments on the Ethical Theory of Edgar A. Singer," *Philosophy of Science* 21 (1954): 1–8.

———, "Edgar A. Singer, Jr. on Contentment," *Journal of Philosophy* 54 (1957): 576–84.

Krikorian, Y. H. "Singer on Mechanism and Teleology," *Journal of Philosophy* 54 (1957): 569–76.

———, "Singer's Philosophy of Experimentalism," *Philosophy of Science* 29 (1962): 81–91.

Nahm, Milton C. "Edgar A. Singer, Jr., and the Aesthetic of Empirical Idealism," *Journal of Philosophy* 54 (1957): 584–94.

David Justin Hodge

SINGER, Irving (1925–)

Irving Singer was born on 24 December 1925 in New York City. He received his BA in 1948, MA in 1949, and PhD in philosophy in 1952 from Harvard University, writing a dissertation titled "An Approach to Aesthetics through the Criticism of Santayana's Views." From 1953 to 1956 he was an instructor in philosophy at Cornell University, and from 1956 to 1959 he was an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Michigan. In 1959 Singer joined the faculty of the philosophy and linguistics department at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and is presently professor of philosophy there.

Singer has maintained a high interest in the

philosophy of George SANTAYANA, from his first books including *Santayana's Aesthetics: A Critical Analysis* (1957) to recent work including another book titled *George Santayana, Literary Philosopher* (2000). Singer has assisted in the critical edition of Santayana's works published by MIT Press, and wrote the introduction to the fourth volume, Santayana's famous novel *The Last Puritan*. Singer has himself made major contributions to the aesthetics of film, notably in *Reality Transformed: Film as Meaning and Technique* (1998) and *Three Philosophical Filmmakers: Hitchcock, Welles, Renoir* (2004).

Inspired by his critical reaction to Santayana's aesthetics and theory of value, Singer approached the philosophy of love in *The Nature of Love: Plato to Luther* (1966) by first distinguishing love from either individual or objective appraisal. According to Singer, love is the free and gratuitous bestowing of value upon something or someone, without regard to the interests of ourselves or others. Ancient Greek and medieval conceptions of love seek intrinsic idealized goodness in the object of love, in contrast to the modern notion that love cannot be compelled by the qualities of the object of love. In *The Nature of Love, vol. 2: Courtly and Romantic* (1984) Singer disentangles the courtly and romantic types of love, arguing that romantic love is a more recent post-seventeenth-century phenomenon related to the movement of romanticism. *The Nature of Love, vol. 3: The Modern World* (1987) brings Singer's story down to the twentieth century.

In the 1990s Singer expanded the scope of his explorations to approach the question of the meaning of life in another trilogy of works. The second volume of *Meaning in Life*, titled *The Pursuit of Love* (1994) declares that "Love is freedom in the midst of conditionality." He sets himself against both Sigmund Freud and Jean-Paul Sartre, who dominated twentieth-century thinking with their psychological theories which claim that all love is basically some form of self-love. Singer instead views love as helping to form voluntary bonds of attachment and social relationships between people, and hence love cannot be reduced to self-interest or a means to happiness. In all three of his books on the meaning of life, Singer rejects the search for a pre-given meaning of life and instead portrays meaning as something creatively formed through actual living. On this view, elaborated in *Meaning in Life, vol. 3: The Harmony of Nature and Spirit* (1996) and *Feeling and Imagination: The Vibrant Flux of Our Existence* (2001), the imaginative creation of meaning in life is more fundamental than any search for happiness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ed., *Essays in Literary Criticism*, by George Santayana (New York, 1956).

Santayana's Aesthetics: A Critical Analysis (Cambridge, Mass., 1957).

The Nature of Love: Plato to Luther (New York, 1966). 2nd edn, *The Nature of Love, vol. 1: Plato to Luther* (Chicago, 1984).

The Goals of Human Sexuality (New York, 1973).

Mozart and Beethoven: The Concept of Love in Their Operas (Baltimore, Md., 1977).

The Nature of Love, vol. 2: Courtly and Romantic (Chicago, 1984).

The Nature of Love, vol. 3: The Modern World (Chicago, 1987).

Meaning in Life, vol. 1: The Creation of Value (New York, 1992; Baltimore, Md., 1996).

Meaning in Life, vol. 2: The Pursuit of Love (Baltimore, Md., 1994).

Meaning in Life, vol. 3: The Harmony of Nature and Spirit (Baltimore, Md., 1996).

Reality Transformed: Film as Meaning and Technique (Cambridge, Mass., 1998).

George Santayana, Literary Philosopher (New Haven, Conn., 2000).

Feeling and Imagination: The Vibrant Flux of Our Existence (Lanham, Md., 2001).

Sex: A Philosophical Primer (Lanham, Md., 2001; 2nd edn 2004).

Explorations in Love and Sex (Lanham, Md., 2001).
Three Philosophical Filmmakers: Hitchcock, Welles, Renoir (Cambridge, Mass., 2004).

Further Reading
Goicoechea, David L., ed. *The Nature and Pursuit of Love: The Philosophy of Irving Singer* (Amherst, N.Y., 1995).

John R. Shook

SINGER, Marcus George (1926–)

Marcus G. Singer was born on 4 January 1926 in New York City. He received his BA in 1948 at the University of Illinois, and his PhD in philosophy in 1952 at Cornell University. He taught at Cornell from 1948 to 1951, and then taught philosophy at the University of Wisconsin from 1952 until his retirement in 1992. He was visiting fellow (1962–3) and honorary research fellow (1984–5) at Birkbeck College of the University of London; a visiting fellow (1977 and 1984–5) at the University of Warwick; and Director of a public lecture series on American philosophy (1984–5) at the Royal Institute of Philosophy in London. Singer was elected President of the American Philosophical Association Central Division (1985–6).

In *Generalization in Ethics* (1961), Singer lays the foundations for a rational and normative system of ethics. He combines the careful analysis of ethical concepts with normative ethics and makes a distinction between moral rules and principles. Moral principles are always relevant to every situation, whereas moral rules only cover *some* situations or actions. Singer gives careful attention to exactly how moral principles function, explicitly and implicitly, in ethical argumentation. Singer's emphasis on generalization has been influential and received favorable responses from American and British philosophers including A. I. MELDEN and R. M. Hare.

He advanced a number of moral principles including the "generalization principle" which can be formulated in several ways, but is always relevant to any moral situation, stating that what is right or wrong for one person must be right or wrong for any similar person in similar circumstances. Another is the "principle of consequences" stating that if the consequences of someone's performing a specific action would be undesirable, then that person ought not to perform that action. Singer rejects the claim of Kantian ethics that the consequences of actions are irrelevant to the determination of moral rightness, and also rejects Kant's claim that lying is always wrong, even for benevolent motives. He insists that although lying may be generally wrong, its wrongness cannot be determined purely in formal terms, apart from the consequences it may have; and that to hold that lying is always wrong is to confuse a moral rule with a moral principle.

According to Singer, instead of asking whether lying could ever be willed as a universal principle, Kant should have asked the following: Could it be willed as a universal law, that everyone should lie in a specific situation where it is known that telling the truth will be put to a morally bad use, and where lying will effect the prevention of murder or serious harm? Singer holds that the "principle of consequences" is a *necessary* ethical or moral principle. It is necessary because its denial involves a self-contradiction, and because, like the "generalization principle," it is a necessary presupposition of moral reasoning.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Generalization in Ethics (New York, 1961).
"Truth, Belief, and Inquiry in Peirce," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 21 (1985): 383–406.
"Universalizability and the Generalization Principle," in *Morality and Universality*, ed. Nelson T. Potter and Mark Timmons (Boston, 1985), pp. 47–73.

The Ideal of a Rational Morality (Oxford, 2002).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with Robert R. Ammerman, *Belief, Knowledge, and Truth; Readings in the Theory of Knowledge* (New York, 1970).

Ed., *Morals and Values: Readings in Theoretical and Practical Ethics* (New York, 1977).

Ed., *American Philosophy* (Cambridge, UK, 1985).

Ed., *Legislative Intent and Other Essays on Law, Politics, and Morality*, by George C. MacCallum (Madison, Wisc., 1993).

Ed., *Reason, Reality, and Speculative Philosophy*, by Arthur E. Murphy (Madison, Wisc., 1996).

Ed., *Essays on Ethics and Method*, by Henry Sidgwick (Oxford, 2000).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Encyc Ethics*, *Pres Addr of APA v9*

Gillespie, Norman C. "A Valid Deduction of the Generalization Argument," *Ethics* 86 (1975): 87–91.

Miller, Dale E. "Actual-Consequence Act Utilitarianism and the Best Possible Humans," *Ratio* 16 (2003): 49–62.

Pollock, Lansing. "The Principle of Consequences," *Philosophical Studies* 31 (1977): 385–90.

Saydah, J. Roger. *The Ethical Theory of C. I. Lewis* (Athens, Ohio, 1969), chap. 5.

Stroh, Guy W. *American Ethical Thought* (Chicago, 1979), chap. 7.

Verdi, J. J. "In Defense of Marcus Singer," *Personalist* 58 (1977): 208–20.

Guy W. Stroh

SKINNER, Burrhus Frederic (1904–90)

B. F. Skinner was born on 20 March 1904 in Susquehanna, Pennsylvania, and died on 18 August 1990 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. His father, William Arthur Skinner, was a lawyer and attorney for the Erie railroad. His mother, Grace Madge Burrhus Skinner, was an accomplished singer who imparted her love of music to her eldest son. From 1922 to 1926 Skinner attended Hamilton College in Clinton, New York, where he majored in literature, intending to become a writer. Upon receiving his BA in 1926 he spent a year at his family home in Scranton, Pennsylvania, trying in vain to realize his literary ambitions. During this year, he was a subscriber to the literary magazine *The Dial*, where he read a review of John B. WATSON's *Behaviorism* by Bertrand Russell. After reading Watson and the newly translated works on conditioned reflexes by Russian physiologist Ivan Pavlov, Skinner decided to pursue graduate training in psychology at Harvard, where he enrolled in 1928. Although the psychology department at Harvard was decidedly non-behavioristic, Skinner quickly came under the influence of William Crozier in physiology. Crozier had been a student of Jacques Loeb, whose work Skinner had read in college.

Skinner completed his PhD in psychology at Harvard in 1931, writing a dissertation on the nature and concept of the reflex, part of which was published as "The Concept of the Reflex in the Description of Behavior" in that year. William Crozier and Edwin G. BORING, the historian of experimental psychology, served on his examining committee. Skinner remained at Harvard until the summer of 1936, first on a National Research Council Fellowship, then as a member of the Harvard Society of Fellows. Another fellow at that time, W. V. QUINE, became interested in behaviorism from Skinner; and Professor Alfred North WHITEHEAD challenged him to offer a comprehensive behavioristic explanation of language. This challenge set the stage for

Skinner's writing on the topic that culminated in the 1957 publication of *Verbal Behavior*.

In 1936, Skinner was offered a professorship at the University of Minnesota, where he taught psychology (and interacted with prominent logical positivist Herbert FEIGL) until 1945, when he took a position as chair of the psychology department at Indiana University. In 1948, after delivering the William James Lectures at Harvard, he returned there as a professor of psychology for the rest of his career. In 1969 he received the United States National Medal of Science, and in 1972, amidst some controversy, was named Humanist of the Year by the American Humanist Association. For his role in developing behavioral principles that were applied to ameliorate the lives of people with mental disabilities, he was honored with a Kennedy International Award in 1971. Skinner retired from teaching in 1974, but continued to write and lecture until his death.

Skinner wrote in a variety of genres on a broad range of topics in the science and technology of behavior, beginning with his laboratory research with non-human organisms (primarily rats and pigeons), and extending to his ideas on the design of cultures and social practices. In his early experimental work, Skinner made an important distinction between respondent and operant behavior. He defined respondent behavior as a class of passive autonomic responses to eliciting stimuli, such as the responses of glands or smooth muscles to stimulation (e.g., salivation to the presentation of food). In contrast, operant responses were those that actively operated on the environment to generate consequences, as when a pigeon pecks a key and grain is delivered. Operant responses may or may not be systematically influenced by prior stimuli.

Having outlined this fundamental distinction, Skinner built his scientific and philosophical system around the concept of the operant. Much of his experimental work was conducted in specially designed operant chambers in which he precisely controlled and manipulated various aspects of the organism's environment. He then automatically recorded ensuing rates of operant response and represented these rates graphically. In this way, he was able to observe and inspect the *ongoing* behavior of *intact* organisms in interaction with their environment, enabling him to discern regularities of responding that would not otherwise have been observable. This was a significant methodological advance over previous approaches in which an organism's behavior was broken up and measured in single, discrete units (e.g., learning trials in a maze experiment), or in which a single reflex (such as the movement of a frog's leg to an electric current) was studied in isolation. Accordingly, Skinner's approach is sometimes referred to as molar behaviorism, in contrast to molecular behaviorism. His dedication to the study of the organism as a whole can be attributed (as he and others have noted) to the influences of Crozier and Loeb.

Over the course of his career, Skinner adopted many roles, from bench scientist, to behavioral technologist, to social critic and public intellectual. He was committed not only to a science of behavior, but to a technology of behavior that could be used to solve human problems and design better cultural practices. In 1948 he published a fictional utopian novel, *Walden Two*, which depicted a community run almost exclusively with the use of positive reinforcement. He also used the behavioral principles he derived from his experimental work to develop educational technologies such as programmed instruction, which he described in his 1968 book *The Technology of Teaching*.

In 1971, in his role as social critic, Skinner published a controversial best-seller, *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*, possibly his most polemical and widely read work. He emphasized the danger of clinging to traditional yet sentimental beliefs in free will and personal autonomy. According to Skinner, adherence to these beliefs prevented widespread acceptance of the fact that behavior is effectively controlled by the environment, thus thwarting the potential of the

science and technology of behavior to develop culture-sustaining, rather than culture-destroying, practices. He believed that a scientific formulation of human behavior, while inherently deterministic, could nonetheless maximize feelings of freedom and dignity by minimizing the use of aversive control and maximizing the use of positive reinforcement.

While Skinner made important and influential contributions to the science and technology of behavior, his place in psychology has been widely and vociferously debated. He has been both highly honored and roundly criticized both within and outside the discipline for his unyielding behaviorist position on matters of ontology, method, and epistemology. He is perhaps best known to both psychologists and philosophers as the originator of radical behaviorism (sometimes referred to as operant behaviorism, or descriptive behaviorism), which he defined as the *philosophy* of the science of behavior. Radical behaviorism eschews mentalistic explanations of behavior, opposing the position that behavior is caused by the activity, will, or function of the mind. Along with earlier forms of behaviorism, radical behaviorism represented a departure, both philosophically and methodologically, from the introspective psychology of the early twentieth century that viewed the nature and structure of consciousness as the proper subject matter of psychology.

Radical behaviorism, however, unlike other forms of behaviorism (such as methodological behaviorism), reconceptualizes the "mental" as the world of private events, consisting of the physiological sensations of the world within the skin or the experience of the physical sensations of the body. Thus, in distinction to methodological behaviorism, it radically reinterprets the nature and role of private events instead of simply ruling them outside the acceptable scope of scientific inquiry, which is taken, in methodological behaviorism, to be the realm of the publicly and objectively observable. Instead, Skinner viewed the private events of the world within the skin as having essentially the same ontological status as publicly verifiable events. They thus hold no unique causal status, and are equally admissible to the experimental analysis of behavior, although they are, admittedly, more difficult to study. Although occasionally characterized erroneously as a "black-box" psychologist, Skinner acknowledged the importance of studying the physiology of the nervous system, writing, "[The physiologist] will be able to show how an organism is changed when exposed to contingencies of reinforcement and why the changed organism behaves in a different way, possibly at a much later date. What he discovers cannot invalidate the laws of a science of behavior, but it will make the picture of human action more nearly complete." (1974, p. 215) He felt that a complete functional analysis of operant behavior could include, but was not dependent upon, findings at the level of neurophysiology.

Skinner's philosophy of science was heavily influenced by the writings and views of Francis Bacon, whom he first read in junior high school. Like Bacon, and to some extent Loeb, Skinner equated explanation with description and control, and rejected traditional definitions of cause in favor of function. For both Bacon and Skinner, science and technology were closely related: to manipulate nature (or behavior) was to essentially understand it. Also like Bacon, Skinner viewed induction as crucial to scientific investigation and discovery. He believed that the observation and visual inspection of the facts of behavior would uncover descriptive laws, and closely followed Bacon's dictum that nature, to be commanded, must be obeyed. In fact, in a seemingly whimsical yet altogether serious paper entitled "A Case History in Scientific Method" (1956), Skinner suggested that a philosophy of science could be based on an empirical analysis of the actual behavior of the scientist. Accordingly, he outlined some observations of his own behavior, and offered five unformalized principles of scientific practice. The first of these, "when you run onto something interesting, drop everything else and study it" (1956, p.

223), illustrated his conviction that the scientific investigation of behavior must remain closely based on the facts as they are observed.

Skinner was opposed to a hypothetico-deductive approach to the science of behavior, and because of this he was often accused of being anti-theory. Although he characterized himself as an anti-formalist in matters of method, he did not characterize himself as anti-theory. Congruent with his inductive and descriptive approach, he viewed theory as the formal representation of data, as a parsimonious summary of the uniform relationships revealed by observation of facts (in this case, the facts of behavior). Skinner strongly objected to theory defined as "any explanation of an observed fact which appeals to events taking place somewhere else, at some other level of observation, described in different terms, and measured, if at all, in different dimensions" (1950, p. 193). Although he noted that generating conjectures and hypotheses about behavior was fun, he maintained that it was also less efficient than actually observing behavior. For example, one of his main objections to cognitive psychology and Freudian psychology (and, for that matter, the behaviorism of Clark L. HULL) was their reliance on theories that made use of hypothetical mind processes or entities which themselves required explanation, when an analysis at the level of behavior could prove more parsimonious and useful. Skinner characterized these types of approaches as relying on a potentially infinite series of homunculi or "little men" inside the brain, each itself requiring explanation at the level of another, smaller, inner homunculus.

Skinner's system has been widely characterized as one of the most thoroughly and consistently positivistic theories in psychology. Skinner was careful to make clear that he was neither a Comtean positivist nor a logical positivist, despite the attempts of some writers to highlight the resemblance between logical positivism and Skinner's position. Although he knew Herbert Feigl, and had met Rudolf CARNAP, he differed from the philosophers of the Vienna Circle on several key points. The differences between Skinner's brand of positivism and that of the logical positivists has been used by some writers to help account for the steady growth of radical behaviorism as a subfield of psychology, despite the decline of logical positivism as a workable philosophy of science. For example, while the logical positivists derived criteria for determining the meaningfulness of scientific statements which included either public verifiability or reduction, through logical operations, to the directly observable; in Skinner's view, language was verbal behavior anchored and understood in relation to the physical and social world in which it operated. Formal linguistic or logical analysis, disconnected from the world of which verbal behavior was a part, ran contrary to Skinner's position. Further, in logical positivism, the data of observation were to be organized and represented in the terms of mathematics and logic. Skinner's brand of positivism emphasized the visual display and inspection of data (through cumulative records), rather than the mathematical representation of them. The latter moved beyond the observable patterns in the data themselves to another (unnecessary) level of abstraction. Finally, while logical positivism accepted theories, hypotheses, and hypothetical constructs (if they could be logically reduced to the publicly verifiable), Skinner's brand of positivism avoided these devices in favor of observable and specifiable functional relations.

Although not a logical positivist, Skinner was heavily influenced by the descriptive positivism of Ernst Mach, especially Mach's *Science of Mechanics*. Like Mach, Skinner believed that all concepts should be grounded in observation, including the concept of causation. Accordingly, cause and effect should be regarded as an observed change in one variable consistently followed by an observed change in another variable. This relationship could be described functionally. Skinner's early definition of the reflex as the observed correlation of stimulus and response reflected his Machian

outlook, as did his consistent emphasis on functional relations. He viewed operant behavior as a function of its antecedent conditions and consequences; he described and classified behavior in terms of its function, not its topography. That is, if two or more topographically distinct responses operate on the environment to generate the same consequence (a child cries, or bangs the table, to get his parents' attention), they are to be viewed as members of the same class of behavior, or as functionally identical.

Skinner reported in several places that epistemology was his first love. Several scholars and historians have remarked that developing an empirical epistemology from a behaviorist basis was an ongoing theme throughout Skinner's career. To understand Skinner's epistemology, one must adopt the behaviorist position that a theory of knowing is a theory of behaving. That is, the only way we acquire knowledge (or, to Skinner, behavior) is through the experience of contingencies of reinforcement in the environment, and, furthermore, the only way we demonstrate this knowledge is through behavior, which is often – especially in response to private events – verbal behavior. In Skinner's words, "The simplest and most satisfactory view is that thought is simply *behavior* – verbal or nonverbal, covert or overt." (1957, p. 449, italics in original). For Skinner, generating an analysis of verbal behavior was akin to generating a theory of knowledge, and his approximately twenty-year effort preparing the manuscript of *Verbal Behavior* attests to the centrality of this topic in his work. Noam CHOMSKY's 1959 review of the book, in which he attacked not only Skinner's account of language as verbal behavior but the very foundations on which Skinner's system was based, has been historically interpreted by some as marking the erosion of the dominant behaviorist standpoint in psychology, and ushering in the cognitive and information-processing theories of the 1950s and 60s.

According to Skinner, we do not generate internal copies of objects or experiences in the world in order to perceive and then know them. Rather, we act as if we know them when the act of behaving in this way is or has been reinforced by the physical or social environment. Skinner argued that we do not, for example, hold iconic representations of stimuli in our minds, or refer to cognitive maps of our physical environments, and act accordingly. Rather, we behave in ways that seem derivative of these hypothetical entities because behaving in these ways has been reinforced in the past, and continues to be reinforced in the present. As he put it, "*the environment stays where it is and where it has always been – outside the body*" (1974, p. 73, italics in original). The organism encounters an environment (including the social environment) in which a response that has previously been emitted has been reinforced, and it is probable that the same response will be emitted again. That this response may consist of verbal behavior does not complicate the analysis except that the consequences of verbal behavior are mediated by other people. In the case of verbal behavior, particular responses may be reinforced by the verbal community only when the response is emitted in the presence of a particular stimulus.

Skinner's functional analysis, thus simplified, does not rely solely on the organism's history of reinforcement within its own lifetime, it also relies on the history of reinforcement contingencies operating during the evolution of the species, making up the genetic endowment of the organism. His system relies on "selectionism" as a key concept, both in the individual organism's ongoing interaction with the environment, and in its phylogenetic past. According to Skinner, a particular operant response is selected from a pool of responses because of its effect on the environment, analogous to the way a physical variation that generates favorable consequences for an organism is selected. Further, Skinner distinguished between biological and cultural evolution. In cultural evolution, the unit of analysis shifts from behavior to social practice. Cultural evolution occurs when social practices that have

reinforcing consequences for the group (not the individual) are selected, thus optimizing the survival of the culture. Especially in Skinner's later writings do his concerns about the future survival of culture emerge, along with his evident frustration that behavioral science was not being put to use to solve social problems.

Skinner's influence on the field and society has been wide-ranging. Behaviorists in the Skinnerian tradition currently work in three well-defined spheres of endeavor, each with its own publication outlets and scholarly/professional organizations: the experimental analysis of behavior, the applied analysis of behavior (often called "behavior modification"), and the conceptual/philosophical foundations and implications of behaviorist epistemology. Skinner's influence is also deeply felt in the field of special education, where behavioral practitioners use principles of operant psychology and verbal behavior to improve the functioning of children with developmental disorders such as autism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Concept of the Reflex in the Description of Behavior," *Journal of General Psychology* 5 (1931): 427–58.
The Behavior of Organisms (New York, 1938).
Walden Two (New York, 1948).
"Are Theories of Learning Necessary?" *Psychological Review* 57 (1950): 193–216.
Science and Human Behavior (New York, 1953).
"A Case History in Scientific Method," *American Psychologist* 11 (1956): 221–33.
Schedules of Reinforcement, with Charles B. Ferster (New York, 1957).
Verbal Behavior (New York, 1957).
Cumulative Record (New York, 1959).
The Technology of Teaching (New York, 1968).
Contingencies of Reinforcement: A Theoretical Analysis (New York, 1969).

Beyond Freedom and Dignity (New York, 1971).
About Behaviorism (New York, 1974).
Particulars of My Life (New York, 1976).
Reflections on Behaviorism and Society (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1978).
The Shaping of a Behaviorist (New York, 1979).
A Matter of Consequences (New York, 1983).
Upon Further Reflection (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1987).
Recent Issues in the Analysis of Behavior (Columbus, Ohio, 1989).

Other Relevant Works
Skinner's papers are at Harvard University.
"Two Types of Conditioned Reflex and a Pseudo Type," *Journal of General Psychology* 12 (1935): 66–77.
"The Operational Analysis of Psychological Terms," *Psychological Review* 52 (1945): 270–77, 291–4.
"The Science of Learning and the Art of Teaching," *Harvard Educational Review* 24 (1954): 86–97.
"The Design of Cultures," *Daedalus* 90 (1961): 534–46.
"Behaviorism at Fifty," *Science* 140 (1963): 951–8.
"The Phylogeny and Ontogeny of Behavior," *Science* 153 (1966): 1205–13.
"B. F. Skinner," in *A History of Psychology in Autobiography*, vol. 5, ed. E. G. Boring and Gardner Lindzey (New York, 1967), pp. 385–414.
"Why I Am Not a Cognitive Psychologist," *Behaviorism* 5 (1977): 1–10.
"Selection by Consequences," *Science* 213 (1981): 501–504.
"The Shame of American Education," *American Psychologist* 39 (1984): 947–54.
"Some Thoughts about the Future," *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior* 45 (1986): 229–35.
"Whatever Happened to Psychology as the

Science of Behavior?" *American Psychologist* 42 (1987): 780–86.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Encyc Cog Sci*, *Encyc Psych*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v10*

Audi, Robert. "B. F. Skinner on Freedom, Dignity, and the Explanation of Behavior," *Behaviorism* 4 (1976): 163–86.

Baldwin, John D. "Mead and Skinner: Agency and Determinism," *Behaviorism* 16 (1988): 109–29.

Barrett, B. H. *The Technology of Teaching Revisited: A Reader's Companion to Skinner's Book* (Cambridge, Mass., 2002).

Baum, W. M. *Understanding Behaviorism: Science, Behavior, and Culture* (New York, 1994).

Bjork, Daniel W. *B. F. Skinner: A Life* (New York, 1993).

Catania, A. C., and S. Harnad, eds. *The Selection of Behavior: The Operant Behaviorism of B. F. Skinner, Comments and Consequences* (New York, 1988).

Chomsky, Noam. "Review of Skinner's *Verbal Behavior*," *Language* 35 (1959): 26–58.

Coleman, S. R. "Background and Change in B. F. Skinner's Metatheory from 1930 to 1938," *Journal of Mind and Behavior* 5 (1984): 471–500.

Creel, Richard. "Radical Epiphenomenalism: B. F. Skinner's Account of Private Events," *Behaviorism* 8 (1980): 31–53.

Day, Willard. "The Historical Antecedents of Contemporary Behaviorism," in *Psychology: Theoretical-Historical Perspectives*, ed. R. W. Rieber and K. Salzinger (Washington, D.C., 1998), pp. 301–52.

Dews, P. B., ed. *Festschrift for B. F. Skinner* (New York, 1970).

"The Double Life of B. F. Skinner," *Journal of Consciousness Studies* 10 (January 2003). Special issue on Skinner.

Evans, Richard I. *B. F. Skinner: The Man and His Ideas* (New York, 1968).

Flanagan, Owen J., Jr. "Skinnerian Metaphysics and the Problem of Operationism," *Behaviorism* 8 (1980): 1–13.

Lattal, K. A., ed. "Reflections on B. F. Skinner and Psychology," *American Psychologist* 47 (1992): 1269–1533. Special issue on Skinner.

Morris, E. K., and N. G. Smith. "Bibliographic Processes and Products, and a Bibliography of the Published Primary-Source Works of B. F. Skinner," *The Behavior Analyst* 26 (2003): 41–67.

Moxley, R. A. "The Two Skinners, Modern and Postmodern," *Behavior and Philosophy* 27 (1999): 97–125.

O'Donohue, William, and Kyle E. Ferguson. *The Psychology of B. F. Skinner* (Thousand Oaks, Cal., 2001).

Ricoeur, Paul. "A Critique of B. F. Skinner's 'Beyond Freedom and Dignity'," *Philosophy Today* 17 (1973): 166–75.

Sagal, Paul T. *Skinner's Philosophy* (Washington, D.C., 1981).

Smith, L. D. *Behaviorism and Logical Positivism: A Reassessment of the Alliance* (Stanford, Cal., 1986).

Smith, L. D., and W. R. Woodward. *B. F. Skinner and Behaviorism in American Culture* (Bethlehem, Penn., 1996).

Todd, J. T., and E. K. Morris. *Modern Perspectives on B. F. Skinner and Contemporary Behaviorism* (Westport, Conn., 1995).

Watson, John B. *Behaviorism* (New York, 1925).

Ziff, Paul. "About Behaviourism," *Analysis* 18 (1958): 132–6.

Zuriff, G. *Behaviorism: A Conceptual Reconstruction* (New York, 1985).

Alexandra Rutherford

SKLAR, Lawrence (1938–)

Lawrence Sklar was born on 25 June 1938 in Baltimore, Maryland. He received his BA from Oberlin College in 1958. He then received his MA in 1960 and PhD in philosophy in 1964 from Princeton University. His dissertation was titled "Inter-theoretic Reduction in Natural Science." He was an instructor and assistant professor of philosophy at Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania from 1962 to 1966. He then returned to Princeton, where he was assistant professor of philosophy from 1966 to 1968 and associate professor from 1968 to 1974. In 1974 he became professor of philosophy at the University of Michigan, and he presently is William K. Frankena Collegiate Professor and Professor of Philosophy. He has been visiting professor at several universities, and was President of the American Philosophical Association Central Division in 2000–2001.

Sklar is a prominent philosopher in the fields of epistemology, philosophy of science, and metaphysics. His book *Space, Time, and Spacetime* (1974) was awarded the Franklin J. Matchette Prize by the American Philosophical Society for the outstanding philosophical book of 1973 and 1974. Its chapters encourage a reengagement between philosophy and science by covering philosophical problems of the epistemology of geometry, absolute motion and substantival space–time, causal order and temporal order, and finally the direction of time.

Sklar's *Philosophy and Spacetime Physics* (1985) is a collection of articles published between 1974 and 1985. They continue to advance his view that space–time physics cannot by itself settle such issues as finding the best methodology of justifying scientific theories, whether the geometry of space–time should be interpreted realistically or conventionally or reduced to non-geometrical concepts, and whether a substantialist or relational view of space–time should prevail. Sklar prefers a "modestly radical empiricism," that respects the theory–observation distinction and the principle of methodological conservatism, to the alternatives of naturalism and pragmatism. These

issues are also pursued in his introductory text *Philosophy of Physics* (1992), which focuses on space–time physics, statistical mechanics, and quantum theory.

Sklar's book *Physics and Chance* (1993) was awarded the Imré Lakatos Award in 1995 for the best book in the philosophy of science. This book surveys twentieth-century developments in classical thermodynamics and statistical mechanics, concentrating on philosophical problems in equilibrium and non-equilibrium theories, entropy, irreversibility, and various cosmological speculations. *Theory and Truth* (2000) shows how some of the major abstract epistemological concerns over whether science can claim truth actually arise in the normal process of refining and developing scientific theories. The practice of evaluating scientific theories usually involves such concerns as whether theories really model unobservable structures, why theoretical idealizations may not track natural processes, and how the historical succession of new theories replacing old theories can cast doubt on our best current theories.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Space, Time, and Spacetime (Berkeley, Cal., 1974).
Philosophy and Spacetime Physics (Berkeley, Cal., 1985).
Philosophy of Physics (Boulder, Col., 1992).
Physics and Chance: Philosophical Issues in the Foundations of Statistical Mechanics (Cambridge, UK, 1993).
Theory and Truth: Philosophical Critique within Foundational Science (Oxford, 2000).

Other Relevant Works
"Types of Inter-theoretical Reduction," *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 18 (1967): 109–24.
"Absolute Space and the Metaphysics of Theories," *Noûs* 6 (1972): 289–309.
"Unfair to Frequencies," *Journal of Philosophy* 70 (1973): 41–52.
"Inertia, Gravitation and Metaphysics," *Philosophy of Science* 43 (1976): 1–23.
"Saving the Noumena," *Philosophical Topics*

13 (1982): 89–110.

"Perceived Worlds, Inferred Worlds, the World," *Journal of Philosophy* 81 (1984): 693–706.

"Modestly Radical Empiricism," in *Observation, Experiment, and Hypothesis in Modern Physical Science*, ed. P. Achinstein and O. Hannaway (Cambridge, Mass., 1985), pp. 1–20.

"Foundational Physics and Empiricist Critique," *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science* 14 (1990): 136–57.

"The Reduction(?) of Thermodynamics to Statistical Mechanics," *Philosophical Studies* 95 (1999): 187–202.

Ed., *The Philosophy of Science: A Collection of Essays*, 6 vols (Hamden, Conn., 2000).

"Interpreting Theories: The Case of Statistical Mechanics," *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* suppl. 51 (2000): 729–42.

"Naturalism and the Interpretation of Theories," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 75 (November 2001): 43–58.

"Dappled Theories in a Uniform World," *Philosophy of Science* 70 (2003): 424–41.

Further Reading

Hellman, Geoffrey. "Reduction(?) to 'What'?: Comments on L. Sklar's 'The Reduction(?) of Thermodynamics to Statistical Mechanics,'" *Philosophical Studies* 95 (1999): 203–14.

Levi, Isaac. "… But Fair to Chance," *Journal of Philosophy* 70 (1973): 52–5.

Vogel, Jonathan. "Sklar on Methodological Conservatism," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 52 (1992): 125–31.

Wolfson, Paul, and James Woodward. "Scientific Explanation and Sklar's Views of Space and Time," *Philosophy of Science* 46 (1979): 287–94.

John R. Shook

SKYRMS, Brian (1938–)

Brian Skyrms was born on 11 March 1939 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. He studied economics and philosophy at Lehigh University, earning his BA in 1960. He earned his MA degree in 1962 and his PhD in philosophy in 1964 from the University of Pittsburgh. He has taught philosophy at San Fernando Valley State College (1964–5); the University of Delaware (1965–6); the University of Michigan (1966–7); and the University of Illinois at Chicago (1967–80). Skyrms joined the philosophy faculty at the University of California at Irvine in 1980, and presently is a professor in both the department of logic and philosophy of science and the department of economics at UC Irvine. In 1994 Skyrms was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and has received numerous other awards and honors. In 1999 Skyrms's *Evolution of the Social Contract* received the Imré Lakatos award, the most esteemed award for a book in the philosophy of science. That same year, he was elected to the National Academy of Sciences, one of the most prestigious societies in science. He was President of the American Philosophical Association Pacific Division in 2000–2001.

Skyrms's research has primarily been in the philosophy of science, decision theory, logic, and the philosophy of language. Much of his work can be characterized by his methods, which follow standard scientific ones. In many of his books and papers, Skyrms begins by introducing a large and important philosophical issue. Rather than trying to address it all at once, he identifies a part of the issue, or a useful idealization of the issue, and shows how this refined question can be decisively answered using a variety of mathematical techniques. For instance, Skyrms has examined the conditions under which various kinds of conventions and aspects of the social contract do and do not develop. Instead of speculating on the origins of, for example, distributive justice, he explored the evolutionary behavior of a number of models of interaction. Imagine, for example, a

population of agents whose only source of interaction occurs when two of them meet and must decide how to split a cake. They will each demand a proportion of the cake, and if the sum of the two proportions is less than one, they will each get what they asked for. If the sum is greater than one, neither will get any of the cake. Each agent always demands the same amount, and each offspring of that agent demands that same amount as well. Assume further that there is selective advantage in receiving cake – those who receive more cake tend to produce more offspring, whereas those who get less cake tend to produce less off-spring. Using this model, Skyrms raised the question of whether evolution favors those sub-populations that tend to ask for only half the cake in such a situation, which intuitively seems like the "fair" amount to ask for. He found that in a population containing three subgroups – those who always demand either one-half, one-third, or two-thirds of the cake – the population typically tended to evolve in such a way as to favor the subpopulation of those demanding one-half of the cake. Skyrms also showed that this phenomenon holds under various conditions, such as different initial proportions of the three subpopulations, and different probabilities of two members of the population encountering one another. Such results, Skyrms suggests, are "perhaps, a beginning of an explanation of our concept of justice" (1994, p. 320).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Choice and Chance: An Introduction to Inductive Logic (Belmont, Cal., 1966; 4th edn 2000).

Causal Necessity (New Haven, Conn., 1980).

Pragmatics and Empiricism (New Haven, Conn., 1984).

The Dynamics of Rational Deliberation (Cambridge, Mass., 1990).

Evolution of the Social Contract (Cambridge, UK, 1996).

Other Relevant Works

"On Failing to Vindicate Induction," *Philosophy of Science* 32 (1965): 235–68.

"Nomological Necessity and the Paradoxes of Confirmation," *Philosophy of Science* 33 (1966): 230–49.

"The Explication of 'X knows that p'," *Journal of Philosophy* 64 (1967): 373–89.

"Supervaluations: Identity, Existence and Individual Concepts," *Journal of Philosophy* 65 (1968): 477–82.

"Return of the Liar: Three Valued Logic and the Nature of Truth," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 7 (1970): 153–61.

"Possible Worlds, Physics and Metaphysics," *Philosophical Studies* 30 (1976): 323–32.

"Resiliency, Propensity and Causal Necessity," *Journal of Philosophy* 74 (1977): 704–13.

"Tractarian Nominalism," *Philosophical Studies* 40 (1981): 199–206.

"Causal Decision Theory," *Journal of Philosophy* 79 (1982): 695–711.

"Dynamic Coherence and Probability Kinematics," *Philosophy of Science* 54 (1987): 1–20.

"Carnapian Inductive Logic for Markov Chains," *Erkenntnis* 35 (1991): 439–60.

Ed. with Wolfgang Spohn and Bas van Fraassen, *Existence and Explanation: Essays Presented in Honor of Karel Lambert* (Dordrecht, 1991).

"Sex and Justice," *Journal of Philosophy* 91 (1994): 305–20.

"The Structure of Radical Probabilism," *Erkenntnis* 45 (1997): 285–97.

"Subjunctive Conditionals and Revealed Preference" *Philosophy of Science* 65 (1998): 545–74.

"Evolution of Inference," in *Dynamics in Human and Primate Societies*, ed. T. Kohler and G. Gumerman (Oxford, 1999), pp. 77–88.

"Bargaining with Neighbors: Is Justice Contagious?" with Jason Alexander, *Journal of Philosophy* 96 (1999): 588–98.

"Stability and Explanatory Significance of

Some Simple Evolutionary Models,"
Philosophy of Science 67 (2000): 94–113.
"The Stag Hunt," *Proceedings and Addresses
of the American Philosophical Association*
75 (November 2001): 31–41.

Further Reading

Hempel, Carl G. "On a Claim by Skyrms
concerning Lawlikeness and
Confirmation," *Philosophy of Science* 35
(1968): 274–8.
McKenzie, Alexander J. "Evolutionary
Explanations of Distributive Justice,"
Philosophy of Science 67 (2000): 490–516.
Swain, Marshall. "Skyrms on Nonderivative
Knowledge," *Noûs* 3 (1969): 227–31.
"Symposium on *Evolution of the Social
Contract*," *Philosophy and
Phenomenological Research* 59 (1999):
217–54.

Kent Johnson

SLATER, John Greer (1930–)

John Greer Slater was born on 1 June 1930 on
a farm near Stoneboro, Pennsylvania. Upon
graduating from high school there in 1948, he
enlisted in the US Navy and served until 1952.
He then enrolled at the University of Florida
and graduated with his BA in 1955. He was
awarded a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship for
graduate studies at the University of Michigan,
where he received his PhD in philosophy in
1961. His dissertation title was "A
Methodological Study of Ordinary-language
Philosophy." He taught philosophy at the
University of Houston from 1961 to 1964, and
was acting chair of the philosophy department
during the second year. In 1964 he became pro-
fessor of philosophy at the University of
Toronto, and taught there until his retirement
in 1995. For five of those years he served as

department chair, and for three additional years
as Acting Chairman.

Slater's primary interest has been the philoso-
phy of Bertrand Russell. After the Bertrand
Russell archives arrived in 1968 at McMaster
University in Hamilton, Ontario, Slater and
Kenneth Blackwell, the Russell archivist, began
an effort to publish all of Russell's shorter works
in a collected edition of around thirty volumes.
In 1980, with additional editorial staff, the
project was funded by the Social Sciences and
Humanities Research Council of Canada. From
then until his retirement he edited five volumes
of Russell's philosophical essays, covering the
period from 1909 to 1968, and with the other
editors helped to produce the first volume of
the edition. His other writings on Russell largely
consist of introductions to ten of his books in
their new Routledge editions, articles in the
journal *Russell*, and a monograph on Russell.

Slater's other major contribution to Russell
studies has been in the area of book collecting.
His Russell interest began in his undergraduate
years and by 1980 he had assembled a collec-
tion of some 10,000 books and pamphlets and
periodicals by and about Russell, which became
the largest collection of printed Russelliana in the
world. In 1980 he donated it to the Thomas
Fisher Rare Books Library at the University of
Toronto. While assembling the Russell collection
he had acquired many books by Russell's con-
temporaries across British and American phi-
losophy, and he continued to build this collection
and donate it to the library. To date he has
donated over 30,000 books and pamphlets, by
philosophers other than Russell, written in
English from about 1870 to the present; the
University of Toronto now houses one of the
richest collections for this period.

Not surprisingly, Slater is one of the finest
historians and bibliographers of British and
American philosophy. His history of the Toronto
philosophy department, *Minerva's Aviary:
Philosophy at Toronto, 1843–2003*, describes in
detail the long and fascinating history of influ-
ential philosophical work done there.
Expositions of the philosophies of James Beaven,

George Paxton YOUNG, George BLEWETT, George S. BRETT, and Thomas GOUDGE, among many others, illustrate the sophistication and depth of Canadian philosophy. His *Bibliography of Modern British Philosophy*, covering a similar stretch of time, is a landmark work that will prove extremely useful for researchers. Slater is currently at work on a companion bibliography for American and Canadian philosophers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Political Philosophy of Bertrand Russell," in *Russell in Review*, ed. J. Thomas and K. Blackwell (Toronto, 1976), pp. 135–54.
"One Hundred Years of Bertrand Russell," *Russell* 23/24 (Autumn–Winter 1976): 4–25.
Ed. with L. W. Sumner and Fred Wilson, *Pragmatism and Purpose: Essays Presented to Thomas A. Goudge* (Toronto, 1981).
Bertrand Russell (Bristol, UK, 1994).
Bibliography of Modern British Philosophy (Bristol, UK, 2004).
Minerva's Aviary: Philosophy at Toronto, 1843–2003 (Toronto, 2005).

Other Relevant Works
Ed. with others, *Cambridge Essays, 1888–1903*, by Bertrand Russell (London, 1983).
Ed., *The Philosophy of Logical Atomism and Other Essays, 1914–1919*, by Bertrand Russell (London, 1986).
Ed., *Logical and Philosophical Papers, 1909–1913*, by Bertrand Russell (London and New York, 1992).
Ed., *Essays on Language, Mind, and Matter, 1919–1926*, by Bertrand Russell (London and New York, 1994).
Ed., *A Fresh Look at Empiricism, 1927–1942*, by Bertrand Russell (London and New York, 1996).
Ed., *Last Philosophical Testament, 1943–1968*, by Bertrand Russell (London and New York, 1997).

Further Reading
Slater, John G. *Minerva's Aviary: Philosophy at Toronto 1843–1943* (Toronto, 2005), chap. 11.

John R. Shook

SLOSSON, May Genevieve Preston (1858–1943)

May Preston was born on 10 September 1858 in Ilion, New York, to Mary Gorsline and Levi Curtis Preston. Her father was a minister in the Free Baptist Church, and after the family moved to Kansas he was elected to its state legislature. She attended Hillsdale College in Michigan, receiving her BA in 1878. She then went to Cornell University for graduate study, wrote a sixteen-page thesis on "Different Theories of Beauty," and received her PhD in philosophy in 1880. She was the first woman to receive a PhD from an American university.

When Hasting College in Nebraska was founded in 1882, she was hired as professor of Greek and English, and taught there until 1891 when she married Edwin Slosson, a scientist, and moved to Wyoming. While in Wyoming, she was the chaplain of the state penitentiary (as the only woman prison chaplain in the world at that time) from 1898 until 1903. She had two sons; one, Preston William Slosson, became a prominent historian.

In 1903 the family moved to New York City, where May Slosson served as Director of the Young Women's Christian Association. She participated in many civic organizations, and was also a strong supporter of the woman suffrage movement. Slosson was a popular public speaker, a writer for several publications including the *New York Independent*, and published a volume, *From a Quiet Garden: Lyrics in Prose and Verse* in 1920. From 1920 to 1929

she lived in Washington, D.C., and thereafter in Ann Arbor, Michigan, where she died on 26 November 1943.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
From a Quiet Garden: Lyrics in Prose and Verse (New York, 1920).

Further Reading
Nat Cycl Amer Bio v35

John R. Shook

SMALL, Albion Woodbury (1854–1926)

Albion Small was born in 11 May 1854 in Buckfield, Maine, to Albion K. P. Small and Thankful Lincoln (Woodbury) Small. Determined to follow his father into the ministry, he received his BA at Colby College in 1876. He then went to Newton Theological Seminary in Massachusetts, graduating as a Baptist minister in 1879. In the same year, Small decided to go to Germany to study for his masters degree in social sciences at the universities of Berlin and Leipzig. While in Germany, he was influenced by the social economists Adolph Wagner and Gustav Schmoller. Upon returning to the United States in 1881, he began studies at Johns Hopkins University and completed his PhD in history in 1889. He served as President and professor of history and political economy at Colby College from 1889 to 1892. While at Colby College, he became interested in sociology and wrote a handbook titled *An Introduction to the Science of Sociology* to accompany the sociology class he offered. Small was influential in establishing sociology as a valid field of academic study.

In 1892 Small founded the first department of sociology in America, at the University of Chicago, and served as chair for over thirty years. He was appointed Dean of the Graduate School in 1905. He remained in these positions until his retirement in 1924. In 1895 he founded the *American Journal of Sociology* which quickly became the foremost journal in the discipline, and he was its editor from its first issue in 1895 until 1935. He was a charter member of the American Sociological Society in 1905 (later renamed the American Sociological Association) and served as its President during 1912–13. Small also served as editor for most of the papers published by the Society in its early years. He died on 24 March 1926 in Chicago, Illinois.

Small maintained that all forms of structure, particularly social institutions, are produced by the interaction of opposing forces. As a result, he paid particular attention to the processes of conflict and competition. In spite of his interest in conflict, he believed there was an underlying community consensus and goodwill within each social institution. This interest led him to become an active participant in social reform, believing that the relations between people are not what they should be and that something needed to be done about it. In spite of his collaboration with Jane ADDAMS of Hull-House, the only reform group that Small openly supported was the Civic Federation of Chicago.

Small's most important contribution to sociology was the development of the Chicago department and his insistence on the objectivity and the use of empirical methods in studying society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
An Outline of the French Revolution, Compiled Chiefly from DeTocqueville, Thiers, Taine, Stevens, Mignet, Kitchin, Tripier (Waterville, Maine, 1887).
An Introduction to the Study of Society, with George E. Vincent (New York, 1894).
The Methodology of the Social Problem (Chicago, 1898).
The Significance of Sociology for Ethics (Chicago, 1902).

General Sociology: An Exposition of the Main Development in Sociological Theory from Spencer to Ratzenhofer (Chicago, 1905).

Adam Smith and Modern Sociology: A Study in the Methodology of the Social Sciences (Chicago, 1907).

The Meaning of Social Science (Chicago, 1910).

Socialism in the Light of Social Science (Chicago, 1912).

Between Eras from Capitalism to Democracy (Kansas City, Missouri, 1913).

The Social Gradation of Capital (Chicago, 1914).

Fifty Years of Sociology in the United States, 1865–1915 (Chicago, 1916).

Americans and World-crisis (Chicago, 1918).

Origins of Sociology (New York, 1924).

Other Relevant Works

Small's papers are at the University of Chicago.

The Beginnings of American Nationality: The Constitutional Relations between the Continental Congress and the Colonies and States from 1774 to 1798 (Baltimore, Md., 1890).

The Cameralists: The Pioneers of German Social Polity (Chicago, 1909).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v25*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Abbott, Andrew. *Department and Discipline: Chicago Sociology at One Hundred* (Chicago, 1999).

Christakes, George. *Albion W. Small* (Boston, 1978).

Deegan, Mary Jo. *Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School, 1892–1918.* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1986).

Dibble, Vernon K. *The Legacy of Albion Small* (Chicago, 1975).

Goodspeed, Thomas W. "Albion Woodbury Small," *American Journal of Sociology* 32 (1926): 1–14.

Ione Y. DeOllos

SMART, Harold Robert (1892–1979)

Harold R. Smart was born on 4 May 1892 in Searsport, Maine. He graduated from Kent's Hill Seminary in Maine in 1909, and then earned a BS in economics and mathematics from Wesleyan University in Connecticut. He served in the US Army from 1917 to 1919 during World War I, and then went to Cornell University, where he earned his MA in 1921 and PhD in philosophy in 1923, writing a dissertation on "The Philosophical Presuppositions of Mathematical Logic." During 1923–4 he was an assistant professor at the University of North Carolina. In 1924 he returned to Cornell as assistant professor of philosophy, was promoted up to full professor by 1939, and taught at Cornell until retiring in 1960. Smart died on 22 November 1979 in Poughkeepsie, New York.

Smart was one of the best students of Cornell idealist James E. CREIGHTON and remained a philosophical idealist himself. He specialized in Kant, epistemology, logic, philosophy of logic, philosophy of science, and aesthetics. He produced logic textbooks both as author, writing on the logic of science, and as editor and co-author of later editions of Creighton's *An Introductory Logic*.

In two articles during the mid 1920s, Smart found traditionalist, "Aristotelian-Hegelian," and "empirical-positivist" approaches to logic competing with the formalism of Alfred North WHITEHEAD and Bertrand Russell in England and America. Smart held that, except for brief ancillary or appendage discussions of logistic in newer editions of certain texts, for example the later

editions of John Neville Keynes's *Formal Logic*, Keynes's book could be fairly representative of the quintessential logic text of the day at colleges and universities through much of the English-speaking world. Not until the mid 1940s did Smart himself venture to consider Frege's logic. Granting that the term "modern" must be relativized to the moment or circumstance of its use, what Smart ("Logical Theory," 1926, pp. 601–602) in this context called modern logic "is often described as a continuation and development of Hegelian principles and doctrines," i.e. what he also called the "Aristotelian-Hegelian" logic, as it is epitomized, even in the mid 1920s, by the logics of British idealists F. H. Bradley and Bernard Bosanquet. For Smart, "modern" logic "seeks a concrete synthesis" of the empirical and the formal. The typical elementary logic textbook of the day, Smart wrote, "usually follows, in fundamentals, the Aristotelian tradition" ("Logical Theory," 1926, p. 594).

In his *Philosophical Presuppositions of Mathematical Logic* (1925), based upon his doctoral thesis, Smart surveyed recent work in mathematical logic and argued there that neither Josiah ROYCE nor Bertrand Russell had properly understood the Leibniz program for developing logic as a *mathesis universalis*. They failed to use the Part–Whole theory (rather than inclusion, set membership, etc.), and they also ignored the creative aspects of mathematics, so that their development of mathematical logic was a "complete failure." Although the algebraic logicians were guilty of neither of these "errors," Smart ignored them and their work in his survey, an indication, perhaps, that by the mid 1920s they were no longer considered either mainstream or even relevant. C. I. LEWIS, reviewing Smart's book, criticized Smart for confusing what is "essential" with what is "accidental," especially the undue emphasis which he gave to extensionality, which he had already shown could be avoided. Smart retorted that "formal or abstract truths" are incompatible with extensionality, and he followed this up, taking his cue from the postulate theorists, with stress upon the need to show the validity of logical principles.

Smart's later research examined topics in the recent history of logic. In reviewing Ernst Cassirer's *Leibniz' System* and Louis Couturat's *La logique de Leibniz*, Bertrand Russell had found Cassirer, operating from a neo-Kantian framework, to have seriously misunderstood Leibniz's work. Smart undertook a comparative discussion of Cassirer and Russell and a defense of Cassirer against Russell in "Cassirer *versus* Russell" (1943), and provided an exposition and defense of Cassirer's neo-Kantian views on mathematics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Philosophical Presuppositions of Mathematical Logic (New York, 1925).
"Logical Theory," *The Monist* 36 (1926): 594–604.
"On Mathematical Logic," *Journal of Philosophy* 23 (1926): 296–300.
The Logic of Science (New York, 1931).
"Cassirer *versus* Russell," *Philosophy of Science* 10 (1943): 167–75.
"Frege's Logic," *Philosophical Review* 54 (1945): 489–505.
"Cassirer's Theory of Mathematical Concepts," in *The Philosophy of Ernst Cassirer*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (Evanston, Ill., 1949), pp. 241–67.
"Two Views on Kant and Formal Logic," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 16 (1955): 155–71.
"Language-Games," *Philosophical Quarterly* 7 (1957): 224–35.

Other Relevant Works
An Introductory Logic, 5th edn, with James E. Creighton (New York, 1932).

Further Reading
Proc of APA v53, Who's Who in Phil
Lewis, C. I. "Smart's *Philosophical Presuppositions of Mathematical Logic*," *Journal of Philosophy* 23 (1926): 220–22.

Irving H. Anellis

SMART, Roderick Ninian (1927–2001)

Ninian Smart was born on 6 May 1927 in Cambridge, England to Scottish parents. After attending Glasgow Academy, he studied at the University of Oxford, earning his BA in 1951, MA in 1953, and BPhil in 1954. From 1952 to 1965 Smart was a lecturer in philosophy and religion at the University of Wales, and from 1956 to 1961 he also was a lecturer at the University of London. From 1961 to 1967 he was a professor at the University of Birmingham. In 1967 he was appointed professor of religious studies and head of the new religious studies department at the University of Lancaster, and he held these positions until 1988. He was named J. F. Rowny Professor of Comparative Religions at the University of California at Santa Barbara in 1977, dividing each year between Lancaster and Santa Barbara until 1988, and he held his position at Santa Barbara until retiring in 1998. Smart died on 29 January 2001 in Lancaster, England.

Smart published over thirty books ranging across philosophy of religion and theology, Eastern religion and philosophy, comparative religion, history of religions, and topics relating to religion including education, ethics, and politics. He strongly advocated the influential view, defended in his first book *Reasons and Faiths* (1958), that philosophy of religion should not be undertaken in ignorance of comparative religion. To escape the boundaries of Western theistic doctrines, the full range of human religious experience and doctrinal creativity should be respected and considered. Once admitted into consideration, religious experience for Smart becomes the way to explain doctrinal and metaphysical disagreements between religions. As mediated by religious practices, religious experiences can be correlated with religious beliefs; for example, in *Doctrine and Argument in Indian Philosophy* (1964) Smart suggests that Christian devotional rituals correlate with belief in a personal God, while Buddhist med-

itation rituals correlate with belief in an impersonal divine realm. *The Concept of Worship* (1972) and some later works including *Dimensions of the Sacred: An Anatomy of the World's Beliefs* (1996) further pursue this careful attention to the diverse religious practices of the world.

Smart's *The Philosophy of Religion* (1970) and his subsequent critical discussions of faith and reason offer no conclusive method or argument for rationally preferring one religion or "worldview" over the rest. Although religions must at least help prevent life becoming meaningless by supporting basic values, enhance a believer's moral life, offer revelation behind a charismatic founder or profound theory, and be internally consistent, Smart finds that these goals are all adequately met by the world's major religions and most smaller religions. In *Secular Education and the Logic of Religion* (1968) and *The Phenomenon of Religion* (1973), he distinguishes seven dimensions of religion: doctrine, mythology, ethical beliefs, rituals, religious experiences, social institutions, and symbolism.

Smart's own religious attitudes embraced the numinous rather than the mystical, and preferred the idea that the divine continually interacts with the human realm. He could not follow the Marxist, sociological, or psychological reductions of religion to the human realm. *The Science of Religion and the Sociology of Knowledge* (1973) criticizes among others Peter BERGER and his projective theory of religion. Smart's Anglicanism, explained in *Christian Systematic Theology in a World Context* (1991), is moderated by Buddhist themes and tends towards panentheism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Reasons and Faiths: An Investigation of Religious Discourse, Christian and Non-Christian (London, 1958; New York, 1959).
A Dialogue of Religions (London, 1960). 2nd edn, *World Religions: A Dialogue*

(Harmondsworth, UK, 1966).

Doctrine and Argument in Indian Philosophy (London, 1964; 2nd edn, Leiden and New York, 1992).

Philosophers and Religious Truth (London, 1964; 2nd edn, New York, 1970).

Secular Education and the Logic of Religion (London, 1968).

The Yogi and the Devotee: The Interplay between the Upanishads and Catholic Theology (London, 1968).

The Religious Experience of Mankind (New York, 1969; 2nd edn 1976; 3rd edn 1984).

The Philosophy of Religion (New York, 1970; Oxford, 1979).

The Concept of Worship (London and New York, 1972).

The Phenomenon of Religion (New York and London, 1973).

The Science of Religion and the Sociology of Knowledge: Some Methodological Questions (Princeton, N.J., 1973).

The Long Search (Boston, 1977).

In Search of Christianity (San Francisco, 1979).

Beyond Ideology: Religion and the Future of Western Civilization (San Francisco, 1981).

Worldviews: Crosscultural Explorations of Religious Belief (New York, 1983; 2nd edn, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1995; 3rd edn, Upper Saddle River, N.J., 2000).

Concept and Empathy: Essays in the Study of Religion, ed. Donald Wiebe (New York, 1986).

Religion and the Western Mind (Albany, N.Y., 1987).

The World's Religions (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1989; 2nd edn, Cambridge, UK, 1998).

Christian Systematic Theology in a World Context, with Steven Konstantine (Minneapolis, 1991).

Buddhism and Christianity: Rivals and Allies (Honolulu, Hawaii, 1993).

Religions of the West (Englewood Cliffs,

N.J., 1994).

Choosing a Faith (London and New York, 1995).

Dimensions of the Sacred: An Anatomy of the World's Beliefs (Berkeley, Cal., 1996).

Lights of the World: Buddha and Christ (Bangalore, 1997).

Reflections in the Mirror of Religion, ed. John P. Burris (New York, 1997).

World Philosophies (London and New York, 1999).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Historical Selections in the Philosophy of Religion* (London, 1962).

Ed., *Nineteenth-century Religious Thought in the West*, 3 vols (Cambridge, UK, 1985).

Further Reading

Barnes, L. P. "The Contribution of Professor Ninian Smart to Religious Education," *Religion* 31 (2001): 317–19.

Good, R. C. "Ninian Smart and the Justification of Religious Doctrinal Schemes," *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 13 (1982): 69–76.

Gowen, Julie. "Religion, Reason and Ninian Smart," *Religious Studies* 9 (1973): 219–27.

Levine, Michael P. "Ninian Smart on the Philosophy of Worldviews," *Sophia* 36 (1997): 11–23.

Masefield, Peter, and Donald Wiebe, eds. *Aspects of Religion: Essays in Honour of Ninian Smart* (New York, 1994). Contains a bibliography of Smart's writings.

John R. Shook

SMITH, Gerald Birney (1868–1929)

Gerald B. Smith was born on 3 May 1868 in Middlefield, Massachusetts. Brown University awarded him the BA degree in 1891 and an honorary DD degree in 1909. Smith taught Latin for one year at Oberlin Academy, and mathematics and foreign languages at Worcester Academy for three years, before enrolling at Union Theological Seminary in New York City in 1895. He was influenced by William Adams BROWN and other faculty who represented the liberal theological orientation associated with Albrecht Ritschl. Smith received his BD from Union in 1898 (summa cum laude) and the MA (magna cum laude) in the same year from Columbia University. Union Seminary then awarded Smith a two-year traveling fellowship that allowed him to study in Europe. In 1900 Smith became an instructor of systematic theology and ethics in the University of Chicago's Divinity School, with promotions leading to full professor in 1913. Smith was ordained into the Christian ministry in 1902 at the Hyde Park Baptist Church, where he remained active as a teacher and officer throughout his life. His service to the Divinity School included a variety of administrative duties, among them acting as dean during the absence of the much-traveled Shailer MATHEWS. Smith was the managing editor of the *American Journal of Theology* from 1909 to 1920 and was also editor of its successor publication, the *Journal of Religion*. He helped found the Midwest Division of the American Theological Society and served as an advisor to the nationwide Religious Education Association. He died unexpectedly while vacationing in Dayton, Ohio, on 2 April 1929.

During his European studies Smith examines the developing theological options related to Ritschlianism, which, influenced by Kantian philosophy, applied historical-critical scholarship to scripture and tradition, and emphasized the role of religious experience in theology. A year in Marburg with Wilhelm Herrmann and a shorter period with Auguste Sabatier in Paris had lasting influence on Smith's thought, especially their appeal to experience in grounding theological claims. He also studied with Adolf von Harnack in Berlin, but this had less impact because Smith was already becoming suspicious of methods that depended on identifying or laying claim to an "essence" of Christianity. He found Herrmann's notion of "communion" with God in human experience to be more promising, and he continued to rely on Sabatier's insights on religious and theological authority throughout his own scholarly career. Smith moved to a more empirical approach to the whole theological enterprise upon joining the faculty of the University of Chicago's Divinity School, which proved to be lifelong and intellectually defining.

Smith quickly became a key, although not the most prominent, member of what has become known as the Early Chicago School of Theology. Many of his Divinity School colleagues were better known: Shailer Mathews in biblical, historical, and constructive theology; Shirley Jackson CASE in historical studies and New Testament scholarship; and George Burman FOSTER and Edward Scribner AMES in philosophy of religion. Smith's central role among these scholars can largely be attributed to his appointment in systematic theology and ethics – disciplines usually at the heart of any theological orientation. But Smith also functioned so decisively among his colleagues because of the quality of his scholarship and the integrity of his person. Smith was the author of three books, co-author of two others, and editor of an additional three books. He wrote approximately sixty articles, several appearing in journals and other publications of the University of Chicago. Sometimes the articles appeared in a series under a common theme, together equivalent to a multi-chaptered book. A prolific writer of book reviews, Smith also often surveyed current literature in scholarly fields in his books and articles. Bernard MELAND, a student of Smith and later a successor in theology at the Divinity School, described him as "warmly sympathetic"

toward others and "exceedingly judicious" in assessing conflicting issues, while "devastating" in his criticism of thought that pretended to express consensus. Meland notes Smith's analytic capacity to expose pretentious or ill-formed proposals as well as his appreciation for constructive insights, minimal though they might be. Meland concludes that colleagues "came to depend on his judgment for winnowing out the truth and error of situations in Divinity School life and thought" and that Smith "exercised a powerful influence in shaping" them.

Smith was in turn deeply influenced by his Divinity School and wider university colleagues. In the study of the scriptures and tradition, these colleagues rigorously employed "a socio-historical method," which sought the source, meaning, and importance of a text, event, or person by identifying major contextual factors. History itself was dynamic, and any age had its distinctive and dominant "social mind" that defined how it should be broadly understood. Smith fully embraced this procedure and, like others, saw its significance for the contemporary setting: the modern age had its distinctive characteristics, which needed to be centrally incorporated in analytic and normative thought, especially theology. Smith and his colleagues welcomed the claim that they and their school of thought were "modernist." Moreover, he contended that this way of doing theology in a bold modernist mode did not diminish religious sensibilities but could deepen devotion, enliven evangelical zeal, and strengthen a commitment to social change, as advocated in the Social Gospel movement. Given the emphasis on sociohistorical factors that shaped any age, including the current one, Smith and his Divinity School partners prized the work of university colleagues in the humanities and, even more, in the emerging social sciences. Particular attention was given to sociology and social work, psychology and education, political science and economics, as well as history.

The excitement about and relevance of the social sciences overshadowed any confessed dependence of these Chicago theologians on philosophy – its traditional disciplinary partner. And for the most part, the Chicago style of theological inquiry led by Smith set aside traditional types of philosophy, in part because they too were reflections of earlier "social minds." But the Chicago theologians made little reference to contemporary philosophy, even the philosophy being developed at the University of Chicago under the leadership of John DEWEY. While not often mentioned, the influence of Dewey was nevertheless profound. They all agreed that the evolutionary principle was foundational and that inductive and scientific reasoning was to be employed in normative inquiries. With Dewey, they also affirmed that the world was not controlled externally and that its parts should be understood as internally changing and interrelated. That meant that the theologian, as well as the philosopher, needed to understand how things *function*, how they adjust to their surroundings, and how they shape those surroundings. These central features of Dewey's thought were key ingredients in Smith's own reformulation of the theological enterprise.

Later in his career, in keeping with the development of a richer naturalism, Smith drew on the philosophical endeavors of William JAMES (particularly his radical empiricism), Henri Bergson, Samuel Alexander, and other emergent evolutionists. He also appreciated the scholarship of Ernst Troeltsch, especially as it pointed to the significant contextual change in which the contemporary theologian operates. He admired the Catholic modernists as he saw them partaking with intellectual integrity in a reformation of theology that moved from a dependence on external authority to an openness to modern research methods and findings.

Smith was a genuinely radical American theologian. Even among his pioneering Chicago colleagues, he was the most consistent and thoroughgoing in attempting to decisively change the course of the theological discipline. At the core of his approach was the thesis that a huge chasm separated the theology preceding the

modern period from that of the present. Previously, religious thought was defined by church control and deductive reasoning based on theological first principles, as was in keeping with the social mind of those early ages. But in a time when democracy and the scientific method, with its inductive reasoning, were becoming dominant, modern theology must give up procedures that depended on appeals to a substantive external authority and instead embrace methods for which authority rested in the *process* of science and democracy. A central part of his defense for this claim was that only by being in harmony with the defining characteristics of modern life could theology hope to have an effective and beneficial influence on modern life. To those who would fault such a proposal because it lacked the capacity for fundamental or prophetic critique, Smith would argue that the scientific and democratic methods, when rigorously pursued, themselves incorporated such means for comprehensive self-criticism and renewal. The fullest exposition of this theological proposal appeared in his "Systematic Theology and Christian Ethics" (1916). But the first concise elaboration of the proposal appears in the 1910 essay "The Task and Method of Systematic Theology." There he outlined the science-like steps that a new approach to theology would include: "(1) the historical understanding of the growth and significance of the religious ideals which constitute our social inheritance; (2) the analysis of present religious needs; (3) the interpretation of these needs in such a way as to suggest religious convictions which shall at the same time be practically efficient and rationally defensible; and (4) the apologetic defense of the theological convictions reached."

Smith tied the treatment of Christian ethics directly to his theological approach. His *Social Idealism and Changing Theology* (1913) is an extended argument about the moral significance of scientific and democratic methods and an ethical indictment of theologies that continued to appeal, either fully or in part, to one or more external authorities. Intellectual and moral integrity was at stake. Furthermore, he contended that avoiding a revised ethical standard in theological efforts had the consequence of robbing Christianity of its power to participate in the redeeming of the modern world. Similarly, in the *Principles of Christian Living* (1924), Smith advanced the theme of recasting moral theology in terms of adjustment to the new social situation and rejected a religious ethic that depended on identifying a Christian "essence." Because the key criterion is effectiveness in living under the actual conditions of the contemporary world, he was willing to entertain the possibility, even likelihood, that Christians can gain insight and assistance from the teachings of other religions and cultures, although he remained confident that "Jesus' way of living" will be relevant for a democratic and scientific age.

World War I caused Smith to focus intently on the religious significance of democracy. In a major programmatic essay and then in a series of six articles, Smith used historical studies to reveal the function of religion in relation to the social conditions of various epochs. He then explored both how the democratic ideal should infuse religious life and thought and how a vital religious faith can contribute to democratic societies. A central notion in these writings is a transformed understanding of assurance when certainty is no longer applicable.

Smith's radically different theological method produced diverse theological doctrines. A mid-career essay on Christology, "The Christ of Faith and the Jesus of History" (1914), reveals how fully he was prepared to accept and incorporate the findings of critical scholarship in theological constructions, including the judgment that the doctrine of Christ could no longer be the keystone for Christian theology. Smith would not protect an honored doctrine from textual and historical criticism. Christianity as a historical religion could remain viable if its followers were willing to embrace and include the results of historical inquiries. The same applied to the doctrine of God. Some of his Chicago colleagues proposed that God be

understood as *representing* the highest expression of human ideals, but Smith instead believed that God had to be a reality that is a part of human experience. He proposed that the divine was a cosmic reality, even if a finite reality or dimension within nature, to which humans must respond and adjust if they are to live creatively and fully in any age. In this spirit, Smith renewed an interest in philosophy, especially in those philosophical proposals that incorporated evolutionary thought and wrestled with the findings of the physical and social sciences. Smith was also open to experiments in forms of worship and spirituality that would enhance the creative relationship of human beings with the cosmic reality that he understood to be God. His untimely death cut short the possibility of his filling out these insights into a full systematic theology and theological ethic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Practical Theology: A Neglected Field in Theological Education," in *Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago*, first series (Chicago, 1903), vol. 3, pp. 69–87.
Biblical Ideas of Atonement, with E. Burton and J. M. P. Smith (Chicago, 1909).
"The Task and Method of Systematic Theology," *American Journal of Theology* 14 (1910): 215–33.
Social Idealism and Changing Theology: A Study of the Ethical Aspects of Christian Doctrine (New York, 1913).
Principles of Christian Living: A Handbook of Christian Ethics (Chicago, 1924).
"Is Theism Essential to Religion?" *Journal of Religion* 5 (1925): 356–77.
Current Christian Thinking (Chicago, 1928).

Other Relevant Works
"The Christ of Faith and the Jesus of History," *American Journal of Theology* 18 (1914): 521–44.
"Systematic Theology and Christian Ethics," in *A Guide to the Study of the Christian Religion*, ed. G. B. Smith (Chicago, 1916), pp. 483–577.
"Christianity and the Spirit of Democracy," *American Journal of Theology* 21 (1917): 339–57.
"The Religious Significance of the Humanity of Jesus," *American Journal of Theology* 24 (1920): 191–208.
Ed. with Shailer Mathews, *A Dictionary of Religion and Ethics* (New York, 1921).
"A Quarter-Century of Theological Thinking," in *Religious Thought in the Last Quarter-Century*, ed. G. B. Smith (Chicago, 1927), pp. 95–115.
"An Overlooked Factor in the Adjustment between Religion and Science," *Journal of Religion* 7 (1927): 337–59.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Brown, Delwin. "The Fall of '26: Gerald Birney Smith and the Collapse of the Socio-historical Framework of Theology," *American Journal of Theology and Philosophy* 2 (1990): 183–202.
Greenfield, Larry L. *The Theology of Gerald Birney Smith*. PhD dissertation, University of Chicago Divinity School (Chicago, 1978).
Kraus, C. Norman. *The Principle of Authority in the Theology of B. B. Warfield, William Adams Brown, and Gerald Birney Smith*. PhD dissertation, Duke University (Durham, N.C., 1961).
Meland, Bernard E. "The Empirical Tradition in Theology at Chicago," in *The Future of Empirical Theology*, ed. Bernard E. Meland (Chicago, 1969), pp. 1–62.

Larry Greenfield

SMITH, Henry Boynton (1815–77)

Henry Boynton Smith was born on 21 November 1815 in Portland, Maine. In 1834 he graduated from Bowdoin College and went on to study theology with Moses Stuart and Leonard Woods at Andover Theological Seminary. Due to ill health, he left Andover and returned to Maine where he completed his theological education under the direction of Enoch Pond at Bangor Theological Seminary. After serving as librarian and tutor at Bowdoin, in 1837 Smith went to Germany to further his theological studies. During his time in Germany he attended the lectures of August Tholuck at the University of Halle and August Neander, August Twesten, Leopold Ranke, Friedrich Adolf Trendelenburg, and Ernst Hengstenberg at the University of Berlin.

Returning to America in 1840, Smith again served as a tutor at Bowdoin. In 1842 he agreed to serve as pastor of the Congregational Church of West Amesbury, Massachusetts. He remained as pastor until 1847 when he accepted the position of professor of moral philosophy and metaphysics at Amherst College. Three years later he moved to Union Theological Seminary in New York City as its fourth faculty member. He served as Washburn Professor of Church History from 1850 to 1853 and then as Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology from 1853 until retiring in 1874. Smith died on 7 February 1877 in New York City.

Drawing on his studies in Germany, Smith delivered the Porter Society Address at Andover in 1849, defending the importance of philosophy for the religious believer. While German idealism had the potential to veer into pantheism, Smith insisted that rational thought, philosophical acumen, and intellectually powerful defenses were necessary for adequate religious belief. For Smith, philosophy was the handmaiden of orthodoxy.

Reflecting his indebtedness to the mediational theology of his German mentors, particularly Tholuck, Neander, and Twesten, Smith throughout his career characterized scientific inquiry as a principle of critical analysis that could be widely applied rather than identifying science with a specific subject field such as chemistry, geology, or biology. In this context, he argued that Americans had too little respect for history, often regarding it as nothing more than lifeless dates learned by rote memory. Smith insisted that history, including church history, was a science and its study should place its facts within generalizations rather than regard them as atomistic units of information. Beyond that, history was developmental, encompassing both causes and purposes. Finally, proper historical methodology must have checks and tests to verify its facts and validate its conclusions.

While Smith subsumed his historical reflections under his theological purposes, in a larger sense his writings were important as efforts to introduce nineteenth-century German Romantic categories with their emphasis on organic and developmental thinking to a literate and educated American public. As an essayist, editor, teacher, and public lecturer, Smith also played a leading role among New School Presbyterians and in their reunion with the Old School Presbyterians in 1869. He served as editor or co-editor of *American Theological Review* from 1859 to 1862, *American Presbyterian and Theological Review* from 1863 to 1868, *American Presbyterian Review* from 1869 to 1871, and *Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review* from 1872 to 1877. Though he never published a full systematic presentation of his ideas, Smith's legacy included his commitment to the compatibility of reason and faith, his appropriation of German organic and idealist thought, and his affirmation of a Christocentric theology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Relations of Faith and Philosophy (Andover, Mass., 1849).
Nature and Worth of the Science of Church History (Andover, Mass., 1851).
History of the Church of Christ in Chronological Tables (New York, 1859).

The Reunion of the Presbyterian Churches, Called New School and Old School (New York, 1867).

Faith and Philosophy (New York, 1877).

System of Christian Theology, ed. William S. Karr (New York, 1884).

Introduction to Christian Theology, ed. William S. Karr (New York, 1885).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v5*

Conser, Walter H., Jr. *God and the Natural World: Religion and Science in Antebellum America* (Columbia, S.C., 1993).

Marsden, George M. *The Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience: A Case Study of Thought and Theology in Nineteenth-century America* (New Haven, Conn., 1970).

Smith, Elizabeth Lee. *Henry Boynton Smith: His Life and Work* (New York, 1880).

Stearns, Lewis F. *Henry Boynton Smith* (Boston, Mass., 1892).

Stoever, William K. B. "Henry Boynton Smith and the German Theology of History," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 24 (1968): 69–89.

Walter H. Conser, Jr.

SMITH, Henry Bradford (1882–1938)

Henry Bradford Smith was born on 14 January 1882 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the son of Henry Augustus and Martha Louise Stevenson Smith. He received his BA from the University of Pennsylvania in 1903, and stayed there for his PhD in philosophy in 1909, writing a dissertation titled "Transition from 'Bewusstsein' to 'Selbstbewusstsein' in Hegel's 'Phenomenology of Mind'." In 1911 Smith became instructor in philosophy at Pennsylvania, was promoted up to full professor in 1924, and held that position until his death on 17 November 1938 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He was Vice President of the American Philosophical Association in 1935.

Smith worked on the relation of Aristotelian logic to the algebraic logic of the Boole–Schröder calculus and to the logic of William Hamilton. He defended classical logic against mathematical logic, arguing against the assertions of algebraic logicians that all of Aristotle's "postulates" are true. He worked on the theory of implication and authored a number of logic textbooks. In his *Symbolic Logic* he employed the term "symbolic logic" to discuss mathematical logic, using it in the context of his discussion on deriving Aristotle's postulates from the Boole–Schröder calculus.

In his writings Smith showed, first how to deduce the postulates of Aristotle's system directly from the Boole–Schröder calculus, and then proved the consistency of Aristotelian "algebra" by showing how to deduce the postulates of the Boole–Schröder calculus from Aristotelian syllogistic, using respectively the definitions for Aristotelian inclusion $a < b$ and for the Boolean inclusion $a \ldots b$. Next, he developed the Hamiltonian set of forms from the properties of the Boole–Schröder calculus, then from these established the characteristic features from Aristotle's logic of obversion, contraposition, and simple conversion where they occurred, and subalternation and the valid moods of syllogisms. With the forms of Aristotelian logic thus defined, he expressed in terms of Boolean inclusion and deduced the fundamental properties of William Hamilton's logic. Archie BAHM argued, however, that Smith failed to prove the invalidity of the equivalent of *Barbara* given in *Principia Mathematica*, as Smith (1927, p. 132) had claimed to do by this method of translation, while Paul HENLE argued that it is "difficult to see" Smith's system as equivalent to Aristotelian logic. Smith had also become embroiled in controversy when his *Foundations of Formal Logic* was reviewed by Ralph Monroe Eaton, with Smith complaining in response that Eaton had

completely misunderstood his work, and that there were "certain conceptions which have confused [the] modernist" Eaton.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Transition from "Bewusstsein" to "Selbstbewusstsein" in Hegel's Phenomenology of Mind: An Exegetical Essay, with an Introduction and with Notes (Pulaski, Virg., 1909).
A Primer of Logic (Pulaski, Virg., 1917).
Non-Aristotelian Logic (Philadelphia, 1919).
Letters on Logic to a Young Man Without Master (Philadelphia, 1920).
A First Book in Logic (New York, 1922; 2nd edn 1938).
Foundations of Formal Logic (Philadelphia, 1922).
How the Mind Falls Into Error: A Brief Treatment of Fallacies, for the General Reader (New York, 1923).
The Collective Mind, and Other Philosophical Papers (Columbus, Ohio, 1924).
Symbolic Logic, Method, and Development (New York, 1927).
Logic as the Art of Symbols (New York, 1938).
Abstract Logic, Problem, Method, and Development (New York, 1938).

Other Relevant Work
"Certain Conceptions which have Confused a Modernist," *Journal of Philosophy* 20 (1923): 48–9.
"On the Derivation of the Aristotelian Algebra from the Properties of a Hamiltonian Set," *The Monist* 42 (1932): 290–93.
"On the Relation of the Aristotelian Algebra to that of Boole–Schroeder," *The Monist* 42 (1932): 282–9.

Further Reading
Proc of APA in Phil Rev v48, Who Was Who in Amer v1

Bahm, Archie J. "Henry Bradford Smith on the Equivalent Form of Barbara," *The Monist* 42 (1932): 632–3.
Eaton, Ralph Monroe. "Smith's *Foundations of Formal Logic*," *Journal of Philosophy* 19 (1922): 715–17.
Henle, Paul. "A Note on the Validity of Aristotelian Logic," *Philosophy of Science* 2 (1935): 111–13.

Irving H. Anellis

SMITH, Henry Ignatius (1886–1957)

Ignatius Smith was born on 25 August 1886 in Newark, New Jersey. He was educated at Seton Hall College; the Dominican House of Philosophy in Somerset, Ohio; and the Dominican House of Studies in Washington, D.C. He was ordained priest in 1910, and taught philosophy and sociology at the Dominican House in Washington while earning his PhD in philosophy from Catholic University of America, which was awarded in 1915. From 1916 to 1920 Smith was prior and pastor at St. Catherine of Siena Church in New York City, and during this time he also was the national director of the Holy Name Society and the Third Order of St. Dominic. In 1922 he became prior of Dominican House in Washington and also joined the faculty of Catholic University's School of Philosophy. He served as prior until 1928, and in 1938 he assumed the responsibilities of Dean of the School of Philosophy. In 1956 he retired from teaching and his position as Dean. Smith died on 8 March 1957 in Washington, D.C.

Smith filled several leadership roles in American Catholic thought. He founded *The Torch* in 1916, editing that journal for several years while also editing *The Holy Name Review*. From 1937 to 1948 he was the editor of *The New Scholasticism*. He contributed

articles to *The Catholic Encyclopedia* and many academic journals including *The Thomist* and *The New Scholasticism*. At Catholic University, besides his important role as Dean, he was responsible for the founding of the Preacher's Institute in 1932 and he led its operations for over two decades. For many years Smith was widely known for his influential sermons and lectures, and his talks on local radio stations. When *Life Magazine* selected the twelve greatest American preachers in its 6 April 1953 issue, Smith was the only Catholic on the list.

Smith's philosophical contributions centered on the examination and application of St. Thomas Aquinas's works. Most of his publications are expositions of the Thomistic philosophy and its implications for contemporary issues such as war, justice, education, and democracy. Recognized as a leader among Catholic philosophers, he was President of the American Catholic Philosophical Association in 1938.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Classification of Desires in St. Thomas and in Modern Sociology (Washington, D.C., 1915).

Justice (Washington, D.C., 1942).

Saint Thomas Aquinas and Human Social Life (Washington, D.C., 1945).

Aquinas and Some American Freedoms (Washington, D.C., 1947).

Other Relevant Works

Smith's papers are at Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C.

Further Reading

Who Was Who in Amer v3

Ryan, John K., ed. *Philosophical Studies in Honor of the Very Reverend Ignatius Smith, O.P.* (Westminster, Md., 1952).

John R. Shook

SMITH, Huston Cummings (1919–)

Huston Smith was born on 31 May 1919 in Soochow, China, the son of devout Methodist missionaries. As a boy, he was bilingual in Chinese and English. At age seventeen, Smith came to the United States to study at Central Methodist College in Fayette, Missouri. His studies there kindled his interest in philosophy and theology, and after receiving his BA in 1940, he enrolled in the Divinity School at the University of Chicago. Enthusiastic about a version of "theistic naturalism" taught by Henry Nelson WIEMAN and Stephen PEPPER, Smith intended to forge a unified world view combining science and religion, completing his PhD in religion in 1945. However, while writing his dissertation on "The Metaphysical Foundation of Contextualistic Philosophy of Religion," Smith discovered the perennial philosophical tradition in Aldous Huxley and Gerald Heard, which led him to shift his interest from naturalism to the divine ground of all existence.

Smith first taught at the Universities of Colorado and Denver from 1944 to 1947, and then taught philosophy and religion at Washington University from 1947 until 1958. It was at Washington that Smith first researched and taught the course in the world's great religions that led to his landmark work in 1958, *The Religions of Man*. Smith then moved to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he was professor of philosophy until 1973. At MIT, Smith awakened to the antipathy between religion and what he calls "scientism," which led to his highly influential book, *Forgotten Truth: The Primordial Tradition* (1976). Smith was subsequently named Thomas J. Watson Professor of Religion and Distinguished Professor of Philosophy at Syracuse University, where he received emeritus status in 1983. Smith finished his formal teaching career as visiting professor at the University of California at Berkeley, retiring in 1996. In the years since *Forgotten Truth*, Smith has written several influential books and

articles, including *Beyond the Post-Modern Mind* (1982) and *Why Religion Matters: The Fate of the Human Spirit in an Age of Disbelief* (2001).

Smith, like Fritjof Schuon and Ananda COOMARASWAMY before him, is an eminent representative of the perennial philosophy or what Smith calls the "primordial tradition." To speak of a tradition as primordial implies that this view of things has been present in every time and place in human history, and so it has, Smith contends. The primordial tradition is a general world view shared with near unanimity by premodern peoples; it claims that there is a common core of assumptions concerning reality lying behind the social and cultural differences found in explicit doctrines. To claim that the primordial world view was dominant in premodern times, however, might imply that this view has somehow been discredited or invalidated by the present modern world view. Nevertheless, Smith insisted that the primordial tradition is concerned with timeless and not bygone truths.

The primordial tradition rests on the metaphysical insight that divine reality is at the root of everything. Furthermore, within divine reality an operational duality sets up a tension or interplay between the eternal and temporal, an interplay that manifests itself hierarchically. The primordial tradition conceives of the universe as organized from the highest perfect being, down through every possible grade to the simplest kind of existent. In this view, causation runs downward. The greater is the source of the lesser; the whole is prior, in principle, to the part. Qualities such as life, sentience, and self-consciousness cannot emerge from the rearrangement of elements that lack those qualities themselves. The universe is teleologically ordered, drawn from above, not driven or determined mechanically from below. The universe is seen as a meaningful, spiritual place in which values, qualities, and purposes, far from being illusions or human projections, are an objective dimension of reality itself. It is on the basis of this operational duality within

unity that Smith develops his theory of religion.

Smith asserts that humans are naturally religious, *homo religious*. From the earliest human times, our ancestors looked beyond the contingent and temporal to the divine metaphysical reality from which the temporal was derived and in which it remains grounded. From the beginning religion has used ritual to anchor each generation in timeless reality, thereby giving these rituals and practices, as well as those participating in them, their enduring meaning. Subsequent ages have further developed both a moral and social dimension to religion. Far from being a superstructure, as the Marxists would have it, Smith sees religion as culture's base and origin.

If divine reality and Truth is single, as the perennialists assert, how can we account for the many apparent contradictions and disagreements among religious traditions concerning the nature of God and reality? In short, how do we account for religious pluralism? Smith found in Fritjof Schuon the categories both for addressing pluralism and avoiding relativism. Each of the great religious traditions, Smith asserts, mirrors reality's duality in unity, its interplay of the eternal and temporal. There is a unity at the heart of the various religions that is more than reflective of some common moral or theological proposition. Because of this unity, the primary distinction is not between whole religious traditions, as, for example, between Buddhism and Christianity, nor is it between traditional family resemblances, such as theistic and nontheistic traditions. Rather, the primary distinction is between the "esoteric" dimension, or infinite plane, of each religion (that dimension which recognizes the unqualified or hidden dimension of reality), and the "exoteric" dimension, or theistic plane, of religion (which emphasizes the formal interplay of being and becoming). Divine reality, Smith contends, reveals different aspects of itself to different people. Humanity and culture act as a kind of prism refracting and reflecting the light of the Ultimate, while cultural peculiarities color each tradition's respective rituals

and practices. Each tradition is sufficient for those who follow it faithfully. And yet, the one who studies other religions gains insight even into his or her own tradition while realizing a fuller relation to transcendent Truth.

Religious traditions essentially attempt to work out or embody this duality in unity, this interplay between the eternal and temporal. In *Why Religion Matters* Smith highlights religion's emphasis on our divine/human becoming. Smith tells us that the practice of religion is one of "commitment to making people real." We are theomorphic creatures whose form or material nature contains the divine within. The world's religions recall us to our true nature and so "enable people to come as close as possible to God's infinite reality." This becoming "as close as possible to God's infinite reality" could be understood as merely a subjective experience. Many today insist that religion is just another psychologically and/or socially constructed experience with no causal connection to "objective" reality, let alone being attributable to some transcendent spiritual reality called God. If this were so, then the modern world view would correctly separate science from religion on the basis of a fact–value split. Science would deal with facts about the natural world and religion with human purposes, meaning, and values. But Smith rejects all attempts to reduce religion to the level of the subjective, psychological, or social. He also rejects the fact–value split as an unexamined bias of modernity's naturalism.

Smith argues that the modern world view has never discredited, invalidated, or rightfully replaced the primordial world view. It is the modern world view which is based on a logical mistake. Grounded in science, the modern world view has made a metaphysics from a method that by definition is capable of studying only the lower, material realms of existence. The methodology of science is suited for measuring, controlling, and predicting, and therefore its area of effectiveness is limited to that which can be quantified. What of the qualitative order? Science attempts to explain it away,

trying to reduce it to the quantitative. In *Forgotten Truth*, Smith uses an image from Karl Popper to illustrate the problem. Popper's image likens science to a searchlight scanning the night sky for airplanes. For an airplane to register, two things are required: it must exist and it must be located where the beam's light is shining. That qualities, values, purposes, and life-meanings are not illuminated by the scientific beam's limited light hardly precludes their existence. And yet, Smith contends, the assumption that matter is the foundation of all reality is a basic feature separating legitimate science from "scientism," and it is scientism that has given rise to the modern world view. Scientism, and so modernity, has dismissed everything except the material plane, with the effect of rendering the world "dis-qualified," stripped of quality and value.

As Smith once put it, using our empirical faculties alone to understand what transcends those faculties is analogous to a dog sniffing the pages of a book and concluding that grammar does not exist. Similarly, the twin pillars of scientism – that scientific method alone reaches truth and that matter is the foundation of everything – are themselves "unscientific." The world is not as the scientist alone describes it, but also as it is revealed to the poet, mystic, artisan, and person of sound common sense. It is not upon the fact–value split that science and religion are to be distinguished. Rather, Smith tells us in *Why Religion Matters*, "science deals with the natural world and religion with the whole of things."

Just as innovations in technology lack wisdom in their use, so science is not its own measure. Science and modernity embraced the Enlightenment's "natural light of reason." It was assumed that reason possessed its own Archimedian point. There were differences over where this point is; Descartes's innate ideas, Kant's categories, and the positivists' sense-data were offered as possibilities. Postmodernism has shown this idea of the "natural light of reason" to be a myth, but has typically sought the basis of reason in something external, specifically in

some aspect of society. Postmodernists contend that social contexts, "forms of life," or cultural-linguistic wholes are the final arbiters of meaning, reality, and truth. But, according to Smith, postmodernism is itself merely a way station on philosophy's journey, since basing reason on cultural-linguistic *gestalts* makes impossible an understanding of truth other than consensus and provides no satisfying response to relativism.

Hume saw that something besides reason is at work in our knowing, but he found nothing to carry reason except the instincts and passions. Smith grounds reason in a higher power, what the medieval theologians termed "Intellect," a power akin to intuition. Called the "eye of the soul" by Plato, Intellect is the mind's foundational light. In Vedantin thought, it is Awareness as distinct from consciousness; in Buddhism, it is pointed to with *prajna* as knowing's supreme capacity. Intellect is itself grounded in the single divine reality. Smith concludes that only the slightest of barriers separates us from the sacred dimension of our being; divine reality is unimaginably close. Alfred North WHITEHEAD predicted that the future will largely be shaped by the way the two most powerful forces in history, science and religion, settle into relation with each other. Smith agrees, and for the sake of humanity's ultimate well-being, establishing a just relation between the two has been his primary concern.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Purpose of Higher Education (New York, 1955; 2nd edn 1972).

The Religions of Man (New York, 1958). Rev. edn, *The World's Religions* (San Francisco, 1991).

The Search for America (New Jersey, 1959).

Condemned to Meaning (New York, 1965).

Forgotten Truth: The Primordial Tradition (New York, 1976).

Beyond the Post-Modern Mind (New York, 1982; 2nd edn 1989; 3rd edn 2003).

Primordial Truth and Postmodern Theology, with David R. Griffin (New York, 1989).

Huston Smith: Essays On World Religion, ed. M. Darrol Bryant (New York, 1992).

The Illustrated World's Religions (San Francisco, 1994).

One Nation Under God: The Triumph of the Native American Church, ed. Reuben Snake (Santa Fe, N.M., 1996).

Cleansing the Doors of Perception: The Religious Significance of Entheogenic Plants and Chemicals (New York, 2000).

Why Religion Matters: The Fate of the Human Spirit in an Age of Disbelief (San Francisco, 2001).

Islam: A Concise Introduction (San Francisco, 2001).

The Way Things Are: Conversations with Huston Smith on the Context of the Human Venture, ed. Phil Cousineau (Berkeley, Cal., 2002).

Buddhism: A Concise Introduction, with Philip Novak (New York, 2003).

Other Relevant Works

Many of Smith's works are at Syracuse University.

The Religions of Man, National Education Television (1955).

A Conversation with Krishnamurti, Blaisdell Institute, Claremont College (1968).

Requiem for a Faith, Hartley Film Foundation (1968).

Music of Tibet: The Tantric Rituals, Anthology Recordings, AST 4005 (1970).

Islamic Mysticism: The Sufi Way, Hartley Film Foundation (1972).

India and the Infinite: The Soul of a People, Hartley Film Foundation (1980).

The Wisdom of Faith with Huston Smith, a 5-part Bill Moyers Public Broadcasting System Special (1996).

The Wisdom of Huston Smith, in Conversation with Michael Toms, audio recording by Hays House (2002).

Further Reading

Bryan, G. McLeod. *Voices in the Wilderness: Twentieth-century Prophets Speak to the*

New Millennium (Macon, Georgia, 1999).

Sharma, Arvind, ed. *Fragments of Infinity: Essays in Religion and Philosophy in honour of Professor Huston Smith* (Dorset, UK, 1991).

Bruce K. Hanson

SMITH, John Edwin (1921–)

John E. Smith was born on 27 May 1921 in Brooklyn, New York. Smith received his BA from Columbia University in 1942. In 1945 he received his M.Div. from Union Theological Seminary, where he studied with both Reinhold NIEBUHR and Paul TILLICH. His interests were American philosophy and philosophy of religion, and he received his PhD in philosophy from Columbia University in 1949. His dissertation was written under the direction of Herbert SCHNEIDER and was published in revised form in 1950 as *Royce's Social Infinite*. While at Columbia, Smith also studied with Jacques Barzun and Lionel Trilling. From 1946 to 1952 Smith taught in the departments of philosophy and religion at Barnard College. In 1952 he joined the faculty at Yale University, where he later was appointed Clark Professor of Philosophy. Smith retired in 1991 and continues to teach one course each year as professor emeritus. Smith has been President of the American Philosophical Association's Eastern Division (1981–2), the American Theological Society, and the Charles S. Peirce Society. He has also received a variety of professional awards, including the Herbert W. Schneider Award from the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy.

Smith is recognized for his powerful interpretive work in American philosophy, for his outstanding teaching career, and for his original contributions to the philosophy of religion. His interpretive work began with his first book, which involved a study of the dialectic of self and community in Josiah ROYCE's idealism. His exploration of American thought continued when he served as General Editor of seven volumes of Jonathan Edwards's collected works. Smith is also recognized for his assessments of the history and future of American pragmatism. In his classic work, *The Spirit of American Philosophy* (1963), and in his later *Purpose and Thought* (1984), Smith offered clear and insightful analyses of the work of Charles PEIRCE, Royce, William JAMES, John DEWEY, and Alfred North WHITEHEAD. Smith's interpretive work was never merely historical, however. His own work developed directly out of his studies of James's and Royce's concerns with the self, of Dewey's emphasis on community and the social import of thought, and of Peirce's attention to metaphysical inquiry in a non-absolutist vein.

Smith's contributions to the philosophy of religion are not systematic in the sense that they define a closed architectonic. Rather, he takes a particular outlook and employs it to interpret key concepts and relationships relevant to philosophy and religion. His outlook is guided by the revised, or what he sometimes calls "recovered," versions of "experience" and "reason." On the one hand, he rejected the notion of traditional empiricism that experience is characterized by a separation of self and world. He understood experience as an avenue of direct encounter with the world. On the other hand, reason should not to be limited to deductive practices, as had been the case with much of the rationalist tradition. Smith developed a conception of "living reason" that sees our reasoning capacity, not as a tool for producing certainty, but as a faculty for providing meaning and purpose for human experience in a historical setting. As he argued in *The Spirit of American Philosophy* in response to contemporary rejections of reason's efficacy, "Faith in reason can be recovered when we once again understand reason not as an abstract formal structure which stands apart from a world of brute fact, but as a living power which informs the world

about us and shapes our thought and speech." (1963, p. 188) As he examined the religious dimension of experience, Smith employed these revised concepts to arrive at original interpretations of, among other things, the self in its relations to community and God, the relation of faith and reason, and the meaning of God in human experience.

At the heart of Smith's work is an exploration of the meaning of the self in its social and natural environment. He believed the existential querying that appears in human life, particularly in the religious dimension of experience, to be foundational to philosophical inquiry. The self is thus the locus of purpose, interest, and concern. At the same time, he recognized the individual's need for a social environment that both allows and enables the growth of meaning. In *Purpose and Thought*, Smith made this point explicit: "it is quite naïve to ignore the social character of religion and to suppose that it is found in pristine form only in the depths of the individual soul without dependence on enduring institutions and their structures" (1984, p. 183). Religious life begins with the individual but then orients the individual toward the human community and toward God.

Smith's discussions of God, like those of W. E. HOCKING, focused less on describing God's attributes in the abstract than on exploring what God meant for human experience. As he explained in *The Analogy of Experience*, "Since the generic concept of God is rooted in experience and the quest for God is also experiential and not a merely speculative endeavor, the actual disclosure of God becomes essentially related to experience." (1973, p. 89) He described the possibility of "direct experience," which is unmediated but temporal, as an avenue of encounter not only with other persons but with God. Such experiences might generate a religious outlook and reorient the whole of one's life. Like James, Smith suggested that we look for the presence of God in the purposes and actions of those whose lives are animated by faith. The life of religious faith is an experimental life that involves both seeking and reasoning.

Reason and faith are thus not mutually exclusive in Smith's thought but instead reciprocally dependent. Faith calls for understanding, and reason, being finite, must accept the presence of faith. Faith may begin in "direct experience" of God, but any such experience still needs to be lived and tested. As Smith argues in *The Philosophy of Religion*, "although intuition or immediate experience may turn out to be essential for any approach to God, it is never sufficient and self-sustaining" (1965, p. 7). Living reason is called on to find the meaning of God in experience and to make sense, both theoretically and practically, of faith. Reason does not provide necessary and certain accounts of religious doctrines. At the same time, reason cannot be dismissed in philosophy and religion. For Smith, metaphysics is not to be overcome but revised. Our living reason can provide metaphysical perspectives and ideal purposes and, at the same time, be used to examine their efficacy in history and experience. Living reason establishes a ground for a pragmatic and experiential approach to our faiths, hopes, and beliefs.

Smith's work is a subtle and original development of American idealism and pragmatism with an emphasis on the religious dimension of experience. By not adhering to any school of philosophy and resisting the turn to analysis, Smith worked against the current of much philosophy of religion in the twentieth century. Nevertheless, the lucidity of his analyses of experience and the reasonableness of his reconstructions of traditional philosophical issues assure his work a place in the history of American philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Royce's Social Infinite (Hamden, Conn., 1950).

Value Convictions and Higher Education (New Haven, 1958).

The Spirit of American Philosophy (New York, 1963).

Religion and Empiricism (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1967).

Experience and God (New York, 1968).

Themes in American Philosophy (New York, 1970).

The Analogy of Experience: An Approach to Understanding Religious Truth (New York, 1973).

Purpose and Thought: The Meaning of Pragmatism (Chicago, 1984).

America's Philosophical Vision (Chicago, 1992).

Jonathan Edwards: Puritan, Preacher, Philosopher (Notre Dame, Ind., 1992).

Quasi-Religions: Humanism, Marxism, Nationalism (New York, 1995).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Jonathan Edwards: Treatise Concerning Religious Affections* (New Haven, Conn., 1959).

Ed., *The Philosophy of Religion* (New York, 1965).

"Prospects for Natural Theology," *The Monist* 75 (1992): 406–20.

"Person to Person: The Community and the Person," *Personalist Forum* 8 (1992): 41–54.

"Philosophy and Religion: One Central Reflection," *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 38 (1995): 103–108.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, Pres Addr of APA v9

Colapietro, Vincent, ed. *Reason, Experience, and God: John E. Smith in Dialogue* (New York, 1997). Contains a bibliography of Smith's publications.

"John E. Smith as an Interpreter of American Philosophy: A Symposium," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 22 (Summer 1986).

Kasulis, Thomas P., and Robert C. Neville, eds. *The Recovery of Philosophy in America: Essays in Honor of John Edwin Smith* (Albany, N.Y., 1997).

Douglas R. Anderson

SMITH, Norman Kemp (1872–1958)

Norman Duncan Smith was born in Dundee, Scotland on 5 May 1872, the sixth and youngest child of a cabinet maker. In 1910 he married longtime friend Amy Kemp, whose last name he substituted for his own neglected middle name. Smith attended high school in his home town before entering the University of St. Andrews on a scholarship at the age of sixteen. Among his teachers at St. Andrews were the eminent classical scholar John Burnet and the idealist philosopher Henry Jones. After graduating first-class honours in 1893, Smith spent part of the next several years in European capitals studying philosophy and languages. In 1896 he returned to Scotland to take up the position of assistant to Robert Adamson, Chair of Logic and Rhetoric at Glasgow. Smith's first book, *Studies in the Cartesian Philosophy* (1902), was very well received, and earned him the DPhil from St. Andrews. While he was at Glasgow, his reputation as an expositor grew, even drawing the attention of William JAMES, who praised him for his sketch of Richard Avenarius in *Mind*.

In 1906 Smith was appointed to the Stuart Chair of Psychology at Princeton University after being interviewed for the job by Woodrow Wilson, then President of Princeton. Smith rose to chair of the department of philosophy and psychology and then, in 1914, was named the McCosh Professor of Philosophy. His major writing project while at Princeton was the *Commentary to Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*, which was mostly completed by the outbreak of World War I but not published until its conclusion. Smith was apparently happy in the United States, and certainly widely respected. Nevertheless, in 1916 he obtained leave from Princeton to join the British war effort, and served in various government posts in London until the armistice.

On the eve of Smith's return to Princeton, the prestigious Chair of Logic and Metaphysics at Edinburgh became vacant. With the *Commentary* now published to uniform

acclaim, and with the support of numerous international figures, including Woodrow Wilson (by this time President of the United States) and Henri Bergson, Smith put forward his name for consideration. He was elected to the chair in 1919, and occupied it for the remainder of his career. His most ambitious work of original philosophy, *Prolegomena to an Idealist Theory of Knowledge*, was published in 1924. The work for which he is most widely known, the masterful translation of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*, appeared in 1929, followed by an abridgement for students in 1934. He next turned his attention to his own country's greatest philosopher (who had himself been denied a chair at Edinburgh two centuries before), publishing an edition of the *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion* in 1935 and the influential *Philosophy of David Hume* in 1941. He retired from teaching in 1945 but continued to work vigorously for another decade. His last major work, *New Studies in the Philosophy of Descartes* (1952), revisited the subject of his first book, published exactly one half-century earlier. Smith died on 3 September 1958 in Edinburgh, Scotland.

Smith was the twentieth century's most influential English-speaking historian of modern philosophy. His focus on Descartes, Hume, and Kant both reflected and reinforced the status of this troika in Anglo-American philosophy. In the preface to his *Studies in the Cartesian Philosophy*, Smith remarked that there existed only one other work in English exclusively devoted to Descartes. Today, there are many published each year. Smith's emphasis in this work is on metaphysics, rather than epistemology, and he places the mind–body dualism at the foundation of Descartes's philosophy, rather than the cogito or the theory of ideas. Dualism leads to the representative theory of perception since the mind can directly know only its own states, and this in turn leads to the cogito since the bare fact of cognition is known best of all. He argues further that because Descartes accepts the scholastic doctrine that each substance has an essence peculiar to itself, and by

which the substance is fully known, he is unable to account for any relation between mind and body. Malebranche's occasionalism is thus for Smith already implicit in Descartes. Only the first half of *Studies* is Descartes exegesis; the rest traces the influences of, and reactions to, the Cartesian philosophy from Spinoza through Kant. His last book, *New Studies in the Philosophy of Descartes*, continues the emphasis on metaphysics, but takes much more detailed account of Descartes's natural philosophy as well as the development of his thought over the course of his life. He also attended to the explosion in Descartes studies that had occurred since the first book, and for which he could justly take much credit.

Smith is much better known for his contribution to Kant scholarship. In 1918 his massive *Commentary* on the first *Critique* was warmly welcomed as a corrective to the prevailing tendency to read Kant from the point of view of Hegel. Based on the 1787 second edition of the *Critique*, Smith endorsed and developed Hans Vaihinger's theory that the work was not composed with a continuous and uniform intent, but rather pieced together from various manuscripts written between 1769 and 1780. Thus, he finds in the transcendental deduction strong traces of four distinct stages in the evolution of Kant's thought. This reading enabled Smith to account for major inconsistencies in the text as byproducts of its "pre-critical" remnants. Although this "patchwork" interpretation of the work as a whole has not been widely embraced, the *Commentary* has had a lasting influence for its emphasis on the realist side of Kant's philosophy and for its meticulous, philosophically rigorous, and historically informed exposition. Several early reviewers of the *Commentary* noted their eager anticipation of Smith's translation of the *Critique*, which finally appeared in 1929, quickly replacing earlier translations. For generations scholars and students alike have valued Smith's translation for its precision, technical nuance, and relative accessibility. According to an oft-repeated legend – which seems to originate in A.

C. Ewing's obituary of Smith – certain German philosophy professors prefer their students to begin with Smith's translation instead of the original.

Like his *Commentary* on Kant, Smith's *Philosophy of David Hume* righted an errant tendency in the scholarship of his time. In this case, the tendency was to read Hume as essentially a skeptic who had brought empiricism to its logical, and fundamentally negative, conclusion. For Smith, the skeptical arguments in Book I of the *Treatise* against rational justifications of induction, causality, and the external world, are meant to clear the way for the alternative naturalistic form of explanation exemplified in the moral theory of Books II and III (which he maintains were composed first). Although not all Hume scholars accept the notion that he "entered into his Philosophy through the Gateway of Morals" (1941, p. 12), Smith's recovery of a positive, naturalistic program in the *Treatise* is now more or less taken for granted. His other main contribution to Hume studies is a critical edition of the *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*, which has a book-length introduction discussing Hume's relation to his native Calvinism, his treatment of religion in other works, and of course the arguments of the *Dialogues* themselves. Smith defends the then-unpopular view that, notwithstanding Pamphilus's closing pronouncement in favor of the believer Cleanthes, Hume's own position throughout is steadfastly that of the skeptic Philo. Far from a cautious rapprochement of skeptical philosophy and religion, the *Dialogues* are according to Smith a thoroughgoing and deliberate attack on "the religious hypothesis."

Smith's contributions to the philosophy of his own time have not aged as well as his commentaries and translations, perhaps because they belong to a philosophical tradition, namely idealism, that fell dramatically out of favor with the rise of analytical philosophy. Smith's brand of idealism is not opposed to realism, but rather to materialistic forms of naturalism. Thus, in his *Prolegomena to an Idealist Theory of Knowledge*, which was heavily influenced by Samuel Alexander and Henri Bergson, Smith maintains that "spiritual values have a determining voice in the ordering of the universe." The book offers sustained attacks on the representational theory of perception and the supposed subjectivity of secondary qualities, and also presents a theory of cognition along Kantian lines. The notion that spiritual values are at work on a cosmic scale has a religious ring to it and Smith was indeed very interested in religion, though he was never himself a member of any church.

A number of Smith's best papers are collected in the posthumous volume *The Credibility of Divine Existence* (1967). In the title paper, he maintains that the divine is known by "immediate experience" rather than by inference. Along with papers on Locke, Hume, and A. N. WHITEHEAD, the volume also contains a psychologically penetrating reflection on "Fear: Its Nature and Diverse Uses" and a programmatic consideration of the question "How far is Agreement Possible in Philosophy?" Smith's answer is that because philosophical problems are humanistic problems "which bring into play the whole man as well as all the sciences," their resolution depends on "recognition of the manner in which the past history of philosophy predetermines, consciously or unconsciously, our present-day problems" (1967, p. 188). By such arguments, and even more by his own example, Smith has shown the mutual dependence between philosophy and its history.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Studies in the Cartesian Philosophy (London, 1902).

A Commentary to Kant's Critique of Pure Reason (London, 1918; 2nd edn 1923).

Prolegomena to an Idealist Theory of Knowledge (London, 1924).

The Philosophy of David Hume: A Critical Study of its Origins and Central Doctrines (London, 1941).

New Studies in the Philosophy of Descartes;

Descartes as Pioneer (London, 1952).

Other Relevant Works

Trans., *Immanuel Kant's Critique of Pure Reason* (London, 1929; abridged edn 1934).

Ed., *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*, by David Hume (London, 1935; 2nd edn 1947).

Trans., *Descartes' Philosophical Writings* (London, 1952).

The Credibility of Divine Existence: The Collected Papers of Norman Kemp Smith, ed. G. E. Davie, R. D. Maclennan, and A. J. D. Porteous (London, 1967).

The Letters of Baron Friedrich von Hügel and Professor Norman Kemp Smith, ed. L. F. Barmannd (New York, 1981).

Further Reading

Ewing, A. C. "Norman Kemp Smith, 1872–1958," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 45 (1959): 297–306.

Stove, D. C. "Hume, Kemp Smith, and Carnap," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 55 (1977): 189–200.

Geoffrey Gorham

SMITH, Thomas Vernor (1890–1964)

Thomas V. Smith was born on 26 April 1890 in Blanket, Texas. His received a BA from the University of Texas in 1915, an MA from Texas in 1916, and a PhD in philosophy from the University of Chicago in 1922. His dissertation was "Philosophical Bases of the American Doctrine of Equality." Smith served during 1916–17 as a professor of English literature and chair of the English department at Texas Christian University. In 1917–18 Smith was professor of philosophy and chair of the philosophy department also at Texas Christian

University. He served in the US Army during World War I. In 1920–21 he was a philosophy instructor at the University of Texas. In 1922, Smith became an associate professor of philosophy at the University of Chicago. He was promoted to full professor in 1926, and taught there until his retirement in 1948. Smith also served as Dean of Colleges from 1923 to 1926 and Associate Dean of Colleges in 1926–7.

In 1948 Smith went to Syracuse University where he worked for half of each year and was known as the "three P professor," teaching poetry, politics, and philosophy until 1956. During this time of semi-retirement, he also taught summer sessions at Columbia University, the University of Texas, and Syracuse University. He had lectureships and visiting appointments at dozens of colleges and universities during his long career. He received LLD degrees from Miami University of Ohio, Florida Southern College, and the University of Toledo; he also received a DLitt from Union College. Smith was President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1934–5. He was also Vice President of the American Political Science Association, a fellow of the American Society for the Advancement of Science, and chair of the Illinois Legislative Council.

In his autobiography *A Non-Existent Man* (1962) Smith credits his first philosophical influence to a brakeman in the caboose of a freight train, with whom he spent a cold night. There, Smith found a copy of Descartes's *Discourse on Method*, which excited his interest in careful philosophical thinking, especially skepticism. He had a lifelong commitment to academic and public discourse on ethics and political philosophy. His *The Democratic Way of Life* (1926) was praised by John DEWEY as the finest discussion of the democratic ideal. Frequently engaged in public discussion about the promise of democracy, he gained national recognition for a series of radio debates with Senator Robert A. Taft, later published as *Foundations of Democracy* (1939). Smith's interest in education led to "The

University of Chicago Round Table," a radio program which he helped to produce and which became the longest continuously broadcast educational program in the country.

Smith's prose is readily accessible and at times humorous and lighthearted, but he is serious about the importance of intellectual humility and skepticism to democratic living. In his book *Creative Sceptics: In Defense of the Liberal Temper* (1934), Smith claims that the purpose of his writing is to "make a democrat of you – making you first humble, then proud, and at last tolerant" (1934, p. 10). Influenced partly by pragmatist Charles PEIRCE, Smith recognized the importance of doubt in forming strong beliefs that can be reopened through democratic engagement. He writes, "Scepticism is not only the great antiseptic for the wounds of the spirit; it is the only known guarantor of modesty enough to make society possible without constant suppression." (1934, p. 265) In addition to serving as associate editor of the *International Journal of Ethics*, Smith contributed regularly to other philosophical journals, *Scientific Monthly*, and numerous newspapers.

Making public his interest in political philosophy, Smith was elected in 1934 to the Illinois State Senate as a Democrat from the Fifth District. In this capacity, he founded the Illinois Legislative Council and was an advocate of reforms of the legislative process. In 1938, he was elected to the seventy-sixth United States Congress as an at-large representative from Illinois. In Congress, Smith pledged to be a "noiseless congressman," accusing other representatives of speaking beyond their knowledge. Smith was a member of the Civil Service Committee. During and after World War II, he served as Director of Education of the Allied Control Commission in Italy, in Germany as an advisor dealing with German prisoners of war, and in Japan as a member of the US Education Mission. Smith died on 24 May 1964 in Hyattsville, Maryland, and was buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Notes on the American Doctrine of Equality (Chicago, 1924).

The Democratic Way of Life (Chicago, 1926; 2nd edn 1939).

The American Philosophy of Equality (Chicago, 1927).

The Philosophic Way of Life (Chicago, 1929). Second edition published as *The Philosophic Way of Life in America* (New York, 1943).

Chicago: An Experiment in Social Science Research (Chicago, 1929).

Philosophers in Hades (Chicago, 1932).

Beyond Conscience (New York, 1934).

Creative Sceptics: In Defense of the Liberal Temper (Chicago, 1934).

The Promise of American Politics (Chicago, 1936).

The Legislative Way of Life (Chicago, 1940).

Lincoln: Living Legend (Chicago, 1942).

The Democratic Tradition in America (New York, 1941).

Discipline for Democracy (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1942).

Atomic Power and Moral Faith (Claremont, Cal., 1946).

Abraham Lincoln and the Spiritual Life (Boston, 1951).

Live without Fear (New York, 1956).

The Ethics of Compromise and the Art of Containment (Boston, 1956).

Other Relevant Works

Smith's papers are at the University of Chicago.

A Preface to the Universe, with Baker Brownell, Clarence Darrow, Edward Emery Slosson, and Winford Lee Lewis (New York, 1929).

Ed. with William K. Wright, *Essays in Philosophy by Seventeen Doctors of Philosophy of the University of Chicago* (Chicago, 1929).

"The Social Philosophy of George Herbert Mead," *American Journal of Sociology* 37 (1931): 368–85.

"The Tragic Realm of Truth," *Philosophical Review* 45 (1936): 111–25.

Foundations of Democracy: A Series of Debates, with Robert A. Taft (New York, 1939).

Ed. with Leonard White, *Politics and Public Service: A Discussion of the Civic Art in America* (New York, 1939).

"The Promise of American Politics, or The Principle of Private and Public Skills," in *What Is Democracy? Its Conflicts, Ends and Means* (Norman, Okla., 1939).

Constructive Ethics, with Contemporary Readings, with William Debbins (New York, 1948).

"Power and Conscience: Beyond Conscience," in *A Study of Power*, ed. T. V. Smith, H. D.

Lasswell, and C. E. Merriam (Glencoe, Ill., 1950).

A Non-Existent Man: An Autobiography (Austin, Tex., 1962).

Further Reading

Dict Amer Bio, *Pres Addr of APA v4*, *Proc of APA v38*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Denise, Theodore C., and Milton H. Williams, eds. *Retrospect and Prospect on the Retirement of T. V. Smith* (Syracuse, N.Y., 1956).

Heather E. Keith
Steven Fesmire

SMITH, Wilfred Cantwell (1916–2000)

Wilfred Cantwell Smith was born on 16 August 1916 in Toronto, Canada, and died there on 7 February 2000. Smith's parents were Victor Arnold Smith and Sarah Cory Cantwell; their other son, Arnold Cantwell Smith, became a Canadian ambassador and Secretary General of the Commonwealth. Smith attended Upper Canada College in Toronto, and then spent a year in Grenoble, France, followed by a long stay in the Middle East with his mother, who was a professor of classics. He then studied Hebrew and Arabic at Toronto University and received his BA with honors in Oriental languages in 1938. Smith next studied at the University of Cambridge for two years, and then went to India from 1940 to 1945, where he was ordained a Presbyterian minister and taught at the Forman Christian College in Lahore, India (presently in Pakistan). Smith went to Princeton University for further graduate study, completing an MA in 1947 and a PhD in religion in 1948.

Smith spent most of his academic career as a professor of religion at McGill University in Montréal from 1949 to 1963, where he founded the Institute of Islamic Studies in 1951; Dalhousie University in Halifax, Nova Scotia from 1973 to 1978; and Harvard University from 1964 to 1973 (also directing the Center for the Study of World Religions) and again from 1978 to 1984. In retirement he was a senior research associate in the Faculty of Divinity at Trinity College, University of Toronto. Until he suffered a stroke in 1993, Smith continued to write and to travel extensively. Smith was President of the Canadian Theological Society, the American Society for the Study of Religion, the American Academy of Religion, the Middle East Studies Association, the International Congress of Orientalists, and the Humanities and Social Sciences section of the Royal Society of Canada. He was a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and in January 2000 he was elected as an Officer of the Order of Canada.

Smith first taught in a Christian missionary college in Lahore before the partition of India, where he worked happily alongside people of different religions and came to admire their dedication and integrity. The ruin and devastation of Lahore in 1948, after the riots and massacres that marked the partition of India,

motivated Smith's lifelong dedication to inter-religion understanding. His first two books attempted to understand the factors that had led to the creation of Muslim Pakistan. The first of these, *Modern Islam in India: A Social Analysis* (1943/1946), was largely a Marxist treatise but he soon repudiated this work as not only inadequate in its understanding of Islam but also as missing the crucial historical role of ideology and morality. Concerns for these factors marked his *Islam in Modern History* (1957), the book that established his reputation as a scholar of Islam. This latter book still offers valuable insight into political problems of the Middle East.

While at McGill, Smith turned his attention to comparative religion, and especially to the way it was addressed in North American universities. He set out his findings in his seminal *The Meaning and End of Religion: A New Approach to the Religious Traditions of Mankind* (1963). Here appears his deconstruction of the idea of a religion as a quasi-static, reified, and bounded entity set against similar entities. Smith suggested instead that we think of religions as internally diverse and ever-changing cumulative traditions. These traditions are the means whereby faith is imparted and through which it is expressed. What matters in the study of religion is the inward, invisible dynamic of faith. But what exactly is faith? This question became Smith's central concern for the next ten years, and he reported his conclusions in two major works: *Belief and History* (1977) and *Faith and Belief* (1979). His last significant contribution to the academic study of religion was a work not yet fully appreciated, *What is Scripture? A Comparative Approach* (1993).

Smith's writings emphasize the immense complexity of religion as an object of study. In *The Meaning and End of Religion* he writes that, because of the bewildering variety of religious phenomena and of the cacophony of interpretations of those phenomena, those "who would understand, and those who would intelligently participate are confronted with a task of no mean proportions." Smith also insisted that the history of religion is not a "field of study" because fields of study, however extensive, can eventually be mastered. "There is no mastery, however, to be achieved in the study of religion; here the subject matter is not, so to speak, supine and inert, but rather something active momentous, with its own initiative." From these two perceptions spring Smith's major emphases. The first of these is his insistence on the unavoidability of the personal quality of all religious activity. Because the inner life of other persons is accessible only from what they choose to reveal of themselves, those who undertake any study of other's religious lives must reflect deeply on the nature of personhood. Persons are constituted by self-reflection, by their selection and by their shaping of meaning; thus, persons' truthfulness, integrity, authenticity, and ability to love must become vital foci of attention.

Because such qualities are difficult to quantify many students of religion have sought to avoid these issues by retreating into an assumed objectivity. "Such scholars," Smith wrote, "might uncharitably be compared to flies crawling on the outside of a goldfish bowl, making accurate and complete observations on the fish inside, measuring their scales meticulously, and indeed contributing much to the knowledge of the subject, but never asking themselves, and never finding out, how it feels to be a goldfish." When dealing with humans, this approach is inhumane. More empathetic techniques are needed because, as he remarked, the proper study of mankind is by inference.

Smith saw history as the process of human involvement in an environment that is simultaneously both mundane and transcendent. Human religious and spiritual life involves a relationship with transcendence, a term Smith uses to indicate whatever overarches mundane, physical existence, including ideals, convictions, and relationships with other people. But Smith also intends by the idea of transcendence what theists call God or the Eternal. The response to both forms of transcendence Smith calls faith;

human beings everywhere, he contends, have always lived from faith, and have lost it only when overtaken by nihilism, ego-disintegration, anomie, and despair. Smith saw this relationship to transcendence as ubiquitous among humanity. Smith's writings are replete with his attempts to define faith, yet finally it remained for him imponderable, a matter of inference only. In his last attempt, in 1998, Smith suggested that faith might be a sense of the transcendent reality to which it is said to be a relation, as well as the source from which it derives. "The fact of its being the human awareness of and response to that reality, and the very fact of the reality's being transcendent, together explain, and even entail, the further fact of inescapable limitation of any instances of faith here on earth." He continues, "My own view would be that any appreciation of beauty; any striving for good; any pursuit of justice; any recognition that some things are good, some are bad, and that it matters; any feeling or practice of love; any love of what theists call 'God'; all these are examples of personal, and communal, faith."

Because religions do not exist as reified entities they cannot enter into either conflict or dialogue. Only persons may do those things. We commit a serious blunder when we think that men and women can belong to religions in the same way they belong to societies or clubs. Smith protested this misunderstanding sharply when he wrote: "We talk blandly of the religion to which [a man] belongs; ought we not rather to concern ourselves with the religion that belongs to him? God is interested in persons and not in types." Furthermore, to give religions names is to fall into category error and to fail to see that developing and cumulative traditions are the means through which human beings respond to transcendence.

Smith recognizes also that some Western traditions, not normally seen as religious, have enabled people to respond, often with heroic integrity, to great ideals. Smith asks us to see these secular traditions, including humanism and rationalism, not only as intellectual options but as forms of faith, as movements of the human spirit in response to transcending ideals such as justice and truth; he wrote that justice is one such transcendent ideal: "something only partly actual but beckoning, demanding our allegiance and rewarding to pursue; let alone, to realize" and that truth is "an ever elusive yet ever demanding goal, enormously rewarding both those who seek it and those who find it, however partial the intermediate truth that is all that one ever finds." Smith saw that responding with loyalty and discipline to these ideals is a profound faith commitment through which persons and whole societies have been able to organize themselves and to find coherence with the larger universe. This broad tradition in the West he called *philosophia*, writing that there can be no way of telling whether a tradition is religious or not just by looking at it from the outside. What makes a tradition religious is the way human lives are affected by it. A corollary of this view is that any religious tradition may also become a vehicle of unfaith or anti-faith, and that many acts perpetrated in the name of religion can equally be nihilistic, life-denying, and inhuman.

For Smith, faith can never be equated with belief. The suggestion that religious commitment is about believing propositions for which there is no evidence, he called a woeful fallacy. One difficulty here is the fact that the English language has no verbal form corresponding to the noun, faith. We talk of love and say, "we love"; we talk of hope and say, "we hope"; we do not talk of faith and say, "we faith." In *Faith and Belief* Smith explored the implications of this foible of the English language. When faith is equated with belief, gross misconceptions arise. There are more important elements in religious traditions than their beliefs, and the proper (though ungrammatical) question is, what do they *faith*? Asking first about the propositional beliefs of others impedes encountering them at the level of faith. Much of today's interfaith thinking owes its inception to Smith's thought about these distinctions.

Smith touched the intellectual life of the second half of the twentieth century at two other

noteworthy points. He often referred to himself as an intellectual living within the tradition of *philosophia* and he claimed an active neo-Platonic imagination; he was philosophically against all reductionism. When the inward truth of persons is ignored, only superficial analysis can occur. Consequently, Smith was concerned lest universities should betray the great humanist ideals of their foundations, and he argued that student unease during the last decades of the twentieth century arose from an intuitive sense of the alienation of much of university studies. Smith rejected the conception of the university as a "multiversity" of disparate and competing disciplines.

Smith's familiarity with world religions made him unhappy with any suggestion that references to the transcendent needed defense. He was hostile to the claim that only empirically verifiable propositions are true, insisting that, when seen in a global perspective, anti-transcendent thinking is an aberration. He repeatedly pointed out that the overwhelming majority of intelligent persons throughout history, and all cultures other than the recent West, have recognized the transcendent quality of the human being and the world. "To be secularist in the negative sense," he wrote, "is to be oddly parochial in both space and time, and to opt for what may alas be a dying culture." He also found the concept of postmodernism "intolerably provincial" in its refusal to recognize the history of non-Western cultures.

Smith's lasting contribution may be as a theorist of inter-religion encounter, which he preferred to call colloquy rather than dialogue. Colloquy suggests more than two partners, and addresses manifold problems of society. Acknowledging his debt to Martin Buber, Smith led the study of comparative religions in treating the other not as an "It" but rather as a "Thou." His vision for interfaith colloquy in the world community demanded that "we," that is "we all," learn to talk together about "us" and "our" responses to transcendence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Modern Islam in India: A Social Analysis (Lahore, India, 1943; London, 1946).

Islam in Modern History (Princeton, N.J., 1957).

The Meaning and End of Religion: A New Approach to the Religious Traditions of Mankind (New York, 1963).

The Faith of Other Men (New York, 1962). Rev. edn, *Patterns of Faith around the World* (Oxford, 1998).

Questions of Religious Truth (New York, 1967).

Religious Diversity: Essays, ed. W. G. Oxtoby (New York, 1976).

Belief and History (Charlottesville, Virg., 1977). Republished as *Believing: A Historical Perspective* (Oxford, 1998).

Faith and Belief (Princeton, N.J., 1979). Republished as *Faith and Belief: The Difference between Them* (Oxford, 1998).

On Understanding Islam: Selected Studies (The Hague, 1981).

Towards a World Theology: Faith and the Comparative History of Religion (Philadelphia, 1981).

What is Scripture? A Comparative Approach (Minneapolis, 1993).

Other Relevant Works

"Philosophia, as One of the Religious Traditions of Humankind; the Greek Legacy in Western Civilisation, Viewed by a Comparativist," in *Différences, valeurs, hiérarchie: Texts offerts à Louis Dumont*, ed. Jean-Claude Galey (Paris, 1984).

Wilfred Cantwell Smith: A Reader, ed. Kenneth Cracknell (Oxford, 2002).

Modern Culture from a Comparative Perspective, ed. John W. Burbidge (Albany, N.Y., 2003).

Further Reading

Bae, Kuk-Won. *Homo Fidei: A Critical Understanding of Faith in the Writings of Wilfred Cantwell Smith and its Implications for the Study of Religion* (New York, 2003).

Hughes, Edward J. *Wilfred Cantwell Smith: A Theology for the World* (London, 1986).

Smith, Brian Cantwell, et al. "In Memoriam: Wilfred Cantwell Smith, 21 July 1916–7 February 2000," *Bulletin of The Canadian Society for the Study of Religion* 23 (April 2000).

Whaling, Frank, ed. *The World's Religious Traditions: Current Perspectives in Religious Studies, Essays in Honour of Wilfred Cantwell Smith* (New York and Edinburgh, 1984).

Kenneth Cracknell

SMULLYAN, Arthur Francis (1912–98)

Arthur F. Smullyan was born on 16 May 1912 in New York City. He received his BA from City College of New York in 1937, and then went to graduate school at Harvard University, where he earned his MA in 1940 and his PhD in philosophy in 1941, writing a dissertation on "Evidence, Memory, and Induction: An Essay on the Foundations of Synthetic Knowledge." After teaching mathematics at Williams College in Massachusetts from 1943 to 1946, he joined the philosophy faculty at the University of Washington in 1946, where he was promoted to full professor in 1956 and served as department chair from 1956 to 1968. In 1968 he became professor of philosophy and department chair at Rutgers University. He served as chair until 1976, helping to establish the doctoral program, and taught until retiring in 1982. Smullyan died on 23 October 1998 in Tacoma, Washington.

Smullyan primarily worked in philosophy of logic, epistemology, and philosophy of science. He authored an elementary logic textbook as well as an introductory philosophy book containing readings in epistemology, metaphysics, ethics, and philosophy of religion. In philosophy of logic, he was particularly interested in modality and modal logic. His article on "Modality and Description" (1948) argued that some alleged modal paradoxes suggested by W. V. Quine can be resolved by treating the relevant expressions as descriptions or class abstracts instead of names. Some claim that this article was useful for the later development of direct reference theories of names, and related work on definitive descriptions. Smullyan's "Absolute and Restricted Concepts" (1977) was a philosophical application to the theory of concepts of Quine's "New Foundations" set theory.

Following his Harvard teachers C. I. Lewis and Ernest Nagel, Smullyan was also interested in defending and developing a foundationalist empiricism. In "Aspects" (1955), he points out that the role of the "sense-datum" has been confused, since philosophers have conflated traits of sensations that can be described and those that cannot. Many objections to sense-data, or what Smullyan labels "sensa," have assumed this conflation, in order to complain that there is no infallible way to describe every sensory trait. Other objections to sense-data suppose that they must be subjectively private since they cannot all be really of external physical objects. Smullyan argues that sensa are aspects of objects, and that we construct our understanding of objects by selecting some aspects as definitive and permanent traits of those objects. In "The Concept of Empirical Knowledge" (1956), he argues that empirical knowledge need only rest on inductive probability, not certainty. In "Sense Content and Perceptual Assurance" (1973), he argues that we justifiably have perceptual assurance of the existence of external objects.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Modality and Description," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 13 (1948): 31–73.

"Some Implications of Critical Common-sensism," in *Studies in the Philosophy of Charles Sanders Peirce*, ed. Philip P. Wiener and Frederic H. Young (Cambridge, Mass., 1952).

"The Variety of Philosophic Idioms," *Journal of Philosophy* 45 (1948): 350–56.

"Aspects," *Philosophical Review* 64 (1955): 33–42.

"A Note on an Argument of Quine," *Mind* 65 (1956): 255–8.

"The Concept of Empirical Knowledge," *Philosophical Review* 65 (1956): 362–70.

"Incomplete Symbols," *Philosophical Review* 67 (1958): 237–42.

Fundamentals of Logic (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1962).

Introduction to Philosophy: Readings in Epistemology, Metaphysics, Ethics, and Philosophy of Religion (Belmont, Cal., 1962).

"The Method of Consequences," *Philosophical Review* 72 (1963): 48–56.

"Sense Content and Perceptual Assurance," *Journal of Philosophy* 70 (1973): 625–8.

"Absolute and Restricted Concepts," *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 6 (1977): 83–91.

"Probability and Credibility," in *Rationality in Thought and Action*, ed. Martin Tamny (New York, 1986), pp. 87–95.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v72
Føllesdal, Dagfinn. "Smullyan's *Fundamentals of Logic*," *Philosophical Review* 73 (1964): 124–7.

Irving H. Anellis
John R. Shook

SMYTH, Samuel Phillips Newman (1843–1925)

Newman Smyth was born on 25 June 1843 in Brunswick, Maine. His father William, a mathematics professor at local Bowdoin College, had strong abolitionist sentiments. Following a family tradition, Smyth also attended Bowdoin College, where he graduated with the BA in the class of 1863. He served as an officer in the Civil War, received the MA from Bowdoin in 1866, and then graduated from Andover Seminary with the BD in 1867. At that time, Andover had the second highest enrollment of any seminary in the United States, after Princeton. Smyth was ordained in 1868 and for the next year Smyth served as minister to a congregation in Providence, Rhode Island. He then studied at the University of Berlin, then notable for the teachings of Schleiermacher and Hegel, in 1869–70. He served several pastorates, but spent most of his ministry at First Congregational Church in New Haven, Connecticut, from 1882 until his retirement in 1907, where he influenced many thoughtful students at Yale University. In 1921 he received the honorary DD from Bowdoin. Smyth died on 6 January 1925 in New Haven, Connecticut.

Smyth was a pioneer of American liberal Christian theology, believing it necessary to establish compatibility between theology and other academic disciplines. Unanimously voted by the faculty and trustees to the chair of systematic theology at Andover Seminary, he had to withdraw his nomination because of hostility from the "Visitors," who supervised such issues as orthodoxy at Andover (among church historians, this became known as the "Andover Controversy"). However, parish ministry in the Congregational denomination required only that he satisfy members of the particular congregation he served, which left him free to develop his thought without censorship by other clergy.

From Schleiermacher, he came to believe that doctrines are only valid when they give expression to actual human experience, especially the "feeling of absolute dependence." From his brother Egbert (who was on the faculty at Andover), he was persuaded that all doctrines emerged from a historical context and are not to be imposed upon a different historical context or generation. This allowed Smyth to distinguish between orthodoxy (which he willingly affirmed) and orthodox-*ism* (which he defined as intellectual bondage to the formulations of earlier generations).

In a cascade of persuasive books, Smyth wrote with great knowledge and clarity, though without rancor toward theological opponents. His books reasoned that: (1) historical and literary criticism of the Bible was the best form of faithfulness to the intent of the authors; (2) the church must engage and accept the conclusions of the Darwinian theory of evolution (he spent several years working in the biology laboratories at Yale); (3) honest scholarship would inevitably lead to an ecumenical movement that would include Roman Catholics, and thereby lead to Christian unity; and (4) the biblical concept of life after death is far from exhausted by the simple notion of judgment based on belief; and (5) in consideration of the alternatives in the Bible, those who did not know and embrace Christ in this life might be given a further opportunity to do so after death – a "future probation."

Smyth was a Christian intellectual, concerned with and committed to his Protestant faith tradition, but also committed to intellectual honesty, engaging that faith tradition with the emerging academic and scientific world view and seeking to reconcile them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Religious Feeling: A Study for Faith (New York, 1877).

Old Faiths in New Light (New York, 1879).

Orthodox Theology of To-day (New York, 1881).

The Reality of Faith (New York, 1884).

The Morality of the Old Testament (New York, 1886).

Old Faiths in New Light (New York, 1887).

Christian Facts and Forces (New York, 1887).

Personal Creeds, or, How to Form a Working-Theory of Life (New York, 1890).

Christian Ethics (New York, 1892).

The Place of Death in Evolution (New York, 1897).

Through Science to Faith (New York, 1902).

Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism (New York, 1908).

Christian Ethics (New York, 1909).

Modern Belief in Immortality (New York, 1910).

Constructive Natural Theology (New York, 1913).

The Meaning of Personal Life (New York, 1916).

Other Relevant Works

Smyth's papers are at Yale University.

Dorner on the Future State, Being a Translation of the Section of his System of Christian Doctrine Comprising the Doctrine of the Last Things, with an Introduction and notes (New York, 1883).

Ed. with Williston Walker, *Approaches Towards Church Unity* (New Haven, Conn., 1919).

The Story of Church Unity, Including the Lambeth Conference and the Congregational-Episcopal Approaches (New York, 1923).

Recollections and Reflections, with Commemorative Addresses by Benjamin W. Bacon, Rev. Peter Ainslie, Rt. Rev. James De Wolf Perry, Jr. (New York, 1926).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v26*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Dorrien, Gary. *The Making of American Liberal Theology: Imagining Progressive Religion 1805–1900* (Louisville, Kent., 2001).

Gentle, Bryan G. *The Natural Theology of Newman Smyth: A Study of a Response of Late Nineteenth-Century New England Calvinism to Darwinian Evolutionary Science*. PhD dissertation, Duke University (Durham, N.C., 1976). Contains a bibliography of Smyth's writings.

Rowe, Henry K. *History of Andover Theological Seminary* (Andover, Mass., 1933).

Williams, Daniel D. *The Andover Liberals* (New York, 1970).

J. Edward Barrett

SNIDER, Denton Jacques (1841–1925)

Denton Jacques Snider was born on 9 January 1841 near Mount Gilead, Ohio, and died on 25 November 1925 in St. Louis, Missouri. Snider records that he seemed always to want to know German, the tongue of his paternal grandfather Johannes Schneider. Since his father spoke only English, as a teenager he sought out local German craftsmen to give voice to the "spirit of my old German ancestry reincarnated in me" (1910, p. 55). In 1856, backed by a forty-dollar loan from an aunt, he entered nearby Iberia College, a "backwater academy" which no longer exists. The following year, assisted by three hundred additional dollars from the aunt, he transferred to Oberlin College, where his fascination with German flowered into interest in classical language and literature. Upon graduating with his BA in 1862 he enlisted in the army, feeling obliged to help preserve the Union. Soon commissioned as a recruiting second lieutenant, he and his recruits took part in Rosecrans's march through Tennessee into Georgia. Weakened by sickness and fatigue, he received a medical discharge following the fall of Chattanooga. Shortly after returning to Ohio he chanced on a newspaper advertisement for a teacher of Greek and Latin placed by the Christian Brothers in St. Louis. Excited by the idea of living in "a Teutonic city of the radical type", he successfully applied for the position.

Snider moved to St. Louis in March 1864. It chanced that Henry BROKMEYER took meals in Snider's boarding house, the Pension Française. One evening Brokmeyer intruded into a conversation between Snider and a pupil, intriguing Snider with his discourse on Goethe and Shakespeare and with the "emphasis and … affection" with which he uttered "the magic name of Hegel" (1910, p. 304). A year later, a new acquaintance, Dr. J. Hall, invited him to a philosophical club meeting at the home of William Torrey HARRIS, where Brokmeyer seemed "the Olympian Zeus of that little set of mortals." Snider recalls that Brokmeyer "became for me that day the interesting, all-dominating personality of my earthly existence" (1910, pp. 309–11). In addition to Sunday afternoon meetings of the club, he began regularly visiting Brokmeyer's law office for philosophical discussions. In effect, he had enrolled in "the University Brokmeyer," majoring in Hegel and Goethe. In January 1866 the club regulars formed the St. Louis Philosophical Society, with Brokmeyer as president and Harris as secretary. Snider was the sixth signatory of the society's constitution, following Brokmeyer, Harris, Britten Hill, George Holmes HOWISON, and Dr. Hall. Although Harris attained much greater national recognition, Snider became the most prolific writer of the group generally known as the St. Louis Hegelians.

In 1867 Snider joined the faculty of the St. Louis High School and married Mary Krug, "a woman of culture … [who] spoke both English and German without accent" (1910, p. 361). During his first four years at the high school he taught mental philosophy, moral philosophy (using Hegel's *Philosophy of Right*), history, and various branches of natural science. He continued his own education, supplementing the University Brokmeyer with diverse studies in law, Hegel's *Philosophie der Natur*, and botany. He even took a course in anatomy, including cadaver dissection, in a medical school. In 1871 he became assistant principal and, inheriting a class in Shakespeare attached to that position, immersed himself in Shakespeare for six years. His wife died in 1874. In 1877 he began a two-year long sojourn in Europe, returning late in 1879 to teach high school for another year and a half.

At this time he embarked on the "super-vocation" with which he subsequently identified himself, becoming a "Writer of Books." He wrote around fifty of them, including autobiography, memoirs of European travels, literature (poetry, drama, a novel), commentaries on Shakespeare, Goethe, Homer, and Dante (whose works he considered Western civilization's "literary Bibles"), and an important

history of the St. Louis Movement. His books were self-published, almost all under the imprint of Sigma Publishing Company ('S' for Snider, St. Louis, and Shakespeare). The few articles and poems appearing in periodicals were invited; Snider was reluctant to accept editorial revision and adjudged the major east coast publishers too provincial to appreciate midwestern ideas.

Since none of his books was commercially successful, Snider needed a more lucrative sub-vocation. He found one in 1879, when a "cultural epidemic" in St. Louis led to his being enticed into resigning from the high school to offer what would now be called adult-education classes, primarily to "wealthy high-toned ladies" (1920, p. 261). Foremost among these ladies was Susan BLOW, who, assisted by Superintendent Harris, instituted the first kindergarten in American public schools. She engaged Snider to teach Greek literature to her protégées. For a couple of years aspiring kinder-garten teachers significantly underwrote his new career, as his topics expanded to include all the "literary Bibles." Snider also lectured at the Concord School of Philosophy each summer from 1880 until 1885 on various literary classics, from Shakespeare to the Greek historians. The Concord program grew pro-gressively less philosophical during this period, and Snider became convinced that literary schools of the sort he was conducting would be its heirs. During the 1883 session he was entranced by William JAMES's three lectures on psychology, despite James's inability to appre-ciate the subtleties of Hegelian dialectic (1920, p. 337).

Snider moved to Chicago in 1884 because it was a better "center of propagation" for a life of "literary hoboism." He lectured in cities as diverse as Milwaukee, Boston, New York, Omaha, and Minneapolis. He considered the Chicago Literary Schools, conducted from 1887 until 1895, "the greatest practical single achievement of my life" (1920, pp. 520, 569). He was involved in other progressive move-ments in Chicago and was among those Jane ADDAMS consulted about the establishment of Hull-House, where he lived for a few months beginning in the fall of 1893. Earlier that year he went almost daily to the Chicago World's Fair, that "grand incarnation of the Earth-Soul," publishing reflections on its wonders as pamphlets during the Fair and as a book in 1895.

The core of Snider's Chicago students con-sisted of persons associated with the Chicago Kindergarten College. As Susan Blow had facil-itated his metamorphosis from high school teacher to evangelist for the literary Bibles, another kindergarten pedagogue prompted his shift from literature to psychology. Early in 1894 Elizabeth Harrison, principal of the Chicago Kindergarten College, hired him to replace an ailing psychology instructor. That course initiated his "most intense and creative" period, in which he wrote the books expound-ing his psychological system. Those were written in St. Louis, to which he returned fol-lowing the final literary school in Chicago. In 1906 he was involved, under the leadership of Amelia Fruchte, in establishing the Communal University. Francis Cook, not Snider, taught that institution's well-attended psychology classes. Snider viewed the founding of the Communal University as the "rejuvenescence," even the "the towering single deed," of the St. Louis Movement (1920, pp. 592, 596).

Snider specifies twenty-two of his works as components of a "System of Psychology," which is "the fulfilment of the St. Louis Movement" (1920, p. 599). This system, "the new Universal Science … in spite of to-day's pragmatic prejudice against all systems," has three divisions: "the psychological organon," treating feeling, volition, and intellect; "the world psychologized," treating physical and biological science, art, literature, history of phi-losophy, institutional sociology, and philoso-phy of history; and "the self psychologized," consisting of biographical studies of Lincoln, Froebel, Goethe, EMERSON, and Shakespeare (for a detailed outline see 1920, pp. 599–608). This Psychology is not what most persons call

"psychology" which Snider labeled "physiological psychology." Rather, it is the successor to two earlier "universal Disciplines," oriental religion and European philosophy. Each universal discipline attempts to explain everything, but their basic principles differ. Religion appeals to an ultimate origin or God, philosophy appeals to natural law, and Psychology appeals to psychical activity. Whereas religion and philosophy have been largely outgrown, Psychology is progressively assimilating all subject matters as specific forms of the psychic activity.

The idea of Psychology as a comprehensive worldview seems bizarre, but Snider deemed it plausible, even necessary, because he thought that the process characteristic of conscious thought is found, not only in introspection, but also throughout nature. He called this process the "Psychosis" and makes it the fundamental principle of his system. He acknowledged that "psychosis" is already being used to designate a pathological mental state corresponding to a physiological neurosis. He assails this usage as "not a little perverted," and believes he is restoring the term to its etymological sense of "the soul's peculiar activity" (1905, p. xx). This etymologizing is a bit fanciful, since *psychosis* in Greek actually meant a process of animating (literally "giving life"). Snider believed that all psychical activity is intrinsically "triune," moving, in a standard human case, from unconscious urge to distinct subject–object consciousness, to a "new concrete unity of the Ego," by which he may mean the unification of all the items of present awareness into one conscious state (1905, pp. xxi–xxiii). Syllogistic reasoning furnishes another example of triune structure. Nature at large betrays its psychical underpinnings in numerous processes having triune organization. Psychology uncovers and catalogs these instances of psychic activity.

Snider's "psychological organon" consists of analyses of mental states, from unconscious feelings and impulses to deliberate acts, revealing their triplistic character. For example, volition ("the Will") takes the increasingly complex forms of impulse – immediate, reflexive response to stimulus; desire – impulse subordinated to an envisaged end; and choice – purposeful desire, i.e., desire motivated by a superordinate desire for an end for which the object of choice is necessary (1899, pp. 70–180). "Moral Will" and "Institutional Will" are still more complex forms, dependent on "free will," by which Snider intends, not metaphysical indeterminism, but the exercise of volition within an established social order. Kant is faulted for failing to achieve any "clear conception of objective or institutional Freedom," and Hegel's treatment of the same in the *Philosophie des Rechts* is lauded as his "greatest product" (1899, pp. 265, 271).

Like Hegel, Snider sees freedom as the ultimate goal of moral and social evolution. So, a moral sensibility that inhibits choices to realize good ends is excessive; "we are responsible for being too responsible" (1899, p. 330). He discovers a Psychosis in the movement of moral theories from hedonism as found in the Cyrenaics, Hume, Mill, Sidgwick, and Spencer, to the intuitionism of the Cynics, Stoics, and Kant, to a synthesis of these in benevolence. Although hedonism and intuitionism only conceive moral agency subjectively, benevolence develops from its origin in sympathy into an objective form in which the state replaces individual charity with a welfare system. Such institutionalized benevolence is a cooperative enterprise furthering the free will "of the whole community or perchance of the whole commonwealth" (1899, p. 453). Historically, institutions have evolved in the direction of optimal freedom and Anglo-Saxon capitalism "has developed the freest institutions yet attained by humanity" (1899, p. 208). Moral virtues evolve along with their institutional loci. Snider distinguishes the heathen, Christian, and modern systems of virtue. The principal heathen virtues are the Platonic ones: wisdom, courage, temperance, justice. The Christian virtues are those recognized by Dante: on the religious side, the Pauline trio of faith, hope, and love; on the secular side, the chivalric trio

of honor, loyalty, and romantic love. The distinctively modern virtue is humanitarianism. It retains both the ancient virtue of justice amended by recognition of society's responsibility for criminal behavior and the Christian virtue of love made more inclusive and secularized. Snider predicts that humanitarianism will eventually evolve into the ideal virtue, "Love of Human Freedom, and of that world which secures such Freedom" (1899, p. 564).

For Snider, the history of natural science and philosophy is a series of Psychoses. Historical developments, which Hegel elucidated in terms of conceptual necessity, Snider treats as instantiations of distinctive modes of thought unconsciously seeking coherent self-expression. For example, ancient Greek atomism as a peculiar way of thinking (a Psychosis) goes through the stages of Leucippus's and Democritus's Cosmical Atomism, Anaxagoras's Noetic Atomism, and Protagoras's Egoistic Atomism (1903, p. 198). In Snider's estimation, Hegel is "Europe's last great philosopher" (1904, p. 814). Hegel's fatal flaw is failure to understand his own philosophizing in the evolutionary way he understands his predecessors. Consequently, the creative ego escapes Hegel's dialectical net, although it is the "secret demiurge" weaving that web of categories. Only a discipline that goes behind the ego's concepts to explain the evolution of the ego itself can remedy philosophy's failure. Enter Darwin, who applies the idea of evolution universally and seeks to understand everything as "Nature's own work" (1904, p. 521). However, Darwin only deals with physical, not psychical, evolution. His work must be supplemented by evolutionary psychology, which was an ongoing development in Snider's day (and still is).

Snider's Psychology tackles the still more general question of how cognition, including such modes of thought as the Darwinian hypothesis and evolutionary psychology, can arise from apparently dead matter. He proposes that a universal psychical process underlies physical nature, life, and consciousness, impelling evolution towards increasingly fuller forms of awareness. This "Pampsychosis" is the ultimate cause of natural order and is an all-encompassing conscious self. This version of pantheism or panentheism resembles the view of his contemporary, Henri Bergson, who also envisions reality as fundamentally energy or process (an *élan vitale*) and who declared that "supra-consciousness" is at the origin of life. Unfortunately, Snider only provides his routine trinitarian distinctions in lieu of Bergson's conceptual clarity and eloquent exposition. The three stages of the "All-psychosis" are the "Primordial One as the creative Self," Nature or "the stage of separation," and the stage of self-awareness in human consciousness.

Because nature is an objectifying, separative stage in the activity of a superior Ego, motion is more basic than matter. It is the "outer" manifestation of volition, "the fundamental principle of the Universe" (1909, p. 26). The evolution of the universe is an "ever-advancing triumph of motion over matter … till Body vanishes and Motion remains as pure self-activity … in the human consciousness" (1909, p. 13). Nature comprises three distinct orders: the cosmos, ruled by gravitation; the diacosmos, principally gravity-defying radiation; and the biocosmos, the domain of generation and consciousness. The pervasive ether is the "reservoir of all force and energy, which are but phases of Motion."

Since the universe tends toward production of entities replicating the activity of the Pampsychosis, the biocosmos is the most highly evolved order. Darwin, the "supreme biologist of all time," revolutionized our understanding of life. Although a genius in observation and insight, he was "gifted with a considerable power of unconscious self-contradiction" in logical reasoning. In particular, Snider thinks Darwin was unduly influenced by Ricardo, Malthus, and Mill. He attacks the "survival of the fittest" as "an insular theory which could not arise in continental America" where land and food abound. It also fails to explain evolution evolving itself in the mind of the biologist (1909, pp. 413–17). There must be "some-

thing in back of Evolution, propelling it onward, and for the most part upward … an energy outside itself … an Ego" (1909, pp. 26–7). All life, including microorganisms, contains a psychical component. That cells associate to form plants, animals, and (to complete the triad) the Earth, "can only be ascribed to the unseen might of the Psyche" (1909, pp. 106–107). Animals, with global sensation and "an inner organic self-control" have achieved greater psychical independence than plants, which are "multicentral" societies in which sensation is "limited and local" (1909, pp. 195–203, 268). The earth is itself a living individual, which has evolved from inorganic to organic and then to conscious existence. The "wide abyss" between each of these stages, "which science finds it impossible to bridge," indicates that thought is "primordial, antecedent to Nature which springs from it …" (1909, pp. 400–401). Like Plato, Snider offers no ecological advice based on this vision of Earth as an organism producing and sustaining all other organisms.

The highest human values are realized institutionally rather than in the intentions and actions of individuals. "The realm of freedom is the Institutional World" where free-will is objectivized in an order of actual facts, in contrast with the subjective freedom of individual moral agents (1901, p. 35). Snider recognizes three basic institutional forms: the secular, inherited from Greece and Rome; the religious, principally a Christian legacy; and the educative, a modern development (1901, p. 24).

The primary secular institutions are family, society, and state. Snider's vision of the family is conventional. It exists to reproduce individuals. Only monogamy "can be made into a universal principle … [or] enacted into a law," since polyandry and polygyny conflict with the nearly equal birthrates of males and females and also foster jealousy and spite (1901, p. 146). The wife is the homemaker, the more inventive husband the provider. Society makes for most of the difference between civilization and barbarism by universalizing consumption and specializing production. In developed societies the "Social Monocrat" (his term for CEO or tycoon) plays a key role in regulating labor, products, and money. The power of these middlemen has the "fearful side" of tending to monopoly and exploitation (1901, p. 235). Indeed, political liberty inevitably leads to social inequality, and Snider believes the inequality of his own day is "the greatest that ever existed" (1901, p. 316). Organized labor can check some of this tendency; but it, too, may become tyrannical. To avoid monopolistic oppression and union tyranny, society as a whole must balance the wants of capital and labor. Snider's remedy is "civic communism," a combination of wide communal ownership of industry and legislative regulation of the economy (1901, pp. 320–35). The Monocrat should be subject to the state, whose "love of law" makes it the arena in which individuals can become "truly actual" and objectively free. Democratic capitalism is the optimally free society, since all forms of socialism (which Snider considers Robert Owen and Saint-Simon as well as Marx) require despotic power to pursue their ideals. Marxism's fundamental error is that it ascribes all value to "the brawn of the laborer and little or none to the brain of middlemen" (1901, pp. 276–7). Socialism appeals principally to those whose training "under a system of paternalism" leads them to believe "the State can do anything." Americans, used to self-government, know better.

Religious institutions arise because all peoples have "some form of God-consciousness." Since institutions evolve toward greater freedom, the implicit goal of institutionalized religion is "the liberation of God." Religious institutions being human, "Man is as necessary to God, as God is to Man" (1901, p. 390). His point is that God is freed from the bondage of abstract, subjective possibility to the extent that the divine purpose is realized by human beings. The "primal religious act" is a monotheistic "Natural Pantheism" or animism; but in complex societies this becomes henothe-

ism, polytheism, or a reasoned form of monotheism (1901, pp. 472–3). All religions betray their psychic origin by containing some "primal Triad" representing the "Divine Psychosis" (1901, p. 440). The Christian trinity was preceded by, among others, Osiris–Isis–Horus in Egypt; Indra–Agni–Vishnu in India, and Yin–Yang–Chi in China. Religion evolves from nature religion through ethical religion to world religion. Christianity most approaches completion of this process, being the only putative world-religion which has completely renounced both "Nativism" (loyalty to an ancestral deity) and racial preference. Buddhism comes second, with Islam a distant third. Religious evolution tends toward one world religion, and the three world-religions "are quite agreed already" on matters of ethics and charity. However, since they "disagree profoundly" in theological conceptions of God, a universally acceptable expression of God-consciousness is yet to emerge. The "prime duty" of religion is to stem reversion to savagery (1901, pp. 486–92). Unhappily, over the ensuing century, religions have shown little devotion to this duty.

Three kinds of educational institutions exist to reproduce *institutional* persons. Public schools provide the basic education needed to be a productive member of society. Special schools – colleges, vocational schools, and universities – provide training for particular professions or social roles. Universities, as the most selective of these, constitute a sort of educational aristocracy. Since university instruction focuses on critical assessment of the past, university students are alienated from the wider contemporary society in which they must live following their university career. The "professors" of the universal school or "University of Civilization" are civilization's creative geniuses, most of whom have no "brick and mortar" institutional affiliation. The curriculum of this "university" consists of the arts, which Snider subdivides into presentative, representative, and noetic. The presentative arts include sculpture, graphic arts, dance, architecture, and music. In architecture Snider is especially impressed with the skyscraper, whose liberation from heavy stonework mirrors American freedom and independence. He anticipates that America will eventually produce distinctive forms of the other fine arts (1905, pp. 32–3). Music's psychological distinctiveness is its temporal fluidity, mimicking the dynamic movement of consciousness and conveying to auditors a quasi-religious sense of unity with the creative activity of the universe (1901, p. 577). By representative art Snider means that expressed through signs and symbols, primarily linguistically. It includes myth, *belles-lettres*, and, pre-eminently, the religious and literary "Bibles." The noetic arts comprise science, history, philosophy, and, of course, philosophy's successor, Psychology. Science's "grand outcome," the laws of nature, evidence a controlling will behind elemental forces. All science "unconsciously presupposes Psychology," by explaining nature in terms originally applied to activities of the self. History chronicles the progress of the *Weltgeist* and uncovers the "institutional law" which must be obeyed to actualize human freedom. Philosophy is a metadiscipline, "the Thought of Thought" elucidating and systematizing concepts found in the other arts. Unfortunately, philosophy tends to become dogmatic. The cure for this disease is Psychology, which never forgets that the self's "own inner movement as the source of all science, and specially of philosophy" (1901, p. 613).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Psychology and the Psychosis (St. Louis, 1896).
The Will and Its World (St. Louis, 1899).
Social Institutions (St. Louis, 1901).
Ancient European Philosophy (St. Louis, 1903).
Modern European Philosophy (St. Louis, 1904).
Architecture as a Branch of Aesthetic (St. Louis, 1905).
Feeling with Prolegomena (St. Louis, 1905).

Cosmos and Diacosmos (St. Louis, 1909).
Biocosmos (St. Louis, 1911).

Other Relevant Works
World's Fair Studies (St. Louis, 1895).
A Writer of Books (St. Louis, 1910).
The St. Louis Movement in Philosophy, Literature, Education, Psychology, with Chapters of Autobiography (St. Louis, 1920).

Further Reading
Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Who Was Who in Amer v1
Bostwick, Arthur E. "List of Books Written by Denton J. Snider, Litt. D., with Annotations," *St. Louis Public Library Monthly Bulletin* (August 1924): 1–8.
DeArmey, Michael, and James A. Good, eds. *The St. Louis Hegelians*, 3 vols (Bristol, UK 2001).
Dye, James Wayne. "Denton J. Snider's Interpretation of Hegel," *Modern Schoolman* 47 (1970): 153–7.
Goetzmann, William H., ed. *The American Hegelians: An Intellectual Episode in the History of Western America* (New York, 1973).
Harmon, Frances. *The Social Philosophy of the St. Louis Hegelians* (New York, 1943).
Harris, David H., ed. *A Brief Report of the Meeting Commemorative of the Early Saint Louis Movement in Philosophy, Psychology, Literature, Art and Education, in honor of Dr. Denton J. Snider's Eightieth Birthday* (St Louis, 1922).
Pochmann, Henry A. *German Culture in America, Philosophical and Literary Influences, 1600–1900* (Madison, Wisc., 1957).

James Dye

SOKOLOWSKI, Robert Stanley (1934–)

Robert S. Sokolowski was born on 3 May 1934 in New Britain, Connecticut. He received his BA in philosophy from the Catholic University of America in 1956, and his MA in philosophy from the same institution in 1957. In 1961 he earned a Bachelor's Degree in Sacred Theology at the University of Louvain in Belgium, and was ordained a priest of the archdiocese of Hartford, Connecticut on 25 June 1961. Sokolowski completed his studies for the PhD in philosophy at Louvain in 1963, and returned to the Catholic University where he has taught philosophy ever since, except for visiting appointments at the New School for Social Research (1969–70), the University of Texas at Austin (spring 1978), Villanova University (spring 1983), and Yale University (fall 1992). In 2001 he became the Elizabeth Breckenridge Caldwell Professor of Philosophy at Catholic University of America.

Sokolowski served on the Executive Committee of the Society for Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy from 1973 to 1975 and on the Executive Committee of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association from 1978 to 1980. From 1981 to 1989 he served as a consultant at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, and worked with theoretical physicists and mathematicians on issues related to the philosophy of science, mathematics, information technology, and artificial intelligence. He also was President of the Metaphysical Society of America during 1989–90. He was named a member of the Polish Academy of Sciences in 1996 and received the Aquinas Medal from the American Catholic Philosophical Association in 2002. He was named a Monsignor in 1992.

Sokolowski's dissertation, entitled "The Formation of Husserl's Concept of Constitution" and written under the direction of Herman Leo van Breda, was published in 1964 and reprinted in 1970. Still widely cited, it established him as one of the foremost interpreters of Husserl's phenomenology. That

Sokolowski chose to elucidate this concept is itself important, for it is central to Husserl's phenomenology and touches upon all the central themes of phenomenology, for example, the phenomenological reduction, intentionality, transcendental idealism, the consciousness of inner time, and subjectivity. Sokolowski makes clear that constitution is for Husserl a matter of bringing things, in their significance for us, to disclosure. Constitution, therefore, concerns both meaning – or better, sense – and objects together. Sokolowski explains that in order to understand constitution, one must account for both the structures and processes of the intentional consciousness that is active in disclosing things and the structures in things that underlie the possibility of their articulation by consciousness. Sense "belongs" to things, but there "is" no sense apart from those subjects to whom the things matter, for whom their significance matters.

This double-sided character of constitution fits well with Husserl's emphasis on the intentionality of consciousness, revealed by the methodological device of the phenomenological reduction, as the correlation of consciousness and world. On one side, consciousness is said to constitute things, and this emphasizes the active character of conscious experience in articulating objects and states of affairs. On the other side, things are said to constitute themselves "in" consciousness. This is not to be understood as some sort of real containment of the object of experience within mind; rather, it is to be understood as things manifesting themselves to consciousness. The use of the reflexive verb emphasizes the passive dimensions in thought; things present themselves to an active consciousness as having certain pre-predicative forms that underlie the intelligibility of things and that are brought to explicit presence by that active consciousness in its thoughtful, judgmental articulation of them.

For Sokolowski, philosophy's task is to analyze the thoughtful disclosure of things, a disclosure that involves the presence of things to us in direct experience, in language, and in symbols. The disclosure of this presence is always mediated by various forms of absence, a point seen most clearly in the analyses of language as making things present to us in their absence. It is just this relation among thinking, language, and things that Sokolowski explores in his major "ontological" works *Husserlian Meditations* (1974) and *Presence and Absence* (1978). The former work advances the understanding of Husserl's methodological innovations by identifying three distinct, yet interrelated, formal structures at work in all of Husserl's phenomenological analyses. These structures are whole and part, identity and manifold, presence and absence. Briefly and incompletely put, an identical object constitutes itself in the play of presence and absence through a manifold of appearances, but it is only by virtue of our intentional achievements that the identity is constituted for us as an identity (rather than merely a sequence of appearances). At a higher level, ideal objects, for example, species or geometrical figures, are constituted as an identity in the play of presence and absence through a manifold of objects that, in the case of the species, manifest certain similarities and, in the case of the ideal figure, approach a limit of exactness. In considering the constituted object, whether real or ideal, we also recognize it as a whole of parts, both separable pieces and inseparable moments. In recognizing the moments of a whole that require supplementation by other moments within the same whole, we grasp what is necessary to the whole, its essentials.

Sokolowski focuses much attention on how acts of judging and the categorial intuitions proper to them constitute states of affairs. The proposition expressed in a sentence can present the state of affairs in its absence; the sentence is that by which a speaker reports *S's being p* to an audience. The proposition properly understood is the state of affairs as supposed in the judging activity of the speaker. It is expressed in the sentence "*S is p*," and this propositional sense is fulfilled, that is, brought to evidential presence, in categorial intuition.

The categorial intuition is a modification of perception such that I not only see *Sp* or *S* as *p,* but I see "that *S* is *p*." The categorial intuition is achieved in the light of the proposition whose fulfillment is sought, and it stands in a necessary relation to it. The critically achieved judgment, in other words, recognizes the proposition as a supposition and confirms it in a direct experience of the state of affairs judged in the "empty" judgmental intention.

The teleological direction of the "empty" intention "presenting" the absent object toward the "full" intention that "fulfills" the empty intention also indicates to us the temporality of consciousness, for it points to the fact that my intending has a future direction to it, a direction toward those subsequent experiences in which my empty intendings are fulfilled. Viewed from another perspective, we can say that in actually grasping the judged state of affairs, I hold on to or retain the proposition as the sense to be fulfilled. Thus, I am able to recognize the "coincidence" or "congruence" (*Deckung*) between the emptily intended sense and the fulfilling sense.

Given Husserl's and Sokolowski's view that the *being* of a thing is for the first time realized in the judgmental activity that asserts *p* of *S*, the focus of *Presence and Absence* is more narrowly on the constitution of the being of an articulated reality and on the categorial forms appropriate to the thing and the correlated syntactical forms appropriate to the propositional sense expressed in a language with its grammatical forms. Sokolowski distinguishes three modes of speech in *Presence and Absence*. There is the everyday speech in which we simply name objects and report our experiences of them. These experiences are often practically engaged with the things they name and articulate, and the articulations are clearly related to the practical engagements we have. However, the interplay of presence and absence in our ordinary experience can be such that the ordinary course of experience is interrupted by discordant appearances or our judgmental intendings of things are disappointed as we try to bring the states of affairs to intuition. This leads to a modalization of the constituted sense of things such that we recognize an appearance specifically as an appearance that might be non-veridical or such that we recognize a judged state of affairs as a supposition that might not be true. In turning to the supposition, we disclose the proposition in the logical sense, and a new domain of discourse opens. Sokolowski calls this turn to the supposition the "propositional turn," and it adjusts our stance toward the ontological such that the concern for the truth of our proposals and for the truth of things becomes an explicit concern. New predicates, for example, "clear," "distinct," "true," "false," "consistent," "inconsistent," "coherent," and "incoherent," become possible for us, and they are predicated of the proposition itself rather than of the situations we articulate in the proposition. The "true" is the logical correlate of the ontological "is." But the "is" captures the more fundamental sense of "truth" as "truthful" disclosure, while the "true" predicated of propositions denotes the correctness of the proposition, its agreement with the state of affairs itself. The propositional turn also discloses the judger and speaker as one who frames, and is responsible for, the suppositions advanced in discourse. Finally, the third mode of speech disclosed in *Presence and Absence* is the philosophical speech in which we articulate these patterns of thoughtful disclosure and truthfulness.

Sokolowski develops his concern with thoughtful and truthful disclosure through a series of essays describing various phenomena, such as pictures, quotations, measurement, and reference. Moreover, he develops this concern at length in relation to two other domains of experience that involve special kinds of disclosure. One of these is the moral dimension, and his *Moral Action: A Phenomenological Study* (1985) is an imaginative extension of Husserl's doctrines of intentionality, categoriality, and identification and differentiation into the framework of Aristotle's moral philosophy. Sokolowski explores the nature of what he calls "moral transactions," and he claims that moral

action is properly characterized by a particular kind of identification that transforms the material performance of an action into a moral transaction. The agent recognizes the action, first, as his or her own action whose initiation will change a situation in a way desirable for herself and, second, as good or bad for the person towards whom the action is directed. The agent, in other words, identifies the good or bad of the target of the action with his or her own good achievable in action. Subjects are agents for disclosing not only the true but the good as well.

The second area into which Sokolowski extends his phenomenological analysis is philosophical theology or, as he calls it, the "theology of disclosure." Two books explore this theme. The first, *The God of Faith and Reason: Foundations of Christian Theology* (1982), explores the Christian understanding of God as rooted in what Sokolowski calls the "Christian distinction," a distinctive way of thinking about the relation between God and the world. That God transcends the world means that God's disclosure is always mediated by absence; it is realized in symbols, most importantly, the symbols involved in our sacramental life. This idea is explored both in more detail and in a more particular way in Sokolowski's *Eucharistic Presence: A Study in the Theology of Disclosure* (1994). The Eucharist is the sacramental presence of the divine Christ that recalls for us not only the Last Supper, Crucifixion, and Resurrection of Christ but also the Passover and Exodus of the Jewish people. At the same time, the Eucharist makes present again for us by quotation and re-enactment the Paschal mystery, and it points toward the eternal life made possible by Christ's redemptive action.

Sokolowski's starting point and lifelong theme is the idea that philosophy's task is to analyze thoughtfulness or thinking, and this involves the analysis of the truthfulness both of thought and of the things that allow and solicit thought. By his analyses of the thoughtful disclosure of things Sokolowski also calls our attention to the fact that the being of the human is to be a responsible agent of disclosure.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Formation of Husserl's Concept of Constitution (The Hague, 1964; 1970).

Husserlian Meditations: How Words Present Things (Evanston, Ill., 1974).

Presence and Absence: A Philosophical Investigation of Language and Being (Bloomington, Ind., 1978).

The God of Faith and Reason: Foundations of Christian Theology (Notre Dame, Ind., 1982; 1995).

Moral Action: A Phenomenological Study (Bloomington, Ind., 1985).

Pictures, Quotations, and Distinctions: Fourteen Essays in Phenomenology (Notre Dame, Ind., 1992).

Eucharistic Presence: A Study in the Theology of Disclosure (Washington, D.C., 1994).

Introduction to Phenomenology (Cambridge, UK, 2000).

Other Relevant Works

"Knowing Natural Law," *Tijdschrift voor Filosofie* 43 (1981): 625–41.

"Husserl's Concept of Categorial Intuition," in *Phenomenology and the Human Sciences,* suppl. to *Philosophical Topics* 12 (1981): 127–41.

"The Human Possession and the Transfer of Information," in *Science, Computers, and the Information Onslaught*, ed. D. M. Kerr et al. (New York, 1984), pp. 15–27.

"The Theory of Phenomenological Description," *Man and World* 16 (1984): 221–32.

"Intentional Analysis and the Noema," *Dialectica* 38 (1984): 114–29.

"Quotation," *Review of Metaphysics* 37 (1984): 699–723.

"Measurement," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 24 (1987): 71–9.

"Natural and Artificial Intelligence," *Daedalus* 117 (1988): 45–64.

"Syntax, Semantics, and the Problem of the Identity of Mathematical Objects," with Gian-Carlo Rota and David Sharp, *Philosophy of Science* 55 (1988): 376–86.

"Knowledge and Its Representation in Writing, Computers, and the Brain," in *The Brain and Intelligence, Natural and Artificial*, ed. O. Barnabei, et al. (Bologna, Italy, 1990), pp. 197–207.

"The Human Person and Political Life," *The Thomist* 65 (2001): 505–27.

Further Reading

Drummond, J. J., and J. G. Hart, eds. *The Truthful and the Good: Essays in Honor of Robert Sokolowski* (Dordrecht, 1996). Contains a bibliography of Sokolowski's writings.

Mansini, G., and J. G. Hart, eds. *Ethics and Theological Disclosures: The Thought of Robert Sokolowski* (Washington, D.C., 2003).

John Drummond

SOLOVEITCHIK, Joseph Dov (1903–93)

Joseph Dov (Ber) Soloveitchik was born on 27 March 1903 in Pruzhan, Poland (now in Belarus, Russia), to an eminent rabbinical Orthodox family. His grandfather, Rabbi Hayyim Soloveitchik, changed Orthodox Talmud study around the world by introducing a revolutionary method of talmudic classification that insisted upon incisive, scientific analysis and dependence on the writings of Maimonides. Joseph Soloveitchik became a dominant intellectual of American Orthodox Jewry in the twentieth century. His prominence arose from being the chief rabbi of Boston, the *rosh yeshiva* of Yeshiva University, and executive chair of the Halakhah committee of the Rabbinical Council of America.

Soloveitchik broke from Eastern European Orthodox tradition by studying with private tutors and attending the Free Polish University from 1920 to 1925. From 1925 to 1931 he studied philosophy at the University of Berlin. The Marburg School of neo-Kantianism as developed by Paul Natorp and Hemann Cohen attracted the young rabbinical scholar. This school accepted that the mind's a priori categories were true sources of knowledge, but went beyond Kant by assuming that thought is the origin of being. According to some sources, the young scholar wished to write his dissertation on Maimonides and Plato challenging the prevalent view that Maimonides was an Aristotelian, but no one at the University of Berlin could supervise that work. Under the direction of Heinrich Maier, Soloveitchik instead wrote his dissertation on the epistemology and metaphysics of Hermann Cohen: "Das reine Denken und die Seinskonstituierung bei Hermann Cohen," and received his PhD in philosophy in 1931.

Soloveitchik emigrated to the United States in 1932, and soon after his arrival in Boston he was made its chief rabbi. He founded the Maimonides School, a Jewish day school, in Boston in 1937. From 1941 until 1985, Rabbi Soloveitchik served as the *rosh yeshiva*, head Talmudic scholar, and professor of Jewish philosophy at the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary of Yeshiva University in New York City. Soloveitchik died on 8 April 1993 in Brookline, Massachusetts.

Much of Soloveitchik's thought concerns his assessment of the human condition and seeks to understand the condition of humanity through the lens of Jewish tradition. Human comprehension of the properly understood Halakhah (the laws that capture the essence of Jewish tradition), set in ideal categories (based on the talmudic system developed by his grandfather), shape human perception of outer reality and inner personality. Individuals are dialectical beings, both object and subject, and the self-awareness of one's dual character as prescribed by the Halakhah is essential to a meaningful life.

Recognition of human loneliness provides the key to one's ability to live religiously and creatively. At the zenith of human experience is the ability to call out to God and to withdraw in the face of possible response from the divine. Ultimately, the Halakhic life, and its minutiae, helps individuals comprehend both outer and inner reality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Be-sod ha-yahid veha-yahad: mivhar ketavim `Ivriyim (Jerusalem, 1976).
Halakhic Man (Philadelphia, 1983).
The Halakhic Mind: An Essay on Jewish Tradition and Modern Thought (New York, 1986).
The Lonely Man of Faith (New York, 1992).

Other Relevant Works
Soloveitchik's papers are at the Joseph B. Soloveitchik Institute in Brookline, Massachusetts.
Reflections of the Rav: Lessons in Jewish Thought, ed. Abraham Besdin (Jerusalem, 1979).
Soloveitchik on Repentance, ed. Peli Pinchas (New York, 1984).
"Kol Dodi Dofek: It is the Voice of My Beloved that Knocketh," in *Theological and Halakhic Reflections on the Holocaust*, ed. Bernhard Rosenberg and Fred Heuman (Hoboken, N.J., 1992).
Family Redeemed: Essays on Family Relationships, ed. David Shatz and Joel B. Wolowelsky (New York, 2000).
Out of the Whirlwind, Essays on Mourning, Suffering and the Human Condition, ed. David Shatz et al. (Hoboken, N.J., 2003).
Selected Lectures of Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik, ed. Arnold Lustiger (Union City, N.J., 2003).

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils
Angel, Marc. *Exploring the Thought of Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik* (Hoboken, N.J., 1997).

Farber, Seth. *An American Orthodox Dreamer: Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik and Boston's Maimonides School* (Hanover, N.H., 2003).
Hartmann, David. *Love and Terror in the God Encounter: The Theological Legacy of Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik* (Woodstock, Verm., 2001).
Kolitz, Zvi. *Confrontation: The Existential Thought of Rabbi J. B. Soloveitchik* (Hoboken, N.J., 1993).
Lichtenstein, Aharon. "Joseph Soloveitchik," in *Great Jewish Thinkers of the Twentieth Century*, ed. Simon Noveck (Washington, D.C., 1963), pp. 281–97.

Seth A. Farber

SOMMERS, Frederic Tamler (1923–)

Frederic Sommers was born on 1 January 1923 in New York City. He was educated at Columbia University, where he received his BA and then his PhD in philosophy in 1955, writing a dissertation on "An Empiricist Ontology: A Study in the Metaphysics of Alfred North WHITEHEAD." Sommers began his academic career at Columbia University, where he was assistant professor of philosophy from 1955 to 1963. He moved to Brandeis University in 1964 as associate professor of philosophy, was promoted to full professor in 1966, and held the Harry Austryn Wolfson Chair of Philosophy from 1965 until his retirement in 1993.

Sommers was a staunch proponent of a traditionalist view of logic, albeit in a "modern" guise. He has consistently expressed the view that progress in logic *should* have stopped, if not with Leibniz, than at least before Frege, devising a variant of syllogistic very close to that undertaken by Leibniz. His "Calculus of Terms" applies a system of pluses and minuses to the subjects and predicates of categorical syl-

logisms, to indicate inclusion and exclusion, the copula and the negation of the copula, as well as for affirmation and denial, with a universal statement having the form +(–…) or –(+…) for the subject term and a particular statement having the form +(+…) or –(–…) for the subject term. His system is essentially that of Leibniz's, with Leibniz's "=" and "±" replaced in Sommers's notation by "+" and "–" respectively. In *Logic of Natural Language* Sommers developed the system in more detail, together with a consideration of its purported philosophical implications. He argued that his calculus of terms is significantly different from the predicate logic; but Gregory McCulloch argued that there really is no such difference. Sommers claims that his calculus of terms is an elaboration of Leibniz's proposal.

Sommers argued that the subject–predicate semantic analysis of syllogistic propositions, with the proper treatment, retains as much deductive power as Frege's calculus, and in an important sense is more expressively powerful than Frege's function-theoretic quantification theory, because it is closer to natural language while being able to handle polyadic relations. In Sommers's calculus, relational terms are represented in the form '$R \pm A \pm B \pm \ldots \pm K$', where R is the relation and some/all A, some/all B, …, some/all K are objects of R. Thus Sommers is able to analyze such propositions as "All censors withhold some books from minors" as "$W + B - M$."

Sommers's "Ordinary Language Tree" for mapping relations among Aristotelian categories was based upon his efforts to arithmeticize Aristotelian syllogistic as a calculus of terms. In Sommers's tree, genera and species give way to subjects and predicates, treated as classes. His book *The Logic of Natural Language* (1982) provides a detailed, systematic and unified elaboration of the Ordinary Language Tree and the Calculus of Terms and explores the philosophical import of this logical system. His *Invitation to Formal Reasoning: The Logic of Terms* (2000) provides a textbook elaboration of the logic of terms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Ordinary Language Tree," *Mind* 68 (1959): 160–85.

"Types and Ontology," *Philosophical Review* 72 (1963): 327–63.

"A Program for Coherence," *Philosophical Review* 73 (1964): 522–7.

"Predicability," in *Philosophy in America*, ed. Max Black (London, 1965), pp. 262–81.

"Why Is There Something and Not Nothing?" *Analysis* 26 (1966): 177–80.

"On a Fregean Dogma," *Problems in the Philosophy of Mathematics*, ed. Imré Lakatos (Amsterdam, 1967), vol. 1, pp. 47–62.

"The Calculus of Terms," *Mind* 79 (1970): 1–39.

"Leibniz's Program for the Development of Logic," in *Essays in Memory of Imre Lakatos*, ed. Robert S. Cohen, Paul K. Feyerabend, and Marx Wartofsky (Dordrecht, 1976), pp. 589–615.

"On Predication and Logical Syntax," in *Language in Focus*, ed. Asa Kasher (Dordrecht, 1976), pp. 41–53.

The Logic of Natural Language (Oxford, 1982).

"Predication in the Logic of Terms," *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 31 (1990): 106–26.

"The World, the Facts, and Primary Logic," *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 34 (1993): 169–82.

"Putnam's Born-again Realism," *Journal of Philosophy* 94 (1997): 453–71.

An Invitation to Formal Reasoning: The Logic of Terms, with George Englebretsen (Aldershot, UK, 2000).

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils
Englebretsen, George. *Three Logicians: Aristotle, Leibniz, and Sommers and the Syllogistic* (Assen, The Netherlands, 1981).

———, *New Syllogistic* (New York, 1987).

Englebretsen, George, ed. *Essays on the Philosophy of Fred Sommers: In Logical Terms* (Lewiston, N.Y., 1990).

McCulluch, Gregory. "Frege, Sommers, Singular Reference," in *Frege: Tradition and Influence*, ed. Crispin Wright (Oxford, 1984), pp. 110–25.

Nelson, John D. "On Summers' Reinstatement of Russell's Ontological Program," *Philosophical Review* 73 91964): 517–21.

Oderberg, David S., ed. *The Old New Logic: Essays on the Philosophy of Fred Sommers* (Cambridge, Mass., 2005).

Irving H. Anellis

SONTAG, Susan Lee (1933–2004)

Susan Sontag was born Susan Lee Rosenblatt in New York City on 16 January 1933. After her father died of tuberculosis in China, where he had been a fur trader, she moved to Tucson, Arizona, with her mother and younger sister. She moved again to North Hollywood, California, in 1945 when her mother married Colonel Nathan Sontag. She attended the University of California at Berkeley before entering the University of Chicago, where she received her BA in 1951. She married Philip Rieff in 1950 and had a son in 1952. She first earned an MA in English at Harvard University in 1954 and also received an MA in philosophy in 1955. She intended to complete a philosophy PhD at Harvard, and accepted an American Association of University Women Fellowship at Oxford for 1957–8 to write her doctoral dissertation on the metaphysical presuppositions of ethics. After a few months in Oxford, however, Sontag went to Paris, where she formed a more daring and socially engaged ideal of intellectual life from her contact with writers, filmmakers, and avant-garde artists, who made an academic career seem impossible to her.

Upon her return to the United States in 1958, she divorced her husband and moved to New York City with her son to assume the life of a writer. From 1960 to 1964 she was an instructor in the religion department of Columbia University. Her writing was informed by her study of literature, religion, and philosophy with some of the best minds in the United States (including Kenneth BURKE, Paul TILLICH, and Joseph Schwab); by her reading of continental cultural theorists (such as Roland Barthes, Walter Benjamin, E. M. Cioran, Claude Lévi-Strauss, Georg Lukács, Jean-Paul Sartre); and by her association with the New York intellectuals (Lionel Trilling, Harold ROSENBERG, and Lionel Abel). She wrote essays, fiction, film scripts, and plays. She was elected to the American Academy and Institute of Arts and Letters (1979) and received two Guggenheim Fellowships (1966, 1975), the National Book Critics Circle Award for Criticism (1978), a MacArthur Foundation Fellowship (1990), an honorary degree from Harvard (1993), and the National Book Award (2001), among other honors. Sontag died on 28 December 2004 in New York City.

Sontag's contributions to American philosophy, though deliberately unsystematic, are primarily in aesthetics. Her best-known essays on aesthetic issues were published in magazines such as *Partisan Review* and the *New York Review of Books* and later collected in *Against Interpretation* (1966), *Styles of Radical Will* (1969) and *On Photography* (1977). They began as expressions of her enthusiasm for what she saw as new masterpieces that were cropping up all over New York and Paris in literature, film, dance, theater, and criticism without proper notice. By 1966, however, she saw her essays as case studies for her own aesthetic, which she felt compelled to clarify so that the assumptions that informed her judgments would not seem arbitrary and would therefore carry more weight when she challenged prevailing standards (1966, p. viii).

Sontag gained aesthetic authority through her epigrammatic style. Assertive claims in short numbered sections of prose allowed her to draw multiple ideas into juxtaposition with each other while still seeming to make progress in an argument. The style required the reader to decide what to accept from the array of ideas, examples, references, and assertions, so it allowed her ample opportunities for continued revision. Although some have called her approach Hegelian because she valued opposing points of view that led her to propose new positions, the label of kaleidoscopic seems closer to the mark.

Sontag's aesthetic theory involved an idiosyncratic merger of aesthetics with ethics, epistemology, and metaphysics. The title essay in *Against Interpretation* began with a clarion call to overthrow any system of aesthetic judgment that did not fit contemporary art practices. Sontag's first crusade was against the search for meaning in texts and in favor of sensuous response to their form: in her famous phrase, "In place of a hermeneutics we need an erotics of art." (1966, p. 14) In another signature essay, "On Style," she called for examination of the ways subject matter functioned as form; she proposed that it functioned by engaging the mind in a process of transformations. Noting the weight of Western culture's misplaced concern that truth and morality may be compromised by art, Sontag contended that moral pleasure in relation to art takes the form of intelligent gratification of consciousness. Since she believed that morality did not consist in making prescribed choices, she found the nourishment of consciousness through the aesthetic experience of form or style in art moral, regardless of the work's content. Works of art become models of consciousness in that they offer different models for the flow of mental energy. Further, she said, they both arise from and arouse the will, and, since the will could take a virtually limitless number of stances, the number of styles that works of art can take is legion (1966, pp. 5, 20–32).

In these 1966 essays, aesthetic experience became a model of healthy moral consciousness capable of discerning and actively responding to an artist's will through the style of a work of art. In the rest of *Against Interpretation*, Sontag uses this hypothesis to call sympathetic attention to forms of avant-garde art that were far from canonical at the time, among them independent films, works of suffering and disaster, happenings, and a style she called "camp." In the final essay, Sontag argued that instead of either defending the function of the arts in terms of their humanistic value or surrendering their value to science, we might see the arts as "a new kind of instrument … for modifying consciousness and organizing new modes of sensibility" (1966, p. 296). In addition to challenging the distinction between form and content, she saw that contemporary arts had challenged distinctions between the frivolous and the serious and between high and low culture. The new sensibility brought about by art led, she thought, to a concept of art as less a criticism of life (in Matthew Arnold's famous phrase) and more an extension of life. The aspects of extended life included beauty, sensation, taste, standards, enthusiasms, and so on. In the last paragraph of the book, Sontag called the new sensibility "defiantly pluralistic" and predicted that from its perspective, the beauty of a machine, a mathematical problem, a painting, a film, and even the Beatles would be equally accessible (1966, pp. 294–304).

On the basis of this book, Sontag is often credited with ushering Americans into a postmodern aesthetic. Apparently no one saw at the time that Sontag herself continued to understand aesthetic experience in the traditional way as distanced and that she still saw art as apolitical (1966, pp. 25, 300). She recently said she had no intention of undercutting the canons of the arts by opening the doors of sensory appreciation to all manner of objects, events and performances (2001, p. 270). The genie of postmodern pluralism, however, had been released from the lamp.

In *Styles of Radical Will*, Sontag extended her aesthetic theory, particularly in "The Aesthetics of Silence," where she explored anti-art phe-

nomena in which subject, intention, object, and image were eliminated from art. In these cases, where art was on its way to a spiritual *via negativa*, she argued, the materiality of art and the presence of an audience became traps to prevent transcendence. For Sontag, the history of art had been a series of successful transgressions or negations of materials and audience that verged closer to silence in the twentieth century. Silence, with its evocation of eternity had become a standard of seriousness, Sontag's term of highest praise. Art's primary use (rather than its meaning) had become to disburden artists and audiences of the effects of language, memory, history, ideas of beauty and other cultural baggage. In addition to providing a model of knowing something, the kind of art that aspires to an absolute also supplies, she said, a model for tact or decorum that transcended ethical or social rules and made a proposal for upsetting them (1969, pp. 4–5, 32).

One of the enduring strengths of Sontag's reflective, meditative, yet controversial essays is her ability to provide verbal portraits of artists and writers who were often virtually unknown in the United States at the time of her writing. Beginning with her essay "Trip to Hanoi" (1969, pp. 205–74), she extended her reach to lands and cultures beyond Western Europe, embarking on a long series of journeys to war zones. At about the same time, in her introduction to an exhibit catalogue of Cuban posters, *The Art of Revolution* (1970), Sontag began to wrestle with the possibility that such works might affect traditional strictures against political art and might be good even though they were not artistically avant-garde. Her trips would culminate in a longterm love affair with Sarajevo, where, as bombs were exploding, she directed a Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian cast in a performance of Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*. In her introduction to a volume of Roland Barthes's work, Sontag saw that this writer she had idolized had turned away from his theories of the death of the author and the aesthetics of absence toward an idea of litera-

ture as a far less intellectual *embrace* of subject and object (1982, p. xxxvi). Sontag's later books of essays were no less concerned with the arts than the earlier ones, but they are perhaps more cognizant of art's relationships to history. In contrast with her first two novels, *The Benefactor* (1963) and *Death Kit* (1967), which took place almost entirely within the minds of their protagonists, her last two, *The Volcano Lover* (1992) and *In America* (2000), were both based on historical characters and events.

In *On Photography*, Sontag turned her attention to another form that had not yet been accepted as high art in order to wrestle with its effect on consciousness. Situating human beings in Plato's cave, she claimed that photographs had changed the nature of human confinement in the cave by providing both a grammar and an ethics of seeing. The grammar had to do with the collection, appropriation, packaging, and arranging of images to represent and certify experience. Photographs had taught us to see, by furnishing and distorting evidence, selecting an angle of vision, idealizing reality, defending against anxiety, memorializing, abetting desire, and encouraging the subject to continue doing whatever was interesting to the photographer. Ethical issues were sure to arise whenever the camera sees the pain and misfortune of others, and throughout the book, Sontag worried that while photographs may have the power to awaken conscience and provoke action in the viewer, they may also have the opposite effect when one sees too many powerful images or sees them too many times. She saw in photography the perpetuation of aesthetic distance and the possibility that even the most amateurish example would seem to be art because of the effect that time would have on one's experience of the photo (1977, pp. 3–21).

Among the many risks of our addiction to taking pictures, she noted, is a kind of mental pollution that turns experience into an object for consumption. Among the benefits is a realization that another world exists apart from the one ordinarily seen. Sontag called this world created by juxtaposition or abstraction *surreal*.

As such, photography has moved beyond the conventionally beautiful to enlarge the realm of what we regard as aesthetic. On the other hand, the very properties that promote aesthetic detachment also compromise the photograph's ability to represent truth. Sontag ended this book with a now familiar Marxist analysis that a capitalist economic system requires images both to stimulate the need for new goods and to anaesthetize citizens to the injuries it perpetuates. Returning to the image of Plato's cave, she observed that photography has made it less possible to distinguish images from things. Photographs are finally material realities: "richly informative deposits left in the wake of whatever emitted them, potent means for turning the tables on reality – for turning *it* into a shadow." While the essays made clear Sontag's love and respect for the medium of photography, they also raised tough ethical questions about how it was used that could not be put to rest (1977, pp. 105, 178–80).

In *Regarding the Pain of Others* (2003), Sontag turned to the long history of photographs that represent the experience of war. The penultimate chapter claims that one value of war photographs is certainly to expand the viewer's knowledge of the wickedness human beings are capable of perpetrating on others. Photographs of war allow us to pay elective attention to the plight of others. Far from being morally wrong, this process at least allows our minds to function, and thought tends to impede violence. Confronted with the atrocities of war, however, Sontag understands, through her own experiences of dodging shells, that not even the most powerful images allow us to imagine the terrifying nature of the thing itself. The aesthete who had believed so completely in the process of transforming consciousness through artistic or stylistic form admits here that the reality of war is beyond the power of art (2003, pp. 114–18).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Against Interpretation (New York, 1966).
Styles of Radical Will (New York, 1969).
The Art of Revolution: Castro's Cuba: 1959–1970 (New York, 1970).
On Photography (New York, 1977).
A Barthes Reader (New York, 1982).
A Susan Sontag Reader (New York, 1982).
Regarding the Pain of Others (New York, 2003).

Other Relevant Works
The Benefactor, a Novel (New York, 1963).
Death Kit (New York, 1967).
Illness As Metaphor (New York, 1978).
Under the Sign of Saturn (New York, 1982).
"The Way We Live Now," *The New Yorker* (24 November 1986): 42–51.
AIDS and Its Metaphors (New York, 1989).
The Volcano Lover (New York, 1992).
In America (New York, 2000).
Where the Stress Falls (New York, 2001).

Further Reading
Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, *Comp Amer Thought*
Acocella, Joan. "The Hunger Artist," *New Yorker* (6 March 2000): 68–77.
Hirsch, Edward. "The Art of Fiction: Susan Sontag," *Paris Review* 137 (Winter 1995): 175–208.
Kennedy, Liam. *Susan Sontag: Mind As Passion* (Manchester, UK, 1995).
Poague, Leland. *Conversations with Susan Sontag* (Jackson, Miss., 1995).
Poague, Leland, and Kathy A. Parsons. *Susan Sontag: An Annotated Bibliography, 1948–1992* (New York, 2000).
Rollyson, Carl. *Reading Susan Sontag* (Chicago, 2001).
Rollyson, Carl, and Lisa Paddock. *Susan Sontag: The Making of An Icon* (New York, 2000).
Sayres, Sohnya. *Susan Sontag: The Elegaic Modernist* (New York, 1990).

Estella Lauter

SOSA, Ernest (1940–)

Ernest Sosa was born on 17 June 1940 in Cardenas, Cuba. He came to the United States and entered the University of Miami, discovering philosophy in his senior year. After graduating from Miami in 1961, Sosa went to the University of Pittsburgh and obtained his PhD in philosophy in 1964. He then went to Brown University for a post-doctorate position from 1964 to 1966, and returned one year later to join the philosophy faculty. Sosa was chair of the philosophy department from 1970 to 1976, and was appointed the Romeo Elton Professor of Natural Theology, a position previously held by Roderick Chisholm. In the 1990s Sosa began visiting regularly at Rutgers University, where he is now distinguished visiting professor every spring. He has also held visiting positions at the Universities of Western Ontario, Miami, Mexico, Harvard, Michigan, and Texas, and Salamanca. He was a visiting fellow at Oxford in 1997, and at the Australian National University in 2002. He gave the John Locke Lectures at Oxford in 2005. He is the editor of *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* and the co-editor of *Noûs*. He was the general editor of the *Cambridge Studies in Philosophy* series from 1992 to 2003. He has held several positions in the American Philosophical Association, including Secretary-Treasurer of the Eastern Division, membership on the APA National Board, and President of the Eastern Division in 2004–2005. He was elected in 2001 to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Sosa has written on a variety of philosophical topics, including influential papers in the areas of metaphysics, philosophy of language and philosophy of mind. He has been most influential in epistemology, where he has written on virtually every important topic in the second half of the twentieth century, including the analysis of knowledge, skepticism, the nature and structure of justification, and the nature of epistemic normativity.

Sosa's influence on contemporary epistemology has been pervasive, shaping that discipline for over four decades. His most seminal work can be divided into three major areas. Most importantly, he is the first modern author to defend a virtue-theoretic approach to the understanding of knowledge and related concepts. Sosa is largely responsible for a renewed interest in the nature of the intellectual virtues and their place in a theory of knowledge. Second, he has mounted groundbreaking attacks on the argumentative theory of justification and, more broadly, on internalist theories of justification. Accordingly he is considered one of the leading proponents of externalism in epistemology. Third, Sosa's thinking has reshaped contemporary understanding of the foundationalism–coherentism debate in epistemology.

The argumentative theory of justification has enjoyed wide appeal throughout the history of philosophy, going back at least to Plato's suggestions in the *Meno*. According to Donald Davidson, "nothing can count as a reason for holding a belief except another belief." According to Richard Rorty, "nothing counts as justification unless by reference to what we already accept, and there is no way to get outside our beliefs and our language so as to find some test other than coherence." Sosa reconstructs the argumentative theory as follows: (AJ) For a belief to be justified is for the believer to justify it or to have justified it; and for one to justify a belief (really, successfully) is for one correctly and seriously to use considerations or reasons in its favor. But why accept AJ? One can point to common usage, and insist that to justify is to bring reasons in favor, but that avoids the more substantive issue: Why does "epistemic authority" in general, or "positive epistemic status" in general, require argumentative justification? Moreover, Sosa argues, the argumentative theory is in trouble as an account of epistemic authority in general. For to "correctly" use reasons in favor is surely to use *justified* reasons in favor, and in that case we are faced with a vicious regress. A natural response to this objection is to say (with Davidson) that justification ends in coherence:

that ultimately a belief is justified not by further reasons brought in its favor, but by its membership in a coherent system of reasons. An alternative response is to say (with Rorty) that justification ends with what our peers let us say: that ultimately a belief is justified because it meets the standards that society plus context fix in place. But either response gives up the argumentative account of justification by specifying an alternative basis for justification – coherence or social standards. In other words, each response claims that something else, not justified reasons, is the ultimate source of epistemic authority.

These epistemological issues relate to another important theme in Sosa's work: the supervenience of the evaluative. In general, Sosa thinks, we should accept the idea that a thing has its evaluative properties in virtue of its non-evaluative properties. An important aim of epistemology, Sosa reasons, is to specify the non-evaluative basis of supervening epistemic properties, thus allowing a special sort of insight into the nature of justification and knowledge. But from this perspective the argumentative account of justification seems clearly hopeless. According to AJ, for one to justify a belief is for one "correctly and seriously to use considerations or reasons in its favor." But again, how are we to understand "correctly"? The most obvious way is in terms of some epistemically evaluative property. But then the argumentative account fails to get to the nature of the epistemically evaluative.

Similar considerations apply, more broadly, against internalist theories of justification. In effect, internalism claims that justification (or epistemic authority, or epistemic status) supervenes entirely on factors that are "internal" to the knower. But that seems wrong, Sosa argues. Consider a victim of a Cartesian deceiver – someone exactly like you in all internal respects, but who is massively deceived about her external environment. Suppose also that some few of the victim's beliefs are true. For example, suppose that she believes (truly) that it is presently raining. Surely her belief does not amount to knowledge. Even if the belief is in some sense justified or rational, it lacks the sort of standing that knowledge requires. But then epistemic standing, Sosa reasons, cannot be entirely understood in terms of what is internal – for by hypothesis, the victim and the knower (i.e., you) are exactly alike in all internal respects.

The dispute between internalism and externalism is over the nature of knowledge, while the dispute between foundationalism and coherentism is over the structure of knowledge. Is knowledge like a pyramid, in which a solid foundation supports the remainder of the structure, or is it more like a raft, in which the various parts are tied together in relations of mutual support? The dispute arises in response to a Pyrrhonian problematic. The Pyrrhonist insists that knowledge requires more than true belief, since one's true belief must have appropriate authority as well. Moreover, such authority involves knowing that the sources of one's beliefs are appropriately tuned to reality – that one's perception is reliable, that one's reasoning is sound. Such a requirement, however, threatens a regress or a circle, for how is one to know that one's sources are appropriately tuned to reality? Surely we are restricted to those very sources, and so we are forced into either a regress of vindications or an argument in a circle. Foundationalism responds that some knowledge is possible without further vindication. The foundations of knowledge enjoy a kind of certainty that allows them to stand on their own. Coherentism responds that not all circles are vicious. Circles that are coherent and comprehensive enough are epistemically virtuous, and make their membership beliefs virtuous as well. The problem for foundationalism is to explain how some knowledge can be self-standing. The problem for coherentism is to explain how some circles can be virtuous.

Sosa argues that the dispute can be resolved by adopting a "Cartesian" solution. According to Sosa, Descartes consistently maintained a distinction between *cognitio* and *scientia*. For

cognitio, one requires only the authority of clear and distinct intuition and demonstration. Specifically, *cognitio* requires no vindication of that authority. Hence a mathematician can have *cognitio* through clear and distinct intuition and demonstration, even if the mathematician never philosophizes about the authority of either. *Scientia*, however, requires more. For this more excellent epistemic status, one must gain a perspective on the authority of intuition and demonstration – one must be able to reason, as Descartes did, that God's goodness guarantees their infallibility. Sosa rejects the details of Descartes's account but embraces its structure. In Sosa's terminology, animal knowledge requires that one's true beliefs have a reliable source. Here the foundationalist is correct, in that not all reliable sources involve inference from further beliefs. For example, perception and introspection are highly reliable, but neither proceeds by inference. Reflective knowledge, which is of a more excellent sort, requires more than a reliable source. For reflective knowledge, one needs a perspective on the reliability of one's sources. Here the coherentist is right, for a reflective perspective just is a sort of coherence in one's overall body of beliefs.

Sosa argues that a virtue approach provides further insight into both the internalism-externalism dispute and the foundationalism–coherentism dispute. Specifically, a virtue approach preserves the insights of all the parties involved, while providing a deeper insight into both the nature of knowledge and its structure. In ethics, virtue theories are commonly understood as embracing a particular direction of analysis: rather than understanding virtuous character in terms of right action, a virtue theory understands right action in terms of virtuous character. Put another way, a virtue theory makes the normative properties of persons more fundamental than the normative properties of actions, defining the latter in terms of the former. Sosa argues that an analogous approach proves fruitful in epistemology. Rather than understanding intellectually

virtuous character in terms of justification and knowledge, we can understand justification and knowledge in terms of virtuous character. We can make the normative properties of persons more fundamental than the normative properties of beliefs, again defining the latter in terms of the former.

Sosa's more specific approach is to define intellectual virtue in terms of reliable (or truth-conducive) cognitive character. Roughly, a cognitive faculty or habit counts as an intellectual virtue just in case the beliefs it produces are likely to be true. Hence good eyesight, sound memory, and various kinds of sound reasoning all count as intellectual virtues, while wishful thinking, superstition, and various kinds of fallacious reasoning fail to qualify. Again roughly, a belief has epistemic authority, or positive epistemic status, if it is produced by an intellectual virtue. Knowledge can then be understood as true belief produced by an intellectual virtue. The resulting view is externalist, in that positive epistemic status is understood to supervene on factors that are relevantly external to the knower. Nevertheless, Sosa argues, the insights of internalism are preserved. For example, we may now make a distinction between external excellence, understood in terms of one's reliable relation to his environment, and internal excellence, understood in terms of what goes on "downstream from experience," so to speak. Hence the victim of the Cartesian deceiver is entirely virtuous in the latter respect, and so there is a clear sense in which his beliefs are internally justified. That sort of justification is not sufficient for knowledge, even when wedded to true belief. Thus positive epistemic status amounts to more than internal justification, a fact that a virtue approach nicely explains.

Sosa argues further that a virtue approach preserves the insights of foundationalism and coherentism while solving the problems faced by each. The problem for foundationalism was to explain how some knowledge can be self-standing. The answer is that knowledge is true belief grounded in an intellectual virtue, and

some intellectual virtues do not involve inference from further beliefs. For example, reliable perception and reliable introspection do not. The problem for coherentism was to explain how some circles can be virtuous. The answer is that something counts as an intellectual virtue just in case it is a reliable cognitive faculty, and coherence-seeking reason is a reliable cognitive faculty. Moreover, coherence-seeking reason can confer a further sort of excellence on one's beliefs, by providing the sort of epistemic perspective that turns mere animal knowledge into reflective knowledge.

According to Sosa, a virtue approach in epistemology reveals two false dichotomies. A fully adequate theory of knowledge preserves the insights of both internalism and externalism concerning the nature of knowledge, and both foundationalism and coherentism concerning the structure of knowledge.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Raft and the Pyramid: Coherence versus Foundations in the Theory of Knowledge," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 5 (1980): 3–25.

"Beyond Skepticism, to the Best of Our Knowledge," *Mind* 97 (1988): 153–89.

"Methodology and Apt Belief," *Synthese* 74 (1988): 415–26.

Knowledge in Perspective: Selected Essays in Epistemology (Cambridge, UK, 1991).

"Philosophical Scepticism and Epistemic Circularity," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 68 (1994): 263–90.

"Reflective Knowledge in the Best Circles," *Journal of Philosophy* 94 (1997): 410–30.

"How to Resolve the Pyrrhonian Problematic: A Lesson from Descartes," *Philosophical Studies* 85 (1997): 229–49.

Epistemic Justification: Internalism vs. Externalism, Foundations vs. Virtues, with Laurence BonJour (Malden, Mass., 2003).

Other Relevant Works

"The Analysis of 'Knowledge That P'," *Analysis* 25 (1964): 1–8.

"Necessity, the A Priori, and Unexpressible Statements," with Brian Skyrms, *Philosophical Studies* 16 (1966): 65–74.

"On the Nature and Objects of Knowledge," *Philosophical Review* 81 (1972): 364–71.

"How Do You Know?" *American Philosophical Quarterly* 11 (1974): 113–22.

"Knowledge and Intellectual Virtue," *The Monist* 68 (1985): 224–45.

"Serious Philosophy and Freedom of Spirit," *Journal of Philosophy* 84 (1987): 707–27.

"Surviving Matters," *Noûs* 24 (1990): 305–30.

"Ayer on Perception and Reality, in *The Philosophy of A. J. Ayer*, ed. Lewis Hahn (Chicago, 1992).

"Davidson's Thinking Causes," in *Mental Causation*, ed. John Heil and Alfred Mele (Oxford, 1993), pp. 41–50.

"Proper Functionalism and Virtue Epistemology," *Noûs* 27 (1993): 51–65.

"Putnam's Pragmatic Realism," *Journal of Philosophy* 90 (1993): 605–26.

"Moral Relativism, Cognitivism, and Defeasible Rules," *Social Philosophy and Policy* 11 (1994): 116–38.

"Philosophical Scepticism and Epistemic Circularity," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* suppl. 68 (1994): 263–90.

"Chisholm's Epistemology and Epistemic Internalism," in *The Philosophy of Roderick M. Chisholm*, ed. Lewis Hahn (Chicago, 1997).

"How to Resolve the Pyrrhonian Problematic: A Lesson from Descartes," *Philosophical Studies* 85 (1997): 229–49.

"Mythology of the Given," *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 14 (1997): 275–86.

"Reflective Knowledge in the Best Circles," *Journal of Philosophy* 94 (1997): 410–30.

"P. F. Strawson's Epistemological Naturalism," in *The Philosophy of P. F. Strawson*, ed. Lewis Hahn (Chicago, 1998).

"The Essentials of Persons," *Dialectica* 53 (1999): 227–41.

"Man the Rational Animal?" with David Galloway, *Synthese* 122 (2000): 165–78.

"Objectivity Without Absolutes," in *Fact and Value: Essays on Ethics and Metaphysics for Judith Jarvis Thomson*, ed. Robert Stalnaker, Alex Byrne, and Ralph Wedgwood (Cambridge, Mass., 2001).

"Are There Two Grades of Knowledge?" *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* suppl. 77 (2003): 113–30.

"Neither Contextualism nor Skepticism," in *The Skeptics: Contemporary Essays*, ed. Steven Luper (Aldershot, 2003), pp. 165–82.

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, *Oxford Comp Phil*
Axtell, Guy, ed. *Knowledge, Belief and Character* (Lanham, Md., 2000).
Foley, Richard. "The Epistemology of Sosa," *Philosophical Issues* 5 (1994): 1–14.
Greco, John. "Virtues in Epistemology," in *The Oxford Handbook of Epistemology* (Oxford, 2002).
Greco, John, ed. *Ernest Sosa and His Critics* (Oxford, 2004).
Plantinga, Alvin. "Why We Need Proper Function," *Noûs* 27 (1993): 66–82.
Shope, Robert. *The Analysis of Knowing: A Decade of Research* (Princeton, N.J., 1983).
"Symposium on *Knowledge in Perspective*," *Philosophical Studies* 78 (1995): 189–235.
Villanueva, Enrique, ed. *Perception. Philosophical Issues* 5 (1994).
Williams, Michael. "Are There Two Grades of Knowledge? Mythology of the Given: Sosa, Sellars and the Task of Epistemology," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* suppl. 77 (2003): 91–112.
Zagzebski, Linda, and Abrol Fairweather, eds. *Virtue Epistemology: Essays on Epistemic Virtue and Responsibility* (Oxford, 2001).

John Greco

SPAHR, Margaret (1893–1973)

Margaret Spahr was born on 10 April 1893 in New York City and died on 25 September 1973 in Northampton, Massachusetts. Spahr was the first woman to graduate with a JD degree from Columbia University's Law School, in 1929. Spahr also held degrees from Smith College (BA 1914) and Barnard College of Columbia (MA 1919, PhD 1926). She taught briefly at Lindenwood College in Missouri and for many years at Hunter College in New York City.

Spahr studied for the doctoral degree at Columbia under political scientist Howard McBain and law professor Thomas Reed Powell, earning a degree in government and public policy in 1926. After completing the doctorate, she began teaching history and government at Hunter College, but decided to pursue the JD degree, so she returned to Columbia to study law. She excelled at Columbia and was the first woman to serve as an editor of the *Columbia Law Review*, later serving on its board.

Spahr did not focus on women's issues in her written work, despite the fact that her education and career were greatly affected by her gender. It was not until Columbia's Dean, Harland Fiske Stone, resigned to become a Supreme Court Justice that Spahr and other women were allowed to study at the law school. Once she began work on her law degree, she and other female students were automatically placed on academic probation in their first semester, not because of any academic inability, but simply because they were the first women to attend the law school.

Spahr spent her career as a professor teaching history and theory of government at Hunter College, retiring in 1959. She edited or co-edited three books on law and government. She also wrote articles on constitutional law and interpretation, and was critical of judicial activism, even in the case of *Brown v. Board of Education*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Supreme Court on the Incidence and Effects of Taxation (Northampton, Mass., 1925).

"Natural Law, Due Process, and Economic Pressure," *American Political Science Review* 24 (1930): 332–54.

The Problems of Our Nation, with Emmett E. Giltner (New York, 1931).

"Sovereignty Under Law: A Possible Redefinition of Sovereignty in the Light of Locke's Theory of Liberty," *American Political Science Review* 39 (1945): 350–55.

"The Leave-it-to-Congress Trend in the Constitutional Law of Tax Immunities," *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 95 (1946): 1–29.

"When the Supreme Court Subordinates Judicial Reason to Legislation," in *Rational Decision: Yearbook of the American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy*, ed. Carl Friedrich (New York, 1964).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Readings in Recent Political Philosophy* (New York, 1935).

Introductory Syllabus in Private Law of the State of New York (Brooklyn, N.Y., 1939).

Further Reading

Morello, Karen Berger. *The Invisible Bar: The Woman Lawyer in America, 1638 to the Present* (New York, 1986).

Dorothy Rogers

SPARSHOTT, Francis Edward (1926–)

Francis Sparshott was born on 19 May 1926 in Chatham, England. He attended Corpus Christi College, Oxford, earning BA and MA (1950) degrees. He came to Canada in 1950 as a lecturer in philosophy at the University of Toronto. In 1955 he joined the staff of its affiliated institution, Victoria University, where he remained until his retirement in 1991. He was made a University Professor in 1982, and in 2000 received an honorary doctorate from the University of Toronto. He is also a much published poet. He has been a member of the League of Canadian Poets since 1968, and its President in 1977–9.

Sparshott is a person of immense learning and analytical powers. Any philosophical position he holds is of such complexity that it could not in any straightforward sense be called a theory. In fact, it would be better to say that he holds detailed views on a large number of detailed topics, rather than that he holds a theory. His philosophical maps are more on a scale of 1:10 than 1:1000. They are also hardly mere maps. In *Looking for Philosophy* (1972), Sparshott embarks on introducing the student to philosophy – by doing it, by reflecting on the doing of it, by doing it in the reflecting on the doing of it. Central to the latter task is the expression of much self-consciousness about the position of the philosopher as no mere mapmaker. Sparshott is concerned with the tension between the conception of philosophical writing as the record of a personal quest, and the conception of it as scientific record. He takes the view that the tension is fundamental, and equivocal. So his philosophizing is, like his poetry, intensely personal. All the same: "poet and philosopher both speak responsibly, but their responsibilities are not the same. Philosophy cannot solve its problems by ceasing to be philosophy … . Literature is neither a form of philosophy nor a substitute for it, but something else entirely … . By appealing to the imagination the narrator abandons argument … . But it is by argument and refutation that

philosophy lives." (1972, pp. 104, 120) Sparshott in his philosophy certainly argues and refutes.

His book on Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* (1994) is unique and controversial. The sustaining premise of the book is that the *Ethics* represents one continuous piece of argument, from the first page to the last. The *Ethics* begins with the question, "How shall I organize my life?" In Sparshott's view, all the familiar topics of the book – intellectual and moral virtue, the varieties of justice, weakness of will, the varieties of friendship, the end for mankind, and so on – are not, as is standardly thought, a series of discrete discussions of topics within ethics. They form a continuous linear argument, each with its place. As Sparshott acknowledges, his approach gives hostages to history: we have no empirical reason to think the book was all written at the same time (and some to think it was not), or even that the pieces were intended by Aristotle to be one book. Sparshott acknowledges he must assume that it was (1994, p. 4). His commentary is a valuable meditation on Aristotle's text, even if deep questions about historical accuracy are begged.

The main body of Sparshott's philosophical work is in aesthetics. His early works display the characteristic approach to philosophical analysis that remains for Sparshott's whole career. He declares in *The Structure of Aesthetics* that he is "not offering solutions to problems, or doctrines to be accepted or rejected, but material" for people seriously interested in aesthetics "to consider in reaching their own conclusions" (1963, preface). The chapter headings illustrate the comprehensiveness and the distinctive approach: "The Approaches to Aesthetics," "Beauty: The Term and Its Relations," "Art and Nature," "Art: The Concept and Its Validity," "Art: Modes and Genres," "Has Art a Function?," "Art and the Individual," etc. Sparshott offers what is in no sense a compendium of what philosophers *have said* about these topics: he is no summarizer or reporter. Nor does he offer an eclectic theory picking a distinctive combination of things already said. His aim is to lay out what *can* be said about all of these topics – conceptual possibilities – and of course his own assessment of their relations and their worth. His second book (1967) follows the same course as regards criticism, of which he takes literary criticism to be paradigmatic. Again, "the essay might have had as its subtitle, 'Prolegomena to a General Theory of Criticism'" (1967, p. 1). Sparshott does not offer his own theory of literary criticism in the style of, say, his Victoria University colleague Northrop FRYE. He surveys the possible elements of a theory of criticism, how they might fit together, or could not fit together, what a person who defends a given view is thereby committed to, or not committed to, and so forth.

The Theory of the Arts (1982) is his major philosophical achievement, because here he comes recognizably closer to genuinely offering a theory of art. The book shows the same virtues of comprehensiveness, subtlety at the level of detail, intelligent and penetrating argument and critique. In addition, there is also a position there, albeit one of predictable complexity. The main expository devices of the book are the four Lines – the Classical Line, the Expressive Line, the Mystic Line, and the Purist Line – with the first-named in pride of place. The Classical Line focuses on the artwork conceived as the product of knowledge and skill. This classical conception is suspended precariously between art seen as imitation and art seen as beautiful. The Expressive Line begins with the assumption of art as the production of knowledge and skill, and extends that to focus essentially on art as related to a mind behind the artwork, rather than the work. The Mystic Line refines away the relation to a particular artist's mind to a connection with, say, Universal Mind. The Purist Line focuses so strongly on the mind behind the work that the qualities of that mind are all that matter, and the work itself drops out as irrelevant.

Sparshott takes us through the logical development of these lines. The Lines are ways of thinking about works of fine art, and about the

making of fine artworks. He shows us how the Classical Line must both initially and continually monopolize the attention of theorists of the fine arts; how difficulties with the Classical Line lead towards the other three lines; how the ultimate emptiness of those three lines lead back to the Classical Line. The "leading" here is a matter both of the logical implications of arguments and the captivating power of images embedded in these arguments. Sparshott presents in this book a working model of philosophical aesthetics. He sees that philosophical reflection is dynamic and not static. He presents through his narrative about the Lines its dynamism. He shows us the interactions between different philosophical theses and theories about art. He tells us this is how theorizing about art must go. And in that "must" lies the theory which I have asserted the book to contain. In a sense, Sparshott offers a metatheory, a theory about the theory of the arts. It is true that at the end he says, "the book does not seek to direct traffic" (1982, p. 464). But he also says that the book's map "is a definite map," and that it is composed in the knowledge that there could be other such maps, but the faith that there are none (*ibid.*). It may be that the difference between a thorough laying out of options, as in his earlier books, and an argument that these options form a coherent and dynamic whole, seems a small difference. In my view the difference makes for a project of a wholly different kind.

With the two subsequent books devoted specifically to the aesthetics of dance (1988, 1995), he returns to the pre-1982 strategy of groundwork or clarification. As he argues at some length (1988, pp. 3–82), the aesthetics of dance has been neglected by philosophers and art theorists. He traces this neglect primarily to two factors. One is "professional," as it were. Dance is a unique phenomenon. The kind of dancing "that anyone can do and everyone does" and "the sort of dancing that can be done only by a dancer who has undertaken a transformation of the body into a performing instrument" are both genuinely forms of dance

as an art (1988, p. xvii). This is not so for the traditional fine arts. My daughters' paintings, or my attempts at singing, are not artworks.

Moreover, dance did not have a place in "certain prominent and influential systems that [in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries] assigned to the fine arts in general a definite and important position among the exercises of the human intellect" (1988, p. 30). Philosophical aesthetics is, Sparshott believes, inherently conservative as to its priority rankings of issues and theories (1988, pp. 7–9). Once dance was left out, left out it remained. It is possible, of course, to generate a theory of dance by taking some established aesthetic theory and mechanically applying it to dance, but Sparshott derides such an approach (1988, p. xx). A serious aesthetics of dance, therefore, has to begin pretty much from the beginning, to examine dance in all its richness with an open mind, and a mind primed for conceptual exploration, and see what is there, and where the arguments lead. And this is exactly what Sparshott does in these two books. The first concentrates on the nature of dance itself. Sparshott locates dance in its place in the general scheme of things developed in *The Theory of the Arts*. He discusses aspects of the meaning of dance, what is and is not dance and the art of dance, and how dance compares with near neighbors like ritual, gymnastics, or mime.

The second book (1995) focuses more or less entirely on dance seen as a fine art, rather than on dance in general. Although the official line again is that the book merely "present[s] materials … which people presenting a general theory or philosophy of dance should know about" (1995, p. xv), there is in the book, if not a theory, at least a unifying theme: "dancing, when done for its own sake … tends to draw its significance from the fact that in it the dancer's self is transformed: to say that a dancer's body is either the medium or the instrument of dance, though not actually false, is misleading" (1995, p. 5). Sparshott later compares dance in this respect with singing (1995, pp. 358–60). There, he finds the idea of

the voice as an instrument not misleading. To learn to sing in the sense of the fine art of singing just is to learn to do certain kinds of things with one's voice. Producing a finely executed song, then, could be "just a job"; but Sparshott rejects the testimony of dancers who speak so of their work (1995, p. 463). This construal of dancing leads Sparshott to take expression more seriously as the form taken by the art of dance than he did in *The Theory of the Arts* as a theory of art in general (1995, chap. 5). The emphasis on self-transformation by the end of the book shades into the presence of the dancer as person in the execution of the art (1995, p. 453), but that still marks a special peculiarity of dance. As in the case of his other books, the range of issues discussed defies summary. He considers principles of movement and possible units of movement, rhythm, solo versus *pas de deux* and ensemble dancing, and so on. Another section of the book is spent on the relation between dance and the other "related fields" of music, language, and theater. This final section ranges over aspects of dance – dance values, choreography, and notation.

If there is one concept which offers a unity and a focus to Sparshott's huge and multifaceted output, both literary and philosophical, it would be the concept of "performance." Performance is for Sparshott a technical term, "the imputed end of any action conceived as intelligently intended to achieve just that end" (1982, p. 41). "Performance" is not anything "mere," to be contrasted with reality, or genuineness. Performances are a special class of real things, including but not confined to things more ordinarily thought of as performances – things done by actors, musicians, or dancers. The life of the poet is not just writing; it is performing. So is criticism. The philosopher should not just think or study; they should perform. Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* is not just a book; it is a performance. Philosophy, art, and life should be performed – done with intelligence, done with an intended end, and able to invoke and withstand criticism. Sparshott's achievement is to have beyond all doubt lived up to his own ideas and his own standards, and shown us what is possible in aesthetics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
An Enquiry into Goodness and Related Concepts (Toronto, 1958).
The Structure of Aesthetics (Toronto and London, 1963).
The Concept of Criticism (Oxford, 1967).
Looking for Philosophy (Montreal and Kingston, Ont., 1972).
The Theory of the Arts (Princeton, N.J., 1982).
Off the Ground: First Steps to a Philosophical Consideration of the Dance (Princeton, N.J., 1988).
Taking Life Seriously: A Study of the Argument of the Nicomachean Ethics (Toronto, 1994).
A Measured Pace; Toward a Philosophical Understanding of the Arts of Dance (Toronto, 1995).
The Future of Aesthetics (Toronto, 1998).

Other Relevant Works
Sparshott's papers are at Victoria University, Toronto.

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, *Canad Encyc*
"Essays in Honor of Francis Sparshott." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 31 (Summer 1997).
Shiner, Roger A. "The Theory of *The Theory of the Arts*," *Dialogue* 25 (1986): 533–46.

Roger A. Shiner

SPAULDING, Edward Gleason (1873–1940)

Edward G. Spaulding was born on 6 August 1873 in Burlington, Vermont, the son of Americus V. and Mary Rice Spaulding.

Spaulding received a BS degree from the University of Vermont in 1894 and later an honorary LLD degree in 1921 from Vermont. In 1896 Spaulding received an MA degree from Columbia University. In 1900 he received his PhD in philosophy with a dissertation on the philosophy of mind from the University of Bonn, Germany. In 1903 he married Olivia Strong Minor. Spaulding was philosophy instructor at the College of the City of New York from 1900 to 1905.

In 1905 Spaulding was called to Princeton by its President, Woodrow Wilson, who was enlisting many promising young teachers into the faculty to inaugurate the preceptor system of assistant professors of philosophy. After serving as a preceptor for nine years, Spaulding was appointed full professor in 1914, and in 1936 he became the McCosh Professor in Philosophy. During World War I, Spaulding served for a brief time in 1918 in the US Army as a first lieutenant in the gas defense training unit of the Engineer Corps, and then the Chemical Warfare Service where he was appointed an intelligence officer. Spaulding was professor of philosophy at Princeton until his death. He also taught summer courses at the universities of Harvard, Chicago, Michigan, Washington, and Oregon. Beginning in 1907 he was for many years a lecturer in philosophy at the Marine Biological Laboratory at Woods Hole, and at the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences. He was President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1932–3. Spaulding died on 31 January 1940 in Princeton, New Jersey.

Together with Edwin B. HOLT, Walter T. MARVIN, William P. MONTAGUE, Ralph B. PERRY, and Walter B. PITKIN, Spaulding was one of the six New Realists who in 1910 proposed a new platform for philosophy, and he collaborated with them on *The New Realism* (1912). In the "Platform," Spaulding argued that we can have direct knowledge of objects (in other words, untainted by the knowledge relation), that the knowledge relation must be seen as an external relation,

and that truth is independent of proof and fallible knowledge.

In *The New Rationalism* (1918), Spaulding develops a systematic account of new realism by seeking to identify the postulates from which each philosophical system can be logically derived. Though closely allied to naturalism, Spaulding denies that naturalism can provide a complete account of reality. For Spaulding certain ideals that are discovered by reason alone, such as truth, justice, and goodness, are real too, because they are logically prior to, or independent of, human nature. In the semipopular collection of essays *What Am I?* Spaulding develops a philosophical anthropology conformant to modern science and his own realist philosophy. In *A World of Chance*, Spaulding continues on the path he set out in *The New Rationalism*. Spaulding aims to give an account of the structure of reality that conforms with the findings of modern logic and the theory of values, as well as with contemporary physics and biology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beiträge zur Kritik des psychophysischen Parallelismus vom Standpunkte der Energetik (Halle am Saale, Germany, 1900).

"The Program and First Platform of Six Realists," with E. B. Holt, W. T. Marvin, W. P. Montague, R. B. Perry, and W. B. Pitkin, *Journal of Philosophy* 7 (1910): 393–401.

"A Defense of Analysis," in *The New Realism: Cooperative Studies in Philosophy* (New York, 1912), pp. 155–251.

The New Rationalism: The Development of a Constructive Realism upon the Basis of Modern Logic and Science, and through the Criticism of Opposed Philosophical Systems (New York, 1918).

What Am I? (New York, 1928).

A World of Chance: Or, Whence, Whither and Why? (New York, 1936).

Other Relevant Works

"The Ground of the Validity of Knowledge,"
Journal of Philosophy 3 (1906): 197–208,
257–66, 309–17, 371–80.

"The Postulates of a Self-critical
Epistemology," *Philosophical Review* 18
(1909): 615–41.

"The Logical Structure of Self-Refuting
Systems," *Philosophical Review* 19 (1910):
276–301, 610–31.

"Joint Discussion with Articles of Agreement
and Disagreement: Professor Dewey and
Dr. Spaulding," with John Dewey, *Journal
of Philosophy* 8 (1911): 574–9.

"Realistic Aspects of Royce's Logic,"
Philosophical Review 25 (1916): 365–77.

"Are There Any Necessary Truths?" *Journal
of Philosophy* 26 (1929): 309–29.

"Freedom, Necessity, and Mind,"
Philosophical Review 42 (1933): 156–201.

Further Reading

Dict Amer Bio, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v31*, *Pres
Addr of APA v4*, *Proc of APA in Phil
Rev v50*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Calkins, Mary Whiton. "Spaulding's
Relations and Subsistent Entities," *Journal
of Philosophy* 16 (1919): 635–40.

Cohen, Morris R. "The New Realism,"
Journal of Philosophy 10 (1913): 197–214.

Collins, Marie T. "Spaulding's Freedom of
the Reason," *Journal of Philosophy* 17
(1920): 150–57.

De Waal, Cornelis. *American New Realism
1910–1920*, 3 vols (Bristol, 2001).

Dewey, John. "The Short-Cut to Realism
Examined," *Journal of Philosophy* 7
(1910): 553–7.

McGilvary, E. B. "The New Realism,"
Philosophical Review 22 (1913): 57–65.

Pratt, James B. "Professor Spaulding's Non-
Existent Illusions," *Journal of Philosophy*
15 (1918): 688–95.

Cornelis de Waal

SPENCER, Anna Garlin (1851–1931)

Anna Garlin was born on 17 April 1851 in
Attleboro, Massachusetts. She had many
strong women role models while growing up
in Massachusetts and Rhode Island. Her
mother, Nancy (Carpenter) Garlin, was an
active abolitionist and her aunt, Sarah
Carpenter, was a missionary who worked with
homeless women. At the age of eighteen, Anna
Garlin began writing for *The Providence Daily
Journal* and teaching in public schools. During
the decade she spent as a journalist, her reli-
gious beliefs took an increasingly liberal turn
toward Free Religion. In 1878 she married
Unitarian minister William H. Spencer.

Spencer, characterizing her religious work
as, "reverent, rational, and ethical devotion,"
became the first woman ordained into the
ministry in the state of Rhode Island, in 1891.
A Unitarian, in 1891 she became the minister
of the Bell Street Chapel in Providence as a
nondenominational ethical church in accor-
dance with her emphasis on social morality
over Christian theology. Spencer described her
perspective as "too radical for the theists and
too theistic for the radicals." She resigned from
Bell Street Chapel in 1902 to move to New
York City, and in 1903 she became the first
female associate leader of the influential New
York Society for Ethical Culture led by Felix
ADLER. Spencer also served as associate
director and staff lecturer of the New York
School of Civics and Philanthropy as well as
special lecturer for the University of Wisconsin.

From 1913 to 1918 Spencer was a professor
of sociology and ethics at the Meadville
Theological School in Pennsylvania, and she
organized the institution's move to Chicago
where it became associated with the University
of Chicago. During 1918–19 she taught at the
University of Chicago. In 1920 she returned to
New York City, where she was a special
lecturer in the social sciences at Columbia
University and a public advocate for her causes
until her death. Spencer died of heart failure on
12 February 1931 in New York City, at a

dinner for the League of Nations, which she had worked many years to help establish.

Spencer was an accomplished speaker and a prolific writer, authoring many books and over seventy articles in both academic and popular magazines. Important issues for Spencer included temperance, suffrage, pacifism, and child welfare. She was active in the National American Women Suffrage Association and the Women's Council of the USA. Spencer believed that the talents of women were being wasted through artificial barriers to their complete participation in society. Although she did not advocate the radical reshaping of family life, as suggested by Charlotte Perkins GILMAN, Spencer believed that once women's obligation for raising children was met, they should have the same opportunities in the public spheres of society as men: "Of all the wastes of human ignorance perhaps the most extravagant and costly to human growth has been the waste of the distinctive powers of womanhood after the child-bearing age." (1912, p. 226)

At a time when patriotism made pacifism unpopular, Spencer made an enormous contribution to the women's peace movement that opposed World War I. She helped found the Woman's Peace Party, served as its vice chair, and wrote the preamble for the party platform adopted in January 1915. It begins, "We Women of the United States, assembled in behalf of World Peace, grateful for the security of our own country, but sorrowing for the misery of all involved in the present struggle among warring nations, do hereby band ourselves together to demand that war be abolished." In 1919 Spencer served as the first chairperson of the national board of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

While Spencer did not achieve the acclaim some of her contemporaries did, she was nevertheless one of the most influential women of her time. Spencer worked within a network of activist women that put her in contact with Jane ADDAMS, Susan B. ANTHONY, Carrie Chapman Catt, and Lucy STONE. These joint efforts manifested themselves in a wealth of social activism, including the women's peace movement and the origins of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People for which Spencer was one of the founding supporters.

Spencer's philosophical work is situated at a unique crossroads between American pragmatism and the Social Gospel Movement, overlaid with the concerns of the women's movement. Although a minister, Spencer was not afraid to level severe criticism upon Christianity and its history while she is simultaneously unwilling to relinquish religiosity to ecclesiastical institutions. Spencer reinvented Christianity as social morality that unequivocally opposes war and sexism while promoting the welfare state. Given contemporary polarization of religious and philosophical thought, Spencer provides a refreshing ameliorative approach that can serve to galvanize efforts toward social improvement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Care of Dependent, Neglected, and Wayward Children (Baltimore, Md., 1884).

Intemperance in Its Relation to Social Ills (Providence, R.I., 1891).

Women and Regulation (Philadelphia, 1896).

Bell Street Chapel Discourses: History of Bell Street Chapel Movement (Providence, R.I., 1889).

Woman's Share in Social Culture (Philadelphia, 1912).

The Scarlet Woman or Social Nemesis and Social Salvation (Philadelphia, 1913).

The Family and Its Members (Philadelphia, 1922).

The Council Idea (New York, 1929).

Other Relevant Works

Spencer's papers are at Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania.

"Advantages and Dangers of

Organization," in *The Congress of Women: Held in the Woman's Building, World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago, U.S.A., 1893*, ed. Mary Eagle (Chicago, 1894), pp. 170–77.

Order of Service for Public Worship (Providence, R.I., 1896).

The Voice Within (Providence, R.I., 1910).

O Soul of Man, Thou Must Arise (Providence, R.I., 1918).

Anna Garlin Spencer Papers, 1878–1931, 5 microfilm reels (Wilmington, Del., 2001).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Degen, Marie Louise. *The History of the Woman's Peace Party* (Baltimore, Md., 1939).

Radest, Howard B. *Toward Common Ground: The Story of the Ethical Culture Societies in the United States* (New York, 1969).

Maurice Hamington

SPIEGELBERG, Herbert (1904–90)

Herbert Spiegelberg was born on 18 April 1904 in Strasburg, Alsace (then in Germany) into a Jewish intellectual family. His father Wilhelm was an eminent Egyptologist and professor in Strasburg, then later in Heidelberg and Munich. His uncle on his mother's side, Heinrich von Recklinghausen, was an unorthodox philosophical autodidact. Early in his life Herbert Spiegelberg became interested in philosophical problems and was as a young man already skeptical towards religion, especially in its ideological variants. Nevertheless, Spiegelberg underwent the Protestant confirmation in 1919, having been convinced by his fellow Alsatian Albert Schweitzer that it was mainly a societal

convention, although Schweitzer also pointed out Christianity's positive ethical implications. In America Spiegelberg became associated with the Quakers (also through Schweitzer's mediation), deeply impressed by their hospitality and social kindness. Though he began his university career by studying jurisprudence, Spiegelberg became increasingly more interested in philosophy, under the tutelage of Heinrich Rickert at Heidelberg, then at Freiburg where he studied under Edmund Husserl, then at Munich with Alexander Pfänder.

It was during the Freiburg and Munich periods that Spiegelberg turned to phenomenology. Spiegelberg considered Pfänder as his real teacher and, convinced of the importance of Pfänder's writings, he later republished and translated some of his writings into English. Spiegelberg defended his PhD thesis in 1928 in Munich under Pfänder. The dissertation was entitled "Das Wesen der Idee" (The Essence of the Idea), and dealt with problems raised in Husserl's seminal work *Logische Untersuchungen*, particularly the Second Investigation on the ideal unity of the species. This short dissertation was published in 1930, in the last volume of the official publishing organ of the Phenomenological Movement, the *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und Phänomenologische Forschung*, published by Husserl in conjunction with Max Scheler and Alexander Pfänder.

Because of his Jewish origin, Spiegelberg was unable to complete the *habilitation* examination necessary to become professor in the German university system. Instead, he emigrated in 1933, first to Switzerland and England, where he held several temporary teaching positions, and then in 1938 to the United States. In 1944 he was naturalized as a US citizen and in the same year married Eldora Haskell who had emigrated from Bulgaria. In 1941 Spiegelberg found employment as an instructor of philosophy at Lawrence College in Appleton, Wisconsin, where he was promoted to full professor in 1953. In 1961–2 he served as Fulbright Professor at the University of

Munich, and from 1963 to 1971 he was a professor of philosophy at Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri. Spiegelberg died on 6 September 1990 in St. Louis.

Spiegelberg directed a well-known annual phenomenological workshop at Washington University from 1965 to 1972. He was a member of numerous philosophical societies and was a founding member of the "Husserl Circle." Among many other academic affiliations, he belonged to the advisory board of the Northwestern University Studies in Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy, as well as the journal *Husserl Studies*. Spiegelberg is widely known for his two-volume historical survey, *The Phenomenological Movement* (1960), which remains the most encompassing and comprehensive account of the history of the phenomenological movement. Besides his historical studies in phenomenology, he also published several substantial works on ethical issues, such as *Gesetz und Sittengesetz* (Law and Moral Law), *Steppingstones Toward an Ethics for Fellow Existers*, and *Sollen und Dürfen* (Ought and May).

Spiegelberg devoted himself to essentially two branches of philosophical research: phenomenology and moral (and legal) philosophy. His work in the latter field was influenced by the phenomenological philosophy of his teacher Pfänder. Within phenomenology, his publications can be subsumed under two related categories: historical and systematic.

Concerning his historical work, Spiegelberg was interested in presenting the so-called "Phenomenological Movement," a term coined by its founder Husserl, in the most true and historically adequate manner. His two-volume book with this title, written in English and intended as an introduction to phenomenology in America, is both historically and philosophically a model of philosophical historiography. Besides the best-known figures (Husserl, Heidegger, Sartre), Spiegelberg was the first to devote serious historical research to recovering the phenomenological groups in Munich and Göttingen. For this latter task, Spiegelberg col-

lected the scattered and in many cases unpublished writings of thinkers such as Reinach, Pfänder, and the infamous Johannes Daubert, whom he identified, among some other scholars in phenomenology (especially K. Schuhmann and B. Smith), as one of the most forceful thinkers of the entire movement, although Daubert had not published a single word. Though many of these phenomenologists have fallen into oblivion in the public eye, they lie ready for rediscovery in this superb scholarly work. Spiegelberg is also responsible for chronicling many anecdotes in the history of the phenomenological "scene," presenting a plethora of historical "groundwork" (letters and other historical documents) that he for the most part collected himself. A selection of these historical essays has been collected in *The Context of the Phenomenological Movement.*

The Phenomenological Movement shows that Spiegelberg had an excellent understanding of the theories the phenomenologists were professing. He insisted in the last edition of this standard work that "all [he] wanted to be [was] a guide but not a mere chronicler." Many of his essays dealing with phenomenological themes in the stricter sense have become classic essays in the tradition of phenomenological philosophy proper. Among them, one needs to mention his studies on "'Intention' and 'Intentionality' in the Scholastics, Brentano and Husserl," "Husserl and Pfänder on the Phenomenological Reduction" (both also reprinted in the *Context*), and his book-length study *Phenomenology in Psychology and Psychiatry* (1972). This handbook-type study presents a sovereign blend of historical accounts of phenomenological psychology in "some major schools of psychology" (Brentano, Husserl, Jaspers, Binswanger, Goldstein, Boss, among many others) as well as systematic assessments of their philosophical achievements. This work also features highly interesting comparisons between phenomenological efforts at psychology with approaches in contemporary psychoanalysis (Freud, Jung, Lacan, and others). Spiegelberg took this attempt seri-

ously as bringing phenomenology into the arena with other philosophical schools and generally academic concerns, in order to study "the impact of phenomenology in areas other than philosophy," as he points out in the preface. Generally speaking, he saw phenomenology as a descriptive discipline dedicated to a realistic account of the world, and thus was rather critical of Husserl's transcendental turn to idealism.

His systematic interest in phenomenology as an important contribution to contemporary philosophy, especially to ethics, led him to become an editor and advocate of the work of his teacher, Pfänder. Pfänder was considered one of the very important representatives of the phenomenological movement but by the end of World War II was already nearly forgotten. Not only out of mere reverence for his teacher, but also from the conviction that Pfänder's work merited a renewed attention, Spiegelberg edited and translated several works by the Munich philosopher, and wrote a short introductory monograph on Pfänder's phenomenology. Already the titles of Pfänder's works that Spiegelberg selected indicate that Spiegelberg especially admired Pfänder's work on moral philosophy and sought to help it gain greater attention.

Parallel to these multifarious activities, Spiegelberg continued to pursue his own systematic work in moral philosophy, beginning with his dissertation and first book-length study *Antirelativismus* of 1935 to his last work, *Steppingstones,* published in 1986. Although *Sollen und Dürfen* was not released to the public until 1989, it had already been completed by 1937 during Spiegelberg's sojourn in England where he had come under the influence of British moral philosophy. For political reasons, the work could not be published in Germany at the time. Nevertheless, it presents, in Spiegelberg's own opinion, his best-developed systematic contribution to moral philosophy. Already in *Antirelativismus,* Spiegelberg attempts to salvage values from any sort of "relativism and skepticism" by applying the

method of eidetic intuition that Husserl developed in the *Logical Investigations* to the sphere of values and the moral imperative – a task Husserl had carried out with respect to pure logic. He further pursued this line in his *Gesetz und Sittengesetz*, in which he attacks what he calls "legism," in other words, an "over-emphasis on the role of law, regardless in which field it occurs." He applied this criticism mainly to the spheres of ethics and legal philosophy.

As Scheler had similarly argued against Kant's focus on living in accordance with the "moral law" (*Sittengesetz*), Spiegelberg proposes a return to an ethics of values that he sees realized already in ancient philosophy, mainly in that of Aristotle. He criticizes a "legistic" ethics for being "removed from life" and "artificial." Instead, a "law-free ethics" insists on a "fundamental givenness" that enables the intuitive graspability of oughts, ought-nots and mays. Only on this basis can one hope to erect a new "practological philosophy" that avoids the errors of "legism." As these formulations clearly reveal, his attempt at an ethics is inspired by the phenomenological method of intuition. This is remarkable since phenomenology's intuitionism is usually held to be incompatible with making normative, ethical claims. Spiegelberg attempted this positive, law-free ethics in the manuscript entitled *Sollen und Dürfen*. In this work, he emphasizes the ethical right of the individual. It is only from the individual's right that duties can be derived. In his preface from 1983, Spiegelberg acknowledges the advances that modern ethics, especially in Analytic philosophy, has made in the latter half of the twentieth century and the limitations of the phenomenological approach. Nevertheless, he sees some modern developments prefigured in his earlier conceptions, especially in the work of Georg Henrik von Wright.

The individual and the ensuing solidarity of individuals in our global society are also the focus of his ethical essays, written between 1944 and 1983, which Spiegelberg collected in his *Steppingstones Toward an Ethics For Fellow Existers*. In these essays, he addresses

specific contemporary moral issues in the nuclear age, and prefaces the work with a quotation from Einstein: "The unleashed power of the atom has changed everything … ." Besides systematic pieces on the problem of selfhood, human equality and human rights and the question of fairness, Spiegelberg offers a number of remarkably timely reflections on contemporary issues. He takes position on issues such as the rights of the "naturally handicapped," the burning problem of the Palestinian–Israeli conflict, and the question of legitimate civil disobedience in a nation that is preparing for nuclear warfare. These reflections culminate in the recurring phrase of the individual's "accident of birth" that merely by chance places one among a group or nation of "haves" or "have-nots." From this follows not only the demand for solidarity in our global society, but also the duty for those born as "haves" to lend support to the "have-nots." This is already formulated in his "Creed" of 1937, written in Latin: "*In consortis locum quem casu tantum non occupas te transpone et sortem actu suam tuam potentia respice.*" "Transpose yourself into the position of your companion in fate, it is only by accident that you do not occupy his place; and respect the fate that is his by actuality as the one which could be potentially yours."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Antirelativismus. Kritik des Relativismus und Skeptizismus der Werte und des Sollens (Zurich, 1935).

Gesetz und Sittengesetz. Strukturanalytische und historische Vorstudien zu einer gesetzesfreien Ethik (Zurich, 1935).

The Phenomenological Movement: A Historical Introduction, 2 vols (The Hague, 1960; 3rd edn 1982).

Phenomenology in Psychology and Psychiatry: A Historical Introduction (Evanston, Ill., 1972).

Doing Phenomenology: Essays on and in Phenomenology (The Hague, 1975).

The Context of the Phenomenological Movement (The Hague, 1981).

Steppingstones Toward an Ethics For Fellow Existers: Essays 1944–1983 (Dordrecht, 1986).

Sollen und Dürfen. Philosophische Grundlagen der Ethischen Rechte und Pflichten, ed. K. Schuhmann (Dordrecht, 1989).

Other Relevant Works

Spiegelberg's papers are at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Munich, Germany.

Alexander Pfänders Phänomenologie (The Hague, 1963).

Ed. with Bayard Morgan, *The Socratic Enigma: A Collection of Testimonies Through Twenty-Four Centuries* (Indianapolis, 1964).

Trans., *Alexander Pfänder, Phenomenology of Willing and Motivation and Other Phaenomenologica* (Evanston, Ill., 1967).

Ed., *Alexander Pfänder, Philosophie auf phänomenologischer Grundlage* and *Einleitung in die Philosophie und Phänomenologie* (Munich, 1973).

Further Reading

Proc of APA v64, Who Was Who in Amer v10, Who's Who in Phil

Phenomenological Perspectives: Historical and Systematic Essays in Honor of Herbert Spiegelberg (The Hague, 1975). Includes a bibliography of Spiegelberg's writings.

Schuhmann, Karl. "Herbert Spiegelberg 1904–1990," *Husserl Studies* 8 (1991): 123–7.

Sebastian Luft

STACE, Walter Terence (1886–1967)

Walter T. Stace was born on 17 November 1886 in London, England. He received a BA from Trinity College in Dublin, Ireland, in 1908. Originally intending to take orders in the Church of England, his growing skepticism caused him to join the British Civil Service where he served in Ceylon from 1910 to 1932. While in the civil service, he foreshadowed his future career as an academic philosopher by publishing *A Critical History of Greek Philosophy* (1920), *The Philosophy of Hegel* (1924), and *The Meaning of Beauty* (1929). In 1932 Stace abruptly changed careers, retiring from the British civil service to become professor of philosophy at Princeton University. He became President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1949–50, and retired from Princeton in 1955. He died on 2 August 1967 in Laguna Beach, California.

Stace's most important statement of his philosophical method was his epistemological work *The Theory of Knowledge and Existence* (1932). He criticized realism, pragmatism, idealism, and transcendentalism in favor of a strict empiricism that insisted that one simply cannot go behind or beyond the data of experience in establishing the foundations of knowledge. Instead, one must always begin with what is given in experience. The starting point of human knowledge is the solitary mind perceiving a hodgepodge of disconnected presentations, such as red patches, soft things, or volitions. From this solipsistic stream of diverse and disconnected presentations, how does one come up with the idea of an independently existing external world? Stace contended that the existence of an independent external world can neither be logically proved nor inferred from the primordially given stream of solipsistic presentations. He also repudiated the argument of certain realists like Bertrand Russell who assumed that the belief in a world external to oneself arose as a prejudice or as a result of some instinctive belief. Instead, Stace argued that "belief in an independent external world is a mental construction" (1932, p. 95), a kind of fiction or assumption invented by the mind without any foundation in the stream of presentations impinging upon it. For example, we assume that a chair continues to exist even if we are not perceiving it. The persistence and independent existence of that chair must be assumed since such features cannot be inferred logically from our immediate perception of it. Furthermore, Stace contended that "the concept of the external world is a social product" (1932, p. 100). By our own unaided efforts, we could never come to believe that an object continues to exist even when it no longer impinges upon our perceptions. It is only through communication with others whose minds are similar to our own that we construct an external world independent of our solitary stream of presentations.

Stace characterized his major work on ethics, *The Concept of Morals* (1937), as an attempt "to give a satisfactory radical empiricist account of morals" (p. 17). Using this empiricist methodology, he challenged the validity of all forms of ethical absolutism (the belief that there is one uniform and universally binding moral code that is rooted in the divine or some other nonhuman source) as well as the forms of ethical relativism that were currently in fashion. Ethical relativism was especially toxic since it logically forces one to acknowledge that moral progress, moral effort, and moral judgments are meaningless. Nevertheless, he did acknowledge that the ethical relativists were correct in assuming that moral values are not rooted in God or some other transcendental absolute but are instead rooted in the universal needs of human nature. Stace advocated a modified utilitarianism centered on a single moral principle, from which all particular duties could be derived in much the same way that all forms of physical motion, such as the elliptical orbits of planets, the parabolic orbits of comets, and the downward motion of free-falling objects on earth, can be derived from one universal law of gravitation. Stace formulated that universal

moral law as follows: "Act always so as to increase human happiness as much as possible. And at the same time act on the principle that all persons, including yourself, are intrinsically of equal value." (1937, p. 180) Any action is morally good if it is in accordance with this law (if the action is unselfish) and morally wrong if it is not in accord with it.

Stace's 1948 article "Man against Darkness" in *Atlantic Monthly* (in 1967) signaled his growing interest in philosophical issues related to religion. Stace argued that modern science has created a tremendous human crisis by dealing a deathblow to religion and those systems of values based upon religion. The result is ethical relativism. People conclude, and live by the assumption, that values are of purely human origin and are merely the by-product of cultural happenstance. The terrible moral crises of the 1940s, namely, the wars, genocides, totalitarianisms, and the almost complete absence of moral values in the international arena, originated from this relativism. As tragic as the loss of traditional religious values was, Stace did not advocate any quest for a new system of religious values. Any new religion would simply be a new opiate, a new system of illusions. Instead, humankind needs to become spiritually and morally mature and in the quest for moral values and happiness by abandoning religious illusions and grasping the real world as it actually is – as science reveals it to be – stark, bleak, devoid of moral purpose, and utterly indifferent to our concerns.

In contrast to "Man against Darkness," which firmly but reluctantly dismissed religion as an illusion and affirmed the need for humankind to adapt itself to the perspective of scientific naturalism, *Time and Eternity* (1952) was, in Stace's words, "a defense of religion," although, as he was careful to add, "I do not in this book retract naturalism by a jot or a tittle." (p. vi) Stace never abandoned his empiricism and scientific naturalism, even in other later writings. Instead, he discovered mystical experience and attempted to integrate its manifold implications into his earlier philosophical per-spective. Stace argued in *Time and Eternity* that "genuine religion" is "founded in the mystical sense of man" (1952, p. 18). He also made the controversial assumption that genuine religion revealed to human beings through the experiences of its greatest mystics, "is the same for all men" (1952, p. 22). Furthermore, he contended that "religious truths depend wholly on religious intuitions" (1952, p. 156), intuition being explicitly equated with mystical experience.

Considering the crucial role that mystical "intuition" played as the foundation of all "genuine" religion in *Time and Eternity*, it is not surprising that Stace's last major work, *Mysticism and Philosophy* (1960), focused on mysticism and its philosophical significance. Stace surveyed a large number of mystics from a wide variety of major religious traditions, as well as some who had no religious affiliation, and compared their descriptions of what they experienced. He divided their mystical experiences into two major types: the "vastly less important" (1960, pp. 62–3) extrovertive experiences where the mystic perceives a multiplicity of objects through a transfiguration of the senses, and the – to him – far more important introvertive experiences where all awareness of multiplicity and individuality disappears, where the mystic experiences "pure consciousness" (1960, p. 86) devoid of any empirical content, and where the mystic's "individual pure ego" merges with the "pure ego of the universe" (1960, p. 147), the One, the Universal Self. Stace's primary objective was to separate the mystical experience itself, its universal common core, from mystics' interpretations of those experiences. This common core shared by all mystical experiences consisted of the following: an experience of ultimate unity, a sense of compelling objectivity or reality to the experience, a feeling of blessedness and peace, and a feeling of being in the presence of the sacred, paradoxicality, and ineffability.

Having isolated this common core of characteristics that he believed separated mystical experience from other types of experience, Stace

then asked whether or not the experiences of the mystics pointed to any objective reality inaccessible to the five senses. He concluded that the Ultimate Self encountered during introvertive mystical experiences was neither an objective fact (since objectivity presupposes a subject–object dualism absent in this mode of experience) nor a subjective illusion (for the perceptual simplicity of these experiences is devoid of any disorderly sequences of events that distinguish subjective experiences from veridical ones) but was, instead, a third alternative, a "transsubjective" (1960, p. 148) datum beyond both time and space, "the unity of the pure ego ... independent of any individual ego" (1960, p. 196). Stace drew an analogy between the transsubjectivy of this Universal Self and the concept of number in the philosophy of mathematics. Numbers are certainly universals but do not exist anywhere in time and space like physical objects. Yet they are clearly not subjective either. Like the Universal Self, numbers are neither subjective nor objective but no less real because of that fact. Stace also tried to account for the ineffability of mystical experiences. He contended that mystics are not wrong when they say contradictory things about the Universal Self, such as that it is simultaneously personal and impersonal, devoid of all activity yet dynamic, creative, and active. They are simply being faithful to the essential paradoxicality that characterizes all introvertive mystical states of consciousness. Mystical experiences are beyond the laws of logic and, for that reason, intrinsically paradoxical and self-contradictory when anyone describes them accurately. This is where the alleged ineffability of mystical experiences originates.

Stace makes a variety of debatable assumptions in *Mysticism and Philosophy*. First, he assumes that "visions and voices are not mystical phenomena" (1960, p. 47) and that introvertive experiences capture the essence of mystical experience better than extrovertive ones. Second, he assumes that the underlying experience of all mystics is essentially the same, that the Buddhist's nirvana is simply an interpretation of a core experience that is otherwise identical to a Christian mystic's union with God. The majority of recent scholars of comparative mysticism, exemplified by Steven Katz, have thoroughly repudiated both Stace's tendency to homogenize mystics' experiences and his assumption that the contextual dimension of mysticism is relatively unimportant.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Critical History of Greek Philosophy (London, 1920).

The Philosophy of Hegel: A Systematic Exposition (London, 1924).

The Meaning of Beauty: A Theory of Aesthetics (London, 1929).

The Theory of Knowledge and Existence (Oxford, 1932).

The Concept of Morals (New York, 1937).

The Nature of the World: An Essay in Phenomenalist Metaphysics (Princeton, N.J., 1940).

The Destiny of Western Man (New York, 1942).

Religion and the Modern Mind (Philadelphia, 1952).

Time and Eternity: An Essay in the Philosophy of Religion (Princeton, N.J., 1952).

Mysticism and Philosophy (Philadelphia, 1960).

Man against Darkness, and Other Essays (Pittsburgh, Penn., 1967).

Other Relevant Works

A portion of an unpublished autobiography that covers his years in India is at the Institute of Commonwealth Studies, University of London.

"The Refutation of Realism," *Mind* 43 (1934): 145–55.

"Metaphysics and Meaning," *Mind* 44 (1935): 417–38.

"Positivism," *Mind* 53 (1944): 215–37.

"Some Misinterpretations of Empiricism," *Mind* 67 (1958): 465–84.

Ed., *The Teachings of the Mystics: Being Selections from the Great Mystics and Mystical Writings of the World* (New York, 1960).

Further Reading

Nat Cycl Amer Bio v55, *Pres Addr of APA v5*, *Proc of APA v41*, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Adam, Martin T. "A Post-Kantian Perspective on Recent Debates about Mystical Experience," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 70 (2000): 801–17.

Ayer, A. J. "The Principle of Verifiability," *Mind* 45 (1936): 199–203.

Gale, Richard M. "Mysticism and Philosophy," *Journal of Philosophy* 57 (1960): 471–81.

Green, Theodore M. "A Critical Examination of Mr. Stace's Solipsism," *Journal of Philosophy* 32 (1935): 197–216.

Katz, Steven T. "Language, Epistemology, and Mysticism," in *Mysticism and Philosophical Analysis*, ed. Steven T. Katz (New York, 1978), pp. 22–74.

Norrman, Christer. *Mystical Experiences and Scientific Method: A Study of the Possibility of Identifying a 'Mystical' Experience by a Scientific Method, with Special Reference to the Theory of Walter T. Stace* (Stockholm, 1987).

Price, H. H. "Mr. W. T. Stace on the Construction of the External World," *Mind* 42 (1933): 273–98.

Schiller, F. C. S. "The Theory of Knowledge and Existence," *Mind* 42 (1933): 94–100.

Stedman, Ralph E., and H. B. Acton. "Mr. Stace's 'Refutation of Realism'," *Mind* 43 (1934): 349–53.

Swabey, William C. "Do Material Things Exist?" *Journal of Philosophy* 38 (1941): 655–65.

Jess Hollenback

STALLKNECHT, Newton Phelps (1906–81)

Newton P. Stallknecht was born on 24 October 1906 in East Orange, New Jersey. He was educated at Princeton University, where he received his BA in 1927, MA in 1928, and PhD in philosophy in 1930, writing a dissertation on "Bergson's Idea of Creation." He also briefly studied at the University of Edinburgh and the University of Freiburg during his graduate education. From 1930 to 1949 he was a professor of philosophy at Bowdoin College in Maine, interrupted by service from 1942 to 1945 in the Signal Intelligence Corps of the US Army during World War II. In 1949 he was appointed by Indiana University as professor of philosophy and department chair, after the departure of William Harry Jellema to Calvin College. In 1961 Stallknecht concluded his service as department chair and in 1962 his title changed to professor of philosophy and comparative literature. From 1968 until his retirement in 1977 he was professor of comparative literature and criticism in Indiana's comparative literature department. In addition, he was Director of Indiana's School of Letters from 1953 to 1972. In retirement, he continued to teach part-time until his death on 26 May 1981 in Bloomington, Indiana.

During Stallknecht's tenure as department chair, his colleague was Henry B. VEATCH, and he hired several philosophers who shared an interest in philosophy of logic and philosophy of science: Andrew P. USHENKO in 1949, Norwood Russell HANSON in 1957, and Michael SCRIVEN in 1960. With the arrival of Herbert HOCHBERG and Alan DONAGAN in 1961, Indiana's philosophy department was firmly set on a course towards national prominence in philosophy of science and related areas of analytic philosophy. Interestingly, Stallknecht's own philosophical interests went in a quite different direction towards speculative metaphysics, the history of philosophy, philosophy of culture and literature, and aesthetics. He was President of the Metaphysical Society of America in 1954–5, and an active

member of the American Society for Aesthetics and the Modern Language Association.

For Stallknecht, a concern for the perennial philosophical issues is thoroughly intertwined with the pursuit of literature, because both manifest a common human creativity. Creativity is at the center of human nature, because it is central to the mind, imagination, freedom, values, and art. Stallknecht first studied the process philosophy thought of Henri Bergson and Alfred North WHITEHEAD alongside his deep reading of German idealism and phenomenology. Finding the unification of great literature and great philosophy exemplified in the poetry of William Wordsworth, Stallknecht's *Strange Seas of Thought: Studies in William Wordsworth's Philosophy of Man and Nature* (1945) compares the poet's philosophy of nature with influential philosophers including Spinoza and Kant. In *The Compass of Philosophy: An Essay in Intellectual Orientation* (1954), Stallknecht and Brumbaugh categorize the major systems of Western philosophy into four types: Mechanism, Formalism, Naturalism, and Philosophy of Creation. As a variation on the earlier effort of Stephen C. PEPPER, this work is interesting mainly for its inclusion of a category for creativity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Studies in the Philosophy of Creation with Especial Reference to Bergson and Whitehead (Princeton, N.J., 1934).
Strange Seas of Thought: Studies in William Wordsworth's Philosophy of Man and Nature (Durham, N.C., 1945; 2nd edn, Bloomington, Ind., 1958).
The Compass of Philosophy: An Essay in Intellectual Orientation, with Robert S. Brumbaugh (New York, 1954).
George Santayana (Minneapolis, 1971).

Other Relevant Works
The Spirit of Western Philosophy: A Historical Interpretation Including Selections from the Major European Philosophers, with Robert S. Brumbaugh (New York, 1951).
Ed. with Horst Frenz, *Comparative Literature: Method and Perspective* (Carbondale, Ill., 1961; 2nd edn 1971).
The Collected Works of Newton P. Stallknecht, 7 vols, ed. Donald L. Jennermann, David A. White, and Marilyn C. Bisch (Lewiston, N.Y., 1999–2003).

Further Reading
Who's Who in Phil
Jennermann, Donald L., David A. White, and Marilyn C. Bisch, eds. *A Congenial Departure; or, Stallknechtian Reflections and the School of Letters* (Lewiston, N.Y., 2003). Vol. 7 of *The Collected Works of Newton P. Stallknecht*, containing a biography of Stallknecht, essays by former colleagues and students, and a bibliography of his writings.

John R. Shook

STALLO, John Bernhard (1823–1900)

Stallo was one of the first proponents of Hegelian philosophy in America. He was born Johann Bernhard Stallo on 16 March 1823 in Sierhausen, Oldenburg, Germany, to Johann Heinrich Stallo and Maria Adelheid Moormann. While attending the Gymnasium at Vechta, the young Stallo showed much promise in philosophical reasoning. His first encounter with formal philosophy was through the study of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*. Due to his family's inability to pay for a university education, Stallo subsequently emigrated to Cincinnati, Ohio, in the spring of 1839. There he began to teach German at parochial schools, wrote poetry, and attended St. Xavier's College. At St. Xavier's he taught German and took courses in mathematics and

Greek. He also made use of the college's library and did extensive reading in physics and chemistry.

In 1844 Stallo accepted a teaching position at St. John's College at Fordham, New York, where he taught physics, mathematics, and chemistry. It was at St. John's that Stallo wrote his first major work, the highly influential *The General Principles of the Philosophy of Nature* (1848). This work, which he later viewed as a failure, was one of the first Hegelian accounts of an evolving universe, and had an enormous effect on scientists, philosophers, artists, and other writers. Soon after its publication, however, Stallo began to study law, and in 1849 he was admitted to the Ohio bar. In 1852 he began a long career as a judge in Cincinnati and he achieved prominence and respect for his judicial expertise, but his philosophical work continued. From 1885 to 1889 Stallo was US Minister to Italy. He remained in Italy for his retirement years, and died on 6 January 1900 in Florence, Italy.

Stallo's influence on subsequent philosophers was widespread. For Ralph Waldo EMERSON, Stallo was his first acquaintance with Hegelian ideas; for Josiah ROYCE, Stallo served as confirmation of the fecundity of idealistic philosophy; and for pragmatists like Charles Sanders PEIRCE and John DEWEY, he was an inspiration for their inquiries in the philosophy of science.

In the decade after the Civil War while he was active in law and politics, Stallo refined the ideas that first appeared in *The General Principles*. Although in *The General Principles* Stallo described various accounts of nature in German philosophy, including Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and Oken, the main focus was upon Hegel. The Hegelian assumption that runs throughout this work is that mind or thought is fundamentally identical with the forces that animate the natural world. This view was opposed to the dominant materialistic view as well as the dualisms of nature perpetuated by Kant between matter and spirit and the objective and subjective. As opposed to the old block universe model, Stallo found the unity of man and nature, of subjectivity and objectivity, in a unitary evolutionary idealism. To Stallo, all manifestations of life are but a process verifying the vital processes of the whole. This emphasis on the unity of things as including their particularity and on the spiral character of evolution is continuous with Hegel's philosophy. Further, like Hegel, Stallo held a broad view of what constituted nature. Nature is the totality of phenomena, the totality of objects that can be experienced by sensuous and introspective observation. Thus Stallo's "psychology" coalesced with his epistemology. Conscious mind is an active interchange with seemingly external objects that reveals the mental character of those objects and at the same time its own reality in and through them. This interchange reveals three progressive phases: perception, where external objects are not engraved upon the mind but rather their particularities become general qualities and relations; observation, where everything exists in its properties, not beside them; and cognition, where the unity of objects depends upon the observer.

Stallo's other major work was *The Concepts and Theories of Modern Physics* (1881). Hailed as a landmark of intellectual history and a vital contribution to the philosophy of science, it contained what Stallo termed his mature philosophy and avoided the overt Hegelianism of *The General Principles*. The goal of *The Concepts and Theories of Modern Physics* is to analyze the relation of the physical sciences to human cognition. This contribution to what he termed the "theory of cognition" was divided in this work along two lines, the first a critique of the mechanical view of nature which argued that its proponents could not logically reconcile this view with contemporary findings in science. The second half of this work illustrated what he believed were the main metaphysical errors in modern physics. Following Hegel, Stallo sought to expose and undermine the atomo-chemical view of nature that had its roots in Greek philosophy and

was carried forward by Newton and Descartes. Many of his contemporaries took this view as axiomatic, but Stallo saw that it could not be squared with experimental science. While the mechanical view had value as an expository device in chemistry, Stallo believed that using this view as a metaphysics of nature went further than experimental science would allow. Proponents were continuing the metaphysical search for "real essences" and thus continuing an outdated ontological metaphysics.

As Peirce and Dewey would later argue, the dogged commitment to this mechanical view of nature served, in Stallo's view, to hinder experimental science. Stallo's alternative accepted that the mechanical view, like any theory, must be seen as a hypothesis that must pass the test of experimentation. Like contemporary philosophers of science, Stallo put forward criteria for determining the truth of hypotheses. His four criteria were that the hypothesis must simplify the data of experience; the explanatory phenomenon must be a datum of experience and not some occult quality; the hypothesis must not contradict itself or established laws of nature; and the hypothesis must admit of deductive inferences. The second half of this work is devoted to exposing the metaphysical errors of the science of his time. He argued that the search for things to correspond with concepts, the assumption that the more general concepts and realities preexist the less general, the assumption that the order of the genesis of concepts is identical with the order of things, and the belief that things themselves exist independently of and prior to their relations all result in metaphysical errors.

Hegel's influence on Stallo was not confined to his work in the philosophy of science, but also informed his views on political philosophy. Indeed, early Hegelians like Stallo believed that Hegel's political philosophy was a needed stimulant to an ossifying democracy, even though Stallo, unlike Hegel, believed that the state must be essentially democratic. From Hegel, Stallo realized that a republican form of government was something that must be con-tinually reconstructed and learned, that religious freedom required a consistent separation of church and state, and that freedom is not a given but must be secured by the creation of conditions that make it possible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The General Principles of the Philosophy of Nature, with an Outline of Some of Its Recent Developments among the Germans, Embracing the Philosophical Systems of Schelling and Hegel, and Oken's System of Nature (Boston, 1848).
State Creeds and Their Modern Apostles (Cincinnati, 1872).
The Concepts and Theories of Modern Physics (New York and London, 1882; 2nd edn 1884; 3rd edn 1888; Cambridge, Mass., 1960).
Reden, Abhandlungen und Briefe (New York, 1893).

Other Relevant Works
"The Primary Concepts of Modern Physical Science," *Popular Science Monthly* 3 (1873): 705–17; 4 (1873–4): 92–108, 219–31, 349–61.
"Speculative Science," *Popular Science Monthly* 21 (1882): 145–64.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v11, Who Was Who in Amer v1
Bloor, David. "Is the Official Theory of Mind Absurd?" *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 21 (1970): 167–83.
Bridgman, Percy W. "Introduction," to *The Concepts and Theories of Modern Physics*, ed. Percy W. Bridgman (Cambridge, Mass., 1960), pp. vii–xxiv.
Easton, L. D. *Hegel's First American Followers: The Ohio Hegelians: John B. Stallo, Peter Kaufmann, Moncure Conway, and August Willich* (Athens, Ohio, 1966).
Goetzmann, William H., ed. *The American*

Hegelians: An Intellectual Episode in the History of Western America (New York, 1973).

Mach, Ernst. "Vorwort," in *Die Begriffe und Theorien der Modernen Physik*, by J. B. Stallo, trans. Hans Kleinpeter (Leipzig, Germany, 1901).

McCormack, T. J. "John Bernhard Stallo: American Citizen, Jurist, Philosopher," *Open Court* 14 (1900): 276.

Ratterman, Heinrich Armin. "John Bernhard Stallo, Deutsch-Amerikanischer Philosoph, Jurist und Staatsmann," *Gesammelte ausgewählte Werke*, by H. A. Ratterman, vol. 12 (Cincinnati, 1911), pp. 11–55.

Stillman, Drake. "J. B. Stallo and the Critique of Classical Physics," in *Men and Moments in the History of Science*, ed. Herbert M. Evans (Seattle, 1959), pp. 22–37.

Strong, John V. "The Erkenntnistheoretiker's Dilemma: J. B. Stallo's Attack on Atomism in his *Concepts and Theories of Modern Physics*," in *Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association* (1974), pp. 105–23.

Thiele, Joachim. "Karl Pearson, Ernst Mach, John B. Stallo: Briefe aus den Jahren 1897 bis 1904," *Isis* 60 (1969): 535–42.

Youmans, William Jay. "Sketch of J. B. Stallo," *Popular Science Monthly* 34 (1888–9): 548–55.

Scott Bartlett

STALNAKER, Robert Culp (1940–)

Robert Stalnaker was born on 22 January 1940 in Princeton, New Jersey. He received a BA in philosophy in 1962 from Wesleyan University, and received a PhD in philosophy in 1965 from Princeton University, where he studied under Carl HEMPEL. He taught philosophy, first as an adjunct and then as an assistant professor, at Yale University, from 1965 to 1968. He was an associate professor of philosophy at the University of Illinois at Urbana from 1968 to 1971, when he moved to Cornell University. He became a full professor at Cornell, and then moved in 1988 to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In 1996 he was appointed Laurance S. Rockefeller Professor of Philosophy at MIT, which is his present position. He was head of the department of linguistics and philosophy from 1997 to 1999. Stalnaker is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

A unifying aspect of Stalnaker's work on issues concerning language, mind, and metaphysics is the application of the possible worlds framework for understanding necessity, possibility, and propositional content. In the early 1970s, in collaboration with Richmond THOMASON, Stalnaker applied this framework to develop a logic of conditionals and, in particular, of conditionals with false antecedents. These often interesting counterfactual conditionals posed a problem for the traditional material analysis of conditionals, which viewed any conditional with a false antecedent as trivially true. Stalnaker and Thomason provided a more natural analysis of the truth conditions of conditionals, according to which one is true just in case its consequent is true in the possible world most like the actual world where the antecedent is also true. A very similar analysis was independently developed by David LEWIS. This analysis allowed for a better understanding of the logic of subjunctive conditionals.

Stalnaker's account of the semantics of conditionals fits neatly into his views on the pragmatics of communication. In an influential series of articles in the mid 1970s, Stalnaker developed an account of the nature of assertion. It was widely accepted that the fact that speech acts are made against a background of shared assumptions plays some role in determining that speech act's content. Stalnaker proposed that this background can usefully be repre-

sented as a set of possible worlds: those compatible with the shared assumptions. The contents of speech acts, including those using counterfactual conditionals, can then be represented as proposed revisions to this set. Developing Paul GRICE's work on the logic of rational communication, Stalnaker argued that a richer conception of the pragmatics of communication would allow for a simpler conception of the semantics of language.

The idea that an agent's beliefs can be represented by a set of possible worlds was central to Stalnaker's *Inquiry* (1984). He argued that belief is best understood as a kind of behavioral disposition, and not, as had become the dominant view, a relation to a representation. He defended the view that beliefs should be individuated in terms of possible worlds, those where things are as the agent believes them to be. This coarse-grained conception, he argued, makes best sense of puzzles about indexical, implicit and conditional belief. Stalnaker has applied this framework to investigate issues in the philosophy of mind, including the nature of phenomenal experience and the dynamics of belief change.

Stalnaker has also explored the possible worlds framework itself. His early paper, "Possible Worlds" (1976), in which he defends a moderate realism about possibility, remains a standard text on the metaphysics of modality. But verificationist and anti-metaphysical tendencies, latent in his early work, have become more prominent in the last twenty years, as has the influence of W. V. QUINE's work. At the heart of the possible worlds framework is the thesis that all necessary truths say the same thing. Much of Stalnaker's recent work has focused, in one way or another, on the question of how metaphysics can be possible at all if this account of content is true.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Possible Worlds," *Noûs* 10 (1976): 65–75.
Inquiry (Cambridge, Mass., 1984).
Context and Content: Essays on Intentionality in Speech and Thought (Oxford, 1999).
Ways a World Might Be: Metaphysical and Anti-Metaphysical Essays (Oxford, 2003).

Other Relevant Works
"A Theory of Conditionals," in *Studies in Logical Theory*, ed. Nicholas Rescher (Oxford, 1968).
"Pragmatics," *Synthese* 22 (1970): 272–89.
"Indicative Conditionals," *Philosophia* 5 (1975): 269–86.
"Assertion," in *Pragmatics*, ed. Peter Cole (New York, 1978), pp. 315–32.
Ed. with William L. Harper and Glenn Pearce, *IFs: Conditionals, Belief, Decision, Chance, and Time* (Dordrecht, 1981).
"David Lewis' *On the Plurality of Worlds*," *Mind* 97 (1988): 116–28.
"Twin Earth Revisited," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 93 (1993): 297–311.
"Stalnaker, Robert," in *A Companion to the Philosophy of Mind*, ed. Samuel Guttenplan (Oxford, 1994), pp. 561–8.
"Dualism, Conceptual Analysis and the Explanatory Gap," with Ned Block, *Philosophical Review* 108 (1999): 1–46.
"On Considering a Possible World as Actual," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* suppl. 65 (2001): 141–56.
Ed. with Alex Byrne and Ralph Wedgwood, *Fact and Value: Essays on Ethics and Metaphysics for Judith Jarvis Thomson* (Cambridge, Mass., 2001).
"What Is it Like to Be a Zombie?" in *Conceivability and Possibility*, ed. T. S. Gendler (Oxford, 2002), pp. 385–400.

Further Reading
Oxford Comp Phil
Field, Hartry. "Stalnaker on Intentionality: On Robert Stalnaker's *Inquiry*," *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 67 (1986): 98–112.
Pendlebury, Michael. "Stalnaker on Inquiry," *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 16 (1987): 229–72.
Tooley, Michael. "The Stalnaker–Lewis

Approach to Counterfactuals," *Journal of Philosophy* 100 (2003): 371–7.

David Hunter

STANDING BEAR, Luther (c.1868–1939)

Luther Standing Bear was born as Ota K'te, or "Plenty Kill," during the winter of 1868–9 in the Pine Ridge Reservation of southwestern South Dakota, the son of Chief Standing Bear and Pretty Face. He was raised a traditional Sioux, but tribal life was put in jeopardy by the westward expansion, and he was among several children whose families encouraged them to assimilate. In 1879 Standing Bear opted to attend the Carlisle Indian Training School in Pennsylvania, and was forced to choose his first name, Luther, from a list he could not yet read in his first week at the school. The school's motto, as put forth by its founder, Richard H. Pratt, was "kill the Indian, save the man." Not surprisingly, it came to be known for its rigid military style of discipline and forced assimilation policies.

After four years at the Carlisle School, Standing Bear spent several years teaching at the Indian school on the Rosebud Reservation in South Dakota. For several years after this, he was also a traveling lecturer and immersed himself in the American subculture of the arts and entertainment industry, joining Buffalo Bill's Wild West show and appearing in some Hollywood films in the 1920s and 30s. While an actor, he was also an activist, trying to convince directors and producers to hire more Native American actors as a founding member of the Indian Actors Association. Standing Bear died on 19 February 1939 in Huntington Park, California.

Standing Bear's work as an intellectual began relatively late in life, with his earliest work, *My People, the Sioux*, appearing in print in 1928 when he was sixty years old. Like other Sioux leaders of his generation, BLACK ELK, Gertrude BONNIN, and Charles EASTMAN, Standing Bear sharply contrasted the dominant European culture and the Native American culture he knew as a child. He was extremely critical of US government policy toward Native American tribes in his works. He also helped create the image of Native American culture as holistic and respectful of nature – an image that persists today.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
My People, the Sioux (Boston, 1928).
"The Tragedy of the Sioux," *American Mercury* (November 1931): 273–8.
My Indian Boyhood (Boston, 1931).
Land of the Spotted Eagle (Boston, 1933).
Stories of the Sioux (Boston, 1934).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*
Markowitz, Harvey. "Standing Bear, Luther," in *Encyclopedia of North American Indians*, ed. Frederick Hoxie (Boston, 1996).
"Standing Bear, Luther," in *Who Was Who in Native American History* (New York, 1990), pp. 255–7.
Tedlock, Dennis, and Barbara Tedlock, eds. *Teachings from the American Earth: Indian Religion and Philosophy* (New York, 1975).

Dorothy Rogers

STANTON, Elizabeth Cady (1815–1902)

Elizabeth Stanton was born Elizabeth Cady on 12 November 1815 in Johnstown, New York. She died on 26 October 1902 in New York City. She attended Johnstown Academy and received the best education available to

women at Emma Willard's Troy Female Seminary in Troy, New York, graduating in 1832. She then read law in the office of her father, Daniel Cady, a United States congressman and later a New York Supreme Court judge. This was where she first learned about the discriminatory legal system for women and began to think about ways to change it. In 1840 she married lawyer and abolitionist Henry Brewster Stanton. Later that same year, while attending the 1840 World Antislavery Convention in London, she met abolitionist and women's rights activist Lucretia Mott. After she, Mott and the other female delegates were refused seating, Stanton became involved in the women's rights movement. In 1848 she worked to pass a bill granting married women's property rights by the New York legislature. On 19–20 July 1848 she and Mott organized the first women's rights convention in Seneca Falls, New York, where Stanton lived with her husband. This convention is credited with launching the American women's rights movement and resulted in a resolution calling for woman suffrage. Stanton also introduced her feminist version of the Declaration of Independence, calling it the *Declaration of Sentiments*. She ascribed the inferior status of women as socially defined, due to their lack of legal and political rights rather than innate inferiority. Stanton argued that women were endowed with the same natural rights and capacity for rational thought as men.

After Stanton met Susan B. ANTHONY in 1851, they began a fifty-year collaboration promoting women's suffrage. Stanton wrote most of their speeches as well as letters, pamphlets, articles and essays for periodicals such as Ameial Bloomer's *Lily*, Paulina Wright Davis's *Una*, and Horace Greeley's *New York Tribune*. During the Civil War, she and Anthony worked for abolitionism, organizing the Women's National Loyal League in 1863 to further efforts immediately to free the slaves. From 1868 to 1870 Stanton was co-editor with Parker Pillsbury of a weekly newspaper devoted to women's rights called *The Revolution*. In 1869 she helped organize the National Woman Suffrage Association, serving as its President until 1890, when it merged with the rival American Woman Suffrage Association. She was then elected the first President of the new National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA), serving from 1890 to 1892. With Susan Anthony and Matilda Joslyn Gage, Stanton compiled the first three volumes of the six-volume *History of Woman Suffrage* (1887). She also published *The Woman's Bible* (1895–8) and an autobiography, *Eighty Years and More* (1898). She drafted the federal suffrage amendment that was introduced in every Congress from 1878 until it passed in 1920. She worked tirelessly for women's suffrage until she died in 1902.

Stanton first articulated the idea that women should be men's equals, in law and in political participation. Using the Declaration of Independence for a starting point, Stanton argued that though it had struck down the old world aristocracies based on birth and hereditary privileges, it had created another type of inequality, a new aristocracy based on sex alone. Universal male suffrage meant that a woman had no legal or political rights and was subject to the "absolute and cruel despotism" of men, whether it was her father, husband, brother or son. Stanton thought the remedy for this injustice was to grant women the same political rights as men. Once suffrage was granted to women, this would provide the opportunity for a social revolution overthrowing the pervasive social and cultural norms that perpetuated women's inferior status.

Stanton also criticized organized religion for reinforcing the political legitimacy of male authority and the subjugation of women. Her irreverent and feminist critique of the Bible, or what she termed "male theology," was published as the *Woman's Bible*. Her dislike of organized religion was increased by contemporary Christian political activists attempting to close public institutions on Sundays and

trying to reverse divorce law liberalization in order to establish Christianity as the state religion. She thought that women could only achieve true equality in a secular state and tried to warn women of how an increasingly politicized organized religion opposed their efforts to gain political or legal rights. Stanton was particularly worried about how religious orthodoxy reinforced patriarchy and undermined women's attempts to be self-sovereign.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

History of Woman Suffrage, 3 vols, with Susan B. Anthony and Matilda Joslyn Gage (Rochester, N.Y., 1887).

The Woman's Bible, 2 vols (Boston, 1895, 1898).

Eighty Years and More: Reminiscences, 1815–1897 (New York, 1898; Boston, 1971).

Other Relevant Works

Papers of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, 45 microfilm reels, ed. Patricia G. Hildebrand, and Ann D. Gordon (Wilmington, Del., 1991).

The Elizabeth Cady Stanton–Susan B. Anthony Reader, 2nd edn, ed. Ellen C. DuBois (Boston, 1992).

The Selected Papers of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, 3 vols to date, ed. Ann D. Gordon (New Brunswick, N.J., 1997–).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Religious Bio, Encyc Amer Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v3, Who Was Who in Amer v1

Banner, Lois W. *Elizabeth Cady Stanton: A Radical for Women's Rights* (Boston, 1980).

Griffith, Elisabeth. *In Her Own Right: The Life of Elizabeth Cady Stanton* (Oxford, 1985).

Kern, Kathi. *Mrs. Stanton's Bible* (Ithaca, N.Y., 2001).

Lutz, Alma. *Created Equal: A Biography of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, 1815–1902* (New York, 1940).

Waggenspack, Beth M. *The Search for Self-sovereignty: The Oratory of Elizabeth Cady Stanton* (New York, 1989).

Jean Van Delinder

STARBUCK, Edwin Diller (1866–1947)

Edwin Eli Starbuck was born on 20 February 1866 in Bridgeport, Indiana, to a Quaker family. Starbuck was educated at Indiana University (BA 1890) where he studied with evolutionist David Starr JORDAN; Harvard University (MA 1895) where William JAMES supported his interest in psychology of religion; and Clark University (PhD 1897), where he studied with G. Stanley HALL. In 1896 Starbuck married Anna M. Diller, one of the first Radcliffe women permitted to take courses at Harvard, and took "Diller" for his middle name. He also studied under the educational psychologist Ernst Meumann at the University of Zürich in 1903–1904.

Starbuck began his professional career as assistant professor of education at Stanford University in 1897, and taught there until 1903. He then was professor of education at Earlham College from 1904 to 1906. From 1906 to 1930 Starbuck was professor of philosophy at the State University of Iowa, with colleague Carl E. SEASHORE. He then was professor of philosophy and psychology at the University of Southern California from 1930 to 1943. Starbuck died on 19 November 1947 in Los Angeles, California.

Starbuck was one of the earliest psychologists to scientifically study religious belief. In "Religion's Use of Me" (1937) Starbuck described himself as a chronically religious

mystic called to "render thinkable and usable the illusive reals of religion" (1937, p. 202). He presented his ideas on the science of religion and its place in education at the 1892 meeting of the Indiana State Teacher's Association, and applied them as a graduate student at Harvard where he designed extensive questionnaires on conversion, the breaking of habits, and the "lines of religious development not attended by conversion" (1937, pp. 223–4). Although the questionnaires generated considerable controversy, William James supported their circulation. During the 1894–5 academic year Starbuck presented preliminary results from 192 extensive biographical questionnaires to a class of Harvard and Radcliffe students that included Anna Diller. He described consistencies in the conversion data, especially its convergence with puberty and its similarity to habit breaking and dissociation.

While studying at Clark University, attracted by G. Stanley Hall's reputation for pursuing questionnaire research, Starbuck found Hall unsupportive of his work and perhaps even envious of what he had already done. Despite this resistance, Starbuck collected 1,265 responses to a briefer questionnaire and published his results, first in two 1897 papers, and then in *The Psychology of Religion* (1899), the first book-length study in the field and an enduring classic.

At Stanford in 1898, Starbuck taught the first course in the United States on character education. There he also introduced courses on educational psychology and the psychology and pedagogy of religion. From 1912 to 1914, on leave of absence from the University of Iowa, he served as a consulting psychologist for the American Unitarian Association in their effort to prepare a religious education curriculum. Upon his return to Iowa, he addressed the widespread demand for work in character education, chairing The Committee of Nine, which in 1921 won a $20,000 prize from the Character Education Institution of Washington D.C. with a proposal emphasizing the arousal of children's creative interest and imagination. Starbuck also headed the University of Iowa's Institute of Character Research and edited the University of Iowa *Studies in Character* from 1927 to 1930.

In 1930, the Institute of Character Research moved with him to the University of Southern California. Starbuck published manuals on character education methods and on character-enhancing literature and with staff at both Institutes of Character Research edited collections of fairy tales and biographies for use in character education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Study of Conversion," *American Journal of Psychology* 8 (1897): 268–308.

"Some Aspects of Religious Growth," *American Journal of Psychology* 9 (1897): 70–124.

The Psychology of Religion: An Empirical Study of the Growth of Religious Consciousness (New York and London, 1899).

A Guide to Literature for Character Training (New York, 1928).

Look to This Day! Selected Writings by Edwin Diller Starbuck (Los Angeles, 1945).

Other Relevant Works

Starbuck's papers are at the University of Southern California and the University of Iowa.

"Life and Confessions of G. Stanley Hall: Some Notes on the Psychology of Genius," *Journal of Philosophy* 21 (1924): 141–54.

"Religion's Use of Me," in *Religion in Transition*, ed. Vergilius Ferm (New York, 1937), pp. 201–60.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Bio Dict Psych by Zusne, Dict Amer Bio, Encyc Relig, Proc of APA in Phil Rev v57, Who Was Who in Amer v2, Who's Who in Phil

Booth, Howard J. *Edwin Diller Starbuck:*

Pioneer in the Psychology of Religion (Washington, D.C., 1981).

Hendrika Vande Kemp

STEARNS, Isabel Scribner (1910–87)

Isabel Stearns was born on 23 June 1910 in Manchester, New Hampshire, the daughter of Hiram Austin and Elizabeth Scribner Stearns. She was educated at Smith College (BA 1931) and Bryn Mawr College (MA 1933, PhD 1938). Her dissertation was titled "The Nature of the Individual." She was an instructor in philosophy at Smith College (1936–8) before making her career at Bryn Mawr as an assistant professor (1938–44), associate professor (1944–52), and full professor (1952–79). She died on 26 April 1987 in Germantown, Pennsylvania.

A gifted and esteemed teacher selflessly devoted to her students, Stearns was no less a gifted metaphysician whose writings demonstrate broad historical learning, dialectical subtlety and speculative imagination. She was influenced by a wide spectrum of contemporary authors and movements, among them, the process philosophers, Alfred North WHITEHEAD and Paul WEISS, the pragmatists Charles S. PEIRCE, William JAMES, George H. MEAD, and John DEWEY, George SANTAYANA, the Gestalt psychologists, and Susanne LANGER, with whom she briefly lived as a younger colleague while an instructor at Smith College.

The foundation of Stearns's work is the methodological primacy of the individual, the individual, that is, as irreducibly mediating conceptual polarities: the sensuous and the rational, the temporal and the timeless, the natural and the ideal. It is in the very complementarity of these and like opposing notions, and not in the reduction of any one to the other, that she grounds her metaphysics. Yet, for Stearns, the individual itself is not ontologically or epistemologically ultimate, as in its propulsive movement through the world it presupposes, gestures toward and creates existents that transcend it. This idea is perhaps most fully illustrated in her article "Time and the Timeless" (1950). In her view, temporal passage cannot be understood except as the passage of enduring entities – namely, individuals. Yet time cannot be simply reduced to the temporal continuity of individuals, for time is likewise a succession. The temporal presents us with discontinuity in discrete endings and beginnings, yet there is never a real rupture in the movement of time. The individual in process enters into the paradox of time in its irreducibly dual meaning: that of a present which never fails, yet within which one event becomes after another. Stearns insists that time is comprehensible only as dynamic, that is, in terms of past-present-future (the so-called A-theory), and not in terms of the static relations of "before-after" (the so-called B-theory). Thus, there is a sense in which the individual "becomes" in time and yet "is" time. Time both creates and is created; it both determines and is determined by, individuals, in whose enduring the totality of time is located. Such a totality is never actualized nor is it self-sufficient – Stearns denies that time is in any sense "absolute" – yet it is nevertheless real and it is "one" (1950, p. 190).

For Stearns, each temporal determination (past, present, and future) can be said with time itself to possess a dual nature. The present both comes to an end and endures; in one sense it becomes past, in another sense, it is never finished. It transcends specific terminal presents (though it is not unrelated to them) and is centered in individuals. This transcendent aspect of the present is its timelessness. Yet, at the same, time, the present is not a timeless present in the sense of a "moving knife edge" of sheer simultaneity, otherwise it could not encompass the past and future and constitute the transition of becoming. The future has two aspects as well: the relevance of *this* present for something new, a relevance that is immanent in the

present; and the negativity or "*not-yetness*" of an ontologically open future. It is this negative character in which the future's transcendence consists (1950, p. 194).

Stearns's analysis of the past parallels that of the present and future. She is explicitly critical of Mead's philosophy while at the same time she acknowledges its profound influence upon her thought. Mead rejects the traditional conception of the past as that which is over and done with, arguing, in effect, that there is no past, or at least, no metaphysically relevant – because there can be no pragmatically relevant – sense of the past that is not always the past of some present and therefore itself present. Thus, one of the senses in which we must construe the past, according to Stearns, is as a *passed present* and not merely as a *present past*. These two facets are complementary; neither is eliminable without doing violence to the concept. The past is truly complete, final, irreversibly actual and, at the same time, still ongoing, living within the individual's present. Moreover, it is the former aspect of the past as a bygone present, as something unalterable, beyond the reach of the present, that defines its transcendence.

Stearns brings to a conclusion her elegant account of time, and with it perhaps, the essential direction of her work, with the following passage:

> Three different sets of phenomena, then, unite to establish the fact that the temporal cannot be isolated from the timeless: the status of the past as a transcendent fact; the appearance of the eternal in the midst of the present; and the necessity for a timeless dimension of the individual within which it may experience trans-experiential meanings. (p. 200)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ed., *Retreat from Reason* (London and New York, 1937).

"The Grounds of Knowledge," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 2 (1942): 359–75.

"The Person," *Review of Metaphysics* 3 (1950): 427–36.

"The Problem of Knowledge," *Review of Metaphysics* 5 (1950): 109–24.

"Time and the Timeless," *Review of Metaphysics* 4 (1950): 187–200.

"Reason and Value," *Philosophical Review* 61 (1952): 3–13.

"Feibleman's Ontology," *Review of Metaphysics* 7 (1954): 436–43.

"The Platonism of Jordan's Metaphysics," *Review of Metaphysics* 16 (1963): 513–21.

"The Apparent Amphiboly of Pierce's Reality," *Transactions of the Charles S. Pierce Society* 4 (1968): 80–89.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v60, Women Phils

Gary S. Calore

STEARNS, Lewis French (1847–92)

Lewis French Stearns was born on 10 March 1847 in Newburyport, Massachusetts. He attended the College of New Jersey in Princeton where his father, Jonathan French Stearns was a Presbyterian minister and served on the board of trustees. After graduating with his BA from Princeton in 1867, he enrolled at Columbia Law School. In 1869 he abandoned plans for a career in the legal profession and returned to Princeton to attend the theological seminary. The leading citadel of Old School Presbyterian orthodoxy, Princeton's theologians championed Reformed confessionalism; divine transcendence and the immutability of God's decrees provided the starting point of the Calvinist Princeton Theology.

After a year in Princeton, Stearns went to Europe to study at the universities of Berlin and Leipzig. But instead of returning to Princeton to complete his seminary education, he enrolled at Union Theological Seminary in

New York City. Union was a New School Presbyterian seminary. The differences between these two seminaries and the theologies they represented were rooted in an ecclesiastical schism that had divided the Presbyterian Church between 1837 and 1869. Whereas Old School Presbyterians had advocated a strict subscription to the Church's doctrinal standards, the Westminster Confession of Faith, New School Presbyterians were less interested in doctrinal conformity than in evangelism, especially during the Second Great Awakening of the early nineteenth century. Consequently, the New School theology stressed human agency more than divine election. In the eyes of Old School Presbyterians, however, such views looked suspiciously like Arminianism and thus conflicted with the Westminster Standards. While the ecclesiastical schism had been healed by the time Stearns enrolled in Union Seminary, the New School tendency toward doctrinal latitudinarianism persisted. Stearns graduated from Union Theological Seminary in 1872 and became pastor of a Presbyterian Church in Norwood, New Jersey in 1873. Three years later he took a position as professor of history and belles-lettres at Albion College in Michigan. In 1879 an eye illness forced Stearns to resign his position. Long troubled by what he perceived as the incompatibility of both Old and New School Presbyterian theology with modern thought, he pondered potential solutions to his theological misgivings while convalescing from his eye ailment.

In 1880 Stearns accepted a position as professor of systematic theology at Bangor Theological Seminary in Maine, holding this position for the rest of his life. He also left the northern Presbyterian denomination for the Congregational Church. Although the rise of historicism and Darwinism led many Protestants in the late nineteenth century to abandon the Christian faith, Stearns sought to adjust Protestant theology to modern thought. The younger Stearns was clearly moving away from his father's orthodoxy. In his inaugural address at Bangor, Stearns expressed certain theological convictions that manifested congruity with the emerging liberal Protestant theology would soon come to be known as the New Theology or Progressive Orthodoxy. By conforming theology to the spirit of the age, theological modernists like Stearns hoped to be able to preserve the intellectual viability of the Christian faith to the modern age. Instead of constructing a system of theology upon a foundation of divine transcendence, as conservative Calvinists had done for generations, Stearns recommended beginning with the person of Christ.

By making Christology the starting point for theology, Stearns was following the lead of Henry Boynton SMITH, the New School Presbyterian theologian with whom he had studied at Union Seminary. While Smith's Christology had influenced Stearns's theology, the impact of philosophical idealism and the romantic theological tradition, which had first been articulated by the early nineteenth-century German theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher, appeared to be even greater. Protestant modernists rejected any strict division between the secular and the sacred. The New Theology likewise stressed divine immanence in culture, history, humanity, and nature. While Stearns took care not to deny the divinity of Christ, which would have been deemed heretical, he stressed the humanity of Jesus as the Christ in a new way. While theological progressives met harsh opposition within certain Protestant denominations, most notably the Congregationalist and northern Presbyterian churches, the New Theology was quickly gaining popularity in some late nineteenth-century Protestant circles. Stearns's inaugural address as well as his articles in the *Andover Review*, the leading journal of the New Theology in the late nineteenth century, put him in the vanguard of this movement.

Although eager to accommodate Protestant theology to modern thought, many Protestant modernists remained committed to the uniqueness of Christianity. Such Protestant modernists, however, faced a crucial challenge: if the divine

infused all of human culture on what basis could they maintain the finality of the Christian religion? In the Ely Lectures at Union Theological Seminary in New York in 1890, which were published as *The Evidence of Christian Experience* (1890), Stearns attempted a solution to this question. He rejected the conventional defenses of the uniqueness of Christianity, such as the miracles of Jesus or Jesus' fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy. Instead, he offered a new doctrine of the atonement as the foundation for the uniqueness of Christianity. According to Stearns, God's saving work through the crucifixion of Jesus provided the Christian with an experience that was beyond scientific criticism. By making individual experience, not a historical fact, such as the resurrection of Christ, the foundation for the uniqueness of Christianity, Stearns was in part drawing upon the work of H. R. Frank and Isaak A. Dorner, with both of whom he had studied in Berlin, and consistent with the Romantic, idealistic stream of thought.

In 1890 Union Seminary invited Stearns to succeed W. G. T. Shedd as professor of systematic theology. Stearns, however, declined the offer for two likely reasons. As a professor at Union he would have had to profess subscription or allegiance to the Westminster Confession. He believed that he could not conscientiously do so since the Calvinistic standards had placed salvation outside the grasp of all of humanity. He may have also been wary of getting caught up in the heated theological controversy between three of Union's professors, A. G. McGiffert, Henry Preserved Smith, and most notably Charles A. Briggs, and the Old School Presbyterian theologians at Princeton. Stearns remained in his position at Bangor Theological Seminary, and died on 9 February 1892 in Bangor, Maine.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Evidence of Christian Experience, Being the Ely Lectures for 1890 (New York, 1890).
Henry Boynton Smith (Boston, 1892).

Present-Day Theology: A Popular Discussion of Leading Doctrines of the Christian Faith (New York, 1893).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*
Hutchison, William R. *The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1976).
"Lewis French Stearns," *Andover Review* 17 (1892): 307–8.
Williams, Daniel Day. *The Andover Liberals* (New York, 1941).

P. C. Kemeny

STEIN, Gertrude (1874–1946)

Gertrude Stein was born in Allegheny, Pennsylvania, on 3 February 1874, the youngest child in an affluent German-Jewish merchant family. Raised in Oakland and Baltimore, she entered Radcliffe College as a special student in 1893. During her freshman and sophomore years, she studied philosophy with George SANTAYANA and Josiah ROYCE, but soon specialized in experimental psychology. She attending graduate-level courses at the Harvard laboratory with the German neo-Kantian Hugo MÜNSTERBERG, and, during her junior year, with William JAMES. By her senior year her academic focus had shifted toward biology. Specializing in neurophysiology, Stein attended Johns Hopkins medical school from 1898 to 1902.

In 1903 Stein left her doctorate unfinished and followed her brother Leo to Paris, where they built a significant collection of modern painting. In 1906, Stein completed what she herself considered the first accomplished work of her writing career, *Three Lives*. By 1912 she had arrived at the radical grammatical experimentalism which distinguishes most of her

major works. With her companion Alice Toklas, Stein spent the rest of her life in France. Though she had already become an important literary influence, only with her best-selling *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas* (1932) did Stein begin to find a wide audience for her work. She died in Neuilly, France, on 27 July 1946.

In Stein's early work she endeavored to continue the science of the mind, of which she had been trained in the form of an exhaustive and highly innovative literary characterology. This effort reached its peak and transformed itself in her mammoth novel *The Making of Americans* (1925), where Stein began her lifelong exploration of being in relation to space and time, and the ways in which it can be recreated in language. Her subsequent, generally short works, particularly those from between the wars, present philosophy in and as linguistic composition. Her essays and lectures, most of which were written after 1932, while more directly explanatory, may still be considered performative philosophical texts.

Steinian philosophy's most immediate affinities are with the aesthetic ontology of Ralph Waldo EMERSON, the radical empiricism of William James, and the process philosophy of Alfred North WHITEHEAD (whose acquaintance she made in 1914). Like these philosophers, Stein radically obliterates dualities, such as those between matter and mind, nature and culture, subjectivity and objectivity, content and form, and continuity and discontinuity, in favor of a pluralistic and rhythmic understanding of experience as an all-embracing ontological process. Based on this framework, the social or cultural philosophy that Stein propounds, especially in her late work, relates to John DEWEY's theories of American democracy. Stein was, in a broad sense, a proponent of American pragmatism who went further than any other in fusing theory and practice in writing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Geography and Plays (Boston, 1922).
The Making of Americans, Being a History of a Family's Progress (Paris, 1925).
Useful Knowledge (New York, 1928).
Portraits and Prayers (New York, 1934).
Lectures in America (New York, 1935).
Narration: Four Lectures (Chicago, 1935).
The Geographical History of The United States or the Relation of Human Nature to the Human Mind (New York, 1936).
Selected Works, ed. Carl Van Vechten (New York, 1947).
A Stein Reader, ed. Ulla Dydo (Evanston, Ill., 1996).

Other Relevant Works
Stein's papers are at the Beinecke Library, Yale University.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v38*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*
Bridgman, Richard. *Gertrude Stein in Pieces* (New York, 1970).
Friedl, Herwig. "Ontography and Ontology: Gertrude Stein Writing and Thinking," *Amerikastudien/American Studies* 41 (1996): 575–91.
———, "Art and Culture as Emerging Events: Gertrude Stein, Pragmatism, and Process Philosophy," in *Emerging Structures in Interdisciplinary Perspective*, ed. Rudi Keller and Karl Menges (Tübingen, 1997), pp. 43–64.
Meyer, Steven. *Irresistible Dictation: Gertrude Stein and the Correlations of Writing and Science* (Stanford, Cal., 2001).
Poirier, Richard. *Poetry and Pragmatism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1992).

Michaela Giesenkirchen

STEIN, Howard (1929–)

Howard Stein was born on 21 January 1929 in New York City. He received his BA from Columbia in 1947. At the University of Chicago he did graduate work in philosophy with Rudolf CARNAP, among others, and received his PhD in philosophy in 1958. His dissertation, "An Examination of Some Aspects of Natural Science," addressed a question of Erwin Schrödinger's about the bearing of fundamental physics on philosophical questions concerning life and determinism. He then earned an MS in mathematics, which was awarded in 1959. Stein was an instructor and assistant professor in the natural sciences at Chicago until 1958, held a National Science Foundation fellowship in 1958–9, and taught mathematics at Brandeis from 1959 to 1962. From 1962 to 1967 he worked at Honeywell Inc. as a mathematician, a systems analyst, and an engineer. Stein rejoined the academic world in 1967 as professor of philosophy at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland. In 1973 he moved to Columbia University as professor of philosophy. From 1980 until his retirement in 2000 he was a professor of philosophy and a member of the committee on the conceptual foundations of science at the University of Chicago. He held a Guggenheim Fellowship in 1974–5, and is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

In Stein's writings, deep and perennial questions of philosophy are approached by extremely careful readings of scientific texts from antiquity to the twentieth century, in a style that is much denser and more literary than is customary among anglophone philosophers. The result is a new, clearer view of the problems, while established "isms" come to seem coarse and irrelevant.

Stein's contributions to our understanding of Newtonian space-time structure, classical field theory, and the "measurement problem" in quantum mechanics are widely appreciated. Less so are his complex and illuminating discussions of the realist/instrumentalist debate, the legacy of logical empiricism, and other central issues in the philosophy of science. This is unfortunate, as Stein's work, though more austere, addresses the same broad themes as much better-known figures, such as W. V. QUINE, Thomas KUHN, Adolf GRÜNBAUM, or Hilary PUTNAM. Though Stein has occasionally pointed out fundamental misunderstandings in such philosophers' understanding of scientific ideas, the precision of his approach has sometimes given the misleading impression that only minor technical details are at stake. His point, however, in these critical writings as elsewhere, is that justice can only be done to the larger questions traditionally addressed by philosophers if their consideration is *preceded* by an adequate understanding of the constraints imposed by scientific knowledge.

Though Stein has written wide-ranging papers on subjects of general interest, these masterpieces of compression often rely on the perspective developed in the more historical or technical papers. The unity of his work is further obscured by its publication in far-flung, often quite obscure conference volumes. On the other hand, though it affords broad vistas, Stein's thought does not, by its very nature, lend itself to exposition in the form of systematic treatises; it is inherently dialogical, questioning, polyphonic. It is to be hoped that the forthcoming collections of his papers will make the unity of his thought more evident and his work more widely accessible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Newtonian Space–Time," *Texas Quarterly* 10 (1967): 174–200.

"Some Philosophical Prehistory of General Relativity," in *Foundations of Space–Time Theories*, ed. John Earman, Clark Glymour, and John Stachel (Minneapolis, 1977), pp. 3–49.

"Yes, But … : Some Skeptical Reflections on Realism and Anti-realism," *Dialectica* 43 (1989): 47–65.

"Was Carnap Entirely Wrong, After All?" *Synthese* 93 (1992): 275–95.

"Some Reflections on the Structure of our Knowledge in Physics," in *Logic, Philosophy, and Methodology of Science IX*, ed. Dag Prawitz, Brian Skyrms, and Dag Westerst"l (New York, 1994), pp. 633–55.

"Newton's Metaphysics," in *The Cambridge Companion to Newton*, ed. I. B. Cohen and G. E. Smith (Cambridge, UK, 2002), pp. 256–307.

"The Enterprise of Understanding and the Enterprise of Knowledge," *Synthese* 140 (2004): 135–76.

Further Reading

Shimony, Abner. "The Character of Howard Stein's Work in Philosophy and History of Physics," in *Reading Natural Philosophy: Essays in the History and Philosophy of Science and Mathematics*, ed. David Malament (LaSalle, Ill., 2002), pp. 1–8. This volume also contains a bibliography of Stein's writings.

André Carus

STEPHENSON, William (1902–89)

William Stephenson was born on 14 May 1902 in Chopwell, County Durham, England, and died on 14 June 1989 in Columbia, Missouri. He was educated in physics at the University of Durham (BSc 1923, MSc 1925, PhD 1927), where study for the diploma in theory and practice of teaching brought him into contact with Godfrey Thomson, one of the pioneers of factor analysis. Inspired by this encounter to explore the application of factor analysis to the study of mind, Stephenson moved in 1926 to University College London to study psychology with Charles Spearman and work as research assistant to Spearman and also to Cyril Burt.

In the 1930s Stephenson became a central figure in the development of and debates about psychometrics and factor analysis. He also became interested in psychoanalysis; and to help raise the research profile of psychoanalysis in the United Kingdom, he was selected in 1935 to begin analysis with Melanie Klein. In 1936 he accepted appointment as assistant director of the newly established Oxford Institute of Experimental Psychology. During World War II he served as a civilian consultant on personnel matters to the British armed forces and from 1943 as a military consultant to the Director General, Medical Services and the Director General of Military Training, rising to the rank of Brigadier-General. He became reader in experimental psychology in 1942 and successor to William Brown as Director of the Institute of Experimental Psychology in 1945.

After failing to secure the first Oxford Chair in Psychology (filled by George Humphrey in 1947), Stephenson emigrated to the United States in 1948, first to the University of Chicago as a visiting professor of psychology and then in 1955, when a permanent academic post at Chicago was not forthcoming, to Greenwich, Connecticut, as research director of a leading market research firm, Nowland & Co. In 1958 he finally obtained a distinguished professorship in advertising research at the School of Journalism of the University of Missouri at Columbia, where he remained until his retirement in 1972.

Stephenson's ideas developed under a number of important intellectual influences in addition to those having to do with factor analysis. Following the transactionalism of John DEWEY and Arthur BENTLEY and the interbehaviorism of Jacob KANTOR, he rejected Cartesian mind–body dualism. Heavily influenced by Kurt KOFFKA and Erving GOFFMAN, he developed a functional and processive theory of self. Chicago's social sciences had maintained some of the functionalism and pragmatism of earlier years when George H. MEAD dominated, and was mutually receptive

to Stephenson. These influences are reflected as well in Stephenson's two most important achievements: his development of Q-methodology, elaborated in *The Study of Behavior: Q-Technique and Its Methodology* (1953) and his theory of communication, an early version of which appeared in his *Play Theory of Mass Communication* (1967).

Q-methodology is a technique for the assessment of value and preference. In Q-methodology, in contrast to the traditional use of factor analysis in psychometrics, persons rather than tests are correlated. When used with multiple participants the procedure identifies the views that participants have in common and is therefore a technique for the assessment of shared meaning. Stephenson later developed Q for use with a single participant with multiple conditions of instruction. The single case use of Q affords a means of exploring the structure and content of the views individuals hold about their worlds (e.g., the interconnections between a person's view of self, of ideal self, and of self as they imagine they are seen by a variety of significant others).

In his theory of communication, Stephenson focused on the social and pleasurable rather than the informational aspects of communication. As in much of his work, the notion of self is central and communication-pleasure is seen as constitutive of self-enhancement and sociability. In later papers, he went on to reject the utility of the notion of consciousness and replace it with a thoroughly social notion of communicability.

Following his retirement, Stephenson devoted much of his time to what had been one of his earliest preoccupations, the exploration of the links between quantum theory and subjectivity. Many of his central notions are brought together in the posthumously published *Quantum Theory of Advertising* (1994).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Testing School Children: An Essay in Educational and Social Psychology (London, 1949).

The Study of Behavior: Q-Technique and Its Methodology (Chicago, 1953).

The Play Theory of Mass Communication (Chicago, 1967).

Quantum Theory of Advertising (Columbia, Missouri, 1994).

Other Relevant Works

"Postulates of Behaviorism," *Philosophy of Science* 20 (1953): 110–20.

"Foundations of Communication Theory," *Psychological Record* 19 (1969): 65–82.

"Methodology of Single Case Studies," *Journal of Operational Psychiatry* 5 (1974): 3–16.

"The Shame of Science," *Ethics in Science & Medicine* 5 (1978): 25–38.

"The Communicability and Operantcy of Self," *Operant Subjectivity* 3 (1979): 2–14.

"Consciring: A General Theory for Subjective Communicability," in *Communication Yearbook*, ed. D. Nimmo (New Brunswick, N.J., 1980), pp. 7–36.

"Quantum Theory of Subjectivity," *Integrative Psychiatry* 6 (1988): 180–95.

Further Reading

Brown, Stephen R., and Donald J. Brenner, eds. *Science, Psychology, and Communication: Essays Honoring William Stephenson* (New York, 1972). Contains a bibliography of Stephenson's publications.

Brown, Stephen R. *Political Subjectivity: Applications of Q Methodology in Political Science* (New Haven, Conn. 1980).

Good, James M. M. "William Stephenson and the Post World War II Bifurcation of British Psychology," *Operant Subjectivity* 23 (2000): 116–30.

Smith, Noel. "Operant Subjectivity: Objectivity of Subjectivity," in *Current Systems in Psychology: History, Theory, Research, and Applications* (Belmont, Cal., 2001), pp. 319–43.

James M. M. Good

STERRETT, James Macbride (1847–1923)

James Macbride Sterrett was born on 13 January 1847 in Howard, Pennsylvania to Robert and Sarah E. MacBride Sterrett (Sterrett spelled his middle name with a lower-case "b" in contrast to his mother's maiden name). In 1867 Sterrett graduated with a BA from the University of Rochester, and in 1872 he graduated from the Episcopal Theological Seminary in Cambridge, Massachusetts (now The Episcopal Divinity School). He then moved to Lawrence, Massachusetts, after graduation to take up a position as assistant minister, having been ordained a deacon. A year later, in 1873, he became rector in Wellsville, New York, after his admission to the priesthood. In Wellsville, he married Adlumia Dent on 20 January 1876. In 1879 Sterrett returned to Pennsylvania to minister a parish in Bedford.

In 1882 Sterrett accepted an appointment as professor of philosophy as the Seabury Divinity School in Faribault, Minnesota. In 1892 Sterrett became professor of philosophy at Columbian University (now called George Washington University) in Washington, D.C., and remained there until his retirement in 1909. Also in 1909, Sterrett was the second President of the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology. Sterrett's clerical work continued while he lived in the nation's capital. He was assistant minister to the Church of the Epiphany from 1892 to 1911, and from 1911 to 1917 he was rector at All Soul's Parish. In 1911, Sterrett established the "James Macbride Sterrett, Jr. Prize" for student performance in physics at George Washington University to honor the memory of his son. Sterrett died on 31 May 1923 in Washington, D.C.

Sterrett's philosophical career centered primarily on idealism, and in particular on Hegel's idealistic philosophy. William T. HARRIS, noted among the St. Louis Hegelians, was a strong influence on Sterrett's work. Sterrett devoted most of his theorizing to the interaction of religious and philosophical thinking. He was intrigued by the intellectual foundations of religious belief, and developed his inquiry in *Studies in Hegel's Philosophy of Religion* (1890), and the following year in *Reason and Authority in Religion* (1891).

In a later work, *The Freedom of Authority: Essays in Apologetics* (1905), Sterrett posited that morality must derive from social engagement, and that the presence and enforcement of law is especially productive of admirable human conduct. Law provides the context in which human freedom can flourish best. Philosophically, this idea kept Sterrett close to Hegel's philosophy; at the outset of the book, he says "the use of dialectic method will be noted" (1905, p. vi). Religiously, this intimacy with Hegel's thinking led him to believe that bishops serve the Episcopal Church best when they interact socially: "It is evident that man is by nature a churchman or ecclesiast, as well as a political being. Ecclesiasticism is as genuine and rational a manifestation of human nature as domestic and political institutions." (1905, p. 218) In the preface, Sterrett exposes his favor for Hegel when he links the ambitions of the book with "the contention that nature and man are known truly, only when they are viewed as a process of objective Mind, realizing itself afresh in and through empirical conditions." He undertakes "a persistent polemic against 'the mechanical view' of the universe" popularized by "the bad metaphysics of some men of Science" (1905, p. v). This entails, in part, showing that the "merely Scientific man, the man whose world-view is merely that of mechanical Science – the undevout astronomer, or geologist, – is mad. Only the devout man is fully sane." (1905, p. v–vi)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Studies in Hegel's Philosophy of Religion: With a Chapter on Christian Unity in America (New York, 1890).

Reason and Authority in Religion (New York, 1891).

The Ethics of Hegel: Translated Selections from his Rechtsphilosophie (Boston, 1893).

*The Freedom of Authority: Essays in
    Apologetics* (New York, 1905).
Modernism in Religion (New York, 1922).

Other Relevant Works
"The Ultimate Ground of Authority,"
    Philosophical Review 1 (1892): 253–64.
"The Proper Affiliation of Psychology with
    Philosophy or with the Natural Sciences?"
    Psychological Review 16 (1909): 130–57.

Further Reading
Dict Amer Bio, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Gardiner, H. N. "The First Twenty-Five
    Years of the American Philosophical
    Association," *Philosophical Review* 35
    (1926): 145–58.
Muirhead, J. H. "How Hegel Came to
    America," *Philosophical Review* 37
    (1928): 226–40.

David Justin Hodge

STEVENS, Stanley Smith (1906–73)

S. S. Stevens was born on 4 November 1906 in
Ogden, Utah, to a Mormon family, the son of
Stanley Stevens and Adeline Smith. After
running his father's electrical equipment
business after the death of his parents in 1924,
Stevens went to Europe for three years as a
missionary for the Mormon Church. His
father's insurance money, along with earnings
from summer construction work, enabled him
to enroll first at the University of Utah and
then, in 1929, at Stanford University. After
some study of philosophy, Stevens spent his
senior year at Stanford studying physics, chem-
istry, and biology, obtaining the BA degree in
1931. In 1932 he went to Harvard, where he
worked as an assistant to Edwin G. BORING
and to B. F. SKINNER, and obtained his PhD in
psychology in 1934. During 1934–5, Stevens

held a fellowship that allowed him to study
physiology with Hallowell Davis at the
Harvard Medical School; and in 1935–6
another fellowship allowed him to study
physics, also at Harvard.

In 1936 Stevens received his first academic
appointment to the department of psychology
at Harvard, where he remained for his entire
career. His consecutive positions were instruc-
tor from 1936 to 1938, assistant professor
from 1938 to 1944, associate professor from
1944 to 1946, and professor of psychology
from 1946 to 1962. Stevens was elected to the
National Academy of Sciences in 1946. Upon
his request for a change of title, Stevens became
professor of psychophysics in 1962, and held
that position until his death. Stevens died on 18
January 1973 while attending a conference in
Vail, Colorado.

One of Stevens's achievements at Harvard
was to sponsor Georg von Bekesy's nonfaculty
research position at the Psycho-Acoustic
Laboratory; von Bekesy won a Nobel Prize in
1961 for his discoveries concerning the
workings of the basilar membrane of the inner
ear and for his work on neural inhibition in
sensory systems. Other achievements of
Stevens included the writing of two important
textbooks: *Hearing: Its Psychology and
Physiology*, with Hallowell Davis (1938), and
Psychophysics, edited by his second wife,
Geraldine Stone, in 1975. Stevens also wrote a
popular text entitled *Sound and Hearing*
(1965) and edited a widely read *Handbook of
Experimental Psychology* (1951).

Stevens's best-known work was published in
the form of journal articles, which may be
divided into three main categories. First, a
series of articles published in the late 1930s
concerned the question of whether some of
the ideas of P. W. BRIDGMAN, as expounded
particularly in Bridgman's *The Logic of
Modern Physics* (1927), could be extrapolated
from physics to psychology in such a way as to
make psychology more acceptable as a science.
Second, a series of articles from the years just
prior to the appearance of the *Handbook* in

1951 concerned the classification of measurement methods in science generally and in psychology in particular. Third, Stevens attempted to apply his own methods of psychological measurement to a question, originally raised by Gustav Theodor Fechner in 1860, regarding the shape of the mathematical function that relates the intensity of a physical stimulus to the intensity of a corresponding sensation.

On the issue of "operationism," it should be noted that Bridgman thought that *any* measurement of a physical object had to be unreliable because nature is a continuity. This means that the measurement, say, of the length of a table top with a ruler will, in a non-trivial sense, contain an arbitrary element because, not only do both ends of the table top not end cleanly with every molecule aligned perfectly with every other molecule, but so do both ends of the ruler that is used to measure the length of the table top. One way out of the dilemma would be the impractical one of measuring the table top several times with several rulers and adopting the principle, proved by Gauss, that, *if* the errors of measurement are normally distributed, the arithmetic mean of the measurements serves as an acceptable estimate of the table top's length. A better way out of the dilemma would be to define the concept of length itself in such a way that the units of length are reliably and validly applicable in practice, at least in a macroscopic world where molecule size is not crucial to scientific accuracy. Over history, length has been defined in a series of increasingly accurate ways, each of these ways serving, for some period of history, as a *concept* of length. Bridgman postulated, therefore, that the meaning of any concept is nothing more than a corresponding set of operations. Operationism, then, is a general perspective on scientific method that insists that science advances in an acceptable way only when the concepts used by scientist A are defined operationally in such a way that another scientist, B, is able to replicate or work with the observations of scientist A.

Bridgman's occupation with physical concepts was complemented by Stevens's occupation with psychological concepts. Stevens believed that a scientific psychology of subjective sensation and perception had to deal first with the fact that the continuous inflow of stimulation is segregated by the sensory nervous system into individual components such as color patches, tones, and things. He saw clearly that so-called "sensations" were actually "discriminations" of segregated elements of the sensory field from their backgrounds (a view currently maintained by some contemporary psychophysicists); and he thought of his task as that of providing operational definitions that would be useful for purposes of measuring particular characteristics of segregated subjective sensory experiences. Stevens's preferred method of measuring "sensation intensity" (or rather, ease of discrimination) was to ask his participants to assign numbers to perceptual experiences with individual stimuli in such a way that, the larger the number assigned to a stimulus, the more clearly the participant could discriminate that stimulus from its background (this is called the method of "magnitude estimation").

Stevens's promulgation of operational definitions in his article entitled "Psychology and the Science of Science" (1939) encouraged other psychologists to offer operational definitions of their measurement units. Theorists of animal learning such as Edward C. TOLMAN, Clark L. HULL, and B. F. Skinner gave operational definitions for conceptual constructs such as "drive strength" or "habit strength." Some critics of this methodological innovation argued that Bridgman had always applied his ideas about operational definitions to conceptual constructs already well established in physics. However, the neo-behaviorist learning theorists applied their definitions to newly hypothesized conceptual constructs that were unobservable and could only be "measured" by using a confining and controversial definition. A full history of the checkered fate of operationism in the hands of psy-

chologists working between the late 1930s and the present has been provided in Grace (2001).

In the course of his investigations into operational definitions of measurement units, Stevens became perhaps the dominant twentieth-century figure in the subdiscipline of measurement theory as applied to psychology. Although the best-known source for his classification of types of measurement is the opening chapter of his *Handbook*, many readers find his article entitled "Measurement, Statistics, and the Schemapiric View" (1968) to be more useful. There he proposed that different types of measurement scales possess different mathematical properties that may be used as a basis for classifying scale type. Scale type, in other words, is "defined by the group of transformations under which the scale form remains invariant …. A *nominal scale* admits any one-to-one substitution of the assigned numbers. Example of a nominal scale: the numbering of football players. An *ordinal scale* can be transformed by any increasing monotonic function. Example of an ordinal scale: the hardness scale determined by the ability of one mineral to scratch another. An *interval scale* can be subjected to a linear transformation. Examples of interval scales: temperature Fahrenheit and Celsius, calendar time, potential energy. A *ratio scale* admits only multiplication by a constant. Examples of ratio scales: length, weight, density, temperature Kelvin, time intervals, loudness in sones." (1968, p. 850)

In Stevens's own work, he employed operational definitions for conceptual constructs concerning the *subjective* world of sensory intensity that allowed him to relate their corresponding measurement units on a *ratio* scale to the measurement units associated with the objective world of physical intensity. Thus, for example, a "sone" was defined by Stevens as being the loudness of a 1,000-cycles/sec. tone that is 40 decibels above the listener's threshold heard binaurally.

Stevens contributed to the problem of the shape of the mathematical relation between the intensity of a physical stimulus and the intensity of the corresponding sensation. Fechner had contended that if the intensity of a tone were increased logarithmically by an experimenter, a listener would experience the subjective loudness of the tone as increasing linearly. Through a series of influential papers, Stevens became the best-known representative of a widely held view, first put forward by some of Fechner's contemporaries, that a listener in these circumstances would actually experience the subjective loudness as increasing logarithmically.

Over the course of his career, Stevens published on a variety of empirical matters, including the standardization of measurements of loudness, the validity of somato-typing, and the relationship between the perceived pitch and the actual frequency of a tone. He also contributed to a "neural quantum theory" according to which activity in a set of sensory receptors can increase in a stepwise, rather than continuous, fashion as the intensity of a stimulus activating that set of receptors increases continuously.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hearing: Its Psychology and Physiology, with Hallowell Davis (New York, 1938).

"Psychology and the Science of Science," *Psychological Bulletin* 36 (1939): 221–63.

"Theory of the Neural Quantum in the Discrimination of Loudness and Pitch," with C. T. Morgan and J. Volkmann, *American Journal of Psychology* 54 (1941): 315–35.

"Measurement, Statistics, and the Schemapiric View," *Science* 161 (1968): 849–56.

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Handbook of Experimental Psychology* (New York, 1951).

Sound and Hearing, with F. Warshofsky and the editors of *Life* magazine (New York, 1965).

"S. S. Stevens," in *A History of Psychology*

in Autobiography, vol. 6, ed. Gardner Lindzey (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1974), pp. 393–420.

Psychophysics: Introduction to Its Perceptual, Neural, and Social Prospects, ed. Geraldine Stone (New York, 1975).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Encyc Psych*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*

Bridgman, Percy W. *The Logic of Modern Physics* (New York, 1927).

Gescheider, George A. *Psychophysics: The Fundamentals*, 3rd edn (Mahwah, N.J., 1997).

Grace, Randolph C. "On the Failure of Operationism," *Theory & Psychology* 11 (2001): 5–33.

Miller, George A. "Stanley Smith Stevens," in *National Academy of Sciences Biographical Memoirs*, vol. 47 (Washington, D.C., 1975), pp. 424–59.

David J. Murray

STEVENSON, Charles Leslie (1908–79)

Charles L. Stevenson was born on 27 June 1908 in Cincinnati, Ohio. He received his BA degree from Yale University in 1930, his BA from the University of Cambridge in 1933, and his PhD degree in philosophy from Harvard in 1935. From 1934 to 1935 he taught at Harvard while doing graduate work. From 1939 to 1946 he was assistant professor of philosophy at Yale. In 1946 he joined the staff at the University of Michigan, where he became professor of philosophy. During 1945–6 he was a Guggenheim Fellow. Stevenson served as President of the American Philosophical Association Western Division in 1961–2. He retired from Michigan in 1977, and died on 14 March 1979 in Bennington, Vermont.

Stevenson was the leading exponent of the emotive theory of ethics in the United States. His 1937 essay, "The Emotive Meaning of Ethical Terms," and his 1944 book, *Ethics and Language*, brought the emotive theory into greater prominence. Stevenson did not invent an emotive theory of ethics, but he produced the most detailed and carefully analyzed version of this theory. Earlier, in 1923 C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards's *The Meaning of Meaning* had stated that since the notion of "good" is the defining subject matter of ethics, this peculiar ethical use of "good" is purely emotive. They contrasted "good" with "red" by claiming that to say something is red is descriptive, it conveys information about what is being referred to, but to say something is good, specifically in any ethical sense, is *not* to describe it, but "good" serves only as an *emotive* sign expressing our attitude or how we feel about it. In 1936 the British philosopher A. J. Ayer and other logical positivists formulated the outlines of an emotive theory of ethics where they claimed that moral judgments typically do not state any facts that could be verified or refuted but, rather, moral judgments simply express emotions, favorable or unfavorable feelings about honesty, murder, justice, etc. Stevenson basically agreed with this but sought to fill in the details of this theory with extended analysis and sought to free this approach from criticisms based upon misunderstanding.

Stevenson made a distinction between normative ethics and what has become known as metaethics. Stevenson limited his approach to the latter. While he admitted that normative questions make up the most important part of ethics, his analysis leaves these questions unanswered. Typical normative or value questions would be: Is abortion wrong? Is capital punishment morally good? Is it always good to keep promises? These normative questions require some value judgment in order to be answered. By contrast, metaethics is, or claims to be, value neutral; it is concerned with questions about what it *means* to say that abortion is wrong or honesty is good. It is also con-

cerned with how and whether any moral judgment can be supported, proved, or refuted. Stevenson's whole effort is not normative but metaethical. It is concerned with questions concerning the *meaning* of moral concepts and judgments, as well as with questions of their evidence and proof.

To understand this, it is important to see another distinction that Stevenson makes between disagreement in belief and disagreement in attitude. When two people disagree about whether an abortion was performed or not, their disagreement could be settled by getting the proper information. On the other hand, when two people disagree about whether abortion is morally wrong or not, this disagreement cannot be settled simply by getting the proper information. This disagreement depends on the values the disputants have, and it is Stevenson's contention that values themselves depend on attitudes, emotions, or how the disputants feel about abortion. Moral disputes or disagreements, for Stevenson, always depend on emotion. If people had no feelings, one way or the other, about abortion they would not make moral judgments about it. The same is true for aesthetic judgments. If people had no emotions or feelings about a piece of music or a work of art, they would not be in a position to judge it as good or bad, beautiful or interesting. Of course, moral or aesthetic *agreements* also depend upon emotion. When people agree that murder is morally wrong, or that a moonlit sky is beautiful, this indicates they have the same feelings. For the emotive theory, values depend on the emotions or the kind of feelings people have; they do not depend simply on facts or descriptive information. To say that Jones lied to a client about the sale of a home is not a moral judgment but only a factual one, unless, or until, we ask – was this right, or was this morally wrong, and how do we feel about this?

Normally, people have feelings about what happens to them and others, they approve of some things and disapprove of others. But attitudes of approval or disapproval depend on emotions. They have emotive meaning as distinguished from factual or descriptive meaning. To say that Smith is six feet tall is descriptive. But, to say that Smith is a good person or morally good is evaluative, and hence, emotive. But because descriptive and evaluative elements tend to be often mixed together in judgments people ordinarily make, Stevenson saw the need for being quite careful in admitting that very often moral concepts and judgments are vague and contain a mixture of factual and emotive elements. This led him in his major work *Ethics and Language* to provide two patterns of analysis for ethical or moral discourse. The simple judgment that Smith is an honest person, for example, turns out to be complex insofar as it involves both factual and emotive meaning. Nevertheless this judgment for Stevenson would not be a moral judgment at all if it lacked any emotive meaning; that is, if it did not tend to arouse anyone's feelings of approval or disapproval.

If emotive meaning is essential to the valuational aspect of moral concepts and judgments, it is also essential to their imperative force and the practical role they serve in encouraging, recommending, influencing, and even commanding courses of action. For Stevenson and the emotive theory, if murder is morally wrong then we should not commit it; if honesty is morally good then we ought to be honest. In other words, the emotive theory claims it can explain why these ordinary implications hold. Although moral judgments, such as murder is wrong or honesty is good, are not cognitively valid or invalid and cannot be proved or verified, they are persuasive. They, in fact, function to reinforce or change people's behavior. Thus, for the emotive theory, there is a meaningful purpose in giving reasons for one's moral judgments. These reasons cannot serve to prove these judgments true or valid – but they can serve to persuade others or to reinforce one's own attitudes or values. Thus, when moral arguments arise, facts and reasons can be brought in not to *prove* the judgments but to get people to endorse or follow them.

Stevenson insisted that his emotive theory, far from implying that moral language is thoughtless and irrational, actually finds a useful place for being thoughtful, giving reasons, and utilizing factual evidence in the endeavor to have an influence and make a difference, in short, to actually guide people's behavior. Moral concepts and judgments would be idle and useless if they had no pragmatic function in directing future courses of action. The emotive theory can explain why it is pointless to make moral judgments about what is unavoidable or about matters that human effort cannot help or do anything about. Although a flood or hurricane may cause much destruction and even loss of life, it is pointless to judge the flood or hurricane as morally wrong or bad. If moral judgments have imperative or persuasive force then they cannot be used on animals or others who cannot understand them and possibly be influenced or persuaded by them. It makes no sense to say that the lion was morally wrong in killing the deer. But it does make sense to say that the policeman was doing the morally right thing to kill a mad dog that was threatening a neighborhood.

Stevenson did discuss other theories of ethics, especially what he terms "related" theories, including those of Ayer and John Dewey. Concerning Ayer, Stevenson says that he found much more to agree with and defend, than to attack. He says he sought only to qualify the views of Ayer – partly in the light of Dewey – and free them from apparent cynicism. He hopes to show that "emotive" need not have a negative or even a derogatory emotive meaning. With regard to Dewey, Stevenson claims his criticisms do not repudiate the central aspects of Dewey's work. Stevenson admits that Dewey emphasized the practical functions of ethical judgments in redirecting attitudes and that he has truly brought ethics into closer contact with actual life. However, Stevenson still finds Dewey neglectful of emotive meaning. Stevenson sees Dewey as over-intellectualizing the emotive urgency of ethical terms. He sees Dewey's procedure in ethics as underempha-sizing disagreement in attitude and of apparently absorbing all disagreement in attitude into disagreement in belief. The fundamental issue that divides Stevenson and Dewey concerns the cognitive status of ethical judgments and language.

Stevenson's version of the emotive theory had a great influence in calling attention to the need for careful consideration to be paid to the *language* of ethics. Soon after his *Ethics and Language* was published in 1944, several more works appeared dealing directly with ethical discourse. Stephen Toulmin's *An Examination of the Place of Reason in Ethics* (1950), R. M. Hare's *The Language of Morals* (1952), Paul Edwards's *The Logic of Moral Discourse* (1955), and others carried on their own analysis of moral language but they also made numerous criticisms of Stevenson's work. In 1945 Dewey published an article "Ethical Subject-Matter and Language" in which he took issue with the emotive theory on two principle points, the one theoretical, the other moral. Dewey argued that the isolation or separation of emotive meaning from descriptive is impossible. Emotive meaning, as any kind of meaning, is always situational. Dewey also alleged that the practical or moral consequence of viewing ethical terms and judgments as principally emotive is a kind of moral laxness or weakness and discouraged the effort to locate sound empirical evidence for moral decisions. Edwards also diverged from Stevenson's position by arguing that it is possible to give reasons for moral judgments that go beyond mere causal factors. He also argued that moral disputes can be settled in a number of ways, not simply if both parties have come to hold the same view, whether this view can be proven or not. J. O. Urmson, in his 1968 book *The Emotive Theory of Ethics*, argued that if one desires to change a person's evaluative attitude one does not wish to change only – or most importantly – his emotions, but rather the whole pattern of his thinking and behavior.

C. I. Lewis, in his influential 1946 work *An Analysis of Knowledge and Valuation* and else-

where, strongly rejected the noncognitive and emotive analysis of ethical judgments presented by Stevenson and others. Lewis held that judgments of what is good, or evaluations generally, are forms of empirical knowledge. The denial to value apprehensions in general as having truth or falsity would, Lewis claims, imply both moral and practical cynicism. It would invalidate all action, since actions become pointless unless there is some measure of assurance of a valuable end-result. For Lewis, human life can prosper only if there are value judgments which are in fact true, judgments which correctly predict the presence of "value quality" as a consequence of actions taken or planned. For Lewis, the simple judgments, that milk is good food or that honesty is good policy, are pragmatically testable and do not simply depend on emotion or approval. Objectively testable judgments of value must, Lewis claims, be distinguished from merely subjective or emotive ones. Statements of approval or likings, or dislikings as mere preferences, do not obviously confer value or disvalue on things. If one asserts "I don't like milk," this may be a sincere judgment, but it does not show or prove that milk is not a good food. On the other hand, to say that one approves of stealing or cheating to get ahead does not confer upon such activities any moral value. For Lewis, there clearly is a difference between approval based on carefully collected evidence and approval lacking such evidence. For Lewis – as for Dewey and other cognitivists – approval and emotion, in isolation from facts and possible evidence to confirm or disconfirm them, simply lack any moral or ethical significance.

In *Ethics and Language*, Stevenson saw no need to make a distinction between the terms "good" and "right," nor did he think that these terms required different patterns of analysis. Lewis and others considered this a mistake. As normative or evaluative terms "good" and "right" apply to things beyond the province of ethics. "Right" and "wrong" are normative terms in mathematics, science, in ordinary practical affairs, as well as in ethics. The same applies to the terms "good" and "bad." Lewis,

for one, held that "good" has a wider application than "right." Anything may be good or bad but only things subject to deliberation, or things that lie within our responsible control, can be judged as right or wrong. What is morally right or wrong is related to what is logically, mathematically or prudentially right or wrong in the sense that all of these require some kind of rational rules or standards of judgment. For Lewis and others, it is not only logic, science and mathematics that need rational rules for decision-making, but ethics also requires rational rules and procedures. For Lewis and others, this shows the basic inadequacy of an emotive approach to ethics since, if ethical decisions concerning right and wrong are centered on emotion or emotive meaning, then they cannot be rational and, thus, they cannot be rationally justified.

Naturalists and pragmatists such as Dewey, Lewis, and others did not oppose Stevenson's emphasis on metaethical concerns. They agreed that ethical language requires careful analysis. However, they objected to Stevenson's approach insofar as they saw this as closing off any intelligible or cogent approach to normative ethics. It is not only that Stevenson did not, himself, offer any normative ethics, but his emotivism precluded the very idea of any cognitively significant normative approach to ethics. That is, for Stevenson, no normative moral judgments could be said to be valid or invalid, correct or incorrect.

J. O. Urmson, in *The Emotive Theory of Ethics*, also criticized Stevenson's views for separating validity and value considerations. For Urmson, where there are no standards of merit, it is pointless to distinguish valid and invalid grounds for a preference. But, when there are standards, which have been agreed upon as a result of the success of standard-setting proposals, it does make sense to distinguish valid or correct valuations from those that are not valid or incorrect. Stevenson's views that no fact is logically more relevant than any other fact to a disagreement in attitude and that no distinction can exist between valid and invalid

arguments to support evaluations, are only true when no standards are set, but, Urmson claims, Stevenson's view is clearly false when standards have been set. Urmson insists that there is an important difference between *standard-setting* and *standard-using*, a distinction he finds that Stevenson failed to make. Ordinarily, when people make moral judgments they are using standards of some kind that have already been set. When they are doing this, it does make sense to apply the terms valid and invalid. Setting standards themselves or evaluating them is a different situation. Normative ethics is rightly concerned with both *standard-setting* and *standard-using*. Urmson's point is not that it is easy, or a simple matter, to set proper standards or use them, but, that unless we distinguish these clearly, any normative ethics will be only left in a state of confusion.

During the 1960s and 1970s Stevenson continued to develop his theory further and to respond to various criticisms of his views. In one of his last essays, "Value-Judgments: Their Implicit Generality," published posthumously in 1983, he provided a concise summary of his meta-evaluative theory and went on to test his own theory with attention to points that he said he had previously neglected. Stevenson never considered his emotive theory fully finished. He developed a theory which not only made an impact, but actually opened up a whole series of investigations in metaethics which others are still carrying on.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Emotive Meaning of Ethical Terms," *Mind* 46 (1937): 14–31.
"Ethical Judgments and Avoidability," *Mind* 47 (1938): 45–57.
Ethics and Language (New Haven, Conn., 1944).
"The Nature of Ethical Disagreement," in *Readings in Philosophical Analysis*, ed. Herbert Feigl and Wilfrid Sellars (New York, 1949), pp. 587–93.
Facts and Values: Studies in Ethical Analysis (New Haven, Conn., 1963).

"Value-Judgments: Their Implicit Generality," in *Ethical Theory in the Last Quarter of the Twentieth Century*, ed. Norman E. Bowie (Indianapolis, Ind., 1983), pp. 13–37.

Other Relevant Works

Stevenson's papers are at the University of Michigan.
"Persuasive Definitions," *Mind* 47 (1938): 331–350.
"Moore's Arguments against Certain Forms of Ethical Naturalism," in *The Philosophy of G. E. Moore*, ed. P. A. Schilpp (New York, 1942), pp. 71–90.
"Reflections on John Dewey's Ethics," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 62 (1961): 25–44.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Blackwell Analytic Phil*, *Encyc Ethics*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v7*, *Proc of APA v52*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*
Bowie, Norman, ed. *Ethical Theory in the Last Quarter of the Twentieth Century* (Indianapolis, 1983).
Dewey, John. "Ethical Subject-Matter and Language," *Journal of Philosophy* 42 (1945): 701–12.
Edwards, Paul. *The Logic of Moral Discourse* (Glencoe, Ill., 1955).
Goldman, Alvin I., and Jaegwon Kim, eds. *Values and Morals: Essays in Honor of William Frankena, Charles Stevenson, and Richard Brandt* (Dordrecht, 1978). Contains a bibliography of Stevenson's writings.
Hudson, W. D. *Modern Moral Philosophy* (New York, 1970).
Stroh, Guy W. *American Ethical Thought* (Chicago, 1979).
Urmson, J. O. *The Emotive Theory of Ethics* (London, 1968).
Warnock, G. J. *Contemporary Moral Philosophy* (London, 1967).

Guy W. Stroh

STEWART, Herbert Leslie (1882–1953)

Herbert Leslie Stewart was born on 31 March 1882 in Cairncastle, Country Antrim, Northern Ireland. He was raised in Carrickfergus just north of Belfast, where his father the Reverend S. Edgar Stewart was minister at Joymount Presbyterian Church. Stewart first studied at the Belfast Royal Academy. Stewart then attended Lincoln College, Oxford, upon winning its open classical scholarship, where he received his BA in 1904, his MA with honors in Literae Humaniores and first class honors in mental and moral science in 1905, and his PhD in 1907. During his study at Oxford, Stewart won the Goldsmith Exhibition and the John Locke scholarship in mental philosophy. Stewart proceeded to Edinburgh University, winning the Cobb Scholarship, and attending lectures on divinity.

Stewart taught philosophy at Queen's University in Belfast, Ireland from 1909 to 1913. In 1914 Stewart emigrated to Canada to join the philosophy faculty of Dalhousie University in Halifax, Nova Scotia. He remained at Dalhousie until his retirement in 1947. Stewart was founding editor of *The Dalhousie Review* in 1921, which he continued to edit for twenty-six years. Stewart died on 19 September 1953 in Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Stewart's conviction that it is the duty of a philosopher to encourage critical inquiry led him to become a radio commentator with his own weekly show, entitled "Dr. Stewart Reviews the News," which was broadcast nationally on the CBC network for ten years, and on station CHNS in Halifax for more than twenty years. His books on Protestant, Catholic and Anglo-Catholic "modernism" also support a critical rather than a skeptical or dogmatic stance.

Stewart's first book, *Questions of the Day in Philosophy and Psychology* (1912), was based on lectures Stewart gave at Belfast, exploring Bergson and certain Bergsonian ideas mediated through the work of William JAMES and F. C. S. Schiller, intended to show how the critical analysis of such philosophers illuminates the source of difficulty in longstanding social and political problems. Stewart is sometimes read as a realist in this work (Armour and Trott 1981). In his later works it has been suggested that Stewart converted to idealism, due to his analysis of Nietzsche (Armour and Trott 1981), or Carlyle (Rabb 1986, 1988).

Stewart's own assessment of his work suggests that he was neither realist nor idealist. In an unpublished autobiography (in the Dalhousie archives) he writes about the dispute between realism and idealism as well as the "conflicts" between absolutism and pragmatism, and between intellectualism and existentialism: "I viewed these intense disputes, so often argued with a quasi-theological vehemence, as like the conflicts of political parties which supply important teaching material to University lectures on Government, using them to explain and illustrate the political structure, while personally convinced that there is truth in them all and no such mutual contradictoriness as partisan zealots suppose."

It has been argued that Stewart's attempt to accommodate opposing views is a typically Canadian response (Armour and Trott 1981). Stewart, who regarded himself as an Irish-Canadian, seems to corroborate this, noting in his book *The Irish in Nova Scotia* (1949) that Ireland itself could learn much from the religious and political tolerance found in the Charitable Irish Society of Halifax. This was the Halifax in which Stewart was content to spend the rest of his days.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Questions of the Day in Philosophy and Psychology (London, 1912).
Nietzsche and the Ideals of Modern Germany (London, 1915).
Modernism Past and Present (London, 1932).

Other Relevant Works
Stewart's papers are at Dalhousie University.
Anatole France the Parisian (New York and

Toronto, 1927).

A Century of Anglo-Catholicism (London and Toronto, 1929).

From a Library Window: Reflections of a Radio Commentator (Toronto, 1940).

The Irish in Nova Scotia (Kentville, Nova Scotia, 1949).

Further Readings

Armour, Leslie, and Elizabeth Trott. *The Faces of Reason: An Essay on Philosophy and Culture in English Canada, 1850–1950* (Waterloo, Ontario, 1981), pp. 402–404.

Mathien, Thomas. *Bibliography of Philosophy in Canada: A Research Guide* (Kingston, Ontario, 1989). Lists eighty-four publications by Stewart.

Rabb, J. Douglas. "Herbert L. Stewart, Thomas Carlyle and Canadian Idealism," *Canadian Literature* 111 (1986): 211–14.

———, "Canadian Idealism, Philosophical Federalism and World Peace," *Dialogue* 25 (1986): 93–103.

———, ed. *Religion and Science in Early Canada* (Kingston, Ontario, 1988).

J. Douglas Rabb

STIEGLITZ, Alfred (1864–1946)

Alfred Stieglitz was born in an affluent German-Jewish family on 1 January 1864 in Hoboken, New Jersey. Educated in New York City, Stieglitz studied at City College before relocating to Germany with his family in 1881. In Germany, Stieglitz trained in mechanical engineering at Berlin Polytecknikum prior to commencing his career in photography in 1883. After returning to the United States in 1890, Stieglitz married his first wife, Emmeline Obermeyer, the mother of his only child, Katharine. Stieglitz married the painter Georgia

O'Keeffe in 1924. Stieglitz died on 13 July 1946 in New York City.

Stieglitz's career was dedicated to fighting for the recognition of photography as an art form. During the late nineteenth century, the majority of scholars viewed photography as a mechanized medium, one that merely recorded reality. Stieglitz worked tirelessly to change this view of photography, by word of mouth, as well as through the various journals he edited, such as *The American Amateur Photographer* (1893–5), *Camera Notes* (1897–1902), and *Camera Work* (1903–17).

Stieglitz's philosophy regarding photography was congruent with larger intellectual inquires regarding the formation of knowledge that took place during the turn of the century. Many scholars began to discuss the fluidity of nature, time, and space as well as the effects of how the mind interprets information and perceives experiences. In contrast to the idea of the mind as a mirror of reality, scholars like William JAMES and John DEWEY questioned notions of truth that relied upon the correspondence between mind and reality.

These intellectual investigations regarding knowledge were integral to Stieglitz's philosophy regarding photography. He began to question the relationship between image and subject as well as the role of the photographer. During this time he believed that the photograph is not an unbiased record, but rather is effected by how a photographer determines to represents a given subject. Stieglitz believed that photography could be used as a tool in which to illustrate ideas or emotions rather than documenting the world.

Stieglitz's early work referenced German romanticism, believing that when an artist creates a successful work of art, the lines between self and object are blurred. His photographs created during the early 1900s explore the relationship of art and spirituality through the use of symbolism. He also began to call photographs "work" and photographers "workers." This idea parallels Marx's belief that a person mixes herself with her work in

unalienated creation. Stieglitz began a movement called Photo-Secession that fought for photography as an art and consisted of two principal elements: a photographic journal, *Camera Work*, and a gallery named 291. Stieglitz used 291 as a forum in which to place contemporary pictorial photography within a larger historical context.

By 1907 Stieglitz's interests began to shift towards a focus on modernism, to which he was exposed by artists such as Edward Steichen, Max Weber, and Marium de Zayas. Stieglitz began to phase out aspects of pictorialism within 291 and *Camera Work*, and was introduced to famous European artists and writers, who were later exhibited in his gallery. Stieglitz was dedicated to keeping abreast with new artistic movements and was determined to interpret their effect upon photography. Influenced by the writings of French philosopher Henri Bergson, Stieglitz defined Modern art as that which creates an interconnection between the physical and spiritual. As deemed by the members of 291, Modern photography, which later came to be known as "straight" photography, consisted of images that employed sharp focus, great depth, and depictions of contemporary subjects.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Alfred Stieglitz: Photographs and Writings, ed. Sarah Greenough and Juan Hamilton (Washington, D.C., 1983).
Stieglitz on Photography: His Selected Essays and Notes, ed. Richard Whelan (New York, 2000). Contains Stieglitz's bibliography.

Other Relevant Works
Stieglitz's archive is at the Beinecke Library, Yale University.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*

Homer, William. *Alfred Stieglitz and the American Avante-garde* (Boston, 1977).
Lowe, Sue D. *Stieglitz: A Memoir/Biography* (Boston, 1983).
Norman, Dorthy. *Alfred Stieglitz: An American Seer* (New York, 1960).
Peeler, David P. *The Illuminating Mind in American Photography: Stieglitz, Strand, Weston, Adams* (Rochester, N.Y., 2001).
Whelan, Richard. *Alfred Stieglitz: A Biography* (Boston, 1995).

Megan Jacobs

STOLNITZ, Jerome (1925–)

Jerome Stolnitz was born on 11 June 1925 in New York City. He received his BA from the City College of New York in 1944 and his PhD in philosophy from Harvard University in 1949. He began his teaching career at Colgate University in 1949, continued at the University of Rochester, and finished at Lehman College of the City University of New York, where he taught from 1968 until his retirement in 1992. In 1979–80 he served as President of the American Society for Aesthetics. He is chiefly known as a philosopher of art. His distinctive approach to aesthetic issues combines an insistence on the importance of critical analysis of concepts, empirical attention to the actual experience of art works, and a persistent willingness to defend tradition-based accounts of aesthetic awareness against modern-day critics.

Most prominent among the controversial doctrines he has defended, is the view that there is a uniquely identifiable frame of mind constituting the aesthetic attitude, an attitude that provides the right basis for aesthetic experience in general. He defines this attitude as "disinterested and sympathetic attention to and contemplation of any object of awareness whatever, for its own sake" (1960, p. 35). The

key element in this definition is disinterestedness, a concept inherited from various eighteenth-century proponents, but refined and modified by Stolnitz, who became its foremost modern champion. Where Kant, for instance, had thought of this quality as excluding interest in having or owning a thing, and other thinkers had thought of it as detaching aesthetic attention from various practical interests, Stolnitz conceives of disinterestedness as excluding both cognitive interest (interest in gaining knowledge about a thing) as well as judgmental interest (interest in evaluating or ranking things). The disinterested attention distinctive of the aesthetic attitude is, as he sees it, attention disconnected from any purpose other than simply having the experience and relishing the qualities of objects of attention for their own sakes.

Stolnitz's conception of aesthetic experience is unusually broad. He espouses a view of art criticism that embraces the legitimacy of multiple competing interpretations of a single work. The notion of sympathetic regard he defends aims at cutting through barriers of bias and enculturation to give objects a chance to show how they can reward attention. He regards the extreme variety of aesthetic preferences as good evidence that no object is impervious to aesthetic regard. In this open arena, ugliness can be as important and revealing as beauty. Stolnitz's account of ugliness as an aesthetic quality is particularly subtle and illuminating. He points out that an aesthetic theory that disqualified negative aspects of experience would be as useless as a moral theory that dwelt only on goodness to the neglect of evil. Lastly, he identifies a variety of ways in which ugliness in art (for example, horrific elements in tragedy) may have beneficial results.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"On Ugliness in Art," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 11 (1950): 1–24.

"On the Formal Structure of Esthetic Theory," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 12 (1952): 346–64.

"On Esthetic Valuing and Evaluation," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 13 (1953): 467–76.

"On Artistic Familiarity and Aesthetic Value," *Journal of Philosophy* 53 (1956): 261–76.

Aesthetics and Philosophy of Art Criticism: A Critical Introduction (Boston, 1960).

"On the Origins of Aesthetic Disinterestedness," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 20 (1961): 131–43.

"'The Aesthetic Attitude' in the Rise of Modern Aesthetics," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 36 (1978): 409–22.

"On the Apparent Demise of Really High Art," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 43 (1985): 345–58.

"On the Cognitive Triviality of Art," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 32 (1992): 191–200.

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *Aesthetics* (New York, 1965; 1970).

"Beauty" and "Ugliness," in *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Paul Edwards (New York, 1967), vol. 1, pp. 263–6; vol. 8, pp. 174–6.

"The Canon," *Primum Philosophari*, ed. Brach-Czaina (Warsaw, 1993), pp. 162–76.

Further Reading
Dickie, George. "Stolnitz's Attitude: Taste and Perception," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 43 (1984): 195–203.

Ronald Moore

STONE, Lucy (1818–93)

Lucy Stone was born on 13 August 1818 on a farm near West Brookfield, Massachusetts and

died on 18 October 1893 in Dorchester, Massachusetts. Stone was born to Francis and Hannah Matthews Stone, the eighth of nine children. Her father held religious convictions that men naturally dominate women. As a result, Stone spent part of her education learning Hebrew and Greek so that she could locate the "misinterpretations" of the Bible in order to fight against discriminatory gendered practices of the church.

Stone was a suffragist, abolitionist, public speaker, writer, publisher, advocate, activist, and feminist. She was a pioneer in many respects: the first Massachusetts woman to earn a bachelor's degree, the first woman who refused to take her husband's name in 1855, and the first person to be cremated in New England. However, Stone should be remembered most for her committed life as an activist for abolition and women's enfranchisement. At a young age, Stone acquired a keen sense of injustice that inspired her lifelong dedication and passion to fight for equality for all. Unlike several of the major historical suffragists, Stone was relentlessly loyal to her commitment for universal suffrage.

Stone attended Mount Holyoke College for a short period of time and several years later transferred to Oberlin College where she graduated with a BA in 1847. During her academic pursuits, Stone was inspired by the Grimké sisters and William Lloyd GARRISON. She was married to Henry Blackwell in 1855 by Reverend Thomas Wentworth HIGGINSON, who read their "Marriage Protest" manifesto objecting to the loss of civil rights for women upon marriage. Stone gave birth to two children, a son who died after birth and a daughter, Alice Stone Blackwell, who later followed in her mother's footsteps to become a notable activist for women's rights.

While at Oberlin, Stone organized and developed the first debate society among college women. After graduating from Oberlin, she became a lecturer for the Anti-Slavery Society in Massachusetts and engaged in political protests. In 1858, while residing in New Jersey, she held a personal protest to expose "taxation without representation" by refusing to pay property taxes because she was not granted the right to vote. In 1855 she drafted legislation for the state of Kansas about married women's property rights that was immediately passed. In 1870 she embarked upon a long career as the founder and editor of *The Women's Journal*, which focused on political, legal, educational, and social equality. The *Journal* lasted until 1917 when it merged with two other suffrage papers to become *The Woman Citizen*. Stone continued her public speaking engagements and edited the *Journal* up to her death. Her last understandable words to her daughter, "Make the world a better place," speak to her political commitment.

In 1850 Stone helped organize the National Women's Rights Convention in Worchester, Massachusetts, which grew out of the 1848 Seneca Falls Convention. It was during the 1850s that Stone converted Susan B. ANTHONY to the suffrage movement. In 1863 Stone, Anthony and Elizabeth Cady STANTON formed the Woman's Loyal National League. This joining of forces linked women's issues to abolition. For many years to follow, the three women struggled with ideological and strategic differences. This ultimately led to a split in which two factions emerged: Anthony and Stanton formed the National Women's Suffrage Association and Stone developed the American Women's Suffrage Association with the help of Julia Ward HOWE and Henry Blackwell. In 1890, with the leadership of Alice Stone Blackwell, the two groups merged to form the National American Women's Suffrage Association with Stanton as President, Anthony as Vice President, and Stone as Chair of the Executive Committee. Despite the many years of tenuous and adversarial tension among these three notable women, they continued communication throughout the years.

Stone was a pivotal player in the suffrage and abolition movements, yet does not hold the notoriety of others. Her work of exposing the inequality of marriage and the role of the

state in marriage remains relevant to the antiquated marriage legislation still enforced to this day.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Woman Suffrage in New Jersey: An Address Delivered by Lucy Stone, at a Hearing before the New Jersey Legislature, March 6th, 1867 (Boston, 1867).

"A Woman Suffrage Catechism," a pamphlet (Boston, 1888).

Hearing of the Woman Suffrage Association before the Committee on the Judiciary, Monday, January 18, 1892 [regarding] Woman Suffrage (Washington, D.C., 1892). Contains the addresses of Stone, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Isabella Beecher Hooker, and Susan B. Anthony.

"The Progress of Fifty Years," in *The Congress of Women: Held in the Woman's Building, World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago, U.S.A., 1893*, ed. Mary Eagle (Chicago, 1894), pp. 58–61.

Other Relevant Works

Stone's papers are at the Library of Congress and Harvard University.

Loving Warriors: Selected Letters of Lucy Stone and Henry B. Blackwell, 1853 to 1893, ed. Leslie Wheeler (Oberlin, Ohio, 1981).

Soul Mates: The Oberlin Correspondence of Lucy Stone and Antoinette Brown, 1846–1850, ed. Carol Lasser and Marlene Merrill (Oberlin, Ohio, 1983).

Friends and Sisters: Letters between Lucy Stone and Antoinette Brown Blackwell, 1846–1893, ed. Carol Lasser and Marlene Merrill (Urbana, Ill., 1987).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v29*

Blackwell, Alice Stone. *Lucy Stone: Pioneer Woman Suffragist* (Norwood, Mass., 1930).

Hays, Eliner Rice. *Morning Star: A Biography of Lucy Stone, 1818–1983* (New York, 1961).

Kerr, Andrea Moore. *Lucy Stone: Speaking Out for Equality* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1992).

Million, Joel. *Woman's Voice, Woman's Place: Lucy Stone and the Birth of the Woman's Rights Movement* (Westport, Conn., 2003).

Susanna Jones

STRATTON, George Malcolm
(1865–1957)

George M. Stratton was born on 26 September 1865 in Oakland, California, and died on 8 October 1957 in Berkeley, California. Stratton earned the BA in 1888 from the University of California, where he was strongly influenced by the philosopher George Holmes HOWISON, whose biography he co-authored in 1934. He earned his MA in philosophy from Yale University in 1890 and returned to the University of California at Berkeley as a philosophy fellow. Stratton married Alice Elenore Miller on 17 May 1894 and soon left for Leipzig to complete his PhD in psychology in 1896 under Wilhelm Wundt with a dissertation on pressure patterns on the skin.

In 1899 Stratton accepted a psychology appointment to the University of California to join Howison, and he became founder and director of the psychology laboratory. By 1904 he had achieved the rank of associate professor. He taught experimental psychology at Johns Hopkins University from 1904 to 1908. In 1908 he was President of the American Psychological Association and returned to the

University of California to establish the psychology department. He remained there as professor of experimental psychology until 1935.

During World War I he attained the rank of major, serving as president of the Army Aviation Examining Board in San Francisco in 1917 and working at the US Army Medical Research Laboratory in 1918. He was a member of the National Research Council during 1921–4, chairing its Division of Anthropology and Psychology in 1925–6; and was elected to the National Academy of Sciences in 1928.

Stratton is best remembered for the classic series of perception experiments in which he viewed the world with an upright retinal image, addressing issues related to retinal image inversion and the role of experience in space perception. He later published papers on pseudoscopic vision; stereoscopic acuity; eye movements, symmetry, and visual illusions; visual direction; and motion perception. He wrote extensive literature reviews on "monocular and stereoscopic depth perception, peripheral vision, eye movements and visual direction, spatial illusions, hemianopsia, Hillebrand's alley experiments, motion aftereffects, Poincaré's analysis of three-dimensional space, Wertheimer's experiments on apparent motion, afterimages, and Katz's colour studies" (Wade 2000, p. 255), and he enhanced the history of the psychology of perception with his superb translation of Theophrastus's *On the Senses* (1917).

Stratton also contributed significantly to the psychology of religion, using a variety of sacred texts as data. In *Psychology of the Religious Life* (1911), he presented a dynamic psychology in which religion results from efforts to grapple with such dichotomies as good and evil, activity and passivity, and humility and confidence. In *Anger: Its Religious and Moral Significance* (1923), Stratton distinguished among irate and martial religions, unangry religions, and religions of anger-supported love; and he provided fifteen principles for handling anger. Stratton's commitment to a higher reality, and his ongoing philosophical proclivities, were also evident in his lesser known works on social psychology, international relations, and problems of war and peace.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Some Preliminary Experiments on Vision without Inversion of the Retinal Image," *Psychological Review* 3 (1896): 611–17.

Experimental Psychology and Its Bearing upon Culture (New York, 1903).

Psychology of the Religious Life (London, 1911).

Theophrastus and the Greek Physiological Psychology before Aristotle (London, 1917).

Developing Mental Power (Boston, 1922).

Anger: Its Religious and Moral Significance (New York, 1923).

Social Psychology of International Conduct (New York and London, 1929).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with John Wright Buckham, *George Holmes Howison: A Selection from His Writings, with a Biographical Sketch* (Berkeley, Cal., 1934).

International Delusions (New York, 1936).

Man: Creator or Destroyer (London, 1952).

Further Reading

Bio Dict Psych by Zusne, *Encyc Psych*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v13*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*

Bridgman, Olga. "George Malcolm Stratton, 1865–1957," *American Journal of Psychology* 71 (1958): 460–61.

Tolman, Edward C. "George Malcolm Stratton," *National Academy of Sciences Biographical Memoirs*, vol. 35 (Washington, D.C., 1961), pp. 292–306.

Wade, Nicholas J. "An Upright Man," *Perception* 29 (2000): 253–7.

Hendrika Vande Kemp

STRAUSS, Leo (1899–1973)

Leo Strauss was born on 20 September 1899 in Kirchhain, Hesse, Germany. He served in the German army during World War I, and then studied philosophy at the universities of Marburg, Frankfurt, and Berlin before going to Hamburg to study with neo-Kantian Ernst Cassirer. He earned his PhD in philosophy in 1921, did postdoctoral study with Edmund Husserl, and encountered phenomenological and Nietzschean critiques of rationalism. While working as a research assistant at the Academy for Jewish Research in Berlin from 1925 to 1932, and traveling as a Rockefeller Fellow in the social sciences in France and Great Britain, Strauss published studies of Spinoza and Hobbes. His first book about his own conclusions was *Philosophy and Law* (1935), which announces his discovery, developed in subsequent works, of the superiority of Greek rationalism and the Socratic mission of civic criticism.

Strauss emigrated to the United States in 1938, becoming an associate professor of political and general philosophy at the New School for Social Research. He became a US citizen in 1944. From 1949 until 1967 he was professor of political philosophy at the University of Chicago, receiving the title of Robert Maynard Hutchins Distinguished Service Professor before he retired from Chicago as emeritus professor. In 1968–9 he was visiting professor of political science at Claremont Men's College in California, and from 1969 until his death he was Scott Buchanan Distinguished Scholar-in-Residence at St. John's College in Maryland. Strauss died on 18 October 1973 in Annapolis, Maryland.

Strauss struggled with the legacy of modern political theory, critical of its individualistic and atheistic excesses yet unable to recommend another system over liberal democracy. In *The Political Philosophy of Hobbes: Its Basis and Its Genesis* (1936) Hobbes is credited with formulating the primary features of modernity, including its hedonistic individualism and its

distance from the natural law tradition. *Natural Right and History* (1953) and *Liberalism, Ancient and Modern* (1968) similarly fault subjectivism and its rejection of natural right for destroying the possibility of virtue and civilization itself. Subjectivism, lacking any objective standards for morality or justice, is simply nihilism. For Strauss, the only alternative (seeing no hope in supernatural revelation) is to return philosophy's attention to the objective natural foundations of right and justice. This return to foundations would be a return to the classical conception of politics, presented in detail in *The City and Man* (1964) and *The Argument and Action of Plato's Laws* (1975), which pursued the art of producing human virtue within the social life. This pursuit entails, for Strauss, a rejection of the modern conception of politics as the means of maximizing personal liberty. Since happiness comes from virtue, and not freedom, modernism's appeal to the individual's own happiness is doubly confused and disastrous.

There is a human nature, primarily social for Strauss, and knowledge of it can be used to justly adjudicate the claims made by competing social, ethnic, and religious groups. The social sciences, caught up in the materialistic and positivistic attitude of the natural sciences, has only promulgated the fact/value dichotomy, resigned itself to historicist relativism, and abandoned the search for knowledge of the good life. The conviction that human beings are indefinitely flexible and malleable has become a dogma. A typical symptom of the social sciences' impotence is their disregard for the sort of education required for virtue; instead, the social sciences have considered education only insofar as it might be modified to maximize the efficient production of workers for capitalist society.

In *Persecution and the Art of Writing* (1952) and portions of *What Is Political Philosophy? and Other Studies* (1959) and other works, Strauss suggests that intellectuals who were unable to follow the prevailing political opinion of their day, and yet wished to write genuine political philosophy in criticism, often resorted

to misdirection, metaphor, and esoteric symbolism for expressing their views. The "useful myths" to maintain cohesive society, perpetuated by intellectual elites, remained an attractive option for Strauss (and his followers), although he himself pointed out that since Machiavelli, benevolent deception of the public is no longer a simple matter. Nevertheless, elites must rule, and to rule a democracy, an internal aristocracy will have to promote covertly the sorts of political truths that the masses would not tolerate.

Strauss's strong preference for classical political theory over modern liberalism was not unique during the twentieth century. George SANTAYANA, Walter LIPPMANN, and Yves SIMON, among others, were major thinkers who similarly had serious philosophical concerns about mass culture and popular democracy. Unlike them, however, Strauss led a large group of disciples and lived long enough to see their careers flourish. By the mid 1960s, Strauss had produced an able group of like-minded political scientists and philosophers, including Alan BLOOM, and has been credited with inspiring a neo-conservative movement that remains influential in US politics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Die religionskritik Spinozas als grundlage seiner Bibelwissenschaft: untersuchungen zu Spinozas Theologisch-politischem traktat (Berlin, 1930). Trans. E. M. Sinclair, *Spinoza's Critique of Religion* (New York, 1965).

Philosophie und gesetz: beiträge zum verständnis Maimunis und seiner vorläufer (Berlin, 1935). Trans. Eve Adler, *Philosophy and Law: Essays Toward the Understanding of Maimonides and His Predecessors* (Albany, N.Y., 1995).

The Political Philosophy of Hobbes: Its Basis and Its Genesis, trans. Elsa Sinclair (Oxford, 1936; Chicago, 1952).

On Tyranny: An Interpretation of Xenophon's "Hiero" (Glencoe, Ill., 1948; 2nd edn 1963).

Persecution and the Art of Writing (Glencoe, Ill., 1952).

Natural Right and History (Chicago, 1953).

Thoughts on Machiavelli (Glencoe, Ill., 1958).

What Is Political Philosophy? and Other Studies (Glencoe, Ill., 1959).

The City and Man (Chicago, 1964).

Socrates and Aristophanes (New York, 1966).

Jerusalem and Athens: Some Preliminary Reflections (New York, 1967).

Liberalism, Ancient and Modern (New York, 1968).

Xenophon's Socratic Discourse: An Interpretation of the Oeconomicus (Ithaca, N.Y., 1970).

Xenophon's Socrates (Ithaca, N.Y., 1972).

The Argument and Action of Plato's Laws (Chicago, 1975).

Political Philosophy: Six Essays, ed. Hilail Gilden (Indianapolis, 1975).

Studies in Platonic Political Philosophy (Chicago, 1983).

Other Relevant Works

Strauss's papers are at the University of Chicago.

Ed. with Milton C. Nahm, *Philosophical Essays, Ancient, Mediaeval, and Modern*, by Isaac Husik (Oxford, 1952).

Ed., *History of Political Philosophy* (Chicago, 1963; 2nd edn 1972).

The Rebirth of Classical Political Rationalism: An Introduction to the Thought of Leo Strauss, ed. Thomas L. Pangle (Chicago, 1989).

Faith and Political Philosophy: The Correspondence between Leo Strauss and Eric Voegelin, 1934–1964, ed. Peter Emberley and Barry Cooper (University Park, Penn., 1993).

Leo Strauss on Plato's Symposium, ed. Seth Benardete (Chicago, 2001).

Leo Strauss: The Early Writings, 1921–1932, ed. Michael Zank (Albany, N.Y., 2002).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Who Was Who in Amer v6*

Cropsey, Joseph, ed. *Ancients and Moderns: Essays on the Tradition of Political Philosophy in Honor of Leo Strauss* (New York, 1964).

Deutsch, Kenneth L., and Walter Soffer, eds. *The Crisis of Liberal Democracy: A Straussian Perspective* (Albany, N.Y., 1987).

Devigne, Robert. *Recasting Conservatism: Oakeshott, Strauss, and the Response to Postmodernism* (New Haven, Conn., 1994).

Drury, Shadia B. *The Political Ideas of Leo Strauss* (New York, 1988).

———, *Leo Strauss and the American Right* (New York, 1997).

McAllister, Ted V. *Revolt against Modernity: Leo Strauss, Eric Voegelin, and the Search for a Postliberal Order* (Lawrence, Kan., 1996).

Murley, John A. *Leo Strauss and His Legacy: A Biography* (Lanham, Md., 2005).

Murley, John A., and Kenneth L. Deutsch, eds. *Leo Strauss, the Straussians, and the American Regime* (Lanham, Md., 1999).

Orr, Susan. *Jerusalem and Athens: Reason and Revelation in the Work of Leo Strauss* (Lanham, Md., 1995).

John R. Shook

STROLL, Avrum (1921–)

Avrum Stroll was born on 15 February 1921 in Oakland, California. He received the BA in 1943, the MA in 1948, and the PhD in philosophy in 1951, all from the University of California at Berkeley. Stroll first taught philosophy at the University of Oregon in 1951–2, and then the University of British Columbia from 1952 to 1963. In 1963 he became professor of philosophy at the University of California, San Diego. He was All-University of California Lecturer in 1965 and a Guggenheim Fellow in 1973. He retired in 1991 and remained at UCSD as a research professor. In 1996 he received the Constantine Panunzio Emeriti Award.

Stroll's interests and work have concentrated on the philosophy of language, epistemology, and the history of twentieth-century analytic philosophy. In philosophy of language, his view is that most philosophical problems originate in non-technical contexts and involve subtle extensions and misuses of everyday speech. Though Stroll is not adverse to introducing technical terms in philosophy, he is adamant that these should be held to a minimum, and that virtually whatever can be said that is sensible can be said in ordinary language. His example-oriented approach to philosophical questions, as an alternative to theory building or to the quest for essences, is embodied in his *Sketches of Landscapes: Philosophy by Example* (1998). This work also contains an essay on the logic of examples, and provides a solution to the problem of fictional reference.

In epistemology, Stroll's contributions have focused on the nature of the external world, skepticism, knowledge and certainty, and the connection between language and reality. His *Moore and Wittgenstein on Certainty* has been, since its publication in 1994, a standard work of reference for scholars. It also constitutes one of Stroll's multi-pronged assaults on the bewitchment of philosophical skepticism.

In *Surfaces* (1988), Stroll conducts an investigation into how we organize (using the logic of ordinary speech) a conceptual model of the world whose components are surfaces, edges, margins, seams, and boundaries. This approach, never before attempted in philosophy, has generated a substantial literature on the ontology of boundaries. *Surfaces* is also an attack on *indirect* as well as *direct* theories of perception. Though Stroll agrees with J. J. GIBSON that we generally see things as they are,

he denies that this amounts to seeing them *directly*, and proposes his own "piecemeal realism" according to which our perception is only rarely and under special conditions to be described as *direct*. He holds that in normal cases objects are neither seen directly nor indirectly. In this, he deviates from the tradition of direct realism, and obviates the problems that come with it, including the idea that a *general* account of perception can explain all the possible ways that human beings see things.

Stroll's *Twentieth-Century Analytic Philosophy* (2000) contains biographical sketches of philosophers he has known personally, such as W. V. QUINE, Gilbert Ryle, and Ruth MARCUS, as well as evaluations of their work. Some of these sketches are autobiographical. Stroll believes that everyday language embeds an informal logic that is interesting in itself and has important implications for grappling with seemingly intractable philosophical problems.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Surfaces (Minneapolis, 1988).

Moore and Wittgenstein on Certainty (Oxford, 1994).

Sketches of Landscapes: Philosophy by Example (Cambridge, Mass., 1998).

Twentieth-Century Analytic Philosophy (New York, 2000).

Skeptical Philosophy for Everyone, with Richard H. Popkin (Amherst, N.Y., 2002).

Wittgenstein (Oxford, 2002).

Other Relevant Works

"Is Everyday Language Inconsistent?" *Mind* 63 (1954): 219–25.

"On 'The'," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 16 (1956): 496–504.

Introduction to Philosophy, with Richard H. Popkin (New York, 1961).

"Truth-Bearers, Propositions and the Problem of Universals," *Dialectica* 30 (1976): 17–34.

"What Water Is or Back to Thales," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 14 (1989): 258–74.

"Observation and the Hidden," *Dialectica* 45 (1991): 165–79.

"Proper Names, Names, and Fictive Objects," *Journal of Philosophy* 95 (1998): 522–34.

"Broadened Logic," *Topoi* 22 (2003): 93–104.

Further Reading

Bar-Hillel, Yehoshua. "Primary Truth-Bearers," *Dialectica* 27 (1973): 304–12.

Martinich, A. P., and M. J. White, eds. *Certainty and Surface in Epistemology and Philosophical Method: Essays in Honor of Avrum Stroll* (Lewiston, N.Y., 1991).

Danièle Moyal-Sharrock

STRONG, Charles Augustus (1862–1940)

Charles Augustus Strong was born on 28 November 1862 in Haverhill, Massachusetts. He was the eldest of six children of Augustus Hopkins Strong and Harriet Louise Savage. In 1865 the family moved to Cleveland, Ohio, where his father had been appointed pastor of the First Baptist Church. Over the next seven years the Strongs became closely acquainted with John D. Rockefeller and his family. In 1872 Strong's father was appointed President of the Rochester Theological Seminary and the family moved to Rochester, New York, his father's home town. Strong attended Phillips Exeter Academy from 1877 to 1880 before entering the University of Rochester. He spent his sophomore and junior year at the Gütersloh Gymnasium in Westphalia, Germany. In 1884 he received the BA degree from the University of Rochester.

In 1885 Strong received a second BA summa cum laude from Harvard University, where he studied with Josiah ROYCE and William JAMES. At Harvard he was also a classmate of George

SANTAYANA who remained a lifelong friend. Together with Santayana, Strong founded the Harvard Philosophical Club. The next year Strong spent at Rochester Theological Seminary, but his study of philosophy at Harvard had quenched his desire to become a minister like his father. Instead, Strong went to the University of Berlin in 1886 on a Walker Fellowship from Harvard, which he shared with Santayana. At Berlin he studied with Friedrich Paulsen.

Strong returned to the US in 1887. From 1887 until 1889 he was an instructor of psychology and philosophy at Cornell. In 1889 he married Elizabeth "Bessie" Rockefeller, the eldest daughter of John D. Rockefeller, and he returned to Europe where he spent a year at the University of Paris before becoming a docent at Clark University in 1890. He quickly went back to Europe to spend a year at the University of Freiburg. Returning to the US, Strong was an associate professor of psychology at the University of Chicago from 1892 to 1895. He then went to Columbia University, where he was a psychology lecturer until 1903 when he was promoted to professor of psychology. In 1910 Strong retired from teaching, because of his wife's share in the family fortune. They lived in Lakewood, New Jersey, but often spent long periods in Europe, mostly France and Italy, in part because of Elizabeth's poor health. Elizabeth Strong died in 1906, leaving Strong with a daughter, Margaret Strong de Cuevas. Around 1916 Strong developed a tumor in his lower spinal cord, which made walking increasingly difficult and which eventually confined him to a wheelchair. In 1919 the University of Rochester conferred the LLD upon him.

Throughout his life, Strong was deeply interested in the origin of mind in the universe, a question which he connected with issues in epistemology, metaphysics, and physiology. In his first book, *Why the Mind Has a Body* (1903), he defended a panpsychism, to which he was introduced by Paulsen. According to Strong, the bodiliness of things is a product of perception which makes them appear to us as material. Strong believed that his monistic doctrine allowed him to resolve the problems of contemporary dualistic theories.

After *Why the Mind Has a Body* was published, Strong continued to spend more and more time in Europe. After his wife's death, he settled in Fiesole, Italy, where he built Villa Le Balze, a long, slender house adjoining the Villa Medici and close to Bernard BERENSON's mansion I Tatti. While he continued to write philosophy, he also spent time writing fables, which were published as *The Wisdom of the Beasts* (1921). During this period Strong further developed his panpsychism, moving, under the influence of Santayana, toward critical realism. Firmly rejecting what he called the fallacy of new realism, on which the phenomenal was identified with the real, Strong held that perception involves not two but three elements: the subject, the object, and the form in which the object appears to the subject. To describe the third, Strong utilized Santayana's concept of "essence." The critical realist Durant DRAKE accepted and advocated Strong's views and Strong contributed a piece to *Essays in Critical Realism* (1920), which included essays by Drake, Santayana, A. O. LOVEJOY, and others. Strong developed this critical–realist panpsychist view in several books: *The Origin of Consciousness* (1918), *A Theory of Knowledge* (1923), *Essays on the Natural Origin of the Mind* (1930), and *A Creed for Skeptics* (1936). Though deeply influenced by James's views on consciousness and cognition, Strong rejected James's pragmatism, his indeterminism, his will-to-believe argument, and the phenomenological side of his radical empiricism.

In his final years, Strong was largely isolated, spending most of his time in his library behind his typewriter. Although he continued to be in frequent contact with Santayana in Rome (the letters are in Santayana's published correspondence), he had few intellectual colleagues among his friends. He died on 25 January 1940 in the nursing home of the Blue Nuns in Fiesole, Italy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Why the Mind Has a Body (New York, 1903).

Leib und Seele: Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Professor Stumpf (Leipzig, 1904).

"The Nature of Consciousness," *Journal of Philosophy* 9 (1912): 533–44, 561–73, 589–603.

The Origin of Consciousness: An Attempt to Conceive the Mind as a Product of Evolution (London, 1918).

"On the Nature of the Datum," in *Essays in Critical Realism* (New York, 1920), pp. 223–44.

A Theory of Knowledge (New York, 1923).

Essays on the Natural Origin of the Mind (London, 1930).

A Creed for Skeptics (London, 1936).

Other Relevant Works

Strong's papers are at Rockefeller University, New York.

The Wisdom of the Beasts (Boston, 1921).

"Nature and Mind," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 2, pp. 313–29.

"Final Observations," *Journal of Philosophy* 24 (1941): 233–43.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v31*, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v50*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Calvert, Ernest R. *The Panpsychism of James Ward and Charles A. Strong*. PhD dissertation, Boston University (Boston, 1942).

Perry, Ralph B. *The Thought and Character of William James* (Boston, 1935), vol. 2.

Cornelis de Waal

STRONG, Josiah (1847–1916)

Josiah Strong was born on 19 January 1847 in Naperville, Illinois, the son of Josiah and Elizabeth Clough (Webster) Strong. Like many Congregationalist leaders of his generation, he was part of America's "New England Diaspora" and claimed descent from seventeenth-century Puritans. His earliest American forebear was Elder John Strong, an English Calvinist who settled in Massachusetts in 1630. At the age of five, Josiah Strong was moved by his family to Hudson, Ohio, the very heart of the Old Connecticut "Western Reserve," a bit of New England transplanted to the Midwest. There in 1869 Strong received his BA from Western Reserve College. For two years (1869–71) Strong attended Lane Theological Seminary in Cincinnati, Ohio, an institution earlier made famous by the presidency of Lyman Beecher, the father of the famed Henry Ward BEECHER, and a school also noted for the residence there of distinguished biblical scholar Calvin Ellis Stowe and his literary wife, Harriet Beecher Stowe, author of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. On 29 August 1871 Strong married Alice Bisbee in Chardon, Ohio. That year, having been ordained to the Congregational ministry, he accepted a missionary pastorate in Cheyenne, Wyoming, from 1871 to 1873. Though Strong did well, he was not happy in the West, returning east to seek his "proper place."

For the next two decades, although Strong was "everywhere successful" he was "nowhere satisfied," rapidly changing positions. From 1873 to 1876 he was an academic, serving as an instructor in theology and chaplain at Western Reserve College. He was a parish minister from 1876 to 1881 serving a Congregational church in Sandusky, Ohio. Administration appealed next; from 1881 to 1884 Strong was Secretary of the Congregational Churches Home Missionary Society for Kentucky, West Virginia, Western Pennsylvania, and Ohio. For two years, from 1884 to 1886, Strong once more returned to the pulpit, ministering for the Central

Congregational Church of Cincinnati. His outer and inner turmoil ended only because of the success of what proved to be his most famous book, *Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis* (1885). This volume made Strong a national figure. With its subsequent translation into many Asian and Western languages, Strong's reputation was established. As a "prophet of social justice" Strong had found his niche, one that occupied his energies until his death on 28 April 1916 in New York City.

Our Country was "the right book" at "the right time." It resonated powerfully with the general reading public because it appealed to sources that commanded respect; it captured the mood of America at that moment; and it prescribed answers that promised "to work." *Our Country* borrowed richly from a variety of "venerable traditions" within the American mind. From Puritanism came the twin convictions of divine sovereignty (God "rules and over-rules" all) and human accountability (grace enables one "to do good"). From evangelicalism, as evidenced in the First and Second Great Awakenings, came a persuasion as to the reliability of Scripture (as a "recipe" for a righteous society) and the centrality of Jesus (now "Friend" as well as "Master"). From the Enlightenment came a hope for the perfectibility of individuals and institutions, a trust in the validity of the sciences (especially, by the 1880s, a confidence in the power of the social sciences), and a confidence in the future (the "Golden Age" was yet to be and the "Kingdom of God" was possible both on the island of Manhattan and in Manhattan, Kansas). From nineteenth-century liberalism came the belief that democracy, by "empowering the people," results in community amelioration of evils; from nationalism derived a "purified" version of "manifest destiny," that the United States was not only "a city set on a hill," but a "missionary leaven" to transform the earth; and from industrialism, made possible by the genesis of technology, grew the assertion of "progress."

These "legacies" were united by Strong with contemporary currents in American philosophy. From personalism (advocated by Borden Parker BOWNE of Boston) came ingredients that were "metaphysical," "rational," "mystical," "ethical," and "strongly eschatological," with the passion for "the free cooperation of different distinct individual persons in a common process." From idealism, both of the "village market variety" of Ralph Waldo EMERSON and of the "lecture hall stripe" of Josiah ROYCE, Strong grasped a profound spirituality, that "the very rhythm of the universe" is "sympathetic to our aspirations." From the pragmatism of William JAMES came a "can do" mentality and a "trust in consequences." Finally, Strong had a kinship with the social gospel theology of Washington GLADDEN and Walter RAUSCHENBUSCH.

Our Country captured the mood of an America on the very "cusp" of two generations. Strong became "a John the Baptist of the Progressive Movement." Like the Progressives, Strong grew up "under the spell of New England" and with them he was a professional (lawyers, educators, writers, and ministers predominated), who was urban (not rural), Northern and Eastern (not Southern or Western), middle class (not working class, like the populists), and of liberal religious views (Reform Judaism, Congregationalism, Unitarianism). With them he sought – in the words of Herbert CROLY in the title of his 1909 book – *The Promise of American Life*. That "promise" seemed imperiled by historian Frederick Jackson Turner's 1890 prediction of the "passing of the frontier." The creation of vast metropolitan centers, as Jacob Riis indicated in *How the Other Half Lives* (1890), generated enormous challenges for society. The vast concentration of wealth under acquisitive capitalism meant – as Henry GEORGE noted – *Progress and Poverty* (1879), and led many to envision the utopian socialist alternative of Edward BELLAMY's novel *Looking Backward* (1888). Imperialism – or the projection of American economic, political, and cultural power around the world – was now possible, said naval historian Alfred Thayer Mahan in his impressive

study, *The Influence of Sea Power* (1890). Like the progressives, Strong – a young man (he was only thirty-eight when *Our Country* was published) – was part of the anxiety and the optimism of his era. For him, as for many, it was an open question as to whether it would be America's "dimmest" or "brightest" hour.

Our Country, as "self-help philosophy" in a popular mode, prescribed procedures by which America could solve the "current crisis" and become the premier power of the future. Seven crises needed resolution. Two were religious – the rise of Roman Catholicism and Mormonism – both of which were to be eclipsed by liberal evangelical Protestantism. Two were moral – the rise of "oligarchy" (or "plutocracy," the power of opulence at the cost of the deprivation of the masses) and substance abuse ("alcoholism") – and these would be transfigured by the energy of the Gospel. Three were social – the need for the Americanization of the immigrants, the civilization of the cities, and the Christianization of Socialism. These needs could be resolved by a combination of intelligence and benevolence. Once these "stumbling blocks" became "stepping stones," the "Anglo-Saxons" would hold sway in the twentieth century as the Romans had ruled antiquity.

Strong's subsequent career as an author, editor, minister, sociologist, and philosopher was largely derived from his work in *Our Country*. In *The New Era* (1893) Strong advocated "the Kingdom of God as an ideal society, now, on earth." An ecumenical (Protestant) church would target industrial justice and social welfare. Active in the Evangelical Alliance from 1886 to 1898, Strong convened three conferences on the Social Gospel. Feeling the Alliance to be too conservative, Strong started the League for Social Service (renamed in 1902 as the American Institute for Social Service). Beginning in 1908, Strong edited *Social Progress* (a yearbook) and the magazine *Gospel of the Kingdom*. His many titles indicated his indefatigable energy and catholicity of interest. At the time of his death, he completed the first two books in a projected four

volume series: *Our World: The New World Life* (1913) and *Our World: The New World Religion* (1915). With a body aged terribly by severe illness, Strong died at seventy, an avid advocate of American expansion and social reform.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis (New York, 1885).

The New Era (New York, 1893).

The Twentieth Century City (New York, 1898).

Religious Movements for Social Betterment (New York, 1900).

Expansion Under New World Conditions (New York, 1900).

The Times and Young Men (New York, 1901).

The Next Great Awakening (New York, 1902).

The Challenge of the City (New York, 1907).

My Religion in Everyday Life (New York, 1910).

Our World: The New World Life (New York, 1913).

Our World: The New World Religion (New York, 1915).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Religious Bio, Encyc Amer Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v9, Who Was Who in Amer v1

May, Henry F. *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* (New York, 1949).

Meyer, P. R. "The Fear of Cultural Decline: Josiah Strong's Thoughts About Reform and Expansion," *Church History* 42 (1973): 396–405.

Muller, Dorothea R. *Josiah Strong and the Challenge of the City*. PhD dissertation, New York University (New York, 1955).

———, "The Social Philosophy of Josiah Strong: Social Christianity and American

Progressivism," *Journal of Church History* 28 (June 1959): 183–201.

Schaller, Lyle E. *Planning for Protestantism in Urban America* (Nashville, Tenn., 1965).

Weisenburger, Francis P. *Ordeal of Faith: The Crisis of Church-going America, 1865–1900* (New York, 1959).

Charles George Fry

STROUD, Barry (1935–)

Barry Stroud was born on 18 May 1935 in Toronto, Canada. He received his BA from the University of Toronto and his PhD from Harvard University in 1962. He joined the philosophy department at the University of California at Berkeley in 1961, where he has been full professor since 1974, and is presently Mills Professor of Metaphysics and Epistemology. He was President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1995–6; a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; and a Corresponding Fellow of the British Academy. As a visiting fellow of New College and All Souls College, he delivered the John Locke Lectures at the University of Oxford in 1986–7.

Stroud is a noted Hume scholar, and a leading contemporary epistemologist. He has also written influentially on Wittgenstein, modality, and issues in metaphysics and the philosophy of mind and language. His first book, *Hume* (1977), which won the Matchette Prize, argued for a naturalistic reading of Hume against reading him as a radical skeptic, contributing to a significant re-evaluation of Hume's philosophy.

Influenced by Ludwig Wittgenstein and J. L. Austin, a central concern of Stroud's work is the relation of everyday life to philosophical inquiry, especially the danger of distortion that lies in our attempt in philosophical inquiry to reach a general understanding of ourselves and our place in the natural world. This is the central theme of both *The Significance of Philosophical Skepticism* (1984) and *The Quest for Reality* (2000). The first book is concerned with the sources of the problem of our knowledge of the external world: "how the problem arises and how it acquires that special character that makes an unsatisfactory negative answer inevitable" (1984, p. 1). The problem lies in the conception of our access to objective reality as epistemically mediated by "ideas" or "appearances," a conception which seems itself to be presupposed by the project of understanding human knowledge in general.

The Quest for Reality is concerned with the general philosophical project of uncovering the nature of reality, how things are as opposed to how they appear – the conception of reality underlying the problem of the external world – with the investigation of the reality of color as a case study. Its central question is "how we arrive at a determinate conception of an independent reality out of everything we believe to be so before any philosophical reflection begins" (p. 20). The idea of a reality absolutely independent of us presupposes that we can discover that our pre-reflective beliefs about the world are, in some respects, fundamentally misleading. This requires that we give an "unmasking explanation" of our mistaken beliefs, about, for example, color, which shows how we come to have them in terms of other things we believe about how the world really is.

Stroud argues that, for the case of the unreality of color, we cannot both identify the beliefs and perceptions that we wish to explain and deny in general the reality of color. If the lesson generalizes, a central project of philosophy cannot be carried out. We cannot start out with ordinary beliefs and perceptions and show that we are in fundamental ways mistaken about the nature of the world. This would not show that we were not mistaken, but only that we could not coherently come to that conclu-

sion. Stroud's work represents perhaps the most searching examination of the nature and limits of philosophical inquiry in contemporary philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Hume (London, 1977).
The Significance of Philosophical Scepticism (Oxford, 1984).
Meaning, Understanding, and Practice: Philosophical Essays (Oxford, 2000).
The Quest for Reality: Subjectivism and the Metaphysics of Colour (Oxford, 2000).
Understanding Human Knowledge: Philosophical Essays (Oxford, 2000).

Other Relevant Works
"The Significance of Naturalized Epistemology," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 6 (1981): 455–71.
"Kant and Skepticism," in *The Skeptical Tradition*, ed. M. F. Burnyeat (Berkeley, Cal., 1983).
"The Physical World," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 87 (1987): 263–77.
"The Study of Human Nature and the Subjectivity of Value," in *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, vol. 10, ed. G. Peterson (Salt Lake City, Utah, 1989), pp. 213–59.
"Hume's Scepticism: Natural Instincts and Philosophical Reflection," *Philosophical Topics* 19 (1991): 271–91.
"Ayer's Hume," in *The Philosophy of A. J. Ayer*, ed. Lewis Haln (Chicago, 1992), pp. 609–31.
"The Charm of Naturalism," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 70 (November 1996): 43–55.
"Unpurged Pyrrhonism," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 57 (1996): 411–6.
"Practical Reasoning," in *Reasoning Practically*, ed. E. Ullmann-Margalit (Oxford, 1999), pp. 27–38.
"The 'Unity of Cognition' and the Explanation of Mathematical Knowledge," *Philosophical Topics* 29 (2001): 415–28.
"Explaining the Quest and Its Prospects: Reply to Boghossian and Byrne," *Philosophical Studies* 108 (2002): 239–47.
"Sense-Experience and the Grounding of Thought," in *Reading McDowell: On Mind and World*, ed. N. H. Smith (London, 2002), pp. 79–91.
"Anti-individualism and Scepticism," in *Reflections and Replies: Essays on the Philosophy of Tyler Burge*, ed. Martin Hahn and Bjørn Ramberg (Cambridge, Mass., 2003).
"Perceptual Knowledge and Epistemological Satisfaction," in *Ernest Sosa and His Critics*, ed. John Greco (Oxford, 2004).

Further Reading
Oxford Comp Phil, *Pres Addr of APA v10*
Gibson, Roger F. "Stroud on Naturalized Epistemology," *Metaphilosophy* 20 (1989): 1–11.
Heil, John. "Doubts about Skepticism," *Philosophical Studies* 51 (1987): 1–17.
Putnam, Hilary. "Skepticism, Stroud and the Contextuality of Knowledge," *Philosophical Explorations* 4 (2001): 2–16.
Quine, W. V. "Reply to Stroud's 'The Significance of Naturalized Epistemology'," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 6 (1981): 473–5.
"Symposium on *The Quest for Reality*," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 68 (2004): 384–442.
Tennant, Neil. "In Defense of Evolutionary Epistemology," *Theoria* 49 (1983): 32–48.

Kirk Ludwig

STUART, Henry Waldgrave (1870–1951)

Henry W. Stuart was born on 1 December 1870 in Oakland, California. Stuart attended the University of California at Berkeley, receiving his BA in 1893. He did his graduate work at the University of Chicago, beginning with a fellowship in economics. He completed the PhD in philosophy in 1900. Stuart's dissertation, "Valuation as a Logical Process," published some years later (1903), discussed the term "object" in relation to the objectivity of judgments in ethics and economics. He argued that valuation determines rather than recognizes values, and that values are always subject to reappraisal. Stuart did postgraduate studies at the University of Munich in 1914–15.

After holding philosophy positions at the University of Iowa from 1901 to 1904, and Lake Forest College from 1904 to 1907, Stuart founded the philosophy department at Stanford University in 1907. He attained the rank of full professor in 1909 and headed the department until his retirement in 1936. He also lectured at Washington University, Ripon College, University of Chicago, and the University of Washington. In 1925–6, Stuart was President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association.

Stuart was heavily influenced by Charles PEIRCE. Although his early work on valuation was hailed by John DEWEY for carefully distinguishing economic from moral judgments, Stuart criticized Dewey's theory of moral judgment as reductionistic and insufficiently rigorous. In his *Philosophical Review* articles on consciousness and experience he echoed Dewey's phenomenological approach. Stuart's pragmatic approach to values in economics anticipates the similar efforts of Clarence AYRES. Stuart's teaching strengths were Kant and Hegel, and he had a reputation as an outstanding teacher. A chair in philosophy at Stanford was endowed in Stuart's name after his death on 22 September 1951 in Carmel, California.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Valuation as a Logical Process," in *Studies in Logical Theory*, by John Dewey et al. (Chicago, 1903), pp. 227–340.
"The Logic of Self-Realization," in *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 1 (1904), pp. 175–205.
"A Reversal of Perspective in Ethical Theory," *Philosophical Review* 29 (1920): 340–54.
"Knowledge and Self-Consciousness," *Philosophical Review* 44 (1937): 609–43.
"The Metaphysics of Experience," *Philosophical Review* 45 (1938): 420–33.
"The Phases of Economic Interest," in *Creative Intelligence: Essays in the Pragmatic Attitude* (New York, 1917), pp. 282–353.

Other Relevant Works
"Subjective and Exchange Value," *Journal of Political Economy* 4 (1896): 208–39, 352–85.
"The Need of a Logic of Conduct," *Journal of Philosophy* 1 (1904): 344–50.
Liberal and Vocational Studies in the College (Palo Alto, Cal., 1918).
"Dewey's Ethical Theory," in *The Philosophy of John Dewey*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (Chicago, 1939), pp. 291–334.

Further Reading
Nat Cycl Amer Bio v41, Pres Addr of APA v3, Who Was Who in Amer v5, Who's Who in Phil

Steven Fesmire
Heather E. Keith

STUMPF, Samuel Enoch (1918–98)

Samuel Stumpf was born on 3 February 1918 in Cleveland, Ohio, to Hungarian immigrants

Louis and Elizabeth Jergens Stumpf. His father was a Baptist minister, and after earning his BS in business and finance from the University of California at Los Angeles in 1940, Stumpf decided also to prepare for the ministry. He received his BD in 1943 from Andover-Newton Theological Seminary in Massachusetts, and served during World War II as a navy chaplain stationed at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. After the war he did graduate study at Columbia University in 1946 and then transferred to the University of Chicago, where he received a PhD in religion in 1948. His dissertation was titled "Emil Brunner's Doctrine of Law: A Study in the Theology of Law."

In 1948 Stumpf was appointed to the faculty of Vanderbilt University's Divinity School as an assistant professor of historical theology, and in 1949 his appointment in the Divinity School changed to associate professor of ethics. He was promoted to full professor in 1952, when he became chair of the newly independent philosophy department and changed his title to professor of philosophy. The former department of philosophy and psychology, led for decades by Herbert C. SANBORN, also had contained philosophers Eugene Bugg, Christopher Salmon, and Arthur SMULLYAN, who were now united under Stumpf's leadership as chair for fifteen years until 1967. With the hiring of John COMPTON, Donald SHERBURNE, John LACHS, and others during this period, Stumpf realized his vision of establishing a genuinely pluralistic department with representatives of many philosophical traditions and fields. In 1960 the philosophy department began its graduate program, and Stumpf's administrative abilities led to further university responsibilities, including service as assistant to the Chancellor in 1966–7.

Stumpf became President of Cornell College in Iowa in 1967 and served until 1974, when he returned to Vanderbilt with joint appointments in the Law School (as research professor of jurisprudence from 1974 to 1977 and professor of law from 1977 to 1984) and the Medical School (as research professor of medical phi-

losophy from 1974 to 1984). Having served on four separate faculties (Divinity, College of Arts and Sciences, Law, and Medicine), Stumpf was a pioneer of interdisciplinary philosophy and an early example to the wider community of philosophers in social theory and applied ethics. He served on panels and committees of numerous philosophical and national organizations, including the American Philosophical Association, the American Council on Legal and Political Philosophy, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, the Association of American Colleges, the National Academy of Sciences, the American Council of Physicians, the Food Safety Council, the Food and Drug Law Institute, and the Nutrition Foundation. He retired in 1984 and lived in Nashville, Tennessee until his death on 16 April 1998.

Stumpf's work ranges across many philosophical fields. Many of his writings focus on the complex relationships between religion, morality, and law in modern democracy. *A Democratic Manifesto* (1954) offers a reply to Marx's communist manifesto. *Morality and the Law* (1966) defends the view that the concept of law must include reference to society's morality, against the more positivistic view that law can be defined as the expression of sovereign authority backed by force. Democratic societies rightly resist laws that lack sufficient moral justification, according to Stumpf. His review of prominent Supreme Court decisions and the evolution of international law exposes the role of moral elements in judicial decisions and international relations as well.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Democratic Manifesto: The Impact of Dynamic Christianity upon Public Life and Government (Nashville, Tenn., 1954).

Morality and the Law (Nashville, Tenn., 1966).

Socrates to Sartre: A History of Philosophy (New York, 1966; 7th edn 2002).

Elements of Philosophy: An Introduction (New York, 1979).

Other Relevant Works
"The Moral Element in Supreme Court Decisions," *Vanderbilt Law Review* 6 (December 1952): 41–65.
"Maximum and Minimum Theories of Natural Law," in *Religion and the Public Order* (Chicago, 1966).
"Some Moral Dimensions of Medicine," *Annals of Internal Medicine* 67 (February 1966): 460–70.
"Momentum and Morality in Medicine," *Annals of Internal Medicine* 67 (September 1967), part 2: 10–14.
"The Moral Order and the Legal Order," in *The Concept of Order*, ed. Paul G. Kuntz (Seattle, 1968).
Ed., *Philosophical Problems* (New York, 1972; 2nd edn 1982; 3rd edn 1989).
"Genetics and the Control of Human Development: Some Ethical Considerations," in *A Matter of Life and Death: Christian Perspectives*, ed. Harry N. Hollis (Nashville, Tenn., 1977), pp. 114–28.
"Moral and Legal Dimensions of the World's Food Supply," *Annual Review of Nutrition* 1 (1981): 1–26.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v72, Who Was Who in Amer v13

John R. Shook

SULLIVAN, Harry Stack (1892–1949)

Harry Stack Sullivan was born on 21 February 1892 in Norwich, New York. At age sixteen he graduated as valedictorian from Smyrna High School and entered Cornell University on scholarship. Though he intended to major in physics, academic failures forced him to leave the university in January 1909. Sullivan decided not to return to Cornell and instead in the fall of 1911 enrolled in the Chicago College of Medicine and Surgery. In 1917 he received the MD and joined the US Army's Medical Corps. At the conclusion of World War I, he began working with veterans suffering from psychological trauma at St. Elizabeth's Hospital in Washington, D.C. There he was greatly influenced by William Alanson White, who strongly supported the theories proposed by Sigmund Freud.

In 1923 Sullivan moved to Enoch Pratt Hospital in Baltimore, where he remained until his death. Beginning in 1939 he assisted in establishing psychiatric standards for the Selective Service System. In 1948 he participated in a UNESCO study on the tensions that cause wars. He also assisted in the development of the Washington School of Psychiatry in Washington, D.C., and the William Alanson White Institute in New York, and the creation of the journal *Psychiatry*. After attending a meeting of the World Federation for Mental Health in Amsterdam, Sullivan died on 14 January 1949 in Paris, France.

Sullivan is best known for his synthesizing of two important human sciences: sociology and psychology. His belief that we are naturally social beings shaped by our relationships led him to develop the theory of interpersonal relations. This also led to his concept of significant social stages of sexual development. Though he was influenced by the psychoanalysis of Freud, Sullivan believed that ultimately this theory failed to recognize the humanity of the patient. As a result he rejected the practical use of Freud in psychiatry. He was also critical of Kraepelinian psychiatry, which emphasized diagnostic categories. He did not feel that descriptive psychiatry was capable of establishing how mental illness develops, nor was it capable of treating patients as social beings. He believed early mental injury could be modified by any significant personal encounter, which inspired his therapeutic interpersonal psychiatry.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Psychiatry: Introduction to the Study of Interpersonal Relations," *Psychiatry* 1 (1938): 121–34.

"Therapeutic Investigation in Schizophrenia," *Psychiatry* 10 (1947): 121–5.

Conceptions of Modern Psychiatry (New York, 1947; 2nd edn 1953).

"The Theory of Anxiety and the Nature of Psycho Therapy," *Psychiatry* 12 (1949): 3–12.

"The Illusion of Personal Individuality," *Psychiatry* 13 (1950): 317–32.

The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry, ed. Perry Gawel and Mary Gawel (New York, 1953).

The Psychiatric Interview, ed. Perry Gawel and Mary Gawel (New York, 1954) .

The Collected Works of Harry Stack Sullivan, M.D., 2 vols, ed. Helen Perry et al. (New York, 1953).

Clinical Studies in Psychiatry, ed. Helen Perry, Mary Gawel, and Martha Gibbon (New York, 1956).

Schizophrenia as a Human Process (New York, 1962).

The Fusion of Psychiatry and Social Science (New York, 1964).

Other Relevant Works

Personal Psychopathology: Early Formulations, ed. Helen Perry et al. (New York, 1972).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Bio Dict Psych by Zusne*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*

Chapman, A. H. *Harry Stack Sullivan: His Life and His Work* (New York, 1976).

Evans, F. Barton. *Harry Stack Sullivan: Interpersonal Theory and Psychotherapy* (London and New York, 1996).

Mullahy, Patrick. *Psychoanalysis and Interpersonal Psychiatry: The Contributions of Harry Stack Sullivan* (New York, 1970).

Mullahy, Patrick, ed. *The Contributions of Harry Stack Sullivan: A Symposium on Interpersonal Theory in Psychiatry and Social Science* (New York, 1952).

Perry, Helen Swick. *Psychiatrist of America: The Life of Harry Stack Sullivan* (Cambridge, Mass., 1982).

John William Bates V

SUMNER, William Graham (1840–1910)

William Graham Sumner was born on 30 October 1840 in Paterson, New Jersey. He grew up in Hartford, Connecticut, a first-generation son of working-class English immigrants. He graduated from Yale College in 1863, and continued his studies at Oxford University in England and at the University of Göttingen in Germany. Sumner studied for the ministry after graduating from Yale, was a tutor from 1866 through 1869, and eventually became an Episcopal priest (Episcopalian curate) in 1867. His tenure in the Episcopal Church, however, was short-lived. He was appointed professor of political and social science at Yale in 1872 and remained there until retiring in 1909. He died on 12 April 1910 in Englewood, New Jersey.

Sumner's reasons for leaving the ministry arose from his intellectual desire to engage in political, economic, and social issues rather than preach on theological topics. He carried over his sermonizing style and dogmatic passions into the social sciences. His popularity and renown as an inspirational teacher earned him the reputation of being one of the most influential figures at Yale during this period.

Sumner is perhaps best known for his Social Darwinism and his uncompromising

laissez-faire approach to political economy. These two theoretical points of reference did not constitute distinct spheres of human action for Sumner, but rather represented parallel principles of social and political action. He insisted on integrating the Darwinian notion of the "survival of the fittest" with liberal economic ideas of a minimalist state and economic individualism. The state was to play a minimal role in the affairs of free and "acquisitive" individuals. Sumner's political and economic individualism was as much a social philosophy as it was a moral tenet. Human history clearly demonstrated the inherent inequalities among all human beings, and therefore to advocate the extension of state intervention in the interest of redressing differentiated social conditions was morally wrong; it interfered with the natural progress of human social existence and ultimately did more harm than good. The state, however, did play a "positive" role in the interactions of individuals. For Sumner, the primary function of government was to preserve individual liberty and maintain order. Governmental intervention was to be limited to guaranteeing the rights of individuals independently to pursue harmony, peace, and happiness, given their innate abilities and gifts.

To a large degree, Sumner was a product of his time. The Industrial Revolution of the late nineteenth century gave rise to increased population densities (primarily immigrants from Europe) in many urban centers. The concern for growing populations, public health, and a shifting economy heightened the anxieties of many in the middle and upper-class ranks of society. Sumner's concern was primarily academic, but the concrete implications of intellectual discourse and debate during this period could not be ignored. He advocated a Malthusian perspective and went so far as to suggest, "… certain classes of troublesome and bewildered persons … that would have been better for society and would have involved no pain to them, if they had never

been born" (1963, p. 25). At this same period, Social Darwinism was at its peak, and the influence of British philosopher Herbert Spencer was clearly present in Sumner's work. The struggle for existence, according to Social Darwinists, provided the conditions that brought about human progress. Human competition and the resulting benefits of those who faired better in socioeconomic terms was simply a natural outcome of the human struggle against nature. Put differently, the degree to which social, political, and economic capital provided the necessary means for winning this battle of survival, the better or worse off individuals were relative to their ability to take advantage of such means.

Sumner expressed his Social Darwinism in no uncertain terms in *What Social Classes Owe to Each Other* (1883). Against proponents of the welfare state who advocated governmental action to assist the poor at the expense primarily of the middle class, Sumner argued that such redistribution of wealth is immoral and unnatural. Sumner believed the middle class (the "Forgotten Man") would be given the undue burden of ameliorating a set of conditions that it did not cause. It would harm society to place such an onerous task on a social group that provides society with its most important assets for the benefit of a group whose inferiority marks them as a social liability. As Sumner argued: "It's the 'Forgotten Man' who is threatened by over extension of the paternal theory of government. It is he who must work and pay. When, therefore, the statesman and social philosophers sit down to think what the State can or ought to do, they really mean to decide what the Forgotten Man shall do." (1883, p. 150)

Sumner's most recognized work, *Folkways* (1906), is an explanation of what Sumner characterizes as the habitual and instinctual tendencies of groups to follow certain behavioral patterns, i.e., social norms. As the subtitle of the book indicates, *Folkways* is "a study of the sociological importance of

usages, manners, customs, mores, and morals." Again, we find Sumner calling attention to the presence of innate characteristics and processes undergirding the beliefs, practices, and traditions of human societies. Ironically, these so-called innate features (habits) reveal themselves in distinct ways, i.e., relative to local groups. Sumner did not hold to a universal conception of "folkways." Rather, social actors within the context of group influence and authority have certain needs in relation to the everyday conditions of life, and these needs produce "… interests under the heads of hunger, love, vanity, and fear" (1906, p. 30), which are specific to the group. Nevertheless, needs in relation to "life conditions" are universal as a function of human survival, but how these needs are satisfied depends upon "the specific character of a society or a period" (p. 59), what Sumner calls "mores."

Mores, like folkways, are particular ways in which a society conducts itself via values and norms, which serve the function of satisfying various human needs and desires. The distinction between "folkways" and "mores" depends upon the type and severity of sanctions involved when violating social norms. Folkways constitute weaker sanctions for their violation due to their less significant normative status (such as eating with the wrong fork) while mores constitute stronger sanctions for their violation due to their more significant normative status (such as robbing a bank). The reason for this difference, according to Sumner, depends upon the degree to which specific norms and values become elevated consciously in society and thus regarded as essential to the well-being of the group. Such values and norms having endured over generations demonstrate, as a result, their selective advantage in the fact that the social group survives; accordingly, mores act as the "engine of social selection" (p. 521). Despite the circularity of Sumner's argument and the rather entrenched or fixed nature of mores, the idea that social mores

serve particular roles relative to particular groups under particular conditions, anticipated the focus of contemporary ethnographic research to understand and explain the locally produced character of sociocultural beliefs and practices and their differences cross-culturally.

It is difficult to contend that Sumner served as a precursor to contemporary ethnographic research, but his work on the normative underpinnings of social groups did serve to highlight an ethnographic and comparative method that was not widely recognized among American social scientists. His most important contributions remain in the realm of social philosophy. He is often described as America's counterpart to Britain's Herbert Spencer. His Social Darwinism and uncompromising laissez-faire approach to political economy made him a controversial figure throughout his career. Sumner represented the most influential voice for the social-evolutionary perspective in the American academy during this period and continues to be a controversial figure today.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Sociology," *Princeton Review* 2 (1881): 303–23.

What Social Classes Owe to Each Other (New York, 1883).

"Sociological Fallacies," *North American Review* 138 (1884): 574–9.

"The Survival of the Fittest," *Index* 4 (1884): 603–4.

"State Interference," *North American Review* 145 (1887): 109–19.

Folkways: A Study of the Sociological Importance of Usages, Manners, Customs, Mores, and Morals (Boston, 1906).

War, and Other Essays, ed. Albert Keller (New Haven, Conn., 1911).

Earth-hunger and Other Essays, ed. Albert Keller (New Haven, Conn., 1913).

The Challenge of Facts, and Other Essays, ed. Albert Keller (New Haven, Conn.,

1914).

The Forgotten Man, and Other Essays, ed.
Albert Keller (New Haven, Conn., 1918).

The Science of Society, with Albert G.
Keller (New Haven, Conn., 1927).

Other Relevant Works
Sumner's papers are at Yale University.

*Selected Essays of William Graham
Sumner*, ed. Albert Keller and Maurice
Davie (North Haven, Conn., 1969).

*Social Darwinism: Selected Essays of
William Graham Sumner*, ed. Stow
Persons (Englewood Cliff, N.J., 1963).

*On Liberty, Society, and Politics: The
Essential Essays of William Graham
Sumner*, ed. Robert C. Bannister
(Indianapolis, 1992).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils Before 1950*,
Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, *Bio 20thC
Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp
Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc
Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v25*, *Who
Was Who in Amer v1*

Bannister, Robert C. *Social Darwinism:
Science and Myth in Anglo-American
Social Thought* (Philadelphia, 1979).

Curtis, Bruce. *William Graham Sumner*
(Boston, 1981).

Hofstadter, Richard. *Social Darwinism in
American Thought* (Boston, 1955).

McCloskey, Robert G. *American
Conservatism in the Age of Enterprise: A
Study of William Graham Sumner,
Stephen J. Field, and Andrew Carnegie*
(Cambridge, Mass., 1951).

Starr, Harris E. *William Graham Sumner*
(New York, 1925).

Jeffrey K. Beemer

SUNDERLAND, Eliza Jane Read
(1839–1910)

Eliza Jane Read was born on 19 April 1839 to
Amasa and Jane Henderson Read on a farm
near Huntsville, Illinois. She died on 10 March
1910 in Hartford, Connecticut. She was
educated at the Abingdon Seminary in Illinois
and began teaching at the age of fifteen. In
1863 she was admitted to Mt. Holyoke
Seminary, graduating with a BA in 1865. In
1867 she became principal of the high school in
Aurora, Illinois where she had been teaching
since completing her degree at Mt. Holyoke,
joining Anna BRACKETT as one of the first
women to be head of a secondary school. By
1871 she had married Jabez T. Sunderland, an
English immigrant and Unitarian minister,
whom she followed to a parish in Chicago and
assisted in his ministry. Unusual as it was in this
period, Sunderland continued on her career
path, teaching high school in Chicago after she
married. She even continued to teach in Ann
Arbor, Michigan, where the couple had moved
in 1878 after the birth of their three children.

In 1889 Sunderland became a student at the
University of Michigan, studying philosophy
under John DEWEY, and earning a second
undergraduate degree in 1889 and then the
PhD in philosophy in 1892. She was one of
just three women at the University of Michigan
to earn a doctorate in philosophy in the nine-
teenth century, and the seventh woman in the
nation to do so. In 1891 and 1894 campaigns
were launched to appoint her to vacant faculty
positions in the philosophy department at
Michigan, with Dewey, Lucinda H. Stone, and
other prominent educators and community
leaders writing letters on her behalf. But the
university had a policy against hiring female
faculty at the time, so nothing came of these
efforts. Even so, Sunderland rose to prominence
as a religious leader and feminist and was one
of very few women to lecture at both the
women's and the main sessions of the 1893
World's Fair, on women's higher education
and comparative religion.

Sunderland wrote a number of articles on women's issues in popular publications as well as authoring a number of religious tracts. Hers was a classic liberal feminism, which focused on women's similarities to men. She advocated women's equal education and employment opportunities, but at the same time made sure to recognize the importance of their work at home. No doubt because she herself was both an educated woman and a wife and mother, she tried to show that women could be both. While higher education did "unfit a girl for domestic life" as she noted in "Higher Education and the Home" (1894), some simple changes could be made so that women's education and domestic responsibilities could be reconciled. This would involve altering the secondary and college curricula so that women's education would be relevant, whether they became wives and mothers or career women.

Sunderland's work in philosophy was not published in her lifetime, but she did produce a series of introductory essays on the great religious and philosophical thinkers of the nineteenth century, which she presented to University of Michigan students in a non-credit course after the university failed to hire her in 1894. These essays demonstrated Sunderland's facility with the history of philosophy and religion, as well as a rather nuanced understanding of the philosophical forms of argumentation employed by challenging thinkers like Kant and Hegel. In fact in her doctoral thesis on "Kant's and Hegel's Conception of the Relation of God and Man," Sunderland parts ways with her colleagues in the St. Louis branch of the idealist movement by maintaining a balanced view of the value of Kant's and Hegel's contribution to philosophy. The St. Louis idealists, by contrast, often approached fanaticism in their exposés on Hegel.

Sunderland was close to many women in the suffrage movement and Unitarian circles, including Julia Ward HOWE, Lucinda Hinsdale Stone, Rebecca Hazard, and Lillian Freeman Clarke. She was also well acquainted with both men and women in professional and parapro-

fessional philosophy: her professors Dewey and Henry Carter Adams; William Torrey HARRIS and his idealist colleagues, and women philosophers such as Anna Brackett, Marietta KIES, Ellen MITCHELL, and Lucia Ames MEAD.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Higher Education and the Home," in *The Congress of Women: Held in the Woman's Building, World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago, U.S.A., 1893*, ed. Mary Eagle (Chicago, 1894).

James Martineau and His Greatest Book, with Jabez T. Sunderland (Toronto, 1905).

Other Relevant Works

Sunderland's religious pamphlets and papers are in the Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

"Series of Lectures on the Great Religious Thinkers of the Nineteenth Century," in *Women in the St. Louis Idealist Movement, 1860-1925*, ed. Dorothy G. Rogers (Bristol, UK, 2003), vol. 4.

Further Reading

Dict Amer Bio, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v10*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Rogers, Dorothy G. "Paraprofessional Philosophy Stage II: Eliza Read Sunderland and Lucia Ames Mead," in *America's First Women Philosophers: Transplanting Hegel* (Bristol, UK, 2005).

Dorothy Rogers

SUPPES, Patrick Colonel (1922–)

Patrick Suppes was born on 17 March 1922 in Tulsa, Oklahoma. He began his college studies at the University of Oklahoma in 1939, but found it too constricting, and he transferred to the University of Chicago, which he found too

unstructured. In his junior year, he transferred to the University of Tulsa. During World War II he served in the army reserves, and finally earned his BS from the University of Chicago in 1943, while in uniform. After the war, in 1947, Suppes went to graduate school at Columbia University, where he was especially influenced by Ernest NAGEL, and earned his PhD in philosophy in 1950 with a dissertation on "The Problem of Action at a Distance." Suppes joined the philosophy faculty of Stanford University in 1950, was named Lucie Stern Professor of Philosophy in 1975, and has continued to be active at Stanford after his retirement in 1992.

Suppes is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the National Academy of Sciences. He was awarded the Butler Medal in Silver from Columbia University in 1965, the Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award from the American Psychological Association in 1972, and the National Medal of Science in 1990. He has been President of several societies: the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1972–3, the American Educational Research Association in 1973–4, the National Academy of Education during 1973–7, the Division of Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science of the International Union of History and Philosophy of Science from 1975 to 1979, and the International Union of History and Philosophy of Science in 1976 and 1978.

Suppes has been associated with the Center for the Study of Language and Information at Stanford, and he was a pioneer in the development of the computer as an instructional tool in language, logic, and mathematics. At CSLI, he concentrated on development of computer-aided language instruction, designing mathematics courses as well as programs for computerized foreign language instruction and for computer-aided logic instruction. He also participated in the development of elementary-school-level mathematics courses using computer-aided instruction. He traveled the short distance to Berkeley on a regular basis, attending seminars given by Alfred TARSKI and learning axiomatics

from J. C. C. McKinsey, both of whom had a significant influence on him.

Suppes is the author of several introductory logic textbooks, an introductory textbook in axiomatic set theory, and has worked on the applications of logic to computer languages and in philosophy of logic. In the late 1950s and into the late 1960s he participated, along with W. V. QUINE, Hugues LEBLANC, and Irving COPI in the effort to develop simplified and correct rules of inferences for the quantified formulae of first-order functional logic. Edward John Lemmon (1961) showed that Suppes's formulation of EI in his *Introduction to Logic* (1957) was incorrect, while Leblanc showed that Quine's formulation, and hence ultimately Copi's in the first edition of his *Symbolic Logic* as well, were also incorrect. Lemmon argued that Suppes's rule of EI in *Introduction to Logic* is too restrictive, making it impossible, for example, to derive $(\exists x)(Fxy$ & $(\exists z)Gxz)$ from $(\exists x)(Fx$ & $(\exists y)Gxy)$ by applying EI (Lemmon 1961, p. 594).

Suppes is best known for his work in philosophy of science, including in particular philosophy of physics. His main contributions concern the foundations of quantum mechanics and statistical mechanics, probability theory, inductive logic, the theory of measurement, and causality. He is also interested in the methodology of science and in mathematical techniques of physics, which has been the special focus of his research outside of, and alongside of, his work on computer-assisted instruction in particular and education in general. He devoted attention to the way in which children learn mathematical concepts, and this contributed to his work in the preparation of instructional materials in mathematics. He has also been active in the preparation of collective works, serving as editor or co-editor of numerous works in philosophy of science, including philosophy of physics, and in the logic, semantics, and philosophy of artificial and natural languages.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Decision Making: An Experimental

Approach, with Donald Davidson and Sidney Siegel (Stanford, 1957).

Introduction to Logic (Princeton, N.J., 1957).

Axiomatic Set Theory (New York, 1960).

Markov Learning Models for Multiperson Interactions, with Richard C. Atkinson (Stanford, Cal., 1960).

The Development of Mathematical Concepts in Children (Stanford, 1964).

A First Course in Mathematical Logic, with Shirley A. Hill (New York, 1964).

Studies in the Methodology and Foundations of Science: Selected Papers from 1951 to 1969 (Dordrecht, 1969).

A Probabilistic Theory of Causality (Dordrecht, 1970).

Probabilistic Metaphysics (Oxford, 1984).

Language for Humans and Robots (Oxford, 1992).

Models and Methods in the Philosophy of Science: Selected Essays (Dordrecht, 1993).

Language and Learning for Robots, with Colleene Crangle (Stanford, Cal., 1994).

Foundations of Probability with Applications: Selected Papers, 1974–1995, with Mario Zanotti (Cambridge, UK, 1996).

Representation and Invariance of Scientific Structures (Stanford, Cal., 2002).

Other Relevant Work

Ed. with Ernest Nagel and Alfred Tarski, *Logic, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science* (Stanford, Cal., 1962).

Ed. with Leon Henkin and Alfred Tarski, *The Axiomatic Method, with Special Reference to Geometry and Physics* (Amsterdam, 1959).

Ed. with Jaakko Hintikka, *Aspects of Inductive Logic* (Amsterdam, 1966).

Ed. with Sydney Morgenbesser and Morton White, *Philosophy, Science, and Methods: Essays in Honor of Ernest Nagel* (New York, 1969).

Ed. with Jaakko Hintikka and Julius Moravcsik, *Approaches to Natural Language* (Dordrecht, 1973).

Ed., *Logic and Probability in Quantum Mechanics* (Dordrecht, 1976).

Ed. with Maria Carla Galovotti and Domienico Constantini, *Stochastic Causality* (Stanford, Cal., 2001).

Further Reading

Bio Dict Psych, *Encyc Psych*, *Pres Addr of APA v8*

Anellis, Irving H. "Forty Years of 'Unnatural' Natural Deduction and Quantification: A History of First-order Systems of Natural Deduction, from Gentzen to Copi," *Modern Logic* 2 (1991): 113–52.

Bogdan, Radu J., ed. *Patrick Suppes* (Dordrecht, 1979). Contains Suppes's autobiography.

Humphreys, Paul, ed. *Patrick Suppes, Scientific Philosopher* (Dordrecht, 1994).

Leblanc, Hughes. *Techniques of Deductive Inference* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1966).

Lemmon, Edward John. "Quantifier Rules and Natural Deduction," *Mind* 70 (1961): 235–8.

Irving H. Anellis

SUZUKI, Daisetz Teitaro (1870–1966)

Teitaro Suzuki was born on 18 October 1870 in Kanazawa, Japan, and died on 12 July 1966 in Tokyo. His family, although physicians and of the samurai class, was poor due to the early deaths of his father, grandfather, and great-grandfather. Suzuki, although a good student, particularly of languages, was forced to leave school at age seventeen and begin teaching English soon afterward. A desire to understand why he should be so beset by misfortune so early in life led him to seek out masters of Zen, his family's faith. Although he never had any formal academic or monastic training in religion, he was a persistent student, studying Zen texts, spending time with the monks, and

going to *sanzen* interviews with the *roshi* Zen masters.

Suzuki was sent to Tokyo by his brother to study at what is now Waseda University, and he began to visit the Engakuji monastery in nearby Kamakura. There he was given a *koan*, or riddle, to solve: "the sound of one hand." As he was making no progress in solving this *koan*, in time he was given another: "*mu*." Suzuki worked for four years on solving this second riddle, with increasing frustration and no success. During this time he was teaching and translating texts, notably the speech that his Zen master Shaku Soen gave in 1893 at the World's Parliament of Religions in Chicago, as the representative of Zen Buddhism. While in Chicago, Shaku Soen met the philosopher and amateur Orientalist Paul CARUS, who was interested in having Asian religious and philosophical works translated into English. Shaku Soen recommended Suzuki for this work, and Suzuki first translated into Japanese Carus's work *The Gospel of Buddha* (1895). Shaku Soen then arranged for Suzuki to travel to the United States to assist Carus in translating the *Tao te ching*. Determination to solve his *koan* before departure resulted in success for Suzuki; he achieved *satori*, or enlightenment, and was able to answer correctly the master's questions about *mu*. In recognition of his achievement, Shaku Soen gave him the name Daisetsu, which means "great simplicity."

From 1897 until 1909 Suzuki lived in the United States, translating texts from Japanese and other Asian languages into English for Carus's publishing company, Open Court. He also taught, lectured, and eventually wrote a book of his own in English, *Outlines of Mahayana Buddhism* (1907). In 1908 he traveled to Europe, where he spent much time at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris copying and researching Chinese religious manuscripts. In London he was invited by the Swedenborg Society to translate *Heaven and Hell* into Japanese. A few years later he was to translate several more of Emanuel Swedenborg's works.

In 1909, at age thirty-nine, he arrived back in Japan and began lecturing at Gakushuin and at Tokyo Imperial University. The following year he was appointed professor at Gakushuin, where he remained for eleven years. During that time he wrote *A Brief History of Early Chinese Philosophy* (1914), several articles on Zen in English, as well as several works in Japanese. In 1911 he married Beatrice Lane, an American, who became his co-editor on many projects.

In 1921 Suzuki became professor of Buddhist philosophy at Otani University in Kyoto. With his wife he began the publication of *The Eastern Buddhist*, a journal. While at Otani University he also published the three volumes of *Essays in Zen Buddhism* (1927–34), *The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk* (1934), and *Zen Buddhism and Its Influence on Japanese Culture* (1938), as well as a translation of *The Lankavatara Sutra* (1932). Beatrice Lane Suzuki died in 1939 and he retired from Otani University in 1940.

For the next ten years he remained in Japan, publishing many works in Japanese. In 1949 Suzuki was elected member of the Japan Academy. Also in that year he began to travel again, first to Hawaii for the Second East–West Philosophers' Conference. He remained there to lecture on Zen Buddhism at the University of Hawaii during 1949–50. During that time he published *The Zen Doctrine of No-Mind* (1949) as well as other texts.

In 1950, at age eighty, he returned once again to the continental United States to lecture, mainly at Columbia University, but at many other institutions as well. He published *Studies in Zen* in 1955, *Zen Buddhism* in 1956, and *Mysticism: Christian and Buddhist* in 1957. He also lectured at several important conferences and symposia in North America and Europe. During this period Suzuki met and influenced many important Western thinkers, notably Carl Jung, Martin Heidegger, Erich FROMM, Karen Horney, Thomas MERTON, John CAGE, Allen Ginsberg, and Jack Kerouac. Returning to Japan in 1958, he pub-

lished *Zen and Japanese Buddhism* (1958), *Zen and Japanese Culture* (1959), and *Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis* (1960). He continued to travel, lecture, write, and edit until his death in 1966 at age ninety-five, leaving behind many manuscripts which were posthumously published.

Suzuki's achievements were many and far-reaching. In his lifetime he produced approximately one hundred and twenty texts, over thirty of them in English. He is universally acknowledged as the man who virtually single-handedly brought knowledge of Zen to the West. Suzuki himself saw the 1893 World's Parliament of Religion in Chicago as a seminal event. If we accept this view, we see that Suzuki was in a unique position to make a global contribution. Not only was Shaku Soen, one of the parliament representatives, his Zen master at the time, but Suzuki had a rare facility with languages. His translation of the *roshi*'s address naturally led to his collaboration with Paul Carus. Moreover, he had just achieved *satori*, and therefore had experiential and not merely intellectual understanding of the material he was disseminating.

At the close of the nineteenth century, when Suzuki began publishing, a global consciousness was just developing; fifty years and two world wars later, the world would be a very different place. Little was known in the West of Eastern religion; but even those wishing to learn would be frustrated without the ability to read Sanskrit, Chinese, or Japanese. Suzuki's work making essential texts like the *Tao te ching* or the *Lankavatara Sutra* available in English was a great contribution, not least because of the difficulty in rendering Eastern thought into a Western language. Chinese and Japanese particularly, with their use of characters rather than an alphabet, are more intuitive and direct than English. Suzuki was aware of the dangers of a too-literal translation, and had the rare ability to write simple and engaging prose.

In addition to translating important texts, Suzuki wrote in English about many aspects of Buddhism and its Japanese offshoot, Zen. He covered the history, the doctrines, and the practical methods of instruction. He described the everyday life of the monks, introduced major Zen practitioners, and repeated instructive anecdotes. This body of work might be seen as merely another form of translation, albeit an extraordinarily prolific and useful one. But Suzuki did more than describe Eastern thought for a Western audience: he made of Zen a philosophy.

Zen was first and foremost for Suzuki an experience, the experience of *satori* or enlightenment. By its nature it transcended words and logic. A glance at the table of contents of one of Suzuki's books will typically reveal loosely grouped essays, rather than steps in a reasoned argument. He did not attempt to explain Zen to the West by using a traditional Western approach, that of logical reasoning. Instead, he began by stressing the nonrational aspect of Eastern thought. Existence, Suzuki explains, is a continuum, but one which we humans, due to our sense limitations and to the construction of consciousness, experience as discrete. The intellectual exercise of postulating a continuum made up of accumulated discrete elements is not the same as apprehending the whole directly and immediately. At the same time this apprehension of the whole does not negate the parts. When a thing is and at the same time is not, there is *satori*. Zen, he explains, delights in using paradoxes to approximate these flashes of intuition into the true nature of being.

While refusing to expound Zen in Western terms, Suzuki also liberates it from its expressly Eastern origins. Suzuki, whether he was conscious of doing so or not, forces philosophy as a worldwide discipline to include Eastern thought, and thereby brings it to a new level, in the same way that Christian thought advanced Greek philosophy. The Christian notion of the infinite – of a God with infinite powers – transcended Greek notions of the finite, and in order to incorporate this mystical and nonrational concept into philosophy, a

leap had to be taken. Suzuki's body of work in English provides the basis for a similar leap.

Far larger than his canon in English is Suzuki's canon in Japanese. Ironically, the Japanese themselves had imperfect understanding of the tenets and historical importance of Buddhism, and Zen in particular, during the first half of the twentieth century. Nationalism forced an interest in the national religion, which is Shinto. Suzuki continually stressed the pervading influence of Zen in every aspect of Japanese life, from the taking of tea to painting and poetry to the love of nature.

Suzuki's brilliant and far-reaching mind found connections between Zen and Christianity, especially Christian mysticism, Zen and the arts, Zen and psychology, Zen and psychotherapy. Carl Jung likened the Zen concept of "making whole" to "psychic healing," and the experience of Zen as the liberation of the unconscious. Karen Horney at her death was trying to create a new psychotherapeutic form which would take Zen into account. A whole generation of Beat poets based their search for freedom on a notion of Zen gleaned from Suzuki, though possibly watered down and misunderstood. And no Western work on Zen to this day fails to acknowledge its debt to Suzuki.

Satori was for Suzuki the essence of Zen. No amount of reading or studying or intellectual understanding could substitute for it. His books were only meant to point the way toward the experience, to put one in the best possible place for receiving it. *Satori* moreover was not an extended state. People must live in the world, constrained by their own consciousness. Experiencing the flash of enlightenment, however, gives one a new understanding with which to go back into the world. In Suzuki's words, "I see. This is it."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acvaghosha's Discourse on the Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana (Chicago, 1900).
Outlines of Mahayana Buddhism (London, 1907).

Essays in Zen Buddhism, 3 vols (London, 1927–34).
The Lankavatara Sutra (London, 1932). A translation from the original Sanskrit.
The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk (Kyoto, 1934).
Zen Buddhism and Its Influence on Japanese Culture (Kyoto, 1938).
The Zen Doctrine of No-Mind (London, 1949).
Studies in Zen (London, 1955).
Zen Buddhism (New York, 1956).
Mysticism: Christian and Buddhist (New York, 1957).
Zen and Japanese Buddhism (Tokyo, 1958).
Zen and Japanese Culture (New York and London, 1959).
Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis (New York and London, 1960).

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *The Eastern Buddhist* (Kyoto, 1921–39).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*
Abe, Masao, ed. *A Zen Life: D. T. Suzuki Remembered* (New York and Tokyo, 1986). Contains a bibliography of Suzuki's writings.
Fields, Rick. *How the Swans Came to the Lake: A Narrative History of Buddhism in America* (New York, 1981).
Switzer, A. Irwin. *D. T. Suzuki: A Biography* (London, 1985).
Yamaguchi, Susumu, ed. *Buddhism and Culture: Dedicated to Dr. Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki in Commemoration of His Ninetieth Birthday* (Kyoto, Japan, 1960).

Cicily Vahadji

SWABEY, Marie Taylor Collins
(1890–1966)

Marie Collins was born on 8 December 1890 in Kansas City, Missouri. She studied under Mary Case and Mary Whiton CALKINS at Wellesley College, where she received her BA in 1913. The following year she received her MA from the University of Kansas. In 1914–15 she was an assistant in philosophy at Wellesley College, and then was an instructor at Broaddus Institute in West Virginia. In 1919 she received her PhD from Cornell University, where she studied under James E. CREIGHTON.

After completing her education, she was an instructor at Wells College in New York in 1919–20; she then married philosopher William Curtis SWABEY on 19 June 1920. William became an instructor of philosophy at New York University in 1923, and the following year Marie did the same. They joined Herman Harrell Horne who had been NYU's professor of philosophy since 1909. Marie was an instructor from 1924 until 1928, an assistant professor from 1928 until 1934, and an associate professor from 1934 until 1956, when both Swabeys retired. During her career, Swabey belonged to the American Philosophical Association and the Association for Symbolic Logic. Swabey died on 3 March 1966 in Aptos, California.

Swabey's research addressed a wide variety of topics, but it did not lack unity. As her colleague Louise Antz wrote in a memorial after Swabey's death, "the guiding idea of her books and teaching was that reason, as presupposing the freedom and impartiality of the mind, implies the falsity of any merely naturalistic or psychologistic account of human nature" (*Proc of APA v40*, 1967, p. 127). This guiding idea is especially salient in Swabey's *Logic and Nature* (1930, 1955). There she contends that logical considerations form the basis of metaphysics, and she attempts to derive an ontology from universal laws of thought. She also defends rationalism, the acceptance of which involves "acceptance of the transcendent com-petence of reasoning and the recognition of its capacity as an infinite part to encompass the whole" (1955, p. 23), against varieties of anti-rationalism, the latter being assaults, stemming from "certain theories of organic causation and of the biologically instrumental nature of thought," on "any attempt to give an objective account of being in its general aspects" (1955, p. v). Swabey argues that these attacks on reason's ability to achieve objective knowledge are self-defeating.

Similar themes occur in Swabey's other works. In *Comic Laughter* (1961) she argues that the comic reflects the reality of the universe as a rational structure. In *Theory of the Democratic State* (1937) she tries to provide a rational foundation for democracy, one that has roots in the laws of logic. In *The Judgment of History* (1954) she challenges historical relativism, arguing for the possibility of objective historical knowledge and for the existence of permanently valid values.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Rational Character of the Democratic Principle," *International Journal of Ethics* 35 (1925): 140–49.

"Democracy and the Concept of Quantity," *International Journal of Ethics* 37 (1927): 189–207.

Logic and Nature (New York, 1930; 2nd edn 1955).

"Publicity and Measurement," *International Journal of Ethics* 41 (1930): 96–114.

"Is There Logical Force in Demonstration," *Journal of Philosophy* 29 (1932): 431–9.

"Logic as Language Habits versus Logic as Formal Truth," *Journal of Philosophy* 30 (1933): 119–28.

Theory of the Democratic State (Cambridge, Mass., 1937).

"The Leading Myths of Our Time," *Ethics* 49 (1939): 169–86.

The Judgment of History (New York, 1954).

Comic Laughter: A Philosophical Essay (New Haven, Conn., 1961).

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, *Proc of APA v40*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*, *Who's Who in Phil*, *Women Phils*

John J. Tilley

SWABEY, William Curtis (1894–1979)

William Curtis Swabey was born on 7 April 1894 in Dayton, Tennessee. He attended high school in Riverside, Illinois, after which he attended Stanford University, earning his BA there in 1915. He received his MA in 1918 and PhD in philosophy in 1919 from Cornell University. In 1918–19 he was an instructor of philosophy at the University of Kansas. From 1919 to 1923 he taught philosophy at the Rice Institute in Houston. He then joined the philosophy faculty at New York University, teaching as an instructor from 1923 to 1927, assistant professor from 1927 to 1932, and associate professor from 1932 until he retired in 1956. During his career he was an active member of the American Philosophical Association and an honorary member of Phi Beta Kappa. He was married to another NYU philosopher, Marie Collins SWABEY, whom he married in 1920. They collaborated on a translation of Ernst Cassirer's *Substance and Function*, and EINSTEIN's *Theory of Relativity* (1923). Swabey died on 2 July 1979 in Los Gatos, California.

Swabey is best known as an advocate of critical realism. Such realism is "critical" in that although it retains some elements of naïve realism – in particular, the view that an objective reality exists independently of our cognitions of it – it corrects what it sees as errors in naïve realism, for example, the error of treating colors, sounds and the like as no less objective than primary qualities. Critical realism also differs from the "new realism" of Edwin B. HOLT, Ralph B. PERRY, and others. For instance, it rejects the idea that we know reality directly and immediately. It contends that there is a mind-independent reality, but we are acquainted with it only indirectly and inferentially through mental data – for example, ideas, symbols, or sensations – that are immediately present to us.

The best source for Swabey's critical realism is his *Being and Being Known* (1937). There he defends and develops his position, partly by criticizing alternative views, including naive realism, new realism, pragmatism, Humean subjectivism, Kantian phenomenalism, and Protagorean relativism. He also surveys, from a critical realist's perspective, several topics in metaphysics, including space, time, mind, substance, freedom, infinity, and causality. This survey is meant not only to supply a realist's perspective on many issues but to yield further support for critical realism. Whether or not this book succeeds in establishing its thesis, it remains an edifying introduction to nearly every topic it covers.

Equally edifying is Swabey's *Ethical Theory from Hobbes to Kant*, which seeks "to discuss the various theories, without taking a strong stand for or against any one of them" (1961, p. vii). As an introduction to its topic, organized around key figures in historical order, it was a successful work.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"On Realism," *The Monist* 30 (1920): 446–59.
"The Regulative Idea of a Cosmos," *Philosophical Review* 38 (1929): 144–51.
"On the Reality of Things," *Philosophical Review* 39 (1930): 351–74.
"Locke's Theory of Ideas," *Philosophical Review* 42 (1933): 573–93.
Being and Being Known: An Introduction to Epistemology and Metaphysics (New York, 1937).
"Do Material Things Exist?" *Journal of Philosophy* 38 (1941): 655–65.
"Benevolence and Virtue," *Philosophical*

Review 52 (1943): 452–67.

"Non-normative Utilitarianism," *Journal of Philosophy* 40 (1943): 365–74.

"The Causal Definition of Existence," *Journal of Philosophy* 41 (1944): 253–61.

"Cassirer and Metaphysics," in *The Philosophy of Ernst Cassirer*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp (Evanston, Ill., 1949).

Ethical Theory from Hobbes to Kant (New York, 1961).

Further Reading
Who's Who in Phil

John J. Tilley

SWENSON, David Ferdinand (1876–1940)

David F. Swenson was born on 29 October 1876 in Kristinehamn, Sweden. He came with his family to Minneapolis, Minnesota, in 1882. He studied engineering and then philosophy with Frederick J. E. WOODBRIDGE at the University of Minnesota, receiving a BS in 1898. As Woodbridge prepared to leave for Columbia University in 1902, Swenson was hired as an instructor of philosophy in 1901. Although Swenson did some graduate study with Woodbridge at Columbia in 1905–1906, he did not receive an advanced degree. He was promoted to full professor in 1917. Aside from teaching as a visiting professor at City College of New York in 1920–21, he taught at Minnesota until his death on 11 February 1940 in Lake Wales, Florida.

Swenson was an early and prominent advocate of continental existentialism in the United States. He devoted himself to translating many of the writings of Kierkegaard into English, which were mostly published after his death with the help of his wife and Walter Lowrie. He also published philosophical interpretations of Kierkegaard and existentialism (including Husserl). He wrote two books about Kierkegaard which were posthumously published: *Something about Kierkegaard* (1941) and *Kierkegaardian Philosophy in the Faith of a Scholar* (1949). For Swenson, existentialism rightly focuses philosophy on questions of ethics and spirituality.

Besides his status as the foremost scholar of Kierkegaard, Swenson was noted for his incisive work on logic and philosophy of religion. He criticized the formal logic of Bertrand Russell and A. N. WHITEHEAD for its insensitivity to the phenomenology of intellectual processes. In some of his articles he searched for an alternative to analytic philosophy's tendency to sever ethics and values from epistemological and scientific problems. He was also active in local community issues. He served on the Minneapolis School Board (1911–12), participated in the debate over evolution in the Minnesota State Legislature, and advocated academic freedom.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Existential Dialectic of Søren Kierkegaard," *Ethics* 49 (1939): 309–28.

"The Anti-Intellectualism of Kierkegaard." *Philosophical Review* 25 (1916): 567–86.

"Sixteen Logical Aphorisms." *Journal of Philosophy* 15 (1918): 515–18.

"The Logical Implicates of the Community," *Journal of Philosophy* 17 (1920): 253–60.

"Objective Uncertainty and Human Faith" in the *Philosophical Review* 37 (1928): 433–59.

"Four Representatives of the Intellect," in *Swedes in America, 1638–1938*, ed. A. B. Benson and Naboth Hedin (New Haven, Conn., 1938).

Something about Kierkegaard, ed. Lillian Swenson (Minneapolis, 1941).

Kierkegaardian Philosophy in the Faith of a Scholar, ed. Lillian Swenson (Philadelphia, 1949).

Other Relevant Works
Swenson's papers are at the University of

Minnesota.

Trans., *Philosophical Fragments, or, A Fragment of Philosophy*, by Søren Kierkegaard (Princeton, N.J., 1962).

Ed., *Lectures on the Religious Thought of Søren Kierkegaard*, by Eduard Geismar (Minneapolis, 1937).

Trans. with Walter Lowrie, *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, by Søren Kierkegaard (Princeton, N.J., 1941). Lowrie's introduction includes a tribute to Swenson.

Trans., *Thoughts on Crucial Situations in Human Life*, by Søren Kierkegaard, ed. Lillian Swenson (Minneapolis, 1941).

Trans. with Lillian Swenson. *Edifying Discourses*, 4 vols, by Søren Kierkegaard (Minneapolis, 1943–6).

Trans. with Lillian Swenson and Walter Lowrie, *Either/Or, A Fragment of Life*, 2 vols, by Søren Kierkegaard (Princeton, N.J., 1944).

Trans. with Lillian Swenson, *Works of Love*, by Søren Kierkegaard (Princeton, N.J., 1946).

Trans. with Lillian Swenson, *The Gospel of Suffering and The Lilies of the Field*, by Søren Kierkegaard (Minneapolis, 1947).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v29*, *Pres Addr of APA v3*, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v50*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Conger, George P., et al. *David F. Swenson, Scholar, Teacher, Friend* (Minneapolis, 1940). Contains a bibliography of Swenson's writings.

John R. Shook

SYNAN, Edward Aloysius, Jr. (1918–97)

Edward A. Synan, Jr. was born on 13 April 1918 in Fall River, Massachusetts, and raised in Ridgewood, New Jersey. He received his BA from Seton Hall College in 1938. After advanced studies in theology at the Catholic University of Louvain, he returned to North America at the start of World War II. He was ordained a priest of the Newark diocese in 1942. From 1944 to 1948 he served as a chaplain in the United States Army Air Force. He then began graduate studies, receiving the MA in 1950 and PhD in philosophy in 1952 from the University of Toronto. Among his mentors at that time were the eminent scholars Etienne GILSON and Jacques MARITAIN.

Professor Synan served as chair of the department of philosophy at Seton Hall University in New Jersey from 1952 to 1959. In 1959 he returned to Canada as professor of the history of medieval philosophy at the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, University of St. Michael's College, Toronto. There he regularly offered a three-year cycle of medieval philosophy, spanning the early Middle Ages to the late fourteenth century. His lectures were celebrated for their organization, scholarly detail, and urbane wit. From 1973 to 1979 he was President of the Pontifical Institute. During his years at the Institute, Synan also taught undergraduate courses in philosophy as a member of the philosophy department of St. Michael's College, which became part of the University of Toronto philosophy department in 1974. These courses included seminars on moral philosophy, the philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas, and introductory philosophy. In the latter courses, Synan was among the most popular of lecturers; as he often noted, the freshmen "want desperately not to be bored" and he did not fail them. He retired in 1983, but continued to teach part time. Synan died on 3 August 1997 in Toronto, Ontario.

Synan's honors included the Prelate of Honor in 1979, which bestowed the rank of Monsignor, an LLD from Seton Hall University

in 1973, a DLitt from the University of Dallas in 1979, fellowship of the Royal Society of Canada in 1980, and the Aquinas Medal of the American Catholic Philosophical Association in 1991.

Synan's principal scholarly interests included the thought of Augustine, Anselm, and Thomas Aquinas, but also included less well-known figures. He published several articles on the work of the fourteenth-century English theologian, Richard of Campsall, as well as his works. He also investigated the thought of Godfrey of St. Victor, Roger of Nottingham, Adam Wodeham, and Walter and Adam Burley. His scholarly approach emphasized the importance of the study of original texts, and in his own words "to situate mediaeval thought in its political, economic, theological, artistic and literary context."

Synan was not only an intellectual scholar; he was actively engaged in ecumenical and social causes. He was deeply committed to Christian-Jewish relations, having been a participant in the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews, and the author of a work on this topic. He was also active in the support of the Solidarity Movement in Poland, traveling there to offer support at rallies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Popes and the Jews in the Middle Ages (New York, 1965).

The Works of Richard Campsall, 2 vols (Toronto, 1968, 1982).

The Fountain of Philosophy by Godfrey of St. Victor (Toronto, 1972).

Thomas Aquinas: Propositions and Parables (Toronto, 1979).

Questions on the De Anima of Aristotle by Magister Adam Burley and Dominus Walter Burley (Leiden, 1997).

An Exposition of the On the Hebdomads of Boethius (Washington, D.C., 2001).

Further Reading
Who Was Who in Amer v13
Houser, R. E., ed. *Medieval Masters: Essays in Memory of Msgr. E. A. Synan* (Houston, Tex., 1999).

Slater, John G. *Minerva's Aviary: Philosophy at Toronto 1843–1943* (Toronto, 2005), chap. 15.

Barry F. Brown

SZASZ, Thomas Stephen (1920–)

Thomas Szasz was born on 15 April 1920 in Budapest, Hungary. After emigrating to the United States in 1938, Szasz received his BA with honors in physics in 1941 and his MD in 1944, both from the University of Cincinnati. He became a naturalized United States citizen in 1944. After completing his intern and residency requirements for medicine at Boston City and Cincinnati General Hospitals, he pursued training in psychiatry at the University of Chicago. In 1950 he completed his psychoanalytical training and received his certificate at the Chicago Institute for Psychoanalysis. Between 1951 and 1956 Szasz was a staff member at the Chicago Institute for Psychoanalysis, while also maintaining a private practice. From 1956 until his retirement in 1990 he was a member of the department of psychiatry at the Upstate Medical Center of the State University of New York in Syracuse. In addition to writing almost thirty books, Szasz has published some four hundred articles, and a multitude of letters, comments, interviews, debates, prefaces, and rejoinders. Many of his books have been widely translated into many languages.

Szasz has been regarded as one of the most controversial psychiatrists in the contemporary world. He is a leading figure in what has become known as the anti-psychiatry movement. Much of this notoriety is directly related to the appearance of his famous book *The Myth of Mental Illness* (1961), where he

debunks the very notion of mental illness and the questionable role of psychiatry in general. Szasz's critique is two-pronged. First, the conceptual criticism asserts that mental illness is not a real illness. The idea of mental illness, he argues, was invented through the mistaken use of metaphor and the self-serving definition of the terms. Like the liver or kidney, the brain is an organ susceptible to disease. In the case of a brain organ disease, treatment is provided by a neurologist. The mind, on the other hand, is not a bodily organ and cannot be diseased except in a metaphorical sense. What are often classified as mental diseases are forms of disapproved behaviors that may very well cause discomfort to individuals who manifest these behaviors and those of others close to them. In the case of someone who fears open places, for example, a psychiatrist will often attach the label of "agoraphobia" in order to name the "illness." Should someone suffer from odd ideas and perceptions, the psychiatrist might apply such names as "delusions" and "hallucinations." But such terms do not necessarily apply to some diseased or disturbed function of the body as much as they point out "problems of living." To say that a person's mind is sick is like saying that the economy is sick or that a joke is sick. When metaphor is mistaken for reality and it is used for social purposes then a myth is in the making. The concepts of mental health and mental illness are mythological concepts. They are used strategically to advance some social interests and to retard others, much as national and religious myths have been used in the past.

Perhaps the most disputed of Szasz's theses is his argument that schizophrenia – the cornerstone of modern psychiatry – is a category error. Modern psychiatry errs, Szasz argues, because it categorizes schizophrenia as an illness on the basis of behavior and mental condition, not on any biological abnormality of the human body. Where it has been shown that epilepsy, Parkinsonism, pheochromocytoma, Cushing's syndrome, and diabetes cause mental symptoms, none of these diseases are treated against the patient's will, and none serve as the legal basis for depriving the patient of his or her liberty and civil rights. However, the twentieth century is full of examples where people have been diagnosed as schizophrenic for exhibiting abnormal behavior based on cultural, legal, moral, and political standards only to be subjected to physical detainment and reduction of their rights and liberty. More than a medical term, Szasz argues that schizophrenia is an issue of power – economic, social, or political – that determines whether or not a person is diagnosed and detained as schizophrenic. Standard accounts of schizophrenia are often cast in a language that conceals the most elementary human conflicts about occupation, money, and family relations and behind a smokescreen of so-called delusions, hallucinations, and other psychotic symptoms. For Szasz, what passes today as "mental illness" is the result of psychiatry's unwillingness to fix the literal meaning of mental illness to an objective standard in order to distinguish between literal and metaphorical "mental diseases." Mental illness remains a ruse invented by declaration and definition.

To what end does such an invention serve? The second prong of Szasz's critique is political. The invention provides an ideological justification for state-sponsored social control. The collaboration between government and psychiatry results in what Szasz calls the "therapeutic state." In the therapeutic state, behaviors of all sorts become "medicalized" and repressed (cured) through pseudomedical methods. Behaviors such as drug use, overeating, gambling, shoplifting, sexual promiscuity, pederasty, rambunctiousness, shyness, anxiety, unhappiness, racial bigotry, unconventional religious beliefs, and suicide are turned into diseases, or symptoms of diseases, that somehow happen to individuals against their will and therefore demand medical intervention. Instead of succeeding in its avowed aim to cultivate and maintain "mentally healthy citizens," American psychiatry has created an introverted and self-pitying population addicted to numerous therapies and drugs that make

them incapable of living the free, independent, and spontaneous lives that reflect mental health. More seriously, when psychiatry provides the false legitimacy to imprison some and exculpate others (the insanity defense), it becomes a powerful arm of the modern nation-state. The history of psychiatry is marked with instances of diseases which the profession has never acknowledged as mistakes. Perhaps the two most obvious ones are masturbation and homosexuality. For hundreds of years individuals exhibiting such behaviors were diagnosed as being "ill" and were subjected to inhumane tortures and incarceration. Today, such illnesses are often considered "lifestyle choices," and have been incorporated into the mainstream of Western culture.

At the heart of the matter is the legal power accorded to psychiatrists. Where dermatologists, ophthalmologists, and gynecologists normally treat voluntary patients seeking advice and aid, a psychiatrist's patient is instead paradigmatically involuntary. Under certain conditions, once a person walks into a psychiatrist's office, the psychiatrist has the legal right and the legal duty to use his or her discretion to commit that person, given present diagnostic standards. The psychiatrist's duty to prevent suicide and murder supercedes that of priests, lawyers, and even judges. No other member in society wields the kind of power the psychiatrist does. This is what separates psychiatry from the rest of medicine. As such, psychiatry is potentially and actually a coercive practice. It is this coercive power, Szasz believes, that psychiatrists must be deprived of, much in the same way that whites had to be deprived of the power to enslave blacks.

While much of Szasz's method is rhetorical in analyzing how language and symbols are employed by psychiatry to control individuals and to act as an arm of state control, he does espouse a strong libertarian position with regard to politics and a strong ethic of personal responsibility with regard to morality. For Szasz, the medicalization of behavior deprives humankind of its greatest freedom – autonomy.

Autonomy implies that individuals own their own bodies and should be free to do with them whatever they like, provided they do not harm others. Behavior, both criminal and noncriminal, represents choices for which individuals must bear responsibility unless they have been coerced, not because they have been labeled ill or "mentally irrational." Furthermore, behaviors that are disapproved and sometimes offensive, but not illegal, should not be interfered with by either involuntary hospitalization or other forms of incarceration. Szasz believes that it is not the place of the psychiatrist to protect people from themselves involuntarily, even in the case of suicide. To do anything less would be to dilute and erode the normative autonomy of our common humanity.

There are two philosophical presumptions underpinning Szasz's central argument about mental illness as myth: one addresses what we call "the mind," and the other concerns language. In *The Meaning of Mind* (1996) Szasz argues that only as a verb does the word "mind" name something in the real world. Etymologically, the Latin word *mens*, from which the English term mind is derived, connotes intention, will, and attending. This is still discernible in our many uses of the verb "to mind" such as "minding the children" or "never mind what you hear." Minding is characterized as an observable property. It exhibits the ability of a person to pay attention and to adapt to one's environment by using language to communicate with others and oneself. In this sense, "minding" implies agency. This is precisely what Szasz wants to reestablish in modern discourse – that the mind is a moral and psychological concept dependent on language characterized by an individual's ability to have a conversation with himself. Such agency, however, is not a given. Moral agency and responsibility are learned gradually (the process of responsibilization) and entails self-conversations framed by self-praise and self-blame. The result is a conscience that has acquired self-control and the ability to cope with temptation.

Since the Enlightenment, the sense of mind as minding has been replaced and become more and more reified into a substantive noun. Modern neuroscience has relegated the mind to the brain. In identifying the mind with the brain there is a tendency to attribute misbehavior to mental (brain) diseases, or the fault of synaptic misfirings. This undermines the traditional image of the individual as a responsible moral agent. In replacing moral-philosophical explanations of personal conduct with neuro-philosophical accounts of mind-as-brain, the individual cannot be held responsible for his or her action because the locus of control is in the brain, not in what one heeds, wills, or desires. Such an over-reliance on reductionistic approaches to behavior undermines personhood, personal autonomy, and moral responsibility. For this reason, Szasz has been a strong advocate of abolishing the plea of insanity in criminal prosecution.

Another closely related philosophical issue is that of language. In claiming that such terms as "thoughts," "images," and "impulses" refer to self-conversations, Szasz defends the philosophical position that the mind is dependent on language. He separates himself from linguists and neuroscientists who see mind and language linked by artificial constructs such as "universal grammar" or "mental grammar." Moreover, Szasz expands the conventional view that regards normal speech as a verbal act between two people to include inner dialogues or "self-conversation." Whether we claim to talk to one another, to ourselves, to God, angels, or the devil, all such conversations are a ubiquitous state of our humanity and, as noted above, the foundation of moral agency. It is only when certain institutional powers wish to suppress moral agency for the sake of control, that self-conversations are appraised in terms of "evil voices" or the symptom of a diseased mind.

Szasz argues that psychiatrists and psychologists have invented, and the public has embraced, a pseudomedical jargon to describe certain unwanted self-conversations as the manifestations of "diseased minds." It has become part of our current thinking to believe that obsessive and repetitive thoughts and voices can somehow invade consciousness and make one mentally ill. For Szasz, such jargon is as arbitrary as it is questionable. As he states in The Second Sin: "If you talk to God, you are praying; if God talks to you, you have schizophrenia. If the dead talk to you, you are a spiritualist; if God talks to you, you are a schizophrenic." (1973, p. 113)

Szasz distinguishes himself on two counts from others like R. D. Laing and Michel Foucault who have also made contemporary critiques of madness. Both thinkers failed to emphasize the metaphoric nature of what is often described as "mental illness" versus mental diseases that have a real and verifiable somatic basis. Also, both made blanket condemnations of psychiatry that were often connected to their leftist indictment of capitalism in general. They did not separate the positive, voluntary, aspects from the dangerous, involuntary, side of modern psychiatry.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Pain and Pleasure (New York, 1957).
The Myth of Mental Illness (New York, 1961; rev. edn 1984).
Law, Liberty, and Psychiatry (New York, 1963).
Psychiatric Justice (New York, 1965).
The Ethics of Psychoanalysis (New York, 1965).
Ideology and Insanity (New York, 1970).
The Manufacture of Madness (New York, 1970).
The Second Sin (New York, 1973).
Ceremonial Chemistry (New York, 1974).
Heresies (New York, 1976).
Karl Kraus and the Soul-Doctors (Baton Rouge, La., 1976).
Schizophrenia: The Sacred Symbol of Psychiatry (New York, 1976).
Psychiatric Slavery (New York, 1977).
The Theology of Medicine (New York, 1977).
The Myth of Psychotherapy (New York,

1978).

Sex by Prescription (New York, 1980).

The Therapeutic State (Buffalo, N.Y., 1984).

Insanity: The Idea and Its Consequences (New York, 1987).

The Untamed Tongue: A Dissenting Dictionary (La Salle, Ill., 1990).

Our Right to Drugs: The Case for a Free Market (New York, 1992).

A Lexicon of Lunacy (New Brunswick, N.J., 1993).

Cruel Compassion (New York, 1994).

The Meaning of Mind (Westport, Conn., 1996).

Fatal Freedom (Westport, Conn., 1999).

Pharmacracy: Medicine and Politics in America (Westport, Conn., 2001).

Liberation by Oppression (New Brunswick, N.J., 2002).

Words to the Wise: A Medical-Philosophical Dictionary (New Brunswick, N.J., 2004).

Faith in Freedom: Libertarian Principles and Psychiatric Practices (New Brunswick, N.J., 2004).

Other Relevant Works

"Psychiatry, Ethics, and the Criminal Law," *Columbia Law Review* 58 (1958): 183–98.

"The Psychiatric Classification of Behavior: A Strategy of Personal Constraint," in *The Classification of Behavior Disorders*, ed. L. D. Eron (Chicago, 1966), pp. 123–70.

"The Insanity Plea and the Insanity Verdict," *Temple Law Quarterly* 40 (1967): 271–82.

"The Right to Health," *Georgetown Law Journal* 57 (1969): 734–51.

"The Ethics of Addiction," *American Journal of Psychiatry* 128 (1971): 541–56.

Ed., *Age of Madness: The History of Involuntary Mental Hospitalization* (Garden City, N.Y., 1973).

"The Psychiatric Perspective on Pain and Its Control," in *The Treatment of Chronic Pain*, ed. F. D. Hart (London, 1974), pp. 39–61.

"Psychiatric Diversion in the Criminal Justice System," in *Mentally Ill Offenders and the Criminal Justice System*, ed. N. J. Beran and B. G. Toomy (New York, 1979), pp. 54–73.

"A Home for the Homeless: The Half-forgotten Heart of Mental Health Services," in *Towards a Whole Society*, ed. R. Terrington (London, 1985), pp. 39–45.

"The Morality of Drug Controls," in *Dealing with Drugs: Consequences of Government Control*, ed. R. Hamony (Lexington, Mass., 1987), pp. 327–51.

"Psychoanalysis as Religion: Psychoanalytic Theory as Ideology, Psychoanalytic Practice as Cure of Souls," in *Prescriptions: The Dissemination of Medical Authority*, ed. G. L. Ormiston and R. Sassower (Westport, Conn., 1990), pp. 121–39.

"The Origin of Psychiatry: The Alienist as Nanny for Troublesome Adults," *History of Psychiatry* 6 (1995): 1–19.

"The Healing Word: Its Past, Present, and Future," *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 38 (1998): 1–13.

"Commentary on Aristotle's Function Argument and the Concept of Mental Illness," *Philosophy, Psychiatry and Psychology* 5 (1998): 203–207.

"Discretion as Power: In the Situation Called 'Psychotherapy'," *British Journal of Psychotherapy* 15 (1998): 216–28.

"The Case against Psychiatric Power," in *The Construction of Power and Authority in Psychiatry*, ed. P. Barker and C. Stevenson (Oxford, 2000), pp. 43–56.

"The Therapeutic State: The Tyranny of Pharmacracy," *The Independent Review: A Journal of Political Economy* 5 (2001): 485–521.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio

Hoeller, Keith, ed. "Thomas Szasz: Philosopher of Psychiatry," *Review of Existential Psychology and Psychiatry*, vol. 23 (1997). Issue devoted to Szasz.

Schaler, Jeffrey, ed. *Szasz Under Fire: A Psychiatric Abolitionist Faces His Critics*

(Chicago, 2004).

Sedgwick, Peter. *Psycho Politics: Laing, Foucault, Goffman, Szasz, and the Future of Mass Psychiatry* (New York, 1982).

Slade, Alexander L. *A Bibliography of Works by and about Thomas Stephen Szasz, M.D., 1947–1975* (Waterloo, Ontario, 1976).

Vatz, Richard E., and Lee S. Weinberg, eds. *Thomas Szasz: Primary Values and Major Contentions* (Buffalo, N.Y., 1983). Contains a bibliography of Szasz's writings.

Vice, Janet. *From Patients to Persons: The Psychiatric Critiques of Thomas Szasz, Peter Sedgwick and R. D. Laing* (New York, 1993).

Mark S. Muldoon

T

TAEUSCH, Carl Frederick (1889–1961)

Carl Taeusch was born on 20 January 1889 in Wapakoneta, Ohio, and died on 20 September 1961 in Berkeley, California. Taeusch attended the College of Wooster (1907–1909), and started his teaching career in a public school in Yampa, Colorado. He then went to Princeton University where he received a LittB in 1914. He taught high school in Hollywood, California, until 1917. He entered Harvard, and in 1920 he was awarded the PhD in philosophy. He taught philosophy for a year at the University of Chicago, and then taught philosophy at Tulane University (1921–3) and Iowa State University (1923–7). Harvard appointed him as a professor of business ethics in 1927, where Taeusch was managing editor of *Harvard Business Review* and acting editor of *International Journal of Ethics*.

In 1935 Taeusch left Harvard to become an official of the US Department of Agriculture. After World War II, he became head of the philosophy program at the American University in Biarritz, France, and also was a professor of public administration for St. Louis University. In 1952–3 Taeusch was a Fulbright Lecturer in public administration at the University of Ankara, Turkey. He was a member of the American Economic Association, the Association of Public Administration, Delta Tau Delta, and Phi Beta Kappa. He wrote seven books, including *Policy and Ethics in Business* (1931) and *Professional and Business Ethics* (1926). He also authored various articles for legal, philosophical and economic journals.

Taeusch was a pioneer in business ethics. In his *Policy and Ethics in Business,* Taeusch describes various perspectives of the business world including the factors that differentiate American businesses from those of other nations. He also discusses various laws, such as the Sherman Law of 1890, the Federal Bankruptcy Law of 1898, and the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887, and states that some of these laws were passed when the problems of business were becoming more and more apparent. Taeusch also describes the dynamics and structure of business and the ethics of inflated prices. He goes on to discuss further serious problems in the business world such as trade piracy, espionage, and misrepresentations.

Taeusch claims that competitive industry differs from other fields like medicine. According to Taeusch, medicine was a more honorable profession because inventors of a cure would not keep things secret as a matter of principle. As a result, the field of medicine advanced because of shared knowledge. In the business world new inventions were often kept secret, which led to espionage and what Taeusch described as "other vexatious tactics." Taeusch gives several cases in his 1931 book as examples of unethical business practices. One of those cited is the Eagle Chemical Company. The company manufactured and sold fertilizer and animal fats. In order to become more powerful, they manipulated the prices of their products in order to drive many of its competitors out of business.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Professional and Business Ethics (New York, 1926).

Policy and Ethics in Business (New York, 1931).

Other Relevant Works

Rural Cooperation and Cooperative Marketing in Ohio, 1913 (Wooster, Ohio, 1913).

"Sanctioning International Peace," *International Journal of Ethics* 33 (1922): 55–65.

"'Contiguity' and 'Sufficient Reason'," *Journal of Philosophy* 23 (1926): 407–11.

"The Logic of the Case Method," *Journal of Philosophy* 25 (1928): 253–63.

"Business and Education," *School and Society* 29 (1929): 723–54.

"Business Ethics," *International Journal of Ethics* 42 (1932): 273–88.

"Professional Ethics," *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, vol. 12 (New York, 1934).

Further Reading

Who Was Who in Amer v4, *Who's Who in Phil*

Hani Morgan

TAFT, Jessie (1882–1960)

Julia "Jessie" Taft was born on 24 June 1882 in Dubuque, Iowa, the eldest of the three daughters of Amanda May Farwell and Charles Chester Taft. She died on 7 June 1960 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Taft earned a BA degree at Drake University in Iowa in 1900, and then spent the summer studying at the University of Chicago. She returned to Des Moines, Iowa where she taught high school for four years. In 1909 she was offered a fellowship for graduate study in philosophy at the University of Chicago, where she received her PhD in philosophy in 1913. Her dissertation was titled "The Woman Movement from the Point of View of Social Consciousness," and so Taft was one of the first American women to write a dissertation in philosophy on women's issues. At Chicago, she worked under the direction of George Herbert MEAD, who was influential both as a pragmatist philosopher and a social psychologist. Taft was strongly influenced by the pragmatist environment in Chicago, and like many other Progressive Era women, was eager to test out philosophical ideas in practice.

As Taft said later in life, "I had been brought up on pragmatism and the thinking of George Herbert Mead and John Dewey." (Robinson 1962, p. 128) DEWEY had left Chicago before Taft began her studies there, but he continued to be influential in the Chicago School. Mead, as her dissertation advisor, was a powerful influence on her early thinking, and was a strong supporter of women's rights and women's suffrage. He theorized that an individual's personal relationships with others were the principle source of personality formation, not biological or cultural influences. Taft's corresponding interest in the formation of the self led her to explore these ideas of personality development in an analysis of women's social constraints and the effects of the women's movement. She developed "a social theory of the self as the ground for the woman movement" (Robinson 1962, p. 38) looking at how the restrictive social attitudes toward women affected the development of feminine character. In her dissertation, she considered the lives and works of American feminists Olive Schreiner, Ellen Key, Charlotte Perkins GILMAN, and Ida Tarbell.

Taft's dissertation examined how a woman is forced to choose between "a crippled life in the home or an unfulfilled one out of it" (Seigfried 1993, p. 216) and how a woman's individual home life causes isolation. Taft pointed out that while most Americans continued to conceive of the family as an individ-

ualistic unit, in reality it had changed enormously and its activities had shifted outward. "Far from being an independent unit, the family exists by virtue of its relations to these social organizations, it is formed by them and in turn reacts upon them." Likewise, she noted that society was trying to preserve the "feudal woman" – "the great producer who knew personally every handmaid, farmer, herd body, or retainer who assisted her in keeping her family clothed, housed, and fed. Her personality was organized on the basis of these relationships." (1993, p. 222) In the industrial age, women were to be consumers rather than producers, without control of production, and often oblivious to the human beings who produced what they used in the home. Although some women did work outside the home, those women often still had no idea of their work in a social context. Without the vote and without social roles, women lacked a "socialized self" and felt little sense of responsibility for the ills of society.

Taft noted that society feared that the woman's movement would result in a loss of morals and social values. Because of a generalized fear of loss of virtues in the industrial world, women were expected to uphold and be carriers of the ancient virtues. Yet Taft realized that since virtue is expressed in action, and women are impotent in social action, they are also paradoxically seen as virtueless. Women were thus kept from reaching full possibilities of selfhood, with a limited self-consciousness. Yet, Taft also criticized the "militancy of the suffragettes" because she believed that getting the vote without a basic change in the social expectations for women would not result in real emancipation. Women, Taft said, need to be immersed in a culture which from a very early age expects them to be active participants.

In 1912 Taft interrupted her doctoral program for some months to work for Katherine Bement Davis at the Reformatory for Women in Bedford Hills, New York. After obtaining her doctoral degree in 1913, she returned to work at the Reformatory with Virginia Robinson, before becoming the Director of the Mental Hygiene Committee of the State Charities Aid Association of New York. This work enabled her to put her theoretical background into practice, employing empirical measures such as development tests in her work. From there she moved to the Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania, where she became a leading figure in the movement to improve foster and adoptive placement through technical skills and careful supervision. She and her life-partner Virginia Robinson, also a significant figure in social work, adopted two children, Everett and Martha. Taft worked for over two decades in child and family services as "a clinical psychologist" (Robinson 1962, p. 122). She continued to explore many aspects of children's and women's lives. She worked, for example, for an understanding of the importance of education, and the public school's role in children's development.

Taft met Otto Rank for the first time in 1924 at a meeting of the American Psychoanalytic Association, when Rank was beginning to separate from Freudian psychology over issues of authority and the role of the patient's will in the analytic process. Taft said of Rank, "for the second time in my life I had met genius" (Robinson 1962, p. 121). (The first meeting was with Mead.) She went to New York for analysis with Rank for several months in 1926 and then joined a weekly Rankian study group. Shortly thereafter she set up a private office and took in a few patients for psychoanalysis, while continuing her job as supervisor for the Children's Aid Society. As translator of Rank's major books, and later as his biographer, Taft became one of the foremost experts on Rankian psychology.

In 1934, at the age of fifty-two, Taft began full-time work as a faculty member of the University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work. She had been teaching courses for the school for over fifteen years, while continuing with her other professional work. She said that

1934 was "the first time I was able to see myself leaving the children's field" for teaching, which for her was "unconquered, undeveloped territory" where it was possible to "make a definitely technical contribution to social work before I leave it" (Robinson 1962, pp. 194–5). As a result of her influence, the graduate program at the University of Pennsylvania came to be known for the development of functional casework. Taft retired from Pennsylvania in 1950, and pursued her work on Rank's thought for the rest of the decade.

Taft authored four books, edited another five volumes, translated two works by Otto Rank, and published over seventy articles in scholarly journals. She is remembered today mostly for her innovations in social work, which she said was her "real experience," rather than for her earlier contributions to academic philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Woman Movement from the Point of View of Social Consciousness (Nebasgam, Wisc., 1915). Chapter 2, "The Woman Movement as Part of the Larger Social Situation," reprinted in *Hypatia* 8 (1993): 219–29.

Some Undesirable Habits and Suggestions as to Treatment, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Bulletin No. 4 (Philadelphia, 1929).

The Dynamics of Therapy in a Controlled Relationship (New York, 1933).

Otto Rank: A Biographical Study Based on Notebooks, Letters, Collected Writings, Therapeutic Achievements and Personal Associations (New York, 1958).

Other Relevant Works

Taft's papers are at the University of Pennsylvania and Harvard University.

Trans., *Will Therapy: An Analysis of the Therapeutic Process in Terms of Relationship*, by Otto Rank (New York, 1936).

Trans., *Truth and Reality: A Life History of the Human Will*, by Otto Rank (New York, 1936).

Ed., *Social Case Work with Children, Studies in Structure and Process* (Philadelphia, 1939).

Ed., *Day Nursery Care as a Social Service* (Philadelphia, 1945).

Ed., *A Functional Approach to Family Case Work* (Philadelphia, 1944).

Ed., *The Role of the Baby in the Placement Process* (Philadelphia, 1946).

Ed., *Counseling and Protective Service as Family Case Work* (Philadelphia, 1946).

Ed., *Family Casework and Counseling, A Functional Approach* (Philadelphia, 1948).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio

Deegan, Mary Jo. "The Clinical Sociology of Jessie Taft," *Clinical Sociology Review* 4 (1986): 30–45.

Robinson, Virginia P., ed. *Jessie Taft: Therapist and Social Work Educator, A Professional Biography* (Philadelphia, 1962).

Rosenberg, Rosalind. *Beyond Separate Spheres: Intellectual Roots of Modern Feminism* (New Haven, Conn., 1982).

Seigfried, Charlene Haddock. "Introduction to Jessie Taft's *The Woman Movement from the Point of View of Social Consciousness*," *Hypatia* 8 (1993): 215–8.

Seigfried, Charlene Haddock. *Pragmatism and Feminism: Reweaving the Social Fabric* (Chicago, 1996).

Judy D. Whipps

TALBOT, Ellen Bliss (1867–1968)

Ellen Bliss Talbot was born on 22 November 1867 in Iowa City, Iowa, the second child and elder daughter of Benjamin and Harriet Bliss Talbot. She earned a BA from Ohio State University in 1890 and a PhD in philosophy from Cornell University in 1898. One of the first truly professional academic women philosophers, Talbot was among the first female members of the American Philosophical Association and one of seven women who also held membership in the American Psychological Association in the organizations' first decades.

Talbot spent her academic career as a professor of philosophy at Mount Holyoke College from 1900 to 1936, serving as chair of the philosophy department for over thirty years. She remained active in the social and political life of the town of South Hadley, Massachusetts for a number of years after her retirement from Mount Holyoke, and then she moved to Spartanburg, South Carolina in 1953 at the age of eighty-five to be near family. She lived for fifteen years in Spartanburg, the last several in the care of a nursing home, dying at the age of one hundred on 25 January 1968.

Talbot's father was an ordained minister, but he made a career for himself as an educator and advocate for the deaf in both Iowa and Ohio. When Ellen was a child, Benjamin Talbot served as the principal of the Iowa Institute for the Deaf and Dumb in Iowa City. By 1880 the family had moved to Columbus, Ohio where her father took a position at the Deaf and Dumb Asylum. Ellen and her sister Mignon both attended Ohio State University, and Mignon also became a professional academic, teaching geology alongside Ellen at Mount Holyoke. The sisters were distantly related to Marion Talbot, the sociologist who established the Association of Collegiate Alumnae and was the Dean of Women at the University of Chicago.

After completing her bachelor's degree at Ohio State University, Talbot taught at high schools in Dresden, Ohio and Troy, Ohio. By 1895 she had returned to the academic world, pursuing the doctoral degree at Cornell as first a Sage Scholar (1895–7) and then a Sage Fellow (1897–8). Talbot was one of five women to earn a doctoral degree in philosophy from Cornell in the nineteenth century. Of the ten universities that allowed women to study at the doctoral level, Cornell's women were by far the most productive. May Preston SLOSSON (1880) taught for several years at Hastings College, stepping down from her position when she married and had children. Eliza RITCHIE (1889) taught at Vassar College, Wellesley College, and Dalhousie University and authored several articles, on Spinoza and on ethics. Grace Neal Dolson (1899) taught at Wells College and wrote a number of articles, on Nietzsche and on ethics. Vida Frank Moore (1900) taught at Mount Holyoke and Elmira College, writing at least a few articles on ethics and on psychology. Dolson and Moore were charter members of the APA with Talbot. Ritchie had joined the organization by 1905. These women's achievements were remarkable, given the obstacles facing them as they sought to become career academics.

Both Johns Hopkins and Harvard had withheld doctoral degrees due to sex bias on four separate occasions, famously affecting two prominent women philosophers, Christine LADD-FRANKLIN (Johns Hopkins, 1882) and Mary Whiton CALKINS (Harvard, 1894), and one lesser-known woman in the discipline, Ethel Puffer Howes (Harvard, 1898). Cornell was one of the few coeducational institutions that actively worked to create an environment conducive to women's achievement in higher education. The network of intellectual women from fully coeducational institutions took over where Cornell left off. Influential in this regard was Helen Magill White, the wife of Cornell's President Andrew White and the first woman in America to earn a doctoral degree in any discipline, a PhD in Greek from Boston University in 1877.

The academic environment beyond the graduate programs of universities like Cornell,

Michigan, and Chicago, all of which welcomed women, was not always friendly, however. Despite having a doctoral degree in philosophy in hand from one of the finest schools in the country in 1898, Talbot was not able to find a position at the college level. Like many of her female academic colleagues, she had to resort to teaching at the secondary level at Emma Willard's school for girls.

In 1900 Talbot followed the path of the majority of women with her credentials in this era when she became a faculty member at Mount Holyoke, a women's college. Mount Holyoke had made the transition from a "female seminary" to a college in 1888, and an increased emphasis on scholarship and curricular growth and change came with this new status. Talbot was hired by Elizabeth Storrs Mead, president of the college throughout the 1890s, who was instrumental in ensuring that Mt. Holyoke met the standards to which it aspired when its trustees determined that it become a college. Into the late 1880s the vast majority of faculty members were alumnae of Mt. Holyoke. Just prior to Mead's presidency, this began to change, and the college was happy to alter schedules to facilitate faculty development. Henrietta Hooker traveled to Berlin each summer to conduct graduate study in chemistry, Mary Berry took a year's leave to do advanced study in botany at Cornell, and Marietta KIES spent the fall term at the University of Michigan for four years while earning a doctoral degree in philosophy. When Talbot arrived on the Mount Holyoke campus in 1900, she was a member of a new league of faculty who brought excellent academic training and credentials to the institution. Her presence at Mount Holyoke was approved by its new president, Mary Emma Woolley, whose tenure at the college nearly paralleled her own, from 1900 to 1937, and by 1904 Talbot was chair of the philosophy department.

Talbot was professionally active beyond the Mount Holyoke campus. She published three books, several articles, and a number of book reviews in the first two decades of the twentieth century. She also held postdoctoral fellowships early in her career, at the University of Chicago (summer 1901), and the universities of Berlin (fall 1904) and Heidelberg (spring 1905). A charter member of the American Philosophical Association, she remained involved in the organization even after she had retired from teaching.

Talbot's dissertation focused on Fichte's epistemology, and the majority of her work continued to explore the nature of knowledge, especially as it is related to consciousness. She published her first article in 1895, where she set herself apart from other thinkers in this era as decidedly more modern and prepared for the intellectual developments of the coming century. In form, her writing is direct and her footnotes detailed and precise. In content, her work shows a clear understanding of some of the key challenges philosophy would face in the decades ahead: distinguishing itself from other disciplines, establishing a systematic method of inquiry, and resisting reliance on metaphysical assumptions that cannot be demonstrated.

Talbot's article on "The Doctrine of Conscious Elements" (1895) discusses the newest theories of mind and insisted on a purely scientific psychology, unfettered by theories of mind–body dualism, soul, or other metaphysical constructs. The philosopher must analyze consciousness free of all assumptions given to us by metaphysics, Talbot said. Philosophy's current task is to make sure it stays within the proper bounds of inquiry so that it can arrive at a set of truly philosophical determinations, rather than simply attempt to mimic religion. As her thought evolved, she explored the work of Fichte as the philosopher she thought was best able to conduct the sort of inquiry required of contemporary philosophy.

Shortly after she began teaching at Mount Holyoke, Talbot published "The Relation of the Two Periods of Fichte's Philosophy" in 1901. She explains that the apparent shift in Fichte's thought, from a focus on Ego/God in his early work to one on Being/the Absolute in later works, is really a deeper expression of his sense of unity. In his earlier years, Fichte was simply

trying to work out the relation of the individual to the world. His later thought focused on the unity of the whole. Because consciousness necessarily points to a duality – an I/Not I – yet it is also striving to achieve unity, it was appropriate for Fichte first to explore the relationship of individual consciousness to the objective world, *then* to look at the unity of all being. Thus what seemed to be a change in Fichte's thought was actually simply a natural progression of thought within it.

Talbot used Fichte's thought as a lens through which to view the work of her colleagues in the pragmatist movement, a school of thought that was gaining recognition when she published "The Philosophy of Fichte in Its Relation to Pragmatism" in 1907. In this article, she asserts that pragmatism has much in common with Fichte's idealism. Specifically, pragmatism recognizes along with Fichte that in practical life an individual "creates," in a sense, a world that is useful, because we make objects and events suit our purposes: "in practical life, the subject makes the object conform to it" (p. 501). In failing to recognize that human inquiry is an active, dynamic force in the world, Fichte falls short in an area in which pragmatism is particularly strong. Yet in one area his thought not only surpasses pragmatism, but provides a model it would do well to follow: his ability to reconcile subject and object. For Fichte, there is a unity, not only to thought, but also between and among objects in the world. His understanding of Being provides a oneness that works in and through individual finite subjects. This makes for a unified, cohesive whole that pragmatism, with its focus on individual inquiries, aims, and desires, cannot provide.

Roughly one-third of Talbot's work consisted of original discussions of philosophical problems, particularly on questions of human freedom and moral value, as in "Humanism and Freedom" (1909), "Individuality and Freedom" (1909), and "The Time-Process and the Value of Human Life" (1914). In these writings, she explores how values, experience, and human freedom intersect with and/or reinforce each other. The most innovative of these writings are the "Time-Process and Value" articles, written when Talbot was a mid-career academic. Here she discusses values and moral goods not as fixed entities, but as dynamic processes which can have a greater or lesser impact, depending on the context, specifically in regard to time. The articles show us that Talbot had a great deal in common with the pragmatist, personalist, and process thought that was under development in her day. Her work as a whole demonstrates that she was a competent philosopher who was comfortable entertaining new ideas and interested in making abstract thought relevant to everyday human problems.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Doctrine of Conscious Elements," *Philosophical Review* 4 (1895): 154–66.

"The Relation between Human Consciousness and Its Ideal as Conceived by Kant and Fichte," *Kantstudien* 3 (1899): 286–312.

"The Relation of the Two Periods of Fichte's Philosophy," *Mind* n.s. 10 (1901): 336–46.

The Fundamental Principle of Fichte's Philosophy (New York, 1906).

"The Philosophy of Fichte in Its Relation to Pragmatism," *Philosophical Review* 16 (1907): 488–505.

"Humanism and Freedom," *Journal of Philosophy* 6 (1909): 149–55.

"Individuality and Freedom," *Philosophical Review* 18 (1909): 600–14.

"The Time-Process and the Value of Human Life," *Philosophical Review* 23 (1914): 634–47; 24 (1915): 17–36.

Further Reading
Nat Cycl Amer Bio v54, Who Was Who in Amer v4, Who's Who in Phil

Dorothy Rogers

TARSKI, Alfred (1901–83)

Alfred Tarski was born Alfred Tajtelbaum on 14 January 1901 in Warsaw, Poland, which at that time was part of the Russian Empire. He died on 26 October 1983 in Berkeley, California. Tarski's early education was at the Mazowiecka school, where he studied languages, classical as well as modern, and was especially interested in biology. He then served in the Polish army, and in 1918 he entered the University of Warsaw as a biology major, but after taking a logic course with Stanislaw Lesniewski he turned to the study of mathematics and philosophy. He wrote his doctoral thesis under Lesniewski's direction, submitting his thesis "O wyrszie peirwotnym logistyki" (On the Primitive Terms of Logistic) in 1923 and receiving his PhD in mathematics in 1924, becoming the youngest PhD produced by that university. In addition to Lesniewski, the major influences on Tarski were mathematicians Jan Lukasiewicz, Waclaw Sierpinski, and Stefan Mazurkiewicz, and philosopher Tadeusz Kotarbinski. In 1923 he and his brother Wlacéaw changed their name from Tajtelbaum to Tarski and converted from Judaism to Roman Catholicism, in order to demonstrate their Polishness.

At a comparatively young age Tarski already was writing on problems of set theory, and the direction of his research on the definition of truth was signaled by the early publication "Sur les truth-functions au sens du MM. Russell et Whitehead" (1924). Tarski soon became a recognized member of the Warsaw mathematical school. He made important contributions in many areas of mathematics, including metamathematics, set theory, measure theory, model theory, mathematical decision problems, universal algebra, algebraic logic, and general algebra. For example, group theorists study "Tarski monsters," infinite groups whose existence seems intuitively impossible. Tarski produced axioms for logical consequence, worked on deductive systems, the algebra of logic and the theory of definability. His most influential contributions were algebraic logic, in particular in the calculus of relations, and especially cylindric and polyadic algebra, cardinal and ordinal algebras and, of special interest for philosophy, in semantics relating to the definition of truth.

Together with Adolf Lindenbaum, Tarski can be seen as a founder of and nucleus around which Polish logicians contributed to the development of algebraic logic during the period between the two world wars, and of which Helena Rasiowa and Andrzej Mostowski became leading successors. Mostowski had entered the University of Warsaw in 1931 and was nominally the doctoral student of Kazimierz Kuratowski, but it was Tarski who had the greatest influence on him. Moreover, although Kuratowski was Mostowski's official thesis advisor, it was Tarski, still a *docent*, who in 1939 supervised his doctoral dissertation. In considering the relation between logic, philosophy, and mathematics at Warsaw during the interbellum period, Jan Wolenski remarked on the great variety of positions resultant from the fact that the Warsaw Logical School was not bound to any philosophical ideology. Typical examples were Lukasiewicz and Tarski, because "both were ready to investigate any logical problem independently of whether it originated in logicism, intuitionism, or formalism." In 1924 Tarski extended the results in set theory of Georg Cantor, Ernst Zermelo, and Richard Dedekind, but making no distinction between Cantor's intuitive set theory and the axiomatic theories of Zermelo or Dedekind. In that same year of 1924 Tarski and Stefan Banach jointly published an important paper which investigated the equivalence of geometric figures by finite decompositions. They devised the so-called "Banach–Tarski Paradox," not really a paradox in the technical sense, but a counterintuitive result in topology, according to which a sphere cut into an finite number of pieces can be reassembled, either into a sphere of larger size than the original, or into two spheres, each equal in size to the original.

Tarski taught at the Polish Pedagogical Institute in Warsaw from 1922 to 1925, and was then appointed *docent* in mathematics and logic at the University of Warsaw, where he later became Lukasiewicz's assistant. In the seminars on the method of quantifier elimination which Tarski gave at the University of Warsaw during 1926–8, he formulated the theorem, known as Tarski's Theorem, that the first-order theory of real numbers with + , * , = , and > allows quantifier elimination. From 1925 until 1939 he also served as mathematics professor at Warsaw's Zeromski Lyceum.

In the autumn of 1929 Karl Menger was asked to lecture at the University of Warsaw. During this trip he became acquainted with the work of the Warsaw School of Logic, and met Lindenbaum and Tarski. Menger felt that both the Vienna Circle and the mathematicians should become familiar with the "logico-philo-sophical work of the Warsaw school and invited Tarski to deliver three lectures before the Colloquium" (Menger 1994, p. 147). These lectures took place in February 1930. The major result of the visit was Tarski's introduction to Rudolf CARNAP and Kurt GÖDEL. This was the beginning of a lasting professional relationship between Carnap and Tarski, and also between Gödel and Tarski.

In August 1939 Tarski was attending a conference on the Unity of Science being held at Harvard University. Two weeks later came the invasion of Poland that began World War II. Consequently Tarski remained in the United States while his wife and children remained in Poland, and his wife taught in Polish underground schools for the duration of the war. The family was reunited after the end of the war, when Tarski was able to bring them to the United States. Tarski was given temporary positions at Harvard from 1939 to 1941 and at the City College of New York in 1940, and was invited by Gödel to the Institute of Advanced Study in Princeton for 1941–2. With letters of recommendation from Bertrand Russell and W. V. QUINE, Tarski was able to join the faculty of University of California at Berkeley in 1942,

where he was assistant professor of mathematics until 1945, promoted to associate professor in 1945, and full professor in 1949, and he later became research professor at the Miller Institute of Basic Research in Science in 1958–60. Tarski was elected to the National Academy of Sciences, the Royal Netherlands Academy of Sciences and Letters, and the British Academy. He was President of the Association for Symbolic Logic during 1944–6 and the International Union for the History and Philosophy of Science in 1956–7. Tarski became emeritus professor in 1968, but was asked to continue teaching until 1973; he continued to supervise research students until his death in 1983.

In 1933 Tarski published "The Concept of Truth in Formalized Languages" (in 1956) establishing a theorem asserting the undefinability of the concept of truth. Here he took truth to be a syntactical property. This was followed in 1936 by "On the Concept of Logical Consequence" (in 1983). Tarski had given a semantic definition of truth as a correspondence theory, according to which "Snow is white" is true if and only if snow is white. Tarski further claimed that the conclusion of an argument will follow logically from its premises if and only if every model of the premises is a model of the conclusion. Formal scientific languages can be subjected to more thorough study by the semantic method that he developed. In 1944 his "The Semantic Conception of Truth and the Foundations of Semantics" appeared; debate continues whether his semantic theory is a variation of a correspondence theory of truth or a deflationary theory of truth. A revised version of his 1933 semantic theory of truth, for model-theoretic languages, in collaboration with Robert Lawson Vaught in their "Arithmetical Extensions of Relational Systems," was published in 1956. The chief criteria for this definition were formal correctness and material adequacy. Formally it is required that $(\forall x)True(x)$ if and only if $\phi(x)$, where "True" does not occur in ϕ, and the definition meets the requirement for material

adequacy when we have ϕ(*s*) if and only if ψ where *s* is the name of a sentence *S* of the language *L* and ψ is a copy of *S* in the metalanguage *M* for *S*. Tarski introduced the term and concept of metalanguage, thereupon popularized by Carnap, on analogy with David Hilbert's concept of *metamathematics*.

In "On the Calculus of Relations" (1941, p. 73), Tarski called Charles PEIRCE "the creator of the theory of relations," which Ernst Schröder continued and systematically developed. As a consequence, Tarski saw it as his task to take up where Peirce and Schröder left off and saw himself in an important sense as the direct mathematical descendent of Peirce.

Tarski wrote more than ten books in different areas of mathematics, and his teaching influenced many young mathematicians. His work includes *A Decision Method for Elementary Algebra and Geometry*, *Undecidable Theories*, written in cooperation with Andrzej Mostowski and Raphel Mitchel Robinson, and the collection titled *Logic, Semantics, Metamathematics* (1956, 1983). Tarski used the method of proof devised by Jacques Sturm in 1940 to prove the completeness of elementary algebra and geometry, and in 1949 he presented a decision procedure for elementary algebra and geometry based on algebraic methods. The algorithm of Tarski was further improved by Abraham ROBINSON, Abraham Seidenberg, P. J. Cohen, Leonard G. Monk, George E. Collins, Michael Ben-Or, Dexter Kozen, and John H. Reif, but the complexity of methods based on Tarski's scheme has resulted in only the more trivial theorems being proved by it on computers.

The Boole–Peirce–Schröder tradition was to some extent absorbed through the more recent quantification-theoretic and set-theoretic traditions into the new mathematical logic, and has, as Tarski noted in "On the Calculus of Relations," been reduced to a consideration of the connections of algebraic logic to first-order functional calculus. Tarski and Steven Givant's *A Formalization of Set Theory without Variables*, which appeared in 1987 after

Tarski's death, was the culmination of Tarski's work in algebraic logic, producing a system bringing together Schröder's goal of developing the class calculus as a branch of algebraic logic with Russell's goal of founding all of mathematics on a small number of logical assumptions. Tarski and Givant achieved this unification by creating a branch of algebraic logic that founds set theory and number theory on a small number of logical assumptions, on the basis of the calculus of relations. But it should be noted that these two goals were also brought together by Peirce, who had already made a start at its realization, especially in "Description of a Notation for the Logic of Relatives," in "The Logic of Relatives," and "On the Algebra of Logic: A Contribution to the Philosophy of Notation."

Tarski began this work as early as 1953. In *A Formalization of Set Theory without Variables*, here a three-variable fragment of first-order logic L_3 is given in which an axiom system is developed which presents set theory and number theory as sets of equations between predicates constructed from two binary predicates denoting the identity and set-theoretic elementhood relations. This presents a partial positive reply to Ernst Schröder's question in *Vorlesungen über die Algebra der Logik* of whether an algebra of relatives can express all statements about relations as equations of the calculus of relations. Tarski and Givant developed L^x as a formal language that is an analog of the algebraic theory of relations, containing two binary relations: identity and set membership, along with the usual Boolean operators. They next derived the theorems, familiar from number theory and set theory in first-order logic as equations of L^x. Thus they established that it is a representable relation algebra, where representability is the counterpart of completeness of axiom systems in first-order logic. Next they considered L^+, which contains the usual logical axioms of first-order logic and the set membership relation of L^x, and a set of translation axioms. L^x is a fragment L^+ of which contains only variable-free equations,

and including only equations of L⁺ of the form R = S. Within this theory, they considered a proposition of first-order logic expressing the existence of an equation of three variables which cannot be expressed in first-order logic without using four variables, and a formula of first-order logic which could be translated into L^x but not into L^+_3, and which appears, therefore, to be a counter-example to Peirce's Reduction Thesis holding that equations of four or more terms can be rendered in the algebra of relatives using combinations of binary and tertiary relations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Sur les truth-functions au sens du MM. Russell et Whitehead," *Fundamenta Mathematicae* 5 (1924): 59–74.

Pojecie prawdy w jezykach nauk dedukcyjnych (Warsaw, 1933). Trans. Olaf Helmer, *Introduction to Logic and the Methodology of Deductive Sciences* (Oxford, 1941; 4th edn 1994).

"On the Calculus of Relations," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 6 (1941): 73–89.

"The Semantic Conception of Truth and the Foundations of Semantics," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* (1944): 13–47.

Cardinal Algebras (New York, 1949).

Undecidable Theories, with Andrzej Mostowski and Raphael M. Robinson (Amsterdam, 1953).

"Arithmetical Extensions of Relational Systems," with Robert Lawson Vaught, *Compositio Mathematica* 13 (1956): 81–102.

Logic, Semantics, Metamathematics: Papers from 1923 to 1938, trans. Joseph Woodger (Oxford, 1956; 2nd edn, Indianapolis, 1983).

Ordinal Algebras (Amsterdam, 1956).

A Formalization of Set Theory without Variables, with Steven R. Givant (Providence, R.I., 1987).

Other Relevant Works

Tarski's papers are at the University of California at Berkeley.

Collected Papers, 4 vols, ed. Steven R. Givant and Ralph N. McKenzie (Boston, Basel, and Stuttgart, 1986).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v8*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Anellis, Irving H. "Tarski's Development of Peirce's Logic of Relations," in *Studies in the Logic of Charles Sanders Peirce*, ed. Nathan Houser, Don D. Roberts, and James W. Van Evra (Indianapolis, 1997), pp. 271–303.

Bach, Craig N. "Tarski's 1936 Account of Logical Consequence," *Modern Logic* 7 (1997): 109–30.

Etchemendy, John. *The Concept of Logical Consequence* (Cambridge, Mass., 1990).

Feferman, Anita Burdman, and Solomon Feferman. *Alfred Tarski: Life and Logic* (Cambridge, UK, 2004).

Givant, Steven R. "Bibliography of Alfred Tarski," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 51 (1986): 913–41.

———, "Tarski's Development of Logic and Mathematics Based on the Calculus of Relations," in *Algebraic Logic*, ed. Hajnal Andréka, James Monk, and István Németi (Amsterdam, 1991), pp. 189–216.

Gómez-Torrente, Mario. "Tarski on Logical Consequence," *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 37 (1996): 125–51.

Henkin, Leon, et al, eds. *Proceedings of the Tarski Symposium: An International Symposium Held to Honor Alfred Tarski on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (Providence, R.I., 1974).

The Journal of Symbolic Logic 51 (1986): 869–912 and 53 (1988): 2–91. Special issues about Tarski.

Menger, Karl. *Reminiscences of the Vienna Circle: A Mathematician's View* (Dordrecht, 1994).

Monk, James Donald. "The Contributions of

Alfred Tarski to Algebraic Logic," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 51 (1986): 899–906.

Riverc, François. *Sémantique et vérité: de Tarski à Davidson* (Paris, 1998).

Scherb, Martin. *Künstliche und natürliche Sprache: Bemerkungen zur Semantik bei Tarski und Wittgenstein* (Hildesheim, Germany, 1992).

Sereny, György. "Gödel, Tarski, Church, and the Liar," *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 9 (2003): 3–25.

Wolenski, Jan, and Eckehart Köhler, eds. *Alfred Tarski and the Vienna Circle: Austro-Polish Connections in Logical Empiricism* (Dordrecht, 1999).

Irving H. Anellis

TASCHEREAU, Elzéar-Alexandre
(1820–98)

Elzéar-Alexandre Taschereau was born on 17 February 1820 in Sainte-Marie-de-la-Nouvelle-Beauce, Lower Canada (Québec). He entered the Petit Séminaire de Québec in 1828 and completed his classical studies with distinction by 1836. Travel in Europe climaxed with a stay in Rome and a decision to become a Benedictine monk in 1837. Persuaded by his Petit Séminaire teacher John Holmes to abandon these plans, Taschereau returned to Québec that year and entered the Grand Séminaire for theological study and teaching duties at the Petit Séminaire. In 1842 he was ordained priest and graduated to a faculty position at the Grand Séminaire. From 1842 to 1854 he taught intellectual and moral philosophy, modifying the curriculum originated by Jérôme Demers by adding contemporary developments including Thomism. He also gave courses in astronomy, architecture, theology, and the Bible.

In 1849 Taschereau joined the Grand Séminaire council of directors, and helped to found l'Université Laval in 1852. He was also director of the Petit Séminaire during 1851–2 and 1856–9. From 1854 to 1856 he studied theology in Rome and earned a doctorate in canon law. Thereafter he assumed greater responsibilities, including service as rector of the Grand Séminaire until 1866. In 1871 he became archbishop of Québec and led the Catholic Church through tumultuous years of internal conflict and a growing sense of crisis for French-speaking Canada. In 1886 he was made the first Cardinal in Canada. Taschereau died on 12 April 1898 in Québec City.

Taschereau, like his friend Benjamin Pâquet, tended towards a moderate position between the extreme ultramontanism of conservative clerics who stressed Papal political supremacy, and the emerging Catholic liberals who promoted democracy and workers' rights. The Church, he believed, should support legitimate political authority here in Canada without taking sides, and discourage social and labor disruptions, including strikes. He was an early clerical proponent of French nationalism, a cause which theologian Louis-Adolphe Pâquet would continue with vigor. Taschereau consistently fought the most conservative elements of the Church and successfully avoided serious conflict with the dominant Protestant authorities over needed social reforms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Discipline du diocèse de Québec (Québec, 1879; 2nd edn 1895).

Remarques de l'archevêque de Québec sur le mémoire de 1883 concernant la division du diocèse des Trois-Rivières et réponse de l'évêque de Trois-Rivières à ces remarques (Québec, 1884).

"Histoire du séminaire des missions étrangères de Québec," *Le Canada français* (Québec) 2nd ser. 20 (1932–33): 628–34.

Further Reading
Canad Encyc, *Dict Canad Bio*

Auclair, Elie-J. "Cardinal Elzéar-Alexandre Taschereau (1820–1898)," in *Figures canadiennes, Première série* (Montréal, 1933), pp. 22–30.

Gosselin, David. "Le Cardinal Taschereau (1820–1898)," *La Semaine religieuse de Québec* 10 (1897–98): 531–6.

John R. Shook

TAWNEY, Guy Allan (1870–1947)

Guy Allan Tawney was born on 11 March 1870 in Tippecanoe City, Ohio, of Daniel Abraham Tawney and Adelle Paige Tawney. He died on 5 January 1947, in Urbana, Illinois. Tawney attended preparatory school in New Castle, Indiana. He attended Macalester College in Minnesota (1887–8) and Wabash College in Indiana (1888–9, 1890–91), before going to Princeton. At Princeton he received the BA degree in 1893 and the MA in 1894. He then went to Germany, to the University of Leipzig, where he studied with Paul Emil Flechsig, Karl Heinze, Rudolf Leuckart, Johannes Immanuel Volkelt, Eilhard Ernst Gustav Wiedemann, and Wilhelm Wundt. In 1896 Tawney received the PhD in philosophy from the University of Leipzig, with a dissertation on tactile sensation entitled, "Über die Wahrnehmung zweier Punkte mittels des Tastsinnes, mit Rücksicht auf die Frage der Übung und die Entstehung der Vexirfehler." The dissertation was written under the supervision of Wundt.

Tawney returned to Princeton in 1896 as a demonstrator in psychology. In 1897 he moved to Beloit College in Wisconsin where he succeeded James J. Blaisdell. In 1899 he became Squier Professor of Mental Science and Philosophy at Beloit, a position he held until 1907. Tawney continued to spend summers at Princeton, where he assisted James Mark BALDWIN in his preparation of *The Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*.

In 1906–1907, taking a leave of absence, Tawney spent a year at Columbia University where he directed the university's psychology laboratory. In 1908 Tawney was appointed assistant professor and chair of the philosophy department at the University of Cincinnati, succeeding H. Heath BAWDEN, and in 1909 he married Marietta Busey, with whom he had three children. In 1927 Tawney was appointed Obediah J. Wilson Professor of Ethics at Cincinnati. During his tenure as department chair, the department grew from 45 students to 450.

In 1930 Tawney moved to a professorship in the philosophy department at the University of Illinois at Urbana, a position he held until his retirement in 1939. Tawney served as Chairman of the Board of Busey's State Bank from 1933 until his death and was a member of the Board of Directors of the Chicago Presbyterian Theological Seminary. He was also a member of the American Philosophical Association, Phi Beta Kappa, and the British Institute for Philosophical Studies. He was a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1925–6.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Über die Trugwahrnehmung zweier Punkte bei der Berührung eines Punktes der Haut," *Philosophische Studien*, ed. Wilhelm Wundt, vol. 11 (1895): 394–405.

"The Nature of Consistency," *Journal of Philosophy* 3 (1906): 113–23.

"Two Types of Consistency," *Journal of Philosophy* 3 (1906): 457–62.

"Constitutive Consistency," *Philosophical Review* 16 (1907): 21–39.

J. S. Mill's Theory of Inductive Logic (Cincinnati, 1909).

"Methodological Realism," *Philosophical Review* 22 (1913): 284–303.

"Causes and Issues of the War," *University*

of Cincinnati Faculty Pamphlet Series
(Cincinnati, 1918).
"Liberty and Democracy," pamphlet for the
Cincinnati City Club (Cincinnati, 1918).
"Logic as the Science of the Pure Concept,"
Journal of Philosophy 16 (1919): 169–80.
"Religion and Experimentation,"
International Journal of Ethics 36 (1926):
337–56.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v3, *Proc of APA in Phil
Rev v56*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*,
Who's Who in Phil

Cornelis de Waal

TAYLOR, Charles (1931–)

Charles Taylor was born on 5 November 1931
in Montréal, Québec, Canada. In 1952 he was
awarded a BA in history with first class
honours from McGill University in Montréal.
He earned a second BA degree in politics, phi-
losophy, and economics from Balliol College,
Oxford in 1955, again with first class honours.
He was awarded an MA in 1960 and a PhD in
philosophy in 1961 from Oxford, having been
a fellow of All Souls College. Returning to
Canada in 1961, he was appointed to the
departments of philosophy and political science
at McGill University. In 1976 he went back to
Oxford to take up the Chichele Professorship
of Social and Political Theory, but returned
once more in 1981 to McGill and the city he
loves and which remains his home. His home-
coming did not preclude him from taking a
variety of visiting positions at places such as the
Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, New
Jersey, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem,
and the New School of Social Research in New
York. He retired from McGill in 1998. Since
2002 he has been on the faculty at

Northwestern University, where he has a joint
appointment in the Law School and in the
Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences as a
permanent visiting professor of philosophy,
and also is a Board of Trustees Professor.

Taylor has been publishing prolifically for
over four decades, engaging in debates about
many of the most important areas of philo-
sophical inquiry. He has staked out distinctive
positions in the areas of ontology, epistemol-
ogy, moral philosophy, philosophical anthro-
pology, hermeneutics and the philosophy of
language, as well as social and political theory.
Acquaintance with even a few of the details of
his biography sheds some light on some of his
major concerns and contributions to philoso-
phy. It would, for example, be hard to deny
that living in Québec, a province that con-
stantly debates its continuing place in the
Canadian federation, has influenced Taylor's
work as a political philosopher. His reflections
on nationalism, on democracy's need for inclu-
sion, and his important account of the politics
of recognition have all been directly affected by
his experience of living, and being politically
active, in Québec. At a wider level, residing in
a country bordered by the world's largest and
probably still most confident liberal democ-
racy has also shaped Taylor's thought about
different styles and understandings of liberal-
ism.

Taylor's father was a Protestant who spoke
English while his mother was a Francophone
Catholic, and being raised in this bicultural,
bi-lingual family has also proved significant
for the evolution of his thought, for no matter
what the topic, a concern with language and
culture is never far from the center of his inter-
rogations. Taylor himself draws a link between
his philosophical interest in language and his
personal background when he reflects that:

> Having belonged to a mixed family for
> several generations, it always seemed obvious
> to me that language is more than an instru-
> ment, that each language carries with it its
> own sense of humour, conception of the

world etc. Hence my interest for language and for the romantic philosophy of language, which criticized the instrumentalist philosophy of Hobbes, Locke or Condillac. (1998, p. 109)

It would be difficult to overestimate the significance Taylor imputes to language and to culture in the creation and transmission of meaning in human life. Yet one of the interesting and challenging features of his thought is that while imputing great significance to culture and language in fashioning identity, he does not accept any idea that identity is purely an artifact of culture or language. This is because Taylor subscribes to something like a conception of human nature, a belief that there are certain features that necessarily accompany being human and which transcend differences of time, place, culture, and language. In his approach to philosophical anthropology we see therefore a mixture of elements: some aspects of the self can only be understood by reference to the person's wider cultural context, while others are part and parcel of what it means to be human. In Taylor's view, among the features that all human beings share are: being language animals, being self-interpreting animals, having identities that are profoundly constituted through dialogue, having purposes which play an important part in a person's sense of who they are, and, finally, being situated in what he calls moral space, which means being located within a moral framework, having a certain orientation to the good and being a strong evaluator.

Both these aspects of Taylor's approach to philosophical anthropology – the perennial and the culture-dependent – are illustrated clearly in his largest work so far, *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity* (1989). In the first part of *Sources of the Self*, he outlines the features that he takes to be constitutive of human selfhood, while in parts II–V, he identifies the distinctively modern aspects of the self and traces the ways in which these have developed over the centuries. This is not a straightforward task, because one of the things Taylor emphasizes is the multiplicity of the modern self: several strands and sources, sometimes complementary, sometimes contradictory, have gone into making the modern identity.

One of the major values that Taylor associates with the modern self is a disengaged notion of freedom. Rather than imagining itself as connected to some wider cosmic-cum-moral order, the modern self believes that it can properly understand and define itself in the absence of any attachment to this ambient reality. The disengaged self makes of its world an object, and stands toward it as a subject whose task it is to understand and control that world (1989, p. 188). Another important strand of modern selfhood is inwardness. The modern self sees itself as an entity with inner depths and believes that exploring, coming to know and perhaps expressing these inner depths is a valuable undertaking (1989, p. 178). Thirdly, the modern self has a powerful sense of its own individuality or uniqueness, and aspires to live in a way that is true to that individuality. According to what Taylor calls this "ethic of authenticity," each person has to discover an original way of being, to recognize it as a true or faithful expression of who they are, and to adopt and take responsibility for it. The fourth element of the modern self is the idea of nature as source. What Taylor means by this is that modern selves harbour a sense that interaction with the natural world can be a source of moral renewal, and such contact enables them to hearken to the voice of nature within. There is seen to be something profoundly valuable for humans about contact with nature. Finally, the modern self is informed by an ethos that Taylor calls the affirmation of ordinary life. This revolves around the idea that what happens in the spheres of work and family makes a substantial contribution to one's sense of the value and meaning of life.

This is an identity picture of the modern self, whose history Taylor traces in *Sources of the*

Self. It is noteworthy that in constructing his history of the modern self, his focus is overwhelmingly on the cultural realm. And within the realm of culture, the accent falls heavily on canonical works of philosophy. Even when he looks beyond philosophy to other cultural products, Taylor's interest tends to remain in written texts, although some consideration is afforded to the ways in which forms of cultural creativity such as music and the visual arts have contributed to the modern identity. Overall, however, although he does not deny their influence, Taylor pays minimal attention to the role that economic activities and institutions, changes in modes of production, science and technology, or systems of government and law, have had in forging the modern identity.

Taylor's most recent book, *Modern Social Imaginaries* (2004), continues the concern expressed in *Sources* with the distinctive ethical or normative features of modern existence, although less attention is paid there to philosophizing about the self and more to articulating the assumptions, presuppositions and beliefs needed to appreciate the modern Western view of society, the economy, and politics. With the term social imaginary, Taylor refers to the loose, general and often tacit sense people have about how society operates and what holds it together. As he defines it, the term captures "the ways people imagine their social existence, how they fit together with others, how things go on between them and their fellows, the expectations that are normally met, and the deeper normative notions and images that underlie these expectations" (2004, p. 23). Much of Taylor's interest in this project lies in examining how modern individuals can understand themselves, their society and the natural world in a purely secular way, without any necessary reference to the divine nor even to a transcendent realm of any sort. However, he also believes that by mapping the contours of the modern social imaginary as it has developed in the West, we will be better placed to recognize the diverse ways in which different cultures have modernized and continue to mod-

ernize. As this suggests, for Taylor there is no linear route to a single destination that is modern society: rather different cultures can incorporate key components of modernity in different ways, so that modern modes of communication and information technology, of industrialization, of state formation and economic organization can acquire different meanings in different cultures. And, as a consequence, different cultures can have different social imaginaries when it comes to modernity.

The blend of ontological and historical factors in Taylor's approach to philosophical anthropology not only gives him a distinctive philosophical anthropology, but it also provides him with an alternative to simply accepting and affirming any culture's beliefs, values, and self-understanding. By maintaining that there are certain ontological truths about being human, Taylor is able to scrutinize and criticize any culture's self-understanding, including his own. He is thus able to emphasize the importance of cultural forces in shaping self-interpretations, beliefs and ethics without descending into cultural relativism and having to endorse all the dimensions of a culture's self-understanding without reservation. A good illustration of Taylor's ability to take critical distance from powerful cultural beliefs comes in his well-known critique of atomism.

Atomism is another term for individualism, but refers specifically to a belief in the ontological primacy of the individual. Taylor associates atomism with the rise of social contract thought from the seventeenth century onwards, and in particular the work of English philosophers Thomas Hobbes and John Locke. But the atomist outlook is now ubiquitous in Western societies: indeed, it has developed such a tight hold on the modern Western social and political imagination that it is taken for granted as the natural position. As Taylor observes, "Atomist views always seem nearer to common sense, more immediately available …. It's as though without a special effort of reflection on this issue, we tend to fall back into an atomist instrumental way of seeing. This seems to

dominate our unreflecting experience of society." (1989, p.196) Taylor's nomination above of Hobbes and Locke as thinkers who adhere to an instrumentalist conception of language is not coincidental, for he thinks that an ontology of the human and a theory of language are two layers of a philosophical position that are likely to be closely related. As we shall see, they certainly are in Taylor's case.

In direct contravention of atomist common sense, Taylor insists that the self is always socially situated and that the individual necessarily points beyond him or herself to their social relations. The community is ontologically prior to the individual in his view, because of the way irreducibly collective forces like culture and language shape and inform individuals. Thus he argues that because certain goods and even conceptions of the self are only available to individuals by virtue of the culture to which they belong, the fact of belonging to a community or society takes pride of place in explaining social and political norms, values and practices. Hobbes and Locke must incline logically toward an instrumental view of language, because as proponents of an atomist ontology, they cannot, on pain of contradiction, allow that a collective force like language can be constitutive of individual identity. Thus for them language is an instrument in the service of individual purposes rather than a force which shapes individuals and their purposes Yet rather than reject notions of individualism altogether, Taylor has sought to explain them by identifying their wider cultural sources. He thus contends that even "the free individual or autonomous agent" so heavily inscribed in the common sense of modern Western culture "can only achieve and maintain his identity in a certain type of culture." Such an individual "is only what he is by virtue of the whole society and civilisation which brought him to be and which nourishes him" (*Philosophy and the Human Sciences*, 1985, pp. 205–206). Taylor's efforts as an expositor of G. W. F. Hegel (1975, 1979) have been important here, for his careful study of

Hegel's philosophy has helped him to identify and criticize the prevalence of atomist assumptions in Western culture generally and within the social sciences more particularly.

Another illustration of how the ontological aspects of Taylor's thought enable him to criticize doctrines and beliefs that have become prominent in shaping the self-understanding of modern individuals and societies comes in his critique of representational epistemology. This is a conception of knowledge based on the idea of humans forming inner mental pictures or representations of the outside world. The better the fit between the inner and outer, the more reliable or true the knowledge. From this standpoint, "knowledge is to be seen as correct representation of an independent reality" (1995, p. 3). A reliable method, a dependable procedure for procuring the truth is, in turn, the best guarantor of the fit between inner and outer.

The representational conception of knowledge both presupposes and promotes what Taylor calls a stance of "disengagement" on the part of the knowing subject and thus is intimately connected with the modern self's valorization of disengaged freedom discussed above. Because knowledge is seen to be knowledge of an independent reality, the disengaged approach of representational epistemology assumes that the subject is separated in some ways from the world around him or her, and that this world is transformed into an object (or series of discrete objects) of inquiry. In order to generate knowledge that is as reliable as possible, steps are taken to minimize all possible intrusions of subjectivity into the process of inquiry. Taylor concedes that the successes of the modern natural sciences are heavily indebted to this representational conception of knowledge, but his worries begin when this very specific conception of what it is to know becomes conflated with human knowing as such, when it comes to be seen as the dominant, or even only, conception of epistemology.

In order to roll back the hegemony of the representational approach, and restore it to its

rightful place as *one* way of describing *a* form of human inquiry, Taylor adumbrates a notion of what he calls engaged, embodied knowledge. Because the representational view of knowledge understates and tries to transcend the role of engaged embodiment in the generation of knowledge, it becomes necessary to issue reminders about the significance of both the body and the imperatives of practical coping with the world for human understanding. Inspired by the work of Hegel, Martin Heidegger, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, and Ludwig Wittgenstein, Taylor draws attention to the fact that in our ordinary ways of being in the world, humans are creatures with bodies who find ourselves in a world where we have to act and meet practical demands. This picture of engaged, embodied agency challenges not just the tendency toward minimizing the body's impact on ordinary ways of knowing but also the very possibility of an inner/outer separation that defines the representational approach to knowledge. The sort of know-how that expresses itself in everyday coping cannot be construed as something that resides in my head nor even in my body alone. It manifests itself in a way of operating in and with the world, so any idea of separating the self from its world becomes forced and artificial.

As Taylor sees it, our status as engaged, embodied knowers is prior to, and indeed the precondition of, representational knowledge. Once the fundamental significance of this sort of knowing is appreciated, the representational approach to knowledge can be seen as nested in this more fundamental way of being in and knowing the world. The limited, disengaged approach to epistemology only becomes possible against the wider background of everyday being in, and coping with, the world.

Another of the striking things about Taylor's work is how heavily he draws upon thinkers from continental Europe, including Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Hegel, Johann Gottfried Herder, and Wilhelm von Humboldt, to name but some. Yet despite his active engagement with, and indebtedness to, European traditions and styles of thought, Taylor typically writes in a reader-friendly way. Even when the most abstruse questions of epistemology or moral theory are under discussion, his style is clear, accessible and even casual at times. And just as he reaches out to non-English, and increasingly non-Western, sources to enrich and extend his thinking, so Taylor's own work continues to be translated into languages other than English. His work on Hegel is available to readers of Chinese, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Persian, Spanish, and Swedish. *Sources of the Self* has been translated into Chinese, French, German, Italian, and Spanish, while Taylor's portrayal of the politics of recognition has been made accessible to readers of Dutch, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Spanish, Swedish, and Turkish.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Explanation of Behaviour (London, 1964).

The Pattern of Politics (Toronto, 1970).

Hegel (Cambridge, UK, 1975).

Erklärung und Interpretation in den Wissenschaften vom Menschen (Frankfurt, 1975).

Hegel and Modern Society (Cambridge, UK, 1979).

Social Theory As Practice (Delhi, India, 1983).

Human Agency and Language: Philosophical Papers 1 (Cambridge, UK, 1985).

Philosophy and the Human Sciences: Philosophical Papers 2 (Cambridge, UK, 1985).

Negative Freiheit? Zur Kritik des neuzeitlichen Individualismus (Frankfurt, 1988).

Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity (Cambridge, Mass., 1989).

The Malaise of Modernity (Concord, Ontario, 1991).

The Ethics of Authenticity (Cambridge, Mass., 1992).

Multiculturalism and 'The Politics of

Recognition', ed. Amy Gutmann (Princeton, N.J., 1992).

Reconciling the Solitudes: Essays in Canadian Federalism and Nationalism, ed. Guy Laforest (Montréal and Kingston, Ontario, 1993).

Philosophical Arguments (Cambridge, Mass., 1995).

Identitet, Frihet och Gemenskap: Politisk-Filosofiska Texter, ed. H. Grimen (Göteborg, Sweden, 1995).

De politieke Cultur van de Moderniteit (The Hague, 1996).

La liberté des modernes (Paris, 1997).

Varieties of Religion Today: William James Revisited (Cambridge, Mass., 2002).

Wieviel Gemeinschaft braucht die Demokratie? Aufsätze zur politische Philosophie (Frankfurt, 2002).

Modern Social Imaginaries (Durham, N.C., 2004).

Other Relevant Works

Roads to Democracy: Human Rights and Democratic Development in Thailand, with Vitit Muntarbhorn (Bangkok and Montréal, 1994).

"From Philosophical Anthropology to the Politics of Recognition: An Interview with Philippe de Lara," *Thesis Eleven* 52 (1998): 103–12.

A Catholic Modernity? Charles Taylor's Marianist Award Lecture, with Responses by William M. Shea, Rosemary Luling Haughton, George Marsden, and Jean Bethke Elshtain, ed. James L. Heft (Oxford, 1999).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Canad Encyc*, *Encyc Ethics*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*

Abbey, Ruth. *Charles Taylor* (Princeton, N.J., 2000). Contains a bibliography of Taylor's writings.

Abbey, Ruth, ed. *Contemporary Philosophy in Focus: Charles Taylor* (New York, 2004).

Redhead, Mark. *Charles Taylor: Thinking and Living Deep Diversity* (Lanham, Md., 2002).

Smith, Nicholas H. *Charles Taylor: Meaning, Morals and Modernity* (Cambridge, UK, 2002).

Spence, Keith. *Charles Taylor: Modernity, Freedom and Community* (Cardiff, Wales, 2004).

Tully, James, ed. *Philosophy in an Age of Pluralism: The Philosophy of Charles Taylor in Question* (Cambridge, UK, 1994).

Ruth Abbey

TAYLOR, Paul Warren (1923–)

Paul Taylor was born on 19 November 1923 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He served in the US Marine Corps from 1943 to 1946. He received his philosophy degrees from Princeton University: his BA in 1947, and his PhD in 1950. His dissertation was titled "The Verification of Value Judgments in Naturalistic Theories of Ethics." He taught at Princeton University in 1949–50. He then accepted a position in the philosophy department at Brooklyn College of City University of New York, where he rose through professorial ranks, retiring as full professor in 1990.

In 1961 Taylor published *Normative Discourse*, which went through two subsequent editions. Taylor argued that evaluative judgments are empirically verifiable provided that the standards of evaluation being used are clear. He claimed that this does not settle the questions of either the truth or the justifiability of such judgments, since reasons are needed to justify the use of the standards. He distinguishes two sorts of reasons: validating (by appealing to more basic or more general principles) and vindicating (showing the consequences of

adopting in practical life the whole system of standards and principles). He claims that a further step of reasoning is needed for the justification of an entire normative system. This step involves defending the rationality of being committed to the total way of life that is integrated on the basis of the system of standards and principles and whose content is found in the consequences of following those norms in practice.

Taylor is best known for his 1986 book *Respect for Nature: A Theory of Environmental Ethics*. This publication established him as the most well-known defender of biocentric individualism in environmental ethics, and a selection from his work on this topic is still included in virtually every collection of readings on alternative theories in environmental ethics. In *Respect for Nature* Taylor argues that we have no non-question-begging grounds for regarding the members of any living species as superior to the members of any other. He allows that the members of species differ in myriad ways, but argues that these differences do not provide grounds for thinking that the members of any one species are superior to the members of any other. In particular, Taylor denies that the differences between species provide grounds for thinking that humans are superior to the members of other species. Taylor recognizes that humans have distinctive traits which the members of other species lack, like rationality and moral agency. But he points out that the members of non-human species also have distinctive traits that humans lack, such as the homing ability of pigeons, the speed of cheetahs, and the ruminative ability of sheep and cattle.

Nor will it do, Taylor argues, to claim that the distinctive traits that humans have are more valuable than the distinctive traits that members of other species possess because there is no non-question-begging standpoint from which to justify that claim. From a human standpoint, rationality and moral agency are more valuable than any of the distinctive traits found in nonhuman species, since, as humans, we would not be better off if we were to trade in those traits for the distinctive traits found in nonhuman species. Yet the same holds true of nonhuman species. Generally pigeons, cheetahs, sheep, and cattle would not be better off if they were to trade their distinctive traits for the distinctive traits of other species.

So there is no non-question-begging perspective from which to judge that distinctively human traits are more valuable than the distinctive traits possessed by other species. Judged from a non-question-begging perspective, Taylor argues, the assertion of human superiority is groundless. It follows then that all individual living beings should count morally, which is the main thesis of Taylor's biocentric individualism. It also follows that we need a set of conflict resolution principles that sometimes favors the interests of humans over the interests of nonhuman living beings and sometimes favors the interests of non-human living beings over the interests of humans. Taylor does his best to come up with a specification of such principles, but the exact formulation of such principles has continued to be debated among environmental philosophers even as they recognize the value of his position.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Normative Discourse (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1961).

"Prescribing and Evaluating," *Mind* 71 (1962): 213–30.

"The Ethnocentric Fallacy," *The Monist* 47 (1973): 563–84.

Principles of Ethics: An Introduction (Encino, Cal., 1975).

"On Taking the Moral Point of View," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 3 (1978): 35–61.

"The Ethics of Respect for Nature," *Environmental Ethics* 3 (1981): 197–218.

"In Defense of Biocentrism," *Environmental Ethics* 5 (1983): 237–43.

"Are Humans Superior to Animals and Plants?" *Environmental Ethics* 6 (1984): 149–60.

Respect for Nature: A Theory of

Environmental Ethics (Princeton, N.J., 1986).

"Inherent Value and Moral Rights," *The Monist* 70 (1987): 15–30.

Other Relevant Works

"Four Types of Ethical Relativism," *Philosophical Review* 63 (1954): 500–516.

"Social Science and Ethical Relativism," *Journal of Philosophy* 4 (1958): 32–44.

"The Normative Function of Meta-Ethics," *Philosophical Review* 67 (1958): 16–32.

"Moral Rhetoric, Moral Philosophy, and the Science of Morals," *Journal of Philosophy* 56 (1959): 689–704.

"Reverse Discrimination and Compensatory Justice," *Analysis* 33 (1973): 177–82.

Further Reading

Lombardi, Louis G. "Inherent Worth, Respect, and Rights," *Environmental Ethics* 5 (1983): 257–70.

Paske, Gerald H. "The Life Principle: A (Metaethical) Rejection," *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 6 (1989): 219–25.

Sterba, James P. *Three Challenges to Ethics: Environmentalism, Feminism, and Multiculturalism* (New York, 2001), pp. 29–44.

James P. Sterba

TAYLOR, Richard Clyde (1919–2003)

Richard Taylor was born on 5 November 1919 in Charlotte, Michigan. He was encouraged towards hardiness and independent self-respect throughout childhood, although his youth was academically miserable and lacking in motivation for study in all but geometry and entomology. After recovering from a brief and unsuccessful stint at an agricultural college, he discovered the vibrant intellectual culture at the University of Illinois. There he made a fresh start of disciplined study and completed a BA in zoology in 1941. With prompting from his mother's pastor, he then enrolled at a seminary in Chicago. He had little interest in biblical study but he enjoyed theological debate, and was able to enroll in a graduate level philosophy course at the University of Chicago. His encounter with Plato's Meno prompted a paper for which he received considerable encouragement, and foreshadowed his future interests in Socrates, virtue, and aporetic argument. At the onset of World War II Taylor left the seminary to join the US Navy and served several years of submarine duty near the Philippines. By the time he returned from the war as a lieutenant in 1946, he had spent many hours at sea with a motley library of philosophical books, and his interest in philosophy had become fixed.

Oberlin College granted Taylor an MA degree in 1947. He went to Brown University and became the first doctoral student to work with Roderick Chisholm, whose influence remained strong throughout Taylor's career. Chisholm professed to discern the implications of obvious starting points, wherever they might lead, rather than to support antecedently cherished conclusions, and Taylor exhibited immediate talent in engaging classic philosophical problems with the same eye for paradox and surprise. His success as a doctoral student invited the notice of Brown's President Wriston, who helped arrange his appointment to the tenured faculty upon receiving his PhD in philosophy in 1951. He served as the first William Herbert Perry Faunce Professor of Philosophy beginning in 1959, acted as chair in 1959–60, and directed graduate studies during 1959–62. Brown proved a collegial environment for Taylor, and he became deeply involved in its educational planning, but a desire for new intellectual horizons prompted him to relocate in 1963. After a brief stay at Ohio State University and two years at Columbia University, Taylor moved to the University of Rochester in 1966. He garnered an early award in undergraduate teaching excellence, served as chair from 1966

to 1969, and filled brief editorial roles for Northwestern University Press and *American Philosophical Quarterly*. Peter Van Inwagen, one of his most prominent doctoral students, edited a festschrift of works in Taylor's honor in 1980. His reputation, robust since the 1963 publication of *Metaphysics*, brought frequent invitations to fill visiting appointments and deliver guest lectures. Tensions with the university administration increased, however, as Taylor's later writings addressed wider audiences, embracing topics such as extramarital affairs and criticizing the pretenses of research academies. From Brown and Columbia, Taylor had visited graduate departments such as Cornell and Princeton, but his later preference was for the educational interaction at small colleges, and he cultivated relationships to Swarthmore, Hamilton, Hobart and William Smith, and Wake Forest. He was active in Phi Beta Kappa. In 1981 he took up the Leavitt-Spencer Adjunct Professorship at Union College, and subsequently served several terms as Resident Distinguished Philosopher at Hartwick College. Taylor retired from Rochester in 1985. He served as contributing editor for *Free Enquiry*, despite a tension between his fideism and the atheistic emphasis of many of its contributors. Concerned that academic publications would have little influence on the moral and political problems for which clear reasoning is most needed, he also wrote for popular audiences and was published in *The New York Times*, *The Manchester Guardian*, *Newsday*, *The Washington Post*, *L.A. Times*, and the magazine *Philosophy Now*. His retirement in the Finger Lakes region of New York was dedicated to parenting and his beekeeping hobby. He died on 30 October 2003 in Trumansburg, New York.

Taylor shifted his philosophical emphasis and style considerably over the course of his career. His early writings are succinct, often playful articles, including lucid objections and responses to authors such as Max BLACK, John Wisdom, and Norman MALCOLM. Based on such publications in *Analysis* and *The Philosophical Review*, Prentice-Hall invited him to compose a primer, *Metaphysics* (1963), which remains widely used. *Action and Purpose* (1966), the culmination of his analytic writing, defends an account of agency as irreducible to causally determined events. A second phase, hailed by his 1968 article "Dare to be Wise," focuses on the value and nature of philosophical insight, and develops substantive views on law, politics, and moral theory. At the close of his professional career, his move away from academic analytic philosophy had become pronounced, and his later writings on political and moral matters frequently favor an expository and less analytic style.

Metaphysics is certainly the main vehicle of Taylor's fame. As a whole text it has been three times revised and five times translated, while its various chapters and whimsical index appear abundantly in reprinted excerpts and anthologies. It offers celebrated proofs, chapter by chapter, for a variety of claims whose superficial incongruity with one another provoke as much reflection as the chapters individually. Materialism comes out ahead of alternative approaches to mind and body, since additional layers of mentalistic explanation prove just as mysterious as the notion that matter might instantiate thought. Determinism is nevertheless cast as the product of scientific prejudice, and at odds with our unshakeable understanding of agents as causes. Fatalism, in another surprising twist, is supported by a consideration of the timelessness of all truths, including truths about human action. The logical parity between space and time is defended in one chapter, while the irreducibility of the concept of "pure becoming" is defended in the next. While distancing himself from religious certainty, Taylor heralds variations on the cosmological argument and argument from design as persuasive. After the first edition, Taylor included a chapter on causality, which argues that the notion of necessity is a primitive ingredient in our ability to conceive of causality. Though well-versed philosophical readers will find in *Metaphysics* several lines of intuition-based

arguments running strictly opposite to Hume's, the text avoids direct discussion of arguments by others. Undoubtedly, this has helped secure its accessibility and popularity as an introductory text. Further, Taylor makes no attempt to reconcile the tensions among argumentative strategies – for example, he shows a preference for ontological simplicity in dismissing appeals to mental substance behind action, yet he complicates his ontology by positing a further, but surely itself inexplicable, first cause behind the universe. Ironically, such tensions seem to reinforce the admonition with which Taylor frames the entire text: that there are no truths to be had in metaphysics, but only problems to be appreciated and dogmatic attachments to be overcome.

Action and Purpose (1966), a work closely allied with similar work by Chisholm, seeks to revive an ancient Greek concept of efficient cause, crediting agents rather than events as causes. Again counter to Hume, Taylor suggests that our primary understanding of causality depends upon our intuitive conception of how human beings cause their actions. The similarity of utterances such as "The window was shattered by a brick" and "The window was shattered by a man," Taylor argues, is merely grammatical, since the second essentially involves an appeal to the agent as cause. We fail to preserve meaning if we posit an event-like intention within the agent's body or mind as a cause, since if such an intention had been brought about by causal manipulation of any kind, we would not be willing to say that this man had done anything, except in the secondary sense in which a brick might "do" something. Taylor claims that "the metaphysical presupposition … that every event *must* have some other event as its cause" cannot be proven, and he successfully argues that when we speak of human action, we employ a different concept of causation, one which is not reducible to a scientific model of causal connection among events. Whether this intuitive concept is accurate, however – whether agency itself lies beyond naturalistic explanation – has

seemed to many to be a different matter. Taylor's argument thus bears some similarity to transcendental arguments in which an account is defended via its indispensability in practice. Unlike Kantian versions, however, Taylor's theory of agency resists dualism between material and intelligent orders of reality. Echoing Gilbert Ryle and William JAMES, he argues that spiritual substances and ineffable mental episodes can resolve no real questions about how intelligence is embodied. Concepts such as "choosing" and "trying" are empty if they are taken as private inner experiences, since they are fundamentally realized and recognized in patterns of action.

Taylor's 1968 "Dare to Be Wise" urged academic philosophers to recapture the ancient emphasis on wisdom, rather than to profess a particular specialized kind of knowledge. Though analytic exercises were recommended as "harmless" tools to sharpen the mind, the goal of mature philosophy must be seen in the sort of "showing" or "displaying" suggested by Wittgenstein or by Buddhist reflections. From that point forward, Taylor's work gravitated towards concern with personal character and meaning, ethics in the virtue tradition, and matters of public controversy in politics and law. His 1973 *With Heart and Mind* turns towards profound themes such as god, eternity, love, death, illusion, and reality, and acknowledges a departure from philosophical dialectic, suggesting that philosophical understanding of such matters lies in recognizing apt metaphors and imagery.

In *Freedom, Anarchy, and the Law* (1973), Taylor elaborates an account of political freedom intended to correct a fatal ambiguity within Mill's defense of liberty. If only direct physical harm to others must be prevented, then theft and all other harms to one's extended interests must be allowed by the state. If all actions which harm others' various extended interests must be prevented, then any action must be curtailed by the state if it offends or frustrates anyone's ambitions. Relying on the Greek distinction between nature and conven-

tion, Taylor distinguishes those injuries which would be experienced as such by anyone, regardless of cultural conditioning, from those which are experienced only because of contingently acquired attachments and values. Prevention of the latter, he argues, is not worth the cost to liberty. In "The Basis for Political Authority" (1983), Taylor argues that respect for freedom is guaranteed not at all by democracy, but by the institution of a certain kind of judicial authority, one that secures deference and functions much as a priesthood. It is to the benefit of a free society if its judges adhere solemnly to applying a text such as the US Constitution, and to its detriment if it seeks to impose value systems more specific than liberty.

Though his political theory recommends insulating citizens from the imposition of any positive vision of the good, his moral theory is far from egalitarian. In *Good and Evil* (1970), *Ethics, Faith, and Reason* (1985), and *Restoring Pride* (1996), Taylor develops a brand of elitist virtue theory deeply influenced by Aristotle and Schopenhauer. Targets include rationalism about moral motivation, all varieties of casuistical moral judgment on particular actions, and prevalent Christian models of character virtue. Instead, he urges an account of moral concepts as dependent on human will. Many of these themes have since become prominent in professional philosophical dialogue with the renaissance of attention on virtue theory and also on Nietzsche, yet Taylor's work has not been acknowledged as central to this renaissance, perhaps because of its polemical style and its tendency to work directly on themes without detailed citation or critical engagement with other academic authors over subtle points. A blunt antimoralism about human desire, one which allocates considerable power to nature as the source of the inclinations of women and men, also pervades his reflections on marriage commitments and infidelity. Though his apparent confidence about discerning a dividing line between nature and culture is among the least convincing aspects of Taylor's moral and political writings, the exhortation to honesty regarding the will remains provocative.

Taylor's style of writing, with its moments of aporia, its extended fictional illustrations, and its warnings against complacent acceptance of comfort, has served to capture the interest of many students. Though only the early work is celebrated among analytic academics, the whole corpus invites radical questioning among professional philosophers about their topics, their audience, and their philosophical attachments.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Metaphysics (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1963; 4th rev. edn 1991).

Action and Purpose (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1966).

Good and Evil: A New Direction (New York, 1970). Revised as *Good and Evil* (Buffalo, N.Y., 1984).

Freedom, Anarchy, and the Law (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1973).

With Heart and Mind: A Picture (New York, 1973).

Having Love Affairs (Buffalo, N.Y., 1982). Revised as *Love Affairs: Marriage and Infidelity* (Buffalo, N.Y., 1996).

Ethics, Faith, and Reason (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1985). Reprinted as *Virtue Ethics: An Introduction* (Buffalo, N.Y., 1991; rev. edn 2002).

Reflective Wisdom: Richard Taylor on Things that Matter, ed. John Donnelly (Buffalo, N.Y., 1989).

Restoring Pride: The Lost Virtue of Our Age (Buffalo, N.Y., 1996).

Understanding Marriage (Buffalo, N.Y., 2004).

Other Relevant Works
"Negative Things," *Journal of Philosophy* 49 (1952): 433–48.

"Spatial and Temporal Analogies and the Concept of Identity," *Journal of Philosophy* 52 (1956): 599–611.

"The 'Justification' of Memories and the

Analogy of Vision," *Philosophical Review* 65 (1956): 192–205.

"The Problem of Future Contingencies," *Philosophical Review* 66 (1957): 1–28.

"I Can," *Philosophical Review* 69 (1960): 78–89.

"Fatalism," *Philosophical Review* 71 (1962): 56–66.

"Causation," *The Monist* 47 (1963): 287–313.

"The Stream of Thoughts vs. Mental Acts," *Philosophical Quarterly* 13 (1963): 311–21.

"Deliberation and Foreknowledge," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 1 (1964): 73–80.

"Dare to be Wise," *Review of Metaphysics* 22 (1968): 615–29.

"Persons and Bodies," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 15 (1978): 67–72.

"The Image of God," in *God: The Contemporary Discussion* (Maui, Hawaii, 1981).

"Agent and Patient: Is There a Distinction?" *Erkenntnis* 18 (1982): 223–32.

"Abortion and Morality," with Jeanne Caputo, *Free Inquiry* 2 (1982).

"The Basis of Political Authority," *The Monist* 66 (1983): 457–71.

"Time and Life's Meaning," *Review of Metaphysics* 40 (1987): 675–86.

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, *Oxford Comp Phil*
Barry, Lawrence E. *Causality: A Critique of Richard Taylor's Theory*. PhD dissertation, Southern Illinois University (Carbondale, Ill., 1970).
Van Inwagen, Peter, ed. *Time and Cause: Essays Presented to Richard Taylor* (Dordrecht, 1980). Contains a bibliography of Taylor's writings.

Elise Springer

TEN BROEKE, James (1859–1937)

James Ten Broeke was born on 13 October 1859 in Panton, Vermont. His father William held several town offices and was the town clerk for twenty-three years; his grandfather James had immigrated to Vermont from England and became a Baptist minister and successful schoolteacher. Ten Broeke received his BA at Middlebury College in 1884, and upon graduating from Rochester Theological Seminary in 1887, he was ordained and served as pastor for a year to the Baptist church in Weedsport, New York. In 1888 he went to Yale University to study philosophy with Noah PORTER and George T. LADD, and in 1891 he received his PhD in philosophy, writing his dissertation on "A Comparison of the Views of Hartmann and Lotze concerning the Self-Consciousness of the Absolute." After a year studying philosophy in Berlin, Germany, Ten Broeke became a pastor of a church in Burlington, Vermont in 1892. In 1895 he was appointed as the professor of philosophy at McMaster University in Toronto, Canada, where he taught until 1932. McMaster honored him with a Doctor of Laws degree in 1924. In retirement Ten Broeke returned to his native state, where he died on 23 October 1937 in Middlebury, Vermont.

Ten Broeke was primarily remembered by colleagues and students as a deeply caring, humble, and inspiring teacher. Among his many students who recall his influence was the social scientist Harold Innis. His two published books were the product of long concentrated thought on how the philosophical school of German idealism could provide the foundations for Christianity. The first two parts of *A Constructive Basis for Theology* (1914) discuss how the philosophies of Greece and the Reformation have affected Christianity, suggesting in the third part how the modern Christian deserves religious doctrines rationally explained and defended using a modern philosophy. The modern philosophy of idealism, by overcoming empiricist skepticism and

dogmatic rationalism, supplies a social psychology that relates the individual to the community and to God. The individual's own experience is where religion lives (since the reality of anything depends on experience), but that experience is not private or isolated. The religious pragmatism of Albrecht Ritschl dominates Ten Broeke's rejection of transcendentalism or dualism, and Ten Broeke approaches conclusions made by William JAMES on the meaning of religion.

Ten Broeke's idealistic pragmatism is evident in his second book, *The Moral Life and Religion* (1922), which nearly identifies the religious life with the moral life. The emphasis on the reality of process and progress evident in his earlier book is applied to the person's religious experience as the pursuit of ideal values that promote community well-being. It is the experience of shared values that should animate our moral lives, and not any revelation, theological doctrine, or set of moral rules. No moral rule, or any law, dictates an action since each lived situation is unique. Each person's effort to live a valuable life is that person's connection with the divine. Ten Broeke, like Ritschl and Hermann Lotze, demanded that teleology and value define reality. For God to be real for us, it is not enough that God sustain supreme values, but also God must satisfy our demand that we are supremely valuable.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
A Constructive Basis for Theology (London, 1914).
The Moral Life and Religion: A Study of Moral and Religious Personality (New York, 1922).

Other Relevant Works
Ten Broeke's papers are at McMaster University.

Further Reading
Armour, Leslie, and Elizabeth Trott. *The Faces of Reason: An Essay on Philosophy and Culture in English Canada,*
1850–1950 (Waterloo, Ontario, 1981).
"Dr. Ten Broeke Retires," *McMaster News* 3 (July 1932).
Waters, F. W. "Professor James Ten Broeke: A Former Student's Tribute," *The Canadian Baptist* 83 (11 November 1937): 6.

John R. Shook

THAYER, Horace Standish (1923–)

Stan Thayer was born on 6 May 1923 in New York City. He received his BA from Bard College in 1945. Concentrating on American philosophy and pragmatism, he earned the MA in 1947 and the PhD in philosophy in 1949 from Columbia University, studying with Ernest NAGEL, Herbert SCHNEIDER, and John H. RANDALL, Jr. He stayed at Columbia to teach philosophy from 1949 to 1961. Then he moved to City College of New York to teach from 1961 until his retirement in 1990. While at City College he chaired the philosophy department from 1965 to 1968. He was also a member of the Princeton Institute for Advanced Study in 1974–5 and 1982–3. He was awarded a Guggenheim Memorial Fellowship in 1970 and a National Endowment for the Humanities Fellowship in 1974–5. He received the Herbert W. Schneider Award for contributions to American philosophy from the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy in 1989.

Thayer's interests extend beyond American philosophy, as many publications on ancient philosophy reveal. However, his definitive histories of pragmatism are his major works and have served for decades as the most comprehensive studies available. The first edition of *Meaning and Action: A Critical History of Pragmatism* appeared in 1968 and remained in high demand as the best single-volume examination of both the primary and secondary

figures of pragmatism. The greatly expanded edition of *Meaning and Action* (1981) still stands as the essential guide to classical pragmatism and its figures in America and Europe. His outstanding expertise made him a valued member of the editorial boards for critical editions of Charles PEIRCE, William JAMES, and John DEWEY.

Although Thayer has published numerous essays and articles about all of the major pragmatists, his research on John Dewey's philosophy has been the most penetrating and influential. His 1952 book *The Logic of Pragmatism: An Examination of John Dewey's Logic* was the first full-length exposition of Dewey's theory of inquiry and knowledge. This valuable book and subsequent articles have powerfully shaped Deweyan scholarship. Thayer's efforts were essential to the preservation and appreciation of classical pragmatism during an era of analytic philosophy's neglect for the traditions of American philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Logic of Pragmatism: An Examination of John Dewey's Logic (New York, 1952; 1969).

Ed. with Irwin Edman, *John Dewey: His Contribution to the American Tradition* (Indianapolis, 1955).

Meaning and Action: A Critical History of Pragmatism (New York, 1968; 2nd edn, Indianapolis, 1981). Abridged edn, *Meaning and Action: A Study of American Pragmatism* (New York, 1973).

Ed., *Pragmatism: The Classic Writings* (New York, 1970; Indianapolis, Ind., 1982).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Newton's Philosophy of Nature: Selections from His Writings* (New York, 1953; 1974).

"Plato: The Theory and Language of Function," *Philosophical Quarterly* 14 (1964): 303–18.

Ed. and trans., *Pensées: Thoughts on Religion and Other Subjects*, by Blaise Pascal (New York, 1965).

Ed. with Irving Horowitz, *Ethics, Science, and Democracy: The Philosophy of Abraham Edel* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1987).

"Necessity and Truth in Dewey's Logical Theory," in *Frontiers in American Philosophy*, vol. 1, ed. Robert Burch and Herman Saatkamp, Jr. (College Station, Tex., 1992), pp. 213–20.

"Truth, Representation and the Real," in *From Time and to Consciousness: Studies in the Metaphysics of Charles S. Peirce*, ed. Edward Moore and Richard Robin (Providence, R.I., 1994), pp. 31–44.

Further Reading

Greenlee, Douglas. "On Pragmatism," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 30 (1969): 603–8.

Singer, Marcus G. "Thayer's *The Logic of Pragmatism*," *Philosophical Review* 62 (1953): 464–7.

John R. Shook

THILLY, Frank (1865–1934)

Frank Thilly was born on 18 August 1865 in Cincinnati, Ohio. In 1887 Thilly graduated from the University of Cincinnati, where he earned the BA (cum laude). He continued his studies in Berlin and Heidelberg, Germany, focusing primarily on philosophy and political economy. In Germany he was influenced by the thought of Kuno Fischer and Friedrich Paulsen. In 1891 he graduated from Heidelberg University with the MA and PhD (incigni cum laude). That same year, he published his dissertation as *Leibnizens Streit gegen Locke in Ansehung der Angeborenen Ideen*.

Thilly returned to the United States in 1891 to become a fellow at Cornell University's Sage

School of Philosophy. In 1892 he was promoted to instructor, and the next year the University of Missouri hired Thilly as its first professor of philosophy and psychology, where he taught for eleven years. Princeton University appointed him Stuart Professor of Psychology in 1904. In 1906, Thilly returned to Cornell as professor of philosophy, and held this position until his death. He also served as Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences from 1915 to 1921. In 1925 and 1927–9 he was a faculty representative on the Board of Trustees. Thilly died on 28 December 1934 in Ithaca, New York.

The Western Philosophical Association emerged, in part, because of Thilly's dedication to its organization, and he served two consecutive terms as its first President during 1900–1902. While at Cornell, Thilly became President of the American Philosophical Association in 1912–13. He also was the President of the American Association of University Professors in 1917, and played a crucial role in its development. Honorary degrees from the University of Missouri (1909), the University of Cincinnati (1913), and Hobart College (1922) were bestowed upon Thilly. Thilly was a member the Spinoza Society of the Hague, the Kant-Gesellshaft in Berlin, the St. Louis Academy of Science, the American Psychological Association, the Author's Club of London (England), the Cornell Club of New York, Phi Kappa Phi, and Phi Beta Kappa.

Thilly dedicated himself to the editorship of several journals, including *University of Missouri Studies*, which he founded and for which he wrote several contributions, and the *School Review*. He also edited the *International Journal of Ethics*, *Philosophical Review*, and *Kant-Studien*.

In addition to his dissertation, Thilly authored several other books, most notably, *The Process of Inductive Inference* (1904), and *Psychology, Natural Science, and Philosophy* (1906). Thilly also translated several works, including Alfred Weber's *History of Philosophy* (1896) and three books by Friedrich Paulsen: *Introduction to Philosophy* (1895), *A System of Ethics* (1899), and *The German Universities and University Study* (1906). His textbook *A History of Philosophy* (1914) was widely used, going through three editions and remaining in print for six decades.

Though Thilly was actively engaged in professional philosophy, publishing many scholarly articles, he did not formulate a thoroughgoing philosophical system. Rather, he dedicated himself to debates among idealists, realists, and pragmatists. In these debates, he indefatigably defended rationalism and idealism, primarily because of his commitment to ethics and social philosophy, which, he argued, depended upon the notion of free will. Thilly's publications also reveal an extraordinary mastery of the history of western philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Leibnizens Streit gegen Locke in Ansehung der Angeborenen Ideen (Heidelberg, Germany, 1891).
Introduction to Ethics (New York, 1900).
The Process of Inductive Inference (Columbia, Missouri, 1904).
A History of Philosophy (New York, 1914; 3rd edn 1937).

Other Relevant Work
Thilly's papers are at Cornell University.
"The Freedom of the Will," *Philosophical Review* 3 (1894): 385–411.
Trans., *Introduction to Philosophy*, by Friedrich Paulsen (New York, 1895).
Trans., *History of Philosophy*, by Alfred Weber (New York, 1896).
Trans., *A System of Ethics*, by Friedrich Paulsen (New York, 1899).
"Conscience," *Philosophical Review* 9 (1900): 18–29.
"The Moral Law," *International Journal of Ethics* 10 (1900): 223–35.
"The Theory of Interaction," *Philosophical*

Review 10 (1901): 124–38.

"Soul Substance," *Philosophical Review* 11 (1902): 16–25.

"Intuitionism and Teleology," *International Journal of Ethics* 12 (1902): 487–94.

"The Theory of Induction," *Philosophical Review* 12 (1903): 401–11.

"Psychology, Natural Science, and Philosophy," *Philosophical Review* 15 (1906): 130–44.

"Causality," *Philosophical Review* 16 (1907): 117–35.

"Friedrich Paulsen," *Journal of Philosophy* 5 (1908): 505–508.

"Friedrich Paulsen's Ethical Work and Influence," *International Journal of Ethics* 19 (1909): 141–55.

"The Self," *Philosophical Review* 19 (1910): 22–33.

"The Relation of Consciousness and Object in Sense-Perception," *Philosophical Review* 21 (1912): 415–32.

"Romanticism and Rationalism," *Philosophical Review* 22 (1913): 107–32.

"The Individualism of John Stuart Mill," *Philosophical Review* 32 (1923): 1–17.

"Sociological Jurisprudence," *Philosophical Review* 32 (1923): 373–84.

"The Philosophy of James Edwin Creighton," *Philosophical Review* 34 (1925): 211–29.

"Contemporary American Philosophy," *Philosophical Review* 35 (1926): 522–38.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v41*, *Pres Addr of APA v1*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Hibben, John Grier. "Thilly's *Introduction to Ethics*," *Philosophical Review* 10 (1901): 63–6.

Taylor, T. Wardlaw. "Frank Thilly – An Appreciation," *Journal of Philosophy* 32 (1935): 279–80.

David Justin Hodge

THOMAS, Dorothy Swaine (1899–1977)

Dorothy Swaine Thomas was born on 24 October 1899 in Baltimore, Maryland, the only child of John Knight Thomas and Sarah Elizabeth Swaine. Both parents came from prosperous families but during their unhappy marriage their social statuses declined. A maternal uncle encouraged Dorothy to read, write, and do arithmetic when she was three years old, but her father strongly opposed this training and it became another source of family conflict. Although her father was a successful salesman, he was a poor money-manager. He left his family when Dorothy was twelve. Her mother then began work as a paid companion and a life of financial struggle for the next decade ensued. After the family break-up, Dorothy moved into the family of a paternal uncle whom she disliked and she found refuge in voracious reading.

Thomas enjoyed school, where she excelled. As a senior, she won a city-wide essay contest and a scholarship to a local college. After she unwittingly broke a school rule, the high school authorities decided she should neither graduate nor receive her award. After other teachers supported her graduation and she apologized, her previous statuses were restored. Before this decision, however, Dorothy won and accepted a scholarship to Barnard College in New York City in 1919, majoring in economics and sociology. She graduated with a BA in 1922. That same year, Thomas entered the University of London's School of Economics where she flourished under the guidance of Arthur L. Bowley and William Beveridge. She received her PhD in economics in 1924. Her doctoral dissertation, *Social Aspects of the Business Cycle*, was awarded the prestigious Hutchinson Research Medal and published in 1925. Despite this impressive achievement, she could not find a position in a first-rate university in the United States. She worked for a year at the Federal Reserve Bank and then received a postdoctoral fellowship from the Social Science

Research Council. In this project Wesley Mitchell became her next important mentor, and he recommended that she contact the sociologist William Isaac THOMAS for advice in her study of crime and economic patterns. In 1926 she began working with W. I. Thomas, whom she married in 1935. Their initial collaboration resulted in *The Child in America* (1928).

Between 1927 and 1930 Thomas worked at Columbia University's Teacher College, where she directed studies on the behavior of children in nursery school. In 1930 she moved to Yale's Institute of Human Relations where she held various positions until 1939. Between 1927 and 1939 she directed an innovative group of women, including Ruth Arrington and Alice Loomis, who assisted her in her groundbreaking studies of children. "An associate from the Yale period recalls Dorothy Thomas as resembling a 'flapper stereotype,' with short, bobbed hair, cigarette in a long holder, dressed in tailored clothes, lively in conversation, and with lots of contagious enthusiasm for her research." (Roscoe 1991, p. 402)

In 1940 Thomas became a tenured full professor in rural sociology at the University of California at Berkeley. In 1948 Thomas left Berkeley, accepting a professorship at the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School of Economics as a research professor of sociology. Thomas was also the first female professor at the Wharton School. While at the University, she was a co-director of the Study of Population Redistribution and Economic Growth from 1952 to 1959, research director of the Population Studies Center from 1959 to 1970, and co-director of Population Studies Center from 1964 to 1970. Thomas also helped begin the doctoral training program in demography. When she retired in 1970, the University gave her an honorary doctorate for her influential work in the field of demography. After she retired, Thomas continued to teach at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. from 1970 to 1974. In 1952 she was elected President of the American Sociological Association, the first woman to hold this office. She was also the first woman on the board of the Social Science Research Council to become President of the Population Association of America in 1958–9, and to be elected the Vice President of the American Statistical Association. Thomas died on 1 May 1977 in Bethesda, Maryland.

Entering college in 1919 opened an exciting world for Thomas, and she formed intense friendships with a stimulating circle of women, including Margaret MEAD. Thomas became a socialist and a vocal political leader on campus. She studied with William F. Ogburn who urged her to become a quantitative scientist instead of an activist, but she wanted to be both scientific and involved in vital social issues. In 1922 Thomas and Ogburn wrote two significant articles documenting the social relationships between economic and technological changes, hypothesizing that social change followed material innovations.

When she met her future husband W. I. Thomas in 1926, he had been a disgraced figure since 1918, after an unproven but devastating charge of sexual misconduct ended his academic career at the University of Chicago. When they met, his efforts to resuscitate his career through applied social research were beginning to be accepted. He hired Dorothy as a statistician on his child development study, which was eventually published as *The Child in America*. This collaborative work contained the most frequently quoted sentence in sociology: "If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences." In 1942 Robert K. Merton dubbed this "the Thomas theorem" and erroneously attributed it to the sole authorship of W. I. Thomas. In the 1980s Merton became increasingly criticized for this error. Robert S. Smith, for example, documented that "the Thomas theorem" is incorrectly quoted or attributed to W. I. Thomas alone in all forty of the textbooks he examined (Smith 1999). Merton tried to justify his denial of Dorothy Thomas's co-authorship in 1995, revealing the continuing animosity toward

awarding full recognition of her work in the discipline, pointing to a continuing pattern of underestimating Thomas's contribution to her co-authored work with her husband.

Although the Thomases worked together continuously after their fateful meeting in 1926, they were not married until 1935. Because they had identical patronymic names, and they are often referred to as "William and Dorothy Thomas," many scholars assumed that they were married by 1928 when *The Child in America* appeared. Yet another complication in her professional recognition arose from the alleged sexual misconduct and subsequent firing of W. I. Thomas. His good name was smeared for the remainder of his life by this sex scandal, and many sociologists falsely assumed that "the sexually irresponsible" W. I. Thomas had seduced or was seduced by his "flapper-type" protégée, suggesting that her name on the book was "part of the sexual deal." Following this false logic then, her ideas were "really" his (Deegan 1988). Contrary to this patriarchal construction of knowledge, Dorothy Thomas was a fully trained, brilliant statistician, economist, theorist, and sociologist long before she met W. I. Thomas.

Between 1930 and 1936 the Thomases spent part of each year working with the Nobelists Alva Myrdal and Gunnar Myrdal in Sweden. The four colleagues hoped to produce a volume similar to W. I. Thomas's and Florian Znaniecki's classic study of *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, but this was never completed. Thomas produced an exemplar of demographic and economic national patterns from this project in her *Social and Economic Aspects of Swedish Population Movements, 1750–1922 (*1941). She also worked on G. Myrdal's now controversial study *An American Dilemma* (1944) which is increasingly attacked as being opposed to legal and political criticisms of white racism and as exploiting many of its researchers, such as Thomas.

In 1940, when Thomas finally had a tenured position at the University of California at Berkeley, a bitter battle was waged over her relations to the sociology department. However, this issue was soon superseded by a grant to study the evacuation, internment, and resettlement of Japanese-Americans during World War II. Originally, she intended to be part of a research team studying American immigrants from Germany, Italy, and Japan. This study was superseded by a larger one that focused on Japanese Americans "evacuated" during World War II. The co-directors included specialists in anthropology, political science, social welfare, and economics, as well as Thomas in sociology. Almost immediately the other, male co-directors were involved in other wartime activities and Thomas was left with all the projects and their separate staffs amidst a drastically shifting policy toward Japanese-Americans.

Although Thomas tried to manage her own conceptions of the "Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study," the massive project was plagued by disparate directions, voices, politics, and controversies. The first major public battle emerged over her right to control data collected by Morton Grodzins, whom she considered a research assistant, while he envisioned himself as her colleague taking up the "political science" specialty that she ignored in her own analyses. Grodzins published his own book in 1949, while D. S. Thomas worked hard, but unsuccessfully, to have it suppressed as "stolen data."

In her specialized domain, Thomas guided a number of students to collect life history documents about this shattering experience, drawing on W. I. Thomas's and her own expertise in situational analysis. Her two powerful books, *The Spoilage* (1946) and *The Salvage* (1952), minutely and carefully documented the devastating effects of this government-sponsored attack on innocent Americans. Her books were used later as evidence in Supreme Court cases documenting the various crimes committed against these innocent Americans. Thomas always argued that her

work was apolitical and unaffected by her personal values.

This "scientific" position and the larger JERS project, including other books and dissertations produced by researchers who worked ostensibly under Thomas's leadership, have been subjected since the 1980s to severe criticism by Japanese-Americans interned in the camps, their descendants, and specialists in Japanese-American studies. Yuji Ichioka collected many of these writings in *Views From Within* (1989). The controversy between Thomas and Morton Grodzins is mentioned there, where Grodzins is depicted sympathetically as victimized by the controlling Thomas.

In 1947 W. I. Thomas died. Little information about the Thomas's personal life has been made public because of the repressive effect of his early sex scandal and her fierce privacy about their lives. Although Dorothy Thomas never connected her own abandonment by her father with her husband who was thirty-six years older than she was, W. I. Thomas seems to fit the model of a powerful father-figure. After his death, she occasionally worked on projects memorializing his work.

In 1948 Thomas left Berkeley, disappointed with her treatment there. She accepted a professorship at the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School of Economics and began a new series of studies. Here she collaborated with the Nobelist Simon Kuznets, a fellow student from her days with Mitchell, to generate four volumes on *Population Redistribution and Economic Growth*, published between 1957 and 1964.

Everyone was impressed by Thomas's forceful personality. Some people considered her moody and difficult, while others were fiercely loyal to her and defended her behavior. Similarly, she experienced patriarchal erasure and hiring practices, as well as being perceived as participating in oppressing her student-employees and the internees in the internment camps. Many of her students continue her intellectual legacy in demography and attribute their success to her leadership, guidance, and

high standards. She left a rich legacy of intellectual excellence and feminist leadership as well as many questions. Controversies still surround her methods outside of demography; her work in situational analysis; her understanding of the minority experience for African Americans and for Japanese Americans, and organizational leadership during the war. She remains a heroic and flawed figure at the center of contemporary disciplinary and intellectual issues.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Social Aspects of the Business Cycle (New York, 1925).

The Child in America: Behavior Problems and Programs, with W. I. Thomas (New York, 1928).

New Techniques for Studying Social Behavior (New York, 1929).

Social and Economic Aspects of Swedish Population Movements, 1750–1933 (New York, 1941).

Population Redistribution and Economic Growth: United States, 1870–1950, 4 vols, with Simon Smith Kuznets (Philadelphia, 1957–64).

Observational Studies of Social Behavior, with Alice M. Loomis, Ruth E. Arrington, and Eleanor C. Isbell (New Haven, Conn., 1933).

The Spoilage, with Richard S. Nishimoto, Rosalie A. Hankey, James M. Sakoda, Morton Grodzius, and Frank Miyamoto (Berkeley, Cal., 1946).

The Salvage, with Charles Kikuchi and James Sakoda (Berkeley, Cal., 1952).

Other Relevant Works

Thomas's papers are at the University of Pennsylvania and the University of California at Berkeley.

"Experiences in Interdisciplinary Research," *American Sociological Review* 17 (1952): 663–9.

"Contribution to the Herman Wold Festschrift," in *Scientists at Work*, ed.

Tore Dalenius et al. (Stockholm, 1970), pp. 216–27.

"Are Inventions Inevitable?" with William F. Ogburn *Political Science Quarterly* 37 (1922): 83–98.

"The Influence of the Business Cycle on Certain Social Conditions," *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 18 (1922): 324–40.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Who Was Who in Amer v7*

Deegan, Mary Jo. *Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School, 1892–1918* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1988).

Grodzius, Morton. *Americans Betrayed* (Chicago, 1949).

Lee, Everett. "Dorothy Swaine Thomas," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, vol. 18 (New York, 1979), pp. 763–5.

Merton, Robert K. "The Thomas Theorem and the Matthew Effect," *Social Forces* 74 (1995): 379–422.

Miyamoto, S. Frank. "Dorothy Swaine Thomas as Director of JERS," in *Views from Within: The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study*, ed. Yuji Ichioka (Los Angeles, 1989), pp. 31–63.

Murray, Stephen O. "Resistance to Sociology at Berkeley," *Journal of the History of Sociology* 2 (1979): 61–84.

Myrdal, Gunnar, et al. *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy* (New York, 1944).

Roscoe, Janice. "Dorothy Swaine Thomas," in *Women in Sociology*, ed. Mary Jo Deegan (Westport, Conn., 1991), pp. 401–406.

Smith, Richard S. "Contested Memory," *American Sociologist* 30 (1999): 62–78.

Mary Jo Deegan

THOMAS, William Isaac (1863–1947)

W. I. Thomas was born on 13 August 1863 on a farm in Russell County, Virginia, and died on 5 December 1947 in Berkeley, California. He graduated with a BA from the University of Tennessee in 1884, where he continued as an instructor of classical and modern languages while he worked on a doctorate in English language and modern languages. After he earned a PhD in 1886 from Tennessee, he became an adjunct professor teaching Greek and natural science. Thomas studied at Berlin University and Göttingen University from 1888 to 1889 and taught English and later sociology at Oberlin College from 1889 to 1895. He took a leave from Oberlin College in 1893 to enter the University of Chicago to study sociology, earning a PhD in 1895. He became a sociology professor at Chicago in 1910. He was in charge of the Helen Culver Fund for Race Psychology from 1908 to 1918. However, in 1918, Thomas was arrested on suspicion of sexual misconduct involving allegations of violation of the Mann Act and of an act forbidding false registration at hotels. Although the charge was thrown out of court, the extensive publicity resulted in the termination of his position at the university.

Thomas then moved to New York, where in 1918 and 1919 he worked with Robert PARK and H. A. Miller on the manuscript *Old World Traits Transplanted*, a volume in the series of Americanization studies sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. In 1923 he published *The Unadjusted Girl* and lectured at the New School for Social Research until 1928. In 1927 he organized a conference on "The Unconscious," under the guidance of the Illinois Society for Mental Hygiene, and also became President of the American Sociological Society in 1927. For the next few years he carried out a number of assignments for Lawrence B. Dunham at the Bureau of Social Hygiene, and prepared an extensive series of unpublished reports on the behavioral sciences, with particular emphasis on criminological and personality research in Germany, Belgium, and Sweden. He

spent part of each year from 1930 to 1936 in Sweden where he informally worked with the Social Science Institute of the University of Stockholm. In 1932 to 1933 he served as a staff member of the Social Science Research Council, in charge of the work in the field of personality and culture. His last academic appointment was as lecturer in sociology at Harvard University in 1936–7 with the remainder of his career spent in independent research and writing.

Though *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (1918) represents his greatest literary contribution, Thomas gained more notoriety for statements made in *The Child in America* (1928) co-authored by his future wife, Dorothy Swaine THOMAS. They suggested that if situations were defined as real, then they were real in their consequences. In addition to the definition of the situation, Thomas was consistent with the early Chicago school social psychology and interactionist style by emphasizing direct observation and participation in social research. He contended that personal observation was best accomplished through living with the group under study and that sociologists must maintain societal context as a central focus rather than specific institutions being demonstrated in the functional and conflict paradigms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sex and Society: Studies in the Social Psychology of Sex (Chicago, 1907).

Source Book for Social Origins: Ethnological Materials, Psychological Standpoint, Classified and Annotated Bibliographies for the Interpretation of Savage Society (Boston, 1909).

The Polish Peasant in Europe and America, 2 vols, with Florian Znaniecki (Chicago, 1918).

Old World Traits Transplanted, with Robert E. Park and Herbert A. Miller (New York, 1921).

The Unadjusted Girl: With Cases and Standpoint for Behavior Analysis, (Boston, 1923).

The Child in America: Behavior Problems and Programs, with Dorothy Swaine Thomas (New York, 1928).

Primitive Behavior: An Introduction to the Social Sciences (New York, 1937).

Other Relevant Works

Thomas's papers are at the University of Chicago.

"Race Psychology: Standpoint and Questionnaire, with Particular Reference to the Immigrant and the Negro," *American Journal of Sociology* 17 (1912): 725–75.

"The Behavior Pattern and the Situation," *Publications of the American Sociological Society* 22 (1927): 1–13.

"The Comparative Study of Cultures," *American Journal of Sociology* 42 (1936): 177–85.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v44*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*

Deegan, Mary Jo. *Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School, 1892–1918* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1988).

Janowitz, Morris, *W. I. Thomas: On Social Organization and Personality* (Chicago, 1966).

Lindenberg, S., J. S. Coleman, and S. Nowak, eds. *Approaches to Social Theory: Based on the W. I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki Memorial Conference on Social Theory* (New York, 1986).

Matthews, Fred H. *Quest for an American Sociology: Robert E. Park and the Chicago School* (Toronto, 1977).

Rosenberg, Rosalind. *Beyond Separate Spheres: Intellectual Roots of Modern Feminism* (New Haven, Conn., 1982).

Wiley, Norbert. "Early American Sociology and the *Polish Peasant*," *Sociological Theory* 4 (1986): 20–40.

Meghan Probstfield

THOMASON, Richmond Hunt (1939–)

Richmond Thomason was born on 5 October 1939 in Chicago, Illinois. He received his BA in mathematics and philosophy from Wesleyan University in 1961, graduating Phi Beta Kappa and Sigma Xi. In 1962 he began graduate studies in philosophy at Yale University, funded by Woodrow Wilson and Danforth fellowships, receiving the MA in 1963 and the PhD in 1965. Thomason began his career at Yale in 1965, teaching philosophy there as instructor, assistant, and then associate professor until 1973. He then moved to the University of Pittsburgh, where he held appointments in linguistics from 1973 to 1999 and philosophy from 1973 to 1990. In 1999 he moved to his current position of professor of philosophy, computer science, and linguistics at the University of Michigan.

Thomason is best known for his writings in mathematical logic, formal semantics of natural language, and artificial intelligence. His earliest publications, some of which appeared while he was still a graduate student, presented metalogical results on the completeness of, and decision procedures for, various non-classical logical systems: for an infinitary propositional calculus, for intuitionistic logic, for a logic with variables ranging over quantifiers, for presupposition-free logic, and so on. By the late 1960s and early 1970s, Thomason was working on topics in formal semantics of natural language, collaborating in particular with Robert STALNAKER on conditionals and adverbs. In retrospect, it is this sort of work that established Thomason's reputation, for he helped found the very discipline of formal semantics, by being among the very first to develop and extend Montague grammar, as it became known. More importantly still, Thomason – along with Richard Montague, Barbara Partee, and Stalnaker – helped launch what is now called "the New Philosophy of Language," which combines rich empirical linguistics with formal philosophy. Later practitioners include Gareth Evans, James Higginbotham, Ernest Lepore, Robert May, and Scott Soames, along with a whole generation of younger philosophers.

In the 1980s Thomason pioneered yet another area, putting linguistics and philosophical logic to work in computer science applications. He helped design and implement knowledge-based information retrieval programs, and contributed to early work on non-monotonic systems in artificial intelligence. His cross-disciplinary interests, drawing on logic, computing, philosophy, and linguistics, are very clearly reflected in Thomason's many editorial positions. He has been editor-in-chief, or served on the editorial board, of the *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, *Linguistics and Philosophy*, and the *Journal of Logic, Language and Information*, the three most important journals in this challenging interdisciplinary domain.

While Thomason's ideas have been widely cited, it is arguably his philosophical orientation that has had the greatest influence. What began as a tiny splinter group in the 1960s, calling for the deployment of results and methods from formal linguistics in philosophizing, had grown into something of a wave by the early twenty-first century. Thomason's interests in applying linguistics and philosophical logic, in artificial intelligence and elsewhere, are also spreading among the next generation of formal philosophers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Rule-completeness Theorem," with Nuel D. Belnap, *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 4 (1963): 39–43.

Symbolic Logic: An Introduction (New York, 1970).

"A Semantic Theory of Adverbs," with Robert Stalnaker, *Linguistic Inquiry* 4 (1973): 195–220.

Ed., *Formal Philosophy: Selected Papers of Richard Montague* (New Haven, Conn., 1974).

"Some Extensions of Montague Grammar," in *Montague Grammar*, ed. B. Partee (New York, 1976).

"A Theory of Conditionals in the Context of Branching Time," with Anil Gupta, *Philosophical Review* 88 (1980): 65–90.

"Philosophical Logic and Artificial Intelligence," *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 17 (1988): 321–7.

Ed., *Philosophical Logic and Artificial Intelligence* (Dordrecht, 1989).

"Nonmonotonicity in Linguistics," in *Handbook of Logic and Language*, ed. J. van Benthem and A. ter Meulen (Amsterdam, 1997).

"Twenty-five Years of Linguistics and Philosophy," with F. J. Pelletier, *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25 (2002): 507–29.

Other Relevant Works

"A Decision Procedure for Fitch's Propositional Calculus," *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 8 (1967): 101–107.

"On the Strong Semantical Completeness of the Intuitionistic Predicate Calculus," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 33 (1968): 1–7.

"Modality and Reference," with Robert Stalnaker, *Noûs* 2 (1968): 359–72.

"A Model Theory for Propositional Attitudes," *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4 (1980): 47–70.

"Deontic Logic and the Role of Freedom in Moral Deliberation," in *New Studies in Deontic Logic*, ed. Risto Hilpinen (Dordrecht, 1981), pp. 177–86.

"Modeling the Beliefs of Other Agents: Achieving Mutuality," in *Logic-based Artificial Intelligence*, ed. J. Minker (Dordrecht, 2000).

Further Reading

Halpin, John F. "Indeterminism, Indeterminateness, and Tense Logic," *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 17 (1988): 207–19.

Robert J. Stainton

THOMPSON, Manley Hawn, Jr. (1917–94)

Manley H. Thompson, Jr., was born on 12 April 1917 in Zanesville, Ohio. He received his BA (1938), MA (1938), and PhD (1942) degrees from the University of Chicago. His philosophy graduate work focused on the relations between C. S. PEIRCE and Kant. In his dissertation, "The Pragmatic Philosophy of C. S. Peirce," Thompson acknowledges his indebtedness to Richard McKEON as well as to Charles W. MORRIS and Rudolph CARNAP. In 1953 he published his thesis as a monograph. During World War II, Thompson served in the US armed forces.

After the war, Thompson taught philosophy at the University of Toronto from 1946 until 1949, when he returned to the University of Chicago as an assistant professor of philosophy. He was promoted to associate professor in 1955 and full professor in 1961. From 1960 to 1969 he served as chair of the department. He was a member of Princeton's Associate Council on Humanities from 1960 to 1965. He also served on the Harvard philosophy department's visiting committee from 1963 to 1969, and chaired that committee from 1978 to 1984. Thompson was President of the American Philosophical Association Central Division in 1982–3. He also held memberships in the Aristotelian Society and the American Council of Learned Societies. He retired from Chicago in 1987, and died on 9 June 1994 in Hyde Park, Chicago, Illinois.

Thompson's Chicago colleague Alan GEWIRTH described him as "the leading authority on the general theory of categories." His book on Peirce was one of the finest studies at that time in Peirce scholarship, and was said to have "defined Peirce and Kant scholarship for the 1950s and beyond."

Befitting the influences of both McKeon and Carnap, Thompson pioneered research in connections between historical and contemporary theories of categories, universals, a priori knowledge, meaning and reference. During the 1950s and 60s he published several papers on

the relations between metaphysical theories of categories and abstract entities, and the semantics of quantificational logic. His investigation into abstract entities, universals, and the realism versus nominalism debate ranged over the views of Plato, Aristotle, Ockham, Peirce, Mill, and Kant. In articles published in the 1980s he contrasted Aristotle's and Kant's approaches to categories and a priori truth, and related them to contemporary discussions of necessity, essentialism, and verificationism in W. V. QUINE, Hilary PUTNAM, and P. F. Strawson. In the 1970s and 80s Thompson also published significant papers on Kant's theories of intuition and the logical basis of categories.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"J. S. Mill's Theory of Truth," *Philosophical Review* 56 (1947): 273–92.

"The Logical Paradoxes and Peirce's Semiotic," *Journal of Philosophy* 46 (1949): 513–35.

The Pragmatic Philosophy of C. S. Peirce (Chicago, Ill., 1953).

Metaphysics (Princeton, N.J., 1964).

"Abstract Entities and Universals," *Mind* 74 (1965): 365–81.

"Who Knows?" *Journal of Philosophy* 67 (1970): 856–69.

"On A Priori Truth," *Journal of Philosophy* 78 (1981): 458–81.

"Epistemic Priority, Analytic Truth, and Naturalized Epistemology," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 18 (1981): 1–12.

"Philosophical Approaches to Categories," *The Monist* 66 (1983): 336–52.

"Unity, Plurality, and Totality as Kantian Categories," *The Monist* 72 (1989): 168–89.

Other Relevant Works

"On Aristotle's Square of Opposition," *Philosophical Review* 62 (1953): 251–65.

"What are Law Statements About?" *Journal of Philosophy* 52 (1955): 421–32.

"On Category Differences," *Philosophical Review* 66 (1957): 486–508.

"On the Elimination of Singular Terms," *Mind* 68 (1959): 361–76.

"Abstract Terms," *Philosophical Review* 68 (1959): 281–302.

"Abstract Entities," *Philosophical Review* 69 (1960): 331–50.

"Things in Themselves," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 57 (September 1983): 33–48.

"Quine and the Inscrutability of Reference," *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 26 (1972): 42–62.

"Singular Terms and Intuitions in Kant's Epistemology," *Review of Metaphysics* 26 (1972): 314–43.

"Peirce's Verificationist Realism," *Review of Metaphysics* 32 (1978): 74–98.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v9, Proc of APA v68

Jill Vance Buroker

THOMSON, Judith Jarvis (1929–)

Judith Jarvis was born on 4 October 1929 in New York City. She received her BA from Barnard College in 1950, her MA from the University of Cambridge in 1956, and her PhD in philosophy from Columbia University in 1959. Her first teaching position was at Barnard where she was a lecturer (1955–9), instructor (1959–60), and assistant professor of philosophy (1960–62). She married James Thomson, and moved to Boston in 1963, first as an assistant professor at Boston University (1963–4), and then to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1964 where she became full professor in 1969. During 1990–96 she held the Laurence S. Rockefeller Chair in Philosophy at MIT. She has received a large number of awards and honors, and contributed in many ways to professional philosophy in

America. In 1992–3, she held the presidency of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division, and in 1999 she gave the Tanner Lectures at Princeton University. She is chair of the American Philosophical Association's board of officers for 2002 to 2005, and gave the APA's Carus Lectures in 2003. Thomson retired from MIT in 2004. She has been widely acknowledged as one of the best teachers of philosophy, and the excellence of the graduate program at MIT was due in no small measure to her influence.

Thomson's philosophical work ranges widely but her main areas of concentration are moral philosophy and metaphysics. In moral philosophy Thomson has made seminal contributions to all three subfields of that discipline: applied ethics, moral theory, and metaethics. The nature of her work makes these divisions seem somewhat artificial. Much of her work discusses the morality of a range of issues of practical concern, including those gathered in *Rights, Restitution, and Risk* (1986), and "Self-Defence" (1991), "Physician Assisted Suicide: Two Moral Arguments" (1999), and "Assisted Suicide: The Philosophers' Brief" (1997), written with John RAWLS, Robert NOZICK, Ronald DWORKIN, T. M. Scanlon, and Thomas NAGEL. *Moral Realism and Moral Objectivity* (1996, written with Gilbert HARMAN), "The Right and the Good" (1997), and *Goodness and Advice* (2001) contain general treatments of metaethics and moral theory. *The Realm of Rights* (1990) is an expansive work that includes all three themes.

In metaphysics she has concentrated on questions about actions and events, and about time and parts. *Acts and Other Events* (1977), "The Individuation of Action" (1971), and "The Time of a Killing" (1971) present a metaphysics of action, while "Parthood and Identity over Time" (1983) and "The Statue and the Clay" (1998) take up a range of questions about identity and constitution. "Parthood and Identity Over Time" is particularly noteworthy for resisting the view, so dominant in contemporary metaphysical thought, that the notion of a temporal part can be used to account for various puzzles about identity. In addition to her work on moral philosophy and metaphysics, Thomson has made contributions to philosophy of mind ("Molyneux's Problem," 1974), philosophy of science ("Grue," 1966), and philosophy of language. Her work is characterized by its exemplary clarity, its foundation on examples, its inventiveness, and depth.

In the 1970s Thomson became extremely well known as the author of "A Defense of Abortion," which appeared in the first issue of *Philosophy and Public Affairs* in 1971. This paper had an immediate impact and continues to influence discussions of abortion. The key idea of the paper is to avoid for purposes of argument the question of whether the fetus is a person. Suppose the fetus *is* a person – how is it supposed to follow that it may not be killed? The usual response is to argue in the following apparently straightforward way: the fetus is a person; all persons have a right to life; hence it is always immoral to kill the fetus, since doing so flouts its right to life. But Thomson shows that the idea of a right to life is vastly more controversial and difficult than it at first appears, which reveals the mistake in the argument. To bring out the difficulty, she presents a passage that has since become one of the most famous of modern philosophy which offers the following imaginary case: "You wake up in the morning and find yourself back to back in bed with an unconscious violinist. A famous unconscious violinist. He has been found to have a fatal kidney ailment and the Society for Music Lovers has canvassed all the available medical records and found that you alone have the right blood type to help. They have therefore kidnapped you, and last night the violinist's circulatory system was plugged into yours …" Thomson completes the story by imagining that the Director of the hospital tells you that you can't unplug yourself without killing the violinist, and moreover that you must remain like that for a period of nine months (and, in another version of the story, for the rest of your life). Does morality require that you stay

in bed so that the violinist may live? A parody of the straightforward argument would suggest so: All persons have a right to life, and violinists are persons, etc. But of course the intuitive response is just the opposite: it is clearly not required by any reasonable moral principle that you lie in bed for the rest of your life. But then there must indeed be something wrong with the argument from the premise that the fetus is a person and all persons have a right to life to the conclusion that abortion is impermissible. In the remainder of the article Thomson explains that it rests on a mistaken conception of what having a right to life consists in. The right to life does not consist in, or include, the right not to be killed; nor does it consist in, or include, the right to be given the bare minimum to sustain life. It consists rather in the right not to be killed unjustly. On the other hand, if the right to life consists in the right not to be killed unjustly, the straightforward argument above is invalid. The position on abortion that emerges at the end of the article is not what every defender of abortion wants – it does not entail that abortion is morally permissible in every case, for example – but Thomson makes a persuasive case that it is nevertheless intuitively the correct response. Some more recent views by Thomson on this issue are contained in "Abortion" (1995); for a recent discussion and further references see Boonin (2004).

Responding to one critic of "A Defence of Abortion," Thomson remarked that the issue about the right to life raised in the article was in fact perfectly general: "the situation about rights … is really this: all of them are problematic in the way I mentioned – none of them will serve anybody in the very simple and clear way in which the opponents of abortion have seemed to think that the right to life will serve them" ("Rights and Deaths," 1973). It is natural to view remarks such as this as prompting her own later work on rights, including in particular *Rights, Restitution, and Risk*, *The Realm of Rights*, and a number of later articles. This work contains a detailed investigation into the idea that for a person to have a right is for

him or her to have a certain moral status, and in particular into the relation between this idea, on the one hand, and other moral ideas, on the other, including in particular the ideas associated with talk about "ought" and "good." The theory that emerges is not easily summarized in a pithy phrase, but, as Thomson says in *Goodness and Advice*, a theory that would replace consequentialism "would lack the simplicity of Consequentialism. But then we really shouldn't have expected a theory of what we ought to do to be simple as Consquentialists take it to be." (2001, p. 47)

The Realm of Rights opens with some metaethical remarks, and in particular includes a discussion of the Fact–Value Gap, the idea that no moral sentence is entailed by any factual or nonmoral sentence. The issue of how to react to the Fact–Value Gap forms the basis of much of Thomson's recent work, contained in *Moral Realism and Moral Objectivity*, "The Right and the Good," *Goodness and Advice*, and other works. Her starting point is an observation due to Peter Geach ("Good and Evil," 1956) about the logic of the word "good." Geach observed that "good" is in many ways like "big": you aren't plain good or big, you are a good pianist or a big land mammal. Indeed – and this point is Thomson's rather than Geach's – the situation with "good" is more extreme than the situation with "big." In the latter case, a statement of the form "X is big" uniformly permits expansion into a statement of the form "X is a big F." Not so for "good." Sometimes a statement of the form "X is good" permits this sort of expansion. But sometimes it does not, permitting instead expansion to "X is good at doing F" or "X is good for F-ing" or "X is good to Fs" or "X is good with Fs" and perhaps others. Thomson summarizes these points in the slogan: all goodness is goodness in a way, and goes on to develop them in two directions. First, she argues that the persuasiveness of the Fact–Value Gap depends largely on failing to see that all goodness is goodness in a way, and failing to see something which is entailed by this, that there is no

such property as the property of goodness (or of rightness, etc.). Second, Thomson argues that, if there is no such property as goodness, we are in possession of a very good reason to reject utilitarianism. Utilitarianism here is a thesis which defines the right in terms of the good, or, rather, as the right action as the one that makes the world better than (contain more good than) it would otherwise. But if there is no property of goodness, there is also no relation of betterness; hence utilitarianism rests on a mistake.

In this work, we see Thomson responding to and rejecting themes that have dominated moral thinking since G. E. Moore's *Principia Ethica* (1903), including questions about the relation between fact and value, the notion of goodness and the definition of the right in terms of the good. With one major exception, Moore raises the questions that are central to moral philosophy in the last hundred years. The major exception is the set of questions concerning applied ethics and political philosophy that became very prominent in the 1970s. Thomson's work provides a strategy, not simply for answering the Moorean questions, but in addition for connecting the Moorean questions with questions of a more practical nature.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Grue," *Journal of Philosophy* 63 (1966): 289–309.

"A Defense of Abortion," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 1 (1971): 47–66.

"The Individuation of Action," *Journal of Philosophy* 68 (1971): 774–81.

"The Time of a Killing," *Journal of Philosophy* 68 (1971): 115–32.

"Rights and Deaths," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 2 (1973): 146–59.

"Molyneux's Problem," *Journal of Philosophy* 71 (1974): 637–50.

Acts and Other Events (Ithaca, N.Y., 1977).

"Parthood and Identity Over Time," *Journal of Philosophy* 80 (1983): 209–19.

Rights, Restitution, and Risk, ed. William Parent (Cambridge, Mass., 1986).

The Realm of Rights (Cambridge, Mass., 1990).

"Self-Defence," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 20 (1991): 283–310.

Moral Realism and Moral Objectivity, with Gilbert Harman (Cambridge, Mass., 1996).

Goodness and Advice (Cambridge, Mass., 2001).

Other Relevant Works

"Abortion," *Boston Review* 20 (Summer 1995): 11–15.

"Assisted Suicide: The Philosophers' Brief," with Ronald Dworkin et al., *New York Review* (27 March 1997).

"The Right and the Good," *Journal of Philosophy* 94 (1997): 273–98.

"The Statue and the Clay," *Noûs* 32 (1998): 149–73.

"Physician Assisted Suicide: Two Moral Arguments," *Ethics* 109 (1999): 497–518.

"Causation: Omissions," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 66 (2003): 81–103.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Encyc Ethics*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v10*

Bennett, Jonathan. "The Necessity of Moral Judgments," *Ethics* 103 (1993): 458–72.

Boonin, David. *A Defense of Abortion* (Cambridge, UK, 2002).

Byrne, A., R. Stalnaker, and R. Wedgwood, eds. *Fact and Value: Essays In Honor of Judith Jarvis Thomson* (Cambridge, Mass., 2001).

Fischer, John M. "Abortion and Self-Determination," *Journal of Social Philosophy* 22 (1991): 5–13.

Gert, Bernard. "Transplants and Trolleys," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 53 (1993): 173–8.

Sturgeon, Nicholas. "Thomson against Moral Explanations," *Philosophy and*

Phenomenological Research 58 (1998): 199–206.

Daniel Stoljar

THORNDIKE, Edward Lee (1874–1949)

Edward L. Thorndike was born on 31 August 1874 in Williamsburg, Massachusetts. He received his BA in classics in 1895 from Wesleyan University. From 1895 to 1897 he studied psychology with William JAMES at Harvard University, and earned a second BA in 1896. He then went to Columbia University to finish his graduate study with James McKeen CATTELL, writing a dissertation on animal intelligence that was soon published, and receiving his PhD in psychology in 1898. From 1899 until his retirement in 1940, Thorndike was professor of educational psychology at Columbia University Teachers College. From 1922 to 1940 he was the Director of its Institute of Educational Research. He was President of the American Psychological Association in 1912, and elected to the National Academy of Sciences in 1917. Thorndike died on 9 August 1949 in Montrose, New York.

Thorndike was a leader of experimental, behavioral, and educational psychology as these fields more clearly separated away from philosophy. Impressed by the increased connectivity of the brain's neurons during learning, he advocated the stimulus-response model and an associationist theory of knowledge that recalled British empiricism. His first book, *Animal Intelligence* (1898), gave evidence that animals apply a "trial and error" method to reach goals.

Ignoring the critics of associationism, including James and John DEWEY who still required a place for holistic human experience in psychology, Thorndike went further to advocate the elimination of experience, mind, and consciousness from consideration by psychology, reaching a full behaviorist standpoint a decade before John B. WATSON. He designed much of the basic equipment still used in animal behavioral psychology to control environmental stimuli and elicit responses. He trained two generations of psychologists who were quite comfortable with evolutionary explanations in psychology and with the idea that animal and human psychology were very similar. His oft-repeated principle, "All that exists, exists in some amount and can be measured," exemplified his positivistic and materialistic philosophy.

Inspired by Cattell, Thorndike carried on the study of individual psychological differences. He attempted to evaluate and standardize education aims from handwriting and drawing to reading and mathematics achievement, and wrote several textbooks and dictionaries. Thorndike encouraged schoolteachers and principals to attend closely every measurable and statistical fact about the educational process, sending the new field of school administration down a firmly scientific path. While his colleague at Teachers College, William Heard KILPATRICK, tried to maintain progressive education's dominance, Thorndike's approach severed the connection between social philosophy and education. His educational psychology and methods of curriculum design, teacher training, and school administration proved to be the direction for post-World War II American education.

Thorndike's application of scientific psychology to intelligence and academic testing was also widely influential. During World War I, he and Robert Yerkes formulated intelligence tests for military recruits. Like many other psychologists of this era, Thorndike concluded that heredity is mostly responsible for intelligence, helping to energize the active eugenics movement in the US before World War II. He was personally active in several eugenics organizations, and his *Human Nature and the Social Order* (1940) argued for the political dominance of a natural aristocracy which will balance the pretensions and instability of popular democracy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Animal Intelligence: An Experimental Study of the Associative Processes in Animals (New York, 1898).

Notes on Child Study (New York, 1901).

An Introduction to the Theory of Mental and Social Measurements (New York, 1904; 2nd edn 1913).

Elements of Psychology (New York, 1905; 2nd edn 1907).

The Principles of Teaching: Based on Psychology (New York, 1906).

Animal Intelligence: Experimental Studies (New York, 1911).

Individuality (Boston, 1911).

Education, a First Book (New York, 1912).

Educational Psychology, 3 vols (New York, 1913–14).

The Psychology of Arithmetic (New York, 1922).

The Measurement of Intelligence (New York, 1927).

Elementary Principles of Education, with Arthur I. Gates (New York, 1929).

Human Learning (New York, 1931).

The Fundamentals of Learning (New York, 1932).

Adult Interests (New York, 1935).

The Psychology of Wants, Interests and Attitudes (New York, 1935).

Education as Cause and as Symptom (New York, 1939).

Human Nature and the Social Order (New York, 1940).

Man and His Works (Cambridge, Mass., 1943).

Selected Writings from a Connectionist's Psychology (New York, 1949).

Other Relevant Works

Thorndike's papers are at Columbia University Teachers College and the Library of Congress.

"Edward Lee Thorndike," in *A History of Psychology in Autobiography*, ed. Carl Murchison (Worcester, Mass., 1930), vol. 3, pp. 263–70.

Psychology and the Science of Education: Selected Writings of Edward L. Thorndike, ed. Geraldine Jonçich (New York, 1962).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v51*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Cremin, Lawrence A. *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876–1957* (New York, 1961).

Hullfish, H. Gordon. *Aspects of Thorndike's Psychology in Their Relation to Educational Theory and Practice* (Columbus, Ohio, 1926).

Jonçich, Geraldine. *The Sane Positivist: Edward L. Thorndike* (Middletown, Conn., 1968).

"In Honor of Edward Lee Thorndike," *Teachers College Record* 27 (February 1926): 466–515; 41 (May 1940): 699–725; 51 (1949): 42–5. Contains a bibliography of Thorndike's writings.

Woodworth, Robert S. "Biographical Memoir of Edward Lee Thorndike, 1874–1949," in *National Academy of Sciences Biographical Memoirs*, vol. 27 (Washington, D.C., 1952), pp. 209–37.

John R. Shook

THURMAN, Howard Washington
(1899–1981)

Howard Thurman was born on 18 November 1899 in Daytona Beach, Florida. The racial discrimination policies of Daytona prevented black youth from attending local high schools. Thurman left Daytona to receive his secondary education at a Baptist academy for black youth

in Jacksonville, Florida. In 1923 he completed his BA degree, majoring in economics and government, at Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia. Thurman's vocational decision to become a Christian minister led him to complete a BD degree from Rochester Theological Seminary in New York in 1926.

After serving as the pastor of a Baptist church in Oberlin, Ohio, he returned to Atlanta in 1929 to become director of religious life and professor of religion for Morehouse College and Spelman College. In 1932 he joined the faculty of Howard University in Washington, D.C., as professor of Christian theology, and later became the dean of the University's chapel. During a lecture tour to India, Burma, and Ceylon (1935–6), Thurman met with Mohandas K. Gandhi and discussed race, religion, and social change in the United States. When Thurman returned to the United States, the relevance of Gandhi's nonviolent social movement to the plight of Black Americans became a major topic of his lecturing throughout the country. In 1944 Thurman moved to San Francisco to co-found the Church for the Fellowship for All Peoples, which was the first interracial church in leadership and membership in the United States. From 1953 to 1965 he was professor of spiritual resources and disciplines and Dean of Marsh Chapel at Boston University. After retiring in 1965, Thurman continued his extensive schedule of preaching and lecturing until his death on 10 April 1981 in San Francisco, California.

Thurman believed religious experience is the basis for comprehending reality and truth. He defined religious experience as "the conscious and direct exposure of the individual to God" (1954, p. 20). Thurman asserted this experience "is capable of providing an ultimate clue to all levels of reality, to all the dimensions of time, and to all aspects of faith and the manifestations therein" (1954, p. 30). Community is a primary revelation from such experience. Persons know that reality is governed by interrelatedness that seeks fulfillment through harmonious communion. Knowledge of God's love in all things assures persons of their own ultimate worth in reality.

Thurman's beliefs flow from classical Christian mysticism. The Quaker mystic Rufus JONES, who in 1929 became a mentor to Thurman, influenced his perspective on religious experience. Thurman's understanding on the nature of God, however, resembles the panentheism of process theology. God is immanent, transcendent, and becoming. The holiness of all persons and things is a tenet of Thurman's vision of community. This holiness requires all persons to interact respectfully with all creation. And God's becoming nature limits the ability of any religious doctrine to claim absolute truth about God. Thurman believed this "fluid" nature of God always made theology "out dated." The implications for community are at least twofold: (1) no sectarian group or collection of groups can claim to have captured the complete meaning of God; and (2) religious groups should interact with humility and respect for one another's religious sensibilities. Thurman's perspective contributes to the efforts of diverse religious groups to form ecumenical and interfaith fellowship.

Thurman wrote and spoke extensively on the ultimate worth of the self. He believed that most personal crises resulted from the failure to affirm a proper sense of self. He asks: "how can one believe that life has meaning, if his own life does not have meaning" (1951, p. 69). The worth and meaning of the self are not earned through virtuous living, but are God given. However, living a disciplined life that seeks to enact in relationships the harmonious communion of religious experience, honors the worth and meaning of the self. A proper sense of self-best enables one to interpret meaning in life and to interact creatively with life.

The philosophical influences of nineteenth-century New England transcendentalism, theological liberalism, and aspects of personalism (as developed by Borden Parker BOWNE)

are evident in Thurman's understanding of the self. But another major influence on his thinking is Nancy Ambrose, his maternal grandmother. Though an illiterate former slave, her personal stories of being sustained through the harsh realities of slavery by the assurance that she was a "child of God" made a profound impression on Thurman's intellectual formation. And Thurman's own childhood experiences of oneness with nature provided him self-assurance that preceded his education in philosophical concepts about the self. Thurman's ideas on the self are presented within the context of his own experiences as a black person within a racially segregated society. He argues against black people, and the "disinherited" of all societies, having their sense of self determined by legal and social definitions.

Thurman's writings, especially *Jesus and the Disinherited* (1949), inspired and instructed many leaders (including Martin Luther KING, Jr.) of the civil rights movement. In *Jesus and the Disinherited* he writes, "the striking similarity between the social position of Jesus in Palestine and that of the vast majority of American Negroes is obvious to anyone who tarries long over the facts" (1949, p. 34). Thurman interpreted Jesus to be one of the disinherited (as a poor, oppressed Jew living under Roman rule) with a message that empowered the disinherited to take the initiative for overcoming oppression and despair. Jesus's message that love is a greater transforming force with one's enemies than fear, deception, and hatred, liberated the disinherited to take the initiative in living their God-given identities. Thurman's interpretation of Jesus's "love ethic" shaped the commitment to nonviolence by the leadership of the civil rights movement.

Thurman's attention to the disinherited as sources of religious truth, also evident in his books on African-American slaves, *The Negro Spiritual Speaks of Life and Death* (1947) and *Deep River*, informs the development of Black Theology that began in the 1960s. His ideas offer increasingly pluralistic societies a way to form community that is based on both the celebration of cultural particularity and universal values.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Mysticism and Social Change," *Eden Theological Seminary Bulletin* (1939): 3–34.

The Negro Spiritual Speaks of Life and Death (Mills College, Cal., 1947).

Jesus and the Disinherited (Nashville, Tenn., 1949).

Deep is the Hunger (New York, 1951).

The Creative Encounter (New York, 1954).

Disciplines of the Spirit (New York, 1963).

"Introduction," in *Why I Believe There is a God: Sixteen Essays By Negro Clergymen* (Chicago, 1965), pp. v–xi.

The Search for Common Ground (New York, 1971).

"What Can We Believe In?" *Journal of Religion and Health* 13 (1973): 111–19.

With Head and Heart: The Autobiography of Howard Thurman (New York, 1979).

Further Reading

Dict Amer Religious Bio

Fluker, Walter. *They Looked for a City* (Lanham, Md., 1989).

Johnson, Alonzo. *Good News for the Disinherited* (Lanham, Md., 1997).

Mitchell, Mozella G. *Spiritual Dynamics of Howard Thurman's Theology* (Bristol, Ind., 1985).

Smith, Luther E., Jr. *Howard Thurman: The Mystic as Prophet* (Washington, D.C., 1981).

———, "Intimate Mystery: Howard Thurman's Search for Ultimate Meaning," *Ultimate Reality and Meaning* 11 (1989): 85–101.

Stewart, Carlyle Fielding, III. *God, Being and Liberation* (Washington, D.C., 1989).

Luther E. Smith, Jr.

TILLICH, Paul Johannes Oskar
(1886–1965)

Paul Tillich was born on 20 August 1886 in Starzeddel, a small village in eastern Germany. The son of a Lutheran pastor, Tillich received a classical education in Greek and Latin before attending some of the finest German universities, including Berlin, Tübingen, and Halle. He earned his PhD in philosophy in 1910 at the University of Breslau with a dissertation on the German idealist philosopher, Friedrich Schelling. He received his Licentiate of Theology degree in 1912 at the University of Halle with a second dissertation on Schelling. He was ordained to the ministry of the Evangelical (Protestant) Church of the Prussian Union in 1912. As a result of his religious upbringing and academic training, Tillich was thoroughly steeped in the sources of Christian theology and Western philosophy. He was well prepared for his lifelong vocation as a philosophical theologian to bring the traditions of Jerusalem and Athens, the church and the academy, into a mutually fruitful dialogue.

During World War I, Tillich served as an army chaplain and, like many young men in the generation of 1914, his confidence in the basic rationality and inherent goodness of bourgeois civilization was profoundly shaken by what he experienced in the trenches. The disillusioning experience of the war years, combined with the failure of the Weimar Republic to establish a stable democracy in postwar Germany, confirmed Tillich's conviction that the basic existential questions of human life could be adequately addressed only by religious faith and not by scientific or technical reason. This conviction did not mean, however, that Tillich rejected the challenge posed by the Enlightenment to Christian theology, as do some postmodern theologians today. Indeed, he fully accepted the results of scientific inquiry into the natural world as well as the historical-critical investigations into the origins of ancient Israel and the early church that had set the agenda for liberal Protestant theology in the nineteenth century.

Like his liberal forebears and teachers, Tillich continued to affirm that the fundamental task of Christian theologians is to mediate the eternal truth of the Christian message to the modern mind in such a way that it can be understood by persons whose world view has been decisively shaped by natural science and historical criticism. Nonetheless, like his Swiss contemporary Karl Barth, Tillich believed that the rationalistic optimism regarding human nature that pervaded bourgeois culture was sorely in need of correction through a retrieval of the profound insights of the biblical writers, of Augustine, and of the Protestant Reformers. An additional resource for this critique of culture was found in the dissident nineteenth-century voices, such as Søren Kierkegaard, Friedrich Nietzsche, and Fyodor Dostoevsky, who had heralded the twentieth century's existentialist protest against idealist philosophy. Tillich once remarked that the emergence of existentialism was "good luck" for theologians since its analysis of human existence as estranged from itself resembled the Pauline–Augustinian–Lutheran depiction of the will's bondage to sin.

In his theological system, Tillich borrowed the existentialist concept of "estrangement" in order to retrieve the classical Christian doctrine of sin as pointing to the spiritual condition of human alienation from God and, thereby, to rescue it from its distorted moralistic connotation as acts of immorality or "sins" in the plural. Along with this recovery of a deepened understanding of the human plight, Tillich believed that the other great words of the religious tradition, such as "faith" and "grace," could also be retrieved in their depth and profundity for a new generation that had suffered a loss of confidence and was searching for meaning. Not surprisingly, then, Tillich was among those younger postwar theologians who welcomed Barth's call for a new type of theology ("dialectical" or "crisis" theology) emphasizing anew such classical Christian themes as the transcendence of God,

the depravity of human sin, and the complete dependence upon grace for salvation. But as time passed, Tillich's own development of these themes led to a break with Barth. Barth and Tillich articulated divergent programs for Christian theology after the catastrophic break with the nineteenth century. Theologians today are still confronted with the choice between them.

In 1919, Tillich became a *Privatdozent* instructor at the University of Berlin. That same year he delivered a lecture on his own constructive thinking to the Kant Society entitled "On the Idea of a Theology of Culture." The guiding premise behind this idea is that every culture, even the most self-consciously secular, lives out of what Tillich called a "dimension of depth" which is its religious dimension of meaning. Hence, theologians can analyze the spiritual situation of a given time by investigating the interpretation of human existence found in a culture's artistic, political, and philosophical expressions. Tillich captured the essence of this approach in his famous maxim: "religion is the substance of culture, culture is the form of religion" (1959, p. 42). Tillich's reputation as a theological interpreter of a disillusioned postwar culture was solidified with the appearance in 1926 of his book *Die religiöse Lage der Gegenwart* (*The Religious Situation*).

In 1924 Tillich was called to replace the ailing Rudolf Otto as professor of theology at the Unversity of Marburg where his colleagues included Martin Heidegger and Rudolf Bultmann. In 1925, Tillich left Marburg to spend four years teaching philosophy and religious studies at the Dresden Institute of Technology. During two of these years he also taught systematic theology as an adjunct professor at Leipzig from 1927 to 1929. In 1929 he was called to teach philosophy at the University of Frankfurt am Main where he became acquainted with Theodor ADORNO and Max HORKHEIMER. These years also witnessed the rise to power of Hitler, whom Tillich passionately opposed. Tillich's political

sympathies lay on the left. From 1912 to 1914 he had served as a pastor in the Moabit district of Berlin, a district of working-class people. After the war he aligned himself with the "religious socialists" who sought, in contrast to the atheism of Marx, a religious foundation for their socialist critique of capitalist society. Tillich's 1933 book *Die sozialistische Entscheidung* (*The Socialist Decision*) was included in the list of books burned by the Nazis. Furthermore, Tillich spoke out in defense of his Jewish students against their Nazi persecutors. This act of protest led to his dismissal from the faculty at Frankfurt in 1933.

Thanks to the mediating efforts of Reinhold NIEBUHR, who arranged a position in philosophical theology at Union Theological Seminary in New York, Tillich and his family left Germany in 1933 for the United States. Tillich was already in his late forties when he had to undergo this momentous shift in the context of his theological work. Since he did not speak English, he had to learn it quickly in order to deliver lectures. This linguistic hurdle was difficult to surmount, not only for Tillich himself but also for his students who had to make sense of what he was trying to say under the heavy weight of his thick German accent (one student recalled his bewilderment at hearing Tillich speak passionately about the importance of "justification by *fate* alone"!).

Aside from having to translate his thought from German to English, Tillich found the academic ethos of an American seminary quite different from the one he had known at German universities. His American students were not trained in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, and they were not as historically informed as were their German counterparts. Nonetheless, these linguistic and institutional shifts were just the beginning of a deeper, more inward engagement with Anglo-American culture that was to bear fruit in a subtle, yet profound impact upon him. Though the challenges were daunting, Tillich fell in love with his adopted homeland. In retrospect, he gratefully

acknowledged that having to translate his theological and philosophical ideas into English forced him to a degree of clarity and precision he would not have needed in his native German. Moreover, the pragmatism of his American students preparing for ministerial work in churches required that he become more concrete and less abstract. Finally, he appreciated that the social and ethical emphasis of American Protestantism led to less rancor about doctrinal and theological disputes than was customary in Germany. Although Tillich's thinking was deeply rooted in the intellectual traditions of Germany, it came to full blossom only after being transplanted to American soil.

For these reasons, Tillich was a pivotal figure in mediating continental theology to the English-speaking world. Ironically, Tillich became far more influential in American theological discussions in the 1940s and 1950s than he was in his native Germany where the memory of him grew increasingly dim. After the end of World War II he returned intermittently to Germany but, like many other German intellectuals who had found refuge in the United States, Tillich never again took up permanent residence there. He became an American citizen in 1940. Tillich gave the Gifford Lectures at the University of Aberdeen in Scotland in 1953 and 1954. After his retirement from Union in 1955, Tillich was University Professor at Harvard until 1962 when he became the John Nuveen Professor of Theology at the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, holding that position until his death. At Chicago he conducted seminars with the Romanian-born historian of religion Mircea ELIADE, which led Tillich to lament that he didn't have enough time left to rewrite his *Systematic Theology* (1951–63) in light of the question of Christianity's relations to non-Christian religions. Tillich died on 22 October 1965 in Chicago, Illinois, having left an indelible mark upon American theology.

Tillich's driving concern throughout his career was to address the secular person who found it difficult to believe in God after the Enlightenment had undermined the traditional bases of religious faith. In this respect Tillich maintained continuity with the liberal Protestant effort to interpret the Christian message in the light of modern culture. In sharp contrast, Barth diagnosed this endeavor to seek a "point of contact" with modern self-understanding as the sickness needing to be cured by a purely "dogmatic" theology that unfolds the church's teachings ("doctrines" or "dogmas") for the sake of the correct proclamation of the gospel. Tillich agreed with Barth that nineteenth-century theologians had sacrificed something essential in their accommodations with modernity but he rejected Barth's categorical objection to "apologetics" (from the Greek word *apologia* meaning "reasoned argument" or "defense"). Tillich thus saw himself as heir not only to the nineteenth-century German Protestant tradition of Friedrich Schleiermacher and G. W. F. Hegel but also to the classical Catholic tradition that includes Athanasius, Augustine, Anselm, and Thomas Aquinas, each of whom drew upon the Greek philosophical legacy as an instrument for interpreting the gospel in accordance with the motto "faith seeking understanding." In this sense, Tillich's theology was self-consciously apologetic, a theology which sought, on the basis of the Christian message, to answer modern questions about the meaning of existence.

Tillich called his approach the "method of correlation." Tillich's method consists in correlating *some* interpretation of the Christian message with *some* interpretation of human existence. In his view, philosophy's task is to articulate the fundamental questions arising from the analysis of human existence. In complementary fashion, theology's task is to interpret the Christian message so that it can be understood as the answer to these existential questions. But Tillich's method recognizes the historical fact that *how* fundamental existential questions are formulated changes from age to age. For that reason, theology must interpret

the Christian answer differently in each age so as to bring the church's message into meaningful relation with the specific understanding of human existence prevalent in a given culture. Like philosophy, therefore, theology has a history, and the method of correlation yields the key for understanding this history as the ever-new attempt on the part of the Christian church to proclaim the gospel's universal significance in changing cultural circumstances. For example, in response to the anxiety about fate and mortality that permeated the Greco-Roman world, the ancient church, through Athanasius and the Nicene Creed, formulated the gospel as the overcoming of death through Christ's incarnation and resurrection. In the late medieval period, tormented by anxiety concerning Judgment Day and the threat of eternal damnation, Martin Luther and the Protestant Reformers articulated anew the meaning of the gospel so as to assure the guilt-ridden conscience of God's merciful forgiveness through Christ. In Tillich's analysis of twentieth-century culture, the distinctively modern formulation of the existential question is the threat of meaninglessness to which Nietzsche called attention when he proclaimed the death of God. Tillich's philosophical theology sought to directly meet this challenge.

Tillich held that modern atheism is, in part, a product of faulty ideas of faith. He criticized the widespread popular notion of faith as unquestioning intellectual assent to teachings found in the Bible or in church tradition. This intellectualistic distortion of faith has roots in classical Catholicism and orthodox Protestantism. Tillich also criticized the emotionalistic and voluntaristic distortions of faith found in Pietism and in some forms of liberal Protestantism. The former confuses faith with an emotional experience and the latter with moral achievement. The problem with each of these distortions is that faith becomes identified with merely one aspect or faculty of the human person. According to Tillich, however, the authentic biblical understanding (redis-

covered in the Reformation) views faith as a centered act of the entire person, involving mind, heart, and will. Hence, Tillich redefined faith as "the state of being ultimately concerned" (1957, p. 1). He intended his definition of faith as "ultimate concern" to be a restatement of the great commandment: "You shall love the LORD your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your might" (Deuteronomy 6:5).

Ultimate concern for Tillich is a double-sided concept. On its subjective side it indicates that someone is concerned about something considered to be of ultimate significance whereas on its objective side it refers to that about which one is concerned. In this formal sense, everyone has faith. Atheism, according to this definition, can mean only a complete absence of ultimate concern, which Tillich believed was impossible for human beings. The issue is not whether we are ultimately concerned but what we are ultimately concerned about. The crucial question is whether that about which we are ultimately concerned is truly ultimate. Luther had redefined faith as trust and said that a god is that in which we place our entire trust, regardless of whether such trust resides in the one true God or in an idol. In Tillich's recasting of Luther's point, idolatry results whenever we are ultimately concerned with penultimate matters (such as the nation, the race, money, etc.). Since that about which we are ultimately concerned has to do with our being or nonbeing, only God as the infinite source of our being is truly ultimate and thus the sole proper object of our ultimate concern.

Tillich was also convinced, however, that inadequate ideas about God have played a decisive role in creating the conditions of modern atheism. God, in Tillich's theology, is not "a being" at all, not even "the supreme being." Speaking of God in this fashion subjects God to the subject–object split characterizing finite being and, thereby, renders God finite. In Tillich's ontological analysis of human existence – finite being aware of itself

as finite – the existential questions about death, guilt, or meaninglessness are all variations on a single theme: the threat of nonbeing. If God is finite, then God cannot be the source of human courage to affirm finite being in the face of nonbeing. But, properly understood, God is the infinite power of being conquering nonbeing. Hence, it is most accurate to speak of God as "being-itself" or "the ground of being."

Some critics accused Tillich of atheism for his denial that God is a being, even though Tillich's meaning is not all that different from what had been said about God by certain classical theologians, especially those under the influence of neo-Platonism (such as Pseudo-Dionysius). As a consequence of his doctrine of God, Tillich denied that there could be a literal language for speaking about God. All language about God is symbolic. In response to the charge that he had made theological language "merely symbolic," Tillich answered that the criticism was symptomatic of the impoverishment of symbolic language in our technical culture and indicated the degree to which modern persons have lost touch with the depth dimension of their lives which only religious symbolism is capable of illuminating. But there is another critical question that Tillich had to answer, namely, whether his doctrine of God as "being-itself" can claim to represent authentic Christian faith since it denies the personal character of God that is central to biblical affirmations about God. To this question Tillich replied that, although God is not a person, as the source or ground of personal being, God is not less than a person. Moreover, it is proper for persons to have a personal relationship with the ground of their being and, for that reason, imagining God as person-like has a certain, albeit limited, theological validity. The problem comes when we forget that our personal language about God is symbolic. When personal symbolism is mistaken for literal language, then God becomes the heteronomous tyrant against whom modern persons justifiably revolt in the name of personal autonomy. Tillich believed that his doctrine of God overcomes the opposition between religious heteronomy and secular autonomy in the direction of "theonomy" which is the ideal of a culture aware of its depth dimension. In a theonomous culture there could be no separation between "religious" and "secular" since all finite being would be transparent to God as the unconditional ground of its own being and meaning.

The New Testament presents a portrait of "Jesus as the Christ," meaning that he is the bearer of the "New Being" in history (Tillich's translation of the Pauline "new creation" of 2 Corinthians 5:17) since he lived under the conditions of human existence without succumbing to estrangement (see Hebrews 4:15). Salvation, for Tillich, is the healing (from the Latin *salus*) of the estranged character of existence which occurs when we are reconciled with the ground of our being to which we essentially belong. In a famous sermon Tillich put his deep pastoral sensibilities into moving words as he sought to evoke this healing experience of "grace" even for the person who no longer adheres to traditional Christian beliefs: "*You are accepted*, accepted by that which is greater than you, and the name of which you do not know…. *Simply accept the fact that you are accepted*." Tillich went on to explain that "nothing is demanded of this experience, no religious or moral or intellectual presupposition, nothing but *acceptance*" (1953, p. 162). Tillich thus gave a radical reinterpretation of Luther's doctrine "justification by faith alone," applying it to the situation of the modern doubter. Just as Luther had affirmed the paradox that we are justified while yet sinners (*simul iustus et peccator*), Tillich insisted that faith as ultimate concern justifies even the person who doubts the existence of God: "Where there is ultimate concern, God can be denied only in the name of God …. Ultimate concern cannot deny its own character as ultimate." (1957, p. 45)

Although Tillich was deeply influenced by existentialism, his philosophical theology

cannot be classified entirely under the rubric "existentialist" on account of his commitment to ontology. In the post-Kantian situation, Tillich prefers the word "ontology" to "metaphysics" since the latter term has come to connote an illicit use of reason beyond its proper sphere. Since he attributes even the predicate "being" to God in a symbolic sense, Tillich's philosophical theology is not subject to Kant's critique of metaphysics or to Heidegger's rejection of "onto-theology." Nonetheless, Tillich did believe that only an ontological analysis of the structures of finite being could provide an adequate basis for a philosophy of religion. Whereas philosophy as ontology aims to provide a theoretical account of being, religion answers the existential question of the *meaning* of being. Tillich lamented that the loss of ontology in modern philosophy has led to a truncation of our intellectual and spiritual horizons. He traced the origins of this loss to the appropriation of Aristotle's empirical philosophy by Aquinas, which then developed into late-medieval nominalism and, finally, into modern scientific empiricism and logical positivism. An empirical philosophy of religion turns the question of God into that of a being whose existence can be doubted. By contrast, Tillich took his stand firmly in the Platonic tradition of Augustine and Anselm where God is presupposed as the unconditioned ground of being and meaning.

Tillich was also critical of those liberal Protestant theologians, such as Albrecht Ritschl and Adolf von Harnack, who sought, in dependence upon Kant, to interpret the significance of religion solely in relation to the moral dimension of life. Tillich defended the development of classical Christian doctrine against Harnack's portrayal of it as resulting from the corrupting influence of Greek philosophy upon the original Hebrew soil of the gospel. In Tillich's view, the early Christian apologists appreciated the genuine existential questions driving the philosophers to inquire into the nature of ultimate reality or being-itself, and thus they correctly sought to demonstrate that the Christian message is the answer to these questions of ultimate concern.

The ontological orientation of Tillich's philosophical thought was, for the most part, foreign to modern sensibilities, even though, ironically, Tillich's attempt to retrieve ontology intended to mediate the Christian message to the scientific mind. It is an interesting question whether the contemporary climate of postmodernism will be more hospitable to Tillich's style of thought since he was so critical of the instrumental character of modern technical reason. Be that as it may, this observation does point to an inevitable tension for a philosophical theologian such as Tillich who stood on the boundary between faith and doubt, the church and the academy, Jerusalem and Athens.

Tillich's work can be assessed from two distinct disciplinary perspectives, those of philosophy and theology. Whereas philosophers may judge his thought to be old-fashioned when measured by contemporary standards, theologians may decide that his redefinition of traditional Christian beliefs has moved outside the boundaries of orthodoxy. Nevertheless, the critical question facing both philosophical and theological interpreters of Tillich today is the question of which aspects of his legacy remain valid and are worthy of development. While judgments about these matters vary widely, no one can doubt the enormous contribution made by this German-born American theologian to the intellectual life of the twentieth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Die religiöse Lage der Gegenwart (Berlin, 1926). Trans. H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Religious Situation* (New York, 1956).

Die sozialistische Entscheidung (Potsdam, 1933). Trans. Franklin Sherman, *The Socialist Decision* (New York, 1977).

Systematic Theology, 3 vols (Chicago, 1951, 1957, 1963).

The Courage to Be (New Haven, Conn., 1952).

The Shaking of the Foundations (New York,

1953).

Biblical Religion and the Search for Ultimate Reality (Chicago, 1955).

The New Being (New York, 1955).

Dynamics of Faith (New York, 1957).

Theology of Culture (Oxford, 1959).

Christianity and the Encounter of the World Religions (New York, 1963).

What is Religion? ed. James Luther Adams (New York, 1969).

Other Relevant Works

Tillich's papers are at Harvard University and the University of Marburg, Germany.

Gesammelte Werke, 20 vols (Stuttgart, 1959–82).

On the Boundary: An Autobiographical Sketch (New York, 1966).

My Travel Diary: 1936, Between Two Worlds (New York, 1970).

Against the Third Reich: Paul Tillich's Wartime Addresses to Nazi Germany, trans. Matthew Weaver, ed. Ronald Stone and Matthew Weaver (Louisville, Kent., 1998).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Religious Bio, Encyc Amer Bio, Encyc Relig, Proc of APA v39, Routledge Encycl Phil, Who Was Who in Amer v4, Who's Who in Phil

Adams, James Luther. *Paul Tillich's Philosophy of Culture, Science, and Religion* (New York, 1965).

Adams, James Luther, Wilhelm Pauck, and Roger Lincoln Shinn, eds. *The Thought of Paul Tillich* (San Francisco, 1985).

Crossman, Richard. *Paul Tillich: A Comprehensive Bibliography and Keyword Index of Primary and Secondary Writings in English* (Metuchen, N.J., 1983).

Jahr, Hannelore. *Theologie als Gestaltmetaphysik: die Vermittlung von Gott und Welt im Frühwerk Paul Tillichs*

(Berlin, 1898).

Kegley, Charles W., ed. *The Theology of Paul Tillich* (New York, 1982).

Pauck, Wilhelm, and Marion Pauck. *Paul Tillich: His Life and Thought* (New York, 1976).

Rowe, William L. *Religious Symbols and God: A Philosophical Study of Tillich's Theology* (Chicago, 1968).

Scharlemann, Robert P. *Reflection and Doubt in the Thought of Paul Tillich* (New Haven, Conn., 1969).

Schüssler, Werner. *"Was uns unbedingt angeht": Studien zur Theologie und Philosophie Paul Tillichs* (Münster, Germany, 1999).

Thomas, J. Heywood. *Tillich* (New York and London, 2000).

Paul E. Capetz

TITCHENER, Edward Bradford
(1867–1927)

Edward Bradford Titchener was born on 11 January 1867 in Chichester, Sussex, England, and died on 3 August 1927 in Ithaca, New York. He was the son of John Titchener and Alice Field Habin and the grandson of Edward Titchener, a successful barrister in Chichester. After the premature death of his father, Titchener was sent to live with his paternal grandfather. He received his early schooling with a tutor and then went to the Cathedral school in Chichester. Later he attended public school in Malvern where he garnered every available honor for academic excellence. Through the influence of his headmaster at Malvern, Titchener went to Oxford, where he was housed in Brasenose College. Although he had been interested in nature study as a boy, his academic interests at Oxford were devoted primarily to philosophy.

At Oxford, Titchener was especially influenced by reading the British empiricists. From James Mill he gained the conviction that it was possible to analyze experience into its simplest components, an idea that moved him toward an introspective psychology. From Hume he gained the conviction that descriptions of experience must be of the contents of the experience and free from logical inferences and from what Titchener would come to call the "stimulus error," confusing the stimulus with the experience. At the same time, Titchener was also drawn toward Darwinian biology, then becoming popular at Oxford. In particular, he was interested in the thinking of Herbert Spencer who emphasized that one must first understand the structure of a process before one can understand its functions. Darwinism led him to comparative psychology, but Titchener found the non-systematic and anecdotal approach of George John Romanes and others of the early comparative school unacceptable.

While at Oxford Titchener also discovered psychology, through George Trumbull LADD's *Elements of Physiological Psychology*, a work influenced by Wilhelm Wundt's *Grundzüge der physiologischen Psychologie*. Titchener found himself strongly attracted both to the introspective psychology Ladd described and to the systematic nature of his approach; but he rejected Ladd's inclusion of the concept of "soul" within psychology.

Acquainted through Ladd with the work of Wundt and his laboratory at Leipzig, Titchener determined to go to Germany for his doctoral work. However, Wundt recommended that Titchener spend a year studying science before coming to Leipzig; and in 1889, upon graduation from Oxford with a double first in his examinations, Titchener began a year in the laboratory of John Scott Burdon-Sanderson, one of England's foremost experimental physiologists. It was in Burdon-Sanderson's laboratory that Titchener came to appreciate the intricacies of the experimental method and to adopt the standards on which he would model his own experimental work.

In 1890 Titchener went to Leipzig to study with Wilhelm Wundt. He was Wundt's first English student. Early in his stay in Leipzig, he thought he had found the key to psychology in psychophysics, the quantitative study of the relationship between changes in the physical world and those in human experience. Later, however, he moved more toward the qualitative methods of introspective analysis. Titchener soon became disenchanted with aspects of Wundt's psychology, particularly the limitations that Wundt found in the experimental method, that is, in introspection. Wundt confined introspection to the lower mental processes, sensation, perception, feelings, emotions, and the like. He held that higher mental processes could not be studied directly using introspection. Thought, judgment, reason, and other such higher mental processes could only be studied by other methods, largely through the "products of mind." Titchener and others of Wundt's students at Leipzig discovered a more consistent approach in the positivism of Ernst Mach. Wundt's inflexibility concerning the methods and limitations of introspection led Titchener to consider leaving Leipzig and studying with Hermann Ebbinghaus. Titchener stayed with Wundt, however, and completed his dissertation in 1892 on the topic of visual perception.

Since there were no academic positions for experimental psychology in England (such positions would not exist for another generation), Titchener accepted appointment to teach psychology in the Sage School of Philosophy at Cornell University in the United States. Arriving there in the fall of 1892, Titchener quickly turned the psychology laboratory, begun by Frank Angell, into one of the finest laboratories of introspective psychology in the world. Rejecting offers from Harvard and elsewhere, Titchener remained professor of psychology until his death in 1927.

Titchener considered the psychology taught in most American colleges to be little more than a watered down Cartesianism. It was primarily philosophical and not experimental and

tainted with the concepts of faculties and soul. Even William JAMES's *Principles of Psychology*, while an advance over faculty psychology, was insufficiently experimental for Titchener. He, like others of the second generation of experimental psychologists, believed that experimental psychology had to break free of philosophy and stand on its own as an independent science. Titchener sought to model experimental psychology after the established experimental sciences, physics and physiology, and to make psychology one of the three fundamental sciences: physical, biological, and mental.

As part of his campaign to introduce American students to the new experimental psychology of Germany, Titchener translated several works. One of these was Wundt's *Human and Animal Psychology*, translated with James E. CREIGHTON in 1894. Another was Oswald Külpe's *Outlines of Psychology*, translated in 1895, because it represented the new, positivistic view of analytical and introspective psychology. In 1896 Titchener produced his own introductory text, *An Outline of Psychology*. This would be supplanted in 1910 by his *Textbook of Psychology*, the most complete statement of his systematic position which he called structuralism. Titchener also had a large influence on the discipline as an editor. He was the American editor of *Mind* from 1894 to 1920. He also served on the editorial board of the *American Journal of Psychology* after 1895 and was its editor from 1921 to 1924.

Titchener's system was cast narrowly, concerning itself with normal, adult human consciousness. His system held that experience, no matter how complicated, can be reduced down to simple elements and their attributes. By "experience," however, Titchener means directly observable consciousness, not understandings that resulted from inference or from meanings. Like Wundt, Titchener began with the simplest elementary processes – sensations, images, and feelings or affections – defined in terms of their attributes. It is in the attributes

that Titchener's and Wundt's systems begin to diverge. Wundt held that sensations, images and feelings were differentiated in terms of quality and intensity. Quality was the aspect that gives the element its name (blue, cold, sweet, etc.); intensity was the degree to which quality is experienced. To these Titchener added duration (protensity), space (extensity), and clearness (vividness, attensity). Not every experience contained all these attributes; but they were sufficient to describe an element. Wundt required accessory concepts such as his doctrine of apperception, unconscious inference, and doctrine of creative synthesis to bring space, time, and attention into his system. Because Titchener, like Mach, believed that an element is not tied to a specific nervous receptor but is the simplest process that can be experienced *consciously* as a process, he thought such accessory concepts unnecessary. This approach allowed Titchener to explore the higher mental processes, such as thought, directly by means of analytical introspection rather than requiring, as did Wundt, a different set of methods.

Beginning around 1917, Titchener began to shift his position away from elementism and toward a multidimensional view of experience. The logic of the system remained much the same, but rather than starting with elements he began with dimensions of attributes. He collapsed the three classes of elements, sensation, image, and affection, into one: sensation. There was no need for any category of element if everything was differentiated by the attributive dimensions. Unfortunately Titchener was unable to publish his new systematic approach in detail before his death in 1927. Also, by the time of his death, the climate of American psychology had ceased to be favorable to the introspective approach. Behaviorism was on the rise and Titchener's system quickly lost favor.

Perhaps Titchener's most important long-term influence was not his system but his emphasis on the experimental method in psychology, especially as embodied in the four

volumes of his *Experimental Psychology*, published from 1901 to 1905. These books, two for students and two for instructors, were used by generations of experimental psychologists, regardless of their theoretical position. They were also as responsible as anything else for establishing the laboratory as the primary locus for data collection in psychology and for placing the laboratory course at the center of the psychological curriculum in higher education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
An Outline of Psychology (New York, 1896).
"The Postulates of a Structural Psychology," *Philosophical Review* 7 (1898): 449–65.
Experimental Psychology, 4 vols (New York, 1901–1905).
Lectures on the Elementary Psychology of Feeling and Attention (New York, 1908).
Lectures on the Experimental Psychology of the Thought Processes (New York, 1909).
Textbook of Psychology (New York, 1910).
Systematic Psychology: Prolegomena (New York, 1929).

Other Relevant Works
Titchener's papers are at Cornell University.
Trans. with James E. Creighton, *Lectures on Human and Animal Psychology*, by Wilhelm Wundt (London and New York, 1894).
Trans., *Outlines of Psychology*, by Oswald Külpe (London and New York, 1895).
A Beginner's Psychology (New York, 1915).
Defining American Psychology: The Correspondence between Adolph Meyer and Edward Bradford Titchener, ed. Ruth Leys and Rand B. Evans (Baltimore, Md., 1990).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, Bio Dict Psych, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Encyc Psych, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v22, Who Was Who in Amer v1

Angell, James R. "The Relations of Structural and Functional Psychology," *Philosophical Review* 12 (1903): 243–71.
Boring, Edwin G. "Edward Bradford Titchener, 1867–1927," *American Journal of Psychology* 38 (1927): 489–506.
———, *A History of Experimental Psychology*, 2nd edn (New York, 1950).
Calkins, Mary Whiton. "Professor Titchener on the Thought Processes," *Psychological Bulletin* 7 (1910): 293–7.
Dallenbach, K. M. "Bibliography of the Writings of Edward Bradford Titchener, 1917–1927," *American Journal of Psychology* 40 (1928): 121–5.
Evans, Rand B. "E. B. Titchener and His Lost System," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 8 (1972): 168–80.
———, "E. B. Titchener's Doctrine of Meaning," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 11 (1975): 334–41.
———, "E. B. Titchener on Scientific Psychology and Technology," in *Portraits of Pioneers in Psychology*, vol. 1, ed. G. A. Kimble, M. Wertheimer, and C. White (Washington, D.C., 1991), pp. 89–103.
Keen, Ernest. *A History of Ideas in American Psychology* (Westport, Conn., 2001).
Larson, Cedric A., and John J. Sullivan. "Watson's Relation to Titchener," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 1 (1965): 338–54.
Pillsbury, W. B. "The Psychology of Edward Bradford Titchener," *Philosophical Review* 37 (1928): 95–108.
———, "Titchener and James," *Psychological Review* 50 (1943): 71–3.
Studies in Psychology Contributed by Colleagues and Former Students of Edward Bradford Titchener (Worcester, Mass., 1917). Contains a bibliography of Titchener's publications.
Watson, R. I., and Rand B. Evans. *The Great Psychologists*, 5th edn (New York, 1991).

Rand B. Evans

TOLMAN, Edward Chace (1886–1959)

Edward C. Tolman was born on 14 April 1886 in West Newton, Massachusetts, and died on 19 November 1959 in Berkeley, California. Ancestors on both sides of his family had settled in New England in the early 1600s. Edward's father, James Pike Tolman, a prosperous cordage manufacturer with many patents to his credit, was a member of the first graduating class of Massachusetts Institute of Technology. His mother, Mary Chace Cheney, came from a long line of Quaker reformers who were especially prominent in the abolition movement. Both Edward and his older brother, Richard, attended MIT. Richard Tolman, who received his PhD in 1910, became an eminent physical chemist, spending most of his career at the California Institute of Technology. He was both a role model and rival for Edward. Edward Tolman completed his BS in electrochemistry in 1911.

Tolman became interested in psychology after reading William JAMES's *Principles of Psychology* in 1890, and to learn more about it, he enrolled in two summer courses at Harvard: a philosophy course taught by neo-realist philosopher Ralph Barton PERRY, and a psychology course taught by comparative psychologist Robert Yerkes. Realizing that as a psychologist he could have a career in science without competing directly with his brother, Tolman began graduate studies at Harvard. At that time, psychology was a division of the philosophy department at Harvard, the most prestigious philosophy department in the country. Tolman received his MA in 1912 and PhD in psychology in 1915 from Harvard. His doctoral research, supervised by Hugo MÜNSTERBERG, studied human memory.

Tolman's first academic appointment was at Northwestern University in 1915, where he remained for three years as a psychology instructor. In 1918 his position was not renewed. Although cutbacks were being made because of the war, Tolman believed that he was dismissed because he had supported a pacifist student periodical. He accepted a psychology appointment at the University of California at Berkeley in the summer of 1918, becoming a colleague of psychologist George M. STRATTON. He progressed through the ranks, becoming a full professor in 1928, and held that position until his retirement in 1957. Tolman received many awards and honors. In 1937 he was President of the American Psychological Association and was elected to the National Academy of Sciences. In 1954 he was Co-President of the International Congress of Psychology. Tolman Hall on the Berkeley campus serves as a memorial to him.

While he was at Northwestern, Tolman continued to conduct research with human subjects, but soon after he arrived at Berkeley he began to work with rats. Tolman's rat research was directed at providing evidence for the theoretical system, purposive behaviorism, he was developing. Later in his career he would claim that anything of importance in psychology could be discovered by theoretically analyzing the behavior of a rat at the choice point in a maze. Behaviorism, the approach to psychological research that was then being promoted by John B. WATSON, maintained that behavior – human or animal – was the only legitimate subject matter for psychology. Tolman liked the fact that this approach was objective and scientific, but he could not accept the strict stimulus–response (S–R), "muscle-twitch" psychology of Watson. Rather than discard the concepts that Watson disdained, such as instincts and emotions, motives and cognitions, Tolman was determined to retain them in a completely objective and scientific way. He would also always conceptualize behavior as involving the whole organism in molar, rather than molecular, terms.

The influence of Tolman's Harvard professors, Perry and Edwin HOLT, is evident in the theory Tolman developed; both had dealt with concepts such as purpose and cognition as objective terms. In particular, Tolman was indebted to Perry whose ideas played an

important role in determining the concepts of Tolman's purposive behaviorism. In Perry's course at Harvard he had been exposed to the ideas of William MCDOUGALL who, in his *Introduction to Social Psychology* (1908), first defined psychology in terms of the study of behavior. In contrast to Watson, McDougall emphasized motivation and emotion, not stimulus and response, which attracted Tolman. However, McDougall's purposiveness was teleological, while Tolman's was not.

Tolman's initial ideas for a behavioristic theory of psychology were put forth in a talk to the Berkeley Philosophical Union in December 1919. In "Instinct and Purpose," the article based on this talk, he presented a behavioristic definition of instinct, and then used this definition to give "a psychological analysis of purpose" (1920, p. 217). For Tolman, an instinct involved a determining adjustment, produced by a particular stimulus, which released innate subordinate acts (relatively random responses). These acts continued until the stimulus causing the determining adjustment was removed. Here then was purposive (goal-directed) action, produced by an entirely deterministic mechanism; Tolman was only interested in a nonteleological purposive psychology.

In 1922 Tolman introduced "A New Formula for Behaviorism" comprising four basic concepts: stimulating agency, behavior-cue, behavior-object, and behavior-act. To emphasize the interdependency between behavior and the environment, he attached the term "behavior" to "cue" and to "object." "Behavior-cue" referred, in an objective way, to the old introspectionist idea of "sense-qualities" or the sensations produced by a stimulus (stimulating agency). In another article, also published in 1922, Tolman outlined a behavioristic account of sensation quality. We can never directly know the sensory experience, the "raw feels," of another organism; we can only observe how their behavior differs with respect to a set of stimuli – that is, how they classify the stimuli behaviorally. The term

"behavior-object" encompassed the meaning that stimuli have for the organism, meaning that is defined by the behavior-act, the final observed response. In other words, in the presence of particular stimuli (behavior-cues), action (a response) is directed toward (or away from) the behavior-object (goal). Over the following decade, in a series of *Psychological Review* articles, Tolman showed how motivational and cognitive concepts, ideas completely discarded by Watsonian behaviorists, could be incorporated into a behavioristic system. He provided objective definitions for emotions, ideas and consciousness, as well as for purpose and cognition.

These ideas were brought together in more fully developed form, employing new terminology, in Tolman's book, *Purposive Behavior in Animals and Men* (1932). Purposiveness was shown to be a feature of behavior itself, defined by persistence of responding until a goal is achieved. Cognitions are expectations about the means–end relationships between signs (his old cue-objects) and significates, the goals (behavior-objects) that they indicate. Tolman identified two types of expectations: (1) means-end-readinesses, which are long-term and depend on genetics or past experience; and (2) sign-gestalt-expectations that provide specific information about how to attain current goals. He believed that this distinction was important, but it was largely ignored by other learning theorists who talked simply about expectations. In *Purposive Behavior*, Tolman also described the results of numerous experiments with rats, mainly carried out by himself and his students, to support the objective status of his theoretical constructs.

Unlike other behaviorisms of the day, Tolman's theory emphasized motivational and cognitive behavior-determinants, purposes and cognitions, that intervened between the factors producing behavior, independent variables, and the final observed response. Soon Tolman began to call these cognitive and purposive concepts "intervening variables." The intro-

duction of the concept of an intervening variable was perhaps the most important contribution Tolman made to psychology. Other learning theorists, particularly Clark HULL, readily adopted the concept.

In his 1937 presidential address to the American Psychological Association, Tolman showed how the function relating environmental events (independent variables) and behavior (dependent variables) could be broken down into two more manageable functions involving intervening variables. Although the intervening variables he introduced, such as "demands" and "hypotheses," might seem subjective, they could be shown to be objective by operationally defining them using standard experimental procedures. Often Tolman referred to his system as operational behaviorism, both because it involved operational definitions and because the experimenter was recording an organism operating on its environment. A final version of Tolman's purposive behaviorism appeared in 1952 in Sigmund KOCH's series *Psychology: A Study of a Science*. Again the terminology was revised, but the basic concepts remained the same.

During the 1930s, Tolman was criticized because his theory was not quantitative. Influenced by the ideas of Kurt Lewin, Tolman used topological representation and vector mathematics to predict the strength of choice (orientation vectors) and movement toward a stimulus (progression vectors). He devised what today would be seen as a cybernetic model that he labeled the "schematic sowbug." The name came about when he attached legs (the vectors) to Lewin's eliptical representation of Life Space, creating what looked like the insect called a "sowbug." The model did not attract much attention, perhaps because of its fanciful name or maybe because it was ahead of its time.

In 1947, Tolman was invited to give the 34th Annual Faculty Research Lecture at Berkeley. He used the occasion to summarize the research carried out in his laboratory over the previous two decades, and to point out how his field theory of learning, as he now called it, differed from the more popular S–R theories. The title of his talk, "Cognitive Maps in Rats and Men," emphasized the important features of Tolman's psychology. The spatial metaphor for memory representation was typical of the kinds of analogies Tolman liked to use; his research program always involved studies of rats in mazes; and finally, his real concern was human behavior. In contrast to the "telephone-switchboard school" of theories popular at the time, Tolman suggested that "in the course of learning something like a field map of the environment gets established in the rat's brain" (1948, p. 192). The influence of Lewin is also evident here; Tolman tended to regarded the cognitive map construct as similar to Lewin's idea of Life Space. Tolman also made an important distinction between two possible types of cognitive maps – broad and comprehensive, or narrowly fixed. When animals are highly motivated or frustrated, for example, their behavior could be determined by narrow strip maps. Applying these ideas to humans, Tolman concluded his talk by suggesting that maladaptive behavior was the result of narrow cognitive maps.

Although he worked with rats, Tolman's ultimate aim was to show how psychology could be used to help mankind. He was a founding member of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, an organization created in 1936 to encourage psychologists to use their expertise to solve problems facing society, which at the time included the effects of the great depression, discrimination, and the prospect of international conflict. As a pacifist, Tolman was greatly distressed by World War II. In 1942, he published a small volume, *Drives Toward War*, in which he presented a theory of human motivation and described how natural aggressive drives could be channeled so that future war could be prevented.

Tolman's interest in human rights extended to academic freedom. During the McCarthy era, the University of California imposed an

anti-communist loyalty oath on the faculty. Tolman, who was not a communist, was the first to point out the problems inherent in a political requirement for employment at the university. He was fired from the university in 1950 for refusing to sign the oath. However, the Group for Academic Freedom of which he was the leader, took the Regents of the university to court and won reinstatement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Instinct and Purpose," *Psychological Review* 27 (1920): 217–33.

"A New Formula for Behaviorism," *Psychological Review* 29 (1922): 44–53.

"Concerning the Sensation Quality: A Behavioristic Account," *Psychological Review* 29 (1922): 140–45.

Purposive Behavior in Animals and Men (New York, 1932).

"Operational Behaviorism and Current Trends in Psychology," in *Proceedings of the 25th Anniversary Celebration of the Inauguration of Graduate Studies* (Los Angeles, 1936), pp. 89–103.

"The Determiners of Behavior at a Choice Point," *Psychological Review* 45 (1938): 1–41.

Drives Toward War (New York, 1942).

"Cognitive Maps in Rats and Men," *Psychological Review* 55 (1948): 189–210.

Behavior and Psychological Man: Essays in Motivation and Learning (Berkeley, Cal., 1951). Also published with the title *Collected Papers in Psychology.*

"Principles of Purposive Behavior," in *Psychology: A Study of a Science,* vol. 2, ed. Sigmund Koch (New York, 1952), pp. 92–157.

Other Relevant Works

Tolman's papers are at the University of California, Berkeley, and in the Archives of the History of American Psychology at the University of Akron, Ohio.

"A Behavioristic Account of the Emotions," *Psychological Review* 30 (1923): 217–27.

"Purpose and Cognition: The Determiners of Animal Learning," *Psychological Review* 32 (1925): 285–97.

"A Behavioristic Theory of Ideas," *Psychological Review* 34 (1926): 433–6.

"A Behaviorist's Definition of Consciousness," *Psychological Review* 34 (1927): 433–9.

"Edward Chace Tolman," in *A History of Psychology in Autobiography*, vol. 4, ed. Edwin G. Boring et al. (Worcester, Mass., 1952), pp. 323–39.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Cog Sci*, *Encyc Psych*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*

Crutchfield, Richard S. "Edward Chace Tolman, 1886–1959," *American Journal of Psychology* 74 (1961): 135–41.

Gleitman, H. "Edward Chace Tolman: A Life of Scientific and Social Purpose," in *Portraits of Pioneers in Psychology*, vol. 1, ed. G. A. Kimble, M. Wertheimer, and C. White (Washington, D.C., 1991), pp. 227–41.

Guthrie, Edwin R. "Tolman on Associative Learning," *Psychological Review* 44 (1937): 525–9.

Innis, Nancy K. "Lessons from the Controversy over the Loyalty Oath at the University of California," *Minerva* 30 (1992): 337–65.

———, "Edward C. Tolman's Purposive Behaviorism," in *Handbook of Behaviorism*, ed. William O'Donohue and Richard Kitchener (San Diego, Cal., 1999), pp. 97–117.

Keen, Ernest. *A History of Ideas in American Psychology* (Westport, Conn., 2001).

Lewin, Kurt. *Principles of Topological Psychology* (New York, 1936).

McDougall, William. *An Introduction to Social Psychology* (London, 1908).

Pepper, Stephen C. "The Conceptual Framework of Tolman's Purposive Behaviorism," *Psychological Review* 41 (1934): 108–34.

Perry, Ralph B. "A Behavioristic View of Purpose," *Journal of Philosophy* 18 (1921): 85–105.

Ritchie, B. F. "Edward Chace Tolman," in *National Academy of Sciences Biographical Memoirs*, vol. 37 (Washington, D.C., 1963), pp. 292–317.

Smith, Lawrence D. "Purpose and Cognition: The Limits of the Neorealist Influence on Tolman's Psychology," *Behaviorism* 10 (1982): 151–63.

———, *Behaviorism and Logical Positivism: A Reassessment of the Alliance* (Stanford, Cal., 1986).

Still, Arthur, ed. "E. C. Tolmin: A Centenary Symposium," *British Journal of Psychology* 77 (1986): 513–39. Four articles on Tolman.

Tibbetts, Paul. "The Doctrine of 'Pure Experience': The Evolution of a Concept from Mach to James to Tolman," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 11 (1975): 55–66.

Nancy K. Innis

TOMAS, Vincent Anthony (1916–95)

Vincent A. Tomas was born on 9 January 1916 in Cicero, Illinois. He received his BA in 1936 from Knox College in Illinois. He then went to Brown University for graduate study, earning his MA in 1937 and his PhD in philosophy in 1941. His dissertation was entitled "The Philosophy of Literary Criticism." In 1941–2 he taught at Duluth Junior College in Minnesota, and then served in the US Army Armored Division during World War II from 1942 to 1946. He then returned to Brown University as an instructor of philosophy in 1946, and was promoted up to full professor by 1958. In 1963 he was named the Herbert Perry Faunce Professor of Philosophy, taking over the title from Richard TAYLOR, and he held this position until his retirement in 1980. He was also chair of the philosophy department from 1963 to 1970. Tomas died on 25 November 1995 in Barrington, Rhode Island.

Tomas was a Guggenheim Fellow in Rome in 1959–60. He was a visiting professor at Dartmouth College, Yale University, Harvard University, New York University, Northwestern University, the University of Minnesota, and the University of Calgary. He was a founder of the American civilization program at Brown. He was active in the American Society for Aesthetics, was President of the Brown chapter of the American Association of University Professors, and served as Secretary-Treasurer of the American Philosophical Association from 1957 to 1959.

In Tomas's aesthetic theory, expounded in a series of articles in the 1950s, the aesthetic attitude is directed towards appearances in experience and not towards objects. On his view, similar to that of Susanne K. LANGER, aesthetic judgments are not concerned with any actual existence or reality beyond that of the immediate appearances of the senses. As for the process of creating art, Tomas believes that the artist modifies the specific aims of the artwork as it develops, in a self-correcting process. This view found an ally in Monroe BEARDSLEY, who was similarly interested in criticizing the opposed view that the artist must be guided by a purpose to accomplish throughout the creative process. Tomas also published on selected aspects of the history of American philosophy, including Jonathan Edwards and Charles S. PEIRCE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Has Professor Greene Proved that Art is a Cognitive Process?" *Journal of Philosophy* 37 (1940): 459–69.

"Broad on 'Supreme Dispositions',"

Philosophical Studies 2 (1951): 81–5.

"Ethical Disagreements and the Emotive Theory of Values," *Mind* 60 (1951): 205–22.

"Can We Know the Contents of C. I. Lewis's Mind?" *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 11 (1951): 541–8.

"The Concept of Expression in Art," in *Science, Language, and Human Rights* (Philadelphia, 1952).

"Ducasse on Art and Its Appreciation," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 13 (1952): 69–83.

"Creativity in Art," *Philosophical Review* 67 (1958): 1–15.

"Aesthetic Vision," *Philosophical Review* 68 (1959): 52–67.

"Dr. Munro, Scientific Aesthetics, and Creative Art," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 19 (1959): 391–8.

"Darkness or Light?" in *Religious Experience and Truth: A Symposium*, ed. Sidney Hook (New York, 1961).

"Nine Basic Arts," *Review of Metaphysics* 15 (1962): 494–8.

"A Note on Creation in Art," *Journal of Philosophy* 59 (1962): 464–8.

"Kandinsky's Theory of Painting," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 9 (1969): 19–38.

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Essays in the Philosophy of Science*, by Charles S. Peirce (Indianapolis, 1957).

Ed., *What is Art?* by Leo Tolstoy (Indianapolis, 1960).

Ed., *Creativity in the Arts* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964).

Further Reading

Proc of APA v69

Cohen, Marshall. "Appearance and the Aesthetic Attitude," *Journal of Philosophy* 56 (1959): 915–26.

Hausman, Carl R. "Mechanism or Teleology in the Creative Process," *Journal of Philosophy* 58 (1961): 577–83.

Stolnitz, Jerome. "Some Questions Concerning Aesthetic Perception," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 22 (1961): 69–87.

John R. Shook

TORREY, Henry Augustus Pearson (1837–1902)

Henry Augustus Pearson Torrey, generally known as "HAP Torrey," was born on 8 January 1837 in Beverly, Massachusetts. While still a youth he joined the household of his uncle, Joseph TORREY, and attended Burlington High School in preparation for entry into the University of Vermont. After graduating with a BA from Vermont in 1858, he studied for the ministry at Union Theological Seminary in New York from which he graduated in 1864. He was ordained in 1865 and assumed the pastoral duties of the Congregational church in Vergennes, Vermont. In that same year, he also married his cousin, Sarah Paine Torrey, the daughter of Joseph Torrey. His career as a clergyman was halted by his appointment in 1868 to the Marsh Chair of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy at Vermont, which was made vacant by the death of Joseph Torrey. H. A. P. Torrey held this position for thirty-four years, and was the longest serving faculty member at the University of Vermont at the time of his death on 20 September 1902 in Burlington, Vermont.

Although he was not prolific in publication, H. A. P. Torrey's posterity in the history of American thought is undoubtedly secure due to his influential position in the development of the young John DEWEY. In 1930 Dewey recalled Torrey as one of the significant influences upon his career choice of philosophy, spending time with his professor both inside and outside the classroom: "… he was an excellent teacher,

and I owe to him a double debt, that of turning my thoughts definitely to the study of philosophy as a life-pursuit, and of a generous gift of time to me during a year devoted privately under his direction to a reading of classics in the history of philosophy and learning to read philosophic German" (Dewey 1988, pp. 148–9). Dewey also recalled Torrey's instruction as based on Scottish realism, and most historical interpretations of Torrey have repeated this claim.

Lewis S. Feuer has persuasively argued that "all the available evidence indicates that Dewey erred, that Torrey indeed was from the beginning to the end of his philosophic career Kantian in his inclinations" (Feuer 1958, p. 41). Nonetheless, more recent scholarship based on the few extant unpublished writings of H. A. P. Torrey indicated that his focus upon "intuition" operated in the service of his attempt to move beyond Kantian skepticism. Although known primarily as a scholar of Kant's philosophy – he taught Kant in the original German – Torrey was unsatisfied with the disconnection of knowledge and being inherent in the Kantian project. Propelled by his piety, which is noted by contemporary recollections of him, Torrey sought to overcome the chasm between knowledge and being (or the practical and the theoretical) by following Plato's ontology.

According to Torrey's interpretation of Plato, the material world "partakes in real being only so far as it shadows forth the eternal, – ideas or thoughts of its Creator. That element in things which proceeds from the Reason of God and addresses the reason of man is, in the view of Plato, that of which alone real existence can be predicated." (Kurita 1981, p. 11) Rather than two worlds, the material and the ideal, there is but one external world with eternal ideas implanted within it that is apprehended by way of two channels, the senses and reason. Although the senses grasp only the flux of the phenomenal, the human mind, which is created in the image of God's own mind, understands the eternal principles of order, harmony, pro-

portion, etc. that underpin the actualization of the things in themselves. Thus "Torrey assumes the divine intelligence both in the outer world and in the human mind and their congeneric correspondence with each other, his metaphysic can be said to be a pantheism" (Kurita 1981, p. 12). Torrey engaged the same quest to overcome dualism as Dewey.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The 'Theodicy of Leibniz'," *Andover Review* 4 (October–December 1885): 511.
"Herbert Spencer's *Facts and Comments*," *Philosophical Review* 12 (1903): 193–9.

Other Relevant Works
Torrey's papers are at the University of Vermont.
Trans., *The Philosophy of Descartes, in Extracts from His Writing* (New York, 1892).

Further Reading
Dewey, John. "From Absolutism to Experimentalism," in *The Later Works of John Dewey*, vol. 5, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale, Ill., 1988), pp. 147–60.
Feuer, Lewis S. "H. A. P. Torrey and John Dewey: Teacher and Pupil," *American Quarterly* 10 (1958): 34–54.
Kurita, Osamu. "H. A. P. Torrey and John Dewey, Re-Examined," *Bulletin of the Kyoto University of Education* series A, no. 58 (1981): 1–15.

C. Anthony Earls

TORREY, Joseph (1797–1867)

Joseph Torrey was born on 2 February 1797 in Rowley, Massachusetts. After graduating with a BA from Dartmouth College in 1816, he earned a BD degree from Andover

Theological Seminary in 1819. Torrey became an itinerant preacher in order to develop his oratory skills for the pulpit. In 1824 he was ordained to the ministry in Royalton, Vermont, where he served the Congregational Church for three years and married Mary Mosely Paine, with whom he had five children. Torrey left Royalton in 1827 to teach Greek and Latin at the University of Vermont in Burlington. In concert with President James Marsh, who had arrived at the university the previous year, Torrey was soon involved in a successful effort to reform the undergraduate curriculum, introducing such innovations as admission of part-time students and a system of electives.

When a fire consumed all but 125 books of the university's library holdings, President John Wheeler sent Torrey to Europe in 1835 to purchase much-needed books for the university. He returned to Vermont with 7000 volumes. When a new library was built in 1862, it was named in his honor. Although no longer the university library, the relocated Torrey Hall remains a prominent feature of the campus.

After the death of Marsh in 1842, Torrey was promoted to professor of intellectual and moral philosophy, a position in which he served until his own death in 1867. He was also recognized as a suitable successor of Marsh's intellectual legacy. This bequest – sometimes known as Vermont Transcendentalism – eschewed the divorce of individual from state and philosophy from faith that seemed implied by Lockean empiricism, while uniting belief with behavior by demonstrating the consistency of Christian doctrine with the universal laws of being as known through the faculty of reason. This "Burlington Philosophy" was preserved by Torrey and also by his nephew H. A. P. TORREY, and in turn influenced the young John DEWEY when he studied as an undergraduate at the University of Vermont during 1875–9.

Torrey's students characterized his teaching as clear and comprehensive, while his peers described his scholarship as lucid, precise, and insightful. Torrey's contemporaries viewed his analysis of philosophical texts as particularly seminal and astute. A lifelong admirer of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Torrey managed to avoid the vagueness that many critics find in Coleridge's writing. Although he was sympathetic to Coleridge's romanticism, Torrey's thinking displayed greater rigor. Throughout his career, despite his familiarity with the ancient and secular, Torrey was known as a Christian scholar who held fast to his faith. Harvard honored him with the DD degree in 1850.

Despite his preference for teaching and scholarship, Torrey reluctantly assumed the duties of President of the University of Vermont in September of 1862 because of his overriding commitment to the mission and success of the institution. At the age of sixty-five and in declining health, he assumed the duties of chief administrator of the school during some of the most troublesome years. While the Civil War decimated attendance – students and graduates served on both sides of the conflict – Torrey oversaw the emergence of the university as the land-grant institution of Vermont in 1865. Among the last of the theologians to serve as a university president, his service to the University of Vermont measured forty years. Torrey died on 26 November 1867 in Burlington, Vermont.

Upon his death, it was lamented that he had spent so little time preparing his own thought for publication, choosing instead to edit and translate the work of others. He edited *The Remains of the Rev. James Marsh* in 1843 and *Select Sermons of the Rev. Worthington Smith* in 1861. Many consider his five-volume translation of Johann August Wilhelm Neander's *Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Religion und Kirche* (1847–8) to be his principal work. A volume of his lectures entitled *A Theory of Fine Art*, edited by his daughter, Mary Cutler, was published posthumously in 1874.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Theory of Fine Art, ed. Mary Cutler (New York, 1874).

Other Relevant Works

Torrey's papers are at the University of Vermont.

Ed., *The Remains of the Rev. James Marsh, D.D.: Late President and Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy, in the University of Vermont; with a Memoir of His Life* (Boston, 1843).

Trans., *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, 5 vols, by J. A. W. Neander (Boston, 1847–8).

Ed., *Select Sermons of the Rev. Worthington Smith with a Memoir of His Life* (Andover, Mass., 1861).

Further Reading

Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v2*

Nicolson, Marjorie H. "James Marsh and the Vermont Transcendentalists," *Philosophical Review* 34 (1925): 28–50.

Services in Remembrance of Rev. Joseph Torrey and of Geo. Wyllys Benedict, Professors in the University of Vermont (Burlington, Vermont, 1874).

Charles Anthony Earls

TOULMIN, Stephen Edelston (1922–)

Stephen Toulmin was born in London, England, on 25 March 1922, to Geoffrey Edelston Toulmin and Doris Holman Toulmin. A physicist and mathematician as an undergraduate, Toulmin received a BA from King's College in 1942 before taking employment as a junior scientific officer for the Ministry of Aircraft Production at the Malvern Radar Research and Development Station. Toward the end of World War II he was stationed at the Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Expeditionary Force in Germany. He returned to England at the end of the war, and earned his MA (1947) and PhD (1948) in philosophy from the University of Cambridge. During his graduate work Toulmin studied with Ludwig Wittgenstein, who was exploring the limitations of formal logic and proposing epistemological problems that were highly influential on later twentieth-century philosophy. Toulmin became fascinated with the nature of rationality. He questioned whether a priori reason was arbitrary only to particular paradigms, rather than being an independently verifiable construct of universal reason. His thesis, "Reason in Ethics," struggled with this question by contrasting the way in which rational judgment may vary when applied to moral and scientific issues.

Toulmin became lecturer in philosophy of science at Oxford after graduating, staying until 1955. Taking a philosophy post at the University of Leeds, Toulmin then elaborated upon this issue in his book *The Uses of Argument* (1958). This work, which drew a distinction between formal logic as rational propositions and substantive arguments based upon experience, was not popular in England because it was still dominated by analytical schools of logic. Much as Wittgenstein himself – whom many claim as a founder of analytic philosophy – fell into disfavor in his later works amongst analytical philosophers, Toulmin found himself alienated from the English academy. Many of his former advisors at Cambridge disowned him through silence, and he was criticized at Leeds for writing a work that was against logical analysis. Due to its highly hostile reception by notable analytic philosophers, Toulmin was surprised that the work continued to sell successfully. This was primarily due to its popularity in America, not among professional philosophers, but communication scholars with a particular interest in the uses of rhetoric. It can be argued that the success of *Uses of Argument* marks the begin-

ning of Toulmin's classification as an "American" philosopher. This designation was fortified by his entry into the United States in 1959 and service as a visiting professor at New York University, Stanford Univerity, and then Columbia University.

The American attraction to Toulmin's analysis can partially be accounted for by its pragmatic orientation, and its ability to apply structural method to understanding rhetorical arguments. In a pragmatic sense, Toulmin's thought was taking the same direction as the later Wittgenstein. Both drew distinctions between formal propositions in logic and phenomenologically descriptive language as it related to direct experience. Toulmin's uniqueness was in his proposal that descriptive language could be understood structurally, as practical argumentation. This proposal was to have profound influence on the understanding of constructs of law as practical argument as it evolved from Common Law, or casuistic examples of case precedence and, by suggestion, the casuistic basis for ethical reasoning in general.

By analyzing the nature of arguments, Toulmin's range of inquiry had approached the analysis of rhetorically structured arguments: the relevance of the application of practical argument to ethics; the foundations of ethics as reason proceeding from experience; and the relationship of science to reason as an applied praxis. The scope of Toulmin's inquiry was proscriptive of ethical problems as they might occur out of scientific culture and the consequences raised by the application of formal reason to practical moral thought. The expansion and recognition of his groundbreaking use of argument to the substantive nature of applied reason was first apparent in his return to England, where from 1960 to 1965 he was Director of the Unit for History of Ideas of the Nuffield Foundation.

Toulmin returned to the United States in 1965 when he became a professor of philosophy at Brandeis University (1965–9), then professor of philosophy at Michigan State University (1969–72). In 1972–3 he was professor of humanities at the University of California at Santa Cruz. During that time he published *Human Understanding: The Collective Use and Evolution of Concepts*. In 1973 he became professor with the committee on social thought at the University of Chicago. *Human Understanding* contained the provocative suggestion that conceptual understanding was a collective process of assimilating meaning and subjecting these constructs to rational critical thought as a consequence of experience and not, necessarily, a conclusion based upon strict formal propositions.

This structural approach to applied reason in scientific procedure earned Toulmin a place with the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research (1975–8), established by the United States Congress. In 1988 he published, with Albert R. Jonsen, the *Abuse of Casuistry: A History of Moral Reasoning*. The revival of casuistry as the foundation for ethical understanding was a tradition that had remained intact in Catholic theological thought. Toulmin's application directly reflected the inherent evolution of legal thought out of Common Law in which a collective of "case studies" established critical precedence for the validity of a premise from one case to the next. Toulmin's use of casuistry was prescient in its grasp of the use of case studies in applied ethics.

After his stay at the University of Chicago, Toulmin took a position at Northwestern University as Avalon Foundation Professor of the Humanities (1986–92). He published *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity* in 1990, a work critical of the understanding of the Enlightenment and modern philosophy since Descartes. Toulmin held that Cartesian rationalism had arbitrarily divided epistemology into recalcitrant structures, with strict formal reasoning on one side and subjective intuition on the other. He asserts the view that human understanding is composed of conceptual understanding related to direct experience and subject to critical, rational thought and,

thus, is a synthetic proposition rather than a series of arbitrary principles.

In 1992 Toulmin became Henry Luce Professor at the Center for Multiethnic and Transnational Studies at the University of Southern California, where he remains at present. Throughout Toulmin's long and distinguished career he has held visiting professorships at Bryn Mawr, Dartmouth College, and Southern Methodist University. He also has been a Phi Beta Kappa National Lecturer, a visiting scholar at the Hastings Center, and a Guggenheim Fellow. In 1998 he was named Jefferson Lecturer by the National Endowment for the Humanities. The combination of Toulmin's long career in America, his work for the United States Congress and his recognition as Jefferson Lecturer – the premier honor given by the United States government for achievement in the humanities – all solidified his identity as a *uniquely* American philosopher. At the University of Southern California Toulmin became something of a living legend. As faculty master at USC's North Residential College he and his wife Donna Toulmin lived with students in the dorms, forming a community based on practical and lived ethical standards, while affording students-at-large the opportunity to come into close contact with a world-renowned philosopher and scholar. In demonstration of Toulmin's versatility and the precocious elements of his theoretical range, he is currently a member of the anthropology department at USC, where he works on multiethnic and transnational studies. His applied ethical constructs have recently focused on the relationship between local and global institutions from a nongovernmental perspective and border, as well, on the analysis of the interdependency of global structure beyond the nation-state. In 2001 Toulmin published *Return to Reason*, where he once again draws a distinction between reason and rationality, arguing that reason must temper the formal rational process in order to confront the emerging problems of twenty-first-century civilization. In many ways Toulmin's title for his latest publication is both a model for and an example of his earliest claims about the nature of logic.

In his early publication *The Uses of Argument*, Toulmin made a distinction between substantial and analytic arguments. Substantial arguments appealed to content for validity. Analytic arguments appealed to form. Substantial argument is an example of inference where a conclusion is reached on the basis of coherence, while analytic argument is based on a consistency of the conclusion to the premise. Analytic arguments must therefore base their premises on a universal truth, while substantive arguments refer to the context of a particular situation. If applied to ethical reasoning, analytic arguments are more in line with Kantian deontological principles, wherein a singular truth, such as "lying is wrong," must be applied in degrees to all situations. The substantive argument, in contrast, may look to a situation and the *reason* for lying for its moral content; such as, telling a potential murderer that one does not know where his victim is hiding is not wrong. A rational principle, such as $2 + 2 = 4$, must be invariant and always true. A reasonable principle, however, such as lying to a murder-crazed individual does not admit to an invariant truth but, rather, admits the circumstance that has incurred the lie. Thus a rational principle may have no bearing on a practical situation.

A great deal of Toulmin's work draws upon this distinction between theoretical and practical argument, and demonstrates that theoretical arguments are often useless in reasoning about everyday situations. Despite this fact, Toulmin claims that theoretical and analytic models have dominated formal and academic thought since the Enlightenment, partially as a consequence of the historical insecurity of the Thirty Years' War (1618–48) and the consequent rise of Cartesian certainty as an antidote to skepticism. This critical analysis of modern philosophy is undertaken in *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity*. Toulmin suggests that the division of analytic and substantive reasoning is a latecomer in the history

of philosophy, and that Aristotle employs the-oretical argument but also employs practical or substantive arguments, particularly in ethics. This tradition was lost, he says, in post-Renaissance Europe and the rise of Cartesian thought, particularly in the need for certainty in analytic reasoning and the exclusively rational constructs of Cartesian methodology.

Analytic rationality became the criterion for all rational principles and, as in mathematics and analytical logic, any rhetorical case-specific form of reasoning was excluded from rational thought and ceded either to theology, or, in late modernism and postmodernism, to psychology. This caused a dramatic division that led to the advent of relativistic ethics in the field of anthropology. According to relativism, ethical conduct could only be measured by the consensus of values in a given group. The alternative was ethical absolutism, where universal premises are the only means of determining the moral content of a given situation. Toulmin demonstrates why ethical absolutism, which was against pluralism and dogmatic in its assertion, is particularly archaic in that only one principle is asserted as governing all fields of knowledge. Just as Aristotle divided philosophy in subject matter under different fields of investigation, Toulmin demonstrates the irrelevance of mathematical and geometrical logic to everyday situations. Formal logic is field-specific to mathematics and geometry but not necessarily to either existential or practical situations, because the person doing the logic is not important to the conclusion reached, unlike ethical arguments or existential considerations. The person is also important for quantum mechanics where, since Heisenberg, the uncertainty principle seems to require that the means of measuring a phenomenon influences the outcome of the measurement. Therefore, an absolute methodology based on absolute analytic reason is inauthentic. Methods instead are learned, and put into praxis, or abandoned, by the people doing the reasoning. Analytic reason was particularly unsuited for human practical application for several crucial reasons.

Practical concerns are rarely governed by a singular set of principles, and the situations we cope with from day to day are, by nature, complex in substance and circumstance. A crucial problem with strictly analytic reason, however, lies in the assumption of formal analytical proposition that time is an irrelevant factor to the process of reasoning, and that formal truths are, therefore, atemporal. Toulmin would hold, however, that time is the shaper of temporal premises and that, within time, there is a latent capacity for infinite circumstances.

In practical and applied reason there can be no absolute: rather, the conditions of probability, such as our judgments, may be probably correct or probably incorrect, depending on the conditions. In this we have a movement away from Kantian ethics and a movement toward axiological or value-based reasoning, in which a conclusion is probably correct or incorrect in accordance with the values or claims held by the premises which, too, are up for critical examination. The way we arrive at practical judgments is through examining values, and then examining case-specific examples in order to reach a synthetic proposition. It is here that Toulmin's foundation in physics is made apparent in that the quantum model of uncertainty and the nature of time and probability, are axioms common to quantum mechanics.

Toulmin's address will become an appeal to casuistry, or the examination of concrete cases, as establishing specific criteria of precedence for rulings on applied ethics. There is a legal turn in ethical reasoning that predates the Enlightenment in the evolution of Common Law, and in the establishment of experience as the foundation for reason. One could argue that, even in the Enlightenment, John Locke makes this same turn in his appeal to reason in the *Second Treatise on Government* in which nature, consulted with reason, leads to sound judgment as a model for civil order. The foundation for judgment is not Cartesian analytic rationality, nor that of a geometry that postulates paradigms – such as straight lines, which

are nowhere found in nature – but rather appeals to a lived engagement with the natural environment. It is out of such an engagement, and consequential experience, that we draw practical knowledge. It is out of this assimilated sense of practical knowledge that claims are made. But such claims, in substantive argument, warrant justification. Thus, substantive arguments are structured and open to critical review. This is most true in ethics, and it is the application of practical reason, as applied to ethics, that is the mainstream of research that unites Toulmin's body of work. The model for practical argument is developed from the idea that justification is the primary function of practical argumentation. As contrasted to the process of inference in analytical propositions, the role of practical argument is to justify claims. Justification is a reflective activity and, therefore, reflects on the nature of experience rather than inferring an absolute conclusion. Justification is a process of testing through critical thought and examination. It is a collective and ongoing reflection on the nature of human experience.

An argument is tentatively sound if it survives the ongoing critical process, including the test of time, and is justified as a verdict grounded in the collective of experience. All arguments may have certain components in common, such as probability, but the claim to justification may vary from field to field. To use one premise as an absolute truth for all fields is the essential problem with analytical thought. What is true in a mathematical premise may not be warranted at all in a problem dealing with field variants, such as dilemmas in ethics. For Toulmin, this was understood by Aristotle but lost in the post-Renaissance understanding of argumentation.

Toulmin wishes to restore and revitalize our sense of reason to keep pace with our understanding of science in the post-Darwinian era. Argumentation, he claims, is organic, dynamic, evolving, and auto-critical through reflective thought. Argumentation involves justifying and reexamining tentative claims, criticized in the light of experience. In many ways what is empirical in argumentation is similar to the empirical redress by Locke, and others, of the rationalist claims of Descartes. Experience, and reflection upon the nature of claims, is the same as experimentation as the final test of a claim in empirical method. Thus experiment and experience are closely related, and experience, reflected upon, is merely the abstraction of experiment into concept. Casuistry, or case study, is the empirical process of empirical experimentation as proof. Critical analysis is the reflection upon this process as an attempt to justify a tentative conclusion drawn, which can always be altered in light of new evidence. As in quantum mechanics, probability is time dependent and, as in evolutionary theory, change is inherent in the process of evolution responding to dynamic conditions.

Toulmin has given us an alternative to the *absolute* premises of Cartesian rationalism, and the concept of moral relativism as *its* alternative. For Toulmin, argumentation is an ongoing process, continually evolving through retrospective critical analysis, and is in itself an exercise in self-awareness. Toulmin has given us a theory of argument which is "part and parcel" of the evolution of consciousness grounded in the expansive and ever-evolving range of human experience. In order to accomplish this end effectively, Toulmin structures the nature of practical arguments. A story, or case, grounds an argument much as the conditions of an empirical experiment is the grounding of the experiment itself. In argumentation, this is accomplished through "contextualizing" the argument within a particular case, which reveals the variants a principle may take under certain conditions, or modalities. The basic elements are claim, grounds, and warrant. The grounds for the warrant justify the claim. Following this is backing, which cross-examines the warrant for sufficient cause; the modal qualifier, whether a claim is possible, impossible or necessary; and the rebuttal. The claim would be the equivalent of the conclusion to an argument or, in metaphorical terms: if we

look at a road map of the United States, it might first appear as a myriad of colors and lines, but it is not until we have established that we are "going to Cleveland" that the map takes on form and design. In this sense, the claim is similar to a thesis. We can then establish on what grounds the trip is being made, and what warrants the trip.

A major difference between practical and formal argument is that in practical argument the claim is not a given and is open to modification and revision. The premise in a formal argument is given as an axiomatically valid principle. The claim is contextualized in a practical argument. Backing, then, may cross-examine the warrant and, therefore, question the claim. If the claim is conceded, backing may also cross-examine why the path chosen to the claim is the best one, based on probability. Probability is key in practical argumentation. A practical argument must consider the modal qualifier or the degree of probability that a warrant has in justifying a claim. The modal qualifier questions the strength of probability between the warrant and the claim. The next step is the rebuttal, or the demonstration that the warrant does not justify the claim. The rebuttal, in practical argument, is conditional, or contextualized and case-specific, and does not necessarily argue the validity of a claim but, rather, whether the claim is justified for a particular situation. What may be a valid claim for one situation is not necessarily good for another. All this can depend on probability. Thus, a particular medication may be proven effective against allergies, except if the patient is suffering from high blood pressure. This introduces risk. The medication might not aggravate the condition of one suffering from high blood pressure, but the probability factor that it *will* arises. Therefore critical judgment, risk, and case-specific examples, are all called for in analyzing the argument. As the critical process evolves over many cases, we begin to grasp the concept of a problem and arrive at evermore complex and sophisticated coherences in conceptual analysis. As in evolution, an essential claim such as DNA is present in all living organisms and takes on the complexity of variant and numerous species, each with a factor in common, but manifest in infinitely diverse expression. For Toulmin, the process of ongoing critical discussion forms a "forum of competition" that, in various contexts, takes on its own process of natural selection.

Toulmin edifies our sense of argument on two fronts: the use of logic in the sciences, as it is applied in its effect on human reality, and the need to examine our conceptual understanding of practical logic. This brings issues such as medical ethics and ecology into the mainstream of discourse. By adapting and demonstrating the structural components of argument, Toulmin offers an alternative to both analytical logic and moral relativism, and demonstrates that the challenge to postmodernism is the redefining and reformation of reason as a practical and necessary tool to address the major issues confronting civilization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An Examination of the Place of Reason in Ethics (Cambridge, UK, 1950; 1986).

The Philosophy of Science: An Introduction (London and New York, 1953).

The Uses of Argument (Cambridge, UK, 1958).

Foresight and Understanding: An Enquiry Into the Aims of Science (Bloomington, Ind., 1961).

The Fabric of the Heavens, with June Goodfield (London and New York, 1961).

The Architecture of Matter, with June Goodfield (New York, 1962; Chicago, 1977).

Night Sky at Rhodes (London, 1963).

The Discovery of Time, with June Goodfield (New York, 1965; Chicago, 1977).

Human Understanding. Volume 1: The Collective Use and Development of Concepts (Oxford and Princeton, N.J., 1972).

Wittgenstein's Vienna, with Allan Janik (New York, 1973).

Knowing and Acting: An Invitation to Philosophy (New York, 1976).

An Introduction to Reasoning, with Richard Reike and Allan Janik (New York, 1979; 2nd edn, London and New York, 1984).

The Return to Cosmology: Postmodern Science and the Theology of Nature (Berkeley, Cal., 1982).

The Abuse of Casuistry: A History of Moral Reasoning, with Alfred R. Jonsen (Berkeley, Cal., 1988).

Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity (New York, 1990).

Return to Reason (Cambridge, Mass., 2001).

Other Relevant Works

"Neuroscience and Human Understanding," in *The Neurosciences*, ed. G. C. Quarton, T. Melnuchuk, and F. O. Schmitt (New York, 1967), pp. 822–32.

"From Logical Analysis to Conceptual History," in *The Legacy of Logical Positivism*, *Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, ed. Peter Achinstein and Stephen Barker (Baltimore, Md., 1969), pp. 25–52.

Ed., *Physical Reality: Philosophical Essays on Twentieth-Century Physics* (New York, 1970).

"The Twin Moralities of Science," in *Science and Society: Past, Present, and Future*, ed. Nicholas Steneck (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1975), pp. 176–95.

"Human Adaptation," in *The Philosophy of Evolution*, ed. U. J. Jensen and R. Harré (New York, 1981), pp. 176–95.

"How Medicine Saved the Life of Ethics," in *New Directions in Ethics: The Challenge of Applied Ethics*, ed. Joseph DeMarco and Richard Fox (New York, 1986), pp. 265–81.

"The Limits of Allegiance in a Nuclear Age," in *Nuclear Weapons and the Future of Humanity*, ed. A. Cohen and S. Lee (Totowa, N.J., 1986), pp. 359–72.

"From Leviathan to Liliput," in *Celebrating Peace*, ed. Leroy Rouner (South Bend, Ind., 1990), pp. 73–86.

Further Reading

Bove, Paul A. "The Rationality of Disciplines: the Abstract Understanding of Stephen Toulmin," in *After Foucault: Humanistic Knowledge, Postmodern Challenges*, ed. J. Arac (New Brunswick, N.J., 1988), pp. 42–70.

Brockriede, Wayne, and Douglas Ehninger. *Decision by Debate* (New York, 1963).

Hart, Roderick P. "On Applying Toulmin: the Analysis of Practical Discourse," in *Explorations in Rhetorical Criticism*, ed. D. Ochs, G. P. Mohrmann, and J. Stewart (University Park, Penn., 1973), pp. 75–95.

Hasting, Arthus, and Russell Windes. *Argumentation and Advocacy* (New York, 1965).

Kerner, George C. *The Revolution in Ethical Theory* (Oxford, 1966), chap. 3.

Leary, David E. *Thinkers of the Twentieth Century*, 2nd edn, ed. Roland Turner (Chicago, 1987).

Nilstun, Tore. *Moral Reasoning: A Study in the Moral Philosophy of S. E. Toulmin* (Lund, Sweden, 1979).

Seibt, Betty Kay, and William E. Tanner. *The Toulmin Method: Exploration and Controversy. A Festschrift in Honor of Stephen E. Toulmin* (Arlington, Tex., 1991).

Laurence L. Murphy

TOWNSEND, Harvey Gates (1885–1948)

Harvey Gates Townsend was born on 27 January 1885 in David City, Nebraska. He earned his BA from Nebraska Wesleyan College in 1908 and his PhD in philosophy from Cornell University in 1913. He began his teaching career as professor of philosophy and education at Central College in Missouri in 1910. He then went to Smith College in

Massachusetts, where he taught education from 1914 to 1917, before becoming associate professor of philosophy in 1917 and full professor in 1925. In 1926 he became professor of philosophy and head of the philosophy department at the University of Oregon, and he held these positions until his death on 19 December 1948 in Eugene, Oregon.

Townsend was a prominent leader of the philosophy profession of America. He guided the American Philosophical Association towards its present national form. He was the secretary of the Eastern Division of the APA from 1926 to 1928, Vice President of the Pacific Division of the APA in 1930–31, Secretary of the Pacific Division from 1932 to 1934, and President of the Pacific Division in 1936–7. In 1945 he gave the Howison Lecture at the University of California at Berkeley, and also was a visiting lecturer at the University of Tennessee, Cornell University, the University of Colorado, and other universities. He was a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and other academic organizations.

Townsend inherited from his education at Cornell University a distrust of naturalism and pragmatism, and a disposition towards personalistic idealism. Naturalism results from excessively crediting science with the best or even unique understanding of reality. Pragmatism subordinates thought to action, harming the development of thoughtful and reflective personality. Despite Townsend's disdain for pragmatism, he made efforts to understand its development. He eventually undertook the study of every major movement of philosophy in America, which resulted in *Philosophical Ideas in the United States* (1934). This book was the first comprehensive exposition of American philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Principle of Individuality in the Philosophy of Thomas Hill Green (New York, 1914).
"Some Practical Substitutes for Thinking," in *Essays in Honor of James Edwin Creighton*, ed. George H. Sabine (New York, 1917), pp. 266–77.
"The Nature of Knowledge and the Knowledge of Nature," in *Studies in Philosophical Naturalism*, ed. Harvey G. Townsend (Eugene, Oregon, 1931).
Philosophical Ideas in the United States (New York, 1934).
As We Are One: The Christian in a Plural Society (Gwelo, Rhodesia, 1962).

Other Relevant Works
"The Church and Society," *Philosophical Review* 29 (1920): 145–53.
"Body, Mind, Soul," *Open Court* 39 (1925): 696–704.
"The Obscurantism of Science," *Journal of Philosophy* 22 (1925): 548–52.
"The Pragmatism of Peirce and Hegel," *Philosophical Review* 37 (1928): 297–303.
"A Persistent Motive for Social Organization," *Journal of Philosophy* 26 (1929): 141–50.
"On the Possibility of a Better World," *Philosophical Review* 46 (1937): 132–46.
"On the History of Philosophy," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 16 (1946): 159–78.
Ed., *The Philosophy of Jonathan Edwards from His Private Notebooks* (Eugene, Oregon, 1955).

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v5, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v40*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*, *Who's Who in Phil*

John R. Shook

TRUTH, Sojourner (c.1797–1883)

Sojourner Truth was born Isabella Baumfree in 1797 (approximately) to slave parents Elizabeth and James Baumfree in Hurley, New York. Isabella began life as a slave and her early life mirrored that of other slaves before emancipation under state law on 4 July 1827, with frequent changes of owners, physical or sexual abuse, and hard work. She married Thomas, also a slave, in 1815, and had five children. Isabella chose to move on after emancipation. After a born-again religious experience, she migrated to New York City and became part of the great religious revival landscape of the nineteenth century, serving as household servant in the homes of several well-known sectarian reformers. Adhering to a series of unorthodox religious societies, such as the Methodist perfectionists and urban missionaries to prostitutes, Isabella was drawn to the millenarian prophet John Mathias. He called himself a traveler, the Spirit of Truth, and became her mentor. After the demise of Mathias and his "kingdom" in 1835, Isabella was charged with attempted poisoning; taking an unlikely step for a free black woman, Isabella sued for libel and won. In 1843 she renamed herself Sojourner Truth – a name with multiple meanings including the integrity of her word or "truth," and a traveler or "sojourner" – thus, an itinerant preacher.

There are no original manuscripts or primary sources of information. Illiterate, her autobiography *The Narrative of Sojourner Truth* (1850) was transcribed by a neighbor, Olive Gilbert. Her informal manager, Frances Titus, added the "Book of Life"; a final edition was published after her death, which included "A Memorial Chapter" and Harriet Beecher Stowe's "The Libyan Sibyl" (1884). It is unfortunate that Truth cannot be known through her own voice rather than filtered through that of others. Sojourner has been projected as a symbol for both abolitionists and feminists, with a contrived dialect, or a Southern slave voice. At times she would be presented as more black and less feminist – or not visible, as the suffrage movement became more white. "Truth's memory changed hands." (Painter 1996, p. 264)

The significance of her deep religious faith and spirituality has mostly been lost. Perhaps her photographs, promoted to cover travel costs, help present a more authentic picture of the many roles Sojourner Truth played. Also dominant have been the symbolism of her "Ain't I a Woman" speech in Akron, Ohio, in 1851, where she bared her breasts as proof of womanhood, and her famous query "Frederick, Is God Dead?" asked of Frederick DOUGLASS. Her influence as a feminist crusader, notwithstanding a meeting with President Abraham Lincoln, is often overshadowed by that symbolism. A more composite picture would feature Truth as a charismatic and illiterate woman of African descent, born a slave, who traveled as an itinerant preacher supporting, at various times, both women's rights and those of abolitionists. She died at her home in Battle Creek, Michigan, on 26 November 1883.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Narrative of Sojourner Truth (Boston, 1850; rev. edn, Battle Creek, Mich., 1884).

Other Relevant Works
Archives of materials about Truth are at the University of Rochester, Smith College, the Detroit Public Library, and the Battle Creek Historical Society.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*
Bernard, Jacqueline. *Journey toward Freedom* (New York, 1967).
Fauset, Arthur H. *Sojourner Truth: God's Faithful Pilgrim* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1938).
Ortiz, Victoria. *Sojourner Truth, A Self-Made Woman* (New York, 1974).
Painter, Nell Irvin. *Sojourner Truth, A Life,*

a *Symbol* (New York and London, 1996).

Pauli, Hertha. *Her Name Was Sojourner Truth* (New York, 1962).

Stroh, Guy W., and H. G. Callaway. "Keeping the Thing Going While Things are Stirring," in *American Ethics: A Source Book from Edwards to Dewey* (Lanham, Md., 2000), p. 187.

Nancy Hurd Schluter

TSANOFF, Radoslav Andrea (1887–1976)

Radoslav Andrea Tsanoff was born on 3 January 1887 in Sofia, Bulgaria. In 1903 he emigrated to the United States to attend Oberlin College, receiving his BA in 1906. He received the PhD in philosophy from Cornell University in 1910. Tsanoff accepted his first position as instructor of philosophy at Clark University (1912–14). In 1914 he went to Rice Institute (now Rice University) where he was professor of philosophy until he reached the mandatory retirement age in 1957. He was professor of philosophy at the University of Houston for three years before returning to Rice as a Distinguished Professor of Humanities (1961–71) and McManis Professor of Philosophy (1971–3). Tsanoff died on 29 May 1976 in Houston, Texas.

Tsanoff was a founding member of the Houston Philosophical Society (1920), President of the American Philosophical Association Western Division (1940–41), and President of the Southwestern Philosophical Society (1950). A staunch advocate of intellectual freedom during the McCarthy era, Tsanoff was a dedicated teacher and a community leader. He served as a member of the board of directors of the Houston Symphony Society for twenty-eight years and a trustee of the Houston Museum of Fine Arts for eight years. In 1970 the Association of Rice Alumni awarded him the Gold Medal for distinguished service.

Tsanoff's writings and professional associations focused on ethical concerns. He proposed an "integral" ethics; one that values scientific inquiry, physical and humanistic, as a means to make moral judgments. In his naturalism, he emphasizes that scientific knowledge is good only if it leads to "self-knowledge" (1947, pp. 376–9). His approach to ethics is broad and interdisciplinary, and includes the fields of biology, psychology, sociology, the arts, and religion.

Tsanoff was concerned primarily with the thread of history in ethics. He records and encapsulates, often chronologically, the ethical views of philosophers and the musings of poets in smooth and elegant prose. In *The Moral Ideals of Our Civilization* (1942), Tsanoff eloquently renders an accurate placement of important moral thinkers in their historical context from ancient Greeks to World War II. A progressive course of social progress and ethical thought is evident, in most of his writings. This idea is treated most comprehensively in his last book, *Civilization and Progress* (1971), which also tempers progress with caution. With increased knowledge and technology, humankind incurs greater responsibilities. Tsanoff aptly introduces the Promethean legend as a metaphor for the inherent dangers wrought in significant change.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Schopenhauer's Criticism of Kant's Theory of Experience (New York, 1911).

The Problem of Immortality: Studies in Personality and Value (New York, 1924).

The Nature of Evil (New York, 1931).

The Moral Ideals of Our Civilization (New York, 1942).

Religious Crossroads (New York, 1942).

Ethics (New York, 1947; 2nd edn 1955).

The Ways of Genius (New York, 1949).

The Great Philosophers (New York, 1953; 2nd edn 1964).

Worlds to Know (New York, 1962). Also

published as *Science and Human Perspectives* (London, 1963).

Civilization and Progress (Lexington, Kent., 1971).

Other Relevant Works

Pawns of Liberty: A Story of Fighting Yesterdays in the Balkans, with Corrine Stephenson (New York, 1914).

Ed., *Autobiographies of Ten Religious Leaders: Alternatives in Christian Experience* (San Antonio, Tex., 1968).

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v5, *Proc of APA v50*, *Who Was Who in Amer v7*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Kolenda, Konstantin, ed. *Insight and Vision: Essays in Philosophy in Honor of Radoslav Andrea Tsanoff* (San Antonio, Tex., 1966). Contains a bibliography of Tsanoff's writings.

Overholt, William A. *Reason and the Nonrational in Lovejoy, Montague, and Tsanoff*. PhD dissertation, Boston University (Boston, 1951).

Charles Frederick Frantz

TUCKER, William Jewett (1839–1926)

William Jewett Tucker was born on 13 July 1839 in Griswold, Connecticut to Henry Tucker, a businessman, and Sarah White Lester. After his mother died, Tucker spent much of his youth living with the family of a maternal uncle, William Jewett, a pastor in Plymouth, New Hampshire. He graduated from Dartmouth College with a BA in 1861. He taught school in Columbus, Ohio until he contracted typhoid fever, which not only prevented him from enlisting in military service during the Civil War but also led him to abandon his plans to study law. After recovering, Tucker enrolled in the Andover Theological Seminary in 1863. Andover, which had been founded in 1808 in response to the drift of Harvard Divinity School toward Unitarianism, was the leading center of Edwardsean Calvinism, commonly known as New England Theology. Among the prominent conservatives with whom Tucker studied was the Calvinist theologian Edwards Amasa PARK. While a seminarian, Tucker had served a brief stint in the United States Christian Commission with the Army of the Cumberland in Georgia. After graduating from Andover in 1866, he spent several months with the American Home Missionary Society in Kansas and Missouri. He was ordained on 24 January 1867 as pastor of Franklin Street Congregational Church in Manchester, New Hampshire. In 1875 he became the pastor of Madison Square Presbyterian Church in New York City.

After his five-year sojourn in the northern Presbyterian Church, Tucker returned to his Congregationalist roots when he became the Barlett Professor of Preaching at Andover Theological Seminary in 1880. Like many Protestant ministers in the late nineteenth century, he was acutely aware that industrialization and urbanization, coupled with the rising tide of immigration, were creating social problems on a scale previously unknown in America. After his pastoral experiences in two rapidly growing cities, Tucker hoped that his work as a professor would help train a future generation of church leaders who would help ameliorate some of the nation's urban problems.

At Andover, Tucker soon became one of the leading advocates of the New Theology or Progressive Orthodoxy. In the face of growing atheism generated by positivism and scientific naturalism, exponents of the New Theology hoped to preserve the intellectual credibility of traditional Protestant theology by accommodating it to modern scientific thought. As Tucker recalled in his 1919 autobiography, *My*

Generation, the advance in science from Newton to Darwin demanded a corresponding advance in theology. Philosophical idealism offered Progressive Orthodoxy a new metaphysical foundation for reconstructing a theology compatible with modern thought. Moreover, whereas New England Theology accented divine transcendence, Progressive Orthodoxy stressed divine immanence or God's presence with nature and in course of human history. Consequently, they embraced evolution as a scientific account of humanity's origins and welcomed the higher criticism of the Bible. While the New Theologians continued to employ the theological terms of conventional Protestantism, they filled it with radically new meaning, thus vexing many conservatives.

When the popular liberal preacher Newman SMYTH was elected in 1886 to succeed the last great defender of the New England Theology, Edwards A. Park, a major theological controversy erupted at Andover Seminary. The publication that same year of a series of articles in the seminary's journal, the *Andover Review*, promoting the New Theology, further aggravated the situation. The controversy culminated in the heresy trial of Tucker and four colleagues before the seminary's board of visitors. While Tucker and the others expressed a number of views that were deemed heterodox by their opponents, the trial focused upon the doctrine of a "second probation," or the belief that infants and adult unbelievers who had never had the opportunity to hear the Christian gospel would be given a second opportunity to respond to it after death. Smyth was found guilty but Tucker and the others acquitted, albeit by a tie vote. The Smyth decision was appealed to the Massachusetts Supreme Court, which eventually resulted in a second trial and his acquittal. While Smyth ultimately declined the appointment, the vindication of Tucker and his other colleagues proved to be a major victory for the New Theology.

Although Tucker was not a systematic theologian, he helped popularize the New Theology. As he expressed it in his 1898 Lyman Beecher Foundation Lectures at Yale in 1898, published as *The Making and Unmaking of the Preacher*, he encouraged preachers to speak in the spirit of the times. In addition to popularizing theological modernism, Tucker also advanced the New Theology through social reform. He criticized the church for neglecting to address the social problems created by labor unrest and laissez-faire capitalism. He chastised the "gospel of wealth" preached by Andrew Carnegie and others. Through his writings and teachings, he challenged the Protestant Church to become directly involved in meeting the practical needs of the urban poor. In 1891 in Boston, he helped Robert A. Woods establish the Andover House. Modeled after Toynbee Hall in London, the Andover House, later renamed the South End House, gained fame as a leading example of progressive Protestant efforts to solve urban problems. Tucker also was one of the first theologians to introduce the study of sociology into a seminary curriculum. While he was a theological progressive, he was still very much a Victorian when it came to personal ethics. As President from 1895 to 1899 of the New England Watch and Ward Society, a moral reform, or anti-vice, organization based in Boston, he encouraged the state to regulate morality by enforcing certain laws against obscene literature, gambling, and prostitution.

In 1893 Tucker became President of Dartmouth College. His presidency at Dartmouth proved to be as radical as his work at Andover Seminary. While a revolution had been reshaping American higher education after the Civil War, under Tucker's predecessor, Samuel C. Bartlett, Dartmouth's curriculum lagged behind. Like other progressive educators, Tucker abandoned the older "piety and discipline" philosophy of higher education. In its place, he advanced a "liberal culture" philosophy of education. Consequently, he strengthened the faculty by hiring more professors with doctoral degrees, established the Tuck School of Business Administration, revamped the curriculum, repaired relations

with the younger alumni, and cultivated student self-government and correspondingly reduced some of the more oppressive *in loco parentis* policies of the previous administration. Upon his retirement in 1909, Dartmouth was widely viewed as a leader among liberal arts colleges. In retirement, Tucker did not retire from public life, continuing to write about various social and theological issues. He died on 29 September 1926 in Hanover, New Hampshire.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Progressive Orthodoxy: A Contribution of Christian Interpretation to Christian Doctrine by the editors of the "Andover Review" (Boston, 1886).

The New Movement in Humanity: From Liberty to Unity (Boston, 1892).

The Making and Unmaking of the Preacher (Boston, 1898).

Personal Power: Counsels to College Men (Boston, 1910).

Public Mindedness: An Aspect of Citizenship Considered in Various Addresses (Concord, N.H., 1910).

The Function of the Church in Modern Society (Boston, 1911).

Other Relevant Works
Tucker's papers are at Dartmouth College.
My Generation: An Autobiographical Interpretation (Boston, Mass., 1919).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v24*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Frank, Thomas Edward. *Theology, Ethics, and the Nineteenth-Century College Ideal* (San Francisco, 1993).

Hutchison, William R. *The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism* (Cambridge, Mass, 1976).

Leavens, Robert, and Arthur Lord. *Dr. Tucker's Dartmouth* (Hanover, N.H., 1964).

Tobias, Marilyn. *Old Dartmouth on Trial* (New York, 1982).

Williams, Daniel Day. *The Andover Liberals* (New York, 1941).

P. C. Kemeny

TUFTS, James Hayden (1862–1942)

James Hayden Tufts was born on 9 July 1862 in Monson, western Massachusetts, to James and Mary Elizabeth Warren Tufts. His parents conducted a home school in addition to running a farm, and young Tufts both worked on the farm and received his primary and secondary education in this home school. The curriculum of the school was somewhat haphazard, since it was focused more on the specific needs of the changing population of students; but the quality of Tufts's education was excellent and he taught in the Monson school district before his sixteenth birthday. He enrolled at Amherst College in 1880 and graduated with his BA and Phi Beta Kappa in 1884. While at Amherst, Tufts was strongly influenced by Charles Edward GARMAN, who instilled in him the necessity for freeing issues of the meaning of life from the constraints of outdated theology. After a year as the principal of Staples High School in Westport, Connecticut, Tufts returned to Amherst as a mathematics instructor. His main aim, however, seems to have been to further his studies with Garman. He entered Yale Divinity School in 1887, intending to prepare for the ministry; but, after receiving the BD degree in 1889, he joined John DEWEY in the philosophy department at the University of Michigan instead. Tufts remained at Michigan for two years, teaching philosophy and psychology courses, before leaving for doctoral work in Germany at the universities of Berlin and Freiburg. He completed his dissertation at

Frieburg on "The Sources and Development of Kant's Teleology," working with Alois Riehl, and received his PhD in philosophy in 1892.

Tufts returned in America as assistant professor of philosophy at the just-opened University of Chicago. During his long career there, he rose through the ranks to full professor, and also served as department chair, Dean of the Senior Colleges, Dean of Faculties, Vice President, and Acting President in 1925. He edited *The School Review* from 1906 to 1909, and edited *The International Journal of Ethics* from 1914 to 1931. He was the author of numerous books and articles on the history of philosophy, ethics, and social issues. Along with Hartley Burr ALEXANDER, Tufts has the unusual distinction of being elected to the presidency of all three divisions of the American Philosophical Association: President of the Western Philosophical Association in 1905–6; Joint President of both the Western Philosophical Association and the American Philosophical Association (now Eastern Division) in 1914–15; and President of the Pacific Division in 1934–5. Tufts retired from Chicago at the end of 1930 and moved to California, where he occasionally taught at southern California universities. He died on 5 August 1942 in Berkeley, California.

Tufts was a member, with John Dewey and George Herbert MEAD, of the social pragmatist movement that developed in Chicago in the late nineteenth century. He generally avoided the logical and epistemological disputes surrounding the nature and meaning of pragmatism – disputes that he found to be of little value – and focused upon advancing social pragmatism's melioristic program for society. Convinced that economic and technological changes had made the lives of virtually all of the members of the community less secure, Tufts and others worked to improve the conditions of education, housing, nutrition, health care, and employment in the Chicago area. In his related ethical writings, Tufts demonstrated a strong emphasis upon reconstructing customs to enable society to focus upon topics of vital contemporary interest. In his contribution to *Ethics* (1908), the volume that he co-wrote with Dewey, Tufts explored the development of the moral tradition of the West, and considered ways that it might be adapted to address contemporary social ills. *The Real Business of Living* (1918) was written to assist high school students grasp the long process of cooperative interaction that is the foundation of public morality. *America's Social Morality* (1933) was a book for the general public that offered a portrait of the moral condition of American society and attempted to portray the historical roots of the various institutional strains and tensions.

Tufts had begun his academic career specializing in the history of philosophy; but, as he wrote in "What I Believe" (1930), his view soon began to change: "I began my work in philosophy with studies in its history. I changed to ethics because, as I came to gain a clearer view of the important tendencies of the time, I thought the ethical changes the most significant." Tufts was reacting here to two important developments. The first was, as previously considered, his increasing familiarity with the sad lives of many of the residents of cities like Chicago; the second, the increasing professionalization of philosophy. It was his belief that, just as increasing powers of cooperative social inquiry were developing, philosophy in America was abandoning its engagement with social life. Philosophy, he maintained, "has suffered by its progressive withdrawal from field after field of broadly human interest"; and its increasing emphases upon metaphysics and epistemology, and logic and language, were drawing philosophy out of the social mainstream. As he wrote in 1938: "during the past forty years extraordinary changes have been taking place in industry and social classes, in government and the family, in science and education. But philosophy, as if to justify the ancient tradition of Thales, has for the most part calmly ignored such events and devoted its energies to the question, How is knowledge possible?"

Following Tufts's analysis, we can attribute much of the trouble of contemporary philosophy to an understanding of its role, and of its progress, that is divorced from the life of the broader society.

Tufts's commitment to the reconstruction of society was grounded in an interpretation of Darwinian evolution that emphasized the continuity of the organic world, the central fact of embodiment, and the need for experimentalism and reconstruction. Also central to Tufts's world view was his belief in the social nature of the self. The ethical implications of this social perspective were three: the importance of studying the history of humankind to uncover the origins of its moral ideas and practices, the examination of the mores of society and their development over time due to various social pressures, and the ongoing need for moral inquiry into the problems of social institutions rather than into theoretical or meta-ethical issues.

Tufts's focus was always upon humans as the potential controllers of their situations. "Potential" here emphasized, among other things, a changed understanding of the nature of education and the role of the scholar. Under the prior system, the scholar was the preserver of learning and culture who knew all that was to be known about a world that was completed. The new evolutionary understanding of scholarship maintained, however, that the scholar was to lead a life of investigation and reconstruction. For Tufts, the aim of scholars should be on developing, and the aim of educators should be on inculcating, methods for bringing the shared wisdom of the past and present to bear upon new situations.

For all of the social pragmatists, education was the preparation for living the broadest lives possible. Much of this preparation involved the transmission of our social inheritance. While Tufts was concerned about education at all levels, his focus was upon higher education. Colleges should concentrate on the most direct role of teaching young adults, a role that Tufts saw as offering a kind of

immortality. A university's job, on the contrary, is research; but it is not doing this job properly unless its investigations have an impact on the lives of people and institutions so as to make a positive difference. The centrality of the role of the teacher in the process of intellectual expansion, all through higher education, becomes clearer in an early address to an audience of graduate students when Tufts emphasized: "You are now planning to teach language or history or science. I feel confident that you will come to place the emphasis rather on teaching *men* and *women*."

The broad conception of social service that was central to social pragmatism was at the foundation of Tufts's thought. He rejected philosophers' narrow concern with what Dewey called "the problems of philosophers" and their progressive withdrawal from "the problems of men." We also find Tufts suggesting that there would be a great benefit from a period of work in which philosophers attempted to "follow the tradition of Plato and Aristotle, Locke, Descartes and Kant, not by discussing their problems, but by attacking the most vital public questions of our day." When philosophers again become more concerned with the fundamental issues of human existence – patterns of work and education, as well as other social institutions – it would be possible to reconnect the lives of scholars with the broader work of the society.

Tufts carried forward the program of social pragmatism through repeated emphases upon the need for social reconstruction. Here, philosophers have a special role to play. If our social institutions are all infected with inertial lag, then our political concepts – themselves social institutions – must be infected as well. Our ideas about what is fair and proper are not "independent of time and place and human bias," he wrote, but were "shaped under the influence of economic, social, and religious forces" and then used as "patterns for action" in future situations. Our political concepts thus represent at any time an historically rooted selection from among a number of possible

interpretations of each term. Our ideas of justice, equality, and freedom were derived largely from the experiences of frontier farms and small towns. These historically derived concepts once made sense, Tufts wrote: "Our conceptions of honesty and justice, of rights and duties, got their present shaping largely in an industrial and business order when mine and thine could be easily distinguished; when it was easy to tell how much a man produced; when the producer sold to his neighbors, and an employer had also the relations of neighbor to his workmen." However, he continued, "such conceptions are inadequate for the present order."

This inadequate relationship between our ideas and our lives called for attempts at conceptual reconstruction. The goal was not to uncover what these terms "really" mean through historical and analytic study. To do so would at best only determine the terms' possibilities as conceived by those who lived long ago. Rather, Tufts maintained that what is necessary in ongoing conceptual reconstruction to reconnect these concepts with the basic human values to which they point, while at the same time not allowing their traditional meanings to prevent developments to satisfy new situations. Tufts placed a large part of the responsibility for this conceptual reconstruction upon philosophers, who should attempt to construct and revise such ideals as equality, justice, and freedom to enable us to address our social problems.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Sources and Development of Kant's Teleology (Chicago, 1892).
Ethics, with John Dewey (New York, 1908: 2nd edn 1932).
Our Democracy: Its Origins and Its Tasks (New York, 1917).
The Real Business of Living (New York, 1918).
The Ethics of Cooperation (Boston, 1918).
Education and Training for Social Work (New York, 1923).
America's Social Morality: Dilemmas of the Changing Mores (New York, 1933).

Other Relevant Works
Tufts's papers are at the University of Chicago, Amherst College in Massachusetts, and Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.
Trans., *A History of Western Philosophy*, by Wilhelm Windelband, 2 vols (New York, 1893; 2nd edn 1901).
"What I Believe," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. George P. Adams and William P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 2, pp. 331–53.
Selected Writings of James Hayden Tufts, ed. James Campbell (Carbondale, Ill., 1992). Contains a bibliography of Tufts's writings.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Ethics*, *Pres Addr of APA v1*, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v52*, *Who Was Who in Amer v2*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Deegan, Mary Jo. *Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School, 1892–1918* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1988).
Diner, Steven J. *A City and Its Universities: Public Policy in Chicago, 1892–1919* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1980).
Feffer, Andrew. *The Chicago Pragmatists and American Progressivism* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1993).
Rucker, Darnell. *The Chicago Pragmatists* (Minneapolis, 1969).

James Campbell

TURBAYNE, Colin Murray (1916–)

Colin Turbayne was born on 7 February 1916 in Tanny Morel, Queensland, Australia. He earned his BA from the University of Queensland in 1940. He emigrated to the US in 1947 for graduate study at the University of Pennsylvania, receiving his MA in 1950 and PhD in philosophy in 1950. His dissertation was titled "Constructions versus Inferences in the Philosophy of Bertrand Russell." Turbayne was an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Washington from 1950 to 1955. He then was an assistant professor of speech at the University of California at Berkeley from 1955 to 1957. In 1957 he joined the philosophy department at the University of Rochester as associate professor of philosophy, was promoted to full professor in 1962, and taught at Rochester until retiring in 1981.

Turbayne is an internationally recognized authority on the thought of British philosopher George Berkeley. He edited several of Berkeley's works during the mid twentieth century, and collections of essays about Berkeley, helping to sustain interest in this philosopher during that era. In his own work on Berkeley's philosophy, among other themes, Turbayne advanced an understanding of Berkeley's theory of vision and space, and a thesis about his application of insights into the nature of language to metaphysical problems. Turbayne argued that one of Berkeley's primary objectives was to expose and dispel the confusing use of metaphorical language about the mind and ideas. Particularly harmful has been the philosophical tendency to convert abstract nouns into names, and to generate puzzles about the mind by imposing metaphors drawn from our hypotheses about the physical world. In "Berkeley's Two Concepts of Mind" (1959) Turbayne argues that Berkeley intended to move beyond ontological idealism towards a skeptical attitude about the existence of a substantial mind.

Turbayne became convinced of phenomenalism, anti-materialism, and the notion of metaphor as a category mistake. He argues in *The Myth of Metaphor* (1962) that physicalist theories depend on mechanistic metaphors drawn from deductive logic for their hypotheses only unwarrantedly to treat them realistically. He goes on to show how mechanistic metaphors in the geometric theory of vision can be satisfactorily replaced by the metaphor of language in the linguistic theory of vision, so that the events of nature are to be read as symbols of a language. In *Metaphors for the Mind: The Creative Mind and Its Origins* (1991) Turbayne explores further ways of understanding mind as symbolic and artistic activity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Ed., *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous* (New York and Indianapolis, 1954).
Ed., *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge*, by George Berkeley (New York, 1957).
The Myth of Metaphor (New Haven, Conn., 1962; 2nd edn, Columbia, S.C., 1970).
Ed., *Works on Vision*, by George Berkeley (Indianapolis, 1963).
Ed., *Principles, Dialogues, and Philosophical Correspondence*, by George Berkeley (Indianapolis, 1965).
Ed., *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge, with Critical Essays* (Indianapolis, 1970).
Ed., *Berkeley: Critical and Interpretive Essays* (Minneapolis, 1982).
Metaphors for the Mind: The Creative Mind and Its Origins (Columbia, S.C., 1991).

Other Relevant Works
"Berkeley and Russell on Space," *Dialectica* 8 (1954): 210–27.
"Kant's Refutation of Dogmatic Idealism," *Philosophical Quarterly* 5 (1955): 225–44.
"The Influence of Berkeley's Science on His Metaphysics," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 16 (1956): 476–87.
"Berkeley's Two Concepts of Mind,"

Philosophy and Phenomenological Research 20 (1959): 85–92; 22 (1962): 383–6.

"The Origin of Berkeley's Paradoxes," in *New Studies in Berkeley's Philosophy*, ed. Warren E. Steinkraus (New York, 1966).

"Hume's Influence on Berkeley," *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 39 (1985): 259–69.

Further Reading

Grave, S. A. "A Note on Berkeley's Conception of the Mind," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 22 (1962): 574–6.

Olscamp, Paul J. "The Philosophical Importance of C. M. Turbayne's 'The Myth of Metaphor'," *International Philosophical Quarterly* 6 (1966): 110–31.

John R. Shook

TURNER, Henry McNeal (1834–1915)

Henry Turner was born to free parents 1 February 1834 in Newberry, Abbeville County, South Carolina. As a young man he did agricultural work and also received some training as a blacksmith. Because the educating of African Americans was illegal in South Carolina, Turner received only an informal education through a tutor and the lawyers at a law firm where he did odd jobs. Turner had an interest in church ministry that he fulfilled as a traveling preacher within the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. He was licensed to preach by this denomination in 1853. He left the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, five years after his ordination in order to join the African Methodist Episcopal Church (AME Church). He was ordained an AME Church elder in 1862 and began work in the pastorate.

Turner's view of the turmoil in the United States intensified after President Abraham Lincoln appointed him the first African-American chaplain of a regiment of the army. After serving in this capacity under both President Lincoln and President Andrew Johnson, Turner returned to full-time church ministry as a presiding elder responsible for monitoring the growth and activities of AME churches in Georgia. He became involved in political issues, ultimately as a state senator in the Georgia legislature, although he was denied the opportunity actually to serve – a point that only intensified his suspicion concerning the ability for African Americans to progress in the United States.

His importance in the AME Church continued, resulting in Turner being named a bishop in 1880. As a bishop, he challenged the Church's restrictions on the ordination of women as ministers. He also criticized the Church's rejection of black nationalism as well as its rejection of emigration to Africa as the proper response to racism. He played a central role in the developing the AME Church's missionary activities in places such as West Africa, South Africa, and the Caribbean. He saw this extension of the Church's activities as being a vital dimension of divine providence and African-American responsibility to others of African descent. Turner died on 9 May 1915 in Windsor, Ontario, Canada.

In 1895 in Atlanta, Turner proclaimed that "God is a Negro" as a way of critiquing the damage done by Eurocentric philosophical and theological assertions. Many historians argue that he was the most radical churchman of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries because of such radical statements and the actions that followed them. Beyond his years, Turner's ontology has helped to shape the work of generations of African-American philosophers and theologians who give attention to black nationalism and theories of identity. For example, his influence is felt in developments such as black theology, a type of US liberation theology that is presently taught at colleges and graduate programs around the world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Negro in All Ages: A Lecture Delivered in the Second Baptist Church of Savannah, Ga. (Savannah, Georgia, 1873).

The Genius and Theory of Methodist Polity; or, The Machinery of Methodism (Philadelphia, 1885; 2nd edn 1889).

African Letters (Nashville, Tenn., 1893).

The Black Man's Doom: The Two Barbarous and Cruel Decisions of the United States Supreme Court, Declaring the Civil Rights Act Unconstitutional and Disrobing the Colored Race of all Civil Protection, with Fredrick Douglass and Robert G. Ingersoll (Philadelphia, 1896).

Other Relevant Works

Turner's papers are at Howard University in Washington, D.C.

Respect Black: The Writings and Speeches of Henry McNeal Turner, ed. Edwin Redkey (New York, 1971).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encycl Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Angell, Stephen. *Bishop Henry McNeal Turner and African-American Religion in the South* (Knoxville, Tenn., 1992).

Wilmore, Gayraud S. *Black Religion and Black Radicalism: An Interpretation of the Religious History of Afro-American People*, 3rd edn (Maryknoll, N.Y., 1998).

Anthony B. Pinn

TWAIN, Mark (1835–1910)

Samuel Langhorne Clemens, who would become known by his pen name Mark Twain, was born on 30 November 1835 in Florida, Missouri. His family moved to Hannibal, Missouri in 1839, where he began his schooling in 1840. Given the frontier nature of Hannibal and his frail childhood health, he attended school irregularly and left entirely in 1849 to write for his brother Orion's newspaper, the *Hannibal Western Union*. While never formally attending school again, he nurtured his intellectual interests throughout his life, reading avidly in the fields of history, religion, and philosophy, in particular. He did receive three honorary doctorate degrees in his lifetime, from Yale University in 1901, the University of Missouri in 1902, and from the University of Oxford in 1907. Twain died on 21 April 1910 in Redding, Connecticut.

Twain honed his intellect primarily within the school of experience, as he moved from his journalistic career to one as steamboat pilot on the Mississippi, to silver mining in Nevada, correspondent for a California newspaper, popular lecturer, and finally to settling down as Mark Twain (he began using that name in 1863) in Hartford, Connecticut. In Hartford, Twain finished *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, his masterpiece in which he proves himself to be as much a thinker as comic artist. The problem of human freedom is at the center of Twain's masterpiece, and on one level the book thematically tackles the extent to which human action is free or determined. Although he allows his hero Huck Finn to celebrate independent thought in his momentous decision to resist social pressures, he primarily portrays humans as "damned" and determined creatures in later works.

In 1906, after eight years of drafting his argument, Twain published his deterministic doctrine in his "gospel" titled *What is Man?* Twain had been setting down his philosophical principles in essays (collected in 1992) since the early 1880s, in "The Character of God,"

(1885), "Bible Teaching And Religious Practice" (1890), "Man's Place in the Animal World" (1896), "God" (1905), and "As Concerns Interpreting the Deity" (1905).

What is Man? states his definitive argument on the human condition. Written as a Socratic dialogue between a young and old man, Twain's gospel argues repeatedly for the image of man as a machine, as a creature wholly shaped by training, temperament, heredity, and environment. Twain's argument brings little that is new to the age-old conundrum of the human condition, and in a contradictory manner, he continued to celebrate independent thought in his final "dream tales," especially in his last novel, *No. 44, The Mysterious Stranger*, in which he posits the mind as a creative force capable of existing apart from determining influences.

Twain's philosophical principles and imaginative efforts reveal a mind actively engaged in the conflict between the claims of freedom and those of determinism. And much like his contemporary William JAMES, whom Twain read and befriended, he could only will into being a faith in human freedom by imaginatively positing it as a real possibility. As an American reformer and intellectual, again like James, Twain longed to restore some ultimate significance to being in the world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adventures of Huckleberry Finn (London and New York, 1884).

Letters from the Earth (New York, 1962).

The Devil's Race-Track: Mark Twain's Great Dark Writings, ed. John S. Tuckey (Berkeley, Cal., 1966).

No. 44, The Mysterious Stranger, ed. John S. Tuckey (Berkeley, Cal., 1982).

What is Man? and Other Philosophical Writings (Berkeley, Cal., 1973)

Other Relevant Works

Twain's papers are at the University of California at Berkeley.

The Autobiography of Mark Twain, ed.

Charles Neider (New York, 1959).

Collected Tales, Sketches, Speeches & Essays, 2 vols (New York, 1992).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v6*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Camfield, Gregg. *Sentimental Twain: Samuel Clemens in the Maze of Moral Philosophy* (Philadelphia, 1994).

Horn, Jason. *Mark Twain and William James: Crafting a Free Self* (Columbia, Miss., 1996).

Johnson, James L. *Mark Twain and the Limits of Power: Emerson's God in Ruins* (Knoxville, Tenn., 1982).

Jason G. Horn

TYLER, Samuel (1809–77)

Samuel Tyler was born on 22 October 1809 in Prince George County, Maryland, and died on 15 December 1877 in Georgetown, District of Columbia. He attended seminary school in Georgetown and from 1826 to 1828 attended Middlebury College in Vermont. He was admitted to the bar in 1831 and started a law practice in Frederick, Maryland. In 1852 he was elected as a commissioner to simplify the pleadings and practice of the state courts, and his report discussing the relative merits of the common and civil law earned him respect and attention. He received two LLD degrees, from the College of South Carolina (1858) and Columbia (1859). In 1852 Tyler was appointed by the Maryland legislature to serve on a board assigned to review and simplify the practice and pleading in the state's courts. In 1864 the Board of Trustees of Columbian College (now

George Washington University) appointed Tyler to rebuild their law degree program. Tyler retired from law practice in 1867 to begin teaching as professor of law at Columbian. He held this position until his death in 1877 and is still honored at George Washington with a chair in his name.

Tyler's philosophical thought covered two general areas: epistemology and aesthetics. His epistemological thought owes much to the work of the Scottish School having its roots, most famously, in the thought of David Hume and Thomas Reid who in turn were influenced by Francis Bacon. In 1844 Tyler wrote his first major work, *A Discourse of the Baconian Philosophy*, where he expressly sought to present the Baconian philosophy to an English-speaking audience more thoroughly than had ever been done before. He argued that Bacon's inductive method for coming to understanding allows, for the first time, the establishment of a "true practical philosophy" and, in doing so, rectifies the "evils of the ancient philosophy" (1844, p. 162). Tyler's efforts to popularize Bacon's system and, with it, the Scottish philosophical movement, won him the respect of the then-influential Scottish philosopher Sir William Hamilton, who urged Tyler to abandon law so as to devote himself to philosophy. While not taking up his suggestion, Tyler went on to publish a work on Hamilton's thought, *Sir William Hamilton and His Philosophy* (1855).

Tyler's work in aesthetics is found mainly in *Robert Burns, as a Poet and as a Man* (1848) and *The Theory of the Beautiful* (1873). Tyler argued in these works that the aesthetic effect of an object is founded in its intrinsic power to affect and excite our emotions in certain ways. According to Tyler, a thing was beautiful insofar as it produces "impressions and feelings analogous to those awakened within us by our converse with woman" (1873, p. 38). Tyler argued that woman is the "spiritual dispenser of beauty to the world" (p. 38). Following these lines, man is the spiritual dispenser of the sublime. It was according to this general frame-

work that Tyler explained, critiqued, and praised the work of Robert Burns.

Tyler's philosophical thought is no longer influential; his views on aesthetics are particularly antiquated. But his work as a popularizer of Bacon's inductive method in America makes him an interesting historical figure for those concerned with American philosophy in the nineteenth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Discourse of the Baconian Philosophy (Frederick City, Md., 1844; 2nd edn 1850).

Robert Burns, as a Poet, and as a Man (New York, 1848).

Sir William Hamilton and His Philosophy (Philadelphia, 1855).

The Progress of Philosophy: In the Past and in the Future (Philadelphia, 1868).

The Theory of the Beautiful (Philadelphia, 1873).

Other Relevant Works

A Treatise on the Maryland Simplified Preliminary Procedure and Pleading (Philadelphia, 1857).

Memoir of Roger Brooke Taney, LL.D. (Baltimore, Md., 1872; 2nd edn 1876).

Further Reading

Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio

Daniels, George H. *American Science in the Age of Jackson* (New York, 1968).

Aaron A. Schiller

TYMIENIECKA, Anna-Teresa (1923–)

Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka was born on 2 February 1923 in Marianowo, Poland. She began her academic career at the Jagellonian University in Krakow, studying with Roman

Ingarden, and obtaining a baccalaureate degree in philosophy in 1946. She pursued further study in France and Switzerland, where she attained the *Diplôme d'études supérieures de philosophie* (equivalent to a Master's degree) from the Sorbonne in 1951, and a PhD in philosophy from the University of Fribourg in 1952. In her doctoral dissertation, *Essence et Existence, Etudes à propos de la philosophie de Nicolai Hartmann et Roman Ingarden* (published in 1957), she explored the ontological foundations of phenomenology, while concurrently engaged in studies of French and Slavic literature. In 1952–3 she studied social and political sciences at the College of Europe in Belgium, and in 1953–4 at the European Institute at the University of the Saar in Germany.

In 1954 Tymieniecka emigrated to the US to embark on a varied teaching career, beginning at the University of California at Berkeley. It was there that she met and married the Harvard economist Hendrik Houthakken, with whom she had three children. Over the next two decades, Tymieniecka did postdoctoral research at Yale, and held a variety of visiting positions, at Oregon State University, Penn State University, Bryn Mawr College, Duquesne University, St. John's University, and the University of Waterloo in Canada.

Pursuing her initial intuitions, she worked through the main philosophical questions, developing a multifaceted, open system of phenomenology/ontopoeisis of life, as a new and post-Husserlian critique of reason, which, while absorbing the Husserlian inheritance, would reach deeper into the primogenital sphere of becoming whence all rationality originates. In contrast to Husserlian transcendental idealism (and to the eideticism of the Ingardenian and Göttingen schools), Tymieniecka pursued her early doctoral investigation of phenomenological foundations and creative experience, giving a preeminent position to the "Archimedean point" in the constitution of the All: human creative experience. This exploration was published in two volumes, *Eros et Logos:* *Introduction à la experience créatrice* (1965) and *Why Is There Something Rather than Nothing? Prolegomena to a Phenomenology of Cosmic Creation* (1966).

Tymieniecka's central philosophical idea bears witness to her interdisciplinary roots. Western philosophy, following Aristotle and Descartes, distinguishes human being from other forms of being through the human capacity of rationality. In contrast, Tymieniecka argues that the defining characteristic of human being is the capacity for creativity, through which the artist creates a unique meaning out of the given phenomena of the lifeworld. Through this action, individuality emerges via the essential regulative principles which organize and orchestrate the ongoing work of becoming in all reality. The capacity for creativity, which Tymieniecka calls "the creative forge," is creative not only of the work of art as an object, but also of the artist as subject, and then of the observer or audience as interpretative subject, holding open the possibility for new meanings continually to emerge. The fundamental concept, for Tymieniecka, is an understanding of human being as the central hinge-point between the noumenal and the phenomenal, the given and the experienced, the real and the transcendent. The dynamic process and progress of the human individual is a mirror for the dynamic process of life, by which all that is seeks to come to meaning through self-individualization. Through phenomenological analysis of the creative experience of human being we can comprehend not only the development of the human person as a self-reflective, meaning-giving individual, but also the development of culture, of nature, and of life itself. This work Tymieniecka terms "ontopoeisis": the dynamic principle of becoming of life into self-individualization into meaning.

While vindicating the pivotal role of imagination outlined by Kant, Tymieniecka found in the concept of the *Imaginatio Creatrix* the fulcrum of the entire human enterprise. Placing intentional consciousness as secondary to cre-

ativity, in her view, the "human creative condition-in-the-unity-of-everything-that-is-alive" determines the starting point of the all-encompassing phenomenology of life.

Pursuing further the evolutionary workings of the human condition, Tymieniecka maintains, we are led to the "abysmal" origins of life: life's self-individualizing becoming. She developed this notion of the ontopoeisis of life, a new phenomenological foundation of Husserlian efforts, in several works, most notably in her four-volume treatise *Logos and Life* (1987–2001). She elaborated these ideas in many books and over 200 essays and short studies.

Convinced that self-reassessment and the invigorating practice of phenomenological inquiry would restore philosophy at large, since 1968 Tymieniecka has been engaged in fostering a worldwide gathering of scholars towards original research. Numerous illustrious minds contributed to this endeavor, including Paul RICOEUR, Emmanuel Levinas, and Karol Wotyla, then Cardinal of Krakow and later Pope John Paul II, with whom Tymieniecka edited the definitive edition of his work, *The Acting Person* (1979).

In 1968 Tymieniecka organized the first international congress for the advanced study of phenomenology. In 1976 she founded what would become her life's work and her scholarly legacy: the World Institute for Advanced Phenomenological Research and Learning, which serves as an umbrella organization for the International Husserl and Phenomenological Research Society (founded 1969), International Society of Phenomenology and Literature (1975), International Society of Phenomenology and the Human Sciences (1976), International Society of Phenomenology, Aesthetics, and Fine Arts (1993), and Sociedad Ibero-Americana de Fenomenologia (1995).

The World Institute, presently located in Hanover, New Hampshire, provides a dynamic interdisciplinary venue for scholars world-wide. The work of the World Institute is recorded in the annual publication of the *Analecta Husserliana*, of which Tymieniecka is the founder and editor-in-chief. The impact of the Institute on philoso-

phy at large is steadily growing, as Tymieniecka encourages the advancing elaboration of novel avenues being continually opened across the globe.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Phenomenology and Science in Contemporary European Thought (New York, 1962).

Leibniz' Cosmological Synthesis (Assen, The Netherlands, 1964).

Eros et logos: Introduction à la experience créatrice (Louvain, 1965).

Why Is There Something Rather than Nothing? Prolegomena to the Phenomenology of Cosmic Creation (Assen, The Netherlands, 1966).

Eros et logos: esquisse de phénoménologie de l'interiorité créatrice (Louvain, 1972).

Logos and Life, 4 vols (Dordrecht, 1987–2001).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *For Roman Ingarden: Nine Essays in Phenomenology* (The Hague, 1959).

Ed. with Charles Parsons, *Contributions to Logic and Methodology in Honor of J. M. Bochenski* (Amsterdam, 1965).

Ed., *The Acting Person*, by Pope John Paul II, trans. Andrzej Potocki (Dordrecht, 1979).

"Self-Presentation," in *American Phenomenology: Origins and Developments*, ed. Eugene F. Kaelin and Calvin O. Schrag (Dordrecht, 1989), pp. 180–90.

Further Reading

Backhaus, Gary, ed. "Thinking Through Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka's *Logos and Life*," *Phenomenological Inquiry* 27 (October 2003). Special issue about Tymieniecka.

Kronegger, Marlies E. *Phenomenology and Aesthetics: Approaches to Comparative Literature and the Other Arts, Homages to A-T. Tymieniecka* (Dordrecht, 1991).

Gorniak-Kocikowska, Krystna. "The Inner Moral Self in Tymieniecka's Vision," in *Reason, Life, Culture, Part 1*, *Analecta*

Husserliana, Vol. 39 (Dordrecht, 1993), pp. 139–54.

Ryba, Thomas. "Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka's Phenomenology of Life," in *Phenomenology World-wide*, ed. Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka (Dordrecht, 2002), pp. 430–60.

Nancy Mardas

U

UNGER, Peter Kenneth (1942–)

Peter Unger was born on 25 April 1942 in New York City. He graduated from Swarthmore College with a BA in 1962, and went on to the University of Oxford, where he earned his D.Phil. in philosophy in 1966. From 1965 until 1972 Unger taught philosophy at the University of Wisconsin. In 1972 he joined the philosophy faculty at New York University, where he has taught ever since. He has held Guggenheim and National Endowment for the Humanities fellowships.

Unger's work is notable for its readiness to take seriously positions that other philosophers have dismissed out of hand. His collected papers bears the subtitle "Selected Heretical Essays"; not surprising for a volume which includes, among others, essays entitled "A Defense of Skepticism" (1971), "An Argument for Skepticism" (1974), "There Are No Ordinary Things" (1979), "I Do Not Exist" (1979), and "Why There Are No People" (1979). Throughout his wide-ranging philosophical writings – including groundbreaking work in epistemology, metaphysics, ethics, and the philosophy of mind – Unger stands out as a philosopher of striking analytical acumen, methodological sensitivity, and intellectual honesty. His willingness and ability to follow philosophical arguments to their logical conclusions has served as a constant challenge to other philosophers seeking to defend more moderate positions.

Unger's early work focused primarily on epistemology. His early papers on skepticism have been widely anthologized, and, along with his important books in this area, *Ignorance: A Case for Scepticism* (1975) and *Philosophical Relativity* (1984), played a central role in revitalizing interest in fundamental questions in epistemology. In a series of papers in the 1970s and 80s, Unger turned to a number of central issues in metaphysics and the philosophy of language surrounding problems of individuation, identity and vagueness, articulating the important "problem of the many" in his paper of the same name. In *Identity, Consciousness, and Value* (1990), he tackled the metaphysical problem of personal identity, defending a subtle view that combined physical and psychological criteria.

In *Living High and Letting Die* (1996), Unger turned his attention to ethics, arguing that each of us has a moral obligation to do as much as we can to alleviate the suffering of others. In *All the Power in the World: Body, Mind and Freedom* (forthcoming), Unger returns to a number of fundamental problems in metaphysics, including the nature of the physical, the mind–body problem and free will.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Ignorance: A Case for Scepticism (Oxford, 1975; 2002).
Philosophical Relativity (Minneapolis, 1984; Oxford, 2002).
Identity, Consciousness, and Value (Oxford, 1990).
Living High and Letting Die: Our Illusion of Innocence (Oxford, 1996).

All the Power in the World: Body, Mind and Freedom (Oxford, forthcoming).

From a Skeptical Point of View: Selected Heretical Essays (Oxford, forthcoming).

Other Relevant Works

"Experience and Factual Knowledge," *Journal of Philosophy* 64 (1967): 152–73.

"A Defense of Skepticism," *Philosophical Review* 80 (1971): 198–219.

"An Argument for Skepticism," *Philosophic Exchange* 1 (1974): 131–55.

Ed. with Milton K. Munitz, *Semantics and Philosophy* (New York, 1974).

"There Are No Ordinary Things," *Synthese* 41 (1979): 117–54.

"I Do Not Exist," in *Perception and Identity*, ed. G. F. MacDonald (London, 1979), pp. 235–51.

"Why There Are No People," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 4 (1979): 177–222.

"The Problem of the Many," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 5 (1980): 411–67.

"Minimizing Arbitrariness: Toward a Metaphysics of Infinitely Many Isolated Concrete Worlds," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 9 (1984): 29–51.

"The Mystery of the Physical and the Matter of Qualities," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 22 (1999): 75–99.

"Free Will and Scientiphicalism," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 65 (2002): 1–25.

"Science and the Possibility of Philosophy," in *Philosophers in Conversation: Interviews from the Harvard Review of Philosophy* (London and New York, 2002).

Further Reading

Black, Max. "An Immoderate Skepticism, Some Comment on Professor Unger's Paper," *Philosophic Exchange* 1 (1974): 157–9.

Harman, Gilbert. "Unger on Knowledge," *Journal of Philosophy* 64 (1967): 390–95.

"Symposium on *Identity, Consciousness, and Value*," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 52 (1992): 133–76.

"Symposium on *Living High and Letting Die*," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 59 (1999): 173–216.

Van Inwagen, Peter. "Unger's 'Identity, Consciousness and Value'," *Noûs* 27 (1993): 373–9.

Tamar Szabó Gendler

UPHAM, Thomas Cogswell (1799–1872)

Thomas Cogswell Upham was born on 20 January 1799 in Rochester, New Hampshire, and died on 2 April 1872 in New York City. He was the oldest son of Nathaniel Upham, merchant and four-term Congressman (1816–24), and Judith Cogswell Upham. Educated in local schools, Upham attended Dartmouth College and graduated with his BA in 1818. During a religious revival at Dartmouth, he dedicated himself to God; upon graduation, he enrolled in the Andover Theological Seminary, a bastion of Congregational trinitarian orthodoxy. At Andover, he studied under Moses Stuart, a teacher of languages and biblical scholar who defended orthodox views against critical German scholarship. Upham served Stuart as an assistant in teaching Hebrew and Greek and taught classical languages himself at Philips Andover Academy. After graduation with his MA from Andover in 1821, he continued as Stuart's assistant. At Stuart's suggestion, he translated and published an abridged Latin edition of *Jahn's Biblical Archaeology* (1823), with passages he translated and added from the original German edition.

While serving as Stuart's assistant, Upham was invited to preach and eventually to become assistant pastor at the First Congregational Church in his hometown of Rochester, New Hampshire. On 16 July 1823

he was ordained at Rochester and began a promising pastorate that ended soon after it had begun when he was invited to join the faculty of Bowdoin College in Maine. Appointed to Bowdoin in September of 1824, Upham continued to serve his Rochester church while he prepared himself for his new position of professor of metaphysics and ethics, which he took up in February of 1825. On 18 May of that year he married Phebe Lord of Kennebunkport, Maine.

In 1826, Upham published the first half of his *Elements of Intellectual Philosophy*; the full volume appeared in 1827 and a second edition was published in 1828. In 1831 this textbook, revised and expanded, was published in two volumes under the title *Elements of Mental Philosophy, Including Two Departments of Mind, the Intellect and the Sensibilities*. After reading Asa Burton's *Essays on Some of the First Principles of Metaphysicks, Ethicks, and Theology* (1824), Upham completed his system of mental philosophy by addressing the will as third coequal department of mind in *A Philosophical and Practical Treatise on the Will* (1834). The complete system was published in three volumes by Harper's in 1840; an abridged edition in one volume covering the Intellect and the Sensibilities was published in 1840, to which a much-abridged section on the will was added in 1861. In 1840 Upham also published *Outlines of Imperfect and Disordered Mental Action* as Number 100 in the Harper's Family Library Series. It was the first attempt at a systematic treatment of abnormal psychology by an American author.

In addition to his philosophical works, Upham pursued an early interest in writing poetry. In 1819, he published his first book of poems, *American Sketches*. His poetry romanticized the natural beauty of New Hampshire, the rural virtues of its people, its early pioneers and those who fought in the Revolutionary War. One of his poems was imitated by a very young Henry Wadsworth Longfellow (Thompson 1938). He published several other

collections of religious and secular poetry, including his popular *A Book for the Home: American Cottage Life* in 1850, more widely distributed as simply *American Cottage Life* (1850–51), which was reprinted several times. His literary contributions also included *Letters Aesthetic, Social, and Moral, Written from Europe, Egypt, and Palestine* (1855). The book was so widely popular in a private printing that it was republished commercially for a wider audience.

Upham was publicly committed to the cause of peace. He served as a Vice President of the American Peace Society from 1843 until his death in 1872. In 1836, his antiwar articles were gathered together in *The Manual of Peace*, reissued in abridged form in 1842 by the American Peace Society. The Society removed chapters that opposed capital punishment and slavery, positions which were not universally shared by its members. His "Essay on a Congress of Nations," a chapter from *The Manual of Peace*, was one of five published in 1840 under the title *Prize Essays on a Congress of Nations*. The 1842 edition of *The Manual of Peace* "was considered by the London Peace Society to be the best manual on the whole subject which had ever been written" (Phelps 1930, p. 71) and, at the time of his death, was still "considered the best general book on the subject" (Whitney 1929, p. 144).

From 1840 to the time of his death, Upham published several popular books on holiness theology to express his personal views on religion. He was persuaded that individuals might achieve freedom from committing sin (sanctification) by making their own will subject to the will of God, thus going beyond a state in which one is forgiven for sins (justification). His books included *Principles of the Interior or Hidden Life* (1843), *Life of Faith* (1845), *Divine Union* (1851), *Christ in the Soul* (1872), and, posthumously, *Absolute Religion* (1873). In addition, he published two biographies of Catholic mystics whose lives were of interest to nineteenth-century

Protestants: *Life of Madame Catharine Adorna* (1845) and *Life and Religious Opinions and Experience of Madame De La Mothe Guyon, Together with Some Account of the Personal History and Religious Opinions of Fenelon, Bishop of Cambray* (1847).

At Bowdoin College, Upham was viewed fondly by students for his avuncular concern for their religious well-being and respected by the Governing Boards of the College for his success in raising funds. He was instrumental in bringing Calvin Stowe to the Bowdoin faculty and Calvin's wife Harriet Beecher Stowe to Brunswick, where she began to write *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Both Upham and his wife Phebe made contributions to Stowe's book (Hedrick 1994). Upham retired from Bowdoin College in 1868.

Upham's contributions to the philosophy of mind began with his 1826–7 *Elements of Intellectual Philosophy*. The *Elements* preceded the publication of most other American textbooks of the discipline, summarizing and interpreting original sources for students to introduce them to the study of mind. To achieve his goal of presenting an impartial view of mind that spared students the perplexity of determining truth from conflicting and contradictory arguments, Upham was avowedly eclectic. He depended most heavily on the philosophies of John Locke and the Scottish philosophers of Common Sense, Thomas Reid and Dugald Stewart. Locke's *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690) and Stewart's *Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind* (1792–1814) were popular texts, and were among those read by Upham as a student at Dartmouth and at Andover. He was also aware, thanks to his knowledge of French and German, of European philosophers and he borrowed from them as well, without giving up his primary reliance on British philosophy. In his textbook, he attempted to sort through the mass of fact and argument in debates on the philosophy of mind to arrive at established principles and

the facts on which they rest. The addition of the words "for Academies and High Schools" to the title of the abridged third edition of the revised and expanded *Elements of Mental Philosophy* made Upham's textbook the first designed for use in secondary schools (Engle 1967).

Upham distinguished intellectual philosophy from metaphysics and its association in the public mind with speculations for which there were no answers and no practical utility (e.g., whether angels occupied space). Intellectual philosophy is to be "prosecuted on different principles and with different results" (1827, p. 11), i.e., as a science. The scientific method employed to determine the laws of nature, mind, or human conduct is empirical and inductive, collecting and organizing facts (empiricism) and inferring from them (induction) the general laws or principles that governed them. In the later decades of the century, "science" would imply laboratory investigations; but for Upham and his contemporaries it implied gathering facts from any source that seemed to provide insight into the operations of mind. The most important observations are those of one's own consciousness or of one's own behavior and the behavior of others. Additional observations of human nature from trusted and sensitive observers, in plays and poems, in legal and medical treatises and cases are also acceptable as facts of mind. The ultimate arbiter of what constitutes a mental fact is the judgment of consciousness, which serves to distinguish among mental processes as the basis for classifying them.

Upham's classification of mental processes constituted a theory of mind. Although mind, for Upham, is unitary and not capable of division, its processes can be classified and organized within three departments or categories of mental operations. The existence of the divisions, and the processes grouped within them, rests on the evidence of consciousness. Upham's tripartite organization not only describes mental processes but also suggests

how they operate to translate mental activity into behavior. The Intellect and the Sensibilities each comprise two subclasses of processes: the Will is not subdivided. The Intellect consists of processes of external and internal origin. These classes reflect the debate over the origins of mind: the view that there is nothing in mind but that which experience provides, or, alternatively, that mind has an existence prior to experience. The processes that Upham categorized as of external origin – dependent upon stimulation from the external world – included, for example, the experience of sensation and perception, "conceptions" (images or representations that occur in the absence of the stimulus object), ideas and the associations among them, and dreaming, conceived of as prompted by external stimulation during sleep. Among processes of internal origin, he included, for example, consciousness itself, suggestion (the mechanism of association, in which one idea "suggests" another), and the origin of ideas that do not depend upon external objects, such as the idea of self and processes of reasoning, memory, and imagination.

Upham also divided the mental processes of the Sensibilities into two categories: natural sensibilities and moral sensibilities, or conscience. The former comprises the emotions and desires or motives (including instincts, appetites, propensities, and affections). The moral sensibilities include emotions of moral approval or disapproval and feelings of moral obligation. In making this categorization, Upham balanced the nature of human beings as creatures of the earth, sharing in the nature common to humans and other animals, and the special responsibility of human beings, as created in God's image, to act ethically.

Upham's theory of mind is explicit in the relation of the processes of the Intellect to those of the Sensibilities; any excitement of the processes of the sensibilities depends upon activation by some process of the intellect. Emotions and desires, natural or moral, can be activated by perception or memory, focused by attention or past associations. The nature of any action, and whether action results or not, depends on the activation of the will by the sensibilities.

Upham's treatment of the Will, as the third department of mind, dealt with three philosophical issues and the empirical facts that might resolve them: whether the will is governed by laws, and hence determined; whether the will is free; and the power of the will. Uniformities of individual conduct and human behavior within social systems support the view that the will is governed by laws, since uniformities in human behavior suggest lawful regulation. At the same time, human beings are confronted with choices, and are therefore free to choose among alternatives, either in accord with the instincts or passions or from motives of moral responsibility. Upham concluded that the will is both free and governed by laws; how both could be true, he was content to leave as a mystery. On the issue of the power of the will, he noted that education and parental child rearing practices can strengthen the will to facilitate appropriate moral choices.

Upham's view of mind categorized processes into three departments. Processes are initiated first in the Intellect, either from internal (e.g., memory) or external (e.g., sensory stimulation); intellectual processes activate processes in the Sensibilities (e.g., emotions either natural or moral) that may give rise to action, mediated by the Will, acting freely or under laws governing its action. The mental processes described by Upham are apparent in consciousness, labeled by language that was commonly understood, and at the same time suggest how behavior, moral or otherwise, may result.

Upham's system was influential in his era. The three part division of mind was adopted by another textbook author of the time, Joseph HAVEN, who noted that there were "many reasons for such a distinction; they have been well stated by Professor Upham" and "generally adopted by the more recent European

writers of note, especially in France and Germany." Upham's text was read and adopted because it was comprehensive for its time: it was judged to "furnish a full view of our mental operations in all their parts and complexities; to leave no class of facts unnoticed, no class of laws unexplained" (Smith 1837, p. 628). Upham, another reviewer noted, "presents the views of others and himself with great good judgment, candor, clearness, and method …. The student by the aid of a thorough teacher, may gain a competent systematic view of the leading principles of the science" (Anonymous 1840, p. 253).

Upham's textbook also broke new ground in its discussion of the abnormal functioning of mental processes, unusual for its time and for the Scottish common sense tradition in which Upham wrote (Madden and Madden 1983). He included discussion of the abnormal in the belief that understanding the aberrations of mind could throw light on its normal functions. Descriptions of various disordered states were attributed to specific disorders of normal mental processes. Disorders of the intellect of external origin include, for example, sensory disorders (seeing apparitions), disordered attention (an inability to focus attention), and somnambulism. Disorders of the intellect of internal origin are identified with, for example, such processes as memory (e.g., senility), imagination (delusions), and idiocy. The sensibilities too have corresponding disorders: of appetites (alcoholism), of affections (hypochondriasis or phobias), or of derangements of moral sensibilities (the absence of conscience). Disorders of will are those characterized by a condition in which actions seem to be determined by passions and the absence, or subjection, of will.

Upham also addressed questions of moral accountability of the insane and the treatment due to them. He recognized that individuals whose will is disordered should be free from responsibility for their actions. Whether an individual should be held accountable or not was left to be decided in particular circumstances. Upham advocated no specific psychological treatment for imperfect or disordered mental action, but suggested medical remedies for disorders having their origin in ills of the body (such as bloodletting). In his 1840 *Outlines of Imperfect and Disordered Mental Action*, Upham introduced his system of the mind to a popular audience. He recognized "that the public mind is but little informed, certainly much less than it should be, in relation to the true doctrines of regular or normal mental action; but it is, undoubtedly, much more ignorant of the philosophy of defective and disordered mental action" (1840, p. iii).

Upham's textbook was in print and still in use in colleges across America as late as 1886 when textbooks heralding the new experimental psychology began to appear. The preface to Upham's first book of poems in 1819, *American Sketches*, contained a call to American authors to create a new national literature. His textbook of 1826–7 and its subsequent editions strove to provide a conception of mind that met the needs of an American audience and helped to establish the continuity of topics of psychology texts well into the modern era.

Upham's books were influential beyond the classroom. For example, it has been suggested that the discussion of Will in his *Outlines of Imperfect and Disordered Mental Action* influenced Herman Melville's depiction of Ahab's will in *Moby Dick* (McCarthy 1987). Also, the clinical symptoms Upham describes may have been the source of symptoms ascribed by Edgar Allan Poe to characters in "The Fall of the House of Usher" (Smith 1973). Upham's philosophy not only influenced the development of academic psychology in America but contributed to the country's broader intellectual development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Elements of Intellectual Philosophy
  (Portland, Maine, 1826–7; 2nd edn 1828).
Elements of Mental Philosophy, Including Two Departments of Mind, the Intellect and the Sensibilities, 2 vols (Portland,

Maine, 1831; 2nd edn 1837).

A Philosophical and Practical Treatise on the Will (Portland, Maine, 1834).

Elements of Mental Philosophy, Abridged and Designed as a Text-book for Academies and High Schools (New York, 1840).

Outlines of Imperfect and Disordered Mental Action (New York, 1840).

Abridgement of Mental Philosophy, Including the Three Departments of the Intellect, Sensibilities, and Will (New York, 1861).

Other Relevant Works

Upham's papers are at Bowdoin College, Maine.

American Sketches (New York, 1819).

Trans. with Johann Jahn, *Jahn's Biblical Archaelogy* (Andover, Mass., 1823).

The Manual of Peace (Brunswick, Maine, 1836; abr. edn 1842).

"Essay on a Congress of Nations," in *Prize Essays on a Congress of Nations*, ed. William Ladd and George C. Beckwith (Boston, 1840), pp. 347–426.

Principles of the Interior or Hidden Life (Boston, 1843).

A Life of Faith (Boston, 1845).

Life of Madame Catharine Adorna (Boston, 1845).

Life and Religious Opinions and Experience of Madame De La Mothe Guyon, Together with Some Account of the Personal History and Religious Opinions of Fenelon, Bishop of Cambray, 2 vols (New York, 1847).

A Book for the Home: American Cottage Life (Boston, 1850).

American Cottage Life (Brunswick, Maine, 1850–51).

Divine Union (Boston, 1851).

Letters Aesthetic, Social, and Moral, Written from Europe, Egypt, and Palestine (Brunswick, Maine, 1855).

Christ in the Soul (New York, 1872).

Absolute Religion (New York, 1873).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v13*

Anonymous. "Review 21," *New York Review* 6 (1840): 253.

Engle, T. L. "Teaching Psychology at the Secondary School Level: Past, Present, Possible Future," *Journal of School Psychology* 5 (1967): 168–76.

Evans, Rand. "The Origins of American Academic Psychology," in *Explorations in the History of Psychology in the United States*, ed. Josef Brozek (Lewisburg, Penn., 1984), pp. 17–60.

Fay, Jay Wharton. *American Psychology before William James* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1939).

Fuchs, Alfred H. "The Contributions of American Mental Philosophers to Psychology in the United States," *History of Psychology* 3 (2000): 3–19.

———, "The Psychology of Thomas C. Upham," in *Portraits of Pioneers in Psychology*, vol. 6, eds G. A. Kimble and Michael Wertheimer (Washington, D.C., 2000), pp. 1–13.

Hedrick, Joan D. *Harriet Beecher Stowe* (New York, 1994).

Madden, M. C., and E. H. Madden. "Thomas Upham on Relations and Alienation," *Transactions of the Charles S. Pierce Society* 19 (1983): 227–53.

McCarthy, Paul. "Forms of Insanity and Insane Characters in 'Moby Dick'," *Colby Library Quarterly* 23 (1987): 39–51.

Phelps, Christina. *The Anglo-American Peace Movement in the Mid-Nineteenth Century* (New York, 1930).

Roback, A. A. *History of American Psychology* (New York, 1952).

Salter, Darius. *Spirit and Intellect: Thomas Upham's Holiness Theology* (Metuchen, N.J., 1986).

Smith, Allan. "The Psychological Context of Three Tales by Poe," *Journal of American Studies* 7 (1973): 279–92.

Smith, Henry B. "Upham's *Mental Philosophy*," *The Literary and Theological Review* 4 (1837): 621–59.

Thompson, Lawrance. *Young Longfellow (1807–1843)* (New York, 1938).

Whitney, Edson L. *The American Peace Society: A Centennial History*, 3rd edn (Washington, D.C., 1929).

Alfred H. Fuchs

URBAN, Wilbur Marshall (1873–1952)

Wilbur M. Urban was born on 27 March 1873 in Mount Joy, Pennsylvania, to Reverend Abraham Linwood and Emma Louisa Trexler. Urban attended the William Penn Charter School in Philadelphia, and in 1892 Urban began his studies at the College of New Jersey, which changed its name to Princeton University a few months after he received his BA in 1895. At the College, Urban studied with Alexander Thomas ORMOND and James Mark BALDWIN. After graduation, Princeton named him the Chancellor Green Fellow in Mental Science, which enabled him to study in Germany, first at Jena with Rudolf Eucken, then in Leipzig with Wilhelm Wundt. Urban received his PhD in philosophy from Leipzig in 1897 writing on the "History of the Principle of Sufficient Reason," and then returned to New Jersey to spend a year as reader in philosophy at Princeton. His dissertation was published in 1898 as the first volume of the *Princeton Contributions to Philosophy*, edited by Ormond. Urban married Elizabeth Newell Wakelin on 27 July 1896.

After four years as professor of philosophy and psychology at Ursinus College in Pennsylvania (1898–1902), Urban assumed a professorship at Trinity College in Connecticut, where he spent the next eighteen years. In 1909 he published *Valuation: Its Nature and Laws,* *Being an Introduction to the General Theory of Value*, which he understood to be his first extended critique of ideas that began during his graduate studies in Germany. Urban's conclusion was to renew the investigation into human values by considering work in epistemology and logic. Baldwin had stimulated his thinking about genetic psychology, but here Urban offers his first systematic treatment of his axiology and the genetic psychology of human values, importantly figured as a response to Friedrich Nietzsche and Alexius Meinong. Urban understood his axiology to mean the metaphysical status of value.

By this time, Urban was blending theories of phenomenology with neo-Kantianism. In 1913, he went to Graz to study with Meinong. While in Austria, he began to read the work of Heinrich Rickert and Edmund Husserl. Urban's version of phenomenology sought to blend Plato and Hegel so that we could understand values as prior to objects of value (Plato), but also intimately dependent upon those objects (Hegel).

In 1920 Urban became Stone Professor of Philosophy at Dartmouth College, succeeding Wilmon SHELDON to that appointment when he had gone to Yale University. In 1931 Urban made his last academic move, following Sheldon to the department of philosophy at Yale University, where he also served as chair and director of graduate studies. He received two honorary degrees, an MA from Yale in 1931, and an LHD from Trinity in 1937.

In Urban's *Language and Reality: The Philosophy of Language and the Principles of Symbolism* (1939), he addressed current issues in semantics. *Language and Reality*, though influenced by Ernst Cassirer's work, continues Urban's project on axiology. The appearance of *Beyond Realism and Idealism* (1949) marks his effort to offer something restorative to the perennial rift between realists and idealists, a division he thought could and should be overcome.

Urban served as President of the American Philosophical Association in 1925–6, and his

presidential address was entitled "Progress in Philosophy in the Last Quarter Century." Urban retired from Yale in 1941. With a book-length manuscript – *Studies in the Philosophy of History* – completed on his desk, Urban died on 15 October 1952 in New Haven, Connecticut.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The History of the Principle of Sufficient Reason (Princeton, N.J., 1898).

Valuation: Its Nature and Laws, Being an Introduction to the General Theory of Value (London and New York, 1909).

The Intelligible World: Metaphysics and Value (London and New York, 1929).

Fundamentals of Ethics: An Introduction to Moral Philosophy (New York, 1930).

Language and Reality: The Philosophy of Language and the Principles of Symbolism (London, 1939).

Beyond Realism and Idealism (London, 1949).

Humanity and Deity (London, 1951).

Other Relevant Works

Urban's papers are at Yale University.

"The Relation of the Individual to the Social Value," *Philosophical Review* 11 (1902): 125–38, 249–63.

"Appreciation and Description and the Psychology of Values," *Philosophical Review* 14 (1905): 645–68.

"What is the Function of a General Theory of Value?" *Philosophical Review* 17 (1908): 42–62.

"The Will to Make-Believe," *International Journal of Ethics* 19 (1909): 212–33.

"On Intolerables: A Study in the Logic of Valuation," *Philosophical Review* 24 (1915): 477–500.

"Value and Existence," *Journal of Philosophy* 13 (1916): 449–65.

"Knowledge of Value and the Value–Judgment," *Journal of Philosophy* 13 (1916): 673–87.

"Is Mankind Worthy of Peace?" *International Journal of Ethics* 27 (1917): 293–305.

"The Knowledge of Other Minds and the Problem of Meaning and Value," *Philosophical Review* 26 (1917): 274–96.

"Ontological Problems of Value," *Journal of Philosophy* 14 (1917): 309–27.

"The Pragmatic Theory of Value: A Reply to Herbert W. Schneider," *Journal of Philosophy* 14 (1917): 701–706.

"Tolstoy and the Russian Sphinx," *International Journal of Ethics* 28 (1918): 220–39.

"Beyond Realism and Idealism vs. Two Types of Idealism," with J. E. Creighton, *Philosophical Review* 27 (1918): 63–75.

"Again, the Value Objective and the Value Judgment: Reply to Professor Perry and Dr. Fisher," *Journal of Philosophy* 15 (1918): 393–405.

"How are Moral Judgments on Groups and Associations Possible? A Neglected Chapter in Ethics," *International Journal of Ethics* 29 (1919): 318–31.

"The Nature of the Community: A Defense of Philosophic Orthodoxy," *Philosophical Review* 28 (1919): 547–61.

"Origin and Value," *Philosophical Review* 32 (1923): 451–69.

"The Intelligible World," *Philosophical Review* 33 (1924): 1–29, 115–42.

"Progress in Philosophy in the Last Quarter Century," *Philosophical Review* 35 (1926): 93–123.

"Metaphysics and Value," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 2, pp. 356–81.

"The Philosophy of Spirit: Idealism and the Philosophy of Value," in *Contemporary Idealism in America*, ed. Clifford Barrett (New York, 1932), pp. 101–30.

"Value Propositions and Verifiability," *Journal of Philosophy* 34 (1937): 589–602.

"Symbolism in Science and Philosophy," *Philosophy of Science* 5 (1938): 276–99.

"Intelligible Communication: Its Nature and

Conditions," *Philosophical Review* 47 (1938): 565–94.

"Elements of Unintelligibility in Whitehead's Metaphysics," *Journal of Philosophy* 35 (1938): 617–37.

"Science and Value," *Ethics* 51 (1941): 291–306.

"The Dialectic of Meaning and Truth: Truth as Immanent in Discourse," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 4 (1944): 377–400.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Pres Addr of APA v3*, *Proc of APA v26*, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Brogan, A. P. "Urban's Axiological System," *Journal of Philosophy* 18 (1921): 197–209.

De Laguna, Grace A. "Professor Urban on Language," *Philosophical Review* 50 (1941): 422–31.

Perry, Ralph B. "Dewey and Urban on Value Judgments," *Journal of Philosophy* 14 (1917): 169–81.

Reck, Andrew J. "The Value-Centric Philosophy of Wilbur Marshall Urban," in *Recent American Philosophy: Studies of Ten Representative Thinkers* (New York, 1964), chap. 5.

———, "W. M. Urban's Philosophy of History," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 31 (1995): 467–81.

Schneider, Herbert W. "The Values of Pragmatic Theory: A Reply to Professor Urban," *Journal of Philosophy* 14 (1917): 706–14.

Shibles, Warren A. *An Analysis of Metaphor in the Light of W. M. Urban's Theories* (The Hague, 1971).

Sleeper, Ralph W. *Metaphysics and the Value Theories of Urban, Dewey and Perry*. PhD dissertation, Columbia University (New York, 1956).

Smith, John E. "Beyond Realism and Idealism: An Appreciation of W. M. Urban," *Review of Metaphysics* 6 (1953): 337–50.

Werkmeister, W. H. "Urban's Theory of Valuation," in *Historical Spectrum of Value Theories, vol. 2: Anglo/American Group* (Lincoln, Neb., 1973), pp. 1–39.

David Justin Hodge

USHENKO, Andrew Paul (1900–1956)

Andrew P. Uchenko was born on 26 November 1900 in Moscow, Russia. His father Paul was a geochemist. After service in the navy during the Bolshevik Revolution, he traveled in India, Europe, and China before emigrating to the United States around 1925. He was accepted to the mathematics graduate program at the University of California at Berkeley. He soon switched to philosophy and earned his MA in 1926 and then his PhD in philosophy in 1927, writing a dissertation on "The Logic of Events." He married Fay Hampton in 1929, and in 1931 he began signing his publications as "Andrew P. Ushenko" at her suggestion and kept that name. From 1929 to 1936 Ushenko was instructor and assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Michigan; from 1936 to 1949 he was associate professor of philosophy at Princeton University, and from 1949 until his death he was a professor of philosophy at Indiana University. While traveling to begin a semester's leave of absence in Cambridge, Massachusetts, Ushenko had a heart attack and later died on 11 September 1956 in Mt. Gilead, Ohio.

Ushenko worked primarily in metaphysics, epistemology, philosophy of science, and philosophy of logic. He was especially interested in the nature of change and time, relativity theory, the theory of meaning, and the conflict between classical logic and the new logical methods. Ushenko was interested in non-classical logic, and he sought to develop a temporal logic in *The Logic of Events* (1929). His *The Theory of*

Logic (1936) and *The Problems of Logic* (1941) defended his vision of logic against the "postulationist theory" of Rudolf CARNAP and Alfred TARSKI which would unify logic with mathematics instead of philosophy. His logical theory was instead "intuitionalist" because it interprets logical symbols with a common language such as English.

The problem of the existential import of propositions became the subject of a lively debate between defenders of Aristotelian logic and proponents of mathematical logic, especially in the first decades of the twentieth century. In the 1920s Ushenko debated with F. C. S. NORTHROP on the existential import of universal affirmative propositions in Aristotelian categorical logic. He also considered the relation of Russell's work on the theory of types to what he considered earlier examples, and sought to establish the nature of the relation between Hegelian logic and Russell's mathematical logic. Soviet Georgian set theorist Levan Petrovich Gokieli, who sought to defend dialectical logic against formal logic, used his work on the axiomatization of logic (Gokieli 1947) to repeat arguments set forth by Ushenko in his rejection of formalism in logic.

The concept of dynamism, not far removed from the ideas of Alfred North WHITEHEAD's process philosophy, inspired Ushenko to reject material substances for a metaphysics of events and processes in *The Philosophy of Relativity* (1937). He went on to apply dynamism in explorations of philosophy in *Power and Events: An Essay on Dynamics in Philosophy* (1946) and aesthetics in *Dynamics of Art* (1953), which includes an introduction by Stephen C. PEPPER. *The Field of Meaning* (1958), also introduced by Pepper, designs a dynamic and contextualist theory of meaning and verification.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Logic of Events: An Introduction to a Philosophy of Time (Berkeley, Cal., 1929).
The Theory of Logic: An Introductory Text (New York, 1936).

The Philosophy of Relativity (London, 1937).
The Problems of Logic (London and Princeton, N.J., 1941).
Power and Events: An Essay on Dynamics in Philosophy (New York, 1946).
Dynamics of Art (Bloomington, Ind., 1953).
The Field of Meaning, ed. Fay Ushenko (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1958).

Other Relevant Works
"Aristotelian Logic and the Logic of Classes: A Reply to Professor Northrop," *The Monist* 39 (1929): 153–6.
"The Veil of Space," *Philosophical Review* 42 (1933): 49–57.
"A Modification of the Theory of Types," *The Monist* 44 (1934): 147–9.
"A Theory of Perception," *Journal of Philosophy* 37 (1940): 141–51.
"Dr. Quine's Theory of Truth-Functions," *Journal of Philosophy* 39 (1942): 64–7.
"The Logics of Hegel and Russell," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 10 (1949): 107–14.
"The Principles of Causality," *Journal of Philosophy* 50 (1953): 85–100.
"Truth in Science and in Philosophy," *Philosophy of Science* 21 (1954): 101–17.

Further Reading
Who's Who in Phil
Gokieli, Levan Petrovich. *K probleme aksiomatizatsii logiki* (Tbilisi, Soviet Union, 1947).
Grünbaum, Adolf. "Some Remarks on Professor Ushenko's Interpretation of Law," *Journal of Philosophy* 50 (1953): 115–19.
Northrop, F. S. C. "An Internal Inconsistency in Aristotelian Logic," *The Monist* 38 (1928): 193–210.
———, "A Reply, Emphasizing the Existential Import of Propositions," *The Monist* 39 (1929): 157–9.
Quine, W. V. "Reply to Professor Ushenko's 'Dr. Quine's Theory of Truth-functions,"

Journal of Philosophy 39 (1942): 68–71.

Reck, Andrew J. "The Philosophy of Andrew Ushenko," *Review of Metaphysics* 11 (1958): 471–85, 673–88.

Irving H. Anellis
John R. Shook

V

VAN EIGENAAR, Valse Leven (1822–87)

Valse van Eigenaar was born on 11 January 1822 in Rotterdam, The Netherlands. Born into a wealthy Dutch Reformed family, he attended the University of Leiden. Classes with Johan Rudolf Thorbecke, professor of modern history and diplomacy, attracted him towards government theory and a liberal and democratic stance in politics like his mentor. When Thorbecke became fully engaged with designing a new constitution for the country, van Eigenaar left the university. His education was further interrupted by travel to Bristol, England, where his father's law practice was frequently involved in lawsuits against delinquent book publishers. Van Eigenaar developed a facility with the English language, and beginning around 1845 he was in the service of one of his father's clients, a wealthy textile merchant named Randolph Hull, as a secretary and accountant. This service brought him to New York City and its financial district by the late 1840s. His unfortunate involvement with the notorious speculation in velvet futures in 1849 depleted the large family investment when Hull pulled his financing and the scheme fell apart. Van Eigenaar decided to settle permanently in New York. Disappointed with his experiment in capitalist finance, his interest in democratic politics redeveloped.

Van Eigenaar took courses on moral philosophy, political economy, and government with Columbia University professor John McVickar, and also studied law. After receiving his BA in 1853, van Eigenaar went into journalism, and later assisted in the publication of the Dutch-language newspaper *Nieuwe Teleurstellingen* for several years. He published his *Labor and the Free-Trade Question; a Discourse on Proposed Legislation* in 1854. His pro-labor and democratic views drew criticism from several New York City legislators, but during Horatio Seymour's first term as Governor of New York, van Eigenaar was appointed to the state's Labor Board in 1855. However, upon Seymour's failed reelection later that year, van Eigenaar was soon removed from the board by the incoming Republican governor.

In 1865 van Eigenaar published his second book, *The Science of Law and Political Government*. This work closely follows McVickar's earlier *Outlines of Political Economy*, except for van Eigenaar's surprising conservative rejection of tax cuts for the working class on the grounds that labor supply can actually decrease as the wage rate increases (later proven by twentieth-century economists). His book at last brought him some attention from academics (although it apparently was not reviewed in any journal), and in 1866 van Eigenaar accepted an invitation to become an instructor in moral philosophy and government from Samuel Ware Fisher, Professor of Hamilton College in upstate New York. However, Fisher left Hamilton the following year to return to the ministry. Under a new college administration, van Eigenaar was not permitted to teach philosophy (to be taught instead by the new college President) but

instead was assigned the teaching of history and politics. He resigned in 1875 because of declining health and moved to Albany, New York, where for several years he resumed his newspaper career. Van Eigenaar died on 23 December 1887 in Utica, New York.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Labor and the Free-trade Question; a Discourse on Proposed Legislation (New York, 1854).

"The Constitution of New York," *United States Democratic Review* 41 (May 1858): 413–18.

The Science of Law and Political Government (London, 1865).

Further Reading

Rouse, Gerald W. "Early Faculty of Hamilton College," *Hamilton College Bulletin* 8 (November 1924): 22–37.

Whitelawe, Nancy, and John C. Miller, eds. *Notable Residents of Hamilton County* (Albany, N.Y., 1913), vol. 7, pp. 593–7.

Rolf H. Nihilartikel

VAN FRAASSEN, Bastiaan Cornelis (1941–)

Bas van Fraassen was born on 5 April 1941 in Goes, The Netherlands. He emigrated with his family to Canada in 1956, and attended the University of Alberta, receiving a BA in 1963. His graduate work was at the University of Pittsburgh, earning an MA in 1964 and a PhD in philosophy in 1966, where he wrote his dissertation "Foundations of the Causal Theory of Time" under the supervision of Adolf GRÜNBAUM. He taught philosophy at Yale University from 1966 to 1969, the University of Toronto from 1969 to 1982, the University of Southern California from 1976 to 1981, and since 1982 he has been professor of philosophy at Princeton University. He is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Van Fraassen's work can be divided into three main areas. The first is philosophical logic, focusing on such issues as free logic and supervaluationist semantics. The second is philosophy of science, including issues in philosophy of physics and the foundations of quantum mechanics. The third encompasses more general issues in philosophy, focusing on the question "what is empiricism, and what could it be?"

Van Fraassen is definitely an analytic philosopher, but his style is often different from that of standard analytic philosophy. While still being rigorous, his writing is often more literary and more playful than is standard. For example, he has sometimes used stories to make philosophical points. Also, he has written on issues such as the similarities between interpretation of scientific theories and interpretation of art, as well as the peculiar effects of love and desire.

Van Fraassen is most famous for his work in philosophy of science, but he has also done important work in philosophical logic. Some of his first publications were on free logic, a variant of standard formal logic in that it drops the assumption that something exists. He proved the completeness of free logic, and also developed supervaluationist semantics. This is still often discussed in the context of vagueness: it provides a way of accommodating all the standard logical truths even in the face of vague sentences which are neither true nor false. Also, he did work on modal logic, deontic logic, quantum logic, and the logic of conditionals. During his early period, he also continued his work on philosophy of time, building from his dissertation. For example, he wrote *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Time and Space*, first published in 1970. He has recently returned to his early interests in logic, publishing in 2003 *Possibilities and Paradox: An Introduction to Modal and Many-valued Logic*, co-authored with J. C. Beall.

Van Fraassen's most famous publication is from the second phase of his career. His 1980

book *The Scientific Image* offers a new way of understanding science, and is still frequently taught in philosophy of science classes and debated in top journals over two decades after publication. He develops the ideas in his book by asking the question "how should an empiricist understand science?" The position that he develops, *constructive empiricism*, holds that the aim of science is to give us theories which are empirically adequate. Roughly speaking, a theory is empirically adequate if and only if what it says about the observable things and events in the world is true. Constructive empiricism is in contrast to the doctrine of scientific realism, according to which the aim of science is to generate theories which give a literally true story of what the world is like, in both its observable and unobservable aspects. Van Fraassen called his position "constructive" to indicate his view that scientific activity is one of construction rather than discovery.

In addition to the doctrine about the aim of science, constructive empiricism includes a doctrine about what it is to accept a scientific theory. Van Fraassen holds that acceptance is not the same as belief; accepting a scientific theory involves as belief only that it is empirically adequate. Here the idea is to capture the pragmatic dimension to theory acceptance: reasons for committing to and working with a scientific theory are different from reasons for believing the theory to be true.

One of the reasons *The Scientific Image* is viewed as significant in that it carries on the tradition of the logical positivists, without suffering from most of the problematic aspects of the positivists' positions. Van Fraassen follows the logical positivists in rejecting metaphysical commitments in science, but he parts with them regarding their endorsement of the verificationist criterion of meaning, as well as their endorsement of the syntactic view of scientific theories, where theories are formulated linguistically. He holds that the logical positivists went too far in their attempts to turn philosophical problems into problems about language. He does not think that the claims

that theories make about unobservables, or the more metaphysical claims theories make about reality, are meaningless; he just thinks that it is reasonable to be agnostic about whether these claims are true. Also, in contrast to the syntactic view of scientific theories, he promulgates the semantic view, where a theory is formulated as a class of mathematical models, together with hypotheses that specify how these models putatively represent reality.

Many of the controversies surrounding constructive empiricism are related to van Fraassen's emphasis on the observable/unobservable distinction. Van Fraassen has a lot to say about what "observable" amounts to, but the rough idea is that an entity is observable if and only if it is capable of being directly perceived by the unaided senses. Thus, dinosaurs and distant stars are observable, while elementary particles and objects that one can only see with the aid of a microscope are not. The observable/unobservable distinction is critically discussed in many of the essays in the book *Images of Science*, a collection of responses to *The Scientific Image*.

After *The Scientific Image*, van Fraassen's next major book was *Laws and Symmetry*, published in 1989. He continues to espouse an empiricist understanding of science by arguing that there are no laws of nature. While the view that there are no laws of nature had been viewed by many as "truly eccentric," as David Armstrong (1983, p. 5) said, van Fraassen's critique of the metaphysical position that there are laws of nature has garnered much respect.

Laws and Symmetry also contains a critique of many aspects of traditional epistemology: epistemology that focuses on issues of justification and warrant for one's beliefs. Part of the critique is a critique of inference to the best explanation (IBE), the rule that one should infer that the best explanation one has for a phenomenon is the true one. These arguments against IBE build on arguments in *The Scientific Image* against the importance of explanation in science. Van Fraassen argues that explanation is a pragmatic notion, and is not a guide to

truth. In contrast to traditional epistemology, in *Laws and Symmetry* (and also in his important paper "Belief and the Will," 1984) he defends a probabilistic, voluntarist epistemology. His epistemology focuses not on justification of opinion but on the rationality of change of opinion. It is voluntarist in that it holds that rationality is just bridled irrationality – rationality does not dictate opinion; rational people with the same evidence can have differences of opinion. It is probabilistic in that opinions are represented by degrees of belief, and normal changes of opinion take place via conditionalization. While a lot of philosophical work in probabilistic epistemology happens in a vacuum, not paying attention to the arguments and concerns of traditional epistemologists, one of the virtues of van Fraassen's work is that he is explicit about presenting his epistemology as an alternative to traditional epistemology. The final part of *Laws and Symmetry* contains a discussion of symmetry arguments as used in metaphysics, physics, and probability theory. This discussion of symmetry arguments is interesting in its own right, and also is significant in that it shows how stringently symmetry arguments constrain theory formation.

In the 1970s and 80s van Fraassen published various papers in the area of foundations of quantum mechanics. This work culminated in his 1991 book *Quantum Mechanics: An Empiricist View*. Because of the conceptual problems in quantum mechanics (such as the measurement problem, exemplified by the Schrödinger cat thought experiment), philosophers attempt to come up with interpretations of the theory that resolve the conceptual difficulties. As van Fraassen puts it, philosophers want to know how the world could possibly be the way quantum mechanics says it is. The project is one that both scientific realists and constructive empiricists can engage in.

Van Fraassen was the first person to develop the framework for the modal interpretation of quantum mechanics, an interpretation which is still under discussion and development. He did this in his 1972 paper "A Formal Approach to

the Philosophy of Science" and his 1973 paper "Semantic Analysis of Quantum Logic." Also, he has done significant work on the problem of identical particles in quantum mechanics; this is discussed in the last two chapters of his 1991 book.

Despite the fact that there are issues in quantum mechanics that can be addressed equivalently by realists and empiricists, such as the ones discussed in the previous paragraph, there are differences between a realist and empiricist approach to quantum mechanics. Van Fraassen puts it most succinctly at the end of the appendix to his "The Charybdis of Realism": according to the empiricist, "There does not have to be a reason for everything." (1989, p. 113) While we need a theory that fits the phenomena, from an empiricist perspective, we do not need a theory that yields an explanation of the phenomena; we do not need a theory that gives us "the reason why." This is relevant to the mysterious nonlocal correlations one gets in quantum mechanics (exemplified by the experimental violation of Bell's inequalities); while many theorists attempt to search for an explanation of these correlations, van Fraassen rejects the demand for explanation. His position here, though a minority one, has been influential.

In the 1990s van Fraassen's work turned to the question "what is it to be an empiricist?" This culminated in his 2002 book, *The Empirical Stance*. Here he positions empiricism in opposition to (pre-Kantian) metaphysics. Specifically, the targets of the empiricist critique are "forms of metaphysics that (a) give absolute primacy to demands for explanation and (b) are satisfied with explanations-by-postulate, that is, explanations that postulate the reality of certain entities or aspects of the world not already evident in experience" (p. 37).

Van Fraassen argues that many formulations of empiricism in the past have themselves ended up being metaphysical positions. He holds that there is no one doctrine that can characterize empiricism; instead empiricism should be

viewed as a philosophical stance. Roughly speaking, a stance is a cluster of attitudes, commitments, approaches, and sometimes beliefs. It is not just empiricism that is a stance, according to van Fraassen; many other philosophical positions are best understood as stances as well. Given that various philosophical positions are stances, how can one adjudicate between stances? Why should one adopt the empiricist stance? In his essay "The World of Empiricism" (p. 123), van Fraassen admits that perhaps one would "feel a great dismay that empiricism deprives us of so much that might comfort us in a hostile world." But he is sanguine about this: what empiricism can offer is "the agony and the ecstasy of freedom in a world governed by no laws except those we create ourselves."

In addition to the discussion of the nature of empiricism, *The Empirical Stance* also contains a discussion of the relationship between science and religion. Van Fraassen is a theist, though *The Empirical Stance* is one of the few places where the point comes up in his philosophical writings. He holds that science is a paradigm of rational inquiry, but he also holds that science does not require a secular attitude. He writes: "It is a poor love, and a poor sense of the sacred, that cannot live in a world infused by science" (p. 185).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Singular Terms, Truth-Value Gaps and Free Logic," *Journal of Philosophy* 63 (1966): 481–95.

An Introduction to the Philosophy of Time and Space (New York, 1970; 2nd edn 1985).

Derivation and Counterexample: An Introduction to Philosophical Logic, with Karel Lambert (Encino, Cal., 1972).

The Scientific Image (Oxford, 1980).

"Belief and the Will," *Journal of Philosophy* 81 (1984): 235–56.

Laws and Symmetry (Oxford, 1989).

Quantum Mechanics: An Empiricist View (Oxford, 1991).

"The World of Empiricism," in *Physics and Our View of the World*, ed. Jan Hilgevoord (Cambridge, UK, 1994), pp. 114–34.

"The False Hopes of Traditional Epistemology," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 60 (2000): 253–80.

The Empirical Stance (New Haven, Conn., 2002).

Possibilities and Paradox: An Introduction to Modal and Many-Valued Logic, with J. C. Beall (Oxford, 2003).

Other Relevant Works

"The Completeness of Free Logic," *Zeitschrift fur Mathem. Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik* 12 (1966): 219–34.

"A Formal Approach to the Philosophy of Science," in *Paradigms and Paradoxes*, ed. R. Colodny (Pittsburgh, 1972), pp. 303–66.

"Semantic Analysis of Quantum Logic," in *Contemporary Research in the Foundations and Philosophy of Quantum Theory*, ed. Clifford Hooker (Dordrecht, 1973), pp. 80–113.

"The Peculiar Effects of Love and Desire," in *Perspectives on Self-Deception*, ed. Amelie Rorty and Brian McLaughlin (Berkeley, 1988), pp. 123–56.

"The Charybdis of Realism: Epistemological Implications of Bell's Inequality," in *Philosophical Consequences of Quantum Theory,* ed. James Cushing and Ernan McMullin (Notre Dame, Ind., 1989), pp. 97–113.

"On (Ix)(x = Lambert)," in *Existence and Explanation*, ed. Wolfgang Spohn, Bas van Fraassen, and Brian Skyrms (Dordrecht, 1991), pp. 1–18.

"Interpretation in Science and in the Arts," with Jill Sigman, in *Realism and Representation*, ed. G. Levine (Madison, Wis., 1993), pp. 73–99.

"Against Transcendental Empiricism," in *The Question of Hermenutics*, ed. T. J.

Stapleton (Dordrecht, 1994), pp. 309–35.

"Against Naturalized Empiricism," in *On Quine*, ed. P. Leionardi and M. Santambrogio (Cambridge, UK, 1995), pp. 68–88.

"Belief and the Problem of Ulysses and the Sirens," *Philosophical Studies* 77 (1995): 7–37.

"The Agnostic Subtly Probabilified," *Analysis* 58 (1998): 212–20.

"Constructive Empiricism Now," *Philosophical Studies* 106 (2001): 151–70.

"Constructive Empiricism and Modal Nominalism," with Bradley Monton, *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 54 (2003): 405–22.

Further Reading
Oxford Comp Phil

Armstrong, David. *What is a Law of Nature?* (Cambridge, UK, 1983).

Churchland, Paul, and Clifford Hooker, eds. *Images of Science: Essays on Realism and Empiricism, with a Reply from Bas C. van Fraassen* (Chicago, 1985).

Fine, Arthur. "The Scientific Image Twenty Years Later," *Philosophical Studies* 106 (2001): 107–22.

McMullin, Ernan. "Van Fraassen's Unappreciated Realism," *Philosophy of Science* 70 (2003): 455–78.

Salmon, Wesley, and Philip Kitcher. "Van Fraassen on Explanation," *Journal of Philosophy* 84 (1987): 315–30.

Bradley Monton

VAN HEIJENOORT, Jean Louis Maxime (1912–86)

Jean van Heijenoort was born on 23 July 1912 in Creil, France, and died on 28 March 1986 near Cuernavaca, outside of Mexico City. He was educated at the Collège de Clermont and at the Lycée de St. Louis in Paris, studying mathematics and philosophy, receiving baccalaureate degrees in both disciplines. Although admitted to the Ecole Normale Supérieure, he apparently never attended; he instead became a secretary and bodyguard to Leon Trotsky in 1932 and continued political work for several years after Trotsky's death in 1940. As Trotsky's secretary, he met John Dewey in Mexico in 1937 when the Dewey Commission convened to examine Stalin's allegations against Trotsky.

Trotsky's assassination and revelations of Stalin's atrocities led van Heijenoort to question the political-ideological premises of Bolshevism. The squabbles between factions of Trotskyites among the New York intellectuals which Trotsky had sent him to mediate, and especially the antiquated conceptions of logic which were exhibited by some, including Trotsky himself, led him also to reevaluate the intellectual relevance of Marxism and its founders. Both his political and his intellectual conversions were expressed in 1948 in "A Century's Balance Sheet" and "Friedrich Engels and Mathematics." From 1940 until his death, van Heijenoort nevertheless served as special archivist for the Trotsky papers at Harvard University, and wrote his personal reflections and reminiscences of Trotsky in *With Trotsky in Exile* and contributed to the bibliographical and the historiographical development of Trotsky studies. After considerable bureaucratic delay he became a US citizen in 1959.

In 1945 van Heijenoort resumed his education by entering New York University, from which he received his MA in 1946 and his PhD in mathematics in 1949. Mathematician Aleksandr Danilovich Aleksandrov anticipated by a few weeks, and published, the principal theorem on differential geometry of van Heijenoort's doctoral thesis, "On Locally Convex Surfaces." This fact may help to explain van Heijenoort's later reluctance to publish his own original work. He taught mathematics at Bard College in 1942–3, at Harvard

for the ASTP Army program (an accelerated academic program providing soldiers with specialized technical education) in 1943–4, and at Wagoner College in 1945–6. From 1946 to 1965 he taught in the undergraduate mathematics program at New York University, and he also taught at Columbia University as a visiting professor from 1961 to 1963, where he first had the opportunity to teach mathematical logic. He later taught at Brandeis University, first as a visiting professor in 1960 and thereafter as professor of mathematics from 1965 until retirement in 1977, teaching logic, its history, and philosophy. From 1981 until his death in 1986, van Heijenoort was a visiting professor at Stanford University, working on the Kurt Gödel Edition Project, the Trotsky papers at Stanford's Hoover Institution, and an uncompleted study comparing the philosophies of history of Trotsky and Thucydides.

During debates between the New York Trotskyites, especially Max Eastman, James Burnham, and Sidney HOOK, Trotsky accused Burnham of misunderstanding dialectical materialism, and he laid the blame for this on Hook's criticisms of Marxism. Burnham in reply complained that Trotsky was ignorant of twentieth-century logic. Intrigued by these debates, van Heijenoort began studying mathematical logic, and this led to his appointment by Alonzo CHURCH as a consulting editor to the *Journal of Symbolic Logic* (1968–79), during which time van Heijenoort produced numerous abstracts and reviews of writings in logic, its history, and philosophy. Aware of van Heijenoort's study of the work of the mathematical logicians of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and of his linguistic abilities, W. V. QUINE recommended van Heijenoort to Harvard University Press when asked who might edit a volume on the history of mathematical logic. Thus van Heijenoort came to be the editor of the celebrated anthology *From Frege to Gödel*, which cemented recognition of van Heijenoort as a leading scholar in the history of mathematical logic and helped to shape American philosophers'

perception of the history of logic – although some historians of logic would later criticize him for his failure to include representative works of the algebraic logicians of the Boolean school or works by Alfred TARSKI.

Van Heijenoort learned logic by learning its history, and he was largely self-taught. Although he was largely self-taught also in foundations and philosophy of mathematics, he came under the guidance of Georg KREISEL. Nevertheless, once freed from his youthful dependence upon the domineering personality of Trotsky, van Heijenoort maintained a critical independence and, much like Kreisel, his views on logic and its history, or any other topic, were always his own.

Van Heijenoort published little of his own research in logic, although he taught several generations of philosophy students the basics of the falsifiability tree method for constructing proofs and testing the validity of proofs for propositional logic and the predicate calculus, and contributed innovations and improvements of his own to that technique, including elegant new proofs (which remained unpublished) of the completeness and soundness of the falsifiability tree method. The majority of his handful of publications, in addition to *From Frege to Gödel* and his edition of Jacques Herbrand's *Ecrits logiques*, were contributions to the history and philosophy of logic. These two subjects were indissolubly linked in van Heijenoort's conception, and many of his writings, including those devoted to elucidating Frege's role in the development of mathematical logic, discussed these contributions in terms of the continuing battle between Gottlob Frege's and Bertrand Russell's absolutism in logic and the relativism of the Booleans. For van Heijenoort, Frege was the creator of mathematical logic. He held that Frege's greatest and enduring contributions to logic included the choice of a fixed universal domain of discourse (the *Universum*), development of a calculus having an extensional semantic and function-theoretic syntax, creation, *ex nihilo*, of a propositional logic, a theory of quantification,

and logicism, thereby neglecting the development, by Charles S. PEIRCE and his student O. H. Mitchell, of a logic of relations and a first-order and second-order quantification theory for that logic.

Next to Frege, the work of Jacques Herbrand took a focal point in van Heijenoort's conception of the history of mathematical logic. Herbrand's work opened the way for the development of the theories of quantification of axiomatic systems, natural deduction, the Gentzen sequence calculus, and Herbrand quantification as a "family of formal systems," which van Heijenoort surveyed in *El dessarrollo de la teoría de la cuantificación*. GÖDEL's incompleteness theorems brings this phase of the development of mathematical logic to its close and to its maturity, marking off the effective limits as it does of the logicist program devised by Frege and Russell. The challenges to the logicist program by Gödel's theorems, together with the "logical" or set-theoretical paradoxes, and especially the Russell Paradox, led to the foundational disputes between the adherents of logicism, formalism, and intuitionism. Gödel's work of 1931 brought, van Heijenoort thought, the formative period of mathematical logic that had begun in 1879 with the appearance in 1879 of Frege's *Begriffsschrift* to a close. Van Heijenoort's major publications dealt with these aspects of the history of logic, and his chief contribution in this regard were his anthologies, *From Frege to Gödel*, Herbrand's *Ecrits logiques*, and his work, until his death, on Gödel's *Collected Works* under the general editorship of his friend Solomon FEFERMAN.

For his own use, van Heijenoort came to favor the analytic tableaux, or *tree method*, developed in the mid 1960s by Raymond Smullyan, which were essentially one-sided Beth tableaux, based upon a cut-free version of Gentzen's natural deduction, and he quickly adopted Richard JEFFREY's *Formal Logic* (1967), the first textbook using the tree method, as his favorite textbook. Van Heijenoort undertook investigations into the tree method,

exploring in particular its relation to other methods among the "family of formal systems" that comprise quantification theory, but his only major publication of a technical (non-historical, non-philosophical) nature was his application of the tree method to non-classical logics, in particular to intuitionisatic logic and to modal logic, in his *Introduction à la sémantique des logiques non-classiques* (1979).

Van Heijenoort's professional reputation rested almost entirely upon his editorial work. *From Frege to Gödel* in particular became a source of attraction to logicians and aspiring logicians, and with the astute, if concise, introductions to each of the articles it contains, has been a powerful formative influence upon our understanding of the history of modern mathematical logic and foundations of mathematics. It has, moreover, as Solomon Feferman proclaimed, set the rigorous standard for similar endeavors, including in particular for the preparation of Gödel's *Collected Works*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ed., *From Frege to Gödel: A Source Book in Mathematical Logic, 1879–1931* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967).

"Logic as Calculus and Logic as Language," *Synthese* 17 (1967): 324–30.

Ed., *Jacques Herbrand, Ecrits logiques* (Paris, 1968).

Ed., *Frege and Gödel: Two Fundamental Texts in Mathematical Logic* (Cambridge, Mass., 1970).

"Subject and Predicate in Western Logic," *Philosophy East and West* 24 (1974): 253–68.

El desarollo de la teoría de la cuantificación (Mexico City, 1976).

Hacia una explicación de las entitades logicas (Mexico City, 1976).

Introduction à la sémantique des logiques non-classiques (Paris, 1979).

"Frege and Vagueness," in *Frege Synthesized: Studies of the Philosophical and Foundational Work of Gottlob Frege*, ed. Leila Haaparanta and Jaakko Hintikka

(Dordrecht, 1985), pp. 31–45.

Selected Essays (Naples, Italy, 1986).

"Historical Development of Modern Logic," *Modern Logic* 2 (1992): 242–55.

Other Relevant Works

Van Heijenoort's papers are in the Archives of American Mathematics at the University of Texas at Austin.

With Trotsky in Exile: From Prinkipo to Coyoacán (Cambridge, Mass., 1978).

Ed. and trans., *Léon et Natalia Trotsky, Correspondence 1933–1938* (Paris, 1980).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio

Anellis, Irving H. "Jean van Heijenoort, the Revolutionary, the Scholar, and Man (1912–1986)," *Studies in Soviet Thought* 35 (1988): 147–78.

———, "Some Unpublished Papers of Jean van Heijenoort: Sources," *Historia Mathematica* 15 (1988): 270–74.

———, *Van Heijenoort: Logic and Its History in the Work and Writings of Jean van Heijenoort* (Ames, Iowa, 1994).

Dawson, John W., Jr. "Jean van Heijenoort: An All Too Brief Acquaintance," *Modern Logic* 2 (1992): 228–30.

Feferman, Anita B. *Politics, Logic, and Love: The Life of Jean van Heijenoort* (Boston and Wellesley, Mass., 1993).

Jeffrey, Richard C. *Formal Logic: Its Scope and Limits* (New York, 1967).

Quine, W. V. "Van Heijenoort," *Modern Logic* 2 (1992): 227.

Irving H. Anellis

VEATCH, Henry Babcock (1911–99)

Henry Veatch was born on 26 September 1911 in Evansville, Indiana. He attended Harvard, which granted him his BA with honors in 1932, his MA in philosophy in 1933, and, after two years of study at Heidelberg, his PhD in philosophy in 1936. He had among his teachers Alfred WHITEHEAD, H. M. SHEFFER, Ralph PERRY, C. I. LEWIS, Arthur LOVEJOY, and Karl Jaspers. He spent most of his career at Indiana University (1937–65), becoming distinguished senior professor of philosophy in 1961. From 1965 to 1973 he was professor of philosophy at Northwestern University, and from 1973 to 1983 he was professor of philosophy at Georgetown University. Veatch died on 9 July 1999 in Bloomington, Indiana.

Veatch was popular and rigorous teacher because of his wit and insightfulness, and he mentored over fifty doctoral students. He was active in professional groups, including the Society for Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy, the Society for Metaphysics (President, 1960–61), the American Philosophical Association (President of the Western Division, 1970–71) and the American Catholic Philosophical Association (President, 1979–80). Veatch received a wide variety of honors and was active in the Episcopal Church.

Veatch was a prolific author, writing ten books, over fifty articles, and dozens of book reviews. Although his training was in analytic philosophy, he became a realist early in his career, and later he was a leading proponent of a modernized Aristotelian–Thomistic viewpoint. Veatch did extensive and technical work in logic. He held mathematical logic to be fundamentally nominalistic and concerned with the relationships we establish within the conceptual structures we choose to set up, making it useful in developing science but not in philosophy and the other humanities. Aristotelian logic, however, is based on a realist metaphysics and is concerned with the proper ordering of our cognitive acts, through which we can understand the world and justify our moral values.

In epistemology, Veatch rebutted modern views of sensation and ideas as mere representations, which logically lead to idealism and

skepticism. He defended Aristotelian realism and empiricism: we do grasp objectively what things are, however incompletely. This knowledge, although sometimes wrong, is corrigible and is generally reliable. He also held it reasonable to remain open to religious faith claims. To make sense of our world, Veatch recommended a return to Aristotelian metaphysics: its notions of actuality and potentiality, matter and form, substance and accidents, and the four types of causes. Only through them can we attain a consistent and objective understanding of our changing world and of our role as responsible agents within it.

In ethics, Veatch argued against relativism, utilitarianism, and deontology, and instead defended a natural law view. His attacks on positivism and analytic philosophy, which were dominant in the mid twentieth century, make him now seem rather prescient. He thought of himself mainly as a defender of what many had come to think of as outdated views which, when properly understood, were really more objective and insightful than most theories of the last four centuries. He wrote works that heightened the appreciation of Aristotle that professional colleagues, as well as informed readers, found stimulating.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Intentional Logic: A Logic Based on Philosophical Realism (New Haven, Conn., 1952).

Realism and Nominalism Revisited (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1954).

Logic as a Human Instrument, with Francis H. Parker (New York, 1959).

Rational Man: A Modern Interpretation of Aristotelian Ethics (Bloomington, Ind., 1962).

Two Logics: The Conflict between Classical and Neo-Analytic Philosophy (Evanston, Ill., 1969).

For an Ontology of Morals: A Critique of Contemporary Ethical Theory (Evanston, Ill., 1971).

Aristotle: A Contemporary Appreciation (Bloomington, Ind., 1974).

Human Rights: Fact or Fancy? (Baton Rouge, La., 1985).

Swimming Against the Current in Contemporary Philosophy: Occasional Essays and Papers (Washington, D.C., 1990).

Other Relevant Works

Veatch's papers are at Indiana University.

Ed. with John B. Brough and Daniel O. Dahlstrom, *Philosophical Knowledge* (Washington, D.C., 1980).

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v8, *Proc of APA v73*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Peterson, John. "Realism, Propositions, and Professor Veatch," *New Scholasticism* 76 (1976): 464–80.

Porreco, Rocco, ed. *The Georgetown Symposium on Ethics: Essays in Honor of Henry Babcock Veatch* (Lanham, Md., 1984). Contains a bibliography of Veatch's writings.

Gerard J. Dalcourt

VEBLEN, Oswald (1880–1960)

Oswald Veblen was born on 24 June 1880 in Decorah, Iowa, and he died on 10 August 1960 in Brooklyn, Maine. He entered the University of Iowa in 1894, receiving his BA in 1898. After earning a BA from Harvard University in 1901, he received his PhD in mathematics from the University of Chicago in 1903, working on geometry under the direction of E. H. Moore, and studying philosophy with John DEWEY. His "Hilbert's Foundations of Geometry" (1902), a review of the English translation of David Hilbert's *Grundlagen der Geometrie*, helped introduce Hilbert's work to those

American mathematicians who had not themselves gone abroad to pursue advanced study, and introduced as well the themes of the consistency, completeness, and independence of sets of postulate for various mathematical theories that became the hallmark and central focus of the American postulate theorists. In this work, Veblen set the context of Hilbert's work and explained his axiomatic method as applied to geometry, noting (1902, p. 307) that his axioms "are in the main independent, but his system of elements is far from irreducible." He points out (pp. 307–8) that Hilbert himself did not fully investigate the independence of his axioms, and that E. H. Moore had already shown that all but one of Hilbert's axioms are independent.

Upon receiving his doctorate, Veblen taught mathematics at the University of Chicago from 1903 to 1905 and then at Princeton University from 1905 to 1932, before moving to the Institute of Advanced Study in Princeton, N.J. where he worked from 1932 to 1950. During World War I, he served as a major with the ordinance department at Aberdeen Proving Ground. He was the organizer and administrator for mathematics at Princeton University, and he was instrumental in sending Alonzo CHURCH to the University of Göttingen to study with Hilbert, and then bringing Church onto the Princeton faculty, thereby establishing one of the leading centers for mathematical logic in the United States in the 1920s and 30s. While at the Institute for Advanced Study, Veblen brought Kurt GÖDEL and Albert EINSTEIN to the Institute.

Veblen applied the axiomatics in particular to projective and differential geometry, and especially quadratic differential forms, treating Riemannian geometry and topology (*analysis situs*). His *Foundations of Differential Geometry*, written with student J. H. C. Whitehead, provided the first definition of a projective manifold. Veblen also worked in logic and set theory, and in the theory of axiomatics, including foundations and axiomatizations of geometry. His thesis, "A System of Axioms for Geometry," was based on the primitives *point* and *order* rather than *point*, *line*, and *plane*. In his "Remarks on the Foundations of Geometry," based on his American Mathematical Society presidential address of 1924, he prognosticated, from the standpoint of the foundations of mathematics, "In the process of constructing [such a foundation] we are likely to adopt the Russell point of view that mathematics is coextensive with logic." (1925, p. 141).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Hilbert's Foundations of Geometry," *The Monist* 13 (1902): 303–6.

"A System of Axioms for Geometry," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 5 (1904): 343–84.

Projective Geometry, 2 vols, with John Wesley Young (Boston, 1910, 1918).

Analysis Situs (New York, 1922; 2nd edn 1931).

"Remarks on the Foundations of Geometry," *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 31 (1925): 121–41.

The Foundations of Differential Geometry, with J. H. C. Whitehead (Cambridge, UK, 1932).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*

Aspray, William. "Oswald Veblen and the Origins of Mathematical Logic at Princeton," in *Perspectives on the History of Mathematical Logic*, ed. Thomas Drucker (Boston, 1991), pp. 54–70.

Mac Lane, Saunders. "Oswald Veblen," in *Biographical Memoirs: National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 37 (Washington, D.C., 1964), pp. 325–41.

Montgomery, Dean. "Oswald Veblen," *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 69 (1963): 26–36.

Irving H. Anellis

VEBLEN, Thorstein Bunde (1857–1929)

Thorstein Veblen was born on 30 July 1857 in Cato Township, Manitowoc County, Wisconsin, and grew up on a farm in Wheeling Township, Minnesota. Veblen attended Carleton College in nearby Northfield, Minnesota and graduated with a BA in 1880, studying philosophy and political economy with John Bates CLARK. His interests led him to Johns Hopkins in 1881, where he planned to study with Richard T. ELY and where he heard philosophy lectures by Charles PEIRCE. Veblen failed to obtain a scholarship to continue his studies at Johns Hopkins after entering an essay competition on political economy with a paper on unearned income, "J. S. Mill's Theory of the Taxation of Land." Lack of financial support prompted a transfer to Yale, where he earned a PhD in philosophy in 1884 with a dissertation entitled "Ethical Grounds of a Doctrine of Retribution."

Despite glowing recommendations and vigorous efforts, Veblen was unable to obtain an academic or professional appointment upon graduation probably due to his atheist skepticism and impious attitude toward Christianity. There are several gaps between his numerous academic appointments teaching economics: the University of Chicago (1892–1906), associate professor of economics at Stanford University (1906–9), lecturer at the University of Missouri (1911–17), and the New School for Social Research (1919–26). Veblen died on 3 August 1929 in Menlo Park, California.

Veblen was a social critic recognized during his lifetime as a premier institutional analyst of industrial capitalism and corporation finance. He continues to inspire work in a number of fields, including economics, sociology, accounting, aesthetics, political science, and consumer sciences. A powerful but uneven stylist, Veblen was responsible for coining, polishing, or popularizing a number of concepts and phrases linked to social and economic criticism, including business sabotage, conspicuous consumption, invidious distinction, trained incapacity, status emulation, penalty of taking the lead, keeping up with the Jones's, pecuniary interests, idle curiosity, instinct of workmanship, and vested interests. A central contribution of Veblen's work is his analytic distinction between industry and business, the former concerned with serviceability and productivity, the latter with marketing and profit. Veblen's writings sustain a surprising independence of vision and avoid conformity to prevalent conventions or ideologies. These attributes have often been traced to his upbringing in culturally distinct Norwegian immigrant communities surrounded by practical, technologically astute and adaptable farmers.

After completing his doctorate, he spent the next seven years in autonomous, private study, primarily while living on a farm in Stacyville, Iowa. During these years, he completed a translation of the *Laxdaela Saga* from the Icelandic, a project that was not published until 1926. Veblen's introduction to the saga details the correspondence between barbaric booty or plunder capitalism of Viking raiders and contemporary corporate activity, a theme developed even more powerfully in his exceptional 1904 essay, "An Early Experiment in Trusts," reprinted in *The Place of Science in Modern Civilization and Other Essays* (1919).

Finally, in 1891 Veblen tried to revive his chances at an academic appointment by enrolling as a graduate student at Cornell University. He obtained a grant with the help of economist J. Laurence Laughlin, and when Laughlin moved in 1892 to the University of Chicago, he took Veblen with him, securing for him a teaching fellowship in economics. At Chicago, Veblen worked on the staff of the *Journal of Political Economy*, where he published an impressive number of book reviews and articles, and eventually served as the journal's managing editor. In his first years at Chicago, he translated from the German Gustav Cohn's sophisticated and detailed *The Science of Finance* (1895). He also published his first and most widely read book, *The*

Theory of the Leisure Class (1899), followed by *The Theory of Business Enterprise* (1904). He was eventually appointed to the regular faculty as an assistant professor in 1900 and was part of the remarkable group of philosophically-oriented Chicago professors that included John DEWEY, George Herbert MEAD, and William Isaac THOMAS.

Veblen's relationship with University of Chicago administration deteriorated in 1904, in part because of allegations of extramarital sexual activity but also because Veblen had written a powerful critique of academic administration focused upon the pernicious influence of business interests in academic life, not published until 1918 as *The Higher Learning in America* (originally subtitled "A Study in Total Depravity"), that antagonized key administrators. In 1906 Veblen was appointed associate professor at Stanford University, but by 1909 he again ran afoul of university administrators who expressed concern for his irregular marital and extramarital relations and he was again forced to seek employment elsewhere. From 1911 to 1918 he was employed on a year-to-year basis as a lecturer at the University of Missouri, in Columbia, Missouri. Though he disparaged the town, the University of Missouri was solicitous toward him and provided him with the most congenial environment he encountered in his academic wanderings. Dorfman's account of his teaching and collegial relationships at Missouri (1966, pp. 302–18) leaves one with a sense that Veblen received admiration and respect, if not tenured employment, from the university. Veblen published several books during this period, including *The Instinct of Workmanship and the State of the Industrial Arts* (1914), *Imperial Germany and the Industrial Revolution* (1915), and *An Inquiry into the Nature of the Peace* (1917).

During World War I, Veblen worked as a "special investigator" for the US Food Administration in Washington, D.C., an agency charged with setting price controls during the war. Immediately after the war,

Veblen accepted an appointment as one of John Dewey's co-editors on the resurrection of *The Dial*, a journal famously associated with Ralph Waldo EMERSON and the transcendentalists. Veblen was one of the journal's major contributors, publishing a steady stream of powerfully argued, somewhat nonacademic, articles and essays, including the classics: "Panem et Circenses," "On the Nature and Uses of Sabotage," and "Bolshevism is a Menace – to Whom?" Most of his *Dial* essays were gathered together in the posthumously published *Essays in Our Changing Order* (1934). When *The Dial* converted into a literary magazine in 1919, Veblen accepted a teaching position in the New School for Social Research, his last academic appointment. Books published during this period include *The Vested Interests and the State of the Industrial Arts* (1919) and a collection of essays and articles, *The Place of Science in Modern Civilization* (1919), *The Engineers and the Price System* (1921), and what may well have been his best book, *Absentee Ownership and Business Enterprise in Recent Times; the Case of America* (1923). This last book contains a mature, sober, and comprehensive analysis of the institutional structure of property ownership and control in the United States, focused not only upon corporate stock ownership, but also upon the dependent, indebted condition of farmers who are tied to the industrial system through railroads and supply outlets in country towns.

During the later 1920s Veblen's critique of capitalism, with its powerful imagery of predatory finance misdirecting corporate activity toward merely pecuniary ends, was overshadowed by the euphoric expansion of stock market participation and apparent prosperity. After the stock market crash of 1929, the ensuing depression led to a sea-change in the evaluation of Veblen's significance, as a new group of political actors influenced by Veblen inaugurated massive economic and social reforms in the Roosevelt Administration's New Deal.

Veblen's impact upon American letters is broad. Since his death a number of highly regarded intellectuals have debated the significance of his work, including Wesley C. Mitchell, John Dewey, Theodor ADORNO, Paul Baran and Paul Sweezey, C. Wright MILLS, Talcott PARSONS, Lewis MUMFORD, John Kenneth GALBRAITH, Stuart Chase, and Robert Heilbroner. Despite many shared assumptions and parallel analyses, American Marxists have neglected Veblen, in part because of his critique of Marx and Hegelian thought, and in part because of his idiosyncratic views. His influence has been through his writings, since his irregular employment did not enable him to build a large cadre of graduate students who continued his work. His analysis of the machinations of predatory finance and the mechanisms of leisure-class control of the economy were widely influential.

Veblen's autonomy of vision and independence has sometimes been traced to admiration for post-Darwinian scientific objectivity. As a leading advocate of Darwinian evolutionary reasoning (and a powerful though sympathetic critic of Hegelian thought), Veblen advocated the reconstruction of economics into an evolutionary science dedicated to the adequate tracing of cause and effect relationships rather than the articulation of satisfying but empirically inadequate, images of "sufficient reason." He consistently argued that the highly individuated "hedonistic calculus" of mainstream economics was too constricting, and advocated a displacement of economic reasoning to the institutional level.

Veblen is of continuing relevance for contemporary socio economic analysts in large part because he understood and clarified the significance of corporate finance and business reorganization in modern capitalism. *The Theory of Business Enterprise* (1904) is his first major structural analysis of the American economy and is arguably one of the first original institutional analyses of modern capitalism completed by an American scholar. In this book, and in *Absentee Ownership* (1923), he traced the impact of pecuniary interests, predatory financiers and the "captains of industry" upon industrial corporations, diverted from single-minded focus upon production efficiency and high productivity. Perhaps better than any analyst of his day, Veblen recognized that large-scale corporate combinations, mergers, and reorganizations were rarely initiated in order to increase productivity and total production, but rather almost always resulted in a net reduction in output. His work points to the use of scientific management as a mere legitimation of predatorial finance. Production engineers, submitting to the technicality and inner logic of the machine process, compel production improvements that would enhance the economic welfare of a community; however, the engineers are not in control of modern corporations, but rather financially sophisticated businessmen. Veblen generally sees business reorganizations and corporate change as a financial machination to realize pecuniary ends, rather than an industrial change to boost efficiency or productivity. It is well known that he argued that corporate changes often constitute "business sabotage," restrictions in production volume in order to manipulate prices and increase profits. But he also argued that corporate reorganizations enable financiers and promoters to capture profits on the stock and bond markets and constitute an important mechanism for the realization of pecuniary ends in modern business. Comparing his 1904 and 1923 books, it can be argued that Veblen placed an increased emphasis upon the institution of stock ownership and control, as well as the utilization of business reorganization as a mechanism to capture financial gains. The sovereignty of financial interests over production management has continued and has been an important factor in recent corporate changes (Krier 2005).

Veblen's seminal work, *The Theory of the Leisure Class*, is more cultural in tone and argument than economic. It contains little sustained analysis of contemporary industrial con-

ditions or corporate financial structures. Yet, Veblen's typification and analysis of the "leisure class" as a self-identified, powerful group of predator/parasites living off the "underlying population" is an enduring contribution to the critique of capitalism. As an ever greater proportion of the world's population is drawn into the global working class, important economic sectors and dynamics have formed around the trading and consumption of the economic surplus by a global leisure class. Veblen's writings contain a penetrating analysis of the leisure-class consumption ethic, the use of consumption to display status and acquire respectability, and the continuation of barbaric modes of living in the midst of modernity. He reveals that a great deal of consumption is driven by a somewhat desperate attempt to maintain respectability through conformity to leisure-class standards of taste. His class analysis, emphasizing the wasteful nature of much economic activity, though inspired by Marx, is more fully saturated with American cultural content. Conspicuous leisure, wealth and waste, and invidious comparisons are built into contemporary marketing schemes, and many students of contemporary consumer capitalism view these phenomena with lenses originally polished by Veblen.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Theory of the Leisure Class (New York, 1899).
The Theory of Business Enterprise (New York, 1904).
The Instinct of Workmanship and the Industrial Arts (New York, 1914).
Imperial Germany and the Industrial Revolution (New York, 1915).
An Inquiry into the Nature of the Peace (New York, 1917).
The Higher Learning in America: A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business (New York, 1919).
The Place of Science in Modern Civilization and Other Essays (New York, 1919).
The Vested Interests and the State of the Industrial Arts (New York, 1919).
The Engineers and the Price System (New York, 1921).
Absentee Ownership and Business Enterprise in Recent Times; the Case of America (New York, 1923).

Other Relevant Works
Veblen's papers are in the Wisconsin State Historical Society in Madison, and at Carleton College in Northfield, Minnesota.
Trans., *The Science of Finance*, by Gustav Cohn (New York, 1895).
Trans., *The Laxdaela Saga* (New York, 1925).
Essays in Our Changing Order, ed. Leon Ardzrooni (New York, 1934; New Brunswick, N.J., 1998).
The Portable Veblen, ed. Max Lerner (New York, 1948).
Essays, Reviews, and Reports: Previously Uncollected Writings, ed. Joseph Dorfman (Clifton, N.J., 1973).

For Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Economics*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v21*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Diggins, John Patrick. *Thorstein Veblen: Theorist of the Leisure Class* (Princeton, N.J., 1999).
Dorfman, Joseph. *Thorstein Veblen and His America* (New York, 1966). Contains a bibliography of Veblen's writings.
Krier, Dan. *Speculative Management: Stock Market Power and Corporate Change* (Albany, N.Y., 2005).
Seckler, David. *Thorstein Veblen and the Institutionalists: A Study in the Social Philosophy of Economics* (Boulder, Col., 1975).
Simich, Jerry L., and Rick Tilman.

Thorstein Veblen: A Reference Guide (Boston, 1985).

Tilman, Rick. *Thorstein Veblen and His Critics, 1891–1963: Conservative, Liberal, and Radical Perspectives* (Princeton, N.J., 1992).

———, *The Intellectual Legacy of Thorstein Veblen: Unresolved Issues* (Westport, Conn., 1996).

Dan Krier

VENDLER, Zeno (1921–2004)

Zeno Vendler was born on 22 December 1921 in Devecser, Hungary. He was educated in Hungary and trained as a Jesuit priest in Maastricht, Holland, receiving the STL degree in 1952. He came to the United States and received a PhD in philosophy from Harvard University in 1959. He briefly taught philosophy at Boston College during 1957–9 but left the Jesuit order, and then taught philosophy at Cornell University during 1960–63 and Brooklyn College in 1964–5. In 1965 Vendler was one of the founding members of the University of Calgary's philosophy department with his appointment as associate professor. He was promoted to full professor in 1967, and served as department head in 1971. In 1973 he went to Rice University as the McManis Professor of Philosophy, and in 1975 he went to the University of California at San Diego, where he was professor of philosophy until retiring in 1989. Vendler died on 13 January 2004 while visiting family in Kossuth, Hungary.

Vendler is best known for his work at the intersection of linguistics, philosophy of language, and philosophy of mind. An early association with Zelig HARRIS, whom Vendler deeply admired, was of lasting influence. A common theme running through Vendler's first three books is that there is great philosophical payoff to be had from the investigation of the structure of words and the way they behave in various contexts. In this sense, he was among the last and linguistically most sophisticated of the ordinary language philosophers. One of Vendler's most important contributions concerns the general notion of the "aspect" of a verbal phrase. Although Vendler credited Aristotle with this discovery, his own work resurrected, clarified and greatly expanded the notion. The "Vendler Classification" is now a standard notion of contemporary linguistic theory.

Vendler's classification broke verbal phrases into four categories, depending on whether they had one, both, or neither of two independent properties. The first property was telicity. A verbal phrase is telic if, as a part of its meaning, it specifies a goal or endpoint, as in "build the house" and "reach the top of the mountain." Verbal phrases lacking such an endpoint specified as a part of their meaning were called "atelic," and they include "laugh" and "know the answer." Vendler famously showed that a mark of telicity and atelicity concerns what sort of durational modifications can be added to the verbal phrase. It is completely normal to say, for instance, that Mary built the house in two weeks or that she reached the top of the mountain in two weeks. However, it is not as natural to say that Mary built the house for two weeks or that she reached the top for two weeks. In contrast, the only meaning that can be assigned to sentences like "Sue laughed in an hour" or "Sue knew the answer in an hour" is one where "in an hour" means something similar to "within an hour after some previously specified time." Importantly, "in an hour" cannot mean what it can mean when it modifies a telic phrase. Similarly, there is no oddity at all in the sentences "Sue laughed for an hour" and "Sue knew the answer for an hour." The "for an hour" or "in an hour" test is widely used today as a diagnostic of telicity.

The second property is that of continuity. A verbal phrase is continuous if it specifies

processes consisting of "successive phases following one another in time" (1967, p. 99). For example "drive the car" and "draw a picture" are both continuous expressions. In contrast, "lose the keys" and "be made of wood" are discontinuous. As with telicity, Vendler noted that there were several diagnostic tests for continuity. In general, only continuous verbal phrases comfortably take the progressive. So although it is natural to say that John was driving the car or drawing a picture yesterday, it would be much less natural to say that he was losing his keys or that the chair was being made of wood.

Although much of Vendler's work involved the careful analysis of everyday language, such efforts were always directed toward understanding traditional philosophical issues from epistemology, metaphysics, and the philosophy of mind and language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Verbs and Times," *Philosophical Review* 56 (1957): 143–60.
Linguistics in Philosophy (Ithaca, N.Y., 1967).
Adjectives and Nominalizations (The Hague, 1968).
Res Cogitans: An Essay in Rational Psychology (Ithaca, N.Y., 1972).
The Matter of Minds (Oxford, 1984).

Further Reading
Proc of APA v77
Bach, Emmon. "The Algebra of Events," *Linguistics and Philosophy* 9 (1986): 5–16.
Dowty, David. *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar* (Dordrecht, 1979).
Peterson, Philip L. "How to Infer Belief from Knowledge," *Philosophical Studies* 32 (1977): 203–209.

Kent Johnson

VIVAS, Eliseo (1901–91)

Eliseo Vivas was born to Venezuelan parents, Eliseo Vivas Perez and Maria Salas de Vivas Perez, on 13 July 1901 in Pamplona, Colombia. Vivas's father was a politician living in exile, and urged him to study a stable profession like engineering. He came to the United States in 1915 and enrolled at the Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute four years later. In 1919 he took an English course with Joseph Wood KRUTCH and decided that he would become a "man of letters." He obtained a Zona Gale scholarship to the University of Wisconsin, where he received his BA degree in 1928. He took a position as Venezuelan Consul in Philadelphia, which enabled him to have a semester of graduate work at the University of Pennsylvania and to also study at the Albert C. Barnes Foundation. Vivas returned to Wisconsin and received his PhD in philosophy in 1935. He stayed on as an assistant professor of philosophy until 1944. Vivas then went to the University of Chicago as an associate professor of philosophy for one year, and had a joint professorship in English and philosophy at the Ohio State University from 1945 to 1951. In 1951 he accepted the John Evans Chair of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy at Northwestern University, where he stayed until his retirement in 1969. Vivas died on 28 August 1991 in Evanston, Illinois.

Vivas held an unusual position by identifying with both philosophical aesthetics – especially in terms of literature and poetics – and criticism. His work fused a relationship between the two, presenting aesthetics and criticism, not as competing rivals, but as informing one another. Vivas was active at the center of New Criticism. Vivas's book, *The Moral Life and the Ethical Life* (1950), outlined the foundation of his philosophical system. He argued that values are objective, and that subjectivist theories cannot resolve moral dilemmas. This book was where Vivas broke with the pragmatism and naturalism of John DEWEY. His criticism of subjectivism and naturalism was consistent

throughout his aesthetics, beginning with *Creation and Discovery* (1955).

Creation and Discovery was a collection of Vivas's most important essays in aesthetics. He elaborated on a distinction between creation and discovery, first suggested in *The Moral Life and the Ethical Life*. The essay entitled, "The Object of the Poem," was most significant in making this distinction. Vivas gave a detailed explanation of how a poem is a work of art, and a creative discovery of values that exist independent of the poem. These values were extracted from a work of art and actualized in human action. Vivas maintained that values were objects and stressed the role of the critic in enhancing the aesthetic experiences of spectators.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Moral Life and the Ethical Life (Chicago, 1950).
Creation and Discovery: Essays in Criticism and Aesthetics (New York, 1955).
The Artistic Transaction and Essays on Theory of Literature (Columbus, Ohio, 1963).

Other Relevant Works
The Problems of Aesthetics: A Book of Readings (New York, 1953).
D. H. Lawrence: The Failure and Triumph of Art (Evanston, Ill., 1960).
Contra Marcuse (New York, 1971).
Two Roads to Ignorance: A Quasi Biography (Carbondale, Ill., 1979).

Further Reading
Who's Who in Phil
Curtler, Hugh. *A Theory of Art, Tragedy, and Literature: The Philosophy of Eliseo Vivas* (New York, 1981).
———, *Eliseo Vivas: An Annotated Bibliography* (New York, 1982).
Curtler, Hugh, ed. *Vivas as Critic: Essays in Poetics and Criticism* (Troy, N.Y., 1982).
Regnery, Henry, ed. *¡Viva Vivas! Essays in Honor of Eliseo Vivas, on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (Indianapolis, 1976).

Joan Grassbaugh Forry

VLASTOS, Gregory (1907–91)

Gregory Vlastos was born on 27 July 1907 in Istanbul, Turkey to a Greek father and a mother of British and Greek descent, and was raised in the Protestant faith. Vlastos graduated from Roberts College of Istanbul in 1925 and came to America to study for the ministry. After receiving a BD degree from Chicago Divinity School, he studied philosophy at Harvard under Alfred North WHITEHEAD, receiving his PhD in philosophy in 1931. His first position was in the philosophy department of Queen's University in Ontario. He married Vernon Abbott Ladd in 1932 and with her was active in Christian socialist causes. An increasing interest in Greek philosophy took Vlastos to the University of Cambridge in 1938 to study under F. M. Cornford. After serving in the Royal Canadian Air Force during World War II, he accepted a philosophy position at Cornell University in 1948, where he learned the methods of analytic philosophy recently introduced to America and applied them to ancient philosophy. In 1954–5 he was a fellow of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, working with Harold Cherniss.

In 1955 Vlastos became Stuart Professor of Philosophy at Princeton University, and held that position until 1976. There he organized the classical philosophy program and led the philosophy department as chair for two long periods, during which Princeton became one of the top philosophy departments in the country. After retiring, Vlastos moved to the University of California at Berkeley, where he was the Mills Visiting Professor of Philosophy until

1987. He also was a distinguished professorial fellow at Christ's College of Cambridge University in 1983–4. Vlastos died on 12 October 1991 in Berkeley, California.

Vlastos combined the rigor of classical scholarship with the precision of analytic philosophy. His studies on Plato, Socrates, and Presocratic philosophy, by their careful scholarship and vigorous argument served as paradigms of a new style of work in the history of philosophy. In a time when historical texts were not considered important to philosophy, he brought them to life. In particular, his article "The Third Man Argument in the *Parmenides*" (1954) provoked replies by such leading philosophers as Peter Geach and Wilfrid SELLARS, against whom Vlastos held his own. He excelled in writing articles that challenged old orthodoxies and opened new lines of interpretation. In Presocratic studies he stressed the role of political ideals in shaping theoretical conceptions. In Platonic studies, he championed a developmental reading of Plato in which the early Plato adhered to Socratic methods and assumptions, which the mature Plato replaced by, or grounded in, complex epistemological and metaphysical theories.

In a career that spanned three generations, Vlastos set the standard for research in ancient philosophy. His program in classical philosophy at Princeton became a model for education in the history of philosophy, and his doctoral students were in demand throughout the country. More than any single person, he was responsible for the central place ancient philosophy now occupies in philosophy departments in the United States. The summer seminars he taught at Berkeley introduced many young scholars to the study of Socrates, where his own interests lay at the end of his career.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Third Man Argument in the *Parmenides*," *Philosophical Review* 63 (1954): 319–49.

Plato's Universe (Seattle, Wash., 1975).

Platonic Studies (Princeton, N.J., 1973; 2nd edn 1981).

Socrates, Ironist and Moral Philosopher (Ithaca, N.Y., 1991).

Socratic Studies, ed. Myles F. Burnyeat (Cambridge, UK, 1994).

Studies in Greek Philosophy, ed. Daniel W. Graham, 2 vols (Princeton, 1995).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *The Philosophy of Socrates: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Garden City, N.Y., 1971).

Ed., *Plato: A Collection of Critical Essays*, 2 vols (Garden City, N.Y., 1971).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Pres Addr of APA v7*, *Proc of APA v65*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v10*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Lee, E. N. et al., eds. *Exegesis and Argument: Studies in Greek Philosophy Presented to Gregory Vlastos* (Assen, The Netherlands, 1973).

Irwin, Terence, and Martha C. Nussbaum, eds. *Virtue, Love and Form: Essays in Memory of Gregory Vlastos* (Edmonton, Canada, 1993).

Daniel W. Graham

VOEGELIN, Eric Herman Wilhelm (1901–85)

Eric Voegelin was born on 3 January 1901 in Cologne, Germany. At age ten, his family moved to Vienna, Austria. He attended the University of Vienna, where he earned his doctorate from the Faculty of Law in 1922 and taught political science. Under pressure from the Nazis, Voegelin was fired from the faculty in 1938 for his publications criticizing racial

ideologies, Adolf Hitler, and National Socialism. He and his wife narrowly escaped from the Gestapo and then immigrated to the United States in 1938, where they became citizens in 1944. Voegelin taught at a number of American institutions before settling at Louisiana State University, where he taught political science from 1943 to 1958. He then taught at the University of Munich until 1967, when he returned to America and occupied a research professorship at Stanford University's Hoover Institution until his death on 19 January 1985 in Stanford, California.

Voegelin developed a far-reaching philosophy, integrating political theory, sociology, and philosophy of history with metaphysical, epistemological, and moral elements from the Greek, Hebraic, and Christian traditions. As an anti-modernist, he sought a remedy for the ideological alienation of modern intellectual and secular movements, which denied the Divine-Ground-of-Being. He referred to such ideologies of cultural disorder as "deformations of reality." Voegelin believed his role as a philosopher was to "restore the problem of the metaxy" to a society whose intellectuals had posited a quasi-gnostic, materialist view of reality, which denied the existential tension of a humanity dwelling "in-between" the Divine and the temporal. Voegelin was also a mystical philosopher whose published works addressed a number of theological problems. In the 1980s, he developed his earlier ideas into a philosophy of consciousness.

Although Voegelin's training was in sociology, political science, and philosophy of law, he later expanded his research and became a recognized expert in other fields. In an era of increasing specialization, Voegelin endeavored to attain the linguistic, literary, and historical training necessary for what he described as the attainment of "comparative historical knowledge" of civilizations and social structures. As a result of the enormous breadth and linguistic power of his published books and essays, Voegelin's work presents a formidable intellectual challenge as each part is related to the whole. The *Collected Works of Eric Voegelin* spans thirty-four volumes, including an eight-volume *History of Political Ideas* and his highly acclaimed five-volume *Order and History*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ueber die form des amerikanischen geistes (Tübingen, Germany, 1928).

Rasse und staat (Tübingen, Germany, 1933).

Die rassenidee in der geistesgeschichte von Ray bis Carus (Berlin, 1933).

Der autoritäre Staat: ein Versuch über das sterreichische Staatsproblem (Vienna, 1936).

Die politischen Religionen (Vienna, 1938; Stockholm, 1939).

The New Science of Politics (Chicago, 1952).

Order and History, 5 vols (Baton Rouge, Louis., 1956–1987).

Wissenschaft, Politik und Gnosis (Munich, 1959). Published as *Science, Politics, and Gnosticism* (Chicago, 1968).

Christentum und Liberalismus (Munich, 1960).

Anamnesis: Zur Theorie der Geschichte und Politik (Munich, 1966). Published as *Anamnesis* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1978).

From Enlightenment to Revolution, ed. John H. Hallowell (Durham, N.C., 1975).

The Collected Works of Eric Voegelin, 34 vols (Baton Rouge, La.; Columbia, Miss., 1989–2004).

Other Relevant Works

Voegelin's papers are at the Hoover Institution in Stanford, California.

Ed. with Hugo Hantsch and Franco Valsecchi, *Historica: Studien zum geschichtlichen Denken und Forschen* (Vienna, 1965).

Ed., *Zwischen Revolution und Restauration: politisches Denken in England im 17. Jahrhundert* (Munich, Germany, 1968).

Conversations with Eric Voegelin, ed. R. Eric O'Connor (Montréal, 1980).

Ordnung, Bewusstsein, Geschichte: späte Schriften, eine Auswahl, ed. Peter J. Opitz

(Stuttgart, 1988). Contains a bibliography of Voegelin's writings.

Autobiographical Reflections, vol. 33 of *The Collected Works of Eric Voegelin* (Baton Rouge, La., 1989).

Faith and Political Philosophy: The Correspondence between Leo Strauss and Eric Voegelin, 1934–1964 (University Park, Penn., 1993; Columbia, Miss., 2004).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Comp Amer Thought, Routledge Encycl Phil, Who Was Who in Amer v8

Cooper, Barry. *Eric Voegelin and the Foundations of Modern Political Science* (Columbia, Miss., 1999).

Day, Jerry. *Voegelin, Schelling, and the Philosophy of Historical Existence* (Columbia, Miss., 2003).

Federici, Michael P. *Eric Voegelin: The Restoration of Order* (Wilmington, Del., 2002).

Heilke, Thomas W. *Voegelin on the Idea of Race: An Analysis of Modern European Racism* (Baton Rouge, La., 1990).

———, *Eric Voegelin: In Quest of Reality* (Lanham, Md., 1999).

Keulman, Kenneth. *The Balance of Consciousness: Eric Voegelin's Political Theory* (University Park, Penn., 1990).

McAllister, Ted V. *Revolt against Modernity: Leo Strauss, Eric Voegelin, and the Search for a Postliberal Order* (Lawrence, Kan., 1996).

McKnight, Stephen A., ed. *Eric Voegelin's Search for Order in History* (Baton Rouge, La., 1978).

McKnight, Stephen A., and Geoffrey L. Price, eds. *International and Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Eric Voegelin* (Columbia, Miss., 1997).

McKnight, Stephen A., Glenn Hughes, and Geoffrey L. Price, eds. *Politics, Order, and History: Essays on the Work of Eric Voegelin* (Sheffield, UK, 2001).

Morrissey, Michael P. *Consciousness and Transcendence: The Theology of Eric Voegelin* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1994).

Price, Geoffrey L. *Eric Voegelin: International Bibliography, 1921–2000* (Munich, Germany, 2000).

Ranieri, John J. *Eric Voegelin and the Good Society* (Columbia, Miss., 1995).

Sandoz, Ellis. *The Voegelinian Revolution: A Biographical Introduction* (Baton Rouge, La., 1981).

———, ed. *Eric Voegelin's Thought: A Critical Appraisal* (Durham, N.C., 1982).

———, ed. *Eric Voegelin's Significance for the Modern Mind* (Baton Rouge, La., 1991).

Webb, Eugene. *Eric Voegelin: Philosopher of History* (Seattle, Wash., 1981).

Albert Hernández

VON MISES, Richard Marten Edler (1883–1953)

Richard von Mises was born on 19 April 1883 in Lemberg (then in Galicia, a province of Austria-Hungary, now Lviv in the Ukraine). His father, of assimilated Viennese Jewish ancestry, was an engineer with the Austrian state railway system, while his mother was of a similar social background and had more literary and scholarly interests. Mises received his secondary education at a humanistic gymnasium in Vienna; he then studied engineering at the Technical University there. He received his PhD in mechanical engineering from the Technical University in Vienna in 1908. His first job was at the German Technical University at Brünn in Moravia (now Brno in the Czech Republic) in 1908–9. He often returned to Vienna, to meet poets and artists such as Adolf Loos and Peter Altenberg, and to join his university friends Philipp FRANK, Otto

Neurath, and Hans Hahn in regular discussions at the Café Central. This "first Vienna Circle" discussed a broad range of scientific and cultural subjects, from phenomenology to psychoanalysis to physics to politics. Ernst Mach and Henri Poincaré were their heroes, but Lenin's critique of Mach was also on the agenda. In 1909 Mises became associate professor of applied mathematics at the University of Strassburg where he taught until 1918. His interest in the poetry of Rainer Maria Rilke grew during his Strassburg years, and he started what would become the most complete collection of publications and manuscripts of the young Rilke (now at the Houghton Library, Harvard), about whom he later also published a number of books and articles.

During World War I, Mises was commissioned to design and supervise the construction of a large aircraft. Despite successful test flights of a prototype in 1916, the Austrian general staff did not pursue the project. Mises remained in charge of technical support for the army's airplanes; he advanced to Lt. First Class of the air troops (the "K.u.k. Luftfahrttruppe"). In 1918 he requested to be transferred to the infantry on the front. When the war ended, and the peace had been signed, the city of Strassburg came back under French control, and Mises, as an ethnic German, lost both his job and the residence that had gone with it. Arriving there to discover that he had lost many of his possessions along with his house, he (literally) walked back across the Rhine. He spent a year teaching in Frankfurt in 1918–19, and then received a full professorship at the Technical University of Dresden. Having become an expert in aerodynamics during the war, in 1918 he published his *Fluglehre* (*Theory of Flight*), which immediately became the standard work in the field and went through numerous editions in German and English until the 1950s.

In 1920 Mises became professor and Director of the Institute for Applied Mathematics at the University of Berlin (now Humboldt University). There he thrived, and became a well-known advocate for his discipline against the condescension of pure mathematicians. In the manifesto with which he opened the first number of the periodical he founded, the *Zeitschrift für angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik*, he declared that the great mathematicians of history, from Archimedes to Newton to Gauss, had been applied mathematicians. With his old friend Philipp Frank he reworked Riemann and Weber's classic *Partial Differential Equations of Physics* into a new two-volume *Differential and Integral Equations of Mechanics and Physics*. He also continued to publish on a large variety of themes in applied mathematics, ranging from crystallography to the load-bearing capacity of beams in half-timber houses.

The work for which he remains best known was on probability. It had two aspects: first, his mathematical framework for a frequency interpretation of probability for which he laid the basis in two 1919 papers, "Fundamental Theorems of Probability" and "Foundations of Probability", and second, his contributions to a purely probabilistic physics, beginning in 1920 with his paper on "Elimination of the Ergodic Hypothesis in Physical Statistics" and the 1921 paper "On the Present Crisis of Mechanics." Both strands came together in his classic popular and philosophical book *Probability, Statistics, and Truth*, first published in 1928.

Mises was not solitary; his prolific abundance of interests and ideas was rooted in an intense interchange with other minds. His house in Berlin was open to a wide range of artists and intellectuals, and became the center of an informal "Mises Circle." One of its most distinguished regular visitors was the Viennese novelist Robert Musil, who lived in Berlin during this period, and with whom Mises shared literary and philosophical interests as well as an engineering background. Another visitor was Hilda Pollaczek-Geiringer, married to the mathematician Felix Pollaczek, and a mathematician in her own right, with many publications. She was also from Vienna, and

had been an assistant at the Institute for Applied Mathematics at the University of Berlin when Mises arrived there. It is unclear exactly when she and Mises became partners, but it was evidently during the Berlin period. They eventually married when this became necessary for US immigration purposes.

Hitler's rise to power in 1933 put an abrupt end to this happy and productive time. Once again, Mises lost his job and had to emigrate because of his ethnic background, only this time it was because he was supposedly *not* German. He immediately got a job at the new University of Istanbul in Turkey. He was able, with astonishing resilience, to start over again, continuing his steady stream of publications on a wide spectrum of topics in statistics and applied mathematics – though now more often in French or Italian than in German. He became fluent in Turkish, formed new friendships, and enjoyed the leisurely and relaxed atmosphere of Istanbul. In the vacations, he hurried back to Vienna (just as he had previously done, during vacations, from Germany) to care for his aging mother and to revisit the café scene.

Von Mises also began to give more of his attention to philosophical questions during his years in Istanbul, contributing a pamphlet on Ernst Mach to Neurath's *Einheitswissenschaft* series. He also wrote his *Kleines Lehrbuch des Positivismus* (Little Textbook of Positivism), later translated into English as *Positivism: A Study in Human Understanding* (1951). This book, a broad survey of intellectual life – including philosophy, science, art, ethics, poetry, and much else – has never received the attention it deserves. It is perhaps the most comprehensive statement by any member or fellow traveler of logical empiricism, broadly defined, of anything like a "philosophy of life." But it was published in German, with a Dutch publisher, after the outbreak of war and only a few months before German troops overran The Netherlands as well. By the time it came out in English, its optimistic and cosmopolitan tone, so characteristic of the Central European

intelligentsia in the tradition of Ernst Mach, Josef Popper-Lynkeus, and Karl Kraus, had come to seem naïve to Americans, and the discussion of logical empiricism had become highly technical and was increasingly dominated by American figures like W. V. QUINE or Nelson GOODMAN, with their narrower preoccupations. Mises was a *philosophe* in the old sense, a follower of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment.

Von Mises may have had more time and leisure to develop his philosophical views more systematically if he had not had to emigrate and start over yet again. As war approached, Mises in 1939 accepted an invitation to teach for a year at Westergaard College, at that time an independent institution that functioned as a kind of engineering school for Harvard University, into which it was soon integrated. Once again, Mises had to start over, and at age fifty-six had to reestablish himself in a new environment where he was entirely cut off from his Central European roots. In this situation, it was natural that he devoted the bulk of his attention to remaining at the forefront of the various fields to which he had contributed, in a language that was new to him. He published a textbook on fluid dynamics, and wrote numerous papers on different aspects of statistics and mathematical problems of flight, among other subjects. In 1944 he became the Gordon McKay Professor of Aerodynamics and Applied Mathematics, which he remained until shortly before his death. He became an American citizen in 1946, having advised both US Army and Navy during the war and sat on the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. In 1951–2 he was a visiting professor in Rome, and had the satisfaction of receiving an honorary degree, at last, from the University of Vienna. In his final years he seems once again to have had the leisure to return to philosophical questions, and took an active interest in discussions of the Institute for the Unity of Science in the early 1950s. He also collected material for a new edition of *Positivism*. But he was given no time to bring any of these

thoughts to completion. He died on 14 July 1953 in Boston, Massachusetts shortly after his retirement from Harvard.

Though he was associated with the logical empiricist movement, it is hard to classify Richard von Mises as a thinker. He was as much an individualist in his philosophical views as in his overall attitude to life. It is easy, therefore, to get the impression that there is no unity to his thought, that he was an eclectic dilettante who wrote a little about almost everything under the sun, from relativity theory to Rilke, a café house intellectual without any clear central focus. But that is a mistake. In the words of Philipp Frank, the man who perhaps knew Mises best, his work "shows great intrinsic unity," and Mises chose his topics very carefully, with an eye to essentials. Applied mathematics was at the center of his attention, Frank says, because in his view it was "the field of central importance for every attempt at a philosophical picture of the world." Such a picture must establish, first and foremost, what the relation is, or could be, between the direct sense observation of the experimentalist and the conceptual system of science that contains expressions such as "increase of entropy" or "principle of relativity." While most scientists take for granted that this relation consists in some form of induction or testing procedure, they forget, Frank points out, that measurement is not innocent: "no numerical value can ever be assigned to a length by a *single* measurement"; only computations on a long series of measurements can result in "the value of the length." Applied mathematics concentrates on just this connection between different observational readings and the result obtained by calculation. Mises was thus naturally led, by his philosophical approach to mechanics, to problems of statistics, and he investigated this relation between observation and theory in all the different fields he touched. In all of them he "investigated the complete range of problems that stretches from the construction of a suitable formal system to methods of numerical computation," in Frank's summary;

"Looking at the great variety of topics in his papers, we may marvel at the broad abilities of the author, but we must admire the work of a mind who is forever searching for the central problem hidden under the apparent variety."

Probability and statistics are certainly the fields in which Mises made the most notable impact on the philosophy of science. *Probability, Statistics and Truth* is still referred to as the definitive statement of the frequency interpretation of probability. Probability is the relative frequency in the long run of an attribute in a series of occurrences. Strictly speaking it applies, in Mises's view, only to *infinite* sequences of points ("collectives") in a sample space (though of course this is an idealization), and these sequences are postulated to be *random*. Randomness is, indeed, the basic primitive concept in Mises's theory, in terms of which all else is defined. Much of the criticism directed at his characterization of randomness is based on misunderstandings. The frequency interpretation is now widely regarded as dated, or almost prehistoric, but Jan von Plato, in his recent history of the modern probability theory (*Creating Modern Probability*, 1994) does much to rehabilitate von Mises and his work, correcting many misconceptions. Von Plato points out that Kolgomorov's axiomatization of probability is merely a formal system, not an interpretation of it, and Kolgomorov himself, who admired von Mises, regarded the frequency interpretation as a kind of default. Indeed, a revival of von Mises's theory was initiated by Kolmogorov himself in the 1960s, and after a period of neglect it is today once again a field of very active research.

Mises regarded probability as simply a mathematical tool for the description of the experienced world, no different in kind from the application of algebra or analysis in mechanics. It was the primary mathematical tool for the description of any process involving uncertainty, such as Brownian motion or the theory of heat. Except for a few clearly deterministic processes, such as those covered by Newton's laws without friction, Mises thought it mean-

ingless to speak of "causes" in nature "underlying" the observed events. Causal relations in explanation were, in his view, to be largely displaced by purely statistical ones. (Interestingly, Mises reached this conclusion long before quantum indeterminacy entered the discussion in physics.) Probability could only be applied to "collectives," long series of events that could meaningfully be idealized by an infinite series. It was senseless, in his view, to apply probabilities to sentences or to single cases. Probability could not, then, be a "guide to life," as Bishop Butler, John Maynard Keynes, and all of classical probability had suggested, and as Rudolf CARNAP was once again arguing in the 1950s.

In his approach to larger questions, von Mises was broadly sympathetic to the "unity of science" view of logical empiricism, but refused to be recruited into a "school." He shared the Vienna Circle's emphasis on formal languages as tools for revolutionary, voluntarist "rational reconstruction" of natural-language concepts, but he was much more aware than they of the cultural embeddedness of natural languages. He appreciated, as they did not, that what might be nonsense by the standard of a formal criterion could have uses within a certain sphere of experience or human activity. He took greater trouble than most logical empiricists to understand the motives behind the views of thinkers such as Edmund Husserl, Wilhelm Dilthey, and Heinrich Rickert. Our effort of enlightenment, he thought, should be directed at building bridges, making such subcultures commensurable with the broader scientific culture, rather than proscribing them. We should engage with them, finding out why they appeal to their followers, and propose ways of expressing this appeal that are compatible with science. This requires dialogue, openmindedness, a willingness to listen, and a commitment never to stop questioning.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Wahrscheinlichkeit, Statistik, und Wahrheit: Einführung in die neue Wahrscheinlichkeitslehre und ihre Anwendung (Vienna, 1928; 3rd edn 1951). Trans. Hilda Geiringer, *Probability, Statistics and Truth* (London and New York, 1957).

Kleines Lehrbuch des Positivismus: Einführung in die empiristische Wissenschaftsauffassung (The Hague, 1939). Trans. Jerry Bernstein and Roger Newton, *Positivism: A Study in Human Understanding* (Cambridge, Mass., 1951).

Mathematical Theory of Probability and Statistics, ed. Hilda Geiringer (New York, 1964).

Other Relevant Works

Von Mises's papers are at Harvard University

Selected Papers of Richard von Mises, 2 vols, ed. Garrett Birkhoff et al. (Providence, R.I., 1963–4). Contains a bibliography of von Mises's writings.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Crämer, Harald. "Richard von Mises's Work in Probability and Statistics," *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 24 (1953): 657–62.

Studies in Mathematics and Mechanics, Presented to Richard von Mises by Friends, Colleagues, and Pupils (New York, 1954).

Von Plato, Jan. *Creating Modern Probability: Its Mathematics, Physics and Philosophy in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge, UK, 1994), chap. 6.

André W. Carus

VON NEUMANN, John Louis (1903–57)

John von Neumann was born on 28 December 1903 in Budapest, Hungary, and he died on 8 February 1957 in Washington, D.C. His name at birth was Neumann János, in the Hungarian

practice of putting the family name first. His father Maximilian was a banker and his mother Margaret came from an affluent family, both part of the Jewish community in Budapest. Von Neumann was educated at home until he was ten and then enrolled in the Lutheran Gymnasium. He was a student of the quality best described as a prodigy, and his interests were spread through several academic disciplines. The academic training he received at the Gymnasium was supplemented by tutoring from various members of the department of mathematics at the University of Budapest, including Michael Fekete. By the time that he was finished with Gymnasium, von Neumann had been recognized as a mathematical peer by professional mathematicians.

Von Neumann entered the University of Budapest himself in 1921 to study mathematics, but, as was typical of his intellectual life, he never found one subject sufficient to occupy his mind. He was simultaneously studying chemical engineering at the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule in Zürich and also spent time in Berlin, where some of the faculty at Budapest had been trained. The PhD in mathematics he received from the University of Budapest in 1926 was in the area of set theory, to which he proposed an alternative approach from the one that had been suggested by Ernst Zermelo. The attractiveness of von Neumann's formulation can be attested to by its having been followed up by both Paul Bernays, the collaborator of David Hilbert at the University of Göttingen, and Kurt GÖDEL, whose work was to have a decisive influence on the foundations of mathematics. As is also not uncommon, the attractiveness of von Neumann's approach to set theory lay more in its technical applications than any particular philosophical basis.

After leaving Budapest, von Neumann became *Privatdozent* at the University of Berlin, perhaps the youngest person to have held that position up to that time. Over the next decade he continued to publish extensively in both pure mathematics and in more applied areas. In 1926 he received a Rockefeller grant for post-doctoral study at the University of Göttingen, where he followed up the variety of Hilbert's interests. Not only did he work in the foundations of mathematics, but Hilbert had himself displayed a great interest in quantum mechanics and its mathematical formulation. The physicists Werner Heisenberg and Ernst Schrödinger had come up with conflicting mathematical interpretations for quantum mechanics, and von Neumann managed to develop a finite set of axioms for the subject that was applicable to both.

One of von Neumann's most influential papers dealt with the logic of quantum mechanics. It had been argued by Albert EINSTEIN, among others, that the appearance of uncertainty in quantum mechanics was deceptive and that the theory, in fact, was deterministic. Since it was not deterministic in terms of the variables physicists were measuring, there must be additional "hidden" variables that would convert the theory into the more familiar shape. Von Neumann used the interplay between algebra and logic to show that this was not an option, although there has remained a controversy about this problem.

In 1929 von Neumann married Mariette Kovesi, the daughter of a physician in Budapest. They were divorced eight years later and von Neumann married a second time in 1938. In 1929 he was invited to teach at Princeton University, where he remained from 1930 until 1933 as Thomas D. Jones Professor of Mathematical Physics. That period included his taking part in a symposium organized by the German Mathematical Society at Königsberg to discuss different approaches to the foundations of mathematics. Rudolf CARNAP represented the logicist view that mathematics was capable of being reduced to logic. Arend Heyting from The Netherlands spoke on behalf of the position of intuitionism developed by his teacher L. E. J. Brouwer. For the formalist position von Neumann made remarks in line with the spirit of Hilbert's program for proving the consistency of arithmetic via the division of the subject into contentual assertions and

formal manipulations. It is hard to tell whether the speakers were chosen as representatives of their positions or as leaders in the field, but it is an indication of von Neumann's stature that he stood in for the Hilbert perspective. He pointed to the success of Hilbert's program in translating mathematics into a regimented language and to the remaining problem of coming up with a mathematical way of checking that the provable statements were exactly the true ones. It was on that problem that the Hilbert program was almost simultaneously running aground in the work of Gödel.

With the foundation of the Institute for Advanced Studies in Princeton in 1930, von Neumann resided there as a professor of mathematics for the rest of his life. He was elected a member of the National Academy of Sciences in 1937, took American citizenship in that year, and became a consultant to the Ballistics Research Laboratory in 1940. With the arrival of World War II, von Neumann became involved with the work on the atomic bomb and remained involved in research relating to national defense for the rest of his life. In a broad sense von Neumann felt that a strong arsenal was a more reliable form of protection against dangers from abroad than international agreements. As a result, he did not display moral qualms about work on technological developments that could cause large numbers of casualties.

Von Neumann worked in two main areas with philosophical implications while in Princeton. One was game theory, where he published the first monograph on the subject with the Austrian economist Oskar Morgenstern, also at Princeton. Game theory required various sorts of assumptions in the formulation by von Neumann and Morgenstern, especially concerning the centrality of zero-sum games. The mathematics of such games was neater and led to more interesting theorems in predicting behavior than allowing for the possibility of cooperative games. The philosophical background behind the assumption of a game's being zero-sum fit in with von Neumann's competitive personality. It was also true that the theory of games as they developed it worked on assumptions of rationality that have been questioned by subsequent investigators like Jon Elster. The theory of games has remained a popular tool for use by corporations and governments, but it can be difficult to reduce the disturbing factors connected with irrationality to confirm its applicability.

On a broader scale, the latter part of von Neumann's research career was devoted to applying the computer to a variety of practical situations where human calculation had proved to be inadequate. This required the development of computers capable of performing a range of tasks, and he could accomplish this with the help of improved technology and the idea of a stored program. In the course of his work on early computers, von Neumann was determined to produce machines that would help the United States to win World War II, and then to stay ahead of its rivals in the post-war period. He developed a model of the brain that was connected with the image of a computer, and the volume *Theory of Self-Reproducing Automata*, even though it was not published until after his death, indicated his willingness to see computers as models for a function like self-reproduction. By contrast with the approach of Alan Turing, for example, who looked for ways to distinguish what computers could accomplish from the way humans interacted, von Neumann simply continued to work on the application of computers to problems that had proved to be beyond human resources and to the analogies between machines and human problem solvers.

Throughout the last period of his life, von Neumann served as a consultant for large companies like Standard Oil and IBM, in addition to the government. His manner carried credibility with the military and he received recognition in the form of the Medal of Freedom awarded by the US government in 1956. The previous year he had been diagnosed with bone cancer, but he did not allow his illness to stop

his involvement in projects and he continued to attend meetings in wheelchairs. At his death he was recognized by the American public as a scientist who had devoted his last years to the public interest. Perhaps that concern with the ongoing details of administration kept him from considering the philosophical implications of some of his work that would be left to his successors in neuroscience and elsewhere.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Eine Axiomatisierung der Mengenlehre," *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik* 154 (1925): 219–40.

"Zur Hilbertschen Beweistheorie," *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 26 (1927): 1–46.

"Die Formalistische Grundlegung der Mathematik," *Erkenntnis* 2 (1931): 116–21. Trans., "The Formalist Foundations of Mathematics," in *Philosophy of Mathematics: Selected Readings*, ed. Paul Benacerraf and Hilary Putnam (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964), pp. 61–5.

Mathematische Grundlagen der Quantenmechanik (Berlin, 1932). Trans. R. T. Beyer, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (Princeton, N.J., 1955).

"The Logic of Quantum Mechanics," with Garrett Birkhoff, *Annals of Mathematics* 37 (1936): 823–43.

Theory of Games and Economic Behavior, with Oskar Morgenstern (Princeton, N.J., 1944; 60th anniversary edn, 2004).

"The General and Logical Theory of Automata," in *Cerebral Mechanisms in Behavior*, ed. L. A. Jeffrees (New York, 1951), pp. 1–41.

The Computer and the Brain (New Haven, Conn., 1958; 2nd edn 2000).

Theory of Self-Reproducing Automata, ed. Arthur Burks (Urbana, Ill., 1966).

Other Relevant Works

Von Neumann's papers are in the Library of Congress and the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in Budapest, Hungary.

Collected Works, 6 vols, ed. A. H. Taub (New York, 1960–63).

Papers of John von Neumann on Computing and Computer Theory, ed. William Aspray and Arthur Burks (Cambridge, Mass., 1987).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych by Zusne*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Economics*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Encyc Cog Sci*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v46*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*

Aspray, Wiliam. *John von Neumann and the Origins of Modern Computing* (Cambridge, Mass., 1990).

Bernstein, Peter L. *Against the Gods: The Remarkable Story of Risk* (New York, 1996).

Glimm, James, John Impagliazzo, and Isadore Singer, eds. *The Legacy of John von Neumann* (Providence, R.I., 1990).

Macrae, Norman. *John von Neumann* (New York, 1992).

Ulam, Stanislaw M. "John von Neumann, 1903–1957," *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 64 (1958): 1–64.

Von Plato, Jan. *Creating Modern Probability: Its Mathematics, Physics and Philosophy in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge, UK, 1994).

Thomas Drucker

W

WACH, Joachim (1898–1955)

Joachim Wach was born on 25 January 1898 in Chemnitz, Saxony, Germany. Wach trained under Friedrich Heiler at Munich and Ernst Troeltsch at Berlin before attending Leipzig to finish a PhD in the history and philosophy of religion in 1922. His dissertation, "Der Erlösungsgedanke und seine Deutung" (The Concept of Redemption and Its Meaning), was published in that year. Wach stayed at Leipzig; in 1924 he became a *Privatdozent*, and in 1929 he was appointed assistant professor of philosophy. The Nazi regime forced Wach's dismissal in 1935, and he quickly emigrated to the United States. Wach was a professor of religion at Brown University from 1935 to 1945. He then became professor and chair of the history of religions at the University of Chicago in 1945, and he held these positions until his death in 1955. Wach died while visiting relatives on 27 August 1955 in Orselina, Locarno, Switzerland.

Early in his life Wach came under the influence of the mystic poet Stephan George, who had written of transcendent experience as providing unity in life's variety. Following his mentor Rudolph Otto, Wach held that the experience of the Holy was the foundation of all religion. These commitments allowed him to explore the various paths of religious experience in human history. Wach followed the analysis of meaning propounded by philologist August Boeckh: scholars had to recognize original data, even if they were not fully expressed in linguistic data. Wach applied this model in his dissertation,

Religionswissenschaft (1924), and in his three-volume work, *Das Verstehen* (1926–33). In these works, Wach developed the Boeckh model into a sophisticated template for understanding the history of religions. He weighed religious ideas from Friedrich Schleiermacher to Max Scheler and analyzed their strengths and weaknesses; his hermeneutic involving a mix of social scientific data and systematic examination yielded a more cogent understanding of religion. This mix of historical and theoretical was the hallmark of his philosophy of religion and the basis for his hermeneutical contributions.

From Heiler, Wach took phenomenology as an analytical tool and used it throughout his academic career to articulate the structures of religion. He thought philosophers of religion should work with primary data, or objective descriptions of historical religions, and then formulate meta-principles of religion as a generic phenomenon. To achieve basic categories of religion from logical analysis of historical expressions was the task of phenomenology.

Previous proponents of the phenomenology of religion had regarded theology as a fundamental requirement for interpreting all religious data. Wach argued that the scientific study of religion was its own discipline and could not be subject to theological or doctrinal restrictions. In this respect, Wach also understood the limitations of traditional philosophy as a normative activity that should be set aside if the new discipline, the history of religions, was to play its proper role in the understanding of human culture. Wach thought his

research occupied a middle terrain between the normative and descriptive branches of knowledge.

Wach was influenced by sociological developments in America after his arrival there and took them into account in his subsequent work; they offered a further instrument for his understanding of religion. His *Sociology of Religion* (1944) applied social scientific theory to religion, specifically to examination of the relationship between religion and its social forms. He sought further to close the gap between social sciences and humanities that he believed isolated both. He held that sociology was but another means to elucidate expressions of religious experience.

Toward the end of his life, Wach wished increasingly to return to an articulation of the basic experience of religion, and to comparative philosophy of religion, but he died before he was able to bring this wish to fruition.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Der Erlösungsgedanke und seine Deutung (Leipzig, 1922).

Religionswissenschaft: Prolegomena zu ihrer wissenschaftstheoretischen Grundlegung (Leipzig, 1924).

Das Verstehen: Grundzüge einer Geschichte der hermeneutischen Theorie im 19. Jahrhundert, 3 vols (Tübingen, 1926–33).

Einführung in die religionssoziologie (Tübingen, 1931).

The Sociology of Religion (Chicago, 1944).

Types of Religious Experience: Christian and Non-Christian (Chicago, 1951).

The Comparative Study of Religions, ed. Joseph M. Kitagawa (New York, 1958).

Understanding and Believing, ed. Joseph M. Kitagawa (New York, 1968). Contains a bibliography of Wach's writings.

Other Relevant Works
Wach's papers are at the University of Chicago.

"The Place of the History of Religions in the Study of Theology," *Journal of Religion* 27 (1947): 157–77.

"The Meaning and Task of the History of Religions (*Religionswissenschaft*)," in *The History of Religions: Essays on the Problem of Understanding*, ed. Joseph M. Kitagawa, Mircea Eliade, and Charles H. Long (Chicago, 1967).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*
Flasche, Rainer. *Die Religionswissenshaft Joachim Wach* (Berlin, 1978).

Kitagawa, Joseph M. "Joachim Wach and Sociology of Religion," *Journal of Religion* 37 (1957): 174–84.

Sharpe, E. J. *Comparative Religion: A History* (London, 1975).

Wood, Charles M. *Theory and Religious Understanding: A Critique of the Hermeneutics of Joachim Wach* (Missoula, Mont., 1975).

Earle Waugh

WALKER, James Barr (1805–87)

James Barr Walker was born on 29 July 1805 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and he died on 6 March 1887 in Wheaton, Illinois. He was a Presbyterian minister, seminary professor, and prolific popular writer on theology and philosophy in the Middle West during the middle decades of the nineteenth century. He was not a philosopher in any academic or professional sense. Like producers of Shakespearean plays before literary specialists took charge of scholarship on the Bard, Walker was a philosophical amateur, writing for a large audience of Calvinist lay people and regaling them with a Platonic interpretation of Protestant Christian orthodoxy. His philosophical credentials were his self-education in classical sources.

Walker studied without earning a degree from Western Reserve College in Ohio in the late 1820s. Later he received limited theological training from local Presbyterian ministers in Ohio. The evangelical abolitionist, Theodore Weld, deeply influenced him. In 1834–5 he published an anti-slavery newspaper in Hudson. Ordained by the Portage Presbytery in 1837, he filled pulpits in Akron, Mansfield, and Sandusky, Ohio, between stints in church journalism as editor of the *Watchman of the Valley* in Cincinnati and *Herald of the Prairies* in Chicago. In 1859 he was appointed to the faculty of Chicago Theological Seminary. In 1863 a substantial inheritance enabled him to create a Christian commune, Benzonia, in Michigan. Financial difficulties forced him to abandon this project in 1865. In 1870 he became professor of theology at Wheaton College in Illinois and minister of the Wheaton Congregational Church. He retired from the Church in 1880 and from teaching in 1884.

Steeped in the writings of Charles HODGE and Lyman Beecher, Walker internalized their apprehension that Calvinist orthodoxy in America was widespread but culturally shallow. In a series of books, he sought to counteract that trend, and in the end, his lack of formal training exacerbated the very provincialism he sought to counteract.

In *God Revealed in the Process of Salvation and by the Manifestation of Jesus Christ* (1856) and a companion volume, *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit; or, Philosophy of the Divine Operation in the Redemption of Man* (1869), Walker associated human "progress" as a kind of Hegelian dialectic between "the legal aspect and practical value of sacrifice" in the history of redemption (1856, p. 188).

In the *Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation* (1887), Walker included a "Supplementary Chapter: An Objective Revelation Necessary as a Means of the Moral Culture of Mankind," his neo-Platonic rendering of Christian theology. "There are two elements in efficient faith; one the form of the fact, the other, the authority of the fact." The "fact" or "truth" of

Christian dogma, he posited, could be found in the writings of "Socrates, Plato, and Seneca," but those moral truths remained inert until given "the force of their own reason" in Christian conversion. "A perception of truth without love and obedience," he explained, "is demoralizing," while "a perception of the truth which moves the heart and will is the process of moral culture," that is, human response to the light of divine truth (1887, pp. 252–4).

Walker's notion of moral culture corresponded to what E. Brooks Holifield called "excellency" in his explication of Jonathan Edwards, what he called "the spiritual harmony mirrored in the order of the natural and social worlds" (Holifield 2003, pp. 104–5). By subsuming Greek ethics and Christian discipleship under the concept of moral culture, Walker anticipated the philosophically oriented scholarship of the latter half of the twentieth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

God Revealed in the Process of Salvation, and by the Manifestation of Jesus Christ (Chicago, 1856).

The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit; or, the Progress of Divine Operation in the Redemption of Man (Chicago, 1869).

Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation: A Book for the Times, by an American Citizen (New York, 1887).

Other Relevant Works

Experiences of Pioneer Life in the Early Settlements and Cities of the West (Chicago, 1881).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio

Holifield, E. Brooks. *Theology in America: Christian Thought from the Age of the Puritans to the Civil War* (New Haven, Conn., 2003).

Smith, Wilson. "James Walker and the Problem of Harvard Moral Philosophy," in

Professors and Public Ethics: Studies of Northern Moral Philosophers before the Civil War (Ithaca, N.Y., 1956), chap. 8.

Robert M. Calhoon

WALLING, William English (1877–1936)

William English Walling was born on 14 March 1877 in Louisville, Kentucky. Descended from a family of wealthy and influential politicians, Walling (called "English" rather than "William") was educated in Edinburgh, Scotland while his father was posted there as United States Counsel. Returning to the United States in 1866, he attended Trinity Hall, a private school for boys in Louisville, Kentucky and eventually graduated from Hyde Park High School in Chicago, Illinois at age sixteen in 1893. He entered the University of Chicago and earned a BS degree in 1897, earning high marks in most subjects but particularly in mathematics. He spent one year at Harvard Law School only to drop out and return to the University of Chicago to attend graduate school in 1898. He studied economics under Thorstein VEBLEN and social philosophy under John DEWEY. Suddenly an indifferent student, he left graduate school after one year. While in Chicago he worked for a year as a state factory inspector and later joined Jane ADDAMS's Hull-House Settlement. He then moved to New York City to work in the Henry Street Settlement.

Because of his inherited wealth, Walling could work without being paid, which he did at the University Settlement on New York's Lower East Side in 1902. His interest in trade unions prompted him to travel to England, also in 1902, where he met trade unionist Mary McArthur, head of the Women's Protective and Provident League. Returning to the United States, in 1903 he helped form the Women's Trade Union League (WTUL) with Mary Kenney O'Sullivan. Similar to its British counterpart, the WTUL was organized to educate women about the advantages of union membership and teach them how to improve their working conditions. During this period Walling wrote several articles about the labor movement for the *Independent*, *World's Work* and the *World To-Day*. The 1905 Russian Revolution prompted him to travel to Europe, writing a series of essays on Russia for the *Independent* and a book, *Russia's Message*, which was published in 1908. He also met and later married Anna Strunsky in Paris in June 1906.

In August 1908 Walling and his wife witnessed the Springfield Riot in Illinois, where a white mob targeted African Americans, lynching two and killing six. This experience resulted in his determination to fight for racial justice and his eventual involvement in helping to organize the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People (NAACP) on 12 February 1909. Soon after this, Walling started distancing himself from the labor movement, which he thought was overshadowing the goals of socialism. He wrote exclusively for socialist periodicals such as *The International Socialist Review*, the *New Review*, and *The Masses*, edited by his friend, Max Eastman. Walling also sought to differentiate American socialism from the limited reforms won by the American progressive movement. These ideas are discussed in his books *Socialism As It Is* (1912), *Larger Aspects of Socialism* (1913), and *Progessivism and After* (1914).

Walling left the American Socialist Party during World War I, accusing it of being pro-German for advocating that the United States should remain neutral rather than join their European allies. After the 1917 Russian Revolution when the Bolsheviks came to power, Walling denounced them in his *Out of Their Own Mouths* (1921). During the last two decades of his life he returned to labor activism, particularly trade unions in Europe,

though his ideas were now out of step with the postwar world. Ailing, he insisted on attending a meeting in Amsterdam with German anti-Nazi trade unionists. He died on 12 September 1936 in Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Walling's philosophy of socialism is difficult to distinguish from the pragmatism of William JAMES and John Dewey, particularly their emphasis on the primacy of the social (material) environment and the importance of an anthropocentric understanding to evolutionary social change. During his lifetime, Walling was concerned with finding an American justification for socialism (such as using Walt WHITMAN as an example of an American type of socialist) and for differentiating socialism from other reform movements, particularly the Progressive Movement. In the *Larger Aspects of Socialism* (1913), he cautioned against confusing socialism with "state socialism" or government control of industry. He also did not think of socialism as being concerned with any particular form of government, or what he called the problem of democracy. Nor did he think socialism was relevant to questions of how much industry a democratic form of government should control. Unlike his contemporary progressive and labor reformers, he saw reorganization not being limited to just economic and political targets.

His defection from radical socialism during World War I and his denunciation of Bolshevik socialism left him with hardly any place to go but back to the labor movement, which he did, working with the American Federation of Labor for the last fifteen years of his life.

Walling's attempts to develop a theory of American socialism have been overshadowed by his skills as a journalist and organizer of the WTUL and the NAACP. His obscurity is also due in part to the contradictory nature of the American socialist movement itself, which, like American society in general, is heterogeneous and exhibits a strong attraction toward bourgeois values.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The New Unionism – The Problem of the Unskilled Worker," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 24 (1904): 296–315.

Russia's Message (New York, 1908).

Larger Aspects of Socialism (New York, 1913).

The Socialists and the War (New York, 1915)

Whitman and Traubel (New York, 1916).

Out of Their Own Mouths, with Samuel Gompers (New York, 1921).

American Labor and American Democracy (New York, 1926).

The Mexican Question (New York, 1927).

Our Next Step with Matthew Woll (New York, 1934).

Other Relevant Works

Walling's papers are primarily at the Wisconsin State Historical Society in Madison.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Boylan, James. *Revolutionary Lives: Anna Strunsky and William English Walling* (Amherst, Mass., 1998).

Egbert, Donald Drew, and Stow Persons, eds. *Socialism and American Life* (Princeton, N.J., 1952).

Hofstadter, Richard. *The Age of Reform* (New York, 1955).

Kellogg, Charles Flint. *NAACP: 1909–1920* (Baltimore, Md., 1967).

Lasch, Christopher. *The True and Only Heaven* (New York, 1991).

Walling, Anna Strunsky, ed. *William English Walling: A Symposium* (New York, 1938).

Jean Van Delinder

WALZER, Michael Laban (1935–)

Michael Walzer was born on 3 March 1935 in New York City. He was raised there and in Pennsylvania. He graduated from Brandeis University in 1956 with a BA in history. He spent 1956–7 at the University of Cambridge on a Fulbright Fellowship before he went on to complete his PhD in government at Harvard University in 1961. His dissertation, which became his first book, was entitled *The Revolution of the Saints* and was supervised by Samuel Beer. He started writing for *Dissent* while in graduate school, and is today the editor of that high-profile periodical. After graduate school, Walzer was a professor of government at Princeton University from 1960 to 1966, and at Harvard University from 1966 to 1980. In 1980 he became a permanent faculty member of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, New Jersey. Walzer currently is the UPS Foundation Professor in the School of Social Science at the Institute for Advanced Study. He serves on the editorial board of, and is a regular contributor to, such distinguished journals as *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, *Political Theory*, and *The New Republic*.

Walzer genuinely deserves the title "public intellectual." He is the author of over a dozen books – many in multiple translations and editions – and dozens of articles. He remains a sought-after speaker and essayist, especially on the ethics of war and peace. Indeed, he is probably best known for his landmark study, *Just and Unjust Wars* (1977), which is now in its third edition and used in countless classrooms the world over.

The first striking thing about Walzer's work is its diversity. While always generally within the scope of social philosophy, Walzer has written about such wide-ranging topics as revolution, obligation, citizenship, nationalism, social criticism, tolerance, democracy, distributive justice, radicalism, socialism, war, communitarianism, human rights, global governance, multiculturalism, the strengths and limits of liberalism, and the Jewish tradition of political thought. The second striking thing is the degree to which history informs Walzer's thought, infusing his concepts and ideas with the vitality of concrete detail and real-world dimension. No abstract meta-theorist he, though of course he has always been capable – and even somewhat overlooked – in that regard.

The third thing about Walzer's corpus to note is the sheer skill displayed by his command of language. Perhaps only Richard RORTY writes as well as Walzer amongst the current generation of American philosophers. One becomes so absorbed in the pictures painted by Walzer's words that it is easy to forget that there is substantive theory-building going on – a theory often wise and always topical. Whatever one thinks of Walzer, one cannot say that he is irrelevant, or ignorant of social fact, or indulgent of philosophical fantasy, or boring to read.

Such is the pluralism of Walzer's work that many overlook the fact that he constructs a full-scale theory of justice equal in scope, but obviously not in influence, to the likes of John RAWLS and Robert NOZICK. Walzer is more often thought of as a seminal contributor in a variety of *applied* fields, distributive justice and the morality of warfare especially, as opposed to an all-encompassing abstract theorist. But there is an ambitious, over-arching understanding of social reality – its nature and potential – present throughout Walzer's work. Generally speaking, this understanding is of a local, decentralized democratic socialism. In this sense, Walzer's work, especially *Spheres of Justice* (1983), completes a triumvirate in recent American political philosophy. If Nozick represents conservatism (or "classical" or "neo" liberalism) whereas Rawls represents liberalism (of contemporary or "welfare" form), then Walzer is probably the most articulate exponent of a plausible socialism, thus rounding out the mainstream political spectrum.

Walzer's socialism is unique in many ways. First, it demands respect for individual

autonomy and human rights, and thus is not a crude collectivism. Second, it is democratic. Third, it is not utopian and it considers the world outside one's borders. So it is not a Platonic exercise in imagining a hermetically sealed perfect society. Finally, it is remarkable for its support of, and delight in, difference and pluralism, and toleration of such. As a result, Walzer admits that, though he is of clear leftist persuasion, his relationship with the left has always been somewhat strained.

The ground of Walzer's theory of justice is an utter rejection of aggression and domination. These ugly twins are essentially the roots of all evil in social life. How do we know this? Walzer says we know this by reflecting seriously upon, and adequately interpreting, the moral and political commitments we already have. Walzer thus sports a methodology unique amongst high-profile political philosophers: he is a conventionalist. He is quite skeptical of the neo-Platonists (in any of a thousand forms) who insist they have *discovered* the objective moral truth. He is equally dismissive of the neo-Kantians (again, in their multitude) who claim that they have *invented* or "constructed" intersubjective norms of justice. Walzer notes that this is, all too often, simply flat assertion. And is it not odd how often the most plausible of these "discoveries" and "inventions" seem not so very different from plain, widespread ethical common sense? We all know the virtues are desirable, so what is added by saying they help fulfil human nature? We already knew we liked being happy, so how was utilitarianism a revelation? Regard for the treatment of others was part of ordinary moral belief – via the Golden Rule – long before Kant constructed the categorical imperative out of pure practical reason. And isn't it funny how much of Rawls's *A Theory of Justice* simply supports the welfare liberalism which post-Depression Western societies were developing while he was growing up, and then writing it?

The best mode of progressing in social philosophy is, says Walzer, to admit that we are neither discovering nor inventing but, rather, *interpreting* our existing moral heritage in light of its inner principles and various external pressures on it, notably the flow of history. Failure to contextualize interpretation within history leads either to excess abstraction or to pretence about having invented something already there in the moral world we share. Walzer clearly thinks Rawls, and his legions, are guilty of both.

Walzer's conventionalism clearly marks him off from his contemporaries, most of whom think of themselves as discoverers or inventors. They tend to think conventionalism too *hoi polloi*, and too deferential to the status quo. This last is a substantial criticism, but Walzer has resources to reply. Which is the best (most biting and motivating) form of moral and political criticism? Walzer's ultimately persuasive answer: uncovering hypocrisy. It is far *less* motivating to tell someone their behaviour fails to meet some discovered external standard, and far *more* gripping to say they fail to meet their own principles. Some of history's most successful moral reformers, such as Jesus, Martin Luther, Ghandi, and Martin Luther KING, Jr., all made liberal and powerful use of accusations of hypocrisy. The psychology here is this: discovery and invention lead to impotent forms of criticism, whereas conventionalism and interpretation lead to some of social criticism's most powerful forms, namely castigating a person (or society) for failing to live up to his (or its) own principles.

What about the other severe criticism, namely, that conventionalism equals relativism, because different people and societies believe different things? Walzer says that, if you look close enough, you can see that every society sports a moral code which incorporates both "thin" and "thick" elements, with the thin elements nested within the thick ones like concentric circles. Walzer claims that it is a sociological fact that there is essentially unanimous endorsement of the "thin" principles: those rules present in every society's moral code. These *universal* rules regulate our

conduct with everyone, and they are mainly prohibitions, such as "don't murder," "don't enslave or torture," "don't aggress or dominate," "don't be cruel or deceptive," and so on. Of course, people violate these rules but that is not the point: the point is that people *still have these rules as part of their moral and political ideals*. So when, for whatever reason, they betray these rules, they open themselves to scathing charges of hypocrisy. Walzer asserts that the substance of thin morality is essentially the same as the substance of modern human rights theory, minimally conceived. There is genuinely universal commitment to realize everyone's human rights to life and liberty as a matter of moral ideal, and so conventionalism need not equal cultural or personal relativism and thereby disable principled criticism. So part of Walzer's enduring importance, as yet overlooked in my view, is the resourcefulness of his brand of conventionalism as a respectable moral methodology.

Above and beyond the moral minimum denoted by the thin universalism of human rights, there is and should be room for moral, cultural, and personal diversity – and such pluralism should be tolerated, even celebrated. For instance, as regards distributive justice, each good should be distributed only in accord with that good's meaning within that culture. Health care in the West, for example, should be distributed not on the basis of ability to pay, since that has nothing to do with health's meaning, but rather on the basis of medical need. And so universal, public health care systems are called for, and are the norm, in developed Western societies, with the present exception of America. The reason why America fails in this regard is that it has allowed one good, money, to intrude on the sphere of another good, health. But each good should be distributed according to its own meaning. Why? Because failure to do so results in aggression, domination, and even tyranny. Money controls health care distribution in America because well-resourced stake-holders,

including hospitals, drug makers, researchers, and insurance providers, want it that way, because it ensures their domination of the sector and their continuing profitability. Walzer calls for the state to offset market forces in this regard, to ensure universal distribution on the basis of need.

The state plays a large, and largely positive, role in Walzer's social philosophy. Its role is to protect everyone's human rights (thin) yet also express a community's identity (thick). Above all, the state is to ensure distributive justice domestically and to protect its community from outside aggression internationally. Walzer discusses in detail moral norms for responding to international aggression in *Just and Unjust Wars*. This book, published in 1977, gets widely credited for reviving the just war tradition, especially at the expense of realism. Realism, very prominent in America during the Cold War and especially during Nixon's presidency, is a highly nationalist and frankly amoral doctrine. A state, according to the realist, should only act to protect and augment its national interests, construed narrowly in terms of resources and power. The rough edges of this doctrine became clear during the Vietnam War, which had major impact on Walzer's life, including inspiring *Just and Unjust Wars*. In that work, he argues forcefully to reject realism as an unprincipled and destabilizing doctrine, and to embrace instead an updated form of just war theory, which frames moral rules and restrictions around the beginning, middle, and end of warfare. The work was immediately noticed and has generated much discussion since. It has stood the test of time and even gets widely taught to future officers and soldiers.

Critics of *Just and Unjust Wars* wonder whether the state plays too large a role in Walzer's thinking. These critics (cosmopolitans, essentially) clearly believe the nation-state is something to be overcome, and global governance fostered instead. Walzer is a wily foe for them to engage, however, because while he is a kind of communitarian, he also insists

on universal respect for human rights. His major point against them is that, like too many philosophers, they indulge in excess abstraction at the expense of sociological fact and historical context. The two huge facts often overlooked by cosmopolitans are: (1) humans strongly prefer to live in groups; and (2) effective cosmopolitan governance is well over the horizon. We are tribal and territorial by nature, so how is global governance going to accommodate this? And genuine global governance is not yet real, much less effective, so how we can we responsibly indulge in breezy, counterfactual talk about world government being the solution to our social ills? Walzer believes in international justice, but not global governance. He thinks every nation should have its own state, and that every state must respect individual human rights and refrain from aggressive and domineering designs upon other states. This more modest, pluralistic goal is much more achievable in our era than is global governance, yet it would also substantially improve upon the status quo. It better reflects the best consensus we actually do have, as opposed to imposing an invented scheme around which there is none (outside faculty conference rooms).

Two states have special place in Walzer's heart. One is America. He has written a book entitled *What it Means to be an American* (1992). The other state is Israel. Walzer is Jewish, proudly so, and much concerned with Israel's fate. His latest project reflects this. Instead of writing another monograph of his own beliefs, he is collaborating as editor of a four-volume work on the tradition of Jewish political thought. This project captures his plural values: having had lots of American self-expression, he now turns to a more communal task regarding Jewish identity.

On Walzer's doctrine of personal identity, he views the self as complex, multiple, and plural, and he resists the many who believe that the richness of the human self can be reduced down to one or two "essential" elements, such as soul, rationality, selfishness, or animality.

Such people are either inexperienced with life or, more often than not, expressing a crude ideological agenda of their own. There are multiple layers of identity and interest in each of us, plural expressions of memory, movement, and value, and the occupation of many salient roles. Walzer refers to himself, in this regard, as an American, a Jew, a professor and author, a family man. We could add *homo sapiens*, male, Anglophone, member of a certain generation, and so on. Walzer correctly cautions us to be suspicious of those who would reduce the rich complexity of the self. We should not reduce the self to fit into some ideologue's Procrustean bed; rather, we should structure society in a complex, plural, and liberating way which allows for and nurtures our multiple selves and interests.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Revolution of the Saints (Cambridge, Mass., 1965).
Obligations (Cambridge, Mass., 1970).
Regicide and Revolution (Cambridge, UK, 1974).
Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations (New York, 1977).
Radical Principles (New York, 1977).
Spheres of Justice (New York, 1983).
Interpretation and Social Criticism (Cambridge, Mass., 1987).
The Company of Critics: Social Criticism and Political Commitment in the Twentieth Century (New York, 1988).
What it Means to Be an American (New York, 1992).
Thick and Thin (South Bend, Ind., 1994).
On Toleration (New Haven, Conn., 1997).
Arguing about War (New Haven, Conn., 2004).
Politics and Passion: Toward a More Egalitarian Liberalism (New Haven, Conn., 2005).

Other Relevant Works
"The Moral Standing of States,"

Philosophy and Public Affairs 9 (1980): 209–29.

Ed. with David Miller, *Pluralism, Justice, and Equality* (Oxford, 1995).

Further Reading
Encyc Ethics, *Oxford Comp Phil*

Allen, Jonathan. "The Situated Critic or the Loyal Critic? Rorty and Walzer on Social Criticism," *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 24 (1998): 25–46.

Barry, Brian. "Social Criticism and Political Philosophy," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 19 (1990): 360–73.

Doppelt, Gerald. "Walzer's Theory of Morality in International Relations," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 8 (1978): 3–26.

Martin, Rex. "The Just War Theory of Walzer and Rawls," *Southwest Philosophy Review* 19 (2003): 135–46.

Mayer, Robert. "Michael Walzer, Industrial Democracy, and Complex Equality," *Political Theory* 29 (2001): 237–61.

Orend, Brian. *Michael Walzer on War and Justice* (Montréal, 2000).

Primoratz, Igor. "Michael Walzer's Just War Theory: Some Issues of Responsibility," *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 5 (2002): 221–43.

Trappenburg, Margo. "In Defence of Pure Pluralism: Two Readings of Walzer's 'Spheres of Justice'," *Journal of Political Philosophy* 8 (2000): 343–62.

Warnke, Georgia. *Justice and Interpretation* (Cambridge, UK, 1992).

Brian Orend

WANG, Hao (1921–95)

Hao Wang was born on 20 May 1921 in Jinan, Shangdon Province, China. He was educated at the National Southwestern Associated University, from which he earned his BS in mathematics in 1943, Quinghan University, from which he received his MA in 1946, and Harvard University, where he held a junior fellowship in the Society of Fellows beginning in 1946, and from which he received his PhD in philosophy in 1951, writing a dissertation on "An Economical Ontology for Classical Arithmetic." In 1950–51 he was at the University of Zurich, where he worked with Paul Bernays. Wang was an assistant professor of philosophy at Harvard from 1951 to 1956, and then was a reader in the philosophy of mathematics at Oxford University from 1956 to 1961. He also worked at the Burroughs Corporation during 1953–5 to learn whether he might like working in the computer industry, at IBM in 1958 and the Bell Laboratory of AT&T in 1959–60. In 1961 he returned to Harvard as Gordon McKay Professor of Mathematical Logic and Applied Mathematics. He moved to Rockefeller University as professor of logic in 1967, where he organized an informal discussion group that attracted logicians from throughout the New York City and New Jersey vicinity. He often returned to China and was a staunch supporter of the Chinese Communists and opponent of the West. He retired in 1991 and died on 13 May 1995 in New York City.

Wang worked on recursion theory, foundations of mathematics, computer programming, philosophy of logic, and philosophy of mathematics. He wrote on logicism, Bertrand Russell, Kurt Gödel, and W. V. Quine, and contributed to Quine's non-classical New Foundations (NF) set theory. In 1959 he proved over 350 theorems of the first-order predicate logic with identity of A. N. Whitehead and Bertrand Russell's *Principia Mathematica* using a computer running a Gentzen-Herbrand prover. He was one of the few longtime confidants of Gödel, a founding member of the Kurt-Gödel-Gesellschaft and its first President from 1987 to 1989. His book *Reflections on Kurt Gödel* (1987), along with such articles as "Kurt

Gödel's Intellectual Development" (1978) and "Some Facts about Kurt Gödel" (1981), shared the intellectual fruits of his personal contacts with Gödel.

Wang had a lively interest in the history of logic as well as its philosophy. He contributed to Jean VAN HEIJENOORT's *From Frege to Gödel*, wrote the expository introduction to van Heijenoort's translation of A. N. Kolmogorov's "O pritsipe *tertium non* datur," and published his own *Popular Lectures on Mathematical Logic*, which grew out of six lectures delivered at the Chinese Academy of Science in October 1977 and began with a ten-page survey of "One Hundred Years of Mathematical Logic." His paper on "Russell and His Logic" gave significant details about Russell's contributions to logic. In his discussion of Russell (1965, pp. 1–2), he held that "professional mathematicians tend to regard [Russell] as an outsider, although in terms of intellectual power he is widely ranked with the best among scientists and mathematicians," adding in reference to the *Principia Mathematica* that "one feels slightly embarrassed when Russell writes that, having done all he set out to do in mathematics, he turned his attention to other matters in about 1910," and that he judged the *Principia Mathematica* to be "a combination and extension" of the work of Gottlob Frege and Giuseppe Peano (1987, p. 179). He called Frege's *Begriffsschrift* "[t]he first formal system for elementary logic …" (1987, p. 266), but then admitted that it was not *entirely* a formal system, since it used, but failed to state, its substitution rules, while the rule of generalization is masked as a notational instruction.

In 1983 Wang was awarded the first "Milestone Award in Automated Theorem Proving" at the American Mathematical Society meeting, for his pioneering work in automated theorem proving in the early years of research in that field. The citation indicated that the award was made to Wang for his "founding of the field" of automated theorem proving. Wang had emphasized that what was

at issue was the development of a new intellectual endeavor, which he proposed to call "inferential analysis" which would depend equally as much upon mathematical logic as numerical analysis depends upon mathematical analysis; he had insisted upon the essential role of the predicate calculus and of the cut-free formalisms of Jacques Herbrand. Wang thought that "the most important results on the predicate calculus are those of Herbrand and Gentzen which enable us to get proofs without using modus ponens" (1970, p. 55). In carrying out this work, Wang was the first to stress the importance of algorithms which "eliminate in advance useless terms" in a Herbrand expansion, and he provided a considered and carefully determined list of theorems of the predicate calculus that could serve as text problems for ascertaining the effectiveness of new theorem-proving programs.

The significance of Herbrand's Fundamental Theorem, according to which for some formula F of classical quantification theory, an infinite sequence of quantifier-free formulae $F_1, F_2, \ldots$, can be effectively generated, for F provable in (any standard) quantification theory, if and only if there exists a k such that F is (sententially) valid; and a proof of F can be obtained from F_f, became the basis for automated theorem proving, was first recognized by Wang, who wrote that: "A fundamental result of Herbrand has the effect that any derivation of a theorem in a consistent axiom system corresponds to a truth-functional tautology of a form related to the statement of the theorem and the axioms of the system in a predetermined way. This and the possibility … of viewing axiom systems as proof-grinding machines[,] to the investigation of the question of derivability in general, and inconsistency (i.e. derivability of contradictions) in particular of axiom systems." (1970, p. 157) This led Wang, while working at IBM and then AT&T's Bell Laboratories, to develop three programs, Wang machines, based upon Gentzen-Herbrand methods, for automated theorem proving for propositional logic, for a

decidable fragment of first-order predicate logic, and for all of the predicate calculus. It was the latter program that proved the more than 350 theorems of the *Principia*, albeit admittedly rather simple theorems of pure predicate calculus with identity. This work, however, became the benchmark for testing the abilities of other theorem provers that would be developed. Wang explained that his work was based on cut-free formalisms of the predicate calculus initiated by Herbrand and Gentzen, with ideas also borrowed from Hilbert and Bernays, Burton DREBEN, Evert Willem Beth, Jaakko HINTIKKA, and Kurt Schütte, among others (1960; 1970, p. 228).

Wang also had a significant impact upon work in "pure" logic, most especially showing how to repair a problem arising in Quine's treatment of ordinal numbers in the first edition of *Mathematical Logic*. The problem was first noted by J. B. Rosser in October 1941. Rosser showed that the Burali–Forti paradox could be derived in the set theory presented in Quine's text. Calling this the "B40" disaster, Quine recalled that Wang showed "what should have been done" to avoid the paradox, namely: "If the sets of *Mathematical Logic* were really not to exceed the classes of 'New foundations', the bound variables in their membership conditions should be limited to sets for their values. Such was Wang's neat repair of *Mathematical Logic*, occasioning the revised edition, 1951." (Quine 1985, p. 146) Quine also noted that the New Foundations system still "retained interest, for Wang proved that *Mathematical Logic* as revised is consistent if and only if" NF is consistent (Quine 1985, p. 146). Wang's interest in pure logic was also exemplified in his writings, mostly from the 1950s and 60s, on formal logic, including, for example, a joint paper with Rosser on nonstandard models of formal logic. His interest in set theory was reflected by a number of papers, for the most part written during that same period, on the set-theoretic axiomatization of number theory, and during the spring of 1964 he and Quine briefly worked together on ways of generating infinite ordinals.

In "Gödel's and Some Other Examples of Problem Transmutation" (1991) Wang showed how an attempt to prove a theorem or study a theory of logic sometimes led to a different theorem or to some result in another theory, not always initially suspected to be related to the first. Thus, for example, he showed how Gödel's effort to prove the (relative) consistency of analysis led to Gödel's discovery of the undecidability of certain propositions of some fragments of set theory, thereby linking the model-theoretic problem of the consistency of a theory with the recursion-theoretic problem of its decidability. Another example of "problem mutation" given by Wang concerned his own domino problem (or Wang tiles), in which the task was to arrange the tiles in a set in a linear arrangement, with one tile recurring in each set, so that each set had a solution, yielding an array equivalent to a Turing machine. Contrary to expectation, the tiling problem was found to be undecidable. So likewise was the task of arranging the tiles in an array in which one tile recurred on the diagonal. This led to the result in computational complexity which seeks to answer the *P = NP* problem in machine computation.

In his work in history and philosophy of logic and philosophy of mathematics, his practical experience in automated theorem proving had a considerable impact. Rather than systematically develop a solution to the philosophical problems in logic and mathematics that he essayed, he strove first and foremost to expound and analyze treatments set forth by others in solution to the problems, although as time progressed one can detect an increasing influence in Wang's philosophical thought of a study of Wittgenstein, especially of the *Tractaus*.

In appraising Wang's contributions, Quine, who knew him from Wang's years at Harvard, called Wang "a gifted mathematical logician" (Quine 1985, p. 306). He likewise felt that Wang was never truly happy, either in China,

to which he returned whenever he could, or in the United States, or anywhere else, although he always considered himself to be Chinese.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Note on Quine's Principles of Quantification," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 12 (1947): 130–32.

"A New Theory of Element and Number," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 13 (1948): 129–37.

"A Formal System of Logic," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 15 (1950): 25–32.

"Existence of Classes and Values Specification of Variables," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 15 (1950): 103–12.

"Non-standard Models for Formal Logic," with John Barkley Rosser, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 15 (1950): 113–29.

"Arithmetic Models for Formal Systems," *Methodos* 3 (1951): 217–32.

"The Irreducibility of Impredicative Principles," *Mathematische Annalen* 125 (1952): 55–66.

"Logic of Many-sorted Theories," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 17 (1952): 105–16.

Les systèmes axiomatiques de la théorie des ensembles, with Robert McNaughton (Paris, 1953).

"On Denumerable Bases of Formal Systems," in *Mathematical Interpretations of Formal Systems* (Amsterdam, 1955), pp. 57–84.

"A Variant to Turing's Theory of Calculating Machines," *Journal of the Association for Computing Machinery* 4 (1957): 63–92.

"Toward Mechanical Mathematics," *IBM Journal* 4 (1960): 2–22.

"Proving Theorems by Pattern Recognition, Part I," *Communications of the Association for Computing Machinery* 3 (1960): 220–34.

"Number-theoretic Concepts and Recursive Well-orderings," with Georg Kreisel and Joseph Schoenfield, *Archives of Mathematical Logic* 5 (1960): 42–64.

"Proving Theorems by Pattern Recognition, Part II," *Bell System Technical Journal* 40 (1961): 1–41.

"An Undecidable Problem on Dominoes," Report No. BL-30 (July 1961), Harvard Computation Laboratory.

A Survey of Mathematical Logic (Peking, 1962; Amsterdam, 1963). Reprinted as *Logic, Computers, and Sets* (New York, 1970).

"Mechanical Mathematics and Inferential Analysis," in *Seminar on the Relationship Between Nonnumerical Programming and the Theory of Formal Systems*, ed. P. Braffort and D. Hirschberg (Amsterdam, 1963), pp. 1–20.

"The Mechanization of Mathematical Arguments," in *Experimental Arithmetic, High Speed Computing and Mathematics* (Providence, R.I., 1963), pp. 31–40.

"Russell and His Logic," *Ratio* 7 (1965): 1–34

"Characterizations of Ordinal Numbers in Set Theory," with S. A. Cook, *Mathematische Annalen* 164 (1966): 1–25.

"Finite Set Theory, Number Theory and Axioms of Limitation," with K. R. Brown, *Mathematische Annalen* 164 (1966): 26–9.

"Short Definitions of Ordinals," with K. R. Brown, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 31 (1966): 409–14.

"Natural Hulls and Set Existence," *Zeitschrift für mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik* 13 (1967): 175–250.

"On Axioms of Conditional Set Existence," *Zeitschrift für mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik* 13 (1967): 183–8.

"A Theorem on Definitions of Zermelo-Neumann Ordinals," *Zeitschrift für mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik* 13 (1967): 241–50.

"Introduction to A. N. Kolmogorov. 'On the Principle of Excluded Middle'," in *From Frege to Gödel: A Source Book of Mathematical Logic, 1879–1931*, ed. Jean van Heijenoort (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), pp. 414–16.

"A Survey of Skolem's Work in Logic," in *Selected Works in Logic*, by Thoralf Skolem, ed. J. E. Fenstad (Oslo, 1970), pp. 17–52.

"On the Long-range Prospects of Automatic Theorem-proving," in *Symposium on Automatic Demonstration* (Berlin, 1970), pp. 101–11.

"Logic, Computation, and Philosophy," *L'âge de la science* 3 (1971): 101–15.

From Mathematics to Philosophy (New York and London, 1974).

"Kurt Gödel's Intellectual Development," *The Mathematical Intelligencer* 1 (1978): 182–4.

"Some Facts about Kurt Gödel," *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 46 (1981): 653–9.

Popular Lectures on Mathematical Logic (Beijing and New York, 1981).

"Computer Theorem Proving and Artificial Intelligence," *Contemporary Mathematics* 29 (1984): 49–70.

Reflections on Kurt Gödel (Cambridge, Mass., 1987).

"Gödel's and Some Other Examples of Problem Transmutation," in *Perspectives on the History of Mathematical Logic*, ed. Thomas Drucker (Boston, 1991), pp. 101–9.

Other Relevant Works
Computation, Logic, Philosophy: A Collection of Essays (Beijing and Dordrecht, 1990).

A Logical Journey: From Gödel to Philosophy (Cambridge, Mass., 1996).

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Proc of APA v70*, *Who Was Who in Amer v12*

Anellis, Irving H. "In Memoriam – Hao Wang (1921–1995)," *Modern Logic* 5 (1995): 329–37.

Loveland, Donald W. "Automated Theorem Proving: A Quarter-Century Review," *Contemporary Mathematics* 29 (1984): 1–45.

O'Leary, Daniel J. "Principia Mathematica and the Development of Automated Theorem Proving," in *Perspectives on the History of Mathematical Logic*, ed. Thomas Drucker (Boston, 1991), pp. 47–53.

Parsons, Charles D. "In Memoriam: Hao Wang, 1921–1995," *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 2 (1996): 108–11.

Parsons, Charles D., et al. "A Bibliography of Hao Wang," *Philosophia Mathematica* 6 (1998): 25–38.

Quine, W. V. *The Time of My Life: An Autobiography* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985).

Irving H. Anellis

WARD, Harry Frederick (1873–1966)

Harry F. Ward was born on 15 October 1873 in Middlesex, England. Ward was raised as a Free Methodist and emigrated to Utah in 1891 to preach. In 1893–4 Ward attended the University of Southern California and became interested in philosophy with professor George Albert COE. Ward followed Coe to Northwestern University, where he came into contact with the pragmatism of John DEWEY and George H. MEAD at the nearby University of Chicago. After completing his BA at Northwestern in 1897, Ward then earned his MA in philosophy at Harvard University in 1898, where William JAMES further influenced him. Upon returning to Chicago, he participated in the settlement house movement, became a Methodist minister in 1902, and ministered to several Chicago churches.

In 1908 the Federal Council of Churches adopted Ward's "Social Creed of the Churches," which urged equal rights, the Sabbath, elimination of child labor, fewer hours of work in a week, and workplace arbitration, and other socially progressive goals.

Other denominations soon supported this social creed, and in modified form the Methodist Church remains committed to its principles. Ward quickly became a national leader of the Social Gospel movement, joining Walter RAUSCHENBUSCH and Washington GLADDEN.

In 1913 Ward was appointed as the first professor of social service at Boston University's School of Theology. In 1918 he became professor of Christian ethics at Union Theological Seminary in New York City, and taught there until retiring in 1941. Remaining active in the Progressive movement and a voice for democratic socialism, he was a leader of the Methodist Church's Federation for Social Service, and a co-founder and chair of the American Civil Liberties Union. In 1932 Ward also helped to found the American League against War and Fascism (later called the League for Peace and Democracy), which was a powerful organization promoting a pacifist approach to international relations, lasting until World War II. After the war, Ward continued to speak and write about his social causes. Ward died on 9 December 1966 in Palisades, New Jersey.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Social Ministry: An Introduction to the Study and Practice of Social Service (New York, 1910).
The Social Creed of the Churches (New York, 1914).
Poverty and Wealth, from the Viewpoint of the Kingdom of God (New York, 1915).
Social Evangelism (New York, 1915).
The Labor Movement, from the Standpoint of Religious Values (New York, 1917).
The Gospel for a Working World (New York, 1918).
The New Social Order: Principles and Programs (New York, 1919).
The Opportunity for Religion in the Present World Situation (New York, 1919).
Our Economic Morality and the Ethic of Jesus (New York, 1929).
Which Way Religion? (New York, 1931).
In Place of Profit: Social Incentives in the Soviet Union (New York, 1933).
Democracy and Social Change (New York, 1940).
The Soviet Spirit (New York, 1944).
The Story of American–Soviet Relations, 1917–1959 (New York, 1959).

Other Relevant Works

Ward's papers are at Union Theological Seminary in New York City.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Religious Bio, Who Was Who in Amer v4
Duke, David N. *In the Trenches with Jesus and Marx: Harry F. Ward and the Struggle for Social Justice* (Tuscaloosa, Ala., 2003).
Link, Eugene P. *Labor-Religion Prophet: The Times and Life of Harry F. Ward* (Boulder, Col., 1984).

John R. Shook

WARD, Lester Frank (1841–1913)

Lester Frank Ward was born on 18 June 1841 in Joliet, Illinois, the youngest of ten children. His father was a jack-of-all-trades working as a millwright, farmer, and mechanic. Since the Ward family was neither wealthy, nor situated in places with well-developed school systems, but rather close to the frontier, Lester did not receive a formal education. Ward's initial experience with education was as an autodidact; he attended school with enthusiasm, whenever possible. However, schools were open only intermittently, and only for a few weeks at a time. The experience of life on the frontier did, however, shape Ward's outlook from early on. In 1855 the Wards moved to Iowa. In

January 1857 Ward's father, Justus Ward, died, and the remainder of the family returned to Illinois. The following year he joined one of his older brothers in Myersburg, Pennsylvania. In 1861 he enrolled at Susquehanna Collegiate Institute in Towanda, Pennsylvania. After the Civil War broke out, he joined a local Pennsylvania regiment in 1862, and was seriously wounded in 1864.

From the war's end until 1905 Ward worked for the federal government and continued his education. Between 1865 and 1881 he worked for the United States Treasury Department, and studied at Columbian College (now George Washington University), receiving the BA in 1869, an LLB degree, and an MA degree in 1872. From 1882 until 1906 he worked for the US Geological Survey, initially as an assistant geologist, after 1889 as a geologist, and after 1892 as a paleontologist. In 1882 he also was appointed honorary curator of the department of fossil plants in the US National Museum. He was appointed professor of sociology at Brown University in 1906 and held that position until his death. In 1905 he became the editor of the *American Journal of Sociology*, and in 1907 he served as the first President of the American Sociological Society (now the American Sociological Association). Ward died on 18 April 1913 in Washington, D.C.

Ward was one of the first American sociologists and frequently is considered the father of American sociology. However, during the twentieth century his contributions seemed to warrant little more than an occasional footnote in sociological books and articles. His most important works include *Dynamic Sociology* (1883), *Outlines of Sociology* (1898), *Pure Sociology* (1903), and *Applied Sociology* (1906), and the collection of his diverse writings in six volumes, *Glimpses of the Cosmos*.

Ward's writings were inspired by his notion that it is possible to identify social laws, and that these laws must be harnessed and controlled for the benefit of humanity. He regarded universal education as the means *par excellence* for achieving equality among human beings. This assumption led to the development of his theory of "Telesis" or planned progress. Ward thought that it was possible to control social evolution through the careful administration of education in order to nurture the type of intellect necessary to direct future social progress. His theories of social engineering represent one of two dominant trends in nineteenth-century American sociology, diverging from the laissez-faire perspective of his contemporary, William Graham SUMNER, who had instead concluded that the power of the norms and folkways developed over the course of human evolution made them immune to social reform.

In these as in many other regards, Ward was ahead of his contemporaries, including many of the early sociologists of his time. Still, the question remains: how did one of the founders of American sociology subsequently become one of the most neglected sociologists and social theorists? The answer may lie in his commitment to social justice. He was a strong supporter of equality between men and women, and also ahead of his time as a critic of economic as well as racial inequality. To Ward, the horizon for studying social reality must not be confined merely to the past and the present, but must include the future. Indeed, in order for social research, and sociology, to be meaningful activities relating to social, political, and cultural life, visions of future conditions of existence that will realize to an increasing extent – and be more compatible with – the norms and values that inform and inspire our actions and lives today, are crucial. Without such visions of future conditions that are qualitatively superior, not only to past conditions, but also and especially to present circumstances, social research and sociology are much more likely to reinforce those features of modern societies that are problematic and causally related to sustaining structures of inequality, rather than pointing beyond those increasingly problematic features.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dynamic Sociology, or Applied Social Science, 2 vols (New York, 1883; 2nd edn 1897).

Outlines of Sociology (New York, 1898).

Pure Sociology: A Treatise on the Origin and Spontaneous Development of Society (New York, 1903, 2nd edn 1909).

Applied Sociology: A Treatise on the Conscious Improvement of Society by Society (Boston, 1906).

The Psychic Factors of Civilization (Boston, 1906; 2nd edn 1913).

Glimpses of the Cosmos, 6 vols (New York, 1913–18).

Other Relevant Works

Ward's papers are at Brown University.

Lester Ward and the Welfare State, ed. Henry Steele Commager (Indianapolis, 1967).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v13*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Bierstedt, Richard. "Lester Frank Ward," in *American Sociological Theory: A Critical History* (New York, 1981), pp. 45–87.

Chugerman, Samuel. *Lester Frank Ward, The American Aristotle: A Summary and Interpretation of His Sociology* (Durham, N.C., 1939).

Rafferty, Edward C. *Apostle of Human Progress: Lester Frank Ward and American Political Thought, 1841–1913* (Lanham, Md., 2003).

Scott, Clifford H. *Lester Frank Ward* (Boston, 1976).

Harry F. Dahms

WARFIELD, Benjamin Breckinridge (1851–1921)

Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield was born on 5 November 1851 at Gasmere, a country estate near Lexington, Kentucky, to a family rich with American and religious heritage. His mother, Mary Cabell Breckinridge, was the daughter of the prominent Presbyterian preacher-theologian Robert Jefferson Breckinridge, and a descendent of John B. Breckinridge, a United States Senator and Attorney General under President Thomas Jefferson. Warfield's father, William Warfield, was descended from English Puritan ancestors who had fled to America to avoid persecution. Warfield received his BA from the College of New Jersey at Princeton in 1871, where President James McCosh was an early influence. After study at universities in Edinburgh and Heidelberg in 1872–3, Warfield graduated from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1876, and then studied at Leipzig in 1876–7. He served as an assistant pastor in Baltimore, Maryland in 1877–8.

In 1878 Warfield accepted a call to teach New Testament at Western Theological Seminary near Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. He soon became professor of New Testament literature and exegesis, winning a reputation as a careful Biblical exegete of outstanding theological insight. He attracted notice internationally very early in his career by his defense of the genuineness and canonicity of Peter's second letter. Early on in his career he produced a widely respected textbook on New Testament textual criticism and was writing articles on a wide range of exegetical and historical studies. This all grounded him well for a long career as professor of theology, although some lamented his shift in direction complaining that he would have become one of the great biblical commentators of that era.

However, by proceeding from New Testament to theology, Warfield was following in the footsteps of his former Princeton professor and predecessor, Charles Hodge.

Following Hodge's death in 1886, Warfield was called to Princeton Theological Seminary to take the historic chair of didactic and polemic theology, and he held this position until his death. In this position, he became one of the leading Reformed theologians of the day. Princeton Seminary, renowned as the bastion of Old School Presbyterianism, had begun in 1812 under the direction of Archibald Alexander as a "nursery of vital piety as well as of sound theological learning" and with the express purpose both to "inform the understanding" and "impress the heart." When Warfield arrived on faculty its tradition had long been faithful to these goals, and his massive scholarship and deeply affective religion would distinguish him as the quintessential Princetonian. Warfield was awarded the honorary degrees DD (1880) and LLD (1892) from the College of New Jersey; LLD from Davidson College (1892); Litt.D. by Lafayette College (1911); and STD by the University of Utrecht (1913). He fell suddenly ill with coronary problems on Christmas Eve of 1920, and Warfield died on 16 February 1921 in Princeton, New Jersey.

In Warfield's day, classic liberal thought was at its height. In his own Presbyterian denomination, the Presbyterian Church of USA, traditional Calvinism was declining, and attempts to revise the Westminster Confession of Faith were increasing. Demands for greater doctrinal latitude came from virtually all sides, and challenges to traditional Christian and Protestant theology came in many forms. Questions regarding the reliability of the Scriptures, the deity of Christ, the nature of the atonement, predestination, the objective reality of the human soul, the supernaturalness of Christian salvation, were all brought to the table. Polemicist that he was, Warfield took all challengers, from the radical biblical criticism and anti-supernaturalists of liberal modernism to the Arminian tendencies of evangelicalism.

Nor was Warfield content with a merely defensive posture. Throughout his productive career he launched his own assault, publishing hundreds of articles, books, and reviews on the widest range of subjects – philosophical, theological, exegetical, scientific, historical, devotional, and popular – producing a steady stream of devastating critical analyses of the many theological aberrations of the day. He championed the cause of historic Calvinism and wrote most widely on scriptural inspiration and inerrancy, Christology, and the history and theology of the various Perfectionist movements of the nineteenth century. He also produced historical–theological analyses of Tertullian, Augustine, Pelagius, John Calvin, the Reformed Confessions, Jonathan Edwards, and others. He provided critical reviews of more than a thousand books, and his other writings, numbering many hundreds and treating a vast array of subjects, appeared in virtually all the periodic publications of the time and most notably in *The Presbyterian Review*, *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, and *The Princeton Theological Review*.

In 1881, with A. A. Hodge, Warfield wrote the influential article "Inspiration" that quickly drew attention to his abilities as a theologian. This and later publications on similar subjects gained him the reputation as the most prominent spokesman for the doctrine of inspiration and inerrancy. That Scripture is the Word of God, Warfield argued, settled all questions of authority and error.

Warfield had a serious interest in the subject of evolution and, ironically, although he rejected atheistic Darwinianism, he saw no necessary conflict between his doctrine of inerrancy and the concept of the evolutionary development of the human body. He allowed for evolution so long as that process is seen as guided by divine providence and so long as the human mind is acknowledged to be the result of a divinely creative act. Even so, however, he found difficulty in reconciling evolution with the details of Genesis chapter two and the creation of Eve from Adam.

Late in his career, Warfield's attention turned toward the various perfectionist move-

ments that had arisen in his day, writing approximately a thousand pages on the subject, the last of which were published posthumously. He judged all varieties of Perfectionism to be a minimizing of sin and the law of God and as inconsistent with the Biblical and Reformed demand of perseverance and struggle against sin. The Christian in this life is always *simul iustus et peccator*.

Supreme among Warfield's many interests was Christology, and more than just a polemic theologian, he was first and foremost a "Christologian." Nor were his reasons merely academic: he was deeply convinced that in this theme we are brought to the very heart of the Christian faith. For Warfield, to maintain vigorously and carefully the doctrine of Christ set forth in scripture is to seek to preserve Christianity itself. Nineteenth and twentieth-century denials of the historicity of Christ, his mighty works, his deity, his two natures, his vicarious death, and his triumphal resurrection, all threatened the very essence of Christianity. If these issues were not understood in light of the Bible, then the entire Christian structure would crumble, and redemption from sin would be only a dream. Warfield wrote therefore as a polemic – with penetrating analysis, careful exposition, and devastating critique – but always with a deep sense of adoration of Christ and of utter dependence upon him for redemption from sin.

Among Warfield's theological contributions was his development and careful statement of the doctrine of the Trinity. He did not primarily develop the doctrine along traditional lines, but in a redemptive-historical manner, showing that God's tri-unity was a truth revealed progressively as the gospel itself came to light. In this sense, he said, the doctrine of the Trinity is "incidental" to the gospel. He also sought more than most to establish the doctrine exegetically seeing it reflected in various New Testament expressions. In terms of theological formulation, Warfield did not deny the significance of the terms Father, Son, and Spirit as revealing the mutual relations of the Persons of the Trinity. But he emphatically denied any semblance of subordinationism and even that the order (Father, Son, Spirit) is an ontological one. He was committed to the principle of equalization and pointed out that the apostle Paul in fact frequently speaks of "Christ/Lord, God, Spirit" – that is, Son, Father, Spirit. All biblical hints of subordination are to be understood in economic and redemptive terms only. "Son" does not connote derivation but likeness and equality. Warfield argued that in Calvin's notion of the *autotheotes* of Christ the *homoousiotes* of the Nicene Fathers was brought to its full right; similarly, in Warfield's commitment to equalization Calvin's notion of *autotheotes* came to its own.

Contemporary Warfield studies tend to make too much of his indebtedness to common sense realism. Warfield was in agreement with the Scottish philosophy – the dominant philosophy of the day, taught by McCosh at Princeton College – which had some bearing on Warfield's overall approach, in which apologetics precedes theology. However, the influence of common sense on Warfield's theological positions has often been overstated, particularly in terms of the inerrancy of Scripture. The same philosophy held by scholars at places such as Harvard and Yale certainly did not lead them to a doctrine of inerrancy. Warfield himself, as well as others since have demonstrated thoroughly that his doctrine was no new innovation but parallels the conviction not only of Augustine, Calvin, and the Westminster Assembly but also of the mainstream of Christianity throughout the centuries, all of which predate common sense realism. In fact Warfield introduced nothing new to the content of Presbyterian theology. Warfield did give large place to reason in his apologetic method – for many, a much greater place than a Calvinist ought. He held that human sense perceptions were generally reliable. And he held that human reason must judge whether revelation is, in fact, divinely given and true. But at the same time he argued

forcefully for the traditional Calvinistic doctrines of human inability and the necessity of the illuminating work of the Spirit. Neither his theological nor his apologetic stances rested on the common sense philosophy – its idea of "first principles" is nowhere evident in his writings, and its language is not prominent. Indeed, judging from Warfield's work, it might seem that the common sense philosophy was on the wane.

Consistently at the center of Warfield's attention was the gospel of divine rescue for sinners. If the attack was on the Person of Christ, his concern was not academic only, but soteriological – we would be left without a savior and without a gospel. If the attack was concerning the integrity of the Scriptures, his concern was not one of party spirit. His concern was that in the end we would be left without witness to Christ and, indeed, with a Christ who is himself mistaken as to the nature and authority of the book that was written about him. If the attack was an Arminian one, his concern was that the gospel would be so watered down as to devalue Christ and render him much less than the mighty savior he is. Throughout even his most polemic writings his passion for Christ and utter dependence upon a divine Savior are plainly evident. It is for this reason Warfield was so passionate for historic Calvinism. For him, "dependence" upon God was the very essence of true religion, and, thus, Calvinism is religion expressed in its purest form. That "God saves sinners" is both the heart of the Calvinistic system and the heart-cry of the Christian.

The breadth and depth of Warfield's scholarship and exhaustive acquaintance with the theological and philosophical literature and thought of his day constituted the high-water mark of Old Princeton. He is recognized by many as the second greatest theologian America has produced, behind Jonathan Edwards. Although Warfield has not proven nearly so influential as Edwards, he far exceeded him in exegetical abilities and in the breadth and depth and precision of his schol-

arship. He is still highly revered in conservative Reformed circles, and in his own day he was recognized by friend and foe alike as a force to be reckoned with in all theological debate. But for all his dedicated effort and prodigious literary output, Warfield ultimately failed in his attempt to stem the tide of liberal thinking. The new ideas he so vigorously opposed continued to gain ground, and Liberalism continued to rise even in his own denomination. Indeed, Princeton itself reorganized just eight years after his death and never again saw itself as the fortress of that faith and world view for which he so passionately contended.

Although good-natured and personable, Warfield was something of a recluse with his books, and due largely to his wife's lifelong illness he was rarely involved in engagements outside Princeton. Nor was he much involved in denominational affairs. Warfield did very little other than write, teach, and preach at Princeton. Consequently, no biography of Warfield has yet appeared: his legacy is found in his writings. Many of Warfield's writings still await republication. After his death many of his major journal articles were collected and published in a series of ten volumes of his *Works* (1927–32), and many other of his significant writings were gathered into the two-volume *Selected Shorter Writings* (1970–73). Several of his monographs remain in print, as do three volumes of sermons.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament (London, 1886).
The Gospel of the Incarnation (New York, 1893).
Two Studies in the History of Doctrine (New York, 1897).
The Right of Systematic Theology (Edinburgh, 1897).
Acts and Pastoral Epistles: Timothy, Titus, and Philemon (Philadelphia and London, 1902).
The Power of God Unto Salvation (Philadelphia, 1903).

The Lord of Glory (New York, 1907).

The Saviour of the World (London and New York, 1914).

The Plan of Salvation (Philadelphia, 1915).

Faith and Life (New York, 1916).

Counterfeit Miracles (New York, 1918).

Other Relevant Works

Warfield's papers are at Princeton Theological Seminary.

The Works of Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, 10 vols (Oxford, 1927–32; Grand Rapids, Mich., 1991).

Selected Shorter Writings of Benjamin B. Warfield, 2 vols, ed. John Meeter (Nutley, N.J., 1970–73).

Evolution, Scripture, and Science: Selected Writings, ed. Mark A. Noll and David N. Livingstone (Grand Rapids, Mich., 2000).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Religious Bio, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v20, Who Was Who in Amer v1

Hoffecker, W. Andrew. *Piety and the Princeton Theologians: Archibald Alexander, Charles Hodge, and Benjamin Warfield* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1981).

Livingstone, David N. "B. B. Warfield, The Theory of Evolution and Early Fundamentalism," *Evangelical Quarterly 58* (1986): 69–83.

Meeter, John E., and Roger Nicole. *A Bibliography of Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, 1851–1921* (Nutley, N.J., 1974).

Noll, Mark A., ed. *The Princeton Theology, 1812–1921: Scripture, Science, Theological Method from Archibald Alexander to Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1983).

Wells, David F., ed. *Reformed Theology in America: A History of Its Modern Development* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1985).

Fred G. Zaspel

WARTOFSKY, Marx William (1928–97)

Marx Wartofsky was born on 5 August 1928 in New York City, and he died there on 4 March 1997. He was raised in a progressive political milieu and both his mother and father worked in the millinery trades. An exceptional young artist and violinist, Wartofsky attended the High School of Music and Art and then studied philosophy at Columbia University (BA in 1948, MA in 1949, and PhD in philosophy in 1952), writing a dissertation on Denis Diderot. After several years of exclusion from the profession because of his political beliefs, he began teaching in the Boston University College of Basic Studies in 1957 and then the university's philosophy department from 1959 to 1983, rising through the professorial ranks and serving as department chair from 1967 to 1973. A renowned teacher, he was Distinguished Professor at Baruch College and the Graduate Center of the City University of New York from 1983 to 1997 and also served terms as department chair at Baruch. He received fellowships from the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Fulbright Foundation, and the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. He was also visiting professor at Brandeis University and at the University of Paris VIII, and for two years an associate of the REHSEIS research group in Paris.

Wartofsky's extensive professional activities included a term as Secretary-Treasurer of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association and the Presidency of the Society for Philosophy and Technology in 1989. He served as Co-Director with Robert S. Cohen of the Boston Colloquium for the Philosophy of Science from 1960 to 1985, was a co-editor of the Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science volumes 1–102, and the Director of the Baruch Colloquium for Philosophy, Politics, and the Social Sciences. From 1970 until 1997 he was the founder and editor of the journal *The Philosophical*

Forum, noted for its breadth and for supporting new directions in philosophy, including its special issues on women and philosophy and on the black experience.

Working within the dialectical tradition of Hegel and Marx, with some pragmatist influences, Wartofsky developed a unique philosophical approach that he called historical epistemology. In addition to his important books *Conceptual Foundations of Scientific Thought* (1968) and the historical and systematic study *Feuerbach* (1977), he advanced this conception in his work *Models: Representation and the Scientific Understanding* (1979) and in his over one hundred published articles.

Wartofsky investigated science and art as modes of what he called "cognitive praxis," where not only what people know but their ways of knowing change historically. He argued that this proceeds through the introduction of models or the making of representational artifacts. By this means, our experiences of nature as of visual space come to be constructed and historically transformed along with changes in social practices, understood as norm-governed sets of action, whether of production, story-telling, war, or politics. Thus science, art, and other ways of knowing are seen as emerging from the distinctively human ability to make artifacts that function as symbols (broadly conceived), where these in turn construct or constitute our very modes of perception and understanding. Inasmuch as representations, as forms of human practice, have a history, so too do ways of seeing and knowing, i.e., what counts as seeing or knowing. For example, on his view, modes of visual perception change along with changes in canonical scientific world views. Wartofsky's richly suggestive approach, which he applied to fields as diverse as early infant development, technology, and the understanding of bodies and health in medicine, has been echoed in recent work of philosophers who seek to relate knowledge to social contexts and practices.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Conceptual Foundations of Scientific Thought (New York, 1968).

Feuerbach (Cambridge, UK, 1977).

Models: Representation and the Scientific Understanding (Dordrecht, 1979).

"From Genetic Epistemology to Historical Epistemology: Kant, Marx, and Piaget," in *Piaget and the Foundations of Knowledge*, ed. L. S. Liben (Hillsdale, N.J., 1982), pp. 1–17.

"The Paradox of Painting: Pictorial Representation and the Dimensionality of Visual Space," *Social Research* 51 (1984): 863–83.

"Epistemology Historicized," in *Naturalistic Epistemology*, ed. Abner Shimony and Debra Nails (Dordrecht, 1987), pp. 357–74.

"Three Stages of Constitution: Historical Changes in the Ontological Status of the Scientific Object," in *Realism and Anti-Realism in the Philosophy of Science*, ed. Robert S. Cohen et al. (Dordrecht, 1995), pp. 207–16.

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with Carol C. Gould, *Women and Philosophy: Toward a Theory of Liberation* (New York, 1976).

Further Reading

Proc of APA v71

Gould, Carol C., and Robert S. Cohen, eds. *Artifacts, Representations and Social Practice: Essays for Marx W. Wartofsky* (Dordrecht, 1994).

Carol C. Gould, ed. *Constructivism and Practice: Toward a Historical Epistemology* (Lanham, Md., 2003).

Carol C. Gould

WASHBURN, Margaret Floy (1871–1939)

Margaret Floy Washburn was born on 25 July 1871 in Harlem, New York City. She discovered experimental psychology and philosophy at Vassar College in upstate New York, where she received her BA in 1891. James McKeen CATTELL wanted to admit her into his graduate courses in psychology at Columbia University, but its trustees delayed her for four months, and then only let her "audit" classes. She impressed Cattell, and with his help she got a scholarship offer to become Edward TITCHENER's graduate assistant at Cornell University. There Washburn absorbed the major currents in experimental psychology and philosophy of mind. She took courses in philosophy as well, notably ethics from Jacob G. SCHURMAN and a course on German philosopher R. H. Lotze from visiting lecturer F. C. S. Schiller. Vassar gave her the MA degree in 1893 for work *in absentia*. She received her PhD in 1894 from Cornell, becoming the first woman to receive a doctorate in psychology in the US. She taught at Wells College in New York as professor of psychology, philosophy, and ethics from 1894 to 1900, at Sage College of Cornell, and the University of Cincinnati. She then accepted a call from Vassar College to become associate professor of psychology in 1903, joining philosopher H. Heath BAWDEN. In 1908 Vassar separated the department of psychology from philosophy, making Washburn the psychology department head and promoting her to full professor.

Washburn conducted extensive research with her students, producing dozens of experimental studies, and quickly developing a reputation for superior teaching skills. She published more than 200 articles across psychology and philosophy, and two major books. She was very active in the profession, serving on the editorial boards of major psychological journals, and on various committees. Her outstanding contributions were recognized when she was elected President of the American Psychological Association in 1921, the second woman after Mary Whiton CALKINS to receive this honor. She was Vice President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1927. After Titchener died in 1929, the Society of Experimental Psychology finally admitted her to membership. She also was President of the New York Branch of the American Psychological Association in 1931 and in that year was elected to the National Academy of Sciences (as only the second woman scientist). In 1932 she was chosen to be the US delegate to the International Congress of Psychology. She retired from Vassar in 1937, and died on 29 October 1939 in Poughkeepsie, New York.

Her senior course in psychology was based on James Clark Murray's *Handbook of Psychology* which impressed upon her the failures of associationism. Also persuaded of absolute idealism's limitations, she initially gravitated towards Wilhelm Wundt and his American follower William JAMES, whose *Principles of Psychology* (1890) advanced a dualistic parallelism and voluntaristic empiricism. However, Titchener's structural psychology was the most developed experimental theory available to her, although Washburn rejected his extreme reliance on introspection to reveal the underlying "atoms" of sensation. Washburn pursued the idea that motor activity is essential to intellectual processes, and after publishing preliminary conclusions in the early 1900s she discovered her agreement with the functional and pragmatic psychologists at Chicago University, John DEWEY and James ANGELL. She could not join these pragmatists or James, because she rejected the efficacy of mental ideas and the pragmatic theory of truth. Washburn remained a dualist and epiphenomenalist, close to the position of Harvard psychologist Hugo MÜNSTERBERG, convinced that neither materialism nor idealism could explain psycho-physiological phenomena.

Washburn's motor theory of consciousness, fully developed in *Movement and Mental Imagery* (1916), rejects the widespread views that ideas become associated simply by appearing consecutively, or by forming more complex

ideas through the work of purely intellectual processes. For ideas to become related, attentive focus must take them up together as relevant to ongoing motor activities that can no longer be habitual. The principle that the flow or temporary blockage of voluntary physical behaviors is the ground for all mental phenomena became Washburn's way of eliminating speculative philosophy from scientific psychology. Subjective idealism, vitalism, and emergent evolutionism all tried to retain special privileges for the mind to keep it immune from mechanistic explanation. Washburn's experimental methodology attacked all such refuges for free will, teleology, and spiritualism.

There were limits to Washburn's scientism. Although she had no friendliness towards consciousness as an independently existing substance, the rise of John B. WATSON's behaviorism in the 1910s aroused her disagreement. Watson not only wanted to discard consciousness, but also any reference to mental events, banishing introspective methods. Behaviorism's materialism met with Washburn's objection that no one can reasonably deny the existence of colors, sounds, and so on. She defended introspection, asserting that psychology had every right and need to interpret mental processes in conjunction with activity, which requires the experimental subject's own reports on perceptions, thoughts, and so on. Washburn also advanced comparative psychology with extensive research into animal psychology. Her pioneering text *The Animal Mind* (1908) consolidated the emerging discipline, showing how to investigate animal mental processes by making analogies with human mental processes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Psychology of Deductive Logic," *Mind* n.s. 7 (1898): 523–30.

"The Genetic Function of Movement and Organic Sensations for Social Consciousness," *American Journal of Psychology* 14 (1903): 73–8.

"Wundtian Feeling Analysis and the General Significance of Feeling," *Philosophical Review* 14 (1905): 21–9.

The Animal Mind (New York, 1908; 1917; 1926; 1936).

Movement and Mental Imagery: Outlines of a Motor Theory of the Complex Mental Process (Boston, Mass., 1916).

"The Social Psychology of Man and the Lower Animals," in *Studies in Psychology Contributed by Colleagues and Former Students of E. B. Titchener* (Worcester, Mass., 1917), pp. 11–17.

"Dualism in Animal Psychology," *Journal of Philosophy* 15 (1919): 41–4.

"Introspection as an Objective Method," *Psychological Review* 29 (1922): 89–112.

"Gestalt Psychology and Motor Psychology," *American Journal of Psychology* 37 (1926): 516–20.

"Feeling and Emotion," *Psychological Bulletin* 24 (1927): 573–95.

Other Relevant Works

"Some Recollections," in *A History of Psychology in Autobiography*, vol. 2, ed. Carl Murchison (Worcester, Mass., 1932), pp. 333–58.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Bio Dict Psych by Zusne*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v30*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Boring, E.G., et al, eds. "Washburn Commemorative Volume," *American Journal of Psychology* 39 (December 1927).

Dallenbach, K. "Margaret Floy Washburn, 1871–1939," *American Journal of Psychology* 53 (1940): 1–5.

Goodman, E. S. "Margaret F. Washburn (1871–1939): First Woman Ph.D. in Psychology," *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 5 (1980): 69–80.

Martin, M. F. "The Psychological Contributions of Margaret Floy Washburn," *American Journal of*

Psychology 53 (1940): 7–18.

Mull, H. K. "A Bibliography of the Writings of Margaret Floy Washburn, 1894–1927," *American Journal of Psychology* 39 (1927): 428–36.

Pillsbury, W. G. "Margaret Floy Washburn (1871–1939)," *Psychological Review* 47 (1940): 99–109.

Scarborough, Elizabeth. "Margaret Floy Washburn," in *Women in Psychology: A BioBibliographic Sourcebook*, ed. A. N. O'Connell and N. F. Russo (New York, 1990), pp. 342–9.

Scarborough, Elizabeth, and Laurel Furumoto. "Margaret Floy Washburn," in *Untold Lives: The First Generation of American Women Psychologists* (New York, 1987), pp. 109–29.

John R. Shook

WASHINGTON, Booker Taliaferro
(1856–1915)

Booker T. Washington was born into slavery on 4 April 1856 in Franklin County south of Roanoke, Virginia. He was educated at Virginia's Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, a freedmen school devoted to industrial education. Upon graduation in 1875, Washington accepted a position as a teacher in Tinkersville, West Virginia and taught there until 1878, when he began to attend Wayland Seminary in Washington, D.C., but he quit after six months. In 1879 Washington was invited to return to Hampton as a teacher. In 1881 he founded Tuskegee Institute in Tuskegee, Alabama and served as its President until his death. He founded the National Negro Business League in the same year he published his widely read autobiography, *Up From Slavery* (1901). Washington died on 14 November 1915 in Tuskegee, Alabama.

To understand Washington's social philosophy, one must understand something of the times in which he lived. His earliest memories were of slavery. He passed his teenage years during the era of Reconstruction, when blacks emphasized education, voting, and politics as the keys to improving their position. Yet after Reconstruction officially ended in 1877, southern whites closed some of the schools that had been established for blacks and also manipulated poll taxes, literacy tests, and primary elections to disenfranchise most black voters. In addition, in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896) the US Supreme Court held that formal, legal segregation was constitutional as long as the separate facilities for blacks were theoretically equal to those provided for whites. The challenge was to devise a strategy that would help blacks survive and even prosper during difficult times.

Washington regarded education as one key to success, but he had in mind the particular sort of industrial education that he personally experienced at Hampton Institute, where he and his fellow students were taught the standard subjects of the high school curriculum but also were expected to work at a trade for a few hours each day and to conform to the canons of Victorian morality. From 5.00 in the morning until 9.30 at night, the ringing of a bell told Hampton's students when to get up, go to classes, go to meals, go to work, and go to bed. Attendance at chapel was compulsory, and relations between the sexes were closely supervised.

Washington regarded Hampton's founder, Samuel Chapman Armstrong, as "a great man – the noblest, rarest human being that it has ever been my privilege to meet" (1901, p. 32). Armstrong had established the regimen at Hampton because he thought that slavery (and perhaps the Negro's own nature as well) created some special problems. Slavery had encouraged laziness and given free rein to sensuality, Armstrong wrote, adding that the Negro was "a child of the tropics and the differentiation of races goes deeper than the skin" (Bullock 1967, p. 76). According to Armstrong, "The North generally thinks that the great thing is to free the

Negro from his former owners; the real thing is to save him from himself." The implications of the Hampton curriculum are still the subject of debate. Critics have said that vocational training was not intended to uplift blacks to the point where they could compete for professional positions, or even for the best technical jobs, but rather to train them for effective service in the humbler walks of life. Behind the emphasis on vocational training for blacks, the critics say, lay the belief that most blacks were incapable of higher learning and should instead be trained as useful workers (Anderson 1988).

Other writers have noted that during the twenty-five years when Armstrong was the principal, Hampton was essentially a normal school preparing teachers for work in the black South. The emphasis on teacher training was supplemented with an emphasis on developing Christian character and with a work program that enabled some students to support themselves and made it easier for the school to raise and save money. But at least until the 1890s Hampton was primarily concerned with general education. Moreover, given the widespread belief that blacks should be kept in subordinate roles, it may be that some emphasis on vocational training was needed to prevent the total eradication of black schools. If schools for blacks had not been made to appear as nonthreatening as possible, there would have been fewer schools (McPherson 1975, pp. 210–12).

Whatever the intent and implications of industrial education, Washington thrived at Hampton. In 1875, when Washington had completed a three-year course that qualified him to be an elementary teacher, he was one of the honor students who spoke at the commencement. Then, after teaching for four years in a school in West Virginia, he was invited to return to Hampton as a teacher. When Hampton admitted some one hundred Indian students from the West, Armstrong chose Washington to preside over their acculturation and to be the house father at the Indian dormitory (the "Wigwam"). Armstrong also put Washington in charge of the night school at Hampton. And in

1881, when he was asked to recommend someone to head a normal school that was to be established for African Americans in the town of Tuskegee, Alabama, Armstrong answered: "The only man I can suggest is one Mr. Booker Washington, a graduate of this institution, a very competent capable mulatto … the best man we ever had here" (Harlan 1972, p. 110).

When offered the opportunity to set up his own school in Tuskegee, Washington chose Hampton as the model. He did so because he thought the Hampton system was especially suited to the requirements of "a race that had little necessity to labor in its native land before coming to America, and after coming to this country was forced to labor for two hundred and fifty years under circumstances that were not calculated to make the race fond of hard work." Washington said it would be "almost a waste of time" to focus exclusively on book learning (1901, p. 69). Instead, he supplemented the standard courses with trades and farming, with compulsory chapel, daily inspections, and military drill. Washington knew that most of his students eventually would become teachers, but he wanted them to do more than impart academic information; he also wanted them to return to their black communities and uplift "the moral and religious life of the people" (1901, p. 74).

Critics have said that Washington was preparing black people for efficient service in subordinate positions. Washington insisted, however, that his goal was *not* to have blacks continue on the same level on which they had worked during the era of slavery, but rather that African Americans should prepare for higher stations by starting with the basic occupations.

For Washington, success in the world of work was a key prerequisite for racial progress. If a black man succeeded in business or farming, Washington wrote, he would eventually win the respect of his neighbors. "No man who continues to add something to the material, intellectual, and social well-being of the place in which he lives is long left without proper reward." (1901, p. 165) "Almost

without exception," Washington wrote, "whether in the North or in the South, wherever I have seen a Negro who was succeeding in business … that man was treated with respect by people of both races" (Harlan 1988, p. 105). There was something in human nature that made people recognize and reward merit, "no matter under what color of skin merit is found." "No race that has anything to contribute to the markets of the world is long in any degree ostracized." (1901, pp. 90, 131)

Washington regarded interracial harmony as another key to progress. During the era of Reconstruction, he said, African Americans had placed too much emphasis on voting and politics. "We made a mistake at the beginning of our freedom …. Politics and the holding of office were too largely emphasized, almost to the exclusion of every other interest." (1972, p. 351) It was a mistake to elect freedmen to public offices, since whites understandably resented being governed by former slaves, many of whom were illiterate and ignorant. It would have been better "if some plan could have been put in operation which would have made the possession of a certain amount of education or property, or both, a test for the exercise of the franchise" (1901, p. 49). Washington insisted, however, that any tests for voting should be applied honestly to both whites and blacks. He also asked for more funding for education, pleading "that in the degree that you close the ballot box against the ignorant you will open the school-house door" (1972, p. 357).

Instead of fostering self-reliance, Washington wrote, Reconstruction caused blacks to depend upon the federal government, "very much as a child looks to its mother" (1901, p. 49). He also said that the black vote had been used to elect white politicians who had their own selfish and partisan agendas, and sometimes to empower northern whites who had gone to the South after the Civil War with revenge on their minds. In the end, though, blacks suffered most from the increase in racial and sectional tensions. Washington thought black people eventually would enjoy full political rights in the South. But progress in this direction would not begin until the white South got over the Reconstruction-born feeling that it was being forced to do something it did not want to do.

Because he thought that no movement for the elevation of southern blacks could succeed without the support of southern whites, Washington tried to reconcile the races. In his own personal life, he had learned that it was hard to win the support of people that one criticized – that making friends was "more often accomplished by giving credit for all the praiseworthy actions performed than by calling attention alone to all the evil done" (1901, pp. 117–18). Consequently, Washington pointed to examples of interracial cooperation and focused on the progress that blacks were making: the improvements in education and land ownership, the establishment of black-owned businesses, and a decline in illegitimacy. Only occasionally did he mention another side of the story – the increases in segregation, disfranchisement, and lynching.

Washington explained his social philosophy in speeches given throughout the country and in articles that had a mass circulation in journals like the *Atlantic Monthly* and the *Independent*. Most famously, he summed up his views in a widely publicized speech at the opening of an exposition (or trade fair) in Atlanta in September 1895. The speech was especially memorable because of a striking story and an unforgettable metaphor.

At the outset of his Atlanta address, Washington told of a ship that had been lost at sea for several days when it sighted another craft. When the distressed ship signaled that its crew was dying of thirst, the other vessel signaled back, "Cast down your bucket where you are." The lost ship then signaled a second time, "Water, water; send us water!" and was answered: "Cast down your bucket where you are." After a third and fourth signal were answered the same way, the captain of the distressed ship did as he was told, cast down his

bucket, and it came up full of fresh water that was fit for drinking. It turned out that the ship, although well off the coast of South America, was within the 200-mile-wide mouth of the Amazon River.

The story was a parable. Washington counseled blacks to reject any dream of returning to Africa, and he advised against moving to the North as well. Instead, he urged African Americans to cast down their buckets where they were in the South, to cultivate friendly relations with white people, and to make the best of their situation by developing skills in agriculture and business. Washington also pleaded with white industrialists not to rely on immigration to supply a workforce for their factories. It was not necessary to recruit workers in foreign lands when America itself contained a large pool of black workers. He urged the industrialists to cast down their buckets among the Negro people – a people who would "stand by you with a devotion that no foreigner can approach" (1900, pp. 166–8).

Then Washington made a dramatic gesture. Holding up his fist, he said that "in all things essential to mutual progress," blacks and whites should be "one as the hand." But, opening his palm to the assembly, Washington also insisted that "in all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the fingers" (1900, p. 168). In essence, Washington accepted separation. He said, "the wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremest folly." He decried "artificial forcing," and he reiterated that "no race that has anything to contribute to the markets of the world is long in any degree ostracized." Washington said that "the opportunity to earn a dollar in a factory just now is worth infinitely more than the opportunity to spend a dollar in the opera house" (1900, pp. 168, 171).

Washington's Atlanta address was a triumph. According to one press report, "the whole audience was on its feet in a delirium of applause" when Washington "held his dusky hand high above his head, with the fingers stretched wide apart, and said to the white people of the South on behalf of his race: 'In all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to social progress'." (Harlan 1972, p. 9) At the close of the speech, the white governor of Georgia, Rufus B. Bullock, rushed across the stage to congratulate Washington, while other whites shook his hand and said, "God bless you" and "I am with you." (1901, p. 142)

The black response to the speech was more varied. Washington acknowledged that some African Americans felt that he had not spoken out strongly enough for the "rights" of his race (1901, p. 134). However several prominent Negroes also congratulated Washington. Edward Wilmot Blyden, one of the pioneers of Pan-Africanism, found "delight" and "inspiration" in the speech" (Blyden , pp. 26–8). In a personal note to Washington, W. E. B. Du Bois characterized the Atlanta address as "a word fitly spoken." When Washington said that blacks and whites could be as separate as the fingers socially and yet united as one hand, Du Bois "rather agreed with him. I thought that this was a good general statement." Du Bois even wrote to the *New York Age* suggesting that "here might be the basis of a real settlement between whites and blacks in the South, if the South opened to the Negroes the doors of economic opportunity and the Negroes co-operated with the white South in political sympathy" (1973, p. 39).

Most important of all, from the standpoint of the history of American race relations, the Atlanta Exposition address catapulted Washington into national prominence as a black leader. Washington doubtless benefited from good timing. The death of Frederick Douglass only a few months earlier had left a vacuum in the leadership of the black race in America. But Washington owed his ascendancy primarily to the artful way in which he shaped a social philosophy to meet the requirements of his time. In the long term,

Washington sought full equality for his race, but he effectively masked the ultimate implications of his philosophy. He did so by criticizing Reconstruction, by discounting the importance of politics and mass voting, and by emphasizing the importance of interracial cooperation, trade training, and practical self-help.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Future of the American Negro (Boston, 1899; 2nd edn 1900).

The Story of My Life and Work (Toronto and Naperville, Ill., 1900).

Up From Slavery: An Autobiography (New York, 1901).

Working with the Hands (New York, 1904).

The Negro in Business (Boston, 1907).

Frederick Douglass (Philadelphia, 1907).

My Larger Education: Being Chapters from My Experience (Garden City, N.Y., 1911).

The Man Farthest Down: A Record of Observation and Study in Europe (Garden City, N.Y., 1912).

Other Relevant Works

Washington's papers are at the Library of Congress and the Tuskegee Institute in Alabama.

The Booker T. Washington Papers, 14 vols, ed. Louis R. Harlan (Urbana, Ill., 1972–89).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v7*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Anderson, James D. *The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860–1935* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1988).

Blyden, Edward Wilmot. "Letter to Booker T. Washington, September 24, 1895," in *The Booker T. Washington Papers*, ed.

Louis R. Harlan (Urbana, Ill., 1972–89), vol. 4, pp. 26–8.

Bullock, Henry. *A History of Negro Education in the South* (New York, 1967).

Du Bois, W. E. B. "Letter to Booker T. Washington, September 24, 1895," in *The Correspondence of W. E. B. Du Bois*, ed. Herbert Aptheker (Amherst, Mass., 1973–78), vol. 1, p. 39.

Harlan, Louis R. *Booker T. Washington: The Making of a Black Leader, 1856–1901* (New York, 1972).

——, *Booker T. Washington: The Wizard of Tuskegee, 1901–1915* (New York, 1983).

——, "Booker T. Washington and the National Negro Business League," in *Booker T. Washington in Perspective: Essays of Louis R. Harlan*, ed. Raymond Smock (Jackson, Miss., 1988).

McPherson, James M. *The Abolitionist Legacy: From Reconstruction to the NAACP* (Princeton, N.J., 1975).

Wolters, Raymond. *Du Bois and His Rivals* (Columbia, S.C., 2002).

Raymond Wolters

WASHINGTON, Joseph Reed, Jr. (1930–)

Joseph Washington was born on 30 October 1930 in Iowa City, Iowa. He received a BA degree in sociology from the University of Wisconsin in 1952. After serving in the United States Army for two years, Washington continued his training at Andover Newton School of Theology (BD 1957). He then completed doctoral work in social ethics at Boston University School of Theology (ThD 1961). While a Boston University student, Washington served in various pastoral capacities. He later blended his academic interests and pastoral

concerns as dean of the chapel and assistant professor of religion and philosophy at Dillard University (1961–3). This appointment was followed by teaching positions in religion at Dickinson College (1963–6), Albion College (1966–9), and Beloit College (1969–70). Washington then was professor of religious studies at the University of Virginia from 1970 to 1975, professor of religious studies and Afro-American studies at the University of California at Riverside from 1975 to 1977, and professor of religious studies and Afro-American studies at the University of Pennsylvania from 1977 to 1994.

Over the course of a distinguished academic career, Washington addressed a variety of issues related to African-American life and thought, including anti-blackness and race relations. He is probably best known for addressing the nature and meaning of black religion from the perspective of ethics and theology, particularly in the form of two books published in the mid 1960s: *Black Religion* (1964) and *The Politics of God* (1967). The former received a great deal of attention by scholars working within the new field of black theology. Their charged conversation typically revolved around questions concerning Washington's critique of black churches as theologically void and more committed to sociopolitical issues than to the gospel of Christ. He argued that the Black Church, as represented by figures such as Martin L. KING, Jr., appeared to mistake the biblical command for justice with the advocacy of coercion. Washington argued that the theological leanings of King and those of a similar mind-set attempt to force change, when adherence to the best of the Christian faith would suggest an alternate strategy. From his perspective, black churches did not provide the best hope for social transformation and racial unity. Finally, taking a controversial position, Washington suggested that blacks be integrated into the larger (white) Christian community in the United States.

The Politics of God extends this work, while also offering a corrective. Washington moved away from his earlier position requiring the dismantling of black churches as separate institutions and began to note the unique contributions these churches can make to the destruction of injustice. What he praised was their creative blending of the political and the religious. Predominantly white churches failed to fulfill their potential as conduits for social equality based on Christian principles. Therefore, blacks and their churches must become the central force in this process of transformation. In outlining this process, Washington provides a theological framework (highlighting theodicy) that emphasizes blacks as the new suffering servants through whom new life options based on equality will emerge. This new twist on theodicy sparked dialogue that has had a significant impact on the manner in which black liberation theology addresses the problem of evil within the context of a liberation paradigm.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Black Religion: The Negro and Christianity in the United States (Boston, 1964).

The Politics of God: The Future of the Black Churches (Boston, 1967).

Black and White Power Subreption (Boston, 1969).

Marriage in Black and White (Boston, 1971).

Black Sects and Cults (Garden City, N.Y., 1972).

Anti-Blackness in English Religion, 1500–1800 (Lewiston, N.Y., 1984).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Blacks in the Year 2000* (Philadelphia, 1981).

Ed., *Jews in Black Perspectives: A Dialogue* (Cranbury, N.J., 1984).

Further Reading

Cone, Cecil W. *The Identity Crisis in Black Theology* (Nashville, Tenn., 1975).

Jones, William R. *Is God a White Racist? A Preamble to Black Theology* (Garden City, N.Y., 1973).

Anthony B. Pinn

WASSERSTROM, Richard Alan (1936–)

Richard Wasserstrom was born on 9 January 1936 in New York City. He graduated from Amherst College with a BA in 1957. He received his PhD in philosophy in 1960 from the University of Michigan and then his LL.B. from Stanford University. He taught law at Stanford from 1959 to 1963, when he became an attorney in the Civil Rights Division for the Department of Justice. His work for civil rights has been a distinguished feature of his career, and includes his service as dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Tuskegee Institute from 1964 to 1967. From 1967 to 1979 he was professor of law and philosophy at the University of California, Los Angeles. In 1979 he moved to the University of California, Santa Cruz, where he held a Presidential Chair in Moral Philosophy. In 1986–7 he was President of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association. In 1994 he retired from UCSC, and he is currently living in Santa Cruz.

In the 1960s and 1970s Richard Wasserstrom was at the forefront of the effort to address philosophically normative issues of great social and political importance: racism, sexism, affirmative action, war, privacy, punishment, and disobeying law. In his important book *Philosophy and Social Issues: Five Studies* (1980), Wasserstrom says that his intention is to use non-esoteric and nontechnical language to map various arguments surrounding a particular issue. While not claiming to have a unified theory or identifiable philosophical metaposition, he acknowledges his own beliefs in the centrality of individual autonomy and the concomitant equality of individuals.

In his famous 1980 essay on "Racism and Sexism," Wasserstrom differentiates four domains of inquiry often conflated. (1) The social realities, or the existing social arrangements involving either race or sex. (2) Matters of explanation, or how given social arrangements got the way they are. (3) Ideals, or how things ought to be. (4) Instrumentalities, or how to develop appropriate vehicles of social change to achieve the suitable ideals. He contends that many current debates over race and sex do not distinguish these four domains of inquiry. For example, to claim affirmative action programs are illegitimate because race and sex are features irrelevant for admissions or other positions is to ignore that as a matter of current and historical fact race and sex play enormous roles in our social realities. To the question of what roles race and sex *ought* to play in an ideal society, Wasserstrom argues for an assimilationist ideal: in a nonracist and nonsexist society the race and sex of its members would be functionally equivalent to eye-color. Thus, no basic political rights or obligations, important institutional burdens or benefits, or social practices such as marriage would be assigned on the basis of race or sex. One challenge to such profound social changes is the claim that racial and, especially, sexual differences are natural and therefore defy the assimilationist ideal. However, he responds, the appeal to the naturalness of racial and sexual differences ignores the important point that human societies decide the meaning and significance of whatever is deemed natural. The question to be asked is *not* whether there are natural differences between males and females but, rather, whether the alleged differences deserve to be upheld and encouraged, or discouraged and eliminated. For Wasserstrom sex roles – and analogously, racial stereotypes – are morally objectionable because they make women subservient to men (or nonwhites to whites) and are inherently restrictive, robbing individuals of their rightful autonomy. Thus, no society with the sex roles or racial barriers historically or currently in place could plausibly be viewed as good or just. While he leaves open the possibility of an ideal differing from assimilationism in allowing for the maintenance of differences, he remains wary that the anti-assimilationist insistence on differences in racial and sexual senses obscures the more profound dangers to justice and morality that racism and sexism continue to pose.

His essay on "Preferential Treatment" builds on the distinctions in "Racism and Sexism." He insists that programs of "preferential treatment," or "affirmative action," be seen only as instrumentalities, that is, necessary steps to achieving an assimilationist ideal. Within a society where race and sex are no longer functionally important, such programs would indeed be unjustifiable. Furthermore, such programs are best construed not as compensatory for past injustices but as means for redistributing power, authority and privilege in morally important and desirable ways. Concomitantly they would alter ideological factors. For example, in law courts or in universities, the active participation of nonwhites and females introduces points of view otherwise excluded or denied.

A frequent claim against preferential treatment is that such programs violate the rights of members of the dominant majority. If it is wrong to take race or sex into account in the oppression of nonwhites or females, the objection goes, then it is equally wrong to take race or sex into account to favor nonwhites or females. But given the context of the historical and social realities, Wasserstrom finds this reasoning to be plainly mistaken. The practices of slavery and subordination are wrong, he argues, not because they take an irrelevant factor – race or sex – into account but because the practices themselves are inherently oppressive. The current programs of preferential treatment, however, do not systematically block the overall capacities, autonomy, and happiness of white males in the ways that slavery and female subordination do. To the objection that affirmative action does not give equal consideration to candidates' qualifications, Wasserstrom problematizes the very notions of qualifications, merit, and desert. First, he claims that the belief that persons in our society occupy positions of power, wealth, and prestige on the basis of their qualifications is empirically false. Second, with the exception of certain highly skilled occupations such as neurosurgeon and jet pilot, what counts as qualifications is often ambiguous and contestable. Third, he finds an elusive gap between the idea of being the most qualified and the idea of deserving something. It would be objectionable to say that only the best tennis players deserve to use the tennis courts, for example; similarly, it is unclear that only the "best qualified" deserve admissions or positions. Rather, we need to explore what factors are genuinely relevant for particular positions. Furthermore, if deserving something entails one's responsibility for bringing about the relevant condition or result, it is difficult to argue that students deserve positions they get, given their lack of control over inherent talents, home environment, socioeconomic class, race, sex, the quality of the schools they attend, etc. He does not conclude that qualifications are irrelevant, only that they are not decisive. The argument that preferential treatment violates persons' rights by not awarding positions to the "best qualified" is thus shown to be problematic.

As a lawyer and philosopher, Wasserstrom's work on punishment has been both practical and philosophical. In 1988 he was appointed by the California Supreme Court to represent a person sentenced to death row, and continued to work on that case for several years. His philosophical explorations of punishment are included in *Five Studies* as well as other articles. He finds consequentialist and retributivist approaches ultimately unsatisfying in not being able to answer the most basic question, why punish wrongdoers at all? But if the justifiability of punishment is generally problematic, he points out, then the dire practice of capital punishment becomes even more so. His article "Capital Punishment as Punishment: Some Theoretical Issues and Objections" (1982) concludes that the moral choice to punish requires decisive arguments to justify a practice "as total and cataclysmic for the individual as death."

In his 1970 anthology *War and Morality*, Wasserstrom notes that the subject of war has been sorely neglected by Western philosophers. His own contribution to that collection examines arguments for assessing war in moral

terms. Rejecting "moral nihilism with respect to war" – the view that moral predicates cannot be meaningfully applied to war at all – he reviews arguments for morally justifying war in terms of laws of war, the causes of war, and the principle of self-defense. Showing these justifications to be problematic, he himself holds that the strongest argument against war turns on the issue of the death of innocent persons. How to define the innocent in times of war is not so easy. Nevertheless, he maintains that modern warfare involving aerial bombardment, not to mention thermonuclear weapons, becomes increasingly difficult to justify insofar as killing the innocent on a large scale becomes practically necessary or inevitable.

"Conduct and Responsibility in War" (1980) focuses on how laws of war – understood as formal agreements, conventions and treaties among countries that prescribe behavior in war times, especially how classes of persons are to be treated and what sorts of weapons and methods are impermissible – are thought to be morally decisive. Rejecting the nihilistic view that in war "anything goes," he remains skeptical that modern laws of war actually prevent moral wrongs. Not only are the laws of war not a rational, coherent scheme of rules and principles, according to Wasserstrom, but they can readily be broken on the grounds of "military necessity," thus frequently excusing such practices as aerial bombing with its inevitable killing of civilians. A fatal flaw in the conception of the laws of war, then, is that they are expected to conform to the nature of modern war and modern weapons, rather than the other way around. Modern warfare also undermines the capacity for moral responsibility among combatants insofar as military training works to transform soldiers into persons who obey without question or hesitation. While the excuse of "simply obeying orders" does not unequivocally exonerate, the typical combat situation is hardly conducive to a reflective consideration of how to apply laws of war to particular situations. Hence, civilian and military leaders rather than actual combatants seem more appropriately liable for war crimes since it is their responsibility to foresee the outcomes of their strategies.

In "The Obligation to Obey the Law" (1980) Wasserstrom questions the claim that it is never right to disobey the law and finds no adequate general arguments to support it. But focusing on the question of the morality of disobeying the law, he warns, may misdirect our attention; it is crucial to examine the moral rightness or wrongness of what a particular law seeks to prevent or require, to assess the significance of people's disobeying it. For example, disobedience to segregation or integration laws in the US during the civil rights movement has crucially different meanings within the given social and political contexts.

Turning to a different area of social concern, Wasserstrom asks, "Is Adultery Immoral?" (1975). Adultery, defined as any case of extramarital sex, is typically presumed immoral, but why? One reason is that it involves breaking an important promise; another, that one deceives one's spouse. Moreover, its prohibition as immoral presumably serves to maintain marriages and nuclear families. But if marriage does not necessarily rely on sexual exclusivity between marriage partners, he suggests, then adultery would not necessarily involve breaking a promise to fidelity, nor would it likely involve deceiving the nonadulterous spouse. "Open marriages" cannot convincingly or conclusively be ruled out. More generally, he argues, grounds for holding adultery immoral depend on variable social and cultural institutions. For example, if people were not socialized to hold sexual intimacy as a primary sign of love and affection, then having sex with someone other than one's marriage partner would not entail deception and pain for one's spouse. Furthermore, that a moral prohibition against adultery strengthens marriage and family arrangements for nurturing children rests on some questionable assumptions; namely, that marriage itself is a morally worthwhile and desirable institution and that childrearing is best conducted within relatively stable two-

partner marriages. But these claims are debatable. In short, the alleged immorality of adultery rests on questionable empirical assumptions and varying cultural standards.

Wasserstrom's essay "Privacy: Some Arguments and Assumptions" (1978) examines why we think privacy so important. Typically, our reasons have to do with features commonly held central to the very idea of what it is to be a person: autonomy, spontaneity, a sense of shame and vulnerability, abilities to form special interpersonal relationships. Should one's daily activities be under constant surveillance or recorded in permanent data banks, for example, one's personal life would be severely altered or compromised. But does this belief reflect an unduly restrictive sense of individuality and ownership? Consider what he dubs a "counterculture" view of privacy. On this view, our sense of autonomy, shame, and vulnerability are predicated on beliefs that many activities, especially sexual ones, are shameful unless done in private. This sense of privacy entails splitting the individual into private and public personae, creating a potential form of hypocrisy and source of personal unhappiness. Rather than merely recounting arguments for the importance of privacy in an era threatened by increasing surveillance, then, Wasserstrom proposes that our assumptions in its favor be more thoroughly examined, opening prospects for developing new self-conceptions and enhanced notions of interpersonal relationships.

Debates at the beginning of the twenty-first century on affirmative action, justifying war, capital punishment, disobeying law, governmental surveillance, and individual rights continue to raise arguments carefully examined in Wasserstrom's work. His thorough, measured treatments of these issues remain timely and invaluable.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Judicial Decision: Toward a Theory of Legal Justification (Stanford, Cal., 1961).
Ed., *War and Morality* (Belmont, Cal., 1970).
Ed., *Morality and the Law* (Belmont, Cal., 1971).
Ed., *Today's Moral Problems* (New York, 1975; 3rd edn 1985).
Philosophy and Social Issues: Five Studies (Notre Dame, Ind., 1980).

Other Relevant Works
"Strict Liability in the Criminal Law," *Stanford Law Review* 12 (1960): 731–45.
"Disobeying the Law," *Journal of Philosophy* 58 (1961): 641–53.
"Rights, Human Rights and Racial Discrimination," *Journal of Philosophy* 61 (1964): 628–41.
"H. L. A. Hart and the Doctrines of *Mens Rea* and Criminal Responsibility," *University of Chicago Law Review* 35 (1967): 92–126.
"The Relevance of Nuremberg," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 1 (1971): 22–46.
"The Laws of War," *The Monist* 56 (1972): 1–19.
"The Responsibility of the Individual for War Crimes," in *Philosophy, Morality and International Affairs*, ed. Virginia Held, Sidney Morgenbesser, and Thomas Nagel (New York, 1974), pp. 47–70.
"Is Adultery Immoral?" in *Philosophy and Sex*, ed. R. Baker and F. Elliston (Buffalo, N.Y., 1975), pp. 207–21.
"The Status of the Fetus," *Hastings Center Report* 5 (June 1975): 18–20.
"Lawyers as Professionals: Some Moral Issues," *Human Rights* 5 (1975): 1–24.
"The University and the Case for Preferential Treatment," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 13 (1976): 165–70.
"Privacy: Some Arguments and Assumptions," in *Philosophical Law*, ed. R. Bronough (Westport, Conn., 1978), pp. 148–66.
"Issues of Privacy and Confidentiality in Sex Therapy and Sex Research," in *Ethical Issues in Sex Therapy and Research*, ed. W. Masters, V. Johnson, and R. Kolodny

(Boston, 1980), vol. 2, pp. 42–60.

"Capital Punishment as Punishment: Some Theoretical Issues and Objections," in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy, vol. 7, Social and Political Philosophy* (Minneapolis, 1982), pp. 473–502.

"Roles and Morality," in *The Good Lawyer*, ed. D. Luban (Totowa, N.J., 1984), pp. 25–37.

"War, Nuclear War, and Nuclear Deterrence: Some Conceptual and Moral Issues," *Ethics* 95 (1985): 424–44.

"Noncombatants, Indiscriminate Killing and the Immorality of Nuclear War," in *Nuclear War: Philosophical Perspectives*, ed. M. Fox and L. Groarke (New York, 1985), pp. 39–49.

"Preferential Treatment, Color-Blindness, and the Evils of Racism and Racial Discrimination," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 61 (September 1987): 27–42.

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v9

Dworkin, Ronald. "Wasserstrom: The Judicial Decision," *Ethics* 75 (1964): 47–56.

Ellin, Joseph. "Wasserstrom and Feinberg on Human Rights," *Journal of Philosophy* 62 (1965): 101–102.

Feinberg, Joel. "Comments on Richard Wasserstrom's 'Rights, Human Rights, and Racial Discrimination'," *Journal of Philosophy* 61 (1964): 641–4.

Sverdlik, Steven. "Punishment," *Law and Philosophy* 7 (1988): 179–201.

Jocelyn Hoy

WATSON, John (1847–1939)

John Watson was one of Canada's foremost intellectuals for over fifty years. He was a leading representative of the idealistic system that dominated Anglo-American philosophy before World War I. He was born on 25 February 1847 in Glasgow, Scotland, and attended the Free Church School in Kilmarnock. At Glasgow University he studied theology, classics, and philosophy with John and Edward Caird, receiving the MA with highest honors in 1872. Since teaching positions in Great Britain were extremely difficult to secure, he quickly accepted an offer to replace John Clark MURRAY as the philosophy chair for teaching logic, metaphysics, and ethics at Queen's University in Kingston, Ontario. He threw himself into the struggles of a growing provincial college, resistant to subsequent offers from larger universities because "the whole atmosphere seemed to radiate with life and enthusiasm." In 1889 his title became professor of moral philosophy, and in 1901 he added the responsibilities of Vice Principal. The curriculum expanded through his introduction of economics, political science, and psychology at Queen's, and he was an early advocate of the admission of women.

Watson served as head of Queen's philosophy department for fifty-two years, retiring in 1924. Over those years he achieved international recognition for his important books on idealism, morality, and religion. He was a visiting professor at University of California at Berkeley in 1895–6, following Josiah ROYCE's visit and continuing the Berkeley debates on conceptions of God (published as *Christianity and Idealism*). He received the supreme honor of giving the Gifford Lectures at Glasgow in 1910–12. He also had a reputation as an excellent teacher, making philosophy a popular discipline and producing numerous graduates to fill ministerial and philosophy positions across Canada. As professor emeritus he published still more philosophical essays and commentaries. He also continued to pursue denomina-

tional unification and helped to found the United Church of Canada in 1925 (although he never joined it). Watson died on 27 January 1939 in Kingston, Ontario.

Following John and Edward Caird, Watson elaborated a theistic idealism that prevented God from either retreating into a remote abstraction or absorbing all other spiritual beings into one predestined pantheism. To achieve such a balance, Watson demanded that God must be available in human religious experience, the sort of experience organized by each person's independently rational mind. His Presbyterianism rejected Calvinism as hostile to free will, morality, and rational religion. A mysterious and imperious God could only divorce faith from morality by demanding an impossibly high standard of goodness that condemns all conduct to uselessness. The Cairdian theology instead found morality to be religion's essence, and as Watson argued, they must progress together over time. Materialism and evolution cannot account for this progress, or even explain genuinely moral feelings such as altruism, and so religion grounds society. Religious ideals lead, but never transcend, our actual social order. If our experience of unity with God is deeply connected with our moral life, then Watson further concluded that our commitment to moral/religious ideals is a commitment to our community, which includes God. Most of Watson's efforts were devoted to showing how the best interpretations of both Christian and idealist truths converge on this unification of God with humanity.

The harmonious co-dependence of all people with each other, their natural environment, and God is suggested by a vision of a living whole of internally organized parts. The proper functioning of any part (such as a person) is at the same time the intended functioning of the divine whole. Neither totally separate nor completely merged, a person retains a measure of individual freedom and responsibility even though dependent on the use of God's spiritual activity to reason and learn. "Man is identical with God because he is a rational subject, not because the immanence of God in him abolishes his individuality. Under the imperfect conception of creation we think of man as projected out of God, or as formed out of a pre-existent material by the shaping activity of God, as the sculptor shapes a block of marble. But, when we discard this inadequate mode of conception, we find that for this external productive or formative activity must be substituted the idea of God as present spiritually in the soul of every man, and therefore as capable of being comprehended by every man. Thus we must conceive of the relation of man to God as one which involves the independent individuality of each, but an individuality which implies the distinction and yet the unity of both." (1912, vol. 2, pp. 291–2) Independence cannot require a mythical free will operating outside of nature's causal network. Nor can science's understanding of nature explain consciousness or will, since a material body can only be a cause for other material body and no system of material bodies could know itself or any other system. Positive freedom is our capacity to act according to our (always partial) moral knowledge.

Watson's usual argument for locating each person within a wider sphere of interacting persons and objects, answering the dualist's and subjectivist's concerns about the external world and other minds, asks how anyone could know that one's experience consisted solely of one's own ideas. It would be impossible to conceive of one's self as an isolated finite mind, since without awareness of a contrasting other, no awareness of any limitation would occur. Unless subjective or personal idealism were to collapse into solipsism, the only reasonable view remaining is to understand knowledge as a unified relationship between subject and object. We are simultaneously aware of ourselves as knowers, and as knowers of things beyond our minds. The subjectivist's fallacious identification of experience with mind must be replaced by taking self-consciousness as a component or aspect of a larger whole of wider experience. Since that wider experience is

hardly physical in essence, some unknowable thing-in-itself, or the province of another human mind, then this all-encompassing experience is really an aspect of God's own rational spirit. Many have appealed to experience to justify faith; but our highest spiritual experiences are not mystical but rather unified movements of emotion, will, and thought.

Watson thus rejected William JAMES's view that the subliminal or subconscious serves as the conduit to higher spiritual powers. He argued strenuously against personalists and pragmatists who appealed to immediate or radical experience to guarantee independence and freedom, but in his view they found only chaos and irrationality. His type of speculative idealism, which brings human personality into direct relationships with nature and God, also diverges from another kind of idealism represented by F. H. Bradley, who argued that relations and personality are ultimately unreal. In the 1880s and 90s the philosophers closer to Watson's position were also indebted to Caird, especially Bernard Bosanquet in England, and George MORRIS and John DEWEY in America. Although Dewey later moved away from absolute idealism, he retained a social psychology and communitarian religious morality that located personhood's growth and worth within a larger evolving system.

Watson, like Bosanquet and Dewey, rejected utilitarianism's subjective and hedonistic psychology and instead developed a theory of personal self-realization that simultaneously depends on the whole community's cultural enrichment.

> The acts of the individual must be his own, but, at the same time, the moral quality of his acts is determined by his total attitude towards the community of which he is a member. As morality consists in willing the good of all, evil is overcome just in so far as the individual views the guilt of all as his own guilt. For, by this supreme act of self-abnegation, self-will is cut at the root, and its place is filled by a will that wills the whole.

Nor is it possible for anyone to separate himself from others, so as to isolate either the evil or the good he does. As St. Paul so clearly saw, the evil of one communicates a taint to all, just as the good of one contributes to the perfection of the whole. On the other hand, the individual bears in himself the guilt of all, as he is uplifted by the good of all. And as man by his very nature is always seeking for complete realization, the process of his history is a continual triumph of the higher over the lower, carrying with it the elevation of the individual as well as of the race. (1907, pp. 462–3)

The Christian should strive to unite his will with God, by uniting with the social community in pursuit of its ideals. Churches should demand no doctrinal or ritual forms; their traditions are not revelations but human creations that aesthetically arouse the heart's devotion. Watson was a liberal and progressive thinker who hoped that actual moral standards would more closely approximate over time the highest Christian ideals of love and justice.

For Watson, whose moral philosophy placed a responsibility for advancing the social good on all adults equally, political participation must be as equally distributed. The widest possible democracy is thus the best instrument for this common moral/political mission. Such a democracy cannot be based on the negative natural rights of John Locke's political theory or on a social contract. Positive rights to achieve social usefulness are more consistent with the protection of individual freedoms:

> In order to realize the good will a system of Rights is necessary. As the ultimate object of society is the development of the best life, each individual must recognize the rights of his neighbor to as free development as that which he claims for himself … . The possession of rights and their recognition by society are not two different things, but the same thing; for, as the individual claims rights in virtue of his being an organ of the common

good, so the State recognizes his rights on the ground that they are required for the realization of the highest good of all. (1919, p. 222)

A pluralism of diverse individuals, and not a restricting uniformity, is the natural outcome of a social community producing an ever-wider array of goods and good lives. Watson's theory of political federalism, standing opposed to unrestrained individualism, materialism, and capitalism, follows from his vision of interdependent and mutually supportive citizens. Broadly socialistic and anti-nationalistic, he outlined an influential path for Canadian federalism that is also applicable to international relations. His final book, *The State in Peace and War* (1919), also proposed a world government based on democracy, tolerance, and multicultural integration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Kant and His English Critics: A Comparison of Critical and Empirical Philosophy (Glasgow and New York, 1881).

Schelling's Transcendental Idealism (Chicago, 1882).

Comte, Mill, and Spencer: An Outline of Philosophy (Glasgow and New York, 1895). 2nd edn, *An Outline of Philosophy, with Notes Historical and Critical* (Glasgow and New York, 1898; 4th edn 1908).

Hedonistic Theories from Aristippus to Spencer (Glasgow and New York, 1895).

Christianity and Idealism (Glasgow and New York, 1897; 2nd edn 1897).

Philo and the New Testament (Kingston, Ont., 1899).

The Philosophical Basis of Religion (Glasgow, 1907).

The Philosophy of Kant Explained (Glasgow, 1908).

The Interpretation of Religious Experience, 2 vols (Glasgow, 1912).

The State in Peace and War (Glasgow, 1919).

Other Relevant Works

Watson's papers are at Queen's University.

"The Relation of Philosophy to Life," Inaugural Lecture pamphlet (Kingston, Ontario, 1872).

"Empiricism and Common Logic," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 9 (1875): 17–36.

Ed. and trans., *The Philosophy of Kant, as Contained in Extracts from His Own Writings* (Glasgow, 1888; 2nd edn 1891; 3rd edn 1919).

Ed., *The Philosophy of John Stuart Mill, as Contained in Extracts from His Own Writings* (Kingston, Ontario, 1891).

"The Critical Philosophy and Idealism," *Philosophical Review* 1 (1892): 9–23.

"Metaphysic and Psychology," *Philosophical Review* 2 (1893): 513–28.

"The Problem of Hegel," *Philosophical Review* 3 (1894): 546–67.

"The Absolute and the Time-Philosophy," *Philosophical Review* 4 (1895): 353–72, 486–505.

"The Metaphysic of Aristotle," *Philosophical Review* 7 (1898): 23–42, 113–34, 248–74, 337–54.

"The New 'Ethical' Philosophy," *International Journal of Ethics* 9 (1899): 413–34.

"The Idealism of Edward Caird," *Philosophical Review* 18 (1909): 147–63, 259–80.

"Some Remarks on Radical Empiricism," *Queen's Quarterly* 18 (1910): 111–19.

"Pragmatism and Empiricism," *Queen's Quarterly* 21 (1914): 465–72.

"The Conflict of Absolutism and Realism," *Philosophical Review* 33 (1924): 229–44.

"Bosanquet on Mind and the Absolute," *Philosophical Review* 34 (1925): 427–42.

"Democracy and the Universities," *Queen's Quarterly* 33 (1926): 355–63.

"A Discussion of Dr. Whitehead's Philosophy of Nature with Special Reference to his Work "'Concept of Nature'," *Actes du Huitième Congrès International de Philosophie à Prague, 1934* (Prague, 1936), pp. 903–9.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Canad Encyc*

Armour, Leslie, and Elizabeth Trott. *The Faces of Reason: An Essay on Philosophy and Culture in English Canada, 1850–1950* (Waterloo, Ont., 1981).

Haldar, Hiralal. *Neo-Hegelianism* (London, 1927).

McKillop, A. B. *A Disciplined Intelligence: Critical Inquiry and Canadian Thought in the Victorian Era* (Montréal, 2001).

Philosophical Essays Presented to John Watson (Kingston, Ont., 1922). Contains a bibliography of Watson's writings.

Rabb, J. Douglas. *Religion and Science in Early Canada* (Kingston, Ont., 1988).

Wallace, Robert. *Some Great Men of Queen's* (Toronto, 1941).

John R. Shook

WATSON, John Broadus (1878–1958)

John B. Watson was born on 9 January 1878 on a farm near Travelers Rest in Greenville County, South Carolina. He studied philosophy and psychology with George B. Moore at Furman University in South Carolina and received an MA in 1899. In 1900 Watson began philosophy graduate study at the University of Chicago, taking courses in philosophy with John Dewey and psychology with James R. Angell. Unable to benefit from their functionalist and pragmatist philosophy, Watson received his inspiration elsewhere. Neurologist Henry Herbert Donaldson, with whom Watson studied the white rat, and biologist Jacques Loeb inducted Watson into the standpoint of reductive materialism. After receiving his PhD in psychology in 1903, writing a dissertation titled "Animal Education: An Experimental Study on the Psychical Development of the White Rat, Correlated with the Growth of its Nervous System." Watson did further experimental research on animal behavior as an assistant in psychology at Chicago from 1903 to 1908.

In 1908 Watson became professor of psychology at Johns Hopkins University, and after the departure of James Mark Baldwin in 1909, he was head of the psychology and philosophy department and the editor of *Psychological Review*. In 1912 Watson and the psychology department separated from philosophy, by then under the leadership of Arthur O. Lovejoy. In 1913 he announced his behaviorist psychology in lectures at Columbia University, and was elected President of the American Psychological Association in 1915. During World War I he served in the Army Signal Corps. Confronted by university officials over his affair with his graduate assistant, whom he later married, Watson resigned from Johns Hopkins in 1920. Interested in applying his behavioral psychology to the marketplace, having already pioneered courses on the psychology of advertising, he joined the J. Walter Thompson advertising company, the first business of its kind in the world, and soon was a vice president located in New York City. Watson was responsible for redirecting advertising from an informational strategy to a strategy of manipulating the consumer's emotions. Through popular books, lecturing, and public speaking, Watson molded himself into America's expert psychologist, able to comment on all facets of society. In 1935 he went to the William Esty Company and created more advertising innovations until retiring in 1945. He lived most of the rest of his life in Woodbury, Connecticut, and died on 25 September 1958 in New York City.

His 1914 book *Behavior: An Introduction to Comparative Psychology* described the proper scientific destiny of psychology, away from the introspective exploration of consciousness and towards the objective prediction and control of behavior. With Columbia's Edward L. Thorndike already leading the way to behaviorism, and inspired by Harvard's Robert M.

Yerkes's assistance (they founded the *Journal of Animal Behavior* in 1910), Watson overcame his reluctance to disown the rest of the psychological community. Many potential critics in fact praised Watson's 1914 manifesto, including Dewey and others long frustrated with the control of idealistic and dualistic metaphysics over psychology. However, widespread acceptance of behaviorism had to wait until after experimental psychology proved helpful to the US government and the war effort. In 1919 Watson published his *Psychology from the Standpoint of a Behaviorist*, which provided a wide treatment of human psychology, and a new generation of psychologists during the 1920s and 1930s gradually adopted many of behaviorism's tenets, including those of B. F. SKINNER.

Skinner's behaviorism was the result of the confluence of many trends in American psychology. Skinner was following many psychologists who demanded that psychology ally with evolutionary biology, and his view that adaptation to environmental pressures select and reinforce habits was not revolutionary. Nor was his stance against introspection and consciousness new; several prominent psychologists and philosophers, notably William JAMES, scorned any psychology still assuming that its object of study was a rational soul, immaterial substance, or ghostly inner theater of ideas. However, Watson's strong scientific reductionism and materialism drew staunch opposition from philosophers and psychologists. Watson declared that psychology must not refer to perceptions, concepts, ideas, reasoning, meanings, and purposes, since they are not objectively measurable and controllable. Resistance came from those who remained convinced that psychology should correlate mental events with physiological ones, and those who approved of the use of teleological explanation in addition to mechanistic explanation. Many scorned Watson's apparent authorization of reductive materialism's elimination of the mental life and its qualitative features, and rejected his crude individualism and stimulus-response methodology. His debates with

William MCDOUGALL (published in 1929) exemplify how these controversial issues were argued before World War II. Watson's behaviorism should not itself be reduced to the type of behaviorism that emerged in the 1950s, but rather studied in its proper context of its earlier intellectual environment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Psychology as the Behaviorist Views It," *Psychological Review* 20 (1913): 158–77.
Behavior: An Introduction to Comparative Psychology (New York, 1914).
Psychology from the Standpoint of a Behaviorist (Philadelphia, 1919; 2nd edn 1924).
Behaviorism (New York, 1924; 2nd edn 1930).

Other Relevant Works
Kinaethetic and Organic Sensations: Their Role in the Reactions of the White Rat to the Maze, *Psychological Review Monograph Supplements*, vol. 8, no. 2 (Lancaster, Penn, 1907).
The Ways of Behaviorism (New York, 1928).
Psychological Care of Infant and Child (New York, 1928).
The Battle of Behaviorism: An Exposition and an Exposure, with William McDougall (New York, 1929).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Encyc Social Behav Sci*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v48*, *Oxford Comp Phil*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*
Buckley, Kerry W. *Mechanical Man: John Broadus Watson and the Beginnings of Behaviorism* (New York, 1989).
O'Donnell, John M. *The Origins of Behaviorism: American Psychology, 1870–1920* (1985).

Thyer, Bruce A., ed. *The Philosophical Legacy of Behaviorism* (Dordrecht, 1999).

Todd, James T., and Edward K. Morris, eds. *Modern Perspectives on John B. Watson and Classical Behaviorism* (Westport, Conn., 1994). Contains a bibliography of Watson's writings.

John R. Shook

WATTS, Alan Wilson (1915–73)

Alan Watts was born on 6 January 1915 in Chislehurst, Kent, England. He attended the prestigious King's School in Canterbury. Instead of going to a university, during much of the 1930s he pursued a life of intense personal questing in London, especially in psychology and Eastern thought. He published his first major book, *The Spirit of Zen*, in 1936. After marriage to an American woman, Eleanor Everett, Watts came to New York City in 1938. He continued studying, teaching, and writing on Eastern themes, publishing *The Meaning of Happiness* in 1940. However, as World War II swept across the world, Watts's thought went back to his ancestral Anglican religion, and he determined to seek ordination in the Episcopal Church as venue for his spiritual work. In 1941 arrangements were made for him to study as a special student on Seabury-Western Theological Seminary in Evanston, Illinois. He was ordained priest in 1944, and became chaplain to Episcopal students at Northwestern University, a position he held for the next six years. *Behold the Spirit* (1947) was an uneven but sometimes brilliant attempt to bring together Eastern and Christian mysticism. It was followed by *The Supreme Identity* (1950), probably his most substantial work of scholarship and sustained, serious philosophical discourse.

In 1950 Watts left the Episcopal priesthood, during a period of both marital and spiritual difficulties. He decided to pursue an independent spiritual and philosophical path based on Eastern teachings, especially Taoist and Zen. After this crisis, he appropriately published *The Wisdom of Insecurity* (1951). In 1951 Watts joined the faculty of the American Academy of Asian Studies in San Francisco. In 1957, with the help of the Bollingen Foundation, he published *The Way of Zen*, perhaps his best-known book. Buoyed by that success, in 1957 Watts left the Academy to commence a career as independent teacher and writer. Watts died on 16 November 1973 in his home, a houseboat moored in San Francisco Bay, Marin County, California.

The last period of Watts's life corresponded with the heyday of the San Francisco "Beats" and the even more halcyon 1960s counterculture, when a new generation was rebelling against the past and seeking fresh spiritual terrain. Watts fitted well into this scene as older mentor and, as he liked to call himself, "philosophical entertainer." He claimed no great academic scholarship or profundity, and even labeled himself a "fake." Yet such disclaimers only enhanced his fame, and as a popularizer Watts had few equals. His writing and speaking was polished, articulate, full of unforgettable turns of phrase. If sometimes repetitious, his long series of later books sold well, at their best evoking a sense of cosmic wonder and a feeling of being on the "inside" of some long-lost secret.

Watts's basic ideas are few and simple. His entertainer's intuitive and inductive approach is as much his message as the notions themselves. First, people must realize they are simply parts of the universe, and the universe is expressing itself through them, or better being itself in them, as surely as through stars or the waves of the sea. We did not drop in from some other sphere, and both minds and bodies are natural parts nature. Consciousness is no more alien to nature than sticks and stones, and therefore must exist in some form

all through nature, at least potentially. That did mean the Western God, for that God is over against the universe as its creator and judge, whereas he was talking about consciousness within nature, nowhere more present than in us.

Life then, is full and complete every moment; though there is continual flux and change, it does not need to progress. One should therefore not live with the idea of "going" someplace or attaining something outside the present, unless in the sense of playing a game in which temporarily "winning" is part of the fun. But overall the attitude should like that of a swimmer who does not swim just to get to the other side of the pool or lake, but for the joy of the sport itself.

The secret of the happy life, then, is spontaneity combined with an ability to enjoy good things as they come while maintaining a sense of joyous wonder toward its mysteries. A way such as this must tack carefully between freedom and the undisciplined self-indulgence of which Watts was accused by his critics. At his best he manifested the exuberant liberty and spiritual excitement of which could write and speak so eloquently. His books have remained in print long after his death.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Spirit of Zen: A Way of Life, Work and Art in the Far East (London and New York, 1936).

The Meaning of Happiness: The Quest for Freedom of the Spirit in Modern Psychology and the Wisdom of the East (New York, 1940).

Behold the Spirit: A Study in the Necessity of Mystical Religion (New York, 1947).

The Supreme Identity: An Essay on Oriental Metaphysic and the Christian Religion (New York, 1950).

The Wisdom of Insecurity (New York, 1951).

The Way of Zen (New York, 1957).

Nature, Man and Woman (New York, 1958).

"This Is It" and Other Essays (New York, 1960).

Psychotherapy, East and West (New York, 1961).

The Joyous Cosmology: Adventures in the Chemistry of Consciousness (New York, 1962).

The Two Hands of God: The Myths of Polarity (New York, 1963).

Beyond Theology: The Art of Godmanship (New York, 1964).

The Book: On the Taboo Against Knowing Who You Are (New York, 1966).

Myth and Ritual In Christianity (Boston, 1968).

Other Relevant Works

Beat Zen, Square Zen, and Zen (San Francisco, 1959).

In My Own Way (New York, 1972).

The Early Writings of Alan Watts, ed. John Snelling and Mark Watts (London and Berkeley, Cal., 1987).

The Modern Mystic: A New Collection of the Early Writings of Alan Watts, ed. John Snelling and Mark Watts (Longmead, Shaftesbury, UK, 1990).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Religious Bio, Who Was Who in Amer v6, Who's Who in Phil

Brannigan, Michael C. *Everywhere and Nowhere: The Path of Alan Watts* (New York, 1988).

Furlong, Monica. *Zen Effects: The Life of Alan Watts* (Boston, 1986).

Stuart, David (pseud. for Edwin Palmer Hoyt). *Alan Watts* (Radnor, Penn., 1976).

Robert Ellwood

WEEDON, William Stone (1908–84)

William S. Weedon was born on 5 July 1908 in Houghton, Michigan. He received a BS in 1929 and an MS in 1931 (writing a thesis on "The Place of Hypothesis in the Physics of René Descartes") from the University of Virginia. Deciding to pursue philosophy, he earned an MA in philosophy from Harvard University in 1933, and a PhD in philosophy from the University of Virginia in 1936, writing a dissertation on "Persuasion."

His philosophy professor at Virginia, Albert G. A. Balz, hired Weedon as an instructor in philosophy in 1934, and he was steadily promoted up to full professor by 1952, interrupted by service in the US Navy during World War II. From 1954 to 1961 he served as chair of the department. He was elected President of the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology in 1956. From 1961 to 1963 he taught at Wesleyan University in Connecticut as William Griffin Professor of Philosophy and department chair. In 1963 he returned to Virginia upon being named University Professor of Philosophy and he held that title until retiring in 1979. Weedon died on 13 May 1984 in Charlottesville, Virginia.

Among Weedon's diverse interests besides philosophy were mathematics, science, psychology, linguistics, comparative religion, and art. Having acquired fluency in Japanese and Chinese, he pursued his love for Asian art and architecture, and desired an appointment as a University Professor (the first at Virginia) so that he could offer courses in Asian architecture, which were very popular. He was a member of the board of the Virginia Center for Creative Arts and a fellow of the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, and served for many years on the advisory boards of *Philosophy East and West* and *Virginia Quarterly Review* where he published articles on diverse subjects.

The University of Virginia recognized Weedon's contributions, bestowing the Algernon Sydney Sullivan Award in 1961, the Thomas Jefferson Award in 1976, the highest award given to a member of the university community, and the Distinguished Teaching Award in 1978. In 2003 the William Stone Weedon Professorship in Asian Architecture in the School of Architecture was inaugurated in his memory.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Psychology as a Natural Science," *Psychological Bulletin* 36 (1939): 612.
"Concerning Biography," in *Humanistic Studies in Honor of John Calvin Metcalf* (New York, 1941), pp. 247–67.
"A Theory of Pointing," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 1 (1963): 20–35.
"Tibetan Buddhism: A Perspective," *Philosophy East and West* 17 (1967): 167–72.

Further Reading
Who's Who in Phil
"Weedon, William Stone," in *Who's Who in America*, 41st edn (Wilmette, Ill., 1980).

John R. Shook

WEINBERG, Julius Randolph (1908–71)

Julius R. Weinberg was born on 3 September 1908 in Zanesville, Ohio. He earned his BA in 1931 and MA in 1932 from Ohio State University, and his PhD in philosophy in 1935 from Cornell University. He taught philosophy at the University of Cincinnati from 1941 to 1947. From 1947 until his death he was a member of the philosophy faculty at the University of Wisconsin. He died on 17 January 1971 in Madison, Wisconsin. He had been named Vilas Professor of Philosophy and participated in founding the Institute for Research in the Humanities, later becoming a permanent member. He was President of the Western (now Central) Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1964–5.

Weinberg was legendary for his knowledge of the history of philosophy, and his kindness. He offered this brief account of what he took philosophy to be: "Philosophy is a continuing search, by dialogue, for greater clarity in understanding the difficulties which beset the answers with which we tend to be prematurely satisfied to questions which are essentially different from those of the natural sciences." (1970, p. 1).

Weinberg's influential early study of logical positivism found that perspective "self-stultifying because it includes in the scope of the nonsensical the philosophical discussions on which its own conclusions depend" (1936, p. 292) A basic consideration here is that, as Weinberg was among the earliest to point out, its criterion of meaning was both at the core of the logical positivist position and its fatal flaw. The Verification Principle, as it was called, roughly was the view that a sentence expresses a truth or a falsehood if and only if it (1) is either true by definition, (2) false by definition, (3) confirmable or disconfirmable by some possible sensory observation, or (4) follows from some sentence that falls under one of (1–3). However, the Verification Principle itself could not be classified with any of (1–4), and so was meaningless on its own terms. Weinberg favored a successor that would "extend our view of meaning so as to include laws among genuine assertions, and adopt a more liberal criterion of truth" (1936, p. 293). His willingness to reject strict logical positivism, and his strong appreciation of and allegiance to the powerful formal logic developed in the Charles PEIRCE–Gottlob Frege–Bertrand Russell tradition, did not extend to a willingness to embrace the further development called modal logic: the logic of necessity, contingency, and possibility. The semantics of this logic dealt with possible worlds, and has been influential in reintroducing the notion of real essences; in more general terms, it has led to the flourishing of non-empiricist metaphysics. Weinberg joined his colleague William H. Hay in thinking of such development not as modal logic, but as (Hay's term) "muddled logic."

An excellent example of the combination of Weinberg's historical learning and his use of logical criticism is found in his 1970 Aquinas lecture. The issue with which it deals is whether, "in order to account for some of the commonest statements about what is involved in human thinking … we have to assume that to certain expressions which are the grammatical accusatives of thought-verbs, desire-verbs, and the like, simple non-verbal but intra-cognitive items correspond?" (1970, p. 3). Simply put, if John thinks about his dog, wants some chocolate, or hopes for heaven, must there be some introspectively inspectable item that corresponds, respectively, to "dog," "chocolate," or "heaven"? Weinberg offers a brief, insightful overview of the discussion of this issue from Plato and Aristotle, through the middle ages, modern philosophy, and on to Russell. While the majority answer to his question in this long period has been affirmative, Weinberg takes the answer to be negative. He offers several objections to the traditional doctrine. To think of a horse is to think of something that is complex in the sense of having various properties – for example, an equine item that is (say) sleek and fast. But no intra-cognitive item that we are aware of contains any correlate to "and". Further, such sentences as "John believes that all square roots are round numbers" can be true (and so are meaningful) even though what is said to be believed is necessarily false. But no intra-cognitive state can represent a contradictory state of affairs. Further still, it can be true that Anselm believed that God is a being that is greater than any being that can be thought, but his so believing is not compatible with there being an intra-cognitive item that represents a being greater than anything that can be thought. Such an item's existence would amount to thinking of a being greater than any that can be thought. In addition, he holds that "Russell's theory of definite and indefinite descriptions does, I think, account for the significance of sentences without it being either

necessary or possible to discover intra-psychic non-verbal counterparts which do not describe anything." (1970, p. 22)

Two other features of Weinberg's 1970 work are typical of the rich texture of his thought. His discussion of course includes a defense of Russell's relevant doctrines against the most influential and interesting objections to it. This is accompanied by his insistence that though the classical doctrine of concepts that he subjects to criticism is not defensible, still "there is a difference of kind between the contents of consciousness and the denizens of the non-conscious world" – that while this difference of kind "has often been denied, … it seems to me quite clear" on grounds well known and (he generously assumes) known to his audience. There is no attempt at an easy reductionism of the mental to the physical based on a rejection of the classical theory of concept (1970, p. 2).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An Examination of Logical Positivism (London, 1936).

Nicholas of Autrecourt (Princeton, N.J., 1948).

Abstraction, Relation, and Induction (Madison, Wisc., 1964).

A Short History of Medieval Philosophy (Princeton, N.J., 1966).

Ideas and Concepts (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1970).

Ockham, Descartes, and Hume (Madison, Wisc., 1977).

Other Relevant Works

Ed. with Keith E. Yandell, *Problems in Philosophical Inquiry* (New York, 1971).

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v7, Proc of APA v44, Who's Who in Phil

"A Bibliography of the Writings of Julius R. Weinberg," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 10 (1972): 83–5.

Keith E. Yandell

WEISHEIPL, James Patrick Athanasius (1923–84)

James Patrick Weisheipl was born on 3 July 1923 in Oshkosh, Wisconsin. He entered the Dominican Novitiate in 1942, receiving the name Athanasius; he was ordained priest in 1949. The only child of deaf-mute parents, he learned early to listen to the sounds of nature, an appropriate preparation for the Dominican House of Studies in River Forest, near Chicago, where he completed his studies in 1950. The "River Forest School" of Thomism strictly followed Aquinas's order of learning: the arts of rhetoric and logic, followed by the mathematical, natural, ethical, and metaphysical sciences. Understanding nature is the key to all higher studies, so Weisheipl became an historian of science.

Weisheipl thus brought River Forest to Rome, where he received a doctorate in philosophy in 1953 from the Angelicum (Pontificia Università San Tommaso D'Aquino). He then earned a D.Phil. in history of science in 1957 from the University of Oxford. Weisheipl returned to teach as professor of medieval studies at the Dominican House of Studies in River Forest from 1957 to 1964. He then was professor of history of medieval science at the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies in Toronto, Canada from 1964 until his death. The Dominican Order bestowed on him the signal honor of Master of Sacred Theology in 1978. He died unexpectedly on 30 December 1984 while visiting St. Thomas More College in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

The positivist interpretation of the scientific revolution held that Galileo and the "new science" had invented the mathematical understanding of nature and as a consequence had to abandon Aristotle's philosophy of nature for a mechanistic world view. In the early twentieth century, Jacques MARITAIN tried to reintroduce natural philosophy as a discipline distinct from modern science, but he was content to let the two go their separate ways. The River Forest School wanted to

bring them closer together and Weisheipl attempted to show that positivism had got its history as well as its philosophy wrong.

The historical error was that modern science did not invent the mathematical understanding of nature. Aristotle recognized it and Aquinas coined a term for it: *scientia media* or "intermediate science." Mathematical astronomy is "intermediate" because it takes its principles from geometry and applies them to understanding the heavenly bodies. What was new in the seventeenth century was "the application of mathematical principles to the *entire range* of nature," exemplified by "Newton's *Principia Mathematica Philosophiae Naturalis*, where the very title reveals the precise nature of the work" (1985, pp. 265–6).

The philosophical error of positivism was to think that the "new science" required rejecting Aristotelian philosophy of nature. His own title, *Nature and Gravitation* (1955), set out Weisheipl's thesis: Aristotelian "nature," an intrinsic principle of motion and rest, could be reconciled with "space" and "gravity." In *Nature and Motion in the Middle Ages* (1985), Weisheipl argues there is "no radical opposition" between modern science and natural philosophy (pp. 272–3). Inertia and gravity, for example, can be accepted if understood as "hypotheses" that "save the appearances" because they are "neither self-evident nor demonstrable" (p. 269). Consequently, "there are realities in nature that are not accounted for by physico-mathematical abstraction, realities such as motion, time, causality, chance, substance, and change itself," which "are not established in metaphysics" but in "natural philosophy" (p. 273).

The program Weisheipl first heard at River Forest drove him to become a historian, first of science and then of philosophy. His most important contribution may be the definitive biography of Thomas Aquinas for the twentieth century, *Friar Thomas d'Aquino: His Life, Thought, and Works* (1974).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Nature and Gravitation (River Forest, Ill., 1955).

Aristotelian Methodology: A Commentary on the Posterior Analytics of Aristotle (River Forest, Ill., 1958).

The Development of Physical Theory in the Middle Ages (London and New York, 1959).

Friar Thomas d'Aquino: His Life, Thought, and Works (Garden City, N.J., 1974; Washington, D.C., 1983).

Nature and Motion in the Middle Ages, ed. William E. Carroll (Washington, D.C., 1985).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *The Dignity of Science: Studies in the Philosophy of Science, Presented to William Humbert Kane, O.P.* (Washington, D.C., 1961).

Ed., *Albertus Magnus and the Sciences: Commemorative Essays 1980* (Toronto, 1980).

Further Reading:

Long, R. James. ed. *Philosophy and the God of Abraham: Essays in Memory of James A. Weisheipl, OP* (Toronto, 1991).

Maurer, Armand. "James A. Weisheipl, O.P. (1923–1984)," *Mediaeval Studies* 47 (1985): x–xix.

Wallace, William A. "James Athanasius Weisheipl, O.P., 3 July 1923–30 December 1984," *Isis* 76 (1985): 566–7.

R. E. Houser

WEISS, Paul (1901–2002)

Paul Weiss was born on 19 May 1901 in Manhattan, New York City, in Lower East Side section. Weiss was the third of six boys born to Samuel and Emma (Rothschild) Weiss, who were both European immigrants. He left school before completing his high school degree at the age of sixteen. After working for six years, in 1924 he enrolled in three philosophy courses in the free night school at the College of the City of New York, and then enrolled as a day student for the following semester, completing the remaining courses for his high school degree. Weiss studied with Morris R. COHEN and graduated with his BA in 1927. Since he had completed all of the requirements for the bachelor's degree by the end of the fall semester of 1926, he enrolled in courses at Harvard during the spring of 1927. At Harvard he studied with Etienne GILSON, William Ernest HOCKING, C. I. LEWIS, Ralph Barton PERRY, Alfred North WHITEHEAD, and Harry Austryn WOLFSON, among others.

Weiss's first version of his dissertation on the nature of logical systems was not approved by the department. Whitehead, his advisor, suggested that Weiss append his critical evaluation of Russell's theory of types (written for one of Whitehead's courses) to it. The supplemented dissertation was accepted, and he received his PhD in philosophy in 1929. During his first semester at Harvard, Weiss volunteered to help Charles HARTSHORNE, who had begun the task of editing the manuscripts of Charles S. PEIRCE. Soon afterward, Weiss joined in the work officially with the approval of the department chair, C. I. Lewis. At the time that Hartshorne and Weiss were editing the manuscripts, none of Peirce's biographical papers or personal correspondence were made available to them. The final order of the volumes was worked out before Hartshorne left Harvard in 1928 to accept an appointment at the University of Chicago. According to the editorial plan that Hartshorne and Weiss had worked out at Harvard, Hartshorne would edit

the first, fifth, and sixth volumes of Peirce's manuscripts with some help from Weiss, while Weiss was to edit the second, third and fourth volumes. As Weiss had noted in the prefaces to the volumes that he edited, he received help from, among others, Henry LEONARD. By 1935, eight years after Weiss had first enrolled at Harvard, the first six volumes of the Peirce papers were published.

Weiss stayed at Harvard as a philosophy instructor until 1931 (with a year off for study abroad). The only academic offer Weiss received after his European studies and after his year as an instructor at Harvard was from Bryn Mawr. During Weiss's teaching at Bryn Mawr, from 1931 until 1946, he published a number of seminal essays in the philosophy of logic, metaphysics, and ethics. His first major work was *Reality*, published in 1938. His second was an exploratory one in the foundations of ethics, *Nature and Man*, published in 1947.

Weiss taught as a visiting professor at Yale in the fall of 1945, after which he returned to Bryn Mawr for the spring semester. In 1946 he accepted an appointment as professor of philosophy at Yale. He founded the *Review of Metaphysics* in 1947, and started the Metaphysical Society of America in 1950. In 1950 Weiss's third major work, *Man's Freedom*, was published, and *Modes of Being* was published in 1958. In the next decade eight more books followed, exploring politics, art, history, religion, education, family, and sports. Weiss received tenure at Yale, the first Jewish professor there to do so, and later he became Sterling Professor of Philosophy. After Weiss reached Yale's mandatory retirement age in 1969, he became the Heffer visiting professor of philosophy at Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C. He was also offered and then denied a philosophy chair at Fordham University, allegedly because of his age; Weiss lost his age discrimination lawsuit against Fordham in 1971. In 1992 Catholic University refused to renew his contract; after the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission alleged that age discrimination was involved, Weiss

taught for two more years until 1994, when he voluntarily retired. Weiss died on 5 July 2002 in Washington, D.C., at the age of 101.

In *Reality*, Weiss offered a comprehensive presentation of his naturalistic view of the full texture of the universe and of man's place in it. The metaphysical orientation of *Reality* is critical of Whitehead's process philosophy. Weiss rejected phenomenalist, idealist, and naïve realist orientations in epistemology, and although he rejected the skeptical dilemmas of Kantian analysis, he recognized the importance of both perceptual synthesis and imaginative synthesis in the formation of propositional attitudes. In his logical analysis he was Peircean, but he did not accept the metaphysics of signs that Peirce had articulated. Although he did not accept the Aristotelean conception of matter and form, he recognized the ontological reality of the complex structure of supervening individuals and both the internality and externality of spatial and temporal relations. Weiss showed that the changes that occur in our world arise from the multiplicity of independent, substantial entities and that these changes are the source of the perceptual judgments by which we come to know these beings.

In *Reality* Weiss wrestled with the two fundamental problems that a philosophy which recognized the concrete presence of both simple and complex individuals had to face: first, the epistemological dilemma of reconciling two brute facts, human knowledge and human ignorance; and second, that although human beings often sought for an explanation of the existence and meaningfulness of the world in one being or one principle of being, that the more fundamental conception of the world lay in the plurality of beings and the fact that they were incomplete. Weiss found a single answer to both these problems: the fundamental multiplicity of beings and their incompleteness allowed for the resolution of the problem of knowledge in the recognition that ignorance is the correlate of the concrete privacy of the plurality of real individuals, a privacy with a thickness and depth.

Weiss believed that any interpretation of the future as merely the possibility of interaction among individuals was unsatisfactory as an explanation of how the future served as a pole guiding the activities of supervening individuals as complex as sensitive organisms. Weiss claimed that such a conception of the future, although helpful as a model for picturing some of the features of individual activity, was unable to explain the depth of singular initiatives and the lure of common goals. A richer, intimate future was the presumption of individual action and inseparable from the striving of individuals to become complete. It was the locus of the freedom that action presupposed.

In *Nature and Man* the issues of the temporal and modal structure of the organism and of psychic disposition become focal areas of his concern. There the problem of how organisms can act to complete themselves, and the prerequisite of such completion – freedom – are explored in detail. There is a fundamental concern that underlies the unity of individuals, whatever their order of complexity might be. That concern is both a vector and a surge toward completion that is the exhibition of the freedom every individual possesses. In the first half of *Nature and Man* Weiss defends the view that there is a freedom resident in every individual existent, one rooted in the future intimate to it; in the second half of that work, he argues that such freedom is decisive for an understanding of the evolution of organic and psychic existence and of the emergence of selves.

In *Nature and Man* the differences exhibited among diverse kinds of organic beings are explained in terms of the notions of emotion and sensitivity. There is a gradient in organic life, a normative one exhibited in the organism's sensitivity to external impression and subsequent response; and that gradient depends upon the future as it is objectified in individual organisms. A natural self arises at the embryonic stage of human development; the consciousness of the intrauterine being is focused upon the rapid changes in its bodily develop-

ment, but this individual cannot exercise control over those processes. This failure becomes the occasion for the constitution of a new concern: the awareness of the body outdistancing the consciousness it possesses. A mind emerges later within the emotionally expressive being that the infant is, when the future that is envisioned is cut short by a new kind of failure, a failure that is analogous to the failure present to the embryo. This challenge is caused by the incapacity of the individual's body to function in the prescribed manner. To continue to exist as a supervening unitary being in the face of such failure, it must reorganize its future and restructure its past. To compensate for the failure, significant features of the individual's past (whether those features are skills, injuries, or memories of achievements and defeats) must be called upon, retrieved, and reoriented. This means that the past is not locked forever beyond our reach; the past is present as more than factual memory and can be made relevant to the present. It is these dimensions of the intimate past of an individual that are called upon by the being who must overcome its failure to reach a goal. But just as the past is not simply a tissue of facts, the future is no simple projection of abstract possibilities. The future that is active within an individual is a realm of goods. That internal future is the Good, and it is rich with possibilities; but it is also a restriction upon some of the attempts by beings to perfect themselves. In the recognition of that encompassing realm of goods, envisioned now as the Good, and in the recognition of the ambiguity of the past (its continued relevance and factuality), a primordial dimension of individuality is disclosed: some beings freely accept the antecedent responsibility that is theirs as natural selves.

Weiss faced the problem that is a central feature in human life: how the past functions in the emergence and disclosure of the self in the world. For human beings, the many strands of that problem can be summed up in the form of the question, "What is the meaning and source of guilt?" In Weiss's investigations, guilt is the symbol of the most pressing theoretical problem in philosophy: the ultimacy of selves. This is the issue of whether the self can be superseded, surpassed as a mode of unitary functioning by a super-self, a higher being that emerges from the self. If a super-self, whether conceived as a society, a political state or a divinity could emerge, then the presumptions that there are ethical demands, universally-binding on selves, could be surpassed.

In *Man's Freedom* Weiss reworked a number of essays he had published as early as 1941. *Man's Freedom* offered an answer to the problem of guilt and the ultimacy of selves. Self-completion is no longer defined in terms of conquest and absorption of the other, but is treated in terms of a primary self-discipline. In the cosmological and ethical analyses in *Nature and Man*, Weiss had defended the view that once a self had been disclosed, no further evolutionary jump was possible. He had claimed that a self could not be superseded because it had an awareness of the Good for itself and others. But the Good was not sufficiently definite to be used as a standard by which a self could be shown to be unsurpassable. There is an ambiguity to ideals that allows a self to contrast them with the definite character of activities; that ambiguity is the sign that an ideal is never exhausted by an activity initiated to achieve some goal, whether of health, fame, wealth, or wisdom. But that ambiguity seems to mean that even a self may be surpassed by something that was not subject to the limitation of never being able to achieve all the good that is needed.

Part of the solution lies in the recognition that the Good is the measure of perfection, but is not itself perfect. Over and over in his works Weiss resisted accepting the Platonic view of the Good. An ideal is never perfect; and it can never be perfected, thoroughly actualized, and exhausted by being realized. The other part of the solution is found at the end of *Man's Freedom*, in the formulation of an absolute injunction and a paradox. Human beings must freely will to do good; they must create oppor-

tunities to complete, and thus perfect themselves and others. But the creation which is possible to one who is truly good, no matter how creative he might be and no matter how lovingly he disposes himself to others, is never enough. Not all that ought to be done by human beings can be accomplished by them, whether singly or together. Yet, even though they could not accomplish all the good that is needed, they are still guilty. Weiss claims that human beings must freely accept responsibility for doing the good even when it is beyond their power to achieve that good. People are necessarily guilty although their existence is a contingent aspect of the universe. Not even a creative God could circumvent the necessity that metaphysical evil be present in the universe. Yet God is also not perfect; thus, even divinity would be guilty, did such a being exist.

That human beings are not surpassable in kind derives not simply from a self cognizing the Good as a whole (for such a whole is itself too ambiguous and vague to be so cognized), but from the fact that a self is the kind of being that cannot avoid accepting responsibility for every evil to which the universe in its entirety (past, present, and future) is subject. If human beings must create the Good, must will that the Good be realized, then such loving dedication would be but an empty gesture were they only willing to attempt to rectify the evil that was a consequence of their own activity. Every past evil, including the lack of harmony that the presence of multiple sources of power (concrete individuals) necessitates, must in some sense be responded to by human beings if they are to perfect themselves.

After three decades of serious reflection upon the responsibility of human beings and contrary to much (but not all) that he had written earlier, in *Modes of Being* Weiss concluded that God must exist. This conclusion results from the double-sided character of the self that human beings can become. First, an ethical self emerges from the recognition of guilt, from the recognition that as a human being it is responsible for all that occurs, even the unforeseen conse-

quences that it did not intend. Second, a self emerges most fully in its acceptance of itself as a symbol of the problematic, ultimately nameless, eternally unfulfilled, incomplete, but continually completing cosmos. Such a double condition is so paradoxical that it seems to be an absurd one. Yet the paradox of this responsibility and this acceptance projects selves to the recognition of the meaning that lies within this seemingly absurd universe: fraught with evil, the universe is neither inherently evil nor absurd. It only seems so because we have cognized unity as an ideal that cannot be achieved. Corresponding to the unity as hoped for but incomplete unity (an incomplete, imperfect condition which we as selves are) is another who, although not omnipotent nor omniscient, is yet the unity of this cosmos operating from within it. That unifying power is God. Each self ought to exemplify the perfections of the universe in a concrete form, but no one does. Each is fragmented. From a variety of possible articulations, each self must choose one or a few ways by which to recognize and achieve the harmony that the universe promises but cannot give. God does make up the debt which ought to be paid, which is owed; but divinity can only complete each self, and the universe that each epitomizes, after the fact. Divinity's providential concern is retroactive. In *Modes of Being* Weiss recognized that God makes the universe companionable. Guilt itself is not an evil; guilt is the vehicle by which the divine assessment is communicated. Were guilt to be avoided or ignored, we would never discover the existence of God. But were God not found, a self would be unable to verify that not only its interests, but also its responsibilities were cosmic in range.

Weiss did not view this cosmic other, this God, as a *self*, even though it is in terms of this cosmic other that the unsurpassable character of selves is recognized. Just as the measure of perfections, the Ideal (as the Good is labeled in *Modes of Being*) is not itself perfect, so the measure of the self's identity and unity is not a unit identity, in other words, it is not a self. For

Weiss, God is the unifier of the world, God is the universal operator or connector by which the harmony of all of the consequences of all of the actions of all of the beings in the universe is achieved. But the harmony that God makes possible in the universe is not the being of the universe. We are not parts of God's being and God is not the creator of the universe. The existence of individuals (actualities in *Modes of Being*) is not due to God, but to the power that is sometimes identified with one of its guises, the dynamic space-time field. That power (or operator Existence) is not a composite tissue of individuals, nor is it the nets of possibilities that are the partial manifestations of the Ideal. Nor is Existence one of the guises of God's nature, nor God's activity. God is simply one of the four kinds of being that with the others co-constitutes the universe. No one of these four kinds of entities that are presented and analyzed in *Modes of Being* – Actuality, Existence, the Ideal, and God – is any more fundamental than the others; but the operations of each are what makes our universe the place that it is.

After completing *Modes of Being* Weiss's later works serve as a disclosure of the seemingly unlimited ways that people strive to achieve some measure of perfection to epitomize their lives. But there is a change in the tone of this striving for perfection. Weiss recognized that the most basic norm in the universe, the one against which every being's attempt to achieve perfection is measured, is the communion of beings. In *Modes of Being* this had been proposed in the abstract as the togetherness of beings. While at Catholic University, Weiss recognized that human beings complete themselves in the concrete not simply by accepting or assenting in the abstract to the community of beings, but by actively fulfilling the demand that there be communion among beings, even though such a condition is never completely attainable.

Beyond All Appearances (1974) is the seminal work for all of his later writings, reshaping the pluralism of *Modes of Being*. In *Beyond All Appearances*, Weiss explained more effectively than he had done in *Modes of Being* how the early analysis contained in his first three works foreshadowed the turn to the fundamental realities that he had called the *modes of being* and later *finalities*. Weiss examined how it is possible to move below the surface, the appearance, of the individuals within our world in order to probe the character of the realities that lie within and between them. The communion of beings that is the heart of Weiss's vision, expressed most deliberately and carefully in *Beyond all Appearances*, and later tested in *First Considerations* (1977), *You, I, and the Others* (1980), *Human Privacy* (1983), and *Being and Other Realities* (1995), is that although the togetherness of beings is a given, the communion of beings is created. In *Being and Other Realities*, Weiss rejects his earlier identification of God with the unifying, harmonizing aspect of the universe. While maintaining that the harmonizing of disparate dimensions of the universe was evidence of an impersonal Affiliator, he was also led to recognize that the ultimacy of selves was to be found in their relation to an impersonal Assessor rather than to divinity.

The world is first given as many, although that world as known is known as one. The response that is demanded of human beings is to create a unity that does not devalue that many, specifically to create one's self and to offer it in return to the cosmos as one moment in the communion of beings. That moment of giving in the works just mentioned is the moment of deep emotion, whether it be in the acceptance of awe, reverence, wonder, interest, or humility, when one is in touch with the final, ultimate realities. The deep emotions put us in communion with realities that we are free to accept. Such communion of beings is not simply an alternative to Weiss's earlier approaches to the knowledge of what is fundamentally real; it was for him a more inclusive comprehension of the earlier positions. The acceptance of these final realities as a communion of beings both entails and is entailed by conquest and self-dis-

cipline. Communion presupposes conquest and self-discipline to be known; but they presuppose the communion of beings to be.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Reality (Princeton, N.J., 1938).
Nature and Man (New York, 1947).
Man's Freedom (New Haven, Conn., 1950).
Modes of Being (Carbondale, Ill., 1958).
Our Public Life (Bloomington, Ind., 1959).
The World of Art (Carbondale, Ill., 1961).
Nine Basic Arts (Carbondale, Ill., 1961).
History: Written and Lived (Carbondale, Ill., 1962).
The God We Seek (Carbondale, Ill., 1964).
Right and Wrong: A Philosophic Dialogue between Father and Son (New York, 1967).
The Making of Men (Carbondale, Ill., 1967).
Sport: A Philosophic Inquiry (Carbondale, Ill., 1969).
Beyond All Appearances (Carbondale, Ill., 1974).
Cinematics (Carbondale, Ill., 1975).
First Considerations (Carbondale, Ill., 1977).
You, I, and the Others (Carbondale, Ill., 1980).
Privacy (Carbondale, Ill., 1983)
Toward a Perfected State (Albany, N.Y., 1986).
Creative Ventures (Carbondale, Ill., 1992).
Being and Other Realities (Chicago, Ill., 1995).
Emphatics (Nashville, Tenn., 2000).
Surrogates (Bloomington, Ind., 2002).

Other Relevant Works
Weiss's papers are at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.
Philosophy in Process, 11 vols (Carbondale, Ill., and Albany, N.Y., 1966–89).

Further Reading
Amer Phils 1950-2000, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Pres Addr of APA v7*, *Proc of APA v77*, *Who Was Who in Amer v14*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Bernstein, Richard J. *The Philosophy of Paul Weiss* (Washington, D.C., 1972).
Hahn, Lewis E., ed. *The Philosophy of Paul Weiss* (Chicago, 1995). Contains Weiss's autobiography and bibliography.
Krettek, Thomas. "Actualities, Finalities and Dunamis as Ultimate Realities in the Thought of Paul Weiss," *Ultimate Reality and Meaning* 16 (1993): 97–109.
Krettek, Thomas, ed. *Creativity and Common Sense: Essays in Honor of Paul Weiss* (Albany, N.Y. 1987).
Kuntz, Paul G. "The Achievement of Paul Weiss," *Review of Metaphysics* 25 (1972): 47–70.
Lieb, Irwin C., ed. *Experience, Existence and the Good: Essays in Honor of Paul Weiss* (Carbondale, Ill., 1961).
Yancy, George. "Paul Weiss: Addressing Persistent Root Questions until the Very End," *Review of Metaphysics* 56 (2002): 123–55.

Robert L. Castiglione

WEITZ, Morris (1916–81)

Morris Weitz was born on 28 July 1916 in Detroit, Michigan. His parents emigrated from Europe, and his father worked as a painting contractor. He received his BA (1938) from Wayne State University. While doing graduate work in French history at the University of Chicago he met Bertrand Russell, which sent Weitz towards philosophy. He received an MA and PhD (1943) in philosophy from the University of Michigan. His dissertation was "The Method of Analysis in the Philosophy of Bertrand Russell." Weitz taught philosophy at the University of Washington (1944–5), Vassar College (1945–8), and Ohio State University (1954–69). In 1969 he moved to Brandeis University where he was named Richard Koret

Professor of Philosophy in 1972, a position that he held until his death. Weitz also served as chair of the philosophy department at Brandeis, and was chair of its Humanities Council. He was a visiting professor at Columbia, Cornell, and Harvard. He received a Guggenheim Fellowship in 1959, and was a Fulbright Senior Scholar. Weitz died on 1 February 1981 in Roxbury, Massachusetts.

Weitz's central interests were the philosophy of art, analytic philosophy, and the philosophy of literature. A year's visit to Oxford led to lifelong friendships with Oxford philosophers such as Gilbert Ryle, Herbert Hart, and Isaiah Berlin, and he wrote a lengthy essay entitled "Oxford Philosophy" (1953). This was a significant publication in the United States as it served for many as an introduction to postwar Oxford philosophy. It also illuminates the course of Weitz's career. In the essay, Weitz argued that postwar Oxford philosophy was not unified by any general metaphilosophical position but rather by a commitment to investigating the logic of concepts. This task of elucidating both ordinary and technical concepts became central to Weitz's philosophical pursuits. His philosophical method may be characterized as one of conceptual analysis, so long as this pursuit is not understood to be predicated on the goal of providing necessary and sufficient conditions. The rejection of the traditional search for necessary and sufficient conditions is central to Weitz's philosophical outlook.

Weitz is perhaps best known for his 1956 article "The Role of Theory in Aesthetics," which won a Matchette Prize. This article been one of the most influential works in contemporary philosophy of art, and it continues to generate debate and discussion. Weitz argues that the traditional project of defining art is doomed – and hence that aesthetic theory is impossible – because the concept of art is an "open" concept. Interestingly, in his earlier work on the philosophy of art, Weitz himself argued for his own traditional definition of art. As he put it in that work: "Every work of art … is an organic complex, presented in a sensuous medium, which complex is composed of elements, their expressive characteristics and the relations obtaining among them. I hold that this is a real definition of art." (1950, p. 44) Subject to devastating criticisms from Margaret McDonald among others, Weitz relinquished the organic theory and began to explore the possibility that no real definition of art could be provided.

"The Role of Theory in Aesthetics" argues for three distinct and important theses: (1) the concept of art is an open concept and, hence, is indefinable; (2) nevertheless there is an effective method for categorizing and classifying objects as art (a version of Ludwig Wittgenstein's family resemblance method); and (3) traditional aesthetic theories can be seen as a form of covert art criticism. Weitz begins his argument for an open concept of art by claiming that closed concepts – which can be defined in terms of necessary and sufficient conditions – can only be found in logic and mathematics, or in cases where we arbitrarily close them by stipulation. Since the concept of art is not a logical or mathematical one, the only way that it could be closed would be by stipulation. But stipulation would be "ludicrous" since it would be inconsistent with the expansive, adventurous, and creative nature of art. Weitz further argues that there are no necessary conditions whatsoever for the correct use of the concept of art. Since aesthetic theory is predicated on defining art, no aesthetic theory is possible.

Weitz's arguments have not convinced many. One of the most common complaints against Weitz is that he seems to only consider the possibility of defining art in terms of manifest (perceptually detectable) features of artworks, and hence fails to consider the possibility that the necessary and sufficient conditions for the correct use of the concept may be relational and not perceptually detectable. While Weitz invites this criticism by encouraging the reader to "look and see" that art has no defining features, it is clear that his argument does not rest on the

aforementioned assumption. His point is meant to be a logical one, not an empirical one. Perhaps more problematic is Weitz's contention that the creativity and expansiveness of art is inconsistent with its definition. One might interpret a good deal of late twentieth-century philosophizing about art as attempting to show that a definition of art can make sense of its inherent creativity. Whatever one thinks of these attempts, it seems evident that creativity is not an insurmountable problem for definition. For example, institutional and historical theories of art would appear to have no problem making room for adventurousness and creativity. Weitz's rejection of artifactuality as a necessary feature of art has also come under direct attack by George DICKIE among others. Finally, many have pointed out that Weitz seems to have an essentialist definition of "aesthetic theory," a definition that leads him to the mistaken conclusion that the indefinability of art would preclude any such theory.

Weitz's positive proposal for identifying art has also been criticized. While his point that categorization and identification do not require definition was widely appreciated (and has influenced some – such as Noël Carroll – to offer alternative nondefinitional approaches to identifying art), the specific method he proposes for identifying art, the family resemblance method, does not seem to work. The problem is that mere resemblance is too weak a notion to ground meaningful and successful identification since everything resembles everything else to some degree. Any attempt to distinguish relevant resemblances will lead to reinstituting necessary conditions for art status. Dickie has raised issues about the identification of the earliest art which cannot be recognized as art in virtue of resemblance to prior art.

Weitz also published numerous works in the philosophy of literature. Some of the themes in his work on literature mirror themes found in his work on aesthetics more generally. For example, in *Hamlet and the Philosophy of Literary Criticism* (1964), Weitz argues that the concept of tragedy is indefinable because it

is "perennially debatable" since any proposed criteria for tragedy is open to challenge. Hence, "any theory, poetics, or real definition of tragedy … constitutes a violation of the logic of that concept" (1964, p. 307). Another important theme in Weitz's writing about literature is the aesthetic importance of the (broadly philosophical) truth claims made in serious works of literature. This joins literature and philosophy in a way that is contrary to much of traditional and contemporary philosophical thinking about the two domains.

Weitz's later work focused generally on the nature (or natures) of concepts. In *The Opening Mind* (1977), as well as several papers in the 1960s and 1970s, Weitz extended his work on open concepts, arguing that a variety of different sorts of open concepts were used in the humanistic disciplines. Among the species of open concepts, there were the perennially flexible (like art), the perennially debatable (like tragedy), and the irreducibly vague (such as many style concepts). Weitz also allowed that there were concepts, like the concept of human action, that admitted of disjunctive sets of sufficient conditions but no necessary conditions. A posthumously published companion volume, *Theories of Concepts* (1988), dealt with the history of philosophical thinking about concepts from Plato through the twentieth century. Weitz held that the investigation of philosophers' theories of concepts would shed light on their philosophical systems, but acknowledged that many philosophers prior to Kant had no explicit theory of concepts. Interestingly, while Weitz found much variety among philosophers' theories of the nature of concepts, he also argued that the view that all concepts are closed "was not effectively challenged until Wittgenstein" (1988, p. 18).

Dickie has argued that Weitz's work on concepts suffers from an illegitimate presupposition: that all linguistic uses of a term "X" employ the concept of X. According to Dickie, it is Weitz's failure to discount nonliteral (for example, metaphorical and analogical) and incorrect uses of expressions that led him to

find openness wherever (or, to be precise, almost wherever) he looks. For if one looks at all uses of an expression one will no doubt find a hodgepodge rather than a neat set of necessary and sufficient conditions. Perhaps Weitz's occasional tendency to argue against essentialism by pointing to disagreement among essentialist theorists lent support to this contention. For example, Weitz wrote, "It is the disagreements among the theorists about the necessary and sufficient properties of tragedy that furnish the clue to the logical behavior of the concept of tragedy and the consequent impossibility of a theory …" (1967, p. 160) But it is not clear that Weitz did make the faulty presupposition that Dickie attributes to him. Ambiguity, metaphor, and other nonliteral uses of expressions are fairly obvious features of our language – the principle of charity would suggest that Weitz was aware of this. Moreover, he distinguished descriptive and evaluative uses of the expression "art" quite clearly in "The Role of Theory in Aesthetics" and offered different theories of how they are used therein. Furthermore, Weitz tended to focus on expert usage rather than ordinary usage. And the argument from disagreement is only one of a number of arguments that Weitz marshaled against necessary and sufficient conditions.

What Weitz did explicitly presuppose was that there was an intimate connection between concepts and language – so intimate in fact that any theory of concepts entailed corresponding claims about language. For example, he held that classic theories of concepts, which assumed that concepts admit of definition in terms of necessary and sufficient conditions, were committed to the view that the correct use of a corresponding term was governed by that very set of necessary and sufficient conditions. With this background assumption, it seems that Weitz need not assume that all uses of a given term were legitimate to motivate the hypothesis that it corresponds to an open concept. Instead, he needed only argue that the correct and literal uses of the linguistic expression in question were not governed by necessary and sufficient conditions. Of course this raises the question of how we are to determine what is literal and correct use and what is not.

While Weitz's arguments for the indefinability of the concept of art have suffered serious criticism, it is worth remarking that his conclusion about the concept of art – and his general skepticism of the possibility of definition – has gained support from recent empirical and philosophical work on concepts. Traditional approaches to concepts (which assume they possess a classical structure consisting of necessary and sufficient conditions) have been on the defensive, and a range of alternative nonclassical theories of concepts have been proposed including exemplar, prototype, and theory models. If such theories are on the right track, then Weitz's view that very few concepts admit of necessary and sufficient conditions of application may turn out to be right after all.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Philosophy of the Arts (Cambridge, Mass., 1950).
"Truth in Literature," *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 9 (1955): 116–29.
"The Role of Theory in Aesthetics," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 15 (1956): 27–35.
Philosophy in Literature: Shakespeare, Voltaire, Tolstoy, and Proust (Detroit, 1963).
Hamlet and the Philosophy of Literary Criticism (Chicago, 1964).
The Opening Mind: A Philosophical Study of Humanistic Concepts (Chicago, 1977).
Theories of Concepts: A History of the Major Philosophical Tradition (London, 1988).
Shakespeare, Philosophy, and Literature: Essays by Morris Weitz, ed. Margaret C. Weitz (New York, 1995).

Other Relevant Works
"Oxford Philosophy," *Philosophical Review* 62 (1953): 187–233.
Ed., *Problems in Aesthetics* (New York,

1959; 2nd rev. edn 1970).

Ed., *Twentieth Century Philosophy: The Analytic Tradition* (New York, 1966).

"Tragedy," in *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Paul Edwards (New York, 1967), pp. 155–61.

"Wittgenstein's Aesthetics," in *Language and Aesthetics*, ed. Benjamin R. Tilghman (Lawrence, Kansas, 1973), pp. 7–19.

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils
Carroll, Noël. *Philosophy of Art: A Contemporary Introduction* (London, 1999).

Davies, Stephen. *Definitions of Art* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1991).

Dean, Jeffrey. "The Nature of Concepts and the Definition of Art," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 61 (2003): 29–35.

Dickie, George. *Art and the Aesthetic: An Institutional Analysis* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1974).

Mandelbaum, Maurice. "Family Resemblances and Generalizations Concerning the Arts," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 2 (1965): 219–28.

Peltz, Richard. "Classification and Evaluation in Aesthetics: Weitz and Aristotle," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 30 (1971): 69–78.

Aaron Meskin

WENLEY, Robert Mark (1861–1929)

Robert M. Wenley was born on 19 July 1861 in Edinburgh, Scotland. His mother, Jemima Isabella, was from the aristocratic Veitch family; his father, James Adams Wenley, was treasurer of the Bank of Scotland. Wenley entered the University of Glasgow at age fifteen and excelled at both philosophy and athletics.

John Veitch, a maternal relation, was professor of logic; while Edward Caird (professor of moral philosophy) and his brother John Caird (Principal of Glasgow) were liberalizing influences who taught an idealistic and evolutionary theism that attracted Wenley's devotion. His studies were interrupted by fatigue and recuperative travel in Europe. After returning to Glasgow in the early 1880s Wenley reassumed his status as one of the Cairds' finest protégés, among a remarkable generation of philosophers from Glasgow that included John H. Muirhead, Henry Jones, and John WATSON. He received the MA in 1884 and remained at Glasgow as assistant professor of logic (1886–94) and degree examiner in mental philosophy (1888–91). The University of Edinburgh awarded Watson the degrees of Doctor of Philosophy (1895) and Doctor of Science (1891). He served as head of the philosophy department at Queen Margaret College from 1888–95.

In 1896 he decided to move to America, to succeed the departed John DEWEY as head of the Michigan philosophy department. With colleague Alfred H. LLOYD, Wenley expanded the department, hiring former student Roy Wood SELLARS and others who later brought fame to Michigan philosophy. Wenley was a contributor to James Mark BALDWIN's *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology* (1901–1905) and the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* (1903–27), and a book reviewer and commentator in the journal *Science* from 1899 to 1913. Wenley was a fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh and the Royal Society of Literature, and a member of the Aristotelian Society and other professional societies. From 1925 to 1927 he was Director of the British division of the American University Union in London. Long suffering from a weakness of the heart, Wenley died in Ann Arbor, Michigan, on 29 March 1929. His colleagues remembered him as a brilliant, powerful, and influential lecturer, whose reputation for sarcastic wit did not deter the best students from flocking to his courses. Sellars's

Reflections on American Philosophy From Within (1969) describes Wenley as a polymath who explored the history of philosophy in his classes without avowing any one system, encouraging students to freely find their own way.

Wenley's philosophical views were elaborated in his many books, which ranged over ancient and Hellenic philosophy, the history of Christianity, modern philosophy and theology, moral theory, and social philosophy. In his autobiographical statement "An Unborn Idealism" (1930), Wenley claimed that he had no creed or system. However, in another quasi-autobiographical essay "Beati Possidentes" he had no difficulty locating his intellectual place: suspended between Scotland's traditions and America's novelties. Nor would he deny that his education under the neo-Hegelian Cairds provided a type of absolute idealism suitable for refuting all positivisms, pragmatisms, naturalisms, and realisms. This idealism was designed to be compatible with his liberal and anti-Calvinist Protestantism compatible with a progressive democracy. Progress for Wenley means only advancement towards realizing Christian principles; but these principles themselves deepen in significance as culture advances. Hence no denominational creed serves for more than a generation at best, and religion ought not to solidify into forced confessions.

For Wenley, only religious experience, by unifying feeling, will, and reason, can bring us into living contact with God. Wenley resisted any attempt to separate reason from religion and morality. For example, mysticism cannot ultimately satisfy our demand for knowledge of God. He also rejected the divorce of rational metaphysics and ethical theology fostered by Albrecht Ritschl's theology, but he recognized its persuasiveness in an age of scientism. His *Contemporary Theology and Theism* (1897) predicts that Ritschlianism will soon appear in America; William JAMES's pragmatic approach to religion, published in articles and books from 1898 to 1902, quickly confirmed his pessimistic expectation. Although Wenley could agree with unifying morality and religion, he required that a rationally principled system, and not merely personal satisfaction, ground both. In close agreement with another Cairdian, John Watson, Wenley argued that the downfalls of subjectivism, dualism, and materialism (all unable to account for self-consciousness and knowledge) require us to view persons as partners within a higher divine and rational unity that ensures the universe's harmony and intelligibility.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Socrates and Christ (Edinburgh, 1889).

Aspects of Pessimism (Edinburgh, 1894).

Contemporary Theology and Theism (New York and Edinburgh, 1897).

An Introductory Outline to Kant's "Critique of Pure Reason" (New York, 1897).

The Preparation for Christianity in the Ancient World (New York and London, 1898).

Modern Thought and the Crisis in Belief (New York, 1909).

Kant and His Philosophical Revolution (New York and Edinburgh, 1910).

The Anarchist Ideal and Other Essays (Boston, 1913).

Stoicism and Its Influence (New York, 1924).

Other Relevant Works

Wenley's papers are at Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

The University Extension Movement in Scotland (Glasgow, 1895).

Ed., *Dualism and Monism and Other Essays*, by John Veitch (Edinburgh, 1895).

The Life of Robert Flint, with Donald Macmillan and others (London, 1914).

The Life and Work of George Sylvester Morris (New York, 1917).

"Beati Possidentes," in *Philosophical Essays Presented to John Watson* (Kingston, Ontario, 1922), pp. 37–62.

Ed., *Poems*, by John Davidson (New York, 1924).

The American University Union in Europe: British Academic Degrees, with Gary N. Calkins (New York, 1927).

"'Tis Sixty Years Since," *University of California Publications in Philosophy* 6 (1929): 265–85.

"An Unborn Idealism," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 2, pp. 385–411.

Further Reading

Dict Amer Bio, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v39*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Albee, Ernest. "Wenley's *Kant and His Philosophical Revolution*," *Philosophical Review* 21 (1912): 683–7.

Hollands, Edmund H. "Wenley's *Modern Thought and the Crisis in Belief*," *International Journal of Ethics* 20 (1910): 504–508.

John R. Shook

WERKMEISTER, William Henry (1901–93)

William Henry Werkmeister was born on 10 August 1901 in Asendorf, Germany. After studying at the University of Münster from 1920 to 1923, he emigrated to the United States in 1923. He received his PhD in philosophy from the University of Nebraska in 1927, writing a dissertation titled "Driesch's Philosophy: An Exposition and a Critical Analysis." He became a naturalized US citizen in 1929. While still a graduate student, Werkmeister joined the University of Nebraska faculty in 1926 and remained there until 1953. He began as an assistant instructor in philosophy from 1926 to 1928, then instructor from 1928 to 1931. He was promoted to assistant professor in 1931 and associate professor in 1940. He served as department chair from 1945 to 1953, and was promoted to full professor in 1947. In 1954 he joined the faculty of the University of Southern California as professor of philosophy and Director of the School of Philosophy, and taught there until 1966, after which he was professor of philosophy at Florida State University until retiring in 1972. He remained active at Florida State until the year of his death. He died on 24 November 1993 in Tallahassee, Florida.

Werkmeister was President of three professional societies: the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1964–5, the Florida Philosophical Association in 1973, and the American Society for Value Inquiry in 1974–5. In addition to contributing over 100 scholarly articles and over 400 book reviews to academic journals, he was editor of *The Personalist* from 1959 to 1966.

Werkmeister's philosophical interests included the issues and theories raised by Kant, Martin Heidegger, Edmund Husserl, and Nicolai Hartmann. In his posthumously published work (1996), he explored the tortuous riddle of the order of Heidegger's works, posing a bold interpretation of their chronological order but also a defense of Heidegger's attraction to National Socialism. But the deeper theme here and elsewhere in his work was the inadequacy of post-Kantian German philosophies in ignoring space, and in its extraordinary preoccupation with time and its relation to human being and human death. Werkmeister believed firmly that Kant's problematic set the full theme for subsequent philosophical work, and he found much of it incomplete in grappling with Kant's challenges.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Philosophy of Science (New York, 1940).

The Basis and Structure of Knowledge (New York, 1948).

An Introduction to Critical Thinking (Lincoln, Nebr., 1948).

A History of Philosophical Ideas in America (New York, 1949).

Theories of Ethics: A Study of Moral Obligation (Lincoln, Nebr., 1961).

Man and His Values (Lincoln, Nebr., 1967).

Historical Spectrum of Value Theories, 2 vols
(Lincoln, Nebr., 1970–73).
*Kant's Silent Decade: A Decade of
Philosophical Development* (Tallahassee,
Fla., 1979).
*Kant: The Architectonic and Development of
His Philosophy* (LaSalle, Ill., 1980).
Nicolai Hartman's New Ontology
(Tallahassee, Fla., 1990).
Martin Heidegger on the Way, ed. Richard T.
Hull (Amsterdam, 1996). Contains a bibliography of Werkmeister's writings.

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *Facets of the Renaissance* (Los Angeles,
1958).
Ed., *Ralph Tyler Flewelling*, *The Forest of
Yggdrasill* (Los Angeles, 1962).
Ed., *Reflections on Kant's Philosophy*
(Gainesville, Fla., 1975).
Ed., *Facets of Plato's Philosophy* (Amsterdam,
1976).
"Autobiographical Sketch," in *A Quarter
Century of Value Inquiry: Presidential
Addresses of the American Society for Value
Inquiry*, ed. Richard T. Hull (Amsterdam,
1994), pp. 79–80.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v7, Who's Who in Phil
Kaelin, Eugene F., ed. *Man and Value: Essays
in Honor of William H. Werkmeister*
(Tallahassee, Fla., 1981).

Richard T. Hull

WERTHEIMER, Max (1880–1943)

Max Wertheimer was born on 15 April 1880
in the German-speaking enclave of Prague,
Austro-Hungarian empire (now Czech
Republic) and died on 12 October 1943 in
New Rochelle, New York. After attending a

Catholic elementary and a public high school,
Wertheimer entered Charles University at
Prague where he studied law and then philosophy, preferring the latter. There he attended
lectures by Christian von Ehrenfels, who in
1890 had coined the term "gestalt-quality" by
which he denoted that property of a stimulus
that gives it its wholeness and identity and
that cannot be derived simply by adding up the
properties of each of its separate parts. This
principle became an important component of
Wertheimer's later theoretical perspective.

Moving to the University of Berlin in 1901,
Wertheimer heard the lectures of Carl Stumpf,
who would later supervise the theses of two
other eminent Gestalt psychologists, Kurt
KOFFKA and Wolfgang KÖHLER. Wertheimer
moved on to Würzburg in 1904, and in that
year he received a PhD in psychology under
Oswald Külpe for research on the usefulness of
word association tests in clinical and forensic
contexts. From 1904 to 1910 he traveled to
various European laboratories to work on a
variety of topics, including ethnic music (the
study of which led him to elaborate the view
that a melody has Gestalt quality), and the
number concepts used in various societies
around the world.

While at the University of Frankfurt, in 1910
Wertheimer conceived the idea of exploring
apparent movement of the kind familiar to us
from flashing neon signs and from cinema. In
this kind of apparent movement, the phenomenal experience of the movement arises from
two separate *successive* stimulations of the
retina by two separate stationary objects. The
apparent movement must arise somehow in
the visual nervous system as it processes the
signals sent by the two stimuli in succession,
and must depend on the time interval between
and content of the two signals. For the
unknown process that took place in the visual
system that gave rise to the *appearance* of
movement, Wertheimer coined the term "phi
phenomenon." In his article of 1912, translated into English as "Experimental Studies
on the Seeing of Motion" (1961), Wertheimer

briefly related the phi phenomenon to the idea of "gestalt-quality"; but this paper was primarily important because it initiated a long series of experimental studies on seen motion.

While at Frankfurt as a *Privatdozent* lecturer from 1912 to 1916, Wertheimer also worked with Wolfgang Köhler and Kurt Koffka, who were then serving as research assistants to Friedrich Schumann. In conversation and in publications (some polemical), the three investigators began to formulate the basic principles of Gestalt psychology (for a detailed history see Ash 1995). In discussing the concept of "gestalt-quality," Wertheimer introduced the useful term "and-sum" to refer to the additive sum of the properties of each of a stimulus's separate parts. Gestalt-quality is something over and above the *and-sum* associated with a two-dimensional figure or three-dimensional object. Gestalt-quality is characterized particularly by regularity and a lack of complexity.

From 1916 to 1922 Wertheimer was a *privatdozent* at the University of Berlin. During World War I he worked with Erich von Hornbostel at Berlin on the development of devices that could detect the direction from which underwater sounds came, such as the sounds made by submarines. A number of important findings about how the direction of a sound can be determined by humans came from this research. After the war, Wertheimer associated himself with the Psychological Institute at the University of Berlin, of which Köhler became acting Director in 1920 and then permanent Director in 1922. In 1921, Wertheimer, Köhler, Koffka, Kurt Goldstein, and Hans Grühle founded a new journal, *Psychologische Forschung*, dedicated to the propagation of Gestalt ideas in articles both theoretical and experimental. The journal ran until 1938, ceased publication during World War II, and was started again under the same title in 1948. It is still one of the major vehicles for publication on the psychology of perception.

Wertheimer's own contributions to the journal in 1921 and 1923 are the source of the demonstrations of perceptual grouping familiar to all readers who have taken a course in introductory psychology; individual elements of a display can be grouped by proximity, similarity, continuity, closure, and other principles. These grouping processes are assumed to be unlearned (Koffka had shown that they appear to be present in human babies). They are also assumed to be mediated by brain events that have evolved in such a way that the representation of physical reality by the brain preserves certain constancies (invariances) necessary if the individual is to make his or her way through the spatial environment efficiently. This clarity or unambiguity of perception is attained, according to the Gestaltists, because the brain represents physical reality in a neural format that is isomorphic with respect to that physical reality in the sense that important invariances (for example, figure–ground quality) are preserved. In turn, phenomenal sensory experience is also characterized by the preservation of invariances because the organization of sensory experience is itself isomorphic with respect to the organization of relevant neural representations (for more about Gestalt notions of isomorphism, see Scheerer 1994).

Wertheimer was professor of psychology at Berlin from 1922 until 1929, when he was called to the chair in philosophy and psychology at the University of Frankfurt. Forced to leave Germany in 1933, Wertheimer was offered a position at the New School for Social Research in New York, an institution founded to provide positions for immigrants fleeing to North America from the Nazi regime (Adler 1994). Wertheimer was professor of psychology there until his death in 1943. At the New School, Wertheimer lectured on a large number of psychological topics, not just perception. These topics included social psychology and the psychology of problem solving. One of his students, Abraham S. Luchins, devised the well-known "water-jar test" for demonstrating how success at problem solving can be damaged if the problem solver stays for too long with a strategy that is initially successful. Ultimate success requires adaptation,

an adaptation that demands "insight" insofar as it requires that the problem solver see the various elements of the problem in a new light. Wertheimer himself collected examples of problem solving in real life that illustrated the need to "restructure" the formulation of the problem in such a way that its solution follows easily. His posthumously published *Productive Thinking* (1945) contained examples of restructuring provided not only by adolescent participants attempting to solve geometrical problems in classroom environments, but also by a first-person account of his own efforts to solve a problem in geometry. It also included an account, based on conversations, of how Albert EINSTEIN had arrived at his special theory of relativity by considering the concept of "simultaneity" from a new perspective. Einstein and Wertheimer were close friends.

Köhler pointed out that it was to Wertheimer that we owe the scientific strategy of viewing problems in cognitive psychology from "above" rather than "below," that is, the strategy of starting with phenomenal experience and tracing its source back to neural events, rather than the other way around. This approach has become common since the advent of the so-called "cognitive revolution" (for a discussion see Murray 1995).

While Wertheimer's original contributions to philosophy may appear, superficially, to be fewer than those of Köhler or Koffka, it was Wertheimer who did the most to produce the classic demonstrations of Gestalt phenomena that have to be taken into account in any discussion of the nature of experience or thought. He incorporated into his thinking such ideas as the automatic organization by the brain of the elements of a visual field into a grouping that facilitated the "making sense of" the contents of that field; and it was Wertheimer who stressed that humans dislike ambiguity and intellectual dilemmas so much that they feel driven to resolve ambiguities and to find solutions to dilemmas. Wertheimer also believed that a person's concept of self included a "We-component" as well as an "I-component" and

that too much personal isolation could lead imperceptibly to a feeling of personal persecution, even delusional psychosis, if that person were not rejoined with a group to which he felt he belonged. In *Psychologische Forschung* in 1924, under the name of a psychiatry student, Heinrich Schulte, Wertheimer described case histories of the onset of paranoid delusions in World War I prisoners whose group included nobody else who spoke their language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Experimentelle Studien über das Sehen von Bewegungen," *Zeitschrift für Psychologie* 61 (1912): 161–265. Abridged English trans. in *Classics in Psychology*, ed. T. Shipley (New York, 1961), pp. 1032–89.

"Versuch einer Theorie der paranoischen Eigenbeziehung und Wahnbildung," published under the name Heinrich Schulte, *Psychologische Forschung* 5 (1924): 1–23. Abridged English trans. in *A Source Book of Gestalt Psychology*, ed. W. D. Ellis (New York, 1938).

Productive Thinking (New York, 1945; 2nd edn 1959). Contains a bibliography of Wertheimer's writings.

Other Relevant Works

Wertheimer's papers are at the New York Public Library and the University of Colorado at Boulder.

Drei Abhandlungen zur Gestalttheorie (Erlangen, Germany, 1925).

Wertheimer's Seminars Revisited, 14 vols, ed. Abraham S. Luchins and Edith H. Luchins (Albany, N.Y., 1970–79).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Psych*, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v57*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Adler, Helmut E. "The European Influence on American Psychology: 1892 and 1942," *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 727 (1994): 113–18.

Ash, Mitchell G. *Gestalt Psychology in German Culture 1890–1967* (New York, 1995).

Murray, David J. *Gestalt Psychology and the Cognitive Revolution* (New York, 1995).

Newman, E. B. "Max Wertheimer: 1880–1943," *American Journal of Psychology* 57 (1944): 428–35.

Scheerer, Eckhard. "Psychoneural Isomorphism: Historical Background and Current Relevance," *Philosophical Psychology* 7 (1994): 183–210.

Wertheimer, Michael. "Max Wertheimer: Modern Cognitive Psychology and the Gestalt Problem," in *Portraits of Pioneers in Psychology*, vol. 1, ed. G. A. Kimble, M. Wertheimer, and C. White (Washington, D.C., 1991), pp. 189–207.

Westheimer, Gerald. "Gestalt Theory Reconfigured: Max Wertheimer's Anticipation of Recent Developments in Visual Neuroscience," *Perception* 28 (1999): 5–15.

David J. Murray

WEYL, Claus Hugo Hermann (1885–1955)

Hermann Weyl was born on 9 November 1885 in Elmshorn near Hamburg, Germany, and he died on 8 December 1955 in Zürich, Switzerland. His father Ludwig was a bank clerk but wealthy enough (with help from the family of his wife Anna) to be able to give his son a sound education. Weyl spent the years from 1895 to 1904 at the Gymnasium in Altona, where the headmaster was a relative of David Hilbert, who had continued the impressive mathematical tradition at the University of Göttingen inaugurated by Felix Klein. As a result, it was not surprising that Weyl went to Göttingen for his undergraduate and graduate studies, with the exception of a brief interval at the University of Münich. He received his PhD in mathematics in 1908 after working with Hilbert, and became a *Privatdozent* in 1910.

In 1913 Weyl left Göttingen to take the chair of mathematics at the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule in Zürich. He was offered the chance to succeed Felix Klein at Göttingen but turned it down, although he later accepted an invitation to take a position there after Hilbert's retirement. There has been speculation that he was eager to avoid having to work in Hilbert's shadow, although he always paid tribute to his influence both on his own work and on mathematics in general.

Weyl's return to Göttingen in 1930 as the chair of mathematics was not long lasting. Although Weyl himself was of irreproachable Aryan descent in Nazi eyes, his wife was part-Jewish, and so he accepted a mathematics position at the newly formed Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, New Jersey in 1933. He remained affiliated with the Institute for the rest of his academic life. He became an American citizen in 1939 but spent a good deal of time in Europe after the end of the war. In particular, at one point he temporarily lost his citizenship as a result of an administrative limit on the amount of time a naturalized citizen could spend abroad, but this did not prove to be a serious impediment. Despite his long residency in the United States, Weyl's style was always heavily influenced by German constructions. He was elected a member of the National Academy of Sciences in 1940, and was a foreign member of the Royal Society and a corresponding member of the Académie des Sciences.

Much of Weyl's philosophical orientation arose out of his mathematical experience. He was one of the great mathematicians of the twentieth century (in fact, Roger Penrose called him the greatest of them). His work cut across many areas of mathematics, from algebra and topology to analysis and physics. In fact, it was from his interest in topology that his distinctive approach to issues in the foundations of mathematics arose. He had consulted the topologi-

cal work of L. E. J. Brouwer and then found in Brouwer's philosophical ideas an attractive response to the classical tradition in which Weyl had grown up. Brouwer's intuitionism was a repudiation of the classical willingness to depend on language and laws of logic to serve as a basis for mathematical truth. Brouwer looked to the mathematical imagination as the creative source of mathematical ideas and as the justification for mathematical results.

Weyl was not wholeheartedly attached to Brouwer's philosophical system, but the opportunity to look beyond the domain of proof was appealing to him. In a paper of 1921, Weyl looked at the current "crisis" in the foundations of mathematics and argued that one of the difficulties was the kind of freedom classical mathematicians had allowed themselves in creating new sets of objects. The paradoxes that had been introduced into mathematics over the previous two decades and more had received various sorts of treatment in the axiomatization of set theory by Ernst Zermelo and in the regimentation of predicates by Bertrand Russell, but Weyl was looking for a more philosophical-based treatment. His suggestion, embodied in a 1918 volume on the continuum that had more of a technical audience than the 1921 paper, was to follow the approach to the foundation of the real numbers as created by Henri Poincaré. This predicative approach was designed to circumvent the vicious circle paradoxes that had arisen from allowing sets to be defined in terms of themselves. By insisting on a constructive approach to building up numbers, Weyl could avoid the paradoxes and could offer a philosophical justification for the alternative.

The problem for the classical mathematicians who were Weyl's seniors, like Hilbert, was that the change in standard for proof led to certain results having to be reformulated and even being lost altogether. Hilbert himself was not inclined to look with great care at exactly what could still be preserved in Weyl's system, once he saw that it would have consequences in reducing the freedom of mathe-

maticians to work on the axioms they had created. In fact, Hilbert took vigorous action to resist the influence of Brouwer and Weyl by insisting on the removal of the former from the editorial board of *Mathematische Annalen*, the most distinguished German publication in mathematics. While Hilbert was clearly concerned about Brouwer's influence on the future of mathematics, he may have been particularly worried about what was to become of Weyl.

Weyl's response to Hilbert's actions and writings against Brouwer was more muted than one might have expected. Hilbert developed his own approach to metamathematics (the division into formal and finitary parts) partly as a way of being able to avoid some of the strictures Brouwer and Weyl had tried to impose on the practice of mathematics. Weyl himself seemed to be pleased with the technical aspects of Hilbert's approach and not to insist on continuing to wave the flag of constructivism. This led to a reconciliation with Hilbert, although Weyl tended to leave foundational concerns in his later work rather than to follow the Hilbert line.

Weyl wrote a good deal about the philosophy of science, not surprisingly in view of his involvement with the technical aspects of the subject. He had written a textbook on the foundations of quantum mechanics and his work laid the basis for the discipline of gauge theory. Beyond technical considerations he saw in the world the basis from which mathematics of any sort would have to emerge. He found in intuition the source of mathematics which proof could only elaborate. In his philosophical writing he gave a crucial role to the idea of "possibility" and from that notion he derived the title of one of his last philosophical works, *The Open World*. He dealt with the topic of statistical indeterminacy in physics as related to this notion of possibility, and seems to have been influenced by Edmund Husserl. There was a connection in his mind between the construction of the world in phenomenology and the construction of real numbers in Brouwerian intuitionism.

Weyl's writings about philosophy of science in a general setting did not have the same influence that his ideas about the foundations of mathematics did. This may partly have been the extent to which his work in foundations had a constructive form and could be followed by others, while in the more general setting, they had a more speculative tone. For those in the communities of mathematics and physics, Weyl could be "a friend, a teacher, and a hero," as John Archibald Wheeler wrote. His philosophical influence has been more lasting through his technical work than his explicitly philosophical statements.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Die Idee der Riemannschen Fläche (Leipzig, 1913; 2nd edn 1923; 3rd edn 1955). Trans. Gerald Maclane, *The Concept of a Riemann Surface* (Reading, Mass., 1964).

Das Kontinuum: Kritische Untersuchungen über die Grundlagen der Analysis (Leipzig, Germany, 1918). Trans. Stephen Pollard and Thomas Bole, *The Continuum: A Critical Examination of the Foundation of Analysis* (Kirksville, Miss., 1987).

Raum, Zeit, Materie: Vorlesungen über allgemeine Relativitätstheorie (Berlin, 1918). Trans. Henry L. Brose, *Space, Time, Matter* (London, 1922).

"Uber die neue Grundlagenkrise der Mathematik," *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 10 (1921): 39–79.

Was Ist Materie? (Berlin, 1924).

Die Heutige Erkenntnislage in der Mathematik (Erlangen, Germany, 1926).

Philosophie der Mathematik und Naturwissenschaft (Münich, Germany, 1927). Trans. Olaf Helmer, *Philosophy of Mathematics and Natural Science* (Princeton, N.J., 1949).

Gruppentheorie und Quantenmechanik (Leipzig, 1928; 2nd edn 1931). Trans. Howard Percy, *The Theory of Groups and Quantum Mechanics* (London and New York, 1931).

Die Stufen des Unendlichen (Jena, Germany, 1931).

The Open World: Three Lectures on the Metaphysical Implications of Science, trans. Lulu Hofmann (New Haven, Conn., 1932).

Mind and Nature (Philadelphia, 1934).

The Classical Groups: Their Invariants and Representations (Princeton, N.J. and Oxford, 1939; 2nd edn 1946).

Algebraic Theory of Numbers (Princeton, N.J., 1940).

Symmetry (Princeton, N.J., 1952).

Other Relevant Works

Weyl's papers are at the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule in Zürich, Switzerland.

Selecta: Hermann Weyl (Basel, 1956).

Gesammelte Abhandlungen, 4 vols, ed. K. Chandrasekharan (Berlin, 1968).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*

Bell, John L. "Hermann Weyl on Intuition and the Continuum," *Philosophia Mathematica* 8 (2000): 259–73.

Chandrasekharan, K., ed. *Hermann Weyl: 1885–1985* (Berlin, 1986).

Drucker, Thomas. "Weyl, Intuitionism, and Modality," in *Exact Sciences and Their Philosophical Foundations*, ed. Wolfgang Deppert et al. (Frankfurt, 1988).

Frei, Günter, and Urs Stammbach. *Hermann Weyl und die Mathematik an der ETH Zürich, 1913–1930* (Basel, 1992).

Hesseling, Dennis E. *Gnomes in the Fog: The Reception of Brouwer's Intuitionism in the 1920's* (Basel, 2003).

Scholz, Erhard, ed. *Hermann Weyl's Raum-Zeit-Materie and a General Introduction to His Scientific Work* (Basel, 2001).

Tieszen, Richard. "The Philosophical Background of Weyl's Mathematical Constructivism," *Philosophia Mathematica* 8 (2000): 274–301.

Von Plato, Jan. *Creating Modern Probability:*

Its Mathematics, Physics and Philosophy in Historical Perspective (Cambridge, UK, 1994).

Wells, R. O., Jr., ed. *The Mathematical Heritage of Hermann Weyl* (Providence, R.I., 1988).

Yandell, Benjamin H. *The Honors Class: Hilbert's Problems and Their Solvers* (Natick, Mass., 2002).

Thomas Drucker

WHEDON, Daniel Denison (1808–85)

Daniel Denison Whedon was born on 20 March 1808 in Onondaga, New York, the son of Daniel Whedon and Clarissa Root. As a young boy, Whedon attended a Presbyterian Sunday school and was much influenced by Caleb Alexander, a clergyman and one of the founders of Hamilton College in upstate New York, although Whedon's mother and eldest brother were active Methodists. Deciding that his son should be a lawyer, Whedon's father placed him under the tutelage of Oliver C. Grosvenor in Rome, New York. At eighteen he was admitted to the junior class of Hamilton College where he studied John Locke, William Paley, Ralph Cudworth, Henry More, and Thomas Reid. Following his graduation in 1828, he studied law with Judge Chapin in Rochester and Alanson Bennett in Rome, New York. Hearing the evangelical preaching of Charles G. Finney in Rome, Whedon experienced conversion and joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was attracted by Methodism's Wesleyan emphasis on free will, which made salvation possible for all.

Whedon received an appointment to teach Greek and mental philosophy at the Oneida Annual Conference Seminary in Cazenovia, New York in 1830. While on the faculty, he was licensed to preach and occasionally spoke at religious meetings. In 1831 he became a tutor at Hamilton College where he later completed his master's degree. He served as professor of ancient languages and literature at Wesleyan University in Connecticut from 1833 until 1843. While a member of the Wesleyan faculty, he was ordained a deacon (1836) and an elder (1838). He was a ministerial member of the New York Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church and, when invited, preached regularly in various churches. His first noteworthy publication appeared in *Zion's Herald*, a denominational periodical, in 1835 as a series of articles in which he described the evil of slavery while criticizing the divisive rhetoric of the northern radical abolitionists. On 15 July 1840 he married Eliza Ann Searles, and five children were born to their union.

As teaching became burdensome, Whedon resigned from the Wesleyan faculty and took up pastorates of Methodist churches in Pittsfield, Massachusetts in 1843 and Renselaerville, New York in 1845. Not finding the pastoral ministry satisfying, he returned to teaching in 1845 when he was named to the chair of logic, rhetoric, and philosophy of history at the University of Michigan. His virulent opposition to slavery led to his dismissal from the Michigan faculty in 1851. The following year he opened a classical and commercial school in Ravenswood, Long Island, New York. Overwhelmed by the demands of his school, he returned to parish ministry, serving churches in New York City and Jamaica, New York from 1854 to 1856.

Recognizing Whedon's theological, writing, and editorial talents, in 1856 the Methodist Episcopal Church elected him editor of its premier theological journal, the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, a position he held with distinction until 1884. He died on 8 June 1885 at the home of his son Charles in Atlantic City, New Jersey.

One of Methodism's most celebrated leaders and theologians, Whedon was chiefly known for his biblical commentaries and his defense of the Arminian views of John Wesley, the

founder of Methodism. Following Wesley, Whedon upheld the freedom of the human will to respond to God's offer of salvation as opposed to the Calvinistic position that, due to the blight of sin, the human will is not free.

His 1864 book, *The Freedom of the Will as a Basis of Human Responsibility, and a Divine Government, Elucidated and Maintained in Its Issue with the Necessitarian Theories of Hobbes, Edwards, the Princeton Essayists, and Other Leading Advocates*, is Whedon's definitive treatment of the Wesleyan position. Employing theological and philosophical categories, it is one of the most substantial and complete examinations of the topic in nineteenth-century American Protestantism. This work, largely critical of Jonathan Edwards's denial of free will, sought to analyze the nature of the human will, the idea of volitional necessity, and genuine free will as a basis for moral responsibility. Free will is the basis for moral and holy living. If people are not free, Whedon argued, they cannot be held responsible for their misdeeds and condemned by God.

In addition to articles, editorials, and reviews, Whedon edited a commentary on the Old Testament and published his own five-volume *Commentary on the New Testament* (1860–80). His persuasion that the New Testament writers supported freedom of the will and emphasized moral responsibility is mainly reflected in his comments on those biblical passages which have been traditionally controversial regarding free will versus predestination, especially St. Paul's Letter to the Romans (chaps 8–11).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Public Addresses, Collegiate and Popular (Cleveland, 1852).
The Freedom of the Will (New York, 1864).
Commentary on the New Testament (New York, 1860–80).
Commentary on the Gospels (New York, 1867).
Essays, Reviews, and Discourses (New York, 1887).
Statements Theological and Critical (New York, 1887).

Further Reading

Chiles, Robert E. *Theological Transition in American Methodism: 1790–1935* (Nashville, Tenn., 1965).
Langford, Thomas A. *Practical Divinity: Readings in Wesleyan Theology* (Nashville, Tenn., 1999), pp. 61–74.
Langford, Thomas A. *Practical Divinity: Theology in the Wesleyan Tradition* (Nashville, Tenn., 1998), pp. 90–94.
Scott, Leland H. *Methodist Theology in America in the Nineteenth Century* (Madison, Wisc., 1954).

Charles Yrigoyen, Jr.

WHEELIS, Allen B (1915–)

Allen Wheelis was born on 23 October 1915 in Marion, Louisiana, (he later added "B" as a middle initial for stylistic reasons). He attended the University of Texas before earning his medical degree from Columbia University in 1943. Wheelis started his psychiatric studies at the Menninger Foundation in Topeka, Kansas, and completed them at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute. He later served as a staff psychiatrist at the Austen Riggs Center in Stockbridge, Massachusetts. In 1954 Wheelis moved to San Francisco, where he presently resides, to practice psychoanalysis and to pursue a writing career.

While the numerous works of Allen Wheelis span a period of some forty years, they are not easily classified either by academic discipline or genre. In these works one finds a heavily crafted style of writing that alternates between discursive analysis (*The Quest for Identity*, 1958) and fiction (*The Doctor of Desire*, 1987). Much of what he has written is a creative com-

bination of psychological analysis, social commentary, and autobiography. Even though psychotherapy is his central subject, many of Wheelis's novels and nonfiction works move beyond psychology and confront the human condition itself. Where psychotherapy, for example, may offer some answers to the remediable pain caused by childhood trauma, Wheelis believes that it can do little to alleviate the irremediable misery that underpins our raw, unadorned mortal existence. Consequently, infused through all of his works are philosophical forays into such questions as meaning, identity, determinism, value theory, and the role of power.

Although influenced in his early years by the pragmatism of William JAMES and Charles S. PEIRCE, Wheelis acknowledges the more persistent influence of Friedrich Nietzsche. Like Nietzsche, Wheelis is not afraid to confront the specter of nihilism, especially when "the way things are" cannot be reconciled with the various "schemes of things" we employ to bring order and constancy to our reality. Yet, nihilism is not an answer in itself, but serves only as a counterpoint to a deeper desire inherent in humankind, namely, the search for meaning and wholeness. Wheelis calls this persistent longing for meaning "grail-hunger." Such yearning is paradoxical in the sense that the wholeness, or truth sought, lies hidden in the longing that fuels the search itself. In the end, the desire to achieve some blissful reprieve from life's miseries and conflict is illusory. Perhaps the only meaning available to us lies in exposing our vulnerability and embracing any meaning, regardless of its veracity.

While a humanist ethic is evident throughout his works – one that arises out of the existential, biological conditions from which human beings evolve – it offers little consolation in the short term. Yet, in *The Moralist*, Wheelis suggests that what one can hope for in the promise and evolution of our humanity is "something different from any humanity yet known on this planet" (1971, p. 81).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Quest for Identity (New York, 1958).
The Seeker (New York, 1960).
The Illusionless Man (New York, 1966).
The Desert (New York, 1969).
The End of the Modern Age (New York, 1971).
The Moralist (New York, 1971).
How People Change (New York, 1973).
On Not Knowing How to Live (New York, 1975).
The Scheme of Things (New York, 1980).
The Doctor of Desire (New York, 1987).
The Path Not Taken (New York, 1990).
The Life and Death of My Mother (New York, 1992).
The Way Things Are (New York, 1994).
The Listener: A Psychoanalyst Examines His Life (New York, 1999).

Other Relevant Works
"The Place of Action in Personality Change," *Psychiatry* 13 (1950): 135–48.
"Will and Psychoanalysis," *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 4 (1956): 285–303.

Further Reading
Explorations, vol. 9, ed. Maurice duQuesnay (Lafayette, La., 1999). Issue devoted to Wheelis.

Mark S. Muldoon

WHEELWRIGHT, Philip Ellis (1901–70)

Philip Ellis Wheelwright was born on 6 July 1901 in Elizabeth, New Jersey, to Jessamine Meeker and Charles Edward Wheelwright, a stockbroker. He married Maude McDuffee in 1940, with whom he had a daughter. While he was a scholar of diverse philosophical interests, he is best remembered for his significant

contributions in the fields of ancient philosophy and aesthetics.

After receiving his BA at Princeton University in 1921, Wheelwright continued his graduate studies at Princeton and successfully defended a dissertation on Charles Renouvier's concepts of liberty and contingency in 1924. After teaching for one year at Princeton, he spent the next ten years at New York University from 1925 to 1935, reaching the rank of professor of philosophy in 1928 and serving as department chair from 1927 to 1932. Wheelwright left NYU to devote two years to scholarly research, and then was a member of the philosophy faculty at Dartmouth College in New Hampshire as professor of philosophy from 1937 to 1953. In 1954 Wheelwright became professor of philosophy at the newly founded University of California at Riverside. He received honorary degrees from Dartmouth (MA 1939) and the University of California (LLD 1968), and was the Visiting Churchill Professor at the University of Bristow in 1960. He was the President of the American Philosophical Association Pacific Division in 1965–6. In 1966 he retired from teaching, and he died on 6 January 1970 in Santa Barbara, California.

A devoted teacher, Wheelwright not only made a significant impact on his own students, but also on the generations of students and scholars influenced by his texts on Aristotle and the pre-Socratics, as well as an influential volume on Heraclitus, his favorite Greek philosopher. Yet his scholarly interests were not limited to the ancient Greeks. He also published important writings on the British empiricists, modern philosophy, metaphor, logic, and aesthetics. His work on metaphor remains particularly significant, especially his book *Metaphor and Reality* (1962).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Burning Fountain: A Study in the Language of Poetry (Bloomington, Ind., 1954; 2nd edn 1968).
Heraclitus (Princeton, N.J., 1959).

A Critical Introduction to Ethics (Garden City, N.Y., 1935; 2nd edn, New York, 1949; 3rd edn 1959).
The Way of Philosophy (New York, 1960).
Metaphor and Reality (Bloomington, Ind., 1962).
Valid Thinking: An Introduction to Logic (New York, 1962).

Other Relevant Works
Ed. with Peter Fuss, *Five Philosophers: Aristotle, René Descartes, David Hume, Immanuel Kant, William James* (New York, 1963).
Ed., *The Presocratics* (New York, 1966).
"On the Meaning of You," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 40 (1967): 35–48.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v7, Proc of APA v43, Who Was Who in Amer v5, Who Was Who in Amer v5, Who's Who in Phil
The Hidden Harmony: Essays in Honor of Philip Wheelwright (New York, 1966). Contains a bibliography of Wheelwright's writings.

Shannon Kincaid

WHIPPER, William (1804–76)

William Whipper was born on 22 February 1804 in Drumore Township (now Little Britain Township) in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. He was the son of Nance, a female slave, and a white merchant. He was raised in the home of a white lumberman where his mother was a servant. After working for a time in Philadelphia, in March 1834 he opened a grocery store next door to the Bethel Church in Philadelphia, where he prominently displayed temperance and abolitionist literature. He

inherited a small lumber yard when his father died, and in 1835 he moved to Columbia, Pennsylvania. With cousin Stephen Smith as a partner, Whipper survived racial prejudice and community hatred to become one of the most successful businessmen in Pennsylvania during the 1850s. He was among the country's wealthiest African Americans before and after the Civil War. He spent enormous amounts of money during the 1840s and 1850s funding abolition societies and operating his station on the Underground Railroad, helping slaves escape to the north into Canada and organizing mass migrations of Pennsylvania's blacks to safer regions. In 1868 he moved to New Brunswick, New Jersey. In the 1870s he resided in Philadelphia and served as treasurer of the Philadelphia Building and Loan Association and also was an officer of the Philadelphia branch of the Freedman's Savings Bank. Whipper died on 9 March 1876 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Whipper was closely involved with several regional and national organizations devoted to abolition and improving the intellectual opportunities for blacks. With James C. Bowers, Samuel E. Cornish, Sarah Douglass, and Robert and Harriet Purvis, he supported literary societies that inevitably had abolition agendas. In 1833 he joined the American Moral Reform Society, an African-American effort to appeal to the nation's moral conscience. During 1838 and 1839 he funded and edited the society's publication, the *National Reformer*, which was the first black newspaper in Philadelphia. During the 1830s he also aided the Negro Convention Movement. He rejected the use of violence, a strategy represented in David Walker's strident call for slave revolt, and instead consistently urged nonviolent action, aligning with William Lloyd GARRISON. Whipper also demanded that abolition societies be integrated and be devoted to stressing the responsibilities of blacks to improve their own moral and social habits. He exchanged letters with Frederick DOUGLASS over their disagreements on these topics.

While Whipper later reversed his position on the root cause of racism, admitting that color and not social status is primarily responsible, he never abandoned his calls for moral reform and his position that only non-violent resistance to slavery is justifiable. His September 1837 articles, published under the title of "An Address on Non-Resistance to Offensive Aggression" in *The Colored American*, provide his fullest explanation. In the section published on 9 September 1837, he appeals to Christian scripture and states that "the practice of non-resistance to physical aggression, is not only consistent with reason, but the surest method of obtaining a speedy triumph of the principles of universal peace." He was strongly opposed by other prominent black leaders, such as Henry Highland Garnet, who instead demanded that blacks immediately exercise their right of self-defense.

By the 1850s Whipper's involvement with black conventions, the National Council of Colored People, and the growth of black schools indicated how he had come to recognize the value of independently black organizations. He also reversed his longtime stance against African colonization by American blacks, and served as Vice President of the African Civilization Society in the 1850s. During the 1860s and 70s he remained actively involved with improving economic and social conditions for freed blacks in Philadelphia. While many Reconstruction Era northern liberals fought against special legislation aiding blacks, Whipper demanded strong government assistance and protection.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"An Address Delivered before the Colored Reading Society of Philadelphia" (1828), in *Early Negro Writing, 1760–1837*, ed. Dorothy Porter (Boston, 1971), pp. 106–19.

"An Address Delivered before the Colored Temperance Society of Philadelphia," *The Liberator* 4 (21, 28 June, 5 July 1834). Repr. in *The Black Abolitionist Papers*, ed.

C. Peter Ripley (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1991), vol. 3, pp. 119–29.

"An Address to the American People at the Fifth Annual Convention for the Improvement of the Free People of Color in the United States" (1835), in *The Black Abolitionist Papers*, ed. C. Peter Ripley (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1991), vol. 3, pp. 146–51.

"An Address on Non-Resistance to Offensive Aggression," *The Colored American* 1 (9, 16, 23, 30 September 1837). Repr. in *The Black Abolitionist Papers*, ed. C. Peter Ripley (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1991), vol. 3, pp. 238–51.

"Three Letters in Opposition to Black Separatism," *The Colored American* 5 (3, 10, 17 January 1841). Repr. in *The Ideological Origins of Black Nationalism*, by Sterling Stuckey (Boston, 1972), pp. 252–60.

Other Relevant Works
Some biographical materials are in the Leigh Whipper Papers at Howard University.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio
Andrews, William L. "William Whipper," in *Oxford Companion to African American Literature*, ed. William L. Andrews, Frances Foster, and Trudier Harris (Oxford, 1997).

Bacon, Jacqueline. *The Humblest May Stand Forth: Rhetoric, Empowerment, and Abolition* (Columbia, S.C., 2002).

Bell, Howard H. "The American Moral Reform Society, 1836–1841," *Journal of Negro Education* 27 (Winter 1958): 34–40.

Hopkins, Leroy. "Black Eldorado on the Susquehanna: The Emergence of Black Columbia, 1726–1861," *Journal of the Lancaster County Historical Society* 89 (1985): 110–32.

Glaude, Eddie. *Exodus! Religion, Race, and Nation in Early Nineteenth-century Black*

America (Chicago, 2000), chap. 7.

Horton, James Oliver, and Lois E. Horton. *In Hope of Liberty: Culture, Community and Protest Among Northern Free Blacks, 1700–1831* (Oxford, 1997).

Lessl, Thomas M. "William Whipper," in *African-American Orators: A Bio-critical Sourcebook*, ed. Richard Leeman (Westport, Conn., 1996), pp. 375–83.

McCormick, Richard P. "William Whipper: Moral Reformer," *Pennsylvania History* 43 (January 1976): 23–46.

Quarles, Benjamin. *Black Abolitionists* (Oxford, 1969).

Sidney (prob. Henry Highland Garnet). "William Whipper's Letters," (1841) in *Witness for Freedom: African American Voices on Race, Slavery, and Emancipation*, ed. Roy E. Finkebine, Michael F. Henbree, and Donald Yacovone (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1993).

John R. Shook

WHITE, Morton Gabriel (1917–)

Morton G. White was born on 29 April 1917 in New York City, where his parents, Robert and Esther Weisberger, had also been born. He attended elementary and high school there, and in 1932 entered the College of the City of New York at the age of fifteen. In his first year, his mathematics teacher was the distinguished logician Emil POST, and the philosophy teachers who influenced him most were Morris COHEN and Ernest NAGEL. In 1936 White went on to graduate study of philosophy at Columbia, where Nagel was a main attraction for him. In the summer of 1938 he also attended a logic course by W. V. QUINE at Harvard University. Although his main interest was philosophy of science, he wrote a historical dissertation, "The Origin of Dewey's Instrumentalism" (published

in 1943), and received his PhD in philosophy in 1942.

After graduation White taught history of Western thought courses for freshmen at Columbia and elementary physics at City College. In 1940 he married Lucia Perry, with whom he had two sons, and co-authored two books: *The Intellectual Versus the City* (1962) and *Journeys to the Japanese* (1986). She died after a long illness in 1996, and in 1997 he married Helen Starobin. During 1943–5 White taught physics at Columbia. In 1946 he became assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania, where he came to know Nelson GOODMAN. In 1948 he became professor of philosophy at Harvard. There he enjoyed the friendship of Henry AIKEN, W. V. Quine, and Burton DREBEN, and they were instrumental in bringing Goodman to Harvard. White also formed close friendships with colleagues outside the philosophy department, notably with Arthur SCHLESINGER, Jr., in history, and with Isaiah Berlin, who often visited Harvard from Oxford. In 1970 White decided to accept an offer to join the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, New Jersey, where he is now professor emeritus.

At the Institute for Advanced Study, White has been in the School of Historical Studies, reflecting his important studies in the History of American Philosophy, starting with his dissertation on John DEWEY and continuing with books and articles on Charles PEIRCE, William JAMES, and other American pragmatists. White's production might appear to spread over a disparate collection of topics, from history and its philosophy over philosophy of language and of science to freedom of the will. However, they are all united through his interest in holism, which gradually became more and more prominent in his writings.

White wrote in his autobiography *A Philosopher's Story*, in 1999: "As I now look back on some of my first publications, I am struck by the fact that my present combination of intellectual interests was formed at a very early age." (p. 33) He then mentions his first

two publications, from 1939, when he was twenty-two: an article on "Probability and Confirmation" in the *Journal of Philosophy* and an article written with Albert Wohlstetter in the *Partisan Review*, where he attacks the popular semantics of Stuart Chase, S. I. Hayakawa, and Alfred KORZYBSKI. In the next couple of years he continued this combination of discussion of technical philosophy and issues on the borderline between philosophy and politics. He reviewed Richard VON MISES's *Probability, Statistics and Truth* and Quine's *Mathematical Logic*, but also wrote in the *Partisan Review* a criticism of Sidney HOOK's book *John Dewey*.

White's dissertation was a historical study of the development of Dewey's instrumentalism, which is the view that ideas are plans of actions, and not mirrors of reality. Dewey's instrumentalism is also a theme of his next book, *Social Thought in America* (1949). However, now a philosophical discussion is added to the historical survey. Dewey's instrumentalism is submitted to critical scrutiny, together with other prominent ideas in early American social thought: Thorstein VEBLEN's institutionalism, Justice HOLMES's realism, and also Charles A. Beard's ideas of how underlying economic forces influence social life and James Harvey Robinson's "new history" view, that history is not merely a chronicle of the past, but a tool for explaining the present and shaping the future.

These views that White criticized have later been subjected to barrages of criticism, not all of it on the same level of clarity and cogency as that of White. White basically shared the liberal outlook of the people he criticized and in a preface to the 1957 edition of the book he states: "I hasten to add that, like Mill [in his reflections on his early criticism of Bentham] I consider my criticism perfectly just, but the present intellectual atmosphere makes it plain that for all of my reservations about Holmes and Dewey I have more in common with them than with most of their contemporary detractors."

Social Thought in America expresses doubt about two interrelated ideas that had domi-

nated philosophy for hundreds of years, up through the logical empiricists: the distinction between analytic and synthetic statements and the distinction between the descriptive and the normative. These doubts were worked out in several of White's later works, and his alternative, holistic view is his core contribution to philosophy. The systematic development of these ideas begins in his next book *Toward Reunion in Philosophy* (1956). This book was originally intended as a second main part of *Social Thought in America*, but in order not to delay the publication of that volume the philosophical discussion was confined to a couple of final chapters. White's qualms about the analytic/synthetic and the descriptive/normative distinctions intensified as he was working on *Toward Reunion in Philosophy*, and he also saw that a third traditional view was intertwined with these two, namely the assumption that ontological statements, that is philosophical statements about what there is, are sharply distinguished from statements about how the world is.

Toward Reunion in Philosophy therefore ends up having three parts, one for each of the following three questions: What is? What must be? and What should be? A fourth and final part is devoted to the interplay between these three questions. There were extensive discussions of these issues in the 1940s and early 50s. The analytic/synthetic distinction was discussed in correspondence and conversations between White, Goodman, Quine, and Alfred TARSKI. As for existential statements, Quine had earlier criticized Rudolf CARNAP for his claim that such statements, unlike descriptive statements, express choices of linguistic framework. Quine argued against Carnap that ontological statements are as scientific as physical statements. Concerning normative questions, White offers an account "in which I deny that they are meaningless and in which I also deny that they are settled by a mode of argument which is wholly different from that which is used in science" (1956, p. 22). "The resulting picture is that of a scientist bringing a system of logical and scientific theory to experience and that of the moralist bringing a combination of logic, scientific theory, and moral principle to bear on his moral problems. By traditional standards it involves a breakdown of the epistemological differences between the logical, the physical, and the ethical. By positivistic standards it involves a breakdown of the semantic walls between the analytic, the synthetic, and the emotive." (1956, p. 257)

Similar views were put forth by John RAWLS in "Outline of a Decision Procedure for Ethics" in 1951 and by Israel SCHEFFLER in "On Justification and Commitment" in 1954. Scheffler gives credit to Goodman, but apart from this there are no cross-references between these authors to tell us where the ideas originated first. In 1971, in *A Theory of Justice*, Rawls states that, "The view proposed here accords with the account in §9 which follows 'Outline for Ethics' (1951). But it has benefited from the conception of justification found in W. V. Quine, *Word and Object*." Rawls also notes White on moral judgment in *Toward Reunion in Philosophy* (p. 579n). Rawls's footnote makes clear how White's 1956 discussion of justification in ethics goes beyond Rawls's 1951 article. However, the main contribution of *Toward Reunion in Philosophy* is the comprehensiveness of its holism. While Goodman and Quine focused on logic and science and Rawls and Scheffler limited themselves to ethics, White proposed a comprehensive holism that treats logic, science, and ethics as components in one unified whole. As White stresses in the passage just quoted, his view involves a breakdown of the epistemological differences between the logical, the physical, and the ethical as well as of the semantic walls between the analytic, the synthetic, and the emotive.

White himself finds this broad holistic view foreshadowed by the American pragmatists, especially James and Dewey. In several later works he explores these antecedents of his own view. *What Is and What Ought To Be Done* (1981) and *A Philosophy of Culture: The Scope*

of *Holistic Pragmatism* (2002) are both devoted to this topic. *What Is and What Ought To Be Done* expands the Duhem–Quine holistic view on the testing of scientific theories to the testing of our whole web of normative and descriptive beliefs. However, White points out that although all our beliefs are interconnected, they are not all tested when something unexpected happens. In order to distinguish his view from that of Quine, White introduces the term "corporatism" for the view that bodies of beliefs and not just individual beliefs are tested through experience. While Quine held that these bodies comprise all our beliefs, White holds that the bodies of beliefs that are tested are limited. For example, if I believe that my car is in the garage and then find upon opening the garage door that it does not appear to be there, "I think that some beliefs played no part in supporting my conclusion that the car was in the garage and therefore were not candidates for rejection or revision when my car did not seem to be in the garage." (1981, p. 20) White finds that Pierre Duhem shared this view that we test *limited* bodies of belief, and he therefore calls Duhem and himself *limited* corporatists, while he calls Quine a *total* or holistic corporatist. While White's holism is less comprehensive than Quine's when it comes to individual testing, White insists that the limited bodies of belief which are tested may contain a mixture of descriptive and normative statements, and in *What Is and What Ought To Be Done* he gives several examples of such mixtures.

Another very important point in *What Is and What Ought To Be Done* is an extension of the notion of evidence to include not only sensory experience, but a special sort of moral feeling or emotion that guides us in our selection of moral views in a way analogous to the way sensory experience guides us in our choice of scientific theories. "I believe in the existence of moral feelings such as this with as much confidence as I believe that there is a sensory experience to which we appeal when we attribute a color to a physical object. I cannot

see how we can deny the existence of such a feeling and, more particularly, how we can deny that when we sincerely *say* that we feel obliged to do something of a certain kind we in fact have the sort of feeling in question. And if I were asked to give an argument for believing that there are feelings of obligation, I should respond as I would if asked to give an argument for the view that we have sensory experiences of red or green." (1981, p. 40)

A Philosophy of Culture: The Scope of Holistic Pragmatism gives a thorough historical and systematic examination of the development of this corporatist view. The word "culture" in the title expresses a main point of the book, namely that while much of philosophy in the twentieth century focused on science, philosophy should have a much broader scope, and include all aspects of the human endeavor, it should be a "philosophy of culture." The holism of Quine and Goodman should be expanded to include this whole field, include philosophy of history, philosophy of law, ethics, and other normative disciplines. So far, this is rather similar to the comprehensive holism of *Toward Reunion in Philosophy* and *What Is and What Ought To Be Done.* However, one important theme that is more thoroughly discussed in *A Philosophy of Culture* than in the earlier works is the status of the holism itself: "I have maintained that thinkers who seek knowledge do and should use the method of holistic pragmatism in testing their views, and therefore that theorists of art, moral thinkers, historians, political thinkers, and predicting lawyers do and should." (2002, pp. 184–5) Can pragmatic holism itself be tested and given up? White responds that we should regard it as a rule of good scientific methodology. It reflects the idea that epistemology is a normative discipline, but it should not be regarded as a priori, necessary, or immutable. Like some other rules in ethics and science "they are entrenched, but they may be removed from their trench for good reason" (2002, p. 182).

White's holistic pragmatism has repercussions in many areas. Philosophy of history has

been mentioned. His book *Foundations of Historical Knowledge* (1965) works out how explanation of action and historical events interweaves with natural and social science, statistics, epistemology and ethics, and other normative disciplines. He also often comes back to the philosophy of law. And in *The Question of Free Will: A Holistic View* (1993) he argues that rather than starting out with some absolute principles of determinism or free choice we should consider the relevant data concerning these notions and a wealth of other descriptive and normative notions, including the ethical principle "every obligatory action is free," and then try to work out a theory that organizes all these data in a simple way. White's rejection of the traditional views on analytic/synthetic and normative/descriptive is crucial to get this enterprise off the ground.

White's writings on philosophy and intellectual history include many books and articles that have not been mentioned. In particular, he has contributed to the philosophy of politics and of education without sacrificing the exacting standards of his work in epistemology, philosophy of science, and ethics. He has not only written about politics and education, but has again and again engaged himself in concrete cases where social justice or quality of scholarship have been threatened. While White tends to be mild on persons, he can speak out sharply when this needs to be done. His writings and his life seem inspired by the last words in his book *Religion, Politics and the Higher Learning*: "to think honestly and to act courageously."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Origin of Dewey's Instrumentalism (New York, 1943).

Social Thought in America: The Revolt Against Formalism (New York, 1949).

Toward Reunion in Philosophy (Cambridge, Mass., 1956).

Religion, Politics and the Higher Learning: A Collection of Essays (Cambridge, Mass., 1959).

Foundations of Historical Knowledge (New York, 1965).

Science and Sentiment in America: Philosophical Thought from Jonathan Edwards to John Dewey (New York, 1972).

The Philosophy of the American Revolution (New York, 1978).

Pragmatism and the American Mind: Essays and Reviews in Philosophy and Intellectual History (New York, 1980).

What Is and What Ought To Be Done: An Essay on Ethics and Epistemology (New York, 1981).

Pragmatism and the Politics of Epistemology (Kyoto, Japan, 1986).

Philosophy, The Federalist, and the Constitution (New York, 1987).

The Question of Free Will: A Holistic View (Princeton, N.J., 1993).

A Philosophy of Culture: The Scope of Holistic Pragmatism (Princeton, N.J., 2002).

From a Philosophical Point of View: Selected Studies (Princeton, N.J., 2004).

Other Relevant Works

The Intellectual Versus the City: From Thomas Jefferson to Frank Lloyd Wright, with Lucia White (Cambridge, Mass., 1962).

Journeys to the Japanese, 1952–1979, with Lucia White (Vancouver, B.C., 1986).

A Philosopher's Story (University Park, Penn., 1999).

Further Reading

Beard, Robert W. "On Professor White's Puzzle," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 27 (1966): 107–109.

Gouinlock, James. "Dewey's Theory of Moral Deliberation," *Ethics* 88 (1978): 218–28.

Martin, Michael. "Corporatism," *Philosophia* 16 (1986): 275–91.

Watkins, J. W. "A Modern Sampson in the

Philosopher's Temple: Morton White's New Books," *Ratio* 1 (1957): 68–84.

Wehrell, Roger. "Morton White's Concept of Specifically Historical Terms," *De Philosophia* 1 (1980): 8–16.

Dagfinn Føllesdal

WHITEHEAD, Alfred North (1861–1947)

Alfred North Whitehead, a British-born philosopher who attained widespread fame in America in the first half of the twentieth century, is perhaps best known among the wider public for his famous saying that all subsequent thought "is but a series of footnotes to Plato." He was born in Ramsgate, on the Isle of Thanet, England on 15 February 1861, and died in Cambridge, Massachusetts, on 30 December 1947.

Whitehead's father was an Anglican minister serving mostly rural parishes. Whitehead received a traditional English "public school" education, steeped in classics, history, literature, and mathematics at Sherborne, a venerable boarding school in Dorset. In 1880 he enrolled in Trinity College, Cambridge with a scholarship in mathematics. He took the Mathematical Tripos examinations in 1883 and graduated first class. In 1884 he also placed first class in Part III of the Mathematical Tripos. He then presented a dissertation on Maxwell's theory of electricity and magnetism, and was elected a fellow of Trinity College in 1884. In that year he was inducted into the famed "Cambridge Apostles." Whitehead lectured in applied mathematics at Cambridge as a fellow and senior fellow (promoted in 1903) until 1910. Having taught as a lecturer for over twenty-five years, usually the maximum allowed, and with little hope of obtaining a mathematics chair there, he resigned from Cambridge in 1910 and moved to London. In 1914 Whitehead accepted a full professorship of applied mathematics at the University of London in the newly established Imperial College of Science and Technology, and for some years he was also Dean of the Faculty of Science and had other administrative positions. He remained at the University of London until 1924.

In the early 1920s the philosophy department at Harvard sought to recover from a series of retirements and deaths of eminent faculty. After rejecting such figures as Bertrand Russell, Henri Bergson, and John DEWEY, C. I. LEWIS suggested Whitehead as a compromise candidate. The proposal was received with enthusiasm, and in 1924 Whitehead was offered a five-year appointment as professor of philosophy for what was then the highest salary at Harvard. The journalist and biographer, Lucien Price, reports in *Dialogues of Alfred North Whitehead* (1961) that the letter was read by both Whitehead and his wife Evelyn, who asked him what he thought of the idea. Whitehead reportedly answered to her surprise, "I would rather do that than anything in the world." At the age of sixty-three, Whitehead retired from his position at the University of London and sailed to America to take up the post at Harvard University. Apart from delivering the Gifford Lectures at the University of Edinburgh during the academic year 1927–8, he did not return to England, but remained in America as a naturalized citizen. In 1937 he retired from Harvard and continued to write until his death.

Whitehead won many awards and honors from universities and societies. He was elected to the Royal Society in 1903, and received its Sylvester Medal in 1925. He received the James Scott Prize from the Royal Society of Edinburgh in 1922, and the Butler Medal from Columbia University in 1930. In 1931 he became a fellow of the British Academy, and was awarded the British Order of Merit in 1945. Whitehead was President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1931–2.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Whitehead began a collaboration with Bertrand

Russell that resulted in their *Principia Mathematica* (1910–13), which attempted to establish the foundations of mathematics in formal logic. Subsequently their philosophical and political interests diverged and their collaboration ceased altogether, though the two remained respectful friends. Other works from Whitehead's academic period in England include *A Treatise on Universal Algebra* (1898), *On Mathematical Concepts of the Material World* (1906), *An Introduction to Mathematics* (1911), *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Natural Knowledge* (1919), and a significant work in the philosophy of science, *The Concept of Nature* (1920).

After coming to America, Whitehead published a continuous series of works on broader themes, encompassing the history and philosophy of science, the philosophy of history, his thoughts on education, and, most famously, an ambitious attempt to develop a descriptive metaphysical system commensurate with early twentieth-century relativistic cosmology and quantum mechanics, labeled as "process philosophy." Works during this American period of his career include *Science and the Modern World* (1925), *Religion in the Making* (1926), *Symbolism* (1927), *The Function of Reason* (1929), *Process and Reality* (1929, based upon the Gifford Lectures of 1927–8), *Adventures of Ideas* (1933), and *Modes of Thought* (1938). Whitehead also gave and published a number of lectures and essays on diverse topics during this period, many of which can be found in collections such as *The Aims of Education* (1929) and *Essays in Science and Philosophy* (1947).

In Great Britain, where Russell's legacy continues to exert an enormous influence, Whitehead is today acknowledged by philosophers (if at all) exclusively for his contributions to the philosophy of mathematics and logic. Many scholars distinguish sharply between these interests, during his early or formal career in his native land, and the broadly speculative and metaphysical interests that characterize a presumably distinct American period.

However, this demarcation may not be justified. The major portion of the early logical work has since been undermined by the later Ludwig Wittgenstein and Kurt GÖDEL, whose famous "incompleteness theorem" in 1931 discredited the project of foundational certainty that the *Principia* (under Russell's influence) had sought. Whitehead himself increasingly harbored suspicions about that positivist project, even as he modestly (and inaccurately) persisted in according the larger share of credit for this work to Russell. Whitehead himself later came to dismiss the claims to certainty of mathematical logic as illusory. A greater challenge is thus to understand why all four of the eminent Cambridge philosophers associated with the dominance of analysis and logical empiricism in Britain – Whitehead, Russell, Moore, and Wittgenstein – each, in their own way, came to repudiate this movement's emphasis on logical precision, exactness, and rigor in favor either of broad and speculative metaphysical views (Whitehead, followed much later by Russell), or of the incorrigible ambiguities and indefiniteness of ordinary language and common life (Moore, followed by Wittgenstein). In any case, a "two Whiteheads" thesis is difficult to sustain.

In *The Concept of Nature*, written while Whitehead was still teaching in England and allegedly in the grip of anti-metaphysical and largely logical and empirical approaches to philosophy, he discusses for the first time the concept of an "event" – a well-defined temporal activity or episode of finite duration, a "quantum" of experience – as an alternative fundamental notion to that of matter or substance at a single location in space and time. He likewise introduced the notion of a non-temporal "form of definiteness" or "enduring object" (examples include specific geometrical shapes, or precise shades of the color blue) as among the components or constituents of events, the particular combination or "togetherness" of which in a concrete episode of experience defines its novelty or uniqueness. The "flux of becoming," the radical temporality

and transitoriness of discrete events, was set against the enduring, eternal backdrop of timeless, Platonic forms, everlastingly available as potential ingredients in finite temporal experience. During his "English" period, the twin themes of permanence and change are already present, which later dominated Whitehead's philosophical work in America.

Albert EINSTEIN's development of a general theory of relativity and subsequent forays into cosmology in 1916–17 inspired Whitehead to return to his own investigations in geometry and cosmology. *The Principle of Relativity* (1922), argued against Einstein's interpretation of the radical discontinuity of space, the paradox of simultaneity, and the "reversibility" of time (which Whitehead saw as tantamount to destroying the distinction between past and future), and what Whitehead objected to as the arbitrary privileging of electromagnetic propagation in a vacuum. Whitehead's alternative theory yields a mathematically equivalent but philosophically divergent account of these physical concepts, retaining the common-sense notion of well-ordered sequences of events that distinguish past from future, together with a substantive conceptual distinction between space and time as dimensions of experience. The project of developing a geometry of space–time occupied Whitehead as early as 1905, yet this geometrical preoccupation continues much later as the focus of "The Theory of Extension," considered by mathematically inclined philosophers to be the most original and important portion of *Process and Reality*. In view of the continuity of Whitehead's major interests across time and two continents, it might be more accurate to discuss his intellectual journey as a sustained pursuit of the mathematical physics of Clerk Maxwell and Henri Poincaré, interrupted for a decade or so by a flirtation with the very different, foundationalist project of logical positivism during his collaboration with Russell.

Whitehead's appointment to Harvard brought relatively light duties as a professor, permitting his broader philosophical interests to blossom. He turned his attention to the history of science, philosophy of culture, philosophy of history, philosophy of religion, and, most significantly, to problems in metaphysics and cosmology. He was especially interested to understand the implications for philosophy of the profound changes in the sciences wrought during his own lifetime by revolutionary thinkers from Charles Darwin, James Clerk Maxwell, and Henri Poincaré to Einstein, Max Plank, and Erwin Schrödinger. Whitehead was the first philosopher to perceive that the philosophical presuppositions of classical mechanics, or "Newtonianism," collectively constituted both a historical artifact and a modern, Western cultural ideology. Whitehead sought both to understand the origins of this wide-ranging and powerful intellectual consensus that dominated European thought from the seventeenth through the nineteenth centuries, and also to suggest alternatives for what he took to be its necessary reconstruction in light of the work of these other, more recent major figures of science and philosophy.

His Lowell Lectures, delivered in February and March of 1925 during Whitehead's first year at Harvard (published as *Science and the Modern World*) offered one of the first comprehensive interpretations of the intellectual history of modern science, revealing the manner in which early disputes and philosophical disagreements among the founders of modern science were subsequently lost or compromised in the gradual forging of the broad intellectual consensus that characterized "Newtonianism" or "materialistic mechanism." Whitehead's discussions in this widely-read work of disputes among rival philosophical theories, the suppression of incommensurate views of nature, and their later re-emergence in revolutions fomented by the incoherence or glaring explanatory inadequacies of this dominant intellectual consensus paved the way for later research by Thomas KUHN on the radical historical and sociological character of scientific investigation. Whitehead's interest, however, was as revisionist as it was descriptive: he aimed

both to expose and purge metaphysical abstractions that could not be grounded in concrete experience – such as matter at specific spatial and temporal locations – and replace them with abstractions that were thoroughly grounded in experience and consonant with newly emerging physical theories – such as events of finite duration, encompassing and interacting with other such loci of temporal activity in a manner resembling localized disturbances in an electromagnetic field of infinite extension.

Whitehead's most famous work, *Process and Reality*, stemmed from his Gifford Lectures in 1927. His attempts to sketch a detailed cosmological foundation for twentieth-century physics to replace the cosmology of Newtonianism have elicited comparisons with Hegel, Leibniz (to whose *Monadology* the specific temporal atomism of this work is specifically indebted), and Aristotle. One of the most striking features of these lectures is the sustained dialogue or discussion that Whitehead carries on about the nature of physical substance, subjective experience, and the space–time continuum with the great European philosophers of the past who had contributed so heavily to the forging of traditional views on these subjects. In addition to Plato's *Timaeus* (from which Whitehead derives a number of insights that challenge the modern mechanistic world view), Whitehead discusses at great length many of the central works of Locke, Descartes, Spinoza, Hume, and Kant. The third portion of the book is a lengthy response to F. H. Bradley's intriguing and once-influential logic of relations and doctrine of feelings. Whitehead evidences profound frustration, in particular, with the inward or subjectivist turn of modern philosophy from Descartes to Kant. Like William JAMES and John Dewey, he resolved to return philosophical activity to pre-Kantian modes of thought focused less on studying the instrument of knowledge (the mind or human reason) than on understanding the broader flux of experience that constitutes the natural world in which that instrument is perpetually immersed, and from which it emerges as an evolutionary product. The mistake of over-generalizing properties of human reason and its conceptual categories to experience generally (instead of the other way around), Whitehead labeled as "The Fallacy of Misplaced Concreteness."

The two most significant concepts discussed in Whitehead's formal metaphysical system in *Process and Reality* are actual entities (or actual occasions) and eternal objects. The first pair of terms actually represent a translation into English of Descartes's terminology in the *Meditations*, where the question is considered: "what are the *res verae*" (that is, what are the *actual things* or *actual entities* that may truly be said to exist)? Whitehead invokes this Cartesian terminology to indicate that his inquiry, too, is aimed at discovering the true nature of being. The shift toward the term "occasion" and away from "entity" in turn suggests that those actualities are not entitative, substantive, or material in the traditional sense, but are episodes or occasions of pure activity or "process." "Actual occasions" designate the fundamental quanta, units, or building blocks ("monads") of which, according to Whitehead's Ontological Principle, all entities of whatever sort are composed. The Ontological Principle establishes the claim that, at the core, change and becoming are the primary characteristics of "true things," while being conceived as unchanging substance (Aristotle, Locke) or inert matter (Newton, Descartes) is either the product or the appearance of episodes or "occasions" of creative, generative activity.

The discrete properties that occasions of experience possess, however, stem from two quite different sources. Each occasion or episode "prehends" (that is, grasps or actively appropriates, either to incorporate as "feelings" or eliminate) elements or features achieved in past occasions of experience. This fundamental act of prehension distinguishes the present from the past; past occasions are themselves no longer active as prehending subjects, while the concrete results or outcomes of their brief episodic experience are available as determinate objects to be "prehended" by subsequent subjective occasions of experience. In this manner, past events are causally efficacious; their per-

sistence shapes and conditions the prospects of the present. Whitehead summarizes this feature of actual entities in what he terms the Reformed Subjectivist Principle, also addressed in his Principle of Relativity: "subject" and "object," in contrast to Descartes, do not designate distinct categories of being. Nature is not divided into two quite distinct ontological categories: rather, these terms are temporally relative. Every actual occasion is at first an active subject, grasping and incorporating elements of its environment (its past) and synthesizing these elements into a new and unique occasion of experience, after which this occasion, too, "perishes" (loses its subjective immediacy) and persists thereafter indefinitely as an "object" or datum for future experiences to take account of (to "feel") or ignore.

There also is a second source of determinateness that contributes to the novelty and uniqueness of each experience. In *The Concept of Nature*, Whitehead recognized that there are properties that not only are ingredients of specific occasions of experience, but seem to appear and reappear, or to be replicated, in precisely the same fashion in myriad different objects and states of affairs over time. Whitehead called these "enduring objects" or "forms of definiteness." In *Process and Reality* he coins the term "eternal objects" for these Platonic universals, to distinguish them from the characteristics of earlier, objectified occasions prehended as data in each new occasion of experience, or "concrescence." These "eternal objects" bear close comparison to the universal qualities or properties of sense data or sensibilia that permeated the epistemological theories of early twentieth-century analysis. Again, according to the Ontological Principle, such "objects" are not "actual," in that they are not themselves events or processes, but are rather to be understood as components or ingredients in actual occasions.

The problem with which Whitehead is wrestling, somewhat in contrast to British and American sense-data theorists, is the origin of novelty (and the explanation, without resort to dualism, of differing degrees of novelty) in the process of becoming. He also must address as well the question of how a "process" ever issues in anything determinate. How is "being" produced by "becoming"? Whitehead's metaphysical project entirely subsumes his English colleagues' more limited epistemological concerns, since he proposes to explain not only how a conscious subject (or even a sentient being) perceives and develops reliable knowledge of its surroundings, but how any entity of whatever sort interacts with its world, weaving elements of that world into its own self-constitution.

The epistemological problem of perception and knowledge simply turns out to be a highly specialized variant of a much more generalized and pervasive activity, characteristic of the self-constitution of all actual entities of whatever sort. In this manner, the problem of Cartesian dualism is avoided. Likewise, what for Kant are categories of understanding and limitations or "categoreal obligations" on Reason become, for Whitehead, categories of experience generally, and categoreal obligations to which all experience, of whatever sort, must conform. Kant's twelve epistemological Categories of Understanding and the resulting categoreal limitations they impose on Pure Reason are replaced in Whitehead's architectonic by eight metaphysical Categories of Existence which collectively impose twenty-seven limitations or "categorial obligations" on experience generally. Such views illustrate Whitehead's gradual migration away from the epistemological concerns of his British analytic colleagues and toward the uniquely American focus on a metaphysics of experience as discerned in the thought of Charles PEIRCE, James, and Dewey.

Whitehead's discussion of prehension, perception, and causality lead to a surprisingly far-sighted evolutionary epistemology that anticipated much of the current discussion of this topic. Perception in the mode of causal efficacy is the underlying feature of connectedness between past and present, the power that past events have to shape and condition the

present, and the manner in which present events inherit and shape this legacy of the past. This epistemological account bears close comparison to the discussion of the limited and constitutive role of information conveyed via light signals in the backward light cone of any given entity in general relativity theory. As a result of the comparatively sophisticated sentient experience possible for complex, conscious, and self-conscious organisms, however, such organisms are able to isolate and abstract certain precise features from the underlying flux of "blooming, buzzing confusion" (James) or "thirdness" (Peirce), and attend to these features in detail. This is, according to Whitehead, what occurs in perception in the mode of presentational immediacy. Early analytic philosophers had mistaken this secondary and specialized, limited kind of perception as the starting point for analysis, but on Whitehead's account, this primitive experience is in fact a very complex mode of perception supervening upon the more fundamental experience of causal efficacy.

Whitehead's use of, and response to, the history of philosophy mirrors his account, in *Process and Reality*, of how past achievements are continuously and selectively incorporated in present experience, and immortalized in the inclusive synthesis that he characterized as "divine experience," or the "Consequent Nature" of God. Whitehead's thoroughgoing efforts to invert the traditional metaphysical priorities that historically seem to give priority and pride of place to substance over process, being over becoming, permanence over change, and inert matter at a specific location over the pervasive interactivity of force and energy fields are what led to the choice of title for this, his most important work, as well as to the subsequent tendency of scholars to characterize Whitehead's thought with the label "process philosophy."

Whitehead enjoyed enormous influence during his lifetime, but the recognition of his philosophical significance has eroded considerably since his death. This is in marked contrast to his reputation among intellectuals outside the discipline of philosophy, especially scholars in comparative religion and philosophical theology, and a great number of humanistically inclined and learned scientists, all of whom continue to hold Whitehead in high regard.

Among Whitehead's most famous students and followers were W. V. QUINE, Gregory VLASTOS, Paul WEISS, and Charles HARTSHORNE (who was not Whitehead's student but inspired a school of process theology through John J. COBB, Jr.). Their own diversity of interests and distinctive reputations offer tribute to Whitehead's influence as a teacher, rather than a dispenser of doctrine or gatherer of disciples. In large part through Weiss's influence at Yale University, other distinguished thinkers have since made important critical contributions to our understanding of Whitehead, or to the application of his philosophical views to new problems. These include Robert C. NEVILLE, Richard RORTY, James K. FEIBLEMAN, Andrew RECK, George Allan, and Donald W. SHERBURNE. Whitehead's influence was also felt at Columbia University through the interest and sponsorship of John H. RANDALL, Jr. and in the interpretive studies of George L. KLINE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Treatise on Universal Algebra (Cambridge, UK, 1898).

The Axioms of Projective Geometry (Cambridge, UK, 1906).

On Mathematical Concepts of the Material World (London, 1906).

The Axioms of Descriptive Geometry (Cambridge, UK, 1907).

Principia Mathematica, 3 vols, with Bertrand Russell (Cambridge, UK, 1910–13).

An Introduction to Mathematics (London, 1911).

The Organization of Thought, Educational and Scientific (London, 1917).

An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Natural Knowledge (Cambridge, UK, 1919).

The Concept of Nature (Cambridge, UK, 1920).

The Principle of Relativity, with Applications to Physical Science (Cambridge, UK, 1922).

Science and the Modern World (New York, 1925; 2nd edn 1932).

Religion in the Making (New York, 1926).

Symbolism: Its Meaning and Effect (New York, 1927).

The Aims of Education and Other Essays (New York, 1929).

The Function of Reason (Princeton, N.J., 1929).

Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology (New York, 1929). Critical edn, ed. D. R. Griffin and D. W. Sherbourne (New York, 1978).

Adventures of Ideas (New York, 1933).

Nature and Life (Chicago, 1934).

Modes of Thought (New York, 1938).

Essays in Science and Philosophy (New York, 1947).

Other Relevant Works

Whitehead's papers were mostly destroyed; materials about Whitehead are archived at the Center for Process Studies in the School of Theology at Claremont, California.

Alfred North Whitehead: An Anthology, ed. F. C. S. Northrup and Mason W. Gross (New York, 1953).

Whitehead's American Essays in Social Philosophy, ed. A. H. Johnson (New York, 1959).

Price, Lucien. *Dialogues of Alfred North Whitehead* (Boston, 1961).

Whitehead's Philosophy: Selected Essays, 1935–1970, ed. Charles Hartshorne (Lincoln, Neb., 1972).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Bio Dict Psych by Zusne, Bio 20thC Phils, Blackwell Amer Phil, Blackwell Comp Phils, Comp Amer Thought, Dict Amer Bio, Encyc Amer Bio, Encyc Relig, Nat Cycl Amer Bio v37,
Oxford Comp Phil, Pres Addr of APA v4, Proc of APA in Phil Rev v58, Routledge Encycl Phil, Who Was Who in Amer v2, Who's Who in Phil

Christian, William. *An Interpretation of Whitehead's Metaphysics* (New Haven, Conn., 1967).

Cobb, John B. *A Christian Natural Theology, Based on the Thought of Alfred North Whitehead* (Philadelphia, 1965).

Epperson, Michael. *Quantum Mechanics and the Philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead* (New York, 2004).

Ford, Lewis S. *The Emergence of Whitehead's Metaphysics, 1925–1929* (Albany, N.Y., 1984).

Ford, Lewis S., and Kline, George L. *Explorations in Whitehead's Philosophy* (New York, 1983).

Jones, Judith. *Intensity: An Essay in Whitehead's Metaphysics* (Nashville, Tenn., 1998).

Kline, George L., ed. *Alfred North Whitehead: Essays on His Philosophy* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1963).

Kuntz, Paul G. *Alfred North Whitehead* (Boston, 1984).

Leclerc, Ivor. *Whitehead's Metaphysics: An Introductory Exposition* (London, 1958).

Lowe, Victor. *Understanding Whitehead* (Baltimore, Md., 1966).

———, *Alfred North Whitehead: The Man and His Work*, 2 vols (Baltimore, Md., 1985–90).

Lucas, George R. *The Rehabilitation of Whitehead: An Analytic and Historical Analysis of Process Philosophy* (Albany, N.Y., 1989).

Philosophical Essays for Alfred North Whitehead (London and New York, 1936).

Pomeroy, Ann F. *Marx and Whitehead: Process, Dialectics, and the Critique of Capitalism* (Albany, N.Y., 2004).

Process Studies (Claremont, Cal., 1971–).

McHenry, Leemon B. *Whitehead and Bradley: A Comparative Analysis* (Albany,

N.Y., 1992).

Rapp, Friedrich, and Reiner Wiehl, eds. *Whitehead's Metaphysics of Creativity* (Albany, N.Y., 1990).

Rescher, Nicholas. *Process Metaphysics: An Introduction to Process Philosophy* (Albany, N.Y., 1996).

Ross, Stephen David. *Perspectives in Whitehead's Metaphysics* (Albany, N.Y., 1983).

Schilpp, Paul A., ed. *The Philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead* (Evanston, Ill., 1941; 2nd edn, New York, 1951). Contains Whitehead's autobiography and bibliography.

Sherburne, Donald W. *A Key to Whitehead's Process and Reality* (Chicago, Ill., 1963).

Shields, George W., ed. *Process and Analysis: Whitehead, Hartshorne, and the Analytic Tradition* (Albany, N.Y., 2002).

Stolz, Joachim. *Whitehead und Einstein* (Frankfurt am Main, 1995).

Woodbridge, Barry A. *Alfred North Whitehead: A Primary-Secondary Bibliography* (Bowling Green, Ohio, 1977).

George R. Lucas, Jr.

WHITMAN, Walt (1819–92)

Of English and Dutch ancestry, Walt Whitman was born in West Hills, Long Island, on 31 May 1819. He died in Camden, New Jersey, on 26 March 1892. His education in public school possibly did not extend beyond the eleventh year; he was largely self-educated. He worked in journalism as an editor for years, but failed as a journalist due to poor punctuality, lack of professional skills, and his passionate individualism. A romantic poet, Whitman was greatly influenced by Ralph Waldo EMERSON.

Whitman has been called the last transcendentalist. He considered Emerson his philosophic mentor, and sent him a copy of *Leaves of Grass* (1855). Emerson responded with a positive and encouraging letter. Whitman possessed a fierce individualistic temperament; his personality was strongly egoistic and self-reliant. He turned away from European culture, claiming it was dead, and wanted to write poetry of undeniable American modernity. The poet believed himself a man of the people, with faith not in religion but in the "average man." In his poetry, he implied that man's first consideration should be his own identity and personal growth. Let us glory in pride of self, he said. Whitman was a humanist and an optimist who believed in a mystic unity of soul and body, and in personal, intuitive idealism.

In *Democratic Vistas* (1871) Whitman presented a vision of American democracy and noted the alarming dangers of universal suffrage. He perceived a battle between democracy's aspirations and the people's crudity and vice, and believed that America needed a great national literature and outstanding individuals who embody a modern democracy. Distrusting any feudal caste or conventional religion, Whitman desired a class of native authors who would breathe new life into this country. Let the priest depart and literary genius come, especially profound poets who will justify democracy, he said. More than wars and trade, America needs first-class poets to bring growth in the spirit. Poetry should be the dominant mode of expression; poetic imagination will provide more moral identity than all laws and constitutions together.

Worldly prosperity, Whitman held, cannot make democracy succeed; the pursuit of money should not be our goal. He claimed that American society was cankered, crude, superstitious, and rotten. Society is hypocritical, he said, saturated in corruption and love of money. The poet recoiled in dismay from the sight of top-hatted speculators. He claimed that New World democracy was, so far, a pathetic failure in religion, morality, literature, and aes-

thetics. Whitman's criticism of the materialism and greed of American society in the late nineteenth century was a courageous and perceptive stand.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Leaves of Grass (New York, 1855; 9th edn Philadelphia, 1892).

Democratic Vistas (Washington, D.C., 1871).

Complete Prose Works (Philadelphia, 1892).

Other Relevant Works

Whitman's papers are at the Library of Congress, and at Duke University and Yale University.

The Early Poems and the Fiction, ed. T. L. Brasher (New York, 1963).

The Correspondence, 6 vols, ed. E. H. Miller (New York, 1963–77).

Prose Works 1892, 2 vols, ed. F. Stovall (New York, 1964).

Leaves of Grass: Comprehensive Reader's Edition, ed. H. W. Blodgett and S. Bradley (New York, 1965).

The Collected Writings of Walt Whitman, ed. R. M. Bucke, T. B. Harned, and H. L. Tranblel (St. Claire Shores, Mich., 1977).

Daybooks and Notebooks, 3 vols, ed. W. White (New York, 1978).

A Textual Variorum of the Printed Poems, 3 vols, ed. S. Bradley et al. (New York, 1980).

Complete Poetry and Collected Prose (New York, 1982).

Notebooks and Unpublished Prose Manuscripts, 6 vols, ed. E. F. Grier (New York, 1984).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*

Allen, Gay W. *The Solitary Singer* (New York, 1955).

Asselineau, Roger. *The Evolution of Walt Whitman* (Iowa City, Iowa, 1999).

Erkkila, Betsy. *Whitman the Political Poet* (Oxford, 1989).

Giantvalley, Scott, ed. *Walt Whitman, 1838–1939: A Reference Guide* (Boston, 1981).

Greenspan, Ezra, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Walt Whitman* (Cambridge, UK, 1995).

Kaplan, Justin. *Walt Whitman: A Life* (New York, 1980).

Miller, Edwin H., ed. *A Century of Whitman Criticism* (Bloomington, Ind., 1969).

Edward W. O'Brien

WHORF, Benjamin Lee (1897–1941)

Benjamin Whorf was born on 24 April 1897 in Winthrop, Massachusetts. He was educated at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he graduated with a BS in chemical engineering in 1918. Whorf's career was spent largely outside academia as an engineer and manager with the Hartford Insurance Company in Hartford, Connecticut. Whorf was mostly self-taught in linguistics, but he made substantial contacts with a number of prominent linguists and anthropologists, especially with Edward SAPIR at nearby Yale University. Whorf began studying linguistics with Sapir in 1931, and focused on the Hopi language. In 1936 he was appointed honorary research fellow in anthropology at Yale; in 1937 he was awarded the Sterling Fellowship, and he was a lecturer in anthropology in 1937–8. Whorf published little during his lifetime, although he extensively studied various aspects of Native American and South American languages. The most important of his writings are collected in the posthumous collection, *Language, Thought, and Reality*. He died on 26 July 1941 in Wethersfield, Connecticut.

Whorf is best known within philosophy as one of the originators of a radical version of relativism, sometimes called the "Whorf–Sapir hypothesis," or just "Whorfianism." This relativism holds that the language one speaks substantially affects both the substance and form of how one thinks about the world. Indeed, Whorf often wrote as if language actually *determined* how one thinks about the world or, more strongly still, that reality itself was determined by the structure of language. As he memorably phrased the idea: "we dissect nature along the lines laid down by our native language" (1956).

Whorf took his inspiration from his observations of Native American languages. In these languages, he contended, many of the characteristic patterns that one finds in English and other "standard" European languages are simply absent, most notably certain expressions and inflections for time and tense. For example, in one of his most famous "demonstrations" of his thesis, Whorf described how Hopi expressions for time behave differently than they do in English. In English, one can talk of time in terms of *amounts* because of the ability of English-speakers to use plurals and other grammatical markers on nominals denoting days, months, hours, and so on. Whorf contended that Hopi does not have, and could not permit, the formation of abstract nominal phrases denoting times or spans of time, and does not allow the use of plural morphemes on expressions for time. Whorf links this difference in grammatical structure to other aspects of Hopi culture and argues that Hopi world views are radically different from those of English-speakers. The Hopi, Whorf concludes, possess a way of looking at the world that is much closer to the subjective "flow" of experience and time, whereas English-speakers impose an abstract scheme upon their experience that divides up the world differently. By virtue of the way that English works, time is made into a series of "objective entities," or moments that can be coordinated along three different dimensions. Hopi-speakers possess a different metaphysics of time in virtue of their language being structured in the way that it is. Even more strongly, Whorf wrote that the Hopi simply do not have the concept of time in the same sense as standard European speakers do.

Whorfian views about language lend themselves to easy caricature and his understanding of the languages upon which he based some of his more radical claims has been criticized. One need only notice the widespread belief within popular culture that "Eskimos have fifty words for snow," a claim that was perpetuated by Whorf in his semi-popular writings, but which lacks empirical support. Nevertheless, his thesis that specific aspects of one's language may have non-trivial effects upon the way one views the world still remains an ongoing topic of debate in psychology, linguistics, anthropology, and philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Punctual and Segmentative Aspects of Verbs in Hopi," *Language* 12 (1936): 127–31.
"An American Indian Model of the Universe," *International Journal of American Linguistics* 16 (1936): 67–72.
"The Relation of Habitual Thought and Behavior to Language," in *Language, Culture and Personality*, ed. Leslie Spier (Menasha, Wisc., 1939), pp. 75–93.
"Science and Linguistics," *(MIT) Technology Review* 42 (1940): 229–31, 247–8.

Other Relevant Works
Whorf's papers are at Yale University.
"Grammatical Categories," *Language* 21 (1945): 1–11.
Language, Thought, and Reality, ed. J. B. Carroll (Cambridge, Mass., 1956).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v30*, *Routledge Encycl Phil*
Carroll, John. "Benjamin Lee Whorf," in

Portraits of Linguists, ed. Thomas Sebeok (Bloomington, Ind., 1966), vol. 2, pp. 563–85.

Hayakawa, S. I. *Language in Thought and Action* (New York, 1941).

Hoijer, Harry, ed. *Language and Culture* (Menasha, Wisc., 1954).

Penny, Lee. *The Whorf Theory Complex: A Critical Reconstruction* (Philadelphia, 1996).

Rollins, Peter. *Benjamin Lee Whorf: Lost Generation Theories of Mind, Language, and Religion* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1980).

Daniel Blair

WIDGERY, Alban Gregory (1887–1968)

Alban Gregory Widgery was born on 9 May 1887 in Bloxwich in Staffordshire, England. He attended St. Catherine's College, Cambridge, where he received a BA in 1908 and an MA in 1912. Among his teachers were idealists James Ward, W. R. Sorley, and F. R. Tennant. From 1908 to 1910 he taught at the University of Bristol. In 1910–11 he went to the universities of Marburg and Jena in Germany for study, and in 1911–12 he studied at the Sorbonne in Paris. In 1914–15 he was an assistant to A. E. Taylor at the University of St. Andrews in Scotland.

From 1915 to 1922 Widgery was professor of philosophy at the University of Bombay, India, and for a time was philosophy tutor to Maharaja Sayajirao Gaekwad of Baroda (now part of the state of Gujarat in western India). From 1922 to 1925 he held the Stanton Lectureship in Philosophy of Religion at Cambridge, and his lectures later formed his book *Christian Ethics in History and Modern Life* published in 1940. He then returned to India to serve as President of the Baroda University Commission during 1926–8, which started the process of establishing that university. In 1928–9 Widgery was a visiting profes-

sor of philosophy at Bowdoin College in Maine, and in 1928–9 he was professor of philosophy at Cornell University.

In 1930 Widgery became professor of philosophy and head of the new philosophy department at Duke University, and held those positions until retiring in 1946. During his time at Duke, he established its philosophy doctorate program and the North Carolina Philosophical Society. In 1937 he was Upton Lecturer at Oxford University, and in 1940–41 he was a visiting professor at the University of Hawaii. Widgery was President of the American Theological Society in 1940. In retirement he taught at Amherst College in 1953–4 and continued to pursue his interest in studying and collecting Indian art. He died on 22 March 1968 in Winchester, Virginia.

Although trained in idealism, Widgery never accepted rationalistic idealism and instead preferred a more pluralistic and inclusive understanding of religion's teachings. He called his own philosophy "theistic eclecticism and maximalism." Devoutly religious himself, he studied the world's religions and formed a theism suiting his mature reflections. His impressive approach to the study of comparative religions did much to bring this field within the arena of respectable philosophical work in the twentieth century.

In "Towards a Modern Philosophy of Religion" (1929) and subsequent writings, Widgery argued that philosophy of religion should begin with an unbiased empirical study of world religions, and proceed from those features belonging to all of them. Philosophers must analyze and compare doctrines across religions to answer whether they genuinely disagree; in many cases disagreement is only superficial and the underlying common religious experience can be exposed. In *What is Religion?* (1953), Widgery declines to credit to mystical experiences and revelations any ability truly to identify deity incarnations. However, Widgery reveals a degree of Christian parochialism by concluding that all "real" religions center on a personal, powerful, and loving God.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Human Needs and the Justification of Religious Beliefs: An Essay in the Philosophy of Religion (Baroda, India, 1918).

Immortality and Other Essays (Baroda, India, 1919).

Goods and Bads, Outlines of Philosophy of Life. Being the Substance of a Series of Talks and Discussions with H.H. the Maharajah Gaekwad of Baroda (Baroda, India, 1920).

The Comparative Study of Religions: A Systematic Survey (Baroda, India, 1922; London, 1923).

Outlines of a Philosophy of Life (London, 1923).

Contemporary Thought of Great Britain (New York, 1927).

Living Religions and Modern Thought (New York, 1936).

Christian Ethics in History and Modern Life (New York, 1940).

What is Religion? (New York, 1953; London, 1954).

Interpretations of History: Confucius to Toynbee (London, 1961).

The Meanings in History (London, 1967).

Other Relevant Works

Trans., *Life's Basis and Life's Ideal: The Fundamentals of a New Philosophy of Life*, by Rudolf Eucken (London, 1911).

"Towards a Modern Philosophy of Religion," *Philosophical Review* 38 (1929): 421–38.

"The Principles of Hindu Ethics," *International Journal of Ethics* 40 (1930): 232–45.

"Religious Realism and the Empirical Facts of Religion," in *Religious Realism*, ed. Douglas C. Macintosh (New York, 1932).

The Socratic Problem (New Haven, Conn., 1933).

"Philosophy of History and the Particularity of Values," *Philosophical Review* 44 (1935): 567–76.

"Classical German Idealism, the Philosophy of Schopenhauer and Neo-Kantianism," in *A History of Philosophical Systems*, ed. Vergilius Ferm (New York, 1950).

A Philosopher's Pilgrimage (London and New York, 1961).

Further Reading

Proc of APA v41

Nilson, Sven. "Widgery's *What is Religion?*" *Philosophical Review* 63 (1954): 457–60.

John R. Shook

WIEMAN, Henry Nelson (1884–1975)

Henry Nelson Wieman was born on 19 August 1884 in Rich Hill, Missouri, the first of eight children of a Presbyterian minister. While in high school he read Fiske's *Destiny of Man* (1884) and accepted evolution with his father's agreement. He graduated with a BA from Park College in 1907. He had become skeptical of traditional supernaturalistic explanations of the power of religion to transform life, yet he remained convinced that the source of this power was real and discoverable. Wieman pursued his religious inquiry at San Francisco Theological Seminary and in a year-long study in Germany with Rudolf Eucken, Wilhelm Windelband, and Ernst Troeltsch. Typically, he claimed that historical and theological studies were irrelevant to his interest in discovering the naturalistic equivalent of the traditional idea of the divine. He then served as a Presbyterian minister for two and a half years in Davis, California, and read the works of Henri Bergson. Wieman went to Harvard University to study with William Ernest HOCKING. He accepted Hocking's interest, like William JAMES's, in religious experience as a datum for inquiry but rejected Hocking's idealism. Wieman received the PhD in philos-

ophy in 1917 and taught philosophy and religion at Occidental College until 1927. During this time he read Alfred North WHITEHEAD, discovering a form of process philosophy without Bergson's anti-intellectualism.

On the basis of his publication of *Religious Experience and Scientific Method* (1926), Wieman was invited to teach at the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. Wieman was recognized as both a naturalist and a theological realist, and it was thought that he would oppose the religious humanism which was becoming more common within the faculty at the time. While at Chicago from 1927 to 1947, Wieman did his most important work in developing a form of naturalistic theism. After a series of visiting professorships, he had a second career from 1956 to 1966 as a professor of philosophy at Southern Illinois University in Carbondale. Wieman was active in the founding of the Institute for Religion in an Age of Science and *Zygon: Journal of Religion and Science*. He died on 19 June 1975 in Grinnell, Iowa.

Wieman's work shows a remarkably single-minded focus on the task of formulating a naturalistic concept of God. His philosophy was an epistemological naturalism, which claims that human knowledge is limited to the world of events. For him, any reality bearing on human life must be encountered within nature. Yet Wieman was also a theological realist. He never doubted that traditional religious beliefs and practices bring people into relation with a real, operative power. Wieman believed that in traditional religions their myth and ritual shape the believer's attitudes and expectations so that they are open to being changed by a power greater than themselves. For example, in the theistic faiths, the idea of a benevolent supernatural deity may lessen the hold of fear and desire, diminish the tendency to cling to the present arrangement of one's life and relationships, and inculcate trust in the process of growth and change. In Wieman's opinion, these beliefs and the practices open people to the working of processes that transform human

life in ways that could not be planned or contrived. However, they do this without providing any knowledge of the factors involved.

Wieman understood his time as one of crisis when the hold of traditional religion was weakening and its ability to relate people to the divine was declining. This, he believed, was due to increased contacts among diverse cultures and the growing influence of science and technology. He said that the power of myth and ritual is far superior to the ability of concepts to guide human life. But he felt that in his time the ability of myth to function as it had in the past had been destroyed, so that there was a need to develop an explicit concept of the nature of the divine creative activity. He concluded that what was required was a clearly delineated operational concept of God, which would do for the present what myth and ritual had done for past generations. His religious inquiry therefore aimed to discover, by methods broadly empirical, the actual power which operates in religious life. The result would be his unique contribution, a form of naturalistic theism.

For many intellectuals who shared Wieman's naturalism, the adaptation of religious thought required some form of humanism. For them, the object of religious effort ought to be an increase of human well-being. But Wieman felt that religious humanism is merely devotion to presently existing visions of human good and their realization. He believed that what is needed for the good of human life to increase is not the realization of good as now conceived but a transformation of persons in which new concepts of good come into being. The problem of life is not to realize goods that we can now imagine but to undergo a change in consciousness in which there will arise possibilities of value we cannot imagine on the basis of our present awareness. This renewal of the mind cannot be imagined before it arises and it cannot be planned or contrived. Wieman's naturalistic theism preserves a traditional religious insight that people must cultivate a willingness to set aside presently held values and open

themselves to a creativity that leads the mind toward a wider awareness.

This critique of religious humanism was clearly developed in a notable exchange with the philosopher and humanist John DEWEY in 1934, on the occasion of the publication of Dewey's *A Common Faith*. Dewey claimed that his humanism was religious because it cultivated a sense of the supportiveness of aspects of nature in the growth of human good. Natural conditions suggest possible changes that would yield a better life and support intelligent human effort to bring this life about; so humanism must include a degree of piety toward nature. But, for Dewey, the factor which brings about actual change toward betterment is human intelligence and communal effort. Wieman replied that Dewey's religious attitude toward nature was deficient because it detaches human intelligence and effort from their natural context. The correct view is that the growth of human welfare is the result of the total situation of interaction of humans and nature. It is this that is creative, and not human effort alone.

Wieman's associates in his early years at Chicago were Edward S. AMES and Shailer MATHEWS. With others, they had come to be referred to in theological circles as the Chicago Naturalists. They did consider themselves naturalistic theists, yet their concept of the natural divine was simply those unspecified aspects of nature which make human life and the growth of good possible. Mathews called this "conceptual theism," because God is taken simply as a concept of those unspecified factors in nature that foster the fulfillment of human life. The value of this view was said to be that it encourages a reverent attitude toward nature and a feeling of relatedness to the universe. Wieman shared with his new colleagues the belief in the importance of the reverential attitude toward nature, but he was not satisfied with the vagueness of their formulations. He wanted a clear concept of the divine as a "structured event" within nature, which can serve as a substitute for the waning influence of myth and ritual. Specificity, he believed, is required to guide human action in a time of increasing technological power. Religious inquiry must be able to make clear exactly what conditions are required in personal and social life to bring people into the best relation with nature's creative power.

Wieman begins his search with a formal definition of God as that upon which human life is dependent for its maintenance and fullest development. The word "God" refers to the source of human good. He repeatedly claims that the fact that there is such a factor is beyond doubt, since human life occurs and, through religious practices, is occasionally raised to great heights. Wieman's religious inquiry aims to specify just what this factor is. In the first phase of his thought (to about 1927), Wieman claims that the search is to be conducted by methods we might call empirical. Religious experience is taken as the datum within which the power operative in religious life can be discriminated. Wieman described religious experience as a diffuse state of consciousness in which subject and object are not discriminated, because of the momentary suspension of the habitual organization of experience. This occurs through the effect of stress or the use of some meditative technique. In the absence of customary patterns of interpretation and response, awareness of the "total event" of nature arises. Wieman believed that in this state the person is most open to the organizing influence which operates throughout the evolving universe. He adopts a term from Whitehead's speculative metaphysical system, "the principle of concretion," to refer to this influence. There is a tension between Wieman's empirical method and this part of Whitehead's metaphysics, and Wieman seems to have concluded that a more consistently empirical idea of the divine was required. For the type of empiricism affirmed by Wieman, events rather than principles are causes.

In the next period of his writing, Wieman focused on the observable tendency in nature to create orders of increasing complexity and

interdependence. Through time, nature weaves relations of mutual support and relatedness. This is perceived in the process that gives rise to atoms of increasing complexity, ever more elaborate molecular structures, highly complex carbon compounds, single-celled organisms, many-celled organisms, sensitive organisms, thinking organisms, minds with self-consciousness, and historical communities of minds. Of special interest is the manifestation of this tendency in the growth of the human mind from childhood onward. Mind is elaborated through the weaving of meaningful connections among experiences. In this way, experience is enriched and the range of what we can know and appreciate is expanded. This is the growth of good for Wieman, since by any definition of good, the value of life increases if experiences that are good are related to each other so that they are mutually supportive and sustaining.

In his writings of the 1930s, Wieman called this nisus toward order "progressive integration," "creative synthesis," or simply "growth." It is the source of all observable order. Beneath created order is the creative character of the energy of the universe. The metaphysical categories, which for Wieman are mind, matter, structure, event, and quality, additionally include creativity. This is a discoverable character of existence. It is the minimum structure that energy must have to produce the evolving world we observe. For Wieman, creativity is the naturalistic equivalent of God, the actual power to which traditional myth and ritual related people. It creates the human organism through the process of evolution; it elaborates the mind and increases the richness of experience when life is lived in openness to transformation by it; it is the basis of the moral absolute (which is always to act so as to foster the operation of creative transformation); it answers prayer in the sense that it creates an expanded awareness in which solutions to besetting problems may be found; it brings about the beloved community through the deepening of interpersonal relations. When people set the conditions for its operation, progressive integration transforms human life beyond the reach of intelligence and effort.

Wieman emphasized that creative synthesis is not like the God of supernaturalism in important ways. It is not omnipotent but is simply one tendency in nature. It is not the origin of matter and energy but a character or generic trait of matter and energy. It is not metaphysically transcendent of the world. However, it is functionally transcendent of human effort, doing for us what we cannot do for ourselves by bringing about personal transformation beyond what can be foreseen and planned. Wieman granted that growth in nature and human life may be the work or manifestation of a supernaturally transcendent being. Still, this being, if it exists, could only be encountered and known in its presence in the world of events and would remain in itself beyond human knowledge.

An aspect of traditional theism prominently retained in Wieman's thought is the distinction between "created good" and "creative good." This is his interpretation of the biblical contrast between idolatry and true worship. Created good is all those structures that are the result of past operations of creative good. Religious life centers on beliefs and practices that encourage people to sacrifice existing created good for the sake of newly emerging good. These beliefs and practices encourage openness to transformation and the letting go of the present order of the self and society. For Wieman, the greatest barrier to the emergence of the new is the idolatrous clinging to present beliefs, values, institutions, and customs, giving to them the loyalty and value that should be given only to creative good. For Wieman, the central religious value is self-commitment to growth and change. Even his own concept of creativity must be taken lightly, Wieman claimed. For it is not this concept, or any other concept, but an actual structure of events to which this concept relates us that transforms human life toward greater good.

Beginning with his major book, *The Source of Human Good* (1946), and increasingly in his

subsequent writing, Wieman's desire to identify a specific structured event as the observable creativity, which is the naturalistic equivalent of God, led him to emphasize the manifestation of creativity in human communication. Wieman's theological realism is seen in his repeated claim that the human task is not to contrive a better form of living based on present understandings but rather to set the conditions under which creativity may operate to expand our awareness. He came to feel that the broad vision of creative synthesis at work on all levels of the cosmos lacked the specificity necessary to guide human decision-making in the modern world. What was needed was a more focused delineation of the way creativity works in human life.

Wieman came to emphasize a concept that had been present in his thought from the beginning, "creative communication." Yet he did this without setting aside his broader vision of creativity as at work throughout the cosmos. Earlier, the growth of the mind as a system of meaningful connections among experiences had been presented as one form of progressive integration. Wieman began emphasizing that the way experience becomes more integrated is through a certain kind of communication. The good of human life increases as the mind becomes a more richly interconnected network of meanings. Our powers of perception and action are magnified when one idea comes to "mean" another and thus be connected to it. The "appreciable world" becomes broader and deeper. This occurs, Wieman maintained, through creative interchange. This is the way that creativity acting on all levels of the cosmos works in human life to broaden and deepen human experience.

Wieman's description of "creative interchange," or "the four-fold creative event," dominates his later writings. The creative event consists of four subevents. (1) An idea or experience that embodies one person's unique way of seeing things is communicated to another. (2) This idea is integrated into the system of meanings that is the other participant's mind.

(3) This integrating has the effect of expanding the world that the second person is able to perceive and appreciate. (4) Since the participants have come to share a way of perceiving or interpreting experience, their ability to enter into creative interchange in the future is increased. The creative event thus must include communication, integration, expansion of awareness, and building of community. Wieman claimed that this process is at work throughout life, creating and expanding the mind and its appreciable world. It may be that considerable time elapses between the phases of the event, or the event may be almost instantaneous. Not all communication expands human awareness, but whenever this type of communication occurs, we are participating in the event that is the source of human good.

The purpose of this concept of creative interchange for Wieman is that it makes possible detailed study of the conditions necessary for the occurrence of creative transformation toward greater good. Wieman seems to have felt that the broader concept of creativity at work on all levels of the evolving universe fails to provide guidance for decision-making, while the conditions under which the event of creative communication occurs can become objects of research. The conditions necessary for creative communication include honesty and candor in expressing our particular way of seeing things. Perhaps most important among the conditions necessary for creative interchange is that those involved must not cling to or insist upon the maintenance of their present patterns of interpretation. The hearer must be open to being changed by the new insight, which involves trust in the process of creative transformation. Wieman was also concerned about the broader context of communication, involving problems of poverty and health as well as social and economic justice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Religious Experience and Scientific Method (New York, 1926).
The Wrestle of Religion with Truth (New

York, 1927).

Methods of Private Religious Living (New York, 1929).

The Issues of Life (New York, 1930).

Is There a God? A Conversation by Henry Nelson Wieman, Douglas Clyde Macintosh, Max Carl Otto (Chicago, 1932).

Normative Psychology of Religion, with Regina Westcott-Wieman (New York, 1935).

The Growth of Religion, with Walter M. Horton (Chicago, 1938).

Now We Must Choose (New York, 1941).

The Source of Human Good (Chicago, 1946; Carbondale, Ill., 1964).

The Directive in History (Boston, 1949).

Man's Ultimate Commitment (Carbondale, Ill., 1958).

The Intellectual Foundation of Faith (New York, 1961).

Religious Inquiry: Some Explorations (Boston, 1968).

Other Relevant Works

Wieman's papers are at Southern Illinois University in Carbondale.

"God and Value," in *Religious Realism*, ed. Douglas C. Macintosh (New York, 1931).

"Theocentric Religion, in *Contemporary American Theology: Theological Autobiographies*, vol. 1, ed. Vergilius Ferm (New York, 1932), pp. 339–52.

"John Dewey's *Common Faith*," *Christian Century* 51 (1934): 1450–52.

"Is John Dewey a Theist?" *Christian Century* 51 (1934): 1550–51.

Ed. with Bernard E. Meland, *American Philosophies of Religion* (Chicago, 1936).

"The Problem of Mysticism," in *Mysticism and the Modern Mind*, ed. Alfred P. Stiernotte (New York, 1959).

"Intellectual Autobiography," in *The Empirical Theology of Henry Nelson Wieman*, ed. Robert Bretall (New York, 1963), pp. 3–18.

Seeking a Faith for a New Age: Essays on the Interdependence of Religion, Science and Philosophy, ed. Cedric L. Hepler (Metuchen, N.J., 1975).

Science Serving Faith, ed. Creighton Peden and Charles Willig (Atlanta, 1987).

"The Confessions of a Religious Seeker," *American Journal of Theology and Philosophy* 12 (1991): 67–119.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, Dict Amer Religious Bio, Proc of APA v48, Who Was Who in Amer v6, Who's Who in Phil

Bretall, Robert, ed. *The Empirical Theology of Henry Nelson Wieman* (New York, 1963). Contains a bibliography of Wieman's publications.

Broyer, John A., and William S. Minor. *Creative Interchange* (Carbondale, Ill., 1982).

Martin, James A. *Empirical Philosophies of Religion, with Special Reference to Boodin, Brightman, Hocking, Macintosh, and Wieman* (New York, 1945).

Minor, William S. *Creativity in Henry Nelson Wieman* (Metuchen, N.J., 1977).

Peden, W. Creighton. *Wieman's Empirical Process Philosophy* (Washington, D.C., 1977).

Peden, W. Creighton, and Larry E. Axel. *God, Values and Empiricism: Issues in Philosophical Theology* (Macon, Georgia, 1989).

Shaw, Marvin C. *Nature's Grace: Essays on H. N. Wieman's Finite Theism* (New York, 1995).

Southworth, Bruce. *At Home in Creativity* (Boston, 1995).

Marvin C. Shaw

WIENER, Norbert (1894–1964)

Norbert Wiener was born on 26 November 1894 in Columbia, Missouri, and he died on 18 March 1964 in Stockholm, Sweden. As a child prodigy he was encouraged early in formal studies by his father Leo, a professor of Slavic languages at Harvard University. He received a BA degree from Tufts College in 1909 and, after entering Harvard Graduate School to study zoology, moved to enter the Sage School of Philosophy at Cornell University in 1910 to study with Frank THILLY, Ernest ALBEE, and Walter A. Hammond. In 1911 he transferred to the Harvard Graduate School and continued his philosophical studies with mathematician Edward V. HUNTINGTON and philosophers Josiah ROYCE, George H. PALMER, Karl SCHMIDT, and George SANTAYANA. He received an MA degree in 1912 and a PhD in philosophy in 1913, writing a dissertation titled "A Comparison of the Algebra of Relatives of Schröder and of Whitehead and Russell" under Royce and Schmidt.

In 1913 Wiener studied logic and philosophy under Bertrand Russell, G. E. Moore and J. M. E. McTaggart, and mathematics under G. H. Hardy and J. E. Littlewood, at Cambridge University. In 1914 he interrupted his studies at Cambridge for a stay at the University of Göttingen attending lectures of David Hilbert, Edmund Landau, and Edmund Husserl. In 1915 he studied philosophy with John DEWEY at Columbia University. From 1915 until 1919 he held a variety of jobs in and out of academia, including lecturing in the Harvard philosophy department and the mathematics department of the University of Maine in Orono. During 1918–19 he served in the US Army as a private at the Aberdeen Proving Ground in Maryland.

From 1919 to 1960 he taught at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, beginning as an instructor of mathematics, and was promoted up to full professor by 1932. Not one for easily rejoicing in honors, he accepted membership in the National Academy of Sciences in 1934 only to resign in 1941 as an expression of his unhappiness with several aspects of the organization. Not least among his misgivings expressed in his resignation letter was the inappropriateness of a "quasi-official" agency of the federal government, as he saw it, consisting of an elite "self-perpetuating" body left to its own devices.

Wiener's philosophical papers come mainly from his earlier years and do not appear to have had any direct influence on the course of philosophy at large. In 1914 the twenty-year-old published several papers, however, that presaged aspects of his later major contributions to cybernetics and the role of computers in society. In two essays that appeared in the *Journal of Philosophy*, "The Highest Good" and "Relativism," Wiener argued in the first against "absolute ethical standards" and in the second defended what might be called a "relativistic pragmatism." Ernest NAGEL in his commentary in Wiener's *Collected Works* points out that many philosophers have expressed views of the sort Wiener presented in these two papers, such as criticisms of F. H. Bradley's absolutism, of Bertrand Russell's logical atomism, and of Henri Bergson's anti-intellectualism.

"A Simplification of the Logic of Relations" (1914), done in connection with his work with Russell, through its set-theoretic definition of ordered pair, showed that the calculus of relations could be reduced to that of classes. This demonstration gave significant impetus to establishing the value of the modern logical approach to the foundations of mathematics. In this period Wiener was employed by the *Encyclopedia Americana* and one of his articles, "Aesthetics," caught the attention of Karl Menger for one who was taken by its positivistic nature. Wiener referred to the de facto uniformity of human nature due to which certain types of things will attract us in the long run while others will repel us. "It is because of the *de facto* permanency of the trends of education that art is a social matter … and not because of any *a priori* character of the beautiful and of art." Even if the center of

Wiener's attention later shifted away from philosophy, his work was never far from the philosophical foundations he received in his early training. For example, his paper "Quantum Mechanics, Haldane, and Leibniz" (1934), written as a comment on a paper of J. B. S. Haldane, introduced Leibnizian monadology into a discussion on quantum mechanics as a basis for philosophy.

Though Wiener's high standing in the scientific community rested mainly on his mathematical achievements, it was his pioneering work in cybernetics that appears to have had the widest influence. His founding work in the field, *Cybernetics*, appeared in 1948. His "patron saint" for cybernetics, Gottfried Leibniz, served as his historical inspiration not only for the notions of a universal symbolism and of a calculus of reasoning, but also for the close relation between mathematical logic and the mechanical computer. He also suggested that human behavior could be modeled computationally. In Wiener's hands the notion of self-regulated or feedback systems became a guiding theme in the neuro-physiological work of his colleagues Warren S. MCCULLOCH, Walter Pitts, and Arturo Rosenblueth.

An impact in philosophy which Wiener and his contemporaries may not have anticipated came from *The Human Use of Human Beings* (1950) which has been cited as the foundational treatise in what is now called computer ethics. Wiener described the pervasive changes in society of the "second industrial revolution" brought about by computers, including the need to establish new codes of conduct for professional organizations and new ways in philosophy of analyzing social and ethical concepts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cybernetics, or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine (Cambridge, Mass., 1948; 2nd edn 1961).

The Human Use of Human Beings: Cybernetics and Society (New York, 1950; 2nd edn 1954).

Nonlinear Problems in Random Theory (Cambridge, Mass., 1958).

God and Golem, Inc.: A Comment on Certain Points where Cybernetics Impinges on Religion (Cambridge, Mass., 1964).

Invention: The Care and Feeding of Ideas (Cambridge, Mass., 1964).

Other Relevant Works

Wiener's papers are at Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Cambridge.

Ex-prodigy: My Childhood and Youth (New York, 1953).

I Am a Mathematician: The Later Life of a Prodigy (New York, 1956).

Selected Papers of Norbert Wiener, Including Generalized Harmonic Analysis and Tauberian Theorems (Cambridge, Mass., 1965).

Collected Works with Commentary, 4 vols, ed. P. R. Masani (Cambridge, Mass., 1976–85).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Bio Dict Psych by Zusne*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*

Conway, Flo, and Jim Siegelman, *Dark Hero of the Information Age: In Search of Norbert-Wiener, the Father of Cybernetics* (New York, 2005).

Heims, Steve J. *John Von Neumann and Norbert Wiener: From Mathematics to the Technologies of Life and Death* (Cambridge, Mass., 1980).

Jerison, David, et al., eds. *The Legacy of Norbert Wiener: A Centennial Symposium in Honor of the 100th Anniversary of Norbert Wiener's Birth* (Providence, R.I., 1997).

Masani, Pesi R. *Norbert Wiener: 1894–1964* (Basel, 1990).

Albert C. Lewis

WIENER, Philip Paul (1905–92)

Philip P. Wiener was born on 8 July 1905 in New York City. He received the BS in 1925 from City College of New York, an MA in 1926 from Columbia University, and a PhD in philosophy in 1931 from the University of Southern California. Wiener wrote his dissertation, "Experimentalism: An Historical and Critical Analysis," under Herbert Wildon CARR. Wiener was a professor of philosophy at City College of New York from 1933 to 1968, and then moved to the philosophy department of Temple University, where he taught until his retirement in 1972. Wiener died on 5 April 1992 in Asheville, North Carolina.

Major academic interests for most of Wiener's career were pragmatism, the history and philosophy of science, Leibniz, Charles S. PEIRCE, and the history of ideas. In 1940 Philip Wiener and Arthur LOVEJOY founded *The Journal of the History of Ideas*. Wiener was its first editor, and became executive editor in 1955, leading the journal until just a few years before his death. The journal appeared at a time when academic disciplines were rigidly distinct; its goal was to encourage and publish papers that involved more than one field or that presented matters of interest to more than one field. The journal was and remains very successful, circulating throughout the world. The term "interdisciplinary" has become a commonplace today, but it was far from that when the journal started.

In addition to editing *The Journal of the History of Ideas*, Wiener was editor-in-chief of the five-volume *Dictionary of the History of Ideas: Studies of Selected Pivotal Ideas* (1972). In its preface, Wiener wrote, "While respecting the integrity and need for specialized departments of learning, the historian of ideas makes his special contribution to knowledge by tracing the cultural roots and historical ramifications of the major and minor specialized concerns of the mind." The *Dictionary* offered 320 articles, from "abstraction" and "academic freedom" to "work" and "*zeitgeist*."

Wiener published thirty articles, fourteen reviews, and edited or authored ten books. His study, *Evolution and the Founders of Pragmatism* (1949), is an analysis of the contributions and motives of the six principal members of what Peirce had called the Metaphysical Club, the group in which American pragmatism was first formulated. Wiener explained the effect of Darwin's work at the time, and examined the different ways each member of the group sought to cope with its consequences for his own field. This book, along with Lovejoy's *The Great Chain of Being*, became a model of scholarship on the history of ideas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Notes on Leibniz's Conception of Logic and Its Historical Context." *Philosophical Review* 48 (1939): 567–86.

"On Methodology in the Philosophy of History," *Journal of Philosophy* 38 (1941): 309–24.

"Method in Russell's Work on Leibniz," in *The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell*, ed. Paul Schilpp (Evanston, Ill., 1944), pp. 259–76.

Evolution and the Founders of Pragmatism (Cambridge, Mass., 1949).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Selections: Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz* (New York, 1951).

Ed. with Frederic H. Young, *Studies in the Philosophy of Charles Sanders Peirce* (Cambridge, Mass., 1952).

Ed., *Readings in Philosophy of Science; Introduction to the Foundations and Cultural Aspects of the Sciences* (New York, 1953).

Ed., *Values in a Universe of Chance: Selected Writings of Charles Sanders Peirce* (New York, 1958).

Ed., *The Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, 5 vols (New York, 1972).

Further Reading

Proc of APA v66, Who's Who in Phil

"Festschrift for Philip P. Wiener," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 33 (1972) 355–520. Includes a bibliography of Wiener's writings.

Sidney Axinn

WIENPAHL, Paul DeVelin (1916–80)

Paul D. Wienpahl was born on 6 March 1916 in Rock Springs, Wyoming. He received his BA magna cum laude from the University of California at Los Angeles, and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. He also received his MA there, and then served in the US army tank corps during World War II. Returning to UCLA, he received his PhD in philosophy in 1947. His dissertation was on "Language, Definition and Ethics." He was an instructor of philosophy at UCLA in 1946–7, and at New York University in 1947–8.

In 1948 Wienpahl became assistant professor of philosophy at the University of California at Santa Barbara, where he was later promoted to full professor, and taught there until his death. Among his colleagues were Herbert FINGARETTE and Alexander Sesonske. Wienpahl served as chair of the philosophy department in 1960 and 1963–6. He was Vice President of the American Philosophical Association Pacific Division in 1961–2. In 1966–7 he was Director of the University of California Education Abroad Study Center at the Chinese University in Hong Kong. He was a Ford Foundation Fellow in 1954, and a fellow of the East-West Conference in Philosophy in 1969. He also was a visiting professor at the University of Hawaii in 1976. Wienpahl died on 1 March 1980 in Santa Barbara, California.

Wienpahl was remembered as an excellent teacher who helped make philosophy central to the mission of the liberal arts at Santa Barbara. In 1957 he was awarded the annual faculty prize for being the most effective in "opening new intellectual and cultural vistas to undergraduate students." The philosophy department now presents the Paul Wienpahl Award for Excellence in Teaching each year. Wienpahl was instrumental to the growth and life of the philosophy department. Only since 1938 had philosophy been offered at the Santa Barbara campus, by Harry K. Girvetz of the Social Sciences Department. After Wienpahl and Fingarette arrived in 1948, they began offering a major in philosophy in 1949, and enlarged that curriculum by adding Sesonske and John Wilkinson and becoming a separate philosophy department in 1959. Under Wienpahl's leadership, the department continued to expand to nine faculty, and began offering the masters degree in 1960 and the doctorate in 1964.

Wienpahl's early work on philosophy of language resulted in influential articles on Frege and Wittgenstein, and studies of Nelson GOODMAN on synonymity and John DEWEY on meaning. Two of Wienpahl's three books concerned the philosophy and way of life of Zen: *The Matter of Zen* (1964) and *Zen Diary* (1970). His understanding of Zen meditation and both Japanese and Chinese Buddhism came not just through philosophical reflection, but also practice and training, including study at a Zen monastery in Japan and discipleship under a Zen Master. Wienpahl also focused on continental philosophy, especially Spinoza and existentialism. His third book was *The Radical Spinoza* (1979), which was informed by Buddhist themes, and he lived in France for a year in order to study existentialism. The common factor running through these interests was his devotion to a kind of radical empiricism that he associated with mysticism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Philosophy of Ethics, Ethics, and Moral Theory," *Journal of Philosophy* 45 (1948): 57–66.
"Are all Signs Signs?" *Philosophical Review* 58 (1949): 243–56.
"Frege's 'Sinn und Bedeutung'," *Mind* 59

(1950): 483–94.

"More about the Denial of Sameness of Meaning," *Analysis* 12 (1951): 19–23.

"Concerning Moral Responsibility," *Analysis* 13 (1953): 127.

The Matter of Zen: A Brief Account of Zazen (New York, 1964).

"Reflections on Life and Death," *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 3 (1965): 6–67.

Zen Diary (New York, 1970).

"Ch'an Buddhism, Western Thought, and the Concept of Substance," *Inquiry* 14 (1971): 84–101.

The Radical Spinoza (New York, 1979).

"Wittgenstein's Blue and Brown Books," *Inquiry* 15 (1972): 267–319, 434–57.

Other Relevant Works

"Dewey's Theory of Language and Meaning," in *John Dewey: Philosopher of Science and Freedom*, ed. Sidney Hook (New York, 1950), pp. 271–88.

"Wittgenstein and the Naming Relation," *Inquiry* 7 (1964): 329–47.

"On the Meaninglessness of Philosophical Questions," *Philosophy East and West* 15 (1965): 135–44.

"Spinoza and Wang Yang-Ming," *Religious Studies* 5 (1969): 19–28.

"Spinoza and Mental Health," *Inquiry* 15 (1972): 64–94.

"Wang Yang-Ming and Meditation," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 1 (1974): 199–227.

Further Reading

Baylis, Charles A. "Tranquility is Not Enough," *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 3 (1965): 84–95.

Rollins, C. D. "Sameness of Meaning," *Analysis* 13 (1952): 46–8.

John R. Shook

WIESEL, Eliezer (1928–)

Elie Wiesel was born in Sighet, Transylvania, Romania, on 30 September 1928. An uneventful early childhood in a Hasidic community was followed by his and his family's deportation by the Nazis to Auschwitz in 1944, when Elie was fifteen. Both his mother and younger sister perished in Auschwitz, while his two older sisters survived. He and his father were eventually transferred to Buchenwald, where his father perished before the camp was liberated by the Allies in April 1945. Wiesel himself was able to survive not only Auschwitz and Buchenwald, but Buna and Gleiwitz as well. With the end of the war in Europe, he was temporarily assigned to a French orphanage and then turned his attention to studies at the Sorbonne in Paris in late 1947. In early 1948 he began work as a journalist with the French newspaper *L'arche*. Until 1954 Wiesel found it impossible to write anything about his concentration camp experience. At the time he was convinced that language was totally inadequate to express the horrors he had experienced and witnessed. "Words," he insisted, "are too impoverished, too transparent to express the Event." When in 1954 he interviewed François Mauriac, a devout Catholic, Wiesel confessed to him that in his judgment the slaughtered children in the camps suffered more than Jesus, yet no one spoke of them or for them. Mauriac, thereupon in tears, convinced Wiesel that he should speak out on behalf of the victims of all the concentration camps.

During a journalistic assignment to Brazil, Wiesel undertook his first effort to formulate in words the horrors of the Holocaust. During this voyage from Marseilles, France, to São Paulo, Brazil, he wrote "feverishly, breathlessly" his testimonial to the dead and his justification for surviving the ordeal. A substantially curtailed version of the work, originally entitled *All the World Remained Silent*, was not published however, until 1958, as *La Nuit* (Night). With the publication of that volume Wiesel became the spokesman for all the

victims of the concentration camps, the living and the dead. As such, Wiesel was to labor for the next fifty years reminding the world of the unique phenomenon that was the Holocaust and warning the world of the possibility of its recurrence if prejudice and hatred were not confronted resolutely.

Wiesel became an American citizen in 1963. He revisited Sighet, presently a Romanian town, and made his first trip to Russia in 1965. In the following year he published *Jews of Silence*. In 1969 he married Marion Rose, who bore him his son in 1972. In 1978 he was appointed chairman of the Presidential Commission on the Holocaust, renamed in 1980 as the United States Holocaust Memorial Council. He serves as Founding President of the Universal Academy of Cultures, based in Paris. Because of his efforts to keep alive the memory of the Shoah, he was awarded (1985) the Congressional Gold Medal of Achievement. In 1986 he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for his work. Wiesel has been awarded more than one hundred honorary degrees from institutions of higher learning. He served as Distinguished Professor of Judaic Studies at the City University of New York (1972–6). He also was the first Henry Luce Visiting Scholar in Humanities and Social Thought at Yale University (1982–3). Since 1976 he has been the Andrew W. Mellon Professor in the Humanities at Boston University. In this capacity he holds membership as university professor in the departments of philosophy and religion. His memoirs, *All Rivers Run to the Sea*, were published in 1995.

In all, Wiesel has published more than thirty books, all of them devoted to Judaism, the Holocaust, and the moral responsibility of all people to confront hatred, racism, and genocide, wherever expressed. In this connection he has boldly, lucidly, and eloquently taken up the cause of the Kurds in Turkey and Iraq, the victims of South African apartheid, the Miskito Indians of Nicaragua, Cambodian refugees, Soviet Jews, and support of the state of Israel.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Dawn (New York, 1961).
Night (New York, 1961).
The Accident (New York, 1962).
The Town Beyond the Wall (New York, 1964).
The Gates of the Forest (New York, 1966).
Jews of Silence (New York, 1966).
Legends of Our Time (New York, 1968).
A Beggar in Jerusalem (New York, 1970).
One Generation After (New York, 1970).
Souls on Fire (New York, 1973).
The Oath (New York, 1973).
Messengers of God (New York, 1976).
Dimensions of the Holocaust (Evanston, Ill., 1977).
A Jew Today (New York, 1978).
Five Biblical Portraits (Notre Dame, Ind., 1978).
Four Hasidic Masters and Their Struggle Against Melancholy (Notre Dame, Ind., 1978).
The Trial of God (New York, 1979).
The Testament (New York, 1981).
Somewhere a Master (New York, 1982).
The Golem (New York, 1983).
Against Silence: The Voice and Vision of Elie Wiesel, 3 vols, ed. Irving Abrahamson (New York, 1985).
The Fifth Son (New York, 1985).
Twilight (New York, 1988).
A Journey into Faith (New York, 1990).
Evil and Exile (Notre Dame, Ind., 1990).
From the Kingdom of Memory: Reminiscences (New York, 1990).
Sages and Dreamers (New York, 1991).
The Forgotten (New York, 1992).
All Rivers Run to the Sea: Memoirs (New York, 1995).
And the Sea is Never Full: Memoirs 1969– (New York, 1999).
Conversations with Elie Wiesel, with Richard D. Heffner, ed. T. J. Vinciguerra (New York, 2001).
Wise Men and Their Tales: Portraits of Biblical, Talmudic, and Hasidic Masters (New York, 2003).

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio

Brown, Robert M. *Elie Wiesel: Messenger to All Humanity* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1983).

Cargas, Harry James, ed. *Telling the Tale: A Tribute to Elie Wiesel* (St. Louis, Missouri, 1993).

Estess, Ted L. *Elie Wiesel* (New York, 1980).

Franciosi, Robert, ed. *Elie Wiesel: Conversations* (Jackson, Miss., 2002).

Greenberg, Irving, and Alvin Rosenfeld, eds. *Confronting the Holocaust: The Impact of Elie Wiesel* (Bloomington, Ind., 1978).

Patterson, David. *In Dialog and Dilemma with Elie Wiesel* (Wakefield, N.H., 1991).

Rittner, Carol, ed. *Elie Wiesel: Between Memory and Hope* (New York, 1990).

Sibelman, Simon P. *Silence in the Novels of Elie Wiesel* (New York, 1995).

Dominick A. Iorio

WILD, John Daniel, Jr. (1902–72)

John D. Wild, Jr. was born on 10 April 1902 in Chicago, Illinois. He received his PhB from the University of Chicago in 1923, his MA from Harvard University in 1925, and his PhD in philosophy from the University of Chicago in 1926 with a dissertation entitled "The Science and Metaphysics of Symbolism." From 1927 to 1961 he taught philosophy at Harvard University, rising in the ranks from instructor to full professor. Wild moved to Northwestern University in 1961 to serve as professor and chair of the department of philosophy. Wild was President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1960–61. In 1963 he resigned from Northwestern University to accept a professorship in philosophy at Yale University. He retired in 1969 and died on 22 October 1972 in New Haven, Connecticut.

As a student at the University of Chicago, then a center of pragmatism, naturalism, and social psychology, Wild was conspicuous for his independence of mind. Although the influence of Darwinism on philosophy in America had engendered pragmatism and naturalism, Wild's intellectual and emotional response led him in the opposite direction. In 1929 he published an essay in a volume edited by a member of "the Chicago School," in which he argued that "the grand strategy of evolution" in this world, reflected in the inner life of man, is a process that transcends itself, culminating in absolute, immutable Being. This theme, redolent with moral and religious concerns, suffused all of Wild's later philosophical works. Wild's thought originated in meticulous scholarship, then climbed to levels of illuminating yet novel interpretation, rising to the speculative heights of a fertile eclecticism in order to return, singularly equipped, to confront the problems of praxis.

Wild's earliest books reveal the character of his thinking, scholarly in character, yet imbued with passionate moral and religious concern. In 1930 he edited a small book of selections from Spinoza intended for students, and in 1936 he published a volume devoted to the study of George Berkeley's life and philosophy. These early contributions to philosophy reveal Wild's profound moral and religious concerns. The first contains copious selections from Spinoza's ethics, and the second portrays Berkeley transcending the empiricism of *The Principles* for the more spiritualistic neo-Platonism of the *Siris*.

Wild's philosophy, as it unfolded in later decades, manifested two aspects: realism and existentialism. Although this distinction of aspects seemed to some of his disciples – such as Henry VEATCH – to betray a split mind or change of heart, Wild himself beheld a developmental unity between realism and existentialism. While he had published articles on existentialism earlier, his realism appeared in his teaching and in book form first.

Wild's realism is a classical realism that sought to synthesize Aristotle's metaphysics and epistemology with Plato's ethics and phi-

losophy of culture. In 1948 he published an introductory textbook on the kind of classical realism he proposed. The doctrines it contained inspired the third realist movement in American philosophy in the twentieth century. Classical realism is traditionally viewed as a philosophy of substance and essence. Distinct from new realism and critical realism, Wild's classical realism nonetheless imitated their strategy. It involved a group of philosophers who organized themselves into the Association for Realistic Philosophy, who published a Platform, and who authored a cooperative collection of essays, entitled *The Return to Reason* (1953) with Wild as editor as well as contributor. In a time fraught with moral and political crises, Wild sought to return to the reason of classical realism as the panacea for contemporary cultural ills.

Paramount in the formation of the realist aspect of Wild's philosophy was the influence of Plato. In *Plato's Theory of Man* (1946) Wild sought to elicit from the ancient philosopher a coherent theory of culture that would project an ideal standard for cultural aspiration and evaluation. Plato, according to Wild, provided a vision of the true, natural order of reality including life and culture, a hierarchical order of things as they proceed from ultimate being as their source. Within the hierarchy the higher levels are more real than the lower, and the latter subserve the former as means to ends, climaxing in the pinnacle occupied by the self-sustaining cause of being. Although the hierarchy is objectively necessary, it is not practically necessary. There is no force compelling men to choose what is objectively necessary. The hierarchy at every level is vulnerable to the domination of a higher level by a lower. Humanity is especially susceptible to such inversion, which Wild named "anatropism." With Plato as his guide, Wild described and condemned anatropism in the arts, in life, in individual behavior, in society, in ontology, and in epistemology, and he traced its origin back to the ancient Sophists.

The existentialist aspects of Wild's philosophy were evident not only in his early articles but also in the essay he contributed to the realists' cooperative volume, *The Return to Reason*. In this essay, entitled "Phenomenology and Metaphysics," Wild argued that phenomenology is the only method which describes accurately and adequately the immediate data of experience upon which metaphysics must be based. He emphasized that the immediate datum permeating every experience is existence.

Two years after the appearance of *The Return of Reason*, Wild published *The Challenge of Existentialism* (1955), signaling an intensification of his interest in existentialism and phenomenology. For Wild, writing in the mid twentieth century, the classical realism he espoused confronted two rival movements: analytic philosophy in the English-speaking world and phenomenology and existentialism on the European Continent. Analytic philosophy he dismissed as "the breakdown of modern philosophy." Concentrating on the tools of logic and analysis and ignoring experience lying beyond the special sciences, analytic philosophy was incapable of describing all the data of immediate experience; therefore, it was not really empirical. Classical realism, unrevised, would be the only viable philosophical alternative, were it not for existentialism. Hailed as the challenge to analytic philosophy, it also challenges realism, which is revitalized, if not transformed, in responding. In *The Challenge of Existentialism* Wild elucidated the main theories of European philosophers: Søren Kierkegaard, Karl Jaspers, Martin Heidegger, Jean-Paul Sartre, and Gabriel Marcel. He highlighted their strengths and exposed their weaknesses. Above all, he focused on their potentialities for alignment with realism. To the existentialists he later added William JAMES, whom he called "the first American existential philosopher."

In *Human Freedom and Social Order* (1959) Wild declared that the existentialists' exploration of the *Lebenswelt* is the most important philosophical achievement in the twentieth century. He had already reconciled the essence of his realism with the existence he recovered by the method of phenomenology. Having

enriched his concept of existence with the findings of the existentialists, he adopted their description of the life-world as the historical situation into which we are born, where we are engaged with others and with our goals, where we die, a world which ordinary language addresses with all its obscurity, complexity and richness. The world as lived, Wild concluded, is the real world; it is prior to science. Hence Wild, reflecting back on Plato's vision as expressed in the Allegory of the Cave, so crucial to his conception of the natural hierarchy, judged Plato to have made a serious mistake. To correct the mistake, Wild proposed to invert Plato's image. The life-world where we begin is the real world outside the cave and we subsequently descend into the cave. Wild described the life-world of the ordinary as open to intimations of and an openness to an authentically Christian philosophy accessible to reason nurtured by faith. Thus the reason of classical realism, responding to the challenge of existentialism, embraces the crown of faith.

Wild's philosophical career spanned nearly a half-century of American philosophy, beginning when critical realism and pragmatism were dominant and ending when analytical philosophy reigned. With philosophical scholarship and a singular eclecticism as his instruments, Wild attracted a considerable following of philosophers from among his students, founding the movement of classical realism and responding creatively to the challenge of existentialism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

George Berkeley: A Study of His Life and Philosophy (Cambridge, Mass., 1936).

Plato's Theory of Man: *An Introduction to the Realistic Philosophy of Culture* (Cambridge, Mass., 1946).

Introduction to Realistic Philosophy (New York, 1948).

Plato's Modern Enemies and the Theory of Natural Law (Chicago, 1953).

The Return to Reason: Essays in Realistic Philosophy (Chicago, 1953).

The Challenge of Existentialism (Bloomington, Ind., 1955).

Human Freedom and Social Order: An Essay in Christian Philosophy (Durham, N.C., 1959).

Existence and the World of Freedom (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1963).

The Radical Empiricism of William James (Garden City, N.Y., 1963).

Other Relevant Works

"The Grand Strategy of Evolution," in *Essays in Philosophy*, ed. T. V. Smith and W. K. Wright (Chicago, Ill., 1929), pp. 308–22.

Ed., *Spinoza: Selections* (New York, 1930).

"Kierkegaard and Classic Philosophy," *Philosophical Review* 49 (1940): 536–51.

"Husserl's Critique of Psychologism: Its Historic Roots and Contemporary Relevance," in *Philosophical Essays in Memory of Edmund Husserl*, ed. Marvin Farber (Cambridge, Mass., 1940), pp. 19–43.

"On the Nature and Aims of Phenomenology," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 3 (1942): 85–95.

Further Reading

Bio 20thC Phils, *Pres Addr of APA v7*, *Proc of APA v46*, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*

Adelmann, Frederick J. "The Root of Existence," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 22 (1962): 405–8.

Edie, James M., Francis H. Parker, and Calvin O. Schrag, eds. *Patterns of the Life-World: Essays in Honor of John Wild* (Evanston, Ill., 1970). Contains a bibliography of Wild's writings.

Kaufman, William E. *John Wild: From Realism to Phenomenology* (New York, 1996).

Reck, Andrew J. *The New American Philosophers* (Baton Rouge, Lou., 1968), pp. 221–54.

Rome, Sydney, and Beatrice Rome, eds. *Philosophical Interrogations* (New York, 1964), pp. 119–78.

Schrag, Calvin O. "John Wild on Contemporary Philosophy," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 22 (1962): 412–15.

Andrew J. Reck

WILDE, Norman (1867–1936)

Norman Wilde was born on 12 June 1867 in Dobbs Ferry, New York. After attending private schools in his hometown, in 1886 he went on to study at Columbia University. He had planned on becoming a lawyer, but upon reading a philosophy book that a classmate had loaned to him, decided he would make a career out of philosophy. While at Columbia, he was in the first philosophy class which Nicholas Murray Butler taught. In 1889 Wilde earned his BA, and in 1890 he received his MA from Columbia. He studied at the University of Berlin from 1891 to 1893. Following his education in Germany, he studied at Harvard in 1893–4. He received his PhD from Columbia in 1894, writing a dissertation entitled "Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi: A Study in the Origins of German Realism" which was published in that year as the first in the series *Columbia University Contributions to Philosophy, Psychology and Education.*

After earning his doctorate, Wilde taught at Columbia for four years until moving to Minnesota, where he became an instructor in philosophy at the University of Minnesota in 1898. In 1900 he was promoted to assistant professor, and he became professor of philosophy and head of the department in 1902, to replace Frederick J. E. Woodbridge after his departure for Columbia. Wilde held these positions at Minnesota until his retirement in 1936.

He died on 25 December 1936 in Adams, Massachusetts.

Wilde was the President of the Western Philosophical Association in 1919–20. In 1921 he merged this association and the American Philosophical Association into a federation. He was also a member of Phi Beta Kappa and the American Academy of Political Science. In 1929 he was honored by Columbia with the honorary LLD, alongside John Dewey who was also given an honorary degree at the same ceremony.

Wilde's primary interests were in ethics, philosophy of religion, and social and political philosophy. He published a book on political theory, *The Ethical Basis of the State*, in 1924. The book described the idealistic theory of the state and was well reviewed. Idealistic theories of social philosophy claim that social relations and institutions are not merely material phenomena but should be understood as something existing at the level of human consciousness. *The Ethical Basis of the State* also focused on the idea that ethics are involved in all of the state's decisions, be it education, national defense, the environment, and so on. Wilde also wrote over thirty articles in philosophy journals, and the topics of these journals ranged from epistemological studies to Kantian ethical theory, as well as the political and social philosophies of Machiavelli, Mandeville, and Rousseau. He was writing a book about the history of political philosophies at the time of his death.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi: A Study in the Origins of German Realism (New York, 1894).

"Morality and Religion," *Philosophical Review* 6 (1897): 64–7.

"The Limitations of Ethical Inquiry," *International Journal of Ethics* 13 (1903): 458–65.

"The Meaning of Evolution in Ethics," *International Journal of Ethics* 19 (1909): 265–83.

"Religion: A Luxury or a Duty?"
International Journal of Ethics 20 (1910):
470–81.
"A Faith Philosopher of the Eighteenth
Century," *Philosophical Review* 23
(1914): 317–32.
"The Pragmatism of Pascal," *Philosophical
Review* 23 (1914): 540–49.
"On the Conversion of Rousseau,"
International Journal of Ethics 26 (1915):
54–71.
"Rousseau's Doctrine of the Right to
Believe," *Mind* 26 (1917): 12–28.
"The Development of Coleridge's Thought,"
Philosophical Review 28 (1919): 147–63.
"The Attack on the State," *International
Journal of Ethics* 30 (1920): 349–71.
The Ethical Basis of the State (Princeton,
N.J., 1924).
"Some Reflections on the Modern Temper,"
International Journal of Ethics 45 (1934):
65–80.

Other Relevant Works
"Kant's Relation to Utilitarianism,"
Philosophical Review 3 (1894): 289–304.
"The Question of Authority in Early English
Ethics," *Philosophical Review* 4 (1895):
603–15.
"Mandeville's Place in English Thought,"
Mind n.s. 7 (1898): 219–32.
"The Faith Philosophy of Pierre Charron,"
Philosophical Review 24 (1915): 614–30.
"Machiavelli," *International Journal of
Ethics* 38 (1928): 212–25.

Further Reading
*Nat Cycl Amer Bio v42, Pres Addr of
APA v2, Proc of APA in Phil Rev v47,
Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Daniel Trippett

WILL, Frederick Ludwig (1909–98)

Frederick Will was born on 8 May 1909 in
Swissvale, Pennsylvania. The son of a poor
Lutheran minister who preached in western
Ohio and eastern Pennsylvania, his interest in
philosophy was likely prompted by overhear-
ing his father's discussions with some parish-
ioners about freedom of the will and other the-
ological issues. Will graduated with a BA from
Thiel College in 1929, having attended on a
Theta Kappa Nu scholarship. He received the
MA from Ohio State University in 1931 and
the PhD in philosophy from Cornell University
in 1938, working closely with George SABINE.
From 1938 until his retirement in 1977, he
was a professor of philosophy at the University
of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He was a
visiting professor at Cornell in 1955 and
1964–5, and at the University of California at
Irvine in 1978. Upon retirement Will continued
his research vigorously. He received a
Guggenheim Fellowship in 1945–6, and a
senior Fulbright Research Scholarship at the
University of Oxford in 1961. In 1965 he was
honored with a D.Litt. from Thiel College. In
1968–9, he was President of the American
Philosophical Association Western Division.
Will died on 27 March 1998 in Newport
Beach, California. He was an avid fisherman,
a tireless gardener, and a superb conversation-
alist. His son, George F. Will, became a promi-
nent political editor and columnist.

Will began his philosophical career as a
follower of Hume, convinced that in both style
and substance Hume's *Enquiry Concerning
Human Understanding* was the epitome of phi-
losophy. He devoted decades of work to dis-
solving the problem of induction through
ordinary language analysis. In the 1950s he
was recognized as a leading analytic episte-
mologist. Two of his articles attempting to
dissolve Hume's problem of induction through
ordinary language analysis were widely anthol-
ogized: "Is There a Problem of Induction?"
(1942) and "Will the Future Be Like the Past?"
(1947).

In 1964 Will completed a book-length manuscript that proposed a definitive solution to the problem of induction, based on "principles of factual reasoning." Like Charles PEIRCE's "leading principles of inference" or Gilbert Ryle's "inference tickets," such principles formulate supposed factual relations among events or objects, such that the occurrence or observation of one would reliably warrant inferring the occurrence or observation of the other. In the manuscript Will contended that such principles are constantly generated, assessed, and revised in the course of our ordinary and specialized (technical or scientific) affairs, always in conjunction with other such principles.

During final revisions of his book, Will realized that his solution was inadequate for two main reasons. First, the inductive skeptic could grant those contentions while denying that they had anything to do with genuine, philosophically legitimate justification. Given the essentially Cartesian terms in which the problem of induction is formulated, admissible premises cannot be justified on the basis of other "principles of factual reasoning." Instead they must be "analytic" or necessary truths, because whether synthetic principles can be justified is precisely the issue challenged by Hume's problem. Second, treating inferential reasoning in terms of "principles of factual reasoning" inherits the basic foundationalist model of knowledge as charting our inferential way from one basic experience to another.

Hume's problem of induction and its foundationalist presuppositions instead require radical critique and replacement. Will realized that it is necessary to go far beyond his earlier argument, which concluded that Hume's problem of induction is incoherent because eliminating all unjustified synthetic principles from the solution to the problem also eliminates all "the considerations necessary for understanding what the inference is about, and thus for grasping not only the scope and significance but, therewith, the very meaning of the inductive conclusion that is supposed to be in question" (1959, p. 371). For example, to strip Newton's Third Rule, his famous inductive generalization ascribing mass and gravity to all matter, of every "synthetic" proposition, would leave one bereft of any principles for understanding Newton's problem as part of an astronomical investigation of planetary motions relying on data collected with a variety of observational instruments.

Discontented with this approach to induction, Will's thought took a profound and highly original pragmatic turn. He criticized the presuppositions of the problem of induction and, by drawing on resources in history and philosophy of science, in ethics, and in law, and on the work of Hegel, Peirce, John DEWEY, and the later Wittgenstein, he developed a penetrating pragmatic analysis of reason, justification, and knowledge. Will's critique of foundationalism and the problems of induction it generates began with his 1969 presidential address, "Thoughts and Things" (1997, chap. 1). His full critique was delivered in *Induction and Justification* (1974). Part 1 of that book placed the problem of induction in the context of foundationalist models of knowledge. Part 2 examined the main root of foundationalist models of justification, the regress argument, and argued that neither the alleged sensory foundations of human knowledge nor the various analytic, postulational, or inductive principles for justifying nonfoundational beliefs met the requirements of the skeptical model of knowledge underlying the regress argument. Part three sketched an alternative, a social and pragmatic account of knowledge and justification, which he then developed in a series of articles (later collected in *Pragmatism and Realism*).

In a second book, Will extended his critique of foundationalism by criticizing the deductivist model of justification on which it rests; hence his title, *Beyond Deduction* (1988). On the deductivist model of justification, norms are treated as kinds of templates (mental, physical, or otherwise) of performance, resident in agents, which determine unilaterally what kinds of thought or action accords with them. This view generates many perplexities; the most important concern

evaluating, justifying, and rectifying such unilaterally determining entities. Sometimes one can appeal to other, supervening norms; but the need to terminate the regressive procedure typically leads to appeals to dubious "foundations," to conventions, or to sheer prejudice. This criticism of deductivism is Will's restatement of the Pyrrhonian dilemma of the criterion. On the constructive side, Will showed how it is possible, while reasoning about some specific problem (whether moral, legal, scientific, or technical), for one to revise one's original principles and concepts – one's understanding of the nature of both the problem and its solution – in the course of solving it. Will showed that a pragmatic, social account of knowledge can be reconciled with realism, the idea that things exist and have characteristics regardless of what we say, think, or believe about them.

Will investigated very broad, fundamental issues about human reason and its objects. His views about rationality, justification, and knowledge are very distinctive and have both direct and indirect implications for many areas of current philosophical debate. A detailed critical overview of Will's later views on pragmatic realism appears in the editor's introduction to his collected late essays, *Pragmatism and Realism* (1997). In his foreword to this collection, Alasdair MacIntyre observes that Will's work is "one of the more remarkable achievements of twentieth-century North American philosophy" and that philosophy can prosper only by taking Will's "splendid" work with "great seriousness."

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Induction and Justification: An Investigation of Cartesian Procedure in the Philosophy of Knowledge (Ithaca, N.Y., 1974).
Beyond Deduction: Ampliative Aspects of Philosophical Reflection (London, 1988).
Pragmatism and Realism, ed. Kenneth R. Westphal (Lanham, Md., 1997). Contains a bibliography of Will's publications.

Other Relevant Works
"Is There a Problem of Induction?" *Journal of Philosophy* 39 (1942): 505–13.
"Will the Future Be Like the Past?" *Mind* 56 (1947): 332–47.
"Justification and Induction," *Philosophical Review* 68 (1959): 359–72.
"The Preferability of Probable Beliefs," *Journal of Philosophy* 62 (1965): 57–67.
"Reason, Social Practice, and Scientific Realism," *Philosophy of Science* 48 (1981): 1–18.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v7, Proc of APA v72, Who's Who in Phil
Capps, John. "The Pragmatism of Frederick L. Will," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 35 (1999): 475–99.
Cohen, L. Jonathan. "Reasonable Doubts," *Times Literary Supplement* (7–13 April 1989): 373.
O'Hear, Anthony. "Reason and Will," *The Salisbury Review* (March 1989): 48–9.
Pihlström, Sami. *Naturalizing the Transcendental: A Pragmatic View* (Amherst, N.Y., 2003).
Singer, Marcus G. "Concerning F. L. Will's *Beyond Deduction*," *Philosophy* 65 (1990): 371–4.
Westphal, Kenneth R., ed. *Pragmatism, Reason, and Norms: A Realistic Assessment* (New York, 1998).

Kenneth R. Westphal

WILLIAMS, Bernard Arthur Owen
(1929–2003)

Bernard Williams was born on 21 September 1929 in Westcliff, Essex, England, and he died in Rome, Italy on 10 June 2003. He was educated at Chigwell School in Essex, and

received an MA with first class honours from Balliol College, Oxford in 1951. After a year's service in the Royal Air Force, he returned to Oxford as a fellow of All Souls College (1951–4), and then of New College (1954–9). In 1959 he moved to London, first as lecturer in philosophy at University College (1959–64), and subsequently as professor of philosophy at Bedford College (1964–7). The middle part of his career was spent at Cambridge University, as Knightbridge Professor of Philosophy (1967–79) and Provost of King's College (1979–87). In 1988 he moved to the US as Monroe Deutsch Professor of Philosophy at the University of California at Berkeley. From 1990 he divided his time between Berkeley and Oxford, where he was White's Professor of Moral Philosophy (1990–96) and fellow of All Souls College (1997–2003). Also active in British public life, Williams served on a number of government committees of enquiry, chairing the Committee on Obscenity and Film Censorship (1977–9), and he was a member of the Board of Sadler's Wells Opera (later the English National Opera) from 1967 to 1986. He was a fellow of the British Academy, and knighted in 1999.

One of the most significant British philosophers of the twentieth century, Williams was a wide-ranging and synoptic thinker, whose work encompasses metaphysics, epistemology, the philosophy of mind and language, the philosophy of action, the philosophy of value and culture, the history of philosophy and the history of ideas. However, he will chiefly be remembered as a philosopher of ethics and (especially through his later work) as the defender of a distinctive post-Nietzschean project – a project of historically informed metaphilosophy, examining the nature of the philosophical enterprise and its relation to cultural explanation.

Williams was not a system-builder: his philosophy does not involve the construction of explanatory or justificatory structures based upon a number of sharply articulated, fundamental principles. Rather, his philosophical outlook is largely defined by its opposition to this kind of systematizing ambition. During his lifetime, he was most widely known as a critic of utilitarianism, and also of the Kantian moral theories that had been regarded as the natural alternatives to it. In *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy* (1985) this criticism is extended into a more general argument against the aspiration to resolve the questions of normative ethics by recourse to any comprehensive ethical theory. This aspiration he saw as involving a kind of cultural myopia – a blindness to the way in which our ethical conceptions are local to a particular, historically conditioned outlook. Within the ethical outlook we currently inhabit, a great variety of ethical considerations have reason-giving force for us: that force cannot be captured by attempting to derive it from the principles of a theoretical structure that claims to capture, trans-historically, the truth about ethics. Perhaps the major theme uniting Williams's work as a whole is the importance of theorizing about human experience in a way that is consistent with recognizing the local perspective from which that theorizing is done. This surfaces in various places – for example, it is at the heart of his criticisms of evolutionary theories of epistemology, and anti-individualist theories of social explanation. However, this theme is developed most fully in his discussion of the proper forms and limits of theorizing about ethics. In explaining his distinctive contribution to philosophy, this is the place to start.

Williams's contribution to ethical philosophy is sometimes described as being to turn it away from an exclusively "meta-ethical" concern with the structure and function of ethical discourse and back to an engagement with normative ethical questions themselves. Often cited in this connection is his complaint (in *Morality*) that "contemporary moral philosophy has found an original way of being boring, which is by not discussing issues at all." However, the practical re-engagement of moral philosophy was well under way by the time Williams wrote these words – not least in

the influential utilitarianism advocated by R. M. Hare, J. C. C. Smart, and others. It is as a critic of the utilitarian view that Williams first came to prominence, and his early work attacking it – especially "A Critique of Utilitarianism" (1973) – remains the most accessible introduction to his philosophy.

Central to Williams's attack on utilitarian moral theories is the accusation that they are hostile to the deliberation and agency that constitute a well-lived life. In "A Critique of Utilitarianism" this objection takes the following form. Utilitarianism instructs me to count my own interests as merely those of one amongst all the different people whom my actions could affect. Doing what is morally right, it claims, is a matter of producing the outcome that is best from a point of view that is impartial between the interests of everyone. But to accept this as an agent, Williams complains, would be to adopt a strangely instrumental attitude towards my own life – to view it as a vehicle for producing impartially preferable outcomes. That would mean alienating myself from the distinctive attachments and commitments that make it *my* life rather than someone else's.

To this objection – the objection that deliberating as a utilitarian would be a personal disaster – utilitarians have replied in two broadly different ways. One has been to accept, heroically, that this would be a disaster for *me*, but to insist that I am only one person amongst many, and suffering an alienated life may well be the price I have to pay in order to do what is best overall. The other, more common reply has been to distinguish between the use of utilitarianism as a theory of the moral justification of action, and its use as a method for actually deliberating about what to do. Utilitarianism can serve as a theory of moral justification without being proposed as a method of deliberation. After all, as a theory of moral justification, it tells us we are justified in deliberating in whatever way produces the best results; and that may not be by deliberating directly in utilitarian terms. Indeed, if deliberating directly in utilitarian terms would be a personal disaster, that may itself supply a good utilitarian justification for not doing so.

Williams's responses to these two options for utilitarianism take us deeper into his ethical philosophy. To think that the first "heroic" option is available, he argues, is to fail to appreciate the depth of the disintegration that would result from trying to think of my own interests as only those of one amongst many people, each of whom has an equal claim to my attention. It is not just that it would be unsatisfying for me to live this way: it would destroy the reasons I have for living at all. Williams's most forceful expression of this point is in the widely cited paper "Persons, Character and Morality" (included in *Moral Luck*, 1981). If I am to recognize a reason to pursue anything at all, I must see my own life as worth living; but I cannot do that if I abandon my commitment to those people and projects that are of special significance to me. "Life has to have substance if anything is to have sense, including adherence to the impartial system; but if it has substance, then it cannot grant supreme importance to the impartial system." This, Williams argues, is a fundamental objection to the impartialist ambitions not only of utilitarianism but of Kantian moral theories too.

In *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy* Williams presses the point further. Our reasons are the considerations that provide compelling recommendations in favour of action. There is a host of considerations that have this force for us. But their having this force is not a matter of their being answerable to the demands of some underlying theoretical structure.

We may be able to show how a given practice hangs together with other practices in a way that makes social and psychological sense. But we may not be able to find anything that will meet a demand for justification made by someone standing outside those practices. We may not be able, in any real sense, to justify it even to ourselves. A practice may be so directly related to our experience that the reason it provides will simply count as stronger

than any reason that might be advanced for it. Given the considerations that we *do* count as strongly supporting our actions, anything that an abstract theory can come up with can only be weaker than them, and thus provide us with less compelling reasons than the ones we have already.

Thus, the target of Williams's attack extends beyond utilitarian and Kantian moral theories in particular, to encompass all purported justifying ethical theories. There are two core elements of this attack. One concerns the relationship of the theorizer to her own theory. A theory the acceptance of which is incompatible with the perspective of an agent towards her own life is not a philosophical contribution to answering the normative questions that need to be answered in living a reflective life. An ethical philosophy that deserves to be taken seriously must be one that is compatible with the perspective of agency. For Williams, this, ultimately, is what is wrong with the attempt to separate utilitarianism as a theory of ethical justification from the non-utilitarian methods of practical deliberation that it recommends. This distinction, he argues, cannot be sustained as part of a stable perspective on one's own life. I might, as a utilitarian theorist, hold that there is a utilitarian justification for you to value your friends in a non-utilitarian way; but I can hardly say that *I* have a utilitarian justification to value *my* friends in a non-utilitarian way – once I become an agent, I cannot sustain the distinction my theory is instructing me to make.

The second core element in Williams's attack on ethical theory comes from his theory of reasons for action – often characterized as "Humean" because of the close connection it insists on between the considerations that provide an agent with good reasons for action and the considerations that are effective in actually motivating that agent. This theory, explicitly presented in the paper "Internal and External Reasons," has deservedly received a great deal of attention amongst philosophers of practical reason. Less often noticed is the way in which it is fundamental to the thesis pre-sented in *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy*, where Williams's complaint is that the ethical considerations that already compel our attention in thinking about how to live are more forceful and engaging motivators of action than the abstract considerations of an ethical theory. Williams's view is not that we ought to make a crude identification of motivation with justification. To be a good reason for me to act, it is not enough simply that a consideration does motivate me: it must be a consideration that does or would motivate me to the extent that I deliberate rationally and knowledgeably about it. However, Williams argues that what qualifies as a reason under these conditions will depend on my own personal motivational tendencies – my "subjective motivational set." He cautions us not to underestimate the extent to which, on this picture, our reasons will converge. Many of our motivational peculiarities are due to failures of rationality and knowledge (a class of failures under which he prominently includes failures of imagination). But that convergence is unlikely to be complete. And it will be local, since the considerations that are available to us as the motivators of action are culturally specific.

Williams's principal philosophical project in the 1970s and 80s, summarized above, had a deflationary aim. It sought to puncture the claims to practical authority of the most prominent forms of ethical theorizing, and to do so by means of a distinctive kind of internal critique. An examination of the force of ethical reasons, Williams argued, shows that they are inaccessible to certain ethical theories: the acceptance of those theories is itself incompatible with a proper recognition of that force. A conclusion he insisted on was the unavailability of an "Archimedean point" from which to validate our ethical commitments – a perspective external to those commitments from which they can be justified. However, his acceptance of this conclusion was conditioned by two further concerns. One was to reject those forms of relativism that undermine the seriousness of ethical commitment. To reject the idea of an

"Archimedean point" for ethics is not to succumb to the view that the ethical opinions we happen to have inherited are no better than any alternative set. The second was to reject equally a conservative complacency about those ethical opinions. Our ethical outlook can be criticized from within. A central role in that criticism can be played by our reflection on the history of this ethical outlook – how and why it has developed into the form it currently takes. Filling in some of that history, while showing that it does not lead to a destructive relativism, was the dominant concern of the latter part of Williams's career.

In *Shame and Necessity* (1993) Williams examines the relationship between our ethical conceptions and those of the ancient Greeks. Paying close attention to the texts of Homer and the great tragedians of the fifth century BCE, he argues that the discontinuities between their outlook and ours have been exaggerated. Our fundamental ethical conceptions of agency, responsibility, shame and freedom are the same. What is noticeably absent from these ancient writers, however, is a sharp distinction between moral and non-moral motivation, marked by a concern with duty. The germ of this distinction, Williams argues, comes from Plato, whose picture of the soul as a battleground between reason and desire gave rise to a tradition in which the "will" is seen as a self-directed motivator of moral action. This conception of the will, which receives its purest expression in Kant, Williams sees as metaphysically confused, and as transmitting its confusions to our practices of blame and punishment. However, this is not to say that the right response for us is simply to attempt to reinhabit the ethical outlook of the ancient Greeks: that is a fantasy which our cultural difference makes impossible. Rather, the right conclusion to draw is that we need to reconstruct our own ethical outlook, from the materials we have to hand, in a way that removes its indefensible elements. Perhaps the central mistake from which we need to free ourselves is the idea of the truly moral self as characterless – as constituted merely by an awareness of the requirements of morality and an effective will. The peculiarities of my character, on this false picture, are external to the free agency of the rational self. Under the influence of this picture, we have wrongly displaced the core ethical emotion of shame – the awareness of those aspects of *myself* that properly elicit the contempt or derision of others – in favour of guilt – the awareness of my *actions* as proper objects of anger or resentment. It is not that we should be aspiring somehow to eliminate guilt from our ethical experience. But it is shame, as the emotion of *personal* inadequacy, that provides us with the guidance we need in order to understand ourselves, our relations to our actions and the social world we inhabit, and what we can become.

Williams's use of historical reflection on the peculiarities of our modern ethical outlook to ground a critique of that outlook has strong affinities with the philosophical project of Nietzsche. As in Nietzsche, we are offered a genealogy of the central components of modern morality – "the morality system" as Williams refers to it at several points in his writings – with the aim of undermining them. And as in Nietzsche, it is the Greeks who provide the principal object of comparison. It is not as though the fact of our being able to show that our ethical conceptions are historically contingent itself casts doubt on them. To take the historical self-awareness of Nietzsche in the direction of ethical nihilism, Williams maintains, is an error that pervades the contemporary intellectual landscape – an error he attacks in his last book, *Truth and Truthfulness* (2002). However, as he points out in that book, there is a kind of genealogical explanation that is destructive – one that exposes the origins of those features of morality that purport to be self-sufficient. To criticize modern morality is not to abandon ethical commitment altogether: that is to commit the nihilistic error. Williams's claim, again like Nietzsche, is that it is the morality of duty, obligation, and the autonomous will that stands exposed by this critique. Williams's target is not specifically

Christian conceptions of morality, as it is in Nietzsche, but rather the kind of impartialism he finds common to utilitarianism and Kant. And Williams's ethical destination is a version of liberalism rather than Nietzsche's perfectionism. But what he shares with Nietzsche is the conviction that effective ethical criticism can be achieved through historical self-understanding.

In *Truth and Truthfulness* Williams's aim is to show that the search for this kind of self-understanding is not destructive of a concern for the truth – and, concomitantly, of our serious commitment to ethical ideals. In this final book he proposes that the genealogical method can be used to do this too. He claims to lay out a "vindicatory" genealogy of truth and truthfulness – one that explains our need for these ideas, and shows how they make sense.

For Williams, this is once more an *ethical* investigation. His genealogy is a genealogy of truthfulness, which he understands as a pair of associated virtues: accuracy (the endeavour to acquire true beliefs) and sincerity (the commitment to revealing what you believe in what you say). Having this pair of virtues requires valuing the truth, and doing so intrinsically rather than merely instrumentally. According to Williams, two conditions are jointly sufficient for something to have intrinsic value: "first, it is necessary (or nearly necessary) for basic human purposes and needs that human beings should treat it as an intrinsic good; and, second, they can coherently treat it as an intrinsic good." A genealogical explanation of our activity of valuing the truth, he maintains, can contribute to showing that both of these conditions are satisfied. To satisfy the first, it can point to a culturally universal need for the pooling of information. The necessity of our being able to develop relations of trust with each other is the core of the virtues of truthfulness. The cross-cultural variations around this basic core are the results of changing, culturally localized conceptions of privacy, rivalry and cooperation, which bring with them different understandings of the access to information that we can properly demand of each other. Turning to the second condition, Williams sees his genealogical account as satisfying this by showing that truthfulness "has an inner structure in terms of which it can be related to other goods."

One of the immediate legacies Williams leaves to philosophy will be to assess the success of this positive genealogical project. One kind of argument he deploys against those he calls "the deniers of truth" – those who hold that truth discourse, the activities that surround it, and the norms that govern those activities are of purely instrumental value – is that their view is ultimately incoherent. To hold that the norms constraining our beliefs are instrumentally valuable is to commit oneself to the truth of claims about the values to which those norms are purportedly instrumental. This is reminiscent of the kind of internal critique he used earlier against ethical theorists. However, this leaves open a question, to be debated by Williams's successors, about whether there is a further, distinctively genealogical argument that can vindicate claims concerning intrinsic value.

A second important question over which there has already been much debate concerns Williams's "Humean" theory of practical reason. A widespread reaction has been that the objectivity of our reasons – an objectivity which it was part of Williams's concern to uphold – carries with it a requirement that they be interpreted in a desire-independent way that is incompatible with the "Humean" theory. And if his theory of reasons is inadequate, that arguably affects the success of his attack on ethical theories.

More important is the assessment of Williams's broader philosophical project – the project of reconciling a reflective awareness of the contingent, local character of the normative questions we face with a commitment to the seriousness of those questions, and the objectivity that this seriousness requires us to attribute to them. The first part of his philosophical career was spent arguing against those

forms of ethical theorizing he saw as lacking the first kind of awareness; the latter part was spent defending the second commitment. It is too early to judge the success of Williams's own efforts to carry this through. He was grappling with what on some accounts is *the* intellectual problem of modernity: his attempts to resolve it will be of enduring interest.

Williams was an agile and sometimes elusive but always stimulating writer. The animating spirit of his work can be described as a kind of ethical realism, in the popular rather than the technical sense. He denied that the objectivity of ethics requires a commitment to metaphysical realism in relation to ethical values. However, his thought was governed by a concern to be true to our ethical experience, seeking to identify the ways in which philosophy distorts that experience, and those in which it provides clarity. In his lifetime his contributions to many other topics sparked much secondary discussion and debate. In addition to the work upon which this article has concentrated, he will be remembered for his detailed study of Descartes's epistemology, and a wide range of stimulating short papers on topics including personal identity, the relationship of luck to moral assessment, moral conflict, and the relationship of culture and biology within the explanation of human action.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Morality: An Introduction to Ethics (Cambridge, UK, 1972).
"A Critique of Utilitarianism," in *Utilitarianism: For and Against*, ed. J. J. C. Smart and Bernard Williams (Cambridge, UK, 1973), pp. 77–150.
Problems of the Self: Philosophical Papers, 1956–1972 (Cambridge, UK, 1973).
Descartes: The Project of Pure Enquiry (Harmondsworth, UK, 1978).
Moral Luck: Philosophical Papers, 1973–1980 (Cambridge, UK, 1981).
Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy (Cambridge, Mass., 1985).
Shame and Necessity (Berkeley, Cal., 1993).

Making Sense of Humanity and Other Philosophical Papers, 1982–1993 (Cambridge, UK, 1995).
Plato: The Invention of Philosophy (London, 1998).
Truth and Truthfulness: An Essay in Genealogy (Princeton, N.J., 2002).
The Sense of the Past: Collected Papers in the History of Philosophy (Cambridge, UK, 2005).

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils
Altham, J. E. J., and Ross Harrison, eds. *World, Mind and Ethics: Essays on the Ethical Philosophy of Bernard Williams* (Cambridge, UK, 1995).
Moore, A. W. "Williams on Ethics, Knowledge, and Reflection," *Philosophy* 78 (2003): 337–54.
Putnam, Hilary. "Reply to Bernard Williams' 'Philosophy As a Humanistic Discipline'," *Philosophy* 76 (2001): 605–14.

Garrett Cullity

WILLIAMS, Daniel Day (1910–73)

Daniel Day Williams was born on 12 September 1910 in Denver, Colorado, and died on 3 December 1973 in New York City. His parents were traditional Methodists; his father was a friend and biographer of William Jennings Bryan. During Williams's student years at the University of Denver (BA 1931) he grew increasingly, even painfully, dissatisfied with the faith of his youth. When he entered Chicago Theological Seminary in 1931 he was ready for an alternative, and there he encountered the "Chicago School" of theology. Under the teaching of Wilhelm Pauck, Day received an introduction to neo-orthodoxy. But the figures who were to influence him most were Henry

Nelson WIEMAN and Charles HARTSHORNE, who led him to the philosophy of Alfred North WHITEHEAD. Day earned his MA in 1933 at the University of Chicago and his BD at Chicago's Theological Seminary in 1934. In 1934 Williams entered Columbia University to study the history of philosophy, and also took a seminar with Reinhold NIEBUHR at nearby Union Theological Seminary. The subject of his 1940 PhD dissertation was the emergence of liberalism at Andover Theological Seminary during the nineteenth century, though his treatment showed the influence of neo-orthodox realism. Williams already had a rather unusual combination of concerns: an interest in liberal theology; a sympathy for neo-orthodox points of view; and a conviction about the significance of philosophy for theology, process philosophy in particular.

After brief stints as pastor of First Congregational Church in Colorado Springs, Colorado, and as instructor in religion at Colorado College, he joined the faculty of the Chicago Theological Seminary in 1939, remaining there when the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago Divinity School was created in 1943. Throughout this period, he was the most eclectic of the resident process theologians, in that he brought an empirical methodology inspired by Wieman into conversation with a wide array of theological alternatives.

In 1954 he left Chicago to work with H. Richard NIEBUHR and James Gustafson on a study of theological education. One year later he accepted a position as professor of theology at Union Theological Seminary in New York City, and held this position until his death. Dominated by Paul TILLICH and Reinhold Niebuhr, his environment was quite different from Chicago. Williams responded by advancing the process orientation with greater freedom, less explicitly in the classroom than in print. At the same time his emphasis shifted, so that he emerged as less the disciple of Wieman and more the interpreter of Whitehead. Nevertheless, his previous eclecticism was still in force;

Whiteheadian metaphysics, far from upstaging theology, accompanied and suffused a broad survey of the major theological traditions.

The trajectory of Williams's development was set during his seminary and graduate school years. During that period, the liberal Christianity that offered a safe harbor for his spiritual uncertainty was itself in a state of crisis, as confident critics confronted uncertain adherents against a backdrop of current events, which seemed to weigh in behalf of the former. Soon Williams began to articulate a response of his own, which sought to reconstruct liberalism while maintaining its essential features. Finding grounds for a new foundation in empirical theology, reminders of overlooked features of the Christian tradition in neo-orthodoxy, and a new and more fruitful philosophical superstructure in process metaphysics, his goal was to put forward a more robust and realistic theology in the American liberal tradition.

The essentials of that tradition were, in Williams's view, the twin categories of freedom and development, the chief expression of the former being freedom for theological inquiry, as opposed to the view that religious truths can be known only by faith, and the central focus of the latter being social improvement through human endeavor, in contrast to the view that hopes for a better world are naïve and utopian. These twin tenets were to be preserved, but there were other features of liberalism that needed to be critiqued and corrected. Central among these were an inadequate doctrine of sin that attributed evil to factors for which there could be no personal responsibility and a deficient doctrine of redemption in which the problem of evil was misconstrued as a problem of an unfinished creation so that a redeemer was unnecessary. There were other weaknesses as well: an understanding of God uncritically inherited from Protestant orthodoxy, and the notion of love that was too vague, subjective, and variable to be ethically useful.

The starting place for the reformulation of liberal theology was one Williams had inherited

from the Chicago empiricists, Wieman in particular, and that was human experience. According to this school of thought, knowledge and its verification can be obtained only from a critical interpretation of what is found in experience. But Williams's empiricism was distinctive, both in its willingness to go beyond common human experience to an acceptance of religious and Christian experience and in its readiness to bring this experience into an interpretative relationship with particular acts of God and the culminating givenness of God in Jesus Christ. Despite all this, Williams maintained that Christian particularities cannot be freestanding; analogies have to be found in universal human experience. In fact, he maintained that when this is not done, Christian faith fails to make good on its claim of offering an authentic message of universal, salvific significance.

In most areas of his theology Williams was a confessional theologian, materially, and a philosophical theologian, formally. The substance of his initial considerations was drawn from the classic sources, the choice of material being heavily influenced by Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, and Reinhold Niebuhr. Yet process categories could have a dramatic shaping effect, as for instance when the two natures of Christ were recast as "two histories." In maintaining that the doctrine of Christ as universal Logos implies that Christian beliefs will become more intelligible under the formative influence of philosophy, Williams found warrant within the tradition for revising the tradition.

There were two related areas, however, where Williams was a process theologian pure and simple: his doctrine of love and his doctrine of God. For the former, he took a cue from Hartshorne, who held that an analysis of love was the key for understanding the being of God. However, rather than follow Hartshorne's method, Williams proceeded empirically as Wieman did, and then followed the implications through to their metaphysical conclusions, as Whitehead did. His analysis involved discerning the structures present in the human experience of love, determining whether they are essential to that experience and, therefore, belong necessarily to being, and applying the results to the being of God. *The Spirit and the Forms of Love* (1968) showcases this approach. The product of more than fifteen years of work, it was his greatest work.

Williams was in general agreement with Whitehead's doctrine of God, though his modifications are noteworthy. On the one hand, he accepted the process philosopher's protest against the God-as-Monarch view. Williams was an articulate apologist for God-as-Fellow-Sufferer, arguing that unless God somehow participates in the world's sufferings the central biblical assertion "God is love" is unintelligible. On the other hand, he was also critical of Whitehead's failure to portray God as a fully actual, initiative-taking subject and of his unanalyzed preference for persuasion over coercion. On the latter point, Williams contended that coercion is an undeniable fact of experience; if it belongs to being, then a Whiteheadian must allow it to belong to God's being as well. These modifications had a direct bearing on Williams's reconstructed liberalism. The liberal program required that persons of good will, who desire to advance God's purposes in the world, be able to do so with well-founded confidence. Recognizing that such efforts often do not appear to meet with immediate success, Williams maintained that it is important to be able to reckon that God has some measure of prevenient and assertable influence. Williams thus argued for a God whose power was commensurate with liberalism's hopes.

Williams's interests extended beyond philosophical and theological issues. He stood out, for instance, in the care he took in examining theology's relationships to psychology and to ministry. At mid-career (1959), he was invited to deliver the Sprunt Lectures at Union Theological Seminary in Virginia. The theme suggested was the theological foundations of pastoral care. The substance of those lectures appeared as *The Minister and the Care of Souls* (1961), a work notable both as an insightful theology for pastoral ministry and as a careful

consideration of the relationship between salvation and therapy.

While Williams was a theologian in the American liberal tradition, in temperament and accomplishment he was more specifically a mediating theologian, one who adopted "both/and" as a specific methodology and as a general stance. His eclecticism straddled the divide between the empirical and ontological polarities within process thought, between the philosophical and confessional orientations in theology, and between the technical abstractions of the thinking professions and their practical applications for the helping professions. Toward the end of his life, when Williams reframed his concern with reformulating liberalism as a call for a revised Augustinianism, this did not indicate a fundamental change of course, but rather the continued broadening of the philosophical theology which he had advanced from the beginning.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Andover Liberals: A Study in American Theology (New York, 1941).

God's Grace and Man's Hope (New York, 1949).

What Present Day Theologians Are Thinking (New York, 1952).

The Minister and the Care of Souls (New York, 1961).

The Spirit and the Forms of Love (New York, 1968).

Essays in Process Theology, ed. Perry LeFevre (Chicago, 1985). Contains a bibliography of William's writings.

The Demonic and the Divine, ed. Stacy A. Evans (Minneapolis, 1990).

Other Relevant Works

Williams's papers are at the Center for Process Studies in Claremont, California.

"The Perplexity and the Opportunity of the Liberal Theology in America," *Journal of Religion* 25 (1945): 168–78.

"Truth in the Theological Perspective," *Journal of Religion* 38 (1948): 242–54.

"The Significance of St. Augustine Today," in *A Companion to the Study of St. Augustine,* ed. Roy W. Battenhouse (New York, 1955), pp. 3–14.

The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry: Reflections on the Aims of Theological Education, with H. Richard Niebuhr and James M. Gustafson (New York, 1956).

The Advancement of Theological Education, with H. Richard Niebuhr and James M. Gustafson (New York, 1957).

"Christianity and Naturalism: An Informal Statement," *Union Seminary Quarterly Register* 12 (1957): 47–53.

"Tradition and Experience in American Theology," in *Religion in American Life*, vol. 1, ed. James W. Smith and A. Leland Jamison (Princeton, N.J., 1961), pp. 443–95.

"The Vulnerable and the Invulnerable God," *Christianity and Crisis* 22 (1962): 27–30.

"Liberal Theology Reconstructed," *Christian Century* 81 (1964): 1494–6.

We Believe: an Interpretation of the United Church Statement of Faith, with Roger L. Shinn (Philadelphia, 1966).

"The New Theological Situation," *Theology Today* 24 (1968): 444–63.

"The Philosophy of Henry Nelson Wieman," in *Charles Hartshorne and Henry Nelson Wieman*, ed. William S. Minor (Carbondale, Ill., 1969).

"Pastoral Psychology, The Next Twenty Years: In Relation to Theology," *Pastoral Psychology* 21 (1970): 80–82.

"Time, Progress and the Kingdom of God," in *Process Philosophy and Christian Thought,* ed. Delwin Brown, Ralph E. James, Jr., and Gene Reeves (Indianapolis, 1971), pp. 441–3.

Ed. with H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Ministry in Historical Perspectives* (New York, 1983).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Proc of APA v47*, *Who Was Who in Amer v6*

"Festschrift in Honor of Daniel Day Williams," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 30 (Winter–Summer 1975): 69–229.

Macquarrie, John. *Thinking about God* (New York, 1975).

McWilliams, Warren. "Daniel Day Williams' Vulnerable and Invulnerable God," *Encounter* 44 (1983): 73–89.

———, *The Passion of God* (Macon, Georgia, 1985).

Miller, Randolph Crump. *The American Spirit in Theology* (Philadelphia, 1974).

Sponheim, Paul R. *Faith and Process* (Minneapolis, 1979).

William D. Eisenhower

WILLIAMS, Donald Cary (1899–1983)

Donald C. Williams was born on 28 May 1899 in Crow's Landing, California, at that time a distinctly rural district, and died in Fallbrook, also in his beloved California, and also at that time far from cities, on 16 January 1983. Throughout his long and distinguished career in philosophy he retained a down-to-earth realism and naturalism in metaphysics, and a conservative outlook on moral and political issues, characteristic of his origins. Donald was the first in his family to pursue an academic education. After studies in English literature at Occidental College (BA 1922), he went to Harvard for his MA in philosophy (1924). He then undertook further graduate study in philosophy, first at the University of California at Berkeley from 1925 to 1927, and then at Harvard, where he received his PhD in philosophy in 1928. Also in 1928 he married Katherine Pressly Adams, from Lamar, Colorado, who was something of a pioneer at Berkeley: a woman graduate student in psychology. They spent a year in Europe in 1928–9, after which Williams began his life's work as a professor of philosophy, first spending ten years at the University of California at Los Angeles from 1929 to 1939, and then at Harvard University from 1939 until his retirement in 1967.

Although Williams's published work ranges across a broad spectrum in philosophy, his importance as a philosopher rests in large measure on four major achievements: his persistence with a traditional style of philosophizing which remained unfashionable throughout most of his active years, a materialistic naturalism in metaphysics which champions a four-dimensional space-time, an original and powerful theory of the nature of natural properties, and a boldly positive justification of inductive inference.

The traditional ambition of philosophy in epistemology and metaphysics is to provide a systematic account of the extent and reliability of our knowledge, and on that basis, to provide a synoptic and well-based account of the main features of the Reality. When Williams was active, this ambition was largely repudiated as inappropriate or unattainable, and a much more modest role for philosophy was proposed. In setting forth his own position, in the preface to the collection of his selected essays (1966, p. viii), he lists some of these fashionable philosophies from the mid twentieth century: "logical positivism, logical behaviorism, operationalism, instrumentalism, the miscellaneous American linguisticisms, the English varieties of Wittgensteinism, the Existentialisms, and Zen Buddhism." Each of these, in its own way, retreats from attempting to construct a positive and systematic epistemology and metaphysics.

Undeterred, Williams sustained the traditional outlook and aspiration. He continued to insist that philosophical issues are real and large questions, having genuine answers, and that mere analysis, concentration on phenomenological description, or exploration of the vagaries of language can constitute an evasion of the philosopher's main duty. Still worse was the suggestion that philosophical questions are

mere surface expressions of a philosopher's underlying psycho-pathology; he met the claim of Morris LAZEROWITZ to that effect with a magisterial rebuke (1959).

In these generally unpropitious circumstances, Williams went his own way, and defended a realist philosophy on traditional empiricist principles. He maintained in "The Inductive Argument for Subjectivism" (1934) that while all knowledge of fact rests on perceptual experience, it is not limited to the perceptually given, but can be extended beyond that by legitimate inference. Recent times have seen a return to something much more like Williams's vision for the role of philosophy, at least among English-speaking philosophers, and his example is in part responsible for this change.

Following his own prescription for an affirmative and constructive philosophy, Williams worked steadily towards the development of his own distinctive position in metaphysics. This view is naturalistic; the natural world of space, time, and matter, with all its constituents, is a reality in its own right, independent of any knowing mind, and it is the only world. There are no divinities or supernatural powers beyond the realm of nature. His position is not only naturalistic but also materialistic: although mind is unquestionably real, mental facts are as natural and spatiotemporally located as any others. The mental is not an independent category parallel to and equal to the material, but rather a tiny, rather insignificant fragment of being, dependent upon, if not quite reducible to, the material nature of living beings. Williams's materialism is not of the rather crude kind that supposes that every reality is composed of a solid, crunchy substance, the stuff that makes up the atoms of Greek speculation. Any spatiotemporal trope, whether an "insubstantial" property, such as colors, or something as abstract as a relation, such as farther-away-than, or faster-than, so long as it takes its place as a spatio-temporal element at home in the world of physics, is accepted as part of this one great spatiotemporal world.

Williams's materialism is thus one that can accept whatever physical theory posits as the most plausible foundation for the natural sciences, provided that it specifies a world which develops according to natural law, without any teleological efficient causes.

Williams's metaphysics is four-dimensional. He insisted, against Aristotle and his followers, that statements about the future, as well as the present and the past, are timelessly true or false, and need not await the event to gain a truth value. This encourages the further view that the facts that underpin truths about the future are (timelessly) real, which would give time status as a dimension not importantly different from the three dimensions of our familiar space. This stance receives powerful support from physical theory. Williams embraced and argued for such a conception of time as a fourth dimension introduced by Minkowski's "block Universe" interpretation of Albert EINSTEIN's theory of special relativity. On this account, time is a dimension, like those of space, on which all points are equally real. A consequence of this is that the experience of the flow of time must be some sort of illusion. Williams embraced that consequence, and argued for it in a celebrated paper, "The Myth of Passage" (in 1966).

Apart from this materialistic naturalism, Williams's major contributions to philosophy, and those for which he is perhaps best known, concern the fundamental constituents of being, and the problem of induction. On the first issue, he advanced an account of the basic structure of reality that rests on a single fundamental category of abstract particulars, or "tropes." Tropes are particular cases of general characteristics. A general characteristic, or universal, such as redness or roundness, can occur in any one of indefinitely many instances. Williams's focus was on that particular instance of red which occurs as the color, for example, of a particular rose at a specific location in space and time, or that particular case of circularity presented by some particular coin in my hand on a single, particular occasion. These tropes are as particular, and as grounded in place and

time, as the more familiar objects, the particular rose and the particular coin, to which they belong.

These tropes are fundamental building blocks of the world. In his analogy, they provide "the Alphabet of Being" from which the entities belonging to more complex categories – objects, properties, relations, events – can be constructed, rather as words and sentences can be built using the letters of the alphabet. Familiar objects such as shoes and ships and lumps of sealing wax, and their parts as revealed by empirical scientific investigation, such as crystals, molecules and atoms, are concrete particulars or things. In Williams's scheme, each of these consists in a *compresent cluster* of tropes: the particular thing's particular shape, size, temperature, and consistency, its translucency, or acidity, or positive charge, and so on. All the multitude of different tropes that comprise some single complex particular do so by virtue of their sharing one and the same place, or sequence of places, in space-time. That is what "compresent" means. There is no inner substratum or individuator to hold all the tropes together. The tropes are individuals in their own right, and do not inhere in any thing-like particular. Williams's view is a No-Substance theory; a theory in which each trope is itself a simple Humean substance, capable of independent existence.

The universal properties and quantities such as acidity and velocity, which are common to many objects, are not beings in their own right, but instead are *resemblance classes* of individual tropes. The tropes of color belonging to two things that match are separate tropes, but each is a member of the class of similar color tropes which constitutes redness. Relations are treated along the same lines. If London is larger-than Edinburgh, and Dublin larger-than Belfast, we have two instances of the relation, two relational tropes. And they, along with countless other cases, all belong to the resemblance class whose members are all and only the cases of larger-than. This account denies that, literally speaking, there is any single entity,

a property, which is simultaneously fully present in two different cases of the same color, or temperature, or whatever. So it is a No-Universals view, and often described as a version of nominalism. This is understandable, but it is better to confine the term "nominalism" to the denial of the reality of properties at all. Far from denying properties, on Williams's theory the entire world consists in nothing but tropes, which are properties construed as particulars. His position is better described not as nominalist but as particularist.

This provides an elegant and economical base for an ontology. Unlike almost all others, it rests on just one basic category, which can be used in the construction not just of things and their properties and relations, but of further categories, such as events and processes. Events are changes in just which tropes are to be found in a given location, the replacement of one trope by another. Processes are sequences of such changes. Trope theory is well placed to furnish an attractive analysis of causality, as involving power tropes that govern and drive the transformations to be found in events and processes.

Williams's theory can also be of use in other areas of philosophy, for example, in value theory, where the existence of many tropes, rather than one single unitary reality, can explain our sometimes divided attitudes toward the same thing. Something can be good in some respects (tropes), but not in others. To view the manifest world as comprising, for the most part, clusters of compresent tropes makes explicit the complexity of the realities with which we are ordinarily in contact.

Williams offered a novel solution to the problem of induction: how can our unavoidable need to generalize, beyond our current evidence to comparable cases that we have not observed, be rationally justified? In *The Ground of Induction* (1947) he makes original use of results already established in probability theory, whose significance for the problem of induction he was first to appreciate. Williams treats inductive inference as a special case of the

problem of validating sampling techniques (similar to the approach of Charles PEIRCE). Among any population, any class of similar items, there will be a definite proportion having any single characteristic. This is the *complexion* of the population with regard to that characteristic. Since the vast majority of reasonably sized samples must be *representative* of their population, or closely resemble it in complexion, then inferences can be made from the complexion of a population to the complexion of most of the reasonably sized samples taken from it. Williams noticed the symmetrical inference that the population's complexion resembles the complexion of most of the samples. This is relevant to the problem of induction, because our observations of the natural world provide us with what can be regarded as samples from larger populations.

Williams thus assimilated the problem of induction to an application of the statistical syllogism. Williams's new inductive syllogism is: since 95 percent of reasonably sized samples are closely representative of their population, therefore this sample we have, provided there are no grounds to think otherwise, is probably one of them. On that basis, we are rationally entitled to infer that the population probably closely matches this sample, whose complexion is known to us. This inference is only probable, as induction cannot deliver certainty since it is still possible that our sample may be a misleading, unrepresentative one.

Williams's treatment of induction created quite a stir when it appeared, but attracted criticisms of varying power from commentators taking more defeatist attitudes. Since his theory of scientific induction was eclipsed by the Popperian strategy of replacing an epistemology of confirmation with one that focused on refutation, it exercised less influence than it deserves.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The A Priori Argument for Subjectivism," *Monist* 43 (1933): 173–202.
"The Inductive Argument for Subjectivism," *Monist* 44 (1934): 80–107.
"The Argument for Realism," *Monist* 44 (1934): 186–209.
"The Realistic Analysis of Scientific Sentences," *Erkenntnis* 7 (1938): 169–78, 375–82.
The Ground of Induction (Cambridge, Mass., 1947).
"On the Direct Probability of Inductions," *Mind* 62 (1953): 465–83.
"Form and Matter," *Philosophical Review* 67 (1958): 291–312, 499–521.
"Dispensing With Existence," *Journal of Philosophy* 59 (1962): 748–62.
"Necessary Facts," *Review of Metaphysics* 16 (1963): 601–26.
Principles of Empirical Realism: Philosophical Essays, ed. H. Ruja (Springfield, Ill., 1966). Contains a bibliography of William's publications.
"Universals and Existents," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 74 (1986): 1–14.

Other Relevant Works
Williams's papers are at Harvard University.
"Professor Carnap's Philosophy of Probability," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 13 (1952): 103–21.
"Philosophy and Psychoanalysis," in *Psychoanalysis, Scientific Method, and Philosophy; a Symposium*, ed. Sidney Hook (New York, 1959), pp. 133–56.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Bio 20thC Phils*, *Proc of APA v57*, *Who's Who in Phil*
Armstrong, D. M. *Universals, An Opinionated Introduction* (Boulder, Col., 1989).
Campbell, Keith. "The Metaphysic of Abstract Particulars," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 6 (1981): 477–88.
Campbell, Keith. *Abstract Particulars* (Oxford, 1990).
Maher, P. "The Hole in the Ground of Induction," *Australasian Journal of*

Philosophy 74 (1996): 423–32.

Stove, D. C. *The Rationality of Induction* (Oxford, 1986).

Will, Frederick L. "Donald Williams' Theory of Induction," *Philosophical Review* 57 (1948): 231–47.

Keith Campbell

WILLIAMS, Fannie Barrier (1855–1944)

Fannie Barrier was born on 12 February 1855 in Brockport, New York, and died there on 4 March 1944. As a third-generation Free Negro, her life differed dramatically from that of the typical African-American slave. She was trained in the public schools and graduated from the State Normal School at Brockport in 1870. She left her sheltered childhood home to teach the young, newly emancipated children of the South during Reconstruction. Her travels and experiences of racial prejudice under the South's Jim Crow laws changed her life sharply. For a decade she taught in the public schools in Washington, D.C. while studying first at the New England Conservatory of Music in Boston and then at the School of Fine Arts in Washington, D.C. In 1887 she married S. Laing Williams, a young lawyer in the US Pension Office, and moved to Chicago. They became leaders among the African-American elite in that city for the next thirty years.

Williams generated a theory of African-American life based on the principles of transcendentalism and pragmatism, especially those of Ralph Waldo EMERSON and Henry David Thoreau, and the Unitarian religion. She blended these ideas with that of feminist pragmatism created by female residents of Hull-House, a social settlement. Jane ADDAMS headed the latter institution and was an active model for Williams's work at a biracial social settlement, the Frederick Douglass Centre.

Williams had a dream for all Americans: the individual pursuit of happiness in one indivisible nation based on truth and justice for all. Her interracial world view encompassed both the accommodationist voice of Booker T. WASHINGTON and the militant voice of W. E. B. DU BOIS. Williams represents an often unheard voice today: one integrating blacks and whites, homemakers and intellectuals, men and women, social settlements and women's clubs. Contrary to most current scholarship, she interpreted slavery as a major factor suppressing the African influence on their descendants. She also argues that an alternative community emerged from the spirituality, courage, and vision of the African Americans who survived the brutality of whites. She is, moreover, a central, founding figure in sociology and the feminist pragmatism created by many women who lived and worked in communities and usually outside of the academy.

Williams developed and applied her ideas in women's clubs, both white and African-American, and social settlements. She generated a distinctive voice as a controversial orator, activist, and writer who analyzed the lives of African Americans, African-American women, and the nature of racism in America, especially in Chicago. Working with white colleagues like Jane Addams and Celia Parker Woolley, Williams integrated both the Chicago Women's Club and the women's session of the 1893 World's Fair and was an important speaker at the Fair. Her writings and speeches often presented a vision of race relations and American society that contrasts with many contemporary ideas on these topics. These writings were scattered in obscure newspapers and African-American journals until 2002. A significant set of her speeches and articles are now available to the contemporary reader and scholar for the first time and analyses of her life and ideas should increase. Williams is a fascinating woman whose voice remains politically and intellectually in tune with contemporary life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The New Woman of Color: The Collected Writings of Fannie Barrier Williams, ed. Mary Jo Deegan (DeKalb, Ill., 2002).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*

Mary Jo Deegan

WILLICH, Johann August Ernst von
(1810–78)

August Willich was born on 19 November 1810 in Braunsberg, East Prussia, the son of Johann G. N. W. von Willich, an army officer and civil official, and Fredericka Lisette Michalowska. Upon the death of his father when August was three years old, he and a brother went to live with Friedrich Schleiermacher, the renowned University of Berlin theology professor. He entered the cadet house at Potsdam when he was twelve years old and, at fifteen, the military academy in Berlin. By the age of eighteen he was a lieutenant in the Prussian army, stationed in Westphalia, and a captain three years later.

By the mid 1840s Willich was leading a circle of army officers in a study of Hegel and the socialism of Ludwig Feuerbach and Moses Hess. After a colleague was dismissed for his participation in the group, Willich protested in an open letter to the king for which he was court-martialed but acquitted, and ultimately permitted to resign his commission. Dropping the "von" from his name, he became a carpenter and President of the Cologne Communist Association. When the Revolution of 1848 threatened the overthrow of all European monarchies, Willich and several former army friends went to Baden to take an active role in the armed attempt to revolutionize Germany. With Friedrich Engels as his adjutant, he commanded a "Workers' Legion" composed of unemployed German laborers. Although Engels viewed him as a brave and skillful military leader, the two men disagreed on political philosophy.

In exile in London, Willich had a bitter falling out with Marx and Engels over tactics. In 1853 he immigrated to the United States where he worked briefly in the Brooklyn Navy Yard and then the US Coastal Survey, before moving to Ohio where he became editor of the *Cincinnati Republikaner* in 1858. In the pages of the *Republikaner*, Willich developed his philosophical and social views, defending Hegel as the greatest philosopher of the nineteenth century and discussing Marx's economic proofs of Hegel's dialectical philosophy of history. Willich maintained that in thought man is infinite, but in relation to body and senses he is particular, egoistic, and selfish. Human history should be viewed as the struggle of these opposites toward unity in a series of stages. The Christian dualism of spirit and matter, he argued, reinforces the unhealthy opposition of government and people, capital and labor. Willich shared Marx's labor theory of value and related ideas of exploitation and class struggle. Workers cannot receive the true value of their labor, he insisted, until they control government and industry. Workers must immediately organize in self-governing, democratic unions and connect them in representative assemblies and a sovereign national assembly. Willich also engaged in direct political action in Cincinnati, reluctantly supporting Republican candidates as preferable to slavery-condoning Democrats. During the Civil War, Willich trained four companies of workmen and ultimately rose to the rank of major general. He fought bravely in several major battles, and earned the undying respect of common soldiers, whom he frequently lectured on socialism.

Willich served as county auditor in Cincinnati for three years, until he returned to Germany in 1870 during the Franco-Prussian War to offer his services to King Wilhelm I, the same monarch he had tried to dethrone. Rejected because of his age, he attended lectures

at the University of Berlin on economics, physics, and natural law. From Germany he returned to Ohio to spend his remaining years in the canal town of St. Marys. He actively participated in the Liberal Republican movement to defeat President Grant, the Republican Party's official nominee, for reelection. He frequently addressed patriotic meetings and German-American societies, and organized a Shakespeare Club that fathered St. Marys' public library. Willich died on 22 January 1878 in St. Marys, Ohio.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Dr. Karl Marx und Seine Enthüllingen," *Belletristisches Journal und New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung* (28 October 1853): 329–30.

The Army, Standing Army or National Army? (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1866).

Other Relevant Works

The *Cincinnati Republikaner* is available in the Midwest Interlibrary Center in Chicago, and on microfilm in the Cincinnati Historical Society.

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v13*

Barnett, James. "August Willich, Soldier Extraordinary," *Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio Bulletin* 20 (1962): 60–74.

Czobel, E. "Zur Geschichte des Kommunistenbundes," *Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus* 11 (1925): 300–32.

Easton, Loyd D. *Hegel's First American Followers: The Ohio Hegelians: J. B. Stallo, Peter Kaufmann, Moncure Conway, August Willich* (Athens, Ohio, 1966).

Stewart, Charles D. "A Bachelor General," *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 17 (1933): 131–54.

James A. Good

WILSON, Edmund (1895–1972)

Edmund Wilson was born on 8 May 1895 in Red Bank, New Jersey. He graduated from Princeton University with his BA in 1916. He served as managing editor of *Vanity Fair* for a year in 1920, as associate editor and principal reviewer at the *New Republic* from 1926 to 1931, and as a reviewer for the *New Yorker* from 1944 to 1948. His first major work of criticism, *Axel's Castle*, appeared in 1931, after which time he permanently remained a figure of prominence in American literary criticism. In addition to his work in criticism, or rather, as an extension of it, Wilson also wrote widely on the politics, economics, and history of both the United States and Europe. Wilson also authored several pieces of literature himself, including three novels. Wilson died on 12 June 1972 in New York City.

Besides *Axel's Castle* (1931), Wilson's most significant works of criticism are *The Wound and the Bow: Seven Studies in Literature* (1941), an appraisal of the relationship of suffering to literature in seven figures ranging from Sophocles to Hemingway; *The Shores of Light: A Literary Chronicle of the Twenties and Thirties* (1952); and *Patriotic Gore* (1962), a study of imperialism in the literature of the American Civil War.

As a philosopher of literature, Wilson was attuned to the larger cultural and political influences that find expression in literature, and his interest was in making the connections explicit. Beginning with his first major work on literary criticism, Wilson sought in an entirely novel way to locate the foundations of the current literary movements within their proper historical contexts. The modernism of T. S. ELIOT, James Joyce, and the later W. B. Yeats had not been evaluated in this way before; for the most part Eliot's poetry had been received as obscure nonsense, Joyce's *Ulysses* as obscenity, and Yeats's poetry as Irish nationalistic verse. Wilson located this new modernism in a historical development that included most of European literature. He saw it as the latest in

a succession of actions and reactions in the development of Western literature ranging at least as far back as the classicism of Pope, Swift, Racine, and Moliére. Classicism gave way to romanticism; romanticism gave way to the new naturalism, inspired by Darwin and typified by such figures as Flaubert, Ibsen, and Zola. In France, the tendency toward naturalism was appropriated and overcome by a group of poets called the Symbolists, which included Mallarmé and Rimbaud. For Wilson, the modernism taking shape in English literature was the direct heir to the tradition of Symbolism in French poetry, a tradition that had until that time been exclusively French.

Though Wilson's historically grounded approach to the new modernism is similar in important ways to Eliot's "historical sense," such as its emphasis on French Symbolism, the critical ideals are distinct ones. While Eliot's concern is for the awareness in the poet of the literary tradition that informs the whole art form in which the poet aims to genuinely participate, Wilson's concerns, while certainly including the development of literary tradition, are more generally cultural. Wilson's discussions center on particular movements in literature, yet these movements are placed within an account of the whole cultural scene in which they grew up. For example, the classical period is analyzed in terms of a mechanistic account of the natural world as imagined by such writers as Descartes and Newton as well as a similar account of political affairs as exemplified by the American Constitution and the rule of Louis XIV. As Wilson's approach in *Axel's Castle* was to view literary currents and particular authors and works in terms of larger philosophical, scientific, and political movements, he was regarded as a writer who defied disciplinary characterization, and he directly ridiculed the disciplinary specialization of the American intellectual scene.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Axel's Castle: A Study in the Imaginative Literature of 1870 to 1930 (New York, 1931; 1984; 1996).

Travels in Two Democracies (New York, 1936).

The Triple Thinkers: Ten Essays on Literature (New York, 1938; 1948; 1963).

To the Finland Station: A Study in the Writing and Acting of History (New York, 1940; 1972; 1994).

The Boys in the Back Room: Notes on California Novelists (San Francisco, 1941; 1950).

The Wound and the Bow: Seven Studies in Literature (Boston, 1941; 1961).

The Shock of Recognition: The Development of Literature in the United States Recorded by the Men Who Made It (Garden City, N.Y., 1943).

Europe Without Baedeker: Sketches among the Ruins of Italy, Greece, and England (Garden City, N.Y., 1947).

Classics and Commercials: A Literary Chronicle of the Forties (New York, 1950).

The Shores of Light: A Literary Chronicle of the Twenties and Thirties (New York, 1952; 2nd edn 1962).

Red, Black, Blond and Olive: Studies in Four Civilizations: Zuni, Haiti, Soviet Russia, Israel (New York, 1956).

Patriotic Gore: Studies in the Literature of the American Civil War (New York, 1962; 1995).

The Bit Between My Teeth: A Literary Chronicle of 1950–1965 (New York, 1965).

A Window on Russia for the Use of Foreign Readers (New York, 1972).

Other Relevant Works

Wilson's papers are at Yale University.

I Thought of Daisy (New York, 1929; 1967).

The American Jitters: A Year of the Slump (New York, 1932; 2nd edn, North Stratford, N.H., 1980).

Memoirs of Hecate County (Garden City, N.Y., 1946).

Five Plays (New York, 1954).

The Scrolls from the Dead Sea (New York,

1955).

The American Earthquake: A Documentary of the Twenties and Thirties (Garden City, N.Y., 1958; 2nd edn 1996).

The Cold War and the Income Tax: A Protest (New York, 1963).

O Canada: An American's Notes on Canadian Culture (New York, 1965).

A Prelude: Landscapes, Characters and Conversations from the Earlier Years of My Life (New York, 1967).

The Sixties: The Last Journal, 1960–1972, ed. Lewis Dabney (New York, 1993).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Encycl Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v5*

Castronovo, David. *Edmund Wilson* (New York, 1984).

Frank, Charles. *Edmund Wilson* (New York, 1970).

Meyers, Jeffrey. *Edmund Wilson: A Biography* (Boston, 1995).

Ramsey, Richard. *Edmund Wilson: A Bibliography* (New York, 1971).

Kyle Broom

WILSON, Edwin Henry (1898–1993)

Edwin H. Wilson was born on 23 August 1898 in Woodhaven on Long Island, New York, but a few weeks after his birth, his father James S. Wilson moved his wife, Mary Grace, and their four children to Concord, Massachusetts where young Wilson grew up. The First Parish Church (Unitarian) became an important part of Wilson's life. Although his father had little use for the Church, his mother was a conservative Christian Unitarian, whose first cousin, Charles E. St. John, had served as minister of Unitarian churches in both Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, and later served as Secretary of the American Unitarian Association. Wilson attended the public schools in Concord. By the time he was seventeen, he had read Ralph Waldo EMERSON's essays on "Nature" and "Self-Reliance" confessing the latter work had become his "Declaration of Independence." In looking back on his formative years, Wilson said, "Somehow I came out of Concord feeling that I could hang my hat anywhere, whether with the President of the United States, or one of the 'unwashed and uncouth million'."

Shortly after graduation from high school, Wilson worked in Boston for a brief time, but World War I was in progress, and he joined the Army Signal Corps. At one time he was sent to flight training school, near Lawton, Oklahoma, where he learned to fly small aircraft. When the war was over, he entered the Business School of Boston University where his studies focused on business law, accounting, and merchandising. The professor who influenced him the most was Harvard University graduate Doe Scammel, who was teaching at both Harvard and Boston University. Wilson especially appreciated the courses in "Argumentation and Debate" and "Writing Through Reading." He studied business administration, was awarded a BBA degree in 1922, and remained in Boston to work in accounting.

It was during his Boston University days that Wilson attended Second Church and had contact with his aunt Martha Everett St. John. He says it was through the influence of this aunt that he decided to study for the Unitarian ministry. In January of 1923 he entered Meadville Theological School, located at the time in Meadville, Pennsylvania. At Meadville, Wilson was exposed to the conflict that was raging in the American Unitarian Association known as the humanist-theist controversy. Unitarians were debating whether or not a person could be a Unitarian and even a minister without belief in God and personal immortality. While a theological student in 1925, Wilson became a non-theistic naturalistic humanist.

He later confessed that "the transition from theism to humanism was not inwardly easy."

Wilson wrote his bachelor's thesis on "The Religion of Humanity according to Auguste Comte and Alfred Loisy" under the guidance of Charles H. Lyttle, a church historian and ardent humanist. Comte was associated with "positivism," not to be confused with logical positivism, and Loisy was excommunicated by Pius X for using the historical-critical method to interpret the Bible. Wilson received his BA degree from Meadville Theological School in 1926, and was awarded a Cruft Fellowship which allowed him to study at both the University of Paris and University of Oxford during 1926–7. In addition to attending lectures and traveling, be sought to follow up on the study of his thesis. At Meadville, he had been in correspondence with Loisy, and when he reached Paris, he had talks with him. He also made contact with leaders of the temples in Paris, Liverpool, and London who were promoting Comte's "Religion of Humanity." He gave an address in the Temple in Liverpool encouraging them in a more new humanistic direction.

After a very stimulating year abroad, Wilson returned home. While working earlier on his divinity school thesis with Lyttle, he also had begun work with A. Eustace HAYDON at the University of Chicago on an MA degree in comparative religion which he received in 1928. His thesis dealt with "The Place of Alfred Loisy in the Religious Sciences." He also was ordained to the Unitarian ministry the same year, and became minister of the Unitarian Church in Dayton, Ohio where he remained until 1932. He published an article in 1930, entitled "Positivism and Humanism," where he said, "Christianity arose in a pre-scientific age and had met the needs of the people of that time. But today we live in a scientific age and the old religion can no longer meet our needs." The problem was: how do we integrate the new world view of science with the religious needs of people today? Both the positivism of Comte and the new humanism have attempted to address this problem. Wilson thought the modernists had confused "the Religion of Humanity" with "the new humanism," and as an advocate of the latter, he sought to distinguish the two.

The major difference was that Comte attempted to found a cult without theology or metaphysics, but then went on to imitate the Roman Catholic hierarchical system of authority. As such, Comte created a central ecclesiastical authority, a systematic and relatively static body of doctrine, and a uniform method of worship. Its results tended to produce minds that were subservient to authority and to the past. Wilson saw "the new humanism" as being quite different. Unlike "the Religion of Humanity" it was not based on the works of a single founder. Its world view was naturalistic, organic, and emergent. It followed evolutionary theory, seeing humans as earth children, "born in the same stardust and fired with the same life force that move the every living thing." Wilson viewed positivism as a system which was fixed and rigid, whereas the new humanism viewed all things as relative and in flux. It also was democratic, and its unity was in free people. Its ideal was seeking "the abundant life" in this world.

Wilson became minister of the Third Unitarian Church in Chicago, serving from 1932 to 1941. During his tenure, he preached religious humanism to his congregation and promoted it within the denomination. In 1933 some members of the Humanist Fellowship in Chicago, mostly a student group, asked Roy Wood SELLARS of the philosophy department at the University of Michigan to draft "A Humanist Manifesto" which he did and passed the draft on to Curtis W. REESE, Edward Wilson, and others. As a committee, they revised and edited the document for publication in *The New Humanist* in 1933. It immediately caused controversy within the American Unitarian Association, and among religious groups beyond the Unitarians.

In 1938 Wilson published an article "The Humanist Controversy Is History" in *The New*

Humanist. Wilson noted the humanists had placed the focus of religion on ethics rather than theological beliefs. If it were agreed that ethics was primary, the denomination should be tolerant of those with various theological beliefs, whether theist, Christian, or non-theist. Although Unitarianism had prided itself on having a tolerant non-creedal religion, many on the theist side thought there should be some minimal statement about belief in God. Wilson discussed the protagonists on both sides of the controversy, and traced the controversy from about 1920 until 1938. Of course, he sided with the humanists, but thought after two decades of conflict the denomination had reached an accord in its belief of a non-creedal church. With such an accord, humanists and theists could now work and worship together addressing those important issues which confront the nation and the world. This freedom which had been enjoyed by the laymen in the pew was now extended to ministers in the pulpit. It meant one had the freedom to be an outright non-theistic humanist and be a minister of a Unitarian church.

A few months later, Wilson followed up this essay with another entitled "Humanism, Theism, and Denominational Unity." Once again, he attempted a rapprochement between humanists and theists. He concluded his analysis with the comment, "When both theist and humanist realize that the important thing is not words but things and events that they focus on in the moments of religious experience and conduct, then the battle of words will cease." Years later the Chicago church honored Wilson by creating a scholarship fund for training humanist students for the ministry.

Wilson was minister of All Souls Church in Schenectady, New York from 1941 to 1946. In 1941 he was involved in the creation of the American Humanist Association, and it immediately resumed publication of *The New Humanist* under the title *The Humanist*, of which he was founding editor. The "New" was dropped to distinguish the humanism of the American Humanist Association from the literary humanism of Irving BABBITT and Paul Elmer MORE, which was also known as "the new humanism." While at All Souls, Wilson was awarded an honorary DD degree by Meadville Theological School, now located in Chicago. In 1946 he became minister of the Unitarian Church in Salt Lake City, where he remained until 1949. By the end of his tenure, the American Humanist Association had grown, and Wilson was selected to be its Executive Director with headquarters established in Yellow Springs, Ohio at the Humanist House, near the campus of Antioch College. In 1952 he participated at a humanist conference in Amsterdam, at which the International Humanist and Ethical Union was created. Its purpose was to relate more than thirty humanist organizations around the world and to promote the advance of humanism on a global scale. In his position as Executive Director of the AHA, Wilson was involved in nearly every development in American humanism until his retirement in 1963.

Following his official retirement, Wilson was minister of the small Unitarian Church of Greater Lafayette, Maryland from 1963 to 1967 while retaining his residency in Yellow Springs. When he retired as Executive Secretary, there had developed two factions within the movement: one group being known as "secular humanists" and the other "religious humanists." Under the leadership of Wilson, along with sixteen Unitarian ministers who had signed the original "Manifesto" and others, the Fellowship of Religious Humanists was created in 1963. Wilson thought the adjective "religious" was important for it indicated a quality of life involving meditation, pursuit of ideals, commitment, and exploring the meaning and importance of "peak experiences." The first annual meeting of the Fellowship was held in Chicago in 1963, at the time of the General Assembly of the Unitarian Universalist Association, a practice which has been followed since. In 1967 Wilson resigned from the West Lafayette Church to become Administrative Secretary

and editor of the quarterly *Religious Humanism* which recently had been created by the Fellowship of Religious Humanists. When the American Humanist Association moved its headquarters from Yellow Springs to California, the Fellowship also purchased Humanist House and made it their headquarters. At the time of the creation of the Fellowship, Wilson said, FRH "shall supplement the work of ABA and UUA and not duplicate the activities of either group."

In 1970 Wilson retired a second time and moved to Cocoa Beach, Florida, where he was actively involved in the small Unitarian Fellowship. He co-authored the "Humanist Manifesto II" with Paul Kurtz in 1973. In 1978 the Unitarian Universalist Association honored him with its "Distinguished Service Award," and the following year the American Humanist Association honored him with its "Humanist of the Year Award." These awards represented the dual interests in his life, for he had devoted his efforts to promoting both institutions. In November 1988 he moved to Salt Lake City, Utah to live near a son and his family; he died there on 26 March 1993.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Humanist Manifesto," *The New Humanist* 6 (May–June 1933): 1–5.

"Humanist Manifesto II," with Paul Kurtz, *The Humanist* 23 (September–October 1973): 4–9.

"The Origins of Modern Humanism," *The Humanist* 51 (January–February 1991): 9–11.

Genesis of a Humanist Manifesto, ed. Teresa Maciocha (Amherst, N.Y., 1995).

Other Relevant Works

Ed., *Freedom of Choice: A Symposium* (Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1970).

"Celebrating Edwin H. Wilson," *Religious Humanism* 27 (Summer 1993). Special issue contains four articles by Wilson.

Further Reading

Lamont, Corliss. *The Philosophy of Humanism*, 5th edn (New York, 1965).

Lyttle, Charles H. *Freedom Moves West: A History of the Western Unitarian Conference: 1852–1952* (Boston, 1952).

Olds, Mason. *American Religious Humanism* (Minneapolis, 1996).

Schultz, William F. *Making the Manifesto: The Birth of Religious Humanism* (Boston, 2002).

Wesley Mason Olds

WILSON, Margaret Dauler (1939–98)

Margaret Dauler Wilson was born in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania on 29 January 1939, and she died in Princeton, New Jersey on 27 August 1998. She received her BA in 1960 from Vassar College, and her PhD from Harvard University in 1965. She taught at Columbia University as an assistant professor of philosophy from 1965 to 1967, and the Rockefeller Institute (now University) from 1967 to 1970. In 1970 she became the first woman faculty member in the philosophy department at Princeton University. In 1998 she was named Stuart Professor of Philosophy, but died later that year.

Wilson was active in many professional organizations. She was President of the Leibniz Society of North America from 1985 to 1990. She was also President of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Society in 1994–5. Her professional honors include a Guggenheim Fellowship in 1977–8, an ACLS Fellowship in 1982–3, and a Centennial Medal from the Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences in 1989. She was also elected a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1992.

Wilson is known primarily for her work in early modern philosophy, having published

numerous articles on the epistemology, metaphysics, perception and mind–body problem of virtually all major seventeenth and eighteenth-century philosophers. A collection of thirty-one of her papers in this area appears in *Ideas and Mechanism: Essays on Early Modern Philosophy* (1999). Her book *Descartes* (1978) is one of the classic interpretive works on Descartes's *Meditations*, and remains an important introduction to his philosophy. She also developed an interest in issues involved in ascribing consciousness to animals, as shown in her APA presidential address on "Animal Ideas." This topic also reflected her strong theoretical and practical interest in the ethical treatment of animals and environmental concerns.

Limited space prohibits a detailed analysis of Wilson's work on even a single topic. A typical example is "Can I Be the Cause of My Idea of the World (Descartes on the Infinite and Indefinite)" (1986). Here she considers an important question concerning Descartes's argument for the existence of God in the Third Meditation (basically, that his finite nature is insufficient to account for his idea of such an infinite being). What about his idea of *res extensa*, taken as the entire material world, indefinite in extension? Wilson carefully considers numerous passages from Descartes's published works and letters, and comes to the plausible conclusion that, though this is not explicitly included in his "mental inventory" of ideas, such "indefinite" conceptions also require a source outside of his own power to generate ideas. That is, as opposed to the *particular* material bodies considered in the argument for the existence of God, the idea of such indefinite extension (or, for that matter, the number series) would also prove the existence of "*something* outside of, and greater than, himself" (p. 354).

Wilson's articles on Descartes, Leibniz, Spinoza, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, and Kant have been published in more than a dozen influential anthologies, and in leading philosophical journals such as *Journal of Philosophy, Noûs,* *Review of Metaphysics*, *Philosophical Review*, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, and *Journal of the History of Philosophy* from 1967 through 2002. It would be difficult to do basic research on any major early modern thinker without taking her work into account. She left a legacy that will be influencing and informing students of seventeenth and eighteenth-century philosophy for some time to come.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Ed., *The Essential Descartes* (New York, 1969).
Descartes (Boston, 1978).
Ideas and Mechanism: Essays on Early Modern Philosophy (Princeton, N.J., 1999).

Other Relevant Works
"Kant and 'The Dogmatic Idealism of Berkeley'," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 9 (1971): 459–75.
"Superadded Properties: The Limits of Mechanism in Locke," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 16 (1979): 143–50.
"Can I Be the Cause of My Idea of the World (Descartes on the Infinite and Indefinite)," in *Essays on Descartes' Meditations*, ed. Amélie Rorty (Berkeley, Cal., 1986).
"Berkeley on the Mind-Dependence of Colors," *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 68 (1987): 249–64.
"Descartes on the Origin of Sensation," *Philosophical Topics* 19 (1991): 293–323.
"Animal Ideas," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 69 (November 1995): 7–25.
"Spinoza's Theory of Knowledge," in *The Cambridge Companion to Spinoza*, ed. Don Garrett (Cambridge, UK, 1996), pp. 89–141.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v10, Proc of APA v72, Who Was Who in Amer v13
Bobro, M. "Is Leibniz's Theory of Personal

Identity Coherent?" *Leibniz-Review* 9 (1999): 117–29.

Frierson, P. "Wilson's *Ideas and Mechanism*," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 38 (2000): 125–6.

Doren A. Recker

WILSON, William Dexter (1816–1900)

Born on 28 February 1816 in Stoddard, New Hampshire, young William Dexter Wilson received the modest educational training available in the western part of the state. Early on he displayed a remarkable aptitude for mathematics and, after graduating from a secondary school in nearby Walpole, he was appointed as assistant teacher in that subject. But he had determined to become a clergyman and studied at Harvard Divinity School from 1835 to 1838, whereupon he was ordained as a Unitarian minister. He served in various churches of that denomination for four years, but he became increasingly convinced of Trinitarian Christological principles, and as a result he entered the Protestant Episcopal Church in 1842.

While serving from 1842 to 1850 as a priest in Sherburne, New York, Wilson's probing mind continued to investigate many philosophical and theological categories pertinent to different cultural and chronological settings. He enjoyed a facility for languages, being able to consult original sources in French, German, Italian, Latin, Greek, Arabic, and Syrian. By virtue of his philological and historical studies Wilson gained a reputation for solid learning and an ability to explain complex matters with logical or even mathematical precision. A small private class of Episcopal ministerial candidates had gathered around him, and this justified his move to Geneva, New York in 1850 in order to become professor of moral and intellectual philosophy at Geneva College (renamed Hobart College in 1852).

Growing fame as educator, public lecturer, and author led to another academic appointment in 1868, when Wilson became professor of mental and moral philosophy at the newly founded Cornell University, where he was the only member of his department for most of his tenure there. This setting proved most conducive to literary productivity. As early ideas matured to fruition and as new questions stimulated additional responses Wilson became quite well known to the reading public for writings in disparate areas. With momentum begun in his early years he published books on positive and negative terms in mathematics, differentials and methods of finding them, and elementary methods of instruction in mathematics. In what some would consider a related field, he produced an elementary treatise on logic and a study of practical and theoretical logic. Regarding epistemological questions he wrote large tomes on theories of knowledge, the influence of language on thought, and the psychology of thought and action. He felt drawn to reconcile some traditional spiritual categories with aspects of modern science, as evidenced by his books on psychology and metaphysics. He was not original in such undertakings, remaining within the Scottish Realism approach to understanding the world, but he applied that perspective widely and effectively, especially in a much-reprinted volume on first principles in political economy.

A great deal of Wilson's writing revolved around questions of the Christian Church, especially the Anglican or Episcopal denomination, and its authenticity in modern times. He produced dozens of sermons and books that sought to prove the harmony of gospel records, the scriptural and philosophical foundations of religious belief, a reliable manual of Christian tenets, the heritage of canon law derived from ancient times, and the legitimacy of an Episcopal polity in his chosen denomination. With equal precision and clear argumentation for proof texts he also argued against claims

about papal supremacy, finding them faulty in light of scriptural warrant.

After retiring from Cornell in 1886, Wilson's frequent, sustained efforts on the part of the Episcopal Church led to an appointment that same year as Dean of St. Andrew's Divinity School in Syracuse, New York. There he continued to write on a number of varying topics until his death on 30 July 1900 in Syracuse, New York.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Church Identified by a Reference to the History of Its Origin, Perpetuation, and Extention into the United States (Utica, N.Y., 1848).

A History of the Reformation in England, Designed to Illustrate the Doctrinal Character and the Ecclesiastical Position of the English Church (Baltimore, Md., 1850).

Lectures on the Psychology of Thought and Action, Comparative and Human (Ithaca, N.Y., 1871).

An Introduction to the Study of Metaphysics and the History of Philosophy with Special Reference to Modern Theories of Theism and Atheism (Ithaca, N.Y., 1872).

First Principles of Political Economy with Reference to Statesmanship and the Progress of Civilization (Ithaca, N.Y., 1875).

The Foundation of Religious Belief; the Methods of Natural Theology Vindicated against Modern Objections (New York, 1883).

Theories of Knowledge Historically Considered with Special Reference to Skepticism and Belief (Syracuse, N.Y., 1889).

Further Reading

Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v12*

Henry Warner Bowden

WINCH, Peter Guy (1926–97)

Peter Winch was born on 14 January 1926 in London, England. He received his MA in 1949 and B.Phil. in 1951 from the University of Oxford. Winch was a lecturer in philosophy at the University of Wales Swansea from 1951 to 1964. He was a reader in philosophy (1964–7) and professor of philosophy (1967–84) at the University of London. Winch then came to the United States in 1985 to become professor of philosophy at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Winch was President of the Central Division of the American Philosophical Association in 1995–6. He died on 27 April 1997 in Champaign, Illinois.

Winch's philosophical reputation is mostly due to his monograph *The Idea of a Social Science* (1958). This is perhaps the most influential of the "little red books" published by followers of Wittgenstein, which briefly dominated the English-speaking philosophical world in the late 1950s and early 1960s. However, unlike others, Winch's book was read widely outside academic philosophy.

Winch's aim in this book was to follow R. G. Collingwood's aim, in his classic work *The Idea of History* (1995), of attempting to understand human behavior "from the inside," as the actions of agents with ideas, and no longer as actions merely related to each other "externally" like billiard balls. Winch urged that any philosophy or social science which ignored the internal dimension of human action was not succeeding in understanding human action – action with an inevitably social dimension – at all. However, while Collingwood saw the study of history as by and large a successful effort to understand, Winch excoriated the social sciences for treating human beings as if they were physical objects or some other matter fit for scientific treatment. Winch famously claimed that most of sociology was in truth not any kind of science, but a disguised form of philosophy. His book might easily have been entitled, "The Very Idea of a Social Science."

Most social scientists were stung or outraged by Winch's claims. A minority thought that Winch made a fair critique of much of their discipline(s), and praised Winch's hermeneutical sensibility. A smaller minority still, of "Wittgensteinian" and ethnomethodological sociologists, have tried to establish a new form of "social studies" which explicitly follows the non-scientistic path that Winch outlines.

Winch's most famous paper, "Understanding a Primitive Society" (1964), is a treatment of anthropology laid out upon broadly similar lines to the treatment of other social sciences offered in *The Idea of a Social Science*. Winch argued that the best way to avoid misunderstanding a primitive society – or any other society which seemed quite different from our own – was to try to understand it as a language-game that was being played, rather than to approach it through our own pre-established standards of judgement. This proposal was strikingly similar to Thomas KUHN's idea, propounded at the same time and also under Wittgenstein's influence, of understanding an "alien" science – such as Aristotle's physics – not as a failed attempt to grasp at what we know, but as its own language-game with its own methods and standards. Winch further held that approaching the society in question in such a genuinely open-minded spirit was likely to have the fortunate side-effect of increasing one's understanding of one's own society. The alien society could function as a genuine object of comparison from which one could learn, by contrast and possibly later by imitation, and not just dismiss.

In 1990 Winch produced a new preface for *The Idea of a Social Science*, which tries to prevent widespread misunderstandings of the earlier work, and to make clear the parallelism between it and the work of Wittgenstein's great student, Rush Rhees (a colleague of Winch's at Swansea). In his last years, Winch became increasingly impressed and critically engaged with the new interpretation of Wittgenstein associated with Stanley CAVELL, Cora DIAMOND, and James Conant. Winch's article

"Persuasion" (1992) gives an interpretation of Wittgenstein that parallels closely Rhees's own views.

Winch made important contributions to ethics, to the understanding of the Holocaust, to the philosophy of literature, to Wittgenstein scholarship, and to translating some of Wittgenstein's work. He would probably be disappointed to be remembered primarily as "a radical philosopher of social science," as his work is far richer than that label would suggest.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"Social Science," *British Journal of Sociology* 7 (1956): 18–33.
The Idea of a Social Science and Its Relation to Philosophy (London, 1958).
"Understanding a Primitive Society," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 1 (1964): 307–24.
Ethics and Action (London, 1972).
Trying to Make Sense (Oxford, 1987).

Other Relevant Works
Winch's papers are at the University of Wales Swansea, UK.
Ed., *Studies in the Philosophy of Wittgenstein* (London, 1969).
Ed. with D. Z. Phillips, *Wittgenstein, Attention to Particulars: Essays in Honour of Rush Rhees* (New York, 1989).
"Persuasion," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 17 (1992): 123–37.
"The Expression of Belief," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 70 (November 1996): 7–23.

Further Reading
Oxford Comp Phil, Pres Addr of APA v10, Proc of APA v71
Borg, R., and Cioffi, F. *Understanding and Explanation in the Behavioral Sciences* (Cambridge, UK, 1970).
Gaita, Raimond, ed. *Value and Understanding: Essays for Peter Winch* (London and New York, 1990).
Hollis, M., and S. Lukes. *Rationality and*

Relativism (Oxford, 1974).

Lerner, Berel Dov. *Rules, Magic and Instrumental Reason: A Critical Interpretation of Peter Winch's Philosophy of the Social Sciences* (London and New York, 2002).

Lyas, Colin. *Peter Winch* (London, 1999).

Rupert Read

WISE, Isaac Mayer (1819–1900)

Isaac M. Wise was born on 29 March 1819 in Steingrub, Bohemia (now Kammeny Dvur, Czech Republic). Young Isaac's ambition to become a rabbi was frustrated by childhood poverty. After his father's early death, Wise received Hebrew instruction from his grandfather. Despite continuing financial hardships he managed to study at several rabbinical schools in Prague, Jenikau, and Vienna. While in Prague he also attended a gymnasium and took classes at the university there. He served as rabbi from 1843 to 1845 in the Bohemian town of Radnitz, but difficulties with local political conservatives made him desire the freedom to be found in the United States.

Arriving in this country in 1846, Wise became rabbi of Beth-El Congregation in Albany, New York, where he served until 1850. Possessed of great energy and self-confidence, his daily activities were fired by a broad vision of Judaism that was based on rational philosophical principles and grounded in democratic participation. Conservatives in synagogue governance and anti-rational, mystic ceremonialists opposed these efforts, but Wise pushed ahead with attempts to introduce such changes as a pipe organ, co-education, mixed seating in pews as well as in choirs, and a school to Americanize recently arrived immigrants. Resistance to his initiatives increased, so he resigned and formed Anshe Emeth Congregation in the same city where the more open-minded of his former charges transferred to enjoy his liberating influence for another four years.

In 1854 Wise moved to Cincinnati, Ohio, where he served as rabbi of B'nai Jesurun Congregation for the rest of his life. In Cincinnati, he publicized many features of what came to be known as Reform Judaism in America. He believed that Judaism was compatible with the openness and pragmatism of American society. He wanted to change perceptions of his faith as an alien sect, "naturalizing" it into one that corresponded to democratic principles in American culture. To disseminate these liberal ideas he established in 1854 a weekly newspaper, *The Israelite* (later renamed *American Israelite*), where he published English translations of hymns, psalms, and prayers plus hundreds of editorials that extolled the virtues of progressive ideas. In the same year he also began publishing *Die Deborah*, printed in German, as another outlet for his fervent convictions about modernizing Jewish ideas and practices.

Wise was the epitome of energetic zeal and organizational talent, characteristics necessary for stimulating a movement and perpetuating its success. He saw the need for instilling a modernized Judaism in members of the next generation, training them in principles of American democratic pragmatism rather than relying on outdated precedents from Old World settings. In 1875 his efforts saw the creation of Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati. He was its first President and served for twenty-five years. In 1883 he conferred the title of rabbi on four young graduates, the first such ordination in American history.

Immigrants from different parts of Europe brought liturgical variations as well as ethnic idiosyncrasies with them, and their proliferation appalled Wise's penchant for organization. As early as 1848 he called for a union of American synagogues that could regulate rabbinical training and set common standards for worship and moral behavior. He sought throughout the

1850s to create a centrist platform for both Reform and Orthodox persuasions, but these efforts never came to fruition because of polarized theological views and personality clashes that were often sparked by Wise's forceful leadership tactics. Still, his dream was partially realized in 1873 when the Union of American Hebrew Congregations was formed to advise, not compel, constituent congregations. In 1889 Wise was instrumental in establishing the Central Conference of American Rabbis, another coordinating facility over which he presided through the remaining decade of his life.

In Wise's vision of Judaism, the freedom available in Reform categories went beyond institutional peculiarities and ethnic mores to embrace universals. These were, he urged, congruent with the spirit of modern times, ideals that nurtured brotherhood, democracy, and rational behavior. But many who deplored such departures accused Wise of abandoning the essentials of Jewish heritage, especially when he endorsed the controversial Pittsburgh Platform of 1885. In response, Wise insisted that he viewed his faith from a more expansive perspective, one not confined to any period, place, or class of people, a flexible faith freed from rigid patterns of thought and behavior, no matter how venerable those traditions might be. He hoped to perpetuate inherited ideals while also welcoming beneficial changes that invigorated contemporary religious life. For these and many other vigorous ideas, Wise was regarded as the most prominent Jew of his generation in the United States. This "Moses of America" died on 26 March 1900 in Cincinnati, Ohio.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

History of the Israelitish Nation from Abraham to the Present Time (Albany N.Y., 1854).

The Essence of Judaism: For Teachers and Pupils, and for Self-instruction (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1861).

The Origin of Christianity and a Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1868).

The Martyrdom of Jesus of Nazareth: A Historico-Critical Treatise on the Last Chapters of the Gospel (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1874).

The Cosmic God (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1876).

History of the Hebrews' Second Commonwealth (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1880).

Judaism and Christianity: Their Agreements and Disagreements (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1883).

A Defense of Judaism versus Proselyting Christianity (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1889).

Pronaos to Holy Writ (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1891).

Selected Writings of Isaac Mayer Wise, edited by David Philipson and Louis Grossman (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1900).

Other Relevant Works

Wise's papers are at Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Reminiscences, trans. and ed. David Philipson (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1901).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Encyc Relig*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v10*

Franklin, Leo M. *The Rabbi, the Man and his Message* (New York, 1938).

Heller, James G. *Isaac M. Wise: His Life, Work and Thought* (New York, 1965). Contains a bibliography of Wise's writings.

Knox, Israel. *Rabbi in America: The Story of Isaac M. Wise* (Boston, 1957).

Sturzenberger, Doris C. *The Papers of Isaac Mayer Wise: A Guide to the Microfilm Edition* (New York, 1981).

Temkin, Sefton D. *Creating American Reform Judaism: The Life and Times of Isaac Mayer Wise* (Portland, Oregon, 1998).

Henry Warner Bowden

WITTKOWER, Rudolf (1901–71)

Rudolf Wittkower was born on 22 June 1901 in Berlin, Germany. He studied architecture for a year there, before moving to Heidelberg, where he eventually settled on art history as his chosen field. Wittkower earned his PhD in art history in 1923 from the University of Berlin. He decided to work with Heinrich Wölfflin in Munich, but when this did not work out he returned to Berlin, writing a thesis on the Veronese painter Domenico Morone. In 1923 he was appointed as a research assistant at the Bibliotecha Hertziana in Rome, where he wrote scholarly entries and articles, and embarked on a monumental catalogue of Bernini's drawings, which was published in 1931. Here began a lifelong interest in Bernini and the baroque in general.

Wittkower's own approach to art history was to shun grand theory and psychology, preferring fine-grained scholarship and contextualism. It was appropriate therefore that when he moved with his family to England in 1933 – benefiting from his father's British birth – he found a home in the relocated Warburg Institute. There he edited the house journal from 1937 to 1956, and during the war collaborated with Fritz Saxl on an exhibit illustrating European influence on British art, which was published as a book in 1948. His interest in Palladio continued with *Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism* (1949), which helped institute a renewal of studies in Renaissance architecture. In true Warburg fashion it sought to place architecture within a specific context, that of mathematical and musical theories of proportion. It remains his most original, and controversial, publication.

In 1949 Wittkower was appointed During Lawrence Professor at the University of London (one of just three chairs of art history at the time). His potential as a teacher was realized however only with his move to the United States in 1954. In 1954 and 1955 he was a visiting professor of art history at Harvard University, and in 1955–6 he was visiting pro-fessor at Columbia University. In 1956 he became professor of art history and chair of the department of fine arts and archaeology at Columbia. Through his energy and example he transformed the department into one of the best in the world, all the while continuing to teach, publish, and organize exhibitions. Although he published more than twenty books and over a hundred articles, *Art and Architecture in Italy* (1958) is one of the most famous; it sought to break down rigid period divisions of early, middle, and high Baroque. One of his other well-known works, *Born Under Saturn* (1963), was written with his wife. He was a fellow of the British Academy, among many other honors. Wittkower was a "massive, energetic, and benevolent man" (1989, p. 24). Wittkower was named the Avalon Foundation Professor in the Humanities at Columbia in 1968, and in 1969 he retired. Wittkower died on 11 October 1971 in New York City.

Wittkower's *Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism* is his most philosophical work. It argues against an aesthetic or formalist view of church architecture and in favor of the significance of numerical and religious symbolism (though some would now criticize its neglect of occult and cabalistic sources). Methodologically, Wittkower was thoroughly Warburgian, advocating the priority of context and reception history. His scholarship remains of value, even while the discipline has since turned more to institutional and social history. Many would still agree with Wittkower's citing of Turner at the end of *Born Under Saturn*: "Art is a rum business." (1963, p. 294)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism (London, 1949; 3rd edn 1962).

Gian Lorenzo Bernini, the Sculptor of the Roman Baroque (London, 1955; 3rd edn 1981).

Art and Architecture in Italy 1600–1750 (The Pelican History of Art) (Harmondsworth, UK, 1958; 2nd edn 1965; 6th edn, New Haven, Conn., 1999).

*Born under Saturn: the Character and
Conduct of Artists: A Documented History
from Antiquity to the French Revolution*,
with Margot Wittkower (London, 1963;
New York, 1969).

Further Reading
*Amer Nat Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio,
Who Was Who in Amer v5*
Reynolds, Donald. *The Writings of Rudolf
Wittkower: A Bibliography* (Rome, 1989).

Martin Donougho

WOLFSON, Harry Austryn (1887–1974)

Harry Wolfson was born on 2 November
1887 in Ostrin, Lithuania. He received a tra-
ditional Jewish education in Talmudic studies
in such centers of Jewish learning as Grodno,
Bialystok, Kovno, Vilna, and Slobodka. He
rebelled against the traditionalism of his
parents and Talmudic teachers to attend the
Slobodka Yeshiva – an outpost of the Musar
movement begun by Israel Salanter, where he
learned a technique for studying, analyzing,
and questioning texts that he never abandoned.
In 1903 Wolfson emigrated to the United
States and, while continuing Talmudic studies
at the Rabbi Isaac Elhanan Yeshiva, eventually
attained an American elementary and sec-
ondary education. He entered Harvard
University in 1908 thanks to winning the Price-
Greenleaf Scholarship. Wolfson received a BA
(1911), MA (1912), and PhD in philosophy
(1915) from Harvard. He began teaching at
Harvard as an instructor of Jewish literature
and history in 1915. In 1925 Wolfson became
the first Littauer Professor of Hebrew
Literature and Jewish Philosophy at Harvard,
and held that position until his retirement in
1958. As a pioneer in the study of Jewish phi-
losophy, he was widely honored and received
numerous honorary degrees, and became a
fellow of the American Academy of Arts and
Sciences. He died on 17 September 1974 in
Cambridge, Massachusetts.

On the eve of receiving his MA in 1912,
Harry Wolfson decided that a "man should
have a middle name" and adapted the name of
his hometown, using a Hellenized form of
"Austryn." That combination of the old and
the new characterized his work. His study on
Spinoza – whom he called "the last of the
ancients and the first of the moderns" – sets the
tone of his investigation of Jewish philosophy.
Wolfson used the technique he learned in
Slobodka to reconstruct Spinoza's sources and
to show the creative way he transformed those
sources so they would address a modern con-
sciousness. He continued that type of recon-
struction to show that the philosophies of Philo
of Alexandria, the medieval Jewish philoso-
phies of Saadia Gaon, Judah Halevi, Moses
Maimonides, and Hasdai Crescas have
intimate correspondences with thinkers of the
Islamic Kalam and with the philosophies of the
Christian Church Fathers. He often argued
that medieval philosophy is "one philosophy
written in three languages" and that no
inherent differences separate the problems and
solutions offered by Jews writing in Hebrew,
Muslims writing in Arabic, or Christians
writing in Latin.

Wolfson's early essay on "Maimonides and
Halevi" (1912) attempted to find a type of
medieval Jewish pragmatism comparable to
the American philosophical pragmatism he has
found in Harvard. Several of his contributions
to the *Menorah Journal* from 1915 to 1925
show him grappling with current issues such as
Zionism and Jewish adaptation to the modern
world. By the end of 1925, however, he had
concluded that scholarship should remain
aloof from the issues of the day. Ideas should
be uncontaminated by external reality. His
decision not to visit the State of Israel because
the actuality there would disturb the ideal he
had in his mind reflects this contention.

Wolfson's thought contributed to ongoing

debates about the meaning of Jewish philosophy in several ways. First, while many scholars contend that philosophy was an alien element in Judaism, an unnatural admixture of "Athens" to "Jerusalem," Wolfson disagreed. He argued that all scriptural religions naturally face the challenges to their views of the divine, of revelation, and of human nature found in "religious philosophy." Religious philosophy in Judaism, therefore, is an essential outgrowth of biblical religion. Secondly, he argued for a substantive notion of divinity. Wolfson objected to existentialists and demythologizers who would reduce the "Philonic God of Revelation" to some sort of humanistic value. He contrasted the "Professed atheist" with the "Verbal atheist" – the latter pretends to a belief in God but then added, "it depends on what you mean by God." As a historian of Jewish philosophy, Wolfson refused to accept the latter's cavalier attitude toward philosophical definitions of the divine.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Maimonides and Halevi: A Study in Typical Attitudes towards Greek Philosophy in the Middles Ages," *Jewish Quarterly Review* n.s. 2 (1912): 297–339.

"Escaping Judaism," *Menorah Journal* 7 (June 1921): 71–83; 7 (August 1921): 155–68.

The Philosophy of Spinoza: Unfolding the Latent Processes of His Reasoning, 2 vols (Cambridge, Mass., 1934).

Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, 2 vols (Cambridge, Mass., 1947).

The Philosophy of the Church Fathers: Faith, Trinity, Incarnation (Cambridge, Mass., 1956).

Religious Philosophy: A Group of Essays (Cambridge, Mass, 1961).

The Philosophy of the Kalam (Cambridge, Mass., 1977).

Repercussions of the Kalam in Jewish Philosophy (Cambridge, Mass., 1979).

Other Relevant Works

Wolfson's papers are at Harvard University.

Studies in the History of Philosophy and Religion, 2 vols, ed. Isadore Twersky and George H. Williams (Cambridge, Mass., 1973, 1977).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Proc of APA v48*, *Who Was Who in Amer v6*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Feuer, Lewis S. "Recollections of Harry Austryn Wolfson," *American Jewish Archives* 28 (April 1976): 25–50.

Lieberman, Saul, ed. *Harry Austryn Wolfson Jubilee Volume: On the Occasion of His Seventy-fifth Birthday*, 2 vols (Jerusalem, 1965). Contains a bibliography of Wolfson's writings.

Schwarz, Leo W. *Wolfson of Harvard: Portrait of a Scholar* (Philadelphia, 1978).

Twersky, Isadore. "Harry Austryn Wolfson (1887–1974)," *American Jewish Yearbook* 76 (1976): 99–111.

S. Daniel Breslauer

WOLIN, Sheldon Sanford (1922–)

Sheldon S. Wolin was born on 4 August 1922 in Chicago, Illinois. He served in the US Air Force during World War II. He received his BA from Oberlin College in 1946, and did graduate study at Harvard University, earning an MA in 1947 and a PhD in political science in 1950. He was an assistant professor of political science at Oberlin from 1950 to 1954. He then went to the University of California at Berkeley as an instructor of political science, where he was promoted up to full professor by 1961. He became a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1966. In 1971 he became professor of political science at Princeton University, and although

he retired from full-time teaching in 1987, has continued to lecture vigorously and publish as emeritus professor at Princeton, and remains at the forefront of political theory.

Wolin's first book, *Politics and Vision: Continuity and Innovation in Western Political Thought* (1960), is widely credited with helping to reinvigorate interest in political theory for Anglo-American political science. By defining politics as a social activity of deliberation about the good of the entire society, he drew attention to public debate about matters that deserves to be called political and also to the absence of public debate about other important matters that has somehow been removed from politics. He pointed to a wide variety of enterprises that are in private hands yet have enormous public consequences and remain unscrutinized by politics. Central figures in the Western political tradition, and even the US Constitution itself, have encouraged the harmful stance that activities classified as private should be exempt from public and governmental scrutiny and intervention. Alongside this development of emaciated political life, Wolin accused political science of becoming devoted to the scientific study of behavior, policy, and administration, instead of investigating how the political life can be nurtured and incorporated into civic life. *Politics and Vision* was one of the most influential books in political theory during the second half of the twentieth century, and still helps to shape debates over participatory democracy.

Wolin's books on Hobbes (1970) and Tocqueville (2001) are major contributions to our understanding of the development of political life and thought in Britain and America. His collection of essays titled *The Presence of the Past: Essays on the State and the Constitution* (1989) further explores the key question of political theory: how can citizens become engaged and effective democratic participants, where such participation requires the capacity of taking responsibility for the common good and society as a whole? He at times appears to despair for this vision of politics, fully recognizing the overwhelming powers of technological and techno-cratic forces now in control. He often expresses a preference for the small-scale politics of local community life, and highlights rather than solves the problem of how to foster a sense of community for an entire nation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Politics and Vision: Continuity and Innovation in Western Political Thought (Boston, 1960; 2nd edn, Princeton, N.J., 2004).

The Berkeley Rebellion and Beyond: Essays on Politics and Education in the Technological Society (New York, 1970).

Hobbes and the Epic Tradition of Political Theory (Los Angeles, 1970).

The Presence of the Past: Essays on the State and the Constitution (Baltimore, Md., 1989).

Tocqueville between Two Worlds: The Making of a Political and Theoretical Life (Princeton, N.J., 2001).

Other Relevant Works

"Essays on the Scientific Study of Politics: A Critique," with John H. Schaar, *American Political Science Review* 57 (1963): 125–50.

"Paradigms and Political Theories," in *Politics and Experience: Essays Presented to Michael Oakeshott*, ed. Preston King and B. C. Parekh (Cambridge, UK, 1968), pp. 125–52.

"Political Theory as a Vocation," *American Political Science Review* 63 (1969): 1062–82.

"The Liberal/Democratic Divide. On Rawl's Political Liberalism," *Political Theory* 24 (1996): 97–119.

Further Reading

Botwinick, Aryeh, and William E. Connolly, eds. *Democracy and Vision: The Vicissitudes of the Political, Essays in Honor of Sheldon S. Wolin* (Princeton, N.J., 2001).

John R. Shook

WOLLHEIM, Richard Arthur (1923–2003)

Richard Wollheim was born on 5 May 1923 in London, England. After serving in the British Army from 1942 to 1945, he attended Balliol College, Oxford, where he first read history and then philosophy, politics, and economics, receiving both his BA and MA in 1949. Wollheim was appointed assistant lecturer at University College London in 1949 and later elected Grote Professor of Philosophy of Mind and Logic in 1963. He was also head of the philosophy department from 1963 to 1982. In 1982 he came to the United States to become a professor of philosophy at Columbia University. In 1985 he was appointed Mills Professor of Philosophy at the University of California at Berkeley, the position he held until his death, and served as chair of the department from 1998 to 2002. During the period from 1989 to 1995 he was also professor of philosophy and humanities at the University of California at Davis. He was made a fellow of the British Academy in 1972, and a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Science in 1986. Wollheim died on 4 November 2003 in London, England.

Among Wollheim's distinguished addresses and lectures are the 1982 William James Lectures, published as *The Thread of Life* (1984), the 1984 Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts, published under the title *Painting as an Art* (1987), and the 1991 Ernst Cassirer Lectures, which appeared in print as *On the Emotions* (1999). Notable early writings include *F. H. Bradley* (1959), a sympathetic reading of a figure then known mainly through caricatures by Bertrand Russell and G. E. Moore; *Socialism and Culture* (1961); and "A Paradox in the Theory of Democracy" (1962).

Art and Its Objects (1968) established Wollheim's reputation in the philosophy of art and remains a fixture of the aesthetics curriculum. It introduces views on the ontology of art, representation, expression, interpretation, the aesthetic attitude, and the value of art, many of which were further developed in later writings. "Criticism as Retrieval," published as a supplement to the second edition of *Art and Its Objects* (1980), vigorously defends the thesis that art interpretation is the reconstruction of the process of artistic creation viewed as a contextualized, intentional act. Another supplementary essay, "Seeing-as, Seeing-in, and Pictorial Representation," gives Wollheim's influential theory of pictorial representation as involving seeing-in, a species of seeing characterized by simultaneous awareness of features of a picture surface and of a scene it depicts. The assumption that the content of a picture is determined by the content of certain experiences of it has been endorsed by many philosophers.

Wollheim was a student of Freudian psychoanalytic theory, especially as interpreted by Melanie Klein and as applied to art criticism by Adrian Stokes. Wollheim's *Sigmund Freud* (1971) lays out Freud's life and thought with analytic clarity. Wollheim's subsequent writings are the offspring of rigorous philosophical theorizing wedded to a psychoanalytic view of human nature. The hybrid is explicit in his accounts of the moral emotions (guilt and shame) and of the expression of emotion in art as a response to anxiety taking advantage of a mechanism of projection. It is implicit in *Painting as an Art*, which offers close, psychoanalytic readings of the paintings of Ingres, Manet, Picasso, Poussin, and Titian. Wollheim was exceptional among philosophers of art for his insights about individual works of art and he is admired for the philosophically grounded art criticism he contributed to several periodicals, especially *Modern Painters*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

F. H. Bradley (Harmondsworth, UK, 1959).
Socialism and Culture (London, 1961).
Art and Its Objects: An Introduction to Aesthetics (New York, 1968; 2nd edn, Cambridge, UK, 1980).
Sigmund Freud (New York, 1971; 2nd edn, Cambridge, UK, 1991).
On Art and the Mind (Cambridge, Mass.,

1974).

The Thread of Life (Cambridge, Mass., 1984).

Painting as an Art (Princeton, N.J., 1987).

The Mind and Its Depths (Cambridge, UK, 1993).

On the Emotions (New Haven, Conn., 1999).

Other Relevant Works

"A Paradox in the Theory of Democracy," in *Philosophy, Politics and Society*, ed. Peter Laslett and W. G. Runciman (Oxford, 1962), pp. 71–87.

On Drawing an Object: An Inaugural Lecture (London, 1965).

"Are the Criteria of Identity that Hold for a Work of Art in the Different Arts Aesthetically Relevant?" *Ratio* 20 (June 1978): 29–48.

"Pictorial Style: Two Views," in *The Concept of Style*, ed. Berel Lang (Philadelphia, 1979), pp. 129–45.

Ed. with James Hopkins, *Philosophical Essays on Freud* (Cambridge, UK, 1982).

"Pictorial Representation," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 56 (1998): 217–26.

"Style in Painting," in *The Question of Style in Philosophy and the Arts*, ed. Caroline van Eck, James McAllister, and Renée van de Wall (Cambridge, UK, 1995).

Further Reading

Oxford Comp Phil

Dickie, George. "Wollheim's Dilemma," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 38 (1998): 127–35.

Goodman, Nelson. "Comments on Wollheim's Paper," *Ratio* 20 (June 1978): 49–51.

Hopkins, James, and Anthony Savile, eds. *Psychoanalysis, Mind and Art: Perspectives on Richard Wollheim* (Oxford, 1992). Contains a bibliography of Wollheim's writings.

Levinson, Jerrold. "Wollheim on Pictorial Representation," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 56 (1998): 227–33.

Podro, Michael. "On Richard Wollheim," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 44 (2004): 213–25.

van Gerwen, Robert, ed. *Richard Wollheim on the Art of Painting: Art as Representation and Expression* (Cambridge, UK, 2001).

Dominic M. Lopes

WOLTERSTORFF, Nicholas Paul (1932–)

Nicholas P. Wolterstorff was born on 21 January 1932 in the small farming village of Bigelow, Minnesota. In 1949 Wolterstorff entered Calvin College, where he studied with Henry Stob and Harry Jellema and received a BA in philosophy in 1953. Wolterstorff continued his studies in philosophy at Harvard University where he earned his MA in 1954 and his PhD in philosophy in 1956, writing his dissertation with Donald C. WILLIAMS on Alfred North WHITEHEAD. Although he has engaged issues of ontology for the duration of his career, Wolterstorff never returned to his early interests in Whitehead.

After teaching briefly at Yale as an instructor of philosophy from 1957 to 1959, Wolterstorff returned to Calvin College in Michigan, where he taught as professor of philosophy for thirty years from 1959 to 1989. At Calvin, Wolterstorff reconnected with his undergraduate friend, Alvin PLANTINGA, and they led a revolution in philosophy of religion that changed the face of analytic philosophy in the twentieth century. From 1986 to 1990, Plantinga held an appointment as professor of philosophy at the Free University of Amsterdam. In 1989 Wolterstorff succeeded Paul L. HOLMER as the Noah Porter Professor of Philosophical Theology at Yale University

Divinity School, and also held joint appointments in the philosophy and religion departments. Wolterstorff retired in 2002.

Wolterstorff has received numerous honorary degrees and fellowships, including Fulbright, National Endowment for the Humanities, and Institute for the Advancement of Christian Scholarship fellowships. Wolterstorff was President of the American Philosophical Association Central Division in 1991–2, and President of the Society of Christian Philosophers during 1992–5. In 1994–5 Wolterstorff gave the Gifford Lectures at St. Andrews University in Scotland.

Self-described as an irresponsible polymath, Wolterstorff has made important contributions to a wide array of fields within philosophy, including ontology, philosophy of religion, epistemology, political philosophy, history of philosophy, philosophy of language, hermeneutics, aesthetics, and philosophy of education. He is also one of the few thinkers within the broadly analytic tradition to engage extensively the thought of a wide range of continental philosophers such as Jacques Derrida and Paul RICOEUR, and theologians such as Hans FREI, Karl Barth, and Abraham Kuyper. Although the breadth of Wolterstorff's interests has been wide, he has defended throughout his career what he calls the "overlooked option" of "anti-foundationalist realism" (1996, p. xii). This position affirms robust realism concerning mind, world, values, and God, while denying strong epistemological foundationalism with respect to epistemic merits such as knowledge and entitlement.

Much of Wolterstorff's earliest work is in ontology. In 1970 he published *On Universals*, a defense of realism about universals according to which universals are kinds capable of being multiply or repeatedly instantiated. Among the enduring contributions this book has made to the debate concerning universals is its attack on "trope nominalism." Wolterstorff argues against the trope nominalist that universals are not sets of resembling tropes or property-instances because sets have their members essentially, and if sets have their members essentially, then it is metaphysically impossible that any set have fewer members than it does. Universals, however, do not have their instances essentially; if they did, then it would be metaphysically impossible that there be, for example, one more courageous thing than there is, a strongly counterintuitive result.

Wolterstorff applies this realist framework to aesthetics in two books published in 1980, *Works and Worlds of Art* and *Art in Action*. In the former, Wolterstorff argues that works of art that are capable of multiple performances or impressions are best thought of as kinds of a special sort, namely, "norm kinds." He contends, furthermore, that we should think of artistic representation as "world projection," the activity in which artists project worlds of various sorts by way of painting portraits, writing books, and so on. Finally, Wolterstorff claims that some of these worlds are "fictively projected" (1980, p. 239) and include fictional characters such as Macbeth and the Wife of Bath, who are themselves kinds rather than nonexistent persons. In *Works and Worlds of Art*, Wolterstorff defends what he calls a "functional approach to art" (1980, p. x) according to which works of art are instruments and objects of a variety of types of action, not simply objects of contemplation. While this functional approach to art is developed within a broadly Reformed Christian world view, Wolterstorff emphasizes issues that Reformed thinkers have given little attention such as the liturgical role of art.

In *Reason within the Bounds of Religion* (1976), "Can Belief in God Be Rational if it has No Foundations?" (1983), and in his unpublished Gifford Lectures of 1995, Wolterstorff defends a position now known as Reformed epistemology. By Wolterstorff's own admission, Reformed epistemology is a polemical position; its primary aim is to respond to the evidentialist challenge that religious belief is irrational, improperly formed or defective if not based on propositional evidence.

Wolterstorff's early writings, joined by Plantinga's work and some of the writings of William ALSTON, argues that the evidentialist challenge is based on an overly strong and problematic version of epistemological foundationalism, one he and Plantinga dubbed "classical foundationalism." In later writings – those informed by his work on Locke – Wolterstorff contends that classical foundationalism is motivated by commitment to the doxastic ideal, the position that an agent's epistemically entitled or virtuous beliefs are those that are either: (1) immediately evoked by acquaintance with facts that correspond to the content of those beliefs, or (2) logically implied or probabilistically supported by beliefs whose content corresponds to facts with which the agent is acquainted. This picture of ideally formed belief has been enormously influential in the history of Western philosophy, but Wolterstorff maintains it is no more plausible for that; it is a picture that deserves to be rejected. In the wake of its rejection, the task of epistemologists is to formulate alternative accounts of the epistemic merits attaching to beliefs and other propositional attitudes.

Wolterstorff has developed an alternative epistemology involving the concept of entitlement or permissible belief and the criteria for its application. This work is partly included in his 1995 book, *Divine Discourse*, based on his 1993 Wilde Lectures at the University of Oxford. *Divine Discourse* offers an account of the theistic claim that God speaks. Drawing upon work in contemporary speech-act theory, Wolterstorff develops the thesis that much of God's discourse is best understood as God's performing illocutionary acts such as asserting and commanding by way of the speech acts performed by human beings (such as acts in which humans assert sentences). In particular, Wolterstorff argues that the Bible may be understood as divinely appropriated discourse. By this Wolterstorff means that the Bible contains a record of speech acts performed by human beings that are appropriated by God and by which God promises deliverance to

human beings, asserts God's rule over creation, commands humans to love one another, and so forth. Wolterstorff further suggests that the New Testament Gospels belong to a genre of narrative recently adopted by writers such as Gore Vidal and Simon Schama in which an author gives a historical portrait of a character that is designed to reveal that character's identity and circumstances of life, but in so doing goes beyond a simple historical chronicle of that character.

In the introduction to his 1996 book, *John Locke and the Ethics of Belief*, Wolterstorff notes that his and Plantinga's attack on evidentialism left him uneasy. If classical foundationalism is so implausible, why had it exercised such a great influence in the history of philosophy? And why were students reluctant to abandon it? To answer these questions and to fill out the program he and Plantinga had begun, Wolterstorff turned to the history of philosophy. The resulting books, *John Locke and the Ethics of Belief* and *Thomas Reid and the Story of Epistemology* (2001), represent Wolterstorff's effort to advance a different narrative of modern philosophy. The narrative is one in which Reid's views rather than Kant's emerge as the most promising alternative to classical foundationalism.

John Locke and the Ethics of Belief develops the thesis that Locke's epistemology is a response to the post-Reformation fracturing of religious and philosophical tradition. Wolterstorff further contends that, if anyone deserves the title "father of modern philosophy," it is not Descartes, but Locke. Only Locke, claims Wolterstorff, fully rejects the medieval project of developing a *scientia* of nature or substance and defends the claim that the doxastic ideal is one to which every person ought to aspire, at least with respect to religious and moral belief. While Locke may have been the first to champion the universal application of the doxastic ideal, Wolterstorff argues in *Thomas Reid and the Story of Epistemology* that Reid deserves credit for being first to reject the ideal wholesale. Reid's

project is to defend the hitherto neglected option of robust realism about mind, world, value, and God, combined with moderate foundationalism – a project, Wolterstorff contends, Reid executes with great skill.

Wolterstorff's work in the history of philosophy has also shaped his more recent work in political philosophy. Beginning with work in the philosophy of education in the 1960s and 70s and continuing with *Until Justice and Peace Embrace* (1983) and *Religion in the Public Square* (1997), Wolterstorff has raised the question of "how Christians should insert themselves into the modern social order" (1983, p. 4). His answer is twofold. First, Christians should primarily be concerned to struggle for justice, where justice is understood in terms of the biblical conception of shalom. Shalom, says Wolterstorff, is human flourishing, that state in which persons dwell in harmony with God, others, nature, and themselves. Justice is that state of a society in which everyone, widows and orphans included, have ample opportunity to enjoy the goods constitutive of shalom.

Second, Christians should not accept what some call the liberal theorist's "public justification thesis." This thesis, defended in various forms by thinkers such as John RAWLS, says that respecting one's fellow citizens requires supporting coercive laws only if one is able to defend them with reasons those fellow citizens can accept. The reasons one offers must be accessible to other reasonable agents, or to those who are adequately informed or fully rational. Since religious reasons do not satisfy these criteria, they should not be used (or used exclusively) in public discourse of certain kinds. Contending that this thesis also has roots in Locke, Wolterstorff argues that it should be rejected; Christians may appropriately appeal, and in some cases may appeal only, to religious reasons when engaging in public political discourse. To require otherwise is to demand what is in many cases not only psychologically impossible, but also unhelpful.

According to Wolterstorff, there is no independent, common source – whether "reason," "public reason," or the like – that yields principles of sufficient richness to guide our public political life. Whether we are religious or not, our only choice with regard to public political discourse is to articulate, in a manner respectful of our fellow citizens, those reasons that seem best to us from the perspective of our own particular narrative identities. Wolterstorff explores further these themes of justice and the location of the Christian in the space of society and politics in his Stone Lectures on "Dual Citizenship, Dual Nationality" given at Princeton in 1998, and in an unpublished book manuscript, *Justice: Human and Divine*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
On Universals: An Essay in Ontology (Chicago, 1970).
Reason within the Bounds of Religion (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1976; 2nd edn 1984).
Works and Worlds of Art (Oxford, 1980).
Art in Action: Toward a Christian Aesthetic (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1980).
Until Justice and Peace Embrace (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1983).
Divine Discourse: Philosophical Reflections on the Claim that God Speaks (Cambridge, UK, 1995).
John Locke and the Ethics of Belief (Cambridge, UK, 1996).
Religion in the Public Square: The Place of Religious Convictions in Political Debate, with Robert Audi (Lanham, Md., 1997).
Thomas Reid and the Story of Epistemology (Cambridge, UK, 2001).
Educating for Life, ed. G. Stronks and C. Joldersma (Grand Rapids, Mich., 2002).
Educating for Shalom: Essays on Christian Higher Education, ed. G. Stronks and C. Joldersma (Grand Rapids, Mich., 2004).

Other Relevant Works
"Are Properties Meanings?" *Journal of*

Philosophy 57 (1960): 277–80.

"Objections to Predicative Relations," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 7 (1970): 238–45.

"Can Ontology Do Without Events?" *Grazer Philosophische Studien* 7–8 (1979): 177–201.

"Can Belief in God Be Rational if it has No Foundations?" in *Faith and Rationality*, ed. Alvin Plantinga and Nicholas Wolterstorff (Notre Dame, Ind., 1983), pp. 135–86.

Lament for a Son (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1987).

"The Grace that Shaped My Life," in *Philosophers Who Believe*, ed. K. J. Clark (Downers Grove, Ill., 1993), pp. 259–75.

What New Haven and Grand Rapids Have to Say to Each Other (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1993).

"Obligations of Belief – Two Concepts," in *The Philosophy of Roderick M. Chisholm*, ed. Lewis E. Hahn (Chicago, 1997).

"Is It Possible and Desirable for Theologians to Recover from Kant?" *Modern Theology* 14 (1998): 1–18.

"Epistemology of Religion," in *The Blackwell Guide to Epistemology*, ed. J. Greco (Malden, Mass., 1999), pp. 303–24.

"An Engagement with Rorty," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 31 (2003): 129–39.

"Art and the Aesthetic: The Religious Dimension," in *The Blackwell Guide to Aesthetics*, ed. P. Kivy (Malden, Mass., 2004), pp. 325–39.

Further Reading
Pres Addr of APA v10
Allaire, Edwin B. "Wolterstorff and Bradley on Ontology," *Journal of Philosophy* 70 (1973): 727–33.

Levine, Michael. "God Speak," *Religious Studies* 34 (1998): 1–16.

McLeod, Mark. *Rationality and Theistic Belief: An Essay on Reformed Epistemology* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1993).

Meynell, Hugo. "Faith, Foundationalism, and Nicholas Wolterstorff," in *Rational Faith: Catholic Responses to Reformed Epistemology*, ed. Linda Zagzebski (Notre Dame, Ind., 1993).

Sloane, Andrew. *On Being a Christian in the Academy: Nicholas Wolterstorff and the Practice of Christian Scholarship* (Waynesboro, Georgia, 2003).

"Symposium on *Divine Discourse*," *Religious Studies* 37 (2001): 249–306.

Terence Cuneo

WOODBEY, George Washington (1854–c.1915)

Born a slave on 5 October 1854 in Johnson County, Tennessee, George Woodbey learned to read and write after the emancipation of 1865. Little is known of his childhood. What we do know is that he was a self-educated person except for two terms in a common school and that his life was one of "hard work and hard study carried on together" (1983, p. 6). He was ordained a Baptist minister in Emporia, Kansas in 1874 and at that time was active in the Republican Party of Missouri. By 1896, however, he had moved to Kansas and switched parties, running for lieutenant governor and for Congress on the Prohibition ticket in that state.

In 1902 Woodbey became the minister of Mount Zion Baptist Church in San Diego, California. He was a delegate to the Socialist Party conventions of 1904 and 1908, as the only African American represented there; he was a nominee in 1908 for running-mate to Eugene DEBS, but received only one vote. Woodbey continued to publish and lecture widely in the early 1910s. His biographer, Philip Foner, reports that Woodbey was known to be still alive in early 1915, but cannot find

any evidence of his existence, or of his death, thereafter. The possibility remains that local vigilantes or police, who had assaulted him for years, achieved their ultimate objective in 1915.

Woodbey was a fearless social activist, who defied countless arrests and harassment by the police in order to spread his message of social equality and complete emancipation of not only the former chattel slaves but also of the new slaves of capitalism. The ideal of complete emancipation from slave labor led him to embrace the socialist movement, and the writings of Debs and Edward BELLAMY were a source of inspiration.

Woodbey's reputation as a philosopher rests mainly on his fiery forty-four-paged booklet, *What to Do and How to Do It; or, Socialism vs. Capitalism*. The attraction of the booklet itself lies in the simplicity of the language and the appeal to the person in the street. Beginning with the dedication, Woodbey addresses the issue of slavery and identifies capitalism as responsible for chattel slavery and its modern-day form: "This little book is dedicated to that class of citizens who desire to know what the Socialists want to do and how they propose to do it. By one who was once a chattel slave freed by the proclamation of Lincoln and wishes to be free from the slavery of capitalism." (1983, p. 40)

Woodbey chose a very appealing style that faintly reminds one of Plato's portrayal of Socrates' ideas in dialogue. In *What to Do and How to Do It*, the author and his mother enter into a dialogue, and he patiently explains to the inquisitive mother socialist issues that bothered her as a black person, a Christian, and a woman. Socialism, Woodbey contends, has a place for every person, unlike capitalism which excludes the exploited class. As Leonard Harris explains, for Woodbey, the imperatives of Christianity and democratic socialism are coterminous. "Unlike the persons only concerned with civil rights, Woodbey is interested in issues of ownership and control as rights themselves." (Harris 2000, p. 70) In Woodbey's booklet, the mother raises concern about the place of women in a socialist order. The author explains to the mother that it is women who suffer most under capitalism. The socialist platform demands "the absolute equality of the sexes before the law, and the repeal of the law that in any way discriminates against women" (1983, p. 80). In the end, the mother is convinced and is converted to socialism. "Well, you have convinced me that I am about as much a slave now as I was in the South, and I am ready to accept any way out of this drudgery." (p. 86)

Woodbey published other booklets: *The Bible and Socialism: A Conversation between Two Preachers* and *The Distribution of Wealth*. These booklets, published in San Diego by the author, further developed the issues raised in *What to Do and How to Do It; or, Socialism vs. Capitalism*. While Woodbey may have staked the glories of socialism too high in his belief of its total triumph over capitalism in America, he did achieve the goal of raising people's consciousness to the injustices of his time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

What to Do and How to Do It; or, Socialism vs. Capitalism (San Diego, 1890).

The Bible and Socialism: A Conversation between Two Preachers (Los Angeles, 1904).

The Distribution of Wealth (San Diego, 1910).

Black Socialist Preacher: The Teachings of Reverend Washington Woodbey and his Disciple, Reverend G. W. Slater, Jr., ed. Philip S. Foner (San Francisco, 1983).

Further Reading

Foner, Philip S. *American Socialism and Black Americans: From the Age of Jackson to World War II* (Westport, Conn., 1977).

Harris, Leonard, ed. *Philosophy Born of Struggle: Anthology of Afro-American Philosophy* (Dubuque, Iowa, 2000).

"Woodbey, George Washington," in *Who's*

Who of the Colored Race, ed. Frank
Mather (Chicago, 1915), pp. 290–91.

Chielozona Eze

WOODBRIDGE, Frederick James Eugene
(1867–1940)

Frederick J. E. Woodbridge was born on 26
March 1867 in Windsor, Ontario, Canada.
His father, an attorney originally from England,
was a significant early intellectual influence,
grounding Woodbridge's thinking in the British
common-sense realist tradition. In 1869 the
family moved to Kalamazoo, Michigan, where
Woodbridge grew up and went to school. He
attended Amherst College and studied philos-
ophy and religion under Charles Edward
GARMAN. Upon graduating from Amherst with
his BA in 1889, Woodbridge enrolled at Union
Theological Seminary to continue his studies. In
1892 he left Union on a traveling fellowship
and went to Germany for graduate studies on
philosophy at the University of Berlin. There,
exposure to Hermann Ebbinghaus's lectures
on the history of philosophy and the opportu-
nity for detailed study of Friedrich
Trendelenburg's work on Aristotle greatly
influenced Woodbridge's views. This historical
scholarship supplied the basis for his mature
philosophical realism and naturalism.

In 1894 Woodbridge returned to the United
States and began a teaching position as a pro-
fessor of philosophy at the University of
Minnesota. In 1902 Woodbridge accepted a
position at Columbia University as the first
Johnsonian Professor of Philosophy. He served
as President of the Western Philosophical
Association in 1903–1904 and as President of
the American Philosophical Association (now
the Eastern Division) in 1911–12. In 1904
Woodbridge and colleague J. McKeen CATTELL
founded *The Journal of Philosophy,*
Psychology, and Scientific Methods, known
since 1921 simply as *The Journal of
Philosophy*. In 1906 Wendell T. BUSH joined
Woodbridge as co-editor. Woodbridge taught
philosophy at Columbia until 1912, when he
became the university's Dean of the Faculties of
Political Science, Philosophy, and Pure Science.
In this position, Woodbridge was instrumental
in molding Columbia into a genuine, world-
class university. He retired as Dean in 1929 in
order to return to teaching, returning also to the
University of Berlin in 1931–2 as the Visiting
Roosevelt Professor of American History and
Institutions. He retired from teaching in 1937,
but he continued to edit *The Journal of
Philosophy* until his death. Woodbridge died
on 1 June 1940 in New York City.

Woodbridge was an important figure in the
transition to philosophical realism and natu-
ralism in the United States from the neo-
Kantian and idealist philosophies that were
dominant there in the late nineteenth and early
twentieth centuries. A classical realist,
Woodbridge characterized his philosophical
position as a synthesis of Aristotle's naturalism
and Spinoza's emphasis on structure, tempered
by Locke's empiricism. He was particularly
concerned with the relationship between struc-
ture and activity, his own view being that the
former determines what is possible, while the
latter determines what is actual. He later found
in George SANTAYANA's writings a powerful
and stimulating statement of the sort of
Aristotelian naturalism he avowed, and he
credited Santayana's works with reorganizing
and solidifying his views. Woodbridge played
a significant role in the revival of Aristotelian
trends of thought in the United States, and in
the development of the classic American natu-
ralistic interpretation of Aristotle.

Woodbridge also had an important impact
on John DEWEY, after the latter's arrival at
Columbia in 1905. Their interaction and
exposure to the naturalistic metaphysics
Woodbridge promoted helped Dewey recog-
nize the possibility of a type of metaphysics
that purported to be neither speculative nor

transcendental and thus could provide a valuable grounding for his naturalistic epistemology and psychology. While Woodbridge authored several books and numerous articles, it was through his tremendous influence as a teacher that he had his greatest effect. His teaching shaped the views of many philosophers from the next generation of naturalists, including Morris COHEN, John H. RANDALL, Jr., Ernest NAGEL, and Sterling P. LAMPRECHT. Their writings and teachings helped spread the fundamental principles of the realism and naturalism Woodbridge championed throughout the American philosophical community.

Woodbridge's philosophical perspective was highly historical, as evidenced by his own characterization of it in historical terms, and he emphasized the history of philosophy in his teaching. In this way, and through encouraging historical interests in his students, he was a leader in establishing the history of philosophy as a major philosophical discipline in twentieth-century America. It is interesting, however, that despite his naturalistic emphasis on scientific inquiry, Woodbridge was disinclined in his own historical works (for example, 1929, 1965) to provide precise, scientific analysis intended to explain just how philosophers of the past and their contemporaries understood various ideas and ways of living in their own time. He preferred to focus on the current significance of the ideas and modes of life they presented, often looking to past philosophers more as models of how to do philosophy than as sources of ideas. More scientific historians sometimes criticized his work for lack of scholarly exactness, but for Woodbridge, these criticisms misunderstood the purpose of his appeals to the history of philosophy. His interest was more thematic than scientific; for him the relevant issue was explaining how and why these historical figures have something important to say to us in our own time. He offered his forays into the history of philosophy not so much as contributions to knowledge of how things were and were thought about in the past, but rather as presentations of resources that might provide insight for and aid in our own struggles with matters of contemporary and perhaps perennial concern.

In an era of epistemologists, Woodbridge was an unabashed metaphysician. However, on his understanding, metaphysics was descriptive and empirical. Following Aristotle, Woodbridge saw metaphysics as a form of scientific inquiry, differing from the special sciences only in virtue of subject matter, not in virtue of method. Whereas the special sciences each focus on a limited subject area and thus on only a particular type or portion of existence, metaphysics applies the scientific method to investigate "existence *as* existence" or existence in general. This is not to be understood as an investigation of reality (what Woodbridge called "Nature") *as a whole*, but rather as inquiry into reality's most general features. Woodbridge's understanding of the scientific method was connected to his realism. He saw scientific inquiry as involving a methodological realism, an approach Woodbridge called "realism in principle" in contrast with the sort of "realism of selection" characteristic of eliminativist or reductionist views. His realism was a commitment to the primacy of an inquiry's subject matter; he grounded scientific inquiry on a principled naïveté that insulated its subject matter from skeptical questioning or denial. Thus insulated, the subject matter (rather than prior theoretical assumptions) should lead the inquiry, determining both the methods used and distinctions drawn in the investigation, and the meaning and adequacy of the inquirer's interpretation.

On Woodbridge's view, the scientific inquirer must always bear in mind the "realistic distinction," that is, the distinction between his interpretation and the extra-linguistic focus of his inquiry. Preconceptions and distinctions made during inquiry should not displace the authority of the subject matter (as happens in reductive analyses); when they do, realistic-scientific inquiry ceases. Woodbridge's commitments to the realistic distinction and the primacy of the subject matter led him to

emphasize the contextual nature of scientific inquiry. As essentially an investigation of empirically accessible activities (activity determining what is), inquiry must always take into account the conditioning environment or structural context of its subject matter. Because the methods and interpretations appropriate to the subject matter and context of one special science might not be suitable for the subject matter of another science and its context of inquiry, Woodbridge saw appreciation of the contextual nature of scientific analysis as essential for realism. This was, on his view, especially important in metaphysics since this sort of analysis involved the most general context of inquiry, namely, that applying to any subject matter whatsoever.

As a scientific investigation into the ontological categories that apply to any and every subject matter, realistic metaphysics, according to Woodbridge, would acknowledge as ultimate the categories of individuality, structure, natural teleology, dynamism, activity, potentiality, and contingency. A failure to respect the contextual nature of inquiry through the misapplication of methods and distinctions developed in a more limited context to reality in general would inevitably overlook some of these categories. For example, emphasis on the notions of mechanism and causation (as in "genetic" analyses) typically leads inquirers to reject natural teleology (Woodbridge's influential understanding of which did not imply design or the productivity of ends). But this rejection would not only disregard the presence of the inquirer as a conditioning factor in every context of inquiry, it would also ignore the ways that efficient factors help or hinder the outcomes of all processes in nature. In this way, the result of overlooking inquiry's contextual nature could only be, on Woodbridge's view, a distorted and unrealistic metaphysics that missed some of nature's richness and variety. This general point was precisely his criticism both of modern philosophy and of pragmatism. On his view, loss of context in the former had led it to transform

acceptable philosophical distinctions into untenable, radical dualisms that eventually forced a choice between the equally problematic alternatives of skeptical epistemology and idealism. With regard to pragmatism, while Woodbridge viewed this approach as a valuable method for clarifying mental activities, one which itself involved a demand to respect contexts, he held that the pragmatists had extended their procedures and concepts beyond their legitimate context of application to that of nature in general and thereby generated confusion and fruitless controversy.

Woodbridge's naturalism was a product of his realism. He held that the empirically accessible activities investigated in realistic inquiry are fundamentally the cooperation of spatiotemporally located bodies, more specifically, that of the subject under investigation with those making up its conditioning environment. Any such activity, however, always also occurs within the most general context of inquiry, that of nature. Woodbridge thus rejected the idea of the supernatural, understood as a domain of activity outside of nature, although he did acknowledge a noncognitive sense of the supernatural. This naturalistic view applied equally to the activities of human beings, including human mental activities. Woodbridge held a broadly functionalist account of the mental, according to which the human mind is nothing more than an activity of the human body, an activity that takes place, like any other, in nature. By theoretically incorporating human beings into nature, Woodbridge rejected the radical dualisms that modern philosophy had derived from its unrealistic divorce of the two, for example, the dualisms of mind–body, appearance–reality, freedom–necessity, and fact–value. These commitments, along with his emphasis on the scientific method as the sole means of securing knowledge, track those typically seen as the characteristic tenets of naturalism. The importance Woodbridge placed on integrating human beings into nature also made his position a form of humanism. Thus naturalized, human beings and their activities were,

on his view, the fullest expression of nature's actualities and the most complete illustration of what nature is. While his humanistic naturalism brought human beings down to earth, this was less a debasement of the human than an elevation of nature. A realistic investigation of human nature would reveal nature to be much more than atoms and the void. By including the unreduced rational and purposeful behavior of human beings, nature goes beyond the baldly materialist view of it as just a domain in which the movements of physical objects illustrate mechanical laws.

On Woodbridge's conception, nature itself was what human beings directly perceive in their ordinary experience of obvious and familiar things and their activities. As a direct realist, he rejected subjectivist epistemologies and the Cartesian-Lockean thesis that experience involves ideas, understood as representations distinct and separated from external objects. He held that the myths of the "endterm" (or entity) conception of the mind and of consciousness as a divide between human perceivers and the world entail the impossibility of knowledge. Woodbridge took the human activities of perceiving, thinking, and even knowing all to be matters of particular sorts of cooperation between bodies (in particular, human bodies) in nature. The immediate objects of thought were, on his view, identical with the very objects whose activities and cooperation constitute nature's processes. While not yet knowledge, experience was, Woodbridge maintained, a completely reliable source of knowledge of the world. Human perception always reveals nature as it really is, given the conditions in which the perceiver's body cooperates with the other bodies in its environment. Cognitive errors, including illusions, hallucinations, etc., are not a matter of deceptive experience but rather result from human judgments made in a state of ignorance about the natures of the objects and the conditions involved.

Understanding experience as he did, Woodbridge claimed that a realistic metaphysics adequate to human experience would identify three types of structure, or "realms of being," in nature. For him this meant that nature was, first and foremost, the "visible world," that is, a spatial realm with a built-in optical structure. Human experience reveals a continuous structure of connected but inherently perspectival positions, each of which is circumscribed by its own horizon. This understanding of nature's spatial structure had interesting consequences, such as parallel lines always meeting at the horizon, but Woodbridge maintained that this is what experience demanded. While Woodbridge emphasized vision because he held that this mode of experience reveals nature's most common and public structure, he recognized that human beings also experience nature as a dynamic context of activities or processes, and thus as a temporal realm. In fact, he considered the spatial and temporal realms inseparable since their combination was a necessary precondition for the physical activities of bodies (including human bodies).

Woodbridge held that realistic inquiry also discovers a third realm of being. Taking human thinking as a bodily activity involving a kind of cooperation with other bodies (the objects of thought) he claimed that nature had to be structured in a way that made this type of bodily cooperation possible. He concluded that nature must also include an objective logical structure, what he called the "realm of mind." Because the objects of thought related in this realm are the same objects that human beings experience as spatiotemporally related, the realm of mind is also inseparable from the spatial and temporal realms. Their explicit connection in thought (discovering the spatiotemporal relations of objects through discovery of their logical relations) was, in fact, how Woodbridge understood knowledge. In describing the realm of mind, Woodbridge coopted terminology from the objective idealism influential in his day. He called objects in their logical relations "ideas" and the world of logically structured objects discovered in human knowledge "objective mind." For Woodbridge,

however, ideas were not subjective and objective mind was no kind of subject. Moreover, knowledge in no way constructed the objects known; their natures and logical relations were an objective aspect of reality discovered in inquiry.

A final, somewhat surprising aspect of Woodbridge's philosophy was his view that realism and naturalism require one to acknowledge the supernatural in addition to nature. This is surprising because it appears to violate naturalism in two ways, by admitting something beyond nature, and by accepting a dualism. While there is a sense in which Woodbridge's philosophy did both of these things, it remained a coherent naturalism by giving the supernatural a natural basis without reducing or eliminating it. His starting point was a recognition of the fact that, while still a part of nature, human beings engage in creative and valuing activities that involve the setting and pursuing of ideals. These ideals are not provided by nature (considered apart from human beings), since nature exhibits no preferences among states of affairs, and they look beyond nature by aspiring to transcend how things are. Woodbridge called this aspect of human life the "pursuit of happiness" in contrast with the pursuit of knowledge, and he considered human spiritual and moral activities paradigmatic forms of this pursuit. As a realist, he held that morality and religion are shown to be real through their occurrence in human experience. Thus, while nature considered apart from human ideals contains no values or divinity, it must include the conditions necessary for their reality. Nature therefore provides the basis for its own transcendence in human activity. Unlike the three realms of being, however, this "moral order" is not something that can be given a scientific account; the supernatural is not a realm of knowledge.

Woodbridge held that while moral and religious discourse appears to make claims about the activities and natures of objects, their grounding in human ideals makes their function expressive rather than cognitive.

Utterances involving supernatural (including moral) terms do not have truth-values, since they are not about how things are. Statements of religious faith, for example, putative claims about the nature of God or about the divine aspect of human beings, should be taken not as statements of fact, but as an expression of devotion to certain values and ideals. For Woodbridge, a supernatural notion like God is a regulating ideal. In contrast with Kant, however, on Woodbridge's view, the notion of God is not a regulating ideal of reason but rather of the pursuit of happiness in the Aristotelian sense of *eudaimonia*. While not clearly making good on all of Woodbridge's realist aspirations, this noncognitivist account at least makes room for some sort of acknowledgment of the supernatural within a naturalistic framework.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Purpose of History (New York, 1916).
The Realm of Mind: An Essay in Metaphysics (New York, 1926).
The Son of Apollo: Themes of Plato (Boston, 1929).
Nature and Mind: *Selected Essays of Frederick J. E. Woodbridge* (New York, 1937). Contains a bibliography of Woodbridge's writings.
An Essay on Nature (New York, 1940).

Other Relevant Works
Woodbridge's papers are at Columbia University.
Contrasts in Education (New York, 1929).
"Confessions," in *Contemporary American Philosophy: Personal Statements*, ed. G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague (New York, 1930), vol. 2, pp. 415–38.
Ed., *Hobbes Selections* (New York, 1930).
Opuscula. Essays, articles, and addresses bound for the Butler Library of Philosophy, Columbia University.
Aristotle's Vision of Nature, ed. John H. Randall, Jr. (New York, 1965).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils Before 1950*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Pres Addr of APA v1*, *Proc of APA in Phil Rev v50*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

Costello, Harry T. "The Naturalism of Frederick Woodbridge," in *Naturalism and the Human Spirit*, ed. Y. H. Krikorian (New York, 1944), pp. 295–318.

Delaney, C. F. *Mind and Nature: A Study of the Naturalistic Philosophy of Cohen, Woodbridge and Sellars* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1969).

Jones, William F. *Nature and Natural Science: The Philosophy of F. J. E. Woodbridge* (Buffalo, N.Y., 1983).

McGilvary, Evander B. "Woodbridge's *An Essay on Nature*," *Journal of Philosophy* 38 (1941): 141–55.

Pyun, Hae Soo. *Nature, Intelligibility, and Metaphysics: Studies in the Philosophy of F. J. E. Woodbridge* (Amsterdam, 1972).

Randall, John H., Jr. "Dean Woodbridge," *Columbia University Quarterly* 32 (1940): 324–31.

———, "Introduction" and "The Department of Philosophy," in *A History of the Faculty of Philosophy, Columbia University* (New York, 1957), pp. 3–57, 102–45.

Ryder, John, ed. *American Philosophic Naturalism in the 20th Century* (Amherst, N.Y., 1994).

Shea, William M. "Frederick Woodbridge: Experience and Idea," *The Thomist* 39 (1975): 712–26.

———, *The Naturalists and the Supernatural* (Macon, Georgia, 1984).

James A. Woodbridge

WOODHULL, Victoria Claflin
(1838–1927)

Victoria Claflin Woodhull was born on 9 September 1838 in Homer, Ohio, the seventh of ten children. Woodhull's formal education consisted of a total of less than three years in Homer's Methodist church school. Her father, Buck Claflin, was unable to support his large family and in 1853 Woodhull sought escape from this transient life by marrying Canning Woodhull. She moved for a short time with her husband to Chicago and San Francisco, where she worked in the theater. She and her husband soon returned to live with her father and she began supporting both families as a "medical clairvoyant." Woodhull's career as a clairvoyant drew her into the Spiritualist Movement, which became a lifelong involvement. She eventually divorced Woodhull (but retained his name), married Colonel James Harvey Blood in 1866 and moved to New York City. Her success as a clairvoyant brought her to the attention of millionaire Cornelius Vanderbilt, who eventually provided the financial support for her and her sister, Tennessee Claflin, to open the world's first women-run stock brokerage firm in 1870. Anarchist Stephen Pearl Andrews became Woodhull's scholarly tutor, helping her and her sister launch *Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly*. The *Weekly* published articles on such topics as women's education, universal suffrage, and free love. Calling herself the "most practical exponent of the principles of equality," Woodhull took controversial stands in advocating for women's equal rights. She also championed worker's rights and published the first English translation of Karl Marx's *Communist Manifesto*. She was nominated as the presidential candidate of the Equal Rights Party in 1872, the first woman to be nominated for that office. She also was the first American woman to address Congress, in 1871. She died on 10 June 1927 in Tewkesbury, England.

Woodhull promoted a philosophy of "social freedom" (or as opponents called it, "free love"), a critique of traditional marriage and

social hypocrisy, particularly the double standard that condemned the sexual behavior of women, but not men. Woodhull's outspokenness about sexuality particularly alarmed Susan B. ANTHONY, who focused on women's political rights. Bankrupt and ostracized by late summer 1872, Woodhull exposed the sexual liaison between beloved reform preacher Henry Ward BEECHER and the wife of his colleague, Theodore Tilton. Woodhull sought to reconcile the contradiction between Beecher's public image – that as an outspoken critic of free love – and his private life where he was carrying on an adulterous affair with a married woman. Since she wrote of the Beecher–Tilton affair in a special issue of the *Weekly*, Woodhull and her sister were subsequently arrested under charges of obscenity as specified by the Comstock laws, which prohibited using the mail to distribute materials deemed pornographic.

The ensuing legal struggles hurt her business, her health, and her newspaper. Public opinion gradually shifted toward Woodhull, however, as she used the Beecher–Tilton scandal to illustrate how the sexual double standard benefited men like Beecher, whose public reputations were untainted by their private immoral behavior, while women's reputations were ruined.

Woodhull eventually capitalized on the scandal to become a successful lecturer. She and her sister moved to England in 1877 and in 1883 she married John Biddulph Martin, a wealthy banker. As Woodhull-Martin, she abandoned her earlier egalitarianism, and (like other sex radicals of the period) dabbled in the eugenics movement, promoting Social Darwinism and the supremacy of the Anglo-American race until her death in 1927.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Origin, Tendencies and Principles of Government, or, A Review of the Rise and Fall of Nations from Early Historic Times to the Present, with Special Considerations Regarding the Future of the United States as the Representative Government of the World and the Form of Administration which Will Secure this Consummation; also, Papers on Human Equality, as Represented by Labor and Its Representative, Money; and The Meaning and Significance of Life from a Scientific Standpoint, with Its Prophecies for the Great Future (New York, 1871).

A Fragmentary Record of Public Work Done in America, 1871–72 (London, 1887).

Stirpiculture; or, The Scientific Propagation of the Human Race (London, 1888).

Humanitarian Government (London, 1890).

The Human Body, the Temple of God; or, The Philosophy of Sociology by Victoria Claflin Woodhull (Mrs. John Biddulph Martin) and Tennessee C. Claflin (Lady Cook), Together with Other Essays, Etc., Etc., Also Press Notices of Extemporaneous Lectures Delivered Throughout America and England from 1869 to 1882 (London, 1890).

Other Relevant Works

Woodhull's papers are located at Southern Illinois University, the New York Historical Society, the Boston Public Library, and Hamilton College in Clinton, New York.

Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly: The Lives and Writings of Notorious Victoria Woodhull and her Sister Tennessee Claflin, compiled by Arlene Kisner (Washington, N.J., 1972).

The Victoria Woodhull Reader, ed. Madeleine Stern (Weston, Mass, 1974).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v4*

Braude, Ann. *Radical Spirits: Spiritualism and Women's Rights in Nineteenth-Century America* (Boston, 1989).

Fox, Richard Wightman. *Trials of Intimacy: Love and Loss in the Beecher–Tilton Scandal* (Chicago, 1999).

Frisken, Amanda. *Victoria Woodhull's Sexual Revolution: Political Theater and the Popular Press in Nineteenth Century America* (Philadelphia, 2004).

Gabriel, Mary. *Notorious Victoria: The Life of Victoria Woodhull, Uncensored* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1998).

Goldsmith, Barbara. *Other Powers: The Age of Suffrage, Spiritualism, and the Scandalous Victoria Woodhull* (New York, 1998).

Horowitz, Helen Lefkovitz. *Rereading Sex: Battles over Sexual Knowledge and Suppression in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York, 2002).

Sachs, Emanie Nahm. *The Terrible Siren* (New York, 1928).

Tilton, Theodore. *The Life of Victoria Woodhull* (New York, 1871).

Underhill, Lois Beachy. *The Woman Who Ran for President: The Many Lives of Victoria Woodhull* (Bridgehampton, N.Y., 1995).

Amanda Frisken

WOODSON, Carter Godwin (1875–1950)

Carter Woodson was born on 19 December 1875 in New Canton, Buckingham County, Virginia. His parents, James and Anne Eliza Riddle Woodson, were born into slavery. Woodson did not have an opportunity to attend school regularly because his family needed the wages he could earn working in the Virginia coalmines. Yet, he was very inquisitive and educated himself through any means available. His family moved to Fayette, West Virginia in 1892 when he was seventeen. He did not get to attend school until 1895 when he entered Douglass High School at the age of twenty with hardly any previous formal education. Woodson received his diploma in 1896 and was admitted to Berea College in Ohio, where he received his BL in 1903. He then received his BA and MA from the University of Chicago in 1908, and his PhD in history from Harvard University in 1912.

While in college and graduate school, Woodson taught in Winona in Fayette County, West Virginia and was principal of Douglass High School (1900–1903); spent three years as supervisor of schools in the Philippines (1903–1906); and spent a year of study and travel abroad in Africa, Asia, and Europe including a semester at the University of Paris (1906–1907). From 1909 to 1919, he taught English, French, history, and Spanish at the M Street, Dunbar High Schools as well as Miner Normal School in Washington, D.C. He also was principal of Armstrong High School (1918–19). Woodson was Dean of the School of Liberal Arts and the head of the Graduate Faculty at Howard University in 1919–20, where he supervised the first successful MA thesis defense. From 1920 to 1922 he served as Dean of West Virginia Collegiate Institute, after which he retired from college teaching and returned to live in Washington. He devoted the remainder of his life to writing, promoting interest in black history, and directing the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History.

On 9 September 1915, Carter G. Woodson, George Cleveland Hall, W. B. Hartgrove, Alexander L. Jackson, and James E. Stamps founded the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History in Chicago, Illinois. The organization was committed to promoting research and activities that produced a popular appreciation for African American history. On 1 January 1916, Woodson founded the *Journal of Negro History*, which showcased the work of black and white scholars about black people throughout the African Diaspora.

In order to popularize the study of Negro history, Woodson instituted Negro History Week in 1926 which eventually grew into February's Black History Month. Woodson authored and edited over twenty-two books in black history as well as articles and other publications. He remained the editor of the *Journal of Negro History* and the Director of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History until his death. Woodson died on 3 April 1950 in Washington, D.C.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861 (New York and London, 1915).
The Negro in Our History (Washington, D.C, 1922).
Negro Orators and Their Orations (Washington, D.C, 1925).
African Myths (Washington, D.C, 1928).
The Miseducation of the Negro (Washington, D.C., 1933; Chicago, 2000).

Other Relevant Works
Woodson's papers are at the Library of Congress and Howard University.
A Century of Negro Migration (Washington, D.C., 1918).
The History of the Negro Church (Washington, D.C., 1921).
African Heroes and Heroines (Washington, D.C., 1939.)

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, Cambridge Dict Amer Bio, Dict Amer Bio, Encycl Amer Bio, Who Was Who in Amer v3
Goggin, Jacqueline. *Carter G. Woodson: A Life in Black History* (Baton Rouge, La., 1993).
Greene, Lorenzo J., and Arvarh E. Strickland. *Working with Carter G. Woodson, the Father of Black History: A Diary, 1928–1930* (Baton Rouge, La., 1989).

Darryl Scriven

WOOLLEY, Helen Bradford Thompson
(1874–1947)

Helen Bradford Thompson was born on 6 November 1874 in Chicago, Illinois. She graduated at the head of her high school class in 1893 and earned her BA at the University of Chicago 1897. Her interests were drawn to psychology by Chicago professors John DEWEY and James B. ANGELL, and she received the PhD summa cum laude in psychology in 1900. She studied at Paris and Berlin in 1900–1901. From 1901 to 1905 she was professor of psychology at Mount Holyoke College, where she directed the psychological laboratory.

She married pathologist Paul Gerhardt Woolley in 1905 and spent the next two years in the Philippines and Siam. Upon returning to the US he joined the University of Cincinnati medical school faculty, and she later obtained a position there as instructor in philosophy from 1910 to 1913. In 1911 she also became director of the Bureau for the Investigation of Condition of Working Children. Ohio had begun compulsory education to the fifth grade and tracked children who left school for work after that grade. Woolley and her staff were able to study the mental and physical effects of child labor for many years, and this work continued after she became Director of the Vocational Bureau of Cincinnati Public Schools from 1914 to 1921. Her pioneering research and conclusions favoring schooling until age sixteen was published as *An Experimental Study of Children* (1926).

When the family moved to Detroit, Michigan in 1921, Woolley found a position at the Merrill-Palmer School, as research fellow and then as assistant director and psychologist from 1922 to 1926. She also pursued her study of child development by starting a nursery school, one of the first in the country that focused on personality development and teacher training. She developed one of the first testing programs for children. In 1926 she joined the faculty of Columbia University Teachers College as the Director of the new Institute of Child Welfare

Research. However, the onset of severe emotional depression caused by overwork, her husband's tuberculosis, and his demand for a divorce, disrupted her career and led to her dismissal from Teachers College in 1930. She lived with her daughter until her death on 24 December 1947 in Havertown, Pennsylvania.

Her dissertation, published in 1903, was the first to challenge scientifically the widespread belief in significant intellectual disparities between the sexes. Like her mentor Dewey and other feminists, she attributed any measurable differences in cognitive achievement to differences in upbringing and schooling. While in Detroit she became a prominent national voice as a lecturer and writer in academic and popular journals, energizing the child development movement then gathering force. She further exemplified the pragmatic progressivism of the Chicago School by working for educational reform and child labor legislation, women's suffrage, and other social justice causes.

 BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Mental Traits of Sex: An Experimental Investigation of the Normal Mind in Men and Women (Chicago, 1903).

Diagnosis and Treatment of Young School Failures, with Elizabeth Ferris (Washington, D.C., 1923).

"The Validity of Standard of Mental Measurement in Young Childhood." *School and Society* 21 (1925): 476-82.

An Experimental Study of Children at Work and in School between the Ages of Fourteen and Eighteen Years (New York, 1926).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*

Morse, Jane M. "Ignored But Not Forgotten: The Work of Helen Bradford Thompson Woolley" *National Women's Studies Association Journal* 14 (Summer 2002): 121–46.

Murchison, Carl, ed. "Helen Bradford Thompson Woolley," in *The Psychological Register*, vol. 3 (Worcester, Mass., 1932), pp. 565–6. Contains a bibliography of Wooley's publications.

Rosenberg, Rosalind. *Beyond Separate Spheres: Intellectual Roots of Modern Feminism* (New Haven, Conn., 1982).

Scarborough, E., and L. Furumoto. *Untold Lives: The First Generation of American Women Psychologists* (New York, 1987).

Zapoleon, M. W., and L. M. Stolz. "Woolley, Helen Bradford Thompson," in *Notable American Women 1607–1950: A Biographical Dictionary*, ed. E. James, J. W. James, and P. S. Boyer (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), vol. 3, pp. 657–60.

John R. Shook

WOOLSEY, Theodore Dwight (1801–89)

Theodore Woolsey was born on 31 October 1801 in New York City. He entered Yale at the age of fifteen and graduated with his BA as class valedictorian in 1820. He read law briefly in 1820–21, and then attended Princeton Theological Seminary. He returned to Yale in 1823 where he worked as a tutor while completing his theological training. Uncertain about his vocation, in 1827 Woolsey elected to travel abroad for further study of classical and modern languages. In 1831 he was hired as a professor of Greek at Yale, an appointment lasting until 1846 that marked the beginning of a long, distinguished career. Woolsey then served with distinction as President of Yale from 1846 until his retirement in 1871. As President, Woolsey taught history, political science, and international law, leaving the responsibility for teaching moral philosophy to his colleague Noah PORTER. Woolsey's tenure at Yale included a term as President of the Oriental Society as well as regent of the Smithsonian Institution. His honorary degrees

included an LLD from Wesleyan in 1845, and a DD from Harvard in 1847 as well as an LLD in 1886. In mid-career he authored two well-respected texts in international law and political science. Woolsey died on 1 July 1889 in New Haven, Connecticut.

Woolsey's writings attest to his engagement with the social issues of his day. His abolitionist views and deft dissection of southerners' invocation of states' rights to justify secession won him national attention in the 1850s. Characteristically, in the post-Civil War period he was foremost among liberal republicans calling for reconciliation. Subsequent decades found him involved in a number of reformist movements, particularly that of civil service reform. Woolsey's positions on specific controversies varied: support for the gold standard, for free trade and against protective tariffs, against universal suffrage but strong advocacy for the voting rights of African Americans, doubts about coeducation in colleges and universities, but strong support for academic freedom and the untrammeled exchange of ideas.

Woolsey's views on specific issues still carry historical interest. The architectural elements of his political philosophy, however, have fared considerably less well. Against such "contractarians" as Hobbes, Locke, or Rousseau, Woolsey held that both a just state and the inalienable rights of its constituent citizens derive not from some juridical creation or merely contingent contract but from conformity with an objective, divinely sanctioned moral order. The natural end of man as ordained by God is to be a free, rational, social being. Consequently, the highest law governing a person's actions must be that which is conducive to the realization of this idea, the universal form. Woolsey was criticized in his own time for trying to anchor international laws and human rights in theology. Given the radically different turn political philosophy has taken in the last century or so, it appears the skepticism evinced by Woolsey's critics was not unwarranted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Introduction to the Study of International Law (Boston, 1860; 6th edn 1891).

Political Science; or, the State Theoretically and Practically Considered, 2 vols (New York, 1877).

Communism and Socialism in Their History and Theory (New York, 1882).

Religion of the Present and the Future (New York, 1887).

Other Relevant Works

Woolsey's papers are at Yale University.

Essays on Divorce and Divorce Legislation (New York, 1869).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v1*

Cooper, Jacob. "Theodore Dwight Woolsey," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 56 (1899): 607–38.

Fisher, George P. "The Academic Career of Ex-President Woolsey," *Century Illustrated Monthly* 24 (September 1882): 709–17.

King, George A. *Theodore Dwight Woolsey, His Political and Social Ideas* (Chicago, 1956).

Stevenson, Louise L. *Scholarly Means to Evangelical Ends: The New Haven Scholars and the Transformation of Higher Learning in America, 1830–1890* (Baltimore, Md., 1986).

Woolsey, Theodore S. *Theodore Dwight Woolsey: A Biographical Sketch, His Early Years* (New Haven, Conn., 1912).

Christopher J. Lucas

WRIGHT, Chauncey (1830–75)

Chauncey Wright was born on 20 September 1830 in Northampton, Massachusetts. He attended the Select High School there, and then received a BA from Harvard University in 1852, having shown exceptional ability in mathematics, physics, and astronomy. The only professor who influenced him was the mathematician Benjamin PEIRCE, father of Charles S. PEIRCE. His early interests in philosophy were Galileo, Bacon, William Hamilton, and John Stuart Mill. Except for Galileo, and Mill's utilitarianism, interest in the others eventually faded, and were replaced by the influence of Charles Darwin.

After college Wright became a member of the mathematical staff at the Cambridge Observatory, assigned to the *American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac* to calculate relationships among nautical data supplied by astronomers. He worked for the *Ephemeris* from 1852 to 1872. He invented new formulas so that he could do a year's calculations in three months; during the other nine months he talked philosophy with students, friends, the members of two clubs, the Septem and the Metaphysical Club. These members included Peirce, William JAMES, Oliver Wendell HOLMES, Jr., and Nicholas St. John GREEN, along with colleagues in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. In this way he became known as the Socratic Sage of Old Cambridge, where he resided the rest of his life.

Wright was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1860 and served as its recording secretary from 1863 to 1870. He contributed many essays and reviews to the *North American Review* and the *Nation*. He was an amiable man – calm, gentle, caring, and always shy with strangers – and was a favorite in his circle of friends. Charles Eliot Norton admired his friend's open-mindedness and dedication to finding the truth. He never argued to win but engaged his friends in the Socratic quest for truth. As Norton said, it was a moral as well as an intellectual experience to argue with Chauncey Wright.

Irregular eating, sleeping, and drinking habits led to Wright's death from a massive heart attack on 11 September 1875 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Norton published his major essays as *Philosophical Discussions* (1877) and James Bradley Thayer edited Wright's *Letters* (1878). No one else in Cambridge ever filled his conversational role.

Skilled in mathematics and physics, Wright was the first technically proficient philosopher of science in America. He clearly defined and defended the hypothetico-deductive approach to science and was a constant critic of the "summary" view of lawfulness held by the entire British empiricist tradition. Wright essentially stated in a new way the views of Galileo and Kepler which had declined as a result of a too literal interpretation by the British empiricists of Newton's famous "Hypotheses non Fingo."

According to Wright, scientists in general demonstrate in their work the hypothetico-deductive method and hence their concepts and laws cannot be interpreted as generalizations drawn from empirical facts, as Hume and Mill had contended. Wright observed that empirical generalizations are limited in scope whereas fundamental laws such as those of gravity and thermodynamics have unlimited scope. Moreover, with regard to the concepts of lower-order laws, such as Kepler's, while they have a limited range, that range is precisely known, unlike generalizations from experience where the scope is indefinite.

The British empiricists also err in claiming that all scientific concepts must come from experience. Wright argued that the physicists are not interested in the origin of ideas but in what consequences they yield. A new hypothesis may be suggested by experience but it may also originate from imagination, metaphors, dreams, illusions or hallucinations. Modern empiricism is forward-looking while British empiricism is origin-oriented. Wright also rejected Hume's causal analysis as inadequate because it could not account for possibility and potentiality and was unable to distinguish laws

from accidental correlations. He thought the stronger bond needed is the mathematical concept of necessity. In the parallelogram of forces if an object encounters two opposing forces of such and such magnitude and direction, the object must move to the specific spot calculated. If the "must" is wholly deductive, it is difficult to see how it could refer to an existential cause.

In Wright's view the worse proponent of the summary view of lawfulness was Herbert Spencer. According to his Law of Evolution all natural events evolve "from homogeneity to heterogeneity through differentiation and integration." This "law," Wright felt, was barbaric science as well as barbaric language. It accomplishes nothing scientifically; it simply summarizes the most general features common to the evolution of the solar system from nebulae to planets, the evolution of species from protozoa to man, and the evolution from tribes to nations. This so-called law is scientifically pointless because it does not lead to any new information or observation. Moreover Spencer never understood the nature and importance of theoretical concepts in physics; he used concepts like force and momentum for his own philosophical purposes, translating, for example, "the conservation of force" into "the persistence of force." However this reinterpretation is completely vague and indefinite and has no predictive value and no significant relation to "the conservation of force." Wright concluded with a statement much quoted by later commentators, "Nothing justifies the development of abstract principles in science but their utility in enlarging our concrete knowledge of nature. The ideas on which mathematical Mechanics and Calculus are founded … and the theories of Chemistry are such working ideas, – finders, not merely summaries of truth." (2000, vol. 1, p. 56)

Numerous authors have seen Wright as the precursor of various aspects of Peirce's or James's versions of pragmatism. However, Wright's emphasis on forward-looking science may well have set the stage for what came later, but nothing more. Peirce generalized forward-looking empiricism to all experiential concepts, not just abstract ones; for example, "this diamond is hard" means "if I rub the diamond across glass it will leave a scratch." Wright did not accept this generalization but believed in a sensory given. Moreover, Peirce's concepts of tychism and evolutionary metaphysics were unacceptable to him. As a determinist Wright rejected absolute chance and would have rejected Peirce's synechism and other notions as another generalization of evolutionary thought, though much superior to Spencer's. Peirce also was a scientist and thought his own evolutionary scheme had some experimental consequences.

It is difficult to say precisely what James meant by "pragmatism" but clearly he accepted a forward-looking pragmatic meaning of "truth" whereas Wright held a correspondence theory. On the other hand, James acknowledged that Wright's analysis of sign reasoning formed the basis of his chapter on Reasoning in *The Principles of Psychology* (1896), one of the chapters most appealing to John DEWEY. Wright in fact had more in common with Dewey than with Peirce or James; they were both naturalists and avoided all philosophical dualisms.

From their earliest acquaintance Wright rejected James's "Will to Believe" argument. If you always demand evidence of God's existence, as James argued, it may not be forthcoming. If you are willing to believe without evidence, then the evidence will become clear. Wright told James personally that his view made nonsense out of the concept of evidence. Wright accepted the right of everyone to believe in God as a matter of faith as long as they did not confuse it with knowledge of God. Having neither faith nor knowledge, Wright was an agnostic. James never understood how moderate Wright's agnosticism was compared with that of W. K. Clifford and Thomas Huxley.

Wright made still another significant contribution to philosophy of science by distinguish-

ing the different senses of explanation in experimental science and derivative science – physics and chemistry versus geology and meteorology, so to speak. The former operate in experimentally controlled situations while derivative sciences try to explain a concrete series of events in the complex and apparently irregular physical world. In the experimental sciences prediction is often taken as explanation, but in the derivative sciences the complexity prevents prediction. However, prediction and explanation are not identical, and perfectly good explanations are made in geology and related sciences. Darwin's concept of natural selection, Wright continued, is similar to geology; it has explanatory power but cannot predict. The explanation of the genesis of species, however, has much evidence in its favor, evidence from palaeontology, comparative anatomy, geographical distribution, and so on. Again, prediction and explanation are not synonymous.

Wright was probably the earliest American intellectual to understand and philosophically defend Darwin. He argued with those critics who said that Darwin's concept of species was conventional, arbitrary, and relative. Wright differentiated different senses of species and was able to show that in one sense at least Darwin's concept of species was not relative or conventional. Darwin was so impressed with Wright's essays that he had "The Genesis of Species" (1871) reprinted in England at his own expense and sent to his scientific collaborators. He also mentioned Wright's "Limits of Natural Selection" (1870) in his own book *The Descent of Man* (1874), and he and his wife invited his American friend, who was touring England, to be their house guest, which was the most enjoyable event of Chauncey's life.

During this visit Darwin asked Wright to work on the problem of determining in the evolution of languages when an advance can properly be ascribed to self-conscious, rational behavior. Wright responded with his most sustained essay, "Evolution of Self-Consciousness" (1873). Wright also considered Darwin's more general problem, that of bridging the supposed evolutionary gap between animal instinct and human intelligence.

According to Wright, sign relations are common to animals and humans but the sign is never distinguished from the thing signified. However, with an extension of the range of memory power together with a corresponding increase in the vividness of its impressions (variations useful in other directions and so likely to be secured by natural selection) a person is able to fix attention on both internal images and present signs and so become aware of signifying which is the first appearance of conceptual language. In the rise of language and self-consciousness new abilities everywhere grow out of causal elements which themselves have no trace of the new ability. The rise of new capacities can be explained but never predicted. The new capacities are genuinely novel. Darwin highly valued Wright's extensive essay on intelligence, for it provided him with the beginning of an answer to Alfred Russel Wallace, the co-discoverer of natural selection who limited it to lower species and thought a miracle was needed to explain human capacities. Darwin looked for further developments of Wright's thought, but Wright's death came too soon.

Wright's emergent naturalism influenced later philosophers in a way that would have embarrassed him had he lived to know about it. Samuel Alexander poking around a second-hand bookstall in London found a copy of *Philosophical Discussions* and was so attracted to the notion of emergence that he developed his own full-blown doctrine of emergence in which even God is an emergent event. Wright would not have been happy being a precursor of process theology and philosophy.

Cosmological speculation about the production of systems of worlds, Wright thought, also belongs to the derivative category of science. The cosmologist uses the laws of physics to explain the physical history of the system of worlds where there has been an uncontrolled, complete interpenetration of the principles at work. "The constitution of the solar system is not archetypal, as the ancients supposed, but

the same corrupt mixture of law and apparent accident that the phenomena of the earth's surface exhibit …" (2000, vol. 1, p. 9) The fact that ordinary weather phenomena exhibit the same logical features of causal complexity and apparent irregularity, and that the effort to predict them runs into the same difficulties as the cosmologist's effort to explain the production of systems of worlds, like ordinary weather, shows overall no development or any noticeable tendency whatever but is a "doing and undoing without end" – a kind of weather that might be called "cosmical weather." Wright based his ateleological view on what he called the principle of counter-movements. He agreed with Aristotle that the physical universe is uncreated and eternal.

Wright never published in moral philosophy, but his letters are filled with discussions of social ethics and reform along utilitarian lines. Utilitarianism was acceptable to Wright because it was the only forward-looking, consequence-oriented element in the whole of British empiricism. He felt that moral judgments based on an examination of consequences, unlike the deliverances of intuition or conscience, lend themselves to public test. He felt that acting from conscience often has undesirable consequences, the correcting of which is the consequential approach of utility. It is crucially important as a standard for correcting a whole world of abuses "which subsist by the very same sanctions … the intuitive morality adopts as the basis of right and wrong" (2000, vol. 2, p. 196).

Wright did have certain reservations about the utilitarian concept of social reform. Utilitarian reason, he felt, is but a crude guide for life; and even well-designed systems of law contain little positive wisdom. Indeed, Wright said, how can we expect to legislate into existence the conditions for happiness when almost everyone has a different notion of what happiness is? But he was convinced that utilitarian reason can do much through legislative and social reform to alleviate the great suffering and injustice everywhere manifest in the world.

While people differ in what constitutes happiness they are in total accord in thinking that living a life of extreme poverty is undesirable. Wright thought that the rights of private property had got out of hand, to a sometimes frightening extent. "But so far as the laws of property … have come to be productive, not of increased gains, but of a large and permanent class of unproductive consumers, so far they are devices of legalized robbery, and must be abrogated and amended." (2000, vol. 2, pp. 173–4)

Wright was never a member of any social reform society because he was never able to put himself in a dramatic context. He was shy and reclusive except for his host of friends. However, it must not be supposed that he was never involved in moral efforts which could be done quietly. He boarded at Mrs Ann Lyman's house to look after the elderly lady who had always enjoyed high-level conversation but in later years whose mind began to deteriorate. Every day he invited his friend E. W. Gurney to tea at Mrs Lyman's, where the two men would continue the type of conversation that Mrs Lyman still enjoyed, although she could not always follow it. Susan Lyman Lesley and her little daughter Mary stayed with Mrs Lyman every summer, during which Chauncey took loving care of Mary so Susan, an invalid and often exhausted, could rest. Mary Walker, former slave, was a servant in the Lyman house and depended upon Wright's help in adapting to a life of freedom. Wright sent messages to slaves from relatives to a contact on the underground railroad and also helped Mary to arrange the escape of her daughter from slavery. Wright's caring nature was a resource for many people, and they responded in kind when he needed help.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Winds and the Weather," *Atlantic Monthly* 1 (January 1858): 272–9.
"Bowen's Logic," *North American Review* 99 (October 1865): 592–605.
"The Philosophy of Herbert Spencer," *North American Review* 100 (April 1865):

423–76.

"The Right of Suffrage," *North American Review* 103 (July 1866): 241–50.

"Limits of Natural Selection," *North American Review* 111 (October 1870): 282–311.

"The Genesis of Species," *North American Review* 113 (July 1871): 63–104.

"Evolution by Natural Selection," *North American Review* 115 (July 1872): 1–31.

"Evolution of Self-consciousness," *North American Review* 116 (April 1873): 245–310.

Philosophical Discussions by Chauncey Wright with a Biographical Sketch of the Author, ed. Charles E. Norton (New York, 1877).

Letters of Chauncey Wright with Some Account of His Life, ed. James B. Thayer (Cambridge, Mass., 1878).

Other Relevant Works

Wright's papers are at Harvard University.

Philosophical Writings: Representative Selections, ed. Edward H. Madden (New York, 1958).

The Evolutionary Philosophy of Chauncey Wright, 3 vols, ed. Frank X. Ryan (Bristol, UK, 2000).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Amer Phils Before 1950*, *Amer Nat Bio*, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v1*, *Oxford Comp Phil*

Blau, Joseph L. "Chauncey Wright: Radical Empiricist," *New England Quarterly* 19 (1946): 495–517.

Bowne, Borden P. "Chauncey Wright as a Philosopher," *New Englander* 37 (1878): 585–603.

Fiske, John. "Chauncey Wright," in *Darwinism and Other Essays* (London, 1879), pp. 79–110.

James, William. "Chauncey Wright," *The Nation* 21 (September 1875): 194.

Kennedy, Gail. "The Pragmatic Naturalism of Chauncey Wright" in *Studies in the History of Ideas*, vol. 3 (New York, 1935).

Madden, Edward H. "Chauncey Wright's Life and Work: Some New Material," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 15 (1954): 445–55.

———, *Chauncey Wright and the Foundations of Pragmatism* (Seattle, 1963).

———, *Chauncey Wright* (New York, 1964).

White, Morton. "Chauncey Wright," in *Science and Sentiment in America* (New York, 1972).

Wiener, Philip P. "Chauncey Wright, Defender of Darwin and Precursor of Pragmatism," in *Evolution and the Founders of Pragmatism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1949), pp. 31–69.

E. H. Madden

WRIGHT, Frank Lloyd (1867–1959)

Frank Lloyd Wright was born on 8 June 1867 in Richland Center, Wisconsin, and died on 9 April 1959 in Phoenix, Arizona. In 1886 Wright attended the College of Engineering at the University of Wisconsin, but left for Chicago after two semesters. In Chicago he apprenticed with architect Joseph Lyman Silsbee and later with the firm run by Dankmar Adler and Louis Sullivan. In 1893 he opened his own architectural practice.

Eloquent, original, and infamous, Wright forged his own highly individual aesthetic path based on his strong belief that architecture must be faithful to the beauty residing in the transient qualities of nature. His projects consistently integrated nature, art, and architecture. Wright called his architectural theory "organic." His reading of R. W. EMERSON echoed his love of nature and prepared him for his first trip to

Japan in 1905. This journey reinforced his love for Japanese architecture and art because of their close bond with environment, simplicity of form, and human scale. Passionate about the creative process, he made no hierarchical distinction between the work of anonymous artists and architects and famous ones. Vernacular architecture and the American prairie perpetually inspired him because of their unassuming beauty.

Wright was a prolific designer, perhaps best known for his elegant prairie houses, distinguished by their large overhangs, cantilevered spaces, and use of natural materials. He believed that everyone should appreciate the aesthetic value of good design. He frequently designed everything: furniture, rugs, stained glass windows, lighting fixtures. The Robie House (1906) in Chicago exemplified his ideas, which culminated in the exquisitely expressed Fallingwaters (1936), a house in Pennsylvania that cantilevers over a waterfall encompassing the surrounding environment.

In 1932, with the help of his fourth wife, Olgivanna Milanoff, he began a fellowship program for students and apprentices at Taliesin, his home near Madison, Wisconsin, and later at Taliesin West in Arizona. Taliesin enabled him to apply notions of environmental aesthetics to the art of everyday life and to advance these notions to future designers.

Disinclined toward height or urban density, Wright nevertheless designed civic centers, schools, commercial, and religious buildings. His legacy may be the Imperial Hotel in Tokyo which survived the 1923 earthquake, and the controversial, curvilinear Guggenheim Museum (1943–59), originally sited amid the trees in Central Park, which finally opened six months after his death. His aesthetic notions continue to inspire architects world-wide, but his "organic" architectural ideas remain elusive to the American public.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Future of Architecture (New York, 1953).

The Natural House (New York, 1954).
A Testament (New York, 1957).
Frank Lloyd Wright: Writings and Buildings, ed. Edgar Kaufmann and Ben Raeburn (New York, 1960).
Collected Writings of Frank Lloyd Wright, 5 vols, ed. Bruce Pfeiffer (New York and Scottsdale, Ariz., 1992–5).

Other Relevant Works
The Frank Wright Archives are at Taliesin West, Scottsdale, Arizona.
An Autobiography (New York, 1943; rev. edn 1977).

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Comp Amer Thought*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Encyc Amer Bio*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*
Alofsin, Anthony. *Frank Lloyd Wright, The Lost Years, 1910–1922: A Study of Influence* (Chicago, 1993).
Futagawa, Yukio, and B. B. Pfeiffer, eds. *Frank Lloyd Wright*, 12 vols (Tokyo, 1984–8).
Gill, Brendan. *Many Masks: A Life of Frank Lloyd Wright* (New York, 1987).
Hitchcock, H. R. *In the Nature of Materials: The Buildings of Frank Lloyd Wright 1887–1941* (New York, 1973).
Levine, Neil. *The Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright* (New York, 1996).
Meech, Julia. *Frank Lloyd Wright and the Art of Japan: The Architect's Other Passion* (New York, 2001).
Storrer, William. *The Frank Lloyd Wright Companion* (Chicago, 1993).

Barbara Sandrisser

WRIGHT, George Frederick (1838–1921)

George Frederick Wright was born on 22 January 1838 in Whitehall, New York, where he attended local schools and was deeply impressed with his family's abiding interest in religion, a heritage that had manifested itself since Puritan times. Charles Finney had been a notable revivalist during the Second Great Awakening, and when he became President of Oberlin College, Wright's admiring parents sent him to study at that institution in Ohio. Graduating with a BA degree in 1859 and then a BD from Oberlin Theological Seminary in 1862, he set out on a ministerial career. He also volunteered upon graduation to serve in the Union army, but poor health prevented his acceptance. Instead he became pastor of a Congregational church in Bakersfield, Vermont, and performed standard clerical duties there for a decade. During his tenure at this town in the Green Mountains Wright developed an interest in geology, exploring on his own and gathering insights that slowly qualified the young minister for activities in a second career that paralleled and supported the primary one.

In 1872 Wright moved to the Free Congregational Church in Andover, Massachusetts, where he continued his exploratory self-education in geology. Settling arguments as to whether Pleistocene gravel deposits in the vicinity had been formed by marine or glacial forces (concluding with the latter hypothesis), his papers on the subject in 1875 and 1876 attracted international attention. This encouraged him even further to combine scientific interests with biblical scholarship to offer a sophisticated correlation of religion and science to an increasingly widening readership. He made friends with Harvard botanist, Asa Gray, and collaborated with him in producing a series of thoughtful articles that embodied a Christian defense of Darwinism.

In 1881 Wright began work as an assistant in the United States Geological Survey that traced the southern edges of terminal glacial moraine, beginning in New York and making its way eventually to Illinois and Kentucky. In that same year he was also called by Oberlin Theological Seminary to occupy the chair of New Testament languages and literature, a position which he held for a decade. During those years he also conducted the first scientific study of Muir Glacier in Alaska (in 1886), similar studies in Greenland, and in 1900 he conducted geological surveys across the breadth of Russia.

In 1892 Wright became professor of the harmony of science and revelation at Oberlin Theological Seminary, an office created specifically for him and one which he filled for the last fifteen years of his academic career. Perhaps the most notable feature of his perspective on science and religion was his conviction that inductive and deductive reasoning were compatible processes in human ratiocination. He viewed both theological constructs and scientific hypotheses as similar patterns that shared the common goal of articulating human experience in the natural world. With a genuine and frank appreciation of inductive science he tried to show how fundamental religious beliefs were not threatened by recent scientific discoveries. The key was to identify scientific explanations as secondary causes, supplemental to the divinely intended purpose behind those actual events. God and evolution could be understood as cooperating agents in the gradual unfolding of the created order. In this way Wright cited empirical evidence to argue that natural phenomena did not belie, but rather buttressed, such improbable events as the destruction of Sodom, the parting of the Red Sea, and fire falling from the sky to consume Elijah's sacrifice.

Beginning in 1883 Wright added to his reputation as a competent field geologist and biblical scholar by serving for almost forty years as editor of *Bibliotheca Sacra*, one of the most respected journals of conservative religious thought in America. Through this outlet in addition to his own lectures and books he sought to harmonize modern science with tra-

ditional beliefs, or at least maintain that the narrative of biblical events was still plausible in light of the most recent scientific knowledge. Arguing in a dignified and restrained manner he also contributed two articles, "Passing of Evolution" and "Testimony of the Monuments to the Truths of the Scriptures," to the collection of publications that came to be known collectively as *The Fundamentals*. Eschewing the rancor that characterized many "fundamentalists," Wright always conveyed a sense of fairness and balanced judgment in his affirmations of providential design in both human and natural history. Retiring in 1907, he remained active locally and died on 20 April 1921 in Oberlin, Ohio.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Logic of Christian Evidences (Andover, Mass., 1880).

Studies in Science and Religion (Andover, Mass., 1882).

The Ice Age in North America and Its Bearings on the Antiquity of Man (New York, 1889).

Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History (Oberlin, Ohio, 1906).

Origin and Antiquity of Man (Oberlin, Ohio, 1912).

Other Relevant Works

Wright's papers are at Oberlin College in Ohio.

Story of My Life and Work (Oberlin, Ohio, 1916).

Further Reading

Amer Nat Bio, *Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v7*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*

"George Frederick Wright: In Memoriam," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 78 nos 311–12 (1921). Special issue about Wright.

McGiffert, Michael. *Christian Darwinism: The Partnership of Asa Gray and George Frederick Wright*. PhD dissertation, Yale University (New Haven, Conn., 1958).

Morison, William J. *George Frederick Wright: In Defense of Darwinism and Fundamentalism*. PhD dissertation, Vanderbilt University (Nashville, Tenn., 1971).

Numbers, Ronald. "George Frederick Wright: From Christian Darwinist to Fundamentalist," *Isis* 79 (1988): 624–45.

Upham, Warren. "Memorial of George Frederick Wright," *Bulletin of the Geological Society of America* 33 (1922): 14–30.

Henry Warner Bowden

WRIGHT, Henry Wilkes (1878–1959)

Henry W. Wright was born on 16 August 1878 in the town of St. James, Michigan, located on Beaver Island in northern Lake Michigan close to the Canadian border. His undergraduate and graduate philosophy study was at Cornell University (BA 1899, PhD 1904). His many years at this center of neo-Hegelianism, which included teaching as an instructor from 1904 to 1907, endowed Wright with an idealistic metaphysics and a personalistic ethics. As professor of philosophy at Lake Forest College near Chicago from 1907 to 1920, Wright published works about psychology, ethics, religion, social theory, and democracy. Wright was President of the Western Philosophical Association in 1918–19, and became a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Taking a more socialist stance than the college's wealthy benefactors, Wright's status as acting President from 1918 to 1920 was not followed by election to the full presidency.

In 1920 Wright decided to accept an offer from the University of Manitoba in Winnipeg, Canada, some 800 miles northwest of Chicago, to become co-chair of the philosophy and psy-

chology department with Rupert LODGE. Wright then headed the psychology department from its independence in 1935 until his retirement in 1948. During this time he published many articles on social psychology and communication theory. Upon his retirement he moved to Kitchener in Ontario and occasionally taught courses at Waterloo College. Wright died on 4 August 1959 in Kitchener, Ontario.

The primary idealists at Cornell were Jacob G. SCHURMAN and James E. CREIGHTON, who taught that self-consciousness and its operations are the foundations for understanding all reality. Since naturalism is incapable of explaining the mental life and its activities, Wright's early writings argue that personhood is dependent on social processes, not natural evolution. Character cannot develop from mere satisfaction of desires; only progressive control over conflicting goals, especially between selfish and socially useful goals, drives the evolution of moral personality towards the ultimate ideal of universal benevolence. This type of self-realization model shuns the dualistic picture, such as T. H. Green's, of a higher rational will struggling with a lower animal drive. Wright adopted a voluntaristic and functional psychology that unified feeling, will, and intellect by treating them as aspects of purposive conduct that improves only by undergoing life's experiences.

Wright credited William JAMES, John DEWEY, and Addison MOORE for exposing the failures of absolute idealism. Although he accepted the pragmatic principles that thought is the reorganization of social habits and conduct is the test of thought, Wright held that the greatest test of moral thought is not greater individual satisfactions (as Dewey and James TUFTS's 1908 *Ethics* appeared to hold) but the capacity for self-sacrifice for the common good. Still, Wright agreed with William James that religion is essentially a manifestation of social morality and should be tested by that society's successful progress. Wright also reached Dewey's own humanistic conclusion that a supernatural God is irrelevant for modern ethics. Instead of using

belief in God to motivate our obedience to the ideal of benevolence, we should treat our prior allegiance to universal benevolence as constituting our faith in God. "Man's gods have been constructions of his imaginative intelligence, given objectivity by an effort of his own will. Religion has not been a mere by-product of social evolution, however; it ranks as a genuine achievement of the human will and plays an essential part in its progressive realization." (1916, p. 262) The irrationalities of World War I did not shatter Wright's confidence in the spirit of democratic community, although the concrete problems of people with conflicting values get closer attention in *The Moral Standards of Democracy* (1925). The intelligent community will discuss shared ideas, cooperate on practical problems of controlling nature, and imaginatively sympathize with each other. The overall tone and recommended social programs are more conservative than progressive.

Wright's pragmatic idealism, fully expressed in "Community as the Key to Evolution" (1931), retained final causes, the coherence criterion for ultimate truth, the intelligibility of objective values (truth, goodness, and beauty), and the metaphysical supremacy of personalities in community. Dualism therefore remains a serious problem: how do personalities connect with each other and with the natural environment? Wright's later writings center on these psychological issues, searching for a social alternative to subjectivism and crude behaviorism. The contest between mechanism and teleology is not solved by pragmatism, which wrongly denies that the value of produced good is determined by its standing to the final ends of universal human intelligence. Communication is the common ground of physical causation and purposive conduct, because signs are both physiological responses and ideal meanings. Influenced by Gestalt theory, Wright distinguished the behavioral field, the mediating and fundamental social field, and the cosmic field.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Self-Realization: An Outline of Ethics (New York, 1913).

"Practical Success as the Criterion of Truth," *Philosophical Review* 22 (1913): 606–22.

Faith Justified by Progress (New York, 1916).

The Moral Standards of Democracy (New York, 1925).

The Religious Response: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion (New York, 1929).

"Social Significance," *American Journal of Psychology* 49 (1937): 49–57.

"The Psychology of Social Culture," *American Journal of Psychology* 52 (1939): 210–26.

"Psychological Worlds," *Journal of Philosophy* 38 (1941): 600–608.

Other Relevant Works

"The Truth in Aesthetic Theories of Morality," *Philosophical Review* 10 (1901): 601–18.

"Evolution and Ethical Method," *International Journal of Ethics* 16 (1905): 59–68.

"Principles of Voluntarism," *Philosophical Review* 24 (1915): 297–313.

"The Religion of Democracy," *Forum and Century* 53 (1915): 327–34.

"The Object of Perception *Versus* the Object of Thought," *Journal of Philosophy* 13 (1916): 437–41.

"Is the Dualism of Mind and Matter Final?" in *Philosophical Essays in Honor of James Edwin Creighton* (New York, 1917), pp. 184–201.

"The Social Significance of Education," *Philosophical Review* 28 (1919): 345–69.

"The Basis of Human Association," *Journal of Philosophy* 17 (1920): 421–30.

"Idealism and Social Progress," Inaugural Lecture, University of Manitoba (Winnipeg, 1921).

"What Alternatives Can Religion Present to the Will of Modern Man?" *American Journal of Religion* 1 (1921): 404–15.

"The Objectivity of Moral Values," *Philosophical Review* 32 (1923): 385–400.

"Ethics and Social Philosophy," in *Philosophy Today*, ed. E. L. Schaub (Chicago, 1928).

"Metaphysical Implications of Human Association," *Philosophical Review* 38 (1929): 54–68.

"Community as the Key to Evolution," *Journal of Philosophy* 28 (1931): 98–102.

"Understanding Human Conduct and Social Relations," *University of Toronto Quarterly* 3 (1934): 321–48.

"The Values of Personal Association," *Ethics* 52 (1942): 447–62.

"The Three Contexts of Human Behavior," *Psychological Review* 50 (1943): 351–69.

"Intellect and the Development of Personality," *American Journal of Psychology* 57 (1944): 371–88.

"Three Theories of the Psychology of Meaning," *Canadian Journal of Psychology* 3 (1949): 80–88.

"The Significance of Communication for Psychological Theory," *Canadian Journal of Psychology* 8 (1954): 32–40.

Further Reading

Pres Addr of APA v2, Who Was Who in Amer v6, Who's Who in Phil

Armour, Leslie, and Elizabeth Trott. *The Faces of Reason: An Essay on Philosophy and Culture in English Canada, 1850–1950* (Waterloo, Ont., 1981), pp. 422–9.

John R. Shook

WRIGHT, William Kelley (1877–1956)

William K. Wright was born on 18 April 1877 in Canton, Illinois. Upon completing his secondary education at Lake Forest Academy in Illinois, Wright attended Amherst College from 1895 to 1897 and then earned his BA from the University of Chicago in 1899. He returned to the University of Chicago after five years in the Canton business sector, completing his PhD

in philosophy in 1906. His dissertation, "The Ethical Significance of Pleasure, Feeling, and Happiness in Modern Non-Hedonistic Systems," was published the following year. He pursued postgraduate studies at the University of Freiburg in 1909 and at Oxford and the University of London in 1912–13.

Wright held philosophy positions at University of Texas in 1906–1907, the University of Chicago from 1907 to 1909, the University of Wisconsin from 1909 to 1911, Indiana University in 1911–12, and Cornell University from 1913 to 1916. In 1916 he became a professor of philosophy at Dartmouth College. Wright was promoted to full professor in 1923, and in 1946 he was named Stone Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy. He served as President of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division in 1945–6. Wright retired in 1947, and died on 29 March 1956 in Hanover, New Hampshire.

As demonstrated in his widely used textbooks on ethics and the philosophy of religion, his primary philosophical project was to assess the significance of moral and religious values from an empirical, nondogmatic standpoint as psychological and cultural phenomena. In this he was heavily influenced by William JAMES. Through the development of empirical knowledge, he believed that ethical and religious theorizing could be more firmly grounded. A Congregationalist, he believed judicious scrutiny of the evidence at hand supported a theistic evolutionary metaphysics marked by the progressive historical emergence of more and more satisfactory ideals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
The Ethical Significance of Feeling, Pleasure, and Happiness in Modern Non-Hedonistic Systems (Chicago, 1907).

A Student's Philosophy of Religion (New York, 1922; 2nd edn 1935).

General Introduction to Ethics (New York, 1929).

A History of Modern Philosophy (New York, 1941).

Other Relevant Works
"Ethical Objectivity in the Light of Social Psychology," *Philosophical Review* 22 (1913): 395–409.

"The Relation of the Psychology of Religion to the Philosophy of Religion," *Philosophical Review* 27 (1918): 134–49.

"Situations and Experience," *Philosophical Review* 31 (1922): 269–80.

"On Certain Aspects of the Religious Sentiment," *Journal of Religion* 3 (1924): 449–63.

"The Relation between Morality and Religion," in *Essays in Philosophy by Seventeen Doctors of the University of Chicago*, ed. William K. Wright and Thomas V. Smith (Chicago, 1929), pp. 61–82.

"A Realistic View of Theism," *Crozer Quarterly* 7 (1930): 5–23.

"God and Emergent Evolution," in *Religious Realism*, ed. Douglas C. Macintosh and Arthur K. Rogers (New York, 1931), pp. 431–75.

"The Recovery of the Religious Sentiment," in *Contemporary American Theology*, vol. 2, ed. Vergilius Ferm (New York, 1933), pp. 343–70.

"The End of the Day," *Philosophical Review* 55 (1946): 321–42.

Further Reading
Nat Cycl Amer Bio v44, *Pres Addr of APA v5*, *Proc of APA v30*, *Who Was Who in Amer v3*, *Who's Who in Phil*

Steven Fesmire
Heather E. Keith

WRIGHTON, William Hazer (1884–1962)

William Hazer Wrighton was born on 13 April 1884 in Godmanchester, England. He was the youngest of four sons born to Abner, a sculptor who taught the craft to his sons, and Elizabeth Wrighton. After receiving theological training at a school in Glasgow, Scotland, he married Alice Wilson in 1909. The next year they emigrated to Canada, first as missionaries to rural Saskatchewan, and then they went to Nova Scotia, where Wrighton attended Acadia University during 1910–12. He also took classes at MacMaster University in Toronto, and served as pastor to Park Baptist Church in Brantford, Ontario during the mid 1910s.

Deciding to pursue further education, Wrighton went to Kentucky, where he earned his BA in 1923 at Central University, a Presbyterian college in Danville, Kentucky. He also completed his DD degree from Central in 1926 while attending the University of Georgia, writing his thesis on "Ancient Bible Schools." He completed his MA at the University of Georgia in 1928, and immediately began teaching English, history, and American government there. In 1930 he became associate professor of philosophy and head of Georgia's newly established philosophy department. For several summers he also taught at Wheaton College in Illinois. In 1939 he was promoted to full professor of philosophy.

In 1941 Wrighton received an honorary LLD degree from Houghton College, and he joined the faculty of Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Philadelphia as professor of homiletics. In 1944 he moved to Gordon College of Theology and Missions in Boston as professor of homiletics. His first wife died in 1952, but he was soon married to Ruth Blott in 1953. In 1958 he became pastor of the First Baptist Church of Ephrata in the state of Washington, and he retired in May 1962. He died on 24 July 1962 in Victoria, British Columbia.

Wrighton's publications primarily consisted of lectures delivered at religious organizations and schools, expressing the rhetorical force and tone of elevated sermons. His articles appeared frequently in religious education serials, such as the Philadelphia *Sunday School Times.* Most of his books are accumulations of these occasional pieces. There is a small measure of theological sophistication in his exhortations, organized to present the fundamentals of conservative Baptist faith.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
A Philosopher's Love for Christ (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1937).
The Human Quest and the Divine Plan (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1938).
A Philosopher's Victory Through Christ (New York, 1938).
In the Land of Cromwell and Bunyan (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1939).
The Glory of His Grace: Norms of Blessing (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1940).
Love without a Limit (Chicago, 1943).

Other Relevant Works
Wrighton's papers are at Wheaton College, Illinois.

Further Reading
Balz, Albert G. A. *Southern Teachers of Philosophy* (Lexington, Kent., 1954), p. 127.

John R. Shook

Y

YODER, John Howard (1927–97)

John Howard Yoder was born on 27 December 1927 in Smithville, Ohio. He received a BA in Bible from Goshen College in Indiana. After postwar relief service with the Mennonite Central Committee in France from 1949 to 1954, he remained in Europe for further theological study, earning a PhD in theology in 1962 from the University of Basel. He studied with Karl Barth, Oscar Cullman, Walter Eichrodt, and Karl Jaspers, and wrote a dissertation in German on "Conversations between Anabaptists and Reformers, 1523–1538" (translated in 2004). Yoder served in administrative capacities in various Mennonite Church overseas agencies from 1959 to 1965. He then was professor of theology at Goshen Biblical Seminary from 1965 to 1984, and also served as the seminary's President from 1970 to 1973. He also began teaching at the University of Notre Dame in the late 1960s, and was a full-time professor of theology there from 1977 until his death. He had also been a longtime fellow of the Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies. He died on 30 December 1997 in South Bend, Indiana.

Yoder was the author of seventeen books and hundreds of articles in five languages, and the translator and co-author of several important works. More of his writings, including several books, have been published since his death. His most influential book, *The Politics of Jesus* (1972), has been translated into ten languages and has sold approximately 100,000 copies. It has been named one of the ten most important theological books of the twentieth century. He has also been identified, in a history of Christian ethics, as one of a handful of the most "formative Christian moral thinkers" of the twentieth century. This internationally renowned scholar and former President of the Society of Christian Ethics was deeply rooted in the Anabaptist and Mennonite tradition. It is true, as Walter Wink has said, that "more than any other person, Yoder has labored to bring the Peace Church witness against violence into the mainstream of theological discussion" (Wink 1998, p. 204). He also achieved intellectual respectability for both his own Anabaptist tradition and pacifism through numerous, compelling writings.

More than thirty-five years separate Yoder's first published words and his initial foray into "philosophical" writing. "But We Do See Jesus: The Particularity of Incarnation and the Universality of Truth" (in 1984) was not only his first serious venture into philosophical discourse but, more specifically, it was a move to make himself a tactical ally of non-foundationalist modes of thought. He joined Alasdair MacIntyre in claiming that "there is no other way to engage in the formulation, elaboration, rational justification, and criticism of accounts of practical rationality … except from within some one particular tradition" (MacIntyre 1988, p. 350). As Yoder puts it, "reality always was pluralistic and relativistic, that is, historical" (1984, p. 59). Moreover, Yoder agreed

with MacIntyre that to understand the morality and rationality of a particular tradition one must become an apprentice to the craft of moral inquiry that exists within that tradition.

One way to view Yoder's intellectual contribution is to see that he applied his considerable intellectual gifts both to apprenticing himself to the craft of moral inquiry embedded within his own Anabaptist/Mennonite tradition and to bringing conceptual clarity to what was best in that tradition. In this sense he was always doing philosophy. For as Stanley HAUERWAS has said: "in speech and writing [Yoder] was exacting. He had the kind of exactness only an analytic philosopher could love" (in *Conrad Grebel Review*, 1998, p. 99). Yoder's apprenticeship began in earnest with a careful study of the convictions and moral practices of Anabaptist radicals who were tortured and executed by the governing authorities within early sixteenth-century Switzerland. He emerged from this dissertation work with a vision for what it meant to be morally serious without persecuting dissenters. This vision included a commitment to nonviolence, economic sharing and communal moral discernment. It extended to the whole world while being rooted, simply but profoundly, in a call to follow Jesus.

Because those who accepted this call formed communities, their life together was shaped by the politics of Jesus. Yoder believed that Jesus, the Messiah, was the Word of God made flesh. This Word was good news – gospel – for the world. It was and is to be borne along, embodied, by a community of people who realize that they "know more fully from Jesus Christ and in the context of the confessed faith than [they] know in other ways" (1984, p. 11). This "knowing" includes loving our neighbors as ourselves and loving our enemies. The set of convictions and practices associated especially with love of enemies is sometimes labeled "pacifism." As we approach this word we need Alasdair MacIntyre's reminder in *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* that "justice" is always a word embedded in a narrative tradition. Likewise Yoder recognized that the word

"pacifism" awaits display. Michael WALZER notes: "morality is thick from the beginning, culturally integrated, fully resonant, and it reveals itself thinly only on special occasions, when moral language is turned to special purposes" (Walzer 1994, p. 4). One of the "special purposes" to which Yoder gave much of his life was instruction. Much of this instruction included a narration of the Christian traditions that make love of neighbors and love of enemies intelligible. But also precisely because of his specific commitment to Jesus and concern about the welfare of neighbors and enemies Yoder sought to educate a broad range of people about the ethics of war.

Many of Yoder's writings are either directly or indirectly related to pacifism. Most of them are theological in nature. However, not all are. *Nevertheless: Varieties of Religious Pacifism* (1971) offers an astute discussion of the inner logic of twenty-nine different types of pacifism. Drawing on his extensive acquaintance with the history of pacifism, he shows the strengths, weaknesses and logical non-pacifist parallels of twenty types of pacifism. He also provides briefer discussions of another eight types and then follows these discussions with an incisive, brief summary of his own approach. His analytical work throughout the book demonstrates how his approach contains the strengths of the other positions while resonating more fully with central Christian beliefs. *Nevertheless: Varieties of Religious Pacifism* provides an argument for pacifism from twenty-nine different directions. This rich variety and complexity substantiate that pacifism cannot be as easily dismissed as many imagine. In the last decade or so of his life Yoder wrote numerous essays reflecting on the relative efficacy of nonviolence for resolving conflicts. Some of these essays are collected in a posthumous book, *The War of the Lamb* (forthcoming).

Because Yoder was convinced that it was important to encourage those who did not embrace pacifism to be disciplined in their use of violence, he taught courses, wrote many articles and one book on the just war theory.

The book is entitled *When War Is Unjust: Being Honest in Just-War Thinking* (1996). The subtitle reflects his central concern: he wanted those who have officially adopted the just war theory to be honest in its employment. This includes being held accountable to just war theory in concrete ways that matter for how they conduct their lives during times of war. It also includes the acknowledgment that too often people who fly the "just war" flag are actually simply handing a government a "blank check." They unquestioningly do the country's bidding. Yoder asks: How does this practice reflect an honest employment of just war thinking? Furthermore, he challenges just war adherents to be prepared for the possibility of surrender in certain circumstances as an alternative to violating the just war theory. If they are not, the integrity of their adherence is brought into question.

From 1983 until his death Yoder wrote another handful of essays that supplemented what he said in "But We Do See Jesus." In "On Not Being Ashamed of the Gospel: Particularity, Pluralism, and Validation" (1992) he again argues for the inescapable reality of deriving truth-claims from particular traditions. In "Meaning After Babble: With Jeffrey Stout Beyond Relativism" (1996) he challenges a fellow moral philosopher who has sought to demonstrate that some moral claims are independent of context. Being impatient with the preoccupation with moral methodology in the academy, Yoder wrote an essay, "Walk and Word: The Alternatives to Methodologism" (1994), arguing that in real life we all employ a variety of methods of moral reasoning.

What we recognize, even in the titles of several of these essays, is that Yoder's more formal, methodological or philosophical essays were written to serve his normative claims. The importance of his work lies in the area of substantive moral claims, claims rooted deeply in the Scriptures, in the Christian tradition and in his own Mennonite tradition. He was convinced that these claims were relevant for – even binding upon – all those who are Christians and of significance to those beyond that community called Church.

All of Yoder's writing on the ethics of war should be understood as deeply rooted in his Mennonite heritage. They are rooted in the conviction that the Gospel of Jesus Christ is truly good news for neighbors and enemies near and far, the Gospel for all the nations. By most accounts this is theology, not philosophy. However, theology and philosophy are not finally two different forms of intellectual activity, but fruitfully related, as in Greek thought.

This brings us back to Yoder's comments regarding the particularity of claims about truth and ethics. If someone believes that "philosophy" offers a wider intellectual world than theology, it is good to be reminded by Yoder's philosophy. He wrote that:

> … any given wider world is still just one more place, even if what its slightly wider or slightly more prestigious circle of interpreters talk about is a better access to 'universality'… . Reality always was pluralistic and relativistic, that is historical. The idea that it could be otherwise was itself an illusion laid on us by Greek ontology language … . The ordinariness of the humanness of Jesus is the warrant for the generalizability of his reconciliation. The nonterritorial particularity of his Jewishness defends us against selling out to *any* wider world's claim to be really wider, or to be self-validating … . [It is precisely this] ordinariness for which our tactical alliance with pluralism/relativism/historicism has freed us, by suspecting all the remaining claims of any wider worlds, however accredited, to have the authority to pass judgment on the Lord. The particularity of incarnation *is* the universality of the good … . The real issue is not whether Jesus can make sense in a world far from Galilee, but whether – when he meets us in our world, as he does in fact – we want to follow him. We don't have to, as they didn't then. That we don't have to is the profoundest proof of his condescen-

sion, and thereby of his glory. (1984, pp. 49, 59, 62)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Christian Witness to the State (Newton, Kan., 1964).

Karl Barth and the Problem of War (Nashville, Tenn., 1970). Rev. edn, *Karl Barth and the Problem of War & Other Essays on Barth*, ed. Mark Thiessen Nation (Eugene, Oregon, 2003).

Nevertheless: Varieties of Religious Pacifism (Scottdale, Penn., 1971; 2nd edn 1992).

The Original Revolution: Essays on Christian Pacifism (Scottdale, Penn., 1971; 2nd edn 1977).

The Politics of Jesus: Vicit Agnus Noster (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1972; 2nd edn 1994).

Preface to Theology: Christology and Theological Method (Elkhart, Ind., 1981).

The Priestly Kingdom: Social Ethics as Gospel (Notre Dame, Ind., 1984).

He Came Preaching Peace: Bible Lectures on Peacemaking (Scottdale, Penn., 1985).

The Death Penalty Debate: Two Opposing Views of Capital Punishment, with H. Wayne House (Dallas, Tex., 1991).

Body Politics: Five Practices of the Christian Community before the Watching World (Nashville, Tenn., 1992).

The Royal Priesthood: Essays Ecclesiological and Ecumenical (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1994).

When War Is Unjust: Being Honest in Just-War Thinking (Maryknoll, N.Y., 1996).

For the Nations: Essays Public & Evangelical (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1997).

To Hear the Word (Eugene, Ore., 1998; 2nd edn 2001).

The Jewish–Christian Schism Revisited, ed. Michael G. Cartwright and Peter Ochs (Grand Rapids, Mich., 2003).

Anabaptism and Reformation in Switzerland: An Historical and Theological Analysis of the Dialogues between Anabaptists and Reformers, ed. C. Arnold Snyder, trans. David Carl Stassen and C. Arnold Snyder (Kitchener, Ontario, 2004).

The War of the Lamb, ed. Glen Harold Stassen and Mark Thiessen Nation (forthcoming).

Other Relevant Works

Yoder's papers are in the Archives of the Mennonite Church at Goshen College in Indiana.

"Reinhold Niebuhr and Christian Pacifism," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 29 (April 1955): 101–17.

"What Would You Do If … ? An Exercise in Situation Ethics," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 2 (1974): 81–105.

"On Not Being Ashamed of the Gospel: Particularity, Pluralism, and Validation," *Faith and Philosophy* 9 (1992): 285–300.

"Walk and Word: The Alternatives to Methodologism," in *Theology Without Foundations*, ed. Stanley Hauerwas, Nancey Murphy and Mark T. Nation (Nashville, Tenn., 1994), pp. 77–90, 312–17.

"How H. Richard Niebuhr Reasoned: A Critique of *Christ and Culture*," in *Authentic Transformation*, by John Howard Yoder et al. (Nashville, Tenn., 1996), pp. 31–89, 271–84.

"Meaning After Babble: With Jeffrey Stout Beyond Relativism," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 24 (1996): 125–39.

Further Reading

Carter, Craig A. *The Politics of the Cross: The Theology and Social Ethics* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 2001).

The Conrad Grebel Review 16 (Spring 1998). Issue devoted to Yoder.

Faith and Freedom: A Journal of Christian Ethics 5 (June 1996). Issue devoted to Yoder.

Hauerwas, Stanley. "Messianic Pacifism," *Worldview* 16 (June 1973): 29–33.

———, "The Nonresistant Church: The Theological Ethics of John Howard

Yoder," in *Vision and Virtue* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1974), pp. 197–221.

———, "When the Politics of Jesus Makes a Difference," *Christian Century* (13 October 1993): 982–7.

Hauerwas, Stanley, Chris K. Huebner, Harry J. Huebner, and Mark Thiessen Nation, eds. *The Wisdom of the Cross: Essays in Honor of John Howard Yoder* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1999). Contains a bibliography of Yoder's writings.

MacIntyre, Alasdair. *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1988).

The Mennonite Quarterly Review 77 (July 2003). Issue devoted to Yoder.

Ollenburger, Ben C., and Gayle Gerber Koontz, eds. *A Mind Patient and Untamed: Assessing John Howard Yoder's Contributions to Theology, Ethics, and Peacemaking* (Telford, Penn. and Scottdale, Penn., 2004).

Nation, Mark Thiessen. *A Comprehensive Bibliography of the Writings of John Howard Yoder* (Goshen, Ind., 1997).

———, *John Howard Yoder: Mennonite Patience, Evangelical Witness and Catholic Convictions* (Grand Rapids, Mich., forthcoming).

Walzer, Michael. *Thick and Thin: Moral Argument at Home and Abroad* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1994).

Wink, Walter. *The Powers That Be* (New York, 1998).

Wright, Nigel. *Disavowing Constantine: Mission, Church and the Social Order in the Theologies of John Howard Yoder and Jürgen Moltmann* (Carlisle, U.K., 2000).

Mark Thiessen Nation

YOLTON, John William (1921–)

John Yolton was born on 10 November 1921 in Birmingham, Alabama. He received his BA with honours at the University of Cincinnati in 1945. He did postgraduate studies at the University of California at Berkeley from 1946 to 1950, and then earned a PhD in philosophy from the University of Oxford in 1952. He was a visiting lecturer at Johns Hopkins University in 1952–3, assistant professor of philosophy at Princeton University from 1953 to 1957, associate professor of philosophy at Kenyon College from 1957 to 1961, and then professor of philosophy at the University of Maryland from 1961 to 1963. From 1963 to 1978 he was professor of philosophy at York University in Toronto, Canada, serving as department chair from 1963 to 1973. He also served as acting dean of graduate studies at York from 1967 to 1968, and acting president from 1973 to 1974. He left York to become professor of philosophy at Rutgers University in 1978 and Dean of Rutgers College (until 1985). From 1989 until his retirement in 1992 Yolton was John Locke Professor of the History of Philosophy at Rutgers.

For philosophers studying the philosophy of John Locke, John Yolton's work has been a necessity. No fewer than eight of his books are about Locke, and much of the rest of his work shows the influence of his study of Locke. Yolton began his career at a time when history of philosophy was largely regarded as a graveyard of past errors. The texts of philosophers like Locke were read in order to see how they had gone wrong, and they were treated as though they were about eternal conceptual issues and as though their intellectual environments were essentially those of the mid twentieth century. In this milieu Yolton demonstrated how to read the history of philosophy, and Locke in particular, with reference to the writings of other thinkers. He brought out the importance of recognizing that Locke is in many ways not our contemporary, although we may be able to learn much from him.

Several themes are found in Yolton's work: first, the controversies over the use of the term "idea," and the considerable importance attached to the claim that innate ideas are central to human moral and social values, and the consequent importance of innate ideas for religious thinkers; second, the religious, social and ethical significance of Locke's failure to insist that thinking required a separate spiritual substance, which led to him being labelled a Spinozist by some; hird, the large interconnection between apparently epistemological issues and the larger social and religious arena. Yolton's work thus highlights connections between Locke and other authors of his time, and between Locke the epistemologist and cognitive psychologist and philosopher of language on the one hand, and Locke the social and religious thinker on the other.

Yolton's influence comes in part from his having made the philosophic public more aware of writers and positions that had receded into the mists, and in part comes from his having thus encouraged others to take the historical context of writers from Descartes to Kant more seriously.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
John Locke and the Way of Ideas (Oxford, 1956).
The Philosophy of Science of A. S. Eddington (The Hague, 1960).
Thinking and Perceiving: A Study in Philosophy of Mind (La Salle, Ill., 1962).
Theory of Knowledge (New York, 1965).
Metaphysical Analysis (Toronto, 1967).
Locke and the Compass of Human Understanding: A Selective Commentary on the Essay (Cambridge, UK, 1970).
John Locke & Education (New York, 1971).
Thinking Matter: Materialism in Eighteenth-century Britain (Minneapolis, 1983).
Perceptual Acquaintance from Descartes to Reid (Minneapolis, 1984).
John Locke: A Reference Guide, with Jean S. Yolton (Boston, 1985).

Locke: An Introduction (Oxford, 1985).
Locke and French Materialism (Oxford, 1991).
A Locke Dictionary (Oxford, 1993).
Perception & Reality: A History from Descartes to Kant (Ithaca, N.Y., 1996).
Realism and Appearances: An Essay in Ontology (Cambridge, UK, 2000).
The Two Intellectual Worlds of John Locke: Man, Person, and Spirits in the Essay (Ithaca, N.Y., 2004).

Other Relevant Works
Ed., *John Locke: Problems and Perspectives, a Collection of New Essays* (Cambridge, UK, 1969).
Ed., *Philosophy, Religion, and Science in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Rochester, N.Y., 1990).
Ed., *Blackwell Companion to the Enlightenment* (Oxford, 1992).
Ed. with John Price and John Stephens, *Dictionary of Eighteenth-century British Philosophers* (Bristol, UK, 1999).

Further Reading
Bio 20thC Phils
Rogers, G. A. J., and Sylvana Tomaselli, eds. *The Philosophical Canon in the 17th and 18th Centuries: Essays in Honour of John W. Yolton* (Rochester, N.Y., 1996).

William R. Abbott

YOUNG, George Paxton (1818–89)

George Paxton Young was born on 9 November 1818 in Berwick upon Tweed, Scotland. He received an MA from the University of Edinburgh around 1840, and then taught mathematics at a small academy in Dollar, forty miles northwest of Edinburgh. Inspired by Thomas Chalmers, a leader of the

disruption against the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, Young decided in 1843 to enter the new Free Church Theological Hall for divinity training. Upon graduation he was ordained in the Free Church of Scotland and served as minister for two or three years before resolving to emigrate, and he arrived in Canada in 1848. In 1850 he was called to the pulpit of Knox Church in Hamilton, Ontario. His broad intellectual capacities were quickly appreciated. In 1853 he accepted an offer to become professor of logic, mental and moral philosophy, and also professor of evidences of natural and revealed religion, at Knox College in Toronto.

By the early 1860s his maturing philosophical views affected his stance towards the Westminster Confession, and so he surrendered his status as clergyman and resigned his college positions in 1864. He then served as the inspector of the region's schools and developed the educational system. In 1868 he returned to Knox College to teach only philosophy, declining an invitation to become professor of mathematics at Victoria College. In 1871, when James Beaven retired from Toronto's nonsectarian University College, Young assumed the chair of metaphysics and ethics, which he held for his remaining years. Young's teaching was highly regarded and very influential. Among his students was James Gibson Hume who later became professor of philosophy at the Toronto University. In those years he was active in the Canadian Institute, served on government education committees, and promoted church reunification. He also continued to publish on mathematics – in 1885 Young provided the solution for irreducible quintics lacking quadratic, cubic, and quartic terms. Young died on 26 February 1889 in Toronto, Ontario.

Young began his career as an advocate of Scottish realism's doctrine of direct and infallible relations with reality and God. This realism was later somewhat modified by reflection on the nature of consciousness inspired by German and British idealism. His 1862 "Lecture on the Philosophical Principles of Natural Religion" agreed with Kant that no proof of God's existence can succeed. However, both Kant's subjectivism and atheistic skepticism is forestalled by the power of reflection on our idea of God, which must be caused by an immediate relation with God. Young's contentious relationship with the last major Scottish realist, William Hamilton, is revealed where Young complains about those Hamiltonian doctrines that approach Hume's. Against British empiricism (including Berkeley), Young announced the doctrine that all conception is knowledge of an objectively existing reality. This doctrine forbids both skepticism and subjective idealism, and since deterministic materialism was out of the question for Young, that left objective and rationalist idealism as the only remaining option. Where British and Scottish empiricism left consciousness as a relation between a knowing self and thing known, Young protested, as did British idealists T. H. Green and F. H. Bradley, that consciousness was an all-encompassing whole that united the conceiving self with the object of knowledge. It is therefore impossible to conceive of mind separated from and only contingently related with the external world, and thus the external world must be mental and rational in nature. Young avoids pantheism by maintaining a clear distinction between the creator and the created. Although his theory of mind easily explains knowledge, error is another matter. Unlike the best British idealists or his fellow Canadian idealist John Watson, Young was never able to grapple with the inevitable difficulties in accounting for error when such infallible powers are granted to the mind.

Young's confidence in the power of mind to apprehend truth did not extend to the truths of moral rules or religious doctrines. However certain we are of the objective difference between right and wrong, no one has standing to claim detailed moral knowledge. Young could not rest with revealed religion, since the meaning of Scripture has been endlessly debated, and furthermore any validity to Scripture rests on the prior establishment of

God's existence, which only philosophy can facilitate. Philosophy, for Young, shows how only natural religion, especially its ability to draw attention to the powers of nature, supplies to a sufficiently intelligent mind the conviction of a divine sustainer of those powers. Interestingly, Young did not regard evolution as a threat, perhaps because evolution suggested that mind has evolved in concert with nature. Science would always be compatible with religion, since science's only task was to discern the harmonious relations within nature, unable to pursue the ultimate ground for the existence of those relations.

Science could never provide an ultimate criterion for ethics, but Young believed that religion could not dictate ethics either. Young rejected the notion that one's conscience could perfectly validate any moral principle, just as conscience was unable to validate a doctrinal stance for anyone but one's self. Conscience could apprehend that an eternal God must be the ground for the absolute distinction between right and wrong. However, only a "science of ethics" (which Young never worked out) could approach the moral nature of God by aiding the perfection of character. This ethical science of the true good for humanity would proceed in a direction contradictory to utilitarianism, since pleasure decreases in significance as people become more rationally devoted to intellectual and social duties. Young's developmental and somewhat democratic approach to religion and ethics caused him to advocate the liberalization of the Church, which should require no creed but only piety and righteousness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Miscellaneous Discourses and Expositions of Scripture (Edinburgh, 1854).

Freedom and Necessity: A Lecture, Delivered in Knox' College on the 6th April, 1870, at the Close of the College Session (Toronto, 1870).

The Ethics of Freedom: Notes Selected, Translated and Arranged by his Pupil James Gibson Hume (Toronto, 1911).

Other Relevant Works

Young's papers are at the University of Toronto.

"Lecture on the Philosophical Principles of Natural Religion," *Home and Foreign Record of the Canada Presbyterian Church* 2 (December 1862): 29–38. Reprinted in *Religion and Science in Early Canada*, ed. J. Douglas Rabb (Kingston, Ont., 1988), pp. 155–66.

Further Reading

Appleton's Cycl Amer Bio, *Canad Encyc*, *Dict Canad Bio*

Armour, Leslie, and Elizabeth Trott. "Reason and Morality: George Paxton Young and the Foundations of Ethics," in *The Faces of Reason: An Essay on Philosophy and Culture in English Canada, 1850–1950* (Waterloo, Ont., 1981), pp. 85–104.

Burton, John. "Biography," in *The Ethics of Freedom*, by George P. Young (Toronto, 1911), pp. 1–4.

Calderwood, H. "Professor George Paxton Young, LL. D.," *Knox College Monthly and Presbyterian Magazine* 10 (May 1889): 1–4.

Caven, William. "Professor Young," *Knox College Monthly and Presbyterian Magazine* 9 (March 1889): 265–8.

Irving, J. A. "The Development of Philosophy in Central Canada from 1850 to 1900," *Canadian Historical Review* 31 (1950): 252–87.

Slater, John G. *Minerva's Aviary: Philosophy at Toronto 1843–1943* (Toronto, 2005), chap. 3.

Stevenson, J. T., and Thomas Mathien. "George Paxton Young: Sceptical Fideist," in *Religion and Science in Early Canada*, ed. J. Douglas Rabb (Kingston, Ont., 1988), pp. 233–7.

John R. Shook

Z

ZAHM, John Augustine (1851–1921)

Born on 14 June 1851 in New Lexington, Ohio, John Augustine Zahm attended at times public, private, and parochial schools in his native state and in Indiana when his family moved westward. Entering the University of Notre Dame at the age of seventeen, he earned a BA in 1871 and became a novice in the Congregation of the Holy Cross that same year. For the next several years he taught science courses to undergraduates while studying at Notre Dame Seminary, receiving ordination in 1875. He was professor of chemistry and physics at Notre Dame from 1875 to 1892. For five years thereafter he lectured to large audiences in New York, Wisconsin, Louisiana, Belgium, and Switzerland. Solid grounding in such basics as sound transmission, optics, and electromagnetism lay underneath and, for many validated his more controversial ideas about science and religion.

Early in educational experience Zahm acquired a respect for modern science, its methods, standards, and accomplishments, and he retained that positive attitude throughout his lifetime. He was also a devoted Roman Catholic who never wavered in his loyalty to his church's basic doctrines. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century he gained an international reputation by viewing these two positions as not incompatible with each other. Because of this he became the most widely known American priest who maintained that modern biology and physics were not contradictory to Catholic dogma. In lectures and books he embraced evolutionary hypotheses about random variation in evolving species, extinction among many of these varying types, and the gradual development of present-day life forms. He regarded such theories not as palpable truths but rather as conclusions that were tenable in the light of geological evidence.

These evolutionary conclusions did not, to Zahm's way of thinking, threaten basic theological affirmations because they operated at a different, secondary, level. In the area of primary causation Zahm held that it was enough to affirm that God had created simple organisms, "unicellular monads" he called them, from nothing. After that providential beginning, evolutionary forces could exert themselves through the development of simple organisms into varied, complicated forms of plant and animal life. Thus God was the potential cause of physical change, not directly involved in proximate events as biblical narratives claimed, but standing behind the effects of natural forces that could be investigated empirically. Zahm saw no reason to deny that these natural processes also applied to the evolution of humanity from anthropoid quadrupeds to *Homo sapiens*. He insisted, however, on one doctrine as superior to the limits of physiology and psychology: rational souls were of divine origin, infused in people directly by God. Since in the last analysis, considering truths derived from both faith and reason, Zahm assured modern Catholics that they could accept evolutionary theories while retaining calm confi-

dence in their faith as well. True science could not destroy the church or belief in the God who engendered both sacred and secular knowledge.

Zahm tried to lay the foundations of an intelligent believer's response to contemporary science by arguing that evolutionary conceptions were as old as Aristotle and that they had been positively received by many church fathers including Thomas Aquinas. In 1895 Pope Leo XIII awarded him with an honorary doctorate, leading some to think that his pro-evolutionary ideas had found favor in high ecclesiastical circles. But he was not without his critics, and these soon made their influence felt. The conservative majority in Catholic thought still preferred customary assumptions about fixed species, mechanical causation, and biblical literalism. In 1898 the Sacred Congregation of the Index temporarily prohibited circulation of Zahm's books, particularly *Evolution and Dogma* (1896) which was being translated at that time into Italian. In the end he submitted to the Congregation's suppression and did not publish anything further about science and religion during the remaining two decades of his life. Many historians interpret this episode as part of the "Americanist" controversy in modern Catholicism. Zahm was silenced not on the merit of his ideas but because he was tarred with the same brush as were other liberal Catholics such as James Gibbons, John Ireland, John Keane, and Denis O'Connell. As is often the case in American history, ideas are frequently eclipsed by political factors.

For a time Zahm served as procurator of his order in Rome from 1896 to 1898. From 1898 to 1906 he served as US provincial of the Congregation of the Holy Cross while residing again at Notre Dame. During those years he sought to improve Catholic education by recruiting exceptional instructors and by improving extant labs and libraries. He built schools and increased the number of postulants in the order, establishing as well a center for graduate study, Holy Cross College, at the Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C. in 1895. But some of his policies regarding advanced study for seminarians and priests were considered too radical, and he was voted out of the provincial office. After what amounted to retirement in 1906, Zahm continued to travel and write, especially about South America and Catholic contributions to cultures there. Still, his principal interests lay in espousing a positive attitude regarding religious traditions and contemporary secular knowledge, a view that increasingly became the norm decades after his pioneering apologetics. While traveling, lecturing, and working to complete another travel book, he died on 10 November 1921 in Munich, Germany.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Catholic Science and Catholic Scientists (Philadelphia, 1893).
Bible, Science and Faith (Baltimore, Md., 1894).
Evolution and Dogma (Chicago, 1896).
Scientific Theory and Catholic Doctrine (Chicago, 1896).
Science and the Church (Chicago, 1896).
Great Inspirers (New York, 1917).

Other Relevant Works
Zahm's papers are at the University of Notre Dame in Indiana.

Further Reading
Amer Nat Bio, *Cambridge Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Bio*, *Dict Amer Religious Bio*, *Nat Cycl Amer Bio v9*, *Who Was Who in Amer v1*
Weber, Ralph E. *Notre Dame's John Zahm: American Catholic Apologist and Educator* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1961).

Henry Warner Bowden

ZANER, Richard Morris (1933–)

Richard Zaner was born on 20 September 1933 in Duncan, Arizona. After completing a BS in 1957 at the University of Houston, he received his MA (1959) and PhD degrees in philosophy (1961) from the New School of Social Research. He was awarded the first Alfred Schutz Memorial Award for outstanding dissertation. Zaner held academic appointments in the departments of philosophy at Lamar State University, Trinity University, and the University of Texas at Austin. Starting in 1971, he served as the first Director of the Division of Social Sciences and Humanities at the Health Sciences Center of the State University of New York at Stony Brook. He later became chair of the department of philosophy at Southern Methodist University. In 1981 Zaner became the Ann Geddes Stahlman Professor of Medical Ethics in the department of medicine at Vanderbilt University. He was founder and Director (1982–2000) of the Vanderbilt Center for Clinical and Research Ethics. He retired in 2002.

In addition to six original books, Zaner has authored over one hundred professional articles and book chapters. He has edited ten books in the areas of phenomenology and medical ethics, and has translated from German to English the works of Wilhelm Dilthey, Alfred SCHUTZ, and Aron GURWITSCH. Zaner has served on the editorial boards of several professional journals and book series, and has delivered over 300 professional lectures, colloquia, and addresses.

The student of Dorion Cairns, Alfred Schutz, Aron Gurwitsch, Werner Marx, and Hans JONAS, Zaner was educated in a classical phenomenological environment. From the beginning he understood phenomenology as a field of inquiry integral to the nature of philosophy itself, and not as a regional topic in the academic study of philosophy. His early works emphasize phenomenology as a discipline of philosophy that can only be learned by engaging in it. Subsequently, his first work on embodiment is not an objective study of the body but an attempt to understand the pre-predicative constitution of our own corporeality.

In the early 1970s, Zaner turned his phenomenological interests toward previously uncharted areas of modern philosophical endeavor – the problem of human illness and its clinical treatment. His many articles and later books have been devoted to the philosophy of medicine in the hopes of establishing a basis for an ethics responsive to clinical encounters and the institutional contexts which frame them. Such an ethics would include the doctor–patient relationship, the nature and requirements of clinical judgment, the social structure of clinical encounters, and the multiple forms of uncertainty and responsibility in decision-making. In a phenomenological sense, Zaner sees his task as identifying the best "evidence" and "mode of expression" for the phenomena in question (the clinical encounter) and then, working within the logic of narrative, to describe how the unique instance of a doctor–patient encounter presents itself as part of our everyday life-world.

Of particular ethical interest to Zaner have been "before birth" issues such as maternal–fetal relationships, prenatal diagnosis, and problems associated with genetics and embryos. Many of his publications attempt to call our attention to the slow shift in medical concern from curing disease and the restoration of health and towards eugenics and the deliberate engineering and transformation of living beings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Problem of Embodiment: Some Contributions to a Phenomenology of the Body (The Hague, 1964).

The Way of Phenomenology (New York, 1970).

The Context of Self: A Phenomenological Inquiry Using Medicine as a Clue (Athens, Ohio, 1981).

Ethics and the Clinical Encounter (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1988).

Troubled Voices: Stories of Ethics and Illness (Cleveland, Ohio, 1993).

At the Edge of Chance (Georgetown, D.C., 2003).

Further Reading
Human Studies 21 (January 1998). Symposium issue on Zaner.
Schenck, David. "Operative Dimensions of Zaner's Context of Self," *International Studies in Philosophy* 16 (1984): 58–64.

Mark S. Muldoon

ZEDLER, Beatrice Hope (1916–)

Beatrice Hope Zedler was born on 14 May 1916, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, the daughter of Edwin and Cecelia M. (Koch) Zedler. She was educated at Marquette University where she received her BA summa cum laude in 1937, and MA in 1938. She was awarded the PhD in philosophy by Fordham University in 1947, writing a dissertation on "St. Thomas' Critique of Avicennism in the '*De Potentia Dei*'." Zedler taught at Marian College in Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, as instructor in English and philosophy in 1939–40, and then at College Misericordia in Dallas, Pennsylvania during 1941–3. In 1946 Zedler joined the philosophy department at Marquette University, teaching there as a philosophy instructor (1946–51), assistant professor (1951–4), associate professor (1954–63), and full professor (1963–86). Zedler held the Women's Chair of Humanistic Studies during 1967–71, and was Marquette's Aquinas Lecturer in 1983. She presently lives in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

A scholar of great erudition and breadth, Zedler is renowned for her translations and studies of Western and Arabic medieval philosophy, as well as for her groundbreaking historical and biographical work on women in philosophy. Yet she was no less at home in the interpretation of the major figures of classical American philosophy. Her sensitive and astute explorations of often neglected aspects of John DEWEY's thought, for example in "The Quiet Dimension of Experience" (1979), in which she allows Dewey's poetry to illuminate his aesthetic theory, are especially noteworthy.

Though much of Zedler's work focused on medieval thought, her knowledge has been fully engaged to clarify momentous current events. Her article, "The Ayatollah Khomeini and his Concept of an Islamic Republic" (1981), carefully narrates the philosophical origins of Khomeini's political beliefs, tracing them back through Alfarabi, Avicenna, and Averroes to their bedrock in Plato's political theory. In her 1983 Aquinas Lecture, *How Philosophy Begins*, Zedler draws on St. Thomas to probe the idea of wonder as the source of our need to philosophize. She finds the answer, in part, in biography: in hardship and loss; in reversal of fortune; in "the sting of reality." "Each temporal and earthly experience," she writes, "can actuate our potentiality for knowing. Each is an invitation to think. Through successive acts of thinking about successive experiences, our philosophical life develops and *moves* towards achieving its fulfillment." (p. 35).

BIBLIOGRAPHY
"The Inner Unity of the De Potentia," *Modern Schoolman* 25 (1948): 91–106.
"Averroes on the Possible Intellect," *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 25 (1951): 164–77.
"Averroes and Immortality," *New Scholasticism* 28 (1954): 436–53.
"St. Thomas, Interpreter of Avicenna," *Modern Schoolman* 33 (1955): 1–18.
"John Dewey in Context," in *Some Philosophers on Education* (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1956).
"Dewey's Theory of Knowledge," in *John Dewey: His Thought and Influence*, ed. John Blewett (New York, 1960).
"The Prince of the Physicians on the Nature

of Man," *Modern Schoolman* 55 (1978): 165–77.

"The Quiet Dimension of Experience," *Modern Schoolman* 56 (1979): 349–55.

"The Ayatollah Khomeini and His Concept of an Islamic Republic." *International Philosophical Quarterly* 21 (1981): 83–98.

"Why Are the Possibles Possible?" *New Scholastism* 55 (1981): 113–30.

How Philosophy Begins (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1983).

"The Three Princesses," *Hypatia* 4 (1989): 28–63.

Other Relevant Works

Zedler's papers are at Marquette University.

Trans., *Destructio Destructionum Philosophiae Algazelis in the Latin Version of Calo Calonymos*, by Averroes (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1961).

Trans., *The History of Women Philosophers. Historia Mulierum Philosopharum*, by Giles Menage (Lanham, Md., 1984).

Trans., *On the Unity of the Intellect against the Averroists. De Unitate Intellectus Contra Averroistas*, by St. Thomas Aquinas (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1968).

Further Reading
Women Phils

Gary S. Calore

ZIFF, Robert Paul (1920–2003)

Paul Ziff was born on 22 October 1920 in New York City. He practiced art until 1942 when he entered the United States Coast Guard, serving until the end of World War II. In 1946 he enrolled at Cornell University to study with the painter J. M. Hanson. He was awarded the BFA in 1949, and in 1951 received a PhD in philosophy after completing a dissertation under the direction of Max BLACK. Ziff taught philosophy at Michigan in 1952–3; Harvard from 1953 to 1959; Pennsylvania from 1959 to 1964; Wisconsin from 1964 to 1968; and the University of Illinois at Chicago from 1968 to 1970. From 1970 until his retirement in 1988, he was William Rand Kenan, Jr. Professor of Philosophy at the University of North Carolina. As much an artist as a philosopher, Ziff was awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship for painting in 1962–3. He died on 9 January 2003 in Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Ziff's primary contributions to philosophy were in philosophy of language, aesthetics, and philosophy of mind, but he also made important contributions to epistemology and philosophy of religion. His work brought together disparate influences in surprising ways, and his importance to the discipline consisted in his style of philosophizing as much as in his defense of doctrines. Ziff was a student at Cornell when Ludwig Wittgenstein and his later philosophy made their appearance in America, and in 1955 he went to Oxford to work with J. L. Austin on a Rockefeller Foundation grant.

Unlike most of those who grasped the power of "ordinary language philosophy," Ziff also was influenced by more formal philosophers such as Nelson GOODMAN and W. V. QUINE. Stronger still was the influence of linguists such as Noam CHOMSKY and Zelig HARRIS. Ziff's *Semantic Analysis* (1960) was the first major work to bring together philosophy of language and the "new linguistics." The theory he sketched in this book was motivated by his interest in aesthetics: he wanted to know what "good painting" means. The final chapter is an analysis of the meaning of "good" that has rarely been exceeded in rigor and insight. Among the many important ideas that have found their way into the literature (often without acknowledgement) is the view that a semantic system is best characterized as a recursive system. In a later work, *Epistemic Analysis*

(1984), Ziff subjected the word "know" to the same kind of obsessive analysis to which he had earlier subjected the word "good."

Ziff's major work in aesthetics is a series of papers published in the 1950s and 60s, and his beautiful, brilliant, sometimes aggravating book, *Antiaesthetics* (1984). Aesthetic appreciation is what matters for Ziff, and here he provocatively asserts that "anything that can be viewed is a fit object for aesthetic attention." He challenges the rigidity and pretentiousness of the aesthetic establishment by asking us to contemplate a beer can on the side of the road along with a Dubuffet painting in the Museum of Modern Art. He brings to the forefront questions about the aesthetic appreciation of nature, a topic largely ignored since Kant, and he anticipates the rise of evolutionary psychology by posing questions about the evolutionary history and functions of our aesthetic practices.

Careful study of Ziff's claims and arguments yields large returns but his passion was for inventing, creating, reframing, and rediscovering questions. By the time those in the mainstream had arrived on the scene, Ziff was usually on to something else. In the words of one of his students, Ziff was "inexhaustibly creative, unflaggingly analytical, and proudly iconoclastic." He was an early explorer of various concepts and ideas including functionalism, the role of empirical inferences in philosophy of mind, the importance of pragmatics in a theory of language, *ceteris paribus* clauses in understanding, and concepts of vagueness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Semantic Analysis (Ithaca, N.Y., 1960).
Philosophic Turnings: Essays in Conceptual Appreciation (Ithaca, N.Y., 1966).
Understanding Understanding (Ithaca, N.Y., 1972).
Antiaesthetics: An Appreciation of the Cow with the Subtile Nose (Dordrecht, 1984).
Epistemic Analysis: *A Coherence Theory of Knowledge* (Dordrecht, 1984).
Moralities: A Diachronic Evolutionary Approach (Dordrecht, 2004).

Other Relevant Works
"Art and the 'Object of Art'," *Mind* 60 (1951): 466–80.
J. M. Hanson (Ithaca, N.Y., 1962).
"On H. P. Grice's Account of Meaning," *Analysis* 28 (1967): 1–8.
"About Proper Names," *Mind* 86 (1977): 319–32.

Further Reading
Proc of APA v77
Alston, William P. "Ziff's Semantic Analysis," *Journal of Philosophy* 59 (1962): 5–20.
Dickie, George. *Evaluating Art* (Philadelphia, 1988).
Jamieson, Dale, ed. *Language, Mind, and Art: Essays in Appreciation and Analysis, in Honor of Paul Ziff* (Dordrecht, 1994). Contains a bibliography of Ziff's publications.

Dale Jamieson

ZUCKERKANDL, Victor (1896–1965)

Victor Zuckerkandl was born on 2 July 1896 in Vienna, Austria. He earned a PhD in music in 1927 at Vienna University. From 1927 to 1933, Zuckerkandl served as music critic for various Berlin newspapers, and from 1934 to 1938 he taught music appreciation and theory at Vienna University. In 1940 Zuckerkandl came to the United States to teach for two years in the music department at Wellesley College. From 1946 to 1948, he taught music theory at the New School for Social Research in New York City, and in 1948 he joined the music faculty at St. John's College in Maryland. While at St. John's, he received a grant from the American Philosophical Society to develop a course on music specifically designed for the liberal arts student. The course dealt with the

nature, structure, and significance of the way great composers of the past utilized tonality. Zuckerkandl retired from St. John's College in 1964 and moved to Ascona, Switzerland. Zuckerkandl died on 25 April 1965 in Locarno, Switzerland.

Zuckerkandl's first major book, *Sound and Symbol: Music and the External World*, was published in 1956. His second work, *The Sense of Music* (1959), presented to a larger audience the ideas developed in the course on music designed for liberal arts students. *Man the Musician* (1973), the second volume of *Sound and Symbol*, was developed throughout his years at St. John's College. Other publications included articles in American, British, and German journals on music, music theory, and education.

In *Sound and Symbol* Zuckerkandl begins with the same kind of question Kant applied to the natural sciences: "How must I consider the world, how must I consider myself, if I am to understand the reality of music?" (1956, p. 7) Generally that question applied to music gets resolved either as a physicist would or as a psychologist would. Music is either sound vibration produced by vocal chords or instruments, or it is the result of those vibrations on the brain. Zuckerkandl rejects both of the answers. He rejects the acoustics of Theodor Lipps and the psychological explanation of Carroll Pratt as well as Gestalt theories. Zuckerkandl also abandons the phenomenological theories of music as intentional object found in Gisèle Brelet or Jeanne Vial, although he is much more sympathetic to this position. Zuckerkandl's very careful phenomenology never shies away from the metaphysical. He insists that music provides us with an unusual experience that deserves careful thought about its most basic elements. *Sound and Symbol* tries to grasp how a simple melody made of simple tones can *be*. Zuckerkandl is not interested in the traditional aesthetic questions of beauty, taste, or pleasure. Nor is he interested in traditional music theory questions. His question about music concerns ontology.

Zuckerkandl discusses how tones have meaning and how it is that we hear successions of tones as melodies. "A melody is a series of tones that makes sense." (1956, p. 15) Since tones do not represent anything outside themselves as words or paintings can, how can they have meaning? It is a meaning that is built out of the relation between tones. A tone by itself has no meaning, but it acquires one when it occurs within a system of sounds, particularly the tonal system. Think of the final phrase of this melody: "Mary had a little lamb whose fleece was white as snow." When we hear in our mind's ear that *as*, we hear the will, the tendency, the dynamic quality of the tone in that melody. The dynamic quality of tone is informed by its contextualization in a phrase or melody (1958, p. 19). We hear the tone become active, as Zuckerkandl describes. Not surprisingly, different tonal contextualization accomplishes this dynamism in different ways. Because acoustics studies only individual tones, it misses this quality that anyone who is not tune-deaf can hear in music.

The dynamic quality *is* the musical quality. But what causes this quality? Not the physical properties of sounds. Zuckerkandl argues that the quality described by Lipps's "pulse theory" is not referring to tones, but to our physical and psychological receptions of music. From yet another perspective, "associationism" wishes to solve the problem by arguing that the play of forces in tones is in us, the hearers, and has no real correspondence to the external world. Yet, as Zuckerkandl points out, the subjective turn of associationist and behaviorist approaches ends up neglecting the very intersubjective element that marks music's tandem with the external world: creation. Artistic (or aesthetic) experience cannot be reduced to "conditioning, repetition, habit, learning," "leaving the element of creativeness out of account" (1956, p. 52).

Another important element of *Sound and Symbol* is Zuckerkandl's notion of the dynamic symbol. Here, Zuckerkandl cautiously acknowledges a debt to a linguistic understanding of music, while making some clear

pragmatic distinctions. In terms of meaning, tones are to music what words are to language. Yet, tone and meaning are connected even more intimately than the way in which a word, or symbol, refers to a thing. The meaning of a tone lies "not in what it points to but *in the pointing itself* …" (1956, p. 68). In this sense, tones are dynamic symbols in that they make manifest the transcendent force of music in a direct perception. This argument of Zuckerkandl's echoes Susanne LANGER's position published in 1943.

The remaining three sections of *Sound and Symbol* on motion, time, and space, are so entitled because they mark for Zuckerkandl the chief tonal phenomena. Each of these, when understood properly, reveals that music is neither matter nor idea, neither inner nor outer, neither physical nor psychological. Motion, which has always been perceived in music, is not quite the same as rhythm, which is a "comparatively new thing" (1956, p. 76). Second, in a chapter on "The Paradox of Motion," Zuckerkandl introduces the key idea that motion in music simultaneously suggests that which moves and that which does not move, or at least, that in which movement is activated and perceived differently. Of time, Zuckerkandl's course of inquiry might be summed up in one phrase: "Measure and thing measured are not one and the same" (1956, p. 153). This is where rhythm becomes most significant – not so much as motion, but as "the principal manifestation of time" (1956, p. 157). Finally, with space, music (which is often designated as a "nonspatial" art, primarily of tone and time) is able to be built up, as Zuckerkandl suggests. Clearly reminiscent of a phenomenological understanding akin to Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Zuckerkandl describes music as that which "occurs where the sun rises and sets, where birds fly past, where a shout sounds: outside, outside of myself, not in me. Music that I hear does not arise in me; it encounters me, it comes to me – from where? What is the meaning of terms like 'outside,' 'from outside,' what is the difference between 'within' and

'without,' if I am not allowed to speak of space?" (1956, p. 268)

Zuckerkandl proposes that music makes us confront the inadequacies of a metaphysic that is dualistic. He insists that the outer world is not equivalent to the physical world (1956, p. 57). He even insists that the space, time, and motion that are heard in music are fundamental elements of our world. They reveal space, time, and motion more clearly and truthfully than the scientists, psychologists, or philosophers have traditionally held (1956, p. 366). In so arguing he is looking back to Schopenhauer's understanding of music as revealing the will of the world, as well as looking forward at the new developments in quantum physics.

Zuckerkandl's second major book, *The Sense of Music*, is an attempt to create an understanding of music which would be palatable to liberal arts students and, in a broader sense, nonprofessionals and novices to music alike. Such an understanding, argues Zuckerkandl, cannot ultimately be found in music theory, music history, or music appreciation. Although all of these approaches ask the question "What is music?" Zuckerkandl insists on eliminating the notion of attaining any absolute truths with respect to the meaning of music. These far-sweeping explanations of music may not exist, but a logical and specific account is still possible.

Zuckerkandl distinguishes his account from emotivist approaches to music. His cautious objectivism argues that emotion, although it does have a place in our experience of music, neither constitutes nor informs the affect of musical tones themselves. Zuckerkandl challenges the ambiguity of emotivist theories with respect to the causality of musical experience. On his account, the motion of musical tones is the cause of the inward motion of the listener's emotional constitution, and not the other way around. Emotion, argues Zuckerkandl, is a "psychological consequence" which must be distinguished from those aspects which constitute "the elementary nature of musical phenomena" (1959, pp. 245–6).

In *Man the Musician*, Zuckerkandl explores the significance of music with respect to spiritual fulfillment, as well as an understanding of history. He argues that music, along with language, is a chief contributor to the spiritual being of humans. Referring to Socrates, Zuckerkandl considers musicality as an essential attribute of human beings, and not merely as a "gift" or "talent" attributable to certain individuals. This belief in the inherent musicality of human beings also informs his discussion of specific aspects of music proper, especially tone.

As in *Sound and Symbol*, Zuckerkandl reiterates the significance of tone as the most fundamental and distinct aspect of music. On the one hand, tones constitute music's self-referentiality – as conveying a meaning that is abstract and unto itself. On the other hand, tones contribute to a kind of musical intentionality – as conveying a meaning that is concrete and wanting to be heard. Zuckerkandl describes this duality as the "outgoing and incoming" dynamism of tones. He suggests that this dynamism is intimately connected to human existence. Not surprisingly, Zuckerkandl often refers to the work of Heinrich Schenker, whose cosmological organicism posited that organic and transcendent qualities were embedded in the tonality and tonal movement of music. In Zuckerkandl's dualistic view, tones constitute music's innate position in the makeup of human consciousness, as well as music's tendency to engender collective experience, or "togetherness" (1973, p. 28).

Finally, Zuckerkandl suggests that we apprehend the significance of music as a kind of law, by which the feeling that we know ourselves to be alive "is realized in its purest form" (1973, p. 350). Zuckerkandl argues that the notion of a musical law would be logically no different from the notion of natural law, in that musical law also displays a kind of internal consistency. Moreover, in Zuckerkandl's view, music provides a valuable medium through which we might grasp the meaning of history, which, like music, is unrepeatable and often unpredictable.

The work of Zuckerkandl is marked by a cumulative effort to balance many detailed insights from music theory and scholarship with a deep concern for linking music fundamentally to human consciousness and understanding. His goal of making a thorough understanding of music palatable to listeners across educational and appreciative backgrounds has left a lasting impression on musical aesthetics and has set a standard for interdisciplinary inquiry.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Music Education in the Liberal Arts College," *Harvard Educational Review* 14 (December–January 1944): 49–58.

Sound and Symbol: Music and the External World (Princeton, N.J., 1956).

The Sense of Music (Princeton, N.J., 1959).

"Cooke: The Language of Music," *Journal of Music Theory* 4 (April 1960): 104–108.

Die Wirklichkeit der Musik: Der musikalische Begriff der Aussenwelt (Zurich, 1963).

"Thomas Mann, musico," *Zeitschrift fur die Iberische Welt* 7 (1967): 45–9.

Man the Musician (Princeton, N.J., 1973).

Further Reading

Hansen, Forest. *Music, Feeling, and Meaning: A Study of Four Theories*. PhD dissertation, Johns Hopkins University (Baltimore, Md., 1967).

Lipp, Gerhard. *Das musikanthropologische Denken von Viktor Zuckerkandl* (Tutzing, Germany, 2002).

MICHAEL DAVID SZÉKELY

Index

INDEX